

# EFFECTIVE CODESCENT MORPHISMS IN LOCALLY PRESENTABLE CATEGORIES

B. Mesablishvili

UDC 512.58

ABSTRACT. A necessary and sufficient condition for pure morphisms in locally presentable categories to be effective is given.

## CONTENTS

1. Preliminaries from Category Theory . . . . .	770
2. Pure Morphisms . . . . .	772
3. Codescent Morphisms . . . . .	773
4. Main Result . . . . .	775
References . . . . .	779

The present article, conceived as the continuation of previous works on the problem of describing (effective) descent morphisms in various categories [11–18], deals with the problem of describing effective codescent morphisms in locally presentable categories. As background to the subject, we refer to S. MacLane [10] for generalities on category theory, and to G. Janelidze and W. Tholen [6–8] for descent theory.

### 1. Preliminaries from Category Theory

We write  $\eta, \varepsilon: F \dashv U: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  to denote that  $F: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  and  $U: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  are functors, where  $F$  is left adjoint to  $U$  with unit  $\eta: 1 \rightarrow UF$  and counit  $\varepsilon: FU \rightarrow 1$ .

A *comonad*  $\mathbf{G}$  on a given category  $\mathcal{A}$  is an endofunctor  $G: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  equipped with natural transformations  $\varepsilon: G \rightarrow 1$  and  $\delta: G \rightarrow G^2$  satisfying

$$G\varepsilon \cdot \delta = \varepsilon G \cdot \delta = 1, \quad G\delta \cdot \delta = \delta G \cdot \delta.$$

For example, any adjunction  $\eta, \varepsilon: F \dashv U: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  determines its *associated comonad*  $(FU, F\eta U, \varepsilon)$  on the category  $\mathcal{A}$ .

The *Eilenberg–Moore construction* associates to any comonad  $\mathbf{G} = (G, \delta, \varepsilon)$  on  $\mathcal{A}$  a category  $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbf{G}}$  the objects of which are the  $\mathbf{G}$ -coalgebras  $(A, \theta)$ , where  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\theta: A \rightarrow G(A)$  is a morphism in  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfying

$$\varepsilon_A \cdot \theta = 1, \quad \delta_A \cdot \theta = G(\theta) \cdot \theta.$$

The morphisms of  $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbf{G}}$  from  $(A, \theta)$  to  $(A', \theta')$  are the morphisms  $f: A \rightarrow A'$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  for which

$$G(f) \cdot \theta = \theta' \cdot f.$$

---

Translated from *Sovremennaya Matematika i Ee Prilozheniya (Contemporary Mathematics and Its Applications)*, Vol. 74, Proceedings of the International Conference “Modern Algebra and Its Applications” (Batumi, 2010), Part 1, 2011.

The forgetful functor  $U^{\mathbf{G}} : \mathcal{A}^{\mathbf{G}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  sending  $(A, \theta)$  to  $A$  admits as a right adjoint the *cofree  $\mathbf{G}$ -coalgebra functor*  $F^{\mathbf{G}} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\mathbf{G}}$ , which is defined on objects by

$$F^{\mathbf{G}}(A) = (G(A), \delta_A)$$

and on morphisms by

$$F^{\mathbf{G}}(f) = G(f).$$

The comonad associated to this adjunction is precisely the original  $\mathbf{G}$ .

Any adjunction  $F \dashv U : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ , with associated comonad  $\mathbf{G} = (FU, \epsilon, F\eta U)$ , admits a unique *comparison functor*

$$K^{\mathbf{G}} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\mathbf{G}},$$

making the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \mathcal{B} & \\
 U \nearrow & & \searrow K^{\mathbf{G}} \\
 \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathcal{A}^{\mathbf{G}} \\
 & U^{\mathbf{G}} \xrightarrow{\quad} & \\
 & \xleftarrow{F^{\mathbf{G}}} & 
 \end{array}$$

commutative, i.e.,

$$U^{\mathbf{G}} \cdot K^{\mathbf{G}} = F, \quad K^{\mathbf{G}} \cdot U = F^{\mathbf{G}}.$$

Explicitly,

$$K^{\mathbf{G}}(B) = (F(B), F(\eta_B)) \quad \forall B \in \mathcal{B}.$$

One says (see [5]) that the functor  $F$  is *precomonadic* if  $K^{\mathbf{G}}$  is full and faithful, and it is *comonadic* if  $K^{\mathbf{G}}$  is an equivalence of categories.

