

PSEUDOSKEW CATEGORY ALGEBRAS AND MODULES OVER REPRESENTATIONS OF SMALL CATEGORIES

MAWEI WU

ABSTRACT. Let \mathcal{C} be a small category and let R be a representation of the category \mathcal{C} , that is, a pseudofunctor from a small category to the category of small preadditive categories. In this paper, we mainly study the category $\text{Mod-}R$ of right modules over R . We characterize it both as a category of the Abelian group valued functors on $Gr(R)$ and as a category of modules over a new family of algebras: the pseudoskew category algebras $R[\mathcal{C}]$, where $Gr(R)$ is the linear Grothendieck construction of R . Moreover, we also classify the hereditary torsion pairs in $\text{Mod-}R$ and reprove a result ([2, Theorem 3.18]) of Estrada and Virili.

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Preliminaries	2
2.1.	Modules over representations of small categories	3
2.2.	Linear Grothendieck constructions and pseudoskew category algebras	4
3.	Two characterizations of categories of modules over representations of a small category	6
3.1.	Characterizing it as functor categories	6
3.2.	Characterizing it as module categories of algebras	14
	Acknowledgments	15
	References	15

1. INTRODUCTION

Let \mathcal{C} be a small category and let $R : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Add}$ be a *representation of the category \mathcal{C}* which is a pseudofunctor from a small category \mathcal{C} to the category of small preadditive categories Add (see Definition 2.1.1 for its precise definition). Given a representation R of the category \mathcal{C} , one can consider *the category $\text{Mod-}R$ of right modules over R* (see Definition 2.1.3). For our purpose, we change slightly the definition of R -modules in [2, Definition 3.6] (see Remark 2.1.4). In 2017, Estrada and Virili showed that the category of right R -modules $\text{Mod-}R$ is a Grothendieck category, and if \mathcal{C} is a poset, it also has a projective generator (see [2, Theorem 3.18]). In this paper, we try to investigate the category $\text{Mod-}R$ further. We obtain two characterizations of it, both as a functor category and as a category of modules over an algebra.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 18A25, 18E10, 16D90, 18F20, 16S90.

Key words and phrases. pseudoskew category algebra, functor category, pseudofunctor, torsion pair, representation, Grothendieck construction, Grothendieck topology.

Given a representation R of the category, one can define the linear Grothendieck construction $Gr(R)$ of it (see Definition 2.2.1). Our first result characterizes the category $\text{Mod-}R$ as a functor category, and reproves (actually our result is slightly more general) Estrada and Virili's result [2, Theorem 3.18] with different method.

Theorem A. *(Theorem 3.1.4 and Corollary 3.1.5) Let \mathcal{C} be a small category and let $R : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Add}$ be a representation of the category \mathcal{C} , then we have the following equivalence*

$$\text{Mod-}R \simeq (Gr(R)^{\text{op}}, \text{Ab}).$$

Consequently, the category of right R -modules $\text{Mod-}R$ is a Grothendieck category and has a projective generator.

The first part of Theorem A above can be viewed as the pseudofunctor analogue of the Howe's result in trivial topology case (see [3, Proposition 5] or Theorem 3.1.3). With the help of Theorem A, we can classify all the hereditary torsion pairs in $\text{Mod-}R$ by the linear Grothendieck topologies on $Gr(R)$. For the definitions of hereditary torsion pairs and linear Grothendieck topologies, one can see [6, Definition 2.3.1 & 2.3.2 and Definition 2.1.15].

Theorem B. *(Corollary 3.1.7) Let \mathcal{C} be a small category and let $R : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Add}$ be a representation of the category \mathcal{C} . Then there is an (explicit) one-to-one correspondence between linear Grothendieck topologies on $Gr(R)$ and hereditary torsion pairs in $\text{Mod-}R$.*

Given a representation R of a small category \mathcal{C} , we introduce a new family of algebras associated to it, so-called the *pseudoskew category algebras* (see Definition 2.2.2). The pseudoskew category algebras include skew category algebras (see [7, Definition 3.2.1]) as special cases. Our second characterization of $\text{Mod-}R$ is as follows, which says that $\text{Mod-}R$ is equivalent to a category of modules over a pseudoskew category algebra $R[\mathcal{C}]$. The following Theorem can be seen as a higher analogue of the [7, Theorem A].

Theorem C. *(Theorem 3.2.1) Let \mathcal{C} be a small category and let $R : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Add}$ be a representation of the category \mathcal{C} . If $\text{Ob } \mathcal{C} < +\infty$ and $\text{Ob } R(i) < +\infty$ for all $i \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{C}$, then we have the following equivalence*

$$\text{Mod-}R \simeq \text{Mod-}R[\mathcal{C}].$$

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the definitions of the representation of a small category and its right modules, as well as the linear Grothendieck constructions are recalled. Then, a new notion, so-called the pseudoskew category algebra, is introduced. In Section 3, two characterizations of categories of modules $\text{Mod-}R$ over representations of a small category \mathcal{C} are given, both as an Abelian group valued functor category and as a category of modules over a pseudoskew category algebra. Besides, the hereditary torsion pairs on $\text{Mod-}R$ are classified and a result ([2, Theorem 3.18]) of Estrada and Virili is reproved in this Section.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we will recall the definitions of the representation of a small category and its right modules, as well as the definition of the linear Grothendieck

constructions. And then, a new concept, so-called the pseudoskew category algebra, will be introduced.

2.1. Modules over representations of small categories. In this subsection, the definitions of a representation of a small category and its right modules will be recorded.

