

# Semi-tilting modules and mutation

Hiroataka Koga

## Abstract

We introduce the notion of semi-tilting modules and show that the class of basic semi-tilting modules is closed under mutation. Using this, we provide a partial answer to the Wakamatsu tilting conjecture.

In this note, using the notion of mutation, we will provide a partial answer to the Wakamatsu tilting conjecture. Let  $R$  be a commutative noetherian complete local ring and  $A$  a noetherian  $R$ -algebra, i.e.,  $A$  is a ring endowed with a ring homomorphism  $\varphi : R \rightarrow A$  whose image is contained in the center of  $A$  and  $A$  is a finitely generated  $R$ -module. A module  $T \in \text{mod-}A$  is said to be a Wakamatsu tilting module if the following conditions are satisfied: (1)  $\text{Ext}_A^i(T, T) = 0$  for  $i \neq 0$ ; (2)  $A$  admits a right resolution  $A \rightarrow T^\bullet$  in  $\text{mod-}A$  with  $T^\bullet \in \mathcal{K}^+(\text{add}(T))$  and  $\text{Ext}_A^j(Z^i(T^\bullet), T) = 0$  for all  $i, j \geq 1$  (see [24]). The Wakamatsu tilting conjecture states that  $\text{proj dim}_{\text{End}_A(T)} T = \text{proj dim } T_A$  for every Wakamatsu tilting module  $T \in \text{mod-}A$  (see [7]). Note that if both  $\text{proj dim}_{\text{End}_A(T)} T$  and  $\text{proj dim } T_A$  are finite then  $T$  is a tilting module (see Definition 2.7) and  $\text{proj dim}_{\text{End}_A(T)} T = \text{proj dim } T_A$ . Some partial answers to the conjecture for artinian algebras were provided in [14], [17] and [25]. Unfortunately, this conjecture does not hold true for artinian rings (see [22]). This conjecture is related to the generalized Nakayama conjecture (see [3]) and a conjecture stating that  $\text{inj dim } {}_\Lambda \Lambda = \text{inj dim } \Lambda_\Lambda$  for every left and right noetherian ring  $\Lambda$ . If both  $\text{inj dim } {}_\Lambda \Lambda$  and  $\text{inj dim } \Lambda_\Lambda$  are finite then  $\text{inj dim } {}_\Lambda \Lambda = \text{inj dim } \Lambda_\Lambda$  (see [26]). In [13] Hoshino and the author provided a partial answer to the latter conjecture.

Mutation is an operation to construct an object from another object by replacing a direct summand, which has its origin in the study of exceptional collections of vector bundles on  $\mathbb{P}^n$  (see [9] and [10]). In [21] Riedtmann and Schofield introduced the method of mutation for tilting modules. In [20] Rickard introduced the notion of tilting complexes which generalizes that of tilting modules, and provided a necessary and sufficient condition for two rings to be derived equivalent. In [16] the author provided a sufficient condition to mutate tilting

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 16E10, 16G30; Secondary 16E35.

*Key words*. Tilting module, Wakamatsu Tilting module, Mutation.

The detailed version of this note will be submitted for publication elsewhere.

complexes. In [11] Happel and Unger showed that mutation for tilting modules is closely related to the partial order of tilting modules defined by Riedtmann and Schofield. This is also the case for semi-tilting modules. The notion of semi-tilting modules is introduced as follows.

A module  $T \in \text{mod-}A$  is said to be a semi-tilting module if the following conditions are satisfied: (1)  $\text{Ext}_A^i(T, T) = 0$  for  $i \neq 0$ ; (2)  $A$  admits a right resolution  $A \rightarrow T^\bullet$  in  $\text{mod-}A$  with  $T^\bullet \in \mathcal{K}^b(\text{add}(T))$ . Note that  ${}_{\text{End}_A(T)}T$  is a Wakamatsu tilting module of finite projective dimension. We will show that the class of basic semi-tilting modules is closed under mutation, i.e., for a basic semi-tilting module  $T = U \oplus X \in \text{mod-}A$  with  $X$  indecomposable, if  $X$  is generated by  $U$  then there exists a non-split exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow E \rightarrow X \rightarrow 0$  in  $\text{mod-}A$  with  $Y$  indecomposable,  $E \in \text{add}(U)$  and  $U \oplus Y$  a semi-tilting module (see Theorems 3.3 and 3.4). Note that for a basic semi-tilting module  $T \in \text{mod-}A$  there always exists a direct summand  $X$  of  $T$  such that  $T \cong U \oplus X$  and  $X$  is generated by  $U$  unless  $T$  is projective (see Proposition 2.12). If  $X$  is generated by  $U$ , then we will denote by  $\mu_X(T)$  the module  $U \oplus Y$ . Following [21], we will define a quiver  $K$  as follows: The vertices of  $K$  are isomorphism classes of basic semi-tilting modules and there is an arrow  $V \rightarrow W$  if  $W$  and  $V$  are represented by basic semi-tilting modules  $T'$  and  $\mu_{X'}(T')$  with  $X'$  a non-projective indecomposable direct summand of  $T'$ , respectively. Then  $K$  contains no oriented cycles (see Proposition 3.10). We will show that if the connected component of  $K$  including a semi-tilting module  $T$  contains a tilting module then  $T$  itself is a tilting module (see Theorem 3.11), i.e., the Wakamatsu tilting conjecture holds true for such a Wakamatsu tilting module.

