

k -linear Morita theory

Matteo Doni*

June 25, 2024

Abstract

In this paper, we prove the standard comparison used by mathematicians between the idempotent complete pretriangulated dg-categories, over a unitary and commutative ring k , and the idempotent complete k -linear stable ∞ -categories. Our approach is completely included in the ∞ -categorical theory. To achieve the target we will reinterpret the Morita theory for dg-categories and we set the Morita theory for k -linear stable ∞ -category.

Contents

1	Recall of higher categories: adding colimits	5
2	Stable ∞-category and presentable ∞-categories	7
3	Cat_{∞}^{perf} and $P_{\omega}^{L,St}$: non-geometrical Morita theory	12
4	The ∞-categories of dg-categories	16
5	k-linear stable ∞-categories	27
6	Results	36

Introduction

Since their first appearance in the 60's by Verdier the theory of triangulated category has gained interest. Today triangulated categories are central objects in many fields of mathematics, ranging from homotopy theory to algebraic and symplectic geometry. The Russian school played a central role in this development. According to Kontsevich, the most fundamental statement of mirror symmetry is as an equivalence of categories between the derived category of coherent sheaves on a Calabi-Yau variety and the Fukaya category of its mirror. The derived category $D(\mathcal{A})$ of an abelian category \mathcal{A} is certainly a very intriguing and ubiquitous mathematical object. It is well known that $D(\mathcal{A})$ is a triangulated category and this leads to some complications: for example, the famous “non-functoriality of the cone” problem. The disadvantage is that during the transition to the derived category $D(\mathcal{A})$ from the abelian \mathcal{A} some “higher” information is lost. The strategy to solve this issue is to lift \mathcal{A} to a higher category \mathcal{C} , whose homotopy category $h\mathcal{C}$ is

*Università degli Studi di Milano, Milan. Email address: matteo.doni@unimi.it

triangulated and such that there exists an equivalence of triangulated categories $h\mathcal{C} \simeq D(\mathcal{A})$: dg-category (over a suitable ring) and ∞ -category theories are two of the common higher category theories used to define \mathcal{C} . In this paper, we are interested in them.

Not all homotopy categories of a dg-category or of an ∞ -category are triangulated, but when they are, they are called pretriangulated and stable, respectively. We must apply a first correction in our previous statement: in this paper, we are interested in pretriangulated dg-categories and stable ∞ -category theories.

Algebraic geometers are focused on studying the existence and uniqueness of such lifts. An in-depth study of this issue in a pretriangulated dg-categorical setting was made by V. Lunts, D. Orlov A. Canonaco, A. Neeman, P. Stellari, see [7][6][5][18]; instead B. Antieua tackles it in stable ∞ -categorical style, see [2]. Actually, the “lift problem” is a bit general, and it can be formulated as follows: *Let T be a triangulated category, does a dg-categorical (or a stable ∞ -categorical) lift exist? And if so, is it unique?*

A triangle category T is called *algebraic* if there exists a pretriangulated dg-categorical lift and, it is called *topological* if a stable ∞ -categorical lift exists. Let \mathcal{A} be a Grothendieck abelian category. The derived ∞ -category $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ exists and it is a stable ∞ -categorical lift of the ordinary derived category $D(\mathcal{A})$. The full dg-subcategory of h-injective objects $\mathcal{C}_{\text{dg}}(h\text{-inj}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})$ is a dg-categorical lift of $D(\mathcal{A})$, [7, Example 3.4] and [21, Proposition 1.3.5.15]. This example is useful because it allows us to understand the difference between topological and algebraic triangulated categories. First of all, given an abelian category \mathcal{A} , it is interesting that the idea of finding $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\text{dg}}(h\text{-inj})$ is the same one: it is just a translation from one theory to the other. The second conclusion follows from a specific case. Let X be a scheme over k , it is well known that the category of quasi-coherent sheaves over X $QCoh(X)$ is abelian, then the derived category $D(QCoh(X))$ is a topological algebraic triangulated category. The dg-categorical lift $\mathcal{C}_{\text{dg}}(h\text{-inj})$ is naturally a k -linear category, since it is dg-category over k ; instead, a priori, the stable ∞ -categorical lift has no natural k -linear structure. Every scheme X is at least over \mathbb{Z} , then each dg-categorical lift is at least \mathbb{Z} -linear: that is why for algebraic geometers the interesting lifts are those with a linear structure. Of course, one can ask if there is a canonical way to give a k -linear structure, for a suitable ring k , to a stable ∞ -categorical lift. Generally, this is not possible. The category of symmetric spectrum Sp^{Σ} is topological, its stable ∞ -categorical lift is Sp , but it is not algebraic, [7, Proposition 3.6]. So topological triangulated categories are more than algebraic ones: the problem is that there is not a canonical linearization of Sp^{Σ} .

One can also ask the opposite question: are there stable ∞ -categories which have a linearization? Our first example comes to our aid. Since the idea of finding $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\text{dg}}(h\text{-inj})$ is similar, it shows that some stable ∞ -categories have a canonical linearization. When this happens they are called k -linear stable ∞ -categories.

An important achievement in this regard is [2, Meta Theorem], B. Antieau proves that some ∞ -categorical lift has a canonical \mathbb{Z} -linearization.

One point needs to be made before you can define $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$, for what we know, you first have to define a dg-category. The use of the dg-category theory to define the stable ∞ -category $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ is not accidental, but it is because this theory is more traditional and studied when working in a linear setting.

The category of symmetric spectra Sp^{Σ} is a fundamental category for algebraic topologists, so they are concerned with a wider range of lifts. So, the term k -linear means that the mathematical object comes from geometry. To highlight this fact, we add the term “not-geometrical” when dealing with a concept without considering k -linearity

The algebraic topologist point of view leads to a spectral algebraic geometry theory, see [20]; the

algebraic geometric point of view leads to derived algebraic geometry theory, see [30]. Our Main results, Theorem 6.5, is a meeting point between them. It states that:

Theorem 0.1 (Main Theorem). *Let k be an \mathbb{E}_∞ -ring. Let $Cat_\infty^{\mathcal{D}^{(k)},perf}$ be the ∞ -category of idempotent complete pretriangulated dg-categories over k , and let $LinCat_{\mathbb{H}k}^{perf}$ the ∞ -category of idempotent complete k -linear stable ∞ -categories. There exists an equivalence of ∞ -categories:*

$$Cat_\infty^{\mathcal{D}^{(k)},perf} \simeq LinCat_{\mathbb{H}k}^{perf}. \quad (1)$$

It is always useful to work with several theories on the same problem; we call both k -linear Morita theory. The two settings in our Main Theorem have different features. Dg-categories are the simplest and most hands-on enhancement of triangulated categories. Lurie develops the second formalism in a series of enormous and instrument-filled books. The theory of k -linear stable ∞ -categories is more flexible, as the theory of localization proves, and the standard enhancement of triangulated categories in many mathematical areas, such as homotopy theory. A dictionary between different enhancements makes it possible, in any given situation, to adopt the formalism which is most convenient; while at the same time allowing for the transfer of results and techniques that are native to the other formalism. As I mentioned, these two different enhancements have actually quite different features, so being able to switch freely between them is particularly valuable.

We remark that the idempotent completion condition serves to deal with the problem of size. Indeed Lurie proves that this ∞ -categorical notion also has different incarnations, (12) and Example 1.6. The fluidity of this notion is crucial in this paper because it allows us to define a symmetric monoidal structure for the ∞ -categories where the non-geometrical Morita theory is embodied, Cat_∞^{perf} and $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$, see Section 3.

Related works

This paper is the last of a series [12, 11], aimed at developing and comparing the Morita theory for dg-categories, over a commutative unitary ring k , and k -linear ∞ -categories in a ∞ -categorical setting. Here we finally set this theory and we call it the *k -linear Morita theory*. The ∞ -categorical Morita theory, without considering that k -linearity, was set up in the pioneering article [4] by A.J. Blumberg, D. Gepner, and G. Tabuada. In this paper, we call it the non-geometrical Morita theory.

Our Main Theorem, Theorem 6.5, was a folklore theorem until 2013; in fact, in 2010 D. Ben-Zvi, J. Francis, and D. Nadler in [3] and in 2012 D. Gaitsgory in [10] used it, although it had not yet been proven.

In 2013 L. Cohn proved it in a preprint, and in 2016, he updated the paper to its latest version. The preprint has been improved along with the young and exuberant ∞ -category and spectral algebraic geometry theories.

It is also interesting to note that J. Lurie conjured our Main Theorem in our version, [21, Remark 1.1.0.2], and in the additive version, [23, p. D.1.2.3].

The ∞ -category theory and the spectral algebraic geometry theory have made further progress. Therefore, we think that a reproof can be useful to make this result clearer for more mathematicians. An important difference between our proof and Cohn's is that our approach is completely ∞ -categorical.

Structure of the work

This paper is composed of six sections. In Section 1, we recall how in ∞ -category theory it is possible to add (chosen) colimits. In Section 2, we review key results, definitions, and construction from higher algebra. For a reader used to the work of Lurie, [19, 21], the first two sections can be skipped.

In Section 3, we review the non-geometrical Morita theory constructed in [4]. Besides establishing definitions for subsequent sections, the primary objective of this chapter is to demonstrate that the categories Cat_{∞}^{perf} and $Pr_{\omega}^{L,St}$ possess certain higher algebraic structures (Remark 3.7). Some of these structures were previously identified, but their proof was either flawed or unconvincing. With this section the prerequisite part concludes, paving the way for the substantive sections of the paper where we tackle for the first time the problem of defining the theory of k -linearization using enriched ∞ -categories (Lurie has previously addressed this topic but with a different setting [23, §D]).

In Section 4, we reinterpret the Morita theory for dg-categories, [29, 28], using the theory of enriched ∞ -category. This theory is classical in derived algebraic geometry but our ∞ -categorical approach is not: this is a substantial difference between our proof and Cohn's.

In Section 5, we investigate linearization from the viewpoint of spectral algebraic geometry (or algebraic topology). We provide a conceptual overview of linearization and define Morita theory for k -linear ∞ -categories. In this part, we will come to realize that there exists an incredible number of equivalent definitions of idempotent complete k -linear stable ∞ -categories, and the main outcome of this section is to demonstrate their equality (Proposition 5.18).

Finally, in Section 6, we present our principal result, Theorem 6.5. It is valuable that we define when a dg-functor is a Morita equivalence, Definition 6.6, and find the (k -linear) Morita localization, Proposition 6.7.

Acknowledgement

I extend my gratitude to Paolo Stellari for his guidance throughout the recent years, which has enabled me to consolidate my ideas.

Notation

- We adhere to Lurie's homological convention, as described in [21];
- with a slight abuse of notation, we denote by $\pi_0 : \mathcal{S}_* \rightarrow Set$ the composition of ∞ -functors $U\pi_0$ where $\pi_0 : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow Set$ is the component-of-space ∞ -functor, [26, Example 3.6.2], and $U : \mathcal{S}_* \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is the canonical forgetful ∞ -functor;
- unless otherwise indicated by the symbol \dashv , the following conventions will be used: in a horizontally written adjunction, the left (right) adjoint has the arrowhead pointing to the right (left);
- we use the symbol \mapsto to indicate where a functor sends objects or where an ∞ -functor, up to equivalence, maps objects. For example, $- + 1 : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} : n \mapsto n + 1$.
- let \mathcal{C} be an ∞ -category. By $h\mathcal{C}$, we denote the ordinary category whose objects are the same as those of \mathcal{C} and whose hom-set between two objects x, y is the set $\pi_0(\mathcal{C}(x, y))$. We call

$h\mathcal{C}$ the *homotopy category* of \mathcal{C} . For a comprehensive presentation of $h\mathcal{C}$, we recommend reading [27, §1.1].

- throughout this paper, we fix k a commutative ring with unit (or a discrete \mathbb{E}_∞ -ring);
- it is very likely that if a notation is used without defining it, you can find its definition in the classical references [21, 19] or that we set it in [11].

1 Recall of higher categories: adding colimits

In this part, we recall how to add colimits to an ∞ -category and how this technique is functorial and monoidal. For a detailed presentation, see [21, §4.8].

Notation 1.1. We denote by $\widehat{\mathcal{C}at}_\infty$ the ∞ -category of non-necessarily small ∞ -categories.

Definition 1.2. Let \mathcal{K} be a collection of simplicial sets. We let $\mathcal{C}at_\infty(\mathcal{K})$ ($\widehat{\mathcal{C}at}_\infty(\mathcal{K})$) denote the ∞ -subcategory of $\mathcal{C}at_\infty$ ($\widehat{\mathcal{C}at}_\infty$) spanned by those small (non-necessarily small) ∞ -categories \mathcal{C} which admit K -indexed colimits for each $K \in \mathcal{K}$, and whose morphisms are ∞ -functor $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ which preserve K -indexed colimits for each $K \in \mathcal{K}$.

We need the following proposition, which is at the same time a definition.

Proposition 1.3 ([19, Proposition 5.3.6.2]). *Let \mathcal{K} be a collection of simplicial sets, \mathcal{C} an ∞ -category, and $\mathcal{R} = \{d_\alpha : \mathbb{1} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^{K_\alpha^\triangleright}\}$ a collection of diagrams in \mathcal{C} . Assume that each K_α belongs to \mathcal{K} . Then there exists a new ∞ -category $P_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{C})$ and a $j : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow P_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{C})$ with the following properties:*

- (1) the ∞ -category $P_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{C})$ admits \mathcal{K} -indexed colimits;
- (2) For every ∞ -category \mathcal{D} which admits \mathcal{K} -indexed colimits, composition with j induces an equivalence of ∞ -categories

$$(-) \circ j : \text{Fun}_{\mathcal{K}}(P_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{C}), \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \text{Fun}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}) : \text{Lan}_j(-);$$

Moreover, if every member of \mathcal{R} is already a colimits diagram in \mathcal{C} , then we have in addition:

- (3) the ∞ -functor j is fully faithful.

Notation 1.4. If \mathcal{K} or \mathcal{R} is empty we will erase the apex or respectively the subscript from $P_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{C})$.

Let \mathcal{K} be a collection of simplicial sets. In [21, Corollary 4.8.1.4], the author proves that $\mathcal{C}at_\infty(\mathcal{K})$ ($\widehat{\mathcal{C}at}_\infty(\mathcal{K})$) admits a symmetric monoidal structure and that the inclusion $\mathcal{C}at_\infty(\mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{C}at}_\infty(\mathcal{K})$ is a lax symmetric monoidal ∞ -functor. We denote the tensor of this category by $\otimes^{\mathcal{K}}$, and the unit is the ∞ -category $P^{\mathcal{K}}(*)$.

Furthermore, if $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ are collections of simplicial sets, then we obtain a monoidal ∞ -functor from:

$$P_{\mathcal{K}}^{\mathcal{H}}(-) : \mathcal{C}at_\infty(\mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}at_\infty(\mathcal{H}). \quad (2)$$

The following examples are important for us.

Example 1.5. Let \mathcal{K} be the collection of all small simplicial sets, then $P(\mathcal{C}) \simeq P^{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{C})$.

Example 1.6 ([19, Corollary 4.4.5.15]). Let $Idem = N(R)$ be the nerve of the category R with only one object X and whose arrows are two, e and the identity id , and such that, without considering the obvious cases, the composition of arrows is described by the equation $e \circ e = e$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{e} & X & \xrightarrow{e} & X. \\ & & \circlearrowleft & & \\ & & e & & \end{array} \quad (3)$$

Let $N = \{Idem\}$ be the collection of simplicial sets composed only of $Idem$, then

$$P^{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{C}) \simeq Idem(\mathcal{C}) := Fun(Idem, X)$$

is the idempotent completion of the ∞ -category \mathcal{C} .

It is important to note that the morphisms in $Cat_{\infty}(N)$ are ∞ -functors between ∞ -categories with no other properties: for a diagram with source an $Idem$, having a colimit is a diagram condition, see [19, Corollary 4.4.5.14], so every ∞ -functor preserves its colimit; in short, they are absolute colimits. We denote by Cat_{∞}^{Idem} the ∞ -category $Cat_{\infty}(N)$ and we call its objects *idempotent complete ∞ -categories*.

The simplicial set $Idem$ is not a finite simplicial set but it is a α -filtered simplicial set for each regular cardinal α , [19, Example 5.3.1.9].

Example 1.7. Let α be a regular cardinal and let K_{α} be the collection of all small α -filtered simplicial sets, then $P^{K_{\alpha}}(\mathcal{C}) \simeq Ind_{\alpha}(\mathcal{C})$. So, there is an ∞ -functor

$$Ind_{\alpha}(-) : Cat_{\infty} \rightarrow Cat_{\infty}(K_{\alpha}).$$

The objects of a ∞ -category \mathcal{C} in $Cat_{\infty}(K_{\alpha})$ are usually called *Ind-objects*.

As usual, when $\alpha = \omega$ we write $Ind(-)$ instead of $Ind_{\omega}(-)$.

Example 1.8. Let \mathcal{F} be the collection of finite simplicial sets. For a definition of finite simplicial set see [22, Definition 3.6.1.1]. $Cat_{\infty}(\mathcal{F})$ is the ∞ -category of ∞ -categories admitting finite colimits and whose morphisms are finite-colimits-preserving ∞ -functors; as usually we denote $Cat_{\infty}(\mathcal{F})$ by Cat_{∞}^{rex} .

We know that Cat_{∞}^{rex} has a symmetric monoidal structure whose unit is the ∞ -category $P^K(*) \simeq \mathcal{S}^{fin}$. We denote its tensor by \otimes^{rex} .

Example 1.9. Let \mathcal{F} be the collection of finite simplicial sets and N as in Example 1.6 we denote by Cat_{∞}^{RIdem} the ∞ -category $Cat_{\infty}^{K \cup \mathcal{F}}$ and we call its objects *idempotent complete cocomplete ∞ -categories*.

Remark 1.10. Let N and \mathcal{F} be as in Example 1.8 and Example 1.9 respectively. Both the ∞ -categories Cat_{∞}^{Idem} and Cat_{∞}^{RIdem} have a symmetric monoidal structure. Furthermore, there exists a monoidal adjunction

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Cat_{\infty}^{Idem} & \xrightarrow{P_N^F(-)} & Cat_{\infty}^{RIdem} \\ & \perp & \\ & \longleftarrow & \end{array}$$

We do not think that the above adjunction is a localization.

