

# VOPĚNKA'S PRINCIPLE, MAXIMUM DECONSTRUCTIBILITY, AND SET-GENERATION OF TORSION CLASSES

SEAN COX

ABSTRACT. Deconstructibility is an often-used sufficient condition on a class  $\mathcal{C}$  of modules that allows one to carry out homological algebra *relative to*  $\mathcal{C}$ . The principle **Maximum Deconstructibility (MD)** asserts that a certain necessary condition for a class to be deconstructible, is also sufficient. MD implies, for example, that the classes of Gorenstein Projective modules, Ding Projective modules, their relativized variants, and all torsion classes are deconstructible over any ring. MD was known to follow from Vopěnka's Principle and imply the existence of an  $\omega_1$ -strongly compact cardinal. We prove that MD is equivalent to Vopěnka's Principle, and to the assertion that all torsion classes of abelian groups are generated by a set (yielding the converse of a theorem of Göbel and Shelah).

## 1. INTRODUCTION

For a fixed unital, associative ring  $R$ , a class  $\mathcal{C}$  of (left)  $R$ -modules is called a *precovering class* if for every module  $K$ , there is some (not necessarily unique) morphism  $\pi_K : C_K \rightarrow K$  with  $C_K \in \mathcal{C}$  such that every morphism from a member of  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $K$  factors (not necessarily uniquely) through  $\pi$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C_K & \xrightarrow{\pi_K} & K \\ & \swarrow \text{dotted} & \uparrow \rho \\ & & C' \in \mathcal{C} \end{array}$$

The same notion appears more generally in category theory, where a precovering class is known as a *weakly coreflective* class, typically under the additional assumption that  $\mathcal{C}$  is retract-closed.

Determining whether a given class is precovering (or weakly coreflective) is a common problem. For example, whether the class of *Gorenstein Projective* modules is a precovering class (over every ring) is a well-known open problem ([7], [9], [10], [11], [12], [13], [14], [15], [17], [18], [19], [21], [22], [26], [27]), though some relative consistency results in set theory are known ([3], [4]).

*Deconstructibility* of a class is an often used sufficient condition for the class to be precovering. The notion of a deconstructible class grew out of Eklof and Trlifaj's contribution to the proof of the Flat Cover Conjecture ([2], [8]). A class  $\mathcal{C}$  is deconstructible if there is a **set**  $\mathcal{C}_0 \subset \mathcal{C}$  such that  $\mathcal{C}$  is exactly the closure of  $\mathcal{C}_0$  under *filtrations* (also known as *transfinite extensions*, see Section 2). This is very similar to the notion of the cellular closure of a set of morphisms, and the key

---

*Date:* December 30, 2024.  
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16E30,16D40, 03E75,16D90, 18G25, 16B70.  
Partially supported by NSF grant DMS-2154141.

fact—which goes via Quillen’s Small Object Argument—is that deconstructibility of a class implies that the class is precovering ([24]).

Deconstructible classes are closed under filtrations and “eventually almost everywhere closed under quotients” (see Section 2). The principle **Maximum Deconstructibility (MD)** asserts that the converse holds. MD was isolated in [4] mainly because it implies that for any ring  $R$  and every class  $\mathcal{X}$  of  $R$ -modules, the class of  $\mathcal{X}$ -Gorenstein Projective and  $\mathcal{X}$ -Ding projective modules are deconstructible, and hence (by [24]) precovering classes.

It was known that Vopěnka’s Principle (VP) implies MD ([4]), and that MD implies the existence of an  $\omega_1$ -strongly compact cardinal ([5]). We prove that VP and MD are equivalent, as part of our Theorem 1.1 below.

Theorem 1.1 also provides information about *torsion classes*, which were introduced by Dickson [6]. A class  $\mathcal{T}$  is a **torsion class** if it is closed under (infinite) direct sums, homomorphic images, and extensions. A torsion class  $\mathcal{T}$  is **generated by a set** if it is the closure of some set under homomorphic images, extensions, and direct sums. Göbel and Shelah proved that Vopěnka’s Principle implies that every torsion class is generated by a set ([16], Remark 4.4). Our Theorem 1.1 shows this is actually an equivalence.

