Norwegian university of science and technology
Faculty of information technology and electronical systems
Department of mathematical sciences

Interactions between exotic algebraic models and localizing subcategories

Torgeir Aambø

0.1 Formalities

0.2 Abstract

0.3 Sammendrag

0.4 Information

This thesis consist mainly of restructured material from the papers [Aam24a], [Aam24c], [Aam24b] and [Aam25], where the candidate is the only author. In addition there are some added remarks, some further results not yet presented in any papers, some more historical background, as well as more in-depth introductions to the central ideas of the thesis.

0.5 Acknowledgements

Contents

Chapter 1.
DG-algebras

1.1 Overview of thesis

1.2 Central ideas

As a backdrop for this entire thesis lies the ubiquitous concept of ∞-*categories*, as developed by Joyal, Lurie and others — the canonical references being [Joy02], [Lur09] and [Lur17]. We will assume familiarity with ∞-categories and their associated standard constructions, and use them all willy-nilly throught the rest of the thesis.

Most ∞-categories considered will be *presentable*, in the sense of [Lur09, Chapter 5]. The $(\infty, 2)$-category of presentable ∞-categories and colimit-preserving functors, Pr^L, has a symmetric monoidal structure via the Lurie tensor product $\otimes^L$, and we will say a presentable ∞-category is *presentably symmetric monoidal* if it is a commutative monoid in Pr^L. Any such category $\mathcal{C}$ has a symmetric monoidal structure, with the property that the tensor product in $\mathcal{C}$ preserves colimits separately in each variable. The unit for the Lurie tensor product on Pr^L is the category of *spaces*, denoted $\mathcal{S}$, which is an ∞-categorical version of the classical category of topological spaces.

We will also assume knowledge about *stable* ∞-categories, which are an ∞-categorical enhancement of triangulated categories. The $(\infty, 2)$-category of presentable stable ∞-categories and exact colimit preserving functors, Pr^L_{st}, inherits a symmetric monoidal structure from Pr^L. An ∞-category $\mathcal{C}$ is a *presentably symmetric monoidal stable ∞-category* if it is a commutative monoid in Pr^L_{st}. This means that it is presentably symmetric monoidal, and the tensor product preserves the stable structure.

The unit for the Lurie tensor product on Pr^L_{st} is the category of *spectra*, denoted Sp. Given any presentable ∞-category, one can form its *stabilization*, given by formally inverting the desuspension functor Ω. The category of spectra can then be defined as the stabilization of the category of spaces.

The categories of spaces, spectra, and many other interesting categories, satisfy some even nicer conditions than merely being presentable: they have an explicit collection of generators, which satisfy some "smallness" condition.

Definition 1.2.1.

The full subcategory of compact objects will be denoted $\mathcal{C}^\omega$.

Definition 1.2.2.

The compact generator for the category of spaces, $\mathcal{S}$, are the *finite spaces*, which correspond to the classical finite CW-complexes. The compact generators for the category of spectra, Sp, are the *finite spectra*. A spectrum is finite if it is the desuspension of a suspension spectrum $\Sigma^{-n}\Sigma^\infty K$ for some number n, where K is a finite space.

In the presence of symmetric monoidal structures we have another "smallness" condition, slightly different from being compact.

Definition 1.2.3.

In a certain sense, being compact is about being small with respect to colimits, while being dualizable is about being small with respect to the monoidal structure. In very well-behaved categories, these two notion of smallness coincide.

Definition 1.2.4.

An example is again our favorite stable ∞-category Sp. Every compact object is dualizable, and conversely, every dualizable object is compact. Hence, Sp is a rigidly generated symmetric monoidal stable ∞-category.

1.2.1 Localizing subcategories and ideals

If we were to assign this thesis a single protagonist, it would be the idea of a localizing subcategory. It will heavily feature in all the different parts of the thesis:

1. In Chapter 2 we study how a specific localizing subcategory, appearing in chromatic homotopy theory, interacts with a specific homological functor.

2. In Chapter 3 we study how, in certain situations, the category of comodules over a coalgebra in a stable ∞-category forms a localizing subcategory.
3. In Chapter 4 we classify certain localizing subcategories along nicely behaved t-structures on stable ∞-categories.

Given a presentable stable ∞-category $\mathcal{C}$, one should think about a localizing subcategory as being a collection of objects in $\mathcal{C}$, that themselves form a nice presentable stable ∞-category, compatible with $\mathcal{C}$. In other words, they are the "structure preserving subcategories", in a certain precise way.

Definition 1.2.5. If $\mathcal{C}$ is a presentable stable ∞-category, then a full subcategory $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is *localizing* if it is closed under desuspensions, colimits and retracts.

This means that $\mathcal{L}$ is itself a presentable stable ∞-category, and that computing colimits in $\mathcal{L}$ is equivalent to computing colimits in $\mathcal{C}$.

Definition 1.2.6. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a presentable stable ∞-category. Given a collection of objects $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ we denote by $\mathrm{Loc}(\mathcal{K})$ the smallest localizing subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$ containing $\mathcal{K}$. We will often call it the localizing subcategory *generated* by $\mathcal{K}$.

Remark 1.2.7. If the collection $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ consists of only compact objects, in the sense of Definition 1.2.1, then the localizing subcategory $\mathrm{Loc}(\mathcal{K})$ is said to be a *compactly generated* localizing subcategory.

A presentable stable ∞-category $\mathcal{C}$ is compactly generated — as in Definition 1.2.2 — if and only if the smallest localizing subcategory containing the collection of all compact objects $\mathcal{C}^\omega$ is the entire ∞-category $\mathcal{C}$. In other words, there is an equivalence

$$\mathcal{C} \simeq \mathrm{Loc}(\mathcal{C}^\omega)$$

of presentable stable ∞-categories.

If our presentable stable ∞-category is also symmetric monoidal, then we we want a version of localizing subcategories that preserve the monoidal structure. If one thinks of a presentably symmetric monoidal stable ∞-category as a categorified version of a ring, then the natural such sub-structure should model that of an ideal in a ring.

Definition 1.2.8. If $\mathcal{C}$ is a presentably symmetric monoidal stable ∞-category, then a full subcategory $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is a *localizing $\otimes$-ideal* if it is a localizing subcategory, and for any $L \in \mathcal{L}$ and $C \in \mathcal{C}$, we have $L \otimes C \in \mathcal{L}$.

The definition of an ideal here is completely analogous to the classical setting of discrete rings.

Definition 1.2.9. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a presentably symmetric monoidal stable ∞-category. Given a collection of objects $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ we denote by $\mathrm{Loc}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{K})$ the smallest localizing $\otimes$-ideal of $\mathcal{C}$ containing $\mathcal{K}$. We will, as before, often refer to this as the localizing $\otimes$-ideal *generated* by $\mathcal{K}$.

Any ideal I in a discrete ring R is a non-unital subring of R. This is also the case for a localizing $\otimes$-ideal $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, which becomes a non-unital presentably symmetric monoidal stable ∞-category. However, in some good cases $\mathcal{L}$ is actually unital, but the unit will naturally have to be different than the unit for the monoidal structure on $\mathcal{C}$, which we denote by $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}$. The localizing ideals we study in both Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 will have this property. In particular, as we will see in the next section, anylocalizing $\otimes$-ideal which is compactly generated in the sense of Remark 1.2.7 will have this property.

1.2.2 Local duality

The theory of abstract local duality, proved in [HPS97] and generalized to the ∞-categorical setting in [BHV18], is one of the central ideas of this thesis that will show up several times.

Definition 1.2.10. A pair $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$, where $\mathcal{C}$ is a presentably symmetric monoidal stable ∞-category compactly generated by dualizable objects, and $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\omega}$ is a subset of compact objects, is called a *local duality context*.

Any choice of local duality context allows us to assign three new categories, which together decomposes the category $\mathcal{C}$.

Construction 1.2.11. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ be a local duality context. We define $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors}$ to be the localizing tensor ideal generated by $\mathcal{K}$, denoted $\mathrm{Loc}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{K})$. Further we define $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-loc}$ to be the left orthogonal complement $(\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors})^{\perp}$, i.e., the full subcategory consisting of objects $C \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(T, C) \simeq 0$ for all $T \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors}$. Similarly, define $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-comp}$ to be the left-orthogonal complement of $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-loc}$, i.e. $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-comp} = (\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-loc})^{\perp}$. These full subcategories are respectively called the $\mathcal{K}$-torsion, $\mathcal{K}$-local and $\mathcal{K}$-complete objects in $\mathcal{C}$. We have inclusions into $\mathcal{C}$, denoted $i_{\mathcal{K}-tors}$, $i_{\mathcal{K}-loc}$ and $i_{\mathcal{K}-comp}$ respectively.

By the adjoint functor theorem, [Lur09, 5.5.2.9], the inclusions $i_{\mathcal{K}-loc}$ and $i_{\mathcal{K}-comp}$ have left adjoints $L_{\mathcal{K}}$ and $\Lambda_{\mathcal{K}}$ respectively, while $i_{\mathcal{K}-tors}$ and $i_{\mathcal{K}-loc}$ have right adjoints $\Gamma_{\mathcal{K}}$ and $V_{\mathcal{K}}$ respectively. These are then, by definition, localizations and colocalizations. Since the torsion, local and complete objects are ideals, these localizations and colocalizations are compatible with the symmetric monoidal structure of $\mathcal{C}$, in the sense of [Lur17, 2.2.1.7]. In particular, by [Lur17, 2.2.1.9] we get unique induced symmetric monoidal structures such that $L_{\mathcal{K}}$, $\Lambda_{\mathcal{K}}$, $\Gamma_{\mathcal{K}}$ and $V_{\mathcal{K}}$ are symmetric monoidal functors.

For any $X \in \mathcal{C}$, these functors assemble into two cofiber sequences:

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{K}}X \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow L_{\mathcal{K}}X \quad \text{and} \quad V_{\mathcal{K}}X \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow \Lambda_{\mathcal{K}}X.$$

Note also that these functors only depend on the localizing subcategory $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors}$, not on the particular choice of generators $\mathcal{K}$. Thus, when the set $\mathcal{K}$ is clear from the context, we often omit it as a subscript when writing the functors.

The following theorem is a slightly restricted version of the abstract local duality theorem of [HPS97, 3.3.5] and [BHV18, 2.21].

Theorem 1.2.12. *Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ be a local duality context. Then*

1. *the functors* Γ *and* L *are* smashing, *meaning that there are natural equivalences* $\Gamma X \simeq X \otimes \Gamma \mathbb{1}$ *and* $LX \simeq X \otimes L\mathbb{1}$,

2. *the functors* Λ *and* V *are* cosmashing, *meaning there are natural equivalences* $\Lambda X \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(\Gamma\mathbb{1}, X)$ *and* $VX \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(L\mathbb{1}, X)$, *and*

3. *the functors* $\Gamma\colon \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-comp} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors}$ *and* $\Lambda\colon \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-comp}$ *are mutually inverse symmetric monoidal equivalences of categories,*

This can be summarized by the following diagram of adjoints

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-loc} \arrow[d, shift right=3, "L"'] \arrow[d, shift left=3, "V"] \arrow[ddr, dashed, bend left] & \\
 & \mathcal{C} \arrow[u, shift right=1] \arrow[u, shift left=1] \arrow[dl, shift left, "\Gamma"] \arrow[dr, shift left, "\Lambda"] & \\
\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors} \arrow[ur, shift left] \arrow[uur, dashed, bend left] \arrow[rr, "\simeq"] & & \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-comp} \arrow[ul, shift left]
\end{tikzcd}$$

Remark 1.2.13. Theorem 1.2.12 implies, in particular, that the symmetric monoidal structure induced by the localization L and the colocalization Γ is just the symmetric monoidal structure on $\mathcal{C}$ restricted to the full subcategories. This is not the case for $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-comp}$, where the symmetric monoidal structure is given by $\Lambda(- \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} -)$. The functor V also induces a symmetric monoidal structure on $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-loc}$, but this coincides with the one induced by L, due to their associated endofunctors on $\mathcal{C}$ defining an adjoint symmetric monoidal monad-comonad pair. Note that we will not need or focus on the functor V, hence it will usually be omitted from the local duality diagrams for the rest of the thesis.

Example 1.2.14. The object $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}/p$ is compact in $\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{Z})_{(p)}$, hence $(D(\mathbb{Z})_{(p)}, \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}/p)$ forms a local duality context. The category of local objects, $\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{Z})_{(p)}^{\mathcal{K}-loc}$, has objects in which p is invertible. But, as all other primes are already invertible, all of these are necessarily rational, giving $\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{Z})_{(p)}^{\mathcal{K}-loc} \simeq \mathrm{D}(\mathbb{Q})$. The category $\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{Z})_{(p)}^{\mathcal{K}-tors}$ is equivalent to the category of derived p-torsion objects in $\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{Z})_{(p)}$. Dually, the category $\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{Z})_{(p)}^{\mathcal{K}-comp}$ is equivalent to the derived p-

complete objects in $\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{Z})_{(p)}$, which gives a local duality diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & \mathrm{D}(\mathbb{Q}) \arrow[d, shift left] \arrow[ddr, dashed, bend left] & \\
 & \mathrm{D}(\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}) \arrow[u, shift left, "L_p"] \arrow[dl, shift left, "\Gamma^p"] \arrow[dr, shift left, "\Delta_p"] & \\
\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{Z}_{(p)})^{p-tors} \arrow[ur, shift left] \arrow[rr, "\simeq"] \arrow[uur, dashed, bend left] & & \mathrm{D}(\mathbb{Z}_{(p)})^{p-comp} \arrow[ul, shift left]
\end{tikzcd}$$

1.2.3 Chromatic homotopy theory

The following introduction to chromatic homotopy theory is inspred by [BB19].

1.2.3.1 Fracture squares and field objects

In light of Waldhausen's viewpoint of stable homotopy theory as an enhancement of algebra, usually called *brave new algebra*, one should view the category of spectra Sp as a homotopical enrichment of the derived category of abelian groups $\mathrm{D}(\mathbb{Z})$. We know that abelian groups can be studied one prime at the time, which corresponds to studying $D(\mathbb{Z})_{(p)}$, the p-local derived category. In [Bou79], Bousfield developed a general machinery for studying localizations on Sp, by inverting maps that are equivalences with respect to some spectrum F. The corresponding localization dunctor is denoted L_F. We can then create p-localization on Sp, by Bousfield localizing at the p-local Moore spectrum $M\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$. On homotopy groups this has the effect of p-localizing, i.e., inverting all primes except for p. The category of p-local spectra, denoted $\mathrm{Sp}_{(p)}$, should then be thought of as a homotopical enrichment of $D(\mathbb{Z})_{(p)}$.

Remark 1.2.15. Both $L_{(p)}\colon D(\mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow D(\mathbb{Z})_{(p)}$ and $L_{(p)}\colon \mathrm{Sp} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Sp}_{(p)}$ are smashing localizations.

The study of $D(\mathbb{Z})_{(p)}$ can be further reduced to the study of its "atomic pieces", which are the minimal localizing subcategories.

Definition 1.2.16. A localizing subcategory $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is said to be *minimal* if any proper localizing subcategory $\mathcal{L}' \subset \mathcal{L}$ is (0).

Remark 1.2.17. If $\mathcal{L}$ is a minimal localizing subcategory, then any non-zero object $K \in \mathcal{L}$ generates $\mathcal{L}$ as $\mathrm{Loc}_{\mathcal{C}}(K) \simeq \mathcal{L}$.

The study of minimal localizing subcategories is tightlu connected to local duality, as in Section 1.2.2. By [BHV18, 2.26], we get from any local duality diagram a fracture square, which for the local duality context $(D(\mathbb{Z})_{(p)}, \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}/p)$ above gives the classical arithmetic fracture square

$$\begin{tikzcd} \mathbb{Z}_{(p)} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathbb{Z}_p \arrow[d] \\ \mathbb{Q} \arrow[r] & \mathbb{Q} \otimes \mathbb{Z}_p \end{tikzcd}$$

which decomposes $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ into a rational part and a p-complete part. This also extends to a general chain complex $A \in D(\mathbb{Z})_{(p)}$, where we have a homotopy pullback square

$$\begin{tikzcd} A \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & A_p^{\wedge} \arrow[d] \\ \mathbb{Q} \otimes A \arrow[r] & \mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} A_p^{\wedge} \end{tikzcd}$$

where $(-)_p^{\wedge}$ denotes derived p-completion as in CREF. We can then wonder whether these also give our minimal localizing subcategories, which is indeed the case.

Proposition 1.2.18. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a minimal localizing subcategory of $D(\mathbb{Z})_{(p)}$. Then either $\mathcal{L} \simeq D(\mathbb{Q})$ or $\mathcal{L}$ is the category of derived p-complete objects, $\mathcal{L} \simeq D(\mathbb{Z})_p^{\wedge}$.*

Now, if $\mathrm{Sp}_{(p)}$ is supposed to be a homotopical enrichment, we should expect there to be an analogy of this decomposition for p-local spectra, which is indeed the case. The first to study such squares in topology was Sullivan in his 1970 MIT notes, where he constructed the analogous square for nilpotent spaces, see [Sul05, 3.20]. This was later lifted up to spectra by Bousfield in [Bou79, 2.9], and takes the following form.

If $\mathbb{S}_{(p)}$ denotes the p-local sphere spectrum, we have a spectral artithmetic fracture square

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathbb{S}_{(p)} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathbb{S}_p^\wedge \arrow[d] \\
H\mathbb{Q} \arrow[r] & H\mathbb{Q} \otimes \mathbb{S}_p^\wedge
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $\mathbb{S}_p^\wedge$ denotes the p-complete sphere. This also extends to any object $X \in \mathrm{Sp}_{(p)}$, just like for $A \in D(\mathbb{Z})_{(p)}$.

We can then ask the same natural question as we did above: do these give all the minimal localizing subcategories of $\mathrm{Sp}_{(p)}$? Recall that this was indeed the case before, but now, this is no longer true. In fact, we now have an infinite sequence of minimal localizing subcategories, indexed by a natural number n, interpolating between the rational spectra $\mathrm{Sp}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and the p-complete spectra $\mathrm{Sp}_p^\wedge$. [1]

We can identify these "intermediary" subcategories by an analysis of field objects. For $D(\mathbb{Z})_{(p)}$ there are exactly two field objects associated to $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$, namely $\mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathbb{F}_p$. For $Sp_{(p)}$ we have a field object for any number $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, usually denoted $K(n)$, or $K_p(n)$ if we want to remember the prime. As we have $K(0) = H\mathbb{Q}$ and $K(\infty) = H\mathbb{F}_p$, this sequence of field objects really forms an interpolation between the two field objects coming from algebra.

Notation 1.2.19. The object $K_p(n)$ is called the *height n Morava K-theory*. Its associated minimal localizing subcategory is the category of $K(n)$-local spectra, denoted $\mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)}$.

These field objects $K_p(n)$ were constructed by Morava in the early 70's, and the categories $\mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)}$ have been under intense

[1] In fact even more is true: By [Bur+23], there are at least two such infinite sequences. We can make sure that there is a single such sequence if we translate over to tensor-triangulated ideals of compact objects, but for the above exposition, we have chosen to push these details under a huge telescope-shaped rug.

study ever since. We do not cover precise constructions here and instead refer the interested reader to [HS99].

Proposition 1.2.20. *Let p be a prime and n a natural number. The height n Morava K-theory spectrum $K_p(n)$ is a complex oriented $\mathbb{E}_1$-ring spectrum with coefficients*

$$K_p(n)_* := \pi_* K_p(n) \simeq \mathbb{F}_p[v_n^{\pm}],$$

with $|v_n| = 2p^n - 2$, whose associated formal group is the height n Honda formal group. Furthermore, for any two spectra $X, Y \in$ Sp, there is a Künneth isomorphism

$$K_p(n)_*(X \times Y) \simeq K_p(n)_* X \otimes_{K_p(n)_*} K_p(n)_* Y.$$

Remark 1.2.21. While the $\mathbb{E}_1$-ring structure on $K_p(n)$ can be shown to be essentially unique, it does admit uncountably many $\mathbb{E}_1$-MU-algebra structures – see [Ang11].

So, how are these new field objects related to the fracture squares above? If the $\mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)}$'s form minimal localizing subcategories, then we should, by the previous discussion, expect there to be an infinite sequence of pullback squares converging to $\mathbb{S}_{(p)}$. This is indeed the case.

Let $L_n := L_{K_p(0) \vee \cdots \vee K_p(n)}$. By Ravenel's smash product theorem, see [Rav92, 7.5.6], the functor $L_n \colon \mathrm{Sp}_{(p)} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Sp}_{(p)}$ is a smashing localization (CREF), hence the relevant fracture squares for the two bottom cases $n = 0$ and $n = 1$ are given by

$$\begin{tikzcd} L_1\mathbb{S} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & L_{K(1)}\mathbb{S} \arrow[d] \\ H\mathbb{Q} \arrow[r] & H\mathbb{Q} \otimes L_{K(1)}\mathbb{S} \end{tikzcd} \qquad \begin{tikzcd} L_2\mathbb{S} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & L_{K(2)}\mathbb{S} \arrow[d] \\ L_1\mathbb{S} \arrow[r] & L_1\mathbb{S} \otimes L_{K(2)}\mathbb{S} \end{tikzcd}$$

making the general square have the form

$$\begin{tikzcd} L_n\mathbb{S} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & L_{K_p(n)}\mathbb{S} \arrow[d] \\ L_{n-1}\mathbb{S} \arrow[r] & L_{n-1}\mathbb{S} \otimes L_{K_p(n)}\mathbb{S} \end{tikzcd}$$

This is called the *chromatic fracture square*, see for example [Hov95, 4.3]. The spectra $L_n\mathbb{S}$ assemble into a tower

$$\cdots \longrightarrow L_3\mathbb{S} \longrightarrow L_2\mathbb{S} \longrightarrow L_1\mathbb{S} \longrightarrow L_0\mathbb{S} = L_{\mathbb{Q}}\mathbb{S}$$

called the chromatic filtration, and by the chromatic convergence theorem of Hopkins-Ravenel, see [Rav92, 7.5.7], we can recover $\mathbb{S}_{(p)}$ as the limit of this diagram.

1.2.3.2 Morava E-theories

In the previous section, we obtained a localization functor L_n, which collected the information coming from height 0 up to, and including, height n. This localization is good for many purposes, but when we later want to tie the homotopy theory to algebra, we need another approach. In particular, we want a spectrum E such that localizing at E is the same as using L_n, but with some additional better properties. There are several approaches to obtaining such a spectrum E, and the goal of this short section is to give a brief overview of the ones we will need later. We will assume general knowledge about formal groups – all needed background can be found in [Rav86, Appendix 2].

Remark 1.2.22. Let p be a prime and k be a perfect field of characteristic p. Lubin and Tate proved in [LT66] that for any formal group law F of height n over k, there is a universal deformation $\bar{F}$ over the *Lubin-Tate ring* $E(k, F) = \mathbb{W}(k)[\![u_1, \ldots, u_{n-1}]\!]$ of formal power series over the Witt vectors of k. Using the algebraic geometry of formal groups, Morava interpreted this universal deformation as a normal bundle over a formal neighborhood of the height n Honda formal group law, leading to a spectrum E_n^{Mor}.

Using the theory of manifolds with singularities developed by Baas-Sullivan (see [Baa73a] and [Baa73b]), Johnson and Wilson constructed in [JW75] an alternative spectrum exhibiting the same information as Morava's spectrum. Using Landweber's exact functor theorem, we can obtain a simpler description.

Definition 1.2.23. Let p be a prime, n a natural number and $E(n)_* := \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[v_1, \ldots, v_{n-1}, v_n^{\pm}]$. The ideal $(p, v_1, \ldots, v_{n-1})$ is a regular invariant ideal, meaning in particular that $E(n)_*$ is Landweber exact. In particular, there is a spectrum $E(n)$, called the height n *Johnson-Wilson theory*, with coefficients $E(n)_*$.

Remark 1.2.24. The construction of $E(n)$ has the added benefit that quotienting by the maximal ideal $I_n = (p, v_1, \ldots, v_{n-1})$ gives $E(n)_*/I_n \cong \mathbb{F}_p[v_n^{\pm}] = K_p(n)_*$. This can also be suitably interpreted as a quotient of spectra.

Definition 1.2.25. An $\mathbb{E}_1$-ring spectrum R is said to be concentrated in degrees divisible by q if $\pi_k R \cong 0$ for all $k \neq 0 \bmod q$.

Proposition 1.2.26. *Let p be a prime and n a natural number. Height n Johnson-Wilson theory $E(n)$ is a complex oriented, Landweber exact, $\mathbb{E}_1$-ring spectrum concentrated in degrees divisible by $2p-2$.*

Later, using a 2-periodic analogue of the universal deformation theory of Lubin and Tate, Hopkins and Miller constructed a 2-periodic $\mathbb{E}_1$-version of Morava's spectrum, which was later enhanced to an $\mathbb{E}_\infty$-ring spectrum E_n via Goerss–Hopkins theory, see [GH04] or [PV22] for a modern treatment. In essence, Hopkins–Miller constructed a functor from pairs (k, F) of a perfect field k of characteristic p, together with a choice of height n formal group law F, to even periodic ring spectra. For a specific choice of (k, F), we can summarize the properties as follows.

Proposition 1.2.27. *Let p be a prime, k a perfect field of characteristic p, and F a formal group law of height n over k. The spectrum $E(k, F)$ is a 2-periodic, complex oriented, Landweber exact, $\mathbb{E}_\infty$-ring spectrum, such that $\pi_0 E(k, F) = \mathbb{W}(k)[\![u_1, \ldots, u_{n-1}]\!]$ and the associated formal group law is the universal deformation of F.*

Definition 1.2.28. For the specific choice $(k, F) = (\mathbb{F}_{p^n}, H_n)$ we simply write $E(\mathbb{F}_{p^n}, H_n) = E_n$, and call it the height n *Morava E-theory.*

Remark 1.2.29. One can also study maps of ring spectra $E_n \longrightarrow K_n$ such that the induced map on homotopy groups is given by taking the quotient by the maximal ideal, just as in Remark 1.2.24. Such spectra K_n are 2-periodic versions of Morava K-theory and have been studied, for example, in [HL17] and [BP23].

Remark 1.2.30. One nice benefit with E_n over $E(n)$ is that the former is $K(n)$-local, making its chromatic behavior even more interesting. In fact, the unit map $L_{K_p(n)}\mathbb{S} \longrightarrow E_n$ is a pro-Galois extension in the sense of [Rog08], where the Galois group is the extended Morava stabilizer group $\mathbb{G}_n$, see [DH04]. We can, however, fix this by instead using a completed version $\widehat{E}(n)$, often called *completed Johnson-Wilson theory*. It has most of the same properties as that of $E(n)$, except that it is $K_p(n)$-local and its coefficients are p-adic and I_n-complete: $\widehat{E}(n)_* \simeq \mathbb{Z}_p[v_1, \cdots, v_{n-1}, v_n^{\pm}]^{\wedge}_{I_n}$.

Remark 1.2.31. An $\mathbb{E}_\infty$-version of Morava's original spectrum E_n^{Mor} can be recovered from E_n by taking the homotopy fixed points with respect to the Galois action $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{F}_{p^n}/\mathbb{F}_p) \cong \mathbb{Z}/n$. Another alternative is to use $E_n^{h\mathbb{F}_p^\times}$. This spectrum is concentrated in degrees divisible by $2p-2$, hence serves as a nice $\mathbb{E}_\infty$-version of the $\mathbb{E}_1$-ring spectrum $E(n)$. This is the model of E used, for example, in Barkan's monoidal algebraicity theory, see [Bar23].

We have now introduced several versions of E-theory, all in light of trying to understand the localization functor L_n. Hence, we round off this section by stating that the Bousfield localizations at any of the above E-theories are equivalent.

Proposition 1.2.32 ([Hov95, 1.12])**.** *Let p be a prime and n a natural number. Then there are symmetric monoidal equivalences of stable ∞-categories*

$$\mathrm{Sp}_n \simeq \mathrm{Sp}_{E(n)} \simeq \mathrm{Sp}_{E(k,F)} \simeq \mathrm{Sp}_{E_n} \simeq \mathrm{Sp}_{\widehat{E}(n)} \simeq \mathrm{Sp}_{E_n^{h\mathbb{F}_p^\times}}.$$

In fact, if E is any Landweber exact v_n-periodic spectrum, then Sp_E is equivalent to the above categories.

Notation 1.2.33. We will use the common notation Sp_n for any of the above categories.

Remark 1.2.34. Note that even though the different models for Sp_n are equivalent, some of them have non-equivalent associated module categories. For example, $\mathrm{Mod}_{E_n} \not\simeq \mathrm{Mod}_{E(n)}$, as the ring spectra E_n and $E(n)$ have different periodicity – the former is 2-periodic while the latter is $(2p^n - 2)$-periodic. Whenever such a distinction is relevant, we will make this explicit.

1.2.4 Hopf algebroids and their comodules

Definition 1.2.35. A (graded) *Hopf algebroid* is a cogroupoid object (A, Ψ) in the category of graded commutative rings.

The use of Hopf algebroids in situations related to homotopy theory was studied by Ravenel in [Rav86, A.1] and later in more detail by Hovey in [Hov04].

Remark 1.2.36. In the literature outside of topology, the assumptions of being commutative and graded are usually not present. But, as all our examples will be of this kind, we keep in line with the topological tradition.

Definition 1.2.37. Let (A, Ψ) be a Hopf algebroid. A Ψ-*comodule* is an A-module M together with a coassociative and counital map $\psi\colon M \longrightarrow M \otimes_A \Psi$. The category of comodules over (A, Ψ) is denoted Comod_Ψ.

Example 1.2.38. For any commutative graded ring A, the pair (A, A) is a called a *discrete Hopf algebroid.* The category of comodules over this Hopf algebroid is the normal abelian category Mod_A of modules over A.

Remark 1.2.39. In algebraic geometry, Hopf algebroids are usually formulated dually as groupoid objects in affine schemes. The left and right unit maps $A \rightrightarrows \Psi$ induces a presentation of stacks $\mathrm{Spec}(\Psi) \rightrightarrows \mathrm{Spec}(A)$, and the category Comod_Ψ is equivalent to the category of quasi-coherent sheaves on the presented stack, see [Nau07, Thm 8].

Construction 1.2.40. Given an Adams Hopf algebroid (A, Ψ), we can define a discretization map $\varepsilon\colon (A, \Psi) \longrightarrow (A, A)$, which is given by the identity on A and the counit on Ψ. By [Rav86, A1.2.1] and [BHV18, 4.6] it induces a faithful exact forgetful functor $\varepsilon_*\colon \mathrm{Comod}_\Psi \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_A$ with a right adjoint ε^* given by $\varepsilon^*(M) \simeq \Psi \otimes_A M$. A comodule in the essential image of ε^* is called an *extended comodule*.

Definition 1.2.41. We say a Hopf algebroid (A, Ψ) is of *Adams type* if Ψ is a filtered colimit $\mathrm{colim}_k \Psi_k \simeq \Psi$ of dualizable comodules Ψ_k.

Proposition 1.2.42 ([Hov04, 1.3.1, 1.4.1])**.** *Let (A, Ψ) be an Adams Hopf algebroid. Then, the category Comod_Ψ is a Grothendieck abelian category generated by the dualizable comodules. There is a symmetric monoidal product $- \otimes_\Psi -$, which on the underlying modules is the normal tensor product of A-modules. It has a right adjoint $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_\Psi(-,-)$, making Comod_Ψ a closed symmetric monoidal category.*

As in **??**, we have certain objects that are especially important — the compact objects and the dualizable objects. In Grothendieck abelian categories it is, in addition, important to understand the injective objects. This will also become important later in **??**, as we will use injective objects to approximate other objects and to build certain spectral sequences.

Proposition 1.2.43. *Let (A, Ψ) be an Adams Hopf algebroid. A Ψ-comodule M is dualizable if and only if its underlying A-module $\varepsilon_* M$ is dualizable, i.e., it is finitely generated and projective. Similarly, a Ψ-comodule is compact if and only if its underlying A-module is compact, which coincides with being finitely presented.*

Proof. The first claim is [Hov04, 1.3.4] and the second is [Hov04, 1.4.2]. □

Remark 1.2.44. As colimits in Comod_Ψ are exact and are computed in Mod_A, all the dualizable comodules are compact. Hence, the full subcategory of dualizable comodules is a set of compact generators for Comod_Ψ.

Proposition 1.2.45 ([HS05b, 2.1])**.** *Let (A, Ψ) be an Adams Hopf alebroid. If I is an injective object in Comod_Ψ, then there is an injective A-module Q, such that I is a retract of the extended comodule $\Psi \otimes_A Q$.*

Remark 1.2.46. Note that as Comod_Ψ is Grothendieck abelian, it has enough injective objects. This allows us to construct injective resolutions and thus Ext-groups, which we will see later, greatly help in computing information in stable homotopy theory. For example, the pair $(\mathbb{F}_2, \mathcal{A}_*)$ where $\mathcal{A}_*$ is the dual Steenrod algebra is a Hopf algebroid, and the groups $\mathrm{Ext}^s_{\mathcal{A}_*}(\mathbb{F}_2, \mathbb{F}_2)$ are used in the Adams spectral sequence to approximate homotopy groups of spheres, see [Ada58].

Given an Adams Hopf algebroid (A, Ψ), we also have an associated derived category. By [Hov04, 2.1.2, 2.1.3] the category of chain complexes of Ψ-comodules, Ch_Ψ, has a cofibrantly generated stable symmetric monoidal model structure. In [BR11] this model structure was modified slightly to more easily compare it to the periodic derived category, which we will consider more closely in Chapter 2. The homotopy category associated to this model structure is the usual unbounded derived category $D(\mathrm{Comod}_\Psi)$ associated to the Grothendieck abelian category Comod_Ψ.

Notation 1.2.47. We will use $D(\Psi)$ as our notation for the underlying symmetric monoidal stable ∞-category associated with the above model structure. The monoidal unit is A, treated as a chain complex centered in degree 0.

Remark 1.2.48. We warn the reader that some authors use the notation $D(\Psi)$ to reffer to the above-mentioned periodic derived category of (A, Ψ). This is the case, for example, in [Pst21].

We also get an induced discretization adjunction on the level of derived categories.

Proposition 1.2.49. *Let (A, ψ) be an Adams Hopf algebroid. Then the discretization adjunction $(\varepsilon_* \dashv \varepsilon^*) \colon \mathrm{Comod}_\Psi \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_A$ induces an adjunction $(\varepsilon_* \dashv \varepsilon^*) \colon D(\Psi) \longrightarrow D(A)$.*

Proof. This follows from the fact that Ψ is flat over A, which implies that both ε_* and ε^* on the abelian categories are exact. ☐

1.2.5 Torsion and completion for comodules

There are two approaches to studying torsion and completion in $D(\Psi)$ – one "internal" and one "external". The internal approach uses the classical theory of torsion objects in abelian categories, while the external uses local duality, as in **??**. These two approaches are luckily equivalent in the situations we are interested in.

We first review the abelian situation: the internal approach. We follow [BHV18] and [BHV20] in notation and results.

Definition 1.2.50. Let A be a commutative ring and $I \subseteq R$ a finitely generated ideal. The I-power torsion of an A-module M is defined as

$$T_I^A M = \{x \in M \mid I^k x = 0 \text{ for some } k \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

We say a module M is I*-torsion* if the natural map $T_I^A M \longrightarrow M$ is an isomorphism.

