

NEW ENHANCEMENTS OF DERIVED CATEGORIES OF COHERENT SHEAVES AND APPLICATIONS

VALERY A. LUNTS AND OLAF M. SCHNÜRER

ABSTRACT. We introduce new enhancements for the bounded derived category $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(X))$ of coherent sheaves on a suitable scheme X and for its subcategory $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}(X)$ of perfect complexes. They are used for translating Fourier-Mukai functors to functors between derived categories of dg algebras, for relating homological smoothness of $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}(X)$ to geometric smoothness of X , and for proving homological smoothness of $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(X))$. Moreover, we characterize properness of $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}(X)$ and $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(X))$ geometrically.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Derived categories of sheaves and subcategories	3
3. Enhancements	7
4. Smoothness of categories and schemes	19
5. Properness of categories and schemes	31
6. Fourier-Mukai functors	34
Appendix A. Sheaf homomorphisms and external tensor products	41
Appendix B. Triangulated categories in terms of dg endomorphism algebras	49
Appendix C. Čech enhancements for locally integral schemes	50
References	59

1. INTRODUCTION

Given quasi-compact separated schemes X and Y over a field k , any $K \in D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X \times Y))$ gives rise to the Fourier-Mukai functor

$$\Phi_K = \mathbf{R}q_*(p^*(-) \otimes^{\mathbf{L}} K): D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X)) \rightarrow D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(Y))$$

where $X \xleftarrow{p} X \times Y \xrightarrow{q} Y$ are the projections. It is well-known that any choice of compact generators provides dg algebras A and B such that $D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))$ and $D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(Y))$ are equivalent to the derived categories $D(A)$ and $D(B)$ of dg modules, respectively. It is therefore natural to expect that there is a dg $A^{\mathrm{op}} \otimes B$ -module M corresponding to K such

that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X)) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_K} & D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(Y)) \\ \downarrow \sim & & \downarrow \sim \\ D(A) & \xrightarrow{-\otimes_A^L M} & D(B) \end{array}$$

commutes.

Theorem 1.1 (Fourier-Mukai kernels and dg bimodules, see Theorem 6.4). *Let X and Y be Noetherian separated schemes over a field k such that $X \times Y$ is Noetherian and the following condition holds for both X and Y : any perfect complex is isomorphic to a strictly perfect complex (i. e. a bounded complex of vector bundles). Then there is an equivalence $\theta: D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X \times Y)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D(A^{\mathrm{op}} \otimes B)$ such that for any $K \in D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X \times Y))$ with corresponding $M = \theta(K) \in D(A^{\mathrm{op}} \otimes B)$ the diagram above commutes.*

We refer the reader to Theorem 6.4 for a more precise formulation of this theorem.

We believe that this theorem is an important step in the writing of the dictionary between derived categories of schemes and those of dg algebras. The commutativity of the diagram is claimed under more general assumptions in [Toë07, after Cor. 8.12] without proof. The main difficulty in the proof of Theorem 1.1 arises from the fact that the different functors involved (inverse image, tensor product, direct image, $\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}$) are usually computed via different types of replacements (h-flat, h-injective) and it is hard to treat these functors compatibly.

Our main tools to overcome these difficulties are new enhancements of the categories $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}(X)$, $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(X))$, and $D^-(\mathrm{Coh}(X))$ that we introduce in this article (see Propositions 3.12, 3.13, 3.15). These enhancements are modeled on left and right (! and *) Čech resolutions and are certain non-full subcategories of the dg category of complexes of sheaves of \mathcal{O}_X -modules.

They also enable us to prove the following two theorems. We call the category $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}(X)$ (resp. $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(X))$) smooth over k if its h-injective enhancement is smooth over k as a dg k -category (see Definition 4.1).

Theorem 1.2 (Homological versus geometric smoothness, see Theorem 4.3). *Let X be a Noetherian separated scheme over a field k such that $X \times X$ is Noetherian and any perfect complex on X is isomorphic to a strictly perfect complex. Let $\Delta: X \rightarrow X \times X$ be the diagonal (closed) immersion. Then the following two conditions are equivalent:*

- (a) $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}(X)$ is smooth over k ;
- (b) $\Delta_*(\mathcal{O}_X) \in \mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}(X \times X)$.

If X is in addition of finite type over k , they are also equivalent to:

- (c) X is smooth over k .

In particular, if X is a separated scheme of finite type over k having the resolution property, i. e. any coherent sheaf is a quotient of a vector bundle, for example if X is quasi-projective over k , then the above three conditions are equivalent.

Theorem 1.3 (see Theorem 4.5). *Let X be a separated scheme of finite type over a perfect field k that has the resolution property. Then $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(X))$ is smooth over k .*

To our knowledge Theorem 1.2 is “well-known” folklore. However, it seems there is no proof available in the literature, cf. the footnote in the introduction of [Shk07]. Versions of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 are claimed in [Lun10, Prop 3.13, Thm. 6.3]. However the proof of the key Proposition 6.17 there is incomplete.

Note the following consequence of Theorem 1.2 (see Corollary 4.4): if X is a smooth quasi-compact separated scheme over a field k , then $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}(X) = D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(X))$ is smooth over k .

We also characterize properness of the categories $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}(X)$ and $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(X))$ geometrically. We call a triangulated k -linear category \mathcal{T} proper over k if it has a classical generator and $\dim_k(\bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(E, [n]F)) < \infty$ for all objects $E, F \in \mathcal{T}$ (see Definition 5.2).

Theorem 1.4 (Homological versus geometric properness, see Theorem 5.5). *Let X be a separated scheme of finite type over a field k . If X is proper over k , then $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}(X)$ is proper over k . If X has the resolution property, the converse is also true.*

Theorem 1.5 (see Theorem 5.6). *Let X be a separated scheme X of finite type over a field k . Then $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(X))$ is proper over k if and only if X is proper over k and regular.*

The proofs of the two Theorems 1.4 and 1.5 are short and independent of the other results of this article. A statement similar to Theorem 1.4 appeared in the recent preprint [Orl14].

Let us finally mention that we define and study Čech enhancements for locally integral schemes in appendix C; this appendix is included because its results are used and referred to in [LSa].

Acknowledgements. We thank Ragnar-Olaf Buchweitz, Henning Krause, Alexander Kuznetsov, Daniel Pomerleano, Anatoly Preygel, Paolo Stellari, and Greg Stevenson for helpful discussions. The results of this article were reported on at a workshop in Oberwolfach in May 2014, see [Sch]. We thank the participants for their interest. We also thank the referee for detailed comments.

The first author was supported by NSA grant H98230-14-1-0110. The second author was supported by postdoctoral fellowships of the DAAD and the DFG, and by the SPP 1388 and the SFB/TR 45 of the DFG.

Conventions. When we take products of schemes (resp. tensor products of algebras or dg (= differential \mathbb{Z} -graded) algebras or modules over algebras) and work over a field k we write \times (resp. \otimes) instead of $\times_k = \times_{\mathrm{Spec} k}$ (resp. \otimes_k). If \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are sheaves of \mathcal{O}_X -modules on a ringed space (X, \mathcal{O}_X) , we usually abbreviate $\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{G}$, $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ and $\mathcal{F}^\vee = \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{O}_X)$. If \mathcal{A} is a dg category, $D(\mathcal{A})$ denotes the derived category of dg \mathcal{A} -modules and $\mathrm{per}(\mathcal{A})$ its subcategory of compact (or perfect) objects.

2. DERIVED CATEGORIES OF SHEAVES AND SUBCATEGORIES

Let X be a scheme. By a sheaf we mean a sheaf of \mathcal{O}_X -modules. We denote by $\mathrm{Sh}(X)$ (resp. $\mathrm{Qcoh}(X)$) the category of sheaves (resp. quasi-coherent sheaves) on X .

2.1. Derived categories of sheaves. Let $D(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$ (resp. $D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))$) denote the (unbounded) derived category of sheaves (resp. quasi-coherent sheaves) on X . Let $D_{\mathrm{Qcoh}}(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$ be the full subcategory of $D(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$ consisting of objects with quasi-coherent cohomologies. By $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}'(X)$ we denote the full subcategory of $D(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$ whose objects are perfect, i.e. locally isomorphic to a bounded complex of vector bundles; it is a thick subcategory (see [TT90, Prop. 2.2.13]). If X is quasi-compact and quasi-separated, then $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}'(X)$ consists precisely of the compact objects of $D_{\mathrm{Qcoh}}(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$, and $D_{\mathrm{Qcoh}}(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$ is generated by a single perfect object (see [BvdB03, Thm. 3.1.1]).

Assume that our scheme X is quasi-compact and separated. Then the obvious functor $D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X)) \rightarrow D(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$ defines an equivalence

$$D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\mathrm{Qcoh}}(\mathrm{Sh}(X)) \subset D(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$$

(see [BN93, Cor. 5.5]). By $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}(X)$ we denote the full subcategory of $D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))$ corresponding to $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}'(X)$ under this equivalence; it consists precisely of those objects that are locally isomorphic to a bounded complex of vector bundles.

Assume in addition that X is Noetherian. Let $\mathrm{Coh}(X)$ be the category of coherent sheaves on X and $D^-(\mathrm{Coh}(X))$ its bounded above derived category. The obvious functor $D^-(\mathrm{Coh}(X)) \rightarrow D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))$ then defines an equivalence

$$(2.1) \quad D^-(\mathrm{Coh}(X)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\mathrm{Coh}}^-(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X)) \subset D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))$$

where $D_{\mathrm{Coh}}^-(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X)) \subset D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))$ is the full subcategory of complexes whose cohomologies are bounded above and coherent (see [BG71, Exp. II, Prop. 2.2.2, p. 167]). This of course remains true if we replace “ $-$ ” by “ b ” and “bounded above” by “bounded”. Since X is quasi-compact we have $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}(X) \subset D_{\mathrm{Coh}}^b(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))$.

The relations between the above categories are summarized by the following diagram where the upper index “cpt” stands for “compact objects”.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 D^-(\mathrm{Coh}(X)) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & D_{\mathrm{Coh}}^-(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X)) & \subset & D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X)) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & D_{\mathrm{Qcoh}}(\mathrm{Sh}(X)) \subset D(\mathrm{Sh}(X)) \\
 \cup & & \cup & & \cup & & \cup \\
 D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(X)) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & D_{\mathrm{Coh}}^b(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X)) & \supset & D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))^{\mathrm{cpt}} & \xrightarrow{\sim} & D_{\mathrm{Qcoh}}(\mathrm{Sh}(X))^{\mathrm{cpt}} \\
 & & & & \parallel & & \parallel \\
 & & & & \mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}(X) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}'(X).
 \end{array}$$

Proposition 2.1. *Let X be a Noetherian separated scheme. Then $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}(X) = D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(X))$ implies that X is regular. If X is of finite dimension, the converse is also true.*

Proof. We always have $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}(X) \subset D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(X))$. Recall the Auslander-Buchsbaum-Serre theorem ([BH93, Thm. 2.2.7], [Ser00, IV.D]) which says that a Noetherian local ring (A, \mathfrak{m}) is regular if and only if $\mathrm{gldim} A < \infty$ if and only if A/\mathfrak{m} has finite projective dimension as an A -module; moreover, if A is regular, then $\dim A = \mathrm{gldim} A$.

Assume that $\mathfrak{P}\text{erf}(X) = D^b(\text{Coh}(X))$. Since any point of X contains a closed point in its closure and the localization of a regular local ring is regular it is enough to show that the local ring of each closed point is regular.

Let $x \in X$ be a closed point. Equip $\{x\} = \overline{\{x\}}$ with the induced reduced scheme structure and let $i: \{x\} \rightarrow X$ be the closed embedding. View $\kappa(x) = \mathcal{O}_{X,x}/\mathfrak{m}_x$ as a coherent sheaf on $\{x\}$. Then $i_*(\kappa(x)) \in \text{Coh}(X) \subset D^b(\text{Coh}(X)) = \mathfrak{P}\text{erf}(X)$. This implies that the restriction of $i_*(\kappa(x))$ to an affine open neighborhood U of x has a finite resolution by finitely generated projective $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$ -modules. Taking the stalk at x shows that the $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ -module $(i_*(\kappa(x)))_x = \kappa(x)$ has finite projective dimension. Hence $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is regular.

Assume that X is regular and of finite dimension. By intelligent truncation it is sufficient to show that any $F \in \text{Coh}(X)$ is in $\mathfrak{P}\text{erf}(X)$. Let $U = \text{Spec } R \subset X$ be an affine open subset and $d = \dim R < \infty$. Choose an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow P^{-d} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow P^0 \rightarrow F|_U \rightarrow 0$ where all P^i are finitely generated projective R -modules. Localizing at an arbitrary $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } R$ shows that $K_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a projective $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ -module (here we use that $\text{gldim } R_{\mathfrak{p}} = \dim R_{\mathfrak{p}} \leq d$). Hence K is a projective R -module. This shows that $F|_U \in \mathfrak{P}\text{erf}(U)$ and hence $F \in \mathfrak{P}\text{erf}(X)$. \square

2.2. Resolution property. A Noetherian scheme is said to have the resolution property if any coherent sheaf is a quotient of a vector bundle. For example, any Noetherian separated scheme that is integral and locally factorial (for example regular) has the resolution property, by a theorem of Kleiman [Har77, Ex. III.6.8]; any Noetherian scheme with an ample family of line bundles has the resolution property, by [TT90, Lemma. 2.1.3(b)].

We say that a scheme X satisfies condition **(RES)** or that X is a **(RES)**-scheme (for “resolution”) if

(RES) X is a Noetherian separated scheme of finite dimension that has the resolution property.

Proposition 2.2. *If X satisfies condition **(RES)** then any object of $D_{\text{Coh}}^-(\text{Sh}(X))$ is isomorphic in $D(\text{Sh}(X))$ to a bounded above complex of vector bundles.*

If on a Noetherian scheme X any coherent sheaf is isomorphic in $D(\text{Sh}(X))$ to a bounded above complex of vector bundles, then it is easy to see (using intelligent truncation) that X has the resolution property.

Proof. The objects of $D_{\text{Coh}}^-(\text{Sh}(X))$ are precisely the pseudo-coherent complexes, by [TT90, Example 2.2.8].

Now observe that the proof of [TT90, Prop. 2.3.1.(e)] works without the assumption that X has an ample family. Its important ingredient [TT90, Lemma 2.1.3(c)] is true in our setting. Namely, if $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is an epimorphism of quasi-coherent sheaves with \mathcal{F} coherent, then there is a vector bundle \mathcal{E} and a morphism $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ such that the composition $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is an epimorphism onto \mathcal{F} . This follows from [Har77, Exercise II.5.15] and the resolution property. \square

2.3. Strictly perfect complexes. We say that a scheme X satisfies condition **(GSP)** or that X is a **(GSP)**-scheme (for “globally strictly perfect”) if

(GSP) X is a quasi-compact separated scheme such that any perfect complex on X is isomorphic in $D(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$ to a bounded complex of vector bundles (= a strictly perfect complex).

Example 2.3. Any affine scheme U satisfies condition (GSP) by [TT90, Prop. 2.3.1(d)].

Another way to see this is as follows. Let $R = \Gamma(U, \mathcal{O}_U)$. Since U is quasi-compact and separated, we have $D(R) = D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(U)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\mathrm{Qcoh}}(\mathrm{Sh}(U))$ where $D(R)$ is the derived category of R -modules. It is well-known that $D(R)^{\mathrm{cpt}} = \mathrm{per}(R)$ where $\mathrm{per}(R)$ consists of those complexes that are isomorphic to a bounded complex of projective R -modules. Hence $\mathrm{per}(R) = \mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}(U) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}'(U)$.

In particular, the restriction of a perfect complex on an arbitrary scheme to any affine open subscheme is isomorphic to a bounded complex of vector bundles.

We give some criteria for a scheme to satisfy condition (GSP) in the following Remark 2.4. These criteria show: Any scheme X which is quasi-projective over an affine scheme satisfies condition (GSP) (since it has an ample family of line bundles). Any regular (or, more generally, integral locally factorial) Noetherian separated scheme satisfies condition (GSP) because it has the resolution property.

Remark 2.4.

- (a) A separated scheme X that has an ample family of line bundles (and hence is quasi-compact) satisfies condition (GSP), by [TT90, Prop. 2.3.1(d)].
- (b) Let X be a quasi-compact separated scheme. Assume that for any epimorphism $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ of quasi-coherent sheaves with \mathcal{F} of finite type, there is a vector bundle \mathcal{E} and a morphism $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ such that the composition $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is an epimorphism onto \mathcal{F} . Then X satisfies condition (GSP). This follows by inspection of the proof of [TT90, Prop. 2.3.1], our condition being its important ingredient [TT90, Lemma 2.1.3(c)].
- (c) Let X be a Noetherian separated scheme that has the resolution property. (This is a little bit weaker than condition (RES).) Then X satisfies condition (GSP). This follows easily from (b) using [Har77, Exercise II.5.15].

We refer the reader to [TT90, 2.1.2] and the discussion in [Tot04, section 2] for examples and more information.

2.4. Some useful facts. The category of injective sheaves (resp. injective quasi-coherent sheaves) on a scheme X is denoted $\mathrm{InjSh}(X)$ (resp. $\mathrm{InjQcoh}(X)$).

Theorem 2.5. Let X be a locally Noetherian scheme.

- (a) Every object of $\mathrm{Qcoh}(X)$ can be embedded in an object of $\mathrm{InjSh}(X) \cap \mathrm{Qcoh}(X)$.
- (b) The injective objects in $\mathrm{Qcoh}(X)$ are precisely the injective objects of $\mathrm{Sh}(X)$ that are quasi-coherent, $\mathrm{InjQcoh}(X) = \mathrm{InjSh}(X) \cap \mathrm{Qcoh}(X)$.
- (c) If $I \in \mathrm{Qcoh}(X)$ is an injective object and $U \subset X$ is open, then $I|_U \in \mathrm{Qcoh}(U)$ is again injective.
- (d) Any direct sum of objects of $\mathrm{InjSh}(X)$ (resp. $\mathrm{InjQcoh}(X)$) is in $\mathrm{InjSh}(X)$ (resp. $\mathrm{InjQcoh}(X)$).

Proof. This follows from [Har66, II.§7] as explained in [LSb, Thm. 2.1] (cf. [Con00, Lemma 2.1.3]). \square

Lemma 2.6. *If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a quasi-compact quasi-separated morphism of schemes (for example an affine morphism or a morphism with Noetherian source or a morphism between quasi-compact quasi-separated schemes), then $f_* : \mathrm{Sh}(X) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(Y)$ preserves coproducts (even filtered colimits), maps $\mathrm{Qcoh}(X)$ to $\mathrm{Qcoh}(Y)$, and the induced functor $f_* : \mathrm{Qcoh}(X) \rightarrow \mathrm{Qcoh}(Y)$ preserves coproducts.*

Proof. See [TT90, Lemmata B.6, B.12]. The statement that f_* maps $\mathrm{Qcoh}(X)$ to $\mathrm{Qcoh}(Y)$ is also shown in [GW10, Cor. 10.27]. \square

Lemma 2.7. *Let $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z$ be morphisms. Assume that g is a quasi-compact separated morphism and that $g \circ f$ is an affine morphism. Then for any $M \in \mathrm{Qcoh}(X)$, the object $f_*(M) \in \mathrm{Qcoh}(Y)$ is acyclic with respect to the functor $g_* : \mathrm{Qcoh}(Y) \rightarrow \mathrm{Qcoh}(Z)$.*

Proof. Note that f is then affine and hence $f_*(M) \in \mathrm{Qcoh}(Y)$ by Lemma 2.6. From [Gro61, Cor. 1.3.2 and Cor. 1.3.4] we see that $(\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{Sh}g_*}^p)(f_*(M))$ vanishes for all $p > 0$ where $\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{Sh}g_*}^p$ is the p -th right derived functor of $g : \mathrm{Sh}(Y) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(Z)$. This means that $f_*(M)$ is acyclic with respect to $g_* : \mathrm{Sh}(Y) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(Z)$. From [TT90, Cor. B.9] we obtain $(\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{Qcoh}g_*}^p)(f_*(M)) = 0$ for all $p > 0$ where $\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{Qcoh}g_*}^p$ is the p -th right derived functor of $g : \mathrm{Qcoh}(Y) \rightarrow \mathrm{Qcoh}(Z)$. This means that $f_*(M)$ is acyclic with respect to $g_* : \mathrm{Qcoh}(Y) \rightarrow \mathrm{Qcoh}(Z)$. \square

Lemma 2.8. *If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a morphism between quasi-compact separated schemes over a field k then the functor $f_* : \mathrm{Qcoh}(X) \rightarrow \mathrm{Qcoh}(Y)$ has finite cohomological dimension.*

Proof. The functor $f_* : \mathrm{Qcoh}(X) \rightarrow \mathrm{Qcoh}(Y)$ is well-defined by Lemma 2.6. If U is an affine open subset of X note that the composition $U \hookrightarrow X \xrightarrow{f} Y$ is affine because its composition with the separated morphism $Y \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} k$ is affine. Fixing some ordered finite affine open covering of X provides for any $A \in \mathrm{Qcoh}(X)$ the finite $*$ -Čech-resolution $A \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_*(A)$, cf. (3.1). Lemma 2.7 then implies that $\mathbf{R}f_*(A) \cong f_*(\mathcal{C}_*(A))$ in $D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(Y))$. \square

3. ENHANCEMENTS

We denote the dg category of complexes in a (pre)additive category \mathcal{A} by $C(\mathcal{A})$. If \mathcal{D} is any dg category, we denote by $Z^0(\mathcal{D})$ the category with the same objects but closed degree zero morphisms, and by $[\mathcal{D}]$ the homotopy category of \mathcal{D} .

For example, $[C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))]$ denotes the category of complexes of quasi-coherent sheaves on X whose morphisms are given by homotopy classes of degree zero maps that commute with the respective differentials.

3.1. Injective enhancements. Let X be a scheme. Then $\mathrm{Sh}(X)$ is a Grothendieck category ([KS06, 18.1.6.(v)]), the full dg subcategory $C^{\mathrm{h-inj}}(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$ of $C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$ consisting of h-injective objects is pretriangulated and the canonical functor $[C^{\mathrm{h-inj}}(\mathrm{Sh}(X))] \rightarrow D(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$ is an equivalence of triangulated categories ([KS06, Thm. 14.3.1.(iii)]), so $C^{\mathrm{h-inj}}(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$ is naturally an enhancement of $D(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$. Similarly, if X is a quasi-compact and quasi-separated scheme, then $\mathrm{Qcoh}(X)$ is a Grothendieck category ([TT90, B.3]), so that the

full dg subcategory $C^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))$ of $C(\text{Qcoh}(X))$ consisting of h-injective objects is an enhancement of $D(\text{Qcoh}(X))$.

Assume that X is quasi-compact and separated. By restricting to suitable subcategories we obtain enhancements of all the full triangulated subcategories of $D(\text{Qcoh}(X))$ and $D(\text{Sh}(X))$ mentioned so far. We give some examples.

The full dg subcategory $C_{\text{Qcoh}}^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Sh}(X))$ of $C^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Sh}(X))$ consisting of complexes with quasi-coherent cohomologies is an enhancement of $D(\text{Qcoh}(X)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\text{Qcoh}}(\text{Sh}(X))$.

The full dg subcategory $\mathfrak{P}erf^{\text{h-inj}}(X)$ of $C^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))$ of objects belonging to $\mathfrak{P}erf(X)$ and also its full dg subcategory $\mathfrak{P}erf^{\text{inj}}(X)$ of bounded below complexes of injective quasi-coherent sheaves are enhancements of $\mathfrak{P}erf(X) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{P}erf'(X)$. Similarly, by considering arbitrary sheaves instead of quasi-coherent ones, we obtain enhancements $\mathfrak{P}erf^{\text{h-inj}}(X)$ and $\mathfrak{P}erf^{\text{inj}}(X)$ of $\mathfrak{P}erf'(X)$.

If X is a Noetherian separated scheme, $D^b(\text{Coh}(X)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\text{Coh}}^b(\text{Qcoh}(X)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\text{Coh}}^b(\text{Sh}(X))$ has the following enhancements: the full dg subcategories $C_{\text{Coh}}^{\text{h-inj},b}(\text{Sh}(X))$ of $C^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Sh}(X))$ and $C_{\text{Coh}}^{\text{h-inj},b}(\text{Qcoh}(X))$ of $C^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))$ consisting of objects with bounded coherent cohomology; the full dg subcategory $C_{\text{Coh}}^{+,b}(\text{InjSh}(X))$ of $C_{\text{Coh}}^{\text{h-inj},b}(\text{Sh}(X))$ consisting of bounded below complexes of injective sheaves with bounded coherent cohomology; the full dg subcategory $C_{\text{Coh}}^{+,b}(\text{InjQcoh}(X))$ of $C_{\text{Coh}}^{\text{h-inj},b}(\text{Qcoh}(X))$ consisting of bounded below complexes of injective quasi-coherent sheaves with bounded coherent cohomology.

Remark 3.1. *Instead of h-injective complexes we could also use fibrant complexes in order to define enhancements; any complex admits a monomorphic quasi-isomorphism to a fibrant complex; a complex is fibrant if and only if it is an h-injective complex of injective objects; in particular, any bounded below complex of injective objects is fibrant; cf. [SS, 12].*

3.2. Čech enhancements.

3.2.1. Čech resolutions. Let X be a quasi-compact separated scheme. If $j: V \hookrightarrow X$ is the inclusion of an open subscheme and F is a sheaf on X , we define ${}_V F := j_* j^*(F) = j_* j^!(F)$ and ${}^V F := j_! j^!(F) = j_! j^*(F)$. Let $\mathcal{U} = (U_s)_{s \in S}$ be an ordered finite open covering of X ; here “ordered finite” means that S is a totally ordered finite set. As usual, we abbreviate $U_I := \bigcap_{i \in I} U_i$ for a subset $I \subset S$, and write $U_{s_0 s_1 \dots s_n}$ instead of $U_{\{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_n\}}$. For any sheaf F on X we can consider its bounded $*$ -Čech resolution

$$(3.1) \quad F \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_*(F) := \left(\prod_{s_0 \in S} U_{s_0} F \rightarrow \prod_{s_0, s_1 \in S, s_0 < s_1} U_{s_0 s_1} F \rightarrow \dots \right)$$

and its bounded $!$ -Čech resolution

$$(3.2) \quad \left(\mathcal{C}_!(F) := \left(\dots \rightarrow \prod_{s_0, s_1 \in S, s_0 < s_1} U_{s_0 s_1} F \rightarrow \prod_{s_0 \in S} U_{s_0} F \right) \right) \rightarrow F$$

with the usual differentials. Both $\mathcal{C}_*(F)$ and $\mathcal{C}_!(F)$ depend on \mathcal{U} but we do not emphasize this in the notation. (Choosing another total ordering on S gives rise to isomorphic resolutions.)

More generally, if F is a complex of sheaves on X , then $\mathcal{C}_*(F)$ and $\mathcal{C}_!(F)$ are defined as the totalizations of the obvious double complexes and we have natural quasi-isomorphisms $F \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_*(F)$ and $\mathcal{C}_!(F) \rightarrow F$ (use [Har77, Lemma III.4.2] for the $*$ -Čech resolution, look

at the stalks for the $!$ -Čech resolution, and use [KS94, Thm. 1.9.3]). This means that $F \mapsto \mathcal{C}_*(F)$ and $F \mapsto \mathcal{C}_!(F)$ define two dg functors

$$\mathcal{C}_*, \mathcal{C}_! : C(\mathrm{Sh}(X)) \rightarrow C(\mathrm{Sh}(X)).$$

They come with morphisms $\mathrm{id} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_*$ and $\mathcal{C}_! \rightarrow \mathrm{id}$ of dg functors that are given at each object by a quasi-isomorphism.

The complexes $\mathcal{C}_*(F)$ (resp. $\mathcal{C}_!(F)$) are complexes of sheaves that are finite direct sums of objects $\bigvee_V (F^i)$ (resp. $\bigvee^V (F^i)$) where V is a finite intersection of elements of \mathcal{U} and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Note that $\mathcal{C}_*(F)$ and $\mathcal{C}_!(F)$ are bounded (resp. bounded above, bounded below) if F is bounded (resp. bounded above, bounded below). If F is a complex of vector bundles (= locally free sheaves of finite type), $\mathcal{C}_!(F)$ is a complex of flat sheaves. If all U_s are quasi-compact and $F \in C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))$ we have $\mathcal{C}_*(F) \in C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))$ by Lemma 2.6 because all inclusions $U_I \rightarrow X$ are quasi-compact and separated.

