**Abstract**

Cosheaves are a dual notion of sheaves. In this paper, we prove existence of a dual of sheafifications, called *cosheafifications*, in the ∞-category theory. We also prove that the ∞-category of ∞-cosheaves is presentable and equivalent to an ∞-category of left adjoint functors.

**Introduction**

Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a small category equipped with a pretopology $J$ and $\mathcal{V}$ be a category. Recall that a functor $\mathcal{G}: \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{V}$ is called a *cosheaf on $\mathcal{X}$*, if the diagram

$$
\coprod_{j,k \in I} \mathcal{G}(U_j \times U_k) \to \coprod_{i \in I} \mathcal{G}(U_i) \to \mathcal{G}(U)
$$

is a coequalizer in $\mathcal{V}$ for all $\{U_i \to U\}_{i \in J}$. In other words, a cosheaf is a $\mathcal{V}^{op}$-valued sheaf. This is a dual notion of sheaves. For example, the zeroth homology functor on the category of open sets is a cosheaf valued in the category abelian groups. We write $\text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ for the category of $\mathcal{V}$-valued precosheaves on $\mathcal{X}$ (i.e. functors $\mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{V}$) and write $\text{CSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ for its full subcategory consisting of cosheaves. In [Pra16], Prasolov proved that the inclusion $\text{CSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \hookrightarrow \text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ admits a right adjoint, called a cosheafification functor. This is a dual notion of sheafification. Recall that the sheafification functor is a left adjoint.

We can define cosheaves on $\mathcal{X}$ valued in an ∞-category by using similar coequalizer diagrams. For example, the suspension spectrum functor and the singular chain complex functor on the category of open sets are cosheaves valued in the ∞-category of spectra and the ∞-derived category of abelian groups, respectively. In general, a precosheaf valued in a stable ∞-category is a cosheaf if and only if it admits a Mayer-Vietoris triangle for all coverings.

The aim of this paper is to construct an ∞-categorical analogue of cosheafification, called an *∞-cosheafification*. Let $\mathcal{V}$ be (an underlying ∞-category of)
a closed symmetric monoidal ∞-category which is presentable in the sense of Lurie [HTT, Def.5.5.0.1]. The main result is stated as follows.

**Theorem** (see Theorem 3.2). If $\mathcal{V}$ satisfies the condition in Definition 2.9, then

1. $\text{CSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \hookrightarrow \text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ admits a right adjoint,
2. $\text{CSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ is presentable, and
3. $\text{CSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ is equivalent to the ∞-category of left adjoint functors from $\text{Sh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ to $\mathcal{V}$.

This theorem can be applied, for example, to the case when $\mathcal{V}$ is

(A) the ∞-category of ∞-groupoids,
(B) the connective part of the ∞-derived category of a commutative ring, or
(C) the ∞-category of connective spectra.

In the cases (B) and (C), cosheaves can be characterized as functors $\mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{V}$ which induce a Mayer-Vietoris triangle for each covering of $\mathcal{X}$. Therefore, the ∞-cosheafification associates a precosheaf to a homology theory admitting Mayer-Vietoris sequences.

This paper is organized as follows. In §1, we give a technical preparation from the ∞-category theory. In §2, we prove that the ∞-category $\text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ is equivalent to the ∞-category of left adjoint functors from $\text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ to $\mathcal{V}$. In §3, we prove the main result.

**Notation.** In this paper, we use quasi-categories as a model of ∞-categories. Every 1-category (i.e. ordinary category) is regarded as an ∞-category after taking the nerve. We write $\mathbb{S}$ for the ∞-category of small ∞-groupoids, i.e., the (∞-categorical) localization of the 1-category of small simplicial sets by weak equivalences under the Quillen model structure. For an ∞-category $\mathcal{C}$, the simplicially enriched hom-set from $X \in \mathcal{C}$ to $Y \in \mathcal{C}$ is denoted by $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(X, Y)$. When $\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{S}$, we write $[X, Y] = \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{S}}(X, Y)$ and $\mathcal{P}(X) = [X, \mathbb{S}]$.
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## 1 Right non-degenerate ∞-bifunctors

In this subsection, we give a technical preparation. For ∞-categories $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$, we write $[\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2]^L$ (resp. $[\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2]^R$) for the full subcategory of $[\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2]$ consisting of left (resp. right) adjoint functors. We consider right non-degenerate bifunctors of ∞-categories in the following sense.

