

ON SEQUENTIAL VERSIONS OF DISTRIBUTIONAL TOPOLOGICAL COMPLEXITY

EKANSH JAUHARI

ABSTRACT. We define a (non-decreasing) sequence $\{\mathrm{dTC}_m(X)\}_{m \geq 2}$ of higher versions of distributional topological complexity (dTC) of a space X introduced by Dranishnikov and Jauhari [DJ]. This sequence generalizes $\mathrm{dTC}(X)$ in the sense that $\mathrm{dTC}_2(X) = \mathrm{dTC}(X)$, and is a direct analog to the classical sequence $\{\mathrm{TC}_m(X)\}_{m \geq 2}$. We show that like TC_m and dTC , the sequential versions dTC_m are also homotopy invariants. Also, $\mathrm{dTC}_m(X)$ relates with the distributional LS-category (dcat) of products of X in the same way as $\mathrm{TC}_m(X)$ relates with the classical LS-category (cat) of products of X . On one hand, we show that in general, dTC_m is a different concept than TC_m for each $m \geq 2$. On the other hand, by finding sharp cohomological lower bounds to $\mathrm{dTC}_m(X)$, we provide various examples of closed manifolds X for which the sequences $\{\mathrm{TC}_m(X)\}_{m \geq 2}$ and $\{\mathrm{dTC}_m(X)\}_{m \geq 2}$ coincide.

1. INTRODUCTION

In robotics, an autonomously functioning mechanical system, such as a robot, is typically required to move from a specified initial position to a specified desired position inside a configuration space in the most optimal way possible. By optimal, we mean with the least possible number of instabilities or discontinuities of motion. This is a motion planning problem whose input is the positions and output is the motion of the system between them. In many practical situations, to obtain a more precise and controlled motion, such a system is additionally required to pass through a fixed number of intermediate positions at some specified timestamps. This adds more constraints to the motion planning problem.

This paper is motivated by the following sequential motion planning problem. Given an autonomous mechanical system with configuration space X , a number $m \geq 2$, and positions x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m in X , we want to construct a “nice” algorithm to get from x_1 to x_m via the $m - 2$ intermediate positions x_2, \dots, x_{m-1} attained in that order for each ordered tuple $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m) \in X^m$. While studying this problem for $m = 2$, M. Farber [Far1] introduced the notion of the *topological complexity* of a space X , denoted $\mathrm{TC}(X)$, as the minimal degree of instability of motion planning algorithms for systems whose configuration space is X . This notion was generalized for each $m \geq 2$ in a natural way by Y. B. Rudyak [Ru] to the m^{th} *sequential topological complexity* of the space, denoted $\mathrm{TC}_m(X)$.

Date: September 16, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 55M30; Secondary 68T40, 70B15.

Key words and phrases. Sequential distributional topological complexity, distributed navigation algorithm, distributional sectional category, distributional Lusternik–Schnirelmann category, sequential topological complexity.

In a recent joint work with A. Dranishnikov [DJ], we considered this problem for the case $m = 2$ for some advanced autonomous systems, such as robots like Terminator 2, that can break into a finite number of pieces at the initial position so that all the pieces travel independently to the desired final position where they reassemble back into the system. For such systems, the notion of the *distributional topological complexity* of a space X , denoted $\text{dTC}(X)$, was introduced in [DJ] as the minimal number of pieces into which the system needs to break to be able to perform a continuous motion between all possible pairs of positions in the configuration space X . For such advanced systems, dTC seems to be an improvement of TC . In this paper, we consider the generalized problem for $m \geq 2$ and introduce a natural generalization of dTC , namely the m^{th} *sequential distributional topological complexity*, denoted dTC_m , which, we think, offers a better solution to the above sequential motion planning problem for some advanced autonomous systems.

1.A. Planning a sequential motion. Consider an advanced autonomous system that is required to reach a position $x_i \in X$ at a time $t_i \in [0, 1]$ for each $1 \leq i \leq m$, where $t_i < t_{i+1}$. The idea for the sequential motion of the system is as follows.

- (1) At time t_1 , the system breaks into finitely many weighted pieces at the initial position x_1 . All the pieces travel independently for time $t_2 - t_1$ to reach position x_2 at time t_2 .
- (2) At time t_2 and position x_2 , all the pieces reassemble back into the system. Then, the system breaks again at x_2 into the same number of pieces having the same weights. These pieces travel to reach x_3 at time t_3 .
- (3) The process continues like this, where the system breaks into the same number of pieces having the same weights at time t_i and position x_i , the pieces travel independently to reach x_{i+1} at t_{i+1} , where they reassemble into the system, and then the system breaks again in the same manner.
- (4) Finally, the pieces reach the final position x_m at time t_m where they reassemble into the system at last.

We assume that our system above has weight 1, i.e., the sum of the non-negative weights of the pieces involved is 1.

The “weights of the pieces” represent the percentage of the portion of the original system in the corresponding pieces. For example, if the weights are 0.23, 0.16, and 0.61, then the system breaks into pieces whose capacities/weights are 23%, 16%, and 61% of its original capacity/weight. In another sense, the “weight of a piece” represents the *probability* that at a given instance, the system is moving/traveling through that particular piece.

The input for our system is an ordered m -tuple of positions. Note that we require our system to first analyze the m positions and then decide the weighted pieces it needs for a continuous motion between those m positions in the given order by the process of repetitive breaking and reassembling. This is different, less chaotic, and better than letting the system decide its weighted pieces at each individual t_i to travel between x_i and x_{i+1} for each $1 \leq i \leq m - 1$.

Let $n \geq 1$ be the maximum number of pieces that the system can break into while traveling between all possible ordered m -tuples of positions in X . If no such n exists, we conclude that the system is extremely complicated for practical purposes and we say that its corresponding sequential distributional topological complexity

is infinite. Such a case is hardly found in real-world situations and is therefore less interesting, both from a physical as well as a theoretical point of view.

1.B. Continuous motion planning algorithm. Let $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in X^m$ be an ordered m -tuple. We define an n -distributed m -sequence of \bar{x} to be an unordered collection of n paths ϕ_j in X , with respective non-negative weights λ_j , such that

- (1) the sum of the weights is 1, i.e., $\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j = 1$, and
- (2) for each $1 \leq j \leq n$, we have $\phi_j(t_i) = x_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$.

Hence, the desired sequential motion planning algorithm is a continuous assignment of each $\bar{x} \in X^m$ to an n -distributed m -sequence of \bar{x} , which is an *unordered probability distribution*. This is in contrast to Farber's algorithm [Far2, Section 12] for $m = 2$ whose output is an *ordered* probability distribution.

The continuous algorithm we seek for the above problem is a natural generalization of the one for $m = 2$ from [DJ] in the following sense. For a metric space Z , let $\mathcal{B}(Z)$ denote the set of probability measures on Z and

$$\mathcal{B}_n(Z) = \{\mu \in \mathcal{B}(Z) \mid |\text{supp}(\mu)| \leq n\}$$

denote the space of probability measures on Z supported by at most n points, equipped with the Lévy–Prokhorov metric [Pr]. If $\mu \in \mathcal{B}_n(Z)$, then

$$\mu = \sum_{z \in F \subset Z, |F| \leq n} \lambda_z z,$$

where $\lambda_z \geq 0$ and $\sum \lambda_z = 1$, and $\text{supp}(\mu) = \{z \in Z \mid \lambda_z > 0\}$. Let $Z = P(X) = \{f \mid f : [0, 1] \rightarrow X\}$ be the path space of X with the compact-open topology, and let

$$P(\bar{x}) = \{f \in P(X) \mid f(t_i) = x_i \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq m\}$$

for any $\bar{x} \in X^m$. Then $\mathcal{B}_n(P(\bar{x}))$ is the space of all n -distributed m -sequences of \bar{x} . The desired m -navigation algorithm for an advanced system with configuration space X is then a continuous map

$$s_m : X^m \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_n(P(X))$$

such that $s_m(\bar{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_n(P(\bar{x}))$ for all $\bar{x} \in X^m$.

We note that the breaking of the system into n pieces while traveling is like an n^{th} degree discontinuity of its motion. Since we are looking for the most optimal algorithm, we want to minimize this number n . This gives us the notion of the m^{th} *sequential distributional topological complexity* of a space X , denoted $\text{dTTC}_m(X)$.