3.2.2. Some auxiliary constructions. Let X be a scheme. We define an additive category $\mathrm{Vb}^\subset(X)$ as follows. Its objects are finite formal direct sums of pairs (U, P) where $U \subset X$ is an open subset and P is a vector bundle on U . Morphism spaces are defined by

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Vb}^\subset(X)}((U, P), (V, Q)) := \begin{cases} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_V}(j_! P, Q), & \text{if } U \subset V, \text{ where } j : U \subset V; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Identities are obvious, and composition is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Vb}^\subset(X)}((V, Q), (W, R)) \times \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Vb}^\subset(X)}((U, P), (V, Q)) &\rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Vb}^\subset(X)}((U, P), (W, R)), \\ (g, f) &\mapsto \begin{cases} g \circ j'_! f, & \text{if } U \subset V \subset W, \\ & \text{where } j' : V \subset W; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we define an additive category $\mathrm{Vb}^\supset(X)$. It has the same objects as $\mathrm{Vb}^\subset(X)$, morphism spaces

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Vb}^\supset(X)}((V, Q), (U, P)) := \begin{cases} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_V}(Q, j_* P), & \text{if } V \supset U, \text{ where } j : U \subset V; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and obvious identities and composition.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $U \subset V \subset X$ be open subschemes of a scheme X , with inclusion morphisms $u : U \subset X$, $j : U \subset V$ and $v : V \subset X$. Let $P \in \mathrm{Sh}(U)$ and $Q \in \mathrm{Sh}(V)$. Then restriction to V and U yields natural isomorphisms*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(u_! P, v_! Q) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_V}(j_! P, Q) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_U}(P, j^* Q)$$

and

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(v_* Q, u_* P) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_V}(Q, j_* P) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_U}(j^* Q, P).$$

Proof. All four isomorphisms are obtained from adjunction isomorphisms using $u_! P = v_! j_! P$, $Q \xrightarrow{\sim} v^* v_! Q$, and $u_* P = v_* j_* P$, $v^* v_* Q \xrightarrow{\sim} Q$. \square

Remark 3.3. Lemma 3.2 provides alternative equivalent definitions of the categories $\mathbf{Vb}^\subset(X)$ and $\mathbf{Vb}_\sup(X)$. A priori it just gives equivalent descriptions of the morphism spaces, but when working with them, composition is defined in the obvious way.

Realization functors and duality. Lemma 3.2 shows that we obtain faithful additive realization functors

$$(3.3) \quad \mathbf{Vb}^\subset(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{Sh}(X), \quad (U, P) \mapsto u_! P, \text{ and}$$

$$(3.4) \quad \mathbf{Vb}_\sup(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{Sh}(X), \quad (U, P) \mapsto u_* P,$$

where $u: U \subset X$ is the inclusion.

Remark 3.4. In general, these realization functors are not full, see Remarks A.7 and A.12.(a). Lemmata A.5 and A.13 provide classes of objects where these functors are full.

We define an additive functor

$$\begin{aligned} (-)^\vee : \mathbf{Vb}^\subset(X)^{\text{op}} &\rightarrow \mathbf{Vb}_\sup(X), \\ (U, P) &\mapsto (U, P^\vee), \end{aligned}$$

which is given on morphism spaces by

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Vb}^\subset(X)}((U, P), (V, Q)) &\rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Vb}_\sup(X)}((V, Q^\vee), (U, P^\vee)), \\ f &\mapsto f^\vee \end{aligned}$$

where we use $(j_! P)^\vee = \mathcal{H}om(j_! P, \mathcal{O}_V) \cong j_* \mathcal{H}om(P, j^* \mathcal{O}_V) = j_*(P^\vee)$ if $j: U \subset V$ (cf. [Gro05, Exp. I, Cor. 1.5] for the isomorphism). Using Lemma 3.2, the map (3.5) for $U \subset V$ is given by

$$(-)^\vee : \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_U}(P, Q|_U) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_U}(Q^\vee|_U, P^\vee)$$

where we use the obvious identification $(Q|_U)^\vee = Q^\vee|_U$. This description clearly shows that $(-)^\vee$ is a duality with inverse $(-)^\vee$ defined similarly, $\text{id} \xrightarrow{\sim} ((-)^\vee)^\vee$.

If $u: U \rightarrow X$ is an open immersion and P a vector bundle on U we have just observed that $\mathcal{H}om(u_! P, \mathcal{O}_X) \cong u_*(P^\vee)$. This implies that the diagram

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{Vb}^\subset(X)^{\text{op}} & \xrightarrow[(3.3)]{(U, P) \mapsto u_! P} & \mathbf{Sh}(X)^{\text{op}} \\ (-)^\vee \downarrow \sim & & \downarrow (-)^\vee = \mathcal{H}om(-, \mathcal{O}_X) \\ \mathbf{Vb}_\sup(X) & \xrightarrow[(3.4)]{(U, P) \mapsto u_* P} & \mathbf{Sh}(X) \end{array}$$

commutes up to a natural isomorphism.

3.2.3. Construction of Čech enhancements. Assume that X is quasi-compact separated. Let $\mathcal{U} = (U_s)_{s \in S}$ be an ordered finite open covering of X . We fix this covering for the rest of this section; mostly we will even assume that all U_s are affine. Although many constructions will depend on this fixed covering we usually do not indicate this in our notation. If P is a vector bundle on X we may consider the complex

$$P_\sup := \left(\prod_{s_0 \in S} (U_{s_0}, P|_{U_{s_0}}) \rightarrow \prod_{s_0, s_1 \in S, s_0 < s_1} (U_{s_0 s_1}, P|_{U_{s_0 s_1}}) \rightarrow \dots \right)$$

(whose first term is in degree zero) in $\mathrm{Vb}_{\supset}(X)$ whose differentials are defined in the obvious way such that the image of this complex under the functor (3.4) is the complex $\mathcal{C}_*(P)$ (see (3.1)). Here we use that the additive category $\mathrm{Vb}_{\supset}(X)$ has finite products. Similarly, if P is a complex of vector bundles on X , we define $P_{\supset} \in C(\mathrm{Vb}_{\supset}(X))$ as the totalization of the obvious double complex. This defines a dg functor $(-)_{\supset}$ from the dg category of complexes of vector bundles to $C(\mathrm{Vb}_{\supset}(X))$.

We define the dg category $\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_*(X)$ as follows. Its objects are bounded complexes P of vector bundles on X , and morphism spaces are defined by

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_*(X)}(P, Q) := \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Vb}_{\supset}(X))}(P_{\supset}, Q_{\supset})$$

with obvious identities and composition. There is an obvious full and faithful dg functor $\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_*(X) \rightarrow C(\mathrm{Vb}_{\supset}(X))$, $P \mapsto P_{\supset}$. If we compose it with the dg functor induced by (3.4) we obtain a faithful dg functor

$$(3.7) \quad \mathcal{C}_* : \check{\mathrm{Cech}}_*(X) \rightarrow C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$$

which we call \mathcal{C}_* since it maps an object P to $\mathcal{C}_*(P)$. In general, this functor is not full, see Remark 3.5.

Similarly, for each vector bundle P we consider the complex

$$P^{\subset} := \left(\dots \rightarrow \prod_{s_0, s_1 \in S, s_0 < s_1} (U_{s_0 s_1}, P|_{U_{s_0 s_1}}) \rightarrow \prod_{s_0 \in S} (U_{s_0}, P|_{U_{s_0}}) \right)$$

(whose last term is in degree zero) in $\mathrm{Vb}^{\subset}(X)$ whose differentials are defined in the obvious way such that the image of this complex under the functor (3.3) is $\mathcal{C}_!(P)$ (see (3.2)). By totalization we define P^{\subset} for complexes P of vector bundles. Let $\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)$ (resp. $\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!^-(X)$) be the dg category with objects bounded (resp. bounded above) complexes of vector bundles and morphism spaces

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!^{\natural}(X)}(P, Q) := \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Vb}^{\subset}(X))}(P^{\subset}, Q^{\subset})$$

(where $\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!^{\natural}(X)$ is $\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)$ (resp. $\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!^-(X)$)) with obvious identities and composition. There is an obvious full and faithful dg functor $\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!^{\natural}(X) \rightarrow C(\mathrm{Vb}^{\subset}(X))$, $P \mapsto P^{\subset}$. If we compose it with the dg functor induced by (3.3) we obtain a faithful dg functor

$$(3.8) \quad \mathcal{C}_! : \check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!^{\natural}(X) \rightarrow C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$$

which we call $\mathcal{C}_!$ since it maps an object P to $\mathcal{C}_!(P)$. In general, this functor is not full, see Remark 3.5.

Obviously, the dg categories $\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_*(X)$, $\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)$, $\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!^-(X)$ contain all shifts $[m]P$ of their objects P , and the functors (3.7) and (3.8) are compatible with shifts.

Remark 3.5. *If X is a Noetherian separated integral scheme and all U_s are affine then the realization functor (3.8) is full (and faithful) as follows from Lemma A.13. If X is in addition Nagata then (3.7) is full (and faithful) by Lemma A.5.*

These statements are not longer true in general if X is Nagata quasi-compact separated and locally integral: let X be the disjoint union of two non-empty affine Nagata integral schemes U and V and consider the open covering $\mathcal{U} = \{X, U, V\}$.

Diagram (3.6) induces a similar diagram on the level of complexes whose left vertical arrow $(-)^{\vee}: C(\mathrm{Vb}^{\subset}(X))^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{\sim} C(\mathrm{Vb}_{\supset}(X))$ maps P^{\subset} to $(P^{\vee})_{\supset}$. From this diagram we obtain the diagram

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)^{\mathrm{op}} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C}_!} & C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))^{\mathrm{op}} \\ (-)^{\vee} \downarrow \sim & & \downarrow \mathrm{Hom}(-, \mathcal{O}_X) \\ \check{\mathrm{Cech}}_*(X) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C}_*} & C(\mathrm{Sh}(X)) \end{array}$$

of dg categories which is commutative up to a natural isomorphism. Its left vertical arrow is an isomorphism of dg categories (and given on objects by $P \mapsto P^{\vee}$).

Remark 3.6. *Let P and Q be bounded vector bundles on X . If U and V are open subsets of X then*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Vb}^{\subset}(X)}((U, P|_U), (V, Q|_V)) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Vb}_{\supset}(X)}((V, P|_V), (U, Q|_U))$$

since both sides are equal to $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_U}(P|_U, Q|_U)$ if $U \subset V$, by Lemma 3.2, and zero otherwise. These equalities combine to an isomorphism of dg modules

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)}(P, Q) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Hom}_{\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_*(X)}(P, Q).$$

It is however not true that these isomorphisms (together with the identity map on objects) define an isomorphism of dg categories $\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X) \rightarrow \check{\mathrm{Cech}}_(X)$: compatibility with composition is violated (except for very trivial situations).*

The following proposition is the main ingredient for showing that our construction provides enhancements (Propositions 3.12, 3.13, 3.15).

Proposition 3.7. *Let X be a quasi-compact separated scheme with an ordered finite affine open covering $\mathcal{U} = (U_s)_{s \in S}$. Let P and Q be complexes of vector bundles on X , with P bounded above. Then the morphism*

$$(3.10) \quad \mathrm{Hom}_{[C(\mathrm{Vb}^{\subset}(X))]}(P^{\subset}, Q^{\subset}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_!(P), \mathcal{C}_!(Q))$$

induced by (3.3) is an isomorphism.

Remark 3.8. *The assumption that P is bounded above is necessary: Let $X = \mathrm{Spec} A$ where $A = k[\varepsilon]/(\varepsilon^2)$ with k a field, and consider the trivial covering $\mathcal{U} = \{X\}$ of X . Let P be the complex $\dots \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} A \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} A \rightarrow \dots$. Then $P = \mathcal{C}_!(P)$ is zero in $D(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$ but $0 \neq \mathrm{id} \in \mathrm{End}_{[C(\mathrm{Vb}^{\subset}(X))]}(P^{\subset}) = \mathrm{End}_{[C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))]}(P)$.*

Proof. We first prove this under the additional assumption that P is bounded. We can even assume that P is a vector bundle sitting in a single degree: brutal truncation provides a sequence of closed degree zero morphisms $\sigma^{\geq p}(P) \rightarrow P \rightarrow \sigma^{< p}(P) \rightarrow [1]\sigma^{\geq p}(P)$ in the dg category of complexes of vector bundles, for any $p \in \mathbb{Z}$, and we can apply the functors $(-)^{\subset}$ and $\mathcal{C}_!$ to this sequence.

Let $q: \mathcal{C}_!(Q) \rightarrow Q$ be the !-Čech resolution and $q': Q^{\subset} \rightarrow (X, Q)$ the obvious morphism in $Z^0(C(\mathrm{Vb}^{\subset}(X)))$ whose image under the functor induced by (3.3) is q . Consider the

commutative diagram

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Hom}_{[C(\mathrm{Vb}^{\subset}(X))]}(P^{\subset}, Q^{\subset}) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_!(P), \mathcal{C}_!(Q)) \\ q'_* \downarrow & & \downarrow q_* \sim \\ \mathrm{Hom}_{[C(\mathrm{Vb}^{\subset}(X))]}(P^{\subset}, (X, Q)) & & \\ \downarrow \sim & & \\ \mathrm{Hom}_{[C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))]}(\mathcal{C}_!(P), Q) & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{can}} & \mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_!(P), Q) \end{array}$$

whose right vertical arrow q_* and lower left vertical arrow are obviously isomorphisms. Since $\mathcal{C}_!(P)$ is a bounded complex with components finite products of objects $U_J P^p$, where $\emptyset \neq J \subset S$ and $p \in \mathbb{Z}$, Lemma 3.9 below implies that can is an isomorphism as well.

We need to show that the upper left vertical map q'_* in (3.11) is an isomorphism. Equivalently, we show that

$$q'_*: \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Vb}^{\subset}(X))}(P^{\subset}, Q^{\subset}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Vb}^{\subset}(X))}(P^{\subset}, (X, Q))$$

is a quasi-isomorphism for any vector bundle P considered as a complex concentrated in degree zero. Applying brutal truncation to P^{\subset} (and passing to direct summands and shifting) we see that it is enough to show that for an arbitrary fixed $\emptyset \neq I \subset S$ the morphism

$$(3.12) \quad \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Vb}^{\subset}(X))}((V, P|_V), Q^{\subset}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Vb}^{\subset}(X))}((V, P|_V), (X, Q))$$

is a quasi-isomorphism where $V := U_I$. This morphism is the morphism associated to a morphism of double complexes whose b -th row (for $b \in \mathbb{Z}$) is

$$(3.13) \quad \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Vb}^{\subset}(X))}((V, P|_V), (Q^b)^{\subset}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Vb}^{\subset}(X))}((V, P|_V), (X, Q^b)).$$

Since the rows of both double complexes involved are uniformly bounded, the morphism (3.12) is a quasi-isomorphism as soon as we have shown that (3.13) is a quasi-isomorphism for any $b \in \mathbb{Z}$, see [KS94, Thm. 1.9.3].

Hence it is enough to show that (3.12) is a quasi-isomorphism if Q is a vector bundle sitting in degree zero. The degree zero component of the right hand side is

$$H := \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_V}(P|_V, Q|_V),$$

by Lemma 3.2, and all other components vanish. The graded components of the left-hand side are direct sums of objects

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Vb}^{\subset}(X)}((V, P|_V), (U_J, Q|_{U_J})) = \begin{cases} H = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_V}(P|_V, Q|_V), & \text{if } V \subset U_J; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

for non-empty $J \subset S$. By assumption, $M(V) := \{s \in S \mid V \subset U_s\}$ is non-empty, and we have $V \subset U_J$ if and only if $J \subset M(V)$. Hence the left-hand side of (3.12) is the chain complex

$$\dots \rightarrow \prod_{s_0, s_1 \in M(V), s_0 < s_1} H \rightarrow \prod_{s_0 \in M(V)} H \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \dots$$

of a (non-empty) simplex with coefficients in H . The map (3.12) is the augmentation map to H which is a homotopy equivalence and in particular a quasi-isomorphism. This proves that (3.10) is an isomorphism if P is bounded.

Now let P be a bounded above complex of vector bundles. For $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ denote by $P^{\geq a}$ the brutal truncation of P which is zero in all degrees $< a$ and coincides with P in all other degrees, and let $P^{\geq -\infty} := P$. Then P is the filtered colimit of the filtered diagram $0 \hookrightarrow \dots \hookrightarrow P^{\geq a+1} \hookrightarrow P^{\geq a} \hookrightarrow \dots$ in the category $Z^0(C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X)))$.

Let $\kappa: \mathcal{C}_!(Q) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ be a quasi-isomorphism with \mathcal{K} an h-injective complex of sheaves. Consider for any $a \in \mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty\}$ the commutative diagram

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Hom}_{[C(\mathrm{Vb}^c(X))]}((P^{\geq a})^c, Q^c) & & \\ \rho \downarrow & \searrow \text{can} \circ \rho & \\ \mathrm{Hom}_{[C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))]}(\mathcal{C}_!(P^{\geq a}), \mathcal{C}_!(Q)) & \xrightarrow{\text{can}} & \mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_!(P^{\geq a}), \mathcal{C}_!(Q)) \\ \kappa_* \downarrow & & \kappa_* \downarrow \sim \\ \mathrm{Hom}_{[C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))]}(\mathcal{C}_!(P^{\geq a}), \mathcal{K}) & \xrightarrow[\sim]{\text{can}} & \mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_!(P^{\geq a}), \mathcal{K}) \end{array}$$

whose right vertical arrow κ_* and lower horizontal arrow can obviously are isomorphisms; hence the diagonal arrow $\text{can} \circ \rho$ is an isomorphism if and only if the vertical composition $\kappa_* \circ \rho$ is an isomorphism. We already know that $\text{can} \circ \rho$ is an isomorphism for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, and this is also true if we replace $(P^{\geq a})^c$ and $\mathcal{C}_!(P^{\geq a})$ by their shifts $[m](P^{\geq a})^c$ and $[m]\mathcal{C}_!(P^{\geq a})$. Hence we know that

$$(3.15) \quad \kappa_* \circ \rho: \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Vb}^c(X))}((P^{\geq a})^c, Q^c) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_!(P^{\geq a}), \mathcal{K})$$

is a quasi-isomorphism for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, and we need to prove this for $a = -\infty$. Both sides of (3.15), for $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, form inverse systems of dg modules with surjective transitions maps. Hence the inverse limit of the quasi-isomorphisms (3.15), for $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, is again a quasi-isomorphism, by Corollary 3.11, and this inverse limit is canonically isomorphic to the morphism (3.15) for $a = -\infty$. Hence $\text{can} \circ \rho$ in (3.14) is an isomorphism for $a = -\infty$. This proves the proposition. \square

Lemma 3.9. *Let X be a scheme and $u: U \subset X$ the inclusion of an affine open subscheme. Let P be a bounded above complex of vector bundles on U and $G \in C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))$. Then the canonical map is an isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{[C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))]}(u_!P, G) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}(u_!P, G).$$

Proof. Our map appears as the left vertical map in the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathrm{Hom}_{[C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))]}(u_!P, G) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathrm{Hom}_{[C(\mathrm{Sh}(U))]}(P, u^*G) & = & \mathrm{Hom}_{[C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(U))]}(P, u^*G) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \sim \\ \mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}(u_!P, G) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathrm{Sh}(U))}(P, u^*G) & \xleftarrow{\sim} & \mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(U))}(P, u^*G) \end{array}$$

whose left horizontal arrows are isomorphisms because $u_!$ is exact and left adjoint to the exact functor u^* , whose lower right horizontal arrow (which is well defined because $u^*G \in$

$C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(U))$ is an isomorphism because $D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(U)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\mathrm{Qcoh}}(\mathrm{Sh}(U))$ is an equivalence (U being quasi-compact and separated), and whose right vertical arrow is an isomorphism because U is affine and hence P can be viewed as a bounded above complex of projective $\mathcal{O}_U(U)$ -modules. \square

Lemma 3.10. *Let $A_0 \xleftarrow{p_1} A_1 \xleftarrow{p_2} A_2 \leftarrow \dots$ be a directed inverse system of acyclic complexes of abelian groups with all transition maps p_i surjective. Then its inverse limit $\varprojlim A_i$ is also acyclic.*

Proof. We split each complex A_i into short exact sequences $0 \rightarrow K_i^j \rightarrow A_i^j \rightarrow K_i^{j+1} \rightarrow 0$ where K_i^j is the image of $A_i^{j-1} \rightarrow A_i^j$. The maps p_{i+1} induce surjective maps $K_{i+1}^j \rightarrow K_i^j$. For each $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ we obtain a short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow K_i^j \rightarrow A_i^j \rightarrow K_i^{j+1} \rightarrow 0$ of directed inverse systems of abelian groups and the direct system $(K_i^j)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Mittag-Leffler. Hence $0 \rightarrow \varprojlim_i K_i^j \rightarrow \varprojlim_i A_i^j \rightarrow \varprojlim_i K_i^{j+1} \rightarrow 0$ is exact. This implies that $\varprojlim A_i$ is acyclic. \square

Corollary 3.11. *Let $X = (X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $Y = (Y_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be directed inverse systems of complexes of abelian groups with surjective transition maps. Assume that $\phi = (\phi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} : X \rightarrow Y$ is a morphism of directed inverse systems such that each $\phi_i : X_i \rightarrow Y_i$ is a quasi-isomorphism. Then the induced morphism $\varprojlim \phi_i : \varprojlim X_i \rightarrow \varprojlim Y_i$ on the inverse limits is a quasi-isomorphism.*

Proof. Consider the short exact sequences $Y_i \rightarrow \mathrm{Cone}(\phi_i) \rightarrow [1]X_i$ of complexes with the obvious transition maps which are all surjective. By assumption each $\mathrm{Cone}(\phi_i)$ is acyclic, so $\varprojlim \mathrm{Cone}(\phi_i) = \mathrm{Cone}(\varprojlim \phi_i)$ is acyclic, by Lemma 3.10. Now take the long exact sequence associated to the short exact sequence $\varprojlim Y_i \rightarrow \mathrm{Cone}(\varprojlim \phi_i) \rightarrow [1]\varprojlim X_i$ of complexes. \square

Proposition 3.12. *Let X be a (GSP)-scheme with an ordered finite affine open covering $\mathcal{U} = (U_s)_{s \in S}$. Then $\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)$ is a pretriangulated dg category and the functor*

$$\mathcal{C}_! : [\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)] \rightarrow \mathfrak{Pctf}'(X)$$

*induced by (3.8) is an equivalence of triangulated categories. Hence the dg category $\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)$ is naturally an enhancement of $\mathfrak{Pctf}'(X)$. We call it the **!-Čech enhancement**.*

Proof. Certainly $\mathcal{C}_!$ is well-defined. By condition (GSP), any object of $\mathfrak{Pctf}'(X)$ is isomorphic to a bounded complex R of vector bundles and hence to $\mathcal{C}_!(R)$. This shows that $\mathcal{C}_!$ is essentially surjective. The full and faithful dg functor $\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X) \rightarrow C(\mathrm{Vb}^\subset(X))$, $P \mapsto P^\subset$, and Proposition 3.7 then show that $\mathcal{C}_! : [\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)] \rightarrow \mathfrak{Pctf}'(X)$ is an equivalence of categories. We already observed that $\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)$ contains all shifts of its objects, but we need to prove that $\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)$ is pretriangulated. The functor (3.8) extends to a dg functor from the pretriangulated envelope $\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)^{\mathrm{pre-tr}}$ of $\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)$ to $C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$ which obviously induces an equivalence $\mathcal{C}_! : [\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)^{\mathrm{pre-tr}}] \rightarrow \mathfrak{Pctf}'(X)$. Hence $[\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)] \xrightarrow{\sim} [\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)^{\mathrm{pre-tr}}]$ and $\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)$ is pretriangulated. \square

Proposition 3.13. *Let X be a (GSP)-scheme with an ordered finite affine open covering $\mathcal{U} = (U_s)_{s \in S}$. Then the functor*

$$\mathcal{C}_* : [\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_*(X)] \rightarrow \mathfrak{Pctf}(X)$$

is an equivalence of triangulated categories. Hence the dg category $\check{\text{Cech}}_*(X)$ is naturally an enhancement of $\mathfrak{P}\text{erf}(X)$. We call it the **-Čech enhancement*.

Proof. This is just a variation of the proofs of Propositions 3.7 and 3.12, cf. also the proof of Proposition C.1. \square

The following Proposition 3.14 is not used in this article.

Proposition 3.14. *Let X be a Noetherian separated scheme with an ordered finite affine open covering $\mathcal{U} = (U_s)_{s \in S}$. Then the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [\check{\text{Cech}}_!(X)]^{\text{op}} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C}_!} & D(\text{Sh}(X))^{\text{op}} \\ (-)^\vee \downarrow \sim & & \downarrow \mathbf{R}\text{Hom}(-, \mathcal{O}_X) \\ [\check{\text{Cech}}_*(X)] & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C}_*} & D(\text{Sh}(X)) \end{array}$$

of categories induced from diagram (3.9) commutes up to a natural isomorphism. (It is a diagram of triangulated categories if X satisfies condition (GSP).)

Proof. Let $u : U \rightarrow X$ be the inclusion of an affine open subscheme and P a vector bundle on X . Then the functor $\text{Hom}(^U P, -) \cong u_* \text{Hom}(u^*(P), u^*(-)) : \text{Qcoh}(X) \rightarrow \text{Qcoh}(X)$ is (well-defined by Lemma 2.6) and exact since u is affine. Hence, if $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{I}$ is a resolution by injective quasi-coherent sheaves, we obtain a quasi-isomorphism $\text{Hom}(^U P, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(^U P, \mathcal{I})$.

By Theorem 2.5.(b), \mathcal{I} consists of injective sheaves and hence, being bounded below, is an h-injective complex of sheaves (Remark 3.1). Hence $\text{Hom}(^U P, \mathcal{I}) \cong \mathbf{R}\text{Hom}(^U P, \mathcal{O}_X)$ in $D(\text{Sh}(X))$.

These facts imply that the canonical morphism $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}_!(Q), \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}\text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}_!(Q), \mathcal{O}_X)$ is an isomorphism for any bounded complex Q of vector bundles on X . Now use the commutativity of diagram (3.9). \square

Let $\check{\text{Cech}}_!^{-b}(X)$ be the full dg subcategory of $\check{\text{Cech}}_!(X)$ of those objects P whose cohomology is bounded, i.e. $H^i(P) = 0$ for all but finitely many $i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Proposition 3.15. *Let X be a (RES)-scheme with an ordered finite affine open covering $\mathcal{U} = (U_s)_{s \in S}$. Then the dg categories $\check{\text{Cech}}_!^{-}(X)$ and $\check{\text{Cech}}_!^{-b}(X)$ are pretriangulated and the functors*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_! : [\check{\text{Cech}}_!^{-}(X)] &\rightarrow D_{\text{Coh}}^{-}(\text{Sh}(X)) \quad \text{and} \\ \mathcal{C}_! : [\check{\text{Cech}}_!^{-b}(X)] &\rightarrow D_{\text{Coh}}^b(\text{Sh}(X)) \end{aligned}$$

are equivalences of triangulated categories. Hence the dg category $\check{\text{Cech}}_!^{-}(X)$ (resp. $\check{\text{Cech}}_!^{-b}(X)$) is naturally an enhancement of $D^{-}(\text{Coh}(X)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\text{Coh}}^{-}(\text{Qcoh}(X)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\text{Coh}}^{-}(\text{Sh}(X))$ (resp. of $D^b(\text{Coh}(X)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\text{Coh}}^b(\text{Qcoh}(X)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\text{Coh}}^b(\text{Sh}(X))$), cf. equivalence (2.1). We call it the *!-Čech enhancement*.

Proof. If P is a bounded above complex of vector bundles on X , all its cohomology sheaves $H^i(P)$ are coherent since X is Noetherian. Hence both functors are well-defined. They

are essentially surjective by Proposition 2.2. Proposition 3.7 then shows that both functors are equivalences of categories. As in the proof of Proposition 3.12 one shows that the dg categories $\check{\text{Cech}}_!^-(X)$ and $\check{\text{Cech}}_!^{-,b}(X)$ are pretriangulated. \square

3.2.4. *Pullbacks.* We discuss some properties of the categories introduced in section 3.2.2. These results will be used in section 6.

Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be a morphism of schemes. Then there are obvious functors

$$\begin{aligned} f^*: \text{Vb}^\subset(X) &\rightarrow \text{Vb}^\subset(Y), & (U, P) &\mapsto (f^{-1}(U), f^*P), \text{ and} \\ f^*: \text{Vb}_\supset(X) &\rightarrow \text{Vb}_\supset(Y), & (U, P) &\mapsto (f^{-1}(U), f^*P). \end{aligned}$$

Note that their definition on morphism spaces uses both identifications from Lemma A.1, or Remark 3.3. Both these pullback functors commute with the realizations functors, i.e. we have diagrams

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{Vb}^\subset(X) & \xrightarrow[\text{(3.3)}]{(U,P) \mapsto u_! P} & \text{Sh}(X) \\ \downarrow f^* & & \downarrow f^* \\ \text{Vb}^\subset(Y) & \xrightarrow[\text{(3.3)}]{(U',P') \mapsto u'_! P'} & \text{Sh}(Y), \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{Vb}_\supset(X) & \xrightarrow[\text{(3.4)}]{(U,P) \mapsto u_* P} & \text{Sh}(X) \\ \downarrow f^* & & \downarrow f^* \\ \text{Vb}_\supset(Y) & \xrightarrow[\text{(3.4)}]{(U',P') \mapsto u'_* P'} & \text{Sh}(Y) \end{array}$$

that commute up to natural isomorphisms coming from Lemma A.1. Pullback also commutes with the duality, i.e. there is a diagram

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{Vb}^\subset(X)^{\text{op}} & \xrightarrow[\sim]{(-)^\vee} & \text{Vb}_\supset(X) \\ \downarrow f^* & & \downarrow f^* \\ \text{Vb}^\subset(Y)^{\text{op}} & \xrightarrow[\sim]{(-)^\vee} & \text{Vb}_\supset(Y) \end{array}$$

which commutes up to a natural isomorphism, as follows from Lemma 3.16.

