

COMPARING τ -TILTING MODULES AND 1-TILTING MODULES

XIAO-WU CHEN, ZHI-WEI LI, XIAOJIN ZHANG*, ZHIBING ZHAO

ABSTRACT. We characterize τ -tilting modules as 1-tilting modules over quotient algebras satisfying a tensor-vanishing condition, and characterize 1-tilting modules as τ -tilting modules satisfying a Tor^1 -vanishing condition. We use delooping levels to study *Self-orthogonal τ -tilting Conjecture*: any self-orthogonal τ -tilting module is 1-tilting. We confirm the conjecture when the endomorphism algebra of the module has finite global delooping level.

1. INTRODUCTION

The τ -tilting theory [1] is a natural generalization of the classical tilting theory [13, 6], and related ideas might be traced back to [5]. It is closely related to the silting theory [2] and cluster tilting theory [14]; see also [9].

Let A be an artin algebra. The central objects in τ -tilting theory are τ -tilting modules. It is well known that a τ -tilting A -module T becomes a 1-tilting module over the quotient algebra $A/\text{Ann}(T)$. Here, $\text{Ann}(T)$ is the annihilator of T , which is known to be a nilpotent ideal of A . However, the converse is not true in general. We are interested in the following basic question: to what extent, a 1-tilting module over a quotient algebra of A becomes a τ -tilting A -module?

The first result answers the question above, using a new tensor-vanishing condition; see Theorem 3.5.

Theorem I. *Let T be an A -module with $\text{Ann}(T)$ nilpotent. Then the A -module T is τ -tilting if and only if the corresponding $A/\text{Ann}(T)$ -module T is 1-tilting satisfying $\text{Ann}(T) \otimes_A T = 0$.*

In contrast to the the trivial fact $\text{Ann}(T)T = 0$, the condition $\text{Ann}(T) \otimes_A T = 0$ above is nontrivial and necessary.

By [4, 1], a 1-tilting module is precisely a faithful τ -tilting module. This might be viewed as a characterization of a 1-tilting module in terms of a τ -tilting module. The second result is another such characterization, using a new Tor^1 -vanishing condition; see Theorem 3.6.

Theorem II. *Let T be an A -module. Then T is 1-tilting if and only if it is τ -tilting satisfying $\text{Tor}_1^A(\text{Ann}(T), T) = 0$.*

The “only if” part of Theorem II is trivial, since the annihilator of any 1-tilting module is zero. We emphasize that the proofs of Theorems I and II are quite elementary.

Recall that an A -module T is self-orthogonal if $\text{Ext}_A^i(T, T) = 0$ for any $i \geq 1$. It is clear that any 1-tilting module is a self-orthogonal τ -tilting module. The following natural question is asked in [26]: is any self-orthogonal τ -tilting module

Date: January 7, 2025.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 18G25, 18G65, 18G05, 18G20.

Key words and phrases. tilting module, τ -tilting module, self-orthogonal module, delooping level, homological conjecture.

* The corresponding author.

xwchen@mail.ustc.edu.cn, zhiweili@jsnu.edu.cn, xjzhang@jsnu.edu.cn, zbzhaoh@ahu.edu.cn.

1-tilting? Since its positive answer is implied by a conjecture in [10], we propose to call it the *Self-orthogonal τ -tilting Conjecture*, and (S τ C) for short.

We mention that (S τ C) holds for algebras with finite global dimension. Indeed, it is shown in [26] that any self-orthogonal τ -tilting module with finite projective dimension is 1-tilting. More generally, by [20], it holds for syzygy-finite Gorenstein algebras, since any self-orthogonal module over such algebras has finite projective dimension; compare [7, 18]. For more confirmed cases, we refer to Proposition 5.3.

We use the delooping level in [11] to investigate (S τ C). Recall that the global delooping level of an algebra is the supremum of the delooping levels of all its left modules. Examples of algebras with finite global delooping level include Gorenstein algebras and syzygy-finite algebras.

We mention that delooping levels play a role in the finitistic dimension conjecture. The following result indicates that they might be useful to study (S τ C); see Theorem 5.4.

Theorem III. *Let T be a self-orthogonal τ -tilting A -module. Set $B = \text{End}_A(T)^{\text{op}}$. Then T is 1-tilting provided that B has finite global delooping level.*

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we recall basic facts in tilting theory. We compare 1-tilting modules and τ -tilting modules in Section 3. We study the delooping level in an exact category in Section 4. In the final section, we discuss homological conjectures on self-orthogonal modules, and prove Theorem III, whose proof relies on Theorem 3.6.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we recall from [4, 1] basic facts on 1-tilting modules and τ -tilting modules.

