

# RELATIVE TILTING THEORY IN ABELIAN CATEGORIES II: $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -TILTING THEORY

ALEJANDRO ARGUDÍN-MONROY

*Centro de Ciencias Matemáticas  
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Morelia, Michoacán, MEXICO.*

OCTAVIO MENDOZA-HERNÁNDEZ

*Instituto de Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México,  
D.F. MEXICO.*

**ABSTRACT.** We introduce a relative tilting theory in abelian categories and show that this work offers a unified framework of different previous notions of tilting, ranging from Auslander-Solberg relative tilting modules on Artin algebras to infinitely generated tilting modules on arbitrary rings. Furthermore, we see that it presents a tool for developing new tilting theories in categories that can be embedded nicely in an abelian category. In particular, we will show how the tilting theory in exact categories built this way, coincides with tilting objects in extriangulated categories introduced recently. We will review Bazzoni's tilting characterization, the relative homological dimensions on the induced tilting classes and parametrise certain cotorsion-like pairs by using  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting classes. As an application, we show how to construct relative tilting classes and cotorsion pairs in  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  (the category of representations of a quiver  $Q$  in an abelian category  $\mathcal{C}$ ) from tilting classes in  $\mathcal{C}$ , where  $Q$  is finite-cone-shape.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Preliminaries	4
3. $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting classes	7
4. $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting versus other notions of tilting	25
5. Tilting and cotorsion pairs in quiver representations	45

---

*E-mail addresses:* `argudin@ciencias.unam.mx`, `omendoza@matem.unam.mx`.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 18G20, 16E10; Secondary: 18E10, 18G25.

*Key words and phrases.* Relative Cotorsion pairs, relative homological dimensions, relative tilting theory, Auslander-Buchweitz-Reiten approximation theory.

*Funding:* This work was supported by the Project PAPIIT-Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México IN100520. The first author was also supported by a postdoctoral fellowship from Programa de Desarrollo de las Ciencias Básicas, Ministerio de educación y cultura, Universidad de la República, Uruguay. He is currently supported with a postdoctoral fellowship from Programa de Becas Posdoctorales en la UNAM, Dirección General de Asuntos del Personal Académico, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Acknowledgements	50
References	50

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In the last 40 years, tilting theory has been generalized in many ways and contexts with different purposes. Its roots can be traced back to the seminal work of P. Gabriel [36], which showed a bijection between the indecomposable modules over a finite-dimensional algebra and the positive roots of a Lie group. After that, J. Bernstein, I. M. Gelfand and V. A. Ponomarev deepened this study with the aim of constructing all of the indecomposable modules over a finite-dimensional algebra [23]. Some time later, M. Auslander, M. I. Platzeck and I. Reiten generalised these results constructing for the first time what we now know as a tilting object in the context of finitely generated modules over Artin algebras [12]. It was S. Brenner and M. Butler who axiomatized and gave name to these objects in [27]. Subsequently, a more general definition was offered by D. Happel and C. M. Ringel in [39] with the goal of achieving a better understanding of tilting objects. Few years later, this definition would be extended from tilting objects of projective dimension  $\leq 1$  to tilting objects of finite projective dimension by Y. Miyashita in [48], but still under the context of finitely generated modules. Later on, the tilting theory context would be extended from finitely generated modules over Artin algebras to infinitely generated modules over arbitrary rings, this is the case of the work of L. Angeleri Hügel and F. U. Coelho in [5].

As can be appreciated, in the literature there are a diverse family of different tilting definitions with different properties and objectives. This family of tilting theories can be bluntly divided in two subfamilies: “big” tilting theories and “small” tilting ones.

The small tilting theories can be described as the ones defined using only finite coproducts. Namely, all the classical tilting theories, which were developed for finitely generated modules, are generalized by the small tilting theories. Among them, we can mention the Brenner-Butler, the Happel-Ringel, and the Miyashita theories referred above, but also we can find more recent research works as the tilting functors by R. Martínez and M. Ortiz in [46].

The big tilting theories are those ones that require arbitrary coproducts on its constructions of tilting classes. These kind of theories started coming up when, inter alia, the works of Brenner-Butler, Happel-Ringel, I. Assem [9] and S. O. Smalø [55] were extended to the setting of infinitely generated modules over arbitrary rings in the works of R. R. Colby and K. R. Fuller [29], R. Colpi, G. D’Este and A. Tonolo [30], R. Colpi, A. Tonolo and Jan Trlifaj [31], R. Colpi and J. Trlifaj [32], A. Tonolo, J. Trlifaj, and L. Angeleri Hügel [4], and L. Angeleri Hügel and F. U. Coelho [5]. Recent works on big tilting theories are focused on abelian categories with coproducts as can be seen in the works of L. Positselski and J. Št’ovíček [53], P. Nicolás, M. Saorín and A. Zvonareva [50].

This manuscript is the last of two forthcoming papers and it is devoted to develop new tools for understanding the tilting phenomenon. Namely, we will be interested in studying the relation of *cotorsion-like pairs* in an abelian category, with a new tilting notion associated to a subcategory  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ , called  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting. This kind

of relations were studied for the first time by M. Auslander and I. Reiten in [14, 15]. One of their results is *the Auslander-Reiten Correspondence* [15, Thm. 4.4], which shows a correspondence between tilting modules over an Artin algebra and covariantly finite subcategories. It is worth mentioning that this theorem has been taken to different contexts by different authors. Some of them are M. Auslander and Ø. Solberg [18, Thms, 3.2 and 3.24], S. K. Mohamed [49, Prop. 4.2], L. Angeleri and O. Mendoza [3, Thm. 3.2], and B. Zhu and X. Zhuang in [59, Thm. 2].

The paper is organized as follows. The cotorsion-like pairs we previously referred to were presented in [7]. They are linked with a possible generalization of the Auslander-Reiten theory, developed in [14], and the Auslander-Buchweitz approximation theory, developed in [11]. In Section 2, we will recall the main definitions and results of [7]. In particular, we will recall notions related to the cotorsion pairs, relative homological dimensions, relative resolution dimensions, closure properties and the class  $\text{Fac}_n^{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T})$ .

In Section 3, we state and develop our  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting theory. The goal is to present a tilting theory relative to a class of objects  $\mathcal{X}$  together with a set of tools that provides us information on the induced homological dimensions and approximation theory. In order that our results can be used in a wide variety of contexts, we sought to provide a definition that on one hand encompasses different prior notions and on the second hand can be specialized to big or small tilting classes according to our needs. In order to do that, we define  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting classes  $\mathcal{T}$  in an abelian category  $\mathcal{C}$ , see Definition 3.1, and say that an object  $T \in \mathcal{C}$  is big (small)  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting if  $\text{Add}(T)$  ( $\text{add}(T)$ ) is an  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting class. Let us describe briefly the most relevant results. In Theorem 3.12 we give some essential properties of the  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting classes, among them it is shown that the pair  $({}^{\perp}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp}), \mathcal{T}^{\perp})$  is  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete. On the other hand, Theorem 3.13 is the generalization of the “Bazzoni’s tilting characterization theorem” which was originally provided for tilting modules over a ring [20, Thm. 3.11]. We also study the relationship between different relative homological dimensions of classes related with  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting classes, as can be seen for example in Propositions 3.18, 3.19 and 3.20. We also have related the big and the small tilting classes. Indeed, in Theorem 3.36 it is shown that, for a class of compact objects  $\mathcal{X}$ , an object  $T$  is big  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting if and only if it is small  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting. One of our goals is to study the properties satisfied by the pair  $({}^{\perp}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp}), \mathcal{T}^{\perp})$  for a  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting class  $\mathcal{T}$ . In order to do that, we introduce the notion of  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting triple and characterize them in Theorem 3.42. There are several consequences of the preceding theorem: (1) we give a bijective correspondence between equivalence classes of  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete hereditary cotorsion pairs (satisfying certain properties) and  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting classes belonging to  $\mathcal{X}$  (see Corollary 3.45); and (2) we get two versions of the Auslander-Reiten Correspondence in Corollary 3.49 (for big tilting) and Corollary 3.50 (for small tilting).

In Section 4, we will show that the notion of  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting generalizes a big variety of previous notions of tilting which appeared in different contexts. We will also see how our results help us to find equivalences between different tilting notions. The first example of this section are the  $\infty$ -tilting objects and pairs which were defined by Leonid Positselski and Jan Šťovíček in [52]. The second one is related with the Miyashita  $n$ -tilting modules, which can be seen as  $n\text{-mod}(R)$ -tilting modules. In the third example of this section, we will develop a theory of Miyashita  $n$ -tilting modules of type  $FP_n$ , for left  $n$ -coherent rings. The fourth example of this section is devoted

to study the tilting phenomena in the context of small exact categories. Namely, for an small exact category  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ , with enough  $\mathcal{E}$ -projectives and  $\mathcal{E}$ -injectives, we introduce the small  $n$ -tilting and the Auslander-Solberg  $n$ -tilting classes in  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ . We show that both of them are equivalent to the Zhu-Zhuang tilting theory for exact categories developed in [59]. Moreover, we will explore a nice embedding of  $\mathcal{A}$  into the functor category  $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{P}^{op})$ , given by Yoneda's functor, where  $\mathcal{P}$  is the set of all the  $\mathcal{E}$ -projective objects in  $\mathcal{A}$ . We also show that the  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting theory developed in the abelian category  $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{P}^{op})$  is strongly related with the small  $n$ -tilting classes in  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ . The fifth example is devoted to the S.K. Mohamed's relative tilting theory [49] and the Auslander-Solberg tilting objects [18]. It is worth mentioning that Auslander-Solberg relative tilting theory has been studied by several authors in the context of Gorenstein homological algebra. In particular, M. Pooyan and Y. Siamak recently published a paper on infinitely generated Gorenstein tilting modules [51]. We believe that our work will be a complementary tool for this research line. In the sixth example, we will study the tilting classes of functors developed by R. Martínez and M. Ortiz [44, 45, 46], and characterize them in terms of  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting theory. Finally, in the last example, we will study the relationship between silting, quasitilting and  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting modules, see Theorems 4.63 and 4.65. One of the consequences of doing this is that we found enough conditions for a quasitilting finendo module to be silting (see Remark 4.66).

In Section 5, we consider an abelian category  $\mathcal{C}$  and a finite-cone-shape quiver  $Q$ . It is presented two main results. The first one is Theorem 5.2 which tells us how to build a tilting class in the abelian subcategory  $\text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C}) \subseteq \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  and also in  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  from a tilting class in  $\mathcal{C}$ . The second one is Theorem 5.6 that tells us how to construct hereditary complete cotorsion pairs in the category of representations from tilting classes in the abelian category  $\mathcal{C}$ . Finally, some concrete examples are given where these theorems can be applied.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we introduce all the necessary notions and results to the development of the paper. For more details, we recommend the reader to see in [7].

**2.1. Notation.** Throughout the paper, we denote by  $\mathcal{C}$  an abelian category. The symbol  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  means that  $\mathcal{M}$  is a class of objects of  $\mathcal{C}$ . In a similar way, the symbol  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}^2$  will mean that  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  are classes of objects of  $\mathcal{C}$ . On the other hand,  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  will mean that  $C$  is an object of  $\mathcal{C}$ . We will use the Grothendieck's notation [38] to distinguish abelian categories with further structure as ABk and their duals ABk\*, for  $k = 3, 4, 5$ .

For  $n \geq 0$ , we will consider the  $n$ -th Yoneda extensions bifunctor  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{C}}^n(-, -) : \mathcal{C}^{op} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Ab}$ , the long exact sequence induced by a short exact sequence [47, Chap. VI, Thm. 5.1] and the Shifting Lemma [7, Lem. 2.2]. If  $\mathcal{C}$  is AB4, for any family  $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$  of objects in  $\mathcal{C}$ , we will make use (without mention it) of the natural isomorphism [6, Thm. 3.12]

$$\Psi_n : \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{C}}^n \left( \bigoplus_{i \in I} A_i, B \right) \rightarrow \prod_{i \in I} \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{C}}^n(A_i, B) \quad \forall B \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ . For any integer  $i \geq 0$ , we consider the right  $i$ -th orthogonal complement  $\mathcal{X}^{\perp_i} := \{C \in \mathcal{C} \mid \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{C}}^i(-, C)|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0\}$  and the total right orthogonal complement  $\mathcal{X}^{\perp} := \bigcap_{i \geq 1} \mathcal{X}^{\perp_i}$  of  $\mathcal{X}$ . Dually, we have the  $i$ -th and the total left orthogonal complements  ${}^{\perp_i}\mathcal{X}$  and  ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}$  of  $\mathcal{X}$ , respectively. In case we have some  $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  such that  $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\perp}$  ( $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}$ ), we say that  $\mathcal{Y}$  is  **$\mathcal{X}$ -injective** ( **$\mathcal{X}$ -projective**).

For a given  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ , we have that:  $\text{smd}(\mathcal{M})$  is the class of all the direct summands of objects in  $\mathcal{M}$ ;  $\mathcal{M}^{\oplus}$  ( $\mathcal{M}^{\oplus < \infty}$ ) is the class of (finite) coproducts of objects in  $\mathcal{M}$ ;  $\text{add}(\mathcal{M}) := \text{smd}(\mathcal{M}^{\oplus < \infty})$  and  $\text{Add}(\mathcal{M}) := \text{smd}(\mathcal{M}^{\oplus})$ . Furthermore, in case  $\mathcal{M}$  consists of a single object  $M$ , we set  $M^{\oplus} := \mathcal{M}^{\oplus}$ ,  $M^{\oplus < \infty} := \mathcal{M}^{\oplus < \infty}$ ,  $\text{smd}(M) := \text{smd}(\mathcal{M})$ ,  $\text{Add}(M) := \text{Add}(\mathcal{M})$ ,  $\text{add}(M) := \text{add}(\mathcal{M})$ ,  $M^{\perp} := \mathcal{M}^{\perp}$ , and  ${}^{\perp}M := {}^{\perp}\mathcal{M}$ .

One important feature of this work is that we do not assume the existence of enough projectives or enough injectives in the abelian category  $\mathcal{C}$ . Instead we will be working with the following notions appearing in [11]. For  $(\mathcal{X}, \omega) \subseteq \mathcal{C}^2$ , it is said that  $\omega$  is a **relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{X}$**  if  $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  and any  $X \in \mathcal{X}$  admits an exact sequence  $X \hookrightarrow W \twoheadrightarrow X'$ , with  $W \in \omega$  and  $X' \in \mathcal{X}$ . The notion of **relative generator** is defined dually.

**2.2. Cotorsion pairs, approximations and related notions.** Following [7, Def. 3.1], we recall that for  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}^2$  and  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ , it is said that  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is a **left (right) cotorsion pair in  $\mathcal{X}$**  if  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X} = {}^{\perp_1}\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$  ( $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A}^{\perp_1} \cap \mathcal{X}$ ). Moreover,  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is a **cotorsion pair in  $\mathcal{X}$**  if it is a left and right cotorsion pair in  $\mathcal{X}$ . In case  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{C}$ , we say that  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is a left (right) cotorsion pair if it is a left (right) cotorsion pair in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Cotorsion pairs are known for their relation with approximations. Namely, for a given  $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ , a morphism  $f : Z \rightarrow M$  is called  **$\mathcal{Z}$ -precover** if  $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$  and  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Z', f) : \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Z', Z) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Z', M)$  is an epimorphism  $\forall Z' \in \mathcal{Z}$ . In case  $f$  fits in an exact sequence  $M' \hookrightarrow Z \twoheadrightarrow M$ , where  $M' \in \mathcal{Z}^{\perp_1}$ ,  $f$  is called **special  $\mathcal{Z}$ -precover**. Dually, we have the notion of  **$\mathcal{Z}$ -preenvelope** and **special  $\mathcal{Z}$ -preenvelope**.

Let  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}^2$ . Following, [7, Def. 3.12], it is said that  $\mathcal{Z}$  is **special precovering in  $\mathcal{X}$**  if any  $X \in \mathcal{X}$  admits an exact sequence  $B \hookrightarrow A \twoheadrightarrow X$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  with  $A \in \mathcal{Z} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{Z}^{\perp_1} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . The notion of **special preenveloping in  $\mathcal{X}$**  is defined dually.

Recall that a cotorsion pair  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is left complete if  $\mathcal{A}$  is special precovering in  $\mathcal{C}$ . As a generalization of that, and following [7, Def. 3.13], it is said that a (not necessarily cotorsion) pair  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}^2$  is **left  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete** if any  $X \in \mathcal{X}$  admits an exact sequence  $B \hookrightarrow A \twoheadrightarrow X$ , with  $A \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . The notion of **right  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete pair** is defined dually. Moreover, a pair is  **$\mathcal{X}$ -complete** if it is right and left  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete. The pair  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is  **$\mathcal{X}$ -hereditary** if  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{C}}^k(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) = 0$   $\forall k > 0$  [7, Def. 3.7].

### 2.3. Relative homological dimensions and relative resolution dimensions.

In [7], we presented a possible generalization of a part of the Auslander-Buchweitz-Reiten approximation theory [11, 14] that were useful for the development of  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting theory. The goal of such work was to study the relations between the relative homological dimensions and the existence of a particular class of relative (co)resolutions. In what follows, we recall some of these notions and notations introduced in [7], for a more detailed treatment, we recommend the reader to see in [7].

Let  $\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ , and  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ . Following [11], the  **$\mathcal{A}$ -projective dimension**  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{A}}(C)$  of  $C$  is  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{A}}(C) := \min \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{C}}^k(C, \mathcal{A}) = 0 \forall k > n\}$ , where the minimum of the empty set is the symbol  $\infty$ . The  **$\mathcal{A}$ -projective dimension** of  $\mathcal{B}$  is  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{B}) := \sup \{\text{pd}_{\mathcal{A}}(B) \mid B \in \mathcal{B}\}$ . Dually, the  **$\mathcal{A}$ -injective dimension**  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{A}}(C)$  of  $C$  and the  **$\mathcal{A}$ -injective dimension**  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{B})$  of  $\mathcal{B}$  are defined dually.

We recall now, from [7, Def. 4.1], the notions of relative (co)resolution classes. Indeed, let  $M \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ . A  **$\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -coresolution** of  $M$  is an exact sequence in  $\mathcal{C}$  of the form  $0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{f_0} Y_0 \xrightarrow{f_1} Y_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow Y_{n-1} \xrightarrow{f_n} Y_n \rightarrow \dots$ , with  $Y_k \in \mathcal{Y} \cup \{0\} \forall k \geq 0$  and  $\text{Im}(f_i) \in \mathcal{X} \cup \{0\} \forall i \geq 1$ . The class of all the objects in  $\mathcal{C}$  having a  $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -coresolution is denoted by  $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}, \infty}^{\vee}$ . A **finite (of length  $n$ )  $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -coresolution** of  $M$  is an exact sequence in  $\mathcal{C}$  of the form  $0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{f_0} Y_0 \xrightarrow{f_1} Y_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow Y_{n-1} \xrightarrow{f_n} Y_n \rightarrow 0$ , with  $Y_n \in \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y}$ ,  $Y_k \in \mathcal{Y} \forall k \in [0, n-1]$ , and  $\text{Im}(f_i) \in \mathcal{X} \forall i \in [1, n-1]$ . The class of all the objects in  $\mathcal{C}$  having a finite  $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -coresolution is denoted by  $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\vee}$ . Moreover, the class of all the objects in  $\mathcal{C}$  having a  $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -coresolution of length  $\leq n$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}, n}^{\vee}$ . Notice that  $\cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}, n}^{\vee} = \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\vee} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}, \infty}^{\vee}$ . The  **$\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -coresolution dimension** of  $M$  is  $\text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathcal{X}}(M) := \min \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid M \in \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}, n}^{\vee}\}$ . For  $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ , we set  $\text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Z}) := \sup \{\text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathcal{X}}(Z) \mid Z \in \mathcal{Z}\}$ . We consider the classes  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})_{\infty}^{\vee} := \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}, \infty}^{\vee}$ ,  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})^{\vee} := \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\vee}$  and  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})_n^{\vee} := \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}, n}^{\vee}$ . Dually, it can be defined the  $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -resolution (of length  $n$ ) of  $M$ , the  $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -resolution dimension  $\text{resdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathcal{X}}(M)$  of  $M$  and the classes  $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\wedge}$ ,  $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}, \infty}^{\wedge}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}, n}^{\wedge}$ . We also have the classes  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{X})_{\infty}^{\wedge} := \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}, \infty}^{\wedge} \cap \mathcal{X}$ ,  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{X})^{\wedge} := \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\wedge} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{X})_n^{\wedge} := \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{X}, n}^{\wedge} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . If  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{C}$ , we omit the “ $\mathcal{X}$ ” symbol in the above notations. Note that,  $M$  is isomorphic to some object in  $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y}$  if, and only if,  $\text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathcal{X}}(M) = 0$  (respectively,  $\text{resdim}_{\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathcal{X}}(M) = 0$ ).

**2.4. Closure properties.** Let  $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  and  $n \geq 1$ . Following [7, Def. 2.4], we recall that  $\mathcal{Y}$  is **closed by  $n$ -quotients in  $\mathcal{X}$**  if for any exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow Y_n \xrightarrow{\varphi_n} \dots \rightarrow Y_1 \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} B \rightarrow 0$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , with  $Y_i \in \mathcal{Y}$ ,  $\text{Ker}(\varphi_i) \in \mathcal{X} \forall i \in [1, n]$  and  $B \in \mathcal{X}$ , we have that  $B \in \mathcal{Y}$ . The notion of being **closed by  $n$ -subobjects in  $\mathcal{X}$**  is defined dually. These closure properties are useful to characterize classes  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  such that  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T}) \leq n$  and  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T}) \leq n$ , respectively, see [7, Prop. 2.6].

Other closure notions that we will be using in the development of the paper are the following ones [7, Def. 3.3]. Let  $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ . We say that  $\mathcal{M}$  is **closed under mono-cokernels in  $\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{X}$**  if, for any exact sequence  $M \hookrightarrow M' \twoheadrightarrow M''$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , with  $M, M' \in \mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{X}$ , we have that  $M'' \in \mathcal{M}$ . Dually, it can be defined the notion of being **closed under epi-kernels in  $\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{X}$** . In case  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ , we will simply say that  $\mathcal{M}$  is closed under mono-cokernels and epi-kernels, respectively. Furthermore,  $\mathcal{M}$  is  **$\mathcal{X}$ -resolving** if  $\mathcal{M}$  contains an  $\mathcal{X}$ -projective relative generator in  $\mathcal{X}$ , it is closed under epi-kernels in  $\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and under extensions; and the notion of being  **$\mathcal{X}$ -coresolving** is defined dually. These notions are very useful to identify  $\mathcal{X}$ -hereditary pairs, see [7, Lems. 3.4 and 3.6].

Following [22, Def. 2.2], a class  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  is **right thick (left thick)** if it is closed under extensions, direct summands and mono-cokernels (epi-kernels); and  $\mathcal{X}$  is **thick** if it is left and right thick.

**2.5. The class of relative  $n$ -quotients.** Let  $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ . Following [7, Sect. 5], we recall the notion of the relative  $n$ -( $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{T}$ )-quotients in  $\mathcal{C}$ , and the different variants related with small and big classes.

For any integer  $n \geq 1$ ,  $\text{Fac}_n^{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T})$  denotes the class of the objects  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  admitting an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow T_n \xrightarrow{f_n} \dots \xrightarrow{f_2} T_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} C \rightarrow 0$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , with  $\text{Ker}(f_i) \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $T_i \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} \forall i \in [1, n]$ . We also define  $\text{Gen}_n^{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T}) := \text{Fac}_n^{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T}^{\oplus})$  and  $\text{gen}_n^{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T}) := \text{Fac}_n^{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T}^{\oplus < \infty})$ . For an object  $T \in \mathcal{C}$ , we define  $\text{Gen}_n^{\mathcal{X}}(T) := \text{Gen}_n^{\mathcal{X}}(\text{Add}(T))$  and  $\text{gen}_n^{\mathcal{X}}(T) := \text{gen}_n^{\mathcal{X}}(\text{add}(T))$ . In case of  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{C}$ , we set  $\text{Fac}_n(\mathcal{T}) := \text{Fac}_n^{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{T})$ ,  $\text{Gen}_n(\mathcal{T}) := \text{Gen}_n^{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{T})$  and  $\text{gen}_n(\mathcal{T}) := \text{gen}_n^{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{T})$ . Some closure properties that such classes have can be found in [7, Prop. 5.2].

### 3. $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -TILTING CLASSES

In this section, we introduce the notion of  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting class in an abelian category  $\mathcal{C}$  and develop a relative tilting theory on  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ . Without further ado, let us define our main object of study.

**Definition 3.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . A class  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  is  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting if the following conditions hold true.*

- (T0):  $\mathcal{T} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{T})$ .
- (T1):  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T}) \leq n$ .
- (T2):  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^{\perp}$ .
- (T3): *There is a class  $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\vee}$  which is a relative generator in  $\mathcal{X}$ .*
- (T4): *There is a class  $\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{T}^{\perp}$  which is a relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{X}$ .*
- (T5): *Every  $Z \in \mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{X}$  admits a  $\mathcal{T}$ -precover  $T' \rightarrow Z$ , with  $T' \in \mathcal{X}$ .*

An  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting class  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  is **big (small)** if  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}^{\oplus}$  ( $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}^{\oplus < \infty}$ ). An object  $T \in \mathcal{C}$  is **big (small)  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting** if  $\text{Add}(T)$  ( $\text{add}(T)$ ) is  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting.

Notice that the condition (T4) requires the existence of an  $\mathcal{X}$ -injective relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{X}$ . It is a well-known fact that this property is satisfied, for example, by the class of finitely generated modules over an Artin  $k$ -algebra. A non trivial situation where there also exist such relative cogenerator is in the category  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  of representations in an abelian category  $\mathcal{C}$  of an arbitrary quiver  $Q$ . Indeed, in [8, Cor. 5.18], we show that, if  $Q$  has a finite number of paths starting or ending at each vertex of  $Q$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  has enough injectives, then the class  $\mathcal{X} := \text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C})$  (of all the representations having finite support) admits an  $\mathcal{X}$ -injective relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{X}$ . On the other hand, the condition (T5) is very helpful to prove nice properties of the pair  $({}^{\perp}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp}), \mathcal{T}^{\perp})$ . For example, by using (T5), we can show that such a pair is  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete and that  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$  is a relative generator in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{X}$ .

In Section 4, we will show that the above definition generalizes a big variety of previous notions of tilting. In Section 5, more concrete examples are given in the context of representations of quivers in abelian categories. For now, the most nearby example is the tilting object in abelian categories developed by Leonid Positselski and Jan Šťovíček [53], that we call PS  $n$ -tilting.

**Definition 3.2.** [53, Sect. 2, Thm. 3.4(3)] *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be AB3 and AB3\* with an injective cogenerator. An object  $T \in \mathcal{C}$  is **PS  $n$ -tilting** if the following conditions hold true.*

- (PST1):  $\text{pd}(T) \leq n$ .
- (PST2):  $\text{Add}(T) \subseteq T^{\perp}$ .
- (PST3): *There is a generating class  $\mathcal{G}$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  such that  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq (\text{Add}(T))^{\vee}$ .*

**Remark 3.3.** Notice that  $T \in \mathcal{C}$  is PS  $n$ -tilting if, and only if,  $T$  is big  $n$ - $\mathcal{C}$ -tilting. Indeed, it can be seen, by taking  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{T} = \text{Add}(T)$  in Definition 3.1, that the conditions (T4) and (T5) are satisfied trivially, and that the conditions (PST1), (PST2), and (PST3) coincide with (T1), (T2), and (T3), respectively.

### 3.1. Elementary properties of relative tilting classes.

**Lemma 3.4.** For  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ , the following statements hold true.

- (a) If  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  satisfies (T2), then  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp)$ .
- (b) If  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  satisfies (T1) and (T4), then  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq (\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X})_{\mathcal{X},n}^\vee$ .

*Proof.* (a) By (T2),  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^\perp$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{M}^\perp)$ , for any class  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ . Therefore  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp)$ .

(b) It follows from [7, Prop. 4.5(a)].  $\square$

**Lemma 3.5.** For  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ , the following statements hold true.

- (a)  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{X}}^\vee \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^\vee \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp) \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X})$ .
- (b) if  $\mathcal{X} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{X})$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  satisfies (T0) and (T2), then  $(\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_{\mathcal{X}}^\vee \cap \mathcal{T}^\perp = \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$ .

*Proof.* (a) The inclusion  $\mathcal{T}^\vee \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp)$  follows from [7, Lem. 4.3].

(b) Let  $A \in (\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_{\mathcal{X}}^\vee \cap \mathcal{T}^\perp$ . Hence, there is an exact sequence

$$\eta : A \hookrightarrow T_0 \twoheadrightarrow A' \text{ with } T_0 \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} \text{ and } A' \in (\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_{\mathcal{X}}^\vee,$$

where  $A' \in {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp)$  by (a). Note that  $\eta$  splits since  $A \in \mathcal{T}^\perp$ , and thus,  $A \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$ .

Since  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq (\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_{\mathcal{X}}^\vee$ , we get from (T2) that  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq (\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_{\mathcal{X}}^\vee \cap \mathcal{T}^\perp$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.6.** Let  $\mathcal{X} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  satisfying (T0), (T1), (T2) and (T4). Then

- (a)  $\text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{X}}((\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_{\mathcal{X}}^\vee \cap \mathcal{X}) \leq \text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T})$ ;
- (b)  $(\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_{\mathcal{X}}^\vee = (\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_{\mathcal{X},k}^\vee \forall k > \text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T})$ .

*Proof.* We consider  $\mathcal{W} := (\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_{\mathcal{X}}^\vee \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $m := \max\{1, \text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T})\}$ .

(a) Let  $X \in \mathcal{W}$ . Then, there is an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{f_0} Y_0 \xrightarrow{f_1} Y_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow Y_{m-1} \xrightarrow{f_m} Y_m \rightarrow 0,$$

with  $Y_m \in \mathcal{W}$ ,  $Y_0, Y_i \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $\text{Im}(f_i) \in \mathcal{X} \forall i \in [1, m-1]$ . Moreover, by (T1), (T4), and [7, Prop. 2.6], it follows that  $Y_m \in \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Then, by Lemma 3.5(b),  $Y_m \in \mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{T}^\perp = \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and thus  $\text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{W}) \leq m$ .

