

ON g -FINITENESS IN THE CATEGORY OF PROJECTIVE PRESENTATIONS

MONICA GARCIA

ABSTRACT. We provide new equivalent conditions for an algebra Λ to be g -finite, analogous to those established by L. Demonet, O. Iyama, and G. Jasso, but within the category of projective presentations $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$. We show that an algebra has finitely many isomorphism classes of basic 2-term silting objects if and only if all cotorsion pairs in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ are complete. Furthermore, we establish that this criterion is also equivalent to all thick subcategories in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ having enough injective and projective objects.

Keywords. Projective presentation, g -finite algebra, thick subcategory, cotorsion pair, silting object.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
Acknowledgments	3
2. Preliminaries	3
2.1. dg algebras and dg categories	3
2.2. 2-term silting objects and 2-term simple-minded collections	5
2.3. 0-Asulander extriangulated categories	6
3. Silting reduction in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$	8
3.1. Thick subcategories generated by 2-term presilting complexes	9
3.2. Silting reduction in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$	11
4. Thick subcategories and cotorsion pairs of g -finite algebras	13
4.1. Bijection between cotorsion and torsion classes	14
4.2. All thick subcategories have enough injectives and projectives	17
References	26

1. INTRODUCTION

The notion of support τ -tilting module [AIR14] was inspired in part by the additive categorification of cluster algebras (see [Ami09, BMR⁺06] or survey papers [Kel11, Ami11]). When Λ is the Jacobi algebra $\mathcal{J}(Q, W)$ associated with a quiver Q with non-degenerate potential W , the set of reachable basic 2-term silting complexes is in bijection with the set of clusters of the cluster algebra \mathcal{A}_Q associated to (Q, W) . One of the first questions to be settled when cluster algebras were introduced is whether the set of clusters of a given cluster algebra \mathcal{A}_Q is finite. This turned out to be equivalent to Q being mutation-equivalent to a quiver of Dynkin type [FZ03]. Since Dynkin quivers are representation finite, $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \mathcal{J}(Q, W))$ has only finitely many isoclasses of indecomposable objects and thus finitely many

isoclasses of basic 2-term silting objects. For a general finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra Λ , this does not have to be the case, prompting the introduction of the following definition.

Definition 1.1. [DIJ19] Let Λ be a finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra. We say that Λ is *g-finite* if it admits only finitely many isomorphism classes of basic 2-term silting objects.

The study of *g-finite* algebras was introduced by L. Demonet, O. Iyama and G. Jasso in [DIJ19], who showed that an algebra Λ being *g-finite* has deep implications on the structure of $\text{mod } \Lambda$.

Theorem 1.2. [DIJ19, Theorems 3.8 and 4.2] *Let Λ be a finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) Λ is *g-finite*.
- (2) There exist finitely many functorially finite torsion classes in $\text{mod } \Lambda$.
- (3) All torsion classes in $\text{mod } \Lambda$ are functorially finite.
- (4) There exist finitely many isomorphism classes of bricks in $\text{mod } \Lambda$.

Functorially finite torsion classes are in one-to-one correspondence with *left finite wide subcategories* [MŠ17, IT09]. Since left finite wide subcategories are defined as those such the smallest torsion class containing them is functorially finite, the following corollary is immediate.

Corollary 1.3. *Let Λ be a finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra. If Λ is *g-finite*, then all wide subcategories are left finite.*

In this article, we study the consequences that being *g-finite* has on the correspondences between complete cotorsion pairs, 2-term silting objects and thick subcategories with enough injectives in the extriangulated category $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ introduced in [Gar23]. Specifically, we provide analogs of Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.3.

Theorem 1.4. *Let Λ be a finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) Λ is *g-finite*.
- (2) There exist finitely many complete cotorsion pairs in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$.
- (3) All cotorsion pairs in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ are complete.
- (4) There exist finitely many thick subcategories in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$.

Theorem (4.22). *Suppose Λ is *g-finite*. Then all thick subcategories of $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ have enough injectives.*

To show condition (3) of Theorem 1.4 we extend a result of D. Pauksztello and A. Zvonareva [PZ23].

Theorem (4.3). *Let Λ be a finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra. Then the functor $H^0 : \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda) \rightarrow \text{mod } \Lambda$ induces a bijection*

$$\begin{aligned} H^0 : \text{cotor } \Lambda &\rightarrow \text{tors } \Lambda \\ (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) &\mapsto H^0(\mathcal{Y}). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that the set of torsion classes of $\text{mod } \Lambda$ equipped with the inclusion forms a lattice, that is, a poset in which any two elements have an unique least upper bound

(or *join*), and an unique greatest lower bound (or *meet*) (see for instance [Tho21]). In a similar way, we can equip the set of cotorsion pairs in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ with a poset structure: for any $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ and $(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{Y}') \in \text{cotor } \Lambda$ we say that $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) \leq (\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{Y}')$ if $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathcal{Y}'$. Since H^0 preserves inclusions, Theorem 4.3 gives the following corollary.

Corollary 1.5. *Let Λ be a finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra. Then the set $\text{cotor } \Lambda$ of cotorsion pairs in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ forms a lattice which is isomorphic to the lattice $\text{tors } \Lambda$ of torsion classes in $\text{mod } \Lambda$.*

To establish the equivalence between being \mathfrak{g} -finite and condition (4), we show that when Λ is \mathfrak{g} -finite, then all thick subcategories in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ contain a presilting object. The proof of this fact relies on geometric results on the degeneration of objects of the triangulated category $\mathcal{K}^b(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ [JSZ05]. We also develop a reduction argument by explicitly computing the silting reduction of the extriangulated category $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ by a presilting object in the manner of that developed by O. Iyama and D. Yang for triangulated categories in [IY18]. Moreover, we show that the categories obtained after reduction are equivalent to the extriangulated category $\text{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)$ of 2-term complexes over a certain non positive dg-algebra Γ .

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to P.-G. Plamondon for his insights and support throughout the development of my Ph.D. thesis, from which this article originates. I would also like to thank E. D. Børve for the many interesting discussions and for sharing with me a preliminary version of [Bør24]. I also thank A. Shah for his comments, which led to the addition of Proposition 2.13. Finally, I thank the organizers of the Oberwolfach Workshop “Cluster Algebras and Its Applications”, where this work was first presented.

2. PRELIMINARIES

The goal of this section is to introduce the necessary preliminaries for Sections 3 and 4. We recall the definition of the extriangulated category of 2-term perfect complexes $\text{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)$ over a dg algebra Γ , of which $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ is a special case. For a broader introduction to dg categories see [Kel94, Kel06]. Most of the results in this section are taken from [BY13, KY14]. Throughout this paper, we fix a field \mathbb{k} .

2.1. dg algebras and dg categories. Recall that a *differential graded algebra*, or dg algebra for short, is a graded \mathbb{k} -algebra $\Gamma = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \Gamma^i$ equipped with a homogeneous \mathbb{k} -linear map of degree one $d_\Gamma : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ such that

- i) $d_\Gamma(ab) = d_\Gamma(a)b + (-1)^i a d_\Gamma(b) \quad \forall a \in \Gamma^i \text{ and } b \in \Gamma;$
- ii) $d_\Gamma \circ d_\Gamma = 0.$

We call d_Γ the *differential* of Γ . We say a dg algebra Γ is *non-positive* if $\Gamma^i = 0$ for all $i \geq 1$. We say that Γ is *finite-dimensional* if it is finite-dimensional as a \mathbb{k} -vector space. A dg Γ -module is a graded right Γ -module $X = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} X^i$ equipped with a homogeneous \mathbb{k} -linear map of degree one $d_X : X \rightarrow X$ such that

$$d_X(xa) = d_X(x)a + (-1)^i x d_\Gamma(a) \quad \forall a \in \Gamma \text{ and } x \in X^i.$$

For a given dg Γ -module X , we denote by $H^i(X) = \text{Ker } d_X^i / \text{Im } d_X^{i-1}$. Recall that for any X and Y dg Γ -modules we have the dg \mathbb{k} -module

$$\mathcal{H}\text{om}_\Gamma(X, Y) = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{H}\text{om}_\Gamma^i(X, Y)$$

where $\mathcal{H}\text{om}_\Gamma^i(X, Y)$ is the subset of $\prod_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{Hom}_\Gamma(X^j, Y^{j+i})$ of elements $(f_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ such that

$$f_j(x)a = f_{j+n}(xa) \text{ for all } x \in X^j \text{ and } a \in \Gamma^n;$$

whose differential is given by the map

$$f \in \mathcal{H}\text{om}_\Gamma^i(X, Y) \mapsto f \circ d_X - (-1)^i d_Y \circ f.$$

When $X = Y$, we will write $\mathcal{H}\text{om}_\Gamma(X, Y) = \mathcal{E}\text{nd}_\Gamma(X)$. Note that given two dg Γ -modules X and Y , the kernel of d^0 , which we denote by $Z^0(\mathcal{H}\text{om}_\Gamma(X, Y))$, is nothing but the set of Γ -linear maps that commute with the differentials of X and Y . For any dg Γ -module X with differential d_X and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $X[i]$ be the dg module whose underlying graded Γ -module is $\bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} X^{i+j}$ equipped with the differential $(-1)^i d_X$, then the sets $H^i(\mathcal{H}\text{om}_\Gamma(X, Y))$ correspond to the sets $Z^0(\mathcal{H}\text{om}_\Gamma(X, Y[i]))$ modulo the homotopy relation.

Definition 2.1. Let Γ be a dg algebra. We denote by $\mathcal{C}(\Gamma)$ the category whose objects are dg Γ -modules and whose morphism spaces are given by

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}(\Gamma)}(X, Y) = Z^0(\mathcal{H}\text{om}_\Gamma(X, Y)).$$

We will denote by $\mathcal{K}(\Gamma)$ the category whose objects are the same as those of $\mathcal{C}(\Gamma)$ but whose morphism spaces are given by

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{K}(\Gamma)}(X, Y) = H^0(\mathcal{H}\text{om}_\Gamma(X, Y)).$$

The *derived category* associated to Γ is the triangulated quotient

$$\mathcal{D}(\Gamma) = \mathcal{K}(\Gamma) / \mathcal{N},$$

where \mathcal{N} is the thick subcategory of objects whose cohomologies are all 0. In other words, $\mathcal{D}(\Gamma)$ is the Verdier localisation of $\mathcal{K}(\Gamma)$ by quasi-isomorphisms.

We will denote by $\mathcal{D}_{fd}(\Gamma)$ the full subcategory of $\mathcal{D}(\Gamma)$ of dg Γ -modules whose total cohomology is finite-dimensional. We will consider as well the category $\text{per}(\Gamma) = \text{thick}_{\mathcal{D}(\Gamma)}(\Gamma)$ the smallest triangulated full subcategory of $\mathcal{D}(\Gamma)$ containing Γ and closed under direct summands. The subcategory $\text{per}(\Gamma)$ is known as the *category of perfect complexes* over Γ .

Example 2.2. Let Λ be a finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra. When Γ is seen as a dg algebra concentrated in degree 0, $\mathcal{C}(\Lambda)$ is precisely the category $\mathcal{C}(\text{Mod } \Lambda)$ of complexes of (not necessarily finite-dimensional) Λ -modules, $\mathcal{D}(\Lambda)$ is $\mathcal{D}(\text{Mod } \Lambda)$, $\mathcal{D}_{fd}(\Lambda)$ corresponds to $\mathcal{D}^b(\text{mod } \Lambda)$ and $\text{per}(\Lambda)$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{K}^b(\text{proj } \Lambda)$.

Theorem 2.3. [KY14, Lemma 4.1] [Kel06, Theorem 3.8 b)] *Let \mathcal{C} be an algebraic triangulated category, that is, equivalent to the stable category of a Frobenius category. Suppose that \mathcal{C} has split idempotents and a silting object $X \in \mathcal{C}$. Then there exists a non-positive dg algebra Γ and a triangle equivalence*

$$\text{per}(\Gamma) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathcal{C}$$

which takes Γ to X . In particular $H^0(\Gamma) \simeq \text{Hom}_{\text{per}(\Gamma)}(\Gamma, \Gamma) \simeq \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, X)$.

