

# GAGA PROBLEMS FOR THE BRAUER GROUP VIA DERIVED GEOMETRY

FEDERICO BINDA AND MAURO PORTA

ABSTRACT. In this paper we prove that the Brauer group of any (derived) scheme  $X$ , proper over the spectrum of a quasi-excellent Henselian ring, injects into the Brauer group of the Henselization of  $X$  along the base, generalizing a classical result of Grothendieck. We offer two proofs of this fact, one based on a formal GAGA-type theorem for smooth and proper stable  $\infty$ -categories enriched over the  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{QCoh}(X)$  of quasi-coherent  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules, and a second one based on a GAGA-type theorem for perfect complexes on  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbes.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. 1-affineness results for smooth and proper categories	5
2.1. Presentable $\infty$ -categories and their tensor product	5
2.2. Descent for sheaves of categories	6
2.3. 1-affineness	8
2.4. 1-affineness for Morita theory	9
2.5. Smooth and proper categories	12
3. The GAGA problem for smooth and proper categories	14
4. Applications to the (derived) Brauer group of formal schemes	16
4.1. Review of derived Azumaya algebras	16
4.2. The formal GAGA problem for the derived Brauer group	18
4.3. A remark on a conjecture of Grothendieck	22
5. Formal injectivity via $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbes	23
5.1. Graded quasi-coherent sheaves on derived stacks	24
5.2. Inertial actions and bandings	25
5.3. GAGA theorem for twisted sheaves	26
5.4. Derived Azumaya algebra vs. $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbes: a dictionary	32
References	33

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $X$  be a scheme. The Brauer-Grothendieck group of  $X$ , i.e. the second étale cohomology group  $H_{\text{ét}}^2(X, \mathbb{G}_m)$  of the multiplicative group  $\mathbb{G}_m$ , is an important arithmetico-geometric invariant of the scheme: for example, it can be used to measure obstructions to various Hasse principles for zero-cycles and rational points, thanks to the Brauer-Manin pairing; or it serves, in the form of the unramified Brauer group, as a useful birational invariant, as shown in the construction, due to Artin and Mumford, of first example of a variety that is unirational but not rational (a counterexample to Luroth's problem in dimension 3, see [2] for a survey and [5]).

*Date:* November 16, 2021.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 14F22; Secondary 14A30, 14D23.

*Key words and phrases.* Brauer group, derived Brauer group, formal GAGA, Grothendieck existence, continuous cohomology, gerbes.

As it is often the case for étale cohomology groups, it is somewhat difficult to get a concrete grasp on the geometric meaning of classes in  $H_{\text{ét}}^2(X, \mathbb{G}_m)$ . Nevertheless, in the special case of the multiplicative group it is suggestive to consider the following table:

$n$	0	1	2
Geometric meaning of $H_{\text{ét}}^n(X, \mathbb{G}_m)$	Invertible algebraic functions on $X$	Invertible coherent sheaves on $X$	?

A first attempt at filling this table has been done by Grothendieck, who built on earlier works of Auslander and Goldman. In [12, Exposé VI], he introduced the notion of sheaf of Azumaya algebras on  $X$ : a vector bundle equipped with an associative multiplication satisfying a certain *invertibility* property, generalizing the notion of central simple algebra over a field. When considered up to Morita equivalence, Azumaya algebras form a group  $\text{Br}_{\text{Az}}(X)$ , known as the *Brauer-Azumaya group* of  $X$  (following e.g. [5]). Grothendieck provided a natural injective map

$$\text{Br}_{\text{Az}}(X) \longrightarrow H_{\text{ét}}^2(X, \mathbb{G}_m)$$

which, however, is far from being surjective. Indeed, the classical Skolem-Noether theorem implies that it hits only torsion classes, whereas D. Mumford constructed an example of a singular surface  $S$  whose  $H_{\text{ét}}^2(S, \mathbb{G}_m)$  contains a non-torsion class (on the other hand O. Gabber showed that the above map is surjective on torsion classes, at least when  $X$  is quasi-projective).

Much later, the advent of homotopical techniques allowed to solve this problem in a completely satisfactory way. In his groundbreaking work [33], B. Toën introduced derived Morita theory. In a nutshell, objects of derived Morita theory are (sheaves of)  $\infty$ -categories equipped with an action of the derived  $\infty$ -category  $\text{QCoh}(X)$ . However, these  $\infty$ -categories are not considered up to equivalence, but only up to *Morita equivalence* (two  $\text{QCoh}(X)$ -linear stable  $\infty$ -categories are Morita equivalent if there is a  $\text{QCoh}(X)$ -linear equivalence between their categories of  $\text{QCoh}(X)$ -valued presheaves). In this paper we denote by  $\mathcal{P}\text{r}_X^{L, \omega}$  the resulting  $\infty$ -category. A key result of Toën (later revisited by J. Lurie) is that  $\mathcal{P}\text{r}_X^{L, \omega}$  admits a symmetric monoidal structure. Building on this theory, in [33], B. Toën proved that every cohomology class in  $H_{\text{ét}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m)$  can be represented by an invertible object in  $\mathcal{P}\text{r}_X^{L, \omega}$ , thus completing the above table. He actually went much further than that: replacing vector bundles by perfect complexes, he adapted the original definition of Grothendieck of sheaf of Azumaya algebras, following the general philosophy of derived geometry. He called the resulting class of objects *derived Azumaya algebras*; when considered up to Morita equivalence they form a group, called the *derived Brauer group* and denoted  $\text{dBr}(X)$ . This group contains the classical Brauer group of  $X$  as a summand, but it has better formal properties.

The goal of this work is to exploit once more Toën's categorical framework in order to deduce new results about the Brauer-Grothendieck group even for classical schemes. More specifically, we are interested in the following, quite general, geometric situation: let  $p: X \rightarrow S$  be a proper (derived) scheme over the spectrum of a Noetherian ring  $R$  which is complete with respect to an ideal  $I$ . Set  $S_n := \text{Spec}(R/I^{n+1})$  and  $X_n := S_n \times_S^{\text{d}} X$ . Let  $\mathfrak{X}$  denote the formal completion of  $X$  along  $S_0 \times_S X$ , i.e.  $\mathfrak{X} = \text{colim}_n X_n$ . Grothendieck's existence theorem (see [9, 8] for the classical statement or [21, Theorem 5.3.2] for its formulation in derived geometry) implies that the canonical map

$$\text{Pic}(X) \longrightarrow \lim_n \text{Pic}(X_n)$$

is an isomorphism. Equivalently, the canonical map

$$H_{\text{ét}}^1(X, \mathbb{G}_m) \longrightarrow \lim_n H_{\text{ét}}^1(X_n, \mathbb{G}_m)$$

is an equivalence, a result that is far from being obvious if formulated purely in terms of étale cohomology. Moving up in the above table, it is very natural to consider the analogous map

$$H_{\text{ét}}^2(X, \mathbb{G}_m) \longrightarrow \lim_n H_{\text{ét}}^2(X_n, \mathbb{G}_m),$$

and indeed this map has been considered as early as in [12, Exposé VI] by Grothendieck himself. Just as the problem for the  $H^1$  is attacked by the identification with the Picard group, Grothendieck studies it via Azumaya algebras: as a consequence, it is only possible to get results about the subgroup  $\text{Br}_{\text{Az}}(X)$ , and this at the cost of a great number of assumptions. In view of Toën's work, one should approach this question via the derived Brauer groups, i.e. consider rather the natural map

$$\text{dBr}(X) \longrightarrow \lim_n \text{dBr}(X_n). \quad (1.1)$$

Still, to be able to properly study this map there is one key ingredient missing. Known to arithmeticians as *continuous cohomology* [16], one should take into account the group  $H_{\text{ét}}^2(\mathfrak{X}, \mathbb{G}_m)$  (and consequently  $\text{dBr}(\mathfrak{X})$ ). The stacky and derived formalism give us a very uniform way to define and study this group but, ultimately, it coincides with

$$H_{\text{ét}}^2(\mathfrak{X}, \mathbb{G}_m) \simeq H^2\left(\lim_n \text{R}\Gamma_{\text{ét}}(X_n, \mathbb{G}_m)\right),$$

where the limit inside the parentheses is understood in the  $\infty$ -categorical way (i.e. it is a homotopy limit). This group, or rather the tightly related  $\text{dBr}(\mathfrak{X})$ , is particularly interesting for us because it provides a canonical factorization of (1.1) into

$$\text{dBr}(X) \longrightarrow \text{dBr}(\mathfrak{X}) \longrightarrow \lim_n \text{dBr}(X_n). \quad (1.2)$$

In [11, Theorem 9.2] it is shown that the first map is injective at the level of the  $H_{\text{ét}}^2$ -component for  $X$  regular and flat over a 1-dimensional complete local base. This generalizes the early work of Grothendieck [12, Exposé VI, 3.3]: indeed, it is a simple consequence of Milnor's exact sequence for the homotopy limit of a tower that when  $\lim_n^1 \text{Pic}(X_n) = 0$ , the right map in the above factorization is an equivalence; and indeed Grothendieck proves exactly that under such a vanishing (plus regularity of  $X$  and flatness of  $X \rightarrow S$ ), the map (1.1) is injective. Regularity and flatness are crucial here: flatness guarantees that none of the  $X_n$  have to be considered as a derived schemes; and regularity guarantees that  $H_{\text{ét}}^2(X, \mathbb{G}_m)$  is torsion, and therefore that its elements are representable by classic Azumaya algebras. On the other hand, as we are going to see, the use of derived Azumaya algebras allows to remove these assumptions.

Indeed, Toën's framework allows to treat this problem in a much greater generality. Representing classes in  $\text{dBr}(X)$  as invertible objects in the Morita theory  $\mathcal{P}\text{r}_X^{\text{L},\omega}$  of  $X$ , one is naturally led to consider the natural comparison map

$$\mathcal{P}\text{r}_X^{\text{L},\omega} \longrightarrow \lim_n \mathcal{P}\text{r}_{X_n}^{\text{L},\omega}.$$

Full faithfulness of this functor would immediately imply the injectivity of  $\text{dBr}(X) \rightarrow \text{dBr}(\mathfrak{X})$ . Although this is too much to hope for (just as one cannot expect Grothendieck's existence theorem to hold for arbitrary quasi-coherent sheaves), we can restrict to compact objects in  $\mathcal{P}\text{r}_X^{\text{L},\omega}$ . These can be understood as sheaves of *smooth and proper* stable  $\infty$ -categories with a coherent action of  $\text{QCoh}(X)$ . Denoting by  $\text{SmPr}^{\text{cat}}(X)$  (resp.  $\text{dAz}^{\text{cat}}(X)$ ) the full subcategory of  $\mathcal{P}\text{r}_X^{\text{L},\omega}$  spanned by smooth and proper (resp. invertible) categories, we can finally state our first main theorem:

**Theorem 1.3** (See Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 4.19). *Let  $S = \text{Spec}(R)$  be the spectrum of a Noetherian ring which is complete with respect an ideal  $I$ . Let  $X \rightarrow S$  be a proper  $S$ -scheme. Then:*

(1) *The natural symmetric monoidal functor*

$$\text{SmPr}^{\text{cat}}(X) \longrightarrow \text{SmPr}^{\text{cat}}(\mathfrak{X}) := \lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{SmPr}^{\text{cat}}(X_n). \quad (1.4)$$

is fully faithful. In particular it induces a fully faithful functor on the subcategory of invertible objects

$$\mathrm{dAz}^{\mathrm{cat}}(X) \longrightarrow \mathrm{dAz}^{\mathrm{cat}}(\mathfrak{X}) := \lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathrm{dAz}^{\mathrm{cat}}(X_n).$$

(2) (Formal injectivity) *The natural map*

$$\mathrm{dBr}(X) \longrightarrow \mathrm{dBr}(\mathfrak{X})$$

*is injective. In particular, the group homomorphism  $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{et}}^2(X, \mathbb{G}_m) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{et}}^2(\mathfrak{X}, \mathbb{G}_m)$  is injective.*

*The conclusion of (2) holds if  $S$  is assumed to be the spectrum of a local Noetherian Henselian ring  $R$  such that the canonical map  $R \rightarrow \lim_n R/\mathfrak{m}^n$  has regular geometric fibers.*

Note that if  $p: X \rightarrow S$  was assumed to be *smooth*, full faithfulness of the functor (1.4) would be a formal consequence of Lurie's [23, Theorems 11.1.4.1, 11.3.6.1 and 11.4.4.1]. In any case, the functor (1.4) is not essentially surjective, even if we restrict ourselves to the subcategory of invertible objects (see Remark 4.20). It would be interesting to determine a specific class of *algebraizable* formal families of smooth and proper (or even invertible)  $\infty$ -categories, i.e. an explicit characterization of the essential image of the functor (1.4).

The approach to the formal injectivity problem for the Brauer-Grothendieck group discussed so far is based on Toën's theorem on derived Azumaya algebras. In this paper we offer a second, alternative, perspective as well. The work of Giraud [13] shows that a class  $\alpha \in \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{et}}^2(X, \mathbb{G}_m)$  can also be geometrically represented by a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe. Explicitly, this is the given of a (derived) stack  $\pi: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow X$  and an isomorphism of group stacks  $\alpha: X \times \mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow \pi_* \mathrm{I}(\mathfrak{A}/X)$ , where  $\mathrm{I}(\mathfrak{A}/X)$  is the inertia stack of  $\mathfrak{A}$  relative to  $X$ . It is easy to provide interpretation of classes in  $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{et}}^2(\mathfrak{X}, \mathbb{G}_m)$  in these terms: a class here is the datum of a compatible family  $(\mathfrak{A}_n, \phi_n)$ , where  $\mathfrak{A}_n \rightarrow X_n$  is a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe and  $\phi_n: \mathfrak{A}_n \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}_n \times_{X_n} X_{n-1}$  is an isomorphism (to these data we have to add the obvious coherent homotopies). From this perspective, formal injectivity says that if  $(\mathfrak{A}, \alpha)$  is a gerbe on  $X$  and we are given a compatible family of trivializations for the reductions  $\mathfrak{A}_n$ , then  $\mathfrak{A}$  itself is trivial. This is essentially the original argument of Grothendieck for (underived) Azumaya algebras, and it requires to show that the natural map of groupoids

$$\mathrm{Pic}(\mathfrak{A}) \longrightarrow \lim_n \mathrm{Pic}(\mathfrak{A}_n)$$

is surjective, which is a direct consequence of Grothendieck's existence theorem for the derived stack  $\mathfrak{A}$ . The only problem is that, since  $\mathfrak{A}$  is not a proper Artin stack (because his stabilizers coincide with  $\mathbb{G}_m$ ), such a theorem has to be proven in an alternative way. For this reason, we provide the following  $\infty$ -categorical version of a theorem of Lieblich [17] (at the level of abelian categories) and Bergh-Schnürer [3] (for the triangulated derived category):

**Theorem 1.5** (Lieblich, Berg-Schnürer). *Let  $X$  be a derived scheme and let  $(\mathfrak{A}, \alpha)$  be a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe on  $X$ . Then  $\mathbb{G}_m$  acts naturally on the objects of  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A})$ , and for every character  $\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}_m}$  there exists a full subcategory  $\mathrm{QCoh}_\chi(\mathfrak{A})$  of  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A})$  spanned by sheaves that are  $\chi$ -homogenous. Moreover  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A})$  decomposes as infinite product of these subcategories. In other words there exists a canonical equivalence*

$$\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A}) \simeq \prod_{\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}_m}} \mathrm{QCoh}_\chi(\mathfrak{A}).$$

For sake of completeness we provide a streamlined proof of this theorem completely internal to the  $\infty$ -categorical world, see Theorem 5.19. Now, the categories  $\mathrm{QCoh}_\chi(\mathfrak{A})$  are all abstractly isomorphic to  $\mathrm{QCoh}(X)$ . As a consequence, the Grothendieck existence theorem for  $\mathrm{Perf}(X)$  implies the following result:

**Theorem 1.6** (See Corollary 5.20). *Let  $p: X \rightarrow S$  be a quasi-compact and quasi separated derived scheme, which is proper and flat over the spectrum of a Noetherian ring  $R$  which is complete with respect to an ideal  $I$ . Let  $(\mathfrak{A}, \alpha)$  be a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe. The canonical maps*

$$\mathrm{APerf}(\mathfrak{A}) \longrightarrow \lim_n \mathrm{APerf}(\mathfrak{A}_n), \quad \mathrm{Perf}(\mathfrak{A}) \longrightarrow \lim_n \mathrm{Perf}(\mathfrak{A}_n)$$

are symmetric monoidal equivalences of stable symmetric monoidal  $\infty$ -categories.

Having this result at our disposal, we can complete the proof of the injectivity of the map  $H_{\text{ét}}^2(X, \mathbb{G}_m) \rightarrow H_{\text{ét}}^2(\mathfrak{X}, \mathbb{G}_m)$  as sketched above, see Corollary 5.21.

**Acknowledgments.** We would like to thank Kęstutis Česnavičius, Jean-Louis Colliot-Thélène, Andrea Di Lorenzo, Andrea Gagna, Thomas Geisser, Rune Haugseng, Lorenzo Mantovani, Guglielmo Nocera, Michele Pernice, Marco Robalo, Bertrand Toën, Shuji Saito, Gabriele Vezzosi and Angelo Vistoli for very interesting conversations on the subject of this paper. F. B. is supported by the PRIN “Geometric, Algebraic and Analytic Methods in Arithmetic”.

## 2. 1-AFFINENESS RESULTS FOR SMOOTH AND PROPER CATEGORIES

Let  $X$  be a scheme and let  $A$  be its algebra of global sections. If  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{QCoh}(X)$  is a quasi-coherent sheaf on  $X$ , then  $\Gamma(\mathcal{F})$  has a canonical structure of  $A$ -module. This results in a functor

$$\Gamma: \text{QCoh}(X) \longrightarrow \text{Mod}_A,$$

which is an equivalence if and only if  $X$  is affine. The notion of 1-affineness is a categorification of this idea, where  $\text{QCoh}(X)$  is replaced by the category  $\text{QCoh}^{\text{cat}}(X)$  of *sheaves* of presentable  $\infty$ -categories equipped with a coherent action of the stably symmetric monoidal  $\infty$ -category  $\text{QCoh}(X)^{\otimes}$ . On the other hand,  $\text{Mod}_A$  is simply replaced by the  $\infty$ -category  $\text{Mod}_{\text{QCoh}(X)}(\mathcal{P}\text{r}^{\text{L}})$ . We say that a scheme (or a stack) is 1-affine if the analogous functor

$$\text{QCoh}^{\text{cat}}(X) \longrightarrow \text{Mod}_{\text{QCoh}(X)}(\mathcal{P}\text{r}^{\text{L}})$$

is an equivalence, see Definition 2.11. It is a theorem of Gaitsgory that quasi-compact and quasi-separated schemes are 1-affine, see Theorem 2.12. Instead of working with presentable  $\infty$ -categories, one can restrict his attention to compactly generated ones, or, even better, to the Morita theory (i.e. only consider morphisms that preserve compact generators). In this section, we review the result of Gaitsgory and show that it remains valid in the setting of Morita theory.