The dual of Beck's monadicity theorem gives a necessary and sufficient condition for a left adjoint functor to be (pre)comonadic. Before stating this result, we need the following definitions (see [10]). An equalizer

$$B \xrightarrow{h} B' \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{f} \\ \xrightarrow{g} \end{array} B''$$

in  $\mathcal{B}$  is said to be *split* if there are morphisms  $k : B' \rightarrow B$  and  $l : B'' \rightarrow B'$  with

$$kh = 1, \quad lf = 1, \quad hk = lg.$$

Given a functor  $F : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ , a pair of morphisms  $(f, g : B \rightrightarrows B')$  in  $\mathcal{B}$  is *F-split* if the pair  $(F(f), F(g))$  is part of a split equalizer in  $\mathcal{A}$ , and  $F$  preserves equalizers of  $F$ -split pairs if for any  $F$ -split pair  $(f, g : B' \rightrightarrows B'')$  in  $\mathcal{B}$ , and any equalizer  $h : B \rightarrow B'$  of  $f$  and  $g$ ,  $F(h)$  is an equalizer (necessarily split) of  $F(f)$  and  $F(g)$ . A pair of morphisms  $(f, g : B \rightrightarrows B')$  in  $\mathcal{B}$  is *coreflexive* if  $f$  and  $g$  have a common left inverse.

**1.1. Theorem** (Beck [3]). *Let  $\eta, \epsilon : F \dashv U : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be an adjunction and  $\mathbf{G} = (FU, F\eta U, \epsilon)$  be the corresponding comonad on  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then:*

- (1) *the functor  $F : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  is precomonadic if and only if  $\eta_B : B \rightarrow UF(B)$  is a regular monomorphism for each  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ ;*
- (2) *the functor  $F : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  is comonadic if and only if  $F$  is conservative (=isomorphism-reflecting),  $\mathcal{B}$  has equalizers of coreflexive  $F$ -split pairs, and  $F$  preserves them.*

## 2. Pure Morphisms

In this section, we recall from [1] the basic facts about locally presentable categories, and the results we need on pure morphisms.

Throughout the paper,  $\lambda$  is a regular cardinal (i.e., an infinite cardinal that is not a sum of a smaller number of smaller cardinals). Recall that a nonempty partially ordered set is  $\lambda$ -directed if every subset of cardinality smaller than  $\lambda$  has an upper bound and a  $\lambda$ -directed colimit is a colimit of a functor whose domain is a  $\lambda$ -directed partially ordered set (considered as a category).

An object  $A$  of a category  $\mathcal{A}$  is called  $\lambda$ -presentable if the hom-functor

$$\mathcal{A}(A, -) : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$$

preserves  $\lambda$ -directed colimits. For example, an object of the category  $\mathbf{Set}$  is  $\lambda$ -presentable if and only if it has cardinality smaller than  $\lambda$ . An object of  $\mathcal{A}$  is called *presentable* if it is  $\lambda$ -presentable for some regular cardinal  $\lambda$ .

A category  $\mathcal{A}$  is called *locally  $\lambda$ -presentable* if it admits colimits and has a set of  $\lambda$ -presentable objects such that each object of  $\mathcal{A}$  is a  $\lambda$ -directed colimit of objects from this set. A category is called *locally presentable* if there is some regular cardinal  $\lambda$  such that it is locally  $\lambda$ -presentable. Every locally presentable category is complete and co-well-powered. Moreover, in each locally  $\lambda$ -presentable category  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\lambda$ -directed colimits commute with  $\lambda$ -small limits. In particular,  $\lambda$ -directed colimits commute with pullbacks in  $\mathcal{A}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a locally  $\lambda$ -presentable category. Recall that a morphism  $f : A \rightarrow B$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $\lambda$ -pure if for every commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A' & \xrightarrow{f'} & B' \\ k \downarrow & \dashrightarrow m & \downarrow l \\ A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \end{array}$$

in which  $A'$  and  $B'$  are  $\lambda$ -presentable objects, the morphism  $k$  factors through  $f'$  (i.e., there is a morphism  $m : B' \rightarrow A$  with  $mf' = k$ ).

