

NON-VANISHING HIGHER DERIVED LIMITS

BOBAN VELIČKOVIĆ AND ALESSANDRO VIGNATI

ABSTRACT. In the study of strong homology Mardesić and Prasad isolated a certain inverse system of abelian groups \mathbf{A} indexed by elements of ω^ω . They showed that if strong homology is additive on a class of spaces containing closed subsets of Euclidean spaces then the higher derived limits $\lim^n \mathbf{A}$ must vanish, for $n > 0$. They also proved that under the Continuum Hypothesis $\lim^1 \mathbf{A} \neq 0$. The question whether $\lim^n \mathbf{A}$ vanishes, for $n > 0$, has attracted considerable interest from set theorists. Dow, Simon and Vaughan showed that under PFA $\lim^1 \mathbf{A} = 0$. Bergfalk show that it is consistent that $\lim^2 \mathbf{A}$ does not vanish. Later Bergfalk and Lambie-Hanson showed that, modulo a weakly compact cardinal, it is relatively consistent with ZFC that $\lim^n \mathbf{A} = 0$, for all n . The large cardinal assumption was recently removed by Bergfalk, Hrušak and Lambie-Hanson. We complete the picture by showing that, for any $n > 0$, it is relatively consistent with ZFC that $\lim^n \mathbf{A} \neq 0$.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider certain directed systems of abelian groups, their derived inverse limits, and how these limits depend on the additional hypotheses of set theory. Derived inverse limits associated to directed systems are often studied from a category theory point of view (see e.g., Mardesić's book [13]) for their connections with strong homology, and consequently with algebraic topology. A recent work of Bergfalk ([4]) further developed connections with phenomena in infinite combinatorics such as walks on ordinals (after Todorčević' [18]), and consequently C -sequences and traces. This work allowed him to glimpse at multidimensional versions of Todorčević's minimal walks.

We are primarily interested in the inverse system \mathbf{A} and its derived inverse limits $\lim^n \mathbf{A}$, for $n > 0$. (For all technical definitions, see §2 and §3). The original motivation for studying $\lim^n \mathbf{A}$ is in that additivity of strong homology on certain topological spaces implies that $\lim^n \mathbf{A}$ must vanish for each $n > 0$, see [14, Theorem 8]. It was also shown in [14] that the Continuum Hypothesis CH implies that $\lim^1 \mathbf{A} \neq 0$. The hypothesis of CH was weakened to that of \mathfrak{d} , the dominating number, being \aleph_1 , see [8, Theorem 2.4]. In the same paper, it was shown that Shelah's Proper Forcing Axiom (PFA) implies that $\lim^1 \mathbf{A} = 0$. Hence the vanishing of $\lim^1 \mathbf{A}$ is independent of the axioms of ZFC. In general, Goble's Theorem (see Theorem 2.3) implies that if $\mathfrak{d} = \aleph_n$, then $\lim^i \mathbf{A} = 0$ for all $i \geq n + 1$. In 2017 Bergfalk ([3]) showed that it is consistent that $\lim^2 \mathbf{A}$ does not vanish. Later Bergfalk and Lambie-Hanson [6] showed that it is relatively consistent, modulo a weakly compact cardinal, that all the $\lim^n \mathbf{A}$, for $n \geq 1$, simultaneously vanish. The use of a weakly compact cardinal was later

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 03E35, 03E75, 18E25, 55Nxx.

Key words and phrases. derived limits, additivity, strong homology, weak diamond.

eliminated by Bergfalk, Hrušak and Lambie-Henson in [5]. Extending [6], Bannister, Bergfalk and Moore ([1]) showed that, modulo a weakly compact cardinal, it is consistent that strong homology for locally compact separable metric spaces is additive. It is not clear if any large cardinal assumptions are needed for this result. Whether higher derived inverse limits of \mathbf{A} could be non-vanishing remained an open question, which we answer in our main result.

Theorem A. For every $n \geq 1$, it is relatively consistent with ZFC that $\lim^n \mathbf{A} \neq 0$.

In order to prove this result we isolate a combination of combinatorial principles that together imply that $\lim^n \mathbf{A} \neq 0$. One of these principles is a version of weak diamond $w\Diamond$ first studied by Devlin and Shelah [7]. This principle has consequences similar to those of the usual diamond principle, but is compatible with a wide range cardinal arithmetic behaviour. It was shown in [7] that $w\Diamond(\omega_1)$ is equivalent to $2^{\aleph_0} < 2^{\aleph_1}$. A similar proof show that if κ is regular then $w\Diamond(\kappa^+)$ is equivalent to $2^\kappa < 2^{\kappa^+}$. For our result we require that weak diamond holds on a specific stationary subset of ω_{k+1} , for all $k < n$. Namely, let $S_{k+1}^k = \{\alpha < \omega_{k+1} : \text{cof}(\alpha) = \omega_k\}$. We show that if \mathfrak{b} and \mathfrak{d} are both equal to \aleph_n , and $w\Diamond(S_{k+1}^k)$ holds, for every $k < n$, then $\lim^n \mathbf{A} \neq 0$. We also show that the combination of these combinatorial principles is relatively consistent with ZFC, for any given $n > 0$.

The paper is organized as follows. First, in §2 we introduce the main objects of interest, directed systems of abelian groups and their derived inverse limits. As these objects were often treated in a category theory setting, we spend some time to prove some of the classical results about derived inverse limits from a set theoretic point of view. In particular we prove the flasque version of Goblot's theorem (Theorem 2.3), and a result of B. Mitchell, Theorem 2.5, saying that the cohomological dimension of \aleph_n is $n + 1$, or, in our terms, that there is a directed system \mathbf{G}_n of cofinality \aleph_n and such that $\lim^{n+1} \mathbf{G}_n \neq 0$. In §3 we focus on \mathbf{A} and related inverse systems, and we prove that under the above combinatorial principles $\lim^n \mathbf{A}$, for $n \geq 1$, does not vanish. Finally, in §4 we show that, for every $n \geq 1$, the combination of the principles required for our main theorem is relatively consistent with ZFC.

2. PRELIMINARIES: DIRECTED SYSTEMS AND THEIR DERIVED INVERSE LIMITS

Let (Λ, \leq) be an ordered set, and let $n \geq 0$. We write $\Lambda^{(n)}$ for the set of \leq -ordered $n + 1$ -uples in Λ . We often confuse $\Lambda^{(0)}$ with Λ . If $\bar{\lambda} = (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \Lambda^{(n)}$, $\mu \in \Lambda$, and $i < n$, we write:

- λ_i for the i -th element of $\bar{\lambda}$,
- $\mu \leq \bar{\lambda}$ if $\mu \leq \lambda_0$,
- $\bar{\lambda} \leq \mu$ if $\lambda_n \leq \mu$, and
- $\bar{\lambda}^i$ for the sequence $(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{i-1}, \lambda_{i+1}, \dots, \lambda_n)$ in $\Lambda^{(n-1)}$.

Definition 2.1. Let Λ be a directed set. We say that

$$\mathbf{G} = \{G_\lambda; p_\lambda^\mu : \lambda \leq \mu \in \Lambda\}$$

is a Λ -inverse system of abelian groups if

- G_λ is an abelian group, for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$,
- $p_\lambda^\mu : G_\mu \rightarrow G_\lambda$ is a group homomorphism, for all $\lambda \leq \mu \in \Lambda$,

- if $\lambda \leq \mu \leq \nu$ then $p'_\lambda = p'_\lambda \circ p'_\mu$.

If each p'_λ is surjective we say that \mathbf{G} is *flasque*. If M is a directed subset of Λ we will write $\mathbf{G} \upharpoonright M$ for the system $\{G_\lambda; p'_\lambda: \lambda \leq \mu \in M\}$.

Let \mathbf{G} be a Λ -inverse system of abelian groups. We will always assume that the individual groups G_λ are pairwise disjoint. Let $G = \bigcup_\lambda G_\lambda$. We let $\text{Fn}(\Lambda^{(n)}, G)$ denote the set of all function from $\Lambda^{(n)}$ to G . If $\bar{x} \in \text{Fn}(\Lambda^{(n)}, G)$ we write $x_{\bar{\lambda}}$ for $\bar{x}(\bar{\lambda})$, where $\bar{\lambda} \in \Lambda^{(n)}$. For $n \geq 0$, define

$$\mathbf{G}^{(n)} = \{\bar{x} \in \text{Fn}(\Lambda^{(n)}, G) : x_{\bar{\lambda}} \in G_{\lambda_0}, \text{ for all } \bar{\lambda} \in \Lambda^{(n)}\}.$$

Then $\mathbf{G}^{(n)}$ is an abelian group with operations defined pointwise. Define

$$\delta^n : \mathbf{G}^{(n-1)} \rightarrow \mathbf{G}^{(n)}$$

by letting

$$\delta^n(\bar{x})_{\bar{\lambda}} = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} (-1)^i x_{\bar{\lambda}_i} + p_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda_1}(x_{\bar{\lambda}_0}),$$

for every $\bar{\lambda} \in \Lambda^{(n)}$. By convention, we set $\mathbf{G}^{(-1)} = 0$ and so $\delta^0 = 0$. Note that $\delta^{n+1} \circ \delta^n = 0$, for every $n \geq 0$. These maps are known as *coboundary maps*.

Definition 2.2. Let $n \geq 1$. An element $\bar{x} \in \mathbf{G}^{(n)}$ is *coherent* if $\delta^{n+1}(\bar{x}) = 0$. We say that $\bar{x} \in \mathbf{G}^{(n)}$ is *trivial* if there is $\bar{y} \in \mathbf{G}^{(n-1)}$ such that $\delta^n(\bar{y}) = \bar{x}$. In this case we say that \bar{y} *trivializes* \bar{x} .

For $n \geq 0$, let

$$\lim^n \mathbf{G} = \ker(\delta^{n+1}) / \text{im}(\delta^n).$$

This is the n -th derived inverse limit of \mathbf{G} . Since $\delta^0 = 0$, $\lim^0 \mathbf{G}$ coincides with $\ker(\delta^1)$, which in turns corresponds to the set of coherent sequences in $\mathbf{G}^{(0)}$, which is just the inverse limit of \mathbf{G} . In other words

$$\lim^0 \mathbf{G} = \{\bar{x} \in \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} G_\lambda : \forall \lambda \leq \mu (x_\lambda = p'_\lambda(x_\mu))\}.$$

For $n \geq 1$, $\lim^n \mathbf{G} \neq 0$ if and only if there is a coherent nontrivial element of $\mathbf{G}^{(n)}$.

If Λ is an ordered set, a subset $C \subseteq \Lambda$ is *cofinal* if for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$ there is $\mu \in C$ with $\lambda \leq \mu$. We denote by $\text{cof}(\Lambda)$ the smallest size of a cofinal subset of Λ . If Λ has a maximum we write $\text{cof}(\Lambda) = \aleph_{-1}$. If \mathbf{G} is a Λ -inverse system of abelian groups, we write $\text{cof}(\mathbf{G})$ for $\text{cof}(\Lambda)$. Goblot's Theorem gives a constraint on $\lim^n \mathbf{G}$ in case $\text{cof}(\mathbf{G})$ is small. (A proof for set theorists can be found in [13, §13].)