1.C. About this paper. At this stage, we mention that typically, one takes

$$t_i = \frac{i-1}{m-1} \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq m,$$

as in [Ru], [LS]. So, in this paper, we will take $t_i = (i-1)/(m-1)$ to get equally-timed motions and we will prove all our results for these t_i . Thus, the sequential distributional topological complexity is discussed in this paper *only* in this sense. However, we note that with minor modifications, suitable analogs of most of our statements and results from Sections 3, 4, and 6 will also hold for any arbitrary

$t_i \in [0, 1]$, satisfying $t_i < t_{i+1}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m-1$, in case of a more general, parametrized motion discussed, for example, in [CFW] and [FP].

In this paper, we are considering the *normalized* version of TC_m in the sense that if X is a contractible space, then $\mathsf{TC}_m(X) = 0$ for all $m \geq 2$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we set the ground for our paper and recall the notion and characterization of the classical sequential topological complexity, TC_m , for $m \geq 2$. In Section 3, we formally define sequential versions, dTC_m , of distributional topological complexity for $m \geq 2$, prove their homotopy invariance, generalize results for dTC to dTC_m , and compare these new numerical invariants $\mathsf{dTC}_m(X)$ for a space X with $\mathsf{TC}_m(X)$ and dcat of X^{m-1} and X^m . Section 4 is devoted to finding sharp lower bounds to $\mathsf{dTC}_m(X)$ in Alexander–Spanier cohomology, using the cohomology of the symmetric products of X^m , in a way slightly different from the one used to bound $\mathsf{dTC}(X)$ from below in [DJ]. In Section 5, we formally define the notion of the distributional sectional category of a fibration, prove its homotopy invariance, and characterize dTC_m and dcat from that perspective. In Section 6, we rigorously prove that $\mathsf{dTC}_{m+1}(X)$ and $\mathsf{dcat}(X^m)$ agree for all path-connected CW H -spaces X for all $m \geq 1$. Finally, Section 7 involves explicit computations and estimates of dTC_m for various classes of closed manifolds, thereby extending some known computations for dTC .

When the author finished writing this paper, he learned about the draft [KW], which introduces the notions of *analog* LS-category (acat) and *analog* sequential topological complexity (ATC_m) of topological spaces with a different motivation and presents some interesting results, particularly for aspherical spaces. [KW] conjectured that their invariants (defined for compactly generated Hausdorff spaces) coincide with the distributional invariants on metrizable spaces. In this paper, we take a step in that direction and prove in Section 8 that the distributional invariants give a sharp lower bound to the respective analog invariants on metrizable spaces. In particular, $\mathsf{dcat}(X) \leq \mathsf{acat}(X)$ and $\mathsf{dTC}_m(X) \leq \mathsf{ATC}_m(X)$ for all $m \geq 2$. This is especially relevant because, unlike the case of dcat and dTC_m , no non-trivial lower bounds to acat and ATC_m are known in general (even for finite CW complexes) at the time this paper was written. Using our computations from this paper, we also find the sequences $\{\mathsf{ATC}_m(X)\}_{m \geq 2}$ for some closed manifolds X .

2. PRELIMINARIES

All the topological spaces considered in this paper are path-connected metric spaces. First, we prove an easy result that will be used in the subsequent sections. For any X , $m \geq 2$, and $a_i \in (1, \infty)$ such that $a_i > a_{i+1}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m-2$, let

$$T_m(X) = \{(f_1, \dots, f_m) \in (P(X))^m \mid f_i(1) = f_{i+1}(0) \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq m-1\}$$

and $\theta_m : T_m(X) \rightarrow P(X)$ be defined as $\theta_m(f_1, \dots, f_m) = f_1 \star \dots \star f_m$, where

$$(f_1 \star \dots \star f_m)(t) = \begin{cases} f_1(a_1 t) & : 0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{a_1} \\ f_2\left(\frac{a_2(a_1 t - 1)}{a_1 - a_2}\right) & : \frac{1}{a_1} \leq t \leq \frac{1}{a_2} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ f_{m-1}\left(\frac{a_{m-1}(a_{m-2} t - 1)}{a_{m-2} - a_{m-1}}\right) & : \frac{1}{a_{m-2}} \leq t \leq \frac{1}{a_{m-1}} \\ f_m\left(\frac{1 - a_{m-1} t}{1 - a_{m-1}}\right) & : \frac{1}{a_{m-1}} \leq t \leq 1 \end{cases}$$

2.1. Lemma. *The map θ_m is continuous for each $m \geq 2$.*

Proof. Let us take some $f = (f_1, \dots, f_m) \in T_m(X)$ and any sub-basis neighborhood $U \subset P(X)$ of $\theta_m(f)$. By definition of the compact-open topology, $U = (K, W) = \{\gamma \in P(X) \mid \gamma(K) \subset W\}$ for some compact $K \subset I$ and open $W \subset X$. Define sets $K_1 = \{a_1 t \mid t \in K \cap [0, 1/a_1]\}$,

$$K_m = \left\{ \frac{1 - a_{m-1} t}{1 - a_{m-1}} \mid t \in K \cap \left[\frac{1}{a_{m-1}}, 1 \right] \right\},$$

and for all $2 \leq i \leq m-1$ the sets

$$K_i = \left\{ \frac{a_i(a_{i-1}t - 1)}{a_{i-1} - a_i} \mid t \in K \cap \left[\frac{1}{a_{i-1}}, \frac{1}{a_i} \right] \right\}.$$

It is easy to see that the sets K_i are compact for each $1 \leq i \leq m$. Therefore,

$$V = T_m(X) \cap \prod_{i=1}^m (K_i, W)$$

is open in $T_m(X)$. For any $(F_1, \dots, F_m) \in T_m(X)$, by definition, $F_i \in (K_i, W)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ if and only if $F_1 \star \dots \star F_m \in (K, W)$. Hence, V is a neighborhood of f and $\theta_m(V) \subset U$. Thus, θ_m is continuous at $f \in T_m(X)$. \square

Let us now recall the classical definitions of the Lusternik–Schnirelmann category [Ja], [CLOT] and the sequential topological complexity [Far1], [Ru] of a space.

The *Lusternik–Schnirelmann category* (LS-category) of a space X , denoted $\text{cat}(X)$, is the minimal number n such that there is a covering $\{U_i\}$ of X by $n+1$ open sets each of which is contractible in X .

For given $m \geq 2$, the m^{th} *sequential topological complexity* of a space X , denoted $\text{TC}_m(X)$, is the minimal number n such that there is a covering $\{U_i\}$ of X^m by $n+1$ open sets over each of which there is a continuous map $s_i : U_i \rightarrow P(X)$ such that for each $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in U_i \subset X^m$, $s_i(\bar{x})(t_j) = x_j$ for all $1 \leq j \leq m$.

We also recall the definition of distributional LS-category [DJ] of a space. Recall that a space X is called k -contractible to a point $x_0 \in X$ if there is a continuous map $H : X \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_k(P(X))$ satisfying $H(x) \in \mathcal{B}_k(P(x, x_0))$ for all $x \in X$.

The *distributional LS-category* of a space X , denoted $\text{dcat}(X)$, is the minimal number n such that X is $(n+1)$ -contractible to some fixed basepoint $x_0 \in X$.

2.A. Ganea–Schwarz’s approach to TC_m . Let $p : E \rightarrow B$ be a fibration. For any $n \geq 1$, the iterated fiberwise join of n -copies of E along p , denoted $*_B^n E$, is defined as the space

$$*_B^n E = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i e_i \mid e_i \in E, \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i = 1, \lambda_i \geq 0, p(e_i) = p(e_j) \right\},$$

where each element is a formal ordered linear combination of elements such that all terms where $\lambda_i = 0$ are dropped. Similarly, the iterated fiberwise join of n -copies of p , denoted $*_B^n p : *_B^n E \rightarrow B$, is defined as the fibration

$$*_B^n p \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i e_i \right) = p(e_i)$$

for any i with $\lambda_i > 0$. Now, we recall the notion of the sectional category, also known as the Schwarz genus, of a fibration.

The *sectional category* of a fibration $p : E \rightarrow B$, denoted $\text{secat}(p)$, is the minimal number n such that the fibration $*_{B}^{n+1} p : *_{B}^{n+1} E \rightarrow B$ admits a section.

Let us fix some $m \geq 2$. Given a space X , let $\pi_m^X : P(X) \rightarrow X^m$ be the fibration defined by $\pi_m^X(\phi) = (\phi(t_1), \phi(t_2), \dots, \phi(t_m))$. Let us denote the space $*_{X^m}^{n+1} P(X)$ by $\mathcal{G}_{m,n}(X)$ and the fibration $*_{X^m}^{n+1} \pi_m^X$ by $\pi_{m,n}^X$. Then the following theorem gives the Ganea–Schwarz characterization of sequential topological complexity.

