

# RELATIVE CLUSTER TILTING THEORY AND $\tau$ -TILTING THEORY

YU LIU, JIXING PAN AND PANYUE ZHOU

ABSTRACT. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a Krull-Schmidt triangulated category with shift functor  $[1]$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  be a rigid subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$ . We are concerned with the mutation of two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategories. We show that any almost complete two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory has exactly two completions. Then we apply the results on relative cluster tilting subcategories to the domain of  $\tau$ -tilting theory in functor categories and abelian categories.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	4
3. Mutation of relative rigid subcategories	8
4. Almost complete relative cluster tilting subcategories	17
5. $\tau$ -tilting theory in functor categories	18
6. $\tau$ -tilting theory in abelian categories	23
7. Examples	35
References	35

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Tilting theory emerges as a versatile method for establishing equivalences between categories. Initially developed in the framework of module categories over finite dimensional algebras, tilting theory has now evolved into an indispensable tool across various mathematical domains. Applications have been found in diverse fields such as finite and algebraic group theory, commutative and non-commutative algebraic geometry, as well as algebraic topology.

Let  $\Lambda$  be a finite dimensional hereditary algebra over an algebraically closed field. All modules are regarded as finite dimensional left  $\Lambda$ -modules. We assume that  $\Lambda$  has  $n$  isomorphism classes of simple modules. A partial tilting module  $M$  is called an almost complete tilting module, if  $M$  has  $n - 1$  non-isomorphic indecomposable direct summands. An indecomposable module  $X$  is called a complement to  $M$ , if  $M \oplus X$  is a tilting module and  $X$  is not isomorphic to a direct summand of  $M$ . It has been shown in [HR] that there always exists a complement to an almost complete tilting module  $M$ , and further research [RS, U, HU] showed that such a partial tilting module allows (up to isomorphism) at most two complements and there are two such complements if and only if the partial tilting module is sincere.

Let  $A$  be a finite dimensional algebra over a field. Adachi, Iyama and Reiten [AIR] introduced  $\tau$ -tilting theory, which is a generalization of classical tilting theory. The impetus to explore  $\tau$ -tilting theory arises from various sources, with a key focus on the mutation of tilting modules. It's worth noting that one limitation of tilting module mutation is its occasional infeasibility. This limitation serves as the driving force behind the exploration of  $\tau$ -tilting theory. Support  $\tau$ -tilting (resp.  $\tau$ -rigid) modules extend the scope of tilting (resp. partial tilting) modules by incorporating the Auslander-Reiten translation. In essence, support  $\tau$ -tilting modules offer a natural extension of the class of tilting module with respect to mutation. Notably, as demonstrated in [AIR], a basic almost complete support  $\tau$ -tilting module emerges as a direct summand of exactly two basic support  $\tau$ -tilting modules. This means that mutation of support  $\tau$ -tilting modules is always possible.

---

Yu Liu is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12171397). Panyue Zhou is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12371034) and by the Hunan Provincial Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 2023JJ30008).

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 18G80; 18E10.

*Key words and phrases.* two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategories; two-term (weak)  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategories; mutations; support  $\tau$ -tilting subcategories.

Cluster categories were introduced by Buan, Marsh, Reineke, Reiten, and Todorov [BMRRT] in order to categorify Fomin-Zelevinsky's cluster algebras [FZ1, FZ2]. Consider  $\Lambda$ , a finite dimensional hereditary algebra over an algebraically closed field with  $n$  non-isomorphic simple modules. The cluster category of  $\Lambda$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{C}_\Lambda = \mathrm{D}^b(\mathrm{mod}\Lambda)/\tau^{-1}[1]$ , arises as the Verdier quotient category. In a triangulated category, rigid objects manifest in three distinct forms: cluster tilting, maximal rigid, and complete rigid. Generally speaking, these forms are not equivalent [BIKR, KZ], yet in the cluster category  $\mathcal{C}_\Lambda$ , they are demonstrated to be equivalence [BMRRT]. In contrast to classical tilting modules, cluster tilting objects in cluster categories exhibit favorable characteristics [BMRRT]. For instance, any almost complete cluster tilting object in a cluster category can be completed to a cluster tilting object in exactly two ways. Adachi, Iyama and Reiten [AIR] established a bijection between cluster tilting objects in a 2-Calabi-Yau triangulated category and support  $\tau$ -tilting modules over a cluster-tilted algebra (also see [CZZ, YZ, FGL] for various versions of this bijection).

Mutation of  $n$ -cluster tilting subcategories was introduced by Iyama and Yoshino [IY], they also studied almost complete  $n$ -cluster tilting subcategories. They proved that any almost complete cluster tilting subcategory of a 2-Calabi-Yau triangulated category is contained in exactly two cluster tilting subcategories. We know that cluster tilting subcategories are maximal rigid subcategories, the converse is not true in general. Zhou and Zhu [ZZ] proved any almost complete maximal rigid subcategory of a 2-Calabi-Yau triangulated category is contained in exactly two maximal rigid subcategories. In [LJY], Iyama, Jørgensen, and Yang introduced a functorial version of  $\tau$ -tilting theory. They extended the concept of support  $\tau$ -tilting modules from finite dimensional algebras to essentially small additive categories. Their results demonstrated that for a triangulated category  $\mathcal{C}$  with a silting subcategory  $\mathcal{S}$ , there exists a one-to-one correspondence between the set of two-term silting subcategories in  $\mathcal{S} * \mathcal{S}[1]$  and the set of support  $\tau$ -tilting subcategories of  $\mathrm{mod}\mathcal{S}$ .

Yang, Zhou, and Zhu [YZZ] introduced the notion of (weak)  $\mathcal{T}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategories for a triangulated category  $\mathcal{C}$  with a cluster tilting subcategory  $\mathcal{T}$ . They established a correspondence between the set of weak  $\mathcal{T}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategories of  $\mathcal{C}$  and the set of support  $\tau$ -tilting subcategories of  $\mathrm{mod}\mathcal{T}$ , which extends the correspondence in [YZ]. This correspondence resembles the one presented in [LJY]. Consider a triangulated category  $\mathcal{C}$  with shift functor  $[1]$  and a rigid subcategory  $\mathcal{R}$ . Zhou and Zhu [ZhZ] introduced the concepts of two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategories, two-term (weak)  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategories, and two-term maximal  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategories. They proved that there is a bijection between the set of two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategories of  $\mathcal{C}$  and the set of  $\tau$ -rigid subcategories of  $\mathrm{mod}\mathcal{R}$ , which establishes a one-to-one correspondence between the set of two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategories of  $\mathcal{C}$  and the set of support  $\tau$ -tilting subcategories of  $\mathrm{mod}\mathcal{R}$ . This result extends the main results in [YZZ] when  $\mathcal{R}$  is a cluster tilting subcategory. Furthermore, when  $\mathcal{R}$  is a silting subcategory, they showed that the two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategories precisely coincide with the two-term silting subcategories presented in [LJY], thus establishing a bijection analogous to the bijection in [LJY].

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a Krull-Schmidt triangulated category with shift functor  $[1]$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  a rigid subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$ . We first show the following result, which is an analogue of co-Bongartz completion.

**Proposition 1.1.** (see Proposition 3.1 for details) *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory such that every object in  $\mathcal{R}$  admits a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation. Then it is contained in a two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$ .*

By [ZhZ, Theorem 3.1], for any two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory  $\mathcal{X}$  such that every object in  $\mathcal{R}[1]$  admits a right  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation, we can construct a two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$  which contains  $\mathcal{X}$ . Our first main result shows that there exists a mutation for two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategories. Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$ . For convenience, if each object in  $\mathcal{R}$  admits a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation and each object in  $\mathcal{R}[1]$  admits a right  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation, we say that  $\mathcal{X}$  is  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -functorially finite.

**Theorem 1.2.** (see Definition 3.9 and Theorem 3.11 for details) *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be an  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -functorially finite two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory. Then  $(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}, \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}})$  forms an  $\mathcal{X}$ -mutation pair.*

Next, we introduce the definition of the *almost complete* relative cluster tilting subcategories.

**Definition 1.3.** *We call a two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory  $\mathcal{X}$  an almost complete two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory if the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (a)  $\mathcal{X}$  is  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -functorially finite;
- (b) There exists an indecomposable object  $W \notin \mathcal{X}$  such that  $\text{add}(\mathcal{X} \cup \{W\})$  is two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting.

Any two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory which has the form in (b) is called a completion of  $\mathcal{X}$ .

Our second main result concerns the existence of completions for almost complete two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategories.

**Theorem 1.4.** (see Theorem 4.4 for details) *Any almost complete two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory  $\mathcal{X}$  has exactly two completions  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$ . Moreover, if  $\mathcal{U}$  is a two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory which contains  $\mathcal{X}$ , then  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$  or  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$ .*

We derive the following direct consequence of Theorem 1.4, where the first part is established in [IY], and the second part in [ZZ].

**Corollary 1.5.** (a) *In a 2-Calabi-Yau triangulated category with cluster tilting subcategories, any almost complete cluster tilting subcategories have exactly two completions.*

(b) *In a 2-Calabi-Yau triangulated category with maximal rigid subcategories, any almost complete maximal rigid subcategories (in the sense of Zhou and Zhu [ZZ]) have exactly two completions.*

We write  $\text{Mod } \mathcal{R}$  for the abelian category of contravariantly additive functor from  $\mathcal{R}$  to the category of abelian group, and  $\text{mod } \mathcal{R}$  for the full subcategory of finitely presentation functor (see [Au] for details). There exists a functor

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}: \mathcal{C} &\longrightarrow \text{Mod } \mathcal{R} \\ M &\longmapsto \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, M) |_{\mathcal{R}} \end{aligned}$$

sometimes known as the restricted Yoneda functor. By [IY, Proposition 6.2], the functor  $\mathbb{H}$  induces an equivalence

$$(\mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]) / \mathcal{R}[1] \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{mod } \mathcal{R}.$$

This result serves as a bridge to connect (relative) cluster tilting theory and  $\tau$ -tilting theory.

Bongartz completion is not always possible in classic tilting theory. However, this is always possible in  $\tau$ -tilting theory. Our third main result shows that every  $\tau$ -rigid pair is contained in exactly two support  $\tau$ -tilting pairs in functor categories.

**Theorem 1.6.** (see Definition 5.6 and Theorem 5.13 for details) *Assume that  $(\mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]) / \mathcal{R}[1]$  is abelian. Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be an  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -functorially finite two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Denote  $\mathcal{X}[-1] \cap \mathcal{R}$  by  $\mathcal{E}$ . If  $(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{E}})$  is NOT a support  $\tau$ -tilting pair in  $(\mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]) / \mathcal{R}[1]$ , then it is contained in two support  $\tau$ -tilting pairs  $(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{F}})$  and  $(\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{E}})$ . Moreover,*

$$\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}} = \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}, \quad \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{X}} = {}^{\perp}(\tau \overline{\mathcal{X}}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{E}}^{\perp} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}} \subsetneq \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{X}}.$$

Buan and Zhou [BZ] introduced the notion of left weak cotorsion torsion triples in module categories and established a bijection between support  $\tau$ -tilting modules and these triples. Let  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  be an abelian category with enough projectives. Asadollahi, Sadeghi and Treffinger [AST] introduced the notion of  $\tau$ -cotorsion torsion triples and established a bijection between the collection of  $\tau$ -cotorsion torsion triples in  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  and the collection of support  $\tau$ -tilting subcategories of  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ . We we apply our main results to  $\tau$ -tilting theory in abelian categories, establishing bijections between  $\tau$ -cotorsion torsion triples, left weak cotorsion torsion triples and support  $\tau$ -tilting subcategories. Our fourth main result is the following.

**Theorem 1.7.** (see Definition 6.3 and Theorem 6.18 for details) *There are bijections between  $\tau$ -cotorsion torsion pairs, left weak cotorsion torsion pairs and support  $\tau$ -tilting subcategories in a Krull-Schmidt abelian category with enough projectives.*

Our fifth main result shows that every almost complete support  $\tau$ -tilting pair is exactly contained in two different support  $\tau$ -tilting pairs.

**Theorem 1.8.** (see Definition 6.29 and Theorem 6.31 for details) *Let  $R$  be a commutative noetherian ring which is complete and local. Let  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  be an Ext-finite abelian category over  $R$  with enough projectives and enough injectives.*

Let  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E})$  be a strong contravariantly finite  $\tau$ -rigid pair. Then it is contained in two support  $\tau$ -tilting pairs  $(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}, \mathcal{F})$  and  $(\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}, \mathcal{E})$  such that

$$\text{Fac } \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} = \text{Fac } \mathcal{X}, \quad \text{Fac } \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}} = {}^{\perp}(\tau\mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{E}^{\perp}, \quad \text{Fac } \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} \subsetneq \text{Fac } \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}.$$

Moreover, if  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E})$  is an almost complete support  $\tau$ -tilting pair, then  $(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}, \mathcal{F})$  and  $(\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}, \mathcal{E})$  are the only support  $\tau$ -tilting pairs which contain  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E})$ .

We also develop the theory of left Bongartz completion in abelian categories (see Propositions 3.20, 6.23 and 6.26 for details).

This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we recall some concepts about (relative) cluster tilting theory, then we show several results concerning relative rigid subcategories, which will be extensively utilized in the sequel. In Section 3, we reveal a structured framework for mutation in two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategories. In Section 4, we show that any almost complete two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory has exactly two completions. In Section 5, we investigate the connection between relative cluster tilting subcategories and  $\tau$ -tilting theory in functor categories. In Section 6, by using the results in the previous sections, we study the  $\tau$ -tilting theory in abelian categories. In Section 7, we provide several examples to explain our main results.

We end this section with some conventions. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a triangulated category with shift functor  $[1]$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  be a rigid subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$ . For two subcategories  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{Y}$  the subcategory in  $\mathcal{C}$  consisting of all objects  $M \in \mathcal{C}$  admitting triangles  $X \rightarrow M \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X[1]$ , with  $X \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}$  the smallest subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$  containing  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$ . For any subcategories  $\mathcal{D}$  of an additive category, we denote by  $\text{add } \mathcal{D}$  the subcategory consisting of objects which are direct sums of direct summands of objects in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Especially, when  $\mathcal{D} = \{D\}$ , we denote  $\text{add } \mathcal{D}$  by  $\text{add } D$ .

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

Cluster tilting subcategories are a significant class in triangulated categories, boasting a plethora of desirable properties. Let's delve into the definition of cluster tilting subcategories and related subcategories, as outlined in seminal works such as [BMRRT, KR, KZ, IY].

For convenience, we introduce the following notions.

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a triangulated category with shift functor  $[1]$ .

- (i) A subcategory  $\mathcal{R}$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  is called rigid if  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}[1]) = 0$ .
- (ii) A subcategory  $\mathcal{R}$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  is called maximal rigid if it is rigid and maximal with respect to the property: If  $M \in \mathcal{C}$  satisfies  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R} \cup \text{add } M, (\mathcal{R} \cup \text{add } M)[1]) = 0$ , then  $M \in \mathcal{R}$ .
- (iii) A functorially finite subcategory  $\mathcal{R}$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  is called cluster tilting if

$$\mathcal{R} = \{M \in \mathcal{C} \mid \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}, M[1]) = 0\} = \{M \in \mathcal{C} \mid \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(M, \mathcal{R}[1]) = 0\}.$$

- (iv) An object  $R$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  is called rigid, maximal rigid, or cluster tilting if  $\text{add } R$  is rigid, maximal rigid, or cluster tilting respectively.

For any subcategory  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ , denote by  $[\mathcal{D}](A, B)$  the subset of  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, B)$  consisting of the morphisms that factors through objects in  $\mathcal{D}$ . Now we recall the notion of two-term relative cluster tilting subcategories and related notations from [YZ, YZZ, ZhZ].

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be a rigid subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

- (i) A subcategory  $\mathcal{X}$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  is called  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid if  $[\mathcal{R}[1]](\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}[1]) = 0$ .  $\mathcal{X}$  is called two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid if in addition,  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$ .
- (ii) A subcategory  $\mathcal{X}$  is called two-term maximal  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid if  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$  is  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid and for any  $M \in \mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$ ,

$$[\mathcal{R}[1]](\mathcal{X} \cup \text{add } M, (\mathcal{X} \cup \text{add } M)[1]) = 0 \text{ implies } M \in \mathcal{X}.$$

- (iii) A subcategory  $\mathcal{X}$  is called two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting if  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$ ,  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{X}[-1] * \mathcal{X}$  and

$$\mathcal{X} = \{M \in \mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1] \mid [\mathcal{R}[1]](M, \mathcal{X}[1]) = 0 \text{ and } [\mathcal{R}[1]](\mathcal{X}, M[1]) = 0\}.$$

- (iv) A subcategory  $\mathcal{X}$  is called two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting if  $\mathcal{X}$  is contravariantly finite and two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting.
- (v) An object  $X$  is called two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid, two-term maximal  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid, two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting, or two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting if  $\text{add} X$  is two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid, two-term maximal  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid, two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting, or two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting respectively.

**Remark 2.3.** By definition, any two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory is a maximal  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory.

From now on, let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a Krull-Schmidt triangulated category with shift functor  $[1]$ . We assume that any subcategory we mentioned is full and closed under isomorphisms. Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be a rigid subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$ , which is closed under direct sums and direct summands.

By definition, if  $\mathcal{U}$  is an  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory, so is  $\text{add} \mathcal{U}$ . Hence, in this paper, when we say  $\mathcal{U}$  is an  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory, we always assume that  $\mathcal{U}$  is closed under direct sums and direct summands.

**Remark 2.4.** If  $\mathcal{C}$  is 2-Calabi-Yau, by [YZZ, Lemma 3.5], a subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$  is two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid if and only if it is rigid. If  $\mathcal{R}$  is a cluster tilting subcategory, then  $\mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1] = \mathcal{C}$ . In this case, all subcategories can be viewed as “two-term”. Then by definition, a functorially finite subcategory  $\mathcal{X}$  is cluster tilting if and only if it is two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting.

**Remark 2.5.** By definition, we know that any rigid subcategory is  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid.

**Lemma 2.6.**  $\mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$  is closed under direct sums, direct summands and isomorphisms.

*Proof.* By definition, it is not hard to check that  $\mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$  is closed under direct sums and isomorphisms. Since  $\mathcal{R}$  is rigid, by [IY, Proposition 2.1], we have that  $\mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$  is closed under direct summands.  $\square$

For convenience, we introduce the following notion: for any subcategory  $\mathcal{X}$ , denote

$$\{R \in \mathcal{R} \mid \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(R, \mathcal{X}) = 0\} \text{ by } \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X}).$$

**Lemma 2.7.** Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be (two-term)  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid. If  $\mathcal{R}' \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})$ , then  $\text{add}(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{R}'[1])$  is still (two-term)  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid.

*Proof.* Since  $\mathcal{R}$  is rigid, we have  $[\mathcal{R}[1]](\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{R}'[2]) = 0$  and  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}'[1], \mathcal{R}'[2]) = 0$ . Since  $\mathcal{R}' \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})$ , we have  $0 = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}'[1], \mathcal{X}[1]) = [\mathcal{R}[1]](\mathcal{R}'[1], \mathcal{X}[1])$ . By definition,  $\text{add}(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{R}'[1])$  is still  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid. If  $\mathcal{X}$  is two-term, since  $\mathcal{R}'[1] \subseteq \mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$ , by Lemma 2.6,  $\text{add}(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{R}'[1])$  is still two-term.  $\square$

On the other hand, we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.8.** Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid. Then  $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{R}[1] \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})[1]$ . Moreover, if  $\mathcal{X}$  is two-term maximal  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid, then  $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{R}[1] = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})[1]$ .

*Proof.* Let  $R[1] \in \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{R}[1]$ . Since  $\mathcal{X}$  is  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid, we have

$$0 = [\mathcal{R}[1]](R[1], \mathcal{X}[1]) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(R[1], \mathcal{X}[1]).$$

Hence  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(R, \mathcal{X}) = 0$  and  $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{R}[1] \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})[1]$ . The “Moreover” part is followed by the argument above and Lemma 2.7.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.9.** Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory. If  $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{R}[1] = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})[1]$ , then for any two-term maximal  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory  $\mathcal{M} \supseteq \mathcal{X}$ , we have  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{M})$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.8, we have

$$\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{R}[1] = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})[1] \supseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{M})[1] = \mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{R}[1] \supseteq \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{R}[1].$$

$\square$

**Lemma 2.10.** Let  $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}$  be two subcategories of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then  $\mathcal{R}[1](\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}[1]) = 0$  if and only if any object  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  admits a triangle

$$R_1 \xrightarrow{f} R_2 \xrightarrow{u_1} U \xrightarrow{u_2} R_1[1]$$

where  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(f, V)$  is surjective for any object  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $U$  be any object in  $\mathcal{U}$ .  $U$  admits a triangle

$$U[-1] \xrightarrow{-u_2[-1]} R_1 \xrightarrow{f} R_2 \xrightarrow{u_1} U$$

with  $R_1, R_2 \in \mathcal{R}$ .

