

REPRESENTATIONS OF GENERALIZED LINEAR REEDY CATEGORIES AND ABELIAN MODEL STRUCTURES

ZHENXING DI, LIPING LI, AND LI LIANG

ABSTRACT. In this paper we consider representations of generalized k -linear Reedy categories \mathfrak{C} , a common generalization of k -linear Reedy categories introduced by Georgios-Št'ovíček and k -linearizations of generalized Reedy categories introduced by Berger-Moerdijk, and construct abelian model structures on \mathfrak{C} -Mod. In the first part, we show that \mathfrak{C} can be viewed as an infinite categorical analogue of standardly stratified algebras. Explicitly, we give a parameterization of irreducible representations of \mathfrak{C} , provide several sufficient criteria such that \mathfrak{C} -Mod is equivalent to the Cartesian product of module categories over the “local” endomorphism algebras of \mathfrak{C} , and describe applications of these results to representation theory of some important combinatorial categories including categories of spans and the category of finite dimensional vector spaces over a finite field and linear maps. In the second part, using the technique of Grothendieck bifibrations, we glue a family of complete cotorsion pairs in the module categories of these “local” endomorphism algebras to a complete cotorsion pair in \mathfrak{C} -Mod, and deduce that under certain mild conditions a family of abelian model structures on these “local” module categories can be glued to an abelian model structure on \mathfrak{C} -Mod. As applications, we obtain a few abelian model structures on generalized k -linear direct or inverse categories.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Motivation	2
1.2. Definition and representations	3
1.3. Applications to representations of combinatorial categories	3
1.4. Abelian model structures	5
1.5. Organization	6
Part I. Representations of Reedy categories	6
2. Preliminaries on Reedy categories and representations	6
2.1. Linear categories and representations	6
2.2. Generalized k -linear Reedy categories	7
2.3. The induction functor	10
3. Standard modules and filtrations	11
3.1. Ideals and quotient categories	11
3.2. Standard modules	12
3.3. Filtrations and irreducible modules	14
4. Decomposition of module categories I: central idempotents	16
5. Decomposition of module categories II: non-degenerate elements	19
5.1. Another sufficient criterion	19
5.2. Applications	21
Part II. Abelian model structures	23

Date: January 6, 2026.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 18A25, 18N40, 18G25.

Key words and phrases. Generalized linear Reedy category, representation, standard module, Grothendieck bifibration, complete cotorsion pair, abelian model structure.

Z.X. Di was partly supported by NSF of China (Grant No. 12471034), Scientific Research Fund of Fujian Province (Grant No. 605-52525002) and Scientific Research Fund of Huaqiao University (Grant No. 605-50Y22050); L.P. Li was partly supported by NSF of China (Grant No. 12171146); L. Liang was partly supported by NSF of China (Grant No. 12271230) and the Foundation for Innovative Fundamental Research Group Project of Gansu Province (Grant No. 25JRRA805).

6. Preliminaries on model structures and Grothendieck bifibrations	23
6.1. Abelian model structures	23
6.2. Grothendieck bifibrations	25
7. Restriction functors and its adjoints	28
8. The bifibrational nature of the restriction functor	31
9. Lifting of complete cotorsion pairs	39
10. Lifting of abelian model structures	44
References	47

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Motivation. The simplex category of finite totally ordered sets and order-preserving maps plays a prominent role in various areas including algebraic topology, homotopy theory, model structures, and higher category theory [16]. Via extracting the following fundamental combinatorial properties of this category, Kan introduced the notion of Reedy categories \mathcal{C} :

- (a) there is a total ordering on the object set $\text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$ given by a degree function;
- (b) it has two subcategories \mathcal{C}^+ and \mathcal{C}^- sharing the same objects as \mathcal{C} such that non-identity morphisms in \mathcal{C}^+ increase the degree and non-identity morphisms in \mathcal{C}^- decrease the degree;
- (c) every morphism in \mathcal{C} can be uniquely expressed as a composite of a morphism in \mathcal{C}^- followed by a morphism in \mathcal{C}^+ .

Reedy categories are widely used to construct model structures on functor categories. In particular, given a model category \mathcal{M} , then the functor category $\text{Fun}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M})$ has a natural model structure called the *Reedy model structure*; for details, see [18] or [19].

Recently, Reedy categories have been generalized from different aspects. To overcome the restriction that all automorphisms in Reedy categories are identities, Berger and Moerdijk introduced generalized Reedy categories in [5] to encompass non-identity automorphisms, and Shulman defined g -Reedy categories and c -Reedy categories in [38] to include non-identity endomorphisms. These generalized constructions loose the strict uniqueness of factorizations in (c) to the uniqueness of factorizations up to a certain equivalence relation, and hence contain quite a lot new examples, such as the category of finite sets and maps, Segal's category Γ [37], Connes' cyclic category Λ [9], and categories of spans of orbit categories of finite groups [12].

To study enriched Reedy model structures on enriched functor categories, Angeltveit introduced enriched Reedy categories in [1]. More recently, to consider k -linear Reedy abelian model structures on k -linear functor categories where k is a field, Georgios and Št'ovíček defined k -linear Reedy categories in [11] via replacing the unique factorization property (c) by the unique factorization via tensors over k , and established many interesting representation theoretic properties of these special k -linear categories. In particular, they showed that k -linear Reedy categories can be viewed as infinite dimensional analogue of quasi-hereditary algebras, and built a bijective correspondence between the set of isomorphism classes of irreducible representations and the set of objects.

Note that k -linearizations of classical Reedy categories are k -linear Reedy categories, so the work of [11] recovers many results on representations of Reedy categories. However, since k -linearizations of generalized Reedy categories, g -Reedy categories, and c -Reedy categories are not k -linear Reedy categories in the sense of [11], one may wonder to introduce a notion of generalized k -linear Reedy categories to unify k -linear Reedy categories and k -linearizations of the above mentioned generalized Reedy categories. Furthermore, we want to extend the representation theoretic results and abelian module structures in [11] to this generalized framework. Besides, since many combinatorial categories such as

- the category of finite sets and partial injections considered in [8, 24, 25],
- the category of finite dimensional vector spaces over a finite field and linear maps studied in [24, 25],
- the category of finite sets and all maps considered in [31, 32, 42],
- Segal's category Γ studied in [25, 29, 37, 39],
- Connes' cyclic category Λ considered in [9, 13, 25, 26, 39],
- the category of spans studied in [10, 12, 17, 39]

are generalized Reedy categories in the sense of [5], and their representations have been extensively studied in the literature, we also hope to provide a systematic approach to unify the various proofs of some important results.

1.2. Definition and representations. Throughout this paper let k be a commutative ring. By reasonably modifying the three axioms listed in the previous subsection, we say that a small skeletal k -linear category \mathfrak{C} is a generalized k -linear Reedy category if the following conditions are fulfilled:

- (a) there is a total ordering on $\text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$ given by a degree function d from $\text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$ to an ordinal λ ;
- (b) it has two k -linear subcategories \mathfrak{C}^+ and \mathfrak{C}^- sharing the same objects as \mathfrak{C} such that nonzero morphisms between distinct objects in \mathfrak{C}^+ increase the degree and nonzero morphisms between distinct objects in \mathfrak{C}^- decrease the degree;
- (c) for each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$, one has $\mathfrak{C}^+(x, x) = \mathfrak{C}^-(x, x)$, denoted by A_x^0 ;
- (d) for all $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$, the composition map gives an (A_y^0, A_x^0) -bimodule isomorphism

$$\bigoplus_{z \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, y) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{C}(x, y).$$

It is easy to see that this definition indeed unifies the concept of k -linear Reedy categories in [11] and k -linearizations of generalized Reedy categories in [5]. Denote by \mathfrak{C}^0 the intersection of \mathfrak{C}^+ and \mathfrak{C}^- , which viewed as a k -algebra is a coproduct of “local” endomorphism algebras A_x^0 ’s with x ranging over all objects in \mathfrak{C} .

Georgios and Št'ovíček have shown in [11] that k -linear Reedy categories are infinite categorical analogue of quasi-hereditary algebras. As a natural generalization, under certain mild conditions we prove that generalized k -linear Reedy categories can be viewed as infinite categorical analogue of standardly stratified algebras. That is, for each object x in \mathfrak{C} , we construct a special \mathfrak{C} -module Δ_x (called the *standard module*) satisfying the following properties:

Theorem A. *Let \mathfrak{C} be a generalized k -linear Reedy category. Suppose that \mathfrak{C}^+ is a right projective \mathfrak{C}^0 -module. Then:*

- (a) $\Delta_x \cong \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^-} A_x^0$ as left \mathfrak{C} -modules;
- (b) $\text{End}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_x) \cong (A_x^0)^{\text{op}}$ as k -algebras;
- (c) $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_x, \Delta_y) \neq 0$ only if $x = y$ or $d(x) > d(y)$;
- (d) $\text{Ext}_{\mathfrak{C}}^n(\Delta_x, \Delta_y) \neq 0$ for $n \geq 1$ only if $d(x) > d(y)$.

Moreover, one can show that every representable functor $\mathfrak{C}(x, -)$ has a (transfinite) filtration whose factors are closely related to these standard modules. For details, please refer to Proposition 3.11 and Remark 3.12.

When \mathfrak{C} is a k -linear Reedy category in the sense of [11], Georgios and Št'ovíček established a bijective correspondence between $\text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$ and the set of isomorphism classes of irreducible \mathfrak{C} -modules. This is no longer true for generalized k -linear Reedy categories. However, with some extra assumption, we obtain the following result, extending their parametrization.

Theorem B. *Let \mathfrak{C} be a generalized k -linear Reedy category. Suppose that A_x^0 is a semi-perfect k -algebra for each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$, \mathfrak{C}^+ is a right projective \mathfrak{C}^0 -module, and \mathfrak{C}^- is a left projective \mathfrak{C}^0 -module. There is a bijective correspondence between the following sets:*

- (1) {isomorphism classes of irreducible \mathfrak{C} -modules};
- (2) $\bigsqcup_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} \{\text{isomorphism classes of irreducible } A_x^0\text{-modules}\}$.

1.3. Applications to representations of combinatorial categories. As we mentioned before, representation theory of many important combinatorial categories with an underlying generalized Reedy structure has been widely studied in the literature. In particular, based on the work of Kovács [23], Kuhn proved in [24] the following surprising result: when q is invertible in k , the category of functors from the category of finite dimensional vector spaces over a finite field \mathbb{F}_q and \mathbb{F}_q -linear maps to the category of k -modules is equivalent to the Cartesian product of module categories of $k\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ for all $n \geq 0$. Via taking $q = 1$, one can recover a result proved in [8] for the category of finite sets and partial injections. Similar results in a more abstract setup have been established by quite a few authors; see for instances [25, 39, 41].

One of the main goals of this paper is to obtain several sufficient criteria for generalized k -linear Reedy categories such that the above equivalence of functor categories holds. The first criterion is motivated by the work of Kuhn [24], relying on the existence of certain special central idempotents. Explicitly, we have:

Theorem C. *Let \mathfrak{C} be a generalized k -linear Reedy category satisfying the following conditions:*

- (a) \mathfrak{C}^+ is a projective right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module, and \mathfrak{C}^- is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module;
- (b) for each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$, there is a central idempotent $e_x \in A_x = \mathfrak{C}(x, x)$ such that

$$e_x A_x e_x = \bigoplus_{z \neq x} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z);$$

- (c) for $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$, the left A_y^0 -module $\mathfrak{C}^-(x, y)$ contains a free direct summand whenever $\mathfrak{C}^+(y, x) \neq 0$.

Then one has an equivalence

$$\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod} \simeq \prod_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} A_x^0\text{-Mod}.$$

The strategy to establish this theorem is a formalization of that in [24]. We can show with the given conditions that the set $\{\Delta_x \mid x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})\}$ of standard modules forms an orthogonal family of projective generators in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$, and the conclusion then follows from a categorical version of Morita equivalence.

The above result indeed covers [24, Theorem 1.1] and [8, Theorem 1.7]. However, in practice it is not an easy task to find central idempotents satisfying the condition (b) in Theorem C. In the next theorem we give another criterion, which can be applied to many combinatorial categories more conveniently.

Given $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$ and a nonzero morphism $g \in \mathfrak{C}^+(x, y)$, we get a k -linear map

$$\varphi_g : \mathfrak{C}^-(y, x) \rightarrow A_x = \mathfrak{C}(x, x), \quad f \mapsto fg.$$

We say that g is *non-degenerate* if $\varphi_g \neq 0$. With respect to this notion, one has:

Theorem D. *Let k be a field and \mathfrak{C} a generalized k -linear Reedy category. Suppose that the following conditions hold for all $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$:*

- (a) $\mathfrak{C}^+(x, y)$ is a finite dimensional vector space over k ;
- (b) $\mathfrak{C}^+(x, y)$ is a projective right A_x^0 -module and $\mathfrak{C}^-(y, x)$ is a free left A_x^0 -module;
- (c) $\dim_k \mathfrak{C}^+(x, y) = \dim_k \mathfrak{C}^-(y, x)$;
- (d) every nonzero morphism $g \in \mathfrak{C}^+(x, y)$ is non-degenerate.

Then one has an equivalence

$$\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod} \simeq \prod_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} A_x^0\text{-Mod}.$$

One may use this theorem as well as its dual version Theorem 5.3 to investigate representations of categories of spans. Explicitly, let \mathcal{C} be small skeletal category such that every endomorphism in \mathcal{C} is an automorphism. Then the binary relation \leqslant on $\text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$ such that $x \leqslant y$ if and only if $\mathcal{C}(x, y) \neq \emptyset$ is a partial order. We say that \mathcal{C} is an *artinian EI category* if this partial order satisfies the descending chain condition. In the case that \mathcal{C} has pullbacks, one can define the *category $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ of spans* as follows: it has the same objects as \mathcal{C} ; a morphism in $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}(x, y)$ is represented by a diagram $x \xleftarrow{f} z \xrightarrow{g} y$ with f and g morphisms in \mathcal{C} , and two pairs (f, g) and (f', g') represent the same morphism in $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ if there is an automorphism $\sigma : z \rightarrow z$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & z & & \\ & f \swarrow & \downarrow \sigma & \searrow g & \\ x & \xleftarrow{f'} & z & \xrightarrow{g'} & y \end{array}$$

Composition of morphisms are induced by pullbacks; see Subsection 5.2 for details. We mention that many interesting combinatorial categories are equivalent to categories of spans, for examples, the category of finite sets and partial injections, the category of finite dimensional vector spaces and linear partial injections, etc.

We can deduce the following result from Theorem D.

Theorem E. *Let k be a field and \mathcal{C} an artinian EI category satisfying the following conditions:*

- (a) \mathcal{C} has pullbacks;
- (b) $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$ is a finite set for all $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$;
- (c) the order of each group $G_x = \mathcal{C}(x, x)$ is invertible in k ;
- (d) every morphism in \mathcal{C} is a monomorphism.

Then one has an equivalence

$$\underline{\mathcal{C}}\text{-Mod} \simeq \prod_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})} kG_x\text{-Mod},$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ is the k -linearization of \mathcal{C} .

1.4. Abelian model structures. A significant motivation to consider Reedy categories and its variants is to construct model structures on functor categories over them. Since in this paper we mainly study the category $\text{Fun}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A})$ of k -linear functors from a generalized k -linear Reedy category \mathcal{C} to another k -linear abelian category \mathcal{A} , we are more interested in the construction of abelian model structures on $\text{Fun}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A})$. By definition (see Hovey [20]), they are model structures compatible with the abelian structure of $\text{Fun}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A})$; that is, cofibrations coincide with monomorphisms with cofibrant cokernels and fibrations coincide with epimorphisms with fibrant kernels. By Hovey's correspondence, this is equivalent to constructing *Hovey triples* $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{R})$ of classes of objects in $\text{Fun}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A})$ such that both $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{R})$ and $(\mathcal{Q} \cap \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{R})$ are complete cotorsion pairs, and \mathcal{W} is thick. Compared to abelian model structures defined in terms of morphisms, Hovey triples can be described by properties of objects, which are much more transparent in practice.

We need to introduce a few more notions before stating our main result in the second part of this paper. Let \mathcal{C} be a generalized k -linear Reedy category. Given any family $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathcal{S}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})}$ of classes of objects in those $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$'s, denote by $\mathcal{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{S}}$ the class of $\mathcal{C}\text{-Mod}$ consisting of all \mathcal{C} -modules Y such that $Y(x)$ belongs to \mathcal{S}_x for each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$. We also consider two classes $\Phi(\mathcal{S})$ and $\Psi(\mathcal{S})$ of \mathcal{C} -modules:

$$\Phi(\mathcal{S}) = \left\{ Y \in \mathcal{C}\text{-Mod} \mid \begin{array}{l} \text{for each } x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C}) \text{ with the degree } \alpha, \\ l_Y^\alpha(x) \text{ is monic and } \text{coker}(l_Y^\alpha(x)) \in \mathcal{S}_x \end{array} \right\}, \text{ and}$$

$$\Psi(\mathcal{S}) = \left\{ Y \in \mathcal{C}\text{-Mod} \mid \begin{array}{l} \text{for each } x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C}) \text{ with the degree } \alpha, \\ m_Y^\alpha(x) \text{ is epic and } \text{ker}(m_Y^\alpha(x)) \in \mathcal{S}_x \end{array} \right\}.$$

Here, $l_Y^\alpha(x) : 1_x \mathcal{C} \otimes_{\mathcal{C}_\alpha} \text{Res}_\alpha Y \rightarrow Y(x)$ is the counit of the adjunction

$$\text{In}_\alpha : \mathcal{C}_\alpha\text{-Mod} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{C}\text{-Mod} : \text{Res}_\alpha$$

evaluated at Y and x , and $m_Y^\alpha(x) : Y(x) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}_\alpha}(\mathcal{C}1_x, \text{Res}_\alpha Y)$ is the unit of the adjunction

$$\text{Res}_\alpha : \mathcal{C}\text{-Mod} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{C}_\alpha\text{-Mod} : \text{coln}_\alpha$$

evaluated at Y and x , where \mathcal{C}_α is the full subcategory of \mathcal{C} consisting of objects with degree less than α ; see Section 7 for details.

The next result asserts that under some mild conditions, a family of (hereditary) Hovey triples in those $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$'s induces a (hereditary) Hovey triple in $\mathcal{C}\text{-Mod}$.

Theorem F. *Let \mathcal{C} be a generalized k -linear Reedy category with \mathcal{C}^+ a projective right \mathcal{C}^0 -module and \mathcal{C}^- a projective left \mathcal{C}^0 -module. Suppose that $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{R}) = \{(\mathcal{Q}_x, \mathcal{W}_x, \mathcal{R}_x)\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})}$ is a family with $(\mathcal{Q}_x, \mathcal{W}_x, \mathcal{R}_x)$ a (hereditary) Hovey triple in $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$. If $\{\mathcal{Q}_x \cap \mathcal{W}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})}$ is compatible and $\{\mathcal{W}_x \cap \mathcal{R}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})}$ is co-compatible, then*

$$(\Phi(\mathcal{Q}), \mathcal{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{W}}, \Psi(\mathcal{R}))$$

forms a (hereditary) Hovey triple in $\mathcal{C}\text{-Mod}$.

For definitions of compatible and co-compatible conditions, see Definition 10.1.

Remark. For the case that the target category of representations is the category of k -modules, Theorem F extends [11, Theorem 7.2] from k -linear Reedy categories with k a field to generalized k -linear Reedy categories. As in [11], the key construction relies on a transfinite induction to glue a family of (complete) cotorsion pairs in those $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$'s to obtain a (complete) cotorsion pair in $\mathcal{C}\text{-Mod}$. However, for our convenience, we use a new approach based on Grothendieck bifibrations. In details, the strategy to carry out the induction step can be divided into the three steps:

- (1) We give a transparent description of the fiber $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}_V$ of a \mathfrak{C}_α -module V , and show that the restriction functor $\text{Res}_\alpha : \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_\alpha\text{-Mod}$ induced by the embedding $\iota_\alpha : \mathfrak{C}_\alpha \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}$ is a Grothendieck bifibration; see Theorem 8.8.
- (2) Given a Grothendieck bifibration $p : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$, Stanculescu [40] provided a method to construct a weak factorization system in the total category \mathcal{T} via combining weak factorization systems in the fibers \mathcal{T}_A for $A \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{B})$ and a weak factorization system in the basis category \mathcal{B} ; see also Cagno and Mellies [7, Lemma 2.4]. Applying this result, we obtain a weak factorization system in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}$ via gluing weak factorization systems in the fibers $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}_V$ for all \mathfrak{C}_α -modules V and a weak factorization system in $\mathfrak{C}_\alpha\text{-Mod}$.
- (3) Finally, by the bijective correspondence between complete cotorsion pairs and weak factorization systems established in [20] (see also Positselski and Šťovíček [30, Theorem 2.4]), we obtain desired complete cotorsion pairs in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}$, completing the induction step.

We then give some examples of Theorem F in Gorenstein homological algebra, and construct several Hovey triples in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$ for some special kinds of generalized k -linear Reedy categories. Explicitly, if \mathfrak{C} is a *generalized k -linear direct category* (that is, $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}^+$) such that it is projective both as a left and a right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module (see Example 10.18), then

$$(\Phi(\mathcal{PGF}), \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{PGF}^\perp}, \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}) \quad \text{and} \quad (\Phi(\mathcal{GF}), \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{PGF}^\perp}, \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{T}})$$

form hereditary Hovey triples in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$; see Corollaries 10.15 and 10.16. Dually, if \mathfrak{C} is a *generalized k -linear inverse category* (that is, $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}^-$) such that it is projective both as a left and a right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module, then

$$(\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}, \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\perp \mathcal{G}\mathcal{I}}, \Psi(\mathcal{G}\mathcal{I}))$$

forms a hereditary Hovey triple in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$; see Corollary 10.17.

1.5. Organization. The paper is divided into two parts, the first one of which handles representation theory of generalized k -linear Reedy categories \mathfrak{C} . Specifically, in Section 2 we introduce generalized k -linear Reedy categories, and study their elementary properties. Standard modules are introduced in Section 3, where we prove Theorem A and give a parameterization of isomorphism classes of irreducible representations of \mathfrak{C} . Theorem C is proved in Section 4, while in Section 5 we prove Theorem D and describe a few applications, including representations of categories of spans as well as semisimplicity of Mackey functors.

In the second part we focus on abelian model structures on $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$. For the convenience of the reader, we describe in Section 6 necessary background knowledge on abelian model structures and Grothendieck (op)fibrations. The main technical tools, namely the restriction functor and its adjoints, are considered in Section 7. In Section 8, we further study the restriction functor, revealing its bifibrational structure. In Section 9, we show that a given family of complete cotorsion pairs in $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$'s can be glued to a complete cotorsion pair in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$. As a direct consequence of this result, we show in the last section that a given family of abelian model structures on $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$'s can be also glued to an abelian model structure on $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$, and describe a few examples.

Part I. Representations of Reedy categories

In this part, we introduce generalized k -linear Reedy categories, explore their representations, and pursue applications to representation theory of combinatorial categories with an underlying generalized Reedy structure.

2. PRELIMINARIES ON REEDY CATEGORIES AND REPRESENTATIONS

In this section we describe some preliminary knowledge on generalized k -linear Reedy categories.

2.1. Linear categories and representations. Throughout the paper let k be a commutative ring with identity, and let \mathfrak{C} be a small skeletal k -linear category. Given $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$, denote by $\mathfrak{C}(x, y)$ the set of all morphisms from x to y , which has a natural structure of a k -module. In particular, when $x = y$, we denote $\mathfrak{C}(x, x)$ by A_x , which is a k -algebra. It is clear that $\mathfrak{C}(x, y)$ is an (A_y, A_x) -bimodule.

Given two k -linear subcategories \mathfrak{D} and \mathfrak{E} of \mathfrak{C} , define the intersection $\mathfrak{D} \cap \mathfrak{E}$ to be the k -linear category: $\text{Ob}(\mathfrak{D} \cap \mathfrak{E}) = \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{D}) \cap \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{E})$; for $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{D} \cap \mathfrak{E})$, set $(\mathfrak{D} \cap \mathfrak{E})(x, y) = \mathfrak{D}(x, y) \cap \mathfrak{E}(x, y)$.

By definition, a *representation* of \mathfrak{C} , or a left \mathfrak{C} -*module*, is a k -linear covariant functor V from \mathfrak{C} to $k\text{-Mod}$, the category of all k -modules. Fixing an object x , we denote by V_x or $V(x)$ the value of V on x . Morphisms between two representations of \mathfrak{C} are k -linear natural transformations. We say that \mathfrak{C} is *locally finite* if $\mathfrak{C}(x, y)$ is a finitely generated k -module for all $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$. Similarly, a left \mathfrak{C} -module V is called *locally finite* if each V_x is a finitely generated k -module.

Sometimes it is more convenient to view \mathfrak{C} as a (non-unital) k -algebra $A_{\mathfrak{C}}$. More explicitly, as (k, k) -bimodules, one has

$$A_{\mathfrak{C}} = \bigoplus_{x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} \mathfrak{C}(x, y),$$

and given two morphisms $f \in \mathfrak{C}(x, y)$ and $g \in \mathfrak{C}(z, w)$, one defines the product gf to be the composite if $y = z$, and to be 0 otherwise. It is easy to check that $A_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is an associative k -algebra. Moreover, if \mathfrak{D} and \mathfrak{E} are k -linear subcategories of \mathfrak{C} , then $A_{\mathfrak{D}}$ and $A_{\mathfrak{E}}$ are (non-unital) k -subalgebras of $A_{\mathfrak{C}}$, and

$$A_{\mathfrak{D} \cap \mathfrak{E}} = A_{\mathfrak{D}} \cap A_{\mathfrak{E}}.$$

Every left \mathfrak{C} -module can be viewed as a left $A_{\mathfrak{C}}$ -module in a natural way, but the converse statement only holds if $\text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$ is a finite set. Indeed, a left $A_{\mathfrak{C}}$ -module M is a left \mathfrak{C} -module if and only if it has the following decomposition

$$M = \bigoplus_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} 1_x M,$$

where 1_x is the identity morphism on x , and in this case we call M a *graded* left $A_{\mathfrak{C}}$ -module. It is well known that $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$, the category of left \mathfrak{C} -modules, is isomorphic to the category of graded left $A_{\mathfrak{C}}$ -modules, and hence can be viewed as a full subcategory of $A_{\mathfrak{C}}\text{-Mod}$. Moreover, for each object x , the projective left $A_{\mathfrak{C}}$ -module $A_{\mathfrak{C}} 1_x$ is a graded left $A_{\mathfrak{C}}$ -module, which is nothing but the representable functor $\mathfrak{C}(x, -)$, and sometimes we also denote it by $\mathfrak{C} 1_x$ by abuse of notations.

2.2. Generalized k -linear Reedy categories. Now we introduce generalized k -linear Reedy categories. Let λ be an ordinal, and $d : \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}) \rightarrow \lambda$ be a *degree function*.