**2.1. Proposition** (see [1, 2]).  *$\lambda$ -Pure morphisms have the following properties:*

- (1)  $\lambda$ -pure morphisms are closed under composition;
- (2)  $\lambda$ -pure morphisms are left cancellative, i.e., if  $qp$  is a  $\lambda$ -pure morphism, then  $p$  is a  $\lambda$ -pure morphism;
- (3) every  $\lambda$ -pure morphism is a regular monomorphism (i.e., an equalizer of a parallel pair of morphisms);
- (4) every  $\lambda$ -pure morphism  $p$  is a  $\lambda$ -directed colimit of split monomorphisms with the same domain as  $p$  in the category  $\mathcal{A}^2$  of morphisms in  $\mathcal{A}$  (recall that objects of this category are morphisms in  $\mathcal{A}$  and morphisms from  $f : A \rightarrow B$  to  $f' : A' \rightarrow B'$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  are pairs  $(g, h)$ , where  $g : A \rightarrow A'$  and  $h : B \rightarrow B'$  with  $hf = f'g$ ). More precisely, if  $p : B \rightarrow E$  is  $\lambda$ -pure in  $\mathcal{A}$ , then there exists a  $\lambda$ -directed diagram of morphisms  $(p_d : B \rightarrow E_d)_{d \in \mathcal{D}}$  in  $\mathcal{A}^2$  with connecting morphisms  $(1_B, e_{d,d'}) : p_d \rightarrow p_{d'}$  for  $d \leq d'$  such that each  $p_d$  is a split monomorphism and

$$p = \varinjlim_{d \in \mathcal{D}} (p_d, (1_B, e_{d,d'}) : p_d \rightarrow p_{d'})$$

in  $\mathcal{A}^2$ . In such case, we say that the purity of  $p$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  is presented by the  $\lambda$ -directed diagram of split monomorphisms  $(p_d : B \rightarrow E_d)_{d \in \mathcal{D}}$  and that such a diagram is a presentation of the purity of  $p$ ;

(5)  $\lambda$ -pure morphisms are stable under pushout, that is, if

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B & \xrightarrow{p} & E \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ B' & \xrightarrow{p'} & E' \end{array}$$

is a pushout, then  $p'$  is  $\lambda$ -pure, provided that  $p$  is  $\lambda$ -pure.

From (3) and (5) we obtain the following proposition.

**2.2. Proposition.** *In a locally  $\lambda$ -presentable category,  $\lambda$ -pure morphisms are pushout-stable regular monomorphisms.*

We know that the following is quite well known but we are not aware of a suitable reference.

**2.3. Proposition.** *Let  $B \rightarrow X$  and  $B \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z$  be morphisms in a category with pushouts. If  $Y \rightarrow Z$  is a pushout-stable (regular) monomorphism, then the induced morphism  $X \sqcup_B Y \rightarrow X \sqcup_B Z$  is a (regular) monomorphism.*

*Proof.* The diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y & \longrightarrow & Z \\ i_Y \downarrow & & \downarrow i_Z \\ X \sqcup_B Y & \longrightarrow & X \sqcup_B Z \end{array}$$

is easily seen to be a pushout and pushout-stability of the (regular) monomorphism  $Y \rightarrow Z$ . This implies that the morphism  $X \sqcup_B Y \rightarrow X \sqcup_B Z$  is also a (regular) monomorphism.  $\square$

### 3. Codescent Morphisms

In this section, we collect some needed definitions and results from descent theory formulated, for convenience, in the dual form (see [6]). More details on descent theory can be found in [7, 8].

We begin by recalling that, for any object  $a$  of a category  $\mathcal{A}$ , one has the *coslice category*  $A \downarrow \mathcal{A}$ , an object of which is a morphism  $\gamma : A \rightarrow X$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ , and a morphism  $\gamma \rightarrow \gamma'$  in which is a morphism  $f : X \rightarrow X'$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  with  $f\gamma = \gamma'$ . Composition and identity morphisms are as in  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**3.1. Proposition.** *The underlying object functor  $A \downarrow \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  is conservative and preserves and reflects (finite) limits that exists in  $\mathcal{A}$ . That is, if  $\mathcal{A}$  has (finite) limits, the category  $A \downarrow \mathcal{A}$  also has (finite) limits, formed as in  $\mathcal{A}$ . In particular, a morphism is a regular monomorphism in  $A \downarrow \mathcal{A}$  if and only if it is so in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Moreover, if  $\mathcal{A}$  is (finitely) cocomplete, then  $A \downarrow \mathcal{A}$  is (finitely) cocomplete as well.*

