

# TRIANGULATED STRUCTURES INDUCED BY MUTATIONS

RYOTA IITSUKA

ABSTRACT. In representation theory of algebras, there exist two types of mutation pairs: rigid type (cluster-tilting mutations by Iyama-Yoshino) and simple-minded type (mutations of simple-minded systems by Simões-Pauksztello). It is known that such mutation pairs induce triangulated categories, however, these facts have been proved in different ways. In this paper, we introduce the concept of “mutation triples”, which is a simultaneous generalization of two different types of mutation pairs as well as concentric twin cotorsion pairs. We present two main theorems concerning mutation triples. The first theorem is that mutation triples induce pretriangulated categories. The second one is that pretriangulated categories induced by mutation triples become triangulated categories if they satisfy an additional condition (MT4).

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Preliminaries	3
2.1. Approximations in additive categories	3
2.2. Extriangulated categories	3
2.3. Approximations in ET categories	7
2.4. Pretriangulated categories	11
3. Mutation triples	14
3.1. Premutation triples	14
3.2. Mutation triples	16
4. Pretriangulated structures induced by mutation triples	19
4.1. Right triangles induced by a mutation triple	19
4.2. Right triangulated structures induced by mutation triples	23
4.3. Pretriangulated structures induced by mutation triples	31
5. Triangulated structures induced by mutation triples	32
5.1. Case 1 : concentric twin cotorsion pairs	33
5.2. Case 2 : mutation triples satisfying (MT4)	33
Appendix A. Twin cotorsion pairs	35
A.1. Definitions and examples	35
A.2. Relations between conic conflations and monic morphisms	37
A.3. Triangulated structures induced by concentric TCPs	38
Appendix B. Mutation theory of rigid subcategories	38
B.1. Definitions and examples	39
B.2. Rigid mutation pairs	39
B.3. Triangulated structures induced by rigid mutation pairs	40
Appendix C. Mutation theory of simple-minded systems	41
C.1. Definitions and examples	41
C.2. Mutation pairs of simple-minded type	41
C.3. Triangulated structures induced by simple-minded mutation pairs	42
Acknowledgements	43
References	44

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The notion of “mutation” plays important roles in representation theory and related topics. Roughly speaking, mutation is an operation to obtain new objects from old ones, usually considered in triangulated categories, exact categories, or extriangulated categories [1, 2, 13, 18]. There are many studies about mutation of tilting objects (for example APR-tilting [4]), sifting objects [2], cluster-tilting objects [6, 18] and  $\tau$ -tilting objects [1], they are respectively called tilting mutations, sifting mutations, cluster-tilting mutations and  $\tau$ -tilting mutations. In many cases, we can study characters of certain objects (sifting objects and so on) by mutating them [1, 6, 18].

What is more interesting is that some mutations in triangulated category induces another triangulated category [2, 6, 8, 18]. This technique is called “reduction” and it is often compatible with mutations. Due to this compatibility, we only have to study under simpler situations by using reduction techniques [1, 2, 6, 18].

The aim of this paper is to study sufficient conditions for mutations to induce another triangulated category.

In section 2, we introduce some basic concepts in this paper such as extriangulated category, pretriangulated category and so on.

In section 3, we introduce the new concept “mutation triples”.

**Definition 1.1.** (Condition 3.1,3.9 and Definition 3.2,3.10)

Let  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$  be an extriangulated category and  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  be a triplet of subcategories of  $\mathcal{C}$ . We call  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  *mutation triple* if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (MT1)  $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z} \cap \mathcal{V}$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{I}$ , and  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{Z}$  is strongly functorially finite.
- (MT2) (i)  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}) = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{S}, \text{CoCone}_{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}}}(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{Z})) = 0$ .  
(ii)  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V}) = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}(\text{Cone}_{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{I}), \mathcal{V}) = 0$ .
- (MT3) (i)  $\text{Cone}_{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z}) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  and  $\text{CoCone}_{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}}}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z}) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{T}}$  where  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$  are in Notation 3.4.  
(ii)  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{Z}$  are closed under extensions in  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathcal{Z}$  are closed under extensions in  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}}$ .

This triplet is a simultaneous generalization of a triplet  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  defined by concentric twin cotorsion pairs in [24] and mutation pairs in [8, 18]. We collect elementary results of the triplets in this section.

In section 4, We show one of the main theorems below, which is a generalization of the results in [24].

**Theorem 1.2.** (Theorem 4.17)

Let  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  be a mutation triple. Then  $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{I}]$  has a pretriangulated structure.

In section 5, we collect sufficient conditions for mutation triples to induce a triangulated category. We consider two cases. The former one is the results in [24], which can be applied to mutation triples defined by concentric twin cotorsion pairs in triangulated category with some conditions: Hovey and heart-equivalent. The latter one is an original result of this paper. This requires an additional condition (MT4), but it is not necessary that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a triangulated category.

**Theorem 1.3.** (Condition 5.3, Theorem 5.4)

Let  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  be a mutation triple. We consider the following new condition (MT4):

- (MT4)  $\text{Cone}_{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{I}) \cap (\mathcal{Z}\langle -1 \rangle * \mathcal{Z}\langle 1 \rangle) = \text{CoCone}_{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}}(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{S}) \cap (\mathcal{Z}\langle -1 \rangle * \mathcal{Z}\langle 1 \rangle)$  where  $*$  is considered in  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}}$ .

If  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  satisfies (MT4), then  $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{I}]$  has a triangulated structure.

Throughout this thesis, let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a skeletally small additive category, thus the isomorphism class of  $\text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$  is a set. We denote the category of abelian groups (resp. sets) by  $\text{Ab}$  (resp.  $\text{Set}$ ).

We also assume all subcategories are additive, full and closed under isomorphisms. We do not always assume that all subcategories are closed under direct summands, so we denote the smallest subcategory containing  $\mathcal{D}$  and closed under direct summands by  $\text{add}\mathcal{D}$  for a subcategory  $\mathcal{D}$ .

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Approximations in additive categories.** To define mutations, we introduce the concept of approximations.

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$  and let  $X \in \mathcal{C}$ .

- (1) A morphism  $a: D_X \rightarrow X$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -*epic* if  $\mathcal{C}(D, a): \mathcal{C}(D, D_X) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(D, X)$  is surjective for any  $D$  in  $\mathcal{D}$ .
- (2) A morphism  $d: D_X \rightarrow X$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  is a *right  $\mathcal{D}$ -approximation* of  $X$  if  $D_X \in \mathcal{D}$  and  $d$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -epic.
- (3)  $\mathcal{D}$  is *contravariantly finite* if any  $X$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  has a right  $\mathcal{D}$ -approximation.

Dually, we define  $\mathcal{D}$ -*monic*, a *left  $\mathcal{D}$ -approximation* of  $X$  and *covariantly finite*.  $\mathcal{D}$  is called *functorially finite* if  $\mathcal{D}$  is both covariantly finite and contravariantly finite.

**2.2. Extriangulated categories.** First, we start this subsection from the definition of extriangulated categories [25].

**Definition 2.2.** [25, Definition 2.7,2.8]

- (1) For  $X, Y$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , we denote the collection of three-term sequences whose first-term is  $X$  and third-term is  $Y$  by  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}(Y, X)$  (note the order of  $X$  and  $Y$ ). Then we introduce an equivalence relation  $\sim$  in  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}(Y, X)$  as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{For } \mathbf{E} = (X \xrightarrow{x} E \xrightarrow{y} Y), \mathbf{E}' = (X \xrightarrow{x'} E' \xrightarrow{y'} Y) \text{ in } \tilde{\mathcal{E}}(Y, X), \\ \mathbf{E} \sim \mathbf{E}' \iff \begin{array}{l} \text{There exists an isomorphism } e: E \rightarrow E' \\ \text{such that } x' = ex \text{ and } y = y'e. \end{array} \end{array}$$

We denote  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}(Y, X)/\sim$  by  $\mathcal{E}(Y, X)$ .

- (2) For  $X, Y$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , we denote as  $0 = (X \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}} X \oplus Y \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}} Y)$  in  $\mathcal{E}(Y, X)$ .
- (3) For  $(X \xrightarrow{a} E \xrightarrow{b} Y)$  in  $\mathcal{E}(Y, X)$  and  $(X' \xrightarrow{a'} E' \xrightarrow{b'} Y')$  in  $\mathcal{E}(Y', X')$ ,  $(X \xrightarrow{a} E \xrightarrow{b} Y) \oplus (X' \xrightarrow{a'} E' \xrightarrow{b'} Y')$  is defined by  $(X \oplus X' \xrightarrow{a \oplus a'} E \oplus E' \xrightarrow{b \oplus b'} Y \oplus Y')$  in  $\mathcal{E}(Y \oplus Y', X \oplus X')$ .

**Remark 2.3.** [25, Definition 2.1-2.3, Remark 2.2] Let  $\mathbb{E}: \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Ab}$  be an additive bifunctor and  $X, X', Y, Y', Z \in \mathcal{C}$ .

- (1) An element  $\delta \in \mathbb{E}(X, Y)$  is called  $\mathbb{E}$ -*extension*.
- (2) For  $a: X \rightarrow Y$  and  $b: Y \rightarrow Z$ , we can define the following natural transformations.

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathbb{E}(b, -): \mathbb{E}(Z, -) \Rightarrow \mathbb{E}(Y, -) \\ \mathbb{E}(-, a): \mathbb{E}(-, X) \Rightarrow \mathbb{E}(-, Y) \end{array}$$

- (3) There exists the following isomorphism.

$$\mathbb{E}(X \oplus Y, X' \oplus Y') \cong \mathbb{E}(X, X') \oplus \mathbb{E}(X, Y') \oplus \mathbb{E}(Y, X') \oplus \mathbb{E}(Y, Y')$$

Then we define  $\delta \oplus \delta'$  in left-hand side as the element which corresponds to  $(\delta, 0, 0, \delta')$  in right-hand side by the above isomorphism.

- (4) Let  $\delta \in \mathbb{E}(Z, X)$ . We write  $\mathbb{E}(b, X)(\delta), \mathbb{E}(Z, a)(\delta)$  as  $\delta b, a\delta$  respectively.
- (5) In the rest of this paper, we sometimes regard  $\mathbb{E}$ -extensions as “morphisms” in  $\mathcal{C}$ , that is, we interpret  $\delta b$  as a “composition” of  $(Y \xrightarrow{b} Z \xrightarrow{-\delta} X)$  and  $a\delta$  as a “composition” of  $(Z \xrightarrow{-\delta} X \xrightarrow{a} Y)$ . Then, we can consider commutative diagrams with  $\mathbb{E}$ -extensions by this notation.

For example, let  $\delta \in \mathbb{E}(X, Y), \delta' \in \mathbb{E}(X', Y'), x \in \mathcal{C}(X, X'), y \in \mathcal{C}(Y, Y')$ , then

$$y\delta = \delta'x \text{ is expressed as } \begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{-\delta} & Y \\ \downarrow x & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow y \\ X' & \xrightarrow{-\delta'} & Y' \end{array} .$$

**Definition 2.4.** [25, Definition 2.4,2.5]

- (1) Let  $\mathbb{E}: \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ab}$  be an additive bifunctor. We call  $\mathfrak{s}$  *realization* of  $\mathbb{E}$  if  $\mathfrak{s}$  satisfies the following conditions:
- (i)  $\mathfrak{s}$  is a collection of maps in  $\mathbf{Ab}$   $\{\mathfrak{s}_{X,Y}: \mathbb{E}(X, Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(X, Y)\}_{X,Y \in \mathcal{C}}$ . We often denote  $\mathfrak{s}_{X,Y}$  as  $\mathfrak{s}$  if there is no confusion.
- (ii) For  $\delta \in \mathbb{E}(Y, X), \delta' \in \mathbb{E}(Y', X')$ , let  $\mathfrak{s}(\delta) = (X \xrightarrow{x} E \xrightarrow{y} Y), \mathfrak{s}(\delta') = (X' \xrightarrow{x'} E' \xrightarrow{y'} Y')$ . Then for any commutative diagrams in  $\mathcal{C}$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X & \xrightarrow{x} & E & \xrightarrow{y} & Y & \xrightarrow{-\delta} & X \\ \downarrow a & & & & \downarrow b & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow a \\ X' & \xrightarrow{x'} & E' & \xrightarrow{y'} & Y' & \xrightarrow{-\delta'} & X' \end{array}$$

there exists a morphism  $e: E \rightarrow E'$  which makes the following diagram commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X & \xrightarrow{x} & E & \xrightarrow{y} & Y & \xrightarrow{-\delta} & X \\ \downarrow a & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \exists e & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow b & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow a \\ X' & \xrightarrow{x'} & E' & \xrightarrow{y'} & Y' & \xrightarrow{-\delta'} & X' \end{array}$$

- (2) Let  $\mathfrak{s}$  be a realization of  $\mathbb{E}$ .  $\mathfrak{s}$  is *additive* if it satisfies the following conditions:
- (i) For any  $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $\mathfrak{s}(0) = (X \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}} X \oplus Y \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}} Y)$ , that is,  $\mathfrak{s}$  maps 0 in  $\mathbb{E}(Y, X)$  to 0 in  $\mathcal{E}(Y, X)$ .
- (ii) For any  $\delta \in \mathbb{E}(X, Y), \delta' \in \mathbb{E}(X', Y')$ ,  $\mathfrak{s}(\delta \oplus \delta') = \mathfrak{s}(\delta) \oplus \mathfrak{s}(\delta')$ .

**Remark 2.5.** [25, Definition 2.15,2.19]

- (1) Let  $\delta \in \mathbb{E}(Y, X)$  and  $\mathfrak{s}(\delta) = (X \xrightarrow{x} E \xrightarrow{y} Y)$ . This sequence  $(X \xrightarrow{x} E \xrightarrow{y} Y)$  is called  $\mathfrak{s}$ -*conflation*. We often call it *conflation* if there is no confusion.
- (2) The left morphism of a conflation is called  $\mathfrak{s}$ -*inflation* and the right one is called  $\mathfrak{s}$ -*deflation*.
- (3) We call a pair  $(\delta, \mathfrak{s}(\delta))$   $\mathfrak{s}$ -*triangle* and it is denoted by:

$$X \xrightarrow{x} E \xrightarrow{y} Y \xrightarrow{-\delta} X \quad \text{or} \quad Y \xrightarrow{-\delta} X \xrightarrow{x} E \xrightarrow{y} Y.$$

**Definition 2.6.** [25, Definition 2.12]

A triplet  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$  is called *extriangulated category*, or *ET category* if the triplet satisfies the following conditions:

- (ET1)  $\mathbb{E}: \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ab}$  is an additive bifunctor.

(ET2)  $\mathfrak{s}$  is an additive realization of  $\mathbb{E}$ .

(ET3) Let  $\delta \in \mathbb{E}(Y, X), \delta' \in \mathbb{E}(Y', X')$ . For  $\mathfrak{s}(\delta) = (X \xrightarrow{x} E \xrightarrow{y} Y) \xrightarrow{\delta} X$ ,  $\mathfrak{s}(\delta') = (X' \xrightarrow{x'} E' \xrightarrow{y'} Y') \xrightarrow{\delta'} X'$ , any diagram in  $\mathcal{C}$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X & \xrightarrow{x} & E & \xrightarrow{y} & Y & \xrightarrow{\delta} & X \\ \downarrow a & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow e & & & & \downarrow a \\ X' & \xrightarrow{x'} & E' & \xrightarrow{y'} & Y' & \xrightarrow{\delta'} & X' \end{array}$$

there exists a morphism  $b: Y \rightarrow Y'$  which makes the following diagram commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X & \xrightarrow{x} & E & \xrightarrow{y} & Y & \xrightarrow{\delta} & X \\ \downarrow a & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow e & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow b & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow a \\ X' & \xrightarrow{x'} & E' & \xrightarrow{y'} & Y' & \xrightarrow{\delta'} & X' \end{array}$$

(ET3)<sup>op</sup> Dual of (ET3).

(ET4) For  $\delta \in \mathbb{E}(C, X), \epsilon \in \mathbb{E}(D, Y)$ ,  $\mathfrak{s}(\delta) = (X \xrightarrow{x} Y \xrightarrow{x'} C) \xrightarrow{\delta} X$ ,  $\mathfrak{s}(\epsilon) = (Y \xrightarrow{y} Z \xrightarrow{z'} E) \xrightarrow{\epsilon} Y$ , there exist  $\mathfrak{s}$ -triangles  $X \xrightarrow{z} Z \xrightarrow{z'} E \xrightarrow{\delta'} X$  and  $C \xrightarrow{c} E \xrightarrow{d} D \xrightarrow{\epsilon} C$  which make the following diagram commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & D & \xlongequal{\quad} & D & & \\ & & \downarrow \epsilon & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \epsilon' & & \\ X & \xrightarrow{x} & Y & \xrightarrow{x'} & C & \xrightarrow{\delta} & X \\ \parallel & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow y & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow c & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \\ X & \xrightarrow{z} & Z & \xrightarrow{z'} & E & \xrightarrow{\delta'} & X \\ & & \downarrow y' & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow d & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow x \\ & & D & \xlongequal{\quad} & D & \xrightarrow{\epsilon} & Y \end{array}$$

(ET4)<sup>op</sup> Dual of (ET4).

**Remark 2.7.** [25, Corollary 3.12] Let  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$  be an ET category and  $(X \xrightarrow{x} Y \xrightarrow{y} Z \xrightarrow{\delta} X)$  be an  $\mathfrak{s}$ -triangle. Then the following are exact sequences.

$$\mathcal{C}(Z, -) \xrightarrow{c(y, -)} \mathcal{C}(Y, -) \xrightarrow{c(x, -)} \mathcal{C}(X, -) \xrightarrow{-\circ\delta} \mathbb{E}(Z, -) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{E}(y, -)} \mathbb{E}(Y, -) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{E}(x, -)} \mathbb{E}(X, -)$$

$$\mathcal{C}(-, X) \xrightarrow{c(-, x)} \mathcal{C}(-, Y) \xrightarrow{c(-, y)} \mathcal{C}(-, Z) \xrightarrow{\delta\circ-} \mathbb{E}(-, X) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{E}(-, x)} \mathbb{E}(-, Y) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{E}(-, y)} \mathbb{E}(-, Z)$$

The following proposition is often used in this paper.

**Proposition 2.8.** [25, Proposition 3.15] (Shifted octahedrons) Let  $X_i \xrightarrow{x_i} Y_i \xrightarrow{y_i} Z \xrightarrow{\delta_i} X_i$  be an  $\mathfrak{s}$ -triangle for  $i = 1, 2$ . Then there exist  $\mathfrak{s}$ -triangles  $X_2 \xrightarrow{v_1} W \xrightarrow{w_1} Y_1 \xrightarrow{\epsilon_1} X_2$  and  $X_1 \xrightarrow{v_2} W \xrightarrow{w_2} Y_2 \xrightarrow{\epsilon_2} X_1$  which make the following diagram

commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & X_2 & \xlongequal{\quad} & X_2 & & \\
& & \downarrow v_1 & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow x_2 & & \\
X_1 & \xrightarrow{v_2} & W & \xrightarrow{w_2} & Y_2 & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_2} & X_1 \\
\parallel & & \downarrow w_1 & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow y_2 & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \\
X_1 & \xrightarrow{x_1} & Y_1 & \xrightarrow{y_1} & Z & \xrightarrow{\delta_1} & X_1 \\
& & \downarrow \epsilon_1 & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \delta_2 & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow v_2 \\
& & X_2 & \xlongequal{\quad} & X_2 & \xrightarrow{-v_1} & W
\end{array}$$

*Proof.* See [25, Proposition 3.15].  $\square$

The following definition of projective objects and injective objects is an analogy of exact category.

**Definition 2.9.** [25] Let  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$  be an ET category.

- (1) We define a subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$ ,  $\text{Proj}_{\mathbb{E}}\mathcal{C}$  as  $\{X \in \mathcal{C} \mid \mathbb{E}(X, \mathcal{C}) = 0\}$ . An object in  $\text{Proj}_{\mathbb{E}}\mathcal{C}$  is called *projective object*.
- (2)  $\mathcal{C}$  has *enough projectives* if, for any  $X$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , there exists a conflation  $X' \rightarrow P \rightarrow X$  with  $P \in \text{Proj}_{\mathbb{E}}\mathcal{C}$ .
- (3) For subcategories  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \subset \mathcal{C}$ , we define the following three subcategories.

$$\mathcal{X} * \mathcal{Y} = \left\{ E \in \mathcal{C} \mid \begin{array}{l} \text{There exists an } \mathfrak{s}\text{-triangle} \\ X \rightarrow E \rightarrow Y \dashrightarrow X \text{ where } X \in \mathcal{X}, Y \in \mathcal{Y} \end{array} \right\}$$

$$\text{Cone}_{\mathbb{E}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) = \left\{ Z \in \mathcal{C} \mid \begin{array}{l} \text{There exists an } \mathfrak{s}\text{-triangle} \\ X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \dashrightarrow X \text{ where } X \in \mathcal{X}, Y \in \mathcal{Y} \end{array} \right\}$$

$$\text{CoCone}_{\mathbb{E}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) = \left\{ Z' \in \mathcal{C} \mid \begin{array}{l} \text{There exists an } \mathfrak{s}\text{-triangle} \\ X \dashrightarrow Z' \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \text{ where } X \in \mathcal{X}, Y \in \mathcal{Y} \end{array} \right\}$$

We denote  $\text{Proj}_{\mathbb{E}}\mathcal{C}$  by  $\text{Proj}\mathcal{C}$  when there is no confusion. Dually, we define  $\text{Inj}_{\mathbb{E}}\mathcal{C}$  and *enough injectives*. We call  $\mathcal{C}$  is *Frobenius* if  $\text{Proj}\mathcal{C} = \text{Inj}\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  has enough projectives and enough injectives.

**Example 2.10.** [25, Corollary 3.18, Proposition 3.22]

- (1) An exact category is an ET category whose inflations are monomorphic and deflations are epimorphic. In this situation,  $\mathfrak{s}$ -conflations are exactly conflations in the exact structure.
- (2) A triangulated category is exactly a Frobenius ET category with  $\text{Proj}\mathcal{C} = 0$ .

There are some ways to obtain a new ET category from old one. First case is a generalized statement of Happel's theorem [14].

**Proposition 2.11.** [25, Proposition 3.30] Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an ET category and let  $\mathcal{I} \subset \text{Proj}\mathcal{C} \cap \text{Inj}\mathcal{C}$ . Then  $\mathcal{C}/[\mathcal{I}]$  also becomes an ET category.