**Theorem 1.1.** *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *Vopěnka’s Principle (VP)*
- (2) *Maximum Deconstructibility (MD)*
- (3) *Every class of abelian groups that is closed under transfinite extensions and quotients is deconstructible.*
- (4) *Every class of abelian groups that is closed under transfinite extensions and homomorphic images is deconstructible.*
- (5) *Every torsion class of abelian groups is deconstructible.*
- (6) *Every torsion class of abelian groups is generated by a set.*

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

An isomorphism-closed class  $\mathcal{C}$  of modules is: (1) **closed under (homomorphic) images** if whenever  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ , any homomorphic image of  $C$  is a member of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Equivalently,  $C/A \in \mathcal{C}$  whenever  $A \subset C$  and  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ . (2) **closed under quotients** if for all modules  $C_0$  and  $C_1$ : if  $C_0$  is a submodule of  $C_1$  and *both  $C_0$  and  $C_1$  are members of  $\mathcal{C}$* , then  $C_1/C_0$  is a member of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Clearly, closure under homomorphic images implies closure under quotients. A very weak form of closure under quotients, called **eventual almost everywhere closure under quotients**, was isolated in [4] as a crucial property of the class of Gorenstein Projective modules. We will not need the definition in this paper; it will suffice to know that eventual almost-everywhere closure under quotients follows trivially from closure under quotients.<sup>1</sup>

Given an ordinal  $\alpha$ ,  $V_\alpha$  refers to  $\alpha$ -th level of the set-theoretic cumulative hierarchy; it is the collection of sets of rank less than  $\alpha$ . Every set is a member of  $V_\alpha$  for some ordinal  $\alpha$ , and each  $V_\alpha$  is a set. See Jech [20] (Chapter 6) for details.

Though we will not need the exact definition of filtrations or filtration closures in this paper, we briefly explain what they are, since they are so prominent in the field.

---

<sup>1</sup>But in general they are not equivalent; e.g., the class of free abelian groups is not closed under quotients, but it is eventually almost everywhere closed under quotients.

Given a class  $\mathcal{C}$  of modules, a  **$\mathcal{C}$ -filtration** is a sequence  $\langle X_\alpha : \alpha \leq \zeta \rangle$  of modules indexed by ordinals up to and including some ordinal  $\zeta$ , such that (1)  $X_0 = 0$  (2) for each  $\alpha$ ,  $X_{\alpha+1}/X_\alpha$  is isomorphic to some member of  $\mathcal{C}$ ; and (3) (continuity) for each limit ordinal  $\gamma$ ,  $X_\gamma = \bigcup_{\alpha < \gamma} X_\alpha$ . A module  $M$  is  **$\mathcal{C}$ -filtered** if it is the union of some  $\mathcal{C}$ -filtration. A class  $\mathcal{C}$  is **filtration-closed** (or “closed under transfinite extensions”) if every  $\mathcal{C}$ -filtered module is a member of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

We employ several closure operations:

- **Filt( $\mathcal{C}$ )** denotes the closure of  $\mathcal{C}$  under filtrations. A class  $\mathcal{C}$  is **deconstructible** if there exists a set  $\mathcal{C}_0 \subset \mathcal{C}$  such that  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Filt}(\mathcal{C}_0)$ .
- **I( $\mathcal{C}$ )** is the closure of  $\mathcal{C}$  under homomorphic images (which is simply the class of images of members of  $\mathcal{C}$ )
- **E( $\mathcal{C}$ )** is the closure of  $\mathcal{C}$  under extensions (where a class  $\mathcal{A}$  is closed under extensions if whenever  $0 \rightarrow A_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow A_1 \rightarrow 0$  is a short exact sequence with  $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ , then  $M \in \mathcal{A}$ ).
- **D( $\mathcal{C}$ )** is the closure of  $\mathcal{C}$  under all (set-indexed) direct sums. For an ordinal  $\alpha$ , we let **D $_\alpha$ ( $\mathcal{C}$ )** denote the class of all  $\alpha$ -indexed direct sums of members of  $\mathcal{C}$ .
- **T( $\mathcal{C}$ )** is the torsion closure of  $\mathcal{C}$ ; i.e.,  $T(\mathcal{C})$  is the smallest class containing  $\mathcal{C}$  that is closed under direct sums, extensions, and homomorphic images.