Remark 1.11. Let N be as in Example 1.6 and \mathcal{F} be as in Example 1.8. Since every ∞ -functor preserves idempotent object $Cat_{\infty}^{RIdem} \subseteq Cat_{\infty}^{rex}$ is a full ∞ -subcategory, so the ∞ -functor $P_{\mathcal{F}}^N(-) : Cat_{\infty}^{rex} \rightarrow Cat_{\infty}^{RIdem}$ defines a localization:

$$Cat_{\infty}^{rex} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{P_{\mathcal{F}}^N(-)} \\ \perp \\ \xleftarrow{\quad} \end{array} Cat_{\infty}^{RIdem}.$$

Example 1.12 ([19, Example 5.3.6.8]). Let α be a regular cardinal. Let \mathcal{K}_{α} denote the collection of all α -small simplicial sets and let \mathcal{K} be the class of all small simplicial sets. Let \mathcal{C} be a small ∞ -category which admits α -small colimits. Then we have a canonical equivalence $P_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha}}^{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{C}) \cong Ind_{\alpha}(\mathcal{C})$. A simplicial set is ω -small if it is finite, [22, Example 5.4.4.4], so \mathcal{K}_{ω} is equivalent to \mathcal{F} in Example 1.8.

Definition 1.13 ([19, Definition 5.4.2.1]). Let γ be a regular cardinal. An ∞ -category \mathcal{C} is γ -accessible if there exists a small ∞ -category \mathcal{C}_0 and an equivalence $Ind_{\gamma}(\mathcal{C}_0) \simeq \mathcal{C}$. We will say that \mathcal{C} is accessible if it is γ -accessible for some regular cardinal γ .

Definition 1.14. Let \mathcal{C} be an ∞ -category which admits filtered colimits (for us it will always be an accessible ∞ -category). An object $c \in \mathcal{C}$ is said to be compact if the corepresentable functor

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(c, -) : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{S};$$

commutes with filtered colimits.

Notation 1.15 ([19, Remark 5.4.2.11]). Let \mathcal{C} be an ∞ -category which admits filtered colimits (for us it will always be an accessible ∞ -category) and γ a regular cardinal. We denote by \mathcal{C}^{γ} the full ∞ -subcategory spanned by the γ -compact objects of \mathcal{C} . The ∞ -category \mathcal{C}^{γ} is essentially small.

2 Stable ∞ -category and presentable ∞ -categories

2.1 Stable and presentable ∞ -category

In [11], we have already presented part of the theory of presentable and stable ∞ -category. So if you find any notation or definition unclear, it is very likely that there is a more detailed explanation in the work just cited. Since this part is taken from [21, 19], these two books also contain a detailed presentation of these topics. We start by recalling the definitions.

There are a lot of definitions of stable ∞ -category but we choose the most similar to the dg -categorical notion of pretriangulated dg -category.

Definition 2.1 ([21, Definitions 1.1.1.9, Corollary 1.4.2.27]). An ∞ -category \mathcal{C} is stable if it satisfies the following conditions:

- There exists a zero object $\mathbf{0}$;
- Every morphism in \mathcal{C} admits cofiber;
- The suspension ∞ -functor

$$\Sigma : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} : X \mapsto \mathrm{colim}(\mathbf{0} \leftarrow X \rightarrow \mathbf{0})$$

is an equivalence of ∞ -categories.

Example 2.2. Recall in Example 1.7 we defined, for each regular cardinal γ , an ∞ -functor

$$\text{Ind}_\gamma(-) : \text{Cat}_\infty \rightarrow \text{Cat}_\infty(K_\alpha).$$

Definition 2.3. an ∞ -category \mathcal{C} is presentable if it admits small colimits and it is accessible. We say that an ∞ -category \mathcal{C} is *compactly generated* if it is presentable and ω -accessible.

Notation 2.4. We use the usual notation $P_r^L \subseteq \widehat{\text{Cat}}_\infty$ to denote the ∞ -subcategory spanned by presentable ∞ -categories and whose morphisms are small-colimits-preserving functors. We denote by $Pr_{cg}^L \subseteq Pr^L$ the full ∞ -subcategory spanned by compactly generated ∞ -categories.

It is well known that there is a closed symmetric monoidal structure $(Pr^L, \otimes^L, \mathcal{S})$ such that the inclusion $\iota : Pr^L \rightarrow \widehat{\text{Cat}}_\infty$ is lax monoidal and \otimes^L preserves small colimits componentwise. We call the algebra objects of Pr^L *presentably monoidal ∞ -categories*.

We need to know what a t -structure on a stable ∞ -category is. Now we will recall its definition and explain some useful examples for us; for a complete introduction, see [21, §1.2.1]. Roughly speaking, giving a t -structure to a stable ∞ -category \mathcal{C} means adding additional information to \mathcal{C} that allows \mathcal{C} to be broken up into homologous parts, and by studying these parts it is possible to derive information on the whole of \mathcal{C} .

Definition 2.5 ([21, Definition 1.2.1.1 Definition 1.2.1.4]). Let \mathcal{C} be a stable ∞ -category. A triple $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}, \mathcal{C}_{\leq 0})$ where $\mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\leq 0}$ are two subcategories of \mathcal{C} is a t -structure for \mathcal{C} if the triple $(h\mathcal{C}, h\mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}, h\mathcal{C}_{\leq 0})$ is a t -structure for the triangulated category $h\mathcal{C}$.

Definition 2.6 ([21, Definition 1.2.1.11]). Let \mathcal{C} be a stable ∞ -category equipped with a t -structure. The *heart* \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit of \mathcal{C} is the full ∞ -subcategory $\mathcal{C}_{\leq 0} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\geq 0} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we let $\pi_0 : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit$ denote the ∞ -functor $\tau_{\geq 0} \circ \tau_{\leq 0} \simeq \tau_{\leq 0} \circ \tau_{\geq 0}$, and let $\pi_n : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit$ denote the composition of π_0 with the shift ∞ -functor $X \mapsto X[-n]$. \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit is an abelian (ordinary) category.

In the construction of the ∞ -functor (22), it is important that the ∞ -categories Mod_{Hk} and $\mathcal{D}(k)$ have a right complete t -structure.

Definition 2.7. Let \mathcal{C} be a stable ∞ -category. A t -structure $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}, \mathcal{C}_{\leq 0})$ is *right complete* if \mathcal{C} is equivalent to the direct limits of its right bounded part

$$\mathcal{C} \simeq \lim(\dots \xrightarrow{\tau_{\leq n-1}} \mathcal{C}_{\geq n-1} \xrightarrow{\tau_{\geq n}} \mathcal{C}_{\geq n} \rightarrow \dots).$$

Remark 2.8. We make two brief remarks about the last definition. Note that in Definition 2.7, we defined the right completeness as a limit of a diagram $D : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \text{Cat}_\infty$ but in Equation (25) as a limit of a diagram $H : \mathbb{N}^{op} \rightarrow \text{Cat}_\infty$. Now we explain why the two limits have the same apex. There is a canonical adjunction:

$$i : \mathbb{N}^{op} \rightleftarrows \mathbb{Z} : R;$$

such that, by straightforward computation, the equality $H = Di$ holds. Every left adjoint is an initial ∞ -functor [27, Proposition 2.4.6], and so we conclude that $\lim(H) \cong \lim(Di) \cong \lim(D)$;

Moreover, we need a method to compare t -structures.

Definition 2.9 ([21, Definition 1.3.3.1]). Let \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} be stable ∞ -categories equipped with t -structures. We will say that a ∞ -functor $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is *right t -exact* if it is exact and carries $\mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}$ into $\mathcal{D}_{\geq 0}$. We say that f is *left t -exact* if it is exact and carries $\mathcal{C}_{\leq 0}$ into $\mathcal{D}_{\leq 0}$.

In the next part, we list the t -structures that are important to us.

Example 2.10. Let $D(k)_{\leq 0}^-$ be the full ∞ -subcategory of $\mathcal{D}(k)^-$ spanned by chain complexes with trivial positive homology groups, i.e., $H_n(C_*) \simeq 0$ if $n > 0$. Let $D(k)_{\geq 0}^-$ be the full ∞ -subcategory of $\mathcal{D}(k)^-$ spanned by chain complexes with trivial negative homology groups, i.e., $H_n(C_*) \simeq 0$ if $n < 0$. The triple $(D(k)^-, D(k)_{\leq 0}^-, D(k)_{\geq 0}^-)$ forms a t -structure. In particular $D(k)^\heartsuit \simeq k\text{-Mod}$.

Example 2.11 ([21, Proposition 1.3.5.21]). The ∞ -category $\mathcal{D}(k)$ is compactly generated and stable. Let $\mathcal{D}(k)_{\leq 0}$ be the full ∞ -subcategory of $\mathcal{D}(k)$ spanned by chain complexes with trivial positive homology groups, i.e., $H_n(C_*) \simeq 0$ if $n > 0$. Let and $\mathcal{D}(k)_{\geq 0}$ be the full ∞ -subcategory of $\mathcal{D}(k)$ spanned by chain complexes with trivial negative homology groups, i.e., $H_n(C_*) \simeq 0$ if $n < 0$. The triple $(D(k), D(k)_{\leq 0}, D(k)_{\geq 0})$ forms a right complete t -structure. In particular $D(k)^\heartsuit \simeq k\text{-Mod}$.

For us, there is another important stable ∞ -category with a t -structure, but before we can consider it, we need a definition.

Example 2.12 ([21, Proposition 7.1.1.5][21, Proposition 7.1.1.13]). The ∞ -category $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ is compactly generated and stable. Let $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{\leq 0}$ be the full ∞ -subcategory of $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ spanned by modules with trivial positive homotopy groups, i.e., $\pi_n(M) \simeq 0$ if $n > 0$. Let $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{\geq 0}$ be the full ∞ -subcategory of $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ spanned by modules with trivial negative homotopy groups, i.e., $\pi_n(M) \simeq 0$ if $n < 0$. The triple $(\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}, \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{\leq 0}, \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{\geq 0})$ forms a right complete t -structure. In particular, $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}^\heartsuit \simeq k\text{-Mod}$.

Notation 2.13. Let $\text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{Lex}} \subseteq \text{Cat}_\infty$ be the ∞ -subcategory spanned by small ∞ -categories with finite limits and whose morphisms preserve finite limits as ∞ -functors. Let $\text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{Ex}} \subseteq \text{Cat}_\infty$ be the ∞ -subcategory spanned by small stable ∞ -categories and whose morphisms are exact ∞ -functors: an ∞ -functor between stable ∞ -categories is exact if it preserves finite colimits and finite limits.

The construction of the ∞ -category of \mathcal{C} -spectra $Sp(\mathcal{C})$ is left adjoint to two adjunctions [21, 15]:

$$\text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{Lex}} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{Sp(-)} \\ \perp \\ \xleftarrow{i} \end{array} \text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{Ex}}; \quad (4)$$

For us, there is another important stable ∞ -category with a t -structure, but before we can consider it, we need a definition.

Now, we study the ∞ -categories which are both presentable and stable. Having these two properties is very interesting because it allows these categories to be seen as $\mathcal{S}p$ -modules objects. In other words, it is possible to translate a higher category concept into a higher algebraic concept.

Notation 2.14. With $Pr^{L,St} \subseteq Pr^L$ we will denote the full ∞ -subcategory generated by the stable and presentable ∞ -categories

The ∞ -subcategory $Pr^L \subseteq \text{Cat}_\infty$ is stable under colimits. By (iii) we can write the ∞ -functor $Sp(-)$ as a colimit, so we deduce that the adjunction (4) continues to be valid if we restrict both

to the ∞ -categories to respective presentable case

$$P_r^L \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{Sp(-)} \\ \xleftarrow[\perp]{i} \\ \xrightarrow{i} \end{array} P_r^{L,St}; \quad (5)$$

Using the symmetric monoidal structure of P_r^L , it is possible describe the ∞ -functor

$$Sp : P_r^L \rightarrow P_r^{L,St}$$

as a tensor:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C} \otimes Sp &\simeq RFun(\mathcal{C}^{op}, Sp) \simeq \text{holim}\{RFun(\mathcal{C}^{op}, \mathcal{S}_*)\} \\ &\simeq \text{holim}\{\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{S}_*\} \simeq \text{holim}\{\mathcal{C}_*\} \\ &\simeq Sp(\mathcal{C}). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Now we explain how the monoidal structure of P_r^L induces a monoidal structure on $P_r^{L,St}$. The ∞ -category $\text{Mod}_{Sp}(P_r^L)$ has the symmetric monoidal structure of left Sp -modules object of P_r^L (i.e. the tensor is relative tensor product [21, §4.4]). It is known that there is a free-forgetful adjunction

$$- \otimes^L Sp : P_r^L \rightleftarrows \text{Mod}_{Sp}(P_r^L) : U. \quad (7)$$

and, [21, Proposition 4.8.2.18], Lurie proves that the forgetful ∞ -functor $U : \text{Mod}_{Sp}(P_r^L) \rightarrow P_r^L$ is fully faithful and that its essential image is the ∞ -category of presentable stable ∞ -categories $P_r^{L,St}$. So the adjoint restricts to an adjoint equivalence

$$- \otimes^L Sp : P_r^{L,St} \rightleftarrows \text{Mod}_{Sp}(P_r^L) : U. \quad (8)$$

We conclude that $P_r^{L,St}$ inherits the symmetric monoidal structure from the ∞ -category of left Sp -module objects of P_r^L , $\text{Mod}_{Sp}(P_r^L)$. We denote by $\otimes^{L,St}$ its tensor:

$$\begin{aligned} - \otimes^{L,St} - &: P_r^{L,St} \times P_r^{L,St} \rightarrow P_r^{L,St} \\ (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) &\mapsto \mathcal{A} \otimes^{L,St} \mathcal{B} := U(- \otimes^L Sp(\mathcal{A}) \otimes_{Sp} - \otimes^L Sp(\mathcal{B})) \\ &\simeq \text{Bar}_{Sp}(\mathcal{A} \otimes^L Sp, \mathcal{B} \otimes^L Sp). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

and its unit is Sp .

Moreover, it preserves small colimits in each component, [21, Corollary 4.4.2.15.]. In short, $P_r^{L,St}$ is a commutative algebra object in $\text{Cat}_\infty(\mathcal{K})$, [11, §2], where \mathcal{K} is the collection of all small simplicial sets.

As a trivial consequence, we obtain that the forgetful-free adjunction

$$- \otimes^L Sp : P_r^L \rightleftarrows \text{Mod}_{Sp}(P_r^L) : U$$

is monoidal.

Warning 2.15. The ∞ -functor $- \otimes^L Sp$ in (7) is not the equal to $Sp(-)$ in (6).

Notation 2.16. Let $P_{cg}^{L,St}$ be the full ∞ -subcategory spanned of $P_r^{L,St}$ spanned by stable and compactly generated ∞ -categories.

The ∞ -category inherits a symmetric monoidal structure via the inclusion $Pr_{cg}^{L,St}$ since the tensor (9) sends compactly generated ∞ -categories in compactly generated ∞ -category. We denote this tensor as the tensor in (9).

Example 2.17. Now we want to prove that $Pr^{L,St}$ and $Pr_{cg}^{L,St}$ are left $Alg(\mathcal{S}p)$ -module objects of $Cat_\infty(\mathcal{K})$ and we need the following results (see [11, Corollary 5.48] for the notation).

Lemma 2.18 ([21, Corollary 4.2.3.7]). *The canonical projection*

$$p_0 : \text{LMod}(\mathcal{S}p) \rightarrow \text{Alg}(\mathcal{S}p)$$

is both a cartesian and cocartesian fibration.

Moreover, both its cocartesian Grothendieck construction

$$\int p : \text{Alg}^{op} \longrightarrow \text{Cat}_\infty$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E & \longmapsto & \text{LMod}_E \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow f! \\ A & & \text{LMod}_A. \end{array}$$

and its cartesian Grothendieck construction

$$\int^{op} p : \text{Alg}^{op} \longrightarrow \text{Cat}_\infty$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E & \longmapsto & \text{LMod}_E \\ \downarrow f & & \uparrow f^* \\ A & & \text{LMod}_A \end{array}$$

factor through the inclusion $\iota : Pr^{L,St} \rightarrow \text{Cat}_\infty$.

Proof. As a consequence of [11, Lemma 4.45, Lemma 4.42], the ∞ -functor p_0 is a cocartesian and cartesian fibration.

Moreover, its Grothendieck construction factors through ι because LMod_E is a stable presentable ∞ -category for each \mathbb{E}_1 -ring E , and the ∞ -functors $f_!$ and f^* preserve small colimits because both of them are left adjoint ∞ -functors, [11, Corollario 5.48]. \square

We denote by $\text{LMod}_{(-)}$ the ∞ -functor $\int p_0$ in the above lemma:

$$\text{LMod}_{(-)} : \text{Alg} \rightarrow Pr^{L,St} : \mathcal{A} \mapsto \text{LMod}_{\mathcal{A}}.$$

This ∞ -functor is monoidal, [21, Corollary 4.8.5.13., Theorem 4.8.5.16. (4)], and this implies that we can restrict the left action of $Pr^{L,St}$ on itself, and we obtain that $Pr^{L,St}$ is a left $Alg(\mathcal{S}p)$ -module object in $Cat_\infty(\mathcal{K})$ with the following tensor product:

$$-_{\mathcal{S}p} \otimes^{L,St} - : \text{Alg} \times Pr^{L,St} \rightarrow Pr^{L,St} : (R, \mathcal{A}) \mapsto \text{LMod}_R \otimes^{L,St} \mathcal{A}. \quad (10)$$

Moreover, since for each \mathcal{A} in $\text{Alg}(\mathcal{S}p)$ the ∞ -category $\text{LMod}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is compactly generated and stable, the above ∞ -functor can be restricted further, and it defines a structure of left $\text{Alg}(\mathcal{S}p)$ -module objects of $\text{Cat}_{\infty}(\mathcal{K})$ on $Pr_{cg}^{L,St}$

$$- \otimes^{L,St} -: \text{Alg}(\mathcal{S}p) \times Pr_{cg}^{L,St} \rightarrow Pr_{cg}^{L,St} : (R, \mathcal{A}) \mapsto \text{Mod}_R \otimes^{L,St} \mathcal{A}. \quad (11)$$

3 $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{perf}$ and $Pr_{\omega}^{L,St}$: non-geometrical Morita theory

In this section, we recall and sometimes reproof some results in the pioneering work [4] which will be important in this paper.