*Proof.* See [25, Proposition 3.30].  $\square$

Next way is to restrict the bifunctor  $\mathbb{E}$  and the realization  $\mathfrak{s}$  to an extension-closed subcategory. We start from the definition of "extension-closed" subcategories.

**Definition 2.12.** [25, Definition 2.17] Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an ET category and  $\mathcal{D}$  be a subcategory. We call  $\mathcal{D}$  *extension-closed* if, for any conflation  $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z$  where  $X, Z$  in  $\mathcal{D}$ , then  $Y$  is also in  $\mathcal{D}$ .

**Lemma 2.13.** [25, Remark 2.18] Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an ET category and  $\mathcal{D}$  is an extension-closed subcategory. Then  $\mathcal{D}$  has an ET structure defined by restricting  $\mathbb{E}$  and  $\mathfrak{s}$  to  $\mathcal{D}$ .

Last way is to restrict the bifunctor to a closed subfunctor. See also [10, p649] for the following definitions in exact categories.

**Definition 2.14.** [15, Definition 3.7] Let  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$  be an ET category.

(1) A functor  $\mathbb{F}: \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Set}$  is called a *subfunctor* of  $\mathbb{E}$  if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (i) For any  $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $\mathbb{F}(X, Y)$  is a subset of  $\mathbb{E}(X, Y)$ .
  - (ii) For any  $x: X' \rightarrow X, y: Y \rightarrow Y'$ ,  $\mathbb{F}(x, y) = \mathbb{E}(x, y)|_{\mathbb{F}(X, Y)}$ .
- Then we denote  $\mathbb{F} \subset \mathbb{E}$ .

(2) A subfunctor  $\mathbb{F} \subset \mathbb{E}$  is called *additive* if  $\mathbb{F}$  is an additive bifunctor.

**Definition 2.15.** [15, Definition 3.8] Let  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$  be an ET category and  $\mathbb{F}$  be an additive subfunctor of  $\mathbb{E}$ . We define  $\mathfrak{s}|_{\mathbb{F}}$  by restriction of  $\mathfrak{s}$  onto  $\mathbb{F}$ .

**Proposition 2.16.** [15, Proposition 3.16] [10, Proposition 1.4] Let  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$  be an ET category and  $\mathbb{F}$  be an additive subfunctor of  $\mathbb{E}$ . Then the following are equivalent.

- (i)  $\mathfrak{s}|_{\mathbb{F}}$ -inflations are closed under composition.
- (ii)  $\mathfrak{s}|_{\mathbb{F}}$ -deflations are closed under composition.
- (iii)  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{F}, \mathfrak{s}|_{\mathbb{F}})$  satisfies (ET4).
- (iv)  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{F}, \mathfrak{s}|_{\mathbb{F}})$  satisfies (ET4)<sup>op</sup>.
- (v)  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{F}, \mathfrak{s}|_{\mathbb{F}})$  is an ET category.

In this case,  $\mathbb{F}$  is called *closed*.

The following subfunctors are examples of closed ones defined in [15].

**Example 2.17.** [15, Definition 3.18, Proposition 3.19] Let  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$  be an ET category and  $\mathcal{D}$  be a full subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

(1) We define a closed subfunctor  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}$  of  $\mathbb{E}$  as follows:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}(C, A) = \{\delta \in \mathbb{E}(C, A) \mid \delta \circ - : \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{D}, C) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{D}, A); \text{zero morphism}\}.$$

(2) We define a closed subfunctor  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{D}}$  of  $\mathbb{E}$  as follows:

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{D}}(C, A) = \{\delta \in \mathbb{E}(C, A) \mid - \circ \delta : \mathcal{C}(A, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}(C, \mathcal{D}); \text{zero morphism}\}.$$

We denote  $\mathfrak{s}|_{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}}$  (resp.  $\mathfrak{s}|_{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{D}}}$ ) by  $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathcal{D}}$  (resp.  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{D}}$ ).

**Remark 2.18.** In this paper, the ET structures defined by  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}, \mathfrak{s}|_{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}})$  and  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{D}}, \mathfrak{s}|_{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{D}}})$  are called *relative extriangulated structure*, or more simply *relative structure*.

On the other hand, in [12, Section 2], all extriangulated substructures are called relative extriangulated structure. Since we do not use other substructures here, there would be no confusion.

**Remark 2.19.** Let  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$  be an ET category and  $\mathcal{D}$  be a full subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then,  $\mathcal{D} \subset \text{Proj}_{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}} \mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D} \subset \text{Inj}_{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{D}}} \mathcal{C}$ . This follows from the long exact sequences in Remark 2.7.

**2.3. Approximations in ET categories.** In this subsection, we fix an ET category  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$  and assume all subcategories are closed under direct summands.

We start from a reformulation of extensions in relative structures by using  $\mathcal{D}$ -epic and  $\mathcal{D}$ -monic morphisms in ET categories for a subcategory  $\mathcal{D}$ .

**Lemma 2.20.** [26, Proposition 3.2] Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Let  $X \xrightarrow{x} Y \xrightarrow{y} Z \xrightarrow{\delta} X$  be an  $\mathfrak{s}$ -triangle.

- (1)  $\delta \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}(Z, X) \iff y$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -epic.  
(2)  $\delta \in \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{D}}(Z, X) \iff x$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -monic.

*Proof.* From Remark 2.7, this follows from definitions of  $\mathcal{D}$ -epic and  $\mathcal{D}$ -monic.  $\square$

**Definition 2.21.** [27, Definition 3.21] Let  $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{D}$  be subcategories of  $\mathcal{C}$  where  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{D}$ .

- (1)  $\mathcal{I}$  is *strongly contravariantly finite* in  $\mathcal{D}$  with respect to  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$  if, for any  $D \in \mathcal{D}$ , there exists an  $\mathfrak{s}$ -deflation  $I_D \xrightarrow{g} D$  where  $g$  is a right  $\mathcal{I}$ -approximation.  
(2)  $\mathcal{I}$  is *strongly covariantly finite* in  $\mathcal{D}$  with respect to  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$  if, for any  $D \in \mathcal{D}$ , there exists an  $\mathfrak{s}$ -inflation  $D \xrightarrow{f} I^D$  where  $f$  is a left  $\mathcal{I}$ -approximation.

**Example 2.22.** Assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  has enough projectives (resp. injectives). Then  $\text{Proj } \mathcal{C}$  (resp.  $\text{Inj } \mathcal{C}$ ) is strongly contravariantly (resp. covariantly) finite in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

**Lemma 2.23.** [26, Lemma 3.5] Let  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{X}$  be subcategories of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

- (1) Assume that  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{X}$  is strongly covariantly finite.  
  - For  $X \in \mathcal{X}$ , there exists an inflation  $i^X: X \rightarrow I^X$  which is a left  $\mathcal{I}$ -approximation of  $X$ . Then we obtain the following  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle.

$$X \xrightarrow{i^X} I^X \xrightarrow{p^X} X\langle 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\lambda^X} X$$

- For  $x: X \rightarrow X'$  in  $\mathcal{X}$ , we define  $x\langle 1 \rangle: X\langle 1 \rangle \rightarrow X'\langle 1 \rangle$  as a morphism in  $\mathcal{C}$  which makes the following diagram in  $\mathcal{C}$  commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X\langle 1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{\lambda^X} & X \\ x\langle 1 \rangle \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow x \\ X'\langle 1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{\lambda^{X'}} & X' \end{array}$$

Then  $\langle 1 \rangle$  induces an additive functor  $\langle 1 \rangle: \mathcal{X}/[\mathcal{I}] \rightarrow \mathcal{C}/[\mathcal{I}]$ . Moreover,  $\langle 1 \rangle$  is unique up to natural isomorphisms.

- (2) Assume that  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{X}$  is strongly contravariantly finite.  
  - For  $X \in \mathcal{X}$ , there exists a deflation  $p_X: I_X \rightarrow X$  which is a right  $\mathcal{I}$ -approximation of  $X$ . Then we obtain the following  $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle.

$$X \xrightarrow{\lambda_X} X\langle -1 \rangle \xrightarrow{i_X} I_X \xrightarrow{p_X} X$$

- For  $x: X \rightarrow X'$  in  $\mathcal{X}$ , we define  $x\langle -1 \rangle: X\langle -1 \rangle \rightarrow X'\langle -1 \rangle$  as a morphism in  $\mathcal{C}$  which makes the following diagram commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\lambda_X} & X\langle -1 \rangle \\ x \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow x\langle -1 \rangle \\ X' & \xrightarrow{\lambda_{X'}} & X'\langle -1 \rangle \end{array}$$

Then  $\langle -1 \rangle$  induces an additive functor  $\langle -1 \rangle: \mathcal{X}/[\mathcal{I}] \rightarrow \mathcal{C}/[\mathcal{I}]$ . Moreover,  $\langle -1 \rangle$  is unique up to natural isomorphisms.

*Proof.* We prove only (1). First, for each  $X$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , choose an  $\mathfrak{s}$ -triangle  $X \xrightarrow{i^X} I^X \xrightarrow{p^X} X\langle 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\lambda^X} X$  where  $i^X$  is a left  $\mathcal{I}$ -approximation. For any  $X \xrightarrow{x} X'$  in  $\mathcal{X}$ , since  $i^X$  is a left  $\mathcal{I}$ -approximation and (ET3), there exist morphisms  $y$  and  $i$  which



make the following diagram commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 X & \xrightarrow{i^X} & I^X & \xrightarrow{p^X} & X\langle 1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{\lambda^X} & X \\
 \downarrow x & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow i & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow y & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow x \\
 X' & \xrightarrow{i^{X'}} & I^{X'} & \xrightarrow{p^{X'}} & X'\langle 1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{\lambda^{X'}} & X'
 \end{array}$$

then we define  $x\langle 1 \rangle$  by  $y$ . Assume that  $y, y': X\langle 1 \rangle \rightarrow X'\langle 1 \rangle$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  satisfy  $x\lambda^X = \lambda^{X'}y = \lambda^{X'}y'$ . Then,  $\lambda^{X'}(y - y') = 0$ . So,  $y - y' = 0$  in  $\mathcal{C}/[\mathcal{I}]$  and  $\langle 1 \rangle: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}/[\mathcal{I}]$  is well-defined. This induces  $\langle 1 \rangle$  because  $\lambda^{X'}x\langle 1 \rangle = x\lambda^X = 0$  for  $x \in [\mathcal{I}]$ . Therefore,  $y$  is uniquely determined by  $x$  up to  $[\mathcal{I}]$  and  $\langle 1 \rangle$  is an additive functor.

Uniqueness of  $\langle 1 \rangle$  up to natural isomorphism follows from the diagram below and  $n^X m^X = \text{id}_{X\langle 1 \rangle}$  in  $\mathcal{C}/[\mathcal{I}]$  where  $X \xrightarrow{j^X} J^X \xrightarrow{q^X} X\langle 1 \rangle' \xrightarrow{\lambda'^X} X$  is another  $\mathfrak{s}$ -triangle with a left  $\mathcal{I}$ -approximation  $j^X$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 X & \xrightarrow{i^X} & I^X & \xrightarrow{p^X} & X\langle 1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{\lambda^X} & X \\
 \parallel \text{id} & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow i & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow m^X & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \text{id} \\
 X & \xrightarrow{j^X} & J^X & \xrightarrow{q^X} & X\langle 1 \rangle' & \xrightarrow{\lambda'^X} & X \\
 \parallel \text{id} & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow j & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow n^X & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \text{id} \\
 X & \xrightarrow{i^X} & I^X & \xrightarrow{p^X} & X\langle 1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{\lambda^X} & X
 \end{array}$$

□

**Remark 2.24.** In the proof of Lemma 2.23, we used the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 X & \xrightarrow{i^X} & I^X & \xrightarrow{p^X} & X\langle 1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{\lambda^X} & X \\
 \parallel \text{id} & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow i & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow m^X & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \text{id} \\
 X & \xrightarrow{j^X} & J^X & \xrightarrow{q^X} & X\langle 1 \rangle' & \xrightarrow{\lambda'^X} & X
 \end{array}$$

Then we denote  $m^X$  in  $\mathcal{C}/[\mathcal{I}]$  (that is  $\underline{m^X}$  in Notation 3.5) by  $\mu_X$  because  $\mu$  induces natural isomorphism  $\langle 1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle 1 \rangle'$  where  $\langle 1 \rangle, \langle 1 \rangle': \mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{I}] \rightarrow \mathcal{C}/[\mathcal{I}]$ .

**Notation 2.25.** Let  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{X}$  be subcategories of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

- (1) We denote  $\text{Cone}_{\mathbb{E}\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{I})$  by  $\mathcal{X}\langle 1 \rangle_{\mathcal{I}}$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{X}\langle 1 \rangle_{\mathcal{I}}$ .
- (2) We denote  $\text{CoCone}_{\mathbb{E}\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{X})$  by  $\mathcal{X}\langle -1 \rangle_{\mathcal{I}}$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{X}\langle -1 \rangle_{\mathcal{I}}$ .

If there is no confusion, we often drop  $\mathcal{I}$  of  $\langle 1 \rangle_{\mathcal{I}}$  and  $\langle -1 \rangle_{\mathcal{I}}$ .

In the situation of Lemma 2.23,  $\{X\langle 1 \rangle \mid X \in \mathcal{X}\}$  in Lemma 2.23 and  $\mathcal{X}\langle 1 \rangle$  are same in  $\mathcal{C}/[\mathcal{I}]$ .

Note that we can define  $\mathcal{X}\langle 1 \rangle$  (resp.  $\mathcal{X}\langle -1 \rangle$ ) even if  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{X}$  is not strongly covariantly (resp. contravariantly) finite.

**Lemma 2.26.** [26, Proposition 3.2] Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

- (1) If  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{C}$  is strongly contravariantly finite, then  $\mathcal{I} = \text{Proj}_{\mathbb{E}\mathcal{I}}\mathcal{C}$  and  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}}, \mathfrak{s}|_{\mathbb{E}\mathcal{I}})$  has enough projectives.
- (2) If  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{C}$  is strongly covariantly finite, then  $\mathcal{I} = \text{Inj}_{\mathbb{E}\mathcal{I}}\mathcal{C}$  and  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}, \mathfrak{s}|_{\mathbb{E}\mathcal{I}})$  has enough injectives.

*Proof.* We only prove (2). Let  $\mathcal{I}' = \text{Inj}_{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}} \mathcal{C}$ . By definition of relative structure,  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{I}'$ . On the other hand, for any  $I' \in \mathcal{I}'$ , there exists an  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle  $I' \rightarrow I \rightarrow Z \dashrightarrow I'$  where  $I \in \mathcal{I}$  since  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{C}$  is strongly covariantly finite. From  $I' \in \mathcal{I}'$ , the above  $\mathfrak{s}$ -triangle splits and  $I' \in \mathcal{I}$ .  $\square$

As an application of this lemma, we define “relative Frobenius” to produce examples later.

**Definition 2.27.** Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then  $\mathcal{C}$  is called *relative  $\mathcal{I}$ -Frobenius* if  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{C}$  is strongly functorially finite and  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}}$ .

For more information about “mutation pair”, see Appendix B and C.

**Example 2.28.** Assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a triangulated category. Let  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{Z}$  be subcategories of  $\mathcal{C}$  which satisfies (IY1), (IY2) and (IY3) in Appendix B.11, then  $\mathcal{Z}$  is relative  $\mathcal{D}$ -Frobenius.

**Remark 2.29.** If  $\mathcal{C}$  is relative  $\mathcal{I}$ -Frobenius,  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}, \mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}})$  is Frobenius ET category.

ET categories are different from triangulated categories in that not every morphism has a cone or cocone. However, we may sometimes replace any morphisms by inflations (resp. deflations) up to ideal quotient in the following meanings.

**Lemma 2.30.** [22, Proposition 1.20] Take  $f \in \mathcal{C}(X, X')$ . Let  $X \xrightarrow{x} E \xrightarrow{y} Y \dashrightarrow^{\delta} X$  be an  $\mathfrak{s}$ -triangle and  $X' \xrightarrow{x'} E' \xrightarrow{y'} Y \dashrightarrow^{f\delta} X'$  be a realization of  $f\delta$ . Then there exists a morphism  $g: E \rightarrow E'$  which satisfies the following two conditions:

(1)  $g$  makes the following diagram commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X & \xrightarrow{x} & E & \xrightarrow{y} & Y & \dashrightarrow^{\delta} & X \\ \downarrow f & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow g & \circlearrowleft & \parallel & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow f \\ X' & \xrightarrow{x'} & E' & \xrightarrow{y'} & Y & \dashrightarrow^{\delta'} & X' \end{array}$$

(2)  $X \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} f \\ x \end{bmatrix}} X' \oplus E \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} -x' & g \end{bmatrix}} E' \dashrightarrow^{\delta y'} X'$  is an  $\mathfrak{s}$ -triangle, in particular  $\begin{bmatrix} f \\ x \end{bmatrix}$  is an inflation.

*Proof.* See [22, Proposition 1.20].  $\square$

The following statement is also useful.

**Lemma 2.31.** [25, Proposition 3.17] Let  $X \xrightarrow{a} Y \xrightarrow{b'} Z \dashrightarrow^{\delta_1} X$ ,  $X \xrightarrow{c} Z' \xrightarrow{d} Z'' \dashrightarrow^{\delta_2} X$  and  $X' \xrightarrow{a'} Y \xrightarrow{b} Z' \dashrightarrow^{\delta_3} X'$  be  $\mathfrak{s}$ -triangles where  $c = ba$ . Then there exists an  $\mathfrak{s}$ -triangle  $X' \xrightarrow{f} Z \xrightarrow{g} Z'' \dashrightarrow^{\delta} X'$  which makes the following diagram commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & X' & \xlongequal{\quad} & X' & & \\ & & \downarrow a' & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow f & & \\ X & \xrightarrow{a} & Y & \xrightarrow{b'} & Z & \dashrightarrow^{\delta_1} & X \\ \parallel & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow b & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow g & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \\ X & \xrightarrow{c} & Z' & \xrightarrow{d} & Z'' & \dashrightarrow^{\delta_2} & X \\ & & \downarrow \delta_3 & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \delta & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow a \\ & & X' & \xlongequal{\quad} & X' & \xrightarrow{-a'} & Y \end{array}$$

*Proof.* This is a dual statement of [25, Proposition 3.17].  $\square$

**Corollary 2.32.** Let  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{C}$  be strongly covariantly finite and  $a: X \rightarrow Y$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Take  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangles  $X \xrightarrow{i^X} I^X \xrightarrow{p^X} X\langle 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\lambda^X} X$  and  $X \xrightarrow{j^X} J^X \xrightarrow{q^X} X\langle 1 \rangle' \xrightarrow{\lambda'^X} X$  where  $i^X$  and  $j^X$  are left  $\mathcal{I}$ -approximations.

There exist the following  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangles from Lemma 2.30.

$$\begin{aligned} X &\xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} a \\ i^X \end{bmatrix}} Y \oplus I^X \xrightarrow{\tilde{b}} C^a \xrightarrow{\tilde{\delta}} X \\ X &\xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} a \\ j^X \end{bmatrix}} Y \oplus J^X \xrightarrow{\tilde{b}' } C^{a'} \xrightarrow{\tilde{\delta}' } X \\ X &\xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} a \\ i^X \\ j^X \end{bmatrix}} Y \oplus I^X \oplus J^X \xrightarrow{\tilde{b}'' } C^{a''} \xrightarrow{\tilde{\delta}'' } X \end{aligned}$$

Then  $C^{a''} \cong C^a \oplus J^X \cong C^{a'} \oplus I^X$ . In particular,  $C^a$  is uniquely determined up to isomorphism in  $\mathcal{C}/[\mathcal{I}]$  and does not depend on choices of  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle  $X \xrightarrow{i^X} I^X \xrightarrow{p^X} X\langle 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\lambda^X} X$ .

*Proof.* From Lemma 2.31, there exists a commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & J^X & \xlongequal{\quad} & J^X & \\ & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ & & & \circ & & \circ & \\ X & \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} a \\ i^X \\ j^X \end{bmatrix}} & Y \oplus I^X \oplus J^X & \xrightarrow{\tilde{b}''} & C^{a''} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\delta}''} & X \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \parallel & & \circ & & \circ & & \circ \\ X & \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} a \\ i^X \end{bmatrix}} & Y \oplus I^X & \xrightarrow{\tilde{b}} & C^a & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\delta}} & \parallel \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & 0 & & \gamma & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & J^X & \xlongequal{\quad} & J^X & & \end{array}$$

Since  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}(C^a, J^X) = 0$ ,  $C^{a''} \cong C^a \oplus J^X$ . One can show  $C^{a''} \cong C^{a'} \oplus I^X$  in the same way.  $\square$

At the end of this subsection, we add the following lemma which is used in section 5.

**Lemma 2.33.** Let  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{X}$  be subcategories of  $\mathcal{C}$  and suppose that  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{X}$  is strongly covariantly finite. Assume that  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{X}) = 0$ , then  $\langle 1 \rangle: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}\langle 1 \rangle$  is an equivalence.

*Proof.* Since  $\langle 1 \rangle: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}\langle 1 \rangle$  is dense by definition and one can directly prove  $\langle 1 \rangle$  is full, we only show that  $\langle 1 \rangle$  is faithful. Let  $x: X \rightarrow X'$  be in  $\mathcal{X}$  and take  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangles  $X \rightarrow I^X \rightarrow X\langle 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\lambda^X} X$  and  $X' \rightarrow I^{X'} \rightarrow X'\langle 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\lambda^{X'}} X'$ . Then we obtain  $x\langle 1 \rangle: X\langle 1 \rangle \rightarrow X'\langle 1 \rangle$  where  $x\lambda^X = \lambda^{X'}x\langle 1 \rangle$ . If  $x\langle 1 \rangle = 0$  in  $\mathcal{C}/[\mathcal{I}]$ ,  $x\lambda^X = 0$  and  $x$  factors through  $I^X$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.34.**  $X \rightarrow I^X \rightarrow X\langle 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\lambda^X} X$  in Lemma 2.33 is not only an  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle but also an  $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle.

**2.4. Pretriangulated categories.** In this subsection, we introduce right triangulated categories and left triangulated categories in [5]. First, we define left triangles and right triangles like as distinguished triangles in triangulated categories.

**Definition 2.35.** [5, II.1] Let  $\Sigma, \Omega: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  be additive (endo)functors.

