

The derived ∞ -category of Cartier modules

Klaus Mattis*, Timo Weiß



ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 9 December 2024

Received in revised form 24 October 2025

Available online 8 December 2025

Communicated by S. Iyengar

MSC:

14G17; 13A35

ABSTRACT

For an endofunctor $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ on an (∞) -category $\mathcal{C}$ we define the ∞ -category $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ of generalized Cartier modules as the lax equalizer of F and the identity. This generalizes the notion of Cartier modules on $\mathbb{F}_p$ -schemes considered in [4]. We show that in favorable cases $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ is monadic over $\mathcal{C}$. If $\mathcal{A}$ is a Grothendieck abelian category and $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is an exact and colimit-preserving endofunctor, we use this fact to construct an equivalence $\mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F)) \simeq \text{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{D}(F))$ of stable ∞ -categories. We use this equivalence to construct a perverse t-structure on $\mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\text{Mod}(X), F_*))$ for any Noetherian $\mathbb{F}_p$ -scheme X with absolute Frobenius F . If F is finite, this coincides with the perverse t-structure constructed in [3].

© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Contents

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Consequences of the main theorem	3
1.2. Monadicity of Cartier modules	3
1.3. The perverse t-structure on Cartier modules	4
1.4. Outline	4
1.5. Notation	5
1.6. Acknowledgments	5
2. Definition of Cartier modules	5
3. The induced t-structure on lax equalizers	10
4. The left adjoint of the forgetful functor	14
5. The derived ∞ -category of Cartier modules	19
6. Applications	23
CRediT authorship contribution statement	27
Declaration of competing interest	27
Appendix A. Derived ∞ -categories	27
References	30

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: timo.weiss@uni-mainz.de (T. Weiß).URL: <http://www.klaus-mattis.com> (K. Mattis).

1. Introduction

A distinguishing aspect of algebraic geometry over a field of positive characteristic $p > 0$ is the presence of the Frobenius endomorphism. A particular point of interest are modules with an action of the Frobenius.

If X is an $\mathbb{F}_p$ -scheme then a (quasi-coherent) $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module with a left action of the absolute Frobenius $F: X \rightarrow X$ is called a Frobenius module. They are related via a Riemann–Hilbert-type correspondence to p -torsion étale sheaves, cf. [11,9,10].

There is also a dual notion of Cartier modules, which are related to Frobenius modules via Grothendieck–Serre duality by a result of Baudin [3, Theorem 4.2.7]. They are (quasi-coherent) $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules with a right action of the Frobenius, or equivalently pairs (M, κ_M) of an $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module M and an $\mathcal{O}_X$ -linear morphism $\kappa_M: F_*M \rightarrow M$. Their category $\text{Cart}(X)$ was first considered by Anderson in [2] and more thoroughly studied by Blickle and Böckle in [4,5]. Both Frobenius modules and Cartier modules are important tools in positive characteristic commutative algebra and algebraic geometry, and have been studied by many authors [23,18,28,26,16].

The aim of this paper is to introduce a general framework where the classical notion of Cartier modules (and Frobenius modules) can be viewed as a special instance: For $\mathcal{C}$ any (∞) -category and $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ any endofunctor we define the following (∞) -category.

Definition A (Definition 2.4). We define the ∞ -category $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ of *Cartier modules in $\mathcal{C}$ with respect to the functor F* as the pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F) & \xrightarrow{U_{\mathcal{C}}} & \mathcal{C} \\ \kappa_{\mathcal{C}} \downarrow & & \downarrow (F, \text{id}_{\mathcal{C}}) \\ \text{Arr}(\mathcal{C}) & \xrightarrow{(\text{ev}_0, \text{ev}_1)} & \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \end{array}$$

in Cat_{∞} , where $\text{Arr}(\mathcal{C}) := \text{Fun}(\Delta^1, \mathcal{C})$ is the ∞ -category of arrows in $\mathcal{C}$ and the functors $\text{ev}_0, \text{ev}_1: \text{Fun}(\Delta^1, \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ are induced by the inclusions $\{0\} \hookrightarrow \Delta^1$ and $\{1\} \hookrightarrow \Delta^1$, respectively.

Example B. As a special case, we recover the definition of Cartier modules in [4] as $\text{Cart}(X) := \text{Cart}(\text{QCoh}(X), F_*)$, where F_* denotes the direct image functor along the absolute Frobenius F on X .

This general framework allows us to consider the ∞ -category of Cartier modules in the derived ∞ -category of quasicohherent modules, or more generally in the derived ∞ -category $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ of any Grothendieck abelian category $\mathcal{A}$. The main theorem of this paper is the following comparison result, which roughly states that the operations of taking Cartier modules and taking the derived ∞ -category commute.

Theorem C (Theorem 5.1). *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a Grothendieck abelian category and $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ an exact and colimit-preserving functor. In particular, F induces a functor $\mathcal{D}(F): \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$. Then $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F)$ is a Grothendieck abelian category and there is a canonical functor $\mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F)) \rightarrow \text{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{D}(F))$ which is an equivalence of ∞ -categories. Moreover, both ∞ -categories carry a natural t -structure and the equivalence is t -exact.*

There was strong evidence that suggested such a result, as there is a similar equivalence of stable ∞ -categories

$$\mathcal{D}(\text{Arr}(\mathcal{A})) \simeq \text{Arr}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})),$$

see e.g. the answer of Hoyois on mathoverflow [15]. Note that this equivalence does not hold if one replaces the derived ∞ -category $\mathcal{D}(-)$ by the ordinary derived category $h\mathcal{D}(-)$. In fact, there is not even a triangulated structure on $\mathrm{Arr}(h\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}))$, except for the trivial case $\mathcal{A} = 0$. The reason for this is that $\mathrm{Arr}(h\mathcal{D}(X))$ is the category of ‘homotopy commutative’ arrows in $\mathcal{D}(X)$, which is not equivalent to $h\mathrm{Arr}(\mathcal{D}(X))$, the category of ‘homotopy coherent’ arrows in $\mathcal{D}(X)$, cf. [21, Section 1.2.6].

This ‘coherence problem’ is why we have to consider (stable) ∞ -categories instead of the triangulated theory: One can still write down a comparison functor

$$\Phi: h\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{Cart}(X)) \rightarrow \mathrm{Cart}(h\mathcal{D}(X), F_*),$$

but this functor fails to be faithful.

Note that it is easy to map into the category $\mathrm{Cart}(h\mathcal{D}(X), F_*)$ (since it is defined as a limit), but very hard to map into the category $h\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{Cart}(X))$ (since this is a localization). This makes it hard to define functors into the ordinary derived category of Cartier modules (e.g. cohomological operations for Cartier modules as in [5]), like for example the twisted inverse image functor $f^!$, which are not induced by corresponding functors on the level of abelian categories $\mathrm{Cart}(X) \rightarrow \mathrm{Cart}(Y)$.

Our main theorem gives a convenient solution to this problem, as it allows to easily construct functors into $\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{Cart}(X))$, which via the equivalence $\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{Cart}(X)) \simeq \mathrm{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(X))$ has a presentation as a limit of ∞ -categories. We will use this result in upcoming work [24] where we construct a coherent functor formalism¹ of derived Cartier modules in appropriate geometric settings. This will in particular include a construction of the twisted inverse image functor $f^!$.

1.1. Consequences of the main theorem

Specializing Theorem C, we deduce the following: If we apply it with $F = \mathrm{id}$, we recover the following well-known result about the derived ∞ -category of the endomorphism category $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{A})$ of a Grothendieck abelian category $\mathcal{A}$ (cf. [8, Definition 3.5] for the definition of the endomorphism category of an ∞ -category).

Corollary D (Corollary 5.7). *There is a canonical equivalence of ∞ -categories $\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{A})) \rightarrow \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}))$.*

On the other hand, if we apply Theorem C with $\mathcal{A} = \mathrm{QCoh}(X)$ and $F = F_*$ the (exact) Frobenius pushforward functor, then we obtain the result about classical Cartier modules that was the motivation for this paper.

Corollary E (Corollary 6.2). *There is a canonical equivalence of ∞ -categories $\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{Cart}(X)) \rightarrow \mathrm{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(X), F_*)$.*

Moreover, for $\mathcal{A} = \mathrm{QCoh}(X)$ and $F = F^*$ with X a regular Noetherian $\mathbb{F}_p$ -scheme, we get a corresponding result about classical Frobenius modules.

Corollary F (Corollaries 2.10 and 6.3). *There is a canonical equivalence of ∞ -categories $\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{Frob}(X)) \rightarrow \mathrm{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(X), F^*)$.*

1.2. Monadicity of Cartier modules

As a main ingredient for the proof of Theorem C we prove the following result which could be of independent interest.

¹ We chose this name since the authors are currently unaware how many of the six functors exist but are confident that Cartier modules do *not* admit a full six functor formalism.

Theorem G (Theorem 4.6). *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an ∞ -category that admits countable coproducts and let $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be an endofunctor that preserves them. Then the forgetful functor $U: \text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ exhibits $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ as monadic over $\mathcal{C}$ (in the sense of [20, Definition 4.7.3.4]).*

Recall that a monadic functor $U: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ abstracts the setting of the forgetful functor $U: \text{Mod}_R \rightarrow \text{Set}$ for a ring R . Precisely, a monadic functor U is a conservative functor with a left adjoint (in the case of modules this is given by the free module functor), such that U commutes with certain sifted colimits. Monadic functors are related to monads (i.e. monoid objects in an (∞) -category of endofunctors with respect to the monoidal structure given by composition) in the following way: Every adjunction $L \dashv R$ gives rise to a monad RL , with multiplication given by $RL \circ RL = R \circ LR \circ L \xrightarrow{\text{counit}} RL$, and unit $\text{id} \xrightarrow{\text{unit}} RL$. In particular, every monadic functor U gives rise to a monad UL . The Barr-Beck Theorem (cf. [20, Theorem 4.7.3.5] for its formulation for ∞ -categories) provides a partial converse to this construction: every monad $T: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ has a unique (up to contractible choice) monadic functor $U: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ with left adjoint L such that $T \simeq UL$.

In the proof of Theorem C, we first show that both ∞ -categories in question are monadic over the base ∞ -category, and then prove that the corresponding monads agree, thus giving an equivalence of the module-categories.

1.3. The perverse t -structure on Cartier modules

Recall that there is a perverse t -structure on $\mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X))$ for X a Noetherian scheme, cf. [6,12,1,7]. Baudin constructed a corresponding perverse t -structure on the ∞ -category $\mathcal{D}^b(\text{Cart}(\text{Coh}(X), F_*))$ under the additional assumption that the absolute Frobenius on X is finite [3, Definition 5.2.1]. We use Theorem C to give a more conceptual construction, that also removes this finiteness assumption.

Theorem H (Theorem 6.9 and Corollary 6.14). *Let X be a Noetherian $\mathbb{F}_p$ -scheme. The perverse t -structure on $\mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X))$ induces a perverse t -structure on $\mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\text{Mod}(X), F_*))$ such that the forgetful functor is t -exact for these t -structures.*

This t -structure coincides with the t -structure of [3, Definition 5.2.1] in the case where the absolute Frobenius of X is finite, in the sense that the canonical functor

$$\mathcal{D}^b(\text{Cart}(\text{Coh}(X), F_*)) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\text{Mod}(X), F_*))$$

is t -exact.

1.4. Outline

In Section 2 we define quite generally the ∞ -category $\text{LEq}(F, G)$ for functors $F, G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$; and its incarnations $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ and $\text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F)$. Moreover, we show that properties of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ like stability or presentability, together with appropriate conditions on F and G , imply the same properties for $\text{LEq}(F, G)$ (resp. for $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ or $\text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F)$) and the forgetful functor $U: \text{LEq}(F, G) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, cf. Proposition 2.6. In particular, we prove the first part of Theorem C that states that $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F)$ is a Grothendieck abelian category.

In Section 3, if $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are stable ∞ -categories with t -structures such that the functors $F, G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ are exact and F is right t -exact and G is left t -exact, we introduce a t -structure on $\text{LEq}(F, G)$ that is characterized by the property that $U: \text{LEq}(F, G) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is t -exact, cf. Proposition 3.3. Moreover, we identify the heart as $\text{LEq}(F^\heartsuit, G^\heartsuit)$ in Proposition 3.4.

In Section 4 we explicitly construct the left adjoint of the forgetful functor $U: \text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and derive t -exactness results about it, cf. Corollary 4.8. Moreover, we show that the existence of a left adjoint of U

implies that U exhibits $\mathrm{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ as monadic over $\mathcal{C}$ if $\mathcal{C}$ is a presentable ∞ -category and F preserves colimits, cf. Theorem 4.6. This is one of the key ingredients for the proof of Theorem C.

In Section 5 we state and prove our main theorem, cf. Theorem 5.1. Roughly, by a consequence of the ∞ -categorical Barr-Beck Theorem [20, Theorem 4.7.3.5] it is enough to check the following:

- (1) The functor $\mathcal{D}(U_{\mathcal{A}}): \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F)) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ induced by the forgetful functor $U_{\mathcal{A}}$ on $\mathrm{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F)$ exhibits $\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F))$ as monadic over $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$.
- (2) The forgetful functor $U_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})}: \mathrm{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{D}(F)) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ exhibits the ∞ -category $\mathrm{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{D}(F))$ as monadic over $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$.
- (3) Denote by $\mathcal{D}(L_{\mathcal{A}})$ and $L_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})}$ the left adjoints of the functors above. Then the natural map $U_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})}L_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})}(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(U_{\mathcal{A}})\mathcal{D}(L_{\mathcal{A}})(M)$ is an equivalence for each object M of $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$.

