

EXTRIANGULATED IDEAL QUOTIENTS AND GABRIEL-ZISMAN LOCALIZATIONS

YU LIU AND PANYUE ZHOU

ABSTRACT. Let $(\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$ be an extriangulated category with enough projectives and enough injectives, and \mathcal{S} be an extension closed subcategory of \mathcal{B} . In this article, we prove that the Gabriel-Zisman localization \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} can be realized as an ideal quotient inside \mathcal{B} when \mathcal{S} satisfies some mild conditions. We also show that the equivalence between the ideal quotient and the localization is not just additive.

1. INTRODUCTION

Triangulated categories were introduced in the mid 1960's by Verdier [V]. Having their origins in algebraic geometry and algebraic topology, triangulated categories have by now become indispensable in many different areas of mathematics. The Verdier quotient \mathcal{T}/\mathcal{S} of a triangulated category \mathcal{T} by a triangulated subcategory \mathcal{S} is defined by a universal property with respect to triangulated functors out of \mathcal{T} . However, \mathcal{T}/\mathcal{S} is in fact a localization of \mathcal{T} , that is, it is obtained from \mathcal{T} by formally inverting a class of morphisms. For example, derived categories are certain Verdier quotients of homotopy categories. But Verdier quotients are in general a bit hard to understand since taking Verdier quotients could drastically change morphisms. More generally, localization is a process of adding formal inverses to an algebraic structure known as Gabriel-Zisman localisation [GZ]. Morphisms in the new category can be regarded as compositions of the original morphisms and the formal inverses that were added.

Iyama and Yang [IY1] gave a sufficient condition for a Verdier quotient \mathcal{T}/\mathcal{S} of a triangulated category \mathcal{T} by a thick subcategory \mathcal{S} to be realized inside of \mathcal{T} as an ideal quotient. Concretely speaking, they assume that \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{S} satisfy the following conditions:

- (T0) \mathcal{T} is a triangulated category with a shift functor [1], and \mathcal{S} is a thick subcategory of \mathcal{T} . Denote by $\mathcal{U} := \mathcal{T}/\mathcal{S}$ the Verdier quotient (which is a triangulated category).
- (T1) $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is a torsion pair in \mathcal{S} .
- (T2) $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}^\perp)$ and $({}^\perp\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$ form two torsion pairs in \mathcal{T} , where $\mathcal{X}^\perp := \{T \in \mathcal{T} \mid \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{X}, T) = 0\}$ and ${}^\perp\mathcal{Y} := \{T \in \mathcal{T} \mid \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(T, \mathcal{Y}) = 0\}$.

Define two full subcategories of \mathcal{T} :

$$\mathcal{Z} := \mathcal{X}^\perp \cap {}^\perp\mathcal{Y}[1] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{M} := \mathcal{X}[1] \cap \mathcal{Y}.$$

We denote by $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{M}]$ the ideal quotient category of \mathcal{Z} by \mathcal{M} . Iyama and Yang [IY1] realized the Verdier quotient $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{T}/\mathcal{S}$ as the ideal quotient $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{M}]$.

Theorem 1.1. [IY1, Theorem 1.1] *With the assumptions (T0), (T1) and (T2) as above, the composition $\mathcal{Z} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ of natural functors induces an equivalence of additive categories: $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{M}] \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{U}$.*

When the condition (T1) is replaced by a special case (T1'): $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is a co- t -structure in \mathcal{S} , the equivalence above is a **triangle** equivalence, see [IY1, Theorem 1.2]. There are many examples of this realization, such as Buchweitz's equivalence [Bu, KV, R] between the singularity category of an Iwanaga-Gorenstein ring and the stable category of Cohen-Macaulay modules over the ring. There are many researches about this context, see [Am, BOJ, C, CZ, G, IY2, K, OPS, ZH].

Recently, the notion of an extriangulated category was introduced by Nakaoka and Palu [NP] as a simultaneous generalization of exact categories and triangulated categories. Exact categories and extension closed subcategories of a triangulated category are extriangulated categories, while there

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 18E35; 18F05; 18E10; 18G80.

Key words and phrases. cotorsion pairs; extriangulated categories; localizations; quotient categories.

Yu Liu is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 11901479 and 12171397).

Panyue Zhou is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11901190).

The authors would like to thank Professor Bin Zhu for helpful discussions.

are some other examples of extriangulated categories which are neither exact nor triangulated, see [NP, ZZ, HZZ, ZhZ]. Hence, many results on exact categories and triangulated categories can be unified in the framework of an extriangulated category.

Note that $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is a torsion pair in \mathcal{T} in the sense of Iyama and Yoshino [IYo] if and only if $(\mathcal{X}[1], \mathcal{Y})$ is a cotorsion pair in \mathcal{T} in the sense of Nakaoka [N]. However, this is not true in an exact category. For example, assume that \mathcal{A} is an exact category with enough projectives \mathcal{P} and enough injectives \mathcal{I} , then $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{A})$ and $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I})$ are two cotorsion pairs on \mathcal{A} , but they are not torsion pairs since $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{A}) \neq 0$ and $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I}) \neq 0$.

Nakaoka and Palu [NP] gave a bijective correspondence between Hovey twin cotorsion pairs and admissible model structures. Let $(\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$ be an extriangulated category satisfying some mild conditions, and $((\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}))$ be a Hovey twin cotorsion pair on \mathcal{B} . Define two full subcategories of \mathcal{B} :

$$\mathcal{M} := \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Z} := \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{U}.$$

Consider the following classes of morphisms:

- $wFib$:= the class of deflations f with $\text{CoCone}(f) \in \mathcal{V}$;
- $wCof$:= the class of inflations f with $\text{Cone}(f) \in \mathcal{S}$;
- $\mathbb{W} := wFib \circ wCof$.

They showed the following theorem.

Theorem 1.2. [NP, Corollary 5.25] and [NP, Theorem 6.20] *The composition of the canonical inclusion $i: \mathcal{Z} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}$ and the Gabriel-Zisman localization $\ell: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}[\mathbb{W}^{-1}]$ induces an equivalence of $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{M}] \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{B}[\mathbb{W}^{-1}]$, which is depicted as follows:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{Z} & \xhookrightarrow{i} & \mathcal{B} & \xrightarrow{\ell} & \mathcal{B}[\mathbb{W}^{-1}] \\ \downarrow \pi & & & \nearrow \bar{\ell} & \\ \mathcal{Z}/\mathcal{M} & & & & \end{array}$$

Moreover, $\mathcal{B}[\mathbb{W}^{-1}]$ is a triangulated category.

Motivated by these results, in this article, we will develop a theory which generalizes and unifies Theorem 1.1 by Iyama-Yang and Theorem 1.2 by Nakaoka-Palu. Let $(\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$ be an extriangulated category with enough projectives \mathcal{P} and enough injectives \mathcal{I} . This paper is dedicated to the Gabriel-Zisman localization \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} of an extriangulated category $(\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$ with respect to an extension closed subcategory \mathcal{S} to be realized as an idea quotient inside \mathcal{B} . Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1.3. (see Theorem 3.7 and Section 4 for details) *Let $(\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$ be an extriangulated category with enough projectives and enough injectives, and \mathcal{S} be an extension closed subcategory of \mathcal{B} such that:*

for any \mathbb{E} -triangle $Y \rightarrow W \rightarrow S \dashrightarrow$ with $Y \in \mathcal{Y}, W \in \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y}$, we have S lies in \mathcal{S} .

Assume that \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are full subcategories of \mathcal{B} satisfy the following conditions:

- (B1) $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is a cotorsion pair in \mathcal{S} .
- (B2) $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ and $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y})$ are two cotorsion pairs in \mathcal{B} .

Let

$$\mathcal{Z} := \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{W} := \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y}.$$

Then we show that the Gabriel-Zisman localization \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} can be realized as the idea quotient $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}]$, that is, there exists an equivalence $H: \mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}] \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S}$. We also show that:

- (1) if \mathcal{S} is a thick subcategory of \mathcal{B} , H becomes an **extriangle** equivalence (see Definition 4.1 for details);
- (2) if $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y})$ are hereditary cotorsion pairs, H becomes an **triangle** equivalence.

Remark 1.4. Under the condition (1) of Theorem 1.3, $((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}))$ is a Hovey twin cotorsion pair, it generalizes Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2. The condition (2) of Theorem 1.3 generalizes [IY1, Theorem 1.2]. Moreover, in Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2, the equivalences between ideal quotients and localizations are additive, although the localizations are triangulated and the ideal quotients are extriangulated. Theorem 1.3 point out that in fact the equivalences have better properties.

This article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review some elementary definitions and facts on extriangulated categories. In Section 3, we show the main result of this article: the existence of equivalences between localizations and quotient categories. In Section 4, we show that under certain condition, the equivalence has better properties.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Let us briefly recall the definition and some basic properties of extriangulated categories. For more details, see [NP, Section 2,3].