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of abelian groups.  ${}^{\perp 0}\mathcal{C}$  denotes the class of  $A$  such that  $\text{Hom}(A, C) = 0$  for every  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ . If  $\mathcal{C} = \{C\}$  is a singleton, we write  ${}^{\perp 0}C$  instead of  ${}^{\perp 0}\{C\}$ . Recall that a torsion class is a class closed under set-sized direct sums, homomorphic images, and extensions; in fact,  $\mathcal{T}$  is a torsion class if and only if it is of the form  ${}^{\perp 0}\mathcal{Y}$  for some class  $\mathcal{Y}$  (cf. [25], Proposition VI.2.1).

**Fact 2.1.** *If  $\mathcal{Y}$  is a class of abelian groups and  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq {}^{\perp 0}\mathcal{Y}$ , then  $I(\mathcal{C})$ ,  $E(\mathcal{C})$ ,  $D(\mathcal{C})$ , and  $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{C})$  are all contained in  ${}^{\perp 0}\mathcal{Y}$ .*

*Proof.* That this is true of  $I$ ,  $E$ ,  $D$ , and  $T$  is routine. That it also holds of  $\text{Filt}$  follows from closure of  ${}^{\perp 0}\mathcal{Y}$  under colimits and extensions (cf. [5], Lemma 6).  $\square$

### 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

The implication (1)  $\implies$  (2) was proved in [4]. Statement (2) trivially implies statement (3), since closure under quotients implies eventual almost everywhere closure under quotients. (3) implies (4) because closure under images implies closure under quotients. (4) implies (5) because torsion classes are closed under filtrations ([5], Lemma 6) and homomorphic images. (5) implies (6) as follows: suppose  $\mathcal{A}$  is a torsion class and is deconstructible; say  $\mathcal{A} = \text{Filt}(\mathcal{A}_0)$  for some set  $\mathcal{A}_0 \subset \mathcal{A}$ . We claim that

$$(*) \quad \mathcal{A} = T(\mathcal{A}_0)$$

Since  $\mathcal{A}$  is a torsion class, it is closed under direct sums, images, and extensions, so the  $\supseteq$  direction of (\*) is trivial. And torsion classes are filtration-closed by Fact 2.1; so  $T(\mathcal{A}_0)$  contains  $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{A}_0) = \mathcal{A}$ .

To prove the (6)  $\implies$  (1) direction of Theorem 1.1, it will help to have an explicit hierarchy of sets whose union is the torsion closure.

**Proposition 3.1.** *If  $\mathcal{C}$  is a set, then for any fixed ordinal  $\kappa$ ,  $I(E(D_\alpha(\mathcal{C})))$  has a set of representatives containing  $\mathcal{C}$ .*

*Proof.* Clearly if  $\mathcal{C}$  is a set then  $D_\alpha(\mathcal{C})$  has a set of representatives. And for any class  $\mathcal{Y}$ , every member of  $E(\mathcal{Y})$  can be obtained from  $\mathcal{Y}$  in a finite number of extensions; so  $E(D_\alpha(\mathcal{C}))$  has a set of representatives. Similarly for  $I(-)$  (but even simpler, since  $I(-)$  is just the class of images). So  $I(E(D_\alpha(\mathcal{C})))$  has a set of representatives (which can be taken to include the set  $\mathcal{C}$ ).  $\square$

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of abelian groups. Recursively define a sequence  $\langle T_\alpha^{\mathcal{C}} : \alpha \in \text{ORD} \rangle$  as follows:

- $T_0^{\mathcal{C}} = \emptyset$
- If  $T_\alpha^{\mathcal{C}}$  is defined, let  $T_{\alpha+1}^{\mathcal{C}}$  be a set of representatives for

$$I(E(D_\alpha(T_\alpha^{\mathcal{C}} \cup (V_{\alpha+1} \cap \mathcal{C}))))$$

that contains  $T_\alpha^{\mathcal{C}} \cup (V_{\alpha+1} \cap \mathcal{C})$ . (Note that as long as  $T_\alpha^{\mathcal{C}}$  is itself a set, then  $T_\alpha^{\mathcal{C}} \cup (V_{\alpha+1} \cap \mathcal{C})$  is a set, so by Proposition 3.1 the displayed class has a set of representatives.)