2.2. Theorem ([Sch]). *For any X , $\text{TC}_m(X) \leq n$ if and only if the fibration*

$$\pi_{m,n}^X : \mathcal{G}_{m,n}(X) \rightarrow X^m$$

admits a section.

Hence, $\text{TC}_m(X) = \text{secat}(\pi_m^X)$ for any space X .

2.B. Cohomological lower bounds of TC_m . The cup-length of a space X with coefficients in a ring R (or alternatively, the cup-length of the cohomology ring $H^*(X; R)$) is the maximal length k of a non-zero cup product $\alpha_1 \smile \dots \smile \alpha_k \neq 0$ of cohomology classes α_i of positive dimensions. Let $\Delta : X \rightarrow X^m$ be the diagonal map that induces $\Delta^* : H^*(X^m; R) \rightarrow H^*(X; R)$. The elements of $\text{Ker}(\Delta^*)$ are called the m^{th} *zero-divisors* of X . Then the cup-length of the ideal of the m^{th} zero-divisors of X is a sharp lower bound of $\text{TC}_m(X)$, see [Ru], [BGRT].

We note that this lower bound can be obtained from a more general result of A. S. Schwarz [Sch].

3. SEQUENTIAL DISTRIBUTIONAL TOPOLOGICAL COMPLEXITY

Given a metric space Z , we equip $\mathcal{B}_n(Z)$ with the Lévy–Prokhorov metric [Pr] (see also [DJ, Section 3.1]) as mentioned in the introduction. We focus on the case $Z = P(X)$ when X is a path-connected metric space.

We recall that for any $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in X^m$, a k -distributed m -sequence of \bar{x} is an unordered collection of k weighted paths ϕ_j in X such that for each $1 \leq j \leq k$, $\phi_j(t_i) = x_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, where the weights are non-negative and the sum of the weights is 1. Here, we have $t_i = (i-1)/(m-1)$ for each i .

3.1. Definition. A k -distributed m -navigation algorithm on a space X is a continuous map

$$s_m : X^m \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_k(P(X))$$

that satisfies $s_m(\bar{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_k(P(\bar{x}))$ for all $\bar{x} \in X^m$, in the notations of Section 1.B.

3.2. Definition. For a given $m \geq 2$, the m^{th} *sequential distributional topological complexity*, or alternatively, the m^{th} *higher distributional topological complexity* of a space X , denoted $\text{dTC}_m(X)$, is the minimal number n such that X admits an $(n+1)$ -distributed m -navigation algorithm.

Each of the following results generalizes the respective statements for dTC proved in [DJ, Section 3].

3.3. Proposition. *For each $m \geq 2$, dTC_m is a homotopy invariant.*

Proof. Let us fix some $m \geq 2$. Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a homotopy domination with a continuous right homotopy inverse $g : Y \rightarrow X$. We only need to prove that $\text{dTC}_m(Y) \leq \text{dTC}_m(X)$. Since $fg \simeq \mathbb{1}_Y$, there exists a homotopy $h : Y \rightarrow P(Y)$ defined as $h(y) = h_y$ for each $y \in Y$, where $h_y(0) = y$ and $h_y(1) = fg(y)$. Let $\text{dTC}_m(X) = n$ and

$$s_m : X^m \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{n+1}(P(X))$$

be an $(n+1)$ -distributed m -navigation algorithm on X . Let f induce a continuous map $f_* : \mathcal{B}_{n+1}(P(X)) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{n+1}(P(Y))$ due to the functoriality of \mathcal{B}_{n+1} . Then the composition

$$f_* s_m g^m : Y^m \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{n+1}(P(Y))$$

maps each $\bar{y} \in Y^m$ to an $(n+1)$ -distributed m -sequence of the ordered m -tuple $f^m g^m(\bar{y}) = \{fg(y_1), \dots, fg(y_m)\}$. Let $s_m g^m(\bar{y}) = \sum \lambda_\phi \phi$. For each such path $\phi \in \text{supp}(s_m g^m(\bar{y}))$, we write $\tilde{\phi} = \{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_{m-1}\}$, where

$$\phi_i(s) = \phi \left(\frac{s+i-1}{m-1} \right)$$

for each $1 \leq i \leq m-1$. So, ϕ_i is a path in X from $g(y_i)$ to $g(y_{i+1})$. Using these paths and the homotopy h , let us define

$$\hat{\phi} = (h_{y_1} \cdot f\phi_1 \cdot \bar{h}_{y_2}) \star (h_{y_2} \cdot f\phi_2 \cdot \bar{h}_{y_3}) \star \dots \star (h_{y_{m-1}} \cdot f\phi_{m-1} \cdot \bar{h}_{y_m}),$$

where \cdot denotes the usual concatenation of paths and \star denotes concatenation done using the map θ_{m-1} from Lemma 2.1 with $a_i = 1/t_{i+1} = (m-1)/i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m-2$. Then the continuous map $\sigma_m : Y^m \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{n+1}(P(Y))$ defined by

$$\sigma_m(\bar{y}) = \sum_{\phi \in \text{supp}(s_m g^m(\bar{y}))} \lambda_\phi \hat{\phi}$$

is an $(n+1)$ -distributed m -navigation algorithm on Y . Therefore, we obtain the inequality $\text{dTC}_m(Y) \leq n = \text{dTC}_m(X)$. \square

The following proposition is straightforward (see [DJ, Proposition 3.10] for a proof in the special case $m = 2$).

3.4. Proposition. *For each $m \geq 2$, $\text{dTC}_m(X) \leq \text{TC}_m(X)$.*

3.5. Proposition. *For each $m \geq 2$, $\text{dcat}(X^{m-1}) \leq \text{dTC}_m(X)$.*

Proof. Let $\text{dTC}_m(X) = n$. Then there exists an $(n+1)$ -distributed m -navigation algorithm on X , say

$$s_m : X^m \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{n+1}(P(X)).$$

For a fixed basepoint $x_0 \in X$, let $J_m : X^{m-1} \hookrightarrow X^m$ be the map

$$J(x_1, \dots, x_{m-1}) = (x_1, \dots, x_{m-1}, x_0).$$

Let $\tilde{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{m-1})$ and $s_m J(\tilde{x}) = \sum \lambda_\phi \phi$. For each such $\phi \in \text{supp}(s_m J(\tilde{x}))$, we can write $\phi' = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_{m-1})$, where

$$\phi_i(s) = \phi \left(\frac{s(m-i) + i - 1}{m-1} \right)$$

for each $1 \leq i \leq m-1$. Then $\phi'(0) = \tilde{x}$ and $\phi'(1) = \tilde{x}_0 = (x_0, \dots, x_0) \in X^{m-1}$. So, the continuous map $\sigma_m : X^{m-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{n+1}(P_0(X^{m-1}))$ defined by

$$\sigma_m(\tilde{x}) = \sum_{\phi \in \text{supp}(s_m J(\tilde{x}))} \lambda_\phi \phi'$$

is an $(n+1)$ -contraction of X^{m-1} to \tilde{x}_0 . Hence, $\text{dcat}(X^{m-1}) \leq n = \text{dTC}_m(X)$. \square

3.6. Proposition. *For each $m \geq 2$, $\text{dTC}_m(X) \leq \text{dcat}(X^m)$.*

Proof. Let $\text{dcat}(X^m) = n$ and let us have an $(n+1)$ -contraction

$$H : X^m \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{n+1}(P_0(X^m))$$

of X^m to its fixed basepoint (x_1^0, \dots, x_m^0) . For some $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in X^m$, let $H(\bar{x}) = \sum \lambda_\phi \phi$. Since $\phi \in \text{supp}(H(\bar{x})) \subset P_0(X^m)$, we can consider

$$\alpha_i = \text{proj}_i \phi \in P(X),$$

so that $\alpha_i(0) = x_i$ and $\alpha_i(1) = x_i^0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. Here, $\text{proj}_i : X^m \rightarrow X$ is the projection map onto the i^{th} coordinate. Let us fix a path $\gamma_i \in P(X)$ from x_i^0 and x_{i+1}^0 for each $1 \leq i \leq m-1$. Define

$$\hat{\phi} = (\alpha_1 \cdot \gamma_1 \cdot \bar{\alpha}_2) \star (\alpha_2 \cdot \gamma_2 \cdot \bar{\alpha}_3) \star \dots \star (\alpha_{m-1} \cdot \gamma_{m-1} \cdot \bar{\alpha}_m),$$

where \star is the concatenation via the map θ_{m-1} with $a_i = 1/t_{i+1} = (m-1)/i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m-2$. Then the continuous map $\sigma_m : X^m \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{n+1}(P(X))$ defined by

$$\sigma_m(\bar{x}) = \sum_{\phi \in \text{supp}(H(\bar{x}))} \lambda_\phi \hat{\phi}$$

is an $(n+1)$ -distributed m -navigation algorithm on X . Therefore, we obtain $\text{dTC}_m(X) \leq n = \text{dcat}(X^m)$. \square

The following statement justifies that $\{\text{dTC}_m(X)\}_{m \geq 2}$ is a non-decreasing sequence for any fixed space X .