Definition 1.2.51. Let A be a commutative ring and $I \subseteq R$ a finitely generated ideal. The I-adic completion of an A-module M is defined as

$$C_I^A M = \lim_k A/I^k \otimes_A M.$$

We say a module M is I*-adically complete* if the natural map $M \longrightarrow C_I^A M$ is an isomorphism.

Remark 1.2.52. The resulting category of I-adically complete modules is not very well-behaved. The I-adic completion functor is often neither left nor right exact, and the category is often not abelian. To fix these issues, Greenlees and May introduced the notion of L-complete modules in [GM92], using instead the zeroth left derived functor $L = \mathbb{L}_0 C_I^A$. Thus, it is also sometimes referred to as derived completion. One then defines *I-complete* modules, also called L-complete or derived complete, to be those R-modules such that the natural map $M \longrightarrow LM$ is an equivalence.

Notation 1.2.53. We denote the full subcategory consisting of I-power torsion A-modules by Mod_A^{I-tors} and the full subcategory of I-complete A-modules by Mod_A^{I-comp}.

Remark 1.2.54. The category Mod_A^{I-tors} is a Grothendieck abelian category. On the other hand, Mod_A^{I-comp} is abelian, but not Grothendieck in general. It is, however, the abelian category of contramodules over the I-adic completion of A, see [Pos22]. CITE

The inclusion of the full subcategory $\mathrm{Mod}_A^{I-tors} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_A$ has a right adjoint, which coincides with the I-power torsion $T_I^A(-)$. This gives the I-power torsion another description as the colimit

$$T_I^A M \cong \mathrm{colim}_k \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_A(A/I^k, M).$$

We want to extend the construction of I-torsion and L-complete modules to general Adams Hopf algebroids (A, Ψ). For this, we need to choose sufficiently nice ideals that interact nicely with the additional comodule structure.

Definition 1.2.55. Let (A, Ψ) be an Adams Hopf algebroid, and I an ideal in A. We say I is an invariant ideal if, for any comodule M, the comodule IM is a subcomodule of M. If I is finitely generated by $(x_1, \ldots, x_r)$ and x_i is non-zero-divisor in $R/(x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1})$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, r$, then we say I is regular.

Definition 1.2.56. Let (A, Ψ) be an Adams Hopf algebroid and $I \subseteq A$ a regular invariant ideal. The I-power torsion of a comodule M is defined as

$$T_I^\Psi M = \{x \in M \mid I^k x = 0 \text{ for some } k \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

We say a comodule M is I-torsion if the natural map $T_I^\Psi M \longrightarrow M$ is an equivalence.

Remark 1.2.57. By [BHV18, 5.10] the full subcategory of I-torsion comodules, which we denote $\mathrm{Comod}_{\Psi}^{I-tors}$, is a Grothendieck abelian category. It also inherits a symmetric monoidal structure from Comod_{Ψ}. This also makes $\mathrm{Mod}_{A}^{I-tors}$ Grothendieck abelian and symmetric monoidal by Example 1.2.38.

Remark 1.2.58. Unfortunately, the corresponding versions of I-adically complete and L-complete comodules do not form abelian categories in general, as we can have problems with the comodule structure on certain cokernels.

As for the case of modules, the inclusion $\mathrm{Comod}_{\Psi}^{I-tors} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Comod}_{\Psi}$ has a right adjoint that corresponds to the I-power torsion construction T_I^{Ψ}. This, by [BHV18, 5.5] also has the alternative description

$$T_I^{\Psi} M \cong \mathrm{colim}_k\, \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_{\Psi}(A/I^k, M).$$

The construction of I-power torsion in Mod_A and Comod_{Ψ} are completely analogous, so one can wonder whether they agree on the underlying modules. This turns out to be the case.

Lemma 1.2.59 ([BHV18, 5.7])**.** *For any Ψ-comodule M there is an isomorphism of A-modules $\varepsilon_* T_I^{\Psi} M \cong T_I^{A} \varepsilon_* M$. Furthermore, if an A-module N is I-power torsion, then the extended comodule $\Psi \otimes_A N$ is I-power torsion. In particular, a Ψ-comodule M is I-power torsion if and only if the underlying A-module is I-power torsion.*

As mentioned above, we will later make use of injectives in $\mathrm{Comod}_{\Psi}^{I-tors}$. Hence, we relate some facts about these.

Lemma 1.2.60. *Let (A, Ψ) be an Adams Hopf algebroid and I a regular invariant ideal.*

1. *If J is an injective in Comod_{Ψ} then $T_I^{\Psi} J$ is an injective in $\mathrm{Comod}_{\Psi}^{I-tors}$.*
2. *There are enough injectives in $\mathrm{Comod}_{\Psi}^{I-tors}$.*
3. *Any injective J' in $\mathrm{Comod}_{\Psi}^{I-tors}$ is a retract of an object of the form $T_I^{\Psi} J$ for an injective Ψ-comodule J.*

Proof. The first point is [BS12, 2.1.4], while the second is a consequence of $\mathrm{Comod}_\Psi^{I-tors}$ being Grothendieck abelian, as mentioned in Remark 1.2.57. The third point is stated in the proof of [BHV20, 3.16]. □

Remark 1.2.61. Choosing a discrete Hopf algebroid (A, A), Lemma 1.2.60 implies that injectives in Mod_A^{I-tors} are retracts of $T_I^A(Q)$ for some injective A-module Q and that T_I^A preserves injectives. As noted in Proposition 1.2.45, an injective object in Comod_Ψ is a retract of an extended comodule of the form $\Psi \otimes_A Q$ for an injective A-module Q. This means that all injectives J in $\mathrm{Comod}_\Psi^{I-tors}$ are retracts of $T_I^\Psi(\Psi \otimes_A Q)$ where Q is an injective A-module.

Remark 1.2.62. As colimits in $\mathrm{Comod}_\Psi^{I-tors}$ are computed in Comod_Ψ, we have, similar to Proposition 1.2.43, that an I-power torsion Ψ-comodule M is dualizable (resp. compact) if and only if its underlying A-module is finitely generated and projective (resp. finitely presented).

Lemma 1.2.63. *Let (A, Ψ) be an Adams Hopf algebroid, where A is noetherian and $I \subseteq A$ a regular invariant ideal. Then $\mathrm{Comod}_\Psi^{I-tors}$ is generated under filtered colimits by the compact I-power torsion comodules.*

Proof. By [BHV20, 3.4] $\mathrm{Comod}_\Psi^{I-tors}$ is generated by the set

$$\mathrm{Tors}_\Psi^{fp} := \{G \otimes A/I^k \mid G \in \mathrm{Comod}_\Psi^{fp}, k \geqslant 1\},$$

where Comod_Ψ^{fp} is the full subcategory of dualizable Ψ-comodules. Since I is finitely generated and regular, A/I^k is finitely presented as an A-module, hence it is compact in $\mathrm{Comod}_\Psi^{I-tors}$ by Proposition 1.2.43 and Remark 1.2.62. As A is noetherian, being finitely generated and finitely presented coincide. The tensor product of finitely generated modules is finitely generated, hence any element in Tors_Ψ^{fp} is compact. □

Remark 1.2.64. The assumption that the ring A is noetherian can most likely be removed, but it makes no difference to the results in this paper.

Notation 1.2.65. Since $\mathrm{Comod}_\Psi^{I-tors}$ is Grothendieck abelian we have an associated derived stable ∞-category $D(\mathrm{Comod}_\Psi^{I-tors})$ which we denote simply by $D(\Psi^{I-tors})$.

We now move to the external approach, using local duality as in Section 1.2.2.

Construction 1.2.66. Let (A, Ψ) be an Adams Hopf algebroid and $I \subseteq A$ a regular invariant ideal. Then A/I, treated as a complex concentrated in degree zero, is by [BHV18, 5.13] a compact object in $D(\Psi)$. Thus, $(D(\Psi), A/I)$ is a local duality context, and we can consider the corresponding local duality diagram

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
 & D(\Psi)^{I-loc} \arrow[d, shift left] \arrow[ddr, dashed, bend left] & \\
 & D(\Psi) \arrow[u, shift left, "L_I^\Psi"] \arrow[dl, shift left, "\Gamma_I^\Psi"] \arrow[dr, shift left, "\Delta_I^\Psi"] & \\
D(\Psi)^{I-tors} \arrow[ur, shift left] \arrow[uur, dashed, bend left] \arrow[rr, "\simeq"] & & D(\Psi)^{I-comp} \arrow[ul, shift left]
\end{tikzcd}
$$

where we have used the superscript I instead of A/I for simplicity. This gives, in particular, a definition of I-torsion objects in $D(\Psi)$ as $D(\Psi)^{I-tors}$.

Our goal was to give two constructions and prove that they were equal in the cases we were interested in.

Lemma 1.2.67 ([BHV20, 3.7(2)])**.** *Let (A, Ψ) be an Adams Hopf algebroid and $I \subseteq A$ a regular invariant ideal. There is an equivalence of categories*

$$D(\Psi)^{I-tors} \simeq D(\Psi^{I-tors}).$$

Furthermore, an object $M \in D(\Psi)$ is I-torsion if and only if the homology groups H_*M are I-power torsion Ψ-comodules.

Remark 1.2.68. One can wonder whether the same is true for the I-complete derived category, but this is unfortunately not true as $\mathrm{Comod}_\Psi^{I-comp}$ is not abelian. A partial result can, however, be recovered for discrete Hopf algebroids (A, A).

We follow [BHV20] in the following construction.

Construction 1.2.69. Recall that Mod_A^{I-comp} denotes the category of L-complete A-modules for $I \subseteq A$ a regular ideal. By [BHV20, 2.11] the category has enough projectives, hence by [Lur17, 1.3.2] we can associate to it the right bounded category $D^-(\mathrm{Mod}_A^{I-comp})$. This has a by [Lur17, 1.3.2.19, 1.3.3.16] a left complete t-structure with heart equivalent to Mod_A^{I-comp}. We can then form its right completion, which we denote $\overline{D}(\mathrm{Mod}_A^{I-comp})$, and call the completed derived category of Mod_A^{I-comp}.

This is what allows us the partial version of Lemma 1.2.67 in the case of I-completion.

Proposition 1.2.70 ([BHV20, 3.7(1)])**.** *Let A be a commutative ring and $I \subseteq A$ a regular ideal. Then, there is an equivalence*

$$D(\mathrm{Mod}_A)^{I-comp} \simeq \overline{D}(\mathrm{Mod}_A^{I-comp}),$$

where the former category is the full subcategory of A/I-complete objects in $D(\mathrm{Mod}_A)$ while the latter is the completed derived category of Mod_A^{I-comp}.

1.3 Summaries

1.3.1 Paper 1

In [PP21] the authors prove, among other things, an algebraicity result for chromatic homotopy theory, based on earlier work by Franke in [Fra96] and Pstrągowski in [Pst21]. More precisely they prove that there is an equivalence of homotopy k-categories

$$h_k\mathrm{Sp}_n \simeq h_k\mathrm{D}^{per}(\mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E})$$

for all primes p and chromatic heights n such that $k = 2p - 2 - n^2 - n > 0$. The main goal of the first paper of this thesis, [Aam24a], is to prove a similar result for the category $\mathrm{Sp}_{K_p(n)}$.

Theorem 1.3.1. *If p is a prime number, and n a non-negative integer such that $k = 2p - 2 - n^2 - n > 0$, then there is an equivalence of homotopy k-categories*

$$h_k\mathrm{Sp}_{K_p(n)} \simeq \mathrm{D}^{per}(\mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E})^{\wedge}_{I_n},$$

where $I_n \subseteq \pi_*E_n$ is the height n Landweber ideal.

1.3.2 Paper 2

Positselski's comodule-contramodule correspondence, see CITE, gives an adjunction between comodules and contramodules over coalgebras in certain categories — like vector spaces over a field. In many nice cases this adjunction is actually an equivalence, for example when the coalgebra K is co-separable.

We had two central goals for the second paper, [Aam24c]:

1. Set up a Positselski duality for cocommutative coalgebras in symmetric monoidal ∞-categories.

2. Prove that for compactly generated symmetric monoidal stable ∞-categories, Positselski duality recovers local duality, in the sense of CITE.

The latter would give new categorical descriptions of categories of interest, like $\mathrm{Sp}_{K_p(n)}$ and $\mathrm{D}(R)_p^\wedge$, as certain categories of contramodules. Admittedly, these new descriptions does not offer any great new insight into the categories, but having a description of "algebraic nature" can often be enlightening in itself, as it could allow us to pull in ideas from other areas of mathematics.

Theorem 1.3.2. *If $\mathcal{C}$ is a presentably symmetric monoidal ∞-category, and $C \in \mathcal{C}$ a cocummutative coidempotent coalgebra, then there is an equivalence*

$$\mathrm{Comod}_C(\mathcal{C}) \simeq \mathrm{Contra}_C(\mathcal{C})$$

of symmetric monoidal ∞-categories.

Example 1.3.3. In the case $\mathcal{C} = \mathrm{Sp}_n$ and $C = \mathcal{M}_n\mathbb{S}$, we get symmetric monoidal equivalences

$$\mathrm{Comod}_{\mathcal{M}_n\mathbb{S}}(\mathrm{Sp}_n) \simeq \mathcal{M}_n \text{ and } \mathrm{Contra}_{\mathcal{M}_n\mathbb{S}}(\mathrm{Sp}_n) \simeq \mathrm{Sp}_{K_p(n)}.$$

1.3.3 Paper 3

In paper 1 we studied a specific interaction between a localizing subcategory of an abelian category, and a localizing subcategory of a stable ∞-category. More precicely, we studied how the adapted homology theory $E_*\colon \mathrm{Sp}_n \longrightarrow \mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}$ could be restricted to an adapted homology theory $E_*\colon \mathcal{M}_n \longrightarrow \mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}^{I_n-tors}$, where $\mathcal{M}_n$ is a localizing subcategory of Sp_n, while $\mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}^{I_n-tors}$ is a localizing subcategory of Comod_{E_*E}.

These former homology theory has an associated category of synthetic spectra, Syn_E, which is a presentable stable ∞-category with a right complete t-structure compatible with filtered colimits. The heart of this category is precicely Comod_{E_*E}.

Motivated by this setup the goal of the paper [Aam24b] is to understand how to lift localizing subcategories of an abelian category $\mathcal{A}$ through a t-structure on a stable ∞-category $\mathcal{C}$, with a t-structure with heart $\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit \simeq \mathcal{A}$. Using an analogous prestable classification due to Lurie in CITE, we proved the following classification result.

Theorem 1.3.4. *If $\mathcal{C}$ is a presentable stable ∞-category, with a right complete t-structure $(\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}, \mathcal{C}_{\leqslant 0})$, compatible with filtered colimits, then there are one-to-one correspondences*

$$\left\{\begin{matrix}\pi\text{-}\textit{exact localizing}\\ \textit{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}\end{matrix}\right\} \simeq \left\{\begin{matrix}\textit{separating localizing}\\ \textit{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}\end{matrix}\right\} \simeq \left\{\begin{matrix}\textit{localizing}\\ \textit{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}\end{matrix}\right\}.$$

Chapter 1.
DG-algebras

Abstract. Using Patchkoria–Pstrągowski's version of Franke's algebraicity theorem, we prove that the category of $K_p(n)$-local spectra is exotically equivalent to the category of derived I_n-complete periodic comodules over the Adams Hopf algebroid (E_*, E_*E) for large primes. This gives a finite prime result analogous to the asymptotic algebraicity for $\mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)}$ of Barthel–Schlank–Stapleton.

2.1 Introduction

The central idea in chromatic homotopy theory is to study the symmetric monoidal stable ∞-category of spectra, Sp, via its smaller building blocks. These are the categories Sp_n and $\mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)}$ of E_n-local and $K_p(n)$-local spectra, where $E = E_n$ is Morava E-theory, and $K_p(n)$ is Morava K-theory, see for example [HS99]. These categories depend on a prime p and an integer n, called the height. For a fixed height n, increasing the prime p makes both categories behave more algebraically. This manifests itself, for example, in the E-Adams spectral sequence of signature

$$E_2^{s,t}(L_n\mathbb{S}) = \mathrm{Ext}^{s,t}_{E_*E}(E_*, E_*) \Longrightarrow \pi_{t-s}L_n\mathbb{S}$$

computing the homotopy groups of the E-local sphere. By the smash product theorem of Ravenel, see [Rav92, 7.5.6], this spectral sequence has a horizontal vanishing line at a finite page. If $p > n+1$, this vanishing line appears already on the second page, where the information is completely described by the homological algebra of Comod_{E_*E}—the Grothendieck abelian category of comodules over the Hopf algebroid (E_*, E_*E).

Increasing the prime p correspondingly increases the distance between objects appearing in the E-Adams spectral sequence. When $2p-2$ exceeds n^2+n, there is no longer room for any differentials, and the spectral sequence in fact collapses to an isomorphism

$$\pi_*L_n\mathbb{S} \cong \mathrm{Ext}^{*,*}_{E_*E}(E_*, E_*),$$

for degree reasons. In other words, the homotopy groups are completely algebraic in this range.

A natural question to ask is whether this collapse is a feature solely of the E-Adams spectral sequence or if it is a feature of the category Sp_n. More precisely, is the entire category of E-local spectra algebraic, in the sense that it is equivalent to a derived category of an abelian category, whenever $2p-2 > n^2+n$? What about the category of $K_p(n)$-local spectra?

At height $n = 0$, both categories Sp_n and $\mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)}$ is the category of rational spectra $\mathrm{Sp}_{\mathbb{Q}}$, which can be seen to be equivalent to the derived ∞-category of rational vector spaces, but at positive heights $n > 0$, there can never be an equivalence of ∞-categories $\mathrm{Sp}_n \simeq \mathrm{D}(\mathcal{A})$ or $\mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)} \simeq \mathrm{D}(\mathcal{A})$.

However, in [Bou85] Bousfield showed that for $p > 2$ and $n = 1$, that there is an equivalence of homotopy categories

$$h\mathrm{Sp}_{1,p} \simeq h\mathrm{Fr}_{1,p},$$

where Fr_n is a certain derived ∞-category of twisted comodules over (E_*, E_*E). As this cannot be lifted to an equivalence of ∞-categories, it is sometimes referred to as an *exotic* equivalence.

Franke expanded upon this in [Fra96] by conjecturing—and attempting to prove—that for $2p-2 > n^2+n$ there should be an equivalence of homotopy categories

$$h\mathrm{Sp}_n \simeq h\mathrm{Fr}_n.$$

Unfortunately, a subtle error was discovered in the proof by Patchkoria in [Pat12], but the result was recovered in [Pst21] with a slightly worse bound: $2p-2 > 2n^2+2n$. Pstrągowski also proved that this equivalence gets "stronger" the larger the prime, where we not only get an equivalence of categories but an equivalence of k-categories

$$h_k\mathrm{Sp}_n \simeq h_k\mathrm{Fr}_n,$$

for $k = 2p-2-2n^2-2n$. Here $h_k\mathcal{C}$ denotes taking the homotopy k-category, given by $(k-1)$-truncating the mapping spaces in $\mathcal{C}$. At $k = 1$, this gives the classical situation of taking the homotopy category $h\mathcal{C}$. Using and developing a more general machinery, Pstrągowski and Patchkoria proved in [PP21] that the above equivalence holds in Franke's conjectured bound, $2p-2 > n^2+n$.

The current belief is that these bounds are optimal. We know this to be true at the prime 2, as Roitzheim proved in [Roi07] that the category $\mathrm{Sp}_{1,2}$ is *rigid*, in the sense that any equivalence of homotopy categories $h\mathrm{Sp}_{1,2} \simeq h\mathcal{C}$ lifts to an equivalence $\mathrm{Sp}_{1,2} \simeq \mathcal{C}$. The $K_p(n)$-local analogue of Roitzheim's result also holds, as Ishak proved in [Ish19] that $\mathrm{Sp}_{K_2(1)}$ is rigid as well. Hence, exotic equivalences for Sp_n or $\mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)}$ can only exist at primes that are large compared to the height.

The above results imply that increasing the prime p decreases how destructive the k-truncation of the mapping spaces needs to be. In the limit $p \to \infty$, we might expect that there is no need to truncate at all, giving an equivalence of ∞-categories. But, there needs to be an appropriate notion of what "going to the infinite prime" should be. In [BSS20], the authors use a notion of ultraproducts over a non-principal ultrafilter of primes, $\mathcal{F}$, to formalize this limiting process. They use this to prove the existence of a symmetric monoidal equivalence of ∞-categories

$$\prod_{\mathcal{F}} \mathrm{Sp}_n \simeq \prod_{\mathcal{F}} \mathrm{Fr}_n.$$

Expanding on their work, Barthel, Schlank, and Stapleton proved in [BSS21] a $K_p(n)$-local version of the above result. More precisely, they show that there is a symmetric monoidal equivalence of ∞-categories

$$\prod_{\mathcal{F}} \mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)} \simeq \prod_{\mathcal{F}} \mathrm{Fr}_n^{I_n-comp},$$

where the right-hand side consists of derived complete twisted comodules for the naturally occurring Landweber ideal $I_n \subseteq E_*$.

Statement of results

We can summarize the most general of the above algebraicity results in the following table,

	$p < \infty$	$p \to \infty$
Sp_n	[PP21]	[BSS20]
$\mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)}$		[BSS21]

A natural question arises: Is there a finite prime exotic algebraicity for $\mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)}$? The goal of this paper is to give an affirmative answer. More precisely, we prove the following.

Theorem A (Theorem 2.4.15)**.** *Let p be a prime and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $k = 2p-2-n^2-n > 0$, then there is an equivalence of k-categories*

$$h_k\mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)} \simeq h_k\mathrm{Fr}_n^{I_n-comp}.$$

In other words, $K_p(n)$-local spectra are exotically algebraic at large primes.

The available tools for proving such a statement require an abelian category with enough injective objects admitting lifts to a stable ∞-category. In lack of such a well-behaved abelian approximation for $\mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)}$, we take inspiration from [BSS21] and instead use the dual category $\mathcal{M}_n$ of monochromatic spectra, which we show has the needed properties. Theorem A will then follow from the following result.

Theorem B (Theorem 2.4.13)**.** *Let p be a prime and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $k = 2p-2-n^2-n > 0$, then there is an equivalence of k-categories $h_k\mathcal{M}_n \simeq h_k\mathrm{Fr}_n^{I_n-tors}$.*

In order to prove Theorem B, we first prove the analogous statement for monochromatic E-modules.

Theorem C (Theorem 2.4.5)**.** *Let p be a prime and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $k = 2p-2-n > 0$, then there is an equivalence of k-categories $h_k\mathrm{Mod}_E^{I_n-tors} \simeq h_k\mathrm{D}^{per}(\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors})$.*

Overview of the paper

Section 2.1 introduces local duality, and the proposed exotic algebraic model using periodic chain complexes of torsion comodules. Section 2.3 focuses on Franke's algebraicity theorem. Most of the new results of the paper are presented in Section 2.4.1 and Section 2.4.2, where we prove Theorem A, Theorem B and Theorem C. In Section 2.5 we prove that Barr–Beck adjunctions interact well with local duality, which is used to prove that periodization, torsion and taking the derived category all commute.

Acknowledgements. We want to thank Drew Heard, Irakli Patchkoria and Marius Nielsen for helpful conversations and for proof-reading the paper. We also want to thank Piotr Pstrągowski for finding a mistake in the proof of a previous version of Lemma 2.4.10, and the anonymous referee for helpful and constructive comments. Lastly, we want to thank the University of Copenhagen for their hospitality while writing most of this paper. This work forms a part of the authors thesis, partially supported by grant number TMS2020TMT02 from the Trond Mohn Foundation.

2.2 The algebraic model

The goal of this section is to set up the necessary background material that will be used throughout the paper. We use these to construct convenient algebraic approximations of categories arising from chromatic homotopy theory.

Some conventions

We freely use the language of ∞-categories, as developed by Joyal [Joy02] and Lurie [Lur09; Lur17]. Even though we are dealing with both classical 1-categories and ∞-categories in this paper, we will sometimes refer to them both as *categories*, hoping that the prefix is clear from the context.

We denote by Pr the ∞-category of presentable stable ∞-categories and colimit preserving functors. Together with the Lurie tensor product, it is a symmetric monoidal ∞-category. The category of algebras $\mathrm{Alg}(\mathrm{Pr})$ is then the category of presentable stable ∞-categories with a symmetric monoidal structure commuting with colimits separately in each variable.

Let $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \in \mathrm{Alg}(\mathrm{Pr})$. A localization is a functor $f\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ with a fully faithful right adjoint i. We denote the composite by $L = i \circ f$. The adjoint i identifies $\mathcal{D}$ with a full subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$, which we denote by $\mathcal{C}_L$. We then view L as a functor $L\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}_L$, that is left adjoint to the inclusion, and by abuse of notation also call these localizations.

2.2.1 Local duality

The theory of abstract local duality, proved in [HPS97] and generalized to the ∞-categorical setting in [BHV18] will be important for the entire paper. In particular, it is the technology that will allow us to translate Theorem B into Theorem A.

Definition 2.2.1. A pair $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$, where $\mathcal{C} \in \mathrm{Alg}(\mathrm{Pr})$ is compactly generated by dualizable objects, and $\mathcal{K}$ is a subset of compact objects, is called a *local duality context*.

Construction 2.2.2. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ be a local duality context. We define $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors}$ to be the localizing tensor ideal generated by $\mathcal{K}$, denoted $\mathrm{Loc}^{\otimes}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{K})$. Further we define $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-loc}$ to be the left orthogonal complement $(\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors})^{\perp}$, i.e., the full subcategory consisting of objects $C \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(T, C) \simeq 0$ for all $T \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors}$. Similarly, define $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-comp}$ to be the left-orthogonal complement of $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-loc}$, i.e. $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-comp} = (\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-loc})^{\perp}$. These full subcategories are respectively called the $\mathcal{K}$-torsion, $\mathcal{K}$-local and $\mathcal{K}$-complete objects in $\mathcal{C}$. We have inclusions into $\mathcal{C}$, denoted $i_{\mathcal{K}-tors}$, $i_{\mathcal{K}-loc}$ and $i_{\mathcal{K}-comp}$ respectively.

By the adjoint functor theorem, [Lur09, 5.5.2.9], the inclusions $i_{\mathcal{K}-loc}$ and $i_{\mathcal{K}-comp}$ have left adjoints $L_{\mathcal{K}}$ and $\Lambda_{\mathcal{K}}$ respectively, while $i_{\mathcal{K}-tors}$ and $i_{\mathcal{K}-loc}$ have right adjoints $\Gamma_{\mathcal{K}}$ and $V_{\mathcal{K}}$ respectively. These are then, by definition, localizations and colocalizations. Since the torsion, local and complete objects are ideals, these localizations and colocalizations are compatible with the symmetric monoidal structure of $\mathcal{C}$, in the sense of [Lur17, 2.2.1.7]. In particular, by [Lur17, 2.2.1.9] we get unique induced symmetric monoidal structures such that $L_{\mathcal{K}}$, $\Lambda_{\mathcal{K}}$, $\Gamma_{\mathcal{K}}$ and $V_{\mathcal{K}}$ are symmetric monoidal functors.

For any $X \in \mathcal{C}$, these functors assemble into two cofiber sequences:

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{K}}X \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow L_{\mathcal{K}}X \quad \text{and} \quad V_{\mathcal{K}}X \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow \Lambda_{\mathcal{K}}X.$$

Note also that these functors only depend on the localizing subcategory $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors}$, not on the particular choice of generators $\mathcal{K}$. Thus, when the set $\mathcal{K}$ is clear from the context, we often omit it as a subscript when writing the functors.

The following theorem is a slightly restricted version of the abstract local duality theorem of [HPS97, 3.3.5] and [BHV18, 2.21].

Theorem 2.2.3. *Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ be a local duality context. Then*

1. *the functors Γ and L are* smashing, *meaning that there are natural equivalences $\Gamma X \simeq X \otimes \Gamma \mathbb{1}$ and $LX \simeq X \otimes L\mathbb{1}$,*

2. *the functors Λ and V are* cosmashing, *meaning there are natural equivalences $\Lambda X \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(\Gamma\mathbb{1}, X)$ and $VX \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(L\mathbb{1}, X)$, and*

3. *the functors $\Gamma\colon \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-comp} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors}$ and $\Lambda\colon \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-comp}$ are mutually inverse symmetric monoidal equivalences of categories,*

This can be summarized by the following diagram of adjoints

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-loc} \arrow[d, shift right=3] \arrow[d, shift left=1] \arrow[drr, dashed, bend left] & \\
 & \mathcal{C} \arrow[u, shift right=1, "L"'] \arrow[u, shift left=3, "V"'] \arrow[dl, shift left, "\Gamma"] \arrow[dr, shift left, "\Lambda"] & \\
\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors} \arrow[ur, shift left] \arrow[uur, dashed, bend left] \arrow[rr, "\simeq"] & & \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-comp} \arrow[ul, shift left]
\end{tikzcd}$$

Remark 2.2.4. Theorem 2.2.3 implies, in particular, that the symmetric monoidal structure induced by the localization L and the colocalization Γ is just the symmetric monoidal structure on $\mathcal{C}$ restricted to the full subcategories. This is not the case for $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-comp}$, where the symmetric monoidal structure is given by $\Lambda(- \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} -)$. The functor V also induces a symmetric monoidal structure on $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-loc}$, but this coincides with the one induced by L, due to their associated endofunctors on $\mathcal{C}$ defining an adjoint symmetric monoidal monad-comonad pair. Note that we will not need or focus on the functor V, hence it will be omitted from the local duality diagrams for the rest of the paper.

We have two main examples of interest for this paper.

Example 2.2.5. Let (A, Ψ) be an Adams type Hopf algebroid, for example the Hopf algebroid (R_*, R_*R) for an Adams type ring spectrum R—see [Rav86, A.1] and [Hov04] for details. Denote by $\mathrm{D}(\Psi)$ the derived ∞-category associated to the symmetric monoidal Grothendieck abelian category Comod_Ψ. This is defined using the model structure from [BR11]. If $I \subseteq A$ is a finitely generated invariant regular ideal, then $(\mathrm{D}(\Psi), A/I)$ is a local duality context, with associated local duality diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & \mathrm{D}(\Psi)^{I-loc} \arrow[d, shift left] \arrow[ddr, dashed, bend left] & \\
 & \mathrm{D}(\Psi) \arrow[u, shift left, "L_I^\Psi"] \arrow[dl, shift left] \arrow[dr, shift left, "\Delta_I^\Psi"] & \\
\mathrm{D}(\Psi)^{I-tors} \arrow[ur, shift left, "\Gamma_I^\Psi"] \arrow[rr, "\simeq"] \arrow[uur, dashed, bend left] & & \mathrm{D}(\Psi)^{I-comp} \arrow[ul, shift left]
\end{tikzcd}$$

In Section 2.2.2 we compare $\mathrm{D}(\Psi)^{I-tors}$ to a more concrete category: the derived category of I-power torsion comodules.

The following example comes from chromatic homotopy theory. For a good introduction, see [BB19].

Example 2.2.6. Let E denote Morava E-theory at prime p and height n. If $F(n)$ is a finite type n spectrum, then the pair $(\mathrm{Sp}_n, L_nF(n))$ is a local duality context. The corresponding diagram can be recognized as

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& \mathrm{Sp}_{n-1,p} \arrow[ddr, dashed, bend left] \arrow[d, shift left] & \\
& \mathrm{Sp}_n \arrow[u, shift left, "L_{n-1}"] \arrow[dr, shift left, "L_{K_p(n)}"] \arrow[dl, shift left, "M_n"] & \\
\mathcal{M}_n \arrow[uur, dashed, bend left] \arrow[ur, shift left] \arrow[rr, "\simeq"] & & \mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)} \arrow[ul, shift left]
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_n$ is the height n monochromatic category and $\mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)}$ is the category of spectra localized at height n Morava K-theory $K_p(n)$. The functor L_{n-1} is the Bousfield localization at E_{n-1}, while $L_{K_p(n)}$ is the Bousfield localization at $K_p(n)$, see [Bou79]. The local duality then exhibits the classical equivalence $\mathcal{M}_n \simeq \mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)}$, see [HS99, 6.19].

Remark 2.2.7. There is also a version of this local duality diagram for modules over E, see [GM95, 4.2, 5.1], or alternatively [BHV18, 3.7] for a version more similar to the above. This gives equivalences

$$\mathcal{M}_n\mathrm{Mod}_E \simeq \mathrm{Mod}_E^{I_n-tors} \simeq \mathrm{Mod}_E^{I_n-comp} \simeq L_{K_p(n)}\mathrm{Mod}_E,$$

where I_n is the Landweber ideal $(p, v_1, \ldots, v_{n-1}) \subseteq E_*$.

2.2.2 The periodic derived torsion category

In this section we identify the category $\mathrm{D}(\Psi)^{I-tors}$—as obtained in Example 2.2.5—as the derived category of I-power torsion comodules. We also modify the category to exhibit some needed periodicity.

Definition 2.2.8. Let (A, Ψ) be an Adams Hopf algebroid and $I \subseteq A$ a regular invariant ideal. The *I-power torsion* of a comodule M is defined as

$$T_I^\Psi M = \{x \in M \mid I^k x = 0 \text{ for some } k \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

We say a comodule M is *I-torsion* if the natural map $T_I^\Psi M \longrightarrow M$ is an equivalence.

Remark 2.2.9. One can similarly define I-power torsion A-modules. If (A, Ψ) is an Adams Hopf algebroid, then a Ψ-comodule M is I-power torsion if and only if its underlying module is I-power torsion, see [BHV18, 5.7].

Remark 2.2.10. By [BHV18, 5.10] the full subcategory of I-torsion comodules, which we denote $\mathrm{Comod}_\Psi^{I-tors}$, is a Grothendieck abelian category. It also inherits a symmetric monoidal structure from Comod_Ψ.

The following technical lemma will be needed later.

Lemma 2.2.11. *Let (A, Ψ) be an Adams Hopf algebroid, where A is noetherian and $I \subseteq A$ a regular invariant ideal. Then $\mathrm{Comod}_\Psi^{I-tors}$ is generated under filtered colimits by the compact I-power torsion comodules.*

Proof. By [BHV20, 3.4] $\mathrm{Comod}_\Psi^{I-tors}$ is generated by the set

$$\mathrm{Tors}_\Psi^{fp} := \{G \otimes A/I^k \mid G \in \mathrm{Comod}_\Psi^{fp}, k \geqslant 1\},$$

where Comod_Ψ^{fp} is the full subcategory of dualizable Ψ-comodules. Since I is finitely generated and regular, A/I^k is finitely presented as an A-module, hence it is compact in Comod_Ψ by [Hov04, 1.4.2], and in $\mathrm{Comod}_\Psi^{I-tors}$ as colimits are computed in Comod_Ψ. As A is noetherian, being finitely generated and finitely presented coincide. The tensor product of finitely generated modules is finitely generated, hence any element in Tors_Ψ^{fp} is compact. $\square$

Remark 2.2.12. The assumption that the ring A is noetherian can most likely be removed, but it makes no difference to the results in this paper.

Notation 2.2.13. Since $\mathrm{Comod}_\Psi^{I-tors}$ is Grothendieck abelian we have an associated derived stable ∞-category $\mathrm{D}(\mathrm{Comod}_\Psi^{I-tors})$ which we denote simply by $\mathrm{D}(\Psi^{I-tors})$.

We e can now compare the torsion category obtained from local duality and the derived category of I-power torsion comodules.

Lemma 2.2.14 ([BHV20, 3.7(2)]). *Let (A,Ψ) be an Adams Hopf algebroid and $I \subseteq A$ a regular invariant ideal. There is an equivalence of categories*

$$\mathrm{D}(\Psi)^{I-tors} \simeq \mathrm{D}(\Psi^{I-tors}).$$

Furthermore, an object $M \in \mathrm{D}(\Psi)$ is I-torsion if and only if the homology groups H_*M are I-power torsion Ψ-comodules.