Theorem 2.3 (Goblot's Theorem, [9]). *Let $n \geq -1$. If \mathbf{G} is an inverse system of abelian groups with $\text{cof}(\mathbf{G}) = \aleph_n$, then $\lim^i \mathbf{G} = 0$, for all $i \geq n + 2$. \square*

Goblot's theorem can be strengthened in case of flasque systems. We present a self-contained proof for completeness.

Theorem 2.4 (Flasque Goblot's Theorem). *Let $n \geq 0$. If \mathbf{G} is a flasque inverse system of abelian groups with $\text{cof}(\mathbf{G}) = \aleph_n$. Then $\lim^k \mathbf{G} = 0$, for all $k \geq n + 1$.*

Proof. We prove the theorem by induction.

First, the base case. Let \mathbf{G} be a flasque Λ -inverse system for a directed set of countable cofinality Λ . We need to prove that $\lim^1 \mathbf{G} = 0$. By directedness of Λ , we can find an increasing sequence $(\mu_i)_{i \in \omega}$ which is cofinal in Λ . Let $\bar{z} \in \mathbf{G}^{(1)}$ be coherent, i.e., $\delta^2(\bar{z}) = 0$. Define x_{μ_0} to be any element of G_{μ_0} . If x_{μ_n} has been defined, by surjectivity of $p_{\mu_n}^{\mu_{n+1}}$, we can find $x_{\mu_{n+1}} \in G_{\mu_{n+1}}$ such that

$$p_{\mu_n}^{\mu_{n+1}}(x_{\mu_{n+1}}) = x_{\mu_n} - z_{\mu_n \mu_{n+1}}.$$

An easy calculation by induction on $j - i$ gives that if $i \leq j$ then

$$z_{\mu_i \mu_j} = x_{\mu_i} - p_{\mu_i}^{\mu_j}(x_{\mu_j}).$$

For $\lambda \in \Lambda$, let i be the least such that $\mu_i \geq \lambda$, and set

$$x_\lambda = p_\lambda^{\mu_i}(x_{\mu_i}) + z_{\lambda \mu_i}.$$

We want to check that $\delta^1(\bar{x}) = \bar{z}$. Let $(\lambda_0, \lambda_1) \in \Lambda^{(1)}$. Let i be the least such that $\mu_i \geq \lambda_0$, and j is the least such that $\mu_j \geq \lambda_1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} z_{\lambda_0 \lambda_1} &= z_{\lambda_0 \mu_j} - p_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda_1}(z_{\lambda_1 \mu_j}) = z_{\lambda_0 \mu_i} + p_{\lambda_0}^{\mu_i}(z_{\mu_i \mu_j}) - p_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda_1}(x_{\lambda_1} - p_{\lambda_1}^{\mu_j}(x_{\mu_j})) \\ &= x_{\lambda_0} - p_{\lambda_0}^{\mu_i}(x_{\mu_i}) + p_{\lambda_0}^{\mu_i}(x_{\mu_i} - p_{\mu_i}^{\mu_j}(x_{\mu_j})) - p_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda_1}(x_{\lambda_1}) + p_{\lambda_0}^{\mu_j}(x_{\mu_j}) \\ &= x_{\lambda_0} - p_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda_1}(x_{\lambda_1}). \end{aligned}$$

We are left with the inductive step. Fix Λ be a directed set of cofinality \aleph_n , and \mathbf{G} be a flasque Λ -inverse system of abelian groups. Assume we have proved the theorem for all flasque systems of cofinality $< \aleph_n$. Write $\Lambda = \bigcup_{\alpha < \omega_n} \Lambda_\alpha$, where each Λ_α is a directed set with $\text{cof}(\Lambda_\alpha) < \aleph_n$ and, if β is a limit, then $\Lambda_\beta = \bigcup_{\alpha < \beta} \Lambda_\alpha$. Fix $\bar{z} \in \mathbf{G}^{(n+1)}$ such that $\delta^{n+2}(\bar{z}) = 0$. We want to find $\bar{x} \in \mathbf{G}^{(n)}$ such that $\delta^{n+1}(\bar{x}) = \bar{z}$. We define inductively $\bar{x}^\alpha \in \mathbf{G} \upharpoonright \Lambda_\alpha^{(n)}$ such that

$$\text{if } \alpha < \beta \text{ then } \bar{x}^\beta \upharpoonright \Lambda_\alpha^{(n)} = \bar{x}^\alpha,$$

and

$$\delta^{n+1}(\bar{x}^\alpha) = \bar{z} \upharpoonright \Lambda_\alpha^{(n+1)}.$$

If this can be done, setting $\bar{x} = \bigcup_\alpha \bar{x}^\alpha$ would complete the proof of the theorem.

For every $\alpha < \omega_n$, we have $\text{cof}(\Lambda_\alpha) < \aleph_n$, hence by induction there is $\bar{y}^\alpha \in \mathbf{G} \upharpoonright \Lambda_\alpha^{(n)}$ such that $\delta^{n+1}(\bar{y}^\alpha) = \bar{z} \upharpoonright \Lambda_\alpha^{(n+1)}$. Set $\bar{x}^0 = \bar{y}^0$. Suppose β is a limit ordinal and \bar{x}^α has been defined for all $\alpha < \beta$. Since $\Lambda_\beta = \bigcup_{\alpha < \beta} \Lambda_\alpha$, we have that $\Lambda_\beta^{(n)} = \bigcup_{\alpha < \beta} \Lambda_\alpha^{(n)}$, hence we can define $\bar{x}^\beta = \bigcup_{\alpha < \beta} \bar{x}^\alpha$.

We are left with the successor step. Notice that both \bar{x}^α and $\bar{y}^{\alpha+1} \upharpoonright \Lambda_\alpha^{(n)}$ trivialize $\bar{z} \upharpoonright \Lambda_\alpha^{(n+1)}$, hence $\bar{y}^{\alpha+1} \upharpoonright \Lambda_\alpha^{(n)} - \bar{x}^\alpha$ is a coherent element of $\mathbf{G} \upharpoonright \Lambda_\alpha^{(n)}$. By the inductive hypothesis and the fact that $\text{cof}(\Lambda_\alpha) < \aleph_n$, there is $\bar{w}^\alpha \in \mathbf{G} \upharpoonright \Lambda_\alpha^{(n-1)}$ trivialising $\bar{y}^{\alpha+1} \upharpoonright \Lambda_\alpha^{(n)} - \bar{x}^\alpha$. We extend \bar{w}^α to $\bar{w}^{\alpha+1} \in \mathbf{G} \upharpoonright \Lambda_{\alpha+1}^{(n-1)}$ by setting:

$$\bar{w}^{\alpha+1}(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}) = \begin{cases} \bar{w}^\alpha(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}) & \text{if } (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}) \in \Lambda_\alpha^{(n-1)} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Define

$$\bar{x}^{\alpha+1} = \bar{y}^{\alpha+1} - \delta^n(\bar{w}^{\alpha+1}).$$

Then $\bar{x}^{\alpha+1} \upharpoonright \Lambda_\alpha^{(n)} = \bar{x}^\alpha$, and

$$\delta^{n+1}(\bar{x}^{\alpha+1}) = \delta^{n+1}(\bar{y}^{\alpha+1}) - (\delta^{n+1} \circ \delta^n)(\bar{w}^{\alpha+1}) = \bar{z} \upharpoonright \Lambda_{\alpha+1}^{(n+1)}. \quad \square$$

The proof of the original Goblot's theorem is similar. One first shows that \lim^2 vanishes for systems of countable cofinality and applies the induction as above.

The following is known as Mitchell's Theorem, and shows that Goblot's bound is optimal. It was proved first in [15], (see also [13, Theorem 13.11]), but in all proofs we could find there was not an explicit example of a system as below.

Theorem 2.5 (Mitchell, [15]). *Let $n \geq 0$. Then there exists an inverse system of abelian groups \mathbf{G}_n such that $\text{cof}(\mathbf{G}_n) = \aleph_n$ and $\lim^{n+1} \mathbf{G}_n \neq 0$.*

Proof. Once again, our proof is by induction. If $n \geq 0$ and $\alpha < \lambda$ is an ordinal, let

$$G_{\alpha,n}^\lambda = \bigoplus_{(\lambda \setminus \alpha)^{(n)}} \mathbb{Z}_2.$$

We can think of $G_{\alpha,n}^\lambda$ as the Boolean group of finite subsets of $(\lambda \setminus \alpha)^{(n)}$, where the group operation is the symmetric difference. For $\alpha < \beta < \lambda$, we let $p_\alpha^\beta: G_{\beta,n}^\lambda \rightarrow G_{\alpha,n}^\lambda$ be the inclusion map. Henceforth we omit the reference to these maps. We let

$$\mathbf{G}_n^\lambda = \{G_{\alpha,n}^\lambda; p_\alpha^\beta: \alpha < \beta < \lambda\}.$$

If $\lambda = \omega_n$, we write $G_{\alpha,n}$ for $G_{\alpha,n}^\lambda$ and \mathbf{G}_n for \mathbf{G}_n^λ . Notice that $\text{cof}(\mathbf{G}_n^\lambda) = \text{cof}(\lambda)$. We plan to show that $\lim^{n+1} \mathbf{G}_n^\lambda \neq 0$, for every λ of cofinality \aleph_n .

Consider first the case $n = 0$, and let λ be an ordinal of cofinality ω . Fix an increasing sequence $(\alpha_i)_{i \in \omega}$ converging to λ . Let $\bar{x} = (x_{\alpha,\beta}) \in (\mathbf{G}_0^\lambda)^{(1)}$ be defined as follows:

$$x_{\alpha,\beta}(\xi) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \alpha \leq \xi < \beta \text{ and } \xi = \alpha_i, \text{ for some } i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Claim 2.6. The sequence $\bar{x} = (x_{\alpha,\beta}) \in (\mathbf{G}_0^\lambda)^{(1)}$ is coherent and nontrivial.

Proof. Let $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in \lambda^{(2)}$. We want to check that $\delta^2(\bar{x})_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma} = \bar{0}$. Since $x_{\alpha,\alpha} = 0$, for all α , we may assume $\alpha < \beta < \gamma$. If $i \in \omega$ is such that $\alpha \leq \alpha_i < \beta$ then $x_{\alpha,\beta}(\alpha_i) = x_{\alpha,\gamma}(\alpha_i) = 1$ and $x_{\beta,\gamma}(\alpha_i) = 0$. Similarly, if $\beta \leq \alpha_i < \gamma$ then $x_{\alpha,\gamma}(\alpha_i) = x_{\beta,\gamma}(\alpha_i) = 1$ and $x_{\alpha,\beta}(\alpha_i) = 0$. Lastly, if $\xi \neq \alpha_i$, for some i such that $\alpha \leq \alpha_i < \gamma$, then $x_{\alpha,\beta}(\xi) = x_{\alpha,\gamma}(\xi) = x_{\beta,\gamma}(\xi) = 0$. Hence $\delta^2(\bar{x})_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}(\xi) = 0$, for all $\xi < \lambda$.

