

# APPLICATIONS OF (HIGHER) CATEGORICAL TRACE I: THE DEFINITION OF AGCat

DENNIS GAITSGORY, NICK ROZENBLYUM, AND YAKOV VARSHAVSKY

ABSTRACT. In this paper we record the formalism of *algebro-geometric* DG categories (in short AGCat) following a suggestion of V. Drinfeld. This formalism will be applied to “real-world” problems in papers sequel to this one, [GRV2] and [GRV3].

## CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1. The enhancement construction	10
2. Construction of AGCat	16
3. The value of $\text{Shv}$ on prestacks	25
4. Duality in DGCat and AGCat	37
5. Computing trace in AGCat	47
Appendix A. Recollections on enriched categories	57
Appendix B. Weighted limits and colimits	73
Appendix C. Adjunctions	79
References	82

## INTRODUCTION

**0.1. What is this paper about?** This paper does not contain deep *original* results. Our goal has been to write down a certain construction, proposed by V. Drinfeld some 20 years ago, that provides an “artificial” fix to the failure of the *categorical Künneth formula*.

0.1.1. For a scheme  $X$  of finite type over a ground field  $k$ , let  $\text{Shv}(X)$  denote the (ind-complete version of the) DG category of  $\ell$ -adic sheaves on  $X$ , defined as in [AGKRRV1, Sect. 1.1]. For a pair of schemes  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ , the operation of *external tensor product* gives rise to a functor

$$(0.1) \quad \text{Shv}(X_1) \otimes \text{Shv}(X_2) \rightarrow \text{Shv}(X_1 \times X_2),$$

where the  $\otimes$  is Lurie’s tensor product of DG categories.

The point of departure of Drinfeld’s proposal and of this paper is that the functor (0.1) is *not* an equivalence (unless one of the schemes  $X_1$  or  $X_2$  is a disjoint union of points). However, there are multiple reasons (see Sect. 0.2) for which one would want to “turn” (0.1) into an equivalence. as explained below.

---

*Date:* December 29, 2025.

The device that turns (0.1) into an equivalence (see below) is basically a formal manipulation, which may seem too naive to produce anything really useful. But it happens to be deeper than it looks. At least, it helps one solve problems that exist outside of this formalism (see Sects. 0.2.3 and 0.2.6).

0.1.2. The formal structure of turning (0.1) into an equivalence will be as follows: we will define a new symmetric monoidal  $(\infty, 2)$ -category, to be denoted  $\text{AGCat}$ , equipped with the following data:

- A symmetric monoidal functor  $\mathbf{i} : \text{DGCat} \rightarrow \text{AGCat}$ ;
- A symmetric monoidal functor  $\underline{\text{Shv}} : \text{Corr}(\text{Sch}) \rightarrow \text{AGCat}$ , where  $\text{Corr}(\text{Sch})$  is the *category of correspondences* of schemes, see Sect. 2.1;
- A symmetric monoidal transformation

$$\alpha : \mathbf{i} \circ \text{Shv}(-) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}},$$

where  $\text{Shv}(-) : \text{Corr}(\text{Sch}) \rightarrow \text{DGCat}$  is the original functor  $X \mapsto \text{Shv}(X)$  equipped with the *right-lax* symmetric monoidal structure encoded by (0.1).

The category  $\text{AGCat}$  is constructed so that it is universal with respect to the possessing the structure of  $(\mathbf{i}, \underline{\text{Shv}}(-), \alpha)$  above.

Moreover, it will follow from the construction that the natural transformation

$$\text{Shv}(-) \rightarrow \mathbf{i}^R \circ \underline{\text{Shv}}(-),$$

arising from  $\alpha$ , is an isomorphism.

0.1.3. The fact that  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(-)$  is *strictly* symmetric monoidal means that we have *isomorphisms*

$$(0.2) \quad \underline{\text{Shv}}(X_1) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(X_2) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}}(X_1 \times X_2)$$

in  $\text{AGCat}$ , which replace the non-isomorphisms (0.1).

0.1.4. One can describe objects of  $\text{AGCat}$  explicitly. Namely, an object  $\underline{\mathbf{C}} \in \text{AGCat}$  is an assignment

$$(X \in \text{Sch}) \mapsto \underline{\mathbf{C}}(X) \in \text{DGCat},$$

such that:

- The category  $\underline{\mathbf{C}}(X)$  is a module over  $\text{Shv}(X)$  (where the latter is equipped with a monoidal structure given by the  $\overset{!}{\otimes}$  tensor product);
- For  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$  we are given functors  $f_* : \underline{\mathbf{C}}(X_1) \rightarrow \underline{\mathbf{C}}(X_2)$  and  $f^! : \underline{\mathbf{C}}(X_2) \rightarrow \underline{\mathbf{C}}(X_1)$ , both  $\text{Shv}(X_2)$ -linear, where  $\text{Shv}(X_2)$  acts on  $\underline{\mathbf{C}}(X_1)$  via  $f^! : \text{Shv}(X_2) \rightarrow \text{Shv}(X_1)$ ;
- For a cartesian square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_1 & \xrightarrow{f_X} & X_2 \\ g_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow g_2 \\ Y_1 & \xrightarrow{f_Y} & Y_2 \end{array}$$

we are given an isomorphism

$$f_Y^! \circ (g_2)_* \simeq (g_1)_* \circ f_X^!$$

- as functors  $\underline{\mathbf{C}}(X_2) \rightarrow \underline{\mathbf{C}}(Y_1)$ ;  
 • Natural compatibilities between the above data.

From this point of view, the category AGCat is a natural substitute for DG categories in algebraic geometry: a “true” algebro-geometric DG category should be a family of such for every scheme, which is exactly what our  $\underline{\mathbf{C}}$ ’s are. Hence, the name AGCat: algebro-geometric categories<sup>1</sup>.

0.1.5. In terms of the above description, the functor  $\mathbf{i}$  is a (fully faithful) embedding

$$\mathrm{DGCat} \rightarrow \mathrm{AGCat}$$

that sends  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathrm{DGCat}$  to  $\mathbf{i}(\mathbf{C})$  defined by

$$\mathbf{i}(\mathbf{C})(X) := \mathbf{C} \otimes \mathrm{Shv}(X).$$

And the functor  $\underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(-)$  sends  $Y \in \mathrm{Sch}$  to  $\underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(Y)$  with

$$\underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(Y)(X) := \mathrm{Shv}(Y \times X).$$

The natural transformation  $\alpha$  is given by the functors (0.1).

## 0.2. What is this good for?

0.2.1. Here is the general philosophy:

In characteristic zero, the theory of D-modules on algebraic varieties (and stacks) gives a well-behaved “geometric” sheaf theory in that geometric constructions are closely mirrored by categorical constructions on the category of sheaves. This, in particular, leads to a rich theory of categorical group representations in that setting.

A substantial motivation for this work is to develop a parallel theory in the constructible setting that would apply in the setting of  $\ell$ -adic sheaves in characteristic  $p > 0$ . The first issue one encounters in building such a geometric theory of constructible sheaf categories is the failure of the categorical Künneth formula, i.e., the fact that (0.1) is not an equivalence.

The key idea in this work is that this is *the only* issue. Once we provide a “formal fix”, everything else falls into place. We now discuss concrete applications for having such a fix.

0.2.2. Here are two primary reasons to want a strictly monoidal functor  $\underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(-)$ . One has to do with *trace calculations*.

Namely, let  $\mathcal{F}$  be an object of  $\mathrm{Shv}(X \times X)$ . We can regard it as a kernel defining a functor

$$[\mathcal{F}] : \mathrm{Shv}(X) \rightarrow \mathrm{Shv}(X),$$

and one can consider its categorical trace

$$(0.3) \quad \mathrm{Tr}([\mathcal{F}], \mathrm{Shv}(X)) \in \mathrm{Vect}.$$

The object (0.3) is well-defined, but we do not know how to calculate (and may not necessarily want to). However, if we calculate the trace of the corresponding endofunctor  $[\mathcal{F}]$  of  $\underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(X)$  we obtain

$$\mathrm{C}^*(X, \Delta_X^!(\mathcal{F})).$$

---

<sup>1</sup>The notation AGCat was suggested by Sam Raskin; previously we used  $\mathrm{DGCat}_{\mathrm{alg-geom}}$ .

An important special case is when  $X$  is a scheme over  $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_q$ , but defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  is given by the direct image (of the dualizing sheaf with respect to the graph) of the geometric Frobenius. Then the above formalism provides a categorical framework for Grothendieck's function-sheaf correspondence, see Sects. 5.1 and 5.5.

0.2.3. When instead of schemes, we allow to consider algebraic stacks, in this way we obtain cohomologies of shtukas<sup>2</sup>. Now, the trace formalism allows one to organize cohomologies of shtukas into a quasi-coherent sheaf on the stack of Langlands parameters; a toy model for this was worked out in [GKRV].

We will address this in a sequel to this paper, [GRV3].

0.2.4. Another reason to want to have a functor  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(-)$  is in order to be able to define the notion of *categorical* representation of a group.

Let us place ourselves temporarily in the context of D-modules, in which case, the categorical Künneth formula does hold, i.e., the functor

$$\text{D-mod}(X_1) \otimes \text{D-mod}(X_2) \rightarrow \text{D-mod}(X_1 \times X_2)$$

is an equivalence.

In this case, by an action of an algebraic group  $G$  on a DG category  $\mathbf{C}$  we will mean a functor

$$\mathbf{C} \xrightarrow{\text{co-act}} \mathbf{C} \otimes \text{D-mod}(G),$$

such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{C} & \xrightarrow{\text{co-act}} & \mathbf{C} \otimes \text{D-mod}(G) \\ \text{co-act} \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbf{C} \otimes \text{D-mod}(G) & \xrightarrow{\text{Id} \otimes \text{mult}^!} & \mathbf{C} \otimes \text{D-mod}(G \times G) \end{array}$$

commutes, where the left vertical arrow is

$$\mathbf{C} \otimes \text{D-mod}(G) \xrightarrow{\text{co-act} \otimes \text{Id}} \mathbf{C} \otimes \text{D-mod}(G) \otimes \text{D-mod}(G) \xrightarrow{\text{Id} \otimes (\boxtimes)} \mathbf{C} \otimes \text{D-mod}(G \times G).$$

Let us now return back to the context of  $\ell$ -adic sheaves. In this case, one can attempt to give a similar definition: a DG category  $\mathbf{C}$  (over the field of coefficients, i.e.,  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ ) and a functor

$$\mathbf{C} \xrightarrow{\text{co-act}} \mathbf{C} \otimes \text{Shv}(G),$$

such that the diagram

$$(0.4) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{C} & \xrightarrow{\text{co-act}} & \mathbf{C} \otimes \text{Shv}(G) \\ \text{co-act} \downarrow & & \downarrow (\text{Id} \otimes (\boxtimes)) \circ (\text{co-act} \otimes \text{Id}) \\ \mathbf{C} \otimes \text{Shv}(G) & \xrightarrow{\text{Id} \otimes \text{mult}^!} & \mathbf{C} \otimes \text{Shv}(G \times G) \end{array}$$

commutes.

<sup>2</sup>But one does this for the Verdier dual version of AGCat, see Sect. 2.5.4.

This is a valid definition, but in this way one produces only a small part of examples that we want to consider. For example, we would not have the regular representation: the pullback functor

$$\mathrm{Shv}(G) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{mult}^!} \mathrm{Shv}(G \times G)$$

does not land in

$$(0.5) \quad \mathrm{Shv}(G) \otimes \mathrm{Shv}(G) \subset \mathrm{Shv}(G \times G).$$

*Remark 0.2.5.* One could attempt to define the regular representation by setting

$$\mathrm{co\text{-}act} := \boxtimes^R \circ \mathrm{mult}^!,$$

where  $\boxtimes^R$  is the right adjoint of (0.5), i.e.,  $\mathrm{co\text{-}act}$  is the *dual* of the convolution functor

$$\mathrm{Shv}(G) \otimes \mathrm{Shv}(G) \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} \mathrm{Shv}(G \times G) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{mult}^*} \mathrm{Shv}(G).$$

However, this  $\mathrm{co\text{-}act}$  fails to make (0.4) commute.

0.2.6. A way to fix this is to consider categorical representations of  $G$  in AGCat instead of DGCat. It turns out that in this way one obtains a very sensible theory. In particular, it allows one to do the following (when working over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  but with our geometric objects defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ ):

- (i) One can compute the 2-categorical trace of Frobenius on  $G\text{-}\mathbf{mod}(\mathrm{AGCat})$ , with the result being  $\mathrm{Shv}(G/\mathrm{Ad}^{\mathrm{Frob}}(G))$ . For example, when  $G$  is connected, the latter object is (up to applying the fully faithful functor  $\mathbf{i}$ ) the category of representations of the finite group  $G(\mathbb{F}_q)$ .
- (ii) If  $G$  is reductive and  $M$  its Levi subgroup, taking  $\mathrm{Tr}(\mathrm{Frob}, -)$  on the the 2-categorical induction functors  $M\text{-}\mathbf{mod}(\mathrm{AGCat}) \rightarrow G\text{-}\mathbf{mod}(\mathrm{AGCat})$ , we recover Deligne-Lusztig representations.
- (iii) One can compute characters of Deligne-Lusztig representations and relate them to pointwise Frobenius traces of Springer sheaves.
- (iv) One can do all of the above for the loop group  $\mathfrak{L}(G)$  instead of  $G$ , and recover (an algebraic version of) the Fargues-Scholze theory.

Points (i)-(iii) above will be developed in [GRV2], and point (iv) in future work.

### 0.3. How is AGCat actually constructed?

0.3.1. The construction of AGCat proceeds within the following general framework:

Given a pair of (closed) symmetric monoidal categories  $\mathbf{O}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  and a *right-lax* symmetric monoidal functor  $F : \mathbf{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ , we define a new symmetric monoidal category  $\underline{\mathcal{V}} := \mathrm{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})$ , equipped with:

- A symmetric monoidal functor  $\mathbf{i} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{V}}$ ;
- A symmetric monoidal functor  $\underline{F} : \mathbf{O} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{V}}$ ;
- A symmetric monoidal transformation:  $\alpha : \mathbf{i} \circ F \rightarrow \underline{F}$ ,

so that  $\underline{\mathcal{V}}$  is universal with respect to admitting the above structure.

The natural transformation  $\alpha$  gives rise to a natural transformation

$$F \rightarrow \mathbf{i}^R \circ \underline{F},$$

and an additional feature of the construction is that the latter map is an isomorphism.

0.3.2. We construct AGCat by taking  $\mathbf{O} := \mathrm{Corr}(\mathrm{Sch})$ ,  $\mathcal{V} := \mathrm{DGCat}$  and  $\mathcal{F} := \mathrm{Shv}(-)$ .

0.3.3. We construct  $\text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})$  using the formalism of enriched categories in three steps:

- (1) We consider  $\mathbf{O}$  as enriched over itself (thanks to the condition that  $\mathbf{O}$  is closed);
- (2) We define the  $\mathcal{V}$ -enriched category  $\text{enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})$  by changing (=inducing) the enrichment from  $\mathbf{O}$  to  $\mathcal{V}$  using  $F$ ;
- (3) We define  $\text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})$  as the category of  $\mathcal{V}$ -enriched presheaves on  $\text{enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})$  (this is a general construction that starts with a  $\mathcal{V}$ -enriched category and produces from it a  $\mathcal{V}$ -module category).

*Remark 0.3.4.* In the particular case of  $(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V}, F) = (\text{Corr}(\text{Sch}), \text{DGCat}, \text{Shv}(-))$ , the intermediate object  $\text{enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})$  is a familiar entity: it is the DGCat-category, whose objects are schemes, and for  $X_1, X_2$

$$\text{Hom}^{\text{DGCat}}(X_1, X_2) = \text{Shv}(X_1 \times X_2),$$

where  $\text{Hom}^{\text{DGCat}}(-, -)$  is the Hom enriched in DGCat.

I.e., this is the category of schemes with “kernels” as maps.

0.3.5. We should point out that the same procedure, namely,

$$(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V}, F) \mapsto \text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V}),$$

has been recently used by G. Stefanich in another context in order to produce the 2-category  $2\text{-IndCoh}(S)$ , which is an enlargement of the 2-category  $2\text{-QCoh}(S) := \text{QCoh}(S)\text{-mod}$  for a base scheme/stack  $S$ .

Namely, Stefanich starts with  $\mathbf{O} := \text{Corr}(\text{Sch}/S)$ ,  $\mathcal{V} := \text{QCoh}(S)\text{-mod}$  and

$$F(X) := \text{IndCoh}(X).$$

Here the right-lax symmetric monoidal structure is expressed by the functor

$$\text{IndCoh}(X_1) \underset{\text{QCoh}(S)}{\otimes} \text{IndCoh}(X_2) \rightarrow \text{IndCoh}(X_1 \underset{S}{\times} X_2).$$

Note that even if  $S$ ,  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are smooth, the above functor is *not* an equivalence as long as  $X_1 \underset{S}{\times} X_2$  is not smooth.

*Remark 0.3.6.* Stefanich’s construction is an improvement and generalization of a construction that produces the same 2-category  $2\text{-IndCoh}(S)$  that had been proposed earlier by D. Arinkin.

This construction plays a key role in formulating the 2-categorical local geometric Langlands, where we take  $S$  to be the stack of local Langlands parameters  $\text{LS}_G^{\text{loc}}$ . The need for an enlargement

$$2\text{-QCoh}(\text{LS}_G^{\text{loc}}) \rightsquigarrow 2\text{-IndCoh}(\text{LS}_G^{\text{loc}})$$

is due to the phenomenon of *non-temperedness*, and is a local counterpart of the enlargement

$$\text{QCoh}(\text{LS}_G^{\text{glob}}) \rightsquigarrow \text{IndCoh}(\text{LS}_G^{\text{glob}})$$

in global geometric Langlands.

#### 0.4. What else is done in this paper?

0.4.1. As was mentioned in Sect. 0.2.2, the formalism of AGCat provides a nice answer for

$$\mathrm{Tr}([\mathcal{F}], \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(X)), \quad \mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Shv}(X \times X)$$

when  $X$  is a scheme.

However, for practical applications we need a similar formula when  $X$  is allowed to be a more general algebro-geometric object, i.e., a *prestack* (assumed locally of finite type). In order to do this, we need to address the following questions:

- (1) What is  $\underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \in \mathrm{AGCat}$  for a prestack  $\mathcal{Y}$ ?
- (2) Under what conditions is it true that

$$\underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1) \otimes \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2) \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2)?$$

- (3) What guarantees that the above object  $\underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \in \mathrm{AGCat}$  is dualizable (so that the trace operation is defined)?
- (4) What guarantees that  $\underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})$  is self-dual?

- (5) If  $\underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})$  is self-dual and  $\underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y})$ , is it true that

$$\mathrm{Tr}([\mathcal{F}], \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})) \simeq \mathrm{C}(\mathcal{Y}, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}}^!(\mathcal{F})), \quad \mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y})?$$

Answering these questions is what occupies the bulk of this paper.

0.4.2. First, we define  $\underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})$  by

$$\underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})(X) := \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y} \times X),$$

where the category of sheaves on a prestack  $\mathcal{Y}'$  is defined by

$$\lim_{X \in (\mathrm{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}')^{\mathrm{op}}} \mathrm{Shv}(X),$$

where the limit is formed using the  $!$ -pullback functors.

With this definition, there is a naturally defined map

$$(0.6) \quad \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1) \otimes \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2) \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2),$$

but it is not an equivalence in general.

0.4.3. That said, one can associate to a prestack  $\mathcal{Y}'$  a different category, namely

$$\mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}')_{\mathrm{co}} := \mathrm{colim}_{X \in \mathrm{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}'} \mathrm{Shv}(X),$$

where the colimit is formed using the  $*$ -pushforward functors.

We define the object  $\underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})_{\mathrm{co}} \in \mathrm{AGCat}$  by

$$\underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})_{\mathrm{co}}(X) = \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y} \times X)_{\mathrm{co}}.$$

If  $\mathcal{Y} = X$  is a scheme, then more or less by definition, we have

$$\mathrm{Shv}(X)_{\mathrm{co}} = \mathrm{Shv}(X) \text{ and } \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(X)_{\mathrm{co}} = \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(X),$$

but for a general prestack  $\mathcal{Y}$ , the two are different. However, if  $\mathcal{Y}$  has a schematic diagonal, there are natural maps

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{Y}} : \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})_{\mathrm{co}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \text{ and } \underline{\Omega}_{\mathcal{Y}} : \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})_{\mathrm{co}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}).$$

We call a prestack *tame* (resp., universally tame) if  $\Omega_{\mathcal{Y}}$  (resp.,  $\underline{\Omega}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ ) is an equivalence. We shall say that  $\mathcal{Y}$  is *AG tame* if both  $\mathcal{Y}$  and  $\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}$  are universally tame.

0.4.4. Tame (resp., universally tame, AG tame) prestacks are quite abundant: any ind-scheme (or, more generally, any pseudo-scheme) is AG tame.

And any quasi-compact algebraic stack with an affine diagonal, which is locally a quotient of a scheme by a group, is AG tame. (In fact, conjecturally, the latter condition is not even necessary).

0.4.5. It turns out that AG tame prestacks are adapted for positive answers to the questions posed in Sect. 0.4.1:

- (1) If  $\mathcal{Y}$  is AG tame, then for any  $\mathcal{Y}'$ , the map

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}') \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}')$$

is an equivalence.

- (2) If  $\mathcal{Y}$  is AG tame, then the object  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \in \text{AGCat}$  is dualizable and self-dual;  
(3) If  $\mathcal{Y}$  is AG tame, then for  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y})$ ,

$$(0.7) \quad \text{Tr}([\mathcal{F}], \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})) \simeq C_{\Delta}(\mathcal{Y}, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}}^!(\mathcal{F})),$$

where  $C_{\Delta}(\mathcal{Y}, -)$  is the functor of *renormalized* cochains, see Sect. 5.2.2.

0.5. **Structure of the paper.** This paper is structured as follows:

0.5.1. In Sect. 1 we explain the general construction

$$(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V}, F) \mapsto \text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V}).$$

0.5.2. In Sect. 2 we use the construction in Sect. 1 to produce  $\text{AGCat}$ .

0.5.3. In Sect. 3 we explain how to evaluate  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(-)$  on prestacks, and develop the theory outlined in Secs. 0.4.2-0.4.5.

0.5.4. In Sect. 4 we explain how the notion of monoidal dual in  $\text{AGCat}$  interacts with Verdier duality on schemes and algebraic stacks.

0.5.5. Finally, in Sect. 5 we perform the trace calculation (0.7). We then specialize to the case of case of the Frobenius map (for algebraic stacks over  $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_q$ ) and show that

$$\text{Tr}(\text{Frob}_*, \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})) \simeq \text{Funct}(\mathcal{Y}(\mathbb{F}_q), \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_{\ell}).$$

We also explain how the latter identification relates to Grothendieck's sheaves-functionss correspondence.

0.5.6. In Sect. A we review the theory of enriched categories (over a given monoidal category  $\mathcal{A}$ ) and relate them to  $\mathcal{A}$ -module categories.

The key notions here are the *enriched presheaves* construction

$$(\mathcal{C} \in \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}) \mapsto (\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}) \in \mathcal{A}\text{-mod}).$$

and the enriched Yoneda functor

$$\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}).$$

0.5.7. In Sect. B we review *weighted limits and colimits*, which are generalizations of usual limits and colimits for  $\mathcal{A}$ -module categories.

The weights in question are given by objects of  $\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C})$  and  $\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}})$ , respectively.

0.5.8. Finally, in Sect. C we review the notion of adjunction in an  $(\infty, 2)$ -category.

## 0.6. Conventions and notations.

0.6.1. We will be working in the context of higher category theory. When we say “category” we always mean an  $\infty$ -category.

We let  $\text{Spc}$  denote the category of *spaces*, a.k.a. *groupoids*.

Given a category  $\mathbf{C}$ , and  $\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2 \in \mathbf{C}$ , we let

$$\text{Maps}_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2) \in \text{Spc}$$

denote the corresponding space of objects.

For a category  $\mathbf{C}$ , we let  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{grp}d}$  denote the space of its objects (i.e., the groupoid obtained from  $\mathbf{C}$  by discarding non-invertible morphisms).

0.6.2. In this paper we will also use  $(\infty, 2)$ -categories. We will adopt the definition developed in [GR1, Chapter 10].

0.6.3. Throughout this paper we will be working with the category of (classical, separated) schemes of finite type over a ground field  $k$ , assumed algebraically closed. We denote this category by  $\text{Sch}$ . We will not need derived algebraic geometry over  $k$  for this paper.

By a prestack we shall mean a (classical) prestack locally of finite type over  $k$  (see [GR1, Chapter 2, Sect. 1.3.6] for what this means). We denote the corresponding category by  $\text{PreStk}$ .

0.6.4. We will do *higher algebra* in vector spaces over the field of coefficients, which in this paper we take to be  $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_{\ell}$ .

We let  $\text{DGCat}$  denote the  $(\infty, 2)$ -category of  $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_{\ell}$ -linear DG categories, defined as in [GR1, Chapter 1, Sect. 10].

We view  $\text{DGCat}$  as equipped with the symmetric monoidal structure, given by the Lurie tensor product. The unit object for this structure is  $\text{Vect}$ , the category of (chain complexes)  $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_{\ell}$ -vector spaces.

For a DG category  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2 \in \mathbf{C}$ , we let

$$\mathcal{H}\text{om}_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2) \in \text{Vect}$$

denote the corresponding object. We have

$$\text{Maps}_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2) = \tau^{\leq 0}(\mathcal{H}\text{om}_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2)),$$

where we view the right-hand side as a connective spectrum.

0.7. **Acknowledgements.** This paper (obviously) owes its existence to V. Drinfeld.

We would also like to thank D. Kazhdan, S. Raskin, G. Stefanich for valuable discussions.

The research of N.R. is supported by an NSERC Discovery Grant (RGPIN-2025-0696).

The research of Y.V. was partially supported by the ISF grants 2091/21 and 2889/25.

## 1. THE ENHANCEMENT CONSTRUCTION

In this section we introduce a general categorical procedure, in the framework of which we will define AGCat. As was mentioned in the introduction (see Sect. 0.3.5), this procedure appears to have a broader use.

### 1.1. Setup and construction.

1.1.1. Let  $\mathbf{O}$  be a closed<sup>3</sup> symmetric monoidal category,  $\mathcal{V}$  a presentable symmetric monoidal category<sup>4</sup> and

$$F : \mathbf{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$$

a right-lax symmetric monoidal functor.

We will construct a symmetric monoidal  $\mathcal{V}$ -module category  $\text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})$  along with a symmetric monoidal functor

$$\underline{F} : \mathbf{O} \rightarrow \text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})$$

together with an identification of right-lax symmetric monoidal functors

$$(1.1) \quad F \simeq \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V}), \mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{1}_{\text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})}, -) \circ \underline{F},$$

where the notation  $\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V}), \mathcal{V}}$  stands for the *relative internal* Hom in  $\text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})$  with respect to  $\mathcal{V}$ .

1.1.2. As was explained in the introduction, the construction of the category  $\text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})$  uses the theory of enriched categories. In Sect. A, we provide a digest of the relevant aspects of the theory of enriched categories (in the  $\infty$ -categorical setting).

For a monoidal category  $\mathcal{A}$ , we will denote by  $\text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}$  the category of  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched categories. When  $\mathcal{A}$  is *symmetric* monoidal,  $\text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}$  is naturally a symmetric monoidal category, see Sect. A.10.1.

We will also be considering module categories over a given presentable monoidal category  $\mathcal{A}$  (see Sect. A.3.4); we denote the 2-category of such by  $\mathcal{A}\text{-mod}$ . For  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{A}\text{-mod}$  and  $m_1, m_2 \in \mathcal{M}$ , we denote by

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}}(m_2, m_2) \in \mathcal{A}$$

the *internal-relative-to  $\mathcal{A}$*  hom, i.e.,

$$\text{Maps}_{\mathcal{A}}(a, \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}}(m_2, m_2)) := \text{Maps}_{\mathcal{M}}(a \otimes m_1, m_2).$$

The assignment

$$(m_1, m_2) \mapsto \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}}(m_2, m_2)$$

makes  $\mathcal{M}$  into an object of  $\text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}$ , whose underlying category is the original  $\mathcal{M}$ , i.e.,

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathcal{A}}(m_1, m_2) := \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}}(m_2, m_2).$$

<sup>3</sup>Recall that a (symmetric) monoidal category is *closed* if it has internal homs; i.e. for every  $x \in \mathbf{O}$ , the functor  $(-) \otimes x : \mathbf{O} \rightarrow \mathbf{O}$  admits a right adjoint.

<sup>4</sup>I.e., an commutative algebra object in  $\text{Cat}^{\text{pres}}$ , see Sect. A.2.7.

1.1.3. By [GeHa, Sect. 7] (see also [He]), the closed symmetric monoidal structure on  $\mathbf{O}$  gives rise to a symmetric monoidal  $\mathbf{O}$ -enriched category

$$\text{Self-Enr}(\mathbf{O}) \in \text{ComAlg}(\text{Cat}^{\mathbf{O}}).$$

The space of objects of  $\text{Self-Enr}(\mathbf{O})$  is the same as that of  $\mathbf{O}$  and for  $\mathbf{o}_1, \mathbf{o}_2 \in \mathbf{O}$

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{Self-Enr}(\mathbf{O})}^{\mathbf{O}}(\mathbf{o}_1, \mathbf{o}_2) \simeq \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathbf{O}}(\mathbf{o}_1, \mathbf{o}_2) \in \mathbf{O}$$

is given by the internal hom in  $\mathbf{O}$ .

We have a symmetric monoidal equivalence

$$\mathbf{oblv}_{\text{Enr}}(\text{Self-Enr}(\mathbf{O})) \simeq \mathbf{O},$$

where  $\mathbf{oblv}_{\text{Enr}}$  is the functor that forgets enrichment (see Sect. A.1.11).

1.1.4. We define

$$\text{enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V}) \in \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{V}}$$

to be the  $\mathcal{V}$ -enriched category obtained from  $\text{Self-Enr}(\mathbf{O})$  and changing enrichment by  $F$ , i.e.,

$$\text{enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V}) := \mathbf{ind}_{\mathbf{O}}^{\mathcal{V}}(\text{Self-Enr}(\mathbf{O})).$$

Since  $F$  is right-lax *symmetric* monoidal,  $\text{enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})$  is naturally a symmetric monoidal  $\mathcal{V}$ -enriched category (see Sect. A.10.2).

The category  $\text{enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})$  has the objects *flagged by*<sup>5</sup>  $\mathbf{O}^{\text{grpd}}$  and morphism objects are given by

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})}^{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbf{o}_1, \mathbf{o}_2) = F(\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathbf{O}}(\mathbf{o}_1, \mathbf{o}_2)),$$

with composition given by the right-lax monoidal structure of  $F$ . Moreover, tensor product in  $\text{enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})$  agrees with that in  $\mathbf{O}$  at the level of objects (see Sect. A.10.2).