**Definition 1.1.** Let $\mathcal{C}$, $\mathcal{C}'$ and $\mathcal{V}$ be locally small ∞-categories. A bifunctor $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}' \to \mathcal{V}$ is called right non-degenerate, if the induced functor $\mathcal{C}' \to [\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V}]$ is fully faithful and its essential image coincides with $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V}]^R$. 

1 Right non-degenerate ∞-bifunctors
Throughout this subsection, we fix a right non-degenerate bifunctor \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : C \times C^\vee \to V \). We give the following easy lemma.

**Lemma 1.2.** If \( C \) and \( V \) are presentable, then so is \( C^\vee \).

**Proof.** This follows from the equivalence of \( \infty \)-categories \( C^\vee \cong [C, V]^L \) and [HTT, Prop. 5.5.3.8].

We write \( \mathcal{G}^\dagger \) for the functor \( \langle - , \mathcal{G} \rangle : C \to V \). Recall that there exists a canonical equivalence of \( \infty \)-categories \( \varepsilon : [C, V]^L \cong ([V, C]^R)^{\text{op}} \). Then we write \( \mathcal{G}^\dagger = \varepsilon(\mathcal{G}^\dagger) \) for \( \mathcal{G} \in C^\vee \).

**Definition 1.3.** Let \( D \) be a strict full subcategory of \( C \). We write \( D^\vee \) for the full subcategory of \( C^\vee \) consisting of \( \mathcal{G} \in C^\vee \) such that \( \mathcal{G}^\dagger v \in D \) for all \( v \in V \). Then \( D^\vee \) is called the dual of \( D \) (with respect to \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \)).

The following states that localizations of \( C \) induce a right-non-degenerate bifunctor.

**Proposition 1.4.** Let \( D \) be a reflective strict full subcategory of \( C \).

(1) The restriction \( D \times D^\vee \to V \) of \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) is right non-degenerate.

(2) If \( C, D \) and \( V \) are presentable, then \( D^\vee \) is coreflective in \( C^\vee \).

**Proof.** (1) For \( \mathcal{G} \in D^\vee \), the functor \( \mathcal{G} : V \to C \) induces \( \mathcal{G}^\dagger : V \to D \). Since \( \mathcal{G}^\dagger \) is right adjoint to \( \mathcal{G} |_D \), we obtain \( (-)^\dagger : D^\vee \to ([V, C]^R)^{\text{op}} \). By the \( \infty \)-commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
D & \xrightarrow{(-)^\dagger} & ([V, D]^R)^{\text{op}} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
C & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} & ([V, C]^R)^{\text{op}},
\end{array}
\]

the functor \( (-)^\dagger \) is fully faithful. On the other hand, the composition

\[
G' : V \xrightarrow{G} D \to C
\]

is contained in \([V, C]^R\) for all \( G \in [V, D]^R\). Thus there exists \( \mathcal{G} \in C^\vee \) such that \( \mathcal{G}^\dagger \) is equivalent to \( G' \) in \(([V, C]^R)^{\text{op}} \). Then we have \( \mathcal{G}^\dagger \cong G \). This means that the functor \( (-)^\dagger \) is essentially surjective and thus equivalence of \( \infty \)-categories. Therefore, \( D \times D^\vee \to V \) induces an equivalence of \( \infty \)-categories \( D^\vee \xrightarrow{\cong} ([V, D]^R)^{\text{op}} \cong [C, V]^L \).

(2) By Lemma 1.2, \( C^\vee \) and \( D^\vee \) are presentable. Thus we only need to show that \( D^\vee \) is closed under small colimits in \( C^\vee \) by [HTT, Cor. 5.5.2.9]. Since limits of right adjoint functors are computed objectwise and \( D \) is closed under small limits in \( C \), the functor \([V, D]^R \to [V, C]^R\) preserves all small limits. Therefore, the assertion follows from the equivalences \( (C^\vee)^{\text{op}} \cong [V, C]^R \) and \( (D^\vee)^{\text{op}} \cong [V, D]^R \).
**Definition 1.5.** The right non-degenerate bifunctor $\mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D}^\vee \to \mathcal{V}$ as in Proposition 1.4 is called the *localization* of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ by $\mathcal{D}$.