- If  $\gamma$  is a limit ordinal,

$$T_\gamma^{\mathcal{C}} := \bigcup_{\alpha < \gamma} T_\alpha^{\mathcal{C}}.$$

Set  $T_\infty^{\mathcal{C}} := \bigcup_{\alpha \in \text{ORD}} T_\alpha^{\mathcal{C}}$ .

**Lemma 3.3.** For any class  $\mathcal{C}$ :

- (1)  $T_\alpha^{\mathcal{C}} \subseteq T_\beta^{\mathcal{C}}$  whenever  $\alpha \leq \beta$
- (2)  $V_\alpha \cap \mathcal{C} \subseteq T_\alpha^{\mathcal{C}}$  for all  $\alpha$
- (3)  $T_\infty^{\mathcal{C}} = T(\mathcal{C})$  (i.e.,  $T_\infty^{\mathcal{C}}$  is the torsion closure of  $\mathcal{C}$ ).

*Proof.* (1) and (2) are clear from the construction; in particular  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq T_\infty^{\mathcal{C}}$ . It is also clear that  $T_\infty^{\mathcal{C}}$  is closed under direct sums, images, and extensions. Furthermore, to see it is minimal with this property, induction on  $\alpha$  together with Fact 2.1 imply that if  $\mathcal{V}$  is a torsion class containing  $\mathcal{C}$ , then  $\mathcal{V} \supseteq T_\alpha^{\mathcal{C}}$  for all  $\alpha \in \text{ORD}$ .  $\square$

To finish the proof, we will use of the following beautiful theorem of Przeździecki:

**Theorem 3.4** (Przeździecki [23]). *There is a functor  $\mathcal{F} : \mathbf{Graphs} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ab}$  such that for any graphs  $U$  and  $V$ ,*

$$\text{hom}_{\mathbf{Ab}}(\mathcal{F}U, \mathcal{F}V) \simeq \mathbb{Z}^{\text{hom}_{\mathbf{Graphs}}(U, V)},$$

where  $\mathbb{Z}^{(I)}$  denotes the direct sum of  $\mathbb{Z}$  with coordinates from  $I$  (i.e., the free group of rank  $|I|$ ), and  $\mathbb{Z}^{(\emptyset)}$  is understood to be the trivial group 0.

Now we prove the (6)  $\implies$  (1) direction of Theorem 1.1. Suppose Vopěnka's Principle fails; then by [1] there is a rigid sequence

$$\langle X_\alpha : \alpha \in \text{ORD} \rangle$$

of graphs, rigid in the sense that  $\text{hom}_{\mathbf{Graphs}}(X_\alpha, X_\beta) = \emptyset$  whenever  $\alpha \neq \beta$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the functor from Theorem 3.4. Let  $G_\alpha := \mathcal{F}X_\alpha$  for each  $\alpha \in \text{ORD}$ . Then

$$\alpha \neq \beta \implies \text{hom}_{\mathbf{Ab}}(G_\alpha, G_\beta) \simeq \mathbb{Z}^{\text{hom}_{\mathbf{Graphs}}(X_\alpha, X_\beta)} = \mathbb{Z}^{(\emptyset)} = 0.$$

Hence,

$$\mathcal{G} := \{G_\alpha : \alpha \in \text{ORD}\}$$

is a rigid proper class of abelian groups. We prove that  $T(\mathcal{G})$  (the torsion closure of  $\mathcal{G}$ ) is not generated by a set. Suppose, toward a contradiction, that there is a set  $\mathcal{S} \subset T(\mathcal{G})$  such that  $T(\mathcal{G}) = T(\mathcal{S})$ . By Lemma 3.3,  $T(\mathcal{G}) = T_\infty^\mathcal{G}$ , so there is an ordinal  $\gamma^*$  such that  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq T_{\gamma^*}^\mathcal{G}$ . Then

$$\mathcal{S} \subseteq T_{\gamma^*}^\mathcal{G} \subseteq T(\mathcal{G}) \text{ and } T(\mathcal{S}) = T(\mathcal{G}).$$

It follows that

$$(1) \quad T(T_{\gamma^*}^\mathcal{G}) = T(\mathcal{G}).$$

Since  $\mathcal{G}$  is a rigid proper class, and  $T_{\gamma^*}^\mathcal{G}$  is a set, we may fix for the remainder of the proof some nonzero  $G \in \mathcal{G} \setminus T_{\gamma^*}^\mathcal{G}$ .

