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Abstract. Let \( T \) be a Krull-Schmidt, \( \text{Hom} \)-finite triangulated category with suspension functor \([1]\). Let \( R \) be a basic rigid object, \( \Gamma \) the endomorphism algebra of \( R \), and \( \text{pr}(R) \subseteq T \) the subcategory of objects finitely presented by \( R \). We investigate the relative rigid objects, i.e. \( R[1] \)-rigid objects of \( T \). Our main results show that the \( R[1] \)-rigid objects in \( \text{pr}(R) \) are in bijection with \( \tau \)-rigid \( \Gamma \)-modules, and the maximal \( R[1] \)-rigid objects with respect to \( \text{pr}(R) \) are in bijection with support \( \tau \)-tilting \( \Gamma \)-modules. We also show that various previously known bijections involving support \( \tau \)-tilting modules are recovered under respective assumptions.

1. Introduction

This note attempts to unify and generalize certain bijections involving support \( \tau \)-tilting modules. Support \( \tau \)-tilting module is the central notion in the \( \tau \)-tilting theory introduced by Adachi-Iyama-Reiten [AIR14], which can be regarded as a generalization of the classical tilting module. Since its appearance, support \( \tau \)-tilting module has been rapidly found to be linked up with various important objects in representation theory, such as torsion class, \( (co)\)\(\text{-}t\)\-structure, cluster tilting object, silting object and so on, see [AIR14, IJY14, CZZ15, LX16, YZ15, YZZ17] for instance. Among others, Adachi-Iyama-Reiten [AIR14] proved that for a 2-Calabi-Yau triangulated category \( T \) with a basic cluster tilting object \( T \), there is a one-to-one correspondence between the set of basic cluster tilting objects of \( T \) and the set of basic support \( \tau \)-tilting \( \text{End}_T(T) \)-modules. It is known that there exist 2-Calabi-Yau triangulated categories which have no cluster tilting objects but only maximal rigid objects. Then the correspondence was generalized to such kind of 2-Calabi-Yau triangulated categories by Chang-Zhang-Zhu [CZZ15] and Liu-Xie [LX16]. The Adachi-Iyama-Reiten’s correspondence has been further generalized by Yang-Zhu [YZ15]. More precisely, let \( T \) be a Krull-Schmidt, \( \text{Hom} \)-finite triangulated category with suspension functor \([1]\). Assume that \( T \) admits a Serre functor and a cluster tilting object \( T \). By introducing the notion of \( T[1] \)-cluster tilting objects as a generalization of cluster tilting objects, Yang-Zhu [YZ15] established a one-to-one correspondence between the set of \( T[1] \)-cluster tilting objects of \( T \) and the set of support \( \tau \)-tilting modules over \( \text{End}_T(T) \). On the other hand, for a Krull-Schmidt, Hom-finite triangulated category \( T \) with a silting object \( S \), Iyama-Jørgensen-Yang [IJY14] proved that the two-term silting objects of \( T \) with respect to \( S \) which belong to the finitely presented subcategory \( \text{pr}(S) \) are in bijection with support \( \tau \)-tilting modules over \( \text{End}_T(S) \).

In this note, we work in the following general setting. Let \( T \) be a Krull-Schmidt, Hom-finite triangulated category with suspension functor \([1]\) and \( R \) a basic rigid object of \( T \) with endomorphism algebra \( \Gamma = \text{End}_T(R) \). Denote by \( \text{pr}(R) \) the subcategory of objects finitely presented by \( R \). Following [YZ15], we introduce the \( R[1] \)-rigid object of \( T \) and the maximal \( R[1] \)-rigid object with respect to \( \text{pr}(R) \) (cf. Definition 2.2). We prove that the \( R[1] \)-rigid objects in \( \text{pr}(R) \) are in bijection with \( \tau \)-rigid \( \Gamma \)-modules, and the maximal \( R[1] \)-rigid objects with respect to \( \text{pr}(R) \) are in bijection with support \( \tau \)-tilting \( \Gamma \)-modules (cf. Theorem 2.5). When \( R \) is a cluster tilting object of \( T \), we show that the bijection reduces to the
bijection between the set of basic $R[1]$-cluster tilting objects of $\mathcal{T}$ and the set of basic support $\tau$-tilting $\Gamma$-modules obtained by Yang-Zhu [YZ15] (Corollary 2.8). We remark that, compare to [YZ15], we do not need the existence of a Serre functor for $\mathcal{T}$ (cf. also [YZZ17]). Since tilting modules are faithful support $\tau$-tilting modules, we also obtain a characterization of tilting $\Gamma$-modules via the bijection (cf. Theorem 2.9).

We apply the aforementioned bijection to the cases of silting objects, $d$-cluster tilting objects and maximal rigid objects in Section 3 and Section 4 respectively. When $R$ is a silting object of a triangulated category $\mathcal{T}$, we proved that the maximal $R[1]$-rigid objects with respect to $\text{pr}(R)$ coincide with the silting objects of $\mathcal{T}$ in $\text{pr}(R)$ (cf. Theorem 3.4). As a consequence, Theorem 2.5 recovers the bijection between the set of basic silting objects of $\mathcal{T}$ in $\text{pr}(R)$ and the set of basic support $\tau$-tilting $\text{End}(R)$-modules obtained by Iyama-Jørgensen-Yang [IJY14] (cf. Corollary 3.5). If $\mathcal{T}$ is a $d(\geq 2)$-cluster category and $R$ is a $d$-cluster tilting object of $\mathcal{T}$, then Theorem 2.5 reduces to the bijection obtained by Liu-Qiu-Xie [LQX] (cf. Corollary 4.5). Assume that $\mathcal{T}$ is a 2-Calabi-Yau triangulated category and $R$ is a basic maximal rigid object of $\mathcal{T}$. We show that Theorem 2.5 implies the bijection between the set of basic maximal rigid object of $\mathcal{T}$ and the set of basic support $\tau$-tilting $\Gamma$-modules obtained in [LX16, CZZ15] (cf. Corollary 4.7).