3.7. Proposition. *For each $m \geq 2$, $\text{dTC}_m(X) \leq \text{dTC}_{m+1}(X)$.*

Proof. The inequality $\text{dTC}_m(X) \leq \text{dcat}(X^m) \leq \text{dTC}_{m+1}(X)$ follows directly from Propositions 3.5 and 3.6. \square

We note that Proposition 3.7 can also be proven directly.

3.8. Proposition. *For any $m \geq 2$, $\max\{\text{dTC}_m(X), \text{dTC}_m(Y)\} \leq \text{dTC}_m(X \times Y)$ for any given spaces X and Y .*

Proof. Let us fix some $b \in Y$ and define $J^m : X^m \rightarrow (X \times Y)^m$ by

$$J^m(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m) = ((x_1, b), (x_2, b), \dots, (x_m, b)).$$

Let us denote $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$. Let $\text{dTC}_m(X \times Y) = n$ with an $(n+1)$ -distributed m -navigation algorithm

$$s_m : (X \times Y)^m \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{n+1}(P(X \times Y))$$

on $X \times Y$. Let $s_m J^m(\bar{x}) = \sum \lambda_\phi \phi$. If $\gamma : P(X \times Y) \rightarrow P(X)$ is defined as

$$\gamma(f) = \text{proj}_1 f,$$

then it induces a map $\gamma^* : \mathcal{B}_{n+1}(P(X \times Y)) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{n+1}(P(X))$ by functoriality of \mathcal{B}_{n+1} . Hence, $\sigma_m = \gamma^* s_m J^m : X^m \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{n+1}(P(X))$ defined as

$$\sigma_m(\bar{x}) = \sum_{\phi \in \text{supp}(s_m J^m(\bar{x}))} \lambda_\phi \text{proj}_1 \phi$$

is an $(n+1)$ -distributed m -navigation algorithm on X . This gives us the inequality $\text{dTC}_m(X) \leq n = \text{dTC}_m(X \times Y)$. By similar arguments, the other inequality $\text{dTC}_m(Y) \leq n = \text{dTC}_m(X \times Y)$ follows. \square

3.9. Proposition. *For any $m \geq 2$ and $n \geq 1$, $\text{dTC}_m(\mathbb{R}P^n) \leq 2^{m-1} - 1$.*

Proof. Fix some $n \geq 1$ and let $X = \mathbb{R}P^n$. Recall that $\text{dTC}(X) = \text{dTC}_2(X) = 1$ due to [DJ, Example 3.13] with a 2-distributed 2-navigation algorithm

$$H : X \times X \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_2(P(X)).$$

Let us fix some $m \geq 3$. Given $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in X^m$, for each $1 \leq i \leq m-1$, we let

$$H(x_i, x_{i+1}) = b_i^1 \phi_i^1 + b_i^2 \phi_i^2,$$

where $b_i^1 + b_i^2 = 1$, $\phi_i^1(0) = x_i = \phi_i^2(0)$, and $\phi_i^1(1) = x_{i+1} = \phi_i^2(1)$. Consider

$$\phi_1^{k_1} \star \phi_2^{k_2} \star \dots \star \phi_{m-1}^{k_{m-1}} \in P(X),$$

where $k_i \in L = \{1, 2\}$ for each $1 \leq i \leq m-1$, and \star denotes concatenation done via the map θ_{m-1} with $a_j = 1/t_{j+1} = (m-1)/j$ for all $1 \leq j \leq m-2$. Then the continuous map $s_m : X^m \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{2^{m-1}}(P(X))$ defined by

$$s_m(\bar{x}) = \sum_{k_1 \in L} \sum_{k_2 \in L} \dots \sum_{k_{m-1} \in L} b_1^{k_1} b_2^{k_2} \dots b_{m-1}^{k_{m-1}} \left(\phi_1^{k_1} \star \phi_2^{k_2} \star \dots \star \phi_{m-1}^{k_{m-1}} \right)$$

is an $(2^{m-1} - 1)$ -distributed m -navigation algorithm on X . Hence, we obtain the inequality $\text{dTC}_m(\mathbb{R}P^n) \leq 2^{m-1} - 1$. \square

The same technique gives the following crude upper bound for any space X .

3.10. Proposition. *For any $m \geq 2$, $\text{dTC}_m(X) \leq (\text{dTC}(X) + 1)^{m-1} - 1$.*

For $m = 2$ and $X = \mathbb{R}P^n$, this upper bound is sharp in view of [DJ, Example 3.13] for each $n \geq 1$. Using Proposition 3.4, we obtain

$$\text{dTC}_m(\mathbb{R}P^n) \leq \text{TC}_m(\mathbb{R}P^n) \leq \text{cat}((\mathbb{R}P^n)^m) = mn.$$

For a fixed $m \geq 2$, this upper bound is linear in n . So, our bound from Proposition 3.9, which is independent of n , is significantly better when n is large. However, using the *analog invariants*, we will improve this upper bound in Section 8.A.

3.11. Remark. Let us fix some $m \geq 3$. Due to Proposition 3.9, we obtain for all $n \geq (2^{m-1} - 1)/(m - 2)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{TC}_m(\mathbb{R}P^n) - \mathrm{dTC}_m(\mathbb{R}P^n) &\geq \mathrm{cat}((\mathbb{R}P^n)^{m-1}) - \mathrm{dTC}_m(\mathbb{R}P^n) \\ &\geq n(m-1) - (2^{m-1} - 1) \geq n. \end{aligned}$$

For $m = 2$ and any $n \geq 1$, we get

$$\mathrm{TC}(\mathbb{R}P^{n+1}) - \mathrm{dTC}(\mathbb{R}P^{n+1}) \geq \mathrm{cat}(\mathbb{R}P^{n+1}) - \mathrm{dTC}(\mathbb{R}P^{n+1}) \geq n.$$

Hence, the gap between $\mathrm{TC}_m(X)$ and $\mathrm{dTC}_m(X)$ can be arbitrarily large for each $m \geq 2$. So, in particular, dTC_m is a different notion than TC_m for each $m \geq 2$ and the inequality in Proposition 3.4 can be strict for all $m \geq 2$.

Since dTC_m is a homotopy invariant, for a discrete group Γ , we can define $\mathrm{dTC}_m(\Gamma) := \mathrm{dTC}_m(B\Gamma)$, where $B\Gamma = K(\Gamma, 1)$ is a classifying space of the universal cover of spaces having Γ as their fundamental group. In view of Proposition 3.9, we get $\mathrm{dTC}_m(\mathbb{Z}_2) = \mathrm{dTC}_m(\mathbb{R}P^\infty) \leq 2^{m-1} - 1$. This upper bound will also be improved using the analog invariants in Section 8.A.

3.12. Remark. We note that an analog of [FO, Theorem 2.1] does not hold in the case of dTC_m for any $m \geq 2$, at least for groups with torsion. This is because for $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}_2$, since the subgroup $K \subset \mathbb{Z}_2^m$ (as defined in [FO, Theorem 2.1]) is finite, $\mathrm{cd}(K)$ is infinite, where cd denotes the cohomological dimension [Br]. But on the other hand, $\mathrm{dTC}_m(\mathbb{Z}_2)$ cannot exceed $2^{m-1} - 1$.

4. COHOMOLOGICAL LOWER BOUNDS

4.A. Symmetric products. For a space X and $k \geq 1$, its k^{th} symmetric product $SP^k(X)$ is defined as the orbit space of the action of the symmetric group S_k on the product space X^k by permutation of coordinates. In this section, we regard each $[x_1, \dots, x_k] \in SP^k(X)$ as a formal sum $\sum n_i x_i$, where $n_i \geq 1$ and $\sum n_i = k$, subject to the equivalence $n_1 x + n_2 x = (n_1 + n_2)x$. So, n_i denotes the number of times x_i appears in the unordered k -tuple $[x_1, \dots, x_k]$. Define $\delta_k : X \rightarrow SP^k(X)$ as the diagonal inclusion $\delta_k(x) = [x, x, \dots, x] = kx$.

The following result in singular cohomology will be very useful in Section 7.