Let A be an artin algebra. Denote by $A\text{-mod}$ the abelian category of finitely generated left A -modules. For each A -module M , we denote by $|M|$ the number of isomorphism classes of indecomposable direct summands of M . For example, $|A|$ is the number of isomorphism classes of indecomposable projective A -modules, which equals the number of isomorphism classes of simple A -modules.

For a projective A -module P , its *trace ideal* [3, §8] is defined to be

$$\text{tr}(P) = \sum_{f \in \text{Hom}_A(P, A)} \text{Im}(f).$$

If $P \simeq Ae$ for some idempotent e , then $\text{tr}(P) = AeA$. We observe

$$(2.1) \quad \text{tr}(P)P = P.$$

Recall that a two-sided ideal I of A is *idempotent* if $I = I^2$. It is well known that an ideal I is idempotent if and only if there is a projective module P satisfying $I = \text{tr}(P)$.

Let I be an ideal of A . Denote by $I_0 \subseteq I$ its *stable part*, that is, the largest idempotent ideal contained in I . We mention that $I^N = I_0$ for any sufficiently large N . Up to isomorphism, there is a unique basic projective A -module P_0 with $I_0 = \text{tr}(P_0)$. Set

$$\text{st}(I) = |P_0|,$$

which might be called the *stable index* of I .

Lemma 2.1. *Let I be an ideal of A . Then we have*

$$|A| = |A/I| + \text{st}(I) = |A/I_0| + \text{st}(I).$$

Moreover, $|A| = |A/I|$ if and only if I is nilpotent.

Proof. For the two equalities, we apply the following facts: for a projective A -module P , $(A/I) \otimes_A P = 0$ if and only if $IP = P$, which is equivalent to $\text{tr}(P) \subseteq I$ by (2.1); moreover, $\text{st}(I) = \text{st}(I_0)$. For the last statement, we observe that $\text{st}(I_0) = 0$ if and only if $I_0 = 0$, which is equivalent to the condition that the ideal I is nilpotent. \square

Let T be an A -module. Denote by $\text{add}(T)$ the full subcategory of $A\text{-mod}$ formed by direct summands of finite direct sums of T , and by $\text{fac}(T)$ the full subcategory formed by factor modules of finite direct sums of T .

An A -module T is called *rigid* if $\text{Ext}_A^1(T, T) = 0$, and called *self-orthogonal* if $\text{Ext}_A^i(T, T) = 0$ for any $i \geq 1$. Recall that an A -module T is called *1-tilting* if it is rigid and satisfying $\text{pd}_A(T) \leq 1$ and $|T| = |A|$. Slightly more generally, an A -module T is called *partial 1-tilting*, if it is rigid and satisfies $\text{pd}_A(T) \leq 1$. Clearly, any partial 1-tilting module is self-orthogonal.

Recall that an *exact category* in the sense of [21] is an additive category with a chosen classes of short exact sequences, called conflatons, which satisfy certain axioms; see [15, Appendix A]. For example, an extension-closed full subcategory of an abelian category inherits the short exact sequences and becomes an exact category.

The following fact is standard.

Lemma 2.2. *Let T be a partial 1-tilting A -module. Then the subcategory $\text{fac}(T)$ of $A\text{-mod}$ is closed under extensions, and becomes an exact category. Moreover, T is projective in the exact category $\text{fac}(T)$.* \square

The following well-known result can be found in [4, VI.2.5 Theorem (c) and (d)]. We denote by D the Matlis duality.

Lemma 2.3. *Let T be a 1-tilting A -module. Then the exact category $\text{fac}(T)$ has enough projective objects and enough injective objects. Moreover, projective objects are precisely modules in $\text{add}(T)$, and injective objects are precisely injective A -modules.*

Proof. The proof uses the following fact: for each $M \in \text{fac}(T)$, take a right $\text{add}(T)$ -approximation $f: T^n \rightarrow M$ of M . Then f is surjective, whose kernel lies in $\text{fac}(T)$. For the last statement, we recall that $D(A)$ belongs to $\text{fac}(T)$; see [4, VI.2.2 Lemma(d)]. \square

An A -module T is called τ -*rigid* if $\text{Hom}_A(T, \tau(T)) = 0$, where τ denotes the Auslander-Reiten translation. By [5, Corollary 5.9], this is equivalent to the condition $\text{Ext}_A^1(T, \text{fac}(T)) = 0$. Moreover, in this case $\text{fac}(T)$ is closed under extensions. We observe that any τ -rigid module is rigid, and any partial 1-tilting module is τ -rigid; see Lemma 2.2.

