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Abstract

Let \( \mathcal{C} \) be a extriangulated category with a proper class \( \xi \) of \( E \)-triangles. We introduce the notions of left Frobenius pairs, left \((n-)\)cotorsion pairs and left (weak) Auslander-Buchweitz contexts with respect to \( \xi \) in \( \mathcal{C} \). We show how to construct left cotorsion pairs from left \( n \)-cotorsion pairs, and establish a one-one correspondence between left Frobenius pairs and left (weak) Auslander-Buchweitz contexts. This generalizes Huang-Ma-Zhao’s results in triangulated categories and partially generalizes Becerril-Mendoza-Pérez-Santiago’s results in abelian categories.

1 Introduction

An important branch of relative homological algebra was developed by Auslander and Buchweitz in their paper [2]. Based on this, Hashimoto [8] defined the so-called “Auslander-Buchweitz context” for abelian categories, Auslander-Buchweitz approximation theory is the prerequisite for computing relative dimensions. On the other hand, cotorsion pairs, developed in [5–7], are important in the study of the algebraic and geometric structures of abelian categories. This notion provides a good setting for investigating relative homological dimensions (see [1]). Moreover, Huerta, Mendoza and Pérez [12] introduced the notion of \( n \)-cotorsion pairs in abelian categories. They described several properties of \( n \)-cotorsion pairs and established a relation with (complete) cotorsion pairs. Becerril, Mendoza, Pérez and Santiago [3] introduced Frobenius pairs in abelian categories, they presented one-to-one correspondences between left Frobenius pairs, Auslander-Buchweitz contexts and cotorsion pairs in abelian categories. Recently, Huang, Ma and Zhao [14] generalized partially this correspondence to triangulated categories with a proper class of triangles.

In [16], Nakaoka and Palu introduced the notion of externally triangulated categories (extriangulated categories for short) as a simultaneous generalization of exact categories and triangulated categories. Up to now, many results on exact categories and triangulated categories have gotten realization in the setting of extriangulated categories. In particular, Ma, Ding and Zhang [15] investigated Auslander-Buchweitz approximation theory in extriangulated categories. In this paper, we will pay close attention to the notion of a proper class of \( E \)-triangles in an extriangulated category \((\mathcal{C}, E, \xi)\), which is introduced by Hu, Zhang and Zhou [9] for developing the Gorenstein homological algebra. Throughout this paper, we always assume that \( \mathcal{C} \) is an extriangulated category with enough \( \xi \)-projective and \( \xi \)-injective objects. We are devoted to introducing the notions of left Frobenius pairs, left \((n-)\)cotorsion pairs and left (weak) Auslander-Buchweitz contexts.
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contexts in an extriangulated category $\mathcal{C}$ with a proper class $\xi$ of $E$-triangles, and developing relative homological theory along with the Auslander-Buchweitz approximation theory, in particular, we will discuss the internal relations among these notions. Moreover, some applications are given in the context of Gorenstein homological algebra in extriangulated categories. When $\mathcal{C}$ is a triangulated category with a proper class of triangles, it recovers the results of Huang, Ma and Zhao in [14]. This paper is organized as follows.

In Section 2, we give some terminology and some preliminary results. In Section 3, we recall the notion of left ($n$-)cotorsion pairs with respect to $\xi$ in $\mathcal{C}$, and then by virtue of an equivalent characterization of $n$-cotorsion pairs [18], we establish a relation between $n$-cotorsion pairs and cotorsion pairs (Proposition 3.9).

In Section 4, we introduce the notions of left Frobenius pairs and left (weak) Auslander-Buchweitz contexts with respect to $\xi$ in $\mathcal{C}$. For a subcategory $\mathcal{X}$ of $\mathcal{C}$ consisting of objects with finite $\mathcal{X}$-resolution dimension. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a left Frobenius pair in $\mathcal{C}$. We show that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is closed under $\xi$-extensions, cocones of $\xi$-deflations, cones of $\xi$-inflations and direct summands (Theorem 4.11). Then we show how to obtain (left) cotorsion pairs from left Frobenius pairs (Theorem 4.13). Finally, we introduce the notion of left (weak) Auslander-Buchweitz contexts.

Let $\mathfrak{A}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{A}'$) be the class of all left Frobenius pairs $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ with respect to $\xi$ (resp. with $\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \mathcal{C}$) in $\mathcal{C}$, and $\mathfrak{B}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{B}'$) be the class of all left weak (resp. left) Auslander-Buchweitz context with respect to $\xi$ in $\mathcal{C}$. Then we establish a one-one correspondence (Theorems 4.21 and 4.22) between $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ (resp. $\mathfrak{A}'$ and $\mathfrak{B}'$) given by

$\Phi : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ via $(\mathcal{X}, \omega) \mapsto (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}^\wedge)$

$\Psi : \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ via $(A, B) \mapsto (A, A \cap B)$.

Let $\mathcal{C}'$ be the class of all cotorsion pair $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ with respect to $\xi$ in $\mathcal{C}$ with $\mathcal{U}$ resolving and $\mathcal{U}^\wedge = \mathcal{C}$, and $\mathcal{D}'$ be the class of all $n$-cotorsion pairs $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ with respect to $\xi$ in $\mathcal{C}$ with $\mathcal{U}$ resolving and $\mathcal{U}^\wedge = \mathcal{C}$. We also show that $\mathfrak{B}' = \mathcal{C}' = \mathcal{D}'$ (Theorem 4.22).

2 Preliminaries

We first recall some notions and some needed properties of extriangulated categories from [16].

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an additive category and $\mathbb{E} : \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}b$ a biadditive functor, where $\mathfrak{A}b$ is the category of abelian groups. Let $A, C \in \mathcal{C}$. An element $\delta \in \mathbb{E}(C, A)$ is called an $\mathbb{E}$-extension. Two sequences of morphisms

$A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C$ and $A \xrightarrow{x'} B' \xrightarrow{y'} C$

are said to be equivalent if there exists an isomorphism $b \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(B, B')$ such that $x' = bx$ and $y = y'b$. We denote by $[A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C]$ the equivalence class of $A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C$. In particular, we write $0 := [A \xrightarrow{\text{Id}_A} A \oplus C \xrightarrow{0 \text{Id}_C} C]$.

For an $\mathbb{E}$-extension $\delta \in \mathbb{E}(C, A)$, we briefly write

$a_\ast \delta := \mathbb{E}(C, a)(\delta)$ and $c^\ast \delta := \mathbb{E}(c, A)(\delta)$. 
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For two $\mathbb{E}$-extensions $\delta \in \mathbb{E}(C, A)$ and $\delta' \in \mathbb{E}(C', A')$, a \textit{morphism} from $\delta$ to $\delta'$ is a pair $(a, c)$ of morphisms with $a \in \text{Hom}_\mathbb{E}(A, A')$ and $c \in \text{Hom}_\mathbb{E}(C, C')$ such that $a \cdot \delta = c \cdot \delta'$.

**Definition 2.1.** ([16], Definition 2.9) Let $s$ be a correspondence which associates an equivalence class $s(\delta) = [A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C]$ to each $\mathbb{E}$-extension $\delta \in \mathbb{E}(C, A)$. Such $s$ is called a \textit{realization} of $\mathbb{E}$ provided that it satisfies the following condition.

(R) Let $\delta \in \mathbb{E}(C, A)$ and $\delta' \in \mathbb{E}(C', A')$ be any pair of $\mathbb{E}$-extensions with

$$s(\delta) = [A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C] \text{ and } s(\delta') = [A' \xrightarrow{x'} B' \xrightarrow{y'} C'].$$

Then for any morphism $(a, c) : \delta \rightarrow \delta'$, there exists $b \in \text{Hom}_\mathbb{E}(B, B')$ such that the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{c}
A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \\
\downarrow a \quad \downarrow b \quad \downarrow c
\end{array}$$

commutes.

Let $s$ be a realization of $\mathbb{E}$. If $s(\delta) = [A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C]$ for some $\mathbb{E}$-extension $\delta \in \mathbb{E}(C, A)$, then we say that the sequence $A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C$ \textit{realizes} $\delta$; and in the condition (R), we say that the triple $(a, b, c)$ \textit{realizes} the morphism $(a, c)$.

For any two equivalence classes $[A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C]$ and $[A' \xrightarrow{x'} B' \xrightarrow{y'} C']$, we define

$$[A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C] \oplus [A' \xrightarrow{x'} B' \xrightarrow{y'} C'] := [A \oplus A' \xrightarrow{x \oplus x'} B \oplus B' \xrightarrow{y \oplus y'} C \oplus C'].$$

**Definition 2.2.** ([16], Definition 2.10) A realization $s$ of $\mathbb{E}$ is called \textit{additive} if it satisfies the following conditions.

1. For any $A, C \in \mathcal{C}$, the split $\mathbb{E}$-extension $0 \in \mathbb{E}(C, A)$ satisfies $s(0) = 0$.
2. For any pair of $\mathbb{E}$-extensions $\delta \in \mathbb{E}(C, A)$ and $\delta' \in \mathbb{E}(C', A')$, we have $s(\delta \oplus \delta') = s(\delta) \oplus s(\delta')$.

**Definition 2.3.** ([16], Definitions 2.15 and 2.19)

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an additive category, $s$ be an additive realization.

- A sequence $A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C$ is called a \textit{conflation} if it realizes some $\mathbb{E}$-extension $\delta \in \mathbb{E}(C, A)$.
  
  In this case, $x$ is called an \textit{inflation} and $y$ is called a \textit{deflation}.

- If a conflation $A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C$ realizes $\delta \in \mathbb{E}(C, A)$, we call the pair $(A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C, \delta)$ an $\mathbb{E}$-\textit{triangle}, and write it in the following way.
  
  $$A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \xrightarrow{\delta}$$

  We usually do not write this “$\delta$” if it is not used in the argument.

- Let $A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \xrightarrow{\delta}$ and $A' \xrightarrow{x'} B' \xrightarrow{y'} C' \xrightarrow{\delta'}$ be any pair of $\mathbb{E}$-triangles. If a triplet $(a, b, c)$ realizes $(a, c) : \delta \rightarrow \delta'$, then we write it as
  
  $$\begin{array}{c}
A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \xrightarrow{\delta} \\
\downarrow a \quad \downarrow b \quad \downarrow c
\end{array}$$

  and call $(a, b, c)$ a \textit{morphism} of $\mathbb{E}$-triangles.

If $a, b, c$ above are isomorphisms, then $A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \xrightarrow{\delta}$ and $A' \xrightarrow{x'} B' \xrightarrow{y'} C' \xrightarrow{\delta'}$ are said to be isomorphic.
**Definition 2.4.** ([16, Definition 2.12]) The triple \((\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}, s)\) is called an *externally triangulated* (or *extriangulated* for short) category if it satisfies the following conditions.

(ET1) \(\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{E}^{op} \times \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{A}b\) is a biadditive functor.

(ET2) \(s\) is an additive realization of \(\mathcal{E}\).

(ET3) Let \(A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \xrightarrow{\delta} \) and \(A' \xrightarrow{x'} B' \xrightarrow{y'} C' \xrightarrow{\delta'} \) be any pair of \(\mathcal{E}\)-triangles. For any diagram with \(bx = x'a\)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{x} & B \\
\downarrow{a} & & \downarrow{b} \\
A' & \xrightarrow{x'} & B' \\
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{ccc}
\xrightarrow{y} & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \\
\downarrow{\delta} & & \downarrow{\delta'} \\
C & \xrightarrow{C} & C' \\
\end{array}
\]

in \(\mathcal{E}\), there exists a morphism \((a, c) : \delta \to \delta'\) which is realized by the triple \((a, b, c)\), that is, \((a, b, c)\) is a morphism of \(\mathcal{E}\)-triangles.

(ET3)
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{x} & B \\
\downarrow{a} & & \downarrow{b} \\
A' & \xrightarrow{x'} & B' \\
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{ccc}
\xrightarrow{y} & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \\
\downarrow{\delta} & & \downarrow{\delta'} \\
C & \xrightarrow{C} & C' \\
\end{array}
\quad \text{Dual of (ET3)}

(ET4) Let \(A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \xrightarrow{\delta} \) and \(B \xrightarrow{x} D \xrightarrow{y} E \xrightarrow{\xi} \) be any pair of \(\mathcal{E}\)-triangles. Then there exist an object \(E \in \mathcal{E}\), an \(\mathcal{E}\)-triangle \(A \xrightarrow{z} D \xrightarrow{w} E \xrightarrow{\xi} \), and a commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{x} & B \\
\downarrow{a} & & \downarrow{b} \\
A & \xrightarrow{z} & D \\
\downarrow{u} & & \downarrow{v} \\
F & \xrightarrow{F} & F \\
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{ccc}
\xrightarrow{y} & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \\
\downarrow{\delta} & & \downarrow{\delta} \\
C & \xrightarrow{C} & C' \\
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{ccc}
\xrightarrow{w} & \xrightarrow{\xi} & \\
\downarrow{\xi} & & \downarrow{\xi} \\
E & \xrightarrow{E} & E' \\
\end{array}
\]

in \(\mathcal{E}\), which satisfy the following compatibilities.

(i) \(C \xrightarrow{s} E \xrightarrow{t} F \xrightarrow{\psi} \) is an \(\mathcal{E}\)-triangle.

(ii) \(s^*\xi = \delta\).

(iii) \(x^*\xi = t^*\rho\).