2.1 Definition. A small skeletal k -linear category \mathfrak{C} is called a generalized k -linear Reedy category with respect to the degree function d if it has two subcategories \mathfrak{C}^+ and \mathfrak{C}^- such that the following conditions hold:

- (a) $\text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}^+) = \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$ and $(\mathfrak{C}^+(x, y) \neq 0) \Rightarrow (x = y) \vee (d(y) > d(x))$;
- (b) $\text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}^-) = \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$ and $(\mathfrak{C}^-(x, y) \neq 0) \Rightarrow (x = y) \vee (d(x) > d(y))$;
- (c) $\mathfrak{C}^+(x, x) = \mathfrak{C}^-(x, x)$ for $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$;
- (d) Let $\mathfrak{C}^0 = \mathfrak{C}^+ \cap \mathfrak{C}^-$. Then the composition induces a $(\mathfrak{C}^0, \mathfrak{C}^0)$ -bimodule isomorphism

$$\rho : A_{\mathfrak{C}^+} \otimes_{A_{\mathfrak{C}^0}} A_{\mathfrak{C}^-} \rightarrow A_{\mathfrak{C}}.$$

2.2 Remark. Although $A_{\mathfrak{C}^+} \otimes_{A_{\mathfrak{C}^0}} A_{\mathfrak{C}^-}$ is a tensor of two rings, in general it cannot be equipped with a ring structure given by the tensor product. However, the above isomorphism ρ allows one to define a ring structure on it. Explicitly, given $f^+ \otimes f^-$ and $g^+ \otimes g^-$ in $A_{\mathfrak{C}^+} \otimes_{A_{\mathfrak{C}^0}} A_{\mathfrak{C}^-}$, their product is defined to be

$$(f^+ \otimes f^-) * (g^+ \otimes g^-) = \rho^{-1}(\rho(f^+ \otimes f^-) \rho(g^+ \otimes g^-)) = \rho^{-1}(f^+ f^- g^+ g^-).$$

Via this construction ρ becomes a (non-unital) ring isomorphism, so we identify $A_{\mathfrak{C}^+} \otimes_{A_{\mathfrak{C}^0}} A_{\mathfrak{C}^-}$ with $A_{\mathfrak{C}}$. With respect to this identification, the subring $A_{\mathfrak{C}^+} \otimes_{A_{\mathfrak{C}^0}} A_{\mathfrak{C}^0}$ (resp., $A_{\mathfrak{C}^0} \otimes_{A_{\mathfrak{C}^0}} A_{\mathfrak{C}^-}$ and $A_{\mathfrak{C}^0} \otimes_{A_{\mathfrak{C}^0}} A_{\mathfrak{C}^0}$) of $A_{\mathfrak{C}^+} \otimes_{A_{\mathfrak{C}^0}} A_{\mathfrak{C}^-}$ is identified with the subring $A_{\mathfrak{C}^+}$ (resp., $A_{\mathfrak{C}^-}$ and $A_{\mathfrak{C}^0}$) of $A_{\mathfrak{C}}$.

In the rest of this paper we always equip $A_{\mathfrak{C}^+} \otimes_{A_{\mathfrak{C}^0}} A_{\mathfrak{C}^-}$ the multiplication $*$. To simplify notation, from now on we identify k -linear categories \mathfrak{C} , \mathfrak{C}^+ , \mathfrak{C}^- and \mathfrak{C}^0 with their associated k -algebras. Although as pointed out before, not all $A_{\mathfrak{C}}$ -module are \mathfrak{C} -modules, this identification does not cause troubles to us since in this paper we only consider graded $A_{\mathfrak{C}}$ -modules, which are precisely \mathfrak{C} -modules. Hopefully this simplification does not cause confusions for reader to figure out the precisely meaning (a k -linear category or a k -algebra) of \mathfrak{C} from the context.

By these conventions, one can restate the condition (d) as $(\mathfrak{C}^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^0} \mathfrak{C}^-, *) \cong \mathfrak{C}$ as rings.

2.3 Remark. The above definition can extend to non-skeletal k -linear categories if we loose the requirement $x = y$ in (a) and (b) to the weaker condition $x \cong y$. To simplify superficial technical issues, we do not pursue this full generality in this paper.

Let us describe a few immediate consequences of the above definition. The degree function d does not induce a partial order \preccurlyeq on $\text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$ via setting $x \preccurlyeq y$ when $d(x) \leq d(y)$, since distinct objects can have the same degree, and hence the anti-symmetry fails. Instead, we can use morphisms in \mathfrak{C}^- to obtain a satisfactory partial order on $\text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$. Explicitly, given objects x and y , define $y \preccurlyeq x$ if there exists a finite sequence of objects $x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n = y$ such that $\mathfrak{C}^-(x_i, x_{i+1}) \neq 0$.

2.4 Lemma. *The binary relation \preccurlyeq is an artinian partial order on $\text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$.*

Proof. It is clear that \preccurlyeq is reflexive and transitive. Suppose that $y \preccurlyeq x$ and $x \preccurlyeq y$. Then we can find two sequences

$$x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_m = y \quad \text{and} \quad y = y_0, y_1, \dots, y_n = x$$

such that $\mathfrak{C}^-(x_i, x_{i+1}) \neq 0$ and $\mathfrak{C}^-(y_i, y_{i+1}) \neq 0$. Accordingly, one has

$$d(x) = d(x_0) \leq d(x_1) \leq \dots \leq d(x_m) = d(y) \quad \text{and} \quad d(y) = d(y_0) \leq d(y_1) \leq \dots \leq d(y_n) = d(x).$$

Thus, all degrees are equal. But $\mathfrak{C}^-(x_i, x_{i+1}) \neq 0$ implies that $x_i = x_{i+1}$ since they share the same degree. Consequently, one has $x = y$, so \preccurlyeq also has the anti-symmetry property. In conclusion, the binary relation \preccurlyeq is a partial order on $\text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$.

We claim that $d(y) < d(x)$ if $y \prec x$. Indeed, since $y \prec x$, we can find a finite sequence $x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n = y$ such that $\mathfrak{C}^-(x_i, x_{i+1}) \neq 0$ and there is at least one i with $x_i \neq x_{i+1}$. But this forces $d(x_{i+1}) < d(x_i)$, so $d(y) < d(x)$, as claimed. Thus, d is an order-preserving map from the poset $(\text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}), \preccurlyeq)$ to the ordinal λ , so \preccurlyeq must be artinian. \square

2.5 Remark. One can define another partial order \preccurlyeq' on $\text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$ via \mathfrak{C}^+ . Explicitly, given objects x and y , define $x \preccurlyeq' y$ if there exists a finite sequence of objects $x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n = y$ such that $\mathfrak{C}^+(x_i, x_{i+1}) \neq 0$. The reader can check that this is also an artinian partial order, but in general we cannot expect that \preccurlyeq and \preccurlyeq' coincide. For example, let \mathfrak{C} be the k -linearization of the category whose objects are $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and morphisms are injections. Define $d : \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}) \rightarrow \lambda$ by setting $d([n]) = n$ where λ is an arbitrary infinite ordinal. Then $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}^+$. It is easy to see that \preccurlyeq is the discrete partial order, while \preccurlyeq' is isomorphic to the usual linear order on \mathbb{N} .

Note that if $\mathfrak{C}^-(x, y) \neq 0$, then $y \preccurlyeq x$. Similarly, if $\mathfrak{C}^+(x, y) \neq 0$, then $x \preccurlyeq' y$. But the converse statements fail since the composite of two nonzero morphisms might be 0. Furthermore, in the proof of Lemma 2.4 we have shown that d is an order-preserving map from $(\text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}), \preccurlyeq)$ to the cardinal λ . The same conclusion holds while replacing $(\text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}), \preccurlyeq)$ by $(\text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}), \preccurlyeq')$. Therefore, we have the following strict implications:

$$\mathfrak{C}^+(x, y) \neq 0 \Rightarrow x \preccurlyeq' y \Rightarrow (x = y) \vee (d(x) < d(y)), \text{ and}$$

$$\mathfrak{C}^-(x, y) \neq 0 \Rightarrow y \preccurlyeq x \Rightarrow (x = y) \vee (d(y) < d(x)).$$

Throughout this paper, we always use the partial order \preccurlyeq on $\text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$ unless otherwise specified.

The following results can also be easily deduced from the definition.

2.6 Lemma. *Suppose that \mathfrak{C} is a generalized k -linear Reedy category. Then for any $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$,*

- (a) $\mathfrak{C}^0(x, y) \neq 0$ if and only if $x = y$;
- (b) the composition ρ induces an isomorphism of (A_y^0, A_x^0) -modules

$$\bigoplus_{z \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, y) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z) \cong \mathfrak{C}(x, y),$$

where $A_z^0 = \mathfrak{C}^0(z, z)$;

- (c) if $d(x) = d(y)$ is minimal but $x \neq y$, then $\mathfrak{C}(x, y) = 0$.

Proof. The if direction of (a) is trivial. Conversely, if $\mathfrak{C}^0(x, y) \neq 0$, then both $\mathfrak{C}^+(x, y)$ and $\mathfrak{C}^-(x, y)$ are nonzero. In the case $x \neq y$, one shall have $d(x) < d(y)$ and $d(x) > d(y)$, which is impossible. Thus, $x = y$.

By (a), we have the following decomposition of k -algebras

$$\mathfrak{C}^0 = \bigoplus_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} \mathfrak{C}^0(x, x) = \bigoplus_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} A_x^0.$$

Correspondingly, for $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$, the left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module \mathfrak{C}^-1_x has the following decomposition

$$\mathfrak{C}^-1_x = \bigoplus_{z \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} 1_z \mathfrak{C}^-1_x = \bigoplus_{z \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z)$$

since each $\mathfrak{C}^-(x, z)$ is a left A_z^0 -module, and hence, is a left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module.

Now we prove (b). Let 1_x and 1_y be the identity morphisms on x and y respectively. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{C}(x, y) &= 1_y \mathfrak{C}1_x \\ &\cong 1_y \mathfrak{C}^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^0} \mathfrak{C}^-1_x \\ &\cong 1_y \mathfrak{C}^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^0} \left(\bigoplus_{z \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} 1_z \mathfrak{C}^-1_x \right) \\ &\cong \bigoplus_{z \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} (1_y \mathfrak{C}^+) \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^0} (1_z \mathfrak{C}^-1_x) \\ &= \bigoplus_{z \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} (1_y \mathfrak{C}^+ 1_z) \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^0} (1_z \mathfrak{C}^-1_x) \\ &= \bigoplus_{z \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, y) \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z) \\ &\cong \bigoplus_{z \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, y) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z), \end{aligned}$$

where the first isomorphism holds by the condition (d) in the definition of Reedy categories,¹ and the last isomorphism follows from the observation that \mathfrak{C}^0 is a direct sum of A_z^0 's, $\mathfrak{C}^+(z, y)$ is a right A_z^0 -module, and $\mathfrak{C}^-(x, z)$ is a left A_z^0 -module.

Statement (c) immediately follows from the isomorphism in (b). Indeed, if $\mathfrak{C}(x, y) \neq 0$, then by the isomorphism in (b), we shall have a certain object z such that $\mathfrak{C}^-(x, z) \neq 0 \neq \mathfrak{C}^+(z, y)$. But since $d(x) = d(y)$ is minimal, one must have $x = z = y$ by the definition of generalized k -linear Reedy categories. \square

2.7 Remark. By the statement (b) in the previous lemma, given a morphism $f : x \rightarrow y$ in \mathfrak{C} , one obtains the decomposition $f = f_1^+ f_1^- + \dots + f_n^+ f_n^-$ with $f_i^+ \in \mathfrak{C}^+(x_i, y)$ and $f_i^- \in \mathfrak{C}^-(x, x_i)$. Furthermore, this expression is unique in the following sense. Let $f = g_1^+ g_1^- + \dots + g_m^+ g_m^-$ be another decomposition with $g_i^+ \in \mathfrak{C}^+(y_i, y)$ and $g_i^- \in \mathfrak{C}^-(x, y_i)$. Without loss of generality, assume that

$$x_1 = x_2 = \dots = x_{i_1}, x_{i_1+1} = x_{i_1+2} = \dots = x_{i_2}, \dots, x_{i_{r-1}+1} = \dots = x_{i_r}$$

with $i_r = n$ and

$$y_1 = y_2 = \dots = y_{j_1}, y_{j_1+1} = y_{j_1+2} = \dots = y_{j_2}, \dots, y_{j_{s-1}+1} = \dots = y_{j_s}$$

with $j_s = m$ such that x_{i_t} 's (resp., y_{j_t} 's) are distinct for $1 \leq t \leq r$ (resp., $1 \leq t \leq s$). Then $r = s$, $y_{i_t} = x_{i_t}$ for $1 \leq t \leq s$, and

$$g_{i_{t-1}+1}^+ \otimes g_{i_{t-1}+1}^- + \dots + g_{i_t}^+ \otimes g_{i_t}^- = f_{i_{t-1}+1}^+ \otimes f_{i_{t-1}+1}^- + \dots + f_{i_t}^+ \otimes f_{i_t}^-$$

in $\mathfrak{C}^+(x_{i_t}, y) \otimes_{A_{x_{i_t}}^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, x_{i_t})$ for each t . We call this expression the *Reedy factorization* of f .

The following two examples show that the notion of generalized k -linear Reedy categories unifies k -linear Reedy categories introduced in [11] and k -linearizations of generalized Reedy categories introduced in [5].

2.8 Example. Let k be a field. Recall from [11, Definitions 3.1 and 3.6] that \mathfrak{C} is called a k -linear Reedy category with respect to a degree function $d : \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}) \rightarrow \lambda$ if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (a) \mathfrak{C} has a subcategory \mathfrak{C}^+ sharing the same objects such that $\mathfrak{C}^+(x, x) \cong k$ and $\mathfrak{C}^+(x, y) \neq 0$ only if $x = y$ or $d(x) < d(y)$;

¹Here we do not require the conclusion that ρ induces a ring isomorphism given in Remark 2.2.

- (b) \mathfrak{C} has a subcategory \mathfrak{C}^- sharing the same objects such that $\mathfrak{C}^-(x, x) \cong k$ and $\mathfrak{C}^-(x, y) \neq 0$ only if $x = y$ or $d(x) > d(y)$;
- (c) for $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$, the composition induces a k -linear isomorphism

$$\bigoplus_{z \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, y) \otimes_k \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z) \cong \mathfrak{C}(x, y).$$

Clearly, a k -linear Reedy category is a generalized k -linear Reedy category satisfying two extra conditions: k is a field, and $A_x^0 \cong k$ for $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$.

2.9 Example. Recall from [5, Definition 1.1] that a small skeletal category \mathcal{C} is called a generalized Reedy category with respect to a degree function $d : \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \lambda$ if \mathcal{C} satisfies the following conditions:

- (a) \mathcal{C} has a subcategory \mathcal{C}^+ sharing the same objects such that $\mathcal{C}^+(x, y) \neq \emptyset$ only if $x = y$ or $d(x) < d(y)$;
- (b) \mathcal{C} has a subcategory \mathcal{C}^- sharing the same objects such that $\mathcal{C}^-(x, y) \neq \emptyset$ only if $x = y$ or $d(x) > d(y)$;
- (c) for $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$, $\mathcal{C}^+(x, x) = \mathcal{C}^-(x, x)$ is the group of automorphisms on x ;
- (d) every morphism f in \mathcal{C} has a factorization $f = f^+ f^-$, where f^+ is a morphism in \mathcal{C}^+ and f^- is a morphism in \mathcal{C}^- , and this factorization is unique up to automorphisms;
- (e) $\mathcal{C}^-(y, y)$ acts freely on $\mathcal{C}^-(x, y)$ for $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$.

Let k be a commutative ring. Then the k -linearization $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ is a generalized k -linear Reedy category satisfying two extra conditions: A_x^0 is a group algebra for $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$, and $\underline{\mathcal{C}}(x, y)$ is a left free A_y^0 -module for $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$.

2.3. The induction functor. Since \mathfrak{C}^- is a subcategory of \mathfrak{C} , the inclusion functor $\iota : \mathfrak{C}^- \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ induces a *restriction functor* $\iota^* : \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}^-\text{-Mod}$. It has a left adjoint given by the left Kan extension, called the *induction functor*, which is nothing but the tensor functor $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^-} -$, and a right adjoint given by the right Kan extension, called the *coinduction functor*. In this paper we mainly consider the induction functor, and particularly its exactness.

2.10 Lemma. Let \mathfrak{C} be a generalized k -linear Reedy category. One has:

- (a) \mathfrak{C}^- is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module (resp., projective right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module) if and only if for all $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$, $\mathfrak{C}^-(x, y)$ is a projective left A_y^0 -module (resp., projective right A_x^0 -module). A similar conclusion holds for \mathfrak{C}^+ .
- (b) If \mathfrak{C}^- is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module, then \mathfrak{C} as a left \mathfrak{C}^+ -module is also projective. Dually, if \mathfrak{C}^+ is a projective right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module, then \mathfrak{C} as a right \mathfrak{C}^- -module is projective.

Proof. (a) Note that \mathfrak{C}^0 is a direct sum of A_x^0 's for all $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$. Consequently, as a left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module, one has the following decomposition

$$\mathfrak{C}^- = \bigoplus_{x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, y).$$

Thus, \mathfrak{C}^- is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module if and only each $\mathfrak{C}^-(x, y)$ is a projective left A_y^0 -module. The other cases can be proved similarly.

(b) By Remark 2.2 and Lemma 2.6, for every $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$, one has

$$\mathfrak{C}(x, -) \cong \bigoplus_{z \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, -) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z)$$

as left \mathfrak{C}^+ -modules. If \mathfrak{C}^- is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module, by (a), $\mathfrak{C}^-(x, z)$ is a projective left A_z^0 -module, so the tensor product $\mathfrak{C}^+(z, -) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z)$ is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^+ -module. Consequently, $\mathfrak{C}(x, -)$ is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^+ -module for $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$, so is \mathfrak{C} .

To prove the second statement, we use the isomorphism

$$\mathfrak{C}(-, x) \cong \bigoplus_{z \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(-, z)$$

of right \mathfrak{C}^- -modules. □

An immediate consequence of this lemma is:

2.11 Corollary. *Let \mathfrak{C} be a generalized k -linear Reedy category. If \mathfrak{C}^+ is a projective right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module, then the functor $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^-} -$ is exact. Dually, if \mathfrak{C}^- is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module, then the functor $- \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^+} \mathfrak{C}$ is exact.*

3. STANDARD MODULES AND FILTRATIONS

Standard modules introduced in [11] play a key role for studying representations of k -linear Reedy categories. The main goal of this section is to generalize many important results in [11] to the framework of generalized k -linear Reedy categories.

Setup. In the rest of this part, let \mathfrak{C} be a generalized k -linear Reedy category with $d : \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}) \rightarrow \lambda$ its degree function.

3.1. Ideals and quotient categories. Let α be an ordinal with $\alpha \leq \lambda$. Define

$$\mathfrak{I}_\alpha^- = \bigoplus_{d(y) < \alpha} \mathfrak{C}^-(-, y).$$

This is clearly a right ideal of \mathfrak{C}^- . Furthermore, for any $f : x \rightarrow y$ in \mathfrak{I}_α^- and any morphism $g : y \rightarrow z$ in \mathfrak{C}^- , the composite $gf : x \rightarrow z$ also satisfies $d(z) \leq d(y) < \alpha$, so \mathfrak{I}_α^- is also a left ideal of \mathfrak{C}^- , and hence, a two-sided ideal of \mathfrak{C}^- . Consequently,

$$\mathfrak{I}_\alpha^-(x, -) = \bigoplus_{d(y) < \alpha} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, y)$$

is a left \mathfrak{C}^- -module for each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$.

Similarly, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{I}_\alpha &= \bigoplus_{d(z) < \alpha} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, -) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(\bullet, z) \text{ and} \\ \mathfrak{I}_\alpha(x, -) &= \bigoplus_{d(z) < \alpha} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, -) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z) \end{aligned}$$

for a fixed object x .

The following lemma asserts that \mathfrak{I}_α is a two-sided ideal of \mathfrak{C} ,² and can be obtained from \mathfrak{I}_α^- via applying the induction functor.

3.1 Lemma. *The set \mathfrak{I}_α is a two-sided ideal of \mathfrak{C} . Furthermore, as left \mathfrak{C} -modules, one has*

$$\mathfrak{I}_\alpha \cong \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^-} \mathfrak{I}_\alpha^-.$$

Proof. To establish the first statement, it is enough to show: for $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$, a morphism

$$f \in \mathfrak{I}_\alpha(x, y) = \bigoplus_{d(z) < \alpha} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, y) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z),$$

and morphisms $g : u \rightarrow x$ and $h : y \rightarrow v$ in \mathfrak{C} , one has $hf \in \mathfrak{I}_\alpha(x, v)$ and $fg \in \mathfrak{I}_\alpha(u, y)$. We only show $hf \in \mathfrak{I}_\alpha(x, v)$ as the second one can be established similarly.

By the Reedy factorization, one can find finitely many objects z_1, \dots, z_n (which might not be distinct) with $d(z_i) < \alpha$ such that $f = f_1^+ f_1^- + \dots + f_n^+ f_n^-$, where $f_i^- \in \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z_i)$ and $f_i^+ \in \mathfrak{C}^+(z_i, y)$. Thus it suffices to show $h f_i^+ f_i^- \in \mathfrak{I}_\alpha(x, v)$ for each i . Similarly, we have another Reedy factorization $h = h_1^+ h_1^- + \dots + h_m^+ h_m^-$. It reduces to show that $h_j^+ h_j^- f_i^+ f_i^- \in \mathfrak{I}_\alpha(x, v)$ for each i and j . But for each fixed i and j we have

$$h_j^- f_i^+ = l_1^+ l_1^- + \dots + l_r^+ l_r^-,$$

so it reduces further to show $h_j^+ l_s^+ l_s^- f_i^- \in \mathfrak{I}_\alpha(x, v)$ for each i, j and s . But from the diagram

$$x \xrightarrow{f_i^-} z_i \xrightarrow{l_s^-} a_s \xrightarrow{l_s^+} w_j \xrightarrow{h_j^+} v$$

one clearly has $d(a_s) \leq d(z_i) < \alpha$, so indeed $h_j^+ l_s^+ l_s^- f_i^- \in \mathfrak{I}_\alpha(x, v)$. This finishes the proof.

²To be more precisely, we shall say that the image of $\mathfrak{I}_\alpha = \bigoplus_{d(z) < \alpha} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, -) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(\bullet, z)$ under the composition map ρ is a two-sided ideal of \mathfrak{C} ; see Remark 2.2.

Now we prove the isomorphism. We just proved that $\mathfrak{I}_\alpha(x, -)$ is a left \mathfrak{C} -module. Since

$$\mathfrak{I}_\alpha = \bigoplus_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} \mathfrak{I}_\alpha(x, -) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{I}_\alpha^- = \bigoplus_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} \mathfrak{I}_\alpha^-(x, -),$$

it suffices to check the \mathfrak{C} -module isomorphism $\mathfrak{I}_\alpha(x, -) \cong \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^-} \mathfrak{I}_\alpha^-(x, -)$. But by Remark 2.2 we have

$$\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^-} \mathfrak{I}_\alpha^-(x, -) \cong (\mathfrak{C}^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^0} \mathfrak{C}^-) \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^-} \mathfrak{I}_\alpha^-(x, -) \cong \mathfrak{C}^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^0} \mathfrak{I}_\alpha^-(x, -).$$

It remains to verify the isomorphism

$$\mathfrak{I}_\alpha(x, -) = \bigoplus_{d(z) < \alpha} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, -) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z) \cong \mathfrak{C}^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^0} \mathfrak{I}_\alpha^-(x, -).$$

This can be checked via showing that the images of both sides under the composition map ρ coincide. Here we prove it using the observation that \mathfrak{C}^0 is a direct sum of A_z^0 's. Indeed, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{C}^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^0} \mathfrak{I}_\alpha^-(x, -) &= \mathfrak{C}^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^0} \left(\bigoplus_{d(z) < \alpha} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z) \right) \\ &\cong \bigoplus_{d(z) < \alpha} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, -) \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z) \\ &\cong \bigoplus_{d(z) < \alpha} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, -) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z). \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof. \square

With respect to \mathfrak{I}_α , one can define a quotient category $\bar{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha$ whose objects are those $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$ with $d(x) \geq \alpha$. For two objects x, y with $d(x) \geq \alpha$ and $d(y) \geq \alpha$, one sets

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha(x, y) &= \mathfrak{C}(x, y) / \mathfrak{I}_\alpha(x, y) \\ &\cong \left(\bigoplus_{z \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, y) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z) \right) / \left(\bigoplus_{d(z) < \alpha} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, y) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z) \right) \\ &\cong \bigoplus_{d(z) \geq \alpha} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, y) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z). \end{aligned}$$

From this construction one immediately has:

3.2 Lemma. *The quotient category $\bar{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha$ is also a generalized k -linear Reedy category.*

Fix an ordinal $\alpha \leq \lambda$. If $d(x) < \alpha$ and $d(y) < \alpha$, then

$$\mathfrak{C}(x, y) = \bigoplus_{z \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, y) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z) = \bigoplus_{d(z) < \alpha} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, y) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z)$$

since $\mathfrak{C}^-(x, z) = 0$ when $d(z) \geq \alpha$. Thus, one can define a full subcategory \mathfrak{C}_α of \mathfrak{C} consisting of objects x with $d(x) < \alpha$, which is a generalized k -linear Reedy category by the above equality. Similarly, for an object x , we can define a full subcategory \mathfrak{C}_x of \mathfrak{C} consisting of objects y with $y \prec x$, which is also a generalized k -linear Reedy category.

3.2. Standard modules. In this subsection we define standard modules and study their homological properties. These special modules were introduced in [11].

3.3 Definition. For $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$ with $d(x) = \alpha$, the *standard* left \mathfrak{C} -module Δ_x is defined as

$$\Delta_x = \mathfrak{C}(x, -) / \mathfrak{I}_\alpha(x, -) \cong \mathfrak{C} / \mathfrak{I}_\alpha \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{C} 1_x = \bar{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{C} 1_x,$$

where \mathfrak{C} is viewed as a k -algebra in the last two terms; see Remark 2.2. Dually, using corresponding right \mathfrak{C} -modules, one can define the standard right \mathfrak{C} -module

$$\Delta^x = \mathfrak{C}(-, x) / \mathfrak{I}_\alpha(-, x) \cong 1_x \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{C} / \mathfrak{I}_\alpha = 1_x \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \bar{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha.$$

We can use partial orders \preccurlyeq and \preccurlyeq' on $\text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$ to reformulate standard modules. Define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{I}_x &= \bigoplus_{z \prec x} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, -) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z), \text{ and} \\ \mathfrak{I}'_x &= \bigoplus_{z \preccurlyeq' x} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(-, z).\end{aligned}$$

3.4 Lemma. *Let x be an object in \mathfrak{C} with $d(x) = \alpha$. Then $\mathfrak{I}_x = \mathfrak{I}_\alpha(x, -)$ and $\Delta_x = \mathfrak{C}1_x/\mathfrak{I}_x$. Similarly, one has $\mathfrak{I}'_x = \mathfrak{I}_\alpha(-, x)$ and $\Delta^x = 1_x\mathfrak{C}/\mathfrak{I}'_x$.*

Proof. We only prove the first statement. By definitions, it suffices to show

$$\bigoplus_{z \prec x} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, -) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z) = \bigoplus_{d(z) < \alpha} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, -) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z).$$

Clearly, if $z \prec x$, then $d(z) < \alpha$, so the left side is contained in the right side. On the other hand, if $\mathfrak{C}^-(x, z) \neq 0$, then $z \preccurlyeq x$. But $d(z) < \alpha = d(x)$, so $z \prec x$, and hence, the right side is also contained in the left side. \square

3.5 Remark. It is clear that Δ_x is only supported on objects y with $d(y) \geq d(x) = \alpha$. Since the quotient category $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha$ is also a generalized k -linear Reedy category by Lemma 3.2, one may view $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha$ -Mod as a full subcategory of \mathfrak{C} -Mod. With respect to this identification, Δ_x is isomorphic to $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha(x, -)$. But x is a minimal object in $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha$ -Mod, so one has

$$\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha(x, -) \cong \overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha^+ \otimes_{\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha^0} \overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha^-(x, -) = \overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha^+ \otimes_{\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha^0} \overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha^-(x, x) \cong \overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha^+(x, -) \cong \mathfrak{C}^+(x, -).$$

Therefore, we may identify Δ_x , $\mathfrak{C}^+(x, -)$ and $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha(x, -)$ as \mathfrak{C}_0 -modules. Dually, we can identify Δ^x , $\mathfrak{C}^-(-, x)$ and left $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha(-, x)$ as right \mathfrak{C}_0 -modules.

It is clear that $A_x^0 \cong \mathfrak{C}^-(x, -)/\mathfrak{I}_\alpha^-(x, -)$ when $d(x) = \alpha$, so one can view A_x^0 as a left \mathfrak{C}^- -module concentrated on the single object x . We show under a mild condition that standard modules are induced from A_x^0 , and have nice homological properties, generalizing [11, Theorems 4.3 and 4.7].

3.6 Theorem. *Suppose that \mathfrak{C}^+ is a projective right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module. Then:*

- (a) $\Delta_x \cong \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^-} A_x^0$ as left \mathfrak{C} -modules;
- (b) $\text{End}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_x) \cong (A_x^0)^{\text{op}}$ as k -algebras;
- (c) $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_x, \Delta_y) \neq 0$ only if $x = y$ or $d(x) > d(y)$;
- (d) $\text{Ext}_{\mathfrak{C}}^n(\Delta_x, \Delta_y) \neq 0$ for $n \geq 1$ only if $d(x) > d(y)$.