In order to state both the general algebraicity machinery of [PP21] and our results, we need the respective derived categories to exhibit the periodic nature of the spectra we are interested in. This is done via the periodic derived category. There are several ways to constructing this, but we follow [Fra96] in spirit, using periodic chain complexes.

Definition 2.2.15. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an abelian category with a local grading, i.e., an auto-equivalence $T\colon \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$, and denote $[1]$ the shift functor on the category of chain complexes $\mathrm{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ in $\mathcal{A}$. A chain complex $C \in \mathrm{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ is called *periodic* if there is an isomorphism $\varphi\colon C[1] \longrightarrow TC$. The full subcategory of periodic chain complexes is denoted by $\mathrm{Ch}^{per}(\mathcal{A})$.

Definition 2.2.16. The forgetful functor $\mathrm{Ch}^{per}(\mathcal{A}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ has a left adjoint P, called the *periodization*.

Definition 2.2.17. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a locally graded abelian category. Then the *periodic derived category* of $\mathcal{A}$, denoted $\mathrm{D}^{per}(\mathcal{A})$ is the ∞-category obtained by localizing $\mathrm{Ch}^{per}(\mathcal{A})$ at the quasi-isomorphism. It is in fact stable by [PP21, 7.8].

Remark 2.2.18. If $\mathcal{A}$ is a symmetric monoidal category, then $P\mathbb{1}$ is a commutative ring object called the *periodic unit*. By [BR11, 2.3] the category of periodic chain complexes $\mathrm{Ch}^{per}(\mathcal{A})$ is equivalent to $\mathrm{Mod}_{P\mathbb{1}}(\mathrm{Ch}(\mathcal{A}))$. This descends also to the derived categories, giving an equivalence

$$\mathrm{D}^{per}(\mathcal{A}) \simeq \mathrm{Mod}_{P\mathbb{1}}(\mathrm{D}(\mathcal{A})),$$

see for example [Pst21, 3.7].

We will also need local duality for the periodic derived category associated to a Hopf algebroid.

Construction 2.2.19. Let (A,Ψ) be an Adams type (graded) Hopf algebroid. Then the shift functor $[1]\colon \mathrm{Comod}_\Psi \longrightarrow \mathrm{Comod}_\Psi$ defined by $(TM)_k = M_{k-1}$ is a local grading on Comod_Ψ. Denote the corresponding periodic derived category by $\mathrm{D}^{per}(\Psi)$. The pair $(\mathrm{D}^{per}(\Psi), P(A/I))$ is a local duality context with associated local duality diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & \mathrm{D}^{per}(\Psi)^{I-loc} \arrow[ddr, dashed, bend left] \arrow[d, shift left] & \\
 & \mathrm{D}^{per}(\Psi) \arrow[u, shift left, "L_I^\Psi"] \arrow[dl, shift left, "\Gamma_I^\Psi"] \arrow[dr, shift left] & \\
\mathrm{D}^{per}(\Psi)^{I-tors} \arrow[uur, dashed, bend left] \arrow[ur, shift left] \arrow[rr, "\simeq"] & & \mathrm{D}^{per}(\Psi)^{I-comp} \arrow[ul, shift left, "\Lambda_I^\Psi"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

The functors in the diagram are induced by the functors from Example 2.2.5. In fact, there is a diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{D}(\Psi)^{I-tors} \arrow[r, shift left] \arrow[d, shift right, "P"'] & \mathrm{D}(\Psi) \arrow[l, shift left, "\Gamma_I^\Psi"] \arrow[r, shift left, "L_I^\Psi"] \arrow[d, shift right, "P"'] & \mathrm{D}(\Psi)^{I-loc} \arrow[l, shift left] \arrow[d, shift right, "P"'] \\
\mathrm{D}^{per}(\Psi)^{I-tors} \arrow[r, shift left] \arrow[u, shift right] & \mathrm{D}^{per}(\Psi) \arrow[l, shift left, "\Gamma_I^\Psi"] \arrow[r, shift left, "L_I^\Psi"] \arrow[u, shift right] & \mathrm{D}^{per}(\Psi)^{I-loc} \arrow[l, shift left] \arrow[u, shift right]
\end{tikzcd}$$

that is commutative in all possible directions. Here the unmarked horizontal arrows are the respective fully faithful inclusions.

Remark 2.2.20. In the specific case of $(A,\Psi) = (E_0, E_0E)$ and $I \subseteq E_0$ the Landweber ideal I_n, then the above construction is [BSS21, 3.12].

There is now some ambiguity to take care of for our category of interest $\mathrm{D}^{per}(\Psi)^{I-tors}$. In the picture above, we do mean that we take I-torsion objects in $\mathrm{D}^{per}(\Psi)$, i.e., $[\mathrm{D}^{per}(\Psi)]^{I-tors}$, but we could also take the periodization of the category $\mathrm{D}(\Psi^{I-tors})$ as our model. Luckily, there is no choice, as they are equivalent. This can be thought of as the periodic version of Lemma 2.2.14.

Theorem 2.2.21. *Let (A,Ψ) be an Adams Hopf algebroid and $I \subseteq A$ a finitely generated invariant regular ideal. Then there is an equivalence of stable ∞-categories*

$$[\mathrm{D}^{per}(\Psi)]^{I-tors} \simeq \mathrm{D}^{per}(\Psi^{I-tors}).$$

The proof of this uses the fact that Barr–Beck adjunctions commute with local duality. Proving this here disrupts the flow of the paper, so we defer it to Section 2.5.

Proof. As Comod_Ψ is symmetric monoidal we have by Remark 2.2.18 an equivalence

$$\mathrm{D}^{per}(\Psi) \simeq \mathrm{Mod}_{P\mathbb{1}}(\mathrm{D}(\Psi)),$$

coming from the periodicity Barr–Beck adjunction. By Theorem 2.5.6 this induces a Barr–Beck adjunction on the torsion subcategories, which gives an equivalence

$$[\mathrm{D}^{per}(\Psi)]^{I-tors} \simeq \mathrm{Mod}_{\Gamma_I^\Psi(P\mathbb{1})}(\mathrm{D}(\Psi)^{I-tors}).$$

Since Γ_I^Ψ is a smashing colocalization, and P is given by tensoring with $P(\mathbb{1})$, they do in fact commute. By Lemma 2.2.14 we have $\mathrm{D}(\Psi)^{I-tors} \simeq \mathrm{D}(\Psi^{I-tors})$, hence the above equivalence can be rewritten as

$$[\mathrm{D}^{per}(\Psi)]^{I-tors} \simeq \mathrm{Mod}_{P(\Gamma_I^\Psi\mathbb{1})}(\mathrm{D}(\Psi^{I-tors})).$$

Now, also $\mathrm{Comod}_\Psi^{I-tors}$ is symmetric monoidal, so Remark 2.2.18 gives an equivalence

$$\mathrm{D}^{per}(\Psi^{I-tors}) \simeq \mathrm{Mod}_{P(\Gamma_I^\Psi\mathbb{1})}(\mathrm{D}(\Psi^{I-tors})),$$

which finishes the proof. □

Addendum 1. This result, and others like it, was one of the inspirations for writing the paper [Aam24b] — see Chapter 4. There we prove some uniqueness results for localizing subcategories that have the property that heart-valued homotopy groups can detect objects. For the above example, both categories have the property that an object $X \in \mathrm{D}^{per}(\Psi)$ lies in $[\mathrm{D}^{per}(\Psi)]^{I-tors}$ or $\mathrm{D}^{per}(\Psi^{I-tors})$ if and only if its homology groups $H_k X$ lies in the heart $\mathrm{Comod}_{\Psi}^{I-tors}$, which is a localizing subcategory of Comod_{Ψ}. By Theorem 4.3.35 this means that the categories have to be equivalent, which gives another proof of the above result.

2.3 Exotic algebraic models

We now have two sets of local duality diagrams, one coming from chromatic homotopy theory, see Example 2.2.6, and one from the homological algebra of Adams Hopf algebroids, see Example 2.2.5. We can also pass between these duality theories, by using homology theories. In particular, if we let $E = E_n$ be height n Morava E-theory at a prime p, then we have the E-homology functor $E_*\colon \mathrm{Sp}_n \longrightarrow \mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}$ converting between homotopy theory and algebra. We can, in some sense, say that E_* approximates homotopical information by algebraic information.

The goal of this section is to set up an abstract framework for studying how good such approximations are. The version we recall below was developed in [PP21], taking inspiration from [Fra96] and [Pst23].

2.3.1 Adapted homology theories

Adapted homology theories are particularly well behaved homology theories that have associated Adams type spectral sequences giving computational benefits over other homology theories.

Definition 2.3.1. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a presentable symmetric monoidal stable ∞-category and $\mathcal{A}$ an abelian category with a local grading [1]. A functor $H\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is called a *conservative homology theory* if:

1. H is additive
2. for a cofiber sequence $X \longrightarrow Y \longrightarrow Z$ in $\mathcal{C}$, then $HX \longrightarrow HY \longrightarrow HZ$ is exact in $\mathcal{A}$

3. there is a natural isomorphism $H(\Sigma X) \cong (HX)[1]$ for any $X \in \mathcal{C}$
4. H reflects isomorphisms.

Remark 2.3.2. The first two axioms make H a homological functor, the third makes H into a locally graded functor, i.e., a functor that preserves the local grading, and the last makes it a conservative functor.

Example 2.3.3. Let R be a ring spectrum. Then the functor $\pi_*\colon \mathrm{Mod}_R \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{R_*}$ defined as $\pi_* M = [\mathbb{S}, M]_*$ is a conservative homology theory.

Example 2.3.4. Let R be a ring spectrum. The functor $R_*(-)\colon \mathrm{Sp} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_R$, defined as the composition

$$\mathrm{Sp} \xrightarrow{R\otimes(-)} \mathrm{Mod}_R \xrightarrow{\pi_*} \mathrm{Mod}_{R_*},$$

is a homology theory. If R is of Adams type, then $R_*(-)$ naturally lands in the subcategory Comod_{R_*R}. If we restrict the domain of R_* to the category of R-local spectra, then it is a conservative homology theory. For the rest of the paper we will use R_* to denote the restricted conservative homology theory $R_*\colon \mathrm{Sp}_R \longrightarrow \mathrm{Comod}_{R_*R}$.

Remark 2.3.5. Recall that we are really interested in the category $\mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)}$ of $K_p(n)$-local spectra. The spectrum $K_p(n)$ is a field object in Sp, and its homotopy groups $\pi_* K_p(n)$ are graded fields. Hence the homology theory $K_p(n)_*\colon \mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{K_p(n)_*}$ is too simple to exhibit the algebraicity properties that we want. As $K_p(n)$ is Adams type $K_p(n)_*(-)$ factors through Comod_{K_*K}, but this category is very complicated. In particular, it does not have finite cohomological dimension, a feature we will need later. We learnt the argument for why this is the case from [BP23]. Having finite cohomological dimension would imply that the $K_p(n)$-Adams spectral sequence has a horizontal vanishing line at a finite page. The groups in this spectral sequence are all torsion, hence this would imply that, for example, the homotopy groups of the $K_p(n)$-local sphere is a finite filtration of torsion groups. In particular there could be no rational homotopy groups. But, by [Bar+24] the rational homotopy groups of the $K_p(n)$-local sphere are highly non-trivial, meaning that the original assumption that Comod_{K_*K} has finite cohomological dimension must be wrong.

There is, however, a version of E_*-homology on $\mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)}$, defined by sending a $K(n)$-local spectrum X to $E_*^\vee(X) := \pi_* L_{K_p(n)}(E \otimes X)$. The functor does land in a category of comodules, specifically over the L-complete Hopf algebroid $(E_*, E_*^\vee E)$, see [Bak09, 5.3]. However, the category $\mathrm{Comod}_{E_*^\vee E}$ is not abelian. This is the reason for instead using the monochromatic category $\mathcal{M}_n$ and the category of I_n-power torsion comodules, as these inherit nicer homological properties we can exploit.

Definition 2.3.6. Let $H \colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be a homology theory and J an injective object in $\mathcal{A}$. An object $\bar{J} \in \mathcal{C}$ is said to be an *injective lift* of J if it represents the functor

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(H(-), J) \colon \mathcal{C}^{op} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}b$$

in the homotopy category $h\mathcal{C}$, i.e. $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(H(-), J) \cong [-, \bar{J}]$. We call $\bar{J}$ a *faithful lift* if the map $H(\bar{J}) \longrightarrow J$ coming from the identity on $\bar{J}$ is an equivalence.

Definition 2.3.7. A homology theory $H \colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is said to be *adapted* if $\mathcal{A}$ has enough injective objects, and for any injective $J \in \mathcal{A}$ there is a faithful lift $\bar{J} \in \mathcal{C}$.

Example 2.3.8. We again return to our two guiding examples $\pi_* \colon \mathrm{Mod}_R \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{R_*}$ and $R_* \colon \mathrm{Sp}_R \longrightarrow \mathrm{Comod}_{R_*R}$, where R is an Adams type ring spectrum. Both functors are conservative adapted homology theories, with faithful lifts provided by Brown representability, see [PP21, 8.2] and [PP21, 8.13] respectively.

Remark 2.3.9. The definition of an adapted homology theory H states that for any injective $J \in \mathcal{A}$, there is some object $\bar{J} \in \mathcal{C}$ together with an equivalence $[X, \bar{J}] \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(HX, J)$ induced by H. Because $\mathcal{A}$ has enough injective objects, we can use these equivalences to approximate homotopy classes of maps by repeatedly mapping into injectives. This gives precisely an associated

Adams spectral sequence for the homology theory H. In fact, Patchkoria and Pstrągowski proved that there is a bijection between adapted homology theories and Adams spectral sequences, see [PP21, 3.24, 3.25]. The construction of the Adams spectral sequence associated to an adapted homology theory $H\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is given in [PP21, 2.24], or alternatively as a totalization spectral sequence in [PP21, 2.27].

In our particular interest $R = E_n$, the associated adapted homology theories π_* and E_* are even nicer than a general adapted homology theory. This is because the category of comodules is particularly simple.

Definition 2.3.10. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a locally graded abelian category with enough injective objects. Then the *cohomological dimension* of $\mathcal{A}$ is the smallest integer d such that $\mathrm{Ext}^{s,t}_{\mathcal{A}}(-,-) \cong 0$ for all $s > d$.

Example 2.3.11. Let n be an integer, p a prime such that $p > n+1$ and $E = E_n$ Morava E-theory at height n. Then by [Pst21, 2.5] the category Comod_{E_*E} has cohomological dimension n^2+n.

For certain Adams type ring spectra R we get decompositions of the category Comod_{R_*R} into periodic families of subcategories. Such decompositions allows for the construction of partial inverses to the associated homology theories.

Construction 2.3.12. Let R be an Adams-type ring spectrum such that π_*R is concentrated in degrees divisible by some positive number $q+1$, i.e., $\pi_m R = 0$ for all $m \neq 0 \bmod q+1$. Any comodule M in the category Comod_{R_*R} splits uniquely into a direct sum of subcomodules $\bigoplus_{\varphi \in \mathbb{Z}/q+1} M_\varphi$ such that M_φ is concentrated in degrees divisible by φ. Such a splitting induces a decomposition of the full subcategory of injective objects

$$\mathrm{Comod}^{inj}_{R_*R} \simeq \mathrm{Comod}^{inj}_{R_*R,0} \times \mathrm{Comod}^{inj}_{R_*R,1} \times \cdots \times \mathrm{Comod}^{inj}_{R_*R,q}$$

where the category $\mathrm{Comod}^{inj}_{R_*R,\varphi}$ denotes the full subcategory spanned by injective comodules concentrated in degrees divisible by φ.

Let $h_k\mathcal{C}$ denote the homotopy k-category of $\mathcal{C}$, obtained by $k+1$-truncating all the mapping spaces in $\mathcal{C}$. The lift associated with each injective via the Adapted homology theory R_* allows us to construct a partial inverse to R_*, called the Bousfield functor β^{inj} in [PP21]. It is a functor $\beta^{inj}\colon \mathrm{Comod}^{inj}_{R_*R} \longrightarrow h_{q+1}\mathrm{Sp}^{inj}_R$, where the latter category is the homotopy $(q+1)$-category of the full subcategory of Sp_R containing all spectra X such that R_*X is injective.

In order to mimic this behavior for a general adapted homology theory, Franke introduced the notion of a splitting of an abelian category.

Definition 2.3.13 ([Fra96])**.** Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an abelian category with a local grading [1]. A *splitting* of $\mathcal{A}$ of order $q+1$ is a collection of Serre subcategories $\mathcal{A}_\varphi \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ indexed by $\varphi \in \mathbb{Z}/(q+1)$ satisfying

1. $[k]\mathcal{A}_n \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{n+k \bmod (q+1)}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and
2. the functor $\prod_\varphi \mathcal{A}_\varphi \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$, defined by $(a_\varphi) \mapsto \oplus_\varphi a_\varphi$, is an equivalence of categories.

Example 2.3.14. As we saw above in Construction 2.3.12, the category of comodules over an Adams Hopf algebroid (R_*, R_*R), where R_* is concentrated in degrees divisible by $q+1$, has a splitting of order $q+1$. This, then, also holds for the discrete Hopf algebroid (R_*, R_*), giving the module category Mod_{R_*} a splitting of order $q+1$ as well.

Example 2.3.15. In the case $R = E(1)$ this has been written out in detail in [BR11, Section 4]. The Serre subcategories are all copies of the category of p-local abelian groups together with Adams operations ψ^k for $k \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$. The shift leaves the underlying module unchanged, but changes the Adams operation.

Definition 2.3.16. We will say that objects $A \in \mathcal{A}_\varphi$ are of *pure weight* φ.

Remark 2.3.17. Just as for Comod_{R_*R}, a splitting of order $q+1$ of a locally graded abelian category $\mathcal{A}$ is enough to define, for any adapted homology theory $H\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$, a partial inverse Bousfield functor β^{inj}, see [PP21, Section 7.2].

2.3.2 Exotic homology theories

In order to make some statements about exotic equivalences a bit simpler, we introduce the concept of exotic adapted homology theories. Note that this is not the way similar results are phrased in [PP21], but the notation serves as a shorthand for the criteria that they use.

Definition 2.3.18. Let $H\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be a homology theory. We say H is *k-exotic* if H is adapted, conservative, $\mathcal{A}$ has finite cohomological dimension d and a splitting of order $q+1$ such that $k = d + 1 - q > 0$.

The remarkable thing about a k-exotic homology theory $H\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is that it forces the stable ∞-category $\mathcal{C}$ to be approximately algebraic. Intuitively: As the order of the splitting is greater than the cohomological dimension, the H-Adams spectral sequence is very sparse and well-behaved. There is a partial inverse of H via the Bousfield functor $\beta\colon \mathcal{A}^{inj} \longrightarrow h_{q+1}\mathcal{C}^{inj}$, which forces a certain subcategory of a categorified deformation of H to be equivalent to both $h_k\mathcal{C}$ and $h_k\mathrm{D}^{per}(\mathcal{A})$. This is the contents of Franke's algebraicity theorem.

Theorem 2.3.19 ([PP21, 7.56])**.** *Let $H\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be a k-exotic homology theory. Then there is an equivalence of homotopy k-categories $h_k\mathcal{C} \simeq h_k\mathrm{D}^{per}(\mathcal{A})$.*

There are several interesting examples of homology theories satisfying Theorem 2.3.19, see Section 8 in [PP21]. We highlight again our two guiding examples but focus specifically on certain Morava E-theories.

Example 2.3.20 ([PP21, 8.7])**.** Let p be a prime, n be a non-negative integer, and E a height n Morava E-theory concentrated in degrees divisible by $2p-2$, for example Johnson-Wilson theory $E(n)$. If $k = 2p - 2 - n > 0$, then the functor $\pi_*\colon \mathrm{Mod}_E \longrightarrow$

Mod_{E_*} is a k-exotic homology theory, giving an equivalence

$$h_k\mathrm{Mod}_E \simeq h_k\mathrm{D}^{per}(\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}).$$

Notation 2.3.21. For the following example and the rest of the paper, we follow the notation of [BSS20], [BSS21] and [Bar23] and denote the category $\mathrm{D}^{per}(\mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E})$ by Fr_n.

Example 2.3.22 ([PP21, 8.13])**.** Let p be a prime, n be a non-negative integer, and E any height n Morava E-theory. If $k = 2p-2-n^2-n > 0$, then the functor $E_*\colon \mathrm{Sp}_n \longrightarrow \mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}$ is a k-exotic homology theory, giving an equivalence

$$h_k\mathrm{Sp}_n \simeq h_k\mathrm{Fr}_n.$$

Remark 2.3.23. As noted in [BSS20, 5.29], this equivalence is strictly exotic for all $n \geqslant 1$ and primes p. In other words, it can never be made into an equivalence of stable ∞-categories. In particular, the mapping spectra in Fr_n are $H\mathbb{Z}$-linear, while the mapping spectra in Sp_n are only $H\mathbb{Z}$-linear for $n = 0$.

Definition 2.3.24. Let $H\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be a k-exotic homology theory. The category $\mathrm{D}^{per}(\mathcal{A})$ is called an *exotic algebraic model* of $\mathcal{C}$ if the equivalence $h_k\mathcal{C} \simeq h_k\mathrm{D}^{per}(\mathcal{A})$ can not be enhanced to an equivalence of ∞-categories $\mathcal{C} \simeq \mathrm{D}^{per}(\mathcal{A})$.

Remark 2.3.25. The notion of being exotically algebraic is part of a complex hierarchy of algebraicity levels, see [IRW23] for a great exposé.

Remark 2.3.26. The existence of an exotic algebraic model for a stable ∞-category $\mathcal{C}$ implies that the category is not rigid. This means, in particular, that there cannot exist a k-exotic homology theory with source Sp or $\mathrm{Sp}_{(p)}$ as these are all rigid for all primes, see [Sch07], [SS02] and [Sch01]. The same holds for $\mathrm{Sp}_{1,2}$, as this is rigid by [Roi07], and similarly for $\mathrm{Sp}_{K_2(1)}$ by [Ish19]. This shows that being k-exotic is quite a strong requirement.

2.4 Algebraicity for monochromatic categories

We are now ready to prove our main results. We start by proving Theorem C, which we will later use to prove Theorem B. The main result, Theorem A will then follow by using certain local duality arguments.

2.4.1 Monochromatic modules

For the rest of this section, we assume that E is the height n Johnson–Wilson theory $E(n)$. This is an $\mathbb{E}_1$-ring spectrum concentrated in degrees divisible by $2p-2$, with coefficient ring $\pi_*E(n) \cong \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{n-1}, v_n^{\pm 1}]$, where $|v_i| = 2p^i - 2$. The goal of this section is to prove Theorem C, which we do in three steps. First we show that the functor $\pi_* \colon \mathrm{Mod}_E^{I_n-tors} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}$ is a conservative adaped homology theory. We then show that $\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}$ has finite cohomological dimension, and lastly that it admits a splitting.

The following lemma is the I_n-power torsion version [BF15, 3.14], and the proof is similar.

Lemma 2.4.1. *If M is an E-module, then $M \in \mathrm{Mod}_E^{I_n-tors}$ if and only if $\pi_*M \in \mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}$.*

Proof. Let $X \in \mathrm{Mod}_E^{I_n-tors}$. By [BHV18, 3.19] there is a strongly convergent spectral sequence of $E(n)_*$-modules with signature

$$E_2^{s,t} = (H_{I_n}^{-s}\pi_*X)_t \implies \pi_{s+t}M_nX,$$

where $H_{I_n}^{-s}$ denotes local cohomology. By [BS12, 2.1.3(ii)] the E_2-page consist of only I_n-power torsion modules. As $\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}$ is abelian, it is closed under quotients and subobjects, as as the higher pages are created from the E_2-page using quotients and subobjects, they must also consist of only I_n-power torsion modules. In particular, the E_∞-page is all I_n-power torsion. By Grothendieck's vanishing theorem, see for example [BS12, 6.1.2],

$H^s_{I_n}(-) \cong 0$ for $s > n$, hence the abutment of the spectral sequence $\pi_* M_n X$ is a finite filtration of I_n-power torsion E_*-modules, and is therefore itself an I_n-power torsion module. Since X was assumed to be monochromatic, i.e. $X \in \mathrm{Mod}_E^{I_n-tors}$, we have $\pi_* M_n X \cong \pi_* X$, and thus $\pi_* X \in \mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}$.

Assume now $X \in \mathrm{Mod}_E$ such that its homotopy groups are I_n-power torsion. Monochromatization gives a map $\varphi\colon M_n X \longrightarrow X$, and as $\pi_* M_n X$ is I_n-power torsion this map factors on homotopy groups as

$$\pi_* M_n X \longrightarrow H^0_{I_n} \pi_* X \longrightarrow \pi_* X,$$

where the first map is the edge morphism in the above-mentioned spectral sequence. As $\pi_* X$ was assumed to be I_n-power torsion we have $\pi_* X \cong H^0_{I_n} \pi_* X$, and $H^s_{I_n} \pi_* X \cong 0$ for $s > 0$. Hence the spectral sequence collapses to give the isomorphism $\pi_* M_n X \cong H^0_{I_n} \pi_* X$, which shows that $\pi_* \varphi$ is an isomorphism. As π_* is conservative φ was already an isomorphism, hence $X \in \mathrm{Mod}_E^{I_n-tors}$. □

Lemma 2.4.2. *For any prime p and non-negative integer n, the functor*

$$\pi_*\colon \mathrm{Mod}_E^{I_n-tors} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}$$

is a conservative adapted homology theory.

Proof. We first note that the functor $\pi_*\colon \mathrm{Mod}_E \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}$ is a conservative adapted homology theory. By Lemma 2.4.1 its restriction to $\mathrm{Mod}_E^{I_n-tors}$ lands in $\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}$, hence autmoatically $\pi_*\colon \mathrm{Mod}_E^{I_n-tors} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}$ is a conservative homology theory.

Let J be an injective I_n-power torsion E_*-module. We can embed $J \longrightarrow Q$ into an injective E_*-module Q, as Mod_{E_*} has enough injectives. After applying the torsion functor $T^{E_*}_{I_n}$ this map has a section, as $J \cong T^{E_*}_{I_n} J$ is injective. In particular, any injective J is a retract of $T^{E_*}_{I_n} Q$ for some injective E_*-module Q, hence we can assume J to be of that form. By [BS12, 2.1.4] any such $J = T^{E_*}_{I_n} Q$ is injective as an object of Mod_{E_*}.

Now, as π_* is adapted on Mod_E we can chose a faithful injective lift $\bar{J}$ of J to Mod_E, and since $\bar{J}$ was assumed to have I_n-torsion homotopy groups we know by Lemma 2.4.1 that $\bar{J}$ is an object of $\mathrm{Mod}_E^{I_n-tors}$. In particular, we have faithful lifts for any injective in $\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}$, which means that $\pi_*\colon \mathrm{Mod}_E^{I_n-tors} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}$ is adapted. □

Let C^{I_n} denote the I_n-adic completion functor on Mod_{E_*}. It is neither left nor right exact, see [HS99, Appendix A.]. As E_* is an integral domain, the higher right derived functors vanish by [GM92, 5.1]. For $i \geqslant 0$ we denote the i'th left derived functor of C^{I_n} by $L_i^{I_n}$. For any $M \in \mathrm{Mod}_E$ there is a natural map $L_0^{I_n} M \longrightarrow C^{I_n} M$. It is always an epimorphism, but usually not an isomorphism.

Lemma 2.4.3. *For any prime p and non-negative integer n, the category $\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}$ has cohomological dimension n.*

Proof. Note first that the category Mod_{E_*} has cohomological dimension n, and that Ext-groups in $\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}$ are computed in Mod_{E_*}. By [BS12, 2.1.4], this implies that the cohomological dimension of $\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}$ cannot be greater than n, so it remains to prove that it is exactly n. We prove this by computing an $\mathrm{Ext}^n_{E_*}$ group that is non-zero.

By [HS99, A.2(d)] we have $L_0^{I_n} M \cong \mathrm{Ext}^n_{E_*}(H^n_{I_n}(E_*), M)$ for any E_*module M. In other words, the derived completion of an E_*-module is the n'th derived functor of maps from the I_n-local cohomology of E_* into M. Choosing $M = E_*/I_n$ we get

$$L_0^{I_n}(E_*/I_n) \cong \mathrm{Ext}^n_{E_*}(H^n_{I_n}(E_*), E_*/I_n).$$

As any bounded I_n-torsion E_*-module is I_n-adically complete we have, as remarked in [BH16, 1.4], an isomorphism $L_0^{I_n}(E_*/I_n) \cong E_*/I_n$. The local cohomology of E_* is also I_n-torsion, in particular $H^n_{I_n} E_* = E_*/I_n^\infty$. Hence we have

$$\mathrm{Ext}^n_{E_*}(E_*/I_n^\infty, E_*/I_n) \cong E_*/I_n \ncong 0,$$

showing that there are two I_n-power torsion E_*-modules with non-trivial n'th Ext, which concludes the proof. □

Lemma 2.4.4. *For any prime p and non-negative integer n, the category $\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}$ has a splitting of order $2p-2$.*

Proof. By [PP21, 8.1] the category Mod_{E_*} has a splitting of order $2p-2$. We define the pure weight φ component of $\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}$, denoted $\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*,\varphi}^{I_n-tors}$, to be the essential image of $T_{I_n}^{E_*}\colon \mathrm{Mod}_{E_*} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}$ restricted to the pure weight φ component $\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*,\varphi}$. We claim that this defines a splitting of order $2p-2$ on $\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}$.

As $\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*,\varphi}$ is a Serre subcategory, and being I_n-power torsion is a property closed under sub-objects, quotients, and extensions, also $\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*,\varphi}^{I_n-tors}$ is a Serre subcategory. As E_* is concentrated in degrees divisible by $2p-2$ every I_n-power torsion module decomposes into its pure weight components. This also gives a decomposition of $\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}$. The shift functor on I_n-power torsion modules simply shifts the underlying module, hence shift-invariance follows from the shift-invariance on Mod_{E_*}.

□

We can now summarize the above discussion with the first of our main results.

Theorem 2.4.5 (Theorem C)**.** *Let p be a prime and n a non-negative integer. If $k = 2p-2-n > 0$, then the functor*

$$\pi_*\colon \mathrm{Mod}_E^{I_n-tors} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}$$

is a k-exotic homology theory, giving an equivalence

$$h_k\mathrm{Mod}_E^{I_n-tors} \simeq h_k\mathrm{D}^{per}(\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}).$$

In particular, monochromatic E-modules are exotically algebraic at large primes.

Proof. By Lemma 2.4.3 the cohomological dimension of the category $\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}$ is n, and by Lemma 2.4.4 we have a splitting on $\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}$ of order $2p-2$. Hence, by Lemma 2.4.2 the functor

$$\pi_*\colon \mathrm{Mod}_E^{I_n-tors} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}$$

is a k-exotic homology theory for $k = 2p-2-n > 0$, which gives an equivalence

$$h_k \mathrm{Mod}_E^{I_n-tors} \simeq h_k \mathrm{D}^{per}(\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors})$$

by Theorem 2.3.19. □

We can also phrase this dually in terms of $K_p(n)$-local E-modules.

Corollary 2.4.6. *Let p be a prime, n a positive integer and $K_p(n)$ be height n Morava K-theory at the prime p. If $k = 2p-2-n > 0$, then we have a k-exotic algebraic equivalence*

$$h_k L_{K_p(n)} \mathrm{Mod}_E \simeq h_k \mathrm{D}^{per}(\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*})^{I_n-comp}.$$

In particular, $K_p(n)$-local E-modules are exotically algebraic at large primes.

Proof. The equivalence is constructed from the equivalences obtained from Remark 2.2.7, Theorem 2.4.5, Theorem 2.2.21 and Construction 2.2.19. In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h_k \mathrm{Mod}_E^{I_n-comp} &\overset{2.2.7}{\simeq} h_k \, \mathrm{Mod}_E^{I_n-tors} \\ &\overset{2.4.5}{\simeq} h_k \mathrm{D}^{per}(\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}) \\ &\overset{2.2.21}{\simeq} h_k \mathrm{D}^{per}(\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*})^{I_n-tors} \\ &\overset{2.2.19}{\simeq} h_k \mathrm{D}^{per}(\mathrm{Mod}_{E_*})^{I_n-comp}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that an equivalence of ∞-categories induces an equivalence on homotopy k-categories. □

Now, let HE_* be the Eilenberg–MacLane spectrum of E_*. By Schwede–Shipleys's derived Morita theory, see [Lur17, 7.1.1.16], there is a symmetric monoidal equivalence of categories $\mathrm{D}(E_*) \simeq \mathrm{Mod}_{HE_*}$, and we can form a local duality diagram for Mod_{HE_*} corresponding to Example 2.2.5 for the discrete Hopf algebroid (E_*, E_*). By arguments similar to Lemma 2.4.1 and Lemma 2.4.2

one can show that the homotopy groups functor $\pi_*\colon \mathrm{Mod}_{HE_*} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}$ restricts to a conservative adapted homology theory

$$\pi_*\colon \mathrm{Mod}_{HE_*}^{I_n-tors} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors}.$$

In the same range as Theorem 2.4.5 this is also k-exotic. We can then combine the algebraicity for $\mathrm{Mod}_E^{I_n-tors}$ and Mod_{HE_*} to get the following statement.

Corollary 2.4.7. *Let p be a prime and n a non-negative integer. If $k = 2p-2-n > 0$, then there is an exotic equivalence $h_k\mathrm{Mod}_E^{I_n-tors} \simeq h_k\mathrm{Mod}_{HE_*}^{I_n-tors}$.*

2.4.2 Monochromatic spectra

Having proven that monochromatic E-modules are algebraic at large primes, we now turn to the larger category of all monochromatic spectra $\mathcal{M}_n$ with the same goal. The strategy is exactly the same as in Section 2.4.1: we first prove that the conservative adapted homology theory $E_*\colon \mathrm{Sp}_n \longrightarrow \mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}$ restricts to a conservative adapted homology theory on $\mathcal{M}_n$, before proving that $\mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}^{I_n-tors}$ has a splitting and finite cohomological dimension. This will prove Theorem B, which we then convert into a proof of Theorem A, as in Corollary 2.4.6.

In this section the choice of v_n-periodic Landweber exact ring spectrum E does not matter, as the categories Sp_n and Comod_{E_*E} are equivalent for all such spectra—see [Hov95, 1.12] and [HS05a, 4.2] respectively. However, to make the interaction with Section 2.4.1 as simple as possible we will continue to use the height n Johnson–Wilson spectrum $E(n)$.

Lemma 2.4.8. *If X is a E-local spectrum, then $X \in \mathcal{M}_n$ if and only if $E_*X \in \mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}^{I_n-tors}$.*

Proof. Assume first that $X \in \mathcal{M}_n$. We have $E \otimes X \in \mathrm{Mod}_E^{I_n-tors}$ as

$$E \otimes X \simeq E \otimes M_nX \simeq M_n(E \otimes X),$$

where the last equivalence follows from M_n being smashing. In particular, the restricted functor $E_*\colon \mathcal{M}_n \longrightarrow \mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}$ factors through $\mathrm{Mod}_E^{I_n-tors}$. By Lemma 2.4.1 and Remark 2.2.9 this means that E_*X is an I_n-power torsion E_*E-comodule.