This note is organized as follows. In Section 1, we will recall several basic facts and definitions. In Section 2, we will introduce the notion of semi-tilting modules and show that every non-projective semi-tilting module  $T \in \text{mod-}A$  admits a decomposition  $T = U \oplus X$  with  $X \in \text{gen}(U)$  indecomposable. In Section 3, we will show that the class of semi-tilting modules is closed under mutation and provide a partial answer to the Wakamatsu tilting conjecture.

We refer to [8], [12] and [23] for basic results in the theory of derived categories.

The author would like to thank M. Hoshino for his helpful advice. This work was supported by Grant-in-Aid for JSPS Fellows.

## 1 Preliminaries

Let  $A$  be a ring. We denote by  $\text{rad}(A)$  the Jacobson radical of  $A$ . We denote by  $\text{Mod-}A$  the category of right  $A$ -modules and by  $\text{mod-}A$  the full subcategory of  $\text{Mod-}A$  consisting of finitely generated modules. We denote by  $A^{\text{op}}$  the opposite ring of  $A$  and consider left  $A$ -modules as right  $A^{\text{op}}$ -modules. Sometimes, we use the notation  $M_A$  (resp.,  ${}_A M$ ) to stress that the module  $M$  considered is a right (resp., left)  $A$ -module. We denote by  $\mathcal{P}_A$  the full subcategory of  $\text{mod-}A$  consisting of projective modules. For a cochain complex  $X^\bullet$  and an integer  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we denote by  $Z^i(X^\bullet)$ ,  $Z^i(X^\bullet)$ ,  $B^i(X^\bullet)$  and  $H^i(X^\bullet)$  the  $i$ th cycle, the  $i$ th cocy-

cle, the  $i$ th boundary and the  $i$ th cohomology of  $X^\bullet$ , respectively. We denote by  $\mathcal{D}(\text{Mod-}A)$  the derived category of cochain complexes over  $\text{Mod-}A$ . For an additive category  $\mathcal{A}$  we denote by  $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})$  the homotopy category of cochain complexes over  $\mathcal{A}$  and by  $\mathcal{K}^+(\mathcal{A})$  (resp.,  $\mathcal{K}^b(\mathcal{A})$ ) the full triangulated subcategory of  $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A})$  consisting of bounded below (resp., bounded) complexes. For an object  $X$  in an additive category  $\mathcal{A}$  we denote by  $\text{add}(X)$  the full subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$  consisting of direct summands of finite direct sums of copies of  $X$ , by  $\text{gen}(X)$  the full subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$  consisting of epimorphic images of objects in  $\text{add}(X)$  and by  $\text{cog}(X)$  the full subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$  consisting of subobjects of objects in  $\text{add}(X)$ . We denote by  $\text{Hom}^\bullet(-, -)$  (resp.,  $- \otimes^\bullet -$ ) the associated single complex of the double hom (resp., tensor) complex. Finally, we consider modules as complexes concentrated in degree zero.

**Definition 1.1.** An exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow E^0 \rightarrow E^1 \rightarrow \dots$  in  $\text{Mod-}A$  is called a right resolution of  $M$ , which we denote by  $M \rightarrow E^\bullet$ . A right resolution  $M \rightarrow E^\bullet$  is said to be finite if there exists  $n \geq 0$  such that  $E^i = 0$  for  $i > n$ . Dually, an exact sequence  $\dots \rightarrow E^{-1} \rightarrow E^0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow 0$  in  $\text{Mod-}A$  is called a left resolution of  $X$ , which we denote by  $E^\bullet \rightarrow X$ . A left resolution  $E^\bullet \rightarrow X$  is said to be finite if there exists  $n \geq 0$  such that  $E^{-i} = 0$  for  $i > n$ .

**Lemma 1.2.** Let  $T, U \in \text{Mod-}A$  with  $\text{Ext}_A^i(T, T) = 0$  for  $i \neq 0$  and  $0 \rightarrow U \rightarrow V^0 \rightarrow V^1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow V^m \rightarrow 0$  a right resolution in  $\text{Mod-}A$ . Assume that each  $V^i$  admits a finite right resolution  $V^i \rightarrow T^{i\bullet}$  in  $\text{Mod-}A$  with  $T^{i\bullet} \in \mathcal{K}^b(\text{add}(T))$ . Then we have a finite right resolution  $U \rightarrow W^\bullet$  in  $\text{Mod-}A$  such that  $W^n = \bigoplus_{i+j=n} T^{ij}$  for all  $n \geq 0$ .

