

EXACT SUBCATEGORIES, SUBFUNCTORS OF  $\text{Ext}$ , AND SOME APPLICATIONS

HAILONG DAO, SOUVIK DEY, MONALISA DUTTA

ABSTRACT. Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category. We establish basic results that allow one to identify sub(bi)functors of  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(-, -)$  using additivity of numerical functions and restriction to subcategories. We also study a small number of these new functors over commutative local rings in details, and find a range of applications from detecting regularity to understanding Ulrich modules.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Yoneda characterization of  $\text{Ext}$  is familiar to most students of homological algebra. Let  $A, B$  be two objects in an abelian category  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}(A, B)$  is the set of all equivalence classes of sequences of the form  $0 \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0$ , where two sequences  $\alpha, \beta$  are equivalent if we have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} \alpha : & 0 & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & C & \longrightarrow & A & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & & \parallel & & \downarrow f & & \parallel & & \\ \beta : & 0 & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & C' & \longrightarrow & A & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

Now  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}(A, B)$  can be given an abelian group structure by the well-known Baer sum as described in, for instance, [39, Lemma 12.6.3]. This consideration can be carried out more generally in any exact category (see [13, Subsection 1.2]).

The purpose of this note is to study the following rather natural questions: what if we place additional constraints on the short exact sequences? When do we get a subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}^1$ ? Can one apply such functors to study ring and module theory, similar to the ways homological algebra has been very successful applied to in the last decades?

Let us elucidate our goals with a concrete example. Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m}, k)$  be a Noetherian local ring. Let  $A, B$  be finitely generated  $R$ -modules. We consider exact sequences  $0 \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0$  of  $R$ -modules, with the added condition that  $\mu(C) = \mu(A) + \mu(B)$ , where  $\mu(-)$  denotes the minimal number of generators. As we shall see later, the equivalence classes of such sequences do form a subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_R^1$ , which we denote by  $\text{Ext}_R^1(-, -)^{\mu}$ . More surprisingly, the vanishing of a single module  $\text{Ext}_R^1(-, -)^{\mu}$  can be used to characterize the regularity of  $R$ , a feature that is lacking with the classical  $\text{Ext}^1$ .

Analogous versions of classical homological functors have been studied by various authors, notably starting with Hochschild ([22]) who studied relative  $\text{Ext}$  and  $\text{Tor}$  groups of modules over a ring with respect to subrings of the original ring. This work is further developed by Butler-Horrocks as well as Auslander-Solberg, where the point of view is switched to allowable exact sequences that give rise to sub(bi)functors of  $\text{Ext}^1$ . The whole circle of ideas is now thriving on its own under the name “relative homological algebra”, with exact structures playing a fundamental role, see [4, 5, 8, 15, 13, 16, 17, 28, 31, 38] for an incomplete list of literature and [33, 6] for some excellent surveys. In commutative algebra, as far as we know, this line of inquiry has not been exploited thoroughly, however traces of it can be found in [30, 34] and [14, Section 1.2].

Although the existing literature provides excellent starting points and inspiring ideas for this present work, it is not always easy to extract the precise results needed for our intended applications. For instance, while the connections between subfunctors of  $\text{Ext}^1$  and certain sub-exact structures on a fixed category are well known ([13, Section 1.2]), checking the conditions of substructures in each case can be time-consuming.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. 18E05, 18G15, 13C13, 13C14, 13C60, 13D07.

*Key words and phrases*. Exact subcategory, subfunctors, extension functors, Ulrich modules.

We are able to find criteria that can be applied in broad settings to identify exact subcategories and subfunctors. Here is a sample result applicable to our motivating example above, which follows from Theorem 4.7 and Proposition 3.8.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category. Let  $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  be a function such that  $\phi$  is constant on isomorphism classes of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\phi$  is additive on finite bi-products, and  $\phi$  is sub-additive on kernel-cokernel pairs in  $\mathcal{E}$  (i.e., if  $M \twoheadrightarrow N \twoheadrightarrow L$  is in  $\mathcal{E}$ , then  $\phi(N) \leq \phi(M) + \phi(L)$ ). Set  $\mathcal{E}^\phi := \{\text{kernel-cokernel pairs in } \mathcal{E} \text{ on which } \phi \text{ is additive}\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{E}^\phi$  gives rise, via the Yoneda construction, to a subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(-, -)$ .*

Our above Theorem is partly motivated by, and can be used to recover and extend recent interesting work of Puthenpurakal in [30].

Another situation we would like to have convenient criteria for subfunctors is when one “restricts” to a certain subcategory. A concrete example we have in mind concerns Ulrich modules and their recent generalizations. These modules form a subcategory of maximal Cohen–Macaulay modules over a commutative ring, and have been receiving increasing attention over the years due to very interesting and useful algebraic and geometric properties that their existence or abundance imply. We are able to show that even the generalized notion of “ $I$ -Ulrich modules”, recently introduced in [10], induces subfunctors of  $\text{Ext}_R^1(-, -)$ .

While this work is mainly concerned with foundational results, we also study the properties of some chosen new subfunctors, just to see if they are worth our efforts to show their existence! The early returns seem promising: these functors can be used to detect a wide range of ring and module-theoretic properties. Below we shall describe the organization of the paper and describe the most interesting findings in more details.

Section 2 is devoted to preliminary results on subfunctors of additive functors. While these results are perhaps not new, we were unable to locate convenient references, hence their inclusion.

Section 3 establishes various foundational results on exact subcategories, which form the cornerstone of the theory. As mentioned above, our applications require some extra care in preparation, and we try to give complete proofs whenever possible.

Section 4 concerns our first main application. We study sub-additive numerical functions  $\phi$  on an exact category and show that under mild conditions they induce exact subcategories and hence subfunctors of  $\text{Ext}^1(-, -)$ , which we denote by  $\text{Ext}^1(-, -)^\phi$ . See Theorem 4.7. A key consequence, Theorem 4.16 is inspired by, as well as extends, [30, Theorem 3.11, Theorem 3.13]. We also give similar results about subfunctors of  $\text{Ext}^1$  induced by half-exact functors, in the spirit of [1], see Corollaries 4.12 and 4.13.

In Section 5 we focus on two special types of subfunctors, which arise from simple applications of previous sections. Already these cases appear to be interesting and useful. The first one is  $\text{Ext}_R^1(-, -)^\mu$ , where  $\mu$  is the minimal number of generator function mentioned above. We compute the values of this subfunctor on all (pair of) finitely generated modules over a DVR (Corollary 5.1.14), as well as for certain pairs of modules over a Cohen–Macaulay ring of minimal multiplicity (Proposition 5.1.21).

Using this subfunctor, we prove the following characterization of regularity of local rings, which is the combination of Theorem 5.1.1, Theorem 5.1.12, Proposition 5.1.14 and Corollary 5.2.7. Note that the regularity can be detected by the vanishing of a single  $\text{Ext}_R^1(-, -)^\mu$ -module.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m}, k)$  be a local ring of depth  $t > 0$ . Then, the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $R$  is regular.
- (2)  $\text{Ext}_R^1(k, R/(x_1, \dots, x_{t-1})R)^\mu = 0$  for some  $R$ -regular sequence  $x_1, \dots, x_{t-1}$ .
- (3)  $\text{Ext}_R^1(k, M)^\mu = 0$  for some finitely generated  $R$ -module  $M$  of projective dimension  $t - 1$ .
- (4)  $R$  is Cohen–Macaulay, and  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^{t-1}k, N)^\mu = 0$  for some finitely generated non-zero  $R$ -module  $N$  of finite injective dimension.

Moreover, if  $t = 1$ , then the above are also equivalent to each of the following

- (5)  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)^\mu = \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)$  for all finitely generated  $R$ -modules  $M$  and  $N$ .
- (6)  $R$  is Cohen–Macaulay and there exist Ulrich modules  $M, N$  such that  $N$  is faithful,  $M \neq 0$  and for every  $R$ -module  $X$  that fits into a short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow X \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  one has  $X$  is also an Ulrich module.

We note here that the usual  $\text{Ext}$ -modules (without the  $\mu$ ) in (2), (3) and (4) of the above theorem are always non-zero.

It is worth mentioning that one can also use  $\text{Ext}_R^1(-, -)^\mu$  to detect the property of  $R$  being a hypersurface of minimal multiplicity (Corollary 5.1.22) or the weak  $\mathfrak{m}$ -fullness of a submodule (Proposition 5.1.11).

The second type arises from  $I$ -Ulrich modules, where  $I$  is any  $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideal in a Noetherian local ring  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ . See 4.4 and 4.6 for definition of  $I$ -Ulrich modules and the fact that they form an exact category. Using a subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}^1$  corresponding to Ulrich modules we give some characterizations of modules in  $\text{add}(B(\mathfrak{m}))$  and when  $B(\mathfrak{m})$  is a Gorenstein ring in terms of annihilator of  $\text{Ext}_R^1$  of Ulrich modules when  $d = 1$ . Here  $B(\mathfrak{m})$  is the blow-up of  $\mathfrak{m}$ . We also present a characterization of almost Gorenstein rings of minimal multiplicity using the annihilator of  $\text{Ext}^1$  against Ulrich modules. See Theorem 5.2.14 and Corollary 5.2.15.

Finally, we should mention that one of the main applications of our results has appeared in a separate work, where we study splitting of short exact sequences of Ulrich modules and connections to other properties of singularities ([9]).

*Acknowledgments.* We are grateful for partial support from the Simons Collaborator Grant FND0077558 and the University of Kansas Mathematics Department. We thank David Eisenbud for helpful conversations and for pointing out reference [14].

## 2. PRELIMINARIES ON SUBFUNCTORS OF ADDITIVE FUNCTORS

Unless otherwise stated, all rings in this paper are assumed to be commutative Noetherian and with unity. For definitions, and basic properties of additive categories, additive functors,  $R$ -linear categories, and  $R$ -linear functors, we refer the reader to [40], [41], [42] respectively. We now recall the definition of subfunctors as in [43].

**Definition 2.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  be two categories. Let  $F : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a covariant (resp. contravariant) functor. A covariant (resp. contravariant) functor  $G : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  is called a subfunctor of  $F$  if for every  $M \in \mathcal{A}$ , there exists a monomorphism  $j_M : G(M) \rightarrow F(M)$ , and moreover, for every  $M, N \in \mathcal{A}$ , and  $f \in \text{Mor}_{\mathcal{A}}(M, N)$ , the following diagrams are commutative, where the left one stands for the covariant case and the right one for the contravariant case:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(M) & \xrightarrow{F(f)} & F(N) \\ j_M \uparrow & & j_N \uparrow \\ G(M) & \xrightarrow{G(f)} & G(N) \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} F(N) & \xrightarrow{F(f)} & F(M) \\ j_N \uparrow & & j_M \uparrow \\ G(N) & \xrightarrow{G(f)} & G(M) \end{array}$$

2.2. For our purposes, we will always take  $\mathcal{B}$  to be either the category of abelian groups  $\mathbf{Ab}$ ,  $\text{Mod } R$  or  $\text{mod } R$  (hence monomorphisms are just injective morphisms) for some commutative ring  $R$ , and  $j_M$  will usually be just the inclusion map.

The following Lemma is probably well-known, but we could not find an appropriate reference, hence we include a proof. This will be used throughout the remainder of the article, possibly without further reference.

**Lemma 2.3.** (1) *Subfunctor of an additive functor, between two additive categories, is additive.*  
(2) *Subfunctor of an  $R$ -linear functor, between two  $R$ -linear categories, is  $R$ -linear.*

*Proof.* We will only prove the covariant case of both, since the contravariant case is similar.

(1) Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  be two additive categories and let,  $F : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be an additive functor. Also let,  $G : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a subfunctor of  $F$ . Then we have to show that the map  $G : \text{Mor}_{\mathcal{A}}(X, Y) \rightarrow \text{Mor}_{\mathcal{B}}(G(X), G(Y))$  is a homomorphism of abelian groups for all  $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ . Fix two objects  $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ . Then we need to prove that  $G(f + g) = G(f) + G(g)$  for all  $f, g \in \text{Mor}_{\mathcal{A}}(X, Y)$ . Since  $G$  is a subfunctor of  $F$ , so we have the

following commutative diagrams:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
F(X) & \xrightarrow{F(f+g)} & F(Y) & F(X) & \xrightarrow{F(f)} & F(Y) & F(X) & \xrightarrow{F(g)} & F(Y) \\
j_X \uparrow & & j_Y \uparrow & j_X \uparrow & & j_Y \uparrow & j_X \uparrow & & j_Y \uparrow \\
G(X) & \xrightarrow{G(f+g)} & G(Y) & G(X) & \xrightarrow{G(f)} & G(Y) & G(X) & \xrightarrow{G(g)} & G(Y)
\end{array}$$

Then we get

$$\begin{aligned}
j_Y \circ G(f+g) &= F(f+g) \circ j_X \\
&= (F(f) + F(g)) \circ j_X \text{ [Since } F \text{ is additive]} \\
&= F(f) \circ j_X + F(g) \circ j_X \\
&= j_Y \circ G(f) + j_Y \circ G(g) \\
&= j_Y \circ (G(f) + G(g))
\end{aligned}$$

where the third and the fifth equalities follow from the fact that  $\mathcal{B}$  is an additive category. Now since  $j_Y$  is a monomorphism, so  $j_Y \circ G(f+g) = j_Y \circ (G(f) + G(g))$  implies that  $G(f+g) = G(f) + G(g)$ . Hence  $G$  is additive.

(2) Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  be two  $R$ -linear categories and let,  $F : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be an  $R$ -linear functor. Also let,  $G : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a subfunctor of  $F$ . Then we have to show that the map  $G : \text{Mor}_{\mathcal{A}}(X, Y) \rightarrow \text{Mor}_{\mathcal{B}}(G(X), G(Y))$  is an  $R$ -linear map for all  $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ . Fix two objects  $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ . Then by part (1) we already have the additivity of  $G$ , so we only need to prove that  $G(rf) = rG(f)$  for all  $f \in \text{Mor}_{\mathcal{A}}(X, Y)$  and for all  $r \in R$ . Since  $G$  is a subfunctor of  $F$ , so we have the following commutative diagrams:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
F(X) & \xrightarrow{F(rf)} & F(Y) & F(X) & \xrightarrow{F(f)} & F(Y) \\
j_X \uparrow & & j_Y \uparrow & j_X \uparrow & & j_Y \uparrow \\
G(X) & \xrightarrow{G(rf)} & G(Y) & G(X) & \xrightarrow{G(f)} & G(Y)
\end{array}$$

Then we get

$$\begin{aligned}
j_Y \circ G(rf) &= F(rf) \circ j_X \\
&= (rF(f)) \circ j_X \text{ [Since } F \text{ is } R\text{-linear]} \\
&= r(F(f) \circ j_X) \\
&= r(j_Y \circ G(f)) \\
&= j_Y \circ (rG(f))
\end{aligned}$$

where the third and the fifth equalities follow from the fact that  $\mathcal{B}$  is an  $R$ -linear category. Now since  $j_Y$  is a monomorphism, so  $j_Y \circ G(rf) = j_Y \circ (rG(f))$  implies that  $G(rf) = rG(f)$ . Hence  $G$  is  $R$ -linear.  $\blacksquare$

We finish this section with a submodule inclusion result relating subfunctors of  $R$ -linear functors which will be applied in Section 5.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an additive  $R$ -linear category, and  $G : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{Mod } R$  be a subfunctor of an  $R$ -linear functor  $F : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{Mod } R$ , and for every object  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ , let  $j_A : G(A) \rightarrow F(A)$  be the monomorphism as in the definition of subfunctor. Let  $I$  be an ideal of  $R$ . Let  $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n$  be objects in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $j_{A_i}(G(A_i)) \subseteq IF(A_i)$  (resp.  $j_{A_i}(G(A_i)) \supseteq IF(A_i)$ ) for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Let  $X := \bigoplus_{i=1}^n A_i$ . Then, it holds that  $j_X(G(X)) \subseteq IF(X)$  (resp.  $j_X(G(X)) \supseteq IF(X)$ ).*

*Proof.* We will only do the covariant case, the contravariant case being similar. For every  $i$ , we have  $\pi_i : X \rightarrow A_i$ , which gives rise to the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
G(X) & \xrightarrow{G(\pi_i)} & G(A_i) \\
\downarrow j_X & & \downarrow j_{A_i} \\
F(X) & \xrightarrow{F(\pi_i)} & F(A_i)
\end{array}$$

So consequently, we get the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G(X) & \xrightarrow{(\theta_{(\pi_i)})_{i=1}^n} & \bigoplus_{i=1}^n G(A_i) \\ \downarrow j_X & & \downarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^n j_{A_i} \\ F(X) & \xrightarrow{(\alpha_{(\pi_i)})_{i=1}^n} & \bigoplus_{i=1}^n F(A_i) \end{array}$$

where the horizontal arrows are isomorphisms, since  $F$  and consequently  $G$  are additive functors (Lemma 2.3). Call the top horizontal map  $\theta$ , and the bottom one  $\alpha$ , so that  $\alpha \circ j_X = (\bigoplus_{i=1}^n j_{A_i}) \circ \theta$ , hence  $j_X \circ \theta^{-1} = \alpha^{-1} \circ (\bigoplus_{i=1}^n j_{A_i})$ . So, now we get,

$$j_X(G(X)) = (j_X \circ \theta^{-1})(\theta(G(X))) = (j_X \circ \theta^{-1})(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n G(A_i)) = (\alpha^{-1} \circ (\bigoplus_{i=1}^n j_{A_i}))(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n G(A_i)) = \alpha^{-1}(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n j_{A_i}(G(A_i)))$$

So, if  $j_{A_i}(G(A_i)) \subseteq IF(A_i)$  (resp.  $j_{A_i}(G(A_i)) \supseteq IF(A_i)$ ) for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , then

$$j_X(G(X)) \subseteq \alpha^{-1}(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n IF(A_i)) = \alpha^{-1}(I(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n F(A_i))) = I\alpha^{-1}(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n F(A_i)) = IF(X)$$

(resp.  $j_X(G(X)) \supseteq \alpha^{-1}(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n IF(A_i)) = \alpha^{-1}(I(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n F(A_i))) = I\alpha^{-1}(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n F(A_i)) = IF(X)$ ), where we have used  $\alpha^{-1}(IM) = I\alpha^{-1}(M)$ , since  $\alpha$  is an  $R$ -linear map.  $\blacksquare$

### 3. SOME GENERALITIES ABOUT EXACT SUBCATEGORIES

In this section, we record some generalities about exact subcategories of an exact category that we will later use for subcategories of  $\text{mod } R$ , when  $R$  is a commutative Noetherian ring. All our sub-categories are strict (closed under isomorphism classes) and full, and we often abbreviate this as strictly-full. We will follow the definition of an exact category described in [6, Definition 2.1]. We try to provide complete proofs whenever possible.

Given an exact category  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ , we call a monomorphism  $X \xrightarrow{i} Y$  to be an  $\mathcal{E}$ -inflation (also, called an admissible monic) if it is the part of a kernel-cokernel pair  $X \xrightarrow{i} Y \rightarrow Z$ , which lies in  $\mathcal{E}$ . Dually, we call an epimorphism  $Y \xrightarrow{p} Z$  to be an  $\mathcal{E}$ -deflation (also, called an admissible epic) if it is the part of a kernel-cokernel pair  $X \rightarrow Y \xrightarrow{p} Z$ , which lies in  $\mathcal{E}$ . We will often denote an admissible monic (resp. an admissible epic) by  $\triangleright \longrightarrow$  (resp.  $\longrightarrow \blacktriangleright$ ).

We begin by stating a lemma on morphisms and kernel-cokernel pairs, which we will use frequently while proving that certain structures are closed under isomorphism classes of kernel-cokernel pairs. This should be standard and well-known, but we could not find an appropriate reference, hence we include a proof.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an additive category. Let  $M, N, L \in \mathcal{A}$  be such that  $M \xrightarrow{i} N \xrightarrow{d} L$  is a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Also, let  $M', N', L' \in \mathcal{A}$ . Consider morphisms  $M' \xrightarrow{i'} N'$ ,  $N' \xrightarrow{d'} L'$ . If we have the following diagram with commutative squares:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} M & \xrightarrow{i} & N & \xrightarrow{d} & L \\ \downarrow \phi_1 & & \downarrow \phi_2 & & \downarrow \phi_3 \\ M' & \xrightarrow{i'} & N' & \xrightarrow{d'} & L' \end{array}$$

where the vertical arrows  $\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3$  are isomorphisms, then  $M' \xrightarrow{i'} N' \xrightarrow{d'} L'$  is a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{A}$ .

*Proof.* We will only prove that,  $\ker(d') = i'$ , since the proof of  $\text{Coker}(i') = d'$  can be given by a dual argument.

From the above commutative diagram we have,

$$(3.0.0.1) \quad \phi_2 \circ i = i' \circ \phi_1, \quad \phi_3 \circ d = d' \circ \phi_2$$

Since  $M \xrightarrow{i} N \xrightarrow{d} L$  is a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{A}$ , so  $d \circ i = 0$ . Then by Equation 3.0.0.1 we have,  $d' \circ i' = (\phi_3 \circ d \circ \phi_2^{-1}) \circ (\phi_2 \circ i \circ \phi_1^{-1}) = \phi_3 \circ d \circ i \circ \phi_1^{-1} = \phi_3 \circ 0 \circ \phi_1^{-1} = 0$ . Now let,  $K \in \mathcal{A}$  and consider a morphism  $f' : K \rightarrow N'$  such that  $d' \circ f' = 0$ . Define  $f := \phi_2^{-1} \circ f' : K \rightarrow N$ . Then by Equation 3.0.0.1 we get that,  $d \circ f = d \circ (\phi_2^{-1} \circ f') = (d \circ \phi_2^{-1}) \circ f' = (\phi_3^{-1} \circ d') \circ f' = \phi_3^{-1} \circ (d' \circ f') = \phi_3^{-1} \circ 0 = 0$ . Now, since  $\ker(d) = i$ , so by the universal property of a kernel of a map, there exists a morphism  $u : K \rightarrow M$

such that  $i \circ u = f$ . Now define  $u' := \phi_1 \circ u : K \rightarrow M'$ . Then by Equation 3.0.0.1 we get that,  $i' \circ u' = i' \circ (\phi_1 \circ u) = (i' \circ \phi_1) \circ u = (\phi_2 \circ i) \circ u = \phi_2 \circ f = \phi_2 \circ (\phi_2^{-1} \circ f') = f'$ . This implies that,  $\ker(d') = i'$ .  $\blacksquare$

We now record a Lemma on the intersection of exact subcategories. Note that, this is slightly different (and in view of [31, Corollary 2], more general) than [4, Lemma 5.2].