Let \mathcal{B} be an additive category equipped with an additive bifunctor

$$\mathbb{E} : \mathcal{B}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \text{Ab},$$

where Ab is the category of abelian groups. For any objects $A, C \in \mathcal{B}$, an element $\delta \in \mathbb{E}(C, A)$ is called an \mathbb{E} -extension. Let \mathfrak{s} be a correspondence which associates with an equivalence class

$$\mathfrak{s}(\delta) = [A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C]$$

to any \mathbb{E} -extension $\delta \in \mathbb{E}(C, A)$. This \mathfrak{s} is called a *realization* of \mathbb{E} , if it makes the diagrams in [NP, Definition 2.9] commutative. A triplet $(\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$ is called an *extriangulated category* if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (1) $\mathbb{E} : \mathcal{B}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \text{Ab}$ is an additive bifunctor.
- (2) \mathfrak{s} is an additive realization of \mathbb{E} .
- (3) \mathbb{E} and \mathfrak{s} satisfy some ‘additivity’ and ‘compatibility’ conditions in [NP, Definition 2.12].

We collect some basic concepts which will be used later.

Definition 2.1. Let $(\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$ be an extriangulated category.

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

$$A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \dashrightarrow^{\delta} .$$

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

- (2) An object $P \in \mathcal{B}$ is called *projective* if for any \mathbb{E} -triangle $A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \dashrightarrow$ and any morphism $c \in \mathcal{B}(P, C)$, there exists $b \in \mathcal{B}(P, B)$ satisfying $yb = c$. We denote the subcategory of projective objects by \mathcal{P} . Dually, the subcategory of injective objects is denoted by \mathcal{I} .
- (3) We say that \mathcal{B} has enough projectives if for any object $C \in \mathcal{B}$, there exists an \mathbb{E} -triangle $A \xrightarrow{x} P \xrightarrow{y} C \dashrightarrow$ satisfying $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Dually we can define *having enough injectives*.
- (4) Let \mathcal{S} be a subcategory of \mathcal{B} . We say \mathcal{S} is *extension closed* if in any \mathbb{E} -triangle $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \dashrightarrow$ with $A, C \in \mathcal{S}$, we have $B \in \mathcal{S}$.

Remark 2.2. Any extension closed subcategory \mathcal{M} of an extriangulated category $(\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$ has a natural extriangulated category structure $(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{E}|_{\mathcal{M}}, \mathfrak{s}|_{\mathcal{M}})$ inherits from $(\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$, where $\mathbb{E}|_{\mathcal{M}}$ is the restriction of \mathbb{E} onto $\mathcal{M}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{M}$ and $\mathfrak{s}|_{\mathcal{M}}$ is the restriction of \mathfrak{s} .

In this paper, let k be a field and $(\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{E}, \mathfrak{s})$ be a Krull-Schmidt, Hom-finite, k -linear extriangulated category with enough projectives and enough injectives. Let \mathcal{P} (resp. \mathcal{I}) be the subcategory of projective (resp. injective) objects. When we say that \mathcal{C} is a subcategory of \mathcal{B} , we always assume that \mathcal{C} is full and closed under isomorphisms.

We can define higher extensions $\mathbb{E}^i(-, -)$, $i \geq 1$ of the bifunctor \mathbb{E} (see [LN, Section 5.1] for details), and any \mathbb{E} -triangle $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \dashrightarrow$ induces the following long exact sequences

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(X, A) &\rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(X, B) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(X, C) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}(X, A) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}(X, B) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}(X, C) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}^2(X, A) \rightarrow \cdots ; \\ \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(C, X) &\rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(B, X) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(A, X) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}(C, X) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}(B, X) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}(A, X) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}^2(C, X) \rightarrow \cdots \end{aligned}$$

for any object $X \in \mathcal{B}$. Moreover, we have $\mathbb{E}^i(\mathcal{P}, -) = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}^i(-, \mathcal{I}) = 0$ for any $i \geq 1$.

In this paper, the cotorsion pairs will be the main tool we use.

Definition 2.3. [NP, Definition 2.1] Let \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} be two subcategories of \mathcal{B} which are closed under direct summands. We call $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ a *cotorsion pair* if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (a) $\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0$.
 (b) For any object $B \in \mathcal{B}$, there exist two \mathbb{E} -triangles

$$V_B \rightarrow U_B \rightarrow B \dashrightarrow, \quad B \rightarrow V^B \rightarrow U^B \dashrightarrow$$

satisfying $U_B, U^B \in \mathcal{U}$ and $V_B, V^B \in \mathcal{V}$.

Remark 2.4. For an extension closed subcategory \mathcal{M} , we say a pair of subcategories $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is a cotorsion pair on \mathcal{M} if $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is a cotorsion pair on the extriangulated category $(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{E}|_{\mathcal{M}}, \mathfrak{s}|_{\mathcal{M}})$.

By the definition of a cotorsion pair, we can immediately conclude the following result.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ be a cotorsion pair in \mathcal{B} .*

- (a) $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{U}^{\perp 1} := \{X \in \mathcal{B} \mid \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{U}, X) = 0\}$.
 (b) $\mathcal{U} = {}^{\perp 1}\mathcal{V} := \{Y \in \mathcal{B} \mid \mathbb{E}(Y, \mathcal{V}) = 0\}$.
 (c) \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} are extension closed.
 (d) $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$.

Definition 2.6. A cotorsion pair $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ is called *hereditary* if $\mathbb{E}^2(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0$.

Lemma 2.7. *For a cotorsion pair $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$, then following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) $\mathbb{E}^2(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0$.
 (ii) For any \mathbb{E} -triangle $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \dashrightarrow$, $B, C \in \mathcal{U}$ implies $A \in \mathcal{U}$.
 (iii) For any \mathbb{E} -triangle $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \dashrightarrow$, $A, B \in \mathcal{V}$ implies $C \in \mathcal{V}$.

Proof. We show that (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii), (i) \Leftrightarrow (iii) is by dual.

(i) \Rightarrow (ii): For any \mathbb{E} -triangle $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \dashrightarrow$ with $B, C \in \mathcal{U}$, we have an exact sequence:

$$0 = \mathbb{E}(B, V) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}(A, V) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}^2(C, V) = 0$$

for any $V \in \mathcal{V}$, which implies that $\mathbb{E}(A, V) = 0$. By Lemma 2.5, we obtain that $A \in \mathcal{U}$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i): Let $U \in \mathcal{U}$ and $V \in \mathcal{V}$. Since \mathcal{B} has enough projectives, U admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $U' \rightarrow P \rightarrow U \dashrightarrow$ with $P \in \mathcal{P}$. By Lemma 2.5, $P \in \mathcal{U}$, hence $U' \in \mathcal{U}$. Then we have an exact sequence:

$$0 = \mathbb{E}(U', V) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}^2(U, V) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}^2(P, V) = 0$$

which implies $\mathbb{E}^2(U, V) = 0$. □

Let $(\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{V}_1), (\mathcal{U}_2, \mathcal{V}_2)$ be two cotorsion pairs. By Lemma 2.5, we can find that

$$\mathcal{U}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{U}_2 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{V}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{V}_1 \Leftrightarrow \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{V}_2) = 0.$$

Definition 2.8. A pair of twin cotorsion pairs $((\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{V}_1), (\mathcal{U}_2, \mathcal{V}_2))$ is called a *twin cotorsion pair* if $\mathcal{U}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{U}_2$.

In the rest of this paper, let $((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}))$ be a twin cotorsion pair. For convenience, we put $\mathcal{W} := \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y}$.

Denote by $[\mathcal{W}](A, B)$ the subgroup of $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(A, B)$ consisting of the morphisms f factoring through objects in \mathcal{W} . We denote by $\overline{\mathcal{B}}/[\mathcal{W}]$ (or $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$ for short) the category which has the same objects as \mathcal{B} , and

$$\text{Hom}_{\overline{\mathcal{B}}}(A, B) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(A, B)/[\mathcal{W}](A, B)$$

for $A, B \in \mathcal{B}$. For any morphism $f \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(A, B)$, we denote its image in $\text{Hom}_{\overline{\mathcal{B}}}(A, B)$ by \overline{f} .

Lemma 2.9. *If $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{Y}$, then $\text{Hom}_{\overline{\mathcal{B}}}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}) = 0$ and $\text{Hom}_{\overline{\mathcal{B}}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) = 0$.*

Proof. If $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{Y}$, then $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{W} = \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{Y}$. Let $u : U \rightarrow Y$ be a morphism such that $U \in \mathcal{U}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. Y admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $Y' \rightarrow U' \xrightarrow{y} Y \dashrightarrow$ where $U' \in \mathcal{Y} \cap \mathcal{U} = \mathcal{W}$ and $Y' \in \mathcal{Y}$. Since $\mathbb{E}(U, Y') = 0$, there is a morphism $u' : U \rightarrow U'$ such that $yu' = u$. Hence $\overline{u} = 0$, this implies $\text{Hom}_{\overline{\mathcal{B}}}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}) = 0$.