Definition 2.1.1. (*[2, Definition 3.1]*) Let \mathcal{C} be a small category, a representation of \mathcal{C} is a pseudofunctor $R : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Add}$, that is, R consists of the following data:

- (1) for each object $i \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{C}$, a preadditive category $R(i)$;
- (2) for all $i, j \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{C}$ and any morphism $a : i \rightarrow j$, an additive functor $R(a) : R(i) \rightarrow R(j)$;
- (3) for each object $i \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{C}$, an isomorphism of functors $\delta_i : 1_{R(i)} \xrightarrow{\sim} R(1_i)$;
- (4) for any pair of composable morphisms a and b in \mathcal{C} , an isomorphism of functors $\mu_{b,a} : R(b)R(a) \xrightarrow{\sim} R(ba)$.

Furthermore, we suppose that the following axioms hold:

- (Rep.1) given three composable morphisms $i \xrightarrow{a} j \xrightarrow{b} k \xrightarrow{c} h$ in \mathcal{C} , the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R(c)R(b)R(a) & \xrightarrow{R(c)\mu_{b,a}} & R(c)R(ba) \\ \mu_{c,b}R(a) \downarrow & & \downarrow \mu_{c,ba} \\ R(cb)R(a) & \xrightarrow{\mu_{cb,a}} & R(cba), \end{array}$$

- (Rep.2) given a morphism $(a : i \rightarrow j) \in \text{Mor } \mathcal{C}$, the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & R(a) & \\ R(a)\delta_i \swarrow & \parallel & \searrow \delta_j R(a) \\ R(a)R(1_i) & & R(1_j)R(a) \\ \mu_{a,1_i} \searrow & & \swarrow \mu_{1_j,a} \\ & R(a) & \end{array}$$

Remark 2.1.2. (1) One should note that the 2-isomorphisms δ and μ above are different from the 2-isomorphisms (when restricting a colax functor to a pseudofunctor) η and θ in [1, Definition 2.1]. In fact, they are in different directions,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R(1_i) & \xrightleftharpoons[\delta_i]{\eta_i} & 1_{R(i)}, \\ R(ba) & \xrightleftharpoons[\mu_{b,a}]{\theta_{b,a}} & R(b)R(a). \end{array}$$

And they are inverse to each other, namely, $\delta_i = (\eta_i)^{-1}$ and $\mu_{b,a} = (\theta_{b,a})^{-1}$.

- (2) A representation $R : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Add}$ is said to be strict if it is a functor, that is, $R(1_i) = 1_{R(i)}$, $R(ba) = R(b)R(a)$, and η and μ are identities, so do δ and μ .

- (3) Given a representation $R : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Add}$ and a morphism $(a : i \rightarrow j) \in \text{Mor } \mathcal{C}$, we denote by

$$a_! : (R(i)^{\text{op}}, \text{Ab}) \rightleftarrows (R(j)^{\text{op}}, \text{Ab}) : a^*$$

the change of base adjunction $(a_!, a^*)$ induced by $R(a)$.

Given a representation of a small category, one can consider its right modules.

Definition 2.1.3. (*[2, Definition 3.6 with slight modifications]*) Let $R : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Add}$ be a representation of the small category \mathcal{C} . A right R -module M consists of the following data:

- (1) for all $i \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{C}$, a right $R(i)$ -module $M_i : R(i)^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Ab}$;
- (2) for any morphism $a : i \rightarrow j$ in \mathcal{C} , a homomorphism $M(a) : a^* M_j \rightarrow M_i$.

Furthermore, we suppose that the following axioms hold:

- (Mod.1) given two morphisms $a : i \rightarrow j$ and $b : j \rightarrow k$ in \mathcal{C} , the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} a^* b^* M_k & \xrightarrow{a^* M(b)} & a^* M_j & \xrightarrow{M(a)} & M_i \\ \theta_{b,a} 1_{M_k} \downarrow & & & \nearrow M(ba) & \\ (ba)^* M_k & & & & \end{array}$$

- (Mod.2) for all $i \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{C}$, the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (1_i)^* M_i & \xrightarrow{M(1_i)} & M_i \\ \eta_i 1_{M_i} \uparrow & & \nearrow 1_{M_i} \\ M_i & & \end{array}$$

For a representation $R : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Add}$ of the small category \mathcal{C} , we will denote the category of all right R -modules by $\text{Mod-}R$, which is the main object studied in this paper.

Remark 2.1.4. The condition (2) of the Definition above is the main difference between ours with [2, Definition 3.6]. We change the direction in order to adapt to the direction chosen in Definition 2.2.1.

2.2. Linear Grothendieck constructions and pseudoskew category algebras. In this subsection, we will first recall the definition of linear Grothendieck constructions, and then we will introduce a new notion, so-called pseudoskew category algebras.

2.2.1. linear Grothendieck constructions. Given an oplax functor, one can define the linear Grothendieck construction of it, see [1, Definition 4.1] for its explicit definition. We can restrict this construction to a pseudofunctor. More specifically, we will apply the linear Grothendieck construction to a representation $R : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Add}$ of a small category \mathcal{C} . Hence we have the following definition. We already knew that the 2-isomorphisms of a pseudofunctor in [2, Definition 3.1] and [1, Definition 2.1] are different, but they are inverse to each other, see Remark 2.1.2 (1).