Assume now that  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T}) = 0$ . Then  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq {}^\perp \mathcal{X}$  and, for any  $W \in \mathcal{W}$ , there is an exact sequence  $\eta_W : W \hookrightarrow T_W \twoheadrightarrow C_W$  with  $T_W, C_W \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Now, since  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq {}^\perp \mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ ,  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{C}}^1(\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{W}) = 0$ . Hence  $\eta_W$  splits  $\forall W \in \mathcal{W}$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and thus  $\text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{W}) = 0$ ; proving (a).

(b) Let  $M \in (\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_{\mathcal{X}}^\vee$ . Then, there is an exact sequence

$$M \hookrightarrow T_0 \twoheadrightarrow M' \text{ with } T_0 \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} \text{ and } M' \in \mathcal{W}.$$

It follows from (a) that  $\text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{X}}(M') \leq \text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T}) = 0$ . Hence  $M' \in (\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_{\mathcal{X},n}^\vee$  and thus  $M \in (\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_{\mathcal{X},n+1}^\vee$ . Therefore, for any  $k > n$ ,  $(\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_{\mathcal{X}}^\vee = (\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_{\mathcal{X},n+1}^\vee \subseteq (\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_{\mathcal{X},k}^\vee \subseteq (\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_{\mathcal{X}}^\vee$ ; proving (b).  $\square$



**Corollary 3.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be closed under extensions,  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting, and  $\omega = \text{smd}(\omega)$  be an  $\mathcal{X}$ -projective relative generator in  $\mathcal{X}$  such that  $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\vee}$ . Then,  $\omega = \mathcal{X} \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}$  and  $\text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) \leq \text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T})$ . Furthermore,  $\omega = \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$  if  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T}) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* By the dual of [22, Prop. 2.7], we have that  $\omega = \mathcal{X} \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}$ . On the other hand,  $\omega \subseteq (\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_{\mathcal{X}}^{\vee} \cap \mathcal{X}$  since  $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\vee}$  and  $\mathcal{X}$  is closed under extensions. Therefore, by Lemma 3.6 (a), it follows that  $\text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) \leq \text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T})$ .

Let us assume that  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T}) = 0$ . Then  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}$  and  $\text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$ . Hence  $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X} \cap {}^{\perp}\mathcal{X} = \omega$ .  $\square$

The following result is a generalization of [5, Lem. 2.3].

**Lemma 3.8.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be closed under extensions. If  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  satisfies (T3), then  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Fac}_1^{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A \in \mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . By (T3), there is an exact sequence  $\eta_1 : K \hookrightarrow W \xrightarrow{a} A$ , with  $W \in \omega$  and  $K \in \mathcal{X}$ . Moreover, by (T3) and Lemma 3.5 (a), there is an exact sequence  $\eta_2 : W \xrightarrow{b} B \twoheadrightarrow C$  with  $B \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $C \in \mathcal{T}^{\vee} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq {}^{\perp}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp}) \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Notice that  $B \in \mathcal{X}$ . Now, considering the push-out of  $b$  and  $a$ , we get the exact sequences  $\eta_3 : K \hookrightarrow B \xrightarrow{x} B'$  and  $\eta_4 : A \hookrightarrow B' \twoheadrightarrow C$ , with  $B' \in \text{Fac}_1^{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T})$ . Furthermore,  $\eta_4$  splits since  $A \in \mathcal{T}^{\perp}$  and  $C \in {}^{\perp}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp})$ . Thus, there is some  $y : B' \rightarrow A$  such that  $yt = 1_A$ . Consider the exact sequence  $\eta_5 : K' \hookrightarrow B \xrightarrow{yx} A$ . Since  $B \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$ , it remains to show that  $K' \in \mathcal{X}$ . For that purpose observe that, by using  $\eta_5$  and  $\eta_2$ , we can build the exact sequence  $K \hookrightarrow K' \twoheadrightarrow C$ , where  $K, C \in \mathcal{X}$ . Therefore  $K' \in \mathcal{X}$  since  $\mathcal{X}$  is closed under extensions.  $\square$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 K & = & K & & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 W & \xhookrightarrow{b} & B & \twoheadrightarrow & C \\
 \downarrow a & & \downarrow x & & \parallel \\
 A & \xhookrightarrow{t} & B' & \twoheadrightarrow & C \\
 & & & & \\
 K & \hookrightarrow & W & \xrightarrow{a} & A \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow b & & \parallel \\
 K' & \hookrightarrow & B & \xrightarrow{yx} & A \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 C & = & C & & 
 \end{array}$$

An important property of an infinitely generated tilting module of finite projective dimension  $T \in \text{Mod}(R)$  is that  $\text{Add}(T)$  is a relative generator in  $T^{\perp}$ . In our relative context, such property can be translated as the following one:  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$  is a relative generator in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . In that sense, the following lemma is a generalization of [5, Lem. 2.4].

**Lemma 3.9.** *For a class  $\mathcal{X} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  closed under extensions and  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  satisfying (T2), (T5) and such that  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Fac}_1^{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T})$ , the following statements hold true.*

- (a)  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$  is a  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{X}$ -projective relative generator in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{X}$ .
- (b) Every morphism  $A \rightarrow X$ , with  $A \in {}^{\perp}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{X})$  (or  $A \in {}^{\perp}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp})$ ) and  $X \in \mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{X}$ , factors through  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Moreover, if  $\mathcal{T} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{T})$ , then

$$\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{X} \cap {}^{\perp}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{X} \cap {}^{\perp}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp}).$$

- (c) If  $\mathcal{T} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{T})$ , then  $\text{resdim}_{\mathcal{T}}(X) \leq \text{resdim}_{\mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{X}}(X) \leq \text{pd}_{\mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{X}}(X) + 1$ , for any  $X \in \mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{X}$ .

*Proof.* We only need to prove (a) since (b) and (c) follow from (a).

Let  $X \in \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ . By (T5), there is a  $\mathcal{T}$ -precover  $g : T' \rightarrow X$  with  $T' \in \mathcal{X}$ . Notice that  $g$  is an epimorphism since  $X \in \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Fac}_1^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T})$ . Let us prove that  $K := \text{Ker}(g) \in \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Consider the exact sequence  $K \hookrightarrow T' \xrightarrow{g} X$ . By (T2) and the fact that  $g$  is an  $\mathcal{T}$ -precover, it follows that  $K \in \mathcal{T}^\perp$ . It remains to show that  $K \in \mathcal{X}$ . Since  $X \in \text{Fac}_1^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T})$ , there is an exact sequence  $K' \hookrightarrow B \xrightarrow{f} X$ , with  $B \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $K' \in \mathcal{X}$ . Let  $Z$  be the pull-back of  $f$  and  $g$ . We have the exact sequences  $\eta : K' \hookrightarrow Z \rightarrow T'$  and  $\eta' : K \hookrightarrow Z \rightarrow B$ . Since  $K', T' \in \mathcal{X}$ , we have  $Z \in \mathcal{X}$ . Furthermore,  $\eta'$  splits since  $K \in \mathcal{T}^\perp$  and  $B \in \mathcal{T}$ . Therefore  $K \in \mathcal{X}$ .  $\square$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & K' = K' & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ K & \hookrightarrow & Z & \twoheadrightarrow & B \\ \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ K & \hookrightarrow & T' & \twoheadrightarrow & X \end{array}$$

**Lemma 3.10.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be closed under extensions, and let  $\mathcal{T} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{T}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be a class satisfying (T1), (T2), (T4), (T5) and such that  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Fac}_1^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T})$ . Then,  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq (\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}^\vee$  and  $(\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})^\vee \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X})$ . Moreover, for each  $X \in \mathcal{X}$ , the following statements hold true:*

- (a)  $m := \text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}}^\mathcal{X}(X) \leq \text{pd}_\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T}) < \infty$ ;
- (b) *there are exact sequences  $X \hookrightarrow M_X \rightarrow C_X$  and  $K_X \hookrightarrow B_X \twoheadrightarrow X$  such that  $M_X, K_X \in \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ ;  $C_X, B_X \in (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})^\vee$ ;  $\text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}}^\mathcal{X}(C_X) = m - 1$  and  $\text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}}^\mathcal{X}(B_X) \leq m$ ;*
- (c)  $B_X \rightarrow X$  is a  $(\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})^\vee$ -precover;
- (d)  $X \rightarrow M_X$  is a  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ -preenvelope.

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.9, it follows that  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$  is a  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ -projective relative generator in  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ . In particular, by [7, Lem. 4.3], we get that  $(\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})^\vee \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X})$ . Moreover, by Lemma 3.4,  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq (\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X})_{\mathcal{X},n}^\vee$  for  $n := \text{pd}_\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T})$ . Hence, by [7, Thm. 4.4], the result follows.  $\square$

In what follows, we will see that the condition  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Fac}_1^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T})$ , obtained in Lemma 3.8, is equivalent to (T3) if it is assumed that  $\mathcal{T}$  satisfies (T1), (T2), (T4), and (T5). The next proposition is a generalization of [53, Thm. 3.4 (2, 3)].

**Proposition 3.11.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be closed under extensions, and let  $\mathcal{T} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{T}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be a class satisfying (T1), (T2), (T4), and (T5). Then,  $\mathcal{T}$  satisfies (T3) if and only if  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Fac}_1^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T})$ . Furthermore, in such case, we can choose a relative generator  $\omega$  in  $\mathcal{X}$  such that  $\omega \subseteq (\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}^\vee$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.8, it is enough to prove that  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Fac}_1^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T})$  implies (T3). By Lemma 3.10, every  $X \in \mathcal{X}$  admits an exact sequence  $X \xrightarrow{f} M_X \rightarrow C_X$ , with  $M_X \in \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ ,  $C_X \in (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}^\vee$ . From the inclusion  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Fac}_1^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T})$ , we have that  $M_X$  admits a short exact sequence  $M'_X \hookrightarrow T_0 \xrightarrow{g} M_X$  with  $T_0 \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $M'_X \in \mathcal{X}$ . Considering the pull-back of  $f$  and  $g$ , we get an exact sequence  $M'_X \hookrightarrow P_X \rightarrow X$ , where  $P_X \in (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})^\vee$ . Hence,  $\omega := \{P_X\}_{X \in \mathcal{X}}$  is a relative generator in  $\mathcal{X}$  satisfying (T3).  $\square$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} M'_X = M'_X & & & & \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ P_X & \hookrightarrow & T_0 & \twoheadrightarrow & C_X \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow g & & \parallel \\ X & \hookrightarrow & M_X & \twoheadrightarrow & C_X \end{array}$$

Let  $R$  be a ring. It can be proved that  $T^\perp$  is preenveloping in  $\text{Mod}(R)$ , for any  $T \in \text{Mod}(R)$  [37, Thm. 3.2.1]. This is a property that greatly enriches tilting theory. Below, in item (c), we will prove a similar property in our relative context.

**Theorem 3.12.** *For a class  $\mathcal{X} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  closed under extensions and an  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting class  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ , the following statements hold true.*

- (a)  ${}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{X} = {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp) \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{T}_\mathcal{X}^\vee \cap \mathcal{X} = (\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}^\vee \cap \mathcal{X}$ .
- (b)  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} = \text{Fac}_k^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{X} \ \forall k \geq \max\{1, \text{pd}_\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T})\}$ .
- (c) *The pair  $({}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp), \mathcal{T}^\perp)$  is  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete and hereditary.*

*Proof.* (a) By Lemma 3.5 (a), we get the inclusions

$$(\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}^\vee \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\mathcal{X}^\vee \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp) \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{X}.$$

Consider  $X \in {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{X}$ . From Lemma 3.10 and Proposition 3.11, we get an exact sequence  $X \hookrightarrow M_X \twoheadrightarrow C_X$  with  $M_X \in \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $C_X \in \mathcal{X} \cap (\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}^\vee$ . Moreover,  $C_X \in {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X})$  by Lemma 3.5 (a). Notice that  $M_X \in {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X})$  since  $C_X, X \in {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X})$ . By Proposition 3.11 and Lemma 3.9 (b),  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} \cap {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X})$  and thus  $M_X \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Therefore,  $X \in (\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}^\vee \cap \mathcal{X}$ .

(b) By Lemma 3.8 and Lemma 3.9 (a),  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$  is a relative generator in  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Hence, it follows that  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Fac}_k^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{X} \ \forall k \geq 1$ . Let  $m := \max\{1, \text{pd}_\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T})\}$ . We will show that  $\text{Fac}_k^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} \ \forall k \geq m$ . Consider  $C \in \text{Fac}_k^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{X}$  with  $k \geq m$ . By definition, there is an exact sequence  $K \hookrightarrow T_k \xrightarrow{f_k} \dots \xrightarrow{f_3} T_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} C$  where  $\text{Ker}(f_i) \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $T_i \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} \ \forall i \in [1, k]$ . Then, by [7, Prop. 2.6], it follows that  $C \in \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ .

(c) It is clear that the pair  $({}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp), \mathcal{T}^\perp)$  is hereditary. Let us prove that it is  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete. By Lemma 3.5 (a),  $(\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}^\vee \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp) \cap \mathcal{X}$ . On the other hand, by Lemma 3.8 and Lemma 3.10, for each  $X \in \mathcal{X}$ , there are exact sequences  $X \hookrightarrow M_X \twoheadrightarrow C_X$  and  $K_X \hookrightarrow B_X \twoheadrightarrow X$ , where  $M_X, K_X \in \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $C_X, B_X \in (\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}^\vee \cap \mathcal{X}$ ; proving (c).  $\square$

The following result is a generalization of [57, Thm. 4.3], [20, Thm. 3.11] and [5, Thm. 4.4].

**Theorem 3.13.** *For  $n \geq 1$ ,  $\mathcal{X} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  closed under extensions and  $\mathcal{T} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{T}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  satisfying (T4) and (T5), the following statements are equivalent.*

- (a)  $\mathcal{T}$  is  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting.
- (b)  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} = \text{Fac}_n^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{X}$ .
- (c)  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} = \text{Fac}_k^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{X} \ \forall k \geq n$ .
- (d)  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$  is closed by  $n$ -quotients in  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Fac}_1^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T})$ .

*Proof.* (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) It follows from Theorem 3.12 (b).

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c) It is enough to prove that  $\text{Fac}_{n+1}^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{X} \supseteq \text{Fac}_n^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Let  $N \in \text{Fac}_n^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Then, by (T5), there is a  $\mathcal{T}$ -precover  $f : A \rightarrow N$  with  $A \in \mathcal{X}$ . Moreover, since  $\text{Fac}_n^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T}) \subseteq \text{Fac}_1^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T})$ , we have the exact sequence  $\eta : K \hookrightarrow A \xrightarrow{f} N$ , where  $A \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Fac}_n^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Using that  $A, N \in \mathcal{T}^\perp$  and that  $f$  is a  $\mathcal{T}$ -precover, we get that  $K \in \mathcal{T}^\perp$ . Let us prove that  $K \in \mathcal{X}$ . Notice that there is an exact sequence  $\eta' : K' \hookrightarrow M_0 \xrightarrow{f'} N$ , where  $M_0 \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $K' \in \mathcal{X}$ . Then, from the pull-back construction of  $f$  and  $f'$ , we

get an exact sequence  $\eta'' : K \hookrightarrow P \twoheadrightarrow M_0$ , where  $P \in \mathcal{X}$  since  $\mathcal{X}$  is closed under extensions. Notice that  $\eta''$  splits since  $M_0 \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $K \in \mathcal{T}^\perp$  and thus  $K \in \mathcal{X}$ . Therefore  $K \in \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} = \text{Fac}_n^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{X}$  and from the exact sequence  $\eta$ , it follows that  $N \in \text{Fac}_{n+1}^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{X}$ .

(c)  $\Rightarrow$  (d) By (c), we know that  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Fac}_n^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Fac}_1^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T})$ . Since  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} = \text{Fac}_n^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{X} = \text{Fac}_{n+1}^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{X}$ , from [7, Prop. 5.2], we get that  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$  is closed by  $n$ -quotients in  $\mathcal{X}$ .

(d)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) Since  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$  is closed by  $n$ -quotients in  $\mathcal{X}$  and (T4) holds true, it follows from [7, Prop. 2.6], that  $\text{pd}_\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T}) \leq n$  and thus (T1) holds true. Furthermore, by (d), we have that (T2) holds true and  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Fac}_1^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Therefore, by Proposition 3.11, we conclude that  $\mathcal{T}$  is  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting.  $\square$

As an easy consequence of Theorem 3.13, we can give an equivalent condition of (T5) in case  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ .

**Corollary 3.14.** *Let  $n \geq 1$ ,  $\mathcal{X} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  closed under extensions, and let  $\mathcal{T} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{T}) \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  satisfying (T1), (T2), (T3) and (T4). Then, the following statements are equivalent.*

- (a)  $\mathcal{T}$  is  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting.
- (b)  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} = \text{Fac}_n^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{X} = \text{Fac}_{n+1}^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{X}$ .

### 3.2. $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting classes and relative dimensions.

**Proposition 3.15.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be a class closed under extensions and  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be an  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting class. Then, the pair  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := (\mathcal{T}^\perp, \mathcal{T})$  and the class  $\nu := \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$  satisfy that  $\nu$  is a relative  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ -projective generator in  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and a relative  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}$ -injective cogenerator in  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Furthermore, the following statements hold true.*

- (a)  $\nu = \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X} \cap (\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X})^\perp = \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \cap {}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) = (\nu, \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X})^\wedge = (\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}, \nu)^\vee = \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X} \cap \nu^\wedge = \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \cap \nu^\vee$ .
- (b)  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq (\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}^\vee \subseteq (\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})^\vee$ .
- (c)  $(\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}^\vee \subseteq (\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})^\vee \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$ .
- (d)  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} = (\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}^\vee \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} = (\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})^\vee \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} = \nu = (\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}^\vee \cap \mathcal{B}$ .
- (e)  $\mathcal{A} \cap (\mathcal{X}, \nu)^\vee = \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}$ .
- (f)  $\mathcal{B} \cap (\nu, \mathcal{X})^\wedge = \{M \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \mid \text{pd}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}(M) < \infty\}$ .

*Proof.* Notice that  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  are closed under extensions and direct summands. By Theorem 3.12 (c), it follows that the pair  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is  $\mathcal{X}$ -hereditary and  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete. Therefore, by [7, Thm. 4.24 (a, b)] we get (a). Moreover, by [7, Prop. 4.23 (a, b)], it follows that  $\nu$  is a relative  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ -projective generator in  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and a relative  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}$ -injective cogenerator in  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}$ .

The items (b) and (c) follow from Lemma 3.10, and the item (d) follows from putting together Lemma 3.5 (b), the item (c) and Lemma 3.9 (b).

Let us prove (e). Indeed, by [7, Lem. 4.17 (a)], we know that

$$\mathcal{A} \cap (\mathcal{X}, \nu)^\vee = \{M \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X} \mid \text{id}_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}(M) < \infty\}.$$

Now, from (T4) and [7, Prop. 4.5 (a)],  $\text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{X}) \leq \text{pd}_\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T}) < \infty$ ; and thus, by [7, Thm. 4.24 (a)],  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}) = \text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{X}) < \infty$ . Therefore  $\mathcal{A} \cap (\mathcal{X}, \nu)^\vee = \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Finally, the item (f) follows from the dual result of [7, Lem. 4.17 (a)].  $\square$

**Proposition 3.16.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be closed under extensions, and let  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting. Then, for the pair  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := (\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp), \mathcal{T}^\perp)$ , it follows that  ${}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X})^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Moreover, the following statements hold true.*

- (a) *For any  $X \in \mathcal{X}$ , we have that*
  - (a1)  $\text{resdim}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{X}}(X) = \text{resdim}_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{X}}(X) = \text{resdim}_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}(X) = \text{resdim}_{\mathcal{A}}(X) = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}(X) \leq \text{resdim}_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) + 1$ ;
  - (a2)  $\text{resdim}_{\mathcal{A}}(X) \leq \text{pd}_{\mathcal{B}}(X) \leq \text{resdim}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{B}) + 1$ ;
  - (a3)  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}(X) = \text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{X}}(X) = \text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{X}}(X) = \text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}(X) = \text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B}}(X) \leq \text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}) + 1$ ;
  - (a4)  $\text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B}}(X) \leq \text{id}_{\mathcal{A}}(X) \leq \text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{A}) + 1$ .
- (b)  $\text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}) \leq \text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T}) = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{A}) = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}({}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})) < \infty$ .

*Proof.* Notice that  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is  $\mathcal{X}$ -hereditary and  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete by Theorem 3.12 (c). Moreover, by Proposition 3.15 (a),  $(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X})^\perp \cap \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  ${}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Thereupon, by [7, Prop. 4.11(e)] and its dual,  $(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X})^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{B} \subseteq (\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X})^\perp$  and  ${}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$ . Hence,  ${}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X})^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . It remains to prove (a) and (b). Indeed, the item (a) follows from [7, Prop. 4.11] and its dual. Finally, the item (b) follows from [7, Prop. 4.5] since  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ .  $\square$

By Theorem 3.12 (c) and [7, Prop. 4.23], we get the following result.

**Corollary 3.17.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be closed under extensions and let  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting. Then, for the pair  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := (\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp), \mathcal{T}^\perp)$  and the class  $\nu := \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ , the following statements hold true.*

- (a)  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}(M) = \text{pd}_\nu(M) = \text{pd}_{\nu^\wedge}(M) = \text{resdim}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{X}}(M) = \text{resdim}_{\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{A}}(M) \forall M \in (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X})^\wedge$ .
- (b)  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}(M) = \text{resdim}_\nu^{\mathcal{X}}(M) \forall M \in (\nu, \mathcal{X})^\wedge$ .
- (c)  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}(M) = \text{id}_\nu(M) = \text{id}_{\nu^\vee}(M) = \text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{X}}(M) = \text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{X}}(M) \forall M \in (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B})^\vee$ .
- (d)  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}(M) = \text{coresdim}_\nu^{\mathcal{X}}(M) \forall M \in (\mathcal{X}, \nu)^\vee$ .

**Proposition 3.18.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be closed under extensions, and let  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting. Then, for the pair  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := (\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp), \mathcal{T}^\perp)$  and the class  $\nu := \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ , we have that  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \nu^\vee$ . Moreover, the following statements hold.*

- (a)  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\nu) = \text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}) = \text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}) = \text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}) = \text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}) = \text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}) = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}) = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}) = \text{coresdim}_\nu(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}) = \text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}) \leq \text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T}) < \infty$ .
- (b)  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\nu) \leq \text{resdim}_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) = \text{resdim}_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) = \text{resdim}_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) = \text{resdim}_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}) = \text{resdim}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}) = \text{resdim}_\nu(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) = \text{id}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) = \text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) = \text{resdim}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$ .
- (c)  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) < \infty$  if and only if  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \nu^\wedge$  and  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\nu) < \infty$ . Furthermore, if  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) < \infty$ , then  $\mathcal{B} \cap (\nu, \mathcal{X})^\wedge = \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ ,  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X})^\wedge \subseteq (\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X})^\wedge$  and  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) = \text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\nu)$ .

*Proof.* By Theorem 3.12 (c), we know that the pair  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is hereditary and  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete. In order to prove (a), observe that, by Proposition 3.16 (b) and [7, Thm. 4.24 (a1)], it follows that

$$\text{pd}_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}) = \text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}) \leq \text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T}) < \infty.$$

Then, by [7, Thm 4.24 (a2)],  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \nu^\vee$  and  $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}) = \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\nu)$ . The rest of the equalities appearing in (a) follow from [7, Thm. 4.24 (a1)].

Except for the equality  $\mathcal{B} \cap (\nu, \mathcal{X})^\wedge = \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$  in (c) (under the hypothesis that  $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) < \infty$ ), the items (b) and (c) follow from [7, Thm. 4.24(b)]. Let us prove such equality. Indeed, assume that  $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) < \infty$ . Then, by (b), we have that  $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) < \infty$ . Hence, from Proposition 3.15 (f), the required equality follows.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.19.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} = \mathrm{smd}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be closed under extensions and let  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting. Then, for the pair  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := ({}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp), \mathcal{T}^\perp)$  and the class  $\nu := \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ , the following statements hold true.*

- (a)  $\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}((\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})_{\mathcal{X}}^\vee) = \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}((\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})^\vee) = \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$ .
- (b)  $\nu = \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Moreover, if  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ , then

$$\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T}) = \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\nu) = \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\nu_{\mathcal{X}}^\vee) = \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\nu^\vee).$$

*Proof.* We point out that, by Theorem 3.12 (c), the pair  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is hereditary and  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete. Then, (a) follows from Proposition 3.15 (b) and [7, Lem. 4.3]. Finally, (b) can be obtained from Proposition 3.15 (c, d) and Proposition 3.16 (b).  $\square$

**Proposition 3.20.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} = \mathrm{smd}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be closed under extensions and let  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting. Then, for the pair  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := ({}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp), \mathcal{T}^\perp)$  and the class  $\nu := \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ , the following statements hold true.*

- (a)  $\nu^\vee \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$  and, for any  $Z \in (\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})_{\mathcal{X}}^\vee$  and  $m := \mathrm{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{X}}(Z)$ , there are short exact sequences

$$Z \xrightarrow{g_Z} M_Z \twoheadrightarrow C_Z \quad \text{with } C_Z \in (\mathcal{X}, \nu)^\vee, M_Z \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X},$$

$$K_Z \hookrightarrow N_Z \xrightarrow{f_Z} Z \quad \text{with } N_Z \in \nu_{\mathcal{X}}^\vee, K_Z \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X},$$

such that  $g_Z$  is a  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ -preenvelope and  $f_Z$  is a  $\nu^\vee$ -precover. Furthermore,  $\mathrm{coresdim}_{\nu}^{\mathcal{X}}(C_Z) = m - 1$ ,  $\mathrm{coresdim}_{\nu}^{\mathcal{X}}(N_Z) \leq m$ , and

$$\nu^\vee \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A} \cap (\mathcal{X}, \nu)^\vee.$$

- (b)  $\nu^\wedge \subseteq (\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X})^\perp$  and, for any  $Z \in (\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X})_{\mathcal{X}}^\wedge$  and  $m := \mathrm{resdim}_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{X}}(Z)$ , there are short exact sequences

$$Z \xrightarrow{f_Z} N_Z \twoheadrightarrow C_Z \quad \text{with } N_Z \in \nu_{\mathcal{X}}^\wedge, C_Z \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X},$$

$$K_Z \hookrightarrow M_Z \xrightarrow{g_Z} Z \quad \text{with } K_Z \in (\nu, \mathcal{X})^\wedge, M_Z \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X},$$

such that  $g_Z$  is a  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}$ -precover and  $f_Z$  is a  $\nu^\wedge$ -preenvelope. Furthermore,  $\mathrm{resdim}_{\nu}^{\mathcal{X}}(K_Z) = m - 1$ ,  $\mathrm{resdim}_{\nu}^{\mathcal{X}}(N_Z) \leq m$ , and

$$\nu^\wedge \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{B} \cap (\nu, \mathcal{X})^\wedge \quad \text{if } \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) < \infty.$$

- (c) For any  $Z \in (\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})^\vee$  and  $m := \mathrm{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}(Z)$ , there are short exact sequences

$$Z \xrightarrow{g_Z} M_Z \twoheadrightarrow C_Z \quad \text{with } C_Z \in (\mathcal{X}, \nu)^\vee, M_Z \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X},$$

$$K_Z \hookrightarrow N_Z \xrightarrow{f_Z} Z \quad \text{with } N_Z \in \nu^\vee, K_Z \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X},$$

such that  $g_Z$  is a  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ -preenvelope and  $f_Z$  is a  $\nu^\vee$ -precover. Furthermore,  $\mathrm{coresdim}_{\nu}^{\mathcal{X}}(C_Z) = m - 1$  and  $\mathrm{coresdim}_{\nu}^{\mathcal{X}}(N_Z) \leq m$ .

(d)  $\forall Z \in (\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X})^\wedge$ , with  $m := \text{resdim}_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}(Z)$ , there are short exact sequences

$$\begin{aligned} Z &\xrightarrow{f_Z} N_Z \twoheadrightarrow C_Z && \text{with } N_Z \in \nu^\wedge, C_Z \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}, \\ K_Z &\hookrightarrow M_Z \xrightarrow{g_Z} Z && \text{with } K_Z \in \nu^\wedge, M_Z \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}, \end{aligned}$$

such that  $g_Z$  is an  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}$ -precover and  $f_Z$  is an  $\nu^\wedge$ -preenvelope. Furthermore,  $\text{resdim}_\nu(K_Z) = m - 1$  and  $\text{resdim}_\nu(N_Z) \leq m$ .

- (e) The pair  $(\nu^\vee, \mathcal{B})$  is right  $(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}^\vee$ -complete,  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete and  $\mathcal{X}$ -hereditary.
- (f)  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$  is special preenveloping in  $(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}^\vee$  and in  $\mathcal{X}$ . Moreover, the pair  $({}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}), \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$  is right  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete.
- (g) Any object of  $(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})^\vee$  admits a special  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ -preenvelope.

*Proof.* (a) Consider the pair  $(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}, \nu)$ . Then, by Proposition 3.15,  $\nu$  is a relative  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ -projective generator in  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . In particular, by [7, Lem. 4.3], we have that  $\nu^\vee \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$ . Hence, from [7, Thm. 4.4], we almost get the item (a), remaining to show the equalities  $\nu^\vee \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A} \cap (\mathcal{X}, \nu)^\vee$ . However, using that  $\nu^\vee \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$ , these equalities follow from Propositions 3.16 and 3.15 (e).

(b) It follows as in (a) by using Proposition 3.15, the dual of [7, Lem. 4.3], the dual of [7, Thm 4.4], Proposition 3.18 (c) and Proposition 3.16.

(c) It can be proved by following similar arguments as we did in (a).

(d) It can be proved by following similar arguments as we did in (b).

(e) It follows from (a), Proposition 3.15 (b) and Lemma 3.10.

(f) Let  $X \in (\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}^\vee$ . By (a), there is an exact sequence  $X \xrightarrow{g_X} M_X \twoheadrightarrow C_X$ , with  $C_X \in (\mathcal{X}, \nu)^\vee$ ,  $M_X \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ , and  $g_X$  a  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ -preenvelope. Thereupon, the following statements are easy to prove. First,  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$  is special preenveloping in  $(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}^\vee$  since  $M_X \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \cap (\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}^\vee$  and  $C_X \in {}^\perp_1(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) \cap (\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}^\vee$  by Proposition 3.15; and second,  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$  is special preenveloping in  $\mathcal{X}$  since  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq (\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}^\vee$  (see Proposition 3.15 (b)),  $M_X \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X} \cap (\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$  and  $C_X \in \mathcal{X} \cap {}^\perp_1(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$ .