The proof of (1) is an application of a more general result about induced functors on derived ∞ -categories (Corollary A.8) once we know that $U_{\mathcal{A}}$ exhibits $\mathrm{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F)$ as monadic over $\mathcal{A}$. But this, as well as (2), is already shown in Section 4. The key point in the proof of (3) is a reduction to the case where M is an object in the heart $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})^{\heartsuit}$. To do so, we use the t-exactness properties of the forgetful functor and its left adjoint that we showed in the previous sections.

In Section 6 we specialize the discussion to the case where $\mathcal{A}$ is the category of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules over a Noetherian $\mathbb{F}_p$ -scheme X . In particular, we construct a perverse t-structure on $\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{Cart}(\mathrm{Mod}(X), F_*))$.

Furthermore, in Appendix A we collect some essentially well-known results about the (unbounded) derived ∞ -category $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ of a Grothendieck abelian category $\mathcal{A}$.

1.5. Notation

We freely use the language of ∞ -categories as developed in [21, 20]. In particular, we regard an (ordinary) category as an ∞ -category via the nerve construction. Moreover, we denote by Cat_{∞} the (very large) ∞ -category of (large) ∞ -categories.

1.6. Acknowledgments

We thank Manuel Blickle for suggesting the topic. We thank Tom Bachmann, Manuel Blickle, Anton Engelmänn, Lorenzo Mantovani and Luca Passolunghi for helpful discussions and reading a draft of the article.

The authors acknowledge support by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) through the Collaborative Research Centre TRR 326 *Geometry and Arithmetic of Uniformized Structures*, project number 444845124.

2. Definition of Cartier modules

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an ∞ -category and $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ an endofunctor. In this section we define the ∞ -category $\mathrm{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ of Cartier modules in $\mathcal{C}$ with respect to the functor F which is a generalization of the usual notion of Cartier modules. Moreover, we investigate how certain properties of $\mathcal{C}$, like stability or presentability, induce the same properties on $\mathrm{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$. We do the same for the ∞ -category $\mathrm{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ of Frobenius modules in $\mathcal{C}$ with respect to F and for the more general concept of lax equalizers.

As $\mathrm{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ and $\mathrm{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ are special cases of lax equalizers recall the following definition.

Definition 2.1 ([25, Definition II.1.4]). Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be ∞ -categories and $F, G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be functors. The *lax equalizer of F and G* is the ∞ -category $\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)$ defined as the pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{LEq}(F, G) & \xrightarrow{U} & \mathcal{C} \\ \kappa \downarrow & & \downarrow (F, G) \\ \mathrm{Arr}(\mathcal{D}) & \xrightarrow{(\mathrm{ev}_0, \mathrm{ev}_1)} & \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D} \end{array}$$

in Cat_∞ , where $\mathrm{Arr}(\mathcal{D}) := \mathrm{Fun}(\Delta^1, \mathcal{D})$ is the ∞ -category of arrows in $\mathcal{D}$ and the functors $\mathrm{ev}_0, \mathrm{ev}_1: \mathrm{Fun}(\Delta^1, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ are induced by the inclusions $\{0\} \hookrightarrow \Delta^1$ and $\{1\} \hookrightarrow \Delta^1$, respectively.

Notation 2.2. Throughout the paper, in the situation above, we denote the natural maps by $U: \mathrm{LEq}(F, G) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and $\kappa: \mathrm{LEq}(F, G) \rightarrow \mathrm{Arr}(\mathcal{D})$, respectively. We refer to the functor U as the *forgetful functor*.

Remark 2.3. Using the universal property of the pullback we can describe the objects and morphisms of the ∞ -category $\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)$:

- (a) Objects of $\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)$ are given by pairs (c, f) of an object c of $\mathcal{C}$ and an arrow $f: F(c) \rightarrow G(c)$ in $\mathcal{D}$.
- (b) A morphism $\varphi: (c, f) \rightarrow (d, g)$ in $\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)$ is given by the data of a morphism $U\varphi: c \rightarrow d$ in $\mathcal{C}$ and a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(c) & \xrightarrow{F(U\varphi)} & F(d) \\ f \downarrow & & \downarrow g \\ G(c) & \xrightarrow{G(U\varphi)} & G(d). \end{array}$$

A formula for mapping spaces in $\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)$ can be found in Proposition 2.6(a).

Definition 2.4. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an ∞ -category and $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be an endofunctor. We define the ∞ -category $\mathrm{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ of *Cartier modules in $\mathcal{C}$ with respect to the functor F* as $\mathrm{LEq}(F, \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{C}})$ and the ∞ -category $\mathrm{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ of *Frobenius modules in $\mathcal{C}$ with respect to the functor F* as $\mathrm{LEq}(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{C}}, F)$.

By Remark 2.3 we can describe the objects and morphisms of $\mathrm{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ and $\mathrm{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F)$.

Remark 2.5. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an ∞ -category and $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be an endofunctor.

- (a) Objects of the ∞ -category $\mathrm{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ are given by pairs (M, κ_M) where $M \in \mathcal{C}$ is an object of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\kappa_M: F(M) \rightarrow M$ is a morphism in $\mathcal{C}$.

In particular, this generalizes the usual notion of Cartier modules on an $\mathbb{F}_p$ -scheme X (cf. [4, Definition 2.1]) that are pairs (M, κ_M) of an $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module M together with an $\mathcal{O}_X$ -linear morphism $\kappa_M: F_*M \rightarrow M$ where $F: X \rightarrow X$ denotes the absolute Frobenius endomorphism of X .

- (b) Similarly, objects of the ∞ -category $\mathrm{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ are given by pairs (M, τ_M) where $M \in \mathcal{C}$ is an object of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\tau_M: M \rightarrow F(M)$ is a morphism in $\mathcal{C}$.

This generalizes the usual notion of Frobenius modules on an $\mathbb{F}_p$ -scheme X (cf. [9, Remark 1.3.2]) that are pairs (M, τ_M) of an $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module M together with an $\mathcal{O}_X$ -linear morphism $\tau_M: M \rightarrow F_*M$ where $F: X \rightarrow X$ denotes the absolute Frobenius endomorphism of X .

- (c) A morphism $\varphi: (M, \kappa_M) \rightarrow (N, \kappa_N)$ in $\mathrm{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ is given by the data of a morphism $U\varphi: M \rightarrow N$ in $\mathcal{C}$ and a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(M) & \xrightarrow{F(U\varphi)} & F(N) \\ \kappa_M \downarrow & & \downarrow \kappa_N \\ M & \xrightarrow{U\varphi} & N, \end{array}$$

and similarly for $\text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F)$.

The following proposition collects a number of useful facts about this construction.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be ∞ -categories and $F, G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be functors.*

(a) *Let $M, N \in \text{LEq}(F, G)$. The mapping space $\text{Map}_{\text{LEq}(F, G)}(M, N)$ is given by the equalizer*

$$\text{Eq} \left(\text{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(UM, UN) \xrightleftharpoons[\kappa(N)_*F]{\kappa(M)^*G} \text{Map}_{\mathcal{D}}(FUM, GUN) \right).$$

- (b) *The forgetful functor $U: \text{LEq}(F, G) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is conservative, i.e. a morphism f in $\text{LEq}(F, G)$ is an equivalence if and only if $U(f)$ is an equivalence in $\mathcal{C}$.*
- (c) *Let $p: K \rightarrow \text{LEq}(F, G)$ be a diagram such that the composite diagram $K \rightarrow \text{LEq}(F, G) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ admits a limit and this limit is preserved by the functor G . Then p admits a limit and the functor $U: \text{LEq}(F, G) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ preserves this limit.*
- (d) *Let $p: K \rightarrow \text{LEq}(F, G)$ be a diagram such that the composite diagram $K \rightarrow \text{LEq}(F, G) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ admits a colimit and this colimit is preserved by the functor F . Then p admits a colimit and the functor $U: \text{LEq}(F, G) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ preserves this colimit.*
- (e) *If $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are stable ∞ -categories (cf. [20, Definition 1.1.1.9]) and F and G are exact, then $\text{LEq}(F, G)$ is a stable ∞ -category and the functor $U: \text{LEq}(F, G) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is exact.*
- (f) *If $\mathcal{C}$ is a presentable ∞ -category (cf. [21, Definition 5.5.0.1]), $\mathcal{D}$ is an accessible ∞ -category (cf. [21, Definition 5.4.2.1]), F preserves colimits and G is accessible (cf. [21, Definition 5.4.2.5]), then $\text{LEq}(F, G)$ is a presentable ∞ -category and the functor $U: \text{LEq}(F, G) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ preserves colimits.*
- (g) *If $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are additive ∞ -categories (cf. [13, Definition 2.6]) and F and G are additive, then $\text{LEq}(F, G)$ is an additive ∞ -category and the functor $U: \text{LEq}(F, G) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is additive.*
- (h) *If $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are abelian categories and F and G are exact, then $\text{LEq}(F, G)$ is an abelian category and the functor $U: \text{LEq}(F, G) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is exact.*
- (i) *If $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are Grothendieck abelian categories (i.e. they are presentable abelian and filtered colimits are exact) and F and G are exact and preserve colimits, then $\text{LEq}(F, G)$ is a Grothendieck abelian category and the functor $U: \text{LEq}(F, G) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is exact and preserves colimits.*

Proof. Parts (a) to (f) are [25, Proposition II.1.5]. Note that (d) follows from their proof of (f).

For the proof of the remaining parts first note that all the claims about the functor U immediately follow from (c) and (d).

Using this there are only two things left to show in (g): that finite coproducts and finite products in $\text{LEq}(F, G)$ are equivalent and that for each object M of $\text{LEq}(F, G)$ the shear map

$$M \oplus M \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}} M \oplus M$$

is an equivalence. But by (b) both of these can be checked after applying U where it is true because $\mathcal{C}$ is additive and U preserves finite coproducts and finite products (and in particular the shear map). This proves (g).

A similar argument, using finite colimits and finite limits instead of finite (co)products, and the comparison map between the coimage and the image, shows (h) (it is clear that a limit of 1-categories is still a 1-category, see e.g. [21, Proposition 2.3.4.12(4)]).

For (i) we have to show that $\mathbf{LEq}(F, G)$ is presentable and that filtered colimits in $\mathbf{LEq}(F, G)$ are exact. Presentability was already shown in (f). Checking that filtered colimits are exact can again be done after applying the functor U because it is conservative by (b), exact by (h) and colimit-preserving by (f). As filtered colimits in $\mathcal{C}$ are exact by assumption this completes the proof. $\square$

Applying this with $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{C}$ and F or G the identity we immediately get analogous results for Cartier modules and Frobenius modules.

Corollary 2.7. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an ∞ -category and $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be an endofunctor.*

(a) *Let $M, N \in \mathbf{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$. The mapping space $\mathbf{Map}_{\mathbf{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)}(M, N)$ is given by the equalizer*

$$\mathrm{Eq} \left(\mathbf{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(UM, UN) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\kappa(M)^*} \\ \xrightarrow{\kappa(N)_* F} \end{array} \mathbf{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(FUM, UN) \right).$$

- (b) *The forgetful functor $U: \mathbf{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is conservative.*
- (c) *Let $p: K \rightarrow \mathbf{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ be a diagram such that the composite diagram $K \rightarrow \mathbf{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ admits a limit. Then p admits a limit and the functor $U: \mathbf{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ preserves this limit.*
- (d) *Let $p: K \rightarrow \mathbf{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ be a diagram such that the composite diagram $K \rightarrow \mathbf{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ admits a colimit and this colimit is preserved by the functor F . Then p admits a colimit and the functor $U: \mathbf{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ preserves this colimit.*
- (e) *If $\mathcal{C}$ is a stable ∞ -category and F is exact, then $\mathbf{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ is a stable ∞ -category and the functor $U: \mathbf{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is exact.*
- (f) *If $\mathcal{C}$ is a presentable ∞ -category and F preserves colimits, then $\mathbf{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ is a presentable ∞ -category and the functor $U: \mathbf{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ preserves colimits.*
- (g) *If $\mathcal{C}$ is an additive ∞ -category and F is additive, then $\mathbf{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ is an additive ∞ -category and the functor $U: \mathbf{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is additive.*
- (h) *If $\mathcal{C}$ is an abelian category and F is exact, then $\mathbf{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ is an abelian category and the functor $U: \mathbf{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is exact.*
- (i) *If $\mathcal{C}$ is a Grothendieck abelian category and F is exact and preserves colimits, then $\mathbf{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ is a Grothendieck abelian category and the functor $U: \mathbf{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is exact and preserves colimits.*

Corollary 2.8. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an ∞ -category and $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be an endofunctor.*

(a) *Let $M, N \in \mathbf{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F)$. The mapping space $\mathbf{Map}_{\mathbf{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F)}(M, N)$ is given by the equalizer*

$$\mathrm{Eq} \left(\mathbf{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(UM, UN) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\kappa(M)^* F} \\ \xrightarrow{\kappa(N)_*} \end{array} \mathbf{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(FUM, UN) \right).$$

- (b) *The forgetful functor $U: \mathbf{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is conservative.*
- (c) *Let $p: K \rightarrow \mathbf{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ be a diagram such that the composite diagram $K \rightarrow \mathbf{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ admits a limit and F preserves this limit. Then p admits a limit and the functor $U: \mathbf{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ preserves this limit.*

- (d) Let $p: K \rightarrow \text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ be a diagram such that the composite diagram $K \rightarrow \text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ admits a colimit. Then p admits a colimit and the functor $U: \text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ preserves this colimit.
- (e) If $\mathcal{C}$ is a stable ∞ -category and F is exact, then $\text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ is a stable ∞ -category and the functor $U: \text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is exact.
- (f) If $\mathcal{C}$ is a presentable ∞ -category and F is accessible, then $\text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ is a presentable ∞ -category and the functor $U: \text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ preserves colimits.
- (g) If $\mathcal{C}$ is an additive ∞ -category and F is additive, then $\text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ is an additive ∞ -category and the functor $U: \text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is additive.
- (h) If $\mathcal{C}$ is an abelian category and F is exact, then $\text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ is an abelian category and the functor $U: \text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is exact.
- (i) If $\mathcal{C}$ is a Grothendieck abelian category and F is exact and preserves colimits, then $\text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ is a Grothendieck abelian category and the functor $U: \text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is exact and preserves colimits.