Next, we consider the dual of the localization of $\mathcal{C}$ by a set of morphisms.

**Definition 1.6.** Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a set of morphisms in $\mathcal{C}$. An object $\mathcal{G}$ in $\mathcal{C}^\vee$ is called *dually $\mathcal{S}$-colocal*, if for every $f: \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{F}'$ in $\mathcal{S}$, the induced morphism

$$\langle f, \mathcal{G} \rangle : \langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \rangle \to \langle \mathcal{F}', \mathcal{G} \rangle$$

is an equivalence in $\mathcal{V}$. We write $\mathcal{C}^\vee_{\text{Scol}}$ for the full subcategory of $\mathcal{C}^\vee$ consisting of dually $\mathcal{S}$-colocal objects.

For a set of morphisms $\mathcal{S}$ in $\mathcal{C}$, we write $\mathcal{C}^\mathcal{S}_{\text{loc}}$ for the full subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$ consisting of $\mathcal{S}$-local objects (see definition [HTT, Def. 5.5.4.1]). The next proposition states that dually $\mathcal{S}$-colocal objects are dual of $\mathcal{S}$-local objects.

**Proposition 1.7.** Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a set of morphisms in $\mathcal{C}$. Then $(\mathcal{C}^\mathcal{S}_{\text{loc}})^\vee = \mathcal{C}^\vee_{\text{Scol}}$.

**Proof.** Let $f: \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{F}'$ be a morphism in $\mathcal{C}$ and let $\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{C}^\vee$. We only need to show that the following two conditions are equivalent.

1. The morphism $\mathcal{G}^\dagger f: \mathcal{G}^\dagger \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}^\dagger \mathcal{F}'$ is an equivalence in $\mathcal{V}$.

2. The morphism $\text{Hom}_c(f, \mathcal{G}^\dagger v): \text{Hom}_c(\mathcal{F}', \mathcal{G}^\dagger v) \to \text{Hom}_c(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}^\dagger v)$ is an equivalence in $\mathcal{S}$ for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$.

On the other hand, the $\infty$-Yoneda lemma states that the condition (1) is equivalent to the following.

$$(1')$$ The morphism $\text{Hom}_c(\mathcal{G}^\dagger f, v): \text{Hom}_c(\mathcal{G}^\dagger \mathcal{F}, v) \to \text{Hom}_c(\mathcal{G}^\dagger \mathcal{F}', v)$ is an equivalence in $\mathcal{S}$ for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$.

Since $\mathcal{G}^\dagger$ is left adjoint to $\mathcal{G}_!$, the equivalence $\text{Hom}_c(\mathcal{G}^\dagger f, v) \cong \text{Hom}_c(f, \mathcal{G}_! v)$ shows that $(1') \iff (2)$. \hfill $\Box$

**Remark 1.8.** When $\mathcal{C}$ is presentable and $\mathcal{S}$ is small, $\mathcal{C}^\mathcal{S}_{\text{loc}}$ is reflective and can be regarded as the localization $S^{-1}\mathcal{C}$ of $\mathcal{C}$ by $\mathcal{S}$ (see [HTT, Prop. 5.5.4.2 and 5.5.4.15]). Therefore, we obtain a right non-degenerate bifunctor $S^{-1}\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}^\mathcal{S}_{\text{loc}} \to \mathcal{V}$ as a localization of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$.

### 2 Presheaves-precosheaves paring

Throughout this subsection, we fix a small simplicial set $\mathcal{X}$ and (the underlying $\infty$-category of) a symmetric closed monoidal $\infty$-category $\mathcal{V}$ which is complete and cocomplete. We write $\text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) = [\mathcal{X}^{op}, \mathcal{V}]$ and $\text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) = \mathcal{X}^{\mathcal{V}}$.

Our aim of this subsection is to prove that the bifunctor as in Definition 2.5 is right non-degenerate under assuming a technical condition for $\mathcal{V}$. Let $\otimes$, $\mathcal{H}om$ and $\mathbb{1}$ denote the monoidal product, the internal hom and the monoidal unit of $\mathcal{V}$, respectively. Let $r_*$ be the covariant functor $\mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{S}$ represented by $\mathbb{1}$ and $r^*$ be the functor $\mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{V}: S \mapsto \text{colim}(S, \mathbb{1}) \to \mathcal{V})$. The pair $(r^*, r_*)$ is a variation of free-forgetful adjunctions.
Lemma 2.1. The functor $r_*$ is right adjoint to $r^*$.