Assume  $\mathcal{R}[1](\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}[1]) = 0$ . Let  $r_1 : R_1 \rightarrow V$  be any morphism with  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ . Since

$$\mathcal{R}[1](\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}[1]) = 0,$$

we have  $r_1(-u_2[-1]) = 0$ , which implies  $r_1$  factors through  $f$ . Hence  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(f, V)$  is surjective for any object  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ .

Now assume that  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(f, V)$  is surjective for any object  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ . Then in the triangle  $R_2 \xrightarrow{u_1} U \xrightarrow{u_2} R_1[1] \xrightarrow{-f[1]} R_2[1]$ ,  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-f[1], \mathcal{V}[1])$  is surjective for any object  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ . Let  $U \xrightarrow{a_1} R[1] \xrightarrow{a_2} V[1]$  be a morphism with  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ . Since  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(R_2, R[1]) = 0$ , there is a morphism  $b_1 : R_1[1] \rightarrow R[1]$  such that  $a_1 = b_1 u_2$ . Then there is a morphism  $b_2 : R_2[1] \rightarrow R[1]$  such that  $b_2(-f[1]) = a_2 b_1$ . Hence  $a_2 a_1 = b_2(-f[1])u_2 = 0$ , which means  $\mathcal{R}[1](U, V[1]) = 0$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.11.** *In the triangle*

$$R \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow R[1]$$

with  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ ,  $A \in \mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$  if and only if  $B \in \mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\mathcal{R}$  is rigid, we have  $\mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}$ . If  $A \in \mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$ , then  $B \in (\mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]) * \mathcal{R}[1] = \mathcal{R} * (\mathcal{R}[1] * \mathcal{R}[1]) = \mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$ . Conversely, if  $B \in \mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$ , then  $A \in \mathcal{R} * (\mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]) = (\mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}) * \mathcal{R}[1] = \mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.12.** *Let*

$$A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \xrightarrow{z} A[1]$$

be a triangle in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then the following are equivalent.

- (1)  $x$  is left minimal;
- (2)  $y$  is in the Jacobson radical;
- (3)  $z$  is right minimal.

*Proof.* We first show that (1)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (2).

Assume that  $y$  is in the Jacobson radical. Let  $u : B \rightarrow B$  be a morphism such that  $ux = x$ . Then we have  $(u - 1_B)x = 0$ . So there exists a morphism  $v : C \rightarrow B$  such that  $u - 1_B = vy$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} A & \xrightarrow{x} & B & \xrightarrow{y} & C & \xrightarrow{z} & A[1] \\ & \searrow & \downarrow u-1_B & & \downarrow v & & \\ & & B & & & & \end{array}$$

(A dashed arrow from  $A$  to  $B$  is labeled  $0$ .)

Because  $y$  is in the Jacobson radical, we obtain that  $u = 1_B + vy$  is invertible. This shows that  $x$  is left minimal.

Conversely, assume that  $x$  is left minimal. Let  $b : C \rightarrow B$  be any morphism. Put  $c := 1_B + by$ . It follows that  $cx = (1_B + by)x = x + byx = x$ . Since  $x$  is left minimal,  $c$  is an isomorphism. This shows that  $y$  is in the Jacobson radical.

We show that (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (3).

Suppose that  $x$  is left minimal. For any morphism  $b : C \rightarrow C$  such that  $zb = z$ , we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} A & \xrightarrow{x} & B & \xrightarrow{y} & C & \xrightarrow{z} & A[1] \\ \parallel & & \downarrow a & & \downarrow b & & \parallel \\ A & \xrightarrow{x} & B & \xrightarrow{y} & C & \xrightarrow{z} & A[1] \end{array}$$

Then there exists a morphism  $a : B \rightarrow B$  such that  $ax = x$ . Since  $x$  is left minimal, we obtain that  $a$  is isomorphism. It follows that  $b$  is also isomorphism. This shows that  $z$  is right minimal.

Dually we can show (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (1).  $\square$

**Lemma 2.13.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be an  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory and  $L$  be any object in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Assume that  $L$  admits a triangle*

$$L \xrightarrow{x_1} X_1 \longrightarrow X_0 \xrightarrow{x_0} L[1]$$

where  $X_1, X_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ .

(1) *If  $x_0$  factors through  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ , then  $x_1$  is a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation. Moreover,  $L$  admits a triangle:*

$$L \xrightarrow{x_2} X_2 \longrightarrow X_4 \xrightarrow{x_4} L[1]$$

where  $x_2$  is a minimal left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation and  $x_4$  factors through  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ .

(2) *If  $x_1$  factors through  $\mathcal{R}$ , then  $x_0$  is a right  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation. Moreover,  $L$  admits a triangle:*

$$L \xrightarrow{x_2} X_2 \longrightarrow X_4 \xrightarrow{x_4} L[1]$$

where  $x_4$  is a minimal right  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation and  $x_2$  factors through  $\mathcal{R}$ .

*Proof.* We only show (1), the proof of (2) is similar.

Since  $\mathcal{X}$  is  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid and  $-x_0[-1]$  factors through  $\mathcal{R}$ , from the triangle

$$X_0[-1] \xrightarrow{-x_0[-1]} L \xrightarrow{x_1} X_1 \longrightarrow X_0$$

we get that any morphism for  $L$  to  $\mathcal{X}$  factors through  $x_1$ , hence  $x_1$  is a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation.

Since  $\mathcal{C}$  is Krull-Schmidt, there exists a decomposition  $X_1 = X_2 \oplus X_3$  such that

$$x_1 = \begin{pmatrix} x_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}: L \rightarrow X_2 \oplus X_3$$

where  $x_2$  is left minimal. Since  $x_1$  is a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation of  $R$ , so is  $x_2$ . Then there exists a triangle

$$L \xrightarrow{x_2} X_2 \longrightarrow X_4 \xrightarrow{x_4} L[1]. \quad (2.1)$$

It follows that  $X_0 \cong X_4 \oplus X_3$  which implies  $X_4 \in \mathcal{X}$ . Thus the triangle (2.1) is what we expect.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.14.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be an  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory and  $L$  be an  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid object. Given a triangle*

$$L \xrightarrow{x} X_1 \xrightarrow{y} X_0 \xrightarrow{z} L[1] \quad (2.2)$$

where  $X_0, X_1 \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $x$  is left minimal and  $z$  factors through  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ . Then  $X_0$  and  $X_1$  do not have common indecomposable direct summands.

*Proof.* Let  $f: X_1 \rightarrow X_0$  be any morphism. It is enough to show that  $f$  is in the Jacobson radical. In fact, applying the functor  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(L, -)$  to the triangle (2.2) we have the following exact sequence:

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(L, X_1) \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(L, y)} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(L, X_0) \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(L, z)=0} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(L, L[1]).$$

So there exists a morphism  $g: L \rightarrow X_1$  such that  $yg = fx$ . By Lemma 2.13,  $x$  is a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation, so there exists a morphism  $h: X_1 \rightarrow X_1$  such that  $hx = g$ . It follows that  $yhx = fx$  and then  $(f - yh)x = 0$ . So there exists a morphism  $w: X_0 \rightarrow X_0$  such that  $f - yh = wy$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} L & \xrightarrow{x} & X_1 & \xrightarrow{y} & X_0 & \xrightarrow{z} & L[1] \\ & \searrow \text{dotted} & \downarrow f-yh & \swarrow \text{curved} & & & \\ & & X_0 & & & & \end{array}$$

$0$  is written near the dotted arrow, and  $w$  is written near the curved arrow.

Since  $x$  is left minimal, by Lemma 2.12, we have that  $y$  is in the Jacobson radical. This shows that  $f = yh + wy$  is in the Jacobson radical, hence any morphism from  $X_1$  to  $X_0$  is in the Jacobson radical.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.15.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1)  $\mathcal{X}$  is two-term maximal  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid such that each object  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  admits a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation.
- (2)  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{X}[-1] * \mathcal{X}$ .
- (3)  $\mathcal{X}$  is two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting.

*Proof.* (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): this is followed by [ZhZ, Lemma 2.6(1)].

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (1): this is followed by definition and Lemma 2.13.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3): Since  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \{M \in \mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1] \mid [\mathcal{R}[1]](M, \mathcal{X}[1]) = 0 \text{ and } [\mathcal{R}[1]](\mathcal{X}, M[1]) = 0\}$ , we only need to show that if  $M \in \mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$  satisfies  $[\mathcal{R}[1]](\mathcal{X}, M[1]) = 0$  and  $[\mathcal{R}[1]](M, \mathcal{X}[1]) = 0$ , then  $M \in \mathcal{X}$ .

Since  $M \in \mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$ , there exists a triangle

$$R_1 \xrightarrow{f} R_0 \xrightarrow{g} M \xrightarrow{h} R_1[1]$$

where  $R_0, R_1 \in \mathcal{R}$ . Note that  $R_0 \in \mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{X}[-1] * \mathcal{X}$ , there exists a triangle

$$R_0 \xrightarrow{u} X_1 \xrightarrow{v} X_2 \xrightarrow{w} R_0[1]$$

with  $X_1, X_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ . Since  $\mathcal{X}$  is  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid,  $u$  is a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation of  $R_0$  by Lemma 2.13. Then we have a commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} R_1 & \xrightarrow{f} & R_0 & \xrightarrow{g} & M & \xrightarrow{h} & R_1[1] \\ \parallel & & \downarrow u & & \downarrow a & & \parallel \\ R_1 & \xrightarrow{x=uf} & X_1 & \xrightarrow{y} & N & \xrightarrow{z} & R_1[1] \\ & & \downarrow v & & \downarrow b & & \\ & & X_2 & \xlongequal{\quad} & X_2 & & \\ & & \downarrow w & & \downarrow c & & \\ & & R_0[1] & \xrightarrow{g[1]} & M[1] & & \end{array}$$

Since  $c \in [\mathcal{R}[1]](X_2, M[1]) = 0$ , we have  $N \cong X_2 \oplus M$ . By Lemma 2.10,  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(f, X)$  is surjective for any object  $X \in \mathcal{X}$ . Since  $u$  is a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation,  $x = uf$  is a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation of  $R_1$ .  $R_1$  admits a triangle

$$R_1 \xrightarrow{r_1} X'_1 \rightarrow X'_2 \rightarrow R[1]$$

with  $X'_1, X'_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ . By Lemma 2.13,  $r_1$  is a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation. Hence we have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} R_1 & \xrightarrow{x} & X_1 & \xrightarrow{y} & N & \xrightarrow{z} & R_1[1] \\ \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ R_1 & \xrightarrow{r_1} & X'_1 & \longrightarrow & X'_2 & \longrightarrow & R_1[1] \\ \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ R_1 & \xrightarrow{x} & X_1 & \xrightarrow{y} & N & \xrightarrow{z} & R_1[1]. \end{array}$$

Then  $N$  is a direct summand of  $X_1 \oplus X'_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ , which implies that  $M \in \mathcal{X}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.16.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$  be a subcategory such that each object in  $\mathcal{R}[1]$  admits a right  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation. Then it is two-term maximal  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid if and only if it is two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting.*

*Proof.* By definition, we know that any two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory is two-term maximal  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid. If  $\mathcal{X}$  is two-term maximal  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid such that each object in  $\mathcal{R}[1]$  admits a right  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation, by [ZhZ, Corollary 2.7],  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{X}[-1] * \mathcal{X}$ . Then by Lemma 2.15,  $\mathcal{X}$  is two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting.  $\square$

### 3. MUTATION OF RELATIVE RIGID SUBCATEGORIES

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory such that each object in  $\mathcal{R}$  admits a left  $\mathcal{U}$ -approximation. Then it is contained in a two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory.*



*Proof.* Let  $R$  be any object in  $\mathcal{R}$ .  $R$  admits a triangle

$$R \xrightarrow{f} U^R \xrightarrow{g} V^R \xrightarrow{h} R[1]$$

where  $f$  is a left  $\mathcal{U}$ -approximation. Let  $\mathcal{M} = \text{add}(\mathcal{U} \cup \{V^R \mid R \in \mathcal{R}\})$ . By Lemma 2.15(2), we only need to show that  $\mathcal{M}$  is two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid.

**Step 1:** By Lemma 2.11 and Lemma 2.6,  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$ .

**Step 2:** We show that  $[\mathcal{R}[1]](V^R, \mathcal{U}[1]) = 0$ .

Let  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $u \in [\mathcal{R}[1]](V^R, U[1])$ . Since  $\mathcal{U}$  is  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid,  $ug \in [\mathcal{R}[1]](U^R, U[1]) = 0$ . Then there is a morphism  $v : R[1] \rightarrow U[1]$  such that  $u = vh$ . Since  $f$  is a left  $\mathcal{U}$ -approximation,  $-f[1]$  is a left  $\mathcal{U}[1]$ -approximation. Then we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} U^R & \xrightarrow{g} & V^R & \xrightarrow{h} & R[1] & \xrightarrow{-f[1]} & U^R[1] \\ & & \downarrow u & \swarrow v & \nearrow w & & \\ & & U[1] & & & & \end{array}$$

which implies that  $u = vh = w(-f[1])h = 0$ .

**Step 3:** We show that  $[\mathcal{R}](\mathcal{U}[-1], V^R) = 0$ .

Let  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $u \in [\mathcal{R}](U[-1], V^R) = 0$ . Then  $u$  can be written as  $u : U[-1] \xrightarrow{u_1} R_0 \xrightarrow{u_2} V^R$  where  $R_0 \in \mathcal{R}$ . Since  $\mathcal{R}$  is rigid,  $hu_2 = 0$ . Then we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} U[-1] & \xrightarrow{u_1} & R_0 & & \\ & \swarrow r_0 & \downarrow u_2 & & \\ U^R & \xrightarrow{g} & V^R & \xrightarrow{h} & R[1]. \end{array}$$

Since  $\mathcal{U}$  is  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid,  $r_0u_1 = 0$ , which implies that  $u = u_2u_1 = gr_0u_1 = 0$ .

**Step 4:** By using the same method as in Step 3 and the result of Step 3, we can get that  $[\mathcal{R}[1]](V_1^R, V_2^R[1]) = 0$  for any  $V_1^R, V_2^R \in \{V^R \mid R \in \mathcal{R}\}$ . Hence  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid.  $\square$

For convenience, we denote the two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory which contains  $\mathcal{U}$  in Proposition 3.1 by  $\mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{R}[1], \mathcal{U})}$  (usually we write  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{U}}$  for short, if there is no other two-term subcategory besides  $\mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$  in the argument).

**Proposition 3.2.** *By [ZhZ, Theorem 3.1], for any two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory  $\mathcal{U}$  such that each object in  $\mathcal{R}[1]$  admits a right  $\mathcal{U}$ -approximation, we can construct a two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{U}}$  which contains  $\mathcal{U}$  in the following way:*

*For any object  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ , take a triangle*

$$R \rightarrow V_R \rightarrow U_R \xrightarrow{h} R[1]$$

*where  $h$  is a right  $\mathcal{U}$ -approximation of  $R[1]$ . Then*

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{U}} =: \text{add}(\mathcal{U} \cup \{V_R \mid R \in \mathcal{R}\})$$

*is the two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory we mentioned above.*

Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$ . For convenience, if each object in  $\mathcal{R}$  admits a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation and each object in  $\mathcal{R}[1]$  admits a right  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation, we say  $\mathcal{X}$  is  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -functorially finite.

**Remark 3.3.** *By Lemma 2.13, any two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory is  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -functorially finite.*

Let  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  be two subcategories of  $\mathcal{C}$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{Y} \setminus \mathcal{X}$  the full subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$  consisting of all objects  $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$  such that  $Y \notin \mathcal{X}$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be an  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -functorially finite two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory.*

- (1)  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}) = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})$ ;
- (2)  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap \mathcal{R}[1] = \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{R}[1]$ .

*Proof.* (1) We only need to show that  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}) \supseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})$ .

Let  $R_0 \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})$  and  $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \mathcal{X}$ .  $M$  admits a triangle

$$R \xrightarrow{r} X \xrightarrow{x} M \xrightarrow{m} R[1]$$

where  $r$  is a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation. For any morphism  $r_0 : R_0 \rightarrow M$ , since  $mr_0 = 0$ , there is a morphism  $x_0 : R_0 \rightarrow X$  such that  $xx_0 = r_0$ . Since  $x_0 = 0$ , we have  $r_0 = 0$ . Hence  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}) \supseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})$ .

(2) We only need to show that  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap \mathcal{R}[1] \subseteq \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{R}[1]$ .

Let  $N_0 \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap \mathcal{R}[1]$ . If  $N_0 \notin \mathcal{X}$ , then it admits a triangle

$$R \rightarrow N \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{x} R[1]$$

where  $x$  is a right  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation and  $N_0$  is direct summand of  $N$ . Since  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(R, N_0) = 0$ ,  $N_0$  is a direct summand of  $X$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be an  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -functorially finite two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory. Let  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ . Then  $R$  admits a triangle*

$$R \xrightarrow{a} X_1 \rightarrow M_1 \xrightarrow{b} R[1]$$

where  $X_1 \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $M_1 \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \mathcal{X}$  if and only if it admits a triangle

$$R \xrightarrow{a'} N_1 \rightarrow X'_1 \xrightarrow{b'} R[1]$$

where  $X'_1 \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $N_1 \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \mathcal{X}$ .

*Proof.* Assume that  $R$  admits a triangle

$$R \xrightarrow{a} X_1 \rightarrow M_1 \xrightarrow{b} R[1]$$

where  $X_1 \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $M_1 \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \mathcal{X}$ . Note that  $R$  also admits a triangle

$$R \xrightarrow{a'} N_1 \rightarrow X'_1 \xrightarrow{b'} R[1]$$

where  $b'$  is a right  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation and  $N_1 \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$ . By Lemma 2.13,  $b$  is a right  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -approximation. If  $N_1 \in \mathcal{X}$ , then  $b'$  is also a right  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -approximation. We can get the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} R & \longrightarrow & X_1 & \longrightarrow & M_1 & \xrightarrow{b} & R[1] \\ \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ R & \longrightarrow & N_1 & \longrightarrow & X'_1 & \xrightarrow{b'} & R[1] \\ \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ R & \longrightarrow & X_1 & \longrightarrow & M_1 & \xrightarrow{b} & R[1] \end{array}$$

which implies  $M_1$  is a direct summand of  $X_1 \oplus X'_1$ , a contradiction. By the similar method we can show the “if” part.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be an  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -functorially finite two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory. Then*

- (1) any object in  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$  admits a right  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation;
- (2) any object in  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$  admits a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation.

*Proof.* (1) Let  $M$  be any indecomposable object in  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \mathcal{X}$ . Then  $M$  admits a triangle

$$R \xrightarrow{a} X_1 \rightarrow M_1 \xrightarrow{b} R[1]$$

where  $X_1 \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $M_1 \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $M$  is a direct summand of  $M_1$ .  $R$  also admits a triangle

$$R \xrightarrow{a'} N_1 \rightarrow X'_1 \xrightarrow{b'} R[1]$$

where  $X'_1 \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $N_1 \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$ . Then we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & N_1 & \xlongequal{\quad} & N_1 & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 X_1 & \longrightarrow & X_1 \oplus X'_1 & \longrightarrow & X'_1 & \xrightarrow{0} & X_1[1] \\
 \parallel & & \downarrow \chi & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
 X_1 & \longrightarrow & M_1 & \longrightarrow & R[1] & \longrightarrow & X_1[1] \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & N_1[1] & \xlongequal{\quad} & N_1[1] & & 
 \end{array}$$

By Lemma 2.13,  $\chi$  is a right  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation. Hence  $M$  admits a right  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation.

Dually we can prove (2).  $\square$

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be an  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -functorially finite two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory. Let  $Y \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \mathcal{X}$  be an indecomposable object. Then in the following triangle*

$$Z \xrightarrow{z} X \xrightarrow{x} Y \xrightarrow{y} Z[1]$$

where  $x$  is a minimal right  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation, we can obtain that:

- (1)  $y$  factors through  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ ;
- (2)  $z$  is a minimal left  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -approximation;
- (3)  $Z$  is indecomposable and  $Z \notin \mathcal{X}$ ;
- (4)  $[\mathcal{R}[1]](\mathcal{X}, Z[1]) = 0$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.6,  $Y$  always admits a triangle

$$Z \xrightarrow{z} X \xrightarrow{x} Y \xrightarrow{y} Z[1]$$

where  $x$  is a minimal right  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation.