Following [1, 1.2], a τ -rigid A -module T is called τ -*tilting* if it satisfies $|T| = |A|$. Slightly more generally, an A -module T is called *support τ -tilting* if there is an idempotent ideal I such that $IT = 0$ and that T is a τ -tilting A/I -module. We mention that the ideal I is unique, which equals the stable part of the annihilator $\text{Ann}(T)$.

The following result is due to [4, VIII.5.1 Lemma]; compare [1, Proposition 1.4].

Lemma 2.4. *Let T be an A -module. Then the following statements hold.*

- (1) *If T is faithful and τ -rigid, then it is partial 1-tilting.*
- (2) *The A -module T is faithful and τ -tilting if and only if it is 1-tilting.*

The following results are well known.

Proposition 2.5. *Let T be an A -module with $I = \text{Ann}(T)$. Then the following statements hold.*

- (1) If T is τ -rigid, we have $|T| \leq |A/I|$.
- (2) The A -module T is support τ -tilting if and only if it is τ -rigid satisfying $|T| = |A/I|$.
- (3) The A -module T is τ -tilting if and only if it is support τ -tilting and the ideal I is nilpotent.

Proof. For (1), we refer to [1, Proposition 1.3]; compare [4, VIII.5.3 Lemma]. For (2), we consider the stable part I_0 of I . Then the A -module T is support τ -tilting if and only if it is a τ -tilting A/I_0 -module. In particular, we have $|T| = |A/I_0| = |A/I|$; see Lemma 2.1. For (3), we just observe that a support τ -tilting A -module is τ -tilting if and only if $I_0 = 0$, which is equivalent to the nilpotency of I . \square

3. NEW COMPARISON RESULTS

In this section, we compare τ -tilting modules and 1-tilting modules. Theorems 3.5 and 3.6 are new characterizations of τ -tilting modules and 1-tilting modules, respectively.

We first characterize τ -rigid modules via certain partial 1-tilting modules over quotient algebras.

Proposition 3.1. *Let T be an A -module. Set $I = \text{Ann}(T)$ and $\bar{A} = A/I$. Then the A -module T is τ -rigid if and only if the corresponding \bar{A} -module T is partial 1-tilting satisfying $I \otimes_A T = 0$.*

Proof. For the “only if” part, we assume that the A -module T is τ -rigid. Then the corresponding \bar{A} -module T is also τ -rigid, which is faithful. By Lemma 2.4(1), it is partial 1-tilting.

Since the \bar{A} -module T is faithful, we infer from [4, VI.2.2 Lemma(d)] that $D(\bar{A})$ belongs to $\text{fac}(T)$. Therefore, we have

$$0 = \text{Ext}_A^1(T, D(\bar{A})) \simeq D\text{Tor}_1^A(\bar{A}, T).$$

Applying $- \otimes_A T$ to the canonical exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow I \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow \bar{A} \longrightarrow 0,$$

we infer that $\text{Tor}_1^A(\bar{A}, T) \simeq I \otimes_A T$. In summary, we conclude that $I \otimes_A T = 0$.

Conversely, we assume that the corresponding \bar{A} -module T is partial 1-tilting satisfying $I \otimes_A T = 0$. The above proof yields $\text{Ext}_A^1(T, D(\bar{A})) = 0$. Consequently, $\text{Ext}_A^1(T, E) = 0$ for any injective \bar{A} -module E .

Take any object $X \in \text{fac}(T)$. We form an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow X \xrightarrow{a} E \xrightarrow{c} Y \longrightarrow 0$$

in \bar{A} -mod with E injective. We observe that Y also belongs to $\text{fac}(T)$, since $D(\bar{A})$ belongs to $\text{fac}(T)$. By Lemma 2.2, T is projective in $\text{fac}(T)$. In particular, $\text{Hom}_A(T, c)$ is surjective. Consequently, we infer that a induces an injective map

$$\text{Ext}_A^1(T, X) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_A^1(T, E).$$

We conclude that $\text{Ext}_A^1(T, X) = 0$. By [5, Corollary 5.9], this implies that T is τ -rigid. \square

Remark 3.2. The vanishing condition $I \otimes_A T = 0$ is necessary. Take any ideal I of A . Then A/I is certainly a partial 1-tilting over A/I . However, the A -module A/I is τ -rigid if and only if I is idempotent.