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category. Also let,  $(\mathcal{A}_\lambda, \mathcal{E}_\lambda)$  be an arbitrary family of exact subcategories of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ . Then  $(\cap_\lambda \mathcal{A}_\lambda, \cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda)$  is exact subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ .*

*Proof.* Clearly,  $(\cap_\lambda \mathcal{A}_\lambda, \cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda)$  is a strictly full additive subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ . By [6, Definition 2.1] and [6, Remark 2.4], it is enough to show that  $\cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda$  is closed under isomorphisms of kernel-cokernel pairs and  $(\cap_\lambda \mathcal{A}_\lambda, \cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda)$  satisfies the axioms [E0], [E0<sup>op</sup>], [E1<sup>op</sup>], [E2] and [E2<sup>op</sup>] of [6, Definition 2.1]. First we will show that,  $\cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda$  is closed under isomorphisms of kernel-cokernel pairs. Let  $M \succrightarrow N \twoheadrightarrow L$  be a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ , so  $M, N, L \in \mathcal{A}_\lambda$  and  $M \succrightarrow N \twoheadrightarrow L$  is a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$  for all  $\lambda$ . Also let,  $M' \rightarrow N' \rightarrow L'$  be a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\cap_\lambda \mathcal{A}_\lambda$  such that it is isomorphic to  $M \succrightarrow N \twoheadrightarrow L$ . So,  $M', N', L' \in \mathcal{A}_\lambda$  and  $M' \rightarrow N', N' \rightarrow L'$  are two morphisms in  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$  for all  $\lambda$ . Hence by Lemma 3.1 we get that,  $M' \rightarrow N' \rightarrow L'$  is a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$  for all  $\lambda$ . Since  $(\mathcal{A}_\lambda, \mathcal{E}_\lambda)$  is an exact category and  $M \succrightarrow N \twoheadrightarrow L$  is in  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda$  for all  $\lambda$ , so  $M' \succrightarrow N' \twoheadrightarrow L'$  is in  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda$  for all  $\lambda$ . So,  $M' \succrightarrow N' \twoheadrightarrow L'$  is in  $\cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ . Thus  $\cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda$  is closed under isomorphisms. Next, we will show that,  $(\cap_\lambda \mathcal{A}_\lambda, \cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda)$  satisfies the axiom [E0]. Let  $A \in \cap_\lambda \mathcal{A}_\lambda$ . Since  $(\mathcal{A}_\lambda, \mathcal{E}_\lambda)$  is an exact category for all  $\lambda$ , so by [6, Lemma 2.7] we get that  $A \xrightarrow{1_A} A \oplus 0 \cong A \xrightarrow{0} 0$  is in  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda$  for all  $\lambda$ . As  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$  is an additive subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$  for all  $\lambda$ , so  $0_{\mathcal{A}} = 0_{\mathcal{A}_\lambda}$  for all  $\lambda$ . Hence by definition  $A \xrightarrow{1_A} A \oplus 0 \cong A \xrightarrow{0} 0$  is in  $\cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ , which implies  $1_A$  is an admissible monic in  $\cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ . So,  $(\cap_\lambda \mathcal{A}_\lambda, \cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda)$  satisfies the axiom [E0]. Next, we will show that,  $(\cap_\lambda \mathcal{A}_\lambda, \cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda)$  satisfies the axiom [E0<sup>op</sup>]. Let  $A \in \cap_\lambda \mathcal{A}_\lambda$ . Since  $(\mathcal{A}_\lambda, \mathcal{E}_\lambda)$  is an exact category for all  $\lambda$ , so by [6, Lemma 2.7] we get that  $0 \xrightarrow{0} 0 \oplus A \cong A \xrightarrow{1_A} A$  is in  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda$  for all  $\lambda$ . As  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$  is an additive subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$  for all  $\lambda$ , so  $0_{\mathcal{A}} = 0_{\mathcal{A}_\lambda}$  for all  $\lambda$ . Hence by definition  $0 \xrightarrow{0} 0 \oplus A \cong A \xrightarrow{1_A} A$  is in  $\cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ , which implies  $1_A$  is an admissible epic in  $\cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ . So,  $(\cap_\lambda \mathcal{A}_\lambda, \cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda)$  satisfies the axiom [E0<sup>op</sup>]. Next, we will show that  $(\cap_\lambda \mathcal{A}_\lambda, \cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda)$  satisfies the axiom [E1<sup>op</sup>]. Let  $B' \xrightarrow{e} B$  and  $B \xrightarrow{p} C$  be two admissible epics in  $\cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ . Then we will show that  $B' \xrightarrow{p \circ e} C$  is an admissible epic in  $\cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ . Now  $B' \xrightarrow{e} B$  and  $B \xrightarrow{p} C$  are admissible epics in  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda$  for all  $\lambda$ . Since  $(\mathcal{A}_\lambda, \mathcal{E}_\lambda)$  is an exact category for all  $\lambda$ , so  $B' \xrightarrow{p \circ e} C$  is an admissible epic in  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda$  for all  $\lambda$ . Hence there exist objects  $D_\lambda \in \mathcal{A}_\lambda$  and kernel-cokernel pairs  $\sigma_\lambda : D_\lambda \xrightarrow{i_\lambda} B' \xrightarrow{p \circ e} C$  in  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda$  for all  $\lambda$ . So,  $D_\lambda \xrightarrow{i_\lambda} B' \xrightarrow{p \circ e} C$  is in  $\mathcal{E}$  for all  $\lambda$ . Hence  $\sigma_\lambda$  is a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{A}$  for all  $\lambda$ , so by the universal property of kernels we get that the kernel-cokernel pairs  $\sigma_\lambda$ 's are all isomorphic to each other. Hence all the  $D_\lambda$ 's are isomorphic to each other. Now fix a  $\lambda$ , say  $\lambda_0$ . Then  $D_{\lambda_0} \cong D_\lambda$  for all  $\lambda$ . Since  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$  is a strict subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$  for all  $\lambda$ , so  $D_{\lambda_0} \in \cap_\lambda \mathcal{A}_\lambda$ . Now  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$  is a strictly full subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$  for all  $\lambda$ , so  $D_{\lambda_0} \in \mathcal{A}_\lambda$  implies that  $\sigma_{\lambda_0}$  is a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$  for all  $\lambda$ . Since  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda$  is closed under isomorphisms of kernel-cokernel pairs in  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$  and  $\sigma_\lambda$ 's are all isomorphic to each other, so  $\sigma_{\lambda_0} \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$  for all  $\lambda$ . So,  $\sigma_{\lambda_0} \in \cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ . Hence  $D_{\lambda_0} \xrightarrow{i_{\lambda_0}} B' \xrightarrow{p \circ e} C$  is in  $\cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ , so  $B' \xrightarrow{p \circ e} C$  is an admissible epic in  $\cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ . Thus  $(\cap_\lambda \mathcal{A}_\lambda, \cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda)$  satisfies the axiom [E1<sup>op</sup>]. Now we will show that  $(\cap_\lambda \mathcal{A}_\lambda, \cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda)$  satisfies the axiom [E2]. Let  $A \xrightarrow{i} B$  be an admissible monic in  $\cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda$  and  $A \xrightarrow{f} A'$  be an arbitrary morphism in  $\cap_\lambda \mathcal{A}_\lambda$ . Now  $A \xrightarrow{i} B$  is an admissible monic in  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda$  for all  $\lambda$ . Since  $(\mathcal{A}_\lambda, \mathcal{E}_\lambda)$  is an exact category for all  $\lambda$ , so by [6, Proposition 2.12(iv)] we have the following pushout commutative diagram with rows being kernel-cokernel pairs in  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda$ :

$$\beta_\lambda : \begin{array}{ccc} A \xrightarrow{i} B & \xrightarrow{p} & C \\ \downarrow f & \text{PO} & \downarrow f'_\lambda \\ A' \xrightarrow{i'_\lambda} B'_\lambda & \xrightarrow{p'_\lambda} & C \end{array} \quad \parallel \quad (\text{Note that, } C \in \cap_\lambda \mathcal{A}_\lambda)$$

Since  $(\mathcal{A}_\lambda, \mathcal{E}_\lambda)$  is an exact subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ , so by [6, Proposition 5.2] we get that the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{i} & B \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow f'_\lambda \\ A' & \xrightarrow{i'_\lambda} & B'_\lambda \end{array}$$

is a pushout square in  $\mathcal{E}$  for all  $\lambda$ . Then by the universal property of pushout we get

that the kernel-cokernel pairs  $\beta_\lambda$ 's are all isomorphic to each other, so all the  $B'_\lambda$ 's are isomorphic to each other. Now fix a  $\lambda$ , say  $\lambda_0$ . Then  $B'_{\lambda_0} \cong B'_\lambda$  for all  $\lambda$ . Since  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$  is a strict subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$  for all  $\lambda$ , so  $B'_{\lambda_0} \in \cap_\lambda \mathcal{A}_\lambda$ . Now  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$  is a strictly full subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$  for all  $\lambda$ , so  $B'_{\lambda_0} \in \mathcal{A}_\lambda$  implies that  $\beta_{\lambda_0}$  is a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$  for all  $\lambda$ . Since  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda$  is closed under isomorphisms of kernel-cokernel pairs in  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$  and  $\beta_\lambda$ 's are all isomorphic to each other, so  $\beta_{\lambda_0} \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$  for all  $\lambda$ . So,  $\beta_{\lambda_0} \in \cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ . Hence  $A' \xrightarrow{i'_{\lambda_0}} B'_{\lambda_0} \xrightarrow{p'_{\lambda_0}} C$

is in  $\cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ , so  $A' \xrightarrow{i'_{\lambda_0}} B'_{\lambda_0}$  is an admissible monic in  $\cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ . Thus  $(\cap_\lambda \mathcal{A}_\lambda, \cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda)$  satisfies the axiom [E2]. A dual argument will show that  $(\cap_\lambda \mathcal{A}_\lambda, \cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda)$  satisfies the axiom [E2<sup>op</sup>]. Hence  $(\cap_\lambda \mathcal{A}_\lambda, \cap_\lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda)$  is an exact subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ . ■

Next we record an useful Lemma for proving exactness of certain structures on additive subcategories of a given exact category.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category. Let  $\mathcal{A}'$  be a strictly full additive subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Define  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'} := \{ M \twoheadrightarrow N \twoheadrightarrow L \text{ is in } \mathcal{E} : M, N, L \in \mathcal{A}' \}$ . If the pullback (resp. pushout) in  $\mathcal{A}$  of every  $\mathcal{E}$ -deflation (resp. inflation) of sequences in  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'}$  along every morphism in  $\mathcal{A}'$  is again in  $\mathcal{A}'$ , then  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'})$  is an exact subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ .*

The proof of Lemma 3.3 depends on Lemma 3.1 and the following proposition:

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category. Suppose we have the following diagram:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A' & \xrightarrow{i'} & B' & & \\ \downarrow e' & & \downarrow e & & \\ A & \xrightarrow{i} & B & \xrightarrow{p} & C \end{array}$$

where the square commutative diagram is a pullback diagram, and  $e, p$  are admissible epics and  $i$  is a kernel of  $p$ . Then  $i'$  is an admissible monic with a cokernel given by  $B' \xrightarrow{p \circ e} C$ .

*Proof.* The proof follows from the construction in the proof of [6, Proposition 2.15]. The only missing point in the proof of [6, Proposition 2.15], towards showing  $i'$  is a kernel of  $p \circ e$ , is the following: it was not shown that  $(p \circ e) \circ i' = 0$ . This can be easily checked as follows:  $(p \circ e) \circ i' = p \circ (e \circ i') = p \circ (i \circ e') = (p \circ i) \circ e' = 0 \circ e' = 0$ , since  $i$  is a kernel of  $p$ . ■

*Proof of Lemma 3.3:* Clearly, each kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'}$  is a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{A}$ , hence also a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{A}'$ . Thus  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'}$  consists of kernel-cokernel pairs in  $\mathcal{A}'$ . From the assumption we conclude that,  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'})$  satisfies the axioms [E2] and [E2<sup>op</sup>]. Hence by [6, Definition 2.1] and [6, Remark 2.4], it is enough to show that  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'}$  is closed under isomorphisms and  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'})$  satisfies the axioms [E0], [E0<sup>op</sup>] and [E1<sup>op</sup>]. First we will show that,  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'}$  is closed under isomorphisms. Let

$M \twoheadrightarrow N \twoheadrightarrow L$  be a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'}$ , so  $M, N, L \in \mathcal{A}'$  and  $M \twoheadrightarrow N \twoheadrightarrow L$  is a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Also let,  $M' \twoheadrightarrow N' \twoheadrightarrow L'$  be a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{A}'$  such that it is isomorphic to  $M \twoheadrightarrow N \twoheadrightarrow L$ . Hence by Lemma 3.1 we get that,  $M' \twoheadrightarrow N' \twoheadrightarrow L'$  is a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Since  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  is an exact category, so  $M' \twoheadrightarrow N' \twoheadrightarrow L'$  is in  $\mathcal{E}$ . Hence by definition,  $M' \twoheadrightarrow N' \twoheadrightarrow L'$  is in  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'}$ . Thus  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'}$  is closed under isomorphisms. Next, we will show that,  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'})$  satisfies the axiom [E0]. Let  $A \in \mathcal{A}'$ . Since  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  is an exact category, so by [6, Lemma 2.7] we get that  $A \xrightarrow{1_A} A \oplus 0 \cong A \xrightarrow{0} 0$  is in  $\mathcal{E}$ . As  $\mathcal{A}'$  is an additive subcategory of

$\mathcal{A}$ , so  $0_{\mathcal{A}} = 0_{\mathcal{A}'}$ . Hence by definition  $A \xrightarrow{1_A} A \oplus 0 \cong A \xrightarrow{0} 0$  is in  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'}$ , which implies  $1_A$  is an admissible monic in  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'}$ . So,  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'})$  satisfies the axiom [E0]. Next, we will show that,  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'})$  satisfies the axiom [E0<sup>op</sup>]. Let  $A \in \mathcal{A}'$ . Since  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  is an exact category, so by [6, Lemma 2.7] we get

that  $0 \succ^0 \rightarrow 0 \oplus A \cong A \xrightarrow{1_A} \twoheadrightarrow A$  is in  $\mathcal{E}$ . As  $\mathcal{A}'$  is an additive subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$ , so  $0_{\mathcal{A}} = 0_{\mathcal{A}'}$ . Hence by definition  $0 \succ^0 \rightarrow A \oplus 0 \cong A \xrightarrow{1_A} \twoheadrightarrow A$  is in  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'}$ , which implies  $1_A$  is an admissible epic in  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'}$ . So,  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'})$  satisfies the axiom [E0<sup>op</sup>]. Next, we will show that  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'})$  satisfies the axiom [E1<sup>op</sup>]. Let  $B' \xrightarrow{e} \twoheadrightarrow B$  and  $B \xrightarrow{p} \twoheadrightarrow C$  be two admissible epics in  $\mathcal{E}$  such that they are in  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'}$ , which means that there exist two kernel-cokernel pairs  $A \succ^i \rightarrow B \xrightarrow{p} \twoheadrightarrow C$  and  $D \succ \rightarrow B' \xrightarrow{e} \twoheadrightarrow B$  in  $\mathcal{E}$  such that  $A, B, C, D, B' \in \mathcal{A}'$ . Then we will show that  $B' \xrightarrow{poe} \twoheadrightarrow C$  is an admissible epic in  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'}$ . From Proposition 3.4 we get that,  $A' \succ^{i'} \rightarrow B' \xrightarrow{poe} \twoheadrightarrow C$  is a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{E}$ . By the hypothesis of Lemma 3.3 and the diagram of Proposition 3.4 we get that,  $A' \in \mathcal{A}'$ . Hence  $B' \xrightarrow{poe} \twoheadrightarrow C$  is an admissible epic in  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'}$ . Thus  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'})$  satisfies the axiom [E1<sup>op</sup>]. So,  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'})$  is an exact subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ .  $\blacksquare$

From now on, given a subcategory  $\mathcal{A}'$  of an exact category  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ , the notation  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'}$  will stand for as defined in Lemma 3.3. Using Lemma 3.3, we now record two quick consequences, which give sufficient condition on a subcategory  $\mathcal{A}'$ , so that  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'})$  is an exact subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ . The first of which we state below now is well-known.

**Proposition 3.5.** (c.f. [6, Lemma 10.20]) *Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category. Let  $\mathcal{A}'$  be a strictly full additive subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Assume that for every  $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z$  in  $\mathcal{E}$ , if  $X, Z \in \mathcal{A}'$ , then  $Y \in \mathcal{A}'$  (i.e.,  $\mathcal{A}'$  is closed under extensions). Then  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'})$  is an exact subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.3, it is enough to show that the pullback (resp. pushout) in  $\mathcal{A}$  of every  $\mathcal{E}$ -deflation (resp. inflation) of sequences in  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'}$  along every morphism in  $\mathcal{A}'$  is again in  $\mathcal{A}'$ . Let  $A \succ^{i'} \rightarrow B$  be an inflation in  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'}$  and  $f : A \rightarrow A'$  be a morphism in  $\mathcal{A}'$ . Then by [6, Proposition 2.12(iv)] we get the following pushout commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A & \xrightarrow{i} & B & \xrightarrow{p} \twoheadrightarrow & C \\ \downarrow f & \text{PO} & \downarrow f' & & \parallel \\ A' & \xrightarrow{i'} & B' & \xrightarrow{p'} \twoheadrightarrow & C \end{array}$$

Since  $A', C \in \mathcal{A}'$ , so by assumption and the bottom row of the above diagram we get that  $B' \in \mathcal{A}'$ . The pullback case follows by a dual argument. Hence  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'})$  is an exact subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category. Let  $\mathcal{A}'$  be a strictly full additive subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Assume that  $\mathcal{A}'$  is closed under kernels and co-kernels of admissible epics and monics in  $\mathcal{E}$  respectively. Then,  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'})$  is an exact subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.3, it is enough to show that the pullback (resp. pushout) in  $\mathcal{A}$  of every  $\mathcal{E}$ -deflation (resp. inflation) of sequences in  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'}$  along every morphism in  $\mathcal{A}'$  is again in  $\mathcal{A}'$ . Let  $A \succ^{i'} \rightarrow B$  be an inflation in  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'}$  and  $f : A \rightarrow A'$  be a morphism in  $\mathcal{A}'$ . Now we have the following pushout commutative diagram in  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A & \xrightarrow{i} & B & & \\ \downarrow f & \text{PO} & \downarrow f' & & \\ A' & \xrightarrow{i'} & B' & & \end{array}$$

Then by [6, Proposition 2.12(ii)] we have the following kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{E}$ :  $A \succ \rightarrow B \oplus A' \twoheadrightarrow B'$ .

As  $B, A' \in \mathcal{A}'$  and  $\mathcal{A}'$  is additive, so  $B \oplus A' \in \mathcal{A}'$ . Since  $A \succ \rightarrow B \oplus A'$  is an admissible monic in  $\mathcal{E}$ , so the cokernel  $B' \in \mathcal{A}'$ . The pullback case follows by a dual argument. Hence  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'})$  is an exact subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ .  $\blacksquare$

Given any exact category  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  and  $C, A \in \mathcal{A}$ , one can define the Yoneda Ext group  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(C, A)$ , which has an abelian group structure by Baer sum (see beginning of [13, Section 1.2] for a description of  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(-, -)$ ). When  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  is moreover an  $R$ -linear category, then  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(C, A)$  can be given an  $R$ -linear structure via either of the following constructions, both of which yield equivalent triples in  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(C, A)$ :



Given a kernel-cokernel pair  $\sigma : A \twoheadrightarrow B \twoheadrightarrow C$  in  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(C, A)$ , the multiplication  $r \cdot \sigma$  is either given by the following pullback diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} r\sigma : & A & \twoheadrightarrow & B' & \twoheadrightarrow & C \\ & \parallel & & \downarrow & \text{PB} & \downarrow r \cdot \text{id}_C \\ \sigma : & A & \twoheadrightarrow & B & \twoheadrightarrow & C \end{array}$$

or by the following pushout diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \sigma : & A & \twoheadrightarrow & B & \twoheadrightarrow & C \\ r \cdot \text{id}_A \downarrow & \text{PO} & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ r\sigma : & A & \twoheadrightarrow & B' & \twoheadrightarrow & C \end{array}$$

That both of these yield equivalent triplet in  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(-, -)$  follows from [6, Proposition 3.1]. Moreover, this makes  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(-, -)$  into an  $R$ -linear functor in each component.

Now we show that if  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}')$  is a strictly full exact subcategory of an exact category  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ , then  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(-, -) : \mathcal{A}'^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{A}' \rightarrow \mathbf{Ab}$  is naturally a subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(-, -)|_{\mathcal{A}'^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{A}'} : \mathcal{A}'^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{A}' \rightarrow \mathbf{Ab}$ . For this, we first record a remark.

**Remark 3.7.** Let  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}')$  be a strictly full exact subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ . Then, for  $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}' (\subseteq \mathcal{E})$ , it is actually true that  $[\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}'} = [\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}}$ , hence the map  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(-, -) \xrightarrow{[\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}'} \mapsto [\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}}} \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(-, -)$  is the natural inclusion map. Indeed, to see  $[\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}'} = [\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}}$ : Let  $\sigma$  be a kernel-cokernel pair  $A \twoheadrightarrow B \twoheadrightarrow C$  in  $\mathcal{E}'$ , so  $A, B, C \in \mathcal{A}'$ . Let,  $\beta \in [\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}}$  be the kernel-cokernel pair  $A \twoheadrightarrow B' \twoheadrightarrow C$  in  $\mathcal{E}$ , so  $B' \in \mathcal{A}$ . Hence there exists  $f \in \text{Mor}_{\mathcal{A}}(B, B')$  such that we have the following commutative diagram in  $\mathcal{A}$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \sigma : & A & \twoheadrightarrow & B & \twoheadrightarrow & C \\ & \parallel & & \downarrow f & & \parallel \\ \beta : & A & \twoheadrightarrow & B' & \twoheadrightarrow & C \end{array}$$

By [6, Corollary 3.2] we get that,  $f$  is an isomorphism. Since  $B \in \mathcal{A}'$ ,  $B' \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}'$  is a strict subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$ , so  $B \cong B'$  implies that  $B' \in \mathcal{A}'$ . Since  $\mathcal{A}'$  is full, so  $f \in \text{Mor}_{\mathcal{A}'}(B, B')$ . Hence the above commutative diagram is in  $\mathcal{A}'$ . Since  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}')$  be an exact category, so  $\mathcal{E}'$  is closed under isomorphisms. Hence  $\beta \in \mathcal{E}'$ , so  $\beta \in [\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}'}$ . Thus  $[\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}} \subseteq [\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}'}$ . Now  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}')$  is a subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ , so  $[\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}'} \subseteq [\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}}$  as well. Hence  $[\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}'} = [\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}}$ .

**Proposition 3.8.** Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category. Let  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}')$  be a strictly full exact subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ . Then  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(-, -) : \mathcal{A}'^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{A}' \rightarrow \mathbf{Ab}$  is a subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(-, -)|_{\mathcal{A}'^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{A}'} : \mathcal{A}'^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{A}' \rightarrow \mathbf{Ab}$ , where for every  $C, A \in \mathcal{A}'$ , the natural inclusion map  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(C, A) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(C, A)$  is given by  $[\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}'} \mapsto [\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}}$ . If  $\mathcal{A}$  is moreover  $R$ -linear, then the natural inclusion map is also  $R$ -linear, hence  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(-, -) : \mathcal{A}'^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{A}' \rightarrow \text{Mod } R$  is a subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(-, -)|_{\mathcal{A}'^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{A}'} : \mathcal{A}'^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{A}' \rightarrow \text{Mod } R$ .

*Proof.* Let  $C, A \in \mathcal{A}'$ . Define  $\phi_{C, A} : \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(C, A) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(C, A)$  by  $\phi_{C, A}([\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}'}) = [\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}}$ . From now on, we will call this map  $\phi$ . The well-definedness and injectivity of  $\phi$  follow from Remark 3.7. Next, we will show that  $\phi$  is a group homomorphism. Let  $[\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}'}, [\beta]_{\mathcal{E}'} \in \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(C, A)$ , where  $\sigma : A \twoheadrightarrow B \twoheadrightarrow C$  and  $\beta : A \twoheadrightarrow B' \twoheadrightarrow C$  for some  $B, B' \in \mathcal{A}'$ . Then  $[\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}'} + [\beta]_{\mathcal{E}'} = [\alpha]_{\mathcal{E}'}$  is given by the following commutative diagram in  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}')$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \sigma \oplus \beta : & A \oplus A & \twoheadrightarrow & B \oplus B' & \twoheadrightarrow & C \oplus C \\ & \downarrow \Sigma & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ \gamma : & A & \twoheadrightarrow & E & \twoheadrightarrow & C \oplus C \\ & \parallel & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \Delta \\ \alpha : & A & \twoheadrightarrow & B + B' & \twoheadrightarrow & C \end{array}$$

We know that,  $\gamma$  is the pushout of  $\sigma \oplus \beta$  in  $\mathcal{E}'$  by the sum map  $A \oplus A \xrightarrow{\Sigma} A$ . Since  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}')$  is an exact subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ , so by [6, Proposition 5.2] we get that  $\gamma$  is also the pushout of  $\sigma \oplus \beta$  in  $\mathcal{E}$  by the sum

map  $A \oplus A \xrightarrow{\Sigma} A$ . Next,  $\alpha$  is the pullback of  $\gamma$  in  $\mathcal{E}'$  by the diagonal map  $C \xrightarrow{\Delta} C \oplus C$ , so by [6, Proposition 5.2] we get that  $\alpha$  is also the pullback of  $\gamma$  in  $\mathcal{E}$  by the diagonal map  $C \xrightarrow{\Delta} C \oplus C$ . This implies that  $\alpha$  is a representative of  $[\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}} + [\beta]_{\mathcal{E}}$  in  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(C, A)$ , i.e.,  $[\alpha]_{\mathcal{E}} = [\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}} + [\beta]_{\mathcal{E}}$ . Since  $\phi([\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}'} + [\beta]_{\mathcal{E}'}) = \phi([\alpha]_{\mathcal{E}'}) = [\alpha]_{\mathcal{E}}$  and  $\phi([\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}'}) + \phi([\beta]_{\mathcal{E}'}) = [\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}} + [\beta]_{\mathcal{E}}$ , so we get  $\phi$  is a group homomorphism.