Proof. For each $S_\bullet \in \mathcal{S}$, $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and $n \geq 0$, there exist equivalences

$$\text{Hom}_\mathcal{V}(r^*S_n, v) \cong \text{Hom}_\mathcal{V}\left(\prod_{s \in S_n} 1, v\right) \cong \prod_{s \in S_n} \text{Hom}_\mathcal{V}(1, v) \cong \text{Hom}_\mathcal{V}(S_n, r_*v).$$

Since $S_\bullet$ is equivalent to the colimit of $\Delta \to \mathcal{S}; [n] \mapsto S_n$ and $r^*$ preserves colimits, we obtain an equivalence

$$\text{Hom}_\mathcal{V}(r^*S_\bullet, v) \cong \text{Hom}_\mathcal{V}(S_\bullet, r_*v)$$

which is functorial in both $S_\bullet$ and $v$. \qed

Let $Y^\infty$ be the $\infty$-Yoneda embedding $\mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. By Lemma 2.1, $r^*$ and $r_*$ induce an adjunction

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \rightleftarrows \mathcal{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}): r.$$ We define $Y^V$ as the composition $\mathcal{P} \circ Y^\infty$. We compute $r^*$ and $r_*$ for some $\mathcal{V}$.

Example 2.2. (1) Assume that $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{S}$ equipped with the cartesian monoidal structure. Then $r^*$ and $r_*$ are equivalent to the identity. Thus we obtain that $Y^V \cong Y^\infty$.

(2) Assume that $\mathcal{V}$ is the 1-category $\text{Set}$ of small sets equipped with the cartesian monoidal structure. Then $r_*$ is the canonical embedding $\text{Set} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{S}$ and $r^*$ is the functor $S \mapsto \pi_0(S)$. In particular, $Y^V$ is the ordinary Yoneda embedding when $\mathcal{X}$ is a 1-category.

(3) Let $\Lambda$ be a commutative unital ring. Assume that $\mathcal{V}$ is the derived $\infty$-category $\mathcal{D}(\Lambda)$ of $\Lambda$ (see [HA, Def. 1.3.5.8]). Recall that $\mathcal{D}(\Lambda)$ has a monoidal structure induced by derived tensor products (see [HA, Prop. 1.3.5.15 and Ex. 4.1.7.6]). Under this monoidal structure, we obtain that $r_*(C_\bullet) \cong \mathcal{D}(\tau_{\geq 0}C_\bullet)$ for each $C_\bullet \in \mathcal{D}(\Lambda)$, where $\mathcal{D}(\Lambda)$ means the Dold-Kan correspondence and $\tau_{\geq 0}$ means the truncation. Thus $r^*$ coincides with the functor of singular chain complexes.

(4) Assume that $\mathcal{V}$ is the stable $\infty$-category of spectra $\mathcal{Sp}$ (see [HA, Def. 1.4.3.1]). Then $\mathcal{V}$ has a symmetric monoidal structure given by smash products (see [HA, §4.8.2]). Since $1$ is equivalent to the suspension spectrum of a point, $r^*$ is equivalent to the suspension spectrum functor $\Sigma^\infty: \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{Sp}$. Hence, $r_*$ coincides with the forgetful functor $\Omega^\infty: \mathcal{Sp} \to \mathcal{S}$.

We give $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{V}(v, w) \cong r_* \mathcal{H}om(v, w)$ for $v, w \in \mathcal{V}$.

Lemma 2.3. There exists an equivalence $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{V} \cong r_* \mathcal{H}om$ in $[\mathcal{V}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{S}]$.

Proof. For each $v, w \in \mathcal{V}$, there exist equivalences

$$r_* \mathcal{H}om(v, w) = \text{Hom}_\mathcal{V}(1, \mathcal{H}om(v, w)) \cong \text{Hom}_\mathcal{V}(v \otimes 1, w) \cong \text{Hom}_\mathcal{V}(v, w)$$

which are functorial in both $v$ and $w$. \qed
For a bifunctor of ∞-categories \( F : \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D} \), we write \( \int_{c \in \mathcal{C}} F(c, c) \) (resp. \( \int^{c \in \mathcal{C}} F(c, c) \)) for the ∞-categorical end (resp. coend) of \( F \) introduced by Glasman [Gla16, Def. 2.2]. Since ends (resp. coends) are defined as a limit (resp. colimit), these commute with right (resp. left) adjoint functors. Now, we define a bifunctor \( \mathcal{H}om' : \text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})^{\text{op}} \times \text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \to \mathcal{V} \) by

\[
\mathcal{H}om'(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}') = \int_{U \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{F}(U), \mathcal{F}'(U))
\]

for each \( \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}' \in \text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \). The next is a variation of Yoneda’s lemma for \( \mathcal{H}om' \).