We conclude this section by investigating the relation between Cartier modules and Frobenius modules with respect to adjoint functors.

Proposition 2.9. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be ∞ -categories and $F, G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be functors. If F has a right adjoint $R: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ then there is an equivalence of ∞ -categories*

$$\text{LEq}(F, G) \simeq \text{LEq}(\text{id}_{\mathcal{C}}, RG) = \text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, RG).$$

If G has a left adjoint $L: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ then there is an equivalence of ∞ -categories

$$\text{LEq}(F, G) \simeq \text{LEq}(LF, \text{id}_{\mathcal{C}}) = \text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, LF).$$

Proof. Recall from [19, Section 2.1] that the oriented fiber product $\mathcal{C} \vec{\times}_{F, \mathcal{D}, G} \mathcal{C}$ of F and G is defined as the pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C} \vec{\times}_{F, \mathcal{D}, G} \mathcal{C} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow (F, G) \\ \text{Arr}(\mathcal{D}) & \xrightarrow{(\text{ev}_0, \text{ev}_1)} & \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D} \end{array}$$

in Cat_{∞} . Hence, there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{LEq}(F, G) & \xrightarrow{U} & \mathcal{C} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \Delta \\ \mathcal{C} \vec{\times}_{F, \mathcal{D}, G} \mathcal{C} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow (F, G) \\ \text{Arr}(\mathcal{D}) & \xrightarrow{(\text{ev}_0, \text{ev}_1)} & \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D} \end{array} \quad (1)$$

in Cat_{∞} , where Δ denotes the diagonal map. By definition of the lax equalizer $\text{LEq}(F, G)$ and the oriented fiber product $\mathcal{C} \vec{\times}_{F, \mathcal{D}, G} \mathcal{C}$ the outer rectangle and the lower square of (1) are cartesian diagrams. Thus, by the pasting law for pullbacks (cf. the dual of [21, Lemma 4.4.2.1]) the upper square of (1) is also a cartesian diagram.

If F has a right adjoint functor R , by [19, Lemma 2.2] there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}^{\vec{\times}}_{F, \mathcal{D}, G} \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \mathcal{C}^{\vec{\times}}_{\text{id}_C, \mathcal{C}, RG} \mathcal{C} \\ & \searrow & \swarrow \\ & \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} & \end{array}$$

where the horizontal arrow is an equivalence of ∞ -categories. Combining this with the discussion above we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LEq}(F, G) &\simeq \lim \left(\mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{\Delta} \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \leftarrow \mathcal{C}^{\vec{\times}}_{F, \mathcal{D}, G} \mathcal{C} \right) \\ &\simeq \lim \left(\mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{\Delta} \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \leftarrow \mathcal{C}^{\vec{\times}}_{\text{id}_C, \mathcal{C}, RG} \mathcal{C} \right) \\ &\simeq \text{LEq}(\text{id}_C, RG). \end{aligned}$$

In the case where G has a left adjoint one argues analogously. $\square$

Corollary 2.10. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an ∞ -category and $L, R: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be functors such that L is left adjoint to R . Then there is an equivalence of ∞ -categories*

$$\text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, L) \simeq \text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, R).$$

3. The induced t-structure on lax equalizers

We fix the following notation for the whole section:

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a stable ∞ -category, cf. [20, Definition 1.1.1.9]. We denote the shift functor by $\Sigma: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. On objects $X \in \mathcal{C}$ it is given by $\Sigma(X) = 0 \amalg_X 0$, cf. [20, Notation 1.1.2.7].

Moreover, assume that $\mathcal{C}$ carries a t-structure $(\mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}, \mathcal{C}_{\leq 0})$, cf. [20, Definition 1.2.1.1]. This means that the following axioms are satisfied:

- (a) $\mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\leq 0}$ are subcategories of $\mathcal{C}$.
- (b) For $X \in \mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{C}_{\leq 0}$ we have $\text{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, \Sigma^{-1}Y) \simeq 0$.
- (c) $\Sigma \mathcal{C}_{\geq 0} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}$ and $\Sigma^{-1} \mathcal{C}_{\leq 0} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leq 0}$.
- (d) For each $X \in \mathcal{C}$ there exists a fiber sequence $X' \rightarrow X \rightarrow X''$ with $X' \in \mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}$ and $X'' \in \mathcal{C}_{\leq -1}$.

Note that we use homological notation for t-structures. As usual, for each n we denote by $\iota_{\geq n}: \mathcal{C}_{\geq n} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{C}: \tau_{\geq n}$ the adjunction of the inclusion and the connective cover functor and by $\tau_{\leq n}: \mathcal{C} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{C}_{\leq n}: \iota_{\leq n}$ the adjunction of the truncation and the inclusion functor, cf. [20, Proposition 1.2.1.5, Notation 1.2.1.7]. In the following, for simplicity we write $\tau_{\geq n}$ for the composition $\iota_{\geq n} \tau_{\geq n}$ and similarly for the truncations. In particular, by [20, Remark 1.2.1.8] for every $X \in \mathcal{C}$ there is a fiber sequence

$$\tau_{\geq n} X \rightarrow X \rightarrow \tau_{\leq n-1} X.$$

Recall that the heart $\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$ of the t-structure is given by $\mathcal{C}_{\geq 0} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\leq 0}$ and that there are homotopy object functors $\pi_n := \tau_{\geq 0} \tau_{\leq 0} \Sigma^{-n}: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}$, cf. [20, Definition 1.2.1.11].

Note that the ∞ -category $\text{Arr}(\mathcal{C})$ is also stable by [20, Proposition 1.1.3.1] and carries an induced t-structure given by $\text{Arr}(\mathcal{C})_{\geq 0} = \text{Arr}(\mathcal{C}_{\geq 0})$ and $\text{Arr}(\mathcal{C})_{\leq 0} = \text{Arr}(\mathcal{C}_{\leq 0})$. In particular, its heart is given by $\text{Arr}(\mathcal{C})^{\heartsuit} = \text{Arr}(\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit})$.

Furthermore, let $\mathcal{D}$ be a stable ∞ -category and $F, G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be exact functors. If $\mathcal{D}$ carries a t-structure $(\mathcal{D}_{\geq 0}, \mathcal{D}_{\leq 0})$ recall that F is called right t-exact (resp. left t-exact) if $F(\mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{\geq 0}$ (resp. $F(\mathcal{C}_{\leq 0}) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{\leq 0}$).

In this section we introduce an induced t-structure on $\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)$. Note that this ∞ -category is stable by Proposition 2.6(e). It is defined in such a way that the forgetful functor is automatically t-exact.

Definition 3.1. Define full subcategories $\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)_{\geq 0}$ and $\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)_{\leq 0}$ of $\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)$ as follows: An object $M \in \mathrm{LEq}(F, G)$ is in $\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)_{\geq 0}$ (resp. $\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)_{\leq 0}$) if and only if UM is in $\mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}$ (resp. in $\mathcal{C}_{\leq 0}$).

We prove in Proposition 3.3 that this defines a t-structure on $\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)$ if F is right t-exact and G is left t-exact. For the proof we need the following.

Lemma 3.2. Let $(\mathcal{D}_{\geq 0}, \mathcal{D}_{\leq 0})$ be a t-structure on $\mathcal{D}$ such that $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is right t-exact. Then there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F\tau_{\geq 0} & \xrightarrow{Fc} & F \\ \downarrow & \nearrow cF & \\ \tau_{\geq 0}F & & \end{array}$$

where $c: \tau_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathrm{id}$ denotes the counit of the adjunction.

Dually, if $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is left t-exact then there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tau_{\geq 0}G & \xrightarrow{cG} & G \\ \downarrow & \nearrow Gc & \\ G\tau_{\geq 0} & & \end{array}$$

Proof. We only show the first claim. The second claim can be shown by a dual argument. There is a fiber sequence

$$\tau_{\geq 0}F\tau_{\geq 0} \xrightarrow{c} F\tau_{\geq 0} \xrightarrow{u} \tau_{\leq -1}F\tau_{\geq 0}$$

where the last term is 0 by the right t-exactness of F . Hence, the counit induces an equivalence $\tau_{\geq 0}F\tau_{\geq 0} \simeq F\tau_{\geq 0}$.

Moreover, the counit also yields a map $\tau_{\geq 0}F\tau_{\geq 0} \xrightarrow{\tau_{\geq 0}Fc} \tau_{\geq 0}F$. Putting everything together we obtain a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F\tau_{\geq 0} & \xrightarrow{Fc} & F \\ cF\tau_{\geq 0} \uparrow \simeq & & \uparrow \\ \tau_{\geq 0}F\tau_{\geq 0} & & \\ \tau_{\geq 0}Fc \downarrow & \nearrow cF & \\ \tau_{\geq 0}F & & \end{array}$$

that commutes because of the naturality of c . $\square$

Proposition 3.3. Assume that there is a t-structure $(\mathcal{D}_{\geq 0}, \mathcal{D}_{\leq 0})$ on $\mathcal{D}$ such that $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is right t-exact and $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is left t-exact. Then the full subcategories $\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)_{\geq 0}$ and $\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)_{\leq 0}$ define a t-structure on $\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)$.

Moreover, the forgetful functor $U: \mathrm{LEq}(F, G) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is t-exact.

Proof. We check that $(\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)_{\geq 0}, \mathrm{LEq}(F, G)_{\leq 0})$ satisfies the properties of a t-structure. First, we have to see that $\Sigma \mathrm{LEq}(F, G)_{\geq 0} \subseteq \mathrm{LEq}(F, G)_{\geq 0}$ and $\Sigma^{-1} \mathrm{LEq}(F, G)_{\leq 0} \subseteq \mathrm{LEq}(F, G)_{\leq 0}$. Let $M \in \mathrm{LEq}(F, G)_{\geq 0}$, i.e. $UM \in \mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}$. By Proposition 2.6(e) the functor U is exact, so we have $U\Sigma M \simeq \Sigma UM \in \mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}$ and hence $\Sigma M \in \mathrm{LEq}(F, G)_{\geq 0}$. The other inclusion can be shown analogously.

Next, let $M \in \mathrm{LEq}(F, G)_{\geq 0}$ and $N \in \mathrm{LEq}(F, G)_{\leq -1}$. We have to show that $\mathrm{Map}_{\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)}(M, N) = 0$. By Proposition 2.6(a) this mapping space can be computed as the equalizer of two maps $\mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(UM, UN) \rightrightarrows \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{D}}(FUM, GUN)$. But we have $UM \in \mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}$ and $UN \in \mathcal{C}_{\leq -1}$ by definition and $FUM \in \mathcal{D}_{\geq 0}$ by the right t-exactness of F and $GUN \in \mathcal{D}_{\leq -1}$ by the left t-exactness of G . Thus, it follows that $\mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(UM, UN) = 0$ and $\mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{D}}(FUM, GUN) = 0$, hence $\mathrm{Map}_{\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)}(M, N) = 0$.

It remains to show that for any object $M \in \mathrm{LEq}(F, G)$ there is a fiber sequence $M' \rightarrow M \rightarrow M''$ with $M' \in \mathrm{LEq}(F, G)_{\geq 0}$ and $M'' \in \mathrm{LEq}(F, G)_{\leq -1}$. We have a fiber sequence

$$\tau_{\geq 0}UM \xrightarrow{c} UM \xrightarrow{u} \tau_{\leq -1}UM \quad (2)$$

in $\mathcal{C}$ where the maps are given by the counit resp. unit of adjunction. Using that F is right t-exact and G is left t-exact we can define a morphism

$$\kappa_{\geq 0}(M): F\tau_{\geq 0}UM \rightarrow \tau_{\geq 0}FUM \xrightarrow{\kappa(M)} \tau_{\geq 0}GUM \rightarrow G\tau_{\geq 0}UM$$

where the first and last morphisms are the ones that we constructed in the proof of Lemma 3.2. Equipping the left-hand term of (2) with this morphism we can promote it to an object of $\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)$. Furthermore, the left-hand map in (2) is a morphism in $\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)$ as can be seen from the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F\tau_{\geq 0}UM & \xrightarrow{Fc} & FUM \\ \downarrow & \nearrow cF & \downarrow \kappa(M) \\ \tau_{\geq 0}FUM & & \\ \kappa(M) \downarrow & & \\ \tau_{\geq 0}GUM & \xrightarrow{cG} & U_{\mathcal{C}}M \\ \downarrow & \nearrow Gc & \\ G\tau_{\geq 0}UM & \xrightarrow{Gc} & U_{\mathcal{C}}M \end{array}$$

Here, the middle part of the diagram commutes because of the naturality of c and the upper and lower parts commute by Lemma 3.2.