Let  $A, B, C \in \mathcal{A}'$  and let  $f \in \text{Mor}_{\mathcal{A}'}(A, B)$  be. First, we will show that  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(C, -)$  is a subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(C, -)$ , so we need to proof that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(C, A) & \xrightarrow{f^*} & \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(C, B) \\ \phi_{C,A} \uparrow & & \phi_{C,B} \uparrow \\ \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(C, A) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}} & \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(C, B) \end{array}$$

where for every  $[\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}} \in \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(C, A)$ , a representative of  $f^*([\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}})$  is the pullback of  $\sigma$  by  $f$  in  $\mathcal{E}$  and for every  $[\beta]_{\mathcal{E}'} \in \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(C, A)$ , a representative of  $\tilde{f}([\beta]_{\mathcal{E}'})$  is the pullback of  $\beta$  by  $f$  in  $\mathcal{E}'$ .

Let,  $[\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}'} \in \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(C, A)$ . Now  $\phi_{C,A}([\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}'}) = [\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}}$  and  $f^*([\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}}) = [\gamma]_{\mathcal{E}}$ , where  $\gamma$  is the pullback of  $\sigma$  by  $f$  in  $\mathcal{E}$ . Next we have,  $\tilde{f}([\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}'}) = [\alpha]_{\mathcal{E}'}$ , so  $\alpha$  is the pullback of  $\sigma$  by  $f$  in  $\mathcal{E}'$ . Hence by [6, Proposition 5.2] we get that,  $\alpha$  is also the pullback of  $\sigma$  by  $f$  in  $\mathcal{E}$ . Hence  $[\alpha]_{\mathcal{E}} = [\gamma]_{\mathcal{E}}$ , so  $\phi_{C,B}(\tilde{f}([\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}'})) = \phi_{C,B}([\alpha]_{\mathcal{E}'}) = [\alpha]_{\mathcal{E}} = [\gamma]_{\mathcal{E}} = f^*([\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}}) = f^*(\phi_{C,A}([\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}'}))$ , so the above diagram commutes. Hence  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(C, -)$  is a subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(C, -)$  for any  $C \in \mathcal{A}'$ . Similarly,  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(-, C)$  is a subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(-, C)$  for any  $C \in \mathcal{A}'$ . Thus  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(-, -) : \mathcal{A}'^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{A}' \rightarrow \mathbf{Ab}$  is a subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(-, -)|_{\mathcal{A}'^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{A}'} : \mathcal{A}'^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{A}' \rightarrow \mathbf{Ab}$ .

Now let  $\mathcal{A}$  be  $R$ -linear, hence so is  $\mathcal{A}'$  because it is a full subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Let  $C, A \in \mathcal{A}'$  and  $[\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}'} \in \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(C, A)$ . Let  $[\gamma]_{\mathcal{E}'} = r \cdot [\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}'}$ , so  $\gamma$  is obtained from  $\sigma$  by pullback in  $\mathcal{E}'$  along the map  $C \xrightarrow{r \cdot \text{id}_C} C$ . Now  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}')$  is an exact subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ , hence this is also the pullback in  $\mathcal{E}$  along the map  $C \xrightarrow{r \cdot \text{id}_C} C$  ([6, Proposition 5.2]). So,  $[\gamma]_{\mathcal{E}} = r \cdot [\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}} = r\phi([\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}'})$ . Also,  $[\gamma]_{\mathcal{E}} = \phi([\gamma]_{\mathcal{E}'}) = \phi(r \cdot [\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}'})$ . This shows that the natural inclusion map  $\phi$  is  $R$ -linear.  $\blacksquare$

In the following corollary, we denote  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(-, -)$  just by  $\text{Hom}(-, -)$  (we completely ignore the subcategory, since all our subcategories are full). In view of Definition 4.9, and the discussion following 4.10, the following corollary is crucial for recovering [34, Proposition 1.37, Proposition 1.38].

**Corollary 3.9.** *Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category. Let  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}')$  be a strictly full exact subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ . Let  $\sigma : M \xrightarrow{i} N \xrightarrow{p} L$  be a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{E}'$ . Then, for every  $A \in \mathcal{A}'$ , we have the following commutative diagrams of long exact sequences:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(A, M) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(A, N) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(A, L) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(A, M) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(A, N) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(A, L) \\ & & \parallel & & \parallel & & \parallel & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(A, M) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(A, N) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(A, L) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(A, M) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(A, N) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(A, L) \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(L, A) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(N, A) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(M, A) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(L, A) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(N, A) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(M, A) \\ & & \parallel & & \parallel & & \parallel & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(L, A) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(N, A) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(M, A) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(L, A) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(N, A) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(M, A) \end{array}$$

*Proof.* We will only prove the covariant version (the first diagram above), since the proof of the contravariant version is given by the dual argument.

In the first diagram above, the commutativity of the first two squares is obvious. Also, the commutativity of the last two squares follows directly from the proof of Proposition 3.8 (i.e,  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(-, -)$  is a subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(-, -)$ ). So, it is enough to prove that the following square is commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Hom}(A, L) & \xrightarrow{f} & \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(A, M) \\ \parallel & & \uparrow \phi_{A,M} \\ \text{Hom}(A, L) & \xrightarrow{f^*} & \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}'}(A, M) \end{array}$$

Now  $f(g) = [\gamma]_{\mathcal{E}}$ , where  $\gamma$  is the pullback of  $\sigma$  by  $g$  in  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $f^*(g) = [\alpha]_{\mathcal{E}'}$ , where  $\alpha$  is the pullback of  $\sigma$  by  $g$  in  $\mathcal{E}'$ . Since  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}')$  is an exact subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ , so by [6, Proposition 5.2] we get that  $[\gamma]_{\mathcal{E}} = [\alpha]_{\mathcal{E}}$ . Also, by definition  $\phi_{A,M}([\alpha]_{\mathcal{E}'}) = [\alpha]_{\mathcal{E}}$ . Thus  $f(g) = \phi_{A,M}(f^*(g))$ , so the above square commutes.  $\blacksquare$

Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category. Let  $\mathcal{A}'$  be a strictly full subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$ . If  $A_1 \succrightarrow^i B \xrightarrow{p} A_2$  and  $A_1 \succrightarrow^i C \xrightarrow{p} A_2$  are two kernel-cokernel pairs in  $\mathcal{E}$  belonging to the same class in  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(A_2, A_1)$ , then  $B \cong C$  (by short five lemma), hence  $B \in \mathcal{A}'$  if and only if  $C \in \mathcal{A}'$ . Hence, for every  $M, N \in \mathcal{A}'$ , the collection  $\{[\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}} \in \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(M, N) : \text{the middle object of } \sigma \text{ is in } \mathcal{A}'\}$  is well-defined.

**Proposition 3.10.** *Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category. Let  $\mathcal{A}'$  be a strictly full additive subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$ . For every  $M, N \in \mathcal{A}'$ , define  $F(M, N) := \{[\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}} \in \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(M, N) : \text{the middle object of } \sigma \text{ is in } \mathcal{A}'\}$ . If  $F(-, -)$  is a subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(-, -)|_{\mathcal{A}'^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{A}'}$  :  $\mathcal{A}'^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{A}' \rightarrow \mathbf{Ab}$  via natural inclusion maps, then  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'})$  is an exact subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.3, it is enough to show that the pullback (resp. pushout) in  $\mathcal{A}$  of every  $\mathcal{E}$ -deflation (resp. inflation) of sequences in  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'}$  along every morphism in  $\mathcal{A}'$  is again in  $\mathcal{A}'$ . We will only prove the pullback case, since the proof of the pushout case can be given by a similar argument. Let  $B \xrightarrow{p} C$  be an admissible epic in  $\mathcal{E}$  such that it is in  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'}$ , which means that there exist a kernel-cokernel pair  $\gamma : A \succrightarrow B \xrightarrow{p} C$  in  $\mathcal{E}$  such that  $A, B, C \in \mathcal{A}'$ . Also, let  $B' \xrightarrow{f} C$  be a morphism in  $\mathcal{A}'$ . Then we have a map  $f^* : \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(C, A) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(B', A)$  defined as follows: for every  $[\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}} \in \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(C, A)$ , a representative of  $f^*([\sigma]_{\mathcal{E}})$  is the pullback of  $\sigma$  by  $f$  in  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ . Now by definition of  $F(-, -)$ , it is clear that  $F(M, N) \subseteq \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(M, N)$  for any  $M, N \in \mathcal{A}'$ . Since  $F(-, -)$  is a subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(-, -)|_{\mathcal{A}'^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{A}'}$  :  $\mathcal{A}'^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{A}' \rightarrow \mathbf{Ab}$ , so we have the following commutative square:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(C, A) & \xrightarrow{f^*} & \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}}(B', A) \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ F(C, A) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}} & F(B', A) \end{array}$$

where the columns are natural inclusion maps. So, for every  $[\beta]_{\mathcal{E}} \in F(C, A)$ , a representative of  $\tilde{f}([\beta]_{\mathcal{E}})$  is the pullback of  $\beta$  by  $f$  in  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ . Now consider the pullback of  $\gamma$  by  $f$  in  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A & \succrightarrow & A' & \xrightarrow{p} & B' \\ & & \downarrow & \text{PB} & \downarrow f \\ \gamma : A & \succrightarrow & B & \xrightarrow{p} & C \end{array}$$

Now  $[\gamma]_{\mathcal{E}} \in F(C, A)$ , so  $\tilde{f}([\gamma]_{\mathcal{E}}) \in F(B', A)$  implies that  $A' \in \mathcal{A}'$ . Hence the pullback in  $\mathcal{A}$  of every  $\mathcal{E}$ -deflation of sequences in  $\mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'}$  along every morphism in  $\mathcal{A}'$  is again in  $\mathcal{A}'$ . Hence by Lemma 3.3 we get that,  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'})$  is an exact subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ .  $\blacksquare$

#### 4. SUBCATEGORY AND SUBFUNCTOR OF $\text{Ext}^1$ FROM NUMERICAL FUNCTION AND APPLICATIONS TO MODULE CATEGORIES

In this section, we present tools to identify exact subcategories of an exact category, and hence also subfunctors of  $\text{Ext}^1$  due to Proposition 3.8, coming from numerical functions. Our first result in this direction is an application of Proposition 3.6.

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category. Let  $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0}$  be a function such that  $\phi$  is constant on isomorphism classes of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\phi$  is additive on finite bi-products, and  $\phi$  is sub-additive on kernel-cokernel pairs in  $\mathcal{E}$  (i.e., if  $M \succrightarrow N \xrightarrow{p} L$  is in  $\mathcal{E}$ , then  $\phi(N) \leq \phi(M) + \phi(L)$ ). Let  $\mathcal{A}'$  be the strictly full subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$ , whose objects are given by  $\{M \in \mathcal{A} : \phi(M) = 0\}$ . Then  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'})$  is an exact subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ .*

*Proof.* Note that,  $\mathcal{A}'$  is a strict subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$ , since  $\phi$  is constant on isomorphism classes of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Since  $\phi$  is additive on finite bi-product, so  $\phi(0_{\mathcal{A}}) = \phi(0_{\mathcal{A}} \oplus 0_{\mathcal{A}}) = \phi(0_{\mathcal{A}}) + \phi(0_{\mathcal{A}})$ , hence  $\phi(0_{\mathcal{A}}) = 0$ . Hence  $0_{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathcal{A}'$ . Since  $\mathcal{A}$  is an additive category and  $\phi$  is additive on finite bi-products, so by definition of  $\mathcal{A}'$  we get that for every  $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}'$ , the bi-product of  $X$  and  $Y$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  also belongs to  $\mathcal{A}'$ . Hence  $\mathcal{A}'$

is an additive subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Let  $B \in \mathcal{A}'$  and  $A_1 \xrightarrow{i} B \xrightarrow{p} A_2$  be a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{E}$ . We will show that  $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{A}'$ . Since  $\phi$  is sub-additive on kernel-cokernel pairs in  $\mathcal{E}$ , and  $B \in \mathcal{A}'$ , so  $0 = \phi(B) \leq \phi(A_1) + \phi(A_2) \leq 0$ . Hence  $\phi(A_1) + \phi(A_2) = 0$ . Since we know  $\phi$  always takes non-positive values, so we get  $\phi(A_1) = \phi(A_2) = 0$ , hence  $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{A}'$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{A}'$  is closed under kernels and co-kernels of admissible epics and monics in  $\mathcal{E}$  respectively. Then by Proposition 3.6 we get that,  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{A}'})$  is an exact subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ .  $\blacksquare$

We now proceed to give our main example of Proposition 4.1. First we recall some terminologies and prove some preliminary lemmas. For any unexpected concepts and notations, we refer the reader to [3] and [26].

Let  $R$  be a commutative ring, let  $\mathcal{S}_R$  be the collection of all short exact sequences of  $R$ -modules, which gives the standard exact structure on  $\text{Mod } R$ . When the ring in question is clear, we drop the suffix  $R$  and write only  $\mathcal{S}$ . Note that, since  $\text{mod } R$  is extension closed in  $\text{Mod } R$ , so the collection of all short exact sequences in  $\text{mod } R$  gives an exact subcategory of  $\text{Mod } R$ , and we take this as the standard exact structure of  $\text{mod } R$ . Note that, if  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E})$  is an exact subcategory of  $\text{Mod } R$  and  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{mod } R$ , then  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E})$  is also an exact subcategory of  $\text{mod } R$ .

Now for a Noetherian local ring  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  of dimension  $d$  and for an integer  $s \geq 0$ , let  $\text{CM}^s(R)$  denote the full subcategory of  $\text{mod } R$  consisting of the zero-module, and all Cohen–Macaulay  $R$ -modules ([3, Definition 2.1.1]) of dimension  $s$ . Note that, when  $s = d$ ,  $\text{CM}^d(R)$  is just the category of all maximal Cohen–Macaulay modules, which we will also denote by  $\text{CM}(R)$ .

4.2. We quickly note that for each  $s \geq 0$ ,  $\text{CM}^s(R)$  is closed under finite direct sums, direct summands and closed under extensions in  $\text{Mod } R$ . Indeed, let  $0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$  be a short exact sequence with  $L, N \in \text{CM}^s(R)$ . If  $L$  or  $N$  is zero, then there is nothing to prove. So, assume  $L, N$  are non-zero. Now  $M \in \text{mod } R$ , and we also have the following calculation for  $\dim M$ :  $\dim M = \dim \text{Supp}(M) = \dim(\text{Supp}(L) \cup \text{Supp}(N)) = \max\{\dim \text{Supp}(L), \dim \text{Supp}(N)\} = \max\{\dim L, \dim N\} = s$ . Consequently,  $s = \inf\{\text{depth}_R L, \text{depth}_R N\} \leq \text{depth}_R M \leq \dim M = s$ , which shows  $M \in \text{CM}^s(R)$ . Thus,  $\text{CM}^s(R)$  is closed under extensions in  $\text{Mod } R$ . To also show  $\text{CM}^s(R)$  is closed under direct summands, let  $M, N$  be non-zero modules with  $M \oplus N \in \text{CM}^s(R)$ . Then,  $M, N \in \text{mod } R$ , and  $s = \text{depth}_R(M \oplus N) = \inf\{\text{depth}_R M, \text{depth}_R N\} \leq \text{depth}_R M \leq \dim M \leq \dim(M \oplus N) = s$ , thus  $M \in \text{CM}^s(R)$ .

Hence, if  $\mathcal{S}$  is the standard exact structure on  $\text{Mod } R$ , then  $(\text{CM}^s(R), \mathcal{S}|_{\text{CM}^s(R)})$  is an exact subcategory of  $\text{Mod } R$  by Proposition 3.5. Now let,  $I$  be a  $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideal and  $\phi_I : \text{CM}^s(R) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  be the function defined by  $\phi_I(M) := \lambda_R(M/IM) - e_R(I, M)$ , where  $e_R(I, M)$  is the multiplicity of  $M$  w.r.t. to  $I$  ([3, Definition 4.6.1]). We first show that  $\phi_I$  satisfy all the hypothesis of Proposition 4.1.

**Lemma 4.3.** *The function  $\phi_I : \text{CM}^s(R) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  satisfies  $\phi_I(M) \leq 0$ , is constant on isomorphism classes of modules in  $\text{CM}^s(R)$ , additive on finite bi-products, and subadditive on short exact sequences of modules in  $\text{CM}^s(R)$ .*

*Proof.* It is obvious that  $\phi_I$  is constant on isomorphism classes of modules in  $\text{CM}^s(R)$ , and additive on finite bi-products (direct sums). Now,  $e_R(I, -)$  is additive on short exact sequences of modules in  $\text{CM}^s(R)$  by [3, Corollary 4.7.7]. Since  $\lambda_R((-) \otimes_R R/I)$  is always subadditive on short exact sequences, so this proves  $\phi_I$  is also subadditive on short exact sequences of modules in  $\text{CM}^s(R)$ . Now we finally prove that  $\phi_I(M) \leq 0$  for all  $M \in \text{CM}^s(R)$ . If  $\dim M = 0$ , then  $e_R(I, M) = \lambda_R(M) \geq \lambda_R(M/IM)$ , so  $\phi_I(M) \leq 0$ . Now assume that  $s = \dim M > 0$ . We may assume that  $R$  has infinite residue field. By [3, Corollary 4.6.10], we have  $e_R(I, M) = e_R(\mathbf{x}, M)$  for some system of parameters  $\mathbf{x} = x_1, \dots, x_s$  on  $M$ , which is a reduction of  $I$  w.r.t.  $M$ . Then,  $\mathbf{x}$  is a  $M$ -regular sequence, since  $M$  is Cohen–Macaulay ([3, Theorem 2.1.2(d)]). Let  $J = (\mathbf{x})$ . Since  $\mathbf{x}$  is a  $M$ -regular sequence, so by

[3, Theorem 1.1.8] we have  $J^n M / J^{n+1} M \cong (M/JM) \oplus \frac{(s+n-1)!}{n!(s-1)!}$ . Hence,  $e_R(I, M) = e_R(J, M) = (s-1)! \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda_R(J^n M / J^{n+1} M)}{n^{s-1}} = \lambda_R(M/JM) \geq \lambda_R(M/IM)$  (the last inequality follow by noticing that  $J \subseteq I$ ). Hence  $\phi_I(M) \leq 0$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Definition 4.4.** Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  be a Noetherian local ring, and  $I$  be an  $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideal. Let  $s \geq 0$  be an integer. We denote by  $\text{Ul}_I^s(R)$  the full subcategory of all modules  $M \in \text{CM}^s(R)$  such that  $\phi_I(M) = 0$ , i.e.,  $\lambda_R(M/IM) = e_R(I, M)$ . When  $s = \dim R$ , we will denote this subcategory simply by  $\text{Ul}_I(R)$ . When  $I = \mathfrak{m}$ ,  $\text{Ul}_{\mathfrak{m}}^s(R)$  will be denoted by  $\text{Ul}^s(R)$ . We will also denote  $\text{Ul}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\dim R}(R)$  simply by  $\text{Ul}(R)$ . Note that, when  $s = \dim R = 1$  and  $R$  is Cohen–Macaulay,  $\text{Ul}_I(R)$  is exactly the collection of all  $I$ -Ulrich modules as defined in [10, Definition 4.1].

**Remark 4.5.** In terms of [20, Definition 2.1], a non-zero  $R$ -module  $M$  is Ulrich if  $M \in \text{Ul}^s(R)$  for some  $s \geq 0$  in our notation. When  $R$  is Cohen–Macaulay, then the modules in  $\text{Ul}(R)$  are simply the maximally generated modules as studied in [2].

**Corollary 4.6.**  $(\text{Ul}_I^s(R), \mathcal{S}_{|\text{Ul}_I^s(R)})$  is an exact subcategory of  $\text{Mod } R$  (hence of  $\text{mod } R$ ).

*Proof.* Since it has been noticed that  $(\text{CM}^s(R), \mathcal{S}_{|\text{CM}^s(R)})$  is an exact subcategory of  $\text{Mod } R$ , so by Lemma 4.3 and Proposition 4.1 it follows that  $(\text{Ul}_I^s(R), \mathcal{S}_{|\text{Ul}_I^s(R)})$  is an exact subcategory of  $(\text{CM}^s(R), \mathcal{S}_{|\text{CM}^s(R)})$ , and hence of  $\text{Mod } R$ .  $\blacksquare$

Next we record a proposition for constructing a special kind of exact substructure of an exact structure  $\mathcal{E}$  on a category  $\mathcal{A}$ , without shrinking the category, that also comes from certain kind of numerical functions. This will be used in the next section to recover and improve some results on module categories.

**Theorem 4.7.** Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact category. Let  $\phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  be a function such that  $\phi$  is constant on isomorphism classes of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\phi$  is additive on finite bi-products, and  $\phi$  is sub-additive on kernel-cokernel pairs in  $\mathcal{E}$  (i.e., if  $M \twoheadrightarrow N \twoheadrightarrow L$  is in  $\mathcal{E}$ , then  $\phi(N) \leq \phi(M) + \phi(L)$ ). Set  $\mathcal{E}^\phi := \{\text{kernel-cokernel pairs in } \mathcal{E} \text{ on which } \phi \text{ is additive}\}$ . Then,  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}^\phi)$  is an exact subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ .

*Proof.* By [6, Definition 2.1] and [6, Remark 2.4], it is enough to show that  $\mathcal{E}^\phi$  is closed under isomorphisms and  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}^\phi)$  satisfies the axioms [E0], [E0<sup>op</sup>], [E1<sup>op</sup>], [E2] and [E2<sup>op</sup>]. First we will show that,  $\mathcal{E}^\phi$  is closed under isomorphisms. Let  $M \twoheadrightarrow N \twoheadrightarrow L$  be a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{E}^\phi$ . Also let,  $M' \rightarrow N' \rightarrow L'$  be a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that it is isomorphic to  $M \twoheadrightarrow N \twoheadrightarrow L$ , which implies

$M' \twoheadrightarrow N' \twoheadrightarrow L'$  is in  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $M \cong M'$ ,  $N \cong N'$ ,  $L \cong L'$ . Since  $\phi(N) = \phi(M) + \phi(L)$  and  $\phi$  is constant on isomorphism classes of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$ , so  $\phi(N') = \phi(N) = \phi(M) + \phi(L) = \phi(M') + \phi(L')$ . So,  $M' \twoheadrightarrow N' \twoheadrightarrow L'$  is in  $\mathcal{E}^\phi$ . Hence  $\mathcal{E}^\phi$  is closed under isomorphisms. Next, we will show that,  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}^\phi)$  satisfies the axiom [E0]. Let  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ . Since  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  is an exact category, so by [6, Lemma 2.7] we get that  $A \xrightarrow{1_A} A \oplus 0 \cong A \xrightarrow{0} 0$  is in  $\mathcal{E}$ . Since  $\phi$  is additive on finite bi-products, so  $\phi$  is additive on the

kernel-cokernel pair  $A \xrightarrow{1_A} A \oplus 0 \cong A \xrightarrow{0} 0$ . Hence by definition  $A \xrightarrow{1_A} A \oplus 0 \cong A \xrightarrow{0} 0$  is in  $\mathcal{E}^\phi$ , which implies  $1_A$  is an admissible monic in  $\mathcal{E}^\phi$ . So,  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}^\phi)$  satisfies the axiom [E0]. Next we will show that,  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}^\phi)$  satisfies the axiom [E0<sup>op</sup>]. Let  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ . Since  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$  is an exact category, so by [6, Lemma 2.7] we get that  $0 \xrightarrow{0} A \oplus 0 \cong A \xrightarrow{1_A} A$  is in  $\mathcal{E}$ . Since  $\phi$  is additive on finite bi-

products, so  $\phi$  is additive on the kernel-cokernel pair  $0 \xrightarrow{0} A \oplus 0 \cong A \xrightarrow{1_A} A$ . Hence by definition  $0 \xrightarrow{0} A \oplus 0 \cong A \xrightarrow{1_A} A$  is in  $\mathcal{E}^\phi$ , which implies  $1_A$  is an admissible epic in  $\mathcal{E}^\phi$ . So,  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}^\phi)$  satisfies the axiom [E0<sup>op</sup>].