Lemma 3.16. *Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be a morphism of schemes. Given $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \in \text{Sh}(X)$, there is a natural morphism $f^* \mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}om(f^* \mathcal{F}, f^* \mathcal{G})$ which is an isomorphism if \mathcal{F} is a vector bundle.*

Proof. Obvious. \square

The pullback functors, the realization functors and the dualities combine to a cube of functors with five commutative faces whose sixth face is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Sh}(X)^{\text{op}} & \xrightarrow{(-)^\vee = \mathcal{H}om(-, \mathcal{O}_X)} & \text{Sh}(X) \\ \downarrow f^* & & \downarrow f^* \\ \text{Sh}(Y)^{\text{op}} & \xrightarrow{(-)^\vee = \mathcal{H}om(-, \mathcal{O}_Y)} & \text{Sh}(Y) \end{array}$$

which comes with a morphism of functors $f^* \mathcal{H}om(-, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}om(f^*(-), \mathcal{O}_Y)$ coming from Lemma 3.16 which is an isomorphism on all objects of the form $u_! P$ where $u: U \subset X$ is an affine inclusion of an open subscheme and P is a vector bundle on U (use Lemmata 3.16, A.1.(b), A.2 and the obvious adjunctions).

3.2.5. Let M be a sheaf on a scheme X . Let $(U, P) \in \mathbf{Vb}^\subset(X)$ and let $u: U \subset X$ be the inclusion. There are morphisms

$$(3.18) \quad (u_* P^\vee) \otimes M \rightarrow u_*(P^\vee \otimes u^* M) \xrightarrow{\sim} u_* \mathcal{H}om(P, u^* M) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{H}om(u_! P, M)$$

constructed as follows: the first morphism corresponds to the obvious morphism $u^*((u_* P^\vee) \otimes M) \xrightarrow{\sim} (u^* u_* P^\vee) \otimes u^* M \rightarrow P^\vee \otimes u^* M$ under the adjunction (u^*, u_*) and is an isomorphism if M is quasi-coherent and u is affine, by Lemma A.3; the second morphism is the isomorphism coming from the obvious isomorphism $P^\vee \otimes u^* M \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{H}om(P, u^* M)$, and the third morphism is the adjunction isomorphism.

Lemma 3.17. *Let M be a quasi-coherent sheaf on a scheme X . Then mapping an object (U, P) of $\mathbf{Vb}^\subset(X)$ to the morphism (3.18) defines a morphism τ from the functor*

$$\mathbf{Vb}^\subset(X)^{\text{op}} \xrightarrow[\sim]{(-)^\vee} \mathbf{Vb}_\sup(X) \xrightarrow[\text{(3.4)}]{(U, P) \mapsto u_* P} \mathbf{Sh}(X) \xrightarrow{(- \otimes M)} \mathbf{Sh}(X)$$

to the functor

$$\mathbf{Vb}^\subset(X)^{\text{op}} \xrightarrow[\text{(3.3)}]{(U, P) \mapsto u_! P} \mathbf{Sh}(X)^{\text{op}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}om(-, M)} \mathbf{Sh}(X).$$

Moreover, if (U, P) is an object of $\mathbf{Vb}^\subset(X)$ such that the inclusion $U \subset X$ is affine, then $\tau_{(U, P)}$ is an isomorphism.

Proof. We need to show that any morphism $\alpha: (U, P) \rightarrow (V, Q)$ in $\mathbf{Vb}^\subset(X)$ gives rise to a commutative square in $\mathbf{Sh}(X)$. We can assume that $j: U \subset V$. Then our morphism is given by $\alpha: j_! P \rightarrow Q$, and $\alpha^\vee: Q^\vee \rightarrow (j_! P)^\vee = \mathcal{H}om(j_! P, \mathcal{O}_V) = j_* \mathcal{H}om(P, \mathcal{O}_U) = j_*(P^\vee)$. Let $u: U \subset X$ and $v: V \subset X$. The morphisms $\tau_{(V, Q)}$ resp. $\tau_{(U, P)}$ appear as the upper resp. lower row in the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} (v_* Q^\vee) \otimes M & \longrightarrow & v_*(Q^\vee \otimes v^* M) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & v_* \mathcal{H}om(Q, v^* M) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathcal{H}om(v_! Q, M) \\ \downarrow v_*(\alpha^\vee) \otimes \text{id}_M & & \downarrow v_*(\alpha^\vee \otimes \text{id}_{v^* M}) & & \downarrow v_*(\alpha^*) & & \downarrow (v_! \alpha)^* \\ (v_* ((j_! P)^\vee)) \otimes M & \longrightarrow & v_* ((j_! P)^\vee \otimes v^* M) & \longrightarrow & v_* \mathcal{H}om(j_! P, v^* M) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathcal{H}om(v_! j_! P, M) \\ \downarrow \sim & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \sim & & \downarrow \sim \\ (u_* P^\vee) \otimes M & \longrightarrow & u_*(P^\vee \otimes u^* M) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & u_* \mathcal{H}om(P, u^* M) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathcal{H}om(u_! P, M) \end{array}$$

whose non-labeled morphisms are the obvious ones. The outer square is the one we need. The last statement is clear from above. \square

Corollary 3.18. *Let X and Y be schemes over a field k , let $p: Y \times X \rightarrow X$ be the second projection, and let M be a quasi-coherent sheaf on $Y \times X$. Then there is a morphism τ' from the functor*

$$\mathbf{Vb}^\subset(X)^{\text{op}} \xrightarrow[\sim]{(-)^\vee} \mathbf{Vb}_\sup(X) \xrightarrow[\text{(3.4)}]{(U, P) \mapsto u_* P} \mathbf{Sh}(X) \xrightarrow{p^*} \mathbf{Sh}(Y \times X) \xrightarrow{(- \otimes M)} \mathbf{Sh}(Y \times X)$$

to the functor

$$\mathbf{Vb}^\subset(X)^{\text{op}} \xrightarrow[\text{(3.3)}]{(U, P) \mapsto u_! P} \mathbf{Sh}(X)^{\text{op}} \xrightarrow{p^*} \mathbf{Sh}(Y \times X)^{\text{op}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}om(-, M)} \mathbf{Sh}(Y \times X).$$

Moreover, if (U, P) is an object of $\mathbf{Vb}^{\subset}(X)$ such that the inclusion $U \subset X$ is affine, then $\tau'_{(U,P)}$ is an isomorphism.

Proof. The commutative diagrams (3.16) and (3.17) show that the first functor is isomorphic to the composition

$$\mathbf{Vb}^{\subset}(X)^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{p^*} \mathbf{Vb}^{\subset}(Y \times X) \xrightarrow[\sim]{(-)^{\vee}} \mathbf{Vb}_{\supset}(Y \times X) \xrightarrow[\text{(3.4)}]{(U,P) \mapsto u_* P} \mathrm{Sh}(Y \times X) \xrightarrow{(- \otimes M)} \mathrm{Sh}(Y \times X)$$

and that the second functor is isomorphic to the composition

$$\mathbf{Vb}^{\subset}(X)^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{p^*} \mathbf{Vb}^{\subset}(Y \times X)^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow[\text{(3.3)}]{(U,P) \mapsto u_! P} \mathrm{Sh}(Y \times X)^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Hom}(-, M)} \mathrm{Sh}(Y \times X).$$

Hence we can use Lemma 3.17. \square

3.3. All enhancements are equivalent.

Remark 3.19. All enhancements mentioned above are equivalent when defined, i. e. the corresponding dg categories are quasi-equivalent. In the non-obvious cases this can be proved using the method of [LSb, Prop. 2.50].

Remark 3.20. In many cases all enhancements of $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}(X)$ (resp. $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(X))$) are quasi-equivalent, for example for X a quasi-projective scheme over a field k , by [LO10, Thm. 2.12, Thm. 2.13]. Paolo Stellari informed the second author that he and Alberto Canonaco can prove uniqueness of enhancements of $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}(X)$ and $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(X))$ for a Noetherian semi-separated scheme X having the resolution property; in the meantime, their preprint has appeared, see [CS15].

If we work on a scheme over a ring R , all the above constructions and results have obvious R -linear analogs, e. g. all enhancements discussed above are then dg R -categories in the obvious way.

There are other enhancements one could consider, for example enhancements using Drinfeld dg quotient categories or “morphism oriented Čech enhancements”, see [LSb]. We do not consider these two types of enhancements in this article because they seem to be badly behaved with respect to products of schemes. The Čech enhancements from section 3.2 were found starting from the “object oriented $*$ -Čech enhancements” discussed in appendix C (and used in [LSa]) which are based on [BLL04, Lemma 6.7].

4. SMOOTHNESS OF CATEGORIES AND SCHEMES

Let k be a field. Recall that a dg k -category \mathcal{A} is smooth over k if \mathcal{A} is a perfect dg $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{op}}$ -module, cf. [LS14, Def. 3.7, Rem. 3.9], and that smoothness is invariant under quasi-equivalences and even under Morita equivalences (see [LSa, Lemma 2.30]).

Definition 4.1. Let X be a quasi-compact separated scheme over a field k . We say that the triangulated category $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}(X) \cong \mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}'(X)$ is **smooth over k** if the dg k -category $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}^{\mathrm{h-inj}}(X)$ is smooth over k . Similarly, if X is a Noetherian separated scheme over a field k , we say that the triangulated category $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(X))$ is **smooth over k** if the dg k -category $C_{\mathrm{Coh}}^{\mathrm{h-inj}, b}(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))$ is smooth over k .

Remark 4.2. *In the above definition we could have chosen any of the equivalent enhancements from section 3, cf. Remark 3.19. If a uniqueness result for enhancements of $\mathfrak{P}erf(X)$ (resp. $D^b(\text{Coh}(X))$) is known (cf. Remark 3.20) one can test k -smoothness on any enhancement.*

Theorem 4.3 (Homological versus geometric smoothness). *Let X be a Noetherian (GSP)-scheme over a field k and assume that $X \times X$ is also Noetherian. Let $\Delta: X \rightarrow X \times X$ be the diagonal (closed) immersion. Then the following two conditions are equivalent:*

- (a) $\mathfrak{P}erf(X)$ is smooth over k ;
- (b) $\Delta_*(\mathcal{O}_X) \in \mathfrak{P}erf(X \times X)$.

If X is in addition of finite type over k , they are also equivalent to:

- (c) X is smooth over k .

In particular, if X is a separated scheme of finite type over k having the resolution property (for example if X is quasi-projective over k), then the above three conditions are equivalent.

Corollary 4.4. *Let X be a smooth quasi-compact separated scheme over a field k . Then $\mathfrak{P}erf(X) = D^b(\text{Coh}(X))$ is smooth over k .*

Proof of Corollary 4.4. Smoothness over k and quasi-compactness imply that X is of finite type over k and hence of finite dimension, so Proposition 2.1 shows that $\mathfrak{P}erf(X) = D^b(\text{Coh}(X))$. Any regular Noetherian separated scheme has the resolution property, by a theorem of Kleiman [Har77, Ex. III.6.8], so that we can apply Theorem 4.3. \square

Theorem 4.5. *Let X be a separated scheme of finite type over a perfect field k that has the resolution property. Then $D^b(\text{Coh}(X))$ is smooth over k .*

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of these two theorems.

Remark 4.6. *The first two conditions of Theorem 4.3 are tautologically equivalent for any affine scheme over a field. Namely, assume that $U = \text{Spec } R$ is an affine scheme over a field k . Then Example 2.3 shows that $\mathfrak{P}erf(U) = \text{per}(R)$ and $\mathfrak{P}erf(U \times U) = \text{per}(R \otimes R)$. The dg category $C^b(\text{proj}(R))$ of bounded complexes of finitely generated projective R -modules is an enhancement of $\mathfrak{P}erf(U) = \text{per}(R)$, in fact it is the enhancement $\check{\text{Cech}}_*(U) = \check{\text{Cech}}_!(U)$ for the trivial open covering of U . Viewing R as a dg category, the obvious inclusion $R \rightarrow C^b(\text{proj}(R))$ is a Morita equivalence. This implies that $\mathfrak{P}erf(U)$ is k -smooth if and only if R is k -smooth as a dg algebra, i. e. $R \in \text{per}(R \otimes R)$, if and only if $\Delta_*(\mathcal{O}_U) \in \mathfrak{P}erf(U \times U)$.*

4.1. Künneth formula and some consequences. We refer to Appendix A.3 for the definition of the bifunctor \boxtimes . This bifunctor is exact (Lemma A.14) and computed on all complexes of sheaves, in particular on objects of the derived categories, in the naive way (Remark A.18).

Proposition 4.7 (Künneth formula, cf. [Kem80, Thm. 14]). *Let X and Y be quasi-compact separated schemes over a field k . Let I (resp. J) be a complex of $\Gamma(X, -)$ -acyclic (resp. $\Gamma(Y, -)$ -acyclic) quasi-coherent sheaves on X (resp. Y) and let $\sigma: I \boxtimes J \rightarrow L$ be a quasi-isomorphism where L is a complex of $\Gamma(X \times Y, -)$ -acyclic quasi-coherent sheaves (the global*

section functors are considered as functors between categories of quasi-coherent sheaves). Then the composition

$$\Gamma(X, I) \otimes \Gamma(Y, J) \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} \Gamma(X \times Y, I \boxtimes J) \xrightarrow{\Gamma(\sigma)} \Gamma(X \times Y, L)$$

is a quasi-isomorphism of dg modules.

From the following proof of this proposition one easily deduces an isomorphism

$$\mathbf{R}\Gamma(X, -) \otimes \mathbf{R}\Gamma(Y, ?) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{R}\Gamma(X \times Y, -\boxtimes?)$$

of functors $D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X)) \times D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(Y)) \rightarrow D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(\mathrm{Spec} k))$.

Proof. Let \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} be ordered finite affine open coverings of X and Y , respectively. Consider the $*$ -Čech resolutions $i: I \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_*(I)$ and $j: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_*(J)$. By Lemma 2.7, the complex $\mathcal{C}_*(I)$ (resp. $\mathcal{C}_*(J)$) consists of $\Gamma(X, -)$ -acyclic (resp. $\Gamma(Y, -)$ -acyclic) quasi-coherent sheaves. Similarly, using Lemma A.16.(c), $i \boxtimes j: I \boxtimes J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_*(I) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_*(J)$ is a quasi-isomorphism to a componentwise $\Gamma(X \times Y, -)$ -acyclic complex, and there is a canonical isomorphism (essentially an equality)

$$\gamma: \Gamma(X, \mathcal{C}_*(I)) \otimes \Gamma(Y, \mathcal{C}_*(J)) \xrightarrow{\sim} \Gamma(X \times Y, \mathcal{C}_*(I) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_*(J)).$$

Let $\lambda: L \rightarrow L'$ be a quasi-isomorphism with L' a fibrant complex of quasi-coherent sheaves. Let $\tau: \mathcal{C}_*(I) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_*(J) \rightarrow L'$ be a quasi-isomorphism such that $\tau \circ (i \boxtimes j) = \lambda \circ \sigma$ in the homotopy category $[C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X \times Y))]$ (we could even assume that this holds in $Z^0(C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X \times Y)))$ since $i \boxtimes j$ is a trivial cofibration and L' is fibrant). Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \Gamma(X, \mathcal{C}_*(I)) \otimes \Gamma(Y, \mathcal{C}_*(J)) & \xrightarrow[\gamma]{\sim} & \Gamma(X \times Y, \mathcal{C}_*(I) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_*(J)) & \xrightarrow{\Gamma(\tau)} & \Gamma(X \times Y, L') \\ \uparrow \Gamma(i) \otimes \Gamma(j) & & \uparrow \Gamma(i \boxtimes j) & & \uparrow \Gamma(\lambda) \\ \Gamma(X, I) \otimes \Gamma(Y, J) & \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} & \Gamma(X \times Y, I \boxtimes J) & \xrightarrow{\Gamma(\sigma)} & \Gamma(X \times Y, L) \end{array}$$

which is commutative in the homotopy category $[C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(\mathrm{Spec} k))]$.

Since the functor $\Gamma(X, -): \mathrm{Qcoh}(X) \rightarrow \mathrm{Qcoh}(\mathrm{Spec} k)$ is of finite cohomological dimension (by Lemma 2.8) the map $\Gamma(i)$ is a quasi-isomorphism (by [SS, Lemma 12.4.(b)]). Similarly, $\Gamma(j)$ is a quasi-isomorphism, and $\Gamma(i) \otimes \Gamma(j)$ is a quasi-isomorphism because k is a field. Similarly, since both λ and τ are quasi-isomorphisms between complexes of $\Gamma(X \times Y, -)$ -acyclic quasi-coherent sheaves (use Remark 3.1), $\Gamma(\lambda)$ and $\Gamma(\tau)$ are quasi-isomorphisms. This implies the proposition. \square

Proposition 4.8. *Let X and Y be Noetherian separated schemes over a field k such that $X \times Y$ is also Noetherian. Let $E \in D_{\mathrm{Coh}}^-(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$ and $F \in D_{\mathrm{Coh}}^-(\mathrm{Sh}(Y))$ be objects that are isomorphic to bounded above complexes of vector bundles. Let I and J be bounded below complexes of injective quasi-coherent sheaves on X and Y , respectively. Let $\tau: I \boxtimes J \rightarrow T$ be a quasi-isomorphism with T a bounded below complex of injective quasi-coherent sheaves. Then the composition*

$$C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))(E, I) \otimes_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(Y))}(F, J) \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} C(\mathrm{Sh}(X \times Y))(E \boxtimes F, I \boxtimes J) \xrightarrow{\tau_*} C(\mathrm{Sh}(X \times Y))(E \boxtimes F, T)$$

is a quasi-isomorphism of dg modules. Here we abbreviate ${}_{\gamma}(-, -) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\gamma}(-, -)$.

Proof. Since an injective quasi-coherent sheaf on a Noetherian scheme is also an injective sheaf, by Theorem 2.5.(b), we can assume that E and F are bounded above complexes of vector bundles.

Then $\mathcal{H}om(E, I)$, $\mathcal{H}om(F, J)$, and $\mathcal{H}om(E \boxtimes F, T)$ are bounded below complexes of injective quasi-coherent sheaves. In particular their components are Γ -acyclic. We will prove below that the composition

$$(4.1) \quad \tau_* \circ \text{can}: \mathcal{H}om(E, I) \boxtimes \mathcal{H}om(F, J) \xrightarrow{\text{can}} \mathcal{H}om(E \boxtimes F, I \boxtimes J) \xrightarrow{\tau_*} \mathcal{H}om(E \boxtimes F, T)$$

is a quasi-isomorphism. Assuming this for a moment, Proposition 4.7 shows that the composition $\Gamma(\tau_* \circ \text{can}) \circ \boxtimes$ in the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma(\mathcal{H}om(E, I)) \otimes \Gamma(\mathcal{H}om(F, J)) & \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} & \Gamma(\mathcal{H}om(E, I) \boxtimes \mathcal{H}om(F, J)) \\ \boxtimes \downarrow & \swarrow \Gamma(\text{can}) & \downarrow \Gamma(\tau_* \circ \text{can}) \\ \Gamma(\mathcal{H}om(E \boxtimes F, I \boxtimes J)) & \xrightarrow{\Gamma(\tau_*)} & \Gamma(\mathcal{H}om(E \boxtimes F, T)) \end{array}$$

is a quasi-isomorphism, and this implies the proposition.

Now let us prove that (4.1) is a quasi-isomorphism. The claim is local on X and Y , by Theorem 2.5.(c). Hence we can assume that $X = \text{Spec } A$ and $Y = \text{Spec } B$ are affine. Then E and F are bounded above complexes of finitely generated projective modules over A and B , respectively. When testing whether (4.1) induces an isomorphism on cohomology in a fixed degree, only finitely many components of E and F are involved. Now use that

$$\text{Hom}_A(A, I) \otimes \text{Hom}_B(B, J) \xrightarrow[\sim]{\text{can}} \text{Hom}_{A \otimes B}(A \otimes B, I \otimes J) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{A \otimes B}(A \otimes B, T)$$

is obviously a quasi-isomorphism since it identifies with $I \otimes J = I \otimes J \rightarrow T$. \square

4.2. Some preparations.

Lemma 4.9. *Let I be an injective sheaf on a scheme X . If F is a flat sheaf on X , then $\mathcal{H}om(F, I)$ is an injective sheaf. If P is a vector bundle on X and $U \subset X$ an open subscheme, then ${}^U P$ is flat and $\mathcal{H}om({}^U P, I)$ is an injective sheaf. If X is Noetherian and I is injective quasi-coherent, then $\mathcal{H}om({}^U P, I)$ is injective quasi-coherent.*

Proof. The functor $\text{Hom}_{\text{Sh}(X)}(-, \mathcal{H}om(F, I)) \cong \text{Hom}_{\text{Sh}(X)}(- \otimes F, I)$ is exact. This proves first and second claim since ${}^U P = u_! u^* P$ is certainly flat, where $u: U \hookrightarrow X$ is the open immersion.

We have $\mathcal{H}om(u_! u^* P, I) \cong u_* \mathcal{H}om(u^* P, u^* I) \cong \mathcal{H}om(P, u_* u^* I) \cong P^\vee \otimes u_* u^* I$, reproving injectivity since $u^* = u^!$ and u_* preserve injective sheaves. Let X be Noetherian and I injective quasi-coherent. Then $u^* I$ is injective quasi-coherent by Theorem 2.5.(c), and u_* preserves quasi-coherence by Lemma 2.6 since X and U are Noetherian. Hence $u_* u^* I$ and $P^\vee \otimes u_* u^* I$ are injective quasi-coherent. \square

Corollary 4.10. *Let X be a scheme. Let $F \in C(\text{Sh}(X))$ be a bounded above complex of flat sheaves and $I \in C(\text{Sh}(X))$ a bounded below complex of injective sheaves. Then $\mathcal{H}om(F, I)$ is a bounded below complex of injective sheaves. In particular, it is h -injective and fibrant as an object of $Z^0(C(\text{Sh}(X)))$.*

Proof. The boundedness condition is obvious, and each component of $\mathcal{H}om(F, I)$ is injective as a finite product of sheaves $\mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{I})$ where \mathcal{F} is a flat sheaf and \mathcal{I} is an injective sheaf (use Lemma 4.9). The last claim follows from Remark 3.1. \square

Corollary 4.11. *Let X be a Noetherian scheme, $I \in C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$ a bounded below complex of injective quasi-coherent sheaves and $F \in C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$ a bounded above complex of sheaves whose components are finite products of sheaves of the form U^*P where P is a vector bundle on X and $U \subset X$ is an open subscheme. Then $\mathcal{H}om(F, I)$ is a bounded below complex of injective sheaves and injective quasi-coherent sheaves and fibrant and h -injective as an object of $Z^0(C(\mathrm{Sh}(X)))$ or $Z^0(C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X)))$.*

Proof. The boundedness condition is obvious, and each component of $\mathcal{H}om(F, I)$ is injective quasi-coherent as a finite product of sheaves $\mathcal{H}om(U^*P, J)$ where P and U are as above and J is an injective quasi-coherent sheaf (use Lemma 4.9). Now use Theorem 2.5.(b) and Remark 3.1. \square

Lemma 4.12. *Let X be a scheme over a field k . Let $\Delta: X \rightarrow X \times X$ be the diagonal immersion and let $p, q: X \times X \rightarrow X$ be first and second projection. Let \mathcal{I} be an h -injective complex of sheaves on X and $\Delta_*(\mathcal{I}) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ a quasi-isomorphism with \mathcal{K} an h -injective complex of sheaves on $X \times X$. Let $j: U \rightarrow X$ be the immersion of an open subscheme and P a vector bundle on U . Then the obvious morphism*

$$(4.2) \quad p_*(\mathcal{H}om(q^*j_!P, \Delta_*\mathcal{I})) \rightarrow p_*(\mathcal{H}om(q^*j_!P, \mathcal{K}))$$

in $C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$ is a quasi-isomorphism between h -injective objects and hence a homotopy equivalence (= an isomorphism in $[C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))]$). If \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{K} are even fibrant, the same is true for both complexes in (4.2).

Proof. The following commutative diagram with two cartesian squares explains our notation.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} U & \xrightarrow{j} & X & & \\ \downarrow \Delta' & & \downarrow \Delta & & \\ X \times U & \xrightarrow{j'} & X \times X & \xrightarrow{p} & X \\ \downarrow q' & & \downarrow q & & \\ U & \xrightarrow{j} & X & & \end{array}$$

Define $p' := p \circ j': X \times U \rightarrow X$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} p_*(\mathcal{H}om(q^*j_!P, -)) &\xleftarrow{\sim} p_*(\mathcal{H}om(j'_!q'^*P, -)) && \text{(by Lemma A.1.(b))} \\ &\xleftarrow{\sim} p'_*(\mathcal{H}om(q'^*P, j'^*(-))) && \text{(by adjunction)} \\ &\xleftarrow{\sim} p'_*(Q \otimes j'^*(-)) \end{aligned}$$

where we abbreviate $Q := (q'^*P)^\vee$. Hence the morphism (4.2) is identified with the morphism

$$(4.3) \quad p'_*(Q \otimes j'^*\Delta_*\mathcal{I}) \rightarrow p'_*(Q \otimes j'^*\mathcal{K}).$$

This morphism is obtained by applying p'_* to the morphism

$$Q \otimes j'^* \Delta_* \mathcal{I} \rightarrow Q \otimes j'^* \mathcal{K}$$

which is certainly a quasi-isomorphism. To see that (4.3) is a quasi-isomorphism it is hence enough to show that $Q \otimes j'^* \Delta_* \mathcal{I}$ is h-limp ($:=$ K-limp) and that $Q \otimes j'^* \mathcal{K}$ is h-injective, by [Spa88, Cor. 5.17].

The claim for $Q \otimes j'^* \mathcal{K}$ is clear because $j'_!$ and $(- \otimes Q^\vee)$ are exact and left adjoint to j'^* and $\mathcal{H}om(Q^\vee, -) \xleftarrow{\sim} (Q \otimes -)$, respectively. From Lemma A.1.(a) and the projection formula [Har77, Exercise II.5.1.(d)] we obtain

$$(4.4) \quad Q \otimes j'^* \Delta_* \mathcal{I} \xrightarrow{\sim} Q \otimes \Delta'_* j^* \mathcal{I} \xrightarrow{\sim} \Delta'_*((\Delta'^* Q) \otimes j^* \mathcal{I}).$$

Similarly as above, $(\Delta'^* Q) \otimes j^* \mathcal{I}$ is h-injective, and in particular h-limp. Hence $\Delta'_*((\Delta'^* Q) \otimes j^* \mathcal{I})$ is h-limp by [Spa88, Prop. 5.15.(b)]. This proves that $Q \otimes j'^* \Delta_* \mathcal{I}$ is h-limp. We conclude that (4.3) is a quasi-isomorphism.

Flatness of p' implies that $p'^* : \mathrm{Sh}(X) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sh}(X \times U)$ is exact, so $p'_*(Q \otimes j'^* \mathcal{K})$ is h-injective. On the other hand, (4.4) yields

$$p'_*(Q \otimes j'^* \Delta_* \mathcal{I}) \xrightarrow{\sim} p'_* \Delta'_*((\Delta'^* Q) \otimes j^* \mathcal{I}) = j_*((\Delta'^* Q) \otimes j^* \mathcal{I})$$

and exactness of j^* and h-injectivity of $(\Delta'^* Q) \otimes j^* \mathcal{I}$ show that this object is h-injective.

Recall from Remark 3.1 that a fibrant complex of sheaves is the same thing as an h-injective complex of injective sheaves. If \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{K} are componentwise injective, the exact left adjoint functors used above also show that $p'_*(Q \otimes j'^* \mathcal{K})$ and $j_*((\Delta'^* Q) \otimes j^* \mathcal{I}) \xleftarrow{\sim} p'_*(Q \otimes j'^* \Delta_* \mathcal{I})$ are componentwise injective. This proves the last claim. \square

Corollary 4.13. *Let X , p , q , Δ , \mathcal{I} , \mathcal{K} and $\Delta_* \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ be as in Lemma 4.12 and assume in addition that X is quasi-compact separated and that \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{K} are bounded below complexes of injective sheaves. Let P be a bounded above complex of vector bundles on X . We also fix an ordered finite affine open covering $\mathcal{U} = (U_s)_{s \in S}$ of X . Then the obvious morphism*

$$(4.5) \quad p_*(\mathcal{H}om(q^*(\mathcal{C}_!(P)), \Delta_* \mathcal{I})) \rightarrow p_*(\mathcal{H}om(q^*(\mathcal{C}_!(P)), \mathcal{K}))$$

in $C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$ is a quasi-isomorphism between bounded below complexes of injective sheaves and hence a homotopy equivalence.

Proof. Both complexes in (4.5) are bounded below since $\mathcal{C}_!(P)$ is bounded above and both $\Delta_* \mathcal{I}$ and \mathcal{K} are bounded below. Recall from Remark 3.1 that a bounded below complex of injective sheaves is the same thing as a bounded below fibrant complex. If P is bounded, brutal truncation and passing to direct summands reduces the statement of the corollary to that of Lemma 4.12.