(g) Let  $X \in (\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})^\vee$ . Consider the exact sequence given by (c),  $X \xrightarrow{g_X} M_X \twoheadrightarrow C_X$  with  $M_X \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $C_X \in \nu^\vee$ . Then  $g_X$  is a special  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ -preenvelope since  $M_X \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $C_X \in (\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})^\vee \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) \subseteq {}^\perp_1(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$  by Proposition 3.15(b).  $\square$

Next, in a similar way as Lemma 3.9 and Proposition 3.20, we will show the behaviour of the pairs  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  such that  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ , where  $\mathcal{T}$  is  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting.

**Proposition 3.21.** *For a class  $\mathcal{X} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  closed under extensions, an  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  and a pair  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  such that  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ , the following statements hold true.*

- (a) Let  $\text{Ext}_\mathcal{C}^1(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) = 0$ . Then any morphism  $A \rightarrow X$ , with  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $X \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ , factors through  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$ .
- (b)  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$  if  $\text{Ext}_\mathcal{C}^1(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) = 0$ .
- (c) Let  ${}^\perp_1 \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  and  $\text{id}_\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) = 0$ . Then, the following conditions are equivalent:
  - (c1)  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ ;
  - (c2)  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete;
  - (c3)  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is left  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete.

*Proof.* (a) It follows from Proposition 3.11 and Lemma 3.9 (a).

(b) By Proposition 3.11 and Lemma 3.9(b),  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} = {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} = {}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Thus, by (a), we conclude that  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$ .

(c) We only prove (c1)  $\Rightarrow$  (c2). Indeed, by the item (b), Proposition 3.11 and Lemma 3.9,  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$  is a relative generator in  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Thus, by [7, Thm. 4.4 (a)],  $\forall X \in (\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}^\vee$  there are short exact sequences  $X \xrightarrow{g_X} M_X \rightarrow C_X$ , with  $M_X \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ ,  $C_X \in (\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})^\vee \cap \mathcal{X}$ , and  $K_X \hookrightarrow B_X \xrightarrow{f_X} X$ , with  $B_X \in (\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})^\vee$ ,  $K_X \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Furthermore, since  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$ , [7, Thm. 4.4 (c)] implies  $(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})^\vee \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$ . Also, by [7, Prop. 4.5 (a)],  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq (T^\perp \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}^\vee = (\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}^\vee$ . Lastly, by [7, Lem. 4.3],  $\text{pd}_\mathcal{B}((\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})^\vee) = \text{pd}_\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) = 0$ . Therefore  $(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})^\vee \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq {}^\perp \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq {}^{\perp_1} \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  and thus  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete.  $\square$

### 3.3. Alternative conditions for the axiom (T3).

**Definition 3.22.** For  $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ , we consider the following conditions.

- (T3'): There exists  $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\mathcal{X}^\vee$  which is an  $\mathcal{X}$ -projective relative generator in  $\mathcal{X}$ .
- (T3''): There exists  $\sigma \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\mathcal{X}^\vee$  such that  $\text{Add}(\sigma)$  is an  $\mathcal{X}$ -projective relative generator in  $\mathcal{X}$ .
- (t3''): There exists  $\sigma \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\mathcal{X}^\vee$  such that  $\text{add}(\sigma)$  is an  $\mathcal{X}$ -projective relative generator in  $\mathcal{X}$ .

The following lemma is a generalization of [5, Lem. 2.3].

**Lemma 3.23.** Let  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be closed under extensions and  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be a class such that  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^\perp$  and  $\sigma \subseteq \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{T}_\mathcal{X}^\vee$ . Then, for any  $W \in \sigma$  and any finite  $(\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}$ -coresolution  $W \xrightarrow{f_0} M_0 \rightarrow \dots \xrightarrow{f_n} M_n$ , we have that  $f_0$  is a special  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ -preenvelope, a special  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$ -preenvelope and a special  $\mathcal{T}^\perp$ -preenvelope.

*Proof.* Let  $W \in \sigma$  and  $W \xrightarrow{f_0} M_0 \rightarrow \dots \xrightarrow{f_n} M_n$  be a finite  $(\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X})_\mathcal{X}$ -coresolution. By Lemma 3.4 (a),  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp)$ . Hence  $M_j \in {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp) \forall j \in [0, n]$ . Moreover  $K_j := \text{Ker}(f_j) \in {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp) \forall j \in [1, n]$  since  ${}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp)$  is closed under epikernels. In particular  $\text{Ext}_\mathcal{C}^1(K_2, X) = 0 \forall X \in \mathcal{T}^\perp$  and thus  $f_0 : W \rightarrow M_0$  is a special  $\mathcal{T}^\perp$ -preenvelope, which is a  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ -preenvelope and a  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$ -preenvelope since  $M_0 \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^\perp$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.24.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an AB4 (abelian) category,  $\mathcal{X} = \text{Add}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  ( $\mathcal{X} = \text{add}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ ) be closed under extensions,  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be a class satisfying (T2),  $\sigma \subseteq \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{T}_\mathcal{X}^\vee$  and  $\omega := \text{Add}(\sigma)$  ( $\omega := \text{add}(\sigma)$ ). Then, the following statements hold true.

- (a)  $\omega \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp) \cap \mathcal{X}$ .
- (b) If  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}^\oplus$  ( $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}^{\oplus < \infty}$ ), then every  $W \in \omega$  admits an exact sequence  $W \xrightarrow{f} M_W \rightarrow C_W$ , where  $M_W \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$ ,  $C_W \in {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp) \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $f$  is a special  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ -preenvelope, a special  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$ -preenvelope and a special  $\mathcal{T}^\perp$ -preenvelope.

*Proof.* Let us prove the lemma by assuming that  $\mathcal{C}$  is an AB4 category. The case when  $\mathcal{C}$  is just abelian can be done by applying similar arguments.

(a) Let us show that  $\sigma \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp) \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Indeed, by Lemma 3.23, every  $S \in \sigma$  admits an exact sequence  $S \hookrightarrow M_S \rightarrow C_S$ , with  $M_S \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp) \cap \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{T}^\perp$ ,



$C_S \in \mathcal{X} \cap {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp)$ , and thus,  $S \in {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp) \cap \mathcal{X}$  since  ${}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp)$  is closed under epi-kernels. Finally,  $\text{Add}(\sigma) \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp) \cap \mathcal{X}$  since  $\mathcal{C}$  is AB4 and  $\sigma \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp) \cap \mathcal{X}$ .

(b) Let  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}^\oplus$  and  $W \in \omega := \text{Add}(\sigma)$ . Then there is  $W' \in \omega$  and a set  $\{S_i\}_{i \in I} \subseteq \sigma \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  such that  $W \oplus W' \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I} S_i^{(\alpha_i)}$ . By Lemma 3.23, for every  $i \in I$ , there is an exact sequence  $S_i \hookrightarrow M_{S_i} \twoheadrightarrow C_{S_i}$  with  $M_{S_i} \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $C_{S_i} \in {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp) \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Let  $S := \bigoplus_{i \in I} S_i^{(\alpha_i)}$ ,  $M' := \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_{S_i}^{(\alpha_i)}$  and  $C := \bigoplus_{i \in I} C_{S_i}^{(\alpha_i)}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} W & \hookrightarrow & S & \twoheadrightarrow & W' \\ \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ W & \hookrightarrow & M' & \twoheadrightarrow & Z \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & C & = & C \end{array}$$

Since  $\mathcal{C}$  is AB4 and  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}^\oplus$ , we have the short exact sequence  $S \xrightarrow{f} M' \xrightarrow{g} C$ , where  $S \in \omega$ ,  $M' \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $C \in {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp) \cap \mathcal{X}$ ;

and the splitting exact sequence  $W \hookrightarrow S \xrightarrow{h} W'$ . Considering the push-out of  $h$  with  $f$ , we get a short exact sequence  $\eta : W \xrightarrow{\alpha} M' \twoheadrightarrow Z$ . Finally, observe from the exact sequence  $W' \hookrightarrow Z \twoheadrightarrow C$  that  $Z \in {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp) \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Therefore, using  $\eta$ , we can conclude the desired result.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.25.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an AB4 (abelian) category,  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be closed under extensions and such that  $\mathcal{X} = \text{Add}(\mathcal{X})$  ( $\mathcal{X} = \text{add}(\mathcal{X})$ ). If  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  satisfies (T2), (T3'') ((t3'')), and  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}^\oplus$  ( $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}^{\oplus < \infty}$ ), then  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Fac}_1^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{T})$ .*

*Proof.* It can be proved in a similar way as Lemma 3.8.  $\square$

We close this section with a generalization of [53, Cor. 3.6].

**Proposition 3.26.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be closed under extensions and admitting an  $\mathcal{X}$ -projective relative generator in  $\mathcal{X}$ , and let  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be satisfying (T0), (T1), (T2), (T4), and (T5). Then, the following conditions are equivalent:*

(T3): *There exists  $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\mathcal{X}^\vee$  which is a relative generator in  $\mathcal{X}$ .*

(T3'): *There exists  $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\mathcal{X}^\vee$  which is an  $\mathcal{X}$ -projective relative generator in  $\mathcal{X}$ .*

*Furthermore, if  $\mathcal{C}$  is AB4 (abelian),  $\mathcal{X} = \text{Add}(\mathcal{X})$  ( $\mathcal{X} = \text{add}(\mathcal{X})$ ) and  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}^\oplus$  ( $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}^{\oplus < \infty}$ ), then (T3) and (T3') are equivalent to the following one:*

(T3''): *there exists  $\sigma \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\mathcal{X}^\vee$  such that  $\text{Add}(\sigma)$  is an  $\mathcal{X}$ -projective relative generator in  $\mathcal{X}$*

((t3'')): *there exists  $\sigma \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\mathcal{X}^\vee$  such that  $\text{add}(\sigma)$  is an  $\mathcal{X}$ -projective relative generator in  $\mathcal{X}$ .*

*Proof.* The implication (T3)  $\Rightarrow$  (T3') follows from Theorem 3.12 (a); and (T3')  $\Rightarrow$  (T3) is trivial. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be AB4,  $\mathcal{X} = \text{Add}(\mathcal{X})$  and  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}^\oplus$  (the case where  $\mathcal{C}$  is abelian,  $\mathcal{X} = \text{add}(\mathcal{X})$  and  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}^{\oplus < \infty}$  can be done by similar arguments).

(T3')  $\Rightarrow$  (T3''): Let  $\omega$  be the relative generator in  $\mathcal{X}$  satisfying (T3'). Since  $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X} = \text{Add}(\mathcal{X})$ , we can take  $\sigma := \omega$ .

(T3'')  $\Rightarrow$  (T3): It follows from Proposition 3.11 and Lemma 3.25.  $\square$

**3.4. Tilting for classes of compact-like objects.** In this section we will consider a class  $\mathcal{X}$  consisting of compact-like objects in an abelian category  $\mathcal{C}$ . We shall see that, in this case, a class  $\mathcal{T}$  is big  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting if and only if it is small  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting. Let us begin by defining what kind of compact-like objects we will be considering.

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an additive category,  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  and  $M \in \mathcal{C}$ . We recall that  $M$  is **finitely  $\mathcal{T}$ -generated** if, for every family  $\{U_i\}_{i \in I} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$  such that  $\bigoplus_{i \in I} U_i$  exists in  $\mathcal{C}$ , every epimorphism  $\varphi : \bigoplus_{i \in I} U_i \rightarrow M$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  admits a finite set  $F \subseteq I$  such that the

composition  $\bigoplus_{i \in F} U_i \xrightarrow{i_{F,I}} \bigoplus_{i \in I} U_i \xrightarrow{\varphi} M$  is an epimorphism, where  $i_{F,I}$  is the natural inclusion. We denote by  $\text{f.g.}(\mathcal{T})$  the class of all the finitely  $\mathcal{T}$ -generated objects in  $\mathcal{C}$ . It is said that  $M$  is  $\mathcal{T}$ -compact ( $\mathcal{T}$ -compact for monomorphisms) if, for every family  $\{U_i\}_{i \in I} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$  such that  $\bigoplus_{i \in I} U_i$  exists in  $\mathcal{C}$ , every morphism (monomorphism)  $\psi : M \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} U_i$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  admits a finite set  $F \subseteq I$  such that  $\psi$  factors through the inclusion  $i_{F,I} : \bigoplus_{i \in F} U_i \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} U_i$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}}$  ( $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T},\mathcal{M}}$ ) the class of all the  $\mathcal{T}$ -compact ( $\mathcal{T}$ -compact for monomorphism) objects in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Notice that  $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}} \subseteq \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T},\mathcal{M}}$ .

**Lemma 3.27.** [47, Chap. II. Lem. 16.1] *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an additive category and  $\{A_i\}_{i \in I} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be a family of objects such that  $\bigoplus_{i \in I} A_i$  exists in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then, for a finite subset  $F \subseteq I$ , a morphism  $\alpha : A \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} A_i$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  factors through  $i_{F,I} : \bigoplus_{i \in F} A_i \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} A_i$  if, and only if,  $\alpha = \sum_{i \in F} u_i p_i \alpha$ , where  $u_i$  and  $p_i$  are, respectively, the  $i$ -th injection and the  $i$ -th projection for the coproduct  $\bigoplus_{i \in I} A_i$ .*

As an easy consequence of Lemma 3.27, we get the following corollary.

**Corollary 3.28.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an additive category and  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ . If  $\pi : M \rightarrow N$  is an epimorphism in  $\mathcal{C}$  with  $M \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}}$ , then  $N \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}}$ .*

The  $\mathcal{T}$ -compact objects can be characterized as follows.

**Lemma 3.29.** *For an additive category  $\mathcal{C}$ ,  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  and  $M \in \mathcal{C}$ , the following statements are equivalent.*

- (a)  $M$  is  $\mathcal{T}$ -compact.
- (b) For every family  $\{U_i\}_{i \in X} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$  such that  $\bigoplus_{i \in X} U_i$  exists in  $\mathcal{C}$ , the map

$$v : \bigoplus_{i \in X} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(M, U_i) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(M, \bigoplus_{i \in X} U_i), (\alpha_i)_{i \in X} \mapsto \sum_{i \in X} u_i \alpha_i,$$

is an isomorphism, where  $u_i : U_i \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in X} U_i$  is the natural inclusion in the coproduct.

*Proof.* Let  $\{U_i\}_{i \in X} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$  such that  $\bigoplus_{i \in X} U_i$  exists in  $\mathcal{C}$ . For every  $i \in X$ , consider the natural projection  $p_k : \bigoplus_{i \in X} U_i \rightarrow U_k$ . Notice that  $v$  is always a monomorphism.

(a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) Let  $\alpha : M \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in X} U_i$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Since  $M \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}}$ , there is a finite set  $J \subseteq X$  such that  $\alpha = \sum_{i \in J} u_i p_i \alpha$ , see Lemma 3.27. Therefore  $\alpha = v(p_i \alpha)_{i \in X}$  and thus  $v$  is surjective.

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) From (b), we have that every  $\alpha \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(M, \bigoplus_{i \in X} U_i)$  admits an element  $(\alpha_i)_{i \in X} \in \bigoplus_{i \in X} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(M, U_i)$  such that  $\alpha = \sum_{i \in X} u_i \alpha_i$ . Now, since  $p_k v(\alpha_i)_{i \in X} = \alpha_k \forall k \in X$ , we get  $\alpha = \sum_{j \in X} u_j \alpha_j = \sum_{j \in X} u_j (p_j v(\alpha_i)_{i \in X}) = \sum_{j \in X} u_j p_j \alpha$ . Hence,  $M \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}}$  by Lemma 3.27.  $\square$

As a consequence of Lemma 3.29, we get the following result.

**Corollary 3.30.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an additive category,  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  and  $A = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n A_i$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then  $A$  is  $\mathcal{T}$ -compact if, and only if, each  $A_i$  is  $\mathcal{T}$ -compact.*

**Corollary 3.31.** *For an additive category  $\mathcal{C}$ ,  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  and a relative generator  $\omega^{\oplus}$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , with  $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}}$ , the following statements hold true.*

- (a)  $\text{f.g.}(\omega) \subseteq \text{Fac}_1(\omega^{\oplus < \infty}) \subseteq \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}}$ .
- (b) If  $\mathcal{C}$  is abelian and  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{C}}^1(\omega, \text{Fac}_1(\omega^{\oplus < \infty})) = 0$ , then  $\text{Fac}_1(\omega^{\oplus < \infty})$  is closed under extensions in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

*Proof.* The item (a) follows from Corollaries 3.28 and 3.30. Finally, the proof of (b) can be done in a similar way as the proof of the Horseshoe's Lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.32.** [56, Chap. V. Lem. 3.1] *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an AB5 category. Then  $\text{f.g.}(\mathcal{C})$  is closed under quotients and extensions.*

We have the following well-known facts.

**Corollary 3.33.** *For a ring  $R$  and  $\text{mod}(R) := \text{f.g.}(\text{Mod}(R))$ , the following statements hold true.*

- (a)  $\text{mod}(R) \subseteq \mathcal{K}_{\text{Mod}(R)}$  and  $\text{mod}(R)$  is closed under extensions and quotients in  $\text{Mod}(R)$ . In particular,  $\text{mod}(R)$  is right thick in  $\text{Mod}(R)$ .
- (b)  $R$  is left noetherian if, and only if,  $\text{mod}(R)$  is a thick abelian subcategory of  $\text{Mod}(R)$ .

**Proposition 3.34.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an abelian category and  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ . Then  $\text{Add}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{Z} = \text{add}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{Z}$  for every  $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{M}}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{M}}$ . Consider  $X \in \text{Add}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{Z}$ . Then, there is a splitting exact sequence  $X' \hookrightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} U_i \xrightarrow{f} X$  with  $\{U_i\}_{i \in I} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ . Let  $\mu : X \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} U_i$  be a monomorphism such that  $f\mu = 1_X$ . It follows that there is a finite set  $J \subseteq I$  and a morphism  $\mu' : X \rightarrow \bigoplus_{j \in J} U_j$  such that  $\mu = i_{J,I} \circ \mu'$ , where  $i_{J,I} : \bigoplus_{j \in J} U_j \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} U_i$  is the natural inclusion. Consider the morphism  $g := f \circ i_{J,I} : \bigoplus_{j \in J} U_j \rightarrow X$ . Since  $g\mu' = f \circ i_{J,I} \circ \mu' = f\mu = 1_X$ ,  $g$  is a splitting epimorphism and thus  $X \in \text{add}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{Z}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.35.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an AB3 category,  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  and  $\alpha : M \rightarrow X$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ . If  $\alpha$  is an  $\text{add}(\mathcal{M})$ -precover of  $X$ , then  $\alpha$  is an  $\text{Add}(\mathcal{M})$ -precover of  $X$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\alpha : M \rightarrow X$  be an  $\text{add}(\mathcal{M})$ -precover. Since  $\text{Add}(\mathcal{M}) = \text{smd}(\mathcal{M}^\oplus)$ , it is easy to see that every morphism  $M' \rightarrow X$ , with  $M' \in \text{Add}(\mathcal{M})$ , factors through  $\mathcal{M}^\oplus$ . Furthermore, every morphism  $M'' \rightarrow X$  with  $M'' \in \mathcal{M}^\oplus$  factors through  $M^\oplus$ . Indeed, consider a morphism  $\alpha' : \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i \rightarrow X$ , with  $M_i \in \mathcal{M} \forall i \in I$ , and the canonical inclusions  $\{v_i : M_i \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i\}_{i \in I}$ . Since  $\alpha$  is an  $\text{add}(\mathcal{M})$ -precover,  $\forall i \in I$  there is  $\lambda_i : M_i \rightarrow M$  such that  $\alpha'v_i = \alpha\lambda_i$ . Therefore, there is  $\lambda : \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i \rightarrow M^{(I)}$  such that  $\lambda v_i = v'_i \lambda_i \forall i \in I$ , where  $v'_i : M \rightarrow M^{(I)}$  is the natural inclusion in the coproduct. Observe that  $\alpha'$  factors through  $\lambda$  and  $\alpha'' : M^{(I)} \rightarrow X$ , where  $\alpha''$  is induced by the coproduct universal property and moreover  $\alpha''v'_i = \alpha$ , for all  $i \in I$ . Now, for each  $i \in I$ , we have  $\alpha''\lambda v_i = \alpha''v'_i \lambda_i = \alpha\lambda_i = \alpha'v_i$  and thus  $\alpha''\lambda = \alpha'$ .

Finally, we assert that  $\alpha''$  factors through  $\alpha$ . To show it, consider the morphism  $\sigma : M^{(I)} \rightarrow M$  such that  $\sigma v'_j = 1_M$ , for all  $j \in I$ . Then, for each  $j \in I$ , we get  $\alpha\sigma v'_j = \alpha 1_M = \alpha = \alpha''v'_j$  and so  $\alpha\sigma = \alpha''$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 3.36.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an AB4 category and  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ . Then, for every  $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{M}}$  closed under extensions,  $\text{Add}(\mathcal{T})$  is  $n$ - $\mathcal{Z}$ -tilting if and only if  $\text{add}(\mathcal{T})$  is  $n$ - $\mathcal{Z}$ -tilting.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{M}}$  be closed under extensions. Since  $\mathcal{C}$  is AB4,  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\text{Add}(\mathcal{T})) = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T}) = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\text{add}(\mathcal{T}))$ . Now, by Proposition 3.34,  $\text{Add}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{Z} = \text{add}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{Z}$ . Hence, using that  $\mathcal{Z}$  is closed under extensions, we have  $\omega \subseteq (\text{Add}(\mathcal{T}))_{\mathcal{Z}}^\vee$  if and only if  $\omega \subseteq (\text{add}(\mathcal{T}))_{\mathcal{Z}}^\vee$ , for any  $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$ . Finally, (T5) follows from Lemma 3.35 and Proposition 3.34.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.37.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an  $AB_4$  category,  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ , and let  $\omega^\oplus$  be a relative generator in  $\mathcal{C}$  such that  $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{W}}$ . Then, for every  $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \text{f.g.}(\omega)$  closed under extensions, we have that  $\text{Add}(\mathcal{T})$  is  $n$ - $\mathcal{Z}$ -tilting if and only if  $\text{add}(\mathcal{T})$  is  $n$ - $\mathcal{Z}$ -tilting.*

*Proof.* It follows by Theorem 3.36 and Corollary 3.31.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.38.** *Let  $R$  be a ring and  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \text{Mod}(R)$ . Then, for every  $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \text{mod}(R)$ , closed under extensions, we have that  $\text{Add}(\mathcal{T})$  is  $n$ - $\mathcal{Z}$ -tilting if and only if  $\text{add}(\mathcal{T})$  is  $n$ - $\mathcal{Z}$ -tilting.*

*Proof.* It follows by Corollary 3.33 (a) and Corollary 3.37.  $\square$

### 3.5. $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting triples in abelian categories.

**Definition 3.39.** *We say that  $((\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}); \mathcal{T})$  is a **big (small)  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting triple** in an abelian category  $\mathcal{C}$  provided the following statements hold true:*

**(TT1):**  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is a left cotorsion pair in  $\mathcal{X}$  with  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) = 0$ .

**(TT2):**  $\mathcal{B}$  is closed under extensions and direct summands.

**(TT3):** *There is a big (small)  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting class  $\mathcal{T}$  such that  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ .*

**Lemma 3.40.** *Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  be a right  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete pair in an abelian category  $\mathcal{C}$  such that  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$ . If  $\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{X} \subseteq {}^\perp \alpha$ , then  $\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ .*

*Proof.* It is straightforward.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.41.** *For a right  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete and  $\mathcal{X}$ -hereditary pair  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  such that  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$  and  $n := \max\{1, \text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{A})\} < \infty$ , the following statements hold true.*

(a) *Every  $X \in \mathcal{X}$  admits an exact sequence*

$$0 \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{f_0} B_{X,0} \xrightarrow{f_1} B_{X,1} \rightarrow \dots \xrightarrow{f_n} B_{X,n} \rightarrow 0,$$

*with  $B_{X,n} \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ ,  $B_{X,i} \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $\text{Coker}(f_i) \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X} \forall i \in [0, n-1]$ . In particular,  $\text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}) \leq n$ .*

(b) *Let  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{X}$  be closed under extensions and  ${}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Then, every  $W \in \mathcal{X} \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{X}$  admits an exact sequence*

$$0 \rightarrow W \xrightarrow{f_0} B_{W,0} \xrightarrow{f_1} B_{W,1} \rightarrow \dots \xrightarrow{f_n} B_{W,n} \rightarrow 0$$

*with  $B_{W,i} \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \forall i \in [0, n]$  and  $\text{Coker}(f_j) \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X} \forall j \in [0, n-1]$ . In particular,  $\text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X} \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{X}) \leq n$ .*

*Proof.* (a) Let  $X \in \mathcal{X}$ . Since  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is right  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete, there is an exact sequence  $X \hookrightarrow B_{X,0} \twoheadrightarrow C_1$ , with  $B_{X,0} \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $C_1 \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Repeating the same argument recursively, we can build an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow B_{X,0} \rightarrow B_{X,1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow B_{X,n} \rightarrow C_{n+1} \rightarrow 0$$

with  $B_{X,i} \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \forall i \in [0, n]$  and  $C_{n+1} \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Moreover  $B_{X,i} \in C_{n+1}^\perp \forall i \in [0, n]$  since  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is  $\mathcal{X}$ -hereditary. Hence  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{C}}^1(C_{n+1}, C_n) \cong \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{C}}^{n+1}(C_{n+1}, X) = 0$  since  $C_{n+1} \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{A}) \leq n$ . Therefore  $C_n \hookrightarrow B_{X,n} \twoheadrightarrow C_{n+1}$  splits and thus  $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow B_{X,0} \rightarrow B_{X,1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow B_{X,n-1} \rightarrow C_n \rightarrow 0$  is the desired exact sequence.

(b) Let  $W \in \mathcal{X} \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{X}$ . Consider the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow W \xrightarrow{f_0} B_{W,0} \xrightarrow{f_1} B_{W,1} \rightarrow \dots \xrightarrow{f_n} B_{W,n} \rightarrow 0$$

obtained in (a). Now, by using that  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}$  is closed under extensions, we can conclude that  $B_{W,k} \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \forall k \in [1, n]$ . Finally, consider the exact sequence  $W \hookrightarrow B_{W,0} \twoheadrightarrow C_1$ . Since  $W \in \mathcal{X} \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X} \cap {}^\perp (\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$  and  $C_1 \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X} \cap {}^\perp (\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$ , we have  $B_{W,0} \in \mathcal{X} \cap {}^\perp (\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}$ .  $\square$

The following result is a generalization of [3, Thm. 3.2]. Note that we are writing, at the same time, the big and the small versions.

**Theorem 3.42.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an  $AB_4$  (abelian) category,  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be closed under extensions such that  $\mathcal{X} = \text{Add}(\mathcal{X})$  ( $\mathcal{X} = \text{add}(\mathcal{X})$ ) and admits an  $\mathcal{X}$ -injective relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{X}$  and an  $\mathcal{X}$ -projective relative generator in  $\mathcal{X}$ . Consider a left cotorsion pair  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  in  $\mathcal{X}$  such that  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) = 0$  and  $\mathcal{B} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{B})$  is closed under extensions, and let  $\kappa := \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (a) *There exists  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  such that  $((\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}); \mathcal{T})$  is a big (small)  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting triple.*
- (b)  *$(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is right  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete,  ${}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ ,  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{A}) \leq n$ ,  $\kappa = \kappa^\oplus$  ( $\kappa = \kappa^{\oplus < \infty}$ ) and  $\kappa$  is precovering in  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ .*
- (c)  *$\kappa$  is a big (small)  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting class such that  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} = \kappa^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ .*

Furthermore, if any of the above conditions is satisfied, then  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \kappa^\vee$ ,  $\kappa = (\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X})^\perp \cap \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X} = {}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ ,  $\text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}) \leq \max\{1, n\}$ , and  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}) = \text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}) \leq n$ . Moreover, if  $\text{Add}(\sigma)$  ( $\text{add}(\sigma)$ ) is  $\mathcal{X}$ -projective and a relative generator in  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\sigma$  is a (finite) set (and  $\text{add}(X)$  is precovering in  $\mathcal{X}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} \forall X \in \kappa$ ), then we can dismiss the hypothesis from (b) which says that  $\kappa$  is precovering in  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and to find  $T \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $\text{Add}(T) = \kappa$  ( $\text{add}(T) = \kappa$ ).

*Proof.* (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) By Proposition 3.21, it follows that  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete,  $\mathcal{X}$ -hereditary, and  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} = \kappa = {}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . In particular  $\kappa = \kappa^\oplus$  ( $\kappa = \kappa^{\oplus < \infty}$ ). Moreover, since  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$ , we can conclude that  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{A}) \leq n$  by [7, Prop. 4.5 (b)], (T1) and (T4). Finally, it follows from (T5) that  $\kappa$  is precovering in  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ .

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c) Let  $\alpha$  be an  $\mathcal{X}$ -injective relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{X}$ . We claim that  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} = \kappa^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Indeed, since  $\kappa \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  and  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) = 0$ , we have  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \kappa^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Let us show that  $\kappa^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Consider  $X \in \kappa^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Then, by Lemma 3.41 (a), there is an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{f_0} B_0 \xrightarrow{f_1} B_1 \xrightarrow{f_2} \dots \xrightarrow{f_k} B_k \rightarrow 0$  such that  $B_k \in \kappa$ ,  $B_i \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $\text{Coker}(f_i) \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X} \forall i \in [0, k]$ . Hence, using that  $X \in \kappa^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $B_i \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \kappa^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ , we have that  $\text{Im}(f_j) \in \kappa^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} \forall j \in [1, k-1]$ .

Let us prove, by induction on  $k$ , that  $X \in \mathcal{B}$ . Indeed, if  $k = 0$  then  $X \cong B_0 \in \mathcal{B}$ . For the case  $k = 1$ , we have an exact sequence  $\eta_1 : X \hookrightarrow B_0 \twoheadrightarrow B_1$ , with  $X \in \kappa^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $B_1 \in \kappa$ . Hence  $\eta_1$  splits and thus  $X \in \mathcal{B}$ .