Suppose now that $\bar{y} = (y_\alpha) \in (\mathbf{G}_0^\lambda)^{(0)}$ trivializes \bar{x} . Since $y_0 \in \bigoplus_{\xi < \lambda} \mathbb{Z}_2$ has finite support, there is $m \in \omega$ such that $y_0(\alpha_n) = 0$, for all $n \geq m$. Since $x_{0,\alpha_m+1} = y_0 + y_{\alpha_m+1}$, we have that

$$1 = x_{0,\alpha_m+1}(\alpha_m) = y_0(\alpha_m) + y_{\alpha_m+1}(\alpha_m).$$

Since $\alpha_m < \alpha_m + 1$ and the support of y_{α_m+1} is contained in $[\alpha_m + 1, \lambda)$, $y_{\alpha_m+1}(\alpha_m) = 0$. Since $y_0(\alpha_m) = 0$, we get $1 = 0$, a contradiction. \square

Suppose $n > 0$ and we have shown that $\lim^n \mathbf{G}_{n-1}^\lambda \neq 0$, for all λ of cofinality \aleph_{n-1} . We have to show that $\lim^{n+1} \mathbf{G}_n^\lambda \neq 0$, for every λ of cofinality \aleph_n . We only do it for $\lambda = \omega_n$, i.e., for the system \mathbf{G}_n , as the general case is only notationally more involved.

We construct by induction a coherent sequence $\bar{x} \in \mathbf{G}_n^{(n+1)}$ with the additional property that if $\bar{\alpha} = (\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{n+1}) \in \omega_n^{(n+1)}$ then $x_{\bar{\alpha}} \in G_{\alpha_0, n}^{\alpha_{n+1}+1}$. We start by letting $x_{\bar{0}} = 0$. Suppose we are at stage $\lambda < \omega_n$ and we have built $\bar{x} \upharpoonright \lambda^{(n+1)}$. We can consider it as a coherent sequence in $(\mathbf{G}_n^\lambda)^{(n+1)}$. It suffices to describe $\bar{x} \upharpoonright (\lambda + 1)^{(n+1)}$. In other words we have to define $x_{\bar{\alpha}}$ for $n + 2$ -tuples $\bar{\alpha} = (\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{n+1})$ such that $\alpha_{n+1} = \lambda$, and we have to make sure that the extended sequence $\bar{x} \upharpoonright (\lambda + 1)^{(n+1)}$ is still coherent. Since $\text{cof}(\lambda) \leq \aleph_{n-1}$, by Theorem 2.3, there exists $\bar{y}^\lambda \in (\mathbf{G}_{n-1}^\lambda)^{(n)}$ that trivializes $\bar{x} \upharpoonright \lambda^{(n+1)}$.

Case 1. Suppose $\text{cof}(\lambda) < \aleph_{n-1}$. For $\bar{\alpha} \in \lambda^{(n)}$, we set $x_{\bar{\alpha}, \lambda} = y_{\bar{\alpha}}^\lambda$. Then the sequence $\bar{x} \upharpoonright (\lambda + 1)^{(n+1)}$ defined in this way is still coherent.

Case 2. Suppose $\text{cof}(\lambda) = \aleph_{n-1}$. Fix a coherent nontrivial sequence $\bar{z}^\lambda \in (\mathbf{G}_{n-1}^\lambda)^{(n)}$. Such a sequence exists by the inductive assumption. We define a new coherent sequence \bar{w}^λ as follows. For $\bar{\alpha} = (\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \lambda^{(n)}$, let

$$w_{\bar{\alpha}}^\lambda(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_n) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \lambda_n \neq \lambda \\ z_{\bar{\alpha}}^\lambda(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}) & \text{if } \lambda_n = \lambda. \end{cases}$$

Note $w_{\bar{\alpha}}^\lambda \in G_{\alpha_0, n}^{\lambda+1}$ and that $\bar{w}_{\bar{\alpha}}^\lambda$ is essentially the same as $\bar{z}_{\bar{\alpha}}^\lambda$, but we add a new coordinate λ to each n -tuple that occurs in the support of $z_{\bar{\alpha}}^\lambda$. Finally, for all $\bar{\alpha} \in \lambda^{(n)}$ we let:

$$x_{\bar{\alpha}, \lambda} = y_{\bar{\alpha}}^\lambda + w_{\bar{\alpha}}^\lambda.$$

Let us explain what we have done. First, we can always extend $\bar{x} \upharpoonright \lambda^{(n+1)}$ to a coherent sequence $\bar{x} \upharpoonright (\lambda + 1)^{(n+1)}$ by defining $x_{\bar{\alpha}, \lambda}$ to be $y_{\bar{\alpha}}^\lambda$, for all $\bar{\alpha} \in \lambda^{(n)}$, but we are twisting the sequence \bar{y}^λ by adding to it the coherent nontrivial sequence \bar{w}^λ . The important point is that $w_{\bar{\alpha}}^\lambda$ lives on the coordinates that do not appear in the support of $y_{\bar{\alpha}}^\lambda$. It is straightforward to check that the sequence $\bar{x} \upharpoonright (\lambda + 1)^{(n+1)}$ defined in this way is still coherent.

Claim 2.7. The sequence $\bar{x} \in \mathbf{G}_n^{(n+1)}$ is nontrivial.

Proof. Suppose that $\bar{u} \in \mathbf{G}_n^{(n)}$ is such that $\delta^{n+1}(\bar{u}) = \bar{x}$. Note that, for every $\bar{\alpha} \in \omega_n^{(n)}$, the support of $u_{\bar{\alpha}}$ is a finite subset of $(\omega_n \setminus \alpha_0)^{(n)}$. Therefore, the set

$$C = \{\lambda < \omega_n : \text{supp}(u_{\bar{\alpha}}) \subseteq \lambda^{(n)} \text{ for all } \bar{\alpha} \in \lambda^{(n)}\}$$

is a club. Hence we can find $\lambda \in C$ with $\text{cof}(\lambda) = \aleph_{n-1}$. We want to show that the coherent sequence \bar{z}^λ used in the construction of $\bar{x} \upharpoonright (\lambda + 1)^{(n+1)}$ is trivial, which is a contradiction. Let us first define an operation d_λ . Given a sequence $\bar{v} \in (\mathbf{G}_n^{\lambda+1})^{(n+1)}$ we let $d_\lambda(\bar{v}) \in (\mathbf{G}_{n-1}^\lambda)^{(n)}$ be defined by letting, for $\bar{\alpha} \in \lambda^{(n-1)}$ and $(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}) \in (\lambda \setminus \alpha_0)^{(n-1)}$,

$$d_\lambda(\bar{v})_{\bar{\alpha}}(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}) = v_{\bar{\alpha}, \lambda}(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}, \lambda).$$

Note that $d_\lambda(\bar{x} \upharpoonright (\lambda + 1)^{(n+1)}) = \bar{z}^\lambda$. Now, recall that we are working with Boolean groups. So for $\bar{v} \in (\mathbf{G}_n^{\lambda+1})^{(n)}$ and $\bar{\alpha} \in \lambda^{(n)}$ we have:

$$\delta^{n+1}(\bar{v})_{\bar{\alpha}, \lambda} = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} v_{\bar{\alpha}^i, \lambda} + v_{\bar{\alpha}}.$$

Therefore, for all $(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}) \in (\lambda \setminus \alpha_0)^{(n-1)}$ we have:

$$d_\lambda(\delta^{n+1}(\bar{v}))_{\bar{\alpha}}(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}) = \delta^n(d_\lambda(\bar{v}))_{\bar{\alpha}}(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}) + v_{\bar{\alpha}}(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}, \lambda).$$

Consider the sequence \bar{u} . For $\bar{\alpha} \in \lambda^{(n)}$, we have $\text{supp}(u_{\bar{\alpha}}) \subseteq \lambda^{(n)}$, hence $u_{\bar{\alpha}}(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}, \lambda) = 0$, for all $(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}) \in (\lambda \setminus \alpha_0)^{(n-1)}$. We know that $\delta^{n+1}(\bar{u}) = \bar{x}$, and we also know that $d_\lambda(\bar{x} \upharpoonright (\lambda + 1)^{(n+1)}) = \bar{z}^\lambda$. Putting this together we conclude that:

$$\delta^n(d_\lambda(\bar{u} \upharpoonright (\lambda + 1)^{(n)})) = \bar{z}^\lambda.$$

This contradicts the fact that \bar{z}^λ is nontrivial and completes the proof. \square

Since \bar{x} is a coherent nontrivial element of $\mathbf{G}_n^{(n+1)}$, the proof is complete. \square

Let Λ and M be directed set and let $\phi: M \rightarrow \Lambda$ be an increasing function. Then, to every Λ -inverse system of abelian groups $\mathbf{G} = \{G_\lambda; p_\lambda^{\lambda'}; \lambda \leq \lambda' \in \Lambda\}$ we can associate a M -inverse system $\phi^*(\mathbf{G}) = \mathbf{H}$. By definition, we let $\mathbf{H} = \{H_\mu; q_\mu^{\mu'}; \mu \leq \mu' \in M\}$, where $H_\mu = G_{\phi(\mu)}$, and $q_\mu^{\mu'} = p_{\phi(\mu)}^{\phi(\mu')}$.

A function $\phi: M \rightarrow \Lambda$ is called *cofinal* if $\phi(M)$ is cofinal in Λ , i.e., for every $\lambda \in \Lambda$ there is $\mu \in M$ such that $\lambda \leq \phi(\mu)$. The following *cofinality theorem* was proved by B. Mitchell [16], see also [13, Theorem 14.9] for a proof.

Theorem 2.8 (Mitchell, [16]). *Let \mathbf{G} be an inverse system indexed by a directed set Λ . Suppose M is another directed set and $\phi: M \rightarrow \Lambda$ is an increasing cofinal map. Then, for every $n \geq 0$,*

$$\lim^n \mathbf{G} \cong \lim^n \phi^*(\mathbf{G}). \quad \square$$

In particular, this implies that if \mathbf{G} is an inverse system of abelian groups indexed by a directed set Λ , and C is a cofinal subset of Λ , then $\lim^n \mathbf{G} \cong \lim^n \mathbf{G} \upharpoonright C$, for all $n \geq 0$. Moreover, note that if Λ is a directed set of cardinality and cofinality \aleph_n then there is an increasing cofinal map $\phi: \Lambda \rightarrow \omega_n$. Therefore, from Theorem 2.5 and Theorem 2.8, we get the following corollary.

Corollary 2.9. *Let $n \geq 0$ and let Λ be a directed set of cofinality \aleph_n . Then there is an inverse system of abelian groups \mathbf{G} indexed by Λ such that $\lim^{n+1} \mathbf{G} \neq 0$. \square*

We only prove an easy instance of Theorem 2.8 which is sufficient for our purposes.