We have a tautologically defined symmetric monoidal functor

$$(1.2) \quad \mathbf{O} \simeq \mathbf{oblv}_{\mathbf{O}\text{-Enr}}(\text{Self-Enr}(\mathbf{O})) \rightarrow \mathbf{oblv}_{\mathcal{V}\text{-Enr}}(\text{enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})).$$

1.1.5. For any  $\mathcal{V}$ -enriched category  $\mathcal{C}$ , there is a corresponding  $\mathcal{V}$ -module category

$$(1.3) \quad \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{V}}(\mathcal{C}) := \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{V}}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{V})$$

of  $\mathcal{V}$ -functors from the opposite category of  $\mathcal{C}$  to  $\mathcal{V}$ . As in the unenriched category theory, this category has the universal property that it is the free cocompletion of  $\mathcal{C}$  as a  $\mathcal{V}$ -enriched category (see Proposition A.5.6 for the precise assertion).

1.1.6. We define  $\text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})$  as the enriched presheaf category:

$$\text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V}) := \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{V}}(\text{enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})).$$

The symmetric monoidal structure on  $\text{enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})$  induces one on  $\text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})$ , see Sect. A.10.5.

Composing (1.2) with the enriched Yoneda embedding (see Sect. A.6), we obtain the desired symmetric monoidal functor

$$\underline{F} : \mathbf{O} \rightarrow \text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V}).$$

Sometimes, when no confusion is likely to occur, we will write

$$\underline{\mathcal{V}} := \text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V}).$$

---

<sup>5</sup>See Sect. A.1 for what this means.

1.1.7. By the enriched Yoneda lemma (Corollary A.6.5), for  $\mathbf{o}_1, \mathbf{o}_2 \in \mathbf{O}$ ,

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}}(\underline{F}(\mathbf{o}_1), \underline{F}(\mathbf{o}_2)) \simeq \text{Hom}_{\text{enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})}^{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbf{o}_1, \mathbf{o}_2) := F(\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathbf{O}}(\mathbf{o}_1, \mathbf{o}_2)).$$

In particular,

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{V}}, \underline{F}(\mathbf{o})) \simeq F(\mathbf{o}),$$

as desired, see (1.1).

1.1.8. Using (1.3), we will regard an object  $\underline{v} \in \underline{\mathcal{V}}$  as an assignment

$$\mathbf{o} \in \mathbf{O} \mapsto \underline{v}(\mathbf{o}) \in \mathcal{V},$$

together with compatible system of maps

$$F(\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathbf{O}}(\mathbf{o}_1, \mathbf{o}_2)) \otimes \underline{v}(\mathbf{o}_2) \rightarrow \underline{v}(\mathbf{o}_1).$$

For example, for  $\underline{v} = \underline{F}(\mathbf{o}')$ , we have

$$(1.4) \quad \underline{v}(\mathbf{o}) = \text{Hom}_{\text{enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})}^{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{o}') = F(\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathbf{O}}(\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{o}')).$$

By the enriched Yoneda lemma (Lemma A.6.3), for  $\underline{v} \in \underline{\mathcal{V}}$  and  $\mathbf{o} \in \mathbf{O}$ ,

$$\underline{v}(\mathbf{o}) \simeq \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}}(\underline{F}(\mathbf{o}), \underline{v}).$$

## 1.2. Basic properties of the enhancement construction.

1.2.1. Let  $\mathbf{O}^{\text{grpD}}$  denote the space of objects of  $\mathbf{O}$ . By Sect. A.9.1, we have a monadic adjunction in  $\mathcal{V}\text{-mod}$ .

$$(1.5) \quad \text{Funct}(\mathbf{O}^{\text{grpD}}, \mathcal{V}) \rightleftarrows \text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V}) = \underline{\mathcal{V}}.$$

In terms of Sect. 1.1.8, the right adjoint in (1.5) sends  $\underline{v} \in \underline{\mathcal{V}}$  to its restriction along  $\mathbf{O}^{\text{grpD}} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{O}$ .

1.2.2. In particular, we obtain that the right adjoint in (1.5) is conservative, and it follows from Section B that it preserves limits and colimits and tensors and cotensors<sup>6</sup> with objects of  $\mathcal{V}$ .

By Proposition B.2.4, this implies that the right adjoint in (1.5) preserves all weighted limits and colimits.

In other words, when we view objects of  $\text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})$  as in Sect. 1.1.8, weighted limits and colimits are computed value-wise.

1.2.3. Consider the functor

$$\mathcal{V} \times \mathbf{O}^{\text{grpD}} \xrightarrow{\text{Id} \otimes \text{Yon}_{\mathbf{O}}} \mathcal{V} \otimes \text{Funct}(\mathbf{O}^{\text{grpD}}, \text{Spc}) \rightarrow \text{Funct}(\mathbf{O}^{\text{grpD}}, \mathcal{V}).$$

The images of the objects  $v \times \mathbf{o}$  for  $\mathbf{o} \in \mathbf{O}^{\text{grpD}}$ ,  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  generate the category  $\text{Funct}(\mathbf{O}^{\text{grpD}}, \mathcal{V})$ . It follows that the corresponding objects

$$v \otimes \underline{F}(\mathbf{o}) \in \underline{\mathcal{V}}$$

generate  $\underline{\mathcal{V}}$  under colimits (see Corollary A.9.4 and Sect. B.4.1 for more precise assertions to this effect).

<sup>6</sup>See Sect. B.1.6 for what this means.

1.2.4. We observe:

**Proposition 1.2.5.** *Suppose that every object of  $\mathbf{O}$  is dualizable. Then the symmetric monoidal category  $\text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})$  is closed; i.e. admits internal homs.*

*Proof.* Since every object in  $\text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})$  is a weighted colimit of  $\underline{F}(\mathbf{o})$  for  $\mathbf{o} \in \mathbf{O}$  and  $\text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})$  admits all weighted limits, by Proposition B.3.3, it suffices to show that for an object  $\underline{v} \in \text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})$ , there exists an internal hom

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})}(\underline{F}(\mathbf{o}), \underline{v}) \in \text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V}).$$

Since the functor  $\underline{F} : \mathbf{O} \rightarrow \text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})$  is symmetric monoidal and  $\mathbf{o}$  is dualizable, the object  $\underline{F}(\mathbf{o})$  is dualizable. Hence, the above internal Hom exists and equals

$$\underline{F}(\mathbf{o}^\vee) \otimes \underline{v}.$$

□

1.2.6. By the construction of  $\underline{\mathcal{V}} := \text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})$ , we have a right-lax symmetric monoidal adjunction of  $\mathcal{V}$ -module categories

$$(1.6) \quad \mathbf{i} : \mathcal{V} \rightleftarrows \underline{\mathcal{V}} : \mathbf{e}$$

given by  $\mathbf{i}(v) = v \otimes \mathbf{1}_{\underline{\mathcal{V}}}$  and

$$\mathbf{e}(\underline{v}) = \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \mathcal{V}}(\mathbf{1}_{\underline{\mathcal{V}}}, \underline{v}) \simeq \underline{v}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{O}}),$$

see Sect. 1.1.8 for the notation.

Note that by definition, for  $\mathbf{o} \in \mathbf{O}$

$$(1.7) \quad \mathbf{i}(v)(\mathbf{o}) = v \otimes F(\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathbf{O}}(\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{O}})).$$

1.2.7. In practice, the functor  $\mathbf{i}$  is often fully faithful.

**Proposition 1.2.8.** *Suppose that the functor  $F$  is strictly unital, i.e. the natural map*

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}} \rightarrow F(\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{O}})$$

*is an isomorphism. Then the functor  $\mathbf{i}$  is fully faithful.*

*Proof.* By assumption, the natural map

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}}, \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}}) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \mathcal{V}}(\mathbf{i}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}}), \mathbf{i}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}}))$$

is an isomorphism. Hence, by Section B.4.8, the functor

$$\mathbf{i} : \mathcal{V} \simeq \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{V}}(*) \rightarrow \text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V}) = \underline{\mathcal{V}}$$

is fully faithful. □

1.2.9. We now show that the general set-up of  $F : \mathbf{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$  can be reduced to one of Proposition 1.2.8:

Note that the functor  $F$  induces a right-lax symmetric monoidal functor

$$F^{\text{enh}} : \mathbf{O} \rightarrow F(\mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{O}})\text{-mod}(\mathcal{V}),$$

so that the original  $F$  is the composition

$$\mathbf{O} \xrightarrow{F^{\text{enh}}} F(\mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{O}})\text{-mod}(\mathcal{V}) \xrightarrow{\text{oblv}_{F(\mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{O}})}} \mathcal{V}.$$

Note that the functor  $F^{\text{enh}}$  is strictly unital.

**Proposition 1.2.10.** *There is a natural equivalence of  $\mathcal{V}$ -module categories*

$$\text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, F(\mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{O}})\text{-mod}(\mathcal{V})) \simeq \text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V}).$$

*Proof.* We have a right-lax symmetric monoidal adjunction

$$(1.8) \quad \mathcal{V} \rightleftarrows F(\mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{O}})\text{-mod}(\mathcal{V})$$

By functoriality of the change of enrichment, the counit of the adjunction (1.8) induces a functor

$$(1.9) \quad \text{ind}_{\mathcal{V}}^{F(\mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{O}})\text{-mod}(\mathcal{V})}(\text{enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V})) \rightarrow \text{enh}(\mathbf{O}, F(\mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{O}})\text{-mod}(\mathcal{V})).$$

Since the left adjoint in Sect. 1.8 is *strictly* symmetric monoidal, by Sect. A.5.7, passing to enriched presheaves, the functor (1.9) gives rise to a functor of  $(F(\mathbb{1})\text{-mod}(\mathcal{V}))$ -module categories

$$F(\mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{O}})\text{-mod}(\mathcal{V}) \otimes_{\mathcal{V}} \text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V}) \rightarrow \text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, F(\mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{O}})\text{-mod}(\mathcal{V})).$$

By adjunction, this gives rise to a functor of  $\mathcal{V}$ -module categories

$$(1.10) \quad \text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V}) \rightarrow \text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}, F(\mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{O}})\text{-mod}(\mathcal{V})).$$

By construction, the functor (1.10) maps representable objects to representable objects and is fully faithful (in the enriched sense) on representable objects. Thus, by Section B.4.9 it is an equivalence.  $\square$

### 1.3. The universal property.

#### 1.3.1. The isomorphism

$$F \simeq \mathbf{e} \circ \underline{F}$$

gives rise to a natural transformation

$$\mathbf{i} \circ F \xrightarrow{\alpha} \underline{F}$$

as right-lax symmetric monoidal functors  $\mathbf{O} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{V}}$ .

1.3.2. We claim that the above data  $(\underline{F}, \mathbf{i}, \alpha)$  satisfy the following universal property:

**Proposition 1.3.3.** *For a presentable symmetric monoidal category  $\mathbf{C}$ , precomposition with the triple  $(\underline{F}, \mathbf{i}, \alpha)$  defines an equivalence between:*

- (i) *The groupoid of colimit-preserving symmetric monoidal functors  $\underline{\mathcal{V}} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ ;*
- (ii) *The groupoid of triples  $(G, \mathbf{j}, \beta)$ , where:*
  - $G$  is a symmetric monoidal functor  $\mathbf{O} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ ;
  - $\mathbf{j}$  is a colimit-preserving symmetric monoidal functor  $\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ ;
  - $\beta$  is a natural transformation  $\mathbf{j} \circ \underline{F} \rightarrow G$  as right-lax symmetric monoidal functors  $\mathbf{O} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ .

*Proof.* We construct a map in the opposite direction.

Let us be given a colimit-preserving symmetric monoidal functor  $\mathbf{j} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ . In particular, we can view  $\mathbf{C}$  a commutative algebra object in  $\text{Cat}^{\mathcal{V}}$ .

Then, by Proposition A.5.6, the datum of a colimit-preserving symmetric monoidal functor  $\underline{\mathcal{V}} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  is equivalent to that of a symmetric monoidal  $\mathcal{V}$ -enriched functor

$$\text{enh}(\mathbf{O}, \mathcal{V}) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}.$$

By the universal property in Sect. A.1.5, the latter is the same as a symmetric monoidal functor

$$\text{Self-Enr}(\mathbf{O}) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$$

compatible with  $F$ . In particular, this produces a symmetric monoidal functor  $G : \mathbf{O} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ .

The structure on  $G$  of compatibility with  $F$  amounts to maps

$$F(\text{Hom}_{\text{Enr}(\mathbf{O})}^{\mathbf{O}}(\mathbf{o}_1, \mathbf{o}_2)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{C}, \mathcal{V}}(G(\mathbf{o}_1), G(\mathbf{o}_2)),$$

compatible with the symmetric monoidal structure.

The latter structure is equivalent to a natural transformation

$$F \rightarrow j^R \circ G$$

as right-lax symmetric monoidal functors  $\mathbf{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ , or which is the same, as a natural transformation

$$j \circ F \rightarrow G$$

as right-lax symmetric monoidal functors  $\mathbf{O} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ . □

1.3.4. Here is an application of Proposition 1.3.3:

**Proposition 1.3.5.** *Suppose that  $F$  is (strictly) symmetric monoidal and every object in  $\mathbf{O}$  is dualizable. Then the adjunction (1.6) is an equivalence.*

*Proof.* It suffices to show that (under the assumptions on  $\mathbf{O}$  and  $F$ ), in the situation of Proposition 1.3.3, the natural transformation  $\beta$  is automatically an isomorphism.

This follows from the fact that a natural transformation between two (strict) symmetric monoidal functors

$$G_1 \rightarrow G_2, \quad G_i : \mathbf{O} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$$

is an isomorphism, provided that every object of  $\mathbf{O}$  is dualizable. □

#### 1.4. Change of source.

1.4.1. Let us now be given two pairs  $(\mathbf{O}_1, F_1 : \mathbf{O}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{V})$  and  $(\mathbf{O}_2, F_2 : \mathbf{O}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{V})$ . Denote

$$\underline{\mathcal{V}}_1 := \text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}_1, \mathcal{V}) \text{ and } \underline{\mathcal{V}}_2 := \text{Enh}(\mathbf{O}_2, \mathcal{V}).$$

Let us be given a symmetric monoidal functor  $\Phi : \mathbf{O}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{O}_2$ , equipped with a symmetric monoidal natural transformation

$$(1.11) \quad F_1 \rightarrow F_2 \circ \Phi,$$

as right-lax symmetric monoidal functors  $\mathbf{O}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ .

1.4.2. We claim that in this case there a naturally defined symmetric monoidal functor

$$\underline{\Phi} : \underline{\mathcal{V}}_1 \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{V}}_2$$

equipped with the identifications

$$\underline{F}_2 \circ \Phi \simeq \underline{\Phi} \circ \underline{F}_1 \text{ and } \mathbf{i}_2 \simeq \underline{\Phi} \circ \mathbf{i}_1$$

that make the following diagram commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \underline{\Phi} \circ \mathbf{i}_1 \circ F_1 & \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} & \underline{\Phi} \circ \underline{F}_1 \\ \sim \downarrow & & \sim \downarrow \\ \mathbf{i}_2 \circ F_1 & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{i}_2 \circ F_2 \circ \Phi \xrightarrow{\alpha_2} \underline{F}_2 \circ \Phi. \end{array}$$

1.4.3. Indeed, this follows from Proposition 1.3.3, where we take

$$\mathbf{C} := \underline{\mathcal{V}}_2, \quad G = \underline{F}_2 \circ \Phi, \quad \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{i}_2$$

and  $\beta$  be the composite bottom horizontal arrow in the above diagram.

1.4.4. Note that from Proposition B.4.7, we obtain:

**Corollary 1.4.5.** *Suppose that all objects in  $\mathbf{O}_1$  are dualizable and (1.11) is an isomorphism. Then the functor  $\underline{\Phi}$  is fully faithful.*

## 2. CONSTRUCTION OF AGCat

In this section we construct the  $(\infty, 2)$ -category AGCat and study its basic properties.

### 2.1. The category of correspondences.

2.1.1. Given a category  $\mathbf{C}$  with finite limits (i.e., fiber products and a final object), we let  $\text{Corr}(\mathbf{C})$  be the category of correspondences as defined in [GR1, Chapter 7, Sect. 1].

Explicitly, objects of  $\text{Corr}(\mathbf{C})$  are the same as objects of  $\mathbf{C}$ . For a pair of objects  $\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2$ , the groupoid of morphisms  $\text{Maps}_{\text{Corr}(\mathbf{C})}(\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2)$  consists of diagrams

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{c}_{1,2} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{c}_2 \\ & \downarrow & \\ & & \mathbf{c}_1, \end{array}$$

with the composition given by

$$(\mathbf{c}_{1,2}, \mathbf{c}_{2,3}) \mapsto \mathbf{c}_{1,2} \times_{\mathbf{c}_2} \mathbf{c}_{2,3}.$$

We will refer to the horizontal morphism in (2.1) as the *forward* arrow, and the vertical one as the *backward* arrow.

2.1.2. The category  $\text{Corr}(\mathbf{C})$  has a natural symmetric monoidal structure, induced by the Cartesian product in  $\mathbf{C}$ .

Note that every object in  $\text{Corr}(\mathbf{C})$  is dualizable and canonically self-dual. Namely, the unit and counit of the self-duality are given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{c} & \xrightarrow{\Delta_{\mathbf{C}}} & \mathbf{c} \times \mathbf{c} \\ \downarrow & & \\ \{\ast\} & & \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{c} & \longrightarrow & \{\ast\} \\ \Delta_{\mathbf{C}} \downarrow & & \\ \mathbf{c} \times \mathbf{c}, & & \end{array}$$

respectively, where  $\{\ast\}$  is the final object in  $\mathbf{C}$ .

In particular, we obtain that  $\text{Corr}(\mathbf{C})$  is closed and for  $\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2 \in \mathbf{C}$ , the internal hom object  $\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\text{Corr}(\mathbf{C})}(\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2)$  is  $\mathbf{c}_1 \times \mathbf{c}_2$ .

2.1.3. Let  $\text{class}_1$  and  $\text{class}_2$  be two classes of morphisms in  $\mathbf{C}$ , each stable under composition, and under base change with respect to each other, i.e., for a Cartesian square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{c}'_1 & \xrightarrow{f'} & \mathbf{c}'_2 \\ g_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow g_2 \\ \mathbf{c}_1 & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathbf{c}_2 \end{array}$$

if  $f \in \text{class}_1$  and  $g_2 \in \text{class}_2$ , then  $f' \in \text{class}_1$  and  $g_1 \in \text{class}_2$ .

Then we define a 1-full subcategory

$$\text{Corr}_{\text{class}_1, \text{class}_2}(\mathbf{C}) \subset \text{Corr}(\mathbf{C}),$$

where we restrict morphisms to those diagrams (2.1), where the forward morphism belongs to  $\text{class}_1$  and the backward morphism belongs to  $\text{class}_2$ .

2.1.4. For  $\text{class}_1 = \text{all}$  and  $\text{class}_2 = \text{isom}$ , we obtain an equivalence

$$\text{Corr}_{\text{all}, \text{isom}}(\mathbf{C}) = \mathbf{C}$$

and for  $\text{class}_1 = \text{isom}$  and  $\text{class}_2 = \text{class}$ , we obtain an equivalence

$$\text{Corr}_{\text{isom}, \text{all}}(\mathbf{C}) = \mathbf{C}^{\text{op}}.$$

2.2. **The functor  $\text{Shv}(-)$ .**

2.2.1. Let  $B$  be a base scheme, and consider the category  $\text{Corr}(\text{Sch}_{/B})$ .

The sheaf-theoretic input to the construction of the category AGCat is provided by a functor

$$(2.2) \quad \text{Shv}(-) : \text{Corr}(\text{Sch}_{/B}) \rightarrow \text{DGCat},$$

which is a *constructible sheaf theory* in the sense of [AGKRRV1, Sect. 1.1.4].

2.2.2. This functor assigns to a scheme  $X$  over  $B$  the corresponding category  $\text{Shv}(X)$  and to a morphism  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$  the functors

$$f_* : \text{Shv}(X_1) \rightarrow \text{Shv}(X_2) \text{ and } f^! : \text{Shv}(X_2) \rightarrow \text{Shv}(X_1).$$

Thus, the restriction  $\text{Shv}(-)|_{\text{Corr}_{\text{isom, all}}(\text{Sch}_{/B})}$  is the functor

$$(2.3) \quad (\text{Sch}_{/B})^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{DGCat}, \quad X \mapsto \text{Shv}(X), \quad (X_1 \xrightarrow{f} X_2) \mapsto f^!,$$

and the restriction  $\text{Shv}(-)|_{\text{Corr}_{\text{all, isom}}(\text{Sch}_{/B})}$  is the functor

$$(2.4) \quad \text{Sch}_{/B} \rightarrow \text{DGCat}, \quad X \mapsto \text{Shv}(X), \quad (X_1 \xrightarrow{f} X_2) \mapsto f_*.$$

2.2.3. The datum of extension of these functors to a functor (2.2) amounts to a homotopy-compatible system of base-change isomorphisms: for

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_1 \times_{X_2} X'_2 & \xrightarrow{f'} & X'_2 \\ g_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow g_2 \\ X_1 & \xrightarrow{f} & X_2 \end{array}$$

an isomorphism

$$g_2^! \circ f_* \simeq f'_* \circ g_1^!,$$

as functors  $\text{Shv}(X_1) \rightarrow \text{Shv}(X'_2)$ .

The gist of the work [GR1] can be summarized as follows: the datum of just (2.4) (or (2.3)) uniquely recovers (2.2).

2.2.4. For this paper, we let (2.2) be the theory of  $\ell$ -adic sheaves, defined as in [GKRV, Sect. A.1.1(d')], followed by tensoring up  $(-) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}_\ell} \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ .

### 2.3. Construction of AGCat.

2.3.1. Morally, we would like to apply the set-up of Sect. 1.1 to

$$\mathbf{O} := \text{Corr}(\text{Sch}_{/B}), \quad \mathcal{V} = \text{DGCat}, \quad F := \text{Shv}(-).$$

Unfortunately, we cannot quite do that, because in Sect. 1.1 we assumed that  $\mathcal{V}$  is presentable, while DGCat is not.

To circumvent this, we will employ the recipe of Sect. A.2.8.

2.3.2. In the setting of Sect. 1.1, we take

$$\mathbf{O} := \text{Corr}(\text{Sch}_{/B}), \mathcal{V} = \text{DGCat}_\kappa, F := \text{Shv}(-),$$

where  $\kappa$  is as in Sect. A.2.4.

Set

$$(2.5) \quad \text{AGCat}_{\kappa, /B} := \text{Enh}(\text{Corr}(\text{Sch}_{/B}), \text{DGCat}_\kappa).$$

$$(2.6) \quad \text{AGCat}_{/B} := \underset{\kappa < \lambda_0}{\text{colim}} \text{AGCat}_{\kappa, /B},$$

where the colimit is taken in  $\text{Cat}_{\text{large}}$ , cf. Sect. A.2.8.

*Remark 2.3.3.* From this point on, in the main body of the paper, we will ignore the difference between  $\text{DGCat}$  and  $\text{DGCat}_\kappa$ , and pretend that the construction in Sect. 1.1 was applied directly that  $\text{DGCat}$ .

We leave it to the reader to verify that the constructions and statements that follow stay within our specified set-theoretic framework.

*Remark 2.3.4.* When  $B = \text{pt} = \text{Spec}(k)$ , we will write simply  $\text{AGCat}$  instead of  $\text{AGCat}_{/B}$ .

#### 2.4. Basic properties of $\text{AGCat}$ .

2.4.1. By construction, the category  $\text{AGCat}_{/B}$  comes equipped with the following data:

- A symmetric monoidal functor

$$(2.7) \quad \underline{\text{Shv}}(-) : \text{Corr}(\text{Sch}_{/B}) \rightarrow \text{AGCat}_{/B};$$

- An adjunction

$$(2.8) \quad \mathbf{i} : \text{DGCat} \rightleftarrows \text{AGCat}_{/B} : \mathbf{e},$$

with  $\mathbf{i}$  (strictly) symmetric monoidal;

- An identification  $\text{Shv}(-) \simeq \mathbf{e} \circ \underline{\text{Shv}}(-)$  as right-lax symmetric monoidal functors.

The above data give rise to a natural transformation

$$\alpha : \mathbf{i} \circ \text{Shv}(-) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}}(-).$$

The triple  $(\underline{\text{Shv}}(-), \mathbf{i}, \alpha)$  has a universal property formulated in Sect. 1.3. I.e., we can think of  $(\text{AGCat}_{/B}, \underline{\text{Shv}}(-))$  as a universal way of turning  $\text{Shv}(-)$  into being strictly monoidal.

2.4.2. As explained in Section 1.1.8, we will regard objects of  $\text{AGCat}$  as functors

$$\underline{\mathbf{C}} : \text{Sch}_{/B}^{\text{grpfd}} \rightarrow \text{DGCat}$$

endowed with additional structure: namely, for every  $X_1, X_2 \in \text{Sch}_{/B}$ , and every sheaf

$$\mathcal{F} \in \text{Shv}(X_1 \times_B X_2),$$

of a functor

$$(2.9) \quad \underline{\mathbf{C}}(\mathcal{F}) : \underline{\mathbf{C}}(X_1) \rightarrow \underline{\mathbf{C}}(X_2)$$

that is natural in all parameters.

2.4.3. From this point of view, for an object  $Z \in \text{Sch}_{/B}$ , the object  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(Z) \in \text{AGCat}_{/B}$  is given by the assignment

$$\text{Sch}_{/B} \ni X \mapsto \underline{\text{Shv}}(Z \times_B X)$$

with the functors

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(Z \times_B X_1) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}}(Z \times_B X_2), \quad \mathcal{F} \in \underline{\text{Shv}}(X_1 \times_B X_2)$$

given by convolution:

$$\mathcal{F} \mapsto [\mathcal{F}], \quad [\mathcal{F}](\mathcal{F}_1) := (p_2)_*(p_1^!(\mathcal{F}_1) \overset{!}{\otimes} p_{1,2}^!(\mathcal{F})),$$

where  $p_1, p_2, p_{1,2}$  are the three projections from  $Z \times_B X_1 \times_B X_2$  to

$$Z \times_B X_1, \quad Z \times_B X_2, \quad X_1 \times_B X_2,$$

respectively.

2.4.4. The data of (2.9) can be rewritten as follows:

- For every  $X$ , the category  $\underline{\mathbf{C}}(X)$  is acted on by  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(X)$ , which is regarded as a (symmetric) monoidal category with respect to the  $\overset{!}{\otimes}$  operation;
- For every  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$  (over  $B$ ), we have a pullback functor  $f^! : \underline{\mathbf{C}}(X_2) \rightarrow \underline{\mathbf{C}}(X_1)$ , which is  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(X_2)$ -linear with respect to  $f^! : \underline{\text{Shv}}(X_2) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}}(X_1)$ .
- For every  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ , we have a pushforward functor  $f_* : \underline{\mathbf{C}}(X_1) \rightarrow \underline{\mathbf{C}}(X_2)$ , which is  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(X_2)$ -linear with respect to  $f^! : \underline{\text{Shv}}(X_2) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}}(X_1)$ .
- For a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_1 \times_Y X_2 & \xrightarrow{f'_1} & X_2 \\ f'_2 \downarrow & & \downarrow f_2 \\ X_1 & \xrightarrow{f_1} & Y \end{array}$$

an identification

$$(f'_1)_* \circ (f'_2)^! \simeq (f_2)^! \circ (f_1)_*, \quad \underline{\mathbf{C}}(X_1) \rightarrow \underline{\mathbf{C}}(X_2);$$

- A homotopy-coherent system of compatibilities between the above data.

2.4.5. *Example.* For  $\underline{\mathbf{C}} = \underline{\text{Shv}}(Z)$ , the data from Sect. 2.4.4 is particularly evident.

2.4.6. In terms of the description in Sect. 2.4.2, the adjoint functors (2.8) look as follows:

For  $\mathbf{C} \in \text{DGCat}$ ,

$$\mathbf{i}(\mathbf{C})(X) = \mathbf{C} \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(X)$$

and

$$\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{C}) = \underline{\mathbf{C}}(B).$$

The natural transformation

$$\alpha : \mathbf{i} \circ \underline{\text{Shv}}(-) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}}(-)$$

assigns to  $Z \in \text{Sch}_{/B}$  the collection of functors

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(Z) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(X) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}}(Z \times_B X).$$

2.4.7. The category  $\text{AGCat}_{/B}$  has limits/colimits and tensors/cotensors by objects of  $\text{DGCat}$ . By Sect. 1.2.2, all these operations are computed value-wise in terms of (2.4.2).

Additionally, thanks to Proposition 1.2.5,  $\text{AGCat}_{/B}$  is closed; i.e. admits internal homs.

2.4.8. By Section 1.2.10, the construction of  $\text{AGCat}_{/B}$  is not very sensitive to the target of the functor  $\text{Shv}(-)$ . In particular, we would get the same category if we replace

$$\text{DGCat} \simeq \text{Vect}\text{-mod}(\text{Cat}^{\text{pres}})$$

by  $\text{Cat}^{\text{pres}}$  or  $\text{Shv}(B)\text{-mod}(\text{DGCat})$ .

In any case, the functor  $\mathbf{i}$  extends to a symmetric monoidal functor

$$\text{Shv}(B)\text{-mod}(\text{DGCat}) \rightarrow \text{AGCat}_{/B},$$

and the latter is fully faithful (see Propositions 1.2.8 and 1.2.10).

**2.5. Variants.** We can consider several variants of the category  $\text{AGCat}$ .

2.5.1. *D-module variant.* Let  $k$  be an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero. To a scheme  $X$  over  $k$ , we can attach the category of D-modules  $\text{D-mod}(X)$ . These assemble to a (strictly) symmetric monoidal functor

$$\text{D-mod}(-) : \text{Corr}(\text{Sch}_k) \rightarrow \text{DGCat}_k,$$

and we can perform the same construction as above.

However, by Section 1.3.5, there is an equivalence

$$\text{Enh}(\text{Corr}(\text{Sch}_k), \text{DGCat}_k) \simeq \text{DGCat}_k.$$

This suggests the following guiding meta-principle for much of this work: theorems about categories about D-modules should hold in the  $\ell$ -adic setting when categories of sheaves are interpreted as objects of  $\text{AGCat}$ .

2.5.2. *Affine schemes are enough.* Instead of considering the source of  $F$  to be all schemes over  $B$ , we can instead consider only affine schemes. As we shall presently see, this produces an equivalent category.

