

# A FORMAL CATEGORY THEORETIC APPROACH TO THE HOMOTOPY THEORY OF DG CATEGORIES

YUKI IMAMURA

ABSTRACT. We introduce a bicategory which refines the localization of the category of dg categories with respect to quasi-equivalences and investigate its properties via formal category theory. Concretely, we first introduce the bicategory of dg categories  $\mathbf{DBimod}$  whose Hom categories are the derived categories of dg bimodules and then define the desired bicategory as the sub-bicategory  $\mathbf{DBimod}^{\text{qr}}$  consisting only of right quasi-representable dg bimodules.

The first half of the paper is devoted to the study of adjunctions and equivalences in these bicategories. We then show that the embedding  $\mathbf{DBimod}^{\text{qr}} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{DBimod}$  is a proarrow equipment in the sense of Richard J. Wood, which is a framework for formal category theory and makes it possible to talk about (weighted) (co)limits in an abstract way. Thus we obtain the notion of homotopical (co)limits in a dg category, including homotopical shifts and cones, by which we obtain a formal characterization of pretriangulated dg categories. As an immediate application we give a conceptual proof of the fact that the pretriangulatedness is preserved under the gluing procedure.

## CONTENTS

0. Introduction	2
Results of this paper	3
Outline	5
1. Preliminaries on triangulated categories	6
2. Basic dg category theory	7
2.1. Preliminaries on dg categories	7
2.2. Dg modules	8
2.3. (Co)end calculus	10
3. Dg bimodules and their bicategorical structures	12
3.1. Bicategories of dg bimodules	12
3.2. The tensor and Hom functors associated with dg bimodules	17
4. Adjunctions in $\mathbf{DBimod}$	19
5. Quasi-functors	23
6. The homotopy category theory of dg categories over a field	24
6.1. Homotopical (co)limits in a dg category	25
6.2. Homotopy Cauchy complete dg categories	30
6.3. Application to the gluing	31
6.4. Adjunctions of quasi-functors	32
7. A universal property of the homotopy category theory	34

---

*Date:* June 7, 2024.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 18G35, 18D60, 18D65, 14F08.

*Key words and phrases.* dg category, dg bimodule, quasi-functor, proarrow equipment, homotopical (co)limit.

A. Proarrow equipments	37
A.1. Basic bicategory theory	37
A.2. Proarrow equipments	40
A.3. The notion of (co)limits in a proarrow equipment	42
A.4. Absolute limits and Cauchy completeness	44
References	45

## 0. INTRODUCTION

Let  $\mathbb{k}$  be a commutative ring with unit (we will assume from [Section 6](#) onwards that  $\mathbb{k}$  is a field for simplicity).

A *differential graded category* (or *dg category*) over  $\mathbb{k}$  is an enriched category over the symmetric monoidal closed category  $\mathbf{Ch}(\mathbb{k})$  of cochain complexes of  $\mathbb{k}$ -modules. If a dg category  $\mathcal{A}$  is *pretriangulated*, then its *homotopy category*  $H^0(\mathcal{A})$  (the preadditive category obtained by taking 0-th cohomology of Hom complexes of  $\mathcal{A}$ ) has a triangulated structure. Hence (pretriangulated) dg categories are viewed as an enhancement of triangulated categories, and used in algebraic geometry and representation theory ([\[BK91\]](#), [\[Kel06\]](#)).

Besides the usual notion of equivalences as enriched categories, dg categories possess a weaker notion of equivalences called quasi-equivalences. A dg functor  $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  is called a *quasi-equivalence* if all  $F_{A,A'}: \mathcal{A}(A, A') \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(FA, FA')$  are quasi-isomorphisms for  $A, A' \in \mathcal{A}$  and if the induced functor  $H^0(F): H^0(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{B})$  is an equivalence of categories. Quasi-equivalences are considered to be the right notion of equivalences between dg categories ([\[Toë07, p. 617\]](#)). In [\[Tab05\]](#), Tabuada established the homotopy theory of dg categories by constructing a model structure on the category  $\mathbf{dgCat}$  of small dg categories whose weak equivalences are the quasi-equivalences. From this we get the localization  $\mathbf{HodgCat}$  of  $\mathbf{dgCat}$  with respect to quasi-equivalences, which is called the *homotopy category of dg categories*.

In addition to the model structure, the category  $\mathbf{dgCat}$  has the structure of a symmetric monoidal closed category. Unfortunately the monoidal structure on  $\mathbf{dgCat}$  is not compatible with the model structure in the sense that it is not a monoidal model category. Nevertheless Toën proved in [\[Toë07\]](#) that the homotopy category  $\mathbf{HodgCat}$  has a symmetric monoidal closed structure  $(\otimes^{\mathbb{L}}, \mathbb{k}, \mathbb{R}\underline{\mathbf{Hom}})$ . The internal Hom  $\mathbb{R}\underline{\mathbf{Hom}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  can be defined as the dg category  $D_{\mathbf{dg}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})^{\mathbf{rqr}}$  of *right quasi-representable dg bimodules* (see [\[Toë07, Theorem 6.1\]](#)).

Furthermore,  $\mathbf{dgCat}$  is a 2-category as well. Does the 2-category structure on  $\mathbf{dgCat}$  descend to the homotopy category  $\mathbf{HodgCat}$ ? The 2-structure on  $\mathbf{dgCat}$  is also incompatible with the model structure. Yet, the following proposition hints at a 2-categorical structure on  $\mathbf{HodgCat}$ .

**Proposition** ([\[Toë07, Corollary 4.8\]](#); see also [\[CS15\]](#)). There exists a bijection

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{HodgCat}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \cong H^0(\mathbb{R}\underline{\mathbf{Hom}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})) / \cong,$$

where the right hand side denotes the set of isomorphism classes of the objects.

This result suggests that a 2-category with  $H^0(\mathbb{R}\underline{\mathbf{Hom}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}))$  as Hom-categories would serve as a refinement of  $\mathbf{HodgCat}$ . Once such a refining 2-category is obtained, it is expected that we can develop *homotopy category theory of dg categories*, just as we use the 2-category structure on  $\mathbf{dgCat}$  to develop category theory of dg categories as enriched categories.

The purpose of this paper is to construct such a 2-category in terms of dg bimodules and to study its properties via formal category theory. Specifically, rather than a mere 2-category,

we construct it as the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{qr}}$  of *right quasi-representable* dg bimodules, which is a sub-bicategory of the derived bicategory  $\text{DBimod}$  of dg bimodules. It is worth noting that these bicategories have already been considered by several authors: [Kel98], [Kel05], [LO10], [Joh14], [Gen17], [AL17], [Orl20], [Yek20], [BB22], [CP23], etc. The Hom category  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{qr}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})^{\text{qr}}$  is equivalent to  $H^0(\mathbb{R}\underline{\text{Hom}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}))$ , and thus we call the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{qr}}$  the *homotopy bicategory of dg categories*.

In the second half of the paper, we present an approach to the homotopy theory of dg categories from the viewpoint of proarrow equipments. Proarrow equipments are known to provide a framework for formal category theory ([Woo82; Woo85]); see [Appendix A](#) for reviews of proarrow equipments. The bicategory  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{qr}}$  together with  $\text{DBimod}$  turns out to form a proarrow equipment  $(-)_* : \text{DBimod}^{\text{qr}} \hookrightarrow \text{DBimod}$ . This observation means that we can develop category theory in the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{qr}}$ , which would be what we should term as the homotopy category theory of dg categories.

**Results of this paper.** A *dg bimodule*  $X : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  between dg categories is defined as a dg functor  $X : \mathcal{B}^{\text{op}} \otimes \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$ , where  $C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$  is the dg category of complexes of  $\mathbb{k}$ -modules. A dg bimodule  $X : \mathbb{k} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  from the unit dg category  $\mathbb{k}$  is nothing but a dg  $\mathcal{B}$ -module. All dg categories and the categories  $C(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  of dg bimodules assemble into a bicategory  $\text{Bimod}$  whose composition  $\odot$  is given by the tensor product of dg bimodules.

The bicategory  $\text{DBimod}$  is a derived version of  $\text{Bimod}$ . Let  $D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  be the derived category of dg bimodules. The *derived composition*

$$\odot^{\mathbb{L}} : D(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}) \times D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})$$

is defined as the total left derived functor of the composition  $\odot$ . In general, the derived composition is not associative and unital; but, it is so when we restrict dg categories to *locally h-projective* (or *locally h-flat*) ones. Namely we have the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}_{\text{hp}}$  (resp.  $\text{DBimod}_{\text{hf}}$ ) such that

- the objects are locally h-projective (resp. locally h-flat) small dg categories;
- the Hom categories  $\text{DBimod}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  are the derived categories  $D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  of dg bimodules.

We remark that if the base ring  $\mathbb{k}$  is a field, then all dg categories are locally h-projective (and locally h-flat). We define  $\text{DBimod} := \text{DBimod}_{\text{hp}}$  and refer to it as the *derived bicategory of dg bimodules*.

In [Section 4](#), we study adjunctions in  $\text{DBimod}$ . In particular, [Theorem 4.5](#), cited below, generalizes [Gen17, Corollary 6.6].

**Theorem A** ([Theorem 4.5](#)). Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  be locally h-projective small dg categories and  $X : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a dg bimodule. Then the following are equivalent.

- (i) The dg bimodule  $X$  has a right adjoint in the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}$ .
- (ii) The right derived functor  $\mathbb{R}H_X : D(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{A})$  preserves coproducts.
- (iii)  $X$  is right compact.

One can find a partial result of this theorem in [AL17, Proposition 2.11]. We also have a characterization of equivalences in  $\text{DBimod}$ .

**Theorem B** ([Theorem 4.6](#)). Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  be locally h-projective dg categories and  $X : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a dg bimodule. Then the following are equivalent.

- (i)  $X$  is an equivalence in the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}$ .
- (ii) The left derived functor  $\mathbb{L}T_X : D(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{B})$  is an equivalence of categories.

In [Section 5](#), we introduce the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}}$  of quasi-functors. We say that a dg bimodule  $M \in D(\mathcal{B})$  is *quasi-representable* if  $M \cong \mathcal{B}(-, B)$  in  $D(\mathcal{B})$  for some  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ . Let  $\overline{\mathcal{B}} \subseteq D(\mathcal{B})$  be the full subcategory of quasi-representables. A dg bimodule  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  is called *right quasi-representable*, or a *quasi-functor*, if for all  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  the dg  $\mathcal{B}$ -modules  $X(-, A)$  are quasi-representable, or equivalently if the derived functor  $\mathbb{L}T_X: D(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{B})$  preserves quasi-representables. Let  $D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})^{\text{rqr}} \subseteq D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  be the full subcategory of quasi-functors, and define  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}} \subseteq \text{DBimod}$  as the sub-bicategory of quasi-functors. We think of  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}}$  as the bicategory above the homotopy category  $\text{HodgCat}$ , and call it the *homotopy bicategory of dg categories*. We observe equivalences of  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}}$ , as follows.

**Theorem C** ([Theorem 5.2](#)). Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  be locally h-projective dg categories and  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a quasi-functor. Then the following are equivalent.

- (i)  $X$  is an equivalence in the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}}$  of quasi-functors.
- (ii) Both the left derived functor  $\mathbb{L}T_X: D(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{B})$  and the restricted one  $\mathbb{L}T_X|_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}: \overline{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{B}}$  are equivalences of categories.

Note that a dg bimodule satisfying the condition (i) is called a *quasi-equivalence* in [[Kel94](#), §7.2].

For a dg functor  $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ , the associated dg bimodule  $F_* = \mathcal{B}(-, F-): \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  is clearly a quasi-functor. When  $F$  is a quasi-equivalence,  $F_*$  is an equivalence in  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}}$ ; see [[Kel94](#), §7.2, Example]. The next proposition says that the converse holds, which is also mentioned in the last of [[GLV22](#), §2.3] without proof.

**Proposition D** ([Proposition 5.3](#)). Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  be locally h-projective dg categories and  $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a dg functor. For the associated quasi-functor  $F_*: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ , the following are equivalent.

- (i)  $F$  is a quasi-equivalence (in the sense of [Definition 2.2](#)).
- (ii)  $F_*$  is an equivalence in the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}}$  of quasi-functors.
- (iii) Both the left derived functor  $\mathbb{L}T_{F_*}: D(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{B})$  and the restricted one  $\mathbb{L}T_{F_*}|_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}: \overline{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{B}}$  are equivalences of categories.

[Section 6](#) is the main section of this paper. In this section, we develop the homotopy category theory of dg categories (over a field). Now let us write the inclusion  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}} \hookrightarrow \text{DBimod}$  by  $(-)_*$ . By [[Gen17](#), Corollary 6.6] or [Theorem A](#), quasi-functors have right adjoints in  $\text{DBimod}$ . Thus we can see that the pseudo functor  $(-)_*$  satisfies:

- (1)  $(-)_*$  is an identity on objects;
- (2)  $(-)_*$  is locally fully faithful;
- (3) for every quasi-functor  $f$ , the dg bimodule  $f = f_*$  has a right adjoint in  $\text{DBimod}$ .

Such a pseudo functor is called a *proarrow equipment*, which is known as a framework for formal category theory; basic references on this subject are [[Woo82](#); [Woo85](#)] (we review it in [Appendix A](#)). For example, the proarrow equipment  $(-)_*: \text{dgCat} \hookrightarrow \text{Bimod}$  of dg functors and dg bimodules provides the  $\text{Ch}(\mathbb{k})$ -enriched category theory. The above observation indicates that we can develop a category theory in  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}}$ . We may name the category theory done in the equipment  $(-)_*: \text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}} \hookrightarrow \text{DBimod}$  as the *homotopy category theory of dg categories*.

In a proarrow equipment, we can define several notions in category theory, such as (weighted) (co)limits, Cauchy completeness, and pointwise Kan extensions. In [Subsection 6.1](#), applying the notion of (co)limits to the equipment  $(-)_*: \text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}} \hookrightarrow \text{DBimod}$ , we introduce the notion of homotopical (co)limits in a dg category (see [Definition 6.2](#)). As special

(co)limits, we obtain homotopical initial objects (Example 6.4), coproducts (Example 6.6), shifts (Example 6.9), and cocones (Example 6.12). In particular, we have a bicategorical characterization of pretriangulated dg categories as those admitting some homotopical limits.

**Corollary E** (Corollary 6.14). A dg category  $\mathcal{A}$  has homotopical shifts and cocones if and only if it is pretriangulated in the sense that  $H^0(\mathcal{A})$  is closed (up to isomorphism) under shifts and cones of  $D(\mathcal{A})$ .

In Subsection 6.2, we say that a dg category  $\mathcal{A}$  is *h-Cauchy complete* if all left adjoint dg bimodules in  $\text{DBimod}$  with codomain  $\mathcal{A}$  are right quasi-representable. Then Theorem A implies:

**Proposition F** (Proposition 6.21). A dg category  $\mathcal{A}$  is h-Cauchy complete if and only if the inclusion  $H^0(\mathcal{A}) \hookrightarrow \text{Perf}(\mathcal{A}) := D(\mathcal{A})^{\text{cpt}}$  is an equivalence of categories.

In Subsection 6.3, we see an application of the bicategorical description of being pretriangulated to the gluing of dg categories along a dg bimodule. For example, it is shown in [KL15, Lemma 4.3] that the gluing of pretriangulated dg categories is again pretriangulated. Proposition 6.23 gives a slight generalization and an alternative, more conceptual proof of this result.

We refer to an adjunction in the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}}$  as an *adjunction of quasi-functors*; see [Gen17, §7]. In Subsection 6.4, we investigate the relation between adjoint quasi-functors and adjoint dg functors. By showing that there exists a normal lax functor  $\Gamma: \text{Bimod} \rightarrow \text{DBimod}$  and it induces a pseudo-functor  $\gamma: \text{dgCat} \rightarrow \text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}}$ , we obtain the following:

**Proposition G** (Proposition 6.28). For an adjunction  $F \dashv G$  of dg functors, we have an adjunction  $F_* \dashv G_*$  of quasi-functors.

Finally, we point out that the pair  $(\Gamma, \gamma)$  behaves like a “morphism of proarrow equipments” in a sense and that the proarrow equipment  $(-)_*: \text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}} \hookrightarrow \text{DBimod}$  has a universal property similar to that of localizations (Theorem 7.5).

**Outline.** Section 1 and Section 2 are devoted to preliminaries on triangulated categories and dg categories. In Subsection 2.3 we summarize results on ends and coends which will be freely used in the sections that follow.

From Section 3 to Section 5, we construct and study the bicategories  $\text{DBimod}$  and  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}}$ . We investigate adjunctions, equivalences, right Kan extensions, and right Kan liftings there. We also construct a pseudo functor  $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}: \text{DBimod} \rightarrow \text{CAT}$  which assigns dg categories  $\mathcal{A}$  to the derived categories  $D(\mathcal{A})$  and dg bimodules  $X$  to the left derived functors  $\mathbb{L}T_X$  of tensoring with  $X$ .

In Section 6, we develop the homotopy category theory of dg categories (over a field), including homotopical (co)limits and homotopy Cauchy completeness. We apply them to the gluing of dg categories. We also study adjunctions of quasi-functors and their relation to adjunctions of dg functors, which [Gen17] does not mention.

Finally, the universal property that the proarrow equipment  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}} \hookrightarrow \text{DBimod}$  admits is explained in Section 7.

Appendix A contains definitions and basic results on proarrow equipments. It mostly follows [Woo82] except for Subsection A.4, which is a folklore.

**Acknowledgements.** The author would like to express his gratitude to his supervisor, Shinnosuke Okawa, for a lot of advice through regular seminars. The author is also very grateful to Hisashi Aratake for inviting him to the world of category theory and giving him opportunities for learning topics on enriched categories and 2-categories, including proarrow equipments.

This work was supported by JST SPRING Grant Number JPMJSP2138 and JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP23KJ1488.

## 1. PRELIMINARIES ON TRIANGULATED CATEGORIES

Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a triangulated category. In this section, we assume that all subcategories of triangulated categories are strictly full; i.e. full and closed under isomorphisms<sup>1</sup>. A subcategory  $\mathcal{S}$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  is called a *triangulated subcategory* if  $\mathcal{S}$  is closed under shifts and cones in  $\mathcal{T}$ . A triangulated subcategory  $\mathcal{S}$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  is *thick* if it is closed under direct summands. When  $\mathcal{T}$  has small coproducts, a triangulated subcategory  $\mathcal{S}$  is called *localizing* if it is closed under coproducts. We remark that localizing subcategories are thick.

For a set  $S$  of objects of  $\mathcal{T}$ , let  $\text{tria}(S)$  denote the smallest triangulated subcategory of  $\mathcal{T}$  containing  $S$ , and  $\text{thick}(S)$  the smallest thick subcategory containing  $S$ . Also, let  $\text{Loc}(S)$  denote the smallest localizing subcategory containing  $S$ , when  $\mathcal{T}$  has small coproducts. We have the sequence of inclusion relations  $\text{tria}(S) \subseteq \text{thick}(S) \subseteq \text{Loc}(S)$ .

For a set  $S$  of objects of  $\mathcal{T}$ , we define the *right orthogonal subcategory*  $S^\perp$  of  $S$  to be the full subcategory of  $\mathcal{T}$  spanned by those objects  $X$  that  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(C[n], X) = 0$  for all  $C \in S$  and all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

**Definition 1.1** ([BB03]). Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a triangulated category with coproducts.

- (1) An object  $C \in \mathcal{T}$  is called *compact* if the functor  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(C, -): \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \text{Ab}$  preserves coproducts.
- (2) A set  $S$  of objects of  $\mathcal{T}$  *generates*  $\mathcal{T}$  if  $S^\perp = 0$ .
- (3)  $\mathcal{T}$  is *compactly generated* if it is generated by a set  $S$  of compact objects. The set  $S$  is called a *generating set* of  $\mathcal{T}$ .

For example, the derived category  $D(R)$  of a ring  $R$  is generated by the single compact generator  $R$ . More generally, we will see that the derived category of a dg category is also compactly generated by the representables (Proposition 2.8).

**Proposition 1.2** ([Nee92; Nee96; Nee01]). Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a compactly generated triangulated category with  $S$  a generating set.

- (1) The full subcategory  $\mathcal{T}^{\text{cpt}}$  consisting of all compact objects of  $\mathcal{T}$  coincides with  $\text{thick}(S)$ .
- (2) The equality  $\text{Loc}(S) = \mathcal{T}$  holds.

**Proposition 1.3** (cf. [Kel94, Lemma 4.2]). Let  $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}'$  be triangulated categories with coproducts,  $F, G: \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}'$  triangulated functors preserving coproducts, and  $\alpha: F \Rightarrow G$  a natural transformation. If  $\mathcal{T}$  is compactly generated by a set  $S$  of objects, then the following hold.

- (1) The restricted functor  $F|_{\text{tria}(S)}: \text{tria}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}'$  is fully faithful if and only if for all  $C, C' \in S$  and all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$F: \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(C, C'[n]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}'}(FC, FC'[n])$$

---

<sup>1</sup>A subcategory closed under isomorphisms are also called *replete*.

is bijective.

- (2) If (1) holds and if for each  $C \in S$  the object  $FC$  of  $\mathcal{T}'$  is compact, then  $F: \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}'$  is fully faithful.
- (3)  $F$  is an equivalence if and only if  $F$  is fully faithful and the set  $\{FC\}_{C \in S}$  of objects compactly generates  $\mathcal{T}'$ .
- (4)  $\alpha$  is an isomorphism if and only if  $\alpha_C: FC \rightarrow GC$  is invertible for each  $C \in S$ .

**Proposition 1.4.** Let  $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}'$  be triangulated categories with coproducts and  $F: \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}'$  a triangulated functor. Suppose that  $\mathcal{T}$  is compactly generated by a set  $S$  of objects. If  $F(C) \in \mathcal{T}'$  is compact for all  $C \in S$ , then  $F$  preserves compact objects.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{T}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{T}$  be the full subcategory spanned by those objects  $X$  that  $F(X)$  is compact. Then  $\mathcal{T}_0$  is a thick subcategory containing  $S$ . Hence [Proposition 1.2](#) shows that  $\mathcal{T}_0$  contains  $\text{thick}(S) = \mathcal{T}^{\text{cpt}}$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 1.5** ([\[KL15, Lemma 2.10 \(2\)\]](#)). Let  $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}'$  be triangulated categories with coproducts and  $F: \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}'$  a triangulated functor. Suppose that  $\mathcal{T}$  is compactly generated by a set  $S$  of objects, and that  $F$  has a right adjoint  $G$ . Then  $F$  preserves compact objects if and only if  $G$  preserves coproducts.

## 2. BASIC DG CATEGORY THEORY

Let  $\mathbb{k}$  be a commutative base ring with unit. This section collects some definitions and basic results concerning dg categories. The reader is referred to [\[Kel94\]](#), [\[Kel06\]](#), [\[Dri04\]](#), and [\[Toë11\]](#) for dg category theory and [\[Kel82\]](#) for general enriched category theory. Also [\[KL15, Section 3\]](#) is helpful.

**2.1. Preliminaries on dg categories.** Let  $\text{Ch}(\mathbb{k})$  denote the category of cochain complexes of  $\mathbb{k}$ -modules; we use cohomological notation. The category  $\text{Ch}(\mathbb{k})$  is a symmetric monoidal closed category via the tensor product  $\otimes_{\mathbb{k}}$  of complexes and the Hom complex  $\text{Hom}^{\bullet}$ , and furthermore has the following model category structure which is compatible with the monoidal structure.

**Proposition 2.1** (The projective model structure on  $\text{Ch}(\mathbb{k})$ ; see [\[Hov99, §2.3\]](#)). The category  $\text{Ch}(\mathbb{k})$  of cochain complexes of  $\mathbb{k}$ -modules has a model category structure whose weak equivalences are quasi-isomorphisms and whose fibrations are surjections, which is called the *projective model structure* on  $\text{Ch}(\mathbb{k})$ . This model category is monoidal model with respect to the tensor product of complexes.

All objects are fibrant. Note that when  $\mathbb{k}$  is a field, all objects are cofibrant.

A *dg category* over  $\mathbb{k}$  is just a  $\text{Ch}(\mathbb{k})$ -enriched category. In this paper, all dg categories are assumed to be over  $\mathbb{k}$ . All cochain complexes of  $\mathbb{k}$ -modules form the dg category  $C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$  whose Hom objects are given by the Hom complex  $\text{Hom}^{\bullet}$ . We identify the base ring  $\mathbb{k}$  with the dg category with one single object and with the unique Hom complex  $\mathbb{k}$ . We call a dg category  $\mathcal{A}$  *small* when the collection  $\text{ob}(\mathcal{A})$  of objects is a small set. Let  $\text{dgCat} = \text{dgCat}_{\mathbb{k}}$  denote the category of small dg categories over  $\mathbb{k}$  (we often omit the subscript  $\mathbb{k}$ ).