So we set $M' := (\tau_{\geq 0}UM, \kappa_{\geq 0}(M))$ and $M'' := \mathrm{cofib}(M' \xrightarrow{c} M)$ where the cofiber is taken in the category $\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)$. Since $\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)$ is stable this gives us a fiber sequence $M' \rightarrow M \rightarrow M''$ in $\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)$. As U is exact by Proposition 2.6(e), we have

$$UM'' \simeq \mathrm{cofib}(\tau_{\geq 0}UM \xrightarrow{c} UM) \simeq \tau_{\leq -1}UM$$

which shows that $M'' \in \mathrm{LEq}(F, G)_{\leq -1}$. Moreover, note that $M' \in \mathrm{LEq}(F, G)_{\geq 0}$ since $UM' = \tau_{\geq 0}UM$.

The t-exactness of the forgetful functor is clear. $\square$

We can also compute the heart of the induced t-structure.

Proposition 3.4. Assume that there is a t-structure $(\mathcal{D}_{\geq 0}, \mathcal{D}_{\leq 0})$ on $\mathcal{D}$ such that $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is right t-exact and $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is left t-exact. The heart of the t-structure $(\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)_{\geq 0}, \mathrm{LEq}(F, G)_{\leq 0})$ is given by $\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)^{\heartsuit} \simeq \mathrm{LEq}(F^{\heartsuit}, G^{\heartsuit})$ where $F^{\heartsuit}$ resp. $G^{\heartsuit}$ denotes the composition $\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{F} \mathcal{D} \xrightarrow{\pi_0} \mathcal{D}^{\heartsuit}$ and for G respectively.

Proof. The forgetful functor $U: \text{LEq}(F, G) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is t-exact by Proposition 3.3, so it restricts to a functor $U^\heartsuit: \text{LEq}(F, G)^\heartsuit \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit$ of the hearts. Moreover, we denote by $U_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}: \text{LEq}(F^\heartsuit, G^\heartsuit) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit$ the forgetful functor of $\text{LEq}(F^\heartsuit, G^\heartsuit)$.

We define a functor $\Phi: \text{LEq}(F, G)^\heartsuit \rightarrow \text{LEq}(F^\heartsuit, G^\heartsuit)$ via the universal property of the pullback and the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & & U^\heartsuit & \\
 & & & \curvearrowright & \\
 \text{LEq}(F, G)^\heartsuit & & & & \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit \\
 \downarrow \kappa|_{\text{LEq}(F, G)^\heartsuit} & \searrow \Phi & & U_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit} & \downarrow (F^\heartsuit, G^\heartsuit) \\
 & \text{LEq}(F^\heartsuit, G^\heartsuit) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & & \\
 & \downarrow \kappa_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit} & & & \\
 \text{Arr}(\mathcal{D}) & \xrightarrow{\pi_0} & \text{Arr}(\mathcal{D}^\heartsuit) & \xrightarrow{(ev_0, ev_1)} & \mathcal{D}^\heartsuit \times \mathcal{D}^\heartsuit.
 \end{array}$$

We show that Φ is an equivalence by proving that it is essentially surjective and fully faithful.

For the essential surjectivity let $M \in \text{LEq}(F^\heartsuit, G^\heartsuit)$. Define a morphism $\tilde{\kappa}_M: FU_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}M \rightarrow GU_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}M$ to be the composition

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 FU_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}M & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\kappa}_M} & GU_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}M \\
 u \downarrow & & \uparrow c \\
 \tau_{\leq 0}FU_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}M & & \tau_{\geq 0}GU_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}M \\
 \simeq \downarrow & & \uparrow \simeq \\
 F^\heartsuit U_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}M & \xrightarrow{\kappa_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}(M)} & G^\heartsuit U_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}M
 \end{array}$$

where the arrows u and c are the unit resp. counit of adjunction, and the equivalences exist because F is right t-exact and G is left t-exact. Equipping $U_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}M$ with this morphism we can promote it to an object $(U_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}M, \tilde{\kappa}_M)$ of $\text{LEq}(F, G)^\heartsuit$. As $\pi_0(\tilde{\kappa}_M) \simeq \pi_0(\kappa_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}(M)) \simeq \kappa_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}(M)$, the functor Φ maps $(U_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}M, \tilde{\kappa}_M)$ to $(U_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}M, \kappa_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}(M)) = M$. Thus, the functor Φ is essentially surjective.

To prove fully faithfulness of Φ , let $M, N \in \text{LEq}(F, G)^\heartsuit$. We show that the map

$$\text{Map}_{\text{LEq}(F, G)}(M, N) \rightarrow \text{Map}_{\text{LEq}(F^\heartsuit, G^\heartsuit)}(\Phi M, \Phi N)$$

induced by Φ is an equivalence by using the description of the mapping spaces from Proposition 2.6(a). Recall that $\text{Map}_{\text{LEq}(F, G)}(M, N)$ is given by

$$\text{Eq} \left(\text{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(UM, UN) \xrightleftharpoons[\kappa(N)_*F]{\kappa(M)^*G} \text{Map}_{\mathcal{D}}(FUM, GUN) \right)$$

and that $\text{Map}_{\text{LEq}(F^\heartsuit, G^\heartsuit)}(\Phi M, \Phi N)$ is given by

$$\text{Eq} \left(\text{Map}_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}(U^\heartsuit M, U^\heartsuit N) \xrightleftharpoons[\pi_0(\kappa(N))_*F^\heartsuit]{\pi_0(\kappa(M))^*G^\heartsuit} \text{Map}_{\mathcal{D}^\heartsuit}(F^\heartsuit U^\heartsuit M, G^\heartsuit U^\heartsuit N) \right).$$

There is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(UM, UN) & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}(U^\heartsuit M, U^\heartsuit N) \\
\downarrow G & & \downarrow G^\heartsuit \\
\mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{D}}(GUM, GUN) & \xrightarrow{\pi_0} & \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{D}^\heartsuit}(G^\heartsuit U^\heartsuit M, G^\heartsuit U^\heartsuit N) \\
\downarrow \kappa(M)^* & & \downarrow \pi_0(\kappa(M))^* \\
\mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{D}}(FUM, GUN) & \xrightarrow{\pi_0} & \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{D}^\heartsuit}(F^\heartsuit U^\heartsuit M, G^\heartsuit U^\heartsuit N).
\end{array}$$

A similar diagram can be drawn for the map $\kappa(N)_*F$. Putting both diagrams together we get a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(UM, UN) & \xrightleftharpoons[\kappa(N)_*F]{\kappa(M)^*G} & \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{D}}(FUM, GUN) \\
\downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \pi_0 \\
\mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}(U^\heartsuit M, U^\heartsuit N) & \xrightleftharpoons[\pi_0(\kappa(N))_*F^\heartsuit]{\pi_0(\kappa(M))^*G^\heartsuit} & \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{D}^\heartsuit}(F^\heartsuit U^\heartsuit M, G^\heartsuit U^\heartsuit N).
\end{array}$$

Taking the equalizer of the rows, the vertical maps in the diagram induce the map Φ . Thus, it suffices to show that the vertical arrow on the right-hand side is an equivalence. This is the case as it is given by the chain of equivalences

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{D}}(FUM, GUN) &\simeq \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{D}}(\tau_{\leq 0}FUM, GUN) \\
&\simeq \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{D}}(\tau_{\leq 0}FUM, \tau_{\geq 0}GUN) \\
&\simeq \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{D}^\heartsuit}(F^\heartsuit U^\heartsuit M, G^\heartsuit U^\heartsuit N)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the left t-exactness of G and the adjunction $\tau_{\leq 0} \dashv \iota_{\leq 0}$ in the first equivalence, the right t-exactness of F and the adjunction $\iota_{\geq 0} \dashv \tau_{\geq 0}$ in the second equivalence and both t-exactness properties in the last equivalence. $\square$

From the definition of the t-structure and the description of its heart we immediately get:

Corollary 3.5. *Assume that there is a t-structure $(\mathcal{D}_{\geq 0}, \mathcal{D}_{\leq 0})$ on $\mathcal{D}$ such that $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is right t-exact and $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is left t-exact. The forgetful functor U is t-exact and there is a cartesian diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathrm{LEq}(F^\heartsuit, G^\heartsuit) & \xrightarrow{U_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}} & \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathrm{LEq}(F, G) & \xrightarrow{U} & \mathcal{C}.
\end{array}$$

4. The left adjoint of the forgetful functor

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an ∞ -category that admits countable coproducts and let $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be an endofunctor that preserves them. In this section we define the left adjoint of the forgetful functor $U: \mathrm{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. It follows that U exhibits $\mathrm{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ as monadic over $\mathcal{C}$, cf. [20, Definition 4.7.3.4]. This is the first key input for the proof of our main theorem. We conclude the section by showing that the left adjoint of U is t-exact if $\mathcal{C}$ is a stable ∞ -category equipped with a t-structure that is compatible with coproducts (cf. [20, Definition 1.2.2.12]).

Definition 4.1. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an ∞ -category that admits all countable coproducts and let $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be an endofunctor that preserves countable coproducts. We define a functor $L: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ via the universal property of the pullback and the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{C} & & \coprod_{n \geq 0} F^n & & \\ & \searrow L & & \searrow & \\ & \text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F) & \xrightarrow{U} & \mathcal{C} & \\ & \downarrow \kappa & & \downarrow (F, \text{id}) & \\ & \text{Arr}(\mathcal{C}) & \xrightarrow{(\text{ev}_0, \text{ev}_1)} & \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}, & \\ & \swarrow s & & & \end{array}$$

where $\coprod_{n \geq 0} F^n$ is the coproduct in $\text{Fun}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C})$ of the functors $F^n: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and the functor s is defined as follows:

Note that specifying a functor $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Arr}(\mathcal{C})$ is the same as giving an arrow in $\text{Fun}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C})$, i.e. a natural transformation. Under this equivalence the functor s corresponds to the natural transformation

$$\coprod_{n \geq 0} \text{inc}_{n+1}: \coprod_{n \geq 0} F^{n+1} \rightarrow \coprod_{k \geq 0} F^k$$

where $\text{inc}_{n+1}: F^{n+1} \rightarrow \coprod_{k \geq 0} F^k$ denotes the natural map into the coproduct.

As F preserves countable coproducts, the outer diagram commutes and hence defines a functor L .

Proposition 4.2. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an ∞ -category that admits all countable coproducts and let $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be an endofunctor that preserves countable coproducts. Then the functor L is left adjoint to the forgetful functor $U: \text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$.

Proof. First, we define the unit map $u: \text{id}_{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow UL$ to be the inclusion of the zeroth component $\text{inc}_0: \text{id}_{\mathcal{C}} = F^0 \rightarrow \coprod_{n \geq 0} F^n$. By [21, Proposition 5.2.2.8] it is enough to show that the map

$$\text{Map}_{\text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)}(LX, M) \xrightarrow{U} \text{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(ULX, UM) \xrightarrow{u^*} \text{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, UM) \quad (3)$$

is an equivalence for all objects $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and $M \in \text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$.

Note that there are equivalences

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Map}_{\text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)}(LX, M) &\simeq \text{Eq} \left(\text{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(ULX, UM) \xrightleftharpoons[\kappa(M)_* F]{\kappa(LX)^*} \text{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(FULX, UM) \right) \\ &\simeq \text{Eq} \left(\text{Map}_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\coprod_{n \geq 0} F^n X, UM \right) \xrightleftharpoons{\quad} \text{Map}_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\coprod_{n \geq 0} F^{n+1} X, UM \right) \right) \\ &\simeq \text{Eq} \left(\prod_{n \geq 0} \text{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(F^n X, UM) \xrightleftharpoons[\Psi]{\Phi} \prod_{n \geq 0} \text{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(F^{n+1} X, UM) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used Corollary 2.7(a) in the first equivalence, the definition of L and the assumption that F preserves countable coproducts in the second equivalence and the universal property of coproducts in the last equivalence. Using the definition of L we see that the map Φ is defined by $\text{pr}_n \Phi := \text{pr}_{n+1}$ where

$$\mathrm{pr}_n: \prod_{k \geq 0} \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(F^k X, UM) \rightarrow \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(F^n X, UM)$$

denotes the projection on the n -th factor. Moreover, the map Ψ is defined by $\mathrm{pr}_n \Psi := \kappa(M)_* F \mathrm{pr}_n$. Thus, the composition (3) is equivalent to the composition

$$\mathrm{Eq}(\Phi, \Psi) \xrightarrow{i} \prod_{n \geq 0} \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(F^n X, UM) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{pr}_0} \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, UM), \quad (4)$$

where i is the natural map out of the equalizer.

To show that this composition is an equivalence we construct a map

$$\beta: \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, UM) \rightarrow \mathrm{Eq}(\Phi, \Psi)$$

that satisfies $\mathrm{pr}_0 i \beta \simeq \mathrm{id}$ and $\beta \mathrm{pr}_0 i \simeq \mathrm{id}$ and hence is an inverse of (4). For that, we use the universal property of the equalizer and construct a map

$$\alpha: \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, UM) \rightarrow \prod_{n \geq 0} \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(F^n X, UM)$$

with a homotopy $\Phi \alpha \simeq \Psi \alpha$. We define inductively

$$\mathrm{pr}_0 \alpha := \mathrm{id}: \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, UM) \rightarrow \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(F^0 X, UM)$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, UM) & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{pr}_{n+1} \alpha} & \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(F^{n+1} X, UM) \\ \mathrm{pr}_n \alpha \downarrow & & \uparrow \kappa(M)_* \\ \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(F^n X, UM) & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(F^{n+1} X, FUM). \end{array}$$

This induces a map $\alpha: \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, UM) \rightarrow \prod_{n \geq 0} \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(F^n X, UM)$ and

$$\Phi \alpha = (\mathrm{pr}_{n+1} \alpha)_n \simeq (\kappa(M)_* F \mathrm{pr}_n \alpha)_n = \Psi \alpha$$

holds by construction. Therefore, we get a map $\beta: \mathrm{Map}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, UM) \rightarrow \mathrm{Eq}(\Phi, \Psi)$ that satisfies $i \beta \simeq \alpha$.

