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Abstract. The theory of $\tau$-tilting was introduced by Adachi–Iyama–Reiten; one of the main results is a bijection between support $\tau$-tilting modules and torsion classes. We are able to generalise this result in the context of the higher Auslander–Reiten theory of Iyama. For a finite-dimensional algebra $A$ with 2-cluster-tilting subcategory $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{mod} A$, we are able to find a correspondence between support $\tau_2$-tilting $A$-modules and torsion pairs in $\mathcal{C}$ satisfying an additional functorial finiteness condition.

1. Introduction

Support-tilting modules were first studied by Ringel [31] and connected to torsion classes and cluster algebras by Ingalls–Thomas [14]. Since support-tilting modules are able to capture the behaviour of clusters, this led to further study. Significantly, Adachi, Iyama and Reiten [1] introduced support $\tau$-tilting modules, and were able to find a bijection, for an finite-dimensional algebra $A$, between support $\tau$-tilting $A$-modules and functorially-finite torsion classes in $\text{mod} A$. See also [18] for a survey of $\tau$-tilting theory, which has seen much activity in recent years [4], [8], [9], [17], [19], [28], [29] as well as its generalisations such as in silting theory [2], [3], [7]. A natural question to ask is whether similar results are true in the context of higher Auslander–Reiten theory, as introduced by Iyama in [15], [16], and an active area of research [10], [20], [22], [23], [24], [30]. As the name suggests, higher Auslander–Reiten theory has connections to higher-dimensional geometry and topology [11], [12], [25], [27], [32] and is hence a natural generalisation. The result we find is the following:

Theorem 1.1. Let $A$ be a finite-dimensional algebra with 2-cluster-tilting subcategory $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{mod} A$. Then there is a correspondence between support $\tau_2$-tilting $A$-modules and 2-functorially finite torsion pairs in $\mathcal{C}$.

2. Background and Notation

Consider a finite-dimensional algebra $A$ over a field $K$, and fix a positive integer $d$. We will assume that $A$ is of the form $KQ/I$, where $KQ$ is the path algebra over some quiver $Q$ and $I$ is an admissible ideal of $KQ$. An $A$-module will mean a finitely-generated left $A$-module; by $\text{mod} A$ we denote the category of $A$-modules. The functor $D = \text{Hom}_K(-, K)$ defines a duality. Let $\text{add} M$ be the full subcategory of $\text{mod} A$ composed of all $A$-modules isomorphic to direct summands of finite direct
sums of copies of $M$. For an $A$-module $M$, the right annihilator of $M$ is the two-sided ideal \( \text{ann}M := \{a \in A | aM = 0\} \); for a class of modules $\mathcal{X}$ we set \( \text{ann}\mathcal{X} := \{a \in A | aX = 0 \ \forall \ X \in \mathcal{X}\} \). For an $A$-module $M$, define \( \text{Sub}M := \{N \in \text{mod}A | \exists \text{ injection } N \hookrightarrow M\} \); for a class of modules $\mathcal{X}$ we set \( \text{Sub}\mathcal{X} := \{N \in \mathcal{X} | \exists X \in \mathcal{X} \text{ injection } N \hookrightarrow X\} \). Define \( \text{Fac}M \) and \( \text{Fac}\mathcal{X} \) dually.

2.1. Higher cluster-tilting subcategories. Define \( \tau_d := \tau \Omega^{d-1} \) to be the $d$-Auslander–Reiten translation and \( \tau_d^{-1} := \tau^{-1} \Omega^{-(d-1)} \) to be the inverse $d$-Auslander–Reiten translation. A subcategory $\mathcal{C}$ of $\text{mod}A$ is precovering or contravariantly finite if for any $M \in \text{mod}A$ there is an object $C_M \in \mathcal{C}$ and a morphism $f : C_M \to M$ such that $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}, -)$ is exact on the sequence

$$C_M \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$$

for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$. The module $C_M$ is said to be a right $\mathcal{C}$-approximation. The dual notion of precovering is preenveloping or covariantly finite. A subcategory $\mathcal{C}$ that is both precovering and preenveloping is called functorially finite.

