

CATEGORICAL PROPERTIES AND HOMOLOGICAL CONJECTURES FOR BOUNDED EXTENSIONS OF ALGEBRAS

YONGYUN QIN, XIAOXIAO XU, JINBI ZHANG* AND GUODONG ZHOU

ABSTRACT. An extension $B \subset A$ of finite dimensional algebras is bounded if the B - B -bimodule A/B is B -tensor nilpotent, its projective dimension is finite and $\mathrm{Tor}_i^B(A/B, (A/B)^{\otimes_B j}) = 0$ for all $i, j \geq 1$. We show that for a bounded extension $B \subset A$, the algebras A and B are singularly equivalent of Morita type with level. Additionally, under mild conditions, their stable categories of Gorenstein projective modules and Gorenstein defect categories are equivalent, respectively. Some homological conjectures are also investigated for bounded extensions, including Auslander-Reiten conjecture, finistic dimension conjecture, Fg condition, Han's conjecture, and Keller's conjecture. Applications to trivial extensions and triangular matrix algebras are given.

In course of proof, we give some handy criteria for a functor between module categories to induce triangle functors between stable categories of Gorenstein projective modules and Gorenstein defect categories, which generalise some known criteria, and hence might be of independent interest.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1. Bounded extensions	4
2. Singular equivalences of Morita type with level induced by bounded extensions	6
3. The stable categories of Gorenstein projective modules and the Gorenstein defect categories for bounded extensions	8
4. Homological conjectures for bounded extensions	14
5. Examples	16
References	19

INTRODUCTION

Let A be a finite dimensional algebra over a field \mathbf{k} . Denote by $\mathrm{Mod}(A)$ (resp. $\mathrm{mod}(A)$, $\mathrm{proj}(A)$, $\mathrm{inj}(A)$) the category of left A -modules (resp. finitely generated left A -modules, finitely generated projective left A -modules, finitely generated injective left A -modules). Let $\mathbf{K}(A) = \mathbf{K}(\mathrm{Mod}(A))$ be the homotopy category of $\mathrm{Mod}(A)$, $\mathbf{K}^b(\mathrm{proj}A)$ be the bounded homotopy category of $\mathrm{proj}(A)$, $\mathbf{D}(A) = \mathbf{D}(\mathrm{Mod}(A))$ be the unbounded derived category of $\mathrm{Mod}(A)$, and by $\mathbf{D}^b(\mathrm{mod}(A))$ be the derived category of bounded complexes over $\mathrm{mod}(A)$. The *singularity category* $\mathbf{D}_{\mathrm{sg}}^b(A)$ of A is defined to be the Verdier quotient

$$\mathbf{D}_{\mathrm{sg}}^b(A) := \mathbf{D}^b(\mathrm{mod}(A)) / \mathbf{K}^b(\mathrm{proj}A),$$

Date: August 6, 2024.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 16E35 16E30 16E40 16E65 16G50 16D20 .

Key words and phrases. Gorenstein defect category; Homological conjecture; Ring extension; Singular equivalence of Morita type with level; Singularity category.

*Corresponding author.

see [7, 35]. The singularity category measures the homological singularity of an algebra in the sense that an algebra A has finite global dimension if and only if its singularity category $D_{\text{sg}}^b(A)$ is trivial.

The singularity category also captures the stable homological features of an algebra A ([7]). Denote by $\underline{\text{Gproj}}(A)$ the stable category of finitely generated Gorenstein projective A -modules. Following [7], there is a natural triangle functor $F : \underline{\text{Gproj}}(A) \rightarrow D_{\text{sg}}^b(A)$ which is always fully faithful, and F is an equivalence if and only if A is Gorenstein (see also [25]). Inspired by this, Bergh, Jørgensen, and Oppermann ([5]) defined the *Gorenstein defect category* as the Verdier quotient

$$D_{\text{def}}^b(A) := D_{\text{sg}}^b(A)/\text{Im}(F)$$

and proved that A is Gorenstein if and only if $D_{\text{def}}^b(A) = 0$. This means that the Gorenstein defect category of A measures how far the algebra A is from being Gorenstein.

The essential image of the functor F is also clear. Denote by $D_{\text{fGd}}^b(A)$ the full subcategory of $D^b(\text{mod}(A))$ formed by all complexes which are quasi-isomorphic to bounded complexes of Gorenstein projective modules, that is, $D_{\text{fGd}}^b(A)$ is the thick subcategory of $D^b(\text{mod}(A))$ generated by $\text{Gproj}(A)$, see [31, Theorem 2.7]. The following triangle equivalence

$$\underline{\text{Gproj}}(A) \simeq D_{\text{fGd}}^b(A)/K^b(\text{proj}(A))$$

is well known, see, for instance, [7, Theorem 4.4.1], [36, Theorem 4], [13, Lemma 4.1], or in a much more general setup [46, Theorem 3.7]. We will see that the triangulated category $D_{\text{fGd}}^b(A)$ play an important role in this paper.

Two algebras A and B are called *singularly equivalent* provided that there is a triangle equivalence between $D_{\text{sg}}^b(A)$ and $D_{\text{sg}}^b(B)$, which is called a *singular equivalence* between A and B . In [44], Wang introduced the notation of singular equivalences of Morita type with level, which is a generalisation of stable equivalences of Morita type in the sense de Broué [6] and singular equivalences of Morita type in the sense of Chen and Sun [14] (see also [48]).

Definition 0.1 ([44]). Given two finite dimensional \mathbf{k} -algebras A and B , and let M be an A - B -bimodule and N be a B - A -bimodule. We say that $({}_A M_B, {}_B N_A)$ defines a singular equivalence of Morita type with level l for some $l \in \mathbb{N}$ if ${}_A M_B$ and ${}_B N_A$ are projective on both sides, and the following conditions are satisfied:

$$M \otimes_B N \cong \Omega_{A^e}^l(A) \text{ in } \underline{\text{mod}}(A^e) \text{ and } N \otimes_A M \cong \Omega_{B^e}^l(B) \text{ in } \underline{\text{mod}}(B^e),$$

where $\Omega_{A^e}^l(-)$ and $\Omega_{B^e}^l(-)$ denote the syzygy endofunctor of the stable module category of A^e and B^e , respectively.

In this situation, there is a triangle equivalence

$$M \otimes_B - : D_{\text{sg}}^b(B) \rightarrow D_{\text{sg}}^b(A)$$

with quasi-inverse

$$[l] \circ (N \otimes_A -) : D_{\text{sg}}^b(A) \rightarrow D_{\text{sg}}^b(B).$$

This kind of singular equivalences provide rich structural information, and plays an important role in the study of singular equivalences and homological properties. For example, it was verified in [44] and [10] that the finitistic dimension conjecture and Keller's conjecture for singular Hochschild cohomology are invariant under singular equivalences of Morita type with level. Thus we are interested in constructing singular equivalences of Morita type with level.

In [11], Chen, Liu, and Wang proved that a tensor functor with a bimodule defines a singular equivalence Morita type with level under certain conditions, and in [20], Dalezios proved that for certain Gorenstein algebras, a singular equivalence induced from tensoring with a complex of bimodules always induces a singular equivalence of Morita type with level. Qin in [38] gave a complex version of Chen-Liu-Wang's work, which extends Dalezios' result to arbitrary algebras (not limited to Gorenstein algebras).

Given an algebra A , there is an exact sequence of triangulated categories:

$$0 \rightarrow \underline{\text{Gproj}}(A) \rightarrow \text{D}_{\text{sg}}^b(A) \rightarrow \text{D}_{\text{def}}^b(A) \rightarrow 0.$$

A natural and fundamental question is: When do two related algebras share the same stable category of Gorenstein projective modules, singularity category and Gorenstein defect category up to triangle equivalence? For partial answers to this question, we refer to [8, 9, 31, 33, 39, 47]. In this paper, we also give a partial answer, that is, we will compare the stable category of Gorenstein projective modules, singularity category and Gorenstein defect category between two algebras linked by a ring extension. From [19], an extension $B \subset A$ is called *left (resp. right) bounded* if A/B has finite projective dimension as a B - B -bimodule, A/B is projective as a left (resp. right) B -module and some tensor power $(A/B)^{\otimes_B p}$ is 0. Inspired by this, we consider a more general situation:

Definition 0.2. An extension $B \subset A$ of finite dimensional algebras is called bounded if

- (1) there exists $p \geq 1$ such that the tensor power $(A/B)^{\otimes_B p}$ vanishes;
- (2) A/B has finite projective dimension as a B - B -bimodule;
- (3) $\text{Tor}_i^B(A/B, (A/B)^{\otimes_B j}) = 0$ for all $i, j \geq 1$.

Examples of bounded extensions in the sense of the above definition but not in the sense of [19] are given in Proposition 1.3 and Example 1.4.

Let $\text{Gproj}(A)^\perp := \{X \in \text{mod}(A) \mid \text{Ext}_A^i(U, X) = 0 \text{ for all } U \in \text{Gproj}(A), i \geq 1\}$. The first main result we obtain in this paper is as follows.

Theorem 0.3. (Theorems 2.7, 2.8, 3.11 and 3.13) *Let $B \subset A$ be a bounded extension. Then*

$${}_A A \otimes_B^\mathbb{L} - : \text{D}_{\text{sg}}^b(B) \rightleftarrows \text{D}_{\text{sg}}^b(A) : \text{Res}_B^A =_B A \otimes_A -$$

is an adjoint triangle equivalence which is in fact a singular equivalence of Morita type with level between A and B , and the functor $\text{Res}_B^A : \text{mod}(A) \rightarrow \text{mod}(B)$ is an eventually homological isomorphism in the sense of [37].

Moreover, there are triangle equivalences

$${}_A A \otimes_B - : \underline{\text{Gproj}}(B) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Gproj}}(A) \text{ and } {}_A A \otimes_B^\mathbb{L} - : \text{D}_{\text{def}}^b(B) \rightleftarrows \text{D}_{\text{def}}^b(A) : \text{Res}_B^A$$

if one of the following two conditions holds:

- (1) $\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_B(A, B)$ is quasi-isomorphic to a bounded complex with each term in $\text{Gproj}(A)^\perp$;
- (2) ${}_B B$ is a direct summand of ${}_B A$.

In course of proof of the above result, we obtain some handy criteria for a functor between module categories to induce triangle functors between stable categories of Gorenstein projective modules, which is our second main result.

Criterion 0.4. [Criteria 3.8 and 3.12] *Let X be an Γ - Λ -bimodule over two finite dimensional \mathbf{k} -algebras Λ and Γ such that X has finite projective dimension both as left Γ -module and as right Λ -module. Assume that $\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_\Gamma(X, \Gamma)$ is quasi-isomorphic to a bounded complex with each term*

in $\text{Gproj}(\Lambda)^\perp$, or that there is an integer t such that $\Omega^t(X \otimes_\Lambda M) \in {}^\perp\Gamma$ for any $M \in {}^\perp\Lambda$. Then $X \otimes_\Lambda^\perp -$ induces a triangle functor from $D_{\text{fGd}}^b(\Lambda)$ to $D_{\text{fGd}}^b(\Gamma)$, and hence a triangle functor from $\underline{\text{Gproj}}(\Lambda) \simeq D_{\text{fGd}}^b(\Lambda)/K^b(\text{proj}(\Lambda))$ to $\underline{\text{Gproj}}(\Gamma) \simeq D_{\text{fGd}}^b(\Gamma)/K^b(\text{proj}(\Gamma))$.

This result is of independent interest as it generalises some known criteria appeared in the literature; see [27] and [34, Theorem I (ii)].