It follows immediately from the construction of α that we have

$$\mathrm{pr}_0 i \beta \simeq \mathrm{pr}_0 \alpha \simeq \mathrm{id}.$$

Thus, it remains to show that $\beta \mathrm{pr}_0 i \simeq \mathrm{id}$. For that, it suffices to show that for all n we have $\mathrm{pr}_n i \beta \mathrm{pr}_0 i \simeq \mathrm{pr}_n i$. We do this inductively. For $n = 0$ we have

$$\mathrm{pr}_0 i \beta \mathrm{pr}_0 i \simeq \mathrm{id} \mathrm{pr}_0 i \simeq \mathrm{pr}_0 i$$

by the above. For $n > 0$ we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{pr}_{n+1} i \beta \mathrm{pr}_0 i &\simeq \mathrm{pr}_{n+1} \alpha \mathrm{pr}_0 i \\ &\simeq \kappa(M)_* F \mathrm{pr}_n \alpha \mathrm{pr}_0 i \\ &\simeq \kappa(M)_* F \mathrm{pr}_n i \\ &\simeq \mathrm{pr}_{n+1} i \end{aligned}$$

where we used the definition of β in the first equivalence, the definition of α in the second equivalence, the induction hypothesis in the third equivalence and the definition of Φ and Ψ in the last equivalence. $\square$

Corollary 4.3. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an ∞ -category that admits all countable coproducts and let $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be a functor that preserves countable coproducts. Let $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be a functor that admits a left adjoint $G^L: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. Then the forgetful functor $U: \text{LEq}(F, G) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ admits a left adjoint. It can be described as in Definition 4.1 by replacing F by $G^L F$.*

Proof. There is an equivalence of ∞ -categories $\text{LEq}(F, G) \simeq \text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, G^L F)$ by Proposition 2.9. Note that the functor G^L preserves countable coproducts as it is a left adjoint. Hence, we can apply Proposition 4.2. $\square$

Corollary 4.4. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an ∞ -category that admits all countable coproducts and let $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be an endofunctor that admits a left adjoint G^L . Then the forgetful functor $U: \text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, G) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ admits a left adjoint. It can be described as in Definition 4.1 by replacing F by G^L .*

Proof. Apply Corollary 4.3 with $F = \text{id}_{\mathcal{C}}$. $\square$

As a consequence, we obtain that the forgetful functor is monadic. The proof of this is an application of the ∞ -categorical Barr-Beck Theorem [20, Theorem 4.7.3.5]. To see this, we first show the following.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be ∞ -categories and $F, G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be functors. The ∞ -categories $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$, $\text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, G)$ (in the case $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{C}$) and $\text{LEq}(F, G)$ admit colimits of U -split simplicial objects (cf. [20, Definition 4.7.2.2]) and U preserves them.*

Proof. Let $X_{\bullet}: N(\Delta_+^{\text{op}})^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ be a U -split simplicial object, i.e. $UX_{\bullet}$ is a split simplicial object in $\mathcal{C}$. By [21, Lemma 6.1.3.16], $UX_{\bullet}$ admits a colimit in $\mathcal{C}$. Note that the functor F preserves this colimit by [20, Remark 4.7.2.4]. Thus, the claim about $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ follows from Corollary 2.7(d).

To prove the claims about $\text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, G)$ and $\text{LEq}(F, G)$ we can do an analogous argument using Corollary 2.8(d), resp. Proposition 2.6(d) at the end. $\square$

Theorem 4.6.

- (a) *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an ∞ -category and let $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be an endofunctor such that the forgetful functor $U: \text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ admits a left adjoint (e.g. if $\mathcal{C}$ admits countable coproducts and F preserves them). Then the functor U exhibits $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ as monadic over $\mathcal{C}$ (in the sense of [20, Definition 4.7.3.4]).*
- (b) *Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be ∞ -categories and let $F, G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be functors such that the forgetful functor $U: \text{LEq}(F, G) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ admits a left adjoint. Then the functor U exhibits $\text{LEq}(F, G)$ as monadic over $\mathcal{C}$.*
- (c) *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an ∞ -category and let $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be an endofunctor such that the forgetful functor $U: \text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, G) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ admits a left adjoint. Then the functor U exhibits $\text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, G)$ as monadic over $\mathcal{C}$.*

Proof. By the ∞ -categorical Barr-Beck Theorem [20, Theorem 4.7.3.5] it is enough to show that U is conservative, $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ (resp. $\text{LEq}(F, G)$ or $\text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, G)$) admits colimits of U -split simplicial objects and U preserves these colimits. The latter holds by Lemma 4.5. Moreover, we have already seen that U is conservative in Corollary 2.7(b) (resp. Proposition 2.6(b) or Corollary 2.8(b)). $\square$

We finish this section by investigating the t-exactness properties of the functor L . Under the additional assumption that the t-structure on $\mathcal{C}$ is compatible with coproducts we get an analog of Corollary 3.5 which is an important ingredient for the proof of our main theorem.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a stable ∞ -category with a t-structure $(\mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}, \mathcal{C}_{\leq 0})$. Suppose that $\mathcal{C}_{\leq 0}$ is stable under coproducts.*

- (a) *Let $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be a t-exact endofunctor that preserves countable coproducts. Then the left adjoint of the forgetful functor $U: \text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ from Definition 4.1 is t-exact (with respect to the induced t-structure on $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)$ described in Proposition 3.3).*
- (b) *Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a stable ∞ -category with a t-structure and $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be a t-exact functor that preserves countable coproducts. Let $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be a functor that admits a t-exact left adjoint. Then the left adjoint of the forgetful functor $U: \text{LEq}(F, G) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is t-exact.*
- (c) *Let $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be an endofunctor that admits a t-exact left adjoint. Then the left adjoint of the forgetful functor $U: \text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, G) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is t-exact.*

Proof. Note for (b) and (c) that G is left t-exact by [6, Proposition 1.3.17(iii)] because it is right adjoint to a t-exact functor. In particular, the ∞ -categories $\text{LEq}(F, G)$ and $\text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, G)$ carry the induced t-structure described in Proposition 3.3.

In all three cases we denote the left adjoint of the forgetful functor by L . By Proposition 3.3 we have to show that $UL(\mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}$ and that $UL(\mathcal{C}_{\leq 0}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\leq 0}$. This follows directly from the definition of L (Definition 4.1, Corollary 4.3, Corollary 4.4), the assumptions on F and G and the fact that $\mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\leq 0}$ are stable under coproducts. $\square$

Corollary 4.8. *Under the respective assumptions of the previous lemma there are commutative diagrams*

(a)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit & \xrightarrow{L_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}} & \text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit, F^\heartsuit) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{L_{\mathcal{C}}} & \text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F) \end{array}$$

(b)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit & \xrightarrow{L_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}} & \text{LEq}(F^\heartsuit, G^\heartsuit) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{L_{\mathcal{C}}} & \text{LEq}(F, G) \end{array}$$

(c)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit & \xrightarrow{L_{\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit}} & \text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit, G^\heartsuit) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{L_{\mathcal{C}}} & \text{Frob}(\mathcal{C}, G) \end{array}$$

In each case the horizontal functors denote the left adjoint of the forgetful functor.

Proof. We only prove (a), an analogous proof shows (b) and (c). For the sake of clarity, we add an index to L and U to indicate to which category they refer.

As $L_{\mathcal{C}}$ is t-exact by Lemma 4.7, it restricts to a functor

$$L_{\mathcal{C}}^{\heartsuit}: \mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit} \rightarrow \text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F)^{\heartsuit}.$$

The same is true for the forgetful functor $U_{\mathcal{C}}: \text{Cart}(\mathcal{C}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ by Corollary 3.5. The restricted functors $L_{\mathcal{C}}^{\heartsuit}$ and $U_{\mathcal{C}}^{\heartsuit}$ are adjoint by [6, Proposition 1.3.17(iii)] because $L_{\mathcal{C}}$ is left adjoint to $U_{\mathcal{C}}$. But again by Corollary 3.5, $U_{\mathcal{C}}^{\heartsuit} \simeq U_{\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}}$, so $L_{\mathcal{C}}^{\heartsuit}$ and $L_{\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}}$ are left adjoints of equivalent functors. Hence, $L_{\mathcal{C}}^{\heartsuit}$ and $L_{\mathcal{C}^{\heartsuit}}$ are equivalent (cf. [21, Remark 5.2.2.2]). $\square$

5. The derived ∞ -category of Cartier modules

In this section we state and prove the main theorem of this paper. The proof relies on a consequence of the ∞ -categorical Barr-Beck Theorem [20, Theorem 4.7.3.5] which we recall in Proposition 5.3.

Recall that a Grothendieck abelian category is a presentable abelian category that has exact filtered colimits. In particular, Grothendieck abelian categories satisfy Grothendieck's axioms AB3, AB4 and AB5, cf. [29, Tag 079A].

Furthermore, if $\mathcal{A}$ is a Grothendieck abelian category we can define its derived ∞ -category $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$, cf. [20, Definition 1.3.5.8]. The derived ∞ -category carries a natural t-structure (cf. [20, Definition 1.3.5.16]) whose heart is given by $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})^{\heartsuit} \simeq \mathcal{A}$ (cf. [22, Remark C.5.4.11]).

For $G: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ a colimit-preserving exact functor between Grothendieck abelian categories there is an induced colimit-preserving t-exact functor

$$\mathcal{D}(G): \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{B})$$

by Proposition A.2. Moreover, we can also apply Proposition A.2 to the equivalence

$$\text{Arr}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \text{Arr}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})^{\heartsuit}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} (\text{Arr}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})))^{\heartsuit}$$

to get a functor $\mathcal{D}(\text{Arr}(\mathcal{A})) \rightarrow \text{Arr}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}))$.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a Grothendieck abelian category and $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be an exact and colimit-preserving functor. Then $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F)$ is a Grothendieck abelian category and the natural functor $\alpha: \mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F)) \rightarrow \text{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{D}(F))$ given by the universal property of the pullback and the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \mathcal{D}(U_{\mathcal{A}}) & & \\ & \nearrow & & \searrow & \\ \mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F)) & & & & \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) \\ & \searrow \alpha & & \nearrow U_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})} & \\ & \text{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{D}(F)) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) & \\ \downarrow \mathcal{D}(\kappa) & \downarrow \kappa_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})} & & \downarrow (\mathcal{D}(F), \text{id}) & \\ \mathcal{D}(\text{Arr}(\mathcal{A})) & \longrightarrow & \text{Arr}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})) & \xrightarrow{(\text{ev}_0, \text{ev}_1)} & \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) \times \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) \end{array}$$

is an equivalence of ∞ -categories.

Furthermore, the functor α is t-exact with respect to the usual t-structure on $\mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F))$ and the induced t-structure on $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{D}(F))$ described in Proposition 3.3.

Note that the outer diagram in the theorem indeed commutes as this can be checked on hearts by Proposition A.2 where the bottom composition is given by $(\text{ev}_0, \text{ev}_1)$. So, it boils down to the commutative diagram defining $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F)$.

Remark 5.2. By Proposition A.2, the equivalence of the heart

$$\text{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F) \simeq \text{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{D}(F))^\heartsuit$$

described in Proposition 3.4 also induces a functor

$$\mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F)) \rightarrow \text{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{D}(F)).$$

It can be shown that this functor is equivalent to the functor α of Theorem 5.1 by checking it on the heart and applying Proposition A.2.

To prove the theorem we use the following result which is a consequence of the ∞ -categorical Barr-Beck Theorem [20, Theorem 4.7.3.5].

Proposition 5.3. *Suppose we are given a commutative diagram of ∞ -categories*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & \mathcal{C}' \\ & \searrow U & \swarrow U' \\ & \mathcal{D} & \end{array}$$

and assume the following:

- (1) *The functor U exhibits $\mathcal{C}$ as monadic over $\mathcal{D}$.*
- (2) *The functor U' exhibits $\mathcal{C}'$ as monadic over $\mathcal{D}$.*
- (3) *Denote the left adjoints of U and U' by L and L' , respectively. For each object $D \in \mathcal{D}$, the unit map $D \rightarrow UL(D) \simeq U'\alpha L(D)$ induces an equivalence $L'(D) \rightarrow \alpha L(D)$ in $\mathcal{C}'$.*

Then α is an equivalence.

Proof. This is a reformulation of [20, Corollary 4.7.3.16] using [20, Theorem 4.7.3.5]. $\square$

So, to prove Theorem 5.1 we show that for the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F)) & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & \text{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{D}(F)) \\ & \searrow \mathcal{D}(U_{\mathcal{A}}) & \swarrow U_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})} \\ & \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) & \end{array}$$

the assumptions (1) to (3) of Proposition 5.3 are satisfied where we keep the notation from Theorem 5.1. Note that the category $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F)$ is Grothendieck abelian by Corollary 2.7(i), so that it makes sense to write $\mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F))$. We start with the proof of (1).

Proposition 5.4. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a Grothendieck abelian category and $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be an exact and colimit-preserving functor. Then the functor*

$$\mathcal{D}(U_{\mathcal{A}}): \mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F)) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$$

exhibits $\mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F))$ as monadic over $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$.