Convention. Let $k$ be an algebraically closed field. Throughout this paper, $\mathcal{T}$ will be a Krull-Schmidt, Hom-finite triangulated category over $k$ unless stated otherwise. For an object $M \in \mathcal{T}$, denote by $|M|$ the number of non-isomorphic indecomposable direct summands of $M$. Denote by $\text{add} M$ the subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$ consisting of objects which are finite direct sum of direct summands of $M$.

2. $R[1]$-rigid objects and $\tau$-rigid modules

2.1. Recollection on $\tau$-tilting theory. We follow [AIR14]. Let $A$ be a finite dimensional algebra over $k$. Denote by $\text{mod} A$ the category of finitely generated right $A$-modules and $\text{proj} A$ the category of finitely generated right projective $A$-modules. For a module $M \in \text{mod} A$, denote by $|M|$ the number of non-isomorphic indecomposable direct summands of $M$. Let $\tau$ be the Auslander-Reiten translation of $\text{mod} A$.

An $A$-module $M$ is $\tau$-rigid if $\text{Hom}_A(M, \tau M) = 0$. A $\tau$-rigid pair is a pair of $A$-modules $(M, P)$ with $M \in \text{mod} A$ and $P \in \text{proj} A$, such that $M$ is $\tau$-rigid and $\text{Hom}_A(P, M) = 0$. A basic $\tau$-rigid pair $(M, P)$ is a basic support $\tau$-tilting pair if $|M| + |P| = |A|$. In this case, $M$ is a support $\tau$-tilting $A$-module and $P$ is uniquely determined by $M$. It has been proved in [AIR14] that for each $\tau$-rigid pair $(M, P)$, we always have $|M| + |P| \leq |A|$ and each $\tau$-rigid pair can be completed into a support $\tau$-tilting pair.

The following criterion for $\tau$-rigid modules has been proved in [AIR14].

Lemma 2.1. For $M \in \text{mod} A$, denote by $P_1^M \xrightarrow{f} P_0^M \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ a minimal projective presentation of $M$. Then $M$ is $\tau$-rigid if and only if

$$\text{Hom}_A(f, M) : \text{Hom}_A(P_0^M, M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_A(P_1^M, M)$$

is surjective.

2.2. $R[1]$-rigid objects. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a Krull-Schmidt, Hom-finite triangulated category with shift functor $[1]$. For $X, Y, Z \in \mathcal{T}$, we denote by $Z(X, Y)$ the subgroup of $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X, Y)$ consisting of morphisms which factor through $\text{add} Z$. An object $X \in \mathcal{T}$ is called rigid if $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X, \tau X[1]) = 0$. It is maximal rigid if it is rigid and $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X \oplus Z, X[1] \oplus Z[1]) = 0$ implies $Z \in \text{add} X$ for any $Z \in \mathcal{T}$. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ be a full subcategory of $\mathcal{T}$. An object $X \in \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ is called maximal rigid with respect to $\mathcal{C}$ provided that it
is rigid and for any object \( Z \in \mathcal{C} \) such that \( \text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X \oplus Z, X[1] \oplus Z[1]) = 0 \), we have \( Z \in \text{add} X \). It is clear that a maximal rigid object of \( \mathcal{T} \) is just a maximal rigid object with respect to \( \mathcal{T} \).

Let \( R \) be a basic rigid object of \( \mathcal{T} \). An object \( X \) is \textit{finitely presented} by \( R \) if there is a triangle \( R^0_1 \rightarrow R^X_0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow R^1_1 \) with \( R^0_0, R^1_1 \in \text{add} R \). Denote by \( \text{pr}(R) \) the subcategory of \( \mathcal{T} \) consisting of objects which are finitely presented by \( R \). Throughout this section, \( R \) will be a basic rigid object of \( \mathcal{T} \).

We introduce the relative rigid objects with respect to \( R \) (cf. [YZ15, CZZ15]).

**Definition 2.2.** Let \( R \in \mathcal{T} \) be a basic rigid object.

1. An object \( X \in \mathcal{T} \) is called \( R[1] \)-rigid if \( R[1](X, X[1]) = 0 \).
2. An object \( X \in \text{pr}(R) \subseteq \mathcal{T} \) is called maximal \( R[1] \)-rigid with respect to \( \text{pr}(R) \) if \( X \) is \( R[1] \)-rigid and for any object \( Z \in \text{pr}(R) \) such that \( R[1](X \oplus Z, X[1] \oplus Z[1]) = 0 \), then \( Z \in \text{add} X \).

By definition, it is clear that rigid objects are \( R[1] \)-rigid, but the converse is not true in general. We are interested in \( R[1] \)-rigid objects of \( \mathcal{T} \) which belong to the subcategory \( \text{pr}(R) \). We have the following observation.

**Lemma 2.3.** Let \( R_1 \xrightarrow{f} R_0 \xrightarrow{g} X \rightarrow R_1[1] \) be a triangle in \( \mathcal{T} \) with \( R_0, R_1 \in \text{add} R \). Then \( X \) is \( R[1] \)-rigid if and only if

\[
\text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(f, X) : \text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(R_0, X) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(R_1, X)
\]

is surjective.

