Non-existence of tensor t-structures on singular noetherian schemes

Rudradip Biswas, Kabeer Manali Rahul, Chris J. Parker

Abstract

We show that there are no non-trivial tensor t-structures on the category of perfect complexes of a singular irreducible finite-dimensional noetherian scheme. To achieve this, we establish some technical results on Thomason filtrations and corresponding tensor t-structures.

In this note, we prove that there exist no non-trivial tensor t-structures on the derived category of perfect complexes of a singular irreducible noetherian scheme of finite dimension. This theorem (Theorem 2.6) is a generalisation of the affine case, which was proven by Smith, see [Smi22, Theorem 6.5]. Both the affine result of Smith, and the non-affine result we obtain in this document, are proved via the classification of compactly generated tensor t-structures in terms of Thomason filtrations. The classification of compactly generated t-structures on $\mathbf{D}(R)$ for a commutative noetherian ring R in terms of Thomason filtrations was done in [ATJLS10, Theorem 3.11]. More recently, a generalisation of this classification to compactly generated tensor t-structures on $\mathbf{D}_{qc}(X)$ for a noetherian scheme X has been obtained in [DS23, Theorem 4.11], which is what our proof utilises to extend to the non-affine case.

Note that Theorem 2.6 cannot be true in the non-affine setting without some additional hypothesis on the class of t-structures (in our case, tensor compatibility is the additional hypothesis) as there are known examples of non-trivial t-structures on $\mathbf{D}^{\text{perf}}(X)$, for X a singular variety, which arise from semi-orthogonal decompositions. This is unlike the affine case, since tensor compatibility is trivially satisfied by any t-structure on $\mathbf{D}^{\text{perf}}(R)$.

1 Background and Notation

In this section we briefly recall some notation, definitions, and results used in this paper.

Let X be a noetherian scheme. Throughout this note, $\mathbf{D}_{qc}(X)$ denotes the unbounded derived category of cochain complexes of \mathcal{O}_X -modules with quasicoherent cohomology, and $\mathbf{D}^{perf}(X)$ denotes the derived category of perfect complexes on X. Let $Z \subseteq X$ be a closed subset, then we denote the corresponding full subcategories of complexes whose cohomology is supported on Z by $\mathbf{D}_{qc,Z}(X)$ and $\mathbf{D}_Z^{perf}(X)$ respectively. Moreover, for a commutative ring R, $\mathbf{D}(R)$ denotes the unbounded derived category of cochain complexes of R-modules, and $\mathbf{D}^{perf}(R)$ denotes the derived category of perfect complexes of R-modules.

Definition 1.1. Let X be a noetherian scheme, and let $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ be a t-structure on $\mathbf{D}_{qc}(X)$. We say that $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ is a *tensor t-structure* if $\mathbf{D}_{qc}(X)^{\leq 0} \otimes \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$, where $\mathbf{D}_{qc}(X)^{\leq 0}$ denotes the aisle of the standard t-structure on $\mathbf{D}_{qc}(X)$. Moreover, a tensor t-structure on $\mathbf{D}^{perf}(X)$ is a tensor t-structure on $\mathbf{D}_{qc}(X)$ which restricts to a t-structure on $\mathbf{D}^{perf}(X)$.

Note that when $X = \operatorname{Spec} R$, every compactly generated t-structure on $\mathbf{D}(R)$ is automatically a tensor t-structure, since the standard t-structure is compactly generated by the tensor unit R.

We now state the classification of compactly generated tensor t-structures on $\mathbf{D}_{qc}(X)$ for a noetherian scheme X. Towards this end, we begin by recalling the definition of Thomason subsets and Thomason filtrations. Note that Thomason sets and filtrations can be defined in a more general setting, but we only state the definition for noetherian schemes.

Definition 1.2. Let X be a noetherian scheme, then a *Thomason subset* of X is precisely a specialisation closed subset. A *Thomason filtration* is a sequence $\Phi = \{Z^i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ such that each Z^i is a Thomason subset of

X, and $Z^i \supseteq Z^{i+1}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

In [DS23], the authors obtain the following classification theorem for compactly generated tensor t-structures on noetherian schemes, generalising the classification of compactly generated t-structures on a noetherian ring from [ATJLS10].