2.2. 2-term silting objects and 2-term simple-minded collections. Let \mathcal{D} be a triangulated category which is essentially small, Krull–Schmidt, \mathbb{k} -linear and Hom-finite with shift functor Σ . Recall that a silting object V of \mathcal{D} is an object that satisfying $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(V, \Sigma^i V) = 0$ for all $i > 0$ and such that $\mathrm{thick}_{\mathcal{D}}(V) = \mathcal{D}$. Let V be a silting object in \mathcal{D} , we say that an object $X \in \mathcal{D}$ is *2-term* with respect to V if there exist $Y, Y' \in \mathrm{add}(V)$ and a triangle

$$Y' \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X \dashrightarrow Y'[1].$$

We will denote by $V * \Sigma V$ the full subcategory of 2-term objects with respect to V . When $\mathcal{D} = \mathrm{per}(\Gamma)$, where Γ is a finite-dimensional non-positive dg algebra, then Γ is itself a silting object in $\mathrm{per}(\Gamma)$, since $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{per}(\Gamma)}(\Gamma, \Gamma[i]) \simeq H^i(\Gamma) = 0$ for all $i > 0$. We write $\mathrm{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma) := \Gamma * \Gamma[1]$ for the full subcategory of 2-term objects of $\mathrm{per} \Gamma$ with respect to Γ . We will refer to $\mathrm{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)$ simply as the category of 2-term objects of Γ and denote by $2\text{-silt } \Gamma$ the set isomorphism classes of basic 2-term silting objects in $\mathrm{per}(\Gamma)$.

Lemma 2.4 (Bongartz Completion). [IJY14, Lemma 4.2] *Let \mathcal{D} be a triangulated category which is essentially small, Krull–Schmidt, \mathbb{k} -linear and Hom-finite with shift functor Σ . Suppose that \mathcal{D} possesses a silting object $V \in \mathcal{D}$. Let $U \in \mathcal{D}$ be a presilting object in $V * \Sigma V$, then there exists an object $U' \in V * \Sigma V$ such that $U \oplus U'$ is a silting object in \mathcal{D} .*

The following consequence of Lemma 2.4 is of particular importance. It allows us to ascertain whether a 2-term presilting object U in a triangulated category \mathcal{D} is silting by examining its number of non-isomorphic direct summands, which we denote by $|U|$.

Proposition 2.5. [IJY14, Proposition 4.3] *Let \mathcal{D} be as in Lemma 2.4 and let U be a presilting object in $V * \Sigma V$. Then U is silting if and only if $|V| = |U|$.*

Definition 2.6. [Ric02] Let \mathcal{C} be a triangulated category with shift functor Σ . A collection of objects X_1, X_2, \dots, X_r is said to be *simple-minded* if the following conditions hold for any $1 \leq i, j \leq n$:

- i) $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X_i, \Sigma^m X_j) = 0$ for all $m < 0$,
- ii) $\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(X_i)$ is a division algebra and $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X_i, X_j) = 0$ when $i \neq j$.
- iii) $\mathrm{thick}_{\mathcal{C}}(\{X_1, \dots, X_r\}) = \mathcal{C}$.

We denote by $\mathrm{smc} \Gamma$ the set of isomorphism classes of simple-minded collections of $\mathcal{D}_{fd}(\Gamma)$.

If Γ is a finite-dimensional non-positive dg algebra, then the set $\{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$ of pairwise non-isomorphic simple $H^0(\Gamma)$ -modules is a simple-minded collection in $\mathcal{D}_{fd}(\Gamma)$ [BY13, Appendix A.1]. We say that a simple-minded collection of $\mathcal{D}_{fd}(\Gamma)$ is *2-term* if $H^j(X_i) = 0$ for all $j \neq 0, -1$ and all $1 \leq i \leq n$. We denote by $2\text{-smc } \Gamma$ the set of isomorphism classes of 2-term simple-minded collections.

Remark 2.7. [BY13, Remark 4.11] Let Λ be a finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra. Suppose that $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ is a 2-term simple-minded collection in $\mathcal{D}^b(\mathrm{mod} \Lambda)$, then for any $1 \leq i \leq n$ the object X_i belongs to either $\mathrm{mod} \Lambda$ or $(\mathrm{mod} \Lambda)[1]$.

Theorem 2.8. [KN13, KY14] [BY13, Corollary 4.1] *Let Γ be a homologically smooth non-positive dg algebra or a finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra. Then there exists a bijection*

$$\Omega : 2\text{-silt } \Gamma \rightarrow \mathrm{smc} \Gamma$$

that restricts to a bijection $\Omega : 2\text{-silt } \Gamma \rightarrow 2\text{-smc } \Gamma$ between the set of 2-term silting objects and 2-term simple-minded collections.

When $\Gamma = \Lambda$ is a finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra, the bijection in Theorem 2.8 is given in the following way. Let U be a silting object in $\text{per } \Lambda$. By Theorem 2.3, there exists a non-positive dg algebra B together with a triangle equivalence $\mathcal{D}(B) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\Lambda)$ that takes B to U . The simple-minded collection $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ corresponding to U under the map Ω is the image under the equivalence $\mathcal{D}(B) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\Lambda)$ of a complete collection of non-isomorphic simple $H^0(B)$ -modules. In particular, any simple-minded collection has $n = |U| = |\Lambda|$ elements.

2.3. 0-Auslander extriangulated categories. Extriangulated categories were introduced by H. Nakaoka and Y. Palu in [NP19] as a mean to generalize both triangulated and exact categories. Examples of extriangulated categories include extension-closed full subcategories of an extriangulated category. In particular, for any given dg algebra Γ , the category $\text{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)$ of 2-term complexes is extriangulated when equipped with the extension functor given by $\mathbb{E}(X, Y) = \text{Hom}_{\text{per}(\Lambda)}(X, Y[1])$ for any $X, Y \in \text{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)$.

We say that a sequence $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z$ in $\text{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)$ is a *conflation* if there exists $\delta \in \text{Hom}_{\text{per}(\Lambda)}(Z, X[1])$ such that (f, g, δ) is a triangle in $\text{per}(\Gamma)$. In such cases, we say that f is an *inflation*, which we denote by $X \xrightarrow{f} Y$, and we write that $Z = \text{Cone}(f)$. Similarly, we say that g is a *deflation*, which we denote by $Y \xrightarrow{g} Z$, and we write $X = \text{Cocone}(g)$. The following definition is due to M. Gorsky, H. Nakaoka and Y. Palu.

Definition 2.9. [GNP23, Definition 3.7] An extriangulated category is a *0-Auslander* if it has enough projectives, enough injectives, global dimension at most one, dominant dimension at least one, and codominant dimension at least one.

When Γ is a non-positive dg algebra, $\text{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)$ is an example of a 0-Auslander extriangulated category. Indeed, by definition for any $X \in \text{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)$ there exists a conflation $U' \rightarrow U \rightarrow X$ where $U, U' \in \text{add}(\Gamma)$ are projective objects in $\text{per}^{[-1,0]}$. Similarly, there is a conflation $X \rightarrow V \rightarrow V'$, where $V, V' \in \text{add}(\Gamma[1])$ are injective objects. To see that $\text{per}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ has dominant and codominant dimension at least one ([GNP23, Definition 3.5]), remark that all projective objects in $\text{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)$ lie in $\text{add}(\Gamma)$, all injective objects lie in $\text{add}(\Gamma[1])$ and for all $U \in \text{add}(\Gamma)$ we have a conflation $U \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow U[1]$.

Proposition 2.10. [FGP⁺23, Proposition 3.2, Corollary 3.3] *Let \mathcal{C} be a 0-Auslander extriangulated category and let J be an ideal generated by morphisms with injective domain and projective codomain. Then the ideal quotient \mathcal{C}/J is a 0-Auslander extriangulated category.*

We now recall the relation between 2-term silting objects of a finite-dimensional non-positive dg algebra Γ and those of the finite-dimensional algebra $H^0(\Gamma)$. Let $\bar{\Gamma} = H^0(\Gamma)$ and $p : \Gamma \rightarrow \bar{\Gamma}$ the canonical projection. The map p gives rise to the triangulated functor

$$\begin{aligned} p_* : \text{per}(\Gamma) &\longrightarrow \text{per}(\bar{\Gamma}) \\ X &\longmapsto X \otimes_{\Gamma} \bar{\Gamma}, \end{aligned}$$

which we refer to as the *induction functor*. Since $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{per}(\Gamma)}(\Gamma, \Gamma) = \bar{\Gamma} = \mathrm{Hom}_{\bar{\Gamma}}(\bar{\Gamma}, \bar{\Gamma})$, then p_* induces an equivalence $\mathrm{add}_{\mathrm{per}(\Gamma)}(\Gamma) \simeq \mathrm{add}_{\mathrm{per}(\bar{\Gamma})}(\bar{\Gamma})$, where $\mathrm{per}(\bar{\Gamma}) \simeq \mathcal{K}^b(\mathrm{proj} \bar{\Gamma})$.

Proposition 2.11. [BY13, Proposition A.5] *Let \mathcal{I} be the ideal of $\mathrm{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)$ consisting of morphisms factoring through morphisms $X[1] \rightarrow Y$ with $X, Y \in \mathrm{add}_{\mathrm{per}(\Gamma)}(\Gamma)$. Then $\mathcal{I}^2 = 0$ and p_* induces an equivalence of \mathbb{k} -linear categories $\mathrm{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)/\mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\mathrm{proj} H^0(\Gamma))$. In particular, p_* is full, detects isomorphisms, preserves indecomposability and induces a bijection between isomorphism classes of objects of $\mathrm{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)$ and $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\mathrm{proj} H^0(\Gamma))$.*

Remark 2.12. The previous proposition and Proposition 2.10, imply that the induction functor p_* is an extriangulated functor and that the equivalence in Proposition 2.11 induces an equivalence of 0-Auslander extriangulated categories. Indeed, recall that an extriangulated functor between two extriangulated categories \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}' is given by an additive functor $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'$ and a natural transformation $\alpha : \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \Rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}'} \circ (\mathcal{F}^{op} \times \mathcal{F})$ such that for any $X, Z \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\delta \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}}(Z, X)$ realized by a conflation $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \xrightarrow{-\delta} \rightarrow$, then $\alpha(\delta) \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}'}(\mathcal{F}(Z), \mathcal{F}(X))$ is realized by the conflation $\mathcal{F}(X) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}(f)} \mathcal{F}(Y) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}(g)} \mathcal{F}(Z) \xrightarrow{-\alpha(\delta)} \rightarrow$ ([BTS21, Definition 2.32]). Moreover, an extriangulated functor (\mathcal{F}, α) is an extriangulated equivalence if and only if \mathcal{F} is an additive equivalence and α is a natural isomorphism ([NOS22, Proposition 2.13]). In our case, the induction functor p_* is an additive equivalence between $\mathrm{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)$ and $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\mathrm{proj} H^0(\Gamma))$ by Proposition 2.11. The corresponding natural transformation is the one making $p_* : \mathrm{per}(\Gamma) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}^b(\mathrm{proj} H^0(\Gamma))$ into a triangulated (and hence extriangulated [BTS21, Theorem 2.33]) functor. By [FGP⁺23, Theorem 2.8] for any $X, Z \in \mathrm{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)$ we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)/\mathcal{I}}(Z, X) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)}(Z, X),$$

and that conflations in $\mathrm{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)/\mathcal{I}$ are precisely the image of those in $\mathrm{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)$. Thus, the only thing left to verify is that for any $X, Z \in \mathrm{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)$ the natural transformation associated to p_* induces an isomorphism between

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{per}(\Gamma)}(Z, X[1]) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{K}^b(\mathrm{proj} H^0(\Gamma))}(p_*(Z), p_*(X)[1]).$$

This follows essentially from [BY13, Proposition A.4]. We include a proof for the convenience of the reader.