Let  $\text{Shv}|_{\text{aff}}(-)$  denote the restriction of the functor  $\text{Shv}(-)$  to the (1-full) subcategory

$$\text{Corr}(\text{Sch}_{/B}^{\text{aff}}) \subset \text{Corr}(\text{Sch}_{/B}),$$

and let

$$\text{AGCat}_{/B}^{\text{aff}} := \text{Enh}(\text{Corr}(\text{Sch}_{/B}^{\text{aff}}), \text{DGCat}).$$

By Sect. 1.4.2, we have a naturally defined functor

$$(2.10) \quad \text{AGCat}_{/B}^{\text{aff}} \rightarrow \text{AGCat}_{/B}.$$

Moreover, by Corollary 1.4.5 (and Sect. 2.1.2), the functor (2.10) is fully faithful. We claim:

**Proposition 2.5.3.** *The functor (2.10) is an equivalence.*

*Proof.* By Corollary B.4.9, it suffices to show that for every  $Z \in \text{Sch}_{/B}$ , the object

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(Z) \in \text{AGCat}_{/B}$$

is in the essential image of the functor (2.10). By construction, this is the case if  $X$  is affine.

Now, every scheme  $Z$  is a sifted colimit (in the category of Zariski sheaves) of affine schemes

$$Z \simeq \underset{i \in I}{\text{colim}} S_i.$$

The operation of  $*$ -pushforward give rise to a functor

$$(2.11) \quad \underset{i \in I}{\text{colim}} \underline{\text{Shv}}(S_i) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}}(Z)$$

in  $\text{AGCat}_{/B}$ . Since (2.10) commutes with colimits, it is enough to show that (2.11) is an equivalence.

Thus, by Sect. 2.4.7, we have to show that (2.11) evaluates to an equivalence on every  $X \in \text{Sch}_{/B}$ . I.e., we have to show that the functor

$$(2.12) \quad \underset{i \in I}{\text{colim}} \text{Shv}(S_i \underset{B}{\times} X) \rightarrow \text{Shv}(Z \underset{B}{\times} X)$$

is an equivalence.

The transition functors in (2.12) preserve compactness. Hence, the left-hand side in (2.12) is compactly generated and its dual identifies with

$$\underset{i \in I^{\text{op}}}{\lim} (\text{Shv}(S_i \underset{B}{\times} X))^{\vee}.$$

Using Verdier duality (see Sect. 4.3), we identify the functor dual to (2.12) with

$$(2.13) \quad \text{Shv}(Z \underset{B}{\times} X) \rightarrow \underset{i \in I^{\text{op}}}{\lim} \text{Shv}(S_i \underset{B}{\times} X),$$

where in the right-hand side, the transition functors are given by  $!$ -restriction.

Thus, it suffices to show that (2.13) is an equivalence. However, this follows from Zariski descent for  $\text{Shv}(-)$ .  $\square$

In light of Section 2.5.3, in the sequel we will sometimes restrict to affine schemes as test objects for  $\text{AGCat}_{/B}$ .

2.5.4. *The left version of AGCat.* In the setting of  $\ell$ -adic sheaves, there is another version of the category  $\text{AGCat}_{/B}$ . Namely, we have another functor

$$\text{Shv}^{\text{left}}(-) : \text{Corr}(\text{Sch}_{/B}) \rightarrow \text{DGCat}$$

which takes a scheme  $X$  to  $\text{Shv}(X)$  and morphisms given by  $*$ -pullback and  $!$ -pushforward.

This functor can be formally expressed in terms of  $\text{Shv}$  as follows. The value of  $\text{Shv}$  on every morphism in  $\text{Corr}(\text{Sch}_{/B})$  admits a left adjoint. Let

$$\text{Shv}^L(-) : \text{Corr}(\text{Sch}_{/B})^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{DGCat}$$

denote the functor obtained from  $\text{Shv}$  by passing to left adjoints. Now, the functor  $\text{Shv}^{\text{left}}(-)$  is given by the composite

$$\text{Corr}(\text{Sch}_{/B}) \simeq \text{Corr}(\text{Sch}_{/B})^{\text{op}} \xrightarrow{\text{Shv}^L} \text{DGCat}$$

where the anti-equivalence of  $\text{Corr}(\text{Sch}_{/B})$  is given by reading correspondences backwards (equivalently, it corresponding to passing to duals).

We define

$$\text{AGCat}_{/B}^{\text{left}} := \text{Enh}(\text{Corr}(\text{Sch}_{/B}), \text{DGCat}),$$

formed using the above functor  $\text{Shv}^{\text{left}}(-)$ .

As before, we have a symmetric monoidal functor

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}^{\text{left}}(-) : \text{Corr}(\text{Sch}_{/B}) \rightarrow \text{AGCat}_{/B}^{\text{left}}.$$

The contents of the previous two sections carry over to the present setting without any change<sup>7</sup>.

*Remark 2.5.5.* For most applications (such as those involving the sheaves-functions correspondence),  $\text{AGCat}_{/B}$  is the more useful category.

Yet, there are some instances (notably ones that have to do with cohomology of shtukas), where it is more convenient to use  $\text{AGCat}_{/B}^{\text{left}}$ .

## 2.6. Change of base.

2.6.1. Let  $\phi : B' \rightarrow B$  be a map between base schemes. Base change defines a symmetric monoidal functor

$$\Phi : \text{Corr}(\text{Sch}_{/B}) \rightarrow \text{Corr}(\text{Sch}_{/B'}).$$

In addition, !-pullback defines a symmetric monoidal natural transformation:

$$(2.14) \quad \text{Shv}(-) \rightarrow \text{Shv}(\Phi(-)).$$

2.6.2. Hence, applying Sect. 1.4.2, we obtain a symmetric monoidal functor

$$\underline{\Phi} : \text{AGCat}_{/B} \rightarrow \text{AGCat}_{/B'}$$

equipped with identifications

$$\mathbf{i}' \simeq \underline{\Phi} \circ \mathbf{i} \text{ and } \underline{\text{Shv}}(\Phi(-)) \simeq \underline{\Phi} \circ \underline{\text{Shv}}(-).$$

In addition, from Corollary 1.4.5 we obtain:

**Corollary 2.6.3.** *Suppose that (2.14) is an isomorphism. Then the functor  $\underline{\Phi}$  is fully faithful.*

---

<sup>7</sup>The two versions are, however, substantially different from the point of view of interaction of monoidal duality on  $\text{AGCat}$  and Verdier duality on schemes discussed in Sect. 4.

2.6.4. Let now  $k' \supset k$  be an algebraically closed field extension; set  $B' := \text{Spec}(k') \times_{\text{Spec}(k)} B$ . Base change gives rise to a symmetric functor

$$\Phi : \text{Corr}(\text{Sch}/B) \rightarrow \text{Corr}(\text{Sch}/B')$$

and a symmetric monoidal natural transformation:

$$(2.15) \quad \text{Shv}(-) \rightarrow \text{Shv}(\Phi(-)).$$

Applying Sect. 1.4.2 again, we obtain a symmetric monoidal functor

$$\underline{\Phi} : \text{AGCat}/B \rightarrow \text{AGCat}/B'$$

equipped with identifications

$$\mathbf{i}' \simeq \underline{\Phi} \circ \mathbf{i} \text{ and } \underline{\text{Shv}}(\Phi(-)) \simeq \underline{\Phi} \circ \underline{\text{Shv}}(-).$$

If (2.15) is an isomorphism, then  $\underline{\Phi}$  is fully faithful.

## 2.7. Adjunctions in $\text{AGCat}$ .

2.7.1. The category  $\text{AGCat}/B$  is tensored over  $\text{DGCat}$ , and in particular  $\text{Cat}$ ; hence, it naturally has the structure of a 2-category (see Section C.2.1).

We have the following characterization of adjunctions in  $\text{AGCat}$ .

**Proposition 2.7.2.** *Let  $F : \underline{\mathbf{C}}_1 \rightarrow \underline{\mathbf{C}}_2$  be a 1-morphism in  $\text{AGCat}/B$ . Then  $F$  admits a left (resp. right) adjoint if and only if for every scheme  $X$ , the corresponding functor*

$$\underline{\mathbf{C}}_1(X) \rightarrow \underline{\mathbf{C}}_2(X)$$

*admits a left (resp. right) adjoint, and for every scheme  $X'$  and a constructible sheaf  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Shv}(X \times_B X')^c$ , the square*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \underline{\mathbf{C}}_1(X) & \longrightarrow & \underline{\mathbf{C}}_2(X) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \underline{\mathbf{C}}_1(X') & \longrightarrow & \underline{\mathbf{C}}_2(X') \end{array}$$

*satisfies the left (resp. right) Beck-Chevalley condition (see Section C.1.3).*

*Proof.* We prove the assertion for the left adjoint (the proof is identical for the right adjoint).

Suppose the conditions are satisfied. By Proposition C.2.2, it remains to show that for every scheme  $X'$ , the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Shv}(X \times X') \otimes \underline{\mathbf{C}}_1(X) & \longrightarrow & \text{Shv}(X \times X') \otimes \underline{\mathbf{C}}_2(X) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \underline{\mathbf{C}}_1(X') & \longrightarrow & \underline{\mathbf{C}}_2(X') \end{array}$$

satisfies the left Beck-Chevalley condition.

The category  $\text{Shv}(X \times X') \otimes \underline{\mathbf{C}}_2(X)$  is generated under colimits by objects of the form  $\mathcal{F} \boxtimes \mathbf{c}_2$  for  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Shv}(X \times X')^c$  and  $\mathbf{c}_2 \in \underline{\mathbf{C}}_2(X)$ . Thus, since all functors preserve colimits, it suffices to check the Beck-Chevalley condition on these objects. This is exactly the condition in the proposition.  $\square$

2.7.3. Section C.1.5 gives a general characterization of functors from the 2-category  $\text{Adj}$ . Specializing to the target  $\text{AGCat}_{/B}$ , we have

**Proposition 2.7.4.** *The restriction functor*

$$\text{Funct}(\text{Adj}, \text{AGCat}_{/B}) \rightarrow \text{Funct}([1], \text{AGCat}_{/B})$$

is 1-full and the essential image is characterized as follows:

- (a) An object  $\underline{\mathbf{C}}_1 \rightarrow \underline{\mathbf{C}}_2 \in \text{Funct}([1], \text{AGCat})$  is in the essential image if and only if it admits a right (resp. left) adjoint in  $\text{AGCat}_{/B}$ ;
- (b) A morphism from  $(\underline{\mathbf{C}}_1 \rightarrow \underline{\mathbf{C}}_2)$  to  $(\underline{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \rightarrow \underline{\mathbf{C}}'_2)$  lies in the essential image if and only if for every scheme  $X$ , the corresponding square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \underline{\mathbf{C}}_1(X) & \longrightarrow & \underline{\mathbf{C}}_2(X) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \underline{\mathbf{C}}'_1(X) & \longrightarrow & \underline{\mathbf{C}}'_2(X) \end{array}$$

satisfies the right (resp. left) Beck-Chevalley condition.

### 3. THE VALUE OF $\underline{\text{Shv}}$ ON PRESTACKS

In this subsection we study the two ways to associate objects of  $\text{AGCat}$  to prestacks

$$\mathcal{Y} \mapsto \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \text{ and } \mathcal{Y} \mapsto \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})_{\text{co}}.$$

We study their interaction, questions of dualizability and behavior with respect to products.

#### 3.1. Sheaves on prestacks.

3.1.1. Let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be a prestack locally of finite type over  $B$ . Recall from [AGKRRV1, Appendix F], that the category of  $\ell$ -adic sheaves on  $\mathcal{Y}$  is defined by

$$\text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}) := \lim_{S \in (\text{Sch}_{/\mathcal{Y}}^{\text{aff}})^{\text{op}}} \text{Shv}(S) \in \text{DGCat},$$

where the limit is taken with respect to  $!$ -pullbacks as transition functors.

Note that by Zariski descent, we can equivalently rewrite the above limit as

$$\lim_{X \in (\text{Sch}_{/\mathcal{Y}})^{\text{op}}} \text{Shv}(X) \in \text{DGCat}.$$

In particular, when  $\mathcal{Y} = X$  is a scheme, the above definition recovers the usual  $\text{Shv}(X)$ .

*Remark 3.1.2.* Since we are working in the constructible context, we can rewrite the limit presentation of  $\text{Shv}(X)$  as a colimit:

$$\text{colim}_{X \in \text{Sch}_{/\mathcal{Y}}} \text{Shv}(X),$$

with  $(-)_!$  as transition functors, see [GR1, Chapter 1, Proposition 2.5.7].

In particular,  $\text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})$  is compactly generated and hence dualizable.

3.1.3. The category  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})$  naturally upgrades to an object of  $\text{AGCat}_{/B}$ ; namely, we define

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) := \lim_{X \in (\text{Sch}_{/\mathcal{Y}})^{\text{op}}} \underline{\text{Shv}}(S) \in \text{AGCat}_{/B}.$$

It follows from Sect. 2.4.7 that for any scheme  $Y$ ,

$$(3.1) \quad \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})(X) \simeq \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y} \times_B X).$$

In particular, for every  $X$ , the DG category  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})(X)$  is compactly generated.

3.1.4. Let  $f : \mathcal{Y}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_2$  be a morphism of prestacks over  $B$ . The functor between index categories

$$\text{Sch}_{/\mathcal{Y}_1}^{\text{aff}} \xrightarrow{f \circ -} \text{Sch}_{/\mathcal{Y}_2}^{\text{aff}}$$

gives rise to a pullback functor

$$f^! : \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1).$$

In terms of (3.1), the above functor is given by

$$(f \times \text{id})^! : \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_2 \times_B X) \rightarrow \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times_B X).$$

The assignment  $\mathcal{Y} \mapsto \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})$  with  $!$ -pullbacks extends to a functor

$$(\text{PreStk}_{/B})^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{AGCat}_{/B}.$$

3.1.5. Let  $f : \mathcal{Y}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_2$  is a schematic morphism of prestacks over  $B$ . In this case, we can define the map

$$f_* : \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2)$$

given in terms of Sect. 2.4.2 by  $*$ -pushforward (which is defined for schematic morphisms of prestacks):

$$(f \times \text{id}_X)_* : \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times_B X) \rightarrow \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_2 \times_B X).$$

3.1.6. The functoriality of the  $*$ -pushforward functor along schematic maps can be organized as follows. Consider the 1-full symmetric monoidal category

$$\text{Corr}_{\text{sch;all}}(\text{PreStk}_{/B}) \subset \text{Corr}(\text{PreStk}_{/B}),$$

where we require the *forward* morphisms to be schematic (see Sect. 2.1.3).

Let

$$(3.2) \quad \underline{\text{Shv}}(-) : \text{Corr}_{\text{sch;all}}(\text{PreStk}_{/B}) \rightarrow \text{AGCat}_{/B}$$

be the right Kan extension of (2.7) along the inclusion functor

$$\text{Corr}(\text{Sch}_{/B}) \rightarrow \text{Corr}_{\text{sch;all}}(\text{PreStk}_{/B}).$$

Note that for every prestack  $\mathcal{Y}$ , the (opposite of the) functor

$$(\text{Sch}^{\text{op}})_{/\mathcal{Y}} \rightarrow \text{Corr}(\text{Sch}_{/B}) \times_{\text{Corr}_{\text{sch;all}}(\text{PreStk}_{/B})} \text{Corr}_{\text{sch;all}}(\text{PreStk}_{/B})_{\mathcal{Y}/}$$

is cofinal (since it admits a right adjoint). In particular, the restriction of (3.2) to

$$(\text{PreStk}_{/B})^{\text{op}} \subset \text{Corr}_{\text{sch;all}}(\text{PreStk}_{/B})$$

agrees with that in Section 3.1.4.

### 3.2. Cosheaves on prestacks.

3.2.1. For a prestack  $\mathcal{Y}$  define

$$\mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})_{\mathrm{co}} := \underset{S \in \mathrm{Sch}_{/\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathrm{aff}}}{\mathrm{colim}} \mathrm{Shv}(S) \in \mathrm{DGCat},$$

where the colimit is taken with respect to  $*$ -pullshforwards as transition functors.

The equivalence (2.12) implies that the above colimit maps isomorphically to

$$\underset{X \in \mathrm{Sch}_{/\mathcal{Y}}}{\mathrm{colim}} \mathrm{Shv}(X).$$

In particular, when  $\mathcal{Y} = X$  is a scheme, we recover the usual  $\mathrm{Shv}(X)$ .

3.2.2. For a map of prestacks  $f : \mathcal{Y}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_2$  we have a tautologically defined functor

$$f_{*,\mathrm{co}} : \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_1)_{\mathrm{co}} \rightarrow \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_2)_{\mathrm{co}}.$$

If  $f$  is schematic, we have the base change functor

$$\mathrm{Sch}_{/\mathcal{Y}_2}^{\mathrm{aff}} \rightarrow \mathrm{Sch}_{/\mathcal{Y}_1}^{\mathrm{aff}}, \quad S \mapsto S \times_{\mathcal{Y}_2} \mathcal{Y}_1,$$

which gives rise to a functor

$$f_{\mathrm{co}}^! : \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_2)_{\mathrm{co}} \rightarrow \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_1)_{\mathrm{co}}.$$

3.2.3. The assignment

$$\mathcal{Y} \mapsto \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})_{\mathrm{co}}$$

extends to a functor

$$\mathrm{Shv}(-)_{\mathrm{co}} : \mathrm{Corr}_{\mathrm{all},\mathrm{sch}}(\mathrm{PreStk}) \rightarrow \mathrm{DGCat},$$

where

$$\mathrm{Corr}_{\mathrm{all},\mathrm{sch}}(\mathrm{PreStk}) \subset \mathrm{Corr}(\mathrm{PreStk})$$

is a 1-full subcategory, in which the backward morphisms are required to be schematic.

Namely,  $\mathrm{Shv}(-)_{\mathrm{co}}$  is the left Kan extension of

$$\mathrm{Shv}(-) : \mathrm{Corr}(\mathrm{Sch}) \rightarrow \mathrm{DGCat}$$

along

$$\mathrm{Corr}(\mathrm{Sch}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Corr}_{\mathrm{all},\mathrm{sch}}(\mathrm{PreStk}).$$

Since the functor

$$\mathrm{Sch}_{/\mathcal{Y}} \rightarrow \mathrm{Corr}(\mathrm{Sch}) \underset{\mathrm{Corr}_{\mathrm{all},\mathrm{sch}}(\mathrm{PreStk})}{\times} (\mathrm{Corr}_{\mathrm{all},\mathrm{sch}}(\mathrm{PreStk}))_{/\mathcal{Y}}$$

is cofinal (it admits a left adjoint), the value of the above left Kan extension on  $\mathcal{Y}$  recovers  $\mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})_{\mathrm{co}}$ .

3.2.4. For a prestack  $\mathcal{Y}$  over  $B$ , set

$$\underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})_{\mathrm{co}} := \underset{X \in \mathrm{Sch}_{/\mathcal{Y}}}{\mathrm{colim}} \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(X) \in \mathrm{AGCat}_{/B},$$

where the colimit is taken with respect to the  $*$ -pushforward functors.

For  $\mathcal{Y} = X \in \mathrm{Sch}$ , we recover the usual object  $\underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(X)$ .

3.2.5. We claim:

**Lemma 3.2.6.** *The value  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})_{\text{co}}(X)$  of  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})_{\text{co}}$  on  $X$  is given by  $\text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y} \times_B X)_{\text{co}}$ .*

*Proof.* By Sect. 1.2.2, we have to establish an isomorphism

$$\underset{Z \in \text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}}{\text{colim}} \text{Shv}(Z \times_B X) \simeq \underset{Z' \in \text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y} \times_X}{\text{colim}} \text{Shv}(Z').$$

This follows from the fact that the functor

$$\text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y} \times_X, \quad Z \mapsto Z \times_B X$$

is cofinal. Indeed, it has a left adjoint given by

$$(Z' \rightarrow \mathcal{Y} \times Y) \mapsto (Z' \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}).$$

□

3.2.7. As above, for any  $f : \mathcal{Y}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_2$ , we have a map

$$f_{\text{co},*} : \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1)_{\text{co}} \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2)_{\text{co}},$$

and when  $f$  is schematic also a map

$$f_{\text{co}}^! : \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2)_{\text{co}} \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1)_{\text{co}}.$$

When we evaluate the above functors on  $X \in \text{Sch}$ , in terms of the identification of Lemma 3.2.6, we recover the corresponding functors from Sect. 3.2.2 for

$$\mathcal{Y}_1 \times_B X \xrightarrow{f \times \text{id}} \mathcal{Y}_2 \times_B X.$$

3.2.8. We define the functor

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(-)_{\text{co}} : \text{Corr}_{\text{all}, \text{sch}}(\text{PreStk}/B) \rightarrow \text{AGCat}/B,$$

to be the left Kan extension of

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(-) : \text{Corr}(\text{Sch}/B) \rightarrow \text{AGCat}/B$$

along

$$\text{Corr}(\text{Sch}/B) \hookrightarrow \text{Corr}_{\text{all}, \text{sch}}(\text{PreStk}/B).$$

As above, the value of the above left Kan extension on  $\mathcal{Y}$  recovers  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})_{\text{co}}$ .

### 3.3. The *right-lax* symmetric monoidal structure(s).

3.3.1. By [AGKRRV1, Theorem B.1.3] (or a special case of [GR1, Chapter 9, Proposition 3.2.4]), the functor (3.2) is naturally right-lax symmetric monoidal.

Concretely, this means that for a pair of prestacks  $\mathcal{Y}_1$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_2$  over  $B$ , we have a canonically defined map

$$(3.3) \quad \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2) \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times_B \mathcal{Y}_2).$$

3.3.2. Explicitly, the map (3.3) is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.4) \quad \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2) &\simeq \left( \lim_{X_1 \in (\text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}_1)^{\text{op}}} \underline{\text{Shv}}(X_1) \right) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2) \xrightarrow{(\text{A})} \\
&\rightarrow \lim_{X_1 \in (\text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}_1)^{\text{op}}} (\underline{\text{Shv}}(X_1) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2)) \simeq \lim_{X_1 \in (\text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}_1)^{\text{op}}} \left( \underline{\text{Shv}}(X_1) \otimes \left( \lim_{X_2 \in (\text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}_2)^{\text{op}}} \underline{\text{Shv}}(X_2) \right) \right) \xrightarrow{(\text{B})} \\
&\rightarrow \lim_{X_1 \in (\text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}_1)^{\text{op}}} \left( \lim_{X_2 \in (\text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}_2)^{\text{op}}} \underline{\text{Shv}}(X_1) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(X_2) \right) \simeq \\
&\simeq \lim_{X_1 \in (\text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}_1)^{\text{op}}, X_2 \in (\text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}_2)^{\text{op}}} \underline{\text{Shv}}(X_1) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(X_2) \simeq \lim_{X_1 \in (\text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}_1)^{\text{op}}, X_2 \in (\text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}_2)^{\text{op}}} \underline{\text{Shv}}(X_1 \times_B X_2) \simeq \\
&\simeq \lim_{X \in (\text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}_1 \times_{\mathcal{Y}_2} \mathcal{Y}_2)^{\text{op}}} \underline{\text{Shv}}(X) = \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times_B \mathcal{Y}_2),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last isomorphism is due to the fact that the functor

$$(3.5) \quad \text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}_2 \rightarrow \text{Sch}/(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times_B \mathcal{Y}_2), \quad ((X_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_1), (X_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_2)) \mapsto (X_1 \times_B X_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_1 \times_B \mathcal{Y}_2)$$

is cofinal.

3.3.3. When  $\mathcal{Y}_1$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_2$  are both schemes, the map (3.3) is an isomorphism; this was the main point of introducing  $\text{AGCat}/B$ .

However, it is not necessarily an isomorphism for general prestacks  $\mathcal{Y}_1$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_2$ : this is due to the fact that the map (A) in (3.4) is not necessarily an isomorphism (we will see, however, that the map (B) *is* always an isomorphism).

However, in the course of this section we will distinguish a class of prestacks  $\mathcal{Y}_1$ , namely, *AG tame* prestacks, for which the map (3.3) is an isomorphism against any  $\mathcal{Y}_2$ , see Proposition 3.6.7.

3.3.4. By contrast, the functor

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(-)_{\text{co}} : \text{Corr}_{\text{all}, \text{sch}}(\text{PreStk}/B) \rightarrow \text{AGCat}/B$$

is *strictly* symmetric monoidal.

Namely, for a pair of prestacks  $\mathcal{Y}_1$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.6) \quad \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1)_{\text{co}} \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2)_{\text{co}} &\simeq \left( \text{colim}_{X_1 \in \text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}_1} \underline{\text{Shv}}(X_1) \right) \otimes \left( \text{colim}_{X_2 \in \text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}_2} \underline{\text{Shv}}(X_2) \right) \simeq \\
&\simeq \text{colim}_{X_1 \in \text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}_1, X_2 \in \text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}_2} \underline{\text{Shv}}(X_1) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(X_2) \simeq \text{colim}_{X_1 \in \text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}_1, X_2 \in \text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}_2} \underline{\text{Shv}}(X_1 \times_B X_2) \simeq \\
&\simeq \text{colim}_{X \in \text{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}_1 \times_{\mathcal{Y}_2} \mathcal{Y}_2} \underline{\text{Shv}}(X) = \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times_B \mathcal{Y}_2)_{\text{co}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last isomorphism is due to the cofinality of (3.5).

3.4. **Tame prestacks.** In this subsection we let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be a prestack with a schematic diagonal.

3.4.1. Due to the assumption on  $\mathcal{Y}$ , for any a map  $f : X \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ , where  $X$  is a scheme, is schematic. Hence, we have a well-defined functor

$$f_* : \mathrm{Shv}(X) \rightarrow \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}).$$

These functors assemble to a functor

$$(3.7) \quad \Omega_{\mathcal{Y}} : \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})_{\mathrm{co}} \rightarrow \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}).$$

3.4.2. Note that for a schematic map between prestacks  $f : \mathcal{Y}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_2$ , we have the commutative diagrams

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_1)_{\mathrm{co}} & \xrightarrow{\Omega_{\mathcal{Y}_1}} & \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_1) \\ f_{\mathrm{co},*} \downarrow & & \downarrow f_* \\ \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_2)_{\mathrm{co}} & \xrightarrow{\Omega_{\mathcal{Y}_2}} & \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_2) \end{array}$$

and

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_1)_{\mathrm{co}} & \xrightarrow{\Omega_{\mathcal{Y}_1}} & \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_1) \\ f_{\mathrm{co}}^! \uparrow & & \uparrow f^! \\ \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_2)_{\mathrm{co}} & \xrightarrow{\Omega_{\mathcal{Y}_2}} & \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_2) \end{array}$$

3.4.3. We shall say that  $\mathcal{Y}$  is *tame* if  $\Omega_{\mathcal{Y}}$  is an equivalence.

Not all prestacks are tame. However, in Sect. 4.6.3 we will single out a class of algebraic stacks, for which it is. Conjecturally, this includes all quasi-compact algebraic stacks.

3.4.4. Recall that  $\mathcal{Y}$  is a *pseudo-scheme* if (up to sheafification in the h-topology) it can be rewritten as a (not necessarily filtered) colimit of schemes with transition maps that are proper. For example, and ind-scheme is such.

We claim:

**Lemma 3.4.5.** *Any pseudo-scheme is tame.*

*Proof.* Write (up to h-sheafification)

$$\mathcal{Y} = \mathrm{colim}_{i \in I} Y_i,$$

where  $Y_i$  are schemes are the transition maps are proper. Then

$$(3.10) \quad \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}) \simeq \lim_{i \in I^{\mathrm{op}}, (-)^!} \mathrm{Shv}(Y_i),$$

and

$$(3.11) \quad \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})_{\mathrm{co}} \simeq \mathrm{colim}_{i \in I, (-)_*} \mathrm{Shv}(Y_i).$$

Note, however, that since the transition functors in (3.10) are the right adjoints of those in (3.11), we obtain that the functor

$$(3.12) \quad \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})_{\mathrm{co}} \simeq \mathrm{colim}_{i \in I, (-)_*} \mathrm{Shv}(Y_i) \rightarrow \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})$$

assembled from the left adjoints of the evaluation functors

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}}(Y_i),$$

is an equivalence, see [GR1, Chapter 1, Proposition 2.5.7].

Now, by construction, the functor (3.12) is the functor  $\Omega_{\mathcal{Y}}$ . □

3.4.6. As in Sect. 3.4.1, the maps

$$f_* : \underline{\text{Shv}}(X) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}), \quad (X, f) \in \text{Sch}_{/\mathcal{Y}}$$

assemble into a map

$$(3.13) \quad \Omega_{\mathcal{Y}} : \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})_{\text{co}} \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}).$$

In terms of the identification given by Lemma 3.2.6, the values of the map (3.13) are given by the functors (3.7) for  $\mathcal{Y} \times_{\mathcal{B}} X$ .

The commutative diagrams (3.8) and (3.9) give rise to commutative diagrams

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1)_{\text{co}} & \xrightarrow{\Omega_{\mathcal{Y}_1}} & \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1) \\ f_{\text{co},*} \downarrow & & \downarrow f_* \\ \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2)_{\text{co}} & \xrightarrow{\Omega_{\mathcal{Y}_2}} & \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2) \end{array}$$

and

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1)_{\text{co}} & \xrightarrow{\Omega_{\mathcal{Y}_1}} & \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1) \\ f_{\text{co}}^! \uparrow & & \uparrow f^! \\ \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2)_{\text{co}} & \xrightarrow{\Omega_{\mathcal{Y}_2}} & \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2) \end{array}$$

3.4.7. We shall say that  $\mathcal{Y} \in \text{PreStk}_{/\mathcal{B}}$  is *universally tame* if the map (3.13) is an isomorphism in  $\text{AGCat}_{/\mathcal{B}}$ . Explicitly, this means that for any  $X \in \text{Sch}$ , the prestack

$$\mathcal{Y} \times_{\mathcal{B}} X$$

is tame.

We shall say that  $\mathcal{Y} \in \text{PreStk}_{/\mathcal{B}}$  is *AG tame* of both  $\mathcal{Y}$  and  $\mathcal{Y} \times_{\mathcal{B}} \mathcal{Y}$  are universally tame.