**Proof.** Applying the functor \( \text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(-, X) \) to the triangle \( X[-1] \xrightarrow{h} R_1 \xrightarrow{f} R_0 \xrightarrow{g} X \) yields a long exact sequence

\[
\text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(R_0, X) \xrightarrow{f^*} \text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(R_1, X) \xrightarrow{h^*} \text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X[-1], X) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(R_0[-1], X),
\]

where \( f^* = \text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(f, X) \) and \( h^* = \text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(h, X) \).

Suppose that \( X \) is \( R[1] \)-rigid, that is \( R[1](X, X[1]) = 0 \). It follows that \( h^* = 0 \) and hence \( f^* \) is surjective.

Now assume that \( f^* \) is surjective. To show \( X \) is \( R[1] \)-rigid, it suffices to prove that \( R(X[-1], X) = 0 \).

Let \( a \in R(X[-1], X) \) and \( a = b \circ c \), where \( c : X[-1] \rightarrow R \) and \( b : R \rightarrow X \). As \( R \) is rigid, we know that each morphism from \( X[-1] \) to \( R \) factors through \( h \). Hence there is a morphism \( c' : R_1 \rightarrow R \) such that \( c = c' \circ h \). Since \( f^* \) is surjective, there is a morphism \( b' : R_0 \rightarrow X \) such that \( b' \circ c' = b' \circ f \circ h = 0 \) (cf. the following diagram).

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
X[-1] & \xrightarrow{h} & R_1 & \xrightarrow{f} & R_0 & \xrightarrow{g} & X & \rightarrow & R_1[1] \\
| c \downarrow & & \downarrow c' \ & & \downarrow b' \ & & \downarrow & & \\
R & \xrightarrow{a} & X
\end{array}
\]

\[\square\]

### 2.3. From \( R[1] \)-rigid objects to \( \tau \)-rigid modules.

Recall that \( R \) is a basic rigid object of \( \mathcal{T} \). Denote by \( \Gamma := \text{End}_\mathcal{T}(R) \) the endomorphism algebra of \( R \) and \( \text{mod} \Gamma \) the category of finitely generated right \( \Gamma \)-modules. Let \( \tau \) be the Auslander-Reiten translation of \( \text{mod} \Gamma \). It is known that the functor \( \text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(R, -) : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \text{mod} \Gamma \) induces an equivalence of categories

\[
\text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(R, -) : \text{pr}(R)/(R[1]) \rightarrow \text{mod} \Gamma,
\]

where \( \text{pr}(R)/(R[1]) \) is the additive quotient of \( \text{pr}(R) \) by morphisms factorizing through \( \text{add}(R[1]) \) (cf. [LY08]). Moreover, the restriction of \( \text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(R, -) \) to the subcategory \( \text{add} R \) yields an equivalence between \( \text{add} R \) and the category \( \text{proj} \Gamma \) of finitely generated projective \( \Gamma \)-modules. The following result is a direct consequence of the equivalence \((2.1)\) and the fact that \( R \) is rigid.
Lemma 2.4. For any $R' \in \text{add } R$ and $Z \in \text{pr}(R)$, we have

$$\text{Hom}_T(\text{Hom}_T(R, R'), \text{Hom}_T(R, Z)) \cong \text{Hom}_T(R', Z).$$

Now we are in position to state the main result of this note.

Theorem 2.5.

(a) Let $X$ be an object in $\text{pr}(R)$ satisfying that $\text{add } X \cap \text{add}(R[1]) = \{0\}$. Then $X$ is $R[1]$-rigid if and only if $\text{Hom}_T(R, X)$ is $\tau$-rigid.

(b) The functor $\text{Hom}_T(R, -)$ yields a bijection between the set of isomorphism classes of basic $R[1]$-rigid objects in $\text{pr}(R)$ and the set of isomorphism classes of basic $\tau$-rigid pairs of $\Gamma$-modules.

(c) The functor $\text{Hom}_T(R, -)$ induces a bijection between the set of isomorphism classes of basic maximal $R[1]$-rigid objects with respect to $\text{pr}(R)$ and the set of isomorphism classes of basic support $\tau$-tilting $\Gamma$-modules.

Proof. Let $R_1 \xrightarrow{f} R_0 \xrightarrow{g} X \rightarrow R_1[1]$ be a triangle in $T$ with $R_1, R_0 \in \text{add } R$ such that $g$ is a minimal right $\text{add } R$-approximation of $X$. As $R$ is rigid and $\text{add } X \cap \text{add}(R[1]) = \{0\}$, applying the functor $\text{Hom}_T(R, -)$, we obtain a minimal projective resolution of $\text{Hom}_T(R, X)$

$$\text{Hom}_T(R, R_1) \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_T(R, f)} \text{Hom}_T(R, R_0) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_T(R, X) \rightarrow 0.$$

According to Lemma 2.4, we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Hom}_T(R_0, X) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \text{Hom}_T(\text{Hom}_T(R, R_0), \text{Hom}_T(R, X)) \\
\downarrow \text{Hom}_T(f,X) & & \downarrow \text{Hom}_T(\text{Hom}_T(R,f), \text{Hom}_T(R,X)) \\
\text{Hom}_T(R_1, X) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \text{Hom}_T(\text{Hom}_T(R, R_1), \text{Hom}_T(R, X)).
\end{array}$$

Now it follows from Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.3 that $X$ is $R[1]$-rigid if and only if $\text{Hom}_T(R, X)$ is $\tau$-rigid. This finishes the proof of (a).