Next, we will show that  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}^\phi)$  satisfies the axiom [E1<sup>op</sup>]. Let  $B' \xrightarrow{e} B$  and  $B \xrightarrow{p} C$  be two admissible epics in  $\mathcal{E}^\phi$ . Then we will show that  $B' \xrightarrow{p \circ e} C$  is an admissible epic in  $\mathcal{E}^\phi$ . Let  $A \xrightarrow{i} B \xrightarrow{p} C$  be the complete kernel-cokernel pair of  $p$ , and consider a pullback square

as in Proposition 3.4. From Proposition 3.4 we get that,  $A' \xrightarrow{i'} B' \xrightarrow{p \circ e} C$  is a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{E}$ , so  $\phi(B') \leq \phi(C) + \phi(A')$ . Since  $A \xrightarrow{i} B \xrightarrow{p} C$  is in  $\mathcal{E}^\phi$ , so  $\phi(B) = \phi(A) + \phi(C)$ . Now by an argument dual to [6, Proposition 2.12(ii)] applied to the pullback square of Proposition 3.4 we get a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{E}$  as follows:  $B' \twoheadrightarrow B \oplus A' \twoheadrightarrow A$ , which implies  $\phi(B) + \phi(A') = \phi(B \oplus A') \leq \phi(A) + \phi(B')$ . Hence  $\phi(A) + \phi(C) + \phi(A') \leq \phi(A) + \phi(B')$ , so  $\phi(C) + \phi(A') \leq \phi(B')$ .

Thus  $\phi(C) + \phi(A') = \phi(B')$ , so  $A' \xrightarrow{i'} B' \xrightarrow{p \circ e} C$  is a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{E}^\phi$ . This implies that  $B' \xrightarrow{p \circ e} C$  is an admissible epic in  $\mathcal{E}^\phi$ . Thus  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}^\phi)$  satisfies the axiom [E1<sup>op</sup>]. Now we will show

that  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}^\phi)$  satisfies the axiom [E2]. Let  $A \succrightarrow^i B$  be an admissible monic in  $\mathcal{E}^\phi$  and  $A \xrightarrow{f} A'$  be an arbitrary morphism in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then we have the following pushout commutative square in  $\mathcal{E}$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{i} & B \\ \downarrow f & \text{PO} & \downarrow f' \\ A' & \xrightarrow{i'} & B' \end{array}$$

Then by [6, Proposition 2.12(ii)] we have the following kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{E}$ :  $A \succrightarrow B \oplus A' \twoheadrightarrow B'$ , so  $\phi(B) + \phi(A') = \phi(B \oplus A') \leq \phi(A) + \phi(B')$ . Also, by [6, Proposition 2.12(iv)] we have the following commutative diagram with rows being kernel-cokernel pairs in  $\mathcal{E}$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A & \xrightarrow{i} & B & \xrightarrow{p} & C \\ \downarrow f & \text{PO} & \downarrow f' & & \parallel \\ A' & \xrightarrow{i'} & B' & \xrightarrow{p'} & C \end{array}$$

Since  $A \succrightarrow^i B$  is an admissible monic in  $\mathcal{E}^\phi$ , so  $\phi(B) = \phi(A) + \phi(C)$ . This implies  $\phi(A) + \phi(C) + \phi(A') \leq \phi(A) + \phi(B')$ , so  $\phi(C) + \phi(A') \leq \phi(B')$ . Also,  $A' \succrightarrow^{i'} B' \xrightarrow{p'} C$  is a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{E}$ , so  $\phi(B') \leq \phi(C) + \phi(A')$ . Thus  $\phi(C) + \phi(A') = \phi(B')$ . Hence  $A' \succrightarrow^{i'} B' \xrightarrow{p'} C$  is a kernel-cokernel pair in  $\mathcal{E}^\phi$  and so,  $A' \succrightarrow^{i'} B'$  is an admissible monic in  $\mathcal{E}^\phi$ . Thus  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}^\phi)$  satisfies the axiom [E2]. A dual argument will show that  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}^\phi)$  satisfies the axiom [E2<sup>op</sup>]. Hence  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E}^\phi)$  is an exact subcategory of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ .  $\blacksquare$

Moving forward, we record some applications of Theorem 4.7.

4.8. Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a subcategory of  $\text{Mod } R$  such that  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S}|_{\mathcal{X}})$  is an exact subcategory of  $\text{Mod } R$ . In this case, for  $M, N \in \mathcal{X}$ , by  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{X}}^1(M, N)$  we will mean  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{S}|_{\mathcal{X}}}(M, N)$ , i.e.,  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{X}}^1(M, N) = \{[\sigma] : \text{the middle object of } \sigma \text{ is in } \mathcal{X}\}$  (Note that, it does not matter whether the equivalence class is taken in  $\mathcal{S}|_{\mathcal{X}}$  or  $\mathcal{S}$  by Remark 3.7). Note that,  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{X}}^1(-, -) : \mathcal{X}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{Mod } R$  is a subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_R^1(-, -) : \mathcal{X}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{Mod } R$  by Proposition 3.8. For example, we can apply this discussion to  $\mathcal{X} = \text{Ul}_1^s(R)$  due to Corollary 4.6.

Note that, if  $\mathcal{X}$  is closed under taking extensions in  $\text{Mod } R$ , then  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S}|_{\mathcal{X}})$  is exact subcategory of  $\text{Mod } R$  by Proposition 3.5. In this case,  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{X}}^1(M, N) = \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)$  for all  $M, N \in \mathcal{X}$ .

**Definition 4.9.** Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a subcategory of  $\text{Mod } R$  such that  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S}|_{\mathcal{X}})$  is an exact subcategory of  $\text{Mod } R$ , and  $\phi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  be a function satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem 4.7, i.e.,  $\phi$  is constant on isomorphism classes of modules in  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $\phi$  is additive on finite direct sum, and sub-additive on short exact sequences of modules in  $\mathcal{X}$ . Then, in the notation of Theorem 4.7,  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S}|_{\mathcal{X}}^\phi)$  is an exact subcategory of  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S}|_{\mathcal{X}})$ , hence an exact subcategory of  $\text{Mod } R$ . For  $M, N \in \mathcal{X}$ , define  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{X}}^1(M, N)^\phi := \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{S}|_{\mathcal{X}}^\phi}(M, N) = \{[\alpha] \in \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{X}}^1(M, N) : \phi \text{ is additive on } \alpha\}$ . Again, we notice that if  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Mod } R$  is closed under taking extensions, then  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{X}}^1(M, N)^\phi = \{[\alpha] \in \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N) : \phi \text{ is additive on } \alpha\}$ , and in this case, we denote it just by  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)^\phi$ .

4.10. Note that,  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{X}}^1(-, -)^\phi : \mathcal{X}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{Mod } R$  is a subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{X}}^1(-, -) : \mathcal{X}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{Mod } R$ , which in turn is a subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_R^1(-, -) : \mathcal{X}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{Mod } R$  (Proposition 3.8) and we have corresponding commutative diagram of long exact sequences by Corollary 3.9.

With the extension-closed subcategory  $\mathcal{X} = \text{mod } R$ , where  $(R, \mathfrak{m}, k)$  is a Noetherian local ring, and the subadditive function  $\phi(-) = \mu(-) : \text{mod } R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  being the number of generator function in Definition 4.9, we see that  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)^\mu = \langle M, N \rangle$  in the notation of [34, Definition 1.35]. So by our discussion, Theorem 4.7, Proposition 3.8 and Corollary 3.9 recovers [34, Corollary 1.36, Proposition 1.37, Proposition 1.38].

Before we apply our discussion to more certain special cases, we record one preliminary lemma.

**Lemma 4.11.** *Let  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact subcategory of  $\text{Mod } R$ . Let  $G : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{fl}(R)$  be an additive half-exact functor, where  $\text{fl}(R)$  denotes the full subcategory of  $\text{mod } R$  consisting of finite length modules. Then,  $\phi(-) := \lambda_R(G(-)) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 4.7. Moreover, given a short exact sequence  $\sigma$  with objects in  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $G(\sigma)$  is a short exact sequence of modules if and only if  $\phi$  is additive on  $\sigma$ .*

*Proof.* We will only prove the statement when  $G$  is a covariant functor, since the proof for contravariant functor being similar.

Since  $G$  is a functor and  $\lambda_R$  is constant on isomorphism classes of objects in  $\text{Mod } R$ , so  $\phi$  is constant on isomorphism classes of objects in  $\mathcal{X}$ . Let  $A, B \in \mathcal{X}$ . Then  $\phi(A \oplus B) = \lambda_R(G(A \oplus B)) = \lambda_R(G(A) \oplus G(B)) = \lambda_R(G(A)) + \lambda_R(G(B)) = \phi(A) + \phi(B)$ , so  $\phi$  is additive on finite bi-products. Next let,  $\sigma : 0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{f} N \xrightarrow{g} L \rightarrow 0$  be a short exact sequence with objects in  $\mathcal{X}$ . Then  $G(\sigma)$  is the exact sequence  $G(\sigma) : 0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow G(M) \xrightarrow{G(f)} G(N) \xrightarrow{G(g)} G(L) \rightarrow P \rightarrow 0$ , where  $K = \text{Ker}(G(f))$  and  $P = \text{Coker}(G(g))$ . Then we have  $\phi(M) + \phi(L) - \phi(N) = \lambda_R(G(M)) + \lambda_R(G(L)) - \lambda_R(G(N)) = \lambda_R(K) + \lambda_R(P) \geq 0$ , so  $\phi(M) + \phi(L) \geq \phi(N)$ . Hence  $\phi$  is subadditive on short exact sequence with objects in  $\mathcal{X}$ . Thus  $\phi$  satisfies the hypothesis of Proposition 4.7.

Next let,  $\sigma : 0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{f} N \xrightarrow{g} L \rightarrow 0$  be a short exact sequence with objects in  $\mathcal{X}$ . Then  $G(\sigma)$  is short exact if and only if  $K = \text{Ker}(G(f)) = 0$  and  $P = \text{Coker}(G(g)) = 0$  if and only if  $\lambda_R(K) = \lambda_R(P) = 0$  if and only if  $\phi(M) + \phi(L) - \phi(N) = \lambda_R(G(M)) + \lambda_R(G(L)) - \lambda_R(G(N)) = \lambda_R(K) + \lambda_R(P) = 0$  if  $\phi(M) + \phi(L) = \phi(N)$  if and only if  $\phi$  is additive on  $\sigma$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Corollary 4.12.** *Let  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E})$  be an exact subcategory of  $\text{Mod } R$ . Let  $G : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{fl}(R)$  be an additive half-exact functor, where  $\text{fl}(R)$  denotes the full subcategory of  $\text{mod } R$  consisting of finite length modules. Set  $\mathcal{E}^G := \{\sigma \in \mathcal{E} : G(\sigma) \text{ is a short exact sequence of modules}\}$ . Then,  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}^G)$  is an exact subcategory of  $\text{Mod } R$ .*

*Proof.* From Lemma 4.11 it follows that,  $\mathcal{E}^G = \mathcal{E}^\phi$ , where  $\phi(-) := \lambda_R(G(-)) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ . Hence the claim now follows from Theorem 4.7.  $\blacksquare$

Now again, let  $\mathcal{X} = \text{mod } R$ , where  $R$  is Noetherian. Basic examples of additive half-exact functors  $G : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{fl}(R)$  are  $G(-) := \text{Ext}_R^i(-, X), \text{Ext}_R^i(X, -), \text{Tor}_i^R(X, -)$ , where  $X$  is a fixed  $R$ -module of finite length and  $i \geq 0$  is an integer.

Given a collection  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{mod } R$ , in [1], the authors considered the following:

$$F_{\mathcal{C}}(C, A) := \{\sigma : 0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0 \mid \text{Hom}_R(X, \sigma) \text{ is short exact for all } X \in \mathcal{C}\}$$

$$F^{\mathcal{C}}(C, A) := \{\sigma : 0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0 \mid \text{Hom}_R(\sigma, X) \text{ is short exact for all } X \in \mathcal{C}\}$$

and showed in [1, Proposition 1.7] that these define subfunctors of  $\text{Ext}_R^1(-, -) : \text{mod } R^{op} \times \text{mod } R \rightarrow \mathbf{Ab}$ . Using Corollary 4.12, we recover this result when  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{fl}(R)$  as follows:

**Corollary 4.13.** *Let  $R$  be a commutative Noetherian ring. Let  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{fl}(R)$ . Then,  $F_{\mathcal{C}}(-, -)$  and  $F^{\mathcal{C}}(-, -)$  are subfunctors of  $\text{Ext}_R^1(-, -) : \text{mod } R^{op} \times \text{mod } R \rightarrow \text{mod } R$ .*

*Proof.* We only prove the case of  $F_{\mathcal{C}}(-, -)$ , since the proof of  $F^{\mathcal{C}}(-, -)$  is similar.

Let  $\mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{C}}$  be the collection of all short exact sequences  $\sigma$  of finitely generated  $R$ -modules such that  $\text{Hom}_R(X, \sigma)$  is short exact for all  $X \in \mathcal{C}$ . Since  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{C}}}(-, -) = F_{\mathcal{C}}(-, -)$ , so by Proposition 3.8 it is enough to prove that,  $(\text{mod } R, \mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{C}})$  is an exact subcategory of  $\text{mod } R$ . Since  $\mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{C}} = \bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{C}}$ , so it is enough to prove that for each  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{C}}$  gives an exact substructure on  $\text{mod } R$  (intersection of exact substructures is again an exact substructure by Lemma 3.2). Now note that,  $\mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{C}} = \{\sigma : G(\sigma) \text{ is short exact}\}$ , where  $G : \text{mod } R \rightarrow \text{fl}(R)$  is given by  $G(-) := \text{Hom}_R(C, -)$ , so by Corollary 4.12 we get that  $(\text{mod } R, \mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{C}})$  is an exact subcategory of  $\text{mod } R$ . Hence we are done.  $\blacksquare$

Next, we recover and improve upon [30, Theorem 3.11, Theorem 3.13].

For a Noetherian local ring  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ , let  $\text{MD}(R)$  denote the full subcategory of  $\text{mod } R$  consisting of all modules  $M$  such that either  $M = 0$ , or  $\dim M = \dim R$ . We recall that, if  $I$  is an  $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideal, then  $e_R(I, -)$  is additive on  $\text{MD}(R)$ . We also recall that, a finitely generated module  $M$  satisfy Serre's condition  $(S_n)$  if  $\text{depth } M_{\mathfrak{p}} \geq \inf\{n, \dim R_{\mathfrak{p}}\}$  for all  $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } R$ . The full subcategory of  $\text{mod } R$  consisting of all modules satisfying  $(S_n)$  is denoted by  $S_n(R)$ . Note that,  $S_n(R)$  is closed under extensions in  $\text{mod } R$ .

**Lemma 4.14.** *Let  $R$  be an equidimensional local ring. Let  $S_1(R)$  be the collection of all modules in  $\text{mod } R$  satisfying Serre's condition  $(S_1)$ . Then,  $S_1(R) \subseteq \text{MD}(R)$ .*

*Proof.* The hypothesis on  $R$  implies that,  $\dim(R/\mathfrak{p}) = \dim R$  for all  $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Min}(R)$ . So, if  $0 \neq M$  satisfy  $(S_1)$ , then there exists  $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Ass}(M) \subseteq \text{Min}(R)$ , so  $\dim(M) \geq \dim(R/\mathfrak{p}) = \dim R$ , and we are done.  $\blacksquare$

Now inspecting the proof of [29, Proposition 17], the only place where  $R$  is Cohen–Macaulay and  $M$  is maximal Cohen–Macaulay are required is to ensure that,  $e_R(I, -)$  is additive on  $0 \rightarrow \Omega_R M \rightarrow F \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  and that  $M, \Omega_R M \in \text{MD}(R)$ . But if we assume  $R$  is equidimensional and satisfy  $(S_1)$ , and  $M \in S_1(R) \subseteq \text{MD}(R)$ , then  $\Omega_R M \in S_1(R) \subseteq \text{MD}(R)$ . Hence we get the following lemma:

**Lemma 4.15.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  be an equidimensional local ring satisfying  $(S_1)$ . Let  $M \in S_1(R)$ . Let  $d = \dim R \geq 1$ , and  $I$  be an  $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideal. Then, the function  $n \mapsto \lambda(\text{Tor}_1^R(M, R/I^{n+1}))$  is given by a polynomial of degree  $\leq d - 1$ . So, in particular, the limit  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda(\text{Tor}_1^R(M, R/I^{n+1}))}{n^{d-1}}$  exists.*

If  $R$  and  $M$  are as in Lemma 4.15, then let us denote  $e_I^T(M) := (d-1)! \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda(\text{Tor}_1^R(M, R/I^{n+1}))}{n^{d-1}}$ . (What [30] denotes by  $e_R^T(M)$  is exactly same as  $e_{\mathfrak{m}}^T(M)$  in our notation).

The following theorem recovers and improves upon [30, Theorem 3.11, Theorem 3.13] (since a local Cohen–Macaulay ring  $R$  is equidimensional, satisfies  $(S_1)$  and  $\text{CM}(R) \subseteq S_1(R)$ ).

**Theorem 4.16.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  be an equidimensional local ring satisfying  $(S_1)$ . Let  $\mathcal{X} = S_1(R)$  be the subcategory of  $\text{mod } R$  consisting of all modules satisfying  $(S_1)$ . Let  $I$  be an  $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideal. Then,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(-, -)^{e_I^T} : S_1(R)^{\text{op}} \times S_1(R) \rightarrow \text{mod } R$  is a subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_R^1(-, -) : S_1(R)^{\text{op}} \times S_1(R) \rightarrow \text{mod } R$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $S_1(R)$  is an extension closed subcategory of  $\text{mod } R$ , so  $(S_1(R), \mathcal{S}|_{S_1(R)})$  is an exact subcategory of  $\text{mod } R$ . Since for each  $n$ , the function  $\text{mod } R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  given by  $M \mapsto \lambda(\text{Tor}_1^R(M, R/I^{n+1}))$  is subadditive on short exact sequences of  $\text{mod } R$ , so  $e_I^T : S_1(R) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  is also subadditive on short exact sequences of  $S_1(R)$ , so  $(S_1(R), \mathcal{S}|_{S_1(R)}^{e_I^T})$  is an exact subcategory of  $(S_1(R), \mathcal{S}|_{S_1(R)})$  by Theorem 4.7. Hence we are done by Proposition 3.8.  $\blacksquare$

## 5. SPECIAL SUBFUNCTORS OF $\text{Ext}^1$ AND APPLICATIONS

Throughout this section,  $R$  will denote a Noetherian local ring with unique maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m}$  and residue field  $k$ . We will denote by  $\mu_R(-)$  the number of generators function for finitely generated modules, i.e.,  $\mu_R(M) = \lambda_R(M \otimes_R R/\mathfrak{m})$  for all  $M \in \text{mod } R$ . We drop the subscript  $R$  when the ring in question is clear. We shall study properties and applications of a number of subfunctors of  $\text{Ext}^1$ , whose existence follow from results in previous sections.

### 5.1. Some computations and applications of the subfunctor $\text{Ext}_R^1(-, -)^\mu$ .

We start this subsection with a characterisation of regularity among Cohen–Macaulay rings of positive dimension  $d$  in terms of vanishing of certain  $\text{Ext}_R^1(-, -)^\mu$  (see Definition 4.9 and the discussion after 4.10 for notation).

**Theorem 5.1.1.** *Let  $R$  be a local Cohen–Macaulay ring of dimension  $d \geq 1$ . Then,  $R$  is regular if and only if  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^{d-1}k, N)^\mu = 0$  for some finitely generated non-zero  $R$ -module  $N$  of finite injective dimension.*

When  $R$  is regular, we show  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^{d-1}k, R)^\mu = 0$ , which shows one direction of Theorem 5.1.1. For this, we first need two preliminary lemmas.

**Lemma 5.1.2.** *Let  $Y$  be a submodule of an  $R$ -module  $X$  such that  $\mathfrak{m}X \subseteq Y$ . If  $X$  is cyclic and  $Y \neq X$ , then  $Y = \mathfrak{m}X$ .*

*Proof.* We prove that if  $Y \neq \mathfrak{m}X$ , then  $Y = X$ . If  $Y \neq \mathfrak{m}X$ , then pick  $y \in Y \setminus \mathfrak{m}X \subseteq X \setminus \mathfrak{m}X$ . Then,  $y$  is part of a minimal system of generators of  $X$ , but  $X$  is cyclic, so  $X = Ry$ . Also,  $Ry \subseteq Y \subseteq X$ . Hence,  $Y = X$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma 5.1.3.** *Let  $M$  be a finitely generated  $R$ -module with first Betti number 1. Then,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, \Omega_R M)^\mu = \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(M, \Omega_R M)$ .*



*Proof.*  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, \Omega_R M)^\mu$  is a submodule of  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, \Omega_R M)$  such that  $\mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(M, \Omega_R M) \subseteq \text{Ext}_R^1(M, \Omega_R M)^\mu$  by Lemma 5.2.1. By hypothesis, we have  $\Omega_R M \cong R/I$  for some ideal  $I \neq R$ , and we have an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow R/I \rightarrow F \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ , for some free  $R$ -module  $F$ . So, in particular,  $\mu(F) = \mu(M) \neq \mu(R/I) + \mu(M)$ . Hence this exact sequence is not  $\mu$ -additive. So,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, \Omega_R M)^\mu \neq \text{Ext}_R^1(M, \Omega_R M)$ . Also, applying  $\text{Hom}_R(-, R/I)$  to the exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow R/I \rightarrow F \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  we get an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(M, R/I) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(F, R/I) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(R/I, R/I) \cong R/I \rightarrow \text{Ext}_R^1(M, R/I) \cong \text{Ext}_R^1(M, \Omega_R M) \rightarrow 0$ . Hence  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, \Omega_R M)$  is a cyclic module. Now applying Lemma 5.1.2 to  $Y = \text{Ext}_R^1(M, \Omega_R M)^\mu$  and  $X = \text{Ext}_R^1(M, \Omega_R M)$ , we get  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, \Omega_R M)^\mu = \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(M, \Omega_R M)$ . ■

Now, one direction of Theorem 5.1.1 is the following.

**Corollary 5.1.4.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m}, k)$  be a regular local ring of dimension  $d \geq 1$ . Then,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^{d-1}k, R)^\mu = 0$ .*

*Proof.* We know  $\Omega_R \Omega_R^{d-1}k \cong R$  by looking at the Koszul complex of  $R/\mathfrak{m}$ , so the first Betti number of  $\Omega_R^{d-1}k$  is 1. Hence by Lemma 5.1.3 we get that,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^{d-1}k, R)^\mu = \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^{d-1}k, R) \cong \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^d(k, R) \cong \mathfrak{m} \cdot k = 0$ . ■

The other direction of Theorem 5.1.1 requires more work. First, we begin with the following setup.

5.1.5. Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m}, k)$  be a local Cohen–Macaulay ring of dimension  $d \geq 1$  admitting a canonical module  $\omega_R$ . Then,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^{d-1}k, \omega_R) \cong k$ . Hence for any two non-split exact sequences  $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^{d-1}k, \omega_R)$ , we have  $[\alpha] = r[\beta] \in \text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^{d-1}k, \omega_R)$  for some unit  $r \in R$ . So, we have the following pushout diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \alpha : 0 & \longrightarrow & \omega_R & \longrightarrow & X_\alpha & \longrightarrow & \Omega_R^{d-1}k \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \cdot r & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ \beta : 0 & \longrightarrow & \omega_R & \longrightarrow & X_\beta & \longrightarrow & \Omega_R^{d-1}k \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Since  $r \in R$  is a unit, so  $\omega \xrightarrow{\cdot r} \omega$  is an isomorphism. Hence by five lemma,  $X_\alpha \cong X_\beta$ . So, there exists a unique module (up to isomorphism), call it  $E^R$ , such that the middle term of every non-split exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow \omega_R \rightarrow X \rightarrow \Omega_R^{d-1}k \rightarrow 0$  is isomorphic to  $E^R$ . Since  $\Omega_R^{d-1}k$  has co-depth 1, so by [26, Proposition 11.21] we get that,  $0 \rightarrow \omega_R \rightarrow E^R \rightarrow \Omega_R^{d-1}k \rightarrow 0$  is the minimal MCM approximation of  $\Omega_R^{d-1}k$ .

Moving forward, we denote  $\text{Hom}_R(-, \omega_R)$  by  $(-)^{\dagger}$ .

We need to collect some properties of  $E^R$  to prove the other direction of Theorem 5.1.1.

**Lemma 5.1.6.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m}, k)$  be a local Cohen–Macaulay ring of dimension 1 admitting a canonical module  $\omega_R$ . Then,  $E^R \cong \mathfrak{m}^{\dagger}$ .*

*Proof.* Dualizing  $0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{m} \rightarrow R \rightarrow k \rightarrow 0$  by  $\omega_R$  we get,  $0 \rightarrow \omega_R \rightarrow \mathfrak{m}^{\dagger} \rightarrow \text{Ext}_R^1(k, \omega_R) \cong k \rightarrow 0$ . So, we have the exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow \omega_R \rightarrow \mathfrak{m}^{\dagger} \rightarrow k \rightarrow 0$ , which is clearly non-split, since  $\mathfrak{m}^{\dagger}$  has positive depth. But  $k \oplus \omega_R$  has depth 0. Thus,  $E^R \cong \mathfrak{m}^{\dagger}$ . ■

We record the following lemma, which will be used to deduce further properties of the module  $E^R$ .

