

# The snail lemma and the long homology sequence

Julia Ramos González<sup>\*†</sup> and Enrico M. Vitale<sup>‡</sup>

March 11, 2025

**Abstract:** In the first part of the paper, we establish an homotopical version of the snail lemma (which is a generalization of the classical snake lemma). In the second part, we introduce the category  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  of sequentiable families of arrows in a category  $\mathcal{A}$  and we compare it with the category of chain complexes in  $\mathcal{A}$ . We apply the homotopy snail lemma to a morphism in  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  obtaining first a six-term exact sequence in  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  and then, unrolling the sequence in  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$ , a long exact sequence in  $\mathcal{A}$ . When  $\mathcal{A}$  is abelian, this sequence subsumes the usual long homology sequence obtained from an extension of chain complexes.

*Keywords:* homology, exact sequence, homotopy kernel, snail lemma, sequentiable family.  
*2020 MSC:* 18G50, 18G35, 18N40.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Preliminaries on nullhomotopies</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>The homotopy snail sequence</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Exactness of the snail sequence</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Sequentiable families of arrows</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>From chain complexes to sequentiable families</b>	<b>24</b>

## 1 Introduction

A cornerstone in homological algebra is the fact that, starting from a short exact sequence of chain complexes in an abelian category  $\mathcal{A}$ , one can construct a long exact sequence relating the homology objects of the original complexes. A classical strategy to prove such a theorem is to prove first the snake lemma and then to construct the long exact sequence in homology pasting together the infinitely many six-term exact sequences coming from the snake lemma (see for example [19]).

---

<sup>\*</sup>Educational Centre for Mathematics, Education, Econometrics and Statistics, KULeuven, Warmoesberg 26, 1000 Brussel, België, julia.ramosgonzalez@kuleuven.be

<sup>†</sup>Most of the research presented in this work was carried out while the first-named author was a Postdoctoral Researcher of the Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique - FNRS grant 32709538

<sup>‡</sup>Institut de recherche en mathématique et physique, UCLouvain, Chemin du Cyclotron 2, 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgique, enrico.vitale@uclouvain.be

The snake lemma is a special case of a more general result, the snail lemma, introduced in [16, 13] and exploited in [11, 15] in order to unify some higher dimensional exact sequences appearing in homotopy theory, see [8], and in the study of groupoids and crossed modules, see [5, 6]. The difference between the snake and the snail lemmas lies in the fact that the snake requires as starting point a short exact sequence in  $\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A})$ , the category of arrows in  $\mathcal{A}$ , whereas the snail works starting from any morphism in  $\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A})$ .

In this note, we show that it is possible to use the snail lemma instead of the snake lemma in order to construct a long exact sequence in homology starting from any morphism of chain complexes, and not necessarily from a short exact sequence of complexes. Even if the idea is quite simple, to state and prove it properly we have to introduce a new concept, that we call a sequentiable family of arrows. The idea behind a sequentiable family is to focus our attention not on the homology objects associated with a chain complex, but on the homology arrows, that is, those arrows whose kernel and cokernel are the homology objects associated with a complex (see Section 6, and especially 6.2, for a more precise explication on how sequentiable families of arrows naturally arise from chain complexes). This allows us to formulate the snail lemma inside the category of sequentiable families, which is equipped with a structure of nullhomotopies more convenient than the one usually considered in the category of chain complexes. This produces a single six-term exact sequence of sequentiable families, sequence which provides a compact presentation of a long exact sequence in the base category  $\mathcal{A}$  (Corollary 5.10) and, as a special case, the long homology sequence (Corollary 6.6).

The layout of the paper is as follows: in Sections 2, 3 and 4, we investigate a general version of the snail lemma in a pointed category equipped with a structure of nullhomotopies, the guiding example being  $\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A})$  for  $\mathcal{A}$  an abelian category. We get a six-term sequence which is exact relatively to a good class of “surjections”. In the second part of the paper, Sections 5 and 6, we introduce the new category  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  of sequentiable families and we compare its nullhomotopy structure with that of the category  $\mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$  of chain complexes when  $\mathcal{A}$  is preadditive. Finally, we apply the homotopy snail lemma in  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  in order to get first a six-term exact sequence in  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  and then, unrolling the sequence in  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$ , a long exact sequence in  $\mathcal{A}$ . If the morphism in  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  that we use to construct the long exact sequence comes from an extension of complexes, the new sequence coincides with the classical long homology sequence. Starting from Section 4, regular, protomodular, preadditive and abelian categories will appear so to make the base category  $\mathcal{A}$  reach enough. Basic references for these kinds of categories are [1, 2, 4].

N.B.: Given two arrows  $A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C$ , the composite arrow will be written as  $f \cdot g$ .

## 2 Preliminaries on nullhomotopies

Categories with a structure of nullhomotopies have been introduced by Grandis in [9]. We follow [14, 17] for the definition of nullhomotopy structure and of strong homotopy (co)kernel.

**Definition 2.1.** A structure of nullhomotopies  $\Theta$  on a category  $\mathcal{B}$  is given by:

- 1) For every arrow  $g$  in  $\mathcal{B}$ , a set  $\Theta(g)$  whose elements are called nullhomotopies on  $g$ .
- 2) For every triple of composable arrows  $A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \xrightarrow{h} D$ , a map

$$f \circ - \circ h: \Theta(g) \rightarrow \Theta(f \cdot g \cdot h)$$

in such a way that, for every  $\varphi \in \Theta(g)$ , one has



element, denoted by  $*_X$ .


If we assume the reduced interchange, we get a canonical nullhomotopy

$$*_Y^X \in \Theta(0_Y^X : X \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow Y)$$


given by  $*_Y^X \circ 0_Y$  or, equivalently, by  $0^X \circ *_Y$ . Observe that in general  $\Theta(0_Y^X)$  is not reduced to the element  $*_Y^X$ , Nevertheless, for all arrows  $f: W \rightarrow X, g: X \rightarrow Y, h: Y \rightarrow Z$  and for all nullhomotopies  $\varphi \in \Theta(g)$  we have:

$$f \circ *_Y^X \circ h = *_Z^W \quad \text{and} \quad 0_X^W \circ \varphi = *_Y^W \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi \circ 0_Z^Y = *_Z^X$$

**2.6.** The first relevant special case of  $\Theta$ -kernel is the one of the initial arrow  $0_Y$  of an object  $Y \in \mathcal{B}$ . Its universal property can be restated as follows: for any object  $X \in \mathcal{B}$  and for any nullhomotopy  $\varphi \in \Theta(0_Y^X)$ , there exists a unique arrow  $g: X \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0_Y)$  such that  $g \circ \nu_{0_Y} = \varphi$



**2.7.** Taking the  $\Theta$ -kernel of the arrow part of the  $\Theta$ -cokernel of the terminal arrow  $0^Y$ , we get the  $\pi_0$  of an object  $Y$ . Here it is:



where  $\eta_Y$  is the unique arrow such that  $\eta_Y \circ \nu_{c_{0^Y}} = \gamma_{0^Y}$ . Observe that the construction of  $\pi_0(Y)$  is a special case of the construction given in 2.6 since  $\pi_0(Y) = \mathcal{N}(c_{0^Y}) = \mathcal{N}(0_{\mathcal{C}(0^Y)})$ .

An interesting fact about objects of the form  $\mathcal{N}(0_Y)$  and, in particular, of the form  $\pi_0(Y)$ , is that they are discrete. Here is the general definition of discrete object. The name will be motivated at the end of Example 2.14.

**Definition 2.8.** Consider a category with nullhomotopies  $(\mathcal{B}, \Theta)$ . Assume that  $\Theta$  satisfies the reduced interchange and that  $\mathcal{B}$  has a  $\Theta$ -strong zero object. An object  $Y \in \mathcal{B}$  is discrete if, for any arrow  $g: X \rightarrow Y$ , the following conditions hold:

- if  $g \neq 0_Y^X$ , then  $\Theta(g) = \emptyset$ ,
- if  $g = 0_Y^X$ , then  $\Theta(g) = \{*_Y^X\}$ .

Codiscrete objects are defined dually.

**Lemma 2.9.** Consider a category with nullhomotopies  $(\mathcal{B}, \Theta)$ . Assume that  $\Theta$  satisfies the reduced interchange and that  $\mathcal{B}$  has a  $\Theta$ -strong zero object, strong  $\Theta$ -kernels and strong  $\Theta$ -cokernels. For any object  $Y \in \mathcal{B}$ , the object  $\mathcal{N}(0_Y)$  is discrete and the object  $\mathcal{C}(0^Y)$  is codiscrete. In particular,  $\pi_0(Y)$  is discrete.

*Proof.* Consider an arrow  $g: X \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0_Y)$  and a nullhomotopy  $\varphi \in \Theta(g)$ . We have to prove that  $g = 0_{\mathcal{N}(0_Y)}^X$  and  $\varphi = *_{\mathcal{N}(0_Y)}^X$ . Using the universal property of the  $\Theta$ -kernel, the first condition follows from the equations:

$$\begin{aligned} - g \cdot n_{0_Y} &= 0^X = 0_{\mathcal{N}(0_Y)}^X \cdot n_{0_Y} \\ - g \circ \nu_{0_Y} &= \varphi \circ 0_Y^{\mathcal{N}(0_Y)} = *_{\mathcal{N}(0_Y)}^X = *_{\mathcal{N}(0_Y)}^X \circ 0_Y^{\mathcal{N}(0_Y)} = 0_{\mathcal{N}(0_Y)}^X \circ \nu_{0_Y} \end{aligned}$$

(in the second one we use 2.5). Using that the  $\Theta$ -kernel is strong, the second condition follows from the equation

$$- \varphi \circ n_{0_Y} = *^X = *_{\mathcal{N}(0_Y)}^X \circ n_{0_Y}$$

where we have used once again 2.5. The proof that  $\mathcal{C}(0^Y)$  is codiscrete is dual.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.10.** *Consider a category with nullhomotopies  $(\mathcal{B}, \Theta)$ . Assume that  $\Theta$  satisfies the reduced interchange and that  $\mathcal{B}$  has a  $\Theta$ -strong zero object and  $\Theta$ -kernels. If an object  $Y \in \mathcal{B}$  is discrete, then for every arrow  $g: X \rightarrow Y$  the  $\Theta$ -kernel of  $g$  coincide with the usual categorical kernel of  $g$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $Y$  is discrete,  $n_g \cdot g = 0_Y^{\mathcal{N}(g)}$  and  $\nu_g = *_{\mathcal{N}(g)}^{\mathcal{N}(g)}$ . Consider an arrow  $f: W \rightarrow X$  such that  $f \cdot g = 0_Y^W$ . This implies that  $*_{\mathcal{N}(g)}^W \in \Theta(f \cdot g)$ , so that there exists a unique arrow  $f': W \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(g)$  such that  $f' \cdot n_g = f$  and  $f' \circ \nu_g = *_{\mathcal{N}(g)}^W$ . If  $f'': W \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(g)$  is another arrow such that  $f'' \cdot n_g = f$ , then  $f'' \circ \nu_g = f'' \circ *_{\mathcal{N}(g)}^{\mathcal{N}(g)} = *_{\mathcal{N}(g)}^W$  by 2.5, so that  $f'' = f'$ . This proves that the  $\Theta$ -kernel satisfies the universal property of the usual kernel.

Conversely, let  $k_g: \text{Ker}(g) \rightarrow X$  be the usual kernel of  $g$ . Since  $k_g \cdot g = 0_Y^{\text{Ker}(g)}$ , we can take  $\nu_g = *_{\text{Ker}(g)}^{\text{Ker}(g)} \in \Theta(k_g \cdot g)$ . Given now  $f: W \rightarrow X$  and  $\varphi \in \Theta(f \cdot g)$ , since  $Y$  is discrete we get  $f \cdot g = 0_Y^W$  and  $\varphi = *_{\text{Ker}(g)}^W$ . From  $f \cdot g = 0_Y^W$ , we get a unique  $f': W \rightarrow \text{Ker}(g)$  such that  $f' \cdot k_g = f$ . Moreover,  $f' \circ \nu_g = f' \circ *_{\text{Ker}(g)}^{\text{Ker}(g)} = *_{\text{Ker}(g)}^W = \varphi$  by 2.5, and we are done.  $\square$

**2.11.** The second relevant special case of  $\Theta$ -kernel is the one of the identity arrow  $\text{id}_Y$  of an object  $Y \in \mathcal{B}$ . Its universal property can be restated as follows: for every arrow  $g: X \rightarrow Y$  and for every nullhomotopy  $\varphi \in \Theta(g)$ , there exists a unique arrow  $\bar{g}: X \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\text{id}_Y)$  such that  $\bar{g} \cdot n_{\text{id}_Y} = g$  and  $\bar{g} \circ \nu_{\text{id}_Y} = \varphi$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{N}(\text{id}_Y) & \xleftarrow{\bar{g}} & X \\ & \searrow n_{\text{id}_Y} & \swarrow g \\ & \nu_{\text{id}_Y} \Rightarrow & \Uparrow \varphi \\ & & Y \end{array}$$

Moreover, if the  $\Theta$ -kernel  $\mathcal{N}(\text{id}_Y)$  is strong, there exists a unique nullhomotopy  $\bar{\varphi} \in \Theta(\bar{g})$  such that  $\bar{\varphi} \circ n_{\text{id}_Y} = \varphi$ .

**2.12.** The  $\Theta$ -kernel of the identity arrow has a special role: if  $\mathcal{B}$  has pullbacks, then the  $\Theta$ -kernel of any arrow  $g: X \rightarrow Y$  is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \downarrow g' \circ \nu_{\text{id}_Y} & & \\ & \text{---} & & \text{---} & \\ \mathcal{N}(g) & \xrightarrow{n_g} & X & \xrightarrow{g} & Y \end{array}$$

where the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{N}(g) & \xrightarrow{g'} & \mathcal{N}(\text{id}_Y) \\ n_g \downarrow & & \downarrow n_{\text{id}_Y} \\ X & \xrightarrow{g} & Y \end{array}$$

is a pullback (see Proposition 5.3 in [14]).

The following general lemma is a variant of Remark 3.2 in [17]. Its dual also holds and both are needed in Section 3 to construct the snail sequence.

**Lemma 2.13.** *Consider the solid part of the following commutative diagram (the one on the left) in a category with nullhomotopy  $(\mathcal{B}, \Theta)$*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{N}(a) & \xrightarrow{n(g,g')} & \mathcal{N}(b) \\ \downarrow n_a & & \downarrow n_b \\ A & \xrightarrow{g'} & B \\ \downarrow a & & \downarrow b \\ X & \xrightarrow{g} & Y \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{N}(a) & \xrightarrow{n(g,g')} & \mathcal{N}(b) \\ \downarrow n_a & & \downarrow n_b \\ A & \xrightarrow{g'} & B \\ \downarrow a & & \downarrow b \\ X & \xrightarrow{g} & Y \end{array}$$

(Left diagram has dashed lines  $\nu_a \Rightarrow$  and  $\Leftarrow \nu_b$  around the square. Right diagram has dashed lines  $\psi \Rightarrow$  and  $\Leftarrow \varphi$  around the square.)