**Definition 2.1.** [16, Definition 2.2] For a finite-dimensional algebra $A$, a subcategory $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{mod}(A)$ is a $d$-cluster-tilting subcategory if it satisfies the following conditions:

$$\mathcal{C} = \{X \in \mathcal{C} | \text{Ext}^i_A(M, X) = 0 \ \forall \ 0 < i < d\}.$$

$$\mathcal{C} = \{X \in \mathcal{C} | \text{Ext}^i_A(X, M) = 0 \ \forall \ 0 < i < d\}.$$

A right $\mathcal{C}$-resolution is a sequence

$$\cdots \longrightarrow C_1 \longrightarrow C_0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$$

with $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$ for each $i$, and which becomes exact under $\text{Hom}_A(\mathcal{C}, -)$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}$. Define a left $\mathcal{C}$-resolution dually.

**Theorem 2.2.** [16, Theorem 3.6.1] Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{mod}A$ be a $d$-cluster-tilting subcategory. Then

1. Any $M \in \text{mod}A$ has a right $\mathcal{C}$-resolution

$$0 \longrightarrow C_{d-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow C_1 \longrightarrow C_0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0.$$

2. Any $M \in \text{mod}A$ has a left $\mathcal{C}$-resolution

$$0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow C_0 \longrightarrow C_1 \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow C_{d-1} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Recall the stable module category $\text{mod}A$ is full subcategory of $\text{mod}A$ obtained by factoring out all morphisms that factor through a projective module.

**Theorem 2.3.** [16, Theorem 1.5] Let $A$ be a finite-dimensional algebra. Then:

- If $\text{Ext}^i_A(M, A) = 0$ for all $0 < i < d$, then $\text{Ext}^i_A(M, N) \cong D\text{Ext}^{d-i}_A(N, \tau_d M)$ and $\text{Hom}_A(M, N) \cong D\text{Ext}^i_A(N, \tau_d M)$ for all $M \in \text{mod}A$ and all $0 < i < d$. 

• If Ext^i_A(DA, N) = 0 for all 0 < i < d, then Ext^i_A(M, N) \cong D\text{Ext}^{d-i}_A(\tau^-_d N, M)
and Hom_A(M, N) \cong D\text{Ext}^d_A(\tau^-_d N, M) for all N \in \text{mod}A for all 0 < i < d.

We may now generalise a result of Auslander–Smalø, the proof of which is unchanged apart from indices.

Proposition 2.4 (c.f. Proposition 5.8 of [6]). Let A be a finite-dimensional algebra. Then for X, Y \in \text{mod}A the following are equivalent:

(i) Hom_A(\tau^- Y, X) = 0.
(ii) Hom_A(\tau^- Y, \text{Sub} X) = 0.
(iii) Ext^2_A(\text{Sub} X, Y) = 0.

Proof. Firstly, statements (ii) and (iii) are equivalent by Theorem 2.3 and statement (i) trivially implies (ii). It remains to show (ii) implies (i); we prove by contradiction. So suppose there is a morphism f : \tau^- Y \rightarrow X is a non-zero morphism with image \text{Im} f \in \text{Sub} X, and such that the induced morphism f' : \tau^- Y \rightarrow \text{Im} f factors through a projective module P. Since f' is surjective, we may assume P is the projective cover of \text{Im} f. Let g : \tau^- Y \rightarrow P be any morphism; since \tau^- Y has no non-trivial projective summands, we have g(\tau^- Y) \subset \text{rad} P, hence any composition \tau^- Y \rightarrow P \rightarrow \text{Im} f is not an epimorphism. Therefore the image of f' in Hom_A(\tau^- Y, \text{Im} f) = 0 is not zero. Hence Hom_A(\tau^- Y, X) = 0 if and only if Hom_A(\tau^- Y, \text{Sub} X) = 0. □

Key homological tools for higher cluster-tilting categories are d-pushouts and d-pullbacks, constructed as follows.