**Lemma 1.3** (cf. [18]). Let  $T, U \in \text{Mod-}A$  with  $\text{Ext}_A^i(T, T) = \text{Ext}_A^i(U, T) = 0$  for  $i \neq 0$  and  $0 \rightarrow V^{-m} \rightarrow V^{-m+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow V^0 \rightarrow U \rightarrow 0$  a left resolution of  $U$  in  $\text{Mod-}A$ . Assume that each  $V^{-i}$  admits a finite right resolution  $V^{-i} \rightarrow T^{-i\bullet}$  in  $\text{Mod-}A$  with  $T^{-i\bullet} \in \mathcal{K}^b(\text{add}(T))$ . Then we have a finite right resolution  $U \rightarrow W^\bullet$  in  $\text{Mod-}A$  with  $W^\bullet \in \mathcal{K}^b(\text{add}(T))$ .

**Definition 1.4** ([1], [2]). A homomorphism  $f : E \rightarrow X$  in  $\text{Mod-}A$  is said to be right minimal if every  $h \in \text{End}_A(E)$  with  $fh = f$  is an isomorphism. Dually, a homomorphism  $f : X \rightarrow E$  in  $\text{Mod-}A$  is said to be left minimal if every  $h \in \text{End}_A(E)$  with  $hf = f$  is an isomorphism.

Note that an epimorphism  $P \rightarrow X$  in  $\text{Mod-}A$  with  $P$  projective is right minimal if and only if it is a superfluous epimorphism and that a monomorphism  $X \rightarrow I$  in  $\text{Mod-}A$  with  $I$  injective is left minimal if and only if it is an essential monomorphism.

**Lemma 1.5** ([1]). Let  $0 \rightarrow Y \xrightarrow{\mu} E \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} X \rightarrow 0$  be a non-split exact sequence in  $\text{Mod-}A$  with  $\text{End}_A(X)$  local. Then  $\mu$  is left minimal.

**Lemma 1.6** ([1]). Let  $0 \rightarrow Y \xrightarrow{\mu} E \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} X \rightarrow 0$  be a non-split exact sequence in  $\text{Mod-}A$  with  $\text{End}_A(Y)$  local. Then  $\varepsilon$  is right minimal.

**Definition 1.7.** A left resolution  $E^\bullet \rightarrow X$  in  $\text{Mod-}A$  is said to be minimal if the epimorphism  $E^i \rightarrow Z^i(E^\bullet)$  is right minimal for all  $i \geq 0$ . Dually, a right resolution  $X \rightarrow E^\bullet$  in  $\text{Mod-}A$  is said to be minimal if the monomorphism  $Z^i(E^\bullet) \rightarrow E^i$  is left minimal for all  $i \geq 0$ .

**Definition 1.8** ([4]). Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a full subcategory of  $\text{Mod-}A$  closed under isomorphisms and direct summands. A homomorphism  $f : E \rightarrow X$  in  $\text{Mod-}A$  with  $E \in \mathcal{C}$  is said to be a right  $\mathcal{C}$ -approximation of  $X$  if  $\text{Hom}_A(E', f)$  is an epimorphism for all  $E' \in \mathcal{C}$ . A right  $\mathcal{C}$ -approximation  $f : E \rightarrow X$  is said to be a minimal right  $\mathcal{C}$ -approximation of  $X$  if  $f$  is right minimal. Dually, a homomorphism  $f : X \rightarrow E$  in  $\text{Mod-}A$  with  $E \in \mathcal{C}$  is said to be a left  $\mathcal{C}$ -approximation of  $X$  if  $\text{Hom}_A(f, E')$  is an epimorphism for all  $E' \in \mathcal{C}$ . A left  $\mathcal{C}$ -approximation  $f : X \rightarrow E$  is said to be a minimal left  $\mathcal{C}$ -approximation of  $X$  if  $f$  is left minimal.

The next lemma is due essentially to Auslander [2].

**Lemma 1.9.** Let  $0 \rightarrow Y \xrightarrow{\mu} E \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} X \rightarrow 0$  be an exact sequence in  $\text{Mod-}A$  with  $\mu$  a minimal left  $\text{add}(E)$ -approximation of  $Y$ ,  $\varepsilon$  a minimal right  $\text{add}(E)$ -approximation of  $X$ . Then  $\text{End}_A(X)$  is a local ring if and only if so is  $\text{End}_A(Y)$ .

**Lemma 1.10.** Let  $0 \rightarrow Y \xrightarrow{\mu} E \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} X \rightarrow 0$  and  $\cdots \rightarrow T^{i-1} \xrightarrow{d^{i-1}} T^i \oplus (\oplus^n X) \rightarrow T^{i+1} \rightarrow \cdots$  be exact sequences in  $\text{Mod-}A$ . Assume that  $\text{Hom}_A(T^{i-1}, \varepsilon)$  is an epimorphism. Then there exists an exact sequence  $\cdots \rightarrow T^{i-1} \oplus (\oplus^n Y) \rightarrow T^i \oplus (\oplus^n E) \rightarrow T^{i+1} \rightarrow \cdots$  in  $\text{Mod-}A$ .