**2.1. Presentable  $\infty$ -categories and their tensor product.** We start by a brief review of the tensor product for presentable  $\infty$ -categories. We start by fixing the following notation:

- Notation 2.1.**
- We let  $\mathcal{P}\text{r}^{\text{L}}$  denote the  $\infty$ -category of presentable  $\infty$ -categories and left adjoint functors between them, see [18, Definition 5.5.3.1].
  - We let  $\mathcal{P}\text{r}^{\text{L}, \text{cg}}$  denote the full subcategory of  $\mathcal{P}\text{r}^{\text{L}}$  spanned by compactly generated presentable  $\infty$ -categories.
  - We let  $\mathcal{P}\text{r}^{\text{L}, \omega}$  denote the subcategory of  $\mathcal{P}\text{r}^{\text{L}, \text{cg}}$  having all the objects and whose morphisms preserve compact objects.

The tensor product of two presentable  $\infty$ -categories corepresents bicontinuous functors:

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$ ,  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{E}$  be presentable  $\infty$ -categories. A functor  $f: \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$  is said to be *bicontinuous* if it commutes with colimits separately in each variable. We denote by  $\text{Fun}^{\text{L} \times \text{L}}(\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E})$  the full subcategory of  $\text{Fun}(\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E})$  spanned by bicontinuous functors.

**Theorem 2.3** (Toën-Lurie). *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  be presentable  $\infty$ -categories. Then the functor*

$$\text{Fun}^{\text{L} \times \text{L}}(\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{D}, -): \mathcal{P}\text{r}^{\text{L}} \longrightarrow \widehat{\text{Cat}}_{\infty}$$

*is corepresentable.*

*Proof.* This follows from the proof of [22, Proposition 4.8.1.17]. □

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  be presentable  $\infty$ -categories. We denote by  $\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{P}\text{r}^{\text{L}}$  the corepresentative of the functor  $\text{Fun}^{\text{L} \times \text{L}}(\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{D}, -)$ .

**Theorem 2.5** (Toën-Lurie).

- (1) Let  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  be two presentable  $\infty$ -categories. If  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  are compactly generated, the same goes for  $\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{D}$ .
- (2) The tensor product  $\otimes$  can be promoted to a symmetric monoidal structure on both  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}^{\mathbb{L}}$  and  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}^{\mathbb{L},\omega}$ . The natural inclusion functor  $j: \mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}^{\mathbb{L},\omega} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}^{\mathbb{L}}$  can be upgraded to a symmetric monoidal  $\infty$ -functor.
- (3) Let  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  be presentable  $\infty$ -categories. The evaluation map

$$\mathcal{C} \times \mathrm{Fun}^{\mathbb{L}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$$

is bicontinuous and the induced map

$$\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathrm{Fun}^{\mathbb{L}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$$

is a counit for the adjunction  $- \otimes \mathcal{C} \dashv \mathrm{Fun}^{\mathbb{L}}(\mathcal{C}, -)$ . In particular, the symmetric monoidal structure on  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}^{\mathbb{L}}$  is closed and  $\otimes$  commutes with colimits in both variables.

*Proof.* The first statement follows from [22, Lemma 5.3.2.11-(2)]. Point (2) is exactly the content of [22, Proposition 4.8.1.15]. Statement (3) is discussed in [22, Remark 4.8.1.18].  $\square$

**2.2. Descent for sheaves of categories.** Next, we review some results from [23, Appendix D].

**Definition 2.6.** Let  $R$  be a connective  $\mathbb{E}_{\infty}$ -ring. We define:

- (1) the  $\infty$ -category of  $R$ -linear presentable  $\infty$ -categories  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_R^{\mathbb{L}}$  as
 
$$\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_R^{\mathbb{L}} := \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{Mod}_R}(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}^{\mathbb{L}}).$$
- (2) The  $\infty$ -category of compactly generated  $R$ -linear  $\infty$ -categories  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_R^{\mathbb{L},\mathrm{cg}}$  as
 
$$\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_R^{\mathbb{L},\mathrm{cg}} := \mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_R^{\mathbb{L}} \times_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}^{\mathbb{L}}} \mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}^{\mathbb{L},\mathrm{cg}}.$$
- (3) The  $\infty$ -category of compactly generated  $R$ -linear  $\infty$ -categories up to Morita equivalence (or simply the Morita theory of  $R$ ) as

$$\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_R^{\mathbb{L},\omega} := \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{Mod}_R}(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}^{\mathbb{L},\omega}).$$

We denote by  $\mathrm{dAff}_R$  the  $\infty$ -category of affine derived schemes over  $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$ . Consider the natural  $\infty$ -functor

$$\mathrm{QCoh}^{\otimes}: \mathrm{dAff}_R^{\mathrm{op}} \longrightarrow \mathrm{CAlg}(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_R^{\mathbb{L}})$$

informally defined by sending  $\mathrm{Spec}(A)$  to  $\mathrm{Mod}_A^{\otimes} \in \mathrm{CAlg}(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_R^{\mathbb{L}})$ . Consider the pullback square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{LMod}_{\mathrm{QCoh}^{\otimes}}(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_R^{\mathbb{L}}) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{LMod}(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_R^{\mathbb{L}}) \\ \downarrow q & & \downarrow p \\ \mathrm{dAff}_R^{\mathrm{op}} & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{QCoh}^{\otimes}} & \mathrm{CAlg}(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_R^{\mathbb{L}}). \end{array}$$

Since  $p$  is a coCartesian fibration, the same goes for  $q$ . Thus, we can give the following definition:

**Definition 2.7.** (1) We let

$$\mathrm{QCoh}^{\mathrm{cat}}: \mathrm{dAff}_R^{\mathrm{op}} \longrightarrow \mathrm{CAlg}(\widehat{\mathrm{Cat}}_{\infty}^{\otimes})$$

be the  $\infty$ -functor classified by the coCartesian fibration  $q$ .

- (2) We let  $\mathrm{QCoh}_{\mathrm{cg}}^{\mathrm{cat}}$  denote the full subfunctor of  $\mathrm{QCoh}^{\mathrm{cat}}$  sending  $\mathrm{Spec}(A) \in \mathrm{dAff}_R$  to  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_A^{\mathbb{L},\mathrm{cg}}$ .
- (3) We let  $\mathrm{QCoh}_{\omega}^{\mathrm{cat}}$  be the subfunctor of  $\mathrm{QCoh}^{\mathrm{cat}}$  sending  $\mathrm{Spec}(A) \in \mathrm{dAff}_R$  to  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_A^{\mathbb{L},\omega}$ .

**Theorem 2.8** (Lurie). *The functors  $\mathrm{QCoh}^{\mathrm{cat}}$  and  $\mathrm{QCoh}_{\mathrm{cg}}^{\mathrm{cat}}$  satisfy étale descent.*

*Proof.* This is a consequence of [20, Theorem 5.13 and Theorem 6.1].  $\square$

We are interested in a variant of this theorem for  $\mathrm{QCoh}_\omega^{\mathrm{cat}}$ . For our purposes, it is enough to replace the étale topology by the Zariski one. We start with the following elementary lemma:

**Lemma 2.9.** *Let  $F: I \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\mathrm{r}^{\mathrm{L},\omega}$  be a finite diagram. For every  $i \in I$ , let  $\mathcal{C}_i := F(i)$  and let*

$$\mathcal{C} := \lim_{i \in I} \mathcal{C}_i$$

*the limit being computed in  $\mathcal{P}\mathrm{r}^{\mathrm{L}}$ . Let  $f_i: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_i$  be the natural projections. If  $c \in \mathcal{C}$  is an object and its components  $f_i(c)$  are compact, the same goes for  $c$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $G: J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  be a filtered diagram. For every  $\alpha \in J$ , let  $d_\alpha := G$  and set

$$d := \mathrm{colim}_{\alpha \in J} d_\alpha.$$

Since  $I$  is finite and  $J$  is filtered, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(c, \mathrm{colim}_{\alpha \in J} d_\alpha) &\simeq \lim_{i \in I} \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}_i}(f_i(c), \mathrm{colim}_{\alpha \in J} f_i(d_\alpha)) \\ &\simeq \lim_{i \in I} \mathrm{colim}_{\alpha \in J} \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}_i}(f_i(c), f_i(d_\alpha)) \\ &\simeq \mathrm{colim}_{\alpha \in J} \lim_{i \in I} \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}_i}(f_i(c), f_i(d_\alpha)) \\ &\simeq \mathrm{colim}_{\alpha \in J} \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(c, d_\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that  $c$  is compact in  $\mathcal{C}$ . □

**Proposition 2.10.** *The functor  $\mathrm{QCoh}_\omega^{\mathrm{cat}}$  satisfies Zariski descent.*

*Proof.* Let  $S = \mathrm{Spec}(A)$  be an affine derived  $R$ -scheme and let  $\{U_i \rightarrow S\}_{i \in I}$  be a Zariski open cover in  $\mathrm{dAff}_R$ . Without loss of generality, we can assume  $I$  to be finite. Let  $J$  be the subposet of the small Zariski site  $S_{\mathrm{Zar}}$  of  $S$  closed under intersection and containing the  $U_i$ . For  $j \in J$ , we let  $U_j$  denote the corresponding affine open Zariski subscheme of  $S$ . Then  $J$  is a finite category, and it is enough to prove that the morphism

$$\mathrm{QCoh}_\omega^{\mathrm{cat}}(S) \longrightarrow \lim_{j \in J} \mathrm{QCoh}_\omega^{\mathrm{cat}}(U_j)$$

is an equivalence. Let  $\mathfrak{C} \in \lim_{j \in J} \mathrm{QCoh}_\omega^{\mathrm{cat}}(U_j)$  be a descent datum and let  $\mathcal{C}_j \in \mathrm{QCoh}_\omega^{\mathrm{cat}}(U_j)$  be its  $j$ -component. Define

$$\mathcal{C} := \lim_{j \in J} \mathcal{C}_j,$$

the limit being computed in  $\mathcal{P}\mathrm{r}^{\mathrm{L}}$ . Thanks to effectivity of descent of Theorem 2.8, we know that

$$\mathcal{C}_j \simeq \mathcal{C} \otimes_{\mathrm{QCoh}(S)} \mathrm{QCoh}(U_j).$$

Write  $U_j = \mathrm{Spec}(A_j)$ . Then we also have

$$\mathcal{C}_j \simeq \mathrm{LMod}_{A_j}(\mathcal{C}).$$

As a consequence, the canonical projection maps

$$f_j: \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}_j$$

commute with compact object, and it is therefore a map in  $\mathcal{P}\mathrm{r}^{\mathrm{L},\omega}$ . Combining this observation with Lemma 2.9 we deduce that an object  $c$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  is compact if and only if its projections  $f_j(c)$  are compact. At this point, we claim that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a limit for the diagram  $\mathfrak{C}$  also in  $\mathcal{P}\mathrm{r}^{\mathrm{L},\omega}$ . Since the functor  $\mathcal{P}\mathrm{r}^{\mathrm{L},\omega} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\mathrm{r}^{\mathrm{L}}$  is faithful, it is enough to argue that if  $\mathcal{D}$  is a compactly generated  $\infty$ -category and

$$g: \mathcal{D} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$$

is a morphism in  $\mathcal{P}\mathbf{r}^{\mathbf{L}}$  such that each composition  $f_j \circ g$  preserves compact objects, then  $g$  itself is a morphism in  $\mathcal{P}\mathbf{r}^{\mathbf{L},\omega}$ . As we know that an object  $\mathcal{C}$  is compact if and only if its components are, the claim is proven. This implies that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{QCoh}_{\omega}^{\mathrm{cat}}(S) & \longrightarrow & \lim_{j \in J} \mathrm{QCoh}_{\omega}^{\mathrm{cat}}(U_j) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{QCoh}^{\mathrm{cat}}(S) & \longrightarrow & \lim_{j \in J} \mathrm{QCoh}^{\mathrm{cat}}(U_j) \end{array}$$

is horizontally right adjointable. As the bottom horizontal arrow is an equivalence and the vertical maps are conservative, we deduce that the top horizontal arrow is an equivalence as well.  $\square$

**2.3. 1-affineness.** Let  $R$  be a connective  $\mathbb{E}_{\infty}$ -ring. We denote by  $\mathrm{dSt}_R$  the  $\infty$ -category of hypercomplete étale sheaves on  $\mathrm{dAff}_R$ . Thanks to Theorem 2.8, we can uniquely extend  $\mathrm{QCoh}^{\mathrm{cat}}$  to a limit-preserving functor

$$\mathrm{QCoh}^{\mathrm{cat}}: \mathrm{dSt}_R^{\mathrm{op}} \longrightarrow \mathrm{CAlg}(\widehat{\mathrm{Cat}}_{\infty}^{\otimes}).$$

For every derived stack  $X \in \mathrm{dSt}_R$ , the  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{QCoh}^{\mathrm{cat}}(X)$  has a canonical symmetric monoidal structure, and the tensor unit is given by  $\mathrm{QCoh}(X)$ . Since  $R$  is the initial object in  $\mathrm{CAlg}_R$ , we obtain canonical maps

$$\mathcal{P}\mathbf{r}_R^{\mathbf{L}} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{Mod}_A}(\mathcal{P}\mathbf{r}_R^{\mathbf{L}}).$$

Passing to the limit over the maps  $\mathrm{Spec}(A) \rightarrow X$ , we obtain a canonical functor

$$\mathrm{Loc}_X: \mathcal{P}\mathbf{r}_R^{\mathbf{L}} \longrightarrow \mathrm{QCoh}^{\mathrm{cat}}(X),$$

which can be canonically promoted to a symmetric monoidal functor. Since  $\mathcal{P}\mathbf{r}_R^{\mathbf{L}}$  has limits, [29, §8.2] shows that this functor has a right adjoint

$$\Gamma_X: \mathrm{QCoh}^{\mathrm{cat}}(X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}\mathbf{r}_R^{\mathbf{L}}.$$

Observe that applying  $\Gamma_X$  to the tensor unit of  $\mathrm{QCoh}^{\mathrm{cat}}(X)$  we simply obtain the  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{QCoh}(X)$ . Since  $\mathrm{Loc}_X$  is symmetric monoidal,  $\Gamma_X$  has a canonical lax monoidal structure. In particular, it factors as

$$\Gamma_X^{\mathrm{enh}}: \mathrm{QCoh}^{\mathrm{cat}}(X) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{QCoh}(X)}(\mathcal{P}\mathbf{r}_R^{\mathbf{L}}).$$

**Definition 2.11.** We say that  $X \in \mathrm{dSt}_R$  is *1-affine* if the functor  $\Gamma_X^{\mathrm{enh}}$  is an equivalence.

The following is one of the main results of [10]. We reproduce a sketch of the proof for the convenience of the reader, as we will improve on it right after:

**Theorem 2.12** (Gaitsgory, see [10, Theorem 2.1.1]). *Let  $X$  be a quasi-compact and quasi-separated derived scheme. Then  $X$  is 1-affine.*

*Proof.* We proceed by induction on the number of affine Zariski open subschemes needed to cover  $X$ . When  $X$  is already affine, the statement is tautological. Assume therefore that the statement is true for schemes that can be covered by  $n - 1$  affine Zariski open subschemes, and let  $\{U_i\}_{i=1, \dots, n}$  be an affine Zariski open cover of  $X$ . Let

$$U := U_1, \quad V := \bigcup_{i=2}^n U_i.$$

Consider the commutative cube

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & \text{Mod}_{\text{QCoh}(X)}(\mathcal{P}r_R^L) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \text{Mod}_{\text{QCoh}(V)}(\mathcal{P}r_R^L) \\
& \swarrow \text{Loc}_X^{\text{enh}} & \downarrow & & \swarrow \text{Loc}_V^{\text{enh}} \\
\text{QCoh}^{\text{cat}}(X) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \text{QCoh}^{\text{cat}}(V) & & \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
& & \text{Mod}_{\text{QCoh}(U)}(\mathcal{P}r_R^L) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \text{Mod}_{\text{QCoh}(U \cap V)}(\mathcal{P}r_R^L) \\
& \swarrow \text{Loc}_U^{\text{enh}} & \downarrow & & \swarrow \text{Loc}_{U \cap V}^{\text{enh}} \\
\text{QCoh}^{\text{cat}}(U) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \text{QCoh}^{\text{cat}}(U \cap V) & & 
\end{array}$$

Since  $\text{QCoh}^{\text{cat}}$  is a sheaf, the front square is a pullback. Since the  $\infty$ -categories  $\text{QCoh}(X)$ ,  $\text{QCoh}(U)$  and  $\text{QCoh}(V)$  are compactly generated, they are also dualizable in  $\mathcal{P}r_R^L$ . Using [10, Lemma B.2.3], we see that  $\text{QCoh}(X)$  is rigid. On the other hand, Lemma D.5.4 in *loc. cit.* implies  $\text{QCoh}(U)$  and  $\text{QCoh}(V)$  are dualizable as  $\text{QCoh}(X)$ -modules as well. Therefore, Proposition 3.2.6-(a).(ii) in *loc. cit.* implies that the side squares in the above cube are horizontally left adjointable. Since  $\text{QCoh}^{\text{cat}}$  is a sheaf, the pair of functors

$$\text{QCoh}^{\text{cat}}(X) \longrightarrow \text{QCoh}^{\text{cat}}(U), \quad \text{QCoh}^{\text{cat}}(X) \longrightarrow \text{QCoh}^{\text{cat}}(V)$$

is jointly conservative. This implies at once that the unit of the adjunction  $\text{Loc}_X^{\text{enh}} \dashv \Gamma_X^{\text{enh}}$  is an equivalence. To conclude, it is enough to argue that the pair of functors

$$\text{Mod}_{\text{QCoh}(X)}(\mathcal{P}r_R^L) \longrightarrow \text{Mod}_{\text{QCoh}(U)}(\mathcal{P}r_R^L), \quad \text{Mod}_{\text{QCoh}(X)}(\mathcal{P}r_R^L) \longrightarrow \text{Mod}_{\text{QCoh}(V)}(\mathcal{P}r_R^L)$$

is jointly conservative as well. To prove this, it is enough to show that for every  $\mathcal{C} \in \text{Mod}_{\text{QCoh}(X)}(\mathcal{P}r_R^L)$  the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{C} \otimes_{\text{QCoh}(X)} \text{QCoh}(V) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathcal{C} \otimes_{\text{QCoh}(X)} \text{QCoh}(U) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{C} \otimes_{\text{QCoh}(X)} \text{QCoh}(U \cap V)
\end{array}$$

is a pullback. This is a special case of what is proven in [10, §A.1.2].  $\square$

**2.4. 1-affineness for Morita theory.** It is useful to have a variant of Theorem 2.12 for compactly generated  $\infty$ -categories. Recall the following definition (see e.g. [10, Definition D.1.1] and [23, Definition D.7.4.1]):

**Definition 2.13.** Let  $R$  be a connective  $\mathbb{E}_\infty$ -ring and let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a presentably symmetric monoidal  $R$ -linear  $\infty$ -category. We say that  $\mathcal{A}$  is *rigid* if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (1) the right adjoint to the multiplication map  $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  is a morphism in  $\mathcal{P}r_R^L$ ;
- (2) the right adjoint to the unit  $\text{Mod}_R \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  is a morphism in  $\mathcal{P}r_R^L$ ;
- (3) every compact object of  $\mathcal{A}$  admits both a left and a right dual.