We can associate two ordinary categories with a dg category. For a dg category  $\mathcal{A}$ , let  $Z^0(\mathcal{A})$  be the *underlying category* (or the *0-th cocycle category*) with the same objects whose Hom sets are  $Z^0(\mathcal{A}(A, B))$ , and  $H^0(\mathcal{A})$  be the *homotopy category* (or the *0-th cohomology category*) with the same objects whose Hom sets are  $H^0(\mathcal{A}(A, B))$ . In the case of the dg

category  $C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$  of complexes of  $\mathbb{k}$ -modules, its underlying category  $Z^0(C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k}))$  is just the enriching category  $\text{Ch}(\mathbb{k})$ .

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a dg functor between dg categories.

- (1)  $F$  is *quasi-fully faithful* if for all  $A, A' \in \mathcal{A}$ , the morphism  $F_{AA'}: \mathcal{A}(A, A') \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(FA, FA')$  of complexes is a quasi-isomorphism.
- (2)  $F$  is *quasi-essentially surjective* if the functor  $H^0(F): H^0(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{B})$  between homotopy categories is essentially surjective.
- (3)  $F$  is a *quasi-equivalence* if it is quasi-fully faithful and quasi-essentially surjective.

For a quasi-equivalence  $F$ , the induced functor  $H^0(F)$  is an equivalence of categories.

**Theorem 2.3** (The Tabuada model structure on  $\text{dgCat}$  [Tab05]). The category  $\text{dgCat}$  of small dg categories (over  $\mathbb{k}$ ) has a model category structure whose weak equivalences are quasi-equivalences. Let  $\text{HodgCat}$  denote the homotopy category of  $\text{dgCat}$ .

**Remark 2.4.** The category  $\text{dgCat}_{\mathbb{k}}$  of small dg categories becomes symmetric monoidal closed via the tensor product  $\otimes$  of  $\text{Ch}(\mathbb{k})$ -enriched categories and the dg functor category  $\text{Fun}_{\text{dg}}(-, -)$ . However, it is not a monoidal model category because the tensor products of cofibrant dg categories are not necessarily cofibrant ([Toë07, p. 631]).

**Proposition 2.5.** In the Tabuada model category  $\text{dgCat}_{\mathbb{k}}$ , the following hold.

- (1) For all dg categories  $\mathcal{A}$ , there exists an identity-on-object quasi-equivalence  $q_{\mathcal{A}}: Q(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  with  $Q(\mathcal{A})$  a cofibrant dg category. We call it a *cofibrant resolution* of  $\mathcal{A}$ .
- (2) For a cofibrant dg category  $\mathcal{A}$ , each Hom complex  $\mathcal{A}(A, B)$  is cofibrant with respect to the projective model structure on  $\text{Ch}(\mathbb{k})$ .

*Proof.* See [Toë07, Proposition 2.3] or the excellent thesis [Bel13, Lemma 3.6, 3.7].  $\square$

Recall that a complex  $X$  of  $\mathbb{k}$ -modules is defined to be *h-projective* if  $\text{Hom}^{\bullet}(X, N)$  is acyclic for every acyclic complex  $N \in \text{Ch}(\mathbb{k})$ . (We will soon generalize the notion of h-projectiveness to dg modules.)

Since cofibrant objects in  $\text{Ch}(\mathbb{k})$  are h-projective, every cofibrant dg category has h-projective Hom complexes by Proposition 2.5 above. Such a dg category will be called *locally h-projective*. Note that those dg categories whose Hom complexes are h-projective are often called h-projective simply, but we do not choose this terminology here. We also remark that, when  $\mathbb{k}$  is a field, every dg category is locally h-projective.

**2.2. Dg modules.** For a small dg category  $\mathcal{A}$ , a (*right*) *dg  $\mathcal{A}$ -module* is a dg functor  $M: \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$ . Let  $C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}) = \text{Fun}_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}, C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k}))$  denote the dg category of dg  $\mathcal{A}$ -modules. Put  $C(\mathcal{A}) = Z^0(C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}))$  and  $K(\mathcal{A}) = H^0(C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}))$ . A right dg  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}$ -module, or a dg functor  $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$ , is called a *left dg  $\mathcal{A}$ -module*. In the following, a right dg module is referred to as just a dg module unless otherwise stated.

For a dg  $\mathcal{A}$ -module  $M$  and an integer  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we define the *shift*  $M[n]$  as the dg module given by  $M[n](A) = M(A)[n]$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ . Here  $M(A)[n]$  denotes the usual shift of the complex  $M(A)$ . For a morphism  $\theta: M \rightarrow N$  in  $C(\mathcal{A}) = Z^0(C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}))$ , we define the *cone*  $\text{Cone}(\theta)$  by  $\text{Cone}(\theta)(A) = \text{Cone}(\theta_A)$ , where  $\text{Cone}(\theta_A)$  is the usual mapping cone of the morphism  $\theta_A: M(A) \rightarrow N(A)$  of complexes.

Given a morphism  $\theta: M \rightarrow N$  in  $C(\mathcal{A})$ , there is a canonical triangle  $M \rightarrow N \rightarrow \text{Cone}(\theta) \rightarrow M[1]$ . With distinguished triangles as those isomorphic to canonical ones, the homotopy category  $K(\mathcal{A}) = H^0(C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}))$  of dg modules is a triangulated category. Since we have the

dg Yoneda embedding  $y: \mathcal{A} \hookrightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})$ , the homotopy category of any dg category can be embedded to a triangulated category. We call a dg category  $\mathcal{A}$  *pretriangulated* if  $H^0(\mathcal{A})$  is closed (up to isomorphism) under shifts and cones of  $K(\mathcal{A})$ . The homotopy category of a pretriangulated dg category has the structure of a triangulated category induced by that of  $K(\mathcal{A})$ .

**Definition 2.6.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a small dg category and  $M \in C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})$  a dg  $\mathcal{A}$ -module.

- (1)  $M$  is called *acyclic* if for all  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ , the complex  $N(A) \in \text{Ch}(\mathbb{k})$  is acyclic. Let  $\text{Acyc}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})$  be the full subcategory consisting of acyclic dg modules.
- (2)  $M$  is called *h-projective* if for all acyclic dg modules  $N \in \text{Acyc}(\mathcal{A})$ , the complex  $C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})(M, N)$  is also acyclic; or equivalently if  $H^0(C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})(M, N)) = K(\mathcal{A})(M, N) \cong 0$  for all acyclic dg modules  $N \in \text{Acyc}(\mathcal{A})$ . Let  $\text{h-proj}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})$  be the full subcategory consisting of h-projective dg modules.
- (3)  $M$  is called *h-injective* if for all acyclic dg modules  $N \in \text{Acyc}(\mathcal{A})$ , the complex  $C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})(N, M)$  is also acyclic; or equivalently if  $H^0(C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})(N, M)) = K(\mathcal{A})(N, M) \cong 0$  for all acyclic dg modules  $N \in \text{Acyc}(\mathcal{A})$ . Let  $\text{h-inj}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})$  be the full subcategory consisting of h-injective dg modules.

The dg Yoneda lemma implies that the representable dg functors  $\mathcal{A}(-, A): \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$  are h-projective dg  $\mathcal{A}$ -modules. Therefore the Yoneda embedding  $y: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})$  factors through  $\text{h-proj}(\mathcal{A})$ .

A morphism  $\theta: M \rightarrow N$  of dg modules over a small dg category  $\mathcal{A}$ , or a morphism in  $C(\mathcal{A}) = Z^0(C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}))$ , is called a *quasi-isomorphism* if for each  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ , the morphism  $\theta_A: M(A) \rightarrow N(A)$  in  $\text{Ch}(\mathbb{k})$  is a quasi-isomorphism. Note that a morphism  $\theta: M \rightarrow N$  of dg modules is a quasi-isomorphism if and only if its cone  $\text{Cone}(\theta)$  is acyclic.

**Lemma 2.7** ([Kel94, Section 3]). Let  $M \in C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})$  be a dg module over a small dg category  $\mathcal{A}$ .

- (1)  $M$  admits an h-projective resolution: that is, there exists a quasi-isomorphism  $p(M) \rightarrow M$  in  $C(\mathcal{A})$  with  $p(M)$  h-projective.
- (2)  $M$  admits an h-injective resolution: that is, there exists a quasi-isomorphism  $M \rightarrow i(M)$  in  $C(\mathcal{A})$  with  $i(M)$  h-injective.

We define the *derived category*  $D(\mathcal{A})$  of a small dg category  $\mathcal{A}$  as the localization of  $K(\mathcal{A})$  with respect to quasi-isomorphisms. This is just the Verdier quotient of  $K(\mathcal{A})$  by the triangulated subcategory  $H^0(\text{Acyc}(\mathcal{A}))$  of acyclic dg modules, and we see from [Lemma 2.7](#) that there are equivalences of triangulated categories

$$D(\mathcal{A}) \simeq K(\mathcal{A})/H^0(\text{Acyc}(\mathcal{A})) \simeq H^0(\text{h-proj}(\mathcal{A})) \simeq H^0(\text{h-inj}(\mathcal{A})),$$

and inclusions  $H^0(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq D(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq K(\mathcal{A})$ . Moreover the localization functor  $\delta: K(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{A})$  has a left adjoint  $p: D(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow K(\mathcal{A})$  and a right adjoint  $i: D(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow K(\mathcal{A})$ .

**Proposition 2.8.** For a small dg category  $\mathcal{A}$ , the derived category  $D(\mathcal{A})$  is a triangulated category compactly generated by the set  $\{\mathcal{A}(-, A)\}_{A \in \mathcal{A}}$ .

We refer to compact objects in  $D(\mathcal{A})$  as *perfect* dg modules. It follows from [Proposition 1.2](#) that  $\text{Perf}(\mathcal{A}) := D(\mathcal{A})^{\text{cpt}} = \text{thick}(\{\mathcal{A}(-, A) \mid A \in \mathcal{A}\})$ .

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a small dg category and  $M \in C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})$  be a (right) dg  $\mathcal{A}$ -module. For a left dg  $\mathcal{A}$ -module  $N \in C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}})$ , the *tensor product*  $M \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} N$  over  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined to be the coequalizer

of the parallel morphisms

$$\coprod_{A,B \in \mathcal{A}} M(A) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \mathcal{A}(B, A) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} N(B) \rightrightarrows \coprod_{A \in \mathcal{A}} M(A) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} N(A)$$

in  $\text{Ch}(\mathbb{k})$  (This is the same as the coend of  $M(-) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} N(-)$ ; see [Example 2.13](#)). The tensor product satisfies

$$(\spadesuit) \quad \text{Hom}^\bullet(M \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} N, X) \cong C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})(M, \text{Hom}^\bullet(N(-), X))$$

for all  $X \in \text{Ch}(\mathbb{k})$ , which we check later in [Example 2.18](#). The tensor product over  $\mathcal{A}$  forms a dg functor

$$- \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} -: C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}) \otimes C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}) \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k}).$$

**Definition 2.9.** A dg module  $M \in C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})$  is called *h-flat* if for all acyclic left dg modules  $N \in C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}})$ , the tensor product  $M \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} N$  is also acyclic.

**Lemma 2.10.** Let  $E \in \text{Mod}(\mathbb{k})$  be an injective  $\mathbb{k}$ -module. We identify  $E$  as the complex  $E \in \text{Ch}(\mathbb{k})$  concentrated in degree 0.

- (1) For a complex  $X \in \text{Ch}(\mathbb{k})$ , we have  $H^n(\text{Hom}^\bullet(X, E)) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}}(H^n(X), E)$ .
- (2) Suppose that  $E \in \text{Mod}(\mathbb{k})$  is an injective cogenerator, i.e. that for every  $\mathbb{k}$ -module  $W \in \text{Mod}(\mathbb{k})$ ,  $W = 0$  if (and only if)  $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}}(W, E) = 0$ . Then a complex  $X$  is acyclic if and only if the Hom complex  $\text{Hom}^\bullet(X, E)$  is acyclic.

*Proof.* (1) Since  $E$  is a complex concentrated in degree 0,  $\text{Hom}^\bullet(X, E)$  is obtained by applying the functor  $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}}(-, E)$  to the each degree term of  $X$ . If  $E$  is injective, then  $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}}(-, E)$  is exact, and so commutes with taking  $n$ -th cohomology.

(2) This follows from (1). □

**Proposition 2.11.** Every h-projective dg module  $M \in C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})$  is h-flat.

*Proof.* Take an injective cogenerator  $E$  of  $\text{Mod}(\mathbb{k})$ . Remark that

$$\text{Hom}^\bullet(M \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} N, E) \cong C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})(M, \text{Hom}^\bullet(N(-), E))$$

for a left dg module  $N \in C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}})$ . If  $N$  is acyclic, then so is  $\text{Hom}^\bullet(N(-), E)$  by [Lemma 2.10](#). H-projectiveness of  $M$  implies that  $C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})(M, \text{Hom}^\bullet(N(-), E))$ , and hence  $\text{Hom}^\bullet(M \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} N, E)$ , is also acyclic. Therefore we see from [Lemma 2.10](#) that  $M \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} N$  is acyclic, which shows  $M$  is h-flat. □

**2.3. (Co)end calculus.** Before proceeding to the next section, we now introduce the notion of (co)ends and collect some facts on (co)ends. (Co)ends are a kind of (co)limits, and provide helpful tools to compute homs and tensors of dg modules. We refer the reader to Loregian's book [[Lor21](#)] and Kelly's book [[Kel82](#)] for details. For the dg case, [[Gen17](#), Section 3] is also a good reference.

Here we define (co)ends of dg functors valued in the dg category  $C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$  of complexes, because only such (co)ends will appear in this paper.

**Definition 2.12.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a small dg category and  $T: \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \otimes \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$  be a dg functor. An *end*  $\int_{A \in \mathcal{A}} T(A, A)$  of  $T$  is defined as the equalizer of

$$\prod_{A \in \mathcal{A}} T(A, A) \xrightarrow[\sigma]{\rho} \prod_{A, B \in \mathcal{A}} \text{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}(A, B), T(A, B)),$$

where  $\rho$  and  $\sigma$  are induced by the morphisms

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{AB}: T(A, A) &\rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}(A, B), T(A, B)), & x &\mapsto (a \mapsto T(A, a)(x)), \\ \sigma_{AB}: T(B, B) &\rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}(A, B), T(A, B)), & x &\mapsto (a \mapsto T(a, B)(x)).\end{aligned}$$

Dually, a *coend*  $\int^{A \in \mathcal{A}} T(A, A)$  of  $T$  is defined as the coequalizer of

$$\coprod_{A, B \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{A}(B, A) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} T(A, B) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\rho'} \\ \xrightarrow{\sigma'} \end{array} \coprod_{A \in \mathcal{A}} T(A, A),$$

where  $\rho'$  and  $\sigma'$  are induced by the morphisms

$$\begin{aligned}\rho'_{AB}: \mathcal{A}(B, A) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} T(A, B) &\rightarrow T(A, A), & a \otimes x &\mapsto T(A, a)(x) \\ \sigma'_{AB}: \mathcal{A}(B, A) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} T(A, B) &\rightarrow T(B, B), & a \otimes x &\mapsto T(a, B)(x).\end{aligned}$$

**Example 2.13.** Let  $M \in C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathcal{A})$  be a right dg  $\mathcal{A}$ -module and  $N \in C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{op}})$  be a left dg  $\mathcal{A}$ -module. The tensor product  $M \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} N$  over  $\mathcal{A}$ , introduced in the previous subsection, is the coend

$$M \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} N = \int^{A \in \mathcal{A}} M(A) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} N(A).$$

**Proposition 2.14.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a small dg category and  $\mathrm{Fun}_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathcal{A}, C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathbb{k}))$  denote the dg functor category from  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$ . For dg functors  $F, G: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$ , the Hom complex  $\mathrm{Fun}_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathcal{A}, C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathbb{k}))(F, G)$  is isomorphic to the end of  $\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(F(-), G(-))$ :

$$\mathrm{Fun}_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathcal{A}, C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathbb{k}))(F, G) \cong \int_A \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(F(A), G(A)).$$

**Proposition 2.15.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a small dg category and  $T: \mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{op}} \otimes \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$  be a dg functor. For a complex  $X \in C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$ , we have natural isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet\left(X, \int_A T(A, A)\right) &\cong \int_A \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(X, T(A, A)), \\ \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet\left(\int^A T(A, A), X\right) &\cong \int_A \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(T(A, A), X), \\ X \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} \int^A T(A, A) &\cong \int^A X \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} T(A, A).\end{aligned}$$

**Proposition 2.16** ((co)Yoneda lemma). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a small dg category.

(1) For a dg functor  $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$ , we have natural isomorphisms

$$F(B) \cong \int_A \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}(B, A), F(A)) \cong \int^A \mathcal{A}(A, B) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} F(A)$$

for all  $B \in \mathcal{A}$ .

(2) For a dg functor  $G: \mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{op}} \rightarrow C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$ , we have natural isomorphisms

$$G(B) \cong \int_A \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}(A, B), G(A)) \cong \int^A \mathcal{A}(B, A) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} G(A)$$

for all  $B \in \mathcal{A}$ .

**Proposition 2.17** (Fubini theorem). Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  be small dg categories and  $T: \mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{op}} \otimes \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{op}} \otimes \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B} \rightarrow C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$  be a dg functor. Then we have

$$\int_{(A, B) \in \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}} T(A, B, A, B) \cong \int_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \int_{B \in \mathcal{B}} T(A, B, A, B) \cong \int_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \int_{A \in \mathcal{A}} T(A, B, A, B),$$

$$\int^{(A,B) \in \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}} T(A, B, A, B) \cong \int^{A \in \mathcal{A}} \int^{B \in \mathcal{B}} T(A, B, A, B) \cong \int^{B \in \mathcal{B}} \int^{A \in \mathcal{A}} T(A, B, A, B).$$

**Example 2.18.** Let  $M \in C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})$  be a right dg  $\mathcal{A}$ -module,  $N \in C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}})$  be a left dg  $\mathcal{A}$ -module, and  $X \in \text{Ch}(\mathbb{k})$  be a complex. Then we can prove  $(\spadesuit)$  by (co)end calculus, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}^\bullet(M \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} N, X) &= \text{Hom}^\bullet \left( \int^{A \in \mathcal{A}} M(A) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} N(A), X \right) && \text{by Example 2.13,} \\ &\cong \int_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \text{Hom}^\bullet(M(A) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} N(A), X) && \text{by Proposition 2.15,} \\ &\cong \int_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \text{Hom}^\bullet(M(A), \text{Hom}^\bullet(N(A), X)) && \text{by the adjunction,} \\ &\cong C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})(M, \text{Hom}^\bullet(N(-), X)) && \text{by Proposition 2.14.} \end{aligned}$$

### 3. DG BIMODULES AND THEIR BICATEGORICAL STRUCTURES

**3.1. Bicategories of dg bimodules.** In this subsection, we construct two bicategories  $\text{Bimod}$  and  $\text{DBimod}$  whose 1-morphisms are dg bimodules. For details on bicategories, we refer to [Bén67] and [JY21].

Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  be small dg categories. A *dg bimodule* (or a *dg profunctor*)  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  from  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $\mathcal{B}$  is a dg functor  $X: \mathcal{B}^{\text{op}} \otimes \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$ . This is the same as a right dg  $(\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}})$ -module. Let  $C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}) = \text{Fun}_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}} \otimes \mathcal{A}, C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k}))$  denote the dg category of dg bimodules from  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $\mathcal{B}$ , and put

$$C(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = C(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \otimes \mathcal{B}), \quad K(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = K(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \otimes \mathcal{B}), \quad D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = D(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \otimes \mathcal{B}).$$

Regarding the base ring  $\mathbb{k}$  as a dg category with a single object, we have  $\mathbb{k}^{\text{op}} \otimes \mathcal{A} \cong \mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \otimes \mathbb{k} \cong \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}$ . Hence, a dg bimodule  $M: \mathbb{k} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  from  $\mathbb{k}$  to  $\mathcal{A}$  is precisely a right dg  $\mathcal{A}$ -module  $M: \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$  and a dg bimodule  $N: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$  from  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $\mathbb{k}$  is precisely a left dg  $\mathcal{A}$ -module  $N: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$ .

A dg bimodule  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  is called *h-projective* if it is h-projective as a right dg  $(\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}})$ -module. On the other hand, one can get from a dg bimodule  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  a right dg  $\mathcal{B}$ -module  $X(-, A)$  for  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  and a left dg  $\mathcal{A}$ -module  $X(B, -)$  for  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ . We call  $X$  *right h-projective* if each  $X(-, A)$  is h-projective as a right dg  $\mathcal{B}$ -module, and *left h-projective* if each  $X(B, -)$  is h-projective as a left dg  $\mathcal{A}$ -module. Similarly we define h-injective (h-flat, compact, etc.) dg bimodules and right or left h-injective (h-flat, compact, etc.) ones in the same way.

For two dg bimodules  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  and  $Y: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ , their *tensor product over  $\mathcal{B}$*  is defined to be the dg bimodule  $X \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} Y: \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \otimes \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$  given by

$$(X \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} Y)(C, A) = X(-, A) \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} Y(C, -) = \int^{B \in \mathcal{B}} X(B, A) \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} Y(C, B).$$

Defining the composition  $\odot$  of dg bimodules by  $Y \odot X := X \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} Y$  (Notice the order!), we obtain a bicategory  $\text{Bimod}$  whose objects are all small dg categories and whose Hom categories  $\text{Bimod}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  are the categories  $C(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  of dg bimodules. Its identities  $I_{\mathcal{A}}: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  are the dg Hom functors  $\mathcal{A}(-, -): \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \otimes \mathcal{A} \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$ .

Let us introduce other constructions of dg bimodules. For dg bimodules  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  and  $Z: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ , the dg bimodule  $X^{\ddagger}Z: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  is defined by setting

$$X^{\ddagger}Z(C, B) = \text{Fun}_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}, C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k}))(X(B, -), Z(C, -)) = \int_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \text{Hom}^\bullet(X(B, A), Z(C, A)).$$

We also define the bimodule  $Y_{\dagger}Z: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  given by

$$Y_{\dagger}Z(B, A) = \text{Fun}_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}, C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k}))(Y(-, B), Z(-, A)) = \int_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \text{Hom}^{\bullet}(Y(C, B), Z(C, A))$$

for dg bimodules  $Y: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  and  $Z: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ . The following is well-known, which we can check by (co)end calculus.

**Proposition 3.1.** Let  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ ,  $Y: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ , and  $Z: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  be dg bimodules between small dg categories. Then we have natural isomorphisms of complexes

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})(Y \odot X, Z) &\cong C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C})(Y, X^{\dagger}Z), \\ C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})(Y \odot X, Z) &\cong C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})(X, Y_{\dagger}Z). \end{aligned}$$

This means that  $X^{\dagger}Z$  forms the right Kan extension  $\text{Ran}_X Z$  and  $Y_{\dagger}Z$  forms the right Kan lifting  $\text{Rift}_Y Z$  in  $\text{Bimod}$ ; in other words,  $\text{Bimod}$  is a closed bicategory.

The composition  $\odot$  of dg bimodules has dg functoriality and gives rise to a dg functor

$$\odot: C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}) \otimes C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}),$$

which induces the functor

$$\odot: K(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}) \times K(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow K(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}).$$

Then we define the *derived composition*  $\odot^{\mathbb{L}}$  by the right Kan extension

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}) \times K(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) & \xrightarrow{\odot} & K(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}) \\ \delta \times \delta \downarrow & & \uparrow \quad \downarrow \delta \\ D(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}) \times D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) & \xrightarrow{\odot^{\mathbb{L}}} & D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}). \end{array}$$

Since the localization functor  $\delta: K(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  has a left adjoint  $\mathfrak{p}: D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow K(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ , we see that the derived composition  $-\odot^{\mathbb{L}}-$  is given by the composites

$$D(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}) \times D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{p} \times \mathfrak{p}} K(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}) \times K(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \xrightarrow{\odot} K(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}) \xrightarrow{\delta} D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}).$$

**Lemma 3.2.** Consider small dg categories  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{B}$ , and  $\mathcal{C}$ .

- (1) If a dg bimodule  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  is right h-flat, then the precomposition

$$-\odot X = X \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} -: C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})$$

preserves quasi-isomorphisms.

- (2) If a dg bimodule  $Y: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  is left h-flat, then the postcomposition

$$Y \odot - = - \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} Y: C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})$$

preserves quasi-isomorphisms.

*Proof.* (1) It suffices to show that if  $N \in C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C})$  is an acyclic dg bimodule, then so is  $N \odot X$ . Given an acyclic  $N$ , then  $N(C, -)$  is an acyclic left dg  $\mathcal{B}$ -module. Therefore the assumption that  $X$  is right h-flat implies that

$$N \odot X(C, A) = X(-, A) \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} N(C, -)$$

is acyclic for  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ . The same for (2).  $\square$

The following propositions are basic relations between properties of bimodules as two-sided modules and as one-sided ones. Recall that a dg category is *locally h-projective* (respectively, *locally h-flat*) if its Hom complexes are h-projective (respectively, h-flat) in  $C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$ .