(ET4)
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{x} & B \\
\downarrow{a} & & \downarrow{b} \\
A & \xrightarrow{z} & D \\
\downarrow{u} & & \downarrow{v} \\
F & \xrightarrow{F} & F \\
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{ccc}
\xrightarrow{y} & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \\
\downarrow{\delta} & & \downarrow{\delta} \\
C & \xrightarrow{C} & C' \\
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{ccc}
\xrightarrow{w} & \xrightarrow{\xi} & \\
\downarrow{\xi} & & \downarrow{\xi} \\
E & \xrightarrow{E} & E' \\
\end{array}
\quad \text{Dual of (ET4)}

**Remark 2.5.** Note that both exact categories and triangulated categories are extriangulated categories (see [16, Proposition 3.22]) and extension closed subcategories of extriangulated categories are again extriangulated (see [16, Remark 2.18]). Moreover, there exist extriangulated categories which are neither exact categories nor triangulated categories (see [16, Proposition 3.30] and [3, Remark 3.3]).

We will use the following terminology.

**Remark 2.6.** We can view the collection of all \(\mathcal{E}\)-triangles together with morphisms of \(\mathcal{E}\)-triangles as an additive category. Indeed,

(i) Let \((a, b, c)\) be a morphism from \(A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \xrightarrow{\delta} \) to \(A' \xrightarrow{x'} B' \xrightarrow{y'} C' \xrightarrow{\delta'} \), and let \((a', b', c')\) be a morphism from \(A' \xrightarrow{x'} B' \xrightarrow{y'} C' \xrightarrow{\delta'} \) to \(A'' \xrightarrow{x''} B'' \xrightarrow{y''} C'' \xrightarrow{\delta''} \). The composition is defined by \((a'a', b'b', c'c')\).

The composition is well defined. In fact, assume that \((a, c) : \delta \to \delta'\) and \((a', c') : \delta' \to \delta''\) define morphisms of \(\mathcal{E}\)-extensions, then \(a_c\delta = c^*\delta'\) and \(a'_c\delta' = c'^*\delta''\). Thus

\[
(a'a)c\delta = (a'a)c\delta = a'_c(a_c\delta) = a'_c(c^*\delta') = (a'_c c^*)\delta' = (c^* a'_c)\delta' = c^*(a'_c \delta') = c^*(c'^* \delta'') = (c^* c'^*) \delta'' = (c c')^* \delta''
\]

that is, \((a'a, c') : \delta \to \delta''\) is a morphism of \(\mathcal{E}\)-extensions.
(iii) The associativity of the composition is inherited by the associativity of the composition in \( C \).

(iv) The \( \mathcal{E} \)-triangle \( 0 \xrightarrow{0} 0 \xrightarrow{0} 0 \xrightarrow{s} \) is an initial and terminal object.

(v) Suppose \( \mathcal{C} \) has coproduct and product. Then this collection has coproduct and product which are induced by that of \( \mathcal{C} \).

The following condition is analogous to the weak idempotent completeness in exact categories (see [16, Condition 5.8]).

**Condition (WIC)** Consider the following conditions.

(a) Let \( f \in \mathcal{C}(A,B), g \in \mathcal{C}(B,C) \) be any composable pair of morphisms. If \( gf \) is an inflation, then so is \( f \).

(b) Let \( f \in \mathcal{C}(A,B), g \in \mathcal{C}(B,C) \) be any composable pair of morphisms. If \( gf \) is a deflation, then so is \( g \).

**Example 2.7.** (1) If \( \mathcal{C} \) is an exact category, then Condition (WIC) is equivalent to that \( \mathcal{C} \) is weakly idempotent complete (see [3, Proposition 7.6]).

In detail, \( \mathcal{C} \) is weakly idempotent complete if and only if given two morphisms \( g : B \to C \) and \( f : A \to B \), if \( gf : A \to C \) is an deflation, then \( g \) is an deflation.

(2) If \( \mathcal{C} \) is a triangulated category, then Condition (WIC) is automatically satisfied.

**Lemma 2.8.** ([16, Proposition 3.15]) Assume that \( (\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{s}) \) is an extriangulated category.

(1) Let \( C \) be an object in \( \mathcal{C} \), and let \( A_1 \xrightarrow{e_1} B_1 \xrightarrow{m_1} C \xrightarrow{\delta_1} \) and \( A_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} B_2 \xrightarrow{m_2} C \xrightarrow{\delta_2} \) be any pair of \( \mathcal{E} \)-triangles. Then there is a commutative diagram in \( \mathcal{C} \):

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A_1 & \xrightarrow{m_1} & M \\
\downarrow{e_2} & & \downarrow{e_1} \\
A_2 & \xrightarrow{m_2} & A_2 \\
\end{array}
\]

which satisfies \( \mathcal{s}(y_2^*\delta_1) = [A_1 \xrightarrow{m_1} M \xrightarrow{e_1} B_2] \) and \( \mathcal{s}(y_1^*\delta_2) = [A_2 \xrightarrow{m_2} M \xrightarrow{e_2} B_1] \).

(2) Let \( A \) be an object in \( \mathcal{C} \), and let \( A \xrightarrow{x_1} B_1 \xrightarrow{y_1} C_1 \xrightarrow{\delta_1} \) and \( A \xrightarrow{x_2} B_2 \xrightarrow{y_2} C_2 \xrightarrow{\delta_2} \) be any pair of \( \mathcal{E} \)-triangles. Then there is a commutative diagram in \( \mathcal{C} \):

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A \xrightarrow{x_1} B_1 & \xrightarrow{y_1} & C_1 \\
\downarrow{x_2} & & \downarrow{m_2} \\
B_2 & \xrightarrow{m_1} & N \\
\downarrow{y_2} & & \downarrow{e_1} \\
C_2 & \xrightarrow{e_2} & C_2 \\
\end{array}
\]

which satisfies \( \mathcal{s}(x_2^*\delta_1) = [B_2 \xrightarrow{m_1} N \xrightarrow{e_1} C_1] \) and \( \mathcal{s}(x_1^*\delta_2) = [B_1 \xrightarrow{m_2} N \xrightarrow{e_2} C_2] \).

The following definitions are quoted verbatim from [3, Section 3].
**Definition 2.9.** A class of \( \mathbb{E} \)-triangles \( \xi \) is **closed under base change** if for any \( \mathbb{E} \)-triangle

\[
A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \xrightarrow{\delta} \in \xi
\]

and any morphism \( c: C' \to C \), then any \( \mathbb{E} \)-triangle \( A \xrightarrow{x'} B' \xrightarrow{y'} C' \xrightarrow{c'\delta'} \) belongs to \( \xi \).

Dually, a class of \( \mathbb{E} \)-triangles \( \xi \) is **closed under cobase change** if for any \( \mathbb{E} \)-triangle

\[
A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C - \delta \in \xi
\]

and any morphism \( a: A \to A' \), then any \( \mathbb{E} \)-triangle \( A' \xrightarrow{x'} B' \xrightarrow{y'} C - a\delta \) belongs to \( \xi \).

A class of \( \mathbb{E} \)-triangles \( \xi \) is called **saturated** if in the situation of Lemma 2.8(1), whenever \( A_2 \xrightarrow{x_2} B_2 \xrightarrow{y_2} C - \delta \) and \( A_1 \xrightarrow{m_1} M \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_1} B_2 - \delta_1 \) belong to \( \xi \), then the \( \mathbb{E} \)-triangle

\[
A_1 \xrightarrow{x_1} B_1 \xrightarrow{y_1} C - \delta_1
\]

belongs to \( \xi \).

An \( \mathbb{E} \)-triangle \( A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C - \delta \) is called **split** if \( \delta = 0 \). It is easy to see that it is split if and only if \( x \) is section or \( y \) is retraction, that is, there exists \( r \in \mathcal{C}(B, A) \), \( s \in \mathcal{C}(C, B) \), which satisfies

\[
\begin{bmatrix} r & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} : B \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} A \oplus C.
\]

The full subcategory consisting of the split \( \mathbb{E} \)-triangles will be denoted by \( \Delta_0 \).

**Definition 2.10.** (cf. [9, Definition 3.1]) Let \( \xi \) be a class of \( \mathbb{E} \)-triangles which is closed under isomorphisms. If the following conditions hold:

(a) \( \xi \) is closed under finite coproducts and \( \Delta_0 \subseteq \xi \),

(b) \( \xi \) is closed under base change and cobase change,

then we call \( \xi \) an **almost proper class** of \( \mathbb{E} \)-triangles.

If, moreover, the following condition holds:

(c) \( \xi \) is saturated,

then we call \( \xi \) a **proper class** of \( \mathbb{E} \)-triangles.

**Proposition 2.11.** ([9, Proposition 3.9]) Let \( \xi \) be an almost proper class of \( \mathbb{E} \)-triangles, then \( \xi \) is saturated if and only if in the situation of Lemma 2.8(2), whenever \( A \xrightarrow{x_2} B_2 \xrightarrow{y_2} C_2 - \delta_2 \) and \( B_2 \xrightarrow{m_1} N \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_1} C_1 - \delta_1 \) belong to \( \xi \), then the \( \mathbb{E} \)-triangle \( A \xrightarrow{x_1} B_1 \xrightarrow{y_1} C_1 - \delta_1 \) also belongs to \( \xi \).

**Definition 2.12.** ([9, Definition 4.1]) An object \( P \in \mathcal{C} \) is called **\( \xi \)-projective** if for any \( \mathbb{E} \)-triangle

\[
A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C - \delta
\]

in \( \xi \), the induced sequence of abelian groups

\[
0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(P, A) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(P, B) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(P, C) \longrightarrow 0
\]

is exact. Dually, we have the definition of **\( \xi \)-injective** objects.

We denote by \( \mathcal{P}(\xi) \) (resp., \( \mathcal{I}(\xi) \)) the full subcategory of \( \mathcal{C} \) consisting of \( \xi \)-projective (resp., \( \xi \)-injective) objects. It follows from the definition that \( \mathcal{P}(\xi) \) and \( \mathcal{I}(\xi) \) are full, additive, closed under isomorphisms and direct summands.
An extriangulated category \((\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}, s)\) is said to have enough \(\xi\)-projectives (resp., enough \(\xi\)-injectives) provided that for each object \(A\) there exists an \(\mathcal{E}\)-triangle \(K \rightarrow P \rightarrow A \rightarrow\) (resp., \(A \rightarrow I \rightarrow K \rightarrow\)) in \(\xi\) with \(P \in \mathcal{P}(\xi)\) (resp., \(I \in \mathcal{I}(\xi)\)).

The \(\xi\)-projective dimension \(\xi\)-pd\(A\) of \(A \in \mathcal{C}\) is defined inductively. If \(A \in \mathcal{P}(\xi)\), then define \(\xi\)-pd\(A\) = 0. For a positive integer \(n\), one writes \(\xi\)-pd\(A\) = \(n\) provided:

(a) there is an \(\mathcal{E}\)-triangle \(K \rightarrow P \rightarrow A \rightarrow\) with \(P \in \mathcal{P}(\xi)\) and \(\xi\)-pd\(K\) = \(n\) - 1,

(b) there does not exist an \(\mathcal{E}\)-triangle \(L \rightarrow P' \rightarrow A \rightarrow\) with \(P' \in \mathcal{P}(\xi)\) and \(\xi\)-pd\(L\) < \(n\) - 1.

Of course we set \(\xi\)-pd\(A\) = \(\infty\), if \(\xi\)-pd\(A\) \(\neq n\) for all \(n \geq 0\).

Dually we can define the \(\xi\)-injective dimension \(\xi\)-id\(A\) of an object \(A \in \mathcal{C}\).

**Definition 2.13.** (Definition 4.4) A \(\xi\)-exact complex \(\mathbf{X}\) is a diagram

\[
\cdots \rightarrow X_1 \xrightarrow{d_1} X_0 \xrightarrow{d_0} X_{-1} \rightarrow \cdots
\]

in \(\mathcal{C}\) such that for each integer \(n\), we have \(d_n = g_{n-1}f_n\) for some \(\mathcal{E}\)-triangle

\[
K_{n+1} \xrightarrow{g_n} X_n \xrightarrow{f_n} K_n \rightarrow
\]

in \(\xi\).

In particular, by saying that

\[
X_n \xrightarrow{d_n} X_{n-1} \rightarrow \cdots \xrightarrow{d_1} X_0
\]

is \(\xi\)-exact, it means that there are \(\mathcal{E}\)-triangles

\[
X_n \xrightarrow{d_n} X_{n-1} \xrightarrow{f_{n-1}} K_{n-1} \rightarrow \quad \text{and} \quad K_{2} \xrightarrow{g_1} X_1 \xrightarrow{d_1} X_0 \rightarrow
\]

in \(\xi\), and for each integer \(1 < i < n - 1\), we have \(d_i = g_{i-1}f_i\) for some \(\mathcal{E}\)-triangle

\[
K_{i+1} \xrightarrow{g_i} X_i \xrightarrow{f_i} K_i \rightarrow
\]

in \(\xi\).

**Definition 2.14.** (Definition 3.1) Let \(M\) be an object in \(\mathcal{C}\). By a \(\xi\)-projective resolution of \(M\) we mean a symbol of the form \(\mathbf{P} \rightarrow M\) where \(\mathbf{P}\) is a \(\xi\)-exact complex, where \(P_n \in \mathcal{P}(\xi)\) for all \(n \geq 0\) and where \(P_{-1} = M\) and \(P_n = 0\) for all \(n < -1\).

The notion of \(\xi\)-injective coresolution of \(M\) is given dually.