Corollary 3.3. *Let T be an A -module. Set $I = \text{Ann}(T)$ and $\bar{A} = A/I$. Then the A -module T is support τ -tilting if and only if the corresponding \bar{A} -module T is 1-tilting satisfying $I \otimes_A T = 0$.*

Proof. We just combine Propositions 3.1 and 2.5(2). \square

Remark 3.4. Let T be a support τ -tilting A -module. The corresponding \bar{A} -module T is 1-tilting. By Lemma 2.3, the exact category $\text{fac}(T)$ has enough projective objects, and the full subcategory of projective objects coincides with $\text{add}(T)$; compare [26, Proposition 2.5]. We emphasize that $\text{fac}(T)$ inherits the same exact structure both from $A\text{-mod}$ and $\bar{A}\text{-mod}$.

Theorem 3.5. *Let T be an A -module. Set $I = \text{Ann}(T)$ and $\bar{A} = A/I$. Then the A -module T is τ -tilting if and only if the ideal I is nilpotent and the corresponding \bar{A} -module T is 1-tilting satisfying $I \otimes_A T = 0$.*

Proof. We just combine Corollary 3.3 and Proposition 2.5(3). \square

In the following result, the equivalence between (1) and (2) is essentially due to [17, Corollary 3.12], which strengthens [26, Theorem 3.2].

Theorem 3.6. *Let T be a τ -tilting A -module. Set $I = \text{Ann}(T)$ and $\bar{A} = A/I$. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) *The A -module T is 1-tilting.*
- (2) $\text{Ext}_A^2(T, \text{fac}(T)) = 0$.
- (3) $\text{Ext}_A^2(T, D(\bar{A})) = 0$.
- (4) $\text{Tor}_1^A(I, T) = 0$.

Proof. Since any 1-tilting module has project dimension at most one. Then we have “(1) \Rightarrow (2)”. The implication “(2) \Rightarrow (3)” is trivial, since $D(\bar{A})$ belongs to $\text{fac}(T)$. We have the following well-known isomorphisms.

$$\text{Ext}_A^2(T, D(\bar{A})) \simeq D\text{Tor}_2^A(\bar{A}, T) \simeq D\text{Tor}_1^A(I, T)$$

Then we have the equivalence between (3) and (4).

It remains to prove “(3) \Rightarrow (1)”. Since by Theorem 3.5 the \bar{A} -module T is 1-tilting, we have an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \bar{A} \longrightarrow T^0 \longrightarrow T^1 \longrightarrow 0$$

with both $T^i \in \text{add}(T)$. Applying $\text{Hom}_A(-, D(\bar{A}))$ to it, we obtain an exact sequence.

$$\text{Ext}_A^1(T^0, D(\bar{A})) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_A^1(\bar{A}, D(\bar{A})) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_A^2(T^1, D(\bar{A}))$$

Since $D(\bar{A})$ belongs to $\text{fac}(T)$ and T is projective in $\text{fac}(T)$, we have

$$\text{Ext}_A^1(T^0, D(\bar{A})) = \text{Ext}_{\text{fac}(T)}^1(T^0, D(\bar{A})) = 0.$$

By the assumption in (3), we have $\text{Ext}_A^2(T^1, D(\bar{A})) = 0$. Consequently, we infer that $\text{Ext}_A^1(\bar{A}, D(\bar{A})) = 0$.

We now use the following well-known isomorphisms.

$$\text{Ext}_A^1(\bar{A}, D(\bar{A})) \simeq D\text{Tor}_1^A(\bar{A}, \bar{A}) \simeq D(I/I^2)$$

We conclude that $I = I^2$. Since I is nilpotent by Theorem 3.5, we infer that $I = 0$, that is, the A -module T is faithful. Then we are done by Lemma 2.4(2). \square

Remark 3.7. Let T be a τ -tilting A -module, which is not 1-tilting. Set $I = \text{Ann}(T)$. The two theorems above imply that $I \otimes_A T = 0$ but $\text{Tor}_1^A(I, T) \neq 0$.

4. THE DELOOPING LEVEL

In this section, we study delooping levels [11] in an exact category. The key observation is that finite delooping levels play a role in obtaining the Ext^2 -vanishing condition in Theorem 3.6; see Proposition 4.4.

Let \mathcal{E} be an exact category [21] with enough projective objects. Denote by \mathcal{P} the full subcategory formed by projective objects. The projectively stable category is denoted by $\underline{\mathcal{E}}$. For each object X , we take a conflation

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathcal{E}}(X) \longrightarrow P \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow 0$$

with P projective. This gives rise to the syzygy endofunctor $\Omega_{\mathcal{E}}: \underline{\mathcal{E}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{E}}$.