**Lemma 3.3** (dg category version of [Yek20, Lemma 14.3.11]). Consider small dg categories  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{B}$ , and  $\mathcal{C}$ .

- (1) If  $\mathcal{A}$  is locally h-flat and if a dg bimodule  $X: \mathcal{A} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{B}$  is h-flat, then  $X$  is right h-flat.
- (2) If  $\mathcal{C}$  is locally h-flat and if a dg bimodule  $Y: \mathcal{B} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{C}$  is h-flat, then  $Y$  is left h-flat.

*Proof.* (1) We want to show that the right dg  $\mathcal{B}$ -module  $X(-, A)$  is h-flat for every  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ . Given a left dg  $\mathcal{B}$ -module  $N: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$ , we have isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned}
X(-, A) \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} N &= \int^{B' \in \mathcal{B}} X(B', A) \otimes N(B') && \text{(Definition)} \\
&\cong \int^{A' \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{A}(A', A) \otimes \int^{B' \in \mathcal{B}} X(B', A') \otimes N(B') && \text{(Proposition 2.16)} \\
&\cong \int^{A' \in \mathcal{A}} \int^{B' \in \mathcal{B}} \mathcal{A}(A', A) \otimes X(B', A') \otimes N(B') && \text{(Proposition 2.15)} \\
&\cong \int^{(B', A') \in \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}} X(B', A') \otimes (N(B') \otimes \mathcal{A}(A', A)) && \text{(Proposition 2.17)} \\
&\cong X \otimes_{\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}} (N(-) \otimes \mathcal{A}(-, A)).
\end{aligned}$$

Suppose  $N$  is acyclic. Then  $N(-) \otimes \mathcal{A}(-, A)$  is acyclic by the locally h-flatness of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Since  $X$  is h-projective as a dg  $(\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}})$ -module, the above isomorphisms imply that  $X(-, A) \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} N$  is acyclic as well. Thus  $X$  is right h-flat.

- (2) It follows in a similar manner, because there is an isomorphism

$$N \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} Y(C, -) \cong Y \otimes_{\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{B}^{\text{op}}} (\mathcal{C}(C, -) \otimes N(-))$$

for a right dg  $\mathcal{B}$ -module  $N: \mathcal{B}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$  and an object  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4** (dg category version of [Yek20, Lemma 14.3.11]). Consider small dg categories  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{B}$ , and  $\mathcal{C}$ .

- (1) If  $\mathcal{A}$  is locally h-flat and if a dg bimodule  $X: \mathcal{A} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{B}$  is h-injective, then  $X$  is right h-injective.
- (2) If  $\mathcal{C}$  is locally h-flat and if a dg bimodule  $Y: \mathcal{B} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{C}$  is h-injective, then  $Y$  is left h-injective.

*Proof.* (1) We want to show that the right dg  $\mathcal{B}$ -module  $X(-, A)$  is h-injective for  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ . Given a right dg  $\mathcal{B}$ -module  $N: \mathcal{B}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{B})(N, X(-, A)) &\cong \int_{B' \in \mathcal{B}} \text{Hom}^{\bullet}(N(B'), X(B', A)) && \text{(Proposition 2.14)} \\
&\cong \int_{A' \in \mathcal{A}} \text{Hom}^{\bullet}\left(\mathcal{A}(A, A'), \int_{B' \in \mathcal{B}} \text{Hom}^{\bullet}(N(B'), X(B', A'))\right) && \text{(Proposition 2.16)} \\
&\cong \int_{A' \in \mathcal{A}} \int_{B' \in \mathcal{B}} \text{Hom}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{A}(A, A'), \text{Hom}^{\bullet}(N(B'), X(B', A'))) && \text{(Proposition 2.15)} \\
&\cong \int_{A' \in \mathcal{A}} \int_{B' \in \mathcal{B}} \text{Hom}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{A}(A, A') \otimes N(B'), X(B', A')) && \text{(adjunction)} \\
&\cong \int_{(B', A') \in \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}} \text{Hom}^{\bullet}(N(B') \otimes \mathcal{A}(A, A'), X(B', A')) && \text{(Proposition 2.17)} \\
&\cong C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}})(N(-) \otimes \mathcal{A}(A, -), X) && \text{(Proposition 2.14)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Suppose  $N$  is acyclic. Then  $N(-) \otimes \mathcal{A}(A, -)$  is acyclic by the locally h-flatness of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Since  $X$  is h-injective as a dg  $(\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}})$ -module,  $C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{B})(N, X(-, A))$  is acyclic as well. Thus  $X$  is right h-injective.

(2) Similarly.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.5** ([CS15, Lemma 3.4]). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be small dg categories, and  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  a dg bimodule.

- (1) If  $\mathcal{A}$  is locally h-projective and if  $X$  is h-projective, then  $X$  is right h-projective.
- (2) If  $\mathcal{B}$  is locally h-projective and if  $X$  is h-projective, then  $X$  is left h-projective.

*Proof.* (1) Let us verify that the dg  $\mathcal{B}$ -module  $X(-, A) \in C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{B})$  is h-projective for  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ . Given a dg bimodule  $N \in C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{B})$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{B})(X(-, A), N) \\
& \cong \int_{B' \in \mathcal{B}} \text{Hom}^\bullet(X(B', A), N(B')) && \text{(Proposition 2.14)} \\
& \cong \int_{A' \in \mathcal{A}} \text{Hom}^\bullet\left(\mathcal{A}(A', A), \int_{B' \in \mathcal{B}} \text{Hom}^\bullet(X(B', A'), N(B'))\right) && \text{(Proposition 2.16)} \\
& \cong \int_{A' \in \mathcal{A}} \int_{B' \in \mathcal{B}} \text{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}(A', A), \text{Hom}^\bullet(X(B', A'), N(B'))) && \text{(Proposition 2.15)} \\
& \cong \int_{A' \in \mathcal{A}} \int_{B' \in \mathcal{B}} \text{Hom}^\bullet(X(B', A'), \text{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}(A', A), N(B'))) && \text{(adjunction)} \\
& \cong \int_{(B', A') \in \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}} \text{Hom}^\bullet(X(B', A'), \text{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}(A', A), N(B'))) && \text{(Proposition 2.17)} \\
& \cong C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}})(X, \text{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}(-, A), N(-))) && \text{(Proposition 2.14)}.
\end{aligned}$$

If  $N$  is acyclic, then  $\text{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}(-, A), N(-))$  is so by the assumption that  $\mathcal{A}$  is locally h-projective. Since  $X$  is h-injective as a dg  $(\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}})$ -module, the above calculation shows  $C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{B})(X(-, A), N)$  is acyclic as well. Thus  $X$  is right h-projective.

(2) Similarly.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.6** ([Gen17, Lemma 6.1], [AL17, Proposition 2.5]). Let  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  and  $Y: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  be dg bimodules.

- (1) If  $X$  is h-projective and  $Y$  is right h-projective, then  $Y \odot X$  is h-projective.
- (2) If  $X$  is left h-projective and  $Y$  is h-projective, then  $Y \odot X$  is h-projective.

In particular, Lemma 3.5 shows that if  $\mathcal{B}$  is locally h-projective and if  $X$  and  $Y$  are h-projective, then  $Y \odot X$  is also h-projective.

*Proof.* (1) Given an acyclic dg bimodule  $N \in C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})$ , we have

$$C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})(Y \odot X, N) \cong C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})(X, Y_{\dagger}N),$$

where the dg bimodule  $Y_{\dagger}N$  is defined as

$$Y_{\dagger}N(B, A) = C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{C})(Y(-, B), N(-, A)).$$

By the right h-projectiveness of  $Y$ , we can see that  $Y_{\dagger}N(B, A)$  is acyclic. Since  $X \in C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is h-projective,  $C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})(Y \odot X, N)$  turns out to be acyclic. Thus  $Y \odot X$  is h-projective.

(2) Similarly.  $\square$

Although the derived composition  $\odot^{\mathbb{L}}$  does not have associativity in general, we can prove the following result.

**Proposition 3.7.** Let  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ ,  $Y: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ , and  $Z: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  be dg bimodules. If either (1)  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  are locally h-projective or (2)  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  are locally h-flat, then there is a natural isomorphism

$$(Z \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} Y) \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} X \cong Z \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} (Y \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} X)$$

in  $D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ .

*Proof.* (1) Suppose that  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  are locally h-projective. Then by [Lemma 3.6](#) we may assume  $\mathfrak{p}(Z \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} Y) = \mathfrak{p}(Z) \odot \mathfrak{p}(Y)$  and  $\mathfrak{p}(Y \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} X) = \mathfrak{p}(Y) \odot \mathfrak{p}(X)$ . Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} (Z \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} Y) \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} X &\cong \mathfrak{p}(Z \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} Y) \odot \mathfrak{p}(X) \\ &\cong (\mathfrak{p}(Z) \odot \mathfrak{p}(Y)) \odot \mathfrak{p}(X) \\ &\cong \mathfrak{p}(Z) \odot (\mathfrak{p}(Y) \odot \mathfrak{p}(X)) \\ &\cong \mathfrak{p}(Z) \odot \mathfrak{p}(Y \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} X) \\ &\cong Z \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} (Y \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} X). \end{aligned}$$

(2) If  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  are locally h-flat, then [Proposition 2.11](#) and [Lemma 3.3](#) shows that  $\mathfrak{p}(X)$  is right h-flat and  $\mathfrak{p}(Z)$  is left h-flat. Thus we have by [Lemma 3.2](#)

$$\begin{aligned} (Z \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} Y) \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} X &\cong \mathfrak{p}(Z \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} Y) \odot \mathfrak{p}(X) \\ &\cong (Z \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} Y) \odot \mathfrak{p}(X) \\ &\cong (\mathfrak{p}(Z) \odot \mathfrak{p}(Y)) \odot \mathfrak{p}(X) \\ &\cong \mathfrak{p}(Z) \odot (\mathfrak{p}(Y) \odot \mathfrak{p}(X)) \\ &\cong \mathfrak{p}(Z) \odot (Y \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} X) \\ &\cong \mathfrak{p}(Z) \odot \mathfrak{p}(Y \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} X) \\ &\cong Z \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} (Y \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} X). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

**Proposition 3.8.** Let  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be dg bimodule.

- (1) If  $\mathcal{B}$  is locally h-flat, then there is a natural isomorphism  $X \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} I_{\mathcal{A}} \cong X$  in  $D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ .
- (2) If  $\mathcal{A}$  is locally h-flat, then there is a natural isomorphism  $I_{\mathcal{B}} \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} X \cong X$  in  $D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ .

*Proof.* (1) If  $\mathcal{B}$  is locally h-flat, then  $\mathfrak{p}(X)$  is left h-flat. Hence we have

$$X \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} I_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathfrak{p}(X) \odot \mathfrak{p}(I_{\mathcal{A}}) \cong \mathfrak{p}(X) \odot I_{\mathcal{A}} \cong \mathfrak{p}(X) \cong X$$

by [Lemma 3.2](#). (2) Similarly. □

According to the above propositions, we can define  $\text{DBimod}_{\text{hf}}$  as the bicategory such that

- the objects are locally h-flat small dg categories;
- the Hom categories  $\text{DBimod}_{\text{hf}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  are the derived categories  $D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  of dg bimodules;
- the compositions are the derived compositions.

Likewise, we can define the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}_{\text{hp}}$  whose objects are locally h-projective small dg categories. This bicategory is a full sub-bicategory of  $\text{DBimod}_{\text{hf}}$ .

Recall that every dg category  $\mathcal{A}$  has a locally h-projective resolution  $Q(\mathcal{A})$ . We can use this assignment to get a new bicategory  $Q^* \text{DBimod}_{\text{hp}}$  whose objects are all small dg categories and whose Hom categories are  $D(Q(\mathcal{A}), Q(\mathcal{B}))$ , which is the same as the bicategory written as  $\text{DBimod}$  in [\[Gen17, p. 651\]](#).

In the following, we will mainly take care of the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}_{\text{hnp}}$  of locally h-projective small dg categories, and simply put  $\text{DBimod} := \text{DBimod}_{\text{hnp}}$ .

**3.2. The tensor and Hom functors associated with dg bimodules.** For a dg bimodule  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  between small dg categories, we have a dg adjunction

$$T_X: C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{\leftarrow \perp \rightarrow} C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{B}) : H_X$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T_X &= X \odot - = - \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} X, \text{ and} \\ H_X &= X_{\ddagger}(-), \text{ i.e. } H_X(N)(A) = C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{B})(X(-, A), N). \end{aligned}$$

The notation is borrowed from Keller's paper [Kel94]. The assignments  $\mathcal{A} \mapsto C(\mathcal{A})$  and  $X \mapsto T_X$  form a pseudo-functor

$$T: \text{Bimod} \rightarrow \text{CAT},$$

where CAT denotes the 2-category of not necessarily small categories.

Applying the 0-th cohomology category functor  $H^0$  to the above dg adjunction, we have an ordinary adjunction

$$T_X: K(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{\leftarrow \perp \rightarrow} K(\mathcal{B}) : H_X$$

(we use the same notation  $T_X, H_X$ ). Then we define the left derived functor of  $T_X$  as the right Kan extension

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{T_X} & K(\mathcal{B}) \\ \delta \downarrow & \uparrow & \downarrow \delta \\ D(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{L}T_X} & D(\mathcal{B}). \end{array}$$

Since the localization  $\delta: K(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{A})$  has a left adjoint  $\mathfrak{p}: D(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow K(\mathcal{A})$ , the left derived functor  $\mathbb{L}T_X$  is given by the composites

$$D(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{p}} K(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{T_X} K(\mathcal{B}) \xrightarrow{\delta} D(\mathcal{B}),$$

and becomes an absolute Kan extension. Also we define the right derived functor of  $H_X$  as the left Kan extension

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K(\mathcal{A}) & \xleftarrow{H_X} & K(\mathcal{B}) \\ \delta \downarrow & \Downarrow & \downarrow \delta \\ D(\mathcal{A}) & \xleftarrow{\mathbb{R}H_X} & D(\mathcal{B}). \end{array}$$

Since the localization  $\delta: K(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{B})$  has a right adjoint  $\mathfrak{i}: D(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow K(\mathcal{B})$ , the right derived functor  $\mathbb{R}H_X$  is given by the composites

$$D(\mathcal{B}) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{i}} K(\mathcal{B}) \xrightarrow{H_X} K(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{\delta} D(\mathcal{A}),$$

and becomes an absolute Kan extension. The following result is fundamental.

**Proposition 3.9.** Let  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a dg bimodule.

- (1) The derived functors  $\mathbb{L}T_X$  and  $\mathbb{R}H_X$  are triangulated functors.
- (2) We have an adjunction

$$\mathbb{L}T_X: D(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{\leftarrow \perp \rightarrow} D(\mathcal{B}) : \mathbb{R}H_X.$$

**Proposition 3.10** ([Kel94, §6.1, Lemma (a)]). Let  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a dg bimodule. If  $X$  is right h-projective, then the following are equivalent.

- (i) The left derived functor  $\mathbb{L}T_X: D(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{B})$  is an equivalence of categories.
- (ii) The morphism of complexes

$$\mathcal{A}(A, A') \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{B})(X(-, A), X(-, A'))$$

is a quasi-isomorphism for all  $A, A' \in \mathcal{A}$ , and the set  $\{X(-, A)\}_{A \in \mathcal{A}}$  of objects compactly generates  $D(\mathcal{B})$ .

*Proof.* Since the representables  $\mathcal{A}(-, A)$  are h-projective, we have  $\mathbb{L}T_X(\mathcal{A}(-, A)) = T_X(\mathcal{A}(-, A)) = X(-, A)$ . Thus the assertion follows from [Proposition 2.8](#) and [Proposition 1.3](#).  $\square$

**Corollary 3.11.** For a dg functor  $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  between small dg categories, the following are equivalent.

- (i) The left derived functor  $\mathbb{L}T_{F_*}: D(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{B})$  is an equivalence of categories.
- (ii)  $F$  is quasi-fully faithful and the set  $\{\mathcal{B}(-, FA)\}_{A \in \mathcal{A}}$  of objects compactly generates  $D(\mathcal{B})$ .

*Proof.* It follows from [Proposition 3.10](#).  $\square$

Assigning to a dg bimodule  $X: \mathcal{A} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{B}$  the left derived functor  $\mathbb{L}T_X: D(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{B})$  gives rise to a functor

$$\mathbb{L} = \mathbb{L}_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}: C(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \text{Fun}(D(\mathcal{A}), D(\mathcal{B})).$$

**Proposition 3.12** ([\[Kel94, §6.1, Lemma \(b\)\]](#)). A morphism  $\mu: X \rightarrow Y$  of dg bimodules in  $C(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is a quasi-isomorphism if and only if the natural transformation  $\mathbb{L}T_\mu: \mathbb{L}T_X \Rightarrow \mathbb{L}T_Y$  is an isomorphism.

*Proof.* By [Proposition 2.8](#) and [Proposition 1.3](#) (4), we can see that  $\mathbb{L}T_\mu$  is an isomorphism if and only if each component  $\mu_A: X(-, A) \rightarrow Y(-, A)$  is invertible in  $D(\mathcal{B})$ . The latter is equivalent to the condition that each  $\mu_A$  is a quasi-isomorphism, which means  $\mu$  itself is a quasi-isomorphism.  $\square$

[Proposition 3.12](#) implies that the functor  $\mathbb{L}_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}$  factors as

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{L}_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}} & \text{Fun}(D(\mathcal{A}), D(\mathcal{B})) \\ \delta \downarrow & \nearrow \tilde{\mathbb{L}}_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}} & \\ D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) & & \end{array}$$

by the universality of localization.

**Corollary 3.13** (See also [\[BB22, Lemma C.5\]](#)). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be small dg categories. Then the induced functor  $\tilde{\mathbb{L}} = \tilde{\mathbb{L}}_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}: D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \text{Fun}(D(\mathcal{A}), D(\mathcal{B}))$  is conservative: namely, a morphism  $\eta: X \Rightarrow Y$  in  $D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is invertible if and only if  $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}(\eta)$  is a natural isomorphism.

*Proof.* Every morphism  $\eta: X \Rightarrow Y$  in  $D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  can be written as the composite  $\mu \circ (p_X)^{-1}$  in which  $\mu: \mathfrak{p}(X) \rightarrow Y$  is some morphism of dg bimodules and  $p_X: \mathfrak{p}(X) \rightarrow X$  is an h-projective resolution. Then we have  $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}(\eta) = \tilde{\mathbb{L}}(\mu) \circ \tilde{\mathbb{L}}(p_X)^{-1} = \mathbb{L}(\mu) \circ \mathbb{L}(p_X)^{-1}$ . Since  $\mathbb{L}(p_X)$  is invertible by [Proposition 3.12](#),  $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}(\eta)$  is an isomorphism if and only if  $\mathbb{L}(\mu) = \mathbb{L}T_\mu$  is so. Again by [Proposition 3.12](#) the latter is equivalent to  $\mu$  being a quasi-isomorphism. Thus the assertion follows.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.14.** Let  $X: \mathcal{A} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{B}$  and  $Y: \mathcal{B} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{C}$  be dg bimodules.

- (1) There is an isomorphism  $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}(I_{\mathcal{A}}) = \mathbb{L}(I_{\mathcal{A}}) \cong \text{id}_{D(\mathcal{A})}$ .

(2) If  $\mathcal{C}$  is locally h-flat, then we have  $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}(Y) \circ \tilde{\mathbb{L}}(X) \cong \tilde{\mathbb{L}}(Y \circ^{\mathbb{L}} X)$ .

*Proof.* (1) It follows from the calculation  $\mathbb{L}T_{I_{\mathcal{A}}} = \delta(\mathfrak{p}(-) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} I_{\mathcal{A}}) \cong \delta \circ \mathfrak{p}(-) \cong \text{id}_{D(\mathcal{A})}$ .

(2) If  $\mathcal{C}$  is locally h-flat, then  $\mathfrak{p}Y$  is left h-flat by [Lemma 3.3](#). Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{L}}(Y) \circ \tilde{\mathbb{L}}(X) &= \mathbb{L}T_Y \circ \mathbb{L}T_X \\ &\cong \mathbb{L}T_{\mathfrak{p}Y} \circ \mathbb{L}T_{\mathfrak{p}X} \\ &\cong \mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{p}(-) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathfrak{p}X) \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} \mathfrak{p}Y \\ &\cong (\mathfrak{p}(-) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathfrak{p}X) \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} \mathfrak{p}Y \\ &\cong \mathfrak{p}(-) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} (\mathfrak{p}X \otimes_{\mathcal{B}} \mathfrak{p}Y) \\ &\cong \mathfrak{p}(-) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} (Y \circ^{\mathbb{L}} X) \\ &\cong \mathbb{L}T_{Y \circ^{\mathbb{L}} X} = \tilde{\mathbb{L}}(Y \circ^{\mathbb{L}} X). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

In the previous section, we observed that locally h-projective (resp. locally h-flat) small dg categories together with the derived categories  $D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  form a bicategory  $\text{DBimod}_{\text{hp}}$  (resp.  $\text{DBimod}_{\text{hf}}$ ). It follows from [Proposition 3.14](#) that the mapping  $\mathcal{A} \mapsto D(\mathcal{A})$  and the functors  $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}: D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \text{Fun}(D(\mathcal{A}), D(\mathcal{B}))$  assemble into a pseudo-functor

$$\tilde{\mathbb{L}}: \text{DBimod}_{\text{hp}} \rightarrow \text{CAT} \quad (\text{resp. } \tilde{\mathbb{L}}: \text{DBimod}_{\text{hf}} \rightarrow \text{CAT}).$$

#### 4. ADJUNCTIONS IN $\text{DBimod}$

In the sequel, we will pay main attention to the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}_{\text{hp}}$  of locally h-projective small dg categories, writing  $\text{DBimod} := \text{DBimod}_{\text{hp}}$ , unless stated otherwise. In this section, we investigate right extensions, right liftings, and adjunctions in the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}$ .

**Proposition 4.1.** Let  $X: \mathcal{A} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{B}$ ,  $Y: \mathcal{B} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ , and  $Z: \mathcal{A} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{C}$  be dg bimodules between small dg categories. Then there exist dg bimodules  $X^{\mathbb{R}\dagger}Z$ ,  $Y_{\mathbb{R}\dagger}Z$  and natural isomorphisms of categories

$$\begin{aligned} D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})(Y \circ^{\mathbb{L}} X, Z) &\cong D(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C})(Y, X^{\mathbb{R}\dagger}Z), \\ D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})(Y \circ^{\mathbb{L}} X, Z) &\cong D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})(X, Y_{\mathbb{R}\dagger}Z). \end{aligned}$$

If  $\mathcal{B}$  is locally h-projective, we can take  $X^{\mathbb{R}\dagger}Z = (\mathfrak{p}X)^{\dagger}Z$  and  $Y_{\mathbb{R}\dagger}Z = (\mathfrak{p}Y)_{\dagger}Z$ .

In particular, when  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{B}$ , and  $\mathcal{C}$  are locally h-projective (or locally h-flat), we have  $X^{\mathbb{R}\dagger}Z = \text{DRan}_X Z$  and  $Y_{\mathbb{R}\dagger}Z = \text{DRift}_Y Z$  in the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}_{\text{hp}}$  (or  $\text{DBimod}_{\text{hf}}$ ); hence  $\text{DBimod}_{\text{hp}}$  (and  $\text{DBimod}_{\text{hf}}$ ) is closed. Here  $\text{DRan}$  and  $\text{DRift}$  denote right Kan extension and lifting in the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}_{\text{hp}}$  (or  $\text{DBimod}_{\text{hf}}$ ), respectively.

*Proof.* We have isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})(Y \circ^{\mathbb{L}} X, Z) &\cong K(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})(Y \circ^{\mathbb{L}} X, iZ) \\ &\cong K(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})(\mathfrak{p}Y \circ \mathfrak{p}X, iZ) \\ &= H^0\left(C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})(\mathfrak{p}Y \circ \mathfrak{p}X, iZ)\right) \\ &\cong H^0\left(C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C})(\mathfrak{p}Y, (\mathfrak{p}X)^{\dagger}(iZ))\right) \\ &= K(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C})(\mathfrak{p}Y, (\mathfrak{p}X)^{\dagger}(iZ)) \\ &\cong D(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C})(Y, (\mathfrak{p}X)^{\dagger}(iZ)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we can take  $X^{\mathbb{R}\dagger}Z = (\mathfrak{p}X)^{\dagger}(iZ)$ . Similarly  $Y_{\mathbb{R}\dagger}Z = (\mathfrak{p}Y)_{\dagger}(iZ)$ .

If  $\mathcal{B}$  is locally h-projective, then  $\mathfrak{p}(Y \odot^{\mathbb{L}} X) = \mathfrak{p}Y \odot \mathfrak{p}X$  by [Lemma 3.6](#). Hence we have  $X^{\mathbb{R}\dagger}Z = (\mathfrak{p}X)^{\dagger}Z$  by similar arguments.