Any morphism  $p : B \rightarrow E$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  induces a functor

$$p^! : E \downarrow \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B \downarrow \mathcal{A}$$

sending  $\gamma : E \rightarrow X$  to  $\gamma p : B \rightarrow X$ ; and when  $\mathcal{A}$  has pushouts, this has a left adjoint  $p^* : B \downarrow \mathcal{A} \rightarrow E \downarrow \mathcal{A}$  (known as the *change-of-cobase* functor) given by pushing out along  $p$ . Thus, for an object

$\sigma : B \rightarrow Y$  of  $B \downarrow \mathcal{A}$ ,  $p^*(\sigma)$  is defined by the pushout

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B & \xrightarrow{p} & E \\ \sigma \downarrow & & \downarrow p^*(\sigma) \\ Y & \xrightarrow{i_Y} & E \sqcup_B Y. \end{array}$$

The unit of this adjunction has

$$i_Y : \sigma \rightarrow p^*(\sigma) \cdot p = p^!(p^*(\sigma))$$

as its  $\sigma$ -component.

We henceforth suppose that  $\mathcal{A}$  admits pushouts.

For a morphism  $p : B \rightarrow E$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ , a *codescent datum* on  $(X, \gamma) \in E \downarrow \mathcal{A}$  (with respect to  $p : B \rightarrow E$ ) is given by a morphism  $\theta : X \rightarrow E \sqcup_B X$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that the following diagrams commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\theta} & E \sqcup_B X \\ \gamma \uparrow & \nearrow i_E & \\ E & & \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} E \sqcup_B X & \xrightarrow{\langle \gamma, 1_X \rangle} & X \\ \theta \uparrow & \nearrow & \\ X & & \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\theta} & E \sqcup_B X \\ \theta \downarrow & & \downarrow E \sqcup_B \theta \\ E \sqcup_B X & \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B i_X} & E \sqcup_B (E \sqcup_B X), \end{array}$$

where

$$i_E : E \rightarrow E \sqcup_B X, \quad i_X : X \rightarrow E \sqcup_B X$$

are the inclusions of the pushout diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B & \xrightarrow{p} & E \\ p \downarrow & & \downarrow i_E \\ E & & \\ \gamma \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ X & \xrightarrow{i_X} & E \sqcup_B X. \end{array}$$

One sometimes refers to the commutativity of the second diagram as the *unit condition*, and to that of the third as the *cocycle condition*.

Descent data (with respect to  $p : B \rightarrow E$ ) form the category  $\mathbf{Codes}_{\mathcal{A}}(p)$ : a morphism from  $((X, \gamma), \theta)$  to  $((X', \gamma'), \theta')$  is a morphism  $f : X \rightarrow X'$  in  $E \downarrow \mathcal{A}$  that commutes with the descent data in the sense that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & X' \\ \theta \downarrow & & \downarrow \theta' \\ E \sqcup_B X & \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B f} & E \sqcup_B X' \end{array}$$

commutes.

If  $(Y, \sigma) \in B \downarrow \mathcal{A}$ , then  $(E \sqcup_B Y, i_E : E \rightarrow E \sqcup_B Y)$  comes equipped with *canonical descent data* given by the morphism  $E \sqcup_B i_Y : E \sqcup_B Y \rightarrow E \sqcup_B (E \sqcup_B Y)$ . Thus, one has a functor  $K_p : B \downarrow \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{Codes}_{\mathcal{A}}(p)$

yielding commutativity in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \mathbf{Codes}_{\mathcal{A}}(p) & \\
 K_p \nearrow & & \searrow U \\
 B \downarrow \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{p^*} & E \downarrow \mathcal{A},
 \end{array}$$

where  $U$  is the evident forgetful functor.

We call

$$K_p : B \downarrow \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{Codes}_{\mathcal{A}}(p)$$

a *comparison functor* associated to the morphism  $p$ . The arrow  $p : B \rightarrow E$  is said to be (an *effective codescent*) if the functor  $K_p$  is (an equivalence) fully faithful.

There is another way of representing descent data that involves coalgebras over the comonad associated to the adjunction  $p^* \dashv p^!$ .