1. There exists a unique arrow  $n(g, g'): \mathcal{N}(a) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(b)$  such that  $n(g, g') \cdot n_b = n_a \cdot g'$  and  $n(g, g') \circ \nu_b = \nu_a \circ g$ .
2. Consider the diagram on the right. Given nullhomotopies  $\varphi \in \Theta(g)$  and  $\psi \in \Theta(n_a)$ , if the  $\Theta$ -kernel of  $b$  is strong and if  $\Theta$  satisfies the reduced interchange, then there exists a unique nullhomotopy  $n(\psi) \in \Theta(n(g, g'))$  such that  $n(\psi) \circ n_b = \psi \circ g'$ .

*Proof.* 1. Just apply the universal property of  $\mathcal{N}(b)$  to  $\nu_a \circ g \in \Theta(n_a \cdot g' \cdot b)$ .  
2. Consider  $\psi \circ g' \in \Theta(n(g, g') \cdot n_b)$ . Since

$$\psi \circ g' \cdot b = \psi \circ a \cdot g = n_a \cdot a \circ \varphi = \nu_a \circ g = n(g, g') \circ \nu_b$$

we can use that  $\mathcal{N}(b)$  is strong to get a unique nullhomotopy  $n(\psi) \in \Theta(n(g, g'))$  such that  $n(\psi) \circ n_b = \psi \circ g'$ .  $\square$

**Example 2.14.** To help the reader with the various constructions introduced so far, let us look at the case where  $(\mathcal{B}, \Theta) = (\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A}), \Theta_\Delta)$ . Objects, arrows and nullhomotopies for this example can be depicted as follows

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} W & \xrightarrow{f} & X & \xrightarrow{g} & Y & \xrightarrow{h} & Z \\ w \downarrow & & \downarrow x & \nearrow \varphi & \downarrow y & & \downarrow z \\ W_0 & \xrightarrow{f_0} & X_0 & \xrightarrow{g_0} & Y_0 & \xrightarrow{h_0} & Z_0 \end{array}$$

In other words,

$$\Theta_\Delta((g, g_0): (X, x, X_0) \rightarrow (Y, y, Y_0)) = \{\varphi: X_0 \rightarrow Y \mid x \cdot \varphi = g, \varphi \cdot y = g_0\}$$

and  $(f, f_0) \circ \varphi \circ (h, h_0) = f_0 \cdot \varphi \cdot h$ . The structure  $\Theta_\Delta$  satisfies the reduced interchange. Moreover, if  $\mathcal{A}$  has pullbacks, then  $\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A})$  has strong  $\Theta_\Delta$ -kernels constructed as in the

following diagram on the left (the dashed arrow is the nullhomotopy), the one on the right being a pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
X & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_X} & X & \xrightarrow{g} & Y \\
\langle x, g \rangle \downarrow & & \downarrow x & \dashrightarrow & \downarrow y \\
X_0 \times_{g_0, y} Y & \xrightarrow{y'} & X_0 & \xrightarrow{g_0} & Y_0
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{ccc}
X_0 \times_{g_0, y} Y & \xrightarrow{g'_0} & Y \\
y' \downarrow & & \downarrow y \\
X_0 & \xrightarrow{g_0} & Y_0
\end{array}$$

Dually, if  $\mathcal{A}$  has pushouts, then  $\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A})$  has strong  $\Theta_\Delta$ -cokernels. Finally, if  $\mathcal{A}$  has a zero object  $0$ , then the object  $(0, \text{id}_0, 0)$  is a  $\Theta_\Delta$ -strong zero object in  $\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A})$ . More details can be found in [14, 17].

Assume now that  $\mathcal{A}$  has a zero object, kernels and cokernels. For an object  $(Y, y, Y_0)$  in  $\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A})$ , the  $\Theta_\Delta$ -kernel  $\mathcal{N}(0_{(Y, y, Y_0)})$  with its structural nullhomotopy is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & \xrightarrow{\quad} & Y \\
\downarrow & \dashrightarrow^{k_y} & \downarrow y \\
\text{Ker}(y) & \xrightarrow{0} & Y_0
\end{array}$$

Dually, the  $\Theta_\Delta$ -cokernel  $\mathcal{C}(0_{(Y, y, Y_0)})$  with its structural nullhomotopy is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
Y & \xrightarrow{0} & \text{Cok}(y) \\
y \downarrow & \dashrightarrow^{c_y} & \downarrow \\
Y_0 & \xrightarrow{\quad} & 0
\end{array}$$

so that the canonical arrow  $\eta_{(Y, y, Y_0)}: (Y, y, Y_0) \rightarrow \pi_0(Y, y, Y_0)$  is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
Y & \xrightarrow{\quad} & 0 \\
y \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
Y_0 & \xrightarrow{c_y} & \text{Cok}(y)
\end{array}$$

Finally, the  $\Theta_\Delta$ -kernel  $\mathcal{N}(\text{id}_{(Y, y, Y_0)})$  with its structural nullhomotopy is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
Y & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_Y} & Y \\
\text{id}_Y \downarrow & \dashrightarrow^{\text{id}_Y} & \downarrow y \\
Y & \xrightarrow{y} & Y_0
\end{array}$$

Observe also that an object  $(X, x, X_0) \in \mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A})$  is discrete if and only if  $X = 0$  (and then, necessarily,  $x = 0_{X_0}$ ). For the only if part, just consider the  $\Theta_\Delta$ -kernel of  $\text{id}_{(X, x, X_0)}$ .

### 3 The homotopy snail sequence

In this section, we work in a category with nullhomotopies  $(\mathcal{B}, \Theta)$  satisfying the reduced interchange condition 2.2. We assume the existence of a  $\Theta$ -strong zero object as in 2.5. We also assume the existence of the strong  $\Theta$ -kernel of any arrow and of the strong  $\Theta$ -cokernel of any terminal arrow.

**3.1.** Consider an arrow  $g$  in  $\mathcal{B}$  together with its  $\Theta$ -kernel

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \text{---} \downarrow \nu_g \text{---} & \\ \mathcal{N}(g) & \xrightarrow{n_g} & X \xrightarrow{g} Y \end{array}$$

We are going to construct the “snail” sequence connecting six discrete objects

$$\mathcal{N}(0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}) \xrightarrow{n(n_g)} \mathcal{N}(0_X) \xrightarrow{n(g)} \mathcal{N}(0_Y) \xrightarrow{\delta} \pi_0(\mathcal{N}(g)) \xrightarrow{\pi_0(n_g)} \pi_0(X) \xrightarrow{\pi_0(g)} \pi_0(Y)$$

where each pair of consecutive arrows gives, by composition, the zero arrow. Its exactness will be discussed in Section 4. We split the construction of the sequence in five steps.

**Step 1:** By applying the first part of Lemma 2.13 to the situations

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{N}(0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}) \xrightarrow{n(n_g)} \mathcal{N}(0_X) & & \mathcal{N}(0_X) \xrightarrow{n(g)} \mathcal{N}(0_Y) \\ \downarrow n_{0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} & \text{id}_0 & \downarrow n_{0_X} \\ \nu_{0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \Rightarrow 0 & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_0} & 0 \Leftarrow \nu_{0_X} \\ \downarrow 0_{\mathcal{N}(g)} & & \downarrow 0_X \\ \mathcal{N}(g) \xrightarrow{n_g} X & & X \xrightarrow{g} Y \end{array}$$

we get the dotted arrows  $n(n_g)$  and  $n(g)$ , which are unique with  $n(n_g) \circ \nu_{0_X} = \nu_{0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ n_g$  and  $n(g) \circ \nu_{0_Y} = \nu_{0_X} \circ g$ . If we apply now the second part of Lemma 2.13 to

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{N}(0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}) & \xrightarrow{n(n_g)} & \mathcal{N}(0_X) & \xrightarrow{n(g)} & \mathcal{N}(0_Y) \\ \downarrow n_{0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} & & \downarrow n_{0_X} & & \downarrow n_{0_Y} \\ \nu_{0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \Rightarrow 0 & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_0} & 0 & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_0} & 0 \\ \downarrow 0_{\mathcal{N}(g)} & & \downarrow 0_X & & \downarrow 0_Y \\ \mathcal{N}(g) & \xrightarrow{n_g} & X & \xrightarrow{g} & Y \\ & & \uparrow \nu_g & & \end{array}$$

we get a nullhomotopy in  $\Theta(n(n_g) \cdot n(g))$ . Since  $\mathcal{N}(0_Y)$  is discrete (see Lemma 2.9), we can conclude that  $n(n_g) \cdot n(g) = 0$ .

**Step 2:** Consider now the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{g} & Y \\ \downarrow \eta_X & & \downarrow \eta_Y \\ \pi_0(X) & \xrightarrow{\pi_0(g)} & \pi_0(Y) \\ \downarrow n_{c_0X} & & \downarrow n_{c_0Y} \\ 0 & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_0} & 0 \\ \downarrow c_{0X} & & \downarrow c_{0Y} \\ \mathcal{C}(0^X) & \xrightarrow{c(g)} & \mathcal{C}(0^Y) \end{array}$$

Starting from  $g: X \rightarrow Y$  and applying the dual of Lemma 2.13, we get a unique arrow  $c(g)$  such that  $\gamma_{0^X} \circ c(g) = g \circ \gamma_{0^Y}$ . If we start now from the arrow  $c(g): \mathcal{C}(0^X) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(0^Y)$  and we work as in Step 1, we get a unique arrow  $\pi_0(g)$  such that  $\pi_0(g) \circ \nu_{c_{0^Y}} = \nu_{c_{0^X}} \circ c(g)$ . Moreover,  $g \cdot \eta_Y = \eta_X \cdot \pi_0(g)$ . To see this, we compose with  $\nu_{c_{0^Y}}$

$$\eta_X \cdot \pi_0(g) \circ \nu_{c_{0^Y}} = \eta_X \circ \nu_{c_{0^X}} \circ c(g) = \gamma_{0^X} \circ c(g) = g \circ \gamma_{0^Y} = g \cdot \eta_Y \circ \nu_{c_{0^Y}}$$

and we can conclude using the first part of 2.4.

If we repeat the same argument starting from  $n_g: \mathcal{N}(g) \rightarrow X$  instead of  $g: X \rightarrow Y$ , we get arrows

$$c(n_g): \mathcal{C}(0^{\mathcal{N}(g)}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(0^X) \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_0(n_g): \pi_0(\mathcal{N}(g)) \rightarrow \pi_0(X)$$

unique with  $\gamma_{0^{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ c(n_g) = n_g \circ \gamma_{0^X}$  and  $\pi_0(n_g) \circ \nu_{c_{0^X}} = \nu_{c_{0^{\mathcal{N}(g)}}} \circ c(n_g)$ . Moreover, by 2.4 we get  $n_g \cdot \eta_X = \eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)} \cdot \pi_0(n_g)$  as above.

Finally, the nullhomotopy  $\nu_g \in \Theta(n_g \cdot g)$  and the dual of the second part of Lemma 2.13 allow us to prove that the composite arrow

$$\mathcal{C}(0^{\mathcal{N}(g)}) \xrightarrow{c(n_g)} \mathcal{C}(0^X) \xrightarrow{c(g)} \mathcal{C}(0^Y)$$

is the zero arrow (because  $\mathcal{C}(0^Y)$  is codiscrete). By the second part of Lemma 2.13 again, we can conclude that also the composite arrow

$$\pi_0(\mathcal{N}(g)) \xrightarrow{\pi_0(n_g)} \pi_0(X) \xrightarrow{\pi_0(g)} \pi_0(Y)$$

is the zero arrow, as needed.

**Step 3:** In order to construct the connecting arrow  $\delta: \mathcal{N}(0_Y) \rightarrow \pi_0(\mathcal{N}(g))$ , consider the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & & & \mathcal{N}(0_Y) \\
 & & & \Delta & \downarrow n_{0_Y} \\
 & & & 0_X^{\mathcal{N}(0_Y)} & 0 \leftarrow \nu_{0_Y} \\
 & & & & \downarrow 0_Y \\
 \mathcal{N}(g) & \xrightarrow{n_g} & X & \xrightarrow{g} & Y \\
 \downarrow \eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)} & & & & \downarrow \nu_g \\
 \pi_0(\mathcal{N}(g)) & & & & 
 \end{array}$$

Since  $\nu_{0_Y} \in \Theta(n_{0_Y} \cdot 0_Y) = \Theta(0_X^{\mathcal{N}(0_Y)} \cdot g)$ , the universal property of the  $\Theta$ -kernel of  $g$  gives a unique arrow  $\Delta: \mathcal{N}(0_Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(g)$  such that  $\Delta \cdot n_g = 0_X^{\mathcal{N}(0_Y)}$  and  $\Delta \circ \nu_g = \nu_{0_Y}$ . We put

$$\delta = \Delta \cdot \eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)}: \mathcal{N}(0_Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(g) \rightarrow \pi_0(\mathcal{N}(g))$$

**Step 4:** To check that the composite arrow

$$\mathcal{N}(0_X) \xrightarrow{n(g)} \mathcal{N}(0_Y) \xrightarrow{\delta} \pi_0(\mathcal{N}(g))$$

is the zero arrow, consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathcal{N}(\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}) & \xleftarrow{r_X} & \mathcal{N}(\text{id}_X) & \xleftarrow{t_X} & \mathcal{N}(0_X) & \xrightarrow{n(g)} & \mathcal{N}(0_Y) \\
\downarrow \nu_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \Rightarrow n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} & & \downarrow \nu_{\text{id}_X} \Rightarrow n_{\text{id}_X} & & \downarrow n_{0_X} \Rightarrow 0 & & \downarrow n_{0_Y} \Rightarrow 0 \\
\mathcal{N}(g) & \xrightarrow{s_X} & X & \xrightarrow{g} & Y & & \\
\downarrow \eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)} & & \downarrow \nu_g & & \downarrow 0_Y & & \\
\pi_0(\mathcal{N}(g)) & & X & & Y & & \\
\end{array}$$

$\nu_{X,g} \Leftarrow s_X$      $\nu_{0_X} \Leftarrow n_{0_X}$      $\nu_g \Leftarrow n_g$

By the universal property of  $\mathcal{N}(\text{id}_X)$ , we get a unique arrow  $t_X$  such that  $t_X \cdot n_{\text{id}_X} = 0_X^{\mathcal{N}(0_X)}$  and  $t_X \circ \nu_{\text{id}_X} = \nu_{0_X}$ . By the universal property of  $\mathcal{N}(g)$ , we get a unique arrow  $s_X$  such that  $s_X \cdot n_g = n_{\text{id}_X}$  and  $s_X \circ \nu_g = \nu_{\text{id}_X} \circ g$ . Since  $\nu_{\text{id}_X} \in \Theta(n_{\text{id}_X}) = \Theta(s_X \cdot n_g)$  and  $\nu_{\text{id}_X} \circ g = s_X \circ \nu_g$ , the fact that  $\mathcal{N}(g)$  is strong gives us a unique nullhomotopy  $\nu_{X,g} \in \Theta(s_X)$  such that  $\nu_{X,g} \circ n_g = \nu_{\text{id}_X}$ . Finally, since  $\nu_{X,g} \in \Theta(s_X)$ , by the universal property of  $\mathcal{N}(\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)})$  we get a unique arrow  $r_X$  such that  $r_X \cdot n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} = s_X$  and  $r_X \circ \nu_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} = \nu_{X,g}$ . Now we can check that

$$n(g) \cdot \Delta = t_X \cdot r_X \cdot n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}}$$

using the first part of 2.4:

- $n(g) \cdot \Delta \cdot n_g = n(g) \cdot 0_X^{\mathcal{N}(0_Y)} = 0_X^{\mathcal{N}(0_X)} = t_X \cdot n_{\text{id}_X} = t_X \cdot s_X \cdot n_g = t_X \cdot r_X \cdot n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \cdot n_g$
- $n(g) \cdot \Delta \circ \nu_g = n(g) \circ \nu_{0_Y} = \nu_{0_X} \circ g = t_X \circ \nu_{\text{id}_X} \circ g = t_X \cdot s_X \circ \nu_g = t_X \cdot r_X \cdot n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ \nu_g$

Thanks to the previous equation, we have that

$$t_X \cdot r_X \circ \nu_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ \eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)} \in \Theta(t_X \cdot r_X \cdot n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \cdot \eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)}) = \Theta(n(g) \cdot \Delta \cdot \eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)}) = \Theta(n(g) \cdot \delta)$$

and, since  $\pi_0(\mathcal{N}(g))$  is discrete (see Lemma 2.9), we can conclude that  $n(g) \cdot \delta$  is the zero arrow.