The last assertion is due to [Proposition A.9](#).  $\square$

As seen in [Proposition 3.1](#) the bicategory  $\mathbf{Bimod}$  is closed, and so we have

$$C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{A})(Y, X_{\dagger}I_{\mathcal{B}}) \cong C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B})(X \odot Y, I_{\mathcal{B}}) \cong C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})(X, Y^{\dagger}I_{\mathcal{B}})$$

for small dg categories  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$ , which means that the dg functors

$$\mathcal{L} = (-)_{\dagger}I_{\mathcal{B}}: C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{A})^{\mathrm{op}},$$

$$\mathcal{R} = (-)^{\dagger}I_{\mathcal{B}}: C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{A})^{\mathrm{op}} \rightarrow C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$$

form a dg adjunction  $\mathcal{L} \dashv \mathcal{R}$ . This adjunction is called *dg Isbell duality* ([\[Gen17\]](#)).

Likewise the bicategory  $\mathbf{DBimod}_{\mathrm{hp}}$  (or  $\mathbf{DBimod}_{\mathrm{hf}}$ ) is also closed, and so we have

$$D(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{A})(Y, X_{\mathbb{R}\dagger}I_{\mathcal{B}}) \cong D(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B})(X \odot^{\mathbb{L}} Y, I_{\mathcal{B}}) \cong D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})(X, Y^{\mathbb{R}\dagger}I_{\mathcal{B}})$$

for locally h-projective (or locally h-flat) small dg categories  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$ , which means that the functors

$$\mathbb{L}\mathcal{L} = (-)_{\mathbb{R}\dagger}I_{\mathcal{B}}: D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{A})^{\mathrm{op}},$$

$$\mathbb{R}\mathcal{R} = (-)^{\mathbb{R}\dagger}I_{\mathcal{B}}: D(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{A})^{\mathrm{op}} \rightarrow D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$$

form an adjunction  $\mathbb{L}\mathcal{L} \dashv \mathbb{R}\mathcal{R}$ . This adjunction is called *derived Isbell duality* ([\[Gen17\]](#)).

**Lemma 4.2.** Let  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a dg bimodule. Suppose  $X$  is right h-projective. Then the functor  $H_X: C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathcal{A})$  preserves quasi-isomorphisms. In particular it induces  $H_X: D(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{B})$  by the universality of localization, and the right and left derived functors  $\mathbb{R}H_X, \mathbb{L}H_X$  are both isomorphic to it.

*Proof.* It suffices to observe that  $H_X$  preserves acyclicity. Given a dg module  $N \in C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathcal{B})$  and an object  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ , we have by definition

$$H_X N(A) = C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathcal{B})(X(-, A), N).$$

If  $N$  is acyclic, then  $H_X N(A)$  is also acyclic as  $X$  is right h-projective, which completes the proof.  $\square$

Let  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a dg bimodule. The dg bimodule  $\mathcal{L}(X)$  is the right Kan lifting in  $\mathbf{Bimod}$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & \mathcal{A} \\ & \nearrow^{\mathcal{L}(X)} & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{B} & \xrightarrow{I_{\mathcal{B}}} & \mathcal{B} \end{array}$$

Applying the pseudo-functor  $T: \mathbf{Bimod} \rightarrow \mathbf{CAT}$  to this diagram, we have a natural transformation  $T_X \circ T_{\mathcal{L}(X)} \Rightarrow \mathrm{Id}_{C(\mathcal{B})}$ , which corresponds to a natural transformation  $\nu: T_{\mathcal{L}(X)} \Rightarrow H_X$  by the adjunction  $T_X \dashv H_X$ . We finally get a transformation  $\mathbb{L}\nu: \mathbb{L}T_{\mathcal{L}(X)} \Rightarrow \mathbb{L}H_X: D(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{A})$  between left derived functors.

**Proposition 4.3** ([\[Kel94, §6.2, Lemma\]](#)). Let  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a dg bimodule and suppose  $X$  is right h-projective. Notice that  $\mathbb{L}H_X \cong H_X$  by [Lemma 4.2](#).

- (1) For the representable dg module  $\mathcal{A}(-, A) \in D(\mathcal{A})$ , the component  $\mathbb{L}\nu_{\mathcal{A}(-, A)}: \mathbb{L}T_X(\mathcal{A}(-, A)) \rightarrow H_X(\mathcal{A}(-, A))$  is invertible.
- (2) The following are equivalent:

- (a) the transformation  $\mathbb{L}\nu: \mathbb{L}T_{\mathcal{L}(X)} \Rightarrow H_X$  is an isomorphism;
  - (b) the triangulated functor  $H_X: D(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{A})$  preserves coproducts;
  - (c)  $X$  is right compact, i.e.  $X(-, A) \in D(\mathcal{B})$  is compact for each  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ .
- (3) If the left derived functor  $\mathbb{L}T_X: D(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{B})$  is an equivalence of categories, then we have  $(\mathbb{L}T_X)^{-1} \cong \mathbb{L}T_{\mathcal{L}(X)}$ .

*Proof.* (1) Since the representable  $\mathcal{A}(-, A)$  is h-projective, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{L}T_{\mathcal{L}(X)}(\mathcal{A}(-, A)) &\cong T_{\mathcal{L}(X)}(\mathcal{A}(-, A)) \cong \mathcal{L}(X)(?, A) \\ &= C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})(X(-, ?), \mathcal{A}(-, A)) = H_X(\mathcal{A}(-, A)). \end{aligned}$$

(2) (a)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (b): It follows from [Proposition 2.8](#) and [Proposition 1.3](#) (4) together with (1) above. (b)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (c): The condition that  $X$  is right compact means that the left derived functor  $\mathbb{L}T_X: D(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{B})$  sends the compact generators  $\mathcal{A}(-, A)$  to compact objects. Therefore, it follows from [Proposition 1.4](#) and [Proposition 1.5](#).

(3) If  $\mathbb{L}T_X$  is an equivalence, then so is  $H_X$  because of the adjunction  $\mathbb{L}T_X \dashv H_X$ . In particular  $H_X$  preserves coproducts. Therefore (2) implies  $\mathbb{L}T_{\mathcal{L}(X)} \cong H_X \cong (\mathbb{L}T_X)^{-1}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4.** Let  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a dg bimodule and suppose that  $X$  is right h-projective. Notice that  $H_X$  preserves quasi-isomorphisms by [Lemma 4.2](#) and we can take  $\mathbb{L}H_X = H_X$ . If the functor  $H_X: D(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{A})$  preserves coproducts, then there exists a natural isomorphism

$$\mathbb{L}T_{X \dagger Z} \cong H_X \circ \mathbb{L}T_Z$$

for a dg bimodule  $Z: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ .

*Proof.* Since the dg bimodule  $X \dagger Z$  is the right Kan lifting  $\text{Rift}_X Z$  of  $Z$  along  $X$  in the bicategory  $\text{Bimod}$ , we have a 2-cell  $X \odot (X \dagger Z) \Rightarrow Z$  in  $\text{Bimod}$  and hence a natural transformation  $T_X \circ T_{X \dagger Z} \Rightarrow T_Z: C(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow C(\mathcal{B})$ . By the adjunction  $T_X \dashv H_X$ , we get  $T_{X \dagger Z} \Rightarrow H_X \circ T_Z: C(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow C(\mathcal{A})$ , which induces a natural transformation  $\mathbb{L}T_{X \dagger Z} \Rightarrow H_X \circ \mathbb{L}T_Z: D(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{A})$  between left derived functors. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{L}T_{X \dagger Z}(\mathcal{C}(-, C)) &= T_{X \dagger Z}(\mathcal{C}(-, C)) = (X \dagger Z)(?, C) \\ &= C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{B})(X(-, ?), Z(-, C)) \\ &= H_X(Z(-, C)) \\ &= H_X(T_Z(\mathcal{C}(-, C))) = H_X \circ \mathbb{L}T_Z(\mathcal{C}(-, C)) \end{aligned}$$

for each  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ . Therefore  $\mathbb{L}T_{X \dagger Z} \Rightarrow H_X \circ \mathbb{L}T_Z$  is invertible on representables. By the assumption that  $H_X$  preserves coproducts, we see  $\mathbb{L}T_{X \dagger Z} \cong H_X \circ \mathbb{L}T_Z$  from [Proposition 1.3](#).  $\square$

We can characterize left adjoints in  $\text{DBimod}$  as follows.

**Theorem 4.5.** Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  be locally h-projective small dg categories and  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a dg bimodule. Then the following are equivalent.

- (i) The dg bimodule  $X$  has a right adjoint in the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}$ .
- (ii) The right derived functor  $\mathbb{R}H_X: D(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{A})$  preserves coproducts.
- (iii)  $X$  is right compact.

In this case,  $\mathcal{L}(X)$  is the right adjoint of  $X$  in  $\text{DBimod}$ .

Note that this is a generalization of [[Gen17](#), Corollary 6.6] (see [Corollary 5.1](#)). One can find a partial result of this theorem in [[AL17](#), Proposition 2.11].

*Proof.* In the derived category  $D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ , every dg bimodule is isomorphic to an h-projective one, and so we may assume that  $X$  is h-projective. Then it follows from [Lemma 3.5](#) that  $X$  is right h-projective as  $\mathcal{B}$  is locally h-projective, and from [Lemma 4.2](#) that  $\mathbb{R}H_X \cong H_X$ . Therefore [Proposition 4.3](#) (2) leads to the equivalence of (ii) and (iii).

(i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii): If  $X$  has a right adjoint  $Y$  in the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}$ , then applying the pseudo-functor  $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}: \text{DBimod} \rightarrow \text{CAT}$  leads to an adjunction  $\mathbb{L}T_X \dashv \mathbb{L}T_Y$ . Since  $\mathbb{L}T_X \dashv \mathbb{R}H_X$ , we have  $\mathbb{L}T_Y \cong \mathbb{R}H_X$ . In particular,  $\mathbb{R}H_X$  preserves coproducts.

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i): In the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}$ , there exists a right Kan lifting

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{A} & \\ & \downarrow X & \\ \mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}(X) = X_{\mathbb{R}\dagger} I_{\mathcal{B}} & \nearrow & \\ \mathcal{B} & \xrightarrow{I_{\mathcal{B}}} & \mathcal{B}. \end{array}$$

It is sufficient by [Proposition A.5](#) to prove that this Kan lifting is absolute. Take a locally h-projective small dg category  $\mathcal{C}$  and a dg bimodule  $Z: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ . Composing  $Z$  with the above diagram, we use the universality of the right Kan lifting  $\text{DRift}_X Z = X_{\mathbb{R}\dagger} Z$  to obtain a 2-cell in  $\text{DBimod}$

$$n: \mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}(X) \circ^{\mathbb{L}} Z \Rightarrow \text{DRift}_X Z = X_{\mathbb{R}\dagger} Z$$

satisfying

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{B} & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}(X)} & \mathcal{A} \\ \uparrow Z & \searrow & \downarrow X \\ \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{Z} & \mathcal{B} \end{array} = \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{B} & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}(X)} & \mathcal{A} \\ \uparrow Z & \xrightarrow{n} & \downarrow X \\ \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{Z} & \mathcal{B}. \end{array}$$

It remains to show that  $n$  is invertible. Because the pseudo-functor  $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}: \text{DBimod} \rightarrow \text{CAT}$  is locally conservative as seen in [Corollary 3.13](#), we only need to check that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{L}}(n): \mathbb{L}T_{\mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}(X)} \circ \mathbb{L}T_Z \rightarrow \mathbb{L}T_{X_{\mathbb{R}\dagger} Z}$$

is an isomorphism. Now that  $H_X$  preserves coproducts, [Lemma 4.2](#) and [Lemma 4.4](#) imply that  $\mathbb{L}T_{\mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}(X)} \cong H_X$  and  $\mathbb{L}T_{X_{\mathbb{R}\dagger} Z} \cong H_X \circ \mathbb{L}T_Z$ . Since  $X$  is h-projective and  $\mathcal{A}$  is locally h-projective, we have  $X_{\mathbb{R}\dagger} Z = X_{\dagger} Z$  by [Proposition 4.1](#). Thus we can see that  $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}(n)$  is an isomorphism.  $\square$

We can also get a characterization of equivalences in  $\text{DBimod}$ .

**Theorem 4.6.** Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  be locally h-projective dg categories and  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a dg bimodule. Then the following are equivalent.

- (i)  $X$  is an equivalence in the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}$ .
- (ii) The left derived functor  $\mathbb{L}T_X: D(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{B})$  is an equivalence of categories.

*Proof.* (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii): This is trivial since the pseudo-functor  $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}: \text{DBimod} \rightarrow \text{CAT}$  preserves equivalences.

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i): Notice that  $\mathbb{L}T_X$  sends the representable dg module  $\mathcal{A}(-, A)$  to  $X(-, A)$ . If  $\mathbb{L}T_X$  is an equivalence, then it preserves compactness, which implies that  $X$  is right compact. Hence by [Theorem 4.5](#)  $X$  has a right adjoint  $\mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}(X)$  in  $\text{DBimod}$ . Let the unit and counit of this adjunction be written by  $\eta$  and  $\varepsilon$ , respectively. It suffices to show that these 2-cells in  $\text{DBimod}$  are isomorphisms. Applying the pseudo-functor  $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}$ , we have an adjunction  $\mathbb{L}T_X = \tilde{\mathbb{L}}(X) \dashv \tilde{\mathbb{L}}(\mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}(X))$  with  $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}(\eta)$  unit and  $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}(\varepsilon)$  counit. Now that  $\mathbb{L}T_X$  is an equivalence, it follows that  $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}(\eta)$  and  $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}(\varepsilon)$  are invertible. Then  $\eta$  and  $\varepsilon$  are invertible as well, because  $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}$  is locally conservative by [Corollary 3.13](#). Thus  $X$  is an equivalence in  $\text{DBimod}$ .  $\square$

5. QUASI-FUNCTORS

Let  $M$  be a right dg module over a small dg category  $\mathcal{A}$ . We say that  $M$  is *quasi-representable* if it is isomorphic to some representable dg module in the derived category  $D(\mathcal{A})$ . This is equivalent to the condition that there are an object  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  and a quasi-isomorphism  $\mathcal{A}(-, A) \rightarrow M$  between dg modules. Let  $\overline{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq D(\mathcal{A})$  denote the full subcategory consisting of all quasi-representable dg modules. As the representables are h-projective, we have an equivalence  $H^0(\mathcal{A}) \simeq \overline{\mathcal{A}}$ .

We call a dg bimodule  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  *right quasi-representable*, or a *quasi-functor*, if the dg  $\mathcal{B}$ -module  $X(-, A)$  is quasi-representable for every  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ . Then the left derived functor  $\mathbb{L}T_X: D(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{B})$  is restricted to a functor

$$\mathbb{L}T_X|_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}: \overline{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{B}}.$$

Analogously we define *left quasi-representable* dg bimodules.

Now, quasi-representable dg modules are compact and so quasi-functors are right compact. Therefore [Theorem 4.5](#) induces the following.

**Corollary 5.1** ([\[Gen17, Corollary 6.6\]](#)). A quasi-functor  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  between locally h-projective small dg categories has a right adjoint  $\mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}(X)$  in  $\text{DBimod}_{\text{hp}}$ .

This is a homotopical analog of the fact that the dg bimodule  $F_* = \mathcal{B}(-, F-)$  associated with a dg functor  $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  is left adjoint to the dg bimodule  $\mathcal{L}(F_*) = F^* = \mathcal{B}(F-, -)$  in the bicategory  $\text{Bimod}$ .

It is easily seen that the identities  $I_{\mathcal{A}}$  and the derived compositions  $Y \circ^{\mathbb{L}} X$  of quasi-functors are again quasi-functors. We write by  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{qr}}$  the sub-bicategory of  $\text{DBimod}$  determined by quasi-functors. We give a characterization of equivalences in  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{qr}}$ .

**Theorem 5.2.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be locally h-projective dg categories and  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a quasi-functor. Then the following are equivalent.

- (i)  $X$  is an equivalence in the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{qr}}$  of quasi-functors.
- (ii) Both the left derived functor  $\mathbb{L}T_X: D(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{B})$  and the restricted one  $\mathbb{L}T_X|_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}: \overline{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{B}}$  are equivalences of categories.<sup>2</sup>

*Proof.* (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii): The proof is easy and left to the reader.

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i): Since  $X$  is an equivalence in  $\text{DBimod}$  as well,  $\mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}(X)$  is its quasi-inverse. The fact that  $\mathbb{L}T_X$  induces an equivalence  $\overline{\mathcal{A}} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \overline{\mathcal{B}}$  implies that  $\mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}(X)$  is also a quasi-functor. Hence  $X$  is an equivalence of  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{qr}}$ .  $\square$

For a dg functor  $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ , the associated dg bimodule  $F_*: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  is clearly a quasi-functor. When  $F$  is a quasi-equivalence,  $F_*$  is an equivalence in  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{qr}}$ ; see [\[Kel94, §7.2, Example\]](#). The next proposition says that the converse holds, which is also mentioned in the last of [\[GLV22, §2.3\]](#) without proof.

**Proposition 5.3.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be locally h-projective dg categories and  $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a dg functor. For the associated quasi-functor  $F_*: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ , the following are equivalent.

- (i)  $F$  is a quasi-equivalence (in the sense of [Definition 2.2](#)).
- (ii)  $F_*$  is an equivalence in the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{qr}}$  of quasi-functors.
- (iii) Both the left derived functor  $\mathbb{L}T_{F_*}: D(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{B})$  and the restricted one  $\mathbb{L}T_{F_*}|_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}: \overline{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{B}}$  are equivalences of categories.

---

<sup>2</sup>Note that a dg bimodule satisfying the condition (ii) is called a *quasi-equivalence* in [\[Kel94, §7.2\]](#).

*Proof.* (ii)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (iii): It follows from [Theorem 5.2](#).

(i)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (iii): Quasi-essential surjectivity of  $F$  is equivalent to that of  $\mathbb{L}T_{F_*}|_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}: \overline{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{B}}$ . When  $F$  is quasi-essentially surjective,  $\{\mathcal{B}(-, FA)\}_{A \in \mathcal{A}}$  compactly generates  $D(\mathcal{B})$ . Hence in such a case, we can see from [Corollary 3.11](#) that  $F$  is quasi-fully faithful if and only if  $\mathbb{L}T_X$  is an equivalence.  $\square$

Let  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a quasi-functor between locally h-projective small dg categories. We define  $X$  to be *fully faithful* if the unit of the adjunction  $X \dashv \mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}(X)$  is invertible.

**Proposition 5.4.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be locally h-projective dg categories and  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a quasi-functor. Then the following are equivalent.

- (i)  $X$  is fully faithful as a quasi-functor.
- (ii) The left derived functor  $\mathbb{L}T_X: D(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{B})$  is fully faithful.

*Proof.* Let  $\eta$  be the unit of  $X \dashv \mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}(X)$ . Then  $\widetilde{\mathbb{L}}(\eta)$  is the unit of the adjunction  $\mathbb{L}T_X = \widetilde{\mathbb{L}}(X) \dashv \widetilde{\mathbb{L}}(\mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}(X))$ . By [Corollary 3.13](#),  $\eta$  is invertible if and only if  $\widetilde{\mathbb{L}}(\eta)$  is a natural isomorphism, which implies that  $X$  is fully faithful if and only if the left adjoint  $\mathbb{L}T_X$  is fully faithful.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.5.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be locally h-projective dg categories and  $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a dg functor. For the associated quasi-functor  $F_*: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ , the following are equivalent.

- (i)  $F$  is quasi-fully faithful.
- (ii)  $F_*$  is fully faithful as a quasi-functor.
- (iii) The left derived functor  $\mathbb{L}T_{F_*}: D(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{B})$  is fully faithful.

*Proof.* (ii)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (iii): It follows from [Proposition 5.4](#).

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i): Since the representables  $\mathcal{A}(-, A)$  are h-projective, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathcal{A})}(\mathcal{A}(-, A), \mathcal{A}(-, A')[n]) &\cong \mathrm{Hom}_{K(\mathcal{A})}(\mathcal{A}(-, A), \mathcal{A}(-, A')[n]) \\ &\cong H^n\left(C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathcal{A})(\mathcal{A}(-, A), \mathcal{A}(-, A'))\right) \\ &\cong H^n(\mathcal{A}(A, A')). \end{aligned}$$

Thus since  $\mathbb{L}T_{F_*}(\mathcal{A}(-, A)) = \mathcal{B}(-, FA)$ , the fully faithfulness of  $\mathbb{L}T_{F_*}$  implies that all  $H^n(\mathcal{A}(A, A')) \rightarrow H^n(\mathcal{B}(FA, FA'))$  are isomorphisms.

(i)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii): It follows from [Proposition 1.3](#) and the above isomorphisms.  $\square$

## 6. THE HOMOTOPY CATEGORY THEORY OF DG CATEGORIES OVER A FIELD

In this section we assume for simplicity that  $\mathbb{k}$  is a field, over which all dg categories are locally h-projective, though the following will work for locally h-projective dg categories over a commutative ring.

We will use straight arrows  $\rightarrow$  for quasi-functors instead of slashed arrows  $\dashrightarrow$  to describe it being a morphism of  $\mathrm{DBimod}^{\mathrm{qr}}$ . A quasi-functor  $f: \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  is written by  $f_*$  when regarded as a morphism of  $\mathrm{DBimod}$ , and let  $f^*$  be its right adjoint. Let us write the inclusion  $\mathrm{DBimod}^{\mathrm{qr}} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{DBimod}$  by  $(-)_*$ .

A dg bimodule is isomorphic to  $f_*$  for some quasi-functor  $f$  if and only if it is right quasi-representable. We have a characterization of a dg bimodule of the form  $f^*$ , as follows.

**Proposition 6.1** ([\[Gen17, Corollary 6.6\]](#)). A dg bimodule  $Y: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  is left quasi-representable if and only if it is right adjoint to a quasi-functor in the bicategory  $\mathrm{DBimod}$ .

In the following, for a right quasi-representable dg bimodule  $X$ , we mean by a *representing quasi-functor* of  $X$  a quasi-functor  $f$  such that  $f_* \cong X$ . For a left quasi-representable  $X$ , we call a quasi-functor  $f$  such that  $f^* \cong X$  as a *corepresenting quasi-functor* of  $X$ .

Now let us point out that the inclusion  $(-)_* : \text{DBimod}^{\text{qr}} \hookrightarrow \text{DBimod}$  satisfies:

- (1)  $(-)_*$  is an identity on objects;
- (2)  $(-)_*$  is locally fully faithful;
- (3) for every quasi-functor  $f$ , the dg bimodule  $f_*$  has a right adjoint in  $\text{DBimod}$  ([Corollary 5.1](#)).

Such a pseudo functor is called a *proarrow equipment*, which is known as a framework for formal category theory; references on this subject are [[Woo82](#); [Woo85](#)] (We review it in [Appendix A](#)). For example, the proarrow equipment  $(-)_* : \text{dgCat} \hookrightarrow \text{Bimod}$  of dg functors and dg bimodules provides the  $\text{Ch}(\mathbb{k})$ -enriched category theory. The above observation indicates that we can develop a category theory in  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{qr}}$ . We may name the category theory done in the equipment  $(-)_* : \text{DBimod}^{\text{qr}} \hookrightarrow \text{DBimod}$  as the *homotopy category theory of dg categories*.

In a proarrow equipment, we can define several notions in category theory, such as (co)limits, Cauchy completeness, and pointwise Kan extensions. Let us apply them to the homotopy category theory of dg categories. In the following, we translate these notions to fit our context. For the definitions in the general setting, refer to [Appendix A](#) or [[Woo82](#)].

**6.1. Homotopical (co)limits in a dg category.** In this subsection, we define homotopical (co)limits in a dg category, including homotopical initial objects, coproducts, shifts, and cocones. They are not just conical, but weighted ones, as weighted (co)limits are the right notion of (co)limits in enriched category theory.

**Definition 6.2.** For a dg bimodule  $W : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}$  and a quasi-functor  $f : \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ , a  *$W$ -weighted colimit* of  $f$  is a quasi-functor  $\text{colim}^W f = W \star f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  together with a 2-cell in  $\text{DBimod}$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & \mathcal{M} \\ & \nearrow^{(W \star f)^*} & \downarrow \downarrow W \\ \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{f_*} & \mathcal{J} \end{array}$$

such that it is a right Kan lifting of  $f_*$  along  $W$ . In other words, when the right Kan lifting  $\text{DRift}_W f_*$  in  $\text{DBimod}$  is left quasi-representable, we call its corepresenting quasi-functor as a *colimit*.