Dually, we can show that $\text{Hom}_{\overline{\mathcal{B}}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}) = 0$. □

Lemma 2.10. *Let*

$$\mathcal{S}_L = \{B \in \mathcal{B} \mid \exists \mathbb{E}\text{-triangle } Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow B \dashrightarrow \text{ with } X \in \mathcal{X} \text{ and } Y \in \mathcal{Y}\},$$

$$\mathcal{S}_R = \{B \in \mathcal{B} \mid \exists \mathbb{E}\text{-triangle } B \rightarrow Y' \rightarrow X' \dashrightarrow \text{ with } X' \in \mathcal{X} \text{ and } Y' \in \mathcal{Y}\}.$$

If $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{Y}$, then \mathcal{S}_L and \mathcal{S}_R are closed under direct summands.

Proof. We show that \mathcal{S}_R is closed under direct summands, the other half is by dual.

Let $A_1 \oplus A_2 \in \mathcal{S}_R$. Then it admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $A_1 \oplus A_2 \rightarrow Y_0 \rightarrow X_0 \dashrightarrow$ with $Y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $X_0 \in \mathcal{X}$. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, A_i admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $A_i \rightarrow Y_i \rightarrow U_i \dashrightarrow$ with $Y_i \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $U_i \in \mathcal{U}$. Hence we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} A_1 \oplus A_2 & \longrightarrow & Y_1 \oplus Y_2 & \longrightarrow & U_1 \oplus U_2 & \dashrightarrow & \\ \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha & & \\ A_1 \oplus A_2 & \longrightarrow & Y_0 & \longrightarrow & X_0 & \dashrightarrow & \\ \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \beta & & \\ A_1 \oplus A_2 & \longrightarrow & Y_1 \oplus Y_2 & \longrightarrow & U_1 \oplus U_2 & \dashrightarrow & . \end{array}$$

It follows that $1 - \beta\alpha$ factors through $Y_1 \oplus Y_2$. This implies $U_1 \oplus U_2$ is a direct summand of $X_0 \oplus Y_1 \oplus Y_2$. By Lemma 2.9, any morphism from $U_1 \oplus U_2$ to $Y_1 \oplus Y_2$ factors through \mathcal{W} , hence $U_i \in \mathcal{X}$, which implies $A_i \in \mathcal{S}_R$. Then \mathcal{S}_R is closed under direct summands. \square

We also have the following observation.

Lemma 2.11. *Let \mathcal{S} be an extension closed subcategory of \mathcal{B} such that $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is a cotorsion pair in \mathcal{S} . Then $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{Y} \cap \mathcal{U}$. Moreover, \mathcal{S} is closed under direct summands.*

Proof. By definition we have $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{V} \supseteq \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y}$. Let $Z \in \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{V}$. Since $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is a cotorsion pair in \mathcal{S} , Z admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $Z \rightarrow W \rightarrow X \dashrightarrow$ with $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $W \in \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{W}$. This \mathbb{E} -triangle splits, which implies Z is a direct summand of $W \in \mathcal{W}$, hence $Z \in \mathcal{W}$. Dually we can show that $\mathcal{Y} \cap \mathcal{U} = \mathcal{W}$.

Since $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_R \cap \mathcal{S}_L$, by Lemma 2.10, we get that \mathcal{S} is closed under direct summands. \square

Definition 2.12. A subcategory \mathcal{M} of \mathcal{B} is called a *thick subcategory* in \mathcal{B} provides that it is closed under direct summands and for any \mathbb{E} -triangle

$$A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \dashrightarrow$$

in \mathcal{M} , if any two objects of A, B and C belong to \mathcal{M} , then so is the third one.

Lemma 2.13. *If $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is a cotorsion pair in a thick subcategory \mathcal{S} , then $\mathcal{S}_R = \mathcal{S}_L = \mathcal{S}$.*

Proof. By definition, we have $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_R \cap \mathcal{S}_L$. But on the other hand, since \mathcal{S} is thick, by definition we have $\mathcal{S}_R \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}_L \subseteq \mathcal{S}$. Hence $\mathcal{S}_R = \mathcal{S}_L = \mathcal{S}$. \square

Remark 2.14. If $((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}))$ satisfies $\mathcal{S}_R = \mathcal{S}_L$, then it is called a *Hovey twin cotorsion pair* (see [NP, Definition 5.1] for more details). Hence if $((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}))$ satisfies the condition in Lemma 2.13, it is a Hovey twin cotorsion pair. Note that if $((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}))$ is Hovey, we always have $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{Y}$ by [NP, Remark 4.17 and Remark 5.2].

3. LOCALIZATIONS AND QUOTIENT SUBCATEGORIES

In an \mathbb{E} -triangle $A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \dashrightarrow$, x is called an *inflation* and y is called a *deflation*. From now on, we also assume \mathcal{B} satisfies condition (WIC) ([NP, Condition 5.8]):

- If we have a deflation $h : A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C$, then g is also a deflation.
- If we have an inflation $h : A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C$, then f is also an inflation.

Note that this condition automatically holds on triangulated categories and Krull-Schmidt exact categories.

By this condition, we can always take right minimal deflations and left minimal inflations.

3.1. Extriangulated quotient categories. In the rest of the paper, let $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V}$. Since $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y})$ are cotorsion pairs, we have that \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} are closed under extensions. It follows that \mathcal{Z} is closed under extensions, hence it is an extriangulated subcategory of \mathcal{B} . Note that $\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{Z}) = 0 = \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{W})$, by definition, we obtain that \mathcal{W} is a subcategory of projective-injective objects in \mathcal{Z} . Then by [NP, Proposition 3.30], $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}]$ has an extriangulated structure induced by \mathcal{Z} .

Moreover, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1. *If $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ and $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y})$ are hereditary cotorsion pairs, then \mathcal{Z} is a Frobenius subcategory in which \mathcal{W} is the subcategory of projective-injective objects, which implies that $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}]$ is a triangulated category.*

Proof. According to [NP, Corollary 7.4], we only need to show that \mathcal{W} is the subcategory of enough projective-injective objects. Let $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ be any object. It admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $V \rightarrow X \rightarrow Z \dashrightarrow$ where $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $V \in \mathcal{V}$. Since $Z, X \in \mathcal{U}$, by Lemma 2.7, we have hence $V \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{Z}$. Moreover, since $V, Z \in \mathcal{V}$, we have $X \in \mathcal{V}$, hence $X \in \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{W}$ by Lemma 2.11. Dually we can show that Z admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $Z \rightarrow Y \rightarrow U \dashrightarrow$ where $Y \in \mathcal{W}$ and $U \in \mathcal{Z}$. Thus \mathcal{Z} is a Frobenius subcategory in which \mathcal{W} is the subcategory of projective-injective objects, which implies that $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}]$ is a triangulated category by [ZZ, Theorem 3.13]. \square

Lemma 3.2. *If $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V})$ and $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y})$ are hereditary cotorsion pairs, then $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}]$ is a triangulated category, whose suspension functor*

$$\langle 1 \rangle : A \mapsto A\langle 1 \rangle, \quad a \mapsto a\langle 1 \rangle$$

and distinguished triangles

$$A \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} B \xrightarrow{\bar{g}} C \xrightarrow{\bar{h}} A\langle 1 \rangle$$

are given by the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} A & \xrightarrow{f} & B & \xrightarrow{g} & C & \dashrightarrow & \gg \\ \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow h & & \\ A & \longrightarrow & W_A & \longrightarrow & A\langle 1 \rangle & \dashrightarrow & \gg \\ a \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow a\langle 1 \rangle & & \\ D & \longrightarrow & W_D & \longrightarrow & D\langle 1 \rangle & \dashrightarrow & \gg \end{array}$$

with $W_A, W_D \in \mathcal{W}$. Here $A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \dashrightarrow$ is an arbitrary \mathbb{E} -triangle in \mathcal{Z} and $a : A \rightarrow D$ is an arbitrary morphism in \mathcal{Z} .

3.2. Hovey twin cotorsion pairs. In [NP, Section 5], Nakaoka-Palu showed that if we have a Hovey twin cotorsion pair $((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}))$, then we can get an equivalence between $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}]$ and a localization with respect to $((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}))$. By Lemma 2.13, we can find that the torsion pairs in [IY1, Theorem 1.2] induces a Hovey twin cotorsion pair, and this theorem becomes a special case of the results in [NP, Section 5].