We first apply Theorem 0.3 to several homological conjectures, which are still open now. These conjectures play important roles in representation theory of finite dimensional algebras and homological algebra. Our third main result concerns reductions of some homological conjectures via bounded extensions.

Theorem 0.5. (Theorem 4.1 and 4.3) *Let $B \subset A$ be a bounded extension. Then the following statements hold:*

- (1) *B satisfies the finitistic dimension conjecture if and only if so does A ;*
- (2) *B satisfies Han's conjecture if and only if so does A ;*
- (3) *B satisfies Keller's conjecture if and only if so does A .*

If, in addition, $\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_B(A, B)$ is perfect as left A -module or ${}_B B$ is a direct summand of ${}_B A$, then

- (4) *B satisfies Auslander-Reiten's conjecture if and only if so does A ;*
- (5) *B satisfies the Fg condition for the Hochschild cohomology if and only if so does A .*

Note that bounded extensions in our definition is less restrictive than the left or right bounded extensions introduced in [19] (but the present definition was also suggested by them [17], see Remark 1.2 (2)). Consequently, Theorem 0.5 (2) extends the main result of [19].

Moreover, we apply Theorem 0.3 to trivial extensions and triangular matrix algebras, and get several reduction methods on singularity categories and Gorenstein defect categories; see Propositions 5.4 and 5.6, and Examples 5.5 and 5.7. In particular, since the arrow removal operation yields a bounded split extension, we reobtain [24, Theorem A (ii)] and the main result of [23] in Example 5.5.

The layout of this paper is as follows: Section 1 introduces the notion of bounded extensions and provide some examples. Section 2 studies singular equivalences of Morita type with level induced by bounded extensions and we prove the first part of Theorem 0.3 (see Theorems 2.7 and 2.8). Section 3 contains some criteria such that a functor between module categories induces triangle functors between stable categories of Gorenstein projective modules and Gorenstein defect categories and their applications to bounded extensions, and we prove Criterion 0.4 (see Criteria 3.8 and 3.12) and the second part of Theorem 0.3 (see Theorems 3.11 and 3.13). In Section 4, we apply the results obtained in Sections 2 and 3 to some homological conjectures. The last Section 5 contains many examples including trivial extensions and triangular matrix algebras, which permits recovering and generalising many results in the literature including the results around the arrow removal operation [23, 24].

1. BOUNDED EXTENSIONS

In this section, we introduce the notion of bounded extensions and provide some examples.

Let B be a finite dimensional algebra over a fixed field \mathbf{k} and M be a B - B -bimodule. Define $M^{\otimes_B 0} = B$ and $M^{\otimes_B (i+1)} = M \otimes_B M^{\otimes_B i}$ for $i \geq 0$. We say that M is B -tensor nilpotent if $M^{\otimes_B p} = 0$ for some $p \geq 1$.

Definition 1.1. An extension $B \subset A$ of finite dimensional algebras is called bounded if

- (1) A/B is B -tensor nilpotent;
- (2) A/B has finite projective dimension as a B - B -bimodule;
- (3) $\mathrm{Tor}_i^B(A/B, (A/B)^{\otimes_B j}) = 0$ for all $i, j \geq 1$.

Remark 1.2. (1) It follows from [32, Proposition 2.4] that $\mathrm{Tor}_i^B(A/B, (A/B)^{\otimes_B j}) = 0$ for all $i, j \geq 1$ if and only if $\mathrm{Tor}_i^B((A/B)^{\otimes_B j}, A/B) = 0$ for all $i, j \geq 1$.

(2) This definition of bounded extensions is not essentially new and has in fact been suggested by Cibils, Lanzilotta, Marcos and Solotar in [17].

Now, we give some examples of extensions which satisfy our definition, but not the definition in [19], where it is required that A/B is projective as a left or right B -module.

Let $Q = (Q_0, Q_1)$ be a quiver with Q_0 the set of vertices and Q_1 the set of arrows between vertices. The source and target of an arrow $\alpha \in Q_1$ are denoted by $s(\alpha)$ and $t(\alpha)$, respectively. Note that the composition of two arrows $\alpha, \beta \in Q_1$ is written as $\beta\alpha$, where α comes first and then β follows. Suppose that Q is a finite acyclic quiver, that is, a quiver with finitely many vertices and finitely many arrows without loops or oriented cycles. Then the path algebra $\mathbf{k}Q$ of Q is a finite dimensional \mathbf{k} -algebra of global dimension 1. As usual, let e_i be the primitive idempotent element in $\mathbf{k}Q$ corresponding to the vertex $i \in Q_0$, and let $S(i)$ and $T(i)$ stand for the simple left B -module and the simple right B -module corresponding to the vertex $i \in Q_0$, respectively.

Proposition 1.3. *Let $B = \mathbf{k}Q$ be the path algebra of a finite acyclic quiver Q defined over an algebraically closed field \mathbf{k} . Let $u \neq v \in Q_0$. Define $M := S(u) \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} T(v)$ and let $A := B \ltimes M$ be the trivial extension of B by M . Suppose that there are arrows originating from u and arrows terminating at v . If there doesn't exist paths from u to v , then $B \subset A$ is a bounded extension with ${}_B M \notin \mathrm{proj}(B)$ and $M_B \notin \mathrm{proj}(B^{\mathrm{op}})$.*

Proof. It is clear that $A/B = M$. Since the algebra B has finite global dimension, then so does B^e and M is of finite projective dimension as a B - B -bimodule. Moreover, it follows from $u \neq v$ that $T(v) \otimes_B S(u) = 0$ and then $M \otimes_B M = 0$. Thus M is B -tensor nilpotent as a B^e -module. Let

$$0 \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\substack{\alpha \in Q_1 \\ s(\alpha)=u}} B e_{t(\alpha)} \rightarrow B e_u \rightarrow S(u) \rightarrow 0$$

be a projective resolution of $S(u)$ as a left B -module. Since there doesn't exist paths from u to v and $u \neq v$, we get that $T(v) \otimes_B B e_{t(\alpha)} \cong T(v) e_{t(\alpha)} = 0$ for $\alpha \in Q_1$ with $s(\alpha) = u$, and $T(v) \otimes_B B e_u \cong T(v) e_u = 0$. Note that $M \cong S(u)$ as a left B -modules and $M \cong T(v)$ as a right B -modules. Applying the functor $T(v) \otimes_B -$ to the above projective resolution, we get that $\mathrm{Tor}_i^B(M, M) = 0$ for all $i \geq 1$. Since $M \otimes_B M = 0$, we have that $\mathrm{Tor}_i^B(M, M^{\otimes_B j}) = 0$ for all $i, j \geq 1$. Hence $B \subset A$ is a bounded extension. Since there are arrows starting u and arrows ending v , ${}_B S(u)$ and $T(v)_B$ are not projective. Therefore, ${}_B M \cong S(u) \notin \mathrm{proj}(B)$ and $M_B \cong T(v) \notin \mathrm{proj}(B^{\mathrm{op}})$. \square

A concrete example can be constructed in the spirit of the above result.

Example 1.4. Let B be the following quiver algebra over \mathbf{k}

$$1 \xrightarrow{\alpha} 2 \xrightarrow{\beta} 3 \xrightarrow{\gamma} 4.$$

Define $M := S(3) \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} T(2)$ and $A := B \ltimes M$. Then it follows from Proposition 1.3 that $B \subset A$ is a bounded extension and ${}_B M \notin \mathrm{proj}(B)$ and $M_B \notin \mathrm{proj}(B^{\mathrm{op}})$. Hence, the extension $B \subset A$ is a bounded extension in the sense of Definition 1.1, but not of [19].

2. SINGULAR EQUIVALENCES OF MORITA TYPE WITH LEVEL INDUCED BY BOUNDED EXTENSIONS

In this section, we are concerned about singular equivalences induced by bounded extensions.

For our proof of Theorem 0.3, we need the following three lemmas whose easy proofs are left to the reader.

Lemma 2.1. *Let A , B and C be finite dimensional algebras, M be an A - B bimodule and N be a B - C bimodule. If $\mathrm{Tor}_i^B(M, N) = 0$ for any $i > 0$, then $M \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} N \cong M \otimes_B N$ in $D^b(\mathrm{mod}(A \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} C^{op}))$.*

Lemma 2.2. *Let $B \subset A$ be an extension of finite dimensional algebras and denote $M = A/B$. Then the following statements hold:*

- (1) *The functor $A \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} - \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} A : D^b(\mathrm{mod}(B^e)) \rightarrow D^b(\mathrm{mod}(A^e))$ sends $\mathbf{K}^b(\mathrm{proj}(B^e))$ to $\mathbf{K}^b(\mathrm{proj}(A^e))$.*
- (2) *If $\mathrm{pd}_{(B)} M_B < \infty$, then the functor ${}_B M \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} - : D^b(\mathrm{mod}(B^e)) \rightarrow D^b(\mathrm{mod}(B^e))$ sends $\mathbf{K}^b(\mathrm{proj}(B^e))$ to $\mathbf{K}^b(\mathrm{proj}(B^e))$.*

Lemma 2.3 (compare with [12, Section 4]). *Let $B \subset A$ be an extension of finite dimensional algebras. If $\mathrm{Tor}_i^B(A/B, (A/B)^{\otimes_B j}) = 0$ for each $i, j \geq 1$, then the following statements hold:*

- (1) $\mathrm{Tor}_i^B(A, A) = 0$ for each $i \geq 1$;
- (2) $\mathrm{Tor}_i^B((A/B)^{\otimes_B j}, A) = 0$ for each $i, j \geq 1$;
- (3) $\mathrm{Tor}_i^B(A, (A/B)^{\otimes_B j} \otimes_B A) = 0$ for each $i, j \geq 1$.

The following two lemmas will be crucial in the proof of Theorem 2.7.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $B \subset A$ be an extension of finite dimensional algebras and denote $M = A/B$. Assume that $\mathrm{pd}_{(B)} M_B < \infty$ and that $\mathrm{Tor}_i^B(M, M^{\otimes_B j}) = 0$ for all $i, j \geq 1$. Then $A \otimes_B M^{\otimes_B j} \otimes_B A \in \mathbf{K}^b(\mathrm{proj}(A^e))$ for any $j \geq 1$.*

Proof. Since $\mathrm{Tor}_i^B(M, M^{\otimes_B j}) = 0$ for each $i, j \geq 1$, it follows from Lemma 2.1 that

$$M \otimes_B M \otimes_B \cdots \otimes_B M \cong M \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} M \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} \cdots \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} M \in D^b(\mathrm{mod}(B^e)),$$

which belongs to $\mathbf{K}^b(\mathrm{proj}(B^e))$ by $\mathrm{pd}_{(B)} M_B < \infty$ and by Lemma 2.2 (2). Therefore, $M^{\otimes_B j} \in \mathbf{K}^b(\mathrm{proj}(B^e))$ for any $j \geq 1$, and it follows from Lemma 2.2 (1) that

$$A \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} M^{\otimes_B j} \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} A \in \mathbf{K}^b(\mathrm{proj}(A^e)).$$

On the other hand, Lemma 2.3 (2), Lemma 2.3 (3) and Lemma 2.1 yield that

$$A \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} M^{\otimes_B j} \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} A \cong A \otimes_B M^{\otimes_B j} \otimes_B A.$$

Therefore, $A \otimes_B M^{\otimes_B j} \otimes_B A \in \mathbf{K}^b(\mathrm{proj}(A^e))$ for any $j \geq 1$. \square

Lemma 2.5. [34, Theorem 3.1 and Proposition 3.7] *Let $B \subset A$ be an extension of finite dimensional algebras. If $\mathrm{pd}(A_B) < \infty$ and $\mathrm{pd}_{(B)} A < \infty$, then there is an adjoint pair*

$${}_A A \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} - : D_{\mathrm{sg}}^b(B) \rightleftarrows D_{\mathrm{sg}}^b(A) : \mathrm{Res}_B^A =_B A \otimes_A -.$$

Assume, moreover, that $\mathrm{pd}_{(B)} M_B < \infty$ with $M = A/B$, then ${}_A A \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} - : D_{\mathrm{sg}}^b(B) \rightarrow D_{\mathrm{sg}}^b(A)$ is fully faithful.