**Lemma 1.11.** Let  $0 \rightarrow Y \xrightarrow{\mu} E \rightarrow X \rightarrow 0$  and  $\cdots \rightarrow T^{i-1} \rightarrow T^i \oplus (\oplus^n Y) \rightarrow T^{i+1} \rightarrow \cdots$  be exact sequences in  $\text{Mod-}A$ . Assume that  $\text{Hom}_A(\mu, T^{i+1})$  is an epimorphism. Then there exists an exact sequence  $\cdots \rightarrow T^{i-1} \rightarrow T^i \oplus (\oplus^n E) \rightarrow T^{i+1} \oplus (\oplus^n X) \rightarrow \cdots$  in  $\text{Mod-}A$ .

**Lemma 1.12** (cf. [5]). Let  $X, Y \in \text{Mod-}A$  with  $\text{End}_A(X)$  local,  $X$  finitely generated over  $\text{End}_A(X)^{\text{op}}$  and  $\text{Hom}_A(Y, X)$  finitely generated over  $\text{End}_A(Y)$ . Assume that there exist  $f_i : X \rightarrow X$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $f_0 : Y \rightarrow X$  such that  $f = (f_0, f_1, \dots, f_n) : Y \oplus (\oplus^n X) \rightarrow X$  is a non-split epimorphism. Then  $X \in \text{gen}(Y)$ .

Let  $T \in \text{Mod-}A$  and set  $B = \text{End}_A(T)$ . We denote by  $\mathbf{R}\text{Hom}_A^\bullet(-, T)$  (resp.,  $\mathbf{R}\text{Hom}_{B^{\text{op}}}^\bullet(-, T)$ ) the right derived functor of  $\text{Hom}_A^\bullet(-, T) : \mathcal{K}(\text{Mod-}A) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(\text{Mod-}B^{\text{op}})$  (resp.,  $\text{Hom}_{B^{\text{op}}}^\bullet(-, T) : \mathcal{K}(\text{Mod-}B^{\text{op}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(\text{Mod-}A)$ ).

**Lemma 1.13** ([15]). We have

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(\text{Mod-}A)}(X^\bullet, \mathbf{R}\text{Hom}_{B^{\text{op}}}^\bullet(Y^\bullet, T)) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(\text{Mod-}B^{\text{op}})}(Y^\bullet, \mathbf{R}\text{Hom}_A^\bullet(X^\bullet, T))$$

for  $X^\bullet \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Mod-}A)$  and  $Y^\bullet \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Mod-}B^{\text{op}})$ .

*Proof.* See [15, Lemma 2.3] the proof of which remains to work in our setting.  $\square$

**Lemma 1.14.** *Let  $U, V \in \text{Mod-}A$ . Assume that  $\text{Ext}_A^i(U, T) = \text{Ext}_A^i(U, V) = 0$  for  $i \neq 0$ , and that  $\text{Ext}_{B^{\text{op}}}^i(\text{Hom}_A(V, T), T) = 0$  for  $i \neq 0$  and the canonical homomorphism  $V \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{B^{\text{op}}}(\text{Hom}_A(V, T), T)$  is an isomorphism. Then  $\text{Ext}_{B^{\text{op}}}^i(\text{Hom}_A(V, T), \text{Hom}_A(U, T)) = 0$  for  $i \neq 0$ .*

**Definition 1.15** ([6]). A family of idempotents  $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$  in a ring  $A$  is said to be orthogonal if  $e_\lambda e_\mu = 0$  unless  $\lambda = \mu$ . An idempotent  $e \in A$  is said to be primitive if  $eA$  is indecomposable and to be local if  $eAe \cong \text{End}_A(eA)$  is local. A ring  $A$  is said to be semiperfect if  $1 = e_1 + \cdots + e_n$  in  $A$  with the  $e_i$  orthogonal local idempotents.

Let  $R$  be a commutative noetherian ring. In this note, a ring  $A$  is said to be a noetherian  $R$ -algebra if  $A$  is a ring endowed with a ring homomorphism  $\varphi : R \rightarrow A$  whose image is contained in the center of  $A$  and  $A$  is a finitely generated  $R$ -module.