Now assume that P is bounded above. Fix $d \in \mathbb{Z}$ and limit attention to the components of the morphism (4.5) in degrees $d-1$, d and $d+1$. These components coincide with those of

$$p_*(\mathcal{H}om(q^*(\mathcal{C}_!(\sigma^{\geq a}(P))), \Delta_* \mathcal{I})) \rightarrow p_*(\mathcal{H}om(q^*(\mathcal{C}_!(\sigma^{\geq a}(P))), \mathcal{K}))$$

if $a \ll 0$ is sufficiently small (where $\sigma^{\geq a}(P)$ denotes the brutal truncation of P), and we already know that this morphism is a quasi-isomorphism between (bounded below) complexes of injective sheaves. This implies that (4.5) induces an isomorphism on the d -th

cohomology sheaves, and that the degree d components of both sides of (4.5) are injective sheaves. \square

4.3. Dualities and !-Čech enhancements. Let X be a scheme. Given $\mathcal{J} \in C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$ we define the dg functor

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}} := \mathcal{H}om(-, \mathcal{J}): C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))^{\mathrm{op}} \rightarrow C(\mathrm{Sh}(X)).$$

If \mathcal{J} is an h-injective complex of sheaves, $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}$ induces the functor

$$(4.6) \quad \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}} = \mathcal{H}om(-, \mathcal{J}) = \mathbf{R}\mathcal{H}om(-, \mathcal{J}): D(\mathrm{Sh}(X))^{\mathrm{op}} \rightarrow D(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$$

of triangulated categories. There are two important cases where this functor restricts to an equivalence on $\mathfrak{P}erf'(X)$ or $D_{\mathrm{Coh}}^b(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$.

4.3.1. Duality for perfect complexes. Let \mathcal{J} be a bounded below complex of injective sheaves on X which is isomorphic to \mathcal{O}_X in $D(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$. In this case the functor (4.6) is isomorphic to $\mathbf{R}\mathcal{H}om(-, \mathcal{O}_X)$ and induces an equivalence

$$(4.7) \quad \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}: \mathfrak{P}erf'(X)^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{P}erf'(X)$$

of triangulated categories which is a duality since $\mathrm{id} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}^2$ naturally ([Sta14, Lemma 08DQ]).

Lemma 4.14. *Let X be a quasi-compact separated scheme, let \mathcal{J} be a bounded below complex of injective sheaves on X which is isomorphic to \mathcal{O}_X in $D(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$, and fix an ordered finite affine open covering $\mathcal{U} = (U_s)_{s \in S}$ of X . Then the dg functor*

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}} \circ \mathcal{C}_!: \check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C}_!} C(\mathrm{Sh}(X)) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}} C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))^{\mathrm{op}}$$

lands in the full dg subcategory of bounded below complexes of injective sheaves and is quasi-faithful, i. e. the morphism

$$(4.8) \quad \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}} \circ \mathcal{C}_!: \mathrm{Hom}_{\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)}(P, Q) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(Q)), \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(P)))$$

is a quasi-isomorphism for all $P, Q \in \check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)$.

Proof. For $P \in \check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)$, the object $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(P)) = \mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{C}_!(P), \mathcal{J})$ is a bounded below complex of injective sheaves and h-injective by Corollary 4.10 since all sheaves $U_I(P^p)$ are flat.

Let $P, Q \in \check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)$. For $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Hom}_{[\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)]}([m]P, Q) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}} \circ \mathcal{C}_!} & \mathrm{Hom}_{[C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))]}([m]\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(Q)), \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(P))) \\ \downarrow \mathcal{C}_! & & \downarrow \mathrm{can} \\ \mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}([m]\mathcal{C}_!(P), \mathcal{C}_!(Q)) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}} & \mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}([m]\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(Q)), \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(P))) \end{array}$$

whose arrows are induced by the indicated functors. The left vertical arrow $\mathcal{C}_!$ is an isomorphism by Proposition 3.7, the lower horizontal arrow $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}$ is an isomorphism by the duality equivalence (4.7), and the right vertical arrow can is an isomorphism since $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(P))$ is h-injective. Hence the upper horizontal arrow is an isomorphism, and this just means that (4.8) is a quasi-isomorphism. \square

4.3.2. Duality for bounded derived categories of coherent sheaves. Let X be a locally Noetherian scheme that has a dualizing complex in the sense of [Har66, V.2, p. 258]. Let \mathcal{J} be a dualizing complex. We can (by [Har66, V.2, p. 257], using Theorem 2.5.(b)) and will assume that \mathcal{J} is a bounded complex of injective quasi-coherent sheaves on X . Then the functor (4.6) induces an equivalence

$$(4.9) \quad \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}: D_{\text{Coh}}^b(\text{Sh}(X))^{\text{op}} \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\text{Coh}}^b(\text{Sh}(X))$$

of triangulated categories (see [Har66, V.2]) satisfying $\text{id} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}^2$.

Lemma 4.15. *Let X be a Noetherian separated scheme having a dualizing complex \mathcal{J} . Assume that \mathcal{J} is a bounded complex of injective quasi-coherent sheaves on X . Fix an ordered finite affine open covering $\mathcal{U} = (U_s)_{s \in S}$ of X . Then the dg functor*

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}} \circ \mathcal{C}_! : \check{\text{Cech}}_!^{-,b}(X) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C}_!} C(\text{Sh}(X)) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}} C(\text{Sh}(X))^{\text{op}}$$

lands in the full dg subcategory of bounded below complexes of injective quasi-coherent sheaves and is quasi-fully faithful, i. e. the morphism

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}} \circ \mathcal{C}_! : \text{Hom}_{\check{\text{Cech}}_!^{-,b}(X)}(P, Q) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{C(\text{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(Q)), \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(P)))$$

is a quasi-isomorphism for all $P, Q \in \check{\text{Cech}}_!^{-,b}(X)$.

Proof. This is proved in the same way as Lemma 4.14, using Corollary 4.11 instead of Corollary 4.10 and the duality equivalence (4.9) instead of (4.7). \square

4.4. Homological smoothness and the structure sheaf of the diagonal.

Proof of Theorem 4.3. Let X be a Noetherian (GSP)-scheme over a field k and assume that $X \times X$ is also Noetherian. Fix an ordered finite affine open covering $\mathcal{U} = (U_s)_{s \in S}$ of X . Then k -smoothness of $\mathfrak{P}\text{erf}(X) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{P}\text{erf}'(X)$ is equivalent to k -smoothness of its enhancement $\check{\text{Cech}}_!(X)$ (Proposition 3.12, Remark 4.2).

Let E be a classical generator of $\mathfrak{P}\text{erf}'(X)$ (which exists by [BvdB03, 2.1, 3.1]). We can and will assume that E is a bounded complex of vector bundles, by condition (GSP). (We can even assume that E is a vector bundle by replacing E by the direct sum of its components.) Then $E \in \check{\text{Cech}}_!(X)$. By [LSa, Prop. 2.18], k -smoothness of $\check{\text{Cech}}_!(X)$ is equivalent to k -smoothness of the dg algebra

$$A := \text{End}_{\check{\text{Cech}}_!(X)}(E),$$

i. e. to the condition $A \in \text{per}(A \otimes A^{\text{op}})$. We also know that E^{\vee} is a classical generator of $\mathfrak{P}\text{erf}'(X)$, by (4.7), and that $E^{\vee} \boxtimes E$ is a classical generator of $\mathfrak{P}\text{erf}'(X \times X)$ and a compact generator of $D_{\text{Qcoh}}(\text{Sh}(X \times X))$, by [BvdB03, Lemma 3.4.1, 3.1, 2.1].

Let $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{J}$ be a resolution by injective quasi-coherent sheaves. Note that \mathcal{J} consists of injective sheaves (by Theorem 2.5.(b)). As before we abbreviate $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}} = \mathcal{H}om(-, \mathcal{J})$. Lemma 4.14 shows that

$$(4.10) \quad \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}} \circ \mathcal{C}_! : A = \text{End}_{\check{\text{Cech}}_!(X)}(E) \rightarrow \text{End}_{C(\text{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(E)))^{\text{op}}$$

is a quasi-isomorphism of dg algebras. Note that $\mathcal{C}_!(E) \rightarrow E$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(E) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(E))$ are quasi-isomorphisms. In particular, we find a quasi-isomorphism $i : \mathcal{C}_!(E) \rightarrow I$ with I

a bounded below complex of injective quasi-coherent sheaves on X . The object $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(E))$ is already a bounded below complex of injective quasi-coherent sheaves, by Corollary 4.11. Let $\tau: \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(E)) \boxtimes I \rightarrow T$ be a quasi-isomorphism with T a bounded below complex of injective quasi-coherent sheaves. Consider the object

$$P := \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(E)) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_!(E)$$

and the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A^{\text{op}} \otimes A & & & & \\ \downarrow (\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}} \circ \mathcal{C}_!) \otimes \mathcal{C}_! & \searrow (\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}} \circ \mathcal{C}_!) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_! & & & \\ {}_X(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(E)), \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(E))) \otimes {}_X(\mathcal{C}_!(E), \mathcal{C}_!(E)) & \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} & {}_{X \times X}(P, P) & \xrightarrow{(\tau \circ (\text{id} \boxtimes i))_*} & {}_{X \times X}(P, T) \\ \downarrow \text{id} \otimes i_* & & \downarrow (\text{id} \boxtimes i)_* & & \parallel \\ {}_X(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(E)), \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(E))) \otimes {}_X(\mathcal{C}_!(E), I) & \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} & {}_{X \times X}(P, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(E)) \boxtimes I) & \xrightarrow{\tau_*} & {}_{X \times X}(P, T) \end{array}$$

where we abbreviate ${}_{\mathcal{J}}(-, -) := \text{Hom}_{C(\text{Sh}(\mathcal{J}))}(-, -)$. The left vertical composition $(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}} \circ \mathcal{C}_!) \otimes (i_* \circ \mathcal{C}_!)$ is a quasi-isomorphism because it is the tensor product over the field k of the quasi-isomorphism (4.10) with the quasi-isomorphism $i_* \circ \mathcal{C}_!: A \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{C(\text{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_!(E), I)$ (use Proposition 3.12 and the fact that the complex I of sheaves is h-injective as a bounded below complex of injective (quasi-coherent) sheaves (Theorem 2.5.(b) and Remark 3.1)). The composition in the lower row is a quasi-isomorphism by Proposition 4.8. Hence the composition of the morphism

$$(4.11) \quad A^{\text{op}} \otimes A \xrightarrow{(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}} \circ \mathcal{C}_!) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_!} \text{End}_{C(\text{Sh}(X \times X))}(P)$$

of dg algebras with the upper right horizontal map $(\tau \circ (\text{id} \boxtimes i))_*$ in the above diagram is a quasi-isomorphism.

Recall the enhancement $C_{\text{Qcoh}}^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Sh}(X \times X))$ of $D(\text{Qcoh}(X \times X)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\text{Qcoh}}(\text{Sh}(X \times X))$ from section 3.1. Note that $\tau \circ (\text{id} \boxtimes i): P \rightarrow T$ is a quasi-isomorphism and that T is an h-injective complex of sheaves on the Noetherian scheme $X \times X$ (Theorem 2.5.(b) and Remark 3.1) and a compact generator of $[C_{\text{Qcoh}}^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Sh}(X \times X))] \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\text{Qcoh}}(\text{Sh}(X \times X))$ because it is isomorphic to $E^{\vee} \boxtimes E$ (use Remark A.18). We apply Proposition B.1.(b) to the dg subcategory $C_{\text{Qcoh}}^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Sh}(X \times X))$ of $C(\text{Sh}(X \times X))$ and β there the morphism (4.11) and obtain an equivalence

$$F := \text{Hom}_{C(\text{Sh}(X \times X))}(P, -): [C_{\text{Qcoh}}^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Sh}(X \times X))] \xrightarrow{\sim} D(A^{\text{op}} \otimes A)$$

of triangulated categories. The category on the left identifies with $D_{\text{Qcoh}}(\text{Sh}(X \times X))$, and F induces an equivalence $\mathfrak{Perf}'(X \times X) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{per}(A^{\text{op}} \otimes A)$ on the subcategories of compact objects. Recall that A is k -smooth if and only if A^{op} is k -smooth (see e.g. [LS14, Remark 3.11]). We claim that F maps (an h-injective lift of) $\Delta_*(\mathcal{O}_X)$ to (an object isomorphic to) A^{op} .

Let $\Delta_*(\mathcal{J}) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ be a quasi-isomorphism with \mathcal{K} a bounded below complex of injective quasi-coherent sheaves on $X \times X$. Then \mathcal{K} consists of injective sheaves (by Theorem 2.5.(b)). Let $p, q: X \times X \rightarrow X$ be first and second projection. We have canonical identifications and

quasi-isomorphisms of $\mathrm{dg} \ A^{\mathrm{op}} \otimes A$ -modules

$$\begin{aligned}
F(\mathcal{K}) &= \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(X \times X))}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(E)) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_!(E), \mathcal{K}) \\
&= \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(X \times X))}(p^* \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(E)) \otimes q^* \mathcal{C}_!(E), \mathcal{K}) \\
&= \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(X \times X))}(p^* \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(E)), \mathcal{H}om(q^* \mathcal{C}_!(E), \mathcal{K})) && \text{(by adjunction)} \\
&= \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(E)), p_*(\mathcal{H}om(q^* \mathcal{C}_!(E), \mathcal{K}))) && \text{(by adjunction)} \\
&\leftarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(E)), p_*(\mathcal{H}om(q^*(\mathcal{C}_!(E)), \Delta_* \mathcal{J}))) && \text{(homotopy equiv. by Cor. 4.13)} \\
&= \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(E)), p_* \Delta_*(\mathcal{H}om(\Delta^* q^*(\mathcal{C}_!(E)), \mathcal{J}))) && \text{(by adjunction)} \\
&= \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(E)), \mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{C}_!(E), \mathcal{J})) \\
&= \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(E)), \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(E))) && \text{(by definition)} \\
&\leftarrow A^{\mathrm{op}} && \text{(quasi-isom. by (4.10)).}
\end{aligned}$$

This proves our claim and shows the equivalence of (a) and (b) in Theorem 4.3.

If X is in addition of finite type over k , the equivalence of (b) and (c) follows from Proposition 4.16. Finally, recall from Remark 2.4.(c) that any separated scheme of finite type over k having the resolution property satisfies condition (GSP). \square

4.5. Geometric smoothness and the structure sheaf of the diagonal.

Proposition 4.16. *Let X be a separated scheme locally of finite type over a field k , and let $\Delta: X \rightarrow X \times X$ be the diagonal (closed) immersion. Consider the following conditions.*

- (a) X is smooth over k .
- (b) $\Delta_*(\mathcal{O}_X) \in \mathfrak{Perf}'(X \times X)$.
- (c) X is regular.

Then (a) and (b) are equivalent, and they imply (c). If the field k is perfect, these three conditions are equivalent.

Proof. Conditions (a) and (c) are obviously local on X , and the same is true for condition (b): if $(U_i)_{i \in I}$ is an open covering of X , then the sets $(U_i \times U_i)_{i \in I}$ together with $(X \times X) \setminus \Delta(X)$ form an open covering of $X \times X$, and the restriction of $\Delta_*(\mathcal{O}_X)$ to $X \times X \setminus \Delta(X)$ is zero.

Hence we can assume that $X = \mathrm{Spec} R$ for R a finitely generated k -algebra. Then the condition $\Delta_*(\mathcal{O}_X) \in \mathfrak{Perf}'(X \times X)$ means precisely that $R \in \mathrm{per}(R \otimes R)$, by Example 2.3. Now all claims follow from the following Proposition 4.17. \square

Proposition 4.17. *Let R be a finitely generated algebra over a field k and put $X = \mathrm{Spec} R$. Consider the following conditions.*

- (i) X is smooth over k .
- (ii) $R \in \mathrm{per}(R \otimes R)$.
- (iii) $\mathrm{projdim}_{R \otimes R} R < \infty$.
- (iv) There are a positive even integer i and a positive odd integer j such that $HH_i(R, R) = 0$ and $HH_j(R, R) = 0$. Here $HH_*(R, R)$ denotes the Hochschild homology of the k -algebra R with values in R .
- (v) R is regular.

Then the four conditions (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) are equivalent, and they imply (v). If the field k is perfect, all five conditions are equivalent.

We give condition (iv) just for curiosity and treat it separately in the following proof.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): Then $X \times X$ is smooth over k and in particular regular ([GW10, Cor. 6.32]. So $R \otimes R$ is regular or, equivalently, of finite global dimension. This means that the diagonal bimodule R has a finite resolution by finitely generated projective $R \otimes R$ -modules (since $R \otimes R$ is Noetherian).

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii): trivial.

(iii) \Rightarrow (v): Let $P \rightarrow R$ be a finite resolution by projective $R \otimes R$ -modules. Let M be any R -module. Then $M \otimes_R P \rightarrow M \otimes_R R = M$ is a quasi-isomorphism since both P and R consist of flat left R -modules (they are h-flat as dg left R -modules). Each $M \otimes_R P^i$ is a projective R -module as a direct summand of a direct sum of modules of the form $M \otimes_R (R \otimes R) = M \otimes R$. Hence $M \otimes_R P \rightarrow M$ is a finite projective resolution, so the projective dimension of M over R is smaller than the length of the resolution P . Hence R has finite global dimension and is regular.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i): Let \bar{k} be an algebraic closure of k and put $\bar{R} = R \otimes \bar{k}$. Applying $(- \otimes \bar{k})$ to a finite projective resolution of R shows that $\text{projdim}_{\bar{R} \otimes \bar{k} \bar{R}} \bar{R} < \infty$. We already know that (iii) implies (v). Hence \bar{R} is regular, so R is smooth over k (by [GW10, Cor. 6.32]).

(iii) \Rightarrow (iv): trivial.

(iv) \Rightarrow (i): This is the main theorem of [AVP92].

Finally, if k is perfect, it is well known that regularity and k -smoothness are equivalent (see e. g. [Liu02, Cor. 3.33]). \square

4.6. Smoothness of bounded derived categories of coherent sheaves. We will need the following two results for the proof of Theorem 4.5.

Theorem 4.18. *Let X be a separated scheme of finite type over a field. Then the category $D^b(\text{Coh}(X))$ has a classical generator.*

Proof. The proof of [Lun10, Prop. 6.8] (where the field is assumed to be perfect) also works over an arbitrary field because the regular locus of a scheme that is locally of finite type over a field is open, by [GW10, Rem. 6.25.(4)]. \square

Theorem 4.19. *Let X and Y be separated schemes of finite type over a perfect field k . If S and T are classical generators of $D^b(\text{Coh}(X))$ and $D^b(\text{Coh}(Y))$, respectively, then $S \boxtimes T$ is a classical generator of $D^b(\text{Coh}(X \times Y))$.*

Remark 4.20. *The assumption that k is perfect is necessary: Let $k \subset K$ be a finite purely inseparable field extension (e. g. $\mathbb{F}_2(t^2) \subset \mathbb{F}_2(t)$) and consider $X = Y = \text{Spec } K$. Since $K \otimes K$ is not reduced (i. e. it contains a non-zero nilpotent element), $X \times X$ is not regular and $\mathfrak{P}\text{erf}(X \times X) \subsetneq D^b(\text{Coh}(X \times X))$, by Proposition 2.1. Consider the classical generators $E = F = K$ of $D^b(\text{Coh}(X)) = \mathfrak{P}\text{erf}(X)$. Then $E \boxtimes F = K \otimes K$ is a classical generator of $\mathfrak{P}\text{erf}(X \times X)$ but not of $D^b(\text{Coh}(X \times X))$.*

Proof. The proof of [Lun10, Thm. 6.3] shows that there are classical generators S' and T' of $D^b(\text{Coh}(X))$ and $D^b(\text{Coh}(Y))$, respectively, such that $S' \boxtimes T'$ is a classical generator of $D^b(\text{Coh}(X \times Y))$. From $S' \in \text{thick}(S)$ we obtain $S' \boxtimes T' \in \text{thick}(S \boxtimes T')$, so $S \boxtimes T'$ is a classical generator of $D^b(\text{Coh}(X \times Y))$. Similarly, we see that $S \boxtimes T$ is a classical generator of $D^b(\text{Coh}(X \times Y))$. \square

We now have all ingredients for the proof of Theorem 4.5; it is similar to that of Theorem 4.3.

Proof of Theorem 4.5. Let X be a separated scheme of finite type over a perfect field k that has the resolution property. The category $D^b(\text{Coh}(X)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\text{Coh}}^b(\text{Qcoh}(X)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\text{Coh}}^b(\text{Sh}(X))$ has a classical generator G (Theorem 4.18). Since X is a (RES)-scheme we can and will assume that G is a bounded above complex of vector bundles with bounded coherent cohomology (Proposition 2.2).

Fix an ordered finite affine open covering $\mathcal{U} = (U_s)_{s \in S}$ of X and consider G as an object of the enhancement $\check{\text{Cech}}_!^{-,b}(X)$ of $D_{\text{Coh}}^b(\text{Sh}(X))$ (Proposition 3.15). By [LSa, Prop. 2.18], k -smoothness of $\check{\text{Cech}}_!^{-,b}(X)$ is equivalent to k -smoothness of the dg algebra

$$A := \text{End}_{\check{\text{Cech}}_!^{-,b}(X)}(G).$$

Since any scheme of finite type over a field has a dualizing complex ([Har66, V.10, p. 299]), there is a bounded complex \mathcal{J} of injective quasi-coherent sheaves on X that is a dualizing complex. Abbreviate $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}} = \mathcal{H}om(-, \mathcal{J})$. Lemma 4.15 shows that

$$(4.12) \quad A = \text{End}_{\check{\text{Cech}}_!^{-,b}(X)}(G) \rightarrow \text{End}_{C(\text{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(G)))^{\text{op}}$$

is a quasi-isomorphism of dg algebras. The object $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(G)$ is a classical generator of $D_{\text{Coh}}^b(\text{Sh}(X))$ by the duality equivalence (4.9), and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(G) \boxtimes G$ is a classical generator of $D^b(\text{Coh}(X \times X)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\text{Coh}}^b(\text{Sh}(X \times X))$, by Theorem 4.19. Note that $\mathcal{C}_!(G) \rightarrow G$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(G))$ are quasi-isomorphisms. In particular, we find a quasi-isomorphism $i : \mathcal{C}_!(G) \rightarrow I$ with I a bounded below complex of injective quasi-coherent sheaves on X . Note that $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(G))$ is already a bounded below complex of injective quasi-coherent sheaves, by Corollary 4.11. Let $\tau : \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(G)) \boxtimes I \rightarrow T$ be a quasi-isomorphism with T a bounded below complex of injective quasi-coherent sheaves. The object

$$P := \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(G)) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_!(G)$$

is a classical generator of $D_{\text{Coh}}^b(\text{Sh}(X \times X))$ because it is isomorphic to $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(G) \boxtimes G$. As in the proof of Theorem 4.3 we see that the composition of the morphism

$$A^{\text{op}} \otimes A \xrightarrow{(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}} \circ \mathcal{C}_!) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_!} \text{End}_{C(\text{Sh}(X \times X))}(P)$$

of dg algebras with the morphism

$$(\tau \circ (\text{id} \boxtimes i))_* : \text{End}_{C(\text{Sh}(X \times X))}(P) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{C(\text{Sh}(X \times X))}(P, T)$$

is a quasi-isomorphism. Recall the enhancement $C_{\text{Coh}}^{+,b}(\text{InjSh}(X \times X))$ of $D^b(\text{Coh}(X \times X)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\text{Coh}}^b(\text{Sh}(X \times X))$ from section 3.1. Note that $T \in C_{\text{Coh}}^{+,b}(\text{InjSh}(X \times X))$ by Theorem 2.5.(b)

and that $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(X \times X))$ is Karoubian by [LC07]. We are allowed to apply Proposition B.1.(a) in this setting and see that

$$F := \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(X \times X))}(P, -) : [C_{\mathrm{Coh}}^{+,b}(\mathrm{InjSh}(X \times X))] \rightarrow \mathrm{per}(A^{\mathrm{op}} \otimes A)$$

is an equivalence of triangulated categories. Certainly $\Delta_*(\mathcal{J}) \in D_{\mathrm{Coh}}^b(\mathrm{Sh}(X \times X))$. We claim that F maps $\Delta_*(\mathcal{J})$ (or rather a lift of this object to $C_{\mathrm{Coh}}^{+,b}(\mathrm{InjSh}(X \times X))$) to (an object isomorphic to) A^{op} .

Let $\Delta_*(\mathcal{J}) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ be a quasi-isomorphism with \mathcal{K} a bounded below complex of injective quasi-coherent sheaves on $X \times X$, so $\mathcal{K} \in C_{\mathrm{Coh}}^{+,b}(\mathrm{InjSh}(X \times X))$ by Theorem 2.5.(b). Let $p, q : X \times X \rightarrow X$ be first and second projection. We have canonical identifications and quasi-isomorphisms of dg $A^{\mathrm{op}} \otimes A$ -modules

$$\begin{aligned} F(\mathcal{K}) &= \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(X \times X))}(p^* \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(G)) \otimes q^* \mathcal{C}_!(G), \mathcal{K}) \\ &= \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(X \times X))}(p^* \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(G)), \mathcal{H}om(q^* \mathcal{C}_!(G), \mathcal{K})) && \text{(by adjunction)} \\ &= \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(G)), p_*(\mathcal{H}om(q^* \mathcal{C}_!(G), \mathcal{K}))) && \text{(by adjunction)} \\ &\leftarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(G)), p_*(\mathcal{H}om(q^*(\mathcal{C}_!(G)), \Delta_* \mathcal{J}))) && \text{(homotopy equiv. by Cor. 4.13)} \\ &= \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(G)), p_* \Delta_*(\mathcal{H}om(\Delta^* q^*(\mathcal{C}_!(G)), \mathcal{J}))) && \text{(by adjunction)} \\ &= \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(G)), \mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{C}_!(G), \mathcal{J})) \\ &= \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(G)), \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{C}_!(G))) && \text{(by definition)} \\ &\leftarrow A^{\mathrm{op}} && \text{(quasi-isom. by (4.12)).} \end{aligned}$$

This proves our claim and shows that $A^{\mathrm{op}} \in \mathrm{per}(A^{\mathrm{op}} \otimes A)$. Hence A^{op} is smooth over k . This is equivalent to A being smooth over k (see e.g. [LS14, Remark 3.11]). \square

5. PROPERNESS OF CATEGORIES AND SCHEMES

Lemma 5.1. *Let X be a separated scheme of finite type over a field k which is not proper over k . Then there is an affine closed curve $C \subset X$. (By a curve we mean a separated scheme of finite type over the field k which is integral and of dimension one.) In particular, the k -vector space $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X, \mathcal{O}_C) = \Gamma(C; \mathcal{O}_C)$ is infinite-dimensional.*

Proof. If C is an affine curve then certainly $\dim_k \Gamma(C; \mathcal{O}_C) = \infty$ because otherwise $\Gamma(C; \mathcal{O}_C)$ would be an Artinian ring.

By [GW10, Prop. 12.58.(5), Prop. 12.59] we can assume that X is integral (and not proper over k).

The case $\dim X = 0$ can not occur: if $\dim X = 0$ we can view X as a closed subscheme of some \mathbb{A}_k^n , by [GW10, Prop. 5.20], and all points of X are closed points of \mathbb{A}_k^n ; then the composition $X \subset \mathbb{A}_k^n \subset \mathbb{P}_k^n$ is a closed immersion so that X is even projective over k in contradiction to our assumption.

If $\dim X = 1$ take $C = X$ which is an affine closed curve by [Sta14, Lemma 0A28].

Assume that $\dim X > 1$. By Nagata's compactification theorem (see [Lüt93, Con07], [GW10, Thm. 12.70]) we can assume that X is an open dense subscheme of a scheme Y which is proper over k . In particular, Y is separated and of finite type over k . By replacing

Y with Y_{red} (which still contains X as an open dense subscheme) we can assume that Y is integral.

Since X is not proper over k we have $X \subsetneq Y$, so there is a closed point $y \in Y \setminus X$, by [Sta14, Lemma 005E].

If $\{y\}$ is an irreducible component of $Y \setminus X$ then y is contained in an irreducible closed subset $D \subset Y$ of dimension one. Then $D \cap X$ is a non-empty irreducible closed subset of X , and we can take C to be $D \cap X$ equipped with the induced reduced scheme structure, by [Sta14, Lemma 0A28], because C is not proper over k (otherwise, since D is separated over k , the inclusion $C \subset D$ would be proper, and in particular closed, so that C would be a non-empty closed and open strict subset of the irreducible set D).

Otherwise all irreducible components C_1, \dots, C_n of $Y \setminus X$ containing y are strictly bigger than $\{y\}$. Let $\text{Spec } A = U \subset Y$ be an affine open neighborhood of y , and let $\mathfrak{m} \subset A$ be the maximal ideal corresponding to y . Let $\mathfrak{p}_i \in \text{Spec } A$ be the prime ideal corresponding to $C_i \cap U$. Then $\mathfrak{p}_i \subsetneq \mathfrak{m}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. By [AM69, Prop. 1.11.(i)] there is an element $f \in \mathfrak{m}$ with $f \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{p}_i$. Then $\mathcal{V}(f) \subset U$ is equi-codimensional of codimension one in U , by [GW10, Thm. 5.32], and contains y . Let D be an irreducible component of $\mathcal{V}(f)$ containing y . Then $\dim D = \dim U - 1 = \dim Y - 1 = \dim X - 1$, and D contains a point of X : otherwise $D \subset Y \setminus X$, so $D \subset C_i$ for some i , so $D = C_i \cap U$ because $\dim D = \dim X - 1 \geq \dim(Y \setminus X) \geq \dim C_i = \dim(C_i \cap U)$, hence $C_i \cap U = D \subset \mathcal{V}(f)$ and we obtain the contradiction $f \in \mathfrak{p}_i$.