Proposition 2.10. *Let \mathbf{G} be an inverse system of abelian groups indexed by a directed set Λ . Suppose that $C \subseteq \Lambda$ is a linear cofinal subset, and that $\bar{x} \in \mathbf{G} \upharpoonright C^{(n)}$ is coherent. Then there is a coherent $\bar{z} \in \mathbf{G}^{(n)}$ such that $\bar{z} \upharpoonright C^{(n)} = \bar{x}$.*

Proof. Fix Λ , \mathbf{G} , C , and n as in the hypothesis. Note that, by replacing C by a cofinal subset if necessary, we may assume that C is well-ordered. For $\lambda \in \Lambda$, let $s(\lambda)$ be the least $\mu \in C$ such that $\lambda \leq \mu$. Note that s is increasing and equals the identity on C . Suppose $\bar{x} \in \mathbf{G} \upharpoonright C^{(n)}$ is coherent. We define its extension $\bar{z} \in \mathbf{G}^{(n)}$. Given $(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \Lambda^{(n)}$, we let:

$$z_{\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_n} = p_{\lambda_0}^{s(\lambda_0)}(x_{s(\lambda_0), \dots, s(\lambda_n)}).$$

Note that \bar{z} is also coherent. Since s is the identity on C , we get that $\bar{z} \upharpoonright C^{(n)} = \bar{x}$, as required. \square

3. THE INVERSE SYSTEM \mathbf{A}

In this section we consider inverse systems of a special form. We fix an infinite set X and for each $x \in X$, a nontrivial abelian group G_x . We also fix \mathcal{I} , a nonprincipal ideal on X containing the Fréchet ideal, i.e., all finite subsets of X . For $a \in \mathcal{I}$ we consider the group:

$$G_a = \bigoplus_{x \in a} G_x.$$

If $a \subseteq b$ we let p_a^b be the natural projection from G_b to G_a . Let

$$\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}} = \{G_a, p_a^b : a, b \in \mathcal{I}, a \subseteq b\}.$$

Note that the map p_a^b is surjective, whenever $a \subseteq b$, and hence $\lim^0 \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}} \neq 0$. We are interested in computing $\lim^n \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}$ for $n \geq 1$. We focus on the case $G_x = \mathbb{Z}$ or $G_x = \mathbb{Z}_2$, for all $x \in X$. The special case where $X = \omega \times \omega$, the ideal \mathcal{I}_0 is generated by sets

$$a_f = \{(i, j) \in \omega \times \omega : j \leq f(i)\},$$

for functions $f \in \omega^\omega$, and $G_{(i,j)} = \mathbb{Z}$, for all $(i, j) \in \omega^2$, corresponds to the inverse system \mathbf{A} studied in [14], [8], [3] [6] and [5], and is the main object of our study, but we find it convenient to consider a slightly more general situation. Our goal is to isolate a combination of combinatorial principles which together imply that $\lim^n \mathbf{A} \neq 0$.

In order to understand the systems $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}$ as above it is convenient to define an associated inverse system $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{I}}$. For $a \in \mathcal{I}$ we let:

$$P_a = \prod_{x \in a} G_x.$$

For $a \subseteq b$ we denote also by p_a^b the natural projection map from P_b to P_a . Note that G_a is a (normal) subgroup of P_a and hence we can construct the quotient inverse system $\mathbf{P}/\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}$, by letting, for all $a \in \mathcal{I}$,

$$(P/G)_a = P_a/G_a.$$

We then have a short exact sequence of \mathcal{I} -inverse systems of abelian groups:

$$\mathbf{0} \rightarrow \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow \mathbf{P}/\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}.$$

Since \lim is a left exact functor, by a standard construction in homological algebra (see e.g., [11, Chapter IV]), this gives rise to a long exact sequence:

$$(1) \quad \cdots \rightarrow \lim^n \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow \lim^n \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow \lim^n \mathbf{P}/\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow \lim^{n+1} \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow \cdots .$$

Lemma 3.1. *If $n \geq 1$, then $\lim^n \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{I}} = 0$.*

Proof. Let $\bar{x} \in \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(n)}$ be a coherent sequence, i.e., such that $\delta^{n+1}(\bar{x}) = 0$. We have to find $\bar{y} \in \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(n-1)}$ such that $\delta^n(\bar{y}) = \bar{x}$. Suppose $\bar{a} = (a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}) \in \mathcal{I}^{(n)}$. We define $y_{\bar{a}} \in G_{a_0}$. Suppose $k \in a_0$. If $a_0 = \{k\}$ we let $y_{\bar{a}}(k) = 0$. Otherwise, we let

$$y_{\bar{a}}(k) = x_{\{k, a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}\}}(k).$$

It is straightforward to check that $\delta^n(\bar{y}) = \bar{x}$ using the coherence of \bar{x} . \square

Let us also define explicitly the map

$$\varphi_n: \lim^n \mathbf{P}/\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow \lim^{n+1} \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}.$$

Let $\bar{x} \in \mathbf{P}/\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(n)}$ be such that $\delta^{n+1}(\bar{x}) = 0$. Note that $\bar{x} = (x_{\bar{a}}: \bar{a} \in \mathcal{I}^{(n)})$ where $x_{\bar{a}} \in P_{a_0}/G_{a_0}$. Let $y_{\bar{a}} \in P_{a_0}$ be such that $x_{\bar{a}} = G_{a_0} + y_{\bar{a}}$. Let $\bar{y} = (y_{\bar{a}}: \bar{a} \in \mathcal{I}^{(n)})$. Since $\delta^{n+2} \circ \delta^{n+1} = 0$, we have that $\delta^{n+1}(\bar{y}) \in \ker(\delta^{n+2})$. We then let $\varphi_n(\bar{x}) = \delta^{n+1}(\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(n)}) + \delta^{n+1}(\bar{y})$. The fact that $\varphi_n(\bar{x})$ is coherent follows from the fact that $\delta^{n+2} \circ \delta^{n+1} = 0$. To see that the definition of $\varphi_n(\bar{x})$ does not depend on the choice of \bar{y} , let \bar{y}' be another such sequence and note that $\bar{y}' - \bar{y} \in \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(n)}$, hence $\delta^{n+1}(\bar{y}' - \bar{y}) \in \delta^{n+1}(\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(n)})$. The fact that φ_n is a homomorphism is straightforward. Let us check that it is injective. Suppose $\bar{x} \in \mathbf{P}/\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(n)}$ is such that $\varphi_n(\bar{x}) = 0$. Let \bar{y} be a lifting of \bar{x} , i.e., $y_{\bar{a}} \in P_{a_0}$ is such that $x_{\bar{a}} = G_{a_0} + y_{\bar{a}}$, for all $\bar{a} \in \mathcal{I}^{(n)}$. Then $\delta^{n+1}(\bar{y}) \in \delta^{n+1}(\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(n)})$. Fix $\bar{z} \in \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(n)}$ such that $\delta^{n+1}(\bar{y}) = \delta^{n+1}(\bar{z})$. Therefore $\delta^{n+1}(\bar{y} - \bar{z}) = 0$. Since $\lim^n \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{I}} = 0$ there is $\bar{u} \in \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(n)}$ such that $\delta^n(\bar{u}) = \bar{y} - \bar{z}$. Let $\bar{v} \in \mathbf{P}/\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(n-1)}$ be defined by $v_{\bar{a}} = G_{a_0} + u_{\bar{a}}$, for all \bar{a} . Then $\delta^n(\bar{v}) = \bar{x}$, as desired. Finally, let us check that φ_n is onto. Let $\bar{y} \in \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(n+1)}$ be such that $\delta^{n+2}(\bar{y}) = 0$. We can view \bar{y} as a member of $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(n+1)}$. Since $\lim^{n+1} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{I}} = 0$ we can find $\bar{z} \in \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(n)}$ such that $\delta^{n+1}(\bar{z}) = \bar{y}$. Now let \bar{u} be defined by $u_{\bar{a}} = G_{a_0} + z_{\bar{a}}$, for all \bar{a} . It follows that $\delta^{n+1}(\bar{u}) = 0$ and $\varphi_n(\bar{u}) = \bar{y}$, as required.

The upshot of this analysis is that $\lim^1 \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is isomorphic to the quotient of $\lim^0 \mathbf{P}/\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}$ by $\lim^0 \mathbf{P}$, and $\lim^{n+1} \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is isomorphic to $\lim^n \mathbf{P}/\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}$, for all $n \geq 1$.

We now consider the question whether $\lim^n \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}$ vanishes or not depending on the cofinality of \mathcal{I} under inclusion. First note that if $\text{cof}(\mathcal{I}) = \aleph_0$, then by Theorem 2.4 $\lim^n \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}} = 0$, for all $n \geq 1$. In order to show that $\lim^{n+1} \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}} \neq 0$, by (1), it suffices to show that $\lim^n \mathbf{P}/\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}} \neq 0$. We find it convenient to replace $\mathbf{P}/\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}$ by a slightly different system $\mathbf{Q}_{\mathcal{I}}$. Consider the ordered set $(\mathcal{I}, \subseteq_*)$, where \subseteq_* denotes inclusion modulo finite sets. Let

$$\mathbf{Q}_{\mathcal{I}} = \{P_a/G_a, p_a^b: a \subseteq_* b \in \mathcal{I}\}.$$

Since \mathcal{I} contains the Fréchet ideal, any coherent nontrivial sequence $\bar{x} \in \mathbf{Q}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(n)}$ is also coherent and nontrivial in $\mathbf{P}/\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}$. Henceforth, we will work with $\mathbf{Q}_{\mathcal{I}}$ instead of $\mathbf{P}/\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}$. To simplify notation, when we are working with this system we will write Q_a for P_a/G_a , when $a \in \mathcal{I}$.

Let us now turn to the first interesting case and assume that \mathcal{I} is an ideal on a countable set X , and $\text{cof}(\mathcal{I}) = \aleph_1$. We would like to know if $\lim^1 \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}$ vanishes or not. It turns out that the answer depends on the choice of groups G_x , for $x \in X$. Recall that two functions with the same domain f and g are said almost equal, written $f =_* g$, if the set of points on which they differ is finite.

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose X is countable and $G_x = \mathbb{Z}$, for all $x \in X$. Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on X with $\text{cof}(\mathcal{I}) = \aleph_1$. Then $\lim^1 \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}} \neq 0$.*

Proof. We may assume $X = \omega$. We show that there is a coherent nontrivial sequence in $\mathbf{Q}_{\mathcal{I}}^{(0)}$. Let $\{a_\xi: \xi < \omega_1\}$ be a cofinal subset of \mathcal{I} under \subseteq_* . We may assume that all the a_ξ are infinite, and no a_ξ belongs to the ideal generated by finite sets and the a_η , for $\eta < \xi$. It suffices to show that there is a family $\{f_\xi: \xi < \omega_1\}$ of functions such that:

- $f_\xi: a_\xi \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, for all $\xi < \omega_1$,
- if $\xi \neq \eta$ then $f_\xi \upharpoonright (a_\xi \cap a_\eta) =_* f_\eta \upharpoonright (a_\xi \cap a_\eta)$,
- there is no $f: \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ such that $f \upharpoonright a_\xi =_* f_\xi$, for all $\xi < \omega_1$.

The second condition states that the family $\{f_\xi: \xi < \omega_1\}$ is coherent and the third that it is nontrivial. To begin, pick by induction on ξ , an infinite subset b_ξ of a_ξ such that $b_\xi \cap a_\eta$ is finite for all $\eta < \xi$. For each ξ , let $e_\xi: b_\xi \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be defined by:

$$e_\xi(n) = \min(b_\xi \setminus (n + 1)),$$

i.e., if $n \in b_\xi$ then $e_\xi(n)$ is the next element of b_ξ above n . Now, by induction on ξ , we build functions $f_\xi: a_\xi \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ such that:

- if $\eta < \xi$ then $f_\eta \upharpoonright (a_\eta \cap a_\xi) =_* f_\xi \upharpoonright (a_\eta \cap a_\xi)$,
- $f_\xi \upharpoonright b_\xi =_* e_\xi$, for all ξ .