- (1) By Proposition 3.1, there exists a triangle

$$R \xrightarrow{f} X_1 \xrightarrow{g} M_1 \xrightarrow{h} R[1]$$

where  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  and  $f$  is a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation such that  $Y$  is a direct summand of  $M_1$ . Then we have a retraction  $p: M_1 \rightarrow Y$  and a section  $i: Y \rightarrow M_1$  such that  $pi = 1_Y$ . Since  $x$  is a right  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation, we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 R & \xrightarrow{f} & X_1 & \xrightarrow{g} & M_1 & \xrightarrow{h} & R[1] \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow p & & \downarrow r \\
 Z & \xrightarrow{z} & X & \xrightarrow{x} & Y & \xrightarrow{y} & Z[1].
 \end{array}$$

Then  $y = ypi = rhi$ , which means  $y$  factors through  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ .

(2) By Lemma 2.13,  $z$  is a left  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -approximation. If  $z$  is not left minimal, we can rewrite the triangle as

$$Z \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}} X' \oplus X'' \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} x_1 & x_2 \end{pmatrix}} Y \xrightarrow{y} Z[1]$$

Then  $X' \oplus X'' \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}} X''$  factors through  $\begin{pmatrix} x_1 & x_2 \end{pmatrix}$ , which implies that  $X'' \cong Y$ , a contradiction.

(3) Note that  $Z \notin \mathcal{X}$ , otherwise  $y = 0$ , then  $Y$  becomes a direct summand of  $X$ . Let  $Z_0$  be an indecomposable direct summand of  $Z$  such that  $Z_0 \notin \mathcal{X}$ . Then we have a retraction  $p_0: Z \rightarrow Z_0$  and a section  $i_0: Z_0 \rightarrow Z$  such that  $p_0 i_0 = 1_{Z_0}$ .  $Z_0$  admits a triangle

$$Z_0 \xrightarrow{z i_0} X \rightarrow Y_0 \rightarrow Z_0[1]$$

where  $Y_0 \neq 0$ . Since  $z$  is a minimal left  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -approximation, we can obtain the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
Z_0 & \xrightarrow{zi_0} & X & \longrightarrow & Y_0 & \longrightarrow & Z_0[1] \\
\downarrow i_0 & & \parallel & & \downarrow b_1 & & \downarrow \\
Z & \xrightarrow{z} & X & \xrightarrow{x} & Y & \xrightarrow{y} & Z[1] \\
\downarrow p_0 & & \downarrow a_2 & & \downarrow b_2 & & \downarrow \\
Z_0 & \xrightarrow{zi_0} & X & \longrightarrow & Y_0 & \longrightarrow & Z_0[1].
\end{array}$$

Since  $zi_0$  is also left minimal,  $a_2$  is an isomorphism. Hence  $b_2b_1$  is also an isomorphism. But  $Y$  is indecomposable, then  $b_1$  is an isomorphism. Thus  $i_0$  is an isomorphism and  $Z$  is indecomposable.

(4) Let  $X_0$  be any object in  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\alpha$  be any morphism in  $[\mathcal{R}[1]](X_0, Z[1])$ . Since  $[\mathcal{R}[1]](X_0, X[1]) = 0$ , there is a morphism  $c : X_0 \rightarrow Y$  such that  $\alpha = yc$ . Since  $x$  is right  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation, there is a morphism  $d : X_0 \rightarrow X$  such that  $c = xd$ . Hence  $\alpha = yxc = 0$ , which implies that  $[\mathcal{R}[1]](\mathcal{X}, Z[1]) = 0$ .  $\square$

Dually, we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.8.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be an  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -functorially finite two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory. Let  $Z \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \mathcal{X}$  be an indecomposable object. Then in the following triangle*

$$Z \xrightarrow{z} X \xrightarrow{x} Y \xrightarrow{y} Z[1]$$

where  $z$  is a minimal left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation, we can obtain that:

- (1)  $y$  factors through  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ ;
- (2)  $x$  is a minimal right  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -approximation;
- (3)  $Y$  is indecomposable and  $Y \notin \mathcal{X}$ ;
- (4)  $[\mathcal{R}[1]](Y, \mathcal{X}[1]) = 0$ .

**Definition 3.9.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory. Let  $\mathcal{M} \neq \mathcal{N}$  be two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategories which contain  $\mathcal{X}$ .  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$  is called an  $\mathcal{X}$ -mutation pair if any object  $Y \in \mathcal{M}$  (resp.  $Z \in \mathcal{N}$ ) admits a triangle*

$$Z \xrightarrow{z} X \xrightarrow{x} Y \xrightarrow{y} Z[1]$$

such that

- (1)  $y$  factors through  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ ;
- (2)  $X \in \mathcal{X}$ ;
- (3)  $Z \in \mathcal{N}$  (resp.  $Y \in \mathcal{M}$ ).

We say  $\mathcal{M}_0$  (resp.  $\mathcal{N}_0$ ) is a left (resp. right) mutation of  $\mathcal{N}_0$  (resp.  $\mathcal{M}_0$ ) if there exists a two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory  $\mathcal{X}_0$  such that  $(\mathcal{M}_0, \mathcal{N}_0)$  is an  $\mathcal{X}_0$ -mutation pair.

**Remark 3.10.** *Since two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategories are  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -functorially finite, by definition, if  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$  is an  $\mathcal{X}$ -mutation pair, then  $\mathcal{X}$  is  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -functorially finite.*

**Theorem 3.11.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be an  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -functorially finite two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory. Then  $(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}, \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}})$  forms an  $\mathcal{X}$ -mutation pair.*

*Proof.* Let  $Y \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \mathcal{X}$  be an indecomposable object. Then by Lemma 3.7,  $Y$  admits a triangle

$$Z \xrightarrow{z} X \xrightarrow{x} Y \xrightarrow{y} Z[1]$$

where  $x$  is a minimal right  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation. We show that  $Z \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$ .

$Y$  admits a triangle

$$R \xrightarrow{a} X_1 \rightarrow M_1 \xrightarrow{b} R[1]$$

where  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ ,  $a$  is a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation and  $Y$  is a direct summand of  $M_1 \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$ . Let  $M_1 = X_0 \oplus \tilde{Y}$  where  $X_0 \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $\tilde{Y}$  is the direct sum of all the indecomposable direct summands of  $M_1$  in  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \mathcal{X}$ . Then  $Y$  is a direct summand of  $\tilde{Y}$ . By Lemma 3.7,  $\tilde{Y}$  admits a triangle

$$\tilde{Z} \xrightarrow{\tilde{z}} \tilde{X} \xrightarrow{\tilde{x}} \tilde{Y} \xrightarrow{\tilde{y}} \tilde{Z}[1]$$

where  $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $\tilde{y}$  factors through  $\mathcal{R}[1]$  and  $Z$  is a direct summand of  $\tilde{Z}$ . Then we have the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & \tilde{Z} & \xlongequal{\quad} & \tilde{Z} & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 R & \xrightarrow{r} & N & \longrightarrow & X_0 \oplus \tilde{X} & \xrightarrow{\chi} & R[1] \\
 \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{x} \end{pmatrix} & & \parallel \\
 R & \longrightarrow & X_1 & \longrightarrow & X_0 \oplus \tilde{Y} & \xrightarrow{b} & R[1] \\
 & & \downarrow c & & \downarrow (0 \ \tilde{y}) & & \\
 & & \tilde{Z}[1] & \xlongequal{\quad} & \tilde{Z}[1] & & 
 \end{array}$$

Since  $c$  factors through  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ , by Lemma 3.7(4),  $c = 0$ . Then  $N \cong \tilde{Z} \oplus X_1$ . By Lemma 2.13,  $b$  is a right  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -approximation. Let  $x_2 : X_2 \rightarrow R[1]$  be any morphism with  $X_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ . Then there is a morphism  $\chi_2 : X_2 \rightarrow X_0 \oplus \tilde{Y}$  such that  $b\chi_2 = x_2$ . Since  $\tilde{y}$  factors through  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ , by Lemma 3.7(4),  $\chi_2$  factors through  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{x} \end{pmatrix}$ . Hence  $x_2$  factors through  $\chi$ , which means  $\chi$  is a right  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation. Then  $N \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$  and thus  $Z \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$ .

Dually we can show that if  $Z \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \mathcal{X}$  be an indecomposable object, then  $Z$  admits a triangle

$$Z \xrightarrow{z} X \xrightarrow{x} Y \xrightarrow{y} Z[1]$$

where  $z$  is a minimal left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation and  $Y \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \mathcal{X}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.12.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be an  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -functorially finite two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory. Then  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}} = \mathcal{X}$ .*

*Proof.* We only need to show that  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ .

If there is an indecomposable object  $L \in (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}) \setminus \mathcal{X}$ , by Theorem 3.11, it admits a triangle

$$L' \rightarrow X \rightarrow L \xrightarrow{l} L'[1]$$

where  $L' \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $l$  factors through  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ . Since  $L \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$ , we have  $l = 0$  and  $L$  becomes a direct summand of  $X$ . Then  $L \in \mathcal{X}$ , a contradiction. Hence  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ .  $\square$

On the other hand, we have the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.13.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory. If  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$  forms an  $\mathcal{X}$ -mutation pair, then  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$ .*

*Proof.* By Theorem 3.11, we only need to show  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$ . Since  $\mathcal{M}$  is two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting, we only need to show  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$ . Let  $M_0$  be any object in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Then  $M_0$  admits a triangle

$$N_0 \rightarrow X_0 \xrightarrow{x_0} M_0 \xrightarrow{m_0} N_0[1]$$

where  $x_0$  is a right  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation and  $m_0$  factors through  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ . Let  $Y_0$  be any indecomposable object in  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \mathcal{X}$ . Then  $Y_0$  admits a triangle  $R \xrightarrow{x} X \rightarrow M_X \xrightarrow{m} R[1]$  where  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ ,  $x$  is a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation,  $M_X \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $Y_0$  is a direct summand of  $M_X$ . Let  $f : M_0[-1] \rightarrow R_0 \xrightarrow{r} M_X$  be any morphism in  $[\mathcal{R}](M_0[-1], M_X)$ . Since  $mr = 0$ ,  $r$  factors through  $X$ . Since  $[\mathcal{R}](\mathcal{M}[-1], \mathcal{X}) = 0$ , we have  $f = 0$ . Let  $g : M_X[-1] \rightarrow R'_0 \xrightarrow{r'} M_0$  be any morphism in  $[\mathcal{R}](M_X[-1], M_0)$ . Since  $m_0 r' = 0$ ,  $r'$  factors through  $X_0$ . Since  $[\mathcal{R}](\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}[-1], \mathcal{X}) = 0$ , we have  $g = 0$ . Hence  $[\mathcal{R}](\mathcal{M}[-1], \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}) = 0$  and  $[\mathcal{R}](\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}[-1], \mathcal{M}) = 0$ , which implies  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$ .  $\square$

We give an application of the results in this section.

We call a subcategory  $\mathcal{S}$  an  $m$ -rigid subcategory if  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}[i]) = 0$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ .  $\mathcal{S}$  is called a presilting subcategory if  $\mathcal{S}$  is  $m$ -rigid,  $\forall m > 0$ ;  $\mathcal{S}$  is called a silting subcategory if it is presilting and  $\mathcal{C} = \text{thick}\mathcal{S}$ . In the rest of this section, we assume that  $\mathcal{R}$  is 2-rigid. From now on, we denote  $\mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$  by  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**Lemma 3.14.**  *$\mathcal{A}$  is extension closed.*

*Proof.* Since  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}[2]) = 0$ , we have  $\mathcal{R}[1] * \mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$ . Hence  $\mathcal{A} * \mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]) * (\mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]) = \mathcal{R} * (\mathcal{R}[1] * \mathcal{R}) * \mathcal{R}[1] \subseteq (\mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}) * (\mathcal{R}[1] * \mathcal{R}[1]) = \mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1] = \mathcal{A}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.15.**  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{A}[1]) = 0$  and  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{R}[2]) = 0$ .

*Proof.* The first equation is followed by the fact  $\mathcal{A}[1] = \mathcal{R}[1] * \mathcal{R}[2]$  and  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}[i]) = 0$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ). The second equation is followed by the fact  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$  and  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}[j], \mathcal{R}[2]) = 0$  ( $j = 0, 1$ ).  $\square$

**Lemma 3.16.** Let  $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ . Then  $[\mathcal{R}[1]](A, B[1]) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, B[1])$ .

*Proof.* It is obvious that  $[\mathcal{R}[1]](A, B[1]) \subseteq \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, B[1])$ . Since  $A \in \mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$ ,  $A$  admits a triangle

$$R_2 \rightarrow R_1 \xrightarrow{a_1} A \xrightarrow{b_1} R_2[1]$$

where  $R_1, R_2 \in \mathcal{R}$ . Let  $c : A \rightarrow B[1]$  be any morphism. By Lemma 3.15,  $ca_1 = 0$ . Hence there is a morphism  $c_1 : R_2[1] \rightarrow B[1]$  such that  $c = c_1 b_1$ . Then  $c \in [\mathcal{R}[1]](A, B[1])$ . Thus  $[\mathcal{R}[1]](A, B[1]) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, B[1])$ .  $\square$

By this lemma, we can get the following corollary immediately.

**Corollary 3.17.**  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  is  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid if and only if it is rigid.

Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a rigid subcategory in  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{U}$  be a covariantly finite rigid subcategory in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Any object  $X \in \mathcal{X}$  admits a triangle

$$X[-1] \xrightarrow{u} U^X \rightarrow V^X \rightarrow X$$

where  $u$  is a left  $\mathcal{U}$ -approximation. We denote  $\text{add}(\mathcal{U} \cup \{V^X \mid X \in \mathcal{X}\})$  by  $B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{X})$ .

**Proposition 3.18.** Let  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  be a two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory (hence is rigid). Let  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  be a covariantly finite rigid subcategory such that  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{T}[1]) = 0$ . Then  $B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{T})$  is both two-term weak  $\mathcal{T}$ -cluster tilting and two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting.

*Proof.* By the definition of  $B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{T})$  and Lemma 3.14, we have  $V^T \in \mathcal{A}$  for any  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ . Hence  $B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{T}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ . Since any object  $T \in \mathcal{T}$  admits a triangle

$$T[-1] \xrightarrow{u} U^T \rightarrow V^T \rightarrow T$$

where  $u$  is a left  $\mathcal{U}$ -approximation, from the following exact sequence

$$0 = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(U^T, \mathcal{T}[1]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(V^T, \mathcal{T}[1]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(T, \mathcal{T}[1]) = 0$$

we can get that  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(V^T, \mathcal{T}[1]) = 0$ , hence  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{T}), \mathcal{T}[1]) = 0$

Since  $\mathcal{T}$  is a two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory, by definition we have  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{T}[-1] * \mathcal{T}$ . Then

$$\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{T}[-1] * \mathcal{T}) * (\mathcal{T} * \mathcal{T}[1]) = (\mathcal{T}[-1] * \mathcal{T}) * \mathcal{T}[1].$$

Since  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{T}[1]) = 0$ , we have  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{T}[-1] * \mathcal{T}$ . Then by Proposition 3.1,  $B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{T}) = \mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{U})}$ , hence is two-term  $\mathcal{T}$ -cluster tilting.

We show that  $B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{T})$  is rigid. By Corollary 3.17, we show that for any object  $L_1, L_2 \in B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{T})$ ,  $[\mathcal{R}[1]](L_1, L_2[1]) = 0$ . Let  $f : L_1 \xrightarrow{l_1} R_0[1] \xrightarrow{l_2} L_2[1]$  be any morphism in  $[\mathcal{R}[1]](L_1, L_2[1])$ .  $R_0[1]$  admits a triangle  $T_2 \rightarrow T_1 \xrightarrow{t_1} R_0[1] \xrightarrow{t_2} T_2[1]$  with  $T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{T}$ . Since  $t_2 l_1 = 0$ ,  $l_1$  factors through  $T_1$ . Hence  $f \in [\mathcal{T}](L_1, L_2[1]) = 0$ .

We show that  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{T})[-1] * B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{T})$ , then by Lemma 2.15,  $B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{T})$  is two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting. Since we have shown that  $B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{T})$  is two-term  $\mathcal{T}$ -cluster tilting, we have  $\mathcal{T}[-1] \subseteq B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{T})[-1] * B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{T})$ . Then

$$\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{T}[-1] * \mathcal{T} \subseteq (B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{T})[-1] * B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{T})) * (B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{T}) * B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{T})[1]) = (B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{T})[-1] * B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{T})) * B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{T})[1].$$

By Lemma 3.15,  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}, B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{T})[1]) = 0$ . Hence  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{T})[-1] * B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{T})$ .  $\square$

This proposition can be regarded as a categorical version of [CWZ, Proposition 4.3] by the following reason.

**Remark 3.19.** If  $\mathcal{R}$  is a silting subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$ , by [ZhZ, Theorem 5.4],  $\mathcal{X}$  is a two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$  if and only if  $\mathcal{X}$  is a silting subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**Proposition 3.20.** *Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be a silting subcategory. Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a silting subcategory in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Assume that  $\mathcal{U}$  is a covariantly finite presilting subcategory in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{M}[1]) = 0$ . Let  $\mathcal{N}$  be a silting subcategory in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{N}$  is a left mutation of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Then the following statements hold.*

- (1)  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{N}[1]) = 0$ .
- (2)  $B_{\mathcal{U}}^{-}(\mathcal{M})$  and  $B_{\mathcal{U}}^{-}(\mathcal{N})$  are silting subcategories in  $\mathcal{A}$ .
- (3) Either  $B_{\mathcal{U}}^{-}(\mathcal{N}) = B_{\mathcal{U}}^{-}(\mathcal{M})$ , or  $B_{\mathcal{U}}^{-}(\mathcal{N})$  is a left mutation of  $B_{\mathcal{U}}^{-}(\mathcal{M})$ .

*Proof.* By definition there is a presilting subcategory  $\mathcal{Y}$  such that  $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M})$  forms a  $\mathcal{Y}$ -mutation pair.

- (1) Let  $N_0$  be any object in  $\mathcal{N}$ . Then it admits a triangle

$$M_0 \rightarrow Y_0 \rightarrow N_0 \rightarrow M_0[1]$$

with  $M_0 \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $Y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}$ . Since  $Y_0 \in \mathcal{M}$ , we have  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{U}, Y_0[1]) = 0$ . By [CWZ, Proposition 4.4],  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{U}, M_0[2]) = 0$ . Hence from the following exact sequence

$$0 = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{U}, Y_0[1]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{U}, N_0[1]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{U}, M_0[2]) = 0$$

we can get that  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{U}, N_0[1]) = 0$ . Hence  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{N}[1]) = 0$ .

(2) By Proposition 3.18, Remark 3.19 and (1), we can get that  $B_{\mathcal{U}}^{-}(\mathcal{M})$  and  $B_{\mathcal{U}}^{-}(\mathcal{N})$  are silting subcategories in  $\mathcal{A}$ .

(3) We show that when  $B_{\mathcal{U}}^{-}(\mathcal{M}) \neq B_{\mathcal{U}}^{-}(\mathcal{N})$ ,  $(B_{\mathcal{U}}^{-}(\mathcal{N}), B_{\mathcal{U}}^{-}(\mathcal{M}))$  is a  $(B_{\mathcal{U}}^{-}(\mathcal{Y}))$ -mutation pair. By Corollary 3.12,  $\mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{Y}$ . Then  $B_{\mathcal{U}}^{-}(\mathcal{Y}) \subseteq B_{\mathcal{U}}^{-}(\mathcal{N}) \cap B_{\mathcal{U}}^{-}(\mathcal{M})$  is presilting.