Remark 2.6. Let us remark on the proof of the first statement of the above result. Consider the adjoint triple between derived categories

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \longleftarrow A \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} - & \\ D(A) & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Res}_B^A =_B A \otimes_A -} & D(B) \\ & \longleftarrow & \end{array} .$$

Since $\text{pd}(A_B) < \infty$ and $\text{pd}({}_B A) < \infty$, this adjoint triple extends one step upwards and one step downwards, respectively. In this case, by [1, Lemma 2.5], the three functors: the left adjoint of $A \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} -$, $A \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} -$ and Res_B^A restrict to $\mathbf{K}^b(\text{proj})$, by [1, Lemma 2.8] and [34, Lemma 3.2], the three functors: $A \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} -$, Res_B^A and the right adjoint of Res_B^A restrict to $D^b(\text{mod})$, hence, both $A \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} -$ and Res_B^A restrict to D_{sg}^b , (see [35, Lemma 1.2]).

This kind of restriction results are rather useful.

Now we will show that for a bounded extension $A \subset B$, the adjoint pair is an adjoint equivalence. Furthermore, this singular equivalence is of special form, singular equivalence of Morita type with level in the sense of Wang [44]. This constitutes the first part of Theorem 0.3 in the introduction.

Theorem 2.7. *Let $B \subset A$ be a bounded extension. Then*

$${}_A A \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} - : D_{\text{sg}}^b(B) \rightleftarrows D_{\text{sg}}^b(A) : \text{Res}_B^A$$

is an adjoint equivalence which induces a singular equivalence of Morita type with level between A and B .

Proof. Denote $M = A/B$. Since $\text{pd}({}_B M_B) < \infty$, we get that $\text{pd}(M_B) < \infty$ and $\text{pd}({}_B M) < \infty$. Now the exact sequence of B - B -bimodules $0 \rightarrow B \rightarrow A \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ shows that $\text{pd}(A_B) < \infty$ and $\text{pd}({}_B A) < \infty$. By Lemma 2.5, there is an adjoint pair

$${}_A A \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} - : D_{\text{sg}}^b(B) \rightleftarrows D_{\text{sg}}^b(A) : \text{Res}_B^A$$

and ${}_A A \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} - : D_{\text{sg}}^b(B) \rightarrow D_{\text{sg}}^b(A)$ is fully faithful.

What we add here is that

$${}_A A \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} - : D_{\text{sg}}^b(B) \rightleftarrows D_{\text{sg}}^b(A) : \text{Res}_B^A$$

is an adjoint equivalence which are in fact singular equivalences of Morita type with level. By [20, Theorem 3.6] and [38, Proposition 3.3] it suffices to show that the natural morphisms $B \rightarrow GF(B)$ and $FG(A) \rightarrow A$ are isomorphisms in $D_{\text{sg}}^b(B^e)$ and $D_{\text{sg}}^b(A^e)$, respectively, where $F = {}_A A \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} -$ and $G = \text{Res}_B^A$.

We observe that the mapping cone of $B \rightarrow GF(B)$ is M , and the assumption $\text{pd}({}_B M_B) < \infty$ yields that $B \cong GF(B)$ in $D_{\text{sg}}^b(B^e)$. This also follows from the fact that ${}_A A \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} - : D_{\text{sg}}^b(B) \rightarrow D_{\text{sg}}^b(A)$ is fully faithful.

By Lemma 2.3 (1) and Lemma 2.1, we have that

$$FG(A) = A \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} A \cong A \otimes_B A \in D^b(\text{mod}(A^e)),$$

and then mapping cone of $FG(A) \rightarrow A$ is isomorphic to the complex

$$0 \rightarrow A \otimes_B A \xrightarrow{\mu} A \rightarrow 0$$

induced by the product μ of A . Since $M^{\otimes_B p} = 0$ for some integer p , it follows from [18, Proposition 2.3] that there is a long exact sequence of A - A -bimodules

$$0 \rightarrow A \otimes_B M^{\otimes_B(p-1)} \otimes_B A \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow A \otimes_B M \otimes_B A \rightarrow A \otimes_B A \xrightarrow{\mu} A \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, the mapping cone of $FG(A) \rightarrow A$ is isomorphic to the complex

$$0 \rightarrow A \otimes_B M^{\otimes_B(p-1)} \otimes_B A \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow A \otimes_B M \otimes_B A \rightarrow 0$$

in $D^b(\text{mod}(A^e))$. Now by Lemma 2.4, $A \otimes_B M^{\otimes_B j} \otimes_B A \in \mathbf{K}^b(\text{proj}(A^e))$ for any $j \geq 1$, and thus $FG(A) \cong A$ in $D_{\text{sg}}^b(A^e)$. \square

A functor $F : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ between abelian categories is called a *t-eventually homological isomorphism* if there is an integer t such that for every $j > t$, the induced homomorphism $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{B}}^j(X, Y) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{C}}^j(FX, FY)$ is an isomorphism for all objects $X, Y \in \mathcal{B}$. This notion was introduced in [37] and has been used widely to reduce homological properties of algebras [24, 37, 40].

Theorem 2.8. *Let $B \subset A$ be a bounded extension. Then the functor $\text{Res}_B^A : \text{mod}(A) \rightarrow \text{mod}(B)$ is a t-eventually homological isomorphism for some integer t .*

Proof. Let $F = {}_A A \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} -$ and $G = \text{Res}_B^A$. Let $\eta : FG \rightarrow 1_{D(A)}$ be the counit of the adjoint pair

$$D(B) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{F} \\ \xleftarrow{G} \end{array} D(A).$$

For any $X, Y \in \text{mod}(A)$, applying $\text{Hom}_{D(A)}(-, Y[i])$ to the canonical triangle

$$FG(X) \xrightarrow{\eta_X} X \longrightarrow \text{Cone}(\eta_X) \longrightarrow$$

in $D(A)$, we get a long exact sequence

$$\cdots \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{D(A)}(\text{Cone}(\eta_X), Y[i]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{D(A)}(X, Y[i]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{D(A)}(FG(X), Y[i]) \rightarrow \cdots (\star).$$

Since $FG(X) \cong FG(A) \otimes_A^{\mathbb{L}} X$, it follows from the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} FG(X) & \xrightarrow{\eta_X} & X & \longrightarrow & \text{Cone}(\eta_X) & \longrightarrow & \\ \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow & & \\ FG(A) \otimes_A^{\mathbb{L}} X & \xrightarrow{\eta_A \otimes_A^{\mathbb{L}} X} & A \otimes_A^{\mathbb{L}} X & \longrightarrow & \text{Cone}(\eta_A) \otimes_A^{\mathbb{L}} X & \longrightarrow & \end{array}$$

that $\text{Cone}(\eta_X) \cong \text{Cone}(\eta_A) \otimes_A^{\mathbb{L}} X$ in $D(A)$. On the other hand, it follows from the proof of Theorem 2.7 that $\text{Cone}(\eta_A) \in \mathbf{K}^b(\text{proj}(A^e))$. Hence, there is a bounded complex of projective A - A bimodules

$$P^\bullet : 0 \rightarrow P^{-t} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow P^s \rightarrow 0$$

such that $P^\bullet \cong \text{Cone}(\eta_A)$ in $D(A^e)$. Therefore, the complex $\text{Cone}(\eta_X) \cong P^\bullet \otimes_A X$ is of the form

$$0 \rightarrow P^{-t} \otimes_A X \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow P^s \otimes_A X \rightarrow 0,$$

where each ${}_A P^i \otimes_A X \in \text{proj}A$ since $P^i \in \text{proj}A^e$. It follows that

$$\text{Hom}_{D(A)}(\text{Cone}(\eta_X), Y[i]) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{K}(A)}(P^\bullet \otimes_A X, Y[i]),$$

which is equal to zero for any $i > t$. Therefore, the long exact sequence (\star) yields that

$$\text{Hom}_{D(A)}(X, Y[i]) \cong \text{Hom}_{D(A)}(FG(X), Y[i]) \cong \text{Hom}_{D(B)}(GX, GY[i])$$

for any $i > t$. Therefore, $\text{Ext}_A^i(X, Y) \cong \text{Ext}_B^i(GX, GY)$ for any $i > t$ and any $X, Y \in \text{mod}(A)$. This shows that G is a *t-eventually homological isomorphism*. \square

3. THE STABLE CATEGORIES OF GORENSTEIN PROJECTIVE MODULES AND THE GORENSTEIN DEFECT CATEGORIES FOR BOUNDED EXTENSIONS

In this section, we will compare the stable categories of Gorenstein projective modules and the Gorenstein defect categories between two algebras linked by a bounded extension.

Throughout this section, let Λ and Γ be two finite dimensional \mathbf{k} -algebras and let X be a finite dimensional Γ - Λ -bimodule such that X has finite projective dimension both as left Γ -module and as right Λ -module.

We will consider the following question which generalises the situation considered in [34]:

Question 3.1. When does the functor $X \otimes_{\Lambda} - : \text{mod}(\Lambda) \rightarrow \text{mod}(\Gamma)$ induce a triangle functor from $\underline{\text{Gproj}}(\Lambda)$ to $\underline{\text{Gproj}}(\Gamma)$?

Some remarks are in order. Following the spirit of Remark 2.6, under the condition that $\text{pd}_{\Gamma}(X), \text{pd}(X_{\Lambda}) < \infty$, the adjoint pair between derived categories

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \xrightarrow{X \otimes_{\Lambda}^{\mathbb{L}} -} & \\ \text{D}(\Lambda) & & \text{D}(\Gamma) \\ & \xleftarrow{\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_{\Gamma}(X, -)} & \end{array}$$

extends one step upwards and one step downwards and we obtain an adjoint quadruple:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \xleftarrow{X^{\text{tr}\Lambda\text{op}} \otimes_{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{L}} -} & \\ & \xrightarrow{X \otimes_{\Lambda}^{\mathbb{L}} - \simeq \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}(X^{\text{tr}\Lambda\text{op}}, -)} & \\ \text{D}(\Lambda) & & \text{D}(\Gamma) \\ & \xleftarrow{\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_{\Gamma}(X, -) \simeq X^{\text{tr}\Gamma} \otimes_{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{L}} -} & \\ & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(X^{\text{tr}\Gamma}, -)} & \end{array}$$

where

$$X^{\text{tr}\Gamma} = \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_{\Gamma}(X, \Gamma), X^{\text{tr}\Lambda\text{op}} = \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_{\Lambda\text{op}}(X, \Lambda).$$

By [1, Lemma 2.5], the two functors $X^{\text{tr}\Lambda\text{op}} \otimes_{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{L}} -$ and $X \otimes_{\Lambda}^{\mathbb{L}} - \simeq \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}(X^{\text{tr}\Lambda\text{op}}, -)$ restrict to $K^b(\text{proj})$, by [1, Lemma 2.8] and [34, Lemma 3.2] (or more generally for differential graded algebras, [28, Proposition 2.5]) the two functors $X \otimes_{\Lambda}^{\mathbb{L}} - \simeq \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}(X^{\text{tr}\Lambda\text{op}}, -)$ and $\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_{\Gamma}(X, -) \simeq X^{\text{tr}\Gamma} \otimes_{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{L}} -$ restrict to $D^b(\text{mod})$, hence, $X \otimes_{\Lambda}^{\mathbb{L}} - \simeq \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}(X^{\text{tr}\Lambda\text{op}}, -)$ restricts to D_{sg}^b (see [35, Lemma 1.2]).