(1) We define a category  $\text{RTri}$  by:

- Objects are diagrams in  $\mathcal{C}$  of the form  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \xrightarrow{h} \Sigma X$ .
- Morphisms are triplets  $(x, y, z)$  which satisfy the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X_1 & \xrightarrow{f_1} & Y_1 & \xrightarrow{g_1} & Z_1 & \xrightarrow{h_1} & \Sigma X_1 \\ \downarrow x & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow y & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow z & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \Sigma x \\ X_2 & \xrightarrow{f_2} & Y_2 & \xrightarrow{g_2} & Z_2 & \xrightarrow{h_2} & \Sigma X_2 \end{array}$$

(2) We define a category  $\text{LTri}$  by:

- Objects are diagrams in  $\mathcal{C}$  of the form  $\Omega Z \xrightarrow{h'} X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z$ .
- Morphisms are triplets  $(x, y, z)$  which satisfy the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \Omega Z_1 & \xrightarrow{h'_1} & X_1 & \xrightarrow{f_1} & Y_1 & \xrightarrow{g_1} & Z_1 \\ \downarrow \Omega z & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow x & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow y & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow z \\ \Omega Z_2 & \xrightarrow{h'_2} & X_2 & \xrightarrow{f_2} & Y_2 & \xrightarrow{g_2} & Z_2 \end{array}$$

Now, let us define left triangulated categories and right triangulated categories.

**Definition 2.36.** [5, II.1]

- (1) A *right triangulated category* is a triplet  $(\mathcal{C}, \Sigma, \nabla)$  where:
- $\Sigma: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  be an additive functor.
  - $\nabla$  is a full subcategory of  $\text{RTri}$ .
  - $(\mathcal{C}, \Sigma, \nabla)$  satisfies all of the axioms of a triangulated category except that  $\Sigma$  is not necessarily an equivalence.
- (2) A *left triangulated category* is a triplet  $(\mathcal{C}, \Omega, \Delta)$  where:
- $\Omega: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  be an additive functor.
  - $\Delta$  is a full subcategory of  $\text{LTri}$ .
  - $(\mathcal{C}, \Omega, \Delta)$  satisfies all of the axioms of a triangulated category except that  $\Omega$  is not necessarily an equivalence.

**Remark 2.37.** For the convenience of the reader, we list the axioms of right triangulated categories  $(\mathcal{C}, \Sigma, \nabla)$  below.

- (RT0)  $\nabla$  is closed under isomorphisms.
- (RT1) (i) For any  $X \in \mathcal{C}$ , the sequence  $X \xrightarrow{\text{id}} X \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \Sigma X$  is in  $\nabla$ .  
(ii) For any  $f: X \rightarrow Y$ , there exists  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow \Sigma X$  in  $\nabla$ .
- (RT2) Let  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \xrightarrow{h} \Sigma X$  be in  $\nabla$ , then  $Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \xrightarrow{h} \Sigma X \xrightarrow{-\Sigma f} \Sigma Y$  is also in  $\nabla$ .
- (RT3) Assume that there exists a commutative diagram where each row is in  $\nabla$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X_1 & \xrightarrow{f_1} & Y_1 & \xrightarrow{g_1} & Z_1 & \xrightarrow{h_1} & \Sigma X_1 \\ \downarrow x & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow y & & & & \downarrow \Sigma x \\ X_2 & \xrightarrow{f_2} & Y_2 & \xrightarrow{g_2} & Z_2 & \xrightarrow{h_2} & \Sigma X_2 \end{array}$$

Then there exists  $z: Z_1 \rightarrow Z_2$  which makes the following diagram commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 X_1 & \xrightarrow{f_1} & Y_1 & \xrightarrow{g_1} & Z_1 & \xrightarrow{h_1} & \Sigma X_1 \\
 \downarrow x & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow y & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow z & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \Sigma x \\
 X_2 & \xrightarrow{f_2} & Y_2 & \xrightarrow{g_2} & Z_2 & \xrightarrow{h_2} & \Sigma X_2
 \end{array}$$

(RT4) Assume that  $a'' = a'a$  and  $X \xrightarrow{a} Y \xrightarrow{b} C \xrightarrow{c} \Sigma X$ ,  $Y \xrightarrow{a'} Z \xrightarrow{b'} D \xrightarrow{c'} \Sigma Y$ ,  $X \xrightarrow{a''} Z \xrightarrow{b''} E \xrightarrow{c''} \Sigma X$  are in  $\nabla$ . Then there exists  $C \xrightarrow{s} E \xrightarrow{t} D \xrightarrow{u} \Sigma C$  in  $\nabla$  which makes the following diagram commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 X & \xrightarrow{a} & Y & \xrightarrow{b} & C & \xrightarrow{c} & \Sigma X \\
 \parallel & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow a' & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow s & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \\
 X & \xrightarrow{a''} & Z & \xrightarrow{b''} & E & \xrightarrow{c''} & \Sigma X \\
 & & \downarrow b' & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow t & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \Sigma a \\
 & & D & \xlongequal{=} & D & \xrightarrow{c'} & \Sigma Y \\
 & & \downarrow c' & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow u & & \\
 & & \Sigma Y & \xrightarrow{\Sigma b} & \Sigma C & & 
 \end{array}$$

**Remark 2.38.** Assume that  $(\mathcal{C}, \Sigma, \nabla)$  satisfies from (RT0) to (RT3). Then one can show the following statements like triangulated categories.

(1) For any right triangle  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \xrightarrow{h} \Sigma X$ ,

$$\mathcal{C}(-, X) \xrightarrow{f^{\circ-}} \mathcal{C}(-, Y) \xrightarrow{g^{\circ-}} \mathcal{C}(-, Z)$$

is exact.

(2) Assume that there exists a commutative diagram where each row is in  $\nabla$  and  $x, y$  are isomorphism.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 X_1 & \xrightarrow{f_1} & Y_1 & \xrightarrow{g_1} & Z_1 & \xrightarrow{h_1} & \Sigma X_1 \\
 \wr \downarrow x & \circlearrowleft & \wr \downarrow y & & & & \wr \downarrow \Sigma x \\
 X_2 & \xrightarrow{f_2} & Y_2 & \xrightarrow{g_2} & Z_2 & \xrightarrow{h_2} & \Sigma X_2
 \end{array}$$

Then there exists an isomorphism  $z: Z_1 \rightarrow Z_2$  which makes the following diagram commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 X_1 & \xrightarrow{f_1} & Y_1 & \xrightarrow{g_1} & Z_1 & \xrightarrow{h_1} & \Sigma X_1 \\
 \wr \downarrow x & \circlearrowleft & \wr \downarrow y & \circlearrowleft & \wr \downarrow z & \circlearrowleft & \wr \downarrow \Sigma x \\
 X_2 & \xrightarrow{f_2} & Y_2 & \xrightarrow{g_2} & Z_2 & \xrightarrow{h_2} & \Sigma X_2
 \end{array}$$

Finally, we define pretriangulated categories.

**Definition 2.39.** [5, II.1]  $(\mathcal{C}, \Sigma, \Omega, \nabla, \Delta)$  is a *pretriangulated category* if it satisfies the following conditions:

(i)  $(\Sigma, \Omega)$  is an adjoint pair of additive endofunctors  $\Sigma, \Omega: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ .

Now, let  $\alpha$  be a unit and  $\beta$  be a counit.

- (ii)  $(\mathcal{C}, \Sigma, \nabla)$  is a right triangulated category.
- (iii)  $(\mathcal{C}, \Omega, \Delta)$  is a left triangulated category.
- (iv) For any commutative diagrams in  $\mathcal{C}$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
X_1 & \xrightarrow{f_1} & Y_1 & \xrightarrow{g_1} & Z_1 & \xrightarrow{h_1} & \Sigma X_1 \\
\downarrow s & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow t & & \downarrow \beta_{Z_2} \circ \Sigma s & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \Omega u' \circ \alpha_{X_1} \\
\Omega Z_2 & \xrightarrow{h'_2} & X_2 & \xrightarrow{f_2} & Y_2 & \xrightarrow{g_2} & Z_2
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
X_1 & \xrightarrow{f_1} & Y_1 & \xrightarrow{g_1} & Z_1 & \xrightarrow{h_1} & \Sigma X_1 \\
\downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow t' & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow u' \\
\Omega Z_2 & \xrightarrow{h'_2} & X_2 & \xrightarrow{f_2} & Y_2 & \xrightarrow{g_2} & Z_2
\end{array}$$

where  $X_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} Y_1 \xrightarrow{g_1} Z_1 \xrightarrow{h_1} \Sigma X_1$  is a right triangle and  $(\Omega Z_2 \xrightarrow{h'_2} X_2 \xrightarrow{f_2} Y_2 \xrightarrow{g_2} Z_2) \in \Delta$  is a left triangle, then there exist  $u$  and  $s'$  which make following diagrams commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
X_1 & \xrightarrow{f_1} & Y_1 & \xrightarrow{g_1} & Z_1 & \xrightarrow{h_1} & \Sigma X_1 \\
\downarrow s & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow t & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow u & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \beta_{Z_2} \circ \Sigma s \\
\Omega Z_2 & \xrightarrow{h'_2} & X_2 & \xrightarrow{f_2} & Y_2 & \xrightarrow{g_2} & Z_2
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
X_1 & \xrightarrow{f_1} & Y_1 & \xrightarrow{g_1} & Z_1 & \xrightarrow{h_1} & \Sigma X_1 \\
\downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow s' & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow t' & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow u' \\
\Omega Z_2 & \xrightarrow{h'_2} & X_2 & \xrightarrow{f_2} & Y_2 & \xrightarrow{g_2} & Z_2
\end{array}$$

**Example 2.40.** [5, II.1]

- (1) A triangulated category  $(\mathcal{C}, [1], \Delta)$  is a pretriangulated category  $(\mathcal{C}, [1], [-1], \Delta, \Delta)$ .
- (2) Assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  is an abelian category. Let  $\text{REx}$  be a collection of right exact sequences and  $\text{LEx}$  be a collection of left exact sequences. Then  $(\mathcal{A}, 0, 0, \text{REx}, \text{LEx})$  is a pretriangulated category.

### 3. MUTATION TRIPLES

In the rest of this paper, we assume all subcategories are closed under direct summands. We fix an ET category  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$ . In the following definition, we use notations which are compatible with [24].

#### 3.1. Premutation triples.

**Condition 3.1.** Let  $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{Z}$  be subcategories of  $\mathcal{C}$ . We denote  $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{Z}$  by  $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}$ , respectively. We consider the following two conditions:

- (RM1)  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{Z}$  is strongly contravariantly finite.
- (RM2)  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}) = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}\langle -1 \rangle) = 0$ .

Dually, we also consider the following two conditions:

- (LM1)  $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{Z}$  is strongly covariantly finite.
- (LM2)  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V}) = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{Z}\langle 1 \rangle, \mathcal{V}) = 0$ .

For convenience, we also use the following conditions:

- (MT1)  $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{J}$  and  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{Z}$  is strongly functorially finite.
- (MT2) (RM2) and (LM2).

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{Z}$  be subcategories of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

- (1) A pair  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z})$  is a *right premutation double* if it satisfies the conditions (RM1) and (RM2).
- (2) A pair  $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  is a *left premutation double* if it satisfies the conditions (LM1) and (LM2).
- (3) A triplet  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  is a *premutation triple* if it satisfies the conditions (MT1) and (MT2).

- Example 3.3.** (1) [25] Assume that  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$  is Frobenius with  $\mathcal{P} = \text{Proj}_{\mathbb{E}} \mathcal{C}$ . Then  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P})$  is a premutation triple.
- (2) [18] Assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a triangulated category. Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a functorially finite rigid subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$  be a rigid  $\mathcal{D}$ -mutation pair (see Appendix B.9). We define  $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y}$ . Then  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{D})$  is a premutation triple.
- (3) [8] Assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a Krull-Schmidt triangulated  $k$ -category ( $k$  is a field) with a Serre functor  $\mathbb{S}$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a collection of  $\text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$  which satisfies the condition (SP1) in Appendix C.4 and  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$  be a simple-minded  $\langle \mathcal{M} \rangle$ -mutation pair (see Appendix C.13). We define  $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y}$ . Then  $(\langle \mathcal{M}[1] \rangle, \mathcal{Z}, \langle \mathcal{M}[-1] \rangle)$  is a premutation triple.
- (4) [24] Let  $((\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}))$  be a concentric twin cotorsion pair (see Appendix A.5). We define  $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{U}$ . Then  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  is a premutation triple.

*Proof.* (1) (MT1) follows from definition of Frobenius ET categories. Since  $\mathcal{P}$  is both projective and injective,  $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{P}} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}$  and  $\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{P}, -) = 0, \mathbb{E}(-, \mathcal{P}) = 0$ . Thus, (MT2) holds.

(2) By definition of rigid  $\mathcal{D}$ -mutation pairs,  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{Z}$  is functorially finite. In particular, (MT1) holds.  $\mathcal{Z} \subset {}^{\perp} \mathcal{D}[1] \cap \mathcal{D}[-1]^{\perp}$  also follows from definition of rigid  $\mathcal{D}$ -mutation pairs. Note that  $\mathcal{Z}\langle 1 \rangle \subset \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}\langle -1 \rangle \subset \mathcal{X}$ . Thus,  $\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{Z}) = 0, \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{Z}\langle -1 \rangle) = 0, \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{D}) = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{Z}\langle 1 \rangle, \mathcal{D}) = 0$ . In particular, (MT2) holds.

(3) Note that  $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{J} = 0$  since  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$  is a simple-minded mutation pair, in particular,  $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}}, \langle 1 \rangle = [1]$ , (MT1) hold. (MT2) follows from  $\mathcal{Z} \subset {}^{\perp} \mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{M}^{\perp} \cap {}^{\perp} \mathcal{M}[-1] \cap \mathcal{M}[1]^{\perp}$ .

(4)  $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{J}$  since  $((\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}))$  is concentric. By definition of twin cotorsion pair,  $\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}) = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V}) = 0$ . From  $\mathcal{Z}\langle 1 \rangle \subset \mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{Z}\langle -1 \rangle \subset \mathcal{T}$ ,  $\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}\langle -1 \rangle) = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{Z}\langle 1 \rangle, \mathcal{V}) = 0$ . Thus, we obtain (MT2). (MT1) is direct from definition of twin cotorsion pairs (for detail, see [22]).  $\square$

From Example 3.3, we may consider premutation triples as a generalization of concentric twin cotorsion pairs. We define new subcategories of  $\mathcal{C}, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$  below. We use these notations because  $\mathcal{U} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  and  $\mathcal{T} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{T}}$  hold for any concentric twin cotorsion pair  $((\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}))$ .

- Notation 3.4.** (1) Let  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z})$  be a right premutation double. We define  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  as  $\text{CoCone}_{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}}}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{S})$ .
- (2) Let  $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  be a left premutation double. We define  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$  as  $\text{Cone}_{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{Z})$ .

- Notation 3.5.** (1) Let  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z})$  be a right premutation double. we denote  $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{I}], \tilde{\mathcal{U}}/[\mathcal{I}]$  and  $\mathcal{C}/[\mathcal{I}]$  by  $\underline{\mathcal{Z}}, \underline{\tilde{\mathcal{U}}}$  and  $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ , respectively.
- (2) Let  $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  be a left premutation double. we denote  $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{J}], \tilde{\mathcal{T}}/[\mathcal{J}]$  and  $\mathcal{C}/[\mathcal{I}]$  by  $\underline{\mathcal{Z}}, \underline{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}}$  and  $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ , respectively.
- (3) For  $x$  in  $\mathcal{Z}$ , we denote  $\underline{x\langle 1 \rangle}$  by  $\underline{x}\langle 1 \rangle$ .

**Lemma 3.6.** [24, Fact 2.1, Definition 3.10]

- (1) Let  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z})$  be a right premutation double. For  $U \in \tilde{\mathcal{U}}$ , take an  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle  $U \xrightarrow{h^U} \mathcal{Z}^U \xrightarrow{g^U} \mathcal{S} \dashrightarrow U$ . Then  $-\circ \underline{h^U}: \underline{\mathcal{Z}}(\mathcal{Z}^U, \mathcal{Z}) \rightarrow \underline{\tilde{\mathcal{U}}}(U, \mathcal{Z})$  is a natural isomorphism. In particular, there exists an additive functor  $\sigma: \underline{\tilde{\mathcal{U}}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{Z}}; U \mapsto \mathcal{Z}^U$  which is a left adjoint of the inclusion functor  $\iota_{\sigma}: \underline{\mathcal{Z}} \rightarrow \underline{\tilde{\mathcal{U}}}$ .
- (2) Let  $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  be a left premutation double. For  $T \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ , take an  $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle  $T \dashrightarrow V \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_T \xrightarrow{h_T} T$ . Then  $\underline{h_T} \circ -: \underline{\mathcal{Z}}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z}_T) \rightarrow \underline{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}}(\mathcal{Z}, T)$  is a natural isomorphism. In particular, there exists an additive functor  $\omega: \underline{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{Z}}; T \mapsto \mathcal{Z}_T$  which is a right adjoint of the inclusion functor  $\iota_{\omega}: \underline{\mathcal{Z}} \rightarrow \underline{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}}$ .

*Proof.* We only prove (1). We denote  $h^U, g^U$  by  $h, g$  respectively. Since  $-\circ \underline{h}: \underline{\mathcal{Z}}(Z^U, \mathcal{Z}) \rightarrow \widetilde{\underline{\mathcal{U}}}(U, \mathcal{Z})$  is clearly well-defined and functorial, we only have to show that this is bijective for any  $Z' \in \mathcal{Z}$ . Take  $z: Z^U \rightarrow Z'$  with  $\underline{zh} = 0$ . There exists an  $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle  $Z'\langle -1 \rangle \rightarrow I \xrightarrow{p_{Z'}} Z' \xrightarrow{\lambda_{Z'}} Z'\langle -1 \rangle$  because  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{Z}$  is strongly contravariantly finite. We denote  $p_{Z'}, \lambda_{Z'}$  by  $p, \lambda$ , respectively. From  $\lambda$  is an  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}}$ -extension and  $zh \in \mathcal{I}$ , there exists  $a: U \rightarrow I$  with  $zh = pa$ . Since  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}) = 0$ , there exists  $a': Z^U \rightarrow I$  such that  $a = a'h$ . Then  $0 = zh - pa = (z - pa')h$ . Thus, there exists  $z': S \rightarrow Z'$  where  $z - pa' = z'g$ . From  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}\langle -1 \rangle) = 0$ ,  $\lambda z' = 0$  and there exists  $z'': S \rightarrow I$  where  $z' = pz''$ . Therefore  $\underline{z} = \underline{pa' + z'g} = \underline{p(a' + z''g)} = 0$ , that is,  $-\circ \underline{h}$  is injective. On the other hand,  $-\circ \underline{h}$  is surjective because  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}) = 0$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.7.** (1) From Lemma 3.6(1), for  $z: Z^U \rightarrow Z$  in  $\mathcal{Z}$ ,

$$\underline{z} = 0 \text{ in } \underline{\mathcal{Z}} \iff \underline{zh^U} = 0 \text{ in } \widetilde{\underline{\mathcal{U}}}.$$

- (2) From the above proof, for any morphism  $u: U \rightarrow Z'$  where  $U \in \widetilde{\underline{\mathcal{U}}}$  and  $Z' \in \mathcal{Z}$ , there exists a morphism  $z: Z^U \rightarrow Z'$  which satisfies  $u = zh^U$  in  $\widetilde{\underline{\mathcal{U}}}$  and such  $z$  is unique up to  $[\mathcal{I}]$ .
- (3) We can construct  $\sigma: \widetilde{\underline{\mathcal{U}}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{Z}}$  directly like (1).

- For  $U \in \widetilde{\underline{\mathcal{U}}}$ , there exists an  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle

$$U \xrightarrow{h^U} \sigma U \xrightarrow{g^U} S \xrightarrow{\rho^U} U$$

where  $\sigma U \in \mathcal{Z}$  and  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ .

- For  $u: U_1 \rightarrow U_2$  in  $\widetilde{\underline{\mathcal{U}}}$ , there exist  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangles  $U_1 \xrightarrow{h^{U_1}} \sigma U_1 \xrightarrow{g^{U_1}} S_1 \xrightarrow{\rho^{U_1}} U_1$  and  $U_2 \xrightarrow{h^{U_2}} \sigma U_2 \xrightarrow{g^{U_2}} S_2 \xrightarrow{\rho^{U_2}} U_2$  where  $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ . We denote  $\sigma U_1, \sigma U_2$  by  $Z_1, Z_2$ , respectively. Then there exists a unique morphism  $z: Z_1 \rightarrow Z_2$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  up to  $[\mathcal{I}]$  which makes the following commutative diagram commutative from (2).

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U_1 & \xrightarrow{h^{U_1}} & Z_1 \\ \downarrow u & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow z \\ U_2 & \xrightarrow{h^{U_2}} & Z_2 \end{array}$$

We define  $\sigma(u)$  as  $z$ .

Then,  $\sigma$  induces  $\sigma: \widetilde{\underline{\mathcal{U}}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{Z}}$ . From uniqueness of left adjoint functor up to natural isomorphisms, so is  $\sigma$ . In particular,  $\sigma$  does not depend on the choices of  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangles in Lemma 3.6 up to natural isomorphisms.

**Notation 3.8.** (1) For  $z$  in  $\mathcal{Z}$ , we denote  $\underline{\sigma(z)}$  by  $\sigma(\underline{z})$ .

(2) We denote the unit of the adjoint pair  $(\sigma, \iota_{\sigma})$  by  $\eta$ .

(3) We denote the counit of the adjoint pair  $(\iota_{\omega}, \omega)$  by  $\varepsilon$ .

### 3.2. Mutation triples.

**Condition 3.9.** We consider the following conditions:

- (RM3) (i)  $\text{Cone}_{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z}) \subset \widetilde{\underline{\mathcal{U}}}$ .  
(ii)  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{Z}$  are closed under extensions in  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}$ .  
(LM3) (i)  $\text{CoCone}_{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}}}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z}) \subset \widetilde{\underline{\mathcal{T}}}$ .  
(ii)  $\mathcal{Z}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  are closed under extensions in  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}}$ .  
(MT3) (RM3) and (LM3).

**Definition 3.10.** Let  $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V}$  be subcategories of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

- (1)  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z})$  is a *right mutation double* if  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{I})$  satisfies (MT1), (RM2) and (RM3).



- (2)  $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  is a *left mutation double* if  $(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  satisfies (MT1), (LM2) and (LM3).  
 (3)  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  is a *mutation triple* if it satisfies from (MT1) to (MT3).

Note that both right and left mutation doubles are required to satisfy (MT1).