**Definition 2.15.** (Definition 3.2) Let \(M\) and \(N\) be objects in \(\mathcal{C}\).

(1) If we choose a \(\xi\)-projective resolution \(\mathbf{P} \rightarrow M\) of \(M\), by applying the functor \(\text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(-, N)\) to \(\mathbf{P}\) we have a complex of abelian groups \(\text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{P}, N)\). For any integer \(n \geq 0\), the \(\xi\)-cohomology groups \(\xi\text{xt}^n_{\mathcal{P}(\xi)}(M, N)\) are defined as

\[
\xi\text{xt}^n_{\mathcal{P}(\xi)}(M, N) = H^n(\text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{P}, N)).
\]

(2) If we choose a \(\xi\)-injective coresolution \(\mathbf{N} \rightarrow I\) of \(N\), by applying the functor \(\text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(M, -)\) to \(\mathbf{I}\) we have a complex of abelian groups \(\text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(M, \mathbf{I})\). For any integer \(n \geq 0\), the \(\xi\)-cohomology groups \(\xi\text{xt}^n_{\mathcal{I}(\xi)}(M, N)\) are defined as

\[
\xi\text{xt}^n_{\mathcal{I}(\xi)}(M, N) = H^n(\text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(M, \mathbf{I})).
\]
Remark 2.16. (1) In fact, there is an isomorphism $\xi\text{xt}^n_{P(\xi)}(M, N) \cong \xi\text{xt}^n_{I(\xi)}(M, N)$, which is denoted by $\xi\text{xt}_{\xi}^n(M, N)$ (see [10, Definition 3.2]).

(2) Assume that $\mathcal{C}$ has enough $\xi$-projective objects. Using a standard argument in homological algebra, there is a bijection

$$\xi\text{xt}_1^1(M, N) \rightarrow \{ \left[ N \xrightarrow{f} Z \xrightarrow{g} M \right] \mid N \xrightarrow{f} Z \xrightarrow{g} M \delta \in \xi \}.$$  

Remark 2.17. ([10, Lemma 3.4]) Let

$$X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow$$

be an $\mathcal{E}$-triangle in $\mathcal{E}$.

(1) If $\mathcal{C}$ has enough $\xi$-projective objects and $M$ is an object in $\mathcal{C}$, then there exists a long exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \xi\text{xt}_1^0(Z, M) \rightarrow \xi\text{xt}_1^0(Y, M) \rightarrow \xi\text{xt}_1^0(X, M) \rightarrow \xi\text{xt}_1^1(Z, M) \rightarrow \xi\text{xt}_1^1(Y, M) \rightarrow \xi\text{xt}_1^1(X, M) \rightarrow \cdots$$

of abelian groups. Moreover, since $\xi$ is closed under cobase change, one has a long exact sequence

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Z, M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Y, M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, M) \rightarrow \xi\text{xt}_1^1(Z, M) \rightarrow \xi\text{xt}_1^1(Y, M) \rightarrow \xi\text{xt}_1^1(X, M) \rightarrow \cdots$$

of abelian groups by [16, Corollary 3.12].

(2) If $\mathcal{C}$ has enough $\xi$-injective objects and $N$ is an object in $\mathcal{C}$, then there exists a long exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \xi\text{xt}_1^0(N, X) \rightarrow \xi\text{xt}_1^0(N, Y) \rightarrow \xi\text{xt}_1^0(N, Z) \rightarrow \xi\text{xt}_1^1(N, X) \rightarrow \xi\text{xt}_1^1(N, Y) \rightarrow \xi\text{xt}_1^1(N, Z) \rightarrow \cdots$$

of abelian groups. Moreover, since $\xi$ is closed under base change, one has a long exact sequence

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(N, X) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(N, Y) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(N, Z) \rightarrow \xi\text{xt}_1^1(N, X) \rightarrow \xi\text{xt}_1^1(N, Y) \rightarrow \xi\text{xt}_1^1(N, Z) \rightarrow \cdots$$

of abelian groups by [16, Corollary 3.12].

Following Remark 2.16 and Remark 2.17, we have the following results.

Remark 2.18. Let

$$K \rightarrow C_{n-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow C_1 \rightarrow C_0 \rightarrow A$$

be a $\xi$-exact complex in the extriangulated category $\mathcal{C}$ such that $C_i \in \perp Y$, $\forall 0 \leq i < n - 1$. Then $\xi\text{xt}_{\xi}^k(K, Y) \cong \xi\text{xt}_{\xi}^{k+n}(A, Y)$.

Now, we set

$$\mathcal{X}^\perp = \{ M \in \mathcal{C} \mid \xi\text{xt}_{\xi}^{n+1}(X, M) = 0 \text{ for all } X \in \mathcal{X} \}$$

$$\perp \mathcal{X} = \{ M \in \mathcal{C} \mid \xi\text{xt}_{\xi}^{n+1}(M, X) = 0 \text{ for all } X \in \mathcal{X} \}.$$

For two subcategories $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{X}$ of $\mathcal{C}$, we say $\mathcal{H} \perp \mathcal{X}$ if $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \perp \mathcal{X}$ (equivalently, $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{H}^\perp$).
Definition 2.19. ([9, Definition 3.4]) Let

\[ \xymatrix{ X \ar[r]^u & Y \ar[r]^v & Z } \]

be an \( \mathcal{E} \)-triangle in \( \xi \). Then the morphism \( u \) (resp. \( v \)) is called a \( \xi \)-\textit{infaltion} (resp. a \( \xi \)-\textit{deflation}).

Fix some arbitrary \( \mathcal{E} \)-triangle

\[ \xymatrix{ X \ar[r] & Y \ar[r] & Z } \]

in \( \xi \). We say that \( \mathcal{X} \) is \textit{closed under \( \xi \)-extensions} if, given any such \( \mathcal{E} \)-triangle in \( \xi \) as above, if \( X, Z \) lie in \( \mathcal{X} \), then \( Y \) lie in \( \mathcal{X} \). We say that \( \mathcal{X} \) is \textit{closed under cocones of \( \xi \)-deflations} (resp. \textit{cones of \( \xi \)-inflations}) if, given any such \( \mathcal{E} \)-triangle in \( \xi \) as above, if \( Y, Z \) lie in \( \mathcal{X} \) (resp. \( X, Y \) lie in \( \mathcal{X} \)), the so too does \( X \) (resp. \( Z \)).

Definition 2.20. Let \( \mathcal{C} \) be an extriangulated category with enough \( \xi \)-projective objects and \( \mathcal{X} \) a subcategory of \( \mathcal{C} \). Then \( \mathcal{X} \) is called a \textit{resolving} subcategory of \( \mathcal{C} \) if the following conditions are satisfied.

1. \( \mathcal{P}(\xi) \subseteq \mathcal{X} \).
2. \( \mathcal{X} \) is closed under \( \xi \)-extensions.
3. \( \mathcal{X} \) is closed under cocones of \( \xi \)-deflations.

Remark 2.21. (a) We do not require that a resolving subcategory is closed under direct summands in the above definition.

(b) \( \mathcal{P}(\xi) \) is a resolving subcategory and closed under direct summands.

(c) In [9], Hu, Zhang and Zhou introduced the notion of \( \xi \)-\text{G}projective (resp., \( \xi \)-\text{G}injective) objects, see [9, Definition 4.8] for the definition. We denote by \( \mathcal{GP}(\xi) \) (resp. \( \mathcal{GI}(\xi) \)) the class of \( \xi \)-\text{G}projective (resp., \( \xi \)-\text{G}injective) objects. Then \( \mathcal{GP}(\xi) \) is a resolving subcategory and closed under direct summands by [9, Theorems 4.16 and 4.17].

Definition 2.22. ([10, Definition 4.1]) A subcategory \( \mathcal{X} \) of \( \mathcal{C} \) is called a \textit{generating subcategory} of \( \mathcal{C} \) if for all \( X \in \mathcal{X} \), the condition \( \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(X, C) = 0 \) implies \( C = 0 \). Dually, a subcategory \( \mathcal{Y} \) is called a \textit{cogenerating subcategory} of \( \mathcal{C} \) if for all \( Y \in \mathcal{Y} \), the condition \( \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(C, Y) = 0 \) implies \( C = 0 \).

Definition 2.23. (cf. [13, Definition 3.8]) Let \( \mathcal{X} \) be a subcategory of \( \mathcal{C} \) and \( M \) an object in \( \mathcal{C} \). A \( \xi \)-\text{deflation} \( X \longrightarrow M \) is said to be a \textit{right \( \mathcal{X} \)-approximation} of \( M \) if the induced complex

\[ \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(\bar{X}, X) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(\bar{X}, M) \longrightarrow 0 \]

is exact for any \( \bar{X} \in \mathcal{X} \). In this case, there is an \( \mathcal{E} \)-triangle

\[ \xymatrix{ K \ar[r] & X \ar[r] & M \ar[r] & - } \]

in \( \xi \). Dually, a \textit{left \( \mathcal{X} \)-approximation} of \( M \) is defined.

We say that the subcategory \( \mathcal{X} \) is \textit{contravariantly finite} if any object \( M \in \mathcal{C} \) admits a right \( \mathcal{X} \)-approximation. Dually, we say that \( \mathcal{X} \) is \textit{covariantly finite} if any object \( M \in \mathcal{C} \) admits a left \( \mathcal{X} \)-approximation. The subcategory \( \mathcal{X} \) is called \textit{functorially finite} if it is both contravariantly finite and covariantly finite.
Definition 2.24. (cf. [13, Definition 2.11]) Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a pair of subcategories in $\mathcal{C}$ with $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}$.

1. $\omega$ is called a $\xi$-cogenerator of $\mathcal{X}$ if for any object $X$ in $\mathcal{X}$, there exists an $E$-triangle

$$X \to W \to X' \to$$

in $\xi$ with $W \in \omega$ and $X' \in \mathcal{X}$.

2. $\omega$ is called $\mathcal{X}$-injective if $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\perp$.

Definition 2.25. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$ and $M \in \mathcal{C}$. The $\mathcal{X}$-resolution dimension of $M$ (with respect to $\xi$), written $\mathcal{X}$-res.$\dim M$, is defined by

$$\mathcal{X}$-res.$\dim M = \inf\{n \geq 0 \mid \text{there exists a } \xi\text{-exact complex } X_n \to \cdots \to X_1 \to X_0 \to M \text{ in } \mathcal{C} \text{ with all } X_i \text{ objects in } \mathcal{X}\}.$$

The $\mathcal{X}$-resolution dimension of $\mathcal{C}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{X}$-res.$\dim \mathcal{C} := \sup\{\mathcal{X}$-res.$\dim M \mid M \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

Dually, the $\mathcal{X}$-coresolution dimensions $\mathcal{X}$-cores.$\dim M$ and $\mathcal{X}$-cores.$\dim \mathcal{C}$ are defined.

For a $\xi$-exact complex

$$\cdots f_{n+1} X_n \to \cdots f_2 X_1 \to f_1 X_0 \to f_0 M$$

with all $X_i \in \mathcal{X}$, there are $E$-triangles $K_1 g_0 X_0 f_0 M \to$ and $K_{i+1} g_i X_i h_i K_i \to$ with $f_i = g_i h_i$ for each $i > 0$. The object $K_i$ are called an $i$th $\mathcal{X}$-syzygy of $M$, denoted by $\Omega^i\mathcal{X}(M)$. In case $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{P}(\xi)$, we have $\xi$-pd $M = \mathcal{X}$-res.$\dim M$ and write $\Omega^i(M) := \Omega^i\mathcal{P}(\xi)(M)$.

In case $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{GP}(\xi)$, $\mathcal{X}$-res.$\dim M$ coincides with $\xi\mathcal{GP}$pd $M$ defined by Hu, Zhang and Zhou [9] as $\xi$-$\mathcal{G}$projective dimension, the proof is straightforward. Dually, the $\xi$-$\mathcal{G}$pd $M$ and $\xi$-$\mathcal{G}$id $M$ are defined.

In [10], Hu, Zhang and Zhou introduced the following condition:

Condition(*) If $X \in \mathcal{C}$, $Y$ be object in $\mathcal{C}$ with finite $\xi$-$\mathcal{G}$projective dimension such that $\xi xt^i_\xi(Y, X) = 0$ for any $i > 0$, then $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Y, X) \cong \xi xt^0_\xi(Y, X)$. Dually, if $X, Y$ be objects in $\mathcal{C}$ with finite $\xi$-$\mathcal{G}$injective dimension such that $\xi xt^i_\xi(X, Y) = 0$ for any $i > 0$, then $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, Y) \cong \xi xt^0_\xi(X, Y)$.

Remark 2.26. ([10, Proposition 4.6 and Corollary 4.8]) Let $M$ be object in $\mathcal{C}$ with finite $\xi$-$\mathcal{G}$projective dimension and finite $\xi$-$\mathcal{G}$injective dimension respectively. Then

1. $\xi$-$\mathcal{G}$pd $M = \xi$-pd $M$.
2. $\xi$-$\mathcal{G}$id $M = \xi$-id $M$.

In this case, if $\mathcal{P}(\xi)$ be a generating subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{T}(\xi)$ is a cogenerating subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ satisfies condition(*). Then we have:

3. $\sup\{\xi$-$\mathcal{G}$pd $X \mid \text{for any } X \in \mathcal{C}\} = \sup\{\xi$-$\mathcal{G}$id $X \mid \text{for any } X \in \mathcal{C}\}$.

We use $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ (resp. $\mathcal{X}^\vee$) to denote the subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$ consisting of objects having finite $\mathcal{X}$-resolution (resp. $\mathcal{X}$-coresolution) dimension, and use $\mathcal{X}^\wedge_n$ (resp. $\mathcal{X}^\vee_n$) to denote the subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$ consisting of objects having $\mathcal{X}$-resolution dimension (resp. $\mathcal{X}$-coresolution) at most $n$.

In the following sections, we always assume that $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}, s)$ is an extriangulated category and $\xi$ is a proper class of $\mathcal{E}$-triangles in $\mathcal{C}$. We also assume that the extriangulated category $\mathcal{C}$ has enough $\xi$-projectives and enough $\xi$-injectives satisfying Condition (WIC).
3 Left $n$-cotorsion pairs

We first introduce the notion of left (resp. right) cotorsion pair in extriangulated categories with respect to a proper class of triangles $\xi$.

**Definition 3.1.** Let $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ be two subcategories of $\mathcal{C}$. We say that $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ is a left cotorsion pair in $\mathcal{C}$ if the following conditions are satisfied.