Dually, for a dg bimodule  $W : \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  and a quasi-functor  $f : \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ , a  *$W$ -weighted limit* of  $f$  is a quasi-functor  $\text{lim}^W f = \{W, f\} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  together with a 2-cell in  $\text{DBimod}$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M} & & \\ \uparrow W & \searrow \{W, f\}_* & \\ \mathcal{J} & \xrightarrow{f_*} & \mathcal{A} \end{array}$$

such that it is a right Kan extension of  $f_*$  along  $W$ . In other words, when the right Kan extension  $\text{DRan}_W f_*$  in  $\text{DBimod}$  is right quasi-representable, we call its representing quasi-functor as a *limit*.

**Remark 6.3.** As observed in [Proposition 4.1](#), the right Kan lifting and Kan extension in  $\text{DBimod}$  are given as

$$\text{DRift}_Y Z = Y_{\mathbb{R}\dagger} Z = (\mathfrak{p} Y)_{\dagger} Z, \quad \text{DRan}_X Z = X^{\mathbb{R}\dagger} Z = (\mathfrak{p} X)^{\dagger} Z.$$

Hence, a  $W$ -weighted colimit of  $f$  exists precisely when for all  $m \in \mathcal{M}$  the left dg  $\mathcal{A}$ -module

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathrm{DRift}_W f^*)(m, -) &= ((\mathfrak{p}W)_\dagger f^*)(m, -) \\ &= \mathrm{Fun}_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathcal{J}^{\mathrm{op}}, C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathbb{k}))((\mathfrak{p}W)(?, m), f^*(?, -)) \end{aligned}$$

is quasi-corepresentable, or more explicitly, there are an object  $(\mathrm{colim}^W f)(m)$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  and a quasi-isomorphism

$$\mathcal{A}((\mathrm{colim}^W f)(m), -) \rightarrow \mathrm{Fun}_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathcal{J}^{\mathrm{op}}, C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathbb{k}))((\mathfrak{p}W)(?, m), f^*(?, -))$$

of left dg  $\mathcal{A}$ -modules. Dually, a  $W$ -weighted limit of  $f$  exists precisely when for all  $m \in \mathcal{M}$  the right dg  $\mathcal{A}$ -module

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathrm{DRan}_W f_\star)(-, m) &= ((\mathfrak{p}W)^\dagger f_\star)(-, m) \\ &= \mathrm{Fun}_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathcal{J}, C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathbb{k}))((\mathfrak{p}W)(m, ?), f_\star(-, ?)) \end{aligned}$$

is quasi-representable, or more explicitly, there are an object  $(\mathrm{lim}^W f)(m)$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  and a quasi-isomorphism

$$\mathcal{A}(-, (\mathrm{lim}^W f)(m)) \rightarrow \mathrm{Fun}_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathcal{J}, C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathbb{k}))((\mathfrak{p}W)(m, ?), f_\star(-, ?))$$

of right dg  $\mathcal{A}$ -modules.

The base field  $\mathbb{k}$  is identified with the dg category with one object. We here give some examples of (co)limits which are module-weighted, instead of bimodule-weighted ones; in other words, we shall consider the case of  $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{k}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dg category. Let us first consider the homotopical version of initial objects and coproducts.

**Example 6.4** (h-initial object). Consider  $\mathcal{J} = \emptyset$ , the empty dg category, and the quasi-functor  $f = F_\star: \emptyset \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  induced by the unique dg functor  $F: \emptyset \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ . Note that  $f_\star = F_\star$  is h-projective since  $C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\emptyset, \mathcal{A}) \cong \mathrm{Fun}_{\mathrm{dg}}(\emptyset, C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathbb{k})) \cong 0$ , and we have  $f^\star = \mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}(F_\star) = \mathfrak{p}(F_\star)_\dagger I_{\mathcal{A}} = (F_\star)_\dagger I_{\mathcal{A}} \cong F^\star$ .

Let  $W: \mathbb{k} \rightarrow \emptyset$  be the unique functor  $\emptyset^{\mathrm{op}} \otimes \mathbb{k} \cong \emptyset \rightarrow C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$ , which is h-projective in  $C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\emptyset, \mathbb{k}) \cong \mathrm{Fun}_{\mathrm{dg}}(\emptyset, C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathbb{k})) \cong 0$ . In this case, we have an isomorphism of left dg modules

$$(\mathrm{DRift}_W f^\star)(-) = \mathrm{Fun}_{\mathrm{dg}}(\emptyset^{\mathrm{op}}, C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathbb{k})) (W(?), F^\star(?, -)) \cong 0.$$

Hence the colimit  $\mathrm{colim}^W f$  exists if and only if there is an object  $i \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{A}(i, -)$  is quasi-isomorphic to 0, or equivalently  $\mathcal{A}(i, -) \cong 0$  in  $D(\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{op}})$ . Such a colimit is called an *h-initial object* of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

Similarly, let  $W: \emptyset \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$  be the unique bimodule  $\mathbb{k}^{\mathrm{op}} \otimes \emptyset \cong \emptyset \rightarrow C_{\mathrm{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$ . Then

$$(\mathrm{DRan}_W f_\star)(-) \cong 0$$

and the limit  $\mathrm{lim}^W f$  exists if and only if there is an object  $t \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{A}(-, t)$  is quasi-isomorphic to 0, or equivalently  $\mathcal{A}(-, t) \cong 0$  in  $D(\mathcal{A})$ . Such a limit is called an *h-terminal object* of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

A dg category  $\mathcal{A}$  is said to have a *contractible object* if  $H^0(\mathcal{A})$  has a zero object.

**Proposition 6.5.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dg category.

- (1)  $\mathcal{A}$  has an h-initial object if and only if it has a contractible object.
- (2)  $\mathcal{A}$  has an h-terminal object if and only if it has a contractible object.

*Proof.* (1) If  $i \in \mathcal{A}$  is h-initial, then we have  $H^0(\mathcal{A})(i, -) = H^0(\mathcal{A}(i, -)) \cong 0$ , which shows that  $i$  is a zero object in  $H^0(\mathcal{A})$ . Conversely, suppose  $\mathcal{A}$  has a contractible object denoted by  $i$ . Then it is preserved by the additive functor  $H^0(y): H^0(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}) \rightarrow H^0(C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}})) = K(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}})$ , and so we have  $\mathcal{A}(i, -) \cong 0$  in  $K(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}})$ , and hence in  $D(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}})$ . (2) Similar.  $\square$

Let  $S(\mathbb{k})$  denote  $\mathbb{k}$  viewed as a complex concentrated in degree 0, which is called the *sphere complex*.

**Example 6.6** (h-coproduct). Consider a set  $J$  and identify it with the dg category  $\coprod_J \mathbb{k}$ . Giving a dg functor  $F: J \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  is equivalent to giving a family  $\{A_j\}_{j \in J}$  of objects. Let  $f = F_*: J \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  be the quasi-functor induced by  $F$ . Note that  $f_* = F_*$  is h-projective since it corresponds to  $(\mathcal{A}(-, A_j))_j$  under the isomorphisms  $C_{\text{dg}}(J, \mathcal{A}) \cong \text{Fun}_{\text{dg}}(J, C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})) \cong \prod_J C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})$ , and hence we have  $f^* = \mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}(F_*) \cong F^*$ .

Let  $W: \mathbb{k} \rightarrow J$  be the dg functor  $J^{\text{op}} \otimes \mathbb{k} \cong J \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$  corresponding to  $(S(\mathbb{k}))_j \in \prod_J C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$ , which is h-projective. In this case, we have isomorphisms of left dg modules

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{DRift}_W f^*)(-) &= \text{Fun}_{\text{dg}}(J^{\text{op}}, C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k}))(W(?), F^*(?, -)) \\ &\cong \prod_j C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})((S(\mathbb{k}))_j, (\mathcal{A}(A_j, -))_j) \\ &\cong \prod_j \mathcal{A}(A_j, -). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the colimit  $\text{colim}^W f$  exists if and only if there is an object  $C \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{A}(C, -)$  is quasi-isomorphic to  $\prod_j \mathcal{A}(A_j, -)$ , or equivalently  $\mathcal{A}(C, -) \cong \prod_j \mathcal{A}(A_j, -)$  in  $D(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}})$ . Such a colimit is called an *h-coproduct* of  $\{A_j\}_{j \in J}$ .

Similarly, let  $W: J \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$  be the bimodule corresponding to  $(S(\mathbb{k}))_j \in \prod_J C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$ . Then

$$(\text{DRan}_W f_*)(-) \cong \prod_j \mathcal{A}(-, A_j)$$

and the limit  $\text{lim}^W f$  exists if and only if there is an object  $D \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{A}(-, D)$  is quasi-isomorphic to  $\prod_j \mathcal{A}(-, A_j)$ , or equivalently  $\mathcal{A}(-, D) \cong \prod_j \mathcal{A}(-, A_j)$  in  $D(\mathcal{A})$ . Such a limit is called an *h-product* of  $\{A_j\}_{j \in J}$ .

Notice that products in  $C(\mathcal{A})$  becomes products in  $D(\mathcal{A})$ .

**Proposition 6.7.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dg category and  $\{A_j\}_j$  a family of objects.

- (1)  $\mathcal{A}$  has an h-coproduct of  $\{A_j\}_j$  if and only if  $H^0(\mathcal{A})$  has a coproduct of  $\{A_j\}_j$  which is preserved by the functor  $H^0(\mathcal{A})^{\text{op}} = H^0(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}})$ .
- (2)  $\mathcal{A}$  has an h-product if and only if  $H^0(\mathcal{A})$  has a product of  $\{A_j\}_j$  which is preserved by the functor  $H^0(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{A})$ .

*Proof.* (1) If  $C \in \mathcal{A}$  is an h-coproduct of  $\{A_j\}_j$ , then we have  $H^0(\mathcal{A})(C, -) = H^0(\mathcal{A}(C, -)) \cong H^0\left(\prod_j \mathcal{A}(A_j, -)\right) \cong \prod_j H^0 \mathcal{A}(A_j, -)$ , which shows that  $C$  is a coproduct of  $\{A_j\}_j$  in  $H^0(\mathcal{A})$ . The converse is immediate. (2) Similar.  $\square$

Before proceeding to homotopical shifts and cones, we recall ordinary shifts and cones for complexes.

**Remark 6.8.** Recall  $S(\mathbb{k})$  denotes the sphere complex. We define the *disk complex*  $D(\mathbb{k})$  to be such a complex that  $D(\mathbb{k})^i = 0$  for  $i \neq -1, 0$  and the non-trivial differential  $d^{-1}: D(\mathbb{k})^{-1} \rightarrow$

$D(\mathbb{k})^0$  is the identity  $\text{id}: \mathbb{k} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$ ; these complexes look like:

$$\begin{aligned} S(\mathbb{k}): & \quad \cdots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \mathbb{k} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \cdots, \\ D(\mathbb{k}): & \quad \cdots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \mathbb{k} \xrightarrow{\text{id}} \mathbb{k} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \cdots. \end{aligned}$$

We have the canonical injection  $\iota: S(\mathbb{k}) \hookrightarrow D(\mathbb{k})$ . Notice that  $D(\mathbb{k})$  is equal to the cone  $\text{Cone}(\text{id}: S(\mathbb{k}) \rightarrow S(\mathbb{k}))$  of the identity.

Put  $S^n(\mathbb{k}) := S(\mathbb{k})[-n]$ . Then it is easy to see that there is an isomorphism of complexes

$$\text{Hom}^\bullet(S^n(\mathbb{k}), X) = \text{Hom}^\bullet(S(\mathbb{k})[-n], X) \cong X[n]$$

for a complex  $X$  of  $\mathbb{k}$ -modules.

Also, write the poset  $\{0 < 1\}$  and its free dg category by the same symbol  $\mathcal{2}$ . Let  $W: \mathcal{2} \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$  be the dg functor which chooses the morphism  $\iota: S(\mathbb{k}) \hookrightarrow D(\mathbb{k})$  in  $\text{Ch}(\mathbb{k})$ . Then we can verify

$$\text{Fun}_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{2}, C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k}))(W, F) \cong \text{Cone}(f)[-1] = \text{Cone}(-f[-1]) =: \text{Cocone}(f)$$

for a dg functor  $F: \mathcal{2} \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}$  which corresponds to a morphism  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  in  $\text{Ch}(\mathbb{k})$ .

**Example 6.9** (h-tensor and h-coshift). Consider  $\mathcal{J} = \mathbb{k}$  and the quasi-functor  $f = F_*: \mathbb{k} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  induced by an object  $A: \mathbb{k} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ . Note that  $f_* = F_*$  is h-projective since it corresponds to  $\mathcal{A}(-, A)$  under  $C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k}, \mathcal{A}) \cong C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})$ , and hence we have  $f^* = \mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}(F_*) \cong F^*$ .

Let  $S \in C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$  be a complex and  $W: \mathbb{k} \leftrightarrow \mathbb{k}$  be the corresponding dg bimodule  $\mathbb{k}^{\text{op}} \otimes \mathbb{k} \cong \mathbb{k} \xrightarrow{S} C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$ . In this case, we have an isomorphism of left dg modules

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{DRift}_W f^*)(-) &= \text{Fun}_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k}^{\text{op}}, C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k}))((\mathfrak{p}W)(?), F^*(?, -)) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}^\bullet(\mathfrak{p}S, \mathcal{A}(A, -)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the colimit  $\text{colim}^W f$  exists if and only if there is an object  $C \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{A}(C, -)$  is quasi-isomorphic to  $\text{Hom}^\bullet(\mathfrak{p}S, \mathcal{A}(A, -))$ , or equivalently  $\mathcal{A}(C, -) \cong \text{Hom}^\bullet(\mathfrak{p}S, \mathcal{A}(A, -))$  in  $D(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}})$ . Such a colimit is called an *h-tensor* of  $A$  with  $S$ .

In particular, let us take  $S = S^n(\mathbb{k}) := S(\mathbb{k})[-n]$ , the  $(-n)$ -shift of the sphere complex (see [Remark 6.8](#)). Then it is h-projective and we have an isomorphism of complexes

$$(\text{DRift}_W f^*)(-) \cong \text{Hom}^\bullet(S^n(\mathbb{k}), \mathcal{A}(A, -)) \cong \mathcal{A}(A, -)[n].$$

Therefore the h-tensor of  $A$  with  $S^n(\mathbb{k})$  is called a *homotopical  $n$ -coshift* of  $A$ .

Similarly, let  $W: \mathbb{k} \leftrightarrow \mathbb{k}$  be the dg bimodule corresponding to  $S \in C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$ . Then

$$(\text{DRan}_W f_*)(-) \cong \text{Hom}^\bullet(\mathfrak{p}S, \mathcal{A}(-, A))$$

and the limit  $\text{lim}^W f$  exists if and only if there is an object  $D \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{A}(-, D)$  is quasi-isomorphic to  $\text{Hom}^\bullet(\mathfrak{p}S, \mathcal{A}(-, A))$ , or equivalently  $\mathcal{A}(-, D) \cong \text{Hom}^\bullet(\mathfrak{p}S, \mathcal{A}(-, A))$  in  $D(\mathcal{A})$ . Such a limit is called an *h-cotensor* of  $A$  with  $S$ . In particular, the h-cotensor of  $A$  with  $S^n(\mathbb{k})$  is called a *homotopical  $n$ -shift* of  $A$ .

Recall that  $H^0(\mathcal{A})$  can be regarded as a (non-replete) full subcategory of the triangulated category  $D(\mathcal{A})$  via  $H^0(\mathfrak{y}): H^0(\mathcal{A}) \hookrightarrow D(\mathcal{A})$ .

**Proposition 6.10.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dg category.

- (1)  $\mathcal{A}$  has all homotopical  $n$ -coshifts if and only if the subcategory  $H^0(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}) \subseteq D(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}})$  is closed (up to isomorphism) under  $n$ -shifts.
- (2)  $\mathcal{A}$  has all homotopical  $n$ -shifts if and only if the subcategory  $H^0(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq D(\mathcal{A})$  is closed (up to isomorphism) under  $n$ -shifts.

*Proof.* Straightforward.  $\square$

Recall that  $\mathcal{2}$  denotes the poset  $\{0 < 1\}$  and is identified with its free dg category. Giving a dg functor  $F: \mathcal{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  is equivalent to giving a morphism  $a: A \rightarrow B$  of  $Z^0(\mathcal{A})$ . We now prepare a lemma.

**Lemma 6.11.** Let  $W: \mathcal{2} \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$  be the dg functor corresponding to the morphism  $\iota: S(\mathbb{k}) \rightarrow D(\mathbb{k})$  from the sphere complex to the disk complex (see [Remark 6.8](#)).

- (1)  $W$  is h-projective in  $\text{Fun}_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{2}, C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})) = C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{2}^{\text{op}})$ .
- (2)  $W$  is compact in  $D(\mathcal{2}^{\text{op}})$ .

*Proof.* (1) We observe that the representable dg functor  $\text{Hom}(0, -): \mathcal{2} \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$  for the object  $0 \in \mathcal{2}$  corresponds to  $\text{id}: S(\mathbb{k}) \rightarrow S(\mathbb{k})$ , and  $\text{Hom}(1, -): \mathcal{2} \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$  corresponds to  $0: 0 \rightarrow S(\mathbb{k})$ . It is easy to see that  $W$  is the cone of  $\text{Hom}(1, -) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(0, -)$  in  $\text{Fun}_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{2}, C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k}))$ . Since representable dg functors are h-projective, so is  $W$ .

(2) As seen in [Remark 6.8](#), we have  $\text{Fun}_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{2}, C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k}))(W, F) \cong \text{Cone}(f)[-1]$  for a dg functor  $F: \mathcal{2} \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}$ . Thus by using h-projectiveness of  $W$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{D(\mathcal{2}^{\text{op}})}(W, -) &\cong \text{Hom}_{K(\mathcal{2}^{\text{op}})}(W, -) \\ &\cong H^0\left(\text{Fun}_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{2}, C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k}))(W, -)\right) \\ &\cong H^0(\text{Cone}(-)[-1]), \end{aligned}$$

which preserves coproducts. Therefore  $W$  is compact in  $D(\mathcal{2}^{\text{op}})$ .  $\square$

**Example 6.12** (h-cone). Consider  $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{2}$  and a morphism  $a: A \rightarrow B$  in  $Z^0(\mathcal{A})$ . Let  $f = a_*: \mathcal{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  be the quasi-functor induced by  $a: \mathcal{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ . Also let  $g^* = a^*: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{2}$  be the left representable dg bimodule induced by  $a: \mathcal{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  and  $g_*: \mathcal{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  be its left adjoint dg bimodule, which we view as a quasi-functor  $g: \mathcal{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ .

Let  $W: \mathbb{k} \rightarrow \mathcal{2}$  be the dg bimodule  $\mathcal{2}^{\text{op}} \otimes \mathbb{k} \cong \mathcal{2}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$  obtained from the morphism of complexes  $\iota: S(\mathbb{k}) \rightarrow D(\mathbb{k})$ . In this case,  $W$  is h-projective and for the quasi-functor  $g$  we have an isomorphism of left dg modules

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{DRift}_W g^*)(-) &= \text{Fun}_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{2}^{\text{op}}, C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k}))(W(?), a^*(?, -)) \\ &\cong \text{Cone}(a^*: \mathcal{A}(B, -) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(A, -))[-1] =: \text{Cocone}(a^*). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the colimit  $\text{colim}^W g$  exists if and only if there is an object  $C \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{A}(C, -)$  is quasi-isomorphic to  $\text{Cocone}(a^*)$ , or equivalently  $\mathcal{A}(C, -) \cong \text{Cocone}(a^*)$  in  $D(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}})$ . Such a colimit is called an *h-cone* of  $a: A \rightarrow B$ . In general, we refer to the colimit of a quasi-functor  $f: \mathcal{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  weighted by the above dg bimodule  $W$  as an *h-cone* of  $f$ .

Similarly, let  $W: \mathcal{2} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$  be the dg bimodule  $\mathbb{k}^{\text{op}} \otimes \mathcal{2} \cong \mathcal{2} \rightarrow C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k})$  obtained from the morphism of complexes  $\iota: S(\mathbb{k}) \rightarrow D(\mathbb{k})$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{DRan}_W f_*)(-) &= \text{Fun}_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{2}, C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k}))(W(?), a_*(?, -)) \\ &\cong \text{Cone}(a_*: \mathcal{A}(-, A) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(-, B))[-1] =: \text{Cocone}(a_*), \end{aligned}$$

and hence the limit  $\text{lim}^W f$  exists if and only if there is an object  $D \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{A}(-, D)$  is quasi-isomorphic to  $\text{Cocone}(a_*)$ , or equivalently  $\mathcal{A}(-, D) \cong \text{Cocone}(a_*)$  in  $D(\mathcal{A})$ . Such a limit is called an *h-cocone* of  $a: A \rightarrow B$ . In general, we refer to the limit of a quasi-functor  $f: \mathcal{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  weighted by the above dg bimodule  $W$  as an *h-cocone* of  $f$ .

Take a quasi-functor  $f: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ . As it is right quasi-representable, the right dg  $\mathcal{A}$ -modules  $f_*(-, i)$  for  $i = 0, 1$  are quasi-representable, i.e. isomorphic to  $\mathcal{A}(-, A_i)$  for some  $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$  in the derived category  $D(\mathcal{A})$ . Then we refer to  $f$  as a *quasi-morphism* from  $A_0$  to  $A_1$ . A quasi-morphism is just a morphism of  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ .

**Proposition 6.13.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dg category.

- (1)  $\mathcal{A}$  has all h-cones if and only if the subcategory  $H^0(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}) \subseteq D(\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}})$  is closed (up to isomorphism) under cocones.
- (2)  $\mathcal{A}$  has all h-cocones if and only if the subcategory  $H^0(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq D(\mathcal{A})$  is closed (up to isomorphism) under cocones.

*Proof.* It is easy to check by definition.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.14.** A dg category  $\mathcal{A}$  has all h-shifts and h-cones if and only if it is pretriangulated, i.e.  $H^0(\mathcal{A})$  is closed (up to isomorphism) under shifts and cones of  $D(\mathcal{A})$ .

We can reduce the existence of bimodule-weighted colimits to that of module-weighted ones.

**Lemma 6.15.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a dg category and  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  an object. Then the associated dg bimodule  $A_*: \mathbb{k} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  is left adjoint to the dg bimodule  $A^*: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$  in  $\text{DBimod}$ .

*Proof.* Under the isomorphism  $C_{\text{dg}}(\mathbb{k}, \mathcal{A}) \cong C_{\text{dg}}(\mathcal{A})$ ,  $A_*$  corresponds to  $\mathcal{A}(-, A)$ , which is h-projective and compact. Thus by [Theorem 4.5](#),  $A_*$  has  $\mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}(A_*) = \mathcal{L}(A_*) = A^*$  as a right adjoint.  $\square$

**Proposition 6.16.** Let  $W: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}$  be a dg bimodule and  $f: \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  a quasi-functor. Then the colimit  $\text{colim}^W f$  exists if and only if the colimits  $\text{colim}^{W(-, M)} f$  exist for all  $M \in \mathcal{M}$ .

*Proof.* We may assume  $W$  to be h-projective. Notice that  $W(-, M) \cong W \odot M_* \cong W \odot^{\mathbb{L}} M_*$  in  $D(\mathcal{J})$  since  $M_*$  is h-projective. The colimit  $\text{colim}^W f$  exists if and only if  $\text{DRift}_W f^*$  is left quasi-representable, i.e.  $(\text{DRift}_W f^*)(M, -)$  is quasi-representable for each  $M \in \mathcal{M}$ . Because  $M^* = \text{DRift}_{M_*} I_{\mathcal{M}}$  is an absolute right Kan lifting in  $\text{DBimod}$ , we have  $M^* \odot^{\mathbb{L}} \text{DRift}_W f^* \cong \text{DRift}_{M_*} \text{DRift}_W f^* \cong \text{DRift}_{W \odot^{\mathbb{L}} M_*} f^* \cong \text{DRift}_{W(-, M)} f^*$ . Thus  $(\text{DRift}_W f^*)(M, -) \cong M^* \odot^{\mathbb{L}} \text{DRift}_W f^*$  is quasi-representable if and only if the colimit  $\text{colim}^{W(-, M)} f$  exists, which proves the proposition.  $\square$

**6.2. Homotopy Cauchy complete dg categories.** We can also define the preservation of (co)limits.

**Definition 6.17.** Let  $W: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}$  be a dg bimodule and  $f: \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  a quasi-functor. Suppose the colimit  $\text{colim}^W f$  exists. We say that a quasi-functor  $g: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  *preserves*  $\text{colim}^W f$  if  $\text{DRift}_W (gf)^* \cong (\text{DRift}_W f^*) \odot^{\mathbb{L}} g^*$ . Dually we define the preservation of limits by a quasi-functor.