For the converse, assume that we have $X \in \mathrm{Sp}_n$ such that $E_*X \in \mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}^{I_n-tors}$. Using the monochromatization functor we obtain a comparison map $M_nX \longrightarrow X$, which induces a map on E-modules $E \otimes M_nX \longrightarrow E \otimes X$. This map is an isomorphism on homotopy groups, as E_*X was assumed to be I_n-power torsion. As E_* is conservative on Sp_n, the original comparison map $M_nX \longrightarrow X$ was an isomorphism, meaning that $X \in \mathcal{M}_n$. □

Lemma 2.4.9. *For any prime p and non-negative integer n, the functor*

$$E_*\colon \mathcal{M}_n \longrightarrow \mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}^{I_n-tors}$$

is a conservative adapted homology theory.

Proof. First note that the image of the functor $E_*\colon \mathrm{Sp}_n \longrightarrow \mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}$ restricted to $\mathcal{M}_n$ is contained in $\mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}^{I_n-tors}$ by Lemma 2.4.8. The functor $E_*\colon \mathcal{M}_n \longrightarrow \mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}^{I_n-tors}$ is then automatically a conservative homology theory. The category $\mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}^{I_n-tors}$ has enough injectives as it is Grothendieck by Remark 2.2.10. Hence, it only remains to prove that we have faithful lifts for all injective objects.

Let J be an injective in $\mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}^{I_n-tors}$. As in the proof of Lemma 2.4.2 we can assume that J has the form $J = T_{I_n}^{E_*E}P$ for some injective E_*E-comodule P, as being torsion is a property of the underlying module. By [HS05b, 2.1(c)] any injective E_*E-comodule is a retract of $E_*E \otimes_{E_*} Q$ for some injective E_*-module Q. Hence, we can further assume that J has the form $J = T_{I_n}^{E_*E}(E_*E \otimes_{E_*} Q)$.

From [BHV18, 5.7] it follows that there is a commutative diagram of adjoint functors

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E} \arrow[r, shift left, "\varepsilon_*"] \arrow[d, shift left, "T_{I_n}^{E_*E}"] & \mathrm{Mod}_{E_*} \arrow[l, shift left, "\varepsilon^*"] \arrow[d, shift left, "T_{I_n}^{E_*}"] \\
\mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}^{I_n-tors} \arrow[r, shift left, "\varepsilon_*"] \arrow[u, shift left] & \mathrm{Mod}_{E_*}^{I_n-tors} \arrow[l, shift left, "\varepsilon^*"] \arrow[u, shift left]
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $\varepsilon_* \dashv \varepsilon^*$ is the forgetful-cofree adjunction. In particular, the functor ε^* is given by $E_*E \otimes_{E_*} (-)$. To justify the notation in the bottom row, let us prove that the cofree functor on I_n-power torsion modules is also given by $E_*E \otimes_{E_*} (-)$. In order to do this we prove that for an I_n-power torsion E_*-module M, that $T_{I_n}^{E_*E}(E_*E \otimes_{E_*} M) \cong E_*E \otimes_{E_*} M$.

By [BHV18, 5.5] there is an isomorphism

$$T_{I_n}^{E_*E}(E_*E \otimes_{E_*} M) \cong \mathrm{colim}_k \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_{E_*E}(E_*/I_n^k, E_*E \otimes_{E_*} M),$$

which by [BHV18, 4.4] gives

$$\mathrm{colim}_k \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_{E_*E}(E_*/I_n^k, E_*E \otimes_{E_*} M) \cong \mathrm{colim}_k(E_*E \otimes_{E_*} \mathrm{Hom}_{E_*}(E_*/I_n^k, M)).$$

As the tensor product $- \otimes_{E_*} -$ commutes with filtered colimits separately in each variable, and M was assumed to be I_n-power torsion, the right hand side is $E_*E \otimes_{E_*} M$.

Now, choosing the injective Q in the top right corner and going through the square gives an isomorphism $T_{I_n}^{E_*E}(E_*E \otimes_{E_*} Q) \cong E_*E \otimes_{E_*} T_{I_n}^{E_*}Q$. By [BS12, 2.1.4] we know that $T_{I_n}^{E_*}Q$ is an injective E_*-module, and by [HS05b, 2.1(a)] the cofree comodule $E_*E \otimes_{E_*} T_{I_n}^{E_*}Q$ is an injective E_*E-comodule. Hence, $J = T_{I_n}^{E_*E}(E_*E \otimes_{E_*} Q)$ is injective also as an object in Comod_{E_*E}.

Finally, as E_* has faithful injective lifts from Comod_{E_*E} to Sp_n, there is a lift $\bar{J}$ such that $[X, \bar{J}] \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{E_*E}(E_*X, J)$ and $E_*\bar{J} \simeq J$. By Lemma 2.4.8 we know that $\bar{J} \in \mathcal{M}_n$, as J was assumed to be I_n-power torsion, hence we have found our faithful injective lift. $\square$

Lemma 2.4.10. *Let p be a prime and n a non-negative integer. If $p - 1 \nmid n$, then the category $\mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}^{I_n-tors}$ has cohomological dimension $n^2 + n$.*

Proof. The proof follows [Pst21, 2.5] closely, which is itself a modern reformulation of [Fra96, 3.4.3.9]. As in Lemma 2.4.3 we note that also Ext-groups in $\mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}^{I_n-tors}$ are computed in Comod_{E_*E}. We start by defining *good targets* to be I_n-power torsion comodules N such that $\mathrm{Ext}^{s,t}_{E_*E}(E_*/I_n, N) = 0$ for all $s > n^2 + n$ and *good sources* to be I_n-power torsion comodules M such that $\mathrm{Ext}^{s,t}_{E_*E}(M, N) = 0$ for all $s > n^2 + n$ and I_n-torsion comodules N.

By the Landweber filtration theorem, see for example [HS05a, 5.7], we know that any finitely presented comodule M has a finite filtration

$$0 = M_0 \subseteq M_1 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq M_{s-1} \subseteq M_s = M,$$

where $M_r/M_{r-1} \cong E_*/I_{j_r}[t_r]$ and $j_r \leqslant n$. When M is I_n-power torsion we get $j_r = n$ for all r, as noted in [HS05a, 4.3]. For primes p not dividing $n+1$ Morava's vanishing theorem, see for example [Rav86, 6.2.10], gives us that $\mathrm{Ext}^{s,t}_{E_*E}(E_*, E_*/I_n) = 0$ for all $s > n^2$. As the generators for the ideal I_i form a regular sequence, we get short exact sequences of the form

$$0 \longrightarrow E_*/I_{i-1} \xrightarrow{v_i} E_*/I_{i-1} \longrightarrow E_*/I_i \longrightarrow 0$$

for $0 \leqslant i \leqslant n$. By the induced long exact sequence in Ext-groups, we get that

$$\mathrm{Ext}^{s,t}_{E_*E}(E_*/I_n, E_*/I_n) = 0$$

for $s > n^2+n$, which by the Landweber filtration implies that any finitely presented I_n-power torsion comodule is a good target.

The comodule E_*/I_n has a finite resolution of E_*E-comodules that are projective as modules over E_*. The Ext-functor out of these projectives can be computed using the cobar complex, see [Rav86, A1.2.12], implying that the functor $\mathrm{Ext}^{s,t}_{E_*E}(E_*/I_n, -)$ commutes with filtered colimits. By Lemma 2.2.11 any I_n-power torsion comodule is a filtered colimit of finitely presented ones, hence any I_n-power torsion comodule is a good target.

Note that the above argument also proves that E_*/I_n is a good source, which by the Landweber filtration argument implies that any finitely presented I_n-torsion comodule is a good source. Again, by Lemma 2.2.11, the category $\mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}^{I_n-tors}$ is generated under filtered colimits by finitely presented comodules. Hence, we can apply [Pst21, 2.4] to any injective resolution

$$0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow J_0 \longrightarrow J_1 \longrightarrow \cdots$$

to get that the map $J_{n^2+n} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Im}(J_{n^2+n} \longrightarrow J_{n^2+n+1})$ is a split surjection, and that the object $\mathrm{Im}(J_{n^2+n} \longrightarrow J_{n^2+n+1})$ is injective. Hence, any injective resolution can be modified to have length n^2+n, which concludes the proof. $\square$

Remark 2.4.11. In a previous version of this paper, we claimed that the cohomological dimension was n^2. We want to thank Piotr Pstrągowski for pointing out the gap in the proof. This means that $\mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}^{I_n-tors}$ has the same cohomological dimension as the non-torsion category Comod_{E_*E}, as seen in Example 2.3.11. However, we do obtain something slightly stronger, as our result holds for all $p-1 \nmid n$, while the analogue in Comod_{E_*E} only holds when $p-1 > n$. In fact, Comod_{E_*E} does not have finite cohomological dimension when $p-1 \leqslant n$, as noted in [Pst21, 2.6]. This difference happens because we only need the Ext^s-groups out of E_*/I_n to vanish for large s, which is given to us by Morava's vanishing theorem whenever $p-1 \nmid n$. For non-torsion comodules one has to have stronger vanishing results. These can be obtained by using the chromatic spectral sequence, which only gives the vanishing results for $p-1 > n$ instead of for $p-1 \nmid n$.

Lemma 2.4.12. *For any prime p and non-negative integer n, the category $\mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}^{I_n-tors}$ has a splitting of order $2p-2$.*

Proof. As E is concentrated in degrees divisible by $2p-2$, [PP21, 8.13] shows that Comod_{E_*E} has a splitting of order $2p-2$. The proof of the induced splitting on the I_n-torsion category is then identical to Lemma 2.4.4. $\square$

We can now summarize the above results with our second main result, which is the monochromatic analogue of Example 2.3.22.

Theorem 2.4.13 (Theorem B)**.** *Let p be a prime and n a non-negative integer. If we have $k = 2p - 2 - n^2 - n > 0$, then the restricted functor $E_* \colon \mathcal{M}_n \longrightarrow \mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}^{I_n-tors}$ is k-exotic. In particular, there is an equivalence*

$$h_k\mathcal{M}_n \simeq h_k\mathrm{D}^{per}(E_*E^{I_n-tors}),$$

meaning that monochromatic homotopy theory is exotically algebraic at large primes.

Proof. By Lemma 2.4.10, the cohomological dimension of $\mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}^{I_n-tors}$ is n^2+n and by Lemma 2.4.12 we have a splitting of order $2p-2$. The restricted functor E_* is then by Lemma 2.4.9 k-exotic whenever $k = 2p - 2 - n^2 - n > 0$, which by Theorem 2.3.19 finishes the proof. □

Remark 2.4.14. By Theorem 2.2.21 there is an equivalence $\mathrm{D}^{per}(E_*E^{I_n-tors}) \simeq \mathrm{Fr}_n^{I_n-tors}$ and by Example 2.2.6 there is an equivalence $\mathcal{M}_n \simeq \mathrm{Sp}_n^{I_n-tors}$. This means that we can write the equivalence in Theorem 2.4.13 as

$$h_k\mathrm{Sp}_n^{I_n-tors} \simeq h_k\mathrm{Fr}_n^{I_n-tors}$$

for $k = 2p - 2 - n^2 - n > 0$. This is more in line with thinking about Theorem 2.4.13 as "coming from" the chromatic algebraicity of Example 2.3.22 on localizing ideals. This formulation is perhaps also easier to connect to the limiting case $p \longrightarrow \infty$ as described using ultra-products in [BSS21], which can be stated informally as

$$\lim_{p\longrightarrow\infty} \mathrm{Sp}_n^{I_n-tors} \simeq \lim_{p\longrightarrow\infty} \mathrm{Fr}_n^{I_n-tors}.$$

Via Theorem 2.2.3 we can now obtain the associated exotic algebraicity statement for the category of $K_p(n)$-local spectra.

Theorem 2.4.15 (Theorem A)**.** *Let p be a prime, n a non-negative integer and $K_p(n)$ be height n Morava K-theory at the* *prime p. If $k = 2p-2-n^2 > 0$, then we have a k-exotic algebraic equivalence*

$$h_k\mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)} \simeq h_k\mathrm{Fr}_n^{I_n-comp}.$$

In other words, $K_p(n)$-local homotopy theory is algebraic at large primes.

Proof. As we did in Corollary 2.4.6, we construct the equivalence from a sequence of equivalences coming from Theorem 2.2.3 and Theorem 2.4.13. More precisely we use equivalences coming from Example 2.2.6, Theorem 2.4.13, Theorem 2.2.21 and Construction 2.2.19, which give

$$\begin{aligned} h_k\mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)} &\overset{2.2.6}{\simeq} h_k\mathcal{M}_n \\ &\overset{2.4.13}{\simeq} h_k\mathrm{D}^{per}(\mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}^{I_n-tors}) \\ &\overset{2.2.21}{\simeq} h_k\mathrm{Fr}_n^{I_n-tors} \\ &\overset{2.2.19}{\simeq} h_k\mathrm{Fr}_n^{I_n-comp}, \end{aligned}$$

where we again have used that an equivalence of ∞-categories induces an equivalence on homotopy k-categories. □

Remark 2.4.16. As in Remark 2.4.14 we can phrase Theorem 2.4.15 as $h_k\mathrm{Sp}_n^{I_n-comp} \simeq h_k\mathrm{Fr}_n^{I_n-comp}$.

Some remarks on future work

The reason why Theorem 2.3.19 works so well, is that there is a deformation of stable ∞-categories lurking behind the scenes. One does not need this in order to apply the theorem, but it is there regardless. In the case of some v_n-periodic Landweber exact ring spectrum E, the deformation associated with the adapted homology theory $E_*\colon \mathrm{Sp}_n \longrightarrow \mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}$ is equivalent to the category of hypercomplete E-based synthetic spectra, $\widehat{\mathrm{Syn}}_E$, introduced in [Pst23]. As both Sp_n and Comod_{E_*E} are invariant under the choice of such E, we conjecture that this is true also for $\widehat{\mathrm{Syn}}_E$.

Our restricted homology theory $E_*\colon \mathcal{M}_{n,p} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}^{I_n-tors}$ should then be associated to a deformation $\widehat{\mathrm{Syn}}_E^{I_n-tors}$ coming from a local duality theory for $\widehat{\mathrm{Syn}}_E$, in the sense that there is a diagram of stable ∞-categories

$$\mathcal{M}_{n,p} \simeq \mathrm{Sp}_n^{I_n-tors} \xleftarrow{\tau^{-1}} \widehat{\mathrm{Syn}}_E^{I_n-tors} \xrightarrow{\tau\sim 0} \mathrm{Fr}_n^{I_n-tors}.$$

Since E_* is adapted on $\mathcal{M}_n$, we abstractly know that there is a deformation $D^\omega(\mathcal{M}_n)$ arising out of the work of Patchkoria-Pstrągowski in [PP21], called the perfect derived category. This should give an equivalent "internal" approach to I_n-torsion synthetic spectra, much akin to how we have equivalences $\mathcal{M}_n \simeq \mathrm{Sp}_n^{I_n-tors}$ and $D(E_*E)^{I_n-tors} \simeq D(E_*E^{I_n-tors})$.

In [Bar23], Barkan provides a monoidal version of Theorem 2.3.19 by using filtered spectra. His deformation $\mathscr{E}_n$ is equivalent to $\widehat{\mathrm{Syn}}_E$, which by the above remarks hints towards a monoidal version of Theorem 2.4.13 as well. We originally intended to incorporate such a result into this paper but decided against it in order to keep it free from deformation theory. We do, however, state the conjectured monoidal result, which we hope to pursue in future work.

Conjecture 2.4.17. Let p be a prime and n a natural number. If k is a positive natural number such that $2p-2 > n^2+(k+3)n+k-1$, then we have a symmetric monoidal equivalence

$$h_k\mathcal{M}_n \simeq h_k\mathrm{Fr}_n^{I_n-tors}$$

of k-categories.

As Theorem 2.2.3 is monoidal, this would give a similar statement for the $K_p(n)$-local category, i.e., a symmetric monoidal equivalence

$$h_k\mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)} \simeq h_k\mathrm{Fr}_n^{I_n-comp}.$$

Since E-based synthetic spectra are categorifications of the E-Adams spectral sequence, one should expect the above-mentioned local duality for $\widehat{\mathrm{Syn}}_E$ to give a category $\widehat{\mathrm{Syn}}_E^{I_n-comp}$, which categorifies the $K_p(n)$-local E-Adams spectral sequence. We plan to study such categorifications of the $K_p(n)$-local E-Adams spectral sequence in future work joint with Marius Nielsen.

2.5 Barr–Beck for localizing ideals

In this appendix we prove that the monoidal Barr–Beck theorem—a monoidal version of Lurie's ∞-categorical version of the classical Barr–Beck monadicity theorem, see [Lur17, Section 4.7]—interacts nicely with local duality.

Theorem 2.5.1 ([MNN17, 5.29])**.** *Let $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \in \mathrm{Alg}(\mathrm{Pr})$ and $(F \dashv G)\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be a monoidal adjunction. If in addition*

1. *G is conservative,*
2. *G preserves colimits, and*
3. *the projection formula holds,*

then (F, G) is a monoidally monadic adjunction and the monad GF is equivalent to the monad $G(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{D}}) \otimes (-)$. In particular this gives a symmetric monoidal equivalence $\mathcal{D} \simeq \mathrm{Mod}_{G(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{D}})}(\mathcal{C})$.

Proof. By [Lur17, 4.7.3.5] the adjunction is monadic by the first two criteria, giving an equivalence $\mathcal{D} \simeq \mathrm{Mod}_{GF}(\mathcal{C})$. The map of monads $G(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{D}}) \otimes (-) \longrightarrow GF$ given by [EK20, 3.6], is seen to be an equivalence by applying the projection formula to the unit $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{D}}$. □

Definition 2.5.2. When the three criteria above hold for a given monoidal adjunction $(F \dashv G)$, we will say that the adjunction satisfies the monoidal Barr–Beck criteria or that it is a *monoidal Barr–Beck adjunction*. We will sometimes omit the prefix monoidal when it is clear from context.

Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ be a local duality context. We wish to prove that the associated local duality diagram is compatible with Theorem 2.5.1. By modifying [BS20, 3.7] slightly, we know that any Barr–Beck adjunction induces a Barr–Beck adjunction on $\mathcal{K}$-local and $\mathcal{K}$-complete objects. Hence, it remains only to prove a similar statement for the $\mathcal{K}$-torsion objects.

Definition 2.5.3. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ and $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{L})$ be local duality contexts. A *map of local duality contexts* is a symmetric monoidal colimit-preserving functor $F\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ such that $F(\mathcal{K}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}$. If, in addition $\mathrm{Loc}^{\otimes}_{\mathcal{D}}(F(\mathcal{K})) = \mathrm{Loc}^{\otimes}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{L})$, then we say F is a *strict* map of local duality contexts. A monoidal adjunction $(F \dashv G)\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ such that F is a strict map of local duality contexts is called a *local duality adjunction*, sometimes denoted

$$(F \dashv G)\colon (\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{L}).$$

Given a local duality context and an appropriate functor, one can always extend the functor to a strict map of local duality context in the following way.

Construction 2.5.4. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ be a local duality context, $\mathcal{D} \in \mathrm{Alg}(\mathrm{Pr})$ and $F\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be a symmetric monoidal colimit-preserving functor. The image of $\mathcal{K}$ under F generates a localizing ideal $\mathrm{Loc}^{\otimes}_{\mathcal{D}}(F(\mathcal{K}))$ in $\mathcal{D}$, which makes F a map of local duality contexts. We call this the local duality context on $\mathcal{D}$ induced by $\mathcal{C}$ via F.

The following lemma is essentially the "non-geometric" version of [BS17, 5.11]. The proof is also similar, but as we have phrased it in a different and slightly more general language, we present a full proof.

Lemma 2.5.5. *Let $(F \dashv G)\colon (\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{L})$ be a local duality adjunction. Then, the adjunction induces a monoidal adjunction on localizing ideals*

$$\mathrm{Loc}^{\otimes}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{K}) \underset{G'}{\overset{F'}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathrm{Loc}^{\otimes}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{L}).$$

Proof. From Remark 2.2.4 we know that the symmetric monoidal structures on $\mathrm{Loc}^{\otimes}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{K})$ and $\mathrm{Loc}^{\otimes}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{L})$ is simply the symmetric monoidal structures on $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$, restricted to the full subcategories.

Since F is a map of local duality contexts, we have an inclusion $F(\mathcal{K}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}$, which gives inclusions

$$F(\mathrm{Loc}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{K})) \subseteq \mathrm{Loc}_{\mathcal{D}}^{\otimes}(F(\mathcal{K})) \subseteq \mathrm{Loc}_{\mathcal{D}}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{L}),$$

meaning that the functor F restricts to the torsion objects. In particular we have for any object $X \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors}$ an equivalence $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} F(X) \simeq F(X)$. We let $F' = F_{|\mathrm{Loc}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{K})}$ and define G' to be the composition

$$Loc_{\mathcal{D}}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{L}) \xrightarrow{i_{\mathcal{L}-tors}} \mathcal{D} \xrightarrow{G} \mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{\Gamma_{\mathcal{K}}} \mathrm{Loc}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{K}),$$

which is an adjoint to F'. We need to show that F is a symmetric monoidal functor, but, as the inclusions $i_{\mathcal{K}-loc}$ and $i_{\mathcal{L}-loc}$ are non-unitally monoidal all that remains to be proven is that F' sends the monoidal unit $\Gamma_{\mathcal{K}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}$ to the monoidal unit $\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{D}}$.

The localizing ideals $\mathrm{Loc}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{K})$ and $\mathrm{Loc}_{\mathcal{D}}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{L})$ are equal to the localizing ideals generated by the respective units, i.e.

$$\mathrm{Loc}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{K}) = \mathrm{Loc}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\otimes}(\Gamma_{\mathcal{K}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{Loc}_{\mathcal{D}}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{L}) = \mathrm{Loc}_{\mathcal{D}}^{\otimes}(\Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{D}}).$$

Since $(F \dashv G)$ is a local duality adjunction we also know that $\mathrm{Loc}_{\mathcal{D}}^{\otimes}(F(\mathcal{K})) = \mathrm{Loc}_{\mathcal{D}}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{L})$, which also means $\mathrm{Loc}_{\mathcal{D}}(F(\Gamma_{\mathcal{K}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}})) = \mathrm{Loc}_{\mathcal{D}}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{L})$.

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the full subcategory of $\mathrm{Loc}_{\mathcal{D}}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{L})$ where $F(\Gamma_{\mathcal{K}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}})$ acts as a unit, in other words objects $M \in \mathrm{Loc}_{\mathcal{D}}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{L})$ such that $F(\Gamma_{\mathcal{K}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}) \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} M \simeq M$. In particular, $F(\Gamma_{\mathcal{K}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}})$ is in $\mathcal{G}$. The category $\mathcal{G}$ is closed under retracts, suspension, and colimits, as well as tensoring with objects in $\mathcal{D}$, as we have

$$F(\Gamma_{\mathcal{K}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}) \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} (M \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} D) \simeq (F(\Gamma_{\mathcal{K}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}) \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} M) \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} D \simeq M \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} D$$

for any $M \in \mathcal{G}$ and $D \in \mathcal{D}$. Hence, it is a localizing tensor ideal of $\mathcal{D}$, with a symmetric monoidal structure where the unit is $F(\Gamma_{\mathcal{K}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}})$. In particular, $\mathcal{G} = \mathrm{Loc}_{\mathcal{D}}^{\otimes}(F(\Gamma_{\mathcal{K}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}))$, which we already know is equivalent to $\mathrm{Loc}_{\mathcal{D}}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{L})$.

Since the ideals are equivalent, and the unit is unique, we must have $F(\Gamma_{\mathcal{K}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}) \simeq \Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} \mathbb{1}_{D}$, which finishes the proof. $\square$

The key feature for us is that such an induced adjunction inherits the property of being a Barr–Beck adjunction, i.e., that the right adjoint is conservative, preserves colimits, and has a projection formula. An analogous, but not equivalent, statement was proven in [BS20, 4.5]. Another related, but not equivalent statement, is Greenlees–Shipley's Cellularization principle, see [GS13].

Theorem 2.5.6. *Let $(F \dashv G)\colon (\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{L})$ be a local duality adjunction. If $(F \dashv G)$ satisfies the Barr–Beck criteria, then the induced monoidal adjunction on localizing ideals*

$$\mathrm{Loc}^{\otimes}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{K}) \underset{G'}{\overset{F'}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathrm{Loc}^{\otimes}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{L})$$

constructed in Lemma 2.5.5, also satisfies the Barr–Beck criteria.

Proof. We need to prove that G' is conservative and colimit-preserving and that the projection formula holds. The first two will both follow from the following computation, showing that also G' is just the restriction of G to $\mathrm{Loc}^{\otimes}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{L})$.

Let $X \in \mathrm{Loc}^{\otimes}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{L})$. By definition we have $G'(X) = \Gamma_{\mathcal{K}} G(X)$, where we have omitted the inclusions from the notation for simplicity. Since $\Gamma_{\mathcal{K}}$ is smashing and $(F \dashv G)$ by assumption has a projection formula we have

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{K}} G(X) \simeq G(X) \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} \Gamma_{\mathcal{K}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}} \simeq G(X \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} F(\Gamma_{\mathcal{K}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}})).$$

By Lemma 2.5.5 F' is symmetric monoidal, hence $F(\Gamma_{\mathcal{K}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}) \simeq \Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{D}}$, which acts on X as the monoidal unit. Thus, we can summarize with

$$G'(X) \simeq G(X \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} F(\Gamma_{\mathcal{K}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}})) \simeq G(X \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} \Gamma_{\mathcal{L}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{D}}) \simeq G(X),$$

which shows that also G' is the restriction of G.

Now, as G is both conservative and preserves colimits, and colimits in the localizing ideals are computed in $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ respectively, then also G' is conservative and colimit-preserving. The projection formula for $(F' \dashv G')$ also automatically follows from the projection formula for $(F \dashv G)$. $\square$

Chapter 1.
DG-algebras

Abstract. We introduce the notion of a contramodule over a cocommutative coalgebra in a presentably symmetric monoidal ∞-category $\mathcal{C}$. Based on this we prove that local duality, in the sense of Hovey–Palmieri–Strickland and Dwyer–Greenlees, is equivalent to Positselski's comodule-contramodule correspondence for coidempotent cocommutative coalgebras in compactly generated symmetric monoidal stable ∞-cateogories.

3.1 Introduction

Let k be a field and a C a cocommutative coalgebra in the abelian category Vect_k. A *comodule* over C is a vector space V together with a coassociative counital map $V \longrightarrow V \otimes_k C$. These objects were introduced in the seminal paper [EM65] and are categorically dual to modules over algebras. In the same paper Eilenberg and Moore introduced a further dual to comodules, which they called *contramodules*. These are vector spaces V with a map $\mathrm{Hom}_k(C, V) \longrightarrow V$ satisfying similar axioms called contra-associativity and contra-unitality.

While modules and comodules got their fair share of fame throughout the decades following their introduction, contramodules were seemingly lost to history — virtually forgotten — until dug out from their grave of obscurity by Positselski in the early 2000's. Positselski has since developed a considerable body of literature on contramodules, see for example [Pos10; Pos11; Pos16; Pos17b; Pos20] or the survey paper [Pos22].

In [Pos10] Positselski introduced the co/contra correspondence, which is an adjunction between the category of comodules and the category of contramodules over a cocommutative coalgebra C. This correspondence sat existing duality theories on a common footing, for example Serre–Grothendieck duality and Feigin–Fuchs central charge duality. Positselski also introduced the coderived and contraderived categories of C-comodules and C-contramodules respectively, and used this to prove a derived co/contra correspondence of the form

$$\mathrm{D}^{co}(\mathrm{Comod}_C) \simeq \mathrm{D}^{contra}(\mathrm{Contra}_C),$$

generalizing for example Matlis–Greenlees–May duality and Dwyer–Greenlees duality — see [Pos16].

The goal of the present paper is to generalize the co/contra correspondence — which we will refer to as Positselski duality — to cocommutative coalgebras in ∞-categories. We will also use the correspondence in stable ∞-categories, which are natural enhancements of triangulated categories. These serve as the natural place to study similar correspondences and equivalences as in the derived co/contra correspondence. The canonical references for ∞-categories are [Lur09] and [Lur17], and we will throughout the paper freely use their language instead of the more standard language of triangulated categories in the homological algebra literature.

Motivation

Let us try to both make a motivation for the traditional Positselski duality theory and for the connection to coalgebras in stable ∞-categories.

We let X be a separated noetherian scheme, $Z \subset X$ a closed subscheme and $U = X \backslash Z$ its open complement. The derived category of all $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules, $\mathrm{D}(\mathcal{O}_X)$, has a full subcategory $\mathrm{D}(X)$ consisting of complexes with quasi-coherent homology. We define $\mathrm{D}(U)$ similarly. These are all stable ∞-categories, with homotopy categories $h\mathrm{D}(X)$ being the more traditional triangulated derived category.

Letting $i\colon U \longrightarrow X$ be the inclusion we get a functor $i^*\colon \mathrm{D}(X) \longrightarrow \mathrm{D}(U)$ by pulling back along i. This has a fully faithful right adjoint $i_*\colon \mathrm{D}(U) \longrightarrow \mathrm{D}(X)$, which itself has a further right adjoint $i^!\colon \mathrm{D}(X) \longrightarrow \mathrm{D}(U)$. The kernels of i^* and $i^!$ determine two equivalent subcategories of $\mathrm{D}(X)$, the former of which is the full subcategory $\mathrm{D}_Z(X) \subseteq \mathrm{D}(X)$ consisting of complexes with homology supported on Z. The fully faithful functor $j_! \colon \mathrm{D}_Z(X) \longrightarrow \mathrm{D}(X)$ has a colimit preserving right adjoint $j^!$. The kernel of $i^!$ is identified with the full subcategory of $\mathrm{D}(X)$ with homology supported on the formal completion of X along Z, which we denote $\mathrm{D}(X)^{\wedge}_{Z}$. The fully faithful inclusion $j_* \colon \mathrm{D}(X)^{\wedge}_{Z} \longrightarrow \mathrm{D}(X)$ has a left adjoint j^*.

As mentioned these two categories are equivalent, and the equivalence is given by the composite $j^* j_!$ with inverse $j^! j_*$. In fact we get a stable recollement

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{D}_Z(X) \arrow[dd, "\simeq"] \arrow[dr, shift left, "j_!"] & & \\
& \mathrm{D}(X) \arrow[ul, shift left, "j^!"] \arrow[dl, shift left, "j^*"] \arrow[r, bend left, "i^*"] \arrow[r, bend right, "i^!"'] & \mathrm{D}(U) \arrow[l, "i_*"'] \\
\mathrm{D}(X)^{\wedge}_{Z} \arrow[ur, shift left, "j_*"'] & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

This equivalence does not on the surface have anything to do with comodules or contramodules, so let us fix this. For simplicity we assume that $X = \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{Z})$, such that $\mathrm{D}(X) \simeq \mathrm{D}(\mathbb{Z})$. Any prime p determines a closed subscheme P of X. With this setup we can identify $\mathrm{D}_P(X) \simeq \mathrm{D}(\mathrm{Comod}_{\mathbb{Z}/p^\infty})$ and $\mathrm{D}(X)^{\wedge}_{Z} \simeq \mathrm{D}(\mathrm{Contra}_{\mathbb{Z}/p^\infty})$, where $\mathbb{Z}/p^\infty$ is the p-Prüfer coalgebra of $\mathbb{Z}$. It is the Pontryagin dual of the p-adic completion of $\mathbb{Z}$, often denoted $\mathbb{Z}_p$.

Remark. There is a more familiar description of $\mathrm{Comod}_{\mathbb{Z}/p^\infty}$ as the p-power torsion objects in Ab and $\mathrm{Contra}_{\mathbb{Z}/p^\infty}$ as the L-complete objects in Ab. The above then reduces to the derived version of Grothendieck local duality by Dwyer–Greenlees, showing that this is a certain version of Positselski duality. In [Pos17a, 2.2(1), 2.2(3)] Positselski proves that the derived complete modules also correspond to a suitably defined version of contramodules over an adic ring. For the above example this is precicely the p-adic integers $\mathbb{Z}_p$. The comodules over $\mathbb{Z}/p^\infty$ then correspond to discrete $\mathbb{Z}_p$-modules, see [Pos22, Sec. 1.9, Sec. 1.10].

The above motivates the classical co/contra correspondence, so let us now see how we wish to abstract this.

As i^* is a symmetric monoidal localization the category $\mathrm{D}_Z(X)$ is a localizing ideal. By [Rou08, 6.8] there is a compact object $F \in \mathrm{D}(X)$ with homology supported on Z such that F generates $\mathrm{D}_Z(X)$ under colimits. Now, as $\mathrm{D}_Z(X)$ is a compactly generated localizing ideal of a compactly generated symmetric monoidal stable ∞-category, the right adjoint $j^*\colon \mathrm{D}(X) \longrightarrow \mathrm{D}_Z(X)$ is smashing, hence given as $j_*j^*(\mathbb{1}) \otimes_{\mathrm{D}(X)} (-)$, where $\mathbb{1}$ denotes the unit in $\mathrm{D}(X)$. In $\mathrm{D}(X)$ the object $j_*j^*(\mathbb{1})$ is the fiber of the unit map $\mathbb{1} \longrightarrow i_*i^*(\mathbb{1})$. In fact, $i_*i^*(\mathbb{1})$ is an idempotent $\mathbb{E}_\infty$-algebra in $\mathrm{D}(X)$, hence the fiber of the unit map, i.e. $j_*j^*(\mathbb{1})$, is an idempotent $\mathbb{E}_\infty$-coalgebra.

Using a dual version of Barr–Beck monadicity, see Section 3.2.3, one can prove that

$$\mathrm{D}_Z(X) \simeq \mathrm{Comod}_{j_*j^*(\mathbb{1})}(\mathrm{D}(X)).$$

Similarly, there is an equivalence

$$\mathrm{D}(X)^\wedge_Z \simeq \mathrm{Contra}_{j_*j^*(\mathbb{1})}(\mathrm{D}(X)),$$

which, put together gives us an instance of Positselski duality for stable ∞-categories:

$$\mathrm{Comod}_{j_*j^*(\mathbb{1})}(\mathrm{D}(X)) \simeq \mathrm{Contra}_{j_*j^*(\mathbb{1})}(\mathrm{D}(X)).$$

This is a special case of our second main theorem, Theorem E, which is an application of the Positselski duality for $\mathbb{E}_\infty$-coalgebras set up in Theorem D.

Overview of results

As mentioned, the main goal of this paper is to introduce the notion of comodules and contramodules in ∞-categories. Our main result is the following.

Theorem D (Theorem 3.3.11)**.** *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a presentably symmetric monoidal ∞-category. For any idempotent cocommutative coalgebra C, there are mutually inverse equivalences*

$$\mathrm{Comod}_C(\mathcal{C}) \rightleftarrows \mathrm{Contra}_C(\mathcal{C})$$

given by the free contramodule and cofree comodule functor respectively.

Our main application of this is to give an alternative perspective on local duality, in the sense of [HPS97] and [BHV18].

Theorem E (Theorem 3.3.17)**.** *Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ be a pair consisting of a rigidly compactly generated symmetric monoidal stable ∞-category $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, \mathbb{1})$ and a set of compact objects $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. Let Γ be the right adjoint to the fully faithful inclusion of the localizing tensor ideal generated by $\mathcal{K}$, i.e. $i\colon \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors} := \mathrm{Loc}^{\otimes}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{K}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}$. Then Positselski duality for the $\mathbb{E}_\infty$-coalgebra $i\Gamma\mathbb{1}$, recovers the local duality equivalence $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors} \simeq \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-comp}$.*

As an example of why the two theorems above might be interesting, we have the following descriptions of the categories $\mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)}$ and $\mathrm{Sp}_{T(n)}$ in chromatic homotopy theory.