Theorem 1.3 [DS23, Theorem 4.11]. Let X be a noetherian scheme. Then, there is a bijective correspondence between the collection of compactly generated tensor t-structures on $\mathbf{D}_{qc}(X)$ and the collection of Thomason filtrations on X.

We give one of the maps of the bijective correspondence explicitly in the following remark, as we will make use of it later.

Remark 1.4. Let $\Phi = \{Z^i\}$ be a Thomason filtration, then the aisle of the corresponding t-structure is given by

$$\mathcal{U}_{\Phi} := \{ E \in \mathbf{D}_{qc}(X) \mid \operatorname{Supp}(\mathcal{H}^{i}(E)) \subseteq Z^{i} \text{ for all } i \in \mathbb{Z} \}.$$

Given a Thomason filtration Φ we will denote the corresponding tensor t-structure by $(\mathcal{U}_{\Phi}, \mathcal{V}_{\Phi})$ and the truncation functors by $\tau_{\Phi}^{\leq 0}$ and $\tau_{\Phi}^{\geq 1}$.

We recall the following definition from [DS23].

Definition 1.5. Given a collection of objects $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{T}$, we denote the smallest cocomplete preaisle of \mathcal{T} containing \mathcal{A} by $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle^{\leq 0}$. Let X be a scheme and $j: U \hookrightarrow X$ an open immersion. Let \mathcal{U} be a preaisle on X, then we define the restriction of the preaisle to U by $\mathcal{U}|_U := \langle j^*U \rangle^{\leq 0}$.

Lemma 1.6 [DS23, Lemma 4.6]. Let X be a noetherian scheme and $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ a tensor t-structure on $\mathbf{D}_{qc}(X)$, and U an open affine subscheme. Then, $(\mathcal{U}|_U, \mathcal{V}|_U)$ is a t-structure on $\mathbf{D}_{qc}(U)$. Further, for any $F \in \mathbf{D}_{qc}(X)$, the truncation triangle with respect to this t-structure is given by,

$$j^*(\tau_{\mathcal{U}}^{\leq 0}F) \to j^*(F) \to j^*(\tau_{\mathcal{U}}^{\geq 1}F) \to j^*(\tau_{\mathcal{U}}^{\leq 0}F)[1]$$

where $\tau_{\mathcal{U}}^{\leq 0}$ and $\tau_{\mathcal{U}}^{\geq 1}$ are the truncation functors for $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$.

We now state some results from [Smi22] which we will need in the following section.

Lemma 1.7 [Smi22, Lemma 6.2]. Let R be a noetherian ring, \mathfrak{p} a prime ideal, and $\Phi = \{Z^i\}$ a Thomason filtration such that $(\mathcal{U}_{\Phi}, \mathcal{V}_{\Phi})$ restricts to a t-structure on $\mathbf{D}^{\text{perf}}(R)$. We define the Thomason filtration $\Psi = \{Z^i \cap \text{Spec } R_{\mathfrak{p}}\}$ on $\text{Spec } R_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Then, the t-structure $(\mathcal{U}_{\Psi}, \mathcal{V}_{\Psi})$ restricts to $\mathbf{D}^{\text{perf}}(R_{\mathfrak{p}})$.

Lemma 1.8 [Smi22, Lemma 6.3]. Let R be a noetherian ring and $\Phi = \{Z^i\}$ a Thomason filtration such that $Z^i = \emptyset$ for large i, and there exists an integer j such that Z^j has a non-trivial intersection with the singular locus of Spec R. Then, $(\mathcal{U}_{\Phi}, \mathcal{V}_{\Phi})$ does not restrict to a t-structure on $\mathbf{D}^{\text{perf}}(R)$.

We recall the following well-known definition.

Definition 1.9. Let X be a scheme, and $Z \subset X$ be any subset. We define the *height* of Z, denoted by height(Z), to be the infimum over the dimensions of the local rings at all $x \in Z$.

The following is a combination of [Smi22, Proposition 5.3 & Corollary A.5]. Also see the proof of [Smi22, Theorem 6.4].

Theorem 1.10. Let R be a noetherian ring. Let Φ be a Thomason filtration on Spec R such that height $(Z^i) = h \ge 1$ for all $a \le i \le a + h$. Then, $H^{a+h}(\tau_{\Phi}^{\le 0}R[-a])$ is not finitely generated as an R-module.