We give several criteria in order to answer Question 3.1.

The first criterion is equivalent to asking that the adjoint quadruple can be extended further one step downwards.

Criterion 3.2 (Compare with [34, Proposition 3.5]). If $X^{\text{tr}\Gamma} = \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_{\Gamma}(X, \Gamma)$ is perfect as complex of Λ -modules, then the triangle functor $X \otimes_{\Lambda}^{\mathbb{L}} - \simeq \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}(X^{\text{tr}\Lambda\text{op}}, -)$ restricts to the stable categories of Gorenstein projective modules.

Proof. This can be deduced from Hu and Pan [27] and also is made explicit in [34] in case that there is a ring homomorphism $f : \Lambda \rightarrow \Gamma$ and $X = {}_{\Gamma}\Gamma_{\Lambda}$.

In fact, the condition that $X^{\text{tr}\Gamma} = \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_{\Gamma}(X, \Gamma)$ is perfect as complex of Λ -modules implies that the adjoint quadruple:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \xleftarrow{X^{\text{tr}\Lambda\text{op}} \otimes_{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{L}} -} & \\ \text{D}(\Lambda) & \xrightarrow{X \otimes_{\Lambda}^{\mathbb{L}} - \simeq \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}(X^{\text{tr}\Lambda\text{op}}, -)} & \text{D}(\Gamma) \\ & \xleftarrow{\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_{\Gamma}(X, -) \simeq X^{\text{tr}\Gamma} \otimes_{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{L}} -} & \\ & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(X^{\text{tr}\Gamma}, -)} & \end{array}$$

can be extended further one step downwards, because $\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(X^{\text{tr}\Gamma}, -) \simeq (X^{\text{tr}\Gamma})^{\text{tr}\Lambda} \otimes_{\Lambda}^{\mathbb{L}} -$ has a right adjoint $\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}((X^{\text{tr}\Gamma})^{\text{tr}\Lambda}, -)$. The functor

$$G := \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_{\Gamma}(X, -) \simeq X^{\text{tr}\Gamma} \otimes_{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{L}} - : D^b(\text{mod}(\Gamma)) \rightarrow D^b(\text{mod}(\Lambda))$$

sends $K^b(\text{proj}(\Gamma))$ to $K^b(\text{proj}(\Lambda))$. Moreover, since $\text{pd}(X_{\Lambda}) < \infty$, a suitable shift of $F := X \otimes_{\Lambda}^{\mathbb{L}} -$ is nonnegative in the sense of [27, Definition 4.1]. By [27, Theorem 5.3], F restricts to the stable categories of Gorenstein projective modules. \square

The condition that $X^{\text{tr}\Gamma} = \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_{\Gamma}(X, \Gamma)$ is perfect as complex of Λ -modules is somehow strong. We will introduce two alternative conditions in the sequel; see Criteria 3.8 and 3.12.

We need several notations. For an algebra A , we denote by $\Omega_A(-)$ the syzygy endofunctor of the stable module category of A . Define

$${}^\perp A := \{X \in \text{mod}(A) \mid \text{Ext}_A^i(X, A) = 0 \text{ for all } i > 0\}.$$

Notice that a module in this subcategory is called semi-Gorenstein projective by Ringel and Zhang [41]. Denote

$$\text{Gproj}(A)^\perp := \{X \in \text{mod}(A) \mid \text{Ext}_A^i(U, X) = 0 \text{ for all } U \in \text{Gproj}(A), i \geq 1\}.$$

The second criterion concerns a right exact functor between module categories which, under certain conditions, sends Gorenstein projective modules to Gorenstein projective modules.

Criterion 3.3. If ${}_\Gamma X$ is projective and $\text{Hom}_\Gamma(X, \Gamma) \in \text{Gproj}(\Lambda)^\perp$, then $X \otimes_\Lambda - : \text{mod}(\Lambda) \rightarrow \text{mod}(\Gamma)$ sends Gorenstein projective modules to Gorenstein projective modules and $X \otimes_\Lambda U \cong X \otimes_\Lambda^\perp U \in D^b(\text{mod}(\Gamma))$ for any $U \in \text{Gproj}(\Lambda)$. In this case, there is an induced triangle functor $X \otimes_\Lambda - : \underline{\text{Gproj}}(\Lambda) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Gproj}}(\Gamma)$.

Proof. Let $U \in \text{Gproj}(\Lambda)$. By definition, there is a complete resolution P^\bullet of U . Since X is projective left Γ -module, thus $X \otimes_\Lambda P^i$ is projective left Γ -module, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. As P^\bullet is exact we see that $H^i(X \otimes_\Lambda P^\bullet) = \text{Tor}_{\Gamma}^{\Lambda}{}_{j-i}(X, B^{j+1}(P^\bullet))$ for any $j > i$. Since the projective dimension of X as right Λ -module is assumed to be finite, we can always choose j sufficiently big so that this Tor group vanishes. Thus $X \otimes_\Lambda P^\bullet$ is exact, which also shows that $\text{Tor}_i^\Lambda(X, U) = 0$ for $i > 0$. By Lemma 2.1, ${}_\Gamma X \otimes_\Lambda^\perp U \cong {}_\Gamma X \otimes_\Lambda U \in D^b(\Lambda)$ for $U \in \text{Gproj}(\Lambda)$.

Note that

$$\text{Hom}_\Gamma(X \otimes_\Lambda P^\bullet, \Gamma) \cong \text{Hom}_\Lambda(P^\bullet, \text{Hom}_\Gamma(X, \Gamma))$$

Since $\text{Hom}_\Gamma(X, \Gamma) \in \text{Gproj}(\Lambda)^\perp$, thus $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(P^\bullet, \text{Hom}_\Gamma(X, \Gamma))$ and $\text{Hom}_\Gamma(X \otimes_\Lambda P^\bullet, \Gamma)$ are exact.

This shows that $X \otimes_\Lambda U$ is still Gorenstein projective.

For the second statement, it remains to show that the additive functor $X \otimes_\Lambda - : \underline{\text{Gproj}}(\Lambda) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Gproj}}(\Gamma)$ is a triangle functor.

Indeed, since ${}_\Gamma X \otimes_\Lambda^\perp U \cong {}_\Lambda X \otimes_\Gamma U \in D^b(\Lambda)$ for $U \in \text{Gproj}(\Lambda)$, the functor ${}_\Gamma X \otimes_\Lambda^\perp -$ induces a triangle functor from $D_{\text{fGd}}^b(\Gamma)$ to $D_{\text{fGd}}^b(\Lambda)$. We have thus a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \underline{\text{Gproj}}(\Lambda) & \xrightarrow{{}_\Gamma X \otimes_\Lambda -} & \underline{\text{Gproj}}(\Gamma) \\ \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong \\ D_{\text{fGd}}^b(\Lambda)/\mathcal{K}^b(\text{proj}(\Lambda)) & \xrightarrow{{}_\Gamma X \otimes_\Lambda^\perp -} & D_{\text{fGd}}^b(\Gamma)/\mathcal{K}^b(\text{proj}(\Gamma)) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ D_{\text{sg}}^b(\Lambda) & \xrightarrow{{}_\Gamma X \otimes_\Lambda^\perp -} & D_{\text{sg}}^b(\Gamma) \end{array}$$

Therefore, $X \otimes_\Lambda - : \underline{\text{Gproj}}(\Lambda) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Gproj}}(\Gamma)$ is a triangle functor. \square

Remark 3.4. Although Criterion 3.3 is somehow trivial, it generalises [34, Proposition 3.4] in which the authors consider the situation where there is a ring homomorphism $f : \Lambda \rightarrow \Gamma$ and $X = {}_\Gamma \Gamma_\Lambda$.

Remark 3.5. In the hypothesis of Criterion 3.3, if we assume that ${}_\Gamma X$ is projective, then $\text{Hom}_\Gamma(X, \Gamma) \in \text{Gproj}(\Lambda)^\perp$ is equivalent to saying that $X \otimes_\Lambda U$ belongs to ${}^\perp \Gamma$ whenever $U \in \text{Gproj}(\Lambda)$. In fact, for

$G \in \text{Gproj}(\Lambda)$ and a deleted projective resolution Q^\bullet of G , $X \otimes_\Lambda Q^\bullet$ is exact which is a projective resolution of $X \otimes_\Lambda G$. By the isomorphism of complexes

$$\text{Hom}_\Lambda(Q^\bullet, \text{Hom}_\Gamma(X, \Gamma)) \cong \text{Hom}_\Gamma(X \otimes_\Lambda Q^\bullet, \Gamma),$$

for any $i > 0$, there is an isomorphism

$$\text{Ext}_\Lambda^i(G, \text{Hom}_\Gamma(X, \Gamma)) \cong \text{Ext}_\Gamma^i(X \otimes_\Lambda G, \Gamma).$$

The equivalence deduces from the above isomorphisms.

This following example verifies the hypothesis of Criterion 3.3, but not that of Criterion 3.2.

Example 3.6. Let Γ be a finite dimensional \mathbf{k} -algebra and $\Lambda = kQ/I$ be the algebra where Q is the quiver

$$\beta \curvearrowright 1 \xleftarrow{\alpha} 2$$

and $I = \langle \beta^2, \beta\alpha \rangle$. Let $X = \Gamma \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} e_1\Lambda$. It is clearly that ${}_\Gamma X_\Lambda$ is a projective bimodule, thus ${}_\Gamma X, X_\Lambda$ are projective, and $\text{Hom}_\Gamma(X, \Gamma) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{k}}(e_1\Lambda, \mathbf{k}) \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \Gamma \in \text{Gproj}(\Lambda)^\perp$. But $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{k}}(e_1\Lambda, \mathbf{k})$ has infinite projective dimension as left Λ -module. Hence, $\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_\Gamma(X, \Gamma) = \text{Hom}_\Gamma(X, \Gamma)$ falls into $\text{Gproj}(\Lambda)^\perp$, but not perfect as Λ -module.

Lemma 3.7. Let Σ be a finite dimensional \mathbf{k} -algebra, $M \in \text{mod}(\Sigma)$. If M is quasi-isomorphic to a bounded complex with each term in $\text{Gproj}(\Sigma)^\perp$, then $M \in \text{Gproj}(\Sigma)^\perp$.

Proof. Let M quasi-isomorphic to

$$L^\bullet : 0 \rightarrow L^s \rightarrow L^{s+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow L^t \rightarrow 0$$

with $L^j \in \text{Gproj}(\Sigma)^\perp, \forall j$. For any $U \in \text{Gproj}(\Sigma)$, let $(Q^\bullet, \partial^\bullet)$ be a complete resolution of U with $U = \ker(\partial^0)$. Let $K^i := \ker(\partial^i)$. Then $K^i \in \text{Gproj}(\Sigma)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ext}_\Sigma^p(U, M) &= \text{Ext}_\Sigma^{j+p}(K^j, M) \\ &= \text{Hom}_{\text{D}^b(\text{mod}(\Sigma))}(K^j, M[j+p]) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{\text{D}^b(\text{mod}(\Sigma))}(K^j, L^\bullet[j+p]). \end{aligned}$$

Due to $K^j \in \text{Gproj}(\Sigma)$, $\text{Ext}_\Sigma^i(K^j, L^q) = 0$ for $i \geq 1$ and $s \leq q \leq t$. By [29, Lemma 1.6], $\text{Hom}_{\text{D}^b(\text{mod}(\Sigma))}(K^j, L^\bullet[j+p]) = 0$ for $j \geq t - p + 1$. Then $\text{Ext}_\Sigma^p(U, M) = 0$ for each $p \geq 1$, that is, $M \in \text{Gproj}(\Sigma)^\perp$. \square

The following result, which is our third criterion, can be considered as a derived version of Criterion 3.3.