Corollary. There are symmetric monoidal equivalences $\mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)} \simeq \mathrm{Contra}_{M_n\mathbb{S}}(\mathrm{Sp}_n)$ and $\mathrm{Sp}_{T(n)} \simeq \mathrm{Contra}_{M_n^f\mathbb{S}}(\mathrm{Sp}_n^f)$.

Acknowledgements and personal remarks

The contents of this paper go back to one of the first ideas I had at the beginning of my PhD. I had my two favorite mathematical hammers — local duality and the monoidal Barr–Beck theorem — and was trying to see if these were really one and the same tool. Local duality consists of three parts: local objects, torsion objects and complete objects. The core idea came from the fact that the local objects are modules over an idempotent algebra, and I thus wanted a similar description of the other two parts. Drew Heard's guidance led me to a dual monoidal Barr–Beck result, checking off the torsion part. I got the first hints of the last piece after an email correspondence with Marius Nielsen, where we discussed a local duality type statement for mapping spectra. The solution clicked into place during a research visit to Aarhus University. During my stay Sergey Arkhipov gave two talks on

contramodules, for completely unrelated reasons, and I immediately knew this was the last piece of the puzzle. Greg Stevenson taught me some additional details, solidifying my ideas, which led me to conjecture one of the main results of the present paper during my talk in their seminar. The crowd nodded in approval, thus, being satisfied I knew the answer, I naturally spent almost two years not writing it up.

I want to thank all of the people mentioned above for their insights and pathfinding skills, without which this project would still have been a rather simple-minded idea in the optimistic brain of a young PhD student.

3.2 General preliminaries

The goal of this section is to introduce comodules and contramodules over an $\mathbb{E}_\infty$-coalgebra in some ∞-category $\mathcal{C}$. In order to do this we first review some basic facts about coalgebras, monads and comonads.

We will for the rest of this section work in some fixed presentably symmetric monoidal ∞-category $\mathcal{C}$. In other words, $\mathcal{C}$ is an commutative algebra object in Pr^L, the category of presentable ∞-categories and left adjoint functors. In particular, the monoidal product, which we denote by $- \otimes - \colon \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ preserves colimits in both variables. We denote the unit of the monoidal structure by $\mathbb{1}$.

3.2.1 Coalgebras, monads and comonads

We denote the category of commutative algebras in $\mathcal{C}$ by $\mathrm{CAlg}(\mathcal{C})$. These are the coherently commutative ring objects in $\mathcal{C}$. By [Lur17, 2.4.2.7] there is a symmetric monoidal structure on $\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}}$, and we define the category of $\mathbb{E}_\infty$-coalgebras in $\mathcal{C}$ to be the category $\mathrm{cCAlg}(\mathcal{C}) := \mathrm{CAlg}(\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}})^{\mathrm{op}}$. We will from now on omit the prefix $\mathbb{E}_\infty$ and refer to objects in $\mathrm{cCAlg}(\mathcal{C})$ as *commutative coalgebras*, or simply just *coalgebras*. Classical coalgebras will be referred to as *discrete* in order to avoid confusion.

Proposition 3.2.1. *The following properties hold for the category* $\mathrm{cCAlg}(\mathcal{C})$*.*

1. *The forgetful functor* $U\colon \mathrm{cCAlg}(\mathcal{C}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ *is conservative and creates colimits.*

2. *The categorical product of two coalgebras* C, D *is given by the tensor product of their underlying objects* $C \otimes D$*.*

3. *The category* $\mathrm{cCAlg}(\mathcal{C})$ *is presentably symmetric monoidal when equipped with the cartesian monoidal structure. In particular, this means that the forgetful functor* U *is symmetric monoidal.*

4. *The forgetful functor* U *has a lax-monoidal right adjoint* $cf\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathrm{cCAlg}(\mathcal{C})$*. The image of an object* $X \in \mathcal{C}$ *is called the cofree coalgebra on* X*.*

Proof. The presentability and creation of colimits by the forgetful functor is proven in [Lur18, 3.1.2] and [Lur18, 3.1.4]. The cartesian symmetric monoidal structure on $\mathrm{cCAlg}(\mathcal{C})$ follows from [Lur17, 3.2.4.7]. The last item follows from the first three together with the adjoint functor theorem, [Lur09, 5.5.2.9]. □

Given any ∞-category $\mathcal{D}$, the category of endofunctors $\mathrm{Fun}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D})$ can be given the structure of a monoidal category via composition of functors.

Definition 3.2.2. A monad M on $\mathcal{D}$ is an $\mathbb{E}_1$-algebra in $\mathrm{Fun}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D})$, and a comonad C is an $\mathbb{E}_1$-coalgebra in $\mathrm{Fun}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D})$.

Example 3.2.3. Any adjunction of ∞-categories $F : \mathcal{D} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{E} : G$ gives rise to a monad $GF\colon \mathcal{D} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ and a comonad $FG\colon \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}$. We call these the *adjunction monad* and *adjunction comonad* of the adjunction $F \dashv G$.

The category $\mathcal{D}$ is left tensored over $\mathrm{Fun}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D})$ via evaluation of functors. Hence, for any monad M on $\mathcal{D}$ we get a category of left modules over M in $\mathcal{D}$.

Definition 3.2.4. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be an ∞-category and M a monad on $\mathcal{D}$. We define the *Eilenberg–Moore category* of M to be the category of left modules $\mathrm{LMod}_M(\mathcal{D})$. Objects in $\mathrm{LMod}_M(\mathcal{D})$ are referred to as *modules over M*.

Remark 3.2.5. Dually, any comonad C on $\mathcal{D}$ gives rise to a category of left comodules over C in $\mathcal{D}$. We also call this the Eilenberg–Moore category of C, and denote it by $\mathrm{LComod}_C(\mathcal{D})$. Its objects are referred to as *comodules* over C.

Given a monad M on $\mathcal{D}$ we have a forgetful functor $U_M \colon \mathrm{LMod}_M(\mathcal{D}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$. By [Lur17, 4.2.4.8] this functor admits a left adjoint $F_M \colon \mathcal{D} \longrightarrow \mathrm{LMod}_M(\mathcal{D})$ given by $X \longmapsto MX$. We call this the free module functor. The adjunction $F_M \dashv U_M$ is called the *free-forgetful* adjunction of M.

Definition 3.2.6. An adjunction is said to be *monadic* if it is equivalent to the free-forgetful adjunction $F_M \dashv U_M$ of a monad M. A functor $G \colon \mathcal{D} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}$ is called *monadic* if it is equivalent to the right adjoint U_M for some monadic adjunction.

The existence of the free-forgetful adjunction for a monad M implies that any monad is the adjunction monad of some adjunction. However, there can be more than one adjunction $F \dashv G$ such that M is the adjunction monad for this adjunction.

Definition 3.2.7. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be an ∞-category and M a monad on $\mathcal{D}$. A left M-module $B \in \mathrm{LMod}_M(\mathcal{D})$ is *free* if it is equivalent to an object in the image of F_M. The full subcategory of free modules is called the *Kleisli category* of M, and is denoted $\mathrm{LMod}_M^{\mathrm{fr}}(\mathcal{D})$.

The free-forgetful adjunction restricts to an adjunction $F_M : \mathcal{D} \rightleftarrows \mathrm{LMod}_M^{\mathrm{fr}}(\mathcal{D}) : U_M^{\mathrm{fr}}$. By [Chr23, 1.8] this is the minimal adjunction with adjunction monad equivalent to M. Using Lurie's ∞-categorical version of the Barr–Beck theorem we can also identify the free-forgetful adjunction as the maximal adjunction with adjunction monad M.

Theorem 3.2.8 ([Lur17, 4.7.3.5])**.** *A functor $G \colon \mathcal{D} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}$ of ∞-categories is monadic if and only if*

1. *G admits a left adjoint,*
2. *G is conservative, and*
3. *the category $\mathcal{D}$ admits colimits of G-split simplicial objects, and these are preserved under G.*

Remark 3.2.9. By definition, if a functor $G\colon \mathcal{D} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}$ is monadic, then there is an equivalence of categories $\mathcal{E} \simeq \mathrm{LMod}_{GF}(\mathcal{D})$, where F is the left adjoint of G.

Definition 3.2.10. Dually, given any comonad C on an ∞-category $\mathcal{D}$, there is a forgetful functor $U_C\colon \mathrm{LComod}_C(\mathcal{D}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$, which admits a right adjoint

$$F_C\colon \mathcal{D} \longrightarrow \mathrm{LComod}_C(\mathcal{D}).$$

We call this the *cofree comodule functor*, and hence the adjunction $U_C \dashv F_C$ is called the *cofree-forgetful* adjunction of C. Any adjunction equivalent to a cofree-forgetful adjunction for some comonad C is said to be *comonadic*. A functor $G\colon \mathcal{D} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}$ is said to be *comonadic* if it is equivalent to the left adjoint of a comonadic adjunction.

Remark 3.2.11. The essential image of F_C in $\mathrm{LComod}_C(\mathcal{D})$ determines the Kleisli category $\mathrm{LComod}_C^{\mathrm{fr}}(\mathcal{D})$ of cofree coalgebras. The cofree-forgetful adjunction restricts to an adjunction on cofree comodules, $U_C^{\mathrm{fr}} : \mathrm{LComod}_C^{\mathrm{fr}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightleftarrows \mathcal{D} : F_C$, which is the minimal adjunction whose adjunction comonad is C.

3.2.2 Comodules and contramodules

Recall that we have fixed a presentably symmetric monoidal ∞-category $\mathcal{C}$. Let us now construct the monads and comonads of interest for this paper.

Example 3.2.12. Let $A \in \mathrm{CAlg}(\mathcal{C})$ be a commutative algebra object in $\mathcal{C}$. The endofunctor $A \otimes (-)\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is a monad on $\mathcal{C}$. By [Chr23, 1.17] the Eilenberg–Moore category of this monad is equivalent to the category of modules over A in $\mathcal{C}$. As A is commutative we denote this by $\mathrm{Mod}_A(\mathcal{C})$. As $\mathcal{C}$ is presentable and the monad $A \otimes (-)$ preserves colimits, there is a right adjoint $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(A, -)\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$. This is a comonad on $\mathcal{C}$. Since these form an adjoint monad-comonad pair, their Eilenberg–Moore categories are equivalent,

$$\mathrm{Mod}_A(\mathcal{C}) \simeq \mathrm{LMod}_{A\otimes(-)}(\mathcal{C}) \simeq \mathrm{LComod}_{\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(A,-)}(\mathcal{C}),$$

see [MM94, V.8.2] in the 1-categorical situation. The ∞-categorical version is exactly the same, and follows from the monadicity and comonadicity of the adjunctions.

The above example changes in an interesting way when replacing the algebra A with a coalgebra C.

Example 3.2.13. Let $C \in \mathrm{cCAlg}(\mathcal{C})$ be a cocommutative coalgebra in $\mathcal{C}$. By an ∞-categorical version of [HJR23, 2.5] the endofunctor $C \otimes (-)\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is a comonad on $\mathcal{C}$. By an argument dual to [Chr23, 1.17] the Eilenberg–Moore category of this comonad is equivalent to the category of comodules over the coalgebra C, which we denote by $\mathrm{Comod}_C(\mathcal{C})$. Since $C \otimes (-)$ preserves colimits there is a right adjoint $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, -)$, and this functor is a comonad on $\mathcal{C}$, again by [HJR23, 2.5]. Note that the category $\mathrm{Comod}_C(\mathcal{C})$ is presentable by [Ram24, 3.8], as $C \otimes (-)$ is accessible.

Notice that the pair $C \otimes (-) \dashv \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, -)$ is not an adjoint monad-comonad pair — it is now an an adjoint comonad-monad pair. This means, in particular, that their Eilenberg–Moore categories might not be equivalent. This possible non-equivalence is the *raison d'être* for contramodules, which we can then define as follows.

Definition 3.2.14. Let $C \in \mathrm{cCAlg}(\mathcal{C})$ be a cocommutative coalgebra. A *contramodule* over C is a module over the internal hom-monad $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_{\mathcal{C}}(C, -)\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$. The category of contramodules over C in $\mathcal{C}$ is the corresponding Eilenberg–Moore category, which will be denoted $\mathrm{Contra}_C(\mathcal{C})$.

Notation 3.2.15. Since we are working in a fixed category $\mathcal{C}$ we will often simply write Contra_C for the category of contramodules, and Comod_C for the category of comodules.

Remark 3.2.16. We also mention that the hom-tensor adjunction is an *internal adjunction*, in the sense that there is an equivalence of internal hom-objects

$$\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(X \otimes Y, Z) \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(X, \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(Y, Z)).$$

This follows from the hom-tensor adjunction together with a Yoneda argument.

Notation 3.2.17. We denote the mapping space in Comod_C by Hom_C and the mapping space in Contra_C by Hom^C. Similarly, the forgetful functors will be denoted $U_C\colon \mathrm{Comod}_C \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and $U^C\colon \mathrm{Contra}_C \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ respectively, while the cofree and free adjoints will be denoted $C\otimes(-)\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Comod}_C$ and $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C,-)\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Contra}_C$, hoping that it is clear from context whether we use them as above or as endofunctors on $\mathcal{C}$.

The following proposition is standard for monads and comonads, see for example [RV15, 5.7].

Proposition 3.2.18. *Let C be a cocommutative coalgebra in $\mathcal{C}$. The forgetful functor $U_C\colon \mathrm{Comod}_C \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ creates colimits, while the forgetful functor $U^C\colon \mathrm{Contra}_C \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ creates limits.*

3.2.3 The dual monoidal Barr–Beck theorem

Lurie's version of the Barr–Beck monadicity theorem, see [Lur17, Section 4.7], allows us to recognize monadic functors from simple criteria. Combined with a recognition theorem for when a monoidal monadic functor is equivalent to $R\otimes -$ for some commutative ring R, Mathew–Neumann–Noel extended the Barr–Beck theorem to a monoidal version. In this short section we prove a categorical dual version of their result.

Let $F : \mathcal{C} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{D} : G$ pair of adjoint functors between symmetric monoidal categories, such that the left adjoint F is symmetric monoidal. This means that the right adjoint G is lax-monoidal, and does in particular preserve algebra objects. There is for any two objects $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{D}$, a natural map

$$F(G(Y) \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} X) \xrightarrow{\simeq} FG(Y) \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} F(X) \longrightarrow Y \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} F(X)$$

where the last map is given by the adjunction counit. By the adjunction property, there is an adjoint map

$$G(Y) \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} X \longrightarrow G(Y \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} F(X)).$$

Definition 3.2.19. An adjoint pair $F \dashv G$ as above is said to satisfy the *monadic projection formula* if the map

$$G(Y) \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} X \longrightarrow G(Y \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} F(X))$$

is an equivalence for all $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{D}$.

We now state the monoidal Barr–Beck theorem of Mathew–Neumann–Noel.

Theorem 3.2.20 ([MNN17, 5.29])**.** *Let $F : \mathcal{C} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{D} : G$ be an adjunction of presentably symmetric monoidal ∞-categories, such that the left adjoint F is symmetric monoidal. If, in addition*

1. *G is conservative,*
2. *G preserves arbitrary colimits, and*
3. *$F \dashv G$ satisfies the monadic projection formula,*

then the adjunction is monadic, and there is an equivalence of monads

$$GF \simeq G(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{D}}) \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} (-).$$

In particular, there is a symmetric monoidal equivalence $\mathcal{D} \simeq \mathrm{Mod}_{G(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{D}})}(\mathcal{C})$.

Remark 3.2.21. Note that this result is stated only for stable ∞-categories in [MNN17], but also holds unstably by a combination of Lurie's ∞-categorical Barr–Beck theorem, Theorem 3.2.8, together with the fact that the monadic projection formula applied to the unit gives an equivalence of monads by [EK20, 3.6].

There is also a dual version of the classical Barr–Beck theorem, see for example [BM23, 4.5]. We wish to extend this to a monoidal version.

Let $F : \mathcal{C} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{D} : G$ pair of adjoint functors between symmetric monoidal categories, such that the right adjoint G is symmetric monoidal. This means that the left adjoint F is op-lax-monoidal, and does in particular preserve coalgebra objects. There is for any two objects $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{D}$, a natural map

$$G(F(X) \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} Y) \xrightarrow{\simeq} GF(X) \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} G(Y) \longrightarrow X \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} G(Y)$$

where the last map is given by the adjunction unit. By the adjunction property, there is an adjoint map

$$F(X) \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} Y \longrightarrow F(X \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} G(Y)).$$

Definition 3.2.22. An adjoint pair $F \dashv G$ as above is said to satisfy the *comonadic projection formula* if the map

$$F(X) \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} Y \longrightarrow F(X \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} G(Y))$$

is an equivalence for all $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{D}$.

Theorem 3.2.23. *Let $F : \mathcal{C} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{D} : G$ be an adjunction of presentably symmetric monoidal ∞-categories, such that the right adjoint G is symmetric monoidal. If, in addition*

1. *F is conservative,*
2. *F preserves arbitrary limits, and*
3. *$F \dashv G$ satisfies the comonadic projection formula,*

then the adjunction is comonadic, and there is an equivalence of comonads

$$FG \simeq F(\mathbb{1}_C) \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} (-)$$

In particular, this gives an equivalence $\mathcal{C} \simeq \mathrm{Comod}_{F(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}})}(\mathcal{D})$.

Remark 3.2.24. Before the proof we just remark why the above statement makes sense. The unit $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}$ in a presentably symmetric monoidal ∞-category $\mathcal{C}$ is both an $\mathbb{E}_\infty$-algebra and an $\mathbb{E}_\infty$-coalgebra. In the above adjunction we have that the right adjoint G is symmetric monoidal, hence its left adjoint F is op-lax monoidal. In particular, it sends coalgebras to coalgebras, meaning that $F(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}})$ is an $\mathbb{E}_\infty$-coalgebra in $\mathcal{D}$. By Example 3.2.13 tensoring with $F(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}})$ is a comonad, not a monad, as for Theorem 3.2.20.

Proof. By [BM23, 4.5] the adjunction is comonadic. A dual version of [EK20, 3.6] shows that there is a map of comonads $\varphi\colon FG \longrightarrow F(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}) \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} (-)$, and consequently an adjunction

$$\mathrm{Comod}_{FG}(\mathcal{D}) \underset{\varphi^*}{\overset{\varphi_*}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathrm{Comod}_{F(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}})\otimes_{\mathcal{D}}(-)}(\mathcal{D})$$

By applying the projection formula to the unit $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}$ we get that φ is a natural equivalence, which means that the adjunction (φ_*, φ^*) is an adjoint equivalence. By Example 3.2.13 the Eilenberg–Moore category of the comonad $F(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}) \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} (-)$ is equivalent to the category of comodules over the $\mathbb{E}_\infty$-coalgebra $F(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}})$, finishing the proof. □

Remark 3.2.25. We want to specify when the above equivalence is an equivalence of symmetric monoidal categories. We could hope for the existence of a symmetric monoidal structure on Comod_C for a cocommutative coalgebra $C \in \mathcal{C}$. For the category $\mathrm{Mod}_R(\mathcal{C})$ of modules over a commutative algebra $R \in \mathcal{C}$ this is done by Lurie's relative tensor product, see [Lur17, Section 4.5.2]. But, for such a relative monoidal product to exist on Comod_C one needs the tensor product in $\mathcal{C}$ to commute with cosifted limits, which is rarely the case. But, as we will see in Section 3.3.1 we sometimes get a monoidal structure, and when this is the case, the equivalence in Theorem 3.2.23 is symmetric monoidal.

3.3 Positselski duality

Classical Positselski duality, usually called the co-contra correspondence, is an adjunction between comodules and contramodules over a R-coalgebra C, where R is an algebra over a field k.

In particular, the categories involved are abelian, which makes some constructions easier. For example, the monoidal structure on Mod_R induces monoidal structures on Comod_C via the relative tensor construction — given by a certain equalizers. For ∞-categories the relative tensor construction is more complicated, as we need the monoidal structure to behave well with all higher coherencies, as mentioned in Remark 3.2.25. We can, however, restrict our attention to a certain type of coalgebra, fixing these issues. This also puts us in the setting we are interested in regarding local duality — see Section 3.3.2.

3.3.1 Idempotent coalgebras

We now restrict our attention to the special class of coalgebras that we will focus on for the remainder of the paper.

Definition 3.3.1. A cocommutative coalgebra $C \in \mathrm{cCAlg}(\mathcal{C})$ is said to be *separable* if the comultiplication map $\Delta\colon C \longrightarrow C \otimes C^{\mathrm{op}}$ admits a (C, C)-bicomodule section $s\colon C \otimes C \longrightarrow C$. It is *idempotent* if Δ is an equivalence.

Remark 3.3.2. Any idempotent coalgebra is in particular separable, see [Ram23, 1.6(1)] for a formally dual statement.

The first reason for our focus on idempotent coalgebras is that their categories of comodules inherit a symmetric monoidal structure from $\mathcal{C}$, which is rarely the case for general coalgebras, see Remark 3.2.25.

Lemma 3.3.3. *Let C be an idempotent cocommutative coalgebra in $\mathcal{C}$. The category of C-comodules Comod_C inherits the structure of a presentably symmetric monoidal ∞-category making the cofree comodule functor a symmetric monoidal smashing colocalization.*

Proof. The category Comod_C is presentable by [Hol20, 2.1.11]. Let M and N be two comodules. Their relative tensor product in Comod_C is defined by the the two sided co-bar construction,

$$M \otimes_C N := \lim_n (M \otimes C^{\otimes n} \otimes N),$$

but, as C is idempotent this is just the object $N \otimes C \otimes M$, which is the cofree comodule on the underlying object of $M \otimes N$. This means that the relative tensor product is defined for all comodules. The unit for the monoidal structure $- \otimes_C -$ is C, and the monoidal structure is symmetric monoidal as the monoidal structure in $\mathcal{C}$ is.

The endofunctor $C \otimes (-) \colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is idempotent when C is. Hence, as the forgetful functor $U_C \colon \mathrm{Comod}_C \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is fully faithful when C is idempotent, the cofree functor $C \otimes (-) \colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Comod}_C$ is a smashing colocalization of $\mathcal{C}$. Hence it is a symmetric monoidal functor by a dual version of [Lur17, 2.2.1.9], as it is obviously compatible with the symmetric monoidal structure in $\mathcal{C}$, due to the idempotency of C. □

Lemma 3.3.4. *The symmetric monoidal structure on* Comod_C *is closed.*

Proof. As the cofree-forgetful adjunction creates colimits in Comod_C the functor

$$- \otimes_C - \simeq C \otimes (- \otimes -) \colon \mathrm{Comod}_C \times \mathrm{Comod}_C \longrightarrow \mathrm{Comod}_C$$

preserves colimits separately in each variable. In particular, the functor $M \otimes_C (-)$ preserves colimits, hence has a right adjoint $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_C(M, -)$ for any comodule M by the adjoint functor theorem, [Lur09, 5.5.2.9]. This determines a functor

$$\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_C(-,-) \colon \mathrm{Comod}_C^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathrm{Comod}_C \longrightarrow \mathrm{Comod}_C$$

making Comod_C a closed symmetric monoidal category. □

Remark 3.3.5. This adjunction, being a hom-tensor adjunction is also internally adjoint in the sense of Remark 3.2.16. Hence we have an equivalence

$$\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_C(M \otimes_C N, A) \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_C(M, \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_C(N, A))$$

for all comodules M, N and A.

Another important reason for using idempotent coalgebras in this paper is the following result. Recall that a comodule over a coalgebra C is called cofree, if it is of the form $M \otimes C$ for some $M \in \mathcal{C}$. These are precisely the comodules in the image of the right adjoint to the forgetful functor $U_C \colon \mathrm{Comod}_C \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$, when C is idempotent. This is a slightly weaker coalgebraic version of [Ram23, 1.13, 1.14]. See also [Brz10, 3.6] for a related 1-categorical version.

Lemma 3.3.6. *Every comodule over an idempotent coalgebra C is a retract of a cofree comodule. In particular, there is an equivalence*

$$\mathrm{Comod}_C(\mathcal{C}) \simeq \mathrm{Comod}_C^{\mathrm{fr}}(\mathcal{C})$$

between the Eilenberg–Moore category and the Kleisli category of the comonad $C \otimes (-)$ on $\mathcal{C}$.

Proof. As idempotent coalgebras are separable, see Remark 3.3.2, the result will follow from the fact that the forgetful functor $U_C \colon \mathrm{Comod}_C \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is separable, in the sense that the adjunction unit map

$$\mathrm{Id}_{\mathrm{Comod}_C} \longrightarrow C \otimes U(-)$$

has a $\mathcal{C}$-linear section, whenever C is separable. The section is given by

$$C \otimes M \xrightarrow{\simeq} (C \otimes C) \otimes_C M \longrightarrow C \otimes_C M \xleftarrow{\simeq} M$$

for any comodule M. □

Remark 3.3.7. The fact that C is idempotent implies that any C-comodule M has a unique comodule structure. In particular, if M is a comodule, then the cofree comodule $C \otimes M$ is equivalent to M.

We get a similar statement for contramodules over C. Recall that a contramodule is said to be free if it is of the form $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, M)$ for some $M \in \mathcal{C}$.

Proposition 3.3.8. *Let $C \in \mathrm{cCAlg}(\mathcal{C})$ be a separable coalgebra. Then every contramodule over C is a retract of a free contramodule. In particular, there is an equivalence*

$$\mathrm{Contra}_C(\mathcal{C}) \simeq \mathrm{Contra}_C^{\mathrm{fr}}(\mathcal{C})$$

between the Eilenberg–Moore category and the Kleisli category of the monad $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, -)$ on $\mathcal{C}$.

Proof. We can prove this by showing that the section for the separable coalgebra C gives a section of the forgetful functor $U^C : \mathrm{Contra}_C \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$. The section is, for a contramodule X, given by the adjoint map $M \longrightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, M)$ to the section of the forgetful functor U_C on Comod_C from Lemma 3.3.6. □

We know from Lemma 3.3.3 that the cofree comodule functor $C \otimes (-): \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Comod}_C$ can be given the structure of a symmetric monoidal functor when the coalgebra C is idempotent. Naturally we want a similar statement for the free contramodule functor $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, -): \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Contra}_C$.

Remark 3.3.9. Let M be a C-comodule and V any object in $\mathcal{C}$. The structure map $\rho_M : M \longrightarrow C \otimes M$ induces a C-contramodule structure on the internal hom-object $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(M, V)$, via

$$\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(M, V)) \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C \otimes M, V) \xrightarrow{- \circ \rho_M} \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(M, V).$$

Lemma 3.3.10. *Let C be an idempotent cocommutative coalgebra in $\mathcal{C}$. The category of C-contramodules Contra_C inherits the structure of a presentably symmetric monoidal ∞-category making the free contramodule functor a symmetric monoidal localization.*

Proof. The functor $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, -): \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is an idempotent functor, as we have

$$\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, -)) \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C \otimes C, -) \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, -)$$

by the internal adjunction property together with the idempotency of C. The forgetful functor $U^C\colon \mathrm{Contra}_C \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is fully faithful, which means that the cofree functor $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C,-)\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Contra}_C$ is a localization.

In order to determine that it induces a symmetric monoidal structure on Contra_C we need to check that the free functor is compatible with the monoidal structure in $\mathcal{C}$. By [Nik16, 2.12(3)] it is enough to check that $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(V, X) \in \mathrm{Contra}_C$ for any $X \in \mathrm{Contra}_C$ and $V \in \mathcal{C}$. By Proposition 3.3.8 we can assume that $X \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, A)$ for some $A \in \mathcal{C}$. By the hom-tensor adjunction we get

$$\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(A, \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, V)) \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C \otimes V, A).$$

The latter is a C-contramodule by Remark 3.3.9, as $C \otimes V$ is a C-comodule.

We can then apply [Lur09, 2.2.1.9], which tells us that the free contramodule functor $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C,-)\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Contra}_C$ can be given the structure of a symmetric monoidal functor. As Contra_C is a localization of a presentably symmetric monoidal category by an accessible functor, it is also presentably symmetric monoidal. □

We can now deduce our main result, namely that Positselski duality is a symmetric monoidal equivalence for idempotent coalgebras.

Theorem 3.3.11. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a presentably symmetric monoidal category and $C \in \mathcal{C}$ an idempotent cocommutative coalgebra. In this situation there are mutually inverse symmetric monoidal functors*

$$\mathrm{Comod}_C(\mathcal{C}) \underset{C\otimes(-)}{\overset{\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C,-)}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathrm{Contra}_C(\mathcal{C})$$

given on the underlying objects by the free contramodule functor and the cofree comodule functor respectively.

Proof. By Lemma 3.3.6 and Proposition 3.3.8 every C-comodule (resp. C-contramodule) is a retract of a cofree comodule (resp.

free contramodule). Hence, it is enough to prove that the functors are mutually inverse equivalences between cofree and free objects.

Let A be any object in $\mathcal{C}$. Denote by $C \otimes A$ the corresponding cofree comodule and $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, A)$ the corresponding cofree contramodule. A simple adjunction argument, using both the cofree-forgetful adjunction and the hom-tensor adjunctions in $\mathcal{C}$ and Comod_C, shows that there is an equivalence

$$\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_C(M, C \otimes A) \simeq C \otimes \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(U_C M, A)$$

for any comodule M. In other words, the internal comodule hom is determined by the underlying internal hom in $\mathcal{C}$. For $M = C$ we get

$$C \otimes \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, A) \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}_C(C, C \otimes A)$$

which is equivalent to $C \otimes A$ as C is the unit in Comod_C.

We wish to show that $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, C \otimes A) \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, A)$. We do this by showing that the cofree-forgetful functor is an internal adjunction, in the sense of Remark 3.2.16.

Let B be an arbitrary object in $\mathcal{C}$, and recall our notation $\mathrm{Hom}(-,-)$ for the mapping space in $\mathcal{C}$. By the hom-tensor adjunction in $\mathcal{C}$ we have

$$\mathrm{Hom}(B, \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, C \otimes A)) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}(C \otimes B, C \otimes A).$$

Both of these are in the image of the forgetful functor $U_C \colon \mathrm{Comod}_C \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$. As it is fully faithful when C is idempotent we get

$$\mathrm{Hom}(C \otimes B, C \otimes A) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_C(C \otimes B, C \otimes A),$$

where we recall that the latter denotes maps of comodules. By the cofree-forgetful adjunction we have

$$\mathrm{Hom}_C(C \otimes B, C \otimes A) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}(C \otimes B, A),$$

which by the hom-tensor adjunction in $\mathcal{C}$ finally gives

$$\mathrm{Hom}(C \otimes B, A) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}(B, \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, C \otimes A)).$$

Summarizing the equivalences we have $\mathrm{Hom}(B, \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, C \otimes A)) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}(B, \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, A))$, which by a Yoneda argument implies that there is an equivalence of internal hom-objects $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, C \otimes A) \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, A)$.

We know by Lemma 3.3.3 and Lemma 3.3.10 that the cofree comodule functor and the free contramodule functor are both symmetric monoidal. By the arguments above, we know that the equivalence $\mathrm{Comod}_C \simeq \mathrm{Contra}_C$ is given by the compositions

$$\mathrm{Comod}_C \underset{C\otimes -}{\overset{U_C}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathcal{C} \underset{U^C}{\overset{\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C,-)}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathrm{Contra}_C$$

The composition from left to right is an op-lax symmetric monoidal functor, and the composition from right to left is a lax symmetric monoidal functor. Since they are both equivalences they are neccessarily also symmetric monoidal. $\square$

Remark 3.3.12. We do believe that the above result to hold more generally. In fact, we believe it should hold for all separable cocommutative coalgebras, as this holds in the 1-categorical situation. However, it will in general not be a monoidal equivalence, due to the lack of monoidal structures.

3.3.2 Local duality

Our main interest for constructing an ∞-categorical version of Positselski duality is related to local duality, in the sense of [HPS97] and [BHV18]. In this section we use Theorem 3.3.11 to to construct an alternative proof of [BHV18, 2.21]. We first recall the construction of local duality.

Let $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, \mathbb{1})$ be a presentably symmetric monoidal ∞-category. The tensor product $\otimes$ preserves filtered colimits separately in each variable, which by the adjoint functor theorem ([Lur09, 5.5.2.9]) means that the functor $X \otimes (-)$ has a right adjoint $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(X, -)$, making $\mathcal{C}$ a closed symmetric monoidal category.

From this internal hom-object we get a functor

$$(-)^\vee = \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(-, \mathbb{1})\colon \mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C},$$

which we call *the linear dual.*

Definition 3.3.13. An object $X \in \mathcal{C}$ is *compact* if the functor $\mathrm{Hom}(X, -)$ preserves filtered colimits, and it is *dualizable* if the natural map $X^\vee \otimes Y \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(X, Y)$ is an equivalence for all $Y \in \mathcal{C}$.

The category $\mathcal{C}$ is said to be *rigidly compactly generated* if it is compactly generated by dualizable objects, and the unit $\mathbb{1}$ is compact. In this situation, the collection of compact objects is also the collection of dualizable objects.

Definition 3.3.14. A *local duality context* is a pair $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$, where $\mathcal{C}$ is a rigidly compactly generated symmetric monoidal stable ∞-category and $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is a set of compact objects.

Construction 3.3.15. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$ be a local duality context. We denote the localizing ideal generated by $\mathcal{K}$ by $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors} = \mathrm{Loc}^{\otimes}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{K})$. The right orthogonal complement of $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors}$, in other words those objects $Y \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\mathrm{Hom}(X, Y) \simeq 0$ for all $X \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-loc}$. By [BHV18, 2.17] this category is also a compactly generated localizing subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$. Lastly, we define the category $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-comp}$ to be the right orthogonal complement to $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-loc}$.

The fully faithful inclusion $i_{\mathcal{K}-tors}\colon \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ has a right adjoint $\Gamma\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors}$, This means, in particular, that Γ is a colocalization. The fully faithful inclusions $i_{\mathcal{K}-loc}\colon \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-loc} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and $i_{\mathcal{K}-comp}\colon \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-comp} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ both have left adjoints $L\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-loc}$ and $\Lambda\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-comp}$ respectively, making them localizations.

Remark 3.3.16. Note that in the paper [BHV18] referenced above, they use the term *left orthogonal complement* instead of right. Both of these are used throughout the literature, but we decided on using *right*, as it felt more natural to the author.

Theorem 3.3.17. *For any local duality context* $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{K})$*,*

1. *the functor L is a smashing localization,*
2. *the functor Γ is a smashing colocalization,*
3. *the functors $\Lambda \circ i_{\mathcal{K}-tors}$ and $\Gamma \circ i_{\mathcal{K}-comp}$ are mutually inverse equivalences, and*
4. *the functors (Γ, Λ), viewed as endofunctors on $\mathcal{C}$ form an adjoint pair.*

In particular, there are equivalences $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors} \simeq \mathrm{Comod}_{\Gamma\mathbb{1}}(\mathcal{C}) \simeq \mathrm{Contra}_{\Gamma\mathbb{1}}(\mathcal{C}) \simeq \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-comp}$.

Remark 3.3.18. The result will essentially follow from recognizing (Γ, Λ), viewed as endofunctors on $\mathcal{C}$ as the adjoint comonad-monad pair $C \otimes (-) \dashv \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(C, -)$ for a certain idempotent $\mathbb{E}_\infty$-coalgebra C, and then applying Theorem 3.3.11.

