

## PROOF OF THEOREM 5.4

### 1. FIRST DEFINITIONS AND COMPARISONS

Let  $\Gamma$  denote the category of finite based sets and based maps, and  $k$  a fixed ground field.

**Definition 1.1.** A *left  $\Gamma$ -module* is a functor  $\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}_k$ , while a *right  $\Gamma$ -module* is a functor  $\Gamma^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}_k$ .

**Definition 1.2.** Given a DGA  $\Lambda$  and a  $\Lambda$ -module  $R$ , the *(graded) Loday functor* is the left  $\Gamma$ -module

$$\mathcal{L}(\Lambda, R): \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}_k, \quad [n] \mapsto \Lambda^{\otimes_{R^n}}.$$

**Definition 1.3.** Let  $\mathrm{Lie}_m^*$  denote the **dual Lie representation**. We define a functor  $\Xi$  from left  $\Gamma$ -modules to bicomplexes by

$$\Xi(F)_{p,q} = \mathcal{B}_p(\mathrm{Lie}_{q+1}^*, \Sigma_{q+1}, F(q+1)) = \mathrm{Lie}_{q+1}^* \otimes k[\Sigma_{q+1}^{\times p}] \otimes F(q+1).$$

One differential comes from the bar complex and is easy; the other is more complicated.

**Definition 1.4.** Given a DGA  $\Lambda$  and a  $\Lambda$ -module  $R$ , the  $\Gamma$ -*cohomology* of  $\Lambda$  over  $R$  is the bigraded abelian group

$$H\Gamma^{*,*}(\Lambda, R) := H^* \mathrm{Tot} \mathrm{Hom}_R^*(\Xi(\mathcal{L}(\Lambda, R)), R).$$

The above clarifies the notation from both of [RW02, Rob03] by resolving the ambiguous placements of  $\Xi$  and also identifying the bidegrees.

**Proposition 1.5** ([Rob03, Cor 3.7] or [Rob18, Cor. 3.17]). *There is an isomorphism*

$$\pi_*(F) \cong H_* \mathrm{Tot} \Xi(F)$$

*natural in left  $\Gamma$ -modules  $F$ .*

We actually need the dual result, which is not stated in [Rob03].

**Proposition 1.6** ([Rob18, Cor 3.17]). *For any right  $\Gamma$ -module  $F$ , the stable cohomotopy  $\pi^n(F)$  is the cohomology of the complex*

$$\pi^*(F) = H^* \mathrm{Tot}_{p,q} \mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{Lie}_{q+1}^* \otimes k[\Sigma_{q+1}]^{\otimes p}, F(q+1)). \quad (1.7)$$

{COMP1\_EQ}

**Lemma 1.8** ([Rob18, §4.9]). *A homotopy ring spectrum  $V = (V, \mu, \eta)$  determines a graded right  $\Gamma$ -module*

$$n \mapsto V^*(V^{\wedge n})$$

UCT\_REM

**Remark 1.9.** If  $V$  satisfies a universal coefficient theorem as on the left below,

$$V^*(V^{\wedge k}) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{V_*}^*((V_* V)^{\otimes k}, V_*) \quad V^*(V^{\wedge(-)}) \equiv \mathrm{Hom}_{V_*}^*(\mathcal{L}(V_* V, V_*), V_*) \quad (1.10)$$

{UCT\_EQ}

then we have an isomorphism of graded right  $\Gamma$ -modules as on the right.

COMP\_COR

**Corollary 1.11.** *For  $V$  satisfying (1.10), we have an isomorphism between  $\Gamma$ -homology of  $V_* V$  and the cohomotopy of  $V^*(V^{\wedge(-)})$ .*

---

*Date:* July 28, 2020.

*Proof.* When  $F^*$  is the graded  $\Gamma$ -module  $\text{Hom}_{V_*}^*(\mathcal{L}(V_*V), V_*, V_*)$ , (1.7) implies we have isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^* \text{Hom}_{V_*}^*(\mathcal{L}(V_*V), V_*, V_*) &= H^* \text{Tot}_{p,q} \text{Hom}_{V_*}^*(\text{Lie}_{q+1}^* \otimes k[\Sigma_{q+1}]^{\otimes p} \otimes (V_*V)^{\otimes q+1}, V_*) \\ &= H^* \text{Tot} \text{Hom}_{V_*}^*(\Xi \mathcal{L}(V_*V, V_*), V_*). \end{aligned} \quad (1.12)$$

{COMP1\_VSTA}

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^* V^*(V^{\wedge(-)}) &= \pi^* \text{Hom}_{V_*}^*(\mathcal{L}(V_*V, V_*), V_*) \\ &= H^* \text{Tot} \text{Hom}_{V_*}^*(\Xi \mathcal{L}(V_*V, V_*), V_*) \\ &= H\Gamma^{*,*}(V_*V, V_*) \end{aligned} \quad (1.13)$$

{COMP\_EQ}

where the first equality is by Remark 1.9, the second is by (1.12), and the third is by definition.  $\square$

## 2. RESULTS

**2.1. Version 1.** In [Rob18], the main result is of a more general nature, living in stable cohomotopy, which is then specified in the case  $V$  satisfies a universal coefficient isomorphism to  $\Gamma$ -cohomology.