- (L1) $\mathcal{U}$ is closed under direct summands.
- (L2) $\xi x t_{\xi}^{1}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0$.
- (L3) Every object $M \in \mathcal{C}$ admits an $E$-triangle $V \rightarrow U \rightarrow M$ in $\xi$ with $U \in \mathcal{U}$ and $V \in \mathcal{V}$.

Dually, we say that $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ is a right cotorsion pair in $\mathcal{C}$ if the following conditions are satisfied.

- (R1) $\mathcal{V}$ is closed under direct summands.
- (R2) $\xi x t_{\xi}^{1}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0$.
- (R3) Every object $N \in \mathcal{C}$ admits an $E$-triangle $N \rightarrow V' \rightarrow U'$ in $\xi$ with $U' \in \mathcal{U}$ and $V' \in \mathcal{V}$.

**Remark 3.2.** Let $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ be subcategories.

1. If $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ is a left cotorsion pair in $\mathcal{C}$, then $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{V}^\perp$. Moreover, we have that $P(\xi) \subseteq \mathcal{U}$, $\mathcal{U}$ is closed under $\xi$-extensions, and $\mathcal{U}$ is a contravariantly finite subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$.

2. If $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ is a right cotorsion pair in $\mathcal{C}$, then $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{U}^\perp$. Moreover, we have that $I(\xi) \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, $\mathcal{V}$ is closed under $\xi$-extensions, and $\mathcal{V}$ is a contravariantly finite subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$.

We say that $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ is a cotorsion pair in $\mathcal{C}$ if $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ is both a left and right cotorsion pair in $\mathcal{C}$.

In what follows, we always assume that $n$ is a positive integer. In [18], Zhou introduced the notion of $n$-cotorsion pairs in extriangulated categories.

**Definition 3.3.** (18, Definition 3.1) Let $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ be two subcategories of $\mathcal{C}$. We say that $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ is a left $n$-cotorsion pair in $\mathcal{C}$ if the following conditions are satisfied.

- (LN1) $\mathcal{U}$ is closed under direct summands.
- (LN2) $\xi x t_{\xi}^{1 \leq i \leq n}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0$.
- (LN3) Every object $M \in \mathcal{C}$ admits an $E$-triangle $K \rightarrow U \rightarrow M$ in $\xi$ with $U \in \mathcal{U}$ and $K \in \mathcal{V}^{\perp}_{n-1}$.

Dually, we say that $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ is a right $n$-cotorsion pair in $\mathcal{C}$ if the following conditions are satisfied.

- (RN1) $\mathcal{V}$ is closed under direct summands.
- (RN2) $\xi x t_{\xi}^{1 \leq i \leq n}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0$.
- (RN3) Every object $N \in \mathcal{C}$ admits an $E$-triangle $N \rightarrow V' \rightarrow K'$ in $\xi$ with $V' \in \mathcal{V}$ and $K' \in \mathcal{U}^{\perp}_{n-1}$.
We say that \((\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})\) is an \(n\)-cotorsion pair in \(\mathcal{C}\) if \((\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})\) is both a left and right \(n\)-cotorsion pair in \(\mathcal{C}\).

We remark that left (resp. right) \(1\)-cotorsion pairs are exactly left (resp. right) cotorsion pairs in \(\mathcal{C}\).

Now we see an example from [18]. We denote by “\(\circ\)” in the Auslander-Reiten quiver the indecomposable objects belong to a subcategory. Let \(\Lambda\) be the algebra given by the following exact sequence

\[-3 \rightarrow -2 \rightarrow -1 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6 \rightarrow 7 \rightarrow \cdots \]

There exists a 3-cluster tilting subcategory \(\mathcal{X}\) of \(\mathcal{C} = \text{mod}\Lambda\) ([17, Example 4.21]) as follows:

\[
\mathcal{X}: \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ
\]

By [18, Example 3.7], \((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X})\) is a 2-cotorsion pair in \(\mathcal{C}\). See [18] for more examples.

**Proposition 3.4.** Let \(\mathcal{U}\) and \(\mathcal{V}\) be subcategories of \(\mathcal{C}\) satisfying \(\xi xt_{\xi}^{1 \leq i \leq n}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0\). If \(Y \in \mathcal{V}^\wedge_k\) with \(0 \leq k \leq n - 1\), then \(\xi xt_{\xi}^{1 \leq i \leq n-k}(\mathcal{U}, Y) = 0\). In particular, \(\xi xt_{\xi}^{1}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}_{n-1}^\wedge) = 0\).

**Proof.** The case \(n = 1\) is clear. Now suppose \(n \geq 2\). We will proceed by induction on \(k\). The \(k = 0\) is also clear, so we suppose \(1 \leq k \leq n - 1\). Let \(U \in \mathcal{U}\) and \(Y \in \mathcal{V}^\wedge_k\). First, for the case \(k = 1\), there is an \(E\)-triangle

\[V_1 \rightarrow V_0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow \]

in \(\xi\) with \(V_1, V_0 \in \mathcal{V}\). Applying the functor \(\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(U, -)\) to the above \(E\)-triangle yields the following exact sequence

\[\cdots \rightarrow \xi xt_{\xi}^{i}(U, V_0) \rightarrow \xi xt_{\xi}^{i}(U, Y) \rightarrow \xi xt_{\xi}^{i+1}(U, V_1) \rightarrow \cdots .\]

For any \(1 \leq i \leq n - 1\), since \(\xi xt_{\xi}^{i}(U, V_0) = 0 = \xi xt_{\xi}^{i+1}(U, V_1)\), we have \(\xi xt_{\xi}^{i}(U, Y) = 0\).

Now suppose \(2 \leq k \leq n - 1\). Consider the following \(E\)-triangle

\[Y' \rightarrow V_0' \rightarrow Y \rightarrow \]

in \(\xi\) with \(Y' \in \mathcal{V}_{k-1}^\wedge\) and \(V_0' \in \mathcal{V}\). Applying the functor \(\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(U, -)\) to the above \(E\)-triangle yields the following exact sequence

\[\cdots \rightarrow \xi xt_{\xi}^{i}(U, V_0') \rightarrow \xi xt_{\xi}^{i}(U, Y) \rightarrow \xi xt_{\xi}^{i+1}(U, Y') \rightarrow \cdots .\]

Since \(\xi xt_{\xi}^{1 \leq i \leq n-k}(U, V_0') = 0\) by assumption, and \(\xi xt_{\xi}^{1 \leq i \leq n-k+1}(U, Y') = 0\) by the induction hypothesis, we have \(\xi xt_{\xi}^{1 \leq i \leq n-k}(U, Y) = 0\). \(\square\)
Immediately, we have

**Corollary 3.5.** (cf. [18, Lemma 3.3]) Let \( \mathcal{V} \) be a subcategory of \( \mathcal{C} \). Then

1. \( \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{V}^i \subseteq \mathcal{V}_{n-i}^\perp \quad (1 \leq i \leq n) \).
2. \( \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{V}^i \subseteq \mathcal{V}_{n-i}^\perp \quad (1 \leq i \leq n) \).

The following result gives an equivalent characterization of left \( n \)-cotorsion pairs.

**Lemma 3.6.** (cf. [18, Lemma 3.4]) Let \( \mathcal{U} \) and \( \mathcal{V} \) be subcategories of \( \mathcal{C} \). Then the following statements are equivalent:

1. \( (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) \) is a left \( n \)-cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \).
2. \( \mathcal{U} = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{V}^i \) and for any object \( T \in \mathcal{C} \), there is an \( \mathcal{E} \)-triangle

   \[
   K \rightarrow U \rightarrow T \rightarrow
   \]

   in \( \xi \) with \( U \in \mathcal{U} \) and \( K \in \mathcal{V}_{n-1}^\perp \).

Moreover, if one of the above conditions holds true, then \( (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}_{n-1}^\perp) \) is a left cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \).

By the dual of Lemma 3.6, we have that if \( (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) \) is a right \( n \)-cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \), then \( (\mathcal{U}_{n-1}^\perp, \mathcal{V}) \) is a right cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \).

In the rest of this section, we give some properties related to (left) \( n \)-cotorsion pairs.

**Proposition 3.7.** Let \( (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) \) be an \( n \)-cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \). Then the following statements are equivalent.

1. \( \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \).
2. \( \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{V}_{n}^\perp \).
3. \( \xi xt_{\xi}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}_{n-1}^\perp) = 0 \).

**Proof.** 
1. \( \Rightarrow \) (2) It is clear.
2. \( \Rightarrow \) (1) Let \( U \in \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \). By assumption, there is an \( \mathcal{E} \)-triangle

   \[
   K \rightarrow V_0 \rightarrow U \rightarrow
   \]

   in \( \xi \) with \( K \in \mathcal{V}_{n-1}^\perp \) and \( V_0 \in \mathcal{V} \). By Lemma 3.6, \( (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}_{n-1}^\perp) \) is a left cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \), and in particular, \( \xi xt_{\xi}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}_{n-1}^\perp) = 0 \). Thus the above \( \mathcal{E} \)-triangle is split, so \( U \) is a direct summand of \( V_0 \), and hence \( U \in \mathcal{V} \). Thus \( \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \).
3. \( \Leftrightarrow \) (3) It follows from the dual of Lemma 3.6.

Note that \( \mathcal{V}^\perp = \mathcal{V} \) if \( \mathcal{V} \) is coresolving, and \( \mathcal{U}^\perp = \mathcal{U} \) if \( \mathcal{U} \) is resolving. By Proposition 3.7 and Lemma 3.6, we have the following result.

**Proposition 3.8.** Let \( (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) \) be an \( n \)-cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \) with \( \xi xt_{\xi}^{n+1}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0 \). Then the following statements are equivalent.

1. \( \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \).
2. \( \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{V} \).
3. \( \xi xt_{\xi}^1(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{U}) = 0 \).
Proof. By Proposition 3.7, it suffices to show that \( \mathcal{U} \) is resolving. By Lemma 3.6, \((\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}^\perp_{n-1})\) is a left cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \). By Remark 3.2, we have that \( \mathcal{U} \) is closed under \( \xi \)-extensions and \( \mathcal{P}(\xi) \subseteq \mathcal{U} \). Now, let

\[
\begin{align*}
U & \rightarrow U' \rightarrow U'' \rightarrow 
\end{align*}
\]

be an \( \mathcal{E} \)-triangle in \( \xi \) with \( U', U'' \in \mathcal{U} \). For any \( V \in \mathcal{V} \), applying the functor \( \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(-, V) \) to the above \( \mathcal{E} \)-triangle yields the following exact sequence

\[
\cdots \rightarrow \xi \text{xt}_{\xi}^{1\leq i \leq n}(U', V) \rightarrow \xi \text{xt}_{\xi}^{1}(U, V) \rightarrow \xi \text{xt}_{\xi}^{1}(U'', V) \rightarrow \cdots .
\]

Notice that \( \xi \text{xt}_{\xi}^{1\leq i \leq n}(\mathcal{U}, V) = 0 \) by assumption, so \( \xi \text{xt}_{\xi}^{1\leq i \leq n}(U, V) = 0 \). Thus \( U \in \bigcap_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{U} \) by Lemma 3.6 and hence \( \mathcal{U} \) is closed under cocones of \( \xi \)-deflations. Therefore, \( \mathcal{U} \) is resolving. \( \square \)

The following result establishes a relation between \( n \)-cotorsion pairs and cotorsion pairs.

**Proposition 3.9.** Let \( \mathcal{U} \) and \( \mathcal{V} \) be subcategories in \( \mathcal{C} \). Then the following statements are equivalent.

1. \((\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})\) is an \( n \)-cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \) with \( \xi \text{xt}_{\xi}^{n+1}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0 \).
2. \((\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})\) is an \( n \)-cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \) and \( \mathcal{U} \) is resolving.
3. \((\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})\) is an \( n \)-cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \) and \( \mathcal{V} \) is coresolving.
4. \((\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})\) is a cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \) and \( \mathcal{U} \) is resolving.
5. \((\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})\) is a cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \) and \( \mathcal{V} \) is coresolving.

Moreover, if one of the above conditions holds true, then \( \xi \text{xt}_{\xi}^{i \geq 1}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0 \).

**Proof.** (1) \( \Rightarrow \) (2) It follows from Proposition 3.8.

(2) \( \Rightarrow \) (1) It suffices to show \( \xi \text{xt}_{\xi}^{n+1}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0 \). Let \( U \in \mathcal{U} \) and \( V \in \mathcal{V} \). Since \( \mathcal{C} \) has enough \( \xi \)-projective objects, there exists the following in \( \mathcal{E} \)-triangle

\[
\begin{align*}
U' & \rightarrow P \rightarrow U \rightarrow 
\end{align*}
\]

in \( \xi \) with \( P \in \mathcal{P}(\xi) \). Since \( \mathcal{U} \) is resolving, we have \( U' \in \mathcal{U} \). Applying the functor \( \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(-, V) \) to the above \( \mathcal{E} \)-triangle yields the following exact sequence

\[
\cdots \rightarrow \xi \text{xt}_{\xi}^{1}(U', V) \rightarrow \xi \text{xt}_{\xi}^{1}(U, V) \rightarrow \xi \text{xt}_{\xi}^{1}(P, V) \rightarrow \cdots .
\]

Since \( \xi \text{xt}_{\xi}^{1\leq i \leq n}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0 \), we have \( \xi \text{xt}_{\xi}^{n+1}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0 \).

(1) \( \iff \) (3) It is a dual of (1) \( \iff \) (2).

(2) \( \Rightarrow \) (4) or (3) \( \Rightarrow \) (4) By Lemma 3.6, \((\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}^\perp_{n-1})\) is a left cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \). Since \( \mathcal{V} \) is coresolving, \( \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}^\perp_{n-1} \). So \((\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})\) is a left cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \). Dually, \((\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})\) is a right cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \). Thus \((\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})\) is a cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \), and \( \mathcal{U} \) is resolving.