**Proposition 6.18.** All existing colimits weighted by left adjoint dg bimodules are preserved by any quasi-functors. Dually, all existing limits weighted by right adjoint dg bimodules are preserved by any quasi-functors. Here adjoint dg bimodules are considered in  $\text{DBimod}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $W: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}$  and  $V: \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  be dg bimodules, and suppose they form an adjunction  $W \dashv V$  in  $\text{DBimod}$ . Take a quasi-functor  $f: \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  and assume the colimit

$\operatorname{colim}^W f$  exists. Then  $\operatorname{DRift}_W f^*$  is left quasi-representable. Since  $\operatorname{DRift}_W f^* \cong V \odot^{\mathbb{L}} f^*$  by [Proposition A.6](#), we have

$$\operatorname{DRift}_W(gf)^* \cong \operatorname{DRift}_W(f^* \odot^{\mathbb{L}} g^*) \cong V \odot^{\mathbb{L}} f^* \odot^{\mathbb{L}} g^* \cong (\operatorname{DRift}_W f^*) \odot^{\mathbb{L}} g^*$$

for any quasi-functor  $g: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ . It follows that  $\operatorname{DRift}_W(gf)^*$  is left quasi-representable and  $g$  preserves  $\operatorname{colim}^W f$ .  $\square$

(Co)limits that are preserved by any quasi-functors are called *absolute*. The proposition above means that colimits weighted by left adjoints and limits weighted by right adjoints are absolute.

Among (co)limits defined in the previous subsection, h-initial and h-terminal objects, finite h-(co)products, h-shifts, and h-(co)cones are absolute.

**Proposition 6.19.** Suppose that a dg bimodule  $W: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}$  is left adjoint to a dg bimodule  $V: \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  in  $\operatorname{DBimod}$ . For quasi-functors  $f: \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  and  $z: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ ,  $z$  is the (absolute)  $W$ -weighted colimit of  $f$  if and only if  $z$  is the (absolute)  $V$ -weighted limit of  $f$ .

*Proof.* This is due to [Proposition A.31](#). However, we give the proof for the convenience of the reader. By [Proposition A.6](#), we have

$$\operatorname{DRift}_W f^* \cong V \odot^{\mathbb{L}} f^*, \quad \operatorname{DRan}_V f_* \cong f_* \odot^{\mathbb{L}} W.$$

In particular, we have an adjunction  $\operatorname{DRan}_V f_* \dashv \operatorname{DRift}_W f^*$ . Hence,  $\operatorname{DRift}_W f^*$  is corepresentable by  $z$  if and only if  $\operatorname{DRan}_V f_*$  is representable by  $z$ .  $\square$

The following is a homotopical analog of Cauchy completeness.

**Definition 6.20.** A dg category  $\mathcal{A}$  is called *h-Cauchy complete* if all left adjoint dg bimodules in  $\operatorname{DBimod}$  with codomain  $\mathcal{A}$  are right quasi-representable.

**Proposition 6.21.** For a dg category  $\mathcal{A}$ , the following are equivalent.

- (i)  $\mathcal{A}$  is h-Cauchy complete.
- (ii)  $\mathcal{A}$  has all limits weighted by right adjoint dg bimodules.
- (iii)  $\mathcal{A}$  has all colimits weighted by left adjoint dg bimodules.
- (iv) The inclusion  $H^0(\mathcal{A}) \hookrightarrow \operatorname{Perf}(\mathcal{A}) := D(\mathcal{A})^{\operatorname{cpt}}$  is an equivalence of categories.

*Proof.* (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii): Let  $W \dashv V$  be an adjunction in  $\operatorname{DBimod}$  and  $f$  a quasi-functor. By the proof of [Proposition 6.19](#),  $\operatorname{DRan}_V f_*$  is a left adjoint, and hence it is right quasi-representable. Thus  $\mathcal{A}$  has all limits weighted by right adjoint dg bimodules.

(ii)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (iii): By [Proposition 6.19](#).

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i): Let  $W: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  be a left adjoint in  $\operatorname{DBimod}$ . Then the colimit  $\operatorname{colim}^W \operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{A}}$  exists, which means that  $\operatorname{DRift}_W I_{\mathcal{A}}$  is left quasi-representable. Since  $\mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}(W) = \operatorname{DRift}_W I_{\mathcal{A}}$  is right adjoint to  $W$ , it follows that  $W$  is right quasi-representable.

(i)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (iv): It follows from [Theorem 4.5](#).  $\square$

**6.3. Application to the gluing.** In [\[KL15\]](#), the gluing construction of two dg categories along a dg bimodule is introduced. That is, from a dg bimodule  $\varphi: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  we can make a new dg category  $\int \varphi$  together with canonical dg functors  $p: \int \varphi \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  and  $q: \int \varphi \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ . It is essentially observed in that paper that the gluing has a weak universality in the following sense.

**Proposition 6.22** ([KL15, Proposition A.7 (i)]). Let  $\varphi: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a dg bimodule. Then, for a dg category  $\mathcal{C}$ , the functor

$$D(\mathcal{C}, \int \varphi) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B}) \downarrow D(\mathcal{C}, \varphi)$$

is *weakly smothering*, i.e. essentially surjective, full, and conservative. Here  $D(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B}) \downarrow D(\mathcal{C}, \varphi)$  denotes the comma category of functors

$$D(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B}) \xrightarrow{\text{id}} D(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B}) \xleftarrow{\varphi \circ^{\mathbb{L}} -} D(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}).$$

Moreover, a dg bimodule  $\alpha: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \int \varphi$  is a quasi-functor if and only if both  $p_* \circ^{\mathbb{L}} \alpha$  and  $q_* \circ^{\mathbb{L}} \alpha$  are quasi-functors.

*Proof.* The original statement is a bijective correspondance between isoclasses of objects of  $D(\mathcal{C}, \int \varphi)$  and of  $D(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B}) \downarrow D(\mathcal{C}, \varphi)$ . This is owing to [KL15, Lemma 2.5]. By refining the proof of [KL15, Lemma 2.5], we obtain the assertion.  $\square$

The notion of *smothering* functors was first introduced in [RV15]. The notion of weakly smothering functors is due to [nLab, “smothering functor”] or [Arl20].

As shown in [KL15, Lemma 4.3], the gluing of pretriangulated dg categories is again pretriangulated. The next proposition gives a slight generalization and an alternative, more conceptual proof of this result.

**Proposition 6.23.** Let  $\varphi: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a dg bimodule. Let  $V: \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  be a right adjoint dg bimodule and suppose that  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  have  $V$ -weighted limits. Then the gluing  $\int \varphi$  has  $V$ -weighted limits as well.

*Proof.* Take a quasi-functor  $f: \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \int \varphi$  and put  $\alpha = \text{DRan}_V f_*: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \int \varphi$ , which is an absolute right Kan extension as  $V$  is right adjoint. We want to prove that  $\alpha$  is a quasi-functor. By Proposition 6.22, it suffices to show that  $p_* \circ^{\mathbb{L}} \alpha$  and  $q_* \circ^{\mathbb{L}} \alpha$  are quasi-functors. Since  $\alpha = \text{DRan}_V f_*$  is absolute,  $p_* \circ^{\mathbb{L}} \alpha$  is a right Kan extension  $\text{DRan}_V(p_* \circ^{\mathbb{L}} f_*)$ . Now that  $\mathcal{A}$  has  $V$ -weighted limits,  $p_* \circ^{\mathbb{L}} \alpha$  is a quasi-functor. The same arguments imply that  $q_* \circ^{\mathbb{L}} \alpha$  is also a quasi-functor.  $\square$

**6.4. Adjunctions of quasi-functors.** We refer to an adjunction in the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{qr}}$  of quasi-functors as an *adjunction of quasi-functors*; see [Gen17, §7]. If a quasi-functor  $f$  is left adjoint to a quasi-functor  $u$ , then we have an adjunction  $f_* \dashv u_*$  in the bicategory  $\text{DBimod}$ . Therefore  $f \dashv u$  holds in  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{qr}}$  if and only if  $f^* \cong u_*$  holds in  $\text{DBimod}$ . Summarizing, we have:

**Proposition 6.24** ([Gen17, Proposition 7.1]). A quasi-functor  $f$  has a left adjoint if and only if the dg bimodule  $f^* = \mathbb{L}\mathcal{L}(f)$  is right quasi-representable. A quasi-functor  $u$  has a left adjoint if and only if  $u_* = u$  is left quasi-representable.

The notion of adjoint dg functors is defined by adjoint morphisms in the 2-category  $\text{dgCat}$ . In this subsection, let us investigate the relation between adjoint quasi-functors and adjoint dg functors that is not studied in [Gen17].

Recall that the diagonal dg bimodule  $I_{\mathcal{A}}$  is the identity in both  $\text{Bimod}$  and  $\text{DBimod}$ . Also we recall that the composition  $\circ^{\mathbb{L}}$  of  $\text{DBimod}$  is given by the total right derived functor of

the composition  $\odot$  of  $\mathbf{Bimod}$ , as follows.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 C(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}) \times C(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) & \xrightarrow{\odot} & C(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}) \\
 \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \\
 K(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}) \times K(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) & \xrightarrow{\odot} & K(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}) \\
 \downarrow & \uparrow & \downarrow \\
 D(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}) \times D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) & \xrightarrow{\odot^{\mathbb{L}}} & D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}).
 \end{array}$$

Hence there is a natural morphism  $\mu: Y \odot^{\mathbb{L}} X = \mathfrak{p}Y \odot \mathfrak{p}X \rightarrow Y \odot X$  in  $D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})$ , which is given by using h-projective resolutions of dg bimodules.

**Lemma 6.25.** The following data define a normal lax functor  $\Gamma: \mathbf{Bimod} \rightarrow \mathbf{DBimod}$ :

- the map  $\text{ob}(\mathbf{Bimod}) \rightarrow \text{ob}(\mathbf{DBimod})$  is the identity;
- for each small dg categories  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$ ,  $\Gamma_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}: C(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is defined to be the composite  $C(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow K(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \xrightarrow{\delta} D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ ;
- the lax functoriality constraint  $\Gamma(Y) \odot^{\mathbb{L}} \Gamma(X) \Rightarrow \Gamma(Y \odot X)$  is defined as the natural morphism  $\mu: Y \odot^{\mathbb{L}} X = \mathfrak{p}Y \odot \mathfrak{p}X \rightarrow Y \odot X$  obtained above;
- the lax unity constraint is the identity.

*Proof.* We omit the proof. □

Moreover the lax functor  $\Gamma$  clearly induces a lax functor  $\gamma = \Gamma|_{\mathbf{dgCat}}: \mathbf{dgCat} \rightarrow \mathbf{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}}$ , which sends a dg functor  $F$  to the quasi-functor  $F_*$ .

In general the constraint  $\mu: Y \odot^{\mathbb{L}} X \rightarrow Y \odot X$  is not invertible, but we have the following result.

**Lemma 6.26.** Let  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  and  $Y: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  be dg bimodules between (locally h-projective) dg categories. If either  $X$  is right h-flat or  $Y$  is left h-flat, then  $\mu: Y \odot^{\mathbb{L}} X \rightarrow Y \odot X$  is invertible in  $D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})$ .

*Proof.* We prove only the first case. Suppose  $X$  is right h-flat. The constraint  $\mu: Y \odot^{\mathbb{L}} X \rightarrow Y \odot X$  factors as the composite

$$Y \odot^{\mathbb{L}} X = \mathfrak{p}Y \odot \mathfrak{p}X \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{p}Y \odot q_X} \mathfrak{p}Y \odot X \xrightarrow{q_Y \odot X} Y \odot X,$$

where  $q_X$  and  $q_Y$  are h-projective resolutions of  $X$  and  $Y$ , respectively. Since  $\mathfrak{p}Y$  is h-projective and  $\mathcal{C}$  is locally h-projective, [Lemma 3.5](#) implies that  $\mathfrak{p}Y$  is left h-projective and hence left h-flat. Therefore, by [Lemma 3.2](#), the first morphism is a quasi-isomorphism. Since  $X$  is right h-flat, the second morphism is also a quasi-isomorphism again by [Lemma 3.2](#). Thus their composite is sent to an isomorphism in  $D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})$ . □

For a dg functor  $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ , the representable dg bimodule  $F_*: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  is right h-flat. Hence the above lemma shows that the constraint  $\mu: Y \odot^{\mathbb{L}} F_* \rightarrow Y \odot F_*$  is invertible. From this we obtain the following.

**Corollary 6.27.** The restricted lax functor  $\gamma: \mathbf{dgCat} \rightarrow \mathbf{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}}$  is a pseudo-functor.

*Proof.* It follows from [Lemma 6.26](#). □

Since a pseudo-functor preserves adjunctions, we have:

**Proposition 6.28.** For an adjunction  $F \dashv G$  of dg functors, we have an adjunction  $F_* \dashv G_*$  of quasi-functors.

In [Subsection 3.2](#), we have constructed the pseudo-functor  $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}: \text{DBimod} \rightarrow \text{CAT}$ , which sends  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  to  $\mathbb{L}T_X: D(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{B})$ . For a right quasi-representable  $X$ , the functor  $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}(X) = \mathbb{L}T_X$  restricts to a functor  $\mathbb{L}T_X|_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}: \overline{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{B}}$ , where  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$  denotes the full subcategory of  $D(\mathcal{A})$  consisting of quasi-representable dg modules. Putting  $\tilde{H}^0(\mathcal{A}) := \overline{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\tilde{H}^0(f) := \mathbb{L}T_{f*}|_{\overline{\mathcal{A}}}: \tilde{H}^0(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \tilde{H}^0(\mathcal{B})$  for quasi-functors  $f: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ , we obtain a new pseudo-functor

$$\tilde{H}^0: \text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}} \rightarrow \text{Cat}.$$

Therefore we see that an adjunction  $f \dashv g: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  of quasi-functors induces an adjunction  $\tilde{H}^0(f) \dashv \tilde{H}^0(g): \tilde{H}^0(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \tilde{H}^0(\mathcal{B})$  of ordinary functors. Since  $\tilde{H}^0(\mathcal{A}) = \overline{\mathcal{A}}$  is equivalent to the homotopy category  $H^0(\mathcal{A})$ , we end up with an adjunction between homotopy categories. In fact, we can observe that the equivalences  $H^0(\mathcal{A}) \simeq \tilde{H}^0(\mathcal{A})$  give rise to a pseudonatural equivalence  $H^0 \xrightarrow{\cong} \tilde{H}^0 \circ \gamma$  from the homotopy category 2-functor  $H^0: \text{dgCat} \rightarrow \text{Cat}$ .

## 7. A UNIVERSAL PROPERTY OF THE HOMOTOPY CATEGORY THEORY

We continue to assume that  $\mathbb{k}$  is a field. We finally observe that the proarrow equipment  $(-)_*: \text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}} \rightarrow \text{DBimod}$  has a universal property among proarrow equipments.

We have seen in the previous section that there are a normal lax functor  $\Gamma: \text{Bimod} \rightarrow \text{DBimod}$  and a pseudo-functor  $\gamma: \text{dgCat} \rightarrow \text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}}$  such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{dgCat} & \xleftarrow{(-)_*} & \text{Bimod} \\ \gamma \downarrow & & \downarrow \Gamma \\ \text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}} & \xleftarrow{(-)_*} & \text{DBimod} \end{array}$$

commutes. Moreover we can see that the pair  $(\Gamma, \gamma)$  behaves like a ‘‘morphism of proarrow equipments’’ in a sense, by using the following proposition.

**Proposition 7.1** (The dual of [\[DPP04, Proposition 2.7 and 2.9\]](#)). Let  $\Phi: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$  be a normal lax functor between bicategories. Suppose that we are given an adjunction  $(f \dashv u: A \rightarrow B, \eta, \varepsilon)$  in  $\mathcal{K}$ . Then the following are equivalent:

- (i) If there is a 2-cell  $\bar{\eta}: \text{id}_{\Phi(A)} \Rightarrow \Phi(u) \circ \Phi(f)$  in  $\mathcal{L}$  such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Phi(u \circ f) & \xleftarrow{\Phi(\eta)} & \Phi(\text{id}_A) \\ \varphi_{u,f} \uparrow & & \uparrow \varphi_A \\ \Phi(u) \circ \Phi(f) & \xleftarrow{\bar{\eta}} & \text{id}_{\Phi(A)} \end{array}$$

commutes, then we have  $\Phi(f) \dashv \Phi(u)$  with unit  $\bar{\eta}$ . Here  $\varphi_{u,f}$  and  $\varphi_A$  denote lax constraints of  $\Phi$ .

- (ii) The constraint  $\varphi_{g,f}: \Phi(g) \circ \Phi(f) \rightarrow \Phi(g \circ f)$  is an isomorphism for any composable morphism  $g$ .

Note that (i) above holds when  $\varphi_{u,f}$  is an isomorphism. In [\[DPP04\]](#) it is said that  $\Phi$  preserves the adjunction  $f \dashv u$  if the condition (i) of [Proposition 7.1](#) is satisfied.

**Corollary 7.2.** The lax functor  $\Gamma: \text{Bimod} \rightarrow \text{DBimod}$  preserves adjunctions of the form  $F_* \dashv F^*$  for some dg functor  $F$ .

*Proof.* By [Lemma 6.26](#) the constraint  $F^* \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} F_* \rightarrow F^* \circ F_*$  (precisely,  $\Gamma(F^*) \circledast^{\mathbb{L}} \Gamma(F_*) \rightarrow \Gamma(F^* \circ F_*)$ ) of  $\Gamma$  is an isomorphism, because  $F_*$  is right h-flat. Hence [Proposition 7.1](#) proves the assertion.  $\square$

This corollary indicates that  $(\Gamma, \gamma)$  is an *equipment morphism* in the sense of [Ver11, Proposition 1.5.13]; but we will not deal with that notion here.

**Theorem 7.3.** Let  $\Theta: \text{Bimod} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  be a lax functor which sends quasi-isomorphism 2-cells to invertible ones. Then there is a lax functor  $\tilde{\Theta}: \text{DBimod} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  such that the following commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Bimod} & \xrightarrow{\Theta} & \mathcal{M}. \\ \Gamma \downarrow & \nearrow \tilde{\Theta} & \\ \text{DBimod} & & \end{array}$$

Moreover,  $\tilde{\Theta}$  is normal if so is  $\Theta$ .

*Proof.* On objects, define  $\tilde{\Theta}(\mathcal{A}) = \Theta(\mathcal{A})$ . As the functor  $\Gamma_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}: C(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is a localization with respect to quasi-isomorphisms,  $\Theta_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}$  factors as

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) & \xrightarrow{\Theta_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}} & \mathcal{M}(\Theta(\mathcal{A}), \Theta(\mathcal{B})). \\ \Gamma_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}} \downarrow & \nearrow \tilde{\Theta}_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}} & \\ D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) & & \end{array}$$

These data determine a lax functor  $\tilde{\Theta}: \text{DBimod} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  whose constraints are

$$\tilde{\Theta}(\Gamma(Y)) \circ \tilde{\Theta}(\Gamma(X)) \cong \Theta(\mathfrak{p}Y) \circ \Theta(\mathfrak{p}X) \rightarrow \Theta(\mathfrak{p}Y \circ \mathfrak{p}X) = \tilde{\Theta}(\Gamma(Y \circ^{\mathbb{L}} X))$$

and

$$\text{id}_{\tilde{\Theta}(\mathcal{A})} = \text{id}_{\Theta(\mathcal{A})} \rightarrow \Theta(I_{\mathcal{A}}) = \tilde{\Theta}(\Gamma(I_{\mathcal{A}})).$$

From the construction we can verify  $\tilde{\Theta} \circ \Gamma = \Theta$ .  $\square$

Applying [Theorem 7.3](#) to the lax functor  $\mathbb{L}: \text{Bimod} \rightarrow \text{CAT}$ ,  $X \mapsto \mathbb{L}T_X$ , we get  $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}: \text{DBimod} \rightarrow \text{CAT}$ , which is obtained in [Subsection 3.2](#).

**Lemma 7.4.** For any right quasi-representable dg bimodule  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  between (locally h-projective) dg categories, there are a dg functor  $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  and a quasi-equivalence  $W: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  such that  $X \circ^{\mathbb{L}} W_* \cong F_*$  in  $D(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B})$ .

*Proof.* This statement is attributed to [Toë07], in which it is shown that there exists a bijection between the set of morphisms  $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  in  $\text{HodgCat}$  and the set of isomorphism classes of right quasi-representable dg bimodules in  $D(\mathcal{B} \otimes^{\mathbb{L}} \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}) = D(Q(\mathcal{C}), \mathcal{B})$  (see [Toë07, Corollary 4.8] or [CS15]). When  $\mathcal{C}$  is cofibrant, morphisms  $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  in  $\text{HodgCat}$  is homotopy classes of dg functors. In such a case, we can thus verify that any right quasi-representable dg bimodule  $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  is isomorphic to  $F_*$  for some dg functor  $F$ .

Take a cofibrant resolution  $W: Q(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  and set  $\mathcal{C} = Q(\mathcal{A})$ . Then  $X \circ^{\mathbb{L}} W_*$  is right quasi-representable. Since  $Q(\mathcal{A})$  is cofibrant, it is isomorphic to  $F_*$  in  $D(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  for some  $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 7.5.** Consider another proarrow equipment  $(-)_\bullet: \mathcal{K} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ . Let  $\Theta: \text{Bimod} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  be a normal lax functor that preserves adjunctions of the form  $F_* \dashv F^*$  for dg functors  $F$  (i.e. it satisfies the equivalent conditions in [Proposition 7.1](#) for  $F_* \dashv F^*$ ), and  $\theta: \text{dgCat} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  be a pseudo-functor such that  $\Theta \circ (-)_* = (-)_\bullet \circ \theta$ . If  $\Theta$  sends quasi-isomorphism 2-cells to invertible ones and  $\theta$  sends quasi-equivalences to equivalences, then  $(\Theta, \theta)$  factors through the

pair  $(\Gamma, \gamma)$ : namely, there exist a normal lax functor  $\tilde{\Theta}: \text{DBimod} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  and a pseudo-functor  $\tilde{\theta}: \text{dgCat} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  such that  $\tilde{\Theta} \circ (-)_* = (-)_\bullet \circ \tilde{\theta}$ ,  $\tilde{\Theta} \circ \Gamma = \Theta$ , and  $\tilde{\theta} \circ \gamma = \theta$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\text{dgCat} & \xrightarrow{\theta} & \mathcal{K} & & \\
\downarrow \gamma & \searrow (-)_* & \nearrow (-)_\bullet & & \\
& & \text{Bimod} & \xrightarrow{\Theta} & \mathcal{M} \\
& & \downarrow \Gamma & & \nearrow \tilde{\Theta} \\
\text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\theta}} & \text{DBimod} & & \\
& \searrow (-)_* & & & 
\end{array}$$

*Proof.* By [Theorem 7.3](#) we have a normal lax functor  $\tilde{\Theta}: \text{DBimod} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  through which  $\Theta$  factors. First let us prove that  $\tilde{\Theta}$  preserves the adjunction  $\Gamma(F_*) \dashv \Gamma(F^*)$  for a dg functor  $F$ . It suffices by [Proposition 7.1](#) to show that the constraint  $\tilde{\Theta}(X) \circ \tilde{\Theta}(\Gamma(F_*)) \rightarrow \tilde{\Theta}(X \circ^{\mathbb{L}} \Gamma(F_*))$  is invertible for any composable morphism  $X$  in  $\text{DBimod}$ . It is given by

$$\tilde{\Theta}(\Gamma(X)) \circ \tilde{\Theta}(\Gamma(F_*)) = \Theta(X) \circ \Theta(F_*) \rightarrow \Theta(X \circ F_*) = \tilde{\Theta}(\Gamma(X \circ F_*)) \cong \tilde{\Theta}(\Gamma(X) \circ^{\mathbb{L}} \Gamma(F_*))$$

where the last isomorphism is due to [Lemma 6.26](#), and hence it is invertible because so is  $\Theta(X) \circ \Theta(F_*) \rightarrow \Theta(X \circ F_*)$  by the assumption.

Secondly take a quasi-functor  $f$ . By [Lemma 7.4](#), we have  $f_* \circ^{\mathbb{L}} \Gamma(W_*) \cong \Gamma(F_*)$  in  $\text{DBimod}$  for some dg functor  $F$  and some quasi-equivalence  $W$ . Hence we have

$$\tilde{\Theta}(f_* \circ^{\mathbb{L}} \Gamma(W_*)) \cong \tilde{\Theta}(\Gamma(F_*)) = \Theta(F_*) = \theta(F)_\bullet.$$

The above argument implies that

$$\tilde{\Theta}(\Gamma(f_*) \circ^{\mathbb{L}} \Gamma(W_*)) \cong \tilde{\Theta}(\Gamma(f_*)) \circ \tilde{\Theta}(\Gamma(W_*)) = \Theta(f_*) \circ \Theta(W_*) = \tilde{\Theta}(f_*) \circ \theta(W)_\bullet.$$

Therefore we have  $\tilde{\Theta}(f_*) \circ \theta(W)_\bullet \cong \theta(F)_\bullet$ . Now we see from the assumption that  $\theta(W)$  is an equivalence in  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $\theta(W)_\bullet$  has the inverse  $\theta(W)^\bullet = (\theta(W)^{-1})_\bullet$ . Thus we obtain  $\tilde{\Theta}(f_*) \cong \theta(F)_\bullet \circ (\theta(W)^{-1})_\bullet \cong (\theta(F) \circ \theta(W)^{-1})_\bullet$ , which shows that the lax functor  $\tilde{\Theta} \circ (-)_*$  factors through  $\mathcal{K}$  and induces a lax functor  $\tilde{\theta}: \text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ .

We finally check that  $\tilde{\theta}$  is in fact a pseudo-functor. For this purpose, we only need to prove that the constraint  $\tilde{\Theta}(X) \circ \tilde{\Theta}(f_*) \rightarrow \tilde{\Theta}(X \circ^{\mathbb{L}} f_*)$  is invertible for any quasi-functor  $f$  and any dg bimodule  $X$ . Take again a dg functor  $F$  and a quasi-equivalence  $W$  such that  $f_* \circ^{\mathbb{L}} \Gamma(W_*) \cong \Gamma(F_*)$ . Since  $\tilde{\Theta}(\Gamma(W_*)) = \Theta(W_*) = \theta(W)_\bullet$  is an equivalence in  $\mathcal{M}$ , it is sufficient to show that

$$\alpha: \tilde{\Theta}(X) \circ \tilde{\Theta}(f_*) \circ \tilde{\Theta}(\Gamma(W_*)) \rightarrow \tilde{\Theta}(X \circ^{\mathbb{L}} f_*) \circ \tilde{\Theta}(\Gamma(W_*))$$

is invertible. By the associativity axiom for the lax functor  $\tilde{\Theta}$ ,

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\tilde{\Theta}(X) \circ \tilde{\Theta}(f_*) \circ \tilde{\Theta}(\Gamma(W_*)) & \longrightarrow & \tilde{\Theta}(X) \circ \tilde{\Theta}(f_* \circ^{\mathbb{L}} \Gamma(W_*)) \cong \tilde{\Theta}(X) \circ \tilde{\Theta}(\Gamma(F_*)) \\
\alpha \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\tilde{\Theta}(X \circ^{\mathbb{L}} f_*) \circ \tilde{\Theta}(\Gamma(W_*)) & \longrightarrow & \tilde{\Theta}(X \circ^{\mathbb{L}} f_* \circ^{\mathbb{L}} \Gamma(W_*)) \cong \tilde{\Theta}(X \circ^{\mathbb{L}} \Gamma(F_*)).
\end{array}$$

commutes and the three morphisms there except  $\alpha$  are invertible by the discussion in the first paragraph. Therefore so is  $\alpha$ , which is the desired conclusion.  $\square$

**Example 7.6.** The 0-th cohomology functor  $H^0: \text{Ch} \rightarrow \text{Ab}$  becomes a lax monoidal functor. This induces not only a 2-functor  $H^0: \text{dgCat} = \text{Ch-Cat} \rightarrow \text{Ab-Cat}$ , but also a normal lax

functor  $\overline{H}^0: \text{Bimod} = \text{Ch-Prof} \rightarrow \text{Ab-Prof}$ , which sends a dg bimodule  $X: \mathcal{B}^{\text{op}} \otimes \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{Ch}_{\text{dg}}$  to

$$H^0(\mathcal{B})^{\text{op}} \otimes H^0(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}} \otimes \mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{H^0(X)} H^0(\text{Ch}_{\text{dg}}) \xrightarrow{H^0} \text{Ab}.$$

It is immediate to see that  $\overline{H}^0$  sends quasi-isomorphisms to isomorphisms and  $H^0$  sends quasi-equivalences to equivalences. Moreover, since  $X \odot F_*$  is isomorphic to the dg functor  $\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \otimes \mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes F} \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \otimes \mathcal{B} \xrightarrow{Y} \text{Ch}_{\text{dg}}$ , we can verify that  $\overline{H}^0(X \odot F_*) \cong \overline{H}^0(X) \odot H^0(F)_* \cong \overline{H}^0(X) \odot \overline{H}^0(F_*)$ . Therefore, by [Theorem 7.5](#),  $(\overline{H}^0, H^0)$  factors through  $(\Gamma, \gamma)$ .

**Remark 7.7.** The universal property of the proarrow equipment  $(-)_*: \text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}} \hookrightarrow \text{DBimod}$  as in [Theorem 7.5](#) is like that of localizations of categories. It is a future work to establish the theory of localizations for proarrow equipments and show that  $\text{DBimod}^{\text{rqr}} \hookrightarrow \text{DBimod}$  is a localization of  $\text{dgCat} \hookrightarrow \text{Bimod}$ .

## A. PROARROW EQUIPMENTS

Proarrow equipments are one of the frameworks for formal category theory. The purpose of formal category theory is to try to synthesize the theory of ordinary categories. With the structure of proarrow equipments, we can interpret many concepts in category theory, such as adjunctions, equivalences, limits, Cauchy completeness, and pointwise Kan extensions, in the 2-categorical way. In this appendix, we review the theory of proarrow equipments from [\[Woo82\]](#).

**A.1. Basic bicategory theory.** In this subsection, we collect some basic facts and fix some notation on bicategories.

A *bicategory* is a notion of weak 2-category. Namely, a bicategory is like a 2-category such that the associativity and unity axioms hold *only* up to coherent isomorphism. Basic references of 2-categories and bicategories are [\[Bén67\]](#) and [\[JY21\]](#). In the following, we will omit the coherent isomorphisms for simplicity.

Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a bicategory. Objects of Hom categories  $\mathcal{K}(A, B)$  are called *1-morphisms* or simply *morphisms* of  $\mathcal{K}$ , and morphisms of Hom categories are called *2-morphisms* or *2-cells*. We let  $\mathcal{K}^{\text{op}}$  denote the bicategory obtained by reversing morphisms of  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathcal{K}^{\text{co}}$  denote the bicategory obtained by reversing 2-cells of  $\mathcal{K}$ . Put  $\mathcal{K}^{\text{coop}} = (\mathcal{K}^{\text{op}})^{\text{co}} = (\mathcal{K}^{\text{co}})^{\text{op}}$ , which is obtained by reversing both 1-morphisms and 2-morphisms of  $\mathcal{K}$ .

As in a 2-category, we can define equivalences and adjunctions in a bicategory as well.

**Definition A.1.** Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a bicategory.

- (1) An *equivalence* in  $\mathcal{K}$  is a pair of morphisms  $f: A \rightarrow B$  and  $u: B \rightarrow A$  such that  $u \circ f \cong \text{id}_A$  and  $u \circ f \cong \text{id}_B$ .
- (2) An *adjunction* in  $\mathcal{K}$  consists of a pair of morphisms  $f: A \rightarrow B$  and  $u: B \rightarrow A$  together with 2-cells  $\eta: \text{id}_A \Rightarrow u \circ f$  and  $\varepsilon: f \circ u \Rightarrow \text{id}_B$  that satisfy the following triangle identities:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & B & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_B} & B \\ & \nearrow f & \searrow u & \nearrow f \\ A & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_A} & A & \\ & \nwarrow \eta & \nearrow \varepsilon & \nwarrow \eta \end{array} = \text{id}_f, \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & B & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_B} & B \\ & \nwarrow u & \nearrow \varepsilon & \nwarrow u \\ & A & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_A} & A \\ & \nearrow \eta & \nwarrow f & \nearrow \eta \end{array} = \text{id}_u.$$

In this case, we call  $f$  the *left adjoint*,  $u$  the *right adjoint*,  $\eta$  the *unit*, and  $\varepsilon$  the *counit*.

- Example A.2.** (1) In the 2-category  $\text{Cat}$  of categories, an equivalence is just an equivalence of categories, and an adjunction is just a pair of adjoint functors.
- (2) Consider the 2-category  $\mathcal{V}\text{-Cat}$  of enriched categories over a cosmos  $\mathcal{V}$ <sup>3</sup>. An adjunction in  $\mathcal{V}\text{-Cat}$  is equivalently a pair of  $\mathcal{V}$ -functors  $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  and  $G: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  together with a natural isomorphism  $\mathcal{B}(FA, B) \cong \mathcal{A}(A, GB)$ .

Now we introduce the notion of Kan extensions and Kan liftings.

**Definition A.3.** Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a bicategory.

- (1) Let  $f: A \rightarrow B$  and  $k: A \rightarrow D$  be morphisms of  $\mathcal{K}$ . A *left Kan extension* of  $f$  along  $k$  is a morphism  $\text{Lan}_k f: D \rightarrow B$  together with a 2-cell  $\theta: f \Rightarrow \text{Lan}_k f \circ k$  such that the map

$$\mathcal{K}(D, B)(\text{Lan}_k f, h) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(A, B)(f, h \circ k), \quad \chi \mapsto (\chi k) \circ \theta$$

is bijective for all morphisms  $h: D \rightarrow B$ . A left Kan extension in  $\mathcal{K}^{\text{co}}$ ,  $\mathcal{K}^{\text{op}}$ , and  $\mathcal{K}^{\text{coop}}$  are called a *right Kan extension*, a *left Kan lifting*, and a *right Kan lifting*, and denoted by  $\text{Ran}$ ,  $\text{Lift}$ , and  $\text{Rift}$ , respectively.

- (2) Let  $g: B \rightarrow C$  be another morphism of  $\mathcal{K}$ . Then we say that  $g$  *commutes with* the left Kan extension  $\text{Lan}_k f$  (resp. the right Kan extension  $\text{Ran}_k f$ ) if  $g \circ \text{Lan}_k f \cong \text{Lan}_k(g \circ f)$  (resp.  $g \circ \text{Ran}_k f \cong \text{Ran}_k(g \circ f)$ ).
- (3) Also we say that  $g$  *commutes with* the left Kan liftings  $\text{Lift}_k f$  (resp. the right Kan liftings  $\text{Rift}_k f$ ) if  $(\text{Lift}_k f) \circ g \cong \text{Lift}_k(f \circ g)$  (resp.  $(\text{Rift}_k f) \circ g \cong \text{Rift}_k(f \circ g)$ ).
- (4) A left Kan extension is called *absolute* if it is commuted with by all morphisms. We define absolute right Kan extensions and absolute Kan liftings in a similar way.

**Proposition A.4.** Consider morphisms  $f: A \rightarrow B$ ,  $k: A \rightarrow D$ , and  $l: D \rightarrow E$  in a bicategory  $\mathcal{K}$ . If the left Kan extension  $\text{Lan}_k f$  exists, then we have an isomorphism

$$\text{Lan}_l \text{Lan}_k f \cong \text{Lan}_{lk} f,$$

either side existing if the other does.

**Proposition A.5.** Consider morphisms  $f: A \rightarrow B$ ,  $g: B \rightarrow A$  in a bicategory  $\mathcal{K}$ .

- (1) For a 2-cell  $\eta: \text{id}_A \Rightarrow g \circ f$ , the following are equivalent:
- (i)  $\eta$  is the unit of the adjunction  $f \dashv g$ .
  - (ii) The pair  $(f, \eta)$  is the absolute left Kan lifting  $\text{Lift}_g \text{id}_A$ .
  - (iii) The pair  $(f, \eta)$  is the left Kan lifting  $\text{Lift}_g \text{id}_A$ , and  $g$  commutes with it.
  - (iv) The pair  $(g, \eta)$  is the absolute left Kan extension  $\text{Lan}_f \text{id}_A$ .
  - (v) The pair  $(g, \eta)$  is the left Kan extension  $\text{Lan}_f \text{id}_A$ , and  $f$  commutes with it.
- (2) For a 2-cell  $\varepsilon: f \circ g \Rightarrow \text{id}_B$ , the following are equivalent:
- (i)  $\varepsilon$  is the counit of the adjunction  $f \dashv g$ .
  - (ii) The pair  $(g, \varepsilon)$  is the absolute right Kan lifting  $\text{Rift}_f \text{id}_B$ .
  - (iii) The pair  $(g, \varepsilon)$  is the right Kan lifting  $\text{Rift}_f \text{id}_B$ , and  $f$  commutes with it.
  - (iv) The pair  $(f, \varepsilon)$  is the absolute right Kan extension  $\text{Ran}_g \text{id}_B$ .
  - (v) The pair  $(f, \varepsilon)$  is the right Kan extension  $\text{Ran}_g \text{id}_B$ , and  $g$  commutes with it.

**Proposition A.6.** Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a bicategory.

---

<sup>3</sup>A (*Bénabou*) *cosmos* means a complete and cocomplete symmetric monoidal closed category.

- (1) A right Kan lifting along a left adjoint is a post-composite with the right adjoint: that is, for morphisms  $h: A \rightarrow C$  and  $f: B \rightarrow C$  where  $f$  has a right adjoint  $g$ , we have

$$\text{Rift}_f h \cong g \circ h.$$

In particular, such a right Kan lifting is absolute.

- (2) A right Kan extension along a right adjoint is a pre-composite with the left adjoint: that is, for morphisms  $f: A \rightarrow B$  and  $h: A \rightarrow C$  where  $f$  has a left adjoint  $g$ , we have

$$\text{Ran}_f h \cong h \circ g.$$

In particular, such a right Kan extension is absolute.

*Proof.* This follows from [Proposition A.5](#). □

**Proposition A.7.** Left adjoints commute with all right Kan liftings. Dually, right adjoints commute with all right Kan extensions.

*Proof.* Easy exercises on diagram chasing. □

**Definition A.8.** A bicategory  $\mathcal{M}$  is said to be *closed* if both the pre-composition functor and the post-composition functor have right adjoints. In other words, for morphisms  $X: A \rightarrow B$ ,  $Y: B \rightarrow C$ , and  $Z: A \rightarrow C$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ , there exist morphisms  $Y_{\ddagger}Z$  and  $X^{\ddagger}Z$  together with natural bijections

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(A, C)(Y \circ X, Z) &\cong \mathcal{M}(A, B)(X, Y_{\ddagger}Z), \\ \mathcal{M}(A, C)(Y \circ X, Z) &\cong \mathcal{M}(B, C)(Y, X^{\ddagger}Z). \end{aligned}$$

**Proposition A.9.** Let  $X: A \rightarrow B$ ,  $Y: B \rightarrow C$ ,  $Z: A \rightarrow C$  be morphisms in a bicategory  $\mathcal{M}$  where  $Y \circ -$  and  $- \circ X$  have right adjoints  $Y_{\ddagger}(-)$  and  $X^{\ddagger}(-)$  respectively. Then the counits of these adjunctions

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & B & \\ Y_{\ddagger}Z \nearrow & & \\ A & \xrightarrow{Z} & C, \\ & \Downarrow & \downarrow Y \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} B & & \\ X \uparrow & \searrow X^{\ddagger}Z & \\ A & \xrightarrow{Z} & C \\ & \Downarrow & \end{array}$$

are respectively a right Kan lifting and a right Kan extension in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Furthermore,  $\mathcal{M}$  being closed is equivalent to the existence of all right Kan liftings and right Kan extensions in  $\mathcal{M}$ .

*Proof.* This follows from the definitions. □

**Example A.10** (The closed bicategory of profunctors). For small categories  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ , a *profunctor*  $X: \mathcal{A} \nrightarrow \mathcal{B}$  is simply an ordinary functor  $X: \mathcal{B}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ . For profunctors  $X: \mathcal{A} \nrightarrow \mathcal{B}$  and  $Y: \mathcal{B} \nrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ , their “composition”  $Y \odot X$  is given by the coend

$$(Y \odot X)(c, a) = \int^{b \in \mathcal{B}} Y(c, b) \times X(b, a).$$

This composition makes profunctors into a bicategory  $\text{Prof}$ . The Hom set functor  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(-, -): \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{Set}$  regarded as a profunctor  $I_{\mathcal{A}}: \mathcal{A} \nrightarrow \mathcal{A}$  performs the identity morphism of  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $\text{Prof}$ .

Furthermore, the bicategory  $\text{Prof}$  is closed. For profunctors  $X: \mathcal{A} \nrightarrow \mathcal{B}$ ,  $Y: \mathcal{B} \nrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ , and  $Z: \mathcal{A} \nrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ , the profunctor  $X^{\ddagger}Z: \mathcal{B} \nrightarrow \mathcal{C}$  is defined by

$$X^{\ddagger}Z(C, B) = \text{Fun}(\mathcal{A}, \text{Set})(X(B, -), Z(C, -)) = \int_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \text{Hom}(X(B, A), Z(C, A)),$$

and the profunctor  $Y_{\dagger}Z: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  is defined by

$$Y_{\dagger}Z(B, A) = \text{Fun}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}, \text{Set})(Y(-, B), Z(-, A)) = \int_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \text{Hom}(Y(C, B), Z(C, A)).$$

Then there are natural bijections

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prof}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})(Y \odot X, Z) &\cong \text{Prof}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C})(Y, X^{\dagger}Z), \\ \text{Prof}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})(Y \odot X, Z) &\cong \text{Prof}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})(X, Y_{\dagger}Z). \end{aligned}$$

**Proposition A.11.** Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a closed bicategory. Then for a morphism  $X: A \rightarrow B$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} X \text{ is a left adjoint} &\iff X \text{ commutes with all right Kan liftings,} \\ X \text{ is a right adjoint} &\iff X \text{ commutes with all right Kan extensions.} \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We show the first statement; the second is dual. The  $(\Rightarrow)$  direction follows from [Proposition A.7](#). For  $(\Leftarrow)$ , since  $\mathcal{M}$  is closed, the statement follows from [Proposition A.5](#).  $\square$

We also recall the notion of morphisms between bicategories.

**Definition A.12.** Let  $\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{L}$  be bicategories. A *lax functor*  $\Phi: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$  consists of

- a map  $\Phi: \text{ob}(\mathcal{K}) \rightarrow \text{ob}(\mathcal{L})$ ,
- for each pair  $A, B \in \mathcal{K}$  of objects, a functor  $\Phi = \Phi_{AB}: \mathcal{K}(A, B) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\Phi(A), \Phi(B))$ ,
- for each object  $A \in \mathcal{K}$ , a 2-cell  $\epsilon^A: \text{id}_{\Phi(A)} \Rightarrow \Phi(\text{id}_A)$ , and
- for each triple  $A, B, C \in \mathcal{K}$  of objects, a 2-cell  $\mu_{g,f}^{A,B,C}: \Phi(g) \circ \Phi(f) \Rightarrow \Phi(g \circ f)$  natural in  $f \in \mathcal{K}(A, B)$  and  $g \in \mathcal{K}(B, C)$

such that these data satisfy the associativity and unity axioms (see [\[JY21, Definition 4.1.2\]](#) for the precise definition). We call  $\epsilon^A$  the *lax unity constraint* and  $\mu_{g,f}^{A,B,C}$  the *lax functoriality constraint*.

A lax functor  $\Phi: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$  is called *normal* (or *unitary*) if all  $\epsilon^A$  are invertible, and a *pseudo-functor* if all  $\epsilon^A$  and  $\mu_{g,f}^{A,B,C}$  are invertible.

It is immediate to see that any pseudo-functor preserves equivalences and adjunctions, but this does not hold for a lax functor in general.

**A.2. Proarrow equipments.** Let  $\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{M}$  be bicategories.

**Definition A.13** ([\[Woo82\]](#), [\[Woo85\]](#)). A pseudo-functor  $(-)_*: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is called a *proarrow equipment* if it satisfies:

- (1)  $(-)_*$  is bijective on objects,
- (2)  $(-)_*$  is locally fully faithful, and
- (3) for any 1-morphism  $f$  in  $\mathcal{K}$ ,  $f_*$  has a right adjoint  $f^*$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ .

Note that in recent years, an equipment often refers to a special double category ([\[Shu08\]](#), [\[CS10\]](#)).

Since a proarrow equipment  $(-)_*$  is bijective on objects, we henceforth identify the objects of  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$ , so  $\text{ob}(\mathcal{K}) = \text{ob}(\mathcal{M})$ .

For a proarrow equipment  $(-)_*: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ , given a morphism  $f: A \rightarrow B$  in  $\mathcal{K}$ , there exists an adjunction  $f_* \dashv f^*$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ . We write the unit of this adjunction by  $\bar{f}: \text{id}_A \Rightarrow f^* \circ f_*$ . Since

the unit is a left Kan extension, for any 2-morphism  $\tau: f \Rightarrow g: A \rightarrow B$  in  $\mathcal{K}$ , one obtains a unique 2-morphism  $\tau^*: g^* \Rightarrow f^*: B \rightarrow A$  in  $\mathcal{M}$  such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 & & B \\
 & \nearrow^{g^*} & \downarrow f^* \\
 A & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_A} & A \\
 & \searrow_{f_*} & \uparrow \bar{f} \\
 & & A
 \end{array}
 & = &
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 & & B \\
 & \nearrow^{g^*} & \downarrow f^* \\
 A & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_A} & A \\
 & \searrow_{f_*} & \uparrow \bar{g} \\
 & & A
 \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

This correspondence defines a pseudo-functor

$$(-)^*: \mathcal{K}^{\text{coop}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$$

which is locally fully faithful since  $(-)_*$  is.

A morphism  $X$  in  $\mathcal{M}$  is called *representable* if it can be written as  $X \cong f_*$  for some morphism  $f$  in  $\mathcal{K}$ , and *corepresentable* if it can be written as  $X \cong f^*$ .

**Example A.14.** The following are typical examples of proarrow equipments.

- (1) Let  $\text{Cat}$  be the 2-category of small categories and  $\text{Prof}$  the bicategory of profunctors. For a functor  $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ , we define the profunctor  $F_*: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  by  $F_* = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(-, F(-))$ . It is known that  $F_*$  has a right adjoint  $F^* = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(F(-), -): \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  in  $\text{Prof}$  (see [Bor94, Proposition 7.9.1] or [Lor21, Remark 5.2.1] for example). Hence the mapping  $F \mapsto F_*$  yields a proarrow equipment

$$(-)_*: \text{Cat} \rightarrow \text{Prof}.$$

- (2) More generally, if  $\mathcal{V}$  is a cosmos, then  $\mathcal{V}$ -enriched profunctors  $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  between  $\mathcal{V}$ -enriched small categories are defined similarly, and there exists a proarrow equipment

$$(-)_*: \mathcal{V}\text{-Cat} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}\text{-Prof}, \quad F \mapsto \mathcal{B}(-, F(-)).$$

**Example A.15.** (Other examples)

- (1) Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a category with pullbacks, and let  $\text{Span}(\mathcal{C})$  denote the bicategory of spans in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then the assignment  $(f: c \rightarrow d) \mapsto (c \xleftarrow{\text{id}_c} c \xrightarrow{f} d)$  defines a proarrow equipment

$$(-)_*: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Span}(\mathcal{C}).$$

- (2) If  $\mathcal{S}$  is a finitely complete category, there exists a proarrow equipment

$$(-)_*: \text{Cat}(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow \text{Prof}(\mathcal{S})$$

relating  $\mathcal{S}$ -internal categories and  $\mathcal{S}$ -internal profunctors.

- (3) Let  $\text{TopGeom}$  denote the 2-category of elementary toposes and geometric morphisms (with morphisms reversed from the direction of left adjoints). Let  $\text{TopLex}$  denote the 2-category of elementary toposes and left exact functors. Then there exists a proarrow equipment

$$(-)_*: \text{TopGeom}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{TopLex}^{\text{co}}$$

given by taking left adjoints of geometric morphisms.

- (4) Similarly, let  $\text{AbelGeom}$  denote the 2-category of Abelian categories and geometric morphisms, and  $\text{AbelLex}$  the 2-category of Abelian categories and left exact functors. Then there exists a proarrow equipment

$$(-)_*: \text{AbelGeom}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{AbelLex}^{\text{co}}$$

given by taking left adjoints of geometric morphisms.

**Proposition A.16** (Yoneda [Woo82, Proposition 3]). Let  $(-)_*: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  be a proarrow equipment.

- (1) For morphisms  $f: B \rightarrow C$  in  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $Z: A \rightarrow C$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ , we have  $\text{Rift}_{f_*} Z \cong f^* \circ Z$ .
- (2) For morphisms  $f: B \rightarrow A$  in  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $Z: A \rightarrow C$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ , we have  $\text{Ran}_{f_*} Z \cong Z \circ f_*$ .

*Proof.* It is immediate from [Proposition A.6](#).  $\square$

**Corollary A.17.** Let  $(-)_*: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  be a proarrow equipment. For morphisms  $f: B \rightarrow C, g: A \rightarrow C$  in  $\mathcal{K}$ , we have  $\text{Rift}_{f_*} g_* \cong f^* \circ g_* \cong \text{Ran}_{g_*} f^*$ .

**A.3. The notion of (co)limits in a proarrow equipment.** Let  $(-)_*: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  be a proarrow equipment.