We start by the following technical lemma:

**Lemma 2.14.** *Let  $R$  be a connective  $\mathbb{E}_\infty$ -ring and let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a presentably symmetric monoidal  $R$ -linear  $\infty$ -category. Assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  is compactly generated and rigid. Then:*

- (1)  $\mathcal{A}$  is a commutative algebra in  $\mathcal{P}r_R^{L,\omega}$ ;
- (2) The canonical functor

$$\text{Mod}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{P}r_R^{L,\omega}) \longrightarrow \text{Mod}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{P}r_R^L)$$

can be upgraded to a symmetric monoidal functor.

*Proof.* Consider the natural inclusion  $j: \mathcal{P}r_R^{L,\omega} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}r_R^L$  equipped with the (natural) symmetric monoidal structure provided by Theorem 2.5-(2). We can review it as a morphism of coCartesian fibrations

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\mathcal{P}r_R^{L,\omega})^\otimes & \xrightarrow{j} & (\mathcal{P}r_R^L)^\otimes \\ & \searrow & \swarrow \\ & \text{Fin}_* & \end{array} .$$

Since  $(\mathcal{P}r_R^L)^\otimes$  and  $(\mathcal{P}r_R^{L,\omega})^\otimes$  are  $\infty$ -operads, for every  $\langle n \rangle \in \text{Fin}_*$ , we have canonical identifications

$$(\mathcal{P}r_R^{L,\omega})_{\langle n \rangle}^\otimes \simeq (\mathcal{P}r_R^{L,\omega})^{\times n}, \quad (\mathcal{P}r_R^L)_{\langle n \rangle}^\otimes \simeq (\mathcal{P}r_R^L)^{\times n}.$$

For every  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , let  $\rho_i^n: \langle n \rangle \rightarrow \langle 1 \rangle$  be the inert morphism sending everything except  $i \in \langle n \rangle$  to  $* \in \langle 1 \rangle$ . If  $\mathcal{B} \in (\mathcal{P}r_R^L)_{\langle n \rangle}^\otimes$ , we let

$$\mathcal{B} \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_i$$

be a coCartesian lift of  $\rho_i^n$ . The objects  $\mathcal{B}_i$  are well defined up to a contractible space of choices, and we therefore allow ourselves to write

$$\mathcal{B} \simeq (\mathcal{B}_i)_{i \in \langle n \rangle^\circ}.$$

Since  $j$  is a symmetric monoidal functor (i.e. it preserves coCartesian edges), we see that a coCartesian morphism  $\mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  in  $(\mathcal{P}r_R^L)^\otimes$  belongs to  $(\mathcal{P}r_R^{L,\omega})^\otimes$  if and only if  $\mathcal{B}$  does.

We can identify  $\text{CAlg}(\mathcal{P}r_R^L)$  with the category of maps of  $\infty$ -operads  $\text{Fin}_* \rightarrow (\mathcal{P}r_R^L)^\otimes$ , and similarly for  $\text{CAlg}(\mathcal{P}r_R^{L,\omega})$ . Since the functor  $j$  is faithful, we see that a section of  $s: \text{Fin}_* \rightarrow (\mathcal{P}r_R^L)^\otimes$  factors through  $(\mathcal{P}r_R^{L,\omega})^\otimes$  if and only if it satisfies the following two conditions:

- (1) for every object  $\langle n \rangle \in \text{Fin}_*$ ,  $s(\langle n \rangle) \in (\mathcal{P}r_R^{L,\omega})^\otimes$ ;
- (2) for every morphism  $f: \langle n \rangle \rightarrow \langle m \rangle$ ,  $s(f)$  is a morphism in  $(\mathcal{P}r_R^{L,\omega})^\otimes$ .

Let  $s: \text{Fin}_* \rightarrow (\mathcal{P}r_R^L)^\otimes$  be the section corresponding to the presentably symmetric monoidal  $\infty$ -category  $\mathcal{A}$ . We have to prove that rigidity of  $\mathcal{A}$  implies that  $s$  satisfies the above two conditions. Since  $s$  is a map of  $\infty$ -operads, we have canonical equivalences

$$s(\langle n \rangle)_i \simeq \mathcal{A}.$$

Since  $\mathcal{A}$  is compactly generated by assumption, we conclude that condition (1) is automatically satisfied. We now verify condition (2). Since every morphism in  $\text{Fin}_*$  can be written as the composition of an inert and an active morphism (see [22, Remark 2.1.2.2]), we see that it is enough to prove that condition (2) is satisfied separately by these two classes of morphisms. To begin with, assume that  $f$  is inert. Since  $s$  is a map of  $\infty$ -operads,  $s(f)$  is coCartesian. Since  $s(\langle n \rangle)$  belongs to  $(\mathcal{P}r_R^{L,\omega})_{\langle n \rangle}^\otimes$ , we deduce that  $s(f)$  belongs to  $(\mathcal{P}r_R^{L,\omega})^\otimes$  as well.

Assume now that  $f$  is active. In this case, we can factor  $f$  as a surjective morphism followed by an injective one, and it is therefore enough to prove that condition (2) holds separately in these two cases. Assume first that  $f$  is active and surjective. Then  $f$  can be (non-uniquely) factored as a composition

$$\langle n \rangle \xrightarrow{f_1} \langle n-1 \rangle \xrightarrow{f_2} \dots \xrightarrow{f_m} \langle m \rangle,$$

where each  $f_i$  is active and surjective. It is therefore enough to treat the case of a morphism  $g: \langle n' \rangle \rightarrow \langle n'-1 \rangle$  which is active and surjective. In this case, there exists an element  $k \in \langle n'-1 \rangle^\circ$  such that:

- (1)  $g^{-1}(k) = \{i_1, i_2\}$  consists of exactly two elements;
- (2) every other element of  $\langle n'-1 \rangle$  has exactly one preimage via  $g$ .

Let

$$s(\langle n' \rangle) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}$$

be a coCartesian lift for  $g$  starting at  $s(\langle n' \rangle)$ . Then  $s(f)$  belongs to  $(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{R}_R^{\mathbb{L},\omega})^{\otimes}$  if and only if the uniquely determined morphism  $\gamma: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow s(\langle n' - 1 \rangle)$  does. Unraveling the definitions, we have:

$$\mathcal{B}_h \simeq \begin{cases} s(\langle n' \rangle)_{g^{-1}(h)} & \text{if } h \neq k \\ s(\langle n' \rangle)_{i_1} \otimes s(\langle n' \rangle)_{i_2} & \text{if } h = k. \end{cases}$$

In other words,  $\mathcal{B}_h \simeq \mathcal{A}$  if  $h \neq k$  and  $\mathcal{B}_k \simeq \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}$ . With these conventions, we see that  $\gamma_h$  is (equivalent to) the identity of  $\mathcal{A}$  if  $h \neq k$  and it is the multiplication

$$\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$$

when  $h = k$ . Since this map belongs to  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{R}_R^{\mathbb{L},\omega}$  by assumption, the conclusion follows in the active and surjective case.

We are left to deal with the case where  $f: \langle n \rangle \rightarrow \langle m \rangle$  is active and injective. Let once again

$$s(\langle n \rangle) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}$$

be the coCartesian lift of  $f$  starting at  $s(\langle n \rangle)$ . Then  $s(f)$  belongs to  $(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{R}_R^{\mathbb{L},\omega})^{\otimes}$  if and only if the uniquely determined morphism  $\delta: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow s(\langle m \rangle)$  does. Unraveling the definitions, we see that

$$\mathcal{B}_k = \begin{cases} \mathcal{A} & \text{if } k \in \text{Im}(f) \\ \text{Mod}_R & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In these terms, the map  $\delta_k$  is the identity of  $\mathcal{A}$  if  $k \in \text{Im}(f)$ , and it corresponds to the the map  $\text{Mod}_R \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  selecting the tensor unit of  $\mathcal{A}$  otherwise. As the latter is in  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{R}_R^{\mathbb{L},\omega}$  by assumption, the proof of point (1) follows.

As for statement (2), it follows from the fact that  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{R}_R^{\mathbb{L},\omega} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\mathcal{R}_R^{\mathbb{L}}$  is strong monoidal and commutes with small colimits together with [22, Theorem 4.2.2.8].  $\square$

Let  $X$  be a quasi-compact and quasi-separated derived scheme over  $\text{Spec}(R)$ . Then  $\text{QCoh}(X) \simeq \text{Ind}(\text{Perf}(X))$  is compactly generated and since perfect modules are dualizable, we see that it is rigid as well. Therefore, Lemma 2.14-(1) shows that  $\text{QCoh}(X)$  is an algebra in  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{R}_R^{\mathbb{L},\omega}$ .

**Definition 2.15.** Let  $X$  be a quasi-compact and quasi-separated derived scheme over  $\text{Spec}(R)$ . The  $\infty$ -category of *compactly generated QCoh}(X)-linear  $\infty$ -categories up to Morita equivalence* (or simply the *Morita theory of  $X$* ) is

$$\mathcal{P}\mathcal{R}_X^{\mathbb{L},\omega} := \text{Mod}_{\text{QCoh}(X)}(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{R}_R^{\mathbb{L},\omega}).$$

**Remark 2.16.** When  $X = \text{Spec}(A)$ , by definition  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{R}_{\text{Spec}(A)}^{\mathbb{L},\omega} = \mathcal{P}\mathcal{R}_A^{\mathbb{L},\omega}$ .

Observe now that if  $f: Y \rightarrow X$  is a quasi-compact and quasi-separated map, the functor

$$f^*: \text{QCoh}(X) \longrightarrow \text{QCoh}(Y)$$

preserves compact objects. Using Lemma 2.14-(2) we see that for every  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{R}_X^{\mathbb{L},\omega}$  the induced map

$$\mathcal{C} \simeq \mathcal{C} \otimes_{\text{QCoh}(X)} \text{QCoh}(X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C} \otimes_{\text{QCoh}(X)} \text{QCoh}(Y)$$

is again a morphism in  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{R}_R^{\mathbb{L},\omega}$ . Therefore, the functor  $\text{Loc}_X^{\text{enh}}: \text{Mod}_{\text{QCoh}(X)}(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{R}_R^{\mathbb{L}}) \rightarrow \text{QCoh}^{\text{cat}}(X)$  restricts to a symmetric monoidal functor

$$\text{Loc}_X^{\text{enh},\omega}: \mathcal{P}\mathcal{R}_X^{\mathbb{L},\omega} \longrightarrow \text{QCoh}_\omega^{\text{cat}}(X)$$

making the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{P}r_X^{L,\omega} & \xrightarrow{\text{Loc}_X^{\text{enh},\omega}} & \text{QCoh}_\omega^{\text{cat}}(X) \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \text{Mod}_{\text{QCoh}(X)}(\mathcal{P}r_R^L) & \xrightarrow{\text{Loc}_X^{\text{enh}}} & \text{QCoh}^{\text{cat}}(X)
 \end{array} \tag{2.17}$$

commutative. We have:

**Proposition 2.18.**

- (1) The square (2.17) is horizontally right adjointable.
- (2) The functor

$$\text{Loc}_X^{\text{enh},\omega} : \mathcal{P}r_X^{L,\omega} \longrightarrow \text{QCoh}_\omega^{\text{cat}}(X)$$

is an equivalence of symmetric monoidal  $\infty$ -categories.

*Proof.* Since the vertical functors in (2.17) are conservative, we see that point (2) follows directly from point (1). As for point (1), let  $\mathfrak{C} \in \text{QCoh}_\omega^{\text{cat}}(X)$ . Choose a finite affine Zariski open cover  $\{U_i\}_{i \in I}$  of  $X$ . Let  $J$  be the subposet of  $X_{\text{Zar}}$  closed under intersection and containing the  $U_i$ s. Let  $U_j$  be the open subscheme of  $X$  corresponding to  $j \in J$ , and let  $\mathfrak{C}_j := \mathfrak{C}(U_j)$ . Using Proposition 2.10 and [29, §8.2], we see that

$$\Gamma_X^{\text{enh},\omega}(\mathfrak{C}) \simeq \lim_{j \in J} \mathfrak{C}_j,$$

the limit being computed in  $\mathcal{P}r_R^{L,\omega}$ . The proof of Proposition 2.10 furthermore shows that the above limit can be equally computed in  $\mathcal{P}r_R^L$ . Therefore, the Beck-Chevalley transformation

$$\Gamma_X^{\text{enh},\omega}(\mathfrak{C}) \longrightarrow \Gamma_X^{\text{enh}}(\mathfrak{C})$$

is an equivalence.  $\square$

**2.5. Smooth and proper categories.** To every algebraic variety  $X$  we can associate the stable  $\infty$ -category of perfect complexes  $\text{QCoh}(X) \simeq \text{Ind}(\text{Perf}(X))$ , which is naturally an object in  $\mathcal{P}r^{L,\omega}$ . This assignment suggests a way to enlarge the category of algebraic variety, and historically lead to the development of noncommutative geometry (see e.g. [30] and the references therein). From this point of view, it is better to work with  $\mathcal{P}r^{L,\omega}$  rather than  $\mathcal{P}r^L$ : for example, it was shown in [32] that morphisms from  $\text{Perf}(X)$  to  $\text{Perf}(Y)$  in  $\mathcal{P}r^{L,\omega}$  correspond exactly to Fourier-Mukai transforms. In line with this philosophy, several geometrical properties can be extended to the noncommutative setting. Most notably, we have a way of formulating smoothness and properness intrinsically inside  $\mathcal{P}r^{L,\omega}$ :

**Definition 2.19.** Let  $R$  be a connective  $\mathbb{E}_\infty$ -ring and let  $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathcal{P}r_R^{L,\omega}$ . We say that:

- (1)  $\mathfrak{C}$  is *proper* if for every  $X, Y \in \mathfrak{C}^\omega$ , the  $R$ -module  $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(X, Y)$  is perfect.
- (2)  $\mathfrak{C}$  is of *finite type* if it is a compact object in  $\mathcal{P}r_R^{L,\omega}$ .
- (3)  $\mathfrak{C}$  is *smooth* if the natural map

$$\text{Mod}_R \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{\mathfrak{C}}} \text{Fun}_R^L(\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{C}) \simeq \mathfrak{C} \otimes_R \text{Ind}((\mathfrak{C}^\omega)^{\text{op}})$$

preserves compact objects.

**Remark 2.20.** We content ourselves with a couple of important remarks about the previous definition, but we refer the reader to [23, §11.4] for a more extended discussion on these notions.

- (1) If  $X$  is a quasi-compact and quasi-separated scheme over  $\text{Spec}(R)$ , then  $\text{QCoh}(X) \simeq \text{Ind}(\text{Perf}(X))$  is smooth (resp. proper) in the above sense if and only if  $X$  is smooth (resp. proper) over  $\text{Spec}(R)$ .

- (2) Let  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_R^{\mathbb{L},\omega}$  be a compactly generated  $R$ -linear stable  $\infty$ -category. If  $\mathcal{C}$  is of finite type, then there exists an algebra of finite type  $A \in \text{Alg}(\text{Mod}_R)$  and an equivalence  $\mathcal{C} \simeq \text{Mod}_A(\text{Mod}_R)$ . Indeed, since  $\mathcal{C}$  is compactly generated, we can choose a family of compact generators  $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$ . For every finite subset  $T' \subseteq T$ , let  $\mathcal{C}_{T'}$  be the smallest stable full subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$  closed under colimits and containing  $\{X_t\}_{t \in T'}$ . It is shown in the proof of [23, Proposition 11.3.2.4] that the canonical map

$$\text{colim}_{T' \subseteq T} \mathcal{C}_{T'} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$$

is an equivalence, the colimit being computed in  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}^{\mathbb{L},\omega}$  (or, equivalently, in  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}^{\mathbb{L}}$  – see [22, Lemma 5.3.2.9]). Since  $\mathcal{C}$  is a compact object in  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_R^{\mathbb{L},\omega}$ , the identity factors through this colimit, showing that there exists a  $T'$  such that  $\mathcal{C}_{T'} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  is essentially surjective. The sum of the objects  $\{X_t\}_{t \in T'}$  provides a single compact generator for  $\mathcal{C}$ . At this point, the conclusion follows for instance from [23, Corollary D.7.6.4] (see also [34, Corollary 2.12]).

- (3) Let  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_R^{\mathbb{L},\omega}$  be a compactly generated  $R$ -linear stable  $\infty$ -category. Since  $\mathcal{C}$  is compactly generated, it is dualizable in  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_R^{\mathbb{L}}$ . Properness is then equivalent to ask that the evaluation map for  $\mathcal{C}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_R^{\mathbb{L},\omega}$ , and smoothness is equivalent to ask that the coevaluation map for  $\mathcal{C}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_R^{\mathbb{L},\omega}$ . In other words,  $\mathcal{C}$  is smooth and proper if and only if it is a dualizable object in  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_R^{\mathbb{L},\omega}$ .