- Example 3.11.** (1) Assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  has enough projectives and  $\text{Proj}\mathcal{C}$  is strongly functorially finite. Then,  $(\text{Proj}\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C})$  is a right mutation double. Dually, assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  has enough injectives and  $\text{Inj}\mathcal{C}$  is strongly functorially finite. Then  $(\mathcal{C}, \text{Inj}\mathcal{C})$  is a left mutation double. One can generalize the above examples to any strongly contravariantly (resp. covariantly) finite subcategory.  
 (2) [25] Assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is Frobenius with  $\mathcal{P} = \text{Proj}\mathcal{C}$ . Then  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P})$  is a mutation triple. More generally, for any strongly functorially finite subcategory  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{X})$  in  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{X}} \cap \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$  is a mutation triple.  
 (3) [18] In the case of Example 3.3(2), we additionally assume that  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y}$  and (IY3) in Appendix B.11. Then  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{D})$  is a mutation triple.  
 (4) [8] In the case of Example 3.3(3), we additionally assume that  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y}$  and (SP3) in Appendix C.15. Then  $(\langle \mathcal{M}[1] \rangle, \mathcal{Z}, \langle \mathcal{M}[-1] \rangle)$  is a mutation triple.  
 (5) [24] In the case of Example 3.3(4),  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  is a mutation triple.

*Proof.* (1) We only prove when  $\mathcal{C}$  has enough projectives. Then by definition of having enough projectives, (RM1) holds. (RM2) follows from  $\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{P}, -) = 0$ . (RM3) is also true because  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}} = \mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  is closed under extensions in  $\mathbb{E}$ . (2) is direct from (1). (3) follows from Lemma 2.20 and [18, Lemma 4.3]. (4) is by definition of (SP3). (5) follows from Lemma A.13 and the definition of twin cotorsion pairs.  $\square$

Because of the condition (RM3)(i) and (LM3)(i), we can finally define mutations.

- Definition 3.12.** (1) Let  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z})$  be a right mutation double. We define an additive functor  $\Sigma = \sigma \circ \langle 1 \rangle: \underline{\mathcal{Z}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{Z}}$ , called *right mutation*.  
 (2) Let  $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  be a left mutation double. We define an additive functor  $\Omega = \omega \circ \langle -1 \rangle: \underline{\mathcal{Z}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{Z}}$ , called *left mutation*.

**Remark 3.13.** In general, mutations defined by left (resp. right) approximations are called left (resp. right) mutations. However, if we use this convention, we should call  $\Sigma$  left mutation in the case of rigid mutation pairs (Definition B.4, B.7) and right mutation in the case of simple-minded mutation pairs (Definition C.11).

To avoid this confusion, we define left and right mutations so that left (resp. right) mutations induce left (resp. right) triangulated structures.

In the last part of this section, we collect some lemmas we use later.

**Lemma 3.14.** [24, Proposition 4.3] Let  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  be a mutation triple. Then  $(\Sigma, \Omega)$  is an adjoint pair.

*Proof.* From Lemma 3.6, we only have to show that there exists a bifunctorial isomorphism  $\Phi: \underline{\mathcal{U}}(Z\langle 1 \rangle, Z') \xrightarrow{\sim} \underline{\mathcal{I}}(Z, Z'\langle -1 \rangle)$  for any  $Z, Z' \in \mathcal{Z}$ . For  $z: Z\langle 1 \rangle \rightarrow Z'$ , we take an  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle  $Z \xrightarrow{i^Z} I^Z \xrightarrow{p^Z} Z\langle 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\lambda^Z} Z$  and an  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle  $Z'\langle -1 \rangle \xrightarrow{i_{Z'}} I_{Z'} \xrightarrow{-p_{Z'}} Z' \xrightarrow{\lambda_{Z'}} Z'\langle -1 \rangle$ . Then there exists  $z': Z \rightarrow Z'\langle -1 \rangle$  which makes the following diagram commutative since  $p_{Z'}$  is a right  $\mathcal{I}$ -approximation.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 Z & \xrightarrow{i^Z} & I^Z & \xrightarrow{p^Z} & Z\langle 1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{\lambda^Z} & Z \\
 \downarrow z' & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow z & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow z' \\
 Z'\langle -1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{i_{Z'}} & I_{Z'} & \xrightarrow{-p_{Z'}} & Z' & \xrightarrow{-\lambda_{Z'}} & Z'\langle -1 \rangle
 \end{array}$$

Then, we define  $\Phi(z) = z'$ . This correspondence is well-defined and injective from the commutativity of the right most square. In particular,  $z'$  is unique up to

$[\mathcal{I}]$  where  $z'\lambda^Z = -\lambda_{Z'}z$ . This correspondence is also surjective since  $i^Z$  is a left  $\mathcal{I}$ -approximation. Finally, this is bifunctorial because  $z'$  is uniquely determined by the commutativity of right square.  $\square$

**Notation 3.15.** We denote the unit (resp. counit) of  $(\Sigma, \Omega)$  by  $\alpha$  (resp.  $\beta$ ).

**Remark 3.16.** From Lemma 3.6, 3.14, we have the following isomorphisms for  $Z, Z' \in \mathcal{Z}$ .

$$\underline{\mathcal{Z}}(\Sigma Z, Z') \xrightarrow{-\circ h^{Z\langle 1 \rangle}} \tilde{\mathcal{U}}(Z\langle 1 \rangle, Z') \xrightarrow{\Phi} \tilde{\mathcal{I}}(Z, Z'\langle -1 \rangle) \xleftarrow{h_{Z'\langle -1 \rangle}^{\circ-}} \underline{\mathcal{Z}}(Z, \Omega Z') \quad (3.1)$$

Then, for  $f: Z \rightarrow \Omega Z'$  in  $\mathcal{Z}$ , the corresponding morphism  $f': \Sigma Z \rightarrow Z'$  in (3.1) is uniquely determined by the following commutative diagram up to  $[\mathcal{I}]$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & Z & \xleftarrow{\lambda^Z} & Z\langle 1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{h^{Z\langle 1 \rangle}} & \Sigma Z \\ & \swarrow f & \downarrow & \circ & \downarrow & \circ & \swarrow f' \\ \Omega Z' & \xrightarrow{h_{Z'\langle -1 \rangle}} & Z'\langle -1 \rangle & \xleftarrow{-\lambda_{Z'}} & Z' & & \end{array} \quad (3.2)$$

Note that  $\underline{f'} = \beta_{Z'} \circ \Sigma(\underline{f})$  and  $f = \Omega(\underline{f'}) \circ \alpha_Z$ .

**Remark 3.17.** We assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a triangulated category and let  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  be a mutation triple induced by a concentric twin cotorsion pair. The negative sign in the proof of Lemma 3.14 comes from the following correspondence.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{E}(X\langle 1 \rangle, X) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathcal{C}(X\langle 1 \rangle, X[1]) \\ \lambda^X & \mapsto & l^X \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathbb{E}(Y, Y\langle -1 \rangle) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathcal{C}(Y[-1], Y\langle -1 \rangle) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathcal{C}(Y, Y\langle -1 \rangle[1]) \\ \lambda_Y & \mapsto & -l_Y[-1] & \mapsto & -l_Y \end{array}$$

then  $\Phi$  in Lemma 3.14 is defined by the following commutative diagram in  $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Z\langle 1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{l^Z} & Z[1] \\ \downarrow z & \circ & \downarrow \Phi(z) \\ Z' & \xrightarrow{l_{Z'}} & Z'\langle -1 \rangle[1] \end{array}$$

This correspondence is used in [24, Definition 4.1].

**Lemma 3.18.** [24, Lemma 3.11] Let  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z})$  be a right mutation double. Take an  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle  $U \xrightarrow{u} U' \rightarrow S \dashrightarrow U$  where  $U, U' \in \tilde{\mathcal{U}}$ . Then  $\sigma(\underline{u}): \sigma U \rightarrow \sigma U'$  is an isomorphism.

*Proof.* By definition of mutation triples, there exists an  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle  $S' \dashrightarrow U' \rightarrow Z' \rightarrow S'$  where  $Z' \in \mathcal{Z}$  and  $S' \in \mathcal{S}$ . Since  $\mathcal{S}$  is closed under extensions in  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}$ , there exists the following commutative diagram in  $\mathcal{C}$

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} U & \xrightarrow{u} & U' & \longrightarrow & S & \dashrightarrow & U \\ \parallel & & \downarrow & \circ & \downarrow & \circ & \parallel \\ U & \longrightarrow & Z' & \longrightarrow & S'' & \dashrightarrow & U \\ & & \downarrow & \circ & \downarrow & & \\ & & S' & \xlongequal{\quad} & S' & & \end{array}$$

where  $S'' \in \mathcal{S}$ . Thus, we obtain an  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle  $U \rightarrow Z' \rightarrow S'' \dashrightarrow U$ . From uniqueness of  $\sigma$ ,  $\sigma(\underline{u})$  is an isomorphism.  $\square$

#### 4. PRETRIANGULATED STRUCTURES INDUCED BY MUTATION TRIPLES

In this section, we consider pretriangulated structures induced by mutation triples. We assume  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z})$  is a right mutation double.

First, we fix the following  $\mathfrak{s}$ -triangles to define  $\langle 1 \rangle$  and  $\sigma$ .

- For  $X \in \mathcal{Z}$ , there exists the following  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle (and also an  $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle) where  $I^X \in \mathcal{I}$  and we fix it.

$$X \xrightarrow{i^X} I^X \xrightarrow{p^X} X\langle 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\lambda^X} X$$

Then we define  $i^X, p^X, \lambda^X$  by the above fixed  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle.

- For  $U \in \tilde{\mathcal{U}}$ , there exists the following  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle where  $\sigma U \in \mathcal{Z}, S^U \in \mathcal{S}$  and we fix it.

$$U \xrightarrow{h^U} \sigma U \xrightarrow{g^U} S^U \xrightarrow{\rho^U} U$$

Then we define  $h^U, g^U, \rho^U$  by the above fixed  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle. For  $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , we always take  $\sigma Z$  and  $h^Z$  so that  $\sigma Z = Z$  and  $h^Z = \text{id}_Z$ .

We remind readers that  $\langle 1 \rangle: \underline{\mathcal{Z}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  and  $\sigma: \tilde{\mathcal{U}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{Z}}$  do not depend on the choices of the above  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangles up to natural isomorphisms.

**Remark 4.1.** Let  $U \in \tilde{\mathcal{U}}$ . From Remark 3.7(3),  $\sigma(h^U)$  is one of the morphisms which makes the following diagram in  $\mathcal{C}$  commutative. Note that  $h^{\sigma U} = \text{id}_{\sigma U}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U & \xrightarrow{h^U} & \sigma U \\ \downarrow h^U & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \sigma(h^U) \\ \sigma U & \xrightarrow{h^{\sigma U}} & \sigma U \end{array}$$

From uniqueness of  $\sigma(h^U)$  up to  $[\mathcal{I}]$ ,  $\sigma(h^U) = \underline{\sigma(h^U)} = \underline{\text{id}_{\sigma U}}$ .

#### 4.1. Right triangles induced by a mutation triple.

**Notation 4.2.** (1) From Lemma 2.30, for  $a: X \rightarrow Y$  in  $\mathcal{Z}$ , there exists the following  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle and we fix it.

$$X \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} a \\ i^X \end{bmatrix}} Y \oplus I^X \xrightarrow{\tilde{b}} C^a \xrightarrow{\tilde{\delta}} X$$

Then we define  $\tilde{b}, C^a$  and  $\tilde{\delta}$  by the above  $\mathfrak{s}$ -triangle. We also define  $\tilde{a} = \begin{bmatrix} a \\ i^X \end{bmatrix}$

and  $b$  as the composition of  $Y \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}} Y \oplus I^X \xrightarrow{\tilde{b}} C^a$ .

- (2) From Lemma 2.31, there exists the following commutative diagram and we fix it.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & Y & \xlongequal{\quad} & Y & & \\
 & & \downarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow b & & \\
 X & \xrightarrow{\tilde{a}} & Y \oplus I^X & \xrightarrow{\tilde{b}} & C^a & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\delta}} & X \\
 \parallel & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow c^a & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \\
 X & \xrightarrow{i^X} & I^X & \xrightarrow{p^X} & X \langle 1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{\lambda^X} & X \\
 & & \downarrow 0 & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \gamma^a & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \tilde{a} \\
 & & Y & \xlongequal{\quad} & Y & \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}} & Y \oplus I^X
 \end{array} \tag{4.1}$$

Then we define  $c^a, \gamma^a$  by the above diagram. We often drop “ $a$ ” if there is no confusion.

There exists the following sequence in  $\underline{\mathcal{Z}}$ .

$$X \xrightarrow{\tilde{a}} Y \oplus I^X \xrightarrow{h^{C^a} \circ \tilde{b}} \sigma C^a \xrightarrow{\sigma(c)} \Sigma X \tag{4.2}$$

We show that the sequence (4.2) in Notation 4.2 does not depend on choices of  $c$  and  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle  $X \rightarrow I^X \rightarrow X \langle 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\lambda^X} X$ .

**Lemma 4.3.** (1)  $c$  in Notation 4.2(2) is uniquely determined in  $\underline{\mathcal{Z}}$ .

- (2) (4.2) in Notation 4.2 does not depend on the choices of  $\langle 1 \rangle$ , up to isomorphisms of sequences in  $\underline{\mathcal{Z}}$ .

*Proof.* (1) If  $c, c': C^a \rightarrow X \langle 1 \rangle$  satisfies  $\tilde{\delta} = \lambda c = \lambda c'$ , then  $c - c'$  factors through  $I^X$ .

(2) Take another  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle  $X \xrightarrow{j^X} J^X \xrightarrow{q^X} X \langle 1 \rangle' \xrightarrow{\lambda'^X} X$  where  $j^X$  is a left  $\mathcal{I}$ -approximation. Let  $\mu: \langle 1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle 1 \rangle'$  be a natural isomorphism defined in Remark 2.24 and  $\Sigma' = \sigma \circ \langle 1 \rangle'$ . Then  $\lambda^X = \lambda'^X m^X$  holds. From Corollary 2.32, there exists the following commutative diagrams.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 X & \xrightarrow{\tilde{a}} & Y \oplus I^X & \xrightarrow{\tilde{b}} & C^a & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\delta}} & X \\
 \parallel & \circlearrowleft & \uparrow f_1 & \circlearrowleft & \uparrow g_1 & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \\
 X & \xrightarrow{\tilde{a}''} & Y \oplus I^X \oplus J^X & \xrightarrow{\tilde{b}''} & C^{a''} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\delta}''} & X \\
 \parallel & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow f_2 & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow g_2 & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \\
 X & \xrightarrow{\tilde{a}'} & Y \oplus J^X & \xrightarrow{\tilde{b}'} & C^{a'} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\delta}'} & X \\
 & & & & \uparrow h^{C^a} & & \uparrow h^{C^a} \\
 & & & & C^a & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \sigma C^a \\
 & & & & \uparrow g_1 & \circlearrowleft & \uparrow \sigma(g_1) \\
 & & & & C^{a''} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \sigma C^{a''} \\
 & & & & \downarrow g_2 & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \sigma(g_2) \\
 & & & & C^{a'} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \sigma C^{a'}
 \end{array}$$

Let  $c: C^a \rightarrow X \langle 1 \rangle$  and  $c': C^{a'} \rightarrow X \langle 1 \rangle'$  in Notation 4.2(2), then there exist the following commutative diagrams in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 C^a & \xrightarrow{h^{C^a}} & \sigma C^a \\
 \downarrow c & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \sigma(c) \\
 X \langle 1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{h^{X \langle 1 \rangle}} & \Sigma X
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 C^{a'} & \xrightarrow{h^{C^{a'}}} & \sigma C^{a'} \\
 \downarrow c' & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \sigma(c') \\
 X \langle 1 \rangle' & \xrightarrow{h^{X \langle 1 \rangle'}} & \Sigma' X
 \end{array}$$

So,  $\lambda'^X m^X c g_1 = \tilde{\delta} g_1 = \tilde{\delta}' g_2 = \lambda'^X c' g_2$ . Thus,  $\underline{m^X c} = \underline{c' g_2 g_1^{-1}}$ . Therefore, the following commutative diagram exists in  $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 X & \xrightarrow{\tilde{a}} & Y \oplus I^X & \xrightarrow{h^{C^a} \tilde{b}} & C^a & \xrightarrow{\sigma(\underline{c})} & \Sigma X \\
 \parallel & & \circlearrowleft & \wr & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \\
 X & \xrightarrow{\tilde{a}'} & Y \oplus J^X & \xrightarrow{h^{C^{a'}} \tilde{b}'} & C^{a'} & \xrightarrow{\sigma(\underline{c}')} & \Sigma' X \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & f_2 f_1^{-1} & & \sigma(g_2 g_1^{-1}) & & \sigma(m^X)
 \end{array}$$

□

**Lemma 4.4.** Let  $a: X \rightarrow Y$  be in  $\mathcal{Z}$  and  $X \xrightarrow{a'} Y \xrightarrow{b'} U' \xrightarrow{\delta'} X$  be  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle where  $\underline{a} = \underline{a}'$ . Then there exists a morphism  $s: \sigma C^a \rightarrow \sigma U'$  which makes the following diagram in  $\underline{\mathcal{Z}}$  commutative where  $\underline{s}$  is an isomorphism.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 X & \xrightarrow{a} & Y & \xrightarrow{h^{C^a} b} & \sigma C^a & \xrightarrow{\sigma(\underline{c})} & \Sigma X \\
 \parallel & & \parallel & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \\
 X & \xrightarrow{a'} & Y & \xrightarrow{h^{C^{a'}} b'} & \sigma U' & \xrightarrow{\sigma(\underline{c}')} & \Sigma X \\
 & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & & & \underline{s} & & 
 \end{array}$$

In particular, the isomorphism class of the sequence (4.2) in  $\mathcal{Z}$  does not depend on the choice of  $a$  up to  $[\mathcal{I}]$ .

Before we show the above statement, we prove the following claim.

**Claim 4.5.** Assume that there exists a commutative diagram in  $\mathcal{C}$  with two  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangles  $X_1 \xrightarrow{a_1} Y_1 \xrightarrow{b_1} U_1 \xrightarrow{\delta_1} X_1$  and  $X_2 \xrightarrow{a_2} Y_2 \xrightarrow{b_2} U_2 \xrightarrow{\delta_2} X_2$  where  $X_i, Y_j \in \mathcal{Z}$  for  $1 \leq i, j \leq 2$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 X_1 & \xrightarrow{a_1} & Y_1 & \xrightarrow{b_1} & U_1 & \xrightarrow{\delta_1} & X_1 \\
 \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \\
 x & & y & & u & & x \\
 X_2 & \xrightarrow{a_2} & Y_2 & \xrightarrow{b_2} & U_2 & \xrightarrow{\delta_2} & X_2
 \end{array}$$

This induces the following commutative diagram in  $\underline{\mathcal{Z}}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 X_1 & \xrightarrow{a_1} & Y_1 & \xrightarrow{h^{U_1} b_1} & \sigma U_1 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(c_1)} & \Sigma X_1 \\
 \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \\
 x & & y & & \sigma(u) & & \Sigma x \\
 X_2 & \xrightarrow{a_2} & Y_2 & \xrightarrow{h^{U_2} b_2} & \sigma U_2 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(c_2)} & \Sigma X_2
 \end{array}$$

*Proof.* First, we recall the following commutative diagrams in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
X_1 & \xrightarrow{i^{X_1}} & I^{X_1} & \xrightarrow{p^{X_1}} & X_1 \langle 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\lambda^{X_1}} X_1 \\
\parallel & \circlearrowleft & \uparrow & \circlearrowleft & \uparrow c_1 \circlearrowleft \\
X_1 & \xrightarrow{a_1} & Y_1 & \xrightarrow{b_1} & U_1 \xrightarrow{\delta_1} X_1 \\
\downarrow x \circlearrowleft & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow y \circlearrowleft & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow u \circlearrowleft \\
X_2 & \xrightarrow{a_2} & Y_2 & \xrightarrow{b_2} & U_2 \xrightarrow{\delta_2} X_2 \\
\parallel & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow c_2 \circlearrowleft \\
X_2 & \xrightarrow{i^{X_2}} & I^{X_2} & \xrightarrow{p^{X_2}} & X_2 \langle 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\lambda^{X_2}} X_2
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{ccccc}
X_1 & \xrightarrow{i^{X_1}} & I^{X_1} & \xrightarrow{p^{X_1}} & X_1 \langle 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\lambda^{X_1}} X_1 \\
\downarrow x \circlearrowleft & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow x \langle 1 \rangle \circlearrowleft \\
X_2 & \xrightarrow{i^{X_2}} & I^{X_2} & \xrightarrow{p^{X_2}} & X_2 \langle 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\lambda^{X_2}} X_2
\end{array}$$

Then  $\lambda^{X_2} x \langle 1 \rangle c_1 = x \lambda^{X_1} c_1 = x \delta_1 = \lambda^{X_2} c_2 u$ . Thus,  $x \langle 1 \rangle c_1 - c_2 u$  factors through  $I^{X_2}$  and  $\underline{x} \langle 1 \rangle c_1 = \underline{c}_2 u$ . Applying  $\sigma$  to this diagram, we obtain the right square of the following commutative diagram in  $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
U_1 & \xrightarrow{h^{U_1}} & \sigma U_1 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(c_1)} & \Sigma X_1 \\
\downarrow \underline{u} \circlearrowleft & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \sigma(\underline{u}) \circlearrowleft & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \Sigma \underline{x} \\
U_2 & \xrightarrow{h^{U_2}} & \sigma U_2 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(c_2)} & \Sigma X_2
\end{array}$$

Therefore, the claim holds.  $\square$

**Proof of Lemma 4.4.** Since  $i^X: X \rightarrow I^X$  is a left  $\mathcal{I}$ -approximation,  $a - a'$  factors through  $i^X$ . Let  $k^X: I^X \rightarrow Y$  where  $a - a' = k^X i^X$ . There exists an  $\mathfrak{s}$ -triangle  $I^X \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} k^X \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}} Y \oplus I^X \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -k^X \end{bmatrix}} Y \xrightarrow{0} I^X$ . Then we obtain the following commutative diagram from Lemma 2.31.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & I^X & \xlongequal{\quad} & I^X \\
& & \downarrow \begin{bmatrix} k^X \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow \\
X & \xrightarrow{\tilde{a}} & Y \oplus I^X & \xrightarrow{\tilde{b}} & C^a \xrightarrow{\tilde{\delta}} X \\
\parallel & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -k^X \end{bmatrix} \circlearrowleft & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow u \circlearrowleft \\
X & \xrightarrow{a'} & Y & \xrightarrow{b'} & U' \xrightarrow{\delta'} X \\
& & \downarrow 0 \circlearrowleft & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow 0 \circlearrowleft \\
& & I^X & \xlongequal{\quad} & I^X
\end{array}$$

From the above claim, we only have to prove  $\sigma(\underline{u})$  is isomorphic. However, this is clear because  $\underline{u}$  is isomorphic from the above diagram.  $\square$

Therefore, the sequence (4.2) does not depend on the choice of  $a$  up to  $[\mathcal{I}]$ . Thus, the following definition makes sense.