Let  $B_{\mathcal{N}}$  be any indecomposable object in  $B_{\mathcal{U}}^{-}(\mathcal{N}) \setminus \mathcal{U}$ . Then  $B_{\mathcal{N}}$  admits a triangle

$$N_1 \rightarrow U_1 \rightarrow B_1 \rightarrow N_1[1]$$

where  $N_1 \in \mathcal{N}$ ,  $U_1 \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $B_1 \in B_{\mathcal{U}}^{-}(\mathcal{N})$  and  $B_{\mathcal{N}}$  is a direct summand of  $B_1$ . Since  $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M})$  forms a  $\mathcal{Y}$ -mutation pair,  $N_1$  admits a triangle

$$M_1 \rightarrow Y_1 \rightarrow N_1 \rightarrow M_1[1]$$

with  $M_1 \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $Y_1 \in \mathcal{Y}$ .  $M_1$  admits a triangle

$$M_1 \rightarrow U'_1 \rightarrow C_1 \rightarrow M_1[1]$$

with  $U'_1 \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $C_1 \in B_{\mathcal{U}}^{-}(\mathcal{M})$ . Then we have the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & C_1[-1] & \xlongequal{\quad} & C_1[-1] & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 N_1[-1] & \longrightarrow & M_1 & \longrightarrow & Y_1 & \longrightarrow & N_1 \\
 \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
 N_1[-1] & \longrightarrow & U'_1 & \longrightarrow & L_1 & \longrightarrow & N_1 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & C_1 & \xlongequal{\quad} & C_1 & & 
 \end{array}$$

$Y_1$  admits a triangle

$$Y_1 \xrightarrow{y_1} U_2 \rightarrow D_1 \rightarrow M_1[1]$$

where  $y_1$  is a left  $\mathcal{U}$ -approximation and  $D_1 \in B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{Y})$ . Since  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(C_1, U_2[1]) = 0$ , we have the following commutative diagrams.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & D_1[-1] \xlongequal{\quad} D_1[-1] & & & D_1[-1] \xlongequal{\quad} D_1[-1] & \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \downarrow & \\
C_1[-1] & \longrightarrow & Y_1 & \longrightarrow & L_1 & \longrightarrow & C_1 \\
\parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
C_1[-1] & \longrightarrow & U_2 & \longrightarrow & U_2 \oplus C_1 & \longrightarrow & C_1 \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
& & D_1 \xlongequal{\quad} D_1 & & & & 
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & D_1[-1] \xlongequal{\quad} D_1[-1] & & & D_1[-1] \xlongequal{\quad} D_1[-1] & \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \downarrow & \\
U'_1 & \longrightarrow & L_1 & \longrightarrow & N_1 & \longrightarrow & U'_1[1] \\
\parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
U'_1 & \longrightarrow & U_2 \oplus C_1 & \longrightarrow & L_2 & \longrightarrow & U'_1[1] \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
& & D_1 \xlongequal{\quad} D_1 & & & & 
\end{array}$$

For convenience, denote  $U_2 \oplus C_1$  by  $\tilde{C}_1$ . Note that  $\tilde{C}_1 \in B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{M})$ . Since  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(D_1, U_1[1]) = 0$ , we have the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & B_1[-1] \xlongequal{\quad} B_1[-1] & & & & \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
D_1[-1] & \longrightarrow & N_1 & \longrightarrow & L_2 & \longrightarrow & D_1 \\
\parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
D_1[-1] & \longrightarrow & U_1 & \longrightarrow & U_1 \oplus D_1 & \longrightarrow & D_1 \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
& & B_1 \xlongequal{\quad} B_1 & & & & 
\end{array}$$

For convenience, denote  $U_1 \oplus D_1$  by  $\tilde{D}_1$ . Since  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(B_1, U'_1[2]) = 0$ , we have the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & B_1[-1] \xlongequal{\quad} B_1[-1] & & & & \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
\tilde{C}_1 & \longrightarrow & L_2 & \longrightarrow & U'_1[1] & \longrightarrow & \tilde{C}_1[1] \\
\parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
\tilde{C}_1 & \longrightarrow & \tilde{D}_1 \xrightarrow{\beta = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ u_1 \end{pmatrix}} & \longrightarrow & B_1 \oplus U'_1[1] & \longrightarrow & \tilde{C}_1[1] \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
& & B_1 \xlongequal{\quad} B_1 & & & & 
\end{array}$$

By Lemma 2.10,  $\beta$  is a right  $(B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{Y}))$ -approximation, thus so is  $b_1$ . Then we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
C_2 & \xrightarrow{d_1} & \tilde{D}_1 & \xrightarrow{b_1} & B_1 & \xrightarrow{c_2} & C_2[1] \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} & & \downarrow \\
\tilde{C}_1 & \longrightarrow & \tilde{D}_1 \xrightarrow{\beta = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ u_1 \end{pmatrix}} & \longrightarrow & B_1 \oplus U'_1[1] & \longrightarrow & \tilde{C}_1[1] \\
\downarrow & & \parallel & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & & \downarrow \\
C_2 & \xrightarrow{d_1} & \tilde{D}_1 & \xrightarrow{b_1} & B_1 & \xrightarrow{c_2} & C_2[1]
\end{array}$$



which implies that  $C_2$  is a direct summand of  $\tilde{C}_1 \oplus \tilde{D}_1$ . Hence  $C_2 \in B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{M})$ . By Lemma 3.16,  $c_2$  factor through  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ . Since  $B_{\mathcal{N}}$  is a direct summand of  $B_1$ , it also admits a triangle:

$$C_{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow D_{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow B_{\mathcal{N}} \xrightarrow{c_{\mathcal{N}}} C_{\mathcal{N}}[1]$$

where  $D_{\mathcal{N}} \in B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{Z})$ ,  $C_{\mathcal{N}} \in B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{N})$  and  $c_{\mathcal{N}}$  factors through  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ . Dually we can show that any object  $C \in B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{M}) \setminus \mathcal{U}$  admits a triangle

$$C \xrightarrow{d} D \xrightarrow{b} B \xrightarrow{c} C[1]$$

where  $B \in B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{N})$  and  $c$  factors through  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ . Hence when  $B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{M}) \neq B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{M})$ ,  $(B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{N}), B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{M}))$  is a  $(B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{Z}))$ -mutation pair.  $\square$

#### 4. ALMOST COMPLETE RELATIVE CLUSTER TILTING SUBCATEGORIES

In this section, we give the definition of an almost complete two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory, and prove that such a subcategory has exactly (up to isomorphism) two completions.

**Definition 4.1.** *We call a two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory  $\mathcal{X}$  an almost complete two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory if the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (a)  $\mathcal{X}$  is  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -functorially finite;
- (b) there exists an indecomposable object  $W \notin \mathcal{X}$  such that  $\text{add}(\mathcal{X} \cup \{W\})$  is two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting.

Any two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory which has the form in (b) is called a completion of  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $W$  is called a complement of  $\mathcal{X}$ .

For convenience, if  $\mathcal{X}$  is an almost complete two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory, we can just say  $\mathcal{X}$  is almost complete.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be an  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -functorially finite two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory. Assume  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} = \text{add}(\mathcal{X} \cup \{Y\})$  where  $Y \notin \mathcal{X}$  is indecomposable. By Lemma 3.7 and Theorem 3.11,  $Y$  admits a triangle*

$$Z \xrightarrow{z} X \xrightarrow{x} Y \xrightarrow{y} Z[1]$$

where  $x$  is a minimal right  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation and  $Z \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \mathcal{X}$  is indecomposable. Then  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}} = \text{add}(\mathcal{X} \cup \{Z\})$ .

*Proof.* Let  $Z_0$  be an indecomposable object in  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \mathcal{X}$ . By Theorem 3.11,  $Z_0$  admits a triangle

$$Z_0 \xrightarrow{z_0} X_0 \xrightarrow{x_0} Y_0 \xrightarrow{y_0} Z_0[1]$$

where  $z_0$  is a left minimal right  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation and  $Y_0 \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \mathcal{X}$  is indecomposable. Then  $Y_0$  has to be isomorphic to  $Y$ . Hence  $Z_0 \cong Z$ .  $\square$

Dually, we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be an  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -functorially finite two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory. Assume  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}} = \text{add}(\mathcal{X} \cup \{Z\})$  where  $Z \notin \mathcal{X}$  is indecomposable. By Lemma 3.8 and Theorem 3.11,  $Z$  admits a triangle*

$$Z \xrightarrow{z} X \xrightarrow{x} Y \xrightarrow{y} Z[1]$$

where  $z$  is a minimal left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation of  $Z$  and  $Y \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \mathcal{X}$  is indecomposable. Then  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} = \text{add}(\mathcal{X} \cup \{Y\})$ .

The following result shows that any almost complete two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory has exactly two completions.

**Theorem 4.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be an almost complete two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory. Then  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$  are the only completions of  $\mathcal{X}$ . Moreover, if  $\mathcal{U}$  is a two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory which contains  $\mathcal{X}$ , then  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$  or  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$ .*

*Proof.* By definition,  $\mathcal{X}$  admits a two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory  $\mathcal{L} = \text{add}(\mathcal{X} \cup \{W\})$  where  $W \notin \mathcal{X}$  is indecomposable. By Lemmas 2.13 and 2.15, every object  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  admits a triangle  $R \xrightarrow{f} L_R^1 \rightarrow L_R^2 \xrightarrow{r} R[1]$  such that  $L_R^1, L_R^2 \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $f$  is a minimal left  $\mathcal{L}$ -approximation. If for every  $R$ ,  $L_R^1, L_R^2 \in \mathcal{X}$ , then by Lemma 2.15,  $\mathcal{X}$  itself becomes two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting, a contradiction. Hence  $W$  must appear in some triangle  $R \xrightarrow{f} L_R^1 \rightarrow L_R^2 \xrightarrow{r} R[1]$ . Since  $f$  is left minimal, by Lemma

2.14,  $L_R^1$  and  $L_R^2$  do not have common direct summands. Hence  $W$  can not be a direct summand of both  $L_R^1$  and  $L_R^2$ . If  $W$  is a direct summand of  $L_R^1$ , then  $W \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$ ; if  $W$  is a direct summand of  $L_R^2$ , then  $W \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$ . Hence  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$  or  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$ . Then by Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.3,  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$  are the completions of  $\mathcal{X}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory which contains  $\mathcal{X}$ . Assume  $\mathcal{U} \neq \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $\mathcal{U} \neq \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} = \text{add}(\mathcal{X} \cup \{Y\})$  where  $Y \notin \mathcal{X}$  is indecomposable. Then there is an object  $R_0 \in \mathcal{R}$  which admits a triangle

$$R_0 \rightarrow X_0 \xrightarrow{x_0} M_0 \xrightarrow{m_0} R_0[1]$$

where  $X_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $M_0 \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $Y$  is a direct summand of  $M_0$ . For any object  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  and any morphism  $\alpha : U[-1] \rightarrow R' \xrightarrow{r'} M_0$  with  $R' \in \mathcal{R}$ , we have  $m_0 r' = 0$ . Then there is a morphism  $x' : R' \rightarrow X_0$  such that  $x_0 x' = r'$ . Hence  $\alpha = 0$ , which implies that  $[\mathcal{R}](\mathcal{U}[-1], \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}) = 0$ .

Now let  $U_0$  be an indecomposable object in  $\mathcal{U} \setminus \mathcal{X}$ . It admits a triangle

$$U_0[-1] \rightarrow R_1 \xrightarrow{r_1} R_2 \rightarrow U_0$$

with  $R_1, R_2 \in \mathcal{R}$ . Since  $[\mathcal{R}](\mathcal{U}[-1], \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}) = 0$ ,  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(r_1, M)$  is surjective for any  $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$  by Lemma 2.10.  $R_2$  admits a triangle

$$R_2 \xrightarrow{x_2} X_2 \rightarrow M'_2 \rightarrow R_2[1]$$

where  $x_2$  is a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation and  $M'_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$ . Then we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & M'_2[-1] & \xlongequal{\quad} & M'_2[-1] & \\ & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ R_1 & \xrightarrow{r} & R_2 & \xrightarrow{\quad} & U_0 & \xrightarrow{\quad} & R[1] \\ & & \parallel & & \parallel & & \\ R_1 & \xrightarrow{r_1} & X_2 & \xrightarrow{\quad} & M'_1 & \xrightarrow{\quad} & R[1] \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & M'_2 & \xlongequal{\quad} & M'_2 & & \end{array}$$

where  $r_1$  is a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation. Then  $M'_1 \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$ . By Lemma 2.13,  $U_0$  admits a triangle

$$U_0 \xrightarrow{u_0} M_1 \xrightarrow{m_1} M_2 \xrightarrow{m_2} U_0[1]$$

where  $u_0$  is a left minimal  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -approximation and  $m_2$  factors through  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ . If  $M_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ , then  $m_2 = 0$ , which implies that  $U_0 \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$ , a contradiction. Hence  $Y$  is a direct summand of  $M_2$ . If  $M_1 \in \mathcal{X}$ , then by Lemma 2.13,  $m_1$  becomes a right  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation of  $M_2$ . Then by Theorem 3.11,  $U_0 \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$ , a contradiction. Hence  $Y$  has to be a direct summand of  $M_1$ . But by Lemma 2.14,  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  have no common direct summands, a contradiction. Hence  $\mathcal{U}$  has to be  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$  or  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$ .  $\square$

## 5. $\tau$ -TILTING THEORY IN FUNCTOR CATEGORIES

From this section, we assume that  $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{R}[1]$  is abelian. Note that when  $\mathcal{R}$  is contravariantly finite,  $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{R}[1]$  is the heart of a cotorsion pair, hence is abelian, see [Na, Theorem 6.4]. For convenience, denote  $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{R}[1]$  by  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ . For any subcategory  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ , we denote its image through canonical quotient functor  $\pi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{A}}$  by  $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$ .

By [IY, Proposition 6.2], the following functor

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H} : \mathcal{C} &\longrightarrow \text{Mod } \mathcal{R} \\ M &\longmapsto \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, M)|_{\mathcal{R}} \end{aligned}$$

induces an equivalence  $\overline{\mathcal{A}} \simeq \text{mod } \mathcal{R}$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \xrightarrow{h} A[1]$  be a triangle such that  $A, B, C \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}, h) = 0$ . Then we have an exact sequence  $A \xrightarrow{\overline{f}} B \xrightarrow{\overline{g}} C \rightarrow 0$ .*

*Proof.* Apply the functor  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}, -)$  to the triangle

$$A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \xrightarrow{h} A[1],$$

we have the follow exact sequence:

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}, A) \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}, f)} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}, B) \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}, g)} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}, C) \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}, h)=0} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}, A[1]).$$

By the equivalence  $\overline{\mathcal{A}} \simeq \text{mod } \mathcal{R}$ , we can get the desired exact sequence.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.2.**  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$  is the subcategory of enough projective objects in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\overline{f} : A \rightarrow B$  be an epimorphism in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ . Then  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(R, A) \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(R, f)} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(R, B)$  is also an epimorphism for any object  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ . Hence we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & R & \\ & \swarrow \text{dotted} & \downarrow \\ A & \xrightarrow{\overline{f}} & B \longrightarrow 0, \end{array}$$

which implies that  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$  is a subcategory of projective objects in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ .

On the other hand, any object  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  admits a triangle  $R_1 \rightarrow R_0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow R[1]$  with  $R_0, R_1 \in \mathcal{R}$ , then by Lemma 5.1, we have an epimorphism  $R_0 \rightarrow A$  in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ . Hence  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$  is the subcategory of enough projective objects in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ .  $\square$

Let  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  be an abelian category. For any subcategory  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ , denote by  $\text{Fac } \mathcal{X}$  the following subcategory of  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ :

$$\{W \in \widehat{\mathcal{A}} \mid \text{there is an epimorphism } X \rightarrow W \text{ with } X \in \mathcal{X}\}.$$

**Lemma 5.3.** Let  $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}$  be two subcategories of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Assume that  $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{R}[1] = 0$ . Then  $\text{Ext}_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}^1(\overline{\mathcal{U}}, \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{V}}) = 0$  if and only if  $[\mathcal{R}[1]](\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}[1]) = 0$ .

*Proof.* We show the “if” part first.

By Lemma 2.10, any object  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  admits a triangle

$$R_1 \xrightarrow{f} R_2 \xrightarrow{u_1} U \xrightarrow{u_2} R_1[1]$$

where  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(f, V)$  is surjective for any object  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ . By Lemma 5.1, we have an exact sequence in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ :

$$R_1 \xrightarrow{\overline{f}} R_2 \xrightarrow{\overline{u}_1} U \rightarrow 0.$$

Let  $R_1 \xrightarrow{\overline{f}_1} Y \xrightarrow{\overline{f}_2} R_2$  be an epic-monic factorization of  $\overline{f}$ . Let  $\overline{y} : Y \rightarrow W$  be any morphism with  $W \in \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{V}}$ .  $W$  admits an epimorphism  $\overline{w} : V \rightarrow W$  with  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ . Since  $R_1$  is a projective object in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$  by Lemma 5.2, there is a morphism  $\overline{r}_1 : R_1 \rightarrow V$  such that  $\overline{w}\overline{r}_1 = \overline{y}\overline{f}_1$ . Since  $\text{Hom}_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}(\overline{f}, V)$  is surjective, there is a morphism  $\overline{r}_2 : R_2 \rightarrow V$  such that  $\overline{r}_1 = \overline{r}_2\overline{f}$ . Then  $\overline{y}\overline{f}_1 = \overline{w}\overline{r}_2\overline{f}$ . Since  $\overline{f}_1$  is an epimorphism, we have  $\overline{y} = \overline{w}\overline{r}_2\overline{f}_2$ . Then we have the following exact sequence

$$\text{Hom}_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}(R_2, W) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}(Y, W) \xrightarrow{0} \text{Ext}_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}^1(U, W) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}^1(R_2, W) = 0.$$

Hence  $\text{Ext}_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}^1(U, W) = 0$ , which implies  $\text{Ext}_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}^1(\overline{\mathcal{U}}, \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{V}}) = 0$ .

Now we show the “only if” part.

Let  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  be an indecomposable object. It admits a triangle

$$R_1 \xrightarrow{f} R_2 \xrightarrow{u_1} U \xrightarrow{u_2} R_1[1].$$

By Lemma 2.10, we need to check that  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(f, V)$  is surjective for any object  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ . Let  $r_1 : R_1 \rightarrow V$  be any morphism. Then we have the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
U[-1] & \longrightarrow & R_1 & \xrightarrow{f} & R_2 & \xrightarrow{u_1} & U \\
\parallel & & \downarrow r_1 & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
U[-1] & \xrightarrow{u} & V & \xrightarrow{v} & A_2 & \xrightarrow{a} & U \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
& & A_1 & \xlongequal{\quad} & A_1 & & \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
& & R_1[1] & \longrightarrow & R_2[1] & & 
\end{array}$$

Note that  $\bar{a} \neq 0$ , otherwise  $u_1 = 0$ , which implies that  $U_1 \in \mathcal{R}[1]$ , a contradiction. By Lemma 2.11,  $A_1 \in \mathcal{A}$ . Again by Lemma 2.11,  $A_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ . Since  $u[1]$  factors through  $R_1[1]$ , we have an exact sequence

$$V \xrightarrow{\bar{v}} A_2 \xrightarrow{\bar{a}} U \rightarrow 0$$

Let  $V \xrightarrow{\bar{v}_1} W \xrightarrow{\bar{v}_2} A_2$  be an epic-monic factorization of  $\bar{v}$ . Since  $W \in \text{Fac } \bar{\mathcal{V}}$  and  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\bar{\mathcal{U}}, \text{Fac } \bar{\mathcal{V}}) = 0$ ,  $\bar{a}$  becomes a retraction. But  $U$  is indecomposable, which means  $a$  is also a retraction. Then  $u = 0$  and  $r_1$  factors through  $f$ .  $\square$

We can get the following corollary immediately.

**Corollary 5.4.** *Let  $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ . Then  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, Y[1]) = 0$  implies that  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(X, Y) = 0$*

We have the following useful proposition.

**Proposition 5.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$  which is closed under direct sums and direct summands. Assume that  $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{R}[1] = 0$ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\mathcal{U}$  is two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid.
- (2)  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\bar{\mathcal{U}}, \text{Fac } \bar{\mathcal{U}}) = 0$ .
- (3) Any object  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  admits a triangle

$$R_1 \xrightarrow{f} R_2 \rightarrow U \rightarrow R[1]$$

where  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(f, U')$  is surjective for any object  $U' \in \mathcal{U}$ .

- (4) Any object  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  admits an exact sequence

$$R_1 \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} R_2 \rightarrow U \rightarrow 0$$

where  $\text{Hom}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}}(\bar{f}, U')$  is surjective for any object  $U' \in \mathcal{U}$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.10 and Lemma 5.3, (1), (2) and (3) are equivalent to each other. By Lemma 5.1, (3) implies (4). We only need to show (4) implies (3).