**Step 5:** The fact that the composite arrow

$$\mathcal{N}(0_Y) \xrightarrow{\delta} \pi_0(\mathcal{N}(g)) \xrightarrow{\pi_0(n_g)} \pi_0(X)$$

is the zero arrow is obvious:

$$\delta \cdot \pi_0(n_g) = \Delta \cdot \eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)} \cdot \pi_0(n_g) = \Delta \cdot n_g \cdot \eta_X = 0_X^{\mathcal{N}(0_Y)} \cdot \eta_X = 0_{\pi_0(X)}^{\mathcal{N}(0_Y)}$$

**Example 3.2.** We go back to Example 2.14, where  $(\mathcal{B}, \Theta) = (\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A}), \Theta_\Delta)$ . We assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  has a zero object, pullbacks and cokernels. Starting from a  $\Theta_\Delta$ -kernel

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
X & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_X} & X & \xrightarrow{g} & Y \\
\downarrow \langle x, g \rangle & & \downarrow x & \dashrightarrow & \downarrow y \\
X_0 \times_{g_0, y} Y & \xrightarrow{y'} & X_0 & \xrightarrow{g_0} & Y_0
\end{array}$$

the associated snail sequence is

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\text{Ker}\langle x, g \rangle & \longrightarrow & \text{Ker}(x) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ker}(y) & \xrightarrow{\delta_0} & \text{Cok}\langle x, g \rangle & \longrightarrow & \text{Cok}(x) & \longrightarrow & \text{Cok}(y)
\end{array}$$

where the unlabelled arrows are the obvious ones and  $\delta_0$  is given by

$$\delta_0 = \langle 0, k_y \rangle \cdot c_{\langle x, g \rangle} : \text{Ker}(y) \longrightarrow X_0 \times_{g_0, y} Y \longrightarrow \text{Cok}\langle x, g \rangle$$

so that the bottom line precisely is the snail sequence appearing in [13, 16].

We end this section with a lemma about the arrow  $\Delta : \mathcal{N}(0_Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(g)$  defined in Step 3. This lemma, needed in the next section, is a generalization of Lemma 3.2 in [15].

**Lemma 3.3.** *(With the previous notation.) The diagram*

$$\mathcal{N}(0_Y) \xrightarrow{\Delta} \mathcal{N}(g) \xrightarrow{n_g} X$$

is a kernel (in the usual categorical sense).

*Proof.* The fact that  $\Delta \cdot n_g = 0_X^{\mathcal{N}(0_Y)}$  is part of the definition of  $\Delta$  (see Step 3 above). Consider now an arrow  $a : A \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(g)$  such that  $a \cdot n_g = 0_X^A$ . This implies that  $a \cdot n_g \cdot g = 0_Y^A$  and then  $a \circ \nu_g \in \Theta(0_Y^A)$ . By the universal property of  $\mathcal{N}(0_Y)$ , we get a unique arrow  $b : A \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0_Y)$  such that  $b \circ \nu_{0_Y} = a \circ \nu_g$ . To check that  $b \cdot \Delta = a$  we use part 1 of 2.4:

$$\begin{aligned}
- & b \cdot \Delta \cdot n_g = b \cdot 0_X^{\mathcal{N}(0_Y)} = 0_X^A = a \cdot n_g \\
- & b \cdot \Delta \circ \nu_g = b \circ \nu_{0_Y} = a \circ \nu_g
\end{aligned}$$

As far as the uniqueness of  $b$  is concerned, let  $b' : A \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0_Y)$  be such that  $b' \cdot \Delta = a$ . It follows that  $b' \circ \nu_{0_Y} = b' \cdot \Delta \circ \nu_g = a \circ \nu_g$ , so that  $b' = b$  by definition of  $b$ .  $\square$

## 4 Exactness of the snail sequence

We work under the same assumptions as in Section 3: the nullhomotopy structure  $\Theta$  satisfies the reduced interchange condition 2.2, the category  $\mathcal{B}$  is equipped with a  $\Theta$ -strong zero object and has all the needed strong  $\Theta$ -kernels and strong  $\Theta$ -cokernels. We moreover assume that  $\mathcal{B}$  has pullbacks.

**Condition 4.1.** We fix a class of arrows  $\mathcal{S}$  in  $\mathcal{B}$  satisfying the following conditions:

1.  $\mathcal{S}$  is closed under composition,
2.  $\mathcal{S}$  is stable under pullbacks,
3.  $\mathcal{S}$  contains all the identities,
4.  $\mathcal{S}$  has the left cancellation property: if a composite  $f \cdot g$  is in  $\mathcal{S}$ , then  $g$  is in  $\mathcal{S}$ .

Note that such a class  $\mathcal{S}$  contains all the isomorphisms. Note also that, if we ask that all monomorphisms in  $\mathcal{S}$  are isomorphisms, we get the notion of surjection-like class of arrows discussed in [10] (where condition 4 is called strong right cancellation property).

**Definition 4.2.** Consider the diagram in  $(\mathcal{B}, \Theta)$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \downarrow \bar{\varphi} & & \\ & \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} & \\ W & \xrightarrow{f} & X & \xrightarrow{g} & Y \end{array}$$

We say that  $(f, \varphi, g)$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -exact if the unique factorization of  $(f, \varphi)$  through the  $\Theta$ -kernel  $(n_g, \nu_g)$  of  $g$  is in  $\mathcal{S}$ .

Note that if  $Y$  is discrete, to be  $\mathcal{S}$ -exact means that the unique factorization of  $f$  through the categorical kernel of  $g$  is in  $\mathcal{S}$ .

**Definition 4.3.** Let  $Y$  be an object in  $(\mathcal{B}, \Theta)$ .

1.  $Y$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -proper if  $\bar{y}: \mathcal{N}(\text{id}_Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\eta_Y)$  is in  $\mathcal{S}$ , where  $\bar{y}$  is the unique arrow such that  $\bar{y} \cdot n_{\eta_Y} = n_{\text{id}_Y}$  and  $\bar{y} \circ \nu_{\eta_Y} = \nu_{\text{id}_Y} \circ \eta_Y$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \downarrow \bar{\nu}_{\text{id}_Y} & & \\ & \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} & \\ \mathcal{N}(\text{id}_Y) & \xrightarrow{n_{\text{id}_Y}} & Y & \xrightarrow{\eta_Y} & \pi_0(Y) \\ & \searrow \bar{y} & \nearrow n_{\eta_Y} & & \\ & & \mathcal{N}(\eta_Y) & & \end{array}$$

2.  $Y$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -global if  $\eta_Y: Y \rightarrow \pi_0(Y)$  is in  $\mathcal{S}$ .

**Example 4.4.** When  $(\mathcal{B}, \Theta) = (\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A}), \Theta_\Delta)$ , the factorization  $\bar{y}$  of Definition 4.3 is essentially the factorization of the arrow part  $y$  of an object  $(Y, y, Y_0)$  through the kernel of its cokernel

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} Y & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_Y} & Y & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \text{id}_Y \downarrow & \text{id}_Y & \text{id}_Y \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ Y & \xrightarrow{y} & Y_0 & \xrightarrow{c_y} & \text{Cok}(y) \\ & \searrow \bar{y} & \nearrow k_{c_y} & & \\ & & Y & & \\ & & \downarrow \bar{y} & & \\ & & \text{Ker}(c_y) & & \end{array}$$

**Proposition 4.5.** Consider an arrow  $g$  in  $(\mathcal{B}, \Theta)$  together with its  $\Theta$ -kernel

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \downarrow \nu_g & & \\ & \text{---} & \text{---} & \text{---} & \\ \mathcal{N}(g) & \xrightarrow{n_g} & X & \xrightarrow{g} & Y \end{array}$$

If  $Y$  and  $\mathcal{N}(g)$  are  $\mathcal{S}$ -proper and  $X$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -global where  $\mathcal{S}$  is a class of morphisms in  $\mathcal{B}$  satisfying Condition 4.1, then the associated snail sequence

$$\mathcal{N}(0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}) \xrightarrow{n(n_g)} \mathcal{N}(0_X) \xrightarrow{n(g)} \mathcal{N}(0_Y) \xrightarrow{\delta} \pi_0(\mathcal{N}(g)) \xrightarrow{\pi_0(n_g)} \pi_0(X) \xrightarrow{\pi_0(g)} \pi_0(Y)$$

is  $\mathcal{S}$ -exact in  $\mathcal{N}(0_X), \mathcal{N}(0_Y)$  and  $\pi_0(X)$ .

*Proof.* We use the constructions and the notations introduced in Section 3. In particular, for the arrows  $t_X, r_X$  and  $s_X$  and for the nullhomotopy  $\nu_{X,g}$ , see Step 4 of Section 3.

**Exactness in  $\mathcal{N}(0_X)$ :** we are going to prove that the diagram

$$\mathcal{N}(0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}) \xrightarrow{n(n_g)} \mathcal{N}(0_X) \xrightarrow{n(g)} \mathcal{N}(0_Y)$$

constructed in Step 1 of Section 3, is a kernel. This implies the  $\mathcal{S}$ -exactness because  $\mathcal{S}$  contains the isomorphisms. Consider an arrow  $a: A \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0_X)$  such that  $a \cdot n(g) = 0_{\mathcal{N}(0_Y)}^A$ . As a preliminary step, we check that  $a \cdot t_X \cdot r_X \cdot n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} = 0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}^A$  using the cancellation property 2.4:

$$\begin{aligned} - t_X \cdot r_X \cdot n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \cdot n_g &= t_X \cdot s_X \cdot n_g = t_X \cdot n_{\text{id}_X} = 0_X^{\mathcal{N}(0_X)} = 0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}^{\mathcal{N}(0_X)} \cdot n_g \text{ and then} \\ a \cdot t_X \cdot r_X \cdot n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \cdot n_g &= a \cdot 0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}^{\mathcal{N}(0_X)} \cdot n_g = 0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}^A \cdot n_g \\ - a \cdot t_X \cdot r_X \cdot n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ \nu_g &= a \cdot t_X \cdot s_X \circ \nu_g = a \cdot t_X \circ \nu_{\text{id}_X} \circ g = a \circ \nu_{0_X} \circ g = a \cdot n(g) \circ \nu_{0_Y} = \\ *_{\mathcal{N}(0_Y)}^A \circ 0_Y^{\mathcal{N}(0_Y)} &= *_{\mathcal{N}(0_Y)}^A \circ 0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}^{\mathcal{N}(0_Y)} \cdot n_g \cdot g = 0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}^A \circ \nu_g \end{aligned}$$

By the universal property of  $\mathcal{N}(0_{\mathcal{N}(g)})$ , there exists a unique arrow  $a': A \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0_{\mathcal{N}(g)})$  such that  $a' \circ \nu_{0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} = a \cdot t_X \cdot r_X \circ \nu_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}}$ . Now we show that  $a' \cdot n(n_g) = a$  using once again 2.4:

$$\begin{aligned} - a' \cdot n(n_g) \cdot n_{0_X} &= 0^A = a \cdot n_{0_X} \\ - a' \cdot n(n_g) \circ \nu_{0_X} &= a' \circ \nu_{0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ n_g = a \cdot t_X \cdot r_X \circ \nu_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ n_g = a \cdot t_X \circ \nu_{X,g} \circ n_g = \\ a \cdot t_X \circ \nu_{\text{id}_X} &= a \circ \nu_{0_X} \end{aligned}$$

As far as the uniqueness of the factorization is concerned, let  $a'': A \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0_{\mathcal{N}(g)})$  be such that  $a'' \cdot n(n_g) = a$ . Since clearly  $a' \cdot n_{0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} = 0^A = a'' \cdot n_{0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}}$ , to have  $a'' = a'$  it remains to show that  $a' \circ \nu_{0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} = a'' \circ \nu_{0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}}$ . Since the  $\Theta$ -kernel  $\mathcal{N}(g)$  is strong, it is enough to compose with  $n_g$ :

$$- a' \circ \nu_{0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ n_g = a' \cdot n(n_g) \circ \nu_{0_X} = a'' \cdot n(n_g) \circ \nu_{0_X} = a'' \circ \nu_{0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ n_g$$

**Exactness in  $\mathcal{N}(0_Y)$ :** We are going to prove that the unique arrow  $\sigma$  making commutative the following diagram is in  $\mathcal{S}$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{N}(\delta) & \xrightarrow{n_\delta} & \mathcal{N}(0_Y) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \pi_0(\mathcal{N}(g)) \\ & \searrow \sigma & \uparrow n(g) & & \\ & & \mathcal{N}(0_X) & & \end{array}$$

For this, consider the factorization  $\Delta'$  of  $n_\delta \cdot \Delta$  through the (homotopy) kernel of  $\eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)}$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathcal{N}(\delta) & \xrightarrow{n_\delta} & \mathcal{N}(0_Y) & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & \mathcal{N}(g) & \xrightarrow{\eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} & \pi_0(\mathcal{N}(g)) \\ & \searrow \Delta' & & & \uparrow n_{\eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} & & \\ & & & & \mathcal{N}(\eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)}) & & \end{array}$$