Let \overline{D} be the closure of D in Y equipped with the induced reduced scheme structure. Then $\overline{D} \cap X$ is non-empty and closed in X , has dimension $\dim \overline{D} = \dim D = \dim X - 1$, and is not proper over k because otherwise the open immersion $\overline{D} \cap X \subsetneq \overline{D}$ would be closed. By induction we find an affine closed curve $C \subset \overline{D} \cap X$. \square

Definition 5.2. *Let k be a field and \mathcal{T} a triangulated k -linear category. We say that \mathcal{T} is **proper over k** if \mathcal{T} has a classical generator and*

$$\dim_k \left(\bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(E, [n]F) \right) < \infty$$

*for all objects $E, F \in \mathcal{T}$. We say that \mathcal{T} is **locally proper over k** if the second condition holds.*

Remark 5.3. *The terminology of Definition 5.2 is motivated by the corresponding terminology for dg k -categories, see e. g. [LSa, Def. 2.11]. If k is a field and \mathcal{T} a triangulated k -linear category admitting a k -linear enhancement, then \mathcal{T} is locally proper (resp. proper) over k if and only if a/any k -linear enhancement of \mathcal{T} is locally proper (resp. proper) over k as a dg k -category (use [LSa, Prop. 2.18], the fact that a dg k -algebra is locally proper if and only if it is proper, and that, given a pretriangulated dg category \mathcal{E} having a compact generator, its homotopy category $[\mathcal{E}]$ has a classical generator).*

Remark 5.4. *Let X be a quasi-compact separated scheme over a field k . Then $\mathfrak{P}erf(X)$ has a classical generator, by [BvdB03, 2.1, 3.1], so $\mathfrak{P}erf(X)$ is proper over k if and only if it is locally proper over k . Similarly, if X is a separated scheme of finite type over a field k , then $D^b(\text{Coh}(X))$ has a classical generator by Theorem 4.18, so $D^b(\text{Coh}(X))$ is proper over k if and only if it is locally proper over k .*

Theorem 5.5 (Homological versus geometric properness). *Let X be a separated scheme of finite type over a field k . If X is proper over k , then $\mathfrak{Pctf}(X)$ is proper over k . If X has the resolution property, the converse is also true.*

Proof. Assume that X is proper over k . For $E, F \in \mathfrak{Pctf}(X)$ (or even $F \in D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(X)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\mathrm{Coh}}^b(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))$) and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, the dimension of

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))}(E, [n]F) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))}(\mathcal{O}_X, [n]\mathbf{R}\mathcal{H}om(E, F)) \cong H^n(X; \mathbf{R}\mathcal{H}om(E, F))$$

is finite since X is proper over k and $\mathbf{R}\mathcal{H}om(E, F) \in D_{\mathrm{Coh}}^b(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))$, by [Gro61, Thm. 3.2.1]. Moreover, since X is quasi-compact, $H^n(X; \mathbf{R}\mathcal{H}om(E, F))$ is nonzero for at most finitely many $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ (by Lemma 2.8). This implies that $\mathfrak{Pctf}(X)$ is proper over k .

Assume now that X has the resolution property and is not proper over k . Lemma 5.1 shows that X contains an affine closed curve C , and in particular $\dim_k \Gamma(C; \mathcal{O}_C) = \infty$. Let $i: C \subset X$ be the inclusion. Since X has the resolution property, $i_*\mathcal{O}_C$ has a resolution $\cdots \rightarrow P^{-1} \rightarrow P^0 \rightarrow i_*\mathcal{O}_C \rightarrow 0$ by vector bundles. Let $\mathcal{U} = (U_s)_{s \in S}$ be an ordered finite affine open covering of X . Given any complex A of quasi-coherent sheaves on X we have $\Gamma(X; \mathcal{C}_*(A)) \cong \mathbf{R}\Gamma(X; A)$ by [SS, Lemma 12.4.(b)] because all components of $\mathcal{C}_*(A)$ are acyclic with respect to the functor $\Gamma(X; -): \mathrm{Qcoh}(X) \rightarrow \mathrm{Qcoh}(\mathrm{Spec} k)$ of finite cohomological dimension (by Lemmata 2.7 and 2.8). Let Q be obtained from P by replacing all components in degrees $< -|S|$ by zero. Then the complexes $\mathcal{C}_*(Q)$ and $\mathcal{C}_*(P)$ coincide in all degrees ≥ -1 , and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))}(\mathcal{O}_X, Q) &\cong H^0(\mathbf{R}\Gamma(X; Q)) \cong H^0(\Gamma(X; \mathcal{C}_*(Q)) = H^0(\Gamma(X; \mathcal{C}_*(P)) \\ &\cong H^0(\mathbf{R}\Gamma(X; P)) \cong H^0(\mathbf{R}\Gamma(X; i_*\mathcal{O}_C) \cong \Gamma(X; i_*\mathcal{O}_C) \cong \Gamma(C; \mathcal{O}_C). \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathcal{O}_X and Q are in $\mathfrak{Pctf}(X)$ and $\dim_k \Gamma(C; \mathcal{O}_C) = \infty$ we see that $\mathfrak{Pctf}(X)$ is not proper over k . \square

Theorem 5.6. *Let X be a separated scheme X of finite type over a field k . Then $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(X))$ is proper over k if and only if X is proper over k and regular.*

Proof. If X is regular and proper, then $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(X)) = \mathfrak{Pctf}(X)$ by Proposition 2.1, and Theorem 5.5 shows that this category is proper over k .

Let X be not proper. Then, by Lemma 5.1, there is an affine closed curve $i: C \subset X$ with $\dim_k \mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))}(\mathcal{O}_X, i_*\mathcal{O}_C) = \infty$. Since \mathcal{O}_X and $i_*\mathcal{O}_C$ are coherent sheaves on X this shows that $D^b(\mathrm{Coh}(X))$ is not proper.

Now assume that X is not regular. Then there is a non-regular closed point $x \in X$. Then $\kappa(x) = \mathcal{O}_{X,x}/\mathfrak{m}_x$ has infinite projective dimension as an $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ -module. This implies that $\mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}^n(\kappa(x), \kappa(x)) \neq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (apply $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}(-, \kappa(x))$ to a minimal free resolution of $\kappa(x)$). Equip $\{x\} = \overline{\{x\}}$ with the induced reduced scheme structure and let $i: \{x\} \rightarrow X$ be the closed embedding. It factors as the composition $\{x\} \xrightarrow{c} \mathrm{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{X,x} \xrightarrow{l} X$ of affine morphisms. We can view $\kappa(x) = \mathcal{O}_{X,x}/\mathfrak{m}_x$ as a coherent sheaf on $\mathrm{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ and as a coherent sheaf on $\{x\}$. Hence $l_*(\kappa(x)) = l_*(c_*(\kappa(x))) = i_*(\kappa(x)) \in \mathrm{Coh}(X)$. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ the adjunction $(l^* = \mathbf{L}l^*, l_* = \mathbf{R}l_*)$ yields

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))}(l_*(\kappa(x)), [n]l_*(\kappa(x))) \cong \mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}}^n(\kappa(x), \kappa(x)).$$

This shows that $D^b(\text{Coh}(X))$ is not proper over k . \square

6. FOURIER-MUKAI FUNCTORS

Our aim in this section is to prove Theorem 6.4. Recall that for a quasi-compact separated scheme X the category $D(\text{Qcoh}(X)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\text{Qcoh}}(\text{Sh}(X))$ is generated by a single perfect object (see [BvdB03, Thm. 3.1.1]) and that the dg subcategory $C^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))$ of $C(\text{Qcoh}(X))$ consisting of h-injective objects is an enhancement of $D(\text{Qcoh}(X))$ (see section 3.1).

Proposition 6.1. *Let X be a (GSP)-scheme. Fix an ordered finite affine open covering $\mathcal{U} = (U_s)_{s \in S}$ of X . Let $E \in C(\text{Qcoh}(X))$ be a bounded complex of vector bundles that is a generator of $D(\text{Qcoh}(X))$. Consider the dg $(\mathbb{Z}-)$ algebras $A = \text{End}_{\check{\text{Cech}}_*(X)}(E)$ and $B = \text{End}_{\check{\text{Cech}}_!(X)}(E)$. Then:*

(a) *The functor*

$$\text{Hom}_{C(\text{Qcoh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_*(E), -): [C^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))] \xrightarrow{\sim} D(A)$$

is an equivalence of triangulated categories.

(b) *The triangulated functor*

$$(6.1) \quad \text{Hom}_{C(\text{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_!(E), -): [C(\text{Qcoh}(X))] \rightarrow D(B)$$

maps acyclic objects to zero and factors uniquely to an equivalence

$$(6.2) \quad \text{Hom}_{C(\text{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_!(E), -): D(\text{Qcoh}(X)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D(B)$$

of triangulated categories.

Proof. (a) Note that $\mathcal{C}_*(E)$ is a complex of quasi-coherent sheaves, and let $z: \mathcal{C}_*(E) \rightarrow I$ be a quasi-isomorphism with $I \in C^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))$. Then the first map in

$$(6.3) \quad A = \text{End}_{\check{\text{Cech}}_*(X)}(E) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C}_*} \text{End}_{C(\text{Qcoh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_*(E)) \xrightarrow{z_*} \text{Hom}_{C(\text{Qcoh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_*(E), I)$$

is a morphism of dg algebras and the composition is a quasi-isomorphism: its n -th cohomology appears as the first row in the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{Hom}_{[\check{\text{Cech}}_*(X)]}(E, [n]E) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C}_*} & \text{Hom}_{[C(\text{Qcoh}(X))]}(\mathcal{C}_*(E), [n]\mathcal{C}_*(E)) & \xrightarrow{z_*} & \text{Hom}_{[C(\text{Qcoh}(X))]}(\mathcal{C}_*(E), [n]I) \\ & \searrow \mathcal{C}_* \sim & \downarrow & & \downarrow \sim \\ & & \text{Hom}_{D(\text{Qcoh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_*(E), [n]\mathcal{C}_*(E)) & \xrightarrow{z_* \sim} & \text{Hom}_{D(\text{Qcoh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_*(E), [n]I) \end{array}$$

whose diagonal arrow is an isomorphism by Proposition 3.13. Since E is a compact generator of $D(\text{Qcoh}(X))$ (see [BvdB03, Thm. 3.1.1]) we see that I is a compact generator of $[C^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))]$ and can apply Proposition B.1.(b).

(b) Since $\mathcal{C}_!(E)$ is a bounded complex with components finite products of objects $U_J E^p$, where $\emptyset \neq J \subset T$ and $p \in \mathbb{Z}$, Lemma 3.9 implies that

$$(6.4) \quad \text{Hom}_{[C(\text{Sh}(X))]}(\mathcal{C}_!(E), G) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}_{D(\text{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_!(E), G)$$

is an isomorphism for every $G \in C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))$. This shows that the functor (6.1) maps acyclic objects to zero and hence factors uniquely to the functor (6.2) we claim to be an equivalence.

Let $E \rightarrow I$ be a quasi-isomorphism with $I \in C^{\mathrm{h-inj}}(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))$ and let z be the composition $\mathcal{C}_!(E) \rightarrow E \rightarrow I$ in $C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$. Then the composition

$$(6.5) \quad B = \mathrm{End}_{\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)}(E) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C}_!} \mathrm{End}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_!(E)) \xrightarrow{z_*} \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_!(E), I)$$

is a quasi-isomorphism: this is proved as the fact that (6.3) is a quasi-isomorphism, using Proposition 3.12 and (6.4) (we only use here that I is a complex of quasi-coherent sheaves). Similarly, using the equivalence $D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\mathrm{Qcoh}}(\mathrm{Sh}(X))$ (X being quasi-compact separated) and (6.4) again, one proves that

$$z^*: \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))}(I, J) = \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}(I, J) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_!(E), J)$$

is a quasi-isomorphism for all $J \in C^{\mathrm{h-inj}}(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))$. Hence Proposition B.1.(b) shows that the restriction of (6.1) to $[C^{\mathrm{h-inj}}(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))]$ is an equivalence. This obviously implies that (6.2) is an equivalence. \square

Proposition 6.2. *Let X and Y be Noetherian (GSP)-schemes over a field k and assume that $Y \times X$ is also Noetherian. Let $E \in C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))$ and $F \in C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(Y))$ be bounded complexes of vector bundles that are generators of $D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))$ and $D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(Y))$, respectively. Fix ordered finite affine open coverings $\mathcal{U} = (U_s)_{s \in S}$ of X and $\mathcal{V} = (V_t)_{t \in T}$ of Y . Consider the dg (k -)algebras $A = \mathrm{End}_{\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_*(X)}(E)$ and $B = \mathrm{End}_{\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(Y)}(F)$. Then there is a triangulated functor*

$$(6.6) \quad \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(Y \times X))}(\mathcal{C}_!(F) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_!(E^\vee), -): [C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(Y \times X))] \rightarrow D(B \otimes A^{\mathrm{op}})$$

which factors uniquely to an equivalence

$$(6.7) \quad \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(Y \times X))}(\mathcal{C}_!(F) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_!(E^\vee), -): D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(Y \times X)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D(B \otimes A^{\mathrm{op}})$$

of triangulated categories.

Proof. Recall the duality isomorphism $(-)^{\vee}: \check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \check{\mathrm{Cech}}_*(X)$ of dg categories from (3.9). It yields an isomorphism

$$\alpha: \mathrm{End}_{\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(X)}(E^\vee) \xrightarrow{\sim} A^{\mathrm{op}} = \mathrm{End}_{\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_*(X)}(E)^{\mathrm{op}}$$

of dg algebras. Let $P := \mathcal{C}_!(F) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_!(E^\vee)$. The morphism of dg algebras

$$(6.8) \quad \mathcal{C}_! \boxtimes (\mathcal{C}_! \circ \alpha^{-1}): B \otimes A^{\mathrm{op}} \rightarrow \mathrm{End}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(Y \times X))}(P)$$

then defines the triangulated functor (6.6). Lemmata 3.9 and A.16.(b) show that

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{[C(\mathrm{Sh}(Y \times X))]}(P, G) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathrm{Sh}(Y \times X))}(P, G)$$

is an isomorphism for every $G \in C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(Y \times X))$. This implies that the functor (6.6) factors uniquely to the functor (6.7) we claim to be an equivalence.

Recall that $F \boxtimes E^\vee$ is a compact generator of $D_{\mathrm{Qcoh}}(\mathrm{Sh}(Y \times X))$ by [BvdB03, Lemma 3.4.1], and so is the quasi-isomorphic object P . Let $E^\vee \rightarrow I$ and $F \rightarrow J$ be quasi-isomorphisms with I and J bounded below complexes of injective quasi-coherent sheaves on X and Y , respectively. Let i be the composition $\mathcal{C}_!(E^\vee) \rightarrow E^\vee \rightarrow I$ and j the composition $\mathcal{C}_!(F) \rightarrow F \rightarrow J$.

Then $j \boxtimes i: P \rightarrow J \boxtimes I$ is a quasi-isomorphism. Let $\tau: J \boxtimes I \rightarrow T$ be a quasi-isomorphism with T a bounded below complex of injective quasi-coherent sheaves.

Consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 B \otimes A^{\text{op}} & & & & \\
 \mathcal{C}_! \otimes (\mathcal{C}_! \circ \alpha^{-1}) \downarrow & \searrow \mathcal{C}_! \boxtimes (\mathcal{C}_! \circ \alpha^{-1}) & & & \\
 {}_X(\mathcal{C}_!(F), \mathcal{C}_!(F)) \otimes {}_X(\mathcal{C}_!(E^\vee), \mathcal{C}_!(E^\vee)) & \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} & {}_{Y \times X}(P, P) & \xrightarrow{(\tau \circ (j \boxtimes i))^*} & {}_{Y \times X}(P, T) \\
 \downarrow j_* \otimes i_* & & \downarrow (j \boxtimes i)_* & & \parallel \\
 {}_X(\mathcal{C}_!(F), J) \otimes {}_X(\mathcal{C}_!(E^\vee), I) & \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} & {}_{Y \times X}(P, J \boxtimes I) & \xrightarrow{\tau_*} & {}_{Y \times X}(P, T)
 \end{array}$$

where we abbreviate ${}_?(-, -) := \text{Hom}_{C(\text{Sh}(?))}(-, -)$. The proof that the composition in (6.5) is a quasi-isomorphism implies that both $j_* \circ \mathcal{C}_!$ and $i_* \circ \mathcal{C}_!$ are quasi-isomorphisms. Hence the left vertical composition $(j_* \circ \mathcal{C}_!) \otimes (i_* \circ \mathcal{C}_! \circ \alpha^{-1})$ is a quasi-isomorphism. The composition in the lower row is a quasi-isomorphism by Proposition 4.8. Hence, the composition of the diagonal arrow $\mathcal{C}_! \boxtimes (\mathcal{C}_! \circ \alpha^{-1})$, our morphism (6.8) of dg algebras, with the upper right horizontal map $(\tau \circ (j \boxtimes i))^*$ is a quasi-isomorphism. We then proceed as in the proof of Proposition 6.1.(b). \square

Let X and Y be quasi-compact separated schemes over a field k . Let $p: Y \times X \rightarrow X$ and $q: Y \times X \rightarrow Y$ be second and first projection. For $K \in C(\text{Qcoh}(Y \times X))$ let ϕ_K be the composition

$$\phi_K: C(\text{Qcoh}(X)) \xrightarrow{p^*} C(\text{Qcoh}(Y \times X)) \xrightarrow{- \otimes K} C(\text{Qcoh}(Y \times X)) \xrightarrow{q_*} C(\text{Qcoh}(Y))$$

of dg functors (which is well-defined by Lemma 2.6). Recall that on a quasi-compact separated scheme any complex of quasi-coherent sheaves admits a quasi-isomorphism from an h-flat complex of quasi-coherent sheaves [Mur06, Lemma 8]. The Fourier-Mukai functor with kernel K is defined as the composition

$$\Phi_K: D(\text{Qcoh}(X)) \xrightarrow{p^* = \mathbf{R}p^*} D(\text{Qcoh}(Y \times X)) \xrightarrow{- \otimes^{\mathbf{L}} K} D(\text{Qcoh}(Y \times X)) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{R}q_*} D(\text{Qcoh}(Y))$$

of triangulated functors.

Proposition 6.3. *Let X and Y be quasi-compact separated schemes over a field k . Let $K' \rightarrow K$ be a quasi-isomorphism in $Z^0(C(\text{Qcoh}(Y \times X)))$ with K' an h-flat complex of quasi-coherent sheaves. Let $\mathcal{U} = (U_s)_{s \in S}$ be an ordered finite affine open covering of X . Then the composition $\text{can} \circ \phi_{K'} \circ \mathcal{C}_*$ of triangulated functors in the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 [C(\text{Qcoh}(X))] & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C}_*} & [C(\text{Qcoh}(X))] \xrightarrow{\phi_{K'}} [C(\text{Qcoh}(Y))] \\
 \downarrow \text{can} & & \downarrow \text{can} \\
 D(\text{Qcoh}(X)) & \xrightarrow{\overline{\phi_{K'} \circ \mathcal{C}_*}} & D(\text{Qcoh}(Y))
 \end{array}$$

maps acyclic complexes to zero and hence factors uniquely to the indicated triangulated functor $\overline{\phi_{K'} \circ \mathcal{C}_}$ making the diagram commutative. This functor $\overline{\phi_{K'} \circ \mathcal{C}_*}$ is isomorphic to*

the Fourier-Mukai functor $\Phi_K = \mathbf{R}q_*(p^*(-) \otimes^{\mathbf{L}} K)$. Moreover, all functors in the above diagram preserve coproducts.

Proof. Let $p: Y \times X \rightarrow X$ and $q: Y \times X \rightarrow Y$ be the projections. Let $A \in C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))$. We claim that all components of $p^*(\mathcal{C}_*(A)) \otimes K'$ are acyclic with respect to the functor $q_*: \mathrm{Qcoh}(Y \times X) \rightarrow \mathrm{Qcoh}(Y)$.

Let $B \in \mathrm{Qcoh}(X)$ and $M \in \mathrm{Qcoh}(Y \times X)$. If $u: U \subset X$ is the inclusion of an affine open subset, then

$$p^*(uB) \otimes M \xrightarrow{\sim}_{Y \times U} (p^*B) \otimes M \xrightarrow{\sim}_{Y \times U} (p^*B \otimes M)$$

by Lemmata A.2 and A.3 because u and $u': Y \times U \rightarrow Y \times X$ are affine. Since also $q \circ u'$ is affine, Lemma 2.7 shows that ${}_{Y \times U}(p^*B \otimes M)$ is acyclic with respect to $q_*: \mathrm{Qcoh}(Y \times X) \rightarrow \mathrm{Qcoh}(Y)$. Since arbitrary coproducts of q_* -acyclic quasi-coherent sheaves are again q_* -acyclic, by [TT90, Lemma B.6, Cor. B.9], each component of $p^*(\mathcal{C}_*(A)) \otimes K'$ is q_* -acyclic.

Note moreover that $q_*: \mathrm{Qcoh}(Y \times X) \rightarrow \mathrm{Qcoh}(Y)$ has finite cohomological dimension (by Lemma 2.8). Then [SS, Lemma 12.4.(b)] shows that

$$q_*(p^*(\mathcal{C}_*(A)) \otimes K') \rightarrow \mathbf{R}q_*(p^*(\mathcal{C}_*(A)) \otimes K')$$

is an isomorphism in $D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(Y))$. Note that

$$p^*(A) \otimes K' \rightarrow p^*(\mathcal{C}_*(A)) \otimes K'$$

is a quasi-isomorphism because p is flat and K' is h-flat. The object on the left is isomorphic to $p^*(A) \otimes^{\mathbf{L}} K$ in $D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(Y \times X))$. Applying $\mathbf{R}q_*$ yields isomorphisms

$$\mathbf{R}q_*(p^*(A) \otimes^{\mathbf{L}} K) \cong \mathbf{R}q_*(p^*(A) \otimes K') \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{R}q_*(p^*(\mathcal{C}_*(A)) \otimes K')$$

in $D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(Y))$. In particular, $q_*(p^*(\mathcal{C}_*(A)) \otimes K')$ is acyclic if A is acyclic. This shows that $\overline{\phi_{K'} \circ \mathcal{C}_*}$ exists and is isomorphic to Φ_K .

The functors can in the diagram preserve coproducts by [BN93, Lemma 1.5]. Lemma 2.6 shows that the functors q_* and u_* preserves coproducts, where $u: U \subset X$ is the inclusion of an affine open subset. This implies that $\phi_{K'} = q_*(p^*(-) \otimes K')$, \mathcal{C}_* , and $\overline{\phi_{K'} \circ \mathcal{C}_*}$ preserve coproducts. \square

Theorem 6.4 (Fourier-Mukai kernels and dg bimodules). *Let X and Y be Noetherian (GSP)-schemes over a field k and assume that $Y \times X$ is also Noetherian. Let $E \in C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))$ and $F \in C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(Y))$ be bounded complexes of vector bundles that are generators of $D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))$ and $D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(Y))$, respectively. Fix ordered finite affine open coverings $\mathcal{U} = (U_s)_{s \in S}$ of X and $\mathcal{V} = (V_t)_{t \in T}$ of Y and let $A = \mathrm{End}_{\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_*(X)}(E)$ and $B = \mathrm{End}_{\check{\mathrm{Cech}}_!(Y)}(F)$. Denote the equivalences of triangulated categories provided by Propositions 6.1 and 6.2 as follows*

$$\theta_X := \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_*(E), -): [C^{\mathrm{h-inj}}(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))] \xrightarrow{\sim} D(A),$$

$$\theta_Y := \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(Y))}(\mathcal{C}_!(F), -): D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(Y)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D(B),$$

$$\theta_{Y \times X} := \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Sh}(Y \times X))}(\mathcal{C}_!(F) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_!(E^\vee), -): D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(Y \times X)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D(B \otimes A^{\mathrm{op}}),$$

and let can^{-1} be a quasi-inverse of the equivalence $\text{can}: [C^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))] \xrightarrow{\sim} D(\text{Qcoh}(X))$. Then for any $K \in D(\text{Qcoh}(Y \times X))$ with corresponding $M = \theta_{Y \times X}(K) \in D(B \otimes A^{\text{op}})$ the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D(\text{Qcoh}(X)) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_K = \mathbf{R}q_*(p^*(-) \otimes^{\mathbf{L}} K)} & D(\text{Qcoh}(Y)) \\ \theta_X \circ \text{can}^{-1} \downarrow \sim & & \theta_Y \downarrow \sim \\ D(A) & \xrightarrow{- \otimes_A^{\mathbf{L}} M} & D(B) \end{array}$$

commutes up to an isomorphism τ^K of triangulated functors.

Proof. In this proof we abbreviate $\text{Hom}_X = \text{Hom}_{C(\text{Sh}(X))}$ and $\text{End}_X = \text{End}_{C(\text{Sh}(X))}$, and similarly for Y and $Y \times X$.

Let $K \in D(\text{Qcoh}(Y \times X))$ and let $K' \rightarrow K$ be a quasi-isomorphism with K' an h-flat complex of quasi-coherent sheaves. Consider the composition

$$C(\text{Qcoh}(X)) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C}_*} C(\text{Qcoh}(X)) \xrightarrow{\phi_{K'}} C(\text{Qcoh}(Y)) \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{C}_!(F), -)} C(B)$$

of dg functors where we write $C(B)$ for the dg category of dg B -modules. Applying it to $\mathcal{C}_*(E)$ we define

$$M' := \text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{C}_!(F), \phi_{K'}(\mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{C}_*(E))))$$

which is naturally a dg $B \otimes A^{\text{op}}$ -module where the B -action is obvious and the A^{op} -action comes from the morphism of dg algebras

$$A = \text{End}_{\check{\text{Cech}}_*(X)}(E) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C}_*} \text{End}_X(\mathcal{C}_*(E)) \xrightarrow{\phi_{K'} \circ \mathcal{C}_*} \text{End}_Y(\phi_{K'}(\mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{C}_*(E)))).$$

Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} [C^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))] & \xrightarrow{\iota} & [C(\text{Qcoh}(X))] & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C}_*} & [C(\text{Qcoh}(X))] & \xrightarrow{\phi_{K'}} & [C(\text{Qcoh}(Y))] \\ \downarrow \theta_X = \text{Hom}_X(\mathcal{C}_*(E), -) \sim & \searrow \text{can} & \downarrow & & \downarrow \overline{\phi_{K'} \circ \mathcal{C}_*} & & \downarrow \\ & & D(\text{Qcoh}(X)) & \xrightarrow{\overline{\phi_{K'} \circ \mathcal{C}_*}} & D(\text{Qcoh}(Y)) & & \\ \downarrow \theta_X = \text{Hom}_X(\mathcal{C}_*(E), -) \sim & & & & \downarrow \theta_Y = \text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{C}_!(F), -) \sim & & \\ D(A) & \xrightarrow{- \otimes_A^{\mathbf{L}} M'} & & & D(B) & & \end{array}$$

of triangulated functors. The triangle and the little rectangle in this diagram are commutative, by Proposition 6.3. Let

$$\sigma^{K'}: (- \otimes_A^{\mathbf{L}} M') \circ \theta_X \rightarrow \theta_Y \circ \overline{\phi_{K'} \circ \mathcal{C}_*} \circ \text{can}$$

be the morphism of triangulated functors $[C^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))] \rightarrow D(B)$ between the two outer paths from the top left corner to the bottom right corner given on objects as follows: for $J \in [C^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))]$ let $\sigma_J^{K'}$ be the composition

$$\text{Hom}_X(\mathcal{C}_*(E), J) \otimes_A^{\mathbf{L}} M' \rightarrow \text{Hom}_X(\mathcal{C}_*(E), J) \otimes_A M' \rightarrow \text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{C}_!(F), \phi_{K'}(\mathcal{C}_*(J)))$$

with obvious first map and second map given by $f \otimes m \mapsto \phi_{K'}(\mathcal{C}_*(f)) \circ m$.

We claim that $\sigma^{K'}$ is an isomorphism of functors. Note that source $(- \otimes_A^{\mathbf{L}} M') \circ \theta_X$ and target $\theta_Y \circ \overline{\phi_{K'} \circ \mathcal{C}_*} \circ \sigma^{K'}$ can of $\sigma^{K'}$ commute with coproducts, by Proposition 6.3 (however, this is not true for the functor ι in the above diagram, cf. Remark 6.6). Hence it is enough to show that $\sigma^{K'}$ evaluates to an isomorphism at an arbitrary compact generator of $[C^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))]$.

As in the proof of Proposition 6.1.(a), the complex $\mathcal{C}_*(E)$ of quasi-coherent sheaves admits a quasi-isomorphism $z: \mathcal{C}_*(E) \rightarrow I$ to an object $I \in C^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))$. Then I is a compact generator of $[C^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))]$ and we need to show that $\sigma_I^{K'}$ is an isomorphism. Recall that the composition in (6.3) is a quasi-isomorphism. If we use it to compute the left derived tensor product, the morphism $\sigma_I^{K'}$ is given by the map

$$\sigma_I^{K'}: \text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{C}_!(F), \phi_{K'}(\mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{C}_*(E)))) = M' = A \otimes_A M' \rightarrow \text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{C}_!(F), \phi_{K'}(\mathcal{C}_*(I)))$$

which maps an element $m \in M'$ to $\phi_{K'}(\mathcal{C}_*(z)) \circ m$. Note that

$$\phi_{K'}(\mathcal{C}_*(z)): \phi_{K'}(\mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{C}_*(E))) \rightarrow \phi_{K'}(\mathcal{C}_*(I))$$

is a quasi-isomorphism between complexes of quasi-coherent sheaves, by Proposition 6.3, and that $\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{C}_!(F), -)$ maps such quasi-isomorphisms to quasi-isomorphisms of dg B -modules, by Proposition 6.1.(b). This shows that $\sigma_I^{K'}$ is an isomorphism in $D(B)$ and proves that $\sigma^{K'}$ is an isomorphism of functors.