For our purposes, it is important to globalize the notion of smooth and proper  $R$ -linear stable  $\infty$ -category. We give the following definition:

**Definition 2.21.** Let  $X$  be a quasi-compact and quasi-separated derived scheme. We say that  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_X^{\mathbb{L},\omega}$  is *smooth and proper* if it is a dualizable object in  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_X^{\mathbb{L},\omega}$ . We denote by  $\text{SmPr}^{\text{cat}}(X)$  the full subcategory of  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_X^{\mathbb{L},\omega}$  spanned by smooth and proper objects.

**Remark 2.22.** Under the equivalence  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_X^{\mathbb{L},\omega} \simeq \text{QCoh}_\omega^{\text{cat}}(X)$  provided by Proposition 2.10-(2), it is easy to see that the condition of being smooth and proper can be tested Zariski locally on  $X$ . Indeed, fix an open affine Zariski cover  $\{U_i\}$  of  $X$  and let  $U_\bullet$  be its Čech nerve. Then Proposition 2.10-(2) implies that the natural map

$$\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_X^{\mathbb{L},\omega} \longrightarrow \lim_{[n] \in \Delta} \mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_{U_n}^{\mathbb{L},\omega}$$

is an equivalence. Then, it follows from [22, Proposition 4.6.1.11]  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_X^{\mathbb{L},\omega}$  is dualizable if and only if each  $\mathcal{C} \otimes_{\text{QCoh}(X)} \text{QCoh}(U_n)$  is dualizable.

Let  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_X^{\mathbb{L},\omega}$  and assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is smooth and proper. Combining the above remark with Remark 2.20-(2), we see that Zariski locally on  $X$ ,  $\mathcal{C}$  can be written as the  $\infty$ -category of modules over an  $\mathbb{E}_1$ -algebra of finite type. One of the main theorems of [33] implies that the same is true globally:

**Proposition 2.23.** *Let  $X$  be a quasi-compact and quasi-separated derived scheme and let  $\mathcal{C} \in \text{SmPr}^{\text{cat}}(X)$ . Then there exists a sheaf of perfect  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -algebras  $\mathcal{A} \in \text{Alg}(\text{Perf}(X))$  and an equivalence*

$$\mathcal{C} \simeq \text{Mod}_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{QCoh}(X))$$

*in  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_X^{\mathbb{L},\omega}$ . Furthermore, this equivalence restricts to an equivalence*

$$\mathcal{C}^\omega \simeq \text{Mod}_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{Perf}(X)).$$

*Proof.* Using [33, Proposition 4.9] we can find a compact local generator  $\mathcal{E}$  for  $\mathcal{C}$ . Let

$$\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{H}\text{om}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}) \in \text{Alg}(\text{Perf}(X))$$

be the associated sheaf of endomorphisms of  $\mathcal{E}$ . The functor

$$\mathcal{H}\text{om}(\mathcal{E}, -): \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \text{Mod}_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{QCoh}(X))$$

is  $\text{QCoh}(X)$ -linear. We claim that it is an equivalence. First of all, since  $\mathcal{C}$  is smooth and proper,  $\mathcal{A}$  is a sheaf of smooth and proper algebras over  $X$ . We now observe that an object in  $\text{Mod}_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{QCoh}(X))$  is compact if and

only if its image in  $\mathrm{QCoh}(X)$  is perfect. Indeed, since  $X$  is a quasi-compact and quasi-separated derived scheme, Lemma 2.9 implies that an object in  $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathrm{QCoh}(X))$  is compact if and only if it is compact Zariski locally. We can therefore assume that  $X$  is affine, in which case the conclusion simply follows from [34, Proposition 2.8-(2)]. At this point, since  $\mathcal{C}$  is proper, we see that  $\mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}(\mathcal{E}, -)$  preserves compact objects, and, as a consequence, it defines a morphism in  $\mathcal{P}\mathrm{r}_X^{\mathrm{L},\omega}$ . Using Proposition 2.18-(2), we see that it is enough to prove that  $\mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}(\mathcal{E}, -)$  is an equivalence Zariski locally on  $X$ . Since  $\mathcal{E}$  is a local compact generator, the conclusion follows. As for the second statement, we already observed above that an object in  $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathrm{QCoh}(X))$  is compact if and only if it belongs to  $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathrm{Perf}(X))$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

### 3. THE GAGA PROBLEM FOR SMOOTH AND PROPER CATEGORIES

We now approach the main result of the paper:

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $S = \mathrm{Spec}(R)$  be the spectrum of a Noetherian ring which is complete with respect to an ideal  $I$ . Set  $R_n := R/I^n$ . Let  $X$  be a proper derived scheme over  $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$  and let  $X_n := X \times_{\mathrm{Spec}(R)} \mathrm{Spec}(R_n)$ . The symmetric monoidal functor*

$$v_{\bullet}^*: \mathrm{SmPr}^{\mathrm{cat}}(X) \longrightarrow \lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathrm{SmPr}^{\mathrm{cat}}(X_n).$$

*is fully faithful. In other words, if  $\mathcal{C}$  is a smooth and proper category over  $X$  and  $\mathcal{C}_n := \mathcal{C} \otimes_{\mathrm{QCoh}(X)} \mathrm{QCoh}(X_n)$ , the natural map*

$$\mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \lim_n \mathcal{C}_n$$

*is an equivalence, where the limit is computed in  $\mathcal{P}\mathrm{r}_X^{\mathrm{L},\omega}$ .*

Before giving the proof, let us recall the following easy lemma:

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{E}^{\otimes}$  be a presentably symmetric monoidal  $\infty$ -category and let*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \xrightarrow{g} & A \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow f' \\ R' & \xrightarrow{g'} & A' \end{array}$$

*be a pushout square in  $\mathrm{CAlg}(\mathcal{E}^{\otimes})$ . Then the induced commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Mod}_R & \xrightarrow{g^*} & \mathrm{Mod}_A \\ \downarrow f^* & & \downarrow f'^* \\ \mathrm{Mod}_{R'} & \xrightarrow{g'^*} & \mathrm{Mod}_{A'} \end{array}$$

*is horizontally and vertically right adjointable.*

*Proof.* The situation is symmetrical, so it is enough to argue for horizontal right adjointability. It follows from [22, Proposition 3.2.4.7] that we have a canonical equivalence  $A' \simeq R' \otimes_R A$ . Combining [22, Theorems 3.4.4.2 and 4.5.3.1 and Corollary 4.5.1.6] we see that  $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathcal{E})^{\otimes} \rightarrow \mathrm{CAlg}(\mathcal{E})$  is a presentable fibration. In particular, the functors  $f^*$ ,  $g^*$  and  $g'^*$  have right adjoint given by the forgetful functors, that we denote  $f_*$ ,  $g_*$  and  $g'_*$ , respectively. Let  $M \in \mathrm{LMod}_A$ . The Beck-Chevalley transformation is

$$g_*(M) \otimes_R R' \longrightarrow g'_*((R' \otimes_R A) \otimes_A M).$$

Since [22, Corollary 4.3.3.2] implies that  $f_*$  is conservative, it is enough to prove that the induced map

$$f_*(g_*(M) \otimes_R R') \longrightarrow f_*g'_*((R' \otimes_R A) \otimes_A M) \quad (3.3)$$

is an equivalence. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} f_* g'_*((R' \otimes_R A) \otimes_A M) &\simeq g_* f'_*((R' \otimes_R A) \otimes_A M) \\ &\simeq g_*(f'_*(R' \otimes_R A) \otimes_A M) \\ &\simeq g_*(f_*(R') \otimes_R A \otimes_A M) \\ &\simeq f_*(R') \otimes_R g_*(M), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equivalence is a consequence of [22, Proposition 4.4.3.16]. On the other hand, the same result equally implies that

$$f_*(g_*(M) \otimes_R R') \simeq g_*(M) \otimes_R f_*(R').$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* Write  $S := \mathrm{Spec}(R)$  and  $S_n := \mathrm{Spec}(R_n)$ . Let  $f: X \rightarrow S$  and  $f_n: X_n \rightarrow S_n$  be the structural morphisms. Consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{P}_X^{\mathrm{L},\omega} & \xrightarrow{v_\bullet^*} & \lim_n \mathcal{P}_{X_n}^{\mathrm{L},\omega} \\ \downarrow f_* & & \downarrow f_{\bullet*} \\ \mathcal{P}_S^{\mathrm{L},\omega} & \xrightarrow{u_\bullet^*} & \lim_n \mathcal{P}_{S_n}^{\mathrm{L},\omega}. \end{array} \quad (3.4)$$

Combining [28, Lemma 6.3] and Lemma 3.2 we see that this diagram is canonically commutative, and horizontally right adjointable. Let  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathrm{SmPr}^{\mathrm{cat}}(X)$  and let  $\mathcal{C}_n := \mathcal{C} \otimes_{\mathrm{QCoh}(X)} \mathrm{QCoh}(X_n)$ . Using Proposition 2.23, we have can choose an equivalence

$$\mathcal{C} \simeq \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathrm{QCoh}(X)) \quad (3.5)$$

in  $\mathcal{P}_X^{\mathrm{L},\omega}$ , where  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathrm{Alg}(\mathrm{Perf}(X))$ . In particular,

$$\mathcal{C}_n \simeq \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathcal{A}_n}(\mathrm{QCoh}(X_n)).$$

We want to prove that the unit morphism

$$\eta_{\mathcal{C}}: \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow v_{\bullet*} v_\bullet^* \mathcal{C} \simeq \lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{C}_n$$

is an equivalence, where the limit is computed in  $\mathcal{P}_R^{\mathrm{L},\omega}$ . Let  $j_n: X_n \rightarrow X$  be the canonical morphism. We denote by

$$j_{n,\mathcal{C}}^*: \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}_n$$

the canonical functor. To prove full faithfulness of  $\eta_{\mathcal{C}}$ , it is enough to check that for  $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{C}^\omega$  the canonical map

$$\mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) \longrightarrow \lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}_{\mathcal{C}_n}(j_{n,\mathcal{C}}^*(\mathcal{F}), j_{n,\mathcal{C}}^*(\mathcal{G}))$$

is an equivalence. Using the equivalence (3.5), we see that

$$j_n^* \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}_{\mathcal{C}_n}(j_{n,\mathcal{C}}^*(\mathcal{F}), j_{n,\mathcal{C}}^*(\mathcal{G}))$$

is an equivalence, and  $\mathcal{H}\mathrm{om}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) \in \mathrm{Perf}(X)$ . At this point, the conclusion follows from formal GAGA for  $\mathrm{Perf}(X)$ , see [23, Theorem 8.5.0.3]. We now prove that  $\eta_{\mathcal{C}}$  is essentially surjective as well. Let therefore  $\mathfrak{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be an element in  $\lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{C}_n^\omega$ . Since  $\mathcal{C}$  is smooth and proper,  $\mathcal{A}$  is a sheaf of smooth and proper algebras over  $X$ , and the same goes for each  $\mathcal{A}_n$ . Therefore,

$$\mathcal{C}_n^\omega \simeq \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathcal{A}_n}(\mathrm{Perf}(X_n)).$$

Using formal GAGA for  $\mathrm{Perf}(X)$ , we can integrate the sequence  $\mathfrak{F}$  to an object  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Perf}(X)$ . Since the equivalence

$$\mathrm{Perf}(X) \simeq \lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathrm{Perf}(X_n)$$

is symmetric monoidal, we see that  $\mathcal{F}$  canonically defines an element in  $\text{Mod}_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{Perf}(X))$ . Finally, since  $\mathcal{A}$  is smooth and proper, Proposition 2.23 implies that we have an equivalence  $\mathcal{C}^{\omega} \simeq \text{Mod}_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{Perf}(X))$ . The conclusion now follows from Lemma 3.2.  $\square$

**Remark 3.6.**

- (1) Statement (1) of Theorem 3.1 is a global counterpart of [23, Theorem 11.4.4.1]. Notice that if one further assumes that  $X$  is smooth and proper over  $\text{Spec}(R)$ , it would be possible to deduce our result from the cited theorem, using [23, Theorem 11.3.6.1] as a stepping stone.
- (2) We do not expect the map  $v_{\bullet}^*: \text{SmPr}^{\text{cat}}(X) \rightarrow \lim_n \text{SmPr}^{\text{cat}}(X_n)$  to be essentially surjective, even when  $X = \text{Spec}(R)$ . Loosely speaking, the reason is that the stack of smooth and proper stable  $\infty$ -categories is not expected to be a geometric stack, and in particular integrability should fail. See [1, §8.1].

#### 4. APPLICATIONS TO THE (DERIVED) BRAUER GROUP OF FORMAL SCHEMES

**4.1. Review of derived Azumaya algebras.** Derived Azumaya algebras were introduced in [33] as derived counterpart of classical Azumaya algebras. When  $X$  is a scheme, a classical Azumaya algebra is sheaf  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -algebras which is étale-locally isomorphic to  $\mathcal{E}nd(V)$  for some (locally defined) vector bundle  $V$ . In the derived setting, we give the following definition:

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $X$  be a derived scheme. A *derived Azumaya algebra over  $X$*  is an object  $\mathcal{A} \in \text{Alg}(\text{Perf}(X))$  satisfying the following two conditions:

- (1) the natural map

$$\mathcal{A} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$$

is an equivalence;

- (2)  $\mathcal{A}$  is a compact generator for  $\text{QCoh}(X)$ .

**Remark 4.2.** In [33, Definition 2.1] the above definition is given only for affine derived schemes. The first condition can obviously be checked étale locally. As for the second one, Theorem 2.8 shows that it can be checked Zariski locally. Therefore, a derived Azumaya algebra over  $X$  is equivalently a perfect complex on  $X$  equipped with an associative multiplication which Zariski locally is a derived Azumaya algebra in the sense of [33].

A derived Azumaya algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  over a derived scheme  $X$  gives automatically rise to an object  $\mathcal{A}\text{-Mod} \in \text{Pr}_X^{\text{L}, \omega}$ .

**Definition 4.3.** Let  $X$  be a derived scheme. We let  $\text{dAz}^{\text{cat}}(X)$  be the full subcategory of  $\text{Pr}_X^{\text{L}, \omega}$  spanned by quasi-coherent sheaves of categories of the form  $\mathcal{A}\text{-Mod}$ , where  $\mathcal{A}$  is a derived Azumaya algebra over  $X$ . We refer to  $\text{dAz}^{\text{cat}}(X)$  as the  *$\infty$ -category of derived Azumaya algebras on  $X$  up to Morita equivalence*. We let  $\text{dAz}(X)$  denote the maximal  $\infty$ -groupoid contained inside  $\text{dAz}^{\text{cat}}(X)$ .

**Remark 4.4.** (1) Let  $X$  be a derived scheme and let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}'$  be two derived Azumaya algebras over  $X$ . Then  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}'$  are Morita equivalent (i.e. they are equivalent when seen as objects in  $\text{dAz}^{\text{cat}}(X)$ ) if and only if there is a  $\text{QCoh}(X)$ -linear equivalence  $\mathcal{A}\text{-Mod} \simeq \mathcal{A}'\text{-Mod}$ .

- (2) Using [15, Corollary 2.1.4], we deduce that a derived Azumaya algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  over  $X$  is Morita equivalent to  $\mathcal{O}_X$  if and only if it is quasi-isomorphic to an algebra of the form  $\mathcal{E}nd(\mathcal{F})$  for some perfect complex  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{Perf}(X)$ .

- (3) Let  $X$  be a derived scheme. Using [33, Proposition 2.14], one shows that étale locally on  $X$  a derived Azumaya algebra on  $X$  is always Morita equivalent to  $\mathcal{O}_X$ .

Let  $X$  be a derived scheme and let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a derived Azumaya algebra on  $X$ . Then  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}$  is again a derived Azumaya algebra, and

$$\mathcal{A}\text{-Mod} \otimes_{\text{QCoh}(X)} \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}\text{-Mod} \simeq \mathcal{E}nd(\mathcal{A})\text{-Mod}.$$

Remark 4.4-(2) implies that  $\mathcal{A}\text{-Mod} \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_X^{\text{L},\omega}$  is an invertible object. A major theorem of [33] states that the vice-versa is true:

**Theorem 4.5** (Toën, [33, Proposition 2.5]). *Let  $X$  be a derived scheme. The full subcategory  $\mathbf{dAz}^{\text{cat}}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_X^{\text{L},\omega}$  coincides with the full subcategory of  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_X^{\text{L},\omega}$  spanned by invertible objects.*

**Corollary 4.6.** *The functors*

$$\mathbf{dAz}^{\text{cat}}: \mathbf{dAff}^{\text{op}} \longrightarrow \text{Cat}_{\infty}, \quad \mathbf{dAz}: \mathbf{dAff}^{\text{op}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}$$

*satisfy étale descent.*

*Proof.* We first observe that an object in  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_X^{\text{L},\omega}$  is invertible if and only if it is invertible in  $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{r}_X^{\text{L},\text{cg}}$ . The conclusion therefore follows from Theorem 2.8.  $\square$

Observe that Remark 4.4-(3) implies that the natural map  $\text{Spec}(\mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \mathbf{dAz}$  is an effective epimorphism. Studying the loop stack, Toën deduces:

**Theorem 4.7** (Toën, [33, Theorem 3.12]). *There is a natural equivalence of stacks*

$$\mathbf{dAz} \simeq \mathbf{K}(\mathbb{G}_m, 2) \times \mathbf{K}(\mathbb{Z}, 1).$$

Motivated by the above theorem, we introduce the following notations:

**Definition 4.8.** Let  $F \in \mathbf{dSt}$  be a derived stack. The derived stack  $\mathbf{dAz}(F)$  parametrizing families of derived Azumaya algebras on  $F$  is defined as

$$\mathbf{dAz}(F) := \mathbf{Map}(F, \mathbf{dAz}).$$

We further introduce the derived stack  $\mathbf{dAz}_0(F)$ , defined as

$$\mathbf{dAz}_0(F) := \mathbf{Map}(F, \mathbf{K}(\mathbb{G}_m, 2)).$$

**Remark 4.9.** (1) By construction, we have a natural map  $\mathbf{dAz}_0(F) \rightarrow \mathbf{dAz}(F)$  exhibiting the source as the fiber of the natural map

$$\mathbf{dAz}(F) = \mathbf{Map}(F, \mathbf{dAz}) \simeq \mathbf{Map}(F, \mathbf{K}(\mathbb{G}_m, 2) \times \mathbf{K}(\mathbb{Z}, 1)) \longrightarrow \mathbf{Map}(F, \mathbf{K}(\mathbb{Z}, 1))$$

at the zero map  $\text{Spec}(\mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Map}(F, \mathbf{K}(\mathbb{Z}, 1))$ .