Consider also the factorization  $\bar{z}$  obtained when, in Definition 4.3.1, we start from the object  $\mathcal{N}(g)$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{N}(\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}) & \xrightarrow{n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}}} & \mathcal{N}(g) \\ & \searrow \bar{z} & \uparrow n_{\eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \\ & & \mathcal{N}(\eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)}) \end{array}$$

Using the arrows  $\sigma, \Delta'$  and  $\bar{z}$ , we can build up the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathcal{N}(\delta) & \xrightarrow{\Delta'} & & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{N}(\eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)}) \\
\sigma \uparrow & & & & \uparrow \bar{z} \\
\mathcal{N}(0_X) & \xrightarrow{t_X} & \mathcal{N}(\text{id}_X) & \xrightarrow{r_X} & \mathcal{N}(\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)})
\end{array}$$

To check its commutativity, we compose with  $n_{\eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)}}$ , which is a monomorphism because  $\pi_0(\mathcal{N}(g))$  is discrete:

$$- \sigma \cdot \Delta' \cdot n_{\eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} = \sigma \cdot n_\delta \cdot \Delta = n(g) \cdot \Delta = t_X \cdot r_X \cdot n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} = t_X \cdot r_X \cdot \bar{z} \cdot n_{\eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)}}$$

By assumption,  $\mathcal{N}(g)$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -proper, that is,  $\bar{z} \in \mathcal{S}$ . Since  $\mathcal{S}$  is stable under pullbacks, to prove that  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$  it remains to show that the previous square is a pullback. For this, consider two arrows

$$a: A \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}) \quad \text{and} \quad b: A \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\delta)$$

such that  $a \cdot \bar{z} = b \cdot \Delta'$ . This equality implies that

$$a \cdot n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \cdot n_g = a \cdot \bar{z} \cdot n_{\eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \cdot n_g = b \cdot \Delta' \cdot n_{\eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \cdot n_g = b \cdot n_\delta \cdot \Delta \cdot n_g = b \cdot n_\delta \cdot 0_X^{\mathcal{N}(0_Y)} = 0_X^A$$

so that we can consider the nullhomotopy  $a \circ \nu_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ n_g \in \Theta(a \cdot n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \cdot n_g) = \Theta(0_X^A)$ . By the universal property of  $\mathcal{N}(0_X)$ , we get a unique arrow  $c: A \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0_X)$  such that  $c \circ \nu_{0_X} = a \circ \nu_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ n_g$ . We have to verify that  $c$  is a factorization of  $a$  and  $b$ . To check that  $c \cdot \sigma = b$ , we compose with  $n_\delta$ , which is a monomorphism because  $\pi_0(\mathcal{N}(g))$  is discrete, and then we use the universal property of  $\mathcal{N}(0_Y)$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
- c \cdot \sigma \cdot n_\delta \circ \nu_{0_Y} &= c \cdot n(g) \circ \nu_{0_Y} = c \circ \nu_{0_X} \circ g = a \circ \nu_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ n_g \cdot g = a \cdot n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ \nu_g = \\
&= b \cdot n_\delta \cdot \Delta \circ \nu_g = b \cdot n_\delta \circ \nu_{0_Y}
\end{aligned}$$

(the fourth equality follows from the reduced interchange). To check that  $c \cdot t_X \cdot r_X = a$ , we use 2.4 and we compose a first time with  $n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}}$  and a second time with  $\nu_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}}$ . In the first case we use 2.4 again, and in the second case we use that the  $\Theta$ -kernel  $\mathcal{N}(g)$  is strong:

$$\begin{aligned}
- c \cdot t_X \cdot r_X \cdot n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \cdot n_g &= c \cdot t_X \cdot s_X \cdot n_g = c \cdot t_X \cdot n_{\text{id}_X} = c \cdot 0_X^{\mathcal{N}(0_X)} = 0_X^A = a \cdot n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \cdot n_g \\
- c \cdot t_X \cdot r_X \cdot n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ \nu_g &= c \cdot t_X \cdot s_X \circ \nu_g = c \cdot t_X \circ \nu_{\text{id}_X} \circ g = c \circ \nu_{0_X} \circ g = a \circ \nu_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ n_g \cdot g = \\
&= a \cdot n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ \nu_g \\
- c \cdot t_X \cdot r_X \circ \nu_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ n_g &= c \cdot t_X \circ \nu_{X,g} \circ n_g = c \cdot t_X \circ \nu_{\text{id}_X} = c \circ \nu_{0_X} = a \circ \nu_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ n_g
\end{aligned}$$

As far as the uniqueness of the factorization  $c$  is concerned, let  $c': A \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0_X)$  be such that  $c' \cdot \sigma = b$  and  $c' \cdot t_X \cdot r_X = a$ . To verify that  $c' = c$ , we go back to the definition of  $c$ :

$$- c' \circ \nu_{0_X} = c' \cdot t_X \circ \nu_{\text{id}_X} = c' \cdot t_X \circ \nu_{X,g} \circ n_g = c' \cdot t_X \cdot r_X \circ \nu_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ n_g = a \circ \nu_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ n_g$$

**Exactness in  $\pi_0(X)$ :** We are going to prove that the unique arrow  $\sigma$  making commutative the following diagram is in  $\mathcal{S}$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathcal{N}(\pi_0(g)) & \xrightarrow{n_{\pi_0(g)}} & \pi_0(X) & \xrightarrow{\pi_0(g)} & \pi_0(Y) \\
& \searrow \sigma & \uparrow \pi_0(n_g) & & \\
& & \mathcal{N}(0_X) & & 
\end{array}$$

We can split the pullback describing the  $\Theta$ -kernel  $\mathcal{N}(g)$  (see 2.12) in two steps:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathcal{N}(g) & \xrightarrow{g'} & \mathcal{N}(\text{id}_Y) & & \\
\downarrow n_g & \searrow a & \downarrow n_{\text{id}_Y} & \searrow \bar{g} & \\
& P & \xrightarrow{c} & \mathcal{N}(\eta_Y) & \\
& \swarrow b & & \swarrow n_{\eta_Y} & \\
X & \xrightarrow{g} & Y & & 
\end{array}$$

Now observe that

$$b \cdot \eta_X \cdot \pi_0(g) = b \cdot g \cdot \eta_Y = c \cdot n_{\eta_Y} \cdot \eta_Y = c \cdot 0_{\pi_0(Y)}^{\mathcal{N}(\eta_Y)} = 0_{\pi_0(Y)}^P$$

so that there exists a unique arrow  $t: P \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\pi_0(g))$  such that  $t \cdot n_{\pi_0(g)} = b \cdot \eta_X$ . In fact, more is true: the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
P & \xrightarrow{t} & \mathcal{N}(\pi_0(g)) \\
\downarrow b & & \downarrow n_{\pi_0(g)} \\
X & \xrightarrow{\eta_X} & \pi_0(X)
\end{array}$$

is a pullback. This can be proved using the following commutative diagrams:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
P & \xrightarrow{c} & \mathcal{N}(\eta_Y) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
\downarrow b & & \downarrow n_{\eta_Y} & & \downarrow \\
X & \xrightarrow{g} & Y & \xrightarrow{\eta_Y} & \pi_0(Y)
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{c} (1) \quad (2) \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
P & \xrightarrow{t} & \mathcal{N}(\pi_0(g)) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
\downarrow b & & \downarrow n_{\pi_0(g)} & & \downarrow \\
X & \xrightarrow{\eta_X} & \pi_0(X) & \xrightarrow{\pi_0(g)} & \pi_0(Y)
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{c} (3) \quad (4) \end{array}$$

Since (1) and (2) are pullbacks, then (1)+(2) is a pullback. This implies that (3)+(4) is a pullback because  $\eta_X \cdot \pi_0(g) = g \cdot \eta_Y$ . Since (4) also is a pullback, we can conclude that (3) is a pullback. Finally, observe that  $a \cdot t = \eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)} \cdot \sigma$ . To check this equality, we can compose with  $n_{\pi_0(g)}$ , which is a monomorphism because  $\pi_0(Y)$  is discrete:

$$- a \cdot t \cdot n_{\pi_0(g)} = a \cdot b \cdot \eta_X = n_g \cdot \eta_X = \eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)} \cdot \pi_0(n_g) = \eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)} \cdot \sigma \cdot n_{\pi_0(g)}$$

Now we can conclude as follows: since  $Y$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -proper,  $\bar{g} \in \mathcal{S}$  and then  $a \in \mathcal{S}$  by stability under pullbacks. Since  $X$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -global,  $\eta_X \in \mathcal{S}$  and then  $t \in \mathcal{S}$  once again by stability under pullbacks. Since  $\mathcal{S}$  is closed under composition, the equality  $a \cdot t = \eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)} \cdot \sigma$  and the left cancellation property imply that  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ .  $\square$

The exactness of the snail sequence in  $\pi_0(\mathcal{N}(g))$  requires one more assumption on the class  $\mathcal{S}$ .

**Condition 4.6.** Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a class of arrows in  $\mathcal{B}$  as in Condition 4.1. We say that  $\mathcal{S}$  satisfies condition (Sub) if, in the following commutative diagram, if  $K(x, y)$  and  $g$  are in  $\mathcal{S}$ , then  $K(g, g_0)$  also is in  $\mathcal{S}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & \text{Ker}(x) & \xrightarrow{K(g, g_0)} & \text{Ker}(y) \\
& & \downarrow k_x & & \downarrow k_y \\
\text{Ker}(g) & \xrightarrow{k_g} & X & \xrightarrow{g} & Y \\
\downarrow K(x, y) & & \downarrow x & & \downarrow y \\
\text{Ker}(g_0) & \xrightarrow{k_{g_0}} & X_0 & \xrightarrow{g_0} & Y_0
\end{array}$$

**Remark 4.7.** Condition (Sub), with  $\mathcal{S} = \{\text{regular epimorphisms}\}$ , has been isolated by Bourn in [3] (see also [2]) and is a special case of the snake lemma. It has been used in [16] to prove the basic version of the snail lemma which, in the context of pointed protomodular regular categories, subsumes the snake lemma. The precise situation has been explained to us by Zurab Janelidze in a private communication and we report it here for the sake of completeness. Assume that the category  $\mathcal{B}$  is pointed and regular. Then condition (Sub) is equivalent to the subtractivity of  $\mathcal{B}$ . First, by Theorem 3 in [13], the subtractivity of  $\mathcal{B}$  is equivalent to the fact that the incomplete snail lemma holds in  $\mathcal{B}$ . Now, the incomplete snail lemma is equivalent to condition (Sub). Indeed, if in the first diagram of Section 3 in [13] we assume that the arrows  $Y_1 \rightarrow X$  and  $W_1 \rightarrow X$  are monos, then the incomplete snail lemma precisely gives condition (Sub). For the converse implication, one has to consider the (regular epi, mono) factorization of the same two arrows. The fact that subtractivity implies condition (Sub) can also be checked using the pointed subobject functor introduced in [12].

**Proposition 4.8.** Consider an arrow  $g$  in  $(\mathcal{B}, \Theta)$  together with its  $\Theta$ -kernel

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & \dashrightarrow & \downarrow \nu_g & \dashrightarrow \\
\mathcal{N}(g) & \xrightarrow{n_g} & X & \xrightarrow{g} & Y
\end{array}$$

If  $X$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -proper and  $\mathcal{N}(g)$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -global and if  $\mathcal{S}$  satisfies Conditions 4.1 and 4.6, then the associated snail sequence

$$\mathcal{N}(0_{\mathcal{N}(g)}) \xrightarrow{n(n_g)} \mathcal{N}(0_X) \xrightarrow{n(g)} \mathcal{N}(0_Y) \xrightarrow{\delta} \pi_0(\mathcal{N}(g)) \xrightarrow{\pi_0(n_g)} \pi_0(X) \xrightarrow{\pi_0(g)} \pi_0(Y)$$


is  $\mathcal{S}$ -exact in  $\pi_0(\mathcal{N}(g))$ .

*Proof.* We are going to prove that the unique arrow  $\sigma$  making commutative the following diagram is in  $\mathcal{S}$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathcal{N}(\pi_0(n_g)) & \xrightarrow{n\pi_0(n_g)} & \pi_0(\mathcal{N}(g)) & \xrightarrow{\pi_0(n_g)} & \pi_0(X) \\
& \swarrow \sigma & \uparrow \delta & & \\
& & \mathcal{N}(0_Y) & & 
\end{array}$$

Consider the following diagram, where the square is the pullback describing the  $\Theta$ -kernel


of  $g$  (see 2.12)



and recall that  $\nu_g = g' \circ \nu_{\text{id}_Y}$ . By the universal property of  $\mathcal{N}(\text{id}_Y)$ , we get a unique arrow  $\bar{g}$  such that  $\bar{g} \cdot n_{\text{id}_Y} = n_{\text{id}_X} \cdot g$  and  $\bar{g} \circ \nu_{\text{id}_Y} = \nu_{\text{id}_X} \circ g$ . Because of the first condition on  $\bar{g}$ , we can use the universal property of the pullback  $\mathcal{N}(g)$  and we get a unique arrow  $v$  such that  $v \cdot g' = \bar{g}$  and  $v \cdot n_g = n_{\text{id}_X}$ . Since

$$v \circ \nu_g = v \cdot g' \circ \nu_{\text{id}_Y} = \bar{g} \circ \nu_{\text{id}_Y} = \nu_{\text{id}_X} \circ g$$

the fact that the  $\Theta$ -kernel  $\mathcal{N}(g)$  is strong gives us a unique nullhomotopy  $\tau \in \Theta(v)$  such that  $\tau \circ n_g = \nu_{\text{id}_X}$ . Consider now the following diagram, where the solid part is commutative and where  $\bar{z}$  (respectively,  $\bar{x}$ ) is the factorization obtained as in Definition 4.3.1 when we start from the object  $\mathcal{N}(g)$  (respectively,  $X$ ), as in the second part of the proof of Proposition 4.5



By the universal property of  $\mathcal{N}(\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)})$ , we get a unique arrow  $\bar{v}$  such that  $\bar{v} \cdot n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} = v$  and  $\bar{v} \circ \nu_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} = \tau$ . Moreover, the universal property of  $\mathcal{N}(\text{id}_X)$  gives a unique arrow  $\bar{n}_g$  such that  $\bar{n}_g \cdot n_{\text{id}_X} = n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \cdot n_g$  and  $\bar{n}_g \circ \nu_{\text{id}_X} = \nu_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ n_g$ . Now we check that  $\bar{v}$  and  $\bar{n}_g$  realize an isomorphism. We will use three times the cancellation property recalled in 2.4. First, we check that  $\bar{n}_g \cdot v = n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}}$ :

- $\bar{n}_g \cdot v \cdot n_g = \bar{n}_g \cdot n_{\text{id}_X} = n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \cdot n_g$
- $\bar{n}_g \cdot v \circ \nu_g = \bar{n}_g \circ \nu_{\text{id}_X} \circ g = \nu_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ n_g \cdot g = n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ \nu_g$ , the last equality coming from the reduced interchange