Suppose we have built f_η , for $\eta < \xi$. We need to construct f_ξ . First, by an easy diagonalisation argument we can find integers n_η , for $\eta < \xi$, such that:

- $a_\eta \cap b_\xi \subseteq n_\eta$, for all $\eta < \xi$,
- if $\eta < \zeta < \xi$ then $f_\eta(k) = f_\zeta(k)$, for all $k \in (a_\eta \setminus n_\eta) \cap (a_\zeta \setminus n_\zeta)$.

For $n \in a_\xi$ we define $f_\xi(n)$ as follows:

$$f_\xi(n) = \begin{cases} f_\eta(n) & \text{if } n \in a_\eta \setminus n_\eta, \\ e_\xi(n) & \text{if } n \in b_\xi, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is clear that the f_ξ constructed in this way are as desired. Let us now show that there is no $f: \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ such that $f \upharpoonright a_\xi =_* f_\xi$, for all ξ . Suppose otherwise and fix such f . Let m_ξ be the least such that f agrees with e_ξ , for all $n \in b_\xi \setminus m_\xi$. We can then find an uncountable $Z \subseteq \omega_1$ and an integer m such that $m_\xi = m$, for all $\xi \in Z$. Since all the b_ξ are infinite, we can find distinct η and ξ in Z and $k \geq m$ such that $k \in b_\eta \cap b_\xi$. We can then define $k_0 = k$, and $k_{i+1} = f(k_i)$, for all i . By the definition of e_η and e_ξ we have that:

$$b_\eta \setminus k = \{k_0, k_1, \dots, k_i, \dots\} = b_\xi \setminus k,$$

which contradicts the fact that b_η and b_ξ are almost disjoint. \square

We now turn to the case X is countable, $G_x = \mathbb{Z}_2$, for all $x \in X$, and \mathcal{I} as an ideal on X of cofinality \aleph_1 . It turns out that the question whether $\lim^1 \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}$ vanishes in this case depends on additional axioms of set theory. In fact, it was shown in [17, Theorem 4.26] that it is relatively consistent with ZFC that there is an almost disjoint family \mathcal{A} of size \aleph_1 of subsets of ω such that the ideal \mathcal{I} generated by \mathcal{A} and the Fréchet ideal has the uniformization property. In our terminology it says that if we let $G_n = \mathbb{Z}_2$, for all n , then $\lim^1 \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}} = 0$. This is complemented by the following. (MA_{\aleph_1} is Martin's Axiom, see [12, III.3])

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose X is countable and $G_x = \mathbb{Z}_2$, for all $x \in X$. Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on X with $\text{cof}(\mathcal{I}) = \aleph_1$. Suppose that either $2^{\aleph_0} < 2^{\aleph_1}$ or MA_{\aleph_1} holds. Then $\lim^1 \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}} \neq 0$.*

Proof. We again assume $X = \omega$. Let $\{a_\xi: \xi < \omega_1\}$ be a cofinal subset of \mathcal{I} under \subseteq_* such that no a_ξ is in the ideal generated by finite sets and the a_η , for $\eta < \xi$. As in the proof of Proposition 3.2 we construct a nontrivial coherent family of functions $\{f_\xi: \xi < \omega_1\}$, but this time the functions f_ξ take values in \mathbb{Z}_2 rather than in \mathbb{Z} . Pick for each $\xi < \omega_1$, an infinite subset b_ξ of a_ξ which has finite intersection with the a_η , for $\eta < \xi$. Now, as in Proposition 3.2, given a family of functions $\{g_\xi: \xi < \omega_1\}$ with $g_\xi: b_\xi \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$, for $\xi < \omega_1$, we can extend as before each g_ξ to a function f_ξ on a_ξ such that the family $\{f_\xi: \xi < \omega_1\}$ is coherent. So, it suffices to show that there is a choice of such functions $\{g_\xi: \xi < \omega_1\}$ which is nontrivial, i.e., there is no $f: \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$ such that $f \upharpoonright b_\xi =_* g_\xi$, for all $\xi < \omega_1$.

Suppose first that $2^{\aleph_0} < 2^{\aleph_1}$. For every $h: \omega_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$ and $\xi < \omega_1$, we let g_ξ^h be the constant function taking value $h(\xi)$ on b_ξ . Note that any $f: \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$ can trivialize the family $\{g_\xi^h: \xi < \omega_1\}$ for at most one $h: \omega_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$. Therefore, by simple counting there is $h: \omega_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$ such that the sequence $\{g_\xi^h: \xi < \omega_1\}$ is nontrivial.

Let us now assume MA_{\aleph_1} . For each $\xi < \omega_1$, let as before e_ξ be the function defined on b_ξ such that if $k \in b_\xi$ then $e_\xi(k)$ is the next element of b_ξ above k . We cannot use the function e_ξ as in Proposition 3.2, but by MA_{\aleph_1} we can find a 2-branching subtree T of $\omega^{<\omega}$ such that the set Y of all $\xi < \omega_1$ such that $e_\xi \in [T]$ is uncountable. For each $s \in T$ let u_0^s and u_1^s be the two integers u such that $s \hat{\ } u \in T$. For $\xi \in Y$, let $g_\xi: b_\xi \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$ be defined as follows. Suppose $k \in b_\xi$ and let $l = |b_\xi \cap (k+1)|$. Let

$$g_\xi(k) = i \text{ if and only if } e_\xi(k) = u_i^{e_\xi \upharpoonright l}.$$

We claim that the sequence of functions $\{g_\xi: \xi \in Y\}$ is nontrivial. Indeed, suppose $f: \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$ is a trivializing function. For each $\xi \in Y$ there is an integer $k_\xi \in b_\xi$ such that $g_\xi \upharpoonright (b_\xi \setminus k_\xi) \subseteq f$. By the pigeon hole principle there is an uncountable $Z \subseteq Y$ and an integer k such that $k_\xi = k$, for all $\xi \in Z$. By shrinking Z if necessary we may assume that there is an integer l and a sequence s of length l such that $|b_\xi \cap (k+1)| = l$ and $e_\xi \upharpoonright l = s$, for all $\xi \in Z$. Let ξ and η be distinct elements of Z . We already know that $b_\xi \cap (k+1) = b_\eta \cap (k+1) = s$. Suppose $m \geq k$ is a common element of b_ξ and b_η and $b_\xi \cap (m+1) = b_\eta \cap (m+1)$. Let t be the increasing enumeration of this finite set. We show that the next elements of b_ξ and b_η above m are equal as well. Indeed, the next element of b_ξ above m is $u_{g_\xi(m)}^t$ and the next element of b_η above m is $u_{g_\eta(m)}^t$. Since $m \geq k$ we know that $g_\xi(m)$ and $g_\eta(m)$ are both equal to $f(m)$, hence the next

element above m of both b_ξ and b_η is equal to $u_{f(m)}^t$. It follows by induction that $b_\xi = b_\eta$, which is a contradiction. \square

It turns out that no additional set theoretic hypothesis is needed for the above result if the ideal \mathcal{I} is generated by a set linearly ordered under inclusion modulo the Fréchet ideal. Recall that a *tower* on ω is a sequence $\{a_\xi: \xi < \kappa\}$ of subsets of ω such that $a_\xi \subset_* a_\eta$, for all $\xi < \eta < \kappa$. The following is an instance of a many faceted phenomenon which can be traced to Hausdorff gaps. It can be obtained for example from [2, Proposition 4.22], [8, Theorem 2.4], and can also be proved using Todorčević's ρ -functions and C -sequences (see [18]). We include a slightly different proof for completeness.

Proposition 3.4. *Suppose \mathcal{I} is an ideal on ω generated by a tower of length ω_1 . Let $G_n = \mathbb{Z}_2$, for all n . Then $\lim^1 \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}} \neq 0$.*

We will use the following lemma.

Lemma 3.5. *There are orderings $<_n$ on ω_1 , for $n < \omega$, such that:*

1. $(\omega_1, <_n)$ is a tree ordering of height at most ω , for all n ,
2. if $\alpha <_m \beta$ and $m < n$, then $\alpha <_n \beta$,
3. if $\alpha < \beta < \omega_1$ then there is n such that $\alpha <_n \beta$,
4. if $\alpha <_n \beta$, then $a_\alpha \setminus n \subseteq a_\beta$,
5. if α is a limit and $\alpha <_n \beta$ then $\alpha + 1 \leq_n \beta$.

Proof. We construct the orderings $<_n \upharpoonright \gamma$, for all n , by induction on γ . Let γ be a countable ordinal and suppose that the orders $<_n \upharpoonright \gamma$, have been constructed so that they satisfy conditions (1)–(5) with γ instead of ω_1 . We need to extend each $<_n \upharpoonright \gamma$ to $<_n \upharpoonright \gamma + 1$, while preserving the conditions (1)–(5) this time with $\gamma + 1$ instead of ω_1 . This means we have to decide where to put γ in each of the orderings $<_n$. Assume first that γ is a successor, e.g., $\gamma = \alpha + 1$, for some α . Let n be the least such that $a_\alpha \setminus n \subseteq a_\gamma$. If $k < n$ we put γ on the 0-th level of $<_k$, i.e., we make γ incomparable with all $\beta < \gamma$ in the sense of $<_k$. If $k \geq n$ we put γ on top of α , i.e., we let $\beta <_k \gamma$ iff $\beta \leq_k \alpha$. Notice that conditions (1)–(5) with ω_1 replaced by $\gamma + 1$ are preserved.

Suppose now that γ is a limit ordinal. Since γ has countable cofinality, we can fix an increasing sequence of successor ordinals $(\gamma_k)_k$ converging to γ . Define n_k as the least $n > n_{k-1}, k$ such that

- $\gamma_0 <_n \gamma_1 <_n \cdots <_n \gamma_k$,
- $a_{\gamma_i} \setminus n \subseteq a_\gamma$, for each $i \leq k$.

For $i < n_0$ we let γ be incomparable in $<_i$ with all $\beta < \gamma$. If $i \in [n_k, n_{k+1})$ we put γ as an immediate successor of γ_k in $<_i$, that is, for $\beta < \gamma$ we let $\beta <_i \gamma$ iff $\beta \leq_i \gamma_k$. This ends the definition of the orderings $<_n \upharpoonright \gamma + 1$. We need to verify that all the conditions are verified, but this is a trivial observation from the choice of n_k . Note that condition (5) is ensured by the fact that all γ_k used in the above construction are successor ordinals. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.4. Let $\{a_\xi: \xi < \omega_1\}$ be a tower on ω generating the ideal \mathcal{I} modulo the Fréchet ideal. We construct a coherent nontrivial family of functions $\{f_\alpha: \alpha < \omega_1\}$ such that

$f_\alpha: a_\alpha \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$, for all $\alpha < \omega_1$. Given Lemma 3.5, we construct $b_\alpha \subseteq a_\alpha$, for all $\alpha < \omega_1$, such that

- if $\alpha < \beta$ then $b_\beta \cap a_\alpha =_* b_\alpha$,
- there is no $b \subseteq \omega$ such that $b \cap a_\alpha =_* b_\alpha$, for all $\alpha < \omega_1$.