Proposition 2.5. [21] Proposition 3.8] Let A be a finite-dimensional algebra and \mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{mod}A. For any d-exact sequence in \mathcal{C}

0 \rightarrow Y_0 \rightarrow Y_1 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow Y_{d+1} \rightarrow 0

and any morphism f : X_{d+1} \rightarrow Y_{d+1} there exists a commutative diagram in \mathcal{C}:

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \rightarrow & Y_0 & \rightarrow & X_1 & \rightarrow & \cdots & \rightarrow & X_d & \rightarrow & X_{d+1} & \rightarrow & 0 \\
0 & \rightarrow & Y_0 & \rightarrow & Y_1 & \rightarrow & \cdots & \rightarrow & Y_d & \rightarrow & Y_{d+1} & \rightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \cdots & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & f & & & & & & & & & &
\end{array}
\]

such that there is an induced d-exact sequence

0 \rightarrow X_1 \rightarrow X_2 \oplus Y_1 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow X_{d+1} \oplus Y_d \rightarrow Y_{d+1} \rightarrow 0

The construction of this commutative diagram is obtained inductively as follows: X_d is defined to be the right \mathcal{C}-approximation of the pullback of ((X_{d+1} \oplus Y_d) \rightarrow Y_{d+1}). Subsequently X_{d-1} is defined to be the right \mathcal{C}-approximation of the pullback of ((X_d \oplus Y_{d-1}) \rightarrow Y_d). This continues until X_0 = Y_0 is reached.
Remark 2.6. In this setting, it is actually immaterial whether \( Y_{d+1} \) is in \( \mathcal{C} \) or not: Theorem \([2.2]\) ensures that the so-called \( d \)-kernel of the morphism \( (X_{d+1} \oplus Y_d) \to Y_{d+1}) \) exists. Equally, it is not important whether \( Y_0 \in \mathcal{C} \).

A technical result is the following:

**Lemma 2.7.** Consider a module \( X \in \mathcal{C} \) and two \( d \)-exact sequences:

\[
0 \to L \to M \to N \to X \to 0,
\]

\[
0 \to L' \to M' \to N' \to X \to 0.
\]

Then there exist \( P, Q \in \mathcal{C} \) with no common non-zero summands and a commutative diagram with exact rows and columns:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & 0 & \\
\downarrow & \downarrow & \\
L & L & \\
\downarrow & \downarrow & \\
Q & Q \oplus M & M \\
\downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
0 & L' \to Q \oplus M' & P \to N & \to 0 \\
\downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
0 & L' & M' & N' & X & \to 0 \\
\downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\
\end{array}
\]

**Proof.** Just as in the above method for \( d \)-pullbacks, we may form the following commutative diagram with exact rows and columns by taking the appropriate
right $C$-approximations of pullbacks: $P, Q, R, S$

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & 0 \\
\downarrow & \downarrow \\
L & L \\
\downarrow & \downarrow \\
Q & S & M & \to 0 \\
\downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
0 & L' & R & P & N & \to 0 \\
\downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
0 & L' & M' & N' & X & \to 0 \\
\downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{array}
\]

It suffices to show the surjection $R \to M'$ is split (by symmetry, also $S \to M$ splits). By the pullback property of $P$, we find $M' \to N'$ factors through $P$. But the pullback property of $R$ then implies both $M' \to P$ factors through $R$ and that $M' \to R \to M' \cong \text{id}$. Hence $R \cong M' \oplus Q$.

Finally, suppose $P$ and $Q$ have a common summand $Y$. Then any morphism $Y \to N'$ must factor through $M'$. But as above, $M' \to N'$ factors through $P$. Hence $Y$ must be a summand of $M'$. This is a contradiction, since $M'$ is already included a summand of $Q \oplus M'$, and hence cannot be a summand of $Q$. This finishes the proof. \qed

A second technical result will prove similarly useful.

**Lemma 2.8.** In the setting of Lemma 2.7, in case there exists $P' \in C$ such that $P \cong P' \oplus M'$, then there is a commutative diagram with exact rows and columns.
Proof. In this case we know that the morphism $L' \to M'$ factors through $Q$. Since we are dealing with a 2-pullback diagram, the 2-exact sequence:

$$
0 \to L \to M \oplus Q \to P' \oplus M' \to N' \to 0
$$

may simply be transcribed into a commutative diagram as stated. □

3. Main results

In this section let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{mod} A$ be a fixed 2-cluster-tilting subcategory.