2 Proof of the main result

Lemma 2.1. Let X be a notherian scheme and U an open affine subscheme. Let $\Phi = \{Z^i\}$ be a Thomason filtration on X. Let $\Phi' = \{Z^i \cap U\}$ be the restricted Thomason filtration on U. Then, $\mathcal{U}_{\Phi'} = \mathcal{U}_{\Phi}|_U$.

Proof. We first prove the easier inclusion, $\mathcal{U}_{\Phi'} \supseteq \mathcal{U}_{\Phi}|_U$. It is easy to see that that $j^*(\mathcal{U}_{\Phi}) \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{\Phi'}$ as the support condition is satisfied trivially, see Remark 1.4. As $\mathcal{U}_{\Phi'}$ is an aisle, it further contains $\mathcal{U}_{\Phi}|_U$, which is the cocomplete pre-aisle generated by $j^*(\mathcal{U}_{\Phi})$.

Let $U = \operatorname{Spec}(R)$. Then, for the other inclusion, it is enough to show that for each prime $\mathfrak{p} \in Z^i \cap U \subseteq$ Spec(R), there is a complex $K \in \mathbf{D}^{\operatorname{perf}}(X)$ with $K[-i] \in \mathcal{U}_{\Phi}$ such that $j^*(K) = K(\mathfrak{p})$. Note that the Koszul complex $K(\mathfrak{p})$ is supported on the closed subset $V(\mathfrak{p}) \subseteq U$. Hence, it lies in $\mathbf{D}_{\operatorname{qc},V(\mathfrak{p})}(U)$. Now, by [Nee, Corollary 3.5 and Remark 3.6], there is an equivalence $j_* : \mathbf{D}_{\operatorname{qc},V(\mathfrak{p})}(U) \leftrightarrows \mathbf{D}_{\operatorname{qc},V(\mathfrak{p})}(X) : j^*$, which restricts on the compacts to the equivalence, $j_! = j_* : \mathbf{D}_{V(\mathfrak{p})}^{\operatorname{perf}}(U) \leftrightarrows \mathbf{D}_{V(\mathfrak{p})}^{\operatorname{perf}}(X) : j^*$. We define K to be $j_*(K(\mathfrak{p}))$, which is a perfect complex by the above discussion. Then, K[-i] lies in \mathcal{U}_{Φ} . Finally, note that $K(\mathfrak{p}) \cong j^*(j_*(K(\mathfrak{p}))) = j^*(K)$, which is what we needed.

Lemma 2.2. Let X be a noetherian scheme. Let $\Phi = \{Z^i\}$ be a Thomason filtration on X corresponding to a tensor t-structure on $\mathbf{D}_{qc}(X)$ which restricts to a t-structure on $\mathbf{D}^{perf}(X)$. Let U be an affine open subset of X. Then the t-structure corresponding to the filtration $\Phi' = \{Z^i \cap \operatorname{Spec} R\}$ on $\mathbf{D}(R)$ restricts to $\mathbf{D}^{perf}(R)$.

Proof. By Lemma 1.6, $\mathcal{U}_{\Phi}|_{U}$ is an aisle and, for any $F \in \mathbf{D}_{qc}(X)$, the truncation triangle with respect to this aisle is given by, $j^*(\tau_{\Phi}^{\leq 0}F) \to j^*(\tau_{\Phi}^{\geq 1}F) \to j^*(\tau_{\Phi}^{\geq 1}F) \to j^*(\tau_{\Phi}^{\leq 0}F)[1]$. By Lemma 2.1, we know that $\mathcal{U}_{\Phi}|_{U} = \mathcal{U}_{\Phi'}$, where Φ' is the Thomason filtration given by $\{Z^i \cap U\}$.

Now, we need to show that this aisle restricts to an aisle on $\mathbf{D}^{\text{perf}}(R)$. That is, we need to show that the truncation triangles with respect to $\mathcal{U}_{\Phi'}$ respect perfect complexes. Let U = Spec(R). Then, we already know that $j^*(\tau_U^{\leq 0}\mathcal{O}_X) \to R \to j^*(\tau_U^{\geq 1}\mathcal{O}_X) \to j^*(\tau_U^{\leq 0}\mathcal{O}_X)[1]$ is the truncation triangle for R. As j^* preserves perfect complexes, we get that $j^*(\tau_U^{\leq 0}\mathcal{O}_X) = \tau_{\Phi'}^{\leq 0}R$ and $j^*(\tau_U^{\geq 1}\mathcal{O}_X) = \tau_{\Phi'}^{\geq 1}R$ are perfect complexes. Note that $\tau_{\Phi'}^{\leq 0}$ and $\tau_{\Phi'}^{\geq 1}$ respects summands, extensions, and shifts. As R is a classical generator for $\mathbf{D}^{\text{perf}}(R)$, we get that the truncation triangles respect perfect complexes of $\mathbf{D}(R)$.