3.4.8. Let  $\mathcal{Y}_1$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_2$  be a pair of prestacks over  $\mathcal{B}$ , both with a schematic diagonal. Note that we have a commutative diagram

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1)_{\text{co}} \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2)_{\text{co}} & \xrightarrow[\sim]{(3.6)} & \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times_{\mathcal{B}} \mathcal{Y}_2)_{\text{co}} \\ \Omega_{\mathcal{Y}_1} \otimes \Omega_{\mathcal{Y}_2} \downarrow & & \downarrow \Omega_{\mathcal{Y}_1 \times_{\mathcal{B}} \mathcal{Y}_2} \\ \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2) & \xrightarrow{(3.3)} & \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times_{\mathcal{B}} \mathcal{Y}_2). \end{array}$$

Hence, we obtain:

**Corollary 3.4.9.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2$  are universally tame. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *The prestack  $\mathcal{Y}_1 \times_B \mathcal{Y}_2$  is also universally tame;*
- (ii) *The map*

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2) \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times_B \mathcal{Y}_2)$$

*of (3.3) is an isomorphism.*

In particular, we obtain:

**Corollary 3.4.10.** *Let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be an AG tame prestack. Then the map*

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y} \times_B \mathcal{Y})$$

*is an isomorphism.*

### 3.5. Dualizability in AGCat.

3.5.1. Since the functor (2.7) is symmetric monoidal, by Sect. 2.1.2, for every scheme  $X$ , the object

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(X) \in \text{AGCat}_{/B}$$

is canonically self-dual with the unit map given by

$$\mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}_{/B}} = \underline{\text{Shv}}(B) \xrightarrow{(p_{X/B})^!} \underline{\text{Shv}}(X) \xrightarrow{(\Delta_{X/B})_*} \underline{\text{Shv}}(X \times_B X) \simeq \underline{\text{Shv}}(X) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(X)$$

and the counit map given by

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(X) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(X) \simeq \underline{\text{Shv}}(X \times_B X) \xrightarrow{(\Delta_{X/B})^!} \underline{\text{Shv}}(X) \xrightarrow{(p_{X/B})^*} \underline{\text{Shv}}(B) \simeq \mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}_{/B}},$$

where  $p_{X/B} : X \rightarrow B$  is the projection map and  $\Delta_{X/B} : X \rightarrow X \times_B X$  is the diagonal.

3.5.2. It follows formally that for a map of schemes  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ , under the above identifications

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(X_i)^\vee \simeq \underline{\text{Shv}}(X_i),$$

we have

$$(f^!)^\vee \simeq f_*$$

as maps

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(X_1) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}}(X_2).$$

3.5.3. We will be interested in more general dualizable objects in AGCat. First, we claim:

**Proposition 3.5.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be a prestack such that  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \in \text{AGCat}_{/B}$  is a dualizable object. Then for any prestack  $\mathcal{Y}'$ , the natural map (see (3.3))*

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}') \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}' \times_B \mathcal{Y})$$

*is an isomorphism.*

*Proof.* We need to show that both maps (A) and (B) in (3.4) are isomorphisms (with  $\mathcal{Y}_1 = \mathcal{Y}'$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_2 = \mathcal{Y}$ ).

The fact that (A) is an isomorphism follows from the assumption that  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})$  is dualizable.

The fact that (B) is an isomorphism follows from the fact that the object  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(X)$  for  $X \in \text{Sch}$  is dualizable.  $\square$

3.5.5. Next, we claim:

**Proposition 3.5.6.** *For a pair of prestacks we have a canonical identification*

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\text{AGCat}/B}(\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1)_{\text{co}}, \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2)) \simeq \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times_B \mathcal{Y}_2).$$

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\text{AGCat}/B}(\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1)_{\text{co}}, \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2)) &\simeq \lim_{X \in (\text{Sch}_{/\mathcal{Y}_1}^{\text{aff}})^{\text{op}}} \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\text{AGCat}/B}(\underline{\text{Shv}}(X), \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2)) \xrightarrow{\text{Sect. 3.5.1}} \simeq \\ &\simeq \lim_{X \in (\text{Sch}_{/\mathcal{Y}_1}^{\text{aff}})^{\text{op}}} \underline{\text{Shv}}(X) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2) \xrightarrow{\text{Proposition 3.5.4}} \simeq \\ &\simeq \lim_{X \in (\text{Sch}_{/\mathcal{Y}_1}^{\text{aff}})^{\text{op}}} \underline{\text{Shv}}(X \times_B \mathcal{Y}_2) \simeq \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times_B \mathcal{Y}_2), \end{aligned}$$

where the last isomorphism follows from the cofinality of (3.5).  $\square$

In particular, we obtain:

**Corollary 3.5.7.** *For a prestack  $\mathcal{Y}$ , we have*

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\text{AGCat}/B}(\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})_{\text{co}}, \mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}/B}) \simeq \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}).$$

3.5.8. Using Sect. 3.5.2, we obtain that for a map  $f : \mathcal{Y}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_2$  between arbitrary prestacks, under the identification of Corollary 3.5.7, the map

$$(f_{\text{co},*})^{\vee} : \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\text{AGCat}/B}(\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2)_{\text{co}}, \mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}/B}) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\text{AGCat}/B}(\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1)_{\text{co}}, \mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}/B})$$

corresponds to  $f^!$ .

Similarly, we obtain that if  $f$  is schematic, the functor

$$(f_{\text{co}}^!)^{\vee} : \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\text{AGCat}/B}(\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1)_{\text{co}}, \mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}/B}) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\text{AGCat}/B}(\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1)_{\text{co}}, \mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}/B})$$

corresponds to  $f_*$ .

3.5.9. As another consequence of Proposition 3.5.6, we obtain:

**Corollary 3.5.10.** *Let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be universally tame. There is a natural isomorphism*

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\text{AGCat}/B}(\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}), \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}')) \simeq \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y} \times_B \mathcal{Y}').$$

3.5.11. Thus, we obtain that if  $\mathcal{Y}$  is a universally tame prestack such that  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})$  is dualizable, then  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})$  is canonically self-dual as an object of  $\text{AGCat}/B$ .

In the next subsection we will see that this is the case for AG tame prestacks.

### 3.6. Dualizability of AG tame prestacks.

3.6.1. We are going to prove:

**Theorem 3.6.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be an AG tame prestack. Then the object  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})$  is dualizable in  $\text{AGCat}_{/B}$ .*

3.6.3. The proof of Theorem 3.6.2 will rely on the following characterization of dualizability:

Recall that if  $\mathcal{A}$  is a monoidal category we have the notion of left and right dualizable objects (see [Lu2, Sect. 4.6.1]) which agree in the case when  $\mathcal{A}$  is symmetric monoidal. Recall also that for two objects  $a_1, a_2 \in \mathcal{A}$  the internal hom  $\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{A}}(a, b)$  is the object representing the functor

$$a \mapsto \text{Maps}_{\mathcal{A}}(a \otimes a_1, a_2).$$

The proof of the following is identical to [Lu2, Lemma 4.6.1.6].

**Proposition 3.6.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a monoidal category. An object  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  is right dualizable if and only if*

- (i) *There exist internal hom objects  $\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{A}}(a, 1_{\mathcal{A}})$  and  $\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{A}}(a, a)$ , and*
- (ii) *The tautological map  $\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{A}}(a, 1_{\mathcal{A}}) \otimes a \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{A}}(a, a)$  is an isomorphism.*

3.6.5. *Proof of Theorem 3.6.2.* By Proposition 3.6.4 we need to show that the canonical map

$$(3.17) \quad \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\text{AGCat}_{/B}}(\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}), 1_{\text{AGCat}_{/B}}) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\text{AGCat}_{/B}}(\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}), \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}))$$

is an isomorphism. We identify

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\text{AGCat}_{/B}}(\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}), 1_{\text{AGCat}_{/B}}) \simeq \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \text{ and } \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\text{AGCat}_{/B}}(\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}), \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})) \simeq \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y})_B$$

by Corollary 3.5.10. Under these identifications, the map (3.17) is the map

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y})_B$$

of (3.4). The latter map is an isomorphism by Section 3.4.10.

□[Theorem 3.6.2]

3.6.6. By Section 3.5.4, we obtain:

**Corollary 3.6.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be an AG tame prestack and  $\mathcal{Y}'$  a prestack. Then the canonical map*

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}') \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}')_B$$

is an isomorphism.

3.6.8. We now obtain a characterization of AG tame prestacks in terms of  $\text{AGCat}_{/B}$ :

**Proposition 3.6.9.** *Let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be a universally tame prestack. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\mathcal{Y}$  is AG tame;
- (ii) The object  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \in \text{AGCat}_{/B}$  is dualizable;
- (iii) The map  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y})_B$  is an isomorphism.

*Proof.* First, (i) implies (ii) by Section 3.6.2. Next, (ii) implies (iii) by Proposition 3.5.4. Finally, (iii) implies (i) by Corollary 3.4.9.

□

3.6.10. We can now prove that the notion of being AG Verdier-compatible is stable under products:

**Proposition 3.6.11.** *If  $\mathcal{Y}_1$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_2$  are AG tame, then so is  $\mathcal{Y}_1 \times_B \mathcal{Y}_2$ .*

*Proof.* We apply the characterization of AG tame prestacks from Section 3.6.9. By Corollary 3.6.7, we have:

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2) \simeq \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times_B \mathcal{Y}_2).$$

Hence, since  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1)$  and  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2)$  are dualizable, so is  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times_B \mathcal{Y}_2)$ .

The fact that  $\mathcal{Y}_1 \times_B \mathcal{Y}_2$  is universally tame follows from Corollary 3.4.9 using Proposition 3.5.4.  $\square$

**3.7. Description of unit and counit.** In this section we let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be an AG tame prestack. By Theorem 3.6.2, we know that  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})$  is dualizable as an object of  $\text{AGCat}_{/B}$ . Moreover, by Sect. 3.5.11, it is self-dual.

In this subsection we will describe explicitly the unit and counit maps for this self-duality.

3.7.1. Note that since  $\mathcal{Y}$  was assumed to have a schematic diagonal, we have a well-defined map

$$(\Delta_{\mathcal{Y}/B})_* : \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}).$$

First, we will prove:

**Proposition 3.7.2.** *The unit of the self-duality on  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})$  is given by the map*

$$(3.18) \quad \mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}_{/B}} = \underline{\text{Shv}}(B) \xrightarrow{(p_{\mathcal{Y}/B})^!} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow{(\Delta_{\mathcal{Y}/B})_*} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow{\text{Corollary 3.4.10}} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}).$$

*Proof.* We will think of the left copy of  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})$  in the tensor product as  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})^\vee$  via

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})^\vee \xrightarrow{\text{Corollary 3.5.7}} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})_{\text{co}} \xrightarrow{\Omega_{\mathcal{Y}}} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}).$$

Since  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})$  is the limit of  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(X)$  over  $X \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{Y}$ , using Sect. 3.5.1, we conclude that we need to show that for every  $f : X \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ , the composition of (3.18) with

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(X) \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes f^!} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(X) \simeq \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})^\vee \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(X)$$

identifies with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}_{/B}} &= \underline{\text{Shv}}(B) \xrightarrow{(p_{\mathcal{X}/B})^!} \underline{\text{Shv}}(X) \xrightarrow{(\Delta_{X/B})_*} \underline{\text{Shv}}(X \times X) \simeq \\ &\simeq \underline{\text{Shv}}(X) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(X) \simeq \underline{\text{Shv}}(X)^\vee \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(X) \xrightarrow{(f^!)^\vee \otimes \text{Id}} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})^\vee \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(X), \end{aligned}$$

functorially in  $(X, f)$ .

Using the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(X) & \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} & \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y} \times X) \\ \text{Id} \otimes f^! \uparrow & & \uparrow (\text{id} \times f)^! \\ \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) & \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} & \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}), \end{array}$$

and base change, we obtain that composition of (3.18) with  $\text{id} \otimes f^!$  is the map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}_{/B}} = \underline{\text{Shv}}(B) &\xrightarrow{(p_{X/B})^!} \underline{\text{Shv}}(X) \xrightarrow{(\Delta_{X/B})_*} \underline{\text{Shv}}(X \times_B X) \simeq \\ &\simeq \underline{\text{Shv}}(X) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(X) \xrightarrow{f_* \otimes \text{Id}} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(X). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it remains to show that the functor

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(X) \simeq \underline{\text{Shv}}(X)^\vee \xrightarrow{(f^!)^\vee} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})^\vee$$

identifies with

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(X) \xrightarrow{f_*} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \simeq \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})^\vee.$$

However, this follows by combining (3.14) and Sect. 3.5.8.  $\square$

3.7.3. For a (not necessarily) schematic map  $f : \mathcal{Y}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_2$  between tame prestacks, we introduce the functor

$$f_\blacktriangle : \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_1) \rightarrow \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_2)$$

to be the composition

$$\text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_1) \xrightarrow{\Omega_{\mathcal{Y}_1}} \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_1)_{\text{co}} \xrightarrow{f_{\text{co},*}} \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_2)_{\text{co}} \xrightarrow{\Omega_{\mathcal{Y}_2}} \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_2).$$

Note that if  $f$  is schematic, it follows from (3.8) that we have

$$f_\blacktriangle \simeq f_*.$$

For future use, we note:

**Lemma 3.7.4.** *Let*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{Y}'_1 & \xrightarrow{g_1} & \mathcal{Y}_1 \\ f' \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ \mathcal{Y}'_2 & \xrightarrow{g_2} & \mathcal{Y}_2 \end{array}$$

be a Cartesian diagram of tame prestacks, where the horizontal maps are schematic. Then there exists a canonical isomorphism

$$g_2^! \circ f_\blacktriangle \simeq f'_\blacktriangle \circ g_1^!.$$

*Proof.* Follows from (3.9).  $\square$

**Corollary 3.7.5.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2, \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2, \mathcal{Y}_2 \times \mathcal{Y}_2$  are tame. Then the functor  $f_\blacktriangle$  satisfies the projection formula:*

$$f_\blacktriangle(\mathcal{F}_1) \otimes \mathcal{F}_2 \simeq f_\blacktriangle(\mathcal{F}_1 \otimes f^!(\mathcal{F}_2)).$$

*Proof.* We apply Lemma 3.7.4 to

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{Y}_1 & \xrightarrow{\text{Graph}_f} & \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2 \\ f \downarrow & & \downarrow f \times \text{id} \\ \mathcal{Y}_2 & \xrightarrow{\Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_2}} & \mathcal{Y}_2 \times \mathcal{Y}_2. \end{array}$$

$\square$

3.7.6. Similarly, for a map  $f : \mathcal{Y}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_2$  between *universally* tame prestacks we define the morphism

$$f_\blacktriangle : \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2)$$

to be the composition

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1) \xrightarrow{\Omega_{\mathcal{Y}_1}} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1)_{\text{co}} \xrightarrow{f_{\text{co},*}} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2)_{\text{co}} \xrightarrow{\Omega_{\mathcal{Y}_2}} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2).$$

The values of the latter map are given by  $(f \times \text{id})_\blacktriangle$  for

$$f \times \text{id} : \mathcal{Y}_1 \underset{B}{\times} X \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_2 \underset{B}{\times} X.$$

3.7.7. Unwinding, from Proposition 3.7.2 and Sect. 3.5.8 we obtain:

**Corollary 3.7.8.** *For a map  $f : \mathcal{Y}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_2$  between AG tame prestacks, with respect to the self-dualities  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_i) \simeq \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_i)^\vee$ , we have*

$$(f^!)^\vee \simeq f_\blacktriangle.$$

3.7.9. As a formal consequence of Corollary 3.7.8 we obtain:

**Corollary 3.7.10.** *The counit of the self-duality of  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})$  is given by*

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow{(\Delta_{\mathcal{Y}/B})^!} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow{(p_{\mathcal{Y}/B})^\blacktriangle} \underline{\text{Shv}}(B) = \mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}/B}.$$

#### 4. DUALITY IN DGCAT AND AGCAT

In this section we study how monoidal duality in DGCat interacts with Verdier duality on schemes and algebraic stacks.

##### 4.1. Ambidexterity.

4.1.1. Recall the general setup in Section 1.1: we have a closed symmetric monoidal category  $\mathbf{O}$  and a right-lax symmetric monoidal functor

$$F : \mathbf{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}.$$

Suppose now that  $F$  satisfies the following additional hypotheses:

(1)  $F$  is strictly unital; i.e. the natural map

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{V}} \rightarrow F(\mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{O}})$$

is an isomorphism.

(2) Every object  $\mathbf{o} \in \mathbf{O}$  is dualizable.

(3) For every  $\mathbf{o} \in \mathbf{O}$ , the pairing

$$F(\mathbf{o}) \otimes F(\mathbf{o}^\vee) \rightarrow F(\mathbf{o} \otimes \mathbf{o}^\vee) \rightarrow F(\mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{O}}) \simeq \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{V}}$$

is the counit of a duality pairing, where  $\mathbf{o}^\vee$  is the dual of  $\mathbf{o}$  and the right map is the image under  $F$  of the duality pairing of  $\mathbf{o}$  and  $\mathbf{o}^\vee$ .

4.1.2. Recall that we have the adjunction (1.6)

$$\mathbf{i} : \mathcal{V} \rightleftarrows \underline{\mathcal{V}} : \mathbf{e}$$

of  $\mathcal{V}$ -module categories.

By Section 1.2.8, condition (1) implies that the functor  $\mathbf{i}$  is fully faithful. Thus, the unit natural transformation

$$(4.1) \quad \text{Id}_{\mathcal{V}} \rightarrow \mathbf{e} \circ \mathbf{i}$$

is an isomorphism.

By Proposition 1.2.5,  $\underline{\mathcal{V}}$  is a closed symmetric monoidal category. We have:

$$(4.2) \quad \mathbf{e}(\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\underline{\mathcal{V}}}(\underline{v}_1, \underline{v}_2)) \simeq \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \mathcal{V}}(\underline{v}_1, \underline{v}_2) \in \mathcal{V}.$$

4.1.3. Assuming conditions (1) and (2), condition (3) is equivalent to the following two conditions:

(3') For every  $\mathbf{o} \in \mathbf{O}$ , the object  $F(\mathbf{o}) \in \mathcal{V}$  is dualizable, and

(3'') The map

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \mathcal{V}}(F(\mathbf{o}), \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{V}}) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \mathcal{V}}(\mathbf{i} \circ \mathbf{e}(F(\mathbf{o})), \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{V}}) \simeq \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \mathcal{V}}(\mathbf{i}(F(\mathbf{o})), \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{V}}) \simeq \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{V}}(F(\mathbf{o}), \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{V}}),$$

given by restriction along the counit map  $\mathbf{i} \circ \mathbf{e}(F(\mathbf{o})) \rightarrow F(\mathbf{o})$ , is an isomorphism.

4.1.4. We claim:

**Proposition 4.1.5.** *The adjunction  $(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{e})$  is ambidexterous, with the counit of the  $(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{i})$ -adjunction given by the inverse of (4.1).*

*Proof.* We need to show that for every  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  and every  $\underline{v} \in \underline{\mathcal{V}}$ , the natural map

$$(4.3) \quad \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \mathcal{V}}(\underline{v}, \mathbf{i}(v)) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbf{e}(\underline{v}), \mathbf{e} \circ \mathbf{i}(v)) \xrightarrow{\sim} \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbf{e}(\underline{v}), v)$$

is an isomorphism.

Since both sides take weighted colimits in the  $\underline{v}$ -variable to weighted limits, by (B.5), it suffices to show that (4.3) is an isomorphism for  $\underline{v} = F(\mathbf{o})$  for  $\mathbf{o} \in \mathbf{O}$ .

By definition,  $\mathbf{i}(v) \simeq \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{V}} \otimes v$ . Hence, we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \mathcal{V}}(F(\mathbf{o}), \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{V}}) \otimes v & \longrightarrow & \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \mathcal{V}}(F(\mathbf{o}), \mathbf{i}(v)) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \mathcal{V}}(\mathbf{i} \circ \mathbf{e}(F(\mathbf{o})), \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{V}}) \otimes v & \longrightarrow & \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \mathcal{V}}(\mathbf{i} \circ \mathbf{e}(F(\mathbf{o})), \mathbf{i}(v)) \xrightarrow{\sim} \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbf{e}(F(\mathbf{o})), v), \end{array}$$

where the composite map

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \mathcal{V}}(F(\mathbf{o}), \mathbf{i}(v)) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \mathcal{V}}(\mathbf{i} \circ \mathbf{e}(F(\mathbf{o})), \mathbf{i}(v)) \simeq \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbf{e}(F(\mathbf{o})), v)$$

is the map (4.3) for  $\underline{v} = F(\mathbf{o})$ . Thus, we need to check that the right vertical map in this diagram is an isomorphism.

In the above diagram, the left vertical map is an isomorphism by condition (3'') above; the top horizontal map is an isomorphism since  $F(\mathbf{o})$  is dualizable; and the bottom horizontal map is an isomorphism because  $\mathbf{i} \circ \mathbf{e}(F(\mathbf{o})) \simeq \mathbf{i}(F(\mathbf{o}))$  is dualizable by condition (3') above. Hence, the right vertical map is an isomorphism, as desired.

□

*Remark 4.1.6.* In the specific situation of AGCat, we will show in Section 4.5.6 that more is true. Namely, in this case the counit map

$$\mathbf{i} \circ \mathbf{e} \rightarrow \text{Id}$$

admits a right adjoint (which makes sense since AGCat is naturally a 2-category). In this situation (i.e., when  $\mathbf{e} \circ \mathbf{i} = \text{Id}$ ), this right adjoint is automatically the unit of an  $(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{i})$ -adjunction, which is automatically the same as the  $(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{i})$ -adjunction described above.

**4.2. Duality of the values.** We keep the assumptions of Section 4.1.1. In this subsection, we will show that the functor

$$\mathbf{e} : \underline{\mathcal{V}} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$$

maps dualizable objects to dualizable objects, and we will describe the duality data explicitly.

4.2.1. We are going to prove:

**Proposition 4.2.2.** *Suppose that  $\underline{v} \in \underline{\mathcal{V}}$  is a dualizable object. Then  $\mathbf{e}(\underline{v})$  is also dualizable, and the paring*

$$(4.4) \quad \mathbf{e}(\underline{v}) \otimes \mathbf{e}(\underline{v}^\vee) \rightarrow \mathbf{e}(\underline{v} \otimes \underline{v}^\vee) \rightarrow \mathbf{e}(\mathbf{1}_v) \simeq \mathbf{1}_v$$

*is the counit of a duality.*

*Proof.* First, we will show that  $\mathbf{e}(\underline{v})$  is dualizable. We need to show that for any  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ , the natural map

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbf{e}(\underline{v}), \mathbf{1}_v) \otimes v \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbf{e}(\underline{v}), v)$$

is an isomorphism. We have a commutative diagram

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{V}, v}(\underline{v}, \mathbf{1}_{\underline{v}}) \otimes v & \longrightarrow & \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{V}, v}(\underline{v}, \mathbf{i}(v)) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbf{e}(\underline{v}), \mathbf{1}_v) \otimes v & \longrightarrow & \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbf{e}(\underline{v}), v) \end{array}$$

The vertical maps in (4.5) are isomorphisms by Section 4.1.5. Since  $\underline{v}$  is dualizable, the map

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{V}}(\underline{v}, \mathbf{1}_{\underline{v}}) \otimes v \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{V}}(\underline{v}, \mathbf{i}(v))$$

is an isomorphism. Applying the functor  $\mathbf{e}$  and using (4.2), we obtain that the top horizontal map in (4.5) is an isomorphism. Hence the bottom horizontal map is also an isomorphism, as desired. Thus, the object  $\mathbf{e}(\underline{v})$  is dualizable.

It remains to show that (4.4) is the counit of a duality. We need to show that the map

$$(4.6) \quad \mathbf{e}(\underline{v}^\vee) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbf{e}(\underline{v}), \mathbf{1}_v)$$

induced by (4.4) is an isomorphism. Unraveling the definition, the map (4.6) is the composite

$$\mathbf{e}(\underline{v}^\vee) \simeq \mathbf{e}(\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{V}}(\underline{v}, \mathbf{1}_{\underline{v}})) \simeq \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{V}, v}(\underline{v}, \mathbf{1}_{\underline{v}}) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbf{e}(\underline{v}), \mathbf{1}_v),$$

which is an isomorphism by Section 4.1.5.

□

4.2.3. As a consequence of Section 4.2.2, we obtain that all values of a dualizable object are dualizable:

**Corollary 4.2.4.** *Let  $\underline{v} \in \underline{\mathcal{V}}$  be a dualizable object and  $\mathbf{o} \in \mathbf{O}$ . Then  $\underline{v}(\mathbf{o}) \in \mathcal{V}$  is dualizable with dual  $\underline{v}^\vee(\mathbf{o}^\vee)$  and the counit given by*

$$\underline{v}(\mathbf{o}) \otimes \underline{v}^\vee(\mathbf{o}^\vee) \rightarrow (\underline{v} \otimes \underline{v}^\vee)(\mathbf{o} \otimes \mathbf{o}^\vee) \rightarrow (\underline{v} \otimes \underline{v}^\vee)(\mathbf{1}_\mathbf{o}) \rightarrow \mathbf{1}_{\underline{\mathcal{V}}}(\mathbf{1}_\mathbf{o}) \simeq \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}}.$$

*Proof.* We have

$$\underline{v}(\mathbf{o}) \simeq \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\underline{\mathcal{V}}, \mathcal{V}}(\underline{F}(\mathbf{o}), \underline{v}) \simeq \mathbf{e}(\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\underline{\mathcal{V}}}(F(\mathbf{o}), \underline{v})) \simeq \mathbf{e}(F(\mathbf{o}^\vee) \otimes \underline{v}).$$

Now,  $\underline{F}(\mathbf{o}^\vee) \otimes \underline{v} \in \underline{\mathcal{V}}$  is a dualizable object (since it's a tensor product of two dualizable objects). Applying Section 4.2.2 to this object, we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

### 4.3. Recollections on Verdier duality on schemes.

4.3.1. Let  $X$  be a scheme. In this case, by definition, we have

$$\text{Shv}(X) = \text{Ind}(\text{Shv}(X)^{\text{constr}})$$

is the ind-category of constructible  $\ell$ -adic sheaves. Now, Verdier duality gives an equivalence

$$(4.7) \quad \mathbb{D}_X : (\text{Shv}(X)^{\text{constr}})^{\text{op}} \simeq (\text{Shv}(X)^{\text{constr}}).$$

4.3.2. Recall that if  $\mathbf{C}$  is a compactly generated DG category, then it is dualizable and the dual is given by

$$(4.8) \quad \mathbf{C}^\vee \simeq \text{Ind}((\mathbf{C}^c)^{\text{op}}),$$

where  $\mathbf{C}^c \subset \mathbf{C}$  is the full subcategory consisting of compact objects.

Moreover, suppose that

$$F : \mathbf{C}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_2$$

is a functor between compactly generated categories that preserves compact objects; i.e.  $F = \text{Ind}(F^c)$  for a DG functor

$$F^c : \mathbf{C}_1^c \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_2^c.$$

Then the dual  $F^\vee$  of  $F$  identifies with

$$\mathbf{C}_2^\vee \simeq \text{Ind}((\mathbf{C}_2^c)^{\text{op}}) \xrightarrow{\text{Ind}((F^c)^{\text{op}})^R} \text{Ind}((\mathbf{C}_1^c)^{\text{op}}) \simeq \mathbf{C}_1^\vee,$$

i.e., the right adjoint of the ind-extension of  $(F^c)^{\text{op}} : \mathbf{C}_1^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_2^{\text{op}}$ .

4.3.3. Applying this to the category  $\text{Shv}(X)$ , we see that the Verdier duality functor gives rise to an identification

$$(4.9) \quad \text{Shv}(X)^\vee \simeq \text{Shv}(X).$$

4.3.4. Recall also that for  $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2 \in \text{Shv}(X)^{\text{constr}}$ , we have

$$\mathcal{H}\text{om}_{\text{Shv}(X)}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2) \simeq \text{C}^*(X, \mathbb{D}_X(\mathcal{F}_1) \overset{!}{\otimes} \mathcal{F}_2).$$

This implies that the pairing

$$\text{Shv}(X) \otimes \text{Shv}(X) \rightarrow \text{Vect}$$

corresponding to (4.9) is given by

$$\text{Shv}(X) \otimes \text{Shv}(X) \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} \text{Shv}(X \times X) \xrightarrow{\Delta_X^!} \text{Shv}(X) \xrightarrow{(p_X)_*} \text{Shv}(\text{pt}) \simeq \text{Vect}.$$

4.3.5. The above formula for the pairing implies that for a map of schemes  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ , we have an identification of functors on the subcategories of compact objects

$$f^! \circ \mathbb{D}_{X_2} \simeq \mathbb{D}_{X_1} \circ f^*$$

and therefore with respect to the self-duality (4.9), we have

$$(4.10) \quad (f^!)^\vee \simeq (f^*)^R \simeq f_*.$$

4.3.6. Let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be a prestack, and recall the category  $\text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})_{\text{co}}$ . Since the transition functors in the colimit preserve compactness, the category  $\text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})_{\text{co}}$  is compactly generated, and hence dualizable.

From (4.10) it follows that we have a canonical identification

$$(4.11) \quad (\text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})_{\text{co}})^\vee \simeq \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}).$$

Under this identification, for a map of prestacks  $f : \mathcal{Y}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_2$ , we have

$$(4.12) \quad f^! \simeq (f_{\text{co},*})^\vee,$$

and if  $f$  is schematic

$$(4.13) \quad f_* \simeq (f_{\text{co}}^!)^\vee.$$

*Remark 4.3.7.* Note that formulas (4.10), (4.12) and (4.13) look similar to those in Sects. 3.5.2 and 3.5.8. However, for now, these are “apples and oranges”: the former talk about duality in DGCat and the latter about duality in AGCat. The two will be related in the next subsection, see Corollary 4.4.3.

4.4. **Duality in AGCat.** We now specialize the discussion in Sects. 4.1 and 4.2 to

$$\text{Shv} : \text{Corr}(\text{Sch}) \rightarrow \text{DGCat},$$

i.e., to the setting of Sect. 2 with  $B = \text{pt}$ .

The latter assumption is needed in order for  $\text{Vect} \rightarrow \text{Shv}(B)$  to be an equivalence. As was mentioned already, in this case we write AGCat instead of  $\text{AGCat}_{/B}$ .

4.4.1. We claim that conditions (1)-(3) in Sect. 4.1.1 are satisfied. Indeed, condition (1) is satisfied since  $B = \text{pt}$ . Condition (2) is satisfied because every object in  $\text{Corr}(\text{Sch})$  is self-dual (see Sect. 2.1.2). Condition (3) is satisfied by Sect. 4.3.4.

Thus, the contents of Sects. 4.1-4.2 are applicable.