**Lemma 1.16.** *Assume that  $R$  is a complete local ring. Then every noetherian  $R$ -algebra  $A$  is semiperfect, so that the Krull-Schmidt theorem holds in  $\text{mod-}A$ .*

*Proof.* This is well known but for the benefit of the reader we include a proof. Let  $\mathfrak{m}$  be the maximal ideal of  $R$  and  $I$  an injective envelope of  $R/\mathfrak{m}$  in  $\text{Mod-}R$ . Since  $A$  is right noetherian, we have  $A = e_1A \oplus \cdots \oplus e_nA$  with the  $e_i$  orthogonal primitive idempotents. Since  $e_iA \cong \text{Hom}_R(\text{Hom}_R(e_iA, I), I)$  canonically,  $\text{Hom}_R(e_iA, I) \in \text{Mod-}A^{\text{op}}$  is indecomposable injective. Also, we have a ring isomorphism  $\text{End}_A(e_iA) \cong \text{End}_{A^{\text{op}}}(\text{Hom}_R(e_iA, I))^{\text{op}}$  with  $\text{End}_{A^{\text{op}}}(\text{Hom}_R(e_iA, I))$  local. Thus every  $e_i$  is local, so that  $A$  is semiperfect. Since  $\text{End}_A(X)$  is a noetherian  $R$ -algebra for  $X \in \text{mod-}A$ , the Krull-Schmidt theorem holds in  $\text{mod-}A$ .  $\square$

## 2 Semi-tilting modules

Throughout the rest of this note,  $R$  is a commutative complete local ring and  $A$  is a noetherian  $R$ -algebra. Note that  $\text{Hom}_A(T, X)$  is finitely generated over  $\text{End}_A(T)$  for  $T, X \in \text{mod-}A$  and that by Lemma 1.16 every  $X \in \text{mod-}A$  admits a minimal projective resolution.

In this section, we will introduce the notion of semi-tilting modules and show that every non-projective semi-tilting module  $T \in \text{mod-}A$  admits a decomposition  $T = U \oplus X$  with  $X \in \text{gen}(U)$  indecomposable.

**Lemma 2.1.** *For any  $T \in \text{mod-}A$  and  $X \in \text{gen}(T)$  we have a epic minimal right  $\text{add}(T)$ -approximation  $\varepsilon : E \rightarrow X$ .*

**Lemma 2.2.** *For any  $T \in \text{mod-}A$  and  $Y \in \text{cog}(T)$  we have a monic minimal left  $\text{add}(T)$ -approximation  $\mu : Y \rightarrow E$ .*

**Definition 2.3** ([24]). A module  $T \in \text{mod-}A$  is said to be a Wakamatsu tilting module if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1)  $\text{Ext}_A^i(T, T) = 0$  for  $i \neq 0$ .
- (2)  $A$  admits a right resolution  $A \rightarrow T^\bullet$  in  $\text{mod-}A$  with  $T^\bullet \in \mathcal{K}^+(\text{add}(T))$  and  $\text{Ext}_A^j(Z^i(T^\bullet), T) = 0$  for  $i, j \geq 1$ .

**Definition 2.4.** A module  $T \in \text{mod-}A$  is said to be a semi-tilting module if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1)  $\text{Ext}_A^i(T, T) = 0$  for  $i \neq 0$ .
- (2)  $A$  admits a right resolution  $A \rightarrow T^\bullet$  in  $\text{mod-}A$  with  $T^\bullet \in \mathcal{K}^b(\text{add}(T))$ .

Note that a semi-tilting module  $T \in \text{mod-}A$  is a Wakamatsu tilting module with  $\text{proj dim}_{\text{End}_A(T)} T < \infty$  (see Lemma 2.5 below).

If  $T \in \text{mod-}A$  is a semi-tilting module, then any finite right resolution with terms in  $\text{add}(T)$  can be chosen to be minimal.

The following lemma is a slight generalization of [19, Proposition 1.4 (2)].

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $T \in \text{mod-}A$  with  $\text{Ext}_A^i(T, T) = 0$  for  $i \neq 0$  and  $B = \text{End}_A(T)$ . Then for any  $M \in \text{mod-}A$  the following are equivalent.*

- (1) *There exists a right resolution  $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow T^0 \rightarrow T^1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T^m \rightarrow 0$  in  $\text{mod-}A$  with  $T^i \in \text{add}(T)$  for  $0 \leq i \leq m$ .*
- (2)  *$\text{proj dim}_B \text{Hom}_A(M, T) < \infty$ ,  $\text{Ext}_{B^{\text{op}}}^i(\text{Hom}_A(M, T), T) = 0$  for  $i \neq 0$  and  $M \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}_{B^{\text{op}}}(\text{Hom}_A(M, T), T)$  canonically.*

*Remark 2.6.* Let  $T \in \text{mod-}A$  be a semi-tilting module and  $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow T^0 \rightarrow T^1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T^m \rightarrow 0$  a minimal right resolution in  $\text{mod-}A$  with  $T^i \in \text{add}(T)$  for  $0 \leq i \leq m$ . Then the following hold.

- (1)  $\text{Ext}_A^i(T, A) = 0$  for  $i > m$  and  $\text{Ext}_A^m(T, A) \neq 0$ .
- (2) If  $P^\bullet \rightarrow T$  is a projective resolution in  $\text{mod-}A$ , then  $\bigoplus_{i=0}^m P^i \in \mathcal{P}_A$  is a projective generator.