(4) \( \Rightarrow \) (2) By using an argument similar to that of the implication (2) \( \Rightarrow \) (1), we get \( \xi \text{xt}_{\xi}^{1\leq i \leq n}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0 \).

(3) \( \Rightarrow \) (5) By the dual of Lemma 3.6.

(5) \( \Rightarrow \) (3) By the dual of (4) \( \Rightarrow \) (2). \( \square \)

By Proposition 3.9 we immediately have the following result.

**Corollary 3.10.** Let \((\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})\) be a cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \). Then the following statements are equivalent.
(1) $\xi xt^2(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0$.
(2) $\mathcal{U}$ is resolving.
(3) $\mathcal{V}$ is coresolving.
Moreover, if one of the above conditions holds true, then $\xi xt^{\geq 1}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0$.

We need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.11. Let $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ be subcategories of $\mathcal{C}$ such that $\xi xt_\xi^{1 \leq i \leq n}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0$.
Then $\mathcal{U}_k^\perp \subseteq \perp^{k+1} \mathcal{V}$ for any $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$.

Proof. We will proceed by induction on $k$. The case $k = 0$ is clear. Let $X \in \mathcal{U}_k^\perp$ and $V \in \mathcal{V}$. For the case $k = 1$, there is an $E$-triangle

$$U_1 \rightarrow U_0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow$$

in $\xi$ with $U_1, U_0 \in \mathcal{U}$. Applying the functor $\text{Hom}_\varphi(\_ , V)$ to the above $E$-triangle yields the following exact sequence

$$\cdots \rightarrow \xi xt_\xi^1(U_1, V) \rightarrow \xi xt_\xi^2(X, V) \rightarrow \xi xt_\xi^2(U_0, V) \rightarrow \cdots .$$

Since $\xi xt_\xi^1(U_1, V) = 0 = \xi xt_\xi^2(U_0, V)$ by assumption, we have $\xi xt_\xi^2(X, V) = 0$ and $X \in \perp^2 \mathcal{V}$.

Now suppose $2 \leq k \leq n - 1$. Consider the following $E$-triangle

$$K \rightarrow U'_0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow$$

in $\xi$ with $U'_0 \in \mathcal{U}$ and $K \in \mathcal{U}^\perp_{k-1}$. Applying the functor $\text{Hom}_\varphi(\_ , V)$ to the above $E$-triangle yields the following exact sequence

$$\cdots \rightarrow \xi xt_\xi^k(K, V) \rightarrow \xi xt_\xi^{k+1}(X, V) \rightarrow \xi xt_\xi^{k+1}(U'_0, V) \rightarrow \cdots .$$

Since $\xi xt_\xi^k(K, V) = 0$ by the induction hypothesis, and since $\xi xt_\xi^{k+1}(U'_0, V) = 0$ by assumption, we have $\xi xt_\xi^{k+1}(X, V) = 0$ and $X \in \perp^{k+1} \mathcal{V}$. Thus $\mathcal{U}_k^\perp \subseteq \perp^{k+1} \mathcal{V}$ for any $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$. 

As a consequence, we get the following proposition.

Proposition 3.12. Let $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ be a left $n$-cotorsion pair in $\mathcal{C}$. Then the following statements are equivalent.

(1) $\mathcal{U} = \perp^1 \mathcal{V}$.
(2) $\mathcal{U}^\perp_k = \perp^{k+1} \mathcal{V}$ for any $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$.

Proof. (2) $\implies$ (1) It is trivial by setting $k = 0$ in (2).

(1) $\implies$ (2) The case $k = 0$ is clear. Now suppose $k \geq 1$. By Lemma 3.11, we have $\mathcal{U}^\perp_k \subseteq \perp^{k+1} \mathcal{V}$. Conversely, let $Y \in \perp^{k+1} \mathcal{V}$. Consider the following $E$-triangle

$$K_1 \rightarrow U_0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow$$

in $\xi$ with $U_0 \in \mathcal{U}$ and $K_1 \in \mathcal{V}^\perp_{n-1}$. Repeating this process, we get the following $\xi$-exact complex

$$K_k \rightarrow U_{k-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow U_1 \rightarrow U_0 \rightarrow Y$$

with $U_i \in \mathcal{U}$ for $0 \leq i \leq k - 1$. Applying the functor $\text{Hom}_\varphi(\_ , V)$ to it, $\xi xt_\xi^{\geq 1}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0$ since $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ is a left $n$-cotorsion pair. Then we have $\xi xt_\xi^1(K_k, V) = \xi xt_\xi^{k+1}(Y, V) = 0$ by Remark 2.18. It implies $K_k \in \perp^1 V = \mathcal{U}$ by assumption. Hence $Y \in \mathcal{U}^\perp_k$ and $\perp^{k+1} \mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{U}^\perp_k$. Thus $\mathcal{U}^\perp_k = \perp^{k+1} \mathcal{V}$. 
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Immediately, we have the following corollary.

**Corollary 3.13.** Let \((\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})\) be a left \(n\)-cotorsion pair in \(\mathcal{C}\). If \(\mathcal{U} = \perp \mathcal{V}\), then for any \(0 \leq k \leq n - 1\), the following statements are equivalent.

1. \(\mathcal{U}\)-res.\,dim \(\mathcal{C} \leq k\).
2. \(\mathcal{C} = \perp_{k+1} \mathcal{V}\).

As an application of Proposition 3.9 along with Proposition 3.12 and its dual, the following result describes the subcategories \(\mathcal{U}^\perp\) and \(\mathcal{V}^\perp\) if \((\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})\) is a cotorsion pair with \(\mathcal{U}\) resolving.

**Corollary 3.14.** Let \((\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})\) be a cotorsion pair with \(\mathcal{U}\) resolving. Then for any \(m, n \geq 0\), we have \(\mathcal{U}^\perp_{m+1} = \mathcal{V}^\perp_m\) and \(\perp_{n+1} \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{U}^\perp_n\).

### 4 Left Frobenius pairs and weak Auslander-Buchweitz contexts

We begin with the following easy observation.

**Proposition 4.1.** Let \((\mathcal{X}, \omega)\) be a pair of subcategories in \(\mathcal{C}\) such that \(\omega\) is \(\mathcal{X}\)-injective. Then we have

1. \(\mathcal{X} \subseteq \perp (\omega^\perp)\).
2. If \(\omega\) is a \(\xi\)-cogenerator for \(\mathcal{X}\) and \(\omega\) is closed under direct summands in \(\mathcal{C}\), then

\[
\omega = \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^\perp = \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{X}^\perp.
\]

**Proof.** (1) Note that \(\mathcal{X} \subseteq \perp (\omega^\perp)\) is equivalent to \(\omega^\perp \in \mathcal{X}^\perp\). For any \(W' \in \omega^\perp\), we can assume \(\omega\)-res.\,dim \(W' = m\), then there exists a \(\xi\)-exact complex

\[
W_m \rightarrow W_{m-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow W_1 \rightarrow W'
\]

with each \(W_i \in \omega\). Consider the \(\mathcal{E}\)-triangle \(W_m \rightarrow W_{m-1} \rightarrow K_{m-1} \rightarrow \rightarrow \) in \(\xi\) with \(W_m, W_{m-1} \in \omega\). Applying the functor \(\text{Hom}_C(X, -)\) to the above \(\mathcal{E}\)-triangle yields the following exact sequence:

\[
\cdots \rightarrow \xi x_t^i (X, W_{m-1}) \rightarrow \xi x_t^i (X, K_{m-1}) \rightarrow \xi x_t^{i+1} (X, W_m) \rightarrow \cdots
\]

By the dual of Remark 2.18, we have \(\xi x_t^i (X, W_{m-1}) = \xi x_t^{i+1} (X, W_m) = 0\) since \(\omega\) is \(\mathcal{X}\)-injective. Thus \(\xi x_t^i (X, K_{m-1}) = 0\). Repeating this process, we can get \(\xi x_t^{i+1} (X, W') = 0\).

(2) By (1), we have \(\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{X}^\perp\), so it suffices to show \(\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{X}^\perp \subseteq \omega\). Now let \(X \in \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{X}^\perp\). Since \(\omega\) is a \(\xi\)-cogenerator in \(\mathcal{X}\), there exists an \(\mathcal{E}\)-triangle

\[
X \rightarrow W \rightarrow X' \rightarrow
\]

in \(\xi\) with \(W \in \omega\) and \(X' \in \mathcal{X}\). Since \(\xi x_t^1 (X', X) = 0\) by assumption, the above \(\mathcal{E}\)-triangle is split. So \(X\) is a direct summand of \(W\) and \(X \in \omega\). Thus we get the desired assertion. \(\square\)

The following result gives the so-called Auslander-Buchweitz approximation \(\mathcal{E}\)-triangles in \(\xi\). It plays a crucial role in the sequel.

**Proposition 4.2.** (c.f. [2, Theorem 1.1], [3, Theorem 2.8], [15, Theorem 3.7]) Let \((\mathcal{X}, \omega)\) be a pair of subcategories in \(\mathcal{C}\) such that \(\mathcal{X}\) is closed under \(\xi\)-extensions and \(\omega\) is a \(\xi\)-cogenerator in \(\mathcal{X}\). Then for any \(C \in \mathcal{X}^\perp_n\), there exist the following \(\mathcal{E}\)-triangles

\[
Y_C \rightarrow X_C \rightarrow C \rightarrow
\]
in ξ with \(Y_C \in \omega_{n-1}^\perp, Y^C \in \omega_n^\perp\) and \(X_C, X^C \in \mathcal{X}\). In particular, if \(\omega\) is \(\mathcal{X}\)-injective, then \(X_C \to C\) is a right \(\mathcal{X}\)-approximation of \(C\).

**Proof.** The proof is similar to that of [15, Theorem 3.7]. □

Applying Proposition 4.2 we get the following two corollaries.

**Corollary 4.3.** Let \((\mathcal{X}, \omega)\) be a pair of subcategories in \(\mathcal{C}\) such that \(\mathcal{X}\) is closed under \(\xi\)-extensions and direct summands, and let \(\omega\) be a \(\xi\)-cogenerator of \(\mathcal{X}\). Then

\[
\{C \in \mathcal{C} \mid \mathcal{X}\text{-res.dim } C \leq 1\} \cap \perp^1 \omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}.
\]

**Proof.** Let \(\mathcal{X}\)-res.dim \(C \leq 1\). By Proposition 4.2, we have the following \(E\)-triangle

\[
K \to X \to C \to
\]

in \(\xi\) with \(X \in \mathcal{X}\) and \(K \in \omega\). Notice that \(\xi \text{-ext}_1(C, K) = 0\) by assumption, so the above \(E\)-triangle is split, and thus \(C\) is a direct summand of \(X\), which implies \(C \in \mathcal{X}\). □

**Corollary 4.4.** Let \((\mathcal{X}, \omega)\) be a pair of subcategories in \(\mathcal{C}\) such that \(\mathcal{X}\) is closed under \(\xi\)-extensions and \(\omega\) is closed under direct summands in \(\mathcal{C}\). If \(\omega\) is \(\mathcal{X}\)-injective and a \(\xi\)-cogenerator for \(\mathcal{X}\), then

\[
\omega^\perp = \mathcal{X}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}^\wedge.
\]

**Proof.** By Proposition 4.1, we have \(\omega^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\perp\). Clearly, \(\omega^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge\). Thus \(\omega^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}^\wedge\).

Conversely, let \(C \in \mathcal{X}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}^\wedge\). Then, by Proposition 4.2 there exists an \(E\)-triangle

\[
Y \to X \to C \to
\]

in \(\xi\) with \(X \in \mathcal{X}\) and \(Y \in \omega^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\perp\). Since \(C \in \mathcal{X}^\perp\), we have \(X \in \mathcal{X}^\perp\). Then \(X \in \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{X}^\perp\). It follows from Proposition 4.1 that \(X \in \omega\). So \(C \in \omega^\perp\), and thus \(\mathcal{X}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}^\wedge \subseteq \omega^\perp\). □

For a pair \((\mathcal{X}, \omega)\) of subcategories in \(\mathcal{C}\), if \(\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}\), then \(\omega^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge\). We establish a more specific relation between them under some conditions.