Definition 2.2.1. Let \mathcal{C} be a small category and let $R : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Add}$ be a representation of \mathcal{C} . Then a category $\text{Gr}(R)$, called the linear Grothendieck construction of R , is defined as follows:

- (1) $\text{Ob Gr}(R) := \cup_{i \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{C}} \{i\} \times \text{Ob } R(i) = \{ {}_i x := (i, x) \mid i \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{C}, x \in \text{Ob } R(i) \}$;
- (2) for each ${}_i x, {}_j y \in \text{Ob Gr}(R)$, we set

$$\text{Gr}(R)({}_i x, {}_j y) := \bigoplus_{a \in \mathcal{C}(i, j)} R(a)(R(a)x, y);$$

- (3) for each ${}_i x, {}_j y, {}_k z \in \text{Ob Gr}(R)$ and each $f = (f_a)_{a \in \mathcal{C}(i, j)} \in \text{Gr}(R)({}_i x, {}_j y)$, $g = (g_b)_{b \in \mathcal{C}(j, k)} \in \text{Gr}(R)({}_j y, {}_k z)$, we set

$$g \circ f := \left(\sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{C}(i, j) \\ b \in \mathcal{C}(j, k) \\ c = ba}} g_b \circ R(b)f_a \circ \theta_{b, a} x \right)_{c \in \mathcal{C}(i, k)}$$

where each summand is the composite of

$$R(ba)x \xrightarrow{\theta_{b, a} x} R(b)R(a)x \xrightarrow{R(b)f_a} R(b)y \xrightarrow{g_b} z;$$

- (4) for each ${}_i x \in \text{Ob Gr}(R)$ the identity $1_{{}_i x}$ is given by

$$1_{{}_i x} := (\delta_{a, 1_i} \eta_i x)_{a \in \mathcal{C}(i, i)} \in \bigoplus_{a \in \mathcal{C}(i, i)} R(a)(R(a)x, x),$$

where $\eta_i x : R(1_i)x \rightarrow 1_{R(i)}x = x$, and $\delta_{a, 1_i}$ is the Kronecker delta (not a 2-isomorphism δ_i in a pseudofunctor!), that is, the a -th component $1_{{}_i x}$ is $\eta_i x$ if $a = 1_i$, and 0 otherwise.

2.2.2. Pseudoskew category algebras. In this subsection, we will introduce a new notion: pseudoskew category algebras, which will be used to characterize the categories of modules over representations of a small category in Section 3.2.

Definition 2.2.2. Let \mathcal{C} be a (non-empty) small category and let $R : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Add}$ be a representation of \mathcal{C} . The pseudoskew category algebra $R[\mathcal{C}]$ on \mathcal{C} with respect to R is a \mathbb{Z} -module spanned over elements of

$$\{f_a \mid a \in \mathcal{C}(i, j), f : R(a)(x) \rightarrow y, x \in \text{Ob } R(i), y \in \text{Ob } R(j)\}.$$

We define the multiplication on two base elements by the rule

$$g_b * f_a = \begin{cases} (g \circ R(b)f \circ \theta_{b, a} x)_{ba}, & \text{if } \text{dom}(b) = \text{cod}(a); \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where the map $g \circ R(b)f \circ \theta_{b, a} x$ can be depicted as follows

$$R(ba)x \xrightarrow{\theta_{b, a} x} R(b)R(a)x \xrightarrow{R(b)f} R(b)y \xrightarrow{g} z,$$

and $\theta_{b, a} : R(ba) \xrightarrow{\sim} R(b)R(a)$ is a 2-isomorphism of R . Extending this product linearly to two arbitrary elements, $R[\mathcal{C}]$ becomes an associative algebra.

Remark 2.2.3. (1) If $\text{Ob } \mathcal{C} < +\infty$ and $\text{Ob } R(i) < +\infty$ for all $i \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{C}$, then the pseudoskew category algebra has an identity

$$\sum_{i \in \text{Ob } Gr(R)} 1_{i,x} = \sum_{i \in \text{Ob } Gr(R)} (\cdots, 0, \eta_i x, 0, \cdots),$$

where $\eta_i x : R(1_i)x \xrightarrow{\sim} 1_{R(i)}x$ is the 1_i -th component of $(\cdots, 0, \eta_i x, 0, \cdots) \in Gr(R)(i, i)$ $x = \bigoplus_{a \in \mathcal{C}(i, i)} R(i)(R(a)x, x)$;

- (2) When $R : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Ring}$ is a precosheaf of rings, thus R is a functor, which can be viewed as a pseudofunctor with 2-morphisms are identities (see Remark 2.1.2), then $R[\mathcal{C}]$ is just a (covariant version) skew category algebra (see [7, Definition 3.2.1]);
- (3) When R is a lax functor (not just a pseudofunctor), then one can define a more general notion, so-called the lax skew category algebra.

3. TWO CHARACTERIZATIONS OF CATEGORIES OF MODULES OVER REPRESENTATIONS OF A SMALL CATEGORY

In this section, two characterizations of categories of modules $\text{Mod-}R$ over representations of a small category will be given. More specifically, we will characterize the category $\text{Mod-}R$ both as an Abelian group valued functor category and as a category of modules over a pseudoskew category algebra.

3.1. Characterizing it as functor categories. Let's first consider the following two constructions, they will be use to prove the main results later.