**Definition 2.7** ([19]). A module  $T \in \text{mod-}A$  is said to be a tilting module if it is a semi-tilting module and has finite projective dimension.

**Lemma 2.8.** *Let  $P^\bullet \in \mathcal{K}^b(\mathcal{P}_A)$  with  $P^i = 0$  unless  $0 \leq i \leq l$  for some integer  $l \geq 1$ . Assume that  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{K}(\text{Mod-}A)}(P^\bullet, P^\bullet[l]) = 0$  and that  $C(\text{id}_P) \notin \text{add}(P^\bullet)$  for any  $P \in \mathcal{P}_A$ , where  $C(\text{id}_P)$  is the mapping cone of the identity map of  $P$ . Then  $\text{add}(P^0) \cap \text{add}(P^l) = \{0\}$ .*

*Remark 2.9.* Let  $M, T \in \text{mod-}A$  with  $\text{Ext}_A^i(M, M) = \text{Ext}_A^i(T, T) = 0$  for  $i \neq 0$  and  $B = \text{End}_A(T)$ . If  $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow T^0 \rightarrow T^1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T^m \rightarrow 0$  is a minimal right resolution in  $\text{mod-}A$  with  $T^i \in \text{add}(T)$  for  $0 \leq i \leq m$ , then  $\text{add}(T^0) \cap \text{add}(T^m) = \{0\}$  unless  $m = 0$ .

**Lemma 2.10.** *Let  $T \in \text{mod-}A$ . Assume that there exists a non-split exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{\mu} E^0 \rightarrow E^1 \rightarrow 0$  in  $\text{mod-}A$  with  $\mu$  left minimal and  $E^i \in \text{add}(T)$  for  $i = 0, 1$ . Then for any indecomposable  $X \in \text{add}(E^1)$ , letting  $T \cong U \oplus X$ , we have  $X \in \text{gen}(U)$ .*

*Remark 2.11.* Let  $T \in \text{mod-}A$  be a semi-tilting module such that  $T \cong \oplus^n X$  with  $X \in \text{mod-}A$  indecomposable. Then  $T$  is projective.

**Proposition 2.12.** *Every non-projective semi-tilting module  $T \in \text{mod-}A$  admits a decomposition  $T = U \oplus X$  with  $X \in \text{gen}(U)$  indecomposable.*

**Lemma 2.13.** *Let  $T = U \oplus X \in \text{mod-}A$  with  $X$  indecomposable,  $X \notin \text{add}(U)$  and  $\text{Ext}_A^i(T, T) = 0$  for  $i \neq 0$ . Assume that there exists an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow E \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} X \rightarrow 0$  in  $\text{mod-}A$  with  $\varepsilon$  a right  $\text{add}(U)$ -approximation. Set  $B = \text{End}_A(T)$ . Then  $\text{Hom}_A(U \oplus Y, T) \in \text{mod-}B^{\text{op}}$  is a tilting module with  $\text{proj dim } {}_B\text{Hom}_A(U \oplus Y, T) = 1$ .*

### 3 Mutation

**Definition 3.1.** A module  $M \in \text{mod-}A$  is said to be basic if  $M \cong \oplus_{i=0}^m M_i$  with the  $M_i$  indecomposable and  $M_i \not\cong M_j$  unless  $i = j$ .

Throughout this section,  $T = U \oplus X \in \text{mod-}A$  is a basic semi-tilting module with  $X$  indecomposable and  $B = \text{End}_A(T)$ . Note that  $X \notin \text{add}(U)$ . We fix a minimal right resolution  $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow T^0 \rightarrow T^1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T^m \rightarrow 0$  in  $\text{mod-}A$  with  $T^i \in \text{add}(T)$  for  $0 \leq i \leq m$ , where  $m = \text{proj dim } {}_B T$ .

We will show that the class of semi-tilting modules is closed under mutation and provide a partial answer to the Wakamatsu tilting conjecture.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Assume that  $X \in \text{add}(T^0)$ . Then  $X \notin \text{gen}(U)$ .*

**Theorem 3.3.** *Assume that  $X \in \text{gen}(U)$ . Then there exists a non-split exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow Y \xrightarrow{\mu} E \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} X \rightarrow 0$  in  $\text{mod-}A$  with  $Y$  indecomposable,  $E \in \text{add}(U)$  and  $T' = U \oplus Y$  a semi-tilting module.*

**Theorem 3.4.** *Assume that  $X \in \text{cog}(U)$ . Then there exists a non-split exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow E' \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$  in  $\text{mod-}A$  with  $Z$  indecomposable,  $E' \in \text{add}(U)$  and  $U \oplus Z$  a semi-tilting module.*

