

APPROXIMATION PROPERTIES OF TORSION CLASSES

SEAN COX, ALEJANDRO POVEDA, AND JAN TRLIFAJ

ABSTRACT. We clarify some results of Bagaria and Magidor [1] about the relationship between large cardinals and torsion classes of abelian groups, and prove that (1) the *Maximum Deconstructibility* principle introduced in [4] requires large cardinals; it sits, implication-wise, between Vopěnka’s Principle and the existence of an ω_1 -strongly compact cardinal. (2) While deconstructibility of a class of modules always implies the precovering property by [13], the concepts are (consistently) non-equivalent, even for classes of abelian groups closed under extensions, homomorphic images, and colimits.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	2
3. Approximation properties and torsion classes	3
4. Clarification of some results of Bagaria and Magidor	4
5. Maximum Deconstructibility, and deconstructibility of torsion classes, require large cardinals	5
6. Questions	7
References	7

1. INTRODUCTION

Classical homological algebra involves approximating an arbitrary module with modules from the well-behaved class \mathcal{P}_0 of projective modules. Relative homological algebra ([8]) attempts to replace \mathcal{P}_0 by some other well-behaved class \mathcal{C} , leading to new invariants that can be used to create new module and ring theoretic invariants. A crucial requirement for this to work nicely is that \mathcal{C} be a *precovering class* in the sense of Enochs and Auslander (see Section 2 for definitions).

It can be difficult to show that a class is precovering, but Saorín and Šťovíček proved that

(\star) \mathcal{C} is **deconstructible** $\implies \mathcal{C}$ is precovering,

where deconstructibility is a concept that arose from the solution of the Flat Cover Conjecture ([9], [3]) and is closely related to Quillen’s *Small Object Argument* from homotopy theory. A natural question arose:

Question 1. *Suppose \mathcal{C} is a class of modules that is closed under transfinite extensions. Does the converse of (\star) hold?*

The first author was supported by the National Science Foundation (DMS-2154141). The second author acknowledges support from the Department of Mathematics at Harvard University as well as from the Harvard Center of Mathematical Sciences and Applications (CMSA). The research of the third author was supported by GACR 23-05148S.

After clarifying some results of Bagaria and Magidor from [1], we use their results to provide a negative answer to Question 1, at least in the absence of large cardinals:

Theorem. *If there are no ω_1 -strongly compact cardinals, then there is a precovering class of abelian groups that is closed under transfinite extensions, homomorphic images, and colimits, but is not deconstructible.*

In fact, the torsion class

$${}^{\perp_0}\mathbb{Z} := \{A \in \mathbf{Ab} : \text{Hom}(A, \mathbb{Z}) = 0\}$$

is always a covering class that is closed under transfinite extensions, homomorphic images, and colimits. We prove:

Theorem 2. *${}^{\perp_0}\mathbb{Z}$ is deconstructible if and only if there is an ω_1 -strongly compact cardinal.*

Theorem 2 strengthens a result of Bagaria and Magidor, who got the same equivalence with “deconstructible” weakened to “bounded” (we show in Lemma 11 that these concepts are equivalent, for any class of modules closed under transfinite extensions, homomorphic images, and colimits).

In [4], the first author proved that any deconstructible class is:

- (a) closed under transfinite extensions (by definition), and
- (b) “eventually almost everywhere closed under quotients”. This is an extremely weak version of saying that if $A \subset B$ are both in the class, then so is B/A . In particular, it holds if the class is closed under homomorphic images.

He introduced the **Maximum Deconstructibility** principle, which asserts that any class satisfying both (a) and (b) is deconstructible, and proved that

Vopěnka’s Principle (VP) implies Maximum Deconstructibility.

Maximum Deconstructibility appeared very powerful, since [4] showed that it implied deconstructibility of many classes in Gorenstein Homological Algebra that (so far) are not known to be deconstructible in ZFC alone. But it was unclear whether Maximum Deconstructibility had any large cardinal strength at all. We again use the (clarified) results of Bagaria and Magidor to show that it does:

Theorem. *Maximum Deconstructibility implies the existence of an ω_1 -strongly compact cardinal.*

So Maximum Deconstructibility lies, implication-wise, between VP and the existence of an ω_1 -strongly compact cardinal. The first author still conjectures that it is equivalent to VP.