(2) Observe that the  $\text{Spec}(\mathbb{Z})$ -points of  $\mathbf{dAz}(F)$  coincide with  $\text{Map}_{\mathbf{dSt}}(F, \mathbf{dAz})$ . We denote them simply by  $\mathbf{dAz}(F)$ .

Finally, following [33, Definition 3.14] we introduce the derived Brauer group and its variants. We start with the categorical derived Brauer group:

**Definition 4.10.** Let  $F \in \mathbf{dSt}$  be a derived stack. The *categorical derived Brauer group* of  $F$  is the group  $\mathbf{dBr}^{\text{cat}}(F) := \pi_0(\mathbf{dAz}(F))$ .

**Remark 4.11.** Let  $F$  be a derived stack. If  $\mathcal{A}$  is a derived Azumaya algebra on  $F$  (defined globally *up to quasi-isomorphism*<sup>1</sup>), then it defines a class  $[\mathcal{A}] \in \mathbf{dBr}^{\text{cat}}(F)$ .

**Definition 4.12.** Let  $F \in \mathbf{dSt}$  be a derived stack. The *derived Brauer group*  $\mathbf{dBr}(F)$  of  $F$  is the subgroup of  $\mathbf{dBr}^{\text{cat}}(F)$  spanned by the classes of the form  $[\mathcal{A}]$  for  $\mathcal{A}$  a derived Azumaya algebra defined globally on  $F$ .

**Warning 4.13.** In this paper,  $\mathbf{dSt}$  denotes the  $\infty$ -category of hypercomplete étale sheaves on  $\mathbf{dAff}$ . It follows that the above derived Brauer groups are *étale versions* of the derived Brauer groups considered in [33]. The arguments given in loc. cit. apply verbatim for these étale derived Brauer groups.

By definition, for every derived stack  $F$  there is a natural inclusion  $\mathbf{dBr}(F) \subseteq \mathbf{dBr}^{\text{cat}}(F)$ . In [33] it is shown that this map is surjective in many cases:

<sup>1</sup>As opposed to *up to Morita equivalence*.

**Theorem 4.14** (Toën, [33, Corollary 4.8]). *Let  $X$  be a quasi-compact and quasi-separated derived scheme. Then the natural map  $\mathrm{dBr}(X) \subseteq \mathrm{dBr}^{\mathrm{cat}}(X)$  is an isomorphism.*

**Remark 4.15.** Let  $X$  be a quasi-compact and quasi-separated derived scheme. Then combining Theorems 4.7 and 4.14 we obtain

$$\mathrm{dBr}(X) \simeq \pi_0 \mathrm{Map}_{\mathrm{dSt}}(X, \mathrm{K}(\mathbb{G}_m, 2) \times \mathrm{K}(\mathbb{Z}, 1)) \simeq \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(X, \mathbb{G}_m) \times \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^1(X, \mathbb{Z}).$$

In particular, every class  $\alpha \in \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(X, \mathbb{G}_m)$  (even non-torsion ones!) can be realized as the class of some *derived* Azumaya algebra over  $X$ .

**4.2. The formal GAGA problem for the derived Brauer group.** Let  $S$  be the spectrum of a commutative ring  $R$  and let  $I$  be an ideal. Let  $p: X \rightarrow S$  be a proper derived scheme. For every integer  $n \geq 0$  set  $S_n := \mathrm{Spec}(R/I^{n+1})$  and  $X_n := S_n \times_S X$ . The *formal completion of  $X$  along the base* is the formal scheme

$$\mathfrak{X} := \mathrm{colim} X_n.$$

To this situation we can attach a number of cohomological invariants. In first place, we have three different declinations of the derived Brauer group:

$$\mathrm{dBr}(X), \quad \mathrm{dBr}(\mathfrak{X}), \quad \lim_n \mathrm{dBr}(X_n).$$

Similarly, we have three different declinations of the cohomological Brauer group:

$$\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m), \quad \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(\mathfrak{X}; \mathbb{G}_m), \quad \lim_n \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(X_n; \mathbb{G}_m).$$

The first and the last one need no further explanation. The middle one is defined as:

$$\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(\mathfrak{X}; \mathbb{G}_m) := \pi_0(\mathrm{dAz}_0(\mathfrak{X})) := \pi_0(\mathrm{Map}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathrm{K}(\mathbb{G}_m, 2))).$$

**Remark 4.16.** It is possible to reformulate  $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(\mathfrak{X}; \mathbb{G}_m)$  in more classical terms as follows. First, we remark that for every scheme  $Y$  there is a canonical quasi-isomorphism (in *cohomological* notation):

$$\mathrm{Map}(Y, \mathrm{K}(\mathbb{G}_m, 2)) \simeq \tau^{\leq 2} \mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathrm{ét}}(Y; \mathbb{G}_m)[2]. \quad (4.17)$$

This quasi-isomorphism arises as follows: let  $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{Ab})}(Y_{\mathrm{ét}}, \tau_{\mathrm{ét}})$  (resp.  $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}(\mathrm{Ab})}(Y_{\mathrm{ét}}, \tau_{\mathrm{ét}})$ ) be the  $\infty$ -category of étale sheaves on  $Y$  with values in the unbounded (resp. connective) derived  $\infty$ -category of abelian groups. Let  $\pi: (Y_{\mathrm{ét}}, \tau_{\mathrm{ét}}) \rightarrow *$  be the canonical functor. We obtain the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}(\mathrm{Ab})}(Y_{\mathrm{ét}}, \tau_{\mathrm{ét}}) & \xleftarrow{\tau^{\leq 0}} & \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{Ab})}(Y_{\mathrm{ét}}, \tau_{\mathrm{ét}}) \\ \leq 0 \pi^* \uparrow & & \pi^* \uparrow \\ \mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}(\mathrm{Ab}) & \xleftarrow{\tau^{\leq 0}} & \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{Ab}). \end{array}$$

One easily verifies that:

$$\mathrm{Map}(Y, \mathrm{K}(\mathbb{G}_m, 2)) \simeq \leq 0 \pi_*(\mathbb{G}_m[2]).$$

At this point, the quasi-isomorphism (4.17) is simply induced by the Beck-Chevalley transformation associated to the above diagram. Having this identification at one's disposal, it is easy to provide a canonical identification

$$\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(\mathfrak{X}; \mathbb{G}_m) \simeq \mathrm{H}^2 \left( \lim_n \tau_{\leq 2} \mathrm{R}\Gamma_{\mathrm{ét}}(X_n; \mathbb{G}_m) \right).$$

The relationship between  $\mathrm{dBr}(\mathfrak{X})$  and  $\lim_n \mathrm{dBr}(X_n)$  is easy to understand in general:

**Proposition 4.18.** *There are short exact sequences*

$$0 \longrightarrow \lim_n^1 \mathrm{Pic}(X_n) \longrightarrow \mathrm{dBr}(\mathfrak{X}) \longrightarrow \lim_n \mathrm{dBr}(X_n) \longrightarrow 0$$

and

$$0 \longrightarrow \lim_n^1 \mathrm{Pic}(X_n) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(\mathfrak{X}; \mathbb{G}_m) \longrightarrow \lim_n \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(X_n; \mathbb{G}_m) \longrightarrow 0.$$

On the other hand, the natural map

$$H_{\acute{e}t}^1(\mathfrak{X}; \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow \lim_n H_{\acute{e}t}^1(X_n; \mathbb{Z})$$

is an isomorphism.

*Proof.* Applying Milnor's short exact sequence to the inverse limit

$$dAz(\mathfrak{X}) \simeq \lim_n dAz(X_n),$$

we obtain

$$0 \longrightarrow \lim_n^1 \pi_1(dAz(X_n)) \longrightarrow dBr(\mathfrak{X}) \longrightarrow \lim_n dBr(X_n) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Using Toën's theorem Theorem 4.7, we see that

$$\pi_1(dAz(X_n)) \simeq \text{Pic}(X_n) \times H_{\acute{e}t}^0(X_n; \mathbb{Z}).$$

Observe that

$$\lim_n^1 (\text{Pic}(X_n) \times H_{\acute{e}t}^0(X_n; \mathbb{Z})) \simeq \lim_n^1 \text{Pic}(X_n) \times \lim_n^1 H_{\acute{e}t}^0(X_n; \mathbb{Z}),$$

and since the transition maps  $H_{\acute{e}t}^0(X_{n+1}; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_{\acute{e}t}^0(X_n; \mathbb{Z})$  are isomorphisms, we deduce that

$$\lim_n^1 \pi_1(dAz(X_n)) \simeq \lim_n^1 \text{Pic}(X_n).$$

The conclusion follows. The other statements result from the same reasoning.  $\square$

Assume furthermore that  $R$  is noetherian and complete with respect to the ideal  $I$ . Using Theorem 3.1, we obtain the following injectivity result:

**Corollary 4.19.** (1) *The natural map*

$$dAz^{\text{cat}}(X) \longrightarrow dAz^{\text{cat}}(\mathfrak{X})$$

*is fully faithful.*

(2) (Formal injectivity) *The natural map*

$$dBr(X) \longrightarrow dBr(\mathfrak{X})$$

*is injective.*

(3) *If  $\lim_n^1 \text{Pic}(X_n) = 0$ , then the natural maps*

$$dBr(X) \longrightarrow \lim_n dBr(X_n) \quad \text{and} \quad H_{\acute{e}t}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m) \longrightarrow \lim_n H_{\acute{e}t}^2(X_n; \mathbb{G}_m)$$

*are injective.*

*Proof.* Recall from Theorem 3.1 that the natural map

$$\text{SmPr}^{\text{cat}}(X) \longrightarrow \lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{SmPr}^{\text{cat}}(X_n)$$

is fully faithful and symmetric monoidal. Passing to invertible objects and applying Toën's Theorem 4.5, we deduce that the comparison map of point (1) is fully faithful as well. Taking  $\pi_0$ , we immediately obtain statement (2). Finally, we observe that (3) follows directly from point (2) and Proposition 4.18 as the map in question factors naturally as

$$dBr(X) \longrightarrow dBr(\mathfrak{X}) \longrightarrow \lim_n dBr(X_n).$$

$\square$

**Remark 4.20.** A natural question to ask is whether the natural comparison map

$$\mathrm{dBr}(X) \longrightarrow \mathrm{dBr}(\mathfrak{X})$$

is surjective in addition to being injective. In general, this will not be true. First of all, remark that if the above map is an isomorphism, then separately

$$\mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^2(\mathfrak{X}; \mathbb{G}_m) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^1(X; \mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^1(\mathfrak{X}; \mathbb{Z})$$

would be isomorphisms. However, Proposition 4.18 shows that

$$\mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^1(\mathfrak{X}; \mathbb{Z}) \simeq \lim_n \mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^1(X_n; \mathbb{Z}),$$

and the topological invariance of the étale site implies that the limit is actually constant and isomorphic to  $\mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^1(X_1; \mathbb{Z})$ . Assume that  $X$  is regular, but that the special fiber  $X_1$  is not. Then  $\mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^1(X; \mathbb{Z}) = 0$  (cf. [8]), while generically  $\mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^1(X_0; \mathbb{Z})$  will not vanish. For example,  $X$  can be a regular scheme, flat and of relative dimension 1 over  $S$  such that the special fiber  $X_0$  is a nodal curve.

In the local case, the injectivity statement of Corollary 4.19-(3) holds true under less stringent restrictions on  $S$  than completeness:

**Corollary 4.21.** *Let  $S$  be the spectrum of a local noetherian henselian  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  such that the natural map*

$$R \longrightarrow \lim_n R/\mathfrak{m}^n$$

*has regular geometric fibers (This is in particular satisfied when  $R$  is quasi-excellent). Let  $p: X \rightarrow S$  be a proper derived scheme. If  $\lim_n^1 \mathrm{Pic}(X_n) = 0$ , then the natural maps*

$$\mathrm{dBr}(X) \longrightarrow \lim_n \mathrm{dBr}(X_n) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m) \longrightarrow \lim_n \mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^2(X_n; \mathbb{G}_m)$$

*are injective.*

*Proof.* Thanks to Proposition 4.18 (which holds without the completeness assumption on  $R$ ), it is enough to prove the statement concerning  $\mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m)$ . Consider the commutative triangle

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m) & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & \mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^2(\mathfrak{X}; \mathbb{G}_m) \\ & \searrow & \swarrow \\ & \lim_n \mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^2(X_n; \mathbb{G}_m) & \end{array}$$

We now observe that [4, Lemma 2.1.3] (applied to the functor sending an  $R$ -algebra  $A$  to  $\mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^2(X \times_S \mathrm{Spec}(A); \mathbb{G}_m)$ ) implies that the horizontal map is injective. Since  $\lim_n^1 \mathrm{Pic}(X_n) = 0$ , Corollary 4.19-(3) implies that the bottom horizontal arrow is injective. The conclusion therefore follows.  $\square$

**Remark 4.22.** The problem of the injectivity of the natural map

$$\mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m) \longrightarrow \lim_n \mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^2(X_n; \mathbb{G}_m)$$

has been considered as early as in [12, Lemma III.3.3]. There, Grothendieck assumes that

$$\lim_n^1 \mathrm{Pic}(X_n) = 0$$

and proves the injectivity under a number of extra restrictions:

- (1) first of all, he has to assume the base to be an henselian, quasi-excellent DVR. This relies on the use of smoothing theorems that at the time [12] was written were available only in dimension 1. It is ultimately Popescu's smoothing theorem that allows to remove the restriction on the dimension (see the proof of [4, Lemma 2.1.3]).

- (2) In second place,  $X$  is assumed to be regular. The regularity assumption is used in loc. cit. to guarantee that  $\mathrm{Br}_{\mathrm{Az}}(X) = \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m)$ . Having this identification, Grothendieck proceeds to prove the injectivity of the map

$$\mathrm{Br}_{\mathrm{Az}}(X) \longrightarrow \lim_n \mathrm{Br}_{\mathrm{Az}}(X_n) \hookrightarrow \lim_n \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m)$$

without further using the regularity assumption. The key to his argument is the possibility of representing every class in  $\mathrm{Br}_{\mathrm{Az}}(X)$  as the Morita equivalence class associated to a (classical) Azumaya algebra over  $X$ . Philosophically, we can bypass this issue thanks to the use of derived Azumaya algebras and the fact that every class in  $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m)$  can be represented by such an object. In practice, this is achieved via our Theorem 3.1. A different approach is also possible, interpreting a class in  $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m)$  as  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbes, and proving a GAGA theorem for twisted sheaves. This will be the content of Section 5.3.

- (3) Finally, Grothendieck also has to assume that the map  $p: X \rightarrow S$  is flat. This is used as a technical assumption in the middle of the proof. In our context, dropping the flatness assumption has the effect that the schemes  $X_n$  become *derived*. In our framework this is at best a minor inconvenience, but this language was of course not available at the time [12] was written. It is worth observing that the possibility of removing this flatness assumption had been contemplated in [12, Remark III.3.4-(a)].

**Remark 4.23.** Continuing point (2) of the previous remark, the use of derived Azumaya algebras (or, alternatively, of  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbes) allows to prove the injectivity result also for *non-torsion* classes (always under the assumption that  $\lim^1 \mathrm{Pic}(X_n) = 0$ ). As we already remarked, the proof of Grothendieck relied explicitly on the possibility of representing every class in  $\mathrm{Br}_{\mathrm{Az}}(X)$  via a classical Azumaya algebra over  $X$ . As a result, Grothendieck's approach can *at best* yield the injectivity result for torsion classes in  $\mathrm{Br}(X)$ .

**Corollary 4.24.** *Under the same assumptions of Corollary 4.21, if the relative dimension of  $p: X \rightarrow S$  is at most 1, then the natural maps*

$$\mathrm{dBr}(X) \longrightarrow \lim_n \mathrm{dBr}(X_n), \quad \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m) \longrightarrow \lim_n \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(X_n; \mathbb{G}_m)$$

are injective.

*Proof.* The obstruction to lift an element in  $\mathrm{Pic}(X_{n-1})$  to  $\mathrm{Pic}(X_n)$  lies in  $\mathrm{H}^2(X_{n-1}, q^*(\mathfrak{m}^n/\mathfrak{m}^{n-1}))$ , where  $q: X_n \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(R/\mathfrak{m})$  is the natural map. Since each  $X_n$  has dimension at most 1, this group vanishes and therefore the map

$$\mathrm{Pic}(X_n) \rightarrow \mathrm{Pic}(X_{n-1})$$

is surjective. This implies that  $\lim_n^1 \mathrm{Pic}(X_n) = 0$ , and therefore the conclusion follows from Corollary 4.21.  $\square$

**Remark 4.25.** In [12, Remark III.3.4-(a)] Grothendieck observes that it is unlikely that the map

$$\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m) \longrightarrow \lim_n \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(X_n; \mathbb{G}_m)$$

is injective in general. In loc. cit. he further proposes a method to obtain an explicit counterexample. The outline of his strategy is the following: starting with Mumford's normal surface  $X$ , we make it projective and we fiber it over a curve  $C$ . The curve necessarily contains a point  $t$  whose fiber  $X_t$  supports the non-torsion Brauer class. If the non-torsion class survived to the base change to the henselianization  $C_t^h$ , then indeed one would get a contradiction. Nevertheless, the previous corollary shows that base-changing to  $C_t^h$ , this non-torsion class must become torsion. This is not entirely surprising: if instead of base-changing we henselianized the local ring of  $X$  at the singular point along any direction over  $C$ , [4, Theorem 2.1.7-(b)] would already show that the non-torsion class would become torsion for dimensional reasons (as the cohomological Brauer group of a noetherian 1-dimensional ring is always torsion).

It is worth observing that our findings (and in particular the short exact sequences of Proposition 4.18 and the injectivity result Corollary 4.19-(2)) are well in line with the general philosophy promoted by Grothendieck. Indeed, as soon as the relative dimension is higher than 1, the obstruction to injectivity is exactly represented by  $\lim_n^1 \mathrm{Pic}(X_n)$ , which generically will not vanish.