**Definition 4.6.** Let  $\underline{a}: X \rightarrow Y$  in  $\underline{\mathcal{Z}}$ . Then there exists the unique sequence in  $\underline{\mathcal{Z}}$  up to isomorphisms.

$$X \xrightarrow{\underline{a}} Y \xrightarrow{h^{C^a} \circ \underline{a}} \sigma C^a \xrightarrow{\sigma(\underline{a})} \Sigma X$$

We define

$$\nabla = \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{sequences in } \underline{\mathcal{Z}} \text{ isomorphic to one in} \\ \{X \xrightarrow{a} Y \xrightarrow{h^{C^a} \circ b} \sigma C^a \xrightarrow{\sigma(\underline{c})} \Sigma X \mid a \text{ is a morphism in } \mathcal{Z}\} \end{array} \right)$$

and the sequence in  $\nabla$  is called a *right triangle* in  $\underline{\mathcal{Z}}$ .

**Example 4.7.** The diagram (4.1) induced by  $a = \text{id}_Z$  for  $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$  is the following one.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & Z & \xlongequal{\quad} & Z & & \\ & & \downarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow -i^Z & & \\ Z & \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ i^Z \end{bmatrix}} & Z \oplus I^Z & \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} -i^Z & 1 \end{bmatrix}} & I^Z & \xrightarrow{0} & Z \\ \parallel & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow p^Z \circlearrowleft & & \parallel \\ Z & \xrightarrow{i^Z} & I^Z & \xrightarrow{p^Z} & Z\langle 1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{-\lambda^Z} & Z \\ & & \downarrow 0 \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow -\lambda^Z \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ i^Z \end{bmatrix} \\ & & Z & \xlongequal{\quad} & Z & \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}} & Z \oplus I^Z \end{array}$$

Thus,  $Z \xrightarrow{\text{id}_Z} Z \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \Sigma Z$  is a right triangle.

**4.2. Right triangulated structures induced by mutation triples.** Now, we check the triplet also satisfies the axioms of right triangulated category.

**Lemma 4.8.** The triplet  $(\underline{\mathcal{Z}}, \Sigma, \nabla)$  satisfies (RT0) and (RT1) in Remark 2.37.

*Proof.* (RT0) is by definition of  $\nabla$ . (RT1)(i) follows from Example 4.7. Since  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{Z}$  is strongly covariantly finite, (RT1)(ii) holds from Lemma 2.30.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.9.**  $(\underline{\mathcal{Z}}, \Sigma, \nabla)$  satisfies (RT2).

*Proof.* We only have to show for right triangles  $X \xrightarrow{a} Y \xrightarrow{h^{C^a} \circ b} \sigma C^a \xrightarrow{\sigma(\underline{c})} \Sigma X$ . In the rest of this proof, we denote  $\sigma C^a$  by  $Z$ . Recall that both  $b: Y \rightarrow C^a$  and  $h^{C^a}: C^a \rightarrow Z$  are  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -inflations. Thus  $h^{C^a} \circ b$ , now denoted by  $b'$ , is also an inflation and there exists an  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle  $Y \xrightarrow{b'} Z \xrightarrow{c'} U \xrightarrow{\delta'} Y$ . We define  $a': U \rightarrow Y\langle 1 \rangle$  by the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} Y & \xrightarrow{b'} & Z & \xrightarrow{c'} & U & \xrightarrow{\delta'} & Y \\ \parallel & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow a' & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \\ Y & \longrightarrow & I^Y & \longrightarrow & Y\langle 1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{-\lambda^Y} & Y \end{array}$$

This  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle induces the following right triangle.

$$Y \xrightarrow{b'} Z \xrightarrow{h^U \circ c'} \sigma U \xrightarrow{\sigma(a')} \Sigma Y$$

It is enough to show that the above sequence is isomorphic to  $Y \xrightarrow{b'} Z \xrightarrow{\sigma(\underline{c})} \Sigma X \xrightarrow{-\Sigma \underline{a}} \Sigma Y$ . From (ET4), we obtain  $u: X\langle 1 \rangle \rightarrow U$  and the following left commutative diagram. We also obtain the following right commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& S^{C^a} = S^{C^a} & & & \\
& \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow & \\
Y & \xrightarrow{b} & C^a & \xrightarrow{c} & X\langle 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{-\gamma} Y \\
\parallel & & \downarrow h^{C^a} & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow u & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \\
Y & \xrightarrow{b'} & Z & \xrightarrow{c'} & U & \xrightarrow{-\delta'} & Y \\
& & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow & & \\
& & S^{C^a} = S^{C^a} & & & & 
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{ccc}
C^a & \xrightarrow{h^{C^a}} & \sigma C^a \\
\downarrow c & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \sigma(c) \\
X\langle 1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{h^{X\langle 1 \rangle}} & \Sigma X \\
\downarrow u & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \sigma(u) \\
U & \xrightarrow{h^U} & \sigma U
\end{array}$$

Then  $\sigma(u)\sigma(c)h^{C^a} = h^U uc = h^U c' h^{C^a}$ . From Remark 3.7(1),  $\sigma(\underline{u})\sigma(\underline{c}) = \underline{h^U c'}$ .

On the other hand, from (4.1),  $a\lambda^X = -\gamma = -\delta' u = -\lambda^Y a' u$ . Thus there exists the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
X & \xrightarrow{i^X} & I^X & \xrightarrow{p^X} & X\langle 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{-\lambda^X} X \\
\downarrow a & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow -a'u & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow a \\
Y & \xrightarrow{i^Y} & I^Y & \xrightarrow{p^Y} & Y\langle 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{-\lambda^Y} Y
\end{array}$$

So,  $\underline{a}\langle 1 \rangle = -\underline{a}'\underline{u}$  and  $\Sigma \underline{a} = -\sigma(\underline{a}')\sigma(\underline{u})$ . From Lemma 3.18,  $\sigma(\underline{u})$  is an isomorphism. Therefore, there exists the following commutative diagram we wanted.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
Y & \xrightarrow{b'} & Z & \xrightarrow{\sigma(\underline{c})} & \Sigma X & \xrightarrow{-\Sigma \underline{a}} & \Sigma Y \\
\parallel & & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \sigma(\underline{u}) & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \\
Y & \xrightarrow{b'} & Z & \xrightarrow{h^U c'} & \sigma U & \xrightarrow{\sigma(\underline{a}')} & \Sigma Y
\end{array}$$

□

**Lemma 4.10.**  $(\underline{Z}, \Sigma, \nabla)$  satisfies (RT3), that is, the following statement holds.

Assume that there exists the following commutative diagram where each row is a right triangle.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
X_1 & \xrightarrow{a_1} & Y_1 & \xrightarrow{h^{C^{a_1}} b_1} & \sigma C^{a_1} & \xrightarrow{\sigma(c_1)} & \Sigma X_1 \\
\downarrow \underline{x} & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \underline{y} & & & & \downarrow \Sigma \underline{x} \\
X_2 & \xrightarrow{a_2} & Y_2 & \xrightarrow{h^{C^{a_2}} b_2} & \sigma C^{a_2} & \xrightarrow{\sigma(c_2)} & \Sigma X_2
\end{array}$$

Then there exists  $z: \sigma C^{a_1} \rightarrow \sigma C^{a_2}$  which makes the following diagram commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
X_1 & \xrightarrow{a_1} & Y_1 & \xrightarrow{h^{C^{a_1}} b_1} & \sigma C^{a_1} & \xrightarrow{\sigma(c_1)} & \Sigma X_1 \\
\downarrow \underline{x} & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \underline{y} & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow z & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \Sigma \underline{x} \\
X_2 & \xrightarrow{a_2} & Y_2 & \xrightarrow{h^{C^{a_2}} b_2} & \sigma C^{a_2} & \xrightarrow{\sigma(c_2)} & \Sigma X_2
\end{array}$$



*Proof.* From  $\underline{ya_1} = \underline{a_2x}$  and  $i^{X_1}$  is a left  $\mathcal{I}$ -approximation, there exists  $j_1: I^{X_1} \rightarrow Y_2, j_2: I^{X_1} \rightarrow I^{X_2}$  where  $a_2x - ya_1 = j_1i^{X_1}$  and  $i^{X_2}x = j_2i^{X_1}$ . Then  $\begin{bmatrix} y & j_1 \\ 0 & j_2 \end{bmatrix} \tilde{a}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} ya_1 + j_1i^{X_1} \\ j_2i^{X_1} \end{bmatrix} = \tilde{a}_2x$ . Thus, there exists the following commutative diagram in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X_1 & \xrightarrow{\tilde{a}_1} & Y_1 \oplus I^{X_1} & \longrightarrow & C & \dashrightarrow & X_1 \\ \downarrow x & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \begin{bmatrix} y & j_1 \\ 0 & j_2 \end{bmatrix} \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow x \\ X_2 & \xrightarrow{\tilde{a}_2} & Y_2 \oplus I^{X_2} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{b}_2} & C^{a_2} & \dashrightarrow & X_2 \end{array}$$

The statement follows from Lemma 4.4 and Claim 4.5.  $\square$

To show  $(\underline{\mathcal{Z}}, \Sigma, \nabla)$  satisfies (RT4), we need some preparations.

**Lemma 4.11.** Let  $U_1 \xrightarrow{a} U_2 \xrightarrow{b} U_3 \dashrightarrow U_1$  be an  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle where  $U_1, U_2, U_3 \in \text{Cone}_{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ . Then there exist three  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangles:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} S_2 & \dashrightarrow & U_2 & \xrightarrow{z_2} & Z_2 & \rightarrow & S_2 \\ S_3 & \dashrightarrow & U_3 & \xrightarrow{u_3} & U_3' & \rightarrow & S_3 \\ \sigma U_1 & \xrightarrow{x} & Z_2 & \xrightarrow{y} & U_3' & \dashrightarrow & Z_1 \end{array}$$

where  $S_2, S_3 \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $Z_2 \in \mathcal{Z}$ ,  $U_3' \in \text{Cone}_{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$  and make the following diagram commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} U_1 & \xrightarrow{a} & U_2 & \xrightarrow{b} & U_3 & \dashrightarrow & U_1 \\ \downarrow h^{U_1} \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow z_2 \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow u_3 \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow h^{U_1} \\ \sigma U_1 & \xrightarrow{x} & Z_2 & \xrightarrow{y} & U_3' & \dashrightarrow & \sigma U_1 \end{array}$$

Moreover, there exists the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \sigma U_1 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(a)} & \sigma U_2 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(b)} & \sigma U_3 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(c^x u_3)} & \Sigma(\sigma U_1) \\ \parallel & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \sigma(z_2) \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow \sigma(u_3) \circlearrowleft & & \parallel \\ \sigma U_1 & \xrightarrow{x} & Z_2 & \xrightarrow{h^{U_3'} y} & \sigma U_3' & \xrightarrow{\sigma(c^x)} & \Sigma(\sigma U_1) \end{array}$$

In particular,

$$\sigma U_1 \xrightarrow{\sigma(a)} \sigma U_2 \xrightarrow{\sigma(b)} \sigma U_3 \xrightarrow{\sigma(c^x u_3)} \Sigma(\sigma U_1)$$

is a right triangle.

*Proof.* First, one can easily show  $\mathcal{Z}^*(\text{Cone}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z})) = \text{Cone}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$  in  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}$  from Proposition 2.8. From the dual of Proposition 2.8 with  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangles  $U_1 \xrightarrow{a} U_2 \xrightarrow{b} U_3 \dashrightarrow U_1$

and  $U_1 \xrightarrow{h^{U_1}} \sigma U_1 \rightarrow S^{U_1} \xrightarrow{\rho^{U_1}} U_1$ , we obtain the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & U_3 & \xlongequal{\quad} & U_3 \\
& & \downarrow \delta & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow h^{U_1} \delta \\
S^{U_1} & \dashrightarrow & U_1 & \xrightarrow{h^{U_1}} & \sigma U_1 & \longrightarrow & S^{U_1} \\
\parallel & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow a & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow u_2' & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \\
S^{U_1} & \dashrightarrow & U_2 & \xrightarrow{u_2} & U_2' & \longrightarrow & S^{U_1} \\
& & \downarrow b & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow v_2' & & \\
& & U_3 & \xlongequal{\quad} & U_3 & & 
\end{array}$$

Note that  $U_2' \in \text{Cone}_{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$  by the first remark.

Next, from (ET4) with  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangles  $\sigma U_1 \xrightarrow{u_2'} U_2' \xrightarrow{v_2'} U_3 \xrightarrow{h^{U_1} \delta} \sigma U_1$  and  $U_2' \xrightarrow{h^{U_2'}} \sigma U_2' \rightarrow S^{U_2'} \xrightarrow{\rho^{U_2'}} U_2'$ , there exists the following commutative diagram where  $U_3' \in \text{Cone}_{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & \sigma U_1 & \xlongequal{\quad} & \sigma U_1 \\
& & \downarrow u_2' & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow x \\
S^{U_2'} & \dashrightarrow & U_2' & \xrightarrow{h^{U_2'}} & \sigma U_2' & \longrightarrow & S^{U_2'} \\
\parallel & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow v_2' & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow y & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \\
S^{U_2'} & \dashrightarrow & U_3 & \xrightarrow{u_3} & U_3' & \longrightarrow & S^{U_2'} \\
& & \downarrow h^{U_1} \delta & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \epsilon & & \\
& & \sigma U_1 & \xlongequal{\quad} & \sigma U_1 & & 
\end{array}$$

Since  $U_3' \in \text{Cone}_{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ , we obtain an  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle  $U_3' \xrightarrow{h^{U_3'}} \sigma U_3' \rightarrow S^{U_3'} \xrightarrow{\rho^{U_3'}} U_3'$ . From (ET4), there exist the following commutative diagrams.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & S^{U_2'} & \xlongequal{\quad} & S^{U_2'} \\
& & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \\
U_2 & \xrightarrow{u_2} & U_2' & \longrightarrow & S^{U_1} & \dashrightarrow & U_2 \\
\parallel & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow h^{U_2'} & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \\
U_2 & \xrightarrow{z_2} & \sigma U_2' & \longrightarrow & S_2 & \dashrightarrow & U_2 \\
& & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow & & \\
& & S^{U_2'} & \xlongequal{\quad} & S^{U_2'} & & 
\end{array} & & 
\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & S^{U_3'} & \xlongequal{\quad} & S^{U_3'} \\
& & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \\
U_3 & \xrightarrow{u_3} & U_3' & \longrightarrow & S^{U_2'} & \dashrightarrow & U_3 \\
\parallel & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow h^{U_3'} & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \\
U_3 & \xrightarrow{z_3} & \sigma U_3' & \longrightarrow & S_3 & \dashrightarrow & U_3 \\
& & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow & & \\
& & S^{U_3'} & \xlongequal{\quad} & S^{U_3'} & & 
\end{array}
\end{array}$$

We denote  $h^{U_2'} u_2, h^{U_3'} u_3$  by  $z_2, z_3$ , respectively. Note that  $S_2, S_3 \in \mathcal{S}$  since  $\mathcal{S}$  is closed under extensions in  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}$ .

Then we finally obtain three  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangles

$$\begin{array}{c} S_2 \dashrightarrow U_2 \xrightarrow{z_2} \sigma U_2' \rightarrow S_2 \\ S^{U_2'} \dashrightarrow U_3 \xrightarrow{u_3} U_3' \rightarrow S^{U_2'} \\ \sigma U_1 \xrightarrow{x} \sigma U_2' \xrightarrow{y} U_3' \dashrightarrow \sigma U_1 \end{array}$$

and the following commutative diagram in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} U_1 & \xrightarrow{a} & U_2 & \xrightarrow{b} & U_3 & \xrightarrow{\delta} & U_1 \\ \downarrow h^{U_1} \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow z_2 \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow u_3 \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow h^{U_1} \\ \sigma U_1 & \xrightarrow{x} & \sigma U_2' & \xrightarrow{y} & U_3' & \xrightarrow{\epsilon} & \sigma U_1 \end{array}$$

There exists the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} U_1 & \xrightarrow{a} & U_2 & \xrightarrow{b} & U_3 & \xrightarrow{h^{U_3}} & \sigma U_3 \\ \downarrow h^{U_1} \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow z_2 \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow u_3 \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow \sigma(u_3) \\ \sigma U_1 & \xrightarrow{x} & \sigma U_2' & \xrightarrow{y} & U_3' & \xrightarrow{h^{U_3'}} & \sigma U_3' \\ \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow c^x & & \downarrow \sigma(c^x) \\ \sigma U_1 & \xrightarrow{i^{\sigma U_1}} & I\sigma U_1 & \xrightarrow{p^{\sigma U_1}} & (\sigma U_1)\langle 1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{h^{(\sigma U_1)\langle 1 \rangle}} & \Sigma(\sigma U_1) \end{array}$$

and  $\sigma U_1 \xrightarrow{x} \sigma U_2' \xrightarrow{h^{U_3'} y} \sigma U_3' \xrightarrow{\sigma(c^x)} \Sigma(\sigma U_1)$  is a right triangle.

Since we define  $\sigma Z = Z$  for  $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ ,  $\underline{x} = \sigma(\underline{x}) = \sigma(\underline{x}h^{U_1}) = \sigma(\underline{z_2}a)$  and  $h^{U_3'} y \sigma(z_2) = \sigma(h^{U_3'} y z_2) = \sigma(y)\sigma(z_2) = \sigma(\underline{u_3})\sigma(\underline{b})$  from Remark 4.1. Thus, the following diagram in  $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$  is commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \sigma U_1 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(a)} & \sigma U_2 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(b)} & \sigma U_3 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(c^x u_3)} & \Sigma(\sigma U_1) \\ \parallel & & \downarrow \sigma(z_2) \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow \sigma(u_3) \circlearrowleft & & \parallel \\ \sigma U_1 & \xrightarrow{\underline{x}} & \sigma U_2' & \xrightarrow{h^{U_3'} y} & \sigma U_3' & \xrightarrow{\sigma(c^x)} & \Sigma(\sigma U_1) \end{array}$$

From Lemma 3.18,  $\sigma(\underline{u_2})$  and  $\sigma(\underline{u_3})$  are isomorphism. Therefore the statement holds.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.12.**  $(\underline{\mathcal{Z}}, \Sigma, \nabla)$  satisfies (RT4).

*Proof.* Let

$$\begin{array}{c} X_1 \xrightarrow{x_1} X_2 \xrightarrow{h^{C^{x_1} y_1}} \sigma C^{x_1} \xrightarrow{\sigma(\underline{c^{x_1}})} \Sigma X_1 \\ X_1 \xrightarrow{x_2} X_3 \xrightarrow{h^{C^{x_2} y_2}} \sigma C^{x_2} \xrightarrow{\sigma(\underline{c^{x_2}})} \Sigma X_2 \\ X_2 \xrightarrow{x_3} X_3 \xrightarrow{h^{C^{x_3} y_3}} \sigma C^{x_3} \xrightarrow{\sigma(\underline{c^{x_3}})} \Sigma X_3 \end{array}$$

be right triangles where  $\underline{x_2} = \underline{x_3}x_1$ ,  $X_i \in \mathcal{Z}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ . From Lemma 4.4, we may assume  $x_i$  is an  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -inflation for  $1 \leq i \leq 3$  and  $x_2 = x_3x_1$ . Indeed, there exist  $j: I^{X_1} \rightarrow X_3$  which satisfies  $x_2 = x_3x_1 + ji^{X_1}$  since  $i^{X_1}$  is a left  $\mathcal{I}$ -approximation, and  $\widetilde{x_2} = \begin{bmatrix} x_2 \\ i^{X_1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_3 & j \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \widetilde{x_1}$ . From Remark 2.38, we may replace  $x_1, x_2$  and  $x_3$  by  $\widetilde{x_1}, \begin{bmatrix} x_3 & j \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \widetilde{x_1}$  and  $\begin{bmatrix} x_3 & j \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ , respectively.