Second, we check that  $\overline{n_g} \cdot \overline{v} = \text{id}$ :

- $\overline{n_g} \cdot \overline{v} \cdot n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} = \overline{n_g} \cdot v = n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}}$
- $\overline{n_g} \cdot \overline{v} \circ \nu_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} = \overline{n_g} \circ \tau = \nu_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}}$  where, for the last equality, we compose with  $n_g$ :
- $\overline{n_g} \circ \tau \circ n_g = \overline{n_g} \circ \nu_{\text{id}_X} = \nu_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ n_g$

Third, we check that  $\overline{v} \cdot \overline{n_g} = \text{id}$ :

- $\overline{v} \cdot \overline{n_g} \cdot n_{\text{id}_X} = \overline{v} \cdot n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \cdot n_g = v \cdot n_g = n_{\text{id}_X}$
- $\overline{v} \cdot \overline{n_g} \circ \nu_{\text{id}_X} = \overline{v} \circ \nu_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \circ n_g = \tau \circ n_g = \nu_{\text{id}_X}$

It remains to check that  $\overline{z} \cdot n(n_g) = \overline{n_g} \cdot \overline{x}$ . For this, it is enough to compose with  $n_{\eta_X}$  which is a monomorphism because  $\pi_0(X)$  is discrete:

$$- \overline{z} \cdot n(n_g) \cdot n_{\eta_X} = \overline{z} \cdot n_{\eta_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \cdot n_g = n_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{N}(g)}} \cdot n_g = \overline{n_g} \cdot n_{\text{id}_X} = \overline{n_g} \cdot \overline{x} \cdot n_{\eta_X}$$

We can conclude as follows: since  $X$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -proper and  $\overline{n_g}$  is an isomorphism, the equality  $\overline{z} \cdot n(n_g) = \overline{n_g} \cdot \overline{x}$  implies that  $n(n_g)$  is in  $\mathcal{S}$  by Condition 4.1. Since  $\mathcal{N}(g)$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -global and  $\Delta: \mathcal{N}(0_Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(g)$  is the kernel of  $n_g$  (see Lemma 3.3), we can use Condition 4.6 and  $\sigma$  is in  $\mathcal{S}$ .  $\square$

**Example 4.9.** Let us consider once again  $(\mathcal{B}, \Theta) = (\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A}), \Theta_\Delta)$  and take as  $\mathcal{S}$  the class of arrows

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{g} & Y \\ x \downarrow & & \downarrow y \\ X_0 & \xrightarrow{g_0} & Y_0 \end{array}$$

such that both  $g$  and  $g_0$  are regular epimorphisms in  $\mathcal{A}$ . To start, assume just that  $\mathcal{A}$  has a zero object, kernels and cokernels. Under these conditions,  $\mathcal{S}$  contains isomorphisms, each object is  $\mathcal{S}$ -global and an object  $(Y, y, Y_0)$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -proper precisely when the factorization of  $y$  through the kernel of its cokernel is a regular epimorphism. This is the definition of proper arrow used in [3, 16]. Now keep in mind that limits and colimits in  $\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A})$  are computed level-wise in  $\mathcal{A}$ . If we add the assumption that  $\mathcal{A}$  is regular, then  $\mathcal{S}$  satisfies Condition 4.1. Finally, if we assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  is regular and protomodular, then  $\mathcal{S}$  satisfies also Condition 4.6, as proved in [3]. In particular, if  $\mathcal{A}$  is abelian, then  $\mathcal{S}$  satisfies Conditions 4.1 and 4.6 and each object in  $\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A})$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -global and  $\mathcal{S}$ -proper. In conclusion, the exactness of the snail sequence appearing in [13, 16] (see Example 3.2) is the special case of Propositions 4.5 and 4.8 when  $(\mathcal{B}, \Theta) = (\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A}), \Theta_\Delta)$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  is pointed, regular and protomodular.

**Remark 4.10.** The proof of the exactness of the snail sequence (Propositions 4.5 and 4.8) is more elaborate but essentially very similar to the proof of the exactness of the snail sequence in the context of pointed regular protomodular categories done in [16]. Strange enough, Lemma 3.3, which is essential in the present proof, does not appear in [16] but comes from the snail lemma for internal groupoids established in [15]. This suggests that something is still to be understood concerning the generality of the homotopical version of the snail lemma.

## 5 Sequentiable families of arrows

In this section, we fix a category  $\mathcal{A}$  with a zero object  $0$ , kernels and cokernels. We start with the definition of sequentiable families of arrows in  $\mathcal{A}$ , with their morphisms and nullhomotopies.

**Definition 5.1.** A sequentiable family of arrows  $h_\bullet$  is a family of pairs of arrows

$$h_\bullet = \{h_n, i_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$$

in  $\mathcal{A}$  with  $i_n$  connecting the cokernel of  $h_{n+1}$  with the kernel of  $h_n$ :

$$\dots \text{Cod}(h_{n+1}) \xrightarrow{q_{n+1}} \text{Cok}(h_{n+1}) \xrightarrow{i_n} \text{Ker}(h_n) \xrightarrow{k_n} \text{Dom}(h_n) \xrightarrow{h_n} \text{Cod}(h_n) \dots$$

A morphism of sequentiable families  $f_\bullet: h_\bullet \rightarrow h'_\bullet$  is a family of pairs of arrows

$$f_\bullet = \{\bar{f}_n: \text{Dom}(h_n) \rightarrow \text{Dom}(h'_n), \underline{f}_n: \text{Cod}(h_n) \rightarrow \text{Cod}(h'_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$$

such that for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$\bar{f}_n \cdot h'_n = h_n \cdot \underline{f}_n \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{f}_{n+1} \cdot q'_{n+1} \cdot i'_n \cdot k'_n = q_{n+1} \cdot i_n \cdot k_n \cdot \bar{f}_n$$

or, equivalently, such that

$$\bar{f}_n \cdot h'_n = h_n \cdot \underline{f}_n \quad \text{and} \quad C(f)_{n+1} \cdot i'_n = i_n \cdot K(f)_n$$

where  $C(f)_{n+1}$  is the unique arrow such that  $\underline{f}_{n+1} \cdot q'_{n+1} = q_{n+1} \cdot C(f)_{n+1}$  and  $K(f)_n$  is the unique arrow such that  $K(f)_n \cdot k'_n = k_n \cdot \bar{f}_n$ , see the next diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \vdots & & \vdots \\
 \text{Dom}(h_{n+1}) & \xrightarrow{\bar{f}_{n+1}} & \text{Dom}(h'_{n+1}) \\
 \downarrow h_{n+1} & & \downarrow h'_{n+1} \\
 \text{Cod}(h_{n+1}) & \xrightarrow{\underline{f}_{n+1}} & \text{Cod}(h'_{n+1}) \\
 \downarrow q_{n+1} & & \downarrow q'_{n+1} \\
 \text{Cok}(h_{n+1}) & \xrightarrow{C(f)_{n+1}} & \text{Cok}(h'_{n+1}) \\
 \downarrow i_n & & \downarrow i'_n \\
 \text{Ker}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{K(f)_n} & \text{Ker}(h'_n) \\
 \downarrow k_n & & \downarrow k'_n \\
 \text{Dom}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{\bar{f}_n} & \text{Dom}(h'_n) \\
 \downarrow h_n & & \downarrow h'_n \\
 \text{Cod}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{\underline{f}_n} & \text{Cod}(h'_n) \\
 \vdots & & \vdots
 \end{array}$$

With the obvious identity morphisms and composition of morphisms, sequentiable families and their morphisms give rise to a category denoted  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$ .

**Remark 5.2.** Observe that the category  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  has kernels and cokernels constructed level-wise in  $\mathcal{A}$ . The connecting arrows are obtained by an easy diagram chasing left to the reader. More in general,  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  inherits level-wise all limits and colimits which eventually exist in  $\mathcal{A}$ .

The category  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  of sequentiable families is equipped with a structure of nullhomotopies which extends the one we considered in  $\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A})$ , see Example 2.14.

**Definition 5.3.** Let  $f_\bullet: h_\bullet \rightarrow h'_\bullet$  be a morphism of sequentiable families. A nullhomotopy  $\lambda_\bullet \in \Theta_\Delta(f_\bullet)$  is a family of arrows

$$\lambda_\bullet = \{\lambda_n: \text{Cod}(h_n) \rightarrow \text{Dom}(h'_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$$

such that  $h_n \cdot \lambda_n = \bar{f}_n$  and  $\lambda_n \cdot h'_n = \underline{f}_n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Dom}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{\bar{f}_n} & \text{Dom}(h'_n) \\ h_n \downarrow & \nearrow \lambda_n & \downarrow h'_n \\ \text{Cod}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{\underline{f}_n} & \text{Cod}(h'_n) \end{array}$$

The composition of a nullhomotopy with morphisms on the left and on the right is defined level-wise as in  $(\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A}), \Theta_\Delta)$ .

**Proposition 5.4.** Consider the category with nullhomotopies  $(\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A}), \Theta_\Delta)$  as in Definitions 5.1 and 5.3.

1. For a morphism  $f_\bullet \in \mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$ , if  $\Theta_\Delta(f_\bullet) \neq \emptyset$  then for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  the arrows  $K(f)_n$  and  $C(f)_n$  are zero arrows.
2. The structure  $\Theta_\Delta$  satisfies the reduced interchange condition 2.2.
3. The sequentiable family  $0_\bullet = \{\text{id}_0, \text{id}_0\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a  $\Theta_\Delta$ -strong zero object of  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$ .
4. If  $\mathcal{A}$  has pullbacks, then  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  has  $\Theta_\Delta$ -kernels constructed level-wise as in  $\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A})$ , and they are strong.
5. Dually, if  $\mathcal{A}$  has pushouts, then  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  has  $\Theta_\Delta$ -cokernels constructed level-wise as in  $\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A})$ , and they are strong.

*Proof.* The only thing that deserves some comments is the construction of the connecting arrows in the  $\Theta_\Delta$ -kernel of a morphism. The  $\Theta_\Delta$ -kernel of a morphism  $f_\bullet: h_\bullet \rightarrow h'_\bullet$  in  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  being constructed level-wise as in  $\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A})$  (see Example 2.14), we adopt the notation depicted in the following diagram (where the region marked as p.b. is a pullback):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Dom}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{\bar{f}_n} & \text{Dom}(h'_n) \\ & \searrow h_n^P & \nearrow \pi'_n \\ & P_n & \\ & \swarrow \pi_n & \\ \text{Cod}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{\underline{f}_n} & \text{Cod}(h'_n) \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \downarrow h_n \\ \\ \downarrow h'_n \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \text{p.b.} \end{array}$$

Consider now the following commutative diagram, which is the  $\Theta_\Delta$ -kernel  $(\mathcal{N}(f_\bullet), n_{f_\bullet}, \nu_{f_\bullet})$  of  $f_\bullet$  from level  $n+1$  to level  $n$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\text{Dom}(h_{n+1}) & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \text{Dom}(h_{n+1}) & \xrightarrow{\bar{f}_{n+1}} & \text{Dom}(h'_{n+1}) \\
h_{n+1}^P \downarrow & & \downarrow h_{n+1} & \dashrightarrow & \downarrow h'_{n+1} \\
P_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{\pi_{n+1}} & \text{Cod}(h_{n+1}) & \xrightarrow{\underline{f}_{n+1}} & \text{Cod}(h'_{n+1}) \\
q_{n+1}^P \downarrow & & \downarrow q_{n+1} & & \downarrow q'_{n+1} \\
\text{Cok}(h_{n+1}^P) & \xrightarrow{C(\pi)_{n+1}} & \text{Cok}(h_{n+1}) & \xrightarrow{C(f)_{n+1}} & \text{Cok}(h'_{n+1}) \\
\vdots & & \downarrow i_n & & \downarrow i'_n \\
i_n^P \downarrow & & \text{Ker}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{K(f)_n} & \text{Ker}(h'_n) \\
\text{Ker}(h_n^P) & \xrightarrow{K(\pi)_n} & \text{Ker}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{K(f)_n} & \text{Ker}(h'_n) \\
k_n^P \downarrow & & \downarrow k_n & & \downarrow k'_n \\
\text{Dom}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \text{Dom}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{\bar{f}_n} & \text{Dom}(h'_n) \\
h_n^P \downarrow & & \downarrow h_n & \dashrightarrow & \downarrow h'_n \\
P_n & \xrightarrow{\pi_n} & \text{Cod}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{\underline{f}_n} & \text{Cod}(h'_n)
\end{array}$$

We are going to prove that, for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , there exists a unique arrow  $i_n^P$  such that  $i_n^P \cdot K(\pi)_n = C(\pi)_{n+1} \cdot i_n$ . This makes  $\mathcal{N}(f_\bullet) = \{h_n^P, i_n^P\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  an object of  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$ .

Existence: first, we check that  $C(\pi)_{n+1} \cdot i_n \cdot k_n \cdot h_n^P = 0$ . For this, we compose with the projections of the pullback  $P_n$ :

- $C(\pi)_{n+1} \cdot i_n \cdot k_n \cdot h_n^P \cdot \pi_n = C(\pi)_{n+1} \cdot i_n \cdot k_n \cdot h_n = C(\pi)_{n+1} \cdot i_n \cdot 0 = 0$
- $C(\pi)_{n+1} \cdot i_n \cdot k_n \cdot h_n^P \cdot \pi'_n = C(\pi)_{n+1} \cdot i_n \cdot k_n \cdot \bar{f}_n = C(\pi)_{n+1} \cdot i_n \cdot K(f)_n \cdot k'_n = C(\pi)_{n+1} \cdot C(f)_{n+1} \cdot i'_n \cdot k'_n = 0$  where, to justify the last equality, we precompose with the epimorphism  $q_{n+1}^P$ :
- $q_{n+1}^P \cdot C(\pi)_{n+1} \cdot C(f)_{n+1} \cdot i'_n \cdot k'_n = \pi_{n+1} \cdot \underline{f}_{n+1} \cdot q'_{n+1} \cdot i'_n \cdot k'_n = \pi'_{n+1} \cdot h'_{n+1} \cdot q'_{n+1} \cdot i'_n \cdot k'_n = \pi'_{n+1} \cdot 0 \cdot i'_n \cdot k'_n = 0$

Now, from  $C(\pi)_{n+1} \cdot i_n \cdot k_n \cdot h_n^P = 0$ , we get a unique arrow  $i_n^P$  such that  $i_n^P \cdot k_n^P = C(\pi)_{n+1} \cdot i_n \cdot k_n$ . This can be rewritten as  $i_n^P \cdot K(\pi)_n \cdot k_n = C(\pi)_{n+1} \cdot i_n \cdot k_n$ . Since  $k_n$  is a monomorphism, we can conclude that  $i_n^P \cdot K(\pi)_n = C(\pi)_{n+1} \cdot i_n$ .