A question is that given a Hovey twin cotorsion pair $((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}))$, can we find a extension closed subcategory \mathcal{S} in which $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is a cotorsion pair. We can answer this question by the following proposition.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}))$ be a Hovey twin cotorsion pair (which means $\mathcal{S}_L = \mathcal{S}_R$). Then $\mathcal{S} := \mathcal{S}_L (= \mathcal{S}_R)$ is a thick subcategory in which $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is a cotorsion pair.*

Proof. We only need to show that \mathcal{S} is a thick subcategory, then by definition we know that $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is a cotorsion pair on \mathcal{S} .

(1) By Lemma 2.10, \mathcal{S} is closed under direct summands.

Let $A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \dashrightarrow$ be an \mathbb{E} -triangle.

(2) If $A, C \in \mathcal{S}$, we show that $B \in \mathcal{S}$. A admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $A \rightarrow Y_A \rightarrow X_A \dashrightarrow$ with $Y_A \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $X_A \in \mathcal{X}$, C admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $Y_C \rightarrow X_C \rightarrow C \dashrightarrow$ with $Y_C \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $X_C \in \mathcal{X}$, then we have the following commutative diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & C \dashrightarrow \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ Y_A & \longrightarrow & D & \longrightarrow & C \dashrightarrow \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ X_A & \xlongequal{\quad} & X_A & & \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \\ \mathcal{Y} & & \mathcal{Y} & & \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & & Y_C \xlongequal{\quad} Y_C & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ Y_A & \longrightarrow & Y_A \oplus X_C & \longrightarrow & X_C \dashrightarrow \\ \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ Y_A & \longrightarrow & D & \longrightarrow & C \dashrightarrow \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \mathcal{Y} & & \mathcal{Y} & & \mathcal{Y} \end{array}.$$

Since for a Hovey twin cotorsion pair, we always have $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{W} = \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{Y}$, Y_A admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $Y_1 \rightarrow W_1 \rightarrow Y_A \dashrightarrow$ with $Y_1 \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $W_1 \in \mathcal{W}$. Then we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 Y_1 & \xlongequal{\quad} & Y_1 & & & & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & & \\
 Y_2 & \longrightarrow & W_1 \oplus X_C & \longrightarrow & D & \dashrightarrow & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel & & \\
 Y_C & \longrightarrow & Y_A \oplus X_C & \longrightarrow & D & \dashrightarrow & \\
 \vdots & & \vdots & & & & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & &
 \end{array}$$

with $Y_2 \in \mathcal{Y}$, hence $D \in \mathcal{S}$. D admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $D \rightarrow Y_D \rightarrow X_D \dashrightarrow$ with $Y_D \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $X_D \in \mathcal{X}$. Then we have the following commutative diagrams:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 B & \longrightarrow & D & \longrightarrow & X_A & \dashrightarrow & \\
 \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 B & \longrightarrow & Y_D & \longrightarrow & X' & \dashrightarrow & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & X_D & \xlongequal{\quad} & X_D & & \\
 & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & &
 \end{array}$$

with $X' \in \mathcal{X}$, hence $B \in \mathcal{S}$.

(3) If $A, B \in \mathcal{S}$, we show that $C \in \mathcal{S}$. In the previous argument, we know that C admits an commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 A & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & C & \dashrightarrow & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel & & \\
 Y_A & \longrightarrow & D & \longrightarrow & C & \dashrightarrow & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & & \\
 X_A & \xlongequal{\quad} & X_A & & & & \\
 \vdots & & \vdots & & & & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & &
 \end{array}$$

Since $B \in \mathcal{S}$, and \mathcal{S} is closed under extensions, we get that $D \in \mathcal{S}$. D admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $Y^D \rightarrow X^D \rightarrow D \dashrightarrow$ such that $Y^D \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $X^D \in \mathcal{X}$, then we get the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 Y^D & \xlongequal{\quad} & Y^D & & & & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & & \\
 Y' & \longrightarrow & X^D & \longrightarrow & C & \dashrightarrow & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel & & \\
 Y_A & \longrightarrow & D & \longrightarrow & C & \dashrightarrow & \\
 \vdots & & \vdots & & & & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & &
 \end{array}$$

with $Y' \in \mathcal{Y}$, hence $C \in \mathcal{S}$.

(4) Dually we can show that $B, C \in \mathcal{S}$ implies $A \in \mathcal{S}$.

Hence \mathcal{S} is a thick subcategory. □

The following proposition gives a sufficient condition when $((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}))$ becomes a Hovey twin cotorsion pair.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}))$ be a twin cotorsion pair. If*

(3) If $A, B \in \mathcal{S}$, we show that $C \in \mathcal{S}$. In the previous argument, we know that C admits an commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 A & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & C \dashrightarrow \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
 Y_A & \longrightarrow & D & \longrightarrow & C \dashrightarrow \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 X_A & \xlongequal{\quad} & X_A & & \\
 \vdots & & \vdots & & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & &
 \end{array}$$

Since $B \in \mathcal{S}$, and \mathcal{S} is closed under extensions, we get that $D \in \mathcal{S}$. Y_A admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $Y_A \rightarrow I \rightarrow Y'' \dashrightarrow$ with $I \in \mathcal{I}$, since $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$, by Lemma 2.7, we get that $Y'' \in \mathcal{Y}$. Then we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 Y_A & \longrightarrow & D & \longrightarrow & C \dashrightarrow \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
 I & \longrightarrow & I \oplus C & \longrightarrow & C \dashrightarrow \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 Y'' & \xlongequal{\quad} & Y'' & & \\
 \vdots & & \vdots & & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & &
 \end{array}$$

Since \mathcal{S} is closed under extensions and direct summands, we get that $C \in \mathcal{S}$.

(4) Dually we can show that $B, C \in \mathcal{S}$ implies $A \in \mathcal{S}$.

Hence \mathcal{S} is a thick subcategory. Moreover, since $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, we have $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_R = \mathcal{S}_L$.

Let \mathcal{M} be an extension closed subcategory in which $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is a cotorsion pair. Then by definition $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$. Let S be any object in \mathcal{S} . S admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $Y^S \rightarrow X^S \rightarrow S \dashrightarrow$ with $Y^S \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $X^S \in \mathcal{X}$, Y^S admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $Y^S \rightarrow I_0 \rightarrow Y_0 \dashrightarrow$ with $I_0 \in \mathcal{I}$. By Lemma 2.7, we get that $Y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}$. We have the following commutative diagram


$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 Y^S & \longrightarrow & X^S & \longrightarrow & S \dashrightarrow \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
 I_0 & \longrightarrow & I_0 \oplus S & \longrightarrow & S \dashrightarrow \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 Y_0 & \xlongequal{\quad} & Y_0 & & \\
 \vdots & & \vdots & & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & &
 \end{array}$$

Since $X^S, Y_0 \in \mathcal{M}$, we have $I_0 \oplus S \in \mathcal{M}$. By Lemma 2.11, \mathcal{M} is closed under direct summands, hence $S \in \mathcal{M}$. This means $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$. Then we get $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{S}$. \square


A natural question is that if $((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}))$ is not Hovey, can we still get a similar equivalence between the ideal quotient $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}]$ and a localization with respect to this twin cotorsion pair. Recently, a more general structure called *general Hovey twin cotorsion pair* was introduced in [O] and a generalized equivalence was given. But these equivalence are just additive, even we know that in some cases the localizations have triangulated category structures ([Y1, Theorem 1.1], for example). In the rest of the paper, we first consider a case when $((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}))$ is contained in an extension closed subcategory but not Hovey that induces an equivalence between the ideal quotient $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}]$ and the localization with respect to this twin cotorsion pair, then we show that under certain conditions the equivalence from $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}]$ to the localization has better properties.

3.3. A localization of \mathcal{B} realized by $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}]$. From now on, we assume that we have an extension closed subcategory \mathcal{S} in which $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is a cotorsion pair.


Let \mathcal{X} be the subcategory whose indecomposable objects are marked by \bullet in the diagram. Let \mathcal{Y} be the subcategory whose indecomposable objects are marked by \clubsuit in the diagram (\clubsuit will continue to appear on the right side of the diagram):




Let $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{X} \vee \mathcal{Y}$. Then \mathcal{S} is an extension closed subcategory such that $\mathcal{S}[1] \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is a cotorsion pair in \mathcal{S} . $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{X}^{\perp 1}$ is the subcategory whose indecomposable objects are marked by \spadesuit in the diagram: (\spadesuit will continue to appear on the both sides of the diagram):



$\mathcal{U} = {}^{\perp 1}\mathcal{Y}$ is the subcategory whose indecomposable objects are marked by \heartsuit in the diagram: (\heartsuit will continue to appear on the left side of the diagram):



The indecomposable objects in $\mathcal{Z}/[W]$ are marked by \blacklozenge in the diagram: (\blacklozenge will continue to appear on the left side of the diagram):



Note that the indecomposable objects marked by \star in the diagram become zero objects in \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} . The twin cotorsion pair in this example is **NOT** a Hovey twin cotorsion pair, since the objects marked by \star lie in \mathcal{S}_R , but do not lie in \mathcal{S}_L .