Let us consider the statement (b). For each object $X \in \text{pr}(R)$, $X$ admits a unique decomposition as $X \cong X_0 \oplus R_X[1]$, where $R_X \in \text{add } R$ and $X_0$ has no direct summands in $\text{add } R[1]$. We then define

$$F(X) := (\text{Hom}_T(R, X_0), \text{Hom}_T(R, R_X)) \in \text{mod } \Gamma \times \text{proj } \Gamma.$$

If $X$ is $R[1]$-rigid, according to (a), we deduce that $\text{Hom}_T(R, X_0)$ is a $\tau$-rigid $\Gamma$-module. And by Lemma 2.4, we know $\text{Hom}_T(\text{Hom}_T(R, R_X), \text{Hom}_T(R, X_0)) = 0$. That is, $F$ maps a basic $R[1]$-rigid object to a basic $\tau$-rigid pair of $\Gamma$-modules. We claim that $F$ is the desired bijection.

Since $\text{Hom}_T(R, -) : \text{pr}(R)/(R[1]) \rightarrow \text{mod } \Gamma$ is an equivalence, we clearly know that $F$ is injective. It remains to show that $F$ is surjective. For each basic $\tau$-rigid pair $(M, P)$ of $\Gamma$-modules, denote by $\tilde{P} \in \text{add } R$ the object in $\text{pr}(R)$ corresponding to $P$ and similarly by $\tilde{M} \in \text{pr}(R)$ the object corresponding to $M$, which has no direct summands in $\text{add } R[1]$. By definition, we clearly have $F(\tilde{M} \oplus \tilde{P}[1]) = (M, P)$. It remains to show that $\tilde{M} \oplus \tilde{P}[1]$ is $R[1]$-rigid, which is a consequence of (a), Lemma 2.4 and the fact that $R$ is rigid. This completes the proof of (b).

For (c), let $X = X_0 \oplus R_X[1]$ be a basic maximal $R[1]$-rigid object with respect to $\text{pr}(R)$, where $R_X \in \text{add } R$ and $X_0$ has no direct summands in $\text{add } R[1]$. We claim that $F(X)$ is a support $\tau$-tilting pair. Otherwise, at least one of the following two situations happen:

(i) there is an indecomposable object $R_X \in \text{add } R$ such that $R_X \notin \text{add } R$ and $(\text{Hom}_T(R, X_0), \text{Hom}_T(R, R_X \oplus R_X[1]))$ is a basic $\tau$-rigid pair;
(ii) there is an indecomposable object $X_1 \in \text{pr}(R) \setminus \text{add} R[1]$ such that $X_1 \not\in \text{add} X_0$ and $(\text{Hom}_\tau(R, X_0 \oplus X_1), \text{Hom}_\tau(R, R_X))$ is a basic $\tau$-rigid pair.

Let us consider the case (i). By definition, we have

$$\text{Hom}_\tau(\text{Hom}_\tau(R, R_X \oplus R_X^\tau), \text{Hom}_\tau(R, X_0)) = 0.$$  

According to Lemma 2.4, we clearly have $\text{Hom}_\tau(R_X \oplus R_X^\tau, X_0) = 0$. Now it is straightforward to check that $X \oplus R_X[-1] \in \text{pr}(R)$ is $R[1]$-rigid. Note that we have $R_X[-1] \not\in \text{add} X$, which contradicts to the assumption that $X$ is a basic maximal $R[1]$-rigid object with respect to $\text{pr}(R)$. Similarly, one can obtain a contradiction for the case (ii).

Now assume that $(M, P)$ is a basic support $\tau$-tilting pair of $\Gamma$-modules. According to (b), let $\hat{M} \oplus \hat{P}[1]$ be the basic $R[1]$-rigid object in $\text{pr}(R)$ corresponding to $(M, P)$. We need to prove that $\hat{M} \oplus \hat{P}[1]$ is maximal with respect to $\text{pr}(R)$. By definition, we show that if $Z \in \text{pr}(R)$ is an object such that $R[1](\hat{M} \oplus \hat{P}[1] \oplus Z, \hat{M}[1] \oplus \hat{P}[2] \oplus Z[1]) = 0$, then $Z \in \text{add}(\hat{M} \oplus \hat{P}[1])$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $Z$ is indecomposable. We separate the remaining proof by considering whether the object $Z$ belongs to $\text{add} R[1]$ or not.

If $Z \not\in \text{add} R[1]$, then $M \oplus \text{Hom}_\tau(R, Z)$ is a $\tau$-rigid $\Gamma$-module by (a). Moreover, according to $R[1](\hat{M} \oplus \hat{P}[1] \oplus Z, \hat{M}[1] \oplus \hat{P}[2] \oplus Z[1]) = 0$, we have

$$\text{Hom}_\Gamma(P, \text{Hom}_\tau(R, Z)) = \text{Hom}_\tau(\hat{P}, Z) = 0.$$  

Consequently, $(M \oplus \text{Hom}_\tau(R, Z), P)$ is a $\tau$-rigid pair. By the assumption that $(M, P)$ is a basic support $\tau$-tilting pair, we conclude that $\text{Hom}_\tau(R, Z) \in \text{add} M$ and hence $Z \in \text{add} \hat{M} \subseteq \text{add}(\hat{M} \oplus \hat{P}[1])$.

Similarly, for $Z \in \text{add} R[1]$, one can show that $(M, P \oplus \text{Hom}_\tau(R, Z[-1]))$ is a $\tau$-rigid pair of $\Gamma$-modules. Consequently, we have $Z \in \text{add} \hat{P}[1] \subseteq \text{add}(\hat{M} \oplus \hat{P}[1])$. This completes the proof of (c). 