*Remark 3.5.* Assume that  $m \geq 1$  and that there exists a non-split exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow E \rightarrow X \rightarrow 0$  in  $\text{mod-}A$  with  $Y$  indecomposable,  $E \in \text{add}(U)$  and  $T' = U \oplus Y$  a semi-tilting module. Take a minimal right resolution  $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow T'^0 \rightarrow T'^1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T'^m \rightarrow 0$  in  $\text{mod-}A$  with  $T'^i \in \text{add}(T')$  for  $0 \leq i \leq m$ . Then for each  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , letting  $T^i \cong E^i \oplus (\oplus^{l_i} X)$  with  $X \notin \text{add}(E^i)$  and  $T'^{i-1} \cong E'^{i-1} \oplus (\oplus^{l'_i} Y)$  with  $Y \notin \text{add}(E'^i)$ , we have  $l_i = l'_i$ .

**Definition 3.6.** If  $X \in \text{gen}(U)$ , then we will denote by  $\mu_X(T)$  the module  $T' = U \oplus Y$  in Theorem 3.3.

*Remark 3.7.* Let  $T \cong U' \oplus X'$  with  $X'$  indecomposable. If  $X \in \text{gen}(U)$  and  $X' \in \text{gen}(U')$  then  $X \cong X'$  if and only if  $\mu_X(T) \cong \mu_{X'}(T)$ .

**Lemma 3.8.** *Assume that  $X \in \text{gen}(U)$ . Then  $\mu_X(T)$  is a tilting module if and only if so is  $T$ .*

Following [21], we will define a quiver  $K$  as follows: The vertices of  $K$  are isomorphism classes of basic semi-tilting modules and there is an arrow  $V \rightarrow W$  if  $W$  and  $V$  are represented by basic semi-tilting modules  $T'$  and  $\mu_{X'}(T')$  with  $X'$  a non-projective indecomposable direct summand of  $T'$ , respectively.

**Definition 3.9.** A vertex  $V$  in  $K$  is said to be a predecessor of  $T$  in  $K$  if there exists a path  $V_0 \rightarrow V_1 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow V_n$  in  $K$  such that  $V_0 = V$  and  $V_n$  is the isomorphism class of  $T$ , and  $T$  is said to have only finitely many predecessors in  $K$  if the number of predecessors of  $T$  in  $K$  is finite.

**Proposition 3.10** ([21]). *The quiver  $K$  contains no oriented cycles.*

*Proof.* For the benefit of the reader we include a proof. Suppose to the contrary that  $K$  contains an oriented cycle  $V_0 \rightarrow V_1 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow V_n \rightarrow V_0$ . By definition there exists a non-split exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow Y_0 \rightarrow E_0 \rightarrow X_0 \rightarrow 0$  in  $\text{mod-}A$  such that  $X_0$  and  $Y_0$  are indecomposable,  $V_0$  and  $V_n$  are represented by basic semi-tilting modules  $U_0 \oplus X_0$  and  $U_0 \oplus Y_0$ , respectively, and  $E_0 \in \text{add}(U_0)$ . Also, there exists a non-split exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow Y_1 \rightarrow E_1 \rightarrow X_1 \rightarrow 0$  in  $\text{mod-}A$  such that  $X_1$  and  $Y_1$  are indecomposable,  $V_1$  and  $V_0$  are represented by basic semi-tilting modules  $U_1 \oplus X_1$  and  $U_1 \oplus Y_1$ , respectively, and  $E_1 \in \text{add}(U_1)$ . Since  $U_0 \oplus X_0 \cong U_1 \oplus Y_1$ , applying  $\text{Hom}_A(X_0, -)$  to the exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow Y_1 \rightarrow E_1 \rightarrow X_1 \rightarrow 0$ , we have  $\text{Ext}_A^i(X_0, X_1) = 0$  for  $i \neq 0$  and hence  $\text{Ext}_A^i(X_0, U_1 \oplus X_1) = 0$  for  $i \neq 0$ . Similarly, we have  $\text{Ext}_A^i(X_0, U_j \oplus X_j) = 0$  for  $i \neq 0$  and  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , where  $U_j \oplus X_j$  is a representative of  $V_j$  with  $X_j$  indecomposable. Then, since  $U_n \oplus X_n \cong U_0 \oplus Y_0$ , we have  $\text{Ext}_A^i(X_0, Y_0) = 0$  for  $i \neq 0$ , which contradicts that the exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow Y_0 \rightarrow E_0 \rightarrow X_0 \rightarrow 0$  does not split.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.11.** *If the connected component of  $K$  including  $T$  contains a tilting module then  $T$  itself is a tilting module.*

**Corollary 3.12.** *If  $T$  has only finitely many predecessors in  $K$ , then  $T$  is a tilting module.*

Assume that  $R$  is a Cohen-Macaulay ring,  $A$  is a maximal Cohen-Macaulay  $R$ -module and  $T$  is a maximal Cohen-Macaulay  $R$ -module. We will denote by  $\mathcal{L}(\perp T)$  the full subcategory of  $\text{mod-}A$  consisting of modules  $M$  which are maximal Cohen-Macaulay  $R$ -modules and  $\text{Ext}_A^i(M, T) = 0$  for  $i \neq 0$ .