Let  $k > 1$ . Let us show that  $B_{k-1} \in \kappa$ . Indeed, using that  $B_{k-1} \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ , it is enough to show that  $B_{k-1} \in \mathcal{A}$ . From the exact sequence  $\eta_k : K_{k-1} \hookrightarrow B_{k-1} \twoheadrightarrow B_k$ , we get  $B_{k-1} \in \mathcal{A}$  since  $K_{k-1}, B_k \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  is closed under extensions; proving that  $B_{k-1} \in \kappa$ . Now, by using that  $B_k \in \kappa$  and  $K_{k-1} \in \kappa^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ , we get that  $\eta_k$  splits and thus  $K_{k-1} \in \kappa$ . Furthermore, from the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{f_0} B_0 \xrightarrow{f_1} B_1 \xrightarrow{f_2} \dots \xrightarrow{f_{k-2}} B_{k-2} \rightarrow K_{k-1} \rightarrow 0,$$

and using that  $K_{k-1} \in \kappa$ , we have by the inductive hypothesis, that  $X \in \mathcal{B}$ .

Let us show that  $\kappa$  is  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting. In order to do that, we proceed to verify the axioms from (T0) to (T5).

(T0): It is clear.

(T1): Since  $\kappa \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ , we have  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\kappa) \leq \text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{A}) \leq n$ .

- (T2): Since  $\kappa \subseteq \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \kappa^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ , we have  $\kappa \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \kappa^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ .  
(T4): By Lemma 3.40,  $\alpha$  is an  $\mathcal{X}$ -injective relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{X}$  such that  $\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Hence,  $\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{X}^\perp \cap \kappa^\perp$  since  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \kappa^\perp$ .  
(T5): By hypothesis,  $\kappa$  is precovering in  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Then, using that  $\kappa^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ , we have that every  $Z \in \kappa^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$  admits a  $\kappa$ -precover  $T' \rightarrow Z$  with  $T' \in \mathcal{X}$ .  
(T3): It follows from Lemma 3.41 (b).

(c)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) It is clear.

Assume now that one of the above equivalent conditions hold true. Then we have the following facts. By Lemma 3.41 (a),  $\text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}) \leq \max\{1, n\}$  and thus  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq (\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}^\vee \subseteq \mathcal{B}_\mathcal{X}^\vee$ . Moreover  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}) = \text{coresdim}_\mathcal{B}^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{X})$  by [7, Cor. 4.12 (a)]. On the other hand  $\kappa = (\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X})^\perp \cap \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}$  by [7, Theorem 4.24 (a)]; and  $\text{pd}_\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{A}) \leq n < \infty$  by (b). Then, by applying [7, Theorem 4.24 (a1, a2)] on  $(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B})$ ,  $\text{coresdim}_\mathcal{B}^\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{X}) = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}) = \text{pd}_\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}) \leq \text{pd}_\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{A}) \leq n$  and  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \kappa^\vee$ .

Finally, assume that  $\sigma$  is a (finite) set,  $(\text{add}(X))$  is precovering in  $X^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$  for every  $X \in \kappa$ ,  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is right  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete,  ${}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ ,  $\text{pd}_\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{A}) \leq n$ , and  $\kappa = \kappa^\oplus$  ( $\kappa = \kappa^{\oplus < \infty}$ ). Since  $\sigma \subseteq \mathcal{X} \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{X}$ , by Lemma 3.41 (b), every  $W \in \sigma$  admits an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow W \xrightarrow{f_0} B_{W,0} \xrightarrow{f_1} B_{W,1} \rightarrow \dots \xrightarrow{f_n} B_{W,n} \rightarrow 0$  such that  $B_{W,i} \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \forall i \in [0, n]$  and  $\text{Coker}(f_j) \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X} \forall j \in [0, n-1]$ . Consider  $T_W := \bigoplus_{i=0}^n B_{W,i}$  for every  $W \in \sigma$ . Since  $\kappa = \kappa^\oplus$  ( $\kappa = \kappa^{\oplus < \infty}$ ), we have  $T := \bigoplus_{W \in \sigma} T_W \in \kappa$  and  $\text{Add}(T) \subseteq \kappa$  ( $\text{add}(T) \subseteq \kappa$ ). We claim that  $\text{Add}(T) = \kappa$  ( $\text{add}(T) = \kappa$ ). In order to prove it, we must show that  $T$  is big (small)  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting. This is done in the same manner as (b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c) was proved.

Let us show that  $\kappa \subseteq \text{Add}(T)$  ( $\kappa \subseteq \text{add}(T)$ ). Consider  $X \in \kappa$ . Observe that  $X \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq T^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Now,  $T^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Fac}_1^\mathcal{X}(\text{Add}(T))$  ( $T^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Fac}_1^\mathcal{X}(\text{add}(T))$ ) by Lemma 3.8. Hence, by Lemma 3.9 (a),  $\text{Add}(T) = \text{Add}(T) \cap \mathcal{X}$  ( $\text{add}(T) = \text{add}(T) \cap \mathcal{X}$ ) is a relative generator in  $T^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Then, using that  $X \in T^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ , we can build an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow K_n \rightarrow T_n \xrightarrow{f_n} T_{n-1} \rightarrow \dots \xrightarrow{f_1} T_0 \xrightarrow{f_0} X \rightarrow 0$ , with  $T_i \in \text{Add}(T)$  ( $T_i \in \text{add}(T)$ ) and  $K_i := \text{Ker}(f_i) \in T^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} \forall i \in [0, n]$ . On the other hand  $\text{pd}_\mathcal{X}(X) \leq \text{pd}_\mathcal{X}(\kappa) \leq n$  and thus  $\text{Ext}_\mathcal{C}^1(K_{n-1}, K_n) \cong \text{Ext}_\mathcal{C}^{n+1}(X, K_n) = 0$ . Therefore,  $K_n \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq (\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X})^\perp$  since the exact sequence  $K_n \hookrightarrow T_n \twoheadrightarrow K_{n-1}$  splits. Then, using that  $T_i \in \kappa \subseteq \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq (\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X})^\perp \forall i \in [0, n]$  and  $(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X})^\perp$  is closed by mono-cokernels, we have  $K_i \in (\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X})^\perp \forall i \in [0, n]$ . Finally, since  $K_0 \in (\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X})^\perp$  and  $X \in \kappa \subseteq \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{X}$ , the exact sequence  $K_0 \hookrightarrow T_0 \twoheadrightarrow X$  splits and thus  $X \in \text{Add}(T)$  ( $X \in \text{add}(T)$ ).  $\square$

**Remark 3.43.** One of the hypotheses (the small case) in Theorem 3.42 is that the class  $\text{add}(X)$  is precovering in  $X^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} \forall X \in \kappa$ . We can give two examples where such condition is satisfied:

- (i)  $\mathcal{X} := \mathcal{FP}_n$ ,  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Mod}(R)$ ,  $\sigma = \{R\}$  with  $R$  an  $n$ -coherent ring, see Lemma 4.11.
- (ii)  $R$  is an Artin algebra,  $\mathcal{C} := \text{mod}(R)$ ,  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{mod}(R)$  and  $\sigma = \{R\}$ , see [16, Prop. 4.2].

**Lemma 3.44.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an abelian category with enough projectives and injectives and  $\mathcal{T}$  be an  $n$ - $\mathcal{C}$ -tilting class in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then  $({}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp), \mathcal{T}^\perp)$  is a complete hereditary cotorsion pair in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\mathcal{T}$  is  $n$ - $\mathcal{C}$ -tilting in  $\mathcal{C}$ , we get from Theorem 3.12 (c) that  $({}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp), \mathcal{T}^\perp)$  is a hereditary  $\mathcal{C}$ -complete pair in  $\mathcal{C}$  which is also a cotorsion one by [7, Cor. 3.11].  $\square$

**Corollary 3.45.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an AB3 (abelian) category with enough injectives and projectives,  $\mathcal{X} = \text{Add}(\mathcal{X})$  ( $\mathcal{X} = \text{add}(\mathcal{X})$ ) be a class in  $\mathcal{C}$  admitting an  $\mathcal{X}$ -injective relative cogenerator and an  $\mathcal{X}$ -projective relative generator. Consider the classes:*

(a)  $\text{HCC}_{n,\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{C})$  is the class of all the hereditary cotorsion pairs  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  which are  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete,  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{A}) \leq n$  and  $\omega := \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$  with  $\omega^\oplus = \omega$  (this condition is dismissed in the small case). We say that  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}), (\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}') \in \text{HCC}_{n,\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{C})$  are related, and write  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \sim (\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}')$  if  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A}' \cap \mathcal{B}' \cap \mathcal{X}$ .

(b)  $\text{Tilt}_{n,\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{C})$  is the class of all the big (small)  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting classes  $\mathcal{T}$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  such that  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ .

Then, the map  $\varphi : \text{HCC}_{n,\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{C})/\sim \rightarrow \text{Tilt}_{n,\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{C})$ ,  $[(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})] \mapsto \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ , is a bijection whose inverse is  $\psi : \text{Tilt}_{n,\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \text{HCC}_{n,\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{C})/\sim$ ,  $\mathcal{T} \mapsto [({}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp), \mathcal{T}^\perp)]$ .

*Proof.* We consider the big case only (the small one is similar). Recall that  $\mathcal{C}$  is AB4 since it is AB3 and has enough injectives and projectives. Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \in \text{HCC}_{n,\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{C})$  and  $\omega := \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Since  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete and hereditary, it follows that  $\omega$  is precovering in  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Moreover, by [7, Thm. 4.24 (b)], we get  $\omega = {}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Thus, by Theorem 3.42, we have that  $\omega \in \text{Tilt}_{n,\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{C})$  and  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} = \omega^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Moreover, by Lemma 3.9 (b) and Proposition 3.11, we have  ${}^\perp(\omega^\perp) \cap \omega^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} = \omega \cap \mathcal{X} = \omega$  and thus  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \sim ({}^\perp(\omega^\perp), \omega^\perp)$ .

Let  $\mathcal{T} \in \text{Tilt}_{n,\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{C})$ . Then, from [7, Prop. 4.5 (b)],  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}({}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp)) \leq \text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T}) \leq n$ . By Lemma 3.9 (b) and Proposition 3.11, we have  ${}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp) \cap \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{T}$ . Moreover, by Lemma 3.44 and Theorem 3.12 (c), we conclude that  $({}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp), \mathcal{T}^\perp) \in \text{HCC}_{n,\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{C})$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 3.46.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an AB4 (abelian) category,  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}^\oplus \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  ( $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ ) be a right thick class admitting an  $\mathcal{X}$ -projective relative generator in  $\mathcal{X}$ , and let  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be right thick. Then, the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (a) *There is a big (small)  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting class  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  such that  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ .*
- (b)  *$\mathcal{B}$  satisfies the following conditions:*
  - (b0)  *$\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \cap {}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$  is closed under coproducts (this condition is dismissed in the small case);*
  - (b1) *there is an  $\mathcal{X}$ -injective relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{X}$ ;*
  - (b2)  *$\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$  is special preenveloping in  $\mathcal{X}$ ;*
  - (b3)  *$\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}({}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})) \leq n$ ;*
  - (b4)  *$\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \cap {}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$  is precovering in  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ .*

Moreover, if (a) or (b) holds true, we have that  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \cap {}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  is  $\mathcal{X}$ -coresolving.

*Proof.* (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) Let  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  be a big (small)  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting class such that  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Let us verify the conditions of (b).

- (b0) Since  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ , by Proposition 3.15 (a, d), we have  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \cap {}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{T}$  and thus (b0) holds true.
- (b1) It follows by (T4).
- (b2) By Theorem 3.12 (c), the pair  $({}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp), \mathcal{T}^\perp)$  is right  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete. Hence, (b2) follows from Theorem 3.12 (a).
- (b3) It follows from [7, Prop. 4.5 (b)], (T4) and (T1).
- (b4) It follows from (T5) and Proposition 3.15 (a, d).

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) Assume the conditions of (b) hold true, and let  $\alpha$  be an  $\mathcal{X}$ -injective relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{X}$ . We assert that  $\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Indeed, using (b2), we have that the pair  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B})$  is right  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete. Hence by Lemma 3.40, our assertion follows. Also note that, since  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{X}$  are right thick,  $\mathcal{B}$  is closed under extensions and mono-cokernels in  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{B}$  is  $\mathcal{X}$ -coresolving, and thus, by [7, Lem. 3.4] and (b2),  $({}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}), \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$  is a right  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete left cotorsion pair in  $\mathcal{X}$ . Now, by (b0), (b3) and (b4), we have that  $({}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$  satisfy the conditions of Theorem 3.42 (b). Hence, by Theorem 3.42 (a), the item (a) is satisfied.  $\square$

**Remark 3.47.** Assume the hypotheses of Theorem 3.46 with  $\mathcal{C}$   $AB_4$ ,  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}^\oplus$  right thick and  $\sigma$  a set, where  $\text{Add}(\sigma)$  is an  $\mathcal{X}$ -projective relative generator in  $\mathcal{X}$ . Then, we can dismiss the condition (b4) from (b). Moreover, if Theorem 3.46(a) is satisfied, we can choose  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  such that  $\mathcal{T} = \text{Add}(T)$  with  $T \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \cap {}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$ . Indeed, this is a consequence of the last sentence in Theorem 3.42 and the fact that  $\text{Add}(T)$  is precovering.

**Remark 3.48.** Assume the hypotheses of Theorem 3.46 with  $\mathcal{C}$  abelian,  $\mathcal{X}$  right thick and  $\sigma$  a finite set, where  $\text{add}(\sigma)$  is an  $\mathcal{X}$ -projective relative generator in  $\mathcal{X}$ . Then, we can replace condition (b4) in (b) for the following condition:

(\*) :  $\text{add}(T)$  is precovering in  $T^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ , for each  $T \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \cap {}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$ .

Moreover, in such case, we can choose  $\mathcal{T} = \text{add}(T)$  with  $T \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \cap {}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$ . Indeed, this is a consequence of the last sentence in Theorem 3.42.

**Corollary 3.49.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an  $AB_4$  category with enough injectives,  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}^\oplus$  be a right thick class admitting an  $\mathcal{X}$ -injective relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{X}$ , and let  $\sigma$  be a set such that  $\text{Add}(\sigma)$  is an  $\mathcal{X}$ -projective relative generator in  $\mathcal{X}$ . Consider the following classes:

$\mathcal{T}_{n,\mathcal{X}}$ : consisting of all the objects  $T \in \mathcal{X}$  that are big  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting;

$\mathcal{TP}_{n,\mathcal{X}}$ : consisting of all the right  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete and left cotorsion pairs  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  such that  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}({}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})) \leq n$ ,  ${}^\perp(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X}$  is closed under coproducts and  $\mathcal{B}$  is right thick.

Consider the equivalence relation  $\sim$  in  $\mathcal{T}_{n,\mathcal{X}}$ , where  $T \sim S$  if  $T^\perp \cap \mathcal{X} = S^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ ; and the equivalence relation  $\approx$  in  $\mathcal{TP}_{n,\mathcal{X}}$ , where  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \approx (\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}')$  if  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{B}' \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Then, there is a bijective map

$$\phi : \mathcal{T}_{n,\mathcal{X}}/\sim \longrightarrow \mathcal{TP}_{n,\mathcal{X}}/\approx, \quad [T] \mapsto [({}^\perp(T^\perp), T^\perp)].$$

*Proof.* For each  $T \in \mathcal{T}_{n,\mathcal{X}}$ , we consider the pair  $\mathcal{P}_T := ({}^\perp(T^\perp), T^\perp)$ . Let us show that  $\mathcal{P}_T \in \mathcal{TP}_{n,\mathcal{X}}$ . To begin with, it is clear that  $T^\perp$  is right thick, and by Theorem 3.12 (c),  $\mathcal{P}_T$  is  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete. On the other hand, by [7, Lemma 3.4],  $\mathcal{P}_T$  is left cotorsion since  $\mathcal{C}$  has enough injectives. Moreover, by Proposition 3.11 and Lemma 3.9,  $T^\perp \cap {}^\perp(T^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{X} = \text{Add}(T) \cap \mathcal{X} = \text{Add}(T)$  and thus  $T^\perp \cap {}^\perp(T^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{X}$  is closed under coproducts. Finally, by Proposition 3.16 (b),  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}({}^\perp(T^\perp \cap \mathcal{X})) \leq n$ .

Moreover, for  $T, S \in \mathcal{T}_{n,\mathcal{X}}$ , we note that  $[T] = [S] \Leftrightarrow [\mathcal{P}_T] = [\mathcal{P}_S]$ . Therefore, the map  $\phi$  is well-defined and injective. It remains to show that  $\phi$  is surjective.

Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \in \mathcal{TP}_{n,\mathcal{X}}$ . In particular,  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  satisfy conditions (b0), (b1), (b2) and (b3) of Theorem 3.46 (b). Then, by Remark 3.47, Theorem 3.46 (a) is satisfied and thus we can find  $T \in \mathcal{T}_{n,\mathcal{X}}$  such that  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} = T^\perp \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Therefore  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \approx ({}^\perp(T^\perp), T^\perp)$  and then  $\phi([T]) = [(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})]$ .  $\square$

A similar result as above can be proved for small  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting objects.



**Corollary 3.50.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an abelian category with enough injectives,  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  be a right thick class admitting an  $\mathcal{X}$ -injective relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{X}$ , and let  $\sigma$  be a finite set such that  $\text{add}(\sigma)$  is an  $\mathcal{X}$ -projective relative generator in  $\mathcal{X}$ . Consider the following classes:*

*$s\mathcal{T}_{n,\mathcal{X}}$ : consisting of all the objects  $T \in \mathcal{X}$  that are small  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting;  
 $s\mathcal{TP}_{n,\mathcal{X}}$ : consisting of all the right  $\mathcal{X}$ -complete and left cotorsion pairs  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  such that  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}({}^{\perp}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})) \leq n$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  is right thick.*

*Consider the equivalence relation  $\sim$  in  $s\mathcal{T}_{n,\mathcal{X}}$ , where  $T \sim S$  if  $T^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{X} = S^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{X}$ ; and the equivalence relation  $\approx$  in  $s\mathcal{TP}_{n,\mathcal{X}}$ , where  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \approx (\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}')$  if  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{B}' \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Then, there is an injective map*

$$\phi : s\mathcal{T}_{n,\mathcal{X}}/\sim \longrightarrow s\mathcal{TP}_{n,\mathcal{X}}/\approx, \quad [T] \mapsto [({}^{\perp}(T^{\perp}), T^{\perp})].$$

*Furthermore,  $\phi$  is bijective if every  $T \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \cap {}^{\perp}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$  satisfies that  $\text{add}(T)$  is precovering in  $T^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{X}$ .*

*Proof.* Using Theorem 3.46 and Remark 3.48, the proof follows by similar arguments as in the proof of Corollary 3.49.  $\square$

In the case of a ring  $R$ , we get the following result.

**Corollary 3.51.** *Let  $R$  be a ring,  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}^{\oplus}$  be a right thick class in  $\text{Mod}(R)$  admitting an  $\mathcal{X}$ -injective relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{X}$ , and let  $\sigma$  be a set such that  $\text{Add}(\sigma)$  is an  $\mathcal{X}$ -projective relative generator in  $\mathcal{X}$ . Then, for every  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \text{Mod}(R)$ , the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (a) *There is a big  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting object  $T \in \mathcal{X}$  such that  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} = T^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{X}$ .*
- (b)  *$\mathcal{B}$  satisfies the following conditions:*
  - (b0)  *$\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} \cap {}^{\perp}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})$  is closed under coproducts;*
  - (b1)  *$\mathcal{B}$  is special preenveloping in  $\mathcal{X}$ ;*
  - (b2)  *$\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}({}^{\perp}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})) \leq n$ ;*
  - (b3)  *$\mathcal{B}$  is right thick in  $\text{Mod}(R)$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from Corollary 3.49.  $\square$

In the case of an Artin algebra  $\Lambda$ , we get the following result.

**Corollary 3.52.** *Let  $\Lambda$  be an Artin algebra,  $\mathcal{X}$  be a right thick class in  $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$  admitting an  $\mathcal{X}$ -injective relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{X}$ , and let  $\sigma$  be a set such that  $\text{add}(\sigma)$  is an  $\mathcal{X}$ -projective relative generator in  $\mathcal{X}$ . Then, for any  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \text{mod}(\Lambda)$ , the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (a) *There is a small  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting object  $T \in \mathcal{X}$  such that  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X} = T^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{X}$ .*
- (b)  *$\mathcal{B}$  satisfies the following conditions:*
  - (b1)  *$\mathcal{B}$  is special preenveloping in  $\mathcal{X}$ ;*
  - (b2)  *$\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\text{mod}(\Lambda) \cap {}^{\perp}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{X})) \leq n$ ;*
  - (b3)  *$\mathcal{B}$  is right thick in  $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from Corollary 3.50 and [16, Prop. 4.2].  $\square$

#### 4. $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -TILTING VERSUS OTHER NOTIONS OF TILTING

In this section, we will show that  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting offers a unified framework of different previous notions of tilting which are in the literature.

**4.1.  $\infty$ -tilting objects and pairs.** Leonid Positselski and Jan Šťovíček defined in [52] the notion of  $\infty$ -tilting object and  $\infty$ -tilting pair. In this section, we recall these notions and give an interpretation in terms of  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting theory. We also recall that an AB3\* category, having an injective cogenerator, is AB3 [47, Ex. III.2].

**Definition 4.1.** [52, Sect. 2] *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an AB3\* category which has an injective cogenerator. An object  $T \in \mathcal{A}$  is  $\infty$ -**tilting** if the following conditions hold true:*

- ( $\infty$ -T1):  $\text{Add}(T) \subseteq T^\perp$ .
- ( $\infty$ -T2):  $\text{Inj}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq (\text{Add}(T), T^\perp)_\infty^\wedge$ .

**Definition 4.2.** [52, Sect. 3] *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an AB3\* category having an injective cogenerator,  $T \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ . The pair  $(T, \mathcal{E})$  is  $\infty$ -**tilting** if the following conditions hold true:*

- ( $\infty$ -PT1): *The class  $\mathcal{E}$  is coresolving.*
- ( $\infty$ -PT2):  $\text{Add}(T) \subseteq \mathcal{E} \subseteq T^{\perp_1}$ .
- ( $\infty$ -PT3): *Any  $\text{Add}(T)$ -precover  $\alpha : T' \rightarrow E$  of  $E \in \mathcal{E}$  is an epimorphism and  $\text{Ker}(\alpha) \in \mathcal{E}$ .*

**Remark 4.3.** [52, Sect. 3] *For an  $\infty$ -tilting pair  $(T, \mathcal{E})$  in an AB3\* category  $\mathcal{A}$ , which has an injective cogenerator  $J$ , the following statements hold true:*

- (a)  $\text{Prod}(J) = \text{Inj}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{E} \subseteq T^\perp$ .
- (b)  $\text{Add}(T) \subseteq T^\perp$ .
- (c)  $\text{Add}(T)$  is a relative  $\mathcal{E}$ -projective generator in  $\mathcal{E}$ .
- (d)  $\text{Prod}(J)$  is an  $\mathcal{E}$ -injective relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{E}$ .

The connection between  $\infty$ -tilting objects and pairs is as follows.

**Lemma 4.4.** [52, Lem. 3.1] *For a bicomplete abelian category  $\mathcal{A}$ , which has an injective cogenerator, and  $T \in \mathcal{A}$ , the following statements hold true.*

- (a) *There exists a class  $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  such that  $(T, \mathcal{E})$  is an  $\infty$ -tilting pair if, and only if,  $T$  is an  $\infty$ -tilting object.*
- (b) *If  $T$  is an  $\infty$ -tilting object, then  $(T, (\text{Add}(T), T^\perp)_\infty^\wedge)$  is an  $\infty$ -tilting pair.*
- (c) *If  $(T, \mathcal{E})$  is an  $\infty$ -tilting pair, then  $\mathcal{E} \subseteq (\text{Add}(T), T^\perp)_\infty^\wedge$ .*

In what follows, we show that the  $\infty$ -tilting pairs are contained in the  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting theory.

**Proposition 4.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an AB3\* category having an injective cogenerator, and let  $(T, \mathcal{E})$  be an  $\infty$ -tilting pair. Then  $T$  is a big 0- $\mathcal{E}$ -tilting object such that  $\text{Add}(T) = \mathcal{E} \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{E}$  and  $T^\perp \cap \mathcal{E} = \text{Gen}_1^\mathcal{E}(T)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $J \in \mathcal{A}$  be an injective cogenerator. By [?, Chap. 3, Cor. 2.9, p.73], we get that  $\mathcal{A}$  is AB4. By taking into account Remark 4.3, we can show the following:

- (T1):  $\text{pd}_{\text{Add}(T)}(\mathcal{E}) = \text{pd}_T(\mathcal{E}) = 0$  since  $\mathcal{E} \subseteq T^\perp$ .
- (T2):  $\text{Add}(T) \cap \mathcal{E} \subseteq T^\perp = \text{Add}(T)^\perp$  since  $\text{Add}(T) \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ .
- (T3): We know that  $\text{Add}(T)$  is an  $\mathcal{E}$ -projective relative generator in  $\mathcal{E}$  and thus  $\text{Add}(T) \subseteq (\text{Add}(T))_\mathcal{E}^\vee$ .
- (T4):  $\text{Prod}(J) = \text{Inj}(\mathcal{A})$  is an  $\mathcal{E}$ -injective relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $T^\perp = (\text{Add}(T))^\perp$ .
- (T5): Notice that  $\text{Add}(T)$  is precovering since  $\mathcal{A}$  is AB3. Using now that  $\text{Add}(T) \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ , any  $X \in T^\perp \cap \mathcal{E}$  has an  $\text{Add}(T)$ -precover  $A \rightarrow X$ , with  $A \in \mathcal{E}$ .

Finally, it is enough to use Corollary 3.7 and Theorem 3.12 to conclude that  $\text{Add}(T) = \mathcal{E} \cap {}^\perp \mathcal{E}$  and  $T^\perp \cap \mathcal{E} = \text{Gen}_1^\mathcal{E}(T) \cap \mathcal{E} = \text{Gen}_1^\mathcal{E}(T)$  since  $\mathcal{E}$  is closed under mono-cokernels.  $\square$

**4.2. Miyashita tilting modules.** In this section we review the tilting theory developed by Yoichi Miyashita in [48]. Recall that, for a ring  $R$ ,  $\text{proj}(R)$  (resp.  $\text{inj}(R)$ ) is the class of finitely generated projective (resp. injective) left  $R$ -modules.

**Definition 4.6.** *Let  $R$  be a ring. A left  $R$ -module  $T$  is **Miyashita  $n$ -tilting** if the following conditions hold true.*

(MT1):  $T \in \text{proj}(R)_n^\wedge$ .

(MT2):  $T \in T^\perp$ .

(MT3):  $R \in \text{add}(T)_n^\vee$ .

**Proposition 4.7.** *Let  $R$  be a finitely generated  $S$ -algebra, where  $S$  is a commutative noetherian ring, and let  $T \in \text{mod}(R)$ . Then, the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (a)  $T$  is a Miyashita  $n$ -tilting module and  $\text{inj}(R)$  is a relative cogenerator in  $\text{mod}(R)$ .
- (b)  $T$  is a big  $n\text{-mod}(R)$ -tilting object.
- (c)  $T$  is a small  $n\text{-mod}(R)$ -tilting object.

Moreover, if  $\text{inj}(R)$  is a relative cogenerator in  $\text{mod}(R)$  and  $T$  satisfies (MT1) and (MT2), then  $T$  satisfies (MT3) if and only if  $\text{coresdim}_{\text{add}(T)}(R) < \infty$ .

*Proof.* Observe that  $\text{mod}(R)$  is a thick abelian subcategory of  $\text{Mod}(R)$  by Corollary 3.33 (b). Moreover, (MT1) and (T1) are equivalent since  $\text{pd}_{\text{mod}(R)}(T) = \text{pd}(T)$ .

(a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) Let  $T$  be a Miyashita  $n$ -tilting module and  $\text{inj}(R)$  be a relative cogenerator in  $\text{mod}(R)$ . Notice that (T4) is trivial and (T5) follows from Lemma 3.35. Finally, (T3) follows from (MT3) and Remark 3.26.

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) Let  $T$  be an  $n\text{-mod}(R)$ -tilting object. We only show (MT3). Indeed, by Theorem 3.12 (c), there is an exact sequence  $R \hookrightarrow M_0 \twoheadrightarrow X_0$ , where  $M_0 \in T^\perp \cap \text{mod}(R)$  and  $X_0 \in {}^\perp(T^\perp) \cap \text{mod}(R)$ . Moreover, using  $R \in {}^\perp(T^\perp)$ , by Lemma 3.9 (b) we get  $M_0 \in {}^\perp(T^\perp) \cap T^\perp \cap \text{mod}(R) = \text{Add}(T) \cap \text{mod}(R) = \text{add}(T)$ . By repeating the above argument, we can build (inductively) an exact sequence  $R \hookrightarrow M_0 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow M_k \twoheadrightarrow X_k$ , with  $X_i \in {}^\perp(T^\perp) \cap \text{mod}(R)$  and  $M_i \in \text{add}(T) \forall i \in [1, k]$ . Finally,  $X_n \in T^\perp \cap {}^\perp(T^\perp) \cap \text{mod}(R) = \text{add}(T)$  by [7, Prop. 2.7].

(b)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (c) It follows from Corollary 3.38.  $\square$

By using Proposition 4.7 together with the main results in this paper, we can infer well-known properties of Miyashita tilting modules.

**4.3. Miyashita tilting for modules of type  $FP_n$ .** In this section we study the left  $n$ -coherent rings and the left modules of type  $FP_{n+1}$ . We characterize when some  $T \in \text{Mod}(R)$  is a big  $n\text{-}\mathcal{FP}_{n+1}$ -tilting object.

Let  $R$  be a ring. Following [25, Section 1], we recall that  $M \in \text{Mod}(R)$  is called **finitely  $n$ -presented** (or of type  $FP_n$ ) if it admits an exact sequence  $F_n \rightarrow F_{n-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow F_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  with  $F_i \in \text{proj}(R) \forall i \in [0, n]$ . The class of all the left  $R$ -modules of type  $FP_n$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{FP}_n(R)$ . Note that  $\mathcal{FP}_0(R) = \text{mod}(R)$ . An  $M \in \text{Mod}(R)$  is called **finitely  $\infty$ -presented** (or of type  $FP_\infty$ ) if it admits an exact sequence  $\cdots \rightarrow F_n \rightarrow F_{n-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow F_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ , with  $F_i \in \text{proj}(R) \forall i \geq 0$ .