First, we define some ∞ -categories. In Example 1.6, we defined the symmetric monoidal ∞ -category $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{Idem}$ whose objects are (not necessarily small) idempotent complete ∞ -categories and whose morphisms are ∞ -functors (with no other properties), and in Example 1.9, we defined the symmetric monoidal ∞ -category $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{RIdem}$ whose objects are idempotent complete ∞ -categories with finite colimits and whose morphisms are finite-colimits-preserving ∞ -functor.

Definition 3.1. We denote by $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{perf} \subseteq \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{RIdem}$ the full ∞ -subcategory whose objects are small stable idempotent complete ∞ -categories.

Definition 3.2 ([19, Definition 5.4.2.19]). We denote by $\text{Acc}_{\omega} \subseteq \widehat{\text{Cat}}_{\infty}$ the ∞ -subcategory defined as follows:

- the objects are ω -accessible ∞ -categories;
- an ∞ -functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ between accessible ∞ -categories belongs to Acc_{ω} if and only if it preserves ω -filtered colimits and preserves compact objects.

Notation 3.3. We denote by Pr_{ω}^L the ∞ -subcategory of Acc_{ω} spanned by compactly generated ∞ -categories and whose morphisms are preserving-small-colimits ∞ -functors.

In [21, Proposition 5.4.2.17], the author proves that there exists an equivalence

$$\text{Ind}_{\omega}(-) : \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{Idem} \rightleftarrows \text{Acc}_{\omega} : (-)^{\omega}. \quad (12)$$

By Remark 1.10, we know that $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{Idem}$ has a symmetric monoidal structure, so Acc_{ω} inherits a symmetric monoidal structure.

By Remark 1.10, there is an inclusion $\iota^{RIdem} : \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{RIdem} \rightarrow \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{Idem}$, and we restrict (12) along this inclusion. Using [19, Theorem 5.5.1 (3)], we obtain that the essential image of $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{RIdem}$ via $\text{Ind}_{\omega}(-)$ is Pr_{ω}^L . So we obtain the next equivalence:

$$\text{Ind}_{\omega}(-) : \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{RIdem} \rightleftarrows Pr_{\omega}^L : (-)^{\omega}. \quad (13)$$

By Remark 1.10, we know that $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{RIdem}$ has a symmetric monoidal structure, so Pr_{ω}^L inherits a symmetric monoidal structure. For the moment we denote the tensor in Pr_{ω}^L by $- \otimes^{L,\omega} -$:

$$- \otimes^{L,\omega} - : (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \mapsto \mathcal{A} \otimes^{L,\omega} \mathcal{B} := \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^{\omega} \otimes^{RIdem} \mathcal{B}^{\omega}).$$

Now we prove that the inclusion $Pr_{\omega}^L \rightarrow Pr^L$ is monoidal.

Let \mathcal{F} be the collection of finite simplicial sets, let N be the collection as in Example 1.6, and \mathcal{K} the collection of all small simplicial sets. From the last part of Section 1, we have the following (a priori non-commutative) diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{rex} & \xrightarrow{P_{\mathcal{F}}^N} & \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{RIdem} & \xrightarrow{Ind} & Pr_{\omega}^L \\
& \perp & & \xleftarrow{(-)^{\omega}} & \downarrow \\
& & & & Pr^L \\
& \searrow^{P_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{K}}(-)} & & & \downarrow \\
& & & & \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}(\mathcal{K}). \\
& \searrow_{P_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{K}}(-)} & & &
\end{array}$$

To achieve our target, we need to prove the following result: for each object $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{rex}$, there exists an equivalence of ∞ -categories

$$P_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{C}) \simeq Ind(P_{\mathcal{F}}^N(\mathcal{C})). \quad (14)$$

We prove the result by showing that $Ind(P_{\mathcal{F}}^N(\mathcal{C}))$ satisfies the properties of $P_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{C})$, Proposition 1.3. Property (1) is trivial consequence of Example 1.12. Let $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}(\mathcal{K})$ be an ∞ -category which admits all small colimits; this implies, in particular, that it is idempotent complete, see Example 1.6.

The following chain of equivalences holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
Fun_{\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}(\mathcal{K})}(Ind(P_{\mathcal{F}}^N(\mathcal{C})), \mathcal{B}) &\simeq Fun_{\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{RIdem}}((Ind(P_{\mathcal{F}}^N(\mathcal{C})))^{\omega}, \mathcal{B}) \\
&\simeq Fun_{\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{RIdem}}(P_{\mathcal{F}}^N(\mathcal{C}), \mathcal{B}) \\
&\simeq Fun_{\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{rex}}(P_{\mathcal{F}}^N(\mathcal{C}), \mathcal{B}).
\end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The first equivalence holds by [19, Proposition 5.5.1.9], the second one because of (13), and the last one because $P_{\mathcal{F}}^N(-) : \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{rex} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{RIdem}$ is a localization, Remark 1.11.

Now we can prove our target. The following chain of equivalences holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A} \otimes^{L,\omega} \mathcal{B} &= Ind(\mathcal{A}^{\omega} \otimes^{RIdem} \mathcal{B}^{\omega}) \cong Ind(P_{\mathcal{F}}^N(\mathcal{A}^{\omega}) \otimes^{RIdem} P_{\mathcal{F}}^N(\mathcal{B}^{\omega})) \\
&\cong Ind(P_{\mathcal{F}}^N(\mathcal{A}^{\omega} \otimes^{rex} \mathcal{B}^{\omega})) \stackrel{\dagger}{\cong} P_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{A}^{\omega} \otimes^{rex} \mathcal{B}^{\omega}) \\
&\cong P_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{A}^{\omega}) \otimes^L P_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{B}^{\omega}) \stackrel{\square}{\cong} Ind(\mathcal{A}^{\omega}) \otimes^L Ind(\mathcal{B}^{\omega}) \\
&\cong \mathcal{A} \otimes^L \mathcal{B}.
\end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

The above equivalences are valid because $P_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{K}}(-)$ and $P_{\mathcal{F}}^N(-)$ are monoidal, $P_{\mathcal{F}}^K(-) : \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{rex} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{RIdem}$ is a localization by Remark 1.11, the \square holds by Example 1.12, the \dagger follows by the equivalence (14), and moreover, we use that the monoidal structure of Pr^L is the restriction of the monoidal structure of $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}(\mathcal{K})$, see [21, Proposition 4.8.1.15].

We conclude that the (non-full) inclusion $Pr_{\omega}^L \rightarrow Pr^L$ is monoidal and that the tensor product and the unit of Pr_{ω}^L coincide with the unit and the tensor of Pr^L . For this reason, from now on, we will denote by \otimes^L the tensor of Pr_{ω}^L , which was previously denoted by $\otimes^{L,\omega}$. So the triple $(Pr_{\omega}^L, \otimes^L, \mathcal{S})$ forms a monoidal structure:

$$\begin{aligned}
- \otimes^L - : Pr_{\omega}^L \times Pr_{\omega}^L &\rightarrow Pr_{\omega}^L \\
(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) &\mapsto \mathcal{A} \otimes^L \mathcal{B} := RFun(\mathcal{A}^{op}, \mathcal{B}).
\end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

In [19, Theorem 5.5.3.18, Proposition 5.5.7.6], the author proves that Pr_ω^L admits small colimits and that the small colimits in Pr_ω^L are computed in Pr^L . Since the tensor product \otimes^L of Pr^L preserves small colimits, the tensor product \otimes^L of Pr_ω^L (which is the same as Pr^L) also preserves them. In short, Pr_ω^L is a commutative algebra object in $Cat_\infty(\mathcal{K})$, where \mathcal{K} is the collection of all small simplicial sets.

Now, we restrict the equivalence in (8) via the inclusion $Pr_\omega^{L,St} \rightarrow Pr^{L,St}$ and we obtain the equivalence

$$Pr_\omega^{L,St} \simeq \text{Mod}_{Sp}(Pr_\omega^L),$$

since Sp is compactly generated [21, Proposition 1.4.3.7]. The ∞ -category $\text{Mod}_{Sp}(Pr_\omega^L)$ has the symmetric monoidal structure of left Sp -module objects of Pr_ω^L (i.e. the tensor is the relative tensor product, [21, §4.4]).

We conclude that $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ inherits the symmetric monoidal structure from the ∞ -category of left Sp -module objects of Pr_ω^L , $\text{Mod}_{Sp}(Pr_\omega^L)$. Reasoning as before, we obtain that the (non-full) inclusion

$$Pr_\omega^{L,St} \rightarrow Pr^{L,St}$$

is monoidal and then the tensor and the unit of $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ are the same as those of $Pr^{L,St}$. Therefore, we use the same notation to denote them:

$$\begin{aligned} - \otimes^{L,St} - &: Pr_\omega^{L,St} \times Pr_\omega^{L,St} \rightarrow Pr_\omega^{L,St} \\ (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) &\mapsto \mathcal{A} \otimes^{L,St} \mathcal{B} := U(- \otimes^L Sp(\mathcal{A})_{Sp} \otimes_{Sp} - \otimes^L Sp(\mathcal{B})) \\ &\simeq \text{Bar}_{Sp}(\mathcal{A} \otimes^L Sp, \mathcal{B} \otimes^L Sp). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

and its unit is Sp . Moreover, the above tensor preserves small colimits in each component, [21, Corollary 4.4.2.15.]. In short, $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ is a commutative algebra of $Cat_\infty(\mathcal{K})$ where \mathcal{K} is the collection of all small simplicial sets.

Finally, the inclusion $\iota : Cat_\infty^{perf} \rightarrow Cat_\infty^{RI dem}$ is fully faithful (in both the ∞ -categories the morphism are preserving-finite-colimits ∞ -functor), then we restrict the equivalence (13) via ι and we find the adjoint equivalence:

$$\text{Ind}(-) : Cat_\infty^{perf} \simeq Pr_\omega^{L,St} : (-)^\omega. \quad (19)$$

This above equivalence was previously described in [4].

Remark 3.4 (Technical point). Let \mathcal{C} be an object of $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$. The full ∞ -subcategory generated by compact objects $\mathcal{C}^\omega \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is not necessarily a small ∞ -category, ([21, Remark 5.4.2.11]), but it is only essentially small. So in Equation (19), the ∞ -functor $(-)^\omega$ actually carries an object $\mathcal{C} \in Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ into a small ∞ -category equivalent to \mathcal{C}^ω .

We conclude that Cat_∞^{perf} inherits a symmetric monoidal structure from Pr_ω^L .

$$\begin{aligned} - \otimes^{perf} - &: Cat_\infty^{perf} \times Cat_\infty^{perf} \rightarrow Cat_\infty^{perf} \\ (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) &\mapsto (\text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}) \otimes^{L,St} \text{Ind}(\mathcal{B}))^\omega. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

and its unit is Sp^ω . Moreover, it preserves small colimits in each component because the tensor of $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ does so. In short, Cat_∞^{perf} is a commutative algebra object of $Cat_\infty(\mathcal{K})$ where \mathcal{K} is the collection of all small simplicial sets.

Remark 3.5. In [8], the proof that Cat_∞^{perf} has a monoidal structure is wrong. The author uses the method in [21, Remark 2.2.1.2] on the inclusion $Pr_\omega^{L,St} \rightarrow Pr_\omega^{L,St}$. However, this criterion cannot be applied because this inclusion is non-full.

In [4], the authors construct the monoidal structure, but they do not write a complete proof.

In [4, Corollary 4.25], the authors prove that Cat_∞^{perf} and $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ are compactly generated ∞ -categories, and then they are presentable ∞ -categories. So, they are actually commutative algebra objects of Pr^L (actually, of Pr_{cg}^L). In particular, this implies that both have an internal-hom.

For us, it is important to find that Cat_∞^{perf} and $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ are left Alg -module objects of Pr^L .

Proposition 3.6. *The ∞ -categories Cat_∞^{perf} and $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ are two left Alg -module objects of Pr^L . Moreover, Cat_∞^{perf} and $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ are equivalent as left Alg -module objects of Pr^L .*

Proof. Since the monoidal structure in Cat_∞^{perf} and $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ is induced by the monoidal structure in $Pr_{cg}^{L,St}$, we can restrict the action of Alg on $Pr_{cg}^{L,St}$ given in (11) to the ∞ -categories Cat_∞^{perf} and $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$. Since there is a monoidal equivalence $Cat_\infty^{perf} \simeq Pr_\omega^{L,St}$, they are equivalent as left Alg -module objects of Pr^L . \square

In the same way, using the monoidal equivalence $Cat_\infty^{perf} \simeq Pr_\omega^{L,St}$, it is possible to see Cat_∞^{perf} as a left $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ -module of Pr^L and, vice versa, $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ as a left Cat_∞^{perf} -module of Pr^L .

Remark 3.7. Now we sum up the higher structures of Cat_∞^{perf} , $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ and we fix the notation for all of them:

- Cat_∞^{perf} as left Alg -module objects of Pr^L :

$$-Sp \otimes^{perf} - : Alg \times Cat_\infty^{perf} \rightarrow Cat_\infty^{perf} : (m, v) \mapsto (LMod_m \otimes^{L,St} Ind(v))^\omega;$$

- Cat_∞^{perf} as associative algebra of Pr^L :

$$- \otimes^{perf} - : Cat_\infty^{perf} \times Cat_\infty^{perf} \rightarrow Cat_\infty^{perf} : (m, v) \mapsto (Ind(m) \otimes^{L,St} Ind(v))^\omega;$$

- Cat_∞^{perf} as left $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ -module objects of Pr^L :

$$-^\omega \otimes^{perf} - : Pr_\omega^{L,St} \times Cat_\infty^{perf} \rightarrow Cat_\infty^{perf} : (m, v) \mapsto (m \otimes^{L,St} Ind(v))^\omega.$$

- $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ as left Alg -module of Pr^L :

$$-Sp \otimes^{L,St} - : Alg \times Pr_\omega^{L,St} \rightarrow Pr_\omega^{L,St} : (m, v) \mapsto LMod_m \otimes^{L,St} v;$$

- $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ as left Cat_∞^{perf} -module of Pr^L :

$$-^{perf} \otimes^{L,St} - : Cat_\infty^{perf} \times Pr_\omega^{L,St} \rightarrow Pr_\omega^{L,St} : (m, v) \mapsto Ind(m) \otimes^{L,St} v.$$

- $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ as associative algebra of Pr^L :

$$- \otimes^{L,St} - : Pr_\omega^{L,St} \times Pr_\omega^{L,St} \rightarrow Pr_\omega^{L,St} : (m, v) \mapsto m \otimes^{L,St} v.$$

4 The ∞ -categories of dg-categories

In this section, we will explain the theory of dg-categories using enriched ∞ -categories theory. This approach is not classical. Historically, dg-categories have been studied using the enriched model category theory. However, since Haugseng proved that enriched ∞ -category theory is a flexible version of enriched model category theory, this modern approach can be useful and natural, see [14, Theorem 5.8] for the original result or [13, §3.3].

Nowadays, the theory of enriched ∞ -category is not well-developed and we must make some choices. We did them in [11, §5] where we explain also our convention. We suggest reading [11, §5] before approaching the remainder of the article.

This section should, however, be seen as “the algebraic geometric way to see a k -linearization”, which in practice means that the ∞ -categories are at least \mathbb{Z} -linear from the start. This has the drawback that when we add properties to an ∞ -category, we need to consider the enrichment. For example, adding small colimits in this context is not as easy as for an ∞ -category (see [19, §5.1.5]), because adding colimits means adding enriched colimits. Nowadays, as far as we know, it is not possible to add freely enriched colimits.

In the first Subsection 4.1, we will prove that $\mathcal{D}(k)$ -enriched ∞ -categories are $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ -enriched ∞ -categories. This result was proved by Lurie in [21] and by Haugseng-Gepner in [9], and it was precedently proved by using enriched model category theory, [13, §3].

In [11], we proved that $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ -enriched ∞ -categories are left $\mathbb{H}k$ -module objects of $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}$. This result is very important for this work because it allows us to redefine a k -linearization in, at least, three ways:

- an $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ -enriched ∞ -category. This is the algebro geometric view;
- or, a Alg -enriched ∞ -functor from the Alg -enriched ∞ -category $\mathbb{H}k$ to the $\text{Alg}(\mathcal{S}p)$ -left tensored ∞ -category $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}$. This new view is the starting point for a general notion of k -linearization, see Subsection 5.1 and it is the spectral algebraic view;
- or, a left $\mathbb{H}k$ -module object of $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}$.

In Subsection 4.2, we will develop the Morita theory for $\mathcal{D}(k)$ -enriched ∞ -categories.

4.1 From $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{D}(k)}$ to $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}$

In this subsection, we will explain how to define an equivalence:

$$\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{D}(k)} \simeq \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}, \quad (21)$$

which will be a change of enrichment (also known as a change of base).

To achieve our result, we apply the construction in [11, Notation 5.18] to a symmetric monoidal equivalence

$$\hat{F} : \mathcal{D}(k) \simeq \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}. \quad (22)$$

In Theorem [21, Theorem 7.1.2.13], the author proves the existence of this symmetric monoidal equivalence. For the sake of completeness, we recall how the ∞ -functor \hat{F} is defined.

This ∞ -functor is constructed in three steps:

First, we construct a right t -exact ∞ -functor

$$F : \mathcal{D}^{-}(k) \rightarrow \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}. \quad (23)$$

The ∞ -category $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ has a right complete t -structure, Example 2.12, then we can use the universal property of the bounded above derived ∞ -category $\mathcal{D}^-(k)$, [21, Theorem 1.3.3.2], which states that the following equivalence holds:

$$\text{Fun}^{p,\heartsuit}(\mathcal{D}^-(k), \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}) \simeq N(\text{Hom}(k\text{-Mod}, k\text{-Mod})). \quad (24)$$

Here, $\text{Fun}^{p,\heartsuit}(\mathcal{D}^-(k), \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k})$ is the ∞ -category of right t -exact ∞ -functors that carry projective objects of $\mathcal{D}^-(k)^{\heartsuit} \simeq k\text{-Mod}$ into the heart of $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$.

Remark 4.1. Equation (24) is truly interesting. It implies that any ordinary derived functor can be lifted to a right t -complete ∞ -functor between derived ∞ -categories. Indeed, this equivalence carries an object $F \in \text{Fun}^{p,\heartsuit}(\mathcal{D}^-(k), \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k})$ into the derived functor

$$k\text{-Mod} \xrightarrow{\text{deg}_0} \text{Ch}_{\geq 0}(k) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{L}hF} \text{Ch}_{\geq 0}(k) \xrightarrow{H_0} k\text{-Mod}$$

of a right exact functor hL . See [25, §2.3] for an introduction to derived functors.