Proof. (a) Let $d(x) = \alpha$. Applying the functor $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^-} -$, which is exact by Corollary 2.11, to the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{I}_\alpha^-(x, -) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}^-(x, -) \rightarrow A_x^0 \rightarrow 0$$

of left \mathfrak{C}^- -modules, we get another short exact

$$0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^-} \mathfrak{I}_\alpha^-(x, -) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^-} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, -) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^-} A_x^0 \rightarrow 0$$

of left \mathfrak{C} -modules. But $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^-} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, -) \cong \mathfrak{C}(x, -)$ and $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^-} \mathfrak{I}_\alpha^-(x, -) \cong \mathfrak{I}_\alpha(x, -)$ by Lemma 3.1. The conclusion follows.

(b) Let $d(x) = \alpha$. Note that $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha$ is a quotient category of \mathfrak{C} , so $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha$ -Mod is a full subcategory of \mathfrak{C} -Mod. Moreover, Δ_x viewed as a left $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha$ -module coincides with $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha(x, -)$. Thus, one has

$$\text{End}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_x) \cong \text{End}_{\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha}(\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha(x, -)) \cong (1_x \overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha 1_x)^{\text{op}} = (A_x^0)^{\text{op}}.$$

(c) We first consider the case that $d(y) = \beta > \alpha = d(x)$. We want to show that $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_x, \Delta_y)$ vanishes. Since $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha$ is again a generalized k -linear Reedy category, viewed as k -algebras one has

$$\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\beta = \mathfrak{C}/\mathfrak{I}_\beta \cong (\mathfrak{C}/\mathfrak{I}_\alpha)/(\mathfrak{I}_\beta/\mathfrak{I}_\alpha).$$

Thus, one may view $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\beta$ as a quotient algebra of $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha$, and $\mathfrak{I}_\beta/\mathfrak{I}_\alpha$ is precisely the two-sided ideal of $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha$ to define this quotient; see the construction before Lemma 3.2. Moreover, $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha$ -Mod is a full subcategory of \mathfrak{C} -Mod and it contains Δ_x and Δ_y , so

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_x, \Delta_y) = \text{Hom}_{\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha}(\Delta_x, \Delta_y) \cong \text{Hom}_{\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha}(\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha(x, -), \Delta_y),$$

as $\Delta_x \cong \overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha(x, -)$ in this full subcategory. But the last term is isomorphic to the value of Δ_y on x , which is clearly 0 since Δ_y is only supported on objects z with $d(z) \geq d(y) = \beta$.

Then we consider the case that $d(y) = d(x)$ but $x \neq y$. As in the previous paragraph, one has

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_x, \Delta_y) = \text{Hom}_{\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha}(\Delta_x, \Delta_y) \cong \text{Hom}_{\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha}(\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha(x, -), \overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha(y, -)) \cong \overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha(y, x) = 0$$

by Lemma 2.6 since x and y are minimal in $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha$.

(d) By (a), $\Delta_x \cong \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^-} A_x^0$. By Eckmann-Shapiro's lemma (see [4, p47], which also holds for rings with a complete family of orthogonal idempotents), one has

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathfrak{C}}^n(\Delta_x, \Delta_y) \cong \text{Ext}_{\mathfrak{C}}^n(\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^-} A_x^0, \Delta_y) \cong \text{Ext}_{\mathfrak{C}^-}^n(A_x^0, \Delta_y).$$

We want to show that this extension group vanishes whenever $d(x) \leq d(y)$.

Construct a projective resolution $\dots \rightarrow P^1 \rightarrow P^0 \rightarrow A_x^0 \rightarrow 0$ in \mathfrak{C}^- -Mod with $P^0 = \mathfrak{C}^-(x, -)$. By the structure of \mathfrak{C}^- , for $n \geq 1$, one can assume that the value of P^i on each object z is 0 if $d(z) \geq d(x)$. In other words, P^n is supported on objects z with $d(z) < d(x) \leq d(y)$. On the other hand, we know that Δ_y is supported on objects z with $d(z) \geq d(y)$. Consequently, $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(P^i, \Delta_y) = 0$ for all $n \geq 1$, and the conclusion follows. \square

3.7 Remark. When \mathfrak{C} is a generalized k -linear Reedy category, so is the opposite category \mathfrak{C}^{op} with $(\mathfrak{C}^{\text{op}})^+ = (\mathfrak{C}^-)^{\text{op}}$ and $(\mathfrak{C}^{\text{op}})^- = (\mathfrak{C}^+)^{\text{op}}$. In this case, the right standard module Δ^x of \mathfrak{C} is a left standard module over \mathfrak{C}^{op} . Therefore, all results established in this subsection hold for Δ^x with suitable modifications. In particular, we obtain a dual version of the above theorem.

3.8 Theorem. Suppose that \mathfrak{C}^- is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module. Then one has:

- (a) $\Delta^x \cong A_x^0 \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^+} \mathfrak{C}$ as right \mathfrak{C} -modules;
- (b) $\text{End}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta^x) \cong A_x^0$ as k -algebras;
- (c) $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta^x, \Delta^y) \neq 0$ only if $x = y$ or $d(x) > d(y)$;
- (d) $\text{Ext}_{\mathfrak{C}}^n(\Delta^x, \Delta^y) \neq 0$ for $n \geq 1$ only if $d(x) > d(y)$.

3.9 Remark. Carefully checking the proof of Theorem 3.6, one can strengthen (c) and (d) using the partial orders \preceq on $\text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$ (see Lemma 2.4 and the paragraph before it for details of this order). Explicitly, we actually proved the following stronger conclusions:

- (c') $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_x, \Delta_y) \neq 0$ only if $x \preceq y$;
- (d') $\text{Ext}_{\mathfrak{C}}^n(\Delta_x, \Delta_y) \neq 0$ for $n \geq 1$ only if $x \prec y$.

Stronger versions of (c) and (d) in Theorem 3.8 can be formulated via \preceq' (see Remark 2.5) similarly.

3.3. Filtrations and irreducible modules. It was shown in [11] that a k -linear Reedy category is similar to a quasi-hereditary algebra; that is, every representable functor has a filtration by standard modules, see [11, Theorem 4.5]. Moreover, standard modules are used to classify all irreducible modules; see [11, Theorem 4.14]. In this subsection we extend these results to generalized k -linear Reedy categories.

Since a classification of irreducible modules of an arbitrary k -algebra in general is not available, in this subsection we impose an extra condition: each A_x^0 is a semi-perfect k -algebra. Therefore, for each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$, one can fix a finite complete set E_x of orthogonal primitive idempotents in A_x^0 . In particular, every indecomposable projective left A_x^0 -module is isomorphic to $A_x^0 e$ for a certain $e \in E_x$. Since $\mathfrak{C} e$ is a projective left \mathfrak{C} -module, one can define $\Delta_{x,e} = \mathfrak{C} e / \mathfrak{J}_{\alpha} e$, where $\alpha = d(x)$. Consequently, $\Delta_{x,e}$ is a direct summand of Δ_x , and $\Delta_x = \bigoplus_{e \in E_x} \Delta_{x,e}$. Moreover, $\Delta_{x,e}$ is indecomposable, since $\text{End}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_{x,e}) \cong \text{End}_{\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha}(\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha e) \cong (e A_x^0 e)^{\text{op}}$ is a local ring.

3.10 Lemma. Suppose that each A_x^0 is a semi-perfect k -algebra for $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$. Let V be a left \mathfrak{C}^- -module such that $V(x)$ is a projective left A_x^0 -module for each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$. Then V admits a transfinite filtration

$$0 = V_{<0} \subseteq V_{<1} \subseteq \dots \subseteq V_{<\lambda+1} = V$$

such that for $0 \leq \alpha \leq \lambda$, each $V_\alpha = V_{<\alpha+1}/V_{<\alpha}$ is isomorphic to a direct sum of members in the family

$$\mathfrak{F}_\alpha = \{A_x^0 e \mid d(x) = \alpha, e \in E_x\}.$$

Proof. For each α , define a submodule $V_{<\alpha}$ of V as follows: for $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$,

$$V_{<\alpha}(x) = \begin{cases} V(x) & \text{if } d(x) < \alpha; \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly, one has $V \cong \varinjlim_{\alpha} V_{<\alpha}$. Furthermore, one has

$$V_{\alpha}(x) = V_{<\alpha+1}(x)/V_{<\alpha}(x) = \begin{cases} V(x) & \text{if } d(x) = \alpha; \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Note that if $d(x) = \alpha = d(y)$ but $x \neq y$, then $\mathfrak{C}^-(x, y) = 0 = \mathfrak{C}^-(y, x)$. Thus, $V_{\alpha} = \bigoplus_{d(x)=\alpha} V(x)$ as left \mathfrak{C}^- -modules. But since $V(x)$ is a projective left A_x^0 -module, we get a further decomposition

$$V_{\alpha} = \bigoplus_{d(x)=\alpha} V(x) \cong \bigoplus_{d(x)=\alpha} \bigoplus_{e \in E_x} (A_x^0 e)^{c_{x,e}},$$

where $c_{x,e}$ is the multiplicity which can be infinity. \square

3.11 Proposition. Suppose that \mathfrak{C}^+ is a projective right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module, \mathfrak{C}^- is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module, and each A_x^0 is a semi-perfect k -algebra for $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$. Then every $\mathfrak{C}(x, -)$ can be filtered by a coproduct of $\Delta_{z,e}$ with $d(z) \leq d(x)$ and $e \in E_z$.

Proof. Let $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$ with $d(x) = \beta$ and let $V = \mathfrak{C}^-(x, -)$. Since \mathfrak{C}^- is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module, $V(y)$ is a projective left A_y^0 -module for each $y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$ by Lemma 2.10(a). Applying Lemma 3.10, we obtain a transfinite filtration

$$0 = V_{<0} \subseteq V_{<1} \subseteq \dots \subseteq V_{<\beta+1} = V$$

such that for $\alpha \leq \beta$, each $V_{\alpha} = V_{<\alpha+1}/V_{<\alpha}$ is a coproduct of $A_z^0 e$ with $d(z) = \alpha$ and $e \in E_z$. Since \mathfrak{C}^+ is a projective right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module, $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^-} -$ is exact by Corollary 2.11. Applying it to the above filtration and observing that $\Delta_{z,e} \cong \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^-} A_z^0 e$ by Theorem 3.6, we establish the conclusion. \square

3.12 Remark. Suppose that \mathfrak{C}^+ is a projective right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module. Without the assumption that each A_x^0 is a semi-perfect k -algebra, using the same argument, one can get a filtration of $\mathfrak{C}(x, -)$ whose factors are $\bigoplus_{d(z)=\alpha} \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^-} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z)$ for each $\alpha \leq d(x)$, where $\mathfrak{C}^-(x, z)$ is viewed as a left \mathfrak{C}^- -module concentrated on the object z . Moreover, one has the following isomorphisms of left \mathfrak{C} -modules:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^-} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z) &\cong \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^-} (A_z^0 \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z)) \\ &\cong (\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^-} A_z^0) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z) \\ &\cong \Delta_z \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, z). \end{aligned}$$

Given a left \mathfrak{C} -module M , denote by $[M]$ its isomorphism class. The following result gives parameterizations of isomorphism classes of irreducible left \mathfrak{C} -modules under some mild assumptions.

3.13 Theorem. Suppose that \mathfrak{C}^+ is a projective right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module, \mathfrak{C}^- is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module, and each A_x^0 is a semi-perfect k -algebra. Then there are bijections between the following sets:

- (1) $\{[S] \mid S \text{ is an irreducible left } \mathfrak{C}\text{-module}\};$
- (2) $\{\Delta_{x,e} \mid x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}), e \in E_x\};$
- (3) $\bigsqcup_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} E_x.$

Proof. We claim that $\Delta_{x,e} \cong \Delta_{x',e'}$ if and only if $x = x'$ and $e = e'$, which trivially gives a bijective correspondence between (2) and (3). One direction is trivial. Conversely, if $\Delta_{x,e} \cong \Delta_{x',e'}$, then

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_x, \Delta_{x'}) \neq 0 \neq \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_{x'}, \Delta_x).$$

This forces $x = x'$ by Theorem 3.6. Furthermore, $\Delta_{x,e} \cong \Delta_{x,e'}$ as left $\bar{\mathfrak{C}}_{\alpha}$ -modules with $\alpha = d(x)$. In particular, their values on x are isomorphic as left $\bar{\mathfrak{C}}_{\alpha}(x, x)$ -modules. But $\bar{\mathfrak{C}}_{\alpha}(x, x) = A_x^0$, and their values on x are $A_x^0 e$ and $A_x^0 e'$, so $A_x^0 e \cong A_x^0 e'$ as left A_x^0 -modules. Since $e, e' \in E_x$, we have $e = e'$.

To obtain a bijective correspondence between (1) and (2), we first show that each $\Delta_{x,e}$ has a unique simple quotient. View $\Delta_{x,e}$ as a left $\bar{\mathfrak{C}}_{\alpha}$ -module with $\alpha = d(x)$. Since its endomorphism ring is local, it has a unique

maximal submodule, and hence a unique simple quotient, which is also simple viewed as a left \mathfrak{C} -module. Consequently, from each $\Delta_{x,e}$ we obtain a simple left \mathfrak{C} -module $S_{x,e}$, and hence a map Φ from (2) to (1).

We prove the surjectivity of Φ by showing that each simple left \mathfrak{C} -module S is isomorphic to the unique simple quotient $S_{x,e}$ of a certain $\Delta_{x,e}$. Take an object x such that $S_x \neq 0$ and $d(x) = \alpha$ is minimal. We obtain a nonzero left \mathfrak{C} -module homomorphism $\varphi : \mathfrak{C}(x, -) \rightarrow S$. For each $f \in \mathfrak{C}(x, y)$ with a Reedy factorization $f_1^+ f_1^- + \dots + f_n^+ f_n^-$, one has

$$\varphi(f) = \varphi\left(\sum_{i=1}^n f_i^+ f_i^-\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n (f_i^+ f_i^-) \cdot \varphi(1_x) = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i^+ \cdot (f_i^- \cdot \varphi(1_x)).$$

Note that $f_i^- \cdot \varphi(1_x) \in S_{z_i}$ with z_i the target of f_i^- . If $f \in \mathfrak{I}_\alpha(x, y)$, then $d(z_i) < \alpha$, so $S_{z_i} = 0$, and hence $\varphi(f) = 0$. Consequently, $\mathfrak{I}_\alpha(x, -)$ is sent to 0 by φ , and we can factorize φ as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{C}(x, -) & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & S \\ & \searrow & \swarrow \psi \\ & \Delta_x = \mathfrak{C}(x, -)/\mathfrak{I}_\alpha(x, -) & \end{array}$$

Since $\Delta_x = \bigoplus_{e \in E_x} \Delta_{x,e}$, we can find an $e \in E_x$ such that the restriction $\Delta_{x,e} \rightarrow S$ of $\varphi : \Delta_x \rightarrow S$ is nonzero; that is, S is isomorphic to $S_{x,e}$. This proves the surjectivity of Φ .

We prove the injectivity of Φ by showing that $S_{x,e} \cong S_{x',e'}$ implies that $\Delta_{x,e} = \Delta_{x',e'}$. Since these two simple modules are isomorphic, they have the same support (that is, the set of objects z such that the value of the module on z is nonzero), so $d(x) = d(x')$. Let $\alpha = d(x)$. Then one can view $S_{x,e}$, $S_{x',e'}$, $\Delta_{x,e}$ and $\Delta_{x',e'}$ as $\bar{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha$ -modules. But in this case $\Delta_{x,e}$ and $\Delta_{x',e'}$ are projective covers of $S_{x,e}$ and $S_{x',e'}$ in $\bar{\mathfrak{C}}_\alpha\text{-Mod}$, so $\Delta_{x,e} \cong \Delta_{x',e'}$, and hence $\Delta_{x,e} = \Delta_{x',e'}$ by the claim at the beginning of the proof. \square

Throughout this paper, for a small category \mathcal{C} , we denote its k -linearization by $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$.

3.14 Example. Let \mathcal{C} be the category with objects $[n]$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and morphisms the usual maps, whose representation theory has been considered in [31, 32, 42]. It is a generalized Reedy category with \mathcal{C}^+ the subcategory of injections and \mathcal{C}^- the subcategory of surjections. By Theorem 3.13, isomorphism class of irreducible $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ -modules are parameterized by pairs $(n, [L])$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $[L]$ is the isomorphism class of a simple kS_n -module L . In particular, if k is a field of characteristic 0, then each irreducible $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ -module is isomorphic to the top of a standard module

$$\Delta_{n,\mu} = \underline{\mathcal{C}}^+ \otimes_{kS_n} L_\mu \cong \underline{\mathcal{C}}^+([n], -) \otimes_{kS_n} L_\mu,$$

where μ is a partition of n , and L_μ is the corresponding irreducible kS_n -module. The reader can compare this result to [42, Theorem 5.5] and [31, Theorem 2].

3.15 Example. Let \mathcal{C} be the category whose objects are $[n]$ equipped with the cyclic order with $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and whose morphisms are order-preserving maps. This is a skeleton of the cyclic category Λ introduced by Connes [9], which has been widely applied in algebraic topology and homology theory. In particular, people have obtained a Dold-Kan type theorem for this category; see for instance [13, 26, 39]. It is easy to check that \mathcal{C} is a generalized Reedy category with \mathcal{C}^+ the subcategory of order-preserving injections and \mathcal{C}^- the subcategory of order-preserving surjections.

By Theorem 3.13, isomorphism class of irreducible $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ -modules are parameterized by pairs $(n, [L])$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $[L]$ is the isomorphism class of a simple kC_n -module L with C_n the cyclic group of order n . If k is a field of characteristic 0, then each irreducible $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ -module is isomorphic to the top of a standard module

$$\Delta_{n,\xi} = \underline{\mathcal{C}}^+ \otimes_{kC_n} L_\xi \cong \underline{\mathcal{C}}^+([n], -) \otimes_{kC_n} L_\xi,$$

where ξ is an n -th root of the unity, and L_ξ is the corresponding irreducible kC_n -module.

4. DECOMPOSITION OF MODULE CATEGORIES I: CENTRAL IDEMPOTENTS

As we mentioned in the introduction, there are quite a few interesting combinatorial categories \mathcal{C} such that $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ are generalized k -linear Reedy categories, and $\underline{\mathcal{C}}\text{-Mod}$ is equivalent to $\underline{\mathcal{C}}^0\text{-Mod}$. In this and the next section we give two sufficient criteria such that this equivalence holds for generalized k -linear Reedy categories.

Let \mathfrak{C} be a generalized k -linear Reedy category. For $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$, recall that $A_x^0 = \mathfrak{C}^+(x, x) = \mathfrak{C}^-(x, x)$,

$$A_x = \mathfrak{C}(x, x) = 1_x \mathfrak{C} 1_x \cong \bigoplus_{y \preccurlyeq x} \mathfrak{C}^+(y, x) \otimes_{A_y^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, y),$$

where the isomorphism of k -algebras is given by the composition ρ (see Remark 2.2), and

$$\mathfrak{I}_x = \bigoplus_{y \prec x} \mathfrak{C}^+(y, -) \otimes_{A_y^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, y).$$

The short exact sequence

$$(*) \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{I}_x \rightarrow \mathfrak{C} 1_x \rightarrow \Delta_x \rightarrow 0$$

of \mathfrak{C} -modules induces a short exact sequence

$$(**) \quad 0 \rightarrow 1_x \mathfrak{I}_x \rightarrow 1_x \mathfrak{C} 1_x = A_x \rightarrow 1_x \Delta_x = A_x^0 \rightarrow 0.$$

It is routine to check that

$$I_x = 1_x \mathfrak{I}_x = \bigoplus_{y \prec x} \mathfrak{C}^+(y, x) \otimes_{A_y^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(x, y)$$

is a two-sided ideal of A_x . Thus, we may view A_x^0 as a quotient k -algebra of A_x .

4.1 Lemma. *If there exists a central idempotent $e_x \in A_x$ such that $I_x = e_x A_x e_x$, then the short exact sequences $(*)$ and $(**)$ split. Furthermore, $\mathfrak{I}_x \cong \mathfrak{C} e_x$ and $\Delta_x \cong \mathfrak{C} f_x$ as left \mathfrak{C} -modules, where $f_x = 1_x - e_x$.*

Proof. Note that e_x is contained in I_x and serves as the identity of I_x as a k -algebra. Thus, the short exact sequence $(**)$ becomes to

$$0 \rightarrow e_x A_x e_x \rightarrow (e_x A_x e_x \oplus f_x A_x f_x) \rightarrow A_x^0 \rightarrow 0$$

which forces $A_x^0 \cong f_x A_x f_x$, and hence, $(**)$ splits. We identify A_x^0 with $f_x A_x f_x$ and under this identification, the identity of this ring is f_x rather than 1_x . In particular, the value $\Delta_x(x)$ becomes $f_x A_x f_x$. Thus,

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathfrak{C} e_x, \Delta_x) \cong e_x \Delta_x(x) = e_x f_x A_x f_x = 0$$

and similarly $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathfrak{C} f_x, \mathfrak{I}_x) = 0$. Consequently, Δ_x is a quotient module of $\mathfrak{C} f_x$ and \mathfrak{I}_x is a quotient module of $\mathfrak{C} e_x$.

Applying the snake lemma to the commutative diagram of exact rows

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{C} e_x & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{C} 1_x & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{C} f_x & \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \parallel & & \downarrow & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{I}_x & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{C} 1_x & \longrightarrow & \Delta_x & \longrightarrow 0, \end{array}$$

where the third vertical arrow is an epimorphism, we deduce another short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{C} e_x \rightarrow \mathfrak{I}_x \rightarrow K \rightarrow 0$$

where K is the kernel of the third vertical map in the commutative diagram. In particular, it is a submodule of $\mathfrak{C} f_x$.

Since \mathfrak{I}_x is a quotient of $\mathfrak{C} e_x$, and K is a quotient of \mathfrak{I}_x by the above short exact sequence, we obtain a surjection from $\mathfrak{C} e_x$ to K . But K is also a submodule of $\mathfrak{C} f_x$, so if $K \neq 0$, we shall obtain a nonzero morphism from $\mathfrak{C} e_x$ to $\mathfrak{C} f_x$, which is impossible since

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathfrak{C} e_x, \mathfrak{C} f_x) \cong e_x \mathfrak{C} f_x = e_x A_x f_x = 0.$$

Thus, K must be the zero module. Consequently, $\Delta_x \cong \mathfrak{C} f_x$ and $\mathfrak{I}_x \cong \mathfrak{C} e_x$, so the exact sequence $(*)$ also splits. \square

Under one more assumption, we show that the family $\{\Delta_x \mid x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})\}$ is orthogonal.

4.2 Lemma. *Under the following assumptions:*

- (a) *the condition in Lemma 4.1 holds for every $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$;*
- (b) *for $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$, the left A_y^0 -module $\mathfrak{C}^-(x, y)$ contains a free direct summand whenever $\mathfrak{C}^+(y, x) \neq 0$, one has $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_x, \Delta_y) \neq 0$ if and only if $x = y$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_x, \Delta_y) \neq 0$. By Lemma 4.1, one can assume that $\Delta_x = \mathcal{C}f_x$ and $\Delta_y = \mathcal{C}f_y$, where f_x and f_y are central idempotents in A_x and A_y respectively. Thus,

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_x, \Delta_y) \cong f_x \mathcal{C}f_y \cong \bigoplus_z f_x \mathcal{C}^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathcal{C}^-(y, z) f_y.$$

If $y \neq z$, then $\mathcal{C}^-(y, z) \in \mathfrak{I}_y$. But by the proof of Lemma 4.1, $\mathfrak{I}_y f_y = \mathcal{C}e_y f_y = 0$, so one has

$$0 \neq \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_x, \Delta_y) \cong f_x \mathcal{C}f_y = f_x \mathcal{C}^+(y, x) \otimes_{A_y^0} \mathcal{C}^-(y, y) f_y.$$

In particular, $f_x \mathcal{C}^+(y, x) \neq 0$. By the condition (b), one has $f_x \mathcal{C}^+(y, x) \otimes_{A_y^0} \mathcal{C}^-(x, y) \neq 0$. If $x \neq y$, then $\mathcal{C}^+(y, x) \otimes_{A_y^0} \mathcal{C}^-(x, y) \subseteq I_x$, so $f_x I_x = f_x e_x A_x e_x \neq 0$, which is impossible as $f_x e_x = 0$. Thus, x must coincide with y . \square

4.3 Remark. The conclusion fails without the extra assumption (b) in Lemma 4.2. For instance, if $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^+$, then $\Delta_x = \mathcal{C}1_x$ and $\Delta_y = \mathcal{C}1_y$, so $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_x, \Delta_y) \cong 1_y \mathcal{C}1_x = \mathcal{C}(x, y)$, which might not be 0 even if $x \neq y$.

The following lemma gives us a new family of projective generators in $\mathcal{C}\text{-Mod}$.

4.4 Lemma. Suppose that \mathcal{C}^+ is a projective right \mathcal{C}^0 -module, and \mathcal{C}^- is a projective left \mathcal{C}^0 -module. If each Δ_x is a projective left \mathcal{C} -module, then $\{\Delta_x \mid x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})\}$ is a set of projective generators in $\mathcal{C}\text{-Mod}$.

Proof. By Remark 3.12, for each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$, the representable functor $\mathcal{C}(x, -)$ has a filtration with factors

$$\bigoplus_{d(z)=\alpha} \mathcal{C} \otimes_{\mathcal{C}^-} \mathcal{C}^-(x, z) \cong \bigoplus_{d(z)=\alpha} \Delta_z \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathcal{C}^-(x, z)$$

for $\alpha \leq d(x)$. Since $\mathcal{C}^-(x, z)$ is a projective left A_z^0 -module by Lemma 2.10(a), up to isomorphism $\Delta_z \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathcal{C}^-(x, z)$ is a direct summand of a direct sum of copies of Δ_z . In particular, it is projective. Thus, from the filtration we deduce that

$$\mathcal{C}(x, -) \cong \bigoplus_{\alpha \leq d(x)} \bigoplus_{d(z)=\alpha} \mathcal{C} \otimes_{\mathcal{C}^-} \mathcal{C}^-(x, z) \cong \bigoplus_{\alpha \leq d(x)} \bigoplus_{d(z)=\alpha} \Delta_z \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathcal{C}^-(x, z)$$

as \mathcal{C} -modules, so $\mathcal{C}(x, -)$ can be generated by the given family. This finishes the proof. \square

Now it is ready to prove the main result in this section.

4.5 Theorem. Suppose that \mathcal{C}^+ is a projective right \mathcal{C}^0 -module, \mathcal{C}^- is a projective left \mathcal{C}^0 -module, and the assumptions in Lemma 4.2 hold. Then

$$\mathcal{C}\text{-Mod} \simeq \prod_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})} A_x^0\text{-Mod}.$$

In particular, if each A_x^0 is a semisimple k -algebra, then $\mathcal{C}\text{-Mod}$ is semisimple as well.

Proof. Lemma 4.1 tells us that each Δ_x is projective, so by Lemma 4.4 they form a family of projective generators in $\mathcal{C}\text{-Mod}$. Lemma 4.2 asserts that this family is orthogonal. The conclusion then follows from the Morita equivalence and the isomorphism $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_x) \cong (A_x^0)^{\text{op}}$ proved in Theorem 3.6. \square

The following example has been studied in [8, 24, 39].

4.6 Example. Let \mathbb{F}_q be a finite field of q elements, and k a commutative ring such that q is invertible in k . Let \mathcal{C} be the category consisting of objects \mathbb{F}_q^n with $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and \mathbb{F}_q -linear maps. Then \mathcal{C} is a generalized Reedy category with \mathcal{C}^+ the subcategory of linear injections and \mathcal{C}^- the subcategory of linear surjections.

For $n \leq m$, the general linear group $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ acts freely on $\mathcal{C}^+(\mathbb{F}_q^n, \mathbb{F}_q^m)$ from the right side and freely on $\mathcal{C}^-(\mathbb{F}_q^m, \mathbb{F}_q^n)$ from the left side. Furthermore, the existence of central idempotents required in Lemma 4.1 was proved in [23] (see also [24, Theorem 2.1]). Thus, by [24, Theorem 1.1] one has

$$\mathcal{C}\text{-Mod} \simeq \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} k\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)\text{-Mod}.$$

When $q = 1$, \mathcal{C} is equivalent to the category of finite sets and partial injections, and the category of finite pointed sets and pointed injections; see [8, Section 4] and [24, Section 4]. In this case, one has

$$\underline{\mathcal{C}}\text{-Mod} \simeq \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} kS_n\text{-Mod},$$

where S_n is the symmetric group on n letters; see [8, Theorem 1.7] and [24, Theorem 4.1].