4.4.2. Applying Section 4.2.4 to AGCat, we obtain:

**Corollary 4.4.3.** *Let  $\underline{\mathbf{C}} \in \text{AGCat}$  be a dualizable object. Then for any scheme  $X$ ,*

$$\underline{\mathbf{C}}(X) \in \text{DGCat}$$

*is dualizable, with dual  $\underline{\mathbf{C}}^\vee(X)$  and counit pairing*

$$\underline{\mathbf{C}}(X) \otimes \underline{\mathbf{C}}^\vee(X) \rightarrow (\underline{\mathbf{C}} \otimes \underline{\mathbf{C}}^\vee)(X \times X) \xrightarrow{\Delta_X^!} (\underline{\mathbf{C}} \otimes \underline{\mathbf{C}}^\vee)(X) \xrightarrow{(p_X)_*} (\underline{\mathbf{C}} \otimes \underline{\mathbf{C}}^\vee)(\text{pt}) \rightarrow \mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}}(\text{pt}) \simeq \text{Vect}.$$

*In particular,  $\underline{\mathbf{C}}(\text{pt})$  is dualizable with counit given by*

$$\underline{\mathbf{C}}(\text{pt}) \otimes \underline{\mathbf{C}}^\vee(\text{pt}) \rightarrow (\underline{\mathbf{C}} \otimes \underline{\mathbf{C}}^\vee)(\text{pt}) \rightarrow \mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}}(\text{pt}) \simeq \text{Vect}.$$

4.4.4. Let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be an AG tame prestack. From Corollaries 4.4.3 and 3.7.10, we obtain:

**Corollary 4.4.5.** *The category  $\text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})$  is self-dual with the counit given by*

$$(4.14) \quad \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow{\Delta_{\mathcal{Y}}^!} \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow{(p_{\mathcal{Y}})_*} \text{Vect}.$$

4.4.6. Unwinding, we obtain that the self-duality

$$\text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})^{\vee} \simeq \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})$$

given by Corollary 4.4.5 equals

$$(4.15) \quad \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})^{\vee} \xrightarrow{\Omega_{\mathcal{Y}}^{\vee}} (\text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})_{\text{co}})^{\vee} \xrightarrow{(4.11)} \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}).$$

We will denote the resulting equivalence

$$(4.16) \quad (\text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})^c)^{\text{op}} \simeq \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})^c$$

by  $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ , see (4.8).

Note that by construction, when  $\mathcal{Y} = X$  is a scheme, this is the same functor as (4.7).

*Remark 4.4.7.* Note that the identification (4.15) and the equivalence (4.16) take place for any tame prestack (it does not need to be AG or universally tame).

For future reference, we note that if  $\mathcal{Y}_1$ ,  $\mathcal{Y}_2$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2$  are tame, and  $\mathcal{F}_i \in \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_i)^c$ , we have a canonical identification

$$(4.17) \quad \mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{Y}_1}(\mathcal{F}_1) \boxtimes \mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{Y}_2}(\mathcal{F}_2) \simeq \mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2}(\mathcal{F}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{F}_2).$$

## 4.5. Ambidexterity in AGCat.

4.5.1. Recall the adjunction

$$(4.18) \quad \mathbf{i} : \text{DGCat} \rightleftarrows \text{AGCat} : \mathbf{e}$$

of (2.8).

The counit is a natural transformation

$$(4.19) \quad \mathbf{i} \circ \mathbf{e} \rightarrow \text{Id}_{\text{AGCat}}$$

of DGCat-module functors  $\text{AGCat} \rightarrow \text{AGCat}$ .

4.5.2. We will prove:

**Proposition 4.5.3.** *The counit natural transformation (4.19) admits a right adjoint in the 2-category  $\text{Funct}_{\text{DGCat}}(\text{AGCat}, \text{AGCat})$ .*

Let us explain what Proposition 4.5.3 says in concrete terms:

First, for any  $\underline{\mathbf{C}} \in \text{AGCat}$  and  $X \in \text{Sch}$ , the functor

$$\text{Shv}(X) \otimes \underline{\mathbf{C}}(\text{pt}) \rightarrow \underline{\mathbf{C}}(X)$$

admits a right adjoint.

Second (see Proposition 2.7.2), for every  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Shv}(X' \times X'')$ , the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Shv}(X') \otimes \underline{\mathbf{C}}(\text{pt}) & \longrightarrow & \underline{\mathbf{C}}(X') \\ \mathcal{F} \otimes \text{Id} \downarrow & & \downarrow \underline{\mathbf{C}}(\mathcal{F}) \\ \text{Shv}(X'') \otimes \underline{\mathbf{C}}(\text{pt}) & \longrightarrow & \underline{\mathbf{C}}(X'') \end{array}$$

satisfies the right Beck-Chevalley condition.

And third (see Proposition 2.7.4), for a map  $\alpha : \underline{\mathbf{C}}_1 \rightarrow \underline{\mathbf{C}}_2$  and  $X \in \text{Sch}$ , the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Shv}(X) \otimes \underline{\mathbf{C}}_1(\text{pt}) & \longrightarrow & \underline{\mathbf{C}}_1(X) \\ \text{Id} \otimes \alpha(\text{pt}) \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha(X) \\ \text{Shv}(X) \otimes \underline{\mathbf{C}}_2(\text{pt}) & \longrightarrow & \underline{\mathbf{C}}_2(X) \end{array}$$

satisfies the right Beck-Chevalley condition.

4.5.4. *Proof of Proposition 4.5.3.* The assignment

$$\underline{\mathbf{C}} \mapsto (\mathbf{i}(\underline{\mathbf{C}}(\text{pt})) \rightarrow \underline{\mathbf{C}})$$

can be viewed as a  $\text{DGCat}$ -module functor

$$(4.20) \quad \text{AGCat} \rightarrow \text{Funct}([1], \text{AGCat}).$$

The assertion of the proposition is equivalent to the assertion that the functor (4.20) factors through  $\text{Funct}(\text{Adj}, \text{AGCat})$ .

By Proposition A.5.6, we have

$$(4.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Funct}_{\text{DGCat}}(\text{AGCat}, \text{Funct}([1], \text{AGCat})) &\simeq \\ &\simeq \text{Funct}^{\text{DGCat}}(\text{enh}(\text{Corr}(\text{Sch}), \text{DGCat}), \text{Funct}([1], \text{AGCat})), \end{aligned}$$

and we need to show that the object corresponding to (4.20) in the right-hand side of (4.21) lies in the 1-full subcategory

$$(4.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Funct}^{\text{DGCat}}(\text{enh}(\text{Corr}(\text{Sch}), \text{DGCat}), \text{Funct}(\text{Adj}, \text{AGCat})) &\subset \\ &\subset \text{Funct}^{\text{DGCat}}(\text{enh}(\text{Corr}(\text{Sch}), \text{DGCat}), \text{Funct}([1], \text{AGCat})). \end{aligned}$$

By Section 2.7.4 and Section A.5.9, we need to show the following:

(1) For every scheme  $Z$  and another scheme  $X$ , the functor

$$(4.23) \quad \text{Shv}(X) \otimes \text{Shv}(Z) \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} \text{Shv}(X \times Z)$$

admits a right adjoint.

(2) For  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Shv}(X' \times X'')$ , the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Shv}(X') \otimes \text{Shv}(Z) & \longrightarrow & \text{Shv}(X' \times Z) \\ [\mathcal{F}] \otimes \text{Id} \downarrow & & \downarrow [\mathcal{F}] \\ \text{Shv}(X'') \otimes \text{Shv}(Z) & \longrightarrow & \text{Shv}(X'' \times Z) \end{array}$$

satisfies the right Beck-Chevalley condition, where the notation  $[-]$  is as in Sect. 2.4.3.

(3) For  $\mathcal{G} \in \text{Shv}(Z_1 \times Z_2)$ , the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Shv}(X) \otimes \text{Shv}(Z_1) & \longrightarrow & \text{Shv}(X \times Z_1) \\ \text{Id} \otimes [\mathcal{G}] \downarrow & & \downarrow [\mathcal{G}] \\ \text{Shv}(X) \otimes \text{Shv}(Z_2) & \longrightarrow & \text{Shv}(X \times Z_2) \end{array}$$

satisfies the right Beck-Chevalley condition.

Note, however, that conditions (2) and (3) amount to the same, up to swapping  $X$  and  $Z$ .

Condition (1) follows from the fact that the functor (4.23) maps compact objects to compact objects.

To prove condition (2), we can assume that  $\mathcal{F}$  is compact (i.e., constructible). In this case, the functor  $[\mathcal{F}]$  admits a left adjoint, which is explicitly given by

$$\mathcal{F}'' \mapsto (p')_! (\mathbb{D}_{X' \times X''}(\mathcal{F}) \otimes (p'')^*(\mathcal{F}'')),$$

where  $p', p''$  are the projections from  $X' \times X''$  to  $X'$  and  $X''$ , respectively.

Now condition (2) follows from the fact that the rotated diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Shv}(X') \otimes \text{Shv}(Z) & \xrightarrow{[\mathcal{F}] \otimes \text{Id}} & \text{Shv}(X'') \otimes \text{Shv}(Z) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Shv}(X' \times Z) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}} & \text{Shv}(X'' \times Z) \end{array}$$

satisfies the *left* Beck-Chevalley condition.

□[Proposition 4.5.3]

4.5.5. Recall from Section 4.1.5 that the adjunction (4.18) is canonically ambidexterous. A consequence of Section 4.5.3 is a more precise description of the resulting  $(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{i})$ -adjunction:

**Corollary 4.5.6.** *The unit of the  $(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{i})$ -adjunction*

$$\text{Id}_{\text{AGCat}} \rightarrow \mathbf{i} \circ \mathbf{e}$$

*is canonically isomorphic to the right adjoint of the counit of the adjunction (4.18).*

*Proof.* Both the unit and the counit of (4.18) admit right adjoints: the unit because it's an isomorphism and the counit by Section 4.5.3. Passing to right adjoints gives an adjunction in the other direction.

By construction, the counit of this new  $(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{i})$ -adjunction equals the counit from Section 4.1.5: both are given by the inverse of  $\text{Id} \rightarrow \mathbf{e} \circ \mathbf{i}$ .

□

**4.6. The notion of Verdier compatible algebraic stack.** In this subsection we let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be an algebraic stack with a schematic diagonal.

4.6.1. Note that we have an inclusion:

$$\mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})^c \subset \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})^{\mathrm{constr}}.$$

I.e., compact objects are constructible (but, in general, not vice versa). Recall from [AGKRRV1, Sect. F.2.6] that  $\mathcal{Y}$  is called *Verdier-compatible* if the subcategory  $\mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})^c$  is preserved by Verdier duality functor<sup>8</sup>

$$\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathrm{Verdier}} : (\mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})^{\mathrm{constr}})^{\mathrm{op}} \simeq \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})^{\mathrm{constr}}.$$

By [AGKRRV1, Theorem F.2.8], all quasi-compact stacks of finite type that are locally quotient stacks are Verdier-compatible. According to [AGKRRV1, Conjecture F.2.7], all quasi-compact algebraic stack with a schematic diagonal are Verdier-compatible.

4.6.2. By (4.8), we obtain that for a Verdier-compatible algebraic stack there is a canonical equivalence

$$(4.24) \quad \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})^{\vee} \simeq \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})$$

4.6.3. Since  $\mathcal{Y}$  has a schematic diagonal, we have a well-defined functor

$$(4.25) \quad \Omega_{\mathcal{Y}} : \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})_{\mathrm{co}} \rightarrow \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}),$$

see (3.7). We claim:

**Proposition 4.6.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be an algebraic stack.  $\mathcal{Y}$  is Verdier-compatible if and only if it is tame.*

*Proof.* The transition functors in the colimit

$$\mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})_{\mathrm{co}} = \underset{S \in \mathrm{Sch}_{/\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathrm{aff}}}{\mathrm{colim}} \mathrm{Shv}(S)$$

preserve compact objects. In particular, the compact objects in the colimit are generated by objects of the form

$$\mathrm{ins}_f(\mathcal{F}) \in \underset{S \in \mathrm{Sch}_{/\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathrm{aff}}}{\mathrm{colim}} \mathrm{Shv}(S),$$

for a map  $f : S \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ ,  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Shv}(S)^{\mathrm{constr}}$ , and where

$$\mathrm{ins}_f : \mathrm{Shv}(S) \rightarrow \underset{S \in \mathrm{Sch}_{/\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathrm{aff}}}{\mathrm{colim}} \mathrm{Shv}(S)$$

is the tautological functor.

By definition,  $\mathcal{Y}$  is Verdier-compatible if the Verdier dual of every compact object of  $\mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})$  is compact. The compact objects in  $\mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})$  are generated by objects of the form  $f_!(\mathcal{F})$  for a map  $f : S \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  and  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Shv}(S)^{\mathrm{constr}}$ . The Verdier dual of  $f_!(\mathcal{F})$  is given by

$$f_*(\mathbb{D}_S(\mathcal{F})) \simeq \Omega_{\mathcal{Y}} \left( \mathrm{ins}_f(\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{F})) \right).$$

In particular, if (3.7) is an equivalence, the objects  $f_*(\mathbb{D}(\mathcal{F}))$  are compact and hence  $\mathcal{Y}$  is Verdier-compatible.

<sup>8</sup>We are insert the superscript Verdier in the notation in order to avoid conflating it with the functor  $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{Y}}$  in (4.16). See Remark 4.6.5 for the relation between the two functors.

Now, suppose that  $\mathcal{Y}$  is Verdier-compatible. In order to show that (3.7) is an equivalence, it suffices to show that its dual functor is an equivalence. However, it is easy to see that the composition

$$\mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow{(4.24)} \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})^\vee \xrightarrow{\Omega_{\mathcal{Y}}^\vee} \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})_{\mathrm{co}}^\vee \xrightarrow{(4.11)} \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})$$

is the identity functor.  $\square$

*Remark 4.6.5.* Note that in the process of proof of Proposition 4.6.4, we have shown that for a Verdier-compatible algebraic stack, the equivalence (4.24) equals

$$(4.26) \quad \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})^\vee \xrightarrow{(4.11)} \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})_{\mathrm{co}} \xrightarrow{\Omega_{\mathcal{Y}}} \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}).$$

In particular, the equivalence

$$(\mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})^c)^{\mathrm{op}} \simeq \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})^c.$$

induced by  $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathrm{Verdier}}$  equals  $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{Y}}$  from (4.16).

*Remark 4.6.6.* Let  $f : \mathcal{Y}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_2$  be a map between Verdier-compatible algebraic stacks. Recall the functor

$$f_\blacktriangle : \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_1) \rightarrow \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_2),$$

see Sect. 3.7.3.

It is not difficult to show that  $f_\blacktriangle$  is the ind-extension of the functor

$$\mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_1)^c \rightarrow \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_2)^c,$$

obtained by restriction from the *usual*  $f_*$ , defined to be the (a priori, non-colimit preserving) right adjoint of the functor  $f^*$ , see Remark 3.1.2.

Thus,  $f_\blacktriangle$  has the same meaning as in [GaVa, Sect. 1.2] and [AGKRRV2, Sect. A.2.3].

*Remark 4.6.7.* We note also that for a map  $f : \mathcal{Y}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_2$  between Verdier-compatible algebraic stacks, we have a natural transformation

$$(4.27) \quad f_\blacktriangle \rightarrow f_*.$$

Namely, (4.27) is obtained by adjunction from the natural transformation

$$(4.28) \quad f^* \circ f_\blacktriangle \rightarrow \mathrm{Id},$$

which in its turn described as follows:

For any  $(X, g) \in \mathrm{Sch}/\mathcal{Y}_1$ , the precomposition of (4.28) with  $g_*$  is the natural transformation

$$\begin{aligned} f^* \circ f_\blacktriangle \circ g_* &\xrightarrow{g \text{ is schematic}} f^* \circ f_\blacktriangle \circ g_\blacktriangle \simeq f^* \circ (f \circ g)_\blacktriangle \xrightarrow{f \circ g \text{ is schematic}} f^* \circ (f \circ g)_* \xrightarrow{\mathrm{unit}} \\ &\rightarrow g_* \circ g^* \circ f^* \circ (f \circ g)_* \simeq g_* \circ (f \circ g)^* \circ (f \circ g)_* \xrightarrow{\mathrm{counit}} g_*. \end{aligned}$$

4.6.8. We give the following definitions:

- $\mathcal{Y}$  is *universally Verdier-compatible* if  $\mathcal{Y} \times_B X$  is Verdier-compatible for every scheme  $X$ ;
- $\mathcal{Y}$  is *AG Verdier-compatible* if both  $\mathcal{Y}$  and  $\mathcal{Y} \times_B \mathcal{Y}$  are universally Verdier-compatible.

From Proposition 4.6.4 we obtain:

**Corollary 4.6.9.**

- $\mathcal{Y}$  is universally Verdier-compatible if and only if it is universally tame.
- $\mathcal{Y}$  is AG Verdier-compatible if and only if it is AG tame.

From Section 3.6.11, we obtain:

**Corollary 4.6.10.** *If  $\mathcal{Y}_1$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_2$  are AG Verdier compatible, then so is  $\mathcal{Y}_1 \times_B \mathcal{Y}_2$ .*

*Remark 4.6.11.* Let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be AG Verdier-compatible. It follows from Remark 4.6.5 and Corollary 4.4.5 that the counit of the self-duality (4.24) is given by formula (4.14).

However, one can show that this formula for the counit is valid for *any* Verdier compatible prestack, see [DrGa, Sect. 9].

## 5. COMPUTING TRACE IN AGCat

In this subsection we perform the trace calculation, deriving formula (0.7), and relate it to Grothendieck's sheaves-functions correspondence.

**5.1. The Grothendieck sheaves-functions correspondence.** In this subsection we let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be a Verdier-compatible algebraic stack over  $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_q$ , defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ .

5.1.1. Let

$$\text{Frob}_{\mathcal{Y}} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$$

denote the geometric Frobenius morphism. (We will simply write Frob if no confusion is likely to occur.)

Suppose that  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})^c \subset \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})^{\text{constr}}$  is an object equipped with a (weak) Weil structure, i.e. a map

$$\text{Frob}^*(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F},$$

or, equivalently, a map

$$\alpha : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \text{Frob}_*(\mathcal{F}).$$

Given this data, the sheaves-functions correspondence associates to  $\mathcal{F}$  a function

$$\text{funct}(\mathcal{F}, \alpha) \in \text{Funct}(\mathcal{Y}(\mathbb{F}_q), \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_{\ell})$$

on the set of  $\mathbb{F}_q$ -points of  $\mathcal{Y}$ .

Given a point

$$y \in \mathcal{Y}(\mathbb{F}_q),$$

the value of  $\text{funct}(\mathcal{F}, \alpha)$  at  $y$  is the trace of Frobenius acting on the  $*$ -stalk  $\mathcal{F}_y$ .

5.1.2. Let us rewrite the above construction in a more categorical language. First, we note:

**Lemma 5.1.3.** *There is a canonical isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{Frob}_* \simeq \mathrm{Frob}_\blacktriangle;$$

*in particular, the functor  $\mathrm{Frob}_*$  is a map in  $\mathrm{DGCat}$ .*

*Proof.* Recall that for a map between (Verdier-compatible) algebraic stacks we have a natural transformation

$$(-)_\blacktriangle \rightarrow (-)_*,$$

see (4.27). We claim that this map is an isomorphism for the geometric Frobenius map.

Recall that the two functors coincide on compact objects, while  $(-)_\blacktriangle$  preserves colimits. Hence, the natural transformation between them is an isomorphism if and only if  $(-)_*$  also preserves colimits.

We claim that this is the case for the Frobenius map. In fact, we claim that  $\mathrm{Frob}_*$  is an equivalence. Since  $\mathrm{Frob}_*$  is by definition the right adjoint of  $\mathrm{Frob}^*$ , it suffices to show that the latter is an equivalence.<sup>9</sup>

To prove this, it suffices to show that for any scheme  $X$  mapping to  $\mathcal{Y}$ , pullback with respect to the map

$$\mathrm{Frob}_{\mathcal{Y}/X} : X \underset{\mathcal{Y}, \mathrm{Frob}_\mathcal{Y}}{\times} \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow X$$

induces an equivalence on  $\mathrm{Shv}(-)$ .

Note that the map  $\mathrm{Frob}_X : X \rightarrow X$  factors as

$$X \rightarrow X \underset{\mathcal{Y}, \mathrm{Frob}}{\times} \mathcal{Y} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Frob}_{\mathcal{Y}/X}} X,$$

with the first arrow being radial, and hence pullback with respect to it is an equivalence.

This implies that  $\mathrm{Frob}_{\mathcal{Y}/X}^*$  is an equivalence by the 2-out-3 property, since  $\mathrm{Frob}_X^*$  is an equivalence. □

5.1.4. Thanks to Lemma 5.1.3, it makes sense to consider the object

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\mathrm{Frob}_*, \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})) \in \mathrm{Vect}.$$

Furthermore, the pair  $(\mathcal{F}, \alpha)$  defines a class

$$\mathrm{cl}(\mathcal{F}, \alpha) \in \mathrm{Tr}(\mathrm{Frob}_*, \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})),$$

see [GKRV, Sect. 3.4.3].

---

<sup>9</sup>Here is an alternative argument: we can write  $\mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})$  as the limit of  $\mathrm{Shv}(X)$  under  $*$ -pullbacks for schemes  $X$  mapping to  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Since for each  $\mathrm{Frob}_X^*$  is an equivalence, so is  $\mathrm{Frob}_\mathcal{Y}^*$ .

5.1.5. We claim that there is a natural map, called “naive local term”

$$(5.1) \quad \text{LT}^{\text{naive}} : \text{Tr}(\text{Frob}_*, \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})) \rightarrow \text{Funct}(\mathcal{Y}(\mathbb{F}_q), \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell)$$

that can be described as follows:

For every  $y \in \mathcal{Y}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ , let

$$i_y : \text{pt} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$$

denote the inclusion of  $y$ . Consider the functor

$$i_y^* : \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow \text{Shv}(\text{pt}) = \text{Vect}.$$

If  $y \in \mathcal{Y}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ , we have

$$(i_y)^* \circ \text{Frob}_* \simeq (i_y)^*.$$

Hence, by the functoriality of the categorical trace (see [GKRV, Sect. 3.4.1]), we obtain a map

$$\text{Tr}(\text{Frob}, i_y^*) : \text{Tr}(\text{Frob}_*, \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})) \rightarrow \text{Tr}(\text{Id}, \text{Vect}) \simeq \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell.$$

The map  $\text{LT}^{\text{naive}}$  is defined so that the composition

$$\text{Tr}(\text{Frob}_*, \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})) \rightarrow \text{Funct}(\mathcal{Y}(\mathbb{F}_q), \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell) \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_y} \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$$

is the above map  $\text{Tr}(\text{Frob}, i_y^*)$ .

Note, however, that the local term map (5.1) is typically *not* an isomorphism.

5.1.6. Unwinding, we obtain that

$$(5.2) \quad \text{funct}(\mathcal{F}, \alpha) = \text{LT}^{\text{naive}}(\text{cl}(\mathcal{F}, \alpha)).$$

5.1.7. In this section we will show that the Grothendieck sheaves-functions correspondence and the local term map have natural interpretations via AGCat.

Specifically, we will show that

$$(5.3) \quad \text{Tr}(\text{Frob}_*, \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})) \simeq \text{Funct}(\mathcal{Y}(\mathbb{F}_q), \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell),$$

where the trace in the left-hand side is taking place in the symmetric monoidal 2-category AGCat and so is an object of

$$\text{Maps}_{\text{AGCat}}(\mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}}, \mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}}) \simeq \text{Vect}.$$

The isomorphism (5.3), which we will denote by  $\text{LT}^{\text{AG}}$ , “corrects” the failure of  $\text{LT}^{\text{naive}}$  to be an isomorphism. That said, the map  $\text{LT}^{\text{naive}}$  also has a natural interpretation via AGCat, see Theorem 5.5.5.

5.2. **Traces in AGCat.** In this subsection, we let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be an AG tame prestack.

5.2.1. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be an object of  $\text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y})$ . We can think of  $\mathcal{F}$  as a map

$$\mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}} \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow{\text{Corollary 3.5.10}} \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\text{AGCat}}(\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}), \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})),$$

i.e., an object in  $\text{Maps}_{\text{AGCat}}(\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}), \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}))$ , which we will denote by  $[\mathcal{F}]$ .

Since  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})$  is dualizable, it makes sense to consider

$$(5.4) \quad \text{Tr}([\mathcal{F}], \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})) \in \text{Maps}_{\text{AGCat}}(\mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}}, \mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}}) \simeq \text{Vect}.$$

5.2.2. We claim:

**Proposition 5.2.3.** *The object (5.4) identifies canonically with*

$$C_{\Delta}^*(\mathcal{Y}, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}}^!(\mathcal{F})).$$

In the above formula and elsewhere,

$$C_{\Delta}^*(\mathcal{Y}, -) := (p_{\mathcal{Y}})_{\Delta}.$$

*Proof of Proposition 5.2.3.* By definition,  $\text{Tr}([\mathcal{F}], \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}))$  is the composition

$$\mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}} \xrightarrow{\text{unit}} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes [\mathcal{F}]} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow{\text{counit}} \mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}}.$$

Using Corollary 3.4.10, we identify

$$(5.5) \quad \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \simeq \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}),$$

and by definition, under this identification, the composition

$$\mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}} \xrightarrow{\text{unit}} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes [\mathcal{F}]} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \simeq \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}),$$

viewed as an object of

$$\text{Maps}(\mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}}, \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y})) \simeq \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y})(\text{pt}) \simeq \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}),$$

equals  $\mathcal{F}$ .

Thus, it suffices to show that the map

$$\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow{(5.5)} \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow{\text{counit}} \mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}},$$

evaluated on pt equals the map

$$\text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow{\Delta_{\mathcal{Y}}^!} \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow{C_{\Delta}^*(\mathcal{Y}, -)} \text{Vect}.$$

However, this is implied by Corollary 3.7.10. □

5.2.4. We will denote the isomorphism established in the above proposition by

$$\text{LT}^{\text{AG}} : \text{Tr}([\mathcal{F}], \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})) \simeq C_{\Delta}^*(\mathcal{Y}, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}}^!(\mathcal{F})).$$

5.2.5. We now consider a particular case of the above situation:

Let

$$(5.6) \quad \mathcal{Y} \xleftarrow{c_l} \mathcal{Z} \xrightarrow{c_r} \mathcal{Y}$$

be a correspondence, where both  $\mathcal{Z}$  and

$$\text{Fix}(\mathcal{Z}) := \mathcal{Z} \underset{\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}}{\times} \mathcal{Y}$$

are also AG tame.

Consider the object

$$(c_l, c_r)_{\Delta}(\omega_{\mathcal{Z}}) \in \text{Shv}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}).$$

defines a morphism. Denote by

$$[\mathcal{Z}] := [(c_l, c_r)_{\Delta}(\omega_{\mathcal{Z}})]$$

the corresponding object in  $\text{Maps}_{\text{AGCat}}(\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}), \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}))$ .

5.2.6. As a special case of Proposition 5.2.3, and using Lemma 3.7.4, we obtain:

**Corollary 5.2.7.** *The object*

$$\mathrm{Tr}([\underline{Z}], \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})) \in \mathrm{Maps}_{\mathrm{AGCat}}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{AGCat}}, \mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{AGCat}}) \simeq \mathrm{Vect}$$

*identifies canonically with*

$$C_{\Delta}^*(\mathrm{Fix}(C), \omega_{\mathrm{Fix}(C)}).$$

### 5.3. Functoriality properties.

5.3.1. Let  $\mathcal{Y}_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  be AG tame prestacks and  $\mathcal{F}_i \in \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_i \times \mathcal{Y}_i)$ .

Let now  $\mathcal{H}$  be an object in  $\mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2)$ . Consider the corresponding map

$$[\mathcal{H}] : \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1) \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2).$$

Let us be given a map

$$\alpha : \mathcal{F}_1 \star \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \star \mathcal{F}_2$$

in  $\mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2)$ , where  $(-) \star (-)$  denote the usual convolution operation:

$$\mathcal{F}_{1,2} \in \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2), \mathcal{F}_{2,3} \in \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_2 \times \mathcal{Y}_3) \mapsto$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{1,2} \star \mathcal{F}_{2,3} := (p_1 \times p_3)_{\Delta}^*(\mathrm{id} \times \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_2} \times \mathrm{id})^!(\mathcal{F}_{1,2} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}_{2,3}).$$

5.3.2. Assume now that the 1-morphism  $[\mathcal{H}]$  admits a right adjoint in  $\mathrm{AGCat}$ . I.e., there exists  $\mathcal{H}^R \in \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_2 \times \mathcal{Y}_1)$ , equipped with the maps

$$\Delta_*(\omega_{\mathcal{Y}_1}) \xrightarrow{u} \mathcal{H} \star \mathcal{H}^R \text{ and } \mathcal{H}^R \star \mathcal{H} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{co}-u} \Delta_*(\omega_{\mathcal{Y}_2}),$$

satisfying the usual adjunction axioms.

In this case, by [GKRV, Sect. 3.3.4], the map  $\alpha$  induces a map

$$(5.7) \quad \mathrm{Tr}([\mathcal{F}_1], \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1)) \rightarrow \mathrm{Tr}([\mathcal{F}_2], \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2)).$$

5.3.3. On the other hand, we claim that the morphisms  $\alpha$ ,  $u$  and  $\mathrm{co}-u$  define a map

$$(5.8) \quad C_{\Delta}^*(\mathcal{Y}_1, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_1}^!(\mathcal{F}_1)) \rightarrow C_{\Delta}^*(\mathcal{Y}_2, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_2}^!(\mathcal{F}_2)).$$

Namely, (5.8) is the composition the following three morphisms:

(1) The map

$$C_{\Delta}^*(\mathcal{Y}_1, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_1}^!(\mathcal{F}_1)) \rightarrow C_{\Delta}^*(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2, {}' \Delta^!(\mathcal{F}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{H} \boxtimes \mathcal{H}^R)),$$

induced by  $u$ , where  $'\Delta$  is the morphism

$$\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2 \times \mathcal{Y}_2 \times \mathcal{Y}_1, \quad (y_1', y_1'', y_2) \mapsto (y_1', y_1'', y_1'', y_2, y_2, y_1');$$

(2) The map

$$C_{\Delta}^*(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2, {}' \Delta^!(\mathcal{F}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{H} \boxtimes \mathcal{H}^R)) \rightarrow C_{\Delta}^*(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2 \times \mathcal{Y}_2, {}'' \Delta^!(\mathcal{H} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}_2 \boxtimes \mathcal{H}^R)),$$

induced by  $\alpha$ , where  $''\Delta$  is the morphism

$$\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2 \times \mathcal{Y}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2 \times \mathcal{Y}_2 \times \mathcal{Y}_2 \times \mathcal{Y}_1, \quad (y_1, y_2', y_2'') \mapsto (y_1, y_2', y_2', y_2'', y_1');$$

(3) The map

$$C_{\Delta}^*(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2 \times \mathcal{Y}_2, {}'' \Delta^!(\mathcal{H} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}_2 \boxtimes \mathcal{H}^R)) \rightarrow C_{\Delta}^*(\mathcal{Y}_2, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_2}^!(\mathcal{F}_2)),$$

induced by  $\mathrm{co}-u$ .

5.3.4. Unwinding, we obtain:

**Lemma 5.3.5.** *The following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Tr}([\mathcal{F}_1], \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1)) & \xrightarrow{(5.7)} & \mathrm{Tr}([\mathcal{F}_2], \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2)) \\ \text{Proposition 5.2.3} \downarrow \sim & & \sim \downarrow \text{Proposition 5.2.3} \\ \mathrm{C}_\blacktriangle(\mathcal{Y}_1, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_1}^!(\mathcal{F}_1)) & \xrightarrow{(5.8)} & \mathrm{C}_\blacktriangle(\mathcal{Y}_2, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_2}^!(\mathcal{F}_2)). \end{array}$$

5.3.6. Here is a particular case of how Lemma 5.3.5 can be applied:

Let  $h : \mathcal{Y}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_2$  be a *proper* schematic map. Note that by Proposition 2.7.2, the corresponding 1-morphism

$$h_* : \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1) \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2)$$

admits a right adjoint, given by  $h^!$ .