**Lemma 5.1.7.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m}, k)$  be a local ring, and  $I$  an ideal of  $R$ , which is not principal. Then, for every  $x \in I \setminus \mathfrak{m}I$ , we have  $(x\mathfrak{m} :_{\mathfrak{m}} I) = (x\mathfrak{m} :_R I) = ((x) :_R I)$ .*

*Proof.* Since trivially  $(x\mathfrak{m} :_{\mathfrak{m}} I) \subseteq (x\mathfrak{m} :_R I) \subseteq ((x) :_R I)$  always holds, so it is enough to prove the inclusion  $((x) :_R I) \subseteq (x\mathfrak{m} :_{\mathfrak{m}} I)$ . So, let  $y \in ((x) :_R I)$ , which means  $yI \subseteq (x)$ . If  $y$  were a unit, then we would have  $I \subseteq y^{-1}(x) = (x) \subseteq I$ , implying  $I = (x)$ , contradicting our assumption that  $I$  is not principal. Thus, we must have  $y \in \mathfrak{m}$ . Now pick an arbitrary element  $r \in I$ . Then  $yr \in yI \subseteq (x)$ , so  $yr = xs$  for some  $s \in R$ . If  $s \notin \mathfrak{m}$ , then  $x = s^{-1}yr \in \mathfrak{m}I$ , which is a contradiction. Hence,  $s \in \mathfrak{m}$ . So,  $yr = xs \in x\mathfrak{m}$ . Since  $r \in I$  was arbitrary, so we get  $yI \subseteq x\mathfrak{m}$ . Hence  $y \in (x\mathfrak{m} :_{\mathfrak{m}} I)$ . ■

In the following,  $\text{r}(-)$  will denote the type of a module, i.e.,  $\text{r}(M) = \dim_k \text{Ext}_R^{\text{depth}_R M}(k, M)$ .

**Lemma 5.1.8.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m}, k)$  be a non-regular local Cohen–Macaulay ring of dimension  $d \geq 1$  admitting a canonical module  $\omega_R$ . Then, we have  $\mu(E^R) = \text{r}(R) + \mu(\Omega_R^{d-1}k)$ .*

*Proof.* We prove this by induction on  $d$ . First, let  $d = 1$ . By Lemma 5.1.6 we have  $E^R \cong \mathfrak{m}^\dagger$ . Pick  $x \in \mathfrak{m} \setminus \mathfrak{m}^2$  to be  $R$ -regular. Then  $\mu_R(E^R) = \mu_{R/xR}(E^R/xE^R)$ . Now,  $E^R/xE^R \cong \mathfrak{m}^\dagger/x\mathfrak{m}^\dagger \cong \text{Hom}_{R/xR}(\mathfrak{m}/x\mathfrak{m}, \omega_R/x\omega_R) \cong (\mathfrak{m}/x\mathfrak{m})^\dagger$  (where the last two isomorphisms follow from [3, Proposition 3.3.3(a), Theorem 3.3.5(a)]). Now,  $\text{Hom}_{R/xR}((\mathfrak{m}/x\mathfrak{m})^\dagger, k) \cong \text{Hom}_{R/xR}(k^\dagger, \mathfrak{m}/x\mathfrak{m}) \cong \text{Hom}_{R/xR}(k, \mathfrak{m}/x\mathfrak{m}) \cong (x\mathfrak{m} :_{\mathfrak{m}} \mathfrak{m})/x\mathfrak{m} = ((x) :_R \mathfrak{m})/x\mathfrak{m}$  (where the first two isomorphisms hold because  $R/xR$  is Artinian, and the last equality follows from Lemma 5.1.7 since  $R$  is not regular). Hence,  $\mu_R(E^R) = \mu_{R/xR}(E^R/xE^R) = \dim_k \text{Hom}_{R/xR}((\mathfrak{m}/x\mathfrak{m})^\dagger, k) = \dim_k((x) :_R \mathfrak{m})/x\mathfrak{m} = \dim_k((xR :_R \mathfrak{m})/xR) + \dim_k(xR/x\mathfrak{m}) = \dim_k \text{Soc}(R/xR) + \dim_k(xR/x\mathfrak{m}) = r(R) + \dim_k(xR/x\mathfrak{m})$  (since  $xR/x\mathfrak{m}$  is annihilated by  $\mathfrak{m}$ , hence it is a  $k$ -vector space). Since  $xR/x\mathfrak{m}$  is generated by  $x$ , and it is a  $k$ -vector space, so  $xR/x\mathfrak{m} \cong k$ . Hence  $\dim_k(xR/x\mathfrak{m}) = 1$ , so  $\mu(E^R) = r(R) + 1 = r(R) + \mu(k)$ . This concludes the  $d = 1$  case.

Now let,  $\dim R = d > 1$  and suppose the claim has been proved for all non-regular local Cohen–Macaulay rings of dimension  $1, \dots, d-1$  admitting a canonical module. Since  $\Omega_R^{d-1}k$  has co-depth 1, so by [26, Proposition 11.21]  $0 \rightarrow \omega_R \rightarrow E^R \rightarrow \Omega_R^{d-1}k \rightarrow 0$  is the minimal MCM approximation of  $\Omega_R^{d-1}k$ . Now pick an  $R$ -regular element  $x \in \mathfrak{m} \setminus \mathfrak{m}^2$  (which is also  $\Omega_R^{d-1}k$ -regular, since  $d-1 > 0$ ). By [37, Corollary 2.5], we have  $0 \rightarrow \omega_{R/xR} \rightarrow E^R/xE^R \rightarrow \Omega_R^{d-1}k/x(\Omega_R^{d-1}k) \rightarrow 0$  is the minimal MCM approximation of  $\Omega_R^{d-1}k/x(\Omega_R^{d-1}k) \cong \Omega_{R/xR}^{d-1}k \oplus \Omega_{R/xR}^{d-2}k$  over  $R/xR$  (the isomorphism follows from [36, Corollary 5.3]). Since  $0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \Omega_{R/xR}^{d-1}k \rightarrow \Omega_{R/xR}^{d-1}k \rightarrow 0$  is the minimal MCM approximation of  $\Omega_{R/xR}^{d-1}k$  over  $R/xR$ , and  $0 \rightarrow \omega_{R/xR} \rightarrow E^{R/xR} \rightarrow \Omega_{R/xR}^{d-2}k \rightarrow 0$  is the minimal MCM approximation of  $\Omega_{R/xR}^{d-2}k$  over  $R/xR$  (by [26, Proposition 11.21]), so their direct sum  $0 \rightarrow \omega_{R/xR} \rightarrow E^{R/xR} \oplus \Omega_{R/xR}^{d-1}k \rightarrow \Omega_{R/xR}^{d-2}k \oplus \Omega_{R/xR}^{d-1}k \rightarrow 0$  is the minimal MCM approximation of  $\Omega_{R/xR}^{d-2}k \oplus \Omega_{R/xR}^{d-1}k \cong \Omega_R^{d-1}k/x(\Omega_R^{d-1}k)$  over  $R/xR$  (direct sum preserves minimal MCM approximation by [37, Theorem 1.4]). By uniqueness of minimal MCM approximation, we have  $E^R/xE^R \cong E^{R/xR} \oplus \Omega_{R/xR}^{d-1}k$ . So,  $\mu_R(E^R) = \mu_{R/xR}(E^R/xE^R) = \mu_{R/xR}(E^{R/xR}) + \mu_{R/xR}(\Omega_{R/xR}^{d-1}k)$ . Since  $R$  is not regular, so  $R/xR$  is not regular. Hence by induction hypothesis, we have  $\mu_{R/xR}(E^{R/xR}) = r(R/xR) + \mu_{R/xR}(\Omega_{R/xR}^{d-2}k) = r(R) + \mu_{R/xR}(\Omega_{R/xR}^{d-2}k)$ . So,  $\mu_R(E^R) = r(R) + \mu_{R/xR}(\Omega_{R/xR}^{d-2}k) + \mu_{R/xR}(\Omega_{R/xR}^{d-1}k) = r(R) + \mu_{R/xR}(\Omega_{R/xR}^{d-2}k \oplus \Omega_{R/xR}^{d-1}k) = r(R) + \mu_{R/xR}(\Omega_R^{d-1}k/x(\Omega_R^{d-1}k)) = r(R) + \mu_R(\Omega_R^{d-1}k)$ . This finishes the inductive step, and hence the proof.  $\blacksquare$

Since  $\mu(\omega_R) = r(R)$ , so Lemma 5.1.8 says that the sequence  $0 \rightarrow \omega_R \rightarrow E^R \rightarrow \Omega_R^{d-1}k \rightarrow 0$  is  $\mu$ -additive. As a consequence of this, we get the following

**Proposition 5.1.9.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m}, k)$  be a non-regular local Cohen–Macaulay ring of dimension  $d \geq 1$ , and  $N$  be a finitely generated non-zero  $R$ -module with finite injective dimension. Then  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^{d-1}k, N)^\mu = \text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^{d-1}k, N) \neq 0$ .*

*Proof.* That  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^{d-1}k, N) \cong \text{Ext}_R^d(k, N) \neq 0$  follows from [3, Exercise 3.1.24]. So, it is enough to prove that  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^{d-1}k, N)^\mu = \text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^{d-1}k, N)$ .

We first consider the case where  $R$  admits a canonical module  $\omega_R$ . Consider the  $\mu$ -additive (by Lemma 5.1.8) exact sequence  $\sigma : 0 \rightarrow \omega_R \rightarrow E^R \rightarrow \Omega_R^{d-1}k \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{mod } R}^\mu$ , so applying  $\text{Hom}_R(-, N)$  to  $\sigma$ , we get the following part of a commutative diagram of exact sequences by Corollary 3.9:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{Hom}_R(\omega_R, N) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^{d-1}k, N) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}_R^1(E^R, N) \\ \parallel & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \text{Hom}_R(\omega_R, N) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^{d-1}k, N)^\mu & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}_R^1(E^R, N)^\mu \end{array}$$

Since  $E^R$  is maximal Cohen–Macaulay, so  $\text{Ext}_R^1(E^R, N) = 0$  by [3, Exercise 3.1.24]. So,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(E^R, N)^\mu = 0$  as well. Hence we get the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Hom}_R(\omega_R, N) & \xrightarrow{f} & \text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^{d-1}k, N) \longrightarrow 0 \\ \parallel & & \uparrow h \\ \text{Hom}_R(\omega_R, N) & \xrightarrow{g} & \text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^{d-1}k, N)^\mu \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Thus  $h \circ g = f$  is surjective, so  $h$  is surjective. Since  $h$  is the natural inclusion map, so  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^{d-1}k, N)^\mu = \text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^{d-1}k, N)$ .

Now we consider the general case. Since  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^{d-1}k, N)^\mu \subseteq \text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^{d-1}k, N)$ , so it is enough to prove the other inclusion. So let,  $\sigma : 0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow X \rightarrow \Omega_R^{d-1}k \rightarrow 0$  be a short exact sequence. We need to show that,  $\sigma$  is  $\mu$ -additive. Now consider the completion  $\widehat{\sigma} : 0 \rightarrow \widehat{N} \rightarrow \widehat{X} \rightarrow \widehat{\Omega_R^{d-1}k} \cong \Omega_{\widehat{R}}^{d-1}k \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $\widehat{R}$  is non-regular, Cohen–Macaulay of dimension  $d$  and admits a canonical module, and  $\widehat{N} \in \text{mod } \widehat{R}$  has finite injective dimension over  $\widehat{R}$ , so by the first part of the proof we get,  $\text{Ext}_{\widehat{R}}^1(\Omega_{\widehat{R}}^{d-1}k, \widehat{N}) = \text{Ext}_{\widehat{R}}^1(\Omega_{\widehat{R}}^{d-1}k, \widehat{N})^\mu$ . Thus,  $[\widehat{\sigma}] \in \text{Ext}_{\widehat{R}}^1(\Omega_{\widehat{R}}^{d-1}k, \widehat{N}) = \text{Ext}_{\widehat{R}}^1(\Omega_{\widehat{R}}^{d-1}k, \widehat{N})^\mu$ . Hence  $\widehat{\sigma}$  is  $\mu$ -additive. So,  $\mu_{\widehat{R}}(\widehat{N}) + \mu_{\widehat{R}}(\Omega_{\widehat{R}}^{d-1}k) = \mu_{\widehat{R}}(\widehat{X})$ . Since number of generators does not change under completion, so we get  $\mu_R(N) + \mu_R(\Omega_R^{d-1}k) = \mu_R(X)$ . Thus  $\sigma$  is  $\mu$ -additive, which is what we wanted to prove.  $\blacksquare$

*Proof. of Theorem 5.1.1:* Follows by combining Corollary 5.1.4 and Proposition 5.1.9.  $\blacksquare$

In general, when a ring (of positive depth) is not Cohen–Macaulay, we can give a characterization of the ring being regular in terms of vanishing of  $\text{Ext}_R^1(k, M)^\mu$  for some  $M \in \text{mod } R$  of finite projective dimension. For this, we first recall the definitions of weakly  $\mathfrak{m}$ -full and Burch submodules of a module from [11, Definition 3.1, 4.1] and subsequently, we relate that property to the vanishing of certain  $\text{Ext}_R^1(k, -)^\mu$ .

**Definition 5.1.10.** Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m}, k)$  be a local ring and let,  $N$  be an  $R$ -submodule of a finitely generated  $R$ -module  $M$ . Then  $N$  is called a weakly  $\mathfrak{m}$ -full submodule of  $M$  if  $(\mathfrak{m}N :_M \mathfrak{m}) = N$ . Also,  $N$  is called a Burch submodule of  $M$  if  $\mathfrak{m}(N :_M \mathfrak{m}) \neq \mathfrak{m}N$ .

**Proposition 5.1.11.** Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m}, k)$  be a local ring and let,  $N$  be an  $R$ -submodule of a finitely generated  $R$ -module  $M$  such that  $\text{Ext}_R^1(k, N)^\mu = 0$ . Then  $(\mathfrak{m}N :_M \mathfrak{m}) = N + \text{Soc}(M)$ , i.e.,  $N + \text{Soc}(M)$  is a weakly  $\mathfrak{m}$ -full submodule of  $M$ . So in particular, if we moreover have  $\text{depth}(M) > 0$ , then  $N$  is a weakly  $\mathfrak{m}$ -full submodule of  $M$ .

*Proof.* Clearly,  $N \subseteq (\mathfrak{m}N :_M \mathfrak{m})$  and  $\text{Soc}(M) = (0 :_M \mathfrak{m}) \subseteq (\mathfrak{m}N :_M \mathfrak{m})$ , so  $N + \text{Soc}(M) \subseteq (\mathfrak{m}N :_M \mathfrak{m})$ . Now if possible let, there exist an element  $f \in (\mathfrak{m}N :_M \mathfrak{m})$  such that  $f \notin N + \text{Soc}(M)$ . Then  $\mathfrak{m}f \subseteq \mathfrak{m}N \subseteq N$ , so  $\mathfrak{m}(N + Rf) = \mathfrak{m}N$ . Hence  $\frac{Rf + N}{N}$  is a non-zero (as  $f \notin N$ )  $k$ -vector space (as  $\mathfrak{m}(N + Rf) \subseteq N$ ). Moreover,  $\frac{Rf + N}{N}$  is cyclically generated by the image of  $f$  in  $M/N$ . Hence  $\frac{Rf + N}{N} \cong k$ , so we have a short exact sequence  $\sigma : 0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow Rf + N \rightarrow k \rightarrow 0$ . This sequence is  $\mu$ -additive, since  $\mu(N + Rf) = \lambda\left(\frac{N + Rf}{\mathfrak{m}(N + Rf)}\right) = \lambda\left(\frac{N + Rf}{\mathfrak{m}N}\right) = \lambda\left(\frac{N + Rf}{N}\right) + \lambda\left(\frac{N}{\mathfrak{m}N}\right) = \lambda(k) + \mu(N) = \mu(k) + \mu(N)$ . So,  $\sigma \in \text{Ext}_R^1(k, N)^\mu = 0$ . Hence  $\sigma$  splits. So,  $N + Rf = N \oplus g(k)$ , where  $g : k \rightarrow N + Rf$  is the splitting map, so  $k \cong g(k)$ . Now  $f \in N + Rf = N \oplus g(k)$ , so  $f = x + y$  for some  $x \in N$  and  $y \in g(k) \subseteq M$ . Since  $k \cong g(k)$ , so  $\mathfrak{m}g(k) = 0$ . Now  $\mathfrak{m}y \in \mathfrak{m}g(k) = 0$ , so  $y \in (0 :_M \mathfrak{m}) = \text{Soc}(M)$ . Hence  $f = x + y \in N + \text{Soc}(M)$ , which is a contradiction. This implies that  $(\mathfrak{m}N :_M \mathfrak{m}) \subseteq N + \text{Soc}(M)$ , so  $(\mathfrak{m}N :_M \mathfrak{m}) = N + \text{Soc}(M)$ . Since  $\mathfrak{m}(N + \text{Soc}(M)) = \mathfrak{m}N$ , so we get  $(\mathfrak{m}(N + \text{Soc}(M)) :_M \mathfrak{m}) = N + \text{Soc}(M)$ , which implies  $N + \text{Soc}(M)$  is a weakly  $\mathfrak{m}$ -full submodule  $M$ . Now note that, if  $\text{depth}(M) > 0$ , then  $\text{Soc}(M) = 0$ . Hence  $N + \text{Soc}(M) = N$  is a weakly  $\mathfrak{m}$ -full submodule of  $M$ .  $\blacksquare$

Now we give another characterization of regular local rings in terms of vanishing of certain  $\text{Ext}_R^1(k, -)^\mu$ .

**Theorem 5.1.12.** Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m}, k)$  be a local ring of depth  $t > 0$ . Then, the following are equivalent:

- (1)  $R$  is regular.
- (2)  $\text{Ext}_R^1(k, R/(x_1, \dots, x_{t-1})R)^\mu = 0$  for some  $R$ -regular sequence  $x_1, \dots, x_{t-1}$ .
- (3)  $\text{Ext}_R^1(k, M)^\mu = 0$  for some finitely generated  $R$ -module  $M$  of projective dimension  $t - 1$ .

*Proof.* (1)  $\implies$  (2) Since  $R$  is regular, so  $t = \dim R$ . Since  $R$  is regular, so  $\mathfrak{m}$  is generated by a regular sequence  $x_1, \dots, x_t$ . Now,  $R/(x_1, \dots, x_{t-1})R$  has projective dimension  $t - 1$  over  $R$  and the  $(t - 1)$ -th Betti number of this module is 1 (by looking at the Koszul complex). Hence,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(k, R/(x_1, \dots, x_{t-1})R) \cong \text{Tor}_{t-1}^R(k, R/(x_1, \dots, x_{t-1})R) \cong k$  by [3, Exercise 3.3.26]. Now, we have an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow R/(x_1, \dots, x_{t-1})R \xrightarrow{x_t} R/(x_1, \dots, x_{t-1})R \rightarrow R/(x_1, \dots, x_{t-1}, x_t)R \cong k \rightarrow 0$ , which is clearly not  $\mu$ -additive. Hence,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(k, R/(x_1, \dots, x_{t-1})R) \neq \text{Ext}_R^1(k, R/(x_1, \dots, x_{t-1})R)^\mu$ . Since  $\text{Ext}_R^1(k, R/(x_1, \dots, x_{t-1})R) \cong k$  is cyclic, so by Lemma 5.1.2 we get that  $\text{Ext}_R^1(k, R/(x_1, \dots, x_{t-1})R)^\mu = \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(k, R/(x_1, \dots, x_{t-1})R) = 0$ .

(2)  $\implies$  (3) Obvious.

(3)  $\implies$  (1) By Auslander-Buchsbaum formula,  $\text{depth } M = 1$ , so  $\text{Soc}(M) = 0$ . Hence by prime avoidance, we can choose  $x \in \mathfrak{m}$ , which is both  $R$  and  $M$ -regular. Then  $xM \cong M$ , so  $\text{Ext}_R^1(k, xM)^\mu \cong \text{Ext}_R^1(k, M)^\mu = 0$ . By Proposition 5.1.11 we get that,  $xM$  is a weakly  $\mathfrak{m}$ -full submodule of  $M$ . Since  $\text{depth}(M/xM) = 0$ , so  $xM$  is a Burch submodule of  $M$  by [11, Lemma 4.3]. Moreover,  $\text{pd}_{R/xR}(M/xM) = \text{pd}_R M < \infty$ , and  $\text{pd}_R R/xR < \infty$ , so  $\text{pd}_R M/xM < \infty$ . Hence  $\text{Tor}_{\geq 0}^R(k, M/xM) = 0$ . Thus,  $\text{pd}_R k < \infty$  by [11, Theorem 1.2], so  $R$  is regular.  $\blacksquare$

Next, we try to relate  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)^\mu$  to  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)$  for all  $M, N \in \text{mod } R$ , when  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  is a regular local ring of dimension 1 (i.e., a local PID). For this, we first record a preliminary lemma.

**Lemma 5.1.13.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  be a local ring and  $x \in \mathfrak{m}$  be a non-zero-divisor. Then,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(R/xR, R/I)^\mu = \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(R/xR, R/I) \cong \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{I + xR}$  for every proper ideal  $I$  of  $R$ .*

*Proof.* Calculating  $\text{Ext}_R^1(R/xR, R/I)$  from the minimal free-resolution  $0 \rightarrow R \xrightarrow{x} R \rightarrow R/xR \rightarrow 0$  of  $R/xR$ , we see that  $\text{Ext}_R^1(R/xR, R/I) \cong R/(xR + I)$  is a cyclic  $R$ -module. By Lemma 5.2.1 we have  $\mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(R/xR, R/I) \subseteq \text{Ext}_R^1(R/xR, R/I)^\mu$ . We finally claim that  $\text{Ext}_R^1(R/xR, R/I)^\mu \neq \text{Ext}_R^1(R/xR, R/I)$ . Indeed, we have an exact sequence  $\sigma : 0 \rightarrow xR/xI \rightarrow R/xI \rightarrow R/xR \rightarrow 0$ . Now, we have a natural surjection  $R \xrightarrow{r \mapsto rx + xI} xR/xI$ , whose kernel is  $\{r \in R : rx \in xI\}$ . Since  $x$  is a non-zero-divisor, so  $rx \in xI$  if and only if  $r \in I$ . Hence, the kernel is  $I$ . So,  $R/I \cong xR/xI$ . So, we get the exact sequence  $\sigma : 0 \rightarrow R/I \rightarrow R/xI \rightarrow R/xR \rightarrow 0$ . Moreover,  $\sigma$  is not  $\mu$ -additive, since  $\mu(R/xI) = 1 \neq 1 + 1 = \mu(R/I) + \mu(R/xR)$ . Thus,  $[\sigma] \in \text{Ext}_R^1(R/xR, R/I) \setminus \text{Ext}_R^1(R/xR, R/I)^\mu$ . Hence  $\text{Ext}_R^1(R/xR, R/I)^\mu = \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(R/xR, R/I)$  by Lemma 5.1.2.  $\blacksquare$

Now using this lemma, we can compare the structure of  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)^\mu$  to  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)$  for every finitely generated modules  $M, N$  over a DVR.

