

PROOF OF THEOREM 5.4

1. FIRST DEFINITIONS AND COMPARISONS

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

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

Definition 1.2. Given a DGA Λ and a Λ -module R , the (graded) *Loday functor* is the left Γ -module

$$\mathcal{L}(\Lambda, R): \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Mod}_k, \quad [k] \mapsto \Lambda^{\otimes_R k}.$$

Definition 1.3. Let Lie_m^* denote the **dual Lie representation**. We define a functor Ξ from left Γ -modules to bicomplexes by

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

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

Definition 1.4. Given a DGA Λ and a Λ -module R , the Γ -*cohomology* of Λ over R is the bigraded abelian group

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

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

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

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

natural in left Γ -modules F .

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

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

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

{COMP1_EQ}

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

$$[k] \mapsto V^*(V^{\wedge k}) = \pi_* \text{End}(V)$$

UCT_REM

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

$$V^*(V^{\wedge k}) \simeq \text{Hom}_{V_*}^* \left((V_* V)^{\otimes k}, V_* \right) \quad V^*(V^{\wedge \bullet}) \equiv \text{Hom}_{V_*}^* (\mathcal{L}(V_* V, V_*), V_*) \quad (1.10)$$

{UCT_EQ}

then we have an isomorphism of graded right Γ -modules as on the right.

COMP_COR

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

Date: August 13, 2020.

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

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^* \mathrm{Hom}_{V_*}^*(\mathcal{L}(V_*V), V_*, V_*) &= H^* \mathrm{Tot}_{p,q} \mathrm{Hom}_{V_*}^* \left(\mathrm{Lie}_{q+1}^* \otimes k[\Sigma_{q+1}]^{\otimes p} \otimes (V_*V)^{\otimes q+1}, V_* \right) \\ &= H^* \mathrm{Tot} \mathrm{Hom}_{V_*}^*(\Xi \mathcal{L}(V_*V, V_*), V_*). \end{aligned} \quad (1.12) \quad \{\text{COMP1_VSTA}\}$$

Thus we have

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

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 Γ -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 Γ -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 $H\Gamma^{n,2-n}(V_*V, V_*) := H^n \mathrm{Tot} \mathrm{Hom}_{V_*}^{2-n}(\Xi \mathcal{L}(V_*V, V_*), V_*)$.*

Proof. Suppose we have a cofiber sequence

$$\nabla^n \cup \partial \nabla^{n+1} \wedge_{\Sigma_m} V^{\wedge m} \longrightarrow \nabla^{n+1} \wedge_{\Sigma_m} V^{\wedge m} \longrightarrow \nabla^{n+1} / (\nabla^n \cup \partial \nabla^{n+1}) \wedge_{\Sigma_m} V^{\wedge m}. \quad (2.4) \quad \{\text{COFIBRE_EQ}\}$$

Moreover, we have

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

where $A = \Sigma_m^{n-m+2}$ and $\mathbb{Z}[(m-1)!] = \mathrm{Lie}_m^*$. Thus, by the LES in cohomology associated to (2.4), the obstruction to lifting the n -stage to an $(n+1)$ -stage (using that the n -stage automatically lifts to $\partial \nabla^{n+1}$) lives in

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

where $\Sigma_m \times \bar{A} = A$. By the universal coefficient isomorphism, this group is also given by

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

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

so this is an issue if $A = \text{Conf}_{n-m+2}(\Sigma_m)$, so the number of Σ_m -s is wrong

The rest of the proof shows this obstruction class is in fact a well-defined cocycle, using explicit information about Lie_m^* . □

Corollary 2.5. *The obstruction lives in $\pi^n(V^{2-n}(V^{\wedge\bullet}))$.* □

3. QUESTIONS

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

REFERENCES

- | | |
|--|---|
| <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">Rob03</div> | [Rob03] A. Robinson, <i>Gamma homology, Lie representations and E_∞ multiplications</i> , Invent. Math. 152 (2003), no. 2, 331–348. doi: 10.1007/s00222-002-0272-5 1 , 2 |
| <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">Rob18</div> | [Rob18] ———, <i>E_∞ obstruction theory</i> , Homology Homotopy Appl. 20 (2018), no. 1, 155–184. doi: 10.4310/HHA.2018.v20.n1.a10 1 , 2 |
| <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">RW02</div> | [RW02] A. Robinson and S. Whitehouse, <i>Operads and Γ-homology of commutative rings</i> , Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 132 (2002), no. 2, 197–234. doi: 10.1017/S0305004102005534 1 |