**Corollary 3.13.** *Assume that  $\mathcal{L}(\perp T)$  contains only a finite number of non-isomorphic indecomposable modules. Then  $T$  is a tilting module.*



## References

- [1] M. Auslander, Applications of morphisms determined by modules, in: Representation theory of algebras (Proc. Conf., Temple Univ., Philadelphia, Pa., 1976), in: Lecture Notes in Pure Appl. Math., Vol. 37, Dekker, New York, 1978, pp. 245–327.
- [2] M. Auslander, Functors and morphisms determined by objects, in: Representation theory of algebras (Proc. Conf., Temple Univ., Philadelphia, Pa., 1976), in: Lecture Notes in Pure Appl. Math., Vol. 37, Dekker, New York, 1978, pp. 1–244.
- [3] M. Auslander and I. Reiten, On a generalized version of the Nakayama conjecture, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **52** (1975), 69–74.
- [4] M. Auslander and I. Reiten, Applications of contravariantly finite subcategories, Adv. Math. **86** (1991), no. 1, 111–152.
- [5] M. Auslander and S. O. Smalø, Preprojective modules over Artin algebras, J. Algebra **66** (1980), no. 1, 61–122.
- [6] H. Bass, Finitistic dimension and a homological generalization of semi-primary rings, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **95**, (1960), 466–488.
- [7] A. Beligiannis and I. Reiten, Homological and homotopical aspects of torsion theories, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **188** (2007), no. 883, viii+207 pp.
- [8] M. Bökstedt and A. Neeman, Homotopy limits in triangulated categories, Compositio Math. **86** (1993), no. 2, 209–234.
- [9] A. I. Bondal, Representations of associative algebras and coherent sheaves, (Russian) Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. **53** (1989), no. 1, 25–44; translation in Math. USSR-Izv. **34** (1990), no. 1, 23–42.
- [10] A. L. Gorodentsev and A. N. Rudakov, Exceptional vector bundles on projective spaces, Duke Math. J. **54** (1987), no. 1, 115–130.
- [11] D. Happel and L. Unger, On a partial order of tilting modules, Algebr. Represent. Theory **8** (2005), no. 2, 147–156.
- [12] R. Hartshorne, *Residues and duality*, in: *Lecture Notes of a seminar on the work of A. Grothendieck, given at Harvard 1963/64*, in: Lecture Notes in Math., **20**, Springer, Berlin, 1966.
- [13] M. Hoshino and H. Koga, Auslander-Gorenstein resolution, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **216** (2012), no. 1, 130–139.
- [14] Z. Y. Huang, Generalized tilting modules with finite injective dimension, J. Algebra **311** (2007), no. 2, 619–634.

- [15] Y. Kato, On derived equivalent coherent rings, *Comm. Algebra* **30** (2002), no. 9, 4437–4454.
- [16] H. Koga, On partial tilting complexes, *Comm. Algebra* **39** (2011), no. 7, 2417–2429.
- [17] F. Mantese and I. Reiten, Wakamatsu tilting modules, *J. Algebra* **278** (2004), no. 2, 532–552.
- [18] J. Miyachi, Injective resolutions of noetherian rings and cogenerators, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **128** (2000), no. 8, 2233–2242.
- [19] Y. Miyashita, Tilting modules of finite projective dimension, *Math. Z.* **193** (1986), no. 1, 113–146.
- [20] J. Rickard, Morita theory for derived categories, *J. London Math. Soc.* (2) **39** (1989), no. 3, 436–456.
- [21] C. Riedtmann and A. Schofield, On a simplicial complex associated with tilting modules, *Comment. Math. Helv.* **66** (1991), no. 1, 70–78.
- [22] R. Schulz, A nonprojective module without self-extensions, *Arch. Math.* (Basel) **62** (1994), no. 6, 497–500.
- [23] J. L. Verdier, Catégories dérivées, état 0, in: *Cohomologie étale*, in: *Lecture Notes in Math.*, **569**, Springer, Berlin, 1977, pp. 262–311.
- [24] T. Wakamatsu, Stable equivalence for self-injective algebras and a generalization of tilting modules, *J. Algebra* **134** (1990), no. 2, 298–325.
- [25] J. Wei, Finitistic dimension conjecture and relative hereditary algebras, *J. Algebra* **322** (2009), no. 12, 4198–4204.
- [26] A. Zaks, Injective dimension of semi-primary rings, *J. Algebra* **13** (1969), 73–86.

Institute of Mathematics, University of Tsukuba, Ibaraki, 305-8571, Japan  
*E-mail address:* koga@math.tsukuba.ac.jp