In our case, we lift the identity functor $id_{k\text{-Mod}}$, and we obtain the desired ∞ -functor (23). This concludes the first step.

The Proposition [21, Proposition 1.3.5.24] allows us to identify $\mathcal{D}^-(k)$ with the full ∞ -subcategory of $\bigcup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{D}(k)_{\geq -n} \subseteq \mathcal{D}(k)$ spanned by the right bounded objects. Since F is a right t -exact ∞ -functor, F sends right bounded objects into right bounded objects. This implies that we can restrict it to every right bounded component and define a diagram $F_* : \mathcal{D}(k)_{\geq *}$ \rightarrow $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{\geq *}$ as in the figure below:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \mathcal{D}(k)_{\geq -2} \\ \downarrow \tau_{\geq -1} \\ \mathcal{D}(k)_{\geq -1} \\ \downarrow \tau_{\geq 0} \\ \mathcal{D}(k)_{\geq 0} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{F_{-2}} \\ \xrightarrow{F_{-1}} \\ \xrightarrow{F_0} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{\geq -2} \\ \downarrow \tau_{\geq -1} \\ \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{\geq -1} \\ \downarrow \tau_{\geq 0} \\ \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{\geq 0} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array}$$

We take the limit of F_* , and since $\mathcal{D}(k)$ and $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ have right complete t -structure, we obtain our desired ∞ -functor (22):

$$\lim(\mathcal{D}(k)_{\geq *}) \simeq \mathcal{D}(k) \xrightarrow{\hat{F} = \lim F_*} \lim(\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{\geq *}) \simeq \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}. \quad (25)$$

That concludes the second step. In the third step, we need to prove that \hat{F} is monoidal and equivalence. This is achieved using Shipley-Schwede's recognition principle [21, §7.1.2], keeping in mind the following two facts:

- the unit object of the symmetric monoidal structure of $\mathcal{D}(k)$ is

$$k[0] := \cdots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow k \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \cdots$$

and $k[0]$ is compact and corepresents the homology (in [21, Theorem 7.1.2.1], Lurie calls an object as $k[0]$ a generator of $\mathcal{D}(k)$) of chain complexes:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_0 \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(k)}(k[0], [-n](-)) &\simeq \pi_0 \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(k)}(k[n], -) \\ &\simeq \mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}(k)}^{-n}(k[0], -) \simeq H_n(-) : h\mathcal{D}(k) \rightarrow \mathrm{Set}; \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

- $\mathbb{H}k$ is the endomorphism algebra of $k[0]$. Now, we prove this. Since $\mathcal{D}(k)$ is a presentable stable ∞ -category, it can be considered as an $\mathcal{S}p$ -enriched ∞ -category (see [9, §7] or [15]). It is easy to see that the endomorphism object of $k[0]$ is the spectrum object $\mathcal{D}(k)(k[0], k[0])$, whose representation as a spectrum is:

$$(\dots, \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(k)}(k[1], k[0]), \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(k)}(k[0], k[0]), \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(k)}(k[-1], k[0]), \dots),$$

for a proof of this easy fact, see [21, Theorem 4.8.5.16] and [21, §4.8.5]. $\mathcal{D}(k)(k[0], k[0])$ is a spectrum object because, by the universal property of pullbacks, the following equivalence holds:

$$\Omega \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(k)}(k[n], k[0]) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(k)}(\Sigma k[n], k[0]) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(k)}(k[n+1], k[0])$$

. In particular, the homotopy groups of this spectrum are

$$\begin{cases} \pi_0 \mathcal{D}(k)(k[0], k[0]) = \pi_0 \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(k)}(k[0], k[0]) \simeq H_0 k[0] \simeq k & \text{if } n = 0; \\ \pi_n \mathcal{D}(k)(k[0], k[0]) = \pi_0 \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(k)}(k[n], k[0]) \simeq H_n k[0] \simeq 0 & \text{if } n \neq 0, \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

We conclude that $\mathcal{D}(k)(k[0], k[0])$ is equivalent to the Eilenberg-MacLane spectrum $\mathbb{H}k$.

Finally, using the functoriality of the ∞ -functor $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{(-)}$, [11, Equation (30)], we obtain the desired Equation (21). So, above we proved the following result:

Proposition 4.2. *The ∞ -category of $\mathcal{D}(k)$ -enriched ∞ -categories $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\mathcal{D}(k)}$ and the ∞ -category of $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ -enriched ∞ -categories $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}$ are equivalent.*

4.2 Morita theory for dg-categories

First of all, we recall what a dg-category over k is for us.

Definition 4.3. A dg-category over k is an object of the ∞ -category of $\mathcal{D}(k)$ -enriched ∞ -categories, denoted as $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\mathcal{D}(k)}$.

Sometimes, with abuse, we say dg-category instead of dg-category over k .

Remark 4.4. Our definition is equivalent to the classical definition, where a dg-category is a $Ch(k)$ -enriched category, e.g. [7, Definition 1.1], since $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\mathcal{D}(k)}$ is the underlying ∞ -category of the Dwyer-Kan model category of $\mathcal{C}at(Ch(k))$, detailed in [13, §3].

Remark 4.5. In Subsection 4.1, we proved that $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\mathcal{D}(k)} \simeq \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}$, so a dg-category over k is also an object of $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}$.

From now on we call dg-categories over k also the objects of $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}$.

Hereafter, we will use the ∞ -category $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}$ instead of $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\mathcal{D}(k)}$.

In this subsection, we enrich the results in Section 3. We begin with the $\mathcal{S}p$ -enriched case. By the end of this thesis, it will be evident that the $\mathcal{S}p$ -enriched case and the non-geometrical case in Section 3 are equivalent. Thus, we sometimes refer to the $\mathcal{S}p$ -enriched case as the non-geometrical case.

After analyzing the non-geometrical case, we will address the k -linear one, i.e., the $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ -enriched case.

Notation 4.6. We refer to objects of $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}$ as *spectral ∞ -categories*.

Notation 4.7 ([11, Exampe 5.22]). Let $\mathcal{A} \in \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}$ be a dg-category, we call *the underlying spectral ∞ -category of \mathcal{A}* the spectral ∞ -category $U_!(\mathcal{A})$ where $U_! : \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}} \rightarrow \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}$ is the canonical change of enrichment. We denote it by \mathcal{A}_{sp} .

Notation 4.8 ([11, Example 5.20, Notation 5.21]). We define the *underlying ∞ -category ∞ -functor* as the following ∞ -functor:

$$(-)_o : \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{V}} \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{V}}, -)_!} \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}} \simeq \text{Cat}_{\infty} : \mathcal{A} \mapsto \mathcal{A}_o \quad (28)$$

Let \mathcal{A} be an enriched ∞ -category we call \mathcal{A}_o its underlying ∞ -category. Moreover, we denote by $h\mathcal{A}$ its homotopy category $h\mathcal{A}_o$ and we call it *the homotopy category of \mathcal{A}* . Let $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be an object in $\text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{V}}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$, we call $f_o : \mathcal{A}_o \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_o$ the *underlying ∞ -functor of f* .

We now consider the analog of the stable condition for spectral ∞ -categories, namely the pretriangulated condition. It will be immediately clear that they are analogous to each other.

Definition 4.9 ([15, Definition 9.1]). Let $\mathcal{A} \in \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}$ be a spectral ∞ -category. We say that it is *pretriangulated* if:

1. (**0**-element) \mathcal{A}_o has a zero object $\mathbf{0}$;
2. (mapping cone) \mathcal{A}_o is closed under cofibers;
3. (shift) The suspension ∞ -functor $\Sigma : \mathcal{A}_o \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_o$ is well-defined, where $\Sigma(X) = \text{colim}(\mathbf{0} \leftarrow X \rightarrow \mathbf{0})$, and Σ is an equivalence of ∞ -categories.

and, for each object $Y \in \mathcal{A}$, the ∞ -functors $\mathcal{A}(Y, -) : \mathcal{A}_o \rightarrow \mathcal{S}p$ and $\mathcal{A}(-, Y) : \mathcal{A}_o^{op} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}p$ are exact.

Remark 4.10. In classical literature, dg-categories satisfying the properties of Definition 4.9 are called *strong pretriangulated*. Those satisfying only the properties (mapping cone) and (shift) are termed pretriangulated. We opt to call pretriangulated those dg-categories with all three properties since with this choice mapping cone and shift are (homotopy) colimits in the same dg-categories, which is significant to us. Using the classical convention for pretriangulated dg-categories (not necessarily strong), mapping cone and shift are defined as enriched (homotopy) colimits in the category of dg-modules.

With a trick of category theory, it is easy to prove that the adjoint inverse of Σ is the loop ∞ -functor

$$\Omega : \mathcal{A}_o \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_o : Y \mapsto \text{lim}(\mathbf{0} \rightarrow Y \leftarrow \mathbf{0}).$$

In [15, Remark 9.7], the author proves that $\Sigma \dashv \Omega$ is actually an $\mathcal{S}p$ -enriched adjunction. This is a consequence of the condition that, for each object $Y \in \mathcal{A}$, the ∞ -functors $\mathcal{A}(Y, -) : \mathcal{A}_o \rightarrow \mathcal{S}p$ and $\mathcal{A}(-, Y) : \mathcal{A}_o^{op} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}p$ are exact.

Using Definition 2.1, we can rewrite Definition 4.9 briefly as follows:

Definition 4.11. Let \mathcal{A} be a spectral ∞ -category. We say that it is *pretriangulated* if its underlying ∞ -category \mathcal{A}_o is stable, and for each object $Y \in \mathcal{A}_o$, the ∞ -functors $\mathcal{A}(Y, -) : \mathcal{A}_o \rightarrow \mathcal{S}p$ and $\mathcal{A}(-, Y) : \mathcal{A}_o^{op} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}p$ are exact.

Remark 4.12. Let \mathcal{A} be a pretriangulated spectral ∞ -category, so \mathcal{A}_o is stable and in particular \mathcal{A}_o has all finite colimits. Since in Definition 4.9 and Definition 4.11 $\mathcal{A}_o(-, X) : \mathcal{A}_o^{op} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}p$ is exact, it preserves finite limits. This implies that \mathcal{A} has $\mathcal{S}p$ -enriched colimits. Indeed, let $d : I \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_o$ be a diagram with source a finite simplicial sets I and $colim_{i \in I} d \in \mathcal{A}_o$ be the nadir of the colimit, then, for each $X \in \mathcal{A}_o$, the following chain of equivalences holds:

$$\mathcal{A}(colim_{i \in I} d(i), X) \simeq \mathcal{A}(lim_{i \in I^{op}} d^{op}(i), X) \simeq lim_{i \in I^{op}} \mathcal{A}(d(i), X), \quad (29)$$

where the first holds because a colimit of d in \mathcal{A}_o is a limit of d^{op} in \mathcal{A}_o^{op} (see [27, Proposition 12.1.7]) and the second one because $\mathcal{A}(-, X)$ preserves finite limits. (29) is the ∞ -categorical analog of the universal property of the enriched (or, conical) colimits of the ordinary case, see [27, §A.5]. In similar way the condition that $\mathcal{A}(X, -) : \mathcal{A}_o \rightarrow \mathcal{S}p$ preserves limits implies that \mathcal{A} admits $\mathcal{S}p$ -enriched limits.

From what we know, the theory of enriched (co)limits is not well defined.

Remark 4.13. From the last definition, it is clear that the stability condition depends almost entirely on the underlying ∞ -category \mathcal{A}_o of a $\mathcal{S}p$ -enriched ∞ -category. In [15, §9], the author proves that the stability condition for a $\mathcal{S}p$ -enriched ∞ -category is completely contained in the underlying ∞ -category \mathcal{A}_o . Indeed, he defines the full ∞ -subcategory $Cat_{\infty}^{Sp, St} \subseteq Cat_{\infty}^{Sp}$ spanned by pretriangulated spectral ∞ -categories and, in [4, Corollary 9.21], he proves that the underlying ∞ -category ∞ -functor define an equivalence:

$$(-)_o : Cat_{\infty}^{Sp, St} \simeq Cat_{\infty}^{Ex}.$$

Moreover, he constructs a localization

$$Cat_{\infty}^{Sp} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \\ \perp \\ \xleftarrow{\quad} \end{array} Cat_{\infty}^{Sp, St} \quad (30)$$

whose right adjoint is lax monoidal. This result is interesting because it is the ∞ -categorical analogous to the triangulated localization $\Psi_{Tri}(-)$ defined in [4].

Remark 4.14. From Definition 4.11, we obtain some obvious consequences:

- $h\mathcal{A}$ is a triangulated category;
- \mathcal{A}_o has finite limits and finite colimits.

Now, we tackle the idempotent complete condition and start by recalling a result about idempotent complete ∞ -categories proved by Lurie.

Proposition 4.15 ([19, Lemma 5.4.2.4]). *Let \mathcal{B} be a small ∞ -category. The following two conditions are equivalent:*

- the ∞ -category \mathcal{B} is idempotent complete, Example 1.6;
- the ∞ -category \mathcal{B} is equivalent to the compact ∞ -subcategory of a ω -accessible ∞ -category.

Definition 4.16. We say that a spectral ∞ -category $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{Sp}$ is *idempotent complete* if its underlying ∞ -category \mathcal{A}_o satisfies one of the equivalent conditions in Proposition 4.15.

Definition 4.17. We say that a spectral ∞ -category \mathcal{A} is *perfect* if it is small, idempotent complete, and pretriangulated. We denote by $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{Sp,perf}$ the full ∞ -subcategory of $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{Sp}$ whose elements are small perfect spectral ∞ -categories. We call $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{Sp}$ the *∞ -category of perfect spectral ∞ -categories*.

Remark 4.18 (Technical Point). Let \mathcal{A} be a perfect spectral ∞ -category. It is important to emphasize that its underlying ∞ -category is small.

Remark 4.19. It is interesting that $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{Sp,perf} \subseteq \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{Sp}$ is a full ∞ -subcategory and we do not request that the underlying ∞ -functor $f_o : \mathcal{A}_o \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_o$ of a Sp -enriched ∞ -functor $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is exact (i.e., it is the correct morphism between stable ∞ -categories). This is because in [15, Proposition 9.19], the author proves that for any \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} pretriangulated spectral ∞ -categories (in particular, that holds for perfect ∞ -categories), the underlying ∞ -functor $f_o : \mathcal{A}_o \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_o$ of an Sp -enriched ∞ -functor $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is an exact ∞ -functor. Moreover, he proves that the underlying ∞ -category ∞ -functor

$$(-)_o : \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{Sp,perf} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{Ex}$$

is conservative, [11, Example 5.20].

Definition 4.20. Let \mathcal{A} be a pretriangulated spectral ∞ -category. We say that it is compactly generated if it satisfies the following conditions:

- \mathcal{A}_o admits small coproducts;
- \mathcal{A}_o is ω -accessible;
- for each object $X \in \mathcal{A}$, the ∞ -functor $\mathcal{A}(-, X) : \mathcal{A}^{op} \rightarrow Sp$ preserves small products

Remark 4.21 ([21, Proposition 1.4.4.1]). Every stable ∞ -category with small (co)products admits all small (co)limits, so \mathcal{A}_o in Definition 4.20 is a compactly generated ∞ -category. In particular, \mathcal{A}_o is not usually small. For the same reason, $\mathcal{A}_o(-, X) : \mathcal{A}^{op} \rightarrow Sp$ preserves all small limits, and this implies that \mathcal{A} has Sp -enriched colimits. Indeed, let $d : I \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_o$ be a diagram and let $colim_{i \in I} d \in \mathcal{A}_o$ be the nadir of the colimit (which is an apex of the limit of d^{op} in \mathcal{A}_o^{op} , see [27, Proposition 12.1.7]), so, for each $X \in \mathcal{A}_o$, the following equivalence holds:

$$\mathcal{A}(colim_{i \in I} d(i), X) \simeq \mathcal{A}(lim_{i \in I^{op}} d^{op}(i), X) \simeq lim_{i \in I^{op}} \mathcal{A}(d(i), X),$$

this is the ∞ -categorical of the ordinary case, see [27, §A.5].

Let \mathcal{A} be a pretriangulated compactly generated spectral category. From the above remark, we know that \mathcal{A}_o is a compactly generated stable ∞ -category. Just like being stable is the ∞ -categorical analog of being triangulated for an ordinary category, being compactly generated for a stable ∞ -category is the ∞ -categorical analog of being a ω -well generated triangulated category (or ω -compactly generated triangulated category). If you are not familiar with what this concept is, you can find a presentation in [7] or in [24].

We recall the definition in [24] of compact object in a triangulated category admitting small coproducts.

Definition 4.22. Let \mathcal{T} be a triangulated category admitting small coproducts. An object $c \in \mathcal{T}$ is said to be compact if the corepresentable functor $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(c, -) : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ commutes with small coproducts.

Proposition 4.23. *Let \mathcal{A} be a stable ∞ -category, then \mathcal{A} is compactly generated if and only if:*

- \mathcal{A} admits small coproducts;
- and the triangulated category $h\mathcal{A}$ is ω -well generated.

In particular, an object of \mathcal{A} is a compact object in the triangulated category with small coproduct $h\mathcal{A}$, Definition 4.22, if and only if it is a compact object in the stable ∞ -category admitting filtered colimits \mathcal{A}_o , Definition 1.14.

Proof. This result is proven by Lurie in [21, Proposition 1.4.4.1, Proposition 1.4.4.2], [19, Theorem 5.1.1.1]. \square

Definition 4.24. We denote by $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p, h\text{-proj}}$ the ∞ -subcategory of $\widehat{\text{Cat}}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}$ whose objects are compactly generated pretriangulated spectral ∞ -categories and whose morphisms are $\mathcal{S}p$ -enriched ∞ -functors such that their underlying ∞ -functor preserves small coproducts. We call the objects of $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p, h\text{-proj}}$ the *h -project spectral ∞ -categories*.

Definition 4.25. We denote by $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p, \omega}$ the ∞ -subcategory of $\widehat{\text{Cat}}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}$ whose objects are compactly generated pretriangulated spectral ∞ -categories and whose morphisms are $\mathcal{S}p$ -enriched ∞ -functors such that their underlying ∞ -functor preserves small coproducts and compact objects. We call the objects of $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p, \omega}$ the *h -project spectral ∞ -category*, because they are the same as $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p, h\text{-proj}}$.

Definition 4.26. Let \mathcal{A} be a pretriangulated spectral ∞ -category. We say that it is presentable if it satisfies the following conditions:

- \mathcal{A}_o is a presentable ∞ -category;
- for each object $X \in \mathcal{A}$, the ∞ -functor $\mathcal{A}(-, X) : \mathcal{A}_o^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}p$ preserves all small limits.