The following notion is a categorical analogue of [11, Definition 1.2]. We mention its derived analogue in [12].

Definition 4.1. Let X be an object in \mathcal{E} . Its *delooping level*, denoted by $\text{dell}_{\mathcal{E}}(X)$, is defined to be minimal nonnegative number n such that $\Omega_{\mathcal{E}}^n(M)$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of $\Omega_{\mathcal{E}}^{n+1}(N)$ for some object N . If there is no such a number n , we set $\text{dell}_{\mathcal{E}}(X) = +\infty$.

The *global delooping level* of \mathcal{E} , denoted by $\text{gl.dell}(\mathcal{E})$, is defined to be the supremum of $\text{dell}_{\mathcal{E}}(X)$ for all objects X .

We observe that $\text{dell}_{\mathcal{E}}(X) \leq \text{pd}_{\mathcal{E}}(X)$. Here, $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{E}}$ denotes the projective dimension in \mathcal{E} . Therefore, we have $\text{gl.dell}(\mathcal{E}) \leq \text{gl.dim}(\mathcal{E})$.

Denote by $\Omega_{\mathcal{E}}^n(\mathcal{E})$ the full subcategory of \mathcal{E} formed by direct summands of $\Omega_{\mathcal{E}}^n(X) \oplus P$ for some object X and projective object P . Then we have a descending chain of subcategories.

$$\mathcal{E} \supseteq \Omega_{\mathcal{E}}^1(\mathcal{E}) \supseteq \Omega_{\mathcal{E}}^2(\mathcal{E}) \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \mathcal{P}$$

Example 4.2. Assume that the exact category \mathcal{E} is *syzygy-stable*, that is, there exists $d \geq 0$ such that $\Omega_{\mathcal{E}}^d(\mathcal{E}) = \Omega_{\mathcal{E}}^{d+1}(\mathcal{E})$. Then $\text{gl.dell}(\mathcal{E}) \leq d$.

A particular case is of interest. Assume that \mathcal{E} is Krull-Schmidt, which is *syzygy-finite*, that is, there exists an object E such that $\Omega_{\mathcal{E}}^d(\mathcal{E}) = \text{add}(E)$ for some $d \geq 0$. Then the descending chain above is stable. It follows that \mathcal{E} is syzygy-stable.

Let A be an artin algebra. The delooping level of an A -module X is denoted by $\text{dell}_A(X)$. Write $\text{gl.dell}(A) = \text{gl.dell}(A\text{-mod})$, called the *global delooping level* of the algebra A .

Example 4.3. (1) Assume that A is d -Gorenstein, that is, the selfinjective dimension of A on each side is at most d . Then $A\text{-mod}$ is syzygy-stable. More precisely, we have $\Omega_A^d(A\text{-mod}) = \Omega_A^{d+1}(A\text{-mod})$. Consequently, we have $\text{gl.dell}(A) \leq d$.

(2) The algebra A is called syzygy-finite if so is $A\text{-mod}$. Syzygy-finite algebras include algebras of finite representation type, torsionless-finite algebras [23], and monomial ideals by [27, Theorem I]. Therefore, the global delooping levels of these algebras are finite.

In what follows, we fix an abelian category \mathcal{A} and a full subcategory $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ which is closed under extensions. We assume further that the exact category \mathcal{E} has enough projective objects, which form the full subcategory ω .

Proposition 4.4. Assume that each object in ω are self-orthogonal in \mathcal{A} . Suppose that $T \in \omega$ and $X \in \mathcal{E}$. Then we have $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^2(T, X) = 0$ provided that $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{A}}(T) < \infty$ or $\text{dell}_{\mathcal{E}}(X) < \infty$.

We emphasize that for objects $X, Y \in \mathcal{E}$, the natural map

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}^2(X, Y) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^2(X, Y)$$

is injective, but not surjective in general; see [8, Proposition 3.4]. For the proof of Proposition 4.4, we need the following easy observations.

Lemma 4.5. *Keep the same assumptions above. For any $T \in \omega$ and any object $Y \in \mathcal{E}$, the following statements hold.*

- (1) $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^i(T, Y) \simeq \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^{i+1}(T, \Omega_{\mathcal{E}}(Y))$ for $i \geq 1$.
- (2) $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^j(T, \Omega_{\mathcal{E}}^k(Y)) = 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq k + 1$.

