

A. Some context, abelian categories.

$\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ abelian categories.
f.f.

We say \mathcal{A} is a Serre subcat. of \mathcal{B} if
it is closed under extensions, subobjects, quotient objects.

Exs (i) X a noetherian scheme, $\mathbb{Z} \subseteq X$,

$$\mathrm{Coh}(X_{\mathrm{an}, \mathbb{Z}}) \subseteq \mathrm{Coh}(X)$$

of coherent sheaves set theoretically supported on \mathbb{Z} is a Serre subcategory.

(ii) $\mathrm{Coh}(\mathbb{Z}) \subseteq \mathrm{Coh}(X)$ is not Serre.

(iii) R a coherent but not noetherian commutative ring,

$$\mathrm{Mod}_R^{\mathrm{f.p.}} \subseteq \mathrm{Mod}_R$$

is not Serre. Ex: non-discrete valuation ring like $\mathbb{Z}_p[\frac{1}{p}]^\wedge$.

Construction. $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ Serre, can construct a new abelian category

$$\mathcal{B}/\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}[\omega^{-1}], \quad \omega = \{f: X \rightarrow Y : \mathrm{ker}(f), \mathrm{coker}(f) \in \mathcal{A}\}.$$

Ex. In (i), if $U = X \setminus \mathbb{Z}$, then $\mathrm{Coh}(X)/\mathrm{Coh}(X_{\mathrm{an}, \mathbb{Z}}) \simeq \mathrm{Coh}(U)$.

In fact, from Gabriel's thesis

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{specialization closed subsets} \\ \text{of } X \end{array} \right\} \xrightleftharpoons{\mathrm{Supp}} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Serre subcategories of} \\ \mathrm{Coh}(X) \end{array} \right\}$$

B. Some context, derived categories.

R a commutative ring.

$\text{Perf}(R) \subseteq D(R)$.

Def. A localization of $D(R)$ is an adjoint pair with L left

$$D(R) \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{U} \\[-1ex] \xrightarrow{L} \end{array} e$$

where U is fully faithful. These are determined by

$$K = \ker(L) \subseteq D(R)$$

||

$$\{X \in D(R) : LX \simeq 0\}.$$

Such K are called localizing subcats of $D(R)$. They are F.F. Δ -subcategories closed under arbitrary coproducts.

A localization is smashing if the following eq. conditions hold:

- (a) L preserves compact objects ($\text{Perf}(R)$),
- (b) UL commutes w/ arbitrary coproducts,
- (c) U commutes w/ arbitrary coproducts.

Telescope conjecture. If K is the kernel of a smashing localization, then K is generated by a set of compact objects of $D(R)$.

Thm (Neeman, Hopkins). R noetherian.

$$(a) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{subcats of} \\ \text{Spec } R \end{array} \right\} \quad \equiv \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{localizations of} \\ D(R) \end{array} \right\}$$

$$(b) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{speculation closed} \\ \text{subcats of} \\ \text{Spec } R \end{array} \right\} \quad \equiv \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{smashing loc of} \\ D(R) \end{array} \right\}; \text{ telescope is true.}$$

Reqs: (a) $Z \subseteq \text{Spec } R$ is cut out by a f.g. ideal
 $I = (a_1, \dots, a_n).$

The Koszul complex

$$\bigotimes_{i=1}^n \text{cone}(R \xrightarrow{a_i} R)$$

is perfect and generates

$$D(\text{Spec } R \text{ on } Z) \rightleftarrows D(\text{Spec } R) \rightleftarrows D(U).$$

(b) Thomason proved that for any commutative R ,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{specialization closed} \\ \text{subsets of} \\ \text{Spec } R \end{array} \right\} \rightleftarrows \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{thick subsets} \\ \text{of } \text{Perf}(R) \end{array} \right\}.$$

(c) Telescope conjecture is typically false.

Let R be a perfect rank 1 valuation ring with maximal k .

Then, $k = R/m$ is also perfect. M is torsion free, hence flat.

Thus, $0 \rightarrow m \rightarrow R \rightarrow k \rightarrow 0$ is a flat resolution.

Tensor with k :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} M \otimes_R k & \longrightarrow & R \otimes_R k & \longrightarrow & k \otimes_R k & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \text{Uw perfect} & \parallel & & & \parallel & & \parallel \\ & & & & k & = & k \\ & & & & 0 & & 0 \end{array}$$

Thus, $\overset{\text{smashing}}{k \otimes_R^L k} \cong k$. Thus, $D(R) \rightleftarrows D(k)$ is a \wedge -localization. (Ward!) But, if $P \in \text{Perf}(R)$ satisfies

$$P \otimes_R^L k = 0,$$

then $P \cong 0$. Hence, the kernel cannot be gen. by cpt. obj. of $D(R)$.