**Claim 3.0.1.**  $T_{\gamma^*}^\mathcal{G} \subseteq {}^{\perp_0}G$ .

*Proof.* We show by induction on  $\alpha \leq \gamma^*$  that  $T_\alpha^\mathcal{G} \subseteq {}^{\perp_0}G$ . The only nontrivial step is the successor step. Assume  $T_\alpha^\mathcal{G} \subseteq {}^{\perp_0}G$  and that  $\alpha + 1 \leq \gamma^*$ . Then

$$T_{\alpha+1}^\mathcal{G} \text{ is a set of representatives for } I(E(D_\alpha(T_\alpha^\mathcal{G} \cup (V_{\alpha+1} \cap \mathcal{G})))) .$$

Since  $I(E(D_\alpha(-)))$  preserves membership in  ${}^{\perp_0}G$  by Fact 2.1, and the induction hypothesis tells us  $T_\alpha^\mathcal{G} \subset {}^{\perp_0}G$ , it suffices to show that  $V_{\alpha+1} \cap \mathcal{G} \subset {}^{\perp_0}G$ ; and by rigidity of  $\mathcal{G}$  it in turn suffices to know that  $G \notin V_{\alpha+1} \cap \mathcal{G}$ . This is true, because  $G \notin T_{\gamma^*}^\mathcal{G}$  and, by Lemma 3.3 and the assumption that  $\alpha + 1 \leq \gamma^*$ ,

$$V_{\alpha+1} \cap \mathcal{G} \subseteq V_{\gamma^*} \cap \mathcal{G} \subseteq T_{\gamma^*}^\mathcal{G}$$

□

Since  ${}^{\perp_0}G$  is a torsion class and  $T_{\gamma^*}^\mathcal{G} \subseteq {}^{\perp_0}G$  by the claim, minimality of torsion closure ensures  $T(T_{\gamma^*}^\mathcal{G}) \subseteq {}^{\perp_0}G$ . Together with (1) this yields

$$0 \neq G \in \mathcal{G} \subseteq T(\mathcal{G}) = T(T_{\gamma^*}^\mathcal{G}) \subseteq {}^{\perp_0}G,$$

which is a contradiction, since  $\text{id}_G$  is a nonzero member of  $\text{hom}(G, G)$ .

#### 4. OPEN QUESTIONS

Given a class  $\mathcal{X}$  of modules over a fixed ring, a module  $G$  is called  $\mathcal{X}$ -Gorenstein Projective ( $\mathcal{X}$ - $\mathcal{GP}$ ) if there is an acyclic complex  $P_\bullet$  of projective modules such that  $G = \ker(P_0 \rightarrow P_1)$  and  $G \in {}^{\perp_1}\mathcal{X}$ ; the latter means that  $\text{Ext}^1(G, X) = 0$  for all  $X \in \mathcal{X}$ . The Gorenstein Projective modules are the class  $\mathcal{X}$ - $\mathcal{GP}$ , where  $\mathcal{X}$  is the class of projective modules. We refer to Cortés-Izurdiaga and Šaroch [3] for more background on these classes, and to Cox [4] for the proof that they have the crucial property of being eventually almost everywhere closed under quotients (despite failing, in general, to be closed under quotients).

The author's original motivation for introducing MD in [4] was to obtain the consistency, relative to large cardinals, of the scheme

“For any class  $\mathcal{X}$  of modules (over any fixed ring), the class  $\mathcal{X}$ - $\mathcal{GP}$  is deconstructible”.