Criterion 3.8. Assume that $\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_\Gamma(X, \Gamma)$ is quasi-isomorphic to a bounded complex with each term in $\text{Gproj}(\Lambda)^\perp$. Then the functor $X \otimes_\Lambda - : \text{mod}(\Lambda) \rightarrow \text{mod}(\Gamma)$ induces $X \otimes_\Lambda^\mathbb{L} - : \text{D}_{\text{fGd}}^b(\Lambda) \rightarrow \text{D}_{\text{fGd}}^b(\Gamma)$.

Proof. By [1, Lemma 2.8], the functor $X \otimes_\Lambda - : \text{mod}(\Lambda) \rightarrow \text{mod}(\Gamma)$ induces $X \otimes_\Lambda^\mathbb{L} - : \text{D}^b(\text{mod}(\Lambda)) \rightarrow \text{D}^b(\text{mod}(\Gamma))$. It is enough to prove that $X \otimes_\Lambda U \in \text{D}_{\text{fGd}}^b(\Gamma)$ for any $U \in \text{Gproj}(\Lambda)$.

Take a projective resolution P^\bullet of X as $\Gamma \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \Lambda^{op}$ -module:

$$\dots \rightarrow P^i \xrightarrow{d^i} P^{i+1} \xrightarrow{d^{i+1}} \dots \rightarrow P^{-1} \xrightarrow{d^{-1}} P^0 \rightarrow {}_\Gamma X_\Lambda \rightarrow 0$$

with $P^{-1} = {}_\Gamma X_\Lambda$. Denote

$$P_{\leq 0}^\bullet = (\dots \rightarrow P^i \xrightarrow{d^i} P^{i+1} \xrightarrow{d^{i+1}} \dots \rightarrow P^{-1} \xrightarrow{d^{-1}} P^0 \rightarrow 0)$$

and for some $l \geq 1$,

$$P_{[-l+1,0]}^\bullet = (0 \rightarrow P^{-l+1} \rightarrow P^{-l+2} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow P^{-1} \xrightarrow{d^{-1}} P^0 \rightarrow 0)$$

Let $l := \max\{\text{pd}(\Gamma X), \text{pd}(X_\Lambda)\}$ and $N := \ker(d^{-l+1})$. Then both ${}_\Gamma N$ and N_Λ are projective. For each $U \in \text{Gproj}(\Lambda)$, by the first statement of Criterion 3.3, the complex $P^\bullet \otimes_\Lambda U$ is exact, and ${}_\Gamma X \otimes_\Lambda U \cong {}_\Gamma X \otimes_\Lambda^\mathbb{L} U \cong P_{\leq 0}^\bullet \otimes_\Lambda U$ in $D^b(\text{mod}(\Gamma))$, which is also quasi-isomorphic to

$$0 \rightarrow N \otimes_\Lambda U \rightarrow P^{-l+1} \otimes_\Lambda U \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow P^{-1} \otimes_\Lambda U \rightarrow P^0 \otimes_\Lambda U \rightarrow 0,$$

where $P^i \otimes_\Lambda U$ is a projective Γ -module for $-l+1 \leq i \leq 0$. Now we claim that $\text{Hom}_\Gamma(N, \Gamma) \in \text{Gproj}(\Lambda)^\perp$, and then by Criterion 3.3 we get $N \otimes_\Lambda U \in \text{Gproj}(\Gamma)$, thus $X \otimes_\Lambda U$ is quasi-isomorphic to a complex in $D_{\text{fGd}}^b(\Gamma)$. This shows that $X \otimes_\Lambda^\mathbb{L} -$ sends a Gorenstein projective module into $D_{\text{fGd}}^b(\Gamma)$, which proves the statement.

Now we show that $\text{Hom}_\Gamma(N, \Gamma) \in \text{Gproj}(\Lambda)^\perp$.

Applying the functor $\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_\Gamma(-, \Gamma) : D(\Gamma \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \Lambda^{\text{op}}) \rightarrow D(\Lambda)$ to the triangle in $D(\Gamma \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \Lambda^{\text{op}})$:

$$N[l-1] \rightarrow P_{[-l+1,0]}^\bullet \rightarrow X \rightarrow N[l],$$

we have the following triangle in $D(\Lambda)$:

$$\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_\Gamma(X, \Gamma) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_\Gamma(P_{[-l+1,0]}^\bullet, \Gamma) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_\Gamma(N, \Gamma[-l+1]) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_\Gamma(X, \Gamma)[1].$$

Since P^i is a projective $\Gamma \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \Lambda^{\text{op}}$ -module for each $-l+1 \leq i \leq 0$, $\text{Hom}_\Gamma(P^i, \Gamma) \in \text{inj}(\Lambda)$ and $\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_\Gamma(P_{[-l+1,0]}^\bullet, \Gamma) \cong \text{Hom}_\Gamma(P_{[-l+1,0]}^\bullet, \Gamma) \in D^b(\text{mod}(\Lambda))$ has all terms lying in $\text{inj}(\Lambda)$. By assumption, $\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_\Gamma(X, \Gamma)$ has all terms in $\text{Gproj}(\Lambda)^\perp$. As $\text{inj}(\Lambda) \subseteq \text{Gproj}(\Lambda)^\perp$, $\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_\Gamma(N, \Gamma[-l+1])$ is quasi-isomorphic to a bounded complex with each term in $\text{Gproj}(\Lambda)^\perp$. Since N is projective left Γ -module, then $\text{Hom}_\Gamma(N, \Gamma) \cong \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_\Gamma(N, \Gamma)$ in $D^b(\text{mod}(\Lambda))$. By Lemma 3.7, $\text{Hom}_\Gamma(N, \Gamma) \in \text{Gproj}(\Lambda)^\perp$. □

Remark 3.9. Since Λ and hence $\text{proj}(\Lambda)$ belong to $\text{Gproj}(\Lambda)^\perp$, if $\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_\Gamma(X, \Gamma)$ is perfect as complex of Λ -modules, $\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_\Gamma(X, \Gamma)$ is quasi-isomorphic to a bounded complex with each term in $\text{Gproj}(\Lambda)^\perp$. So Criterion 3.8 generalises Criterion 3.2.

Note, however, that if Λ is Gorenstein, $\text{Gproj}(\Lambda)^\perp$ is exactly the subcategory of modules of finite projective dimension and the thick subcategory generated by $\text{Gproj}(\Lambda)^\perp$ inside $D^b(\text{mod}(\Lambda))$ is exactly $\mathbf{K}^b(\text{proj}(\Lambda))$.

Now we apply Criteria 3.3 and 3.8 to bounded extensions. We begin with an observation which follows from [34, Theorem I (iii) or Proposition 3.7].

Proposition 3.10. *Let $B \subset A$ be a bounded extension. Then ${}_{AA} \otimes_B - : \underline{\text{Gproj}}(B) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Gproj}}(A)$ is fully faithful.*

Theorem 3.11. *Let $B \subset A$ be a bounded extension. Suppose that $\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_B(A, B)$ is quasi-isomorphic to a bounded complex with each term in $\text{Gproj}(A)^\perp$. Then*

$${}_{AA} \otimes_B - : \underline{\text{Gproj}}(B) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Gproj}}(A) \text{ and } {}_{AA} \otimes_B^\mathbb{L} - : D_{\text{def}}^b(B) \rightleftarrows D_{\text{def}}^b(A) : \text{Res}_B^A$$

are equivalences.

Proof. Since ${}_{AA}$ projective as left A -module and $\text{pd}({}_B A), \text{pd}(A_B) < \infty$, it follows from Criteria 3.3 (with $\Lambda = B, \Gamma = A, {}_\Gamma X_\Lambda = {}_A A_B$) that the functor ${}_{AA} \otimes_B - : \text{mod}(B) \rightarrow \text{mod}(A)$ induces a functor ${}_{AA} \otimes_B - : \underline{\text{Gproj}}(B) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Gproj}}(A)$ and thus ${}_{AA} \otimes_B^\mathbb{L} - : D_{\text{fGd}}^b(B)/\mathbf{K}^b(\text{proj}(B)) \rightarrow D_{\text{fGd}}^b(A)/\mathbf{K}^b(\text{proj}(A))$.

Since A_A is projective, $\text{pd}({}_B A) < \infty$ and $\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_B(A, B)$ is quasi-isomorphic to a bounded complex with each term in $\text{Gproj}(A)^\perp$, by Criteria 3.8 (with $\Lambda = A, \Gamma = B, {}_\Gamma X_\Lambda = {}_B A_A$), we have the functor $\text{Res}_B^A = {}_B A \otimes_A^{\mathbb{L}} -$ restricts to a triangle functor from $D_{\text{fGd}}^b(A)$ to $D_{\text{fGd}}^b(B)$.

We obtain an induced commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Gproj}(B) & \xrightarrow{{}_A A \otimes_B -} & \text{Gproj}(A) \\
\downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq \\
D_{\text{fGd}}^b(B)/K^b(\text{proj}(B)) & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{{}_A A \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} -} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{Res}_B^A} \end{array} & D_{\text{fGd}}^b(A)/K^b(\text{proj}(A)) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
D_{\text{sg}}^b(B) & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{{}_A A \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} -} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{Res}_B^A} \end{array} & D_{\text{sg}}^b(A) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
D_{\text{def}}^b(B) & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{{}_A A \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} -} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{Res}_B^A} \end{array} & D_{\text{def}}^b(A)
\end{array}$$

By Theorem 2.7,

$${}_A A \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} - : D_{\text{sg}}^b(B) \rightleftarrows D_{\text{sg}}^b(A) : \text{Res}_B^A$$

form an adjoint equivalence which imply that all the horizontal functors are equivalences. \square

Now we will give the last criteria from a different point of view.

Criterion 3.12. Assume there is an integer t such that $\Omega^l(X \otimes_\Lambda U) \in {}^\perp \Gamma$ for any $U \in {}^\perp \Lambda$. Then $X \otimes_\Lambda^{\mathbb{L}} -$ induces a triangle functor from $D_{\text{fGd}}^b(\Lambda)$ to $D_{\text{fGd}}^b(\Gamma)$.

Proof. This can be proved similarly as [40, Lemma 3.8]. For the convenience of the reader, we include here a proof.