Suppose that such sets are constructed. Let $f_\alpha: a_\alpha \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$, for $\alpha < \omega_1$, be defined by

$$f_\alpha(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n \in b_\alpha \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Then $\{f_\alpha: \alpha < \omega_1\}$ is the required coherent nontrivial family of functions.

Fix α and let $\xi < \alpha$. Let n be the least such that $\xi <_n \alpha$, and η be the least ordinal $> \xi$ such that $\xi <_n \eta \leq_n \alpha$. Define $n_{\xi, \alpha}$ be the least integer in $a_\eta \setminus a_\xi$ which is bigger than n . Let

$$b_\alpha = \{n_{\xi, \alpha} \mid \xi < \alpha\}.$$

We need to verify that the b_α thus constructed have the required properties. Suppose first that $\alpha < \beta$. We want to show that $b_\beta \cap a_\alpha =_* b_\alpha$. Let m be the least such that $\alpha <_m \beta$. Since the height of $(\omega_1, <_{m-1})$ is at most ω , the set $F_{m-1}(\beta) = \{\xi < \beta: \xi <_{m-1} \beta\}$ is finite. Suppose $\xi \in \beta \setminus F_{m-1}(\beta)$ and let n be the least such that $\xi <_n \beta$. Then $n \geq m$ and since $\alpha <_m \beta$, the ordering $<_n$ is a tree ordering and extends $<_m$, we have that ξ and α are comparable in $<_n$. Moreover, if $\xi < \alpha$ then $n_{\xi, \alpha} = n_{\xi, \beta}$, and if $\xi \geq \alpha$ then $n_{\xi, \alpha} \notin a_\alpha$. This implies that $b_\beta \cap a_\alpha =_* b_\alpha$.

Let us now show that there is no set b such that $b \cap a_\alpha =_* b_\alpha$ for all α . First, note that if $\alpha < \beta$ then $b_\beta \cap (a_{\alpha+1} \setminus a_\alpha)$ is finite. The reason is that for some k we will have $\alpha <_n \alpha+1 \leq_n \beta$, for all $n \geq k$. So, for all $\xi \in \beta \setminus F_k(\beta)$, if $\xi < \alpha$ then $n_{\xi, \beta} \in a_\alpha$, and if $\xi > \alpha$ then $n_{\xi, \beta} \notin a_{\alpha+1}$. Suppose now b is such that $b \cap a_\alpha =_* b_\alpha$, for all α . Then, for each α , there is m_α such that $(b \cap a_\alpha) \setminus m_\alpha = b_\alpha \setminus m_\alpha$ and $b \cap (a_{\alpha+1} \setminus a_\alpha) \subseteq m_\alpha$. By increasing m_α , we may require that $\alpha <_{m_\alpha} \alpha+1$. Now, there is a fixed m such that $m_\alpha = m$, for an uncountable set X of limit ordinals. Take some $\beta \in X$ such that $X \cap \beta$ is infinite. Then there is $\alpha \in X \cap \beta$ such that the least n such that $\alpha <_n \beta$ is bigger than m . By (5) $\alpha+1 \leq_n \beta$, and so $n_{\alpha, \beta} \in a_{\alpha+1} \setminus a_\alpha$. It follows that $n_{\alpha, \beta} \in b_\beta \setminus m$, thus $n_{\alpha, \beta} \in b$. On the other hand we have that $b \cap (a_{\alpha+1} \setminus a_\alpha) \subseteq m$, so $n_{\alpha, \beta} < m$, a contradiction. \square

Let us now turn to higher derived limits. We will consider the following statement, for a countable abelian group G .

$\varphi_n(G)$: Suppose \mathcal{I} is an ideal on ω generated by a tower of length ω_n . Set $G_k = G$, for all $k < \omega$, and let $\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{I}$ be the associated inverse system of abelian groups. Then $\lim^n \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{I} \neq 0$.

By Proposition 3.4, the statement $\varphi_1(\mathbb{Z}_2)$ holds in ZFC. It follows that $\varphi_1(G)$ holds, for every nontrivial abelian group G . We intend to leverage the statement $\varphi_n(G)$ with a certain combinatorial principle to get $\varphi_{n+1}(G)$. Recall the following weak version of diamond.

$w\Diamond(S)$: Suppose κ is an uncountable regular cardinal and S is a stationary subset of κ . Then, for every $F: 2^{<\kappa} \rightarrow 2$, there is $g: \kappa \rightarrow 2$ such that, for every $f: \kappa \rightarrow 2$, the set $\{\alpha \in S: g(\alpha) = F(f \upharpoonright \alpha)\}$ is stationary.

This principle was introduced by Devlin and Shelah [7], who showed that $w\Diamond(\omega_1)$ is equivalent to $2^{\aleph_0} < 2^{\aleph_1}$. More generally, $w\Diamond(\kappa^+)$ is equivalent to $2^\kappa < 2^{\kappa^+}$, for every regular κ . For our purposes we will require that weak diamond holds on a specific stationary subset of ω_{n+1} , namely on the set

$$S_{n+1}^n = \{\alpha < \omega_{n+1} : \text{cof}(\alpha) = \omega_n\}.$$

The following stepping-up lemma is the main technical tool we will use.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $n \geq 1$ and let G be a countable abelian group. Suppose $w\Diamond(S_{n+1}^n)$ and $\varphi_n(G)$ both hold, then so does $\varphi_{n+1}(G)$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on ω generated by a tower $C = \{a_\xi : \xi < \omega_{n+1}\}$. Let $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}}$ be the system obtained by setting $G_k = G$, for all $k \in \omega$. Let $\mathbf{Q}_{\mathcal{I}}$ be the associated quotient system. By Proposition 2.10, it suffices to produce a coherent nontrivial sequence $\bar{x} \in (\mathbf{Q}_{\mathcal{I}} \upharpoonright C)^{(n)}$. To simplify notation let $Q_\xi = P_{a_\xi}/G_{a_\xi}$, for all $\xi < \omega_{n+1}$. Let us also write p_ξ^η for the canonical projection from Q_η to Q_ξ , for $\xi \leq \eta$. Therefore, we can identify the system $\mathbf{Q}_{\mathcal{I}} \upharpoonright C$ with the system

$$\mathbf{Q} = \{Q_\xi; p_\xi^\eta : \xi \leq \eta < \omega_{n+1}\}.$$

Let T be the tree $2^{<\omega_{n+1}}$ with the ordering being end-extension. For $s \in T$, we let $l(s) = \text{dom}(s)$. We will define, for all $s \in T$, a sequence \bar{x}^s such that:

1. $\bar{x}^s \in \mathbf{Q} \upharpoonright l(s)^{(n)}$ and is coherent
2. if $s \leq t$ then \bar{x}^s is an initial segment of \bar{x}^t
3. if $\text{cof}(l(s)) = \aleph_n$, and $\bar{u} \in \mathbf{Q} \upharpoonright l(s)^{(n-1)}$ trivializes \bar{x}^s , then there is $\epsilon \in \{0, 1\}$ such that there is no extension of \bar{u} in $\mathbf{Q} \upharpoonright (l(s) + 1)^{(n-1)}$ that trivializes $\bar{x}^{s, \epsilon}$.

We do this by induction on $l(s)$. If $l(s)$ is a limit ordinal and \bar{x}^t has been constructed, for all t with $l(t) < l(s)$, we let $\bar{x}^s = \bigcup_{\alpha < l(s)} \bar{x}^{s \upharpoonright \alpha}$.

Consider now the successor case. Suppose $s \in T$ and let $\lambda = l(s)$. We have constructed the sequence $\bar{x}^s \in \mathbf{Q} \upharpoonright \lambda^{(n)}$, and we need to extend it to two coherent sequences $\bar{x}^{s, \epsilon} \in \mathbf{Q} \upharpoonright (\lambda + 1)^{(n)}$, for $\epsilon \in \{0, 1\}$. For this we need to pick $x_{\bar{\alpha}, \lambda}^{s, \epsilon} \in Q_{\alpha_0}$, for all $\bar{\alpha} \in \lambda^{(n-1)}$, and $\epsilon \in \{0, 1\}$. Given $\bar{w} \in \mathbf{Q} \upharpoonright \lambda^{(n-1)}$, we define the sequence $\bar{x}^s *_\lambda \bar{w}$ by letting, for $\bar{\alpha} = (\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \lambda^{(n)}$,

$$(\bar{x}^s *_\lambda \bar{w})_{\bar{\alpha}} = \begin{cases} x_{\bar{\alpha}}^s & \text{if } \alpha_n \neq \lambda \\ w_{\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}} & \text{if } \alpha_n = \lambda. \end{cases}$$

Observe that

$$\delta^{n+1}(\bar{x}^s *_\lambda \bar{w}) = \delta^{n+1}(\bar{x}^s) *_\lambda (\delta^n(\bar{w}) + (-1)^n \bar{x}^s).$$

It follows that $\bar{x}^s *_\lambda \bar{w}$ is a coherent sequence in $\mathbf{Q} \upharpoonright (\lambda + 1)^{(n)}$ if and only if $(-1)^{n+1} \bar{w}$ trivializes \bar{x}^s . Since λ is of cofinality $\leq \omega_n$, and the system \mathbf{Q} is flasque, by Theorem 2.4, we can always find such a sequence \bar{w} . If $\text{cof}(\lambda) < \aleph_n$ we let

$$\bar{x}^{s, 0} = \bar{x}^{s, 1} = \bar{x}^s *_\lambda \bar{w}.$$

Let us now concentrate on the case $\text{cof}(\lambda) = \aleph_n$. Observe that if two sequences \bar{w}^0 and \bar{w}^1 both trivialize \bar{x}^s then $\bar{w}^0 - \bar{w}^1$ is a coherent sequence in $\mathbf{Q} \upharpoonright \lambda^{(n-1)}$. Conversely, if \bar{w} trivializes \bar{x}^s and \bar{z} is a coherent sequence in $\mathbf{Q} \upharpoonright \lambda^{(n-1)}$ then $\bar{w} + \bar{z}$ also trivializes \bar{x}^s . By $\varphi_n(G)$ and the

fact that $\text{cof}(\lambda) = \aleph_n$, there is a nontrivial coherent sequence $\bar{z} \in \mathbf{Q} \upharpoonright \lambda^{(n-1)}$. We fix some $\bar{w} \in \mathbf{Q} \upharpoonright \lambda^{(n-1)}$ such that $(-1)^{n+1}\bar{w}$ trivializes \bar{x}^s , and let:

$$\bar{x}^{s,0} = \bar{x}^s *_{\lambda} \bar{w}; \quad \bar{x}^{s,1} = \bar{x}^s *_{\lambda} (\bar{w} + \bar{z}).$$

Let us check that the sequence $\bar{x}^{s,0}$ and $\bar{x}^{s,1}$ satisfy condition 3. Consider first the case $n = 1$. Suppose that \bar{u}^ϵ trivializes $\bar{x}^{s,\epsilon}$, for $\epsilon \in \{0,1\}$, and $\bar{u}^0 \upharpoonright \lambda = \bar{u}^1 \upharpoonright \lambda$. We would then have that $u_\lambda^1 - u_\lambda^0$ trivializes \bar{z} , which would be a contradiction.