5. DECOMPOSITION OF MODULE CATEGORIES II: NON-DEGENERATE ELEMENTS

The conditions in Theorem 4.5, in particular the existence of central idempotents, are hard to check in many situations. In this section we provide another criterion for a special family of generalized k -linear Reedy categories such that the conclusion of Theorem 4.5 still holds.

5.1. Another sufficient criterion. Let $\mathfrak{C} \cong \mathfrak{C}^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^0} \mathfrak{C}^-$ be a generalized k -linear Reedy category. Given $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$ and a nonzero $g \in \mathfrak{C}^+(x, y)$, the composition ρ gives rise to a k -linear map

$$\varphi_g : \mathfrak{C}^-(y, x) \longrightarrow A_x = \mathfrak{C}(x, x) \longrightarrow A_x^0, \quad f \mapsto fg \mapsto \overline{fg},$$

where the second arrow is the natural quotient map since A_x^0 is a quotient algebra of A_x . We say that g is *non-degenerate* if φ_g is nonzero. Similarly, for a nonzero $f \in \mathfrak{C}^-(x, y)$, we have a k -linear map

$$\psi_f : \mathfrak{C}^+(x, y) \longrightarrow A_x = \mathfrak{C}(x, x) \longrightarrow A_x^0, \quad g \mapsto fg \mapsto \overline{fg},$$

and we say that f is *non-degenerate* if ψ_f is nonzero.

5.1 Theorem. *Let k be a field and \mathfrak{C} a generalized k -linear Reedy category. Suppose that the following conditions hold for all $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$:*

- (a) $\mathfrak{C}^+(x, y)$ is a finite dimensional vector space over k ;
- (b) $\mathfrak{C}^+(x, y)$ is a projective right A_x^0 -module and $\mathfrak{C}^-(y, x)$ is a free left A_x^0 -module;
- (c) $\dim_k \mathfrak{C}^+(x, y) = \dim_k \mathfrak{C}^-(y, x)$;
- (d) every nonzero $g \in \mathfrak{C}^+(x, y)$ is non-degenerate.

Then one has an equivalence

$$\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod} \simeq \prod_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} A_x^0\text{-Mod}.$$

Proof. Similar to the proof of Theorem 4.5, we show that $\{\Delta_x \mid x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})\}$ is an orthogonal family of projective generators in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$. The proof is based on a transfinite induction.

Firstly, if x and y are distinct objects such that $d(x) = d(y) = 0$, then $\Delta_x = \mathfrak{C}(x, -)$ and $\Delta_y = \mathfrak{C}(y, -)$ are projective \mathfrak{C} -modules. Furthermore, these two standard modules are orthogonal by Lemma 2.6.

Now we carry out the induction step. Suppose that for

$$S_{<\alpha} = \{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}) \mid d(x) < \alpha\}$$

we have proved the following facts:

- (1) $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_x, \Delta_y) = 0$ for $x, y \in S_{<\alpha}$ with $x \neq y$;
- (2) each Δ_x is projective.

We want to show the facts for the subset $S_{\leq \alpha} \subseteq \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$.

Proof of (1). Take distinct $x, y \in S_{\leq \alpha}$. Clearly, the conclusion holds if $x, y \in S_{<\alpha}$. Suppose that $d(y) = \alpha$ and $d(x) \leq \alpha$. If $d(x) = \alpha$, then $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_y, \Delta_x) = 0$ by Theorem 3.6, so we may assume that $d(x) < \alpha$. Applying $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(-, \Delta_x)$ to the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{I}_y \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}1_y \rightarrow \Delta_y \rightarrow 0,$$

one obtains another exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_y, \Delta_x) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathfrak{C}1_y, \Delta_x) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathfrak{I}_y, \Delta_x) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\mathfrak{C}}^1(\Delta_y, \Delta_x) \rightarrow 0.$$

By Remark 3.12, \mathfrak{I}_y has a filtration whose factors are coproducts of the form

$$\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^-} \mathfrak{C}^-(y, z) \cong \Delta_z \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(y, z)$$

with $d(z) < \alpha$. But $\mathfrak{C}^-(y, z)$ is a free left A_z^0 -module by the condition (b) and Δ_z is a projective left \mathfrak{C} -module by the induction hypothesis, so every filtration factor is a projective left \mathfrak{C} -module. Consequently, we obtain an isomorphism of left \mathfrak{C} -modules:

$$\mathfrak{I}_y \cong \bigoplus_{d(z) < \alpha} \Delta_z \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(y, z).$$

Again, the induction hypothesis implies that $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_z \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(y, z), \Delta_x) = 0$ if $z \neq x$, it follows

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathfrak{I}_y, \Delta_x) = \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_x \otimes_{A_x^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(y, x), \Delta_x).$$

Thus the above exact sequence becomes

$$(\dagger) \quad 0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_y, \Delta_x) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathfrak{C}1_y, \Delta_x) \xrightarrow{\varphi} \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_x \otimes_{A_x^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(y, x), \Delta_x) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\mathfrak{C}}^1(\Delta_y, \Delta_x) \rightarrow 0.$$

We will show that the middle map φ is an isomorphism in the next lemma, so one has

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_y, \Delta_x) = 0 = \text{Ext}_{\mathfrak{C}}^1(\Delta_y, \Delta_x).$$

Proof of (2). We have shown that $\text{Ext}_{\mathfrak{C}}^1(\Delta_y, \Delta_x) = 0$ whenever $d(x) < d(y) = \alpha$. Since

$$\mathfrak{I}_y \cong \bigoplus_{d(x) < \alpha} \Delta_x \otimes_{A_x^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(y, x),$$

it follows that $\text{Ext}_{\mathfrak{C}}^1(\Delta_y, \mathfrak{I}_y) = 0$. Consequently, the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{I}_y \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}1_y \rightarrow \Delta_y \rightarrow 0$$

splits, so Δ_y is a projective left \mathfrak{C} -module.

Now we have proved (1) and (2) for the family $\{\Delta_x \mid d(x) \leq \alpha\}$. A transfinite induction tells us that $\{\Delta_x \mid x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})\}$ is an orthogonal family of projective generators in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$. The conclusion then follows. \square

5.2 Lemma. *Under the assumptions in the previous theorem, the middle map φ in the short exact sequence (\dagger) is an isomorphism.*

Proof. By Remark 3.5, for each $f \in \mathfrak{C}^+(x, y)$, we denote by \bar{f} the corresponding elements in $\Delta_x(y)$. Via this correspondence,

$$\mathfrak{C}^+(x, y) \cong \Delta_x(y) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathfrak{C}1_y, \Delta_x)$$

with an explicit isomorphism

$$\phi : \mathfrak{C}^+(x, y) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathfrak{C}1_y, \Delta_x), \quad g \mapsto (\phi_g : 1_y \mapsto \bar{g})$$

Via this isomorphism, the middle map

$$\varphi : \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathfrak{C}1_y, \Delta_x) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_x \otimes_{A_x^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(y, x), \Delta_x)$$

can be described as

$$\phi_g \mapsto [\varphi(\phi_g) : \bar{h} \otimes f \mapsto \bar{h}\bar{f}\bar{g}, \forall \bar{h} \in \Delta_x(z), f \in \mathfrak{C}^-(y, x)].$$

This map is injective. Indeed, if $\phi_g \neq \phi_{g'}$, then $\bar{g} \neq \bar{g}'$, so $g - g' \neq 0$. But $g - g' \in \mathfrak{C}^+(x, y)$ is non-degenerate by the condition (d), so one can find an $f \in \mathfrak{C}^-(y, x)$ such that $\bar{f}\bar{g} \neq \bar{f}\bar{g}'$. In particular, for $h = 1_x$, one has

$$\varphi(\phi_g)(\bar{1}_x \otimes f) = \bar{f}\bar{g} \neq \bar{f}\bar{g}' = \varphi(\phi_{g'})(\bar{1}_x \otimes f),$$

so $\varphi(\phi_g) \neq \varphi(\phi_{g'})$; that is, φ is injective.

Now we show that φ is also surjective. Note that $\mathfrak{C}^-(y, x) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n A_x^0$ for a certain $n \in \mathbb{N}$ since $\mathfrak{C}^-(y, x)$ is a free left A_x^0 -module of finite rank by the conditions (a) and (b). Consequently, $\Delta_x \otimes_{A_x^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(y, x)$ is isomorphic to the coproduct of n copies of Δ_x , so

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_x \otimes_{A_x^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(y, x), \Delta_x) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_x, \Delta_x) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n A_x^0,$$

as vector spaces over k . By comparing dimensions, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_k \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_x \otimes_{A_x^0} \mathfrak{C}^-(y, x), \Delta_x) &= n \dim_k A_x^0 = \dim_k \mathfrak{C}^-(y, x), \text{ and} \\ \dim_k \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathfrak{C}1_y, \Delta_x) &= \dim_k \mathfrak{C}^+(x, y) = \dim_k \mathfrak{C}^-(x, y), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the condition (c). Since φ is an injective linear map between two finite dimensional vector spaces with the same dimension, it must be surjective. \square

Using the right standard module Δ^x (see Remark 3.7), one may obtain the dual version of this theorem.

5.3 Theorem. *Let k be a field and \mathfrak{C} a generalized k -linear Reedy category. Suppose that the following conditions hold for $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$:*

- (a) $\mathfrak{C}^+(x, y)$ is a finite dimensional vector space over k ;
- (b) $\mathfrak{C}^+(x, y)$ is a free right A_x^0 -module and $\mathfrak{C}^-(y, x)$ is a projective left A_x^0 -module;
- (c) $\dim_k \mathfrak{C}^+(x, y) = \dim_k \mathfrak{C}^-(y, x)$;
- (d) every nonzero $f \in \mathfrak{C}^-(y, x)$ is non-degenerate.

Then one has an equivalence

$$\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod} \simeq \prod_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} A_x^0\text{-Mod}.$$

5.4 Remark. The condition (b) in the above two theorems can be replaced by other conditions for some special cases. For instance, if each A_x^0 is the group algebra kG_x of a finite group G_x whose order is invertible in k , then in the proof of Lemma 5.2, by the tensor-hom adjunction one has

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_x \otimes_{kG_x} \mathfrak{C}^-(y, x), \Delta_x) &\cong \text{Hom}_{kG_x}(\mathfrak{C}^-(y, x), \text{End}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta_x)) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{kG_x}(\mathfrak{C}^-(y, x), kG_x) \\ &\cong \mathfrak{C}^-(y, x), \end{aligned}$$

as vector spaces over k , so the map φ is surjective. Note that the assumption that the order of each G_x is invertible in k is essential to guarantee that \mathfrak{C}^+ is a projective right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module and \mathfrak{C}^- is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module.

5.2. Applications. In this subsection we give some applications of Theorem 5.1 and its dual version.

Let \mathcal{C} be a small EI category (that is, every endomorphism in \mathcal{C} is an isomorphism) with pullbacks. Without loss of generality we can assume that \mathcal{C} is skeletal since if \mathcal{C} has pullbacks, so does each of its skeletal subcategories. Under this extra assumption it is easy to check that the relation \preccurlyeq on $\text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$ defined via setting $x \preccurlyeq y$ if $\mathcal{C}(x, y) \neq \emptyset$ is a partial order on $\text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$. Denote by G_x the group of automorphisms on x for $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$.

5.5 Definition. A small skeletal EI category \mathcal{C} is called an *artinian* EI category if $(\text{Ob}(\mathcal{C}), \preccurlyeq)$ satisfies the descending chain condition. It is locally finite if $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$ is a finite set for all $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$.

From now on, we assume that \mathcal{C} is a locally finite skeletal artinian EI category with pullbacks. Define a degree function d from $\text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$ to a sufficiently large ordinal λ as follows: for minimal elements in the artinian poset $(\text{Ob}(\mathcal{C}), \preccurlyeq)$, set their degree to be 0. While removing these objects from $\text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$, we obtain a new artinian poset, and let minimal elements in the new poset have degree 1. The degree function can be defined via a transfinite process. Let \mathcal{C}^0 be the subcategory of \mathcal{C} consisting of all objects and all isomorphisms.

The *category of spans* $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ is defined as follows. It has the same objects as \mathcal{C} . For $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$, the morphism set is defined to be

$$\widehat{\mathcal{C}}(x, y) = \bigsqcup_{z \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})} \mathcal{C}(z, y) \times_{G_z} \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}(x, z).$$

More explicitly, a morphism in $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}(x, y)$ is represented by a diagram $x \xleftarrow{f} z \xrightarrow{g} y$ with f and g morphisms in \mathcal{C} , and two pairs (f, g) and (f', g') represent the same morphism if there is an automorphism $\sigma \in G_z$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & z & & \\ & f \swarrow & \downarrow \sigma & \searrow g & \\ x & \xleftarrow{f'} & z & \xrightarrow{g'} & y \end{array}$$

The composite of morphisms $(f, g) : x \rightarrow y$ and $(f', g') : y \rightarrow w$ is $(fl, g'h) : x \rightarrow w$, where the top square is a pullback:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 v & \xrightarrow{h} & u & \xrightarrow{g'} & w \\
 \downarrow l & & \downarrow f' & & \\
 z & \xrightarrow{g} & y & & \\
 \downarrow f & & & & \\
 x & & & &
 \end{array}$$

For more details, please refer to [3] or [10].

It is easy to check that $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ is almost a generalized Reedy category in the sense of [5]. Indeed, by setting $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}^+ = \mathcal{C}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}^- = \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}$, we see that all conditions except the last one specified in Example 2.9 hold. Thus, its k -linearization $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ is a generalized k -linear Reedy category.

Applying Theorem 5.1 we obtain the following result:

5.6 Theorem. *Let k be a field and \mathcal{C} an artinian EI category satisfying the following conditions:*

- (a) \mathcal{C} has pullbacks;
- (b) \mathcal{C} is locally finite;
- (c) the order of G_x is invertible in k for each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$;
- (d) every morphism in \mathcal{C} is a monomorphism.

Then one has

$$\widehat{\mathcal{C}}\text{-Mod} \simeq \prod_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})} kG_x\text{-Mod}.$$

Proof. We need to check the conditions (a)-(d) specified in Theorem 5.1. Clearly, the condition (a) holds as \mathcal{C} is locally finite, and the condition (b) holds by Remark 5.4. Noting that $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}^+ = \mathcal{C}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}^- = \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}$. Then the condition (c) automatically holds. Thus it is sufficient to show the condition (d) in Theorem 5.1.

Given a nonzero $g \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}^+(x, y) = \mathcal{C}(x, y)$, write $g = a_1g_1 + \dots + a_ng_n$ with distinct $g_i \in \mathcal{C}(x, y)$ and $0 \neq a_i \in k$. Let $g'_1 \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}^-(y, x) = \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}(y, x) = \mathcal{C}(x, y)$ be the morphism corresponding to g_1 . Then the product $g'_1g_i \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}(x, x)$ is represented by the pair (p_i, q_i) appeared in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 z & \xrightarrow{p_i} & x & \xrightarrow{1_x} & x \\
 \downarrow q_i & & \downarrow g_1 & & \\
 x & \xrightarrow{g_i} & y & & \\
 \downarrow 1_x & & & & \\
 x & & & &
 \end{array}$$

When $i = 1$, since g_1 is monic, it follows that $z = x$ and $p_i = q_i = 1_x$; see [17, Proposition 3.12]. If $i \neq 1$, then (p_i, q_i) is not equivalent to $(1_x, 1_x)$ since otherwise we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & x & & \\
 & \swarrow 1_x & \downarrow \sigma & \searrow 1_x & \\
 x & \xleftarrow{p_i} & x & \xrightarrow{q_i} & x
 \end{array}$$

so $p_i = q_i = \sigma^{-1}$, and hence $g_i = g_1$ from the pullback diagram. Thus, g'_1g_i and g'_1g_1 are different morphisms in $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}(x, x)$ if $i \neq 1$. Consequently, $g'_1g = a_1g'_1g_1 + a_2g'_1g_2 + \dots + a_ng'_1g_n \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}(x, x)$ is nonzero. Furthermore, its image in the quotient algebra kG_x of $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}(x, x)$ is nonzero as well since g'_1g_1 is the identity element in G_x . Thus, g is non-degenerate. \square

Theorem 5.6 may apply to many combinatorial categories. We give a few examples, most of which have been studied in literature such as [8, 25]. The reader can easily find more.

5.7 Example. Let \mathcal{C} be an artinian poset such that every two elements in it have the greatest lower bound. It is easy to see that all conditions in Theorem 5.6 hold. Therefore, for a field k with any characteristic, one has

$$\widehat{\mathcal{C}}\text{-Mod} \simeq \prod_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})} k\text{-Mod}.$$

5.8 Example. Let \mathcal{C} be the category consisting of objects \mathbb{F}_q^n with $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and \mathbb{F}_q -linear injections. The category $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ of spans is equivalent to the category of finite dimensional spaces over \mathbb{F}_q and partial linear injections. When $q = 1$, it is equivalent to the category FI^\sharp studied in [8]. One can check that all conditions in Theorem 5.6 hold for \mathcal{C} . Thus when k is a field of characteristic 0, we deduce the following equivalences for $q = 1$ (see [25, Corollary 7.7] and [8, Theorem 4.1.5]):

$$\widehat{\mathcal{C}}\text{-Mod} \simeq \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} k\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)\text{-Mod} \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{\mathcal{C}}\text{-Mod} \simeq \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} kS_n\text{-Mod}.$$

5.9 Example. Let k be a field of characteristic 0. Let \mathcal{C} be the category consisting of objects \mathbb{F}_q^n with $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and \mathbb{F}_q -linear surjections. Then \mathcal{C}^{op} satisfies all conditions in Theorem 5.6. Consequently, one has

$$\widehat{\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}}\text{-Mod} \simeq \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} k\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)\text{-Mod}.$$

Similarly, if we let \mathcal{C} be the category consisting of objects $[n]$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and surjections, then

$$\widehat{\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}}\text{-Mod} \simeq \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} kS_n\text{-Mod}.$$

5.10 Remark. The conclusions of the above two examples actually hold for any commutative ring k in which q is invertible, as asserted in [25, Theorem 6.7]. It follows from the facts that indempotents split and finite direct sums exist in these categories.

Part II. Abelian model structures

In this part we focus on abelian model structures on the representation category $\mathcal{C}\text{-Mod}$ of a generalized k -linear Reedy category \mathcal{C} . In particular, using the technique of Grothendieck bifibrations, we construct various abelian model structures on $\mathcal{C}\text{-Mod}$ from families of abelian model structures on $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$'s.

Setup. Throughout this part, let \mathcal{C} be a generalized k -linear Reedy category with $d : \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \lambda$ its degree function, and recall that $A_x^0 = \mathcal{C}^0(x, x)$ for each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$.

6. PRELIMINARIES ON MODEL STRUCTURES AND GROTHENDIECK BIFIBRATIONS

For the convenience of the reader, in this section we give some necessary preliminaries on abelian model structures and Grothendieck bifibrations.

6.1. Abelian model structures. The main content of this subsection includes weak factorization systems, (abelian) model structures, cotorsion pairs as well as various close relations among them.

Let $l : A \rightarrow B$ and $r : C \rightarrow D$ be morphisms in a category \mathcal{E} . Recall that l has the *left lifting property* with respect to r (or r has the *right lifting property* with respect to l) if for every pair of morphisms $f : A \rightarrow C$ and $g : B \rightarrow D$ with $rf = gl$, there exists a morphism $t : B \rightarrow C$ such that $f = tl$ and $g = rt$. Given a class \mathcal{C} of morphisms in \mathcal{E} , let \mathcal{C}^\square denote the class of all morphisms r in \mathcal{E} having the right lifting property with respect to all morphisms l in \mathcal{C} . The class ${}^\square\mathcal{C}$ is defined dually.

Following Bousfield [6], a pair $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ of classes of morphisms in \mathcal{E} is called a *weak factorization system* if $\mathcal{C}^\square = \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{C} = {}^\square\mathcal{D}$, and every morphism α in \mathcal{E} can be decomposed as $\alpha = fc$ with $c \in \mathcal{C}$ and $f \in \mathcal{D}$. Elements in \mathcal{C} (resp., in \mathcal{D}) are called *left maps* (resp., *right maps*) of the weak factorization system.

There are many examples of weak factorization systems. We only recall the following one, which will be used in next sections.

6.1 Example. Given a morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ in \mathcal{E} , denote by $X \setminus_f^{\mathcal{E}} Y$ the coslice category of \mathcal{E}/Y under f (or equivalently, the slice category of $X \setminus \mathcal{E}$ over f):

- objects in $X \setminus_f^{\mathcal{E}} Y$ are morphisms h in \mathcal{E} such that the next diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{h} & \bullet \\ & \searrow f & \swarrow g \\ & Y & \end{array}$$

- morphisms in $X \setminus_f^{\mathcal{E}} Y$ from $(f \xrightarrow{h} g)$ to $(f \xrightarrow{h'} g')$ are morphisms l in \mathcal{E} such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & l & & \\ & \bullet & \xleftarrow{h} & X & \xrightarrow{h'} \star \\ & \swarrow g & & \downarrow f & \searrow g' \\ & Y & & & \end{array}$$

It is routine to verify that each weak factorization system (C, D) in \mathcal{E} induces a weak factorization system $(X \setminus_f^C Y, X \setminus_f^D Y)$ in $X \setminus_f^{\mathcal{E}} Y$, where

$$\begin{aligned} X \setminus_f^C Y &= \{ l \in X \setminus_f^{\mathcal{E}} Y \mid \text{as a morphism in } \mathcal{E}, l \text{ is contained in } C \} \text{ and} \\ X \setminus_f^D Y &= \{ r \in X \setminus_f^{\mathcal{E}} Y \mid \text{as a morphism in } \mathcal{E}, r \text{ is contained in } D \}. \end{aligned}$$

The following definition of a model category is adopted from Hüttemann and Röndigs [21]. It requires the existence of small limits and colimits, and hence, is a strengthening of Quillen's axioms for a closed model category [33]. It is also slightly more general than the definition given by Hovey [19] in which the factorizations have to be functorial.

6.2 Definition. Let \mathcal{E} be a bicomplete category. A *model structure* on \mathcal{E} is a triple (C, W, F) of classes of morphisms satisfying the following conditions:

- $(C, W \cap F)$ and $(C \cap W, F)$ are weak factorization systems;
- W satisfies the 2-out-of-3 property: if two of the three morphisms α , β and $\beta\alpha$ are contained in W , then so is the third one.

A morphism in C (resp., W , F) is said to be a *cofibration* (resp., *weak equivalence*, *fibration*). A morphism in $C \cap W$ (resp., $F \cap W$) is called a *trivial cofibration* (resp., *trivial fibration*). An object in \mathcal{E} is said to be *cofibrant* if the map to it from the initial object is a cofibration. Dually, an object in \mathcal{E} is called *fibrant* if the map from it to the terminal object is a fibration. An object in \mathcal{E} is *trivial* if the map to it from the initial object is a weak equivalence, or equivalently, the map from it to the terminal object is a weak equivalence.

The following definition of an abelian model structure is taken from [20].

6.3 Definition. Let \mathcal{A} be a bicomplete abelian category. A model structure on \mathcal{A} is said to be *abelian* if the following conditions are satisfied:

- every cofibration is a monomorphism;
- a map is a (trivial) fibration if and only if it is an epimorphism with a (trivial) fibrant kernel.

6.4 Remark. By [20, Proposition 4.2], a model structure on \mathcal{A} in which every cofibration is a monomorphism and every fibration is an epimorphism, is abelian if trivial cofibrations are monomorphisms with trivially cofibrant cokernels and cofibrations coincide with monomorphisms with cofibrant cokernels.

Weak factorization systems and abelian model structures are closely related to cotorsion pairs, which was first introduced by Salce [35] and rediscovered by Enochs and Jenda in [14]. As an analogue to torsion pairs, cotorsion pairs are defined using the Ext functor instead of the Hom functor. Explicitly, let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category. Following [14], a pair $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ of classes of objects in \mathcal{A} is called a *cotorsion pair* if $\mathcal{C}^\perp = \mathcal{D}$ and ${}^\perp \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{C}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}^\perp &= \{ M \in \mathcal{A} \mid \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(C, M) = 0 \text{ for all objects } C \in \mathcal{C} \} \text{ and} \\ {}^\perp \mathcal{D} &= \{ M \in \mathcal{A} \mid \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(M, D) = 0 \text{ for all objects } D \in \mathcal{D} \}. \end{aligned}$$

A cotorsion pair $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ is said to be *complete* if for any object M in \mathcal{A} , there exist short exact sequences

$$0 \rightarrow D \rightarrow C \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow D' \rightarrow C' \rightarrow 0$$

in \mathcal{A} with $D, D' \in \mathcal{D}$ and $C, C' \in \mathcal{C}$.

For a class \mathcal{S} of objects in an abelian category \mathcal{A} , set

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Mon}(\mathcal{S}) &= \{ f \in \mathcal{A} \mid f \text{ is a monomorphism with } \text{coker}(f) \in \mathcal{S} \} \text{ and} \\ \text{Epi}(\mathcal{S}) &= \{ f \in \mathcal{A} \mid f \text{ is an epimorphism with } \text{ker}(f) \in \mathcal{S} \}. \end{aligned}$$

The next result, essentially due to Hovey [20] (see also Positselski and Šťovíček [30, Theorem 2.4]), provides a close relation between weak factorization systems and complete cotorsion pairs.

6.5 Lemma. *Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ be a pair of classes of objects in \mathcal{A} . Then $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ is a complete cotorsion pair if and only if $(\text{Mon}(\mathcal{C}), \text{Epi}(\mathcal{D}))$ is a weak factorization system in \mathcal{A} .*

The following result, now known as *Hovey's correspondence*, is a central result on abelian model structures. Recall that a class of objects in \mathcal{A} is called *thick* if it is closed under direct summands, extensions, kernels of epimorphisms and cokernels of monomorphisms.

6.6 Theorem (Hovey's correspondence). *Let \mathcal{A} be a bicomplete abelian category. Then there exists a bijective correspondence between*

- (1) *abelian model structures $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{F})$ on \mathcal{A} and*
- (2) *triples $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{R})$ of classes of objects in \mathcal{A} such that both $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{R})$ and $(\mathcal{Q} \cap \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{R})$ are complete cotorsion pairs, and \mathcal{W} is thick.*

Explicitly, given an abelian model structure $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{F})$ on \mathcal{A} , the corresponding triple of classes of objects in \mathcal{A} consists of the cofibrant, trivial and fibrant objects. Conversely, given a triple $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{R})$ satisfying the requirements in (2), the associated abelian model structure is $(\text{Mon}(\mathcal{Q}), \mathcal{W}, \text{Epi}(\mathcal{R}))$, where

$$\mathcal{W} = \{w \mid w \text{ can be decomposed as } w = fc \text{ with } c \in \text{Mon}(\mathcal{Q} \cap \mathcal{W}) \text{ and } f \in \text{Epi}(\mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{R})\}.$$

By the Hovey's correspondence, an abelian model structure on a bicomplete abelian category \mathcal{A} can be succinctly represented by a triple of classes of objects in \mathcal{A} satisfying the conditions in (2). Therefore, one often refers to such a triple as an abelian model structure, and call it a *Hovey triple*.

Recall that a cotorsion pair $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ in \mathcal{A} is called *resolving* if \mathcal{C} is closed under kernels of epimorphisms. Dually, one can define *coresolving* cotorsion pairs. We say that a cotorsion pair $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ is *hereditary* if it is both resolving and coresolving. The following result by Becker [2] asserts that the resolving condition and coresolving condition are equivalent when $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ is complete.

6.7 Lemma. *Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ be a complete cotorsion pair in an abelian category \mathcal{A} . Then $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ is hereditary if and only if it is resolving, and if and only if it is coresolving.*

A Hovey triple $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{R})$ in \mathcal{A} is said to be *hereditary* if both cotorsion pairs $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{R})$ and $(\mathcal{Q} \cap \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{R})$ are hereditary. The reader may refer to [15] for more on hereditary abelian model structures.