**Lemma 2.4.** In \([\mathcal{X}^{\text{op}} \times \text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})], \mathcal{V}\), the functor \((U, \mathcal{F}) \mapsto \mathcal{F}(U)\) is equivalent to \((U, \mathcal{F}) \mapsto \mathcal{H}om'(Y^\mathcal{X}(U), \mathcal{F})\).

**Proof.** Since ends are defined as a limit, these commute with a hom-functor. Thus we obtain an equivalence

\[
\mathcal{H}om_v(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{H}om'(Y^\mathcal{X}(U), \mathcal{F})) \cong \int_{V \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{H}om_v(\mathcal{F}(V), \mathcal{H}om_v(Y^\mathcal{X}(U)(V), \mathcal{F}(V)))
\]

for each \( U \in \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F} \in \text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \) and \( v \in \mathcal{V} \). On the other hand, we have

\[
\mathcal{H}om_v(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{H}om_v(Y^\mathcal{X}(U)(V), \mathcal{F}(V))) \cong \mathcal{H}om_v(v \otimes Y^\mathcal{X}(U)(V), \mathcal{F}(V)) \cong \mathcal{H}om_v(Y^\mathcal{X}(U)(V), \mathcal{H}om_v(v, \mathcal{F}(V))).
\]

By Lemmas 2.1 and 2.3, we also have

\[
\mathcal{H}om_v(Y^\mathcal{X}(U)(V), \mathcal{H}om_v(v, \mathcal{F}(V))) \cong \mathcal{H}om_v(Y^\mathcal{X}(U)(V), \mathcal{H}om_v(v, \mathcal{F}(V))) \cong \mathcal{H}om_v(v, \mathcal{F}(U)).
\]

Hence, we obtain that

\[
\mathcal{H}om_v(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{H}om'(Y^\mathcal{X}(U), \mathcal{F})) \cong \int_{V \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{H}om_v(Y^\mathcal{X}(U)(V), \mathcal{H}om_v(v, \mathcal{F}(V))).
\]

Then the right-hand side is equivalent to \( \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{P}sh(\mathcal{X})}(Y^\mathcal{X}(U), \mathcal{H}om_v(v, \mathcal{F}(-))) \) by [Gla16, Prop. 2.3]. Therefore, the ∞-Yoneda lemma in \( \mathcal{X} \) gives an equivalence

\[
\int_{V \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{H}om_v(Y^\mathcal{X}(U)(V), \mathcal{H}om_v(v, \mathcal{F}(V))) \cong \mathcal{H}om_v(v, \mathcal{F}(U)).
\]

Applying the ∞-Yoneda lemma in \( \mathcal{V} \) to the equivalence

\[
\mathcal{H}om_v(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{H}om'(Y^\mathcal{X}(U), \mathcal{F})) \cong \mathcal{H}om_v(v, \mathcal{F}(U)),
\]

we see that the assertion follows. \( \square \)
We construct a bifunctor \( \text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \times \text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \to \mathcal{V} \) as follows.

**Definition 2.5.** A bifunctor \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \times \text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \to \mathcal{V} \) is defined by

\[
\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \rangle = \int_{U \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{F}(U) \otimes \mathcal{G}(U)
\]

for each \( \mathcal{F} \in \text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \) and \( \mathcal{G} \in \text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \). This bifunctor is called the \( \mathcal{V} \)-valued presheaves-precosheaves paring on \( \mathcal{X} \).

We write \( \mathcal{G}^\dagger \) for the functor \( \langle - , \mathcal{G} \rangle : \text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \to \mathcal{V} \). We also write \( \mathcal{G}^\dagger \mathcal{V} \) for the functor \( \mathcal{V} \to \text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}); v \mapsto \text{Hom}(\mathcal{G}(\cdot), v) \).