Since all basic support $\tau$-tilting pairs of $\Gamma$-modules have the same number of non-isomorphic indecomposable direct summands [AIR14]. As a byproduct of the proof, we have

**Corollary 2.6.**

1. Each $R[1]$-rigid object in $\text{pr}(R)$ can be completed to a maximal $R[1]$-rigid object with respect to $\text{pr}(R)$.

2. All basic maximal $R[1]$-rigid objects with respect to $\text{pr}(R)$ have the same number of non-isomorphic indecomposable direct summands.

Recall that an object $T \in \mathcal{T}$ is a cluster tilting object provided that

$$\text{add} T = \{X \in \mathcal{T} \mid \text{Hom}_\tau(T, X[1]) = 0\} = \{X \in \mathcal{T} \mid \text{Hom}_\tau(X, T[1]) = 0\}.$$  

It is clear that cluster tilting objects are maximal rigid. Let $R$ be a cluster tilting object of $\mathcal{T}$. In this case, we have $\text{pr}(R) = \mathcal{T}$ (cf. [LY08, KZ08]). An object $X \in \mathcal{T}$ is called $R[1]$-cluster tilting if $X$ is $R[1]$-rigid and $|X| = |R|$ (cf. [YZ15]). As a direct consequence of Corollary 2.6, we have

**Lemma 2.7.** Let $R$ be a cluster tilting object of $\mathcal{T}$. Then an object $T \in \mathcal{T}$ is maximal $R[1]$-rigid with respect to $\mathcal{T}$ if and only if $T$ is $R[1]$-cluster tilting.

Combining Lemma 2.7 with Theorem 2.5, we obtain the following result of Yang-Zhu [YZ15, Theorem 1.2].

**Corollary 2.8.** Let $R$ be a cluster tilting object of $\mathcal{T}$ with endomorphism algebra $\Gamma = \text{End}_\tau(R)$. There is a bijection between the set of isomorphism classes of basic $R[1]$-cluster tilting objects and the set of isomorphism classes of basic support $\tau$-tilting $\Gamma$-modules.
2.4. A characterization of tilting modules. Recall that a basic \( \Gamma \)-module \( M \) is a \textit{tilting module} provided that

- \( \text{pd}_\Gamma M \leq 1 \);
- \( \text{Ext}_\Gamma^1(M, M) = 0 \);
- \( |M| = |\Gamma| \).

It has been observed in [AIR14] that tilting \( \Gamma \)-modules are precisely faithful support \( \tau \)-tilting \( \Gamma \)-modules. As in [LX14, BBT14], we consider the projective dimension of \( \Gamma \)-modules and give a characterization of tilting \( \Gamma \)-modules via \( \text{pr}(R) \).

\textbf{Theorem 2.9.} For an object \( X \in \text{pr}(R) \) without direct summands in \( \text{add } R[1] \), we have

\[ \text{pd}_\Gamma \text{Hom}_\Gamma(R, X) \leq 1 \quad \text{if and only if } X(R[1], R[1]) = 0. \]

In particular, for a basic object \( X \in \text{pr}(R) \) which has no direct summands in \( \text{add } R[1] \), \( \text{Hom}_\Gamma(R, X) \) is a tilting \( \Gamma \)-module if and only if \( X(R[1], R[1]) = 0 \) and \( X \) is maximal \( R[1] \)-rigid with respect to \( \text{pr}(R) \).

\textbf{Proof.} Since \( X \in \text{pr}(R) \), we have a triangle \( R_1 \xrightarrow{f} R_0 \xrightarrow{g} X \xrightarrow{h} R_1[1] \) in \( \mathcal{T} \) such that \( R_0, R_1 \in \text{add } R \) and \( g \) is a minimal right \( \text{add } R \)-approximation of \( X \). Applying the functor \( \text{Hom}_\Gamma(R, -) \), we obtain a long exact sequence

\[ \text{Hom}_\Gamma(R, X[-1]) \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_\Gamma(R, h[-1])} \text{Hom}_\Gamma(R, R_1) \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_\Gamma(R, f)} \text{Hom}_\Gamma(R, R_0) \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_\Gamma(R, h)} \text{Hom}_\Gamma(R, X) \rightarrow 0. \]

Assume that \( X(R[1], R[1]) = 0 \). It follows that \( \text{Hom}_\Gamma(R, h[-1]) = 0 \) and \( \text{Hom}_\Gamma(R, f) \) is injective. That is, \( \text{pd}_\Gamma \text{Hom}_\Gamma(R, X) \leq 1 \).

Suppose that \( \text{pd}_\Gamma \text{Hom}_\Gamma(R, X) \leq 1 \). Then \( \text{Hom}_\Gamma(R, f) \) is injective and \( \text{Hom}_\Gamma(R, h[-1]) = 0 \). It suffices to prove that \( X[-1](R, R) = 0 \). Let \( s : R \rightarrow X[-1] \) be a morphism from \( R \) to \( X[-1] \) and \( t : X[-1] \rightarrow R \) a morphism from \( X[-1] \) to \( R \). We need to show that \( t \circ s = 0 \). Since \( R \) is rigid, we know that the morphism \( t : X[-1] \rightarrow R \) factors through the morphism \( h[-1] \). In particular, there is a morphism \( t' : R_1 \rightarrow R \) such that \( t = t' \circ h[-1] \). On the other hand, by \( \text{Hom}_\Gamma(R, h[-1]) = 0 \), we deduce that \( h[-1] \circ s = 0 \). Consequently, \( t \circ s = t' \circ h[-1] \circ s = 0 \).