Construction 1: Given $M \in \text{Mod-}R$, let's define F_M (we will show that $F_M \in (Gr(R)^{\text{op}}, \text{Ab})$ in Lemma 3.1.1) as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Gr(R)^{\text{op}} & \xrightarrow{F_M} & \text{Ab} \\ \Downarrow & & \Downarrow \\ \begin{array}{c} i, x \\ \downarrow \\ (\cdots, 0, f_a, 0, \cdots) \\ \downarrow \\ j, y \end{array} & \longmapsto & \begin{array}{ccc} & M_i(x) & \\ & \uparrow M(a)_x & \\ M(a)_x \circ M_j(f) & & M_j(R(a)x) \\ \downarrow & & \uparrow M_j(f) \\ M_j(y) & & \end{array} \end{array}$$

For a general morphism $(f_a)_a \in \text{Hom}_{Gr(R)}(i, j)$, we define

$$F_M[(f_a)_a] := \sum_{a, f} M(a)_x \circ M_j(f).$$

Construction 2: Given $F \in (Gr(R)^{op}, Ab)$, let's define M_F (we will show that $M_F \in Mod-R$ in Lemma 3.1.2) as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 i \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{M_F} & (R(i)^{op} \longrightarrow Ab) \\
 & & \Psi \qquad \qquad \qquad \Psi \\
 & & x \qquad \qquad \qquad F(i x) \\
 & & \downarrow g \qquad \qquad \qquad \uparrow F[(\dots, 0, g \circ \eta_i x, 0, \dots)] \\
 & & x' \qquad \qquad \qquad F(i x')
 \end{array}$$

where $g \circ \eta_i x$ is the composite of

$$R(1_i)x \xrightarrow{\eta_i x} 1_{R(i)}x = x \xrightarrow{g} x'.$$

and $(\dots, 0, g \circ \eta_i x, 0, \dots)$ is a morphism of $\text{Hom}_{Gr(R)}(ix, ix')$. Recall that $a^* : (R(j)^{op}, Ab) \rightarrow (R(i)^{op}, Ab)$ is the restriction functor along $R(a) : R(i) \rightarrow R(j)$, we define $M(a) : a^* M_j \rightarrow M_i$ as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 a^* M_j(x) & \xrightarrow{M(a)_x} & M_i(x) \\
 \parallel & & \parallel \\
 M_j(R(a)x) & & \\
 \parallel & & \parallel \\
 F(j R(a)x) & \xrightarrow{F[(\dots, 0, 1_{R(a)x}, 0, \dots)]} & F(i x)
 \end{array}$$

where $(\dots, 0, 1_{R(a)x}, 0, \dots)$ is a morphism in $\text{Hom}_{Gr(R)}(ix, j R(a)x)$. Thus we define $M(a)_x := F[(\dots, 0, 1_{R(a)x}, 0, \dots)]$, where $1_{R(a)x}$ is in the a -th component.

Lemma 3.1.1. *If $M \in Mod-R$, then $F_M \in (Gr(R)^{op}, Ab)$, where F_M is defined in Construction 1.*

Proof. We will prove that F_M is a contravariant functor. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
 & F_M(1_{ix}) \\
 &= F_M[(\dots, 0, \eta_i x, 0, \dots)] \\
 & \text{def. of } F_M = M(1_i)_x \circ M_i(\eta_i x) \\
 & \text{(Mod.2) of def.2.1.3} = 1_{M_i(x)} \\
 & \text{def. of } F_M = 1_{F_M(ix)},
 \end{aligned}$$

hence F_M preserves the identity: $F_M(1_{ix}) = 1_{F_M(ix)}$. For any two composable morphisms in $Gr(R)$:

$$ix \xrightarrow{f=(f_a)_a} jy \xrightarrow{g=(g_b)_b} kz,$$

we have to check that $F_M(gf) = F_M(f)F_M(g)$. Let $h := g_b \circ R(b)f_a \circ \theta_{b,a}x$ and $c := ba$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& F_M(gf) \\
&= F_M((g_b)_b \circ (f_a)_a) \\
&= F_M \left[\left(\sum_{c=ba} g_b \circ R(b)f_a \circ \theta_{b,a}x \right)_c \right] \\
\text{def. of } F_M &= \sum_{c,h} M(c)_x \circ M_k \left(\sum_{c=ba} h \right) \\
M_k \text{ is an add. functor} &= \sum_{c,h} M(c)_x \circ M_k(h) \\
&\stackrel{(\dagger)}{=} \sum_{a,b,f,g} M(a)_x \circ M(b)_{R(a)x} \circ M_k[R(b)(f_a)] \circ M_k(g_b) \\
&= \sum_{a,b,f,g} M(a)_x \circ (M(b)_{R(a)x} \circ M_k[R(b)(f_a)]) \circ M_k(g_b) \\
&\stackrel{(\ddagger)}{=} \sum_{a,b,f,g} M(a)_x \circ (M_j(f_a) \circ M(b)_y) \circ M_k(g_b) \\
&= \left(\sum_{a,f} M(a)_x \circ M_j(f_a) \right) \circ \left(\sum_{b,g} M(b)_y \circ M_k(g_b) \right) \\
&= F_M[(f_a)_a] \circ F_M[(g_b)_b] \\
&= F_M(f)F_M(g).
\end{aligned}$$

The equality (\dagger) holds because the following diagram commutes (The left square commutes as M_k is a functor, and the right square commutes because of the condition (Mod.1) of Definition 2.1.3):

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
M_k(R(b)y) & \xrightarrow{M_k(R(b)f_a)} & M_k(R(b)R(a)x) & \xrightarrow{M(b)_{R(a)x}} & M_j(R(a)x) \\
\uparrow M_k(g_b) & & \parallel & & \downarrow M(a)_x \\
& & (a^*b^*M_k)(x) & & \\
& & \simeq \downarrow M_k(\theta_{b,a}x) & & \\
& & (ba)^*M_k(x) & & \\
& & \parallel & & \\
M_k(z) & \xrightarrow{M_k(h)} & M_k(R(ba)x) & \xrightarrow{M(c)_x} & M_i(x).
\end{array}$$