As in the proof of Criterion 3.8, take a projective resolution P^\bullet of X as $\Gamma \otimes_k \Lambda^{op}$ -module:

$$\dots \rightarrow P^i \xrightarrow{d^i} P^{i+1} \xrightarrow{d^{i+1}} \dots \rightarrow P^{-1} \xrightarrow{d^{-1}} P^0 \rightarrow {}_\Gamma X_\Lambda \rightarrow 0$$

and take $N = \Omega^l({}_\Gamma X_\Lambda)$ for $l \gg 0$. Then N is projective as left Γ -module and right Λ -module. For any $U \in \text{Gproj}(\Lambda)$, $P^\bullet \otimes_\Lambda U$ is exact, so the sequence

$$0 \rightarrow {}_\Gamma N \otimes_\Lambda U \rightarrow {}_\Gamma P^{-l+1} \otimes_\Lambda U \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow {}_\Gamma P^{-1} \otimes_\Lambda U \rightarrow {}_\Gamma P^0 \otimes_\Lambda U \rightarrow {}_\Gamma X \otimes_\Lambda U \rightarrow 0$$

is exact. Hence, ${}_\Gamma N \otimes_\Lambda U \cong \Omega^l({}_\Gamma X \otimes_\Lambda U) \oplus {}_\Gamma V$ with ${}_\Gamma V \in \text{proj}(\Gamma)$, and ${}_\Gamma X \otimes_\Lambda^{\mathbb{L}} U \cong {}_\Gamma X \otimes_\Lambda U \in D^b(\text{mod}(\Gamma))$, which is quasi-isomorphic to

$$0 \rightarrow {}_\Gamma N \otimes_\Lambda U \rightarrow {}_\Gamma P^{-l+1} \otimes_\Lambda U \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow {}_\Gamma P^{-1} \otimes_\Lambda U \rightarrow {}_\Gamma P^0 \otimes_\Lambda U \rightarrow 0.$$

To show that this complex falls into $D_{\text{fGd}}^b(\Gamma)$, since ${}_\Gamma P^j \otimes_\Lambda U$ is projective for $j = -l+1, \dots, 0$, it remains to prove that when $l > t$, ${}_\Gamma N \otimes_\Lambda U$ belongs to $\text{Gproj}(\Gamma)$.

First, since ${}^\perp \Gamma$ is closed under taking syzygies and $\Omega^l({}_\Gamma X \otimes_\Lambda U) \in {}^\perp \Gamma$, when $l > t$, ${}_\Gamma N \otimes_\Lambda U \cong \Omega^l({}_\Gamma X \otimes_\Lambda U) \oplus {}_\Gamma V$ with ${}_\Gamma V \in \text{proj}(\Gamma)$ will belong to ${}^\perp \Gamma$.

Decompose a complete Λ -projective resolution $(Q^\bullet, \partial^\bullet)$ of U with $U = \ker(\partial^0)$ into short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow U^i \rightarrow Q^i \rightarrow U^{i+1} \rightarrow 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $U^i := \ker(\partial^i)$. Since N_Λ is projective, we have exact sequences:

$$0 \rightarrow {}_\Gamma N \otimes_\Lambda U^i \rightarrow {}_\Gamma N \otimes_\Lambda Q^i \rightarrow {}_\Gamma N \otimes_\Lambda U^{i+1} \rightarrow 0.$$

Since all U^i are Gorenstein projective, ${}_{\Gamma}N \otimes_{\Lambda} U^i \in {}^{\perp}\Gamma$. As all ${}_{\Gamma}N \otimes_{\Lambda} Q^i$ are projective, we can form a complete resolution of $N \otimes_{\Lambda} U$, hence $N \otimes_{\Lambda} U \in \mathbf{Gproj}(\Gamma)$.

This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 3.13. *Let $B \subset A$ be a bounded extension. Suppose that ${}_B B$ is a direct summand of ${}_B A$. Then*

$${}_A A \otimes_B - : \underline{\mathbf{Gproj}}(B) \rightarrow \underline{\mathbf{Gproj}}(A) \text{ and } {}_A A \otimes_B^{\mathbb{L}} - : \mathbf{D}_{\text{def}}^b(B) \rightleftarrows \mathbf{D}_{\text{def}}^b(A) : \text{Res}_B^A$$

are equivalences. In particular, these two equivalences exist if the extension $B \xrightarrow{i} A$ splits (i.e. there is an algebra homomorphism $p : A \rightarrow B$ such that $p \circ i = \text{Id}_B$) or the left B -module ${}_B A/B$ is projective.

Proof. Note that $\text{Res}_B^A = {}_B A \otimes_A -$ is exact and $\text{pd}({}_B A) = \text{pd}({}_B \text{Res}_B^A(A)) < \infty$. Now we claim that there is an integer t such that $\Omega^t(\text{Res}_B^A(U)) \in {}^{\perp}B$ for any $U \in {}^{\perp}A$, and then Criterion 3.12 can be applied. The equivalences can be shown as in the last paragraph of the proof of Theorem 3.11.

Let us show the claim that there is an integer t such that $\Omega^t(\text{Res}_B^A(U)) \in {}^{\perp}B$ for any $U \in {}^{\perp}A$.

Since ${}_B B$ is a direct summand of ${}_B A$, then for any $U \in {}^{\perp}A$ and $i > 0$, $\text{Ext}_B^i(\text{Res}_B^A(U), B)$ is a direct summand of $\text{Ext}_B^i(\text{Res}_B^A(U), {}_B A)$. On the other hand, it follows from Theorem 2.8 that the functor Res_B^A is a t -eventually homological isomorphism for some integer t . Therefore, for any $i > t$, we have isomorphisms

$$\text{Ext}_B^i(\text{Res}_B^A(U), {}_B A) = \text{Ext}_B^i(\text{Res}_B^A(U), \text{Res}_B^A(A)) \cong \text{Ext}_A^i(U, A),$$

which is equal to zero since $U \in {}^{\perp}A$. Hence, for any $i > t$ we have $\text{Ext}_B^i(\text{Res}_B^A(U), B) = 0$, and for any $j > 0$,

$$\text{Ext}_B^j(\Omega^t(\text{Res}_B^A(U)), B) = \text{Ext}_B^{j+t}(\text{Res}_B^A(U), B) = 0.$$

This shows that $\Omega^t(\text{Res}_B^A(U)) \in {}^{\perp}B$. \square

4. HOMOLOGICAL CONJECTURES FOR BOUNDED EXTENSIONS

In this section, we use the results of Sections 2 and 3 to deal with several homological conjectures for bounded extensions, which are still open. They are stated as follows.

The finitistic dimension conjecture [4]: *The finitistic dimension of A which is the supremum of the projective dimensions of finitely generated A -modules with finite projective dimension, is finite.*

Han's conjecture [26]: *If the Hochschild homology groups $\text{HH}_n(A)$ vanish for all sufficiently large n , then its global dimension is finite.*

Keller's conjecture [30]: *Let $\mathbf{S}_{\text{dg}}(A)$ be the dg enhancement of the singularity category $\mathbf{D}_{\text{sg}}^b(A)$. Then there is an isomorphism in the homotopy category of B_{∞} -algebras*

$$\mathbf{C}_{\text{sg}}^*(A, A) \cong \mathbf{C}^*(\mathbf{S}_{\text{dg}}(A), \mathbf{S}_{\text{dg}}(A)),$$

where $\mathbf{C}_{\text{sg}}^*(A, A)$ is the singular Hochschild cohomology complex [45] of A , and $\mathbf{C}^*(\mathbf{S}_{\text{dg}}(A), \mathbf{S}_{\text{dg}}(A))$ is the Hochschild cochain complex of $\mathbf{S}_{\text{dg}}(A)$.

Auslander and Reiten's Conjecture [2]: *A finitely generated A -module X satisfying $\text{Ext}_A^i(X, X \oplus A) = 0$ for all $i \geq 1$ must be projective.*

From [43, 22], an algebra A is said to satisfy **the Fg condition** if the Hochschild cohomology ring $\text{HH}^*(A)$ is Noetherian and the Yoneda algebra $\text{Ext}_A^*(A/\text{rad}A, A/\text{rad}A)$ is a finitely generated $\text{HH}^*(A)$ -module. The Fg condition enables developing support variety theory via Hochschild cohomology [43, 22].

Theorem 4.1. *Let $B \subset A$ be a bounded extension. Then the following statements hold:*

- (1) *B satisfies the finitistic dimension conjecture if and only if so does A .*
- (2) *B satisfies Han's conjecture if and only if so does A .*
- (3) *B satisfies Keller's conjecture if and only if so does A .*

Proof. By Theorem 2.7, we know that A and B are singularly equivalent of Morita type with level, which induces an equivalence of singularity categories, thus the finiteness of the global dimension is preserved. Note that this equivalence preserves the finitistic dimension conjecture [44], Hochschild homology [44] and Keller's conjecture [10]. Thus the statements (1)-(3) follow. \square

Remark 4.2. The assumption in Theorem 4.1 regarding the bounded extension is less restrictive than that imposed on the left or right bounded extension as introduced in [19]. Consequently, Theorem 4.1(2) extends the main result presented in [19]. Additionally, the approach employed to establish Theorem 4.1(2) differs entirely from that adopted in [19], where the Jacobi-Zariski long nearly exact sequence is utilized.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $B \subset A$ be a bounded extension. Assume that ${}_A A^{\text{tr}B} = \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_B({}_B A_A, {}_B B)$ is perfect as left A -module or that ${}_B B$ is a direct summand of ${}_B A$. Then the following statements hold:*

- (1) *B satisfies Auslander-Reiten's conjecture if and only if so does A .*
- (2) *B satisfies the Fg condition if and only if so does A .*

Proof. (1) By the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow B \rightarrow A \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$, since the projective dimension of M as B - B -bimodule is finite, $\text{pd}({}_B A)$ and $\text{pd}(A_B)$ are finite. Then we have the following adjoint 5-tuple of triangle functors

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \xleftarrow{{}_B A^{\text{tr}B^{\text{op}}} \otimes_A^L -} & \\
 & \xleftarrow{{}_A A \otimes_B^L -} & \\
 \mathbf{D}(B) & \xleftarrow{\text{Res}_B^A = {}_B A \otimes_A -} \mathbf{D}(A) & \\
 & \xrightarrow{-\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_B({}_B A_A, -)} & \\
 & \xleftarrow{\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_A({}_A (A^{\text{tr}B})_B, -)} &
 \end{array}$$

where $A^{\text{tr}B^{\text{op}}} = \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_{B^{\text{op}}}({}_A A_B, B)$, and $({}_A A \otimes_B^L -, {}_B A \otimes_A -)$ induces mutually inverse singular equivalences between A and B . Since ${}_B A \otimes_A -$ preserves $\mathbf{K}^b(\text{proj})$ and coproducts, we get that ${}_B A \otimes_A -$ preserves $\mathbf{K}^b(\text{Proj})$. Then it follows from [15, Corollary 3.5] that Auslander-Reiten's conjecture holds for B if it holds for A . Now we will prove the converse statement under the following two cases.

Case 1. Assume $A^{\text{tr}B} = \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_B({}_B A_A, {}_B B)$ is perfect as left A -module. Then the functor $\mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_B({}_B A_A, -) \cong {}_A A^{\text{tr}B} \otimes_B^L -$ preserves perfect complexes and the diagram extends downwards one step further. Thus we complete the proof by [15, Corollary 3.7].

Case 2. Assume the extension $B \subset A$ splits. Then by the proof of Theorem 3.13, there is an integer t such that $\Omega^t(\text{Res}_B^A(U)) \in {}^\perp B$ for any $U \in {}^\perp A$. Therefore, there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 {}^\perp A & \xrightarrow{\Omega^t \circ \text{Res}_B^A} & {}^\perp B \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 D_{\text{sg}}(A) & \xrightarrow{[-t] \circ \text{Res}_B^A} & D_{\text{sg}}(B)
 \end{array}$$

where $[1]$ is the shift functor on singularity category, ${}^{\perp}A$ is the additive quotient category of ${}^{\perp}A$ modulo projective modules and the vertical maps are natural full embedding, see [15, Lemma 2.1] for example. Since $[-t] \circ \text{Res}_B^A : D_{sg}(A) \rightarrow D_{sg}(B)$ is an equivalence, it follows from [15, Lemma 3.3] that Auslander-Reiten's conjecture holds for A if it holds for B .