In the rest of the proof, we denote  $C^{x_i}$  by  $U_i$ . There exist  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangles

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X_1 & \xrightarrow{x_1} & X_2 & \xrightarrow{y_1} & U_1 \xrightarrow{\delta_1} X_1 \\ X_1 & \xrightarrow{x_2} & X_3 & \xrightarrow{y_2} & U_2 \xrightarrow{\delta_2} X_2 \\ X_2 & \xrightarrow{x_3} & X_3 & \xrightarrow{y_3} & U_3 \xrightarrow{\delta_3} X_3. \end{array}$$

From (ET4),

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & U_3 & \xlongequal{\quad} & U_3 & & \\ & & \downarrow \delta_3 & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \delta & & \\ X_1 & \xrightarrow{x_1} & X_2 & \xrightarrow{y_1} & U_1 & \xrightarrow{\delta_1} & X_1 \\ \parallel & & \downarrow x_3 & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow a & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \\ X_1 & \xrightarrow{x_2} & X_3 & \xrightarrow{y_2} & U_2 & \xrightarrow{\delta_2} & X_1 \\ & & \downarrow y_3 & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow b & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow x_1 \\ & & U_3 & \xlongequal{\quad} & U_3 & \xrightarrow{\delta_3} & X_2 \end{array}$$

and we obtain  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle  $U_1 \xrightarrow{a} U_2 \xrightarrow{b} U_3 \xrightarrow{\delta} U_1$ . By Claim 4.5,

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X_1 & \xrightarrow{x_1} & X_2 & \xrightarrow{y_1} & U_1 & \xrightarrow{\delta_1} & X_1 \\ \parallel & & \downarrow x_3 & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow a & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \\ X_1 & \xrightarrow{x_2} & X_3 & \xrightarrow{y_2} & U_2 & \xrightarrow{\delta_2} & X_1 \end{array}$$

induces

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X_1 & \xrightarrow{x_1} & X_2 & \xrightarrow{h^{U_1}y_1} & \sigma U_1 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(c^{x_1})} & \Sigma X_1 \\ \parallel & & \downarrow x_3 & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \sigma(\underline{a}) & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \\ X_1 & \xrightarrow{x_2} & X_3 & \xrightarrow{h^{U_2}y_2} & \sigma U_2 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(c^{x_2})} & \Sigma X_1. \end{array} \quad (4.3)$$

From Lemma 4.11, there exists the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} U_1 & \xrightarrow{a} & U_2 & \xrightarrow{b} & U_3 & \xrightarrow{\delta} & U_1 \\ \downarrow h^{U_1} & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow z_2 & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow u_3 & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow z_1 \\ \sigma U_1 & \xrightarrow{x} & Z_2 & \xrightarrow{y} & U_3' & \xrightarrow{\epsilon} & Z_1 \end{array}$$

where  $Z_2 \in \mathcal{Z}$  and  $U_3' \in \text{Cone}_{\mathbb{P}\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$ . Moreover, there exists the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \sigma U_1 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(\underline{a})} & \sigma U_2 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(\underline{b})} & \sigma U_3 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(c^x u_3)} & \Sigma(\sigma U_1) \\ \parallel & & \downarrow \sigma(z_2) & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \sigma(u_3) & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \\ \sigma U_1 & \xrightarrow{x} & Z_2 & \xrightarrow{h^{U_3'}y} & \sigma U_3' & \xrightarrow{\sigma(c^x)} & \Sigma(\sigma U_1) \end{array}$$

Thus, by Claim 4.5 again,

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 X_2 & \xrightarrow{x_3} & X_3 & \xrightarrow{y_3} & U_3 & \xrightarrow{\delta_3} & X_2 \\
 \downarrow h^{U_1 y_1} \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow z_2 y_2 \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow u_3 \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow h^{U_1 y_1} \\
 \sigma U_1 & \xrightarrow{x} & Z_2 & \xrightarrow{y} & U'_3 & \xrightarrow{\epsilon} & \sigma U_1
 \end{array}$$

induces

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 X_2 & \xrightarrow{x_3} & X_3 & \xrightarrow{h^{U_3 y_3}} & \sigma U_3 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(c^{x_3})} & \Sigma X_2 \\
 \downarrow h^{U_1 y_1} \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow z_2 y_2 \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow \sigma(u_3) \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow \Sigma h^{U_1 y_1} \\
 \sigma U_1 & \xrightarrow{x} & Z_2 & \xrightarrow{h^{U_3' y}} & \sigma U'_3 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(c^{\sigma(a)})} & \Sigma(\sigma U_1) .
 \end{array}$$

Then we obtain the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 X_2 & \xrightarrow{x_3} & X_3 & \xrightarrow{h^{U_3 y_3}} & \sigma U_3 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(c^{x_3})} & \Sigma X_2 \\
 \downarrow h^{U_1 y_1} \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow z_2 y_2 \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow \sigma(u_3) \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow \Sigma h^{U_1 y_1} \\
 \sigma U_1 & \xrightarrow{x} & Z_2 & \xrightarrow{h^{U_3' y}} & \sigma U'_3 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(c^{\sigma(a)})} & \Sigma(\sigma U_1) \\
 \parallel & & \uparrow \sigma(z_2) \circlearrowleft & & \uparrow \sigma(u_3) \circlearrowleft & & \parallel \\
 \sigma U_1 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(a)} & \sigma U_2 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(b)} & \sigma U_3 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(c^{x_3} u_3)} & \Sigma(\sigma U_1)
 \end{array} \tag{4.4}$$

Note that  $\sigma(z_2)^{-1} z_2 y_2 = \sigma(z_2)^{-1} \sigma(z_2 y_2) = \sigma(y_2) = h^{U_2 y_2}$ . Thus, we obtain the following commutative diagram from (4.3) and (4.4).

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 X_1 & \xrightarrow{x_1} & X_2 & \xrightarrow{h^{U_1 y_1}} & \sigma U_1 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(c^{x_1})} & \Sigma X_1 \\
 \parallel & & \downarrow x_3 \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow \sigma(a) \circlearrowleft & & \parallel \\
 X_1 & \xrightarrow{x_2} & X_3 & \xrightarrow{h^{U_2 y_2}} & \sigma U_2 & \xrightarrow{\sigma(c^{x_2})} & \Sigma X_1 \\
 & & \downarrow h^{U_3 y_3} \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow \sigma(b) & & \\
 & & \sigma U_3 & \xlongequal{\quad} & \sigma U_3 & & \\
 & & \downarrow \sigma(c^{x_3}) \circlearrowleft & & \downarrow \sigma(c^{\sigma(a)} u_3) & & \\
 & & \Sigma X_2 & \xrightarrow{\Sigma(h^{U_1 y_1})} & \Sigma(\sigma U_1) & & 
 \end{array}$$

So, it is enough to show that  $\Sigma \underline{x_1} \sigma(\underline{c^{x_2}}) = \sigma(\underline{c^{x_3}}) \sigma(\underline{b})$ . From the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
X_1 & \xrightarrow{x_2} & X_3 & \xrightarrow{y_2} & U_2 & \xrightarrow{\delta_2} & X_1 \\
\parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow c^{x_2} & & \parallel \\
X_1 & \xrightarrow{i^{X_1}} & I^{X_1} & \xrightarrow{p^{X_1}} & X_1 \langle 1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{\lambda^{X_1}} & X_1 \\
\downarrow x_1 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow x_1 \langle 1 \rangle & & \downarrow x_1 \\
X_2 & \xrightarrow{i^{X_2}} & I^{X_2} & \xrightarrow{p^{X_2}} & X_2 \langle 1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{\lambda^{X_2}} & X_2 \\
\parallel & & \uparrow & & \uparrow c^{x_3} & & \parallel \\
X_2 & \xrightarrow{x_3} & X_3 & \xrightarrow{y_3} & U_3 & \xrightarrow{\delta_3} & X_2
\end{array}$$

then  $\lambda^{X_2} c^{x_3} b = \delta_3 b = x_1 \delta_2 = x_1 \lambda^{X_1} c^{x_2} = \lambda^{X_2} x_1 \langle 1 \rangle c^{x_2}$ . So,  $\underline{x_1} \langle 1 \rangle \underline{c^{x_2}} = \underline{c^{x_3}} \underline{b}$ . Applying  $\sigma$ ,  $\Sigma \underline{x_1} \sigma(\underline{c^{x_2}}) = \sigma(\underline{c^{x_3}}) \sigma(\underline{b})$  holds.  $\square$

To sum up, we obtain the following result.

**Corollary 4.13.** Let  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z})$  be a right mutation double. Then  $(\underline{\mathcal{Z}}, \Sigma, \nabla)$  is a right triangulated category.

*Proof.* From Lemma 4.8, 4.9, 4.10 and Proposition 4.12.  $\square$

Dually, we can construct left triangulated structures from left mutation double  $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$ .

First, we fix the following  $\mathfrak{s}$ -triangles to define  $\langle -1 \rangle$  and  $\omega$ .

- For  $X \in \mathcal{Z}$ , there exists the following  $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle where  $I_X \in \mathcal{I}$  and we fix it:

$$X \xrightarrow{\lambda_X} X \langle -1 \rangle \xrightarrow{i_X} I_X \xrightarrow{p_X} X$$

then we define  $i_X, p_X, \lambda_X$  by the above fixed  $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle.

- For  $T \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ , there exists the following  $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle where  $\omega T \in \mathcal{Z}, V_T \in \mathcal{V}$  and we fix it.

$$T \xrightarrow{\rho_T} V_T \xrightarrow{g_T} \omega T \xrightarrow{h_T} T$$

Then we define  $h_T, g_T, \rho_T$  by the above fixed  $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle. For  $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , we always take  $\omega Z$  so that  $\omega Z = Z$ .

**Notation 4.14.** (1) For  $b: Y \rightarrow Z$  in  $\mathcal{Z}$ , there exists the following  $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle from dual of Lemma 2.30 and we fix it:

$$Z \xrightarrow{\hat{\delta}} C_b \xrightarrow{\hat{a}} Y \oplus I_Z \xrightarrow{[b \ p_X]} Z$$

then we define  $\hat{a}$  and  $\hat{\delta}$  by the above  $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle. We also define  $\hat{b} = [b \ p_X]$  and  $a$  as the composition of  $C_b \xrightarrow{\hat{a}} Y \oplus I_X \xrightarrow{[1 \ 0]} Y$ .

(2) There exists following commutative diagram and we fix it:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & Y & \xlongequal{\quad} & Y & & \\
 & & \downarrow \gamma_b & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow 0 & & \\
 Z & \xrightarrow{-\lambda_Z} & Z\langle -1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{i_Z} & I_Z & \xrightarrow{p_Z} & Z \\
 \parallel & & \downarrow c_b & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \\
 Z & \xrightarrow{-\widehat{\delta}} & C_b & \xrightarrow{\widehat{a}} & Y \oplus I_Z & \xrightarrow{\widehat{b}} & Z \\
 & & \downarrow a & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \lambda_Z \\
 & & Y & \xlongequal{\quad} & Y & \xrightarrow{-\gamma_b} & Z\langle -1 \rangle
 \end{array} \tag{4.5}$$

then we define  $c_b, \gamma_b$  by the above diagram. (We often drop “ $b$ ” if there is no confusion.)

There exists the sequence in  $\underline{\mathcal{Z}}$ :

$$\Omega Z \xrightarrow{\omega(\underline{c})} \omega C_b \xrightarrow{\widehat{a}h_{C_b}} Y \oplus I_Z \xrightarrow{\widehat{b}} Z. \tag{4.6}$$

**Definition 4.15.** Let  $\underline{b}: Y \rightarrow Z$  in  $\underline{\mathcal{Z}}$ . Then there exists the unique sequence in  $\underline{\mathcal{Z}}$  up to isomorphisms:

$$\Omega Z \xrightarrow{\omega(\underline{c})} \omega C_b \xrightarrow{ah_{C_b}} Y \xrightarrow{b} Z.$$

We define

$$\Delta = \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{sequences in } \underline{\mathcal{Z}} \text{ isomorphic to one in} \\ \{ \Omega Z \xrightarrow{\omega(\underline{c})} \omega C_b \xrightarrow{ah_{C_b}} Y \xrightarrow{b} Z \mid b \text{ is a morphism in } \underline{\mathcal{Z}} \} \end{array} \right)$$

and the sequence in  $\Delta$  is called a *left triangle* in  $\underline{\mathcal{Z}}$ .

We omit the proof of the following statement, which is the dual of Corollary 4.13.

**Proposition 4.16.** Let  $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  be a left mutation double. Then  $(\underline{\mathcal{Z}}, \Omega, \Delta)$  is a left triangulated category.

#### 4.3. Pretriangulated structures induced by mutation triples.

**Theorem 4.17.**  $(\underline{\mathcal{Z}}, \Sigma, \Omega, \nabla, \Delta)$  is a pretriangulated category, that is, for the following commutative diagrams in  $\underline{\mathcal{Z}}$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 X & \xrightarrow{a} & Y & \xrightarrow{h^{C^a}b} & Z & \xrightarrow{\sigma(\underline{c})} & \Sigma X \\
 \downarrow \underline{s} & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \underline{t} & & \downarrow \beta_{Z'} \circ \Sigma \underline{s} & \Omega \underline{u}' \circ \alpha_X & \downarrow \\
 \Omega Z' & \xrightarrow{\omega(\underline{c}')} & X' & \xrightarrow{a'h_{C_{b'}}} & Y' & \xrightarrow{\underline{b}'} & Z'
 \end{array}$$

where  $Z = \sigma C^a, c = c^a, X' = \omega C_{b'}$  and  $c' = c_{b'}$ , there exists  $u: Z \rightarrow Y'$  and  $s': Y \rightarrow X'$  which makes the following diagrams commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 X & \xrightarrow{a} & Y & \xrightarrow{h^{C^a}b} & Z & \xrightarrow{\sigma(\underline{c})} & \Sigma X \\
 \downarrow \underline{s} & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \underline{t} & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \underline{u} & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \beta_{Z'} \circ \Sigma \underline{s} \\
 \Omega Z' & \xrightarrow{\omega(\underline{c}')} & X' & \xrightarrow{a'h_{C_{b'}}} & Y' & \xrightarrow{\underline{b}'} & Z'
 \end{array}$$

*Proof.* We only prove the existence of  $u$  because one can show that of  $s'$  by dual argument. We divide our proof into two steps.

**Step.1 Construct the morphism  $u: Z \rightarrow Y'$**

From  $\underline{ta} = \omega(\underline{c}')\underline{s}$ , there exists  $j: I^X \rightarrow X'$  where  $ta + ji^X = \omega(c')s$ . By (ET3) of  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$ , we obtain  $u': C^a \rightarrow Y'$  which makes the following diagram commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X & \xrightarrow{\tilde{a}} & Y \oplus I^X & \xrightarrow{\tilde{b}} & C^a & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\delta}} & X \\ \downarrow h_{Z'(-1)}s & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow h_{C_{b'}[tj]} & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow u' & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow h_{Z'(-1)}s \\ Z'(-1) & \xrightarrow{c'} & C_{b'} & \xrightarrow{a'} & Y' & \xrightarrow{\gamma_{b'}} & Z'(-1) \end{array}$$

Since we assumed that  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}) = 0$ ,  $u'$  factors through  $h^{C^a}: C^a \rightarrow Z$ . Then, there exists a morphism  $u: Z \rightarrow Y'$  where  $u' = uh^{C^a}$ . Thus we obtain the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} Y \oplus I^X & \xrightarrow{\tilde{b}} & C^a & \xrightarrow{h^{C^a}} & Z \\ \downarrow h_{C_{b'}[tj]} & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow u' & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow u \\ C_{b'} & \xrightarrow{a'} & Y' & \xleftarrow{u} & Z \end{array}$$

**Step.2 Checks for commutativity**

Since  $uh^{C^a}\tilde{b} = a'h_{C_{b'}[tj]}$ ,  $\underline{uh^{C^a}b} = a'h_{C_{b'}t}$ . We only have to show that  $\beta_{Z'}\Sigma(\underline{s})\sigma(\underline{c}) = \underline{b'u}$ . Recall that we obtain  $\underline{s'}: \Sigma X \rightarrow Z'$  where  $\underline{s'} = \beta_{Z'}\Sigma(\underline{s})$  from Remark 3.16 and the following commutative diagram exists.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \xleftarrow{\lambda^X} & X(1) & \xrightarrow{h^{X(1)}} & \Sigma X \\ \swarrow s & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \\ \Omega Z' & \xrightarrow{h_{Z'(-1)}} & Z'(-1) & \xleftarrow{-\lambda_{Z'}} & Z' \\ & & & & \swarrow s' \end{array}$$

Then  $\lambda_{Z'}s'\sigma(c)h^{C^a} = \lambda_{Z'}s'h^{X(1)}c = -h_{Z'(-1)}s\lambda^Xc = -h_{Z'(-1)}s\tilde{\delta} = -\gamma_{b'}u' = \lambda_{Z'}\tilde{b}'uh^{C^a}$  from (4.1) and (4.5). Thus,  $\lambda_{Z'}(s'\sigma(c) - \tilde{b}'u)h^{C^a} = 0$  and  $(\beta_{Z'}\Sigma(\underline{s})\sigma(\underline{c}) - \underline{b'u})h^{C^a} = 0$ . From Remark 3.7(1),  $\beta_{Z'}\Sigma(\underline{s})\sigma(\underline{c}) - \underline{b'u} = 0$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.18.** Let  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  be a mutation triple where  $\Omega$  and  $\Sigma$  are mutually quasi-inverse. Then  $(\underline{\mathcal{Z}}, \Sigma, \nabla)$  is a triangulated category.

*Proof.* By definition of pretriangulated categories.  $\square$

We consider sufficient conditions that  $\Omega$  and  $\Sigma$  are mutually quasi-inverse in the next section.

## 5. TRIANGULATED STRUCTURES INDUCED BY MUTATION TRIPLES

We finally achieve the aim of this paper, which is finding sufficient conditions for mutation triples to induce triangulated categories, in this section.



**5.1. Case 1 : concentric twin cotorsion pairs.** First, the following statement is proved in [24].

**Theorem 5.1.** [22, 24] We assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a triangulated category and let  $((\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}))$  be a concentric twin cotorsion pair.

(1) [24, Remark 5.8] If  $((\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}))$  satisfies the following conditions, then a pretriangulated category  $(\underline{\mathcal{Z}}, \Sigma, \Omega, \nabla, \Delta)$  defined by mutation triple  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  is a triangulated category.

$$(i) \underline{\mathcal{Z}\langle -1 \rangle}^+ \subset \mathcal{S}[-1] * \mathcal{V}.$$

$$(ii) \underline{\mathcal{Z}\langle 1 \rangle}^- \subset \mathcal{S} * \mathcal{V}[1].$$

(See Appendix A.14 or [22, Definition 2.18] for definitions of  $\mathcal{T}^+$  and  $\mathcal{U}^-$ .)

(2) [24, Condition 6.1, Proposition 6.2, Definition 6.6, Corollary 6.12] [22, Definition 3.10, Proposition 3.12] We consider following conditions:

$$(HE) \text{add}(\mathcal{S} * \mathcal{T}) = \text{add}(\mathcal{U} * \mathcal{V}).$$

$$(HO) \mathcal{S} * \mathcal{V}[1] = \mathcal{S}[-1] * \mathcal{V}.$$

If one of the above two conditions holds, the TCP satisfies the condition in (1). In particular,  $(\underline{\mathcal{Z}}, \Sigma, \Omega, \nabla, \Delta)$  defined by mutation triple  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  is a triangulated category.

**Remark 5.2.** A concentric twin cotorsion pair satisfying condition (HE) is called *heart-equivalent* and satisfying condition (HO) is called *hovey* in [22, 24].

**5.2. Case 2 : mutation triples satisfying (MT4).** Next, we consider another condition to induce triangulated structures for mutation triples in ET categories. We define

$$\mathcal{Z}\langle -1 \rangle * \mathcal{Z}\langle 1 \rangle = \left\{ E \in \mathcal{C} \mid \begin{array}{l} X \rightarrow E \rightarrow Y \xrightarrow{-\delta} X \text{ where } X \in \mathcal{Z}\langle -1 \rangle, Y \in \mathcal{Z}\langle 1 \rangle \\ \text{and } \delta \text{ is an } \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}}\text{-extension.} \end{array} \right\}.$$

**Condition 5.3.** Let  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  be a mutation triple and we consider the following conditions:

$$(MT4) \text{Cone}_{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{I}) \cap (\mathcal{Z}\langle -1 \rangle * \mathcal{Z}\langle 1 \rangle) = \text{CoCone}_{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}}}(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{S}) \cap (\mathcal{Z}\langle -1 \rangle * \mathcal{Z}\langle 1 \rangle)$$

**Theorem 5.4.** Let  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  be a mutation triple satisfying (MT4). Then the quintuplet  $(\underline{\mathcal{Z}}, \Sigma, \Omega, \nabla, \Delta)$  in Theorem 4.17 is a triangulated category.

*Proof.* We only prove  $\Sigma\Omega \cong \text{Id}$ . Let  $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$  and we obtain the following left commutative diagram in  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}}$  where  $V \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $V' \in \text{Cone}_{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{I}}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{I})$  from (ET4) and Remark 2.34. Note that  $h_{Z\langle -1 \rangle} \lambda^{\Omega Z}$  is an  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle.

From (MT4), there exists an  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle  $S \xrightarrow{-\delta} V' \xrightarrow{s} I'_Z \xrightarrow{t} S$  where  $I'_Z \in \mathcal{I}, S \in \mathcal{S}$ . By (ET4) again, we obtain the following right commutative diagram in  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\Omega Z)\langle 1 \rangle = (\Omega Z)\langle 1 \rangle & & Z\langle -1 \rangle = Z\langle -1 \rangle \\ \downarrow \lambda^{\Omega Z} \circlearrowleft \downarrow & & \downarrow f \quad \circlearrowleft \quad \downarrow i'_Z \\ V \longrightarrow \Omega Z \xrightarrow{h_{Z\langle -1 \rangle}} Z\langle -1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\rho_{Z\langle -1 \rangle}} V & & S \xrightarrow{-\delta} V' \xrightarrow{s} I'_Z \xrightarrow{t} S \\ \parallel \quad \circlearrowleft \quad \downarrow \quad \circlearrowleft \quad \downarrow f \quad \circlearrowleft \quad \parallel & & \parallel \quad \circlearrowleft \quad \downarrow g \quad \circlearrowleft \quad \downarrow p'_Z \quad \circlearrowleft \quad \parallel \\ V \longrightarrow I^{\Omega Z} \longrightarrow V' \dashrightarrow V & & S \xrightarrow{\quad} (\Omega Z)\langle 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\tilde{h}^{(\Omega Z)\langle 1 \rangle}} \Psi(Z) \longrightarrow S \\ \downarrow \quad \circlearrowleft \quad \downarrow g & & \downarrow h_{Z\langle -1 \rangle} \lambda^{\Omega Z} \quad \circlearrowleft \quad \downarrow \epsilon_Z \\ (\Omega Z)\langle 1 \rangle = (\Omega Z)\langle 1 \rangle & & Z\langle -1 \rangle = Z\langle -1 \rangle \end{array}$$

Thus, we obtain an  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle  $Z\langle -1 \rangle \xrightarrow{i'_Z} I'_Z \xrightarrow{p'_Z} \Psi(Z) \xrightarrow{\epsilon_Z} Z\langle -1 \rangle$ . Then we obtain the following diagram in  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{I}}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
Z\langle -1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{i_Z} & I_Z & \xrightarrow{p_Z} & Z & \xrightarrow{\lambda_Z} & Z\langle -1 \rangle \\
\parallel & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \psi_Z & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \\
Z\langle -1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{i'_Z} & I'_Z & \xrightarrow{p'_Z} & \Psi(Z) & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_Z} & Z\langle -1 \rangle
\end{array} \tag{5.1}$$

One can show that  $\underline{\psi}_Z$  is an isomorphism, like as proof of Lemma 2.23 since both  $i_Z$  and  $i'_Z$  are left  $\mathcal{I}$ -approximations. Then  $\Psi(Z) \in \mathcal{Z}$ . For  $z: Z_1 \rightarrow Z_2$  in  $\mathcal{Z}$ , there exists the following commutative diagram in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
Z_1\langle -1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{i'_{Z_1}} & I'_{Z_1} & \xrightarrow{p'_{Z_1}} & \Psi(Z_1) & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_{Z_1}} & Z_1\langle -1 \rangle \\
\downarrow z\langle -1 \rangle & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \Psi(z) & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow z\langle -1 \rangle \\
Z_2\langle -1 \rangle & \xrightarrow{i'_{Z_2}} & I'_{Z_2} & \xrightarrow{p'_{Z_2}} & \Psi(Z_2) & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_{Z_2}} & Z_2\langle -1 \rangle
\end{array} \tag{5.2}$$

Then we define  $\Psi(\underline{z}): \Psi(Z_1) \rightarrow \Psi(Z_2)$  as  $\underline{\Psi}(z)$ . We obtain an additive functor  $\underline{\Psi}: \underline{\mathcal{Z}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{Z}}$ . Moreover,  $\underline{\psi}_Z$  induce a natural isomorphism  $\underline{\psi}: \text{Id} \Rightarrow \underline{\Psi}$  from (5.1) and (5.2).