Now we assume that \( X \) is a maximal \( R[1] \)-rigid object with respect to \( \text{pr}(R) \) such that \( X(R[1], R[1]) = 0 \). By Theorem 2.5, \( \text{Hom}_\Gamma(R, X) \) is a support \( \tau \)-tilting \( \Gamma \)-module. Since \( X \) does not admit an indecomposable direct summand in \( \text{add } R[1] \), we have \( |\text{Hom}_\Gamma(R, X)| = |X| = |R| = |\Gamma| \) by Corollary 2.6. The condition \( X(R[1], R[1]) = 0 \) implies that \( \text{pd}_\Gamma \text{Hom}_\Gamma(R, X) \leq 1 \). Putting all of these together, we conclude that \( \text{Hom}_\Gamma(R, X) \) is a tilting \( \Gamma \)-module.

Conversely, let us assume that \( \text{Hom}_\Gamma(R, X) \) is a tilting \( \Gamma \)-module. Since tilting modules are support \( \tau \)-tilting modules, we know that \( X \) is a maximal \( R[1] \)-rigid object with respect to \( \text{pr}(R) \) by Theorem 2.5 (c). By definition of tilting modules, we have \( \text{pd}_\Gamma \text{Hom}_\Gamma(R, X) \leq 1 \). Consequently, \( X(R[1], R[1]) = 0 \) and we are done.

3. \( R[1] \)-rigid objects and presilting objects

3.1. (Pre)silting objects. Recall that \( \mathcal{T} \) is a Krull-Schmidt, Hom-finite triangulated category with shift functor \([1]\). Following [AI12], for \( X, Y \in \mathcal{T} \) and \( m \in \mathbb{Z} \), we write the vanishing condition \( \text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X, Y[\geq m]) = 0 \) for \( i > m \) by \( \text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X, Y[\geq m]) = 0 \). An object \( X \in \mathcal{T} \) is called \textit{presilting} if \( \text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X, X[\geq 0]) = 0 \); \( X \) is called \textit{silting} if \( X \) is presilting and the thick subcategory of \( \mathcal{T} \) containing \( X \) is \( \mathcal{T} \); \( X \) is called \textit{partial silting} if \( X \) is a direct summand of some silting objects.

It is clear that (pre)silting objects are rigid. The following result has been proved in [AI12].

\textbf{Lemma 3.1.} All silting objects in \( \mathcal{T} \) have the same number of non-isomorphic indecomposable summands.
In general, it is not known that whether a presilting object is partial silting. The following is proved in [A13].

**Lemma 3.2.** Let $R$ be a silting object and $X$ a presilting object of $T$. If $X \in \text{pr}(R)$, then there is a presilting object $Y \in \text{pr}(R)$ such that $X \oplus Y$ is a silting object of $T$.

### 3.2. From $R[1]$-rigid objects to (pre)silting objects.

**Lemma 3.3.** Let $R$ be a presilting object and $X \in \text{pr}(R)$. Then $\text{Hom}_T(X, X[>1]) = 0$.

**Proof.** As $X \in \text{pr}(R)$, we have the following triangle
\[
R_1 \xrightarrow{f} R_0 \xrightarrow{g} X \xrightarrow{h} R_1[1],
\]
(3.2)
where $R_0, R_1 \in \text{add} R$. Applying the functor $\text{Hom}_T(R, -)$ to the triangle yields a long exact sequence
\[
\cdots \rightarrow \text{Hom}_T(R, R_0[1]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_T(R, X[1]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_T(R, R_1[2]) \rightarrow \cdots
\]
Then the assumption that $R$ is presilting implies that $\text{Hom}_T(R, X[>0]) = 0$.

(3.3)
On the other hand, applying the functor $\text{Hom}_T(-, X[i])$ to the triangle (3.2), we obtain a long exact sequence
\[
\cdots \rightarrow \text{Hom}_T(R_1[1], X[i]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_T(X, X[i]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_T(R_0, X[i]) \rightarrow \cdots
\]
Then (3.3) implies that $\text{Hom}_T(X, X[>1]) = 0$. □

**Theorem 3.4.** Let $X$ be an object in $\text{pr}(R)$.

1. If $R$ is a presilting object, then the followings are equivalent.
   a. $X$ is an $R[1]$-rigid object;
   b. $X$ is a rigid object;
   c. $X$ is a presilting object.

2. If $R$ is a silting object, then $X$ is a maximal $R[1]$-rigid object with respect to $\text{pr}(R)$ if and only if $X$ is a silting object.

**Proof.** For (1), according to Lemma 3.3, it suffices to prove that each $R[1]$-rigid object is rigid.

Let us assume that $X$ is an $R[1]$-rigid object in $\text{pr}(R)$. Then there exists a triangle
\[
R_1 \xrightarrow{f} R_0 \xrightarrow{g} X \xrightarrow{h} R_1[1],
\]
(3.4)
with $R_0, R_1 \in \text{add} R$. By applying the functor $\text{Hom}_T(R, -)$ to the triangle (3.4), we obtain an exact sequence
\[
\cdots \rightarrow \text{Hom}_T(R_1[1], X[1]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_T(R, X[1]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_T(R_1[2], X[1]) \rightarrow \cdots
\]
Since $R$ is a presilting object and $R_0, R_1 \in \text{add} R$, we have
\[
\text{Hom}_T(R, R_0[1]) = 0 = \text{Hom}_T(R, R_1[2]).
\]
Consequently, $\text{Hom}_T(R, X[1]) = 0$. Now applying the functor $\text{Hom}_T(-, X[i])$ to (3.4), we obtain an exact sequence
\[
\text{Hom}_T(R_1[1], X[1]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_T(X, X[1]) \rightarrow 0.
\]
In other words, each morphism from $X$ to $X[1]$ factors through the morphism $h : X \rightarrow R_1[1]$. However, we have $R[1](X, X[1]) = 0$, which implies that $\text{Hom}_T(X, X[1]) = 0$ and hence $X$ is rigid. This completes the proof of (1).
Now suppose that $R$ is a silting object. If $X$ is a silting object, then $X$ is an $R[1]$-rigid object by (1). By Lemma 3.1, we have $|X| = |R|$. Hence, $X$ is a maximal $R[1]$-rigid object with respect to $\text{pr}(R)$ by Corollary 2.6.