Section 2 has preliminaries. Section 3 proves the approximation properties of torsion classes that are provable in ZFC alone. Section 4 clarifies some results of Bagaria-Magidor [1]. Section 5 proves the main theorems mentioned above, and Section 6 includes some questions.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Our notation and conventions follow Kanamori [12] (for set theory and large cardinals) and Göbel-Trlifaj [11] (for module theory). By *ring* we will mean a unital and not necessarily commutative ring. If R is a ring, the class of left R -modules will be denoted by $R\text{-Mod}$. We will say that M is a *module* rather than a left R -module whenever R is clear from the context. For a regular cardinal κ and a module M , the collection of all submodules N of M that are $<\kappa$ -generated will be denoted by $[M]^{<\kappa}$; if $|R| < \kappa$ and κ is regular and uncountable, then “ $<\kappa$ -generated” is equivalent to “of cardinality less than κ ”. A cardinal κ is *strongly compact* if every κ -complete filter (on any set whatsoever) can be extended to a κ -complete ultrafilter. Bagaria and Magidor considered a weakening of strong compactness:

Definition 3 (Bagaria and Magidor, [1]). *An uncountable cardinal κ is called ω_1 -strongly compact if every κ -complete filter extends to an ω_1 -complete ultrafilter.*

Note that if κ is ω_1 -strongly compact then so is any cardinal $\lambda \geq \kappa$. Unlike strongly compact cardinals, an ω_1 -strongly compact cardinal may fail to be regular [1, §6].

3. APPROXIMATION PROPERTIES AND TORSION CLASSES

Given a class \mathcal{K} of R -modules, a \mathcal{K} -filtration is a \subseteq -increasing and \subseteq -continuous sequence $\langle M_\xi \mid \xi < \eta \rangle$ of modules such that $M_0 = 0$ and for all $\xi < \eta$ such that $\xi + 1 < \eta$, M_ξ is a submodule of $M_{\xi+1}$ and $M_{\xi+1}/M_\xi$ is isomorphic to a member of \mathcal{K} . A module M is \mathcal{K} -filtered whenever there is a \mathcal{K} -filtration $\langle M_\xi \mid \xi < \eta \rangle$ whose union is M . We shall denote the class of all \mathcal{K} -filtered modules by $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{K})$. \mathcal{K} is closed under transfinite extensions whenever $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{K}) \subseteq \mathcal{K}$. Finally, $\mathcal{K}^{<\kappa}$ denotes the class of all $<\kappa$ -presented members of \mathcal{K} .

Definition 4. Let \mathcal{K} be a class of modules and $\lambda \leq \kappa$ be regular cardinals.

- (1) \mathcal{K} is κ -deconstructible whenever $\mathcal{K} = \text{Filt}(\mathcal{K}^{<\kappa})$; equivalently, \mathcal{K} is closed under transfinite extensions, and every $M \in \mathcal{K}$ admits a $\mathcal{K}^{<\kappa}$ -filtration.¹
- (2) \mathcal{K} is (κ, λ) -cofinal if $\mathcal{K} \cap [M]^{<\kappa}$ is \subseteq -cofinal in $[M]^{<\lambda}$ for every module $M \in \mathcal{K}$ (i.e., whenever every $N \in [M]^{<\lambda}$ is contained in some $L \in \mathcal{K} \cap [M]^{<\kappa}$).
- (3) \mathcal{K} is bounded by κ whenever $M = \sum (\mathcal{K} \cap [M]^{<\kappa})$ for all $M \in \mathcal{K}$ (i.e., if every $x \in M$ is contained in some $<\kappa$ -presented submodule of M that lies in \mathcal{K}).²
- (4) \mathcal{K} is κ -decomposable if every module in \mathcal{K} is a direct sum of $<\kappa$ -presented modules from \mathcal{K} .

\mathcal{K} is said to be deconstructible provided it is κ -deconstructible for a regular cardinal κ . The same convention is applied to the rest of above-mentioned properties.