**4.3. A remark on a conjecture of Grothendieck.** Assume once again that  $S = \text{Spec}(R)$  is a noetherian, complete local ring and that  $p: X \rightarrow S$  is a proper and flat morphism. As we already recalled in Remark 4.22, in [12, III, §3], Grothendieck considers the natural map

$$\text{Br}_{\text{Az}}(X) \rightarrow \lim_{n \geq 1} \text{Br}_{\text{Az}}(X_n) \quad (4.26)$$

and raises the problem of its injectivity. Besides proving it under a certain number of assumptions, he suggests in [12, Remark III.3.4] that injectivity might hold in general, and in particular without flatness and without the vanishing of  $\lim^1 \text{Pic}(X_n)$ .

Let us rephrase Grothendieck's question as follows. We continue with the notations of the previous paragraph. Let  $\ell$  be a prime number different from the residue characteristic of  $S$ , and let

$$\mathbb{H}_{\text{ét}}^2(\mathfrak{X}; \mu_\ell) := \pi_0(\text{Map}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathbb{K}(\mu_\ell, 2))).$$

Note that since  $\ell$  is coprime to the residue characteristic of  $S$ , the stack  $\mathbb{K}(\mu_\ell, 2)$  satisfies nil-invariance, so that the transition maps  $\mathbb{H}_{\text{ét}}^2(X_{n+1}; \mu_\ell) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_{\text{ét}}^2(X_n; \mu_\ell)$  are all isomorphism. In particular, we have that the canonical map

$$\mathbb{H}_{\text{ét}}^2(\mathfrak{X}; \mu_\ell) \rightarrow \lim_n \mathbb{H}_{\text{ét}}^2(X_n; \mu_\ell)$$

is an isomorphism.

We relate this group with the derived Brauer group in the following way:

**Lemma 4.27.** *There is a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \lim_n^1 \text{Pic}(X_n) & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{H}_{\text{ét}}^2(\mathfrak{X}; \mathbb{G}_m) & \longrightarrow & \lim_n \mathbb{H}_{\text{ét}}^2(X_n; \mathbb{G}_m) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ & & & & \mathbb{H}_{\text{ét}}^2(\mathfrak{X}; \mu_\ell) & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & \lim_n \mathbb{H}_{\text{ét}}^2(X_n; \mu_\ell) \\ & & & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ & & & & \text{Pic}(X)/\ell & \longrightarrow & \lim_n (\text{Pic}(X_n)/\ell) \\ & & & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ & & & & 0 & & 0. \end{array} \quad (4.28)$$

where the first row is exact, the middle horizontal map is an isomorphism and the columns are exact.

*Proof.* The first row is simply the Milnor sequence already considered in Proposition 4.18. The central column is obtained from the long exact sequence of homotopy groups associated to the Kummer sequence  $\mathbb{K}(\mu_\ell, 2) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}(\mathbb{G}_m, 2) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}(\mathbb{G}_m, 2)$  induced by the  $\ell$ -power map on  $\mathbb{G}_m$

$$\text{Pic}(\mathfrak{X}) \xrightarrow{\ell} \text{Pic}(\mathfrak{X}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{H}_{\text{ét}}^2(\mathfrak{X}; \mu_\ell) \longrightarrow \mathbb{H}_{\text{ét}}^2(\mathfrak{X}; \mathbb{G}_m),$$

noting that the group  $\text{Pic}(\mathfrak{X})$  is isomorphic to  $\text{Pic}(X)$  by GAGA. Finally, the right column is obtained by applying the inverse limit functor to the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Pic}(X_n)/\ell \longrightarrow \mathbb{H}_{\text{ét}}^2(X_n; \mu_\ell) \longrightarrow \mathbb{H}_{\text{ét}}^2(X_n; \mathbb{G}_m),$$

which holds for every  $n \geq 1$ . □

Applying the Snake Lemma to the first two (exact) rows of (4.28), we obtain in particular an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Pic}(X)/\ell \longrightarrow \lim_n (\text{Pic}(X_n)/\ell) \xrightarrow{\rho} \lim_n^1 \text{Pic}(X_n).$$

The following Lemma is a simple diagram chase.

**Lemma 4.29.** *The kernel of the composite morphism*

$$\mathrm{Br}(X)[\ell] \hookrightarrow \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(\mathfrak{X}; \mathbb{G}_m)[\ell] \longrightarrow \lim_n \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(X_n; \mathbb{G}_m)$$

is isomorphic to the cokernel of  $\rho$ .

Recall now that by the classical Skolem-Noether Theorem [25, Theorem 2.5], there is a canonical injective homomorphism  $\mathrm{Br}_{\mathrm{Az}}(X) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Br}(X) = \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m)$ , whose image is contained in the subgroup of torsion elements of  $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m)$ . In fact, if  $X$  is a scheme endowed with an ample invertible sheaf, a result of Gabber [7] affirms that the image consists precisely of the torsion elements, i.e. that every torsion class in  $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m)$  can be realized as a (classical) Azumaya algebra on  $X$ .

For such  $X$ , a positive answer to Grothendieck's question on the injectivity of (4.26) would imply in particular that for every  $\ell$  coprime to the residue characteristic of  $S$ , the map

$$\mathrm{Pic}(X)/\ell \rightarrow \lim_n (\mathrm{Pic}(X_n)/\ell)$$

is an isomorphism.

This is unlikely to be true for a general proper morphism  $p: X \rightarrow S$ . Notice that this is clearly the case if the transition maps  $\mathrm{Pic}(X_n) \rightarrow \mathrm{Pic}(X_{n-1})$  are surjective, for example when the relative Picard functor  $\mathbf{Pic}_{X/S}$  is representable by a smooth algebraic space over  $S$ . In this case, however, the whole term  $\lim_n^1 \mathrm{Pic}(X_n) = 0$  vanishes, and this already implies a stronger injectivity result as discussed in Corollary 4.19-(2).

## 5. FORMAL INJECTIVITY VIA $\mathbb{G}_m$ -GERBES

Assume again that  $S = \mathrm{Spec}(R)$  is a noetherian ring, complete along an ideal  $I$ . Let  $p: X \rightarrow S$  is a proper morphism. Write  $S_n := \mathrm{Spec}(R/I^n)$  and set  $X_n := S_n \times_S X$ . As in the previous section we let

$$\mathfrak{X} := \mathrm{colim}_n X_n$$

be the formal completion of  $X$  along the special fiber. In Corollary 4.19-(2) we proved that the natural map

$$\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(\mathfrak{X}; \mathbb{G}_m)$$

is injective. This was obtained by interpreting classes in  $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m)$  as derived Azumaya algebras and, ultimately, as smooth and proper  $\infty$ -categories linear over  $X$ . We now offer a different perspective on this result, by interpreting classes in  $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m)$  as  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbes. A  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe on the formal scheme  $\mathfrak{X}$  is exactly the given of a sequence  $(\mathfrak{A}_n, \phi_n)_{n \geq 1}$ , where each  $\mathfrak{A}_n$  is a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe on  $X_n$  and  $\phi_n$  is an equivalence

$$\phi_n: \mathfrak{A}_n \simeq X_n \times_{X_{n+1}} \mathfrak{A}_{n+1}.$$

The formal injectivity therefore can be phrased as follows: if  $\mathfrak{A}$  is a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe on  $X$  and we are given trivializations  $\sigma_n$

$$\sigma_n: \mathfrak{A}_n \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times X_n$$

as  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbes over  $X_n$ , together with homotopies  $h_n$  making the diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{A}_n & \xrightarrow{\phi_n} & \mathfrak{A}_{n+1} \\ \downarrow \sigma_n & & \downarrow \sigma_{n+1} \\ \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times X_n & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m} \times i_n} & \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times X_{n+1}, \end{array} \quad (5.1)$$

then there exists a global trivialization  $\sigma: \mathfrak{A} \simeq \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times X$  as  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbes over  $X$ . The main step consists in showing that the natural map of groupoids

$$\mathrm{Pic}(\mathfrak{A}) \longrightarrow \lim_n \mathrm{Pic}(\mathfrak{A}_n)$$

is surjective, and this will be achieved via a GAGA theorem for  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbes. It is worth making the following complementary observations:

- Remark 5.2.** (1) A  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe  $\mathfrak{A}$  on  $X$  is a (very special) Artin stack on  $X$ . Nevertheless, the structural morphism  $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow X$  is not proper, and therefore the formal GAGA theorem for proper Artin stack (see for instance [27, 6]) does not apply. This result is therefore new, and it has an independent interest.
- (2) It is possible to formulate a precise dictionary relating  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbes and derived Azumaya algebras (see Section 5.4). Using this correspondence, the formal GAGA theorem for  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbes can be seen as a direct consequence of our main theorem Theorem 3.1 for sheaves of smooth and proper  $\infty$ -categories linear over  $X$ . This implies, in particular, that the approach via derived Morita theory is intrinsically richer than the approach via  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbes. Nevertheless, the proof we give below of the formal GAGA theorem for  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbes will rather rely on the results of [3] (and for this reason we will have to assume that the map  $p: X \rightarrow S$  is flat).

For lack of convenient references in the literature, we collect a couple of elementary results and constructions on the  $\infty$ -categories of graded quasi-coherent sheaves and on the canonical action of the inertia stack.

**5.1. Graded quasi-coherent sheaves on derived stacks.** We start with the following natural definition:

**Definition 5.3.** Let  $F \in \text{dSt}$  be a derived stack. The  $\infty$ -category of graded quasi-coherent sheaves on  $F$  is

$$\text{Fun}(\mathbb{Z}, \text{QCoh}(F)),$$

where  $\mathbb{Z}$  is regarded as a discrete category.

There is another reasonable definition of the same  $\infty$ -category: one could simply consider  $\text{QCoh}(F \times \text{BG}_m)$ . The goal of this section is to prove that these two  $\infty$ -categories always canonically agree. We start by constructing the comparison functor between the two.

**Lemma 5.4.** *There is a canonical equivalence  $\text{Fun}(\mathbb{Z}, \text{QCoh}(F)) \simeq \text{QCoh}(\text{BG}_m) \otimes \text{QCoh}(F)$ .*

*Proof.* Considering  $\mathbb{Z}$  as a discrete category, the Yoneda lemma induces a canonical equivalence

$$\text{Fun}(\mathbb{Z}, \text{QCoh}(F)) \simeq \text{Fun}(\mathbb{Z}^{\text{op}}, \text{QCoh}(F)) \simeq \text{Fun}^{\text{R}}(\text{PSh}(\mathbb{Z})^{\text{op}}, \text{QCoh}(F)) \simeq \text{PSh}(\mathbb{Z}) \otimes \text{QCoh}(F),$$

where the last equivalence is [22, Proposition 4.8.1.17] and the tensor product is computed in  $\mathcal{P}\text{r}^{\text{L}}$ . Since  $\text{QCoh}(F)$  is  $\mathcal{D}(\text{Ab})$ -linear, we can further rewrite it as

$$\text{PSh}(\mathbb{Z}) \otimes \text{QCoh}(F) \simeq \text{PSh}(\mathbb{Z}) \otimes (\mathcal{D}(\text{Ab}) \otimes_{\mathcal{D}(\text{Ab})} \text{QCoh}(F)) \simeq \text{PSh}_{\mathcal{D}(\text{Ab})}(\mathbb{Z}) \otimes \text{QCoh}(F).$$

Now,

$$\text{PSh}_{\mathcal{D}(\text{Ab})}(\mathbb{Z}) \simeq \prod_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{D}(\text{Ab}) \simeq \text{QCoh}(\text{BG}_m),$$

where the last equivalence is proven, for instance, in [26, Theorem 4.1].  $\square$

**Proposition 5.5.** *Let  $F$  and  $G$  be two derived stacks. Assume that  $\text{QCoh}(G)$  is compactly generated. Then the canonical box product*

$$\boxtimes: \text{QCoh}(F) \otimes \text{QCoh}(G) \longrightarrow \text{QCoh}(F \times G)$$

*is an equivalence.*

*Proof.* Observe that the box product is (contravariantly) functorial in both  $F$  and  $G$ . Because  $\text{QCoh}(G)$  is compactly generated, the functor  $- \otimes \text{QCoh}(G)$  commutes with arbitrary limits in  $\mathcal{P}\text{r}^{\text{L}}$ . We can therefore reduce ourselves to the case where  $F$  is affine. Say  $F = \text{Spec}(A)$ . Using [22, Proposition 4.8.1.17], we see that

$$\text{QCoh}(F) \otimes \text{QCoh}(G) \simeq \text{Fun}^{\text{R}}(\text{Mod}_A^{\text{op}}, \text{QCoh}(G)) \simeq \text{Mod}_A(\text{QCoh}(G)).$$

This once again takes colimits in the variable  $G$  to limits in  $\mathcal{P}\text{r}^{\text{L}}$ . We can therefore reduce to the case where  $G$  itself is an affine derived scheme. In this case, the statement is well known.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.6.** *Let  $G$  be a linearly reductive group. Then for any derived stack  $F$ , the box product induces a canonical equivalence*

$$\boxtimes: \mathrm{QCoh}(F) \otimes \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathrm{BG}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{QCoh}(F \times \mathrm{BG}).$$

*Proof.* Using [14, Example 8.6], we see that  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathrm{BG})$  is compactly generated. Thus, the conclusion follows from Proposition 5.5.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.7.** *Let  $F$  be a derived stack. Then the box product induces a canonical equivalence*

$$\mathrm{Fun}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathrm{QCoh}(F)) \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(F \times \mathrm{BG}_m).$$

*Proof.* Combine Lemma 5.4 and Corollary 5.6.  $\square$

**5.2. Inertial actions and bandings.** Let  $f: Y \rightarrow X$  be a morphism of derived stacks. We let  $\mathbf{I}_Y^\bullet X := \check{C}(f)$  be the Čech nerve of  $f$ . Notice that [18, Proposition 6.1.2.11] shows that this is a groupoid object in the sense of [18, Definition 6.1.2.7]. We refer to it as the *self-intersection groupoid of  $Y$  inside  $X$* . We let

$$\mathrm{B}_Y X := |\mathbf{I}_Y^\bullet X|$$

be the geometric realization of the self-intersection groupoid. It coincides with its classifying groupoid. By construction, there is a canonical map  $\tau: \mathrm{B}_Y X \rightarrow X$ . Notice that this map is sensitive to the infinitesimal geometry of  $Y$  inside  $X$ , and in particular does *not* factor as a projection to  $Y$  followed by the map to  $X$ . On the other hand, when  $f$  is an epimorphism,  $\tau$  is simply an equivalence.

Let  $Y \rightarrow X$  again be a morphism of derived stacks and consider the canonical diagonal map  $\delta_{Y/X}: Y \rightarrow Y \times_X Y$ . We refer to the self-intersection groupoid of  $\delta_{Y/X}$  as the inertia groupoid of  $Y$  relative to  $X$ . We denote it by  $\mathbf{I}^\bullet(Y/X)$  and when  $X$  is clear out of the context we simply write  $\mathbf{I}^\bullet Y$ . This is an object in  $\mathrm{Fun}(\Delta^{\mathrm{op}}, \mathrm{dSt}_{/Y \times_X Y})$ . Notice that we have

$$\mathbf{I}^0(Y/X) \simeq Y, \quad \mathbf{I}^1(Y/X) \simeq Y \times_{Y \times_X Y} Y.$$

In particular, this simplicial object has the usual inertia stack  $\mathrm{I}(Y/X)$  of  $Y$  relative to  $X$  as stack of morphisms, and  $Y$  as stack of objects. Let  $p_1, p_2: Y \times_X Y \rightarrow Y$  be the two projections. Composing with  $p_1$  yields a groupoid object in  $\mathrm{Fun}(\Delta^{\mathrm{op}}, \mathrm{dSt}_{/Y})$ , which is easily seen to be a group object. We can therefore think of  $\mathbf{I}^\bullet(Y/X)$  as a group structure on  $\mathrm{I}(Y/X)$ . Beware however that the choice of the projection is important, as using  $p_2$  instead of  $p_1$  yields the opposite group structure. Notice further that the forgetful functor  $\mathrm{dSt}_{/Y \times_X Y} \rightarrow \mathrm{dSt}_{/Y}$  commutes with colimits. In particular, computing the geometric realization in  $\mathrm{dSt}_{/Y \times_X Y}$  or in  $\mathrm{dSt}_{/Y}$  produces the same output, but with the difference that doing it in the second category allows us to identify  $\mathrm{B}_Y(Y \times_X Y)$  with the classifying stack of the group object  $\mathrm{I}(Y/X)$ . For this reason, we simply denote this object by  $\mathrm{B}_Y(\mathrm{I}(Y/X))$ . Finally, we define the map  $\mathrm{act}: \mathrm{B}_Y(\mathrm{I}(Y/X)) \rightarrow X$  as the composition

$$\mathrm{act}: \mathrm{B}_Y(\mathrm{I}(Y/X)) \simeq \mathrm{B}_Y(Y \times_X Y) \xrightarrow{\tau} Y \times_X Y \xrightarrow{p_2} Y.$$

This map is not the projection, but the composite

$$Y \longrightarrow \mathrm{B}_Y(\mathrm{I}(Y/X)) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{act}} Y$$

is canonically equivalent to the identity. This implies that pulling back along  $\mathrm{act}$  we can endow objects (e.g. quasi-coherent sheaves) over  $Y$  with a canonical right action of the inertia stack  $\mathrm{I}(Y/X)$ .

We now turn to the notion of banding. We start with the following easy construction:

**Construction 5.8.** Let  $q: Y \rightarrow X$  be a morphism of derived stacks. The functor

$$q^*: \mathrm{dSt}_{/X} \longrightarrow \mathrm{dSt}_{/Y}$$

given by pullback along  $q$  admits a *right* adjoint  $q_*: \mathrm{dSt}/_Y \rightarrow \mathrm{dSt}/_X$ . Since  $q^*$  is monoidal (with respect to the cartesian structures),  $q_*$  is lax-monoidal. In particular, it gives rise to an adjunction

$$q^*: \mathrm{Mon}_{\mathbb{E}_1}^{\mathrm{gp}}(\mathrm{dSt}/_X) \rightleftarrows \mathrm{Mon}_{\mathbb{E}_1}^{\mathrm{gp}}(\mathrm{dSt}/_Y): q_*.$$

**Definition 5.9.** Let  $q: Y \rightarrow X$  be a morphism of derived stacks and let  $G$  be a derived group stacks over  $X$ . A *weak  $G$ -banding on  $Y$*  is a morphism

$$\alpha: G \longrightarrow q_*(\mathrm{I}(Y/X))$$

in  $\mathrm{Mon}_{\mathbb{E}_1}^{\mathrm{gp}}(\mathrm{dSt}/_X)$ , where  $\mathrm{I}(Y/X)$  is considered as a group via the structure introduced in Section 5.2. A weak  $G$ -banding  $\alpha$  is said to be a  *$G$ -banding* if  $\alpha$  is an equivalence.