6.2. Grothendieck bifibrations. The main content of the subsection includes notations, definitions and elementary facts on Grothendieck bifibrations.

6.8. Let $p : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be a functor. Following Cagno and Melliès [7], an object Y in \mathcal{T} is called *above* an object V in \mathcal{B} if $p(Y) = V$; similarly, a morphism $f : Y \rightarrow Z$ in \mathcal{T} is called *above* a morphism $u : V \rightarrow W$ in \mathcal{B} if $p(f) = u$. Given an object V in \mathcal{B} , the *fiber* of V with respect to p , denoted by \mathcal{T}_V , is the subcategory of \mathcal{T} with objects Y in \mathcal{T} such that $p(Y) = V$ and morphisms f in \mathcal{T} such that $p(f) = 1_V$.

Given a morphism $f : Y \rightarrow Z$ in \mathcal{T} which is above a morphism $u : V \rightarrow W$ in \mathcal{B} , we say that f is *cartesian* with respect to p if for every morphism $v : U \rightarrow V$ in \mathcal{B} and a morphism $g : X \rightarrow Z$ that is above

$u \circ v : U \rightarrow W$, there is a unique morphism $h : X \rightarrow Y$ such that it is above v and $f \circ h = g$, as shown below:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & X & & Y & Z \\
 & \swarrow \exists | h & & \searrow \forall g & \\
 U & \xrightarrow{\forall v} & V & \xrightarrow{u \circ v} & W \\
 & \searrow \forall g & & \swarrow \exists | h & \\
 & V & \xrightarrow{u} & W &
 \end{array}$$

Dually, a morphism $f : Y \rightarrow Z$ in \mathcal{T} that is above a morphism $u : V \rightarrow W$ in \mathcal{B} is called *cocartesian* with respect to p if for every morphism $v : W \rightarrow U$ in \mathcal{B} and a morphism $g : Y \rightarrow X$ that is above $v \circ u : V \rightarrow U$, there exists a unique morphism $h : Z \rightarrow X$ such that it is above v and $h \circ f = g$, as shown below:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & Y & & Z & X \\
 & \swarrow f & & \searrow \exists | h & \swarrow \forall g \\
 V & \xrightarrow{u} & W & \xrightarrow{v \circ u} & U \\
 & \searrow \forall g & & \swarrow \exists | h & \\
 & W & \xrightarrow{\forall v} & U &
 \end{array}$$

It is easy to check that the class of all (co)cartesian morphisms is closed under compositions. We refer the reader to [7] for another way to define (co)cartesian morphisms via pullbacks. Recall that a *Grothendieck fibration* is a functor $p : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$, such that for any morphism $u : V \rightarrow W$ in \mathcal{B} and any object Z in \mathcal{T}_W , there is a cartesian morphism ϕ with codomain Z that is above u ; it is called a *cartesian lifting* of Z along u . Dually, a *Grothendieck opfibration* is a functor $p : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$, such that for any morphism $u : V \rightarrow W$ in \mathcal{B} and any object Y in \mathcal{T}_V , there is a cocartesian morphism ϕ with domain Y that is above u ; it is called a *cocartesian lifting* of Y along u . A functor $p : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is called a *Grothendieck bifibration* if it is both a Grothendieck fibration and a Grothendieck opfibration.

6.9 Definition. Recall from [7] that a *cloven Grothendieck bifibration* is a functor $p : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ together with (G1) for each morphism $u : V \rightarrow W$ in \mathcal{B} and each object Z in \mathcal{T}_W , an object $u^*(Z)$ in \mathcal{T} and a cartesian morphism $\rho_{u,Z} : u^*(Z) \rightarrow Z$ that is above u . Pictorially:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 u^*(Z) & \xrightarrow{\rho_{u,Z}} & \forall Z \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 V & \xrightarrow{u} & W;
 \end{array}$$

(G2) for each morphism $u : V \rightarrow W$ in \mathcal{B} and each object Y in \mathcal{T}_V , an object $u_!(Y)$ in \mathcal{T} and a cocartesian morphism $\lambda_{u,Y} : Y \rightarrow u_!(Y)$ that is above u . Pictorially:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \forall Y & \xrightarrow{\lambda_{u,Y}} & u_!(Y) \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 V & \xrightarrow{u} & W.
 \end{array}$$

In this paper, we always consider **cloven** Grothendieck bifibrations, and call them simply *Grothendieck bifibrations*. Indeed, if \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{B} are small relatively to a universe \mathbb{U} in which the axiom of choice is assumed, then cloven Grothendieck bifibrations coincide with the original notion of Grothendieck bifibrations; see [27] for details.

6.10 Lemma. Let $p : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be a Grothendieck bifibration and $f : Y \rightarrow Z$ a morphism in \mathcal{T} that is above a morphism $u : V \rightarrow W$ in \mathcal{B} . Then f can be factored uniquely as the cocartesian morphism $\lambda_{u,Y} : Y \rightarrow u_!(Y)$ followed by a morphism $f_! : u_!(Y) \rightarrow Z$ in the fiber \mathcal{T}_W , and f can also be factored uniquely as a morphism

$f^\triangleleft : Y \rightarrow u^*(Z)$ in the fiber \mathcal{T}_V followed by the cartesian morphism $\rho_{u,Z} : u^*(Z) \rightarrow Z$. Diagrammatically:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y & \xrightarrow{\lambda_{u,Y}} & u_!(Y) \\ f^\triangleleft \downarrow & \searrow f & \downarrow f_\triangleright \\ u^*(Z) & \xrightarrow{\rho_{u,Z}} & Z \end{array}$$

Proof. We only prove the first statement as the other one may be proved dually. Consider the following diagram of solid arrows:

$$(6.10.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} Y & \xrightarrow{\lambda_{u,Y}} & u_!(Y) \\ & \nearrow f & \downarrow f_\triangleright \\ V & \xrightarrow{u} & W \end{array}$$

Z

The diagram consists of three objects: Y , $u_!(Y)$, and W . There are solid arrows $\lambda_{u,Y} : Y \rightarrow u_!(Y)$, $u : V \rightarrow W$, and $f : Y \rightarrow u_!(Y)$. There is also a curved arrow f from Y to Z . Dotted arrows $f_\triangleright : u_!(Y) \rightarrow Z$ and $u_\triangleright : W \rightarrow Z$ are shown as dashed lines.

By the cocartesian universal property of $\lambda_{u,X}$, there is a unique morphism f_\triangleright , which is clearly contained in the fiber \mathcal{T}_W , such that $f_\triangleright \circ \lambda_{u,X} = f$. \square

6.11 Remark. Let $p : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be a Grothendieck bifibration and $u : V \rightarrow W$ a morphism in \mathcal{B} . Then the assignment u^* appearing in Definition 6.9 forms a functor from \mathcal{T}_W to \mathcal{T}_V . To specify its action on morphisms, let $k : Z' \rightarrow Z$ be a morphism in \mathcal{T}_W , and consider the morphism $k \circ \rho_{u,Z'} : u^*(Z') \rightarrow Z$ which is above u . By Lemma 6.10, the morphism $k \circ \rho_{u,Z'}$ can be factored as $\rho_{u,Z} \circ (k \circ \rho_{u,Z'})^\triangleleft$, that is, the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} u^*(Z') & \xrightarrow{\rho_{u,Z'}} & Z' \\ (k \circ \rho_{u,Z'})^\triangleleft \downarrow & & \downarrow k \\ u^*(Z) & \xrightarrow{\rho_{u,Z}} & Z \end{array}$$

Set $u^*(k) = (k \circ \rho_{u,Z'})^\triangleleft$. It is easy to check that this construction is functorial.

Dually, one may prove that the assignment $u_!$ appearing in Definition 6.9 also forms a functor from \mathcal{T}_V to \mathcal{T}_W . Its sends a morphism $l : Y \rightarrow Y'$ in \mathcal{T}_V to the morphism $(\lambda_{u,Y'} \circ l)_\triangleright$ appearing in the following commutative diagram whose existence is guaranteed by Lemma 6.10:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y & \xrightarrow{\lambda_{u,Y}} & u_!(Y) \\ l \downarrow & & \downarrow (\lambda_{u,Y'} \circ l)_\triangleright \\ Y' & \xrightarrow{\lambda_{u,Y'}} & u_!(Y') \end{array}$$

The above functors u^* and $u_!$ are called the *reindexing functors* of u . By Lemma 6.10, it is routine to check that they form an adjoint pair between \mathcal{T}_V and \mathcal{T}_W :

$$u_! : \mathcal{T}_V \rightleftarrows \mathcal{T}_W : u^*.$$

The reader can refer to [7] for more details.

The following result, taken from [7, Lemma 2.4], provides a method to construct weak factorization systems in the total category of a Grothendieck bifibration via weak factorization systems in the basis category and all fibers; see also Stanculescu [40].

6.12 Lemma. Let $p : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be a Grothendieck bifibration with a weak factorization system $(\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{B})$ in \mathcal{B} and a weak factorization system $(\mathcal{C}_V, \mathcal{D}_V)$ in the fiber \mathcal{T}_V for each $V \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{B})$. If $u_!(\mathcal{C}_V) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_W$ for each

morphism $u : V \rightarrow W$ in \mathcal{B} , then there exists a weak factorization system $(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}})$ in \mathcal{T} , which is defined as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{T}} &= \{ f : Y \rightarrow Z \in \mathcal{T} \mid p(f) \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}} \text{ and } f_{\triangleright} \in \mathcal{C}_{p(Z)} \} \text{ and} \\ \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}} &= \{ f : Y \rightarrow Z \in \mathcal{T} \mid p(f) \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}} \text{ and } f^{\triangleleft} \in \mathcal{D}_{p(Y)} \}.\end{aligned}$$

6.13 Remark. By the proof of [7, Lemma 2.4], for any morphism f in \mathcal{T} , we have a factorization

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \\ & \searrow \tilde{l} & \swarrow \tilde{r} \\ & \bullet & \end{array}$$

given by the induced weak factorization system $(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}})$ as well as a factorization

$$\begin{array}{ccc} p(X) & \xrightarrow{p(f)} & p(Y) \\ & \searrow l & \swarrow r \\ & p(\bullet) & \end{array}$$

of $p(f)$ given by the weak factorization system $(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}})$. Then one has $p(\tilde{l}) = l$ and $p(\tilde{r}) = r$. Moreover, the lifting morphism \tilde{h} in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \longrightarrow & V \\ \downarrow & \nearrow \tilde{h} & \downarrow \\ Y & \longrightarrow & W \end{array}$$

in \mathcal{T} , which is constructed to prove the lifting property of $(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}})$, is above the lifting morphism h in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} p(X) & \longrightarrow & p(V) \\ \downarrow & \nearrow h & \downarrow \\ p(Y) & \longrightarrow & p(W) \end{array}$$

in \mathcal{B} given by the lifting property of $(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}})$.

7. RESTRICTION FUNCTORS AND ITS ADJOINTS

For every non-zero ordinal α , define \mathfrak{C}_α to be the full subcategory of \mathfrak{C} consisting of objects x with $d(x) < \alpha$. It is easy to see that \mathfrak{C}_α inherits a generalized k -linear Reedy structure from \mathfrak{C} . Consequently, we obtain the chain

$$\emptyset = \mathfrak{C}_0 \subseteq \mathfrak{C}_1 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \mathfrak{C}_\lambda \subseteq \mathfrak{C}_{\lambda+1} = \mathfrak{C}$$

of \mathfrak{C} by generalized k -linear Reedy subcategories. **Throughout this section**, we let $\beta \leq \lambda+1$ be a non-zero ordinal, and consider the generalized k -linear Reedy category \mathfrak{C}_β .

7.1 Adjoint triples. For each non-zero ordinal $\alpha < \beta$, the fully faithful embedding functor $\iota_\alpha : \mathfrak{C}_\alpha \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_\beta$ induces a *restriction functor*

$$\text{Res}_\alpha : \mathfrak{C}_\beta\text{-Mod} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_\alpha\text{-Mod}.$$

It admits a left adjoint In_α and a right adjoint coln_α given by the left and right Kan extensions, respectively; see for instance [28, Section 4]. Pictorially:

$$(7.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & & \text{In}_\alpha & & \\ & \swarrow & \curvearrowright & \searrow & \\ \mathfrak{C}_\beta\text{-Mod} & \xrightarrow{\quad \text{Res}_\alpha \quad} & & & \mathfrak{C}_\alpha\text{-Mod} \\ & \nwarrow & \curvearrowright & \nearrow & \\ & & \text{coln}_\alpha & & \end{array}$$

More explicitly, given a left \mathfrak{C}_α -module V and $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_\beta)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{In}_\alpha V)(x) &= 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} V = \mathfrak{C}_\beta(\iota_\alpha(-), x) \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} V, \text{ and} \\ (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(x) &= \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha}(\mathfrak{C}_\beta 1_x, V) = \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha}(\mathfrak{C}_\beta(x, \iota_\alpha(-)), V). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, given a left \mathfrak{C}_β -module Y and $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_\beta)$ with $d(x) = \alpha$, the counit l^α of the adjunction $(\text{In}_\alpha, \text{Res}_\alpha)$, evaluated at Y and x , is the A_x^0 -homomorphism

$$(7.1.1) \quad l_Y^\alpha(x) : 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} \text{Res}_\alpha Y \rightarrow Y(x), \quad \phi \otimes \xi \mapsto Y(\phi)(\xi),$$

and the unit m^α of the adjunction $(\text{Res}_\alpha, \text{coln}_\alpha)$, evaluated at Y and x , is the A_x^0 -homomorphism

$$(7.1.2) \quad m_Y^\alpha(x) : Y(x) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha}(\mathfrak{C}_\beta 1_x, \text{Res}_\alpha Y), \quad \xi \mapsto [f \mapsto Y(f)(\xi)].$$

In literature $1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} \text{Res}_\alpha Y$ is called the *latching object* of Y at x , and $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha}(\mathfrak{C}_\beta 1_x, \text{Res}_\alpha Y)$ is called the *matching object* of Y at x .

Now we state the main result of this section, generalizing [11, Theorem 5.6].

7.2 Theorem. *Let Y be a left \mathfrak{C}_β -module and $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_\beta)$ with $d(x) = \alpha$. Then one has the following natural isomorphisms of left A_x^0 -modules:*

- (a) $1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} \text{Res}_\alpha Y \cong 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+} \text{Res}_\alpha Y$;
- (b) $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha}(\mathfrak{C}_\beta 1_x, \text{Res}_\alpha Y) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^-}(\mathfrak{C}_\beta^- 1_x, \text{Res}_\alpha Y)$.

We need some preparatory work before proving Theorem 7.2. **In the rest of this section**, for each non-zero ordinal $\alpha < \beta$, we still use the symbol \mathfrak{I}_α to denote the following two-sided ideal of \mathfrak{C}_β :

$$\bigoplus_{d(z) < \alpha} \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+(z, -) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}_\beta^-(\bullet, z).$$

7.3 Lemma. *For all $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_\beta)$ with $d(x) = \alpha$, there is an isomorphism*

$$1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+} \mathfrak{C}_\beta 1_y \cong 1_x \mathfrak{I}_\alpha 1_y.$$

Proof. Since \mathfrak{C}_β^+ as a $(\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+, \mathfrak{C}^0)$ -bimodule is the same as \mathfrak{C}_α^+ , it follows that

$$1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+} \mathfrak{C}_\beta 1_y \cong 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+} (\mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^0} \mathfrak{C}_\beta^- 1_y) = 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+} (\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^0} \mathfrak{C}_\beta^- 1_y).$$

Note that $\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+ 1_z = 0$ provided that $d(z) = \alpha$, so

$$1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+} (\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^0} \mathfrak{C}_\beta^- 1_y) \cong 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^0} \left(\bigoplus_{d(z) < \alpha} 1_z \mathfrak{C}_\beta^- 1_y \right).$$

But as (A_x^0, \mathfrak{C}_0) -bimodules, one has $(\mathfrak{C}_\beta^+)_\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+ \oplus A_x^0 = 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+$. Furthermore, one also has

$$A_x^0 \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^0} \left(\bigoplus_{d(z) < \alpha} 1_z \mathfrak{C}_\beta^- 1_y \right) = 0.$$

Consequently, one gets

$$1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}^0} \left(\bigoplus_{d(z) < \alpha} 1_z \mathfrak{C}_\beta^- 1_y \right) \cong \bigoplus_{d(z) < \alpha} 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ 1_z \otimes_{A_z^0} 1_z \mathfrak{C}_\beta^- 1_y,$$

which is precisely $\mathfrak{I}_\alpha(y, x) = 1_x \mathfrak{I}_\alpha 1_y$. □

The following result will be used frequently in the sequel.

7.4 Lemma. *For each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_\beta)$ with $d(x) = \alpha$, there is an isomorphism*

$$1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+} \mathfrak{C}_\alpha \cong 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta$$

of $(A_x^0, \mathfrak{C}_\alpha)$ -bimodules.

Proof. Note that for each y with $d(y) < \alpha$, as left \mathfrak{C}_α^+ -modules, one has $\mathfrak{C}_\alpha 1_y = \mathfrak{C}_\beta 1_y$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+} \mathfrak{C}_\alpha &\cong 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+} \left(\bigoplus_{d(y) < \alpha} \mathfrak{C}_\alpha 1_y \right) \\ &= 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+} \left(\bigoplus_{d(y) < \alpha} \mathfrak{C}_\beta 1_y \right) \\ &\cong \bigoplus_{d(y) < \alpha} 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+} \mathfrak{C}_\beta 1_y. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 7.3, one has

$$\bigoplus_{d(y) < \alpha} 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+} \mathfrak{C}_\beta 1_y \cong \bigoplus_{d(y) < \alpha} 1_x \mathfrak{J}_\alpha 1_y.$$

But

$$\bigoplus_{d(y) < \alpha} 1_x \mathfrak{J}_\alpha 1_y = \bigoplus_{d(y) < \alpha} \bigoplus_{d(z) < \alpha} \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} \mathfrak{C}_\beta^-(y, z) = \bigoplus_{d(y) < \alpha} \mathfrak{C}_\beta(y, x),$$

which is precisely the $(A_x^0, \mathfrak{C}_\alpha)$ -bimodule $1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta$. The conclusion follows. \square

Now, we can give the proof of Theorem 7.2.

7.5 Proof of Theorem 7.2. We prove the isomorphism in (a); the one in (b) may be proved dually. Note that

$$1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+} \text{Res}_\alpha Y \cong 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+} (\mathfrak{C}_\alpha \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} \text{Res}_\alpha Y) \cong (1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+} \mathfrak{C}_\alpha) \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} \text{Res}_\alpha Y.$$

But $1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta \cong 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+} \mathfrak{C}_\alpha$ as right \mathfrak{C}_α -modules by Lemma 7.4. Thus, the conclusion follows. \square

The next technical result will be applied in the proofs of Proposition 7.7 and Lemma 10.8.

7.6 Lemma. *Let Y be a left \mathfrak{C}_β -module. Then for each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_\beta)$ with $d(x) = \alpha$, there is an isomorphism*

$$1_x \mathfrak{J}_\alpha \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta} Y \cong (\text{In}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha Y)(x).$$

Proof. For all $y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_\beta)$, by Lemma 7.3, one has $1_x \mathfrak{J}_\alpha 1_y \cong 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+} \mathfrak{C}_\beta 1_y$. On the other hand, by Lemma 7.4, one also has

$$1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} \mathfrak{C}_\beta 1_y \cong (1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+} \mathfrak{C}_\alpha) \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} \mathfrak{C}_\beta 1_y \cong 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+} \mathfrak{C}_\beta 1_y.$$

Consequently, $1_x \mathfrak{J}_\alpha 1_y \cong 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} \mathfrak{C}_\beta 1_y$, and hence, $1_x \mathfrak{J}_\alpha \cong 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} \mathfrak{C}_\beta$ as right \mathfrak{C}_β -modules. Therefore, one has $1_x \mathfrak{J}_\alpha \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta} Y \cong (1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} \mathfrak{C}_\beta) \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta} Y \cong 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} \text{Res}_\alpha Y = (\text{In}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha Y)(x)$. \square

By Lemma 7.6 and its dual result, one has the following observation.

7.7 Proposition. *Let Y be a left \mathfrak{C}_β -module. Then for each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_\beta)$ with $d(x) = \alpha$,*

- (a) *the morphism $l_Y^\alpha(x) : (\text{In}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha Y)(x) \rightarrow Y(x)$ in (7.1.1) is naturally isomorphic to the obvious morphism*

$$1_x \mathfrak{J}_\alpha \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta} Y \rightarrow 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta} Y \cong Y(x);$$

- (b) *the morphism $m_Y^\alpha(x) : Y(x) \rightarrow (\text{coln}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha Y)(x)$ in (7.1.2) is naturally isomorphic to the obvious morphism*

$$Y(x) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta}(\mathfrak{C}_\beta 1_x, Y) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta}(\mathfrak{J}_\alpha 1_x, Y).$$

Proof. We only show the first statement as the second one may be proved dually. Since $1_x \mathfrak{J}_\alpha \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta} Y \cong (\text{In}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha Y)(x)$ by Lemma 7.6, the conclusion follows readily as one can obtain the counit morphism $l_Y^\alpha(x) : (\text{In}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha Y)(x) \rightarrow Y(x)$ via tensoring the inclusion $1_x \mathfrak{J}_\alpha \rightarrow 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta$ by Y . \square

As an immediate consequence of Proposition 7.7, one has:

7.8 Corollary. *Let Y be a left \mathfrak{C}_β -module and $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_\beta)$ with $d(x) = \alpha$. Then the following hold.*

- (a) *The cokernel of $l_Y^\alpha(x)$ is isomorphic to $\Delta^x \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta} Y$, and $l_Y^\alpha(x)$ is a monomorphism if and only if $\text{Tor}_1^{\mathfrak{C}_\beta}(\Delta^x, Y) = 0$;*

- (b) The kernel of $m_Y^\alpha(x)$ is isomorphic to $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta}(\Delta_x, Y)$, and $m_Y^\alpha(x)$ is an epimorphism if and only if $\text{Ext}_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta}^1(\Delta_x, Y) = 0$.

Proof. As before, we only prove the first statement. Applying $- \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta} Y$ to the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow 1_x \mathfrak{J}_\alpha \rightarrow 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta \rightarrow \Delta^x \rightarrow 0$$

of right \mathfrak{C}_β -modules, we deduce the conclusion from Proposition 7.7. \square

8. THE BIFIBRATIONAL NATURE OF THE RESTRICTION FUNCTOR

In this section, we consider the embedding $\iota_\alpha : \mathfrak{C}_\alpha \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}$ for each non-zero ordinal $\alpha \leq \lambda$, and show that the restriction functor $\text{Res}_\alpha : \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_\alpha\text{-Mod}$ is a Grothendieck bifibration.

8.1 A natural transformation. Note that $\iota_\alpha : \mathfrak{C}_\alpha \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}$ is fully faithful. It follows that both the functors In_α and coln_α in (7.1) are also fully faithful; see [22, Proposition 4.23]. Consequently, both the unit η^α of $(\text{In}_\alpha, \text{Res}_\alpha)$ and the counit ϵ^α of $(\text{Res}_\alpha, \text{coln}_\alpha)$ are isomorphisms. Thus, there is a natural transformation

$$\tau^\alpha : \text{In}_\alpha \rightarrow \text{coln}_\alpha,$$

which can be described as the map

$$\text{In}_\alpha \xrightarrow{m^\alpha \circ \text{In}_\alpha} \text{coln}_\alpha \circ \text{Res}_\alpha \circ \text{In}_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{coln}_\alpha \circ (\eta^\alpha)^{-1}} \text{coln}_\alpha,$$

or equivalently, the map

$$\text{In}_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{In}_\alpha \circ (\epsilon^\alpha)^{-1}} \text{In}_\alpha \circ \text{Res}_\alpha \circ \text{coln}_\alpha \xrightarrow{l^\alpha \circ \text{coln}_\alpha} \text{coln}_\alpha,$$

where m^α is the unit of $(\text{Res}_\alpha, \text{coln}_\alpha)$ and l^α is the counit of $(\text{In}_\alpha, \text{Res}_\alpha)$; see [11, Lemmas 2.28]. Moreover, one has a commutative diagram

$$(8.1.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{In}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha & \xrightarrow{\tau^\alpha * 1_{\text{Res}_\alpha}} & \text{coln}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha \\ l^\alpha \searrow & & \swarrow m^\alpha \\ & 1_{\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}} & \end{array}$$

of natural transformations, where “ $*$ ” denotes the Godment product; see [11, Lemma 2.29] for details.

In the following, we describe the fiber $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}_V$ of a left \mathfrak{C}_α -module V with respect to the restriction functor $\text{Res}_\alpha : \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_\alpha\text{-Mod}$.

8.2. Let Y be in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}_V$. By (8.1.1), one gets a factorization

$$\text{In}_\alpha V = \text{In}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha Y \xrightarrow{l_Y^\alpha} Y \xrightarrow{m_Y^\alpha} \text{coln}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha Y = \text{coln}_\alpha V$$

of τ_V^α . In particular, for all objects x in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}$ with $d(x) = \alpha$, the above factorization restricts to factorizations

$$(\text{In}_\alpha V)(x) \xrightarrow{l_Y^\alpha(x)} Y(x) \xrightarrow{m_Y^\alpha(x)} (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(x)$$

of A_x^0 -homomorphism factorizations of those $\tau_V^\alpha(x)$.

Conversely, given a family $\{(\text{In}_\alpha V)(x) \xrightarrow{\varphi(x)} M_x \xrightarrow{\psi(x)} (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(x)\}_{d(x)=\alpha}$ of A_x^0 -homomorphism factorizations of those $\tau_V^\alpha(x)$, one may define a left $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}$ -module Y as follows:

For any object x in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}$, set

$$(8.2.1) \quad Y(x) = \begin{cases} V(x) & \text{if } d(x) < \alpha, \text{ i.e. } x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_\alpha); \\ M_x & \text{if } d(x) = \alpha. \end{cases}$$

In the next three steps we define the values of Y on morphisms in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}$.

Step 1. Given a $f^+ \in \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}^+(x, y)$, we have the following cases:

- (1) If $d(x) = \alpha$, then $d(y) = \alpha$ as well. Hence, $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}^+(x, y) = 0$ or $x = y$, and correspondingly $f^+ = 0$ or $f^+ \in A_x^0$. If $f^+ = 0$, we set $Y(f^+) = 0$; otherwise, we set $Y(f^+)$ to be $M_x(f^+)$ by noting that M_x is a left A_x^0 -module.

(2) If $d(x) < \alpha$ and $d(y) = \alpha$, then $Y(x) = V(x)$. Consider the following diagram of solid arrows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} (\text{In}_\alpha V)(x) = (\text{In}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha V)(x) & \xrightarrow{l_V^\alpha(x)} & V(x) & = & Y(x) \\ (\text{In}_\alpha V)(f^+) \downarrow & & & & \downarrow Y(f^+) \\ (\text{In}_\alpha V)(y) & \xrightarrow{\varphi(y)} & M_y & = & Y(y) \end{array}$$

Since $d(x) < \alpha$, the top morphism $l_V^\alpha(x)$ is an isomorphism. We define $Y(f^+)$ to be the morphism such that the above diagram commutes, that is,

$$Y(f^+) = \varphi(y) \circ (\text{In}_\alpha V)(f^+) \circ (l_V^\alpha(x))^{-1}.$$

(3) If $d(x) < \alpha$ and $d(y) < \alpha$, then $f^+ \in \mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+(x, y)$, and $Y(x) = V(x)$ and $Y(y) = V(y)$. In this case, set $Y(f^+)$ to be $V(f^+)$.