Definition 4.27. We denote by $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p, L, St}$ the ∞ -subcategory of $\widehat{\text{Cat}}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}$ whose objects are presentable pretriangulated spectral ∞ -categories and whose morphisms are $\mathcal{S}p$ -enriched ∞ -functors such that their underlying ∞ -functor preserves small colimits. We call the objects of $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p, L, St}$ the *presentable pretriangulated spectral ∞ -categories*.

The pretriangulated presentable spectral ∞ -categories have an important property.

Proposition 4.28. *Let \mathcal{A} be a pretriangulated presentable spectral ∞ -category, then \mathcal{A} is a tensored $\mathcal{S}p$ -enriched ∞ -category. Vice versa, every tensored $\mathcal{S}p$ -enriched ∞ -category \mathcal{A} whose underlying ∞ -category \mathcal{A}_o is presentable is a pretriangulated presentable spectral ∞ -category.*

Proof. By definition, the underlying ∞ -category \mathcal{A}_o is presentable and stable so it is a left $\mathcal{S}p$ -module object in Pr^L . In particular, there is an ∞ -functor

$$- \otimes - : \mathcal{S}p \times \mathcal{A}_o \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_o$$

which preserves small colimits componentwise. It is straightforward to prove that this ∞ -functor satisfies the properties in [11, Definition 5.29]. The vice versa is obvious. \square

Remark 4.29. As a consequence of Proposition 4.28, the ∞ -category $Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,L,St}$ is the ∞ -category Pr_{Sp}^L defined in [15]. Indeed, Pr_{Sp}^L is the ∞ -subcategory of $\widehat{Cat}_{\infty}^{Sp}$ generated by tensored Sp -enriched ∞ -categories whose underlying ∞ -category is presentable and whose morphisms are the same as $Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,L,St}$. In particular, in [15, Theorem 1.2], the author proves the fundamental result for us that

$$Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,L,St} = Pr_{Sp}^L \simeq LMod_{Sp}(Pr^L) \simeq Pr^{L,St}.$$

Now we add a k -linearization to the above definitions. The idea of the k -linearization definitions is very simple: the properties inside the underlying ∞ -category \mathcal{A}_o remain unchanged and the properties associated with the (co)limits-preservation ∞ -functors remain the same but the ∞ -functors will target the ∞ -category $Mod_{\mathbb{H}k}$ instead of Sp . We will find out that even this difference can be eliminated.

Definition 4.30. Let \mathcal{A} be a dg-category, we will say that it is *pretriangulated* if its underlying ∞ -category \mathcal{A}_o is stable and, for each objects $Y \in \mathcal{A}_o$, the ∞ -functors $\mathcal{A}(Y, -) : \mathcal{A}_o \rightarrow Mod_{\mathbb{H}k}$ and $\mathcal{A}(-, Y) : \mathcal{A}_o^{op} \rightarrow Mod_{\mathbb{H}k}$ are exact.

Definition 4.31. We denote by $Cat_{\infty}^{Mod_{\mathbb{H}k},St}$ the full ∞ -subcategory of $Cat_{\infty}^{Mod_{\mathbb{H}k}}$ whose objects are small pretriangulated dg-categories.

Remark 4.32. The same deduction of Remark 4.12 holds for pretriangulated dg-category, with the only difference that it admits finite $Mod_{\mathbb{H}k}$ -enriched colimits and finite $Mod_{\mathbb{H}k}$ -enriched limits, instead of Sp -enriched.

Definition 4.33. We say that a dg-category $\mathcal{A} \in Cat_{\infty}^{Mod_{\mathbb{H}k}}$ is *idempotent complete* if its underlying ∞ -category \mathcal{A}_o satisfies one of the equivalent conditions in Proposition 4.15.

Definition 4.34. We say that a dg-category \mathcal{A} is *perfect* if it is small, idempotent complete, and pretriangulated. Moreover, we denote by $Cat_{\infty}^{Mod_{\mathbb{H}k},perf}$ the full ∞ -subcategory of $Cat_{\infty}^{Mod_{\mathbb{H}k}}$ whose elements are small perfect dg-categories. We call $Cat_{\infty}^{Mod_{\mathbb{H}k},perf}$ the *∞ -category of small perfect dg-categories*.

Definition 4.35. Let \mathcal{A} be a pretriangulated dg-category, we say that it is compactly generated if it satisfies the following conditions:

- \mathcal{A}_o admits small coproducts,
- \mathcal{A}_o is ω -accessible;
- for each object $X \in \mathcal{A}$, the ∞ -functor $\mathcal{A}(-, X) : \mathcal{A}_o^{op} \rightarrow Mod_{\mathbb{H}k}$ preserves small products.

Definition 4.36. We denote by $Cat_{\infty}^{Mod_{\mathbb{H}k},h-proj}$ the ∞ -subcategory of $\widehat{Cat}_{\infty}^{Mod_{\mathbb{H}k}}$ whose objects are compactly generated pretriangulated dg-categories and whose morphisms are $Mod_{\mathbb{H}k}$ -enriched ∞ -functors such that their underlying ∞ -functor preserves small coproducts. We call the objects of $Cat_{\infty}^{Mod_{\mathbb{H}k},\omega}$ *h -project dg-categories*.

Remark 4.37. Let \mathcal{A} be a pretriangulated compactly generated dg-category. Since \mathcal{A}_o is stable and has small coproducts, then it has small colimits, [21, Proposition 1.4.4.1]. In particular, \mathcal{A}_o is a compactly generated ∞ -category. For the same reason, the morphisms in $Cat_{\infty}^{Mod_{\mathbb{H}k},h-proj}$ preserve all small colimits. In fact, they preserve small coproducts by definition and they are exact, see Remark 4.19.

Definition 4.38. We denote by $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}, \omega}$ the ∞ -subcategory of $\widehat{\mathcal{C}at}_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}$ whose objects are compactly generated pretriangulated dg-categories and whose morphisms are $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ -enriched ∞ -functors such that their underlying ∞ -functor preserves small coproducts and compact objects. We call the objects of $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}, \omega}$ *h-project dg-categories*.

Definition 4.39. Let \mathcal{A} be a pretriangulated dg-category, we say that it is presentable if it satisfies the following conditions:

- \mathcal{A}_o is a presentable ∞ -category;
- for each object $X \in \mathcal{A}$, the ∞ -functor $\mathcal{A}(-, X) : \mathcal{A}^{op} \rightarrow \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ preserves all small limits.

Remark 4.40. The same deduction of Remark 4.21 holds for a compactly generated pretriangulated dg-category and for a presentable pretriangulated dg-category, with the only difference that it admits small $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ -enriched colimits, instead of $\mathcal{S}p$ -enriched.

Definition 4.41. We denote by $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}, L, St}$ the ∞ -subcategory of $\widehat{\mathcal{C}at}_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}$ whose objects are presentable pretriangulated dg-categories and whose morphisms are $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ -enriched ∞ -functors such that their underlying ∞ -functor preserves small colimits. We call the objects of $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}, L, St}$ *presentable pretriangulated dg-categories*.

The pretriangulated presentable dg-categories have an important property.

Proposition 4.42. *Let \mathcal{A} be a pretriangulated presentable dg-category, then \mathcal{A} is a tensored $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ -enriched ∞ -category. Vice versa, every tensored $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ -enriched ∞ -category \mathcal{A} whose underlying ∞ -category \mathcal{A}_o is presentable is a pretriangulated presentable spectral ∞ -category.*

Proof. The proof is the same as Proposition 4.28. \square

Remark 4.43. As a consequence of Proposition 4.42, $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}, L, St}$ is the ∞ -category $Pr_{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}^L$ defined in [15]. Indeed, $Pr_{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}^L$ is the ∞ -subcategory of $\widehat{\mathcal{C}at}_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}$ generated by tensored $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ -enriched ∞ -categories whose underlying ∞ -category is presentable and whose morphisms are the same as $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}, L, St}$. In particular, in [15, Theorem 1.2], the author proves the fundamental result for us that

$$\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}, L, St} = Pr_{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}^L \simeq \text{LMod}_{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(Pr^L). \quad (31)$$

Let us recall some results that allow us to reduce the study of dg-categories to the study of their underlying spectral ∞ -categories \mathcal{A}_{sp} .

Remark 4.44 ([21, Corollary 4.2.3.5.] [21, Corollary 4.2.3.3]). Let $U_k : \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}p$ the forgetful ∞ -functor:

- U_k preserves, reflects, and creates small colimits;
- U_k preserves and reflects small limits.

In [11, Theorem 6.4], we proved that there exist an equivalent to $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}} \simeq \text{LMod}_{\mathbb{H}k}(\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p})$. As above, the forgetful ∞ -functor

$$\mathcal{U}_k : \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}} \simeq \text{LMod}_{\mathbb{H}k}(\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}$$

has the properties:

- \mathcal{U}_k preserves, reflects, and creates small colimits;
- \mathcal{U}_k preserves and reflects small limits.

Note that the forgetful ∞ -functor \mathcal{U}_k can be described in at least two other ways: as the evaluation ∞ -functor

$$ev_* : \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}} \simeq \text{Fun}^{\text{Alg}(\mathcal{S}p)}(\mathbb{H}k, \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p},$$

or as the change of base ∞ -functor U_1 , [11, Exampe 5.22].

Using Remark 4.44, we can reformulate the above definitions.

Proposition 4.45. *Let \mathcal{A} be a dg-category. Then the following properties are equivalent:*

- \mathcal{A} is pretriangulated;
- its underlying ∞ -category \mathcal{A}_o is stable and for each object $Y \in \mathcal{A}_o$, the ∞ -functors $\mathcal{U}_k \circ \mathcal{A}(Y, -) : \mathcal{A}_o \rightarrow \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}p$ and $\mathcal{U}_k \circ \mathcal{A}(-, Y) : \mathcal{A}_o^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}p$ are exact;
- a dg-category $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}$ is pretriangulated if its underlying spectral ∞ -category \mathcal{A}_{sp} is.

Proof. Follows from Remark 4.44. \square

Proposition 4.46. *Let \mathcal{A} be a pretriangulated ∞ -category, then the following properties are equivalent:*

- it is idempotent complete,
- its underlying spectral ∞ -category \mathcal{A}_{sp} is idempotent complete;
- its underlying ∞ -category \mathcal{A}_o is idempotent complete.

Proof. Follows from Remark 4.44. \square

Remark 4.47. From Proposition 4.45 and Proposition 4.46, we obtain that $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}, \text{perf}}$ is the pullback square in the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}, \text{perf}} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}} \\ \mathcal{U}_k^{\text{perf}} \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \mathcal{U}_k \\ \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p, \text{perf}} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p} \end{array} \quad (32)$$

Since the class of conservative ∞ -functors is the right class of a factorization system in $\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}$, see [1, Example 3.1.7 (f)], the class of conservative ∞ -functors is stable under pullback (or base change). This implies that the ∞ -functor $\mathcal{U}_k^{\text{perf}}$ in (32) is conservative. So we deduce that the ∞ -functor

$$\mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}, \text{perf}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{U}_k^{\text{perf}}} \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p, \text{perf}} \xrightarrow{(-)_o} \mathcal{C}at_{\infty}^{\text{Ex}}$$

is conservative because it is a composition of conservative ∞ -functors, see Remark 4.19.

Proposition 4.48. *Let \mathcal{A} be a pretriangulated dg-category, then the following properties are equivalent:*

- \mathcal{A} is compactly generated;

- its underlying ∞ -category \mathcal{A}_o is compactly generated and for each object $Y \in \mathcal{A}_o$, the ∞ -functor $\mathcal{U}_k \circ \mathcal{A}(-, Y) : \mathcal{A}_o^{op} \rightarrow \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k} \rightarrow \text{Sp}$ preserves small limits;
- the underlying spectral ∞ -category \mathcal{A}_{sp} is compactly generated;

Proof. Follows from Remark 4.44. \square

Remark 4.49. From Proposition 4.48, we obtain that $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}, \omega}$ is the pullback square in the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}, \omega} & \longrightarrow & \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}} \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Sp}, \omega} & \longrightarrow & \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Sp}} \end{array}$$

Proposition 4.50. *Let \mathcal{A} be a pretriangulated compactly generated dg-category, then \mathcal{A} is a tensored $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ -enriched ∞ -category.*

Proof. This result is a consequence of Proposition 4.28. \square

Now we prove the Sp -enriched version and the $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ -enriched version of (19).

Proposition 4.51. *There exists an equivalence of ∞ -categories*

$$M : \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Sp}, \text{perf}} \simeq \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Sp}, \omega} : Y. \quad (33)$$

Proof. In [15, Theorem 1.2], the author proves that there exists an equivalence $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Sp}, \text{St}, L} \simeq P_{r^L, \text{St}}$. We restrict this equivalence via the inclusion $P_{r_{\omega}^L, \text{St}} \rightarrow P_{r^L, \text{St}}$, and we obtain an equivalence:

$$\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Sp}, \omega} \simeq P_{r_{\omega}^L, \text{St}}. \quad (34)$$

In the same paper [15, Theorem 9.18], the author proves that there exists an equivalence $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Sp}, \text{St}} \simeq \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Ex}}$. We restrict this equivalence via the inclusion $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{perf}} \rightarrow \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Ex}}$, and we obtain an equivalence:

$$\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Sp}, \text{perf}} \simeq \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{perf}}. \quad (35)$$

So we obtain the thesis from (35) and (34) and (19). \square

Remark 4.52. The above proposition is important because the elements in $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Sp}, \omega}$ are by definition not necessarily small; instead, the elements of $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Sp}, \text{perf}}$ are small.

Remark 4.53. The statement of 4.51 is interesting.

Combining it with a few results from [15] and in [4], we can deduce some important facts. Indeed, the ∞ -functor $M : \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Sp}, \text{perf}} \rightarrow \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Sp}, L, \text{St}}$ in (33) postcomposed with the ∞ -functor underlying ∞ -category

$$M(-)_o := \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Sp}, \text{perf}} \rightarrow \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Sp}, \omega} \xrightarrow{(-)_o} P_{r_{\omega}^L},$$

can be described on the objects in three ways.

Let \mathcal{A} be an object of $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Sp}, \text{perf}}$:

- (i) $M(\mathcal{A})_o$ is the ind-completion of the underlying category of \mathcal{A} , i.e., $M(\mathcal{A})_o \simeq \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}_o)$;

- (ii) $M(\mathcal{A})_o$ is the ∞ -category of $\mathcal{S}p$ -enriched ∞ -functors $P_{\mathcal{S}p}(\mathcal{A})$. In particular, $M(\mathcal{A})_o$ is the Hinich's Yoneda Embedding;
- (iii) $M(\mathcal{A})_o$ is the ∞ -category of exact ∞ -functors $Fun^{Ex}(\mathcal{A}_o, \mathcal{S}p)$.

Heine proves that (i) is equivalent to (ii), whereas Tabuada-Blumberg-Gepner prove that (i) is equivalent to (iii).

Moreover, if we further compose $M(-)_o$ with the equivalence $(-)_\omega : Pr_\omega^{L, St} \rightarrow Cat_\infty^{perf}$, we obtain an ∞ -functor

$$M(-)_{o, \omega} : Cat_\infty^{Sp, perf} \rightarrow Pr_\omega^L \xrightarrow{(-)_\omega} Cat_\infty^{perf}.$$

Also, $M(-)_{o, \omega}$ can be described on the objects in three ways. Let \mathcal{A} be an object of $Cat_\infty^{Sp, perf}$:

- (1) $M(\mathcal{A})_{o, \omega}$ is the full ∞ -subcategory generated by the compact objects of $Ind(\mathcal{A}_o)$, i.e., $M(\mathcal{A})_{o, \omega} \simeq Ind(\mathcal{A}_o)^\omega$. But by definition, $\mathcal{A}_o \simeq Ind(\mathcal{A}_o)^\omega$, so $M(\mathcal{A})_{o, \omega}$ is the underlying ∞ -category;
- (2) $M(\mathcal{A})_{o, \omega}$ is the full ∞ -subcategory generated by the compact objects of $\mathcal{S}p$ -enriched ∞ -functors ∞ -category $P_{\mathcal{S}p}(\mathcal{A})$, i.e., $M(\mathcal{A})_{o, \omega} \simeq P_{\mathcal{S}p}(\mathcal{A})^\omega$;
- (3) $M(\mathcal{A})_{o, \omega}$ is the full ∞ -subcategory generated by the compact objects of $Fun^{Ex}(\mathcal{A}_o, \mathcal{S}p)$, i.e., $M(\mathcal{A})_{o, \omega} \simeq Fun^{Ex}(\mathcal{A}_o, \mathcal{S}p)^\omega$.

Instead, if we post-compose the ∞ -functor $Y : Cat_\infty^{Sp, \omega} \simeq Cat_\infty^{Sp, perf}$ with the underlying ∞ -category functor, we obtain an ∞ -functor:

$$Y(-)_o : Cat_\infty^{Sp, \omega} \simeq Cat_\infty^{Sp, perf} \xrightarrow{(-)_o} Cat_\infty^{perf},$$

which carries an object \mathcal{A} of $Cat_\infty^{Sp, \omega}$ in the full ∞ -subcategory generated by the compact objects of its underlying ∞ -category, i.e., $Y(\mathcal{A})_o \simeq (\mathcal{A}_o)^\omega$.

We conclude that the adjoint equivalence $M \dashv Y$ is the $\mathcal{S}p$ -enriched analog of (19).

Now, we are going to k -linearize Proposition 4.51.

Corollary 4.54. *There exists an equivalence of ∞ -categories*

$$Cat_\infty^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}, perf} \simeq Cat_\infty^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}, \omega}.$$

Proof. Since there is the equivalence between $Cat_\infty^{Sp, perf} \simeq Cat_\infty^{Sp, \omega}$, by Proposition 4.51, they are apex of the same pullback diagram, see Remark 4.47 and Remark 4.49. So, by the universal property of the pullback, we obtain the thesis. \square

Remark 4.55. The result in Corollary 4.54 is important because it allows us to work with presentable ∞ -categories using small ∞ -categories; i.e., the objects in $Cat_\infty^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}, \omega}$ are compactly generated and not necessarily small, whereas the objects in $Cat_\infty^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}, perf}$ are small.

5 k -linear stable ∞ -categories

Warning 5.1. In [23], the author chooses that a k -linear (stable) ∞ -category is always a presentable ∞ -category. While for us, a k -linear (stable) ∞ -category is not necessarily presentable. Here, we do not define what a k -linear stable ∞ -category is, and we hope that this topic is for future work.