Let  $q: Y \rightarrow X$  be a morphism of derived stacks and let  $\alpha$  be a weak  $G$ -banding on  $Y$ . By adjunction, it corresponds to a morphism of group stacks over  $Y$

$$q^*G \longrightarrow \mathrm{I}(Y/X).$$

Applying the deloop functor, we obtain a canonical map

$$\varpi_\alpha: q^*(\mathrm{B}_X(G)) \simeq \mathrm{B}_Y(q^*G) \longrightarrow \mathrm{B}_Y(\mathrm{I}(Y/X)).$$

Composing with  $\mathrm{act}: \mathrm{B}_Y(\mathrm{I}(Y/X)) \rightarrow Y$  we obtain a map

$$\mathrm{act}_\alpha := \mathrm{act} \circ \varpi_\alpha: q^*(\mathrm{B}_X(G)) \longrightarrow Y.$$

Observe that the composition of  $\mathrm{act}_\alpha$  with the atlas  $u: Y \rightarrow q^*(\mathrm{B}_X(G))$  is canonically equivalent to the identity of  $Y$ . In particular, we have:

**Lemma 5.10.** *Assume that  $G$  is flat group stack over  $X$ . Then the functor*

$$\mathrm{act}_\alpha^*: \mathrm{QCoh}(Y) \longrightarrow \mathrm{QCoh}(q^*(\mathrm{B}_X(G)))$$

*is flat.*

*Proof.* Since  $G$  is flat over  $X$ , the induced map  $Y \rightarrow q^*(\mathrm{B}_X(G))$  is flat as well. Therefore the conclusion simply follows from the fact that  $\mathrm{act}_\alpha \circ u$  is the identity of  $Y$ .  $\square$

**5.3. GAGA theorem for twisted sheaves.** We start with a brief review of the notion of  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbes and twisted sheaves (see [13, 17, 3] for more thorough introductions to this language).

**Definition 5.11.** Let  $X$  be a derived stack. A  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe on  $X$  is a pair  $(\mathfrak{A}, \alpha)$ , where:

- (1)  $\pi: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow X$  is a derived stack over  $X$  such that both the structural map  $\pi$  and the diagonal  $\delta_\pi: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A} \times_X \mathfrak{A}$  are epimorphism;
- (2) a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -banding (see Definition 5.9)

$$\alpha: X \times \mathbb{G}_m \longrightarrow \pi_*\mathrm{I}(\mathfrak{A}/X).$$

Using the general machinery of Section 5.2, we can perform the following construction:

**Construction 5.12.** Fix a derived stack  $X$  and let  $(\mathfrak{A}, \alpha)$  be a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe on  $X$ . Let

$$q: \mathfrak{A} \times \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m \longrightarrow \mathfrak{A}$$

be the canonical projection. We further let  $u: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A} \times \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m$  be the atlas map. If  $\chi: \mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_m$  is a character, we denote by  $\mathcal{L}_\chi \in \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A} \times \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m)$  the pullback along the *canonical projection*  $\mathfrak{A} \times \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m$  of the line bundle associated to  $\chi$ . If  $\mathfrak{G} \in \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A} \times \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m)$  is a quasi-coherent sheaf and  $\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}_m}$  is a character, we define

$$\mathfrak{G}_\chi := q^*q_*(\mathcal{L}_\chi^\vee \otimes \mathfrak{G}) \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi.$$

The counit of the adjunction  $q^* \dashv q_*$  and the evaluation map  $\mathcal{L}_\chi^\vee \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{A} \times \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m}$  induce a canonical map

$$j_{\chi, \mathfrak{G}}: \mathfrak{G}_\chi \longrightarrow \mathfrak{G}.$$

Recall from the previous section the map

$$\text{act}_\alpha : \mathfrak{A} \times \text{B}\mathbb{G}_m \longrightarrow \mathfrak{A}.$$

For every  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A})$  and every character  $\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m$  we define

$$\mathcal{F}_\chi := u^*(\text{act}_\alpha^*(\mathcal{F})_\chi).$$

We further write

$$i_{\chi, \mathcal{F}} := u^*(j_{\chi, \text{act}_\alpha^*(\mathcal{F})}): \mathcal{F}_\chi \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \quad (5.13)$$

for the induced map.

**Definition 5.14.** Let  $X$  be a derived stack and let  $(\mathfrak{A}, \alpha)$  be a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe over  $X$ . Let  $\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m$  be a character. We say that a quasi-coherent sheaf  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A})$  is  $\chi$ -homogeneous if the canonical map  $i_{\chi, \mathcal{F}}$  of equation (5.13) is an equivalence. We let  $\text{QCoh}_\chi(\mathfrak{A})$  be the full subcategory of  $\text{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A})$  spanned by  $\chi$ -homogeneous sheaves.

**Lemma 5.15.** Let  $X$  be a derived stack and let  $(\mathfrak{A}, \alpha)$  be a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe over  $X$ . Let  $\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m$  be a character. For every  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A})$ , the canonical map

$$i_{\chi, \mathcal{F}_\chi} : (\mathcal{F}_\chi)_\chi \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_\chi$$

is an equivalence.

*Proof.* The question is local on  $\mathfrak{A}$ , and therefore on  $X$  as well. Using [31, Tag 06QH], we can reduce ourselves to the case where  $\mathfrak{A}$  is the trivial gerbe, i.e.  $\mathfrak{A} \simeq \text{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times X$ . Using Corollary 5.6, we have

$$\text{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A}) \simeq \text{QCoh}(\text{B}\mathbb{G}_m) \otimes \text{QCoh}(X).$$

Since the functor

$$(-)_\chi := u^*(q^*q_*(\mathcal{L}_\chi^\vee \otimes \text{act}_\alpha^*(-)) \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi)$$

is  $\text{QCoh}(X)$ -linear, it is enough to treat the case  $X = \text{Spec}(k)$ . In other words, we can assume  $X = \text{Spec}(k)$  and  $\mathfrak{A} = \text{B}\mathbb{G}_m$ . In this case,

$$\text{I}(\text{B}\mathbb{G}_m) \simeq [\mathbb{G}_m/\mathbb{G}_m] \simeq \text{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times \mathbb{G}_m.$$

Then

$$\pi_*\text{I}([\mathbb{G}_m/\mathbb{G}_m]) \simeq \text{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times \mathbb{Z}(\mathbb{G}_m) \simeq \text{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times \mathbb{G}_m,$$

and the banding is just the identity of  $\mathbb{G}_m$ . May's delooping equivalence  $\text{Mon}_{\mathbb{P}^1}^{\text{gp}}(\text{dSt}/\text{B}\mathbb{G}_m) \simeq \text{dSt}_{/\text{B}\mathbb{G}_m}^{\geq 1}$  shows that the map of  $\text{B}\mathbb{G}_m$ -groups<sup>2</sup>

$$\text{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times \mathbb{G}_m \longrightarrow [\mathbb{G}_m, \mathbb{G}_m]$$

classifies the map

$$\text{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times \text{B}\mathbb{G}_m \simeq \text{B}_{\text{B}\mathbb{G}_m}(\pi^*\mathbb{G}_m) \xrightarrow{\varpi_\alpha} \text{B}_{\text{B}\mathbb{G}_m}([\mathbb{G}_m/\mathbb{G}_m]) \simeq \text{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times \text{B}\mathbb{G}_m$$

whose first component is the first projection and the second one is the multiplication  $\text{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times \text{B}\mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow \text{B}\mathbb{G}_m$ . On the other hand, since the diagonal  $\text{B}\mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow \text{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times \text{B}\mathbb{G}_m$  is an effective epimorphism,  $\text{act}$  can be canonically identified with the projection  $p$  on the second component. In conclusion,

$$\text{act}_\alpha : \text{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times \text{B}\mathbb{G}_m \longrightarrow \text{B}\mathbb{G}_m$$

classifies the line bundle  $\mathcal{L}^{\text{univ}} \boxtimes \mathcal{L}^{\text{univ}}$ , where  $\mathcal{L}^{\text{univ}}$  is the universal line bundle  $\text{B}\mathbb{G}_m$ . We know that  $\text{QCoh}(\text{B}\mathbb{G}_m) \simeq \text{Fun}(\mathbb{Z}, \text{Mod}_k)$ . Using Corollary 5.6, we find a canonical equivalence

$$\text{QCoh}(\text{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times \text{B}\mathbb{G}_m) \simeq \text{Fun}(\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}, \text{Mod}_k).$$

Under these identifications,  $\text{act}_\alpha^*$  can be represented as left Kan extension along the diagonal  $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ . In other words, it sends  $\mathcal{F} \in \text{QCoh}(\text{B}\mathbb{G}_m)$  to  $\mathcal{F} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}$ . At this point, we can compute:

$$\mathcal{F}_\chi \simeq u^*(q^*q_*(\mathcal{L}_\chi^\vee \otimes \text{act}_\alpha^*(\mathcal{F})) \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi) \simeq q_*(\mathcal{L}_\chi^\vee \otimes \mathcal{F} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}).$$

<sup>2</sup>Representing an object in  $[\mathbb{G}_m, \mathbb{G}_m]$  as a 4-tuple  $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}, \alpha, \beta)$ , where  $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}$  are line bundles, and  $\alpha, \beta : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$  are equivalences, this map sends  $(\mathcal{L}, \alpha)$  to  $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}, \alpha, \alpha^{-1})$ .

Given a character  $\rho \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m$ , write  $V_\rho \in \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m)$  for the corresponding representation of  $\mathbb{G}_m$ . Let

$$q, p: \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m \longrightarrow \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m$$

be the projections on the first and the second component, respectively. Then by definition  $\mathcal{L}_\rho := p^*V_\rho$ . Since  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m) \simeq \mathrm{Fun}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathrm{Mod}_k)$  is generated under colimits by the line bundles  $\{V_\rho\}_{\rho \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m}$ , it is enough to prove the lemma in the case where  $\mathcal{F} = V_\rho$ . Now, observe that the projection formula and Schur's lemma yield:

$$q_*(\mathcal{L}_\chi^\vee \otimes V_\rho \boxtimes V_\rho) \simeq q_*(p^*V_\chi^\vee \otimes q^*V_\rho \otimes p^*V_\rho) \simeq q_*p^*(V_\chi^\vee \otimes V_\rho) \otimes V_\rho \simeq \begin{cases} V_\rho & \text{if } \rho = \chi \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This immediately implies the result.  $\square$

The above lemma shows that there is an abundance of  $\chi$ -homogeneous sheaves. In particular, it shows that the functor

$$(-)_\chi := u^*(q^*q_*(\mathcal{L}_\chi^\vee \otimes \mathrm{act}_\alpha^*(-)) \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi): \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A})$$

factors canonically through  $\mathrm{QCoh}_\chi(\mathfrak{A})$ . Committing a slight abuse of notation, we denote again by

$$(-)_\chi: \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{QCoh}_\chi(\mathfrak{A}) \quad (5.16)$$

for the induced functor. We refer to it as the  $\chi$ -homogeneous component functor.

**Lemma 5.17.** *Let  $X$  be a derived stack and let  $(\mathfrak{A}, \alpha)$  be a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe over  $X$ . Let  $\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m$  be a character. Then a quasi-coherent sheaf  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A})$  is  $\chi$ -homogeneous if and only if  $\pi_i(\mathcal{F})$  is  $\chi$ -homogeneous for every  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ . In particular, if  $X$  is an underived scheme, then the underlying triangulated category of  $\mathrm{QCoh}_\chi(\mathfrak{A})$  coincides with the triangulated category introduced in [3].*

*Proof.* Since the  $t$ -structure on  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A})$  is both left and right complete, we see that  $i_{\chi, \mathcal{F}}$  is an equivalence if and only if  $\pi_i(i_{\chi, \mathcal{F}})$  is an equivalence for every  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ . It is therefore enough to identify  $\pi_i(i_{\chi, \mathcal{F}})$  with  $i_{\chi, \pi_i(\mathcal{F})}$ . Since  $u$  is flat, it is  $t$ -exact. This reduces us to prove that the functor

$$q^*q_*(\mathcal{L}_\chi^\vee \otimes \mathrm{act}_\alpha^*(-)) \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi: \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A} \times \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m)$$

is  $t$ -exact as well. Since  $\mathcal{L}_\chi$  and  $\mathcal{L}_\chi^\vee$  are flat, it is enough to argue that  $\mathrm{act}_\alpha^*$ ,  $q^*$  and  $q_*$  are  $t$ -exact. For  $\mathrm{act}_\alpha^*$ , this is guaranteed by Lemma 5.10. Since  $q$  is flat,  $q^*$  is  $t$ -exact. Finally, since  $\mathbb{G}_m$  is reductive,  $q_*$  is  $t$ -exact as well. The comparison with [3] just follows from Lemma 5.2 in loc. cit.  $\square$

We finally recall the notion of twisted sheaf:

**Definition 5.18.** Let  $X$  be a derived stack and let  $\alpha \in \mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m)$ . Let  $(\mathfrak{A}, \alpha)$  be the associated  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe on  $X$ . Then the  $\infty$ -category of  $\alpha$ -twisted quasi-coherent sheaves on  $X$  is

$$\mathrm{QCoh}_\alpha(X) := \mathrm{QCoh}_{\mathrm{id}}(\mathfrak{A}).$$

The following result has been obtained by M. Lieblich at the level of abelian categories, and it has recently been extended to the derived categories by D. Bergh and O. Schnürer:

**Theorem 5.19** (Lieblich, Bergh-Schnürer). *Let  $X$  be an underived scheme and let  $\mathfrak{A}$  be a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe on  $X$ . Then:*

- (1) *Let  $\alpha \in \mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m)$  and let  $(\mathfrak{A}, \alpha)$  be the associated  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe on  $X$ . Then pullback along the structural map  $\pi_\alpha: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow X$  induces an equivalence*

$$\pi_\alpha^*: \mathrm{QCoh}(X) \longrightarrow \mathrm{QCoh}_\alpha(X).$$

- (2) *Let  $\alpha \in \mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m)$  and let  $d \in \mathbb{Z} \simeq \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m$  be an integer. Denote by  $(\mathfrak{A}, \alpha)$  the  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe on  $X$  classified by  $\alpha$  and by  $(\mathfrak{A}^{(d)}, \alpha^{(d)})$  the  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe on  $X$  classified by  $\alpha^{(d)}$ . Then there is an equivalence*

$$\mathrm{QCoh}_{\alpha^{(d)}}(X) \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}_{\mathrm{id}}(\mathfrak{A}^{(d)}) \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}_d(\mathfrak{A}).$$

(3) The  $\chi$ -homogeneous component functors  $(-)_\chi$  introduced in (5.16) induce an equivalence

$$D: \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A}) \longrightarrow \prod_{\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m} \mathrm{QCoh}_\chi(\mathfrak{A}).$$

*Proof.* When  $X$  is underived, statements (1) and (2) follows from [3, Proposition 5.7], and statement (3) follows from Theorem 5.4 in loc. cit. We sketch the proof in the general case. First of all, since  $(-)_\chi: \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A}) \rightarrow \mathrm{QCoh}_\chi(\mathfrak{A})$  is  $\mathrm{QCoh}(X)$ -linear, we see that

$$\pi_\alpha^*(\mathcal{F})_\chi \simeq \pi_\alpha^*(\mathcal{F}) \otimes (\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{id}})_\chi,$$

and the computation made at the end of Lemma 5.15 shows that this coincides with  $\pi_\alpha^*(\mathcal{F})$  when  $\chi = \mathrm{id}$ , and it's zero otherwise. To complete the proof of (1), it is enough to prove that  $\pi_\alpha^*$  is fully faithful. In other words, we have to check that the unit transformation  $\mathrm{Id}_{\mathrm{QCoh}(X)} \rightarrow \pi_{\alpha^*} \pi_\alpha^*$  is an equivalence. Since  $\pi_{\alpha^*}$  satisfies base-change against open immersions  $U \rightarrow X$ , this can be checked locally. We can therefore assume without loss of generality that  $\mathfrak{A}$  is the trivial gerbe, and in that case the conclusion is immediate.

Let

$$\nu_d: \mathfrak{A} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{A}^{(d)}$$

be the natural map (see [3, Construction 3.8]). Consider the pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{A} \times_X \mathfrak{A}^{(d)} & \xrightarrow{p} & \mathfrak{A} \\ \downarrow q & & \downarrow \\ \mathfrak{A}^{(d)} & \longrightarrow & X. \end{array}$$

The map  $\nu_d$  provides a section for  $p$  and therefore a trivialization of the  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe  $\mathfrak{A} \times_X \mathfrak{A}^{(d)}$  on  $\mathfrak{A}$ . This produces a line bundle  $\mathcal{L}$  on  $\mathfrak{A} \times_X \mathfrak{A}^{(d)}$  and the reader can check that

$$q_*(p^*(-) \otimes \mathcal{L}): \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A}^{(d)})$$

realizes the claimed equivalence. See also the proof of [3, Proposition 4.10].