**Proposition 5.1.14.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  be a regular local ring of dimension 1. Then,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)^\mu = \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)$  for all finitely generated  $R$ -modules  $M$  and  $N$ . So, in particular,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(k, N)^\mu = 0$  for all finitely generated  $R$ -modules  $N$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathfrak{m} = xR$ . Then, for every finitely generated  $R$ -module  $X$ , we have  $X \cong R^{\oplus a} \oplus (\bigoplus_{i=1}^n R/x^{a_i}R)$  for some non-negative integers (depending on  $X$ )  $a, a_i$ . Now, fix arbitrary  $N \in \text{mod } R$ . Applying Lemma 2.4 to the subfunctor  $\text{Ext}_R^1(-, N)^\mu$  of  $\text{Ext}_R^1(-, N)$  and taking  $I = \mathfrak{m}$ , it is enough to prove that  $\text{Ext}_R^1(R, N)^\mu = \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(R, N)$  and  $\text{Ext}_R^1(R/x^l R, N)^\mu = \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(R/x^l R, N)$  for every integer  $l \geq 1$ . Now  $\text{Ext}_R^1(R, N)^\mu = \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(R, N)$  is obvious, as both sides are zero. Now to prove  $\text{Ext}_R^1(R/x^l R, N)^\mu = \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(R/x^l R, N)$  for every integer  $l \geq 1$ , first fix an  $l \geq 1$ , and look at the subfunctor  $\text{Ext}_R^1(R/x^l R, -)^\mu$  of  $\text{Ext}_R^1(R/x^l R, -)$ . Again by the structure of finitely generated  $R$ -modules and Lemma 2.4, it is enough to prove that  $\text{Ext}_R^1(R/x^l R, R)^\mu = \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(R/x^l R, R)$  and  $\text{Ext}_R^1(R/x^l R, R/x^b R)^\mu = \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(R/x^l R, R/x^b R)$  for every integer  $b \geq 1$ . Now these later equalities follow from Lemma 5.1.13, since  $x$  is a non-zero-divisor.  $\blacksquare$

When restricting to short exact sequences in  $\text{Ext}^1$ , on which certain more subadditive functions, other than  $\mu(-)$ , is also additive, then one obtains vanishing of the corresponding submodule of  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, F)$  for any free  $R$ -module  $F$ . We make this precise in Proposition 5.1.16, whose proof uses the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.1.15.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  be a local Cohen–Macaulay ring of dimension 1. Let  $x \in \mathfrak{m}$  be  $R$ -regular. Let  $\sigma : 0 \rightarrow F_1 \rightarrow F_2 \oplus \frac{R}{x^a R} \rightarrow \frac{R}{x^b R} \rightarrow 0$  be a short exact sequence, where  $a, b > 0$  and  $F_1, F_2$  are free*

$R$ -modules such that  $\text{rank}(F_2) \leq \text{rank}(F_1)$ . Let  $c$  be an integer such that  $c \geq b$  and  $\sigma \otimes \frac{R}{x^c R}$  is short exact. Then  $a = b$  and  $\text{rank}(F_2) = \text{rank}(F_1)$ . So, in particular,  $\sigma$  is split exact.

*Proof.* First we will show that,  $a \leq b$ . Dualizing  $\sigma$  by  $R$ , we get the following part of a long exact sequence:  $\text{Ext}_R^1\left(\frac{R}{x^b R}, R\right) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_R^1\left(\frac{R}{x^a R}, R\right) \rightarrow 0$ . Now, since  $x^a \in \mathfrak{m}$  is  $R$ -regular, so by taking the resolution  $0 \rightarrow R \xrightarrow{x^a} R \rightarrow \frac{R}{x^a R} \rightarrow 0$  of  $\frac{R}{x^a R}$ , and dualizing by  $R$ , and calculating the cohomology we get that,  $\text{Ext}_R^1\left(\frac{R}{x^a R}, R\right) \cong \frac{R}{x^a R}$ . Similarly,  $\text{Ext}_R^1\left(\frac{R}{x^b R}, R\right) \cong \frac{R}{x^b R}$ . Hence we have the exact sequence  $\frac{R}{x^b R} \rightarrow \frac{R}{x^a R} \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $x^b$  annihilates  $\frac{R}{x^b R}$ , so  $x^b$  annihilates  $\frac{R}{x^a R}$  as well, which implies  $x^b R \subseteq x^a R$ . Since  $x \in \mathfrak{m}$  is  $R$ -regular and  $a, b > 0$ , so  $x^b R \subseteq x^a R$  implies that  $a \leq b$ . Next let,  $F_i \cong R^{\oplus l_i}$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Since  $\sigma \otimes \frac{R}{x^c R}$  is short exact, so we have the following short exact sequence  $\sigma \otimes \frac{R}{x^c R} : 0 \rightarrow \left(\frac{R}{x^c R}\right)^{\oplus l_1} \rightarrow \left(\frac{R}{x^c R}\right)^{\oplus l_2} \oplus \frac{R}{x^a R} \rightarrow \frac{R}{x^b R} \rightarrow 0$ , where we have used that  $\frac{R}{x^c R} \otimes \frac{R}{x^a R} \cong \frac{R}{x^c R + x^a R} \cong \frac{R}{x^a R}$  and  $\frac{R}{x^c R} \otimes \frac{R}{x^b R} \cong \frac{R}{x^c R + x^b R} \cong \frac{R}{x^b R}$ , as  $a \leq b \leq c$ . Since  $R$  is local Cohen–Macaulay of dimension 1 and  $x \in \mathfrak{m}$  is  $R$ -regular, so  $x^a R, x^b R, x^c R$  are  $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideals. Hence by calculating the length along the short exact sequence  $\sigma \otimes \frac{R}{x^c R}$  we get that,  $\lambda\left(\frac{R}{x^b R}\right) - \lambda\left(\frac{R}{x^a R}\right) = (l_2 - l_1)\lambda\left(\frac{R}{x^c R}\right)$ . Since  $x^b R \subseteq x^a R$ , so  $\lambda\left(\frac{R}{x^b R}\right) \geq \lambda\left(\frac{R}{x^a R}\right)$ . Hence  $\lambda\left(\frac{R}{x^b R}\right) - \lambda\left(\frac{R}{x^a R}\right) \geq 0$ . Also,  $\text{rank}(F_2) \leq \text{rank}(F_1)$  implies  $l_2 \leq l_1$ , so  $(l_2 - l_1)\lambda\left(\frac{R}{x^c R}\right) \leq 0$ . Hence  $\lambda\left(\frac{R}{x^b R}\right) - \lambda\left(\frac{R}{x^a R}\right) = 0$ , which implies  $(l_2 - l_1)\lambda\left(\frac{R}{x^c R}\right) = 0$ . Now if  $\lambda\left(\frac{R}{x^c R}\right) = 0$ , then  $R = x^c R$ , which isn't possible, as  $x^c \in \mathfrak{m}$ . So,  $l_1 = l_2$ . Hence  $\text{rank}(F_2) = \text{rank}(F_1)$ . Next, consider the short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow \frac{x^a R}{x^b R} \rightarrow \frac{R}{x^b R} \rightarrow \frac{R}{x^a R} \rightarrow 0$ . Then by calculating the length along this short exact sequence and using  $\lambda\left(\frac{R}{x^b R}\right) = \lambda\left(\frac{R}{x^a R}\right)$ , we get that  $\lambda\left(\frac{x^a R}{x^b R}\right) = 0$ , which implies  $x^a R = x^b R$ . Since  $x \in \mathfrak{m}$  is  $R$ -regular and  $a, b > 0$ , so we have  $a = b$ . Finally, since  $\text{rank}(F_2) = \text{rank}(F_1)$  and  $a = b$ , so  $\sigma$  is split exact.  $\blacksquare$

Given a family of functions  $\phi_i : \text{mod } R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ , we define  $\mathcal{S}^{\{\phi_i\}_i} := \cap_i \mathcal{S}^{\phi_i}$ , which is an intersection of exact substructures. Hence it defines an exact substructure on  $\text{mod } R$ . We denote the corresponding subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}^1$  by  $\text{Ext}_R^1(-, -)^{\{\phi_i\}_i}$ , which will be used in the following proposition. Note that,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)^{\{\phi_i\}_i}$  is nothing but the  $R$ -submodule  $\cap_i \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)^{\phi_i}$  of  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)$ . In the following, for a finite length  $R$ -module  $M$ ,  $\ell(M)$  will stand for the smallest integer  $n \geq 0$  such that  $\mathfrak{m}^n M = 0$ .

**Proposition 5.1.16.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  be a regular local ring of dimension 1. Let  $L \in \text{mod}(R)$ . Let  $c$  be an integer such that  $c \geq \ell(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^0(L))$ . Consider the function  $\phi_L(-) := \lambda\left(\frac{R}{\mathfrak{m}^c} \otimes -\right) : \text{mod}(R) \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ . Then for any free  $R$ -module  $F$  we have,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(L, F)^{\mu, \phi_L} = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Note that,  $R$  is not a field, since  $\dim R = 1$ . Since  $R$  is a regular local ring, so we have  $L \cong G \oplus L'$ , where  $G$  is a finite free  $R$ -module, and  $L'$  is a  $R$  module of finite length. We have  $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^0(L) \cong L'$ . Since  $\text{Ext}_R^1(L, F)^{\mu, \phi_L} \cong \text{Ext}_R^1(G, F)^{\mu, \phi_L} \oplus \text{Ext}_R^1(L', F)^{\mu, \phi_L} \cong \text{Ext}_R^1(L', F)^{\mu, \phi_L}$ , so we may replace  $L$  by  $L'$ , and consider w.l.o.g that  $L$  has finite length, and  $c \geq \ell(L)$ . For simplicity we denote  $\phi_L = \phi$ . Now it is enough to show that,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(L, R)^{\mu, \phi} = 0$ . Since  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  is a regular local ring of dimension 1, so  $R$  is a PID. Hence  $\mathfrak{m} = xR$  for some  $x \neq 0$ . Since  $L$  is a finite length module, so by structure theorem we have,  $L \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \frac{R}{x^{b_i} R}$ , where  $b_i > 0$ . So,  $\ell(L) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} b_i$ . Hence it is enough to show that,  $\text{Ext}_R^1\left(\frac{R}{x^{b_i} R}, R\right)^{\mu, \phi} = 0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Fix an  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  and consider a short exact sequence  $\sigma : 0 \rightarrow R \rightarrow X \rightarrow \frac{R}{x^{b_i} R} \rightarrow 0$  in  $\text{Ext}_R^1\left(\frac{R}{x^{b_i} R}, R\right)^{\mu, \phi}$ . We also have  $X \cong R^{\oplus s} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=1}^t \frac{R}{x^{a_j} R}$ , where  $a_j > 0$ . Since  $\sigma$  is  $\mu$ -additive, so  $s + t = \mu(X) = 2$ . Hence three cases are possible: either  $s = t = 1$  or  $s = 0, t = 2$  or  $s = 2, t = 0$ . First let,  $s = 2, t = 0$ , which means  $X \cong R^{\oplus 2}$ . So, we have the short exact sequence  $\sigma : 0 \rightarrow R \rightarrow R^{\oplus 2} \rightarrow \frac{R}{x^{b_i} R} \rightarrow 0$ . Also, we have the following short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow R \xrightarrow{\cdot x^{b_i}} R \rightarrow \frac{R}{x^{b_i} R} \rightarrow 0$  (as  $x \neq 0$  and  $R$  is an integral domain). Hence by Schanuel's lemma we get that,  $R \oplus R \cong R^{\oplus 2} \oplus R$ , which is a contradiction. Next let,  $s = 0, t = 2$ , which means  $X \cong \bigoplus_{j=1}^2 \frac{R}{x^{a_j} R}$ . Then we have the short exact sequence  $\sigma : 0 \rightarrow R \rightarrow \bigoplus_{j=1}^2 \frac{R}{x^{a_j} R} \rightarrow \frac{R}{x^{b_i} R} \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $\bigoplus_{j=1}^2 \frac{R}{x^{a_j} R}$  has finite length, so we get that  $R$  has finite length, which is a contradiction. Hence  $s = t = 1$ , so  $X \cong R \oplus \frac{R}{x^a R}$  for some  $a = a_j$ . So, we have the short exact sequence  $\sigma : 0 \rightarrow R \rightarrow R \oplus \frac{R}{x^a R} \rightarrow \frac{R}{x^{b_i} R} \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $\sigma$  is  $\phi$ -additive, so by calculating the length along the exact sequence  $\sigma \otimes \frac{R}{\mathfrak{m}^c} = \sigma \otimes \frac{R}{x^c R}$  we get that, the sequence  $\sigma \otimes \frac{R}{x^c R}$  is short exact (by Lemma 4.11). Since  $c \geq \ell(L) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} b_i$ , so  $c \geq b_i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Hence by applying Lemma 5.1.15 on  $\sigma$  we get that,  $\sigma$  is split exact. Since  $\sigma$  is an

arbitrary element of  $\text{Ext}_R^1\left(\frac{R}{x^{b_i}R}, R\right)^{\mu, \phi}$ , so  $\text{Ext}_R^1\left(\frac{R}{x^{b_i}R}, R\right)^{\mu, \phi} = 0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . This implies that,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(L, R)^{\mu, \phi} = 0$ , so  $\text{Ext}_R^1(L, F)^{\mu, \phi} = 0$ .  $\blacksquare$

Taking  $L = k$ ,  $c = 1 = \ell\ell(k)$ , we see that  $\phi_L(-) = \mu(-)$  in Proposition 5.1.16. So, we also get another proof of Corollary 5.1.4 in dimension 1.

Next we compare  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, R)^\mu$  with  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, R)$ . In arbitrary dimension, we only consider this for local Cohen–Macaulay rings of minimal multiplicity. We first record some general preliminary lemmas.

**Lemma 5.1.17.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m}, k)$  be a local ring such that  $\mathfrak{m}^2 = 0$ ,  $\mathfrak{m} \neq 0$ . Let  $e := \mu(\mathfrak{m})$ . Then  $\mu(\omega_R) = e$ ,  $\mu(\Omega_R\omega_R) = e^2 - 1$  and  $\Omega_R\omega_R \cong k^{\oplus(e^2-1)}$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathfrak{m}^2 = 0$  and  $\mathfrak{m} \neq 0$ , so  $\mathfrak{m} \subseteq (0 :_R \mathfrak{m}) \subsetneq R$ . Hence  $\mathfrak{m} = (0 :_R \mathfrak{m})$ . Then we have  $\mu(\omega_R) = r(R) = \dim_k(0 :_R \mathfrak{m}) = \dim_k \mathfrak{m} = \dim_k\left(\frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{m}^2}\right) = \mu(\mathfrak{m}) = e$ . Also note that,  $\lambda(R) = \lambda\left(\frac{R}{\mathfrak{m}^2}\right) = \lambda\left(\frac{R}{\mathfrak{m}}\right) + \lambda\left(\frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{m}^2}\right) = 1 + \mu(\mathfrak{m})$ . Next, consider the short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow \Omega_R\omega_R \rightarrow R^{\oplus\mu(\omega_R)} \rightarrow \omega_R \rightarrow 0$ , so  $\Omega_R\omega_R \subseteq \mathfrak{m}R^{\oplus\mu(\omega_R)}$ . Hence  $\mathfrak{m}\Omega_R\omega_R = 0$ . This implies that,  $\mu(\Omega_R\omega_R) = \lambda\left(\frac{\Omega_R\omega_R}{\mathfrak{m}\Omega_R\omega_R}\right) = \lambda(\Omega_R\omega_R) = \lambda(R^{\oplus\mu(\omega_R)}) - \lambda(\omega_R) = \mu(\omega_R)\lambda(R) - \lambda(R) = \lambda(R)(\mu(\omega_R) - 1) = \lambda(R)(\mu(\mathfrak{m}) - 1) = (1 + \mu(\mathfrak{m}))(\mu(\mathfrak{m}) - 1) = e^2 - 1$ , where  $\lambda(\omega_R) = \lambda(R)$  follows from Matlis duality.  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma 5.1.18.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m}, k)$  be a local ring and let,  $M$  be a finitely generated  $R$ -module. If  $x$  is  $M$ -regular, then  $\frac{\Omega_RM}{x\Omega_RM} \cong \Omega_{R/xR}\left(\frac{M}{xM}\right)$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $x$  is  $M$ -regular, so  $\text{Tor}_1^R(M, \frac{R}{xR}) = 0$ . Hence tensoring the short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow \Omega_RM \rightarrow R^{\oplus\mu_R(M)} \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  with  $R/xR$ , we get the exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow \frac{\Omega_RM}{x\Omega_RM} \rightarrow \left(\frac{R}{xR}\right)^{\oplus\mu_R(M)} \rightarrow \frac{M}{xM} \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $\mu_R(M) = \mu_{\frac{R}{xR}}\left(\frac{M}{xM}\right)$ , so  $\frac{\Omega_RM}{x\Omega_RM} \cong \Omega_{R/xR}\left(\frac{M}{xM}\right)$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Proposition 5.1.19.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m}, k)$  be a local Cohen–Macaulay ring of minimal multiplicity admitting a canonical module  $\omega_R$  and also let,  $\mathfrak{m} \neq 0$ . Then  $\mu((\Omega_R\omega_R)^\dagger) = r(R)^2 - 1$ .*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we may pass to the faithfully flat extension  $S := R[X]_{\mathfrak{m}[X]}$  and assume the residue field is infinite.

We will prove the claim by induction on  $\dim R = d$ . First let,  $d = 0$ . Since  $R$  has minimal multiplicity, so  $\mathfrak{m}^2 = 0$ . Hence by Lemma 5.1.17 we get that,  $\Omega_R\omega_R \cong k^{\oplus(r(R)^2-1)}$ . This implies  $(\Omega_R\omega_R)^\dagger \cong k^{\oplus(r(R)^2-1)}$ , so  $\mu((\Omega_R\omega_R)^\dagger) = r(R)^2 - 1$ . Now let,  $\dim R = d \geq 1$  and let, the claim be true for rings with dimension  $d - 1$ . Let  $x \in \mathfrak{m}$  be such that  $\mathfrak{m}^2 = (x, x_1, \dots, x_{d-1})\mathfrak{m}$ . So,  $\frac{R}{xR}$  has minimal multiplicity. Now we have

$$\frac{(\Omega_R\omega_R)^\dagger}{x(\Omega_R\omega_R)^\dagger} \cong \left(\frac{\Omega_R\omega_R}{x\Omega_R\omega_R}\right)^\dagger \cong \left(\Omega_{\frac{R}{xR}}\left(\frac{\omega_R}{x\omega_R}\right)\right)^\dagger \cong \left(\Omega_{\frac{R}{xR}}\omega_{\frac{R}{xR}}\right)^\dagger$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_R((\Omega_R\omega_R)^\dagger) &= \mu_{\frac{R}{xR}}\left(\frac{(\Omega_R\omega_R)^\dagger}{x(\Omega_R\omega_R)^\dagger}\right) = \mu_{\frac{R}{xR}}\left(\left(\Omega_{\frac{R}{xR}}\omega_{\frac{R}{xR}}\right)^\dagger\right) \\ &= r\left(\frac{R}{xR}\right)^2 - 1 \text{ [By induction hypothesis]} \\ &= r(R)^2 - 1 \end{aligned}$$

**Proposition 5.1.20.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m}, k)$  be a local Cohen–Macaulay ring of minimal multiplicity admitting a canonical module  $\omega_R$ . Then the exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow R \rightarrow \omega_R^{\oplus\mu(\omega_R)} \rightarrow (\Omega_R\omega_R)^\dagger \rightarrow 0$  is  $\mu$ -additive.*

*Proof.* Consider the exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow \Omega_R\omega_R \rightarrow R^{\oplus\mu(\omega_R)} \rightarrow \omega_R \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\omega_R, \omega_R) = 0$ , so we have the exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow R \rightarrow \omega_R^{\oplus\mu(\omega_R)} \rightarrow (\Omega_R\omega_R)^\dagger \rightarrow 0$ . From Proposition 5.1.19 we have,  $\mu((\Omega_R\omega_R)^\dagger) = r(R)^2 - 1 = \mu(\omega_R)^2 - \mu(R) = \mu(\omega_R^{\oplus\mu(\omega_R)}) - \mu(R)$ . Hence  $0 \rightarrow R \rightarrow \omega_R^{\oplus\mu(\omega_R)} \rightarrow (\Omega_R\omega_R)^\dagger \rightarrow 0$  is  $\mu$ -additive.  $\blacksquare$

**Proposition 5.1.21.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m}, k)$  be a local Cohen–Macaulay ring of minimal multiplicity. Then  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, F) = \text{Ext}_R^1(M, F)^\mu$  for any maximal Cohen–Macaulay  $R$ -module  $M$  and any finitely generated free  $R$ -module  $F$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.4, it is enough to prove the claim for  $F = R$ .

We first consider the case when  $R$  has a canonical module  $\omega_R$ . Consider the  $\mu$ -additive (by Proposition 5.1.20) exact sequence  $\sigma : 0 \rightarrow R \rightarrow \omega_R^{\oplus \mu(\omega_R)} \rightarrow (\Omega_R \omega_R)^\dagger \rightarrow 0$ . Applying  $\text{Hom}_R(M, -)$  to  $\sigma$ , we get the following part of a commutative diagram of exact sequences by Corollary 3.9:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{Hom}_R(M, (\Omega_R \omega_R)^\dagger) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}_R^1(M, R) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}_R^1(M, \omega_R^{\oplus \mu(\omega_R)}) \\ \parallel & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \text{Hom}_R(M, (\Omega_R \omega_R)^\dagger) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}_R^1(M, R)^\mu & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}_R^1(M, \omega_R^{\oplus \mu(\omega_R)})^\mu \end{array}$$

Since  $\omega_R$  has finite injective dimension, so  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, \omega_R^{\oplus \mu(\omega_R)}) = 0$  by [3, Exercise 3.1.24]. So,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, \omega_R^{\oplus \mu(\omega_R)})^\mu = 0$  as well. Hence we get the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{Hom}_R(M, (\Omega_R \omega_R)^\dagger) & \xrightarrow{f} & \text{Ext}_R^1(M, R) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \parallel & & \uparrow h & & \\ \text{Hom}_R(M, (\Omega_R \omega_R)^\dagger) & \xrightarrow{g} & \text{Ext}_R^1(M, R)^\mu & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

Thus  $h \circ g = f$  is surjective, so  $h$  is surjective. Since  $h$  is the natural inclusion map, so  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, R) = \text{Ext}_R^1(M, R)^\mu$ .

Now we consider the general case. Since  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, R)^\mu \subseteq \text{Ext}_R^1(M, R)$ , so it is enough to prove the other inclusion. So let,  $\sigma : 0 \rightarrow R \rightarrow X \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  be an exact sequence. We need to show  $\sigma$  is  $\mu$ -additive. Now consider the completion  $\widehat{\sigma} : 0 \rightarrow \widehat{R} \rightarrow \widehat{X} \rightarrow \widehat{M} \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $\widehat{R}$  is Cohen–Macaulay, having minimal multiplicity, admitting a canonical module, and  $\widehat{M}$  is maximal Cohen–Macaulay over  $\widehat{R}$ , so by the first part of the proof, we get  $\text{Ext}_{\widehat{R}}^1(\widehat{M}, \widehat{R}) = \text{Ext}_{\widehat{R}}^1(\widehat{M}, \widehat{R})^\mu$ . Thus,  $[\widehat{\sigma}] \in \text{Ext}_{\widehat{R}}^1(\widehat{M}, \widehat{R}) = \text{Ext}_{\widehat{R}}^1(\widehat{M}, \widehat{R})^\mu$ , hence  $\widehat{\sigma}$  is  $\mu$ -additive. Since number of generators does not change under completion, so  $\sigma$  is  $\mu$ -additive, which is what we wanted to prove.  $\blacksquare$

**Corollary 5.1.22.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m}, k)$  be a local Cohen–Macaulay ring of dimension  $d$  and minimal multiplicity. If  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^d k, R)^\mu = 0$ , then  $R$  is a hypersurface.*

*Proof.* By Proposition 5.1.21 we have,  $\text{Ext}_R^{d+1}(k, R) \cong \text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^d k, R) = \text{Ext}_R^1(\Omega_R^d k, R)^\mu = 0$ . Hence  $R$  has finite injective dimension, so  $R$  is Gorenstein. Since  $R$  has minimal multiplicity, so  $R$  is a hypersurface.  $\blacksquare$

One can also detect when a local ring has depth 0 by comparing  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, R)$  to  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, R)^\mu$  as shown in the following proposition. In the following,  $\text{Tr}(-)$  stands for Auslander transpose (see [26, Definition 12.3]).

**Proposition 5.1.23.** *Let  $I$  be an ideal of a local ring  $(R, \mathfrak{m}, k)$ . Then,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Tr}(R/I), R/\text{ann}_R(I))^\mu = \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Tr}(R/I), R/\text{ann}_R(I))$ . Moreover, the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\text{depth } R = 0$ .
- (2)  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, F)^\mu = \text{Ext}_R^1(M, F)$  for all finitely generated  $R$ -modules  $M$  and  $F$ , where  $F$  is free.
- (3)  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Tr } k, R)^\mu = \text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Tr } k, R)$ .