The class of all the left  $R$ -modules of type  $FP_\infty$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{FP}_\infty(R)$ . Note that  $\mathcal{FP}_\infty(R) = \text{proj}(R)_\infty^\wedge$ .

**Lemma 4.8.** [25, Prop. 1.7] *Let  $R$  be a ring. Then,  $\mathcal{FP}_n(R)$  is right thick and  $\mathcal{FP}_\infty(R)$  is thick.*

**Lemma 4.9.** [24, Lem. 2.11] *Let  $R$  be a ring and  $C \in \text{Mod}(R)$  be such that there is an exact sequence  $F_n \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow F_1 \rightarrow F_0 \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ , where  $F_i \in \mathcal{FP}_n(R) \forall i \in [0, n]$ . Then  $C \in \mathcal{FP}_n(R)$ .*

We recall from [25, Def. 2.2] that a ring  $R$  is left  $n$ -coherent if  $\mathcal{FP}_n(R) = \mathcal{FP}_{n+1}(R)$ .

**Lemma 4.10.** [25, Cor. 2.6] *Let  $R$  be a left  $n$ -coherent ring. Then  $\mathcal{FP}_n$  is closed under epi-kernels.*

**Lemma 4.11.** *For an  $n$ -coherent commutative ring  $R$  and  $T \in \mathcal{FP}_n(R)$ , the following statements hold true.*

- (a)  $\text{Hom}_R(T, X) \in \mathcal{FP}_n(R) \forall X \in T^\perp \cap \mathcal{FP}_n(R)$ .
- (b) Every  $X \in T^\perp \cap \mathcal{FP}_n(R)$  admits an  $\text{add}(T)$ -precover. Moreover, such  $\text{add}(T)$ -precover is an  $\text{Add}(T)$ -precover.

*Proof.* (a) There is a family  $\{K_{i+1} \hookrightarrow R^{m_i} \rightarrow K_i\}_{i=0}^n$  of exact sequences in  $\text{Mod}(R)$ , where  $K_0 = T$  and  $m_i \in \mathbb{N} \forall i \in [0, n]$ , since  $T \in \mathcal{FP}_n(R)$ .

Let  $X \in T^\perp \cap \mathcal{FP}_n(R)$ . Then  $\text{Ext}_R^1(K_i, X) \simeq \text{Ext}_R^{1+i}(T, X) = 0 \forall i \in [0, n]$ , and thus, by applying the functor  $\text{Hom}_R(-, X)$  to the above family of exact sequences, we get the family  $\{0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(K_i, X) \rightarrow X^{m_i} \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(K_{i+1}, X) \rightarrow 0\}_{i=0}^n$  of exact sequences in  $\text{Mod}(R)$ . From this family, we get the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(T, X) \rightarrow X^{m_0} \rightarrow X^{m_1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow X^{m_n} \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(K_{n+1}, X) \rightarrow 0.$$

Then by Lemmas 4.8 and 4.9, it follows that  $\text{Hom}_R(K_{n+1}, X) \in \mathcal{FP}_n(R)$ . Thus, by using recursively Lemmas 4.8 and 4.10, we get that  $\text{Hom}_R(T, X) \in \mathcal{FP}_n(R)$ .

(b) Let  $X \in T^\perp \cap \mathcal{FP}_n(R)$ . Then, by (a),  $\text{Hom}_R(T, X) \in \text{mod}(R)$  and let  $\{f_1, \dots, f_k\}$  be a finite generating set. It is straightforward to show that  $\alpha := (f_1, \dots, f_k) : T^k \rightarrow X$  is an  $\text{add}(T)$ -precover. The second statement in (b) follows from Lemma 3.35.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.12.** *Let  $R$  be a ring and  $T \in \text{mod}(R)$  be such that  $T \in T^\perp$  and  $T \in \text{proj}(R)_n^\wedge$ . Then, the following statements hold true.*

- (a)  $\mathcal{Q} := ({}^\perp T \cap \mathcal{FP}_\infty(R), \text{add}(T))_\infty^\vee$  is left thick.
- (b)  $(\text{add}(T))_{\mathcal{FP}_\infty(R)}^\vee = \text{add}(T)^\vee = \{M \in \mathcal{Q} \mid \text{id}_{\mathcal{Q}}(M) < \infty\}$  is left thick.

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.8, we know that  $\mathcal{FP}_\infty(R)$  is thick in  $\text{Mod}(R)$ . Note that  $T \in \mathcal{FP}_\infty(R)$  and thus  $\text{add}(T) \subseteq \mathcal{FP}_\infty(R)$ . Moreover  $\text{add}(T) \subseteq T^\perp \cap \mathcal{FP}_\infty$  since  $T \in T^\perp$ . Hence, the result follows from [7, Cor. 4.21].  $\square$

**Theorem 4.13.** *Let  $R$  be a left  $n$ -coherent ring and  $T \in \mathcal{FP}_{n+1}(R)$ . Consider the following statements:*

- (a)  $T$  is a Miyashita  $n$ -tilting  $R$ -module and there is an  $\mathcal{FP}_{n+1}(R)$ -injective relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{FP}_{n+1}(R)$ .
- (b)  $T$  is a big  $n$ - $\mathcal{FP}_{n+1}(R)$ -tilting object.
- (c)  $T$  is a small  $n$ - $\mathcal{FP}_{n+1}(R)$ -tilting object.

Then (b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) and (b)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (c) hold true. Furthermore, (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) holds true if  $R$  is commutative.

*Proof.* Note first that, by [25, Thm. 2.4 (3)],  $R$  is  $k$ -coherent  $\forall k \geq n$ . In particular, by Lemmas 4.8 and 4.10,  $\mathcal{FP}_{n+1}(R)$  is thick in  $\text{Mod}(R)$ .

(a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) Let  $R$  be commutative. The conditions (T1), (T2), (T4) and (T5) are proved straightforward by using [37, Lem. 3.1.6] and Lemma 4.11 (b). The condition (T3) follows from (MT3) and Lemma 4.12.

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) Let  $T$  be an  $n$ - $\mathcal{FP}_{n+1}(R)$ -tilting object. By (T4), we know there is an  $\mathcal{FP}_{n+1}(R)$ -injective relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{FP}_{n+1}(R)$ .

Let us prove that  $T$  is Miyashita tilting. Since  $T \in \mathcal{FP}_{n+1}(R)$  and  $R$  is  $(n+1)$ -coherent, it can be shown that (MT1) is satisfied by using (T1) and the Shifting Lemma. Moreover, (MT2) follows from (T2). Finally, since  $\mathcal{FP}_{n+1}(R)$  is thick in  $\text{Mod}(R)$ , by Theorem 3.12 (c), there is an exact sequence  ${}_R R \hookrightarrow M_0 \rightarrow X_0$  where  $M_0 \in T^\perp \cap \mathcal{FP}_{n+1}(R)$  and  $X_0 \in {}^\perp(T^\perp) \cap \mathcal{FP}_{n+1}(R)$ . Then, using  ${}_R R \in {}^\perp(T^\perp)$  and Proposition 3.15 (d), we have  $M_0 \in {}^\perp(T^\perp) \cap T^\perp \cap \mathcal{FP}_{n+1}(R) = \text{Add}(T) \cap \mathcal{FP}_{n+1}(R) = \text{add}(T)$ . By repeating the same arguments (recursively), we can build a long exact sequence  $R \hookrightarrow M_0 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow M_k \rightarrow X_k \forall k \geq 1$  with  $M_i \in \text{add}(T)$  and  $X_i \in {}^\perp(T^\perp) \cap \mathcal{FP}_{n+1}(R) \forall i \in [1, k]$ . Now, since  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{FP}_{n+1}(R)}(T) \leq n$ , we have  $T^\perp \cap \mathcal{FP}_{n+1}(R)$  is closed by  $n$ -quotients in  $\mathcal{FP}_{n+1}(R)$  by [7, Prop. 2.6]. Thus, we have  $X_n \in T^\perp \cap {}^\perp(T^\perp) \cap \mathcal{FP}_{n+1}(R) = \text{add}(T)$  and therefore  $T$  satisfies (MT3).

(b)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (c) It follows from Corollary 3.38 since  $\mathcal{FP}_{n+1}(R) \subseteq \text{mod}(R)$ .  $\square$

**4.4. Tilting in exact categories.** It is a known fact that a small exact category can be embedded into an abelian category. In this section, we will use this fact to introduce a tilting theory on small exact categories. Furthermore, we will see that the tilting objects obtained by this procedure coincide with the tilting objects defined by Bin Zhu y Xiao Zhuang in [59].

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an additive category. A **kernel-cokernel pair**  $(i, p)$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  is a sequence of morphisms  $A' \xrightarrow{i} A \xrightarrow{p} A''$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $i$  is the kernel of  $p$  and  $p$  is the cokernel of  $i$ . Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a fixed class of kernel-cokernel pairs in  $\mathcal{A}$ . A morphism  $i$  ( $p$ , respectively) is called **admissible mono** (**admissible epi**, respectively) if there is a pair  $(i, p) \in \mathcal{E}$ . An **exact category** is a pair  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ , where  $\mathcal{A}$  is an additive category and  $\mathcal{E}$  is a class of kernel-cokernel pairs satisfying certain axioms, see [28, Def. 2.1] for more details.

Given an exact category  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ , an element  $(i, p) \in \mathcal{E}$  is called **short exact sequence** and it is also denoted as  $0 \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{i} Z \xrightarrow{p} Y \rightarrow 0$ . Moreover, for every  $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{E}(X, Y)$  the class of all the short exact sequences of the form  $0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow X \rightarrow 0$ . Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  and  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}')$  be exact categories and  $F : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}'$  be an additive functor. Following [28, Def. 5.1], we recall that  $F$  is **exact** if  $F(\mathcal{E}) \subseteq \mathcal{E}'$ . We say that  $F$  **reflects exactness** in case  $(F\alpha, F\beta) \in \mathcal{E}'$  implies  $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{E}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an additive category and  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} X$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $fg = 1_Y$ . In this case, we say that  $f$  is a **split-epi** and  $g$  is a **split-mono**. Following [28, Def. 6.1, Rk. 6.2], we recall that  $\mathcal{A}$  is **idempotent complete** if any idempotent morphism  $p : A \rightarrow A$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  admits a kernel. If every split-epi admits a kernel, we say that  $\mathcal{A}$  is **weakly idempotent complete**.

Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category. Following [28, Def. 11.1], we recall that an object  $P \in \mathcal{A}$  is  **$\mathcal{E}$ -projective** if  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(P, -) : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{Ab}$  is exact. We denote by

$\text{Proj}_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{A})$  the class of all the  $\mathcal{E}$ -projective objects. The  **$\mathcal{E}$ -injective** objects are defined dually, and the class of all the  $\mathcal{E}$ -injective objects is denoted by  $\text{Inj}_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{A})$ . We say that  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  **has enough  $\mathcal{E}$ -projectives** [28, Def. 11.9] if every  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  admits an admissible epi  $P \rightarrow A$  with  $P \in \text{Proj}_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{A})$ . Dually,  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  **has enough  $\mathcal{E}$ -injectives** if every  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  admits an admissible mono  $A \rightarrow I$  with  $I \in \text{Inj}_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{A})$ .

Consider a category  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ . Let  $[\mathcal{X}]$  denotes the class of all the objects  $Z \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $Z \cong X$  with  $X \in \mathcal{X}$ . For a functor  $F : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ , the class  $[F(\mathcal{A})]$  is also known as the essential image of  $F$  in  $\mathcal{B}$ .

**Remark 4.14.** Let  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  be classes objects in a category  $\mathcal{C}$ . Note that  $[\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y}] \subseteq [\mathcal{X}] \cap [\mathcal{Y}]$ . Furthermore,  $[\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y}] = \mathcal{X} \cap [\mathcal{Y}]$  if  $\mathcal{X} = [\mathcal{X}]$ .

**Theorem 4.15.** [28, Thm. A.1] For a small exact category  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ , the following statements hold true.

- (a) There is an abelian category  $\mathcal{B}$  and a fully faithful exact functor  $i : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  that reflects exactness. Moreover,  $[i(\mathcal{A})]$  is closed under extensions in  $\mathcal{B}$ .
- (b) The category  $\mathcal{B}$  may canonically be chosen to be the category  $\text{Lex}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  (of all the contravariant additive left exact functors  $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{Ab}$ ) and  $i$  to be the Yoneda embedding  $i(A) := \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(-, A)$ .
- (c) Assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  is weakly idempotent complete. If  $f$  is a morphism in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $i(f)$  is epic (monic) in  $\mathcal{B}$ , then  $f$  is an admissible epi (mono).

**Definition 4.16.** Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category and  $\mathcal{C}$  be an abelian category. If there is a fully faithful additive exact functor  $i : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  that reflects exactness and  $[i(\mathcal{A})]$  is closed under extensions in  $\mathcal{C}$ , we say that  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  is **embedded** in  $\mathcal{C}$ , and that  $i : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  is **the embedding of  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $\mathcal{C}$** .

Observe that, having an exact category  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  such that  $\mathcal{A}$  is a full subcategory of an abelian category  $\mathcal{C}$ , is not the same as having the exact category  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  embedded in  $\mathcal{C}$ , via the inclusion  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ . For example, if  $R$  is a ring and  $\mathcal{E}$  is the class of all the splitting exact sequences in  $\text{Mod}(R)$ , then  $(\text{Mod}(R), \mathcal{E})$  is an exact category. Notice that  $(\text{Mod}(R), \mathcal{E})$  is not embedded in  $\text{Mod}(R)$  unless  $R$  be a semisimple ring. We will see a non-trivial example of this in the section related with Mohamed's contexts in  $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$ .

In what follows, we introduce a tilting theory in exact categories. We can find precedents of this in different contexts. As examples, we can cite Maurice Auslander and Øyvind Solberg's relative tilting theory [18], or the generalization of such theory developed by Soud Khalifa Mohamed in [49]. In this section, we will approach to the tilting theory recently developed by Bin Zhu and Xiao Zhuang in [59].

Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ . An  **$\mathcal{X}$ -resolution** (of length  $n$ ) in  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  of  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  is a sequence  $X_n \xrightarrow{d_n} X_{n-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow X_1 \xrightarrow{d_1} X_0 \xrightarrow{d_0} A$  of morphisms in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that there is a family  $\{K_{i+1} \xrightarrow{g_i} X_i \xrightarrow{f_i} K_i\}_{i=0}^n$  in  $\mathcal{E}$  with  $K_{n+1} = 0$ ,  $K_n = X_n$ ,  $K_0 = A$ ,  $g_{n-1} = d_n$ ,  $f_n = 1_{X_n}$ ,  $f_0 = d_0$  and  $d_i = g_{i-1}f_i \forall i \in [1, n-1]$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{X}_{n, \mathcal{E}}^{\wedge}$  the class of all the objects  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  admitting an  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolution in  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  of length  $\leq n$ . We define the class  $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{E}}^{\wedge} := \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{X}_{n, \mathcal{E}}^{\wedge}$  and, for any  $A \in \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{E}}^{\wedge}$ , the  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolution dimension of  $A$  is  $\text{resdim}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}}(A) := \min \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid A \in \mathcal{X}_{n, \mathcal{E}}^{\wedge}\}$ . The notion of  $\mathcal{X}$ -coresolution, the classes  $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{E}, n}^{\vee}$  and  $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{E}}^{\vee}$ , and the  $\mathcal{X}$ -coresolution dimension  $\text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}}(A)$  of  $A$  are defined dually.

Given  $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(B, A)$  or  $\text{Ext}_{(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})}^1(B, A)$  denote the class of extensions of  $A$  by  $B$  whose elements are equivalence classes of  $\mathcal{E}(B, A)$ . As in the case of abelian

categories, we have that  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(B, A)$  is an abelian group with the Baer's sum, where 0 is the equivalence class of exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}} A \oplus B \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}} B \rightarrow 0$ .

Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be with enough  $\mathcal{E}$ -projectives and  $\mathcal{E}$ -injectives. Then, any  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  admits short exact sequences  $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow I \rightarrow A^1 \rightarrow 0$  and  $0 \rightarrow A_1 \rightarrow P \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0$  in  $\mathcal{E}$ , with  $I \in \text{Inj}(\mathcal{A})[\mathcal{E}]$  and  $P \in \text{Proj}(\mathcal{A})[\mathcal{E}]$ . In this case,  $A^1$  is a **first cosyzygy** of  $A$  and  $A_1$  is a **first syzygy** of  $A$ . Define an  **$n$ -th cosyzygy** ( **$n$ -th syzygy**, respectively) by recursion as the cosyzygy (syzygy) of the  $(n-1)$ -th cosyzygy ( $(n-1)$ -th syzygy). The class of all the  $n$ -th cosyzygies of  $A$  is denoted by  $\Sigma^n(A)$ , and the class of all the  $n$ -th syzygies of  $A$  is denoted by  $\Omega_n(A)$ . In [42, Lem. 5.1] it is shown that, for  $k \geq 2$ ,  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(X, Y^{k-1}) \cong \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(X_{k-1}, Y) \quad \forall X_{k-1} \in \Omega^{k-1}(X), \forall Y^{k-1} \in \Sigma^{k-1}(Y)$ . Such group is called the  $k$ -th Ext of  $X$  and  $Y$ , and it is denoted by  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^k(X, Y)$  or by  $\text{Ext}_{(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})}^k(X, Y)$ . For  $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ , we consider the right orthogonal class  $\mathcal{Z}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}} := \{A \in \mathcal{A} \mid \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^i(Z, A) = 0 \quad \forall Z \in \mathcal{Z}, \forall i > 0\}$ , and the left orthogonal class  ${}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}\mathcal{Z}$  is defined dually. For  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ , we consider its  $\mathcal{X}$ -projective dimension  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{X}}(A) := \min \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^i(A, -)|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0 \quad \forall i > n\}$ .

Given a class  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ , we define  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{T}) := \sup \{\text{pd}_{\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{X}}(T) \mid T \in \mathcal{T}\}$ . In case  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A}$ , we set  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{E}}(A) := \text{pd}_{\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{A}}(A)$  and  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{T}) := \text{pd}_{\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{T})$ . Notice that, by [59, Lem. 3], we have that, for any  $X \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{E}}(X) \leq n \Leftrightarrow X \in (\text{Proj}(\mathcal{A})[\mathcal{E}])_{\mathcal{E}, n}^{\wedge}$ .

**Lemma 4.17.** *Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category with enough  $\mathcal{E}$ -projectives and  $\mathcal{E}$ -injectives. Then, for  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ , the following statements hold true.*

- (a)  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{E}}^{\vee}) = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X})$ .
- (b)  $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{E}}^{\vee} \subseteq {}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}(\mathcal{X}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}})$ .

*Proof.* We let it to the reader. □

Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category, with enough  $\mathcal{E}$ -projectives and  $\mathcal{E}$ -injectives, and let  $\omega, \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ . We say that  $\omega$  is a **relative  $\mathcal{E}$ -cogenerator** in  $\mathcal{X}$  if  $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  and every  $X \in \mathcal{X}$  admits a short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow W \rightarrow X' \rightarrow 0$  in  $\mathcal{E}$  such that  $W \in \omega$  and  $X' \in \mathcal{X}$ . Moreover,  $\omega$  is  **$\mathcal{X}$ -injective** if  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$ . The **relative  $\mathcal{E}$ -generators** in  $\mathcal{X}$  and the  **$\mathcal{X}$ -projectives** are defined dually.

**Definition 4.18.** *Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category with enough  $\mathcal{E}$ -projectives and  $\mathcal{E}$ -injectives. A class  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  is called **small  $n$ -tilting** in  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  if the following conditions hold true.*

- (TEC0):  $\mathcal{T} = \text{add}(\mathcal{T})$ .
- (TEC1):  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{T}) \leq n$ .
- (TEC2):  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}$ .
- (TEC3): There is a class  $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{E}}^{\vee}$  which is a relative  $\mathcal{E}$ -generator in  $\mathcal{A}$ .
- (TEC4):  $\mathcal{T}$  is precovering in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}$ .

An object  $T \in \mathcal{A}$  is **small  $n$ -tilting in  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$**  if  $\text{add}(T)$  is a small  $n$ -tilting class in  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ .

**Definition 4.19.** [59, Def. 7] *Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category with enough  $\mathcal{E}$ -projectives and  $\mathcal{E}$ -injectives. A class  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  is called **Zhu-Zhuang  $n$ -tilting** if the following conditions hold true.*

- (ZZT0):  $\mathcal{T} = \text{add}(\mathcal{T})$ .
- (ZZT1):  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{T}) \leq n$ .
- (ZZT2):  $\mathcal{T}$  is a relative  $\mathcal{E}$ -generator in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}$ .

An object  $T \in \mathcal{A}$  is called **Zhu-Zhuang  $n$ -tilting** if  $\text{add}(T)$  is a Zhu-Zhuang  $n$ -tilting class.

Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category with enough  $\mathcal{E}$ -projectives and  $\mathcal{E}$ -injectives,  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ , and let  $n \geq 0$ . Following [59, Sect. 4], we denote by  $\text{Pres}_{(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})}^n(\mathcal{T})$  (or  $\text{Pres}_{\mathcal{E}}^n(\mathcal{T})$ ) the class of all the objects  $X \in \mathcal{A}$  admitting a family  $\{0 \rightarrow X_{i+1} \rightarrow T_i \rightarrow X_i \rightarrow 0\}_{i=1}^n$  of short exact sequences in  $\mathcal{E}$ , where  $T_i \in \mathcal{T} \forall i \in [1, n]$  and  $X_1 = X$ .

**Theorem 4.20.** [59, Theorem 1] *Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category with enough  $\mathcal{E}$ -projectives and  $\mathcal{E}$ -injectives, and  $\mathcal{T} = \text{add}(\mathcal{T}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  such that every object in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}$  admits a  $\mathcal{T}$ -precover. Then,  $\mathcal{T}$  is a Zhu-Zhuang  $n$ -tilting class if and only if  $\text{Pres}_{\mathcal{E}}^m(\mathcal{T}) = \mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}$ , where  $m := \max\{1, n\}$ .*

**Proposition 4.21.** [59, Rk. 4(1)] *Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category with enough  $\mathcal{E}$ -projectives and  $\mathcal{E}$ -injectives, and let  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  be a Zhu-Zhuang  $n$ -tilting class. Then, the following statements hold true.*

- (a)  $\mathcal{T}$  is a  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}$ -projective relative  $\mathcal{E}$ -generator in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}$ .
- (b)  $\text{Proj}(\mathcal{A})[\mathcal{E}] \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{n, \mathcal{E}}^{\vee}$ .
- (c)  $(\mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}})_{\mathcal{E}}^{\vee} = \mathcal{A}$ .

**Lemma 4.22.** *For a idempotent complete exact category  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  with enough  $\mathcal{E}$ -projectives and  $\mathcal{E}$ -injectives,  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  and  $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{E}}^{\vee}$  a relative  $\mathcal{E}$ -generator in  $\mathcal{A}$ , the following conditions are satisfied.*

- (a)  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}} \subseteq \text{Pres}_{\mathcal{E}}^1(\mathcal{T})$ .
- (b) If  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  is precovering in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}$ , then  $\mathcal{T}$  is a relative  $\mathcal{E}$ -generator in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}$ .

*Proof.* (a) Let  $A \in \mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}$ . Since  $\omega$  is a relative  $\mathcal{E}$ -generator in  $\mathcal{A}$ , there is a short exact sequence  $\eta : 0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow W \xrightarrow{a} A \rightarrow 0$  in  $\mathcal{E}$ , with  $W \in \omega$ . Since  $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{E}}^{\vee}$ , there is a short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow W \xrightarrow{b} B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$  in  $\mathcal{E}$ , with  $B \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $C \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{E}}^{\vee} \subseteq {}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}})$  (see Lemma 4.17).

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} K & = & K & & \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ W & \xrightarrow{b} & B & \rightarrow & C \\ \downarrow a & & \downarrow x & & \parallel \\ A & \xrightarrow{t} & B' & \rightarrow & C \end{array}$$

By the push-out diagram of  $a$  and  $b$ , the exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B' \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$  in  $\mathcal{E}$  splits since  $A \in \mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}$  and  $C \in {}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}})$ . Hence, there is a morphism  $y : B' \rightarrow A$  such that  $yt = 1_A$ . Now, since  $x, y$  are admissible epis, it follows from [28, Prop. B.1(ii)] that  $yx : B \rightarrow A$  is an admissible epi with  $B \in \mathcal{T}$ .

(b) Let  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}$  be precovering in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}$ . Consider  $X \in \mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}$  and a  $\mathcal{T}$ -precover  $g : T' \rightarrow X$ . By (a), there is an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow R \rightarrow T \xrightarrow{\alpha} X \rightarrow 0$  in  $\mathcal{E}$ , with  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ . Now, since  $g$  is a  $\mathcal{T}$ -precover, there is  $g' : T \rightarrow T'$  such that  $\alpha = gg'$ . Then, by [28, Prop. B.1(iii)],  $g$  is an admissible epi. In particular, there is an exact sequence  $\eta : 0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow T' \xrightarrow{g} X \rightarrow 0$  in  $\mathcal{E}$ . Finally, since  $T' \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}$  and  $g$  is a  $\mathcal{T}$ -precover, it follows by [42, Fact 1.18, Prop. 5.2] that  $K \in \mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}$  and thus  $\mathcal{T}$  is a relative  $\mathcal{E}$ -generator in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}$ .  $\square$

The following notion is inspired on [18, Sect. 3].

**Definition 4.23.** *Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category with enough  $\mathcal{E}$ -projectives and  $\mathcal{E}$ -injectives. A class  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  is **Auslander-Solberg  $n$ -tilting** in  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  if the following conditions hold true.*



- (AST0):  $\mathcal{T} = \text{add}(\mathcal{T})$ .  
 (AST1):  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{T}) \leq n$ .  
 (AST2):  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}$ .  
 (AST3):  $\text{Proj}_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{E}}^{\vee}$ .

An object  $T \in \mathcal{A}$  is Auslander-Solberg  $n$ -tilting in  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  if the class  $\text{add}(T)$  is Auslander-Solberg  $n$ -tilting in  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ .

**Theorem 4.24.** *Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an idempotent complete exact category with enough  $\mathcal{E}$ -projectives and  $\mathcal{E}$ -injectives, and let  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ . Then, the following statements are equivalent.*

- (a)  $\mathcal{T}$  is Zhu-Zhuang  $n$ -tilting in  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ , with  $\mathcal{T}$  precovering in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}$ .
- (b)  $\mathcal{T}$  is small  $n$ -tilting in  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ .
- (c)  $\mathcal{T}$  is Auslander-Solberg  $n$ -tilting in  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ , with  $\mathcal{T}$  precovering in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}$ .

Furthermore, if one of the above conditions holds true, then  $\text{Proj}_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{n, \mathcal{E}}^{\vee}$ .

*Proof.* It follows from Proposition 4.21 and Lemma 4.22 (b).  $\square$

As a consequence of Theorems 4.24 and 4.20, we get the following result.

**Corollary 4.25.** *For an idempotent complete exact category  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ , with enough  $\mathcal{E}$ -projectives and  $\mathcal{E}$ -injectives, and  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ , the following statements are equivalent.*

- (a)  $\mathcal{T}$  is small  $n$ -tilting in  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ .
- (b)  $\mathcal{T}$  is precovering in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}$  and  $\text{Pres}_{\mathcal{E}}^m(\mathcal{T}) = \mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}$ , with  $m := \max\{1, n\}$ .

**Lemma 4.26.** *Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an idempotent complete exact category with enough  $\mathcal{E}$ -projectives and  $\mathcal{E}$ -injectives, embedded in an abelian category  $\mathcal{C}$ , via  $i : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ . Then, for  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ , we have  $\text{add}(i(\mathcal{T})) = [i(\text{add}(\mathcal{T}))]$  and  $\text{gen}_n^{[i(\mathcal{A})]}(i(\mathcal{T})) \cap [i(\mathcal{A})] = [i(\text{Pres}_{\mathcal{E}}^n(\text{add}(\mathcal{T})))]$ .*

*Proof.* It is straightforward and we left it to the reader  $\square$

**Lemma 4.27.** *Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category with enough  $\mathcal{E}$ -projectives and  $\mathcal{E}$ -injectives embedded in an abelian category  $\mathcal{C}$ , via  $i : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ , and let  $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ . If  $i(\text{Proj}_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{A})) \subseteq \text{Proj}(\mathcal{C})$ , then the following statements hold true.*

- (a)  $i(\text{Proj}_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{A}))$  is an  $i(\mathcal{A})$ -projective relative generator in  $i(\mathcal{A})$ .
- (b)  $i(\text{Inj}_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{A}))$  is an  $i(\mathcal{A})$ -injective relative cogenerator in  $i(\mathcal{A})$ .
- (c)  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{C}}^k(i(\mathcal{A}), i(\mathcal{A}')) \cong \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^k(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}') \forall \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}' \in \mathcal{A}, \forall k > 0$ .
- (d)  $i(\mathcal{Z}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}) = i(\mathcal{Z})^{\perp} \cap i(\mathcal{A})$  and  $i({}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}}}\mathcal{Z}) = {}^{\perp}i(\mathcal{Z}) \cap i(\mathcal{A})$ .

*Proof.* The proof of (a) is straightforward, and (b) and (d) follow from (c).