**Lemma 2.6.** In \( [\text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})^{\text{op}} \times \text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{V}] \), the functor \( (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, v) \mapsto \text{Hom}(\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \rangle, v) \)

is equivalent to

\[
(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, v) \mapsto \text{Hom}^\prime(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}^\dagger v).
\]

**Proof.** For each \( \mathcal{F} \in \text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \), \( \mathcal{G} \in \text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \) and \( v \in \mathcal{V} \), there exist equivalences

\[
\text{Hom}(\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \rangle, v) \cong \int_{U \in \mathcal{X}} \text{Hom}(\mathcal{F}(U) \otimes \mathcal{G}(U), v)
\]

\[
\cong \int_{U \in \mathcal{X}} \text{Hom}(\mathcal{F}(U), \text{Hom}(\mathcal{G}(U), v))
\]

\[
= \int_{U \in \mathcal{X}} \text{Hom}(\mathcal{F}(U), (\mathcal{G}^\dagger v)(U))
\]

\[
= \text{Hom}^\prime(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}^\dagger v)
\]

which are functorial in \( \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \) and \( v \). \( \square \)

By Lemmas 2.3 and 2.6, we see that \( \mathcal{G}^\dagger \) is left adjoint to \( \mathcal{G}^\dagger \). This means that the presheaves-precosheaves pairing induces a functor \( (-)^\dagger : \text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \to [\text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), \mathcal{V}]^L \). Let \( \text{Res} \) be the functor \( [\text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})^{\text{op}} \to \text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}); F \mapsto F \circ \mathcal{Y}^\dagger \). We next prove that \( (-)^\dagger \) is an essential section of \( \text{Res} \).

**Lemma 2.7.** The composition

\[
\text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \xrightarrow{(-)^\dagger} [\text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), \mathcal{V}] \xrightarrow{\text{Res}} \text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})
\]

is equivalent to the identity of \( \text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \). In other words, we have

\[
\langle \mathcal{Y}^\dagger(U), \mathcal{G} \rangle \cong \mathcal{G}(U)
\]

which is functorial in \( U \in \mathcal{X} \) and \( \mathcal{G} \in \text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \).
Proof. For each $G \in \text{PCSh}(X, V)$ and $v \in V$, there exist equivalences
\[
\text{Hom}(G^\dagger \circ YV(-), v) \cong \text{Hom}(YV(-), G^\dagger v) \cong (G^\dagger v)(-) = \text{Hom}(G(-), v)
\]
by Lemmas 2.6 and 2.4. Thus Lemma 2.3 gives
\[
\text{Hom}_V(G^\dagger \circ YV(-), v) \cong \text{Hom}_V(G(-), v).
\]
Therefore, the $\infty$-Yoneda lemma in $V$ leads to a functorial equivalence $\text{Res}(G^\dagger) \cong G$.

We prove a variation of the co-Yoneda lemma.

Lemma 2.8. In $[\mathcal{X}^{\text{op}} \times \text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, V), V]$, the functor $(V, F) \mapsto F(V)$ is equivalent to $V \mapsto \int_{U \in \mathcal{X}} F(U) \otimes YV(U)(V)$.

Proof. Since $\text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, V) = \text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{op}}, V)$ and $\text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}, V) = \text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}^{\text{op}}, V)$, Lemma 2.7 for the $V$-valued presheaves-prescosheaves pairing on $\mathcal{X}^{\text{op}}$ gives a desired equivalence.

We need the following technical definition.

Definition 2.9. The $\infty$-category $V$ is said to be generated by units, if for each $v \in V$, a colimit of the functor
\[
D_v : S \times V/V_v \xrightarrow{(r^*, \text{id})} V \times V/V_v \to V
\]
even exists and the canonical morphism $\text{colim} D_v \to v$ is an equivalence in $V$, where $(-) \times V/V_v$ is defined by the pullback diagram
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
(-) \times V/V_v & \longrightarrow & V/V_v \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
(-) & \longrightarrow & V
\end{array}
\]
in the 1-category of simplicial sets.

Remark 2.10. Recall that $r^*$ is defined by the colimit of constant diagrams at 1. Therefore, if $V$ is generated by units, every $v \in V$ is the colimit of a constant diagram $K_v \to V$ at 1 such that the association $v \mapsto K_v$ is functorial.

We see some examples of symmetric monoidal $\infty$-categories generated by units.