On the other hand, applying the functor $\text{Hom}$ from (4.1), we have $|X| = |R|$. Therefore, $X$ must be a silting object by Lemma 3.1.

Combining Theorem 2.5 with Theorem 3.4, we obtain the following bijection, which is due to Iyama-Jørgensen-Yang (cf. [IY14, Theorem 0.2]).

**Corollary 3.5.** Let $R$ be a basic silting object of $\mathcal{T}$ with endomorphism algebra $\Gamma = \text{End}_\mathcal{T}(R)$. There is a bijection between the set of silting objects which belong to $\text{pr}(R)$ and the set of $\tau$-rigid pair of $\Gamma$-modules, which induces a one-to-one correspondence between the set of silting objects in $\text{pr}(R)$ and the set of support $\tau$-tilting $\Gamma$-modules.

4. $R[1]$-rigid objects and $d$-rigid objects in $(d + 1)$-Calabi-Yau category

Let $d$ be a positive integer. Throughout this section, we assume that $\mathcal{T}$ is $(d + 1)$-Calabi-Yau, i.e. we are given bifunctorial isomorphisms

$$\text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X, Y) \cong \mathbb{D} \text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(Y, X[d + 1])$$

for $X, Y \in \mathcal{T}$, where $\mathbb{D} = \text{Hom}_k(-, k)$ is the usual duality over $k$.

**4.1. From $R[1]$-rigid objects to $d$-rigid objects.** An object $T \in \mathcal{T}$ is called $d$-rigid if $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(T, T[i]) = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, d$. It is maximal $d$-rigid if $T$ is $d$-rigid and for $i = 1, \ldots, d$, $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(T \oplus X, (T \oplus X)[i]) = 0$ implies that $X \in \text{add} T$. An object $T \in \mathcal{T}$ is a $d$-cluster-tilting object if $T$ is $d$-rigid and for $i = 1, \ldots, d$, $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(T, X[i]) = 0$ implies that $X \in \text{add} T$.

**Lemma 4.1.** Let $R$ be a $d$-rigid object of $\mathcal{T}$ and $X \in \text{pr}(R)$. Then $X$ is rigid if and only if $X$ is $d$-rigid.

**Proof.** It is obvious that a $d$-rigid object is rigid.

Now suppose that $X$ is rigid. As $X \in \text{pr}(R)$, we have a triangle

$$R_1 \xrightarrow{f} R_0 \xrightarrow{g} X \xrightarrow{h} R_1[1]$$

(4.5)

with $R_0, R_1 \in \text{add} R$. Note that we have $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(R, R[i]) = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, d$. Applying the functor $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(R, -)$ to the triangle (4.5), we obtain a long exact sequence

$$\cdots \rightarrow \text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(R, R_0[i]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(R, X[i]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(R, R_1[i + 1]) \rightarrow \cdots.$$

Consequently,

$$\text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(R, X[i]) = 0, \quad i = 1, \cdots, d - 1.$$  

(4.6)

On the other hand, applying the functor $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(-, X[i])$ to the triangle (4.5) yields a long exact sequence

$$\cdots \rightarrow \text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(R_1[1], X[i]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X, X[i]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(R_0, X[i]) \rightarrow \cdots.$$

Then (4.6) implies that $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X, X[i]) = 0$ for $i = 2, \cdots, d - 1$.

Recall that $X$ is rigid and $\mathcal{T}$ is $(d + 1)$-Calabi-Yau, we have

$$\text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X, X[d]) \cong \mathbb{D} \text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(X, X[1]) = 0.$$

Hence $X$ is a $d$-rigid object of $\mathcal{T}$.

**Theorem 4.2.** Let $R \in \mathcal{T}$ be a $d$-rigid object and $X \in \text{pr}(R)$. Then the followings are equivalent.

(1) $X$ is an $R[1]$-rigid object.
(2) $X$ is a rigid object.
(3) $X$ is a $d$-rigid object.

Proof. According to Lemma 4.1, it suffices to prove that each $R[1]$-rigid object is rigid.

Let us first consider the case that $d \geq 2$. Applying the functor $\text{Hom}_T(R, -)$ to the triangle (4.5) yields a long exact sequence

$$\cdots \rightarrow \text{Hom}_T(R, R_0[1]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_T(R, X[1]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_T(R, R_1[2]) \rightarrow \cdots.$$ 

As $R$ is $d$-rigid and $R_0, R_1 \in \text{add} R$, we conclude that $\text{Hom}_T(R, X[1]) = 0$. Applying the functor $\text{Hom}_T(-, X[1])$ to the triangle (4.5), we obtain an exact sequence

$$\text{Hom}_T(R_1[1], X[1]) \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_T(h, X[1])} \text{Hom}_T(X, X[1]) \rightarrow 0.$$ 

In particular, each morphism from $X$ to $X[1]$ factors through the morphism $h : X \rightarrow R_1[1]$. Hence the assumption that $X$ is an $R[1]$-rigid object implies that $X$ is rigid.