Since for any  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ ,  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(R, U') = \text{Hom}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}}(R, U')$ ,  $\text{Hom}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}}(\bar{f}, U')$  is surjective implies that  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(f, U')$  is surjective. We have a triangle  $R_1 \xrightarrow{f} R_2 \rightarrow U_0 \rightarrow R_1[1]$ . It induces an exact sequence  $R_1 \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} R_2 \rightarrow U_0 \rightarrow 0$  in  $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$ . Hence  $U \cong U_0$  in  $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$ . Since  $U$  has no direct summand in  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ ,  $U_0 = U \oplus R'[1]$  with  $R' \in \mathcal{R}$ . Since  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(R_2, R'[1]) = 0$ , we can find that  $R_1 \xrightarrow{f} R_2 \rightarrow U \rightarrow R_1[1]$  is the direct sum of triangle  $R'_1 \xrightarrow{f'} R_2 \rightarrow U \rightarrow R'_1[1]$  and  $R' \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow R'[1] \xrightarrow{1} R'[1]$ . Hence  $U$  admits a triangle  $R'_1 \xrightarrow{f'} R_2 \rightarrow U \rightarrow R'_1[1]$  where  $R'_1 \in \mathcal{R}$  and  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(f', U')$  is surjective for any object  $U' \in \mathcal{U}$ .  $\square$

**Definition 5.6.** *Let  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  be a Krull-Schmidt abelian category with enough projectives. A subcategory  $\mathcal{U}$  is called a  $\tau$ -rigid subcategory if  $\text{Ext}_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}}^1(\mathcal{U}, \text{Fac } \mathcal{U}) = 0$ ; an object  $U$  is called a  $\tau$ -rigid object if  $\text{add } U$  is a  $\tau$ -rigid subcategory. A pair  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Q})$  is called a  $\tau$ -rigid pair if*

- (1)  $\mathcal{U}$  is  $\tau$ -rigid;
- (2)  $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \{P \text{ is projective} \mid \text{Hom}_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}}(P, \mathcal{U}) = 0\}$ .

A subcategory  $\mathcal{M}$  is called a support  $\tau$ -tilting subcategory if

- (a)  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $\tau$ -rigid;  
 (b) every projective object  $P$  admits an exact sequence

$$P \xrightarrow{p} M_1 \rightarrow M_2 \rightarrow 0$$

where  $M_1, M_2 \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $p$  is a left  $\mathcal{M}$ -approximation. An object  $M$  is called a support  $\tau$ -tilting object if  $\text{add } M$  is a support  $\tau$ -tilting subcategory.

A pair  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{E})$  is called a support  $\tau$ -tilting pair if it is a  $\tau$ -rigid pair,  $\mathcal{M}$  is support  $\tau$ -tilting and  $\mathcal{E} = \{P \text{ is projective} \mid \text{Hom}_{\widehat{\mathcal{A}}}(P, M) = 0\}$ . We say a support  $\tau$ -tilting pair  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{E})$  contains a  $\tau$ -rigid pair  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Q})$  if  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ .

A  $\tau$ -rigid pair  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Q})$  is called an almost complete support  $\tau$ -tilting pair if there exists an indecomposable object  $X$  such that  $(\text{add}(\mathcal{U} \cup \{X\}), \mathcal{Q})$  or  $(\mathcal{U}, \text{add}(\mathcal{Q} \cup \{X\}))$  is a support  $\tau$ -tilting pair.

**Remark 5.7.** By definition, if  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Q})$  is a  $\tau$ -rigid pair in  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ , so is  $(\text{add } \mathcal{U}, \text{add } \mathcal{Q})$ . For convenience, we always assume that  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Q}) = (\text{add } \mathcal{U}, \text{add } \mathcal{Q})$  for a  $\tau$ -rigid pair.

The following result is not hard to check:

**Lemma 5.8.** Let  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  be an abelian category with enough projectives. If  $\mathcal{U}$  is a  $\tau$ -rigid subcategory, then  $\text{Fac } \mathcal{U}$  is closed under extensions.

For the convenience of the readers, we give a proof for the following theorem (see [ZhZ, Theorem 4.4 and Theorem 4.5] for more general results).

**Theorem 5.9.** Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then

- (1)  $(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{E}})$  is a  $\tau$ -rigid pair if and only if  $\mathcal{X}$  is two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid and  $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})$ ;
- (2) If  $\mathcal{X}$  is two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting, then  $(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})})$  is a support  $\tau$ -tilting pair;
- (3) If  $(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})})$  is a support  $\tau$ -tilting pair and  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})[1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ , then  $\mathcal{X}$  is two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{X}'$  be the subcategory of  $\mathcal{X}$  consisting of the objects which do not have direct summands in  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ . Note that  $\overline{\mathcal{X}'} = \overline{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X}')$ .

(1) If  $\mathcal{X}$  is two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid, so is  $\mathcal{X}'$ . By Proposition 5.5,  $\overline{\mathcal{X}'}$  is  $\tau$ -rigid. Then by definition  $(\overline{\mathcal{X}'}, \overline{\mathcal{E}'})$  is a  $\tau$ -rigid pair when  $\mathcal{E}' \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X}')$ . If  $(\overline{\mathcal{X}'}, \overline{\mathcal{E}'})$  is a  $\tau$ -rigid pair, then  $\mathcal{E}' \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X}')$ . By Proposition 5.5,  $\mathcal{X}'$  is two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid. Then by Lemma 2.7,  $\mathcal{X}$  is also two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid.

(2) If  $\mathcal{X}$  is two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting, by (1), Lemma 2.13, Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 2.8,  $(\overline{\mathcal{X}'}, \overline{\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X}')})$  is a support  $\tau$ -tilting pair.

(3) If  $(\overline{\mathcal{X}'}, \overline{\mathcal{E}'})$  is a support  $\tau$ -tilting pair, Then  $\mathcal{X}'$  is two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid by (1). Since each  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  admits an exact sequence  $R \xrightarrow{\bar{x}} X_1 \rightarrow X_2 \rightarrow 0$  where  $X_1, X_2 \in \mathcal{X}'$  and  $\bar{x}$  is a left  $\overline{\mathcal{X}'}$ -approximation, we have a triangle  $R \xrightarrow{x} X_1 \rightarrow X'_2 \rightarrow R[1]$ . We can assume that  $X_1, X_2 \in \mathcal{X}'$ . By Lemma 5.1,  $X_2 \cong X'_2$  in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ . Hence  $X_2 \cong X'_2 \oplus R'[1]$  with  $R' \in \mathcal{R}$ . Note that  $x$  is in fact a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation, we have  $X'_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$ . Hence  $R' \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})$  by Lemma 3.4. When  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})[1] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ , by Lemma 2.15  $\mathcal{X}$  is two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting.  $\square$

We introduce the following notion. Let  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  be an abelian category with enough projectives. For any subcategory  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ , denote

$$\{T \in \mathcal{T} \mid \text{Ext}_{\widehat{\mathcal{A}}}^1(T, \mathcal{T}) = 0\} \text{ by } \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{T});$$

denote

$$\{A \in \widehat{\mathcal{A}} \mid \text{Ext}_{\widehat{\mathcal{A}}}^1(\mathcal{U}, \text{Fac}(\text{add } A)) = 0\} \text{ by } {}^\perp(\tau\mathcal{U});$$

denote

$$\{A \in \widehat{\mathcal{A}} \mid \text{Hom}_{\widehat{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathcal{U}, A) = 0\} \text{ by } \mathcal{U}^\perp.$$

**Proposition 5.10.** Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be an  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -functorially finite two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory such that  $\mathcal{X} \not\subseteq \mathcal{R}[1]$ . Then

- (1)  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}} = \mathbf{P}(\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}})$ ;
- (2) if  $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{R}[1] = 0$ , then  $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{X}} = \mathbf{P}({}^\perp(\tau\overline{\mathcal{X}}))$ .

*Proof.* (1) If any indecomposable object in  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \mathcal{X}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ , by Lemma 5.3, we have  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}} = \overline{\mathcal{X}} \subseteq \mathbf{P}(\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}})$ . Now let  $M_0 \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \mathcal{X}$  be an indecomposable object. Assume that  $M_0 \notin \mathcal{R}[1]$ . It admits an exact sequence

$$R \xrightarrow{\overline{f}} X \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$$

in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$  where  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ ,  $f$  is a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation and  $M_0$  is a direct summand of  $M$ . Hence  $M_0 \in \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}$ . Let  $R \xrightarrow{\overline{f}_1} S \xrightarrow{\overline{f}_2} X$  be the epic-monic factorization of  $\overline{f}$ . Let  $W$  be any object in  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}$  which admits an epimorphism  $X_W \xrightarrow{\overline{w}} W$  with  $X_W \in \mathcal{X}$ . Let  $\overline{r} : R \rightarrow W$  be any morphism. Since  $R$  is projective in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ , there is a morphism  $\overline{r}' : R \rightarrow X_W$  such that  $\overline{w}\overline{r}' = \overline{r}$ . Since  $f$  is a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation, there is a morphism  $x' : X \rightarrow X_W$  such that  $\overline{x}'\overline{f} = \overline{r}'$ . Hence  $\overline{w}\overline{x}'\overline{f} = \overline{r}$ . Then we have the following exact sequence

$$\text{Hom}_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}(S, W) \xrightarrow{0} \text{Ext}_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}^1(M, W) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}^1(X, W) = 0.$$

Hence  $\text{Ext}_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}^1(M, W) = 0$ , which implies that  $M_0 \in \mathbf{P}(\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}})$ . Hence  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}} \subseteq \mathbf{P}(\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}})$ .

For convenience, we still use  $\mathbf{P}(\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}})$  to denote the subcategory in  $\mathcal{A}$  which has the same object as the one in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ . Assume  $\mathbf{P}(\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}) \cap \mathcal{R}[1] = 0$ . By Lemma 5.3,  $\mathbf{P}(\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}})$  is two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid. Since  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$  is two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting, to show that  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}} = \mathbf{P}(\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}})$ , we only need to check  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(R, \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}) = 0$  implies that  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(R, \mathbf{P}(\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}})) = 0$ .

Let  $M_1 \in \mathbf{P}(\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}})$ . It admits a triangle

$$L \rightarrow X_1 \xrightarrow{x_1} M_1 \xrightarrow{m_1} L_1[1]$$

where  $X_1 \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}, m_1) = 0$ . Assume  $R_1 \in \mathcal{R}$  satisfies  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(R_1, \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}) = 0$ . Then for any morphism  $r_1 : R_1 \rightarrow M_1$ , since  $m_1 r_1 = 0$ ,  $r_1$  factors through  $X_1$ . But  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(R, X_1) = 0$ , hence  $r_1 = 0$ . This means  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(R_1, \mathbf{P}(\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}})) = 0$ .

(2) Let  $N_0 \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \mathcal{X}$  be an indecomposable object. By Lemma 3.4(2),  $N_0 \notin \mathcal{R}[1]$ . By Lemma 5.3,  $N_0 \in {}^\perp(\tau \overline{\mathcal{X}})$ . Again by Lemma 5.3, to show  $\text{Ext}_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}^1(N_0, U) = 0$  for any  $U \in {}^\perp(\tau \overline{\mathcal{X}})$ , we only need to check  $[\mathcal{R}[1]](N_0, U[1]) = 0$ .  $N_0$  admits a triangle

$$R_0 \xrightarrow{r_0} N \xrightarrow{n} X_0 \xrightarrow{x_0} R_0[1]$$

where  $R_0 \in \mathcal{R}$ ,  $x_0$  is a right  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation and  $N_0$  is a direct summand of  $N$ . Let  $\alpha : N \xrightarrow{a_1} R'[1] \xrightarrow{a_2} U[1]$  be a morphism with  $R' \in \mathcal{R}$ . Since  $a_1 r_0 = 0$ , there is a morphism  $u : X_0 \rightarrow R'[1]$  such that  $a_1 = un$ . Since  $X_0$  has no direct summand in  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ , we have  $a_2 u = 0$ . Then  $a_2 a_1 = a_2 un = 0$ . Hence  $[\mathcal{R}[1]](N_0, U[1]) = 0$ , which implies that  $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{X}} \subseteq \mathbf{P}({}^\perp(\tau \overline{\mathcal{X}}))$ .

By Lemma 3.4(2), in  $\mathcal{A}$  we still have  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}} \subseteq \mathbf{P}({}^\perp(\tau \overline{\mathcal{X}}))$ . By Lemma 5.3,  $\mathbf{P}({}^\perp(\tau \overline{\mathcal{X}}))$  is two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid. But  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$  is two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting, hence  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}} = \mathbf{P}({}^\perp(\tau \overline{\mathcal{X}}))$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 5.11.** If  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{R}[1]$ , then by definition, we can get that  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} = \mathcal{R}[1]$  and  $\mathbf{P}({}^\perp(\tau \overline{\mathcal{X}})) = \overline{\mathcal{R}}$ .

**Lemma 5.12.** Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory,  $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})$ . Then  ${}^\perp(\tau \overline{\mathcal{X}}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{E}}^\perp \supseteq \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}$ .

*Proof.* If  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{R}[1]$ ,  $\overline{\mathcal{X}} = 0$ , hence  ${}^\perp(\tau \overline{\mathcal{X}}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{E}}^\perp \supseteq \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}$ . Now we assume that  $X \notin \mathcal{R}[1]$ .

Since  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$  is the subcategory of projective objects in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ , any morphism from  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$  to  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}$  factors through  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$ . Hence  $\overline{\mathcal{E}}^\perp \supseteq \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}$ . Let  $W \in \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}$  be any indecomposable non-zero object. By Lemma 5.3, to get that  $W \in {}^\perp(\tau \overline{\mathcal{X}})$ , we only need to check that  $[\mathcal{R}](X[-1], W) = 0$  for any indecomposable object  $X \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{R}[1]$ .

Since  $W \in \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}$ , then  $W$  admits a triangle

$$U \rightarrow X' \xrightarrow{x'} W \xrightarrow{w} U[1]$$

where  $X' \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}, w) = 0$ . Let  $\alpha : X[-1] \xrightarrow{a_1} R \xrightarrow{a_2} W$  be any morphism in  $[\mathcal{R}](X[-1], W)$ . Since  $wa_2 = 0$ , there is a morphism  $r : R \rightarrow X'$  such that  $x'r = a_2$ . Since  $ra_1 \in [\mathcal{R}](X[-1], X') = 0$ , we have  $\alpha = 0$ . Thus  ${}^\perp(\tau \overline{\mathcal{X}}) \supseteq \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}$ .  $\square$

In summary, we have the following main result.

**Theorem 5.13.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be an  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -functorially finite two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory. Denote  $\mathcal{X}[-1] \cap \mathcal{R}$  by  $\mathcal{E}$ . If  $(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{E}})$  is NOT a support  $\tau$ -tilting pair in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ , then it is contained in two (different) support  $\tau$ -tilting pairs  $(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})})$  and  $(\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{E}})$ . Moreover,*

$$\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}} = \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}, \text{ Fac } \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{X}} = {}^{\perp}(\tau \overline{\mathcal{X}}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{E}}^{\perp} \text{ and } \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}} \subsetneq \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{X}}.$$

*Proof.* By Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2,  $\mathcal{X}$  is contained in 2 two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategories  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$ .

By Lemma 3.4(1) and Lemma 2.8, we have

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap \mathcal{R}[1] = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})[1] \supseteq \mathcal{E}[1].$$

Then  $(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})})$  is a support  $\tau$ -tilting pair that contain  $(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{E}})$ . On the other hand, by Lemma 3.4(2),  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap \mathcal{R}[1] = \mathcal{E}[1]$ . Hence  $(\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{E}})$  is also a support  $\tau$ -tilting pair that contains  $(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{E}})$  by Theorem 5.9.

Now we show the ‘‘Moreover’’ part.

Since  $\overline{\mathcal{X}} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}} \subseteq \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}$ , we have  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}} = \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}$ .

Since  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}} \cap \mathcal{R}[1] = \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{R}[1]$ , by Lemma 5.12,  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{X}} \subseteq {}^{\perp}(\tau \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{X}}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{E}}^{\perp} \subseteq {}^{\perp}(\tau \overline{\mathcal{X}}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{E}}^{\perp}$ . Let  $L \in {}^{\perp}(\tau \overline{\mathcal{X}}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{E}}^{\perp}$  be a non-zero indecomposable object. Any indecomposable object  $N_0 \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \mathcal{X}$  admits a triangle

$$X_1[-1] \rightarrow R_1 \xrightarrow{r_1} N_1 \xrightarrow{x_1} X_1$$

where  $N_1 \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$ ,  $X_1 \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $N_0$  is a direct summand of  $N_1$ . For any morphism  $\alpha : N_1 \xrightarrow{n_1} R[1] \xrightarrow{l_1} L[1]$ , since  $n_1 r_1 = 0$ , there is a morphism  $x : X_1 \rightarrow R[1]$  such that  $n_1 = x x_1$ . Assume  $X_1 = X'_1 \oplus R'_1[1]$ , where  $R'_1 \in \mathcal{R}$  and  $X'_1$  has no direct summand in  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ . Since  $R' \in \mathcal{E}$ , we have  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(R'_1, L) = 0$ . By Lemma 5.3,  $L \in {}^{\perp}(\tau \overline{\mathcal{X}})$  implies that  $[\mathcal{R}[1]](X'_1, L[1]) = 0$ . Hence  $l_1 x_1 = 0$ , which implies  $\alpha = 0$ . Thus  $L \in {}^{\perp}(\tau \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{X}})$  and  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{X}} = {}^{\perp}(\tau \overline{\mathcal{X}}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{E}}^{\perp}$ .  $\square$

## 6. $\tau$ -TILTING THEORY IN ABELIAN CATEGORIES

**Definition 6.1.** *A pair of subcategories  $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$  in an abelian category  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  is called a torsion pair if the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (1)  $\text{Hom}_{\widehat{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F}) = 0$ ;
- (2) any object  $A \in \widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  admits a short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow T \rightarrow A \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0$  where  $T \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $F \in \mathcal{F}$

A subcategory  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  is called torsion class if it admits a torsion pair  $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ .

**Lemma 6.2.** *Let  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$  be a contravariantly finite  $\tau$ -rigid subcategory in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ . Then  $(\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{X}}^{\perp})$  is a torsion pair. Moreover, if any object  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  admits a left  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$ -approximation, then  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}$  is functorially finite.*

*Proof.* For convenience, we can assume that  $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{R}[1] = 0$ . It is obvious that  $\text{Hom}_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}(\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}, \overline{\mathcal{X}}^{\perp}) = 0$ . Let  $A \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}$  be any object. Assume that  $A$  has no direct summand in  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ .

Since  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$  is contravariantly finite in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ ,  $A$  admits a right  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$ -approximation  $\overline{x} : X \rightarrow A$ . Then we have a triangle

$$B[-1] \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{\overline{x}} A \rightarrow B.$$

$X$  admits a triangle

$$X \xrightarrow{r_1} R_1[1] \xrightarrow{r_2} R_2[1] \xrightarrow{x_1} X[1]$$

where  $R_1, R_2 \in \mathcal{R}$ . Then we have the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
B[-1] & \longrightarrow & X & \xrightarrow{x} & A & \longrightarrow & B \\
\parallel & & \downarrow r_1 & & \downarrow a & & \parallel \\
B[-1] & \longrightarrow & R_1[1] & \xrightarrow{u_1} & U & \longrightarrow & B \\
& & \downarrow r_2 & & \downarrow u_2 & & \\
& & R_2[1] & \xlongequal{\quad} & R_2[1] & & \\
& & \downarrow x_1 & & \downarrow & & \\
& & X[1] & \xrightarrow{x[1]} & A[1] & & 
\end{array}$$

By Lemma 2.11,  $U \in \mathcal{A}$ . We can get a triangle  $X \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} x \\ r_1 \end{pmatrix}} A \oplus R_1[1] \xrightarrow{(-a \ u_1)} U \xrightarrow{x_1 u_2} X[1]$ . Then we have an exact sequence  $X \xrightarrow{\bar{x}} A \xrightarrow{-\bar{a}} U \rightarrow 0$  in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ . Let  $X \xrightarrow{\bar{c}_1} C \xrightarrow{\bar{c}_2} A$  be the epic-monic factorization of  $\bar{x}$ . Then  $C \in \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}$  and we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow C \xrightarrow{\bar{c}_2} A \rightarrow U \rightarrow 0.$$

We show  $U \in \overline{\mathcal{X}}^\perp$ .

Let  $X_0$  be any object in  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $f \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X_0, U)$ . Since  $\mathcal{X}$  is  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid,  $x_1 u_2 f = 0$ . Then there is a morphism  $x_0 : X_0 \rightarrow R_1[1]$  such that  $r_2 x_0 = u_2 f$ . Hence  $0 = r_2 x_0 - u_2 f_2 = u_2 (u_1 x_0 - f_2)$  and there exists a morphism  $x'_0 : X_0 \rightarrow A$  such that  $a x'_0 = u_1 x_0 - f_2$ . Since  $\bar{x}$  is a right  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$ -approximation, there is a morphism  $\bar{x}' : X_0 \rightarrow X$  such that  $\bar{x}'_0 = \bar{x} x'$ . Hence

$$\bar{f}_2 = \bar{u}_1 \bar{x}'_0 - \bar{a} \bar{x}' = \bar{u}_1 \bar{x}'_0 - \bar{u}_1 \bar{x}' = 0,$$

which implies  $U \in \overline{\mathcal{X}}^\perp$ .