Let us be given a map

$$\alpha : (\mathrm{id} \times f)_*(\mathcal{F}_1) \rightarrow (f \times \mathrm{id})^!(\mathcal{F}_2).$$

Note that we have a canonical map

$$(5.9) \quad \mathrm{C}_\blacktriangle(\mathcal{Y}_1, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_1}^!(\mathcal{F}_1)) \rightarrow \mathrm{C}_\blacktriangle(\mathcal{Y}_1, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_2}^!(\mathcal{F}_2))$$

defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{C}_\blacktriangle(\mathcal{Y}_1, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_1}^!(\mathcal{F}_1)) &\rightarrow \mathrm{C}_\blacktriangle(\mathcal{Y}_1, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_1}^! \circ (\mathrm{id} \times f)^! \circ (\mathrm{id} \times f)_*(\mathcal{F}_1)) = \\ &= \mathrm{C}_\blacktriangle(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathrm{Graph}_f^! \circ (\mathrm{id} \times f)_*(\mathcal{F}_1)) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathrm{C}_\blacktriangle(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathrm{Graph}_f^! \circ (f \times \mathrm{id})^!(\mathcal{F}_2)) \simeq \\ &\simeq \mathrm{C}_\blacktriangle(\mathcal{Y}_1, f^! \circ \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_2}^!(\mathcal{F}_2)) \simeq \mathrm{C}_\blacktriangle(\mathcal{Y}_2, f_* \circ f^! \circ \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_2}^!(\mathcal{F}_2)) \rightarrow \mathrm{C}_\blacktriangle(\mathcal{Y}_2, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_2}^!(\mathcal{F}_2)). \end{aligned}$$

We obtain:

**Corollary 5.3.7.** *Under the identification of Proposition 5.2.3, the morphism*

$$\mathrm{Tr}([\mathcal{F}_1], \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_1)) \rightarrow \mathrm{Tr}([\mathcal{F}_2], \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}_2))$$

*induced by  $f_*$  and  $\alpha$  corresponds to the map (5.9).*

5.3.8. We now consider another case of Lemma 5.3.5. Namely, given  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y})$ , we will explain a geometric procedure that produces elements in

$$\mathrm{Tr}([\mathcal{F}], \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})) \simeq \mathrm{C}_\blacktriangle(\mathcal{Y}, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}}^!(\mathcal{F})).$$

5.3.9. Let  $\mathcal{G} \in \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})$  be a compact object. We claim that the resulting 1-morphism

$$[\mathcal{G}] : \mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{AGCat}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})$$

admits a right adjoint, given by  $[\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{G})]$ , where  $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{Y}}$  is an in (4.16).

Indeed, this follows from Proposition 2.7.2, using the fact that for

$$X \in \mathrm{Sch}, \quad \mathcal{G}' \in \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y} \times X) \text{ and } \mathcal{G}_X \in \mathrm{Shv}(X),$$

we have

$$\mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}_{\mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y} \times X)}(\mathcal{G} \boxtimes \mathcal{G}_X, \mathcal{G}') \simeq \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}_{\mathrm{Shv}(X)}\left(\mathcal{G}_X, (p_2)_\blacktriangle(p_1^!(\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{G})) \overset{!}{\otimes} \mathcal{G}')\right),$$

where  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  are the two projections from  $\mathcal{Y} \times X$  to  $\mathcal{Y}$  and  $X$ , respectively.

Indeed, we can assume that  $\mathcal{G}_X$  is compact, and both sides in the above formula identify with

$$C_\blacktriangleleft(\mathcal{Y} \times X, (\mathbb{D}_Y(\mathcal{G}) \boxtimes \mathbb{D}_X(\mathcal{G}_X)) \overset{!}{\otimes} \mathcal{G}') \xrightarrow{(4.17)} C_\blacktriangleleft(\mathcal{Y} \times X, \mathbb{D}_{Y \times X}(\mathcal{G} \boxtimes \mathcal{G}_X) \overset{!}{\otimes} \mathcal{G}').$$

5.3.10. Let us now be given a map

$$\alpha : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow [\mathcal{F}](\mathcal{G}) \simeq \mathcal{G} \star \mathcal{F}.$$

By Sect. 5.3.2, to this data, we associate a map

$$\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell \rightarrow \text{Tr}([\mathcal{F}], \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})),$$

i.e., an element of  $\text{Tr}([\mathcal{F}], \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y}))$ , which we will denote by

$$\text{cl}([\mathcal{G}], \alpha) \in \text{Tr}([\mathcal{F}], \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})).$$

5.3.11. Let us compute this element in terms of the identification of Proposition 5.2.3. From Lemma 5.3.5, we obtain that this element is the image of the canonical element

$$u \in C_\blacktriangleleft(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{G} \overset{!}{\otimes} \mathbb{D}_Y(\mathcal{G}))$$

(the unit of the adjunction) under the map

$$C_\blacktriangleleft(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{G} \overset{!}{\otimes} \mathbb{D}_Y(\mathcal{G})) \simeq C_\blacktriangleleft(\mathcal{Y}, \Delta_Y^!(\mathcal{G} \boxtimes \mathbb{D}_Y(\mathcal{G}))) \rightarrow C_\blacktriangleleft(\mathcal{Y}, \Delta_Y^!(\mathcal{F})),$$

induced by a map

$$\mathcal{G} \boxtimes \mathbb{D}_Y(\mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F},$$

obtained in the following three steps:

(1) We start with the counit of the adjunction, i.e., a map

$$\text{co-}u : \mathcal{G} \boxtimes \mathbb{D}_Y(\mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \Delta_*(\omega_Y);$$

(2) We apply to it  $[\mathcal{F}]$  along the first factor and thus obtain a map

$$[\mathcal{F}](\mathcal{G}) \boxtimes \mathbb{D}_Y(\mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F};$$

(3) We precompose the latter map with

$$\mathcal{G} \boxtimes \mathbb{D}_Y(\mathcal{G}) \xrightarrow{\alpha \boxtimes \text{id}} [\mathcal{F}](\mathcal{G}) \boxtimes \mathbb{D}_Y(\mathcal{G}).$$

5.4. **Comparing traces in AGCat and DGCat.** In this subsection we continue to assume that  $\mathcal{Y}$  be an AG tame prestack, and we let  $\mathcal{F}$  be an object in  $\text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y})$ .

5.4.1. We now consider the induced action of  $[\mathcal{F}]$  on  $\mathbf{e}(\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})) \simeq \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})$ ; denote the corresponding endofunctor  $[\mathcal{F}]$ . Explicitly, it is given by

$$[\mathcal{F}](\mathcal{F}_1) := \mathcal{F}_1 \mapsto (p_2)_\blacktriangleleft(p_1^!(\mathcal{F}_1) \overset{!}{\otimes} \mathcal{F}).$$

We will now recall, following [GaVa], the construction of a map

$$(5.10) \quad \text{LT}^{\text{true}} : \text{Tr}([\mathcal{F}], \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})) \rightarrow C_\blacktriangleleft(\mathcal{Y}, \Delta_Y^!(\mathcal{F})).$$

5.4.2. Consider the object

$$([\mathcal{F}] \otimes \text{Id})(\text{unity}_{\mathcal{Y}}) \in \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}),$$

where  $\text{unity}_{\mathcal{Y}} \in \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})$  is the unit of the self-duality.

We claim:

**Lemma 5.4.3.** *There is a canonical isomorphism*

$$([\mathcal{F}] \otimes \text{Id})(\text{unity}_{\mathcal{Y}}) \simeq (\boxtimes^R)(\mathcal{F}),$$

where  $\boxtimes^R$  is the right adjoint to

$$\text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}).$$

*Proof.* The assertion of the lemma can be reformulated as follows: for  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y})$ , the object

$$[\mathcal{F}] \in \text{Funct}(\text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}), \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})) \simeq \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})^\vee \otimes \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}) \simeq \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})$$

is given by  $\boxtimes^R(\mathcal{F})$ .

In fact, this is true for  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2)$  and  $[\mathcal{F}] \in \text{Funct}(\text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_1), \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_2))$ . This is [GaVa, Lemma 4.5 and footnote 4], which we reproduce here for completeness.

It suffices to show that for  $\mathcal{F}_1 \in \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_1)^c$  and  $\mathcal{F}_2 \in \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_2)^c$ ,

$$(5.11) \quad \mathcal{H}\text{om}_{\text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_1) \otimes \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_2)}(\mathcal{F}_1 \otimes \mathcal{F}_2, [\mathcal{F}]) \simeq \mathcal{H}\text{om}_{\text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2)}(\mathcal{F}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{F}).$$

Unwinding, we obtain that the left-hand side in (5.11) is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}\text{om}_{\text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_1)}(\mathcal{F}_1, [\mathcal{F}](\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{Y}_2}(\mathcal{F}_2))) &\simeq \mathcal{H}\text{om}_{\text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}_1)}\left(\mathcal{F}_1, (p_1)_\blacktriangle(\mathcal{F} \overset{!}{\otimes} p_2^!(\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{Y}_2}(\mathcal{F}_2)))\right) \simeq \\ &\simeq C_\blacktriangle\left(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{Y}_1}(\mathcal{F}_1) \overset{!}{\otimes} (p_1)_\blacktriangle(\mathcal{F} \overset{!}{\otimes} p_2^!(\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{Y}_2}(\mathcal{F}_2)))\right) \simeq C_\blacktriangle\left(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2, \mathcal{F} \overset{!}{\otimes} (\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{Y}_1}(\mathcal{F}_1) \boxtimes \mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{Y}_2}(\mathcal{F}_2))\right) \simeq \\ &\overset{(4.17)}{\simeq} C_\blacktriangle\left(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2, \mathcal{F} \overset{!}{\otimes} \mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2}(\mathcal{F}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{F}_2)\right), \end{aligned}$$

which identifies with the right-hand side of (5.11), as desired.  $\square$

5.4.4. From Lemma 5.4.3 we obtain a canonical map

$$(5.12) \quad \boxtimes(([\mathcal{F}] \otimes \text{Id})(\text{unity}_{\mathcal{Y}})) \simeq \boxtimes(\boxtimes^R(\mathcal{F})) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$$

By definition,

$$\text{Tr}([\mathcal{F}], \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})) = \text{counity}_{\mathcal{Y}}(([\mathcal{F}] \otimes \text{Id})(\text{unity}_{\mathcal{Y}})).$$

By Remark 4.6.11, we obtain that

$$\text{Tr}([\mathcal{F}], \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})) \simeq C_\blacktriangle(\mathcal{Y}, \Delta_\mathcal{Y}^!(\boxtimes(([\mathcal{F}] \otimes \text{Id})(\text{unity}_{\mathcal{Y}})))).$$

Composing with (5.12) we obtain the desired map  $\text{LT}^{\text{true}}$  in (5.10).

5.4.5. Let  $\underline{\mathbf{C}} \in \text{AGCat}$  be a dualizable object; in particular, by Corollary 4.4.3,  $\mathbf{e}(\underline{\mathbf{C}}) \in \text{DGCat}$  is also dualizable. Since the functor

$$\mathbf{i} : \text{DGCat} \rightarrow \text{AGCat}$$

is symmetric monoidal, we have a map of dualizable objects

$$\mathbf{i} \circ \mathbf{e}(\underline{\mathbf{C}}) \rightarrow \underline{\mathbf{C}}.$$

By Section 4.5.3, this 1-morphism admits a right adjoint. Hence, by [GKRV, Sect. 3.4.3] for an endomorphism  $\alpha$  of  $\underline{\mathbf{C}}$ , we obtain a map

$$(5.13) \quad \text{Tr}(\mathbf{i} \circ \mathbf{e}(\alpha), \mathbf{i} \circ \mathbf{e}(\underline{\mathbf{C}})) \rightarrow \text{Tr}(\alpha, \underline{\mathbf{C}})$$

in the category  $\text{Maps}_{\text{AGCat}}(\mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}}, \mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}})$ .

5.4.6. In addition, since  $\mathbf{i}$  is symmetric monoidal, we have

$$\text{Tr}(\mathbf{i} \circ \mathbf{e}(\alpha), \mathbf{i} \circ \mathbf{e}(\underline{\mathbf{C}})) \simeq \mathbf{i}(\text{Tr}(\mathbf{e}(\alpha), \mathbf{e}(\underline{\mathbf{C}}))),$$

where:

- $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{e}(\alpha), \mathbf{e}(\underline{\mathbf{C}})) \in \text{Maps}_{\text{DGCat}}(\mathbb{1}_{\text{DGCat}}, \mathbb{1}_{\text{DGCat}}) \simeq \text{Vect}$ ;
- The symbol  $\mathbf{i}$  in the right-hand side indicates the functor

$$\text{Vect} \simeq \text{Maps}_{\text{DGCat}}(\mathbb{1}_{\text{DGCat}}, \mathbb{1}_{\text{DGCat}}) \rightarrow \text{Maps}_{\text{AGCat}}(\mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}}, \mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}}) \simeq \text{Vect},$$

induced by  $\mathbf{i}$ , which is (homotopic to) the identity.

5.4.7. Summarizing, we obtain a map

$$(5.14) \quad \text{Tr}(\mathbf{e}(\alpha), \mathbf{e}(\underline{\mathbf{C}})) \rightarrow \text{Tr}(\alpha, \underline{\mathbf{C}})$$

in  $\text{Vect}$ .

5.4.8. We apply the above discussion to  $\underline{\mathbf{C}} = \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})$  and  $\alpha = [\mathcal{F}]$ , so that  $\mathbf{e}(\alpha) = [\mathcal{F}]$ . Thus, (5.14) yields a map

$$(5.15) \quad \text{Tr}([\mathcal{F}], \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})) \rightarrow \text{Tr}([\mathcal{F}], \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})).$$

5.4.9. Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a compact object of  $\text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})$  equipped with a map

$$\alpha : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow [\mathcal{F}](\mathcal{G}).$$

By Sect. 5.3.10, to this data we assign an element

$$\text{cl}([\mathcal{G}], \alpha) \in \text{Tr}([\mathcal{F}], \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})).$$

In addition, we can consider

$$\text{cl}([\mathcal{G}], \alpha) \in \text{Tr}([\mathcal{F}], \text{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})).$$

From the functoriality of the natural transformation (5.14), we obtain:

**Lemma 5.4.10.** *The image image of  $\text{cl}([\mathcal{G}], \alpha)$  under (5.15) equals  $\text{cl}([\mathcal{G}], \alpha)$ .*

5.4.11. We are going to prove:

**Theorem 5.4.12.** *The map*

$$\mathrm{Tr}([\mathcal{F}], \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})) \xrightarrow{(5.15)} \mathrm{Tr}([\mathcal{F}], \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{LT}^{\mathrm{AG}}} \mathrm{C}_{\blacktriangle}(\mathcal{Y}, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}}^!(\mathcal{F}))$$

equals the above map  $\mathrm{LT}^{\mathrm{true}}$ .

*Proof.* We first consider the case when  $\mathcal{F}$  belongs to the full subcategory

$$\mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}) \subset \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}).$$

In this case, the assertion of the theorem is obtained by unraveling the definitions (and the maps  $\mathrm{LT}^{\mathrm{true}}$  and (5.15) are isomorphisms).

Next we note that for a morphism  $\alpha : \mathcal{F}' \rightarrow \mathcal{F}''$  in  $\mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y})$ , we have the commutative diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Tr}([\mathcal{F}'], \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})) & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{LT}^{\mathrm{true}}} & \mathrm{C}_{\blacktriangle}(\mathcal{Y}, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}}^!(\mathcal{F}')) \\ \alpha \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha \\ \mathrm{Tr}([\mathcal{F}''], \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})) & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{LT}^{\mathrm{true}}} & \mathrm{C}_{\blacktriangle}(\mathcal{Y}, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}}^!(\mathcal{F}'')) \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Tr}([\mathcal{F}'], \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})) & \xrightarrow{(5.15)} & \mathrm{Tr}([\mathcal{F}'], \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{LT}^{\mathrm{AG}}} \mathrm{C}_{\blacktriangle}(\mathcal{Y}, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}}^!(\mathcal{F}')) \\ \alpha \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha \\ \mathrm{Tr}([\mathcal{F}''], \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})) & \xrightarrow{(5.15)} & \mathrm{Tr}([\mathcal{F}''], \underline{\mathrm{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{LT}^{\mathrm{AG}}} \mathrm{C}_{\blacktriangle}(\mathcal{Y}, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}}^!(\mathcal{F}'')). \end{array}$$

Hence, if the assertion of the theorem holds for  $\mathcal{F}'$  and the map

$$\mathrm{Tr}([\mathcal{F}'], \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathrm{Tr}([\mathcal{F}''], \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}))$$

is an isomorphism, then it also holds for  $\mathcal{F}''$ .

Finally, we note that for  $\mathcal{F}'' := \mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{F}' := \boxtimes(\boxtimes^R(\mathcal{F}))$ , we have

$$\mathcal{F}' \in \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y}) \subset \mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}),$$

and by Lemma 5.4.3, the counit map

$$\boxtimes(\boxtimes^R(\mathcal{F})) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$$

induces an isomorphism

$$[\boxtimes(\boxtimes^R(\mathcal{F}))] \rightarrow [\mathcal{F}]$$

(as endofunctors of  $\mathrm{Shv}(\mathcal{Y})$ ), and hence also an isomorphism of traces.  $\square$

**5.5. The Frobenius correspondence.** In this subsection we let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be an algebraic stack over  $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_q$ , defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . We will assume that  $\mathcal{Y}$  is AG Verdier compatible (and hence AG tame).

5.5.1. Note that since  $\mathcal{Y}$  was assumed to be an algebraic stack, the stack  $\mathcal{Y}^{\mathrm{Frob}}$  is *algebro-geometrically discrete*, i.e., it is isomorphic to the groupoid  $\mathcal{Y}(\mathbb{F}_q)$  with the trivial algebro-geometric structure (see [GaVa, Lemma 6.4]).

In particular,

$$\mathrm{C}_{\blacktriangle}(\mathcal{Y}^{\mathrm{Frob}}, \omega_{\mathcal{Y}^{\mathrm{Frob}}}) \simeq \mathrm{Funct}(\mathcal{Y}(\mathbb{F}_q), \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_{\ell}).$$

5.5.2. Taking (5.6) to be

$$\mathcal{Y} \xleftarrow{\text{id}} \mathcal{Y} \xrightarrow{\text{Frob}} \mathcal{Y},$$

from Corollary 5.2.7, we obtain:

**Corollary 5.5.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be an AG Verdier-compatible algebraic stack defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . Then*

$$\text{Tr}(\text{Frob}_\Delta; \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})) \simeq \text{Funct}(\mathcal{Y}(\mathbb{F}_q), \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell).$$

5.5.4. Consider the composition

$$(5.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\text{Frob}_*, \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})) &\xrightarrow{\text{Lemma 5.1.3}} \text{Tr}(\text{Frob}_\Delta, \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})) \xrightarrow{(5.15)} \\ &\rightarrow \text{Tr}(\text{Frob}_\Delta, \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})) \xrightarrow{\text{Corollary 5.5.3}} \text{Funct}(\mathcal{Y}(\mathbb{F}_q), \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell). \end{aligned}$$

We claim:

**Theorem 5.5.5.** *The map (5.16) equals the map  $\text{LT}^{\text{naive}}$  of (5.1).*

*Proof.* By Theorem 5.4.12, the composition (5.16) equals  $\text{LT}^{\text{true}}$ . Now, in the particular case of the Frobenius correspondence,

$$\text{LT}^{\text{true}} = \text{LT}^{\text{naive}},$$

by one of the main results of [GaVa], see Theorem 0.8 in *loc. cit.*

□

5.5.6. Let now  $\mathcal{F}$  be an object in  $\underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})$ . We can view  $\mathcal{F}$  as a morphism

$$[\mathcal{F}] : \mathbb{1}_{\text{AGCat}} \rightarrow \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})$$

in  $\text{AGCat}$ . Note that if  $\mathcal{F}$  is compact, then  $[\mathcal{F}]$  admits a right adjoint, see Sect. 5.3.9.

Moreover, let  $\mathcal{F}$  be equipped with a weak Weil structure, i.e., a morphism

$$\alpha : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \text{Frob}_*(\mathcal{F}) \simeq \text{Frob}_\Delta(\mathcal{F}).$$

Then by Sect. 5.3.10, to this data we attach an element

$$\text{cl}([\mathcal{F}], \alpha) \in \text{Tr}(\text{Frob}_\Delta, \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})).$$

From Theorem 5.5.5, Lemma 5.4.10 and (5.2), we obtain:

**Corollary 5.5.7.** *The image of  $\text{cl}([\mathcal{F}], \alpha)$  under*

$$\text{Tr}(\text{Frob}_\Delta, \underline{\text{Shv}}(\mathcal{Y})) \xrightarrow{\text{Corollary 5.5.3}} \text{Funct}(\mathcal{Y}(\mathbb{F}_q), \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell)$$

*equals  $\text{funct}(\mathcal{F}, \alpha)$ .*

## APPENDIX A. RECOLLECTIONS ON ENRICHED CATEGORIES

This is a summary of the relevant parts of the theory of enriched  $\infty$ -categories developed in [GeHa, He, Hi1, Hi2].

### A.1. The basics.

A.1.1. Recall that one of the (most convenient) frameworks for talking about  $\infty$ -categories is via Segal spaces (see [GR1, Chapter 10, Sect. 1] for a review). In this approach, an  $\infty$ -category  $\mathcal{C}$  is encoded by a space  $\mathcal{C}^{\text{grp}d}$  of objects of  $\mathbf{C}$  and a functor

$$\mathcal{C}^{\text{grp}d} \times \mathcal{C}^{\text{grp}d} \rightarrow \text{Spc}, \quad (c_1, c_2) \mapsto \text{Maps}_{\mathcal{C}}(c_1, c_2),$$

equipped with a multiplicative structure.

By contrast, when discussing enriched categories, it is often convenient to parameterize its objects by another space.

A.1.2. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a monoidal category and  $\mathcal{S}$  a space. To this pair, one associates the notion of  $\mathcal{S}$ -flagged  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched category, see [GeHa, Sect. 2.4].

An  $\mathcal{S}$ -flagged  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched category  $\mathcal{C}$  consists of a functor

$$(A.1) \quad \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}, \quad (s_1, s_2) \mapsto \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(s_1, s_2), \quad s_1, s_2 \in \mathcal{S},$$

endowed with a multiplicative structure

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(s_2, s_3) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(s_1, s_2) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(s_1, s_3),$$

equipped with a homotopy-coherent data of associativity.

A.1.3. *Example.* One can take  $\mathcal{S} = \{*\}$  and  $\text{Hom}^{\mathcal{A}}(\{*\}, \{*\})$  to be any algebra object  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ .

A.1.4. The totality of  $\mathcal{S}$ -flagged  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched categories forms a category, denoted  $\text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{S})$ . Furthermore, we can form the “total space”  $\text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}(\text{Spc})$ , equipped with a Cartesian fibration

$$(A.2) \quad \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}(\text{Spc}) \rightarrow \text{Spc}.$$

A.1.5. Let  $F : \mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_2$  be a *right-lax* monoidal functor. Given  $(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{C}_1) \in \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}_1}(\text{Spc})$  and  $(\mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{C}_2) \in \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}_2}(\text{Spc})$ , there is a natural notion of functor

$$(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{C}_1) \rightarrow (\mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{C}_2)$$

compatible with  $F$ . The collections of such functors forms a functor

$$(A.3) \quad (\text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}_1}(\text{Spc}))^{\text{op}} \times \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}_2}(\text{Spc}) \rightarrow \text{Spc}.$$

Keeping  $(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{C}_1)$  fixed and making  $(\mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{C}_2)$  variable, the functor (A.3) is corepresentable by an object, denoted

$$\mathbf{ind}_{\mathcal{A}_1}^{\mathcal{A}_2}(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{C}_1) \in \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}_2}(\text{Spc}).$$

The assignment

$$(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{C}_1) \mapsto \mathbf{ind}_{\mathcal{A}_1}^{\mathcal{A}_2}$$

is a functor

$$(A.4) \quad \mathbf{ind}_{\mathcal{A}_1}^{\mathcal{A}_2} : \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}_1}(\text{Spc}) \rightarrow \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}_2}(\text{Spc}).$$

The object  $\mathbf{ind}_{\mathcal{A}_1}^{\mathcal{A}_2}(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{C}_1) =: (\mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{C}_2)$  can be described as follows:  $\mathcal{S}_2 = \mathcal{S}_1 =: \mathcal{S}$  and for  $s', s'' \in \mathcal{S}$ ,

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}_2}^{\mathcal{A}_2}(s', s'') := F(\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}_1}^{\mathcal{A}_1}(s', s'')).$$

The composition rule is induced by one on  $\mathcal{C}_1$  using the right-lax monoidal structure on  $F$ .

A.1.6. Take  $\mathcal{A} = \text{Spc}$  equipped with the Cartesian monoidal structure. We have a fully faithful functor

$$t : \text{Cat} \rightarrow \text{Cat}^{\text{Spc}}(\text{Spc})$$

that sends a category  $\mathcal{C}$  to the space  $\mathcal{S} := \mathcal{C}^{\text{grpd}}$  and

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}}^{\text{Spc}}(c_1, c_2) := \text{Maps}_{\mathcal{C}}(c_1, c_2).$$

The functor  $t$  admits a left adjoint, to be denoted  $t^L$ . Thus, we can view  $\text{Cat}$  as a localization of  $t^L$ .

*Remark A.1.7.* One can give an explicit description of the arrows in  $\text{Cat}^{\text{Spc}}(\text{Spc})$  that get sent to isomorphisms by  $t^L$ :

Note that to an object  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C})$  one can naturally attach the *set*  $\pi_0(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C})$ : the quotient of  $\pi_0(\mathcal{S})$  by the equivalence relation generated by  $\pi_0(\mathcal{C})$ .

A morphism  $(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{C}_1) \rightarrow (\mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{C}_2)$  becomes an isomorphism under  $t^L$  if and only if:

- It is Cartesian with respect to  $\text{Cat}^{\text{Spc}}(\text{Spc}) \rightarrow \text{Spc}$ ;
- The induced map  $\pi_0(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{C}_1) \rightarrow \pi_0(\mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{C}_2)$  is a surjection.

A.1.8. Consider the (right-lax) monoidal functor

$$\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{Spc}, \quad a \mapsto \text{Maps}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}, a).$$

Applying the corresponding functor  $\text{ind}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{Spc}}$ , we obtain a functor

$$\text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}(\text{Spc}) \rightarrow \text{Cat}^{\text{Spc}}(\text{Spc}),$$

which we denote by  $\text{oblv}_{\mathcal{A}\text{-Enr}}$  (or simply  $\text{oblv}_{\text{Enr}}$  if the choice of  $\mathcal{A}$  is clear).

A.1.9. A morphism in  $\text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}(\text{Spc})$  is called an *enriched equivalence* if:

- It is Cartesian with respect to (A.2);
- Its image under

$$\text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}(\text{Spc}) \xrightarrow{\text{oblv}_{\mathcal{A}\text{-Enr}}} \text{Cat}^{\text{Spc}}(\text{Spc}) \xrightarrow{t^L} \text{Cat}$$

is an isomorphism.

We define  $\text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}$  to be the localization of  $\text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}(\text{Spc})$  obtained by inverting enriched equivalences.

Note that by definition

$$\text{Cat}^{\text{Spc}} \simeq \text{Cat}.$$

A.1.10. Let us be in the setting of Sect. A.1.5. One shows that the functor (A.4) induces a functor on the corresponding localizations:

$$(A.5) \quad \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}_1} \rightarrow \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}_2},$$

which we denote by the same character  $\text{ind}_{\mathcal{A}_1}^{\mathcal{A}_2}$ .

A.1.11. *The underlying category.* In particular, applying this to the situation in Sect. A.1.8, we obtain a functor

$$\mathrm{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathrm{Cat}^{\mathrm{Spc}} \simeq \mathrm{Cat},$$

which we denote by  $\mathbf{oblv}_{\mathcal{A}\text{-Enr}}$  (or simply  $\mathbf{oblv}_{\mathrm{Enr}}$  if the choice of  $\mathcal{A}$  is clear).

For  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathrm{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}$ , we will refer to  $\mathbf{oblv}_{\mathcal{A}\text{-Enr}}(\mathcal{C})$  as the *underlying category*.

A.1.12. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an object of  $\mathrm{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{S})$ . Unwinding, we obtain that there is a naturally defined map

$$(A.6) \quad \mathcal{S} \rightarrow (\mathbf{oblv}_{\mathrm{Enr}}(\mathcal{C}))^{\mathrm{grp}d}.$$

Note, however, that this map is *not necessarily* an equivalence. For example, in the example of Sect. A.1.3,

$$(\mathbf{oblv}_{\mathrm{Enr}}(\mathcal{C}))^{\mathrm{grp}d} = B(\mathrm{Maps}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}, A)^{\times}),$$

where:

- $\mathrm{Maps}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}, A)$  is viewed as a monoid in  $\mathrm{Spc}$ ;
- $(-)^{\times}$  denotes the group of invertible points in a given monoid;
- $B(-)$  denotes the classifying space of a given group.

Note also that the functor  $\mathbf{ind}_{\mathcal{A}_1}^{\mathcal{A}_2}$  changes the underlying groupoid of the underlying category, which is one of the reasons to consider flaggings.

A.1.13. That said, there is a canonical fully faithful embedding

$$(A.7) \quad \mathrm{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathrm{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathrm{Spc}),$$

whose essential image consists of those pairs  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C})$  for which the map (A.6) is an isomorphism.

In other words, the functor (A.7) sends  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathrm{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}$  to its canonical flagging by  $(\mathbf{oblv}_{\mathrm{Enr}}(\mathcal{C}))^{\mathrm{grp}d}$ .

Thus, in particular, we have a well-defined functor

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{grp}d} \times \mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{grp}d} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}, \quad (c_1, c_2) \mapsto \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c_1, c_2) \in \mathcal{A}.$$

A.1.14. The above procedure defines  $\mathrm{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}$  as an  $(\infty, 1)$ -category, in particular, for  $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2 \in \mathrm{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}$  we obtain the *space*

$$\mathrm{Maps}_{\mathrm{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2)$$

of  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched functors  $\mathcal{C}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_2$ .

Now, there is also a naturally defined notion of *natural transformation* between  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched functors, which upgrades  $\mathrm{Maps}_{\mathrm{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2)$  to an  $(\infty, 1)$ -category

$$\mathrm{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2), \quad \mathrm{Maps}_{\mathrm{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2) \simeq \left( \mathrm{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2) \right)^{\mathrm{grp}d}.$$

Furthermore, the assignment

$$\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2 \mapsto \mathrm{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2)$$

extends to a structure of  $(\infty, 2)$ -category on  $\mathrm{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}$ , in the sense of [GR1, Chapter 10, Sect. 2].