**Definition 3.1.** Define a subcategory $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ to be 2-contravariantly finite in $\mathcal{C}$ if for any $M \in \mathcal{C}$ there exists a right $\mathcal{X}$-approximation $X_1 \to M$ and object $X_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ and a sequence $X_2 \to X_1 \to M$ on which $\text{Hom}(C, -)$ is exact for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$.

Dually, define a subcategory $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ to be 2-covariantly finite in $\mathcal{C}$ if for any $M \in \mathcal{C}$ there exists a left $\mathcal{X}$-approximation $M \to X_1$ and object $X_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ and a sequence $M \to X_1 \to X_2$ on which $\text{Hom}(-, C)$ is exact for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$. A subcategory $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ will be said to be 2-functorially finite in $\mathcal{C}$ if it is both 2-contravariantly finite in $\mathcal{C}$ and 2-covariantly finite in $\mathcal{C}$.

**Lemma 3.2.** Let $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ be functorially finite. Then $\mathcal{X}$ is 2-covariantly finite in $\mathcal{C}$ if and only if it is 2-contravariantly finite in $\mathcal{C}$.

Proof. It suffices to show any subcategory $\mathcal{X}$ 2-contravariantly finite in $\mathcal{C}$ is also 2-covariantly finite in $\mathcal{C}$. So suppose $\mathcal{X}$ is 2-contravariantly finite in $\mathcal{C}$. Let $f : M \to X_0$ be a left $\mathcal{X}$ approximation and let $X'_1 \to X'_0 \to \text{coker} f$ be a right $\mathcal{X}$-approximation. We have that $X_0 \to \text{coker} f$ factors through $X'_1$, and since $X'_0 \not\cong \text{coker} f$, this induces an additional non-zero morphism $M \to X'_0$. The sequence $M \to X'_0 \to \text{coker} f$ is now zero, and hence induces a morphism $g : M \to X'_1$. Since $f : M \to X_0$ is a left $\mathcal{X}$-approximation, we have that $g$ factors through $X_0$. But this means $X_0 \to \text{coker} f$ factors through $X'_1 \to X'_0$ and is hence zero, a
contradiction. This is illustrated below:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
M \xrightarrow{f} X_0 \longrightarrow \text{coker} f \\
\downarrow g \quad \downarrow \quad \quad \\
X'_1 \longrightarrow X'_0 \longrightarrow \text{coker} f
\end{array}
\]

Recall that for a finite-dimensional algebra \( A \), then a torsion pair in \( \text{mod}A \) consists of two subcategories \((\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})\) such that

- \( \text{Hom}_A(T, F) = 0 \) for all \( T \in \mathcal{T}, F \in \mathcal{F} \).
- \( \mathcal{T} = \{ X \in \text{mod}A | \text{Hom}_A(X, F) = 0 \ \forall \ F \in \mathcal{F} \} \).
- \( \mathcal{F} = \{ Y \in \text{mod}A | \text{Hom}_A(T, Y) = 0 \ \forall \ T \in \mathcal{T} \} \).

We may now define one of our primary objects of study.

**Definition 3.3.** A 2-functorially-finite torsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \) consists of two subcategories \((\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})\) each 2-functorially finite in \( \mathcal{C} \) and such that

- \( \text{Hom}_A(T, F) = 0 \) for all \( T \in \mathcal{T}, F \in \mathcal{F} \).
- \( \mathcal{T} = \{ X \in \mathcal{C} | \text{Hom}_A(X, F) = 0 \ \forall \ F \in \mathcal{F} \} \).
- \( \mathcal{F} = \{ Y \in \mathcal{C} | \text{Hom}_A(T, Y) = 0 \ \forall \ T \in \mathcal{T} \} \).

For a 2-functorially-finite torsion pair \((\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})\) in \( \mathcal{C} \), we say \( \mathcal{T} \) is a torsion class and \( \mathcal{F} \) a torsion-free class.

**Lemma 3.4.** For any 2-functorially-finite torsion pair \((\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})\) in \( \mathcal{C} \) then \((\text{Fac}\mathcal{T}, \text{Sub}\mathcal{F})\) is a torsion pair in \( \text{mod}A \).