**Lemma 4.5.** Let \(\omega\) be a subcategory of \(\mathcal{C}\) such that \(\omega\) is closed under direct summands. Then

1. \(\perp^1 \omega = \perp^1 (\omega^\perp)\)
2. \(\omega^\perp \cap \perp^1 \omega \subseteq \omega\)

**Proof.** (1) Clearly, \(\perp^1 (\omega^\perp) \subseteq \perp^1 \omega\).

Conversely, for any \(X \in \perp^1 \omega\), \(\xi \text{-ext}_{i+1}(X, \omega) = 0\). For any \(Y \in \omega^\perp\), assume \(\omega\)-res.dim \(Y = m\), then there exists a \(\xi\)-exact complex:

\[
W_m \to W_{m-1} \to \cdots \to W_1 \to W_0 \to Y
\]

with each \(W_i \in \omega\), \(0 \leq i \leq m\). Applying the functor \(\text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(X, -)\) to the \(E\)-triangle

\[
W_m \to W_{m-1} \to K_{m-1} \to
\]

we can get the following exact sequence:

\[
\cdots \to \xi \text{-ext}_i(X, W_m) \to \xi \text{-ext}_i(X, W_{m-1}) \to \xi \text{-ext}_i(X, K_{m-1}) \to \xi \text{-ext}_i+1(X, W_m) \to \cdots
\]
with \( \xi \mathcal{t}_i(X, W_{m-1}) = \xi \mathcal{t}_{i+1}(X, W_m) = 0, \ i \geq 1 \), then \( \xi \mathcal{t}_i(X, K_{m-1}) = 0 \). Let’s take just \( Y \) 
to be \( K_0 \). Repeat this process, we have \( \xi \mathcal{t}_{i+1}^0(X, K_j) = 0, \ 0 \leq j \leq m - 1 \), where \( \mathcal{E} \)-triangle \( K_{k+1} \to W_k \to K_k \to - \) is in \( \xi \), \( 1 \leq k \leq m - 2 \). Thus \( \xi \mathcal{t}_{i+1}^0(X, Y) = 0 \), and so \( \downarrow(\omega^\perp) \geq \downarrow\omega \)

(2) Let \( Z \in \omega^\perp \cap \downarrow\omega \). Consider the following \( \xi \)-exact complex

\[
W_n \to W_{n-1} \to \cdots \to W_1 \to W_0 \to Z
\]

with \( W_i \in \omega \), \( 0 \leq i \leq n \). Applying the functor \( \text{Hom}_\Phi(Z, -) \) to the \( \mathcal{E} \)-triangle

\[
W_n \to W_{n-1} \to K_{n-1} \to -
\]

we can get the following exact sequence:

\[
\cdots \to \xi \mathcal{t}_1^0(Z, W_{n-1}) \to \xi \mathcal{t}_1^0(Z, K_{n-1}) \to \xi \mathcal{t}_2^0(Z, W_n)
\]

Then \( \xi \mathcal{t}_1^0(Z, K_{n-1}) = 0 \) since \( \xi \mathcal{t}_1^0(Z, W_{n-1}) = \xi \mathcal{t}_2^0(Z, W_n) = 0 \). For the same reason, we can obtain that \( \xi \mathcal{t}_1^0(Z, K_i) = 0, \ 1 \leq i \leq n - 1 \). Then \( \xi \mathcal{t}_1^0(Z, K_1) = 0 \), that is, the \( \mathcal{E} \)-triangle \( K_1 \to W_0 \to Z \to - \) is split. Thus \( Z \oplus K_1 \cong W_0 \in \omega \). It follows that \( Z \in \omega \) from the fact that \( \omega \) is closed under direct summands.

**Proposition 4.6.** Let \( \mathcal{X} \) and \( \mathcal{Y} \) be subcategories of \( \mathcal{C} \) such that \( \mathcal{X} \) and \( \mathcal{Y} \) are closed under direct summands and \( \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\perp \). Assume that

(a) \( \mathcal{X} \) is closed under \( \xi \)-extensions and cocones of \( \xi \)-deflations, and

(b) \( \mathcal{Y} \) is closed under \( \xi \)-extensions and cones of \( \xi \)-inflations.

If \( \omega := \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y} \) is \( \mathcal{X} \)-injective and a \( \xi \)-cogenerator for \( \mathcal{X} \), then

\[
\mathcal{X} = \omega^\perp = \mathcal{X}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}^\perp = \mathcal{X}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}^\perp.
\]

**Proof.** By Corollary 4.4, we know \( \omega^\perp = \mathcal{X}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}^\perp \).

Since \( \mathcal{Y} \) is closed under cones of \( \xi \)-inflations, we have \( \omega^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{Y} \). It follows that \( \omega^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{Y} \) since \( \omega \subseteq \mathcal{Y} \). Now let \( Y \in \mathcal{Y} \). Since \( \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\perp \) by assumption, by Proposition 4.2 there is an \( \mathcal{E} \)-triangle

\[
K \to X \to Y \to -
\]

in \( \xi \) with \( X \in \mathcal{X} \) and \( K \in \omega^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{Y} \). Since \( \mathcal{Y} \) is closed under \( \xi \)-extensions, we have \( X \in \mathcal{Y} \). So \( X \in \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y} = \omega \), and hence \( Y \in \omega^\perp \) and \( \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \omega^\perp \). Thus \( \mathcal{Y} = \omega^\perp \).

Clearly, \( \mathcal{X}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}^\perp \). Now let \( Z \in \mathcal{X}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}^\perp \). By Proposition 4.2 there is an \( \mathcal{E} \)-triangle

\[
Z \to W \to X \to -
\]

in \( \xi \) with \( X \in \mathcal{X} \) and \( W \in \omega^\perp \). Since \( Z \in \mathcal{X}^\perp \), the above \( \mathcal{E} \)-triangle is split. So \( Z \) is a direct summand of \( W \). Notice that \( \omega^\perp (= \mathcal{Y}) \) is closed under direct summands, we have \( Z \in \omega^\perp = \mathcal{X}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}^\perp \). Thus we get the third equality.

Clearly, \( \mathcal{X} \subseteq \downarrow \omega \cap \mathcal{X}^\perp \). By Lemma 4.5(1), \( \downarrow \omega \cap \mathcal{X}^\perp = \downarrow(\omega^\perp) \cap \mathcal{X}^\perp \). It suffices to show that \( \downarrow \omega \cap \mathcal{X}^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{X} \).

Now, let \( M \in \downarrow \omega \cap \mathcal{X}^\perp \). By Proposition 4.2 there is an \( \mathcal{E} \)-triangle \( K \to X \to M \to - \) in \( \xi \) with \( X \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \downarrow \omega \) and \( K \in \omega^\perp \). Then \( K \in \downarrow \omega \), and so \( K \in \omega^\perp \cap \downarrow \omega \subseteq \omega \) by Lemma 4.5. Notice that \( \xi \mathcal{t}_1^0(M, K) = 0 \), that is, the above \( \mathcal{E} \)-triangle is split, hence \( X \cong K \oplus M \). It follows that \( M \in \mathcal{X} \) from the fact that \( \mathcal{X} \) is closed under direct summands. Thus \( \mathcal{X}^\perp \cap \downarrow \omega \subseteq \mathcal{X} \).
4.1 Left Frobenius pairs

Inspired by the definition of left Frobenius pairs in abelian categories \([3]\), we introduce the notion of left Frobenius pairs with respect to \(\xi\) in extriangulated categories as follows.

**Definition 4.7.** A pair of subcategories \((X, \omega)\) in \(\mathcal{C}\) is called a left Frobenius pair if

- (LF1) \(X\) and \(\omega\) are closed under direct summands.
- (LF2) \(X\) is closed under \(\xi\)-extensions and cocones of \(\xi\)-deflations.
- (LF3) \(\omega\) is \(X\)-injective and a \(\xi\)-cogenerator of \(X\).

We have the following example.

**Example 4.8.**

1. We have the following facts.
   1.1 \(\mathcal{GP}(\xi)\) is closed under direct summands (see \([9, \text{Theorem 4.17}]\)).
   1.2 \(\mathcal{GP}(\xi)\) is closed under \(\xi\)-extensions and cocones of \(\xi\)-deflations(see \([9, \text{Lemma 4.16}]\)).

   Thus, \(\mathcal{GP}(\xi)\) is a resolving subcategory of \(\mathcal{C}\).

2. Let \((X, \omega)\) be a left Frobenius pair in \(\mathcal{C}\) such that \(X\)-res.\ dim \(\mathcal{C} = n\). By Proposition 4.2, \((X, \omega)\) is a left \(n\)-cotorsion pair in \(\mathcal{C}\). In particular, if \(\sup\{\xi\text{-pd} T \mid T \in \mathcal{C}\} = n\), then \((\mathcal{GP}(\xi), \mathcal{P}(\xi))\) is a left \(n\)-cotorsion pair in \(\mathcal{C}\).

Let \((X, \omega)\) be a left Frobenius pair in \(\mathcal{C}\). In the following, we will study the homological behavior of \(X^\wedge\), involving \(\omega^\wedge\).

**Lemma 4.9.** Let \((X, \omega)\) be a left Frobenius pair in \(\mathcal{C}\), and let

\[
X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \xrightarrow{\delta} \quad (4.1)
\]

be an \(\mathcal{E}\)-triangle in \(\xi\).

1. If \(Z \in X\), then \(X \in X^\wedge\) if and only if \(Y \in X^\wedge\).
2. If \(Y \in X\), then \(X \in X^\wedge\) if and only if \(Z \in X^\wedge\).

**Proof.** (1) Assume that \(Y \in X^\wedge\) and \(X\)-res.\ dim \(Y = m\). The case for \(m = 0\) is clear. Now suppose \(m \geq 1\). Consider the following \(\mathcal{E}\)-triangle

\[
K \rightarrow X_0 \rightarrow Y \xrightarrow{\delta_2} \quad (4.2)
\]

in \(\xi\) with \(X_0 \in X\) and \(K \in X^\wedge_{m-1}\). Then there exist an \(\mathcal{E}\)-triangle

\[
X_0^\wedge \rightarrow X_0 \rightarrow Z \xrightarrow{\delta_3} \quad (4.3)
\]

and a commutative diagram in \(\mathcal{C}\) by \((\text{ET4})^\text{op}\):

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
K & \xrightarrow{k} & X_0^\wedge \xrightarrow{f} X \xrightarrow{g} \quad (4.2) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
K & \xrightarrow{h} & X_0 \xrightarrow{\delta_2} Y \\
& & \downarrow \\
Z & \xrightarrow{\delta_3} & Z
\end{array}
\]
where $h^*\delta_3 = k_*\delta_2$, $f_*\delta_3 = \delta_1$.

Applying Lemma 2.8 yields the following commutative diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
X & \to & X \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
X'_0 & \to & M \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
X'_0 & \to & X_0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
& & \delta_1 \\
\end{array}
\]

where the $E$-triangle $X'_0 \to M \to Y^{k_*\delta_2}$ belongs to $\xi$. Then $X'_0 \to X_0 \to Z \delta_3 >$ in $\xi$ since $\xi$ is saturated. It follows that $X'_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ since $X_0 \in \mathcal{X}$, $Z \in \mathcal{X}$. Thus $X \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$ by the top $E$-triangle in the diagram (4.2).

On the other hand, assume that $X \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$ and $\mathcal{X}$-res.$\dim X = m$. The case for $m = 0$ is clear. Suppose $m \geq 1$. By Proposition 4.2, there exist the following $E$-triangles

\[
K \to X_0 \overset{p}{\to} X >
\]

in $\xi$ with $X_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $K \in \omega^\wedge_{m-1}$. Since $Z \in \omega^\wedge_{m-1}$ by Corollary 4.4, applying the functor $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(Z,-)$ to the $E$-triangle(4.3) yields an isomorphism $p_* : \xi t^{1}_\xi(Z,X_0) \to \xi t^{1}_\xi(Z,X)$. Then we have the following commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
X_0 & \to & X'' \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
X & \to & Y \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
& & \delta = p_*\delta'
\end{array}
\]

where all $E$-triangles are in $\xi$. Since $\mathcal{X}$ is closed under $\xi$-extensions, $X'' \in \mathcal{X}$. By (ET4), we have the following commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
K & \to & X_0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
K & \to & X'' \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
& & B \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
Z & \to & Z \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
& & p_*\delta'
\end{array}
\]

By the second horizontal $E$-triangle, we know $B \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. Then $Y \cong B \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$.

(2) When $X \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$, the assertion $Z \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is clear. On the other hand, assume that $Z \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$ and $\mathcal{X}$-res.$\dim Z = m$. We proceed by induction on $m$. The case $m = 0$ is clear. Now suppose $m \geq 1$. Consider the following $E$-triangle

\[
K \to X_0 \to Z >
\]

in $\xi$ with $X_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $K \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge_{m-1}$. We get the following commutative diagram by Lemma 2.8:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
K & \to & K \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
X & \to & U \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
X & \to & X_0 >
\end{array}
\]

(4.4)
Since $\xi$ is closed under base change, the middle row and the middle column are in $\xi$. Note that $X_0 \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. By (1), we have $U \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$, and thus $X \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. \hfill \Box

**Proposition 4.10.** Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a left Frobenius pair in $\mathcal{C}$. Then for any $T \in \mathcal{C}$, the following statements are equivalent.

(1) $\mathcal{X}$-res. $\dim T \leq n$.

(2) If

$$K_n \longrightarrow X_{n-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow X_1 \longrightarrow X_0 \longrightarrow T$$

(4.5)

is a $\xi$-exact complex in $\mathcal{C}$ with $X_i \in \mathcal{X}$ for any $0 \leq i \leq n-1$, then $K_n \in \mathcal{X}$.

**Proof.** (2) $\implies$ (1) It is obvious.

(1) $\implies$ (2) By Lemma 4.9, we have $K_n \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. For any $W \in \omega$, $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \perp \omega$ since $\omega$ is $\mathcal{X}$-injective. Applying the functor $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(\cdot, W)$ to the $\xi$-exact complex (4.5), by Remark 2.18, we have

$$\xi xt^i_\xi(K_n, W) \cong \xi xt^{n+i}(T, W) = 0$$

for all $i \geq 1$. Then $K_n \in \perp \omega$, and hence $K_n \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge \cap \perp \omega = \mathcal{X}$ by Proposition 4.6. \hfill \Box

The following result shows that $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ satisfies the two-out-of-three property.

**Theorem 4.11.** (c.f. [15, Propositions 3.10 and 3.14]) Let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a left Frobenius pair in $\mathcal{C}$. Then $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is closed under $\xi$-extensions, cocones of $\xi$-deflations, cones of $\xi$-inflations and direct summands.

**Proof.** Let

$$X \longrightarrow Y \longrightarrow Z \longrightarrow$$

(4.6)

be an $\mathcal{E}$-triangle in $\xi$.

**Claim 1.** $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is closed under $\xi$-extensions. The proof is similar to that of [15, Proposition 3.10].