In addition, for  $F : \mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_2$ , the functor  $\mathbf{ind}_{\mathcal{A}_1}^{\mathcal{A}_2}$  extends to a functor of  $(\infty, 2)$ -categories

$$\mathrm{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}_1} \rightarrow \mathrm{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}_2}.$$

**A.2. A set-theoretic digression.** In this subsection, we explain the approach adopted in this paper for dealing with set-theoretic issues.

A.2.1. Given a cardinal  $\mu$ , we shall say that a category is of size  $< \mu$  if in Joyal's model of quasi-categories, it can be represented by a simplicial set of cardinality  $< \mu$ , see [Lu1, Sect. 5.4.1].

We let  $\text{Cat}_{<\mu}$  the category of categories of size  $< \mu$ .

A.2.2. We fix a sequence of inaccessible cardinals

$$\lambda_0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2.$$

In particular, for  $i = 0, 1$ , categories generated under  $\lambda_i$ -small colimits by subcategories of size  $< \lambda_i$  are of size  $< \lambda_{i+1}$ .

A.2.3. By the definition of inaccessibility, we have:

- The category  $\text{Sch}$  of schemes of finite type over the ground field  $k$  is of size  $< \lambda_0$ ;
- For  $X \in \text{Sch}$ , the category  $\text{Shv}(X)^{\text{constr}}$  (of *constructible*  $\ell$ -adic sheaves on  $X$ ) is of size  $< \lambda_0$ .

We will refer to categories of size  $< \lambda_0$  (resp.,  $< \lambda_1$ ,  $< \lambda_2$ ) as *small* (resp., *large*, *huge*).

Note that the category  $\text{Cat}_{\text{small}}$  of small categories is itself large, while the category  $\text{Cat}_{\text{large}}$  of large categories is huge.

A.2.4. Recall, following [Lu1, Sect. 5.5] (see also [Lu2, Sect. 5.3.2]), that given a regular cardinal  $\kappa < \lambda_0$ , a category is said to be  $\kappa$ -presentable if it contains small colimits, and is generated under small  $\kappa$ -filtered colimits by a *small* subcategory of  $\kappa$ -compact objects.

Note that a  $\kappa$ -presentable category is automatically (not more than) large.

A.2.5. We let  $\text{Cat}_\kappa^{\text{pres}}$  denote the category, whose objets are  $\kappa$ -presentable categories, and whose morphisms are functors that commute with all colimits and preserve  $\kappa$ -compact objects.

Note that  $\text{Cat}_\kappa^{\text{pres}}$  itself is  $\kappa$ -presentable; in particular, it is (not more than) large.

We will regard  $\text{Cat}_\kappa^{\text{pres}}$  as a symmetric monoidal category with respect to the Lurie tensor product.

A.2.6. Note that for  $\kappa < \kappa'$ , the inclusion

$$\text{Cat}_\kappa^{\text{pres}} \rightarrow \text{Cat}_{\kappa'}^{\text{pres}}$$

is symmetric monoidal and preserves all small colimits and limits of size  $< \kappa$ .

A.2.7. We let  $\text{Cat}^{\text{pres}}$  denote the category, whose objects are  $\kappa$ -presentable categories for some  $\kappa < \lambda_0$ , and whose morphisms are functors that preserve  $\lambda_0$ -small colimits.

We have

$$\text{Cat}^{\text{pres}} \simeq \underset{\kappa < \lambda_0}{\text{colim}} \text{Cat}_\kappa^{\text{pres}},$$

where the colimit is taken in  $\text{Cat}_{\text{large}}$ .

We will regard  $\text{Cat}^{\text{pres}}$  as a symmetric monoidal category with respect to the Lurie tensor product.

A.2.8. Repeating the contents of Sects. A.2.4-A.2.7, we obtain:

- The notion of  $\kappa$ -presentable DG category;
- The category  $\text{DGCat}_\kappa$  of  $\kappa$ -presentable DG categories, equipped with a symmetric monoidal structure;
- The large category

$$\text{DGCat} \simeq \underset{\kappa < \lambda_0}{\text{colim}} \text{DGCat}_\kappa,$$

where the colimit is taken in  $\text{Cat}_{\text{large}}$ .

A.2.9. The category  $\text{DGCat}$  is the natural category of DG categories with which one works.

### A.3. Module categories—a recap.

A.3.1. For  $\mathcal{S} \in \text{Spc}$  and  $\mathbf{C} \in \text{Cat}^{\text{pres}}$ , set

$$\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathbf{C} := \underset{\mathcal{S}}{\text{colim}} \mathbf{C}.$$

For a point  $s \in S$ , we have a natural insertion functor

$$\text{ins}_s : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{S} \otimes \mathbf{C},$$

which admits a colimit-preserving right adjoint, to be denoted  $\text{ev}_s$ .

The functors  $\text{ev}_s$  assemble to a colimit-preserving functor

$$(A.8) \quad \mathcal{S} \otimes \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \underset{\mathcal{S}^{\text{op}}}{\lim} \mathbf{C} \simeq \underset{\mathcal{S}}{\lim} \mathbf{C} \simeq \text{Funct}(\mathcal{S}, \mathbf{C}).$$

The following is a particular case of [GR1, Chapter 1, Proposition 2.5.7]:

**Lemma A.3.2.** *The functor (A.8) is an equivalence.*

**Corollary A.3.3.** *For an object  $\Phi \in \mathcal{S} \otimes \mathbf{C}$ , we have a canonical isomorphism*

$$\Phi \simeq \underset{s \in \mathcal{S}}{\text{colim}} \text{ins}_s \circ \text{ev}_s(\Phi).$$

A.3.4. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an algebra object in  $\text{Cat}^{\text{pres}}$  (see Sect. A.2.7). We let  $\mathcal{A}\text{-mod}$  denote the category of  $\mathcal{A}$ -modules in  $\text{Cat}^{\text{pres}}$ .

Given  $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{A}\text{-mod}$ , we denote by

$$\text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$$

the category of  $\mathcal{A}$ -linear functors.

A.3.5. Applying Sect. A.3.1 to  $\mathbf{C} = \mathcal{A}$ , we obtain the object

$$\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{A}\text{-mod},$$

and an isomorphism

$$(A.9) \quad \mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A} \simeq \text{Funct}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A})$$

in  $\mathcal{A}\text{-mod}$ .

A.3.6. For  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  denote  $\delta_s \in \mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A} \simeq \text{Funct}(S, \mathcal{A})$  the object

$$\text{ins}_s(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}).$$

From Corollary A.3.3, we obtain a canonical isomorphism

$$(A.10) \quad \Phi \simeq \underset{s \in \mathcal{S}}{\text{colim}} \Phi(s) \otimes \delta_s, \quad \Phi \in \text{Funct}(S, \mathcal{A}),$$

where  $(-) \otimes (-)$  stands for the action of  $\mathcal{A}$  on  $\text{Funct}(S, \mathcal{A})$ .

A.3.7. Recall that given an object  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{A}\text{-mod}$ , its dual (if it exists) is an object  $\mathcal{M}^{\vee} \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}\text{-mod}$  such that

$$\text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}) \simeq \underset{\mathcal{A}}{\mathcal{M}^{\vee} \otimes \mathcal{N}}, \quad \mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{A}\text{-mod}.$$

In this case we shall say that  $\mathcal{M}$  is dualizable<sup>10</sup>.

We claim that the object  $\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{A}\text{-mod}$  is dualizable with dual  $\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}$ . Indeed, for any  $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{A}\text{-mod}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{N}) &= \text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}(\underset{\mathcal{S}}{\text{colim}} \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{N}) \simeq \underset{\mathcal{S}}{\lim} \text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{N}) \simeq \\ &\simeq \underset{\mathcal{S}}{\lim} \mathcal{N} \stackrel{\text{Lemma A.3.2}}{\simeq} \underset{\mathcal{S}}{\text{colim}} \mathcal{N} \simeq \underset{\mathcal{A}}{\text{colim}} (\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{N}) \simeq (\underset{\mathcal{S}}{\text{colim}} \mathcal{A}) \otimes \mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}) \otimes \mathcal{N}, \end{aligned}$$

as required.

In particular, we obtain that for  $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2$  we have a canonical equivalence of categories.

$$(A.11) \quad \text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{S}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{S}_2 \otimes \mathcal{A}) \simeq \text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{S}_2 \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}, \mathcal{S}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}).$$

*Remark A.3.8.* Note, however, that when  $\mathcal{S}_1 = \mathcal{S}_2 = \mathcal{S}$ , both sides of (A.11) have natural monoidal structures, while (A.11) reverses them.

#### A.4. Enriched vs tensored.

A.4.1. In this subsection we let  $\mathcal{A}$  be as in Sect. A.3.4. We will distinguish two classes of  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched categories.

We will keep the notation  $\text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}$  for the category of  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched categories that can be flagged by a *small* space. We will denote by  $\text{Cat}_{\text{large}}^{\mathcal{A}}$  the category of  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched categories that can be flagged by a large space.

We have the obvious inclusion

$$\text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}} \subset \text{Cat}_{\text{large}}^{\mathcal{A}}.$$

---

<sup>10</sup>Here and elsewhere, for an algebra  $A$  in a symmetric monoidal category,  $A^{\text{rev}}$  denotes the algebra obtained by reversing the multiplication.

A.4.2. Since  $\mathcal{A}$  was assumed presentable, for  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{A}\text{-mod}$  and a pair of objects  $m_1, m_2 \in \mathcal{M}$ , we have a well-defined *internal-relative to  $\mathcal{A}$  Hom*

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}}(m_1, m_2) \in \mathcal{A}, \quad \text{Maps}_{\mathcal{A}}(v, \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}}(m_1, m_2)) := \text{Maps}_{\mathcal{M}}(v \otimes m_1, m_2).$$

This allows us to view  $\mathcal{M}$  as *enriched* over  $\mathcal{A}$ :

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathcal{A}}(m_1, m_2) := \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}}(m_1, m_2),$$

see [GeHa, Corollary 7.4.9].

This way we obtain a functor

$$(A.12) \quad \text{Mod-to-Enr} : \mathcal{A}\text{-mod} \rightarrow \text{Cat}_{\text{large}}^{\mathcal{A}}.$$

A.4.3. In particular, for  $\mathcal{C} \in \text{Cat}_{\text{large}}^{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{A}\text{-mod}$ , it makes sense to talk about the category

$$\text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M}) := \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \text{Mod-to-Enr}(\mathcal{M}))$$

of  $\mathcal{A}$ -functors.

By definition, the datum of an object  $\Phi \in \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M})$  consist of a functor

$$\Phi : \mathbf{oblv}_{\mathcal{A}\text{-Enr}}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M},$$

equipped with a compatible family of morphisms

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c_1, c_2) \otimes \Phi(c_1) \rightarrow \Phi(c_2),$$

where  $(-) \otimes (-)$  refers to the action of  $\mathcal{A}$  on  $\mathcal{M}$ .

*Remark A.4.4.* In Sect. A.8 we will explain a different point of view on  $\text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M})$ , developed in [Hi1, Hi2].

### A.5. Enriched presheaves.

A.5.1. We now claim that the functor Mod-to-Enr admits a (partially defined) left adjoint, defined on  $\text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}} \subset \text{Cat}_{\text{large}}^{\mathcal{A}}$ , to be denoted

$$(A.13) \quad \mathcal{C} \mapsto \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}).$$

Explicitly,

$$\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}) = \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}),$$

where:

- $\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}$  denotes the monoidal category obtained from  $\mathcal{A}$  by reversing the monoidal operation;
- $\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}$  is regarded as enriched over  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}$ ;
- $\text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}})$  is regarded as an  $\mathcal{A}$ -module category, via the  $\mathcal{A}$ -action on  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}$  “on the right” (which commutes with the natural left action of  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}$  on itself).

*Remark A.5.2.* The assumption that  $\mathcal{C} \in \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}$  is needed in order to make  $\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C})$  a large (as opposed to huge) category.

A.5.3. Concretely, an object of  $\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C})$  is a functor

$$\Phi : \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A},$$

equipped with a compatible data of maps

$$\Phi(c_2) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c_1, c_2) \rightarrow \Phi(c_1), \quad c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{C}.$$

A.5.4. The unit of the  $(\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(-), \text{Mod-to-Enr})$ -adjunction is the  $\mathcal{A}$ -functor

$$(A.14) \quad \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}),$$

that sends

$$c \mapsto \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(-, c).$$

We will refer to (A.14) as the  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched Yoneda functor, and denote it by

$$\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}} \in \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C})).$$

A.5.5. In Sect. A.8 we will give a slightly different description of the category  $\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C})$ , from which we will deduce (see Sect. A.8.8):

**Proposition A.5.6.** *For  $\mathcal{C} \in \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{A}\text{-mod}$ , precomposition with  $\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}$  gives rise to an equivalence*

$$\text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}), \mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M}).$$

Note that the assertion of Proposition A.5.6 is equivalent to the statement that  $\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}$  indeed makes  $\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(-)$  a left adjoint of Mod-to-Enr on  $\text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}$ .

A.5.7. Let  $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}'$  be a monoidal functor. From Proposition A.5.6 we obtain a canonical identification:

$$\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}'}(\mathbf{ind}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{A}'}(\mathcal{C})) \simeq \mathcal{A}' \otimes \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}).$$

A.5.8. Recall that a functor  $\Phi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$  between  $\infty$ -categories is said to be *1-full* if for every  $m_1, m_2 \in \mathcal{C}$ , the map

$$(A.15) \quad \text{Maps}_{\mathcal{M}}(m_1, m_2) \rightarrow \text{Maps}_{\mathcal{N}}(\Phi(m_1), \Phi(m_2))$$

is fully faithful (i.e., is an embedding of a union of connected components).

From Proposition A.5.6 we deduce the following fact, which we will use later on:

**Proposition A.5.9.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched category, and let  $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$  be a 1-full functor of  $\mathcal{A}$ -module categories. Then:*

(a) *The induced functor*

$$\text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{N})$$

*is 1-full and the essential image consists of objects  $\Phi \in \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{N})$  such that:*

(i)  $\Phi(x) \in \mathcal{M}$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{C}$ ;

(ii) *For every  $c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{C}$ , the morphism*

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c_1, c_2) \otimes \Phi(c_1) \rightarrow \Phi(c_2)$$

*given by (A.15) lies in  $\mathcal{M}$ .*

(b) *A map  $\Phi' \rightarrow \Phi''$  between two such functors lies in  $\text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M})$  iff  $\Phi'(c) \rightarrow \Phi''(c)$  lies in  $\mathcal{M}$  for all  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ .*

**A.6. The enriched Yoneda lemma.** Given  $\mathcal{C} \in \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}$ , we continue to study the  $\mathcal{A}$ -functor

$$\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}).$$

A.6.1. Note that for any  $c, c' \in \mathcal{C}$ , we have a tautological identification

$$(A.16) \quad \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c', c) \simeq \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c)(c'),$$

where:

- $\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c) \in \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C})$  is viewed as an  $\mathcal{A}$ -functor  $\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ ;
- $\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c)(c')$  denotes the value of the above functor on  $c'$ .

In particular, we obtain a canonical map

$$(A.17) \quad \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c)(c),$$

A.6.2. Note also that for any  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ , evaluation on  $c$  gives rise to an  $\mathcal{A}$ -linear functor

$$\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}) := \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A},$$

to be denoted  $\text{ev}_c$ .

As with the usual Yoneda embedding, the functor  $\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}$  has the following property:

**Lemma A.6.3.** *For  $c \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $\Phi \in \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}) := \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}})$ , the map*

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}), \mathcal{A}}(\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c), \Phi) \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_c} \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c)(c), \Phi(c)) \xrightarrow{(A.17)} \Phi(c)$$

*is an isomorphism.*

The proof is the same as for the usual Yoneda lemma: one constructs explicitly the inverse map.

A.6.4. As a particular case of Lemma A.6.3, we obtain:

**Corollary A.6.5.** *For  $c, c' \in \mathcal{C}$ , the map*

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}), \mathcal{A}}(\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c), \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c')) &\xrightarrow{\text{ev}_c} \\ &\rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c)(c), \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c')(c)) \xrightarrow{(A.17)} \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c')(c) \simeq \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c, c') \end{aligned}$$

*is an isomorphism.*

**A.7. More on the  $(\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(-), \text{Mod-to-Enr})$ -adjunction.** This subsection is optional in that its contents are not used elsewhere in the paper.

A.7.1. Fix a regular cardinal  $\kappa < \lambda_0$ , set

$$\mathcal{A}\text{-}\mathbf{mod}_{\kappa} := \mathcal{A}\text{-}\mathbf{mod} \times_{\text{Cat}^{\text{pres}}} \text{Cat}_{\kappa}^{\text{pres}}.$$

We define the functor

$$\text{Mod-to-Enr}_{\kappa} : \mathcal{A}\text{-}\mathbf{mod}_{\kappa} \rightarrow \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}$$

by sending  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{A}\text{-}\mathbf{mod}_{\kappa}$  to the (automatically *small*) category of  $\kappa$ -compact objects  $\mathcal{M}_{\kappa}^c \subset \mathcal{M}$ , equipped with the  $\mathcal{A}$ -enrichment inherited from that on  $\text{Mod-to-Enr}(\mathcal{M})$ .

A.7.2. Note that the functor  $\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(-)$  sends  $\text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}$  to  $\mathcal{A}\text{-}\mathbf{mod}_{\kappa}$  for any  $\kappa$  such that  $\mathcal{A} \in \text{Cat}_{\kappa}^{\text{pres}}$ .

We claim that we have an adjunction

$$\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(-) : \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{A}\text{-}\mathbf{mod}_{\kappa} : \text{Mod-to-Enr}_{\kappa}.$$

A.7.3. The unit of the adjunction is given by the enriched Yoneda functor

$$(A.18) \quad \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}),$$

whose image is easily seen to lie in the subcategory of  $\kappa$ -compact objects.

Let us describe the counit of the adjunction, which is by definition a map

$$\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\text{Mod-to-Enr}(\mathcal{M})_{\kappa}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}.$$

A.7.4. For a given  $\mathcal{M}$ , we start with the enriched Yoneda functor

$$\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{M}_{\kappa}^c}^{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{M}_{\kappa}^c \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\text{Mod-to-Enr}(\mathcal{M})_{\kappa}),$$

and we let

$${}' \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\text{Mod-to-Enr}(\mathcal{M})_{\kappa})$$

be its extension to a colimit-preserving functor.

In Sect. A.9.6 we will show that the functor  $' \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathcal{A}}$  admits a *left* adjoint:

$$({}' \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathcal{A}})^L : \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\text{Mod-to-Enr}(\mathcal{M})_{\kappa}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}.$$

The functor  $' \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathcal{A}}$  is naturally right-lax compatible with the action of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Hence, the functor  $({}' \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathcal{A}})^L$  acquires a structure of left-lax compatibility with the action of  $\mathcal{A}$ . However, in Sect. A.9.6, we will see that this left-lax compatibility is actually strict, i.e.,  $({}' \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathcal{A}})^L$  is a morphism in  $\mathcal{A}\text{-mod}_{\kappa}$ .

A.7.5. We claim the above natural transformations indeed provide a unit and counit of the adjunction. Moreover, for  $\mathcal{C} \in \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{A}\text{-mod}_{\kappa}$ , the resulting isomorphism

$$\text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \text{Mod-to-Enr}(\mathcal{M})_{\kappa}) \simeq \text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}\text{-mod}_{\kappa}}(\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}), \mathcal{M})$$

fits into the commutative diagram

$$(A.19) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}\text{-mod}_{\kappa}}(\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}), \mathcal{M}) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \text{Mod-to-Enr}(\mathcal{M})_{\kappa}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}), \mathcal{M}) & \xrightarrow[\sim]{\text{Proposition A.5.6}} & \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \text{Mod-to-Enr}(\mathcal{M})). \end{array}$$

A.7.6. First, we claim that the composition

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}\text{-mod}_{\kappa}}(\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}), \mathcal{M}) &\xrightarrow{(-)\circ(A.18)} \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \text{Mod-to-Enr}(\mathcal{M})_{\kappa}) \hookrightarrow \\ &\quad \rightarrow \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \text{Mod-to-Enr}(\mathcal{M})) \end{aligned}$$

equals

$$\text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}\text{-mod}_{\kappa}}(\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}), \mathcal{M}) \hookrightarrow \text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}), \mathcal{M}) \xrightarrow{\text{Proposition A.5.6}} \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \text{Mod-to-Enr}(\mathcal{M})).$$

To check this, it is sufficient to consider the universal case, i.e., when we take  $\mathcal{M} := \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C})$ , and we start with the identity functor. However, in this case, the assertion becomes tautological.

A.7.7. It remains to show that for  $\mathcal{C} \in \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}$  and an  $\mathcal{A}$ -functor  $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\kappa}^c$ , i.e., an  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched functor  $\Phi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Mod-to-Enr}(\mathcal{M})_{\kappa}$ , the composition

$$\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\Phi)} \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\text{Mod-to-Enr}(\mathcal{M})_{\kappa}) \xrightarrow{('Yon_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathcal{A}})^L} \mathcal{M}$$

corresponds under the isomorphism of Proposition A.5.6 to the initial functor  $\Phi$ , followed by the embedding  $\mathcal{M}_{\kappa}^c \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ .

I.e., we have to show that the composite

$$\mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}} \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\Phi)} \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\text{Mod-to-Enr}(\mathcal{M})_{\kappa}) \xrightarrow{('Yon_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathcal{A}})^L} \mathcal{M},$$

viewed as an  $\mathcal{A}$ -functor, is isomorphic to  $\Phi$ , followed by the embedding  $\mathcal{M}_{\kappa}^c \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ .

By the functoriality of  $\text{Yon}_{-}^{\mathcal{A}}$ , the above composition identifies with

$$\mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{\Phi} \text{Mod-to-Enr}(\mathcal{M})_{\kappa} \xrightarrow{\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{M}_{\kappa}^c}^{\mathcal{A}}} \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\text{Mod-to-Enr}(\mathcal{M})_{\kappa}) \xrightarrow{('Yon_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathcal{A}})^L} \mathcal{M}.$$

Thus, it suffices to show that the composition

$$\mathcal{M}_{\kappa}^c = \text{Mod-to-Enr}(\mathcal{M})_{\kappa} \xrightarrow{\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{M}_{\kappa}^c}^{\mathcal{A}}} \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\text{Mod-to-Enr}(\mathcal{M})_{\kappa}) \xrightarrow{('Yon_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathcal{A}})^L} \mathcal{M},$$

viewed as an  $\mathcal{A}$ -functor, is isomorphic to the embedding  $\mathcal{M}_{\kappa}^c \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ .

However, this follows from the fully faithfulness of  $\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathcal{A}}$ , see Corollary A.6.5.

**A.8. Enriched categories via quivers.** In this subsection we will outline an approach to enriched categories developed in [Hi1, Hi2]. It gives a complementary point of view on many notions discussed earlier in this section.

A comparison between the two approaches can be found in [He].

A.8.1. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an associative algebra in  $\text{Cat}^{\text{pres}}$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be an object of  $\text{Spc}$ . Consider the object

$$\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{A}\text{-mod}$$

and the monoidal category

$$\text{Quiv}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{A}) := \text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A})^{\text{rev}}.$$

By Sect. A.3.7, we can identify  $\text{Quiv}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{A})$  as a plain category with

$$\text{Funct}(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}).$$

In terms of this description, the monoidal structure on  $\text{Quiv}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{A})$  corresponds to the *convolution* monoidal structure on  $\text{Quiv}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{A})$ , i.e., the monoidal operation is pull-push along

$$(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}) \times (\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}) \leftarrow \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S},$$

where ‘‘push’’ means left Kan extension.

We will regard  $\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}$  as a *right* module over  $\text{Quiv}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{A})$ . This (right) action of  $\text{Quiv}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{A})$  on  $\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}$  commutes with the natural (left) action of  $\mathcal{A}$  on  $\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}$ .

A.8.2. Note that there is a canonical isomorphism

$$(\text{Quiv}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{A}))^{\text{rev}} \xrightarrow{\tau} \text{Quiv}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}),$$

namely

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A})^{\text{rev}} &\simeq \text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}((\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A})^{\vee}, (\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A})^{\vee}) \stackrel{(\text{A.11})}{\simeq} \\ &\simeq \text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}, \mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}). \end{aligned}$$

In terms of the identifications

$$\text{Quiv}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{A}) \simeq (\text{Funct}(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}))^{\text{rev}} \text{ and } \text{Quiv}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}) \simeq \text{Funct}(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}})^{\text{rev}},$$

it corresponds to the swap of the factors in  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$ , followed by the identity functor

$$\text{Funct}(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}) \simeq \text{Funct}(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}).$$

For an algebra object  $R \in \text{Quiv}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{A})$ , we let  $\tau(R^{\text{rev}})$  denote the corresponding algebra object in  $\text{Quiv}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}})$ .

A.8.3. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an  $\mathcal{S}$ -flagged category enriched over  $\mathcal{A}$ .

To this data we associate an algebra object

$$R_{\mathcal{C}} \in \text{Quiv}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{A})$$

by letting the value of the corresponding functor  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  on  $(s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$  be

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{A}.$$

A.8.4. Note that for the opposite category

$$\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \in \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}},$$

we have

$$R_{\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}} \simeq \tau(R_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{rev}}) \in \text{Alg}(\text{Quiv}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}})).$$

A.8.5. Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be an  $\mathcal{A}$ -module category. Unwinding the definitions, we obtain that the category  $\text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M})$  identifies with

$$(A.20) \quad R_{\mathcal{C}} \text{-mod}(\text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M})),$$

where we consider  $\text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M})$  as acted on the left by  $\text{Quiv}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{A})$  via its right action on the source.

A.8.6. We obtain that

$$\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}) = \tau(R_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{rev}}) \text{-mod}(\text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}, \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}})).$$

By (A.11), we identify

$$\text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}, \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}) \simeq \mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}.$$

Under this identification, the left action of  $\text{Quiv}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}})$  on  $\text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}, \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}})$  corresponds to the right action of  $\text{Quiv}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{A})$  on  $\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}$  via  $\tau$ .

In particular, we obtain an identification

$$(A.21) \quad \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}) \simeq R_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{rev}} \text{-mod}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}).$$

A.8.7. Unwinding, we obtain that in terms of the identification (A.21), the Yoneda functor

$$\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C})$$

corresponds to the tautological object in

$$R_{\mathcal{C}}\text{-mod}(\text{Funct}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}, R_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{rev}}\text{-mod}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}))),$$

whose underlying object of  $\text{Funct}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}, R_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{rev}}\text{-mod}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}))$  is the induction functor

$$\mathbf{ind}_{R_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{rev}}} : \mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A} \rightarrow R_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{rev}}\text{-mod}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}).$$

A.8.8. The latter observation makes the assertion of Proposition A.5.6 manifest: for any  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{A}\text{-mod}$ , the map

$$\text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}(R_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{rev}}\text{-mod}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}), \mathcal{M}) \rightarrow R_{\mathcal{C}}\text{-mod}(\text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}))$$

given by precomposition with  $\mathbf{ind}_{R_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{rev}}}$  is an isomorphism: indeed, both sides are monadic over  $\text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M})$ , and the above functor induces an isomorphism of monads.

A.8.9. Note that the interpretation of  $\text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M})$  given by (A.20) implies that the canonical functor

$$(A.22) \quad \text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M})$$

is an equivalence.

Indeed, the above functor identifies with

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\mathcal{C}}\text{-mod}(\text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{M} &\rightarrow R_{\mathcal{C}}\text{-mod}(\text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \\ &\rightarrow R_{\mathcal{C}}\text{-mod}(\text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M})), \end{aligned}$$

and both above arrows are equivalences.

A.8.10. In the sequel, we will make use of the following fact.

**Proposition A.8.11.** *The  $\mathcal{A}$ -module category  $\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C})$  is dualizable (as an  $\mathcal{A}$ -module category) with dual given by  $\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}})$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to establish an equivalence

$$\text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}), \mathcal{M}) \simeq \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{M}, \quad \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{A}\text{-mod}.$$

We have

$$\text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}), \mathcal{M}) \simeq \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M}) \xrightarrow{(A.22)} \text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{M} \simeq \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{M},$$

as required. □

**A.9. Bousfield-Kan formula for enriched presheaves.** In this subsection we continue to explore the point of view on enriched categories via quivers. We use it to derive information about the category  $\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C})$ .

A.9.1. Our point of departure is formula (A.21). Hence, we obtain a monadic adjunction of  $\mathcal{A}$ -module categories

$$(A.23) \quad \text{Funct}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}) \simeq \mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A} \rightleftarrows R_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{rev}}\text{-mod}(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}) \simeq \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}).$$

The left adjoint in (A.23) is the  $\mathcal{A}$ -linear extension of the enriched Yoneda embedding  $\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}$ . For the duration of this subsection, we denote it by  $\mathbf{i}$ .

In terms of the identification

$$\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A} \simeq \text{Funct}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}),$$

the right adjoint in (A.23) is given by restriction along  $\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}$ . For the duration of this subsection, we denote it by  $\mathbf{e}$ .

A.9.2. From (A.10) we obtain that for  $\Phi \in \text{Funct}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A})$ ,

$$(A.24) \quad \mathbf{i}(\Phi) \simeq \underset{s \in \mathcal{S}}{\text{colim}} \Phi(s) \otimes \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(s).$$

A.9.3. Let now  $\Psi$  be an object  $\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C})$ . From (A.23), we obtain that  $\Psi$  can be *canonically* written as a geometric realization of a simplicial object  $\text{BK}_{\bullet}(\Psi)$  where

$$(A.25) \quad \text{BK}_n(\Psi) = \mathbf{i}((R_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{rev}})^{\otimes n} \otimes \mathbf{e}(\Psi)).$$

Combining with (A.24), we obtain:

**Corollary A.9.4.** *Every object  $\Psi \in \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C})$  is canonically a colimit of objects of the form*

$$a \otimes \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c) \in \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}),$$

for  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ .

*Remark A.9.5.* The formula for  $\text{BK}_n(-)$  can be made even more explicit. Namely, for any  $\Phi \in \text{Funct}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}) \simeq \mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{A}$  we have

$$(R_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{rev}})^{\otimes n} \otimes \Phi \simeq \underset{(s_0, \dots, s_n) \in (\mathcal{S})^{n+1}}{\text{colim}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(s_0, s_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(s_{n-1}, s_n) \otimes \Phi(s_n) \otimes \delta_{s_0}.$$

Hence,

$$\text{BK}_n(\Psi) \simeq \underset{(s_0, \dots, s_n) \in (\mathcal{S})^{n+1}}{\text{colim}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(s_0, s_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(s_{n-1}, s_n) \otimes \Psi(s_n) \otimes \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(s_0).$$

A.9.6. We now return to the left adjoint of the functor  $'\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathcal{A}}$  from Sect. A.7.1. We will now show that the left-lax compatibility structure  $('\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathcal{A}})^L$  with the action of  $\mathcal{A}$  is actually strict.