Since we already know that $\overline{\phi_{K'} \circ \mathcal{C}_*}$ and $\Phi_K = \mathbf{R}q_*(p^*(-) \otimes^{\mathbf{L}} K)$ are isomorphic, by Proposition 6.3, it remains to show that $\theta_{Y \times X}(K) \cong M'$ in $D(B \otimes A^{\text{op}})$.

Observe that we have isomorphisms of dg $B \otimes A^{\text{op}}$ -modules

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{Y \times X}(K') &= \text{Hom}_{Y \times X}(\mathcal{C}_!(F) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_!(E^\vee), K') \\ &= \text{Hom}_{Y \times X}(q^*(\mathcal{C}_!(F)) \otimes p^*(\mathcal{C}_!(E^\vee)), K') \\ &= \text{Hom}_{Y \times X}(q^*(\mathcal{C}_!(F)), \mathcal{H}om(p^*(\mathcal{C}_!(E^\vee)), K')) && \text{(by adjunction)} \\ &= \text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{C}_!(F), q_*(\mathcal{H}om(p^*(\mathcal{C}_!(E^\vee)), K'))) && \text{(by adjunction)} \\ &\xleftarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{C}_!(F), q_*(p^*(\mathcal{C}_*(E)) \otimes K')) && \text{(by Lemma 6.5)} \\ &= \text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{C}_!(F), \phi_{K'}(\mathcal{C}_*(E))). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\rho_{\mathcal{C}_*(E)}: \mathcal{C}_*(E) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{C}_*(E))$ be the canonical quasi-isomorphism from $\mathcal{C}_*(E)$ to its $*$ -Čech resolution (see (3.1)). The proof of Proposition 6.3 shows that all components of $p^*(\mathcal{C}_*(E)) \otimes K'$ and of $p^*(\mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{C}_*(E))) \otimes K'$ are acyclic with respect to the functor $q_*: \text{Qcoh}(Y \times X) \rightarrow \text{Qcoh}(Y)$ of finite cohomological dimension. Since $p^*(\rho_{\mathcal{C}_*(E)}) \otimes \text{id}_{K'}$ is a quasi-isomorphism, [SS, Lemma 12.4.(b)] shows that its q_* -image $\phi_{K'}(\rho_{\mathcal{C}_*(E)})$ is a quasi-isomorphism between complexes of quasi-coherent sheaves. As above, $\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{C}_!(F), -)$ preserves such quasi-isomorphisms, so that we get a quasi-isomorphism

$$\text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{C}_!(F), \phi_{K'}(\mathcal{C}_*(E))) \xrightarrow{\phi_{K'}(\rho_{\mathcal{C}_*(E)}) \circ ?} \text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{C}_!(F), \phi_{K'}(\mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{C}_*(E)))) = M'$$

of dg B -modules. Let us argue that it is in fact a morphism of dg $B \otimes A^{\text{op}}$ -modules where the A^{op} -action on the left-hand side comes from the morphism of dg algebras

$$A = \text{End}_{\check{\text{Cech}}_*(X)}(E) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C}_*} \text{End}_X(\mathcal{C}_*(E)) \xrightarrow{\phi_{K'}} \text{End}_Y(\phi_{K'}(\mathcal{C}_*(E))).$$

Given any $a \in A$, applying the morphism $\rho : \text{id} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_*$ of functors to the morphism $\mathcal{C}_*(a) : \mathcal{C}_*(E) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_*(E)$ shows that $\rho_{\mathcal{C}_*(E)} \circ \mathcal{C}_*(a) = \mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{C}_*(a)) \circ \rho_{\mathcal{C}_*(E)}$. We then obtain for any $f \in \text{Hom}_Y(\mathcal{C}_!(F), \phi_{K'}(\mathcal{C}_*(E)))$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{K'}(\rho_{\mathcal{C}_*(E)}) \circ \phi_{K'}(\mathcal{C}_*(a)) \circ f &= \phi_{K'}(\rho_{\mathcal{C}_*(E)} \circ \mathcal{C}_*(a)) \circ f = \phi_{K'}(\mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{C}_*(a)) \circ \rho_{\mathcal{C}_*(E)}) \circ f \\ &= \phi_{K'}(\mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{C}_*(a))) \circ \phi_{K'}(\rho_{\mathcal{C}_*(E)}) \circ f. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above (quasi-)isomorphisms of dg $B \otimes A^{\text{op}}$ -modules yields that $\theta_{Y \times X}(K) \cong \theta_{Y \times X}(K')$ and M' are isomorphic in $D(B \otimes A^{\text{op}})$. \square

Lemma 6.5. *Let X and Y be schemes over a field k . Assume that X is quasi-compact separated and fix an ordered finite affine open covering $\mathcal{U} = (U_s)_{s \in S}$ of X . Let L be a complex of quasi-coherent sheaves on $Y \times X$. Then there is an isomorphism*

$$p^*(\mathcal{C}_*((-)^{\vee})) \otimes L \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}(p^*(\mathcal{C}_!(-)), L)$$

of dg functors

$$\check{\text{Cech}}_!(X)^{\text{op}} \rightarrow C(\text{Sh}(Y \times X)).$$

In particular, if E is a bounded complex of vector bundles on X , plugging in E^{\vee} yields an isomorphism

$$\gamma : p^*(\mathcal{C}_*(E)) \otimes L \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}(p^*(\mathcal{C}_!(E^{\vee})), L)$$

in $Z^0(C(\text{Qcoh}(Y \times X)))$ which is compatible with the left action of the dg algebra

$$\text{End}_{\check{\text{Cech}}_*(X)}(E) \xleftarrow[\sim]{(-)^{\vee}} \text{End}_{\check{\text{Cech}}_!(X)}(E^{\vee})^{\text{op}}$$

in the sense that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{End}_{\check{\text{Cech}}_*(X)}(E) & \xleftarrow[\sim]{(-)^{\vee}} & \text{End}_{\check{\text{Cech}}_!(X)}(E^{\vee})^{\text{op}} \\ \downarrow p^*(\mathcal{C}_*(-)) \otimes L & & \downarrow \text{Hom}(p^*(\mathcal{C}_!(-)), L) \\ \text{End}_{C(\text{Sh}(Y \times X))}(p^*(\mathcal{C}_*(E)) \otimes L) & \xrightarrow[\sim]{\gamma \circ ? \circ \gamma^{-1}} & \text{End}_{C(\text{Sh}(Y \times X))}(\text{Hom}(p^*(\mathcal{C}_!(E^{\vee})), L)) \end{array}$$

of dg algebras commutes.

Proof. This follows from Corollary 3.18 because X is separated and all the inclusions $U_I \subset X$ for $I \subset S$ are affine. \square

Remark 6.6. *Let X be a Noetherian separated scheme. Since $\text{can} : [C^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))] \rightarrow D(\text{Qcoh}(X))$ is an equivalence, $[C^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))]$ has arbitrary coproducts. In general, however, it is not true that the inclusion functor $\iota : [C^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))] \rightarrow [C(\text{Qcoh}(X))]$ commutes with coproducts. Surprisingly, this is related to regularity of X as explained in (the proof of) the following Proposition 6.7.*

Proposition 6.7. *Let X be a Noetherian separated scheme. Then the following conditions are equivalent where coproducts are formed in $Z^0(C(\text{Qcoh}(X)))$.*

- (a) *all coproducts of h-injective complexes of quasi-coherent sheaves are h-injective;*
- (b) *all coproducts of fibrant complexes of quasi-coherent sheaves are fibrant;*
- (c) $\mathfrak{P}erf(X) = D^b(\text{Coh}(X)).$

These conditions imply regularity of X . If X is of finite dimension, they are equivalent to regularity of X .

The main argument of the following proof is due to Henning Krause.

Proof. Let $C^{\text{fib}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))$ denote the full dg subcategory of $C(\text{Qcoh}(X))$ of fibrant objects. We use results explained in Remark 3.1.

(a) \Rightarrow (b): Let $(F_l)_{l \in L}$ be a family of fibrant complexes of quasi-coherent sheaves. Since all F_l are h-injective and degreewise injective quasi-coherent, $\bigoplus F_l$ is h-injective by assumption and degreewise injective quasi-coherent by Theorem 2.5.(d). Hence $\bigoplus F_l$ is fibrant.

(b) \Rightarrow (a): Let $(I_l)_{l \in L}$ be a family of h-injective complexes of quasi-coherent sheaves. Choose quasi-isomorphisms $I_l \rightarrow F_l$ with F_l fibrant complexes of quasi-coherent sheaves. These morphisms are homotopy equivalences because all I_l and F_l are h-injective. Hence $\bigoplus I_l \rightarrow \bigoplus F_l$ is a homotopy equivalence. Since $\bigoplus F_l$ is fibrant by assumption, in particular h-injective, $\bigoplus I_l$ is h-injective.

(a) \Leftrightarrow (c): We first reformulate (a). Let $\iota: [C^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))] \rightarrow [C(\text{Qcoh}(X))]$ and $\iota': [C^{\text{fib}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))] \rightarrow [C(\text{Qcoh}(X))]$ denote the inclusions. Since $Z^0(C(\text{Qcoh}(X))) \rightarrow [C(\text{Qcoh}(X))]$ preserves coproducts, condition (a) holds if and only if ι preserves coproducts, and this is the case if and only if ι' preserves coproducts because $[C^{\text{fib}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))] \xrightarrow{\sim} [C^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))]$ is an equivalence. Moreover, $[C(\text{InjQcoh}(X))]$ is cocomplete (by Theorem 2.5.(d)) and the obvious functor $[C(\text{InjQcoh}(X))] \rightarrow [C(\text{Qcoh}(X))]$ preserves coproducts and obviously detects them. This implies that ι' preserves coproducts if and only if $\iota'': [C^{\text{fib}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))] \rightarrow [C(\text{InjQcoh}(X))]$ preserves coproducts.

Recall from [Kra05, Thm. 1.1] that $[C(\text{InjQcoh}(X))]$ is compactly generated, and that the functor $Q: [C(\text{InjQcoh}(X))] \rightarrow D(\text{Qcoh}(X))$ induces an equivalence

$$(6.9) \quad [C(\text{InjQcoh}(X))]^{\text{cpt}} \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\text{Coh}(X))$$

and has a right adjoint functor. If we identify $D(\text{Qcoh}(X)) \cong [C^{\text{fib}}(\text{Qcoh}(X))]$ this right adjoint is given by ι'' . This implies that the functor ι'' preserves coproducts if and only if Q preserves compact objects (use the adjunction (Q, ι'') and that $[C(\text{InjQcoh}(X))]$ is compactly generated) if and only if $\mathfrak{P}\text{erf}(X) = D^b(\text{Coh}(X))$ (use (6.9) and $D(\text{Qcoh}(X))^{\text{cpt}} = \mathfrak{P}\text{erf}(X) \subset D^b(\text{Coh}(X))$). Thus (a) \Leftrightarrow (c). The last claim follows from Proposition 2.1. \square

APPENDIX A. SHEAF HOMOMORPHISMS AND EXTERNAL TENSOR PRODUCTS

In this appendix we use calligraphic letters like \mathcal{E} , \mathcal{F} for sheaves and quasi-coherent sheaves, and ordinary letters like P , Q for vector bundles.

A.1. Some base change isomorphisms.

Lemma A.1. *Let $f: (Y, \mathcal{O}_Y) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ be a morphism of ringed spaces. Let $U \subset X$ be an open subset and $V := f^{-1}(U)$. Consider U and V as ringed spaces with structure sheaves*

$\mathcal{O}_X|_U$ and $\mathcal{O}_Y|_V$ so that we have a cartesian diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V & \xrightarrow{v} & Y \\ \downarrow f' & & \downarrow f \\ U & \xrightarrow{u} & X \end{array}$$

of ringed spaces. Then:

- (a) For \mathcal{G} a sheaf of \mathcal{O}_Y -modules, there is a natural isomorphism $u^*f_*\mathcal{G} \xrightarrow{\sim} f'_*v^*\mathcal{G}$ of sheaves of \mathcal{O}_U -modules.
- (b) For \mathcal{F} a sheaf of \mathcal{O}_U -modules, there is a natural isomorphism $f^*u_!\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\sim} v_!f'^*\mathcal{F}$ of \mathcal{O}_Y -modules.

Proof. (a): The morphism comes from $f'^*u^*f_* = v^*f^*f_* \rightarrow v^*$ by adjunction. For $W \subset U$ open we have $(u^*(f_*\mathcal{G}))(W) = (f_*\mathcal{G})(W) = \mathcal{G}(f^{-1}(W)) = \mathcal{G}(f'^{-1}(W)) = (v^*\mathcal{G})(f'^{-1}(W)) = (f'_*(v^*\mathcal{G}))(W)$.

(b): The morphism in the lemma is constructed in the usual way, see e. g. [SS]. The stalk of $f^*u_!\mathcal{F}$ at a point $y \in Y$ is

$$(\mathcal{O}_Y \otimes_{f^{-1}\mathcal{O}_X} f^{-1}u_!\mathcal{F})_y = \mathcal{O}_{Y,y} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X,f(y)}} (u_!\mathcal{F})_{f(y)} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}_{Y,y} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X,f(y)}} \mathcal{F}_{f(y)} & \text{if } f(y) \in U, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, we have $(v_!f'^*\mathcal{F})_y = \mathcal{O}_{V,y} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{U,f'(y)}} \mathcal{F}_{f'(y)}$ if $y \in V$, and $(v_!f'^*\mathcal{F})_y = 0$ otherwise. One may also deduce (b) from (a) (and conversely) using the Yoneda embedding and the obvious adjunctions. \square

Lemma A.2. *Let*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y' & \xrightarrow{g'} & Y \\ \downarrow a' & & \downarrow a \\ X' & \xrightarrow{g} & X \end{array}$$

*be a cartesian diagram of schemes. If a is an affine morphism, there is an isomorphism $g^*a_* \xrightarrow{\sim} a'_*g'^*$ of functors $\mathrm{Qcoh}(Y) \rightarrow \mathrm{Qcoh}(X')$.*

Proof. See [GW10, Prop. 12.6]. Both a_* and a'_* preserve quasi-coherence by Lemma 2.6. \square

Lemma A.3. *Let $a: Y \rightarrow X$ be an affine morphism of schemes. Given $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Qcoh}(Y)$ and $\mathcal{G} \in \mathrm{Qcoh}(X)$ there is a canonical isomorphism $(a_*\mathcal{F}) \otimes \mathcal{G} \xrightarrow{\sim} a_*(\mathcal{F} \otimes a^*\mathcal{G})$ of quasi-coherent sheaves.*

Proof. Use [GW10, Prop. 12.6] and that a_* preserves quasi-coherence by Lemma 2.6. \square

Lemma A.4 (Projection formula for an open embedding). *Let (X, \mathcal{O}_X) be a ringed space and $U \subset X$ an open subset, considered as a ringed space with structure sheaf $\mathcal{O}_U = \mathcal{O}_X|_U$. Let \mathcal{F} be a sheaf of \mathcal{O}_U -modules and \mathcal{G} a sheaf of \mathcal{O}_X -modules. Then there is a natural isomorphism of sheaves of \mathcal{O}_X -modules*

$$(u_!\mathcal{F}) \otimes \mathcal{G} \xrightarrow{\sim} u_!(\mathcal{F} \otimes u^*\mathcal{G}).$$

Proof. The morphism in the lemma is constructed in the usual way, see e. g. [SS]. To check that it is an isomorphism we consider it on the stalks at an arbitrary point $x \in X$. The stalks of both sides are compatibly identified with $\mathcal{F}_x \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}} \mathcal{G}_x$ if $x \in U$, and vanish otherwise. \square

A.2. Some results for sheaf homomorphisms. Given open subschemes U and V of a scheme X the cartesian diagram

$$(A.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} U \cap V & \xrightarrow{u'} & V \\ \downarrow v' & & \downarrow v \\ U & \xrightarrow{u} & X \end{array}$$

will be used several times in the following.

Recall that an integral domain R is N-1 if the integral closure of R in its quotient field is a finite R -module (see [Sta14, Def. 032F]). Trivially, any integrally closed (= normal) integral domain is N-1. More interestingly, any Nagata integral domain and in particular any (quasi-)excellent integral domain is N-1. [Sta14, Lemma 07QV, Lemma 035S]

Lemma A.5. *Let X be a scheme and let $u: U \subset X$ and $v: V \subset X$ be inclusions of open subschemes. Assume that V is an affine Noetherian integral scheme such that $\mathcal{O}_V(V)$ is N-1, and that $U \cap V$ is affine. Let P be a vector bundle on U and Q a vector bundle on V . Then*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(u_*P, v_*Q) = \begin{cases} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_V}(P|_V, Q) & \text{if } V \subset U, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In Remark A.7 below we show that this lemma is not true if we replace “integral” and “N-1” by “irreducible”, or by “reduced”. Lemma A.8 contains a variant of this lemma.

Proof. We work with the cartesian diagram (A.1). The adjunction (v^*, v_*) and Lemma A.1.(a) yield

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(u_*P, v_*Q) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_V}(v^*u_*P, Q) \xleftarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_V}(u'_*v'^*P, Q).$$

If $V \subset U$ then $U \cap V = V$ and the claim is trivial. Assume that $V \not\subset U$. So $u': U \cap V \subsetneq V$. If $U \cap V = \emptyset$ the claim is trivial, so assume that $U \cap V \neq \emptyset$.

So we have $\emptyset \neq U \cap V = \mathrm{Spec} B \subsetneq V = \mathrm{Spec} A$. The corresponding ring morphism $A \rightarrow B$ is injective but not bijective, and we can view $A \subsetneq B$ as subrings of the quotient field $Q(A)$ of the Noetherian N-1 integral domain A .

Assume that $u'_*(P|_{U \cap V}) \rightarrow Q$ is a nonzero morphism. Since its source and target are quasi-coherent sheaves on V , by Lemma 2.6, taking global sections translates this morphism into a nonzero morphism $P|_{U \cap V}(U \cap V) \rightarrow Q(V)$ of A -modules. Since $P|_{U \cap V}$ and Q are vector bundles on $\mathrm{Spec} B$ and $\mathrm{Spec} A$, respectively, they are direct summands of free modules of finite rank. In particular we deduce that there is a nonzero morphism $B \rightarrow A$ of A -modules. But this cannot happen by Lemma A.6. \square

Lemma A.6. *Let A be a Noetherian N-1 integral domain with quotient field $Q(A)$, and let $A \subsetneq B \subset Q(A)$ be an intermediate ring such that $\mathrm{Spec} B \subsetneq \mathrm{Spec} A$ is open. Then any morphism $f: B \rightarrow A$ of A -modules is zero.*

Proof. Let \tilde{A} (resp. \tilde{B}) be the integral closure of A (resp. B) in $Q(A)$. Then the multiplication map $B \otimes_A \tilde{A} \rightarrow \tilde{B}$ is an isomorphism and $\tilde{A} \subsetneq \tilde{B}$ and $\text{Spec } \tilde{B} \subsetneq \text{Spec } \tilde{A}$ is open (by [GW10, Prop. 12.43]). Both vertical arrows in the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} B & \xrightarrow{f} & A & & \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ \tilde{B} & \xleftarrow{\sim} B \otimes_A \tilde{A} & \xrightarrow{f \otimes \text{id}} & A \otimes_A \tilde{A} & \xrightarrow{\sim} \tilde{A} \end{array}$$

are injective since they correspond to the inclusions $B \subset \tilde{B}$ and $A \subset \tilde{A}$. (The isomorphism $B \otimes_A \tilde{A} \xrightarrow{\sim} \tilde{B}$ is an easy instance of Lemma A.2.) Hence it is enough to show that the morphism $f \otimes \text{id}$ of \tilde{A} -modules is zero. Since A is N-1 the ring \tilde{A} is Noetherian, so it is enough to prove the lemma under the additional assumption that A is integrally closed (= normal).

Let A be normal. (In the rest of the proof we do not need that $\text{Spec } B \subset \text{Spec } A$ is open.) Let $b \in B$ with $b \notin A$. As a normal Noetherian integral domain, A is the intersection of the discrete valuation rings $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$, where \mathfrak{p} runs through all minimal nonzero prime ideals $\mathfrak{p} \subset A$ (see [Rei95, Thm. 8.10]). Hence there is a nonzero minimal prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \subset A$ such that $b \notin A_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Let $S := A \setminus \mathfrak{p}$. We localize the composition $A \rightarrow B \xrightarrow{f} A$ of A -linear maps at S and obtain $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ -linear maps

$$A_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow S^{-1}B \xrightarrow{S^{-1}f} A_{\mathfrak{p}}$$

The first morphism takes place in $Q(A)$ and is injective but not bijective since $b \in B \subset S^{-1}B$ but $b \notin A_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Since $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a discrete valuation ring this implies that $S^{-1}B = Q(A)$. Then $S^{-1}f: S^{-1}B = Q(A) \rightarrow A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ -linear and then certainly zero. (If R is an integral domain which is not a field, any R -linear morphism $\varphi: Q(R) \rightarrow R$ is zero: let $r := \varphi(1)$; if $r = 0$ then $\varphi = 0$; otherwise any $0 \neq s \in R$ is invertible in R : $s\varphi(1/rs) = \varphi(1/r) = 1$.) Hence the composition $B \xrightarrow{f} A \rightarrow A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is zero, and so is f . \square

Remark A.7. We give two examples that Lemma A.5 is not true if V is only required to be irreducible (resp. reduced) instead of integral with $\mathcal{O}_V(V)$ N-1. Both examples are simple in the sense that we have $U \subsetneq X = V$ and the vector bundles on U and V are the structure sheaves. Let k be a field.

- (a) Let $A := k[T, \varepsilon]/((T^2-1)\varepsilon, \varepsilon^2)$ and $B := A_T = A[T^{-1}] = k[T, T^{-1}, \varepsilon]/((T^2-1)\varepsilon, \varepsilon^2)$. Then $A = k[T] \oplus \frac{k[T]}{(T^2-1)}\varepsilon$ and $B = k[T, T^{-1}] \oplus \frac{k[T]}{(T^2-1)}\varepsilon$ as $k[T]$ -modules. Then the composition $B \rightarrow k[T, T^{-1}] \xrightarrow{1 \mapsto \varepsilon} \frac{k[T]}{(T^2-1)}\varepsilon \rightarrow A$ is a nonzero morphism of A -modules. Hence if we define $X = V = \text{Spec } A$ and $U = \text{Spec } B$ and $Q = \mathcal{O}_X$ and $P = \mathcal{O}_U$ we see that $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(u_*P, v_*Q) = \text{Hom}_A(B, A) \neq 0$ but $V \not\subset U$. Note that $X = V$ is an affine irreducible (non-reduced) Noetherian excellent scheme and $U = U \cap V$ is a strict principal open subset.
- (b) Let $A := k[S, T]/(ST)$ and $B := A[(S+1)^{-1}] = k[S, T, (S+1)^{-1}]/(ST)$. Any element of B can be written as $\frac{f(S)+g(T)T}{(S+1)^n}$ with $f \in k[S]$, $g \in k[T]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Mapping such an element to $(f(0) + g(T)T)T^2$ yields a well-defined nonzero morphism $f: B \rightarrow$

A of A -modules. Then $X = V = \operatorname{Spec} A$ is affine reduced (non-irreducible but connected) Noetherian excellent and $U = \operatorname{Spec} B$ is a strict principal open subset but $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(u_*\mathcal{O}_U, v_*\mathcal{O}_V) \neq 0$.

Lemma A.8. *Let X be a scheme and assume that $u: U \subset X$ and $v: V \subset X$ are affine inclusions of open subschemes. We assume that V is a Nagata integral scheme. Let $u': U \cap V \subset V$ be the open immersion. Let P be a vector bundle on U and Q a vector bundle on V . Then*

$$(A.2) \quad \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(u_*P, v_*Q) \xrightarrow{\sim} v_*u'_! \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{U \cap V}}(P|_{U \cap V}, Q|_{U \cap V}),$$

and taking global sections yields

$$(A.3) \quad \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(u_*P, v_*Q) = \begin{cases} \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_V}(P|_V, Q) & \text{if } V \subset U, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In particular, $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(u_*P, v_*Q)$ is not quasi-coherent in general.

Corollary A.9. *If X is a Nagata integral scheme, $u: U \subset X$ is an affine inclusion of an open subscheme, and P is a vector bundle on U , then*

$$(u_*P)^\vee \xrightarrow{\sim} u_!(P^\vee).$$

If $U \subsetneq X$ then $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(u_*P, \mathcal{O}_X) = 0$.

Proof of Corollary A.9. Apply Lemma A.8 to $V = X$ and $Q = \mathcal{O}_X$. \square

Remark A.10. *If X is a scheme, $u: U \subset X$ the inclusion of an open subscheme, and \mathcal{F} a sheaf on U we have $(u_!\mathcal{F})^\vee = \operatorname{Hom}(u_!\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{O}_X) \cong u_*\operatorname{Hom}(\mathcal{F}, u^*\mathcal{O}_X) = u_*(\mathcal{F}^\vee)$. Hence in the setting of Corollary A.9 the sheaves $u_!P$ and u_*P satisfy $u_!P \cong ((u_!P)^\vee)^\vee$ and $u_*P \cong (u_*P)^\vee^\vee$.*

Proof of Lemma A.8. We work with the cartesian diagram (A.1). Consider the morphism $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(u_*P, v_*Q) \rightarrow \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(u_!P, v_*Q)$ coming from $u_!P \rightarrow u_*P$. Its target

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(u_!P, v_*Q) &= v_*\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_V}(v^*u_!P, Q) \xleftarrow{\sim} v_*\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_V}(u'_!v'^*P, Q) \\ &= v_*u'_*\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{U \cap V}}(P|_{U \cap V}, Q|_{U \cap V}) \end{aligned}$$

(use the adjunctions (v^*, v_*) and $(u'_!, u'^! = u'^*)$ and Lemma A.1.(b)) contains the right-hand side of (A.2) as a subsheaf (v_* being left exact). We claim that it induces an isomorphism onto this subsheaf. To see this we show that both sides of (A.2) have the same evaluation at an arbitrary affine open subset $W \subset X$. The commutative diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U \cap W & \xrightarrow{u''} & W \\ \downarrow w' & & \downarrow w \\ U & \xrightarrow{u} & X, \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} V \cap W & \xrightarrow{v''} & W \\ \downarrow w'' & & \downarrow w \\ V & \xrightarrow{v} & X, \end{array}$$

and Lemma A.1.(a) imply that $(u_*P)|_W = w^*u_*P \xrightarrow{\sim} u''_*w'^*P = u''_*(P|_{U \cap W})$ and $(v_*Q)|_W = w^*v_*Q \xrightarrow{\sim} v''_*w''^*Q = v''_*(Q|_{V \cap W})$. This and Lemma A.5 (note that both $V \cap W$ and $U \cap V \cap W$

are affine since v and u are affine, and that $V \cap W$ is either empty or Nagata (by [Sta14, Lemma 033X]), in particular Noetherian, and integral with $\mathcal{O}_{V \cap W}(V \cap W)$ N-1) show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_X}(u_*P, v_*Q)(W) &= \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_W}(u''_*(P|_{U \cap W}), v''_*(Q|_{V \cap W})) \\ &= \begin{cases} \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{V \cap W}}(P|_{V \cap W}, Q|_{V \cap W}) & \text{if } V \cap W \subset U, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand we have

$$(v_*u'_! \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{U \cap V}}(P|_{U \cap V}, Q|_{U \cap V}))(W) = (u'_! \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{U \cap V}}(P|_{U \cap V}, Q|_{U \cap V}))(V \cap W)$$

Note that $E := \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{U \cap V}}(P|_{U \cap V}, Q|_{U \cap V})$ is a vector bundle on $U \cap V$ satisfying

$$E(U \cap V \cap W) = \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_{U \cap V \cap W}}(P|_{U \cap V \cap W}, Q|_{U \cap V \cap W}),$$

and that in case $V \cap W \subset U$ we have $U \cap V \cap W = V \cap W$. Hence it is sufficient to check that

$$(u'_!E)(V \cap W) = \begin{cases} E(V \cap W) & \text{if } V \cap W \subset U, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since the inclusion morphism $u': U \cap V \hookrightarrow V$ is affine, this follows from Lemma A.11, applied to $r = u': R = U \cap V \hookrightarrow Y = V$ and $T = V \cap W$. This establishes the isomorphism (A.2).

If we evaluate it at X we obtain $\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_X}(u_*P, v_*Q) = (u'_!E)(V)$, and Lemma A.11 applied to the same morphism as above but $T = V$ shows (A.3) because $V \subset U \cap V$ is equivalent to $V \subset U$ and to $V = U \cap V$. \square

Lemma A.11. *Let $r: R \subset Y$ be the inclusion of an open subscheme in an integral scheme Y (it is sufficient to assume that R is integral and Y is irreducible). Assume that r is an affine morphism. If E is a vector bundle on R and $T \subset Y$ is an arbitrary open subset, then*

$$(r_!E)(T) = \begin{cases} E(T) & \text{if } T \subset R, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. By definition of $r_!$ we have

$$(r_!E)(T) = \{s \in E(T \cap R) \mid \text{Supp } s \subset T \text{ closed}\}.$$

So if $T \subset R$ this is equal to $E(T)$ because any section of $E(T)$ has closed support in T .