4.1. Proposition ([DJ, Proposition 4.3]). *For a finite simplicial complex X and any $k \geq 1$, the induced homomorphism $\delta_k^* : H^*(SP^k(X); \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow H^*(X; \mathbb{Q})$ is surjective.*

In this section, we regard X as the subspace of $SP^k(X)$ under the diagonal inclusion δ_k and use the term *inclusion* to refer to the map δ_k .

4.B. Lower bound for dTC_m .

4.2. Lemma. *For any $k \geq 1$, $SP^k(P(X))$ deforms to $SP^k(X)$.*

Proof. Let $\mathrm{ev} : P(X) \rightarrow X$ be defined as the evaluation fibration $\mathrm{ev} : \phi \mapsto \phi(0)$. Let $f = SP^k(\mathrm{ev}) : SP^k(P(X)) \rightarrow SP^k(X)$ be induced by ev due to functoriality of the k^{th} symmetric product SP^k . Define $g : SP^k(X) \rightarrow SP^k(P(X))$ as

$$g[a_1, \dots, a_k] = [c_{a_1}, \dots, c_{a_k}],$$

where c_{a_i} denotes the constant path at $a_i \in X$. Clearly, $fg = \mathbb{1}_{SP^k(X)}$. Finally, define a map $h : SP^k(P(X)) \times I \rightarrow SP^k(X)$ such that

$$h([\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k], t)(s) = [\phi_1(s(1-t)), \dots, \phi_k(s(1-t))]$$

for all $s \in [0, 1]$. Then h is a homotopy between $\mathbb{1}_{SP^k(P(X))}$ and gf . \square

For fixed $m \geq 2$ and space X , the fibration $\pi_m : P(X) \rightarrow X^m$ defined in Section 2.A induces by functoriality $\zeta_n = SP^{n!}(\pi_m) : SP^{n!}(P(X)) \rightarrow SP^{n!}(X^m)$ for each $n \geq 1$. Let $\partial_n : X^m \rightarrow SP^{n!}(X^m)$ be the diagonal inclusion in the above sense. Consider the following pullback diagram.

$$(4.a) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{D}_{n,m} & \xrightarrow{a} & SP^{n!}(P(X)) \\ \sigma_n \downarrow & & \zeta_n \downarrow \\ X^m & \xrightarrow{\partial_n} & SP^{n!}(X^m) \end{array}$$

Here, for $t_j = (j-1)/(m-1)$, we have

$$\mathcal{D}_{n,m} = \{((x_1, \dots, x_m), [\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n]) \mid \phi_i(t_j) = x_j \text{ for all } 1 \leq j \leq m\},$$

and σ_n is the canonical projection, the pullback of ζ_n along ∂_n .

4.3. Lemma. *If $dTC_m(X) < n$, then there exist sets A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n that cover X^m and over each of which σ_n has a section.*

Proof. Since $dTC_m(X) < n$, there exists an n -distributed m -navigation algorithm

$$s_m : X^m \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_n(P(X))$$

on X^m . For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, define

$$A_i = \{\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in X^m \mid |\text{supp}(s_m(\bar{x}))| = i\}.$$

We define a continuous mapping $H_i : A_i \rightarrow SP^{n!}(P(X))$ as

$$H_i(\bar{x}) = \sum_{\phi \in \text{supp}(s_m(\bar{x}))} \frac{n!}{i} \phi.$$

For each $\bar{x} \in X^m$, see that $\zeta_n H_i(\bar{x}) = n! \bar{x} \in SP^{n!}(X^m)$. Hence, $\zeta_n H_i = \partial_n$. So, the following diagram commutes.

$$(4.b) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} A_i & \xrightarrow{H_i} & SP^{n!}(P(X)) \\ \tau_i \swarrow & & \downarrow \sigma_n \\ \mathcal{D}_{n,m} & \xrightarrow{a} & SP^{n!}(P(X)) \\ \downarrow \sigma_n & & \downarrow \zeta_n \\ A_i & \xrightarrow{\partial_n} & SP^{n!}(X^m) \end{array}$$

Here, $\tau_i : A_i \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{n,m}$ exists due to the universal property of pullback and we have $\sigma_n \tau_i = \mathbb{1}_{A_i}$. So, we have found a section of σ_n over each A_i . \square

For a fixed $m \geq 2$, let $\Delta : X \rightarrow X^m$ be the diagonal map and let the map $\Delta_n : SP^{n!}(X) \rightarrow SP^{n!}(X^m)$ be induced from Δ by functoriality of $SP^{n!}$. We use an idea from [Far1, Theorem 7] and [Sh, Section 2] to prove the following result in Alexander–Spanier cohomology [Sp].

4.4. Theorem. *Suppose that $\alpha_i^* \in H^{k_i}(SP^{n!}(X^m); R)$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, for some ring R and $k_i \geq 1$, are cohomology classes such that $\Delta_n^*(\alpha_i^*) = 0$. Let α_i be their images under the induced homomorphism ∂_n^* such that $\alpha_1 \smile \alpha_2 \smile \cdots \smile \alpha_n \neq 0$. Then,*

$$d\mathrm{TC}_m(X) \geq n.$$

Proof. We have the following commutative diagram.

$$(4.c) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} H^*(SP^{n!}(P(X)); R) & & \\ \downarrow g^* & \swarrow \zeta_n^* & \\ H^*(SP^{n!}(X); R) & \xleftarrow{\Delta_n^*} & H^*(SP^{n!}(X^m); R) \end{array}$$

Due to Lemma 4.2, g^* is an isomorphism. So, in particular, $\mathrm{Ker}(\Delta_n^*) \subset \mathrm{Ker}(\zeta_n^*)$. Suppose that $d\mathrm{TC}_m(X) < n$. Then from Lemma 4.3, there exists a cover $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of X^m such that σ_n has a section τ_i over each A_i , i.e., $\sigma_n \tau_i = \mathbb{1}_{A_i}$. Due to this and Diagram 4.a, the following diagram commutes for each $1 \leq i \leq n$.

$$(4.d) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} H^{k_i}(A_i; R) & \xrightleftharpoons[\tau_i^*]{\sigma_n^*} & H^{k_i}(\mathcal{D}_{n,m}; R) \\ \uparrow \partial_n^* & & \uparrow a^* \\ H^{k_i}(SP^{n!}(X^m); R) & \xrightarrow{\zeta_n^*} & H^{k_i}(SP^{n!}(P(X)); R) \end{array}$$

Clearly, $\tau_i^* \sigma_n^* = \mathbb{1}_{H^{k_i}(A_i; R)}$. Therefore, σ_n^* is injective. Since $\Delta_n^*(\alpha_i^*) = 0$, we get $\zeta_n^*(\alpha_i^*) = 0$, and thus,

$$a^*(\zeta_n^*(\alpha_i^*)) = \sigma_n^*(\partial_n^*(\alpha_i^*)) = 0.$$

Now, because σ_n^* is injective, $\partial_n^*(\alpha_i^*) = 0$. From the long exact sequence of the pair $(SP^{n!}(X^m), A_i)$ in Alexander–Spanier cohomology,

$$\cdots \rightarrow H^{k_i}(SP^{n!}(X^m), A_i; R) \xrightarrow{j_i^*} H^{k_i}(SP^{n!}(X^m); R) \xrightarrow{\partial_n^*} H^{k_i}(A_i; R) \rightarrow \cdots,$$

there exists $\overline{\alpha}_i^* \in H^{k_i}(SP^{n!}(X^m), A_i; R)$ such that $j_i^*(\overline{\alpha}_i^*) = \alpha_i^*$. Further, let $\partial_n^*(\overline{\alpha}_i^*) = \overline{\alpha}_i \in H^{k_i}(X^m, A_i; R)$. For j and j' denoting the sums of maps j_i and j'_i , respectively, and $k = \sum k_i$, we get the following commutative diagram.

$$(4.e) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} H^k(X^m; R) & \xleftarrow{(j')^*} & H^k(X^m, \bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i; R) \\ \uparrow \partial_n^* & & \uparrow \partial_n^* \\ H^k(SP^{n!}(X^m); R) & \xleftarrow{j^*} & H^k(SP^{n!}(X^m), \bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i; R) \end{array}$$

The cup product $\overline{\alpha}_1^* \smile \cdots \smile \overline{\alpha}_n^*$ in the bottom-right goes to the non-zero cup product $\alpha_1 \smile \cdots \smile \alpha_n \neq 0$ in the top-left. But in the process, it factors through $\overline{\alpha}_1 \smile \cdots \smile \overline{\alpha}_n \in H^k(X^m, X^m; R) = 0$. This is a contradiction. Hence, we must have $d\mathrm{TC}_m(X) \geq n$. \square

We note that the reason we work in Alexander–Spanier cohomology in Theorem 4.4 is that the sets A_i defined in Lemma 4.3 need not be open or closed in $SP^{n!}(X^m)$. So, $(SP^{n!}(X^m), A_i)$ may not be a good pair in the sense of [Ha].