Proof. By Proposition 4.2 the functor $U_{\mathcal{A}}: \text{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ admits a left adjoint $L_{\mathcal{A}}$. Using Theorem 4.6(a) we see that $U_{\mathcal{A}}$ exhibits $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F)$ as monadic over $\mathcal{A}$. Noting that coproducts in Grothendieck abelian categories are exact by axiom AB4, we get that $L_{\mathcal{A}}$ is an exact functor. Thus, we conclude by applying Corollary A.8. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 5.1. First note that the category $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F)$ is Grothendieck abelian by Corollary 2.7(i).

Moreover, the t-exactness of the functor α follows immediately from the definition of the induced t-structure on $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{D}(F))$ and the t-exactness of $\mathcal{D}(U_{\mathcal{A}}) \simeq U_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})}\alpha$.

So, it remains to show that the natural functor

$$\alpha: \mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F)) \rightarrow \text{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{D}(F))$$

is an equivalence. As we already described above the proof proceeds by considering the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F)) & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & \text{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{D}(F)) \\ & \searrow \mathcal{D}(U_{\mathcal{A}}) & \swarrow U_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})} \\ & \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) & \end{array}$$

and checking that the assumptions (1) to (3) of Proposition 5.3 are satisfied.

(1) is Proposition 5.4.

For (2) note that $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ is presentable by [20, Proposition 1.3.5.21(1)] and that $\mathcal{D}(F)$ preserves colimits by definition. Hence, we can apply Theorem 4.6(a) to get (2).

It remains to prove (3). We have to show that for each object $M \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ there is an equivalence $L_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})}(M) \rightarrow \alpha \mathcal{D}(L_{\mathcal{A}})(M)$ induced by the unit of the adjunction $\mathcal{D}(L_{\mathcal{A}}) \dashv \mathcal{D}(U_{\mathcal{A}})$. As $U_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})}$ is conservative it suffices to show that the map

$$U_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})}L_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})}(M) \rightarrow U_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})}\alpha \mathcal{D}(L_{\mathcal{A}})(M) \simeq \mathcal{D}(U_{\mathcal{A}})\mathcal{D}(L_{\mathcal{A}})(M)$$

is an equivalence.

The functor $U_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})}$ is t-exact by Corollary 3.5 and colimit-preserving by Corollary 2.7(f). Note that the t-structure on $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ is compatible with filtered colimits by [20, Proposition 1.3.5.21(3)], and hence, the functor $L_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})}$ is t-exact by Lemma 4.7(a). The functor $L_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})}$ also preserves colimits as it is a left adjoint. Moreover, the functors $\mathcal{D}(U_{\mathcal{A}})$ and $\mathcal{D}(L_{\mathcal{A}})$ are t-exact and colimit-preserving by definition. Thus, we can apply Proposition A.2 to reduce to the case $M \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})^{\heartsuit}$.

Denote by $H: \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})^{\heartsuit} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ the inclusion of the heart. Then there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \pi_0 U_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})} L_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})} H(M) & \longrightarrow & \pi_0 \mathcal{D}(U_{\mathcal{A}}) \mathcal{D}(L_{\mathcal{A}}) H(M) \\ \simeq \downarrow & & \downarrow \simeq \\ U_{\mathcal{A}} L_{\mathcal{A}}(M) & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & U_{\mathcal{A}} L_{\mathcal{A}}(M) \end{array}$$

where the left vertical arrow is an equivalence because of Corollary 4.8(a), Corollary 3.5 and the fact that $\pi_0 H \simeq \text{id}$ and the right vertical arrow is an equivalence by definition of $\mathcal{D}(U_{\mathcal{A}})$ and $\mathcal{D}(L_{\mathcal{A}})$. The commutativity follows because the top horizontal map is induced by the composition

$$U_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})} L_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}(u)} U_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})} L_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})} \mathcal{D}(U_{\mathcal{A}}) \mathcal{D}(L_{\mathcal{A}})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \xrightarrow{\simeq} U_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})} L_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})} U_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})} \alpha \mathcal{D}(L_{\mathcal{A}}) \\
& \xrightarrow{c_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})}} U_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})} \alpha \mathcal{D}(L_{\mathcal{A}}) \\
& \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathcal{D}(U_{\mathcal{A}}) \mathcal{D}(L_{\mathcal{A}})
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{D}(u)$ denotes the unit of the adjunction $\mathcal{D}(L_{\mathcal{A}}) \dashv \mathcal{D}(U_{\mathcal{A}})$ and $c_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})}$ the counit of the adjunction $L_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})} \dashv U_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})}$. When restricted to the heart these two adjunctions both become equivalent to the adjunction $L_{\mathcal{A}} \dashv U_{\mathcal{A}}$ and the map comes down to

$$U_{\mathcal{A}} L_{\mathcal{A}} \xrightarrow{u} U_{\mathcal{A}} L_{\mathcal{A}} U_{\mathcal{A}} L_{\mathcal{A}} \xrightarrow{c} U_{\mathcal{A}} L_{\mathcal{A}}$$

which is equivalent to the identity because of one of the triangle identities.

The diagram shows that the map

$$\pi_0 U_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})} L_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})} H(M) \rightarrow \pi_0 \mathcal{D}(U_{\mathcal{A}}) \mathcal{D}(L_{\mathcal{A}}) H(M)$$

is an equivalence for $M \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})^\heartsuit$. As we explained above, this implies that the map

$$U_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})} L_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})}(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(U_{\mathcal{A}}) \mathcal{D}(L_{\mathcal{A}})(M)$$

is an equivalence for all $M \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$. This completes the proof of (3) and thus also the proof of the theorem. $\square$

Corollary 5.5. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a Grothendieck abelian category and $F, G: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be exact and colimit-preserving functors. Assume that G has an exact left adjoint G^L . Then $\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)$ is a Grothendieck abelian category and the natural functor*

$$\alpha: \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{LEq}(F, G)) \rightarrow \mathrm{LEq}(\mathcal{D}(F), \mathcal{D}(G)),$$

defined analogously to the one in Theorem 5.1, is a t-exact equivalence of ∞ -categories.

Proof. Note that by Lemma A.6, $\mathcal{D}(G^L)$ is left adjoint to $\mathcal{D}(G)$. So, by Proposition 2.9 there are equivalences $\mathrm{LEq}(F, G) \simeq \mathrm{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, G^L F)$ and

$$\mathrm{LEq}(\mathcal{D}(F), \mathcal{D}(G)) \simeq \mathrm{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{D}(G^L) \mathcal{D}(F))$$

of ∞ -categories. Now we can apply Theorem 5.1 to conclude. $\square$

Corollary 5.6. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a Grothendieck abelian category and $G: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be an exact and colimit-preserving functor. Assume that G has an exact left adjoint. Then $\mathrm{Frob}(\mathcal{A}, G)$ is a Grothendieck abelian category and the natural functor*

$$\alpha: \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{Frob}(\mathcal{A}, G)) \rightarrow \mathrm{Frob}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{D}(G)),$$

defined analogously to the one in Theorem 5.1, is a t-exact equivalence of ∞ -categories.

Proof. Apply Corollary 5.5 with $F = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}$. $\square$

If we apply Theorem 5.1 with $F = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}$ we recover the following well-known result about the category $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{A})$ of endomorphisms of $\mathcal{A}$.

Corollary 5.7. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a Grothendieck abelian category. Then there is a canonical equivalence $\mathcal{D}(\text{End}(\mathcal{A})) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{End}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}))$ of ∞ -categories.*

6. Applications

In this section we collect some applications of our main theorem. These include in particular the corresponding statements about (classical) Cartier modules on a scheme over a field of positive characteristic. We also construct a perverse t-structure on classical Cartier modules. As the perverse t-structure is usually denoted by cohomological notation in the literature, we chose to do the same here, although we used homological notation before.

Notation 6.1. For a scheme X , let $\text{Mod}(X)$ be the Grothendieck abelian category of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules, and $\text{QCoh}(X)$ be the subcategory of quasi-coherent $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules, which itself is Grothendieck abelian.

If $p > 0$ is a prime and X is an $\mathbb{F}_p$ -scheme, we denote by $F: X \rightarrow X$ the absolute Frobenius of X . Consider the associated pushforward functor $F_*: \text{Mod}(X) \rightarrow \text{Mod}(X)$. Since F is affine, it is separated and quasi-compact [29, Tag 01S7], and hence it restricts to a functor $F_*: \text{QCoh}(X) \rightarrow \text{QCoh}(X)$ [29, Tag 01LC]. On both categories the functor F_* is exact since F is topologically the identity and thus does nothing on stalks (viewed as abelian groups). Hence, F induces derived functors $\mathcal{D}(F_*): \mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X)) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X))$ and $\mathcal{D}(F_*): \mathcal{D}(\text{QCoh}(X)) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\text{QCoh}(X))$ which are t-exact with respect to the standard t-structures.

Corollary 6.2. *Let $p > 0$ be a prime and X be an $\mathbb{F}_p$ -scheme. Then there are canonical t-exact equivalences of ∞ -categories*

$$\mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\text{QCoh}(X), F_*)) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(\text{QCoh}(X)), \mathcal{D}(F_*))$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\text{Mod}(X), F_*)) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X)), \mathcal{D}(F_*)).$$

Proof. Apply Theorem 5.1 with the Grothendieck abelian category $\text{QCoh}(X)$ and the exact and colimit-preserving functor $F_*: \text{QCoh}(X) \rightarrow \text{QCoh}(X)$ for the first equivalence. For the other replace $\text{QCoh}(X)$ by $\text{Mod}(X)$. $\square$

Corollary 6.3. *Let $p > 0$ be a prime and X be a regular Noetherian $\mathbb{F}_p$ -scheme. Then there are canonical t-exact equivalences of ∞ -categories*

$$\mathcal{D}(\text{Frob}(\text{QCoh}(X), F_*)) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Frob}(\mathcal{D}(\text{QCoh}(X)), \mathcal{D}(F_*))$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}(\text{Frob}(\text{Mod}(X), F_*)) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Frob}(\mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X)), \mathcal{D}(F_*)).$$

Proof. First note that the functor $F^*: \text{QCoh}(X) \rightarrow \text{QCoh}(X)$ is left adjoint to F_* and exact by [17, Theorem 2.1]. Thus, for the first equivalence we can apply Corollary 5.6 to $\mathcal{A} = \text{QCoh}(X)$ and $G = F_*$. For the second equivalence replace $\text{QCoh}(X)$ by $\text{Mod}(X)$. $\square$

Another application of Theorem 5.1 is that it enables us to define t-structures on $\mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\mathcal{A}, F))$ by giving an induced t-structure on $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{D}(F))$ in the sense of Section 3.

As an example we construct a perverse t-structure on the bounded derived category of classical Cartier modules with coherent cohomology. Perverse t-structures in general were first studied in [6] and later more

generally by Gabber [12]. As they are usually denoted by cohomological notation in the literature, we chose to do the same here, although we used homological notation before.

Notation 6.4. If $\mathcal{D}$ is a stable ∞ -category with a t-structure $(\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}, \mathcal{D}^{\geq 0})$, we write

$$\mathcal{D}^b := \bigcup_{\substack{a \rightarrow \infty \\ b \rightarrow -\infty}} \mathcal{D}^{\leq a} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\geq b}$$

for the subcategory of bounded objects. Similarly, denote by

$$\mathcal{D}^+ := \bigcup_{b \rightarrow -\infty} \mathcal{D}^{\geq b}$$

the full subcategory of those objects that are bounded below.

We introduce some more notation. For a scheme X and a point $x \in X$ we denote by $i_x: \operatorname{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{X,x}) \rightarrow X$ the inclusion of the local scheme at x . Recall that there is an exact inverse image functor

$$i_x^*: \operatorname{Mod}(X) \rightarrow \operatorname{Mod}(\mathcal{O}_{X,x})$$

and a left exact functor

$$i_x^!: \operatorname{Mod}(X) \rightarrow \operatorname{Mod}(\mathcal{O}_{X,x})$$

given by taking sections with support in $\overline{\{x\}}$ (compare with [14, Section IV.1, Variation 8]). We denote their derived, resp. right derived functors by

$$i_x^*: \mathcal{D}(\operatorname{Mod}(X)) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\operatorname{Mod}(\mathcal{O}_{X,x})),$$

resp.

$$Ri_x^!: \mathcal{D}^+(\operatorname{Mod}(X)) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^+(\operatorname{Mod}(\mathcal{O}_{X,x})).$$

Remark 6.5. *A priori* it is not clear that the right derived functor $Ri_x^!$ exists on the ∞ -categorical level. We will not need this in the sequel, as we only need the value of $Ri_x^!$ on objects. Nonetheless, one can construct $Ri_x^!$ on the ∞ -categorical level via the adjoint functor theorem, since $\mathcal{D}(i_{x,*})$ preserves all colimits by construction, and all involved derived ∞ -categories are presentable.

Theorem 6.6 ([12, §6]). *Let X be a Noetherian scheme. Let $d: X \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a bounded below weak perversity function in the sense of [12, §1]. Define full subcategories ${}^d\mathcal{D}^{\geq 0}(\operatorname{Mod}(X))$ and ${}^d\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}(\operatorname{Mod}(X))$ of $\mathcal{D}(\operatorname{Mod}(X))$ as follows: Let $M \in \mathcal{D}(\operatorname{Mod}(X))$ be an object. Then*

- $M \in {}^d\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}(\operatorname{Mod}(X))$ if we have $i_x^*(M) \in \mathcal{D}^{\leq d(x)}(\operatorname{Mod}(\mathcal{O}_{X,x}))$ for every point $x \in X$, and
- $M \in {}^d\mathcal{D}^{\geq 0}(\operatorname{Mod}(X))$ if $M \in \mathcal{D}^+(\operatorname{Mod}(X))$ and we have $Ri_x^!(M) \in \mathcal{D}^{\geq d(x)}(\operatorname{Mod}(\mathcal{O}_{X,x}))$ for every point $x \in X$.