Clearly any (κ, λ) -cofinal class is bounded by κ . In the forthcoming Lemma 11 we will argue that for certain classes \mathcal{K} , the concepts are equivalent.

The following definitions are due to Enochs (generalizing earlier work of Auslander):

Definition 5. Let \mathcal{K} be a class of modules. We say that \mathcal{K} is:

- (1) Precovering: If every module M possesses a \mathcal{K} -precover; namely, a morphism $f: C \rightarrow M$ with $C \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $\text{Hom}(D, f)$ is surjective for all $D \in \mathcal{K}$.
- (2) Covering: If every module M possesses a \mathcal{K} -cover; namely, a \mathcal{K} -precover $f: C \rightarrow M$ such that for each $g \in \text{End}(C)$ if $fg = f$ then g is an automorphism of C .

Saorín and Štoviček [13] proved that if a class \mathcal{K} (of, say, modules) is deconstructible, then it is precovering. In §5 we argue that there are nicely-behaved covering classes which are yet, at least consistently, not deconstructible. The concrete example we have in mind is the torsion class of the abelian group \mathbb{Z} in a context where the set-theoretic universe does not have any ω_1 -strongly compact cardinals (see Definition 3).

Dickson [6] introduced the concept of *torsion pairs*, which are pairs $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ such that

$$\mathcal{A} = {}^{\perp_0}\mathcal{B} := \{X \mid \text{Hom}(X, B) = 0 \text{ for all } B \in \mathcal{B}\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}^{\perp_0} := \{Y \mid \text{Hom}(A, Y) = 0 \text{ for all } A \in \mathcal{A}\}.$$

A class of modules is called a *torsion class* if it is of the form ${}^{\perp_0}\mathcal{B}$ for some class \mathcal{B} ; notice that in this situation,

$$\left({}^{\perp_0}\mathcal{B}, ({}^{\perp_0}\mathcal{B})^{\perp_0} \right)$$

¹This is the definition of deconstructibility in most newer references, such as [14], since it is the version that (by [13]) implies the precovering property. Some other sources (e.g. Cox [4], Göbel-Trlifaj [11]) only require that $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \text{Filt}(\mathcal{K}^{<\kappa})$ (i.e., with \subseteq rather than equality).

²This property was introduced by Gardner in [10] and later investigated by Dugas in [7].

is easily seen to be a torsion pair (the torsion pair *cogenerated by* \mathcal{B}). So torsion classes are exactly those classes that are the left part of some torsion pair. Whenever \mathcal{X} is a singleton $\{X\}$, the convention is to write ${}^{\perp_0}X$ rather than ${}^{\perp_0}\{X\}$.

By [6], torsion classes are exactly those classes that are closed under arbitrary direct sums, extensions, and homomorphic images ([15], Proposition VI.2.1). They have many other desirable features; we list the ones that are relevant for this paper:

Lemma 6. *Torsion classes are:*

- (1) *closed under homomorphic images*
- (2) *closed under colimits*
- (3) *closed under transfinite extensions*
- (4) *covering classes.*

(1) is immediate from the definition of torsion class, and (2) follows from closure under direct sums and homomorphic images. Closure under transfinite extensions follows easily from closure under extensions and colimits. Finally, given any module M and any torsion class $\mathcal{T} := {}^{\perp_0}\mathcal{X}$, the *trace of* \mathcal{T} in M is defined as

$$r(M) := \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \{\text{im } \pi : \pi \in \text{Hom}(T, M)\}.$$

Then it is easily seen that $r(M) \in \mathcal{T}$ and that the inclusion $r(M) \rightarrow M$ is a \mathcal{T} -cover of M .

4. CLARIFICATION OF SOME RESULTS OF BAGARIA AND MAGIDOR

In Bagaria-Magidor [1, §5] a torsion class ${}^{\perp_0}\mathcal{X}$ is called “ κ -generated” whenever every $A \in {}^{\perp_0}\mathcal{X}$ is a *direct* sum of subgroups in ${}^{\perp_0}\mathcal{X}$, each of cardinality $< \kappa$; this is what is usually called κ -decomposable (see Definition 4). However, their use of the word “direct” on page 1867 of [1] appears to be a misprint, since the arguments there never use (or conclude) directness of the relevant sums. All of the arguments in [1, §5], and the citation they provide for the concept (Dugas [7]), appear to use the weaker property that every group in the class is merely a sum of subgroups in the class of cardinality $< \kappa$. The latter condition is what we called *bounded by* κ in Section 2 (this terminology was used by Gardner [10] and Dugas [7]).