*Proof.* First we prove,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Tr}(R/I), R/\text{ann}_R(I))^\mu = \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Tr}(R/I), R/\text{ann}_R(I))$ . We may assume  $\text{Tr}(R/I)$  is non-free. Dualizing the exact sequence  $R^{\oplus \mu(I)} \rightarrow R \xrightarrow{\pi} R/I \rightarrow 0$  by  $R$ , we get  $0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(R/I, R) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} R \rightarrow R^{\oplus \mu(I)} \rightarrow \text{Tr}(R/I) \rightarrow 0$ . Under the natural identification  $\text{Hom}_R(R/I, R) \cong \text{ann}_R(I)$ , the map  $\text{Hom}_R(R/I, R) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} R$  can be identified with the inclusion map  $\text{ann}_R(I) \rightarrow R$ , giving us  $0 \rightarrow \text{ann}_R(I) \rightarrow R \rightarrow R^{\oplus \mu(I)} \rightarrow \text{Tr}(R/I) \rightarrow 0$ . Hence, we get an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow R/\text{ann}_R(I) \rightarrow R^{\oplus \mu(I)} \rightarrow \text{Tr}(R/I) \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $\text{Tr}(R/I)$  is non-free, so this sequence gives us  $\Omega_R \text{Tr}(R/I) \cong R/\text{ann}_R(I)$  and the first Betti number of  $\text{Tr}(R/I)$  is 1. Hence,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Tr}(R/I), R/\text{ann}_R(I))^\mu = \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Tr}(R/I), R/\text{ann}_R(I))$  by Lemma 5.1.3.

Now we prove the equivalence of the three conditions as follows:

(1)  $\implies$  (2): Let  $\sigma : 0 \rightarrow F \rightarrow X \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  be an exact sequence, where  $F$  is a finitely generated free  $R$ -module. Since  $\text{depth } R = 0$ , so  $k$  embeds inside  $R$ , i.e.,  $k$  is torsionless. Hence  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Tr } k, R) = 0$  by [26, Proposition 12.5]. Hence,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Tr } k, F) = 0$ . So, we get an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(\text{Tr } k, F) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(\text{Tr } k, X) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(\text{Tr } k, M) \rightarrow 0$ . Then by [32, Theorem 8.3] we get that, the sequence  $0 \rightarrow F \otimes_R k \rightarrow X \otimes_R k \rightarrow M \otimes_R k \rightarrow 0$  is also exact, which means  $\sigma$  is  $\mu$ -additive. Thus  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, F)^\mu = \text{Ext}_R^1(M, F)$ .

(2)  $\implies$  (3) Obvious.

(3)  $\implies$  (1): Assume  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Tr } k, R)^\mu = \text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Tr } k, R)$ . Now if possible let,  $\text{depth } R > 0$ . Then  $\mathfrak{m}$  contains a non-zero-divisor, so  $\text{ann}_R(\mathfrak{m}) = 0$ . Then by the first part of this proposition, we get  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Tr } k, R)^\mu = \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Tr } k, R)$ . Hence  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Tr } k, R) = \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Tr } k, R)$ . Then by Nakayama's lemma,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Tr } k, R) = 0$ . Hence by [26, Proposition 12.5], we have an embedding  $k \rightarrow k^{**}$ . Consequently,  $k^* \neq 0$ , i.e.,  $\text{depth } R = 0$ .  $\blacksquare$

For general local Cohen–Macaulay rings of dimension 1, we now show that if  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, R)^\mu = 0$  for some  $I$ -Ulrich module ([10, Definition 4.1])  $M \subseteq Q(R)$  containing a non-zero-divisor of  $R$ , then  $I$  is principal. For this, we first need the following lemma. For the remainder of this section, given  $R$ -submodules  $M, N$  of  $Q(R)$ , by  $(M : N)$  we will mean  $\{x \in Q(R) : xN \subseteq M\}$ .

**Lemma 5.1.24.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  be a local Cohen–Macaulay ring of dimension 1. Let  $I$  be an  $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideal of  $R$  admitting a principal reduction  $a \in I$ . Assume  $(I : I) = R$ . If  $M \subseteq Q(R)$  is an  $I$ -Ulrich module, and contains a non-zero-divisor of  $R$ , then the natural inclusion map  $\text{Hom}_R(M, (a)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(M, I)$ , induced by the inclusion  $(a) \rightarrow I$ , is an isomorphism.*

*Proof.* The natural inclusion  $0 \rightarrow (a) \xrightarrow{i} I$  induces the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}_R(M, (a)) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}_R(M, I) \\ & & \alpha \rightarrow \{x \mapsto \alpha x\} \uparrow & & \uparrow \alpha \rightarrow \{x \mapsto \alpha x\} \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & ((a) : M) & \longrightarrow & (I : M) \end{array}$$

where the rows are natural inclusion maps, and the vertical arrows are isomorphisms due to [25, Proposition 2.4(1)]. So, it is enough to show that  $(I : M) \subseteq ((a) : M)$ . Indeed, if  $x \in (I : M)$ , then  $xM \subseteq I$ . Since  $M$  is  $I$ -Ulrich, so  $M$  is a  $B(I) = R \left[ \frac{I}{a} \right]$ -module ([10, Remark 4.4, Theorem 4.6]). So,  $\frac{I}{a}M \subseteq M$ , so  $\frac{I}{a}xM \subseteq xM \subseteq I$ . Hence  $\frac{1}{a}xM \subseteq (I : I) = R$ , so  $xM \subseteq (a)$ . Thus  $x \in ((a) : M)$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Proposition 5.1.25.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  be a local Cohen–Macaulay ring of dimension 1. Let  $I$  be an  $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideal of  $R$  admitting a principal reduction  $a \in I$ . Assume  $(I : I) = R$ . If there exists an  $I$ -Ulrich module  $M \subseteq Q(R)$ , containing a non-zero-divisor of  $R$  such that  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, R)^\mu = 0$ , then  $I \cong R$ .*

*Proof.* Consider the short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow (a) \xrightarrow{i} I \rightarrow I/(a) \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $I^{n+1} = aI^n$  for all  $n \gg 0$ , and  $I$  contains a non-zero-divisor, so  $a$  is a non-zero-divisor, so  $(a) \cong R$ . If  $a \in \mathfrak{m}I$ , then  $I^{n+1} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}I^n = \mathfrak{m}I^{n+1}$ , which implies  $I^{n+1} = 0$  by Nakayama's lemma. This contradicts the fact that  $I$  is  $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary. So,  $a \notin \mathfrak{m}I$ , hence  $\mu(I/(a)) = \mu(I) - 1$ . Hence, the above short exact sequence is  $\mu$ -additive. So, by Corollary 3.9 we get the following induced exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(M, (a)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(M, I) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(M, I/(a)) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_R^1(M, (a))^\mu \cong \text{Ext}_R^1(M, R)^\mu = 0$$

where the induced map  $\text{Hom}_R(M, (a)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(M, I)$  is an isomorphism by Lemma 5.1.24. Hence we get  $\text{Hom}_R(M, I/(a)) = 0$ . Now  $I/(a)$  has finite length. So, if  $I/(a) \neq 0$ , then  $\text{Ass}(I/(a)) = \{\mathfrak{m}\}$ . Hence  $\text{Ass}(\text{Hom}_R(M, I/(a))) = \text{Supp}(M) \cap \text{Ass}(I/(a)) = \text{Supp}(M) \cap \{\mathfrak{m}\} = \{\mathfrak{m}\}$ , contradicting  $\text{Hom}_R(M, I/(a)) = 0$ . Thus, we must have  $I/(a) = 0$ , i.e.,  $I = (a) \cong R$ .  $\blacksquare$

## 5.2. Some applications of the subfunctor $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}_I(R)}^1(-, -)$ .

Let  $I$  be an  $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideal. In this subsection, we give various applications of the subfunctor  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}_I^s(R)}^1(-, -) : \text{Ul}_I^s(R)^{op} \times \text{Ul}_I^s(R) \rightarrow \text{mod } R$  (see 4.8 for notation), where we recall from Corollary 4.6 that,  $\text{Ul}_I^s(R)$  along with its all short exact sequences form an exact subcategory of  $\text{mod } R$ . Hence



$\text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}_I^s(R)}^1(-, -) : \text{Ul}_I^s(R)^{\text{op}} \times \text{Ul}_I^s(R) \rightarrow \text{mod } R$  is a subfunctor of  $\text{Ext}_R^1(-, -) : \text{Ul}_I^s(R)^{\text{op}} \times \text{Ul}_I^s(R) \rightarrow \text{mod } R$  by Proposition 3.8.

We begin by observing a general connection between  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)$  and  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)^{\nu_I}$ , where  $M, N \in \text{mod } R$  and  $\nu_I(-) := \lambda((-) \otimes_R R/I) : \text{mod } R \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  and (see Definition 4.9 for notation of  $\text{Ext}_R^1(-, -)^\phi$ ).

**Lemma 5.2.1.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  be a Noetherian local ring, and  $I$  be an  $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideal. Then,  $I \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N) \subseteq \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)^{\nu_I}$  for all  $M, N \in \text{mod } R$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\sigma : 0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow X \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  be a short exact sequence in  $I \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)$ . Then  $\sigma \otimes_R R/I$  splits by [35, Theorem 1.1], so  $M/IM \oplus N/IN \cong X/IX$ . Hence taking length we get,  $\lambda(M/IM) + \lambda(N/IN) = \lambda(X/IX)$ , so  $\sigma$  is  $\nu_I$ -additive. ■

This allows us to prove a general connection between  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}_I^s(R)}^1(M, N)$  and  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)^{\nu_I}$ , when  $M, N \in \text{Ul}_I^s(R)$  (recall the definition of  $\text{Ul}_I^s(R)$  from Definition 4.4).

**Lemma 5.2.2.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  be a local ring,  $s \geq 0$  be an integer and  $I$  an  $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideal. Then,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)^{\nu_I} = \text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}_I^s(R)}^1(M, N)$  for all  $M, N \in \text{Ul}_I^s(R)$ . So, in particular,  $I \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N) \subseteq \text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}_I^s(R)}^1(M, N)$  for all  $M, N \in \text{Ul}_I^s(R)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $M, N \in \text{Ul}_I^s(R)$ , and  $\sigma : 0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow X \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  be a short exact sequence of  $R$ -modules. Then  $X \in \text{CM}^s(R)$  (see 4.2), and  $\lambda(M/IM) + \lambda(N/IN) = e_R(I, M) + e_R(I, N) = e_R(I, X)$ . Now,  $\sigma \in \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)^{\nu_I}$ , if and only if  $\lambda(X/IX) = \lambda(M/IM) + \lambda(N/IN)$ , if and only if  $\lambda(X/IX) = e_R(I, X)$ , if and only if  $X \in \text{Ul}_I^s(R)$  if and only if  $\sigma \in \text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}_I^s(R)}^1(M, N)$ . This proves the desired equality  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)^{\nu_I} = \text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}_I^s(R)}^1(M, N)$ . The last inclusion in the statement now follows from this and Lemma 5.2.1. ■

When  $R$  is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension 1 and  $M, N \in \text{Ul}_I(R)$ , then one can improve the inclusion  $I \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N) \subseteq \text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}_I(R)}^1(M, N)$  of Lemma 5.2.2 quite a bit. For this, we first record a general lemma about trace ideals. In the following, we say that  $\frac{a}{b} \in Q(R)$  is a non-zero-divisor if  $a$  is a non-zero-divisor in  $R$ . Note that, this does not depend on the choice of representative, since  $\frac{a}{b} = \frac{a'}{b'}$  in  $Q(R)$  implies  $ab' = a'b$ , and since  $b, b'$  are non-zero-divisors in  $R$ , so  $a$  is a non-zero-divisor in  $R$  if and only if  $a'$  is a non-zero-divisor in  $R$ .

**Lemma 5.2.3.** *Let  $I$  be an ideal of  $R$  containing a non-zero-divisor. Then the following holds:*

- (1) *There exist non-zero-divisors  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in R$  such that  $I = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ .*
- (2) *There exist non-zero-divisors  $y_1, \dots, y_n \in (R : I)$  such that  $\text{tr}_R(I) = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i I$ .*

*Proof.* (1) Let  $S$  be the collection of all non-zero-divisors of  $R$  that are in  $I$ . Let  $\langle S \rangle$  be the ideal of  $R$  generated by  $S$ . Then  $I \subseteq (\cup_{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Ass}(R)} \mathfrak{p}) \cup \langle S \rangle$ . By prime avoidance, either  $I \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$  for some  $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Ass}(R)$ , or  $I \subseteq \langle S \rangle$ . But  $I$  contains a non-zero-divisor, so  $I \not\subseteq \mathfrak{p}$  for every  $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Ass}(R)$ . Hence  $I \subseteq \langle S \rangle$ . Since  $S$  is a subset of  $I$ , so we conclude  $I = \langle S \rangle$ . Since  $R$  is Noetherian, so there exist finitely many elements  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in S$  such that  $I = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ .

(2) We know that  $\text{tr}_R(I) = (R : I)I$  in  $Q(R)$  (see [25, Proposition 2.4(2)]). Pick a non-zero-divisor  $a \in I$ , so  $J = a(R : I) \subseteq R$  is an ideal of  $R$ . Then  $\text{tr}_R(I) = J(\frac{1}{a}I)$ . Now  $J$  contains a non-zero-divisor, so by part (1) we have  $J = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  for some non-zero-divisors  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . Then  $\text{tr}_R(I) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{a} x_i I$ . Denoting  $y_i := \frac{1}{a} x_i$ , we see that each  $y_i \in Q(R)$  is a non-zero-divisor, and  $y_i \in (R : I)$  as  $x_i \in a(R : I)$ . Hence the claim. ■

**Proposition 5.2.4.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  be a local Cohen–Macaulay ring of dimension 1, and  $I$  be an  $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideal of  $R$ . Then  $\text{tr}_R(I) \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N) \subseteq \text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}_I(R)}^1(M, N)$  for all  $M, N \in \text{Ul}_I(R)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $M, N \in \text{Ul}_I(R)$  and  $a \in (R : I)$  be a non-zero-divisor. Then  $aI$  is an  $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideal of  $R$  and  $B(I) = B(aI)$ . So,  $\text{Ul}_I(R) = \text{Ul}_{aI}(R)$  by [10, Proposition 4.24]. Hence for every non-zero-divisor  $a \in (R : I)$ , we have  $aI \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N) \subseteq \text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}_I(R)}^1(M, N)$  by Lemma 5.2.2. Now by Lemma 5.2.3, there exist non-zero-divisors  $y_1, \dots, y_n \in (R : I)$  such that  $\text{tr}_R(I) = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i I$ . Thus  $\text{tr}_R(I) \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N) = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i I \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N) \subseteq \text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}_I(R)}^1(M, N)$ . ■

When  $s = 1$ ,  $\text{depth } R > 0$  and  $I = \mathfrak{m}$  (so  $\nu_I(-) = \mu(-)$ ), the inclusion  $I \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N) \subseteq \text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}^1(R)}^1(M, N)$  of Lemma 5.2.2 is actually an equality as we prove next. For this, we first record an easy lemma about flat extensions.

**Lemma 5.2.5.** *Let  $R \rightarrow S$  be a flat extension of rings. Let  $M$  be a  $R$ -module and  $I$  an ideal of  $R$ . Then, the following holds:*

- (1)  $S \otimes_R (IM) \cong (IS)(S \otimes_R M)$ .
- (2) If  $N \subseteq M$  is an  $R$ -submodule,  $S$  is a faithfully flat extension of  $R$  and  $S \otimes_R M = S \otimes_R N$ , then  $M = N$ .

*Proof.* (1) Consider the exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow IM \rightarrow M \rightarrow M/IM \rightarrow 0$ , which after tensoring with  $S$  gives  $0 \rightarrow S \otimes_R (IM) \rightarrow S \otimes_R M \rightarrow S \otimes_R M/IM \rightarrow 0$ . Now  $S \otimes_R M/IM \cong S \otimes_R (M \otimes_R R/I) \cong (S \otimes_R M) \otimes_R R/I \cong (S \otimes_R M)/I(S \otimes_R M)$ . Now by the natural  $S$ -module structure on  $S \otimes_R M$ , we see that  $I(S \otimes_R M) = (IS)(S \otimes_R M)$ . Thus we get the exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow S \otimes_R (IM) \rightarrow S \otimes_R M \rightarrow (S \otimes_R M)/(IS)(S \otimes_R M) \rightarrow 0$ , and by naturality of the isomorphisms, we see that the map  $S \otimes_R M \rightarrow (S \otimes_R M)/(IS)(S \otimes_R M)$  in the exact sequence has kernel  $(IS)(S \otimes_R M)$ . Hence  $S \otimes_R (IM) \cong (IS)(S \otimes_R M)$ .

(2) Tensoring the exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow M \rightarrow M/N \rightarrow 0$  with  $S$  and using  $S \otimes_R M = S \otimes_R N$ , we get  $(M/N) \otimes_R S = 0$ . Since  $S$  is faithfully flat, so  $M/N = 0$ . Hence  $M = N$ .  $\blacksquare$

Now we prove the desired equality between  $\mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)$  and  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}^1(R)}^1(M, N)$ , when  $R$  has positive depth.

**Proposition 5.2.6.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m}, k)$  be a local ring of positive depth. Let  $M, N \in \text{Ul}^1(R)$ . Then, the following holds:*

- (1) We always have  $\mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N) = \text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}^1(R)}^1(M, N)$ .
- (2) If  $R$  is moreover Cohen–Macaulay of dimension 1 (so,  $\text{Ul}^1(R) = \text{Ul}(R)$ ) and if  $x \in \mathfrak{m}$  is a minimal reduction of  $\mathfrak{m}$ , then  $x \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N) = \text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}(R)}^1(M, N)$ .

*Proof.* (1) Due to Lemma 5.2.2, we only need to prove  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}^1(R)}^1(M, N) \subseteq \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)$ . We may assume  $M, N \neq 0$ .

First, we assume that the residue field is infinite. Let  $\sigma : 0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow X \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  be a short exact sequence such that  $X \in \text{Ul}^1(R)$ . Choose  $x \in \mathfrak{m}$  to be  $R \oplus M \oplus N \oplus X$ -superficial (which exists by [23, Proposition 8.5.7], since we are assuming  $R$  has infinite residue field). Now  $\text{depth}_R(R \oplus M \oplus N \oplus X) = \inf\{\text{depth}_R R, \text{depth}_R M, \text{depth}_R N, \text{depth}_R X\} > 0$ , so  $x$  is  $R \oplus M \oplus N \oplus X$ -regular by [23, Lemma 8.5.4]. Hence  $x \in \mathfrak{m}$  is regular on  $R, M$  and  $N$ , and superficial on  $M, N$  and  $X$ . Hence,  $M/xM, N/xN, X/xX$  are 0-dimensional Ulrich modules by [20, Proposition 2.2(4)], so these are  $k$ -vector spaces by [20, Proposition 2.2(1)]. Hence  $\sigma \otimes_R R/xR$ , being a short exact sequence of  $k$ -vector spaces, is split exact. Since  $x$  is  $R, M, N$ -regular, so [35, Proposition 2.8] now implies  $\sigma \in x \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N) \subseteq \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)$ .

Now we prove the general case. This part will use extensively that,  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}^1(R)}^1(M, N)$  is a submodule of  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)$ , where  $M, N \in \text{Ul}^1(R)$ . Consider the faithfully flat extension of  $R$  as follows:  $S := R[X]_{\mathfrak{m}[X]}$ , with maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m}S$ , and infinite residue field. Since we already know,  $\mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N) \subseteq \text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}^1(R)}^1(M, N)$  by Lemma 5.2.2 and since  $S$  is faithfully flat, so it is enough to prove  $S \otimes_R \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N) = S \otimes_R \text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}^1(R)}^1(M, N)$  (by Lemma 5.2.5(2)). Now  $\mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N) \subseteq \text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}^1(R)}^1(M, N)$ , with flatness of  $S$ , already implies  $S \otimes_R \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N) \subseteq S \otimes_R \text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}^1(R)}^1(M, N)$ . So, to prove equality, it is enough to prove that  $S \otimes_R \text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}^1(R)}^1(M, N) \subseteq S \otimes_R \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)$ . Now due to Lemma 5.2.5(1), it is enough to prove  $S \otimes_R \text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}^1(R)}^1(M, N) \subseteq (\mathfrak{m}S)(S \otimes_R \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N))$ , and the later object here is naturally identified with  $(\mathfrak{m}S) \text{Ext}_S^1(S \otimes_R M, S \otimes_R N)$ . Since the  $S$ -module  $S \otimes_R \text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}^1(R)}^1(M, N)$  is generated by  $1 \otimes_R \sigma$ , as  $\sigma$  runs over all elements of  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}^1(R)}^1(M, N)$ , so we need to prove that  $1 \otimes_R \sigma \in (\mathfrak{m}S) \text{Ext}_S^1(S \otimes_R M, S \otimes_R N)$  for all  $\sigma \in \text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}^1(R)}^1(M, N)$ . So, let  $\sigma : 0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow X \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  be a short exact sequence such that  $X \in \text{Ul}^1(R)$ . Then,  $1 \otimes_R \sigma \in S \otimes_R \text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}^1(R)}^1(M, N) \subseteq S \otimes_R \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N) \cong \text{Ext}_S^1(S \otimes_R M, S \otimes_R N)$  is naturally identified with the exact sequence  $S \otimes_R \sigma : 0 \rightarrow S \otimes_R N \rightarrow S \otimes_R X \rightarrow S \otimes_R M \rightarrow 0$  in  $\text{Ext}_S^1(S \otimes_R M, S \otimes_R N)$ . Now  $S \otimes_R \sigma$  is a short exact sequence of modules in  $\text{Ul}^1(S)$  by [20, Proposition 2.2(3)]. Hence,  $1 \otimes_R \sigma \in$

$\text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}(S)}^1(S \otimes_R M, S \otimes_R N)$ . Since  $S$  also has positive depth, and infinite residue field, so by the proof of the infinite residue field case, we get  $1 \otimes_R \sigma \in \text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}(S)}^1(S \otimes_R M, S \otimes_R N) \subseteq (\mathfrak{m}S) \text{Ext}_S^1(S \otimes_R M, S \otimes_R N)$ , which is what we wanted to prove.

(2) Due to Lemma 5.2.2, we only need to prove  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}(R)}^1(M, N) \subseteq x \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)$ . So, let  $\sigma : 0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow X \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  be a short exact sequence such that  $X \in \text{Ul}(R)$ . Since  $xR$  is a reduction of  $\mathfrak{m}$ , so  $xR$  is  $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary. Hence  $x$  is  $R$ -regular, so  $x$  is  $M, N, X$ -regular. Also,  $\mathfrak{m}M = xM, \mathfrak{m}N = xN, \mathfrak{m}X = xX$ . So,  $\sigma \otimes_R R/xR : 0 \rightarrow N/xN \rightarrow X/xX \rightarrow M/xM \rightarrow 0$  is an exact sequence of  $k$ -vector spaces. Hence,  $\sigma \otimes_R R/xR$  is split exact. Since  $x$  is  $R, M, N, X$ -regular, so [35, Proposition 2.8] now implies  $\sigma \in x \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)$ . Thus we get  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}(R)}^1(M, N) \subseteq x \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)$ .  $\blacksquare$

Following is an interesting consequence of Proposition 5.2.6. Here, for  $R$ -modules  $X, Y$ , we denote by  $X * Y$ , the collection of all  $R$ -modules  $Z$  that fits into a short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Z \rightarrow Y \rightarrow 0$ .

**Corollary 5.2.7.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  be a local 1-dimensional Cohen–Macaulay ring. Then, the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $R$  is regular.
- (2)  $\text{Ul}(R)$  is closed under taking extensions.
- (3) There exists  $M, N \in \text{Ul}(R)$  such that  $N$  is faithful,  $M \neq 0$  and  $N * M \subseteq \text{Ul}(R)$ .

*Proof.* (1)  $\implies$  (2): If  $R$  is regular, then  $\text{Ul}(R) = \text{CM}(R)$ , which is closed under taking extensions.

(2)  $\implies$  (3): One can take  $M = N = \mathfrak{m}^n$  for some  $n \gg 0$ .

(3)  $\implies$  (1): By hypothesis, we get  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, N) = \text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}(R)}^1(M, N)$ . Then from Proposition 5.2.6 (remembering  $\text{Ul}^1(R) = \text{Ul}(R)$  in our case) we get,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, N) = \mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)$ . So by Nakayama's lemma, we get  $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, N) = 0$ . By [10, Theorem 4.6] (also, see [11, 5.2]) we get,  $M \cong \mathfrak{m}M$  and  $N \cong \mathfrak{m}N$ . So,  $\text{Ext}_R^1(\mathfrak{m}M, \mathfrak{m}N) = 0$ . Hence  $\text{pd}_R(\mathfrak{m}M) < \infty$  by [11, Proposition 2.6]. Since  $0 \neq M$ , so  $\mathfrak{m}M \neq 0$ . Thus  $R$  is regular by [27, Theorem 1.1].  $\blacksquare$

**Remark 5.2.8.** When  $R$  is local Cohen–Macaulay of minimal multiplicity, (2)  $\implies$  (1) of Corollary 5.2.7 also follows from [12, Proposition 3.2(5)].