These subcategories define a t-structure on $\mathcal{D}(\operatorname{Mod}(X))$, which is called the perverse t-structure (with respect to d).

Observe that the standard t-structure is a special case of a perverse t-structure.

Lemma 6.7. *Let X be a Noetherian scheme. The perverse t-structure with respect to $d = 0$ is equivalent to the standard t-structure on $\mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X))$.*

Proof. As t-structures are uniquely determined by their connective part it suffices to show ${}^0\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}(\text{Mod}(X)) = \mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}(\text{Mod}(X))$. The lemma thus follows from the fact that the stalk functors i_x^* are jointly conservative and exact (and hence commute with cohomology). $\square$

We now want to define the induced perverse t-structure on classical Cartier modules. To be able to apply the results from Section 3 we first have to show that the Frobenius pushforward functor is right t-exact. We more generally show the following:

Lemma 6.8. *Let X be a Noetherian scheme, and let $G: X \rightarrow X$ be an endomorphism that is topologically the identity (e.g. X is a positive characteristic scheme, and $G = F$ is the Frobenius endomorphism). Then $G_*: \mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X)) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X))$ is right t-exact with respect to the perverse t-structure with respect to any bounded below weak perversity function $d: X \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$.*

Proof. Since G is topologically the identity, for every $M \in \text{Mod}(X)$ we have $(G_*M)(U) = M(G^{-1}U) = M(U)$ (as abelian groups), and in particular, for every $x \in X$ it follows that $(G_*M)_x = M_x$. In particular, $G_*: \text{Mod}(X) \rightarrow \text{Mod}(X)$ is exact. Thus, the derived functor $\mathcal{D}(G_*): \mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X)) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X))$ exists and is t-exact for the standard t-structures.

Let $M \in {}^d\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}(\text{Mod}(X))$, i.e. we have that $M_x \cong i_x^*M \in \mathcal{D}^{\leq d(x)}(\text{Mod}(\mathcal{O}_{X,x}))$ for every point $x \in X$. We have to see that the same is true for $(\mathcal{D}(G_*)(M))_x \cong i_x^*\mathcal{D}(G_*)(M)$. This is clear since $(\mathcal{D}(G_*)(M))_x \cong M_x$, as this can be checked on cohomology. $\square$

Theorem 6.9. *Let $p > 0$ be a prime and X be a Noetherian $\mathbb{F}_p$ -scheme. Then the perverse t-structure with respect to any bounded below weak perversity function $d: X \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$ induces a perverse t-structure on $\mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\text{Mod}(X), F_*))$ such that the forgetful functor $\mathcal{D}(U): \mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\text{Mod}(X), F_*)) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X))$ is t-exact for the perverse t-structures.*

Proof. We showed in Corollary 6.2 that there is an equivalence of ∞ -categories

$$\alpha: \mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\text{Mod}(X), F_*)) \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X)), \mathcal{D}(F_*))$$

which is t-exact for the standard t-structure on $\mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\text{Mod}(X), F_*))$ and the induced t-structure on $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X)), \mathcal{D}(F_*))$. Using this, it is left to show that there is an induced perverse t-structure on $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X)), \mathcal{D}(F_*))$. This follows directly from Lemma 6.8 and Proposition 3.3. The t-exactness of the forgetful functor $\mathcal{D}(U): \mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\text{Mod}(X), F_*)) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X))$ follows from the definition of α because $\mathcal{D}(U)$ can be written as the composition

$$\mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\text{Mod}(X), F_*)) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \text{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X)), \mathcal{D}(F_*)) \xrightarrow{U} \mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X))$$

of two t-exact functors. $\square$

Under suitable conditions, Gabber shows that the perverse t-structure on $\mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X))$ restricts to a t-structure on derived modules with quasi-coherent (resp. coherent) cohomology. We now show that this also works for derived Cartier modules. For this, we need the following definitions.

Definition 6.10. Let $p > 0$ be a prime and X be an $\mathbb{F}_p$ -scheme. A (classical) Cartier module $M \in \text{Cart}(\text{Mod}(X), F_*)$ is called *quasi-coherent* (resp. *coherent*) if its underlying $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module UM is quasi-coherent (resp. coherent).

Notation 6.11. Let $p > 0$ be a prime and X be an $\mathbb{F}_p$ -scheme. We write

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{coh}}(\text{Cart}(\text{Mod}(X), F_*)) \subset \mathcal{D}_{\text{qcoh}}(\text{Cart}(\text{Mod}(X), F_*)) \subset \mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\text{Mod}(X), F_*))$$

for the full subcategories consisting of those derived Cartier modules that have coherent or quasi-coherent cohomology, respectively.

Similarly, we define $\mathcal{D}_{\text{coh}}(\text{Mod}(X)) \subset \mathcal{D}_{\text{qcoh}}(\text{Mod}(X)) \subset \mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X))$.

Lemma 6.12. *Let $p > 0$ be a prime and X be a Noetherian $\mathbb{F}_p$ -scheme. The equivalence $\alpha: \mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\text{Mod}(X), F_*)) \rightarrow \text{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X)), \mathcal{D}(F_*))$ from Corollary 6.2 restricts to an equivalence*

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{qcoh}}(\text{Cart}(\text{Mod}(X), F_*)) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Cart}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{qcoh}}(\text{Mod}(X)), \mathcal{D}(F_*)).$$

If moreover F is finite, then this further restricts to an equivalence

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{coh}}(\text{Cart}(\text{Mod}(X), F_*)) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Cart}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{coh}}(\text{Mod}(X)), \mathcal{D}(F_*)).$$

Proof. Since F is affine, it is in particular separated and quasi-compact [29, Tag 01S7], hence $\mathcal{D}(F_*)$ preserves quasi-coherent cohomology [29, Tag 01LC]. If F is finite (hence proper), then $\mathcal{D}(F_*)$ moreover preserves coherent cohomology [29, Tag 02O5]. Hence, the ∞ -categories on the right-hand side are defined.

Since limits of fully faithful functors are fully faithful, we indeed have that $\text{Cart}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{qcoh}}(\text{Mod}(X)), \mathcal{D}(F_*)) \rightarrow \text{Cart}(\mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X)), \mathcal{D}(F_*))$ is again fully faithful, and similarly for the coherent version.

It thus suffices to compare the respective subcategories on both sides of the equivalence α . Since α commutes with the forgetful functors, and since the forgetful functors are t-exact, they agree. $\square$

Proposition 6.13. *Let $p > 0$ be a prime, X be a Noetherian $\mathbb{F}_p$ -scheme and $d: X \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$ a bounded below weak perversity function. Consider the perverse t-structure on $\mathcal{D}(\text{Cart}(\text{Mod}(X), F_*))$.*

- (a) *If d is a strong perversity function [12, §1], then this t-structure restricts to $\mathcal{D}_{\text{qcoh}}(\text{Cart}(\text{Mod}(X), F_*))$.*
- (b) *If F is finite and d is a finite-valued strong perversity function (i.e. lands in $\mathbb{Z} \subset \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$) satisfying [12, condition (c) from §9], then this t-structure restricts to $\mathcal{D}_{\text{coh}}(\text{Cart}(\text{Mod}(X), F_*))$.*

Proof. If d is a strong perversity function, then the perverse t-structure on $\mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X))$ restricts to $\mathcal{D}_{\text{qcoh}}(\text{Mod}(X))$ by [12, Remarks 6.1 (6)]. Hence, in this case the proposition immediately follows from Lemmas 6.8 and 6.12 and Proposition 3.3.

For the second part, since X is Noetherian and F is finite, X admits a dualizing complex [12, Remark 13.6]. Hence, if d is moreover finite-valued and strong, then the perverse t-structure on $\mathcal{D}(\text{Mod}(X))$ restricts to $\mathcal{D}_{\text{coh}}(\text{Mod}(X))$ by [12, Theorem 9.1]. Hence, the same proof as above works. $\square$

Let X be a Noetherian scheme that admits a dualizing complex $\omega_X^\bullet$. By [14, Section V.7] the complex $Ri_x^! \omega_X^\bullet$ is concentrated in a single homological degree $d(x)$ for each point $x \in X$. The obtained map $d: X \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is a finite-valued strong perversity function satisfying [12, condition (c) from §9]. Let us write $\text{Coh}(X) \subset \text{QCoh}(X)$ for the full subcategory of coherent modules. Assume that F is finite. Using duality theory, Baudin defined in [3, Definition 5.2.1] a perverse t-structure on $\mathcal{D}^b(\text{Cart}(\text{Coh}(X), F_*))$ for the perversity function d described above. We can compare this t-structure with the perverse t-structure on $\mathcal{D}_{\text{coh}}(\text{Cart}(\text{Mod}(X), F_*))$.

Corollary 6.14. *Let $p > 0$ be a prime and X be a Noetherian $\mathbb{F}_p$ -scheme that admits a dualizing complex. Assume moreover that the absolute Frobenius F of X is finite. The canonical functor*

$$\mathcal{D}^b(\mathrm{Cart}(\mathrm{Coh}(X), F_*)) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathrm{Cart}(\mathrm{Mod}(X), F_*))$$

is perverse t-exact.

Proof. This is clear as this can be checked after applying the perverse t-exact conservative forgetful functor $\mathcal{D}(U)$. $\square$

Remark 6.15. In the last corollary, if one furthermore assumes that X has affine diagonal, one can show that the canonical functor

$$\mathcal{D}^b(\mathrm{Cart}(\mathrm{Coh}(X), F_*)) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{coh}}^b(\mathrm{Cart}(\mathrm{Mod}(X), F_*))$$

is an equivalence, which is t-exact for the perverse t-structures.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Klaus Mattis: Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft. **Timo Weiß:** Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Appendix A. Derived ∞ -categories

In this appendix we state and prove some facts about derived ∞ -categories of Grothendieck abelian categories that we use to prove our main theorem.

Recall that a t-structure $(\mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}, \mathcal{C}_{\leq 0})$ on an ∞ -category $\mathcal{C}$ is called right complete if the natural functor

$$\mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{\sim} \lim(\cdots \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\geq 0} \xrightarrow{\tau_{\geq 1}} \mathcal{C}_{\geq 1} \xrightarrow{\tau_{\geq 2}} \mathcal{C}_{\geq 2} \rightarrow \cdots)$$

is an equivalence of ∞ -categories. It is called right separated if $\bigcap_n \mathcal{C}_{\leq n} = 0$ and left separated if $\bigcap_n \mathcal{C}_{\geq n} = 0$.

Notation A.1. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a Grothendieck abelian category. We denote by $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ the derived ∞ -category of $\mathcal{A}$, cf. [20, Definition 1.3.5.8].

It carries a t-structure $(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})_{\geq 0}, \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})_{\leq 0})$ (cf. [20, Definition 1.3.5.16]) which is accessible, right complete and compatible with filtered colimits by [20, Proposition 1.3.5.21].

For each n we denote by $\iota_{\geq n}: \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})_{\geq n} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$: $\tau_{\geq n}$ the adjunction of the inclusion and the connective cover functor and by $\tau_{\leq n}: \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})_{\leq n}$: $\iota_{\leq n}$ the adjunction of the truncation functor and the inclusion.

Furthermore, the heart of the t-structure is given by $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})^\heartsuit \simeq \mathcal{A}$ (cf. [22, Remark C.5.4.11]) and we denote the inclusion of the heart by $H: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$.

The next proposition can be seen as a universal property of derived ∞ -categories. It shows that t-exact and colimit-preserving functors out of a derived ∞ -category are uniquely determined by their restrictions to the heart.

Proposition A.2. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a Grothendieck abelian category and $\mathcal{C}$ a presentable stable ∞ -category. Assume that $\mathcal{C}$ carries a right complete and left separated t-structure $(\mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}, \mathcal{C}_{\leq 0})$ that is compatible with filtered colimits. Then the restriction functor

$$\mathrm{LFun}^{\mathrm{t-ex}}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathrm{LFun}^{\mathrm{ex}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit), \quad G \mapsto \pi_0 GH$$

is an equivalence, where objects in the source are colimit-preserving t -exact functors from $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ to $\mathcal{C}$ and objects in the target are colimit-preserving exact functors from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{C}^\heartsuit$.

Proof. By [22, Theorem C.5.4.9] the restriction to the heart induces an equivalence

$$\mathrm{LFun}^{\mathrm{lex}}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})_{\geq 0}, \mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathrm{LFun}^{\mathrm{ex}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit)$$

where objects in the source are colimit-preserving and left exact functors from $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})_{\geq 0}$ to $\mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}$. Therefore, it suffices to show that the restriction functor

$$\mathrm{LFun}^{\mathrm{t-ex}}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathrm{LFun}^{\mathrm{lex}}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})_{\geq 0}, \mathcal{C}_{\geq 0})$$

is an equivalence.