In this section, we will define what a k -linearization is for a general ∞ -category (not necessarily enriched) and analyze some specific cases.

The idea is to use the construction and results seen in [11] and to remove from them the dependence on enrichment. In the work just mentioned, we have proved that an $\mathbb{H}k$ -linearization of an ∞ -category \mathcal{A} , i.e., \mathcal{A} with an $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ -enrichment, is equivalent to giving a left $\mathbb{H}k$ -module of $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}$, i.e., a pair $(\hat{A}, \mathbb{H}k \otimes^{\mathcal{S}p} \hat{A} \rightarrow \hat{A})$ where the first component is a spectral ∞ -category (or a $\mathcal{S}p$ -enriched ∞ -category) and the second component is a left $\mathbb{H}k$ -action on \hat{A} .

In turn, in [11, Theorem 6.5], we have proved that a left $\mathbb{H}k$ -module can be seen as an enriched ∞ -functor from $\mathbb{H}k$ to an Internal-hom, $\mathbb{H}k \rightarrow (\hat{A})^{\hat{A}}$.

We deduce that a general k -linearization (probably too general to be useful) is a left $\mathbb{H}k$ -module in Cat_{∞} that can be seen as ∞ -functor from $\mathbb{H}k$ to the internal-hom of Cat_{∞} $A : \mathbb{H}k \rightarrow \text{Fun}(-, -)$, see Definition 5.4.

Some $\mathcal{S}p$ -enrichment can be internalized in the theory of ∞ -categories, in particular, it is uniquely determined by limits and colimits in \mathcal{A}_o . Something very similar happens in the ordinary category theory too: additive ∞ -categories and abelian categories have the enrichment which is uniquely determined by their limits and their colimits. We will see this fact in Subsection 5.2. So, the ∞ -functor A must have the property that “If \mathcal{A}_o has suitable colimits or/and limits and A respects these limits and colimits, then it defines uniquely a k -linearization.”

There is a drawback in our last sentence: what is an ∞ -functor $\mathbb{H}k \rightarrow \text{Fun}(-, -)$? Or equivalently, what is a left $\mathbb{H}k$ -module in Cat_{∞} ? an ∞ -functor $\mathbb{H}k \rightarrow \text{Fun}(-, -)$ is not well defined because the source and the target live in two different ∞ -categories: the former lives in $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}$ while the latter lives in Cat_{∞} .

In Subsection 5.1, we will solve the drawback using a different point of view of spectra and explain how to formalize “general k -linearization”. Probably this generalization is useless, but we think that it can help to understand the reasoning behind this idea. Instead, some less general k -linearizations can be interesting and we hope that they will be the topic of some future work. In Subsection 5.2, we will analyze the presentable and stable case: here we will find that our definition and Lurie’s definition are equivalent. This case has the drawback that the presentable ∞ -categories are big and might not be the correct notion for our main theorem. That’s why there is the Subsection 5.3 where we will define the correct setting for our Main Theorem.

5.1 Defining k -linearization for general ∞ -categories

This subsection provides informative content, and we hope to return in the future to analyze the ideas it contains; thus, not all the ideas are proven.

First, we recall that a connective spectrum (e.g., $\mathbb{H}k$) can be seen as a grouplike commutative monoid in \mathcal{S} , [21, Remark 5.2.6.26 and §1.4 (D)]. In the following remark, we summarize this viewpoint.

Remark 5.2 ([23, §0.2: Spectra are generalized abelian groups]). Let E be a spectrum. Then, the 0^{th} space $\Omega^{\infty} E$ is an example of an \mathbb{E}_{∞} -space: that is, it can be equipped with an addition law

$$+ : \Omega^{\infty} E \times \Omega^{\infty} E \rightarrow \Omega^{\infty} E$$

that is unital, commutative, and associative up to coherent homotopy. Moreover, the construction $E \rightarrow \Omega^{\infty} E$ restricts to an equivalence from the ∞ -category $\mathcal{S}p^{cn}$ of connective spectra to the ∞ -category $\mathcal{C}Alg^{gp}(\mathcal{S})$ of grouplike \mathbb{E}_{∞} -spaces

$$\Omega^{\infty} : \mathcal{S}p^{cn} \simeq \mathcal{C}Alg^{gp}(\mathcal{S}).$$

An \mathbb{E}_∞ -space A is said to be grouplike if the addition on A exhibits the set of connected components $\pi_0 A$ as an abelian group.

This is the spectral algebraic view of a spectrum, and it is the fundamental observation that allows us to define a k -linearization without a starting \mathbb{Z} -linearization.

In particular, we can see $\mathbb{H}k$ as an ∞ -category as a space via the forgetful ∞ -functor $U : \mathcal{CAlg}^{gp}(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$, which is monoidal with respect to the cartesian structure of \mathcal{S} . Thus, it induces a morphism between algebras:

$$U : \mathcal{Alg}(\mathcal{CAlg}^{gp}(\mathcal{S})) \rightarrow \mathcal{Alg}(\mathcal{S}); \quad (36)$$

and between commutative algebras:

$$\mathcal{Alg}(U) : \mathcal{Alg}(\mathcal{CAlg}^{gp}(\mathcal{S})) \rightarrow \mathcal{Alg}(\mathcal{S}). \quad (37)$$

$\mathcal{Alg}(U)$ allows us to see an $\mathbb{H}k$ only as commutative algebras in the ∞ -category \mathcal{S} . Postcomposing the ∞ -functor in (37) with the underlying ∞ -functor $(-)$ (it is defined in [11, §5.3]), we obtain the next definition.

Definition 5.3. We call the *overline ∞ -functor* the following ∞ -functor:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{(-)} &:= \underline{(-)} \circ \mathcal{Alg}(U) : \mathcal{Alg}(\mathcal{CAlg}^{gp}(\mathcal{S})) \rightarrow \mathcal{Alg}(\mathcal{S}) \subseteq \mathcal{Cat}_\infty^{Cat_\infty} : \\ &A \mapsto \overline{A}, \end{aligned}$$

and we denote it by $\overline{(-)}$.

It is well-known that $(\mathcal{Cat}_\infty, \times, *, \mathit{Fun}(-, -))$ is a closed monoidal ∞ -category. This implies that \mathcal{Cat}_∞ is a \mathcal{Cat}_∞ -enriched ∞ -category. Since \mathcal{Cat}_∞ is a presentably monoidal ∞ -category, the ∞ -category of \mathcal{Cat}_∞ -enriched ∞ -categories $\mathcal{Cat}_\infty^{Cat_\infty}$ has a monoidal structure whose tensor is the \mathcal{Cat}_∞ -enriched tensor $- \otimes^{Cat_\infty} -$ and whose unit is $\underline{1}$. Furthermore, \mathcal{Cat}_∞ has a canonical structure of left \mathcal{Cat}_∞ -module of Pr^L and, since the full inclusion $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{Cat}_\infty$ is monoidal, it is also a left \mathcal{S} -module of Pr^L .

In [11, Theorem 6.5], we have seen that a k -linearization is a $\mathcal{Cat}_\infty^{Sp}$ -enriched ∞ -functor with source $\underline{\mathbb{H}k}$ and target $\mathcal{Cat}_\infty^{Sp}$ -enriched ∞ -categories $\mathcal{Cat}_\infty^{Sp}$: note that the objects of $\mathcal{Cat}_\infty^{Sp}$ are non-geometrical ∞ -categories. In short, such an ∞ -functor is a way to linearize a non-geometrical object of $\mathcal{Cat}_\infty^{Sp}$. Now, we have the idea and the tools to give the first definition of a general k -linearization.

Definition 5.4. We denote by $LinCat_{\mathbb{H}k}$ the ∞ -category $\mathit{Fun}^{Cat_\infty}(\overline{\mathbb{H}k}, \mathcal{Cat}_\infty)$ and we call it the ∞ -category of *general k -linear ∞ -categories*. Moreover, we call k -linear ∞ -categories the objects of $\mathit{Fun}^{Cat_\infty}(\overline{\mathbb{H}k}, \mathcal{Cat}_\infty)$.

Remark 5.5. Since $\overline{\mathbb{H}k}$ is an ∞ -category, \mathcal{Cat}_∞ -enriched ∞ -functors with source $\overline{\mathbb{H}k}$ are actually ∞ -functors. So we immediately have a redefinition of the ∞ -category of general k -linear ∞ -categories:

$$LinCat_{\mathbb{H}k} = \mathit{Fun}^{Cat_\infty}(\overline{\mathbb{H}k}, \mathcal{Cat}_\infty) \simeq \mathit{Fun}(\overline{\mathbb{H}k}, \mathcal{Cat}_\infty).$$

Just as in [11, Theorem 6.5], we can immediately give another definition.

Proposition 5.6. *There is an equivalence*

$$LinCat_{\mathbb{H}k} \simeq \mathit{LMod}_{\mathbb{H}k}(\mathcal{Cat}_\infty).$$

Proof. Since the space of objects of $\overline{\mathbb{H}k}$ is trivial, i.e., $\overline{\mathbb{H}k}_{ob} \simeq *$, the equivalence follows by the definition of ∞ -category of enriched ∞ -functors, [11, §5.4]. \square

These definitions above are useless because they have lost the essential fact that a connective spectrum, as $\mathbb{H}k$, is a generalized abelian group, Remark 5.2. We have lost this information when we use the forgetful ∞ -functor (37) in the definition of $\overline{(-)}$. Instead of $\overline{(-)}$, we have to use the underline ∞ -functor

$$\underline{(-)} : Alg(CAlg^{gr}(\mathcal{S})) \rightarrow Cat_{\infty}^{CAlg^{gr}(\mathcal{S})}.$$

In particular, the ∞ -category of k -linear ∞ -categories should be an ∞ -category of $CAlg^{gr}(\mathcal{S})$ -enriched ∞ -functors.

In short, we have to restrict our attention to a suitable (not full) ∞ -subcategory S of Cat_{∞} with the following features: an ∞ -category \mathcal{C} belongs to S if:

- for each pair of objects $x, y \in S$, $\text{Hom}_S(x, y)$ belongs to $CAlg^{gr}(\mathcal{S}) \simeq Sp^{cn}$, i.e., it is, at least, a Sp^{cn} -enriched ∞ -category;
- \mathcal{C} admits Y -colimits, for a suitable collection of simplicial sets Y , such that the colimits “are well intertwined” with the structure of $CAlg^{gr}(\mathcal{S})$ of the Hom-spaces.

An ∞ -functor $F : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ belongs to S if:

- for each pair of objects $x, y \in S$, $F : \text{Hom}_S(x, y) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(Fx, FY)$ belongs to $CAlg(\mathcal{S})$;
- F preserves Y -colimits.

Since $CAlg^{gr}(\mathcal{S}) \simeq Sp^{cn}$ has a monoidal structure [21, Lemma 7.1.1.7.], the definition of ∞ -category of k -linear S ∞ -categories is

Definition 5.7. We denote by $LinCat_{\mathbb{H}k}^S$ the ∞ -category $Fun^{CAlg^{gr}(\mathcal{S})}(\underline{\mathbb{H}k}, S) \simeq Fun^{Sp^{cn}}(\underline{\mathbb{H}k}, S)$ and we call it the ∞ -category of S k -linear ∞ -categories. Moreover, we call S k -linear ∞ -categories the objects of $LinCat_{\mathbb{H}k}^S$.

The above definition is well posed if the ∞ -category $Fun^{CAlg^{gr}(\mathcal{S})}(\underline{\mathbb{H}k}, S)$ is well defined; e.g., if S is a left Sp^{cn} -module in $Cat_{\infty}(\mathcal{K})$.

In [21, Lemma 7.1.1.7.], the author proves that the inclusion $i : Sp^{cn} \rightarrow Alg(Sp)$ is monoidal. Tautologically, giving a Sp^{cn} -enriched ∞ -functor with source $\underline{\mathbb{H}k}$ is the same as giving a $Alg(Sp)$ -enriched ∞ -functor with source $\underline{\mathbb{H}k}$, so the next definition is the same as Definition 5.7.

Definition 5.8. We denote by $LinCat_{\mathbb{H}k}^S$ the ∞ -category $Fun^{Alg(Sp)}(\underline{\mathbb{H}k}, S)$ and we call it the ∞ -category of S k -linear ∞ -categories. Moreover, we call S k -linear ∞ -categories the objects of $LinCat_{\mathbb{H}k}^S$.

The above definition is well posed if the ∞ -category $Fun^{Sp}(\underline{\mathbb{H}k}, S)$ is well defined; e.g., if S is a left $Alg(Sp)$ -module in $Cat_{\infty}(\mathcal{K})$.

In Subsection 5.2 and Subsection 5.3, we will study the situation when S is $Pr^{L, St}$, $Pr_{\omega}^{L, St}$ or Cat_{∞}^{perf} . There are other possible choices for S : e.g. the ∞ -category of additive ∞ -categories Cat_{∞}^{Add} , the ∞ -category of Grothendieck prestable ∞ -categories $Groth$. In this paper, we are not interested in these other choices, but we hope that they will be the subject of future work.

5.2 Presentable and stable k -linearity ∞ -categories

In this subsection, we will define what a k -linearization is for a presentable stable ∞ -category.

Remark 5.9. Since $\mathbb{H}k$ is an object of $CAlg(\mathcal{S}p)$, it is particularly an algebra in the symmetric monoidal ∞ -category $Alg(\mathcal{S}p)$. There exists the canonical forgetful ∞ -functor:

$$U : CAlg(\mathcal{S}p) \simeq Alg_{\mathbb{E}_\infty}(\mathcal{S}p) \rightarrow Alg_{\mathbb{E}_2}(\mathcal{S}p) \simeq Alg(Alg(\mathcal{S}p)). \quad (38)$$

Also, in this setting, we have the underline ∞ -functor:

$$\underline{(-)} : Alg(Alg(\mathcal{S}p)) \rightarrow Cat_\infty^{Alg(\mathcal{S}p)}. \quad (39)$$

As a consequence, Proposition 5.11 and Proposition 5.12 will be well-posed. This observation emphasizes why it is important that $\mathbb{H}k$ is a commutative algebra; i.e., an \mathbb{E}_∞ -ring. Actually, it is sufficient that it is an \mathbb{E}_2 -ring, but in this article, we are not interested in this generalization.

We know that the ∞ -category $Pr^{L,St}$ is a left $Alg(\mathcal{S}p)$ -module object of Pr^L , see (10), so using the idea in Definition 5.8, the next definition is the natural one.

Definition 5.10. We denote by $LinCat_{\mathbb{H}k}^{L,St}$ the ∞ -category $Fun^{Alg(\mathcal{S}p)}(\underline{\mathbb{H}k}, Pr^{L,St})$. Moreover, we call k -linear stable presentable ∞ -categories the objects of $LinCat_{\mathbb{H}k}^{L,St}$, and we call $LinCat_{\mathbb{H}k}^{L,St}$ the ∞ -category of stable presentable k -linear ∞ -categories.

Proposition 5.11. *There exists an equivalence of ∞ -categories:*

$$LinFun_{\mathbb{H}k}^{L,St} = Fun^{Alg(\mathcal{S}p)}(\mathbb{H}k, Pr^{L,St}) \simeq LMod_{\mathbb{H}k}(Pr^{L,St}).$$

Proof. The results follow from the chain of equivalences:

$$\begin{aligned} LinCat_{\mathbb{H}k}^{L,St} &= Fun^{Alg(\mathcal{S}p)}(\underline{\mathbb{H}k}, Pr^{L,St}) \\ &\simeq LMod_{\underline{\mathbb{H}k}}(Fun(*, Pr^{L,St})) \\ &\simeq LMod_{\mathbb{H}k}(Pr^{L,St}). \end{aligned}$$

The first equivalence holds by the definition of ∞ -category of $Alg(\mathcal{S}p)$ -enriched ∞ -functors plus the fact that the space of objects of $\underline{\mathbb{H}k}$ is trivial, i.e., $\underline{\mathbb{H}k}_{ob} \simeq *$. The latter follows from the well-known equivalence $ev_* : Fun(*, Pr^{L,St}) \simeq Pr^{L,St}$. \square

In the rest of this subsection, we will find other equivalent definitions using different higher structures of $Pr^{L,St}$. For example, using the fact that it is left tensored over itself (18), we obtain the following result:

Proposition 5.12. *There exists an equivalence of ∞ -categories*

$$LinCat_{\mathbb{H}k}^{L,St} = LMod_{\mathbb{H}k}(Pr^{L,St}) \simeq LMod_{Mod_{\mathbb{H}k}}(Pr^{L,St}).$$

Proof. We prove the equivalence by showing that both the ∞ -categories are apexes of the same pullback square.

The structure of $Pr^{L,St}$ as a left $Alg(\mathcal{S}p)$ -module object of Pr^L is the restriction of its structure as a left $Pr^{L,St}$ -module via the monoidal ∞ -functor $LMod_{(-)} : Alg(\mathcal{S}p) \rightarrow Pr^{L,St}$. This means that it is obtained by the following pullback square:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathrm{LMod}(Pr^L, St) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{LMod}(Pr^L, St) \\
\downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\
\mathrm{Alg}(\mathcal{S}p) & \longrightarrow & Pr^{L, St}.
\end{array}$$

By definition, [11, Example 3.15], the ∞ -category of left $\mathbb{H}k$ -module object of $Pr^{L, St}$, there is the following pullback square:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathrm{LMod}_{\mathbb{H}k}(Pr^{L, St}) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{LMod}(Pr^{L, St}) \\
\downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\
\mathbb{1} & \xrightarrow{\{\mathbb{H}k\}} & \mathrm{Alg}(\mathcal{S}p).
\end{array}$$

Now, pasting together the above pullback squares, we obtain the diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathrm{LMod}_{\mathbb{H}k}(Pr^{L, St}) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{LMod}(Pr^{L, St}) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{LMod}(Pr^{L, St}) \\
\downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\
\mathbb{1} & \xrightarrow{\{\mathbb{H}k\}} & \mathrm{Alg}(\mathcal{S}p) & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{LMod}_{(-)}} & Pr^{L, St}.
\end{array} \tag{40}$$

Using the composition and cancellation of pullback squares rule, [27, Proposition 4.3.11], we deduce that the composite rectangle is a pullback.