C. The almost categories.

The almost setup:

R commutative ring,

$I \subset R$ a f.flat ideal s.t.

$$I^2 = I.$$

(Includes $I=0$ and $I=R$.)

Lemma. $I \otimes_R I \cong I^2 = I$.

Lemma. $\text{Mod}_{R/I} \subseteq \text{Mod}_R$ is Serre.

proof. Just have to check closure under extensions. Let

$$0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow P \rightarrow 0$$

be an exact $\rightarrow \text{Mod}_R$ with $M, P \in \text{Mod}_{R/I}$. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with image $\bar{n} \in P$. Let $a \in I$ and write $a = b, c$ when $b, c \in I$. Then, $c\bar{n} = 0$, so $cn \in M$ and hence $b(cn) = 0$ whenever $an = 0$.

Def. $\text{Mod}_R^a := \text{Mod}_R / \text{Mod}_{R/I}$.

$$\mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}_R^a) = \mathcal{D}(R) / \mathcal{D}(R/I).$$

The six functors perspective.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & i_! & & i_+ & \\
 \text{Mod}_{R/I} & \xleftarrow{i_*} & \text{Mod}_R & \xleftarrow{j^*} & \text{Mod}_R^a \\
 & i^+ & & j_! & \\
 & \xleftarrow{i^+} & & \xleftarrow{j_!} &
 \end{array}$$

- i^+ left adj. to i_+ .

- $i_!(M) = \text{Hom}_R(R/I, M) = M[I]$ right adj. to i_+ .

- $j_!$ fully faithful left adj. to j^* .

Rmk. Kind of strange for $j_!$ to exist in the

- j_+ fully faithful right adj. to j^* .

Rmk. Kind of strange for $j_!$ to exist in the

Rmk. Let U be the complement of $\text{Spec } R/I \subset \text{Spec } R$.

Then,

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \text{Mod}_R & \longrightarrow & \text{QCoh}(U) \\
 & \searrow & \nearrow \\
 & \text{Mod}_R^a &
 \end{array}$$

Bhargav suggests viewing Mod_R^a as q-c sheaves on a large (non-existent) open containing U .

The i adjoints exist for any ring R . The point they have is that the image of ι_* is Soc .

Def. Set $A \subseteq \text{Mod}_R$ to be the full subset of M s.t.

$$I \otimes_R M \cong M.$$

Lemma. $A \subseteq \text{Mod}_R^a$, inclusion into Mod_R is $j_!$.

Proof. j^*, j_+ exist by formal nonsense. Monaurily, set

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Mod}_R & \xrightarrow{k^+} & A \\ M & \longmapsto & I \otimes_R M. \end{array}$$

If $k^+ M = 0$, then $M \cong R/I \otimes_R M$ and conversely.

Thus, $\ker(k^+) = \text{Mod}_{R/I}$.

Let $k_+: A \longrightarrow \text{Mod}_R$ by $M \longmapsto \underset{R}{\text{Hom}}(I, M)$.

Then, $\underset{R}{\text{Hom}}(M, \underset{R}{\text{Hom}}(I, N)) \cong \underset{\text{Hom}_R}{\text{Hom}}(I \otimes_R M, N) = \text{Hom}_A(I \otimes_R M, N)$.

So, k_+ is right adj. to k^+ . adjunction

Given M in A we have a comit map

$$\begin{array}{ccc} I \otimes_R \underset{R}{\text{Hom}}(I, M) & \longrightarrow & M \\ a \otimes f & \longmapsto & f(a). \end{array}$$

$$R\text{Hom}(R/I, M) \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow R\text{Hom}(I, M)$$

$$I \otimes_R^L R\text{Hom}(R/I, M) \xrightarrow{\quad S \quad} M \xrightarrow{\sim} I \otimes_R R\text{Hom}(I, M).$$

$$\underbrace{I \otimes_R^L R/I \otimes_R^L R\text{Hom}(R/I, M)}_{\cong 0} \cong 0$$

$$\text{Hom}_A(M, I \otimes_R N) \cong \text{Hom}(N, N)$$

How to show

$$R\text{Hom}_R(M, R/I \otimes_R^L N) \cong 0$$

SI

$$R\text{Hom}_{R/I}(M \otimes_R^L R/I, R/I \otimes_R^L N)$$

So, we have described $j_!$ and j_+ and

$$\text{Mod}_R^a.$$