Now we assume that any object  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  admits a left  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$ -approximation. Note that this means any object  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  admits a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation. Since  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}$  is already contravariantly finite, we show that it is covariantly finite in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ .

$A$  admits a triangle  $R_0 \rightarrow R_A \xrightarrow{r_A} A \rightarrow R_0[1]$  with  $R_0, R_A \in \mathcal{R}$ .  $R_A$  admits a triangle  $M[-1] \rightarrow R_A \xrightarrow{r'} X_1 \rightarrow M_1$  where  $r'$  is a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation. Then we have the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & M_1[-1] & \xlongequal{\quad} & M_1[-1] & & \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
R_0 & \longrightarrow & R_A & \xrightarrow{r_A} & A & \longrightarrow & R_0[1] \\
\parallel & & \downarrow r' & & \downarrow a_1 & & \parallel \\
R_0 & \longrightarrow & X_1 & \longrightarrow & C_1 & \longrightarrow & R_0[1] \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
& & M_1 & \xlongequal{\quad} & M_1 & & 
\end{array}$$

Note that  $C_1 \in \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}$ , we show that  $\bar{a}_1$  is a left  $(\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}})$ -approximation.

Let  $C'$  be any object in  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}$ . Then  $C'$  admits a triangle  $D[-1] \rightarrow X' \xrightarrow{x'} C' \xrightarrow{c'} D$  where  $X' \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}, c') = 0$ . Let  $a' \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, C')$ . Since  $c' a' r_A = 0$ , there is a morphism  $x_A : R_A \rightarrow X'$  such that  $x' x_A = a' r_A$ . Since  $r'$  is a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation, there is a morphism  $x'_1 : X_1 \rightarrow X'$  such that  $x'_1 r' = x_A$ . Hence  $x' x'_1 r' = a' r_A$  and there exists a morphism  $c'_1 : C_1 \rightarrow C'$  such that  $c'_1 a_1 = a'$ . Hence  $\bar{a}_1$  is a left  $(\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}})$ -approximation.  $\square$

**Definition 6.3.** Let  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  be an abelian category with enough projectives. Let  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  be a pair of subcategories in  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ . Consider the following conditions:

- (a1)  $\mathcal{U} = \{A \in \widehat{\mathcal{A}} \mid \text{Ext}_{\widehat{\mathcal{A}}}^1(A, \mathcal{V}) = 0\} := {}^\perp \mathcal{V}$ .



- (a2) Any projective object  $P$  admits an exact sequence  $P \xrightarrow{p} V^P \rightarrow U^P \rightarrow 0$  where  $U^P \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $V^P \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V}$  and  $p$  is a left  $\mathcal{V}$ -approximation.
- (b1)  $\text{Ext}_{\widehat{\mathcal{A}}}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0$ .
- (b2) Any object  $A \in \widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  admits two exact sequences

$$0 \rightarrow V_A \rightarrow U_A \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0 \text{ and } A \xrightarrow{v} V^A \rightarrow U^A \rightarrow 0$$

where  $U_A, U^A \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $V_A, V^A \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $v$  is a left  $\mathcal{V}$ -approximation.

- (c1)  $\text{Fac } \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}$ .
- (c1')  $\mathcal{V}$  is a torsion class.
- (c2)  $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V}$  is contravariantly finite.

$(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  is called a  $\tau$ -cotorsion pair ([PZZ, Definition 2.9]) if conditions (a1) and (a2) are satisfied; it is called a  $\tau$ -cotorsion torsion pair ([AST, Definition 4.4]) if in addition, (c1') and (c2) are satisfied.  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  is called a left weak cotorsion pair ([BZ, Definition 0.2], [AST, Remark 4.9]) if conditions (b1) and (b2) are satisfied; it is called a left weak cotorsion torsion pair ([AST, Remark 4.9]) if in addition, (c1') is satisfied.

We recall the following result:

**Theorem 6.4.** ([PZZ, Theorem 3.8], [AST, Theorem 5.7]) *Let  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  be a Krull-Schmidt abelian category with enough projectives. There are mutually inverse bijections:*

$$\begin{aligned} \{ \text{support } \tau\text{-tilting subcategories} \} &\leftrightarrow \{ \tau\text{-cotorsion pairs } (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) \mid \mathcal{V} \text{ satisfies (c1)} \} \\ \mathcal{M} &\rightarrow ({}^{\perp 1}(\text{Fac } \mathcal{M}), \text{Fac } \mathcal{M}) \\ \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V} &\leftarrow (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, these bijections induce the following one-to-one correspondence:

$$\{ \text{contravariantly finite support } \tau\text{-tilting subcategories} \} \leftrightarrow \{ \tau\text{-cotorsion torsion pairs} \}$$

According to this theorem, we can define a partial order of support  $\tau$ -tilting subcategories in  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ :

**Definition 6.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  be two support  $\tau$ -tilting subcategories. We write  $\mathcal{M} \geq \mathcal{N}$  when  $\text{Fac } \mathcal{M} \supseteq \text{Fac } \mathcal{N}$ .*

**Proposition 6.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be an  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -functorially finite two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory. Denote  $\mathcal{X}[-1] \cap \mathcal{R}$  by  $\mathcal{E}$ . Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory. Then  $\mathcal{L} \supseteq \mathcal{X}$  if and only if  $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{X}} \geq \overline{\mathcal{L}} \geq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}}$ .*

*Proof.* We assume  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$  first. Since  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}} = \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}$  by Theorem 5.13, we have  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{L}} \supseteq \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}}$ . Hence  $\overline{\mathcal{L}} \geq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}}$ . Since by Lemma 2.9,  $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{L})$ , we have  $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{E}^{\perp}$ . On the other hand,  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$  implies that  $[\mathcal{R}[1]](\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}[1]) = 0$ , then by Lemma 5.3,  $\text{Ext}_{\widehat{\mathcal{A}}}^1(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{L}}) = 0$ . Then  $\overline{\mathcal{L}} \subseteq {}^{\perp}(\tau \overline{\mathcal{X}}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{E}}^{\perp}$ . Hence by Theorem 5.13,  $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{X}} \geq \overline{\mathcal{L}}$ .

Now we assume  $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{X}} \geq \overline{\mathcal{L}} \geq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}}$ . Since  $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{E}^{\perp}$ , we have  $\mathcal{E}[1] \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ . Since  $\overline{\mathcal{L}} \geq \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}}$ , we have  $\overline{\mathcal{X}} \subseteq \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{L}}$ . Then any morphism from  $\mathcal{R}$  to  $\mathcal{X}$  factors through  $\mathcal{L}$ . Hence  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})[1] \supseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{L})[1] = \mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{R}[1]$ . We also have  $\text{Ext}_{\widehat{\mathcal{A}}}^1(\overline{\mathcal{L}}, \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}) = 0$ , which implies that  $[\mathcal{R}[1]](\mathcal{L}, X[1]) = 0$  for any indecomposable object  $X \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{R}[1]$ . On the other hand,  $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{X}} \geq \overline{\mathcal{L}}$  implies that  $\text{Ext}_{\widehat{\mathcal{A}}}^1(\overline{\mathcal{X}}, \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{L}}) = 0$ . Hence  $[\mathcal{R}[1]](X, \mathcal{L}[1]) = 0$  for any indecomposable object  $X \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{R}[1]$ . Since  $\mathcal{L}$  is a two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory, we have  $\mathcal{L} \supseteq \mathcal{X}$ .  $\square$

By Theorem 6.4, we can get the following corollary.

**Corollary 6.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be an  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -functorially finite two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -rigid subcategory such that  $\mathcal{X}[-1] \cap \mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})$ . Then  $\mathcal{X}$  is two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting if and only if  ${}^{\perp}(\tau \overline{\mathcal{X}}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})}^{\perp} = \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}$ .*

*Proof.* If  $\mathcal{X}$  is two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting, by Theorem 5.13,  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}} = \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{X}} = {}^{\perp}(\tau \overline{\mathcal{X}}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})}^{\perp}$ . If  ${}^{\perp}(\tau \overline{\mathcal{X}}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})}^{\perp} = \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{X}}$ , then by Theorem 5.13,  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}} = \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{X}}$ . Thus by Theorem 6.4, we have  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{X}} = \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{X}}$ . By Corollary 3.12,  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} = \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$ , hence  $\mathcal{X}$  is two-term weak  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting.  $\square$

**6.1 When  $\mathcal{R}$  is 2-rigid.** In this subsection, we assume that  $\mathcal{R}$  is 2-rigid.

**Remark 6.8.** Since  $\mathcal{A}$  is extension closed by Lemma 3.14, it is an extriangulated category (see [NP] for details). Lemma 3.15 shows that  $\mathcal{R}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ ) is a subcategory of projective (resp. injective) objects in  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**Definition 6.9.** A pair of subcategories  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  which are closed under direct summands is called a cotorsion pair if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1)  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}[1]) = 0$ ;
- (2) any object  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  admits two-triangles

$$A[-1] \rightarrow V_A \rightarrow U_A \rightarrow A \text{ and } A \rightarrow V^A \rightarrow U^A \rightarrow A[1]$$

where  $U_A, V^A \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $V_A, V^A \in \mathcal{V}$ .

The following remark is useful.

**Remark 6.10.** ([LN, Remark 2.2]) If  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  be a cotorsion pair in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then

- (1)  $\mathcal{U} = \{A \in \mathcal{A} \mid \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, \mathcal{V}[1]) = 0\}$ ;
- (2)  $\mathcal{V} = \{A' \in \mathcal{A} \mid \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{U}, A'[1]) = 0\}$ ;
- (3)  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ ;
- (4)  $\mathcal{R}[1] \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ ;
- (5)  $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}$  are closed under extensions and direct sums.

**Lemma 6.11.** Let  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  be a cotorsion pair in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then  $(\overline{\mathcal{U}}, \overline{\mathcal{V}})$  satisfies conditions (a1), (a2), (b2) and (c1) in Definition 6.3 (hence  $(\overline{\mathcal{U}}, \overline{\mathcal{V}})$  is both a  $\tau$ -cotorsion pair and a left weak cotorsion pair).

*Proof.* (c1) Let  $W \in \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{V}}$  be a non-zero indecomposable object. Then it admits an epimorphism  $\overline{v}: V \rightarrow W$ . Since  $V$  admits a triangle

$$R \rightarrow V \rightarrow R'[1] \rightarrow R[1]$$

with  $R, R' \in \mathcal{R}$ , we get the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} R & \longrightarrow & V & \longrightarrow & R'[1] & \longrightarrow & R[1] \\ \parallel & & \downarrow v & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ R & \longrightarrow & W & \xrightarrow{w} & X & \longrightarrow & R[1]. \end{array}$$

By Lemma 2.11,  $X \in \mathcal{A}$ . Since  $\overline{wv} = 0$ , we have  $\overline{w} = 0$ . Then from the following exact sequence

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{C})(\mathcal{R}, W) \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}, w)=0} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}, X) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{R}, R[1]) = 0$$

we can find that  $X \in \mathcal{R}[1]$ . Since we have the following triangle

$$V \rightarrow W \oplus R'[1] \rightarrow X \rightarrow V[1],$$

by Remark 6.10,  $W \in \mathcal{V}$ .

(a1) Let  $A$  be any indecomposable object in  $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{R}[1]$ . Since  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  is a cotorsion pair,  $A$  admits a triangle  $V_A \rightarrow U_A \rightarrow A \rightarrow V_A[1]$  with  $V_A \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $U_A \in \mathcal{U}$ . Since  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{V}} = \overline{\mathcal{V}}$ , we can get a short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow V'_A \rightarrow U_A \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0$  in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$  with  $V'_A \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}$ . By Corollary 5.4,  $\text{Ext}_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}^1(\overline{\mathcal{U}}, \overline{\mathcal{V}}) = 0$ . If  $\text{Ext}_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}^1(A, \overline{\mathcal{V}}) = 0$ , the short exact sequence splits, hence  $A$  is a direct summand of  $U_A$ . Then  $A \in \mathcal{U}$ , which implies that  $\overline{\mathcal{U}} = {}^{\perp 1} \overline{\mathcal{V}}$ .

(b2)  $A$  admits a triangle  $R_0 \rightarrow R_A \xrightarrow{\tau_A} A \rightarrow R_0[1]$  with  $R_0, R_A \in \mathcal{R}$ . Since  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  is a cotorsion pair,  $R_A$  admits a triangle  $R_A \xrightarrow{\tau} V_1 \rightarrow U_1 \rightarrow R_A[1]$  with  $U_1 \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $V_1 \in \mathcal{V}$ . Then we have the following

commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 R_0 & \longrightarrow & R_A & \xrightarrow{r_A} & A & \longrightarrow & R_0[1] \\
 \parallel & & \downarrow r & & \downarrow a_1 & & \parallel \\
 R_0 & \longrightarrow & V_1 & \longrightarrow & V_2 & \longrightarrow & R_0[1] \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & U_1 & \xlongequal{\quad} & U_1 & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & R_A[1] & \longrightarrow & A[1] & & 
 \end{array}$$

We can get an exact sequence  $R_0 \rightarrow V_1 \rightarrow V_2 \rightarrow 0$  by Lemma 5.1, then  $V_2 \in \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{V}} = \overline{\mathcal{V}}$ . By Remark 6.10,  $V_2 \in \mathcal{V}$ .  $A$  admits an exact sequence  $A \rightarrow V_2 \rightarrow U_1 \rightarrow 0$  by Lemma 5.1, where  $V_2 \in \overline{\mathcal{V}}$  and  $U_1 \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}$ . Since  $a_1$  is a left  $\mathcal{V}$ -approximation, we have  $\overline{a_1}$  is a left  $\overline{\mathcal{V}}$ -approximation.

(a2) When  $A \in \mathcal{R}$ , then  $V_2 \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V}$  by Remark 6.10.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.12.** *If  $\overline{\mathcal{V}}$  is functorially finite in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ , then  $\overline{\mathcal{U}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{V}}$  satisfies condition (c2) in Definition 6.3.*

*Proof.* Since  $\overline{\mathcal{V}}$  is functorially finite in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ , it is enough to show that  $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V}$  is contravariantly finite in  $\mathcal{V}$ . Any object  $V \in \mathcal{V}$  admits a triangle

$$V_1 \rightarrow U_1 \xrightarrow{u_1} V \rightarrow V_1[1]$$

with  $V_1 \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $U_1 \in \mathcal{U}$ . By Remark 6.10,  $U_1 \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V}$ . Since  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}[1])$ ,  $u_1$  is a right  $(\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V})$ -approximation.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.13.** *Let  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$  be a subcategory which is closed under extensions and  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{T}} = \overline{\mathcal{T}}$ . Denote  $\text{add}(\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{R}[1])$  by  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ . Then  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$  is extension closed.*

*Proof.* Let  $T_1 \xrightarrow{\bar{t}} T_2 \rightarrow T_3 \rightarrow T_1[1]$  be a triangle with  $T_1, T_3 \in \widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ . Then by Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 3.16, we have an exact sequence  $T_1 \xrightarrow{\bar{t}} T_2 \rightarrow T_3 \rightarrow 0$  in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ . Let  $T_1 \xrightarrow{\bar{t}_1} T \xrightarrow{\bar{t}_2} T_2$  be the epic-monic factorization of  $\bar{t}$ . Then  $T \in \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{T}} = \overline{\mathcal{T}}$ . Since  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$  is extension closed, we have  $T_2 \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}$  in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ . Then  $T_2 \in \widehat{\mathcal{T}}$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 6.14.** *Let  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$  be a subcategory of  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$  such that:*

- (1) *any object  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  admits a left  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$ -approximation;*
- (2)  *$\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{T}} = \overline{\mathcal{T}}$ ;*
- (3)  *$\overline{\mathcal{T}}$  is closed under extensions.*

*Denote  $\text{add}(\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{R}[1])$  by  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ , then  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$  admits a cotorsion pair  $(\mathcal{S}, \widehat{\mathcal{T}})$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ .*

*Proof.* Denote  $\{S \in \mathcal{A} \mid \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(S, \widehat{\mathcal{T}}[1]) = 0\}$  by  $\mathcal{S}$ . Note that  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$  are closed under direct summands. Let  $A$  be any object in  $\mathcal{A}$ . It admits a triangle  $R_0 \rightarrow R_A \xrightarrow{r_A} A \rightarrow R_0[1]$  with  $R_0, R_A \in \mathcal{R}$ . If  $\overline{r}' : R_A \rightarrow T_1'$  is a left  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$ -approximation, then  $r'$  is a left  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$  approximation in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Hence  $R_A$  admits a triangle  $M[-1] \rightarrow R_A \xrightarrow{r} T_1 \rightarrow S_1$  where  $r$  is a left minimal  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ -approximation. By Lemma 6.13 and Wakamatsu's Lemma,  $S_1 \in \mathcal{S}$ . Thus we have the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & S_1[-1] & \xlongequal{\quad} & S_1[-1] & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 R_0 & \longrightarrow & R_A & \xrightarrow{r_A} & A & \longrightarrow & R_0[1] \\
 \parallel & & \downarrow r & & \downarrow a_1 & & \parallel \\
 R_0 & \longrightarrow & T_1 & \longrightarrow & T_2 & \longrightarrow & R_0[1] \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & S_1 & \xlongequal{\quad} & S_1 & & 
 \end{array}$$

Then we can get an exact sequence  $R_0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow 0$  by Lemma 5.1, which implies that  $T_2 \in \widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ . Since  $A$  is arbitrary, we know that  $R_0$  admits a triangle  $S_0[-1] \rightarrow R_0 \rightarrow T_0 \rightarrow S_0$  where  $T_0 \in \widehat{\mathcal{T}}$  and  $S_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ . Then we have the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & S_0[-1] & \xlongequal{\quad} & S_0[-1] & & \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
A[-1] & \longrightarrow & R_0 & \longrightarrow & R_A & \xrightarrow{r_A} & A \\
\parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
A[-1] & \longrightarrow & T_0 & \longrightarrow & S & \longrightarrow & A \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
& & S_0 & \xlongequal{\quad} & S_0 & & 
\end{array}$$

By Remark 6.10  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ . By definition,  $(\mathcal{S}, \widehat{\mathcal{T}})$  is a cotorsion pair in  $\mathcal{A}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 6.15.** *Assume  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$  satisfies the conditions in Lemma 6.14. Then  $({}^{\perp 1}\overline{\mathcal{T}}, \overline{\mathcal{T}})$  is both a left weak cotorsion pair and a  $\tau$ -cotorsion pair. Moreover, if  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$  is a functorially finite torsion class, then  $({}^{\perp 1}\overline{\mathcal{T}}, \overline{\mathcal{T}})$  is both a left weak cotorsion torsion pair and a  $\tau$ -cotorsion torsion pair.*

*Proof.* This is followed by Lemma 6.14, Lemma 6.11 and Corollary 6.12.  $\square$

**6.2 Abelian categories of which the bounded derived categories are Krull-Schmidt.** From this subsection, let  $R$  be a commutative noetherian ring which is complete and local. Let  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  be an Ext-finite abelian category over  $R$  with enough projectives. Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be the subcategory of projective objects. Let  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{D}^b(\widehat{\mathcal{A}})$ . By [LC, Corollary B],  $\mathcal{C}$  is Krull-Schmidt. Moreover, it is Hom-finite over  $R$ . Since  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  is the heart of a  $t$ -structure in  $\mathcal{C}$ ,  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  is also Krull-Schmidt. Note that  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}[i]) = 0, \forall i > 0$ . We denote  $\mathcal{P} * \mathcal{P}[1]$  by  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $(\mathcal{P} * \mathcal{P}[1])/\mathcal{P}[1]$  by  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ .

**Lemma 6.16.**  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A}, \widehat{\mathcal{A}}[2]) = 0$  and  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A}, \widehat{\mathcal{A}}[1]) = [\mathcal{P}[1]](\mathcal{A}, \widehat{\mathcal{A}}[1])$ .

*Proof.* Let  $A$  be any object in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then  $A$  admits a triangle  $P_1 \rightarrow P_0 \xrightarrow{p_0} A \xrightarrow{a} P_1[1]$  with  $P_0, P_1 \in \mathcal{P}$ .

Let  $a_0 : A \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{A}}[2]$  be a morphism with  $\widehat{A} \in \widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ . Then  $a_0 p_0 = 0$  and  $a_0$  factors through  $P_1[1]$ . But  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P_1[1], \widehat{\mathcal{A}}[2]) = 0$ . Hence  $a_0 = 0$ .