By definition, [11, Example 3.15], the ∞ -category of left $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ -module object of $Pr^{L, St}$, there is the following pullback square:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathrm{LMod}_{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(Pr^{L, St}) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{LMod}(Pr^{L, St}) \\
\downarrow & \triangleright & \downarrow \\
\mathbb{1} & \xrightarrow{\{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}\}} & Pr^{L, St}.
\end{array} \tag{41}$$

Since the external rectangle pullback square in (40) and the pullback square in (41) are computed on the same diagram, their apexes are equivalent. Thus,

$$\mathrm{LMod}_{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(Pr^{L, St}) \simeq \mathrm{LMod}_{\mathbb{H}k}(Pr^{L, St}).$$

□

In the last proposition, we have almost recovered the definition of k -linear stable presentable ∞ -category in [23, Variant D.1.5.1.], but in our definition there is an extra subscription “st”. In the next proposition, we prove that the two definitions are equivalent.

Proposition 5.13. *There is an equivalence:*

$$\mathrm{LMod}_{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(Pr^{L, St}) \simeq \mathrm{LMod}_{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(Pr^L).$$

Proof. We shall prove the proposition by demonstrating that the following chain of equivalences holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{LMod}_{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(Pr^{St}) &\simeq \mathrm{LMod}_{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(\mathrm{LMod}_{\mathcal{S}p}(Pr^L)) \simeq \mathrm{LMod}_{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(\mathrm{RMod}_{\mathcal{S}p}(Pr^L)) \\ &\simeq_{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}} \mathrm{BMod}(Pr^L)_{\mathcal{S}p} \simeq \mathrm{LMod}_{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k} \otimes^L \mathcal{S}p}(Pr^L) \\ &\simeq \mathrm{LMod}_{\mathcal{S}p(\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k})}(Pr^L) \simeq \mathrm{LMod}_{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(Pr^L). \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

The first equivalence follows from the monoidal equivalence

$$Pr^{L,St} \simeq \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathcal{S}p}(Pr^L),$$

see (8).

In (6), we have shown that the stabilization ∞ -functor is equivalent to tensorizing with $\mathcal{S}p$, i.e., there is a natural equivalence $\mathcal{S}p(-) \simeq - \otimes^L (\mathcal{S}p) : Pr^L \rightarrow Pr^{L,St}$. So the second-to-last one holds. Since $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ is presentable and stable, the last one also holds. The second holds because $\mathcal{S}p$ is a commutative algebra. The third holds for [21, Theorem 4.3.2.7.]. The next one holds by the folding technique, see [16, Corollary in §3.6]. Indeed, it implies that the ∞ -category of $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ - $\mathcal{S}p$ -bimodule objects of Pr^L and the ∞ -category of left $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k} \otimes^L \mathcal{S}p^{rev}$ -modules of Pr^L . \square

Hence, we find Lurie's definition:

Definition 5.14 ([23] Variant D.1.5.1). We denote by $\mathrm{LinCat}_k^{L,St}$ the ∞ -category of k -linear stable ∞ -categories, the ∞ -category $\mathrm{LMod}_{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(Pr^L)$. We will refer to the elements of $\mathrm{LinCat}_k^{L,St}$ as *stable presentable k -linear ∞ -categories*.

5.3 Morita theory for k -linear stable ∞ -categories

In [4], the authors define a Morita theory for stable ∞ -categories without considering a k -linearization, which in this paper we refer to as non-geometrical Morita theory.

In this subsection, we will generalize their theory by incorporating a general k -linearization.

In Proposition 3.6, we proved that the ∞ -categories $\mathrm{Cat}_\infty^{perf}$ and $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ are equivalent as left $\mathrm{Alg}(\mathcal{S}p)$ -module objects of Pr^L . In particular, this implies that their k -linearizations are equivalent.

The idea presented in Definition 5.8 leads us to the following two natural definitions.

Definition 5.15. We denote by $\mathrm{LinCat}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{St,\omega}$ the ∞ -category $\mathrm{Fun}^{\mathrm{Alg}(\mathcal{S}p)}(\underline{\mathbb{H}k}, Pr_\omega^{L,St})$ and call it the ∞ -category of k -linear h -projective ∞ -categories. Moreover, we call k -linear h -projective ∞ -categories the objects of $\mathrm{LinCat}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{St,\omega}$.

Definition 5.16. We denote by $\mathrm{LinCat}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{perf}$ the ∞ -category $\mathrm{Fun}^{\mathrm{Alg}(\mathcal{S}p)}(\underline{\mathbb{H}k}, \mathrm{Cat}_\infty^{perf})$ and call it the ∞ -category of k -linear perfect ∞ -categories. Moreover, we call k -linear perfect ∞ -categories the objects of $\mathrm{LinCat}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{perf}$.

Using the definition of ∞ -category of enriched ∞ -functors [11, §5.4], we can immediately give an alternative definition. This is analog to Proposition 5.11.

Proposition 5.17. *There are two equivalences of ∞ -categories:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{LinCat}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{St,\omega} &= \mathrm{Fun}^{\mathrm{Alg}(\mathcal{S}p)}(\underline{\mathbb{H}k}, Pr_\omega^{L,St}) \simeq \mathrm{LMod}_{\mathbb{H}k}(Pr_\omega^{L,St}); \\ \mathrm{LinCat}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{perf} &= \mathrm{Fun}^{\mathrm{Alg}(\mathcal{S}p)}(\underline{\mathbb{H}k}, \mathrm{Cat}_\infty^{perf}) \simeq \mathrm{LMod}_{\mathbb{H}k}(\mathrm{Cat}_\infty^{perf}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 5.11. \square

Using the left module structure in Remark 3.7, we also find the analogous definition of Proposition 5.11.

Proposition 5.18. *There are four equivalences of ∞ -categories:*

(1)

$$\text{LinCat}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{St,\omega} \simeq \text{LMod}_{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}^\omega}(Pr_\omega^{L,St});$$

(2)

$$\text{LinCat}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{St,\omega} \simeq \text{LMod}_{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(Pr_\omega^{L,St}).$$

(3)

$$\text{LinCat}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{perf} \simeq \text{LMod}_{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}^\omega}(\text{Cat}_\infty^{perf}).$$

(4)

$$\text{LinCat}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{perf} \simeq \text{LMod}_{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(\text{Cat}_\infty^{perf}).$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 5.12, except that we consider different left module structures. Indeed, instead of considering the left $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ -module structure of Pr^L :

- in (1) we consider $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ as a left Cat_∞^{perf} -module object of Pr^L ;
- in (2) we consider $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ as a left $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ -module object of Pr^L ;
- in (3) we consider Cat_∞^{perf} as a left Cat_∞^{perf} -module object of Pr^L ;
- in (4) we consider Cat_∞^{perf} as a left $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ -module object of Pr^L .

\square

As mentioned before, the ∞ -category of perfect k -linear ∞ -categories and the ∞ -category of h -projective k -linear ∞ -categories are equivalent.

Proposition 5.19. *The ∞ -category of perfect k -linear ∞ -categories and the ∞ -category of h -projective k -linear ∞ -categories are equivalent:*

$$\text{Ind}(-) : \text{LinCat}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{St,\omega} \simeq \text{LinCat}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{perf} : (-)^\omega.$$

Proof. In Proposition 3.6, we proved that Cat_∞^{perf} and $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ are equivalent as left $\text{Alg}(\mathcal{S}p)$ -module objects of Pr^L , so their ∞ -categories of left $\mathbb{H}k$ -module objects are equivalent:

$$\text{LMod}_{\mathbb{H}k}(Pr_\omega^{L,St}) \simeq \text{LMod}_{\mathbb{H}k}(\text{Cat}_\infty^{perf}).$$

\square

In particular, as a consequence of Proposition 5.18 and Proposition 5.19, we find the result of Cohn [8, Proposition 5.6]:

Corollary 5.20. *There is an equivalence of ∞ -categories:*

$$\text{LMod}_{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}^\omega}(\text{Cat}_\infty^{perf}) \simeq \text{LMod}_{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(\text{Cat}_\infty^{perf}).$$

Using the same idea as in Proposition 5.13, we can eliminate the subscript St .

Proposition 5.21. *There exists an equivalence of ∞ -categories:*

$$LinCat_{\mathbb{F}k}^{St,\omega} \simeq LMod_{Mod_{\mathbb{F}k}}(Pr_{\omega}^L).$$

Proof. In Proposition 5.18 we proved that there is an equivalence

$$LinCat_{\mathbb{F}k}^{St,\omega} \simeq LMod_{Mod_{\mathbb{F}k}}(Pr_{\omega}^{L,St}),$$

so the proof is similar to that of Proposition 5.13. \square

In the final part of this subsection, we will explain why all the definitions of $LinCat_{\mathbb{F}k}^{perf}$ and $LinCat_{\mathbb{F}k}^{St,\omega}$ can be rewritten using the ∞ -categories $Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,perf}$ and $Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,\omega}$ instead of the ∞ -categories Cat_{∞}^{perf} and Pr_{ω}^L .

To do this, we will demonstrate that $Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,perf}$ and $Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,\omega}$ have equivalent structures as left $Alg(Sp)$ -module objects of Pr^L ; this structure will not be the restriction of the higher structures of the ∞ -category of Sp -enriched ∞ -categories, [11, §5.3].

In the proof of Proposition 4.51, we established that there are two adjoint equivalences:

$$(-)_o : Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,\omega} \simeq Pr_{\omega}^{L,St} : \chi; \quad (43)$$

and

$$(-)_o : Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,perf} \simeq Cat_{\infty}^{perf} : (Y\chi \circ Ind(-)). \quad (44)$$

In particular, $Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,perf}$ and $Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,\omega}$ inherit a monoidal structure from Cat_{∞}^{perf} and $Pr_{\omega}^{L,St}$ and a structure as left $Alg(Sp)$ -module objects in Pr^L . Thus, the equivalence (33) becomes a monoidal equivalence and also an equivalence of left $Alg(Sp)$ -module objects in Pr^L .

Remark 5.22. Now we summarize the higher structures of $Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,perf}$ and $Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,\omega}$:

- $Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,perf}$ is a presentably monoidal ∞ -category:

$$- \otimes^{Sp,perf} - : Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,perf} \times Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,perf} \rightarrow Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,perf} :$$

with the unit being the Sp -enriched ∞ -category of compact spectra denoted by $Y\chi \circ Ind(Sp^{\omega})$;

- $Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,perf}$ is a left $Alg(Sp)$ -module object of Pr^L :

$$- {}_{Sp} \otimes^{Sp,perf} - : Alg(Sp) \times Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,perf} \rightarrow Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,perf} :$$

- $Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,\omega}$ is a presentably monoidal ∞ -category:

$$- \otimes^{Sp,\omega} - : Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,\omega} \times Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,h-\omega} \rightarrow Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,\omega} :$$

with the unit being the Sp -enriched ∞ -category of spectra denoted by $\chi \circ Sp$;

- $Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,\omega}$ is a left $Alg(Sp)$ -module object of Pr^L :

$$- {}_{Sp} \otimes^{Sp,\omega} - : Alg(Sp) \times Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,h-proj} \rightarrow Cat_{\infty}^{Sp,\omega} .$$

Corollary 5.23. *The equivalences (33), (43), and (44) extend to a monoidal equivalence and to an equivalence of left $\text{Alg}(Sp)$ -module objects in Pr^L , where $\text{Cat}_\infty^{Sp,perf}$ and $\text{Cat}_\infty^{Sp,\omega}$ have the structures in Remark 5.22 and Cat_∞^{perf} and $Pr_\omega^{L,St}$ have the structure in Remark 3.7.*

As an immediate consequence of the above corollary, we obtain that all the definitions of $\text{LinCat}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{perf}$ and $\text{LinCat}^{St,\omega}$ found in this subsection (Proposition 5.18, Proposition 5.17, Definition 5.15, and Definition 5.16) can be reformulated with the ∞ -categories $\text{Cat}_\infty^{Sp,perf}$ and $\text{Cat}_\infty^{Sp,\omega}$ instead of the ∞ -categories Cat_∞^{perf} and Pr_ω^L . For example, $\text{LinCat}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{perf} \simeq \text{LMod}_{\mathbb{H}k}(\text{Cat}_\infty^{Sp,perf}) \simeq \text{LMod}_{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(\text{Cat}_\infty^{Sp,\omega})$.

6 Results

In this section, we will compare the two approaches to linearization seen in Section 4 and Section 5.

In the first part, we will define a localization in the non-geometrical setting, which is the ∞ -categorical analog of the localization Ψ_{perf} in [4, Theorem 4.23]. From Remark 4.13, we know that there is a localization:

$$\text{Cat}_\infty^{Sp} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{S}(-)_o} \\ \xleftarrow{\perp} \end{array} \text{Cat}_\infty^{Sp,St} \simeq \text{Cat}_\infty^{Ex} \quad (45)$$

In [4, Lemma 2.20], the authors prove that there is a localization:

$$\text{Cat}_\infty^{Ex} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{Idem}(-)} \\ \xleftarrow{\perp} \end{array} \text{Cat}_\infty^{perf} \quad (46)$$

whose left adjoint is the ∞ -functor in Example 1.6, which can also be described on the objects as $\text{Idem}(\mathcal{C}) \simeq (\text{Ind}(\mathcal{C}))^\omega$ as we mentioned in Proposition 4.15.

Moreover, we know that there is an equivalence $\text{Ind}(-) : \text{Cat}_\infty^{perf} \simeq Pr_\omega^{L,St}$, see (19).

Putting together the above we obtain the Morita localization in the non-geometrical case.

Proposition 6.1. *There are two localizations of ∞ -categories whose right adjoint is lax monoidal:*

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Cat}_\infty^{Sp} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{Ind}(\text{Idem}(\mathcal{S}(-)_o))} \\ \xleftarrow{\perp} \end{array} Pr_\omega^{L,St}; \\ \\ \text{Cat}_\infty^{Sp} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{Idem}(\mathcal{S}(-)_o)} \\ \xleftarrow{\perp} \end{array} \text{Cat}_\infty^{perf}. \end{array}$$

Proof. The second localization has been proved before the proposition was stated. The first is the second postcomposed with the equivalence (19). \square

Using Corollary 5.23, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 6.2. *There exists two localization of ∞ -categories:*

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Cat}_\infty^{Sp} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{I}} \\ \xleftarrow[\iota]{\perp} \end{array} \text{Cat}_\infty^{Sp,\omega}; \\ \\ \text{Cat}_\infty^{Sp} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{M}} \\ \xleftarrow[\iota]{\perp} \end{array} \text{Cat}_\infty^{Sp,perf}. \end{array}$$

Now we want to understand the essential image of the right adjoint in Proposition 6.1 and Corollary 6.2, and we will describe it more explicitly.

In [15, Theorem 1.2], the author proves that there exists a fully faithful ∞ -functor

$$\chi : P^{L,St} \simeq \text{LMod}_{\mathcal{S}p}(Pr^L) \rightarrow \widehat{\text{Cat}}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}$$

whose essential image is the ∞ -category $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p,L,St}$, which we defined in Definition 4.27. The first equivalence is (8).

First, we restrict χ along the inclusion $P_{\omega}^{L,St} \subseteq Pr_{\omega}^{L,St}$ and we obtain a fully faithful ∞ -functor:

$$\chi|_{Pr_{\omega}^{L,St}} : Pr_{\omega}^{L,St} \rightarrow \widehat{\text{Cat}}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}. \quad (47)$$

The essential image of $\chi|_{Pr_{\omega}^{L,St}}$ is the ∞ -category of h-projective spectral ∞ -categories $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p,\omega}$, which we defined in Definition 4.25. This is not the correct ∞ -functor in our localization because the objects of $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p,\omega}$ are not necessarily small.

The Morita theory for spectral ∞ -categories solves this problem. In Proposition 4.51, we proved that $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p,\omega}$ is equivalent to the ∞ -category of perfect spectral ∞ -categories $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p,perf}$, so we can change the ∞ -functor $\chi|_{Pr_{\omega}^{L,St}}$ so that its essential image is $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p,perf}$.

Now we have overcome the problem because the objects of $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p,perf}$ are small by definition. So the ∞ -functor $\chi|_{Pr_{\omega}^{L,St}}$ factors through the inclusion $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p} \subseteq \widehat{\text{Cat}}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}$, and we obtain the correct right adjoint in our localization, the lax monoidal fully faithful:

$$\chi|_{Pr_{\omega}^{L,St}} : Pr_{\omega}^{L,St} \rightarrow \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}, \quad (48)$$

whose essential image is $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p,perf}$. Note that we use the same notation for the ∞ -functors (48) and (47) because they are essentially the same ∞ -functor. The ∞ -functor (48) is the right adjoint in Proposition 6.1 and Corollary 6.2.

Above we have proved the following corollary.

Corollary 6.3. *There exists an equivalence of ∞ -categories:*

$$\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p,perf} \simeq Pr_{\omega}^{L,St} \simeq \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{perf}. \quad (49)$$

Proof. The ∞ -functor (48) gives the first equivalence. While the second is (19). \square

Thanks to Corollary 4.54 and Remark 4.43, the same construction above holds if we replace the presentably monoidal ∞ -category $\mathcal{S}p$ by the presentably monoidal ∞ -category $\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$.

For the sake of completeness, we will sketch the argument once more.

In [15, Theorem 1.2], the author proves that there exists a fully faithful ∞ -functor

$$\chi : \text{LMod}_{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(Pr^{L,St}) \simeq \text{LMod}_{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(Pr^L) \rightarrow \widehat{\text{Cat}}_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}},$$

whose essential image is the ∞ -category $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k},L,St}$, which we define in Definition 4.41. Instead, the first equivalence is (5.13).

We restrict χ along the inclusion $\text{LMod}_{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(P_{\omega}^{L,St}) \subseteq \text{LMod}_{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(Pr_{\omega}^{L,St})$ and we obtain a fully faithful ∞ -functor:

$$\chi|_{\text{LMod}_{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(P_{\omega}^{L,St})} : \text{LMod}_{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(P_{\omega}^{L,St}) \rightarrow \widehat{\text{Cat}}_{\infty}^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}. \quad (50)$$

The essential image of $\chi_{|\mathrm{LMod}_{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(P_\omega^{L,St})}$ is the ∞ -category $\mathcal{C}at_\infty^{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k},\omega}$, which we defined in Definition 4.38. To use it in our last proposition we need the ∞ -functor (50) to target the ∞ -category of small $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}$ -enriched ∞ -categories. However, the objects $\mathcal{C}at_\infty^{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k},\omega}$ are not necessarily small, so this ∞ -functor is not the right one. The Morita theory for dg-categories resolves this problem. As shown in Corollary 4.54, the ∞ -category $\mathcal{C}at_\infty^{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k},\omega}$ is equivalent to the ∞ -category of perfect spectral ∞ -categories $\mathcal{C}at_\infty^{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k},perf}$, allowing us to adjust the ∞ -functor $\chi_{|\mathrm{LMod}_{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(P_\omega^{L,St})}$ so that its essential image is $\mathcal{C}at_\infty^{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k},perf}$. This resolves the issue as the objects of $\mathcal{C}at_\infty^{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k},perf}$ are small by definition.