Step 2. Given a $f^- \in \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}^-(x, y)$, we have the following cases:

- (1') If $d(y) = \alpha$, then $d(x) = \alpha$ as well. Hence, $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}^-(x, y) = 0$ or $x = y$, and correspondingly $f^- = 0$ or $f^- \in A_x^0$. If $f^- = 0$, then set $Y(f^-) = 0$; otherwise, $f^- \in A_x^0$, so we can define $Y(f^-)$ to be $M_x(f^-)$.
(2') If $d(y) < \alpha$ and $d(x) = \alpha$, then $Y(y) = V(y)$. Since $m_V^\alpha(y)$ in the following diagram is an isomorphism

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y(x) = M_x & \xrightarrow{\psi(x)} & (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(x) \\ Y(f^-) \downarrow & & \downarrow (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(f^-) \\ Y(y) = V(y) & \xrightarrow{m_V^\alpha(y)} & (\text{coln}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha V)(y) = (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(y) \end{array}$$

we set

$$Y(f^-) = (m_V^\alpha(y))^{-1} \circ (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(f^-) \circ \psi(x).$$

- (3') If $d(y) < \alpha$ and $d(x) < \alpha$, then $f^- \in \mathfrak{C}_\alpha^-(x, y)$, and $Y(y) = V(y)$ and $Y(x) = V(x)$. In this case, we set $Y(f^-)$ to be $V(f^-)$.

Step 3. Given an arbitrary $f \in \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}(x, y)$, we have a Reedy decomposition $f = f_1^+ f_1^- + \dots + f_n^+ f_n^-$, so we define $Y(f) = Y(f_1^+) \circ Y(f_1^-) + \dots + Y(f_n^+) \circ Y(f_n^-)$.

8.3 Lemma. *The above construction gives a left $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}$ -module Y in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}_V$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that the construction of $Y(f)$ in Step 3 is independent of the choice of Reedy factorizations of f . But as we explained in Remark 2.7, Reedy factorizations are unique up to tensor product over \mathfrak{C}^0 . Thus, we only need to check the construction of $Y(f)$ respects the balanced relation $f^+ \otimes_k \phi f^- - f^+ \phi \otimes_k f^-$, where $f^+ \in \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}^+(z, y)$, $\phi \in \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}^0(z, z)$ and $f^- \in \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}^-(x, z)$. Explicitly, given the following diagram

$$x \xrightarrow{f^-} z \xrightarrow{\phi} f^+ \xrightarrow{y}$$

of morphisms in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}$, we need to show that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y(x) & \xrightarrow{Y(\phi f^-)} & Y(z) \\ Y(f^-) \downarrow & & \downarrow Y(f^+) \\ Y(z) & \xrightarrow{Y(f^+ \phi)} & Y(y) \end{array}$$

commutes; that is, $Y(f^+) \circ Y(\phi f^-) = Y(f^+ \phi) \circ Y(f^-)$.

If $d(z) = \alpha$, then $d(x) = \alpha = d(y)$. We may suppose that $x = z = y$ because for the other cases one has $f^+ = 0$ or $f^- = 0$, and the desired equality holds clearly. Under this assumption, all of f^- , ϕ and f^+ are contained in A_x^0 and $Y(x) = M_x$ is a left A_x^0 -module. Thus, the desired equality clearly follows from the axiom of modules.

Now, suppose that $d(z) < \alpha$. We establish the conclusion by showing $Y(\phi f^-) = Y(\phi) \circ Y(f^-)$ and $Y(f^+ \phi) = Y(f^+) \circ Y(\phi)$.

If $d(x) = \alpha$, then one has

$$\begin{aligned}
 Y(\phi f^-) &= (m_V^\alpha(z))^{-1} \circ (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(\phi f^-) \circ \psi(x) && \text{by (2')} \\
 &= (m_V^\alpha(z))^{-1} \circ (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(\phi) \circ (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(f^-) \circ \psi(x) && \text{as } \phi, f^- \in \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1} \\
 &= V(\phi) \circ (m_V^\alpha(z))^{-1} \circ (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(f^-) \circ \psi(x) && \text{as } m_V^\alpha \text{ is a natural transformation} \\
 &= V(\phi) \circ Y(f^-) && \text{by (2') again} \\
 &= Y(\phi) \circ Y(f^-) && \text{by (3')}
 \end{aligned}$$

Otherwise, if $d(x) < \alpha$, then all of ϕ , f^- and ϕf^- are contained in \mathfrak{C}_α^- , and so by (3'), one has

$$Y(\phi f^-) = V(\phi f^-) = V(\phi) \circ V(f^-) = Y(\phi) \circ Y(f^-).$$

Consequently, we always have $Y(\phi f^-) = Y(\phi) \circ Y(f^-)$.

Similarly, if $d(y) = \alpha$, then one has

$$\begin{aligned}
 Y(f^+ \phi) &= \varphi(y) \circ (\text{In}_\alpha V)(f^+ \phi) \circ (l_V^\alpha(z))^{-1} && \text{by (2')} \\
 &= \varphi(y) \circ (\text{In}_\alpha V)(f^+) \circ (\text{In}_\alpha V)(\phi) \circ (l_V^\alpha(z))^{-1} && \text{as } f^+, \phi \in \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1} \\
 &= \varphi(y) \circ (\text{In}_\alpha V)(f^+) \circ (l_V^\alpha(z))^{-1} \circ V(\phi) && \text{as } l_V^\alpha \text{ is a natural transformation} \\
 &= Y(f^+) \circ V(\phi) && \text{by (2) again} \\
 &= Y(f^+) \circ Y(\phi) && \text{by (3)}
 \end{aligned}$$

Otherwise, if $d(y) < \alpha$, then all of f^+ , ϕ , and $f^+ \phi$ are contained in \mathfrak{C}_α^+ , and so by (3), one has

$$Y(f^+ \phi) = V(f^+ \phi) = V(f^+) \circ V(\phi) = Y(f^+) \circ Y(\phi).$$

Consequently, we always have $Y(f^+ \phi) = Y(f^+) \circ Y(\phi)$. The conclusion then follows. \square

One can easily deduce the following result from 8.2 and the above lemma.

8.4 Theorem. *Let V be a left \mathfrak{C}_α -module. Then there exists a one-to-one correspondence between modules in the fiber $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}_V$ and families*

$$\{(\text{In}_\alpha V)(x) \longrightarrow \bullet \longrightarrow (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(x)\}_{d(x)=\alpha}$$

of left A_x^0 -homomorphism factorizations of $\tau_V^\alpha(x)$.

8.5 Remark. Let V and W be left \mathfrak{C}_α -modules, and $Y \in \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}_V$ and $Y' \in \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}_W$. By Theorem 8.4, the commutative diagram (8.1.1) of natural transformations, and an argument similar to that in [34, Observation 3.11], one concludes that an extension of a morphism $u : V \rightarrow W$ in $\mathfrak{C}_\alpha\text{-Mod}$ to a morphism $f : Y \rightarrow Y'$ in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}$ that is above u uniquely corresponds to a family $\{Y(x) \xrightarrow{\delta(x)} Y'(x)\}_{d(x)=\alpha}$ of morphisms of left A_x^0 -modules such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 (\text{In}_\alpha V)(x) & \longrightarrow & Y(x) & \longrightarrow & (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(x) \\
 \downarrow (\text{In}_\alpha u)(x) & & \downarrow \delta(x) & & \downarrow (\text{coln}_\alpha u)(x) \\
 (\text{In}_\alpha W)(x) & \longrightarrow & Y'(x) & \longrightarrow & (\text{coln}_\alpha W)(x).
 \end{array}$$

We mention that for each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1})$, the morphism $f(x) : Y(x) \rightarrow Y'(x)$ is as follows:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} u(x) & \text{if } d(x) < \alpha, \text{ i.e. } x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_\alpha); \\ \delta(x) & \text{if } d(x) = \alpha. \end{cases}$$

8.6. Let V be a left \mathfrak{C}_α -module. We give a description for the category $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}_V$. For each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1})$ with $d(x) = \alpha$, recall from Example 6.1 the category $(\text{In}_\alpha V)(x) \setminus \frac{A_x^0\text{-Mod}}{\tau_V^\alpha(x)} / (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(x)$. Define a rule

$$\mathcal{R} : \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}_V \longrightarrow \prod_{d(x)=\alpha} (\text{In}_\alpha V)(x) \setminus \frac{A_x^0\text{-Mod}}{\tau_V^\alpha(x)} / (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(x)$$

as follows:

- For any $Y \in \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}_V$, set $\mathcal{R}(Y)$ to be the family

$$\{(\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x) \xrightarrow{l_Y^\alpha(x)} Y(x) \xrightarrow{m_Y^\alpha(x)} (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha V)(x)\}_{d(x)=\alpha}$$

of left A_x^0 -homomorphism factorizations of those $\tau_V^\alpha(x)$ given in 8.2.

- Let $f : Y \rightarrow Y'$ be a morphism in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}_V$. Then for each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1})$ with $d(x) = \alpha$, $f(x)$ makes the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} (\mathbf{In}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha Y)(x) & \xrightarrow{l_Y^\alpha(x)} & Y(x) & \xrightarrow{m_Y^\alpha(x)} & (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha Y)(x) \\ \parallel & & f(x) & & \parallel \\ (\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x) & & & & (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha V)(x) \\ \parallel & & & & \parallel \\ (\mathbf{In}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha Y')(x) & \xrightarrow{l_{Y'}^\alpha(x)} & Y'(x) & \xrightarrow{m_{Y'}^\alpha(x)} & (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha Y')(x) \end{array}$$

commutes; see Remark 8.5. Therefore, $f(x)$ is a morphism in the category $(\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x) \setminus \frac{A_x^0\text{-Mod}}{\tau_V^\alpha(x)} / (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha V)(x)$.

Set $\mathcal{R}(f)$ to be the family $\{f(x)\}_{d(x)=\alpha}$.

It is routine to check that \mathcal{R} is a functor.

The next result can be easily deduced from Theorem 8.4.

8.7 Corollary. *Let V be a left \mathfrak{C}_α -module. Then $\mathcal{R} : \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}_V \rightarrow \prod_{d(x)=\alpha} (\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x) \setminus \frac{A_x^0\text{-Mod}}{\tau_V^\alpha(x)} / (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha V)(x)$ is an isomorphism of categories.*

Now we state the main result in this section, which exhibits the bifibrational nature of the restriction functor Res_α .

8.8 Theorem. *The restriction functor $\text{Res}_\alpha : \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_\alpha\text{-Mod}$ with respect to the embedding $\iota_\alpha : \mathfrak{C}_\alpha \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}$ is a Grothendieck bifibration.*

Proof. We first prove (G2) in Definition 6.9. To this end, given a morphism $u : V \rightarrow W$ in $\mathfrak{C}_\alpha\text{-Mod}$ and a module Y in the fiber $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}_V$, we have to construct a $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}$ -module $u_!(Y)$ in the fiber $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}_W$ and a cocartesian morphism $\lambda_{u,Y} : Y \rightarrow u_!(Y)$ that is above u .

Step 1: Constructions of $u_!(Y)$ and $\lambda_{u,Y}$. By Theorem 8.4, the module Y gives rise to a family

$$\{(\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x) \xrightarrow{l_Y^\alpha(x)} Y(x) \xrightarrow{m_Y^\alpha(x)} (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha V)(x)\}_{d(x)=\alpha}$$

of left A_x^0 -homomorphism factorizations of those $\tau_V^\alpha(x)$ (see 8.2 for details.) For each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1})$ with $d(x) = \alpha$, the pushout

$$(8.8.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} (\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x) & \xrightarrow{(\mathbf{In}_\alpha u)(x)} & (\mathbf{In}_\alpha W)(x) \\ l_Y^\alpha(x) \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \varphi(x) \\ Y(x) & \xrightarrow{\theta(x)} & (\mathbf{In}_\alpha W)(x) \sqcup_{(\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x)} Y(x) \end{array}$$

in $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$ fits into the following diagram of solid arrows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & (\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x) & \xrightarrow{(\mathbf{In}_\alpha u)(x)} & (\mathbf{In}_\alpha W)(x) \\ & \swarrow \tau_V^\alpha(x) & l_Y^\alpha(x) \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \varphi(x) \\ & & Y(x) & \xrightarrow{\theta(x)} & (\mathbf{In}_\alpha W)(x) \sqcup_{(\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x)} Y(x) \\ & \searrow m_Y^\alpha(x) & & \downarrow \psi(x) & \swarrow \tau_W^\alpha(x) \\ & & (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha V)(x) & \xrightarrow{(\mathbf{coln}_\alpha u)(x)} & (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha W)(x) \end{array}$$

Since $(\text{coln}_\alpha u)(x) \circ \tau_V^\alpha(x) = \tau_W^\alpha(x) \circ (\text{ln}_\alpha u)(x)$ and $m_Y^\alpha(x) \circ l_Y^\alpha(x) = \tau_V^\alpha(x)$, one has

$$(\text{coln}_\alpha u)(x) \circ m_Y^\alpha(x) \circ l_Y^\alpha(x) = \tau_W^\alpha(x) \circ (\text{ln}_\alpha u)(x).$$

By the universal property of the pushout (8.8.1), there exists a unique morphism $\psi(x)$ such that the whole diagram commutes. Consequently, one obtains a family

$$\{(\text{ln}_\alpha W)(x) \xrightarrow{\varphi(x)} (\text{ln}_\alpha W)(x) \sqcup_{(\text{ln}_\alpha V)(x)} Y(x) \xrightarrow{\psi(x)} (\text{coln}_\alpha W)(x)\}_{d(x)=\alpha}$$

of left A_x^0 -homomorphism factorizations of those $\tau_W^\alpha(x)$ as well as a family

$$\{Y(x) \xrightarrow{\theta(x)} (\text{ln}_\alpha W)(x) \sqcup_{(\text{ln}_\alpha V)(x)} Y(x)\}_{d(x)=\alpha}$$

of left A_x^0 -modules homomorphisms such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} (\text{ln}_\alpha V)(x) & \xrightarrow{l_Y^\alpha(x)} & Y(x) & \xrightarrow{m_Y^\alpha(x)} & (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(x) \\ (\text{ln}_\alpha u)(x) \downarrow & & \downarrow \theta(x) & & \downarrow (\text{coln}_\alpha u)(x) \\ (\text{ln}_\alpha W)(x) & \xrightarrow{\varphi(x)} & (\text{ln}_\alpha W)(x) \sqcup_{(\text{ln}_\alpha V)(x)} Y(x) & \xrightarrow{\psi(x)} & (\text{coln}_\alpha W)(x). \end{array}$$

Consequently, one gets a left $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}$ -module $u_!(Y)$ in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}_W$ by Theorem 8.4 and a morphism $\lambda_{u,Y} : Y \rightarrow u_!(Y)$ in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}$ that is above u by Remark 8.5. More explicitly, for any object x in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}$, the morphism $\lambda_{u,Y}(x) : Y(x) \rightarrow u_!(Y)(x)$ is as follows:

$$\lambda_{u,Y}(x) = \begin{cases} u(x) & \text{if } d(x) < \alpha, \text{ i.e. } x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_\alpha); \\ \theta(x) & \text{if } d(x) = \alpha. \end{cases}$$

Step 2: $\lambda_{u,Y}$ is cocartesian. Consider the following diagram of solid arrows with f above $v \circ u$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y & \xrightarrow{\lambda_{u,Y}} & u_!(Y) \\ \text{Res}_\alpha f \downarrow & \nearrow g & \text{Res}_\alpha \xrightarrow{\quad} \\ V & \xrightarrow{u} & W \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} V & \xrightarrow{v} & U \\ \text{Res}_\alpha v \downarrow & \nearrow v \circ u & \text{Res}_\alpha \xrightarrow{\quad} \\ W & \xrightarrow{u} & U \end{array}$$

We have to construct a unique morphism g that is above v such that the left triangle in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}$ commutes. To this end, apply the commutative diagram (8.1.1) of natural transformations to f , one obtains the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{ln}_\alpha V = \text{ln}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha Y & \xrightarrow{l_Y^\alpha} & Y & \xrightarrow{m_Y^\alpha} & \text{coln}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha Y = \text{coln}_\alpha V \\ \text{ln}_\alpha v \circ u = \text{ln}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha f \downarrow & & \downarrow f & & \downarrow \text{coln}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha f = \text{coln}_\alpha v \circ u \\ \text{ln}_\alpha U = \text{ln}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha Z & \xrightarrow{l_Z^\alpha} & Z & \xrightarrow{m_Z^\alpha} & \text{coln}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha Z = \text{coln}_\alpha U \end{array}$$

in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}$. Restricting further to each object x in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}$ with $d(x) = \alpha$, one obtains the following commutative diagram

$$(8.8.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} (\text{ln}_\alpha V)(x) & \xrightarrow{l_Y^\alpha(x)} & Y(x) & \xrightarrow{m_Y^\alpha(x)} & (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(x) \\ (\text{ln}_\alpha v \circ u)(x) \downarrow & & \downarrow f(x) & & \downarrow (\text{coln}_\alpha v \circ u)(x) \\ (\text{ln}_\alpha U)(x) & \xrightarrow{l_Z^\alpha(x)} & Z(x) & \xrightarrow{m_Z^\alpha(x)} & (\text{coln}_\alpha U)(x) \end{array}$$

in A_x^0 -Mod, which fits into the following diagram of solid arrows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & (\mathbf{In}_\alpha v \circ u)(x) & & \\
 & \nearrow & \downarrow & \nearrow & \\
 (\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x) & \xrightarrow{(\mathbf{In}_\alpha u)(x)} & (\mathbf{In}_\alpha W)(x) & \xrightarrow{(\mathbf{In}_\alpha v)(x)} & (\mathbf{In}_\alpha U)(x) \\
 \downarrow l_Y^\alpha(x) & & \downarrow f(x) & & \downarrow l_Z^\alpha(x) \\
 Y(x) & \xrightarrow{\theta(x)} & (\mathbf{In}_\alpha W)(x) \sqcup_{(\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x)} Y(x) & \xrightarrow{\delta(x)} & Z(x) \\
 \downarrow m_Y^\alpha(x) & & \downarrow \psi(x) & & \downarrow m_Z^\alpha(x) \\
 (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha V)(x) & \xrightarrow{(\mathbf{coln}_\alpha u)(x)} & (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha W)(x) & \xrightarrow{(\mathbf{coln}_\alpha v)(x)} & (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha U)(x)
 \end{array}$$

By the commutativity of the left square of (8.8.2) and the universal property of the pushout (8.8.1), there exists a unique morphism $\delta(x)$ such that the upper half of the above diagram commutes. It is routine to check that the equality

$$m_Z^\alpha(x) \circ \delta(x) = (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha v)(x) \circ \psi(x)$$

holds by the universal property of the pushout (8.8.1) again. Thus, one gets a family

$$\{(\mathbf{In}_\alpha W)(x) \sqcup_{(\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x)} Y(x) \xrightarrow{\delta(x)} Z(x)\}_{d(x)=\alpha}$$

of left A_x^0 -modules homomorphisms such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 (\mathbf{In}_\alpha W)(x) & \xrightarrow{\varphi(x)} & (\mathbf{In}_\alpha W)(x) \sqcup_{(\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x)} Y(x) & \xrightarrow{\psi(x)} & (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha W)(x) \\
 \downarrow (\mathbf{In}_\alpha v)(x) & & \downarrow \delta(x) & & \downarrow (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha v)(x) \\
 (\mathbf{In}_\alpha U)(x) & \xrightarrow{l_Z^\alpha(x)} & Z(x) & \xrightarrow{m_Z^\alpha(x)} & (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha U)(x)
 \end{array}$$

According to Remark 8.5, one obtains a (unique) morphism $g : u_!(Y) \rightarrow Z$ in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}$ -Mod that is above v . More explicitly, for any object x in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}$, the morphism $g(x) : u_!(Y)(x) \rightarrow Z(x)$ is as follows:

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} v(x) & \text{if } d(x) < \alpha, \text{ i.e. } x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_\alpha); \\ \delta(x) & \text{if } d(x) = \alpha. \end{cases}$$

Now it is routine to check that $g \circ \lambda_{u,Y} = f$, as desired.

Dually, one may prove (G1) in Definition 6.9. Thus, the functor Res_α is a Grothendieck bifibration. \square

8.9 Remark. Let $f : Y \rightarrow Z$ be a morphism in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}$ -Mod that is above the morphism $u : V \rightarrow W$ in \mathfrak{C}_α -Mod. Then by Lemma 6.10, f can be factored uniquely as

- the cocartesian morphism $\lambda_{u,Y} : Y \rightarrow u_!(Y)$ followed by a morphism $f_\triangleright : u_!(Y) \rightarrow Z$ in the fiber $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}$ -Mod_W, and
- a morphism $f^\triangleleft : Y \rightarrow u^*(Z)$ in the fiber $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}$ -Mod_V followed by the cartesian morphism $\rho_{u,Z} : u^*(Z) \rightarrow Z$.

Under the identification given by the isomorphism functor \mathcal{R} established in Corollary 8.7,

- the fiber morphism f_\triangleright is the family

$$\{(\mathbf{In}_\alpha W)(x) \sqcup_{(\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x)} Y(x) \xrightarrow{\sigma(x)} Z(x)\}_{d(x)=\alpha}$$

of morphisms of left A_x^0 -modules, where $\sigma(x)$ is the unique morphism, obtained by the universal property of the pushout (8.8.1), such that the following diagram in A_x^0 -Mod commutes:

$$(8.9.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & & (\text{In}_\alpha u)(x) & \longrightarrow & (\text{In}_\alpha W)(x) \\ & & \searrow & \nearrow & \downarrow l_Z^\alpha(x) \\ (\text{In}_\alpha V)(x) & \xrightarrow{(\text{In}_\alpha u)(x)} & (\text{In}_\alpha W)(x) & \xrightarrow{f(x)} & Z(x) \\ \downarrow l_Y^\alpha(x) & & \downarrow \varphi(x) & & \downarrow m_Z^\alpha(x) \\ Y(x) & \xrightarrow{\theta(x)} & (\text{In}_\alpha W)(x) \sqcup_{(\text{In}_\alpha V)(x)} Y(x) & \xrightarrow{(\text{coln}_\alpha u)(x)} & (\text{coln}_\alpha W)(x) \\ \downarrow m_Y^\alpha(x) & & \downarrow \psi(x) & & \downarrow \\ (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(x) & \xrightarrow{(\text{coln}_\alpha u)(x)} & (\text{coln}_\alpha W)(x) & \xrightarrow{\sigma(x)} & \end{array}$$

- dually, the fiber morphism f^\triangleleft is the family

$$\{Y(x) \xrightarrow{\varsigma(x)} Z(x) \times_{(\text{coln}_\alpha W)(x)} (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(x)\}_{d(x)=\alpha}$$

of morphisms of left A_x^0 -modules, where $\varsigma(x)$ is the unique morphism, obtained by the universal property of the pullback

$$(8.9.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} Z(x) \times_{(\text{coln}_\alpha W)(x)} (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(x) & \longrightarrow & Z(x) \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow m_Z^\alpha(x) \\ (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(x) & \xrightarrow{(\text{coln}_\alpha u)(x)} & (\text{coln}_\alpha W)(x) \end{array}$$

such that the following diagram in A_x^0 -Mod commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} (\text{In}_\alpha V)(x) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & (\text{In}_\alpha V)(x) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & (\text{In}_\alpha W)(x) \\ \downarrow & \searrow & \downarrow & \nearrow & \downarrow \\ Y(x) & \xrightarrow{\varsigma(x)} & Z(x) \times_{(\text{coln}_\alpha W)(x)} (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(x) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & Z(x) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(x) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & (\text{coln}_\alpha V)(x) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & (\text{coln}_\alpha W)(x) \end{array}$$

8.10 Remark. Let $u : V \rightarrow W$ be a morphism in \mathfrak{C}_α -Mod. Under the identification given by \mathcal{R} established in Corollary 8.7, we can give explicit descriptions of $u_!(l)$ for any morphism $l : Y \rightarrow Y'$ in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}$ -Mod_V as well as $u^*(k)$ for any morphism $k : Z' \rightarrow Z$ in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}$ -Mod_W.

Recall from Remark 6.11 that $u_!(l)$ is the fiber morphism $(\lambda_{u,Y'} \circ l)_\triangleright$ in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}$ -Mod_W, which modulo identification \mathcal{R} , is the family

$$\{(\text{In}_\alpha W)(x) \sqcup_{(\text{In}_\alpha V)(x)} Y(x) \xrightarrow{\varrho(x)} (\text{In}_\alpha W)(x) \sqcup_{(\text{In}_\alpha V)(x)} Y'(x)\}_{d(x)=\alpha}$$

of morphisms of left A_x^0 -modules, where $\varrho(x)$ is the unique morphism given by the universal property of the pushout (8.8.1) such that the following diagram in A_x^0 -Mod commutes (see Remark 8.9):

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & (\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x) & \longrightarrow & (\mathbf{In}_\alpha W)(x) & \\
 \swarrow \quad \searrow & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \swarrow \quad \searrow \\
 (\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x) & \longrightarrow & (\mathbf{In}_\alpha W)(x) & \longrightarrow & (\mathbf{In}_\alpha W)(x) \sqcup_{(\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x)} Y'(x) \\
 \downarrow & \downarrow l(x) & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
 Y(x) & \xrightarrow{l(x)} & Y'(x) & \longrightarrow & (\mathbf{In}_\alpha W)(x) \sqcup_{(\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x)} Y(x) \\
 \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
 & (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha V)(x) & \longrightarrow & (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha W)(x) & \\
 \swarrow \quad \searrow & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \swarrow \quad \searrow \\
 (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha V)(x) & \longrightarrow & (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha W)(x) & \longrightarrow & (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha W)(x)
 \end{array}$$

Note that both upper squares in the front and back of the above diagram are pushouts. By the pasting lemma, the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 Y(x) & \longrightarrow & (\mathbf{In}_\alpha W)(x) \sqcup_{(\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x)} Y(x) \\
 l(x) \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \varrho(x) = (u_!(l))(x) \\
 Y'(x) & \longrightarrow & (\mathbf{In}_\alpha W)(x) \sqcup_{(\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x)} Y'(x)
 \end{array}
 \tag{8.10.1}$$

is also a pushout.

Dually, by Remark 6.11, $u^*(k)$ is the fiber morphism $(k \circ \rho_{u, Z'})^\triangleleft \in \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}_V$, which modulo identification \mathcal{R} , is the family

$$\{Z'(x) \times_{(\mathbf{coln}_\alpha W)(x)} (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha V)(x) \xrightarrow{\zeta(x)} Z(x) \times_{(\mathbf{coln}_\alpha W)(x)} (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha V)(x)\}_{d(x)=\alpha}$$

of morphisms of left A_x^0 -modules, where $\zeta(x)$ is the unique morphism given by the universal property of the pullback (8.9.2), such that the following diagram in A_x^0 -Mod commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathbf{In}_\alpha V(x) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{In}_\alpha W(x) & & \\
 \downarrow & \searrow & \downarrow & \swarrow & \downarrow \\
 \mathbf{In}_\alpha V(x) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{In}_\alpha W(x) & & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 Z'(x) \times_{(\mathbf{coln}_\alpha W)(x)} (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha V)(x) & \xrightarrow{\zeta(x)} & Z'(x) & \xrightarrow{k(x)} & Z(x) \\
 \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
 Z(x) \times_{(\mathbf{coln}_\alpha W)(x)} (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha V)(x) & \longrightarrow & Z(x) & & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \mathbf{coln}_\alpha V(x) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{coln}_\alpha W(x) & & \\
 \downarrow & \searrow & \downarrow & \swarrow & \downarrow \\
 \mathbf{coln}_\alpha V(x) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{coln}_\alpha W(x) & &
 \end{array}$$

Since both lower squares in the front and back of the above diagram are pullbacks, the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 Z'(x) \times_{(\mathbf{coln}_\alpha W)(x)} (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha V)(x) & \longrightarrow & Z'(x) \\
 (u^*(k))(x) = \zeta(x) \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow k(x) \\
 Z(x) \times_{(\mathbf{coln}_\alpha W)(x)} (\mathbf{coln}_\alpha V)(x) & \longrightarrow & Z(x)
 \end{array}$$

is also a pullback.

9. LIFTING OF COMPLETE COTORSION PAIRS

In this section, our main goal is to show that under some mild assumptions, a family $\{(\mathcal{C}_x, \mathcal{D}_x)\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ of complete cotorsion pairs in those $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$'s induces a complete cotorsion pair in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$.

We begin by introducing the following classes of objects, which constitute the key components of the above mentioned induced complete cotorsion pair as well as the induced Hovey triple given in the next section. We refer the reader to 7.1 for the adjoint triple induced by the embedding $\iota_\alpha : \mathfrak{C}_\alpha \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_\beta$ with $\alpha < \beta \leq \lambda + 1$ and for some relevant facts.