The adjunction

$$B \downarrow \mathcal{A} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{p^*} \\ \xleftarrow{p^!} \end{array} E \downarrow \mathcal{A}$$

generates a comonad  $\mathbf{G}_p$  on the category  $E \downarrow \mathcal{A}$ , whose Eilenberg–Moore category of coalgebras is isomorphic to the codescent category  $\mathbf{Codes}_{\mathcal{A}}(p)$  (and thus, a codescent datum  $\theta$  on  $(X, \gamma)$  is nothing but a  $\mathbf{G}_p$ -coalgebra structure on  $(X, \gamma)$ ). This allows us to identify, modulo this isomorphism, the comparison functor  $K_p : B \downarrow \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{Codes}_{\mathcal{A}}(p)$  with the comparison functor  $K_{\mathbf{G}_p} : B \downarrow \mathcal{A} \rightarrow (E \downarrow \mathcal{A})_{\mathbf{G}_p}$  corresponding to the comonad  $\mathbf{G}_p$ . Accordingly we conclude that  $p$  is a codescent (respectively, an (effective) codescent) morphism if and only if the functor  $p^*$  is precomonadic (respectively, comonadic).

As for every adjunction, the comparison functor  $K_p$  is full and faithful if and only if the components of the unit of the adjunction  $p^* \dashv p^!$  are regular monomorphisms. Since these components are given as

$$\eta_{(Y, \sigma)} = i_Y : (Y, \sigma) \rightarrow (E \sqcup_B Y, i_{EP})$$

and since  $i_Y$  is a pushout of  $p$ , the morphism  $i_Y$  is a regular monomorphism in  $\mathcal{A}$ , and hence in  $B \downarrow \mathcal{A}$  (recall that, by Proposition 3.1, the forgetful functor  $B \downarrow \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  preserves and reflects regular monomorphisms), if and only if  $p$  is a pushout-stable regular monomorphism. Hence we have the following assertion.

**3.2. Proposition** (see [5]). *A morphism in a category with pushouts is a codescent morphism if and only if it is a pushout-stable regular monomorphism.*

#### 4. Main Result

Now we fix a locally  $\lambda$ -presentable category  $\mathcal{A}$ , where  $\lambda$  is a regular cardinal and consider a  $\lambda$ -pure morphism  $p : B \rightarrow E$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Suppose that a  $\lambda$ -directed diagram of split monomorphisms  $(p_d : B \rightarrow E_d)_{d \in \mathcal{D}}$  is a presentation of the purity of  $p$ . For any coreflexive  $p^*$ -split pair of morphisms

$$Y \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{g} \\ \xrightarrow{h} \end{array} Z$$

in  $B \downarrow \mathcal{A}$  and any  $d \in \mathcal{D}$ , write  $(V_d, f_d)$  for an equalizer of the pair of morphisms  $(E_d \sqcup_B g, E_d \sqcup_B h)$ .

**4.1. Theorem.** A  $\lambda$ -pure morphism  $p : B \rightarrow E$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  is an effective codesent morphism if and only if for any  $\lambda$ -directed diagram of split monomorphisms  $(p_d : B \rightarrow E_d)_{d \in \mathcal{D}}$  that represents the purity of  $p$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ , and for any coreflexive  $p^*$ -split pair of morphisms

$$Y \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{g} \\ \xrightarrow{h} \end{array} Z$$

in  $B \downarrow \mathcal{A}$ , the morphism

$$E \sqcup_B f_d : E \sqcup_B V_d \rightarrow E \sqcup_B (E_d \sqcup_B Y)$$

is a monomorphism for every  $d \in \mathcal{D}$ .

*Proof.* Assume that  $(p_d : B \rightarrow E_d)_{d \in \mathcal{D}}$  is a  $\lambda$ -directed diagram of morphisms with connecting morphisms  $(1_B, e_{d,d'}) : p_d \rightarrow p_{d'}$  for  $d \leq d'$ , representing the purity of  $p$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then each  $p_d$  is a split monomorphism (say, with splitting  $q_d$ ) and  $p$  is a colimit of this diagram, say, with colimit morphisms,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B & \xrightarrow{p_d} & E_d \\ \parallel & & \downarrow \kappa_d \\ B & \xrightarrow{p} & E \end{array}, \quad d \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Now, if  $p$  is an effective codesent morphism, then the functor  $p^* : B \downarrow \mathcal{A} \rightarrow E \downarrow \mathcal{A}$  is comonadic, and according to Theorem 1.1, it preserves equalizers of coreflexive  $p^*$ -split pairs. If  $g, h : Y \rightarrow Z$  is such a pair, then it is easy to see that

$$E_d \sqcup_B Y \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{E_d \sqcup_B g} \\ \xrightarrow{E_d \sqcup_B h} \end{array} E_d \sqcup_B Z$$

is also a coreflexive  $p^*$ -split pair. It follows that the morphism  $E \sqcup_B f_d$  is an equalizer of the pair of morphisms  $(E \sqcup_B (E_d \sqcup_B g), E \sqcup_B (E_d \sqcup_B h))$ . Hence, in particular,  $E \sqcup_B f_d$  is a monomorphism in  $E \downarrow \mathcal{A}$  and hence in  $\mathcal{A}$ . This proves the necessity.