Let us now suppose that $n > 1$. Given $\bar{u} \in \mathbf{Q} \upharpoonright (\lambda + 1)^{(n-1)}$, we define a sequence $d_\lambda(\bar{u}) \in \mathbf{Q} \upharpoonright \lambda^{(n-2)}$ by letting, for $\bar{\alpha} = (\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{n-2}) \in \lambda^{(n-2)}$,

$$d_\lambda(\bar{u})_{\bar{\alpha}} = u_{\bar{\alpha},\lambda}.$$

Note that in any case we have $\bar{u} = \bar{u} \upharpoonright \lambda^{(n-1)} *_{\lambda} d_\lambda(\bar{u})$. Now observe also that:

$$\delta^n(\bar{u}) = \delta^n(\bar{u} \upharpoonright \lambda^{(n-1)}) *_{\lambda} (\delta^{n-1}(d_\lambda(\bar{u})) + (-1)^{n-1}\bar{u} \upharpoonright \lambda^{(n-1)}).$$

Suppose now that \bar{u}^ϵ trivializes $\bar{x}^{s,\epsilon}$, for $\epsilon \in \{0,1\}$, and $\bar{u}^0 \upharpoonright \lambda^{(n-1)} = \bar{u}^1 \upharpoonright \lambda^{(n-1)}$. It follows that:

$$\delta^{n-1}(d_\lambda(\bar{u}^0)) + (-1)^{n-1}\bar{u}^0 \upharpoonright \lambda^{(n-1)} = \bar{w},$$

and

$$\delta^{n-1}(d_\lambda(\bar{u}^1)) + (-1)^{n-1}\bar{u}^1 \upharpoonright \lambda^{(n-1)} = \bar{w} + \bar{z},$$

Since $\bar{u}^0 \upharpoonright \lambda^{(n-1)} = \bar{u}^1 \upharpoonright \lambda^{(n-1)}$, we get that:

$$\delta^{n-1}(d_\lambda(\bar{u}^1 - \bar{u}^0)) = \bar{z},$$

which contradicts our assumption that \bar{z} is nontrivial. This completes the construction of the sequences \bar{x}^s , for $s \in T$. For $b \in 2^{\omega_{n+1}}$, we define:

$$\bar{x}^b = \bigcup_{\lambda < \omega_{n+1}} \bar{x}^{b \upharpoonright \lambda}.$$

Note that $\bar{x}^b \in \mathbf{Q}^{(n)}$ and is coherent, for all b . We now use the principle $w \diamond (S_{n+1}^n)$ to find $b \in 2^{\omega_{n+1}}$ such that \bar{x}^b is nontrivial. Let

$$D = \{\lambda < \omega_{n+1} : \omega_n \cdot \lambda = \lambda\}.$$

Note that D is a club in ω_{n+1} . Suppose $s \in T$, let $\lambda = l(s)$, and suppose that $\lambda \in D$. We think of s as coding a sequence $\bar{u}^s \in \mathbf{Q} \upharpoonright \lambda^{(n-1)}$. The exact nature of the coding is not important, we only require that:

- if $\lambda \in D$ then every $\bar{u} \in \mathbf{Q} \upharpoonright \lambda^{(n-1)}$ is coded by some $s: \lambda \rightarrow 2$,
- if $s \leq t$ then \bar{u}^s is an initial segment of \bar{u}^t .

If $b: \omega_{n+1} \rightarrow 2$, we let

$$\bar{u}^b = \bigcup_{\lambda \in D} \bar{u}^{b \upharpoonright \lambda}.$$

We now define a function $F: T \upharpoonright D \rightarrow 2$ as follows. Given $s \in T \upharpoonright D$, if \bar{u}^s trivializes the sequence \bar{x}^s we let $F(s) = \epsilon \in \{0,1\}$ be such that no extension of \bar{u}^s in $\mathbf{Q} \upharpoonright (l(s) + 1)^{(n-1)}$ trivializes $\bar{x}^{s,\epsilon}$. Such an ϵ exists by 3. If \bar{u}^s does not trivialize \bar{x}^s we let $F(s)$ be an arbitrary

element of $\{0, 1\}$. Now, by $w\Diamond(S_{n+1}^n)$ there is a function $g: \omega_{n+1} \rightarrow 2$ such that, for every $b: \omega_{n+1} \rightarrow 2$, the set

$$\{\lambda \in S_{n+1}^n: g(\lambda) = F(b \upharpoonright \lambda)\}$$

is stationary. We claim that \bar{x}^g is nontrivial. Indeed, suppose \bar{u} trivializes \bar{x}^g and find $b \in 2^{\omega_{n+1}}$ such that $\bar{u}^b = \bar{u}$. Then by the guessing property of g there is some $\lambda \in D$ such that $g(\lambda) = F(b \upharpoonright \lambda)$. This means that $\bar{u}^{b \upharpoonright \lambda}$ cannot be extended to a sequence in $\mathbf{Q} \upharpoonright (\lambda + 1)^{(n-1)}$ that trivializes $\bar{x}^g \upharpoonright (\lambda + 1)^{(n)}$, a contradiction. \square

Theorem 3.7. *Suppose $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{d} = \aleph_n$, and $w\Diamond(S_{k+1}^k)$ holds, for all $k < n$. Then $\lim^n \mathbf{A} \neq 0$.*

Proof. Recall that the system \mathbf{A} corresponds to $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{I}_0}$, where \mathcal{I}_0 is the ideal on $\omega \times \omega$ generated by sets of the form:

$$a_f = \{(i, j) \in \omega \times \omega: j \leq f(i)\},$$

for all $f \in \omega^\omega$, and $G_{m,n} = \mathbb{Z}$, for all $(n, m) \in \omega^2$. The ideal \mathcal{I}_0 is generated by a tower of length ω_n precisely when $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{d} = \aleph_n$. In this case, we have that $\phi_n(\mathbb{Z})$ suffices to get $\lim^n \mathbf{A} \neq 0$. But by Proposition 3.2, $\phi_1(\mathbb{Z})$ holds, and by Lemma 3.6 and our set theoretic hypotheses, so does $\phi_n(\mathbb{Z})$. \square

4. THE CONSISTENCY RESULT

We now turn to the consistency of the combination of combinatorial principles we need for our main result.

Definition 4.1. Given a regular cardinal κ and a set I , we let $\text{Fn}(I, 2, \kappa)$ denote the poset of partial functions p such that $\text{dom}(p) \in [I]^{<\kappa}$ and $p: \text{dom}(p) \rightarrow 2$. The order is reverse inclusion.

It is well known that $\text{Fn}(I, 2, \kappa)$ is κ -closed and has the $(2^{<\kappa})^+$ -chain condition. Thus, if $2^{<\kappa} = \kappa$ then forcing with $\text{Fn}(I, 2, \kappa)$ preserves cardinals. If λ is a cardinal and $I = \lambda \times \kappa$, then $\text{Fn}(I, 2, \kappa)$ is the usual poset for adding λ many Cohen subsets of κ . If GCH holds in V and $\text{cof}(\lambda) > \kappa$, then in the generic extension $V[G]$ by $\text{Fn}(\lambda \times \kappa, 2, \kappa)$ we have $2^\kappa = \lambda$ (see [12, IV.7]). The following lemma is fairly standard. We include a proof for completeness.

Lemma 4.2. *Let κ be an uncountable regular cardinal. Suppose \mathbb{P} is a κ -cc poset and \mathbb{Q} is κ -closed. Let $(p, q) \in \mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{Q}$ and let τ be a $\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{Q}$ -name for an ordinal. Then there is a condition $r \leq q$ and a \mathbb{P} -name for an ordinal σ such that $(p, r) \Vdash \tau = \sigma$.*

Proof. We build inductively an antichain $(p_\xi: \xi < \delta)$ of conditions in \mathbb{P} below p , a sequence of ordinals $(\alpha_\xi: \xi < \delta)$ and a decreasing sequence of conditions $(q_\xi: \xi < \delta)$ in \mathbb{Q} below q . At stage $\gamma < \kappa$ we have built $(p_\xi: \xi < \gamma)$, $(\alpha_\xi: \xi < \gamma)$, and $(q_\xi: \xi < \gamma)$. We ask if there is a condition $p^* \leq p$ which is incompatible with all the p_ξ , for $\xi < \gamma$, an ordinal α^* and $q^* \leq q_\xi$, for all $\xi < \gamma$, such that $(p^*, q^*) \Vdash \tau = \check{\alpha}$. If so, we pick such witnesses p^* , q^* , and α^* , and we let $p_\gamma = p^*$, $q_\gamma = q^*$, and $\alpha_\gamma = \alpha^*$. Since \mathbb{P} is κ -cc the construction cannot continue for κ many steps. Let δ be the stage at which it stops. Since \mathbb{Q} is κ -closed we can find $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $r \leq q_\xi$, for all $\xi < \delta$. We let $\sigma = \{(p_\xi, \check{\alpha}_\xi): \xi < \delta\}$. Then r and σ are as required. \square

Lemma 4.3. *Let κ be an uncountable regular cardinal, and let λ and μ be cardinals such that $\lambda^{<\kappa} < \mu$. Suppose \mathbb{P} is a κ -cc poset of size λ . Let $\mathbb{Q} = \text{Fn}(\mu \times \kappa, 2, \kappa)$. Then, for every stationary subset S of κ in V , $w\dot{\diamond}(S)$ holds in the generic extension by $\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{Q}$.*

Proof. We may assume that $\lambda \geq 2$, since otherwise forcing with $\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{Q}$ is equivalent to forcing with \mathbb{Q} and it is well-known that \mathbb{Q} adds a regular $\dot{\diamond}(S)$ -sequence. Let \dot{F} be a $\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{Q}$ -name and suppose without loss of generality that the maximal condition in $\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{Q}$ forces that \dot{F} is a function from $2^{<\kappa}$ to 2. Since \mathbb{P} has the κ -cc and cardinality λ there are at most $\lambda^{<\kappa}$ canonical \mathbb{P} -names for elements of $2^{<\kappa}$. Since $\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{Q}$ has the $2^{(<\kappa)^+}$ -cc we can find a subset A of μ of size $\lambda^{<\kappa}$ such that, letting $\mathbb{Q} \upharpoonright A$ denote the poset $\text{Fn}(A \times \kappa, 2, \kappa)$, for every canonical \mathbb{P} -name τ for an element of $2^{<\kappa}$, $\dot{F}(\tau)$ is a $\mathbb{P} \times (\mathbb{Q} \upharpoonright A)$ -name. Since the cardinality of A is less than μ , we can find $\delta \in \mu \setminus A$. Let \dot{g}_δ be the canonical \mathbb{Q} -name for the δ -th Cohen subset of κ added by \mathbb{Q} . We now claim that \dot{g}_δ is forced by the maximal condition in $\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{Q}$ to be a guessing function for \dot{F} .