4.5. **Remark.** If X is a locally finite CW complex, then Theorem 4.4 for $m = 2$ is recovered from [DJ, Theorem 4.12] due to the fact that the Alexander–Spanier cohomology groups coincide with the singular cohomology groups for locally finite CW complexes [Sp], and the following commutative diagram.

$$(4.f) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} H^*(SP^{n!}(X^2); R) & \xrightarrow{\Delta_n^*} & H^*(SP^{n!}(X); R) \\ \partial_n^* \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H^*(X^2; R) & \xrightarrow{\Delta^*} & H^*(X; R) \end{array}$$

Hence, $\Delta_n^*(\alpha_i^*) = 0$ implies that $\Delta^*(\alpha_i) = 0$, i.e., α_i is a 2^{nd} zero-divisor.

5. DISTRIBUTIONAL SECTIONAL CATEGORY

Let $p : E \rightarrow B$ be a Hurewicz fibration. For each $n \geq 1$, define a space

$$E_n(p) = \bigcup_{x \in B} \mathcal{B}_n(p^{-1}(x)) = \{\mu \in \mathcal{B}_n(E) \mid \text{supp}(\mu) \subset p^{-1}(x), x \in B\}$$

and a continuous map $\mathcal{B}_n(p) : E_n(p) \rightarrow B$ such that

$$\mathcal{B}_n(p)(\mu) = x \quad \text{whenever} \quad \mu \in \mathcal{B}_n(p^{-1}(x)).$$

5.1. **Proposition** ([DJ, Proposition 5.1]). *The mapping $\mathcal{B}_n(p) : E_n(p) \rightarrow B$ is a Hurewicz fibration.*

5.2. **Definition.** Given a fibration $p : E \rightarrow B$, its *distributional Schwarz genus*, or alternatively, its *distributional sectional category*, denoted $\text{dsecat}(p)$, is the minimal number n such that $\mathcal{B}_{n+1}(p) : E_{n+1}(p) \rightarrow B$ admits a section.

5.3. **Proposition.** *dsecat is a homotopy invariant.*

Proof. Given fibrations $p : E \rightarrow B$ and $q : Z \rightarrow C$ and the following commutative diagram where the horizontal maps are homotopy equivalences,

$$(5.a) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} E & \xrightleftharpoons{f} & Z \\ p \downarrow & & \downarrow q \\ B & \xrightleftharpoons{g} & C \end{array}$$

we need to show that $\text{dsecat}(p) = \text{dsecat}(q)$. For any $k \geq 1$, we first obtain fibrations $\mathcal{B}_k(p) : E_k(p) \rightarrow B$ and $\mathcal{B}_k(q) : Z_k(q) \rightarrow C$ by Proposition 5.1. The functoriality of \mathcal{B}_k gives a map $f_* : \mathcal{B}_k(E) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_k(Z)$ such that

$$f_* \left(\sum \lambda_r r \right) = \sum \lambda_r f(r).$$

Let $\mu = \sum \lambda_r r \in \mathcal{B}_k(p^{-1}(x)) \subset E_k(p)$ for some $x \in B$. So, $\text{supp}(\mu) \subset p^{-1}(x)$, which means $p(r) = x$ whenever $\lambda_r > 0$. Note that $q(f(r)) = g(p(r)) = g(x)$ whenever

$\lambda_r > 0$. So, $\text{supp}(f_*(\mu)) \subset q^{-1}(g(x))$ and thus, $f_*(\mu) \in \mathcal{B}_k(q^{-1}(g(x))) \subset Z_k(q)$. Let F denote the restriction of f_* to $E_k(p)$. Thus, $F : E_k(p) \rightarrow Z_k(q)$ is defined. Similarly, $F' : Z_k(q) \rightarrow E_k(p)$ is obtained as the restriction of f'_* to $Z_k(q)$. If $\mu \in \mathcal{B}_k(p^{-1}(x)) \subset E_k(p)$ for some $x \in B$, then

$$(\mathcal{B}_k(q) F)(\mu) = g(x) = (g \mathcal{B}_k(p))(\mu).$$

Similarly, if $\vartheta \in \mathcal{B}_k(q^{-1}(y)) \subset Z_k(q)$ for some $y \in C$, then

$$(\mathcal{B}_k(p) F')(\vartheta) = g'(y) = (g' \mathcal{B}_k(q))(\vartheta).$$

So, we get the following commutative diagram.

$$(5.b) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} E_k(p) & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{F} \\ \xleftarrow{F'} \end{array} & Z_k(q) \\ \mathcal{B}_k(p) \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathcal{B}_k(q) \\ B & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{g} \\ \xleftarrow{g'} \end{array} & C \end{array}$$

Let $\text{dsecat}(p) = n - 1$. Then by definition, there exists a section $s : B \rightarrow E_n(p)$ of $\mathcal{B}_n(p)$. Consider $Fsg' : C \rightarrow Z_n(q)$. See that

$$\mathcal{B}_n(q)Fsg' = g \mathcal{B}_n(p)sg' = gg' \simeq \mathbb{1}_C.$$

So, Fsg' is a homotopy section of $\mathcal{B}_n(q)$. Since $\mathcal{B}_n(q)$ is a fibration, the homotopy section Fsg' gives a section of $\mathcal{B}_n(q)$. So, $\text{dsecat}(q) \leq n - 1 = \text{dsecat}(p)$. Similarly, if $\text{dsecat}(q) = m - 1$ and $s' : C \rightarrow Z_m(q)$ is a section of $\mathcal{B}_m(q)$, then $F's'g$ helps obtain a section of $\mathcal{B}_m(p)$. This gives $\text{dsecat}(p) \leq m - 1 = \text{dsecat}(q)$. \square

Let $h : A \rightarrow B$ be any continuous map. It has a fibrational substitute, say $p_h : E \rightarrow B$. Since any two fibrational substitutes of a given continuous map are fiberwise homotopy equivalent, using Proposition 5.3, we can define

$$\text{dsecat}(h) := \text{dsecat}(p_h).$$

5.4. Remark. We can also define the distributional sectional category of group homomorphisms between discrete groups. Let $\phi : \Gamma \rightarrow \Lambda$ be such a homomorphism. This gives a continuous map $B\phi : B\Gamma \rightarrow B\Lambda$ that induces ϕ at the level of fundamental groups. We define $\text{dsecat}(\phi) := \text{dsecat}(B\phi)$.

5.A. For dTC_m . For $m \geq 2$, upon taking $p = \pi_m^X, E = P(X)$, and $B = X^m$, and observing that an $(n + 1)$ -distributed m -navigation algorithm on X produces a section of the fibration $\mathcal{B}_{n+1}(\pi_m^X)$ and vice-versa, we get the following Ganea-Schwarz-type characterization of dTC_m .

5.5. Proposition. For $m \geq 2$, $\text{dTC}_m(X) \leq n$ if and only if the fibration

$$\mathcal{B}_{n+1}(\pi_m^X) : P(X)_{n+1}(\pi_m^X) \rightarrow X^m$$

admits a section.

Therefore, for any space X and $m \geq 2$, we conclude that

$$\text{dTC}_m(X) = \text{dsecat}(\pi_m^X).$$

5.6. Remark. This realization provides an alternate proof of the homotopy invariance of dTC_m (see Proposition 3.3) in light of Proposition 5.3.

If $\Delta_m^X : X \rightarrow X^m$ denotes the diagonal map, then since π_m^X is the fibrational substitute of Δ_m^X , we have $\text{dTC}_m(X) = \text{dsecat}(\Delta_m^X)$.

5.B. **For dcat.** A Ganea–Schwarz-type characterization of $\text{dcat}(X)$ was provided in [DJ, Proposition 5.3]. For any given $m \geq 1$, we now obtain a slightly different characterization of $\text{dcat}(X^m)$ as follows. Let $\xi_m^X : P(X) \rightarrow X^m$ be the fibration

$$\xi_m^X(\phi) = \left(\phi\left(\frac{1}{m}\right), \phi\left(\frac{2}{m}\right), \dots, \phi\left(\frac{m-1}{m}\right), \phi(1) \right).$$

From this, we can form the fibration $\mathcal{B}_{n+1}(\xi_m^X) : P(X)_{n+1}(\xi_m^X) \rightarrow X^m$. For some fixed basepoint $x_0 \in X$, let

$$\mathcal{P}_{n+1}(X) = \left\{ \sum \lambda_\psi \psi \in \mathcal{B}_{n+1}(P(X)) \mid \psi(0) = x_0 \text{ when } \lambda_\psi > 0 \right\}.$$

If $\mathcal{A}_{n+1}(X) = P(X)_{n+1}(\xi_m^X) \cap \mathcal{P}_{n+1}(X)$, then we let the map $\mathcal{C}_{n+1}(\xi_m^X)$ denote the restriction of the fibration $\mathcal{B}_{n+1}(\xi_m^X)$ to the subspace $\mathcal{A}_{n+1}(X)$. The following statement generalizes [DJ, Proposition 5.3].