**Theorem 2.1** ([Rob18, Thm. 4.13]). *Let  $V$  be a homotopy commutative ring spectrum. Then the obstruction to lifting an  $n$ -stage lives in  $\pi^n(V^{2-n}(V^{\wedge \bullet}))$ .*

**Corollary 2.2.** *If  $V$  is homotopy commutative and satisfies (1.10), then the obstruction lives in  $H\Gamma^{n,2-n}(V_*V, V_*)$ .*  $\square$

**2.2. Version 2.** In [Rob03], the obstruction is found in an explicit group, which is defined(?) to be  $\Gamma$ -cohomology, which is then related to stable cohomotopy.

**Proposition 2.3** ([Rob03, Prop. 5.4]). *For a homotopy commutative ring spectrum satisfying (1.10), the obstruction lives in  $H\Gamma^{n,2-n}(V_*V, V_*) := H^n \text{Tot} \text{Hom}_{V_*}^{2-n}(\Xi \mathcal{L}(V_*V, V_*, V_*))$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose we have a cofiber sequence

$$\nabla^n \cup \partial \nabla^{n+1} \wedge_{\Sigma_m} V^{\wedge m} \longrightarrow \nabla^{n+1} \wedge_{\Sigma_m} V^{\wedge m} \longrightarrow \nabla^{n+1} / (\nabla^n \cup \partial \nabla^{n+1}) \wedge_{\Sigma_m} V^{\wedge m}.$$

Moreover, we have

$$\nabla^{n+1} / (\nabla^n \cup \partial \nabla^{n+1}) \simeq E\Sigma_m^{n-m+1} / E\Sigma_m^{n-m} \wedge \tilde{T}_m / \partial \tilde{T}_m \simeq \bigvee_A S^{n-m+1} \wedge \bigvee_{(m-1)!} S^{m-2} \simeq S^{n-1} \wedge (A \times (m-1)!)_+$$

where  $A = \Sigma_m^{n-m+2}$  and  $\mathbb{Z}[(m-1)!] = \text{Lie}_m^*$ . Thus, for each  $1 \leq m \leq n+1$ , we have an obstruction in

$$V^1(\nabla^{n+1} / (\nabla^n \cup \partial \nabla^{n+1}) \wedge_{\Sigma_m} V^{\wedge m}) = V^{2-n}((A \times (m-1)!)_+ \wedge_{\Sigma_m} V^{\wedge m})$$

which by the universal coefficient isomorphism is given by

$$\text{Hom}_{V_*}^{2-n}(\text{Lie}_m^* \otimes V_*[\bar{A}] \otimes V_*V^{\otimes m}, V_*) = \text{Hom}_{V_*}^{2-n}(\Xi_{n-m+1, m-1} \mathcal{L}(V_*V, V_*), V_*)$$

where  $\Sigma_m \times \bar{A} = A$ . These combine to form an  $n$ -cochain in  $\text{Tot} \text{Hom}_{V_*}^{2-n}(\Xi \mathcal{L}(V_*V, V_*), V_*)$ .

so this is an issue if in fact  $A = \text{Conf}_{n-m+2}(\Sigma_m)$  instead and so the number of  $\Sigma_m$ -s is wrong, as we expect

The rest of the proof shows this obstruction class is in fact a well-defined cocycle, using explicit information about  $\text{Lie}_m^*$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.4.** *The obstruction lives in  $\pi^n(V^{2-n}(V^{\wedge \bullet}))$ .*  $\square$

## 3. QUESTIONS

**Question 3.1.** *Which side of (1.13) is more conceptual? Easier to compute? Useful?*

## REFERENCES

- [Rob03] A. Robinson, *Gamma homology, Lie representations and  $E_\infty$  multiplications*, Invent. Math. **152** (2003), no. 2, 331–348. doi:[10.1007/s00222-002-0272-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00222-002-0272-5) [1](#), [2](#)
- [Rob18] ———,  *$E_\infty$  obstruction theory*, Homology Homotopy Appl. **20** (2018), no. 1, 155–184. doi:[10.4310/HHA.2018.v20.n1.a10](https://doi.org/10.4310/HHA.2018.v20.n1.a10) [1](#), [2](#)
- [RW02] A. Robinson and S. Whitehouse, *Operads and  $\Gamma$ -homology of commutative rings*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **132** (2002), no. 2, 197–234. doi:[10.1017/S0305004102005534](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305004102005534) [1](#)