Proposition 2.13. [BY13, Proposition A.4] *Let $X, Z \in \mathrm{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)$. Then the functor p_* induces an isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{per}(\Gamma)}(Z, X[1]) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{K}^b(\mathrm{proj} H^0(\Gamma))}(p_*(Z), p_*(X)[1]).$$

Proof. Let $X, Z \in \mathrm{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)$. There are conflations

$$(2.1) \quad X' \twoheadrightarrow X \twoheadrightarrow X''[1]$$

$$(2.2) \quad Z' \twoheadrightarrow Z \twoheadrightarrow Z''[1]$$

with $X', X'', Z', Z'' \in \mathrm{add}_{\mathrm{per}(\Gamma)}(\Gamma)$. By applying the functor $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{per}(\Gamma)}(-, X''[1])$ and $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{K}^b(\mathrm{proj} H^0(\Gamma))}(-, p_*(X''[1]))$ to the conflation 2.2 and its image under p_* , we get the following commutative diagram with exact rows

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\mathrm{Hom}(Z'[1], X''[1]) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}(Z''[1], X''[1]) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}(Z, X''[1]) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}(Z', X''[1]) = 0 \\
\downarrow f_1 & & \downarrow f_2 & & \downarrow f_3 & & \downarrow \\
\mathrm{Hom}(p_*(Z')[1], p_*(X'')[1]) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}(p_*(Z'')[1], p_*(X'')[1]) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}(p_*(Z), p_*(X'')[1]) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}(p_*(Z'), p_*(X'')[1]) = 0.
\end{array}$$

Since p_* is an additive equivalence between $\mathrm{add}_{\mathrm{per}(\Gamma)}(\Gamma)$ and $\mathrm{add}_{\mathrm{per}(\bar{\Gamma})}(\bar{\Gamma})$, both f_1 and f_2 are isomorphisms, and by the Four Lemma then so if f_3 . By applying $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{per}(\Gamma)}(-, X'[1])$ and $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{K}^b(\mathrm{proj} H^0(\Gamma))}(-, p_*(X')[1])$ and using a similar argument, we get that p_* induces an isomorphism $\mathrm{Hom}(Z, X'[1]) \xrightarrow{g_3} \mathrm{Hom}(p_*(Z), p_*(X')[1])$. Now we apply $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{per}(\Gamma)}(Z, -)$ and $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{K}^b(\mathrm{proj} H^0(\Gamma))}(p_*(Z), -)$ to the conflation 2.1 and its image under p_* , which produces the following commutative diagram with exact rows

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\mathrm{Hom}(Z, X''[1]) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}(Z, X'[1]) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}(Z, X[1]) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}(Z, X''[2]) = 0 \\
\downarrow f_3 & & \downarrow g_3 & & \downarrow h & & \downarrow \\
\mathrm{Hom}(p_*(Z), p_*(X'')[1]) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}(p_*(Z), p_*(X')[1]) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}(p_*(Z), p_*(X)[1]) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}(p_*(Z), p_*(X'')[2]) = 0.
\end{array}$$

Since f_3 and g_3 are isomorphisms, by the Four Lemma then so is h . □

Corollary 2.14. *Let $X, Z \in \mathrm{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)$ and suppose there is a conflation*

$$(2.3) \quad p_*(X) \twoheadrightarrow \bar{Y} \twoheadrightarrow p_*(Z) \xrightarrow{-f}$$

where $\bar{Y} \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\mathrm{proj} H^0(\Gamma))$. Then there exists $Y \in \mathrm{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)$ and a conflation

$$X \twoheadrightarrow Y \twoheadrightarrow Z \xrightarrow{-F}$$

whose image by p_* is the conflation 2.3.

Proof. Let $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{K}^b(\mathrm{proj} H^0(\Gamma))}(p_*(Z), p_*(X)[1])$ and $p_*(X) \twoheadrightarrow \bar{Y} \twoheadrightarrow p_*(Z) \xrightarrow{-f}$ be a conflation realizing f . By Proposition 2.13 there exist $F \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{per}(\Gamma)}(Z, X[1])$ such that $p_*(F) = f$. By letting $Y = \mathrm{Cocone}(F)$ we get the result. □

We end this section with the following result by T. Brüstle and D. Yang, which relates the set of isomorphism classes of 2-term silted objects in $\mathrm{per}^{[-1,0]}(\Gamma)$ and that of $\mathrm{per}^{[-1,0]}(\bar{\Gamma})$.

Proposition 2.15. [BY13, Proposition A.3] *The induction functor $p_* : \mathrm{per}(\Gamma) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}^b(\mathrm{proj} \bar{\Gamma})$ induces a bijection between the sets of isomorphism classes of 2-term silted objects $2\text{-silt } \Gamma$ and $2\text{-silt } \bar{\Gamma}$.*

3. SILTING REDUCTION IN $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\mathrm{proj} \Lambda)$

The goal of this section is to explicitly describe the reduction of $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\mathrm{proj} \Lambda)$ with respect to a presilting object U . Reductions for hereditary extriangulated categories were treated in general in [GNP23, Section 2.2.3]. In our setting, we show that the reduction of $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\mathrm{proj} \Lambda)$ by a 2-term presilting complex is equivalent to the 2-term category of perfect complexes over a non-positive dg algebra. This is

done using Iyama-Yoshino reduction in $\mathcal{K}^b(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ [IY08] as well as Iyama-Yang's results showing that the Verdier localisation by a presilting object is a reduction [IY18]. We show that both operations are compatible with those in [GNP23]. This is a particular case of the reduction of a 0-Auslander triangulated category \mathcal{K} with respect to a presilting object U being equivalent to the Verdier localization $\mathcal{K}/\text{thick}(U)$, which was shown in general in [Bør24].

3.1. Thick subcategories generated by 2-term presilting complexes. Let \mathcal{H} be a full subcategory of an extriangulated category \mathcal{K} . We say that \mathcal{H} is *closed under extensions* if for every conflation $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z$ such that $X, Z \in \mathcal{H}$, then $Y \in \mathcal{H}$ as well. We say that \mathcal{H} is *closed under cones* (resp. *closed under cocones*) if for any inflation $X \xrightarrow{f} Y$ (resp. deflation $X \xrightarrow{g} Y$) with $X, Y \in \mathcal{H}$ we have that $\text{Cone}(f) \in \mathcal{H}$ (resp. $\text{Cocone}(g) \in \mathcal{H}$).

Definition 3.1. [NOS22] Let \mathcal{K} be an extriangulated category. We say that a full subcategory $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{K}$ is *thick* if it is stable under finite direct sums and direct summands, and closed under extensions, cones and cocones.

If \mathcal{D} is a triangulated category with shift functor Σ , then a full subcategory \mathcal{T} of \mathcal{D} is thick (with respect to the previous definition) if and only if it is a triangulated subcategory which is stable under direct summands. Recall that if $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{D}$ is a full and closed under extensions, then it is extriangulated [NP19] with respect to $\Sigma|_{\mathcal{K}}$. The next proposition follows from the definitions.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{D}$ be a thick subcategory of \mathcal{D} and let $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{D}$ be closed under extensions and direct summands. Then $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{K}$ is a thick subcategory of the extriangulated category \mathcal{K} .*

In what follows, $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{K}^b(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ and $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$. Since we will work with the notion of thick subcategory in the triangulated category $\mathcal{K}^b(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ as well as the notion of thick subcategory in the extriangulated category $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$, to avoid confusion, for any subcategories $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{K}^b(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ and $\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ we will denote $\text{thick}_b(\mathcal{C})$ the smallest (triangulated) thick subcategory in $\mathcal{K}^b(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ containing \mathcal{C} , and by $\text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(\mathcal{H})$ the smallest (extriangulated) thick subcategory of $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ that contains \mathcal{H} . The following proposition relates both notions.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $U \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ be a 2-term presilting object and $\mathcal{U} = \text{add}(U)$, then*

$$\text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(\mathcal{U}) = \text{thick}_b(\mathcal{U}) \cap \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda) = (\mathcal{U}[-1] * \mathcal{U} * \mathcal{U}[1]) \cap \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda).$$

In order to prove Lemma 3.3 we will make use of the following proposition.

Proposition 3.4. *Let \mathcal{D} be a Hom-finite, Krull-Schmidt triangulated category. If $\mathcal{U} = \text{add}(U)$ is a presilting subcategory of \mathcal{C} , then*

(i) [IY18, Propositions 2.7] *For all $n \leq 0$,*

$$\mathcal{U} * \mathcal{U}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{U}[n] = \text{add}(\mathcal{U} * \mathcal{U}[1] * \cdots * \mathcal{U}[n]).$$

(ii) [AI12, Propositions 2.15]

$$\begin{aligned} \text{thick}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{U}) &= \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \text{add}(\mathcal{U}[-n] * \mathcal{U}[1-n] * \cdots * \mathcal{U}[n-1] * \mathcal{U}[n]) \\ &= \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{U}[-n] * \mathcal{U}[1-n] * \cdots * \mathcal{U}[n-1] * \mathcal{U}[n]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 3.3. It follows from the definitions that $\text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(U) \subset \text{thick}_b(U) \cap \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$. Let $X \in (\mathcal{U}[-1] * \mathcal{U} * \mathcal{U}[1]) \cap \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$, then there exists a triangle

$$(3.1) \quad V[-1] \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \dashrightarrow V$$

where $V \in \mathcal{U}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{U} * \mathcal{U}[1]$. In particular Y is a 2-term complex in $\mathcal{U} * \mathcal{U}[1]$. By definition, there exists a triangle

$$(3.2) \quad \bar{U}' \rightarrow Y \rightarrow \bar{U}[1] \dashrightarrow \bar{U}'[1]$$

with $\bar{U}, \bar{U}' \in \mathcal{U}$. A rotation of the previous triangle gives a conflation $\bar{U} \twoheadrightarrow \bar{U}' \twoheadrightarrow Y$ in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$, which implies that $Y \in \text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(U)$. By rotating the triangle 3.1, we get $X \twoheadrightarrow Y \twoheadrightarrow V$, implying that $X \in \text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(U)$. Thus

$$(\mathcal{U}[-1] * \mathcal{U} * \mathcal{U}[1]) \cap \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda) \subset \text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(U).$$

We show now that $\text{thick}_b(U) \cap \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda) \subset \mathcal{U}[-1] * \mathcal{U} * \mathcal{U}[1]$. Since \mathcal{U} is presilting, by Proposition 3.4 we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{thick}_b(U) &= \text{thick}_b(\mathcal{U}) = \\ &= \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{U}[-n] * \mathcal{U}[1-n] * \cdots * \mathcal{U}[n-1] * \mathcal{U}[n]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $X \in \text{thick}_b(U) \cap \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$. Then there exists n such that $X \in \mathcal{U}[-n] * \mathcal{U}[1-n] * \cdots * \mathcal{U}[n-1] * \mathcal{U}[n]$. Since taking extensions is an associative operation, we can find a triangle

$$U'[-n] \xrightarrow{f} X \rightarrow X' \dashrightarrow U'[1-n]$$

where $U' \in \mathcal{U}$ and $X' \in \mathcal{U}[1-n] * \cdots * \mathcal{U}[n-1] * \mathcal{U}[n]$. Suppose that $n > 1$. Since both X and U' are 2-term complexes, $X \in {}^\perp \mathcal{U}[\leq 2] \cap \mathcal{U}[\geq 2]^\perp$. This implies that $f = 0$ and thus, X is a direct summand of X' . By Proposition 3.4 i), we know that $\mathcal{U}[1-n] * \cdots * \mathcal{U}[n-1] * \mathcal{U}[n] = \text{add}(\mathcal{U}[1-n] * \cdots * \mathcal{U}[n-1] * \mathcal{U}[n])$ and thus $X \in \mathcal{U}[1-n] * \cdots * \mathcal{U}[n-1] * \mathcal{U}[n]$. By applying the previous argument whenever $i - n < -1$, we can deduce that $X \in \mathcal{U}[-1] * \mathcal{U} * \cdots * \mathcal{U}[n-1] * \mathcal{U}[n]$. Using again the associativity of taking extension, we can find a triangle

$$X'' \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{g} U''[n] \dashrightarrow X''[1].$$

where $X'' \in \mathcal{U}[-1] * \mathcal{U} * \cdots * \mathcal{U}[n-1]$ and $U'' \in \mathcal{U}$. Once more, if $n > 1$ we deduce that $g = 0$, since both X and U'' are 2-term complexes, and thus X is a direct summand of $X'' \in \mathcal{U}[-1] * \mathcal{U} * \cdots * \mathcal{U}[n-1] = \text{add}(\mathcal{U}[-1] * \mathcal{U} * \cdots * \mathcal{U}[n-1])$. We conclude that $X \in \mathcal{U}[-1] * \mathcal{U} * \cdots * \mathcal{U}[n-1]$. Applying this argument recursively whenever $n - i > 1$, we finally get that $X \in \mathcal{U}[-1] * \mathcal{U} * \mathcal{U}[1]$. We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{U}[-1] * \mathcal{U} * \mathcal{U}[1]) \cap \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda) &\subset \text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(U) \\ &\subset \text{thick}_b(U) \cap \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda) \subset (\mathcal{U}[-1] * \mathcal{U} * \mathcal{U}[1]) \cap \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda), \end{aligned}$$

which gives the result. \square

Corollary 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ be a thick subcategory and consider $U \in \mathcal{H}$ a 2-term presilting object. If $\text{thick}_b(U) = \text{thick}_b(\mathcal{H})$, then $\text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(U) = \mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. Suppose $\text{thick}_b(U) = \text{thick}_b(\mathcal{H})$ and let $\mathcal{U} = \text{add}(U)$. Since $U \in \mathcal{H}$ and since \mathcal{H} is thick, we have that $\text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(U) \subset \mathcal{H}$. For the other inclusion note that $\mathcal{H} \subset \text{thick}_b(\mathcal{H}) \cap \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda) = \text{thick}_b(U) \cap \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$. By Lemma 3.3, $\text{thick}_b(U) \cap \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda) = \text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(U)$, which gives the result. \square

3.2. Silting reduction in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$. Before introducing the notion of reduction in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$, let us first recall O. Iyama and D. Yang's additive description of the reduction of a triangulated category with respect to a presilting subcategory.