Recall that  $S \xrightarrow{g^\delta} (\Omega Z)\langle 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{h^{(\Omega Z)\langle 1 \rangle}} \Psi(Z) \rightarrow S$  is an  $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathcal{I}}$ -triangle. Then, from Remark 3.7(3) and  $\Psi(Z) \in \mathcal{Z}$ , there exists a morphism  $\varphi_Z: \Sigma\Omega Z \rightarrow \Psi(Z)$  which satisfies  $h^{(\Omega Z)\langle 1 \rangle} = \varphi_Z h^{(\Omega Z)\langle 1 \rangle}$  and  $\varphi_Z$  is unique up to  $[\mathcal{I}]$ . Because of this uniqueness, one can show  $\underline{\varphi}: \underline{\Psi} \Rightarrow \Sigma\underline{\Omega}$  is a natural isomorphism like Remark 3.7(3).

Therefore,  $(\underline{\mathcal{Z}}, \Sigma, \underline{\Omega}, \nabla, \Delta)$  is a triangulated category from Corollary 4.18.  $\square$

- Example 5.5.** (1) [25] Assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is Frobenius with  $\mathcal{P} = \text{Proj}_{\mathbb{E}} \mathcal{C}$ . Then a mutation triple  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P})$  satisfies (MT4). More generally, for any strongly functorially finite subcategory  $\mathcal{X}$ , a mutation triple  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{X})$  in  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{X}} \cap \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$  also satisfies (MT4).
- (2) [18] In the case of Example 3.11(3), then a mutation triple  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{D})$  satisfies (MT4).
- (3) [8] In the case of Example 3.11(4), then a mutation triple  $(\langle \mathcal{S}[1] \rangle, \mathcal{Z}, \langle \mathcal{S}[-1] \rangle)$  satisfies (MT4).
- (4) [24] In the case of Example 3.3(4) and we assume an additional condition that  $\text{Cone}_{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{X}}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{I}) = \text{CoCone}_{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{X}}}(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{S})$ . Then a mutation triple  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  satisfies (MT4).

*Proof.* (1) follows from  $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{V}$  and these are projective and injective. One can show (2) from  $\mathcal{Z}\langle -1 \rangle * \mathcal{Z}\langle 1 \rangle = \mathcal{Z} * \mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}$  and  $\text{Cone}_{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{X}}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{I}) \cap \mathcal{Z} = \text{CoCone}_{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{X}}}(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{S}) \cap \mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{D}$ . Since  $\text{Cone}_{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{X}}}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{I}) = \text{Cone}_{\mathbb{E}}(\mathcal{V}, 0) = \mathcal{V}[1] = \mathcal{S}[-1] = \text{CoCone}_{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{X}}}(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{S})$ , (3) holds. (4) is direct.  $\square$

The aim of this appendix is to introduce interesting examples of mutation triples. If the reader is interested in contents below, one can get more information about twin cotorsion pairs from [22, 24, 25] and mutation theories from [2, 7–9, 11, 16–18, 20, 21, 23, 27].

## APPENDIX A. TWIN COTORSION PAIRS

In this section, let  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$  be an ET category. We assume all subcategories are additive, full and closed under both isomorphisms and direct summands.

**A.1. Definitions and examples.** Before we define cotorsion pairs in ET categories, we recall that of torsion pairs in triangulated categories.

**Definition A.1.** [18, Definition 2.2] Assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is triangulated. A pair of subcategories of  $\mathcal{C}$ ,  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  is a *torsion pair* (*torsion theory*) of  $\mathcal{C}$  if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (i)  $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0$ .
- (ii)  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{U} * \mathcal{V}$ .

**Definition A.2.** [22, Definition 2.1] A pair of subcategories of  $\mathcal{C}$   $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  is a *cotorsion pair*, or *CP* of  $\mathcal{C}$  if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (i)  $\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0$ .
- (ii)  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Cone}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{U})$ .
- (iii)  $\mathcal{C} = \text{CoCone}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{U})$ .

**Remark A.3.** (1) If  $\mathcal{C}$  is triangulated, there exists the following one-to-one correspondence:

$$\{(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) \mid \text{cotorsion pair}\} \longleftrightarrow \{(\mathcal{U}[-1], \mathcal{V}) \mid \text{torsion pair}\}.$$

(2) By definition of CP, if  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  is CP, then

$$\mathcal{U} = \{X \in \mathcal{C} \mid \mathbb{E}(X, \mathcal{V}) = 0\} \text{ and } \mathcal{V} = \{X \in \mathcal{C} \mid \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{U}, X) = 0\}.$$

In particular,  $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}$  are closed under extensions.

(3) Let  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  be a CP. Then  $\mathcal{U}$  is strongly contravariantly finite in  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  is strongly covariantly finite in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

We sometimes use the following notation in this paper.

**Notation A.4.** Let  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$  be subcategories of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

- (1)  $\mathcal{X} *^1 \mathcal{Y} = \text{Cone}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{X})$ . Note that  $\mathcal{X} *^1 \mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{Y}[1]$  if  $\mathcal{C}$  is triangulated.
- (2)  $\mathcal{X} {}^1 * \mathcal{Y} = \text{CoCone}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{X})$ . Note that  $\mathcal{X} {}^1 * \mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X}[-1] * \mathcal{Y}$  if  $\mathcal{C}$  is triangulated.

We can consider “resolutions” of objects in  $\mathcal{C}$  with each CP. Thus, we can deal with different kinds of resolutions at the same time when there exists a pair of CPs. Next, we study special pairs of CPs.

**Definition A.5.** [22, Definition 2.3] [24, Definition 3.3]

- (1) Let  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  be CPs of  $\mathcal{C}$ . A pair of CP  $((\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}))$  is *twin cotorsion pair*, or *TCP* if  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{U}$ .
- (2) Let  $((\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}))$  be a TCP.  $((\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}))$  is called *concentric* if  $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{T} = \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V}$ .

**Example A.6.** (1) For any CP  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ , then  $((\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}))$  is a trivial concentric TCP.

(2) Assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  has enough projectives and enough injectives. Then  $((\text{Proj } \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}), (\mathcal{C}, \text{Inj } \mathcal{C}))$  is a TCP, which is not concentric in general.

- (3) [18] Assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a Krull-Schmidt triangulated category. If there exists a functorially finite rigid subcategory  $\mathcal{D}$ ,  $((\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}[-1]^\perp), (\perp\mathcal{D}[1], \mathcal{D}))$  is a concentric TCP.
- (4) [17, 20] Assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a Krull-Schmidt triangulated category. If there exists a functorially finite thick subcategory  $\mathcal{N}$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  and a CP of  $\mathcal{N}$   $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{V})$ , then  $((\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}[-1]^\perp), (\perp\mathcal{V}[1], \mathcal{V}))$  is a TCP.
- Moreover, if there exist a presilting subcategory  $\mathcal{P}'$  and a silting subcategory  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  where  $\mathcal{P}' \subset \mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{N} = \text{thick } \mathcal{P}'$ , then  $((\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}[-1]^\perp), (\perp\mathcal{V}[1], \mathcal{V}))$  is a concentric TCP with  $\mathcal{P}' = \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{S}[-1]^\perp$ .

We define some important subcategories.

**Definition A.7.** [22, Definition 2.5, 2.6] Let  $((\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}))$  be a TCP in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

- (1)  $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{U}$  is called *core* of the TCP.
- (2)  $\mathcal{C}^+ = \text{Cone}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{Z}) = \mathcal{Z} *^1 \mathcal{V}$ .
- (3)  $\mathcal{C}^- = \text{CoCone}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{S} {}^1_* \mathcal{Z}$ .
- (4)  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{C}^+ \cap \mathcal{C}^-$ .
- (5)  $\mathcal{H}/[\mathcal{Z}]$  is a *heart* of the TCP.

**Remark A.8.** For  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}, \tilde{\mathcal{T}}$  in Notation 3.4,  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}} \subset \mathcal{C}^-$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}} \subset \mathcal{C}^+$  hold. If  $\mathcal{I} \subset \text{Proj } \mathcal{C} \cap \text{Inj } \mathcal{C}$ , then  $\mathcal{C}^- = \tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  and  $\mathcal{C}^+ = \tilde{\mathcal{T}}$  hold.

**Example A.9.** (1) Let  $A$  be a ring. The derived category of  $A$ -modules  $\text{D}(A)$  has the standard  $t$ -structure  $(\text{D}^{\leq 0}(A), \text{D}^{> 0}(A))$ .

This induces a CP  $(\text{D}^{< 0}(A), \text{D}^{> 0}(A))$ . We regard this CP as a TCP like Example A.6(1).

- $\mathcal{Z} = \text{D}^{> 0}(A) \cap \text{D}^{< 0}(A) = 0$
  - $\mathcal{C}^+ = 0 *^1 \text{D}^{> 0}(A) = \text{D}^{\geq 0}(A)$
  - $\mathcal{C}^- = \text{D}^{< 0}(A) {}^1_* 0 = \text{D}^{\leq 0}(A)$  (aisle of the  $t$ -structure)
  - $\mathcal{H}/[\mathcal{Z}] = \mathcal{C}^+ \cap \mathcal{C}^- = \text{D}^0(A) \cong \text{Mod}(A)$  (heart of the  $t$ -structure)
- (2) Let  $A$  be a ring. The perfect derived category of  $A$  in  $\text{D}(A)$ , denoted by  $\text{per}(A)$ , has the standard co- $t$ -structure  $(\text{per}_{\geq 0}(A), \text{per}_{< 0}(A))$ .

This induces a CP  $(\text{per}_{\geq 0}(A), \text{per}_{\leq 0}(A))$ . We regard this CP as a TCP like Example A.6(1).

- $\mathcal{Z} = \text{per}_{\geq 0}(A) \cap \text{per}_{< 0}(A) = \text{add } A$  (co-heart of the co- $t$ -structure)
- $\mathcal{C}^+ = \text{add } A *^1 \text{per}_{< 0}(A) = \text{per}_{\leq 0}(A)$
- $\mathcal{C}^- = \text{per}_{\geq 0}(A) {}^1_* \text{add } A = \text{per}_{\geq 0}(A)$  (aisle of the co- $t$ -structure)
- $\mathcal{H}/[\mathcal{Z}] = \text{add } A / \text{add } A = 0$

Next, we introduce two types of TCPs which plays an important role in this paper.

**Definition A.10.** [24, Condition 6.1, Definition 6.6] [22, Definition 3.10, Proposition 3.12] Let  $((\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}))$  be a concentric TCP. We denote  $\mathcal{S} *^1 \mathcal{V}$  by  $\mathcal{N}^i$  and  $\mathcal{S} {}^1_* \mathcal{V}$  by  $\mathcal{N}^f$ .

- (1)  $((\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}))$  is called *Hovey* if  $\mathcal{N}^i = \mathcal{N}^f$ .
- (2)  $((\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}))$  is called *heart-equivalent* if  $\text{add}(\mathcal{S} * \mathcal{T}) = \text{add}(\mathcal{U} * \mathcal{V})$ .

**Example A.11.** Assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a Krull-Schmidt triangulated category.

- (1) [17] Assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  has a silting subcategory  $\mathcal{M}$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a presilting subcategory which is functorially finite in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then  $((\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}))$  defined as follows is Hovey.
  - $\mathcal{S} = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} \mathcal{P}[-i] * \cdots * \mathcal{P}$ .
  - $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{S}[-1]^\perp$ .
  - $\mathcal{U} := \perp\mathcal{V}[1]$ .

- $\mathcal{V} = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} \mathcal{P} * \cdots * \mathcal{P}[i]$ .
- (2) [20] Assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  has a simple-minded collection  $\mathcal{X}$  and let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be a subset of  $\mathcal{X}$ . We define  $\mathcal{P}$  as the extension closure of  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Assume that  $\mathcal{P}$  is functorially finite in  $\mathcal{C}$ , then  $((\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}))$  defined as follows is Hovey.
- $\mathcal{S} = \bigcup_{i > 0} \mathcal{P}[i] * \cdots * \mathcal{P}[1]$ .
  - $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{S}[-1]^\perp$ .
  - $\mathcal{U} = {}^\perp \mathcal{V}[1]$ .
  - $\mathcal{V} = \bigcup_{i > 0} \mathcal{P}[-1] * \cdots * \mathcal{P}[-i]$ .
- (3) [18] We additionally assume  $\mathcal{C}$  is  $k$ -linear Hom-finite and has a Serre functor  $\mathbb{S}$ , where  $k$  is a field. Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a functorially finite rigid subcategory in  $\mathcal{C}$ . If  $\mathcal{D}$  is  $\mathbb{S}_2$ -subcategory (see Appendix B.13),  $((\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}[-1]^\perp), ({}^\perp \mathcal{D}[1], \mathcal{D}))$  is heart-equivalent.

**A.2. Relations between conic conflations and monic morphisms.** The following statement is used in Example 3.11. In this section, we denote  $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{T}$  by  $\mathcal{I}$  for a concentric TCP  $((\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}))$ .

**Definition A.12.** [24, Definition 4.4] Let  $((\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}))$  be a concentric TCP. Let  $A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \xrightarrow{-\delta} A$  be an  $\mathfrak{s}$ -triangle.

- (1)  $A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \xrightarrow{-\delta} A$  is called  $\mathcal{U}$ -conic if  $A, B \in \mathcal{Z}$  and  $C \in \mathcal{U}$ .
- (2)  $A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \xrightarrow{-\delta} A$  is called  $\mathcal{T}$ -coconic if  $B, C \in \mathcal{Z}$  and  $A \in \mathcal{T}$ .

In [24, Definition 4.4],  $\mathcal{U}$ -conic is defined in triangulated categories.

**Lemma A.13.** Let  $((\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}))$  be a concentric TCP. Let  $A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \xrightarrow{-\delta} A$  be an  $\mathfrak{s}$ -triangle.

- (1) Assume  $A, B \in \mathcal{Z}$ , then

$$A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \xrightarrow{-\delta} A \text{ is } \mathcal{U}\text{-conic.} \iff x \text{ is } \mathcal{I}\text{-monic.}$$

- (2) Assume  $B, C \in \mathcal{Z}$ , then

$$A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \xrightarrow{-\delta} A \text{ is } \mathcal{T}\text{-coconic.} \iff y \text{ is } \mathcal{I}\text{-epic.}$$

*Proof.* We only prove (1). Assume that  $A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \xrightarrow{-\delta} A$  is  $\mathcal{U}$ -conic. Then  $\mathbb{E}(C, \mathcal{I}) = 0$ , so  $x$  is  $\mathcal{I}$ -monic. On the other hand, assume that  $x$  is  $\mathcal{I}$ -monic. From  $\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{I}) = 0$  and long exact sequence,  $\mathbb{E}(C, \mathcal{I}) = 0$ . Take a conflation  $V \rightarrow U \rightarrow C \xrightarrow{-\delta'}$  where  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ . Then we obtain the following diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & V & \xlongequal{\quad} & V & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & \circ & & \circ & & \\
 A & \longrightarrow & U' & \longrightarrow & U & \dashrightarrow & A \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & \circ & & \circ & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 A & \xrightarrow{x} & B & \xrightarrow{y} & C & \dashrightarrow & A \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & \delta' & & \delta'' & & \\
 & & V & \xlongequal{\quad} & V & & 
 \end{array}$$

Note that  $U' \in \mathcal{U}$  since  $A, U \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{U}$  is closed under extensions. From  $\delta' \in \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V}) = 0$ ,  $V \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{I}$ . Thus,  $\delta'' \in \mathbb{E}(C, \mathcal{I}) = 0$ . Therefore,  $C \in \mathcal{U}$ .  $\square$

**A.3. Triangulated structures induced by concentric TCPs.** The following definition is well-defined from [22].

**Definition A.14.** [22, Definition 2.18] Let  $((\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}))$  be a concentric TCP and  $X \in \mathcal{C}$ .

- (1) There exist  $X^+ \in \mathcal{C}^+$  and the following commutative diagram in  $\mathcal{C}$  where  $S \in \mathcal{S}, U \in \mathcal{U}, Z \in \mathcal{Z}$  and  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & S & \xlongequal{\quad} & S & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & \circ & & \rho^X & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 V & \longrightarrow & U & \longrightarrow & X & \dashrightarrow & V \\
 \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
 & & \circ & & r^X & & \circ \\
 V & \longrightarrow & Z & \longrightarrow & X^+ & \dashrightarrow & V \\
 \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
 & & \circ & & s^X & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & S & \xlongequal{\quad} & S & & 
 \end{array}$$

Moreover,  $(\cdot)^+ : \mathcal{C}/[\mathcal{I}] \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^+/\mathcal{I}$  is a left adjoint functor of the inclusion functor  $\mathcal{C}^+/\mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}/[\mathcal{I}]$ .

- (2) There exist  $X^- \in \mathcal{C}^-$  and the following commutative diagrams in  $\mathcal{C}$  where  $S \in \mathcal{S}, T \in \mathcal{T}, Z \in \mathcal{Z}$  and  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & S & \xlongequal{\quad} & S & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & \circ & & \rho^X & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 V & \xrightarrow{r^X} & X^- & \xrightarrow{s^X} & X & \dashrightarrow & V \\
 \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
 & & \circ & & \rho^X & & \circ \\
 V & \longrightarrow & Z & \longrightarrow & T & \dashrightarrow & V \\
 \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
 & & \circ & & & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & S & \xlongequal{\quad} & S & & 
 \end{array}$$

Moreover,  $(\cdot)^- : \mathcal{C}/[\mathcal{I}] \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^-/\mathcal{I}$  is a right adjoint functor of the inclusion functor  $\mathcal{C}^-/\mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}/[\mathcal{I}]$ .

**Theorem A.15.** [24, Remark 5.8] Let  $((\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}))$  be a concentric TCP. We assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a triangulated category and following conditions:

- (i)  $\mathcal{T}^+/\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{N}^f/\mathcal{I}$ .  
(ii)  $\mathcal{U}^-/\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{N}^i/\mathcal{I}$ .

Let  $(\underline{\mathcal{Z}}, \Sigma, \Omega, \nabla, \Delta)$  be a pretriangulated category defined by a mutation triple  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V})$  in Theorem 4.17. Then  $(\underline{\mathcal{Z}}, \Sigma, \Omega, \nabla, \Delta)$  is a triangulated category.

*Proof.* See [24, Remark 5.8]. □

## APPENDIX B. MUTATION THEORY OF RIGID SUBCATEGORIES

The aim of this section is to introduce rigid mutation pairs. For detail, see [2, 18].

We assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a triangulated category and  $k$  is a field in this section. In this case,  $\mathbb{E}(-, -) = \mathcal{C}(-, -[1])$ . We also assume that all subcategories are full, additive and closed under isomorphisms and direct summands.

### B.1. Definitions and examples.

**Definition B.1.** [18, Section 3] [17, 2.3] Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $n \geq 2$  be an integer.

- (1)  $\mathcal{D}$  is *(n-)rigid* if for any integer  $0 < i < n$ ,  $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}[i]) = 0$ .
- (2)  $\mathcal{D}$  is *presilting* if for any positive integers  $i$ ,  $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}[i]) = 0$ .

**Remark B.2.** [18, Section 3] We often use *rigid* instead of 2-rigid.

**Example B.3.** [2, 6]

- (1) Let  $A$  be a finite dimensional  $k$ -algebra and  $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{D}^b(A)$ . Then  $\mathbf{add} A$  is a pre-silting subcategory (in this case, this subcategory is also a silting subcategory.)
- (2) Let  $Q$  be a Dynkin quiver and  $H = kQ$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the cluster category of  $H$  (for detail, see [6].) Then  $\mathbf{add} H$  is a rigid subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$  (in this case, this subcategory is also cluster-tilting subcategory).

### B.2. Rigid mutation pairs.

**Definition B.4.** [18, Definition 2.5] Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a functorially finite rigid subcategory. Let  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$  be subcategories where  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$ . We define the following two subcategories:

- (1)  $\mu^+(\mathcal{X}; \mathcal{D}) = (\mathcal{D} * \mathcal{X}[1]) \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{D}[1]$ .
- (2)  $\mu^-(\mathcal{Y}; \mathcal{D}) = (\mathcal{Y}[-1] * \mathcal{D}) \cap \mathcal{D}[-1]^\perp$ .

Then  $\mu^+(\mathcal{X}; \mathcal{D})$  is called *left mutation* of  $\mathcal{X}$  by  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mu^-(\mathcal{Y}; \mathcal{D})$  is called *right mutation* of  $\mathcal{Y}$  by  $\mathcal{D}$ .

**Remark B.5.** There are different notations about  $\mu^+$  and  $\mu^-$ . This paper used the notations in [1] not [2, 18]. That is because notations in Definition B.4 are “compatible” with [1], that is,  $\mu^+(\mathcal{X}; 0) = \mathcal{X}[1]$ .

**Lemma B.6.** In Definition B.4, the following equalities hold:

- (1)  $\mu^+(\mathcal{X}; \mathcal{D}) = \text{Cone}_{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})$ .
- (2)  $\mu^-(\mathcal{Y}; \mathcal{D}) = \text{CoCone}_{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{Y})$ .

*Proof.* We only show (1). Take  $Z \in \mu^+(\mathcal{X}; \mathcal{D})$ . Since  $Z \in \mathcal{D} * \mathcal{X}[1]$ , there exists a triangle  $X \xrightarrow{f} D \xrightarrow{g} Z \xrightarrow{h} X[1]$  where  $X \in \mathcal{X}, D \in \mathcal{D}$ . From  $Z[-1] \in {}^\perp \mathcal{D}$ ,  $f$  is a left  $\mathcal{D}$ -approximation. Let  $Z \in \text{Cone}_{\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathcal{X}; \mathcal{D})$ , then  $Z \in \mathcal{D} * \mathcal{X}[1]$ . From the long exact sequence,  $Z \in {}^\perp \mathcal{D}[1]$ .  $\square$

From the above proof, we can consider object-wise left (resp. right) mutation.