Lemma 2.3. Let X be a noetherian scheme. Let $\Phi = \{Z^i\}$ be a Thomason filtration on X corresponding to a tensor t-structure on $\mathbf{D}_{qc}(X)$ which restricts to $\mathbf{D}^{perf}(X)$. Let $x \in X$ be some point. Then the filtration $\Phi' = \{Z^i \cap \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_x\}$ on $\operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_x$ corresponds to a t-structure on $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{O}_x)$ which restricts to $\mathbf{D}^{perf}(\mathcal{O}_x)$.

Proof. From Lemma 2.2 we can reduce the problem to the case where X is affine. Moreover, the affine case is already covered by 1.7.

Lemma 2.4. Let X be a singular noetherian scheme. Let $\Phi = \{Z^i\}$ be a Thomason filtration on X such that there exists an r with $Z^r = \emptyset$ and an s with Z^s containing a singular point of X. Then the compactly generated tensor t-structure on $\mathbf{D}_{qc}(X)$ corresponding to this Thomason filtration does not restrict to $\mathbf{D}^{perf}(X)$.

Proof. Suppose for contradiction that the t-structure does restrict to the $\mathbf{D}^{\text{perf}}(X)$. Now pick any affine open set Spec R containing the singular point in question. By Lemma 2.2 the filtration $\Phi' = \{Z^i \cap \text{Spec } R\}$ restricts to $\mathbf{D}^{\text{perf}}(R)$, so the question is local. Now we apply Lemma 1.8, which gives us a contradiction. \Box

Lemma 2.5. Let X be a noetherian scheme and let $\Phi = \{Z^i\}$ be a Thomason filtration on X corresponding to a tensor t-structure on $\mathbf{D}_{qc}(X)$ which restricts to $\mathbf{D}^{perf}(X)$. If dim $X \ge h \ge 1$ then there are at most h many consecutive Z^i 's of height h.

Proof. Suppose for a contradiction that there are h + 1 many consecutive Z^i 's of height h, that is, there exists an a such that for i in the interval [a, a + h], each Z^i has height $h \ge 1$. Take a point $x \in Z^{a+h}$ which is minimal, that is, the point x corresponds to a prime ideal \mathfrak{p} in some affine open set Spec R such that height(\mathfrak{p}) = height(Z^{a+h}). Consider the Thomason filtration $\Phi' = \{Z^i \cap \text{Spec } R\}$ on Spec R. By our assumption combined with Lemma 2.2 we can see that the t-structure $(\mathcal{U}_{\Phi'}, \mathcal{V}_{\Phi'})$ restricts to $\mathbf{D}^{\text{perf}}(R)$. The Thomason filtration $\Phi' = \{Z^i \cap \text{Spec } R\}$ on Spec R is

equal to h for all $i \in [a, a + h]$, since the minimal point x of Z^{a+h} was assumed to be in Spec R and such filtrations are defined to be decreasing.

From Theorem 1.10, we see that this property of the filtration implies that $H^{a+h}(\tau_{\Phi}^{\leq 0}R[-a])$ is infinitely generated over R, and thus $\tau_{\Phi}^{\leq 0}R[-a]$ cannot be a perfect complex. Therefore the t-structure $(\mathcal{U}_{\Phi'}, \mathcal{V}_{\Phi'})$ cannot restrict to $\mathbf{D}^{\text{perf}}(R)$, which is a contradiction.

Theorem 2.6. Let X be a singular irreducible finite-dimensional noetherian scheme. Let $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ be a tensor t-structure on $\mathbf{D}^{\text{perf}}(X)$, then either $\mathcal{U} = \emptyset$ or $\mathcal{U} = \mathbf{D}^{\text{perf}}(X)$.