The equality (\ddagger) holds since one can show

$$M_j(f_a) \circ M(b)_y = M(b)_{R(a)x} \circ M_k[R(b)(f_a)].$$

This is the case because we have the following commuting diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 M_i(x) & & & & \\
 \uparrow & \swarrow M(a)_x & & \searrow M(ba)_x & \\
 M(a)_x \circ M_j(f_a) & & M_j(R(a)x) & & \\
 \uparrow & \nearrow M_j(f_a) & \xleftarrow{M(b)_{R(a)x}} & (b) & \\
 M_j(y) & & & & M_k(R(b)R(a)x) \xrightarrow{M_k(\theta_{b,a}x)} M_k(R(ba)x) \\
 \uparrow & \nwarrow M(b)_y & & \nearrow M_k[R(b)(f_a)] & (\sharp) \\
 M(b)_y \circ M_k(g_b) & & M_k(R(b)y) & & \\
 \uparrow & \nearrow M_k(g_b) & \xrightarrow{M_k(h)} & & \\
 M_k(z) & & & &
 \end{array}$$

Due to

$$\begin{aligned}
 & F_M[(\dots, 0, f_a, 0, \dots)] \circ F_M[(\dots, 0, g_b, 0, \dots)] \\
 &= F_M[(\dots, 0, g_b, 0, \dots) \circ (\dots, 0, f_a, 0, \dots)]
 \end{aligned}$$

and the definition of F_M , the outer triangle commutes. By the condition (Mod.1) of Definition 2.1.3, the diagram (b) commutes, and the diagram (sharp) commutes as M_k is a functor. Therefore the diagram (b) commutes, then the equality (sharp) holds. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 3.1.2. *If $F \in (Gr(R)^{op}, Ab)$, then $M_F \in \text{Mod-}R$, where M_F is defined in Construction 2.*

Proof. Let's first check that M_i in Construction 2 is a functor. For any $x \in \text{Ob } R(i)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & M_i(1_x) \\
 & \text{def. of } M_i = F[(\dots, 0, \eta_i x, 0, \dots)] \\
 & = F(1_{i,x}) \\
 & F \text{ preserves identity} = 1_{F(i,x)} \\
 & \text{def. of } M_i = 1_{M_i(x)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

For any $x \xrightarrow{f} x' \xrightarrow{g} x''$ in $\text{Mor } R(i)$, we have to check $M_i(gf) = M_i(f) \circ M_i(g)$. By the definition of M_i in Construction 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & M_i(f) \circ M_i(g) \\
 &= F[(\dots, 0, f \circ \eta_i x, 0, \dots)] \circ F[(\dots, 0, g \circ \eta_i x', 0, \dots)] \\
 &= F[(\dots, 0, g \circ \eta_i x', 0, \dots) \circ (\dots, 0, f \circ \eta_i x, 0, \dots)]
 \end{aligned}$$

and $M_i(gf) = F[(\dots, 0, gf \circ \eta_i x, 0, \dots)]$, so to check $M_i(gf) = M_i(f) \circ M_i(g)$, it is enough to show

$$(\dots, 0, g \circ \eta_i x', 0, \dots) \circ (\dots, 0, f \circ \eta_i x, 0, \dots) = (\dots, 0, gf \circ \eta_i x, 0, \dots).$$

This is true because the outer morphisms of the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 R(1_i 1_i)x & \xrightarrow{\theta_{1_i, 1_i x}} & R(1_i)R(1_i)x & \xrightarrow{R(1_i)(f \circ \eta_i x)} & R(1_i)x' & \xrightarrow{g \circ \eta_i x'} & x'' \\
 \parallel & \searrow & \downarrow R(1_i)\eta_i x & \nearrow R(1_i)(f) & \downarrow \eta_i x' & \nearrow g & \\
 R(1_i)x & & R(1_i)x & (\diamond) & 1_{R(i)}x' = x' & & \\
 & \searrow \eta_i x & \downarrow \eta_i x & \nearrow f & & \nearrow gf & \\
 & & 1_{R(i)}x = x & & & &
 \end{array}$$

The triangle (\triangle) commutes by the inverse of the condition of (Rep.2) of Definition 2.1.1. Since η_i is a natural transformation, hence the parallelogram (\diamond) in the middle commutes. It is easy to see that the other diagrams commute.

In order to check $M_F \in \text{Mod-}R$, by the Definition of R -modules, we also have to check that the conditions (Mod.1) and (Mod.2) of the Definition 2.1.3 are both satisfied. Let $i \xrightarrow{a} j \xrightarrow{b} k$ be two composable morphisms in \mathcal{C} . In order to check the condition (Mod.1), we have to check the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 a^* b^* M_k & \xrightarrow{a^* M(b)} & a^* M_j & \xrightarrow{M(a)} & M_i \\
 \theta_{b, a} 1_{M_k} \downarrow & & & \nearrow M(ba) & \\
 (ba)^* M_k & & & &
 \end{array}$$

By the definition of M_i, M_j, M_k in Construction 2, it is equivalent to check the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 F({}_k R(b)R(a)x) & \xrightarrow{F[(\dots, 0, 1_{R(b)R(a)x}, 0, \dots)]} & F({}_j R(a)x) & \xrightarrow{F[(\dots, 0, 1_{R(a)x}, 0, \dots)]} & F({}_i x) \\
 \downarrow F[(\dots, 0, \theta_{b, a} x \circ \eta_k R(ba)x, 0, \dots)] & & & \nearrow F[(\dots, 0, 1_{R(ba)x}, 0, \dots)] & \\
 F({}_k R(ba)x) & & & &
 \end{array}$$

where $\theta_{b, a} x \circ \eta_k R(ba)x$ is the composite of

$$R(1_k)R(ba)x \xrightarrow{\eta_k R(ba)x} 1_{R(k)}R(ba)x = R(ba)x \xrightarrow{\theta_{b, a} x} R(b)R(a)x.$$