Proof. By [HPS97, 3.3.3] the functor L is smashing, as it is a finite localization away from $\mathcal{K}$. By construction the functor Γ is determined by the kernel of the localization $X \longrightarrow LX$, hence is also smashing. The functor L has a fully faithful right adjoint, hence is a localization — similarly for Γ.

As Γ is smashing it is given by $\Gamma X \simeq \Gamma\mathbb{1} \otimes X$, and as $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors}$ is an ideal, it inherits a symmetric monoidal structure from $\mathcal{C}$, making Γ a symmetric monoidal functor. In particular, the object $\Gamma\mathbb{1}$ is the unit in $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors}$. The unit in a compactly generated symmetric monoidal stable ∞-category is both an $\mathbb{E}_\infty$-algebra and an $\mathbb{E}_\infty$-coalgebra. The inclusion $i_{\mathcal{K}-tors} \colon \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is oplax monoidal, as it is the left adjoint of a symmetric monoidal functor, meaning that it preserves coalgebras. In particular, $\Gamma\mathbb{1}$ treated as an object in $\mathcal{C}$ is a cocommutative coalgebra. Since Γ is a smashing colocalization $\Gamma\mathbb{1}$ is an idempotent coalgebra.

By Theorem 3.3.11 we then get an equivalence of categories

$$\mathrm{Comod}_{\Gamma\mathbb{1}}(\mathcal{C}) \simeq \mathrm{Contra}_{\Gamma\mathbb{1}}(\mathcal{C})$$

given by the mutually inverse equivalences

$$\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(\Gamma\mathbb{1}, -) \colon \mathrm{Comod}_{\Gamma\mathbb{1}}(\mathcal{C}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Contra}_{\Gamma\mathbb{1}}(\mathcal{C})$$

and

$$\Gamma\mathbb{1} \otimes -\colon \mathrm{Contra}_{\Gamma\mathbb{1}}(\mathcal{C}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Comod}_{\Gamma\mathbb{1}}(\mathcal{C}).$$

By Theorem 3.2.23 there is an equivalence $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-tors} \simeq \mathrm{Comod}_{\Gamma\mathbb{1}}(\mathcal{C})$, so it remains to show that $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-comp} \simeq \mathrm{Contra}_{\Gamma\mathbb{1}}(\mathcal{C})$. This follows from [BHV18, 2.2], just as in the proof of [BHV18, 2.21(4)], as it gives a sequence of equivalences

$$\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(\Gamma X, Y) \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(\Lambda X, \Lambda Y) \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(X, \Lambda Y)$$

which reduces to $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(\Gamma\mathbb{1}, Y) \simeq \Lambda Y$ when applied to $X = \mathbb{1}$. $\square$

Remark 3.3.19. The author feels that the equivalence $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-comp} \simeq \mathrm{Contra}_{\Gamma\mathbb{1}}$ should be a formal consequence of a “contramodular” Barr–Beck theorem, but such a result has so far escaped our grasp.

Remark 3.3.20. If the more general version of Positselski duality from Remark 3.3.12 holds, one could be able to generalize local duality to slightly more exotic situations, where the functors are not localizations.

The motivation for proving local duality in this setup was to have the following visually beautiful description of local duality.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & \mathrm{Mod}_{L\mathbb{1}} \arrow[dd, shift left, dotted, phantom] \arrow[d, shift right] \arrow[ddr, dotted, bend left] & \\
 & \mathcal{C} \arrow[u, shift right] \arrow[dl, shift left] \arrow[dr, shift left] & \\
\mathrm{Comod}_{\Gamma\mathbb{1}} \arrow[ur, shift left] \arrow[uur, dotted, bend left] \arrow[rr, shift left, "\simeq"] & & \mathrm{Contra}_{\Gamma\mathbb{1}} \arrow[ul, shift left] \arrow[ll, shift left]
\end{tikzcd}$$

Here the dotted arrows correspond to taking the right-orthogonal complement.

Remark 3.3.21. A visual, and intuitional, problem with the above picture is that the contramodule category is dependent on the coalgebra $\Gamma\mathbb{1}$ and not on its unit $\Lambda\mathbb{1}$. In the abelian situation, there is a notion of contramodule over a topological ring which would perfectly fix this issue, as one can show that $\Lambda\mathbb{1}$ is always an adic $\mathbb{E}_\infty$-ring. We plan to explore this connection in future work. The above comment in Remark 3.3.19 on a Barr–Beck result for contramodules might then be more easily accessible in this case, as one does not have to construct the unit in a dual but equal category. It might also be possible directly by using Positselski's notion of a *dedualizing complex*, see [Pos16].

Remark 3.3.22. In local duality there is another functor, that we did not really consider here, which is the right adjoint to the inclusion $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{K}-loc} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}$. This functor is given by $V = \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(L\mathbb{1}, -)$. As discussed in Example 3.2.12 it is a comonadic functor, and its category of comodules is equivalent to $\mathrm{Mod}_{L\mathbb{1}}$. We can think of the objects in $\mathrm{Comod}_{\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(L\mathbb{1},-)}$ as "co-contramodules". Adding these to the picture gives

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{Mod}_{L\mathbb{1}} \arrow[rr, "\simeq"] \arrow[dr, shift left] & & \mathrm{Cocontra}_{L\mathbb{1}} \arrow[dl, shift left] \arrow[dd, dotted] \\
& \mathcal{C} \arrow[ul, shift left] \arrow[ur, shift left] \arrow[dl, shift left] \arrow[dr, shift left] & \\
\mathrm{Comod}_{\Gamma\mathbb{1}} \arrow[uu, dotted] \arrow[ur, shift left] \arrow[rr, "\simeq"] & & \mathrm{Contra}_{\Gamma\mathbb{1}} \arrow[ul, shift left]
\end{tikzcd}$$

which also makes this story enticingly connected to 4-periodic semi-orthogonal decompositions and spherical adjunctions — see [Dyc+24, Section 2.5].

3.3.3 Examples

Our main interest in Theorem 3.3.17 is related to chromatic homotopy theory and derived completion of rings. We will not present comprehensive introductions to these topics here, hence the interested reader is referred to [BB19] for details on the former and [BHV20] for the latter.

Chromatic homotopy theory

The category of spectra, Sp, is the initial presentably symmetric monoidal stable ∞-category. Fixing a prime p, one can describe chromatic homotopy theory as the study of p-local spectra together with a *chromatic filtration*, coming from the height filtration of formal groups. In such a filtration there is a filtration component corresponding to each natural number n, which we will refer to as the n-th component. There are, at least, two different chromatic filtrations on Sp, and their conjectural equivalence was recently disproven in [Bur+23]. For simplicity we will distinguish these two by referring to them as the *compact filtration* and the *finite filtration*. This latter is a bit misleading, as it is not a finite filtration — the word finite corresponds to a certain finite spectrum. The n-th filtration component in the compact filtration is controlled by the Morava K-theory spectrum $K(n)$, and the n-th filtration component in the finite filtration is controlled by the telescope spectrum $T(n)$.

We denote the n-th component of the compact filtration by Sp_n and the n-th component of the finite filtration by Sp_n^f. The different components are related by smashing localization functors $L_{n-1}\colon \mathrm{Sp}_n \longrightarrow \mathrm{Sp}_{n-1}$ and $L_n^f\colon \mathrm{Sp}_n^f \longrightarrow \mathrm{Sp}_{n-1}^f$ respectively.

In the light of local duality, the category Sp_{n-1} is the category of local objects in Sp_n for a compact object $L_nV_n \in \mathrm{Sp}_n$. The torsion objects with respect to L_nV_n is the category of *monochromatic spectra*, denoted $\mathcal{M}_n$ and the category of complete objects are the $K(n)$-local spectra, $\mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)}$. For more details on monochromatic and $K(n)$-local spectra, see [HS99], and for the relationship to local duality, see [BHV18, Section 6.2].

Proposition 3.3.23. *For any non-negative integer n, there are symmetric monoidal equivalences $\mathcal{M}_n \simeq \mathrm{Comod}_{M_n\mathbb{S}}(\mathrm{Sp}_n)$ and $\mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)} \simeq \mathrm{Contra}_{M_n\mathbb{S}}(\mathrm{Sp}_n)$.*

Proof. This follows directly from Theorem 3.3.17, as the pair (Sp_n, L_nV_n) is a local duality context. □

We also have a similar description of the objects coming from the finite chromatic filtration.

Proposition 3.3.24. *For any non-negative integer n, there are* *symmetric monoidal equivalences* $\mathcal{M}_n^f \simeq \mathrm{Comod}_{M_n^f\mathbb{S}}(\mathrm{Sp}_n^f)$ *and* $\mathrm{Sp}_{T(n)} \simeq \mathrm{Contra}_{M_n^f\mathbb{S}}(\mathrm{Sp}_n^f)$.

Proof. As the functor $M_n^f \colon \mathrm{Sp}_n^f \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_n^f$ is a smashing colocalization, Theorem 3.2.23 gives an equivalence $\mathcal{M}_n^f \simeq \mathrm{Comod}_{M_n^f\mathbb{S}}(\mathrm{Sp}_n^f)$. As there is an equivalence $\mathcal{M}_n^f \simeq \mathrm{Sp}_{T(n)}$ the claim of the result is then a formal consequence of Theorem 3.3.11. □

Remark 3.3.25. In light of Remark 3.3.21 we would really like to have a description of $\mathrm{Sp}_{K(n)}$ and $\mathrm{Sp}_{T(n)}$ via certain contramodules over their respective units, which are the $K(n)$-local and $T(n)$-local spheres respectively. These spheres are both naturally $\mathbb{E}_\infty$-algebras in $\mathrm{Pro}(\mathrm{Sp}_n^\omega)$ and $\mathrm{Pro}(\mathrm{Sp}_n^{f,\omega})$ respectively, hence a natural starting point is to take advantage of this fact. We will investigate this in joint work with Florian Riedel.

Derived completion

Let R be a commutative noetherian ring and $I \subseteq R$ an ideal generated by a finite regular sequence. The I-adic completion functor $C^I \colon \mathrm{Mod}_R \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_R$, defined by $C^I(M) = \lim_k M/I^k$ is neither a left, nor right exact functor. However, by [GM92, 5.1] the higher right derived functors vanish. We denote the higher left derived functors of C^I by L_i^I. An R-module M is said to be *I-adically complete* if the natural map $M \longrightarrow C^I(M)$ is an isomorphism. It is said to be *L-complete* if the natural map $M \longrightarrow L_0^I(M)$ is an isomorphism. The map $M \longrightarrow C^I(M)$ factors through $L_0^I(M)$, and the map $L_0^I(M) \longrightarrow C^I(M)$ is always an epimorphism, but usually not an isomorphism. The full subcategory consisting of the L-complete modules form an abelian category Mod_R^{I-comp}. The full subcategory of I-adically complete modules, $\mathrm{Mod}_R^\wedge$ is usually not abelian.

The I-power torsion submodule of an R-module M is defined to be

$$T_I(M) := \{m \in M \mid I^k m = 0 \text{ for some } k \geqslant 0\}.$$

We say an R-module M is I-power torsion if the natural map $T_I(M) \longrightarrow M$ is an isomorphism. The full subcategory of I-power torsion R-modules form a Grothendieck abelian category, denoted Mod_R^{I-tors}.

The object R/I is compact in $\mathrm{D}(R)$, which is a rigidly compactly generated symmetric monoidal stable ∞-category. Hence, $(\mathrm{D}(R), R/I)$ is a local duality context. The category $\mathrm{D}(R)^{R/I-tors}$ is by [BHV20, 3.7(2)] equivalent to $\mathrm{D}(\mathrm{Mod}_R^{I-tors})$, the derived category I-power torsion modules. The category $\mathrm{D}(R)^{R/I-comp}$ is by [BHV20, 3.7(1)] equivalent to the right completion of the derived category of Mod_R^{I-comp}.

The functors Γ and Λ coming from this local duality context can by [BHV18, 3.16] be identified with the total right derived functor $\mathbb{R}T_I$ and the total left derived functor $\mathbb{L}C^I$ respectively. By Theorem 3.3.11 we know that these are the cofree comodule functor and the free contramodule functor, hence we can conclude with the following.

Proposition 3.3.26. *There are symmetric monoidal equivalences*

$$\mathrm{D}(R)^{R/I-tors} \simeq \mathrm{D}(\mathrm{Mod}_R^{I-tors}) \simeq \mathrm{Comod}_{\mathbb{R}T_I(R)}$$

and

$$\mathrm{D}(R)^{R/I-comp} \simeq \mathrm{D}(\mathrm{Mod}_R^{I-comp}) \simeq \mathrm{Contra}_{\mathbb{R}T_I(R)}$$

Interestingly, there are also descriptions of the category Mod_R^{I-comp} as a category of contramodules, and Mod_R^{I-tors} as a category of comodules. This makes the above example into an example of the derived co-contra-correspondence, see for example [Pos16].

As for the $K(n)$-local case described above, the equivalences

$$\mathrm{D}(R)^{R/I-comp} \simeq \mathrm{D}(\mathrm{Mod}_R^{I-comp}) \simeq \mathrm{Contra}_{\mathbb{R}T_I(R)}$$

is somewhat unsatisfactory, as we would really like to have equivalences

$$\mathrm{D}(R)^{R/I-comp} \simeq \mathrm{D}(\mathrm{Mod}_R^{I-comp}) \simeq \mathrm{Contra}_{\mathbb{L}C^I(R)}$$

instead. We hope that the before-mentioned future joint work with Florian Riedel will shed some light on this, hopefully giving such an equivalence.

3.4 Addendum: Modules over pro-algebras

We ended the last section by wishing for a way to construct a well behaved category of contramodules over the $K(n)$-local and $T(n)$-local spheres, $\mathbb{S}_K(n)$ and $\mathbb{S}_T(n)$. The current section is not a part of the paper [Aam24c], but we wanted to include some progress on the above question.

Chapter 1.
DG-algebras

Abstract. We study the interplay between localizing subcategories in a stable ∞-category $\mathcal{C}$ with t-structure $(\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}, \mathcal{C}_{\leqslant 0})$, the prestable ∞-category $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ and the abelian category $\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$. We prove that weak localizing subcategories of $\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$ are in bijection with the localizing subcategories of $\mathcal{C}$ where object-containment can be checked on the heart. This generalizes similar known correspondences for noetherian rings and bounded t-structures. We also prove that this restricts to a bijection between localizing subcategories of $\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$, and localizing subcategories of $\mathcal{C}$ that are kernels of t-exact functors — lifting Lurie's correspondence between localizing subcategories in $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ and $\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$ to the stable category $\mathcal{C}$.

4.1 Introduction

The concept of a t-structure on a triangulated category was introduced in [BBD82], and in a way axiomatizes the concept of taking the homology of a chain complex in the derived category of a ring. Most interesting triangulated categories arise as the homotopy category of a stable ∞-category, and the concept of a t-structure lifts to this setting. Having a t-structure allows us to naturally compare features of a stable ∞-category $\mathcal{C}$ to features of an abelian category $\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$, called the heart of the given t-structure.

In order to understand the internal structure of a stable ∞-category, is its important to understand its *localizing subcategories*. A full subcategory is called localizing if it is a stable full subcategory closed under colimits. The goal of this paper is to classify the localizing subcategories of $\mathcal{C}$ that interact well with t-structures. These are the localizing subcategories $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ that inherit a t-structure, and you can check if an object X is in $\mathcal{L}$ by checking whether $\pi_n^{\heartsuit} X \in \mathcal{L}^{\heartsuit}$. We call these the *$\pi$-stable localizing subcategories* — see Definition 4.3.2.

We want to compare these localizing subcategories of $\mathcal{C}$ to subcategories of $\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$. The abelian analog of localizing subcategories of a stable ∞-category, are the *weak Serre subcategories* closed under coproducts. We call these the *weak localizing subcategories*.

Our first main result is the following classification of π-stable localizing subcategories in $\mathcal{C}$ via the heart construction. This generalizes a similar correspondence due to Takahashi ([Tak09]) for commutative noetherian rings, see Corollary 4.3.13.

Theorem F (Theorem 4.3.11)**.** *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a stable ∞-category with a t-structure. If the t-structure is right complete and compatible with filtered colimits, then the map $\mathcal{L} \longmapsto \mathcal{L}^{\heartsuit}$ gives a one-to-one correspondence between π-stable localizing subcategories of $\mathcal{C}$ and weak localizing subcategories in $\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$.*

The above theorem also holds when we exclude the existence of coproducts, giving a one-to-one correspondence between π-stable thick subcategories of $\mathcal{C}$ and weak Serre subcategories of $\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$. This generalizes the similar result of Zhang–Cai ([ZC17]) to the setting of unbounded t-structures, see Proposition 4.3.17 and Corollary 4.3.18.

We also want a way to study the analog of (non-weak) Serre subcategories of $\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$ closed under coproducts — called the *localizing subcategories* of $\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$ — in the stable ∞-category $\mathcal{C}$. In order to do this we use the bridge between stable ∞-categories with a t-structure and prestable ∞-categories, as developed mainly by Lurie in [Lur16, App. C]. A prestable ∞-category acts as the connected part of the t-structure, denoted $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$, and they allow us to study t-structures on $\mathcal{C}$ indirectly, without carrying around extra data.

Lurie introduced the notion of localizing subcategories of the prestable ∞-category $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$, which more closely mimics the construction of localizing subcategories of abelian categories. The analog of π-stable localizing subcategory in this situation are called *separating localizing subcategories* by Lurie. Using the heart construction for prestable ∞-categories, Lurie classified the separating localizing subcategories of $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ in [Lur16, C.5.2.7], by proving that there is a one-to-one correspondence

$$\left\{\begin{matrix}\text{separating localizing}\\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}\end{matrix}\right\} \simeq \left\{\begin{matrix}\text{localizing}\\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}\end{matrix}\right\}.$$

Our second main theorem provides an extension of this correspondence to the stable ∞-category $\mathcal{C}$, allowing us to strengthen Theorem F to non-weak localizing sucategories. This interacts well with existing classifications of localizing subcategories in modules over noetherian rings and quasicoherent sheaves on noetherian schemes.

Theorem G (Theorem 4.3.35)**.** *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a stable category with a t-structure. If the t-structure is right complete and compatible with filtered colimits, then the map $\mathcal{L} \longmapsto \mathcal{L}^{\heartsuit}$ gives a one-to-one correspondence between localizing subcategories of $\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$, and π-stable localizing subcategories of $\mathcal{C}$ that are kernels of a t-exact localization.*

Note that any stable ∞-category is prestable, hence the above result might at first glance seem to follow trivially from Luries's classification. But, any separating localizing subcategory of a stable ∞-category $\mathcal{C}$, viewed as a prestable one, is the whole category $\mathcal{C}$ by [Lur16, C.1.2.14, C.5.2.4]. This means that the stable situation needs its own separate treatment, hence the existence of the current paper.

The results of the paper can be summarized in the following diagram, showcasing the bijections ($\simeq$) and the inclusions ($\subseteq$) between the different types of subcategories.

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
\left\{\begin{array}{c}t\text{-stable localizing}\\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}\end{array}\right\} \arrow[drr, "(-)^{\heartsuit}"] & & \\
\left\{\begin{array}{c}\pi\text{-stable localizing}\\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}\end{array}\right\} \arrow[u, hook, "\subseteq"'] \arrow[rr, "\simeq"] & & \left\{\begin{array}{c}\text{weak localizing}\\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}\end{array}\right\} \\
\left\{\begin{array}{c}\pi\text{-exact localizing}\\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}\end{array}\right\} \arrow[u, hook, "\subseteq"'] \arrow[r, "\simeq"] \arrow[d, hook, "\subseteq"] & \left\{\begin{array}{c}\text{separating localizing}\\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}\end{array}\right\} \arrow[r, "\simeq"] \arrow[d, hook, "\subseteq"] & \left\{\begin{array}{c}\text{localizing}\\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}\end{array}\right\} \arrow[u, hook, "\subseteq"'] \\
\left\{\begin{array}{c}t\text{-exact localizing}\\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}\end{array}\right\} \arrow[r, "(-)_{\geqslant 0}"] & \left\{\begin{array}{c}\text{localizing}\\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}\end{array}\right\} \arrow[ur, "(-)_{\leqslant 0}"'] &
\end{tikzcd}
$$

Linear overview: We start Section 4.2 with some recollections on t-structures, prestable ∞-categories, and their interactions, before we introduce the notion of localizing subcategories in Section 4.2.2. We then study some further interactions between these, which we use to prove Theorem F in Section 4.3.1 and Theorem G in Section 4.3.2. We finish the paper by looking at some consequences and applications of our results.

Conventions: We will work in the setting of ∞-categories, as developed by Lurie in [Lur09] and [Lur17]. We will restrict our attention to presentable stable ∞-categories, which we will just call *stable categories*. Given a stable category $\mathcal{C}$ with a nice t-structure, its associated prestable category will be denoted $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ and its heart by $\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$. We assume all t-structures to be accessible.

Acknowledgements: We wish to thank Drew Heard and Marius Nielsen for helpful conversations. This work was partially finished during the authors visit to the GeoTop center at the University of Copenhagen, which we gratefully thank for their hospitality. This work was supported by grant number TMS2020TMT02 from the Trond Mohn Foundation.

4.2 Prestable and stable categories

For the rest of the paper we fix a stable category $\mathcal{C}$. We wish to equip this with a t-structure, which will allow us to always have a comparison from $\mathcal{C}$ to an abelian category. The main reference for t-structures in this setting is [Lur17, Sec 1.2.1]. Note that, as opposed to much of the homological algebra literature, we follow Lurie's homological indexing convention.

Definition 4.2.1. A *t-structure* on $\mathcal{C}$ is a pair of full subcategories $(\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}, \mathcal{C}_{\leqslant 0})$ such that:

1. The mapping space $\mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, Y[-1]) \simeq 0$ for all $X \in \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{C}_{\leqslant 0}$;
2. There are inclusions $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}[1] \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\leqslant 0}[-1] \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leqslant 0}$;
3. For any $Y \in \mathcal{C}$ there is a fiber sequence $X \longrightarrow Y \longrightarrow Z$ such that $X \in \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ and $Z[1] \in \mathcal{C}_{\leqslant 0}$.

This is equivalent to choosing a t-structure on the homotopy category $h\mathcal{C}$, which is a triangulated category. Hence the contents of this paper should be equally useful to those familiar with t-structures on triangulated categories.

We will assume all t-structures to be accessible, in the sense that the connected part $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ is presentable. By [Lur17, 1.2.16] the inclusions $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\leqslant 0} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ have a right adjoint $\tau_{\geqslant 0}$ and a left adjoint $\tau_{\leqslant 0}$ respectively. We denote $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant n} := \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}[n]$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\leqslant n} := \mathcal{C}_{\leqslant 0}[n]$.

Definition 4.2.2. The heart of a t-structure $(\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}, \mathcal{C}_{\leqslant 0})$ on $\mathcal{C}$ is defined as the full subcategory $\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit} := \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\leqslant 0}$.

The heart $\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$ is always equivalent to the nerve of its homotopy category $h\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$, which was proven in [BBD82] to be an abelian category. It is standard to follow [Lur17, 1.2.1.12] and identify the two.

Definition 4.2.3. The composite functor $\tau_{\geqslant 0} \circ \tau_{\leqslant 0} \simeq \tau_{\leqslant 0} \circ \tau_{\geqslant 0} \colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$ is denoted by $\pi_0^{\heartsuit}$ and its composition with the shift functor

$X \longrightarrow X[-n]$ by $\pi_n^{\heartsuit}$. These are called the *heart-valued homotopy groups* of X.

The last definition we will need, before going on to prestable categories is the following niceness condition.

Definition 4.2.4. A t-structure $(\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}, \mathcal{C}_{\leqslant 0})$ on a stable category $\mathcal{C}$ is said to be *compatible with filtered colimits* if $\mathcal{C}_{\leqslant 0}$ is closed under all filtered colimits in $\mathcal{C}$.

We now recall the notion of prestable ∞-categories, which, similarily to the stable ∞-categories, we will simply call *prestable categories*. The theory of prestable categories was developed by Lurie in [Lur16, App. C], and has since been applied in a varied range of areas. We define these as follows.

Definition 4.2.5. An ∞-category $\mathcal{D}$ is *prestable* if there exists a stable category $\mathcal{C}$ with a t-structure $(\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}, \mathcal{C}_{\leqslant 0})$, such that $\mathcal{D} \simeq \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$.

Remark 4.2.6. This is not the most general, nor the standard, definition of a prestable category — see [Lur16, C.1.2.1] — but by [Lur16, C.1.2.9] the above definition describes all prestable categories admitting finite limits, hence it is not a very severe restriction. The category $\mathcal{D}$ is also not unique, see [Lur16, C.1.2.10], but we will mostly focus on the choice

$$\mathcal{D} = \mathrm{Sp}(\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}) = \operatorname{colim}(\cdots \xrightarrow{\Omega} \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0} \xrightarrow{\Omega} \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}).$$

Since we will discuss both stable and prestable categories, and their interactions, we will try to consequently denote prestable categories by $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ and stable categories by $\mathcal{C}$.

Remark 4.2.7. Any stable category $\mathcal{C}$ is prestable, as seen by choosing the trivial t-structure $(\mathcal{C}, 0)$. This is both a blessing, as it allows us to talk about both in a common language, and a curse, as using common language can be rather confusing when trying to study their interactions.

We will restrict our attention to Grothendieck prestable categories, which are prestable categories that work well with colimits. There are numerous different equivalent definition of these, see

[Lur16, C.1.4.1], but the one best related to the above definition of a prestable category is the following.

Definition 4.2.8. A prestable category $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ is *Grothendieck* if the t-structure on its associated stable category $\mathcal{C}$ is compatible with filtered colimits.

The following example is perhaps the main reason for the naming convention.

Example 4.2.9. For any Grothendieck abelian category $\mathcal{A}$, the derived category category $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ has a natural t-structure with heart $\mathcal{A}$. The connected component $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})_{\geqslant 0}$, which consists of complexes $X_\bullet$ such that $H_i(X_\bullet) = 0$ for $i < 0$ is a Grothendieck prestable category.

We also have some examples showing up in stable homotopy theory.

Example 4.2.10. Let Sp be the stable ∞-category of spectra. This has a natural t-structure with heart Ab. The connected component $\mathrm{Sp}_{\geqslant 0}$, consisting of connective spectra, is a Grothendieck prestable category.

Example 4.2.11. Important for modern homotopy theory is the category of E-based synthetic spectra Syn_E for some Landweber exact homology theory E, see [Pst23]. This has a naturally occurring t-structure with heart Comod_{E_*E}, and its connected component $\mathrm{Syn}_E^{\geqslant 0}$ is Grothendieck prestable. This example is one of our main motivations for this work, and we plan to study the applications of the contents in this paper to synthetic spectra in future work.

Remark 4.2.12. If the prestable category $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ is compactly generated, then it is automatically Grothendieck, see [Lur16, C.1.4.4]. A stable ∞-category $\mathcal{C}$ is, as mentioned above, also prestable. It is in fact Grothendieck if and only if it is presentable.

Definition 4.2.13. We say a t-structure on a stable category $\mathcal{C}$ is *right complete* if the natural functor $\operatorname{colim}_n \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant -n} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathcal{C}$ is an equivalence.

Remark 4.2.14. For any Grothendieck prestable category $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ the functor $\mathrm{Sp}(-)$, sending $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ to its stabilization, $\mathrm{Sp}(\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0})$, provides a one-to-one correspondence between Grothendieck prestable categories and stable categories equipped with a right complete t-structure compatible with filtered colimits. This is one of the main reasons to study prestable categories, as being prestable is a property, while having a t-structure is extra structure.

Remark 4.2.15. If $\mathcal{C}$ is a stable category with a t-structure compatible with filtered colimits, then the heart-valued homotopy groups functors $\pi_n^{\heartsuit}$ preserve filtered colimits.

4.2.1 Bridging the gap

In this section we study the passage from stable to prestable and vice versa. In particular we look into when they determine each other.

If $\mathcal{C}$ is a stable category with a right complete t-structure $(\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}, \mathcal{C}_{\leqslant 0})$, we can reconstruct it from its connected component.

Lemma 4.2.16 ([Lur16, C.1.2.10])**.** *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a stable category. If $\mathcal{C}$ has a right complete t-structure, then there is an equivalence $\mathrm{Sp}(\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}) \simeq \mathcal{C}$.*

This fact also extends to equivalences of categories, as proven by Antieau.

Lemma 4.2.17 ([Ant21, 6.1])**.** *Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be stable categories equipped with right complete t-structures. If $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0} \simeq \mathcal{D}_{\geqslant 0}$, then also $\mathcal{C} \simeq \mathcal{D}$.*

Remark 4.2.18. In particular both the above results hold for any $\mathcal{C}$ such that $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ is Grothendieck.

We can also naturally go in the other direction. If we have an equivalence of stable categories $\mathcal{C} \simeq \mathcal{D}$, that is compatible with the t-structures, then we get an induced equivalence on the connected components. The precise definition of being compatible with the t-structures is as follows.

Definition 4.2.19. Let $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$ be stable categories with t-structures. An exact functor $F\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is *right t-exact* if $F(\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{\geqslant 0}$. The notion of *left t-exactness* is defined similarly. If F satisfies both, we say that it is a *t-exact functor*.

Remark 4.2.20. This convention might seem wrong to readers with a background in homological algebra, as the role of left and right t-exact functors are usually the opposite. This flip is a consequence of using the homological indexing convention rather than cohomological indexing.

The above can then be made precise as follows.

Lemma 4.2.21. *Let $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$ be stable categories with t-structures. If $F\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is a right t-exact functor, then we have an induced functor of prestable categories $F_{\geqslant 0}\colon \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\geqslant 0}$. If F is an equivalence, then so is $F_{\geqslant 0}$.*

For the rest of the paper we will use the following terminology.

Definition 4.2.22. A *t-stable category* is a stable category $\mathcal{C}$ together with a choice of a right complete t-structure compatible with filtered colimits.

Example 4.2.23. Let us see some examples of t-stable categories.

1. For every commutative noetherian ring R, the derived category $\mathrm{D}(R)$ together with its natural t-structure, is a t-stable category.

2. The category of spectra, together with its natural t-structure, is a t-stable category.

3. The category of synthetic spectra, Syn_E, together with its natural t-structure is a t-stable category.

4. For a noetherian scheme X, its associated derived category of quasi-coherent $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules, $\mathrm{D}_{qc}(X)$, is t-stable.

Remark 4.2.24. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a t-stable category. By definition we have that the connective part, $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$, is a Grothendieck prestable category, and that the heart $\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit$ is a Grothendieck abelian category. Hence t-stable categories serve as a natural place to study the interactions between these three types of categories.

Remark 4.2.25. In [Lur16, Section C.3.1] Lurie constructs a category of t-stable categories. If we denote this by $t\mathrm{Cat}$ then the contents of Remark 4.2.14 can be described as an adjoint pair of equivalences

$$\mathrm{Groth}_\infty \underset{(-)_{\geqslant 0}}{\overset{\mathrm{Sp}(-)}{\rightleftarrows}} t\mathrm{Cat}.$$

This should, however, be viewed as a heuristic rather than a very precise statement, as the right hand category is a bit tricky to define.

4.2.2 Localizing subcategories

We now turn our attention to localizing subcategories. As we are working in three interconnected settings — stable, prestable and abelian — and all settings use the same terminology, we feel that this section is very ripe for confusions to occur . In an attempt to clarify which setting we are in, we will usually refer to localizing subcategories of stable categories as *stable localizing subcategories*, localizing subcategories of prestable categories as *prestable localizing subcategories* and localizing subcategories of abelian categories as *abelian localizing subcategories.* We will, however, sometimes omit the categorical prefix when we feel that it is clear from context.

Definition 4.2.26. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a stable category. A full subcategory $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is said to be *thick* if it is a full stable subcategory closed under finite colimits. In particular, it is closed under extensions and desuspensions. We say $\mathcal{L}$ is a *stable localizing subcategory* if it is thick and closed under filtered colimits.

Stable localizing subcategories are uniquely determined by localization functors on $\mathcal{C}$, hence their name. This is a standard fact about localizations, but we include a sketch of the proof for convenience.

Lemma 4.2.27. *A full subcategory $\mathcal{L}$ of a stable category $\mathcal{C}$, is a stable localizing subcategory if and only if there is a stable category $\mathcal{D}$, and an exact localization $L\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$, such that $\mathcal{L}$ is the kernel of L.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a localizing subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$. The right-orthogonal complement

$$\mathcal{L}^{\perp} = \{C \in \mathcal{C} \mid \operatorname{Hom}(X, C) \simeq 0, \forall X \in \mathcal{C}\}$$

is closed under limits in $\mathcal{C}$, hence the fully faithful inclusion $\mathcal{L}^{\perp} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ has a left adjoint L. This is an exact localization of stable ∞-categories, and the kernel is precisely $\mathcal{L}$. Now, given an exact localization $L\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ such that $\mathcal{L} = \operatorname{Ker} L$, then $\mathcal{L}$ is a stable category by the exactness of L, which is in addition closed under colimits as L preserves these by being a left adjoint. □

The definition of a localizing subcategory of a prestable category is very similar in nature to its stable brethren, but there is a slight variation.

Definition 4.2.28. Let $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ be a Grothendieck prestable category and C an object in $\mathcal{C}$. Another object $C' \in \mathcal{C}$ is said to be a sub-object of C if there is a map $f\colon C' \longrightarrow C$ with $\operatorname{Cofib}(f) \in \mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$.

Remark 4.2.29. For Grothendieck prestable categories, this is equivalent to the assertion that C' is a (-1)-truncated object in $\mathcal{C}_{/C}$ via the map f, which is the more standard definition of being a sub-object — see [Lur16, C.2.3.4]

Definition 4.2.30 ([Lur16, C.2.3.3])**.** Let $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ be a Grothendieck prestable category. A full subcategory $\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ is a *prestable localizing subcategory* if it is accessible and closed under coproducts, cofiber sequences and sub-objects.

Remark 4.2.31. Any prestable localizing subcategory $\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0}$ of a Grothendieck prestable category $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ is by [Lur16, C.5.2.1] itself a Grothendieck prestable category. This means, in particular, that $\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0}$ is the connected part of a colimit-compatible t-structure on a stable category, hence using the notation $\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0}$ is not abusive.

Remark 4.2.32. Recall from Remark 4.2.7 that any stable category $\mathcal{C}$ can be treated as a prestable category. By [Lur16, C.2.3.6] a full subcategory $\mathcal{L}$ of $\mathcal{C}$ is a prestable localizing subcategory if and only if it is a stable localizing subcategory.

As in the stable situation we have a description of prestable localizing subcategories via localization functors.

Proposition 4.2.33 ([Lur16, C.2.3.8])**.** *A full subcategory $\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ of a Grothendieck prestable category is localizing if and only if there is a Grothendieck prestable category $\mathcal{D}_{\geqslant 0}$, and left exact localization $L\colon \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\geqslant 0}$, such that $\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0}$ is the kernel of L.*

As prestable localizing subcategories are again prestable, we know that there is some stable category with a t-structure presenting it as its connected component. The prestable localizing subcategories hence naturally encodes a sort of induced t-structure. This does not happen automatically for stable categories, hence we need to make some additional requirements in order to successfully move between the prestable and stable situation.

Definition 4.2.34. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a t-stable category. A full subcategory $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is said to be a *t-stable localizing subcategory* if it is localizing, and for any $X \in \mathcal{L}$ we have $\tau_{\geqslant 0}X \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\tau_{\leqslant 0}X \in \mathcal{L}$.

Remark 4.2.35. We hope that using both the names t-stable categories and t-stable localizing subcategories does not cause confusion. We decided to use this terminology, as a t-stable localizing subcategory is itself a t-stable category, as we will see in Lemma 4.2.46.