By [20, Proposition 1.3.5.21(3)] the t -structure on $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ is right complete, i.e. $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \lim_n \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})_{\geq -n}$. Thus, combining [22, Remark C.1.2.10] and [22, Proposition C.3.1.1] we get an equivalence

$$\mathrm{LFun}^{\mathrm{r-t-ex}}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{C}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathrm{LFun}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})_{\geq 0}, \mathcal{C}_{\geq 0})$$

where objects in the source are colimit-preserving right t -exact functors from $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ to $\mathcal{C}$ and objects in the target are colimit-preserving functors from $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})_{\geq 0}$ to $\mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}$. But by [22, Proposition C.3.2.1] this induces an equivalence

$$\mathrm{LFun}^{\mathrm{t-ex}}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{C}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathrm{LFun}^{\mathrm{lex}}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})_{\geq 0}, \mathcal{C}_{\geq 0}). \quad \square$$

In particular, by [22, Remark C.5.4.11] the above lemma applies if we take $\mathcal{C}$ to be the derived ∞ -category $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{B})$ of a Grothendieck abelian category $\mathcal{B}$.

Notation A.3. Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ be as in Proposition A.2. We denote by

$$\mathcal{D}: \mathrm{LFun}^{\mathrm{ex}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit) \rightarrow \mathrm{LFun}^{\mathrm{t-ex}}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{C}), \quad G \mapsto \mathcal{D}(G)$$

the inverse to the restriction functor.

In the following we investigate the properties of the functor $\mathcal{D}(G)$ if $G: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit$ is an exact and colimit-preserving functor. In the case where $\mathcal{C}$ is also a derived ∞ -category, we show that $\mathcal{D}$ preserves adjoint functors and monadicity. To that end we start by showing that $\mathcal{D}$ preserves conservativity of functors. For that we need the following lemma.

Lemma A.4. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ be as in Proposition A.2 and $G: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit$ an exact and colimit-preserving functor. Then there is an equivalence $\pi_n \mathcal{D}(G) \simeq G\pi_n$ of functors $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\heartsuit$ for each n .*

Proof. We show the claim for $n = 0$. Then the lemma follows from

$$\pi_n \mathcal{D}(G) \simeq \pi_0 \Sigma^{-n} \mathcal{D}(G) \simeq \pi_0 \mathcal{D}(G) \Sigma^{-n} \simeq G\pi_0 \Sigma^{-n} \simeq G\pi_n$$

where we used that $\mathcal{D}(G)$ is exact in the second equivalence.

Note that by the definition of the restriction functor of Proposition A.2 we have $G \simeq \pi_0 \mathcal{D}(G)H$. We show that there are equivalences

$$\pi_0 \mathcal{D}(G) H \pi_0 \xrightarrow{\cong} \pi_0 \mathcal{D}(G) \tau_{\leq 0} \xleftarrow{\cong} \pi_0 \mathcal{D}(G) \quad (5)$$

where the first map is given by the counit of the adjunction $\iota_{\geq 0} \dashv \tau_{\geq 0}$ (note that $H \pi_0 \simeq \tau_{\geq 0} \tau_{\leq 0}$) and the second map is given by the unit of the adjunction $\tau_{\leq 0} \dashv \iota_{\leq 0}$.

To see that the first map is an equivalence consider the fiber sequence

$$H \pi_0 X = \tau_{\geq 0} X \rightarrow X \rightarrow \tau_{\leq -1} X$$

for $X \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})_{\leq 0}$. Applying $\mathcal{D}(G)$ we get another fiber sequence

$$\mathcal{D}(G) H \pi_0 X \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(G) X \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(G) \tau_{\leq -1} X$$

where the last term is (-1) -truncated and the other terms are 0-truncated because of the t-exactness of $\mathcal{D}(G)$. This shows that the induced map

$$\pi_0 \mathcal{D}(G) H \pi_0 X \rightarrow \pi_0 \mathcal{D}(G) X$$

is an equivalence. Hence, also the first map of (5) is an equivalence.

To check that the second map of (5) is an equivalence we consider the fiber sequence

$$\tau_{\geq 1} Y \rightarrow Y \rightarrow \tau_{\leq 0} Y$$

for $Y \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$. Applying $\mathcal{D}(G)$ we get another fiber sequence whose first term is 1-connective and whose last term is 0-truncated. Hence, the unit of the adjunction $\tau_{\leq 0} \dashv \iota_{\leq 0}$ induces an equivalence $\pi_0 \mathcal{D}(G) Y \simeq \pi_0 \mathcal{D}(G) \tau_{\leq 0} Y$. So, also the second map of (5) is an equivalence, which completes the proof. $\square$

Using the above lemma we can conclude that $\mathcal{D}$ preserves conservativity of functors. Note that if an ∞ -category $\mathcal{C}$ carries a right and left separated t-structure then a morphism f in $\mathcal{C}$ is an equivalence if and only if for every n , the induced map $\pi_n(f)$ is an equivalence.

Corollary A.5. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ be as in Proposition A.2 and $G: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\vee$ an exact and colimit-preserving functor that is conservative. Then the induced functor $\mathcal{D}(G)$ is conservative.*

Proof. Let f be a morphism in $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\mathcal{D}(G)(f)$ is an equivalence. It follows that for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ the morphism $\pi_n \mathcal{D}(G)(f)$ is an equivalence. But by Lemma A.4 this morphism is equivalent to the morphism $G \pi_n(f)$. Using that G is conservative we get that $\pi_n(f)$ is an equivalence for every n . Note that the t-structure on $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ is right complete by [20, Proposition 1.3.5.21(3)], so in particular right separated by the dual of [20, Proposition 1.2.1.19]. Furthermore, it is left separated by [22, Remark C.5.4.11]. Thus, $\pi_n(f)$ being an equivalence already implies that f is an equivalence. $\square$

We finish this section by showing that $\mathcal{D}$ preserves adjoints and monadicity.

Lemma A.6. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be Grothendieck abelian categories and $L: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ and $R: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be exact and colimit-preserving functors such that L is left adjoint to R . Then $\mathcal{D}(L)$ is left adjoint to $\mathcal{D}(R)$.*

Proof. We define the unit and counit as

$$u_{\mathcal{D}}: \text{id}_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})} \simeq \mathcal{D}(\text{id}_{\mathcal{A}}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}(u)} \mathcal{D}(RL) \simeq \mathcal{D}(R) \mathcal{D}(L)$$

and

$$c_{\mathcal{D}}: \mathcal{D}(L)\mathcal{D}(R) \simeq \mathcal{D}(LR) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}(c)} \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{B}}) \simeq \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{B})},$$

respectively, where $u: \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow RL$ and $c: LR \rightarrow \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{B}}$ denote the unit and counit of the adjunction $L \dashv R$. To check that they satisfy the triangle identities (which is enough by [27, Remark 4.4.5]) consider the following diagram whose commutativity can be checked on the heart by using the equivalence from Proposition A.2

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathcal{D}(L) & \xrightarrow{u_{\mathcal{D}}} & \mathcal{D}(L)\mathcal{D}(R)\mathcal{D}(L) & \xrightarrow{c_{\mathcal{D}}} & \mathcal{D}(L) \\
 \simeq \downarrow & & \swarrow \simeq & \searrow \simeq & \downarrow \simeq \\
 \mathcal{D}(L)\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}(u)} & \mathcal{D}(L)\mathcal{D}(RL) & & \mathcal{D}(LR)\mathcal{D}(L) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}(c)} \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{B}})\mathcal{D}(L) \\
 \simeq \downarrow & & \searrow \simeq & \swarrow \simeq & \downarrow \simeq \\
 \mathcal{D}(L\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}(Lu)} & \mathcal{D}(LRL) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}(cL)} & \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{B}}L).
 \end{array}$$

Note that the lower horizontal composition is equivalent to $\mathcal{D}(cL \circ Lu)$ which is equivalent to the identity by a triangle identity for u and c . Thus, the top horizontal composition in the diagram is equivalent to the identity. The other triangle identity can be shown analogously. $\square$

Remark A.7. One can also extend the functor $\mathcal{D}$ to a functor from the $(2, 2)$ -category of Grothendieck abelian categories with colimit-preserving exact functors to the $(\infty, 2)$ -category of stable ∞ -categories with t-structure with colimit-preserving t-exact functors. From this description the result of Lemma A.6 is a formal consequence.

Corollary A.8. Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be Grothendieck abelian categories and $L: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ and $R: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be exact and colimit-preserving functors such that L is left adjoint to R . Assume that R exhibits $\mathcal{B}$ as monadic over $\mathcal{A}$. Then $\mathcal{D}(R)$ exhibits $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{B})$ as monadic over $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$.

Proof. Note that by Lemma A.6 the functor $\mathcal{D}(R)$ has a left adjoint. By the ∞ -categorical Barr-Beck Theorem (cf. [20, Theorem 4.7.3.5]) it is enough to show that $\mathcal{D}(R)$ is conservative, $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{B})$ admits colimits (of $\mathcal{D}(R)$ -split simplicial objects) and that $\mathcal{D}(R)$ preserves these colimits. Using the ∞ -categorical Barr-Beck Theorem for R we get that R is conservative. Hence, $\mathcal{D}(R)$ is conservative by Corollary A.5. Moreover, the ∞ -category $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{B})$ admits all colimits by [20, Proposition 1.3.5.21(1)], and $\mathcal{D}(R)$ preserves all colimits by definition. $\square$

References

- [1] Arinkin Dmitry, Roman Bezrukavnikov, Perverse coherent sheaves, arXiv preprint, arXiv:0902.0349, 2021.
- [2] Greg W. Anderson, An elementary approach to L -functions mod p , J. Number Theory 80 (2) (2000) 291–303.
- [3] Jefferson Baudin, Duality between Cartier crystals and perverse $\mathbb{F}_p$ -sheaves, and application to generic vanishing, arXiv preprint, arXiv:2306.05378, 2023.
- [4] Manuel Blickle, Gebhard Böckle, Cartier modules: finiteness results, J. Reine Angew. Math. (Crelle's J.) (2011), 09 2009.
- [5] Manuel Blickle, Gebhard Böckle, Cartier crystals, arXiv preprint, arXiv:1309.1035, 2013.
- [6] Alexander A. Beilinson, Joseph Bernstein, Pierre Deligne, Faisceaux pervers, in: Luminy Conference, 06-07-1981 Through 11-07-1981, Soc. Math. Fr., Paris 100 (1982) 5–171.
- [7] Bhargav Bhatt, Manuel Blickle, Gennady Lyubeznik, Anurag K. Singh, Wenliang Zhang, Applications of perverse sheaves in commutative algebra, arXiv preprint, arXiv:2308.03155, 2023.
- [8] Andrew Blumberg, David Gepner, Gonçalo Tabuada, K -theory of endomorphisms via noncommutative motives, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. 368 (2) (2016) 1435–1465.
- [9] Bhargav Bhatt, Jacob Lurie, A Riemann-Hilbert correspondence in positive characteristic, arXiv preprint, arXiv:1711.04148, 2017.
- [10] Gebhard Böckle, Richard Pink, Cohomological Theory of Crystals over Function Fields, EMS Tracts in Mathematics, European Mathematical Society, 2009.
- [11] Matthew Emerton, Mark Kisin, The Riemann-Hilbert correspondence for unit F -crystals, Astérisque (2018).
- [12] Gabber Ofer, Notes on Some t-Structures, De Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 2004, pp. 711–734.

- [13] David Gepner, Moritz Groth, Thomas Nikolaus, Universality of multiplicative infinite loop space machines, *Algebr. Geom. Topol.* 15 (6) (2015) 3107–3153.
- [14] Robin Hartshorne, *Residues and Duality: Lecture Notes of a Seminar on the Work of A. Grothendieck, Given at Harvard 1963 /64*, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Springer, 1966.
- [15] Marc Hoyois, Sheaves of complexes and complexes of sheaves, *MathOverflow*, <https://mathoverflow.net/q/265628> (version: 2017-03-27).
- [16] Christopher D. Hacon, Zolt Patakfalvi, Generic vanishing in characteristic $p > 0$ and the characterization of ordinary abelian varieties, *Am. J. Math.* 138 (4) (2016) 963–998.
- [17] Ernst Kunz, Characterizations of regular local rings for characteristic p , *Am. J. Math.* 91 (1969) 772–784.
- [18] Gennady Lyubeznik, Karen Smith, On the commutation of the test ideal with localization and completion, *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* 353 (8) (2001) 3149–3180.
- [19] Markus Land, Georg Tamme, On the K -theory of pushouts, *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:2304.12812, 2023.
- [20] Jacob Lurie, *Higher algebra*, available online: <https://www.math.ias.edu/~lurie/papers/HA.pdf>, 2017.
- [21] Jacob Lurie, *Higher Topos Theory*, Princeton University Press, 2017, available online: <https://www.math.ias.edu/~lurie/papers/HTT.pdf>.
- [22] Jacob Lurie, *Spectral algebraic geometry*, available online: <https://www.math.ias.edu/~lurie/papers/SAG-rootfile.pdf>, 2018.
- [23] Gennady Lyubeznik, F -modules: applications to local cohomology and D -modules in characteristic $p > 0$, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 485 (1997) 65–130.
- [24] Klaus Mattis, Timo Weiß, Coherent functor formalisms of Cartier and Frobenius modules, in preparation.
- [25] Nikolaus Thomas, Peter Scholze, On topological cyclic homology, *Acta Math.* 221 (2) (2018) 203–409.
- [26] Zolt Patakfalvi, Frobenius techniques in birational geometry, *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:1610.03390, 2016.
- [27] Emily Riehl, Dominic Verity, The 2-category theory of quasi-categories, *Adv. Math.* 280 (2015) 549–642.
- [28] Karl Schwede, F -adjunction, *Algebra Number Theory* 3 (8) (2009) 907–950.
- [29] The Stacks project authors, *The stacks project*, <https://stacks.math.columbia.edu>, 2024.