We first show an important property of functor G .

Proposition 3.9. $G(f)$ is an isomorphism for any morphism $f : B \rightarrow C$ in \mathcal{R} .

Proof. There is an \mathbb{E} -triangle $B \xrightarrow{f} C \rightarrow S \rightarrow$ with $S \in \mathcal{S}$. Then we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 B & \xrightarrow{v_B} & V_B & \xrightarrow{x_B} & X_B & \dashrightarrow & \\
 \downarrow f & & \downarrow d_1 & & \parallel & & \\
 C & \xrightarrow{c'} & C' & \longrightarrow & X_B & \dashrightarrow & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow d'_2 & & & & \\
 S & \xlongequal{\quad} & S & & & & \\
 \vdots & & \vdots & & & &
 \end{array}$$

Since $V_C \in \mathcal{V}$, we have $\mathbb{E}(X_B, V_C) = 0$, then we get the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
B & \xrightarrow{v_B} & V_B & \xrightarrow{x_B} & X_B & \dashrightarrow & \\
f \downarrow & & \downarrow d_1 & & \parallel & & \\
C & \xrightarrow{c'} & C' & \xrightarrow{x'} & X_B & \dashrightarrow & \\
v_C \downarrow & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} d_2 \\ x' \end{pmatrix} & & \parallel & & \\
V_C & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}} & V_C \oplus X_B & \longrightarrow & X_B & \dashrightarrow & \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel & & \\
X_C & \xlongequal{\quad} & X_C & & & & \\
\vdots & & \vdots & & & & \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & & &
\end{array}$$

such that $\overline{d_2 d_1} = \overline{v_f}$ by the proof of Lemma 3.5. Then we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
V_B & \xrightarrow{d_1} & C' & \xrightarrow{d'_2} & S & \dashrightarrow & \\
\parallel & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} d_2 \\ x' \end{pmatrix} & & \downarrow & & \\
V_B & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} d_2 d_1 \\ x_B \end{pmatrix}} & V_C \oplus X_B & \longrightarrow & S_1 & \dashrightarrow & \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
& & X_C & \xlongequal{\quad} & X_C & & \\
& & \vdots & & \vdots & & \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & &
\end{array}$$

with $S_1 \in \mathcal{S}$. Since X_B admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $X_B \xrightarrow{w} W \rightarrow X_1 \dashrightarrow$ where $W \in \mathcal{W}$ and $X_1 \in \mathcal{X}$, we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
V_B & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} d_2 d_1 \\ x_B \end{pmatrix}} & V_C \oplus X_B & \longrightarrow & S_1 & \dashrightarrow & \\
\parallel & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & w \end{pmatrix} & & \downarrow & & \\
V_B & \longrightarrow & V_C \oplus W & \longrightarrow & S_2 & \dashrightarrow & \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
& & X_1 & \xlongequal{\quad} & X_1 & & \\
& & \vdots & & \vdots & & \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & &
\end{array}$$

with $S_2 \in \mathcal{S}$. S_2 admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $Y_2 \rightarrow X_2 \rightarrow S_2 \dashrightarrow$ with $Y_2 \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $X_2 \in \mathcal{X}$, then we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & Y_2 & \xlongequal{\quad} & Y_2 & & \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
V_B & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 1_{V_B} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}} & V_B \oplus X_2 & \longrightarrow & X_2 & \dashrightarrow & \\
\parallel & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} d_2 d_1 & * \\ * & * \end{pmatrix} & & \downarrow & & \\
V_B & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} d_2 d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & w x_B \end{pmatrix}} & V_C \oplus W & \longrightarrow & S_2 & \dashrightarrow & . \\
& & \vdots & & \downarrow & & \\
& & \downarrow & & & &
\end{array}$$

Lemma 3.13. *Let $f : B \rightarrow C$ be any morphism in \mathcal{R} . Then we have the following commutative diagram in \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S}*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} C & \xrightarrow{v_C} & V_C & \xrightarrow{z_C^{-1}} & Z_C \\ \downarrow f^{-1} & & \downarrow v_f^{-1} & & \downarrow z \\ B & \xrightarrow{v_B} & V_B & \xrightarrow{z_B^{-1}} & Z_B \end{array}$$

where $z : Z_C \rightarrow Z_B$ is a morphism in \mathcal{Z} such that $\bar{z} = G(f)^{-1}$.

Proof. By Proposition 3.9, $G(f) = \bar{z}_f$ is an isomorphism, let $\bar{z} = G(f)^{-1}$. Then $1_{Z_C} - z_f z$ factors through \mathcal{W} , by Lemma 3.10, we have $\underline{1}_{Z_C} = \underline{z}_f z$ in \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} . By the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} B & \xrightarrow{v_B} & V_B & \xleftarrow{z_B} & Z_B \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow v_f & & \downarrow z_f \\ C & \xrightarrow{v_C} & V_C & \xleftarrow{z_C} & Z_C \end{array}$$

we have $v_f z_B z = z_C z_f z$. By applying $L_{\mathcal{R}}$ to this equation, we get $\underline{v}_f \underline{z}_B \underline{z} = \underline{z}_C$, then $\underline{z} \underline{z}_C^{-1} = \underline{z}_B^{-1} \underline{v}_f^{-1}$. Hence we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} C & \xrightarrow{v_C} & V_C & \xrightarrow{z_C^{-1}} & Z_C \\ \downarrow f^{-1} & & \downarrow v_f^{-1} & & \downarrow z \\ B & \xrightarrow{v_B} & V_B & \xrightarrow{z_B^{-1}} & Z_B. \end{array}$$

□

We now give the proof of Theorem 3.7.

Proof of Theorem 3.7. We show that H is an equivalence. Since $G|_{\mathcal{Z}}$ is identical on objects, we know that H is dense.

We show that H is faithful. Let $\alpha : B \rightarrow C$ be any morphism in \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} . It has the form $B \xrightarrow{\beta_0} D_1 \xrightarrow{\beta_1} \dots \xrightarrow{\beta_{n-1}} D_n \xrightarrow{\beta_n} C$ where β_i is a morphism \underline{f}_i or a morphism \underline{g}_i^{-1} with $g_i \in \mathcal{R}$. We have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} B & \xrightarrow{\beta_0} & D_1 & \xrightarrow{\beta_1} & \dots & \xrightarrow{\beta_{n-1}} & D_n & \xrightarrow{\beta_n} & C \\ \downarrow \underline{z}_B^{-1} \underline{v}_B & & \downarrow & & \dots & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \underline{z}_C^{-1} \underline{v}_C \\ Z_B & \xrightarrow{z_0} & Z_1 & \xrightarrow{z_1} & \dots & \xrightarrow{z_{n-1}} & Z_n & \xrightarrow{z_n} & Z_C \end{array}$$

where $Z_i \in \mathcal{Z}$ and z_i are morphisms in \mathcal{Z} by Lemma 3.13. Denote $z_0 z_1 \dots z_{n-1} z_n$ by ζ , we have $\alpha = \underline{v}_C^{-1} \underline{z}_C \underline{\zeta} \underline{z}_B^{-1} \underline{v}_B$. If there exists a morphism $\alpha' : B \rightarrow C$ in \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} such that $H(\alpha) = H(\alpha')$, since we also have $\alpha' = \underline{v}_C^{-1} \underline{z}_C \underline{\zeta}' \underline{z}_B^{-1} \underline{v}_B$ with some $\zeta' \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(Z_B, Z_C)$, we can get that $\bar{\zeta} = H(\underline{\zeta}) = H(\underline{\zeta}') = \bar{\zeta}'$. Hence $\zeta - \zeta'$ factors through \mathcal{W} , which implies $\underline{\zeta} = \underline{\zeta}'$. Thus $\alpha = \alpha'$.

Finally we show that H is full. Let $\gamma : H(B) \rightarrow H(C)$ be any morphism. By the similar argument as above, we can get that $\gamma = \bar{z}$ where z is a morphism in \mathcal{Z} . Since we have the following commutative diagram in \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} :

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} B & \xrightarrow{v_B} & V_B & \xleftarrow{z_B} & Z_B = H(B) \\ \downarrow \alpha & & \downarrow \underline{z}_C \underline{z} \underline{z}_B^{-1} & & \downarrow z \\ C & \xrightarrow{v_C} & V_C & \xleftarrow{z_C} & Z_C = H(C) \end{array}$$

we have $H(\alpha) = H(\underline{v}_C)^{-1} H(\underline{z}_C) H(\underline{z}) H(\underline{z}_B)^{-1} H(\underline{v}_B)$. Since $H(\underline{v}_C) = H(\underline{z}_C) = \bar{1}_{Z_C}$ and $H(\underline{v}_B) = H(\underline{z}_B) = \bar{1}_{Z_B}$ by Remark 3.6, we obtain that $H(\alpha) = H(\underline{z}) = \bar{z} = \gamma$, hence H is full. □

Remark 3.14. This theorem also generalizes [Y1, Theorem 1.1].