We find that the ∞ -functor $\chi_{|\mathrm{LMod}_{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(P_\omega^{L,St})}$ factors through the inclusion $\mathcal{C}at_\infty^{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}} \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{C}at}_\infty^{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}$, allowing us to obtain the fully faithful ∞ -functor:

$$\chi_{|\mathrm{LMod}_{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(P_\omega^{L,St})} : \mathrm{LMod}_{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(P_\omega^{L,St}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}at^{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}, \quad (51)$$

whose essential image is $\mathcal{C}at_\infty^{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k},perf}$. Note that we use the same notation for the ∞ -functors (51) and (50) because they are essentially the same ∞ -functor.

Above, we have proven the following result.

Proposition 6.4. *Let k be a discrete \mathbb{E}_∞ -ring. There exists an equivalence of ∞ -categories:*

$$\mathcal{C}at_\infty^{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k},perf} \simeq \mathrm{LMod}_{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}(P_\omega^{L,St}). \quad (52)$$

Finally, we can state the Main Theorem of this paper: “idempotent complete pretriangulated dg-categories over k are stable k -linear idempotent complete ∞ -categories”.

Theorem 6.5 (Main Theorem). *Let k be an \mathbb{E}_∞ -ring. There exists an equivalence of ∞ -categories:*

$$\mathcal{C}at_\infty^{\mathcal{D}(k),perf} \simeq \mathrm{Lin}\mathcal{C}at_{\mathbb{H}k}^{perf}. \quad (53)$$

Proof. This follows easily from Proposition 6.4, Proposition 4.2, and Proposition 5.18. \square

Now, we define what it means for two dg-categories to be Morita equivalent. We denote by \mathcal{U} the following composition of ∞ -functors:

$$\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{C}at_\infty^{\mathcal{D}(k)} \simeq \mathcal{C}at_\infty^{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}} \simeq \mathrm{LMod}_{\mathbb{H}k}(\mathcal{C}at_\infty^{Sp}) \xrightarrow{U} \mathcal{C}at_\infty^{Sp} \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{M}} \mathcal{C}at_\infty^{Sp,perf}, \quad (54)$$

we found the first equivalence in Proposition 4.2, the second equivalence is [11, Theorem 6.4], U is the canonically forgetful ∞ -functor, and \mathfrak{M} is the ∞ -functor in Corollary 6.2.

Definition 6.6. Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be two objects of $\mathcal{C}at_\infty^{\mathcal{D}(k)}$, and $F : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be an arrow in $\mathcal{C}at_\infty^{\mathcal{D}(k)}$ between them. We say that F is a *Morita equivalence* if the arrow $\mathcal{U}(F) : \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{B})$ is an equivalence in $\mathcal{C}at_\infty^{Sp,perf}$.

Let \mathcal{M}_k be the collection of Morita equivalences of $\mathcal{C}at_\infty^{\mathcal{D}(k)}$. Since $\mathcal{C}at_\infty^{\mathcal{D}(k)}$ is a presentable ∞ -category, we can localize with respect to the strongly saturated class of morphisms generated by \mathcal{M}_k [19, Proposition 5.5.4.15], and we obtain a localization

$$\mathcal{C}at_\infty^{\mathcal{D}(k)} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \\ \perp \\ \xleftarrow{i} \end{array} \mathcal{C}at_\infty^{\mathcal{D}(k)}[\mathcal{M}_k^{-1}] \quad (55)$$

In the last result of this paper, we proved that the ∞ -category $\mathcal{C}at_\infty^{\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}[\mathcal{M}_k^{-1}]$ is equivalent to the ∞ -category $\mathrm{Lin}\mathcal{C}at_{\mathbb{H}k}^{perf}$.

Proposition 6.7. *There exists a localization*

$$\text{Cat}_\infty^{\mathcal{D}(k)} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{M}_k} \\ \perp \\ \xleftarrow{i} \end{array} \text{LinCat}_{\mathbb{H}k}^{\text{perf}}, \quad (56)$$

Proof. For Proposition 6.4, Proposition 4.2, and Proposition 5.18, to prove the results, it is enough to prove that $\text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}}[\mathcal{M}_k^{-1}]$ is equivalent to $\text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{Mod}_{\mathbb{H}k}, \text{perf}}$. Since (55) is a localization of a presentable ∞ -category, the above sentence is proved if we show that a dg-category is perfect if and only if it is a \mathcal{M}_k -local object. Since $\text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{Sp}}$ and $\text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{Sp}, \text{perf}} \simeq \text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{perf}}$ are presentable ∞ -categories the localization in Corollary 6.2 is characterized by its class of local morphisms, [19, Proposition 5.5.4.2], we denote this class by \mathcal{M} .

We start with a claim:

(*) if $f : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ belongs to \mathcal{M} , then $\mathbb{H}k \otimes f : \mathbb{H}k \otimes^{\text{Sp}} \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}k \otimes^{\text{Sp}} \mathcal{C}$ belongs to \mathcal{M} .

Let's assume for a moment that the claim holds.

Let

$$F : \text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{Sp}} \rightleftarrows \text{LMod}_{\mathbb{H}k}(\text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{Sp}}) : U \quad (57)$$

be the extension-restriction of scalar adjunction, see [11, §4.2].

By definition of \mathcal{M}_k , (54), U sends arrows in \mathcal{M}_k into arrows in \mathcal{M} .

We show that F sends arrows in \mathcal{M} into arrows in \mathcal{M}_k .

Let $f : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be an element in \mathcal{M} and we need to show that the ∞ -functor (54) sends $F(f) : F(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow F(\mathcal{C})$ into an isomorphism. In short, we need to prove that $UF(f) : UF(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow UF(\mathcal{C})$ belongs to \mathcal{M} . This is a consequence of claim (*), because the ∞ -functor $UF(-)$ is equivalent to the ∞ -functor $\mathbb{H}k \otimes^{\text{Sp}} - : \text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{Sp}} \rightarrow \text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{Sp}}$, see [11, §4.2].

Let $\mathcal{A} \in \text{LMod}_{\mathbb{H}k}(\text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{Sp}})$ be an \mathcal{M}_k -local object and we want to prove that it also belongs to $\text{LMod}(\text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{Sp}, \text{perf}})$; i.e. that $U(\mathcal{A})$ is a perfect spectral ∞ -category or equivalently that it is a \mathcal{M} -local object of $\text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{Sp}}$. So, let $f : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be an arrows in \mathcal{M} , we need to prove that the composition morphism

$$f^* := (-) \circ f : \text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{Sp}}}(\mathcal{C}, U(\mathcal{A})) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{Sp}}}(\mathcal{B}, U(\mathcal{A})),$$

is an equivalence of ∞ -groupoids (or spaces); as usual, we denote the precomposition with an arrow f by f^* . Using the universal property of the adjunction (57), it is equivalent to prove that the composition morphism

$$F(f)^* : \text{Hom}_{\text{LMod}_{\mathbb{H}k}(\text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{Sp}})}(F(\mathcal{C}), \mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\text{LMod}_{\mathbb{H}k}(\text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{Sp}})}(F(\mathcal{B}), \mathcal{A}),$$

is an equivalence of ∞ -groupoids. But this is holds because \mathcal{A} is a \mathcal{M}_k -local object and F sends arrows in \mathcal{M} into arrows in \mathcal{M}_k .

Vice versa, let $\mathcal{A} \in \text{LMod}_{\mathbb{H}k}(\text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{Sp}})$ be a perfect dg-category we want to prove that \mathcal{A} is a \mathcal{M}_k -local object of $\text{LMod}_{\mathbb{H}k}(\text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{Sp}})$.

Let $f : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be an arrow in \mathcal{M}_k and we want to proves that the composition morphism

$$f^* : \text{Hom}_{\text{LMod}_{\mathbb{H}k}(\text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{Sp}})}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\text{LMod}_{\mathbb{H}k}(\text{Cat}_\infty^{\text{Sp}})}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{A}), \quad (58)$$

is an equivalence of ∞ -groupoids.

The morphism (58) is the limit

$$\lim \text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}}((\otimes^{\mathcal{S}p,n} \mathbb{H}k) \otimes^{\mathcal{S}p} U(\mathcal{B}), U(\mathcal{A})) \rightarrow \lim (\text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}}((\otimes^{\mathcal{S}p,n} \mathbb{H}k) \otimes^{\mathcal{S}p} U(\mathcal{B}), U(\mathcal{A}))) \quad (59)$$

of the morphism between cosimplicial objects:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}}(U(\mathcal{C}), U(\mathcal{A})) & \xrightarrow{f^*} & \text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}}(U(\mathcal{B}), U(\mathcal{A})) \\ \uparrow \uparrow & & \uparrow \uparrow \\ \text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}}(\mathbb{H}k \otimes^{\mathcal{S}p} U(\mathcal{C}), U(\mathcal{A})) & \xrightarrow{(\mathbb{H}k \otimes^{\mathcal{S}p} f)^*} & \text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}}(\mathbb{H}k \otimes^{\mathcal{S}p} U(\mathcal{B}), U(\mathcal{A})) \\ \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow & & \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \\ \text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}}(\mathbb{H}k \otimes^{\mathcal{S}p} \mathbb{H}k \otimes^{\mathcal{S}p} U(\mathcal{C}), U(\mathcal{A})) & \xrightarrow{(\mathbb{H}k \otimes^{\mathcal{S}p} f)^*} & \text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}}(\mathbb{H}k \otimes^{\mathcal{S}p} U(\mathcal{B}), U(\mathcal{A})) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}}((\otimes^{\mathcal{S}p,n} \mathbb{H}k) \otimes^{\mathcal{S}p} U(\mathcal{C}), U(\mathcal{A})) & \xrightarrow{((\otimes^{\mathcal{S}p,n} \mathbb{H}k) \otimes^{\mathcal{S}p} f)^*} & \text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}}((\otimes^{\mathcal{S}p,n} \mathbb{H}k) \otimes^{\mathcal{S}p} U(\mathcal{B}), U(\mathcal{A})) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \end{array}$$

here, we denoted by $\otimes^{\mathcal{S}p,n} \mathbb{H}k$ the object $\underbrace{\mathbb{H}k \otimes^{\mathcal{S}p} \dots \otimes^{\mathcal{S}p} \mathbb{H}k}_{n\text{-times}}$. The horizontal morphisms in the above diagram between cosimplicial objects are equivalences of ∞ -groupoids: $U(\mathcal{A})$ is a \mathcal{M} -local object of $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}$ and, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the

$$(\otimes^{\mathcal{S}p,n} \mathbb{H}k) \otimes^{\mathcal{S}p} f : (\otimes^{\mathcal{S}p,n} \mathbb{H}k) \otimes^{\mathcal{S}p} U(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow (\otimes^{\mathcal{S}p,n} \mathbb{H}k) \otimes^{\mathcal{S}p} U(\mathcal{C})$$

belongs to \mathcal{M} as a consequence of the claim (*) and the fact that U sends arrows in \mathcal{M}_k into arrows in \mathcal{M} . This implies that (59) and (58) are equivalences.

To conclude we are left only to prove claim (*). Let $f : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be an arrow in \mathcal{W} and let \mathcal{A} be a \mathcal{M} -local object. We want to prove that

$$(\mathbb{H}k \otimes^{\mathcal{S}p} f)^* : \text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}}(\mathbb{H}k \otimes^{\mathcal{S}p} \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}}(\mathbb{H}k \otimes^{\mathcal{S}p} \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{A}),$$

is an equivalence of ∞ -groupoids. Since $(\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}, \otimes^{\mathcal{S}p})$ has an internal-hom $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}(-, -)$, it is the same prove that

$$f^* : \text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}}(\mathcal{C}, \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}(\mathbb{H}k, \mathcal{A})) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}}(\mathcal{B}, \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}(\mathbb{H}k, \mathcal{A})), \quad (60)$$

is an equivalence of ∞ -groupoids. To archive this, it is sufficient to prove that $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}(\mathbb{H}k, \mathcal{A})$ is a \mathcal{M} -local object of $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}$, i.e. it is perfect spectral ∞ -category. So we need to prove that its underlying ∞ -category $\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}(\mathbb{H}k, \mathcal{A})_o$ is perfect.

The following chain of equivalences holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{S}p}(\mathbb{H}k, \mathcal{A})_o &\simeq \text{Fun}^{\mathcal{S}p}(\mathbb{H}k, \mathcal{A}) \simeq \text{Fun}_{\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{E}x}}(\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{H}k)_o, \mathcal{A}_o) \\ &\simeq \text{Fun}_{\text{Cat}_{\infty}^{\text{per}f}}(\text{Idem}(\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{H}k)_o), \mathcal{A}_o) \\ &\simeq \text{Fun}^{\mathcal{E}x}(\text{Idem}(\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{H}k)_o), \mathcal{A}_o); \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

the first equivalence is by definition [11, §5.4], the second one is [15, Corollary 9.20], the third is by universal property of Idem, Example 1.6, and the last one follows because Cat_{∞}^{perf} is a full ∞ -subcategory of Cat_{∞}^{Ex} .

In [17, §4], the authors prove that $Fun^{Ex}(-, -)$ is the internal-hom of Cat_{∞}^{perf} , so $Cat_{\infty}^{Sp}(\mathbb{H}k, \mathcal{A})_o$ is perfect. \square

Note that the functor i in (56) is equivalent to (51).

References

- [1] Mathieu Anel, Georg Biedermann, Eric Finster, and André Joyal. “Left-exact localizations of ∞ -topoi I: Higher sheaves”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 400 (2022), p. 108268.
- [2] Benjamin Antieau. “On the uniqueness of ∞ -categorical enhancements of triangulated categories”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.01526* (2018).
- [3] Francis John Ben-Zvi and Nadler David. “Integral transforms and Drinfeld centers in derived algebraic geometry”. In: *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 23 (2010), 909-966 (2010).
- [4] Andrew J Blumberg, David Gepner, and Gonalo Tabuada. “A universal characterization of higher algebraic K-theory”. In: *Geometry & Topology* 17.2 (2013), pp. 733–838.
- [5] Alberto Canonaco, Amnon Neeman, and Paolo Stellari. “Uniqueness of enhancements for derived and geometric categories”. In: *Forum of Mathematics, Sigma*. Vol. 10. Cambridge University Press. 2022, e92.
- [6] Alberto Canonaco, Mattia Ornaghi, and Paolo Stellari. “Localizations of the category of ∞ -categories and internal Homs”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.07830* (2018).
- [7] Alberto Canonaco and Paolo Stellari. “A tour about existence and uniqueness of dg enhancements and lifts”. In: *Journal of Geometry and Physics* 122 (2017), pp. 28–52.
- [8] Lee Cohn. *Differential Graded Categories are K-Linear Stable ∞ -categories*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1308.2587>.
- [9] Rune Haugseng David Gepner. “Enriched ∞ -categories via non-symmetric ∞ -operad”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 279 (2015), pp. 575-716 (2013).
- [10] Gaitsgory Dennis. *Generalities on DG-Categories*. <https://people.math.harvard.edu/~gaitsgde/GL/textDG.pdf>. 2012.
- [11] Matteo Doni. *Mod $_{\mathbb{H}k}$ -enriched ∞ -categories are left $\mathbb{H}k$ -module objects of Cat_{∞}^{Sp} and Cat_{∞}^{Sp} -enriched ∞ -functors*. <https://sites.google.com/view/matteodoni/home-page/research>. 2024.
- [12] Matteo Doni. *R-Mod-enriched categories are left \underline{R} -module objects of $Cat(\mathbb{A}b)$ and $Cat(\mathbb{A}b)$ -enriched functors*. <https://sites.google.com/view/matteodoni/home-page/research>. 2024.
- [13] Matteo Doni. *From dg-categories over k to k -linear stable ∞ -categories*. <https://sites.google.com/view/matteodoni/home-page/research>. 2024.
- [14] Rune Haugseng. “Rectification of enriched ∞ -categories”. In: *J Topology* (2015) 8 (2): 377-413 (2013).

- [15] Hadrian Heine. “An equivalence between enriched ∞ -categories and ∞ -categories with weak action”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 417 (2023), p. 108941.
- [16] Vladimir Hinich. *Yoneda lemma for enriched infinity categories*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.07635>.
- [17] Marc Hoyois, Sarah Scherotzke, and Nicolo Sibilla. “Higher traces, noncommutative motives, and the categorified Chern character”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 309 (2017), pp. 97–154.
- [18] Valery Lunts and Dmitri Orlov. “Uniqueness of enhancement for triangulated categories”. In: *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* 23.3 (2010), pp. 853–908.
- [19] Jacob Lurie. *Higher Topos Theory*. Annals of Mathematics Studies, 2009.
- [20] Jacob Lurie. *Derived Algebraic Geometry VII: Spectral Scheme*. <https://www.math.ias.edu/~lurie/papers/DAG-VII.pdf>. 2011.
- [21] Jacob Lurie. *Higher Algebra*. <https://www.math.ias.edu/~lurie/papers/HA.pdf>. 2017.
- [22] Jacob Lurie. *Kerodon*. <https://kerodon.net>. 2018.
- [23] Jacob Lurie. *Spectral Algebraic Geometry*. <https://www.math.ias.edu/~lurie/papers/SAG-rootfile.pdf>. 2018.
- [24] Amnon Neeman. *Triangulated Categories. (AM-148), Volume 148*. Vol. 148. Princeton University Press, 2014.
- [25] Emily Riehl. *Categorical homotopy theory*. Vol. 24. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [26] Emily Riehl. *Category Theory in Context*. Dover Pubns, 2016.
- [27] Emily Riehl and Dominic Verity. *Elements of ∞ -category theory*. Vol. 194. Cambridge University Press, 2022.
- [28] Goncalo Tabuada. “Une structure de catégorie de modeles de Quillen sur la catégorie des dg-catégories”. In: *Comptes Rendus Mathématique* 340.1 (2005), pp. 15–19.
- [29] Bertrand Toën. “The homotopy theory of dg-categories and derived Morita theory”. In: *Inventiones mathematicae* 167.3 (2007), pp. 615–667.
- [30] Bertrand Toën. “Derived algebraic geometry”. In: *EMS Surveys in Mathematical Sciences* 1.2 (2014), pp. 153–240.