Remark 4.2.36. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a t-stable localizing subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$. As localizing subcategories are stable under (de)suspension, this means that also all $\tau_{\geqslant n}X$ and $\tau_{\leqslant n}$ lie in $\mathcal{L}$ for all n. In particular, the homotopy groups $\pi_n^{\heartsuit}X$ lie in $\mathcal{L}$ for all n.

Remark 4.2.37. This definition is motivated by [BBD82, 1.3.19], where the authors prove that such a full subcategory inherits a t-structure given by

$$(\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0}, \mathcal{L}_{\leqslant 0}) = (\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0} \cap \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{C}_{\leqslant 0} \cap \mathcal{L})$$

with heart $\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit \cap \mathcal{L}$. In other words, a t-stable localizing subcategory has a “sub t-structure”, such that the inclusion is t-exact. In particular, the truncation functors $\tau_{\geqslant n}$ and $\tau_{\leqslant n}$ are the same as those in $\mathcal{C}$, hence also the homotopy group functors $\pi_n^\heartsuit$ are the same in $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{L}$.

We will from now on assume that a t-stable localizing subcategory is equipped with the above t-structure.

Proposition 4.2.38. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a stable category with a right complete t-structure and let $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ be a localizing subcategory. If $\mathcal{L}$ is t-stable, then the induced t-structure on $\mathcal{L}$ is right complete.*

Proof. This follows immediately from the fact that the truncation functors are the same as in $\mathcal{C}$, and that colimits in $\mathcal{L}$ are the same as those in $\mathcal{C}$. □

The last thing to introduce in this section are the abelian analogs of the above definitions.

Definition 4.2.39. A full subcategory $\mathcal{T}$ of a Grothendieck abelian category $\mathcal{A}$ is called a *weak Serre subcategory*, if for any exact sequence

$$A_1 \longrightarrow A_2 \longrightarrow A_3 \longrightarrow A_4 \longrightarrow A_5$$

in $\mathcal{A}$ such that A_1, A_2, A_4, A_5 are all in $\mathcal{T}$, then also $A_3 \in \mathcal{T}$. It is a *abelian weak localizing subcategory* it it is a weak Serre subcategory closed under arbitrary coproducts.

Remark 4.2.40. A full subcategory is a weak Serre subcategory if it is closed under kernels, cokernels and extensions. In particular it is an abelian subcategory, and the fully faithful inclusion $\mathcal{T} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is exact.

Definition 4.2.41. A full subcategory $\mathcal{T}$ of a Grothendieck abelian category $\mathcal{A}$ is called a *Serre subcategory* if for any short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

in $\mathcal{A}$, we have $B \in \mathcal{T}$ if and only if $A, C \in \mathcal{T}$. It is an *abelian localizing subcategory* if it is a Serre subcategory closed under arbitrary coproducts.

Remark 4.2.42. A full subcategory is a Serre subcategory if it is closed under sub-objects, quotients and extensions. This means that all Serre subcategories are weak Serre subcategories, and that all abelian localizing subcategories are abelian weak localizing subcategories. In particular they are all abelian subcategories with exact inclusions into $\mathcal{A}$.

Remark 4.2.43. Weak Serre subcategories seem to also be called *thick* or *wide* subcategories in the homological algebra literature. But, to make the connection with abelian localizing subcategories clearer we chose to use this terminology.

As one perhaps should expect at this point, Abelian localizing subcategories are also determined by localization functors — as above, so below.

Proposition 4.2.44 ([Lur16, C.5.1.1, C.5.1.6])**.** *A full subcategory $\mathcal{T}$ of a Grothendieck abelian category $\mathcal{A}$ is an abelian localizing subcategory if and only if there is an exact localization $L\colon \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}$, where $\mathcal{B}$ is a Grothendieck abelian category, such that $\mathcal{T}$ is the kernel of L.*

4.2.3 Stable and prestable comparisons

The first thing we need is to be able to recognize stable localizing subcategories by their connected part, as we did for stable categories in Lemma 4.2.16.

Corollary 4.2.45. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a stable category with a right complete t-structure and $\mathcal{L}$ a t-stable localizing subcategory. In this situation there is an equivalence $\mathcal{L} \simeq \mathrm{Sp}(\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0})$.*

Proof. This follows directly from Proposition 4.2.38 and Lemma 4.2.16. □

Using this we can increase the strength of Proposition 4.2.38 by also incorporating compatibility with filtered colimits. Recall that we use the name t-stable category for a stable category with a right complete t-structure compatible with filtered colimits.

Lemma 4.2.46. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a t-stable category and $\mathcal{L}$ a localizing subcategory. If $\mathcal{L}$ is t-stable, then $\mathcal{L}$ is itself a t-stable category.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.2.38 we know that the induced t-structure on $\mathcal{L}$ is right complete. By [Lur16, C.5.2.1(1)] $\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0}$ is Grothendieck prestable, hence the t-structure on its stabilization $\mathrm{Sp}(\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0})$ is compatible with filtered colimits by definition, see [Lur16, C.1.4.1]. This stabilization is by Corollary 4.2.45 equivalent to $\mathcal{L}$, completing the proof. $\square$

Recall that any stable localizing subcategory $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is equivalently determined as the acyclic objects to an exact localization functor $L\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$. We want a similar fact to hold for the t-stable ones. The naïve guess could perhaps be that $\mathcal{L}$ is t-stable if and only if the localization functor L is t-exact. This turns out to be too strong of a condition on the nose, but a very interesting condition nonetheless.

Lemma 4.2.47. *Let $L\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be a localization of stable categories with t-structures. If L is t-exact, then* $\mathrm{Ker}(L)$ *is a t-stable localizing subcategory.*

Proof. Let $X \in \mathrm{Ker}(L)$. Since L is t-exact we have $L(\tau_{\geqslant 0}X) \simeq \tau_{\geqslant 0}L(X) \simeq 0$, hence also $\tau_{\geqslant 0}X$ is in $\mathrm{Ker}(L)$. We have $\tau_{\leqslant 0}X \in \mathrm{Ker}(L)$ by an identical argument. $\square$

We can then relate this to the prestable situation via the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2.48 ([Lur16, C.2.4.4])**.** *If $F\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is an t-exact functor between stable categories with right complete t-structures, then the induced functor of Grothendieck prestable categories $F_{\geqslant 0}\colon \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\geqslant 0}$ is left exact.*

Remark 4.2.49. Since prestable localizing subcategories are determined by left exact localization functors, see Proposition 4.2.33, Lemma 4.2.48 means that if $\mathcal{L}$ is a stable localizing subcategory determined by a t-exact localization functor $\mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$, then the connected part $\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0}$ is a prestable localizing subcategory of $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$.

We also want a converse to this statement.

Lemma 4.2.50. *If $\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0}$ is a prestable localizing subcategory of a Grothendieck prestable category $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$, then its stabilization $\mathrm{Sp}(\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0})$ is the kernel of a t-exact localization L on $\mathrm{Sp}(\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0})$.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.2.33 there is a left exact localization $L_{\geqslant 0}\colon \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\geqslant 0}$ such that $\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0}$ is the kernel of $L_{\geqslant 0}$. In particular it is a colimit preserving functor. The induced functor $\mathrm{Sp}(\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0})\colon \mathrm{Sp}(\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Sp}(\mathcal{D}_{\geqslant 0})$ is then left t-exact by [Lur16, C.3.2.1] and right t-exact by [Lur16, C.3.1.1]. □

Remark 4.2.51. In particular, by Lemma 4.2.47 the stabilization $\mathrm{Sp}(\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0})$ is a t-stable localizing subcategory.

In light of the above results we introduce the following definition.

Definition 4.2.52. A stable localizing subcategory $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is said to be *t-exact* if it is the kernel of a t-exact localization.

Remark 4.2.53. As we will have several definitions for different kinds of localizing subcategories, we will have a recurring remark about their dependencies. In this first such remark, we note that there is an implication

$$t\text{-exact} \implies t\text{-stable}$$

by Lemma 4.2.47.

We can then conclude this section with the following bijection.

Corollary 4.2.54. *For any t-stable category $\mathcal{C}$, there is a bijection between the collection of t-exact stable localizing subcategories $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, and prestable localizing subcategories of $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$, given by the mutually inverse functors $(-)_{\geqslant 0}$ and $\mathrm{Sp}(-)$.*

Proof. From Remark 4.2.49 and Lemma 4.2.50 we have maps

$$\left\{\begin{matrix} t\text{-exact localizing} \\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C} \end{matrix}\right\} \xrightarrow{(-)_{\geqslant 0}} \left\{\begin{matrix} \text{localizing} \\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0} \end{matrix}\right\}$$

and

$$\left\{\begin{matrix} \text{localizing} \\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0} \end{matrix}\right\} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Sp}(-)} \left\{\begin{matrix} t\text{-exact localizing} \\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C} \end{matrix}\right\}$$

These are mutually inverse functors by Corollary 4.2.45, and the fact that any prestable localizing subcategory of a Grothendieck prestable category is itself a Grothendieck prestable category, see Remark 4.2.31. □

Remark 4.2.55. The above corollary gives us a t-exact approximation result for t-stable localizing subcategories. Suppose we have a t-stable localizing subcategory $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. We can choose the smallest prestable localizing subcategory of $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ containing $\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0}$, which we denote $\mathrm{Loc}_{\geqslant 0}(\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0})$. Upon stabilization we obtain by Corollary 4.2.54 a stable localizing subcategory $\mathcal{L}^t$ that is the kernel of a t-exact functor. As $\mathrm{Sp}(\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0}) \simeq \mathcal{L}$, we know that $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{L}^t$, making $\mathcal{L}^t$ a t-exact approximation of $\mathcal{L}$. It is also the smallest such approximation, and, naturally, $\mathcal{L}$ is t-exact if and only if $\mathcal{L} \simeq \mathcal{L}^t$.

4.3 The correspondences

The goal of this section is to prove our two main results. We start with the classification of weak localizing subcategories, before proving the non-weak case. The former does not need any of the connections to prestable categories, hence can also be viewed as a self contained argument. The latter, however, relies on Lurie's correspondence between certain prestable localizing subcategories of $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ and localizing subcategories of $\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$.

4.3.1 Classification of weak localizing subcategories

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem F, and the following lemma is the first step for obtaining the wanted correspondence.

Lemma 4.3.1. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a t-stable category. If $\mathcal{L}$ is a t-stable localizing subcategory, then $\mathcal{L}^\heartsuit$ is a weak localizing subcategory of $\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit$.*

Proof. As $\mathcal{L}$ is t-stable we know that the fully faithful inclusion $\mathcal{L} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is t-exact. By [AGH19, 2.19] the induced functor $\mathcal{L}^\heartsuit \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit$ is exact and fully faithful, and $\mathcal{L}^\heartsuit$ is closed under extensions. In particular, $\mathcal{L}^\heartsuit$ is an abelian subcategory closed under extensions, so it remains only to show that $\mathcal{L}^\heartsuit$ is closed under coproducts.

As $\mathcal{L}^\heartsuit \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ we can include a coproduct of objects in $\mathcal{L}^\heartsuit$ into $\mathcal{L}$. The inclusion and $\pi_n^\heartsuit$ preserves coproducts for all n. Hence, as $\mathcal{L}$ is localizing it is closed under coproducts, implying that also $\mathcal{L}^\heartsuit$ is. $\square$

This means that the heart construction $\mathcal{C} \longmapsto \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit$ determines a map

$$\left\{\begin{matrix} t\text{-stable localizing} \\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C} \end{matrix}\right\} \xrightarrow{(-)^\heartsuit} \left\{\begin{matrix} \text{weak localizing} \\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit \end{matrix}\right\}$$

for any t-stable category $\mathcal{C}$.

This map is in general not injective, meaning we have to restrict our domain. As described in the introduction, we will use the localizing subcategories where objects can be identified by their heart-valued homotopy groups. The precise definition is as follows.

Definition 4.3.2. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a stable category with a t-structure. A stable localizing subcategory $\mathcal{L}$ is said to be *π-stable* if $X \in \mathcal{L}$ if and only if $\pi_n^\heartsuit X \in \mathcal{L}^\heartsuit$ for all n.

Remark 4.3.3. The terminology is motivated by, and generalizes, Takahashi's definition of H-stable subcategories of the unbounded derived category of a commutative noetherian ring, see [Tak09, 2.11]. These are subcategories of derived categories where one can detect containment by checking on homology. Letting $\mathcal{C} = \mathrm{D}(R)$ for a Noetherian commutative ring R considered with the natural t-structure, then we have $\pi_n^\heartsuit = H_n$, meaning that being π-stable is equivalent to being H-stable. Note, however, that the homological algebra literature often uses cohomological indexing, while we follow Lurie's convention of using the homological one.

Remark 4.3.4. The above definition is equivalent to Zhang–Cai's generalization of Takahashi's H-stable subcategories, see [ZC17]. Note that the authors of loc. cit. do not consider the subcategories themselves to have t-structures, but rather just includes the image of $\pi_k^\heartsuit$ back into the stable category.

Example 4.3.5. Let R be a commutative noetherian ring and $I \subseteq R$ a finitely generated regular ideal. Then the full subcategory of I-power torsion modules, $\mathrm{Mod}_R^{I-tors} \subseteq \mathrm{Mod}_R$ is an abelian weak localizing subcategory. It is in particular a Grothendieck abelian category, hence has a derived category $\mathrm{D}(\mathrm{Mod}_R^{I-tors})$. We can also form the derived I-torsion category $\mathrm{D}(R)^{I-tors}$, which is the localizing subcategory generated by A/I. The categories $\mathrm{D}(R)^{I-tors}$ and $\mathrm{D}(\mathrm{Mod}_R^{I-tors})$ are both π-stable localizing subcategories of $\mathrm{D}(R)$ with heart Mod_R^{I-tors} — see [GM92] or [BHV18] for more details. These categories are equivalent, seemingly implying that having the same heart is enough for the stable categories to be equivalent as well. This also generalizes to other similar situations, see for example [BHV20, 3.15, 3.17] or Theorem 2.2.21. Such equivalences were one of the main inspirations for this paper, where the author wanted an easier way of checking similar statements, which led to the main result Theorem F.

Proposition 4.3.6. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a localizing subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$. If $\mathcal{L}$ is π-stable, then $\mathcal{L}$ is t-stable.*

Proof. Let $X \in \mathcal{L}$. We need to show that $\tau_{\geqslant 0}X \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\tau_{\leqslant 0}X \in \mathcal{L}$.

The proofs are similar, hence we only cover the former.

We have $\pi_n^{\heartsuit}\tau_{\geqslant 0}X \simeq \pi_n^{\heartsuit}X$ for all $n \geqslant 0$ and $\pi_n^{\heartsuit}\tau_{\geqslant 0}X \simeq 0$ for all $n < 0$. This means that $\pi_n^{\heartsuit}\tau_{\geqslant 0}X \in \mathcal{L}^{\heartsuit}$ for all n, which implies $\tau_{\geqslant 0}X \in \mathcal{L}$ by the assumption that $\mathcal{L}$ was π-stable. □

Remark 4.3.7. In light of Proposition 4.3.6 we can continue our recurring remark (see Remark 4.2.53) about the dependencies of the different definitions. We now have implications

$$\begin{tikzcd} & \pi\text{-stable} \arrow[d, Rightarrow] \\ t\text{-exact} \arrow[r, Rightarrow] & t\text{-stable} \end{tikzcd}$$

for any localizing subcategory $\mathcal{L}$ of a t-stable category $\mathcal{C}$.

Remark 4.3.8. In particular, if $\mathcal{L}$ is a π-stable localizing subcategory then Lemma 4.2.46 implies that $\mathcal{L}$ is itself a t-stable category. This is rather convenient, as it allows us to treat nested pairs of π-stable localizing subcategories $\mathcal{L}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{L}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ either as both being subcategories of $\mathcal{C}$, or as $\mathcal{L}_2$ being a π-stable localizing subcategory of $\mathcal{L}_1$.

Proposition 4.3.6 implies that the heart construction $\mathcal{L} \longmapsto \mathcal{L}^{\heartsuit}$ gives a map

$$\left\{\begin{matrix}\pi\text{-stable localizing} \\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}\end{matrix}\right\} \xrightarrow{(-)^{\heartsuit}} \left\{\begin{matrix}\text{weak localizing} \\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}\end{matrix}\right\}$$

as the heart of any t-stable localizing subcategory $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is an abelian weak localizing subcategory $\mathcal{L}^{\heartsuit} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$ by Lemma 4.3.1. The claim of Theorem F is that this map is a bijection.

It turns out that the π-stable localizing subcategories are the largest localizing subcategories with a given heart. This is the stable analog of [Lur16, C.5.2.5] for prestable categories.

Lemma 4.3.9. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a t-stable category. Given two t-stable localizing subcategories $\mathcal{L}_0$ and $\mathcal{L}_1$, where $\mathcal{L}_1$ is π-stable, then $\mathcal{L}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{L}_1$ if and only if $\mathcal{L}_0^{\heartsuit} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_1^{\heartsuit}$.*

Proof. First, notice that as both categories are t-stable the truncation functors and the homotopy groups functors $\pi_k^\heartsuit$ are the same, see Remark 4.2.37.

Assume $\mathcal{L}_0^\heartsuit \subseteq \mathcal{L}_1^\heartsuit$ and $X \in \mathcal{L}_0$. Then $\pi_k^\heartsuit X \in \mathcal{L}_0^\heartsuit \subseteq \mathcal{L}_1^\heartsuit$ for all k. This implies that $X \in \mathcal{L}_1$ by the assumption that it is π-stable.

For the converse, assume $\mathcal{L}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{L}_1$. As the truncation functors are the same in $\mathcal{L}_0$ and $\mathcal{L}_1$ we have that $\mathcal{L}_0$ is a t-stable localizing subcategory of the t-stable category $\mathcal{L}_1$, see Remark 4.3.8. In particular, $\mathcal{L}_0^\heartsuit = \mathcal{L}_1^\heartsuit \cap \mathcal{L}_0$, hence we have $\mathcal{L}_0^\heartsuit \subseteq \mathcal{L}_1^\heartsuit$. ☐

This immediately implies the injectivity of our proposed one-to-one correspondence.

Corollary 4.3.10. *For any t-stable category $\mathcal{C}$, the map*

$$\left\{\begin{matrix}\pi\text{-stable localizing}\\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}\end{matrix}\right\} \xrightarrow{(-)^\heartsuit} \left\{\begin{matrix}\text{weak localizing}\\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit\end{matrix}\right\}$$

is injective.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{L}_0$ and $\mathcal{L}_1$ be π-stable localizing subcategories such that $\mathcal{L}_0^\heartsuit \simeq \mathcal{L}_1^\heartsuit$ as subcategories of $\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit$. In particular, they are contained in each other, hence Lemma 4.3.9 implies that $\mathcal{L}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{L}_0$ as they are both π-stable. ☐

It remains to show that the map is also surjective.

Theorem 4.3.11 (Theorem F)**.** *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a t-stable category. In this situation, the map*

$$\left\{\begin{matrix}\pi\text{-stable localizing}\\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}\end{matrix}\right\} \xrightarrow{(-)^\heartsuit} \left\{\begin{matrix}\text{weak localizing}\\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit\end{matrix}\right\}$$

is a bijection.

Proof. We know by Corollary 4.3.10 that the map is injective, hence it remains to prove surjectivity. To do this we follow the proof of [Lur16, C.5.2.7], adapted to the stable setting.

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a weak localizing subcategory of $\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit$. Define $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ to be the full subcategory spanned by objects X such that $\pi_n^\heartsuit X \in \mathcal{A}$. We prove that it is a stable localizing subcategory — it will obviously be π-stable by definition. In particular we prove that it is closed under cofiber sequences, desuspension and colimits.

Let $A \to B \to C$ be a cofiber sequence in $\mathcal{C}$. We need to show that if two of the objects A, B, C is in $\mathcal{L}$, then also the last one is. The long exact sequence of heart-valued homotopy groups has the form

$$\cdots \to \pi_{n-1}^\heartsuit B \to \pi_{n-1}^\heartsuit C \to \pi_n^\heartsuit A \to \pi_n^\heartsuit B \to \pi_n^\heartsuit C \to \pi_{n+1}^\heartsuit A \to \pi_{n+1}^\heartsuit B \to \cdots$$

Assuming that A, B are in $\mathcal{L}$ we get by the definition of $\mathcal{L}$ that the four objects $\pi_n^\heartsuit A, \pi_n^\heartsuit B, \pi_{n+1}^\heartsuit A, \pi_{n+1}^\heartsuit B$ are in $\mathcal{A}$. Hence, as $\mathcal{A}$ is a weak Serre subcategory we have $\pi_n^\heartsuit C \in \mathcal{A}$. This works for all n, hence we must have $C \in \mathcal{L}$ as well. The proof is identical in the case that A, C or B, C are in $\mathcal{L}$.

The full subcategory $\mathcal{L}$ is also closed under desuspension, as we have $\pi_n^\heartsuit(\Omega X) \simeq \pi_{n+1}^\heartsuit(X)$ by the long exact sequence in heart-valued homotopy groups. Hence $\mathcal{L}$ is a full stable subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$. In particular this means it is closed under finite colimits. Now, as $\pi_n^\heartsuit$ preserves coproducts, and $\mathcal{A}$ is closed under coproducts, we also get that $\mathcal{L}$ is closed under coproducts. This implies that $\mathcal{L}$ is closed under colimits, which finishes the proof. $\square$

Remark 4.3.12. It is somewhat unfortunate that the terminology does not align perfectly in these two situations — meaning that we had to add a prefix "weak" for the abelian case. As both are inspired by the existence of localization functors, they are the natural terminology in their respective settings, and we should perhaps not expect everything to always agree perfectly. In Theorem G we will use the abelian localizing subcategories, and then again be left with a choice of a different prefix for the stable version.

Theorem F recovers, and generalizes, a theorem by Takahashi for commutative noetherian rings. Note that Takahashi does not refer to the abelian subcategories as weak localizing, but as thick subcategories closed under coproducts.

Corollary 4.3.13 ([Tak09])**.** *If R is a commutative noetherian ring, then there is a bijection between the set of H-stable localizing subcategories of* $\mathrm{D}(R)$ *and the set of weak localizing subcategories in* Mod_R*.*

A theorem of Krause — see [Kra08, 3.1] — shows that these two collections are also in bijection with certain subsets of $\operatorname{Spec} R$, which Krause calls the *coherent subsets*. In light of Theorem F we can generalize Takahashi's result to a noetherian scheme X, and we conjecture that these are also in bijection with the coherent subsets of X — generalizing the result by Krause.

Corollary 4.3.14. *If X noetherian scheme, then there is a bijection between the set of stable localizing subcategories of* $\mathrm{D}_{qc}(X)$ *closed under homology, and the set of weak localizing subcategories in* $\mathrm{QCoh}(X)$*.*

Conjecture 4.3.15. For a noetherian scheme X, there is a bijection between the collection of coherent subsets of X and weak localizing subcategories of $\mathrm{QCoh}(X)$.

Remark 4.3.16. A hint towards the truth of this conjecture comes from a theorem by Gabriel ([Gab62, VI.2.4(b)]), where he shows that the above proposed bijection restricts to a bijection between specialization closed subsets of X and localizing subcategories of $\mathrm{QCoh}(X)$.

Now, we want to mention that we also obtain a classification of weak Serre subcategories of $\mathcal{C}$. This is done by recognizing that the proofs of Lemma 4.3.1, Corollary 4.3.10 and Theorem F also holds without the assumption about coproducts. The proofs treats coproducts as a separate part, hence just omitting it from the proofs gives the following result.

Proposition 4.3.17. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a t-stable category. In this situa-*

tion, the map

$$\left\{ \begin{matrix} \pi\text{-stable thick} \\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C} \end{matrix} \right\} \xrightarrow{(-)^{\heartsuit}} \left\{ \begin{matrix} \text{weak Serre} \\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit} \end{matrix} \right\}$$

is a bijection.

This recovers the following classification of weak Serre subcategories in the case where the t-structure on $\mathcal{C}$ is bounded, due to Zhang–Cai, see [ZC17].

Corollary 4.3.18. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a triangulated category with a bounded t-structure. In this situation there is a bijection between π-stable subcategories of $\mathcal{C}$ and weak Serre subcategories of $\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$.*

We can summarize the contents of this section with half of the diagram from the introduction.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\left\{ \begin{matrix} t\text{-stable localizing} \\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C} \end{matrix} \right\} \arrow[drr, "(-)^{\heartsuit}"] & & \\
\left\{ \begin{matrix} \pi\text{-stable localizing} \\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C} \end{matrix} \right\} \arrow[u, hook, "\subseteq"'] \arrow[rr, "\simeq"] & & \left\{ \begin{matrix} \text{weak localizing} \\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit} \end{matrix} \right\}
\end{tikzcd}$$

Digression on Grothendieck homology theories

There is a slight generalization of the surjectivity result above, which we decided to include here for future reference. The generalization comes from realizing that there are other functors that have similar properties to the heart valued homotopy group functor $\pi_*^{\heartsuit}\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$.

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a presentable stable ∞-category and $\mathcal{A}$ be a graded Grothendieck abelian category — meaning it comes equipped with an autoequivalence $[1]\colon \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$, which we think of as a grading shift functor.

Definition 4.3.19. A functor $H\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is called a *Grothendieck homology theory* if it satisfies the following properties:

1. It is additive.
2. It sends cofiber sequences $X \to Y \to Z$ to exact sequences $HX \to HY \to HZ$.
3. It is a graded functor, i.e. $H(\Sigma X) \cong (HX)[1]$.
4. It preserves coproducts.

Remark 4.3.20. The first two criteria defines H to be what is usually called a homological functor. Adding the third criteria makes H a homology theory, and the last is what makes it Grothendieck.

The main example of these come from the category of spectra, Sp, where the associated homology theory to any spectrum is a Grothendieck homology theory.

Example 4.3.21. Let $\mathcal{C} = \mathrm{Sp}$ and R be a graded commutative ring. The Eilenberg–MacLane spectrum HR is a commutative ring spectrum, and the associated homology theory $HR_* := [\mathbb{S}, HR \otimes (-)]_* \colon \mathrm{Sp} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_R$ is a Grothendieck homology theory. This homology theory is equivalent to singular homology with R coefficients.

The above example holds more generally as well.

Example 4.3.22. If $\mathcal{C}$ is monoidal and the unit $\mathbb{1}$ is compact, then for any $H \in \mathcal{C}$ the associated functor

$$\begin{aligned} H_* \colon \mathcal{C} &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Ab}^{\mathrm{gr}} \\ X &\longmapsto [\mathbb{1}, H \otimes X]_* \end{aligned}$$

is a Grothendieck homology theory.

Proposition 4.3.23. *Let $H \colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be a Grothendieck homology theory and $\mathcal{T}$ a weak localizing subcategory of $\mathcal{A}$. In this situation, the full subcategory $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ consisting of objects X such that $HX \in \mathcal{T}$, is a localizing subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$.*

Proof. This holds by using the same surjectivity argument from Theorem 4.3.11, just exchanging $\pi_n^{\heartsuit}(-)$ with $H(-)[n]$. $\square$

This gives a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} \mathcal{C} \arrow[r, "H"] & \mathcal{A} \\ \mathcal{L} \arrow[r, "H"] \arrow[u] & \mathcal{T} \arrow[u] \end{tikzcd}$$

where both of the fully faithful vertical functors have right adjoints. Note that the adjoint diagram might not commute.

Remark 4.3.24. In addition to being a localizing subcategory, we have by definition that we can check containment of $\mathcal{L}$ on the associated Grothendieck abelian category $\mathcal{T}$. This means that $\mathcal{L}$ also has a certain π-stability property, which one might call being H-stable, generalizing both Definition 4.3.2 and Takahashi's notion of H-stability.

4.3.2 Classification of localizing subcategories

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem G, and that it interacts well with both Lurie's classification via prestable categories, and Theorem F. As in Section 4.3.1 we start by proving that the wanted map of sets exists.

Lemma 4.3.25. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a t-stable category. If $\mathcal{L}$ is a t-exact localizing subcategory, then $\mathcal{L}^\heartsuit$ is an abelian localizing subcategory of $\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit$.*

Proof. The t-exact localization $L\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ and its right adjoint i induces an adjunction

$$\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit \underset{}{\overset{L^\heartsuit}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathcal{D}^\heartsuit$$

on the corresponding hearts. As L was t-exact, the functor $L^\heartsuit$ is exact. In particular, the heart $\mathcal{L}^\heartsuit$ is the kernel of $L^\heartsuit$, which by Proposition 4.2.44 means that $\mathcal{L}^\heartsuit$ is an abelian localizing subcategory of $\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit$. $\square$

This means that we have a map

$$\left\{\begin{matrix} t\text{-exact localizing} \\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C} \end{matrix}\right\} \xrightarrow{(-)^\heartsuit} \left\{\begin{matrix} \text{localizing} \\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit \end{matrix}\right\}$$

Just as for the non-t-exact case, this map is not injective in general, meaning we have to restrict to a type of subcategory with more structure.

Definition 4.3.26. A localizing subcategory $\mathcal{L}$ of a t-stable category $\mathcal{C}$ is said to be a π-exact localizing subcategory if

1. it is π-stable, and
2. it is the kernel of a t-exact localization.

Remark 4.3.27. We continue our recurring remark about the dependencies of the different kinds of localizing subcategories introduced in the paper, see Remark 4.2.53 and Remark 4.3.7. We now have implications

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \pi\text{-exact} & \Longrightarrow & \pi\text{-stable} \\ \Downarrow & & \Downarrow \\ t\text{-exact} & \Longrightarrow & t\text{-stable} \end{array}$$

for any localizing subcategory $\mathcal{L}$ of a t-stable category $\mathcal{C}$.

Remark 4.3.28. The above remark also shows how the classification results are related. By Theorem F we know that π-stable corresponds to abelian weak localizing subcategories, and by Corollary 4.2.54 we know that t-exact corresponds to prestable localizing subcategories. By Lurie's classification, see Theorem 4.3.34, we should expect the combination of the two to yield a correspondence between π-exact localizing subcategories and abelian localizing subcategories.

As π-exact localizing subcategories are by definition t-exact, we immediately get that the map $(-)^\heartsuit$ restricts to a map

$$\left\{\begin{matrix} \pi\text{-exact localizing} \\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C} \end{matrix}\right\} \xrightarrow{(-)^\heartsuit} \left\{\begin{matrix} \text{localizing} \\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit \end{matrix}\right\}$$

The claim of Theorem G is that this map is a bijection.

The π-exact localizing subcategories are the stable analogs of Lurie's notion of separating prestable localizing subcategories, defined as follows.

Definition 4.3.29. Let $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ be a Grothendieck prestable category. A prestable localizing subcategory $\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ is *separating* if for every $X \in \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ such that $\pi_n^{\heartsuit} X \in \mathcal{L}^{\heartsuit}$ for all n, then $X \in \mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0}$.

What we mean by saying that these are the stable analogs, is that the bijection

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{c} t\text{-exact localizing} \\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C} \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{(-)_{\geqslant 0}} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{localizing} \\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0} \end{array} \right\}$$

from Corollary 4.2.54 restricts to a bijection between π-exact stable localizing subcategories and separating prestable localizing subcategories. We prove this in two steps.

Lemma 4.3.30. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a t-stable category. If $\mathcal{L}$ is a π-exact localizing subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$, then $\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0}$ is a separating localizing subcategory of $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$.*

Proof. By Corollary 4.2.54 we know that $\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0}$ is a prestable localizing subcategory of $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$, so it remains to check that it is separating. Assume $X \in \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ and $\pi_n^{\heartsuit} X \in \mathcal{L}^{\heartsuit}$ for all $n \geqslant 0$. Treating X as an object in $\mathcal{C}$ via the inclusion $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ we have $\pi_i^{\heartsuit} X = 0$ for all $i < 0$. Hence,by the assumption that $\mathcal{L}$ is π-stable, we must have $X \in \mathcal{L}$. This means that $X \in \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0} \cap \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0}$, which finishes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 4.3.31. *If $\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0}$ is a separating prestable localizing subcategory of $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$, then $\mathrm{Sp}(\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0})$ is a π-exact localizing subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$.*

Proof. We know by Corollary 4.2.54 that $\mathrm{Sp}(\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0})$ is a t-exact localizing subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$, so it remains to show that it is π-stable.

For the sake of a contradiction, assume that there is some $X \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\pi_n^\heartsuit X \in \mathcal{L}^\heartsuit$ for all n, but $X \notin \mathcal{L}$. As the corresponding localization functor $L\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is t-exact we get $L\tau_{\geqslant 0}X \simeq \tau_{\geqslant 0}LX$, which is by assumption non-zero, as X was not in $\mathcal{L}$. This means, however, that there is an object $Y = \tau_{\geqslant 0}X$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ with $\pi_n^\heartsuit Y \in \mathcal{L}^\heartsuit$ but Y not in $\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0}$, which contradicts $\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0}$ begin separating. $\square$

We are now ready to prove Theorem G. As for Theorem F we prove that the map $(-)^\heartsuit$ is both injective and surjective, starting with the former.

Lemma 4.3.32. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a t-stable category. Given two t-exact localizing subcategories $\mathcal{L}_0$ and $\mathcal{L}_1$, where $\mathcal{L}_1$ is π-exact, then $\mathcal{L}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{L}_1$ if and only if $\mathcal{L}_0^\heartsuit \subseteq \mathcal{L}_1^\heartsuit$.*

Proof. This immediately follows from the non-t-exact case from Lemma 4.3.9, as $\mathcal{L}_1$ is π-stable and $\mathcal{L}_0$ is t-stable. $\square$

As before, this implies that the wanted map is injective.

Corollary 4.3.33. *For any t-stable category $\mathcal{C}$, the map*

$$\left\{\begin{matrix}\pi\text{-exact localizing} \\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}\end{matrix}\right\} \xrightarrow{(-)^\heartsuit} \left\{\begin{matrix}\text{localizing} \\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit\end{matrix}\right\}$$

is injective.

It remains then to show that the map is also surjective. In order to do this we invoke Lurie's correspondence. The author originally wanted to have a proof not relying on the prestable case. But, we currently do not know how to directly lift an abelian subcategory to a kernel of a t-exact functor, without passing through the bijection from Corollary 4.2.54. There is a more direct approach in certain contexts — for example if the t-structure is bounded, see [AGH19, 2.20], or the inclusion $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ preserves compacts, see [HPV16, 2.7] — but as far as the author is aware, there is no general way to know when the localization determined by a localizing subcategory $\mathcal{L}$ is t-exact.

Theorem 4.3.34 ([Lur16, C.5.2.7])**.** *For any Grothendieck prestable category $\mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$, there is a bijection*

$$\left\{\begin{matrix}\textit{separating localizing}\\ \textit{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}\end{matrix}\right\} \longrightarrow \left\{\begin{matrix}\textit{localizing}\\ \textit{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}\end{matrix}\right\}$$

given by $\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0} \longmapsto \mathcal{L}^{\heartsuit}$.

Using this, together with Lemma 4.3.31 we finally get our wanted one-to-one correspondence.

Theorem 4.3.35 (Theorem G)**.** *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a t-stable category. There is a bijective map*

$$\left\{\begin{matrix}\pi\textit{-exact localizing}\\ \textit{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}\end{matrix}\right\} \xrightarrow{(-)^{\heartsuit}} \left\{\begin{matrix}\textit{localizing}\\ \textit{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}\end{matrix}\right\}$$

given by $\mathcal{L} \longmapsto \mathcal{L}^{\heartsuit}$.