**Definition A.18** ([Woo82, §2]). For morphisms  $f: J \rightarrow A$  in  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $W: M \rightarrow J$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ , the *W-weighted colimit* of  $f$  is a morphism  $\text{colim}^W f = W \star f: M \rightarrow A$  in  $\mathcal{K}$  together with a right Kan lifting

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & M \\ & \nearrow^{(W \star f)^*} & \downarrow W \\ A & \xrightarrow{f^*} & J \end{array}$$

in  $\mathcal{M}$ . If the  $W$ -weighted colimit of  $f$  exists, then  $(W \star f)^* = \text{Rift}_W f^*$ . In other words,  $W \star f$  exists if and only if the right Kan lift  $\text{Rift}_W f^*$  exists and is corepresentable.

Dually, for morphisms  $f: J \rightarrow A$  in  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $W: J \rightarrow M$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ , the *W-weighted limit* of  $f$  is a morphism  $\text{lim}^W f = \{W, f\}: M \rightarrow A$  in  $\mathcal{K}$  together with a right Kan extension

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & & \\ W \uparrow & \searrow^{\{W, f\}_*} & \\ J & \xrightarrow{f_*} & A \end{array}$$

in  $\mathcal{M}$ . If the  $W$ -weighted limit of  $f$  exists, then  $\{W, f\}_* = \text{Ran}_W f_*$ . In other words,  $\{W, f\}$  exists if and only if the right Kan extension  $\text{Ran}_W f_*$  exists and is representable.

**Example A.19.** Consider the proarrow equipment  $\mathcal{V}\text{-Cat} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}\text{-Prof}$  of enriched categories. Let  $M = \mathcal{I}$  be the unit  $\mathcal{V}$ -category.

For a  $\mathcal{V}$ -functor  $F: \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  and a  $\mathcal{V}$ -profunctor  $W: \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}$ , the right Kan lifting  $\text{Rift}_W F^*: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{I}$  is given by

$$\text{Rift}_W F^*(*, A) = \text{Fun}(\mathcal{J}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{V})(W(-, *), \mathcal{A}(F-, A)).$$

Hence the  $W$ -weighted colimit of  $F$  in the sense of [Definition A.18](#) is precisely the enriched colimit of  $F$  weighted by the presheaf  $W: \mathcal{J}^{\text{op}} \cong \mathcal{J}^{\text{op}} \otimes \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$  in the sense of [Kel82, §3.1].

**Proposition A.20** ([Woo82, Proposition 6]). For morphisms  $f: J \rightarrow A$  in  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $V: N \rightarrow M, W: M \rightarrow A$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ , if the  $W$ -weighted colimit  $W \star f$  exists, then we have an isomorphism

$$V \star (W \star f) \cong (W \circ V) \star f,$$

either side existing if the other does.

Dually, for suitable  $U, W, f$ , if the  $W$ -weighted limit  $\{W, f\}$  exists, then we have an isomorphism

$$\{U, \{W, f\}\} \cong \{U \circ W, f\},$$

either side existing if the other does.

*Proof.* We prove the first half. In general,  $\text{Rift}_V(\text{Rift}_W f^*) \cong \text{Rift}_{W \circ V} f^*$  so we have

$$(V \star (W \star f))^* \cong \text{Rift}_V(W \star f)^* \cong \text{Rift}_V(\text{Rift}_W f^*) \cong \text{Rift}_{W \circ V} f^* \cong ((W \circ V) \star f)^*$$

and since  $(-)^*$  is locally fully faithful, we get  $V \star (W \star f) \cong (W \circ V) \star f$ .  $\square$

**Proposition A.21** ([Woo82, Proposition 7]). For morphisms  $f: J \rightarrow A$ ,  $w: M \rightarrow J$  in  $\mathcal{K}$ , we have

$$w_* \star f \cong f \circ w \cong \{w^*, f\}.$$

*Proof.* By [Proposition A.16](#), we have

$$(f \circ w)^* \cong w^* \circ f^* \cong \text{Rift}_{w_*} f^* = (w_* \star f)^*,$$

which implies  $w_* \star f \cong f \circ w$ . The other isomorphism is proved similarly.  $\square$

**Definition A.22.** A morphism  $g: A \rightarrow B$  in  $\mathcal{K}$  is said to *preserve* a weighted colimit  $W \star f$  if  $g^*$  commutes with the right Kan lifting  $(W \star f)^* = \text{Rift}_W f^*$ .

Similarly,  $g: A \rightarrow B$  is said to *preserve* a weighted limit  $\{W, f\}$  if  $g_*$  commutes with the right Kan extension  $\{W, f\}_* = \text{Ran}_W f_*$ .

**Proposition A.23** ([Woo82, Proposition 8]). Left adjoints preserve all weighted colimits. Dually, right adjoints preserve all weighted limits.

*Proof.* If a morphism  $f$  in  $\mathcal{K}$  has a right adjoint  $u$ , then we get the adjunction  $f^* \dashv u^*$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ , so by [Proposition A.7](#),  $f^*$  commutes with all right Kan liftings. Hence  $f$  preserves all weighted colimits in particular.  $\square$

**Proposition A.24** (Formal criterion for representability [Woo82, Proposition 9]). For morphisms  $f: A \rightarrow B$  in  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $X: A \rightarrow B$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ , the following are equivalent:

- (i)  $X \cong f_*$ .
- (ii) The weighted colimit  $X \star \text{id}_B$  exists,  $X \star \text{id}_B \cong f$ , and  $X$  commutes with all right Kan liftings.
- (iii) The weighted colimit  $X \star \text{id}_B$  exists,  $X \star \text{id}_B \cong f$ , and  $X$  commutes with the right Kan lifting  $(X \star \text{id}_B)^* = \text{Rift}_X \text{id}_B^*$ .

*Proof.* (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii): By [Proposition A.21](#), we have

$$X \star \text{id}_B \cong f_* \star \text{id}_B \cong \text{id}_B \circ f \cong f.$$

Also, since  $X \cong f_*$  has a right adjoint, it commutes with all right Kan liftings.

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii): Clear.

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i): From  $X \star \text{id}_B \cong f$ , we have

$$f^* \cong (X \star \text{id}_B)^* \cong \text{Rift}_X \text{id}_B^* \cong \text{Rift}_X \text{id}_B.$$

Since  $X$  commutes with this Kan lifting, [Proposition A.5](#) shows that there is an adjunction  $X \dashv f^*$ . As  $f_* \dashv f^*$ , we get  $X \cong f_*$ .  $\square$

Note that for morphisms  $f: A \rightarrow B$ ,  $u: B \rightarrow A$  in  $\mathcal{K}$ ,  $f \dashv u$  holds in  $\mathcal{K}$  if and only if  $f^* \cong u_*$  holds in  $\mathcal{M}$ .

**Corollary A.25** (Formal adjoint arrow theorem [Woo82, Corollary 10]). For morphisms  $f: A \rightarrow B$ ,  $u: B \rightarrow A$  in  $\mathcal{K}$ , the following are equivalent:

- (i)  $f \dashv u$  holds in  $\mathcal{K}$ .

- (ii) The weighted colimit  $f^* \star \text{id}_A$  exists,  $f^* \star \text{id}_A \cong u$ , and  $f$  preserves all weighted colimits.
- (iii) The weighted colimit  $f^* \star \text{id}_A$  exists,  $f^* \star \text{id}_A \cong u$ , and  $f$  preserves the weighted colimit  $f^* \star \text{id}_A$ .

*Proof.* This follows from [Proposition A.24](#) by taking  $X = f^*: B \rightarrow A$ .  $\square$

**Definition A.26.** A morphism  $f: A \rightarrow B$  in  $\mathcal{K}$  is called *fully faithful* if the unit of the adjunction  $f_* \dashv f^*$  is an isomorphism.

**Example A.27.** In the proarrow equipment  $\mathcal{V}\text{-Cat} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}\text{-Prof}$  of enriched categories over a cosmos  $\mathcal{V}$ , a  $\mathcal{V}$ -functor  $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  is fully faithful in the above sense if and only if it is fully faithful in the enriched sense; that is, all  $F_{AA'}: \mathcal{A}(A, A) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(FA, FA')$  are isomorphisms for  $A, A' \in \mathcal{A}$ .

**Proposition A.28** ([\[Woo82, Proposition 13\]](#)). For a left adjoint  $f: A \rightarrow B$  in  $\mathcal{K}$  with unit  $\eta$ , the following are equivalent.

- (i)  $f$  is fully faithful.
- (ii)  $\eta$  is an isomorphism.

*Proof.* If  $f$  has a right adjoint with unit  $\eta$ , then  $\eta_*$  is the unit of the adjunction  $f_* \dashv f^*$ . Thus the assertion follows, since  $(-)_*$  is locally fully faithful.  $\square$

**A.4. Absolute limits and Cauchy completeness.** Let  $(-)_*: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  be a proarrow equipment.

**Definition A.29.** For morphisms  $f: J \rightarrow A$  in  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $W: M \rightarrow J$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ , the  $W$ -weighted colimit  $W \star f: M \rightarrow A$  of  $f$  is said to be *absolute* if it is preserved by every morphism  $g: A \rightarrow B$  in  $\mathcal{K}$ . Similarly, the  $W$ -weighted limit  $\{W, f\}: M \rightarrow A$  of  $f$  is said to be *absolute* if it is preserved by every morphism  $g: A \rightarrow B$  in  $\mathcal{K}$ .

**Proposition A.30.** Let  $W: M \rightarrow J$  be a morphism in  $\mathcal{M}$ . If  $W$  has a right adjoint  $V: J \rightarrow M$ , then all  $W$ -weighted colimits are absolute. Similarly, if  $W: J \rightarrow M$  has a left adjoint  $U: M \rightarrow J$ , then all  $W$ -weighted limits are absolute.

*Proof.* Suppose  $f: J \rightarrow A$  is a morphism in  $\mathcal{K}$  and the  $W$ -weighted colimit  $W \star f: M \rightarrow A$  exists. Then  $(W \star f)^* = \text{Rift}_W f^*$ . Since  $W$  is a left adjoint, [Proposition A.6](#) shows  $\text{Rift}_W f^* \cong V \circ f^*$ . Hence for any  $g: A \rightarrow B$  in  $\mathcal{K}$ , we have

$$\text{Rift}_W f^* \circ g^* \cong V \circ f^* \circ g^* \cong V \circ (gf)^* \cong \text{Rift}_W (gf)^*.$$

Thus  $g^*$  commutes with the right Kan lifting  $\text{Rift}_W f^*$ , and  $g$  preserves the colimit  $W \star f$ . The case of weighted limits is similar.  $\square$

**Proposition A.31** (A generalization of [\[Gar14\]](#)). Let  $W: M \rightarrow J$  be a morphism in  $\mathcal{M}$  with a right adjoint  $V: J \rightarrow M$ . For morphisms  $f: J \rightarrow A$  and  $z: M \rightarrow A$  in  $\mathcal{K}$ ,  $z$  is the (absolute)  $W$ -weighted colimit of  $f$  if and only if  $z$  is the (absolute)  $V$ -weighted limit of  $f$ .

*Proof.* Since  $W \dashv V$ , we see from [Proposition A.6](#)

$$\text{Rift}_W f^* \cong V \circ f^*, \quad \text{Ran}_V f_* \cong f_* \circ W.$$

In particular, we get an adjunction  $\text{Ran}_V f_* \dashv \text{Rift}_W f^*$ . Therefore,  $\text{Rift}_W f^*$  being corepresentable by  $z$  is equivalent to  $\text{Ran}_V f_*$  being representable by  $z$ .  $\square$

**Definition A.32.** An object  $A \in \mathcal{K}$  is said to be *Cauchy complete* if every left adjoint morphism  $\Phi: D \rightarrow A$  in  $\mathcal{M}$  is representable.

**Proposition A.33.** For an object  $A \in \mathcal{K}$ , the following are equivalent:

- (i)  $A$  is Cauchy complete.
- (ii)  $A$  has all colimits weighted by left adjoints.
- (iii)  $A$  has all limits weighted by right adjoints.

*Proof.* (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii): Let  $W: D \rightarrow J$  be a left adjoint in  $\mathcal{M}$  with right adjoint  $V: J \rightarrow D$ . For any morphism  $f: J \rightarrow A$  in  $\mathcal{K}$ , by [Proposition A.31](#), the existence of  $\text{colim}^W f$  is equivalent to the existence of  $\text{lim}^V f$ , which holds if and only if  $\text{Ran}_V f_* \cong f_* \circ W$  is representable. Since  $f_* \circ W$  is a left adjoint in  $\mathcal{M}$ , it is representable by the Cauchy completeness of  $A$ .

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i): Let  $W: D \rightarrow A$  be a left adjoint in  $\mathcal{M}$  with right adjoint  $V: A \rightarrow D$ . Since  $A$  has  $W$ -weighted colimits, in particular  $g := \text{colim}^W \text{id}_A$  exists. Then  $g^*$  is the right Kan lifting  $\text{Rift}_W \text{id}_A^*$ . Now  $W \dashv V$  implies  $V \cong g^*$ , and hence  $g_* \cong W$ .

(ii)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (iii): This follows from [Proposition A.31](#). □

Therefore, by [Proposition A.30](#), an object is Cauchy complete if it has all absolute weighted colimits.

**Remark A.34.** For the proarrow equipment  $(-)_*: \mathcal{V}\text{-Cat} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}\text{-Prof}$  of enriched categories and enriched profunctors, the converse of [Proposition A.30](#) holds ([\[Str83\]](#)). That is, weights of absolute colimits have right adjoints; and hence an enriched category is Cauchy complete if and only if it has all absolute weighted colimits. It is not clear to the author whether this is the case for general proarrow equipments.

## REFERENCES

- [nLab] nLab authors. *nLab*. –2024. URL: <https://ncatlab.org/nlab/show/HomePage>. (Cit. on p. 32.)
- [AL17] Rina Anno and Timothy Logvinenko. “Spherical DG-functors”. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society (JEMS)* 19 (2017), no. 9, pp. 2577–2656. DOI: [10.4171/JEMS/724](https://doi.org/10.4171/JEMS/724). (Cit. on pp. 3, 15, 21.)
- [Arl20] Kevin Arlin. “2-categorical Brown representability and the relation between derivators and infinity-categories”. PhD thesis. University of California, Los Angeles, 2020. URL: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6834c18d>. (Cit. on p. 32.)
- [Bel13] Pieter Belmans. *On the homotopy theory of differential graded categories*. 2013. URL: <https://pbelmans.ncag.info/assets/memoire.pdf>. (Cit. on p. 8.)
- [Bén67] Jean Bénabou. “Introduction to bicategories”. In: *Reports of the Midwest Category Seminar*. Vol. 47. Lecture Notes in Math. Springer, Berlin-New York, 1967, pp. 1–77. DOI: [10.1007/BFb0074299](https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0074299). (Cit. on pp. 12, 37.)
- [BB22] Agnieszka Bodzenta and Alexey Bondal. “Flops and spherical functors”. *Compositio Mathematica* 158 (2022), no. 5, pp. 1125–1187. DOI: [10.1112/s0010437x22007497](https://doi.org/10.1112/s0010437x22007497). (Cit. on pp. 3, 18.)
- [BB03] A. Bondal and M. van den Bergh. “Generators and representability of functors in commutative and noncommutative geometry”. *Moscow Mathematical Journal* 3 (2003), no. 1, pp. 1–36, 258. DOI: [10.17323/1609-4514-2003-3-1-1-36](https://doi.org/10.17323/1609-4514-2003-3-1-1-36). (Cit. on p. 6.)

- [BK91] A. I. Bondal and M. M. Kapranov. “Enhanced triangulated categories”. *Mathematics of the USSR, Sbornik* 70 (1991), no. 1, pp. 93–107. DOI: [10.1070/sm1991v070n01abeh00125](https://doi.org/10.1070/sm1991v070n01abeh00125). (Cit. on p. 2.)
- [Bor94] Francis Borceux. *Handbook of Categorical Algebra 1, Basic Category Theory*. Vol. 50. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994. (Cit. on p. 41.)
- [CP23] Jonathan A. Campbell and Kate Ponto. “Riemann-Roch theorems in monoidal 2-categories”. *The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics* 74 (2023), no. 3, pp. 1119–1163. DOI: [10.1093/qmath/haad003](https://doi.org/10.1093/qmath/haad003). (Cit. on p. 3.)
- [CS15] Alberto Canonaco and Paolo Stellari. “Internal Homs via extensions of dg functors”. *Advances in Mathematics* 277 (2015), pp. 100–123. DOI: [10.1016/j.aim.2015.03.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2015.03.004). (Cit. on pp. 2, 15, 35.)
- [CS10] G. S. H. Crutwell and Michael A. Shulman. “A unified framework for generalized multicategories”. *Theory and Applications of Categories* 24 (2010), No. 21, 580–655. (Cit. on p. 40.)
- [DPP04] R. J. MacG. Dawson, R. Paré, and D. A. Pronk. “Universal properties of Span”. *Theory and Applications of Categories* 13 (2004), No. 4, 61–85. (Cit. on p. 34.)
- [Dri04] Vladimir Drinfeld. “DG quotients of DG categories”. *Journal of Algebra* 272 (2004), no. 2, pp. 643–691. DOI: [10.1016/j.jalgebra.2003.05.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalgebra.2003.05.001). (Cit. on p. 7.)
- [Gar14] Richard Garner. “Diagrammatic characterisation of enriched absolute colimits”. *Theory and Applications of Categories* 29 (2014), No. 26, 775–780. (Cit. on p. 44.)
- [Gen17] Francesco Genovese. “Adjunctions of quasi-functors between dg-categories”. *Applied Categorical Structures* 25 (2017), no. 4, pp. 625–657. DOI: [10.1007/s10485-016-9470-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10485-016-9470-y). (Cit. on pp. 3–5, 10, 15, 16, 20, 21, 23, 24, 32.)
- [GLV22] Francesco Genovese, Wendy Lowen, and Michel Van den Bergh. *T-structures on dg-categories and derived deformations*. 2022. arXiv: [2212.12564](https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.12564) [math.CT]. (Cit. on pp. 4, 23.)
- [Hov99] Mark Hovey. *Model categories*. Vol. 63. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999. URL: <https://people.math.rochester.edu/faculty/doug/otherpapers/hovey-model-cats.pdf>. (Cit. on p. 7.)
- [Joh14] Niles Johnson. “Azumaya objects in triangulated bicategories”. *Journal of Homotopy and Related Structures* 9 (2014), no. 2, pp. 465–493. DOI: [10.1007/s40062-013-0035-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40062-013-0035-6). (Cit. on p. 3.)
- [JY21] Niles Johnson and Donald Yau. *2-dimensional categories*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2021. DOI: [10.1093/oso/9780198871378.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198871378.001.0001). (Cit. on pp. 12, 37, 40.)
- [Kel94] Bernhard Keller. “Deriving DG categories”. *Annales Scientifiques de l’École Normale Supérieure. Quatrième Série* 27 (1994), no. 1, pp. 63–102. DOI: [10.24033/asens.1689](https://doi.org/10.24033/asens.1689). URL: [http://www.numdam.org/item?id=ASENS\\_1994\\_4\\_27\\_1\\_63\\_0](http://www.numdam.org/item?id=ASENS_1994_4_27_1_63_0). (Cit. on pp. 4, 6, 7, 9, 17, 18, 20, 23.)
- [Kel98] Bernhard Keller. “Invariance and localization for cyclic homology of DG algebras”. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 123 (1998), no. 1-3, pp. 223–273. DOI: [10.1016/S0022-4049\(96\)00085-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4049(96)00085-0). (Cit. on p. 3.)
- [Kel05] Bernhard Keller. “On triangulated orbit categories”. *Documenta Mathematica* 10 (2005), pp. 551–581. (Cit. on p. 3.)

- [Kel06] Bernhard Keller. *On differential graded categories*. 2006. arXiv: [math/0601185](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0601185) [[math.KT](#)]. (Cit. on pp. 2, 7.)
- [Kel82] G. M. Kelly. *Basic concepts of enriched category theory*. Vol. 64. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York, 1982. URL: <http://tac.mta.ca/tac/reprints/articles/10/tr10abs.html>. Reprints in *Theory and Applications of Categories* 10, 1–136, 2005. (Cit. on pp. 7, 10, 42.)
- [KL15] Alexander Kuznetsov and Valery A. Lunts. “Categorical resolutions of irrational singularities”. *International Mathematics Research Notices. IMRN* (2015), no. 13, pp. 4536–4625. DOI: [10.1093/imrn/rnu072](https://doi.org/10.1093/imrn/rnu072). (Cit. on pp. 5, 7, 31, 32.)
- [Lor21] Fosco Loregian. *(Co)end calculus*. Vol. 468. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2021. DOI: [10.1017/9781108778657](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108778657). (Cit. on pp. 10, 41.)
- [LO10] Valery A. Lunts and Dmitri O. Orlov. “Uniqueness of enhancement for triangulated categories”. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* 23 (2010), no. 3, pp. 853–908. DOI: [10.1090/S0894-0347-10-00664-8](https://doi.org/10.1090/S0894-0347-10-00664-8). (Cit. on p. 3.)
- [Nee92] Amnon Neeman. “The connection between the  $K$ -theory localization theorem of Thomason, Trobaugh and Yao and the smashing subcategories of Bousfield and Ravenel”. *Annales Scientifiques de l’École Normale Supérieure. Quatrième Série* 25 (1992), no. 5, pp. 547–566. DOI: [10.24033/asens.1659](https://doi.org/10.24033/asens.1659). URL: [http://www.numdam.org/item?id=ASENS\\_1992\\_4\\_25\\_5\\_547\\_0](http://www.numdam.org/item?id=ASENS_1992_4_25_5_547_0). (Cit. on p. 6.)
- [Nee96] Amnon Neeman. “The Grothendieck duality theorem via Bousfield’s techniques and Brown representability”. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* 9 (1996), no. 1, pp. 205–236. DOI: [10.1090/S0894-0347-96-00174-9](https://doi.org/10.1090/S0894-0347-96-00174-9). (Cit. on p. 6.)
- [Nee01] Amnon Neeman. *Triangulated categories*. Vol. 148. Annals of Mathematics Studies. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2001. DOI: [10.1515/9781400837212](https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400837212). (Cit. on p. 6.)
- [Orl20] Dmitri Orlov. “Finite-dimensional differential graded algebras and their geometric realizations”. *Advances in Mathematics* 366 (2020), pp. 107096, 33. DOI: [10.1016/j.aim.2020.107096](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2020.107096). (Cit. on p. 3.)
- [RV15] Emily Riehl and Dominic Verity. “The 2-category theory of quasi-categories”. *Advances in Mathematics* 280 (2015), pp. 549–642. DOI: [10.1016/j.aim.2015.04.021](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2015.04.021). (Cit. on p. 32.)
- [Shu08] Michael Shulman. “Framed bicategories and monoidal fibrations”. *Theory and Applications of Categories* 20 (2008), No. 18, 650–738. (Cit. on p. 40.)
- [Str83] Ross Street. “Absolute colimits in enriched categories”. *Cahiers de Topologie et Géométrie Différentielle* 24 (1983), no. 4, pp. 377–379. (Cit. on p. 45.)
- [Tab05] Goncalo Tabuada. “Une structure de catégorie de modèles de Quillen sur la catégorie des dg-catégories”. French. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique. Académie des Sciences. Paris* 340 (2005), no. 1, pp. 15–19. DOI: [10.1016/j.crma.2004.11.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crma.2004.11.007). (Cit. on pp. 2, 8.)
- [Toë07] Bertrand Toën. “The homotopy theory of dg-categories and derived Morita theory”. *Inventiones Mathematicae* 167 (2007), no. 3, pp. 615–667. DOI: [10.1007/s00222-006-0025-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00222-006-0025-y). (Cit. on pp. 2, 8, 35.)

- [Toë11] Bertrand Toën. “Lectures on dg-categories”. In: *Topics in algebraic and topological K-theory*. Vol. 2008. Lecture Notes in Math. Springer, Berlin, 2011, pp. 243–302. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-642-15708-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-15708-0). (Cit. on p. 7.)
- [Ver11] Dominic Verity. “Enriched categories, internal categories and change of base”. *Reprints in Theory and Applications of Categories* (2011), no. 20, pp. 1–266. (Cit. on p. 35.)
- [Woo82] R. J. Wood. “Abstract proarrows. I”. *Cahiers de Topologie et Géométrie Différentielle Catégoriques* 23 (1982), no. 3, pp. 279–290. (Cit. on pp. 3–5, 25, 37, 40, 42–44.)
- [Woo85] R. J. Wood. “Proarrows. II”. *Cahiers de Topologie et Géométrie Différentielle Catégoriques* 26 (1985), no. 2, pp. 135–168. (Cit. on pp. 3, 4, 25, 40.)
- [Yek20] Amnon Yekutieli. *Derived categories*. Vol. 183. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2020. DOI: [10.1017/9781108292825](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108292825). (Cit. on pp. 3, 14.)

(Y. Imamura) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE, OSAKA UNIVERSITY,  
MACHIKANNEYAMA 1-1, TOYONAKA , OSAKA 560-0043, JAPAN

*Email address:* [u287972b@ecs.osaka-u.ac.jp](mailto:u287972b@ecs.osaka-u.ac.jp)