Since we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{Z} & \xrightarrow{i} & \mathcal{B} & \xrightarrow{L_{\mathcal{R}}} & \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} \\ & \searrow \pi & & \nearrow F & \\ & & \mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}] & & \end{array}$$

where i is the embedding functor and π is the canonical quotient functor, we can get the following proposition.

Proposition 3.15. F is the quasi-inverse of H .

Proof. By definition we can obtain $HF = \text{Id}_{\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}]}$. Let $\alpha : B \rightarrow C$ be any morphism in \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} . By the proof of Theorem 3.7, we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} FH(B) & \xrightarrow{\underline{v}_B^{-1} \underline{z}_B} & B \\ FH(\alpha) \downarrow & \simeq & \downarrow \alpha \\ FH(C) & \xrightarrow{\underline{v}_C^{-1} \underline{z}_C} & C \end{array}$$

which implies that $FH \cong \text{Id}_{\mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S}}$. □

3.4. Another localization. Let \mathcal{C} be any subcategory of \mathcal{B} . Denote by $\Sigma\mathcal{C}$ the following subcategory:

$$\{D \in \mathcal{B} \mid \exists \mathbb{E}\text{-triangle } C \rightarrow I \rightarrow D \dashrightarrow \text{ with } C \in \mathcal{C}, I \in \mathcal{I}\}.$$

In this subsection, we assume $\Sigma\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$. Under this assumption, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 3.16. \mathcal{S} satisfies the condition **(CoS)** in Theorem 3.7. Moreover, for any \mathbb{E} -triangle $Y \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{f} B \dashrightarrow$ with $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $G(f)$ is an isomorphism.

Proof. We show the fact that for any \mathbb{E} -triangle $S_1 \rightarrow S_2 \rightarrow S_3 \dashrightarrow$ with $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{S}$, we have $S_3 \in \mathcal{S}$, which implies that condition **(CoS)** is satisfied.

Since S_1 admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $S_1 \rightarrow I_1 \rightarrow S'_1 \dashrightarrow$ with $I_1 \in \mathcal{I}$, we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} S_1 & \longrightarrow & S_2 & \longrightarrow & S_3 & \dashrightarrow & \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel & & \\ I_1 & \longrightarrow & I_1 \oplus S_2 & \longrightarrow & S_3 & \dashrightarrow & \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel & & \\ S'_1 & \xlongequal{\quad} & S'_1 & & & & \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & & & \\ \mathcal{Y} & & \mathcal{Y} & & & & \end{array}$$

Since $S'_1 \in \mathcal{S}$, we have $I_1 \oplus S_2 \in \mathcal{S}$. Since \mathcal{S} is closed under direct summands, by Lemma 2.11, we have $S_2 \in \mathcal{S}$.

Let $Y \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{f} B \dashrightarrow$ be an \mathbb{E} -triangle with $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. Since Y admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $Y \rightarrow I_Y \rightarrow S' \dashrightarrow$ with $I_Y \in \mathcal{I}$. By the previous argument, we obtain that $S' \in \mathcal{S}$. We have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} Y & \longrightarrow & A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \dashrightarrow \\ \parallel & & \downarrow a & & \downarrow b \\ Y & \longrightarrow & I_Y & \xrightarrow{i} & S' \dashrightarrow \end{array}$$

By the dual of [LN, Proposition 1.20], we can choose morphism $a : A \rightarrow I_Y$ to make an \mathbb{E} -triangle $A \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} f \\ a \end{pmatrix}} B \oplus I_Y \xrightarrow{(-b \ i)} S' \dashrightarrow$. Since $S' \in \mathcal{S}$, by Proposition 3.9, we get that $G(f)$ is an isomorphism. □

Remark 3.17. We claim that if $\Sigma\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, then $((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}))$ is a general Hovey twin cotorsion pair. By [O, Definition 3.9, Theorem 3.10], we only need to check the following fact:

For an \mathbb{E} -triangle $Y \rightarrow U \xrightarrow{u} A \dashrightarrow$ with $Y \in \mathcal{Y}, U \in \mathcal{U}, G(u)$ is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}]$.

This is just followed by Proposition 3.16.

Denote by \mathbb{W}_1 the following class of morphisms:

$$\{f : A \rightarrow B \mid \exists \mathbb{E}\text{-triangle } A \xrightarrow{f} B \rightarrow X \dashrightarrow \text{ with } X \in \mathcal{X}\}.$$

Denote by \mathbb{W}_2 the following class of morphisms:

$$\{g : C \rightarrow D \mid \exists \mathbb{E}\text{-triangle } Y \rightarrow C \xrightarrow{g} D \dashrightarrow \text{ with } Y \in \mathcal{Y}\}.$$

Denote by \mathbb{W} the following class of morphisms:

$$\{h = g \circ f \mid f \in \mathbb{W}_1 \text{ and } g \in \mathbb{W}_2\}.$$

Denote by $\mathcal{B}[\mathbb{W}^{-1}]$ the Gabriel-Zisman localization of \mathcal{B} with respect to \mathbb{W} , by $L : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}[\mathbb{W}^{-1}]$ the localization functor.

Remark 3.18. By definition, we can get that morphisms in \mathbb{W}_1 and \mathbb{W}_2 are invertible in $\mathcal{B}[\mathbb{W}^{-1}]$.

Remark 3.19. If \mathcal{S} is a thick subcategory, then by Lemma 2.13 we have $\mathcal{S}_R = \mathcal{S}_L$ and $((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}))$ is a Hovey twin cotorsion pair. $\mathcal{B}[\mathbb{W}^{-1}]$ becomes the localization discussed in [NP, Section 5].

Since morphisms in \mathbb{W}_1 and \mathbb{W}_2 become invertible in \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} , there exists a unique functor $F_1 : \mathcal{B}[\mathbb{W}^{-1}] \rightarrow \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S}$ such that $F_1 L = L_{\mathcal{R}}$. On the other hand, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 3.20. *Morphisms in \mathcal{R} are invertible in $\mathcal{B}[\mathbb{W}^{-1}]$.*

Proof. Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a morphism in \mathcal{R} . Then it admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $A \xrightarrow{f} B \rightarrow S \dashrightarrow$ with $S \in \mathcal{S}$. Since S admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $Y_S \rightarrow X_S \rightarrow S \dashrightarrow$ with $Y_S \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $X_S \in \mathcal{X}$, we have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & Y_S & \xlongequal{\quad} & Y_S \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ A & \xrightarrow{d_1} & D & \longrightarrow & X_S \dashrightarrow \\ \parallel & & \downarrow d_2 & & \downarrow \\ A & \xrightarrow{f} & B & \longrightarrow & S \dashrightarrow \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & \mathcal{Y} & & \mathcal{X} \end{array}$$

This means $f \in \mathbb{W}$. Hence $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathbb{W}$ and morphisms in \mathcal{R} are invertible in $\mathcal{B}[\mathbb{W}^{-1}]$. \square

By this proposition, there exists a unique functor $F_2 : \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}[\mathbb{W}^{-1}]$ such that $F_2 L_{\mathcal{R}} = L$. Hence $L = F_2 F_1 L$ and $L_{\mathcal{R}} = F_1 F_2 L_{\mathcal{R}}$. By the universal property of the localization functors, we have $F_2 F_1 = \text{Id}_{\mathcal{B}[\mathbb{W}^{-1}]}$ and $F_1 F_2 = \text{Id}_{\mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S}}$. This means \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} is isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}[\mathbb{W}^{-1}]$.

4. EXTRIANGLE EQUIVALENCES

Definition 4.1. Let \mathcal{B}_1 and \mathcal{B}_2 be two extriangulated categories and $\sigma : \mathcal{B}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_2$ be an equivalence functor. σ is called an *extriangle equivalence* if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1) σ preserves \mathbb{E} -triangles, which means for any \mathbb{E} -triangle $A_1 \xrightarrow{x_1} B_1 \xrightarrow{y_1} C_1 \dashrightarrow$ in \mathcal{B}_1 , $\sigma(A_1) \xrightarrow{\sigma(x_1)} \sigma(B_1) \xrightarrow{\sigma(y_1)} \sigma(C_1) \dashrightarrow$ is an \mathbb{E} -triangle in \mathcal{B}_2 .
- (2) For any \mathbb{E} -triangle $A_2 \xrightarrow{x_2} B_2 \xrightarrow{y_2} C_2 \dashrightarrow$ in \mathcal{B}_2 , there exists an \mathbb{E} -triangle $A_1 \xrightarrow{x_1} B_1 \xrightarrow{y_1} C_1 \dashrightarrow$ in \mathcal{B}_1 admitting an isomorphism of \mathbb{E} -triangles:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A_2 & \xrightarrow{x_2} & B_2 & \xrightarrow{y_2} & C_2 \dashrightarrow \\ \downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq \\ \sigma(A_1) & \xrightarrow{\sigma(x_1)} & \sigma(B_1) & \xrightarrow{\sigma(y_1)} & \sigma(C_1) \dashrightarrow \end{array}$$

In this section, we assume that \mathcal{S} is a thick subcategory of \mathcal{B} (note that by Lemma 2.13 we have $\mathcal{S}_R = \mathcal{S}_L$ and $((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}))$ is a Hovey twin cotorsion pair). We show that $F: \mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}] \rightarrow \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S}$ is an extriangle equivalence. Since $((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}))$ is a Hovey twin cotorsion pair, we can use the results in [NP, Section 6].