Proof. The map is injective by Corollary 4.3.33, so it remains only to show surjectivity. Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$ be an abelian localizing subcategory. By Theorem 4.3.34 there is a unique separating prestable localizing subcategory $\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}$ such that $\mathcal{L}^{\heartsuit} \simeq \mathcal{A}$. By Lemma 4.3.31 the spectrum objects in this category, $\mathrm{Sp}(\mathcal{L}_{\geqslant 0})$ is a π-exact stable localizing subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$ with heart $\mathcal{A}$. Hence, the map is also surjective. $\square$

From this we again obtain some natural corollaries. The first one is a partial converse to [Tak09, 2.13].

Corollary 4.3.36. *Let R be a commutative noetherian ring and equip $\mathrm{D}(R)$ with its natural t-structure. In this situation there is a bijection between the collection of smashing localizing subcategories and the collection of π-exact localizing subcategories in $\mathrm{D}(R)$.*

Proof. A theorem of Gabriel, see [Gab62, VI.2.4(b)], shows that there is a bijection between the collection of localizing subcategories of Mod_R and specialization closed subsets of $\operatorname{Spec} R$. Further, Neeman shows in [NB92, 3.3] that there is a bijection between specialization closed subsets of $\operatorname{Spec} R$ and smashing localizing subcategories of $\mathrm{D}(R)$. The result then follows from these, together with Theorem 4.3.35. $\square$

We can also obtain an extension of Corollary 4.3.36 to noetherian schemes X. Recall that we denote the abelian category of quasi-coherent sheaves on X by $\mathrm{QCoh}(X)$, and its associated derived category of quasi-coherent $\mathcal{O}_X$-modules by $\mathrm{D}_{qc}(X)$.

Lemma 4.3.37. *For any noetherian scheme X, there are bijections*

$$\left\{\begin{matrix}\textit{smashing subcategories}\\ \textit{of } \mathrm{D}_{qc}(X)\end{matrix}\right\} \simeq \left\{\begin{matrix}\textit{specialization closed}\\ \textit{subsets of } X\end{matrix}\right\} \simeq \left\{\begin{matrix}\textit{localizing subcategories}\\ \textit{of } \mathrm{QCoh}(X)\end{matrix}\right\}$$

Proof. The latter bijection is again due to Gabriel — [Gab62, VI.2.4(b)]. By [AJS04, 4.13] the telescope conjecture holds for noetherian schemes. In particular, this means that there is a bijection between subsets of X and localizing $\otimes$-ideals in $\mathrm{D}_{qc}(X)$, see [Ste13, 8.13], which restricts to a bijection

$$\left\{\begin{matrix}\text{smashing subcategories}\\ \text{of } \mathrm{D}_{qc}(X)\end{matrix}\right\} \simeq \left\{\begin{matrix}\text{specialization closed}\\ \text{subsets of } X\end{matrix}\right\},$$

giving the first bijection. $\square$

Utilizing this, together with Theorem 4.3.35, we obtain the following generalization.

Corollary 4.3.38. *Let X be a noetherian scheme and equip $\mathrm{D}_{qc}(X)$ with its natural t-structure. In this situation, there is a bijection*

$$\left\{\begin{matrix}\textit{smashing subcategories}\\ \textit{of } \mathrm{D}_{qc}(X)\end{matrix}\right\} \simeq \left\{\begin{matrix}\pi\textit{-exact localizing}\\ \textit{subcategories of } \mathrm{D}_{qc}(X)\end{matrix}\right\}.$$

Using Corollary 4.3.14 we then get a partial extension of the two bottom rows in the main result of [Tak09] to the case of noetherian schemes.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\left\{\begin{matrix}\pi\text{-stable localizing}\\ \text{subcategories of } \mathrm{D}_{qc}(X)\end{matrix}\right\} \arrow[r, "\simeq"] \arrow[rr, bend left, "\simeq"] & \left\{\begin{matrix}\text{coherent subsets}\\ \text{of } X\end{matrix}\right\} \arrow[r, "\simeq"] & \left\{\begin{matrix}\text{weak localiz}\\ \text{subcategor}\\ \text{of } \mathrm{QCoh}(\end{matrix}\right. \\
\left\{\begin{matrix}\text{smashing subcategories}\\ \text{of } \mathrm{D}_{qc}(X)\end{matrix}\right\} \arrow[r, "\simeq"] \arrow[u, hook, "\subseteq"'] & \left\{\begin{matrix}\text{specialization closed}\\ \text{subsets of } X\end{matrix}\right\} \arrow[r, "\simeq"] \arrow[u, hook, "\subseteq"'] & \left\{\begin{matrix}\text{localizing}\\ \text{subcategor}\\ \text{of } \mathrm{QCoh}(\end{matrix}\right. \arrow[u, hook, "\subseteq"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

Here the grey color indicates the conjectured relationship from Conjecture 4.3.15.

We can also use the proof of the telescope conjecture for certain algebraic stacks, due to Hall–Rydh ([HR17]), to extend the above corollary even further. We leave the details of this to the interested reader.

By work of Kanda we can almost extend this to the locally noetherian setting. In particular, for X a locally noetherian scheme, Kanda proves in [Kan15, 1.4] that there is a bijection between localizing subcategories of $\mathrm{QCoh}(X)$ and specialization closed subsets of X. However, as the telescope conjecture is — to the best of our knowledge — currently unresolved for locally noetherian schemes, we do not get a bijection to smashing localizing subcategories. The best we can obtain is then the following corollary.

Corollary 4.3.39. *For X a locally noetherian scheme, there are bijections*

$$\left\{\begin{matrix}\pi\textit{-exact localizing}\\ \textit{subcategories of } \mathrm{D}_{qc}(X)\end{matrix}\right\} \simeq \left\{\begin{matrix}\textit{specialization closed}\\ \textit{subsets of } X\end{matrix}\right\} \simeq \left\{\begin{matrix}\textit{localizing subcategories}\\ \textit{of } \mathrm{QCoh}(X)\end{matrix}\right.$$

Remark 4.3.40. It would be very interesting to have a more direct proof for the fact that π-exact localizing subcategories of $\mathrm{D}(R)$ and $\mathrm{D}_{qc}(X)$ corresponds to smashing localizations. Having a direct proof would allow for a new proof of the telescope conjecture for commutative noetherian rings and noetherian schemes, and could shed some new light on the currently unsolved telescope conjecture for locally noetherian schemes.

Remark 4.3.41. We also want to highlight other work of Kanda, where he shows that localizing subcategories of a locally noetherian Grothendieck abelian category $\mathcal{A}$ are classified by the *atom spectrum* of $\mathcal{A}$, see [Kan12, 5.5]. It would be interesting to see if these atomic methods could provide new insight also into the stable ∞-category $\mathcal{C}$.

To summarize this section, we construct the bottom part of the diagram from the introduction. By Lemma 4.3.30 the bijection from Theorem G factors through the bijection of Theorem 4.3.34. In particular, we get bijections

$$\begin{tikzcd} \left\{\begin{matrix}\pi\text{-exact localizing}\\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}\end{matrix}\right\} \arrow[r, shift left, "(-)_{\geqslant 0}"] & \left\{\begin{matrix}\text{separating localizing}\\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}\end{matrix}\right\} \arrow[l, shift left, "\mathrm{Sp}(-)"] \arrow[r, "(-)_{\leqslant 0}"] & \left\{\begin{matrix}\text{localizing}\\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}\end{matrix}\right. \end{tikzcd}$$

such that the composite map from the left to the right is the map $(-)^{\heartsuit}$ from Theorem G. This finally gives the wanted diagram.

$$\begin{tikzcd} \left\{\begin{matrix}\pi\text{-exact localizing}\\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}\end{matrix}\right\} \arrow[r, "\simeq"] \arrow[d, hook, "\subseteq"] & \left\{\begin{matrix}\text{separating localizing}\\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}\end{matrix}\right\} \arrow[r, "\simeq"] \arrow[d, hook, "\subseteq"] & \left\{\begin{matrix}\text{localizing}\\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}\end{matrix}\right. \\ \left\{\begin{matrix}t\text{-exact localizing}\\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}\end{matrix}\right\} \arrow[r, "(-)_{\geqslant 0}"] & \left\{\begin{matrix}\text{localizing}\\ \text{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}_{\geqslant 0}\end{matrix}\right\} \arrow[ur, "(-)_{\leqslant 0}"'] & \end{tikzcd}$$

4.3.3 Comparing stable categories with the same heart

We round off the paper by proving some easy corollaries of Theorem F and Theorem G for stable categories with t-structures with the same heart. The first immediate corollary is the following.

Corollary 4.3.42. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be any Grothendieck abelian category. For any two t-stable categories $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ with $\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit} \simeq \mathcal{A} \simeq \mathcal{D}^{\heartsuit}$ there* *are one-to-one correspondences*

$$\left\{\begin{matrix}\pi\textit{-stable localizing}\\ \textit{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}\end{matrix}\right\} \longrightarrow \left\{\begin{matrix}\pi\textit{-stable localizing}\\ \textit{subcategories of } \mathcal{D}\end{matrix}\right\}$$

and

$$\left\{\begin{matrix}\pi\textit{-exact localizing}\\ \textit{subcategories of } \mathcal{C}\end{matrix}\right\} \longrightarrow \left\{\begin{matrix}\pi\textit{-exact localizing}\\ \textit{subcategories of } \mathcal{D}\end{matrix}\right\}.$$

The above correspondence might not be induced by a functor between $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$, but is just an abstract isomorphism. However, in the case when there is a functor, the π-stable localizing subcategories are also functorially related. We can set this up as follows.

Lemma 4.3.43. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be t-stable categories with $\mathcal{A}^{\heartsuit} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$ and $\mathcal{T}^{\heartsuit} \subseteq \mathcal{D}^{\heartsuit}$ abelian weak localizing subcategories of the respective hearts. If there is a t-exact functor $F\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ such that the functor on hearts $F^{\heartsuit}\colon \mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}^{\heartsuit}$ restricts to a functor*

$$F^{\heartsuit}_{|\mathcal{A}^{\heartsuit}}\colon \mathcal{A}^{\heartsuit} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}^{\heartsuit},$$

then the functor F restricts to the unique π-stable localizing subcategories $F_{|\mathcal{A}}\colon \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}$.

Proof. As F is t-exact we have $F(\pi^{\heartsuit}_{\mathcal{C},n}X) \simeq \pi^{\heartsuit}_{\mathcal{D},n}F(X)$. By assumption we know that $F(\pi^{\heartsuit}_{\mathcal{C},n}X) \simeq F^{\heartsuit}(\pi^{\heartsuit}_{\mathcal{C},n}X) \in \mathcal{T}^{\heartsuit}$, hence any Y in the image of F has $\pi^{\heartsuit}_{\mathcal{D},n}Y \in \mathcal{T}^{\heartsuit}$ for any n. Since $\mathcal{T}$ is π-stable this implies that $Y \in \mathcal{T}$, proving the claim. $\square$

Let $F\colon \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be a t-exact functor of t-stable categories such that the induced functor $F^{\heartsuit}\colon \mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathcal{D}^{\heartsuit}$ is an equivalence. Assume further that $\mathcal{A}$ is an abelian weak localizing subcategory of $\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$, and that $F^{\heartsuit}$ restricts to a functor $F^{\heartsuit}_{|\mathcal{A}}\colon \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$. By Lemma 4.3.43 we get restricted functors $F_{|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}}\colon \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{D}}$, where $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{D}}$ respectively denote the unique π-stable localizing subcategories of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ obtained via Theorem F.

Corollary 4.3.44. *If F is an equivalence, then every such restricted functor $F_{|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}}$ is an equivalence.*

One interesting feature of the ∞-categorical framework is the existence of realization functors in reasonable generalities. If $\mathcal{C}$ is a t-stable category, then a realization functor for $\mathcal{C}$ is a functor $R\colon \mathrm{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$, extending the inclusion of the heart. In particular, R restricts to the identity on $\mathrm{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit})^{\heartsuit} \simeq \mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$. These realization functors are rarely equivalences, even rarely full or faithful, but we can still apply Lemma 4.3.43 to functorially relate the π-stable localizing subcategories. Note that as R restricts to the identity in hearts, we dont even need to assume or prove that the functor R is t-exact, as the proof of Lemma 4.3.43 goes through regardless.

The following argument is due to Maxime Ramzi.

Lemma 4.3.45. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a t-stable category and $\mathrm{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit})$ the derived category of its heart. In this situation there is a realization functor $R\colon \mathrm{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ extending the inclusion $\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}$.*

Proof. The inclusion of the heart extends to a functor $\mathrm{Fun}(\Delta^{\mathrm{op}}, \mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ via geometric realization, which preserves weak equivalences by [Lur17, 1.2.4.4, 1.2.4.5]. Via the Dold–Kan correspondence this gives a essentially unique colimit preserving functor $\mathrm{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit})_{\geqslant 0} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$, which extends uniquely to a functor $\mathrm{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ by [Lur17, 1.4.4.5], as $\mathcal{C}$ is stable. This functor preserves both colimits and the heart $\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$. □

We can then functorially relate the π-stable localizing subcategories of $\mathrm{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit})$ and $\mathcal{C}$ via the realization functor.

Corollary 4.3.46. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a t-stable category and $R\colon \mathrm{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ the realization functor. For any weak localizing subcategory $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$, the functor R restricts to a functor*

$$R\colon \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit})} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}},$$

where the former category denotes the unique π-stable lift of $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathrm{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit})$, and the latter the unique π-stable lift of $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{C}$.

Proof. This follows immediately from Lemma 4.3.43, the π-stability of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}$ and the fact that the identity restricts to the identity functor $\mathcal{A} \simeq \mathcal{A}^{\heartsuit}_{\mathrm{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit})} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\heartsuit}_{\mathcal{C}} \simeq \mathcal{A}$. □

Remark 4.3.47. By Proposition 4.3.6 the π-stable localizing subcategory $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is also t-stable, with heart $\mathcal{A}$. Hence, there is also a realization functor $R' \colon \mathrm{D}(\mathcal{A}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}$, and a natural question to ask is wether this coincides with the above restricted functor $R \colon \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit})} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}$. There is an inclusion $\mathrm{D}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit})}$, as the latter is a π-stable localizing subcategory of $\mathrm{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit})$, but we do not know if this is always an equivalence. In particular, we don't know whether $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$, treated as a subcategory of $\mathrm{D}(\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit})$, is always a π-stable localizing subcategory.

4.4 Addendum: Subcategories of synthetic spectra

One of the main motivations for Theorem 4.3.35 was to understand localizing subcategories of Pstrągowski's category of E_n-based synthetic spectra — see [Pst23]. This section is not part of the paper [Aam24b], but is added to flesh out this example further, and to relate this paper to Chapter 2. We have also included some conjectures which we hope to pursue in future work.

Proposition 4.4.1 ([BH18, 2.17])**.** *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a localizing subcategory in a Grothendieck abelian category $\mathcal{A}$, and $\Psi \colon \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{T}$ the associated Gabriel quotient. If S is a localizing subcategory in $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{T}$, then there is a localizing subcategory $\overline{S}$ in $\mathcal{A}$ containing $\mathcal{T}$ such that $\Psi(\overline{S}) = S$.*

This result was used by Barthel–Heard to classify localizing subcategories in Comod_{E_*E}, as a corollary to the partial classification of localizing subcategories in Comod_{BP_*BP}, due to Hovey–Strickland in [HS05a].

Theorem 4.4.2 ([BH18, 2.21])**.** *If $\mathcal{T}$ is a localizing subcategory in Comod_{E_*E}, then there is an $0 \leqslant k \leqslant n$ such that $\mathcal{T} \simeq \mathrm{Comod}^{I_k-tors}_{E_*E}$.*

Remark 4.4.3. Note that the Gabriel quotient $\mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}/\mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}^{I_k-tors} \simeq \mathrm{Comod}_{E(k)_*E(k)}$. Hence we get a chain of localizing subcategories

$$\mathcal{T}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{T}_1 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \mathcal{T}_n$$

in Comod_{E_*E}, corresponding each to one of the generators in the Landweber ideal $I_n = (v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n) \subseteq E_*$. Hence this result also classifies the localizing subcategories in the torsion categories $\mathrm{Comod}_{E_*E}^{I_k-tors}$.

Bibliography

[Aam24a] Torgeir Aambø. "Algebraicity in monochromatic homotopy theory". In: *To appear in Algebraic & Geometric topology* (2024). arXiv:2403.07725 (Pages ii, 25).

[Aam24b] Torgeir Aambø. *Classification of localizing subcategories along t-structures.* 2024. arXiv: `2412.09391 [math.AT]` (Pages ii, 26, 42, 133).

[Aam24c] Torgeir Aambø. *Positselski duality in stable ∞-categories.* 2024. arXiv: `2411.04060 [math.AT]` (Pages ii, 25, 96).

[Aam25] Torgeir Aambø. "Balmer didn't need nerves of steel". In: (2025) (Page ii).

[Ada58] John F. Adams. "On the structure and applications of the Steenrod algebra". In: *Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici* 32.1 (1958), pp. 180–214 (Page 18).

[AJS04] Leovigildo Alonso Tarrío, Ana Jeremías López, and María José Souto Salorio. "Bousfield localization on formal schemes". In: *Journal of Algebra* 278.2 (2004), pp. 585–610 (Page 128).

[Ang11] Vigleik Angeltveit. "Uniqueness of Morava K-theory". In: *Compositio Mathematica* 147.2 (2011), pp. 633–648 (Page 12).

[Ant21] Benjamin Antieau. *On the uniqueness of infinity-categorical enhancements of triangulated categories.* 2021. arXiv: `1812.01526 [math.AG]` (Page 105).

[AGH19] Benjamin Antieau, David Gepner, and Jeremiah Heller. "K-theoretic obstructions to bounded t-structures". In: *Inventiones Mathematicae* 216 (2019), pp. 241–300 (Pages 115, 126).

[Baa73a] Nils A. Baas. "On bordism theory of manifolds with singularities". In: *Mathematica Scandinavica* 33.2 (1973), pp. 279–302 (Page 13).

[Baa73b] Nils A. Baas. "On formal groups and singularities in complex cobordism theory". In: *Mathematica Scandinavica* 33.2 (1973), pp. 303–313 (Page 13).

[Bak09] Andrew Baker. "L-complete Hopf algebroids and their comodules". In: *Contemporary Mathematics* 504 (2009), pp. 1–22 (Page 45).

[BS17] Paul Balmer and Beren Sanders. "The spectrum of the equivariant stable homotopy category of a finite group". In: *Inventiones Mathematicae* 208.1 (2017), pp. 283–326 (Page 64).

[Bar23] Shaul Barkan. *Chromatic Homotopy is Monoidally Algebraic at Large Primes*. 2023. arXiv: `2304.14457 [math.AT]` (Pages 15, 49, 62).

[BR11] David Barnes and Constanze Roitzheim. "Monoidality of Franke's exotic model". In: *Advances in mathematics* 228.6 (2011), pp. 3223–3248 (Pages 18, 37, 40, 47).

[BB19] Tobias Barthel and Agnès Beaudry. "Chromatic structures in stable homotopy theory". In: *Handbook of Homotopy Theory*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2019 (Pages 9, 37, 92).

[BF15] Tobias Barthel and Martin Frankland. "Completed power operations for Morava E-theory". In: *Algebraic & Geometric Topology* 15.4 (2015), pp. 2065–2131 (Page 50).

[BH16] Tobias Barthel and Drew Heard. "The E_2-term of the $K(n)$-local E_n-Adams spectral sequence". In: *Topology and its Applications* 206 (2016), pp. 190–214 (Page 52).

[BH18] Tobias Barthel and Drew Heard. "Algebraic chromatic homotopy theory for BP_*BP-comodules". In: *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society* 117.6 (2018). arXiv:1708.09261 [math], pp. 1135–1180 (Page 133).

[BHV18] Tobias Barthel, Drew Heard, and Gabriel Valenzuela. "Local duality in algebra and topology". In: *Advances in Mathematics* 335 (2018), pp. 563–663 (Pages 6, 7, 10, 17, 19, 21, 23, 35, 36, 38, 39, 50, 56, 57, 72, 88, 89, 91, 93, 95, 116).

[BHV20] Tobias Barthel, Drew Heard, and Gabriel Valenzuela. "Derived completion for comodules". In: *Manuscripta Mathematica* 161.3-4 (2020), pp. 409–438 (Pages 19, 22–24, 39, 40, 92, 95, 116).

[BP23] Tobias Barthel and Piotr Pstrągowski. "Morava K-theory and filtrations by powers". In: *Journal of the Institute of Mathematics of Jussieu* (2023), pp. 1–77 (Pages 15, 44).

[BSS20] Tobias Barthel, Tomer M. Schlank, and Nathaniel Stapleton. "Chromatic homotopy theory is asymptotically algebraic". In: *Inventiones Mathematicae* 220.3 (2020), pp. 737–845 (Pages 32, 33, 49).

[BSS21] Tobias Barthel, Tomer M. Schlank, and Nathaniel Stapleton. "Monochromatic homotopy theory is asymptotically algebraic". In: *Advances in Mathematics* 393 (2021) (Pages 32, 33, 41, 49, 60).

[Bar+24] Tobias Barthel, Tomer M. Schlank, Nathaniel Stapleton, and Jared Weinstein. *On the rationalization of the $K(n)$-local sphere.* 2024. arXiv: `2402.00960 [AT]` (Page 45).

[BS20] Mark Behrens and Jay Shah. “C_2-equivariant stable homotopy from real motivic stable homotopy”. In: *Annals of K-Theory* 5.3 (2020), pp. 411–464 (Pages 63, 66).

[BBD82] Alexander Beilinson, Joseph Bernstein, and Pierre Deligne. “Faisceaux pervers”. In: *Astérisque* 100 (1982) (Pages 98, 102, 109).

[Bou79] Aldridge K. Bousfield. “The localization of spectra with respect to homology”. In: *Topology* 18.4 (1979), pp. 257–281 (Pages 9, 10, 38).

[Bou85] Aldridge K. Bousfield. “On the homotopy theory of K-local spectra at an odd prime”. In: *American Journal of Mathematics* 107.4 (1985), pp. 895–932 (Page 31).

[BM23] Lukas Brantner and Akhil Mathew. *Deformation Theory and Partition Lie Algebras*. 2023. arXiv: `1904.07352 [math.AG]` (Pages 79, 81).

[BS12] Markus Brodmann and Rodney Sharp. *Local Cohomology: An Algebraic Introduction with Geometric Applications*. 2nd ed. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. ISBN: 978-0-521-51363-0. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012 (Pages 22, 50–52, 57).

[Brz10] Tomasz Brzeziński. “The structure of corings: Induction functors, Maschke-type theorem, and Frobenius and Galois-type properties”. In: *Algebras and representation theory* 5 (2010), pp. 389–410 (Page 84).

[Bur+23] Robert Burklund, Jeremy Hahn, Ishan Levy, and Tomer M. Schlank. *K-theoretic counterexamples to Ravenel’s telescope conjecture*. 2023. arXiv: `2310.17459 [math.AT]` (Pages 11, 93).

[Chr23] Merlin Christ. “Spherical monadic adjunctions of stable infinity categories”. In: *International Mathematics Research Notices* 2023 (2023) (Pages 75–77).

[DH04] Ethan S. Devinatz and Michael J. Hopkins. "Homotopy fixed point spectra for closed subgroups of the Morava stabilizer groups". In: *Topology* 43.1 (2004) (Page 15).

[Dyc+24] Tobias Dyckerhoff, Mikhail Kapranov, Vadim Schechtman, and Yan Soibelman. "Spherical adjunctions of stable ∞-categories and the relative S-construction". In: *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 307.4 (2024), p. 73 (Page 92).

[EM65] Samuel Eilenberg and John Moore. "Foundations of relative homological algebra". In: *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society* 55 (1965) (Page 68).

[EK20] Elden Elmanto and Håkon Kolderup. "On modules over motivic ring spectra". In: *Annals of K-theory* 5 (2020), pp. 327–355 (Pages 63, 79, 81).

[Fra96] Jens Franke. "Uniqueness for certain categories with an Adams SS". In: *K-theory preprint archives* 139 (1996) (Pages 25, 31, 40, 43, 47, 58).

[Gab62] Pierre Gabriel. "Des catégories abéliennes". In: *Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France* 90 (1962), pp. 323–448 (Pages 120, 127, 128).

[GH04] Paul G. Goerss and Michael J. Hopkins. "Moduli spaces of commutative ring spectra". In: *Structured ring spectra*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004, pp. 151–200 (Page 14).

[GM92] John P. C. Greenlees and Jon P. May. "Derived functors of I-adic completion and local homology". In: *Journal of Algebra* 149.2 (1992), pp. 438–453 (Pages 19, 52, 94, 116).

[GM95] John P. C. Greenlees and Jon P. May. "Completions in algebra and topology". In: *Handbook of algebraic topology*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1995, pp. 255–276 (Page 38).

[GS13] John P. C. Greenlees and Brooke Shipley. “The Cellularization Principle for Quillen adjunctions”. In: *Homology, Homotopy and Applications* 15.2 (2013), pp. 173–184 (Page 66).

[HR17] Jack Hall and David Rydh. “The telescope conjecture for algebraic stacks”. In: *Journal of Topology* 10.3 (2017), pp. 776–794 (Page 129).

[HPV16] Benjamin Hennion, Mauro Porta, and Gabriele Vezzosi. *Formal gluing along non-linear flags*. 2016. arXiv: `1607.04503 [math.AG]` (Page 126).

[Hol20] Maximilien Thomas Holmberg-Peroux. “Highly Structured Coalgebras and Comodules”. In: (2020). PhD thesis, University of Illinois (Page 82).

[HL17] Michael J. Hopkins and Jacob Lurie. *On Brouer groups of Lubin–Tate spectra I*. Available at the authors website. 2017 (Page 15).

[Hov95] Mark Hovey. “Bousfield localization functors and Hopkins’ chromatic splitting conjecture”. In: *The ech centennial (Boston, MA, 1993)*. Vol. 181. Contemporary Mathematics. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1995, pp. 225–250 (Pages 13, 15, 55).

[Hov04] Mark Hovey. “Homotopy theory of comodules over a Hopf algebroid”. In: *Homotopy theory: relations with algebraic geometry, group cohomology, and algebraic K-theory*. Vol. 346. Contemporary mathematics. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society, 2004, pp. 261–304 (Pages 16–18, 37, 39).

[HPS97] Mark Hovey, John H. Palmieri, and Neil P. Strickland. *Axiomatic Stable Homotopy Theory*. ISBN: 978-0-8218-0624-1. American Mathematical Society, 1997 (Pages 6, 7, 35, 36, 72, 88, 90).

[HS99] Mark Hovey and Neil P. Strickland. *Morava K-theories and localisation*. Vol. 139. Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society. ISBN: 978-0-8218-1079-8. American Mathematical Society, 1999 (Pages 12, 30, 38, 52, 93).

[HS05a] Mark Hovey and Neil P. Strickland. "Comodules and Landweber exact homology theories". In: *Advances in Mathematics* 192.2 (2005), pp. 427–456 (Pages 55, 58, 133).

[HS05b] Mark Hovey and Neil P. Strickland. "Local cohomology of BP_*BP-comodules". In: *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society* 90.2 (2005), pp. 521–544 (Pages 18, 56, 57).

[HJR23] Katerina Hristova, John Johes, and Dmitriy Rumynin. "General comodule-contramodule correspondence". In: *São Paulo Journal of Mathematical Sciences* (2023) (Page 77).

[Ish19] Jocelyne Ishak. "Rigidity of the $K(1)$-local stable homotopy category". In: *Homology, Homotopy and Applications* 21.2 (2019), pp. 261–278 (Pages 32, 49).

[IRW23] Jocelyne Ishak, Constanze Roitzheim, and Jordan Williamson. "Levels of algebraicity in stable homotopy theories". In: *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* 108.2 (2023), pp. 545–577 (Page 49).

[JW75] David C. Johnson and Walter S. Wilson. "BP operations and Morava's extraordinary K-theories". In: *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 144.1 (1975), pp. 55–75 (Page 13).

[Joy02] André Joyal. "Quasi-categories and Kan complexes". In: *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*. Special volume celebrating the 70th birthday of professor Max Kelly 175.1 (2002), pp. 207–222 (Pages 3, 34).

[Kan12] Ryo Kanda. "Classifying Serre subcategories via atom spectrum". In: *Advances in Mathematics* 231.3 (2012), pp. 1572–1588 (Page 130).

[Kan15] Ryo Kanda. “Classification of categorical subspaces of locally noetherian schemes”. In: *Documenta Mathematica* 20 (2015), pp. 1403–1465 (Page 129).

[Kra08] Henning Krause. “Thick subcategories of modules over commutative noetherian rings (with an appendix by Srikanth Iyengar)”. In: *Mathematische Annalen* 340.4 (2008), pp. 733–747 (Page 120).

[LT66] Jonathan Lubin and John Tate. “Formal moduli for one-parameter formal Lie groups”. In: *Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France* 94 (1966), pp. 49–59 (Page 13).

[Lur09] Jacob Lurie. *Higher topos theory*. ISBN: 978-0-691-14049-0. Princeton University Press, 2009 (Pages 3, 7, 34, 35, 69, 74, 83, 86, 88, 101).

[Lur16] Jacob Lurie. *Spectral algebraic geometry*. Available at the authors website. 2016 (Pages 99, 100, 103–105, 107–109, 111–113, 117, 118, 127).

[Lur17] Jacob Lurie. *Higher algebra*. Available at the authors website. 2017 (Pages 3, 7, 24, 34, 36, 54, 63, 69, 73–75, 78, 81, 83, 101, 102, 132).

[Lur18] Jacob Lurie. *Elliptic cohomology I: Spectral abelian varieties*. 2018 (Page 74).

[MM94] Saunders MacLane and Ieke Moerdijk. *Sheaves in geometry and logic: A first introduction to topos theory*. Universitext. Springer Verlag, 1994 (Page 77).

[MNN17] Akhil Mathew, Niko Naumann, and Justin Noel. “Nilpotence and descent in equivariant stable homotopy theory”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 305 (2017), pp. 994–1084 (Pages 63, 79).

[Nau07] Niko Naumann. “The stack of formal groups in stable homotopy theory”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 215.2 (2007), pp. 569–600 (Page 16).

[NB92] Amnon Neeman and Marcel Bökstedt. "The chromatic tower for $D(R)$". In: *Topology* 31.3 (1992), pp. 519–532 (Page 127).

[Nik16] Thomas Nikolaus. *Stable ∞-Operads and the multiplicative Yoneda lemma*. 2016. arXiv: `1608.02901 [math.AT]` (Page 86).

[Pat12] Irakli Patchkoria. "On the algebraic classification of module spectra". In: *Algebraic & Geometric Topology* 12.4 (2012), pp. 2329–2388 (Page 31).

[PP21] Irakli Patchkoria and Piotr Pstrągowski. *Adams spectral sequences and Franke's algebraicity conjecture*. 2021. arXiv: `2110.03669 [math.AT]` (Pages 25, 32, 33, 40, 43, 45–49, 53, 59, 62).

[Pos10] Leonid Positselski. *Homological algebra of semimodules and semicontramodules: Semi-infinite homological algebra of associative algebraic structures*. Vol. 70. Monografie Matematyczne. Birkhäuser, 2010 (Page 68).

[Pos11] Leonid Positselski. "Two kinds of derived categories, Koszul duality, and comodule-contramodule correspondence". In: *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society* 212 (2011) (Page 68).

[Pos16] Leonid Positselski. "Dedualizing complexes and MGM duality". In: *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 220 (2016) (Pages 68, 69, 92, 95).

[Pos17a] Leonid Positselski. *Abelian right perpendicular subcategories in module categories*. 2017. arXiv: `1705.04960 [math.CT]` (Page 70).

[Pos17b] Leonid Positselski. "Contraadjusted modules, contramodules, and reduced cotorsion modules". In: *Moscow Mathematical Journal* 17 (2017) (Page 68).

[Pos20] Leonid Positselski. "Smooth duality and co-contra correspondence". In: *Journal of Lie Theory* 30 (2020) (Page 68).

[Pos22] Leonid Positselski. *Contramodules*. 2022. arXiv: `1503.00991 [math.CT]` (Pages 20, 68, 70).

[Pst21] Piotr Pstrągowski. "Chromatic homotopy theory is algebraic when $p > n^2 + n + 1$". In: *Advances in Mathematics* 391 (2021), p. 107958 (Pages 18, 25, 31, 40, 46, 58, 59).

[Pst23] Piotr Pstrągowski. "Synthetic spectra and the cellular motivic category". In: *Inventiones Mathematicae* 232.2 (2023), pp. 553–681 (Pages 43, 61, 104, 133).

[PV22] Piotr Pstrągowski and Paul VanKoughnett. "Abstract Goerss-Hopkins theory". In: *Advances in Mathematics* 395 (2022) (Page 14).

[Ram23] Maxime Ramzi. *Separability in homotopical algebra*. 2023. arXiv: `2305.17236 [math.AT]` (Pages 82, 84).

[Ram24] Maxime Ramzi. *Dualizable presentable ∞-categories*. 2024. arXiv: `2410.21537 [math.CT]` (Page 77).

[Rav86] Douglas C. Ravenel. *Complex cobordismc and stable homotopy groups of spheres*. 2nd ed. ISBN: 978-1-4704-7293-1. AMS Chelsea Publishing, 1986 (Pages 13, 16, 17, 37, 58).

[Rav92] Douglas C. Ravenel. *Nilpotence and periodicity in stable homotopy theory*. ISBN: 978-0-691-08792-4. Princeton University Press, 1992 (Pages 12, 13, 30).

[RV15] Emily Riehl and Dominic Verity. "Completeness results for quasi-categories of algebras, homotopy limits, and related general constructions". In: *Homology, Homotopy and Applications* 17.1 (June 2015). Publisher: International Press of Boston, pp. 1–33 (Page 78).

[Rog08] John Rognes. *Galois extensions of structured ring spectra*. Vol. 192. Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society. ISBN: 978-0-8218-4076-4. American Mathematical Society, 2008 (Page 15).

[Roi07] Constanze Roitzheim. “Rigidity and exotic models for the K-local stable homotopy category”. In: *Geometry & Topology* 11.4 (2007), pp. 1855–1886 (Pages 32, 49).

[Rou08] Raphaël Rouquier. “Dimensions of triangulated categories”. In: *Journal of K-theory* 1 (2008) (Page 71).

[Sch01] Stefan Schwede. “The stable homotopy category has a unique model at the prime 2”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 164.1 (2001), pp. 24–40 (Page 49).

[Sch07] Stefan Schwede. “The stable homotopy category is rigid”. In: *Annals of Mathematics. Second Series* 166.3 (2007), pp. 837–863 (Page 49).

[SS02] Stefan Schwede and Brooke Shipley. “A uniqueness theorem for stable homotopy theory”. In: *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 239.4 (2002), pp. 803–828 (Page 49).

[Ste13] Greg Stevenson. “Support theory via actions of tensor triangulated categories”. In: *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik* 2013.681 (2013), pp. 219–254 (Page 128).

[Sul05] Dennis Sullivan. *Geometric topology: localization, periodicity and Galois symmetry: The 1970 MIT Notes*. ISBN: 978-1-4020-3511-1. Springer, 2005 (Page 10).

[Tak09] Ryo Takahashi. “On localizing subcategories of derived categories”. In: *Kyoto Journal of Mathematics* 49 (2009), pp. 771–783 (Pages 99, 116, 120, 127, 128).

[ZC17] Chao Zhang and Hongyan Cai. “A note on thick subcategories and wide subcategories”. In: *Homology, Homotopy and Applications* 19.2 (2017), pp. 131–139 (Pages 99, 116, 121).

Index