Since F is a functor, it is equivalent to check the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 {}_k R(b)R(a)x & \xleftarrow{(\dots, 0, 1_{R(b)R(a)x}, 0, \dots)} & {}_j R(a)x & \xleftarrow{(\dots, 0, 1_{R(a)x}, 0, \dots)} & {}_i x \\
 \uparrow F[(\dots, 0, \theta_{b, a} x \circ \eta_k R(ba)x, 0, \dots)] & & & \nearrow F[(\dots, 0, 1_{R(ba)x}, 0, \dots)] & \\
 {}_k R(ba)x & & & &
 \end{array}$$

This is true due to the following commuting diagram (using the inverse of the condition (Rep.2) of the Definition 2.1.1):

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 R(ba)x & \xrightarrow{\theta_{b,ax}} & R(b)R(a)x & \xrightarrow{R(b)1_{R(a)x}} & R(b)R(a)x & \xrightarrow{1_{R(b)R(a)x}} & R(b)R(a)x \\
 \parallel & & & & & & \parallel \\
 R(ba)x & \xrightarrow{\theta_{1_k,ba}x} & R(1_k)R(ba)x & \xrightarrow{R(1_k)(1_{R(ba)x})} & R(1_k)R(ba)x & \xrightarrow{\theta_{b,ax} \circ \eta_k R(ba)x} & R(b)R(a)x.
 \end{array}$$

Therefore, the condition (Mod.1) of the Definition 2.1.3 is satisfied.

In order to check condition (Mod.2), we have to check the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 (1_i)^* M_i & \xrightarrow{M(1_i)} & M_i \\
 \eta_i 1_{M_i} \uparrow & \nearrow 1_{M_i} & \\
 M_i & &
 \end{array}$$

That is,

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 M_i(R(1_i)(x)) & \xrightarrow{M(1_i)_x} & M_i(x) \\
 \eta_i 1_{M_i x} \uparrow & \nearrow 1_{M_i(x)} & \\
 M_i(x) & &
 \end{array}$$

By the definition of M_i in Construction 2, it is equivalent to check the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 F({}_i R(1_i)(x)) & \xrightarrow{F[(\dots, 0, 1_{R(1_i)(x)}, 0, \dots)]} & F({}_i x) \\
 F[(\dots, 0, \eta_i x \circ \mu_{1_i, 1_i} x, 0, \dots)] \uparrow & \nearrow 1_{F({}_i x)} = F[(\dots, 0, \eta_i x, 0, \dots)] & \\
 F({}_i x) & &
 \end{array}$$

where $\eta_i x \circ \mu_{1_i, 1_i} x$ is the composite of

$$R(1_i)R(1_i)(x) \xrightarrow{\mu_{1_i, 1_i} x} R(1_i)(x) \xrightarrow{\eta_i x} 1_{R(1_i)}(x) = x.$$

Since F is a functor, it is equivalent to check the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 {}_i R(1_i)(x) & \xleftarrow{(\dots, 0, 1_{R(1_i)(x)}, 0, \dots)} & {}_i x \\
 (\dots, 0, \eta_i x \circ \mu_{1_i, 1_i} x, 0, \dots) \downarrow & \nearrow (\dots, 0, \eta_i x, 0, \dots) & \\
 {}_i x & &
 \end{array}$$

This is true since we have the following commuting diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 R(1_i)(x) & \xrightarrow{\theta_{1_i, 1_i} x} & R(1_i)R(1_i)(x) & \xrightarrow{R(1_i)(1_{R(1_i)(x)})} & R(1_i)R(1_i)(x) & \xrightarrow{\eta_i x \circ \mu_{1_i, 1_i} x} & x. \\
 & & & & & \searrow & \\
 & & & & & & \eta_i x
 \end{array}$$

Therefore, the condition (Mod.2) of the Definition 2.1.3 is satisfied. This completes the proof. \square

Now we can characterize $\text{Mod-}R$ as a functor category (see Theorem 3.1.4). This can be viewed as the pseudofunctor analogue of the following Howe's result.

Theorem 3.1.3. (see [3, Proposition 5], [4, Theorem 5] or [6, Theorem 3.0.1]) *Let \mathcal{C} be a small category and let $R : \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Ring}$ be a presheaf of unital rings on \mathcal{C} (note that R is a strict functor here!). Then we have the following equivalence*

$$\text{Mod-}R \simeq (\text{Gr}(R)^{\text{op}}, \text{Ab}),$$

where $\text{Mod-}R$ is the category of right R -modules (see [6, Definition 2.1.13]) and $\text{Gr}(R)$ is the linear Grothendieck construction of R (see [6, Definition 2.2.1]).

Theorem 3.1.4. *Let \mathcal{C} be a small category and let $R : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Add}$ be a representation of the category \mathcal{C} , then we have the following equivalence*

$$\text{Mod-}R \simeq (\text{Gr}(R)^{\text{op}}, \text{Ab}).$$

Proof. Let $M \in \text{Mod-}R$ and $F \in (\text{Gr}(R)^{\text{op}}, \text{Ab})$, we define

$$\Phi : \text{Mod-}R \rightarrow (\text{Gr}(R)^{\text{op}}, \text{Ab})$$

and

$$\Psi : (\text{Gr}(R)^{\text{op}}, \text{Ab}) \rightarrow \text{Mod-}R$$

by $\Phi(M) = F_M$ and $\Psi(F) = M_F$ respectively. This two functors are well defined by Lemma 3.1.1 and Lemma 3.1.2. We will check that they are inverse to each other.