Before proceeding further with applications to  $\text{Ul}_I(R)$ , we outline an alternative proof that  $\text{Ul}_I(R)$  is an exact subcategory of  $\text{mod } R$ , when  $R$  is a local 1-dimensional Cohen–Macaulay ring, via birational extensions. For this, we first record some preliminary results.

The following is easy to see from the definition of exact category.

**Lemma 5.2.9.** *Let  $R, S$  be two commutative rings such that  $R \rightarrow S$  be a ring extension. Let  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E})$  be a strictly full exact subcategory of  $\text{Mod } S$ . Assume that,  $\mathcal{X}$  is closed under  $R$ -linear isomorphism of  $R$ -modules. Also, assume that every  $R$ -linear map between any two modules in  $\mathcal{X}$  is  $S$ -linear, i.e.,  $\text{Hom}_R(M, N) = \text{Hom}_S(M, N)$  for all  $M, N \in \mathcal{X}$ . Then,  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E})$  is a strictly full exact subcategory of  $\text{Mod } R$ .*

As a consequence we can deduce the following:

**Proposition 5.2.10.** *Let  $R \subseteq S$  be a birational extension ( $S \subseteq Q(R)$ ) of commutative rings. Let  $\mathcal{S}_R$  be the standard exact structure on  $\text{Mod } R$ . Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be the strictly full subcategory of  $\text{Mod } S$  consisting of all torsion-free  $S$ -modules. Then it holds that  $\mathcal{S}_R|_{\mathcal{X}} = \mathcal{S}_S|_{\mathcal{X}}$ , and  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S}_R|_{\mathcal{X}})$  is a strictly full exact subcategory of  $\text{Mod } R$ , and  $(\mathcal{X} \cap \text{mod } R, \mathcal{S}_R|_{\mathcal{X} \cap \text{mod } R})$  is an exact subcategory of  $\text{Mod } R$  (hence, also of  $\text{mod } R$ ).*

*Proof.* By definition,  $\mathcal{S}_R|_{\text{mod } R \cap \mathcal{X}} = \mathcal{S}_R|_{\text{mod } R} \cap \mathcal{S}_R|_{\mathcal{X}}$ . Since  $(\text{mod } R, \mathcal{S}_R|_{\text{mod } R})$  is an exact subcategory of  $\text{Mod } R$ , so the second part of the statement would readily follow from the first part of the statement and Lemma 3.2. First, we show that  $\mathcal{X}$  is strictly full in  $\text{Mod } R$ . If  $M, N$  are two  $R$ -modules and  $f : M \rightarrow N$  is an  $R$ -linear isomorphism and  $N$  is moreover a torsion-free  $S$ -module extending its  $R$ -module structure. Then  $M$  has an  $S$ -module structure, extending its  $R$ -module structure, given by  $s \cdot m := f^{-1}(sf(m))$  for all  $s \in S, m \in M$ . Note that, with this structure,  $M$  is moreover a torsion-free  $S$ -module. Indeed, let  $s \in S$  be a non-zero-divisor such that  $s \cdot m = 0$ . Then,  $sf(m) = f(s \cdot m) = 0$ , so  $f(m) = 0$  as  $N$  is  $S$ -torsionfree. Then  $m = 0$  as  $f$  is an isomorphism. Moreover,  $\text{Hom}_R(M, N) = \text{Hom}_S(M, N)$  for all torsion-free  $S$ -modules  $M, N$ , which follows from [26, Proposition 4.14(i)]. Consequently, we notice that  $\mathcal{S}_R|_{\mathcal{X}} = \mathcal{S}_S|_{\mathcal{X}}$ . So, to show  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S}_R|_{\mathcal{X}})$  is an exact subcategory of  $\text{Mod } R$ , it is enough to show that

$(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S}_S|_{\mathcal{X}})$  is an exact subcategory of  $\text{Mod } S$  (by Lemma 5.2.9). Now it is well-known that for any ring  $S$ , the subcategory of all  $S$ -torsionfree modules is closed under extensions in  $\text{Mod } S$ . Hence  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S}_S|_{\mathcal{X}})$  is an exact subcategory of  $\text{Mod } S$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Corollary 5.2.11.** *Let  $R$  be a local Cohen–Macaulay ring of dimension 1. Let  $R \subseteq S$  be a finite birational extension. Then,  $(\text{CM}(S), \mathcal{S}_R|_{\text{CM}(S)})$  is a strictly full exact subcategory of  $\text{mod } R$ .*

*Proof.* We note that,  $\text{mod } S = \text{Mod } S \cap \text{mod } R$ . Since  $S$  is also 1-dimensional Cohen–Macaulay, so  $\text{CM}(S) = \text{collection of all finitely generated torsion-free } S\text{-modules} = \text{collection of all torsion-free } S\text{-modules} \cap \text{mod } R$ . Hence, the conclusion follows from Proposition 5.2.10.  $\blacksquare$

When  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  is a local Cohen–Macaulay ring of dimension 1 and  $I$  an  $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideal, then considering the finite birational extension  $R \subseteq B(I)$ , where  $B(I)$  denotes blow-up of  $I$  ([10, Definition 4.3, Remark 4.4]), it is shown in [10, Theorem 4.6] that  $\text{CM}(B(I)) = \text{Ul}_I(R)$ . Thus, in this particular case, we get another proof of the fact that  $\text{Ul}_I(R)$  is an exact subcategory of  $\text{mod } R$ , which is very different from Corollary 4.6.

For further applications, we first record a lemma connecting  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}_I(R)}^1(-, -)$  to  $\text{Ext}_{B(I)}^1(-, -)$ . Here, we will keep in mind that, when  $\dim R = 1$ , we write  $\text{Ul}_I^1(R) = \text{Ul}_I(R)$  in our notation (see Definition 4.4).

**Lemma 5.2.12.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  be a local Cohen–Macaulay ring of dimension 1. Let  $I$  be an  $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideal of  $R$ . Then, for all  $I$ -Ulrich modules  $M, N$ , we have a natural map  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}_I(R)}^1(M, N) \xrightarrow{[\sigma]_R \rightarrow [\sigma]_{B(I)}} \text{Ext}_{B(I)}^1(M, N)$ , which is an isomorphism of  $R$ -modules.*

*Proof.* We recall that,  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}_I(R)}^1(M, N)$  is the equivalence class of all short exact sequences  $0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow X \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  of  $I$ -Ulrich modules and  $R$ -linear maps. Since  $\text{Ul}_I(R) = \text{CM}(B(I))$  ([10, Theorem 4.6]), so any  $R$ -linear map between two Ulrich modules are  $B(I)$ -linear ([26, Proposition 4.14(i)]). Hence any short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow X \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  of  $I$ -Ulrich modules and  $R$ -linear maps is a short exact sequence of maximal Cohen–Macaulay  $B(I)$ -modules and  $B(I)$ -linear maps, and any  $R$ -linear morphism between two short exact sequences of  $I$ -Ulrich  $R$ -modules is actually a  $B(I)$ -morphism. This proves well-definedness of the map. Injectivity is similarly obvious. To prove surjectivity, we note that if  $Y$  is a  $B(I)$ -module, and  $0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow Y \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  is a short exact sequence in  $\text{Mod}(B(I))$ , then  $M, N \in \text{CM}(B(I))$  implies  $Y \in \text{CM}(B(I))$ . Hence  $Y \in \text{Ul}_I(R)$ . Since  $B(I)$ -linear maps are  $R$ -linear, so this gives a pre-image in  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}_I(R)}^1(M, N)$ . Finally, to show the map is  $R$ -linear, we recall that the Baer-sum structure and multiplication by  $R$  on  $\text{Ext}^1$  are given by certain pullback and pushout diagrams. So, it is enough to prove that, given an exact sequence  $\sigma : 0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow X \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  in  $\text{Ul}_I(R)$  and  $R$ -linear maps  $f : N \rightarrow N', g : M' \rightarrow M$  with  $M', N' \in \text{Ul}_I(R)$ , the pushout and pullback of  $\sigma$  by  $f$  and  $g$  in  $\text{mod } R$  respectively are actually pushout and pullback in  $\text{mod}(B(I))$ . Let us look at the pushout case, the pullback case being similar. If we have the following pushout diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} \sigma : 0 & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & & & f \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ & & & & 0 & \longrightarrow & N' & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

then in the bottom row we again have  $Y \in \text{Ul}_I(R)$ , since  $\text{Ul}_I(R)$  along with all its short exact sequences is an exact subcategory of  $\text{mod } R$  by Corollary 4.6. Hence in the above diagram, all the modules are in  $\text{Ul}_I(R) = \text{CM}(B(I))$ , so all the  $R$ -linear maps are moreover  $B(I)$ -linear. Since  $\text{CM}(B(I))$  is extension-closed subcategory of  $\text{mod}(B(I))$ , so it is an exact subcategory of  $\text{mod}(B(I))$ . Thus this is a pushout diagram in  $\text{mod}(B(I))$  as well by [6, Proposition 2.12]. This is what we wanted to show.  $\blacksquare$

**Corollary 5.2.13.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  be a local Cohen–Macaulay ring of dimension 1, and  $I$  be an  $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideal of  $R$ . If  $M, N \in \text{Ul}_I(R)$  are such that  $\text{Ext}_{B(I)}^1(M, N) = 0$ , then  $\text{tr}_R(I) \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* This follows from Lemma 5.2.12 and Proposition 5.2.4.  $\blacksquare$

In the following, for a module  $X$  over a ring  $R$ , by  $\text{add}_R(X)$  we denote the collection of all  $R$ -modules  $Y$  such that there exists an  $R$ -module  $Z$  and an isomorphism of  $R$ -modules  $Y \oplus Z \cong X^{\oplus n}$  for some integer  $n \geq 0$ .

**Theorem 5.2.14.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  be a local Cohen–Macaulay ring of dimension 1. Let  $I$  be an  $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideal of  $R$ . Then the following hold:*

- (1) *If  $M \in \text{add}_R(B(I))$ , then  $\text{tr}_R(I) \text{Ext}_R^1(M, \text{Ul}_I(R)) = 0$ .*
- (2) *Let  $M \in \text{Ul}(R)$ . Then  $M \in \text{add}_R(B(\mathfrak{m}))$  if and only if  $\mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(M, \text{Ul}(R)) = 0$ .*
- (3) *If  $B(I)$  is a Gorenstein ring, then  $\text{tr}_R(I) \text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Ul}_I(R), B(I)) = 0$ . The converse holds when  $I = \mathfrak{m}$ .*

*Proof.* (1) Denote  $S := B(I)$ . If  $M \in \text{add}_R(S) (\subseteq \text{Ul}_I(R))$ , then there exists  $X \in \text{mod}(R)$  and an isomorphism of  $R$ -modules  $M \oplus X \cong B(I)^{\oplus n}$  for some  $n \geq 0$ . Then  $M, X$  are  $I$ -Ulrich, so  $M, X \in \text{CM}(S)$ . Hence the isomorphism is also  $S$ -linear, so  $M$  is a projective  $S$ -module. Thus,  $\text{Ext}_S^1(M, N) = 0$  for all  $N \in \text{CM}(S) = \text{Ul}_I(R)$ . Now the conclusion follows from Corollary 5.2.13.

(2) If  $M \in \text{add}_R(B(\mathfrak{m}))$ , then the conclusion follows by (1) as  $\mathfrak{m} \subseteq \text{tr}_R(\mathfrak{m})$ . So, assume  $M \in \text{Ul}(R)$  and  $\mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(M, N) = 0$  for all  $N \in \text{Ul}(R)$ . By Proposition 5.2.6, we then have  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}(R)}^1(M, N) = 0$  for all  $N \in \text{Ul}(R)$ . Now denote  $S = B(\mathfrak{m})$ . Then by Lemma 5.2.12 we have,  $\text{Ext}_S^1(M, N) = 0$  for all  $N \in \text{Ul}(R) = \text{CM}(S)$ . We know that, for any Cohen–Macaulay ring  $S$ , and  $M \in \text{CM}(S)$ , we have  $\text{Ext}_S^1(M, \text{CM}(S)) = 0$  if and only if  $M \in \text{add}_S(S)$ . Thus  $M \in \text{add}_S(B(\mathfrak{m})) = \text{add}_R(B(\mathfrak{m}))$ .

(3) Nothing to prove if  $R$  is regular, so we assume  $R$  is singular. If  $B(I)$  is a Gorenstein ring, then  $\text{Ext}_{B(I)}^1(M, B(I)) = 0$  for all  $M \in \text{CM}(B(I)) = \text{Ul}_I(R)$ . Since  $B(I)$  is  $I$ -Ulrich, so by Lemma 5.2.12 we get,  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}_I(R)}^1(M, B(I)) = 0$  for all  $M \in \text{Ul}_I(R)$ . Then by Corollary 5.2.13 we get,  $\text{tr}_R(I) \text{Ext}_R^1(M, B(I)) = 0$  for all  $M \in \text{Ul}_I(R)$ . For the converse part, assume  $I = \mathfrak{m}$  and  $\mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(M, B(\mathfrak{m})) = 0$  for all  $M \in \text{Ul}(R)$ . Then by Proposition 5.2.6 we have,  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ul}(R)}^1(M, B(\mathfrak{m})) = 0$  for all  $M \in \text{Ul}(R)$ . Hence by Lemma 5.2.12 we have,  $\text{Ext}_{B(\mathfrak{m})}^1(M, B(\mathfrak{m})) = 0$  for all  $M \in \text{Ul}(R) = \text{CM}(B(\mathfrak{m}))$ . It is well known that, for a Cohen–Macaulay ring  $S$ , if  $\text{Ext}_S^1(M, S) = 0$  for all  $M \in \text{CM}(S)$ , then  $S$  is Gorenstein. Thus  $B(\mathfrak{m})$  is Gorenstein.  $\blacksquare$

Since for 1-dimensional local Cohen–Macaulay rings  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  of minimal multiplicity, it holds that  $B(\mathfrak{m}) = (\mathfrak{m} : \mathfrak{m}) \cong \mathfrak{m}$ , so the following corollary is an immediate consequence of Theorem 5.2.14(3) and [19, Theorem 5.1].

**Corollary 5.2.15.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  be a local Cohen–Macaulay ring of dimension 1 and minimal multiplicity. Then,  $R$  is almost Gorenstein if and only if  $\mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Ul}(R), \mathfrak{m}) = 0$ .*

Finally, we give one more application of Theorem 5.2.14(3), for which we first record an easy observation:

**Lemma 5.2.16.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  be a local Cohen–Macaulay ring of dimension 1. Let  $I$  be a  $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideal of  $R$  admitting a principal reduction  $x \in I$ . Then,  $\mathfrak{m}$  is  $I$ -Ulrich if and only if  $\mathfrak{m} \subseteq ((x) : I)$ .*

*Proof.* If  $I$  is principal, then all MCM modules are  $I$ -Ulrich. So, it is enough to assume  $I$  is not principal. If  $\mathfrak{m}$  is  $I$ -Ulrich, then  $\mathfrak{m}I = x\mathfrak{m}$  ([10, Proposition 4.5]), so  $\mathfrak{m} \subseteq ((x) : I)$ . Conversely, let  $\mathfrak{m} \subseteq ((x) : I)$ . Then,  $\mathfrak{m} \subseteq ((x) :_R I)$ . We claim that,  $x \notin \mathfrak{m}I$ . Since  $x \in I$  is a principal reduction of  $I$ , so  $I^{n+1} = xI^n$  for some  $n \geq 1$ . Hence if  $x \in \mathfrak{m}I$ , then  $I^{n+1} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}I^{n+1}$ . So,  $I^{n+1} = \mathfrak{m}I^{n+1}$ , so by Nakayama’s lemma,  $I^{n+1} = 0$ , contradicting  $I$  is  $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary. Thus,  $x \in I \setminus \mathfrak{m}I$ . Since  $\mathfrak{m} \subseteq ((x) :_R I)$  and  $I$  is not principal, so  $\mathfrak{m} \subseteq (x\mathfrak{m} :_R I)$  by Lemma 5.1.7. So,  $\mathfrak{m}I \subseteq x\mathfrak{m}$ . Hence  $\mathfrak{m}I = x\mathfrak{m}$ , so  $\mathfrak{m}$  is  $I$ -Ulrich.  $\blacksquare$

**Corollary 5.2.17.** *Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  be a local Cohen–Macaulay ring of dimension 1 and minimal multiplicity. If  $\mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Ul}(R), \mathfrak{m}) = 0$ , then  $R$  admits a canonical ideal  $\omega$  and  $B(\omega)$  is Gorenstein. Consequently,  $\mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Ul}_\omega(R), B(\omega)) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* We show that  $R$  admits a canonical ideal  $\omega$ ,  $\mathfrak{m} \subseteq \text{tr}(\omega)$ , and  $B(\omega)$  is Gorenstein. Since  $R$  has minimal multiplicity and  $\mathfrak{m} \text{Ext}_R^1(\text{Ul}(R), \mathfrak{m}) = 0$ , so  $R$  is almost Gorenstein by Corollary 5.2.15. Hence  $\mathfrak{m} \subseteq \text{tr}_R(\omega)$  from [21, Definition 2.2, Proposition 6.1], so  $R$  is generically Gorenstein. Hence  $R$  admits a canonical ideal, say  $\omega$ . Since  $R$  is almost Gorenstein, so  $\mathfrak{m} \subseteq ((x) : \omega)$  for some principal reduction  $x$  of  $\omega$  (see [19, Theorem 3.11]). Thus  $\mathfrak{m}$  is  $\omega$ -Ulrich by Lemma 5.2.16. So,  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{CM}(B(\omega))$  by [10, Theorem 4.6]. Hence  $\mathfrak{m} \subseteq \text{tr}_R(\mathfrak{m}) \subseteq (R :_{Q(R)} B(\omega))$  by [10, Theorem 2.9]. Hence, the conductor  $c_R(B(\omega)) := (R :_{Q(R)} B(\omega))$  of  $B(\omega)$  is either  $\mathfrak{m}$  or  $R$ , both of which are stable ideals (since  $R$  has minimal multiplicity). Thus,  $B(\omega)$  is Gorenstein by [19, Corollary 3.8(2)]. Now the claim follows from Theorem 5.2.14(3).  $\blacksquare$

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Auslander, Ø. Solberg, Relative homology and representation theory. I. Relative homology and homologically finite subcategories, *Comm. Algebra* 21 (1993), no. 9, 2995–3031.
- [2] J. P. Brennan, J. Herzog, B. Ulrich, Maximally generated Cohen–Macaulay modules, *Mathematica Scandinavica*, 61, 181–203.
- [3] W. Bruns, J. Herzog, *Cohen–Macaulay Rings*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics (1993).
- [4] T. Brüstle, S. Hassoun, D. Langford, S. Roy, Reduction of exact structures, *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, Volume 224, Issue 4, April 2020, 106212.
- [5] A. B. Buan, Closed subbifunctors of the extension functor, *J. Algebra* 244 (2001), no. 2, 407–428.
- [6] T. Bühler, Exact Categories, *Expo. Math.*, 28 (2010), 1–69.
- [7] M. C. R. Butler, G. Horrocks, Classes of extensions and resolutions, *Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A* 254 1961/1962, 155–222.
- [8] S. Crivei, When stable short exact sequences define an exact structure on any additive category. preprint, [arXiv:1209.3423](https://arxiv.org/abs/1209.3423).
- [9] H. Dao, S. Dey, M. Dutta, Ulrich split rings, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.03872>.
- [10] H. Dao, S. Maitra, P. Sridhar, On reflexive and  $I$ -Ulrich modules over curves, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.02641>, *Trans. of Amer. Math. Soc.*, to appear.
- [11] S. Dey, T. Kobayashi, Vanishing of (co)homology of Burch and related submodules, [arXiv:2201.01023](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.01023).
- [12] S. Dey, R. Takahashi, On the subcategories of  $n$ -torsionfree modules and related modules, *Collect. Math.* (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13348-021-00338-1>.
- [13] P. Dräxler, I. Reiten, S.O. Smalø, Ø. Solberg, with an appendix by B. Keller, Exact categories and vector space categories, *Trans. of Amer. Math. Soc.*, 351:2 (1999), 647–682.
- [14] D. Eisenbud, F.-O. Schreyer, Relative Beilinson monad and direct image for families of coherent sheaves, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc* 360:10 (2008), 5367–5396.
- [15] E. E. Enochs, O. M. G. Jenda, Relative homological algebra, Volume 2, *De Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics* 54 (2011).
- [16] H. Enomoto, Classifications of exact structures and Cohen–Macaulay-finite algebras, *Adv. Math.* 335 (2018), 838–877.
- [17] H. Enomoto, Relations for Grothendieck groups and representation-finiteness, *J. Algebra* 539 (2019), 152–176.
- [18] L. Fiorot,  $N$ -Quasi-Abelian Categories vs  $N$ -Tilting Torsion Pairs, preprint, [arXiv:1602.08253](https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.08253).
- [19] S. Goto, N. Matsuoka, T. T. Phuong, Almost Gorenstein rings, *Journal of Algebra*, Volume 379, 1 April 2013, Pages 355–381.
- [20] S. Goto; R. Takahashi; N. Taniguchi, Almost Gorenstein rings—towards a theory of higher dimension. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **219** (2015), no. 7, 2666–2712.
- [21] J. Herzog, T. Hibi, D. I. Stamate, The trace of the canonical module, *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, Volume 233, Issue 1 (2019), 133–165.
- [22] G. Hochschild, Relative homological algebra, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 82 (1956), 246–269.
- [23] C. Huneke and I. Swanson, *Integral closure of ideals, rings and modules*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, **336**, Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [24] B. Keller, Chain complexes and stable categories, *Manus. Math.* 67 (1990), 379–417.
- [25] T. Kobayashi, R. Takahashi, Rings whose ideals are isomorphic to trace ideals, *Mathematische Nachrichten*(2019), Vol. 292, no. 10, 2252–2261.
- [26] G. J. Leuschke, R. Wiegand, *Cohen–Macaulay Representations*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 181, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012.
- [27] G. Levin and V. Vasconcel, Homological dimensions and Macaulay rings, *Pacific Journal of Math.*, 25(2), (1968), 315–323.
- [28] H. Matsui, Classifying dense resolving and coresolving subcategories of exact categories via Grothendieck groups, *Algebr. Represent. Theory* 21 (2018), no. 3, 551–563.
- [29] T. J. Puthenpurakal, Hilbert-coefficients of a Cohen–Macaulay module, *J. Algebra*, 264 (2003), no. 1, 82–97.
- [30] T. J. Puthenpurakal, A sub-functor for Ext and Cohen–Macaulay associated graded modules with bounded multiplicity, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 373 (2020), 2567–2589.
- [31] W. Rump, On the maximal exact structure on an additive category, *Fund. Math.* 214 (2011), no. 1, 77–87.
- [32] E. G. Sklyarenko, Relative homological algebra in categories of modules, *Russian Math. Surveys* 33(3) (1978) 97–137.
- [33] Ø. Solberg, Going relative with Maurice - A survey, chapter in *Surveys in Representation Theory of Algebras*, *Contemporary Mathematics* 716 (2018), 155–172.
- [34] J. Striuli, Extensions of modules and uniform bounds of Artin-Rees type; Ph.D Thesis, University of Kansas 2005.
- [35] J. Striuli, On extensions of modules, *Journal of Algebra*, Vol. 285, Issue 1, March 2005, Pages 383–398.
- [36] R. Takahashi, Syzygy modules with semidualizing or  $G$ -projective summands, *J. Algebra*, 295 (2006), no. 1, 179–194.
- [37] K. Yoshida, A note on minimal Cohen–Macaulay approximations, *Communications in Algebra*, Vol. 24 (1996), Issue 1, 235–246.
- [38] B. Zhu, X. Zhuang, Grothendieck groups in extriangulated categories, preprint, [arXiv:1912.00621](https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.00621).
- [39] The Stacks project [Tag 010I](https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.00621).
- [40] The Stacks project [Tag 09SE](https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.00621).
- [41] The Stacks project [Tag 010M](https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.00621).
- [42] The Stacks project [Tag 09MI](https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.00621).

[43] nLab [Subfunctor](#).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS, LAWRENCE, KS 66045-7523, USA  
*Email address:* [hdao@ku.edu](mailto:hdao@ku.edu), [souvik@ku.edu](mailto:souvik@ku.edu), [m819d903@ku.edu](mailto:m819d903@ku.edu)