The proof of [1, Theorem 5.1] shows that if κ is a ω_1 -strongly compact cardinal and X is a countable abelian group, then ${}^{\perp_0}X$ is bounded by κ . In fact, they prove the stronger property of ${}^{\perp_0}X$ being (κ, ω_1) -cofinal.³ The proof however does *not* show that ${}^{\perp_0}X$ is κ -decomposable, and in fact that is impossible, because of the following theorem (due to the third author):

Theorem 7. *${}^{\perp_0}\mathbb{Z}$ is not decomposable.*

Proof. Suppose toward a contradiction that ${}^{\perp_0}\mathbb{Z}$ is κ -decomposable, with κ (without loss of generality) a regular uncountable cardinal. Fix any prime p . Then all p -groups⁴ are in ${}^{\perp_0}\mathbb{Z}$. So, in particular, the κ -decomposability assumption of ${}^{\perp_0}\mathbb{Z}$ implies

- (1) Every p -group is a direct sum of $< \kappa$ -sized subgroups.

For a p -group G , we can consider its p -length, which is the least ordinal σ such that $G_\sigma = G_{\sigma+1}$, where G_σ is defined recursively by $G_0 := G$, $G_{\sigma+1} = \{pg : g \in G_\sigma\}$, and $G_\sigma = \bigcap_{\xi < \sigma} G_\xi$ for limit ordinals σ . By a construction of Walker [16] (see also Bazzoni-Šťovíček [2]), there exists a p -group, denoted P_{κ^+} , whose

³Recall that this stands for the following property: For each $G \in {}^{\perp_0}\mathbb{Z}$ every countable subgroup $H \leq G$ is included in a member of ${}^{\perp_0}\mathbb{Z} \cap [G]^{< \kappa}$ (see Definition 4).

⁴Abelian groups whose elements all have order a power of p .

p -length is exactly $\kappa^+ + 1$.⁵ By (1),

$$P_{\kappa^+} = \bigoplus_{i \in I} Q_i$$

for some collection $(Q_i)_{i \in I}$ of $< \kappa$ -sized subgroups. Since subgroups of p -groups are also p -groups, each Q_i has a p -length, which is $< \kappa$ because $|Q_i| < \kappa$. And it is easy to check that the p -length of a direct sum is at most the supremum of the p -lengths of the direct summands, so $\bigoplus_{i \in I} Q_i$ has p -length at most κ , contradicting that the p -length of P_{κ^+} is $\kappa^+ + 1$. \square

The proof of their Theorem 5.1 really showed:

Theorem 8 (clarification of [1, Theorem 5.1]). *If κ is a δ -strongly compact cardinal and X is an abelian group of cardinality less than δ , then ${}^{\perp_0}X$ is bounded in κ .*

In the other direction, Theorem 5.3 of [1] asserted that if ${}^{\perp_0}\mathbb{Z}$ is “ κ -generated” (using their definition, with “direct sum” instead of just “sum”), then κ is ω_1 -strongly compact. Fortunately, their argument never used the “direct” part of their definition, since by Theorem 7, that would have been an inconsistent assumption. Their proofs really showed:

Theorem 9 (clarification of [1, Theorem 5.3]). *If ${}^{\perp_0}\mathbb{Z}$ is bounded in κ , then κ is ω_1 -strongly compact.*

Corollary 10 (clarification of [1, Corollary 5.4]). *${}^{\perp_0}\mathbb{Z}$ is bounded in κ if and only if κ is ω_1 -strongly compact.*