9.1 Definition. Let $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathcal{S}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ be a family with each \mathcal{S}_x a class of objects in $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$. For each ordinal β with $\beta \leq \lambda + 1$, we define the following classes of objects in $\mathfrak{C}_\beta\text{-Mod}$:

$$\Phi_\beta(\mathcal{S}) = \left\{ Y \in \mathfrak{C}_\beta\text{-Mod} \mid \begin{array}{l} \text{for each } x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_\beta) \text{ with } d(x) = \alpha, \\ l_Y^\alpha(x) \text{ is monic and } \text{coker}(l_Y^\alpha(x)) \in \mathcal{S}_x \end{array} \right\}, \text{ and}$$

$$\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{S}) = \left\{ Y \in \mathfrak{C}_\beta\text{-Mod} \mid \begin{array}{l} \text{for each } x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_\beta) \text{ with } d(x) = \alpha, \\ m_Y^\alpha(x) \text{ is epic and } \text{ker}(m_Y^\alpha(x)) \in \mathcal{S}_x \end{array} \right\}.$$

Alternatively, by Corollary 7.8, $\Phi_\beta(\mathcal{S})$ and $\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{S})$ can be described as follows:

$$\Phi_\beta(\mathcal{S}) = \{Y \in \mathfrak{C}_\beta\text{-Mod} \mid \forall x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_\beta), \text{Tor}_1^{\mathfrak{C}_\beta}(\Delta^x, Y) = 0, \Delta^x \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta} Y \in \mathcal{S}_x\}, \text{ and}$$

$$\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{S}) = \{Y \in \mathfrak{C}_\beta\text{-Mod} \mid \forall x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_\beta), \text{Ext}_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta}^1(\Delta_x, Y) = 0, \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}_\beta}(\Delta_x, Y) \in \mathcal{S}_x\}.$$

If $\beta = \lambda + 1$, then $\mathfrak{C}_\beta\text{-Mod} = \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$ obviously. In this case, we use the symbols $\Phi(\mathcal{S})$ and $\Psi(\mathcal{S})$ for short instead of $\Phi_\beta(\mathcal{S})$ and $\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{S})$.

The next result will be used frequently in the rest of the paper, which can be proved easily.

9.2 Proposition. Let $\text{Res}_\alpha : \mathfrak{C}_\beta\text{-Mod} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_\alpha\text{-Mod}$ be the restriction functor with respect to the embedding $\iota_\alpha : \mathfrak{C}_\alpha \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_\beta$ with $\alpha < \beta \leq \lambda + 1$. Then for each family $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathcal{S}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ of classes of objects in those $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$'s, one has $\text{Res}_\alpha(\Phi_\beta(\mathcal{S})) \subseteq \Phi_\alpha(\mathcal{S})$ and $\text{Res}_\alpha(\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{S})) \subseteq \Psi_\alpha(\mathcal{S})$.

The main result in this section is as follows:

9.3 Theorem. Suppose that \mathfrak{C}^+ is a projective right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module and \mathfrak{C}^- is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module. If $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}) = \{(\mathcal{C}_x, \mathcal{D}_x)\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ is a family of complete cotorsion pairs in those $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$'s, then $(\Phi(\mathcal{C}), \Psi(\mathcal{D}))$ forms a complete cotorsion pair in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$.

As one may expect, the proof of Theorem 9.3 relies on a transfinite induction. To carry out the induction step, we need some preparations. The next result is essentially a dual version of Remark 3.12.

9.4 Lemma. Suppose that \mathfrak{C}^+ is a projective right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module and \mathfrak{C}^- is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module. Then for each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$ with $d(x) = \alpha$, the right \mathfrak{C}_α -module $1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta = \mathfrak{C}_\beta(\iota_\alpha(-), x)$ admits a filtration of right \mathfrak{C}_α -modules with each factor

$$\bigoplus_{d(z)=\gamma} \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} \Delta^z$$

for $0 \leq \gamma < \alpha$, where Δ^z is the standard right \mathfrak{C}_α -module.

Proof. Consider the right \mathfrak{C}_α^+ -module $1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+$. Since \mathfrak{C}^+ is a projective right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module, it follows from Lemma 2.10(a) that $\mathfrak{C}_\beta^+(z, x)$ is a projective right A_z^0 -module for each $z \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_\alpha)$. By the dual version of Lemma 3.10 (taking $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}_\alpha$), the right \mathfrak{C}_α^+ -module $1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+$ admits a filtration

$$0 = (1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+)_<0 \subseteq (1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+)_<1 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq (1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+)_<\alpha = 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+$$

such that each factor is

$$(1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+)_<\gamma+1 / (1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+)_<\gamma = \bigoplus_{d(z)=\gamma} \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+(z, x)$$

for $0 \leq \gamma < \alpha$. Since \mathfrak{C}^- is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module, so is \mathfrak{C}_α^- . Hence, by Corollary 2.11, $- \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+} \mathfrak{C}_\alpha$ is exact. Applying it to the above filtration of $1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+$ and noting that $1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta \cong 1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+ \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+} \mathfrak{C}_\alpha$ by Lemma 7.4, one

gets a filtration of the right \mathfrak{C}_α -module $1_x \mathfrak{C}_\beta$ with each factor

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\bigoplus_{d(z)=\gamma} \mathfrak{C}_\beta^+(z, x) \right) \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+} \mathfrak{C}_\alpha &\cong \bigoplus_{d(z)=\gamma} (\mathfrak{C}_\beta^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} (A_z^0 \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha^+} \mathfrak{C}_\alpha)) \\ &\cong \bigoplus_{d(z)=\gamma} (\mathfrak{C}_\beta^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} \Delta^z) \end{aligned}$$

for $0 \leq \gamma < \alpha$, where the second isomorphism holds by Theorem 3.8(a). \square

The following technical result is well known; see [11, Lemma 6.7] for a proof.

9.5 Lemma. *Let U be a left \mathfrak{C} -module and let W be a right \mathfrak{C} -module admitting a filtration*

$$0 = W_0 \xrightarrow{\iota_{0,1}} W_1 \xrightarrow{\iota_{1,2}} W_2 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow W_\mu = W$$

such that $\text{Tor}_1^{\mathfrak{C}}(\text{coker}(\iota_{\omega, \omega+1}), U) = 0$ for each $\omega < \mu$. Then one has $\text{Tor}_1^{\mathfrak{C}}(W, U) = 0$.

The next result will play a key role in the proof of Theorem 9.3.

9.6 Lemma. *Suppose that \mathfrak{C}^+ is a projective right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module and \mathfrak{C}^- is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module. Let $x \in \text{Ob } \mathfrak{C}$ with $d(x) = \alpha$, and let $0 \rightarrow V \rightarrow W \rightarrow U \rightarrow 0$ be an exact sequence in $\mathfrak{C}_\alpha\text{-Mod}$ such that $\text{Tor}_1^{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha}(\Delta^z, U) = 0$ for all $z \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_\alpha)$. Then there is a short exact sequence in $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$:*

$$0 \rightarrow (\text{In}_\alpha V)(x) \rightarrow (\text{In}_\alpha W)(x) \rightarrow (\text{In}_\alpha U)(x) \rightarrow 0$$

Proof. Applying $1_x \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} -$ to the given short exact sequence, one gets an exact sequence

$$\cdots \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha}(1_x \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}, U) \rightarrow 1_x \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} V \rightarrow 1_x \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} W \rightarrow 1_x \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} U \rightarrow 0.$$

It suffices to prove $\text{Tor}_1^{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha}(1_x \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}, U) = 0$. But the right \mathfrak{C}_α -module $1_x \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}$ has a filtration of right \mathfrak{C}_α -modules with each factor $\bigoplus_{d(z)=\gamma} (\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} \Delta^z)$ for $0 \leq \gamma < \alpha$ (see Lemma 9.4), so one only needs to show that $\text{Tor}_1^{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha}(\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} \Delta^z, U) = 0$ for each $z \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_\alpha)$ by Lemma 9.5. Since \mathfrak{C}^+ is a projective right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module, it follows from Lemma 2.10 (a) that $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}^+(z, x)$ is a projective right A_z^0 -module. Hence, one has $\text{Tor}_1^{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha}(\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} \Delta^z, U) \cong \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} \text{Tor}_1^{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha}(\Delta^z, U) = 0$ as $\text{Tor}_1^{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha}(\Delta^z, U) = 0$ by the assumption. \square

Now we are ready to give a proof of Theorem 9.3.

9.7 Proof of Theorem 9.3. We prove that for each ordinal $\beta \leq \lambda + 1$, $(\Phi_\beta(\mathfrak{C}), \Psi_\beta(\mathcal{D}))$ forms a complete cotorsion pair in $\mathfrak{C}_\beta\text{-Mod}$. The conclusion then follows.

The case that $\beta = 1$. In this case \mathfrak{C}_1 only contains objects of degree zero, so

$$\mathfrak{C}_1\text{-Mod} \cong \prod_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_1)} A_x^0\text{-Mod}.$$

Meanwhile, for each $Y \in \mathfrak{C}_1\text{-Mod}$ and each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_1)$, it is clear that

$$1_x \mathfrak{C}_1 \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_0} \text{Res}_0 Y = 0 = \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}_0}(\mathfrak{C}_1 1_x, \text{Res}_0 Y)$$

as $\mathfrak{C}_0 = \emptyset$, so both $l_Y^0(x)$ and $m_Y^0(x)$ are zero. Consequently, one has

$$\Phi_1(\mathfrak{C}) \cong \prod_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_1)} \mathfrak{C}_x \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi_1(\mathcal{D}) \cong \prod_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_1)} \mathcal{D}_x.$$

But each $(\mathfrak{C}_x, \mathcal{D}_x)$ is a complete cotorsion pair in $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$, so $(\Phi_1(\mathfrak{C}), \Psi_1(\mathcal{D}))$ is also a complete cotorsion pair in $\mathfrak{C}_1\text{-Mod}$.

The case that $\beta = \alpha+1$ is a successor ordinal. We carry out the induction procedure with the following strategy. By Lemma 6.5, it suffices to show that $(\text{Mon}(\Phi_{\alpha+1}(\mathfrak{C})), \text{Epi}(\Psi_{\alpha+1}(\mathcal{D})))$ is a weak factorization system in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}$. Since $(\Phi_\alpha(\mathfrak{C}), \Psi_\alpha(\mathcal{D}))$ is a complete cotorsion pair in $\mathfrak{C}_\alpha\text{-Mod}$ by the induction hypothesis, it follows from Lemma 6.5 that $(\text{Mon}(\Phi_\alpha(\mathfrak{C})), \text{Epi}(\Psi_\alpha(\mathcal{D})))$ is a weak factorization system in $\mathfrak{C}_\alpha\text{-Mod}$. But the restriction $\text{Res}_\alpha : \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_\alpha\text{-Mod}$ is a Grothendieck bifibration by Theorem 8.8. Thus, one may use Lemma 6.12 to construct an induced weak factorization system $(\mathfrak{C}_{\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}})$ in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}$, and show further that $\text{Mon}(\Phi_{\alpha+1}(\mathfrak{C})) = \mathfrak{C}_{\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}}$ and $\text{Epi}(\Psi_{\alpha+1}(\mathcal{D})) = \mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}}$.

Step 1: Construct the weak factorization system $(\mathbf{C}_{\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}}, \mathbf{D}_{\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}})$. Firstly, we show that the fiber $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}_V$ admits a weak factorization system for each $V \in \mathfrak{C}_\alpha\text{-Mod}$. It follows from Corollary 8.7 that the functor \mathcal{R} gives an isomorphism

$$\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}_V \cong \prod_{d(x)=\alpha} (\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x) \setminus \begin{smallmatrix} A_x^0\text{-Mod} \\ \tau_V^\alpha(x) \end{smallmatrix} /_{(\mathbf{coln}_\alpha V)(x)}.$$

For each $x \in \mathbf{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1})$ with $d(x) = \alpha$, since $(\mathbf{C}_x, \mathbf{D}_x)$ is a complete cotorsion pair in $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$, it follows from Lemma 6.5 that $(\mathbf{Mon}(\mathbf{C}_x), \mathbf{Epi}(\mathbf{D}_x))$ is a weak factorization system in $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$. This induces a weak factorization system

$$(\text{wfs 1}) \quad ((\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x) \setminus \begin{smallmatrix} \mathbf{Mon}(\mathbf{C}_x) \\ \tau_V^\alpha(x) \end{smallmatrix} /_{(\mathbf{coln}_\alpha V)(x)}, (\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x) \setminus \begin{smallmatrix} \mathbf{Epi}(\mathbf{D}_x) \\ \tau_V^\alpha(x) \end{smallmatrix} /_{(\mathbf{coln}_\alpha V)(x)})$$

in the category $(\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x) \setminus \begin{smallmatrix} A_x^0\text{-Mod} \\ \tau_V^\alpha(x) \end{smallmatrix} /_{(\mathbf{coln}_\alpha V)(x)}$; see Example 6.1. Thus, under the identification via \mathcal{R} , one gets the following weak factorization system in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}_V$:

$$(\text{wfs 2}) \quad \left(\prod_{d(x)=\alpha} (\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x) \setminus \begin{smallmatrix} \mathbf{Mon}(\mathbf{C}_x) \\ \tau_V^\alpha(x) \end{smallmatrix} /_{(\mathbf{coln}_\alpha V)(x)}, \prod_{d(x)=\alpha} (\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x) \setminus \begin{smallmatrix} \mathbf{Epi}(\mathbf{D}_x) \\ \tau_V^\alpha(x) \end{smallmatrix} /_{(\mathbf{coln}_\alpha V)(x)} \right).$$

In what follows, in order to simplify the symbols, denote the weak factorization system (wfs 1) by $(\mathbf{C}_V(x), \mathbf{D}_V(x))$ and in turn, (wfs 2) by $(\mathbf{C}_V, \mathbf{D}_V)$.

Next, for any morphism $u : V \rightarrow W \in \mathfrak{C}_\alpha\text{-Mod}$, consider the adjunction

$$u_! : \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}_V \rightleftarrows \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}_W : u^*.$$

We prove that $u_!$ preserves the left maps in (wfs 2). By the explicit description of the action of $u_!$ on morphisms (see Remark 8.10), it suffices to prove that for any morphism $l \in \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}_V$ and each $x \in \mathbf{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1})$ with $d(x) = \alpha$, if $l(x)$ is contained in $\mathbf{Mon}(\mathbf{C}_x)$, then so is $(u_!(l))(x)$. But this is clear since (8.10.1) is a pushout and $(\mathbf{Mon}(\mathbf{C}_x), \mathbf{Epi}(\mathbf{D}_x))$ is a weak factorization system.

Finally, applying Lemma 6.12, one gets a weak factorization system $(\mathbf{C}_{\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}}, \mathbf{D}_{\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}})$ in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}_{\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}} &= \{ f : Y \rightarrow Z \in \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod} \mid \mathbf{Res}_\alpha f \in \mathbf{Mon}(\Phi_\alpha(\mathcal{C})) \text{ and } f_\triangleright \in \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{Res}_\alpha Z} \}, \text{ and} \\ \mathbf{D}_{\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}} &= \{ f : Y \rightarrow Z \in \mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod} \mid \mathbf{Res}_\alpha f \in \mathbf{Epi}(\Psi_\alpha(\mathcal{D})) \text{ and } f^\lhd \in \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{Res}_\alpha Y} \}. \end{aligned}$$

Step 2: Prove $\mathbf{C}_{\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}} = \mathbf{Mon}(\Phi_{\alpha+1}(\mathcal{C}))$ and $\mathbf{D}_{\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}} = \mathbf{Epi}(\Psi_{\alpha+1}(\mathcal{D}))$. We only prove the first equality; the second one may be proved dually.

Let $f : Y \rightarrow Z$ be a morphism in $\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}$ and let $u = \mathbf{Res}_\alpha f : V \rightarrow W$. Then one has

(1) f is contained in $\mathbf{Mon}(\Phi_{\alpha+1}(\mathcal{C}))$ if and only if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (i) f is monic, that is, $f(x)$ is monic for each $x \in \mathbf{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1})$;
- (ii) $\mathbf{coker}(f) \in \Phi_{\alpha+1}(\mathcal{C})$, that is, $l_{\mathbf{coker}(f)}^{d(x)}(x)$ is monic with its cokernel contained in \mathcal{C}_x for each $x \in \mathbf{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1})$.

(2) f is contained in $\mathbf{C}_{\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}}$ if and only if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (a) u is monic, that is, $u(x)$ is monic for each $x \in \mathbf{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_\alpha)$.
- (b) $\mathbf{coker}(u) \in \Phi_\alpha(\mathcal{C})$, that is, $l_{\mathbf{coker}(u)}^{d(x)}(x)$ is monic with its cokernel contained in \mathcal{C}_x for each $x \in \mathbf{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_\alpha)$.
- (c) The fiber morphism f_\triangleright is in \mathbf{C}_W , that is, up to the identification given by \mathcal{R} , the family

$$\{(\mathbf{In}_\alpha W)(x) \sqcup_{(\mathbf{In}_\alpha V)(x)} Y(x) \xrightarrow{\sigma(x)} Z(x)\}_{d(x)=\alpha}$$

belongs to C_W (see Remark 8.9), where $\sigma(x)$ appears in the following commutative diagram with the inner square a pushout:

$$(9.7.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} (\mathsf{In}_\alpha V)(x) & \xrightarrow{(\mathsf{In}_\alpha u)(x)} & (\mathsf{In}_\alpha W)(x) \\ l_Y^\alpha(x) \downarrow & & \downarrow \varphi(x) \\ Y(x) & \xrightarrow{\theta(x)} & (\mathsf{In}_\alpha W)(x) \sqcup_{(\mathsf{In}_\alpha V)(x)} Y(x) \\ & \searrow & \downarrow \sigma(x) \\ & & f(x) \curvearrowright Z(x). \end{array}$$

Thus, the condition (c) is equivalent to

(c') $\sigma(x)$ is monic with its cokernel contained in C_x for each $x \in \mathsf{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1})$ with $d(x) = \alpha$.

We mention that no matter which class f belongs to, one has $\mathsf{Res}_\alpha f = u \in \mathsf{Mon}(\Phi_\alpha(\mathfrak{C}))$ by Proposition 9.2, so one gets that

$$0 \rightarrow V \xrightarrow{u} W \rightarrow \mathsf{coker}(u) \rightarrow 0$$

is an exact sequence in $\mathfrak{C}_\alpha\text{-Mod}$ with $\mathsf{coker}(u) \in \Phi_\alpha(\mathfrak{C})$. By Lemma 9.6, for each $x \in \mathsf{Ob}(\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1})$ with $d(x) = \alpha$, the sequence

$$0 \rightarrow (\mathsf{In}_\alpha V)(x) \xrightarrow{(\mathsf{In}_\alpha u)(x)} (\mathsf{In}_\alpha W)(x) \rightarrow (\mathsf{In}_\alpha \mathsf{coker}(u))(x) \rightarrow 0$$

is exact. Since the inner square in (9.7.1) is a pushout, one gets the next commutative diagram with exact rows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 \rightarrow (\mathsf{In}_\alpha V)(x) & \xrightarrow{(\mathsf{In}_\alpha u)(x)} & (\mathsf{In}_\alpha W)(x) & \longrightarrow & (\mathsf{In}_\alpha \mathsf{coker}(u))(x) & \longrightarrow 0 \\ l_Y^\alpha(x) \downarrow & & \downarrow \varphi(x) & & \parallel & & \\ 0 \rightarrow Y(x) & \xrightarrow{\theta(x)} & (\mathsf{In}_\alpha W)(x) \sqcup_{(\mathsf{In}_\alpha V)(x)} Y(x) & \longrightarrow & (\mathsf{In}_\alpha \mathsf{coker}(u))(x) & \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Then one has the following commutative diagram:

$$(9.7.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 \rightarrow (\mathsf{In}_\alpha V)(x) & \xrightarrow{(\mathsf{In}_\alpha u)(x)} & (\mathsf{In}_\alpha W)(x) & \longrightarrow & (\mathsf{In}_\alpha \mathsf{coker}(u))(x) & \longrightarrow 0 \\ l_Y^\alpha(x) \downarrow & & \downarrow \varphi(x) & & \parallel & & \\ 0 \rightarrow Y(x) & \xrightarrow{\theta(x)} & (\mathsf{In}_\alpha W)(x) \sqcup_{(\mathsf{In}_\alpha V)(x)} Y(x) & \longrightarrow & (\mathsf{In}_\alpha \mathsf{coker}(u))(x) & \longrightarrow 0 \\ \parallel & & \downarrow \sigma(x) & & \downarrow \kappa & & \\ Y(x) & \xrightarrow{f(x)} & Z(x) & \longrightarrow & \mathsf{coker}(f(x)) & \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Since $\mathsf{Res}_\alpha f = u$, it is easy to see that $(\mathsf{In}_\alpha \mathsf{coker}(u))(x) = (\mathsf{In}_\alpha \mathsf{Res}_\alpha \mathsf{coker}(f))(x)$. But $\sigma(x) \circ \varphi(x) = l_Z^\alpha(x)$ by the commutative diagram (9.7.1). By the universal property of cokernels, one can check that $\kappa = l_{\mathsf{coker}(f)}^\alpha(x)$.

Applying the Five Lemma to the lower part of (9.7.2), one gets that

$$(9.7.3) \quad \mathsf{coker}(\sigma(x)) \cong \mathsf{coker}(\kappa) = \mathsf{coker}(l_{\mathsf{coker}(f)}^\alpha(x)), \text{ and}$$

$$(9.7.4) \quad \sigma(x) \text{ is monic if and only if } \kappa \text{ is monic if and only if } l_{\mathsf{coker}(f)}^\alpha(x) \text{ is monic.}$$

Now we prove that $\mathsf{Mon}(\Phi_{\alpha+1}(\mathfrak{C})) = \mathsf{C}_{\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}}$. Let f be in $\mathsf{Mon}(\Phi_{\alpha+1}(\mathfrak{C}))$. Then by (9.7.3) and (9.7.4) one gets that the condition (c') holds. It is easy to see that the conditions (a) and (b) hold, so one gets that $f \in \mathsf{C}_{\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}}$. Conversely, let f be in $\mathsf{C}_{\mathfrak{C}_{\alpha+1}\text{-Mod}}$, that is, the conditions (a), (b) and (c') hold. Then by (9.7.3) and (9.7.4) one gets that the condition (ii) holds. On the other hand, since $f(x) = \sigma(x) \circ \theta(x)$ and $\theta(x)$ is monic by the diagram (9.7.2), one gets that the condition (i) holds as $\sigma(x)$ is monic by (c').

The case that β is a limit ordinal. We mention that the weak factorization systems

$$(\mathbf{Mon}(\Phi_\alpha(\mathcal{C})), \mathbf{Epi}(\Psi_\alpha(\mathcal{D})))$$

constructed for all $\alpha < \beta$ are compatible; see Remark 6.13. Then they fit together to a weak factorization system $(\mathbf{Mon}(\Phi_\beta(\mathcal{C})), \mathbf{Epi}(\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{D})))$ in $\mathcal{C}_\beta\text{-Mod}$. \square

The next result shows that the induced complete cotorsion pair in $\mathcal{C}\text{-Mod}$ inherits the hereditary property.

9.8 Proposition. *Suppose that \mathcal{C}^+ is a projective right \mathcal{C}^0 -module and \mathcal{C}^- is a projective left \mathcal{C}^0 -module. If $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}) = \{(\mathcal{C}_x, \mathcal{D}_x)\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})}$ is a family of hereditary complete cotorsion pairs in those $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$'s, then $(\Phi(\mathcal{C}), \Psi(\mathcal{D}))$ forms a hereditary complete cotorsion pair in $\mathcal{C}\text{-Mod}$.*

Proof. Theorem 9.3 asserts that $(\Phi(\mathcal{C}), \Psi(\mathcal{D}))$ is a complete cotorsion pair in $\mathcal{C}\text{-Mod}$, so we only need to deal with the hereditary property. By Lemma 6.7, it suffices to show that it is resolving; that is, $\Phi(\mathcal{C})$ is closed under kernels of epimorphisms in $\mathcal{C}\text{-Mod}$. Explicitly, given a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow T \rightarrow 0$$

in $\mathcal{C}\text{-Mod}$ with both Z and T in $\Phi(\mathcal{C})$, we need to show that $Y \in \Phi(\mathcal{C})$ as well.

For each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$ with $d(x) = \alpha$, one gets a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Res}_\alpha Y \rightarrow \text{Res}_\alpha Z \rightarrow \text{Res}_\alpha T \rightarrow 0$$

in $\mathcal{C}_\alpha\text{-Mod}$. But $\text{Res}_\alpha T \in \Phi_\alpha(\mathcal{C})$ by Proposition 9.2 as $T \in \Phi(\mathcal{C})$, and so by Lemma 9.6, it induces an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow (\text{In}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha Y)(x) \rightarrow (\text{In}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha Z)(x) \rightarrow (\text{In}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha T)(x) \rightarrow 0$$

in $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$, which fits into the following commutative diagram with exact rows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & (\text{In}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha Y)(x) & \longrightarrow & (\text{In}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha Z)(x) & \longrightarrow & (\text{In}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha T)(x) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow l_Y^\alpha(x) & & \downarrow l_Z^\alpha(x) & & \downarrow l_T^\alpha(x) \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & Y(x) & \longrightarrow & Z(x) & \longrightarrow & T(x) \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Since Z and T belong to $\Phi(\mathcal{C})$, it follows that $l_Z^\alpha(x)$ and $l_T^\alpha(x)$ are monic, and both $\text{coker}(l_Z^\alpha(x))$ and $\text{coker}(l_T^\alpha(x))$ are in \mathcal{C}_x . By the Snake Lemma one gets that $l_Y^\alpha(x)$ is monic, and obtain an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{coker}(l_Y^\alpha(x)) \rightarrow \text{coker}(l_Z^\alpha(x)) \rightarrow \text{coker}(l_T^\alpha(x)) \rightarrow 0.$$

of left A_x^0 -modules. But \mathcal{C}_x is resolving as the cotorsion pair $(\mathcal{C}_x, \mathcal{D}_x)$ is hereditary by assumption, so one has $\text{coker}(l_Y^\alpha(x)) \in \mathcal{C}_x$, and hence $Y \in \Phi(\mathcal{C})$ as desired. \square

In the rest of the section, we consider two special types of generalized k -linear Reedy categories.

9.9 Definition. Let \mathcal{C} be a generalized k -linear Reedy category.

- (1) If $\mathcal{C}^+ = \mathcal{C}$, then \mathcal{C} is called a *generalized k -linear direct category*; in this case one has $\mathcal{C}^- = \mathcal{C}^0$.
- (2) If $\mathcal{C}^- = \mathcal{C}$, then \mathcal{C} is called a *generalized k -linear inverse category*; in this case one has $\mathcal{C}^+ = \mathcal{C}^0$.

Given a family $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathcal{S}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})}$ of classes of objects in those $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$'s, denote by $\mathcal{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{S}}$ the subcategory of $\mathcal{C}\text{-Mod}$ consisting of \mathcal{C} -modules Y such that $Y(x)$ belongs to \mathcal{S}_x for each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$.

9.10 Lemma. *If \mathcal{C} is a generalized k -linear direct category, then for any family $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathcal{S}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})}$ of classes of objects in those $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$'s, there is an equality $\Psi(\mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{S}}$.*

Proof. For each \mathcal{C} -module Y and any $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$ with $d(x) = \alpha$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{coln}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha Y)(x) &= \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}_\alpha}(\mathcal{C}1_x, \text{Res}_\alpha Y) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}_\alpha^-}(\mathcal{C}^-1_x, \text{Res}_\alpha Y) \\ &= \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}_\alpha^0}(\mathcal{C}^01_x, \text{Res}_\alpha Y) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the first isomorphism holds by Theorem 7.2(b), the second equality holds as $\mathcal{C}^- = \mathcal{C}^0$, and the last equality follows from Lemma 2.6(a). Consequently, one has $\Psi(\mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{S}}$. \square

Dually, we have the next result.

9.11 Lemma. *If \mathfrak{C} is a generalized k -linear inverse category, then for any family $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathcal{S}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ of classes of objects in those A_x^0 -Mod's, there is an eaulity $\Phi(\mathcal{S}) = \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{S}}$.*

In what follows, for any category \mathcal{E} , denote by $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ (resp., $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{E})$) the class of all projective (resp., injective) objects in \mathcal{E} . The following result gives a characterization of projective objects in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$ when \mathfrak{C} is a generalized k -linear direct category.