**Proof.** Suppose \((\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})\) is a 2-functorially-finite torsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \). Clearly any \( X \in \text{mod}A \) satisfies that \( \text{Hom}_A(\text{Fac}\mathcal{T}, X) = 0 \) if and only if \( \text{Hom}_A(\mathcal{T}, X) = 0 \). Let \( f : X \rightarrow C_X \) be a left \( \mathcal{C} \)-approximation of \( X \), moreover \( f \) must be injective. So \( \text{Hom}_A(\mathcal{T}, X) = 0 \) if and only if \( \text{Hom}_A(\mathcal{T}, C_X) = 0 \) and hence whenever \( C_X \in \mathcal{F} \) and \( X \in \text{Sub}\mathcal{F} \). The result follows.

**Proposition 3.5.** Let \( A \) be a finite-dimensional algebra and \( \mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{mod}A \) a 2-cluster-tilting subcategory. Let \( \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \) be 2-functorially-finite subcategories in \( \mathcal{C} \). The following are equivalent.

(i) \((\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})\) is a 2-functorially-finite torsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \).

(ii) For every \( M \in \mathcal{C} \) there is an exact sequence

\[
T_M \rightarrow M \rightarrow F_M
\]

such that \( M \rightarrow F_M \) is a left \( \mathcal{F} \)-approximation and \( T_M \rightarrow M \) is a right \( \mathcal{T} \)-approximation.

**Proof.** (i) \( \Rightarrow \) (ii): Given \( M \in \mathcal{C} \), and a 2-functorially-finite torsion pair \((\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})\) in \( \mathcal{C} \), it follows from Lemma 3.4 that \((\text{Fac}\mathcal{T}, \text{Sub}\mathcal{F})\) is a torsion pair in \( \text{mod}A \). A classical property of torsion pairs (see for example [5, Proposition V1.1.5]) there
is an exact sequence in $\text{mod}A$: $0 \to T \to M \to F \to 0$ for some $T \in \text{Fac} \mathcal{T}$ and $F \in \text{Sub} \mathcal{F}$. By taking appropriate approximations we obtain the result.

(ii) $\implies$ (i) This is trivial. □

We may characterise torsion classes in $\mathcal{C}$.

**Proposition 3.6.** For a 2-functorially-finite subcategory $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, the following are equivalent:

(i) There is an inclusion $(\text{Fac} \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ and for every $d$-exact sequence in $\mathcal{C}$ with $T_0, T_3 \in \mathcal{T}$:

$$0 \to T_0 \to X \to Y \to T_3 \to 0$$

there exists a $d$-pushout diagram with exact rows:

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & T_0' & \longrightarrow & T_1' & \longrightarrow & T_2' & \longrightarrow & T_3 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & T_0 & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & T_3 & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}
$$

such that $T_0', T_1', T_2' \in \mathcal{T}$.

(ii) $\mathcal{T}$ is the torsion part of a 2-functorially-finite torsion pair in $\mathcal{C}$.

**Proof.** (i) $\implies$ (ii) For an arbitrary $M \in \mathcal{C}$, let $g : T_M \to M$ be a right $\mathcal{T}$-approximation. By Proposition 3.5 it suffices to show that $\text{Hom}_A(\mathcal{T}, \text{coker}g) = 0$. So assume there exists a morphism $T_3 \to \text{coker}g$ for some $T_3 \in \mathcal{T}$. Then there exist $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$ and a pullback diagram by Remark 2.6

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & T_0 & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & T_3 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & T_0 & \longrightarrow & T_M & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & \text{coker}g & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}
$$

By assumption there exist some $T_0', T_1', T_2' \in \mathcal{T}$ making the following diagram commute:

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & T_0' & \longrightarrow & T_1' & \longrightarrow & T_2' & \longrightarrow & T_3 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & T_0 & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & T_3 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & T_0 & \longrightarrow & T_M & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & \text{coker}g & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}
$$