Now let T be arbitrary and assume that $s \in (r_!E)(T)$ is nonzero. Then there is some $t \in T \cap R$ such that the germ s_t is nonzero. Let $A \subset T$ be an affine open neighborhood of t . Since r is affine, $A \cap R$ is affine, and hence $E|_{A \cap R}$ is a direct summand of a finite direct sum of copies of $\mathcal{O}_{A \cap R}$. In particular, there is a morphism $E|_{A \cap R} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{A \cap R}$ such that the image s' of $s|_{A \cap R}$ in $\mathcal{O}_{A \cap R}(A \cap R)$ is nonzero. Since $A \cap R$ is an integral scheme we have $\text{Supp } s' = A \cap R$. This implies that $\text{Supp}(s|_{A \cap R}) = A \cap R$. Hence $s|_A \in (r_!E)(A)$ when viewed as an element of $E(A \cap R)$ has support $A \cap R$, so $A \cap R$ is closed in A .

If $B \subset T$ is an arbitrary non-empty affine open subset, then $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$ because T is irreducible. Since the stalk of s at all points of $A \cap B$ is nonzero we can repeat the above argument and see that $B \cap R$ is closed in B . This means that $T \cap R$ is closed in T . Since

$T \cap R$ is non-empty and open in T and T is irreducible we have $T \cap R = T$, hence $T \subset R$. This proves the lemma. \square

Remark A.12. We give two examples showing that Lemma A.11 is not true if Y is only required to be irreducible (resp. reduced) instead of integral. Let k be any algebraically closed field.

- (a) Let $A = k[U, V]/(UV, V^2)$ and $a \in k[U] \subset A$ with $a \notin k$ and $a(0) \neq 0$. Let $R := \text{Spec } A_a \subsetneq Y := \text{Spec } A$ and let $T = Y$. So Y and R are irreducible but not reduced. The section $s := V \in \mathcal{O}_R(T \cap R) = \mathcal{O}_R(R) = A_a$ is nonzero and its support $\text{Supp } s = \{(U, V)\} \subset R$ is closed in $T = Y$. Hence it defines a nonzero element of $(r_! \mathcal{O}_R)(T)$ even though $T \not\subset R$. We may rewrite this as

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(\mathcal{O}_Y, (r_! \mathcal{O}_R)) \xrightarrow{\sim} (r_! \mathcal{O}_R)(Y) \neq 0.$$

- (b) Let $Y = \text{Spec } k[U, V]/(UV)$ which is reduced and connected but not irreducible. Let $R := Y_U$ (the U -axis without zero, which is integral) and $T = Y_{U+V}$ (Y without the origin). Then $(r_! \mathcal{O}_R)(T) = \mathcal{O}_R(R) \neq 0$ even though $T \not\subset R$.

Lemma A.13. Let X be a scheme and let $u: U \subset X$ and $v: V \subset X$ be inclusions of open subschemes. We assume that U is an affine integral scheme and that $U \cap V$ is affine (it is sufficient to assume that U is affine irreducible and that $U \cap V$ is affine integral). Let P be a vector bundle on U and Q a vector bundle on V . Then

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(u_! P, v_! Q) = \begin{cases} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_U}(P, Q|_U) & \text{if } U \subset V, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Remark A.12.(a) shows that this lemma is not true if we replace “integral” by “irreducible”.

Proof. We work with the cartesian diagram (A.1). The adjunction $(u_!, u^! = u^*)$ and Lemma A.1.(b) yield

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(u_! P, v_! Q) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_U}(P, u^* v_! Q) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_U}(P, v'_! u'^* Q).$$

If $U \subset V$ then $U \cap V = U$ and the claim is clear.

Assume that $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_U}(P, v'_! u'^* Q) \neq 0$. We need to show that $U \subset V$. Since U and $U \cap V$ are affine and P and $u'^* Q$ are vector bundles we see that

$$0 \neq \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_U}(\mathcal{O}_U, v'_! \mathcal{O}_{U \cap V}) \xrightarrow{\sim} (v'_! (\mathcal{O}_{U \cap V}))(U).$$

Pick a nonzero element of the right hand side. It is given by an element $s \in \mathcal{O}_{U \cap V}(U \cap V)$ whose support is closed in U , cf. the proof of Lemma A.11. Since $U \cap V$ is integral we necessarily have $\text{Supp } s = U \cap V$. This set is non-empty and open and closed in the irreducible set U , hence $U \cap V = U$ and $U \subset V$. This proves the lemma. \square

A.3. External tensor product. Let X and Y be schemes over a field k with projection morphisms $X \xleftarrow{p} X \times Y \xrightarrow{q} Y$. We explain some properties and compatibilities of the bifunctor

$$(-\boxtimes?) := p^*(-) \otimes q^*(?): \text{Sh}(X) \times \text{Sh}(Y) \rightarrow \text{Sh}(X \times Y).$$

Lemma A.14. *Given schemes X and Y over a field k the bifunctor \boxtimes is exact.*

Proof. For $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Sh}(X)$ and $\mathcal{G} \in \text{Sh}(Y)$ we have

$$\mathcal{F} \boxtimes \mathcal{G} = p^{-1}\mathcal{F} \otimes_{p^{-1}\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{O}_{X \times Y} \otimes_{q^{-1}\mathcal{O}_Y} q^{-1}\mathcal{G} \xrightarrow{\sim} (p^{-1}\mathcal{F} \otimes_{\underline{k}} q^{-1}\mathcal{G}) \otimes_{p^{-1}\mathcal{O}_X \otimes_{\underline{k}} q^{-1}\mathcal{O}_Y} \mathcal{O}_{X \times Y}$$

(where \underline{k} is the constant sheaf with stalk k) and the morphism $p^{-1}\mathcal{O}_X \otimes_{\underline{k}} q^{-1}\mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X \times Y}$ of sheaves of rings is flat because for $\text{Spec } A \subset X$ and $\text{Spec } B \subset Y$ open it is given at the stalk at $\mathfrak{r} \in \text{Spec}(A \otimes B)$ with $\mathfrak{p} = p(\mathfrak{r})$ and $\mathfrak{q} = q(\mathfrak{r})$ by $A_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes B_{\mathfrak{q}} \rightarrow (A \otimes B)_{\mathfrak{r}}$. \square

Lemma A.15. *Let X be a scheme over a field k , and let $u: U \subset X$ and $v: V \subset X$ be affine immersions of open subschemes. Then $\Delta^*(_{U \times V}(\mathcal{E} \boxtimes \mathcal{F})) \xrightarrow{\sim} _{U \cap V}(\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{F})$ canonically, for \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} quasi-coherent sheaves on X .*

Proof. Consider the pullback diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U \cap V & \xrightarrow{s} & X \\ \downarrow \delta & & \downarrow \Delta \\ U \times V & \xrightarrow{u \times v} & X \times X. \end{array}$$

If \mathcal{G} is a quasi-coherent sheaf on $U \times V$, there is a natural isomorphism $\Delta^*(u \times v)_*(\mathcal{G}) \xrightarrow{\sim} s_*\delta^*(\mathcal{G})$, by Lemma A.2. In particular, we obtain

$$\Delta^*(u \times v)_*(u \times v)^*(\mathcal{E} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}) \xrightarrow{\sim} s_*\delta^*(u \times v)^*(\mathcal{E} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}) = s_*s^*\Delta^*(\mathcal{E} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}) \xrightarrow{\sim} s_*s^*(\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{F}).$$

\square

Lemma A.16. *Let $u: U \rightarrow X$ and $v: V \rightarrow Y$ be morphisms of schemes over a field k . Then*

(a) *Let $\mathcal{E} \in \text{Sh}(X)$ and $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Sh}(Y)$. Then $u^*\mathcal{E} \boxtimes v^*\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\sim} (u \times v)^*(\mathcal{E} \boxtimes \mathcal{F})$ naturally.*

Assume in addition that U and V are open subschemes of X and Y , respectively.

(b) *Let $\mathcal{E}' \in \text{Sh}(U)$ and $\mathcal{F}' \in \text{Sh}(V)$. Then $u_!\mathcal{E}' \boxtimes v_!\mathcal{F}' \xrightarrow{\sim} (u \times v)_!(\mathcal{E}' \boxtimes \mathcal{F}')$ naturally. In particular, ${}_U\mathcal{E} \boxtimes {}_V\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\sim} {}^{U \times V}(\mathcal{E} \boxtimes \mathcal{F})$ for $\mathcal{E} \in \text{Sh}(X)$ and $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Sh}(Y)$.*

Assume in addition that u and v are affine morphisms.

(c) *Let $\mathcal{E}' \in \text{Qcoh}(U)$ and $\mathcal{F}' \in \text{Qcoh}(V)$. Then $u_*\mathcal{E}' \boxtimes v_*\mathcal{F}' \xrightarrow{\sim} (u \times v)_*(\mathcal{E}' \boxtimes \mathcal{F}')$ naturally. In particular, ${}_U\mathcal{E} \boxtimes {}_V\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\sim} {}_{U \times V}(\mathcal{E} \boxtimes \mathcal{F})$ for $\mathcal{E} \in \text{Qcoh}(X)$ and $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Qcoh}(Y)$.*

Proof. Part (a) follows from the usual isomorphism encoding compatibility of pullback and tensor product. For part (b), apply Lemma A.1.(b) and Lemma A.4 twice. The morphism in part (c) is constructed using the adjunction $((u \times v)^*, (u \times v)_*)$. That it is an isomorphism can be checked locally on $X \times Y$. Since u and v are affine we can assume that $u: U = \text{Spec } A' \rightarrow X = \text{Spec } A$ and $v: V = \text{Spec } B' \rightarrow Y = \text{Spec } B$. In this case the claim is obvious. \square

Corollary A.17. *Let X be a scheme over a field k , and let $u: U \subset X$ and $v: V \subset X$ be affine immersions of open subschemes. Then*

$$\Delta^*({}_U\mathcal{E} \boxtimes {}_V\mathcal{F}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \Delta^*(_{U \times V}(\mathcal{E} \boxtimes \mathcal{F})) \xrightarrow{\sim} _{U \cap V}(\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{F})$$

for $\mathcal{E} \in \text{Qcoh}(X)$ and $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Qcoh}(X)$.

Proof. Use Lemmata A.15 and A.16.(c). \square

Remark A.18. If X and Y are schemes over a field k we have seen in Lemma A.14 that the bifunctor $\boxtimes: \text{Sh}(X) \times \text{Sh}(Y) \rightarrow \text{Sh}(X \times Y)$ is exact. Hence we use the same symbol for the induced functor

$$(-\boxtimes?): D(\text{Sh}(X)) \times D(\text{Sh}(Y)) \rightarrow D(\text{Sh}(X \times Y)).$$

It is easy to see that this functor is isomorphic to $\mathbf{L}p^*(-) \otimes^{\mathbf{L}} \mathbf{L}q^*(?)$ which is isomorphic to $p^*(-) \otimes^{\mathbf{L}} q^*(?)$ because p and q are flat.

APPENDIX B. TRIANGULATED CATEGORIES IN TERMS OF DG ENDOMORPHISM ALGEBRAS

We work with dg categories over an arbitrary commutative ground ring.

Proposition B.1. *Let \mathcal{C} be a dg category with a full pretriangulated dg subcategory \mathcal{I} . Let $z: P \rightarrow I$ be a closed degree zero morphism in \mathcal{C} with $I \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $z^*: \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(I, J) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, J)$ is a quasi-isomorphism for all $J \in \mathcal{I}$, and let B be a dg algebra together with a morphism $\beta: B \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(P)$ of dg algebras such that the composition $B \xrightarrow{\beta} \text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(P) \xrightarrow{z_*} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, I)$ is a quasi-isomorphism.*

(a) *If $[\mathcal{I}]$ is Karoubian and I is a classical generator of $[\mathcal{I}]$ then the functor*

$$\text{res}_B^{\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(P)} \circ \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, -): [\mathcal{I}] \rightarrow \text{per}(B)$$

is an equivalence of triangulated categories.

(b) *If $[\mathcal{I}]$ has all coproducts and I is a compact generator of $[\mathcal{I}]$ then the functor*

$$\text{res}_B^{\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(P)} \circ \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, -): [\mathcal{I}] \rightarrow D(B)$$

is an equivalence of triangulated categories.

Proof. (a): The upper horizontal arrow in the following commutative diagram is an isomorphism since all the other maps are isomorphisms.

$$(B.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{Hom}_{[\mathcal{I}]}(I, [m]I) & \xrightarrow{\text{res}_B^{\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(P)} \circ \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, -)} & \text{Hom}_{D(B)}(\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, I), [m] \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, I)) \\ \parallel & & \downarrow (z_* \circ \beta)^* \sim \\ H^m(\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(I, I)) & & \\ H^m(z^*) \downarrow \sim & & \\ H^m(\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, I)) & \xleftarrow[\sim]{\text{can}} & \text{Hom}_{D(B)}(B, [m] \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, I)). \end{array}$$

Hence our functor is full and faithful. The quasi-isomorphism $z_* \circ \beta: B \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, I)$ of dg B -modules shows that it maps I to a classical generator of the Karoubian category $\text{per}(B)$. Since $[\mathcal{I}]$ is Karoubian we see that our functor is essentially surjective.

(b): We first claim that the functor $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{I}}(I, -): [\mathcal{I}] \rightarrow D(A)$ preserves all coproducts where $A = \text{End}_{\mathcal{I}}(I)$. Let $(M_r)_{r \in R}$ be a family of objects of $[\mathcal{I}]$, and let $\bigoplus M_r$ together with

morphisms $s_r: M_r \rightarrow \bigoplus M_r$ be their coproduct in $[\mathcal{I}]$. Lifts of the s_r to closed degree zero morphisms in \mathcal{I} induce a morphism

$$\bigoplus \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{I}}(I, M_r) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{I}}(I, \bigoplus M_r)$$

in $D(A)$. Taking the m -th cohomology we obtain an isomorphism since I is compact in $[\mathcal{I}]$.

Using the quasi-isomorphisms $z^*: \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(I, J) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, J)$ for $J = M_r$ and $J = \bigoplus M_r$ one shows that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, -): [\mathcal{I}] \rightarrow D(B)$ preserves all coproducts, and this is clear for $\mathrm{res}_B^{\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(P)}: D(\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(P)) \rightarrow D(B)$. By assumption we have a quasi-isomorphism $z_* \circ \beta: B \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, I)$ of dg B -modules and hence $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, I)$ is a compact generator of $D(B)$. The commutative diagram (B.1) from the proof of (a) shows that the functor $\mathrm{res}_B^{\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(P)} \circ \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(P, -)$ is full and faithful on all shifts of I . Then one proceeds as in the proof of [Kel94, Lemma 4.2]. \square

APPENDIX C. ČECH ENHANCEMENTS FOR LOCALLY INTEGRAL SCHEMES

The aim of this section is to provide some results which are used in [LSa]. We employ them for proving Theorem C.16.

In this section we assume that X is a scheme satisfying the following condition (GSP+).

(GSP+) X is Nagata, locally integral, i.e. all local rings $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ are integral domains, and satisfies condition (GSP).

This condition implies that the irreducible and connected components of X coincide; in particular, X is the finite disjoint union of integral schemes ([GW10, Ex. 3.16, p. 90]).

The condition “Nagata” in (GSP+) can be replaced by “Noetherian” if X is excellent, for example if X is of finite type over a field or the integers.

C.1. Čech enhancements. We repeat (in a more general setting) the definition of the enhancement explained in [BLL04, Lemma 6.7].

Fix an ordered finite affine open covering $\mathcal{U} = (U_s)_{s \in S}$ of X . Denote by $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}_{\check{\mathrm{Cob}}^*}(X)$ the smallest full dg subcategory of $C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))$ that contains all objects $\mathcal{C}_*(P)$, for P a vector bundle on X , is closed under shifts in both directions, under cones of closed degree zero morphisms and under taking homotopy equivalent objects. Then $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}_{\check{\mathrm{Cob}}^*}(X)$ is strongly pretriangulated. If R is a bounded complex of vector bundles we have $\mathcal{C}_*(R) \in \mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}_{\check{\mathrm{Cob}}^*}(X)$ (use brutal truncation on R).

Proposition C.1 (cf. [BLL04, Lemma 6.7]). *The canonical functor*

$$\varepsilon: [\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}_{\check{\mathrm{Cob}}^*}(X)] \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}(X)$$

is an equivalence of triangulated categories. Hence the dg category $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}_{\check{\mathrm{Cob}}^}(X)$ is naturally an enhancement of $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}(X)$. We call it the (object oriented) *-Čech enhancement.*

The proof of this proposition is similar to that of Proposition 3.7.

Proof. By condition (GSP), any object of $\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{erf}(X)$ is isomorphic to a bounded complex R of vector bundles, and then to $\mathcal{C}_*(R)$. This shows that ε is essentially surjective.

Let P and Q be vector bundles on X . In order to prove that ε is full and faithful it is enough to show that

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{[C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))]}(\mathcal{C}_*(P), [m]\mathcal{C}_*(Q)) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_*(P), [m]\mathcal{C}_*(Q))$$

is an isomorphism, for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Applying brutal truncation to $\mathcal{C}_*(Q)$ and passing to direct summands reduces this to the claim of the following Lemma [C.2](#). \square

Lemma C.2. *Let P and Q be vector bundles on X and let $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Assume that $V = U_I$ for some non-empty subset $I \subset S$. Then*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{[C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))]}(\mathcal{C}_*(P), [n]_V Q) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_*(P), [n]_V Q)$$

is an isomorphism.

Proof. Let $p: P \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_*(P)$ be the Čech resolution and consider the commutative diagram

$$(C.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Hom}_{[C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))]}(\mathcal{C}_*(P), [n]_V Q) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_*(P), [n]_V Q) \\ p^* \downarrow & & p^* \downarrow \sim \\ \mathrm{Hom}_{[C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))]}(P, [n]_V Q) & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon'} & \mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))}(P, [n]_V Q). \end{array}$$

The right vertical map p^* is an isomorphism since p is a quasi-isomorphism. We will prove that ε' and the left vertical map p^* are isomorphisms.

Let us show first that ε' is an isomorphism. Note that $j: V \rightarrow X$ is affine and open, hence $\mathbf{R}j_* = j_*$ and $\mathbf{L}j^* = j^*$, and recall that ${}_V Q = j_* j^*(Q)$. Hence the adjunction (j^*, j_*) show that it is enough to prove that

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{[C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(V))]}(j^*(P), [n]j^*(Q)) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(V))}(j^*(P), [n]j^*(Q))$$

is an isomorphism. But this is clear since V is affine and $j^*(P)$ corresponds to a projective module over $\mathcal{O}_V(V)$.

Note that V is the finite disjoint union of its connected components which are integral schemes. Let V' be a connected component of V . (Alternatively we could also assume without loss of generality that X and hence V are integral.) In order to show that the left vertical map p^* in [\(C.1\)](#) is an isomorphism it is sufficient to prove that

$$(C.2) \quad p^*: \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_*(P), {}_{V'} Q) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X))}(P, {}_{V'} Q)$$

is a quasi-isomorphism. The right hand side is equal to $\mathrm{Hom}_{C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(V'))}(P|_{V'}, Q|_{V'})$. Its degree zero component is

$$H := \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{V'}}(P|_{V'}, Q|_{V'}),$$

and all other components vanish. The graded components of the left hand side are direct sums of objects

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(U_J P, {}_{V'} Q)$$

for non-empty $J \subset S$. Lemma [A.5](#) says that this is equal to H if $V' \subset U_J$, and zero otherwise. By assumption, $M(V') := \{s \in S \mid V' \subset U_s\}$ is non-empty, and we have $V' \subset U_J$ if and only if $J \subset M(V')$. Hence the left hand side of [\(C.2\)](#) is the chain complex

$$\dots \rightarrow \prod_{s_0, s_1 \in M(V'), s_0 < s_1} H \rightarrow \prod_{s_0 \in M(V')} H \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \dots$$

of a (non-empty) simplex with coefficients in H . The map (C.2) is the augmentation map to H which is a homotopy equivalence and in particular a quasi-isomorphism. This proves the lemma. \square

Remark C.3. *If R is a bounded complex of vector bundles on X then we have observed above that $C_*(R) \in \mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{\text{Cob}}*}(X)$. Conversely, any object of $\mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{\text{Cob}}*}(X)$ is homotopy equivalent to an object of this form. Indeed, given $P \in \mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{\text{Cob}}*}(X)$, there is a finite complex R of vector bundles such that P and (R) and $C_*(R)$ are isomorphic in $\mathfrak{P}erf(X)$, by condition (GSP). But then Proposition C.1 shows that P and $C_*(R)$ are already isomorphic in $[\mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{\text{Cob}}*}(X)]$.*

Remark C.4. *The realization functor (3.7) defines a quasi-equivalence $C_*: \check{\text{Cech}}_*(X) \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{\text{Cob}}*}(X)$ because both dg categories enhance $\mathfrak{P}erf(X)$, by Propositions 3.13 and C.1 (use [LSa, Lemma 2.5]). In particular, these two enhancements of $\mathfrak{P}erf(X)$ are equivalent. Remark C.3 says that any object of $\mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{\text{Cob}}*}(X)$ is homotopy equivalent to an object in the image of this realization functor. If X is assumed to be integral the realization functor is not only full but also faithful, as already observed in Remark 3.5.*

C.1.1. *Version for arbitrary sheaves.* In the following section C.2 we need a small generalization of the previous constructions and results (cf. Remark C.5).

Recall the equivalence $\mathfrak{P}erf(X) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{P}erf'(X)$. Denote by $\mathfrak{P}erf'_{\check{\text{Cob}}*}(X)$ the smallest full dg subcategory of $C(\text{Sh}(X))$ that contains all objects of $\mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{\text{Cob}}*}(X)$ and is closed under taking homotopy equivalent objects; then the inclusion $\mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{\text{Cob}}*}(X) \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}erf'_{\check{\text{Cob}}*}(X)$ of dg categories is a quasi-equivalence and $\mathfrak{P}erf'_{\check{\text{Cob}}*}$ is an enhancement of $\mathfrak{P}erf'(X)$.

C.2. Lifting the duality. Keep the ordered finite affine open covering $\mathcal{U} = (U_s)_{s \in S}$ from above and abbreviate $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_X$. The functor

$$\mathbf{R} \mathcal{H}om(-, \mathcal{O}): D(\text{Sh}(X))^{\text{op}} \rightarrow D(\text{Sh}(X))$$

induces an auto-equivalence $D: \mathfrak{P}erf'(X)^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}erf'(X)$ satisfying $\text{id} \xrightarrow{\sim} D^2$. If E is a bounded complex of vector bundles we have $D(E) \cong E^\vee = \mathcal{H}om(E, \mathcal{O})$ and $E = (E^\vee)^\vee$. Our aim is to show that we can lift the auto-duality D to the enhancement $\mathfrak{P}erf'_{\check{\text{Cob}}*}(X)$. For this we consider the dg functor

$$\tilde{D} := \mathcal{H}om(-, C_*(\mathcal{O})): C(\text{Sh}(X))^{\text{op}} \rightarrow C(\text{Sh}(X)).$$

Remark C.5. *In general, \tilde{D} does not preserve $C(\text{Qcoh}(X))$ (Lemma A.8). This forces us to leave the quasi-coherent world and to work with $\mathfrak{P}erf'_{\check{\text{Cob}}*}(X)$ instead of $\mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{\text{Cob}}*}(X)$.*

Remark C.6. *If E and F are vector bundles on X and $v: V \subset X$ is an open subscheme, then $v_* v^* \mathcal{H}om(E, F) = v_* \mathcal{H}om(v^*(E), v^*(F)) = \mathcal{H}om(E, v_* v^*(F))$ where the first equality is obvious (see Lemma 3.16) and the second equality is the adjunction. Hence we can and will identify $C_*(E^\vee) = \mathcal{H}om(E, C_*(\mathcal{O}))$.*

Lemma C.7. *Let E be a vector bundle (or a bounded complex of vector bundles) on X . Consider the canonical quasi-isomorphism $\alpha: E \rightarrow C_*(E)$. Then the induced morphism*

$$\tilde{D}(\alpha): \tilde{D}(C_*(E)) = \mathcal{H}om(C_*(E), C_*(\mathcal{O})) \rightarrow \tilde{D}(E) = \mathcal{H}om(E, C_*(\mathcal{O})) = C_*(E^\vee)$$

is a homotopy equivalence.

Proof. Using brutal truncation we can assume that E is a vector bundle. Write $\alpha^* := [-1]\tilde{D}(\alpha)$. We will show that the complex $\text{Cone}(\alpha^*) = \mathcal{H}om(\text{Cone}(\alpha), \mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{O}))$ is contractible (this certainly implies the lemma). We can also assume that X is irreducible: decompose E into a direct sum of vector bundles according to the decomposition of X into irreducible components.

First we filter $\text{Cone}(\alpha^*)$ according to the “target”, so that the subquotients are the complexes $\text{Cone}(\alpha^*)_I := \mathcal{H}om(\text{Cone}(\alpha), {}_{U_I}\mathcal{O})$ labeled by non-empty subsets $I \subset S$. Fix such an I . It suffices to prove that each $\text{Cone}(\alpha^*)_I$ is contractible. Note that $\text{Cone}(\alpha^*)_I$ as a graded sheaf is the direct sum of all $\mathcal{H}om({}_{U_J}E, {}_{U_I}\mathcal{O})$ (shifted to the obvious degree) where $J \subset S$ (here $J = \emptyset$ is allowed, then $U_\emptyset = X$ and ${}_{U_\emptyset}E = E$).

Observe that the sheaf $\mathcal{H}om({}_{U_J}E, {}_{U_I}\mathcal{O})$ depends only on (the fixed set U_I and) the intersection $U_J \cap U_I = {}_{U_{I \cup J}}$. Indeed, let $i: U_I \rightarrow X$ and $l: U_I \cap U_J \rightarrow U_I$ be the open immersions. Then

$$(C.3) \quad \mathcal{H}om({}_{U_J}E, {}_{U_I}\mathcal{O}) \xrightarrow{\sim} i_* l^* \mathcal{H}om(E|_{U_I \cap U_J}, \mathcal{O}_{U_I \cap U_J}) \xleftarrow{\sim} \mathcal{H}om({}_{U_{I \cup J}}E, {}_{U_I}\mathcal{O})$$

by Lemma A.8 (note that the inclusion morphism $U_J \subset X$ is affine, even for $J = \emptyset$, and that U_I is Nagata integral (if non-empty) since X is Nagata integral) or trivially if $U_I = \emptyset$. So it is natural to consider all subsets $J \subset S$ for which $I \cup J$ is constant.

Accordingly, we filter the complex $\text{Cone}(\alpha^*)_I$ so that the subquotients $\text{Cone}(\alpha^*)_I^K$ are labeled by subsets $K \subset S \setminus I$ (possibly empty) and are (as graded sheaves) direct sums of all $\mathcal{H}om({}_{U_J}E, {}_{U_I}\mathcal{O})$ (shifted to the obvious degree) where $K \subset J \subset (I \cup K)$ (so $I \cup J$ is constant and equal to $I \cup K$). Fix such a K .

It follows from (C.3) that the complex $\text{Cone}(\alpha^*)_I^K$ is isomorphic to the augmented chain complex of a (non-empty) simplex with coefficients in $\mathcal{H}om({}_{U_{I \cup K}}E, {}_{U_I}\mathcal{O})$, and hence contractible. This implies that $\text{Cone}(\alpha^*)_I$ is contractible. \square

Corollary C.8. *The dg functor \tilde{D} induces a dg functor*

$$\tilde{D} = \mathcal{H}om(-, \mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{O})): \mathfrak{P}erf'_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}ob*}(X)^{op} \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}erf'_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}ob*}(X)$$

which lifts the duality D in the sense that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [\mathfrak{P}erf'_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}ob*}(X)]^{op} & \xrightarrow{[\tilde{D}]} & [\mathfrak{P}erf'_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}ob*}(X)] \\ \downarrow \sim & & \downarrow \sim \\ \mathfrak{P}erf'(X)^{op} & \xrightarrow{D} & \mathfrak{P}erf'(X) \end{array}$$

commutes up to an isomorphism of functors.

Proof. Let E be a bounded complex of vector bundles. Lemma C.7 shows that $\tilde{D}(\mathcal{C}_*(E))$ is homotopy equivalent to $\mathcal{C}_*(E^\vee)$ and hence in $\mathfrak{P}erf'_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}ob*}(X)$. This implies the first claim.

For the second claim we need to define an isomorphism between the two compositions in the above diagram. On $\mathcal{C}_*(E)$ for E as above we define it to be the isomorphisms $D(\mathcal{C}_*(E)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D(E) \cong E^\vee$ followed by the isomorphism induced by the quasi-equivalence

$E^\vee \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_*(E^\vee)$ followed by the inverse of the isomorphism induced by the homotopy equivalence $\tilde{D}(\mathcal{C}_*(E)) \rightarrow \tilde{D}(E) = \mathcal{C}_*(E^\vee)$ from Lemma C.7. This is easily checked to be compatible with morphisms, and sufficient by Remark C.3. \square

The canonical morphism

$$(C.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \theta_F: F &\rightarrow \tilde{D}^2(F) = \mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{H}om(F, \mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{O})), \mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{O})), \\ f &\mapsto (\lambda \mapsto \lambda(f)), \end{aligned}$$

(for $F \in C(\text{Sh}(X))$) defines a morphism $\theta: \text{id} \rightarrow \tilde{D}^2$ of dg functors $C(\text{Sh}(X)) \rightarrow C(\text{Sh}(X))$, and, by Corollary C.8, also of dg functors $\mathfrak{P}erf'_{\text{Cob}*}(X) \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}erf'_{\text{Cob}*}(X)$.