**Definition B.7.** [18, Section 2] In Definition B.4., we can define the following functors by Lemma 2.23.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle 1 \rangle: \mathcal{X}/[\mathcal{D}] &\rightarrow \mu^+(\mathcal{X}; \mathcal{D})/[\mathcal{D}] \\ \langle -1 \rangle: \mathcal{Y}/[\mathcal{D}] &\rightarrow \mu^-(\mathcal{Y}; \mathcal{D})/[\mathcal{D}] \end{aligned}$$

In the rest of this section, we denote  $\mu^+(\mathcal{X}; \mathcal{D})$  by  $\mathcal{X}\langle 1 \rangle$  and  $\mu^-(\mathcal{Y}; \mathcal{D})$  by  $\mathcal{Y}\langle -1 \rangle$ .

The following statement is a corollary of Lemma 2.33.

**Proposition B.8.** [18, Proposition 2.6, 2.7] Assume that  $\mathcal{D}$  is a functorially finite rigid subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

- (1)  $\langle 1 \rangle: \mathcal{D}[-1]^\perp \rightarrow {}^\perp \mathcal{D}[1]$  and  $\langle -1 \rangle: {}^\perp \mathcal{D}[1] \rightarrow \mathcal{D}[-1]^\perp$  are mutually quasi-inverse.

(2) (1) induces the following one-to-one correspondence of subcategories.

$$\langle 1 \rangle: \{ \mathcal{X}: \text{subcategory} \mid \mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{D}[-1]^\perp \} \rightleftharpoons \\ \{ \mathcal{Y}: \text{subcategory} \mid \mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{Y} \subset {}^\perp \mathcal{D}[1] \}: \langle -1 \rangle$$

*Proof.* Since  $\mathcal{D}$  is rigid,  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}[-1]^\perp) \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}^\perp) = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}({}^\perp \mathcal{D}[1], \mathcal{D}) \subset \mathcal{C}({}^\perp \mathcal{D}[1], \mathcal{D}[1]) = 0$ . From Lemma 2.33 and  $(\mathcal{D}[-1]^\perp)\langle 1 \rangle = {}^\perp \mathcal{D}[1]$ , then (1) follows. (2) is direct from (1).  $\square$

**Definition B.9.** [18, Definition 2.5] Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a functorially finite rigid subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Let  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  be subcategories of  $\mathcal{C}$  containing  $\mathcal{D}$ .

We call a pair of subcategories  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$  a *rigid  $\mathcal{D}$ -mutation pair* if  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{D}[-1]^\perp$  and  $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X}\langle 1 \rangle$ .

**Example B.10.** [18] Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a functorially finite rigid subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$ . The following pairs of subcategories are elementary examples of rigid mutation pairs.

- (1)  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D})$  is a rigid  $\mathcal{D}$ -mutation pair.
- (2)  $(\mathcal{D}[-1]^\perp, {}^\perp \mathcal{D}[1])$  is a rigid  $\mathcal{D}$ -mutation pair.
- (3) For any subcategory  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}[1])$  is a rigid 0-mutation pair.

**B.3. Triangulated structures induced by rigid mutation pairs.** The following statement is Theorem 4.2 in [18].

**Condition B.11.** [18, Section 4] Let  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{Z}$  be subcategories of  $\mathcal{C}$ . We consider the following conditions:

- (IY1)  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{C}$  is functorially finite.
- (IY2)  $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$  is a rigid  $\mathcal{D}$ -mutation pair.
- (IY3)  $\mathcal{Z}$  is closed under extensions.

**Theorem B.12.** [18, Theorem 4.2] We assume (IY1), (IY2) and (IY3) in Condition B.11.

Then,  $(\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{D}], \langle 1 \rangle, \Delta)$  is a triangulated category, where distinguished triangles are defined as follows:

For  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  in  $\mathcal{Z}$ , we define a distinguished triangle  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \xrightarrow{h} X\langle 1 \rangle$  in  $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{D}]$  by the following diagram in  $\mathcal{C}$

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X & \xrightarrow{i^X} & D^X & \xrightarrow{p^X} & X\langle 1 \rangle & \longrightarrow & X[1] \\ \downarrow f & \circ & \downarrow & \circ & \parallel & \circ & \downarrow f[1] \\ Y & \xrightarrow{g} & Z & \xrightarrow{h} & X\langle 1 \rangle & \longrightarrow & Y[1] \end{array}$$

and

$$\Delta = \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{sequences in } \mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{D}] \text{ isomorphic to one in} \\ \{ X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \xrightarrow{h} X\langle 1 \rangle \mid f \text{ is a morphism in } \mathcal{Z} \} \end{array} \right).$$

In the last of this section, we introduce important examples of rigid mutation pairs. We assume  $\mathcal{C}$  is a  $k$ -category and has a Serre functor  $\mathbb{S}$  in Definition B.13 and Example B.14.

**Definition B.13.** [18, Section 3] [8, Definition 2.5] Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $n$  be an integer.

- (1) We define  $\mathbb{S}_n$  by  $\mathbb{S} \circ [-n]$ .
- (2)  $\mathcal{D}$  is  $\mathbb{S}_n$ -stable if  $\mathcal{D} = \mathbb{S}_n(\mathcal{D})$ .

**Example B.14.** [18] Let  $n \geq 2$  be an integer and  $\mathcal{D}$  be a functorially finite  $n$ -rigid  $\mathbb{S}_n$ -stable subcategory.

Then  $\mathcal{Z} = \bigcap_{0 < i < n} {}^\perp \mathcal{D}[i]$  satisfies (IY1), (IY2) and (IY3).



## APPENDIX C. MUTATION THEORY OF SIMPLE-MINDED SYSTEMS

**C.1. Definitions and examples.** We collect some information about mutations of simple-minded systems in this section. For details, see [8, 11].

In this section, we assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a Krull-Schmidt triangulated  $k$ -category ( $k$  is a field) and has a Serre functor  $\mathbb{S}$ . For  $\mathcal{S} \subset \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$ , we denote the extension closure of  $\mathcal{S}$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  by  $\langle \mathcal{S} \rangle$ .

**Definition C.1.** [8, Definition 2.1] [3, Definition 1.1] [21, Definition 3.2]

Let  $\mathcal{S} = \{S_i \mid i \in I\} \subset \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$  where  $S_i \neq S_j$  for  $i \neq j$ , and  $n \geq 1$ .

- (1)  $\mathcal{S}$  is *n-orthogonal* if  $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{S}[i], \mathcal{S}) = 0$  for any  $0 < i < n$ .
- (2)  $\mathcal{S}$  is a *semibrick* if  $\mathcal{C}(S_i, S_j) = \begin{cases} \text{division ring} & (i = j) \\ 0 & (\text{else}) \end{cases} \quad (S_i, S_j \in \mathcal{S})$
- (3)  $\mathcal{S}$  is a *pre n-simple-minded system (pre n-SMS)* if  $\mathcal{S}$  is an  $n$ -orthogonal semibrick.
- (4)  $\mathcal{S}$  is a *simple-minded collection (SMC)* if  $\mathcal{S}$  is an  $n$ -orthogonal semibrick for any  $n \geq 2$  and  $\mathcal{C} = \text{thick } \mathcal{S}$ .

**Remark C.2.** (1) The definition of “ $n$ -orthogonal” is not coincident with that in [8, Definition 2.1].

(2) We often use *orthogonal* instead of 2-orthogonal.

**Example C.3.** (1) [21] Let  $A$  be a finite dimensional  $k$ -algebra. Then  $\mathcal{S} = \{\text{simple } A\text{-modules}\}$  is an SMC of  $\text{D}^b(A)$ .

(2) [19, 20] Let  $H$  be a path algebra of Dynkin diagram. A dg  $k$ -algebra  $A = H \oplus DH[1 - d]$  is defined by zero differential for  $d \geq 1$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a complete system of representatives of simple  $H^0 A$ -modules with respect to isomorphism class. Then  $\mathcal{S}$  is a  $(-d)$ -SMS of  $(-d)$ -cluster category  $\text{D}^b(A)/\nu[d]$  where  $\nu$  is a Nakayama functor of  $\text{D}^b(A)$ .

**C.2. Mutation pairs of simple-minded type.** Let  $\mathcal{S} \subset \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$  and fix it.

**Condition C.4.** [8, Setup 3.5] We consider the following conditions for  $\mathcal{S}$ .

- (SP1) (i)  $\mathcal{S}$  is a semibrick and  $\langle \mathcal{S} \rangle \subset \mathcal{C}$  is functorially finite.
- (ii)  $\mathcal{S}$  is orthogonal or  $\mathbb{S}_{-1}$ -stable.

**Definition C.5.** [8, Definition 3.1, Lemma 3.3] [11, Section 4] We assume (SP1)(i). Let  $X \in \mathcal{C}$ .

(1)  $\omega X$  is defined (uniquely up to isomorphisms) by the following triangle.

$$\omega X \xrightarrow{f^X} X \xrightarrow{g^X} S^X \xrightarrow{h^X} \omega X[1]$$

where  $g^X$  is a left minimal  $\langle \mathcal{S} \rangle$ -approximation.

(2)  $\sigma X$  is defined (uniquely up to isomorphisms) by the following triangle.

$$S_X \xrightarrow{f_X} X \xrightarrow{g_X} \sigma X \xrightarrow{h_X} S_X[1]$$

where  $f_X$  is a right minimal  $\langle \mathcal{S} \rangle$ -approximation.

**Remark C.6.** From Wakamatsu’s lemma,  $\omega X \in {}^\perp \mathcal{S}$  and  $\sigma X \in \mathcal{S}^\perp$ .

**Lemma C.7.** [8, Lemma 2.6(1)] We assume (SP1)(i). Let  $X \in \mathcal{C}$ .

- (1) If  $X \in {}^\perp \mathcal{S}[-1]$ , then  $\omega X \in {}^\perp \mathcal{S}[-1]$ .
- (2) If  $X \in \mathcal{S}[1]^\perp$ , then  $\sigma X \in \mathcal{S}[1]^\perp$ .

*Proof.* See [8, Lemma 2.6(1)]. □

**Corollary C.8.** (1)  $\omega: {}^\perp \mathcal{S}[-1] \rightarrow {}^\perp \mathcal{S}[-1] \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{S}$  is an additive functor.

(2)  $\sigma: \mathcal{S}[1]^\perp \rightarrow \mathcal{S}[1]^\perp \cap \mathcal{S}^\perp$  is an additive functor.

*Proof.* We only prove (1). Take  $a: X \rightarrow Y$ .  $a$  induces  $b: \omega X \rightarrow \omega Y$  since  $X \xrightarrow{g^X} S^X$  is a left  $\langle \mathcal{S} \rangle$ -approximation and (TR3). Uniqueness of  $b$  follows from  $\omega X \in {}^\perp \mathcal{S}[-1]$ .  $\square$

**Lemma C.9.** [8, Lemma 2.6(3)] We assume (SP1).

- (1) If  $X \in \mathcal{S}^\perp$ , then  $\omega X \in \mathcal{S}^\perp$ .
- (2) If  $X \in {}^\perp \mathcal{S}$ , then  $\sigma X \in {}^\perp \mathcal{S}$ .

*Proof.* We only prove (2). If  $\mathcal{S}$  is  $n$ -orthogonal, this is clear. If  $\mathcal{S}$  is  $\mathbb{S}_{-1}$ -stable, this follows from [8, Lemma 2.6(3)].  $\square$

**Corollary C.10.** We denote  ${}^\perp \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{S}^\perp$  by  ${}^\perp \mathcal{S}^\perp$ . Assume (SP1).

- (1)  $\omega: {}^\perp \mathcal{S}[-1] \cap \mathcal{S}^\perp \rightarrow {}^\perp \mathcal{S}[-1] \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{S}^\perp$  is an additive functor.
- (2)  $\sigma: \mathcal{S}[1]^\perp \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}[1]^\perp \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{S}^\perp$  is an additive functor.

**Definition C.11.** [8, Definition 3.1] Assume (SP1). We define following functors.

- (1)  $\Omega = \omega \circ [-1]: {}^\perp \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{S}[1]^\perp \rightarrow {}^\perp \mathcal{S}[-1] \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{S}^\perp$ , called *left mutation*.
- (2)  $\Sigma = \sigma \circ [1]: \mathcal{S}^\perp \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{S}[-1] \rightarrow \mathcal{S}[1]^\perp \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{S}^\perp$ , called *right mutation*.

**Proposition C.12.** [8, Lemma 3.6] Assume (SP1).

- (1)  $\Sigma$  and  $\Omega$  are mutually quasi-inverse.
- (2) (1) induces the following one-to-one correspondence of subcategories.

$$\Sigma: \{\mathcal{X}: \text{subcategory} \mid \mathcal{X} \subset {}^\perp \mathcal{S}^\perp \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{S}[-1]\} \rightleftarrows \{\mathcal{Y}: \text{subcategory} \mid \mathcal{Y} \subset {}^\perp \mathcal{S}^\perp \cap \mathcal{S}[1]^\perp\} : \Omega$$

where  $\Sigma \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}[1] * \langle \mathcal{S}[1] \rangle \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{S}[1] \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{S}^\perp$  and

$$\Omega \mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Y}[-1] * \langle \mathcal{S}[-1] \rangle \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{S}[-1] \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{S}^\perp.$$

*Proof.* For (1), see [8, Lemma 3.6]. We only prove  $\Sigma \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}[1] * \langle \mathcal{S}[1] \rangle \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{S}[1] \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{S}^\perp$ .

By definition,  $\Sigma \mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{X}[1] * \langle \mathcal{S}[1] \rangle \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{S}[1] \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{S}^\perp$ . Take  $Z \in \mathcal{X}[1] * \langle \mathcal{S}[1] \rangle \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{S}[1] \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{S}^\perp$ . Then there exists a triangle  $Z[-1] \rightarrow S \xrightarrow{f} X[1] \rightarrow Z$  where  $S \in \langle \mathcal{S} \rangle, X \in \mathcal{X}$ . From  $Z \in \mathcal{S}^\perp$ ,  $f$  is a right  $\langle \mathcal{S} \rangle$ -approximation. Assume that  $f$  is not right minimal. Then  $Z[-1]$  and  $S$  has a nonzero common direct summand. However, this contradicts  $Z[-1] \in {}^\perp \mathcal{S}$ . Thus,  $f$  is right minimal. Therefore,  $Z \cong \sigma(X[1]) = \Sigma X$ .  $\square$

**Definition C.13.** [8, Definition 3.2] Let  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$  be subcategories of  $\mathcal{C}$  and assume (SP1). A pair of subcategories  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$  is a *simple-minded  $\langle \mathcal{S} \rangle$ -mutation pair* if  $\mathcal{X} \subset {}^\perp \mathcal{S}[-1] \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{S}^\perp$  and  $\Sigma \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y}$ .

**Remark C.14.** In [8], they define (simple-minded)  $\langle \mathcal{S} \rangle$ -mutation pair for a collection  $\mathcal{S}$  in  $\text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$  where  $\langle \mathcal{S} \rangle \subset \mathcal{C}$  is functorially finite. From Proposition C.12, the definition of simple-minded mutation pairs in [8] is equivalent to that in Definition C.13.

### C.3. Triangulated structures induced by simple-minded mutation pairs.

The following statement is Theorem 5.1 in [8]. We start from introducing some conditions for simple-minded  $\langle \mathcal{S} \rangle$ -mutation pairs satisfying (SP1).

**Condition C.15.** [8, Theorem 4.1] We assume  $\mathcal{S}$  satisfies (SP1). Let  $\mathcal{Z}$  be a subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

- (SP2)  $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z})$  is a simple-minded  $\langle \mathcal{S} \rangle$ -mutation pair.
- (SP3) (i)  $\text{Cone}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z}) \subset \langle \mathcal{S} \rangle * \mathcal{Z}$ .
- (ii)  $\text{CoCone}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z}) \subset \mathcal{Z} * \langle \mathcal{S} \rangle$ .
- (iii)  $\mathcal{Z}$  is closed under extensions.

**Theorem C.16.** [8, Theorem 4.1,5.1] We assume (SP1), (SP2) and (SP3) in Condition C.15.

Then,  $(\mathcal{Z}, \Sigma, \Delta)$  is a triangulated category, where distinguished triangles are defined as follows:

For  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  in  $\mathcal{Z}$ , we define a distinguished triangle  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \xrightarrow{h} \Sigma X$  in  $\mathcal{Z}$  by the following diagram in  $\mathcal{C}$

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 X & \longrightarrow & 0 & \longrightarrow & X[1] & \xlongequal{\quad} & X[1] \\
 \downarrow f & & \circ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow f[1] \\
 Y & \xrightarrow{g'} & Z' & \xrightarrow{h'} & X[1] & \xrightarrow{f[1]} & Y[1] \\
 & \searrow g & \downarrow g_{Z'} & \circ & \downarrow g_{X[1]} & & \\
 & & Z & \xrightarrow{h} & \Sigma X & & 
 \end{array}$$

where  $Z = \sigma Z'$  and  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g'} Z' \xrightarrow{h'} X[1]$  is a triangle. Then

$$\Delta = \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{sequences in } \mathcal{Z} \text{ isomorphic to one in} \\ \{X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \xrightarrow{h} \Sigma X \mid f \text{ is a morphism in } \mathcal{Z}\} \end{array} \right).$$

**Example C.17.** [8, Lemma 6.3] Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a  $\mathbb{S}_{-n}$ -stable pre  $n$ -SMS for  $n \geq 1$ . Let  $\mathcal{Z} = \bigcap_{i=0}^n \mathcal{S}[i]^\perp$ . Then  $\mathcal{Z}$  satisfies (SP1), (SP2) and (SP3).

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank H. Nakaoka for his careful reading and valuable suggestions to improve this paper.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Takahide Adachi, Osamu Iyama, and Idun Reiten.  $\tau$ -tilting theory. *Compos. Math.*, 150(3):415–452, 2014.
- [2] Takuma Aihara and Osamu Iyama. Silting mutation in triangulated categories. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 85(3):633–668, 2012.
- [3] Sota Asai. Semibricks. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (16):4993–5054, 2020.
- [4] Ibrahim Assem, Daniel Simson, and Andrzej Skowroński. *Elements of the representation theory of associative algebras. Vol. 1*, volume 65 of *London Mathematical Society Student Texts*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006. Techniques of representation theory.
- [5] Apostolos Beligiannis and Idun Reiten. Homological and homotopical aspects of torsion theories. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 188(883):viii+207, 2007.
- [6] Aslak Bakke Buan, Robert Marsh, Markus Reineke, Idun Reiten, and Gordana Todorov. Tilting theory and cluster combinatorics. *Adv. Math.*, 204(2):572–618, 2006.
- [7] Raquel Coelho Simões. Mutations of simple-minded systems in Calabi-Yau categories generated by a spherical object. *Forum Math.*, 29(5):1065–1081, 2017.
- [8] Raquel Coelho Simões and David Pauksztello. Simple-minded systems and reduction for negative Calabi-Yau triangulated categories. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 373(4):2463–2498, 2020.
- [9] Raquel Coelho Simões, David Pauksztello, and David Ploog. Functorially finite hearts, simple-minded systems in negative cluster categories, and noncrossing partitions. *Compos. Math.*, 158(1):211–243, 2022. Appendix by Coelho Simões, Pauksztello and Alexandra Zvonareva.
- [10] Peter Dräxler, Idun Reiten, Sverre O. Smalø, and Øyvind Solberg. Exact categories and vector space categories. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 351(2):647–682, 1999. With an appendix by B. Keller.
- [11] Alex Dugas. Torsion pairs and simple-minded systems in triangulated categories. *Appl. Categ. Structures*, 23(3):507–526, 2015.
- [12] Xin Fang, Mikhail Gorsky, Yann Palu, Pierre-Guy Plamondon, and Matthew Pressland. Extriangulated ideal quotients, with applications to cluster theory and gentle algebras, 2024. arXiv:2308.05524.
- [13] Mikhail Gorsky, Hiroyuki Nakaoka, and Yann Palu. Hereditary extriangulated categories: Silting objects, mutation, negative extensions, 2023. arXiv:2303.07134.
- [14] Dieter Happel. *Triangulated categories in the representation theory of finite-dimensional algebras*, volume 119 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988.
- [15] Martin Herschend, Yu Liu, and Hiroyuki Nakaoka.  $n$ -exangulated categories (I): Definitions and fundamental properties. *J. Algebra*, 570:531–586, 2021.
- [16] Osamu Iyama and Haibo Jin. Positive Fuss-Catalan numbers and simple-minded systems in negative Calabi-Yau categories. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (8):6624–6647, 2023.
- [17] Osamu Iyama and Dong Yang. Silting reduction and Calabi-Yau reduction of triangulated categories. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 370(11):7861–7898, 2018.
- [18] Osamu Iyama and Yuji Yoshino. Mutation in triangulated categories and rigid Cohen-Macaulay modules. *Invent. Math.*, 172(1):117–168, 2008.
- [19] Haibo Jin. Cohen-Macaulay differential graded modules and negative Calabi-Yau configurations. *Adv. Math.*, 374:107338, 59, 2020.
- [20] Haibo Jin. Reductions of triangulated categories and simple-minded collections. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 107(4):1482–1518, 2023.
- [21] Steffen Koenig and Dong Yang. Silting objects, simple-minded collections,  $t$ -structures and co- $t$ -structures for finite-dimensional algebras. *Doc. Math.*, 19:403–438, 2014.
- [22] Yu Liu and Hiroyuki Nakaoka. Hearts of twin cotorsion pairs on extriangulated categories. *J. Algebra*, 528:96–149, 2019.
- [23] Yu Liu and Bin Zhu. Triangulated quotient categories. *Comm. Algebra*, 41(10):3720–3738, 2013.
- [24] Hiroyuki Nakaoka. A simultaneous generalization of mutation and recollement of cotorsion pairs on a triangulated category. *Appl. Categ. Structures*, 26(3):491–544, 2018.
- [25] Hiroyuki Nakaoka and Yann Palu. Extriangulated categories, Hovey twin cotorsion pairs and model structures. *Cah. Topol. Géom. Différ. Catég.*, 60(2):117–193, 2019.
- [26] Aran Tattar. Right triangulated categories: As extriangulated categories, aisles and co-aisles, 2021. arXiv:2106.09107.
- [27] Panyue Zhou and Bin Zhu. Triangulated quotient categories revisited. *J. Algebra*, 502:196–232, 2018.