Example 2.11. By (1) and (2) in Example 2.2, $\mathbb{S}$ and $\text{Set}$ are generated by units. Let $\mathcal{D}_{\geq 0}(\Lambda)$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}$) be the full subcategory of $\mathcal{D}(\Lambda)$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}$) consisting of objects whose homology (resp. homotopy) groups vanish in degree $< 0$. Then $\mathcal{D}_{\geq 0}(\Lambda)$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}$ are also generated by units by (3) and (4) in Example 2.2.
We prove that presheaves-presheaves pairings are right non-degenerate if \( \mathcal{V} \) is generated by units.

**Proposition 2.12.** Assume that \( \mathcal{V} \) is generated by units. Then the functor \((-)^! : \text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \to [\text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), \mathcal{V}]^L \) is an equivalence of \( \infty \)-categories and \( \text{Res} \) gives its inverse.

**Proof.** By Lemma 2.7, it suffices to show that the composition

\[
[\text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), \mathcal{V}]^L \xrightarrow{\text{Res}} \text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \xrightarrow{(-)^!} [\text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), \mathcal{V}]^L
\]

is equivalent to the identity of \([\text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), \mathcal{V}]^L\). For \( F \in [\text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), \mathcal{V}]^L \) and \( \mathcal{F} \in \text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \), we have

\[
F(\mathcal{F}) \cong F \left( \int_{U \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{F}(U) \otimes \mathcal{V}(U)(-\) \right)
\]

\[
\cong \int_{U \in \mathcal{X}} F(\mathcal{F}(U) \otimes \mathcal{V}(U)(-))
\]

by Lemma 2.8. On the other hand, we also have

\[
\text{Res}(F)^!(\mathcal{F}) = \int_{U \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{F}(U) \otimes F(\mathcal{V}(U))
\]

by the definition of \( \text{Res}(F) \). Thus we only need to construct an equivalence

\[
F(\mathcal{F}(U) \otimes \mathcal{V}(U)(-)) \cong \mathcal{F}(U) \otimes F(\mathcal{V}(U))
\]

in \( \mathcal{V} \) which is functorial in \( F, \mathcal{F} \) and \( U \). For \( v \in \mathcal{V} \), let \( K_v \) be the simplicial set as in Remark 2.10. Then the association \((U, \mathcal{F}) \mapsto K_{\mathcal{F}(U)}\) is functorial. Since left adjoint functors preserve colimits, we obtain that

\[
F(\mathcal{F}(U) \otimes \mathcal{V}(U)(-)) \cong F \left( \left( \colim_{s \in K_{\mathcal{F}(U)}} 1 \right) \otimes \mathcal{V}(U)(-\) \right)
\]

\[
\cong F \left( \colim_{s \in K_{\mathcal{F}(U)}} (1 \otimes \mathcal{V}(U)(-)) \right)
\]

\[
\cong \colim_{s \in K_{\mathcal{F}(U)}} F(1 \otimes \mathcal{V}(U)(-))
\]

\[
\cong \colim_{s \in K_{\mathcal{F}(U)}} F(\mathcal{V}(U))
\]

\[
\cong \colim_{s \in K_{\mathcal{F}(U)}} (1 \otimes F(\mathcal{V}(U)))
\]

\[
\cong \left( \colim_{s \in K_{\mathcal{F}(U)}} 1 \right) \otimes F(\mathcal{V}(U))
\]

\[
\cong \mathcal{F}(U) \otimes F(\mathcal{V}(U)).
\]

}\]
3 Proof of main results

Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a small 1-category equipped with a pretopology $J$ and $\mathcal{V}$ be a presentable symmetric closed monoidal $\infty$-category generated by units. Our aim of this section is to prove the main result. We first give a precise definition of $\mathcal{V}$-valued (co)sheaves on $\mathcal{X}$.

**Definition 3.1.** (1) A presheaf $F \in \text{PSh}^{-}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ is called a sheaf, if the diagram

$$F(U) \to \prod_{i \in I} F(U_i) \rightrightarrows \prod_{j,k \in I} F(U_j \times_U U_k)$$

is an equalizer in $\mathcal{V}$ for all $\{U_i \to U\}_{i \in I} \in J$. We write $\text{Sh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ for the full subcategory of $\text{PSh}^{-}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ consisting of sheaves.