Let $f: A \rightarrow B$ be any morphism in \mathcal{B} . We have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A & \xrightarrow{y_A} & Y_A & \longrightarrow & U_A \dashrightarrow \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow & & \downarrow u_f \\ B & \xrightarrow{y_B} & Y_B & \longrightarrow & U_B \dashrightarrow \end{array}$$

with $U_A, U_B \in \mathcal{U}$, y_A, y_B are left minimal \mathcal{Y} -approximations. Since \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} and $\mathcal{B}[\mathbb{W}^{-1}]$ are isomorphic to each other, by the results in [NP, Section 6], we can define an auto-equivalence [1] on \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} such that $A[1] = U_A$ and $\underline{f}[1] = \underline{u}_f$. Moreover, the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A_1 & \xrightarrow{f_1} & B_1 & \xrightarrow{g_1} & C_1 \dashrightarrow \\ \downarrow a_1 & & \downarrow b_1 & & \downarrow h_1 \\ A_2 & \xrightarrow{f_2} & B_2 & \xrightarrow{g_2} & C_2 \dashrightarrow \end{array}$$

induces a commutative diagram in \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} A_1 & \xrightarrow{f_1} & B_1 & \xrightarrow{g_1} & C_1 & \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} & A_1[1] \\ \downarrow a_1 & & \downarrow b_1 & & \downarrow h_1 & & \downarrow a_1[1] \\ A_2 & \xrightarrow{f_2} & B_2 & \xrightarrow{g_2} & C_2 & \xrightarrow{\alpha_2} & A_2[1]. \end{array}$$

The rows are called *the standard triangles* in \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} . The *distinguished triangles* are the sequences which are isomorphic to the standard triangles. By [NP, Theorem 6.20], \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} is a triangulated category with distinguished triangles and the shift functor [1]. Note that any triangulated category can be viewed as an extriangulated category (see [NP, Proposition 3.22] for details).

Lemma 4.2. *Let $A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \dashrightarrow$ be any \mathbb{E} -triangle in \mathcal{B} . There exists isomorphism of triangles*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} A' & \xrightarrow{x'} & B & \xrightarrow{y'} & C' & \longrightarrow & A'[1] \\ \simeq \downarrow & & \parallel & & \downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq \\ A & \xrightarrow{x} & B & \xrightarrow{y} & C & \longrightarrow & A[1] \end{array}$$

in \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} such that the first row admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $A' \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} x' \\ * \end{pmatrix}} B \oplus I \xrightarrow{(y' \ *)} C' \dashrightarrow$ with $A' \in \mathcal{U}$ and $I \in \mathcal{I}$.

Proof. Since $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y})$ is a cotorsion pair, then A admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $Y \longrightarrow A' \xrightarrow{a} A \dashrightarrow$ with $A' \in \mathcal{U}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. Y admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $Y \longrightarrow I \longrightarrow S' \dashrightarrow$ with $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and $S' \in \mathcal{S}$. Then we have the following commutative diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y \longrightarrow A' \xrightarrow{a} A \dashrightarrow & & A' \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} a \\ * \end{pmatrix}} A \oplus I \longrightarrow S' \dashrightarrow \\ \downarrow & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} a \\ * \end{pmatrix} & \parallel & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} x \ 0 \\ 0 \ 1 \end{pmatrix} & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ I \longrightarrow A \oplus I \xrightarrow{(1 \ 0)} A \dashrightarrow & , & A' \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} x' \\ * \end{pmatrix}} B \oplus I \xrightarrow{(y' \ *)} C' \dashrightarrow & & & \\ \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} y \ 0 \end{pmatrix} & \downarrow c & & \\ S' \xrightarrow{=} S' & & C \xrightarrow{=} C & & & \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & & \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & \end{array}$$

By Lemma 3.10, $\underline{a} : A \rightarrow A'$ is invertible. S' admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $S' \rightarrow I' \rightarrow S'' \dashrightarrow$ with $I' \in \mathcal{I}$ and $S'' \in \mathcal{S}$, then we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} S' & \longrightarrow & C' & \xrightarrow{c} & C \dashrightarrow \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} c \\ * \end{pmatrix} & & \parallel \\ I' & \longrightarrow & C \oplus I' & \xrightarrow{(1 \ 0)} & C \dashrightarrow \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ S'' & \xlongequal{\quad} & S'' & & \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \end{array},$$

By Lemma 3.10, $\underline{c} : C' \rightarrow C$ is invertible. Hence we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A' & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} x' \\ * \end{pmatrix}} & B \oplus I & \xrightarrow{(y' \ *)} & C' \dashrightarrow \\ \begin{pmatrix} a \\ * \end{pmatrix} \downarrow & & \parallel & & \downarrow c \\ A \oplus I & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} x & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}} & B \oplus I & \xrightarrow{(y \ 0)} & C \dashrightarrow \end{array}$$

which induces a commutative diagram of triangles

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} A' & \xrightarrow{x'} & B & \xrightarrow{y'} & C' & \longrightarrow & A'[1] \\ \underline{a} \downarrow \simeq & & \parallel & & \underline{c} \downarrow \simeq & & \underline{a}[1] \downarrow \simeq \\ A & \xrightarrow{x} & B & \xrightarrow{y} & C & \longrightarrow & A[1]. \end{array}$$

□

Dually, we have the following lemma:

Lemma 4.3. *Let $A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \dashrightarrow$ be any \mathbb{E} -triangle in \mathcal{B} . There is a commutative diagram of triangles in \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} :*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} A & \xrightarrow{x} & B & \xrightarrow{y} & C & \longrightarrow & A[1] \\ \downarrow \simeq & & \parallel & & \downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq \\ A'' & \xrightarrow{x''} & B & \xrightarrow{y''} & C'' & \longrightarrow & A''[1] \end{array}$$

in \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} such that the second row admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $A'' \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} x'' \\ * \end{pmatrix}} B \oplus P \xrightarrow{(y'' \ *)} C'' \dashrightarrow$ with $C'' \in \mathcal{V}$ and $P \in \mathcal{P}$.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $A \xrightarrow{x} B \xrightarrow{y} C \dashrightarrow$ be any \mathbb{E} -triangle in \mathcal{B} . There is an isomorphism between \mathbb{E} -triangles*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A & \xrightarrow{x} & B & \xrightarrow{y} & C \\ \downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq \\ Z^A & \xrightarrow{z^x} & Z^B & \xrightarrow{z^y} & Z^C \end{array}$$

in \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} , where $Z^A \xrightarrow{z^x} Z^B \xrightarrow{z^y} Z^C \dashrightarrow$ is an \mathbb{E} -triangle in \mathcal{Z} .

Proof. By Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.3, we can assume that $A \in \mathcal{U}$ and $C \in \mathcal{V}$. Since A admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $A \xrightarrow{a} Z^A \longrightarrow X^A \dashrightarrow$ with $Z^A \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $X^A \in \mathcal{X}$, we have the following commutative

diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
A & \xrightarrow{x} & B & \xrightarrow{y} & C \dashrightarrow \\
\downarrow a & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
Z^A & \longrightarrow & B' & \longrightarrow & C \dashrightarrow \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
X^A & \xlongequal{\quad} & X^A & & \\
\vdots & & \vdots & & \\
\mathcal{Y} & & \mathcal{Y} & &
\end{array}$$

Since C admits an \mathbb{E} -triangle $Y^C \longrightarrow Z^C \xrightarrow{c} C \dashrightarrow$ with $Z^C \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $Y^C \in \mathcal{Y}$, we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & Y^C \xlongequal{\quad} & Y^C & \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
Z^A & \xrightarrow{z^x} & Z^B & \xrightarrow{z^y} & Z^C \dashrightarrow \\
\parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow c \\
Z^A & \longrightarrow & B' & \longrightarrow & C \dashrightarrow \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
& & \mathcal{Y} & & \mathcal{Y}
\end{array}$$

with $Z^B \in \mathcal{Z}$. By the arguments above, we have a commutative diagram of triangles

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
A & \xrightarrow{x} & B & \xrightarrow{y} & C & \longrightarrow & A[1] \\
\downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq \\
Z^A & \xrightarrow{z^x} & Z^B & \xrightarrow{z^y} & Z^C & \longrightarrow & Z^A[1].
\end{array}$$

Hence

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
A & \xrightarrow{x} & B & \xrightarrow{y} & C \\
\downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq \\
Z^A & \xrightarrow{z^x} & Z^B & \xrightarrow{z^y} & Z^C
\end{array}$$

is an isomorphism of \mathbb{E} -triangles in \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} . □

Remark 4.5. Note that we can only get that $Z^A[1]$ lies in \mathcal{U} (not \mathcal{Z}).