For the sufficiency, note first that, because  $p$  is a pushout-stable regular monomorphism by Proposition 2.2,  $p^* : B \downarrow \mathcal{A} \rightarrow E \downarrow \mathcal{A}$  reflects isomorphisms (see, e.g., [9]). So in order to be able to apply the comonadicity criterion of Theorem 1.1 we still have to show that an equalizer of a coreflexive pair of morphisms

$$Y \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{g} \\ \xrightarrow{h} \end{array} Z$$

in  $B \downarrow \mathcal{A}$  is preserved by  $p^*$ , whenever an equalizer of

$$E \sqcup_B Y \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B g} \\ \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B h} \end{array} E \sqcup_B Z$$

in  $E \downarrow \mathcal{A}$  is split. Since split equalizers are absolute (in the sense that they are preserved by any functor) and since, by Proposition 3.1, the underlying object functor  $A \downarrow \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  preserves and reflects finite limits, it is enough to show that if

$$X \xrightarrow{f} Y \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{g} \\ \xrightarrow{h} \end{array} Z \tag{4.1}$$

is an equalizer in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that

$$E \sqcup_B Y \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B g} \\ \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B h} \end{array} E \sqcup_B Z$$

has a split equalizer in  $\mathcal{A}$ , then

$$E \sqcup_B X \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B f} E \sqcup_B Y \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B g} \\ \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B h} \end{array} E \sqcup_B Z$$

is also an equalizer in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Assume that (4.1) is such an equalizer and that the diagram

$$V \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} E \sqcup_B Y \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B g} \\ \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B h} \end{array} E \sqcup_B Z$$

is a split equalizer. Then we have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{g} \\ \xrightarrow{h} \end{array} & Z \\ s \downarrow & & p \downarrow \sqcup_B Y & & p \downarrow \sqcup_B Z \\ V & \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} & E \sqcup_B Y & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B g} \\ \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B h} \end{array} & E \sqcup_B Z \end{array} \quad (4.2)$$

for some  $s : X \rightarrow V$ .

It is not hard to see that

$$(f_d, (v_{d,d'}, e_{d,d'} \sqcup_B Z) : f_d \rightarrow f_{d'})_{d \leq d' \in \mathcal{D}}$$

is a  $\lambda$ -directed diagram in  $\mathcal{A}^2$ , where connecting morphisms  $v_{d,d'} : V_d \rightarrow V_{d'}$  ( $d \leq d'$ ) are the comparison morphisms induced by the universal property of equalizers:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} V_d & \xrightarrow{f_d} & E_d \sqcup_B Y & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{E_d \sqcup_B g} \\ \xrightarrow{E_d \sqcup_B h} \end{array} & E_d \sqcup_B Z \\ v_{d,d'} \downarrow & & e_{d,d'} \downarrow \sqcup_B Y & & e_{d,d'} \downarrow \sqcup_B Z \\ V_{d'} & \xrightarrow{f_{d'}} & E_{d'} \sqcup_B Y & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{E_{d'} \sqcup_B g} \\ \xrightarrow{E_{d'} \sqcup_B h} \end{array} & E_{d'} \sqcup_B Z \end{array}$$

For each  $d \in \mathcal{D}$ , write  $\iota_d : V_d \rightarrow V$  for the comparison morphism making the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} V_d & \xrightarrow{f_d} & E_d \sqcup_B Y & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{E_d \sqcup_B g} \\ \xrightarrow{E_d \sqcup_B h} \end{array} & E_d \sqcup_B Z \\ \iota_d \downarrow & & \kappa_d \downarrow \sqcup_B Y & & \kappa_d \downarrow \sqcup_B Z \\ V & \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} & E \sqcup_B Y & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B g} \\ \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B h} \end{array} & E \sqcup_B Z \end{array}$$

commutative. Since  $E$  is a  $\lambda$ -directed colimit of  $E_d$ 's and since  $\lambda$ -directed colimits commute with equalizers, taking  $\lambda$ -directed colimit in the last diagram gives

$$\bar{f} = \varinjlim_{d \in \mathcal{D}} (f_d, (v_{d,d'}, e_{d,d'} \sqcup_B Z) : f_d \rightarrow f_{d'}).$$