5.7. Proposition. *For $m \geq 1$, $\text{dcat}(X^m) \leq n$ if and only if the map*

$$\mathcal{C}_{n+1}(\xi_m^X) : \mathcal{A}_{n+1}(X) \rightarrow X^m$$

admits a section.

Proof. Let $\text{dcat}(X^m) \leq n$. Then for a fixed basepoint $\bar{x}_0 = (x_1^0, \dots, x_m^0) \in X^m$, there exists an $(n+1)$ -contraction

$$H : X^m \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{n+1}(P_0(X^m))$$

of X^m to \bar{x}_0 . For $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in X^m$, let $H(\bar{x}) = \sum \lambda_\phi \phi$. Let

$$\beta_i = \text{proj}_i \bar{\phi} \in P(X),$$

where $\bar{\phi}(t) = \phi(1-t)$. Let $\gamma_i \in P(X)$ be a path from x_i^0 to x_{i+1}^0 for each i . Define

$$\widehat{\phi} = \beta_1 \star (\bar{\beta}_1 \cdot \gamma_1 \cdot \beta_2) \star (\bar{\beta}_2 \cdot \gamma_2 \cdot \beta_3) \star \dots \star (\bar{\beta}_{m-1} \cdot \gamma_{m-1} \cdot \beta_m),$$

where \star is the concatenation via the map θ_m in Lemma 2.1 with $a_i = i/m$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m-1$. Note that $\widehat{\phi}(0) = x_1^0$, which we shall regard as the basepoint of X . Finally, define $K : X^m \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{n+1}(P(X))$ as

$$K(\bar{x}) = \sum_{\phi \in \text{supp}(H(\bar{x}))} \lambda_\phi \widehat{\phi}.$$

By definition, the range of K is contained in $\mathcal{A}_{n+1}(X)$. Clearly, we have that $\mathcal{C}_{n+1}(\xi_m^X) K = \mathbb{1}_{X^m}$. Therefore, K is a section of $\mathcal{C}_{n+1}(\xi_m^X)$. For the converse, let

$$\psi : X^m \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{n+1}(X)$$

be a section of $\mathcal{C}_{n+1}(\xi_m^X)$, with a chosen basepoint $x_0 \in X$. Let $\psi(\bar{x}) = \sum \lambda_\phi \phi$. For each such path $\phi \in \text{supp}(\psi(\bar{x}))$, we can define $\phi' = (\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_m)$, where

$$\phi_i(s) = \phi\left(\frac{i(1-s)}{m}\right)$$

for each $1 \leq i \leq m$. Then $\phi'(0) = \bar{x}$ and $\phi'(1) = (x_0, \dots, x_0) \in X^m$. So, the continuous map $\sigma_m : X^m \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{n+1}(P_0(X^m))$ defined by

$$\sigma_m(\bar{x}) = \sum_{\phi \in \text{supp}(\psi(\bar{x}))} \lambda_\phi \phi'$$

is an $(n+1)$ -contraction of X^m to (x_0, \dots, x_0) . Hence, $\text{dcat}(X^m) \leq n$. \square

Therefore, for any space X and $m \geq 1$, it follows that

$$\text{dcat}(X^m) = \text{dsecat}(\xi_m^X).$$

For a fixed $x_0 \in X$, let $P_0(X)$ denote the space of paths that end at x_0 , and let $p_0^X : P_0(X) \rightarrow X$ be the fibration that evaluates each path at $t = 0$. Then, in particular for $m = 1$, we have $\text{dcat}(X) = \text{dsecat}(\xi_1^X) = \text{dsecat}(p_0^X)$.

5.8. Remark. This gives an alternate proof of the homotopy invariance of dcat obtained in [DJ, Proposition 3.2].

Also, for the inclusion map $\iota_X : x_0 \hookrightarrow X$, we have $\text{dcat}(X) = \text{dsecat}(\iota_X)$. This is in analogy with the fact that $\text{cat}(X) = \text{secat}(\iota_X)$, see [Ja], [CLOT].

5.C. A lower bound for dsecat. Let $p : E \rightarrow B$ be a continuous map and for a fixed $n \geq 1$, let $p_n : SP^{n!}(E) \rightarrow SP^{n!}(B)$ be induced by the functor $SP^{n!}$. As in Section 4.A, we let $\delta_n : B \rightarrow SP^{n!}(B)$ be the diagonal inclusion. In light of Schwarz's cohomological lower bound [Sch] for $\text{secat}(p)$, and motivated by the analogy between the definitions of $\text{dsecat}(p)$ and $\text{secat}(p)$, we propose the following generalization of Theorem 4.4 and [DJ, Theorem 4.7].

5.9. Conjecture. Suppose $\alpha_i^* \in H^{k_i}(SP^{n!}(B); R)$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, for some ring R and $k_i \geq 1$, are cohomology classes such that $p_n^*(\alpha_i^*) = 0$. If α_i are their images under the induced homomorphism δ_n^* such that $\alpha_1 \smile \dots \smile \alpha_n \neq 0$, then $\text{dsecat}(p) \geq n$.

6. FOR H -SPACES

6.1. Definition. A CW complex X is called a H -space if there exists a basepoint $e \in X$, called an *identity* of X , and a continuous map $\nu : X \times X \rightarrow X$, called a *product* on X , such that $\nu(x, e) = x = \nu(e, x)$ for all $x \in X$.

For classical sequential topological complexity and LS-category, when a CW complex X is a H -space, then $\text{TC}_{m+1}(X) = \text{cat}(X^m)$ holds for all $m \geq 1$ [LS]. For dTC and dcat , when X is a topological group, then $\text{dTC}(X) = \text{dcat}(X)$ [DJ].

Here, using ideas from [LS, Theorem 1], we obtain the following generalization.

6.2. Theorem. If X is a H -space, then $\text{dTC}_{m+1}(X) = \text{dcat}(X^m)$ for all $m \geq 1$.

Proof. Since X is a H -space, we have an identity element $e \in X$ and a product $\nu : X \times X \rightarrow X$ as above. Following the proof of [LS, Theorem 1], we obtain a continuous map $D : X \times X \rightarrow X$ such that $\text{proj}_1 \bullet D \simeq \text{proj}_2$, where \bullet is the product in $[X \times X, X]$ induced by ν and $\text{proj}_i : X \times X \rightarrow X$ are the projections onto the i^{th} coordinate. We define a continuous map $f_m : X^{m+1} \rightarrow X^m$ as

$$f_m(x, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m) = (D(x, x_1), D(x, x_2), \dots, D(x, x_m)).$$

Let $\text{dcat}(X^m) = n$. In the notations of Section 5.B, consider the following pullback.

$$(6.a) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} Q_m & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{A}_{n+1}(X) \\ q_m \downarrow & & \downarrow c_{n+1}(\xi_m^X) \\ X^{m+1} & \xrightarrow{f_m} & X^m \end{array}$$

Here, we regard $e \in X$ as the basepoint of X to form $\mathcal{P}_{n+1}(X)$, and thus $\mathcal{A}_{n+1}(X)$. By definition, the subset $Q_m \subset X^{m+1} \times \mathcal{A}_{n+1}(X)$ is

$$Q_m = \left\{ \left((x, x_1, \dots, x_m), \sum \lambda_\phi \phi \right) \mid \phi(0) = e, \phi\left(\frac{i}{m}\right) = D(x, x_i) \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq m \right\},$$

and q_m is the projection onto X^{m+1} . For each $y \in X$ and $\psi \in P(X)$, we define a path $\nu(y, \psi) \in P(X)$ such that $\nu(y, \psi)(t) = \nu(y, \psi(t))$ for all $t \in I$. Let us define a continuous mapping $\Theta_m : Q_m \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{n+1}(P(X))$ as

$$\Theta_m \left((x, x_1, \dots, x_m), \sum \lambda_\phi \phi \right) = \sum \lambda_\phi \nu(x, \phi).$$