Remark 4.6. Since $F: \mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}] \rightarrow \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S}$ is just the following:

$$F(Z) = Z, \forall Z \in \mathcal{Z}; \quad F(\bar{f}) = \underline{f}, \quad f \text{ is any morphism in } \mathcal{Z},$$

and $HF = \text{Id}_{\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}]}$, the image of $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}]$ by F is an extriangulated subcategory of \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} . By Proposition 4.4, we can say that F is an extriangle equivalence.

Theorem 4.7. *Assume that $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y})$ are hereditary cotorsion pairs. Then $F: \mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}] \rightarrow \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S}$ becomes a triangle equivalence.*


Proof. By Proposition 3.1, we know that $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}]$ is a triangulated category with shift functor $\langle 1 \rangle$. Moreover, by Proposition 3.4, we can find that $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_R = \mathcal{S}_L$ is a thick subcategory, and $((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{V}), (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{Y}))$ is a Hovey twin cotorsion pair. By definition, if $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$, then $Z[1] = Z\langle 1 \rangle$. For an \mathbb{E} -triangle $A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \dashrightarrow$ in \mathcal{Z} , the image of the induced triangle $A \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} B \xrightarrow{\bar{g}} C \xrightarrow{\bar{h}} A\langle 1 \rangle$ in $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}]$ by F becomes a standard triangle $A \xrightarrow{\underline{f}} B \xrightarrow{\underline{g}} C \xrightarrow{\underline{h}} A[1]$ in \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} . Since we have $HF = \text{Id}_{\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}]}$ and $FH \cong \text{Id}_{\mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S}}$, the image of $\mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}]$ is a triangulated subcategory of \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} . Moreover, we have $F \circ \langle 1 \rangle = [1] \circ F$. This shows that $F: \mathcal{Z}/[\mathcal{W}] \rightarrow \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S}$ is a triangle equivalence. □

We give an example of our main results.


Example 4.8. Let Q be the following infinite quiver:

$$\dots \xrightarrow{x_{-5}} -4 \xrightarrow{x_{-4}} -3 \xrightarrow{x_{-3}} -2 \xrightarrow{x_{-2}} -1 \xrightarrow{x_{-1}} 0 \xrightarrow{x_0} 1 \xrightarrow{x_1} 2 \xrightarrow{x_2} 3 \xrightarrow{x_3} 4 \xrightarrow{x_4} \dots$$


Let $\Lambda = kQ/(x_i x_{i+1} x_{i+2}, i \neq 4k, x_{4k} x_{4k+1})$. Then the AR-quiver of $\mathcal{B} = \text{mod } \Lambda$ is the following.



The additive closure of the indecomposable objects denoted by \star and \blacklozenge form a thick subcategory in \mathcal{B} , denote it by \mathcal{S} . We denote the additive closure of the indecomposable objects in \blacklozenge by \mathcal{X} , it is the subcategory of all the projective objects in \mathcal{B} . Then $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S})$ is a cotorsion pair in \mathcal{S} , we also have two hereditary cotorsion pairs $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B})$ and $({}^{\perp 1}\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S})$. In this case, $\mathcal{Z} = {}^{\perp 1}\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{X}$. The indecomposable objects in $({}^{\perp 1}\mathcal{S})/[\mathcal{X}]$ are denoted by \clubsuit in the diagram:



The indecomposable objects denoted by \clubsuit are non-zero objects in \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{S} which do not lie in ${}^{\perp 1}\mathcal{S}$, they are isomorphic to the objects in ${}^{\perp 1}\mathcal{S}$:



REFERENCES

[Am] C. Amiot. Cluster categories for algebras of global dimension 2 and quivers with potential. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* 59 (2009), no. 6, 2525–2590.

[Bu] R. Buchweitz. Maximal Cohen-Macaulay modules and Tate cohomology. With appendices and an introduction by Luchezar L. Avramov, Benjamin Briggs, Srikanth B. Iyengar and Janina C. Letz. *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*, 262. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2021.

[BM] A. Buan, R. Marsh. From triangulated categories to module categories via localisations. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 365 (2013), no. 6, 2845–2861.

[BOJ] P. Bergh, S. Oppermann, D. Jorgensen. The Gorenstein defect category. *Q. J. Math.* 66 (2015), no. 2, 459–471.

[C] X. Chen. Relative singularity categories and Gorenstein-projective modules. *Math. Nachr.* 284 (2011), no. 2-3, 199–212.

[CZ] X. Chen, P. Zhang. Quotient triangulated categories. *Manuscripta Math.* 123 (2007), no. 2, 167–183.

[G] L. Guo. Cluster tilting objects in generalized higher cluster categories. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 215 (2011), no. 9, 2055–2071.

[GZ] P. Gabriel, M. Zisman. *Calculus of fractions and homotopy theory*. *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, Band 35* Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., New York, 1967.

[HZZ] J. Hu, D. Zhang, P. Zhou. Proper classes and Gorensteinness in extriangulated categories. *J. Algebra* 551 (2020), 23–60.

[IYo] O. Iyama, Y. Yoshino. Mutation in triangulated categories and rigid Cohen-Macaulay modules. *Invent. Math.* 172 (2008), no. 1, 117–168.

- [IY1] O. Iyama, D. Yang. Quotients of triangulated categories and equivalences of Buchweitz, Orlov, and Amiot-Guo-Keller. *Amer. J. Math.* 142 (2020), no. 5, 1641–1659.
- [IY2] O. Iyama, D. Yang. Silting reduction and Calabi-Yau reduction of triangulated categories. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 370 (2018), no. 11, 7861–7898.
- [K] H. Krause. The stable derived category of a Noetherian scheme. *Compos. Math.* 141 (2005), no. 5, 1128–1162.
- [K1] H. Krause. Localization theory for triangulated categories. *Triangulated categories*, 161–235, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 375, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2010.
- [KV] B. Keller, D. Vossieck. Sous les catégories dérivées. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* 305 (1987), no. 6, 225–228.
- [LN] Y. Liu, H. Nakaoka. Hearts of twin cotorsion pairs on extriangulated categories. *J. Algebra* 528 (2019), 96–149.
- [N] H. Nakaoka. General heart construction on a triangulated category (I): Unifying t -structures and cluster tilting subcategories. *Appl. Categ. Structures* 19 (2011), no. 6, 879–899.
- [NP] H. Nakaoka, Y. Palu. Extriangulated categories, Hovey twin cotorsion pairs and model structures. *Cah. Topol. Géom. Différ. Catég.* 60 (2019), no. 2, 117–193.
- [O] Y. Ogawa. Abelian categories from triangulated categories via Nakaoka-Palu’s localization. *Appl. Categ. Structures* 30 (2022), no. 4, 611–639.
- [OPS] S. Oppermann, C. Psaroudakis, T. Stai. Change of rings and singularity categories. *Adv. Math.* 350 (2019), 190–241.
- [R] J. Rickard. Derived categories and stable equivalence. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 61 (1989), no. 3, 303–317.
- [V] J. Verdier. Des catégories dérivées des catégories abéliennes. With a preface by Luc Illusie. Edited and with a note by Georges Maltsiniotis. *Astérisque* No. 239, 1996.
- [W] J. Wei. Relative singularity categories, Gorenstein objects and silting theory. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 222 (2018), no. 8, 2310–2322.
- [ZH] Y. Zheng, Z. Huang. Triangulated equivalences involving Gorenstein projective modules. *Canad. Math. Bull.* 60 (2017), no. 4, 879–890.
- [ZZ] P. Zhou, B. Zhu. Triangulated quotient categories revisited. *J. Algebra* 502 (2018), 196–232.
- [ZhZ] B. Zhu, X. Zhuang. Tilting subcategories in extriangulated categories. *Front. Math. China* 15 (2020), no. 1, 225–253.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, SOUTHWEST JIAOTONG UNIVERSITY, 610031 CHENGDU, SICHUAN, CHINA
Email address: liuyu86@swjtu.edu.cn

COLLEGE OF MATHEMATICS, HUNAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, 414006 YUEYANG, HUNAN, CHINA
Email address: panyuezhou@163.com