5. MAXIMUM DECONSTRUCTIBILITY, AND DECONSTRUCTIBILITY OF TORSION CLASSES, REQUIRE LARGE CARDINALS

Through this section κ will denote a regular uncountable cardinal. Our main goal is to clarify, for a given class of modules \mathcal{K} , the relationship between \mathcal{K} being κ -deconstructible and \mathcal{K} being bounded in κ . As noted in §2, any (κ, κ) -cofinal class \mathcal{K} is bounded in κ . In fact the former property seems to be strictly stronger than the latter, and they both follow from κ -deconstructibility. Lemma 11 provides some important scenarios where these concepts to be equivalent. Combining this lemma with the (clarified) results of Bagaria and Magidor from Section 4 allows us to prove the main results mentioned in the introduction, namely:

- (1) that the *Maximum Deconstructibility* principle introduced in [4] entails the existence of large cardinals;
- (2) that in the absence of ω_1 -strongly compact cardinals, the class ${}^{\perp_0}\mathbb{Z}$ is a covering class (cf. Lemma 6 above) that is *not* deconstructible.

Lemma 11. *Suppose κ is a regular uncountable cardinal and R is a ring of size less than κ , and \mathcal{K} is a class of R -modules. Consider the following statements:*

- (a) \mathcal{K} is κ -deconstructible.
- (b) \mathcal{K} is (κ, κ) -cofinal and closed under transfinite extensions.
- (c) \mathcal{K} is bounded by κ and closed under transfinite extensions.

Then:

- (1) (a) \implies (b) \implies (c).
- (2) If \mathcal{K} is closed under quotients—i.e., if

$$(A \subset B, A \in \mathcal{K}, \text{ and } B \in \mathcal{K}) \implies B/A \in \mathcal{K}$$

for all modules A and B —then (a) and (b) are equivalent.

- (3) If \mathcal{K} is closed under homomorphic images and colimits, then all three statements are equivalent.

⁵The group is indexed by decreasing finite sequences $\kappa^+ > \beta_1 > \dots > \beta_k$, with relations $p(\kappa^+ \beta_1 \dots \beta_k \beta_{k+1}) = p(\kappa^+ \beta_1 \dots \beta_k)$ and $p(\kappa^+) = 0$.

Proof. The (a) \Rightarrow (b) direction follows from the Hill Lemma (cf. Göbel-Trlifaj [11], Theorem 7.10). The (b) \Rightarrow (c) implication is immediate from the definitions.

Now suppose \mathcal{K} is closed under transfinite extensions and quotients. We prove (b) \Rightarrow (a). Without losing any generality we may assume that (the universe of) every module $M \in \mathcal{K}$ is a cardinal. Since \mathcal{K} is closed both under transfinite extensions and quotients, then by [4, Theorem 6.3] in order to prove κ -deconstructibility of \mathcal{K} it suffices to show that if $M \in \mathcal{K}$, then $\mathcal{K} \cap \wp_\kappa^*(M)$ is stationary in $\wp_\kappa^*(M)$, where $\wp_\kappa^*(M)$ denotes the $<\kappa$ -sized submodules of M whose intersection with κ is transitive.

The set $\mathcal{K} \cap \wp_\kappa^*(M)$ being stationary in $\wp_\kappa^*(M)$ is equivalent to the following statement: For each algebra $\mathfrak{A} = (M, \dots)$ on M in a countable signature, there is $X \prec \mathfrak{A}$ in $\mathcal{K} \cap \wp_\kappa^*(M)$. We prove this next.

Using the assumption that \mathcal{K} is \subseteq -cofinal in $[M]^{<\kappa}$, and the downward Löwenheim-Skolem Theorem, we construct an \subseteq -increasing ω -chain

$$X_0 \subseteq C_0 \subseteq X_1 \subseteq C_1 \subseteq \dots$$

such that for each $n \in \omega$:

- $X_n \prec \mathfrak{A}$, $|X_n| < \kappa$, and X_n has transitive intersection with κ .
- $C_n \in \mathcal{K}$ and $|C_n| < \kappa$ (but might have non-transitive intersection with κ).

Let $X := \bigcup_{n < \omega} X_n$. Then $X \prec \mathfrak{A}$, $|X| < \kappa$, and $X \cap \kappa$ is transitive. Also, note that $X = \bigcup_{n < \omega} C_n$ too. Since \mathcal{K} is closed under quotients, each C_{n+1}/C_n is in \mathcal{K} . So since \mathcal{K} is closed under transfinite extensions, and each C_{n+1}/C_n is in \mathcal{K} , we conclude that $X \in \mathcal{K}$.