Uniqueness: this easily follows composing with the monomorphism  $k_n^P = K(\pi)_n \cdot k_n$ .  $\square$

**5.5.** Based on the description of the  $\Theta_\Delta$ -kernel in  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  contained in the proof of Proposition 5.4, we list here some special cases of  $\Theta_\Delta$ -kernels involved in the snail sequence.

1. The  $n$ -th level of the  $\Theta_\Delta$ -kernel of  $\text{id}_{h_\bullet}$  is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\text{Dom}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \text{Dom}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \text{Dom}(h_n) \\
\text{id} \downarrow & & \downarrow h_n & \dashrightarrow & \downarrow h_n \\
\text{Dom}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{h_n} & \text{Cod}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \text{Cod}(h_n)
\end{array}$$

and the  $n$ -th connecting arrow of  $\mathcal{N}(\text{id}_{h_\bullet})$  is  $\text{id}: 0 \rightarrow 0$ .

2. The  $n$ -th level of the  $\Theta_\Delta$ -kernel of  $0_{h_\bullet}$  is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Dom}(h_n) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & \dashrightarrow & \downarrow h_n \\ \text{Ker}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{k_{h_n}} & 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Cod}(h_n) \end{array}$$

and the  $n$ -th connecting arrow of  $\mathcal{N}(0_{h_\bullet})$  is  $0: \text{Ker}(h_{n+1}) \rightarrow 0$ .

3. The  $n$ -th level of the morphism  $\eta_{h_\bullet}: h_\bullet \rightarrow \pi_0(h_\bullet)$  is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Dom}(h_n) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ h_n \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Cod}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{c_{h_n}} & \text{Cok}(h_n) \end{array}$$

and the  $n$ -th connecting arrow of  $\pi_0(h_\bullet)$  is  $0: \text{Cok}(h_{n+1}) \rightarrow 0$ .

4. The  $n$ -th level of the factorization  $\bar{h}_\bullet: \mathcal{N}(\text{id}_{h_\bullet}) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\eta_{h_\bullet})$  of  $n_{\text{id}_{h_\bullet}}: \mathcal{N}(\text{id}_{h_\bullet}) \rightarrow h_\bullet$  through  $n_{\eta_{h_\bullet}}: \mathcal{N}(\eta_{h_\bullet}) \rightarrow h_\bullet$  (see Definition 4.3) is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Dom}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \text{Dom}(h_n) \\ \text{id} \downarrow & & \downarrow \bar{h}_n \\ \text{Dom}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{\bar{h}_n} & \text{Ker}(c_{h_n}) \end{array}$$

where  $\bar{h}_n$  is the factorization of  $h_n$  through the kernel of its cokernel.

**5.6.** Assume now that the category  $\mathcal{A}$  has pullbacks. Thanks to Proposition 5.4, we can perform the construction of Section 3 in the category with nullhomotopies  $(\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A}), \Theta_\Delta)$ . Starting from a morphism  $f_\bullet: h_\bullet \rightarrow h'_\bullet$ , we get a sequence

$$\mathcal{N}(0_{\mathcal{N}(f_\bullet)}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}(0_{h_\bullet}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}(0_{h'_\bullet}) \longrightarrow \pi_0(\mathcal{N}(f_\bullet)) \longrightarrow \pi_0(h_\bullet) \longrightarrow \pi_0(h'_\bullet)$$

Keeping in mind the various special cases of  $\Theta_\Delta$ -kernels described in 5.5, we can make the previous sequence explicit. Here it is from level  $n+1$  to level  $n$ :

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Ker}(h_{n+1}^P) & \xrightarrow{K(\pi)_{n+1}} & \text{Ker}(h_{n+1}) & \xrightarrow{K(f)_{n+1}} & \text{Ker}(h'_{n+1}) & \xrightarrow{\langle 0, k'_{n+1} \rangle \cdot q'_{n+1}} & \text{Cok}(h_{n+1}^P) & \xrightarrow{C(\pi)_{n+1}} & \text{Cok}(h_{n+1}) & \xrightarrow{C(f)_{n+1}} & \text{Cok}(h'_{n+1}) \\ \text{id} \downarrow & & \text{id} \downarrow \\ \text{Ker}(h_{n+1}^P) & \xrightarrow{K(\pi)_{n+1}} & \text{Ker}(h_{n+1}) & \xrightarrow{K(f)_{n+1}} & \text{Ker}(h'_{n+1}) & \xrightarrow{\langle 0, k'_{n+1} \rangle \cdot q'_{n+1}} & \text{Cok}(h_{n+1}^P) & \xrightarrow{C(\pi)_{n+1}} & \text{Cok}(h_{n+1}) & \xrightarrow{C(f)_{n+1}} & \text{Cok}(h'_{n+1}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Ker}(h_n^P) & \xrightarrow{K(\pi)_n} & \text{Ker}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{K(f)_n} & \text{Ker}(h'_n) & \xrightarrow{\langle 0, k'_n \rangle \cdot q'_n} & \text{Cok}(h_n^P) & \xrightarrow{C(\pi)_n} & \text{Cok}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{C(f)_n} & \text{Cok}(h'_n) \end{array}$$

**5.7.** Consider now a class  $\mathcal{S}$  of arrows in  $\mathcal{A}$  and extend it to a classe, still denoted by  $\mathcal{S}$ , of morphisms in  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  taking as  $\mathcal{S}$ -morphisms in  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  those morphisms  $f_\bullet: h_\bullet \rightarrow h'_\bullet$  such that both  $\overline{f}_n$  and  $\underline{f}_n$  are in  $\mathcal{S}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Since all the objects involved are discrete, and thanks to Remark 5.2, the  $\mathcal{S}$ -exactness in  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  of the sequence in 5.6 amounts to the  $\mathcal{S}$ -exactness in  $\mathcal{A}$ , for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , of the sequence

$$\mathrm{Ker}(h_n^P) \xrightarrow{K(\pi)_n} \mathrm{Ker}(h_n) \xrightarrow{K(f)_n} \mathrm{Ker}(h'_n) \xrightarrow{\langle 0, k'_n \rangle \cdot q'_n} \mathrm{Cok}(h_n^P) \xrightarrow{C(\pi)_n} \mathrm{Cok}(h_n) \xrightarrow{C(f)_n} \mathrm{Cok}(h'_n)$$

**5.8.** Let us observe also that the connecting arrows of the sequentiable families  $\mathcal{N}(f_\bullet)$ ,  $h_\bullet$  and  $h'_\bullet$  allow us to past together all the six-term sequences in  $\mathcal{A}$ , getting a long sequence as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc} \mathrm{Ker}(h_{n+1}^P) & \xrightarrow{K(\pi)_{n+1}} & \mathrm{Ker}(h_{n+1}) & \xrightarrow{K(f)_{n+1}} & \mathrm{Ker}(h'_{n+1}) & \xrightarrow{\langle 0, k'_{n+1} \rangle \cdot q'_{n+1}} & \mathrm{Cok}(h_{n+1}^P) & \xrightarrow{C(\pi)_{n+1}} & \mathrm{Cok}(h_{n+1}) & \xrightarrow{C(f)_{n+1}} & \mathrm{Cok}(h'_{n+1}) \\ & & & & \nearrow i_n^P & & \nearrow i_n & & \nearrow i'_n & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & \\ \mathrm{Ker}(h_n^P) & \xrightarrow{K(\pi)_n} & \mathrm{Ker}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{K(f)_n} & \mathrm{Ker}(h'_n) & \xrightarrow{\langle 0, k'_n \rangle \cdot q'_n} & \mathrm{Cok}(h_n^P) & \xrightarrow{C(\pi)_n} & \mathrm{Cok}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{C(f)_n} & \mathrm{Cok}(h'_n) \end{array}$$

Here is an ad hoc condition which ensures the preservation of exactness of the six-term sequences in  $\mathcal{A}$  when we past them all together.

**Definition 5.9.** We denote by  $\mathbf{IsoSeq}(\mathcal{A})$  the full subcategory of  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  of the isosequentiable families, that is, those families  $h_\bullet = \{h_n, i_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  such that  $i_n$  is an isomorphism for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

**Corollary 5.10.** Let  $f_\bullet: h_\bullet \rightarrow h'_\bullet$  be a morphism in  $\mathbf{IsoSeq}(\mathcal{A})$ . Take as  $\mathcal{S}$  the class of regular epimorphisms in  $\mathcal{A}$  and extend  $\mathcal{S}$  to  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  as in 5.7. Consider the following sequences, the first one being in  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  and the second one being in  $\mathcal{A}$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc} \mathcal{N}(0_{\mathcal{N}(f_\bullet)}) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{N}(0_{h_\bullet}) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{N}(0_{h'_\bullet}) & \longrightarrow & \pi_0(\mathcal{N}(f_\bullet)) & \longrightarrow & \pi_0(h_\bullet) & \longrightarrow & \pi_0(h'_\bullet) \\ \\ \mathrm{Ker}(h_{n+1}^P) & \xrightarrow{K(\pi)_{n+1}} & \mathrm{Ker}(h_{n+1}) & \xrightarrow{K(f)_{n+1}} & \mathrm{Ker}(h'_{n+1}) & \xrightarrow{\langle 0, k'_{n+1} \rangle \cdot q'_{n+1}} & \mathrm{Cok}(h_{n+1}^P) & \xrightarrow{C(\pi)_{n+1}} & \mathrm{Cok}(h_{n+1}) & \xrightarrow{C(f)_{n+1}} & \mathrm{Cok}(h'_{n+1}) \\ & & & & & & \nearrow C(f)_{n+1} \cdot i'_n = i_n \cdot K(f)_n & & & & \\ \mathrm{Ker}(h_n^P) & \xrightarrow{K(\pi)_n} & \mathrm{Ker}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{K(f)_n} & \mathrm{Ker}(h'_n) & \xrightarrow{\langle 0, k'_n \rangle \cdot q'_n} & \mathrm{Cok}(h_n^P) & \xrightarrow{C(\pi)_n} & \mathrm{Cok}(h_n) & \xrightarrow{C(f)_n} & \mathrm{Cok}(h'_n) \\ & & & & & & \nearrow C(f)_n \cdot i'_{n-1} = i_{n-1} \cdot K(f)_{n-1} & & & & \\ \mathrm{Ker}(h_{n-1}^P) & \xrightarrow{K(\pi)_{n-1}} & \mathrm{Ker}(h_{n-1}) & \xrightarrow{K(f)_{n-1}} & \mathrm{Ker}(h'_{n-1}) & \xrightarrow{\langle 0, k'_{n-1} \rangle \cdot q'_{n-1}} & \mathrm{Cok}(h_{n-1}^P) & \xrightarrow{C(\pi)_{n-1}} & \mathrm{Cok}(h_{n-1}) & \xrightarrow{C(f)_{n-1}} & \mathrm{Cok}(h'_{n-1}) \end{array}$$

1. If  $\mathcal{A}$  is regular and protomodular and if  $\mathcal{N}(f_\bullet)$ ,  $h_\bullet$  and  $h'_\bullet$  are  $\mathcal{S}$ -proper, then the six-term sequence in  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  and each row of the long sequence in  $\mathcal{A}$  are  $\mathcal{S}$ -exact.
2. If moreover  $h_\bullet$  and  $h'_\bullet$  are isosequentiable, then the long sequence in  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -exact at each point.

*Proof.* 1. By Propositions 4.5 and 4.8, the six-term sequence in  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -exact. Therefore, by point 5.7, each horizontal row of the long sequence is  $\mathcal{S}$ -exact. Note that we can use Propositions 4.5 and 4.8 because the class  $\mathcal{S}$  satisfies Conditions 4.1 and 4.6. The argument for  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  is the same as for  $\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A})$ , see Example 4.9.

2. By assumption, the connecting arrows  $i_n$  and  $i'_n$  are now isomorphisms. Therefore, we can paste vertically the different rows and we are done.  $\square$

**Remark 5.11.** As already observed in Example 4.9 in the case  $(\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A}), \Theta_\Delta)$ , each object of  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -global and, if  $\mathcal{A}$  is abelian, it is also  $\mathcal{S}$ -proper. Therefore, in the abelian case, the assumptions in Corollary 5.10 that  $\mathcal{N}(h_\bullet)$ ,  $h_\bullet$  and  $h'_\bullet$  are  $\mathcal{S}$ -proper are redundant.

**Remark 5.12.** In general, the  $\Theta_\Delta$ -kernel of a morphism between isosequentic families is not isosequentic. The second item of point 5.5 provides a counterexample: the  $\Theta_\Delta$ -kernel of the initial morphism  $0 \rightarrow h_\bullet$  is isosequentic precisely when each  $h_n$  has trivial kernel.

## 6 From chain complexes to sequentic families

As in Section 5, we fix a category  $\mathcal{A}$  with a zero object  $0$ , kernels and cokernels. The category of chain complexes in  $\mathcal{A}$  will be denoted by  $\mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$  and a typical object will be depicted as

$$C_\bullet: \quad \dots C_{n+1} \xrightarrow{d_{n+1}^C} C_n \xrightarrow{d_n^C} C_{n-1} \xrightarrow{d_{n-1}^C} C_{n-2} \dots$$

**6.1.** In this section, we fix as class  $\mathcal{S}$  of arrows in  $\mathcal{A}$  the class of regular epimorphisms and we write proper instead of  $\mathcal{S}$ -proper. By Example 4.9, we already know that an arrow in  $\mathcal{A}$  is proper (in the sense that its factorization through the kernel of its cokernel is a regular epimorphism) iff it is proper as an object of  $(\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A}), \Theta_\Delta)$ . Similarly, for a sequentic family  $h_\bullet = \{h_n, i_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ , to be proper as an object of  $(\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A}), \Theta_\Delta)$  amounts to the fact that each  $h_n$  is a proper arrow. By analogy, we will say that a complex  $C_\bullet \in \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$  is proper if each  $d_n^C$  is a proper arrow. In this way, our terminology for complexes agrees with the terminology introduced in [7].