**Claim 2.** $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is closed under cocones of $\xi$-deflations.

Let $Y, Z \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$ with $\mathcal{X}$-res. $\dim Z = n$. We proceed by induction on $n$. The case for $n = 0$ follows from Lemma 4.9(1). Now suppose $n \geq 1$. Consider the following $\mathcal{E}$-triangle

$$K \longrightarrow X_0 \longrightarrow Z \longrightarrow$$

in $\xi$ with $X_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $K \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge_{n-1}$. By Lemma 2.8 we get the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
K \\
\downarrow \\
X \end{array} & \longrightarrow & \begin{array}{c}
U \\
\downarrow \\
X \end{array} \longrightarrow \begin{array}{c}
X_0 \\
\downarrow \\
Y \\
\downarrow \\
X \end{array} \longrightarrow \begin{array}{c}
Z \\
\downarrow \\
\end{array} \longrightarrow \\
& \longrightarrow & \\
\end{array}
\end{array}$$

where the second vertical and the second horizontal $\mathcal{E}$-triangles are in $\xi$. By **Claim 1**, we have $U \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$. So $X \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$ by Lemma 4.9(1).

**Claim 3.** $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$ is closed under cones of $\xi$-inflations.
Let \( X, Y \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge \) with \( \mathcal{X}\text{-res. dim}\ Y = n \). We proceed by induction on \( n \). The case for \( n = 0 \) holds by Lemma 4.9(2). Now suppose \( n \geq 1 \). Consider the following \( \mathbb{E}\)-triangle

\[
K \longrightarrow X_0 \longrightarrow Y \rightarrow
\]

in \( \xi \) with \( X_0 \in \mathcal{X} \) and \( K \in \mathcal{X}_{n-1}^\wedge \). By (ET4)\(^{op} \), we have the following commutative diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
K & \longrightarrow & U \longrightarrow X \rightarrow \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
K & \longrightarrow & X_0 \longrightarrow Y \rightarrow \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
Z & \longrightarrow & Z \rightarrow \\
\end{array}
\]

The first horizontal \( \mathbb{E}\)-triangle and the second vertical \( \mathbb{E}\)-triangle are in \( \xi \). By Claim 1, we have \( U \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge \), and thus \( Z \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge \) by Lemma 4.9(2).

Claim 4. \( \mathcal{X}^\wedge \) is closed under direct summands.

The proof is similar to that of [15, Proposition 3.14]. □

The following result provides a standard criterion for computing the \( \mathcal{X}\)-resolution dimension of an object in \( \mathcal{C} \).

We need the following fact.

Lemma 4.12. ([11], Lemma 3.9) Let \( X \) be an object of \( \mathcal{C} \).

(1) If \( \mathcal{P}(\xi) \) is a generating subcategory of \( \mathcal{C} \), then \( \xi\text{-pd} \ X \leq n \) if and only if \( \xi xt_\xi^{n+1}(X, Y) = 0 \) for any \( Y \in \mathcal{C} \).

(2) If \( \mathcal{I}(\xi) \) is a cogenerating subcategory of \( \mathcal{C} \), then \( \xi\text{-id} \ X \leq n \) if and only if \( \xi xt_\xi^{n+1}(Y, X) = 0 \) for any \( Y \in \mathcal{C} \).

In particular, if the above \( X \in \mathcal{P}(\xi) \), then we have \( \xi xt_\xi^{\geq 1}(X, Y) = 0 \), \( \forall Y \in \mathcal{C} \).

The following result shows how to obtain cotorsion pairs from left Frobenius pairs in \( \mathcal{C} \).

Theorem 4.13. Let \( (\mathcal{X}, \omega) \) be a left Frobenius pair in \( \mathcal{C} \). Assume that \( \mathcal{I}(\xi) \) is a cogenerating subcategory of \( \mathcal{C} \) and \( \mathcal{P}(\xi) \) is a generating subcategory of \( \mathcal{C} \). Then the following statements are equivalent.

(1) \( \mathcal{X}^\wedge = \mathcal{C} \).

(2) \( (\mathcal{X}, \omega^\wedge) \) is a cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \) with \( \xi\text{-id} \omega < \infty \).

(3) \( (\mathcal{X}, \omega^\wedge) \) is a left cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \) with \( \xi\text{-id} \omega < \infty \).

(4) \( \mathcal{X} = \perp \omega \) and \( \xi\text{-id} \omega < \infty \).

Moreover, if one of the equivalent conditions holds, then \( \mathcal{X}\text{-res. dim}\ \mathcal{C} = \xi\text{-id} \omega \).

Proof. (1) \( \Longrightarrow \) (2) By Corollary 4.4 we have \( \omega^\wedge = \mathcal{X}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}^\wedge \). Note that \( \mathcal{X}^\wedge \) is closed under direct summands by Proposition 4.11 so \( \omega^\wedge \) is closed under direct summands. By Proposition 4.1 we have \( \xi xt_\xi^1(\mathcal{X}, \omega^\wedge) = 0 \). On the other hand, we can get two desired \( \mathbb{E}\)-triangles as in the Definition 3.1 by Proposition 4.2. Thus \( (\mathcal{X}, \omega^\wedge) \) is a cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \).

Let \( W \in \omega \) and \( T \in \mathcal{C} \) with \( \mathcal{X}\text{-res. dim}\ T \leq n \). Then we have the following \( \xi\)-exact complex

\[
X_n \longrightarrow X_{n-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow X_1 \longrightarrow X_0 \longrightarrow T
\]
in \( \mathcal{C} \) with \( X_i \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \perp \omega \) for any \( 0 \leq i \leq n \). Applying the functor \( \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, W) \), by Remark 2.18 we have
\[
\xi x t^{n+1}_{\xi}(T, W) \cong \xi x t^1_{\xi}(X_n, W) = 0.
\]
So \( \xi \cdot \text{id} W \leq n \) by Lemma 4.12 and thus \( \xi \cdot \text{id} \omega < \infty \).

(2) \implies (3) It is obvious.

(3) \implies (4) Note that \( \mathcal{X} = \perp^1(\omega^\omega) \) by Remark 3.2. It is clear that \( \perp^1(\omega^\omega) \subseteq \perp^1(\omega^\omega) = \mathcal{X} \). On the other hand, we know that \( \mathcal{X} \subseteq \perp^1(\omega^\omega) \) by Proposition 4.1. Thus \( \perp^1(\omega^\omega) = \perp(\omega^\omega) \). Clearly, \( \perp^1(\omega^\omega) = \perp^1(\omega^\omega) = \perp^1(\omega^\omega) \).

(4) \implies (1) Suppose \( \xi \cdot \text{id} \omega = n \). For any \( T \in \mathcal{C} \), since \( \mathcal{C} \) has enough \( \xi \)-projective objects, there exists the following \( \xi \)-exact complex
\[
K \longrightarrow P_{n-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow P_1 \longrightarrow P_0 \longrightarrow T
\]
in \( \mathcal{C} \) with \( P_i \in \mathcal{P}(\xi) \) for any \( 0 \leq i \leq n - 1 \). For any \( W \in \omega \), applying the functor \( \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, W) \), by Lemma 4.12 and Remark 2.18 we have
\[
\xi x t^i_{\xi}(K, W) \cong \xi x t^{n+1}_{\xi}(T, W) = 0
\]
for any \( i \geq 1 \) since \( \xi \cdot \text{id} W \leq n \). So \( K \in \perp^1 \omega \). Since \( \mathcal{X} = \perp^1 \omega \) by assumption, we have that \( K \in \mathcal{X} \).

Notice that all \( P_i \) are in \( \mathcal{X} \), so \( \mathcal{X} \)-res.\ dim \( T \leq n \) and \( T \in \mathcal{X}^\omega \), and therefore \( \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{X}^\omega \).

Putting \( \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{G} \mathcal{P}(\xi) \) and \( \omega = \mathcal{P}(\xi) \) in Theorem 4.13 we get the following result, in which part of the implication (1) \implies (2) was proved in [10, Proposition 4.7].

**Corollary 4.14.** If \( \mathcal{I}(\xi) \) is a cogenerating subcategory of \( \mathcal{C} \) and \( \mathcal{P}(\xi) \) is a generating subcategory of \( \mathcal{C} \), then the following statements are equivalent.

1. \( \sup \{ \xi \cdot \text{pd} T \mid T \in \mathcal{C} \} < \infty \).
2. \( (\mathcal{G} \mathcal{P}(\xi), \mathcal{P}(\xi)^{\perp}) \) is a cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \) and \( \xi \cdot \text{id} \mathcal{P}(\xi) < \infty \).
3. \( (\mathcal{G} \mathcal{P}(\xi), \mathcal{P}(\xi)^{\perp}) \) is a left cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \) and \( \xi \cdot \text{id} \mathcal{P}(\xi) < \infty \).
4. \( \mathcal{G} \mathcal{P}(\xi) = \perp \mathcal{P}(\xi) \) and \( \xi \cdot \text{id} \mathcal{P}(\xi) < \infty \).

Moreover, if one of these equivalent conditions holds, then \( \sup \{ \xi \cdot \text{pd} T \mid T \in \mathcal{C} \} = \xi \cdot \text{id} \mathcal{P}(\xi) \).

Furthermore, we have the following result.

**Proposition 4.15.** Assume that \( \mathcal{P}(\xi) \) is a generating subcategory of \( \mathcal{C} \) and \( \mathcal{I}(\xi) \) is a cogenerating subcategory of \( \mathcal{C} \).

1. If \( (\mathcal{G} \mathcal{P}(\xi), \mathcal{P}(\xi)) \) is a left n-cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \), then
\[
\sup \{ \xi \cdot \text{pd} T \mid T \in \mathcal{C} \} = \xi \cdot \text{id} \mathcal{P}(\xi) \leq n.
\]
Dually, if \( (\mathcal{I}(\xi), \mathcal{G} \mathcal{I}(\xi)) \) is a right m-cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \), then
\[
\sup \{ \xi \cdot \text{id} T \mid T \in \mathcal{C} \} = \xi \cdot \text{pd} \mathcal{I}(\xi) \leq m.
\]

2. If there are \( n, m \geq 1 \) such that \( (\mathcal{G} \mathcal{P}(\xi), \mathcal{P}(\xi)) \) is a left n-cotorsion pair, \( (\mathcal{I}(\xi), \mathcal{G} \mathcal{I}(\xi)) \) is a right m-cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \) and \( \mathcal{C} \) satisfies Condition(*), then we can choose \( n = m = \xi \cdot \text{id} \mathcal{P}(\xi) = \xi \cdot \text{pd} \mathcal{I}(\xi) \).
Proof. (1) Suppose \((\mathcal{GP}(\xi), \mathcal{P}(\xi))\) is a left \(n\)-cotorsion pair in \(\mathcal{C}\). Then every object in \(\mathcal{C}\) has \(\xi\)-Gorenstein projective dimension at most \(n\), and hence \(\sup\{\xi\cdot \mathcal{G} \text{pd} T \mid T \in \mathcal{C}\} \leq n\). Then, by Corollary 4.14 we have

\[
\sup\{\xi\cdot \mathcal{G} \text{pd} T \mid T \in \mathcal{C}\} = \xi\cdot \text{id} \mathcal{P}(\xi) \leq n.
\]

Dually, we get the other assertion.

(2) By (1), we have \(\sup\{\xi\cdot \mathcal{G} \text{pd} T \mid T \in \mathcal{C}\} = \xi\cdot \text{id} \mathcal{P}(\xi) \leq n\) and \(\sup\{\xi\cdot \mathcal{G} \text{id} T \mid T \in \mathcal{C}\} = \xi\cdot \text{pd} \mathcal{I}(\xi) \leq m\), where \(m, n\) are nonnegative integers. It follows from Remark 2.26 that \(\sup\{\xi\cdot \mathcal{G} \text{pd} T \mid T \in \mathcal{C}\} = \sup\{\xi\cdot \mathcal{G} \text{id} T \mid T \in \mathcal{C}\} = \xi\cdot \text{pd} \mathcal{I}(\xi) = \xi\cdot \text{id} \mathcal{P}(\xi)\).

The following result is a consequence of Proposition 4.15.

Corollary 4.16. Assume that \(\mathcal{P}(\xi)\) is a generating subcategory of \(\mathcal{C}\) and \(\mathcal{I}(\xi)\) is a cogenerating subcategory of \(\mathcal{C}\), and assume that \((\mathcal{GP}(\xi), \mathcal{P}(\xi))\) is a left \(n\)-cotorsion pair in \(\mathcal{C}\), and \((\mathcal{GI}(\xi), \mathcal{G}\mathcal{I}(\xi))\) is a right \(m\)-cotorsion pair in \(\mathcal{C}\). Then we have

1. \(\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{GP}(\xi)^\wedge_n = (\mathcal{P}(\xi)^\wedge_{n-1})^{\perp}\).
2. \(\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{GI}(\xi)^\vee_m = (\mathcal{I}(\xi)^\vee_{m-1})^{\perp}((\mathcal{G}\mathcal{I}(\xi)))\).

Proof. We only need to prove (1), since (2) is a dual of (1).

Since \((\mathcal{GP}(\xi), \mathcal{P}(\xi))\) is a left \(n\)-cotorsion pair in \(\mathcal{C}\), we have that \(\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{GP}(\xi)^\wedge_n\) by Proposition 4.15, and that \(\mathcal{GP}(\xi) = (\mathcal{P}(\xi)^\wedge_{n-1})^{\perp}\) by Theorem 3.6. Notice that \(\mathcal{P}(\xi)^\wedge_{n-1} \subseteq (\mathcal{P}(\xi)^\wedge_n)^\perp\), so \((\mathcal{GP}(\xi), (\mathcal{P}(\xi)^\wedge_{n-1})^\perp)\) is a left \((n + 1)\)-cotorsion pair in \(\mathcal{C}\). Then \(\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{P}(\xi)^\wedge_{n-1})^{\perp}\) by Corollary 3.13.

4.2 Left weak Auslander-Buchweitz contexts, corresponding with cotorsion pairs and left Frobenius pairs

In [8], Hashimoto introduce and studied relative Auslander-Buchweitz contexts in abelian categories. Motivated by it, we will introduce left (weak) Auslander-Buchweitz contexts with respect to \(\xi\) in a triangulated category \(\mathcal{C}\), and establish a one-one correspondence between left weak Auslander-Buchweitz contexts and left Frobenius pairs.