Lemma C.9. *For each $F \in \mathfrak{P}erf'_{\text{Cob}*}(X)$, the morphism θ_F in (C.4) is a homotopy equivalence.*

Proof. Assume that $F = \mathcal{C}_*(E)$ for E a vector bundle on X . It is certainly enough to show the claim in this special case. Note that θ_F is a closed degree zero morphism in $\mathfrak{P}erf'_{\text{Cob}*}(X)$. Hence (the $\mathfrak{P}erf'$ -version of) Proposition C.1 shows that it is enough to prove that θ_F is a quasi-isomorphism.

The canonical quasi-isomorphism $\alpha_E: E \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_*(E)$ induces the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E & \xrightarrow{\theta_E} & \tilde{D}^2(E) = \mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{H}om(E, \mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{O})), \mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{O})) \\ \downarrow \alpha_E & & \downarrow \tilde{D}^2(\alpha_E) \\ \mathcal{C}_*(E) & \xrightarrow{\theta_F} & \tilde{D}^2(\mathcal{C}_*(E)) = \mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{C}_*(E), \mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{O})), \mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{O})) \end{array}$$

of closed degree zero morphisms. The morphism $\tilde{D}(\alpha_E)$ is a homotopy equivalence by Lemma C.7, so a fortiori the morphism $\tilde{D}^2(\alpha_E)$ is a homotopy equivalence. Therefore it suffices to prove that θ_E is a quasi-isomorphism.

Let $i: \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{O})$ be the canonical quasi-isomorphism. Note that the morphism

$$i_*: E^\vee = \mathcal{H}om(E, \mathcal{O}) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}om(E, \mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{O})) = \tilde{D}(E)$$

coincides with the canonical quasi-isomorphism $\alpha_{E^\vee}: E^\vee \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_*(E^\vee)$ if we identify the targets according to Remark C.6. Lemma C.7 then implies that $\tilde{D}(i_*)$ is a homotopy equivalence. It is easy to check that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E & \xrightarrow{\theta_E} & \tilde{D}^2(E) \\ \downarrow \sim & & \downarrow \tilde{D}(i_*) \\ E^{\vee\vee} = \mathcal{H}om(E^\vee, \mathcal{O}) & \xrightarrow{i_*} & \mathcal{H}om(E^\vee, \mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{O})) = \tilde{D}(E^\vee) \end{array}$$

commutes, where the left vertical arrow is the canonical isomorphism. Obviously, i_* is a quasi-isomorphism. Hence the same is true for θ_E . \square

Corollary C.10. *The dg functor $\tilde{D} = \mathcal{H}om(-, \mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{O})): \mathfrak{P}erf'_{\text{Cob}*}(X)^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}erf'_{\text{Cob}*}(X)$ is a quasi-equivalence. The induced functor $[\tilde{D}]$ on homotopy categories is an equivalence and a duality in the sense that the natural morphism $\theta: \text{id} \rightarrow [\tilde{D}]^2$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. Lemma C.9 shows that $\theta: \text{id} \rightarrow [\tilde{D}]^2$ is an isomorphism. In particular, $[\tilde{D}]$ is an equivalence, and \tilde{D} is a quasi-equivalence. \square

C.3. Products and enhancements. We work now over a field k . Let X and Y be k -schemes such that X , Y , and $X \times Y$ satisfy condition (GSP+).

C.3.1. Enhancements for products. Fix ordered finite affine open coverings $\mathcal{U} = (U_s)_{s \in S}$ of X and $\mathcal{V} = (V_t)_{t \in T}$ of Y . On $X \times Y$ we consider the finite affine open covering $\mathcal{W} := \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V} = (W_{(s,t)})_{(s,t) \in S \times T}$ where $W_{(s,t)} = U_s \times V_t$ (and equip $S \times T$ with some total ordering). Let $\mathfrak{P}\text{erf}_{\check{\text{Cob}}*\boxtimes}(X \times Y)$ be the smallest full dg subcategory of $C(\text{Qcoh}(X \times Y))$ that contains all objects $\mathcal{C}_*(P) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_*(Q)$ for P and Q vector bundles on X and Y , respectively, all objects $\mathcal{C}_*(R)$ for R a vector bundle on $X \times Y$, and is closed under shifts in both directions, cones of closed degree zero morphisms and under taking homotopy equivalent objects. It is strongly pretriangulated. We will see in Corollary C.12 that we have defined nothing new.

Proposition C.11. *The dg category $\mathfrak{P}\text{erf}_{\check{\text{Cob}}*\boxtimes}(X \times Y)$ is naturally an enhancement of $\mathfrak{P}\text{erf}(X \times Y)$.*

Proof. We essentially repeat the proof of Proposition C.1. Note that $\mathfrak{P}\text{erf}_{\check{\text{Cob}}*}(X \times Y) \subset \mathfrak{P}\text{erf}_{\check{\text{Cob}}*\boxtimes}(X \times Y)$. It remains to prove that

$$\text{Hom}_{[C(\text{Qcoh}(X \times Y))]}(A, [m]B) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{D(\text{Qcoh}(X \times Y))}(A, [m]B)$$

is an isomorphism for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ in the four cases where A and B are of the form $\mathcal{C}_*(P) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_*(Q)$ or $\mathcal{C}_*(R)$. Note that $\mathcal{C}_*(P) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_*(Q)$ is built up from objects $U_{S'} P \boxtimes_{V_{T'}} Q \xrightarrow{\sim} U_{S' \times V_{T'}} (P \boxtimes Q)$ for non-empty subsets $S' \subset S$ and $T' \subset T$ (see Lemma A.16.(c)), and that $\mathcal{C}_*(R)$ is built up from objects $U_{S' \times V_{T'}} R$ (where S' (resp. T') is the image of some non-empty subset of $S \times T$ under the first (resp. second) projection). Hence the two cases where A is of the form $\mathcal{C}_*(R)$ can be treated as in the proof of Proposition C.1. The remaining two cases follow from the following claim.

Let P, Q, R be vector bundles on X, Y , and $X \times Y$, respectively, and let $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Assume that V' is an irreducible component of $U_I \times V_J$ where $I \subset S$ and $J \subset T$ are non-empty subsets. Then

$$\text{Hom}_{[C(\text{Qcoh}(X \times Y))]}(\mathcal{C}_*(P) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_*(Q), [n]_{V'} R) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{D(\text{Qcoh}(X \times Y))}(\mathcal{C}_*(P) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_*(Q), [n]_{V'} R)$$

is an isomorphism.

This claim is proved as Lemma C.2, using $P \boxtimes Q \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_*(P) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_*(Q)$. The analog of the map ε' in (C.1) is an isomorphism by the same argument. The analog of the left vertical map p^* comes from the augmentation map of the chain complex of the product of two (non-empty) simplices and is therefore an isomorphism: consider $M(V') := \{(s, t) \in S \times T \mid V' \subset U_s \times V_t\}$ and note that $M(V') = M(\text{pr}_1(V')) \times M(\text{pr}_2(V'))$ where $X \xleftarrow{\text{pr}_1} X \times Y \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_2} Y$ are the projections and $M(\text{pr}_1(V'))$ and $M(\text{pr}_2(V'))$ are defined in the obvious way. \square

Corollary C.12. *We have $\mathfrak{P}\text{erf}_{\check{\text{Cob}}*}(X \times Y) = \mathfrak{P}\text{erf}_{\check{\text{Cob}}*\boxtimes}(X \times Y)$.*

Proof. Obviously $\mathfrak{P}\text{erf}_{\check{\text{Cob}}*}(X \times Y) \subset \mathfrak{P}\text{erf}_{\check{\text{Cob}}*\boxtimes}(X \times Y)$. Let P and Q be vector bundles on X and Y , respectively. Since $\mathcal{C}_*(P) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_*(Q)$ and $\mathcal{C}_*(P \boxtimes Q)$ are isomorphic in $\mathfrak{P}\text{erf}(X \times Y)$, they

are isomorphic in $\mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{C}ob* \boxtimes}(X \times Y)$, by Proposition C.11. This means that $\mathcal{C}_*(P) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_*(Q)$ is homotopy equivalent to $\mathcal{C}_*(P \boxtimes Q)$ and hence already in $\mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{C}ob*}(X \times Y)$. \square

Let $\Delta: X \rightarrow X \times X$ be the diagonal (closed) immersion. We consider the product covering $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U}$ of $X \times X$.

Lemma C.13. *Assume that $X \times X$ satisfies condition (GSP+). Let P, Q, R be vector bundles on X , and let $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then the canonical map*

$${}^m_{[C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X \times X))]}(\mathcal{C}_*(P) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_*(Q), \Delta_*(\mathcal{C}_*(R))) \rightarrow {}^m_{D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X \times X))}(\mathcal{C}_*(P) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_*(Q), \Delta_*(\mathcal{C}_*(R)))$$

is an isomorphism. Here we write ${}^m_?(-, -)$ instead of $\mathrm{Hom}_?(-, [m]-)$.

Proof. We follow the idea of the proof of Proposition C.1. We need to show the following two claims where $V = U_I$ for some non-empty subset $I \subset S$.

- (a) ${}_{[C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X \times X))]}(P \boxtimes Q, [n]\Delta_*(V'R)) \rightarrow {}_{D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X \times X))}(P \boxtimes Q, [n]\Delta_*(V'R))$ is an isomorphism, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.
- (b) Let $p: P \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_*(P)$ and $q: Q \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_*(Q)$ denote the obvious maps, and let $V' \subset V$ be an irreducible component. Then

$$(p \boxtimes q)^*: {}_{C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X \times X))}(\mathcal{C}_*(P) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_*(Q), \Delta_*(V'R)) \rightarrow {}_{C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(X \times X))}(P \boxtimes Q, \Delta_*(V'R))$$

is a quasi-isomorphism.

Proof of (a): Note that Δ is affine as a closed immersion and hence $\mathbf{R}\Delta_* = \Delta_*$. Moreover we have $\mathbf{L}\Delta^*(P \boxtimes Q) = \Delta^*(P \boxtimes Q) = P \otimes Q$. Using the obvious adjunctions we can hence proceed as in the proof of Proposition C.1.

Proof of (b): The right hand side is concentrated in degree zero and equal to

$$H := \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}((P \otimes Q)|_{V'}, R|_{V'})$$

there. The graded components of the left hand side are direct sums of objects

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{X \times X}}(U_K P \boxtimes_{U_L} Q, \Delta_*(V'R)) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(U_K \cap U_L (P \otimes Q), V'R)$$

where $K, L \subset S$ are non-empty subsets and the isomorphism follows from Corollary A.17. Using Lemma A.5 this implies that $(p \boxtimes q)^*$ is the augmentation map of the chain complex of the product of two (non-empty) simplices with coefficients in H and therefore a quasi-isomorphism. \square

C.3.2. Enhancements and external tensor product. We come back to the product situation $X \times Y$ with covering $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}$.

Lemma C.14. *The obvious dg functor*

$$(C.5) \quad \boxtimes: \mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{C}ob*}(X) \otimes \mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{C}ob*}(Y) \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{C}ob*}(X \times Y)$$

is quasi-fully faithful, i. e. induces quasi-isomorphisms between morphisms spaces.

Proof. Corollary C.12 makes sure that this functor is well-defined. We can assume without loss of generality that X and Y are integral. Let $T \subset X$, $T' \subset X$, $U \subset Y$ and $U' \subset Y$ be

affine open subsets, and let E, E' be vector bundles on X and F, F' be vector bundles on Y . We claim that the morphism

$$\boxtimes: \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(T E, T' E') \otimes \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(U F, U' F') \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{X \times Y}}(T \times U(E \boxtimes F), T' \times U'(E' \boxtimes F'))$$

is an isomorphism (cf. Lemma A.16.(c)). This is trivial if one of the sets T, T', U, U' is empty, and otherwise the condition $(T' \subset T \text{ and } U' \subset U)$ is equivalent to the condition $T' \times U' \subset T \times U$. Now we use Lemma A.5. If these conditions do not hold, both sides are zero; if they hold we need to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \boxtimes: \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{T'}}(E|_{T'}, E'|_{T'}) \otimes \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{U'}}(F|_{U'}, F'|_{U'}) \\ \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{T' \times U'}}((E \boxtimes F)|_{T' \times U'}, (E' \boxtimes F')|_{T' \times U'}) \end{aligned}$$

is an isomorphism. But since T' and U' are affine and E and F are vector bundles this is obvious. This proves our claim, and it is easy to deduce the lemma. \square

Remark C.15. Consider the composition

$$(C.6) \quad \mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{C}ob*}(X) \times \mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{C}ob*}(Y) \xrightarrow{\otimes} \mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{C}ob*}(X) \otimes \mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{C}ob*}(Y) \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} \mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{C}ob*}(X \times Y)$$

where the first functor is the obvious dg bifunctor and the second functor is the dg functor (C.5). Passing to homotopy categories defines the upper row in the following diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} [\mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{C}ob*}(X)] \times [\mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{C}ob*}(Y)] & \xrightarrow{\otimes} & [\mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{C}ob*}(X) \otimes \mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{C}ob*}(Y)] & \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} & [\mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{C}ob*}(X \times Y)] \\ \downarrow \varepsilon \times \varepsilon & & & & \downarrow \varepsilon \\ \mathfrak{P}erf(X) \times \mathfrak{P}erf(Y) & \xrightarrow{\quad \boxtimes \quad} & & & \mathfrak{P}erf(X \times Y). \end{array}$$

This diagram is commutative. This means that the dg bifunctor (C.6) is a lift of the bifunctor $\boxtimes: \mathfrak{P}erf(X) \times \mathfrak{P}erf(Y) \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}erf(X \times Y)$ of triangulated categories to the indicated enhancements.

C.3.3. *Version for arbitrary sheaves on products.* It is clear that the previous results of section C.3 remain true if we replace $\mathfrak{P}erf_{\check{C}ob*}$ by $\mathfrak{P}erf'_{\check{C}ob*}$ and $\mathfrak{P}erf$ by $\mathfrak{P}erf'$ and $C(\mathrm{Qcoh}(-))$ by $C(\mathrm{Sh}(-))$ and $D(\mathrm{Qcoh}(-))$ by $D(\mathrm{Sh}(-))$.

C.4. Homological smoothness and the structure sheaf of the diagonal – the locally integral case.

Theorem C.16. Let X be a scheme over a field k such that X and $X \times X$ satisfy condition (GSP+). Let $\Delta: X \rightarrow X \times X$ be the diagonal (closed) immersion. Then $\mathfrak{P}erf(X)$ is smooth over k if and only if $\Delta_*(\mathcal{O}_X) \in \mathfrak{P}erf(X \times X)$.

This theorem is weaker than Theorem 4.3 because a Nagata quasi-compact scheme is Noetherian. Anyway we include a proof based on the results of this section.

Proof. Fix an ordered finite affine open covering $\mathcal{U} = (U_s)_{s \in S}$ of X . We can test k -smoothness of $\mathfrak{P}erf(X) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{P}erf'(X)$ on the enhancement $\mathfrak{P}erf'_{\check{C}ob*}(X)$, cf. Remark C.4 and section C.1.1.

As in the proof of Theorem 4.3 we find a vector bundle E on X that is a classical generator of $\mathfrak{P}erf'(X)$ and see that k -smoothness of $\mathfrak{P}erf(X)$ is equivalent to k -smoothness of the dg algebra

$$A := \text{End}_{C(\text{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_*(E)),$$

i. e. to the condition $A \in \text{per}(A \otimes A^{\text{op}})$. We also know that E^\vee is a classical generator of $\mathfrak{P}erf'(X)$ and that $E \boxtimes E^\vee$ is a classical generator of $\mathfrak{P}erf'(X \times X)$.

We use the $*$ -Čech enhancement $\mathfrak{P}erf'_{\text{Cob}*}(X \times X) = \mathfrak{P}erf'_{\text{Cob}* \boxtimes}(X \times X)$ of $\mathfrak{P}erf'(X \times X)$ with respect to $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U}$. A lift of $E \boxtimes E^\vee$ to this enhancement is given by the object

$$P := \mathcal{C}_*(E) \boxtimes \tilde{D}(\mathcal{C}_*(E))$$

because Lemma C.7 provides the homotopy equivalence

$$(C.7) \quad \text{id} \boxtimes \tilde{D}(\alpha): P \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_*(E) \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_*(E^\vee).$$

Note that

$$\tilde{D}: A^{\text{op}} = \text{End}_{C(\text{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_*(E))^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{End}_{C(\text{Sh}(X))}(\tilde{D}(\mathcal{C}_*(E)))$$

is a quasi-isomorphism of dg algebras by Corollary C.10. Since we work over a field, this and Lemma C.14 imply that both arrows in

$$(C.8) \quad A \otimes A^{\text{op}} \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes \tilde{D}} \text{End}_{C(\text{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_*(E)) \otimes \text{End}_{C(\text{Sh}(X))}(\tilde{D}(\mathcal{C}_*(E))) \xrightarrow{\boxtimes} \text{End}_{C(\text{Sh}(X \times X))}(P)$$

are quasi-isomorphisms of dg algebras.

As in the proof of Theorem 4.3 we use the enhancement $C_{\text{Qcoh}}^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Sh}(X \times X))$ of $D(\text{Qcoh}(X \times X)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\text{Qcoh}}(\text{Sh}(X \times X))$. Let $z: P \rightarrow I$ be a quasi-isomorphism with $I \in C^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Sh}(X \times X))$. Note that I is isomorphic to the vector bundle $E \boxtimes E^\vee$ in $D(\text{Sh}(X \times X))$ and hence a compact generator of $[C_{\text{Qcoh}}^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Sh}(X \times X))] \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\text{Qcoh}}(\text{Sh}(X \times X))$. We now can apply Proposition B.1.(b) to the dg subcategory $C_{\text{Qcoh}}^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Sh}(X \times X))$ of $C(\text{Sh}(X \times X))$ and β there the composition in (C.8). Note for this that

$$z_*: \text{Hom}_{C(\text{Sh}(X \times X))}(P, P) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{C(\text{Sh}(X \times X))}(P, I)$$

is a quasi-isomorphism: the induced map on the m -th cohomology identifies with the isomorphism

$$z_*: \text{Hom}_{D(\text{Sh}(X \times X))}(P, [m]P) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{D(\text{Sh}(X \times X))}(P, [m]I)$$

since P is in the enhancement $\mathfrak{P}erf'_{\text{Cob}*}(X \times X)$ of $\mathfrak{P}erf'(X \times X) \subset D(\text{Sh}(X \times X))$ and I is h-injective. We deduce that

$$F := \text{Hom}_{C(\text{Sh}(X \times X))}(P, -): [C_{\text{Qcoh}}^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Sh}(X \times X))] \xrightarrow{\sim} D(A \otimes A^{\text{op}})$$

is an equivalence of triangulated categories. The category on the left identifies with $D_{\text{Qcoh}}(\text{Sh}(X \times X))$, and F induces an equivalence $\mathfrak{P}erf'(X \times X) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{per}(A \otimes A^{\text{op}})$ on the subcategories of compact objects. Hence it is enough to show that F maps (an h-injective lift of) $\Delta_*(\mathcal{O}_X)$ to (an object isomorphic to) A .

The Čech resolution $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{O}_X)$ yields a resolution $\Delta_*(\mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow \Delta_*(\mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{O}_X))$. Let $\Delta_*(\mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{O}_X)) \rightarrow T$ be a quasi-isomorphism with $T \in C_{\text{Qcoh}}^{\text{h-inj}}(\text{Sh}(X \times X))$. So T is an h-injective lift of $\Delta_*(\mathcal{O}_X)$. Note that the induced map

$$\text{Hom}_{C(\text{Sh}(X \times X))}(P, \Delta_*(\mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{O}_X))) \rightarrow F(T) = \text{Hom}_{C(\text{Sh}(X \times X))}(P, T)$$

is a quasi-isomorphism (of dg $A \otimes A^{\text{op}}$ -modules): use the homotopy equivalence (C.7), Lemma C.13, $D(\text{Qcoh}(X \times X)) \xrightarrow{\sim} D_{\text{Qcoh}}(\text{Sh}(X \times X))$, and the h-injectivity of T .

The obvious adjunctions of dg functors provide isomorphisms of dg $A \otimes A^{\text{op}}$ -modules

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{C(\text{Sh}(X \times X))}(P, \Delta_*(\mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{O}_X))) &\xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}_{C(\text{Sh}(X))}(\Delta^*(\mathcal{C}_*(E) \boxtimes \tilde{D}(\mathcal{C}_*(E))), \mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{O}_X)) \\ &= \text{Hom}_{C(\text{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_*(E) \otimes \tilde{D}(\mathcal{C}_*(E)), \mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{O}_X)) \\ &\xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}_{C(\text{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_*(E), \mathcal{H}om(\tilde{D}(\mathcal{C}_*(E)), \mathcal{C}_*(\mathcal{O}_X))) \\ &= \text{Hom}_{C(\text{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_*(E), \tilde{D}^2(\mathcal{C}_*(E))). \end{aligned}$$

Now use Lemma C.9. The canonical morphism $\theta_{\mathcal{C}_*(E)}: \mathcal{C}_*(E) \rightarrow \tilde{D}^2(\mathcal{C}_*(E))$ is a homotopy equivalence, so

$$(\theta_{\mathcal{C}_*(E)})_*: \text{Hom}_{C(\text{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_*(E), \mathcal{C}_*(E)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{C(\text{Sh}(X))}(\mathcal{C}_*(E), \tilde{D}^2(\mathcal{C}_*(E)))$$

is a homotopy equivalence; moreover, it is a morphism of dg $A \otimes A^{\text{op}}$ -modules. The object on the left is the diagonal dg $A \otimes A^{\text{op}}$ -module A .

The above (quasi-)isomorphisms provide an isomorphism $F(T) \cong A$ in $D(A \otimes A^{\text{op}})$. This shows that F maps $\Delta_*(\mathcal{O}_X)$ to A . \square

REFERENCES

- [AM69] M. F. Atiyah and I. G. Macdonald, *Introduction to commutative algebra*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass.-London-Don Mills, Ont., 1969.
- [AVP92] Luchezar L. Avramov and Micheline Vigué-Poirrier, *Hochschild homology criteria for smoothness*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices (1992), no. 1, 17–25.
- [BG171] P. Berthelot, A. Grothendieck, and L. Illusie, *Théorie des intersections et théorème de Riemann-Roch*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 225, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1971, Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois-Marie 1966–1967 (SGA 6), Dirigé par P. Berthelot, A. Grothendieck et L. Illusie. Avec la collaboration de D. Ferrand, J. P. Jouanolou, O. Jussila, S. Kleiman, M. Raynaud et J. P. Serre.
- [BH93] Winfried Bruns and Jürgen Herzog, *Cohen-Macaulay rings*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 39, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.
- [BLL04] Alexey I. Bondal, Michael Larsen, and Valery A. Lunts, *Grothendieck ring of pretriangulated categories*, Int. Math. Res. Not. (2004), no. 29, 1461–1495.
- [BN93] Marcel Bökstedt and Amnon Neeman, *Homotopy limits in triangulated categories*, Compositio Math. **86** (1993), no. 2, 209–234.
- [BvdB03] A. Bondal and M. van den Bergh, *Generators and representability of functors in commutative and noncommutative geometry*, Mosc. Math. J. **3** (2003), no. 1, 1–36, 258.
- [Con00] Brian Conrad, *Grothendieck duality and base change*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1750, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000.
- [Con07] ———, *Deligne’s notes on Nagata compactifications*, J. Ramanujan Math. Soc. **22** (2007), no. 3, 205–257.
- [CS15] Alberto Canonaco and Paolo Stellari, *Uniqueness of dg enhancements for the derived category of a Grothendieck category*, 2015, [arxiv:1507.05509](https://arxiv.org/abs/1507.05509).

- [Gro61] A. Grothendieck, *Éléments de géométrie algébrique. III. Étude cohomologique des faisceaux cohérents (première partie)*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1961), no. 11, 167.
- [Gro05] Alexander Grothendieck, *Cohomologie locale des faisceaux cohérents et théorèmes de Lefschetz locaux et globaux (SGA 2)*, Documents Mathématiques (Paris), 4, Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 2005, Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois Marie, 1962, Revised reprint of the 1968 French original.
- [GW10] Ulrich Görtz and Torsten Wedhorn, *Algebraic geometry I*, Advanced Lectures in Mathematics, Vieweg + Teubner, Wiesbaden, 2010.
- [Har66] Robin Hartshorne, *Residues and duality*, Lecture notes of a seminar on the work of A. Grothendieck, given at Harvard 1963/64. With an appendix by P. Deligne. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, No. 20, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1966.
- [Har77] ———, *Algebraic geometry*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1977, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 52.
- [Kel94] Bernhard Keller, *Deriving DG categories*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **27** (1994), no. 1, 63–102.
- [Kem80] George R. Kempf, *Some elementary proofs of basic theorems in the cohomology of quasicoherent sheaves*, Rocky Mountain J. Math. **10** (1980), no. 3, 637–645.
- [Kra05] Henning Krause, *The stable derived category of a Noetherian scheme*, Compos. Math. **141** (2005), no. 5, 1128–1162.
- [KS94] Masaki Kashiwara and Pierre Schapira, *Sheaves on manifolds*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. 292, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994.
- [KS06] ———, *Categories and sheaves*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. 332, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006.
- [LC07] Jue Le and Xiao-Wu Chen, *Karoubianness of a triangulated category*, J. Algebra **310** (2007), no. 1, 452–457.
- [Liu02] Qing Liu, *Algebraic geometry and arithmetic curves*, Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 6, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002.
- [LO10] Valery A. Lunts and Dmitri O. Orlov, *Uniqueness of enhancement for triangulated categories*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **23** (2010), no. 3, 853–908.
- [LSa] Valery A. Lunts and Olaf M. Schnürer, *Matrix factorizations and motivic measures*, accepted by Journal of Noncommutative Geometry, [arXiv:1310.7640](https://arxiv.org/abs/1310.7640).
- [LSb] ———, *Matrix-factorizations and semi-orthogonal decompositions for blowing-ups*, accepted by Journal of Noncommutative Geometry, [arXiv:1212.2670](https://arxiv.org/abs/1212.2670).
- [LS14] ———, *Smoothness of equivariant derived categories*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **108** (2014), no. 5, 1226–1276.
- [Lun10] Valery A. Lunts, *Categorical resolution of singularities*, J. Algebra **323** (2010), no. 10, 2977–3003.
- [Lüt93] W. Lütkebohmert, *On compactification of schemes*, Manuscripta Math. **80** (1993), no. 1, 95–111.
- [Mur06] Daniel Murfet, *Derived categories of quasi-coherent sheaves*, Note (2006), 1–62, therisingsea.org/notes/DerivedCategoriesOfQuasicoherentSheaves.pdf.
- [Orl14] Dmitri Orlov, *Smooth and proper noncommutative schemes and gluing of dg categories*, Preprint (2014), [arXiv:1402.7364](https://arxiv.org/abs/1402.7364) [math.AG].
- [Rei95] Miles Reid, *Undergraduate commutative algebra*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts, vol. 29, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [Sch] Olaf M. Schnürer, *Some enhancements of derived categories of coherent sheaves and applications*, to appear in Oberwolfach Reports, abstract from the talk given in May 2014 at the workshop on Interactions between Algebraic Geometry and Noncommutative Algebra.
- [Ser00] Jean-Pierre Serre, *Local algebra*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000, Translated from the French by CheeWhye Chin and revised by the author.
- [Shk07] Dmytro Shklyarov, *On Serre duality for compact homologically smooth DG algebras*, Preprint (2007), [arXiv:math/0702590v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0702590v1) [math.RA].
- [Spa88] N. Spaltenstein, *Resolutions of unbounded complexes*, Compositio Math. **65** (1988), no. 2, 121–154.

- [SS] Olaf M. Schnürer and Wolfgang Soergel, *Proper base change for separated locally proper maps*, to appear in Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico della Università di Padova, [arXiv:1404.7630](https://arxiv.org/abs/1404.7630).
- [Sta14] The Stacks Project Authors, *Stacks project*, <http://stacks.math.columbia.edu>, 2014.
- [Toë07] Bertrand Toën, *The homotopy theory of dg-categories and derived Morita theory*, Invent. Math. **167** (2007), no. 3, 615–667.
- [Tot04] Burt Totaro, *The resolution property for schemes and stacks*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **577** (2004), 1–22.
- [TT90] R. W. Thomason and Thomas Trobaugh, *Higher algebraic K-theory of schemes and of derived categories*, The Grothendieck Festschrift, Vol. III, Progr. Math., vol. 88, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1990, pp. 247–435.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIANA UNIVERSITY, RAWLES HALL, 831 EAST 3RD STREET, BLOOMINGTON, IN 47405, USA

E-mail address: `vlunts@indiana.edu`

MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, UNIVERSITÄT BONN, ENDENICHER ALLEE 60, 53115 BONN, GERMANY

E-mail address: `olaf.schnuerer@math.uni-bonn.de`