Let us show (c). Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}' \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $k > 0$ . For  $k = 1$ , the result follows since  $i$  is an embedding of  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Let  $k \geq 2$ . Using (a), we can construct the exact sequence in  $\mathcal{C}$

$$i(\mathcal{A}_{k-1}) \hookrightarrow i(\mathcal{P}_{k-1}) \xrightarrow{f_{k-2}} \cdots \xrightarrow{f_1} i(\mathcal{P}_1) \twoheadrightarrow i(\mathcal{A}),$$

where  $i(\mathcal{P}_j) \in i(\text{Proj}_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{A})) \subseteq \text{Proj}(\mathcal{C}) \forall j \in [1, k-1]$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_{k-1} \in \mathcal{A}$  y  $i(\mathcal{A}_j) := \text{Im}(f_j) \in i(\mathcal{A}) \forall j \in [1, k-2]$ . Thus by the Shifting Lemma (and the case  $k = 1$ ), we get

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{C}}^k(i(\mathcal{A}), i(\mathcal{A}')) \simeq \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{C}}^1(i(\mathcal{A}_{k-1}), i(\mathcal{A}')) \simeq \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{A}_{k-1}, \mathcal{A}') \simeq \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^k(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}').$$

$\square$

**Lemma 4.28.** *Let  $F : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  be a full and faithful functor, and let  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  be such that  $[F(\mathcal{X})] = \mathcal{X}$  and  $[F(\mathcal{Y})] = \mathcal{Y}$ . If  $[F(\mathcal{X})] = [F(\mathcal{Y})]$ , then  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y}$ .*

*Proof.* It is straightforward.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.29.** *Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an idempotent complete exact category with enough  $\mathcal{E}$ -projectives and  $\mathcal{E}$ -injectives embedded in an abelian category  $\mathcal{C}$ , via  $i : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ , such that  $i(\text{Proj}_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{A})) \subseteq \text{Proj}(\mathcal{C})$ , and let  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ . Then, the following statements are equivalent.*

- (a) *The class  $\mathcal{T}$  is small  $n$ -tilting in  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ .*
- (b) *The class  $[i(\mathcal{T})]$  is small  $n$ - $[i(\mathcal{A})]$ -tilting in  $\mathcal{C}$ .*

*Proof.* (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) Let us show the conditions on  $[i(\mathcal{T})]$  to be  $n$ - $[i(\mathcal{A})]$ -tilting in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Condition (T0) follows from Lemma 4.26; (T1) follows from Lemma 4.27 (c) and (TEC1); (T2) follows from (TEC2) and Lemma 4.27 (d); (T3) follows straightforward from (TEC3); (T4) follows from Lemma 4.27 (b, d); and finally, (T5) follows from (TEC4) and Lemma 4.27 (d).

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) By Theorem 4.24, it is enough to show that  $\mathcal{T}$  is Zhu-Zhuang  $n$ -tilting in  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  and that  $\mathcal{T}$  is precovering in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp \mathcal{E}}$ . Let us show that  $\mathcal{T}$  is precovering in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp \mathcal{E}}$ . By (T5), every  $X \in [i(\mathcal{T})]^{\perp} \cap [i(\mathcal{A})]$  admits an  $[i(\mathcal{T})]$ -precover. Then, since  $i$  is full and  $[i(\mathcal{T})]^{\perp} \cap [i(\mathcal{A})] = [i(\mathcal{T}^{\perp \mathcal{E}})]$  by Lemma 4.27(d), any object of  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp \mathcal{E}}$  admits a  $\mathcal{T}$ -precover.

Let  $m := \max\{1, n\}$ . By Proposition 3.13, Lemma 4.26 and Lemma 4.27(d),

$$[i(\text{Pres}_{\mathcal{E}}^m(\mathcal{T}))] = \text{gen}_m^{[i(\mathcal{A})]}(i(\mathcal{T}) \cap [i(\mathcal{A})]) = i(\mathcal{T}^{\perp}) \cap [i(\mathcal{A})] = [i(\mathcal{T})]^{\perp} \cap [i(\mathcal{A})] = [i(\mathcal{T}^{\perp \mathcal{E}})].$$

Hence,  $\mathcal{T}$  is Zhu-Zhuang  $n$ -tilting in  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  by Lemma 4.28 and Theorem 4.20.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.30.** *Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be a skeletally small exact category with enough  $\mathcal{E}$ -projectives, and let  $\mathcal{P} := \text{Proj}_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{A})$ . Then,  $i : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{Mod}(\mathcal{P}^{op})$ ,  $X \mapsto \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(-, X)|_{\mathcal{P}}$ , is an additive, faithful, full and exact functor that reflects exactness and such that  $i(\mathcal{P}) \subseteq \text{Proj}(\text{Mod}(\mathcal{P}^{op}))$ .*

*Proof.* it follows from [33, Prop. 2.1].  $\square$

**Corollary 4.31.** *Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an idempotent complete, skeletally small, exact category with enough  $\mathcal{E}$ -projectives and enough  $\mathcal{E}$ -injectives. Then, by using the functor  $i : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{Mod}(\mathcal{P}^{op})$  given in Lemma 4.30, the following conditions are equivalent for a class  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ .*

- (a)  *$\mathcal{T}$  is small  $n$ -tilting in  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ .*
- (b)  *$[i(\mathcal{T})]$  is small  $n$ - $[i(\mathcal{A})]$ -tilting in  $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{P}^{op})$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from Lemma 4.30 and Theorem 4.29.  $\square$

**4.5. S. K. Mohamed's contexts in  $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$ .** In [49], Soud Khalifa Mohamed developed a relative tilting theory inspired in the work of Maurice Auslander and Øyvind Solberg in [18]. In this section, we will review the main aspects of his work and characterize his tilting objects in terms of  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting theory. We recall that, in the context of Artin algebras, a class  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{mod}(\Lambda)$  is functorially finite if it is a precovering and preenveloping class in  $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$ .

**Proposition 4.32.** [17, 49] *Let  $\Lambda$  be an Artin algebra,  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{mod}(\Lambda)$  be functorially finite and closed under extensions, and let  $\mathcal{X} = \text{add}(\mathcal{X})$  be precovering and a relative generator in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Consider the class  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$  of all the short exact sequences  $A \hookrightarrow B \xrightarrow{f} C$  in  $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$  such that  $\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(X, f)$  is surjective  $\forall X \in \mathcal{X}$ . Then, the following statements hold true.*

- (a)  $\overline{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}} := \{\overline{\eta} \mid \eta \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}\}$  is an additive subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(-, -)$ .
- (b) For any exact sequence  $A \hookrightarrow B \xrightarrow{f} C$  in  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$  with  $B, C \in \mathcal{C}$ , we have that  $A \in \mathcal{C}$ .
- (c) The pair  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}})$  is an exact category, for  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}} := \{\eta \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}(X, Y) \mid X, Y \in \mathcal{C}\}$ .
- (d) If  $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}) := \{C \in \mathcal{C} \mid \text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(\eta, C) \text{ is exact } \forall \eta \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}\}$  is preenveloping in  $\mathcal{C}$ , then  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}})$  has enough  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}}$ -injectives.
- (e) The exact category  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}})$  has enough  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}}$ -projectives and  $\mathcal{X} = \text{Proj}_{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}}}(\mathcal{C})$ .

**Definition 4.33.** [49, Sect. 4] Let  $\Lambda$  be an Artin algebra. A **Mohamed context** in  $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$  is a pair  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{X})$  of classes of objects in  $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$  satisfying the following conditions.

- (MC1):  $\mathcal{C}$  is functorially finite and closed under extensions.
- (MC2):  $\mathcal{X} = \text{add}(\mathcal{X})$  is precovering and a relative generator in  $\mathcal{C}$ .
- (MC3):  $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$  is preenveloping in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

**Remark 4.34.** Let  $\Lambda$  be an Artin algebra and let  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{X})$  be a Mohamed's context in  $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$ .

- (1) By Proposition 4.32,  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}})$  is a skeletally small exact category with enough  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}}$ -projectives and  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}}$ -injectives, where  $\text{Proj}_{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}}}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{X}$ .
- (2) For  $\mathcal{P} := \text{Proj}_{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}}}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{X}$  and  $i : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Mod}(\mathcal{P}^{op})$ ,  $C \mapsto \text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(-, C)|_{\mathcal{P}}$ , the following statements are equivalent: (a)  $\mathcal{C} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{C})$  in  $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$ ; (b)  $\mathcal{C}$  is idempotent complete; and (c)  $[i(\mathcal{C})] = \text{smd}([i(\mathcal{C})])$  in  $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{P}^{op})$ .

Observe that, in general, for a Mohamed's context  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{X})$  in  $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$ , the inclusion functor  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}}) \rightarrow \text{mod}(\Lambda)$ , induced by the inclusion  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{mod}(\Lambda)$ , does not reflect exactness. Indeed, consider  $\Lambda := \mathbb{R}[x]/\langle x^4 \rangle$ ,  $M = {}_{\Lambda}\Lambda$ ,  $N := x^2M$  and  $K := N/x^2N$ . Take  $\mathcal{C} := \text{mod}(\Lambda)$  and  $\mathcal{X} := \text{add}(M \oplus K)$ . Notice that  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{X})$  is a Mohamed context in  $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$ . Moreover, the exact sequence  $N \hookrightarrow M \twoheadrightarrow K$  does not belong in  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}}$  since it does not split. Therefore,  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{X})$  is not embedded in  $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$ , via the natural inclusion  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{mod}(\Lambda)$ .

**Theorem 4.35.** Let  $\Lambda$  be an Artin algebra and let  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{X})$  be a Mohamed's context in  $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$ . Consider the exact category  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}})$ ,  $\mathcal{P} := \text{Proj}_{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}}}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{X}$  and the embedding  $i : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Mod}(\mathcal{P}^{op})$ ,  $C \mapsto \text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(-, C)|_{\mathcal{P}}$ . Then, for a class  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ , the following statements are equivalent.

- (a)  $\mathcal{T}$  is Auslander-Solberg  $n$ -tilting in  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}})$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  is precovering in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}}}$ .
- (b)  $[i(\mathcal{T})]$  is small  $n$ - $[i(\mathcal{C})]$ -tilting in  $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{P}^{op})$ .
- (c)  $\mathcal{T}$  is Zhu-Zhuang  $n$ -tilting in  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}})$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  is precovering in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}}}$ .
- (d)  $\mathcal{T}$  is small  $n$ -tilting in  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}})$ .
- (e)  $\mathcal{T}$  is precovering in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}}}$  and  $\text{Pres}_{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}}}^m(\mathcal{T}) = \mathcal{T}^{\perp \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}}}$ , where  $m := \max\{1, n\}$ .

*Proof.* It follows from Theorem 4.24, Corollary 4.25, [33, Props. 2.1 and 2.8], Remark 4.34 (2) and Theorem 4.29.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.36.** Let  $\Lambda$  be an Artin algebra,  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{X})$  be a Mohamed's context in  $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$  and let  $T \in \text{mod}(\Lambda)$ . Then, for the embedding  $i : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Mod}(\mathcal{X}^{op})$ ,  $C \mapsto \text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(-, C)|_{\mathcal{X}}$ , the following statements are equivalent.

- (a)  $T$  is Auslander-Solberg  $n$ -tilting in  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}})$ .
- (b)  $i(T)$  is small  $n$ - $[i(\mathcal{C})]$ -tilting in  $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{X}^{op})$ .

- (c)  $T$  is Zhu-Zhuang  $n$ -tilting in  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}})$ .
- (d)  $T$  is small  $n$ -tilting in  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}})$ .
- (e)  $\text{Pres}_{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}}}^m(\text{add}(T)) = T^{\perp \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\mathcal{C}}}$ , where  $m := \max\{1, n\}$ .

*Proof.* It follows from Proposition 4.35 since  $\text{add}(T)$  is precovering.  $\square$

In what follows, we will approach briefly to the precursor of S. K. Mohamed's tilting theory. Namely, we shall introduce the relative homological algebra presented by Maurice Auslander and Øyvind Solberg in [17, 18].

Let  $\Lambda$  be an Artin algebra and  $F$  be an additive subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(-, -)$ . A short exact sequence  $\eta : N \hookrightarrow M \twoheadrightarrow K$  in  $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$  is  **$F$ -exact** if  $\bar{\eta} \in F(K, N)$ , and the class of all the short  $F$ -exact sequences is denoted by  $\mathcal{E}_F$ .

The class  $\mathcal{P}(F)$  of the  **$F$ -projective** modules consists of all the  $P \in \text{mod}(\Lambda)$  such that for every  $F$ -exact sequence  $\eta : N \hookrightarrow M \twoheadrightarrow K$ , the sequence  $\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(P, \eta)$  is exact. It is said that  $F$  has enough projectives if any  $M \in \text{mod}(\Lambda)$  admits an  $F$ -exact sequence  $M' \hookrightarrow P \twoheadrightarrow M$  with  $P \in \mathcal{P}(F)$ . Define dually  $F$ -injective modules, the class  $\mathcal{I}(F)$  and the notion of saying that  $F$  has enough injectives.

Each  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{mod}(\Lambda)$  induces two subfunctors  $F_{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $F^{\mathcal{X}}$  of  $\text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(-, -)$ . Indeed, for every  $A, C \in \text{mod}(\Lambda)$ ,  $F_{\mathcal{X}}(C, A)$  is formed by all the extensions  $\bar{\eta} \in \text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(C, A)$ , with  $\eta : A \hookrightarrow B \twoheadrightarrow C$ , such that  $\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(-, B)|_{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(-, C)|_{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow 0$  is exact. The functor  $F^{\mathcal{X}}$  is defined dually.

**Proposition 4.37.** [17, 18] *For an Artin algebra  $\Lambda$  and a class  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{mod}(\Lambda)$ , the following statements hold true.*

- (a)  $F_{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $F^{\mathcal{X}}$  are additive subfunctors of  $\text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(-, -)$ .
- (b) Let  $F$  be an additive subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(-, -)$ . Then the class  $\mathcal{E}_F$  is closed under pull-backs, push-outs and finite coproducts.
- (c) The map  $F \mapsto \mathcal{P}(F)$  is a bijection between the class of all the additive subfunctors of  $\text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(-, -)$  with enough projectives and the class of all the precovering classes  $\mathcal{X}$  in  $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$  such that  $\text{proj}(\Lambda) \subseteq \mathcal{X} = \text{add}(\mathcal{X})$ .
- (d) Let  $F$  be an additive subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(-, -)$  with enough projectives. Then,  $(\text{mod}(\Lambda), \mathcal{E}_F)$  is an exact category with  $\text{Proj}_{\mathcal{E}_F}(\text{mod}(\Lambda)) = \mathcal{P}(F)$  and  $\text{Inj}_{\mathcal{E}_F}(\text{mod}(\Lambda)) = \mathcal{I}(F)$ .
- (e) Let  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{mod}(\Lambda)$  be such that  $\text{proj}(\Lambda) \subseteq \mathcal{X} = \text{add}(\mathcal{X})$ . Then,  $F_{\mathcal{X}}$  has enough projectives and injectives if, and only if,  $\mathcal{X}$  is functorially finite.

As a consequence of [17, Cor. 1.13], we get the following result that is useful to obtain examples of Mohamed's contexts.

**Proposition 4.38.** *Let  $\Lambda$  be an Artin algebra and let  $F$  be an additive subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(-, -)$ . Then, the following statements hold true.*

- (a)  $F$  has enough projectives and injectives if, and only if,  $\mathcal{P}(F)$  is functorially finite and  $F = F_{\mathcal{P}(F)}$ .
- (b) Let  $F$  be with enough projectives and injectives. Then,  $(\text{mod}(\Lambda), \mathcal{P}(F))$  is a Mohamed's context in  $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}(F)}^{\text{mod}(\Lambda)} = \mathcal{E}_F$ .

**Corollary 4.39.** *Let  $\Lambda$  be an Artin algebra,  $F$  an additive subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(-, -)$  with enough projectives and enough injectives,  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \text{mod}(\Lambda)$  and the functor  $i : \text{mod}(\Lambda) \rightarrow \text{Mod}(\mathcal{P}^{op})$ ,  $M \mapsto \text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(-, M)|_{\mathcal{P}}$ , where  $\mathcal{P} := \mathcal{P}(F)$ . Then, the pair  $(\text{mod}(\Lambda), \mathcal{E}_F)$  is an exact category with enough  $\mathcal{E}_F$ -projectives and  $\mathcal{E}_F$ -injectives. Moreover, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (a)  $\mathcal{T}$  is Auslander-Solberg  $n$ -tilting in  $(\text{mod}(\Lambda), \mathcal{E}_F)$  and precovering in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}_F}}$ .
- (b)  $[i(\mathcal{T})]$  is small  $n$ - $[i(\text{mod}(\Lambda))]$ -tilting in  $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{P}^{op})$ .
- (c)  $\mathcal{T}$  is Zhu-Zhuang  $n$ -tilting in  $(\text{mod}(\Lambda), \mathcal{E}_F)$  and precovering in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}_F}}$ .
- (d)  $\mathcal{T}$  is small  $n$ -tilting in  $(\text{mod}(\Lambda), \mathcal{E}_F)$ .
- (e)  $\text{Pres}_{\mathcal{E}_F}^m(\mathcal{T}) = \mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}_F}}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  is precovering in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}_F}}$ , where  $m := \max\{1, n\}$ .

*Proof.* It follows from Proposition 4.38 (b) and Theorem 4.35.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.40.** *Let  $\Lambda$  be an Artin algebra,  $T \in \text{mod}(\Lambda)$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $m := \max\{1, n\}$  and let  $F$  be an additive subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(-, -)$  with enough injectives and projectives. Then,  $T \in \text{mod}(\Lambda)$  is Auslander-Solberg  $n$ -tilting in  $(\text{mod}(\Lambda), \mathcal{E}_F)$  if, and only if,  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{E}_F}} = \text{Pres}_{\mathcal{E}_F}^m(\text{add}(T))$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from Theorem 4.39 since  $\text{add}(T)$  is precovering.  $\square$

**Remark 4.41.** *Let  $\Lambda$  be an Artin algebra.*

(1) [58, Thm. 3.10] is a particular case of Corollary 4.40. Indeed, if  $F$  is an additive subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(-, -)$  with enough projectives and such that  $\mathcal{P}(F)$  is of finite type, then  $F$  has enough projectives and injectives by [17, Thm. 1.12], [17, Cor. 1.13] and [16, Prop. 4.2].

(2) There are examples where we can apply Corollary 4.40 but not [58, Thm. 3.10]. In order to see that, we need to give an example of an additive subfunctor  $F$  with enough projectives and injectives and such that  $\mathcal{P}(F)$  is not of finite type. Let  $\Lambda$  be a quasi-hereditary algebra. Consider the class  $\mathcal{F}(\Delta)$  of all the objects in  $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$  filtered by the set of standard modules  $\Delta$ . It is well known, that  $\mathcal{F}(\Delta)$  is resolving and functorially finite [54, Thms. 1 and 3]. Therefore, from Proposition 4.37 (e), we get that  $F_{\mathcal{F}(\Delta)}$  has enough projectives and injectives. Finally, in [34, Sect. 3.5] we can find examples of quasi-hereditary algebras where  $\mathcal{P}(F_{\mathcal{F}(\Delta)}) = \mathcal{F}(\Delta)$  is not of finite type.

**4.6. Tilting classes in functor categories.** In the early years of the last decade, Roberto Martínez Villa and Martín Ortiz Morales begun a series of research works with the goal of extending tilting theory to arbitrary functor categories [44, 45, 46]. In the following lines, we will see how such theory can be related with  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting objects. We will start this description by following the steps of Maurice Auslander in [10].

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an skeletally small additive category and  $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  denote the category of additive contravariant functors  $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Ab}$ . Notice that  $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  is an AB3\* and AB5 abelian category having enough projectives and injectives, and any projective is a direct summand of a coproduct of the form  $\bigoplus_{i \in I} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, C_i)$ , where  $I$  is a set and  $C_i \in \mathcal{C} \forall i \in I$ . For more details the reader is referred to [10, Sect. 2, pp.184-187] and [46, Lem. 2].

As we study  $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  we will be interested in the following subcategories. The subcategory of **finitely generated** functors  $\text{mod}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  whose elements are the functors  $F \in \text{Mod}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  that admit an epimorphism  $\bigoplus_{i \in I} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, C_i) \rightarrow F$  where  $I$  is a finite set and  $C_i \in \mathcal{C} \forall i \in I$  [10, Prop. 2.1.(b), p.186]; and the subcategory of **finitely presented** functors  $\text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  whose elements are the functors  $F \in \text{Mod}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  that admit an exact sequence  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, C') \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, C) \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0$ , where  $C, C' \in \mathcal{C}$ . Furthermore, following [10], we denote by  $\text{proj}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  the category of all the finitely generated projective objects in  $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ .

We point out that  $\text{Add}(\text{proj}(\mathcal{C}^{op})) = \text{Proj}(\text{Mod}(\mathcal{C}^{op}))$ . Therefore, since  $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  has enough projectives, we have that  $\text{pd}_{\text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})}(\mathcal{T}) = 1$  if and only if  $\text{pd}(\mathcal{T}) = 1$ , for every class  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ .

We will be interested in particular when all idempotents in  $\mathcal{C}$  split. In that case  $\mathcal{C}$  is called an **annuli variety**.

**Definition 4.42.** [46, Def. 8] A class  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \text{Mod}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  is a **tilting category** if the following conditions hold true.

(FT0):  $\mathcal{T} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{T}) \subseteq \text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ .

(FT1):  $\text{pd}(\mathcal{T}) \leq 1$ .

(FT2):  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^{\perp 1}$ .

(FT3):  $\text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{T}}(\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, C)) \leq 1 \ \forall C \in \mathcal{C}$ .

An object  $T \in \text{Mod}(\mathcal{C})$  is a **big (small) tilting functor** if  $\text{Add}(T)$  ( $\text{add}(T)$ ) is a tilting category.

**Proposition 4.43.** Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a tilting category in  $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ . Then  $\text{Fac}_1(\mathcal{T}) = \mathcal{T}^{\perp}$  and  $\text{gen}_1(\mathcal{T}) = \mathcal{T}^{\perp} \cap \text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ .

*Proof.* It follows from [46, Prop. 10].  $\square$

**Theorem 4.44.** For  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ , the following statements are equivalent.

(a)  $\mathcal{T}$  is big 1- $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ -tilting.

(b)  $\mathcal{T} = \text{Add}(\mathcal{T})$  is a tilting category which is precovering in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp 1}$ .

*Proof.* (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be big 1- $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ -tilting. In particular  $\mathcal{T} = \text{Add}(\mathcal{T})$  and by (T5)  $\mathcal{T}$  is precovering in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp 1} = \mathcal{T}^{\perp}$ . Now (FT1) follows from (T1), and (FT2) follows from (T2). Let  $\rho := \{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, C)\}_{C \in \mathcal{C}}$  and  $\omega := \text{Add}(\rho)$ . Then, by Theorem 3.12 (a), we get  $\omega \subseteq {}^{\perp}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp}) = \mathcal{T}^{\vee}$ . Moreover, by Corollary 3.7,  $\text{coresdim}_{\mathcal{T}}(\omega) \leq \text{pd}(\mathcal{T}) \leq 1$  and thus (FT3) holds true.

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) Let  $\mathcal{T} = \text{Add}(\mathcal{T})$  be a tilting category which is precovering in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp}$ . Since  $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  has enough injectives,  $\mathcal{T}$  satisfies (T4). Moreover,  $\mathcal{T}$  satisfies (T5) since  $\mathcal{T}$  is precovering in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp} = \mathcal{T}^{\perp 1}$ . Moreover, using that  $\mathcal{T} = \text{Add}(\mathcal{T})$  and Proposition 4.43, we get  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp} = \text{Fac}_1(\mathcal{T}) = \text{Gen}_1(\mathcal{T})$ . Thus  $\mathcal{T}$  is 1- $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ -tilting by Theorem 3.13.  $\square$

To state the small version of the above theorem, we will need to recall the following notion. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an additive category. We recall that a morphism  $g : C \rightarrow A$  is a **pseudo-kernel** of a morphism  $f : A \rightarrow B$  if the sequence of functors  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, C) \xrightarrow{(-, g)} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, A) \xrightarrow{(-, f)} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, B)$  is exact. If any morphism in  $\mathcal{C}$  has a pseudo-kernel, we say that  $\mathcal{C}$  has pseudo-kernels. The notion of **pseudo-cokernel** is introduced dually.

**Theorem 4.45.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an annuli variety with pseudo-kernels and such that  $\text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  has enough injectives. Then, for a class  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ , the following statements are equivalent.

(a)  $\mathcal{T}$  is small 1- $\text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ -tilting.

(b)  $\mathcal{T} = \text{add}(\mathcal{T})$  is a tilting category which is precovering in  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp 1} \cap \text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ .

*Proof.* Notice that  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp 1} = \mathcal{T}^{\perp}$  if  $\text{pd}(\mathcal{T}) \leq 1$ . Now, by [33, Props. 2.6 and 2.7], it follows that  $\text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  is a thick class in  $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  and  $\text{proj}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  is a relative generator in  $\text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ . Using this fact, the rest of the proof follows as in the proof of Theorem 4.44.  $\square$

Recall that a **dualizing  $R$ -variety** is an  $R$ -category  $\mathcal{C}$ , where  $R$  is an artinian ring, such that  $\mathcal{C}$  is an annuli variety and the functor  $D : \text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ ,  $D(M)(X) = \text{Hom}_R(M(X), I_0(\text{top}(R)))$ , is a duality [13, p.307].

**Corollary 4.46.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a skeletally small additive category with pseudo-kernels. Then,  $\text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op}) = (\text{proj}(\mathcal{C}^{op}))_\infty^\wedge$  and it is a thick class in  $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from [33, Props. 2.6 and 2.7].  $\square$

**Lemma 4.47.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a dualizing  $R$ -variety with pseudo-kernels and pseudo-cokernels. Then,  $\text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op}) = (\text{proj}(\mathcal{C}^{op}))_\infty^\wedge$  and it is a thick abelian subcategory of  $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  with enough injectives.*

*Proof.* By Corollary 4.46,  $\text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op}) = (\text{proj}(\mathcal{C}^{op}))_\infty^\wedge$  and it is thick in  $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ . Similarly, by Corollary 4.46,  $\text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{C})_\infty^\wedge$  and it has enough projectives. Then, by the duality  $D : \text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ , we get that  $\text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  has enough injectives.  $\square$

**Definition 4.48.** [45, Def. 6] *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an annuli variety. A class  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \text{Mod}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  is a **generalized  $n$ -tilting subcategory** if the following conditions hold true.*

(FGT0):  $\mathcal{T} = \text{smd}(\mathcal{T})$ .

(FGT1):  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq (\text{proj}(\mathcal{C}^{op}))_n^\wedge$ .

(FGT2):  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^\perp$ .

(FGT3):  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, C) \in \mathcal{T}^\vee \forall C \in \mathcal{C}$ .

*An object  $T \in \text{Mod}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  is a **generalized small (big)  $n$ -tilting functor** if  $\text{add}(T)$  ( $\text{Add}(T)$ ) is a generalized  $n$ -tilting subcategory.*

**Corollary 4.49.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a skeletally small additive category with pseudo-kernels. Then, the functor  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Mod}(\mathcal{C}^{op})}^n(M, -)$  commutes with coproducts  $\forall M \in \text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  and  $\forall n \geq 1$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from [45, Cor. 2] and Corollary 4.46.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.50.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an annuli variety with pseudo-kernels and  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ . Consider the following statements:*

(a)  $\mathcal{T}$  is small  $n$ -f.p.  $(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ -tilting.

(b)  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}^{\oplus < \infty}$  is a generalized  $n$ -tilting subcategory and there is a f.p.  $(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ -injective relative cogenerator in  $\text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ .

*Then, (a) implies (b). Furthermore, if  $\mathcal{T}$  has pseudo-kernels, then (a) and (b) are equivalent.*

*Proof.* (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be small  $n$ -f.p.  $(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ -tilting. By [24, Prop. C.1.(2)], it follows that  $\rho := \{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, C)\}_{C \in \mathcal{C}}$  is a f.p.  $(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ -projective relative generator in  $\text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ . Then, there is a long exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow F_{n+1} \xrightarrow{f} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, C_n) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, C_0) \rightarrow T \rightarrow 0,$$

where  $F_{n+1} \in \text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ . Consider the exact sequence

$$\eta : F_{n+1} \xrightarrow{f} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, C_n) \twoheadrightarrow F_n.$$

Thus, by the Shifting Lemma and (T1), we have

$$\text{Ext}_{\text{Mod}(\mathcal{C})}^1(F_n, F_{n+1}) \simeq \text{Ext}_{\text{Mod}(\mathcal{C})}^{n+1}(T, F_{n+1}) = 0.$$

Hence  $\eta$  splits and then  $F_n \in \text{proj}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ . Therefore  $T \in \text{proj}(\mathcal{C}^{op})_n^\wedge$  and so (FGT1) holds true. Condition (FGT2) follows from (T2). By Proposition 3.15(e),  $\rho \subseteq {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp) \cap \text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op}) = {}^\perp(\mathcal{T}^\perp) \cap (\text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op}), \mathcal{T})^\vee \subseteq \mathcal{T}^\vee$ , which proves (FGT3). Finally, by (T4),  $\text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  has a  $\text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ -injective relative cogenerator in  $\text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ .

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) By (FGT1),  $\text{pd}_{\text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})}(\mathcal{T}) \leq \text{pd}(\mathcal{T}) \leq n$  and thus (T1) is satisfied. Since  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ , using (FGT2), we have  $\mathcal{T} \cap \text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op}) = \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^\perp$  and then (T2) holds true. Note that (FGT3) implies (t3''). Thus (T4) is satisfied since there is a  $\text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ -injective relative cogenerator in  $\text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  and  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ . Now, using that  $\mathcal{T}$  has pseudo-kernels and [45, Props. 6 and 7], we get that  $\mathcal{T}$  is precovering in  $\text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ . In particular, every  $Z \in \mathcal{T}^\perp \cap \text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  admits a  $\mathcal{T}$ -precover, and hence (T5) holds true. Finally, by Lemma 3.35, condition (T3) follows since Definition 3.22 (t3'') is satisfied and  $\text{f.p.}(\mathcal{C}^{op})$  is thick by Corollary 4.46.  $\square$

**4.7. Silting modules, quasitilting modules and  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting objects.** Silting modules were introduced in [2], by Lidia Angeleri Hügel, Frederik Marks and Jorge Vitoria, as a simultaneous generalization of tilting modules over an arbitrary ring and support  $\tau$ -tilting modules over a finite dimensional algebra. In this section we will focus on understanding silting theory through  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting objects. Let us begin by recalling some known results on silting theory.

By [2, Lemdef 3.1 and Lem. 2.3], it can be shown the following result.