Proof. For (1), we consider the conflation

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathcal{E}}(Y) \longrightarrow P \longrightarrow Y \longrightarrow 0$$

with P projective in \mathcal{E} . The self-orthogonality condition on ω implies that $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^i(T, P) = 0$ for any $i \geq 1$. Applying $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(T, -)$ to the conflation above, we infer (1).

Since \mathcal{E} is closed under extensions in \mathcal{A} , we have $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(T, Y) = \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}^1(T, Y) = 0$. This yields (2) in the case $j = 1$. By induction, the general case follows immediately from (1). \square

Proof of Proposition 4.4. By applying Lemma 4.5(1) repeatedly, we have an isomorphism

$$(4.1) \quad \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^2(T, X) \simeq \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^{n+2}(T, \Omega_{\mathcal{E}}^n(X)).$$

for any $n \geq 0$. If $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{A}}(T)$ is finite, we are done.

We assume that $\text{dell}_{\mathcal{E}}(X) = d$. There exists some object $X' \in \mathcal{E}$ and a projective object P in \mathcal{E} , such that $\Omega_{\mathcal{E}}^d(X)$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of $\Omega_{\mathcal{E}}^{d+1}(X') \oplus P$. By Lemma 4.5(2), we have

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^{d+2}(T, \Omega_{\mathcal{E}}^{d+1}(X') \oplus P) = 0.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^{d+2}(T, \Omega_{\mathcal{E}}^d(X)) = 0.$$

Combining this with (4.1), we infer the required vanishing. \square

Remark 4.6. The proof above yields a slightly stronger result. Fix $d \geq 0$. Assume that $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^i(P, P) = 0$ for any $P \in \omega$ and $2 \leq i \leq d + 2$. Then we still have $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^2(T, X) = 0$, provided that $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{A}}(T) \leq d + 2$ or $\text{dell}_{\mathcal{E}}(X) \leq d$.

5. HOMOLOGICAL CONJECTURES

In this section, we study the self-orthogonal τ -tilting conjecture [26], which is implied by a conjecture in [10]. Theorem 5.4 confirms the conjecture under the assumption that the endomorphism algebra of the τ -tilting module has finite global delooping level.

In what follows, we assume that A is an artin algebra. The following conjecture is posted in [10, Conjecture 5.9].

Self-orthogonal Wakamatsu-tilting Conjecture (SWC). Let T be a self-orthogonal A -module with $|T| = |A|$. Then T is Wakamatsu-tilting.

We recall from [25, 19] that a self-orthogonal A -module W is called *Wakamatsu-tilting* if there is a long exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow T^0 \longrightarrow T^1 \longrightarrow T^2 \longrightarrow \dots$$

with each $T^i \in \text{add}(W)$ and each cocycle in ${}^{\perp}W = \{M \mid \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^i(M, W) = 0, i \geq 1\}$. We observe that a Wakamatsu-tilting module is necessarily faithful.

Self-orthogonal Faithful Conjecture (SFC). Let T be a self-orthogonal A -module with $|T| = |A|$. Then T is faithful.

We mention that if A is selfinjective, then (SFC) is equivalent to the following well-known Tachikawa's Conjecture [24]: any self-orthogonal module over a selfinjective algebra is projective. Here, we use the fact that any faithful A -module T with $|T| = |A|$ is necessarily a projective generator.

Recall that any τ -tilting A -module T satisfies $|T| = |A|$. Since any faithful τ -tilting module is 1-tilting, we infer that (SFC) implies the following conjecture posted in [26].

Self-orthogonal τ -tilting Conjecture (S τ C). Let T be a self-orthogonal τ -tilting A -module. Then T is 1-tilting.

In summary, we have the following implications for any given algebra A .

$$(\text{SWC}) \Rightarrow (\text{SFC}) \Rightarrow (\text{S}\tau\text{C})$$

Remark 5.1. It is well known that for a local algebra A , the only basic τ -tilting A -module is isomorphic to A ; see [1, Example 6.1]. Therefore, (S τ C) holds trivially for local algebras.

Let T be a τ -tilting A -module. Then the exact category $\text{fac}(T)$ has enough projective objects, which are precisely modules in $\text{add}(T)$; see Remark 3.4. The delooping levels in $\text{fac}(T)$ will be denoted by dell_T , which might be viewed as a relative version of the delooping level in [11].

The following result is partly due to [26, Theorem 1.3].