Does this scheme imply VP? An affirmative answer would necessarily involve non-hereditary rings, since over a hereditary ring, for any class  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $\mathcal{X}\text{-}\mathcal{GP}$  is equal to the class of projective modules, which is always deconstructible. An affirmative answer would also need to involve some class  $\mathcal{X}$  other than the class of projectives, since by [3], a proper class of strongly compact cardinals (which is much weaker than VP) suffices to obtain deconstructibility of  $\mathcal{GP}$  ( $= \{\text{projectives}\}\text{-}\mathcal{GP}$ ) over every ring.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Jiří Adámek and Jiří Rosický, *Locally presentable and accessible categories*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 189, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.
- [2] L. Bican, R. El Bashir, and E. Enochs, *All modules have flat covers*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **33** (2001), no. 4, 385–390.
- [3] Manuel Cortés-Izurdiaga and Jan Šaroch, *The cotorsion pair generated by the Gorenstein projective modules and  $\lambda$ -pure-injective modules*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08602 (2023).
- [4] Sean Cox, *Maximum deconstructibility in module categories*, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra **226** (2022), no. 5.
- [5] Sean Cox, Alejandro Poveda, and Jan Trlifaj, *Approximation properties of torsion classes*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **56** (2024), no. 12, 3819–3828.
- [6] Spencer E. Dickson, *A torsion theory for Abelian categories*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **121** (1966), 223–235.
- [7] Nanqing Ding, Yuanlin Li, and Lixin Mao, *Strongly Gorenstein flat modules*, J. Aust. Math. Soc. **86** (2009), no. 3, 323–338.
- [8] Paul C. Eklof and Jan Trlifaj, *How to make Ext vanish*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **33** (2001), no. 1, 41–51.
- [9] Ioannis Emmanouil, *Precovers and orthogonality in the stable module category*, J. Algebra **478** (2017), 174–194.
- [10] Edgar E. Enochs and Overtoun M. G. Jenda, *Gorenstein injective and projective modules*, Math. Z. **220** (1995), no. 4, 611–633.
- [11] ———, *Relative homological algebra*, De Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics, vol. 30, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 2000.
- [12] Sergio Estrada, Alina Iacob, and Sinem Odabasi, *Gorenstein flat and projective (pre)covers*, Publ. Math. Debrecen **91** (2017), no. 1-2, 111–121.
- [13] Sergio Estrada, Alina Iacob, and Katelyn Yeomans, *Gorenstein projective precovers*, Mediterr. J. Math. **14** (2017), no. 1, Paper No. 33, 10.
- [14] James Gillespie, *Gorenstein complexes and recollements from cotorsion pairs*, Adv. Math. **291** (2016), 859–911.
- [15] ———, *On Ding injective, Ding projective and Ding flat modules and complexes*, Rocky Mountain J. Math. **47** (2017), no. 8, 2641–2673.
- [16] Rüdiger Göbel and Saharon Shelah, *Semirigid classes of cotorsion-free abelian groups*, J. Algebra **93** (1985), no. 1, 136–150.
- [17] Henrik Holm, *Gorenstein homological dimensions*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **189** (2004), no. 1-3, 167–193.
- [18] Alina Iacob, *Gorenstein homological algebra*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2019. With a foreword by Sergio Estrada.
- [19] ———, *Projectively coresolved Gorenstein flat and ding projective modules*, Comm. Algebra **48** (2020), no. 7, 2883–2893.
- [20] Thomas Jech, *Set theory*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. The third millennium edition, revised and expanded.
- [21] Peter Jørgensen, *Existence of Gorenstein projective resolutions and Tate cohomology*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **9** (2007), no. 1, 59–76.
- [22] Daniel Murfet and Shokrollah Salarian, *Totally acyclic complexes over Noetherian schemes*, Adv. Math. **226** (2011), no. 2, 1096–1133.
- [23] Adam J. Przeździecki, *An almost full embedding of the category of graphs into the category of abelian groups*, Adv. Math. **257** (2014), 527–545.

- [24] Manuel Saorín and Jan Šťovíček, *On exact categories and applications to triangulated adjoints and model structures*, Adv. Math. **228** (2011), no. 2, 968–1007.
- [25] Bo Stenström, *Rings of quotients*, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. Band 217, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1975.
- [26] Jian Wang and Li Liang, *A characterization of Gorenstein projective modules*, Comm. Algebra **44** (2016), no. 4, 1420–1432.
- [27] Bin Yu, *On  $\mathcal{X}$ -Gorenstein projective dimensions and precovers*, Turkish J. Math. **44** (2020), no. 5, 1768–1782.

*Email address:* scox9@vcu.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS, VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITY, 1015 FLOYD AVENUE, RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23284, USA