Theorem 3.6. [IY18, Theorem 1.1] *Let \mathcal{D} be a triangulated category and let \mathcal{U} be a presilting subcategory of \mathcal{D} satisfying certain mild assumptions¹. Let $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{U}} = \mathcal{D}/\text{thick}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{U})$ the triangle quotient of \mathcal{D} with respect to \mathcal{U} . Let $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}} = ({}^{\perp \mathcal{D}}\mathcal{U}[> 0]) \cap \mathcal{U}[< 0]^{\perp \mathcal{D}}$. Then the additive quotient $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}/[\mathcal{U}]$ has a natural structure of a triangulated category and we have a triangle equivalence*

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}/[\mathcal{U}] \xrightarrow{\bar{\rho}} \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{U}},$$

where $\bar{\rho}$ is induced by the functor $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}} \subset \mathcal{D} \xrightarrow{\rho} \mathcal{D}/\text{thick}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{U}) = \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{U}}$.

Theorem 3.7. [IY18, Theorem 3.7] *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.6, the functor $\rho : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{U}}$ induces a bijection between the sets of presilting subcategories in $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{U}}$ and presilting subcategories in \mathcal{D} containing \mathcal{U} . Moreover, a subcategory $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{D}$ containing \mathcal{U} is silting if and only if $\rho(\mathcal{P})$ is silting in $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{U}}$.*

From now on $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{K}^b(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ and $\mathcal{U} = \text{add}(U)$ where U is a 2-term presilting object in $\mathcal{K}^b(\text{proj } \Lambda)$. In this setting, the category $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{U}}$ of Theorem 3.6 has the following explicit description.

Proposition 3.8. [Nee92, Bør21] *Let Λ be a finite-dimensional algebra and let U be a basic 2-term presilting complex in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ with Bongartz completion T_U . Then $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{U}} = \mathcal{K}^b(\text{proj } \Lambda)/\text{thick}_b(\mathcal{U})$ is equivalent to the category of perfect complexes $\text{per}(C_U)$ where C_U is the dg algebra $\text{End}_{\mathcal{D}}(T_U)/\langle e_U \rangle$.*

Remark 3.9. The choice of C_U as notation is intentional. Let (M, P) be the support τ -rigid pair associated to U , then by [Jas15, Theorem 4.12 b)]

$$H^0(C_U) = \text{End}_{\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{U}}}(T_U) \simeq \text{End}_{\Lambda}(H^0(T_U))/\langle e_{H^0(U)} \rangle,$$

where $\text{End}_{\Lambda}(H^0(T_U))/\langle e_{H^0(U)} \rangle = C_{(M,P)}$ is the algebra associated to the τ -tilting reduction of $\text{mod } \Lambda$ by (M, P) as described by G. Jasso in [Jas15].

The following result is a weaker version of [IY18, Lemma 3.4] which will be essential for our results.

Proposition 3.10. [IY18, Lemma 3.4] *The functor $\mathcal{K}^b(\text{proj } \Lambda) \xrightarrow{\rho} \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{U}}$ induces a bijective map*

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(X, Y[i]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{U}}}(X, Y[i])$$

for every $i > 0$ and $X, Y \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$.

¹These assumptions are satisfied if, for instance, \mathcal{D} is Hom-finite over a field and $\mathcal{U} = \text{add}(U)$ for certain $U \in \mathcal{D}$ that can be completed into a silting object. Since we are working in the context where \mathcal{K} is an algebraic 0-Auslander reduced extriangulated category, and thus equivalent to $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ for certain finite-dimensional algebra Λ [Che23], the needed assumptions hold (for more on these hypotheses, see [IY18, Section 3.1]).

We denote by $\langle 1 \rangle$ the shift functor in \mathcal{J}_U induced by $[1]$. We note that any triangle $X \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} Y \xrightarrow{\bar{g}} Z \dashrightarrow X\langle 1 \rangle$ in \mathcal{J}_U is the image of a triangle in $\mathcal{Z}_U/[U]$, which is in turn isomorphic to triangles obtained from a commutative diagram of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y & \xrightarrow{g} & Z & \dashrightarrow & X[1] \\ \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ X & \xrightarrow{p_U} & U_X & \longrightarrow & X\langle 1 \rangle & \dashrightarrow & X[1], \end{array}$$

where p_U is a minimal left U -approximation of X . This fact says in particular that if $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{Z}_U$ is thick in \mathcal{Z}_U , this remains true for $\mathcal{C}/[U]$ in $\mathcal{Z}_U/[U]$ and thus for $\rho(\mathcal{C}) \subset \rho(\mathcal{Z}_U)$.

The following lemma was originally shown by O. Iyama and D. Yang as a step towards proving Theorem 3.6. In their context, they establish that for any $X \in \mathcal{D}$ there exists $Y \in \mathcal{Z}_U$ such that $X \simeq Y$ in \mathcal{J}_U . In the following lemma, we adapt their arguments to show that if $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{K}^b(\text{proj } \Lambda)$, and $X \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$, then Y can be chosen from $\mathcal{Z}_U \cap \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$.

Lemma 3.11. [IY18, Lemma 3.3] *Let Λ be a finite-dimensional algebra and let U be a basic 2-term presilting object in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$. For any $X \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ there exists $Y \in \mathcal{Z}_U^{[-1,0]} = \mathcal{Z}_U \cap \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ satisfying $X \simeq Y$ in \mathcal{J}_U .*

Proof. Let $U = \text{add}(U)$, with U basic and presilting. First note that

$$\mathcal{Z}_U = \{X \in \mathcal{D} \mid \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(X, U[i]) = 0 = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(U[-i], X) \forall i > 0\}.$$

Since $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(Y, Y[i]) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(Y[-i], Y) = 0$ for all $i \geq 2$ and all $Y \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$, then

$$\mathcal{Z}_U^{[-1,0]} = \{X \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda) \mid \mathbb{E}(X, U) = 0 = \mathbb{E}(U, X)\}.$$

Recall that $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda) = \Lambda * \Lambda[1]$ and that Λ and T_U are isomorphic in \mathcal{J}_U where T_U is the Bongartz completion of U into a silting complex in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$, which by definition lies in $\mathcal{Z}_U^{[-1,0]}$. We will show that we can find $H \in \mathcal{Z}_U^{[-1,0]}$ such that $T_U[1] \simeq H$ in \mathcal{J}_U . Consider the conflation $\Lambda \rightarrow U' \rightarrow V \dashrightarrow \Lambda[1]$ where the first morphism is a minimal right U -approximation of Λ , then by definition $V \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ and $V \simeq \Lambda[1] \simeq T_U[1]$ in \mathcal{J}_U . In fact, $V \simeq T_U^c$ inside \mathcal{J}_U , where T_U^c is the Bongartz co-completion of U , that is, the basic silting complex satisfying that $\text{add}(T_U^c) = \text{add}(V \oplus U)$. Since $T_U^c \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ and $\mathbb{E}(T_U^c, U) = 0 = \mathbb{E}(U, T_U^c)$, we have that $T_U^c \in \mathcal{Z}_U^{[-1,0]}$ and that $T_U * T_U^c \subset \mathcal{Z}_U^{[-1,0]}$. Since the functor $\bar{\rho}$ is a triangle equivalence, by Proposition 3.10 we have that

$$\mathcal{Z}_U^{[-1,0]}/[U] \supseteq (T_U * T_U^c)/[U] \xrightarrow{\bar{\rho}} \rho(\Lambda) *_{\mathcal{J}} \rho(\Lambda)\langle 1 \rangle \simeq \rho(\Lambda * \Lambda[1]) = \subseteq \mathcal{J}_U.$$

In particular, for each $X \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ there exists $X' \in T_U * T_U^c$ such that $\rho(X) \simeq \rho(X')$. \square

Remark 3.12. We note that the full extension-closed subcategory $\mathcal{Z}_U^{[-1,0]}$ is precisely the subcategory considered by M. Gorsky, H. Nakaoka and Y. Palu in [GNP23, Definition 2.7] to define the reduction of an extriangulated category with respect to a presilting object.

Lemma 3.13. *Let $U \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ be a 2-term presilting complex and \mathcal{U} its additive closure. Consider $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$ and $\rho : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}/\text{thick}_b(\mathcal{U})$ as in Theorem 3.6. Let $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ be a thick subcategory such that $U \in \mathcal{H}$. Then*

$$\frac{\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}}{[U]} \simeq \rho(\mathcal{H}).$$

In particular, $\rho(\mathcal{H})$ is thick inside the extriangulated category

$$\rho(\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)) \simeq \text{per}^{[-1,0]}(C_U).$$

Proof. The following argument follows closely the those in [IY18, Proposition 3.2, Lemma 3.3]. We are going to show that for every $X \in \mathcal{H}$ there exists an object $Z \in \mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}} \subset \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}^{[-1,0]}$ such that $\rho(X) \simeq \rho(Z)$. Let $X \in \mathcal{H}$ and take $X \xrightarrow{f} U'[1]$ a minimal left $\mathcal{U}[1]$ -approximation of X and let $Y = \text{Cocone}(f)$. We then can construct a conflation

$$U' \twoheadrightarrow Y \twoheadrightarrow X \xrightarrow{f} U'[1],$$

which implies that $Y \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ and $\text{Hom}(Y, U[n]) = 0$ for all $n \geq 2$. Moreover, applying the functor $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(-, U[1])$ to the previous triangle we obtain an exact sequence

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(U'[1], U[1]) \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(-, f)} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(X, U[1]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(Y, U[1]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(U', U[1]).$$

Given that $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(U', U[1]) = 0$, since U is presilting and since $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(-, f)$ is surjective because f is a left $\mathcal{U}[1]$ -approximation, we deduce that $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(Y, U[1]) = 0$. Now, consider $U''[-1] \xrightarrow{g} Y$ a minimal right $\mathcal{U}[-1]$ -approximation and let $Z = \text{Cone}(g)$, then there exists a conflation

$$Y \twoheadrightarrow Z \twoheadrightarrow U'' \xrightarrow{g[1]} U''[1].$$

In particular, $Z \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ and $Z \in U[< -1]^{\perp}$. As before, by applying the functor $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(U[-1], -)$, and using that g is a right $\mathcal{U}[-1]$ -approximation and U silting, we can deduce that $Z \in U[-1]^{\perp}$. But Z is an extension between two objects in ${}^{\perp}U[1]$, which implies that $Z \in {}^{\perp}U[1] \cap U[> 0] \cap U[< 0]^{\perp} = \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$. Moreover, under the assumption that $U \in \mathcal{H}$, both previous conflations give that both Y and Z lie in \mathcal{H} . We get that

$$\rho(X) \simeq \rho(Y) \simeq \rho(Z),$$

with $Z \in \mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$. Since $\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is thick in $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}^{[-1,0]}$ by Proposition 3.2, we get that

$$\rho(\mathcal{H}) \simeq \bar{\rho}(\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}) \subset \bar{\rho}(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{U}}^{[-1,0]}) \simeq \rho(\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda))$$

is thick in $\rho(\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)) \simeq \text{per}^{[-1,0]}(C_U)$. □

4. THICK SUBCATEGORIES AND COTORSION PAIRS OF g -FINITE ALGEBRAS

In this section we assume that Λ is a g -finite algebra and study the maps between cotorsion pairs, thick subcategories and presilting objects in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ introduced in [Gar23].