Proposition 5.2. *Let T be a self-orthogonal τ -tilting A -module. Set $\bar{A} = A/\text{Ann}(T)$. Assume that either $\text{pd}_A(T) < +\infty$ or $\text{dell}_T(D\bar{A}) < +\infty$. Then T is 1-tilting.*

Proof. By Remark 3.4, the assumptions in Proposition 4.4 hold for $\text{fac}(T) \subseteq A\text{-mod}$. Applying Proposition 4.4, we obtain $\text{Ext}_A^2(T, D(\bar{A})) = 0$. Using Theorem 3.6(3), we are done. \square

Recall that an algebra A is *minimal representation-infinite* if it is of infinite representation type and any proper quotient algebra is of finite representation type; see [22]. In the following result, we mention that (2) is due to [26, 18]; compare [7].

Proposition 5.3. *The conjecture (S τ C) holds for the following classes of algebras.*

- (1) *Local algebras.*
- (2) *Syzygy-finite Gorenstein algebras, including algebras with finite global dimension.*
- (3) *Algebras of finite representation type.*
- (4) *Minimal representation-infinite algebras.*

Proof. Let T be a self-orthogonal τ -tilting A -module. We may assume that T is not faithful.

For (1), we refer to Remark 5.1. For a Gorenstein algebra, it is syzygy-finite if and only if it is CM-finite. By [20, Corollary 2.3], any self-orthogonal module over a CM-finite Gorenstein algebra has finite projective dimension. Then Proposition 5.2 applies to (2).

We observe that in cases (3) and (4), the exact category $\text{fac}(T)$ is syzygy-finite, and thus has finite global delooping level; see Example 4.2. For (4), we observe that $\text{fac}(T)$ is a subcategory of $\bar{A}\text{-mod}$. Therefore, the quotient algebra \bar{A} is of finite representation type. Consequently, the category $\text{fac}(T)$ is syzygy-finite. \square

The following theorem indicates that the delooping level might play a role in the study of (S τ C).

Theorem 5.4. *Let T be a self-orthogonal τ -tilting A -module. Set $B = \text{End}_A(T)^{\text{op}}$. If $\text{dell}_B(DT)$ is finite, then T is 1-tilting. Consequently, if $\text{gl.dell}(B)$ is finite, then T is 1-tilting.*

Here, $B = \text{End}_A(T)^{\text{op}}$ is the opposite algebra of the endomorphism algebra of T . In particular, T becomes an A - B -bimodule, and $D(T)$ a B - A -bimodule.

Proof. Recall that T is a 1-tilting \bar{A} -module, with $\bar{A} = A/\text{Ann}(T)$. By the classical theorem of Brenner-Bulter [4, VI.3], we have an equivalence between exact categories

$$F = \text{Hom}_A(T, -): \text{fac}(T) \longrightarrow \text{sub}(DT) = \mathcal{S}.$$

Moreover, $\text{sub}(DT)$ is a torsionfree class in $B\text{-mod}$, which contains all projective B -modules. Consequently, we have $\text{dell}_{\mathcal{S}}(X) = \text{dell}_B(X)$ for any $X \in \mathcal{S}$.

We observe that $F(D\bar{A}) \simeq DT$. Consequently, we have

$$\text{dell}_T(D\bar{A}) = \text{dell}_{\mathcal{S}}(DT) = \text{dell}_B(DT).$$

Then the required statement follows from Proposition 5.2. \square

The B -module $D(T)$ above is 1-cotilting; [4, VI.3.8 Theorem(a)]. Since $(S\tau C)$ holds for local algebras, we may assume that A and thus B are non-local. Therefore, it would be nice to explore the following problem.

Problem. Construct a 1-cotilting module over a non-local algebra B with infinite delooping level.

We mention the work [16], where explicit modules with infinite delooping level are studied.

Acknowledgements. This project is supported by National Key R&D Program of China (No. 2024YFA1013801) and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No.s 12325101, 12131015, 12171207, 12371015, and 12371038).