**6.2.** Let us start this last section looking more carefully at the classical link between the snake lemma and the long homology sequence in the abelian case (see for example [19]). Given an extension of complexes

$$A_\bullet \xrightarrow{f_\bullet} B_\bullet \xrightarrow{g_\bullet} C_\bullet$$

we get a family of extensions in  $\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A})$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A_n & \xrightarrow{f_n} & B_n & \xrightarrow{g_n} & C_n \\ d_n^A \downarrow & & d_n^B \downarrow & & d_n^C \downarrow \\ A_{n-1} & \xrightarrow{f_{n-1}} & B_{n-1} & \xrightarrow{g_{n-1}} & C_{n-1} \end{array}$$

that is,  $g_n$  is the cokernel of  $f_n$  and  $f_n$  is the kernel of  $g_n$ , and this for each  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Nevertheless, in order to get the homology sequence, we do not apply the snake lemma directly to these extensions. Instead, we factorize each one of them and we get a new family of dotted commutative diagrams (notation  $\mathcal{F}(-)$  is explained in Proposition 6.3)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} A_n & \xrightarrow{f_n} & B_n & \xrightarrow{g_n} & C_n & & \\ & \searrow q_n^A & & \searrow q_n^B & & \searrow q_n^C & \\ & \text{Cok}(d_{n+1}^A) & \xrightarrow{\overline{\mathcal{F}f_n}} & \text{Cok}(d_{n+1}^B) & \xrightarrow{\overline{\mathcal{F}g_n}} & \text{Cok}(d_{n+1}^C) & \\ & \downarrow h_n^{\mathcal{F}A} & & \downarrow h_n^{\mathcal{F}B} & & \downarrow h_n^{\mathcal{F}C} & \\ & \text{Ker}(d_{n-1}^A) & \xrightarrow{\underline{\mathcal{F}f_n}} & \text{Ker}(d_{n-1}^B) & \xrightarrow{\underline{\mathcal{F}g_n}} & \text{Ker}(d_{n-1}^C) & \\ & \swarrow k_n^A & & \swarrow k_n^B & & \swarrow k_n^C & \\ A_{n-1} & \xrightarrow{f_{n-1}} & B_{n-1} & \xrightarrow{g_{n-1}} & C_{n-1} & & \end{array}$$

Finally we apply the snake lemma to this second family of diagrams (this is possible because  $\overline{\mathcal{F}g_n}$  is still the cokernel of  $\overline{\mathcal{F}f_n}$  and  $\underline{\mathcal{F}f_n}$  is still the kernel of  $\underline{\mathcal{F}g_n}$ ) and we get the long exact sequence in homology. Indeed, the kernel of  $h_n^{\mathcal{F}A}$  is the homology object  $H_n(A_\bullet)$  and the cokernel of  $h_n^{\mathcal{F}A}$  is the homology object  $H_{n-1}(A_\bullet)$ , and the same holds for the complexes  $B_\bullet$  and  $C_\bullet$ . The sequentiable families of arrows in  $\mathcal{A}$  arise precisely from this intermediate construction, as formalized in the next proposition.

**Proposition 6.3.** *From any complex  $C_\bullet \in \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ , we obtain a sequentiable family of arrows  $\mathcal{F}(C_\bullet) = \{h_n^{\mathcal{F}C}, i_n^{\mathcal{F}C}\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  depicted hereunder (from level  $n+1$  to level  $n$ )*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
C_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{q_{n+1}^C} & \text{Cok}(d_{n+2}^C) \\
\downarrow d_{n+1}^C & \searrow k(d_{n+1}^C) & \downarrow h_{n+1}^{\mathcal{F}C} \\
& & \text{Ker}(d_n^C) \\
& \searrow q(d_{n+1}^C) & \downarrow q_{n+1}^{\mathcal{F}C} \\
& & \text{Cok}(h_{n+1}^{\mathcal{F}C}) \\
& \searrow k_n^C & \downarrow i_n^{\mathcal{F}C} \\
C_n & & \text{Ker}(h_n^{\mathcal{F}C}) \\
\downarrow d_n^C & \searrow q_n^C & \downarrow k_n^{\mathcal{F}C} \\
& & \text{Cok}(d_{n+1}^C) \\
& \searrow k(d_n^C) & \downarrow h_n^{\mathcal{F}C} \\
& & \text{Ker}(d_{n-1}^C) \\
& \searrow q(d_n^C) & \\
C_{n-1} & \xleftarrow{k_{n-1}^C} & 
\end{array}$$

where  $k(d_n^C)$  is the unique arrow such that  $k(d_n^C) \cdot k_{n-1}^C = d_n^C$  and  $q(d_n^C)$  is the unique arrow such that  $q_n^C \cdot q(d_n^C) = d_n^C$ . The components of the family  $\mathcal{F}(C_\bullet)$  are as follows:

- $h_n^{\mathcal{F}C}$  is the unique arrow such that  $q_n^C \cdot h_n^{\mathcal{F}C} = k(d_n^C)$  or, equivalently, the unique arrow such that  $h_n^{\mathcal{F}C} \cdot k_{n-1}^C = q(d_n^C)$ .
- $i_n^{\mathcal{F}C}$  is the unique arrow such that  $q_{n+1}^{\mathcal{F}C} \cdot i_n^{\mathcal{F}C} \cdot k_n^{\mathcal{F}C} = k_n^C \cdot q_n^C$ .

This construction extends to a functor

$$\mathcal{F}: \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) \longrightarrow \mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$$

Moreover, if  $\mathcal{A}$  is regular and protomodular, then the family  $\mathcal{F}(C_\bullet)$  is isosequentiable provided that the complex  $C_\bullet$  is proper.

In particular, if  $\mathcal{A}$  is abelian, we get a functor  $\mathcal{F}: \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathbf{IsoSeq}(\mathcal{A})$ .

*Proof.* The equivalence between the two possible definitions of  $h_n^{\mathcal{F}C}$  comes from the fact that  $q_n^C$  is an epimorphism and  $k_{n-1}^C$  is a monomorphism. As far as  $i_n^{\mathcal{F}C}$  is concerned, observe that, since  $q_{n+1}^C$  is an epimorphism,  $\text{Cok}(h_{n+1}^{\mathcal{F}C}) = \text{Cok}(k(d_{n+1}^C))$ . Similarly, since  $k_{n-1}^C$  is a monomorphism,  $\text{Ker}(h_n^{\mathcal{F}C}) = \text{Ker}(q(d_n^C))$ . Now the argument runs as usual:

since  $k(d_{n+1}^C) \cdot k_n^C \cdot q_n^C = 0$ , there exists a unique  $j_n: \text{Cok}(k(d_{n+1}^C)) \rightarrow \text{Cok}(d_{n+1}^C)$  such that  $q_{n+1}^{\mathcal{F}C} \cdot j_n = k_n^C \cdot q_n^C$ . Since moreover  $j_n \cdot q(d_n^C) = 0$  (precompose with  $q_{n+1}^{\mathcal{F}C}$ ), there exists a unique  $i_n^{\mathcal{F}C}$  such that  $i_n^{\mathcal{F}C} \cdot k_n^{\mathcal{F}C} = j_n$ .

The construction of a morphism  $\mathcal{F}(g_\bullet) = \{\overline{\mathcal{F}g_n}, \underline{\mathcal{F}g_n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}: \mathcal{F}(B_\bullet) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(C_\bullet)$  from a morphism  $g_\bullet: B_\bullet \rightarrow C_\bullet$  in  $\mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$  has been already depicted in the last diagram of 6.2 and the functoriality of the construction is obvious. Let us check just that  $\mathcal{F}(g_\bullet)$  is indeed a morphism in  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$ :

$$- \frac{\mathcal{F}g_{n+1}}{q_{n+1}^{\mathcal{F}B}} \cdot q_{n+1}^{\mathcal{F}C} \cdot i_n^{\mathcal{F}C} \cdot k_n^{\mathcal{F}C} = \underline{\mathcal{F}g}_{n+1} \cdot k_n^C \cdot q_n^C = k_n^B \cdot g_n \cdot q_n^C = k_n^B \cdot q_n^B \cdot \overline{\mathcal{F}g}_n =$$

Finally, keeping in mind what we have observed above about  $\text{Cok}(h_{n+1}^{\mathcal{F}C})$  and  $\text{Ker}(h_n^{\mathcal{F}C})$ , the fact that  $\mathcal{F}(C_\bullet)$  is isosequenciable if  $C_\bullet$  is proper and  $\mathcal{A}$  is regular and protomodular follows from Lemma 4.5.1 in [2]. The special case follows once again because in an abelian category all arrows are proper.  $\square$

**6.4.** Let us point out explicitly from the proof of Proposition 6.3 that the homology objects of the complex  $C_\bullet$  can be recovered, for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , as  $H_n(C_\bullet) = \text{Cok}(h_{n+1}^{\mathcal{F}C})$  or, equivalently, as  $H_n(C_\bullet) = \text{Ker}(h_n^{\mathcal{F}C})$ . In other words, for an isosequenciable family  $h_\bullet$ , we can put  $H_n(h_\bullet) = \text{Cok}(h_{n+1})$  or  $H_n(h_\bullet) = \text{Ker}(h_n)$ . In this way, if  $\mathcal{A}$  is regular and protomodular and if we consider proper complexes, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}} & \mathbf{IsoSeq}(\mathcal{A}) \\ & \searrow H_n & \swarrow H_n \\ & \mathcal{A} & \end{array}$$

commutes (up to isomorphism) for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . We can relate this fact to Remark 5.12: for a complex  $C_\bullet$ , the  $\Theta_\Delta$ -kernel of the initial morphism  $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(C_\bullet)$  is isosequenciable precisely when  $C_\bullet$  is acyclic.

**Lemma 6.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a regular category.*

1. *Consider the following situation*

$$A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \xrightarrow{h} D$$

*If  $f \cdot g \cdot h$  is proper,  $f$  is an epimorphism and  $h$  is a monomorphism, then  $g$  is proper.*

2. *If a complex  $C_\bullet$  is proper, then the associated sequenciable family  $\mathcal{F}(C_\bullet)$  is proper.*

*Proof.* 1. We split the proof in two parts.

(a) We assume that  $a = g \cdot h$  is proper and  $h$  is a monomorphism and we show that  $g$  is proper. Consider the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & B & & \\ & \swarrow \bar{a} & & \searrow \bar{g} & \\ \text{Ker}(c_a) & \xrightarrow{s} & & \xrightarrow{t} & \text{Ker}(c_g) \\ \downarrow k_{c_a} & \swarrow a & & \searrow g & \downarrow k_{c_g} \\ D & \xrightarrow{h} & C & & \\ \downarrow c_a & & \downarrow c_g & & \\ \text{Cok}(a) & \xrightarrow{h'} & \text{Cok}(g) & & \end{array}$$

Since  $k_{c_g} \cdot h \cdot c_a = 0$ , there exists a unique arrow  $t$  such that  $t \cdot k_{c_a} = k_{c_g} \cdot h$ . Since  $\bar{a} \cdot k_{c_a} = \bar{g} \cdot k_{c_g} \cdot h$ , with  $\bar{a}$  a regular epimorphism (because  $a$  is proper) and  $k_{c_g} \cdot h$  a monomorphism, there exists a unique arrow  $s$  such that  $\bar{a} \cdot s = \bar{g}$  and  $s \cdot k_{c_g} \cdot h = k_{c_a}$ . Composing on the left with  $\bar{a}$  and on the right with  $k_{c_a}$ , one checks that  $s \cdot t = \text{id}$ . Composing on the right with  $k_{c_g} \cdot h$ , one checks that  $t \cdot s = \text{id}$ . Therefore,  $\bar{a}$  and  $\bar{g}$  are equal up to an isomorphism, so that  $\bar{g}$  is a regular epimorphism, that is,  $g$  is proper.

(b) We assume that  $b = f \cdot g$  is proper and  $f$  is an epimorphism and we show that  $g$  is proper. Consider the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\
 \bar{b} \downarrow & \searrow b & \nearrow g \\
 \text{Ker}(c_b) & \xrightarrow{t} & \text{Ker}(c_g) \\
 \swarrow k_{c_b} & & \swarrow k_{c_g} \\
 & C & \\
 \swarrow c_b & & \swarrow c_g \\
 \text{Cok}(b) & \xrightarrow{s} & \text{Cok}(g)
 \end{array}$$

Since  $f$  is an epimorphism, the unique arrow  $s$  such that  $c_b \cdot s = c_g$  is an isomorphism. Therefore, the unique arrow  $t$  such that  $t \cdot k_{c_g} = k_{c_b}$  also is an isomorphism. Since  $\bar{b} \cdot t = f \cdot \bar{g}$  (compose with  $k_{c_g}$  to check this) and since  $\bar{b}$  is a regular epimorphism (because  $b$  is proper), we conclude that  $\bar{g}$  is a regular epimorphism, that is,  $g$  is proper.

2. This follows from 1. because, for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we have  $q_n^C \cdot h_n^{\mathcal{F}C} \cdot k_{n-1}^C = d_n^C$ , which is proper (notation as in Proposition 6.3).  $\square$

**Corollary 6.6.** *Let  $A$  be regular and protomodular and let  $g_\bullet: B_\bullet \rightarrow C_\bullet$  be a morphism of proper complexes. If  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}(g_\bullet))$  is proper, then we get a long exact sequence in homology*

$$\dots H_{n+1}(B_\bullet) \longrightarrow H_{n+1}(C_\bullet) \longrightarrow \text{Cok}(h_{n+1}^P) \longrightarrow H_n(B_\bullet) \longrightarrow H_n(C_\bullet) \dots$$

*In particular, if  $A$  is abelian this holds with no assumption on  $B_\bullet, C_\bullet$  and  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}(g_\bullet))$ .*

*Proof.* This is the long exact sequence of Corollary 5.10 applied to  $\mathcal{F}(g_\bullet): \mathcal{F}(B_\bullet) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(C_\bullet)$  (we need Lemma 6.5 to use Corollary 5.10). Therefore,  $\{h_n^P\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is the first component of the  $\Theta_\Delta$ -kernel  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}(g_\bullet))$  in  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  and the homology objects of  $B_\bullet$  and  $C_\bullet$  appear in the sequence as explained in 6.4.  $\square$

**6.7.** It is time to compare the long sequence of Corollary 6.6 with the usual one obtained from an extension of complexes, but this is an easy task. Assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  is regular and protomodular and consider an extension of proper complexes

$$A_\bullet \xrightarrow{f_\bullet} B_\bullet \xrightarrow{g_\bullet} C_\bullet$$

Assume also that the sequentiable family  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}(g_\bullet))$  is proper. The long exact sequence of Corollary 6.6 is obtained pasting together infinitely many copies of the six-term snail sequence coming from

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \text{Cok}(d_{n+1}^B) & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \text{Cok}(d_{n+1}^B) & \xrightarrow{\overline{\mathcal{F}g_n}} & \text{Cok}(d_{n+1}^C) \\
 h_n^P \downarrow & & \downarrow h_n^{\mathcal{F}B} & & \downarrow h_n^{\mathcal{F}C} \\
 P_n & \xrightarrow{\pi_n} & \text{Ker}(d_{n-1}^B) & \xrightarrow{\underline{\mathcal{F}g_n}} & \text{Ker}(d_{n-1}^C)
 \end{array}$$

The usual long exact sequence in homology is obtained pasting together infinitely many copies of the six-term snake sequence coming from

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathrm{Cok}(d_{n+1}^A) & \xrightarrow{\overline{\mathcal{F}f_n}} & \mathrm{Cok}(d_{n+1}^B) & \xrightarrow{\overline{\mathcal{F}g_n}} & \mathrm{Cok}(d_{n+1}^C) \\
h_n^{\mathcal{F}A} \downarrow & & \downarrow h_n^{\mathcal{F}B} & & \downarrow h_n^{\mathcal{F}C} \\
\mathrm{Ker}(d_{n-1}^A) & \xrightarrow{\underline{\mathcal{F}f_n}} & \mathrm{Ker}(d_{n-1}^B) & \xrightarrow{\underline{\mathcal{F}g_n}} & \mathrm{Ker}(d_{n-1}^C)
\end{array}$$

Since, for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , the arrow  $\overline{\mathcal{F}g_n}$  is a regular epimorphism (because  $g_n \cdot q_n^C = q_n^B \cdot \overline{\mathcal{F}g_n}$ , see 6.2, and  $g_n$  is a regular epimorphism), we can apply Proposition 4.3 in [16] and we have that the two six-term exact sequences are isomorphic. We can conclude that, in this particular case, the long exact sequence of Corollary 6.6 is nothing but the usual one

$$\dots H_{n+1}(B_\bullet) \longrightarrow H_{n+1}(C_\bullet) \longrightarrow H_n(A_\bullet) \longrightarrow H_n(B_\bullet) \longrightarrow H_n(C_\bullet) \dots$$

**6.8.** Under the same assumptions, we can reformulated point 6.7 in a more synthetic way. First, observe that the functor  $\mathcal{F}: \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  preserves kernels and regular epimorphisms (use Remark 5.2). Second, compare the kernel and the  $\Theta_\Delta$ -kernel of  $\mathcal{F}(g_\bullet)$  in  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathcal{F}(A_\bullet) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}(f_\bullet)} & \mathcal{F}(B_\bullet) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}(g_\bullet)} & \mathcal{F}(C_\bullet) \\
& \searrow \sigma & & \uparrow n_{\mathcal{F}(g_\bullet)} & \\
& & \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}(g_\bullet)) & & 
\end{array}$$

Proposition 4.3 in [16] provides the non trivial part of the proof that the comparison  $\sigma$  is a quasi-isomorphism, that is, all the induced arrows  $C(\sigma)_n$  and  $K(\sigma)_n$  are isomorphisms. Keeping in mind 6.4, this means that  $H_n(A_\bullet) \simeq H_n(\mathcal{F}(A_\bullet)) \simeq \mathrm{Cok}(h_{n+1}^P)$  and we can conclude that the long exact sequence of Corollary 6.6 is the usual long homology sequence.