We now prove (3). Fix a character  $\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m$  and let

$$\iota_\chi: \mathrm{QCoh}_\chi(\mathfrak{A}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A}).$$

We claim that  $\iota_\chi \dashv (-)_\chi$ . Consider once again the projection

$$q: \mathfrak{A} \times \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m \longrightarrow \mathfrak{A}.$$

Using Corollary 5.6, we obtain a canonical equivalence  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A} \times \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m) \simeq \mathrm{Fun}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A}))$ . Under this identification,  $q^*$  corresponds to left Kan extension along the inclusion  $\{0\} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ . In particular, this shows that one has the adjunctions  $q_* \dashv q^* \dashv q_*$ . Recall from Construction 5.12 that for any quasicohherent sheaf  $\mathcal{G} \in \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A} \times \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m)$  we set

$$\mathcal{G}_\chi := q^* q_*(\mathcal{L}_\chi^\vee \otimes \mathcal{G}) \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi.$$

The *coevaluation* map  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{A} \times \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_\chi^\vee \otimes \mathcal{L}_\chi$  and the *unit* of the adjunction  $q_* \dashv q^*$  induce a canonical map

$$\eta_{\chi, \mathcal{G}}: \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}_\chi.$$

Specializing this construction when  $\mathcal{G} := \mathrm{act}_\alpha^*(\mathcal{F})$  and pulling back along the atlas  $u$  we obtain a natural transformation

$$e_\chi: \mathrm{Id}_{\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A})} \longrightarrow \iota_\chi \circ (-)_\chi,$$

which is easily checked (via Schur's lemma) to be a unit transformation testifying the adjunction  $\iota_\chi \dashv (-)_\chi$ . This implies that each component of

$$D: \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A}) \longrightarrow \prod_{\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m} \mathrm{QCoh}_\chi(\mathfrak{A})$$

commutes with both limits and colimits. Combining Lemma 5.15 with [18, Proposition 5.5.4.2] we see that each  $\mathrm{QCoh}_\chi(\mathfrak{A})$  is itself a presentable  $\infty$ -category. Therefore,  $D$  admits both a right adjoint  $R$  and a left adjoint  $L$ , that can informally be described as sending  $\{\mathcal{G}_\chi\}_{\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m}$  to

$$R\left(\{\mathcal{G}_\chi\}_{\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m}\right) \simeq \prod_{\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m} \mathcal{G}_\chi, \quad L\left(\{\mathcal{G}_\chi\}_{\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m}\right) \simeq \bigoplus_{\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m} \mathcal{G}_\chi,$$

see for instance [29, §8.2]. Since the formation of both  $L$  and  $\mathfrak{D}$  is compatible with pullback along morphisms  $Y \rightarrow X$ , we see that in order to check that the unit and the counit of  $L \dashv D$  are equivalences it is enough to work locally on  $X$ . In other words, we can assume that  $\mathfrak{A}$  is the trivial gerbe, in which case the conclusion follows from Corollary 5.6.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.20.** *Let  $S$  be as at the beginning of Section 5 and let  $p: X \rightarrow S$  be a proper and flat map. Let  $\pi: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow X$  be a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe. The canonical maps*

$$\mathrm{APerf}(\mathfrak{A}) \longrightarrow \lim_n \mathrm{APerf}(\mathfrak{A}_n), \quad \mathrm{Perf}(\mathfrak{A}) \longrightarrow \lim_n \mathrm{Perf}(\mathfrak{A}_n)$$

are symmetric monoidal equivalences of stable symmetric monoidal  $\infty$ -categories.

*Proof.* Consider the natural map

$$\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A}) \longrightarrow \lim_n \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A}_n).$$

Using the decomposition provided by Theorem 5.19, we can rewrite it as

$$\prod_{\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m} \mathrm{QCoh}_\chi(\mathfrak{A}) \longrightarrow \lim_n \prod_{\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m} \mathrm{QCoh}_\chi(\mathfrak{A}_n).$$

For every character  $\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m$ , set:

$$\mathrm{APerf}_\chi(\mathfrak{A}) := \mathrm{APerf}(\mathfrak{A}) \cap \mathrm{QCoh}_\chi(\mathfrak{A}), \quad \mathrm{Perf}_\chi(\mathfrak{A}) := \mathrm{Perf}(\mathfrak{A}) \cap \mathrm{QCoh}_\chi(\mathfrak{A}).$$

Consider the diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{APerf}(\mathfrak{A}) & \longrightarrow & \lim_n \mathrm{APerf}(\mathfrak{A}_n) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \prod_{\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m} \mathrm{APerf}_\chi(\mathfrak{A}) & \longrightarrow & \lim_n \prod_{\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m} \mathrm{APerf}_\chi(\mathfrak{A}_n). \end{array}$$

The vertical arrows are fully faithful and [23, Proposition 8.4.2.10] shows that the horizontal arrows are  $t$ -exact. Theorem 5.19-(2) implies that  $\mathrm{APerf}_\chi(\mathfrak{A})$  is equivalent to  $\mathrm{APerf}_\chi(X)$ . Therefore, the usual formal GAGA for  $X$  (see [23, Theorem 8.5.0.3]) shows that the bottom horizontal arrow is an equivalence. We immediately deduce that the top horizontal arrow is fully faithful. For the essential surjectivity, let  $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 1} \in \lim_n \mathrm{APerf}(X_n)$  be an object in the inverse limit. For every character  $\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m$ , let  $\mathcal{F}_\chi \in \mathrm{APerf}_\chi(X)$  be the object corresponding to the sequence  $((\mathcal{F}_n)_\chi)_{n \geq 1} \in \lim_{n \geq 1} \mathrm{APerf}_\chi(X_n)$ . Via the ( $t$ -exact) equivalence provided by Theorem 5.19, this corresponds to an object  $\mathcal{F}$  in  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A})$ . Since the involved equivalence is  $t$ -exact, we see that

$$\pi_n(\mathcal{F}) \simeq \prod_{\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m} \pi_n(\mathcal{F}_\chi) \simeq \prod_{\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m} (\pi_n(\mathcal{F}))_\chi.$$

Let  $N \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $\pi_m(\mathcal{F}_1) = 0$  for every  $m < N$ . Then cohomological Nakayama implies that for every  $n \geq 1$ ,  $\pi_m(\mathcal{F}_n) = 0$  for every  $m < N$ . In other words, the sequence  $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  is uniformly homologically bounded below. This implies that  $\pi_m(\mathcal{F}) = 0$  for every  $m < N$ . We are left to show that for every  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\pi_m(\mathcal{F})$  is coherent. In virtue of the above equivalences, it is enough to prove that  $(\pi_m(\mathcal{F}))_\chi = 0$  for all but a finite number of characters  $\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m$ . Let first  $m$  be the smallest integer such that  $\pi_m(\mathcal{F}) \neq 0$  and let  $j: X_1 \rightarrow X$  be the natural map. In this case, we have

$$\pi_m(j^*(\pi_m(\mathcal{F}))) \simeq \pi_m(\mathcal{F}_1).$$

Nakayama's lemma implies that a non-vanishing  $\chi$ -homogeneous factor of  $\pi_m(\mathcal{F}_1)$  must induce a non-vanishing  $\chi$ -homogeneous factor of  $\pi_m(\mathcal{F})$ . Therefore, there are only finitely many  $\chi$ -homogeneous factors of  $\pi_m(\mathcal{F})$ . Proceeding by descending induction on  $m$ , the conclusion follows.

Concerning perfect complexes, we consider the analogous diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Perf}(\mathfrak{A}) & \longrightarrow & \lim_n \mathrm{Perf}(\mathfrak{A}_n) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \prod_{\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m} \mathrm{Perf}_\chi(\mathfrak{A}) & \longrightarrow & \lim_n \prod_{\chi \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m} \mathrm{Perf}_\chi(\mathfrak{A}_n). \end{array}$$

The same argument given above shows that the top horizontal arrow is fully faithful. To prove essential surjectivity, it is enough to use the fact that the canonical map

$$\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A}) \longrightarrow \lim_n \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A}_n)$$

is symmetric monoidal, and perfect complexes are exactly dualizable objects in  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A})$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 5.21.** *The natural map*

$$\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(\mathfrak{X}; \mathbb{G}_m)$$

*is injective.*

*Proof.* We continue the argument we began at the beginning of Section 5. Let  $\alpha \in \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m)$  and let  $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow X$  be the corresponding  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe. For every  $n \geq 1$ , let

$$\mathfrak{A}_n := \mathfrak{A} \times_X X_n.$$

To say that the image of  $\alpha$  in  $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ét}}^2(\mathfrak{X}; \mathbb{G}_m)$  is zero is equivalent to say that we are given equivalences

$$\sigma_n: \mathfrak{A}_n \simeq \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times X_n,$$

together with homotopies making the diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{A}_n & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{A}_{n+1} \\ \downarrow \sigma_n & & \downarrow \sigma_{n+1} \\ \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times X_n & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times X_{n+1} \end{array}$$

commutative. The maps  $\sigma_n$  determine line bundles  $\mathcal{L}_n \in \mathrm{Pic}(\mathfrak{A}_n)$ , and the above homotopies make the sequence of line bundles  $(\mathcal{L}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  into an object of  $\lim_{n \geq 1} \mathrm{Pic}(\mathfrak{A}_n)$ . Using Corollary 5.20, we see that there exists a line bundle  $\mathcal{L} \in \mathrm{Pic}(\mathfrak{A})$  inducing  $\mathcal{L}_n$  after pullback to  $\mathfrak{A}_n$ . This provides a global map

$$\sigma: \mathfrak{A} \longrightarrow \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times X.$$

Observe that Corollary 5.20 implies that

$$\sigma^*: \mathrm{Perf}(\mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times X) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Perf}(\mathfrak{A})$$

is an equivalence. Since  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A}) \simeq \mathrm{Ind}(\mathrm{Perf}(\mathfrak{A}))$  and  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times X) \simeq \mathrm{Ind}(\mathrm{Perf}(\mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times X))$ , we deduce that

$$\sigma^* : \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times X) \longrightarrow \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{A})$$

is an equivalence. It preserves connective objects and colimits by construction. Locally on  $X$ , the map  $\sigma$  can be trivialized to a map  $\mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times X \rightarrow \mathrm{B}\mathbb{G}_m \times X$ . Since all such maps are induced by flat maps of group schemes  $\mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_m$ , we conclude that  $\sigma^*$  preserves flat objects as well. Therefore, the hypotheses of Lurie's Tannakian reconstruction theorem (see e.g. [19, Theorem 3.4.2]) are satisfied. This shows that  $\sigma$  itself is an equivalence.  $\square$

**5.4. Derived Azumaya algebra vs.  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbes: a dictionary.** To complete this section, we provide a (conjectural) dictionary relating the world of derived Azumaya algebras to the world of  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbes. Let  $X$  be a derived quasi-compact and quasi-separated scheme. Then classes  $\mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m)$  can be geometrically realized both as  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbes and as Morita equivalence classes of derived Azumaya algebras over  $X$ . It is possible to relate  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbes and derived Azumaya algebras directly, without passing through the interpretation as classes in  $\mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m)$ . To see how this is possible, we start by recalling the following result of [3]:

**Proposition 5.22** ([3, Corollary 5.9]). *Let  $X$  be a quasi-compact and quasi-separated scheme. Let  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m)$  be two cohomology classes. Then at the level of the underlying triangulated homotopy categories there exists a tensor product:*

$$\otimes : \mathrm{h}(\mathrm{QCoh}_{\alpha}(X)) \times \mathrm{h}(\mathrm{QCoh}_{\beta}(X)) \longrightarrow \mathrm{h}(\mathrm{QCoh}_{\alpha\beta}(X)).$$

The above result is not yet optimal. Working at the level of the stable  $\infty$ -categories, we propose the following conjecture:

**Conjecture 5.23.** *Let  $X$  be a quasi-compact and quasi-separated scheme. Let  $(\mathfrak{A}, \alpha)$  and  $(\mathfrak{A}', \alpha')$  be two  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbes on  $X$ . Let  $\chi, \chi' \in \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_m$  be two characters. Then there exists a canonical equivalence*

$$\mathrm{QCoh}_{\chi}(\mathfrak{A}) \otimes_{\mathrm{QCoh}(X)} \mathrm{QCoh}_{\chi'}(\mathfrak{A}') \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}_{(\chi, \chi')}(\mathfrak{A} \times_X \mathfrak{A}'),$$

where  $\mathfrak{A} \times_X \mathfrak{A}'$  is considered as  $\mathbb{G}_m \times \mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe. Furthermore let  $\mathfrak{A} \star \mathfrak{A}'$  be  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe on  $X$  classifying the product  $\alpha\alpha' \in \mathrm{H}_{\acute{\mathrm{e}}\mathrm{t}}^2(X; \mathbb{G}_m)$ . Then pulling back along the canonical projection map of [3, Construction 3.8]

$$\rho_{\alpha, \alpha'} : \mathfrak{A} \times_X \mathfrak{A}' \longrightarrow \mathfrak{A} \star \mathfrak{A}'$$

yields an equivalence

$$\rho_{\alpha, \alpha'}^* : \mathrm{QCoh}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{G}_m}}(\mathfrak{A} \star \mathfrak{A}') \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}_{(\mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{G}_m}, \mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{G}_m})}(\mathfrak{A} \times_X \mathfrak{A}').$$

**Corollary 5.24.** *Let  $X$  be a quasi-compact and quasi-separated scheme and let  $(\mathfrak{A}, \alpha)$  be a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe over  $X$ . Then  $\mathrm{QCoh}_{\alpha}(X)$  is an invertible  $\mathrm{QCoh}(X)$ -linear stable  $\infty$ -category. In particular, it is Morita equivalent to a derived Azumaya algebra.*

The above corollary explains how to directly associate to a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe a Morita equivalence class of derived Azumaya algebras. For the converse, we formulate the following conjecture:

**Conjecture 5.25.** *Let  $X$  be a quasi-compact and quasi-separated scheme. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a derived Azumaya algebra over  $X$ . Then:*

(1) *the stable  $\infty$ -category*

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}} := \prod_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{A}^{\otimes n}\text{-Mod}$$

*acquires a symmetric monoidal structure.*

(2) *Let  $F_{\mathcal{A}}$  be the functor of point obtained from the Tannakian reconstruction formalism of [19, §3.4] applied to  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}$ . Then  $F_{\mathcal{A}}$  is a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbe over  $X$ .*

(3) The assignments  $\mathcal{A} \mapsto F_{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $(\mathfrak{A}, \alpha) \mapsto \mathrm{QCoh}_{\alpha}(X)$  form an equivalence of  $\infty$ -categories between  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -gerbes on  $X$  and Morita equivalence classes of derived Azumaya algebras over  $X$ .

**Remark 5.26.** Equivalently, we expect that the stack  $F_{\mathcal{A}}$  can equally be described as the stack of trivializations of the derived Azumaya algebra  $\mathcal{A}$ , as in [24, page 145].

## REFERENCES

- [1] Mathieu Anel and Bertrand Toën. Dénombrabilité des classes d'équivalences dérivées de variétés algébriques. *J. Algebraic Geom.*, 18(2):257–277, 2009.
- [2] Arnaud Beauville. The Lüroth problem. In *Rationality problems in algebraic geometry*, volume 2172 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 1–27. Springer, Cham, 2016.
- [3] Daniel Bergh and Olaf M Schnürer. Decompositions of derived categories of gerbes and of families of brauer-severi varieties. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.08945*, 2019.
- [4] Alexis Bouthier and Kęstutis Česnavičius. Torsors on loop groups and the hitchin fibration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.07480*, 2019.
- [5] Jean-Louis Colliot-Thélène and Alexei N. Skorobogatov. The Brauer-Grothendieck group. Preprint, 2019.
- [6] Brian Conrad. Formal GAGA for Artin stacks. Preprint, 2005.
- [7] A. Johan de Jong. A result of gabber. Preprint, 2004.
- [8] Ch. Deninger. A proper base change theorem for nontorsion sheaves in étale cohomology. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 50(3):231–235, 1988.
- [9] Barbara Fantechi, Lothar Göttsche, Luc Illusie, Steven L. Kleiman, Nitin Nitsure, and Angelo Vistoli. *Fundamental algebraic geometry*, volume 123 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2005. Grothendieck's FGA explained.
- [10] Dennis Gaitsgory. Sheaves of categories and the notion of 1-affineness. In *Stacks and categories in geometry, topology, and algebra*, volume 643 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 127–225. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2015.
- [11] Thomas H. Geisser and Baptiste Morin. On the kernel of the brauer-manin pairing, 2021.
- [12] J. Giraud, A. Grothendieck, S. L. Kleiman, M. Raynaud, and J. Tate. *Dix exposés sur la cohomologie des schémas*, volume 3 of *Advanced Studies in Pure Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam; Masson & Cie, Editeur, Paris, 1968.
- [13] Jean Giraud. *Cohomologie non abélienne*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1971. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 179.
- [14] Jack Hall and David Rydh. Perfect complexes on algebraic stacks. *Compos. Math.*, 153(11):2318–2367, 2017.
- [15] Mike Hopkins and Jacob Lurie. On Brauer groups of Lubin-Tate spectra I. Preprint, 2020.
- [16] Uwe Jannsen. Continuous étale cohomology. *Math. Ann.*, 280(2):207–245, 1988.
- [17] Max Lieblich. Twisted sheaves and the period-index problem. *Compos. Math.*, 144(1):1–31, 2008.
- [18] Jacob Lurie. *Higher topos theory*, volume 170 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2009.
- [19] Jacob Lurie. DAG VIII: Quasi-coherent sheaves and Tannaka duality theorems. Preprint, 2011.
- [20] Jacob Lurie. DAG XI: Descent theorems. Preprint, 2011.
- [21] Jacob Lurie. DAG XII: Proper morphisms, completions and the Grothendieck existence theorem. Preprint, 2011.
- [22] Jacob Lurie. Higher algebra. Preprint, September 2017.
- [23] Jacob Lurie. Spectral Algebraic Geometry. Preprint, 2018.
- [24] James Milne. Lectures on étale cohomology.
- [25] James S. Milne. *Étale cohomology*. Princeton Mathematical Series, No. 33. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1980.
- [26] Tasos Moulinos. The geometry of filtrations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.13562*, 2019.
- [27] Martin C. Olsson. On proper coverings of Artin stacks. *Adv. Math.*, 198(1):93–106, 2005.
- [28] Mauro Porta. The derived Riemann-Hilbert correspondence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.03907*, 2017.
- [29] Mauro Porta and Tony Yue Yu. Higher analytic stacks and GAGA theorems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.5166*, 2014.
- [30] Marco Robalo.  $K$ -theory and the bridge from motives to noncommutative motives. *Adv. Math.*, 269:399–550, 2015.
- [31] The Stacks Project Authors. Stacks Project. <http://stacks.math.columbia.edu>, 2013.
- [32] Bertrand Toën. The homotopy theory of  $dg$ -categories and derived Morita theory. *Invent. Math.*, 167(3):615–667, 2007.
- [33] Bertrand Toën. Derived Azumaya algebras and generators for twisted derived categories. *Invent. Math.*, 189(3):581–652, 2012.
- [34] Bertrand Toën and Michel Vaquié. Moduli of objects in  $dg$ -categories. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 40(3):387–444, 2007.