Definition 4.17. Let \((\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})\) be a pair of subcategories in \(\mathcal{C}\) and \(\omega = \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}\). We say that \((\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})\) is a **left weak Auslander-Buchweitz context** (left weak AB context for short) in \(\mathcal{C}\) if the following conditions are satisfied.

(A1) The pair \((\mathcal{A}, \omega)\) is a left Frobenius pair in \(\mathcal{C}\).

(A2) \(\mathcal{B}\) is closed under direct summands, \(\xi\)-extensions and cones of \(\xi\)-inflations.

(A3) \(\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^\wedge\).

A left weak \(AB\) context \((\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})\) is called a **left \(AB\) context** if the following condition is satisfied.

(A4) \(\mathcal{A}^\wedge = \mathcal{C}\).

The following result shows how to obtain left (weak) \(AB\) contexts from left Frobenius pairs in \(\mathcal{C}\).

Proposition 4.18. Let \((\mathcal{X}, \omega)\) be a left Frobenius pair in \(\mathcal{C}\). Then \((\mathcal{X}, \omega^\wedge)\) is a left weak \(AB\) context in \(\mathcal{C}\). Moreover, if \(\mathcal{X}^\wedge = \mathcal{C}\), then \((\mathcal{X}, \omega^\wedge)\) is a left \(AB\) context in \(\mathcal{C}\).
Proof. By Proposition 4.11 we have \( X \cap \omega^\perp = \omega \). Since \((X, \omega)\) is a left Frobenius pair in \( \mathcal{C} \), we have \( \omega^\perp = X \cap X^\perp \) by Corollary 4.4. Since \( X^\perp \) is closed under direct summands, \( \xi \)-extensions and cones of \( \xi \)-inflations by Theorem 4.11, we have that \( \omega^\perp \) is closed under direct summands, \( \xi \)-extensions and cones of \( \xi \)-inflations. Clearly, \( \omega^\perp \subseteq X^\perp \). Thus \((X, \omega^\perp)\) is a left weak AB context in \( \mathcal{C} \). The last assertion is clear. □

The following result shows how to obtain cotorsion pairs from left AB contexts in \( \mathcal{C} \).

**Proposition 4.19.** Let \((A, B)\) be a left weak AB context in \( \mathcal{C} \) and \( \omega := A \cap B \). Then

\[
\omega = A \cap A^\perp \text{ and } \omega^\perp = B.
\]

In this case, we have the following equivalent statements.

1. \( \mathcal{C} = A^\perp \)
2. \((A, B)\) is a cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \).

Moreover, if one of the above conditions holds, then \( A \) is resolving.

Proof. By assumption, we know that \((A, \omega)\) is a left Frobenius pair in \( \mathcal{C} \). Then by Proposition 4.1 and Corollary 4.4, we have \( \omega = A \cap \omega^\perp \) and \( \omega^\perp = A^\perp \cap A^\perp \). Thus

\[
\omega = A \cap A^\perp \cap A^\perp = A \cap A^\perp.
\]

Since \( \omega \subseteq B \) and \( B \) is closed under cones of \( \xi \)-inflations, we have \( \omega^\perp \subseteq B \). Conversely, let \( X \in B \subseteq A^\perp \). By Proposition 4.2, there is a \( \mathbb{E} \)-triangle

\[
K \rightarrow A \rightarrow X \rightarrow \]

in \( \xi \) with \( A \in A \) and \( K \in \omega^\perp \subseteq B \). It follows that \( A \in B \) since \( B \) is closed under \( \xi \)-extensions. So \( A \in A \cap B = \omega \), and hence \( X \in \omega^\perp \) and \( B \subseteq \omega^\perp \). Thus \( \omega = B^\perp \).

(1) \( \Rightarrow \) (2) By Proposition 4.11, we have \( A \subseteq \bot_1(\omega^\perp) \) and \( \xi xt_1^L(A, B) = 0 \). Since \( \mathcal{C} = A^\perp \) by assumption, for any \( T \in \mathcal{C} \), there exist \( \mathbb{E} \)-triangles

\[
B \rightarrow A \rightarrow T \rightarrow \]

and

\[
T \rightarrow B' \rightarrow A' \rightarrow \]

in \( \xi \) with \( A, A' \in A \) and \( B, B' \in \omega^\perp = B \) by Proposition 4.2. Thus \((A, B = \omega^\perp)\) is a cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \).

(2) \( \Rightarrow \) (1) It is clear.

The last assertion follows by the fact that \( A = \bot_1 B \supset P(\xi) \) (see Remark 3.2). □

The following result provides a way to obtain left Frobenius pairs and left (weak) AB contexts from cotorsion pairs in \( \mathcal{C} \).

**Proposition 4.20.** Let \((U, V)\) be a cotorsion pair in \( \mathcal{C} \) with \( U \) resolving. Then \((U, \omega)\) is a left Frobenius pair in \( \mathcal{C} \), where \( \omega := U \cap V \). Moreover, the following assertions hold true.

1. If \( V \subseteq U^\perp \), then \((U, V)\) is a left weak AB context in \( \mathcal{C} \).
2. If \( U^\perp = \mathcal{C} \), then \((U, V)\) is a left AB context in \( \mathcal{C} \).
Proof. By assumption, we have that $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ are closed under direct summands, and $\mathcal{U}$ is closed under $\xi$-extensions and cocones of $\xi$-deflations. So $\omega := \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V}$ is closed under direct summands. It follows from Corollary 3.10 that $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{U}^\perp$ and $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{U}^\perp$, which implies that $\omega$ is $\mathcal{U}$-injective.

Now, let $U \in \mathcal{U}$. Consider the following $\mathcal{E}$-triangle

\[
\begin{array}{c}
U \\
V' \\
U'
\end{array} \xrightarrow{=} \begin{array}{c}
V \\
U'
\end{array} \xrightarrow{=} \begin{array}{c}
U
\end{array}
\]

in $\xi$ with $U' \in \mathcal{U}$ and $V' \in \mathcal{V}$. It follows that $V' \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V} = \omega$ from the fact that $\mathcal{U}$ is closed under $\xi$-extensions, and so $\omega$ is a $\xi$-cogenerator in $\mathcal{U}$. Thus $(\mathcal{U}, \omega)$ is a left Frobenius pair in $\mathcal{C}$.

(1) By Corollary 3.10, $\mathcal{V}$ is closed under $\xi$-extensions and cones of $\xi$-inflations. Since $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ by assumption, $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ is a left weak $AB$ context in $\mathcal{C}$.

(2) It is clear by (1). □

Our main result is the following correspondence theorem.

**Theorem 4.21.** For an integer $n \geq 1$, consider the following classes:

- $\mathfrak{A} := \{A \text{ pair } (\mathcal{X}, \omega) \text{ in } \mathcal{C} : (\mathcal{X}, \omega) \text{ is a left Frobenius pair in } \mathcal{C}\}$,
- $\mathfrak{B} := \{A \text{ pair } (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \text{ in } \mathcal{C} : (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \text{ is a left weak AB context}\}$,
- $\mathfrak{C} := \{A \text{ pair } (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) \text{ in } \mathcal{C} : (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) \text{ is a cotorsion pair in } \mathcal{C} \text{ with } \mathcal{U} \text{ resolving and } \mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{U}^\perp\}$,
- $\mathfrak{D} := \{A \text{ pair } (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) \text{ in } \mathcal{C} : (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) \text{ is an } n\text{-cotorsion pair in } \mathcal{C} \text{ with } \mathcal{U} \text{ resolving and } \mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{U}^\perp\}$.

Then we have

(1) There is a one-one correspondence between $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ given by

\[
\Phi : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B} \text{ via } (\mathcal{X}, \omega) \rightarrow (\mathcal{X}, \omega^\perp),
\]

\[
\Psi : \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A} \text{ via } (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}).
\]

(2) $\mathfrak{C} \subseteq \mathfrak{B}$.

(3) $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{D}$.

Proof. (1) Following Proposition 4.18, we know that $\Phi$ is well-defined. It suffices to prove $\Phi \Psi = 1_{\mathfrak{B}}$ and $\Psi \Phi = 1_{\mathfrak{A}}$.

Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ be a left weak $AB$ context. Then

$\Phi \Psi (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \Phi (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}) = (\mathcal{A}, (\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B})^\perp)$.

By Proposition 4.19 we have $\mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B})^\perp$. It follows that $\Phi \Psi (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ and $\Phi \Psi = 1_{\mathfrak{B}}$.

Conversely, let $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ be a left Frobenius pair. Then

$\Psi \Phi (\mathcal{X}, \omega) = \Psi (\mathcal{X}, \omega^\perp) = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X} \cap \omega^\perp)$.

Since $\mathcal{X} \cap \omega^\perp = \omega$ by Proposition 4.11, we have $\Psi \Phi (\mathcal{X}, \omega) = (\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ and $\Phi \Phi = 1_{\mathfrak{A}}$.

(2) It follows from Proposition 4.20.

(3) It follows from Proposition 3.9. □

Furthermore, we get the following result.
Theorem 4.22. For an integer \( n \geq 1 \), consider the following classes:

- \( \mathfrak{A}' := \{ \text{A pair } (X, \omega) \text{ in } \mathcal{C} : (X, \omega) \text{ is a left Frobenius pair with } X^\lambda = \mathcal{C} \} \),
- \( \mathfrak{B}' := \{ \text{A pair } (A, B) \text{ in } \mathcal{C} : (A, B) \text{ is a left } AB \text{ context} \} \),
- \( \mathfrak{C}' := \{ \text{A pair } (U, V) \text{ in } \mathcal{C} : (U, V) \text{ is a cotorsion pair in } \mathcal{C} \text{ with } U \text{ resolving and } U^\lambda = \mathcal{C} \} \),
- \( \mathfrak{D}' := \{ \text{A pair } (U, V) \text{ in } \mathcal{C} : (U, V) \text{ is an } n\text{-cotorsion pair in } \mathcal{C} \text{ with } U \text{ resolving and } U^\lambda = \mathcal{C} \} \).

Then \( \mathfrak{B}' = \mathfrak{C}' = \mathfrak{D}' \) and there is a one-one correspondence between \( \mathfrak{A}' \) and \( \mathfrak{B}' \).

Proof. By Theorem 4.21 it suffices to show \( \mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{C} \). Now the assertion follows from Proposition 4.19.

Following Example 4.8(1) and Theorem 4.21 we have that \( (\mathcal{G}P(\xi), P(\xi)^\lambda) \) is a left weak AB context in \( \mathcal{C} \). In addition, if \( \sup \{ \xi \mbox{-gp} d T \mid T \in \mathcal{C} \} < \infty \), then \( (\mathcal{G}P(\xi), P(\xi)^\lambda) \) is a left AB context by Theorem 4.22.

Now let \( \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{T} \) be a triangulated category, [1] the shift functor, and \( \mathcal{E} = \Hom_{\mathcal{T}}(-, -[1]) \). Then we recover Huang-Ma-Zhao’s result as follows.

Corollary 4.23. (cf. [4, Theorem 4.23]) Let \( \mathcal{C} \) be a triangulated category with a proper class of triangles. For an integer \( n \geq 1 \), consider the following classes:

- \( \mathfrak{A}' := \{ \text{A pair } (X, \omega) \text{ in } \mathcal{T} : (X, \omega) \text{ is a left Frobenius pair with } X^\lambda = \mathcal{T} \} \),
- \( \mathfrak{B}' := \{ \text{A pair } (A, B) \text{ in } \mathcal{T} : (A, B) \text{ is a left } AB \text{ context} \} \),
- \( \mathfrak{C}' := \{ \text{A pair } (U, V) \text{ in } \mathcal{T} : (U, V) \text{ is a cotorsion pair in } \mathcal{T} \text{ with } U \text{ resolving and } U^\lambda = \mathcal{T} \} \),
- \( \mathfrak{D}' := \{ \text{A pair } (U, V) \text{ in } \mathcal{T} : (U, V) \text{ is an } n\text{-cotorsion pair in } \mathcal{T} \text{ with } U \text{ resolving and } U^\lambda = \mathcal{T} \} \).

Then \( \mathfrak{B}' = \mathfrak{C}' = \mathfrak{D}' \) and there is a one-one correspondence between \( \mathfrak{A}' \) and \( \mathfrak{B}' \).

Finally, let \( \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{A} \) be an abelian category, and \( \mathcal{E} = \Ext^1_{\mathcal{A}}(-, -) \). Then we recover partially Becerril-Mendoza-Pérez-Santiago’s result as follows.

Corollary 4.24. (cf. [3, Theorem 5.4]) Let \( \mathcal{A} \) be an abelian category. For an integer \( n \geq 1 \), consider the following classes:

- \( \mathfrak{A}' := \{ \text{A pair } (X, \omega) \text{ in } \mathcal{A} : (X, \omega) \text{ is a left Frobenius pair with } X^\lambda = \mathcal{A} \} \),
- \( \mathfrak{B}' := \{ \text{A pair } (A, B) \text{ in } \mathcal{A} : (A, B) \text{ is a left } AB \text{ context} \} \),
- \( \mathfrak{C}' := \{ \text{A pair } (U, V) \text{ in } \mathcal{A} : (U, V) \text{ is a cotorsion pair in } \mathcal{A} \text{ with } U \text{ resolving and } U^\lambda = \mathcal{A} \} \),
- \( \mathfrak{D}' := \{ \text{A pair } (U, V) \text{ in } \mathcal{A} : (U, V) \text{ is an } n\text{-cotorsion pair in } \mathcal{A} \text{ with } U \text{ resolving and } U^\lambda = \mathcal{A} \} \).

Then \( \mathfrak{B}' = \mathfrak{C}' = \mathfrak{D}' \) and there is a one-one correspondence between \( \mathfrak{A}' \) and \( \mathfrak{B}' \).
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