REFERENCES

- [1] T. ADACHI, O. IYAMA AND I. REITEN, τ -tilting theory, *Compos. Math.* **150** (3) (2014), 415–452. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [8](#)
- [2] T. AIHARA, AND O. IYAMA, *Silting mutation in triangulated categories*, *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* **85** (3) (2012), 633–668. [1](#)
- [3] F.W. ANDERSON, AND K.R. FULLER, *Rings and Categories of Modules*, Second Edition, *Graduate Texts Math.* **13**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1992. [2](#)
- [4] I. ASSEM, D. SIMSON, AND A. SKOWRONSKI, *Elements of the Representation Theory of Associative Algebras*, Volume 1. *Techniques of Representation Theory*, *London Math. Soc. Student Texts* **65**, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2006. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [9](#)
- [5] M. AUSLANDER, AND S.O. SMALO, *Almost split sequences in subcategories*, *J. Algebra* **69** (1981), 426–454. [1](#), [3](#), [4](#)
- [6] K. BONGARTZ, *Tilted algebras*, in: *Representations of Algebras*, 26–38, *Lect. Notes Math.* **903**, Springer, Berlin New York, 1981. [1](#)
- [7] W. CHANG, *Tilting-completion for gentle algebras*, arXiv:2412.13971, 2024. [2](#), [8](#)
- [8] L. DEMONET, AND O. IYAMA, *Lifting preprojective algebras to orders and categorifying partial flag varieties*, *Algebra Number Theory* **10** (7) (2016), 1527–1580. [7](#)
- [9] H. DERKSEN, AND J. FEI, *General presentations of algebras*, *Adv. Math.* **278** (2015), 210–237. [1](#)
- [10] H. ENOMOTO, *Maximal self-orthogonal modules and a generalization of tilting modules*, arXiv:2301.13498v2, 2023. [2](#), [7](#)
- [11] V. GELINAS, *The depth, the delooping level and the finitistic dimension*, *Adv. Math.* **294** (2022), 108052. [2](#), [6](#), [8](#)
- [12] R. GUO, AND K. IGUSA, *Derived delooping levels and finitistic dimension*, arXiv:2311.00661, 2023. [6](#)
- [13] D. HAPPEL, AND C.M. RINGEL, *Tilted algebras*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **274** (2) (1982), 399–443. [1](#)
- [14] O. IYAMA, AND Y. YOSHINO, *Mutation in triangulated categories and rigid Cohen-Macaulay modules*, *Invent. Math.* **172** (2008), 117–168. [1](#)
- [15] B. KELLER, *Chain complexes and stable categories*, *Manuscr. Math.* **67** (1990), 379–417. [3](#)
- [16] L. KERSHAW, AND J. RICKARD, *A finite dimensional algebra with infinite delooping level*, *Ann. Rep. Th.* **1** (1) (2024), 61–65. [9](#)

- [17] J. LIU, AND J. WEI, *Sincere silting modules and vanishing conditions*, *Comm. Algebra* **52** (6) (2024), 2225–2234. [5](#)
- [18] J. LYU, AND J. WEI, *A note on Zhang’s question*, preprint, 2024. [2](#), [8](#)
- [19] F. MANTESE, AND I. REITEN, *Wakamatsu tilting modules*, *J. Algebra* **278** (2) (2004), 532–552. [7](#)
- [20] R. MARCZINZIK, *On self-orthogonal modules in Iwanaga-Gorenstein rings*, *Ann. Rep. Th.* **1** (1) (2024), 67–70. [2](#), [8](#)
- [21] D. QUILLEN, *Higher algebraic K-theory I*, in: *Higher K-Theories*, *Lecture Notes Math.* **341**, 85–147, Springer, Berlin Heidelberg, 1973. [3](#), [6](#)
- [22] C.M. RINGEL, *The minimal representation-infinite algebras which are special biserial*, in: *Representations of Algebras and Related Topics*, 501–560, EMS Ser. Congr. Rep., Eur. Math. Soc., Zurich, 2011. [8](#)
- [23] C.M. RINGEL, *On the representation dimension of artin algebras*, *Bull. Inst. Math. Acad. Sinica* **7** (1) (2012), 33–70. [6](#)
- [24] H. TACHIKAWA, *Quasi-Frobenius Rings and Generalizations*, *Lect. Notes Math.* **351**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1973. [8](#)
- [25] T. WAKAMATSU, *Stable equivalence for self-injective algebras and a generalization of tilting modules*, *J. Algebra* **134** (2) (1990), 298–325. [7](#)
- [26] X. ZHANG, *Self-orthogonal τ -tilting modules and tilting modules*, *J Pure Appl. Algebra*, **226** (3) (2022), 10860. [1](#), [2](#), [5](#), [7](#), [8](#)
- [27] B. ZIMMERMANN-HUISGEN, *Predicting syzygies over monomial relation algebras*, *Manuscr. Math.* **70** (1991), 157–182. [6](#)

Xiao-Wu Chen

School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, Anhui, PR China

Zhi-Wei Li, Xiaojin Zhang

School of Mathematics and Statistics, Jiangsu Normal University, Xuzhou 221116, Jiangsu, PR China

Zhibing Zhao

School of Mathematical Sciences, Anhui University, Hefei 230601, Anhui, PR China