So, fix a condition $(p, q) \in \mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{Q}$, a $\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{Q}$ name \dot{f} for a function from κ to 2, and a $\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{Q}$ name \dot{C} for a club in κ . We need to find some $(p^*, q^*) \leq (p, q)$ and $\alpha \in S$ such that

$$(p^*, q^*) \Vdash \check{\alpha} \in \dot{C} \text{ and } \dot{F}(\dot{f} \upharpoonright \check{\alpha}) = \dot{g}_\delta(\check{\alpha}).$$

We now proceed as in the standard proof that adding a Cohen subset of κ adds a $\dot{\diamond}(S)$ -sequence. To do this, we build an increasing continuous sequence $(\alpha_\xi: \xi < \kappa)$ of ordinals less than κ , a decreasing sequence of conditions $(q_\xi: \xi < \kappa)$ in \mathbb{Q} below q , and two other sequences $(\sigma_\xi: \xi < \kappa)$ and $(\dot{f}_\xi: \xi < \kappa)$ of canonical \mathbb{P} -names such that:

- σ_ξ is a \mathbb{P} -name for an ordinal $< \kappa$ and is forced by $(p, q_{\xi+1})$ to be the next element of \dot{C} above $\check{\alpha}_\xi$. Since \mathbb{P} has the κ -cc we have $< \kappa$ many possible values for σ_ξ .
- \dot{f}_ξ is a \mathbb{P} -name for a function from α_ξ to 2 and $(p, q_{\xi+1}) \Vdash \dot{f} \upharpoonright \check{\alpha}_\xi = \dot{f}_\xi$.

We can do this by the Lemma 4.2. Suppose we have done the construction up to ξ . We need to define the ξ -th elements of the above sequences. Consider first the successor case, i.e., $\xi = \eta + 1$, for some η . By Lemma 4.2 we can extend q_η to q' and find a canonical \mathbb{P} -name for an ordinal σ_ξ such that (p, q') forces that σ_ξ is the next point of \dot{C} above α_η . Since \mathbb{P} is κ -cc there are $< \kappa$ many possible values of σ_ξ . We then pick some α_ξ above all these values. Moreover, we ensure that α_ξ is at least $\sup\{\alpha: (\delta, \alpha) \in \text{dom}(q_\eta)\}$. Now, by Lemma 4.2 again, we extend q' to some q_ξ , and find a canonical \mathbb{P} -name \dot{f}_ξ such that (p, q_ξ) forces that $\dot{f} \upharpoonright \check{\alpha}_\xi$ equals \dot{f}_ξ . At a limit stage ξ we let

$$\alpha_\xi = \sup\{\alpha_\eta: \eta < \xi\}, \quad q_\xi = \bigcup\{q_\eta: \eta < \xi\}, \text{ and } \dot{f}_\xi = \bigcup\{\dot{f}_\eta: \eta < \xi\}.$$

We also let $\sigma_\xi = \check{\alpha}_\xi$. Since \dot{C} is forced to be a club in κ , we will have that $(p, q_\xi) \Vdash \check{\alpha}_\xi \in \dot{C}$. We continue this construction for κ many steps. The set $\{\alpha_\xi: \xi < \kappa\}$ will be a club in κ and, since S is stationary, we are going to reach a limit stage ξ such that $\xi \in S$. Note that (p, q_ξ) forces that $\dot{f} \upharpoonright \check{\alpha}_\xi$ is equal to \dot{f}_ξ , which is a \mathbb{P} -name. Now, we can extend (p, q_ξ) to some condition (p^*, q') which decides the value of $\dot{F}(\dot{f}_\xi)$. Since $\dot{F}(\dot{f}_\xi)$ is a $\mathbb{P} \times (\mathbb{Q} \upharpoonright A)$ -name and $\delta \notin A$ we can do this without extending the δ -th component of q_ξ . Note also that $\sup\{\alpha: (\delta, \alpha) \in \text{dom}(q_\xi)\} \leq \alpha_\xi$. This means that (p^*, q') decides the value of $\dot{F}(\dot{f} \upharpoonright \check{\alpha}_\xi)$, but

we have not yet made a commitment on the value of \dot{g}_δ at α_ξ , i.e., $(\delta, \alpha_\xi) \notin \text{dom}(q')$. So if this decision is equal to some $i \in \{0, 1\}$ we can now extend the δ -th component of q' by putting value i at α_ξ ; in other words, we let $q^* = q' \cup \{((\delta, \alpha_\xi), i)\}$. Putting everything together, we have found a condition (p^*, q^*) extending (p, q) which forces $\check{\alpha}_\xi$ is in \dot{C} and $\dot{g}_\delta(\alpha_\xi)$ equals to $\dot{F}(\dot{f} \upharpoonright \check{\alpha}_\xi)$. This is what we needed to prove. \square

We recall the following well-known forcing notion \mathbb{H} due to Hechler, [10], but see [12, IV.4.11].

Definition 4.4. We say $p \in \mathbb{H}$ if $p = (s_p, f_p)$, where s_p is a finite partial function from ω to ω , and $f_p \in \omega^\omega$. We say that $q \leq p$ if $s_q \subseteq s_p$, and $s_q(n) \geq f_p(n)$, for all $n \in \text{dom}(s_q) \setminus \text{dom}(s_p)$.

The forcing notion \mathbb{H} is c.c.c., in fact, σ -centered, and adds a function $g: \omega \rightarrow \omega$ which dominates modulo finite sets all ground model functions in ω^ω . Given a cardinal κ we let \mathbb{H}_κ denote the finite support iteration of \mathbb{H} of length κ . It is a standard fact that if κ is uncountable then forcing with \mathbb{H}_κ makes $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{d} = \kappa$.

Let us also recall that for an integer k , S_{k+1}^k denotes the set $\{\alpha < \omega_{k+1} : \text{cof}(\alpha) = \omega_k\}$.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $n \geq 1$. Then it is relatively consistent with ZFC that $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{d} = \aleph_n$, and $w\Diamond(S_{k+1}^k)$ holds, for all $k < n$.*

Proof. We start with a model V satisfying GCH. For $1 \leq k \leq n$, let $\mathbb{C}_k = \text{Fn}(\omega_{n+k} \times \omega_k, 2, \omega_k)$ and $\mathbb{C} = \mathbb{H}_{\omega_n} \times \mathbb{C}_1 \cdots \times \mathbb{C}_n$ be the product forcing notion. It is a standard fact (see [12, V.2]) that forcing with \mathbb{C} preserves cofinalities. Let $G = G_0 \times \cdots \times G_n$ be a generic over \mathbb{C} . Then in $V[G]$ we have $2^{\aleph_k} = \aleph_{n+k}$, for all $k \leq n$. By the product lemma and the fact that $\mathbb{C}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{C}_n$ does not add reals, we can view the final model $V[G_0 \times G_1 \times \cdots \times G_n]$ as a generic extension over $V[G_1 \times \cdots \times G_n]$ by \mathbb{H}_{ω_n} as defined in that model. Therefore the final model satisfies $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{d} = \aleph_n$. We need to check that $w\Diamond(S_{k+1}^k)$ holds in $V[G]$, for all $k < n$. Fix $k < n$. The forcing notion $\mathbb{C}_{k+2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{C}_n$ is ω_{k+2} -closed. Hence, if we let $W = V[G_{k+2} \times \cdots \times G_n]$, we have $2^{\omega_k} = \omega_{k+1}$ in W . Moreover, if we let $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{H}_{\omega_n} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{C}_k$, $\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{C}_{k+1}$, $\kappa = \omega_{k+1}$, $\lambda = \omega_{n+k}$, $\mu = \omega_{n+k+1}$, and $S = S_{k+1}^k$, then the assumptions of Lemma 4.3 are satisfied in W . By the product lemma of forcing, $V[G]$ can be viewed as a generic extension of W by $\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{Q}$. It follows that $w\Diamond(S_{k+1}^k)$ holds in $V[G]$, as required. \square

Finally, from Theorem 4.5 and Theorem 3.7 we conclude the main result of this paper.

Theorem 4.6. *Let $n \geq 1$. Then it is relatively consistent with ZFC that $\lim^n \mathbf{A} \neq 0$.* \square

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Bannister, J. Bergfalk, and J.T. Moore. On the additivity of strong homology for locally compact separable metric spaces. arXiv:2008.13089, 2020.
- [2] M. Bekkali. *Topics in set theory. Lebesgue measurability, large cardinals, forcing axioms, rho-functions*, volume 1476. Berlin etc.: Springer-Verlag, 1991.
- [3] J. Bergfalk. Strong homology, derived limits, and set theory. *Fund. Math.*, 236(1):71–82, 2017.
- [4] J. Bergfalk. The first omega alephs: from simplices to trees of trees to higher walks. arXiv:2008.03386, 2020.
- [5] J. Bergfalk, M. Hrušák, and C. Lambie-Hanson. Simultaneously vanishing higher derived limits without large cardinals. arXiv:2102.06699, 2021.

- [6] J. Bergfalk and C. Lambie-Hanson. Simultaneously vanishing higher derived limits. arXiv:1907.11744, 2019.
- [7] K. J. Devlin and S. Shelah. A weak version of \diamond which follows from $2^{\aleph_0} < 2^{\aleph_1}$. *Israel J. Math.*, 29(2-3):239–247, 1978.
- [8] A. Dow, P. Simon, and J. E. Vaughan. Strong homology and the proper forcing axiom. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 106(3):821–828, 1989.
- [9] R. Gobel. Sur les dérivés de certaines limites projectives. Applications aux modules. *Bull. Sci. Math. (2)*, 94:251–255, 1970.
- [10] S. H. Hechler. On the existence of certain cofinal subsets of ${}^\omega\omega$. In *Axiomatic set theory (Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Vol. XIII, Part II, Univ. California, Los Angeles, Calif., 1967)*, pages 155–173, 1974.
- [11] P. J. Hilton and U. Stammbach. *A course in homological algebra. 2nd ed*, volume 4. New York, NY: Springer, 2nd ed. edition, 1997.
- [12] K. Kunen. *Set theory*, volume 34 of *Studies in Logic (London)*. College Publications, London, 2011 (revised edition 2013).
- [13] S. Mardešić. *Strong shape and homology*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000.
- [14] S. Mardešić and A.V. Prasolov. Strong homology is not additive. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 307(2):725–744, 1988.
- [15] B. Mitchell. Rings with several objects. *Advances in Math.*, 8:1–161, 1972.
- [16] B. Mitchell. The cohomological dimension of a directed set. *Can. J. Math.*, 25:233–238, 1973.
- [17] S. Shelah. *Proper and Improper Forcing*. Perspectives in Logic. Cambridge University Press, 2 edition, 2017.
- [18] S. Todorčević. *Walks on ordinals and their characteristics*, volume 263. Basel: Birkhäuser, 2007.

(B. Veličković) INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE JUSSIEU - PARIS RIVE GAUCHE (IMJ-PRG), UNIVERSITÉ DE PARIS, BÂTIMENT SOPHIE GERMAIN, 8 PLACE AURÉLIE NEMOURS, 75013 PARIS, FRANCE

Email address: boban@math.univ-paris-diderot.fr

URL: <http://www.logique.jussieu.fr/~boban/>

(A. Vignati) INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE JUSSIEU - PARIS RIVE GAUCHE (IMJ-PRG), UNIVERSITÉ DE PARIS, BÂTIMENT SOPHIE GERMAIN, 8 PLACE AURÉLIE NEMOURS, 75013 PARIS, FRANCE

Email address: alessandro.vignati@imj-prg.fr

URL: <http://www.automorph.net/avignati>