4.1. Bijection between cotorsion and torsion classes.

Definition 4.1. [PZ23, Definition 1.7] Let \mathcal{K} be an extriangulated category with extension bifunctor \mathbb{E} . We say that a pair of subcategories $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is a *cotorsion pair* if they are both full and additive and they satisfy

- (1) $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X}^{\perp_1} = \{Y \in \mathcal{K} \mid \mathbb{E}(X, Y) = 0 \forall X \in \mathcal{X}\}$.
- (2) $\mathcal{X} = {}^{\perp_1}\mathcal{Y} = \{X \in \mathcal{K} \mid \mathbb{E}(X, Y) = 0 \forall Y \in \mathcal{Y}\}$.

We say that $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is *complete* [NP19, Definition 4.1], if additionally

$$\mathcal{K} = \text{Cone}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{X}) = \text{Cocone}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{X}).$$

When $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$, we will denote by $\text{cotor } \Lambda$ the set of all cotorsion pairs in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ and by $\text{c-cotor } \Lambda$ the subset of cotorsion pairs of $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ which are complete.

In [PZ23], D. Pauksztello and A. Zvonareva showed that the functor $H^0 : \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda) \rightarrow \text{mod } \Lambda$ induces a map between the set of cotorsion pairs in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ and that of *torsion classes* in $\text{mod } \Lambda$, which we denote by $\text{tors } \Lambda$.

Theorem 4.2. [PZ23, Proposition 3.6 and Theorem 3.7] *Let Λ be a finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra. Then the functor $H^0 : \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda) \rightarrow \text{mod } \Lambda$ induces a well-defined map*

$$\begin{aligned} \psi : \text{cotor } \Lambda &\rightarrow \text{tors } \Lambda \\ (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) &\mapsto H^0(\mathcal{Y}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, ψ induces a bijection between the sets of complete cotorsion pairs in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ and functorially finite torsion classes in $\text{mod } \Lambda$.

The following is an extension of Theorem 4.2.

Theorem 4.3. *Let Λ be a finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra. Then the functor $H^0 : \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda) \rightarrow \Lambda$ induces a bijection*

$$\begin{aligned} \psi : \text{cotor } \Lambda &\rightarrow \text{tors } \Lambda \\ (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) &\mapsto H^0(\mathcal{Y}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Theorem 4.2, the only thing left to prove is that ψ is always a bijection whose inverse map is given by

$$\mathcal{T} \mapsto ({}^{\perp_1}\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{T}})$$

where $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{T}} = \{X \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda) \mid H^0(X) \in \mathcal{T}\}$. It suffices to show that $({}^{\perp_1}\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{T}})^{\perp_1} = \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{T}}$. Remark that for any $X \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$, $X \simeq X_M \oplus Q[1]$, where X_M is the minimal projective presentation of $M = H^0(X)$ and $Q \in \text{proj } \Lambda$. By [Pla13, Lemma 2.6], for any $Y \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ we have that $\mathbb{E}(X_M, Y) \simeq D\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(H^0(Y), \tau M)$. We deduce that for any $X, Y \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(X, Y) &\simeq \mathbb{E}(X_M, Y) \oplus \mathbb{E}(Q[1], Y) \simeq D\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(H^0(Y), \tau M) \oplus \text{Hom}_{[-1,0]}(Q, Y) \\ &\simeq D\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(H^0(Y), \tau M) \oplus \text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(Q, H^0(Y)). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that for any additive subcategory $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^{\perp 1} &= \{X \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda) \mid \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{H}, X) = 0\} \\ &= \text{add} \left(\left\{ X_N \mid N \in {}^{\perp} \tau H^0(\mathcal{H}) \cap (\mathcal{H} \cap \text{add}(\Lambda[1]))[-1]^{\perp} \right\} \cup \text{add}(\Lambda[1]) \right) \\ {}^{\perp 1} \mathcal{H} &= \{X \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda) \mid \mathbb{E}(X, \mathcal{H}) = 0\} \\ &= \text{add} \left(\{X_M \mid \tau M \in H^0(\mathcal{H})^{\perp}\} \cup \left(\text{add}(\Lambda) \cap {}^{\perp} H^0(\mathcal{H}) \right) [1] \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now let $\mathcal{T} \subset \text{mod } \Lambda$ be a torsion class and let $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{T}} = \{X \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda) \mid H^0(X) \in \mathcal{T}\}$. Since \mathcal{T} is closed under direct summands and for every $X, Y \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$, $H^0(X \oplus Y) \simeq H^0(X) \oplus H^0(Y)$, we readily see that $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{T}}$ is additive. This implies that

$${}^{\perp 1} \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{T}} = \text{add} \left(\{X_M \mid \tau M \in \mathcal{T}^{\perp}\} \cup \left(\text{add}(\Lambda) \cap {}^{\perp} \mathcal{T} \right) [1] \right).$$

Hence

$$H^0({}^{\perp 1} \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{T}}) = \{M \in \text{mod } \Lambda \mid \tau M \in \mathcal{T}^{\perp}\} = \text{add}(\tau^{-1}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp}) \cup \text{add}(\Lambda))$$

and

$${}^{\perp 1} \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{T}} \cap \text{add}(\Lambda[1]) = \left(\text{add}(\Lambda) \cap {}^{\perp} \mathcal{T} \right) [1].$$

Finally, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} ({}^{\perp 1} \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{T}})^{\perp 1} &= \\ &= \text{add} \left(\left\{ X_N \mid N \in {}^{\perp} \tau H^0({}^{\perp 1} \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{T}}) \cap \left({}^{\perp 1} \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{T}} \cap \text{add}(\Lambda[1]) \right) [-1]^{\perp} \right\} \cup \text{add}(\Lambda[1]) \right) \\ &= \text{add} \left(\left\{ X_N \mid N \in {}^{\perp} \tau (\tau^{-1}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp}) \cup \text{add}(\Lambda)) \cap \left(\text{add}(\Lambda) \cap {}^{\perp} \mathcal{T} \right)^{\perp} \right\} \cup \text{add}(\Lambda[1]) \right) \end{aligned}$$

The only thing left to prove is that

$${}^{\perp} \tau (\tau^{-1}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp}) \cup \text{add}(\Lambda)) \cap \left(\text{add}(\Lambda) \cap {}^{\perp} \mathcal{T} \right)^{\perp} = \mathcal{T}.$$

Note that $\tau (\tau^{-1}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp}) \cup \text{add}(\Lambda)) = \tau (\tau^{-1}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp}))$. Since $\tau (\tau^{-1}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp}))$ and $\mathcal{T}^{\perp} \setminus (\mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \text{inj } \Lambda)$ have the same indecomposables, we get that

$${}^{\perp} \tau (\tau^{-1}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp}) \cup \text{add}(\Lambda)) = {}^{\perp} (\mathcal{T}^{\perp} \setminus (\mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \text{inj } \Lambda)).$$

Given that \mathcal{T} is a torsion class and hence $\mathcal{T} = {}^{\perp}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp})$, we have that

$$\mathcal{T} \subset {}^{\perp} (\mathcal{T}^{\perp} \setminus (\mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \text{inj } \Lambda)) \cap \left(\text{add}(\Lambda) \cap {}^{\perp} \mathcal{T} \right)^{\perp}.$$

For the other inclusion, let M in ${}^{\perp} (\mathcal{T}^{\perp} \setminus (\mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \text{inj } \Lambda)) \cap \left(\text{add}(\Lambda) \cap {}^{\perp} \mathcal{T} \right)^{\perp}$. We want to prove that $M \in {}^{\perp}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp})$. Let L be an indecomposable in \mathcal{T}^{\perp} . If L is not injective, then $\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(M, L) = 0$ by definition of M . Assume thus that $L = I_i$, where $I_i \in \mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \text{inj } \Lambda$ is the injective envelope of the simple S_i . Recall that for any $N \in \text{mod } \Lambda$, $\text{Hom}(N, I_i) = 0$ if and only if $\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(P_i, N) = 0$, where P_i is the projective cover of S_i . Thus $I_i \in \mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \text{inj } \Lambda$ if and only if $\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(\mathcal{T}, I_i) = 0 = \text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(P_i, \mathcal{T})$, which is equivalent to $P_i \in \text{add}(\Lambda) \cap {}^{\perp} \mathcal{T}$. But $M \in \left(\text{add}(\Lambda) \cap {}^{\perp} \mathcal{T} \right)^{\perp}$ as well, so we have that

$$\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(P_i, M) = 0 = \text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(M, I_i).$$

We conclude that $M \in {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp) = \mathcal{T}$. In particular we get that

$$({}^\perp\mathcal{Y}_\mathcal{T})^{\perp 1} = \text{add}(\{X_N \mid N \in \mathcal{T}\} \cup \text{add}(\Lambda[1])) = \mathcal{Y}_\mathcal{T}$$

which implies that $({}^\perp\mathcal{Y}_\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{Y}_\mathcal{T})$ is a cotorsion pair. \square

Theorem 4.3 induces a “mirror” of Theorem 1.2 in the category of projective presentations:

Corollary 4.4. *Let Λ be a finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) Λ is g -finite.
- (2) There exist finitely many complete cotorsion pairs in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$.
- (3) All cotorsion pairs in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ are complete.

Proof. The implications follow from Theorem 4.3, Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 1.2. \square

Example 4.5 (Kronecker Quiver). Consider Λ to be the path algebra the Kronecker quiver

$$1 \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\alpha} \\ \xrightarrow{\beta} \end{array} 2 .$$

Recall that all torsion classes of Λ can be described as the additive closure of one of the following four types of subsets of indecomposable modules :

- (1) Any final part of the preinjective component of the Auslander-Reiten quiver of $\text{mod } \Lambda$.
- (2) All preinjectives and a subset of the tubes of the Auslander-Reiten quiver of $\text{mod } \Lambda$.
- (3) All preinjectives, all tubes and a final part of the postprojective component of the Auslander-Reiten quiver of $\text{mod } \Lambda$
- (4) The module P_1 whose dimension vector is $(1, 0)$.




FIGURE 1. Example of a non-complete cotorsion pair $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ when Λ is the Kronecker algebra. Here λ and λ' lie in two disjoint parts of $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{k})$. The object at the base of the tube corresponding to the point at infinity is $P_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha} P_2$.

From these torsion classes, all are functorially finite with the exception of those of type (2). As a result of Theorem 4.3, we can explicitly describe all cotorsion pairs of $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$. All complete ones are easily described by the results of T. Adachi and M. Tsukamoto in [AT22], who showed that any complete cotorsion

pair $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ satisfies that $\mathcal{X} = \text{Cocone}(\text{add}(U), \text{add}(U))$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \text{Cone}(\text{add}(U), \text{add}(U))$ for a certain two-term silting object $U \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ satisfying $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y} = \text{add}(U)$. A non-complete cotorsion pair $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is presented in Figure 1. Note that in this case $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y}$ is always trivial.

4.2. All thick subcategories have enough injectives and projectives. Let Λ be a finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra. A *wide subcategory* of $\text{mod } \Lambda$ is a full additive subcategory of $\text{mod } \Lambda$ that is closed under extensions, kernels and cokernels. We say that a wide subcategory is *left finite*, if the smallest torsion class containing it is functorially finite. Left finite wide subcategories were defined by F. Marks and J. Šťovíček in [MŠ17], where it was shown that they are in bijection with functorially finite torsion classes. Given that the definition of a left finite wide subcategory is given by a condition on its associated torsion class, the following results follows immediately from Theorem 1.2.

Corollary 4.6. [DIJ19, MŠ17] *If Λ is a g -finite finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra, then all wide subcategories are left finite.*

In [Gar23], new maps between cotorsion pairs, thick subcategories and silting complexes in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ were introduced. These maps mirror the maps between torsion classes, wide subcategories and support τ -tilting pairs of $\text{mod } \Lambda$ introduced in [AIR14], [IT09] and [MŠ17]; and restrict to bijections for certain subsets of these sets of objects. We denote by $\text{thick } \Lambda$ the set of thick subcategories of $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ and by $\text{inj-thick } \Lambda$ the set of those thick subcategories that have enough injectives with respect to the extriangulated structure inherited of $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$.

Theorem 4.7. [Gar23, Theorem 3.1] *Let Λ be a finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra. There exists a well defined map*

$$\text{cotor } \Lambda \xrightarrow{\beta} \text{thick } \Lambda$$

given by

$\beta(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) = \{X \in \mathcal{X} \mid \forall \text{ conflation } X \rightarrow X' \rightarrow X'' \text{ such that } X' \in \mathcal{X}, \text{ then } X'' \in \mathcal{X}\}$.
for any $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) \in \text{cotor } \Lambda$. Moreover, β induces a bijection between the set of complete cotorsion pairs and that of thick subcategories with enough injectives.