Now suppose that $d = 1$. In this case, $T$ is a 2-Calabi-Yau triangulated category. Applying the functor $\text{Hom}_T(-, X[1])$ to (4.5) yields a long exact sequence

$$\cdots \rightarrow \text{Hom}_T(R_1[1], X[1]) \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_T(h, X[1])} \text{Hom}_T(X, X[1]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_T(R_0, X[1]) \rightarrow \cdots.$$ 

Then the assumption that $X$ is $R[1]$-rigid implies that $\text{Hom}_T(g, X[1])$ is injective. Consequently, the morphism

$$\mathbb{D} \text{Hom}_T(g, X[1]) : \mathbb{D} \text{Hom}_T(R_0, X[1]) \rightarrow \mathbb{D} \text{Hom}_T(X, X[1])$$

is surjective. Thanks to the 2-Calabi-Yau property, we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Hom}_T(R_0, X[1]) & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{D} \text{Hom}_T(g, X[1])} & \mathbb{D} \text{Hom}_T(X, X[1]) \\
\mathbb{D} \text{Hom}_T(R_0[1], X[1]) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \text{Hom}_T(X, R_0[1]) \\
\text{Hom}_T(X, R_0[1]) & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{D} \text{Hom}_T(X, g[1])} & \text{Hom}_T(X, X[1]).
\end{array}$$

In particular, $\text{Hom}_T(X, g[1]) : \text{Hom}_T(X, R_0[1]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_T(X, X[1])$ is surjective. Again, $R[1](X, X[1]) = 0$ implies that $\text{Hom}_T(X, g[1]) = 0$ and then $\text{Hom}_T(X, X[1]) = 0$. 

4.2. $d$-cluster-tilting objects in $d$-cluster categories. This subsection concentrates on $d$-cluster categories, a special class of $(d + 1)$-Calabi-Yau triangulated categories. We refer to [K05, T07] for definitions and [ZZ09, W09] for basic properties of $d$-cluster categories. Among others, the following result proved in [ZZ09, W09] is useful.

Lemma 4.3. Let $T$ be a $d$-cluster category. Then an object $T$ is a $d$-cluster tilting object if and only if $T$ is a maximal $d$-rigid objects. Moreover, all $d$-cluster tilting objects have the same number of non-isomorphic indecomposable direct summands.

Then for relative rigid objects, we have the following.

Proposition 4.4. Let $T$ be a $d$-cluster category and $R$ be a $d$-cluster tilting object in $T$. Assume $X \in \text{pr}(R)$, then $X$ is a maximal $R[1]$-rigid object with respect to $\text{pr}(R)$ if and only if $X$ is a $d$-cluster tilting object.

Proof. Let $X$ be a maximal $R[1]$-rigid object with respect to $\text{pr}(R)$. By Corollary 2.6, we have $|X| = |R|$. According to Theorem 4.2, $X$ is $d$-rigid and hence a maximal $d$-rigid object in $T$. It follows from Lemma 4.3 that $X$ is a $d$-cluster tilting object in $T$.

Conversely, assume that $X$ is a $d$-cluster tilting object. According to Lemma 4.3, $X$ is a maximal $d$-rigid object with $|X| = |R|$ and hence a maximal $R[1]$-rigid object respect to $\text{pr}(R)$ by Theorem 4.2. 

Combining Theorem 2.5, Thereom 4.2 with Proposition 4.4, we obtain the following main result of [LQX].

**Corollary 4.5.** Assume that $d \geq 2$. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a $d$-cluster category with a $d$-cluster-tilting object $R$. Denote by $\Gamma = \text{End}_\mathcal{T}(R)$ the endomorphism algebra of $R$. The functor $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{T}(R, -)$ yields a bijection between the set of isomorphism classes of $d$-rigid objects of $\mathcal{T}$ which belong to $\text{pr}(R)$ and the set of isomorphism classes of $\tau$-rigid $\Gamma$-modules. The bijection induces a bijection between the set of isomorphism classes of $d$-cluster tilting objects of $\mathcal{T}$ which belong to $\text{pr}(R)$ and the set of isomorphism classes of support $\tau$-tilting $\Gamma$-modules.

### 4.3. Maximal rigid objects in 2-Calabi-Yau categories.

In this subsection, we assume that $\mathcal{T}$ is a 2-Calabi-Yau category and $R$ a basic maximal rigid object of $\mathcal{T}$. It has been proved in [BIRS09, ZZ11] that each rigid object of $\mathcal{T}$ belongs to $\text{pr}(R)$.

The following proposition is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.2 and Corollary 2.6.

**Proposition 4.6.** Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a 2-Calabi-Yau triangulated category and $R$ a basic maximal rigid object of $\mathcal{T}$. Let $X$ be an object of $\mathcal{T}$, then $X$ is a maximal $R[1]$-rigid object with respect to $\text{pr}(R)$ if and only if $X$ is a maximal rigid object of $\mathcal{T}$.

Combining Theorem 2.5 with Proposition 4.6, we obtain the main result of [CZZ15, LX16].

**Corollary 4.7.** Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a 2-Calabi-Yau category with a basic maximal rigid object $R$. Denote by $\Gamma = \text{End}_\mathcal{T}(R)$ the endomorphism algebra of $R$. Then there is a bijection between the set of isomorphism classes of rigid objects of $\mathcal{T}$ and the set of isomorphism classes of $\tau$-rigid $\Gamma$-modules, which induces a bijection between the set of isomorphism classes of maximal rigid objects of $\mathcal{T}$ and the set of isomorphism classes of support $\tau$-tilting $\Gamma$-modules.
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