By Corollary A.9.4, in order to show both facts, it suffices to show that  $('\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathcal{A}})^L$  is defined and commutes with the action of  $\mathcal{A}$  on objects of the form  $a \otimes \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathcal{A}}(m)$ ,  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $m \in \mathcal{M}$ .

However, Corollary A.6.5 implies that

$$(''\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathcal{A}})^L(a \otimes \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathcal{A}}(m)) \simeq a \otimes m.$$

**A.10. Compatibility with the symmetric monoidal structure(s).** In this subsection we let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a *symmetric* monoidal category.

A.10.1. When  $\mathcal{A}$  is *symmetric monoidal* (which is the case of interest in the present paper), the operation of Cartesian product of the underlying plain categories extends to a symmetric monoidal structure on  $\text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}$ :

For  $\mathcal{C}', \mathcal{C}'' \in \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}$ ,  $c'_1, c'_2 \in \mathcal{C}'$  and  $c''_1, c''_2 \in \mathcal{C}''$ , we have

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}' \times \mathcal{C}''}^{\mathcal{A}}((c'_1, c''_1), (c'_2, c''_2)) := \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}'}^{\mathcal{A}}(c'_1, c'_2) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}''}^{\mathcal{A}}(c''_1, c''_2).$$

Note, however, that this symmetric monoidal structure on  $\text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}$  is *not* Cartesian.

Thus, we can talk about (symmetric) monoidal  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched categories.

A.10.2. let  $F : \mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_2$  be a symmetric monoidal functor. Note that the functor  $\mathbf{ind}_{\mathcal{A}_1}^{\mathcal{A}_2}$  is (strictly) symmetric monoidal.

In particular, it sends (symmetric) monoidal  $\mathcal{A}_1$ -enriched categories to (symmetric) monoidal  $\mathcal{A}_2$ -enriched categories.

Explicitly, if we lift  $\mathcal{C}_1 \in \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}_1}$  to a (commutative) algebra object in  $(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{C}_1) \in \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}_1}(\text{Spc})$ , the corresponding (commutative) algebra object  $(\mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{C}_2) := \mathbf{ind}_{\mathcal{A}_1}^{\mathcal{A}_2}(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{C}_1)$  has the property that  $\mathcal{S}_2 = \mathcal{S}_1 = \mathcal{S}$  with the structure of (commutative) monoidal coming from the (commutative) algebra structure on  $(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{C}_1)$ .

A.10.3. Assume now that  $\mathcal{A}$  is presentable. Note that in this case the functor Mod-to-Enr has a natural right-lax symmetric monoidal structure.

By adjunction, we obtain that the functor

$$\mathcal{C} \mapsto \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C})$$

acquires a left-lax symmetric monoidal structure.

However, from (A.21), we obtain that the above left-lax symmetric monoidal structure is strict.

A.10.4. Concretely, this means that for  $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$  there is a naturally defined  $\mathcal{A}$ -bilinear functor

$$\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}_1) \times \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}_2) \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}_1 \times \mathcal{C}_2),$$

such that the induced morphism in  $\mathcal{A}\text{-mod}$ :

$$\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}_1) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}_2) \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}_1 \times \mathcal{C}_2)$$

is an equivalence.

A.10.5. In particular, we obtain that if  $\mathcal{C}$  is a symmetric monoidal  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched category, then  $\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C})$  acquires a natural symmetric monoidal structure as an object of  $\mathcal{A}\text{-mod}$ .

The Yoneda functor, viewed as a natural transformation

$$\text{Id} \rightarrow \text{Mod-to-Enr} \circ \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(-)$$

between right-lax symmetric monoidal functors, itself has a natural symmetric monoidal structure.

A.10.6. In particular, if  $\mathcal{C}$  is a symmetric monoidal  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched category, the Yoneda functor

$$\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C})$$

has a natural symmetric monoidal structure (as a functor between symmetric monoidal  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched categories).

In particular, the plain functor underlying  $\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}$  has a natural symmetric monoidal structure.

## APPENDIX B. WEIGHTED LIMITS AND COLIMITS

In this section, we let

$$\mathcal{A}, \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}, \mathcal{A}\text{-mod}$$

be as in Sect. A.4.

**B.1. Weighted limits.** The usual notion of limits and colimits is not sufficient in the setting of enriched categories. For this, we need the notion of weighted limits and colimits. We consider several variants of these.

B.1.1. For  $\mathcal{C} \in \text{Cat}^{\mathcal{A}}$  let

$$\mathcal{W} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$$

be an  $\mathcal{A}$ -functor. Given  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{A}\text{-mod}$  and an  $\mathcal{A}$ -functor

$$\Phi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{M},$$

we define the weighted limit of  $\Phi$  with weight  $\mathcal{W}$

$$\lim_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{W}} \Phi \in \mathcal{M}$$

as follows.

B.1.2. Using the functor  $\mathcal{W}$ , we define the functor

$$\mathcal{W} \otimes (-) : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M})$$

informally given by

$$m \mapsto (c \mapsto \mathcal{W}(c) \otimes m).$$

Formally,  $\mathcal{W} \otimes (-)$  is defined as the composite

$$(B.1) \quad \mathcal{M} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{W} \otimes \text{id}} \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}) \otimes \mathcal{M} \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M}).$$

Now given  $\Phi \in \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M})$ , the weighted limit  $\lim_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{W}} \Phi$  is defined as the value of the right adjoint to (B.1), which exists by the Adjoint Functor Theorem ([Lu1, Corollary 5.5.2.9]) (indeed, (B.1) is a colimit-preserving functor between presentable categories).

B.1.3. Explicitly, for  $m \in \mathcal{M}$

$$(B.2) \quad \text{Maps}_{\mathcal{M}}(m, \lim_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{W}} \Phi) \simeq \text{Maps}_{\text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M})}(\mathcal{W}(-) \otimes m, \Phi).$$

B.1.4. It is clear that the formation of weighted limits is functorial in  $F$ . Moreover, from (B.2), we obtain that the formation of weighted colimits is contravariantly functorial in  $\mathcal{W}$ . Moreover, we have:

**Lemma B.1.5.** *Let*

$$\mathcal{W}_I : I \rightarrow \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}), \quad i \mapsto \mathcal{W}_i$$

*be a (small) diagram of weights, and let  $\mathcal{W} = \underset{i \in I}{\text{colim}} \mathcal{W}_i$ . Then for an  $\mathcal{A}$ -functor  $\Phi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  there is a canonical isomorphism*

$$\underset{\mathcal{C}}{\lim}^{\mathcal{W}} \Phi \simeq \underset{i \in I^{\text{op}}}{\lim} \underset{\mathcal{C}}{\lim}^{\mathcal{W}_i} \Phi.$$

B.1.6. Suppose that  $\mathcal{C} = *$  (i.e. it only has one object and the object of morphisms is  $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}$ ). In this case,  $\mathcal{W}$  is given by an object  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\Phi$  is given by an object  $m \in \mathcal{M}$ . In this case, the weighted limit

$$\underset{\mathcal{C}}{\lim}^{\mathcal{W}} \Phi \simeq m^a$$

is the *cotensor* of  $m$  by  $a$ ; i.e.

$$\text{Maps}_{\mathcal{M}}(m', m^a) \simeq \text{Maps}(a \otimes m', m).$$

In particular, if  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{A}$  and  $m = a'$ , we have

$$\underset{\mathcal{C}}{\lim}^{\mathcal{W}} \Phi \simeq \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{A}}(a, a')$$

is the internal hom object.

B.1.7. As in Lemma B.1.5 we have

$$(B.3) \quad (\underset{\mathcal{C}}{\lim}^{\mathcal{W}} \Phi)^a \simeq \underset{\mathcal{C}}{\lim}^{a \otimes \mathcal{W}} \Phi, \quad a \in \mathcal{A},$$

where  $a \otimes \mathcal{W}$  is obtained from  $\mathcal{W}$  by tensoring with  $a$  on the target.

B.1.8. Another key example of a weighted limit is when the weight is representable. Namely, let

$$\mathcal{W} \in \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A})$$

be of the form  $\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}}^{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(c)$  for  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ .

**Proposition B.1.9.** *In the above situation,*

$$\underset{\mathcal{C}}{\lim}^{\mathcal{W}} \Phi \simeq \Phi(c)$$

*for any  $\Phi \in \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M})$ .*

*Proof.* By Sect. A.9.1, we have an adjunction of  $\mathcal{A}$ -module categories

$$(-) \otimes \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}}^{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(c) : \mathcal{A} \rightleftarrows \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}) : \mathbf{e}_c,$$

where  $\mathbf{e}_c$  is the functor of evaluation at  $c \in \mathcal{C}$  functor, i.e.,  $\mathbf{e}_c(\Phi) \simeq \Phi(c)$ . The desired result is obtained by applying the functor  $(-)$  to this adjunction and using (A.22).  $\square$

B.1.10. *Unenriched weighted limits.* A useful class of examples of weighted limits is when the indexing category  $\mathcal{C}$  is of the form  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Enr}_{\mathcal{A}}(I)$  for  $I \in \text{Cat}$ .

In this case, we have

$$\text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M}) \simeq \text{Funct}(I, \mathcal{M})$$

for any  $\mathcal{A}$ -module category  $\mathcal{M}$ . We will sometimes refer to weighted limits with such indexing category as unenriched weighted limits.

There are two important classes of unenriched weighted limits. When  $I = \{\text{pt}\}$ , this gives the cotensor as in Sect. B.1.6.

Another example is when the weight  $\mathcal{W} : I \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  is the constant functor  $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}$ . In this case, the weighted limit of a functor  $\Phi : I \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is the ordinary limit

$$\lim_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{W}} \Phi \simeq \lim_I \Phi$$

in the category  $\mathcal{M}$ .

## B.2. Further properties of weighted limits.

B.2.1. An important aspect of weighted limits is that they are preserved by right adjoints. Namely, suppose we have an  $\mathcal{A}$ -module functor

$$F : \mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2.$$

Then for any  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched category  $\mathcal{C}$ , weight  $\mathcal{W} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ , and an  $\mathcal{A}$ -functor

$$\Phi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1,$$

from the definition, we have a natural map

$$(B.4) \quad F(\lim_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{W}} \Phi) \rightarrow \lim_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{W}} (F \circ \Phi)$$

**Lemma B.2.2.** *Suppose that in the above situation, the functor  $F$  admits a left adjoint which is a strict<sup>11</sup>  $\mathcal{A}$ -module functor. Then  $F$  preserves weighted limits; i.e. the map (B.4) is an isomorphism.*

*Proof.* The existence of an  $\mathcal{A}$ -module left adjoint  $F^L$  gives rise to the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}_2 & \xrightarrow{F^L} & \mathcal{M}_1 \\ \downarrow \mathcal{W} \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{M}_2} & & \downarrow \mathcal{W} \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{M}_1} \\ \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}) \otimes \mathcal{M}_2 & \xrightarrow[\mathcal{A}]{\text{id} \otimes F^L} & \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}) \otimes \mathcal{M}_1 \end{array}$$

of  $\mathcal{A}$ -module categories. Evaluating the corresponding commutative diagram obtained by passing to right adjoints on

$$\Phi \in \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}) \otimes \mathcal{M}_1 \simeq \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M}_1)$$

gives the desired result. □

<sup>11</sup>Recall that a left adjoint of an  $\mathcal{A}$ -module functor is automatically  $\mathcal{A}$  left-lax and being strict is then a condition, see [GR1, Chapter 1, Lemma 3.2.4]

B.2.3. We have the following basic result decomposing weighted limits into simpler ones.

**Proposition B.2.4.** *An  $\mathcal{A}$ -module functor  $F : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}'$  preserves weighted limits if and only if it preserves all limits and cotensors.*

*Proof.* The “only if” direction is obvious as limits and cotensors are special cases of weighted limits.

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched category, and

$$\mathcal{W} \in \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}) \simeq \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}})$$

be a weight. By Corollary A.9.4,  $\mathcal{W}$  is the colimit of objects in  $\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}})$  of the form

$$a \otimes \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}}^{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(c)$$

for  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ .

Hence, by Lemma B.1.5, it suffices to consider  $\mathcal{W}$  of this form. Further, by (B.3), it suffices to consider  $\mathcal{W}$  of the form  $\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}}^{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(c)$ .

Now the assertion follows from Proposition B.1.9. □

B.2.5. We can make the decomposition of weighted limits into ordinary limits and cotensors explicit using Sect. A.9.3 and Remark A.9.5:

Let

$$\mathcal{W} \in \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}) \simeq \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}})$$

be a weight functor. By Sect. A.9.3,  $\mathcal{W}$  is the geometric realization of the simplicial object  $\text{BK}_{\bullet}(\mathcal{W})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BK}_n(\mathcal{W}) &\simeq \mathbf{i}((\tau(R_{\mathcal{C}}))^{\otimes n} \otimes \mathbf{e}(\mathcal{W})) \simeq \\ &\simeq \underset{(s_0, \dots, s_n) \in \mathcal{S}^{n+1}}{\text{colim}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(s_0, s_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(s_{n-1}, s_n) \otimes \mathcal{W}(s_0) \otimes \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}}^{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(s_n). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\lim_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{W}} \Phi \simeq \text{Tot}(\lim_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{BK}_{\bullet}(\mathcal{W})} \Phi),$$

where

$$\lim_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{BK}_n(\mathcal{W})} \Phi \simeq \underset{(s_0, \dots, s_n) \in \mathcal{S}^{n+1}}{\lim} \Phi(s_n)^{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(s_0, s_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(s_{n-1}, s_n) \otimes \mathcal{W}(s_0)}.$$

**B.3. Weighted colimits.** The notion of a weighted colimit is dual to that of a weighted limit. However, because our notion of  $\mathcal{A}$ -module categories is built on the symmetric monoidal category of presentable categories, there is some asymmetry in the discussion that follows.

B.3.1. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched category and

$$\Phi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$$

be an  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched functor, and an  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}$ -functor  $\mathcal{W} : \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}$ , a “weight.” We can think of  $\mathcal{W}$  as an object of  $\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C})$ .

By the universal property of the Yoneda embedding, the functor  $\Phi$  induces a functor of  $\mathcal{A}$ -module categories

$$\tilde{\Phi} : \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}.$$

Following [Hi2, Sect. 6], we define

$$\text{colim}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{W}} \Phi := \tilde{\Phi}(\mathcal{W}).$$

B.3.2. Let us describe the above construction more explicitly. Namely, we claim:

**Proposition B.3.3.** *We have a canonical isomorphism*

$$\text{Maps}_{\mathcal{M}}(\text{colim}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{W}} \Phi, m) \simeq \text{Maps}_{\text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}})}(\mathcal{W}, \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}}(\Phi(-), m)).$$

*Proof.* The statement of the proposition is equivalent to the assertion that the functor right adjoint to  $\tilde{\Phi}$  sends  $m \in \mathcal{M}$  to the object

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}}(\Phi(-), m) \in \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}) = \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}).$$

By the (Yoneda) Lemma A.6.3, given  $F \in \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C})$ , the  $\mathcal{A}$ -functor  $\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}$  corresponding to it is given by

$$c \mapsto \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}), \mathcal{A}}(\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c), F).$$

Hence, for  $F := (\tilde{\Phi})^R(m)$ , the corresponding  $\mathcal{A}$ -functor  $\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\text{rev}}$  is

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}), \mathcal{A}}(\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c), (\tilde{\Phi})^R(m)),$$

which by adjunction identifies with

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}}(\tilde{\Phi}(\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c)), m).$$

However, by construction

$$\tilde{\Phi}(\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(-)) = \Phi(-),$$

and the assertion follows.  $\square$

B.3.4. By definition, weighted colimits commute with colimits in the weight. Namely, if we have a diagram

$$\mathcal{W}_I : I \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}), \quad i \mapsto \mathcal{W}_i$$

of weights, for any functor  $\Phi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ , we have a natural isomorphism

$$\text{colim}_{i \in I} \text{colim}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{W}_i} \Phi \simeq \text{colim}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{W}} \Phi$$

where  $\mathcal{W} = \text{colim}_{i \in I} \mathcal{W}_i$ .

B.3.5. In the case that  $\mathcal{C} = *$  with  $\mathcal{W}$  given by  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\Phi$  by  $m \in \mathcal{M}$ , we have:

$$\operatorname{colim}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{W}} \Phi \simeq a \otimes m.$$

Moreover, for a general  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{W} = \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c)$ ,  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ , we have

$$\operatorname{colim}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{W}} \Phi \simeq \Phi(c).$$

B.3.6. As in the case of weighted limits, we can describe weighted colimits explicitly in terms of ordinary limits and tensors using Sect. A.9.3 as a geometric realization:

$$\operatorname{colim}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{W}} \Phi \simeq |\operatorname{colim}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{BK}_{\bullet}(\mathcal{W})} \Phi|,$$

where  $\operatorname{colim}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\text{BK}_{\bullet}(\mathcal{W})} \Phi$  is the simplicial object in  $\mathcal{M}$  with terms given by

$$\operatorname{colim}_{(c_0, \dots, c_n) \in \mathcal{S}^{n+1}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c_0, c_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c_{n-1}, c_n) \otimes \mathcal{W}(c_n) \otimes \Phi(c_0).$$

B.3.7. It follows immediately from the definition of weighted colimits that all  $\mathcal{A}$ -module functors

$$\mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2$$

preserve weighted colimits.

#### B.4. Weighted colimits and enriched presheaves.

B.4.1. An key feature of weighted colimits is that every object in  $\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C})$  is canonically a weighted colimit. Namely, by definition, we have that for  $F \in \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C})$ ,

$$(B.5) \quad F \simeq \operatorname{colim}_{\mathcal{C}}^F \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}},$$

where  $\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C})$  is the enriched Yoneda embedding.

B.4.2. We will say that an object  $m \in \mathcal{M}$  is *totally  $\mathcal{A}$ -compact* if the functor

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}}(m, -) : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$$

preserves all weighted colimits.

B.4.3. We have the following evident characterization of totally  $\mathcal{A}$ -compact objects:

**Lemma B.4.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be an  $\mathcal{A}$ -module category and  $m \in \mathcal{M}$ . The following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $m$  is totally  $\mathcal{A}$ -compact;
- (ii) The functor  $(-) \otimes m : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  admits an  $\mathcal{A}$ -module right adjoint<sup>12</sup>;
- (iii)  $\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}}(m, -) : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  is an  $\mathcal{A}$ -module functor.

B.4.5. Note that the essential image of the enriched Yoneda functor

$$\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C})$$

consists of totally  $\mathcal{A}$ -compact objects.

Indeed, this follows from (i)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (iii) in Lemma B.4.4 and Lemma A.6.3.

---

<sup>12</sup>I.e., we need that the right adjoint as a plain functor preserves colimits, and that the natural stricture on it of right-lax compatibility with the action of  $\mathcal{A}$  be strict.

B.4.6. The following assertion is useful:

**Proposition B.4.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched category and let*

$$\tilde{\Phi} : \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$$

*be an  $\mathcal{A}$ -module functor such that:*

- (i)  $\tilde{\Phi}$  is fully faithful in the enriched sense<sup>13</sup> on the essential image of the enriched Yoneda functor;
- (ii) For every  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ , the object  $\Phi(c) \in \mathcal{M}$  is totally compact, where  $\Phi := \tilde{\Phi} \circ \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}$ .

*Then  $\tilde{\Phi}$  is fully faithful.*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C})$  is generated under weighted colimits by the objects  $\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c)$  for  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ , and  $\tilde{\Phi}$  preserves weighted colimits, by Proposition B.3.3, it suffices to show that for  $c \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $F \in \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C})$ , the map

$$(B.6) \quad \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}), \mathcal{A}}(\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c), F) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}}(\tilde{\Phi} \circ \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c), \tilde{\Phi}(F))$$

is an isomorphism.

Now, by (B.5), we have

$$F \simeq \underset{c' \in \mathcal{C}}{\text{colim}}^F \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c').$$

Since both sides in (B.6) preserve weighted colimits in  $F$ , we are reduced to showing that

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}), \mathcal{A}}(\text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c), \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c')) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}}(\tilde{\Phi} \circ \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c), \tilde{\Phi} \circ \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}(c'))$$

is an isomorphism, which follows from the assumption.  $\square$

**Corollary B.4.8.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_2$  be a functor of  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched categories that is fully faithful in the enriched sense<sup>14</sup>. Then the corresponding functor*

$$\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}_1) \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}_2)$$

*is fully faithful.*

**Corollary B.4.9.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched category. An  $\mathcal{A}$ -module functor*

$$\tilde{\Phi} : \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$$

*is an equivalence if and only if*

- (i)  $\tilde{\Phi}$  is fully faithful in the enriched sense on essential image of the enriched Yoneda functor;
- (ii) For every  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ , the object  $\Phi(c) \in \mathcal{M}$  is totally compact, where  $\Phi := \tilde{\Phi} \circ \text{Yon}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{A}}$ ;
- (iii) The image of  $\mathcal{C}$  generates  $\mathcal{M}$  under weighted colimits.

## APPENDIX C. ADJUNCTIONS

### C.1. Adjunctions in 2-categories.

<sup>13</sup>I.e., it induces an isomorphism on  $\underline{\text{Hom}}_{-, \mathcal{A}}(-, -)$ .

<sup>14</sup>I.e., it induces an isomorphism on  $\text{Hom}^{\mathcal{A}}(-, -)$ .

C.1.1. Let  $\mathbf{S}$  be a 2-category. Recall that a 1-morphism  $f : x \rightarrow y$  in  $\mathbf{S}$  admits a right (resp. left) adjoint if there exists another 1-morphism

$$f^R : y \rightarrow x \text{ (resp. } f^L : y \rightarrow x)$$

and 2-morphisms

$$\begin{aligned} f^L \circ f &\rightarrow \text{id}_x \text{ (resp. } f \circ f^R \rightarrow \text{id}_y), \text{ and} \\ \text{id}_y &\rightarrow f \circ f^L \text{ (resp. } \text{id}_x \rightarrow f^R \circ f) \end{aligned}$$

satisfying the standard relations.

C.1.2. Let  $\text{Adj}$  denote the universal adjunction, i.e., this is a 2-category such that the *space* of functors

$$\text{Adj} \rightarrow \mathbf{S}$$

for any 2-category  $\mathbf{S}$  is the space of adjunctions in  $\mathbf{S}$ , i.e. the subspace of 1-morphisms of  $\mathbf{S}$  that admit a right adjoint. There are natural functors

$$(C.1) \quad \rho, \lambda : [1] \rightarrow \text{Adj}$$

selecting the right and left adjoint, respectively.

For a 2-category  $\mathbf{S}$ , we will be interested in a description of the 2-category of functors

$$\text{Funct}(\text{Adj}, \mathbf{S}).$$

C.1.3. Recall the following notion. Suppose that

$$(C.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} x & \xrightarrow{f} & y \\ p \downarrow & & \downarrow q \\ z & \xrightarrow{g} & w \end{array}$$

is a commutative square in  $\mathbf{S}$ . We say that (C.2) satisfies the right (resp. left) Beck-Chevalley condition if the 1-morphisms  $f$  and  $g$  admit right (resp. left) adjoints and the corresponding 2-morphism

$$g^L \circ q \rightarrow p \circ f^L \text{ (resp. } p \circ f^R \rightarrow g^R \circ q)$$

is an isomorphism.

C.1.4. We have the following basic fact (see e.g. [AMR, Lemma B.5.9] and [AGH, Theorem D]):

**Proposition C.1.5.** *Let  $\mathbf{S}$  be a 2-category and let*

$$(C.3) \quad \text{Funct}(\text{Adj}, \mathbf{S}) \rightarrow \text{Funct}([1], \mathbf{S})$$

*denote the restriction along the right (resp. left) adjoint (C.1). The functor (C.3) is 1-full:*

- (a) *Its essential image consists of objects  $x \rightarrow y$  that admit a right (resp. left) adjoint.*
- (b) *A 1-morphism*

$$(C.4) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} x & \longrightarrow & y \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ x' & \longrightarrow & y' \end{array}$$

*between two such objects  $x \rightarrow y$  and  $x' \rightarrow y'$  lies in the image iff the square (C.4) satisfies the right (resp. left) Beck-Chevalley condition.*

## C.2. Adjunctions in enriched presheaves.

C.2.1. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a presentable monoidal category.

We will be interested in the case when  $\mathcal{A}$  has the structure of 2-category (e.g.  $\mathcal{A} = \text{DGCat}_\kappa$ ) and the resulting 2-categorical aspects of  $\mathcal{A}$ -module categories.

Namely, suppose that  $\mathcal{A}$  is itself tensored over  $\text{Cat}_\kappa^{\text{pres}}$  (for some regular cardinal  $\kappa$ ), i.e.,  $\mathcal{A}$  is a  $\text{Cat}_\kappa^{\text{pres}}$ -algebra in categories  $\text{Cat}^{\text{pres}}$ . In particular, this endows every  $\mathcal{A}$ -module category with the structure of 2-category.<sup>15</sup>

**Proposition C.2.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an  $\mathcal{A}$ -enriched category and let  $\mathcal{M}$  be an  $\mathcal{A}$ -module category. A 1-morphism  $f : \Phi_1 \rightarrow \Phi_2$  in  $\text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M})$  admits a right (resp. left) adjoint if and only if the following two conditions are satisfied:*

(i) *For every  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ , the 1-morphism*

$$f(c) : \Phi_1(c) \rightarrow \Phi_2(c)$$

*in  $\mathcal{M}$  admits a right (resp. left) adjoint;*

(ii) *For all  $c', c'' \in \mathcal{C}$ , the square*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}}(c', c'') \otimes \Phi_1(c') & \longrightarrow & \underline{\text{Hom}}_{\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}}(c', c'') \otimes \Phi_2(c'') \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Phi_1(c'') & \longrightarrow & \Phi_2(c'') \end{array}$$

*satisfies the right (resp. left) Beck-Chevalley condition.*

*Proof.* We will prove the assertion for right adjoints (the case of left adjoints is identical). The 1-morphism  $f$  is given by a functor

$$[1] \rightarrow \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M}) \simeq \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{M}.$$

By Section A.8.11, such a functor is given by a functor of  $\mathcal{A}$ -module categories

$$(C.5) \quad \mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \text{Funct}([1], \mathcal{M}).$$

The 1-morphism  $f$  admits a right adjoint iff the functor (C.5) factors through the functor

$$(C.6) \quad \text{Funct}(\text{Adj}, \mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \text{Funct}([1], \mathcal{M}),$$

which is 1-full by Section C.1.5.

By Proposition A.5.6, we have

$$\text{Funct}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}), \text{Funct}([1], \mathcal{M})) \simeq \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \text{Funct}([1], \mathcal{M})).$$

Now, the 1-morphism  $f$  admits a right adjoint if and only if the corresponding object in the category  $\text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \text{Funct}([1], \mathcal{M}))$  lies in the subcategory  $\text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \text{Funct}(\text{Adj}, \mathcal{M}))$ . By Section A.5.9 and Section C.1.5, the functor

$$\text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \text{Funct}(\text{Adj}, \mathcal{M})) \rightarrow \text{Funct}^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{C}, \text{Funct}([1], \mathcal{M}))$$

is 1-full and the essential image is as claimed. □

<sup>15</sup>Since  $\text{Cat}_\kappa^{\text{pres}}$  is presentable, it follows that every  $\text{Cat}_\kappa^{\text{pres}}$ -module category in  $\text{Cat}^{\text{pres}}$  has  $\text{Cat}_\kappa^{\text{pres}}$ -valued homs.

## REFERENCES

- [AGKRRV1] D. Arinkin, D. Gaitsgory, D. Kazhdan, S. Raskin, N. Rozenblyum, Y. Varshavsky, *The stack of local systems with restricted variation and geometric Langlands theory with nilpotent singular support*, arXiv:2010.01906.
- [AGKRRV2] D. Arinkin, D. Gaitsgory, D. Kazhdan, S. Raskin, N. Rozenblyum, Y. Varshavsky, *Duality for automorphic sheaves with nilpotent singular support*, arXiv:2012.07665
- [AGH] F. Abellán, A. Gagna and R. Haugseng, *Straightening for lax transformations and adjunctions of  $(\infty, 2)$ -categories*, Selecta Math. (N.S.) **31** (2025), no. 4, Paper No. 85.
- [AMR] D. Ayala, A. Mazel-Gee and N. Rozenblyum, *Stratified noncommutative geometry*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **297** (2024), no. 1485.
- [DrGa] V. Drinfeld and D. Gaitsgory, *On some finiteness questions for algebraic stacks*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **23** (2013), no. 1, 149–294.
- [GKRV] D. Gaitsgory, D. Kazhdan, N. Rozenblyum, Y. Varshavsky *A toy model for the Drinfeld-Lafforgue shtuka construction*, Indag. Math. (N.S.) **33** (2022), no. 1, 39–189.
- [GRV2] D. Gaitsgory, N. Rozenblyum, Y. Varshavsky, *Applications of (higher) categorical trace II: Deligne-Lusztig theory*, in preparation.
- [GRV3] D. Gaitsgory, N. Rozenblyum, Y. Varshavsky, *Applications of (higher) categorical trace III: cohomologies of shtukas*, in preparation.
- [GR1] D. Gaitsgory and N. Rozenblyum, *A study in derived algebraic geometry, Vol. 1: Correspondences and Duality*, Mathematical surveys and monographs **221** (2017), AMS, Providence, RI.
- [GR2] D. Gaitsgory and N. Rozenblyum, *A study in derived algebraic geometry, Vol. 2: Deformations, Lie Theory and Formal Geometry*, Mathematical surveys and monographs **221** (2017), AMS, Providence, RI.
- [GaVa] D. Gaitsgory and Y. Varshavsky, *Local terms for the categorical trace*, Adv. Math. **470** (2025), Paper No. 110223.
- [GeHa] D. Gepner and R. Haugseng, *Enriched  $\infty$ -categories via non-symmetric  $\infty$ -operads*, Adv. Math. **279** (2015), 575–716.
- [He] H. Heine, *An equivalence between enriched  $\infty$ -categories and  $\infty$ -categories with weak action*, Adv. Math. **417** (2023), Paper No. 108941.
- [Hi1] V. Hinich, *Yoneda lemma for enriched infinity categories*, Adv. Math. **367** (2020), 107129.
- [Hi2] V. Hinich, *Colimits in enriched  $\infty$ -categories and Day convolution*, Theory Appl. Categ. **39** (2023), Paper No. 12, 365–422.
- [Lu1] J. Lurie, *Higher Topos Theory*, Annals of Mathematical Studies, Princeton University Press (2009).
- [Lu2] J. Lurie, *Higher Algebra*, available at: [www.math.ias.edu/~lurie](http://www.math.ias.edu/~lurie).