Theorem 4.8. [Gar23, Theorem 3.15] *Let Λ be a finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra. There exists a well defined map*

$$\text{thick } \Lambda \xrightarrow{\mathscr{W}} \text{wide } \Lambda$$

such that, when restricted to thick subcategories with enough injectives and left finite wide subcategories, it fits in the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & & \text{2-silt } \Lambda \\
 & \nearrow \Psi & \searrow \text{thick}(U_\rho) \\
 \text{c-cotor } \Lambda & \xrightarrow{\beta} & \text{inj-thick } \Lambda \\
 \downarrow \Phi & & \downarrow \mathscr{W} \\
 \text{f-tors } \Lambda & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & \text{l-wide } \Lambda
 \end{array}$$

$\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ $\text{mod } \Lambda$

In particular, \mathscr{W} and the map taking any $U \in 2\text{-silt } \Lambda$ to the thick category $\text{thick}(U_\rho) \in \text{inj-thick } \Lambda$ are bijective. Here, U_ρ is the basic direct summand of U satisfying $\text{add}(U_\rho) = \text{add}(U')$, where U' is such that $U' \rightarrow \Lambda[1]$ is a minimal right $\text{add}(U)$ -approximation of $\Lambda[1]$.

Corollary 4.9. [Gar23, Corollary 1.1] *There are explicit bijections between:*

- (i) *Isomorphism classes of basic sifting objects in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$.*
- (ii) *Complete cotorsion pairs in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$.*
- (iii) *Thick subcategories in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ with enough injectives.*

These bijections fit in the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & 2\text{-silt } \Lambda & & \\
 & \swarrow [\text{AT22}] & \downarrow \beta & \searrow \text{thick}(U_\rho) & \\
 \text{cotor } \Lambda & & & & \text{inj-thick } \Lambda \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow [\text{AIR14}] H^0 & & \downarrow \mathscr{W} \\
 \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda) & & & & \text{mod } \Lambda \\
 \downarrow [\text{PZ23}] H^0 & & \downarrow & & \\
 \text{f-tors } \Lambda & & \text{s}\tau\text{-tilt } \Lambda & & \text{l-wide } \Lambda \\
 & \swarrow [\text{AIR14}] & \downarrow \alpha & \searrow & \\
 & & \text{[MS17]} & &
 \end{array}$$

Unlike being a left finite wide subcategory, having enough injectives is a characteristic of thick subcategories that is inherent to them. In this section, we establish an equivalence between being g -finite and having finitely many thick subcategories. Furthermore, we will show that if Λ is g -finite, then every thick subcategory in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ is generated by a 2-term presilting complex, and that we can choose it to be injective in the thick subcategory it generates.

First, we will need to show that if Λ is a g -finite algebra, then all non-trivial thick subcategories in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ contain a non-zero presilting complex. For any $X \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$, we denote by $[X]$ the class of X in the Grothendieck group $K_0(\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda))$.

Proposition 4.10. *Let Λ be a finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra. Suppose that Λ is g -finite and let $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ be a full additive subcategory that is closed under extensions. If $X \in \mathcal{H}$, then \mathcal{H} contains a presilting object $0 \neq U$ such that $[X] = [U]$ or \mathcal{H} contains a non-zero $P \in \text{proj } \Lambda$ and its shift $P[1]$.*

To establish 4.10, we will employ an algebraic-geometric result concerning the varieties of bounded complexes of projective modules over a finite-dimensional algebra. Let $p < q \in \mathbb{Z}$ and consider $\mathcal{C}^{[p,q]}(\text{proj } \Lambda) \subset \mathcal{C}^b(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ the category of complexes of projective Λ -modules concentrated in degrees in the interval $[p, q]$. Fix a set of representatives $\{P_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ of the isoclasses of indecomposable projective Λ -modules, then for any choice of $\vec{l} = (l_p, \dots, l_{p+j}, \dots, l_q) \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n)^{q-p+1}$ where $l_j = (l_{j,1}, l_{j,2}, \dots, l_{j,n})$, we define $R_{\vec{l}}$ to be the closed subvariety

$$R_{\vec{l}} \subset \prod_{j=0}^{q-p-1} \text{Hom}_\Lambda \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n P_i^{\oplus l_{p+j,i}}, \bigoplus_{i=1}^n P_i^{\oplus l_{p+j+1,i}} \right)$$

defined by the relation $f_{p+i+1} \circ f_{p+i} = 0$ for all $0 \leq i \leq q-p-2$. In other words, $R_{\bar{l}}$ parametrizes all complexes in $\mathcal{C}^{[p,q]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ with $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n P_i^{\oplus l_{p+j,i}}$ in position $p+j$. The variety $R_{\bar{l}}$ is equipped with a group action of

$$G_{\bar{l}} = \prod_{j=0}^{q-p} \text{Aut}_{\Lambda} \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n P_i^{\oplus l_{p+j,i}} \right)$$

given by

$$(g_{p+j})_{0 \leq j \leq q-p} \cdot (f_{p+i})_{0 \leq i \leq q-p-1} = (g_{p+i+1} f_{p+i} g_{p+i}^{-1})_{0 \leq i \leq q-p-1}.$$

Theorem 4.11. [JSZ05, Theorem 2] *Let Λ be a finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra and suppose that $\mathbb{k} = \bar{\mathbb{k}}$. Let $\bar{l} = (l_p, \dots, l_{p+j}, \dots, l_q) \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n)^{q-p+1}$ for some $p < q \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $N, M \in R_{\bar{l}}$ such that $N \in \overline{G_{\bar{l}} \cdot M}$. Then there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and exact sequences in $\mathcal{C}^b(\text{proj } \Lambda)$*

$$0 \rightarrow N_0 \rightarrow N_{i+1} \rightarrow N_i \rightarrow 0$$

for any $0 \leq i \leq m-1$ such that $N_0 = N$ and $N_m \simeq M \oplus N'$ for some $N' \in \mathcal{C}^{[p,q]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$.

We will also make use of the following known result, which follows from [DIJ19].

Proposition 4.12. [DIJ19] *Suppose that Λ is g -finite. Then for any $\theta \in K_0(\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda))$ there exists a presilting object $X \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ such that $[X] = \theta$.*

Theorem 4.13. [DIJ19, Theorem 6.5] *Let Λ be a finite-dimensional algebra and let U and V be 2-term presilting complexes in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$. Then $[U] = [V]$ if and only if $U \simeq V$.*

Proof of Proposition 4.10. Note that if $\mathcal{H} = \{0\}$ then the proposition follows immediately. Suppose then that there is $0 \neq X \in \mathcal{H}$.

Case $[X] = 0$: If $[X] = 0$, given that the only 2-term presilting complex with zero g -vector is 0, we have to show that there exists a non-zero projective module P such that $\begin{smallmatrix} P \\ \downarrow \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix} \in \mathcal{H}$. Since $[X] = 0$, there exists $P \in \text{proj } \Lambda$ such that $X \simeq \begin{smallmatrix} P \\ \downarrow f \\ P \end{smallmatrix}$.

If f is not radical, then X is isomorphic to some $\begin{smallmatrix} P' \oplus P'' \\ \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} f & 0 \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix} \\ P' \oplus P \end{smallmatrix}$ with a invertible.

Since \mathcal{H} is additive we can assume that $\begin{smallmatrix} P' \\ \downarrow f' \\ P' \end{smallmatrix} \in \mathcal{H}$. Thus we can suppose that f is radical and hence there exists $m \geq 1$ such that $f^m = 0$. Consider the morphism $\delta \in \text{Hom}(X, X[1])$ given by the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & P \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ P & \xrightarrow{1_P} & P \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow \\ P & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

Since f is radical, then $\delta \neq 0$ and its mapping cone $\begin{array}{c} P \oplus P \\ \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} -f & 0 \\ 1_P & f \end{pmatrix} \\ P \oplus P \end{array}$ is isomorphic to the complex in the rightmost column of the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P \oplus P & \begin{array}{c} \begin{pmatrix} 1_P & f \\ 0 & 1_P \end{pmatrix} \\ \xrightarrow{\cong} \end{array} & P \oplus P \\ \begin{array}{c} \begin{pmatrix} -f & 0 \\ 1_P & f \end{pmatrix} \downarrow \\ P \oplus P \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & f^2 \\ 1_P & 0 \end{pmatrix} \downarrow \\ P \oplus P \end{array} \\ & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\cong} \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1_P & f \\ 0 & 1_P \end{pmatrix} \end{array} & \end{array}$$

This implies that $X^{(1)} = \text{Cone}(\delta)[-1] \simeq \begin{array}{c} P \\ \downarrow_{f^2} \\ P \end{array}$ belongs to the thick subcategory \mathcal{H} since it is an self-extension of X . By repeating this argument we can construct objects $X^{(i)} \simeq \begin{array}{c} P \\ \downarrow_{f^{2i}} \end{array}$ for every $i \geq 1$. By choosing i such that $2i \geq m$ we conclude that $P \oplus P[1] \simeq \begin{array}{c} P \\ \downarrow_{0=f^{2i}} \end{array}$ is in \mathcal{H} , and since \mathcal{H} is closed under direct summands, then both P and $P[1]$ are in \mathcal{H} .

Case $[X] \neq 0$: First suppose that $\mathbb{k} = \bar{\mathbb{k}}$. Let $X \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $[X] \neq 0$, then $X = \begin{array}{c} X^{-1} \\ \downarrow_f \\ X^0 \end{array}$, where $[X^{-1}] \neq [X^0]$. Recall that we can decompose the g -vector of X as $[X] = \theta_X^+ - \theta_X^-$, where $\theta_X^+ = (\max\{0, \theta_{X,i}\})_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ and $\theta_X^- = (\max\{0, -\theta_{X,i}\})_{1 \leq i \leq n}$. By Proposition 4.12 there exist a 2-term presilting complex U whose g -vector is $[X]$. Take u the point in $\text{Hom}(P^{\theta_X^-}, P^{\theta_X^+})$ corresponding to U , which has an open dense orbit (see for instance [Pla13, Lemma 2.16]). Choose $Q \in \text{proj } \Lambda$ such that $P^{\theta_X^-} \oplus Q = X^{-1}$ and $P^{\theta_X^+} \oplus Q = X^0$, then $u \oplus 1_Q$ still has an open dense orbit in $\text{Hom}(X^{-1}, X^0)$. Hence $\overline{G \cdot u \oplus 1_Q} = \text{Hom}(X^{-1}, X^0)$, and $X \in \overline{G \cdot U \oplus \begin{array}{c} Q \\ \parallel \\ Q \end{array}}$. From

Theorem 4.11 we deduce that $U \oplus \begin{array}{c} Q \\ \parallel \\ Q \end{array}$ can be constructed as a direct summand of a sequence of self-extensions of X in $\mathcal{C}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$. In particular, U is contained in \mathcal{H} and $[U] = [X]$. This proves the result over an algebraically closed field.