**6.9.** To conclude, let us make more precise the comparison between chain complexes and sequentiable families. Assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  is preadditive (= enriched in abelian groups). Recall that, in this case, the category  $\mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$  is equipped with a structure of nullhomotopies  $\Theta_{\mathbf{Ch}}$  defined as follows. For a morphism  $g_\bullet: B_\bullet \rightarrow C_\bullet$ , a nullhomotopy  $\varphi_\bullet \in \Theta_{\mathbf{Ch}}(g_\bullet)$  is a family  $\{\varphi_n: B_n \rightarrow C_{n+1}\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  of arrows in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\varphi_n \cdot d_{n+1}^C + d_n^B \cdot \varphi_{n-1} = g_n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
B_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{g_{n+1}} & C_{n+1} \\
d_{n+1}^B \downarrow & \nearrow \varphi_n & \downarrow d_{n+1}^C \\
B_n & \xrightarrow{g_n} & C_n \\
d_n^B \downarrow & \nearrow \varphi_{n-1} & \downarrow d_n^C \\
B_{n-1} & \xrightarrow{g_{n-1}} & C_{n-1}
\end{array}$$

For morphisms  $f_\bullet: A_\bullet \rightarrow B_\bullet$  and  $h_\bullet: C_\bullet \rightarrow D_\bullet$ , the nullhomotopy  $f_\bullet \circ \varphi_\bullet \circ h_\bullet$  is defined by  $\{f_n \cdot \varphi_n \cdot h_{n+1}\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ . The structure  $\Theta_{\mathbf{Ch}}$  in  $\mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$  is not so good as the structure  $\Theta_\Delta$  in  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  is. Here is why.

1. The main problem with  $\Theta_{\mathbf{Ch}}$  is that the reduced interchange condition 2.2 is not satisfied. To see this, start with any morphism of complexes  $g_\bullet: B_\bullet \rightarrow C_\bullet$  and any

nullhomotopy  $\varphi_\bullet \in \Theta_{\mathbf{Ch}}(g_\bullet)$ . Then, construct the following diagram, where  $C_\bullet[-1]$  is the  $(-1)$ -translate of  $C_\bullet$ ,

$$C_\bullet \longrightarrow 0 \longrightarrow C_\bullet[-1]$$

equipped with the nullhomotopy given by the family of identity arrows. Explicitly:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} B_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{g_{n+1}} & C_{n+1} & \longrightarrow & 0 & \longrightarrow & C_n \\ \downarrow d_{n+1}^B & \nearrow \varphi_n & \downarrow d_{n+1}^C & \text{id} & \downarrow & \nearrow & \downarrow -d_n^C \\ B_n & \xrightarrow{g_n} & C_n & \longrightarrow & 0 & \longrightarrow & C_{n-1} \end{array}$$

The reduced interchange condition between the two depicted nullhomotopies gives  $\varphi_n \cdot 0 = g_n \cdot \text{id}_{C_n}$ , so that one would have  $g_n = 0$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

- Another problem is that, for any complex  $C_\bullet$ , the canonical arrow  $\eta_{C_\bullet} : C_\bullet \rightarrow \pi_0(C_\bullet)$  is the identity arrow. This comes from the fact that in the diagram

$$C_\bullet \longrightarrow 0 \longrightarrow C_\bullet[-1]$$

equipped with the already mentioned nullhomotopy, the left part is the  $\Theta_{\mathbf{Ch}}$ -kernel of the right part and the right part is the  $\Theta_{\mathbf{Ch}}$ -cokernel of the left part. As a consequence, in  $(\mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A}), \Theta_{\mathbf{Ch}})$  each object is  $S$ -global and  $S$ -proper (in the sense of Definition 4.2), and this whatever the class  $S$  is.

**6.10.** Recall from [17] that a morphism  $\mathcal{F} : (\mathcal{A}, \Theta_{\mathcal{A}}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{B}, \Theta_{\mathcal{B}})$  of categories with nullhomotopies is a functor  $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  equipped, for every arrow  $g : B \rightarrow C$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ , with a map

$$\mathcal{F}_g : \Theta_{\mathcal{A}}(g) \longrightarrow \Theta_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{F}(g))$$

such that  $\mathcal{F}_{f \cdot g \cdot h}(f \circ \varphi \circ h) = \mathcal{F}(f) \circ \mathcal{F}_g(\varphi) \circ \mathcal{F}(h)$  for all  $f : A \rightarrow B$  and  $h : C \rightarrow D$ .

**Proposition 6.11.** *If  $\mathcal{A}$  is preadditive, the functor  $\mathcal{F}$  of Proposition 6.3 extends to a morphism of categories with nullhomotopies*

$$\mathcal{F} : (\mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A}), \Theta_{\mathbf{Ch}}) \longrightarrow (\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A}), \Theta_{\Delta})$$

*Proof.* To start, consider a morphism of complexes  $g_\bullet : B_\bullet \rightarrow C_\bullet$  and a nullhomotopy  $\varphi_\bullet \in \Theta_{\mathbf{Ch}}(g_\bullet)$ . The situation is depicted by the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & B_n & \xrightarrow{g_n} & C_n & & \\ & q_n^B \swarrow & \downarrow d_n^B & \nearrow \varphi_{n-1} & \downarrow d_n^C & \searrow q_n^C & \\ \text{Cok}(d_{n+1}^B) & \xrightarrow{\overline{\mathcal{F}}g_n} & & & & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \text{Cok}(d_{n+1}^C) \\ \downarrow h_n^{\mathcal{F}B} & & & & & & \downarrow h_n^{\mathcal{F}C} \\ \text{Ker}(d_{n-1}^B) & \xrightarrow{\underline{\mathcal{F}}g_n} & & & & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \text{Ker}(d_{n-1}^C) \\ & k_{n-1}^B \swarrow & \downarrow d_{n-1}^B & \nearrow \varphi_{n-1} & \downarrow d_{n-1}^C & \searrow k_{n-1}^C & \\ & & B_{n-1} & \xrightarrow{g_{n-1}} & C_{n-1} & & \end{array}$$

The nullhomotopy  $\mathcal{F}(\varphi_\bullet) \in \Theta_{\Delta}(\mathcal{F}(g_\bullet))$  is defined, in degree  $n$ , by the formula

$$\mathcal{F}(\varphi)_n = k_{n-1}^B \cdot \varphi_{n-1} \cdot q_n^C$$

To check the condition  $h_n^{FB} \cdot \mathcal{F}(\varphi)_n = \overline{\mathcal{F}g}_n$ , compose on the left with the epimorphism  $q_n^B$ . To check the condition  $\mathcal{F}(\varphi)_n \cdot h_n^{FC} = \underline{\mathcal{F}g}_n$ , compose on the right with the monomorphism  $k_{n-1}^C$ . The rest of the proof is straightforward.  $\square$

**Remark 6.12.** Proposition 6.11 can be improved a bit.

1. When  $\mathcal{A}$  is preadditive, the category  $\mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$  has a 2-categorical structure: an homotopy  $\varphi_\bullet: f_\bullet \Rightarrow g_\bullet: B_\bullet \rightrightarrows C_\bullet$  is an element in  $\Theta_{\mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})}(g_\bullet - f_\bullet)$ . Explicitly,  $\varphi_\bullet$  is a family  $\{\varphi_n: B_n \rightarrow C_{n+1}\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  such that  $g_n = f_n + \varphi_n \cdot d_{n+1}^C + d_n^B \cdot \varphi_{n-1}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . A 2-cell  $[\varphi_\bullet]: f_\bullet \Rightarrow g_\bullet$  is a class of homotopies, where two homotopies  $\varphi_\bullet, \psi_\bullet: f_\bullet \Rightarrow g_\bullet$  are equivalent if there exists a family  $\{\alpha_n: B_n \rightarrow C_{n+2}\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  such that  $\varphi_n = \psi_n + \alpha_n \cdot d_{n+2}^C - d_n^B \cdot \alpha_{n-1}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ .
2. When  $\mathcal{A}$  is additive and has finite limits, there is an equivalence of categories  $\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A}) \simeq \mathbf{Grpd}(\mathcal{A})$ , where the latter is the category of internal groupoids and internal functors in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Since  $\mathbf{Grpd}(\mathcal{A})$  is a 2-category (2-cells are the internal natural transformations), using this equivalence we get a 2-categorical structure on  $\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A})$ . A 2-cell  $\varphi: (f, f_0) \Rightarrow (g, g_0): (B, b, B_0) \rightrightarrows (C, c, C_0)$  is an arrow  $\varphi: B_0 \rightarrow C$  such that  $g = f + b \cdot \varphi$  and  $g_0 = f_0 + \varphi \cdot c$ .
3. Clearly, the 2-categorical structure of  $\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A})$  can be extended level-wise to a 2-categorical structure for  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$ . It is easy to see that, in this case, the functor  $\mathcal{F}: \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  of Proposition 6.3 is a 2-functor. The argument is essentially the same as in the proof of Proposition 6.11, one has just to check that the definition of  $\mathcal{F}$  on homotopies is compatible with the equivalence relation used in  $\mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$  to define 2-cells.
4. Let us end this remark with a point of attention about the terminology introduced in point 6.8. On one hand, the name of quasi-isomorphism is justified by the fact that, by point 6.4, a morphism in  $\mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$  is a quasi-isomorphism if and only if its image under the functor  $\mathcal{F}$  is a quasi-isomorphism in  $\mathbf{IsoSeq}(\mathcal{A})$ . On the other hand, by analogy with the simpler situation of  $\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A})$ , quasi-isomorphisms in  $\mathbf{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  could be called weak equivalences. Indeed, under the biequivalence  $\mathbf{Arr}(\mathcal{A}) \simeq \mathbf{Grpd}(\mathcal{A})$  recalled above, morphisms  $(g, g_0): (B, b, B_0) \rightarrow (C, c, C_0)$  such that  $K(g)$  and  $C(g_0)$  are isomorphisms correspond to weak equivalences, that is, internal functors which are fully faithful and essentially surjective.

**Acknowledgements:** We thank Zurab Janelidze for his help with Condition 4.6 (see Remark 4.7).

## References

- [1] F. BORCEUX, Handbook of categorical algebra, vol. 2. Cambridge University Press (1994) xvii+443 pp.
- [2] F. BORCEUX, D. BOURN, Mal'cev, protomodular, homological and semi-abelian categories. Kluwer Academic Publishers (2004) xiv+479 pp.
- [3] D. BOURN,  $3 \times 3$  lemma and protomodularity, *Journal of Algebra* 236 (2001) 778–795.

- [4] D. BOURN, M. GRAN, Regular, protomodular and abelian categories. In: Categorical Foundations, M.C. Pedicchio and W. Tholen Editors, *Cambridge University Press* (2004) 169–211.
- [5] R. BROWN, Fibrations of groupoids, *Journal of Algebra* 15 (1970) 103–132.
- [6] J. DUSKIN, R. KIEBOOM, E.M. VITALE, Morphisms of 2-groupoids and low-dimensional cohomology of crossed modules, *Fields Institute Communication Series* 43 (2004) 227–241.
- [7] T. EVERAERT, T. VAN DER LINDEN, Baer invariants in semi-abelian categories II: homology, *Theory and Applications of Categories* 12 (2004) 195–224.
- [8] P. GABRIEL, M. ZISMAN, Calculus of fractions and homotopy theory, *Springer-Verlag* (1967) x+167 pp.
- [9] M. GRANDIS, A note on exactness and stability in homotopical algebra, *Theory and Applications of Categories* 9 (2001) 17–42.
- [10] P.-A. JACQMIN, Surjection-like classes of morphisms, *Theory and Applications of Categories* 39 (2023) 949–1013
- [11] P.-A. JACQMIN, S. MANTOVANI, G. METERE, E.M. VITALE, Bipullbacks of fractions and the snail lemma, *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 223 (2019) 5147–5162.
- [12] Z. JANELIDZE, The pointed subobject functor,  $3 \times 3$  lemmas, and subtractivity of spans, *Theory and Applications of Categories* 23 (2010) 221–242.
- [13] Z. JANELIDZE, E.M. VITALE, The snail lemma in a pointed regular category, *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 221 (2017) 135–143.
- [14] S. MANTOVANI, M. MESSORA, E.M. VITALE, Homotopy torsion theories, *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 228 (2024).
- [15] S. MANTOVANI, G. METERE, E.M. VITALE, The snail lemma for internal groupoids, *Journal of Algebra* 535 (2019) 1–34.
- [16] E.M. VITALE, The snail lemma, *Theory and Applications of Categories* 31 (2016) 484–501.
- [17] E.M. VITALE, Completion under strong homotopy cokernels, *Theory and Applications of Categories* 41 (2024) 168–193.
- [18] E.M. VITALE, From abelian categories to 2-abelian bicategories, *Theory and Applications of Categories* 41 (2024) 1812–1872.
- [19] C. WEIBEL, An introduction to homological algebra, Cambridge University Press (1994) xiv+450 pp.