Firstly, let's check that $\Psi \circ \Phi \cong \text{Id}_{\text{Mod-}R}$. Since $(\Psi \circ \Phi)(M) = \Psi(\Phi(M)) = \Psi(F_M) = M_{F_M}$, we have to show $M_{F_M} \cong M$ in $\text{Mod-}R$. In order to do that let's first prove $(M_{F_M})_i \cong M_i$ as functors in $(R(i)^{\text{op}}, \text{Ab})$ for each $i \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{C}$. Let $g : x \rightarrow x'$ be a morphism in $R(i)$, then we have the following commuting diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 (M_{F_M})_i(x) & \xleftarrow{(M_{F_M})_i(g)} & (M_{F_M})_i(x') \\
 \parallel & \text{Construction 2} & \parallel \\
 F_M(i x) & \xleftarrow{F_M[(\dots, 0, g \circ \eta_i x, 0, \dots)]} & F_M(i x') \\
 \parallel & \text{Construction 1} & \parallel \\
 M_i(x) & & M_i(x') \\
 \swarrow M(1_i)_x & & \swarrow M_i(g \circ \eta_i x) \\
 & M_i(R(1_i)x) &
 \end{array}$$

Therefore, $(M_{F_M})_i(g) = M(1_i)_x \circ M_i(g \circ \eta_i x)$. By (Mod.2) of Definition 2.1.3, one can deduce that $M(1_i)_x = M_i((\eta_i x)^{-1})$. Thus $(M_{F_M})_i(g) = M(1_i)_x \circ M_i(g \circ \eta_i x) = M_i((\eta_i x)^{-1}) \circ M_i(g \circ \eta_i x) = M_i(g)$. Hence $(M_{F_M})_i \cong M_i$ as functors in $(R(i)^{\text{op}}, \text{Ab})$.

To show $M_{F_M} \cong M$ in $\text{Mod-}R$, we also have to prove that, for any $a : i \rightarrow j$,

$$a^*(M_{F_M})_j \xrightarrow{(M_{F_M})_j(a)_x} (M_{F_M})_i = a^* M_j \xrightarrow{M(a)_x} M_i.$$

For each $x \in \text{Ob } R(i)$, we have the following commuting diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 a^*(M_{F_M})_j(x) & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & (M_{F_M})_i(x) \\
 \parallel & \text{Construction 2} & \parallel \\
 F_M(jR(a)(x)) & \xrightarrow{F_M[(\dots, 0, 1_{R(a)(x)}, 0, \dots)]} & F_M(ix) \\
 \parallel & & \parallel \\
 M_j(R(a)(x)) & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & M_i(x) \\
 \searrow^{M_j(1_{R(a)(x)})} & \text{Construction 1} & \nearrow^{M(a)_x} \\
 & M_j(R(a)(x)) &
 \end{array}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (M_{F_M})(a)_x \\
 &= F_M[(\dots, 0, 1_{R(a)(x)}, 0, \dots)] \\
 &= M(a)_x \circ M_j(1_{R(a)(x)}) \\
 M_j \text{ preserves identity} &= M(a)_x \circ 1_{M_j(R(a)(x))} \\
 &= M(a)_x.
 \end{aligned}$$

Secondly, let's check that $\Phi \circ \Psi \cong \text{Id}_{(Gr(R)^{\text{op}}, \text{Ab})}$. Since $(\Phi \circ \Psi)(M) = \Phi(\Psi(M)) = \Phi(M_F) = F_{M_F}$, we have to show $F_{M_F} \cong F$ in $(Gr(R)^{\text{op}}, \text{Ab})$. For any morphism

$${}_i x \xrightarrow{(\dots, 0, f_a, 0, \dots)} {}_j y,$$

we have to show

$$F_{M_F}[(\dots, 0, f_a, 0, \dots)] = F[(\dots, 0, f_a, 0, \dots)].$$

For $F_{M_F}[(\dots, 0, f_a, 0, \dots)]$, by Construction 2 and Construction 1, we have the following commuting diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 F_{M_F}(ix) & \xrightarrow{F_{M_F}[(\dots, 0, f_a, 0, \dots)]} & & & F_{M_F}(jy) \\
 \parallel & & \text{Construction 1} & & \parallel \\
 (M_F)_j(y) & \xrightarrow{(M_F)_j(f)} & (M_F)_j(R(a)(x)) & \xrightarrow{M_F(a)_x} & (M_F)_i(x) \\
 \parallel & & \parallel & & \parallel \\
 & \text{Construction 2} & & \text{Construction 2} & \\
 F(jy) & \xrightarrow{F[(\dots, 0, f \circ \mu_{1_j, ax}, 0, \dots)]} & F(jR(a)(x)) & \xrightarrow{F[(\dots, 0, 1_{R(a)(x)}, 0, \dots)]} & F(ix).
 \end{array}$$

It follows that

$$F_{M_F}[(\dots, 0, f_a, 0, \dots)] = F[(\dots, 0, 1_{R(a)(x)}, 0, \dots)] \circ F[(\dots, 0, f \circ \mu_{1_j, ax}, 0, \dots)].$$

In order to show

$$F_{M_F}[(\dots, 0, f_a, 0, \dots)] = F[(\dots, 0, f_a, 0, \dots)],$$

it is enough to show

$$(\cdots, 0, f \circ \mu_{1_j, a} x, 0, \cdots) \circ (\cdots, 0, 1_{R(a)(x)}, 0, \cdots) = (\cdots, 0, f_a, 0, \cdots).$$