Let  $a_1 : A \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{A}}[1]$  be a morphism with  $\widehat{A} \in \widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ . Then  $a_1 p_0 = 0$  and  $a_1$  factors through  $P_1[1]$ . Hence  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A}, \widehat{\mathcal{A}}[1]) = [\mathcal{P}[1]](\mathcal{A}, \widehat{\mathcal{A}}[1])$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 6.17.** *We have an equivalence of additive categories:  $\overline{\mathcal{A}} \simeq \widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  be an object having no direct summand in  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ .  $A$  admits a triangle  $P_1 \xrightarrow{p} P_0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow P_1[1]$  with  $P_0, P_1 \in \mathcal{P}$ . Let  $P_1 \xrightarrow{p_1} A''_1 \xrightarrow{a_1} P_0$  be the epic-monic factorization of  $p$  in  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ . Then we have two short exact sequences

$$0 \rightarrow A''_1 \xrightarrow{a_1} P_0 \rightarrow \widehat{A}_0 \rightarrow 0, \quad 0 \rightarrow A''_2 \rightarrow P_1 \xrightarrow{p_1} A''_1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } \widehat{\mathcal{A}}$$

which induces two triangles

$$A''_1 \xrightarrow{a_1} P_0 \rightarrow \widehat{A}_0 \rightarrow A''_1[1], \quad A''_2 \rightarrow P_1 \xrightarrow{p_1} A''_1 \rightarrow A''_2[1] \text{ in } \mathcal{C}.$$

Then we have the following commutative diagram of triangles

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 P_1 & \xrightarrow{p_1} & A_1'' & \longrightarrow & A_2''[1] & \longrightarrow & P_1[1] \\
 \parallel & & \downarrow a_1 & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
 P_1 & \xrightarrow{p} & P_2 & \longrightarrow & A & \longrightarrow & P[1] \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow a_0 & & \\
 & & \widehat{A}_0 & \xlongequal{\quad} & \widehat{A}_0 & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & A_1''[1] & \longrightarrow & A_2''[2] & & 
 \end{array}$$

Since  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\widehat{\mathcal{A}}[1], \widehat{\mathcal{A}}) = 0$ ,  $a_0$  is a left  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ -approximation. Hence  $A$  admits a triangle

$$A_1[1] \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{a} \widehat{A} \rightarrow A_1[2]$$

where  $a$  is a left minimal  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ -approximation and  $A_1 \in \widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ . Then for any two object  $A, A' \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}$  and a morphism  $\overline{f} : A \rightarrow A'$ , we have the following commutative diagram of triangles

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 A_1[1] & \longrightarrow & A & \xrightarrow{a} & \widehat{A} & \xrightarrow{\widehat{a}} & A_1[2] \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow f & & \downarrow \widehat{f} & & \downarrow \\
 A_1'[1] & \longrightarrow & A' & \xrightarrow{a'} & \widehat{A}' & \xrightarrow{\widehat{a}'} & A_1'[2].
 \end{array}$$

Then we can define a functor  $\mathbb{G} : \overline{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  such that

$$\mathbb{G}(A) = \widehat{A}, \quad \mathbb{G}(\overline{f}) = \widehat{f}.$$

It is well-defined: if there is a morphism  $f_1 : A \rightarrow A'$  such that  $\overline{f}_1 = \overline{f}$ , then we have the following commutative diagram of triangles

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 A_1[1] & \longrightarrow & A & \xrightarrow{a} & \widehat{A} & \longrightarrow & A_1[2] \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow f_1 & & \downarrow \widehat{f}_1 & & \downarrow \\
 A_1'[1] & \longrightarrow & A' & \xrightarrow{a'} & \widehat{A}' & \longrightarrow & A_1'[2].
 \end{array}$$

Since  $\widehat{f}_1 - \widehat{f}$  factors through  $\mathcal{P}[1]$ ,  $0 = a'(\widehat{f}_1 - \widehat{f}) = (\widehat{f}_1 - \widehat{f})a$ . Then  $\widehat{f}_1 - \widehat{f}$  factors through  $A_1[2]$ , but  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\widehat{\mathcal{A}}[2], \widehat{\mathcal{A}}) = 0$ , hence  $\widehat{f}_1 = \widehat{f}$ . By definition,  $\mathbb{G}$  is additive. We show  $\mathbb{G}$  is fully-faithful and dense.

$\mathbb{G}$  is full: for any morphism  $\widehat{g} : \widehat{A} \rightarrow \widehat{A}'$ , since  $\widehat{a}'\widehat{g}a = 0$  by Lemma 6.16, we have a commutative diagram of triangles

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 A_1[1] & \longrightarrow & A & \xrightarrow{a} & \widehat{A} & \xrightarrow{\widehat{a}} & A_1[2] \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow g & & \downarrow \widehat{g} & & \downarrow \\
 A_1'[1] & \longrightarrow & A' & \xrightarrow{a'} & \widehat{A}' & \xrightarrow{\widehat{a}'} & A_1'[2]
 \end{array}$$

which implies  $\mathbb{G}(g) = \widehat{g}$ .

$\mathbb{G}$  is faithful: if  $\mathbb{G}(\overline{f}) = 0$ , then  $a'f = 0$ . Hence  $f$  factors through  $A_1'[1]$ . By Lemma 6.16,  $\overline{f} = 0$ .

$\mathbb{G}$  is dense: let  $\widehat{A}_0$  be any object in  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ . It admits two short exact sequences:

$$0 \rightarrow A_1'' \xrightarrow{a_1} P_0 \rightarrow \widehat{A}_0 \rightarrow 0, \quad 0 \rightarrow A_2'' \rightarrow P_1 \xrightarrow{p_1} A_1'' \rightarrow 0$$

in  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  with  $P_0, P_1 \in \mathcal{P}$ . Then we have two triangles

$$A_1'' \xrightarrow{a_1} P_0 \rightarrow \widehat{A}_0 \rightarrow A_1''[1], \quad A_2'' \rightarrow P_1 \xrightarrow{p_1} A_1'' \rightarrow A_2[1] \text{ in } \mathcal{C}.$$

We can get the following commutative diagram of triangles

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
P_1 & \xrightarrow{p_1} & A''_1 & \longrightarrow & A''_2[1] & \longrightarrow & P_1[1] \\
\parallel & & \downarrow a_1 & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
P_1 & \xrightarrow{p} & P_2 & \longrightarrow & A'_0 & \longrightarrow & P[1] \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow a_0 & & \\
& & \widehat{A}_0 & \xlongequal{\quad} & \widehat{A}_0 & & \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
& & A''_1[1] & \longrightarrow & A''_2[2] & & 
\end{array}$$

where  $A'_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ . We can assume  $A'_0$  has no direct summand in  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}[1]$ .  $A'_0$  admits a triangle

$$A'_1[1] \rightarrow A'_0 \xrightarrow{a'_0} \widehat{A}'_0 \rightarrow A'_1[1]$$

where  $A'_1 \in \widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ ,  $a'_0$  is a left minimal  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ -approximation. Since  $a_0$  is a left  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ -approximation, we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
A''_1[1] & \longrightarrow & A'_0 & \xrightarrow{a_0} & \widehat{A}_0 & \longrightarrow & A''_1[2] \\
\downarrow & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
A_1[1] & \longrightarrow & A'_0 & \xrightarrow{a'_0} & \widehat{A}'_0 & \longrightarrow & A_1[2] \\
\downarrow & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
A''_1[1] & \longrightarrow & A'_0 & \xrightarrow{a_0} & \widehat{A}_0 & \longrightarrow & A''_1[2]
\end{array}$$

Hence  $\widehat{A}_0$  is a direct summand of  $\widehat{A}'_0 \oplus A''_1[2]$  and  $\widehat{A}'_0$  is a direct summand of  $\widehat{A}_0$ . But  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}[2] \cap \widehat{\mathcal{A}} = 0$ , we have  $\widehat{A}_0 \cong \widehat{A}'_0$ .  $\square$

We introduce the following notions:

- (1)  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{c-s\tau\text{-til}} =: \{ \text{contravariantly finite support } \tau\text{-tilting subcategories in } \widehat{\mathcal{A}} \};$
- (2)  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{lw\text{-ctp}} =: \{ \text{left weak cotorsion torsion pairs in } \widehat{\mathcal{A}} \};$
- (3)  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tau\text{-ctp}} =: \{ \tau\text{-cotorsion torsion pairs in } \widehat{\mathcal{A}} \};$
- (4)  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{f\text{-tor}} =: \{ \text{functorially finite torsion class } \mathcal{T} \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{A}} \}.$

**Theorem 6.18.** *There are bijections*

$$\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{c-s\tau\text{-til}} \longleftrightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{f\text{-tor}} \longleftrightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{lw\text{-ctp}}$$

given by

- (a1)  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{c-s\tau\text{-til}} \ni \mathcal{M} \mapsto \text{Fac } \mathcal{M} \in \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{f\text{-tor}};$
- (a2)  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{f\text{-tor}} \ni \mathcal{T} \mapsto {}^{\perp 1}\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T} (= \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{T})) \in \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{c-s\tau\text{-til}};$
- (b1)  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{f\text{-tor}} \ni \mathcal{T} \mapsto ({}^{\perp 1}\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}) \in \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{lw\text{-ctp}};$
- (b2)  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{lw\text{-ctp}} \ni (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}) \mapsto \mathcal{T} \in \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{f\text{-tor}}.$

*Proof.* (b1) and (b2): This is followed by Proposition 6.17 and Proposition 6.15.

(a1) and (a2): By Proposition 6.17 and Proposition 6.15, if  $\mathcal{T}$  is a functorially finite torsion class, then  $({}^{\perp 1}\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T})$  is both a  $\tau$ -cotorsion torsion pair and a left weak cotorsion pair. Then by Theorem 6.4, the bijections in (a1) and (a2) are induced by the bijections in (b1) and (b2).  $\square$

By this theorem and Theorem 6.4, we can get the following corollary, which generalizes [AST, Theorem 4.10].

**Corollary 6.19.**  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{\tau\text{-ctp}} = \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{lw\text{-ctp}}.$

**Lemma 6.20.** *Let  $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}$  be a subcategory of  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  such that every projective object admits a left  $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}$ -approximation. Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be the quasi-inverse of  $\mathbb{G}$ . Then every object in  $\mathcal{P}$  admits a left  $\mathbb{F}(\widehat{\mathcal{X}})$ -approximation in  $\mathcal{A}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $P \in \mathcal{P}$  be any projective object. Denote  $\mathbb{F}(\widehat{\mathcal{X}})$  by  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$ , assume that  $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{R}[1] = 0$ .

Let  $P \xrightarrow{\hat{p}} \widehat{X}$  be a left  $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}$ -approximation of  $P$ . By the proof of Proposition 6.17,  $\widehat{X}$  admits a triangle

$$A_1[1] \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{x} \widehat{X} \xrightarrow{\hat{x}} A_1[2]$$

where  $A_1 \in \widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ ,  $X \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $X \cong \mathbb{F}(\widehat{X})$ . Since  $\hat{x}\hat{p} = 0$ , there is a morphism  $p : P \rightarrow X$  such that  $xp = \hat{p}$ . We show that  $p$  is a left  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$ -approximation.

Let  $X' \in \overline{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $p' : P \rightarrow X'$  be any morphism.  $X'$  admits a triangle

$$A'_1[1] \rightarrow X' \xrightarrow{x'} \widehat{X}' \xrightarrow{\hat{x}'} A'_1[2]$$

where  $A'_1 \in \widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\widehat{X}' \in \widehat{\mathcal{X}}$ . Since  $\hat{p}$  is a left  $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}$ -approximation, there is a morphism  $\hat{y} : \widehat{X} \rightarrow \widehat{X}'$  such that  $\hat{y}\hat{p} = \hat{x}'p'$ . Since  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, A'_1[2]) = 0$ , there is a morphism  $y : X \rightarrow X'$  such that  $x'y = \hat{y}x$ . Hence

$$x'p' = \hat{y}\hat{p} = \hat{y}xp = x'yp.$$

Then  $p' - yp$  factors through  $A'_1[1]$ , which implies  $p' = yp$ .  $\square$

In  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ , for two subcategories  $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2$ , let

$$\mathcal{B}_1 * \mathcal{B}_2 =: \{A \in \widehat{\mathcal{A}} \mid \exists \text{ exact sequence } 0 \rightarrow B_1 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B_2 \rightarrow 0, B_i \in \mathcal{B}_i, i = 1, 2\}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a subcategory of  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ . For convenience, we give the following conditions:

- (X1)  $\mathcal{X}$  is contravariantly finite;
- (X2) every projective object admits a left  $\mathcal{X}$ -approximation.

**Lemma 6.21.** *Let  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E})$  be a  $\tau$ -rigid pair in  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  such that  $\mathcal{X}$  satisfies (X1) and (X2). Then  $\text{Fac } \mathcal{X}$  is a functorially finite torsion class.*

*Proof.* This is followed by Proposition 6.17 and Lemma 6.2.  $\square$

**Proposition 6.22.** *Let  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E})$  be a  $\tau$ -rigid pair in  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  such that  $\mathcal{X}$  satisfies (X1) and (X2). Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a support  $\tau$ -tilting subcategory in  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ . Then  $\text{Fac } \mathcal{X} * \text{Fac } \mathcal{L} = \text{Fac } \mathcal{X} * (\mathcal{X}^\perp \cap \text{Fac } \mathcal{L})$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 6.21,  $\text{Fac } \mathcal{X}$  is a functorially finite torsion class. Then we have a torsion pair  $(\text{Fac } \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}^\perp)$ . Let  $A \in \text{Fac } \mathcal{X} * \text{Fac } \mathcal{L}$ . It admits a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow W \rightarrow A \rightarrow K \rightarrow 0$$

with  $W \in \text{Fac } \mathcal{X}$  and  $K \in \text{Fac } \mathcal{L}$ .  $A$  also admits a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow W_A \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{a} Y_A \rightarrow 0$$

with  $W_A \in \text{Fac } \mathcal{X}$  and  $Y_A \in \mathcal{X}^\perp$ . Then we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & W & \longrightarrow & A & \longrightarrow & K \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \text{dotted} & & \parallel & & \downarrow \text{dotted } y \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & W_A & \longrightarrow & A & \xrightarrow{a} & Y_A \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

Since  $a$  is an epimorphism, so is  $y$ . Hence  $Y_A \in \mathcal{X}^\perp \cap \text{Fac } \mathcal{L}$ , which implies that  $A \in \text{Fac } \mathcal{X} * (\mathcal{X}^\perp \cap \text{Fac } \mathcal{L})$ .  $\square$

As an application of our results, we show the following proposition, which is a categorical version of left Bongartz completion (see [CWZ, Proposition 3.4] when  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  is a module category).

**Proposition 6.23.** *Let  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E})$  be a  $\tau$ -rigid pair in  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  such that  $\mathcal{X}$  satisfies (X1) and (X2). Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a support  $\tau$ -tilting subcategory in  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ . Denote  $\text{Fac } \mathcal{X} * \text{Fac } \mathcal{L}$  by  $\mathcal{T}$ . If  $\text{Ext}_{\widehat{\mathcal{A}}}^1(\mathcal{X}, \text{Fac } \mathcal{L}) = 0$ , then  $({}^\perp \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T})$  is a  $\tau$ -cotorsion pair such that  $\text{Fac } \mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}$ .*

*Proof.* By Proposition 6.15 and Proposition 6.17, we need to check that  $\mathcal{T}$  satisfies the following conditions:

- (1) any object  $P \in \mathcal{P}$  admits a left  $\mathcal{T}$ -approximation;

- (2)  $\text{Fac } \mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}$ ;  
(3)  $\mathcal{T}$  is closed under extensions.  
(1) Let  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ . By Theorem 6.4,  $P$  admits an exact sequence

$$P \xrightarrow{k} K \rightarrow J \rightarrow 0$$

where  $K \in \text{Fac } \mathcal{L} \cap {}^{\perp 1}(\text{Fac } \mathcal{L})$ ,  $J \in {}^{\perp 1}(\text{Fac } \mathcal{L})$  and  $k$  is a left  $(\text{Fac } \mathcal{L})$ -approximation. By Lemma 6.21 and Theorem 6.18,  $({}^{\perp 1}(\text{Fac } \mathcal{L}), \text{Fac } \mathcal{L})$  is a left weak cotorsion pair. Hence  $K$  admits a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow W_K \rightarrow T_K \xrightarrow{t_0} K \rightarrow 0$$

where  $W_K \in \text{Fac } \mathcal{X}$  and  $T_K \in {}^{\perp 1}(\text{Fac } \mathcal{X})$ . Note that  $T_K \in \mathcal{T}$  and there is a morphism  $p : P \rightarrow T_K$  such that  $t_0 p = k$ . By Theorem 6.18 and Corollary 6.19,  $P$  also admits an exact sequence

$$P \xrightarrow{w} W_P \rightarrow U_P \rightarrow 0$$

where  $w$  is a left  $(\text{Fac } \mathcal{X})$ -approximation. We show that  $P \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} p \\ w \end{pmatrix}} T_K \oplus W_P$  is a left  $\mathcal{T}$ -approximation. Let  $T \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $t \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(P, T)$ .  $T$  admits a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow W_T \xrightarrow{w_0} T \xrightarrow{t_1} K_T \rightarrow 0$$

with  $W_T \in \text{Fac } \mathcal{X}$  and  $K_T \in \text{Fac } \mathcal{L}$ . Since  $k$  is a left  $(\text{Fac } \mathcal{L})$ -approximation, we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & P & \xrightarrow{k} & K & \longrightarrow & J \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow t & & \downarrow k_1 & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & W_T & \xrightarrow{w_0} & T & \xrightarrow{t_1} & K_T \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Since  $T_K \in {}^{\perp 1}(\text{Fac } \mathcal{X})$ , there is a morphism  $w_1 : T_K \rightarrow T$  such that  $k_1 t_0 = t_1 w_1$ . Hence  $t_1 t = k_1 k = k_1 t_0 p = t_1 w_1 p$ , which implies that there is a morphism  $p_0 : P \rightarrow W_T$  such that  $w_0 p_0 = t - w_1 p$ . Since  $w_0$  factors through  $w$ , we can find that  $t$  factors through  $P \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} p \\ w \end{pmatrix}} T_K \oplus W_P$ .

(2) Let  $S \in \text{Fac } \mathcal{T}$ . It admits an epimorphism  $t_0 : T_S \rightarrow S$  with  $T_S \in \mathcal{T}$ .  $T_S$  admits a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow W \rightarrow T_S \rightarrow K \rightarrow 0$$

with  $W \in \text{Fac } \mathcal{X}$  and  $K \in \text{Fac } \mathcal{L}$ .  $S$  admits a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow W_S \rightarrow S \xrightarrow{s} Y_S \rightarrow 0$$

with  $W_S \in \text{Fac } \mathcal{X}$  and  $Y_S \in \mathcal{X}^{\perp}$ . Then we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & W & \longrightarrow & T_S & \longrightarrow & K \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \vdots & & \downarrow t_0 & & \vdots y \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & W_S & \longrightarrow & S & \xrightarrow{s} & Y_S \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

Since  $st_0$  is an epimorphism, so is  $y$ . Hence  $Y_S \in \text{Fac } \mathcal{L}$ , which implies that  $S \in \mathcal{T}$ .