(2) Since $\text{proj}(A)$ belong to $\text{Gproj}(A)^{\perp}$, it follows from Theorem 3.11 and Theorem 3.13 that $D_{\text{def}}^b(B) \simeq D_{\text{def}}^b(A)$. Therefore, B is Gorenstein if and only if so does A . Assume that B satisfies the Fg condition. Then it follows from [22, Theorem 1.5 (a)] that B is a Gorenstein algebra, and so does A by (1). On the other hand, it follows from Theorem 2.7 that there is a singular equivalence of Morita type with level between A and B . Therefore, A satisfies the Fg condition by [42, Theorem 7.4], and similarly, if A satisfies the Fg condition then so does B . \square

5. EXAMPLES

In this section, we apply Theorems 2.7, 2.8, 3.11, 3.13, 4.1 and 4.3 to many examples, and we get several reduction methods on singularity categories and Gorenstein defect categories.

Let $B \subset A$ be an algebra extension which splits. We will describe the construction of split algebra extensions. Let $i : B \rightarrow A$ be the algebra inclusion and $q : A \rightarrow B$ be the retraction. Denote $M = \text{Ker}(q)$ and $j : M \rightarrow A$ be the inclusion. Then there is a linear map $p : A \rightarrow M$ such that $j \circ p + i \circ q = \text{Id}_A$, that is, we have the splitting:

$$0 \longrightarrow B \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{i} \\ \xleftarrow{q} \end{array} A \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{p} \\ \xleftarrow{j} \end{array} M \longrightarrow 0$$

and we have the vector space isomorphism $A \cong B \oplus M$. Since $q : A \rightarrow B$ is an algebra homomorphism, M is a B - B -bimodule. The multiplication on A induces, via the vector space isomorphism $A \cong B \oplus M$, a multiplication on $M: \cdot : M \otimes_B M \rightarrow M$ which is also a B - B -bimodule homomorphism. In this case, the multiplication on $B \oplus M$ will be given by

$$(b, x)(b', x') = (bb', bx' + xb' + x \cdot x').$$

This motivated the following definition as well as a complete description of split algebra extensions.

Definition 5.1 ([3, Definition 2.3]). Let B be algebra and M a B - B -bimodule. The bimodule ${}_B M_B$ is called a bimodule algebra if there is a B - B -bimodule homomorphism

$$\cdot : M \otimes_B M \rightarrow M$$

subject to the following properties:

$$(x \cdot y) \cdot z = x \cdot (y \cdot z), x, y, z \in M.$$

Proposition 5.2 ([3, Proposition 2.4]). *Let B be algebra and M a B - B -bimodule algebra with product $\cdot : M \otimes_B M \rightarrow M$. Then the vector space $A = B \oplus M$ has an algebra structure given by*

$$(b, x)(b', x') = (bb', bx' + xb' + x \cdot x'), b, b' \in B, x, x' \in M.$$

Moreover, the inclusion $B \rightarrow A, b \mapsto (b, 0)$ is an algebra extension which splits via $q : A \rightarrow B, (b, x) \mapsto b$.

Conversely, each split algebra extension $B \subset A$ is given as above.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $B \subset A = B \oplus M$ be a split algebra extension. Then it is a bounded extension if and only if $\text{pd}_B(M_B) < \infty$, $M^{\otimes_B p} = 0$ for some integer p and $\text{Tor}_i^B(M, M^{\otimes_B j}) = 0$ for each $i, j \geq 1$. Hence, Theorems 2.7, 2.8, 3.13, 4.1 and 4.3 apply.*

Let us specify Proposition 5.3 for trivial extensions and further to triangular matrix algebras.

Let B be a finite dimensional algebra and M a finite dimensional B - B -bimodule. The trivial extension $A = B \ltimes M$ is by definition $B \oplus M$ and the multiplication is given by

$$(b, m)(b', m') = (bb', mb' + bm'), b, b' \in B, m, m' \in M.$$

Obviously, the algebra inclusion $B \hookrightarrow A$ defined by $b \mapsto (b, 0)$ has a retraction $A \rightarrow B$ given by $(b, m) \mapsto b$. Therefore, the extension $B \subset A$ splits with ${}_B(A/B)_B = {}_B M_B$. Trivial extensions of algebras are exactly split algebra extensions with trivial product on the bimodule algebras.

Proposition 5.4. *The trivial extension $B \subset A = B \ltimes M$ is a bounded extension if and only if $\text{pd}_B(M_B) < \infty$, $M^{\otimes_B p} = 0$ for some integer p and $\text{Tor}_i^B(M, M^{\otimes_B j}) = 0$ for each $i, j \geq 1$. Hence, Theorems 2.7, 2.8, 3.13, 4.1 and 4.3 apply.*

Example 5.5. Let A be an admissible quotient $\mathbf{k}Q/I$ of a path algebra $\mathbf{k}Q$ over a field \mathbf{k} . Consider an arrow α in Q such that α does not occur in a minimal generating set of I . The *arrow removal algebra* $B = A/\langle \bar{\alpha} \rangle$ of A was investigated in [16, 21, 23, 24]. Indeed, it follows from [24, Theorem A] that $A = B \ltimes M$ where M is projective as a B - B -bimodule and $M \otimes_B M = 0$. Therefore, $B \subset A$ is a bounded split extension. Applying Theorem 2.7, 2.8, 4.1(1) and 4.3(1)(2), we reobtain [24, Theorem A (ii)] and the main result of [23]. We mention that the Auslander-Reiten conjecture, Gorenstein defect categories and stable categories of Gorenstein projective modules between A and B were investigated in [40, Corollary I], which can also be deduced by Theorem 3.13 and Theorem 4.3(3).

Let Λ and Γ be two finite dimensional algebras, ${}_{\Gamma}W_{\Lambda}$ be a Γ - Λ -bimodule and $A = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda & 0 \\ {}_{\Gamma}W_{\Lambda} & \Gamma \end{pmatrix}$ be a triangular matrix algebra. In [33], Lu proved that if W is projective as a Γ - Λ -bimodule, then there are triangle equivalences

$$D_{\text{sg}}^b(A) \simeq D_{\text{sg}}^b(\Lambda) \coprod D_{\text{sg}}^b(\Gamma) \text{ and } D_{\text{def}}^b(A) \simeq D_{\text{def}}^b(\Lambda) \coprod D_{\text{def}}^b(\Gamma)$$

(see the proof of [33, Proposition 4.2 and Theorem 4.4]). Now we will generalize these results as follows.

Proposition 5.6. *Keep the above notations. If $\text{pd}_{\Gamma}({}_{\Gamma}W_{\Lambda}) < \infty$, then there are triangle equivalences:*

$$D_{\text{sg}}^b(A) \simeq D_{\text{sg}}^b(\Lambda) \coprod D_{\text{sg}}^b(\Gamma), \underline{\text{Gproj}}(A) \simeq \underline{\text{Gproj}}(\Lambda) \coprod \underline{\text{Gproj}}(\Gamma), \text{ and } D_{\text{def}}^b(A) \simeq D_{\text{def}}^b(\Lambda) \coprod D_{\text{def}}^b(\Gamma).$$

Proof. It is clear that

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda & 0 \\ {}_{\Gamma}W_{\Lambda} & \Gamma \end{pmatrix} \cong (\Lambda \times \Gamma) \ltimes W, W \otimes_{\Gamma \times \Lambda} W = 0, \text{ and } \text{Tor}_i^{\Lambda \times \Gamma}(W, W) = 0, \text{ for } i \geq 1.$$

Therefore, the statement follows from Proposition 5.4. \square

Now we will illustrate our results by two examples.

Example 5.7. Let $\Lambda = \mathbf{k}Q/I$ be the algebra where Q is the quiver

$$\gamma \curvearrowright 1 \begin{matrix} \xrightarrow{\beta} \\ \xleftarrow{\alpha} \end{matrix} 2$$

and $I = \langle \gamma^2, \alpha\beta \rangle$. We write the concatenation of paths from the right to the left. Let $\Gamma = \Lambda/\Lambda\alpha\Lambda$. Then Γ is the quiver

$$\gamma \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ 1 \end{array} \xrightarrow{\beta} 2$$

with relation $\{\gamma^2\}$, and Γ is a subalgebra of Λ . Therefore, $\Lambda\alpha\Lambda$ can be viewed as a Γ - Γ bimodule, and there is an algebra isomorphism $\Lambda \cong \Gamma \ltimes \Lambda\alpha\Lambda$ mapping $\bar{\varepsilon}_i$ to $(\bar{\varepsilon}_i, 0)$, $\bar{\gamma}$ to $(\bar{\gamma}, 0)$, $\bar{\beta}$ to $(\bar{\beta}, 0)$ and $\bar{\alpha}$ to $(0, \bar{\alpha})$, where ε_i is the trivial path at i . It is easy to check that $\Lambda\alpha\Lambda_\Gamma \cong (e_2\Gamma/\text{rad}(e_2\Gamma))^\Gamma$ and ${}_\Gamma\Lambda\alpha\Lambda \cong \Gamma e_1$. Therefore, we get $\Lambda\alpha\Lambda \otimes_\Gamma \Lambda\alpha\Lambda = 0$ and $\text{Tor}_i^\Gamma(\Lambda\alpha\Lambda, \Lambda\alpha\Lambda) = 0$ for each $i \geq 1$. Now we claim that $\text{pd}_{\Gamma^e}(\Lambda\alpha\Lambda) < \infty$, and then we get triangle equivalences $D_{\text{sg}}^b(\Lambda) \simeq D_{\text{sg}}^b(\Gamma)$ and $D_{\text{def}}^b(\Lambda) \simeq D_{\text{def}}^b(\Gamma)$ by Proposition 5.4. Indeed, the enveloping algebra Γ^e has the following quiver

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ 1 \otimes \gamma^{\text{op}} \\ \curvearrowright \end{array} & \xrightarrow{\beta \otimes 1^{\text{op}}} & \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ 2 \otimes \gamma^{\text{op}} \\ \curvearrowright \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ 1 \times 1^{\text{op}} \\ \curvearrowright \end{array} & \xrightarrow{\beta \otimes 1^{\text{op}}} & \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ 2 \times 1^{\text{op}} \\ \curvearrowright \end{array} \\ \uparrow 1 \otimes \beta^{\text{op}} & & \uparrow 2 \otimes \beta^{\text{op}} \\ \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ 1 \otimes 2^{\text{op}} \\ \curvearrowright \end{array} & \xrightarrow{\beta \otimes 2^{\text{op}}} & \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ 2 \otimes 2^{\text{op}} \\ \curvearrowright \end{array} \end{array}$$

with relations $\{(\gamma \otimes 1^{\text{op}})^2, (1 \otimes \gamma^{\text{op}})^2, (2 \otimes \gamma^{\text{op}})^2, (\gamma \otimes 2^{\text{op}})^2, (2 \otimes \beta^{\text{op}})(\beta \otimes 2^{\text{op}}) - (\beta \otimes 1^{\text{op}})(1 \otimes \beta^{\text{op}}), (\gamma \otimes 1^{\text{op}})(1 \otimes \beta^{\text{op}}) - (1 \otimes \beta^{\text{op}})(\gamma \otimes 2^{\text{op}}), (2 \otimes \gamma^{\text{op}})(\beta \otimes 1^{\text{op}}) - (\beta \otimes 1^{\text{op}})(1 \otimes \gamma^{\text{op}}), (\gamma \otimes 1^{\text{op}})(1 \otimes \gamma^{\text{op}}) - (1 \otimes \gamma^{\text{op}})(\gamma \otimes 1^{\text{op}})\}$. The Γ^e -module $\Lambda\alpha\Lambda$ is given by the following representation:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ 0 \\ \curvearrowright \end{array} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ 0 \\ \curvearrowright \end{array} \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \begin{array}{c} \left(\begin{array}{cc} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{array} \right) \curvearrowright \\ \mathbf{k}^2 \end{array} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathbf{k}^2 \\ & & \left(\begin{array}{cc} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{array} \right) \end{array}$$

There is an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \Gamma^e e_{1 \times 1^{\text{op}}} \rightarrow \Gamma^e e_{1 \times 2^{\text{op}}} \rightarrow \Lambda\alpha\Lambda \rightarrow 0$$

of Γ^e -modules, and thus $\text{pd}_{\Gamma^e}(\Lambda\alpha\Lambda) = 1$.