Now let \mathbb{k} be any field and let $\mathbb{K} = \bar{\mathbb{k}}$. We have a fully faithful functor $\mathcal{C}^b(\text{proj } \Lambda) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}^b(\text{proj } \Lambda \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K})$ induced by $- \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K}$. Let $X \in \mathcal{H}$ be as before and consider $\bar{X} = X \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K})$. By the previous argument we can find a 2-term presilting complex $\bar{U} \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K})$ that is a direct summand of an object obtained by a sequence of self-extensions of \bar{X} . Explicitly, there are exact

sequences in $\mathcal{C}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K})$

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \bar{X}_0^{-1} & \longrightarrow & \bar{X}_{i+1}^{-1} & \longrightarrow & \bar{X}_i^{-1} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \bar{f}_0 & & \downarrow \bar{f}_{i+1} & & \downarrow \bar{f}_i \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \bar{X}_0^0 & \longrightarrow & \bar{X}_{i+1}^0 & \longrightarrow & \bar{X}_i^0 \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

for $0 \leq i \leq m-1$ where $\bar{X} = \begin{array}{ccc} X^{-1} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K} & & \bar{X}_0^{-1} \\ & \downarrow f \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K} & = \downarrow \bar{f}_0 \\ X^0 \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K} & & \bar{X}_0^0 \end{array}$ and such that \bar{U} is a direct

summand of $\bar{X}_m = \begin{array}{ccc} \bar{X}_m^{-1} & & \\ & \downarrow \bar{f}_m & \\ \bar{X}_m^0 & & \end{array}$. In particular, for $i=0$ we get

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \bar{X}_0^{-1} & \longrightarrow & \bar{X}_1^{-1} & \longrightarrow & \bar{X}_0^{-1} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \bar{f}_0 & & \downarrow \bar{f}_1 & & \downarrow \bar{f}_0 \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \bar{X}_0^0 & \longrightarrow & \bar{X}_1^0 & \longrightarrow & \bar{X}_0^0 \longrightarrow 0 . \end{array}$$

By definition, both lines in the commutative diagram 4.2 are short exact sequences. Since $\bar{X}_0^{-1} = X_0^{-1} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K}$ and $\bar{X}_0^0 = X_0^0 \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K}$ are projective modules in $\text{proj } \Lambda \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K}$, both exact sequences split. In particular

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{X}_1^{-1} &\simeq (X_0^{-1} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K}) \oplus (X_0^{-1} \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K}) \simeq (X_0^{-1} \oplus X_0^{-1}) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K} \\ \bar{X}_1^0 &\simeq (X_0^0 \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K}) \oplus (X_0^0 \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K}) \simeq (X_0^0 \oplus X_0^0) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K} \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}_1 &\in \text{Hom}_{\Lambda \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K}} \left((X_0^{-1} \oplus X_0^{-1}) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K}, (X_0^0 \oplus X_0^0) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K} \right) \\ &\simeq \text{Hom}_{\Lambda} (X_0^{-1} \oplus X_0^{-1}, X_0^0 \oplus X_0^0) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K}. \end{aligned}$$

We deduce that the exact sequence of complexes 4.2 is induced by an exact sequence of complexes in $\mathcal{C}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ under the functor $- \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K}$. By applying the same argument for every $0 \leq i \leq m-1$ and its respective exact sequence 4.1, we deduce that all self-extensions of $\bar{X} = X \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K}$ lie in $\mathcal{C}^b(\text{proj } \Lambda) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K}$. In particular, there exists $U \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ which is a direct summand of a sequence of self-extensions of X such that $\bar{U} \simeq U \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{K}$. Moreover, U is presilting if and only if \bar{U} is (see for instance [DIJ19, Proposition 6.6 b)), and $[X] = [\bar{X}] = [\bar{U}] = [U]$, which finishes the proof. \square

Theorem 4.14. *Let Λ be a g -finite, finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra. Let \mathcal{H} be any thick subcategory of $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$, then there exists a presilting complex $U \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ such that $\mathcal{H} = \text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(U)$.*

Proof. Let Λ be any g -finite finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra and let \mathcal{H} be a thick subcategory of $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$. If $\mathcal{H} = \{0\}$ then we are done. If not, take $0 \neq X \in \mathcal{H}$. By Proposition 4.10 there exists a presilting $0 \neq U$ in \mathcal{H} and we let $\text{thick}_b(U)$ be the thick subcategory of $\mathcal{K}^b(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ generated by U . By Lemma 3.3 we know that $\text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(U) = \text{thick}_b(U) \cap \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$. Consider $\mathcal{J}_U = \mathcal{K}^b(\text{proj } \Lambda) / \text{thick}_b(U)$ and $\rho : \mathcal{K}^b(\text{proj } \Lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{J}_U$ as in Theorem 3.6. By Lemma 3.13, we know that $\mathcal{H}' = \rho(\mathcal{H})$ is a thick subcategory of $\rho(\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)) \simeq \text{per}^{[-1,0]}(C_U)$.

Now consider the functor

$$p_* : \text{per}^{[-1,0]}(C_U) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } H^0(C_U))$$

induced by the canonical projection $p : C_U \rightarrow H^0(C_U)$ as in Proposition 2.11. This functor induces an equivalence $p_* : \text{per}^{[-1,0]}(C_U)/\mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } H^0(C_U))$ where \mathcal{I} is the ideal of morphisms that factor through a morphism $X[1] \rightarrow Y$ for $X, Y \in \text{add}(C_U)$. By Corollary 2.14, $p_*(\mathcal{H}')$ is closed under extensions and direct summands. Moreover, if $\mathcal{H}' \neq \{0\}$ then $p_*(\mathcal{H}') \neq \{0\}$ since p_* preserves isomorphism classes. As recalled in Remark 3.9, $\text{mod}(H^0(C_U))$ is equivalent to the τ -tilting reduction of $\text{mod } \Lambda$ associated to U , in particular $H^0(C_U)$ is g -finite by [Jas15, Theorem 3.16]. By applying 4.10 to the category $p_*(\mathcal{H}') \subset \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } H^0(C_U))$, we can find a 2-term presilting object $0 \neq V' \in p_*(\mathcal{H}')$, and thus there exists $V \in \mathcal{H}'$ such that $V' = p_*(V)$ which is itself presilting by Proposition 2.15. Moreover, $V \in \rho(\mathcal{H}) \simeq \bar{\rho}(\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{Z}_U)$, thus by Theorem 3.7 we know that $V = W \oplus U \in \mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{Z}_U \subset \mathcal{H}$, where $W \neq 0$ since we supposed V' and thus V to be non-zero in \mathcal{J}_U . By substituting U by V in the previous argument, we can find a sequence of 2-term presilting complexes $(V_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\text{add}(V_i) \subsetneq \text{add}(V_{i+1})$. Since the number of indecomposables of a presilting 2-term complex is bounded by $|\Lambda|$, the sequence must stabilize, that is for $i \gg 0$

$$\text{add}(V_i) = \text{add}(V_{i+1}) = \text{add}(\bar{U}),$$

where $\bar{U} \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ is a basic presilting complex. Then $\mathcal{H} = \text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(\bar{U})$, which gives the result. \square

Corollary 4.15. *Let Λ be a finite-dimensional algebra, then Λ is g -finite if and only if there exist finitely many thick subcategories in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$.*

Proof. Suppose Λ is g -finite. By Theorem 4.14, any thick subcategory is generated by a presilting complex $U \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$, and since there are finitely many isomorphism classes of such U , then there exist finitely many thick subcategories. Conversely, if there are finitely many thick subcategories, then there are also finitely many of them with enough injectives. Given that Corollary 4.9 establishes a bijection between isomorphism classes 2-term silting complexes and thick subcategories with enough injectives, we conclude that Λ is g -finite. \square

Example 4.16. Consider Λ to be the path algebra the Kronecker quiver

$$Q = 1 \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\alpha} \\ \xrightarrow{\beta} \end{array} 2 .$$

Theorem 4.14 provides yet another illustration of the fact that Λ is g -infinite. Indeed, the tubes in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ provide a family of thick subcategories which do not contain a non-zero presilting object and that have no non-zero object whose g -vector coincides with that of a presilting object of $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$.

Before moving on to prove Theorem 4.22, we first recall the definition of the map \mathscr{W} introduced in Proposition 4.10.

Definition 4.17. Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \text{mod } \Lambda$ and $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ be subcategories of $\text{mod } \Lambda$ and $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ respectively. We define $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})$ to be the full subcategory

of $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ whose objects are all complexes $X = \begin{array}{c} X^{-1} \\ \downarrow x \\ X^0 \end{array}$ such that the \mathbb{k} -linear map

$$\text{Hom}_\Lambda(x, M) : \text{Hom}_\Lambda(X^0, M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_\Lambda(X^{-1}, M)$$

is an isomorphism. Similarly, we define $\mathscr{W}(\mathcal{H})$ as the full subcategory of modules M such that $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(x, M)$ is an isomorphism for all complexes $X = \begin{array}{c} X^{-1} \\ \downarrow x \\ X^0 \end{array} \in \mathcal{H}$.

Proposition 4.18. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \text{mod } \Lambda$ and $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ be subcategories, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{W}(\mathcal{H}) &= \mathcal{H}^{\perp \mathbb{Z}} \cap \text{mod } \Lambda \\ \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}) &= {}^{\perp \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^{\perp \mathbb{Z}} &= \{Y \in \mathcal{D} \mid \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{H}, Y[i]) = 0 \ \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}\} \\ {}^{\perp \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{C} &= \{Y \in \mathcal{D} \mid \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(Y[i], \mathcal{C}) = 0 \ \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}\} \end{aligned}$$

and $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^b(\text{mod } \Lambda)$.

Proof. Let $M \in \text{mod } \Lambda$ and $X = \begin{array}{c} X^{-1} \\ \downarrow f \\ X^0 \end{array} \in \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$. Then $M \in \mathscr{W}(X)$ (or equivalently $X \in \mathcal{T}(M)$) if and only if the \mathbb{k} -linear map

$$\text{Hom}_\Lambda(X^0, M) \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_\Lambda(f, M)} \text{Hom}_\Lambda(X^{-1}, M)$$

is an isomorphism. By definition, $X \in {}^{\perp} M[i]$ (or equivalently $M \in X[-i]^{\perp}$) for any $i \neq 0, 1$, so the only thing left to prove is the case when $i = 0$ or 1 . Consider the triangle

$$X[-1] \dashrightarrow X^{-1} \xrightarrow{f} X^0 \rightarrow X.$$

Then by applying $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(-, M)$ we get an exact sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(X, M) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(X^0, M) & \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(f, M)} & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(X^{-1}, M) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(X[-1], M) \\ & & \parallel & & \parallel & & \\ & & \text{Hom}_\Lambda(X^0, M) & \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_\Lambda(f, M)} & \text{Hom}_\Lambda(X^{-1}, M) & & \end{array}$$

This implies that $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(f, M)$ is an isomorphism if and only if $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(X[-1], M) \simeq 0 \simeq \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(X, M)$, which is equivalent to $M \in X^{\perp \mathbb{Z}}$ (and $X \in {}^{\perp \mathbb{Z}} M$). \square

Remark 4.19. The wide subcategories $\mathscr{W}(\mathcal{H})$ were already considered in work of L. Angeleri Hügel, F. Marks and J. Vitória [AHMV16a, AHMV16b]. In their work, they are defined with respect to a morphism between two (not necessarily finite-dimensional) projective Λ -modules, and are key to their generalization of large tilting modules and support τ -tilting modules.

Lemma 4.20. *Let Γ be a non-positive dg algebra over \mathbb{k} such that $H^0(\Gamma)$ is finite-dimensional. Let S be a simple module in the heart of the standard t -structure $\{X \in \mathcal{D}(\Gamma) \mid H^i(X) = 0 \text{ for } i \neq 0\} \subset \mathcal{D}(\Gamma)$. Then $X \in \text{per}(\Gamma)$ belongs to ${}^{\perp \mathbb{Z}} S$ if and only if $X \in \text{thick}_{\text{per } \Gamma}(\text{add}(\Gamma) \setminus \text{add}(P))$ where P is the direct summand of Γ satisfying that $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(\Gamma)}(P, S[i])$ is a division algebra if $i = 0$ and is 0 otherwise.*

Proof. We are going to prove that if $X \in {}^{\perp z}S \cap \text{per } \Gamma$ then $X \in \text{thick}_{\text{per } \Gamma}(\text{add}(\Gamma) \setminus \text{add}(P))$. The other direction is straightforward. Let $X \in \text{per } \Gamma$, then by [Pla11, Lemma 2.14] X is quasi-isomorphic to a *twisted complex* in $\mathcal{D}(\Gamma)$, that is, its underlying graded module is of the form

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^l Q_i$$

where $Q_i \in \text{add}(\Gamma)[n_i]$ for some $n_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and its differential is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & f_{12} & \cdots & f_{1l} \\ 0 & d_2 & \cdots & f_{2l} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & d_l \end{pmatrix}$$

where d_i is the differential corresponding to Q_i . Recall that for any $Q \in \text{add}(\Gamma)[n]$, then $\text{Hom}(Q, S[i]) = 0$ if and only if $Q \notin \text{add}(P)$ or $i \neq n$. Since $\text{Hom}(X, S[i]) = 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, we conclude that none of the Q_i are shifts of P . In particular, $X \in \text{thick}_{\text{per } \Gamma}(\text{add}(\Gamma) \setminus \text{add}(P))$. \square

Proposition 4.21. *Let*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W} &: \text{thick } \Lambda \rightarrow \text{wide } \Lambda \\ \mathcal{T} &: \text{wide } \Lambda \rightarrow \text{thick } \Lambda \end{aligned}$$

be the maps defined in Proposition 4.18. Then \mathcal{W} and \mathcal{T} induce mutually inverse bijections between the set of left finite wide subcategories in $\text{mod } \Lambda$ and thick subcategories with enough injectives in $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{H} = \text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(U)$ where U a basic injective generator of \mathcal{H} . Then by Proposition 4.18 we know that $\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{W}(U) = U^{\perp z} \cap \text{mod } \Lambda$. By Theorem 4.8, we know that $\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{W}_{(M,P)}$ where (M, P) is the support τ -tilting pair associated to the presilting complex U . The only thing we need to prove is that $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{W}_{(M,P)}) \subset \text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(U)$, since the other inclusion is always satisfied.