Since the composition $T_2' \to T_3 \to \text{coker}g$ is non-zero there exists a non-zero morphism $T_2' \to M$, which by assumption factors through $T_M$. But this implies the above non-zero morphism $T_2' \to \text{coker}g$ factors through $T_M \to M \to \text{coker}g$, a contradiction.
(ii) $\implies$ (i) Clearly $\mathcal{T}$ is closed under factor modules in $\mathcal{C}$. Now let

$$(*) : 0 \to T_0 \to X \to Y \to T_3 \to 0$$

be $\delta$-exact with $T_0, T_3 \in \mathcal{T}$. By Proposition 3.5 there exist $T_X, T_Y \in \mathcal{T}$ and $F_X, F_Y \in \mathcal{F}$ and exact sequences

$$T_X \to X \to F_X,$$
$$T_Y \to Y \to F_Y.$$

Applying $\text{Hom}_A(\cdot, F)$ to $(*)$ implies an isomorphism $\text{Hom}_A(Y, F) \cong \text{Hom}_A(X, F)$ for any $F \in \text{Sub}\mathcal{F}$; this implies $\text{Im}(X \to F_X) \cong \text{Im}(Y \to F_Y)$. We are in the situation of Lemma 2.8 so there exist $T'_X, T'_Y, T' \in \mathcal{T}$ such that there there is a pullback diagram

$$
\begin{array}{cccccc}
0 & \downarrow & 0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
0 & \to & T'_X & \to & T'_Y & \to \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
0 & \to & T_0 & \to & T_X & \to \quad T_Y & \to \quad T' & \to 0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
0 & \to & T_0 & \to & X & \to & Y & \to & T_3 & \to 0 \\
& & & & \downarrow & & & & \downarrow & \\
& & & & & & & & & & 0
\end{array}
$$

This induces the required $\delta$-pushout diagram

$$
\begin{array}{cccccc}
0 & \to & T_0 \oplus T'_X & \to & T_X \oplus T'_Y & \to & T_Y & \to & T_3 & \to 0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
0 & \to & T_0 & \to & X & \to & Y & \to & T_3 & \to 0 \\
\end{array}
$$

since we know $0 \to T'_X \to T_X \oplus T'_Y \to X \oplus T_Y \to Y \to 0$ is exact. $\square$

Recall an object $T \in \mathcal{C}$ is $\tau$-tilting [1] if

- $\text{Hom}_A(T, \tau T) = 0$
- $|T| = |A|$, where $|\cdot|$ denotes the number of indecomposable summands.

If $T$ is $\tau$-tilting as an $A/\langle e \rangle$-module for some idempotent $e$, then $T$ is support $\tau$-tilting. This can be generalised as follows, using the generalised tilting theory of [13], [26]: recall that an $A$-module $T$ is a $\delta$-tilting module if:

1. $\text{proj.dim}(T) \leq \delta$. 

(2) $\text{Ext}_A^i(T, T) = 0$ for all $0 < i \leq d$.
(3) there exists an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow T_0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow T_d \rightarrow 0$$

where $T_0, \ldots, T_d \in \text{add}T$.

We may now define the latter of our primary objects of study.

**Definition 3.7.** An object $T \in \mathcal{C}$ is $\tau_2$-tilting if

- $\text{Hom}_A(T, \tau_2 T) = 0$
- There exists an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow T_0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow 0$$

such that $T_0, T_1, T_2 \in \text{add}T$.

If $T$ is $\tau_2$-tilting as an $A/\langle e \rangle$-module for some idempotent $e$, then we say that $T$ is support $\tau_2$-tilting.

We now show that support $\tau_2$-tilting modules are indeed 2-tilting. Recall that an $A$-module $T$ is faithful if its right annihilator $\text{ann}T$ vanishes.

**Lemma 3.8** (c.f. Lemma IV.2.7 of [5]; c.f Lemma VII.5.1 of [3]; c.f. Proposition 2.2(b) of [1]). Let $A$ be a finite-dimensional algebra with 2-cluster-tilting subcategory $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{mod}A$. Then

(i) For any $T \in \mathcal{C}$, $\text{proj.dim}T \leq 2$ if and only if $\text{Hom}_A(DA, \tau_2 T) = 0$.
(ii) Let $T \in \mathcal{C}$ be a faithful $A$-module. If $\text{Hom}_A(T, \tau_2 T) = 0$, then $\text{proj.dim}T \leq 2$.
(iii) Any $\tau_2$-tilting $A$-module $T$ is a tilting $(A/\text{ann}T)$-module.