Example 5.8. This example is taken from [37, Example 5.5].

Consider the triangular matrix algebra

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{k} & 0 \\ \mathbf{k} & \mathbf{k}[x]/(x^2) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since the bimodule $W = \mathbf{k}$ is not a $\mathbf{k}[x]/(x^2)$ - \mathbf{k} -bimodule of finite projective dimension, the algebra extension $B = \mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{k}[x]/(x^2) \subset A$ is NOT a bounded extension. In fact, B is a Gorenstein algebra, while A is NOT, so their Gorenstein defect categories are not equivalent.

Acknowledgments. The first author was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12061060, 11961007), by the project of Young and Middle-aged Academic and Technological leader of Yunnan (Grant No. 202305AC160005) and by Yunnan Key Laboratory of Modern Analytical Mathematics and Applications (No. 202302AN360007). The second and the fourth authors were supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12071137), by Key Laboratory of Mathematics and Engineering Applications (Ministry of

Education), by Shanghai Key Laboratory of PMMP (No. 22DZ2229014) and by Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities.

Declaration of interests. The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Data availability. No new data were created or analyzed in this study.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Angeleri Hügel, S. König, Q. H. Liu and D. Yang, *Ladders and simplicity of derived module categories*. J. Algebra **472** (2017), 15-66. [7](#), [9](#), [11](#)
- [2] M. Auslander, I. Reiten, *On a generalized version of the Nakayama conjecture*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **52** (1975) 69-74. [14](#)
- [3] C. Bai, L. Guo, X. Ni, *O-operators on associative algebras and associative Yang-Baxter equations*. Pacific J. Math. **256** (2012), no. 2, 257-289. [16](#)
- [4] H. Bass, *Finitistic dimension and a homological generalization of semiprimary rings*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **95** (1960) 466-488. [14](#)
- [5] P. A. Bergh, D. A. Jørgensen and S. Oppermann, *The Gorenstein defect category*. Q. J. Math. Soc. **66** (2015), 459-471. [2](#)
- [6] M. Broué, *Equivalences of blocks of group algebras*. In: Finite dimensional algebras and related topics. V. Dlab and L.L.Scott (eds.), Kluwer, 1994, 1-26. [2](#)
- [7] R. O. Buchweitz, *Maximal Cohen-Macaulay modules and Tate-cohomology over Gorenstein rings*, with appendices by L.L. Avramov, B. Briggs, S.B. Iyengar and J.C. Letz. Math. Surveys and Monographs, vol. 262, Amer. Math. Soc., 2021. [2](#)
- [8] X. W. Chen, *Singularity categories, Schur functors and triangular matrix rings*. Algebr. Represent. Theor. **12** (2009), 181-191. [3](#)
- [9] X. W. Chen, *Singular equivalences induced by homological epimorphisms*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **142** (2014), no. 8, 2633-2640. [3](#)
- [10] X. W. Chen, H. H. Li and Z. F. Wang, *Leavitt path algebras, B_∞ -algebras and Keller's conjecture for singular hochschild cohomology*. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. to appear, arXiv: 2007.06895. [2](#), [15](#)
- [11] X. W. Chen, J. Liu and R. Wang, *Singular equivalences induced by bimodules and quadratic monomial algebras*. Algebr. Represent. Theory **26** (2023), no. 2, 609-630. [3](#)
- [12] X. W. Chen and M. Lu, *Gorenstein homological properties of tensor rings*. Nagoya Math. J. **237** (2020), 188-208. [6](#)
- [13] X. W. Chen and W. Ren, *Frobenius functors and Gorenstein homological properties*. J. Algebra **610** (2022), 18-37. [2](#)
- [14] X. W. Chen and L. G. Sun, *Singular equivalence of Morita type*. Preprint, (2012). [2](#)
- [15] Y. P. Chen, W. Hu, Y. Y. Qin, and R. Wang, *Singular equivalences and Auslander-Reiten conjecture*. J. Algebra. **623** (2023), 42-63. [15](#), [16](#)
- [16] C. Cibils, M. Lanzilotta, E. N. Marcos, and A. Solotar, *Deleting or adding arrows of a bound quiver algebra and Hochschild (co)homology*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **148** (2020), 2421-2432. [17](#)
- [17] C. Cibils, M. Lanzilotta, E. N. Marcos, and A. Solotar, *Erratum to the article Split bounded extension algebras and Han's conjecture*. Pacific J. Math. **318** (2022), no. 1, 229-231. [4](#), [5](#)
- [18] C. Cibils, M. Lanzilotta, E. N. Marcos, and A. Solotar, *Jacobi-Zariski long nearly exact sequences for associative algebras*. Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **53** (2021), no. 6, 1636-1650. [7](#)
- [19] C. Cibils, M. Lanzilotta, E. N. Marcos, and A. Solotar, *Han's conjecture for bounded extensions*. J. Algebra **598** (2022), 48-67. [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [15](#)
- [20] G. Dalezios, *On singular equivalences of Morita type with level and Gorenstein algebras*. Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **53** (2021), no. 4, 1093-1106. [3](#), [7](#)
- [21] L. Diracca, S. Koenig, *Cohomological reduction by split pairs*. J. Pure Appl. Algebra **212** (2008), no. 3, 471-485. [17](#)
- [22] K. Erdmann, M. Holloway, N. Snashall, Ø. Solberg and R. Taillefer, *Support varieties for selfinjective algebras*. K-Theory **33** (2004), no. 1, 67-87. [14](#), [16](#)
- [23] K. Erdmann, C. Psaroudakis and Ø. Solberg, *Homological invariants of the arrow removal operation*. Represent. Theory **26** (2022), 370-387. [4](#), [17](#)

- [24] E. L. Green, C. Psaroudakis and Ø. Solberg, *Reduction techniques for the finitistic dimension*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc 374 (2021), 6839–6879. [4](#), [8](#), [17](#)
- [25] D. Happel, *On Gorenstein algebras*. In: Progress in Math. **95**, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1991, 389-404. [2](#)
- [26] Y. Han, *Hochschild (co)homology dimension*. J. London Math. Soc. (2) **73** (2006), no. 3, 657-668. [14](#)
- [27] W. Hu and S. Pan, *Stable functors of derived equivalences and Gorenstein projective modules*. Math. Nachr. **290**, (2017) No. 10, 1512-1530. [4](#), [9](#)
- [28] H. Jin, D. Yang, and G. Zhou, *A localisation theorem for singularity categories of proper dg algebras*. arXiv:2302.05054. [9](#)
- [29] Y. Kato, *On derived equivalent coherent rings*. Comm. Algebra **30** (2002), no. 9, 4437-4454. [11](#)
- [30] B. Keller, *Singular Hochschild cohomology via the singularity category*. C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **356** (11-12) (2018), 1106-1111. Corrections, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **357** (6) (2019), 533-536. See also arXiv:1809.05121v10, 2020 [14](#)
- [31] H. H. Li, J. S. Hu and Y. F. Zheng, *When the Schur functor induces a triangle-equivalence between Gorenstein defect categories*. Sci. China Math. **65** (2022), no. 10, 2019-2034. [2](#), [3](#)
- [32] C. Löfwall, *The global homological dimensions of trivial extensions of rings*. J. Algebra. **39** (1976), 287-307. [5](#)
- [33] M. Lu, *Gorenstein defect categories of triangular matrix algebras*. J. Algebra **480** (2017), 346-367. [3](#), [17](#)
- [34] S. Oppermann, C. Psaroudakis, and T. Stai, *Change of rings and singularity categories*. Adv. Math. **350** (2019), 190-241. [4](#), [6](#), [7](#), [9](#), [10](#), [12](#)
- [35] D. Orlov, *Triangulated categories of singularities and D-branes in Landau-Ginzburg models*. Trudy Steklov Math. Institute **204** (2004), 240-262. [2](#), [7](#), [9](#)
- [36] S. Y. Pan and X. J. Zhang, *Derived equivalences and Cohen-Macaulay Auslander algebras*. Front. Math. China **10** (2015), no. 2, 323-338. [2](#)
- [37] C. Psaroudakis, Ø. Skartsæterhagen and Ø. Solberg, *Gorenstein categories, singular equivalences and finite generation of cohomology rings in recollements*. Trans. Am. Math. Soc. Ser. B 1 (2014), 45–95. [3](#), [8](#), [18](#)
- [38] Y. Y. Qin, *Reduction techniques of singular equivalences*. J. Algebra **612** (2022), 616-635. [3](#), [7](#)
- [39] Y. Y. Qin, *A note on singularity categories and triangular matrix algebras*. Algebr. Represent. Theory **27** (2024), no. 2, 1111-1119. [3](#)
- [40] Y. Y. Qin and D. W. Shen, *Eventually homological isomorphisms and Gorenstein projective modules*. Sci China Math. **67** (2024), 1719–1734. [8](#), [13](#), [17](#)
- [41] C.M.Ringel and P. Zhang, *Gorenstein-projective and semi-Gorenstein-projective modules*. Algebra Number Theory **14** (2020), no.1, 1-36. [10](#)
- [42] Ø. Skartsæterhagen, *Singular equivalence and the (Fg) condition*. J. Algebra 452 (2016), 66–93. [16](#)
- [43] N. Snashall and Ø. Solberg, *Support varieties and the Hochschild cohomology ring*. Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **88** (2004), no. 3, 705-732. [14](#)
- [44] Z. F. Wang, *Singular equivalence of Morita type with level*. J. Algebra **439** (2015), 245-269. [2](#), [7](#), [15](#)
- [45] Z. F. Wang, *Gerstenhaber algebra and Deligne’s conjecture on the Tate-Hochschild cohomology*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **374** (2021), no. 7, 4537-4577. [14](#)
- [46] H. Y. You and G. D. Zhou, *Relative derived categories, relative singularity categories and relative defect categories*. Rocky Mountain J. Math. **52** (2022), no. 6, 2189-2209. [2](#)
- [47] Y. F. Zhang, Y. Z. Liu and Y. J. Ma, *Triangle equivalences of Gorenstein defect categories induced by homological epimorphisms*. Comm. Algebra **52** (2024), no. 1, 116-127. [3](#)
- [48] G. D. Zhou and A. Zimmermann, *On singular equivalences of Morita type*. J. Algebra **385** (2013), 64-79. [2](#)

YONGYUN QIN, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, YUNNAN KEY LABORATORY OF MODERN ANALYTICAL MATHEMATICS AND APPLICATIONS, YUNNAN NORMAL UNIVERSITY, KUNMING 650500, CHINA.

Email address: qinyongyun2006@126.com

XIAOXIAO XU AND GUODONG ZHOU, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, KEY LABORATORY OF MATHEMATICS AND ENGINEERING APPLICATIONS OF MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, SHANGHAI KEY LABORATORY OF PMMP, EAST CHINA NORMAL UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI 200241, CHINA

Email address: 52275500015@stu.ecnu.edu.cn, gdzhou@math.ecnu.edu.cn

JINBI ZHANG, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, ANHUI UNIVERSITY, HEFEI 230601, CHINA

Email address: zhangjb@ahu.edu.cn