(2) A precosheaf $G \in \text{PSh}^{-}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ is called a cosheaf, if the diagram

$$\prod_{j,k \in I} G(U_j \times_U U_k) \rightrightarrows \prod_{i \in I} G(U_i) \to G(U)$$

is a coequalizer in $\mathcal{V}$ for all $\{U_i \to U\}_{i \in I} \in J$. We write $\text{CSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ for the full subcategory of $\text{PSh}^{-}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ consisting of cosheaves.

We prove the main result.

**Theorem 3.2.** (1) Under the presheaves-precosheaves paring $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \times \text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \to \mathcal{V}$, we have $\text{CSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) = \text{Sh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})^\vee$.

(2) The $\infty$-category $\text{Sh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ is presentable.

(3) The $\infty$-category $\text{CSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ is presentable.

(4) The inclusion $\text{Sh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \hookrightarrow \text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ admits a left adjoint.

(5) The inclusion $\text{CSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \hookrightarrow \text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ admits a right adjoint.

(6) There exists an equivalence of $\infty$-categories $\text{CSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \cong [\text{Sh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), \mathcal{V}]^L$.

**Proof.** We see that (1) and (2) imply (3)-(6). Indeed, since $\text{Sh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ is closed under limits in $\text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$, (2) proves (4) by [HTT, Cor. 5.5.2.9]. Therefore, (3), (5) and (6) follow from Lemma 1.2 and Proposition 1.4. We prove (2). For $U = \{U_i \to U\}_{i \in I} \in J$, we write

$$Y^V(U) = \text{colim} \left( \prod_{j,k \in I} Y^V(U_j \times_U U_k) \rightrightarrows \prod_{i \in I} Y^V(U_i) \right).$$

By the $\infty$-Yoneda lemma in $\mathcal{X}$, a presheaf $F \in \text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ is a sheaf if and only if the canonical morphism

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})}(Y^V(U), F) \to \text{Hom}_{\text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})}(Y^V(U), F)$$

is an equivalence in $\mathcal{V}$ for all $U = \{U_i \to U\}_{i \in I} \in J$. In other words, $\text{Sh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ is the full subcategory of $\text{PSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ consisting of $S$-local objects for

$$S = \{Y^V(U) \to Y^V(U) \mid U \in J \}.$$
Thus [HTT, Prop. 5.5.4.15] proves (2). Finally, we prove (1). Since \( \mathcal{G}^! \) preserves colimits, a precosheaf \( \mathcal{G} \in \text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \) is a cosheaf if and only if the canonical morphism
\[
\langle Y^V(U), \mathcal{G} \rangle \rightarrow \langle Y^V(U), \mathcal{G} \rangle
\]
is an equivalence in \( \mathcal{V} \) by Lemma 2.7. Thus \( \text{CSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \) coincides with the full subcategory of \( \text{PCSh}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) \) consisting of dually \( S \)-local objects. Thus we have (1) by Proposition 1.7.

Remark 3.3. Theorem 3.2 can be applied to the case when \( \mathcal{V} \) is \( \mathbb{S}, D_{\geq 0}(\Lambda) \) or \( \text{Sp}_{\geq 0} \). Indeed, these are generated by units (see Example 2.11) and presentable (see [HTT, Ex. 5.5.1.8] and [HA, Prop. 1.3.5.21, 1.4.3.4 and 1.4.4.13]).

Remark 3.4. Let \( \mathcal{Y} \) be a small \( \infty \)-category equipped with a topology in the sense of [HTT, Def. 6.2.2.1]. We write \( S \) for the set of monomorphisms associated with some covering sieves of \( \mathcal{Y} \). We define \( \text{Sh}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{V}) \) for the full subcategory of \( \text{PSh}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{V}) \) consisting of \( \mathfrak{r}S \)-local objects. This definition is a generalization of the construction of the \( \infty \)-topos on \( \mathcal{Y} \) (see [HTT, Def. 2.2.6]). Then we also define \( \text{CSh}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{V}) = \text{Sh}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{V})^\vee \). Since \( \mathfrak{r}S \) is small, \( \text{Sh}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{V}) \) is presentable by [HTT, Prop. 5.5.4.15]. Therefore, we see that \( \text{Sh}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{V}) \) and \( \text{CSh}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{V}) \) also satisfies Theorem 3.2 by a similar proof.
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