It is true because we have the following commuting diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} R(1_j a)(x) & \xrightarrow{\theta_{1_j, a} x} & R(1_j)R(a)(x) & \xrightarrow{R(1_j)1_{R(a)(x)}} & R(1_j)R(a)(x) \\ \parallel & & & & \downarrow f \circ \mu_{1_j, a} x \\ R(a)(x) & \xrightarrow{f} & & & y. \end{array}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 3.1.5. *Let \mathcal{C} be a small category and let $R : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Add}$ be a representation of the category \mathcal{C} . Then the category of right R -modules $\text{Mod-}R$ is a Grothendieck category and it has a projective generator.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 3.1.4 immediately. \square

Remark 3.1.6. *In [2, Theorem 3.18], the authors proved the same result with different method, and our result is more general than theirs since we don't assume \mathcal{C} is a poset.*

Similar to [6, Theorem 4.0.1], we can classify the hereditary torsion pairs in $\text{Mod-}R$ by linear Grothendieck topologies. For the definitions of hereditary torsion pairs and linear Grothendieck topologies, one can see [6, Definition 2.3.1 & 2.3.2 and Definition 2.1.15].

Corollary 3.1.7. *Let \mathcal{C} be a small category and let $R : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Add}$ be a representation of the category \mathcal{C} . Then there is an (explicit) one-to-one correspondence between linear Grothendieck topologies on $\text{Gr}(R)$ and hereditary torsion pairs in $\text{Mod-}R$.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 3.1.4 and [5, Theorem 3.7]. \square

3.2. Characterizing it as module categories of algebras. In this subsection, we will characterize the category of right R -modules $\text{Mod-}R$ as the category of modules over a pseudoskew category algebra $R[\mathcal{C}]$. This can be seen as a higher analogue of the [7, Theorem A].

Theorem 3.2.1. *Let \mathcal{C} be a small category and let $R : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Add}$ be a representation of the category \mathcal{C} . If $\text{Ob } \mathcal{C} < +\infty$ and $\text{Ob } R(i) < +\infty$ for all $i \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{C}$, then we have the following equivalence*

$$\text{Mod-}R \simeq \text{Mod-}R[\mathcal{C}].$$

Proof. By Theorem 3.1.4, we know that

$$\text{Mod-}R \simeq (\text{Gr}(R)^{\text{op}}, \text{Ab}).$$

Let

$$G := \bigoplus_{ix \in \text{Ob } \text{Gr}(R)} \text{Hom}_{\text{Gr}(R)}(-, ix),$$

then G is a projective generator of $(Gr(R)^{\text{op}}, \text{Ab})$, hence of $\text{Mod-}R$. Since $\text{Ob } \mathcal{C} < +\infty$ and $\text{Ob } R(i) < +\infty$ for all $i \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{C}$, so $\text{Ob } Gr(R) < +\infty$, it follows that G is even small. Then we will immediately have the following equivalence

$$\text{Mod-}R \simeq \text{Mod-} \text{End}(G).$$

Now, let's compute $\text{End}(G)$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{End}(G) \\ &= \text{Hom} \left(\bigoplus_{i x \in \text{Ob } Gr(R)} \text{Hom}_{Gr(R)}(-, i x), \bigoplus_{j y \in \text{Ob } Gr(R)} \text{Hom}_{Gr(R)}(-, j y) \right) \\ \text{compa. of 1st argu.} & \cong \bigoplus_{j y \in \text{Ob } Gr(R)} \text{Hom} \left(\bigoplus_{i x \in \text{Ob } Gr(R)} \text{Hom}_{Gr(R)}(-, i x), \text{Hom}_{Gr(R)}(-, j y) \right) \\ \text{Ob } Gr(R) < +\infty & \cong \bigoplus_{j y \in \text{Ob } Gr(R)} \bigoplus_{i x \in \text{Ob } Gr(R)} \text{Hom}(\text{Hom}_{Gr(R)}(-, i x), \text{Hom}_{Gr(R)}(-, j y)) \\ \text{Yoneda} & \cong \bigoplus_{j y \in \text{Ob } Gr(R)} \bigoplus_{i x \in \text{Ob } Gr(R)} \text{Hom}_{Gr(R)}(i x, j y) \\ \left((f_a)_a \mapsto \sum_a f_a \right) & \cong R[\mathcal{C}]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\text{Mod-}R \simeq \text{Mod-} \text{End}(G) \simeq \text{Mod-}R[\mathcal{C}].$$

This completes the proof. □

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my Ph.D. supervisor Prof. Fei Xu (徐斐) in Shantou University for motivating me to think representation theory higher categorically. I also want to thank my girlfriend Wenwen Sun (♡ 孙雯雯 ♡) for her love.

REFERENCES

- [1] Hideto Asashiba. Gluing derived equivalences together. *Advances in Mathematics*, 235:134–160, 2013.
- [2] Sergio Estrada and Simone Virili. Cartesian modules over representations of small categories. *Advances in Mathematics*, 310:557–609, 2017.
- [3] Douglas Howe. Module categories over topoi. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 21(2):161–165, 1981.
- [4] Daniel Murfet. *Linearised categories*, 2006.
- [5] Carlos E Parra, Manuel Saorín, and Simone Virili. Torsion pairs in categories of modules over a preadditive category. *Bulletin of the Iranian Mathematical Society*, 47:1135–1171, 2021.
- [6] Mawei Wu. Torsion pairs in categories of modules on ringed finite sites. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.15001*, 2024.
- [7] Mawei Wu and Fei Xu. Skew category algebras and modules on ringed finite sites. *Journal of Algebra*, 631:194–217, 2023.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, LINGNAN NORMAL UNIVERSITY, ZHANJIANG,
GUANGDONG 524048, CHINA

Email address: wumawei@lingnan.edu.cn