Recall that since U is a 2-term presilting complex, it can be completed into a 2-term silting complex. Let T_U the Bongartz completion of U . Since U is injective in $\mathcal{H} = \text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(U)$, then $T_U = U \oplus V$ where V is the Bongartz complement of U satisfying that $\text{add}(V) \cap \text{add}(U) = 0$ [Gar23, Lemma 3.11]. Let $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{D}^{[-1,0]}(\text{mod } \Lambda)$ be the simple-minded collection associated to T_U , then $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_U \sqcup \mathcal{S}_V$ where $\mathcal{S}_U = U^{\perp z} \cap \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}_V = V^{\perp z} \cap \mathcal{S}$. By [Asa20, Theorem 2.3], we know that $\mathcal{S}_U \subset \text{mod } \Lambda$ and that $\mathcal{W}(U) = \mathcal{W}_{(M,P)} = \text{Filt}(\mathcal{S}_U)$. Thus $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{H})) = {}^{\perp z}\mathcal{S}_U \cap \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$. Recall that there exists a non-positive dg algebra Γ_U and triangulated equivalences

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{D}_{fd}(\Gamma_U) & \xrightarrow[\phi]{\cong} & \mathcal{D}^b(\text{mod } \Lambda) \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \text{per}(\Gamma_U) & \xrightarrow[\phi]{\cong} & \mathcal{K}^b(\text{proj } \Lambda) \end{array}$$

which take Γ_U to T_U and all simple $H^0(\Gamma_U)$ -modules to the simple-minded collection \mathcal{S} (Theorem 2.8). Let $\bar{U} \in \text{add}(\Gamma_U)$ be the perfect complex sent to U and $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_U$ the

set of simple $H^0(\Gamma_U)$ -modules that are perpendicular to \bar{U} . Then $\phi(\overline{\mathcal{S}_U}) = \mathcal{S}_U$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}(\mathscr{W}(\mathcal{H})) &= {}^{\perp z}\mathcal{S}_U \cap \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda) \\ &= {}^{\perp z}\phi(\overline{\mathcal{S}_U}) \cap \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda) \\ &= \phi\left({}^{\perp z}\overline{\mathcal{S}_U}\right) \cap \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda) \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.20, we know that ${}^{\perp z}\overline{\mathcal{S}_U} = \text{thick}_{\text{per}(\Gamma_U)}(\bar{U})$. Since ϕ is a triangle equivalence $\phi(\text{thick}_{\text{per}(\Gamma_U)}(\bar{U})) = \text{thick}_b(U)$. This implies that $\mathcal{T}(\mathscr{W}(\mathcal{H})) = \text{thick}_b(U) \cap \mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$. By applying Lemma 3.3 we get that

$$\mathcal{T}(\mathscr{W}(\mathcal{H})) = \text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(U) = \mathcal{H}.$$

□

Theorem 4.22. *Suppose Λ is g -finite. Then all thick subcategories of $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ have enough injectives.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{H} be a thick subcategory of $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$, by Theorem 4.14 we know that there exists a 2-term presilting complex U such that $\mathcal{H} = \text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(U)$. Since Λ is g -finite, then $\mathscr{W}(\mathcal{H})$ is left finite and by Proposition 4.21 $\mathcal{T}(\mathscr{W}(\mathcal{H}))$ has enough injectives. Let V be an injective generator of $\mathcal{T}(\mathscr{W}(\mathcal{H}))$, then

$$\text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(U) \subset \mathcal{T}(\mathscr{W}(\text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(U))) = \text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(V).$$

Since $U \in \text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(V) = \text{Cocone}(V, V)$ [Gar23, Lemma 3.9], there exists a conflation $U \rightarrow V' \rightarrow V''$ with $V', V'' \in \text{add}(V)$ and thus U is 2-term presilting in $\text{thick}_b(V)$ with respect to $V[-1]$. By Lemma 2.4, we know that U can be completed into a silting complex in $\text{thick}_b(V)$. Since U and V give rise to the same τ -perpendicular category $\mathscr{W}(\mathcal{H})$, we deduce that $|U| = |V| = |V[-1]|$, which in turn implies by Proposition 2.5 that U is already silting in $\text{thick}_b(V)$ and thus $\text{thick}_b(V) = \text{thick}_b(U)$. By Corollary 3.5 this implies that

$$\mathcal{H} = \text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(U) = \text{thick}_{[-1,0]}(V).$$

□

Remark 4.23. The arguments used both in Proposition 4.21 and Theorem 4.22 can be adapted to show that the results hold if we substitute left finite for *right finite* wide subcategories [Asa20, Definition 1.2]. That is, \mathscr{W} and \mathcal{T} are inverse of each other if restricted to the set of right-finite wide subcategories and thick subcategories with enough projectives. Moreover, if Λ is g -finite, the dual statement of Theorem 4.22 also holds.

Theorem 4.24. *Suppose Λ is g -finite. Then all thick subcategories of $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ have enough projectives.*

Corollary 4.25. *Suppose Λ is g -finite. Then all thick subcategories of $\mathcal{K}^{[-1,0]}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ have enough projectives and enough injectives.*

REFERENCES

- [AHMV16a] Lidia Angeleri Hügel, Frederik Marks, and Jorge Vitória. Silting modules. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (4):1251–1284, 2016.
- [AHMV16b] Lidia Angeleri Hügel, Frederik Marks, and Jorge Vitória. Silting modules and ring epimorphisms. *Adv. Math.*, 303:1044–1076, 2016.
- [AI12] Takuma Aihara and Osamu Iyama. Silting mutation in triangulated categories. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 85(3):633–668, 2012.
- [AIR14] Takahide Adachi, Osamu Iyama, and Idun Reiten. τ -tilting theory. *Compositio Mathematica*, 150(3):415–452, 2014.
- [Ami09] Claire Amiot. Cluster categories for algebras of global dimension 2 and quivers with potential. In *Annales de l’Institut Fourier*, volume 59, pages 2525–2590, 2009.
- [Ami11] Claire Amiot. On generalized cluster categories. In *Representations of algebras and related topics*, EMS Ser. Congr. Rep., pages 1–53. Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2011.
- [Asa20] Sota Asai. Semibricks. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (16):4993–5054, 2020.
- [AT22] Takahide Adachi and Mayu Tsukamoto. Hereditary cotorsion pairs and silting subcategories in extriangulated categories. *Journal of Algebra*, 594:109–137, 2022.
- [BMR⁺06] Aslak Bakke Buan, Bethany Rose Marsh, Markus Reineke, Idun Reiten, and Gordana Todorov. Tilting theory and cluster combinatorics. *Advances in Mathematics*, 204(2):572–618, 2006.
- [Bør21] Erlend D Børve. Two-term silting and τ -cluster morphism categories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.03472*, 2021.
- [Bør24] Erlend D Børve. Silting reduction and picture categories of 0- Auslander extriangulated categories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.00593*, 2024.
- [BTS21] Raphael Bennett-Tennenhaus and Amit Shah. Transport of structure in higher homological algebra. *J. Algebra*, 574:514–549, 2021.
- [BY13] Thomas Brüstle and Dong Yang. Ordered exchange graphs. In *Advances in representation theory of algebras*, EMS Ser. Congr. Rep., pages 135–193. Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2013.
- [Che23] Xiaofa Chen. 0-Auslander correspondence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.15958*, 2023.
- [DIJ19] Laurent Demonet, Osamu Iyama, and Gustavo Jasso. τ -tilting finite algebras, bricks, and g-vectors. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2019(3):852–892, 2019.
- [FGP⁺23] Xin Fang, Mikhail Gorsky, Yann Palu, Pierre-Guy Plamondon, and Matthew Pressland. Extriangulated ideal quotients, with applications to cluster theory and gentle algebras. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.05524*, 2023.
- [FZ03] Sergey Fomin and Andrei Zelevinsky. Cluster algebras. II. Finite type classification. *Invent. Math.*, 154(1):63–121, 2003.
- [Gar23] Monica Garcia. On thick subcategories of the category of projective presentations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05226*, 2023.
- [GNP23] Mikhail Gorsky, Hiroyuki Nakaoka, and Yann Palu. Hereditary extriangulated categories: Silting objects, mutation, negative extensions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.07134*, 2023.
- [IJY14] Osamu Iyama, Peter Jørgensen, and Dong Yang. Intermediate co- t -structures, two-term silting objects, τ -tilting modules, and torsion classes. *Algebra Number Theory*, 8(10):2413–2431, 2014.
- [IT09] Colin Ingalls and Hugh Thomas. Noncrossing partitions and representations of quivers. *Compositio Mathematica*, 145(6):1533–1562, 2009.
- [IY08] Osamu Iyama and Yuji Yoshino. Mutation in triangulated categories and rigid Cohen-Macaulay modules. *Invent. Math.*, 172(1):117–168, 2008.
- [IY18] Osamu Iyama and Dong Yang. Silting reduction and Calabi-Yau reduction of triangulated categories. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 370(11):7861–7898, 2018.
- [Jas15] Gustavo Jasso. Reduction of τ -tilting modules and torsion pairs. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (16):7190–7237, 2015.
- [JSZ05] Bernt Tore Jensen, Xiuping Su, and Alexander Zimmermann. Degenerations for derived categories. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 198(1-3):281–295, 2005.
- [Kel94] Bernhard Keller. Deriving DG categories. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 27(1):63–102, 1994.

- [Kel06] Bernhard Keller. On differential graded categories. In *International Congress of Mathematicians. Vol. II*, pages 151–190. Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2006.
- [Kel11] Bernhard Keller. Algèbres amassées et applications. In *Séminaire Bourbaki*, number 339. 2011. Vol. 2009/2010. Exposé 1014.
- [KN13] Bernhard Keller and Pedro Nicolás. Weight structures and simple dg modules for positive dg algebras. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (5):1028–1078, 2013.
- [KY14] Steffen Koenig and Dong Yang. Silting objects, simple-minded collections, t -structures and co- t -structures for finite-dimensional algebras. *Doc. Math.*, 19:403–438, 2014.
- [MŠ17] Frederik Marks and Jan Šťovíček. Torsion classes, wide subcategories and localisations. *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society*, 49(3):405–416, 2017.
- [Nee92] Amnon Neeman. The connection between the K -theory localization theorem of Thomason, Trobaugh and Yao and the smashing subcategories of Bousfield and Ravenel. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 25(5):547–566, 1992.
- [NOS22] Hiroyuki Nakaoka, Yasuaki Ogawa, and Arashi Sakai. Localization of extriangulated categories. *Journal of Algebra*, 611:341–398, 2022.
- [NP19] Hiroyuki Nakaoka and Yann Palu. Extriangulated categories, Hovey twin cotorsion pairs and model structures. *Cah. Topol. Géom. Différ. Catég*, 60(2):117–193, 2019.
- [Pla11] Pierre-Guy Plamondon. Cluster characters for cluster categories with infinite-dimensional morphism spaces. *Adv. Math.*, 227(1):1–39, 2011.
- [Pla13] Pierre-Guy Plamondon. Generic bases for cluster algebras from the cluster category. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (10):2368–2420, 2013.
- [PZ23] David Pauksztello and Alexandra Zvonareva. Co- t -structures, cotilting and cotorsion pairs. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 175(1):89–106, 2023.
- [Ric02] Jeremy Rickard. Equivalences of derived categories for symmetric algebras. *J. Algebra*, 257(2):460–481, 2002.
- [Tho21] Hugh Thomas. An introduction to the lattice of torsion classes. *Bull. Iranian Math. Soc.*, 47:S35–S55, 2021.

LABORATOIRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE VERSAILLES, UVSQ, CNRS, UNIVERSITÉ PARIS-SACLAY.
OFFICE 3305, BÂTIMENT FERMAT, 45 AVENUE DES ÉTATS-UNIS, 78035 VERSAILLES CEDEX,
FRANCE

Email address: monica.garcia@uvsq.fr