**Lemma 4.51.** *For a ring  $R$  and  $T \in \text{Mod}(R)$ , the following statements are equivalent.*

- (a)  $\text{Gen}_1(T) = \text{Gen}_2(T)$  is a torsion class in  $\text{Mod}(R)$  and  $\text{Hom}_R(T, -)$  is exact on  $\text{Gen}_1(T)$ .
- (b)  $\text{Gen}_1(T) = \overline{\text{Gen}_2(T)}$  and  $T \in {}^{\perp_1} \text{Gen}_1(T)$ .
- (c)  $\text{Gen}_1(T) = \overline{\text{Gen}_1(T)} \cap T^{\perp_1}$ , where  $\overline{\text{Gen}_1(T)}$  is the class of all the submodules of modules in  $\text{Gen}_1(T)$ .

Let  $R$  be a ring and  $T \in \text{Mod}(R)$ . We recall from [2, Lemdef 3.1] that  $T$  is **quasitilting** if  $T$  satisfies one of the equivalent conditions in Lemma 4.51. Let  $E := \text{End}_R(M)$ . We recall, from [35] that  $T$  is **finendo** if  $M$  is finitely generated as a left  $E$ -module.

**Definition 4.52.** *For a ring  $R$ , we denote by  $\text{qtilt}(R)$  the class of all the left  $R$ -modules which are quasitilting and finendo.*

Note that the relation  $\sim$  on  $\text{qtilt}(R)$ , where  $T_1 \sim T_2$  if  $\text{Add}(T_1) = \text{Add}(T_2)$ , is an equivalence relation on  $\text{qtilt}(R)$ .

**Theorem 4.53.** [2, Thm. 3.4] *Let  $R$  be a ring. Then, the map  $T \mapsto \text{Gen}_1(T)$  induces a bijection between the quotient class  $\text{qtilt}(R)/\sim$  and the class of all the torsion classes  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \text{Mod}(R)$  satisfying the following condition:*

**(QT):** *every  $M \in \text{Mod}(R)$  admits a  $\mathcal{T}$ -preenvelope  $\phi : M \rightarrow T_0$  with  $\text{CoKer}(\phi)$  in  ${}^{\perp_1} \mathcal{T}$ .*

Let  $R$  be a ring and let  $\sigma$  be a morphism in  $\text{Proj}(R)$ . Following [2, Sect. 3.2], we consider the class  $\mathcal{D}_\sigma := \{X \in \text{Mod}(R) \mid \text{Hom}_R(\sigma, X) \text{ is an epimorphism}\}$ . The reader can find the elementary properties of this class in [2].

Let  $R$  be a ring and  $T \in \text{Mod}(R)$ . Following [2, Def. 3.7], we recall that  $T$  is **partial silting** if there is a projective presentation  $\sigma$  of  $T$  such that the following two conditions hold true: **(S1)**  $\mathcal{D}_\sigma$  is a torsion class and **(S2)**  $T \in \mathcal{D}_\sigma$ . On the



other hand, it is said that  $T$  is **silting** if there is a projective presentation  $\sigma$  of  $T$  such that  $\text{Gen}_1(T) = \mathcal{D}_\sigma$ . In such a case, we say that  $T$  is silting with respect to  $\sigma$ .

**Proposition 4.54.** [2] *For a ring  $R$ , the following statements hold true.*

- (a) *Every silting left  $R$ -module is finendo and quasitilting.*
- (b) *Let  $T \in \text{Mod}(R)$ . Then:  $T$  is 1-tilting  $\Leftrightarrow T$  is faithful and silting  $\Leftrightarrow T$  is faithful, finendo and quasitilting.*

*Proof.* It follows from [2, Props. 3.10 and 3.13 (2)].  $\square$

**Proposition 4.55.** [2, Prop. 3.11] *For a ring  $R$  and a projective presentation  $\sigma$  of  $T \in \text{Mod}(R)$ , the following statements are equivalent.*

- (a)  *$T$  is a silting  $R$ -module with respect to  $\sigma$ .*
- (b)  *$T$  is a partial silting  $R$ -module with respect to  $\sigma$  and the following condition holds true:*  
**(S3):** *there is an exact sequence  $R \xrightarrow{\phi} T_0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow 0$ , where  $T_0, T_1 \in \text{Add}(T)$  and  $\phi$  is a  $\mathcal{D}_\sigma$ -preenvelope of  $R$ .*

We are ready to start discussing silting theory through  $n$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting theory.

**Lemma 4.56.** *Let  $R$  be a ring and let  $T \in \text{Mod}(R)$  be such that  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(T) \leq 1$ , where  $\text{Gen}_1(T) \subseteq \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \text{Mod}(R)$ . Then, the following statements hold true.*

- (a)  $(\text{Gen}_1(T))^{\perp_1} \cap \mathcal{Y} \subseteq (\text{Add}(T))^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{Y}$ .
- (b)  $(\text{Gen}_1(T))^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{Y} = (\text{Gen}_1(T))^{\perp_1} \cap \mathcal{Y}$  if  $\text{Gen}_1(T) = \text{Gen}_2(T)$ .

*Proof.* The item (a) follows from  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(T) \leq 1$ . To prove (b), it is enough to show that  $(\text{Gen}_1(T))^{\perp_1} \cap \mathcal{Y} \subseteq (\text{Gen}_1(T))^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{Y}$ . Consider  $M \in (\text{Gen}_1(T))^{\perp_1} \cap \mathcal{Y}$  and  $N \in \text{Gen}_1(T)$ . In particular  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{C}}^1(N, M) = 0$ . Let  $m \geq 2$ . Since  $\text{Gen}_1(T) = \text{Gen}_2(T)$ , we can build an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow K_{m-1} \rightarrow T_{m-1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$ , where  $T_i \in \text{Add}(T) \forall i \in [1, m-1]$  and  $K_{m-1} \in \text{Gen}_1(T)$ . Using that  $M \in (\text{Gen}_1(T))^{\perp_1} \cap \mathcal{Y} \subseteq (\text{Add}(T))^{\perp}$ , by the Shifting Lemma we have  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{C}}^m(N, M) \cong \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{C}}^1(K_{m-1}, M) = 0$  and thus  $M \in \text{Gen}_1(T)^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{Y}$ .  $\square$

**Definition 4.57.** *Let  $R$  be a ring and let  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$  be a pair of classes of objects in  $\text{Mod}(R)$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{X}_{(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{Y})}$  the class of all the  $R$ -modules  $M \in \mathcal{X}$  admitting an exact sequence  $M \hookrightarrow I_0(X) \twoheadrightarrow Y$ , where  $X \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$  and  $I_0(X)$  is the injective envelope of  $X$  in  $\text{Mod}(R)$ .*

**Lemma 4.58.** *Let  $R$  be a ring and let  $T \in \text{Mod}(R)$  be quasitilting and such that  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(T) \leq 1$ , where  $\text{Gen}_1(T) \subseteq \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \text{Mod}(R)$ . Then, for  $\omega(T) := \text{Gen}_1(T)_{(\mathcal{I}, T^{\perp_0})}$ , the following statements hold true.*

- (a)  $T^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{Y} = T^{\perp_1} \cap \mathcal{Y}$ .
- (b)  $\text{Gen}_1(T) \subseteq T^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{Y}$ .
- (c)  $\text{Add}(T)$  is a relative  $\text{Gen}_1(T)$ -projective generator in  $\text{Gen}_1(T)$ .
- (d)  $(\text{Gen}_1(T))^{\perp_1} \cap \mathcal{Y} = (\text{Gen}_1(T))^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{Y}$ .
- (e)  $\omega(T)$  is a relative  $\text{Gen}_1(T)$ -injective cogenerator in  $\text{Gen}_1(T)$ .
- (f)  $\omega(T) \subseteq \text{Gen}_1(T)^{\perp} \subseteq T^{\perp}$ .
- (g)  $\text{Gen}_1^{\text{Gen}_1(T)}(T) = \text{Gen}_1(T)$ .

*Proof.* The item (a) follows from  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(T) \leq 1$ , (b) can be shown from (a) and Lemma 4.51 (b), and (c) can be obtained from (b) and Lemma 4.51 (b). On the other hand, (d) can be obtained from Lemmas 4.51 (b) and 4.56 (b). The first inclusion in (f) follows from (e) and the second one from  $T \in \text{Gen}_1(T)$ . Moreover, (g) follows from Lemma 4.51 (b).

Let us show (e). By [2, Lem. 2.3] and (b),  $\mathfrak{C} := (\text{Gen}_1(T), T^{\perp_0})$  is a torsion pair. Let us prove that  $\omega(T)$  is a relative cogenerator in  $\text{Gen}_1(T)$ . Let  $X \in \text{Gen}_1(T)$  and  $i : X \rightarrow I_0(X)$  be its injective envelope. Consider the exact sequences  $\eta : X \xrightarrow{i} I_0(X) \rightarrow Y$  and  $\mu : T' \xrightarrow{a} I_0(X) \xrightarrow{b} F$ , where  $\mu$  is the canonical exact sequence induced by  $\mathfrak{C}$  with  $T' \in \text{Gen}_1(T)$  and  $F \in T^{\perp_0}$ . Note that  $T' \in \omega(T)$  by definition. Now, since  $X \in \text{Gen}_1(T)$  and  $F \in T^{\perp_0}$ , we have  $bi = 0$ . Then,  $i$  factors through  $a$ . Consider the exact sequence  $X \xrightarrow{f} T' \rightarrow D$ , where  $af = i$ . Note that  $D \in \text{Gen}_1(T)$  since  $T' \in \text{Gen}_1(T)$ . Therefore,  $\omega(T)$  is a relative cogenerator in  $\text{Gen}_1(T)$ .

It remains to show that  $\omega(T) \subseteq (\text{Gen}_1(T))^{\perp}$ . Let  $W \in \omega(T)$ . Then, there is an exact sequence  $\nu : W \hookrightarrow I \rightarrow F$  with  $I \in \text{Inj}(R)$  and  $F \in T^{\perp_0}$ . Thus, for each  $G \in \text{Gen}_1(T)$ , we have an epimorphism  $\text{Hom}_R(G, F) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{C}}^1(G, W)$ . Hence  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{C}}^1(G, W) = 0$  since  $\mathfrak{C}$  is a torsion pair. Finally, by (d), we have  $W \in \text{Gen}_1(T)^{\perp_1} \cap \text{Gen}_1(T) \subseteq \text{Gen}_1(T)^{\perp_1} \cap \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \text{Gen}_1(T)^{\perp}$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.59.** *Let  $R$  be a ring and let  $T \in \text{Mod}(R)$  be quasitilting and such that  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(T) \leq 1$ , where  $\text{Gen}_1(T) \subseteq \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \text{Mod}(R)$ . Then,  $T$  is big 1- $\text{Gen}_1(T)$ -tilting.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.51 (a), we get that  $\text{Gen}_1(T)$  is closed under extensions and direct summands. By Lemma 4.58 (e, f), (T4) holds true; and (T5) is satisfied since  $\text{Add}(T)$  is precovering. Then, by Lemma 4.58 (g) and Theorem 3.13, it remains to show the equality  $\text{Gen}_1(T) = T^{\perp} \cap \text{Gen}_1(T)$ , which follows from Lemma 4.58 (b).  $\square$

**Remark 4.60.** *Let  $R$  be a ring. In [2, Ex. 3.14], it was given an example of an  $R$ -module  $T$ , with  $\text{pd}(T) \leq 1$ , such that  $T$  is silting but it is not tilting. Therefore, Theorem 4.59 show the existence of 1- $\text{Gen}_1(T)$ -tilting  $R$ -modules of projective dimension  $\leq 1$  that are not tilting.*

In what follows, we will study 1- $\text{Gen}_1(T)$ -tilting  $R$ -modules with the goal of finding the conditions needed for a 1- $\text{Gen}_1(T)$ -tilting  $R$ -module to be silting. As a result of this pursuit, we will prove in Theorem 4.63, for an  $R$ -module  $T$  with  $\text{pd}(T) \leq 1$ , that  $T$  is quasitilting if and only if  $T$  is big 1- $\text{Gen}_1(T)$ -tilting.

**Proposition 4.61.** *Let  $R$  be a ring and let  $T \in \text{Mod}(R)$  be such that  $\text{Gen}_1(T)$  is closed under extensions and  $T$  is big  $n$ - $\text{Gen}_1(T)$ -tilting. Then, for  $m := \max\{1, n\}$ , the following statements hold true.*

- (a)  $\text{Gen}_k^{\text{Gen}_1(T)}(T) = \text{Gen}_{k+1}(T) \ \forall k \geq m$ .
- (b)  $\text{Gen}_{m+1}(T) = T^{\perp} \cap \text{Gen}_1(T)$ .
- (c)  $\text{Gen}_{k+1}(T) = T^{\perp} \cap \text{Gen}_1(T) \ \forall k \geq m$ .
- (d)  $\text{Add}(T) \subseteq T^{\perp} \cap \text{Gen}_1(T) \subseteq \text{Gen}_2(T)$  and  $T^{\perp} \cap \text{Gen}_1(T)$  is closed by  $m$ -quotients in  $\text{Gen}_1(T)$ .

*Proof.* Let us show (a). By Theorem 3.13 (c),  $\text{Gen}_k^{\text{Gen}_1(T)}(T) = \text{Gen}_{k+1}^{\text{Gen}_1(T)}(T) \subseteq \text{Gen}_{k+1}(T)$ . Consider  $X \in \text{Gen}_{k+1}(T)$ . Then, there is an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow$

$T_k \xrightarrow{f_k} \dots \rightarrow T_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} X \rightarrow 0$ , with  $K \in \text{Gen}_1(T)$  and  $T_i \in \text{Add}(T) \forall i \in [1, k]$ . Thus  $X \in \text{Gen}_k^{\text{Gen}_1(T)}(T)$  since  $\text{Ker}(f_i) \in \text{Gen}_1(T) \forall i \in [1, k]$ . Therefore, (a) holds true.

Finally, (b), (c) and (d) follow by (a) and Theorem 3.13 (b, c, d).  $\square$

**Lemma 4.62.** *Let  $R$  be a ring and let  $T \in \text{Mod}(R)$  be big 1- $\text{Gen}_1(T)$ -tilting and  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(T) \leq 1$ , where  $\overline{\text{Gen}_1(T)} \subseteq \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \text{Mod}(R)$ . Then, the following statements hold true.*

- (a)  $\text{Gen}_1(T) \subseteq T^\perp$ .
- (b)  $(\text{Gen}_1(T), T^{\perp_0})$  is a torsion pair.
- (c)  $\text{Gen}_1(T) = \text{Gen}_1(T) \cap T^\perp = \text{Gen}_{k+1}(T) \forall k \geq 1$ .
- (d)  $T$  is quasitilting.
- (e)  $(\text{Gen}_1(T))^\perp \cap \mathcal{Y} = (\text{Gen}_1(T))^{\perp_1} \cap \mathcal{Y} \subseteq T^\perp \cap \mathcal{Y}$ .
- (f)  $\text{Gen}_1(T) \cap {}^{\perp_1}(\text{Gen}_1(T)) = {}^\perp(T^\perp \cap \text{Gen}_1(T)) \cap \text{Gen}_1(T) = \text{Add}(T) = {}^\perp(T^\perp) \cap \text{Gen}_1(T) = (\text{Add}(T))^\vee \cap \text{Gen}_1(T)$ .

*Proof.* (a) Let  $X \in \text{Gen}_1(T)$ ,  $H := \text{Hom}_R(T, X)$ , and  $u : T^{(H)} \rightarrow X$  be the morphism defined by  $(m_f)_{f \in H} \mapsto \sum_{f \in H} f(m_f)$ . Since  $X \in \text{Gen}_1(T)$ ,  $u$  is an epimorphism. Thus, we have the exact sequence  $\eta : K \hookrightarrow T^{(H)} \xrightarrow{u} X$ . Now, applying  $\text{Hom}_R(T, -)$  to  $\eta$ , we get the long exact sequence

$$\text{Hom}_R(T, T^{(H)}) \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_R(T, u)} \text{Hom}_R(T, X) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_R^1(T, K) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_R^1(T, T^{(H)}).$$

By (T2),  $\text{Ext}_R^1(T, T^{(H)}) = 0$  and thus  $\text{Ext}_R^1(T, K) = 0$  since  $\text{Hom}_R(T, u)$  is surjective. Therefore,  $K \in T^{\perp_1} \cap \mathcal{Y} \subseteq T^\perp$  since  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(T) \leq 1$ . Then, using that  $T^{(H)}, K \in T^\perp$  and  $T^\perp$  is closed under mono-cokernels, we get  $X \in T^\perp$ .

(b) It follows from (a) and [2, Lem. 2.3].

(c) By (b),  $\text{Gen}_1(T)$  is closed under extensions. Then, (c) follows straightforward by (a) and Proposition 4.61 (c).

(d) Observe that  $\text{Gen}_1(T) = \text{Gen}_2(T)$  by (c), and that  $\text{Hom}_R(T, -)$  is exact on  $\text{Gen}_1(T)$  by (a). Moreover,  $\text{Gen}_1(T)$  is a torsion class by (b). Therefore,  $T$  is quasitilting by Lemma 4.51 (a).

(e) It follows by (c) and Lemma 4.56.

(f) By (d) and [2, Lem. 3.3], we have  $\text{Add}(T) = \text{Gen}_1(T) \cap {}^{\perp_1}(\text{Gen}_1(T))$ . Note that  $\text{Add}(T) \subseteq \text{Gen}_1(T) \cap (\text{Add}(T))^\vee$ . In order to prove that the inclusion above is an equality, observe firstly that  $\text{pd}_{\text{Gen}_1(T)}((\text{Add}(T))^\vee) = \text{pd}_{\text{Gen}_1(T)}(\text{Add}(T)) = 0$  by [7, Lem. 4.3] and (a). Let  $X \in \text{Gen}_1(T) \cap (\text{Add}(T))^\vee$ . Then, there is an exact sequence  $\eta : X \hookrightarrow T_0 \rightarrow X'$  with  $T_0 \in \text{Add}(T)$  and  $X' \in (\text{Add}(T))^\vee$ . Since  $\text{pd}_{\text{Gen}_1(T)}((\text{Add}(T))^\vee) = 0$ , we have that  $\eta$  splits and then  $X \in \text{Add}(T)$ . Therefore  $\text{Add}(T) = \text{Gen}_1(T) \cap (\text{Add}(T))^\vee$ .

Now, by (b), we know that  $\text{Gen}_1(T)$  is closed under extensions and direct summands. Hence, applying Theorem 3.12 (a), we get the equalities  ${}^\perp(T^\perp \cap \text{Gen}_1(T)) \cap \text{Gen}_1(T) = (\text{Add}(T))_{\text{Gen}_1(T)}^\vee \cap \text{Gen}_1(T) = {}^\perp(T^\perp) \cap \text{Gen}_1(T)$ . Finally, observe that  $(\text{Add}(T))_{\text{Gen}_1(T)}^\vee = (\text{Add}(T))^\vee$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.63.** *Let  $R$  be a ring and  $T \in \text{Mod}(R)$  with  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(T) \leq 1$ , where  $\overline{\text{Gen}_1(T)} \subseteq \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \text{Mod}(R)$ . Then,  $T$  is quasitilting if and only if  $T$  is big 1- $\text{Gen}_1(T)$ -tilting.*

*Proof.* Note that  $\text{Gen}_1(T) \subseteq \overline{\text{Gen}_1(T)}$ . Then, the result follows from Lemma 4.62 (d) and Theorem 4.59.  $\square$

The following lemma is contained in the proof of [21, Prop. 5.6].

**Lemma 4.64.** [21] *Let  $R$  be a ring and let  $T \in \text{Mod}(R)$  be such that  $\text{Gen}_1(T) \subseteq T^{\perp 1}$ . If  $P_1 \xrightarrow{\sigma} P_0$  is a projective presentation of  $T$  such that  $\text{Ker}(\sigma)$  is a superfluous submodule of  $P_1$ , then  $\text{Gen}_1(T) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_\sigma$ .*

**Theorem 4.65.** *Let  $R$  be a ring,  $T \in \text{Mod}(R)$  with  $\text{pd}_Y(T) \leq 1$  and  $\overline{\text{Gen}_1(T)} \subseteq Y \subseteq \text{Mod}(R)$ , and let  $\sigma : P_1 \rightarrow P_0$  be a projective presentation of  $T$  with  $\text{Ker}(\sigma)$  a superfluous submodule of  $P_1$ . Then, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (a)  *$T$  is silting with respect to  $\sigma$ .*
- (b)  *$T$  is big  $1\text{-Gen}_1(T)$ -tilting and there is a  $\mathcal{D}_\sigma$ -preenvelope  $\phi : R \rightarrow T_0$  such that  $T_0 \in \text{Add}(T)$ .*

Moreover,  $\mathcal{D}_\sigma = \text{Gen}_1(T) = T^\perp \cap Y = T^{\perp 1} \cap Y$  if one of the above conditions holds true.

*Proof.* (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) By Proposition 4.55, there is an exact sequence  $R \xrightarrow{\phi} T_0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow 0$ , where  $T_0, T_1 \in \text{Add}(T)$  and  $\phi$  is a  $\mathcal{D}_\sigma$ -preenvelope. Finally, note that  $T$  is big  $1\text{-Gen}_1(T)$ -tilting by Proposition 4.54 (a) and Theorem 4.59.

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) Observe that  $\text{Gen}_1(T) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_\sigma$  by Lemma 4.62 (a) and Lemma 4.64. Let us show that  $\mathcal{D}_\sigma \subseteq \text{Gen}_1(T)$ . We know that there is a  $\mathcal{D}_\sigma$ -preenvelope  $\phi : R \rightarrow T_0$ . Then, for  $X \in \mathcal{D}_\sigma$ , every epimorphism  $R^{(\alpha)} \rightarrow X$  factors through the preenvelope  $\phi^{(\alpha)}$  via an epimorphism  $T_0^{(\alpha)} \rightarrow X$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{D}_\sigma \subseteq \text{Gen}_1(T)$ .  $\square$

Let  $R$  be a ring,  $T \in \text{Mod}(R)$  and let  $\sigma : P_1 \rightarrow P_0$  be a projective presentation of  $T$ . The condition of  $\text{Ker}(\sigma)$  being a superfluous submodule of  $P_1$  means that the induced morphism  $P_1 \rightarrow \text{Im}(\sigma)$  is a projective cover. We can find different contexts where this kind of projective resolution can be built. For example, in [21, Cor. 5.7], the following conditions on the ring and the module are mentioned: (i)  $R$  is left perfect; (ii)  $R$  is semi perfect and  $T$  is finitely presented; and (iii)  $\text{pd}(T) \leq 1$ .

**Remark 4.66.** In [26], Simion Breaz and Jan Žemlička studied the torsion classes generated by silting modules. In particular, this kind of torsion classes are characterized for perfect and hereditary rings. Namely, for a left perfect (or a left hereditary) ring  $R$  and  $S \in \text{Mod}(R)$  such that  $\text{Gen}_1(S)$  is a torsion class, they proved in [26, Thms. 2.4 and 2.6] that  $S$  is silting if and only if there is a  $\text{Gen}_1(S)$ -preenvelope  $\epsilon : R \rightarrow M$  such that  $M \in {}^{\perp 1}\text{Gen}_1(S)$ . Note that, by [2, Lem. 3.3], Proposition 4.54 and Theorem 4.63, the preenvelope  $\epsilon : R \rightarrow M$  is the same preenvelope that appears in Theorem 4.65 (b). Comparing these results, we observe the following.

(1) Let  $R$  be a left perfect ring and  $T \in \text{Mod}(R)$  be big  $1\text{-Gen}_1(T)$ -tilting. Since  $R$  is left perfect, for every left  $R$ -module we can find a projective presentation  $\tau : Q_1 \rightarrow Q_0$ , with  $\text{Ker}(\tau)$  superfluous in  $Q_0$ . Then, by Theorem 4.65 and [26, Thm. 2.4],  $T$  is silting with respect to a projective presentation  $\rho$  if and only if  $T$  is silting with respect to every projective presentation  $\sigma : P_1 \rightarrow P_0$  of  $T$ , with  $\text{Ker}(\sigma)$  superfluous in  $P_1$ .

(2) Let  $R$  be a left hereditary ring and  $T \in \text{Mod}(R)$  be big  $1\text{-Gen}_1(T)$ -tilting. Since  $R$  is left hereditary, for every left  $R$ -module we can find a monomorphic projective presentation  $\tau : Q_1 \rightarrow Q_0$ , and consequently, with  $\text{Ker}(\tau)$  superfluous in  $Q_0$ . Then, by Theorem 4.65 and [26, Thm. 2.6],  $T$  is silting with respect to a projective presentation  $\rho$  if and only if  $T$  is silting with respect to every projective presentation  $\sigma : P_1 \rightarrow P_0$  of  $T$  with  $\text{Ker}(\sigma)$  superfluous in  $P_1$ .

(3) Let  $R$  be a ring. Proposition 4.55 states that, for every silting  $S \in \text{Mod}(R)$ , there is a  $\text{Gen}_1(S)$ -preenvelope  $\epsilon : R \rightarrow M$  with  $M \in \text{Add}(S)$ . However, there are examples where the existence of this preenvelope does not imply that  $S$  is silting (see [26, Ex. 2.5] and [1, Ex. 5.4]). Therefore, it is worth noting that Theorem 4.65 give enough conditions in order to have that the existence of such preenvelope implies the silting property.

(4) In [26, Cor. 2.9], it is proved for a left perfect (or a left hereditary) ring  $R$  that, for every quasitilting finendo  $Q \in \text{Mod}(R)$ , there is a silting  $T \in \text{Mod}(R)$  such that  $\text{Add}(T) = \text{Add}(Q)$ . It is important mentioning that this is not true for every ring, see [26, Ex. 2.10] and [1, Ex. 5.4]. Therefore, it is worth noting that Theorem 4.65 give us enough conditions for a quasitilting finendo  $R$ -module to be silting. Indeed, let  $T$  be a quasitilting finendo  $R$ -module such that  $\text{pd}_{\text{Gen}_1(T)}(T) \leq 1$ . By Theorems 4.63 and 4.53,  $T$  satisfies Theorem 4.65(b). Therefore, if  $T$  admits a projective presentation  $\sigma : P_1 \rightarrow P_0$  with  $\text{Ker}(\sigma)$  superfluous in  $P_1$ , then  $T$  is silting with respect to  $\sigma$  by Theorem 4.65.

## 5. TILTING AND COTORSION PAIRS IN QUIVER REPRESENTATIONS

Let  $Q$  be a quiver. That is, a directed graph given by a set of vertices  $Q_0$ , a set of arrows  $Q_1$ , a *source map*  $s : Q_1 \rightarrow Q_0$  and a *target map*  $t : Q_1 \rightarrow Q_0$ . In this context, a **path**  $\gamma$  (of length  $n$ ) starting at  $s(\gamma) := x$  and ending at  $t(\gamma) := y$ , is a sequence of arrows  $\gamma := \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \cdots \alpha_n$  such that:  $s(\alpha_n) = x$ ,  $s(\alpha_k) = t(\alpha_{k+1})$   $\forall k \in [1, n-1]$ , and  $t(\alpha_1) = y$ . Here, we consider the case  $n = 0$  as the trivial path ending and starting at  $x = y$ . It can be defined the *free category*, or *category of paths*, generated by  $Q$  as the category whose objects are the vertices in  $Q$  and the morphisms are the paths in  $Q$ . The composition of morphisms in the path category is the concatenation of paths in  $Q$ . A quiver  $Q$  is **finite** if  $Q_0$  and  $Q_1$  are finite, and  $Q$  is **acyclic** if there are no paths  $\gamma = \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \cdots \alpha_n$  of length  $n \geq 1$  with  $s(\gamma) = t(\gamma)$ .

Given an abelian category  $\mathcal{C}$ , we understand the category  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  of representations of the quiver  $Q$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  as the category of functors from the free category generated by  $Q$  to  $\mathcal{C}$ . The basic tools for working with  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  are the following functors. For  $x \in Q_0$ , we have the evaluation functor  $e_x : \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  which sends  $F$  to its evaluation  $F_x := F(x)$ , and the stalk functor  $s_x : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$ , defined by  $(s_x(C))_x = C$  and  $(s_x(C))_y = 0$  for all  $y \neq x$ . It is well known that, under certain conditions [8, Prop. 2.18], the functor  $e_x$  admits a right adjoint  $g_x : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  and a left adjoint  $f_x : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$ . In particular, if  $\mathcal{C}$  is AB4 and AB4\*, or  $Q$  is finite and acyclic, then these functors exist and can be defined as  $f_x(C) = C^{(Q(x, -))}$  and  $g_x(C) = C^{Q(-, x)}$ , see [8, Def. 2.16, Prop. 2.17]. Given a class  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ , we consider the classes  $g_*(\mathcal{X}) := \bigcup_{i \in Q_0} g_i(\mathcal{X})$  and  $s_*(\mathcal{X}) := \bigcup_{i \in Q_0} s_i(\mathcal{X})$ . In case we need to highlight in which quiver we are working, we will use the notation  $f_x^Q := f_x$ ,  $g_x^Q := g_x$  and  $e_x^Q := e_x$ , see [8, Section 2.11] for more details.

Let  $Q$  be a quiver. In case  $Q_0$  is not finite, it is common to consider the full subcategory  $\text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C})$  of **finite-support representations**, i.e. representations  $F \in \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  such that the support  $\text{Supp}(F) := \{x \in Q_0 \mid F(x) \neq 0\}$  of  $F$  is finite. Observe that  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  is an abelian category and  $\text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C}) \subseteq \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  is a full abelian subcategory closed under subobjects and quotients [8, Rk. 5.4]. Following [8, Def. 2.6], we recall that the quiver  $Q$  is **finite-cone-shape** if for every vertex  $x \in Q_0$  there exists a finite number of paths ending or starting at  $x$ . In this case

it is known that the categories  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  and  $\text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C})$  are intimately related [8, Sect. 5]. For example, let  $Q$  be finite-cone-shape. It is known that the functors  $e_x, f_x, g_x$  can be restricted to  $\text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C})$  and such restrictions also form adjoint pairs [8, Prop. 5.14]. Moreover if  $\mathcal{C}$  has enough projectives and injectives then so do  $\text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C})$  and  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$ , and  $\text{Inj}(\text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C})) = \text{Inj}(\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})) \cap \text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C})$  and  $\text{Proj}(\text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C})) = \text{Proj}(\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})) \cap \text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C})$  [8, Cor. 5.18].