Now suppose that \mathcal{K} is closed under homomorphic images and colimits; we show that (c) implies (b) (and hence (a) will hold too, since closure under homomorphic images trivially implies closure under quotients in the sense of 2). Suppose \mathcal{K} is bounded in κ . Suppose $M \in \mathcal{K}$, and fix any $X \in [M]^{<\kappa}$. By κ -boundedness of \mathcal{K} , for each $x \in X$ there is a $Y_x \in \mathcal{K} \cap [M]^{<\kappa}$ with $x \in Y_x$. Then $S := \sum_{x \in X} Y_x$ is a $<\kappa$ -sized submodule of M and contains X . And S is a homomorphic image of the colimit of the (possibly non-directed) diagram of inclusions

$$\{Y_x \rightarrow Y_z : Y_x \subseteq Y_z \text{ and } x, z \in X\}.$$

So by closure of \mathcal{K} under homomorphic images and colimits, $S \in \mathcal{K}$. □

We now focus on abelian groups. Recall that by Lemma 6 any torsion class ${}^{\perp_0}\mathcal{X}$ is closed under homomorphic images, transfinite extensions, and colimits. So by Lemma 11, a class of the form ${}^{\perp_0}\mathcal{X}$ is deconstructible if and only if it is bounded in some cardinal. Furthermore, as noted in the introduction, although an ω_1 -strongly compact cardinal might be singular, all cardinals above it are also ω_1 -strongly compact. In particular (by considering its successor if necessary), there exists an ω_1 -strongly compact cardinal if and only if there exists a *regular* ω_1 -strongly compact cardinal. Then Lemma 6, Lemma 11, and the (clarified) Corollary 10 of Bagaria and Magidor immediately imply Theorem 2 from the introduction, which asserted that ${}^{\perp_0}\mathbb{Z}$ is deconstructible if and only if there is an ω_1 -strongly compact cardinal. In fact, making use of the (clarified) Theorem 8 of Bagaria and Magidor, we have:

Corollary 12. *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *There exists an ω_1 -strongly compact cardinal.*
- (2) *${}^{\perp_0}\mathbb{Z}$ is deconstructible.*
- (3) *For all countable abelian groups X , ${}^{\perp_0}X$ is deconstructible.*

Since ${}^{\perp_0}\mathbb{Z}$ is closed under transfinite extensions and homomorphic images, we solve part of [4, Question 8.2] in the affirmative:

Corollary 13. *Maximum Deconstructibility of [4] has large cardinal consistency strength. Specifically, it lies implication-wise, in between the existence of an ω_1 -strongly compact and Vopěnka's Principle.*

Recall that deconstructible classes of modules are always precovering ([11, Theorem 7.21]). Thus, another interesting corollary of Corollary 12 and Lemma 6 is the existence of precovering classes (even covering classes) which are not deconstructible:

Corollary 14. *If there are no ω_1 -strongly compact cardinals, then there is a covering class in \mathbf{Ab} that is closed under colimits, transfinite extensions, and homomorphic images, but is not deconstructible (namely, the class ${}^{\perp_0}\mathbb{Z}$). Thus, ZFC cannot prove that all subclasses of \mathbf{Ab} satisfying the clauses in Lemma 6 are deconstructible. \square*

6. QUESTIONS

Question 15. *Suppose that $\kappa \geq \omega_2$ is a regular cardinal such that ${}^{\perp_0}X$ is deconstructible for all abelian group of size $< \kappa$. Must κ be strongly compact?*

Much of the literature focuses on deconstructibility and precovering properties of “roots of Ext” classes, i.e., classes of the form

$${}^{\perp}\mathcal{B} := \{A : \forall B \in \mathcal{B} \text{Ext}^1(A, B) = 0\}$$

for some fixed class \mathcal{B} of modules. Our results in Section 5 consistently separates deconstructibility from precovering for ${}^{\perp_0}\mathbb{Z}$, but this is very far from being a root of Ext; it does not even contain the ring \mathbb{Z} .