Now consider the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{g} \\ \xrightarrow{h} \end{array} & Z \\ s_d \downarrow & & p_d \downarrow \sqcup_B Y & & p_d \downarrow \sqcup_B Z \\ V_d & \xrightarrow{f_d} & E_d \sqcup_B Y & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{E_d \sqcup_B g} \\ \xrightarrow{E_d \sqcup_B h} \end{array} & E_d \sqcup_B Z, \\ t_d \uparrow & & q_d \uparrow \sqcup_B Y & & q_d \uparrow \sqcup_B Z \end{array}$$



in which  $s_d$  and  $t_d$  are the comparison morphisms induced by the universal property of equalizers. This gives rise to a  $\lambda$ -directed diagram

$$(s_d, (1_X, v_{d,d'}) : s_d \rightarrow s_{d'})_{d \leq d' \in \mathcal{D}}.$$

Since  $\varinjlim_{d \in \mathcal{D}} f_d = \bar{f}$  and since  $\lambda$ -directed colimits commute with equalizers in  $\mathcal{A}$ , taking the  $\lambda$ -directed colimit in the last diagram, we obtain

$$s = \varinjlim_{d \in \mathcal{D}} (s_d, (1_X, v_{d,d'}) : s_d \rightarrow s_{d'}).$$

Since  $q_d p_d = 1$ ,  $t_d s_d = 1$ , and hence each  $s_d$  is a split monomorphism, implying that  $s$  is a  $\lambda$ -pure morphism. Looking now at the left square in Diagram 4.2 and using that the morphism  $\bar{f}$ , being a split monomorphism, is  $\lambda$ -pure, we conclude by Proposition 2.1(1), (2) that  $f$  is also  $\lambda$ -pure.

Next, since  $\lambda$ -pure morphisms are stable under pushout, the morphism  $E \sqcup_B f$  in the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E \sqcup_B X & \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B f} & E \sqcup_B Y \\ \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ E \sqcup_B s_d \\ \downarrow \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} E \sqcup_B t_d \\ \uparrow \\ E \sqcup_B (p_d \sqcup_B Y) \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ E \sqcup_B (q_d \sqcup_B Y) \\ \downarrow \end{array} \\ E \sqcup_B V_d & \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B f_d} & E \sqcup_B (E_d \sqcup_B Y), \end{array}$$

is also  $\lambda$ -pure and thus a (regular) monomorphism (see Proposition 2.1). Now, since the morphism  $E \sqcup_B f_d$  is also a monomorphism by hypothesis, it follows from [4, Lemma 10] that the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E \sqcup_B X & \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B f} & E \sqcup_B Y \\ \downarrow E \sqcup_B s_d & & \downarrow E \sqcup_B (p_d \sqcup_B Y) \\ E \sqcup_B V_d & \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B f_d} & E \sqcup_B (E_d \sqcup_B Y) \end{array}$$

is a pullback. Since

$$\varinjlim_{d \in \mathcal{D}} s_d = s, \quad \varinjlim_{d \in \mathcal{D}} f_d = \bar{f}$$

and hence

$$\varinjlim_{d \in \mathcal{D}} (E \sqcup_B s_d) = E \sqcup_B s, \quad \varinjlim_{d \in \mathcal{D}} (E \sqcup_B f_d) = E \sqcup_B \bar{f},$$

and since pullbacks commute with  $\lambda$ -directed colimits in  $\mathcal{A}$ , the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E \sqcup_B X & \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B f} & E \sqcup_B Y \\ \downarrow E \sqcup_B s & & \downarrow E \sqcup_B (p \sqcup_B Y) \\ E \sqcup_B V & \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B \bar{f}} & E \sqcup_B (E \sqcup_B Y) \end{array}$$

is also a pullback. Applying now [19, Lemma 2.3] to the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 E \sqcup_B X & \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B f} & E \sqcup_B Y & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B g} \\ \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B h} \end{array} & E \sqcup_B Z \\
 \downarrow E \sqcup_B s & & \downarrow E \sqcup_B (p \sqcup_B Y) & & \downarrow E \sqcup_B (p \sqcup_B Z) \\
 E \sqcup_B V & \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B \bar{f}} & E \sqcup_B (E \sqcup_B Y) & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B (E \sqcup_B g)} \\ \xrightarrow{E \sqcup_B (E \sqcup_B h)} \end{array} & E \sqcup_B (E \sqcup_B Z),
 \end{array}$$

in which the bottom row is a (split) equalizer, one concludes that the top row is also an equalizer diagram, as desired. Thus the functor  $p^*$  is comonadic, and hence  $p$  is an effective codescent morphism.  $\square$