(3) Let  $T \in \mathcal{T} * \mathcal{T} = (\text{Fac } \mathcal{X} * (\text{Fac } \mathcal{L} * \text{Fac } \mathcal{X})) * \text{Fac } \mathcal{L}$ . Then we have the following short exact sequences

$$0 \rightarrow A_1 \rightarrow T \rightarrow K_1 \rightarrow 0, \quad 0 \rightarrow W_1 \rightarrow A_1 \rightarrow B_1 \rightarrow 0, \quad 0 \rightarrow K_2 \rightarrow B_1 \rightarrow W_2 \rightarrow 0$$

with  $K_1, K_2 \in \text{Fac } \mathcal{L}$  and  $W_1, W_2 \in \text{Fac } \mathcal{X}$ . Since  $K_2 \in \text{Fac } \mathcal{L}$ , we have  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{X}, K_2) = 0$ . Since  $W_2$  admits an epimorphism  $x_2 : X_2 \rightarrow W_2$  with  $X_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ , we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & K_2 & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}} & K_2 \oplus X_2 & \xrightarrow{(0 \ 1)} & X_2 \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow \alpha & & \downarrow x_2 \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & K_2 & \longrightarrow & B_1 & \longrightarrow & W_2 \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$



where  $\alpha$  is an epimorphism. Then we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & W_1 & \longrightarrow & C_1 & \longrightarrow & K_2 \oplus X_2 \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow c_1 & & \downarrow \alpha \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & W_1 & \longrightarrow & A_1 & \longrightarrow & B_1 \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

where  $c_1$  is an epimorphism. Since we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & W_1 & \longrightarrow & W_3 & \longrightarrow & X_2 \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & W_1 & \longrightarrow & C_1 & \longrightarrow & K_2 \oplus X_2 \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ & & & & K_2 & \xlongequal{\quad} & K_2 \\ & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & & & 0 & & 0 \end{array}$$

where  $W_3 \in \text{Fac } \mathcal{X}$  by Lemma 5.8, we have  $C_1 \in \mathcal{T}$ . By (2),  $A_1 \in \text{Fac } \mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}$ . Hence  $T \in \mathcal{T} * \text{Fac } \mathcal{L} = \text{Fac } \mathcal{X} * (\text{Fac } \mathcal{L} * \text{Fac } \mathcal{L}) = \mathcal{T}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 6.24.** Denote  ${}^{\perp 1}\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}$  by  $\mathcal{L}^-$  and  $\{P \in \mathcal{P} \mid \text{Hom}_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}}(P, \mathcal{L}^-) = 0\}$  by  $\mathcal{Q}^-$ . If in addition,  $\text{Hom}_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{L}) = 0$ , then  $(\mathcal{L}^-, \mathcal{Q}^-)$  is a support  $\tau$ -tilting pair that contains  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E})$ .

*Proof.* By Proposition 6.23 and Theorem 6.4,  $(\mathcal{L}^-, \mathcal{Q}^-)$  is a support  $\tau$ -tilting pair. Since  $\text{Ext}_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}}^1(\mathcal{X}, \text{Fac } \mathcal{X}) = 0$  and  $\text{Ext}_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}}^1(\mathcal{X}, \text{Fac } \mathcal{L}) = 0$ , we have  $\mathcal{X} \in {}^{\perp 1}\mathcal{T}$ . Hence  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{L}^-$ . Since  $\text{Hom}_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{L}) = 0$ , we have  $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}^-$ . Then by definition,  $(\mathcal{L}^-, \mathcal{Q}^-)$  is a support  $\tau$ -tilting pair that contains  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E})$ .  $\square$

**Remark 6.25.** According to [CWZ], we can call  $(\mathcal{L}^-, \mathcal{Q}^-)$  the left Bongartz completion of  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E})$  with respect to  $\mathcal{L}$ .

Finally, we show the following proposition, which is a categorical version of [CWZ, Theorem 4.9].

**Proposition 6.26.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a Krull-Schmidt triangulated category. Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be a silting subcategory. Denote  $\mathcal{R} * \mathcal{R}[1]$  by  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{R}[1]$  by  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ . Assume  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$  is abelian. Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a functorially finite presilting subcategory in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Denote  $\mathcal{U}[-1] \cap \mathcal{R}$  by  $\mathcal{E}$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a silting subcategory in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{T}[1]) = 0$ . Denote  $B_{\overline{\mathcal{U}}}(\mathcal{T})$  by  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}[-1] \cap \mathcal{R}$  by  $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}$ . Then  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{M}} = \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{U}} * \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{T}}$ . Moreover,  $(\overline{\mathcal{M}}, \overline{\mathcal{Q}})$  contains  $(\overline{\mathcal{U}}, \overline{\mathcal{E}})$ .

*Proof.* We first show that  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{T}} \subseteq {}^{\perp}(\tau \overline{\mathcal{U}}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{E}}^{\perp}$ .

To show  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{T}} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{E}}^{\perp}$ , it is enough to check  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{T}) = 0$ . Since  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{T}[1]) = 0$ , we have  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{E}[1], \mathcal{T}[1]) = 0$ , hence  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{T}) = 0$ . By Lemma 5.3,  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{T}[1]) = 0$  implies that  $\text{Ext}_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}}^1(\overline{\mathcal{U}}, \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{T}}) = 0$ . Hence  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{T}} \subseteq {}^{\perp}(\tau \overline{\mathcal{U}})$ . Then  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{T}} \subseteq {}^{\perp}(\tau \overline{\mathcal{U}}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{E}}^{\perp}$ .

By Proposition 3.20,  $\mathcal{M}$  is a silting subcategory in  $\mathcal{A}$ . By definition, any object  $M_0 \in \mathcal{M}$  admits a triangle

$$U_0 \rightarrow M_0 \rightarrow T_0 \rightarrow U_0[1]$$

with  $T_0 \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $U_0 \in \mathcal{U}$ . This triangle induces an exact sequence

$$U_0 \rightarrow M_0 \rightarrow T_0 \rightarrow 0$$

in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ . Hence  $\overline{\mathcal{M}} \subseteq \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{U}} * \overline{\mathcal{T}}$ , which implies  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{M}} \subseteq \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{U}} * \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{T}}$  by Proposition 6.23. Since  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{M}}$  is closed under extensions, to show  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{M}} \supseteq \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{U}} * \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{T}}$ , we only need to check  $\overline{\mathcal{U}}$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$  are contained in  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ .

By definition,  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ , hence  $\overline{\mathcal{U}} \subseteq \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ . Since any  $T \in \mathcal{T}$  admits a triangle

$$U \rightarrow M \rightarrow T \rightarrow U[1]$$

with  $T \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $U \in \mathcal{U}$ , which induces an exact sequence

$$U \rightarrow M \rightarrow T \rightarrow 0$$

in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ , we have  $T \in \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ . Thus  $\overline{\mathcal{T}} \subseteq \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ . The ‘‘Moreover’’ part is followed by Corollary 6.24.  $\square$

**Remark 6.27.** Proposition 3.20 and Proposition 6.26 work when  $\mathcal{R}$  is just presilting. In fact, we can consider thick  $\mathcal{R}$  instead of  $\mathcal{C}$  in the proof.

### 6.3 $\tau$ -rigid objects

**Lemma 6.28.** Let  $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ . If  $\mathcal{E}$  is contravariantly finite in  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ , then  $\mathcal{E}[1]$  is contravariantly finite in  $\mathcal{A}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $X$  be an indecomposable object in  $\mathcal{A}$ . If  $X \in \mathcal{R}[1]$ , since  $\mathcal{E}$  is contravariantly finite in  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ , we have a right  $\mathcal{E}[1]$ -approximation of  $X$ . Now assume  $X \notin \mathcal{R}[1]$ , then  $X$  admits a triangle

$$A_1[1] \xrightarrow{a_1} X \xrightarrow{x} \widehat{X} \xrightarrow{\hat{x}} A_1[2]$$

where  $A_1, \widehat{X} \in \widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ . Let  $e_1 : E_1 \rightarrow A_1$  be a right  $\mathcal{E}$ -approximation. We show that  $a_1 e_1[1]$  is a right  $\mathcal{E}[1]$ -approximation of  $X$ .

Let  $g : E[1] \rightarrow X$  be any morphism. Since  $xg = 0$ , there is a morphism  $f : E[1] \rightarrow A[1]$  such that  $a_1 f = g$ . But  $f$  factors through  $e_1[1]$ , hence  $a_1 e_1[1]$  is a right  $\mathcal{E}[1]$ -approximation of  $X$ .  $\square$

**Definition 6.29.** A  $\tau$ -rigid pair  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Q})$  is called strong contravariantly finite if:

- (1)  $\mathcal{U} = \text{add } \mathcal{U}$ ;
- (2)  $\mathcal{Q}$  is contravariantly finite.

By Lemma 6.28, we can get the following corollary immediately.

**Corollary 6.30.** If  $(\widehat{\mathcal{X}}, \mathcal{E})$  is a strong contravariantly finite  $\tau$ -rigid pair in  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ , then  $\text{add}(\mathbb{F}(\widehat{\mathcal{X}}) \cup \mathcal{E}[1])$  is a  $\mathcal{P}[1]$ -functorially finite two-term  $\mathcal{P}[1]$ -rigid subcategory in  $\mathcal{A}$ .

By Theorem 5.9, Corollary 6.7, Theorem 5.13, Theorem 4.4, Proposition 6.6, Proposition 6.17 and Corollary 6.30, we have the following result.

**Theorem 6.31.** Let  $R$  be a commutative noetherian ring which is complete and local. Let  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  be an Ext-finite abelian category over  $R$  with enough projectives.

Let  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E})$  be a strong contravariantly finite  $\tau$ -rigid pair. Then it is contained in two support  $\tau$ -tilting pairs  $(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}, \mathcal{F})$  and  $(\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}, \mathcal{E})$  such that

$$\text{Fac } \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} = \text{Fac } \mathcal{X}, \quad \text{Fac } \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}} = {}^\perp(\tau \mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{E}^\perp, \quad \text{Fac } \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} \subsetneq \text{Fac } \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}.$$

Moreover, if  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E})$  is an almost complete support  $\tau$ -tilting pair, then  $(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}, \mathcal{F})$  and  $(\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}, \mathcal{E})$  are the only support  $\tau$ -tilting pairs which contain  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E})$ .

**Definition 6.32.** Let  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{F}_1)$  and  $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{F}_2)$  be two support  $\tau$ -tilting pairs in  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ .  $\mathcal{M}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{N}$ ) is called a left (resp. right) mutation of  $\mathcal{N}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{M}$ ) if there exists a  $\tau$ -rigid pair  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E})$  such that  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}}$  (in the sense of Theorem 6.31).

**Proposition 6.33.** Let  $(\widehat{\mathcal{U}}, \mathcal{Q})$  be a  $\tau$ -rigid pair in  $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$  such that  $\widehat{\mathcal{U}} = \text{add } \widehat{\mathcal{U}}$  and  $\mathcal{Q} = \text{add } \mathcal{Q}$ . Let  $(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_1, \mathcal{F}_1)$  be a support  $\tau$ -tilting pair such that  $\text{Fac } \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_1 \subseteq \text{Fac } \mathcal{N}_{\widehat{\mathcal{U}}}$ . Let  $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_2$  be a left mutation of  $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_1$ . Then  $\text{Fac } \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_2 \subseteq \text{Fac } \mathcal{N}_{\widehat{\mathcal{U}}}$ . Let  $(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_i^-, \mathcal{F}_i^-)$  be the left Bongartz completion of  $(\widehat{\mathcal{U}}, \mathcal{Q})$  with respect to  $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Then either  $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_1^- = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_2^-$  or  $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_2^-$  is a left mutation of  $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_1^-$ .

*Proof.* By Proposition 6.17, in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ , we have

- (1) a  $\tau$ -rigid pair  $(\overline{\mathcal{U}}, \overline{\mathcal{Q}})$  such that  $\overline{\mathcal{U}} = \text{add } \mathcal{U}$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{Q}} = \text{add } \mathcal{Q}$ ;
- (2) a support  $\tau$ -tilting pair  $(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_1, \overline{\mathcal{F}}_1)$  such that  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{M}}_1 \subseteq \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{U}}$ ;
- (3) a support  $\tau$ -tilting pair  $(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_2, \overline{\mathcal{F}}_2)$  such that  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_2$  is a left mutation of  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_1$ .

By Theorem 5.9, we have

- (a) a two-term  $\mathcal{P}[1]$ -rigid subcategory  $\mathcal{U}$  such that  $\mathcal{U}[-1] \cap \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{Q}$ ;
- (b) a two-term weak  $\mathcal{P}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory  $\mathcal{M}_1$  such that  $\mathcal{M}[-1] \cap \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{F}_1$ ;
- (c) a two-term weak  $\mathcal{P}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory  $\mathcal{M}_2$  such that  $\mathcal{M}_2$  is a left mutation of  $\mathcal{M}_1$ .


Since  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{M}}_1 \subseteq \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{U}} = {}^\perp(\tau \overline{\mathcal{U}}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{Q}}^\perp$ , we have  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{M}_1[1]) = 0$ . Since  $\mathcal{C}$  is Hom-finite,  $\mathcal{U}$  is functorially finite. Since  $\mathcal{P}$  is presilting, we have  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{A}[2]) = 0$ , hence  $\mathcal{U}$  is also presilting. By Proposition 3.20, we can get that  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{M}_2[1]) = 0$ , which implies  $\text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{M}}_2 \subseteq \text{Fac } \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\mathcal{U}}$ . Again by

Proposition 3.20,  $B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{M}_2) = B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{M}_1)$ , or  $B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{M}_2)$  is a left mutation of  $B_{\mathcal{U}}^-(\mathcal{M}_1)$ . Let  $(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_i^-, \overline{\mathcal{F}}_i^-)$  be the left Bongartz completion of  $(\overline{\mathcal{U}}, \overline{\mathcal{Q}})$  with respect to  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_i^-$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Then by Proposition 6.26, either  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_1^- = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_2^-$  or  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_2^-$  is a left mutation of  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_1^-$ . Finally, by Proposition 6.17, we can get what we want.  $\square$

7. EXAMPLES


In this section we give several examples about our results.

**Example 7.1.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a cluster category of type  $\mathbb{A}_\infty$  in [HJ, Ng]. It is a 2-Calabi-Yau triangulated category. The Auslander-Reiten quiver of  $\mathcal{C}$  is as follows:




Set  $\mathcal{X}$  the subcategory whose indecomposable objects are marked by clubsuits ♣ here. It is straightforward to verify that  $\mathcal{X}$  is a almost complete cluster tilting subcategory, which is contained in exactly two cluster tilting subcategories  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}} := \text{add}(\mathcal{X} \cup \{\star\})$  and  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}} := \text{add}(\mathcal{X} \cup \{\spadesuit\})$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

**Example 7.2.** Let  $Q: 1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3$  be the quiver of type  $A_3$  and  $\mathcal{C} := D^b(kQ)$  the bounded derived category of  $kQ$  whose Auslander-Reiten quiver is the following:



Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be the subcategory whose indecomposable objects are marked by • in the diagram. Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be the cluster tilting subcategory whose indecomposable objects are the objects in  $\mathcal{X}$  and the object marked by ♣. Then  $\mathcal{X}$  is an almost complete two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting subcategory. By Theorem 4.4,  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{X}} = \mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$  is the subcategory whose indecomposable objects are the objects in  $\mathcal{X}$  and the object marked by ♠ in the diagram:



We can find that  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$  is indeed two-term  $\mathcal{R}[1]$ -cluster tilting, but it is not cluster tilting (even not rigid).

REFERENCES

[Au] M. Auslander. Representation theory of Artin algebras I. Comm. Algebra 1 (1974), 177–268.  
 [AI] T. Aihara O. Iyama. Silting mutation in triangulated categories. J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) 85 (2012), no. 3, 633–668.  
 [AIR] T. Adachi, O. Iyama, I. Reiten.  $\tau$ -tilting theory. Compos. Math. 150 (2014), no. 3, 415–452.  
 [AST] J. Asadollahi, S. Sadeghi, H. Treffinger. On  $\tau$ -tilting subcategories. To appear in Canadian Journal of Mathematics, 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4153/S0008414X24000221>  
 [BZ] A. Buan, Y. Zhou. Weak cotorsion,  $\tau$ -tilting and two-term categories. J. Pure Appl. Algebra 228 (2024), no. 1, Paper No. 107445, 18 pp.  
 [BIKR] I. Burban, O. Iyama, B. Keller, I. Reiten. Cluster tilting for one-dimensional hypersurface singularities. Adv. Math. 217 (2008), no.6, 2443–2484.  
 [BMRRT] A. B. Buan, R. Marsh, M. Reineke, I. Reiten, G. Todorov. Tilting theory and cluster combinatorics. Adv. Math. 204 (2006), no.2, 572–618.  
 [CWZ] P. Cao, Y. Wang, H. Zhang. Relative left Bongartz completions and their compatibility with mutations. Math. Z. (2023)305:27.  
 [CZZ] W. Chang, J. Zhang, B. Zhu. On support  $\tau$ -tilting modules over endomorphism algebras of rigid objects. Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.) 31 (2015), no. 9, 1508–1516.

- [FGL] C. Fu, S. Geng, P. Liu. Relative rigid objects in triangulated categories. *J. Algebra* 520 (2019), 171–185.
- [FZ1] S. Fomin, A. Zelevinsky. Cluster algebras. I. Foundations. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 15 (2002), no.2, 497–529.
- [FZ2] S. Fomin, A. Zelevinsky. Cluster algebras. II. Finite type classification. *Invent. Math.* 154 (2003), no.1, 63–121.
- [HJ] T. Holm, P. Jørgensen. On a cluster category of infinite Dynkin type, and the relation to triangulations of the infinity-gon. *Math. Z.* 270 (2012), no. 1–2, 277–295.
- [HR] D. Happel, C. M. Ringel. Tilted algebras. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 274 (1982), no.2, 399–443.
- [HU] D. Happel, L. Unger. Almost complete tilting modules. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 107 (1989), no.3, 603–610.
- [IY] O. Iyama, Y. Yoshino. Mutation in triangulated categories and rigid Cohen–Macaulay modules. *Invent. Math.* 172 (2008), no. 1, 117–168.
- [IJY] O. Iyama, P. Jørgensen, D. Yang. Intermediate co- $t$ -structures, two-term silting objects,  $\tau$ -tilting modules, and torsion classes. *Algebra Number Theory* 8 (2014), no. 10, 2413–2431.
- [KR] B. Keller, I. Reiten. Cluster-tilted algebras are Gorenstein and stably Calabi–Yau. *Adv. Math.* 211(2007), no.1, 123–151.
- [KZ] S. Koenig, B. Zhu. From triangulated categories to abelian categories: cluster tilting in a general framework. *Math. Z.* 258 (2008), no.1, 143–160.
- [LC] J. Le, X. Chen. Karoubianness of a triangulated category, *J. Algebra* 310 (2007), no.1, 452–457.
- [LN] Y. Liu, H. Nakaoka. Hearts of twin cotorsion pairs on extriangulated categories *J. Algebra* 528 (2019), 96–149.
- [LZ1] Y. Liu, P. Zhou.  $\tau$ -tilting theory in abelian categories. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 150 (2022), no. 6, 2405–2413.
- [LZ2] Y. Liu, P. Zhou. Relative rigid subcategories and  $\tau$ -tilting theory. *Algebr. Represent. Theory* 25 (2022), no. 6, 1699–1722.
- [LZ3] Y. Liu, P. Zhou. Cotorsion pairs on  $m$ -term subcategories. To appear in *Acta Mathematica Sinica, English Series*, 2023.
- [Na] H. Nakaoka. General heart construction on a triangulated category (I): Unifying  $t$ -structures and cluster tilting subcategories. *Appl. Categ. Structures* 19 (2011), no. 6, 879–899.
- [Ng] P. Ng. A characterization of torsion theories in the cluster category of Dynkin type  $\mathbb{A}_\infty$ . arXiv: 1005.4364, 2010.
- [NP] H. Nakaoka, Y. Palu. Extriangulated categories, Hovey twin cotorsion pairs and model structures. *Cah. Topol. Géom. Différ. Catég.* 60 (2019), no. 2, 117–193.
- [PZZ] J. Pan, Y. Zhang, B. Zhu. Support  $\tau$ -tilting subcategories in exact categories. *J. Algebra* 636 (2023), 455–482.
- [RS] C. Riedtmann, A. Schofield. On a simplicial complex associated with tilting modules. *Comment. Math. Helv.* 66 (1991), no.1, 70–78.
- [U] L. Unger. Schur modules over wild, finite-dimensional path algebras with three simple modules. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 64 (1990), no.2, 205–222.
- [XZ] J. Xiao, B. Zhu. Locally finite triangulated categories. *J. Algebra* 290 (2005), no. 2, 473–490.
- [YZ] W. Yang, B. Zhu. Relative cluster tilting objects in triangulated categories. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 371 (2019), no. 1, 387–412.
- [YZZ] W. Yang, P. Zhou and B. Zhu. Triangulated categories with cluster-tilting subcategories. *Pacific J. Math.* 301 (2019), no. 2, 703–740.
- [ZhZ] P. Zhou, B. Zhu. Two-term relative cluster tilting subcategories,  $\tau$ -tilting modules and silting subcategories. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 224 (2020), no. 9, 106365, 22 pp.
- [ZZ] Y. Zhou, B. Zhu. Maximal rigid subcategories in 2–Calabi–Yau triangulated categories. *J. Algebra* 348 (2011), 49–60.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, SHAANXI NORMAL UNIVERSITY, 710062 XI'AN, SHANNXI, P. R. CHINA  
*Email address:* recursive08@hotmail.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY, 100084 BEIJING, P. R. CHINA  
*Email address:* pjax19@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, CHANGSHA UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, 410114 CHANGSHA, HUNAN, P. R. CHINA  
*Email address:* panyuezhou@163.com