Proof. To achieve this, we classify the possible Thomason filtrations on X which can correspond to tensor t-structures on $\mathbf{D}_{qc}(X)$ which restrict to $\mathbf{D}^{perf}(X)$.

If dim X = 0, then X is just a single point. In which case there are only three possible Thomason filtrations on X, the constant filtration associated to \emptyset , the constant filtration associated to X, and the standard filtration up to shifting. Lemma 2.4 contradicts the possibility of the standard filtration being associated to a tensor t-structure which restricts to $\mathbf{D}^{\text{perf}}(X)$. The other two filtrations correspond to the two trivial tensor t-structures.

Let $d = \dim X \ge 1$, and let $\Phi = \{Z^i\}$ be a Thomason filtration on X corresponding to a tensor t-structure on $\mathbf{D}_{qc}(X)$ which restricts to $\mathbf{D}^{perf}(X)$. Since X is finite-dimensional, the heights of the non-empty Z^i must be bounded between 0 and dim X. Lemma 2.5 shows us that there can only h many Z^i of height h for dim $X \ge h \ge 1$, therefore we can see that there can only be at most d(d+1)/2 non-empty Z^i of height dim $X \ge h \ge 1$. Combining these two observations we see that the Thomason filtration must be bounded, in the sense that it must start with either \emptyset or X, and end with either \emptyset or X. In other words, the only permitted Thomason filtrations are of one of three forms, the constant filtration associated to the empty set:

$$\cdots \supseteq \varnothing \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \varnothing \supseteq \ldots,$$

the constant filtration associated to the entire space:

$$\cdots \supseteq X \supseteq \cdots \supseteq X \supseteq \ldots,$$

or some intermediate filtration with finitely many terms in the middle

$$\cdots \supseteq X \supseteq Z^{a+d(d+1)/2} \supseteq \cdots \supseteq Z^{a+1} \supseteq \varnothing \supseteq \ldots$$

Now since X is assumed to be singular, Lemma 2.4 excludes the possibility of this intermediate filtration, as it would give us a contradiction. Therefore we can see that the only possibilities are the constant filtrations associated to either \emptyset or X. These filtrations correspond to the two trivial tensor t-structures, so we are done.

Remark 2.7. If X is a finite-dimensional noetherian scheme and $Z \subseteq X$ is an irreducible closed subset, it is an obvious question to wonder if there are any tensor t-structures on the category $\mathbf{D}_Z^{\text{perf}}(X)$ whenever Z is not contained in the regular locus of X. Indeed, the details work out nicely with suitable modifications, and are to appear in forthcoming work by the authors.

Acknowledgements. K. Manali Rahul was supported by the ERC Advanced Grant 101095900-TriCatApp, the Australian Research Council Grant DP200102537, and is a recipient of the AGRTP scholarship. The work of C. J. Parker was partially supported by the same ERC Advanced Grant during his stay as a guest at the University of Milan, as well as the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (SFB-TRR 358/1 2023 - 491392403).

References

[ATJLS10] Leovigildo Alonso Tarrío, Ana Jeremías López, and Manuel Saorín. Compactly generated tstructures on the derived category of a noetherian ring. *Journal of Algebra*, 324(3):313–346, 2010.

- [DS23] Umesh V Dubey and Gopinath Sahoo. Compactly generated tensor t-structures on the derived categories of Noetherian schemes. *Math. Z.*, 303(4):Paper No. 100, 22pp, 2023.
- [Nee] Amnon Neeman. Bounded t-structures on the category of perfect complexes. Acta Math (to appear). arxiv:2202.08861v3.
- [Smi22] Harry Smith. Bounded t-structures on the category of perfect complexes over a noetherian ring of finite krull dimension. *Adv. Math*, 399:Paper No. 108241, 21pp, 2022.

Rudradip Biswas,

Mathematics Institute, Zeeman Building, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom.

Email: Rudradip.Biswas@warwick.ac.uk (R.Biswas)

Kabeer Manali Rahul,

Center for Mathematics and its Applications, Mathematical Science Institute, Building 145, The Australian National

University, Canberra, ACT 2601, Australia

Email: kabeer.manalirahul@anu.edu.au (K. Manali Rahul)

Chris J. Parker,

Fakultät für Mathematik, Universität Bielefeld, 33501, Bielefeld, Germany

Email: cparker@math.uni-bielefeld.de (C.Parker)