**Proof.** (i): Apply the left exact functor $\nu^{-1} = \text{Hom}_A(DA, -)$ to the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \tau_2 M \rightarrow \nu P_2 \rightarrow \nu P_1 \rightarrow \nu P_0 \rightarrow \nu M \rightarrow 0$$

to obtain an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \nu^{-1}\tau_2 M \rightarrow \nu^{-1}\nu P_2 \rightarrow \nu^{-1}\nu P_1 \rightarrow \nu^{-1}\nu P_0 \rightarrow \nu^{-1}\nu M \rightarrow 0$$

It follows that $\text{Hom}_A(DA, \tau_2 M) = \nu^{-1}\tau_2 M$ vanishes if and only if $\text{proj.dim}M \leq 2$.

(ii): It is known (see [3, V1.2.2]) that an $A$-module $T$ is faithful if and only if $DA$ is generated by $T$. So let $T^i \rightarrow DA$ be a surjection. Applying the functor $\text{Hom}_A(-, \tau_2 T)$ results in a monomorphism $\text{Hom}_A(DA, \tau_2 T) \hookrightarrow \text{Hom}_A(T, \tau_2 T)$. The result now follows from part (i) above.

(iii) Note that for any idempotent ideal $\langle e \rangle$ of $A$, and any $M, N \in \text{mod}A$ there is a natural inclusion $\text{Ext}_A^2(A/\langle e \rangle)M, N) \hookrightarrow \text{Ext}_A^2(M, N)$. In this case let $\langle e \rangle := \text{ann}T$. Since $\text{Hom}_A(T, \tau_2 T) = 0$, Proposition 2.4 implies $\text{Ext}_A^2(T, \text{Fac}T) = 0$, and it follows that $\text{Ext}_A^2(A/\langle e \rangle)T, FacT) = 0$. By Proposition 2.3 once more, we have $\text{Hom}_A(A/\langle e \rangle)T, \tau_2 T) = 0$. Since $T$ is faithful as an $(A/\text{ann}T)$-module, it follows from part (ii) that $\text{proj.dim}T \leq d$ and that $T$ is 2-tilting as an $(A/\text{ann}T)$-module. □
Lemma 3.9 (Happel [13]). Let $A$ be a finite-dimensional algebra and $T$ be a $d$-tilting $A$-module. Assume that $M \in \text{mod}(A)$ satisfies $\text{Ext}^i_A(T, M) = 0$ for all $i > 0$. Then there exists an exact sequence

$$0 \to T_m \to \cdots \to T_1 \to T_0 \to M \to 0$$

such that $T_j \in \text{add}(T)$ for all $0 \leq j \leq m$ and $m \leq \text{gl.dim} A$.

We may now prove our main result.

**Theorem 1.1.** An object $T \in \mathcal{C}$ is a support $\tau_2$-tilting module if and only if $\text{Fac} T \cap \mathcal{C}$ is the torsion part of a 2-functorially-finite torsion pair in $\mathcal{C}$.

**Proof.** Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a torsion class in $\mathcal{C}$, then by 2-functorial finiteness and closure under factor modules, there exists an exact sequence $A \to T_0 \to T_1 \to T_2 \to 0$ such that $f : A \to T_0$ is a left $\mathcal{T}$-approximation and $T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{T}$. Clearly $\text{Im} f \cong A/\text{Ann} T$.

Now we need to prove that $T_i$ are Ext-projective in $\mathcal{T}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq 2$, i.e. that $\text{Ext}^2_A(T_i, T) = 0$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}$. First suppose $\text{Ext}^2_A(T_0, T) \neq 0$. Then by Proposition 3.6 there exists some $T_0' \in \mathcal{T}$ and a non-split surjection $T_0' \twoheadrightarrow T_0$. But then $f$ must factor through $T_0'$, a contradiction.