This suggests asking whether deconstructibility is equivalent to precovering for classes of the form ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{B}$, but there is a caveat: the first author proved in [5] that it is consistent, relative to consistency of Vopěnka’s Principle (VP), that over every *hereditary* ring (such as \mathbb{Z}), every class of the form ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{B}$ is deconstructible. So deconstructibility is trivially equivalent to precovering for roots of Ext (over hereditary rings) in that model. But the following questions are open:

Question 16. *Is it consistent with ZFC that there is a class \mathcal{B} of abelian groups such that ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{B}$ is precovering, but not deconstructible?*

Question 17. *Does ZFC prove the existence of a ring R and a class \mathcal{B} of R -modules, such that ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{B}$ is precovering, but not deconstructible? By the remarks above, such a ring could not be provably hereditary (unless VP is inconsistent).*

Both questions are even open if we replace “classes of the form ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{B}$ ” with “classes that are closed under transfinite extensions and contain the ring” (such classes would contain all free modules).

REFERENCES

- [1] Joan Bagaria and Menachem Magidor, *Group radicals and strongly compact cardinals*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **366** (2014), no. 4, 1857–1877.
- [2] Silvana Bazzoni and Jan Šťovíček, *On the abelianization of derived categories and a negative solution to Rosický’s problem*, Compos. Math. **149** (2013), no. 1, 125–147.
- [3] L. Bican, R. El Bashir, and E. Enochs, *All modules have flat covers*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **33** (2001), no. 4, 385–390.
- [4] Sean Cox, *Maximum deconstructibility in module categories*, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra **226** (2022), no. 5.
- [5] ———, *Salce’s problem on cotorsion pairs is undecidable*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **54** (2022), no. 4, 1363–1374.
- [6] Spencer E. Dickson, *A torsion theory for Abelian categories*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **121** (1966), 223–235.
- [7] Manfred Dugas, *On reduced products of abelian groups*, Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova **73** (1985), 41–47.
- [8] Samuel Eilenberg and J. C. Moore, *Foundations of relative homological algebra*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **55** (1965), 39.
- [9] Paul C. Eklof and Jan Trlifaj, *How to make Ext vanish*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **33** (2001), no. 1, 41–51.
- [10] B. J. Gardner, *When are radical classes of abelian groups closed under direct products?*, Algebraic structures and applications (Nedlands, 1980), Lect. Notes Pure Appl. Math., vol. 74, Dekker, New York, 1982.
- [11] Rüdiger Göbel and Jan Trlifaj, *Approximations and endomorphism algebras of modules. Volume 1*, Second revised and extended edition, De Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics, vol. 41, Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin, 2012.
- [12] Akihiro Kanamori, *The higher infinite*, 2nd ed., Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. Large cardinals in set theory from their beginnings. MR1994835 (2004f:03092)
- [13] Manuel Saorín and Jan Šťovíček, *On exact categories and applications to triangulated adjoints and model structures*, Adv. Math. **228** (2011), no. 2, 968–1007.

- [14] Jan Šároch and Jan Trlifaj, *Deconstructible abstract elementary classes of modules and categoricity*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02623 (2023).
- [15] Bo Stenström, *Rings of quotients*, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. Band 217, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1975. An introduction to methods of ring theory.
- [16] Elbert A. Walker, *The groups β* , Symposia Mathematica, Vol. XIII (Convegno di Gruppi Abeliani & Convegno di Gruppi e loro Rappresentazioni, INDAM, Rome, 1972), Academic Press, London-New York, 1974, pp. 245–255.

(Cox) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS, VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITY, 1015 FLOYD AVENUE, RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23284, USA

Email address: `scox9@vcu.edu`

(Poveda) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND CENTER OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES AND APPLICATIONS, HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE MA, 02138, USA

Email address: `alejandro@cmsa.fas.harvard.edu`

(Trlifaj) FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND PHYSICS, DEPARTMENT OF ALGEBRA, CHARLES UNIVERSITY, SOKOLOVSKÁ 83, 186 75 PRAGUE 8, CZECH REPUBLIC

Email address: `trlifaj@karlin.mff.cuni.cz`