**Remark 5.1.** *Throughout this section, we will be using the results of [8]. So it is worth saying a few words about the hypotheses that appear in such paper. Namely, in [8], it is introduced certain cardinal numbers that measure the complexity of a quiver  $Q$ . These cardinals are denoted by:  $\text{lccn}(Q)$ ,  $\text{rcn}(Q)$ ,  $\text{lccn}(Q)$ ,  $\text{rtcn}(Q)$ ,  $\text{ccn}(Q)$ ,  $\text{tcn}(Q)$ ,  $\text{lmcn}(Q)$  and  $\alpha(Q)$  [8, Defs. 2.9, 2.10 and 5.8]. By using these cardinals, the conditions  $AB3(\kappa)$ ,  $AB4(\kappa)$ ,  $AB3^*(\kappa)$  and  $AB4^*(\kappa)$  appear for an infinite cardinal  $\kappa$  greater or equal to these cardinals (such conditions are the usual Grothendieck conditions restricted to coproducts or products of  $< \kappa$  objects). Since we will only be interested in finite-cone-shape quivers, all these cardinals turn out to be  $\leq \aleph_0$  and the quiver turns out to be rooted [8, Sect. 2.8]. In particular, for the scope of this section, the reader does not need these cardinal numbers (but in order to understand the statements we are using from [8] they actually do need it) because any abelian category is  $AB3(\aleph_0)$ ,  $AB4(\aleph_0)$ ,  $AB3^*(\aleph_0)$  and  $AB4^*(\aleph_0)$ . It is also worth mentioning that in [8, Section 5] certain full subcategories of  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  denoted by  $\text{Rep}^{ft}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  and  $\text{Rep}^{fb}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  are studied. However, in the finite-cone-shape case, one has that  $\text{Rep}^{fb}(Q, \mathcal{C}) = \text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C}) = \text{Rep}^{ft}(Q, \mathcal{C})$ , see [8, Lem. 5.11].*

Without further ado, we present the first central theorem of this section, which tells us how to build a tilting class in the abelian subcategory  $\text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C}) \subseteq \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  and also in  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  from a tilting one in  $\mathcal{C}$ . We recall that an abelian  $AB3$  category which has enough injectives is  $AB4$ .

**Theorem 5.2.** *Let  $Q$  be a finite-cone-shape quiver,  $\mathcal{C}$  an abelian category with enough injectives,  $\mathcal{T} = \text{add}(\mathcal{T})$  a precovering and  $n$ - $\mathcal{C}$ -tilting class in  $\mathcal{C}$ , and let  $\mathcal{X} := \text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C}) \subseteq \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$ . Then  $\mathbb{T} := \text{add}(g_*(\mathcal{T})) \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  and the following statements hold true.*

- (a)  $\mathbb{T}$  is precovering in  $\mathcal{X}$ .
- (b)  $\mathbb{T}$  is an  $(n+1)$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting class in  $\mathcal{X}$ .
- (c)  $\mathbb{T}$  is an  $(n+1)$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting class in  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$ .
- (d) Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be  $AB3$ ,  $\mathcal{T} = \text{Add}(T)$  for some  $T \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $S := \bigoplus_{x \in Q_0} g_x(T)$ . Then  $\mathbb{T} = \text{Add}(S) \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $S$  is a big  $(n+1)$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting object in  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$ .

*Proof.* Before proceeding with the proof, we point out the following facts: (i) the functors  $f_i, g_i : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  are exact for all  $i \in Q_0$  [8, Rk. 2.19 (c)]; (ii)  $\text{pd}(\mathcal{T}) \leq n$ ,  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^\perp$  and there is a class  $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{T}^\vee$  which is a generator in  $\mathcal{C}$ ; and (iii)  $\text{Rep}^{ft}(Q, \mathcal{C}) = \text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C}) = \text{Rep}^{fb}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  and  $g_z(C), f_z(C) \in \text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C})$  for all  $z \in Q_0$  and all  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  [8, Prop. 5.6 (a), Prop. 5.7 (a), Lem. 5.11]. In particular, we get that  $\mathbb{T} \subseteq \text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C})$ .

(a) It follows from [8, Prop. 5.14 (b)].

(b) We proceed by proving all the conditions of Definition 3.1. In what follows, we will be working in the abelian category  $\mathcal{X} = \text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C})$ . In particular, for each

$F \in \mathcal{X}$ , we have  $\text{pd}(F) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{X}}^k(C, -) = 0 \forall k > n\}$ ; and for all  $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ , we set  $\mathcal{Z}^\perp := \{F \in \mathcal{X} \mid \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{X}}^k(-, F)|_{\mathcal{Z}} = 0 \forall k \geq 1\}$ .

**(T0):** By definition  $\mathbb{T}$  is closed under direct summands.

**(T1):**  $\text{pd}(\mathbb{T}) = \text{pd}(g_*(\mathcal{T})) \leq \text{pd}(\mathcal{T}) + 1$ , see [8, Prop. 5.14 (d)].

**(T2):** Let  $T, T' \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $x, y \in Q_0$ . Then, for  $k \geq 1$ , we have that

$$\text{Ext}_{\text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C})}^k(g_x(T), g_y(T')) \cong \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{C}}^k(e_y g_x(T), T') = \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{C}}^k(T^{Q(y, x)}, T') = 0,$$

where the above isomorphism is given by [8, Prop. 5.7 (d)] and the last equality follows from the fact that  $Q(y, x)$  is finite. Therefore  $g_*(\mathcal{T}) \subseteq (g_*(\mathcal{T}))^\perp$  and thus  $\mathbb{T} \subseteq \mathbb{T}^\perp$ .

**(T3):** We know that there is a class  $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{T}^\vee$  which is a generator in  $\mathcal{C}$ . By [8, Prop. 3.30 (a)], we get that  $\Omega := \coprod_{< \aleph_0} f_*(\omega)$  is a generator in  $\text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C})$ .

Let us show that  $\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{T}^\vee$ . Consider  $W \in \omega$  and  $i \in Q_0$ . Using that  $W \in \mathcal{T}^\vee$ , we have that  $g_i e_j f_k(W) \in g_i(\mathcal{T})^\vee$  for all  $i, j, k \in Q_0$  since  $g_i$  is exact and  $\mathcal{T} = \text{add}(\mathcal{T})$ . Now, by [8, Cor. 5.12 (b2)], for all  $k \in Q_0$  there is a short exact sequence

$$\eta : f_k(W) \hookrightarrow \prod_{i \in Q_0} g_i e_i(f_k(W)) \twoheadrightarrow \prod_{\rho \in Q_1} g_{s(\rho)} e_{t(\rho)}(f_k(W))$$

in  $\text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C})$ . Using that  $Q$  is a finite-cone-shape quiver, it can be shown that only a finite number of factors in  $\prod_{i \in Q_0} g_i e_i(f_k(W))$  and  $\prod_{\rho \in Q_1} g_{s(\rho)} e_{t(\rho)}(f_k(W))$  are not zero. Indeed,  $e_i(f_k(W)) \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow Q(k, i) \neq \emptyset$ , and hence  $g_i e_i(f_k(W)) \neq 0$  only for  $i \in t(Q(k, -))$ ; however the set  $t(Q(k, -))$  is finite since  $Q(k, -)$  is finite. Similarly,  $g_{s(\rho)} e_{t(\rho)}(f_k(W)) \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow t(\rho) \in t(Q(k, -))$ , and thus, there is only a finite number of arrows  $\rho$  such that  $g_{s(\rho)} e_{t(\rho)}(f_k(W)) \neq 0$  since the set  $\bigcup_{i \in t(Q(k, -))} Q(i, -)$  is finite. Then, it follows that the middle and right terms in the exact sequence  $\eta$  belong to  $\mathbb{T}^\vee$ . Therefore, by [7, Cor. 4.21], we have that  $f_k(W) \in \mathbb{T}^\vee$  and hence  $\Omega = \coprod_{< \aleph_0} f_*(\omega) \subseteq \mathbb{T}^\vee$ .

**(T4):** Since  $\mathcal{C}$  has enough injectives, we get from [8, Cor. 5.18(e)] that  $\text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C})$  has enough injectives; and thus (T4) follows.

**(T5):** This follows from (a).

Let us prove (c). We show that  $\mathbb{T}$  is  $(n+1)$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting in  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$ , for  $\mathcal{X} := \text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C})$ . We point out that  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  is a full abelian subcategory which is closed under subobjects and quotients [8, Rk. 5.4]. We proceed by showing that all the conditions of Definition 3.1 hold true for  $\mathbb{T}$  and  $\mathcal{X}$ . In what follows we will be working in the abelian category  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$ . In particular, the  $\mathcal{X}$ -projective dimension of  $F \in \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  is given by  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(F) = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \text{Ext}_{\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})}^k(F, -)|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0 \forall k > n\}$ , and  $\mathcal{Z}^\perp := \{F \in \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C}) \mid \text{Ext}_{\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})}^k(-, F)|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0 \forall k \geq 1\}$ , for  $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$ .

**(T1):** Let  $T \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $z \in Q_0$ . By replacing  $\text{pd}$  (the projective dimension in the abelian category  $\text{Rep}^{ft}(Q, \mathcal{C})$ ) with  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}$  (the relative projective dimension in  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$ ) in the proof of [8, Prop. 5.9 (a)] and using [8, Prop. 2.18 (a)] we can conclude that

$$\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(g_z(T)) \leq \sup_{i \in Q_0} \{\text{pd}_{\mathcal{C}}(T^{Q(i, z)})\} + 1 = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{C}}(T) + 1.$$

Therefore  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbb{T}) = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(g_*(\mathcal{T})) \leq \text{pd}(\mathcal{T}) + 1$ .

**(T2):** It follows as in the proof of (T2) in (b) by using [8, Prop. 2.18(b)].

**(T3):** It follows from the condition (T3) in (a) since  $\mathbb{T} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  is a full abelian subcategory which is closed under subobjects and quotients.

**(T4):** Since  $\mathcal{C}$  has enough injectives, we get from [8, Cor. 5.18 (e)] that  $\mathcal{X}$  has an  $\mathcal{X}$ -injective relative cogenerator. Therefore (T4) holds true since  $\mathbb{T} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ .

**(T5):** This follows from (c) and the inclusion  $\mathbb{T} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ .

Let us prove (d). We show that the class  $\text{Add}(S)$  is  $(n+1)$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting in  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$ , for  $\mathcal{X} = \text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C})$ . We proceed by showing that all the conditions of Definition 3.1 hold true for  $\text{Add}(S)$  and  $\mathcal{X}$  in  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$ . Notice that  $(\text{Add}(F))^\perp = F^\perp$ , for any  $F \in \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  since  $\mathcal{C}$  is AB4 [8, Lem. 3.18]. Let us show, firstly, that  $\mathbb{T} = \text{Add}(S) \cap \mathcal{X}$ . Indeed, for  $x, y \in Q_0$  and a set  $I$ , by using that  $Q(-, x)$  is finite, we have that  $(g_x(T^{(I)}))_y = (T^{(I)})^{Q(y, x)} = (T^{Q(y, x)})^{(I)} = ((g_x(T))^{(I)})_y$  and thus  $g_x(T^{(I)}) \simeq (g_x(T))^{(I)}$ . Therefore  $\mathbb{T} = \text{add}(g_*(\mathcal{T})) \cap \mathcal{X} = \text{Add}(g_*(\mathcal{T})) \cap \mathcal{X} = \text{Add}(S) \cap \mathcal{X}$ .

**(T1):** It follows as in the proof of (T1) in (c).

**(T2):** It follows as in the proof of (T2) in (c) since  $\mathbb{T} = \text{Add}(S) \cap \mathcal{X}$  and  $\text{Add}(S)^\perp = S^\perp$ .

**(T3):** Notice that  $\mathbb{T}^\vee \subseteq \text{Add}(S)_{\mathcal{X}}^\vee$  since  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  is a full abelian subcategory closed under quotients. Thus (T3) follows from (T3) in (b).

**(T4):** Since  $\text{Add}(S)^\perp = S^\perp = \bigcap_{x \in Q_0} (g_x(T))^\perp$ , we have that the  $\mathcal{X}$ -injective cogenerator from (T4) (c) belongs to  $\text{Add}(S)^\perp$ .

**(T5):** It follows from (a).

□

**Example 5.3.** Let  $Q$  be a finite-cone-shape quiver and  $\mathcal{C}$  be an abelian category with enough projectives and injectives. Observe that in this case  $\text{Proj}(\mathcal{C})$  is an 0- $\mathcal{C}$ -tilting class in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Therefore, by Theorem 5.2, we have that  $\text{add}(g_*(\text{Proj}(\mathcal{C})))$  is an 1- $\text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C})$ -tilting class in  $\text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C})$ . Notice that this was proved in [19, Prop. 3.9] for the case when  $Q$  is finite and acyclic.

**Example 5.4.** Let  $k$  be a field,  $Q$  be a finite acyclic quiver and  $\mathcal{C} := \text{mod}(k)$  the category of finite dimensional  $k$ -vector spaces. In this case  $\text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C}) = \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  and hence, by the example above, we have that  $\mathcal{T} := \text{add}(g_*(\mathcal{C}))$  is an 1- $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$ -tilting class in  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$ . Moreover, we have that  $g_x(k)$  is the injective representation at the vertex  $x \in Q_0$  and  $\mathcal{T} = \text{add}(T)$ , where  $T := \bigoplus_{x \in Q_0} g_x(k)$  is a small 1- $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$ -tilting object. Furthermore, since  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C}) \cong \text{mod}(kQ)$ , it follows from Proposition 4.7 that the module corresponding to  $T$  is a Miyashita 1-tilting  $kQ$ -module.

**Example 5.5.** Let  $k$  be a field,  $Q$  and  $S$  be finite acyclic quivers and  $\mathcal{C} := \text{mod}(k)$  be the category of finite dimensional  $k$ -vector spaces. By [41, Lem. 1.3], we know that  $\text{Rep}(Q, \text{Rep}(S, \mathcal{C})) \simeq \text{Mod}(kQ \otimes_k kS)$  and thus, by proceeding as in the example above, we can conclude that the module corresponding to  $\bigoplus_{y \in Q_0} \bigoplus_{x \in S_0} g_y^Q g_x^S(k)$  is a Miyashita 2-tilting  $(kQ \otimes_k kS)$ -module. Notice that, for a finite set  $Q^1, \dots, Q^n$  of finite acyclic quivers, we can repeat these arguments recursively to get a Miyashita  $n$ -tilting  $(kQ^1 \otimes_k \dots \otimes_k kQ^n)$ -module.

Our next goal is to give a description of the cotorsion pair induced by a tilting class which is built in the previous theorem. For this, we recall the following definitions from [40]. Let  $Q$  be a quiver,  $\mathcal{C}$  be an abelian category and  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ . The following notation is convenient:  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{A}) := \{F \in \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C}) \mid F_x \in \mathcal{A} \text{ for all } x \in Q_0\}$ .



$Q_0\}$ . For  $x \in Q_0$ , define  $Q_1^{x \rightarrow *}$  as the set of arrows starting at  $x$ . Now, for  $F \in \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  and  $x \in Q_0$ , define  $\psi_x^F : F_x \rightarrow \prod_{\alpha \in Q_1^{x \rightarrow *}} F_{t(\alpha)}$  as the morphism induced by the universal property of products through the family of morphisms  $\{F(\alpha) \mid \alpha \in Q^{x \rightarrow *}\}$ . Lastly, define  $\Psi(\mathcal{A})$  as the class of the representations  $F \in \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  such that  $\psi_x^F$  is an epimorphism and  $\text{Ker}(\psi_x^F) \in \mathcal{A}$  for all  $x \in Q_0$ , see also in [8] for more details.

For the full abelian subcategory  $\mathcal{X} := \text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C}) \subseteq \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  and a class  $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ , we consider the following orthogonal classes  $\mathcal{Z}^{\perp_{\mathcal{X}}} := \{F \in \mathcal{X} : \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{X}}^k(-, F)|_{\mathcal{Z}} = 0 \ \forall k \geq 1\}$  and  $\mathcal{Z}^{\perp} := \{F \in \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C}) : \text{Ext}_{\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})}^k(-, F)|_{\mathcal{Z}} = 0 \ \forall k \geq 1\}$ . In general, we only have that  $\mathcal{Z}^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{Z}^{\perp_{\mathcal{X}}}$ . Dually, we have the classes  ${}^{\perp_{\mathcal{X}}}\mathcal{Z}$  and  ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{Z}$ .

The second central theorem of this section tells us how to construct cotorsion pairs in the category of representations from tilting classes in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

**Theorem 5.6.** *Let  $Q$  be a finite-cone-shape quiver,  $\mathcal{C}$  be an abelian category with enough projectives and injectives,  $\mathcal{T} = \text{add}(\mathcal{T})$  be a precovering and  $n$ - $\mathcal{C}$ -tilting class in  $\mathcal{C}$ , and let  $\mathcal{X} := \text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C}) \subseteq \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$ . Then  $\mathbb{T} := \text{add}(g_*(\mathcal{T})) \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  and the following statements hold true.*

- (a)  $({}^{\perp_{\mathcal{X}}}(\mathbb{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{X}}}), \mathbb{T}^{\perp_{\mathcal{X}}})$  is a hereditary complete cotorsion pair in the abelian category  $\mathcal{X}$ .
- (b)  $({}^{\perp}(\mathbb{T}^{\perp}), \mathbb{T}^{\perp})$  is a hereditary complete cotorsion pair in  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$ . Moreover  $\mathbb{T}^{\perp} = \Psi(\mathcal{T}^{\perp})$  and  ${}^{\perp}(\mathbb{T}^{\perp}) = \text{Rep}(Q, {}^{\perp}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp}))$ .
- (c) Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be AB3,  $\mathcal{T} = \text{Add}(\mathcal{T})$  for some  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $S := \bigoplus_{x \in Q_0} g_x(\mathcal{T})$ . Then  $({}^{\perp}(S^{\perp}), S^{\perp})$  is a complete hereditary cotorsion pair in  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$ ,  $S^{\perp} = \Psi(\mathcal{T}^{\perp})$  and  ${}^{\perp}(S^{\perp}) = \text{Rep}(Q, {}^{\perp}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp}))$ .

*Proof.* Observe that the abelian categories  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  have enough projectives and injectives since  $\mathcal{C}$  is so [8, Cor. 5.18 (e,f)].

(a) It follows from Lemma 3.44 since the abelian category  $\mathcal{X}$  has enough projectives and injectives and, by Theorem 5.2 (b), we know that  $\mathbb{T}$  is  $(n+1)$ - $\mathcal{X}$ -tilting in  $\mathcal{X}$ .

(b) By Lemma 3.44, we know that  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := ({}^{\perp}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp}), \mathcal{T}^{\perp})$  is a complete hereditary cotorsion pair in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then, by [8, Cor. 5.18 (a,g)] it follows that  $(\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{A}), \Psi(\mathcal{B}))$  is a complete hereditary cotorsion pair in  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  and  $g_*(\mathcal{A})^{\perp} = \Psi(\mathcal{B})$ . Moreover, by [7, Lem. 4.3] and Theorem 3.12 (a), it follows that  $g_*(\mathcal{A})^{\perp} = g_*(\mathcal{T}^{\vee})^{\perp} = (g_*(\mathcal{T})^{\vee})^{\perp} = g_*(\mathcal{T})^{\perp}$ . Therefore,  $\mathbb{T}^{\perp} = g_*(\mathcal{T})^{\perp} = g_*(\mathcal{A})^{\perp} = \Psi(\mathcal{B})$ . Finally, since  $(\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{A}), \Psi(\mathcal{B}))$  is a hereditary cotorsion pair, we have that  ${}^{\perp}(\mathbb{T}^{\perp}) = {}^{\perp}\Psi(\mathcal{B}) = \text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{A})$ .

(c) Since  $S := \bigoplus_{x \in Q_0} g_x(\mathcal{T})$  and  $\mathcal{T} = \text{Add}(\mathcal{T})$ , we get  $\text{Add}(S) = \text{Add}(g_*(\mathcal{T})) = \text{Add}(g_*(\mathcal{T})) = \text{Add}(\mathbb{T})$ . Therefore  $S^{\perp} = \text{Add}(S)^{\perp} = \text{Add}(\mathbb{T})^{\perp} = \mathbb{T}^{\perp}$  and hence (c) follows from (b).  $\square$

**Example 5.7.** *Let  $Q$  be a finite-cone-shape quiver,  $R$  be a ring,  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Mod}(R)$  and  $T \in \text{Mod}(R)$  be a big  $n$ - $\mathcal{C}$ -tilting module. Then, by Theorems 5.2 and 5.6, we have that  $\mathbb{T} := \text{add}(g_*(\text{Add}(T)))$  is a small  $(n+1)$ - $\text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C})$ -tilting class in  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$  and  $S := \bigoplus_{x \in Q_0} g_x(T)$  is big  $(n+1)$ - $\text{Rep}^f(Q, \mathcal{C})$ -tilting object in  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$ . Moreover  $({}^{\perp}(S^{\perp}), S^{\perp})$  is a complete hereditary cotorsion pair in  $\text{Rep}(Q, \mathcal{C})$ ,  $S^{\perp} = \Psi(\mathcal{T}^{\perp})$  and  ${}^{\perp}(S^{\perp}) = \text{Rep}(Q, {}^{\perp}(\mathcal{T}^{\perp}))$ .*

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Part of the research presented in this paper was conducted while the first named author was on a post-doctoral fellowship at Centro de Ciencias Matemáticas, UNAM Campus Morelia, funded by the DGAPA-UNAM. The first named author would like to thank all the academic and administrative staff of this institution for their warm hospitality, and in particular Dr. Raymundo Bautista (CCM, UNAM) for all his support.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Angeleri Hügel, L., Hrbek, M. (2016). Silting Modules over Commutative Rings. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*. 2017(13): 4131-4151.
- [2] Angeleri Hügel, L., Marks, F., Vitória, J. (2015) Silting Modules. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*. 2016(4): 1251-1284.
- [3] Angeleri Hügel, L., Mendoza Hernández, O. (2009). Homological dimensions in cotorsion pairs. *Illinois J. Math.* 53(1): 251-263.
- [4] Angeleri Hügel, L., Tonolo, A., Trlifaj, J. (2001). Tilting preenvelopes and cotilting precovers. *Algebr. Represent. Theory*. 4: 155-170.
- [5] Angeleri Hügel, L., Ulhoa Coelho, F. (2001) Infinitely generated tilting modules of finite projective dimension. *Forum Math.* 13: 239-250.
- [6] Argudín Monroy, A. (2022). The Yoneda Ext bifunctor and arbitrary products and coproducts in abelian categories. *Glasgow Math. J.* 64(2) : 277-291.
- [7] Argudín Monroy, A., Mendoza-Hernández, O. (2021). Relative tilting theory in abelian categories I: Auslander-Buchweitz approximations theory in subcategories and cotorsion-like pairs. Available at: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.11361v2>.
- [8] Alejandro Argudín-Monroy and Octavio Mendoza-Hernández. Categories of quivers representations and relative cotorsion pairs. arXiv:2311.12774v1 [math.RT] 21 Nov 2023.
- [9] Assem, I. (1984). Torsion theories induced by tilting modules. *Canad. J. Math.* 36(5): 899-913.
- [10] Auslander, M. (1974). Representation theory of Artin algebras I. *Comm. Algebra*. 1(3): 177-268.
- [11] Auslander, M., Buchweitz, R.-O. (1989). The homological theory of maximal Cohen-Macaulay approximations. *Mém. Soc. Math. Fr. (N.S.)*. 38: 5-37.
- [12] Auslander, M., Platzeck, M.I., Reiten, I. (1979) Coxeter functors without diagrams. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 250: 1-46.
- [13] Auslander, M., Reiten, I. (1974). Stable equivalence of dualizing R-varieties. *Adv. Math.* 12(3): 306-366.
- [14] Auslander, M., Reiten, I. (1991). Applications of contravariantly finite subcategories. *Adv. Math.* 86(1): 111-152.
- [15] Auslander, M., Reiten, I. (1992). Homologically finite subcategories. *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.* 168: 1-42.
- [16] Auslander, M., Smalø, S.O. (1980). Preprojective modules over Artin algebras. *J. Algebra*. 66(1): 61-122.
- [17] Auslander, M., Solberg, Ø. (1993). Relative homology and representation theory I: Relative homology and homologically finite subcategories. *Comm. Algebra*. 21(9): 2995-3031.
- [18] Auslander, M., Solberg, Ø. (1993). Relative homology and representation theory II: Relative cotilting theory. *Comm. Algebra*. 21(9): 3033-3079.
- [19] Bauer, U., Botnan, M.B., Oppermann, S., Steen, J. (2020). Cotorsion torsion triples and the representation theory of filtered hierarchical clustering. *Adv. Math.*, 369:107171.
- [20] Bazzoni, S. (2004). A characterization of  $n$ -cotilting and  $n$ -tilting modules. *J. Algebra*. 273(1): 359-372.
- [21] Bazzoni, S., Herzog, I., Příhoda, P., Šaroch, J., Trlifaj, J. (2017). Pure projective tilting modules. Available at: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1703.04745>.
- [22] Becerril, V., Mendoza, O., Pérez, M.A., Santiago, S. (2019). Frobenius pairs in abelian categories. *J. Homotopy Relat. Struct.* 14(1): 1-50.
- [23] Bernstein, J., Gel'fand, I.M., Ponomarev, V.A. (1973). Coxeter functors and Gabriel's theorem. *Russian Math. Surveys*. 28(2): 17.

- [24] Bravo, D., Gillespie, J., Pérez, M.A. (2019). Locally type  $\mathcal{FP}_n$  and  $n$ -coherent categories. Available at: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.10987>.
- [25] Bravo, D., Pérez, M.A. (2017). Finiteness conditions and cotorsion pairs. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*. 221(6): 1249-1267.
- [26] Breaz, S., Žemlička, J. (2018). Torsion classes generated by silting modules. *Ark. Mat.* 56(1): 15-32.
- [27] Brenner, S., Butler, M.C.R. (1980). Generalizations of the Bernstein-Gelfand-Ponomarev reflection functors. In: Dlab, V., Gabriel, P., eds. *Representation theory II*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 103-169..
- [28] Bühler, T. (2010). Exact categories. *Expo. Math.* 28(1): 1-69.
- [29] Colby, R.R., Fuller, K.R. (1990). Tilting, cotilting, and serially tilted rings. *Comm. Algebra*. 18(5): 1585-1615.
- [30] Colpi, R., D'Este, G., Tonolo, A. (1997). Quasi-tilting modules and counterequivalences. *J. Algebra*. 191(2): 461-494.
- [31] Colpi, R., Tonolo, R., Trlifaj, J. (1997). Partial cosilting modules and the lattices induced by them. *Comm. Algebra*. 25(10): 3225-3237.
- [32] Colpi, R., Trlifaj, J. (1995). Tilting modules and tilting torsion theories. *J. Algebra*. 178: 614-634.
- [33] Enomoto, H. (2017). Classifying exact categories via Wakamatsu tilting. *J. Algebra*. 485: 1-44, 2017.
- [34] Erdmann, K., Madsen, D., Miemietz, V. (2010). On Auslander-Reiten translates in functorially finite subcategories and applications. *Colloq. Math.* 119: 51-77.
- [35] Faith, C. (1972). Modules finite over endomorphism ring. In: *Tulane University Ring and Operator Theory Year, 1970-1971, Vol.1: Lectures on Rings and Modules*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 145-189..
- [36] Gabriel, P. (1972). Unzerlegbare darstellungen I. *Manuscripta Math.* 6(1): 71-103.
- [37] Göbel, R., Trlifaj, J. (2006). *Approximations and Endomorphism Algebras of Modules*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- [38] Grothendieck, A. (1957). Sur quelques points d'algebre homologique. *Tohoku Math. J.* 9: 119-221.
- [39] Happel, D., Ringel, C.M. (1982). Tilted algebras. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 274(2): 399-443.
- [40] Holm, H., Jørgensen, P. (2019). Cotorsion pairs in categories of quiver representations. *Kyoto J. Math.* 59(3): 575-606.
- [41] Leszczyński, Z. (1994). On the representation type of tensor product algebras. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 144(2):143-161.
- [42] Liu, Y., Nakaoka, H. (2019). Hearts of twin cotorsion pairs on extriangulated categories. *J. Algebra*. 528: 96-149.
- [43] Mac Lane, S. (1998). *Categories for the working mathematician*. New York, NY: Springer.
- [44] Martínez-Villa, R., Ortiz-Morales, M. (2011). Tilting theory and functor categories III. The Maps Category. *Int. J. Algebra* 5(11): 529-561.
- [45] Martínez-Villa, R., Ortiz-Morales, M. (2013). Tilting theory and functor categories II. Generalized Tilting. *Appl. Categ. Structures*. 21(4): 311-348.
- [46] Martínez-Villa, R., Ortiz-Morales, M. (2014). Tilting theory and functor categories I. Classical tilting. *Appl. Categ. Structures*. 22(4): 595-646.
- [47] Mitchell, B. (1965). *Theory of Categories*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- [48] Miyashita, Y. (1986). Tilting modules of finite projective dimension. *Math. Z.* 193(1): 113-146.
- [49] Mohamed, S.K. (2009). Relative theory in subcategories. *Colloq. Math.* 117: 29-63.
- [50] Nicolás, P., Saorín, M., and Zvonareva, Z. (2019). Silting theory in triangulated categories with coproducts. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*. 223(6): 2273-2319.
- [51] Pooyan, M., Siamak, Y. (2021). Infinitely generated Gorenstein tilting modules. *Algebr. Represent. Theory*, Advance online publication. DOI: 10.1007/s10468-021-10072-8
- [52] Positselski, L., Šťovíček, J. (2019).  $\infty$ -tilting theory. *Pacific J. Math.* 301(1): 297-334.
- [53] Positselski, L., Šťovíček, J. (2019). The tilting-cotilting correspondence. *Int. Math. Res. Not.* 2021(1): 189-274.
- [54] Ringel, C.M. (1991). The category of modules with good filtrations over a quasi-hereditary algebra has almost split sequences. *Math. Z.*, 208(1): 209-223.

- [55] Smalø, S.O. (1984). Torsion theories and tilting modules. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* 16(5): 518-522, 1984.
- [56] Stenström, B. (1975). *Rings of Quotients. An introduction to Methods of Ring Theory.* Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer.
- [57] Wei, J. (2005).  $n$ -star modules and  $n$ -tilting modules. *J. Algebra.* 283(2): 711-722.
- [58] Wei, J. (2010). A note on relative tilting modules. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra.* 214(4): 493-500.
- [59] Zhu, B., Zhuang, X. (2020). Tilting subcategories in extriangulated categories. *Front. Math. China.* 15(1): 225-253.