9.12 Corollary. *Let \mathfrak{C} be a generalized k -linear direct category such that it is a projective right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module. Then $\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}) = \Phi(\{\mathcal{P}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})})$, where \mathcal{P}_x is the class of all projective left A_x^0 -modules.*

Proof. It is known that $(\mathcal{P}_x, A_x^0\text{-Mod})$ is a complete cotorsion pair for each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$, and so it follows from Theorem 9.3 and Lemma 9.10 that $(\Phi(\{\mathcal{P}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}), \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod})$ is a complete cotorsion pair in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$. Thus one has $\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}) = \Phi(\{\mathcal{P}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})})$. \square

A dual version of the above result gives a characterization of injective objects in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$ when \mathfrak{C} is a generalized k -linear inverse category.

9.13 Corollary. *Let \mathfrak{C} be a generalized k -linear inverse category such that it is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module. Then $\mathcal{I}(\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}) = \Psi(\{\mathcal{I}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})})$, where \mathcal{I}_x is the class of all injective left A_x^0 -modules.*

10. LIFTING OF ABELIAN MODEL STRUCTURES

In this section, as an application of Theorem 9.3, we show that under the extra (co)compatible condition, a family $\{(\mathcal{Q}_x, \mathcal{W}_x, \mathcal{R}_x)\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ of (hereditary) Hovey triples in those A_x^0 -Mod's induces a (hereditary) Hovey triple in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$. We then give some examples in Gorenstein homological algebra.

10.1 Definition. Let $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathcal{S}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ be a family with each \mathcal{S}_x a class of objects in $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$. Then \mathcal{S} is called

- (1) *cocompatible* if $S \in \mathcal{S}_y$ implies that $\mathfrak{C}^+(y, x) \otimes_{A_y^0} S \in \mathcal{S}_x$ for all $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$;
- (2) *compatible* if $S \in \mathcal{S}_y$ implies that $\text{Hom}_{A_y^0}(\mathfrak{C}^-(x, y), S) \in \mathcal{S}_x$ for all $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$.

10.2 Remark. If \mathfrak{C} is a k -linear Reedy category in the sense of [11], then $A_x^0 \cong k$ is a field for each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$. In this case, $\mathfrak{C}^+(y, x)$ and $\mathfrak{C}^-(x, y)$ are free k -modules for all $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$. Thus, if \mathcal{S} is closed under coproducts then it is cocompatible, and if \mathcal{S} is closed under products then it is compatible.

10.3 Example. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathcal{P}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ be a family with each \mathcal{P}_x the class of all projective objects in $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$, and let $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ be a family with each \mathcal{F}_x the class of all flat objects in $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$. If \mathfrak{C}^+ is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module, then both \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{F} are cocompatible. Dually, let $\mathcal{I} = \{\mathcal{I}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ be a family with each \mathcal{I}_x the class of all injective objects in $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$. If \mathfrak{C}^- is a projective right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module, then \mathcal{I} is compatible.

10.4 Example. If \mathfrak{C} is a generalized k -linear direct category, then any family $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathcal{S}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ of classes of objects in those A_x^0 -Mod's is compatible. Indeed, for all $x, y \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$ and $S \in \mathcal{S}_y$,

- if $x \neq y$, then $\text{Hom}_{A_y^0}(\mathfrak{C}^-(x, y), S) = \text{Hom}_{A_y^0}(\mathfrak{C}^0(x, y), S) = 0 \in \mathcal{S}_x$;
- if $x = y$, then $\text{Hom}_{A_y^0}(\mathfrak{C}^-(x, x), S) = \text{Hom}_{A_x^0}(\mathfrak{C}^0(x, x), S) \cong S \in \mathcal{S}_x$.

Dually, If \mathfrak{C} is a generalized k -linear inverse category, then any family $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathcal{S}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ of classes of objects in those A_x^0 -Mod's is cocompatible.

Now we state the main result in this section.

10.5 Theorem. *Suppose that \mathfrak{C}^+ is a projective right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module and \mathfrak{C}^- is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module. Let $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{R}) = \{(\mathcal{Q}_x, \mathcal{W}_x, \mathcal{R}_x)\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ be a family with each $(\mathcal{Q}_x, \mathcal{W}_x, \mathcal{R}_x)$ a Hovey triple in $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$. If $\mathcal{Q} \cap \mathcal{W} = \{\mathcal{Q}_x \cap \mathcal{W}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ is cocompatible and $\mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{R} = \{\mathcal{W}_x \cap \mathcal{R}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ is compatible, then*

$$(\Phi(\mathcal{Q}), \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{W}}, \Psi(\mathcal{R}))$$

forms a Hovey triple in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$.

Before giving a proof, we need some auxiliary facts and results. The next result can be proved similarly as in Lemma 9.4.

10.6 Lemma. *Suppose that \mathfrak{C}^+ is a projective right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module and \mathfrak{C}^- is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module. For each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$, the right \mathfrak{C} -module $1_x \mathfrak{C}$ admits a filtration of right \mathfrak{C} -modules with factors*

$$\bigoplus_{d(z)=\gamma} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} \Delta^z$$

for $0 \leq \gamma \leq \lambda$, where Δ^z is the standard right \mathfrak{C} -module.

10.7 Lemma. *Suppose that \mathfrak{C}^+ is a projective right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module and \mathfrak{C}^- is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module. Let $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathcal{S}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ be a cocompatible family of classes of objects in those A_x^0 -Mod's such that \mathcal{S}_x is closed under filtrations and coproducts for each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$. Then one has $\Phi(\mathcal{S}) \subseteq \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{S}}$.*

Proof. Let Y be in $\Phi(\mathcal{S})$ and $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$. Since $Y(x) \cong 1_x \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} Y$ and \mathcal{S}_x is closed under filtrations in A_x^0 -Mod, it suffices to show that $1_x \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} Y$ admits a filtration whose factors are in \mathcal{S}_x . By Lemma 10.6, the right \mathfrak{C} -module $1_x \mathfrak{C}$ has a filtration of right \mathfrak{C} -modules with factors $\bigoplus_{d(z)=\gamma} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} \Delta^z$ for $0 \leq \gamma \leq \lambda$. Since Y is contained in $\Phi(\mathcal{S})$, one has $\text{Tor}_1^{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta^z, Y) = 0$. Hence, $\text{Tor}_1^{\mathfrak{C}}(\mathfrak{C}^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} \Delta^z, Y) = 0$ as $\mathfrak{C}^+(z, x)$ is a projective right A_z^0 -module by Lemma 2.10(a). It follows that

$$\text{Tor}_1^{\mathfrak{C}}\left(\bigoplus_{d(z)=\gamma} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} \Delta^z, Y\right) = 0.$$

Consequently, $1_x \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} Y$ admits a filtration with factors $(\bigoplus_{d(z)=\gamma} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} \Delta^z) \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} Y$ for $0 \leq \gamma \leq \lambda$.

It remains to show that $(\mathfrak{C}^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} \Delta^z) \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} Y \in \mathcal{S}_x$ as \mathcal{S}_x is closed under coproducts in A_x^0 -Mod. This is clear. Indeed, by the definition of $\Phi(\mathcal{S})$, we know that $\Delta^z \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} Y \in \mathcal{S}_z$. Therefore, by the cocompatible assumption, $(\mathfrak{C}^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} \Delta^z) \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} Y \cong \mathfrak{C}^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} (\Delta^z \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} Y)$ is in \mathcal{S}_x , as desired. \square

The following result plays a key role in the proof of Theorem 10.5.

10.8 Lemma. *Suppose that \mathfrak{C}^+ is a projective right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module and \mathfrak{C}^- is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module. Let $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathcal{S}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ and $\mathcal{W} = \{\mathcal{W}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ be families with both \mathcal{S}_x and \mathcal{W}_x classes of objects in A_x^0 -Mod. If the family $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{W} = \{\mathcal{S}_x \cap \mathcal{W}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ is cocompatible, and for each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$ the following conditions hold:*

- (a) $\mathcal{S}_x \cap \mathcal{W}_x$ is closed under filtrations and coproducts in A_x^0 -Mod, and
- (b) \mathcal{W}_x is closed under cokernels of monomorphisms in A_x^0 -Mod,

then one has $\Phi(\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{W}) = \Phi(\mathcal{S}) \cap \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{W}}$.

Proof. It is clear that $\Phi(\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{W}) \subseteq \Phi(\mathcal{S})$. On the other hand, by Lemma 10.7, we have $\Phi(\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{W}) \subseteq \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{W}} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{W}}$. Thus, $\Phi(\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{W}) \subseteq \Phi(\mathcal{S}) \cap \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{W}}$.

For the other inclusion, take a left \mathfrak{C} -module $Y \in \Phi(\mathcal{S}) \cap \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{W}}$. For each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$ with $d(x) = \alpha$, one gets that $l_Y^\alpha(x)$ is a monomorphism with $\Delta^x \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} Y \in \mathcal{S}_x$. Hence, to show $Y \in \Phi(\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{W})$, it suffices to prove $\Delta^x \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} Y \in \mathcal{W}_x$. We check this fact by transfinite induction on $d(x) = \alpha$.

If $\alpha = 0$, then $\Delta^x \cong 1_x \mathfrak{C}$, and so $\Delta^x \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} Y \cong Y(x) \in \mathcal{W}_x$ as $Y \in \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{W}}$.

Suppose that $\alpha > 0$ and $\Delta^z \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} Y \in \mathcal{W}_z$ for all $z \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$ with $d(z) < \alpha$. Since $Y \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$, one has $\text{Tor}_1^{\mathfrak{C}}(\Delta^x, Y) = 0$. So we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow 1_x \mathfrak{J}_\alpha \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} Y \rightarrow 1_x \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} Y \rightarrow \Delta^x \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} Y \rightarrow 0$$

in A_x^0 -Mod. Note that $1_x \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} Y \cong Y(x) \in \mathcal{W}_x$ as $Y \in \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{W}}$ and \mathcal{W}_x is closed under cokernels of monomorphisms in A_x^0 -Mod by assumption. To check $\Delta^x \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} Y \in \mathcal{W}_x$, one has to prove $1_x \mathfrak{J}_\alpha \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} Y \in \mathcal{W}_x$.

By Lemma 7.6, one has

$$1_x \mathfrak{J}_\alpha \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} Y \cong (\text{In}_\alpha \text{Res}_\alpha Y)(x) = 1_x \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} \text{Res}_\alpha Y.$$

Note that $\text{Res}_\alpha Y \in \Phi_\alpha(\mathcal{S})$ by Proposition 9.2 as $Y \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$. Using the filtration of right \mathfrak{C}_α -modules given in Remark 9.4 as well as the argument in the proof of the previous lemma, we deduce that $1_x \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} \text{Res}_\alpha Y$ admits a filtration with factors

$$\left(\bigoplus_{d(z)=\gamma} \mathfrak{C}^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} \Delta^z \right) \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} \text{Res}_\alpha Y$$

for $0 \leq \gamma < \alpha$. But $\mathcal{S}_x \cap \mathcal{W}_x$ is closed under filtrations and coproducts in $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$, it suffices to show that

$$(\mathfrak{C}^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} \Delta^z) \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} \text{Res}_\alpha Y \in \mathcal{S}_x \cap \mathcal{W}_x$$

for each z with $d(z) < \alpha$.

By the induction hypothesis, $\Delta^z \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} \text{Res}_\alpha Y \cong \Delta^z \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} Y$ is contained in \mathcal{W}_z , and it is also contained in \mathcal{S}_z as $Y \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$. Thus, $\Delta^z \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} \text{Res}_\alpha Y \in \mathcal{S}_z \cap \mathcal{W}_z$. By the cocompatible assumption on $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{W}$, one gets that

$$(\mathfrak{C}^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} \Delta^z) \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} \text{Res}_\alpha Y \cong \mathfrak{C}^+(z, x) \otimes_{A_z^0} (\Delta^z \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}_\alpha} \text{Res}_\alpha Y)$$

is contained in $\mathcal{S}_x \cap \mathcal{W}_x$, as desired. \square

Now we give a proof of Theorem 10.5.

10.9 Proof of Theorem 10.5. The given family $\{(\mathcal{Q}_x, \mathcal{W}_x, \mathcal{R}_x)\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ of Hovey triples in those $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$'s gives rise to two families

$$\{(\mathcal{Q}_x \cap \mathcal{W}_x, \mathcal{R}_x)\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})} \quad \text{and} \quad \{(\mathcal{Q}_x, \mathcal{W}_x \cap \mathcal{R}_x)\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$$

of complete cotorsion pairs in them. By Theorem 9.3, one obtains two complete cotorsion pairs

$$(\Phi(\mathcal{Q} \cap \mathcal{W}), \Psi(\mathcal{R})) \quad \text{and} \quad (\Phi(\mathcal{Q}), \Psi(\mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{R}))$$

in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$. Note that $\mathcal{Q} \cap \mathcal{W}$ is cocompatible by assumption, $\mathcal{Q}_x \cap \mathcal{W}_x$ as the left part of a complete cotorsion pair is closed under filtrations and coproducts in $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$ for each $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$, and \mathcal{W}_x is closed under cokernels of monomorphisms in $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$. It follows that $\Phi(\mathcal{Q} \cap \mathcal{W}) = \Phi(\mathcal{Q}) \cap \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{W}}$ by Lemma 10.8 and $\Psi(\mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{R}) = \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{W}} \cap \Psi(\mathcal{R})$ dually. Consequently, one gets two complete cotorsion pairs

$$(\Phi(\mathcal{Q}) \cap \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{W}}, \Psi(\mathcal{R})) \quad \text{and} \quad (\Phi(\mathcal{Q}), \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{W}} \cap \Psi(\mathcal{R}))$$

in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$. Since $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{W}}$ is clearly a thick subcategory of $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$, the conclusion follows from Hovey's correspondence; see Theorem 6.6. \square

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 10.5 and Lemma 9.8, we obtain the following result.

10.10 Proposition. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 10.5, if each Hovey triple $(\mathcal{Q}_x, \mathcal{W}_x, \mathcal{R}_x)$ in $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$ is hereditary, then so is the Hovey triple $(\Phi(\mathcal{Q}), \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{W}}, \Psi(\mathcal{R}))$.*

10.11 Corollary. *Let \mathfrak{C} be a generalized k -linear direct category such that it is a projective right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module, and let $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{R}) = \{(\mathcal{Q}_x, \mathcal{W}_x, \mathcal{R}_x)\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ be a family with each $(\mathcal{Q}_x, \mathcal{W}_x, \mathcal{R}_x)$ a (hereditary) Hovey triple in $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$. If $\{\mathcal{Q}_x \cap \mathcal{W}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ is cocompatible, then $(\Phi(\mathcal{Q}), \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{W}}, \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{R}})$ forms a (hereditary) Hovey triple in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$.*

Proof. It follows from Lemma 9.10 that $\Psi(\mathcal{R}) = \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{R}}$. Combining Theorem 10.5, Proposition 10.10 and Example 10.4, one gets that $(\Phi(\mathcal{Q}), \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{W}}, \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{R}})$ forms a (hereditary) Hovey triple in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$. \square

A dual result is:

10.12 Corollary. *Let \mathfrak{C} be a generalized k -linear inverse category such that it is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module, and let $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{R}) = \{(\mathcal{Q}_x, \mathcal{W}_x, \mathcal{R}_x)\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ be a family with each $(\mathcal{Q}_x, \mathcal{W}_x, \mathcal{R}_x)$ a (hereditary) Hovey triple in $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$. If $\{\mathcal{W}_x \cap \mathcal{R}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ is compatible, then $(\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathcal{W}}, \Psi(\mathcal{R}))$ forms a (hereditary) Hovey triple in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$.*

We end this section with some examples of Theorem 10.5; we obtain several abelian model structures in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$ related to Gorenstein homological modules.

10.13 Gorenstein homological modules. Recall from Enochs and Jenda [14] that a left \mathfrak{C} -module M is called *Gorenstein injective* if there is an exact sequence

$$\cdots \rightarrow E_1 \rightarrow E_0 \rightarrow E_{-1} \rightarrow \cdots$$

of injective left \mathfrak{C} -modules such that it remains exact after applying the functor $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(-, I)$ for every injective left \mathfrak{C} -module I , and $M \cong \text{coker}(E_1 \rightarrow E_0)$. A left \mathfrak{C} -module M is called *Gorenstein flat* if there is an exact sequence

$$\cdots \rightarrow F_1 \rightarrow F_0 \rightarrow F_{-1} \rightarrow \cdots$$

of flat left \mathfrak{C} -modules such that it remains exact after applying the functor $I \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}}$ – for every injective right \mathfrak{C} -module I , and $M \cong \text{coker}(F_1 \rightarrow F_0)$. Recently, Šaroch and Št'oviček introduced *projectively coresolved Gorenstein flat* left \mathfrak{C} -modules in [36] via replacing flat modules in the above exact sequence by projective modules.

Let $\mathfrak{GJ} = \{\mathfrak{GJ}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ (resp., $\mathfrak{GF} = \{\mathfrak{GF}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$, $\mathfrak{PGF} = \{\mathfrak{PGF}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$) be families with \mathfrak{GJ}_x (resp., \mathfrak{GF}_x , \mathfrak{PGF}_x) the class of all Gorenstein injective (resp., Gorenstein flat, projectively coresolved Gorenstein flat) modules in $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$.

Recall that a left A_x^0 -module N is called *cotorsion* if $\text{Ext}_{A_x^0}^1(F, N) = 0$ for each flat left A_x^0 -module F . We let $\mathfrak{CT} = \{\mathfrak{CT}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ be the family with \mathfrak{CT}_x the class of all cotorsion modules in $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$. The next result can be found in [36].

10.14 Proposition. *For all $x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})$, the triples*

$$(\mathfrak{PGF}_x, \mathfrak{PGF}_x^\perp, A_x^0\text{-Mod}), \quad (\mathfrak{GF}_x, \mathfrak{GF}_x^\perp, \mathfrak{CT}_x), \quad (A_x^0\text{-Mod}, {}^\perp\mathfrak{GJ}_x, \mathfrak{GJ}_x)$$

are hereditary Hovey triples in $A_x^0\text{-Mod}$ with

$$\mathfrak{PGF}_x \cap \mathfrak{PGF}_x^\perp = \mathfrak{P}_x, \quad \mathfrak{GF}_x \cap \mathfrak{GF}_x^\perp = \mathfrak{F}_x, \quad {}^\perp\mathfrak{GJ}_x \cap \mathfrak{GJ}_x = \mathfrak{J}_x.$$

Now we are ready to obtain several abelian model structures on $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$.

10.15 Corollary. *Let \mathfrak{C} be a generalized k -linear direct category such that it is projective both as a left and a right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module. Then $(\Phi(\mathfrak{PGF}), \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathfrak{PGF}^\perp}, \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod})$ forms a hereditary Hovey triple in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$, where $\mathfrak{PGF}^\perp = \{\mathfrak{PGF}_x^\perp\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$.*

Proof. We mention that $(\mathfrak{PGF}_x, \mathfrak{PGF}_x^\perp, A_x^0\text{-Mod})$ is a hereditary Hovey triple with $\mathfrak{PGF}_x \cap \mathfrak{PGF}_x^\perp = \mathfrak{P}_x$ by Proposition 10.14. The family $\{\mathfrak{P}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$ is cocompatible as \mathfrak{C}^+ is a projective left \mathfrak{C}^0 -module; see Example 10.3. The conclusion then follows from Corollary 10.11. \square

Similarly, we have the following result.

10.16 Corollary. *Let \mathfrak{C} be a generalized k -linear direct category such that it is projective both as a left and a right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module. Then $(\Phi(\mathfrak{GF}), \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathfrak{PGF}^\perp}, \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\mathfrak{CT}})$ forms a hereditary Hovey triple in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$.*

The next result can be proved dually using Corollary 10.12.

10.17 Corollary. *Let \mathfrak{C} be a generalized k -linear inverse category such that it is projective both as a left and a right \mathfrak{C}^0 -module. Then $(\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}, \mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}_{\perp\mathfrak{GJ}}, \Psi(\mathfrak{GJ}))$ forms a hereditary Hovey triple in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-Mod}$, where ${}^\perp\mathfrak{GJ} = \{{}^\perp\mathfrak{GJ}_x\}_{x \in \text{Ob}(\mathfrak{C})}$.*

We mention that the k -linearizations of quite a few combinatorial categories described before satisfy the conditions specified in these corollaries.

10.18 Example. Let k be a field of characteristic 0. Then the k -linearizations of skeletons of the following combinatorial categories satisfy conditions specified in Corollaries 10.15 and 10.16:

- (1) the category of finite sets and injections;
- (2) the category of finite dimensional vector spaces over a finite field and linear maps;
- (3) the category of finite totally ordered sets and order-preserving injections;
- (4) the category of cyclically ordered sets and order-preserving injections.

Dually, via replacing injections in the definitions of the above categories by surjections, we obtain examples satisfying conditions specified in Corollary 10.17.

REFERENCES

- [1] Vigleik Angeltveit, *Enriched Reedy categories*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **136** (2008), no. 7, 2323–2332. MR2390498
- [2] Hanno Becker, *Models for singularity categories*, Adv. Math. **254** (2014), 187–232. MR3161097
- [3] Jean Bénabou, *Introduction to bicategories*, Reports of the Midwest Category Seminar, Lecture Notes in Math., No. 47, Springer, Berlin-New York, 1967, pp. 1–77. MR220789
- [4] David J. Benson, *Representations and cohomology. I*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 30, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991, Basic representation theory of finite groups and associative algebras. MR1110581

- [5] Clemens Berger and Ieke Moerdijk, *On an extension of the notion of Reedy category*, Math. Z. **269** (2011), no. 3-4, 977–1004. MR2860274
- [6] Aldridge K. Bousfield, *Constructions of factorization systems in categories*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **9** (1976/77), no. 2, 207–220. MR478159
- [7] Pierre Cagne and Paul-André Melliès, *On bifibrations of model categories*, Adv. Math. **370** (2020), 107205, 43. MR4099827
- [8] Thomas Church, Jordan S. Ellenberg, and Benson Farb, *FI-modules and stability for representations of symmetric groups*, Duke Math. J. **164** (2015), no. 9, 1833–1910. MR3357185
- [9] Alain Connes, *Cohomologie cyclique et foncteurs Extⁿ*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **296** (1983), no. 23, 953–958. MR777584
- [10] Ivan Contreras, Molly Keller, and Rajan A. Mehta, *Frobenius objects in the category of spans*, Rev. Math. Phys. **34** (2022), no. 10, Paper No. 2250036, 34. MR4514384
- [11] Georgios Dalezios and Jan Šťovíček, *Linear reedy categories, quasi-hereditary algebras and model structures*, Adv. Math., **481** (2025), Paper No. 110550, 57. MR4963165
- [12] Andreas W. M. Dress, *Notes on the theory of representations of finite groups. Part I: The Burnside ring of a finite group and some AGN-applications*, Universität Bielefeld, Fakultät für Mathematik, Bielefeld, 1971, With the aid of lecture notes, taken by Manfred Küchler. MR360771
- [13] William G. Dwyer and Daniel M. Kan, *Normalizing the cyclic modules of Connes*, Comment. Math. Helv. **60** (1985), no. 4, 582–600. MR826872
- [14] Edgar E. Enochs and Overtoun M. G. Jenda, *Relative homological algebra*, De Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics, vol. 30, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 2000. MR1753146
- [15] James Gillespie, *Hereditary abelian model categories*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **48** (2016), no. 6, 895–922. MR3608936
- [16] Paul G. Goerss and John F. Jardine, *Simplicial homotopy theory*, Progress in Mathematics, vol. 174, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1999. MR1711612
- [17] Randall D. Helmstutler, *Conjugate pairs of categories and Quillen equivalent stable model categories of functors*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **218** (2014), no. 7, 1302–1323. MR3168497
- [18] Philip S. Hirschhorn, *Model categories and their localizations*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 99, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003. MR1944041
- [19] Mark Hovey, *Model categories*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 63, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999. MR1650134
- [20] ———, *Cotorsion pairs, model category structures, and representation theory*, Math. Z. **241** (2002), no. 3, 553–592. MR1938704
- [21] Thomas Hüttemann and Oliver Röndigs, *Twisted diagrams and homotopy sheaves*, preprint, arXiv:0805.4076.
- [22] Gregory M. Kelly, *Basic concepts of enriched category theory*, Repr. Theory Appl. Categ. (2005), no. 10, vi+137, Reprint of the 1982 original [Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge; MR0651714]. MR2177301
- [23] László G. Kovács, *Semigroup algebras of the full matrix semigroup over a finite field*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **116** (1992), no. 4, 911–919. MR1123658
- [24] Nicholas J. Kuhn, *Generic representation theory of finite fields in nondescribing characteristic*, Adv. Math. **272** (2015), 598–610. MR3303242
- [25] Stephen Lack and Ross Street, *Combinatorial categorical equivalences of Dold-Kan type*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **219** (2015), no. 10, 4343–4367. MR3346494
- [26] Jean-Louis Loday, *Cyclic homology*, second ed., Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 301, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998, Appendix E by María O. Ronco, Chapter 13 by the author in collaboration with Teimuraz Pirashvili. MR1600246
- [27] Joe Moeller and Christina Vasilakopoulou, *Monoidal Grothendieck construction*, Theory Appl. Categ. **35** (2020), Paper No. 31, 1159–1207. MR4127726
- [28] Daniel Murfet, *Rings with several objects*, preprint, 2006.
- [29] Teimuraz Pirashvili, *Dold-Kan type theorem for Γ -groups*, Math. Ann. **318** (2000), no. 2, 277–298. MR1795563
- [30] Leonid Positselski and Jan Šťovíček, *Derived, coderived, and contraderived categories of locally presentable abelian categories*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **226** (2022), no. 4, Paper No. 106883, 39. MR4310048
- [31] Geoffrey Powell, *Functors on the category of finite sets revisited*, preprint, arXiv:2407.11623.
- [32] Geoffrey Powell and Christine Vespa, *A Pirashvili-type theorem for functors on non-empty finite sets*, Glasg. Math. J. **65** (2023), no. 1, 1–61. MR4518761
- [33] Daniel G. Quillen, *Homotopical algebra*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, No. 43, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1967. MR223432
- [34] Emily Riehl and Dominic Verity, *The theory and practice of Reedy categories*, Theory Appl. Categ. **29** (2014), 256–301. MR3217884
- [35] Luigi Salce, *Cotorsion theories for abelian groups*, Symposia Mathematica, Vol. XXIII (Conf. Abelian Groups and their Relationship to the Theory of Modules, INDAM, Rome, 1977), Academic Press, London-New York, 1979, pp. 11–32. MR565595
- [36] Jan Šaroch and Jan Šťovíček, *Singular compactness and definability for Σ -cotorsion and Gorenstein modules*, Selecta Math. (N.S.) **26** (2020), no. 2, Paper No. 23, 40. MR4076700
- [37] Graeme Segal, *Categories and cohomology theories*, Topology **13** (1974), 293–312. MR353298
- [38] Michael Shulman, *Reedy categories and their generalizations*, preprint, arXiv:1507.01065.
- [39] Jolanta Ślomińska, *Dold-Kan type theorems and Morita equivalences of functor categories*, J. Algebra **274** (2004), no. 1, 118–137. MR2040866

- [40] Alexandru E. Stanculescu, *Bifibrations and weak factorisation systems*, Appl. Categ. Structures **20** (2012), no. 1, 19–30. MR2886231
- [41] Ross Street, *The core groupoid can suffice*, Theory Appl. Categ. **41** (2024), Paper No. 21, 686–706. MR4761160
- [42] John D. Wiltshire-Gordon, *Uniformly presented vector spaces*, preprint, arXiv:1406.0786.

Z.X. DI SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, HUAQIAO UNIVERSITY, QUANZHOU 362021, CHINA
Email address: `dizhenxing@163.com`

L.P. LI DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HUNAN NORMAL UNIVERSITY, CHANGSHA 410081, CHINA
Email address: `lipingli@hunnu.edu.cn`

L. LIANG DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, GANSU CENTER FOR FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH IN COMPLEX SYSTEMS ANALYSIS AND CONTROL, LANZHOU JIAOTONG UNIVERSITY, LANZHOU 730070, CHINA
Email address: `lliangnju@gmail.com`
URL: <https://sites.google.com/site/lliangnju>