We next claim that there is a surjection $\text{Ext}^2_A(T_2, T) \twoheadrightarrow \text{Ext}^2_A(T_1, T)$ for any $T \in \mathcal{T}$. Let $X := \text{Im}(T_0 \to T_1)$. This induces exact sequences

$$\begin{align*}
\text{Ext}^2_A(T_2, T) &\rightarrow \text{Ext}^2_A(T_1, T) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^2_A(X, T) \\
\text{Ext}^1_A(A/\text{ann} \mathcal{T}, T) &\rightarrow \text{Ext}^2_A(X, T) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^2_A(T_0, T) = 0.
\end{align*}$$

Suppose $\text{Ext}^1_A(A/\text{ann} \mathcal{T}, T) \neq 0$ and there exists a short exact sequence

$$0 \to T \to E \to A/\text{ann} \mathcal{T} \to 0.$$

But then $E$ must be an $A/\text{ann} \mathcal{T}$-module, since both $T$ and $A/\text{ann} \mathcal{T}$ are, meaning that this sequence splits, a contradiction. So $\text{Ext}^1_A(A/\text{ann} \mathcal{T}, T) = 0 = \text{Ext}^2_A(X, T)$, and there is a surjection $\text{Ext}^2_A(T_2, T) \twoheadrightarrow \text{Ext}^2_A(T_1, T)$ as claimed.

Now suppose $\text{Ext}^2_A(T_2, T') \neq 0$ for some $T' \in \mathcal{T}$. By Proposition 3.6 there exists $T_0', T_1', T_2' \in \mathcal{T}$ and a $d$-exact sequence $0 \to T_0' \to T_1' \to T_2' \to T_2 \to 0$. By Lemma
there exist \( P, Q \in \mathcal{C} \) and a commutative diagram with exact rows and columns:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
0 \\
\downarrow \\
A/\text{ann}T \\
\downarrow \\
Q \\
\downarrow \\
T'_0 \rightarrow Q \oplus T'_1 \rightarrow P \\
\downarrow \\
T'_2 \rightarrow 0 \\
\downarrow \\
0
\end{array}
\quad\begin{array}{c}
0 \\
\downarrow \\
A/\text{ann}T \\
\downarrow \\
Q \oplus T_0 \\
\downarrow \\
T_0 \\
\downarrow \\
T_1 \\
\downarrow \\
0
\end{array}
\]

Moreover \( P, Q \in \mathcal{T} \) by assumption, since they have no common non-zero summands and we may replace \( T'_0 \) if necessary. This implies a morphism \( A \rightarrow Q \), which by assumption factors through \( T_0 \). But this implies the morphism \( T_0 \rightarrow T_1 \) also factors through \( Q \), and is hence the zero composition \( Q \rightarrow P \rightarrow T_1 \), a contradiction.

On the other hand, let \( T \) be a support \( \tau_2 \)-tilting module. We show that \( \text{Fac}\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{C} \) satisfies the conditions of Proposition 3.6. Closure under factor modules is trivial, and 2-functorial finiteness in \( \mathcal{C} \) follows from Lemma 3.9. So let

\[
0 \rightarrow T_0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow T_3 \rightarrow 0
\]

be a \( d \)-exact sequence in \( \mathcal{C} \) with \( T_0, T_3 \in \text{Fac}\mathcal{T} \). By Lemma 2.4, we have that \( \text{Hom}_A(T, \tau_2T) = 0 \iff \text{Ext}^2_A(T, \text{Fac}\mathcal{T}) = 0 \), so \( T_3 \) is not in \( \text{add}T \). Lemma 3.9 implies there exists an exact sequence in \( \text{Fac}\mathcal{T} \): \( 0 \rightarrow T'_0 \rightarrow T'_1 \rightarrow T'_2 \rightarrow T_3 \rightarrow 0 \). By Lemma 2.7 there exist \( P, Q \in \mathcal{C} \) to form a commutative diagram with exact rows and columns:
Applying Lemma 2.4 once more, we find $\text{Ext}^2_A(T_2', T_0) = 0$. This implies the diagram splits, $Q \cong T_0$, $P \cong T_2' \oplus X$ and that we are in the situation of Lemma 2.8 with a commutative diagram with exact rows and columns:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & \rightarrow & T_0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
0 & \rightarrow & T_0 \\
\end{array}
\]

Hence we find the required $d$-pushout diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & \rightarrow & T_0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
0 & \rightarrow & T_0 \\
\end{array}
\]

since we know $0 \rightarrow T_2' \rightarrow T_0 \oplus T_1' \rightarrow X \oplus T_2' \rightarrow Y \rightarrow 0$ is exact. \qed
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