We call a morphism  $p : B \rightarrow E$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  *weakly flat* if the change-of-cobase functor  $p^* = E \sqcup_B - : B \downarrow \mathcal{A} \rightarrow E \downarrow \mathcal{A}$  takes regular monomorphisms into monomorphisms.

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 4.1, we obtain the following assertion.

**4.2. Theorem.** *In a locally  $\lambda$ -presentable category, any  $\lambda$ -pure and weakly flat morphism is an effective codescent morphism.*

## REFERENCES

1. J. Adámek and J. Rosický, *Locally Presentable and Accessible Categories*, London Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser. **189**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge (1994).
2. J. Adámek and J. Rosický, “On pure quotients and pure subobjects,” *Czech. Math. J.*, **54 (129)**, No. 3, 623–636 (2004).
3. J. M. Beck, “Triples, algebras and cohomology,” *Rep. Theory Appl. Categ.*, No. 2, 1–59 (2003).
4. F. Borceux and F. Grandjean, “Descent theory and Morita theory for ultrametric Banach modules,” *Appl. Categ. Struct.*, **6**, No. 1, 105–116 (1998).
5. G. Janelidze and W. Tholen, “How algebraic is the change-of-base functor?” in: *Category theory* (Como, 1990), Lect. Notes Math., **1488**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1991), pp. 174–186,
6. G. Janelidze and W. Tholen, “Facets of descent, I,” *Appl. Categ. Struct.*, **2**, No. 3, 245–281 (1994).
7. G. Janelidze and W. Tholen, “Facets of descent, II,” *Appl. Categ. Struct.* **5**, No. 3, 229–248 (1997).
8. G. Janelidze and W. Tholen, “Facets of descent, III. Monadic descent for rings and algebras,” *Appl. Categ. Struct.*, **12**, Nos. 5–6, 461–477 (2004).
9. G. M. Kelly and A. J. Power, “Adjunctions whose counits are coequalizers, and presentations of finitary enriched monads,” *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, **89**, Nos. 1–2, 163–179 (1993).
10. S. MacLane, *Categories for the Working Mathematician*, Grad. Texts Math., **5**, Springer-Verlag, New York–Berlin (1971).
11. B. Mesablishvili, “Pure morphisms of commutative rings are effective descent morphisms for modules—a new proof,” *Theory Appl. Categ.*, **7**, No. 3, 38–42 (2000).
12. B. Mesablishvili, “Descent theory for schemes,” *Appl. Categ. Struct.*, **12**, Nos. 5–6, 485–512 (2004).
13. B. Mesablishvili, “More on descent theory for schemes,” *Georgian Math. J.*, **11**, No. 4, 783–800 (2004).
14. B. Mesablishvili, “Descent in categories of (co)algebras,” *Homology Homotopy Appl.*, **7**, No. 1, 1–8 (2005).

15. B. Mesablishvili, “Monads of effective descent type and comonadicity,” *Theory Appl. Categ.*, **16**, No. 1, 1–45 (2006).
16. B. Mesablishvili, “On comonadicity of the extension-of-scalars functors,” *J. Algebra*, **305**, No. 2, 1102–1110 (2006).
17. B. Mesablishvili, “Comonadicity and invertible bimodules,” *J. Algebra*, **313**, No. 2, 761–772 (2007).
18. B. Mesablishvili, “Descent in  $*$ -autonomous categories,” *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, **213**, No. 1, 60–70 (2009).
19. B. Mesablishvili and R. Wisbauer, “On rational pairings of functors,” *Appl. Categ. Struct.* (in press); [arXiv:1003.3221v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/1003.3221v1) [math.CT] (2010).

B. Mesablishvili  
A. Razmadze Mathematical Institute,  
I. Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University,  
Tbilisi Centre for Mathematical Sciences, Tbilisi, Georgia  
E-mail: [bachi@rmi.acnet.ge](mailto:bachi@rmi.acnet.ge)