Thus, applying the fibration $\mathcal{B}_{n+1}(\pi_{m+1})$ from Section 5.A, we get the following:

$$\mathcal{B}_{n+1}(\pi_{m+1}) \Theta_m \left((x, x_1, \dots, x_m), \sum \lambda_\phi \phi \right) = (x, \nu(x, D(x, x_1)), \dots, \nu(x, D(x, x_m))).$$

Now, as in [LS, Page 5], let us define maps $p_i : X^{m+1} \rightarrow X$ as $p_i(a_1, \dots, a_{m+1}) = a_i$, and $p_{1,i} : X^{m+1} \rightarrow X^2$ as $p_{1,i}(a_1, \dots, a_{m+1}) = (a_1, a_{i+1})$. Then

$$\nu(x, D(x, x_i)) = (\text{proj}_1 \bullet D) p_{1,i}(x, x_1, \dots, x_m)$$

and $\text{proj}_2 p_{1,i} = p_{i+1}$. Since $\text{proj}_1 \bullet D \simeq \text{proj}_2$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_{n+1}(\pi_{m+1}) \Theta_m &= (p_1, (\text{proj}_1 \bullet D) p_{1,1}, \dots, (\text{proj}_1 \bullet D) p_{1,m}) q_m \\ &\simeq (p_1, \text{proj}_2 p_{1,1}, \dots, \text{proj}_2 p_{1,m}) q_m = (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{m+1}) q_m = q_m. \end{aligned}$$

So, $\mathcal{B}_{n+1}(\pi_{m+1}) \Theta_m \simeq q_m$. Since $\text{dcat}(X^m) = n$, there exists a section of $\mathcal{C}_{n+1}(\xi_m^X)$, say $H : X^m \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{n+1}(X)$, due to Proposition 5.7. Then we get the following commutative diagram.

$$(6.b) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & & & & Hf_m \\ & & & & \curvearrowright \\ X^{m+1} & & & & \mathcal{A}_{n+1}(X) \\ & \searrow s & & & \downarrow c_{n+1}(\xi_m^X) \\ & & Q_m & \longrightarrow & \\ & & \downarrow q_m & & \\ & & X^{m+1} & \xrightarrow{f_m} & X^m \\ & \searrow \mathbb{1}_{X^{m+1}} & & & \end{array}$$

Here, $s : X^{m+1} \rightarrow Q_m$ exists due to the universal property of the pullback and we have $\mathbb{1}_{X^{m+1}} = q_m s$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{1}_{X^{m+1}} = q_m s \simeq (\mathcal{B}_{n+1}(\pi_{m+1}) \Theta_m) s = \mathcal{B}_{n+1}(\pi_{m+1}) (\Theta_m s).$$

Hence, $\Theta_m s$ is a homotopy section of $\mathcal{B}_{n+1}(\pi_{m+1})$. But since $\mathcal{B}_{n+1}(\pi_{m+1})$ is a fibration because of Proposition 5.1, $\Theta_m s$ gives a section of $\mathcal{B}_{n+1}(\pi_{m+1})$. So, by Proposition 5.5, we get the inequality $\text{dTC}_{m+1}(X) \leq n = \text{dcat}(X^m)$. The reverse inequality $\text{dcat}(X^m) \leq \text{dTC}_{m+1}(X)$ follows from Proposition 3.5. \square

6.3. **Remark.** In view of Proposition 6.2, the lower bound of dTC_m in Proposition 3.5 is sharp for all $m \geq 2$.

6.4. **Corollary.** *If G is a topological group, in particular a Lie group, then for all $m \geq 1$, we have $\text{dTC}_{m+1}(G) = \text{dcat}(G^m)$.*

6.5. **Example.** For $k = 1, 3$, and 7 , we obtain $\text{dTC}_m(S^k) = \text{dcat}((S^k)^{m-1}) = m - 1$ from Theorem 6.2 and [DJ, Proposition 6.7].

6.6. **Example.** For the n -torus T^n , due to Theorem 6.2 and [DJ, Proposition 6.7],

$$\text{dTC}_m(T^n) = \text{dcat}((S^1)^{n(m-1)}) = n(m-1).$$

Like in the case of [LS, Corollary 3.5] for classical invariants, it follows from Theorem 6.2 that

$$\text{dTC}_m(X^k) = \text{dcat}(X^{k(m-1)}) = \text{dTC}_{k+1}(X^{m-1})$$

if X is a H -space. Thus, $\text{dTC}(T^2) = 2 = \text{dTC}_3(S^1)$ and $\text{dTC}_4(T^2) = 6 = \text{dTC}_3(T^3)$.

7. ESTIMATES AND COMPUTATIONS

Recall that Alexander–Spanier cohomology coincides with singular cohomology on locally finite CW complexes [Sp]. Hence, for all the spaces discussed in this section, Theorem 4.4 will hold in singular cohomology as well. So, from now onwards, we will work only with the singular cohomology groups.

7.A. dTC_m of surfaces.

7.1. **Proposition.** *If X is a closed orientable manifold, or if X is a closed non-orientable surface of genus > 1 , then $\text{dTC}_m(X) \geq m - 1$ for all $m \geq 2$.*

Proof. Let $X \in \{M^n, N_g \mid n \geq 1, g \geq 2\}$, where M^n is a closed orientable manifold of dimension n and N_g is a closed non-orientable surface of genus g . For $m = 2$, the statement is obvious because X is not contractible. Let us fix some $m \geq 3$. Let

$$d = \begin{cases} n & : X = M^n \text{ for some } n \geq 1 \\ 1 & : X = N_g \text{ for any } g \geq 2 \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $H^d(X; \mathbb{Q}) \neq 0$. So, there exists some $v \in H^d(X; \mathbb{Q})$ such that $v \neq 0$. Due to Proposition 4.1, there exists $w \in H^d(SP^{(m-1)!}(X); \mathbb{Q})$ such that $\partial_{m-1}^*(w) = v$, where $\partial_{m-1} : X \rightarrow SP^{(m-1)!}(X)$ is the diagonal embedding. For $1 \leq i \leq m$, let $\text{proj}_i : X^m \rightarrow X$ be the projection onto the i^{th} coordinate. By functoriality, we get $r_i = SP^{(m-1)!}(\text{proj}_i) : SP^{(m-1)!}(X^m) \rightarrow SP^{(m-1)!}(X)$. For brevity, let $Y = SP^{(m-1)!}(X)$ and $Z = SP^{(m-1)!}(X^m)$. Then for each i , the following diagram commutes.

$$(7.a) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} Y & \xleftarrow{r_i} & Z & \xleftarrow{\Delta_{m-1}} & Y \\ \partial_{m-1} \uparrow & & \partial_{m-1}^m \uparrow & & \uparrow \partial_{m-1} \\ X & \xleftarrow{\text{proj}_i} & X^m & \xleftarrow{\Delta} & X \end{array}$$

Here, $\partial_{m-1}^m : X^m \rightarrow Z$ is the diagonal embedding, Δ is the diagonal map, and $\Delta_{m-1} = SP^{(m-1)!}(\Delta)$. For each fixed $1 \leq i \leq m - 1$, proj_i and proj_m induce the

map $\phi_i : H^d(X; \mathbb{Q}) \oplus H^d(X; \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow H^d(X^m; \mathbb{Q})$, and similarly, r_i and r_m induce $\psi_i : H^d(Y; \mathbb{Q}) \oplus H^d(Y; \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow H^d(Z; \mathbb{Q})$ defined, respectively, as

$$\phi_i(x \oplus y) = \text{proj}_i^*(x) - \text{proj}_m^*(y) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_i(a \oplus b) = r_i^*(a) - r_m^*(b).$$

Let us denote $\phi_i(v \oplus v)$ by α_i and $\psi_i(w \oplus w)$ by α_i^* . Then due to Diagram 7.a, we have the following commutative diagram for each $1 \leq i \leq m-1$.

$$(7.b) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} w \oplus w & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & \alpha_i^* & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & w - w = 0 \\ \cap & & \cap & & \cap \\ H^d(Y; \mathbb{Q}) \oplus H^d(Y; \mathbb{Q}) & \xrightarrow{\psi_i} & H^d(Z; \mathbb{Q}) & \xrightarrow{\Delta_{m-1}^*} & H^d(Y; \mathbb{Q}) \\ \partial_{m-1}^* \oplus \partial_{m-1}^* \downarrow & & (\partial_{m-1}^m)^* \downarrow & & \partial_{m-1}^* \downarrow \\ H^d(X; \mathbb{Q}) \oplus H^d(X; \mathbb{Q}) & \xrightarrow{\phi_i} & H^d(X^m; \mathbb{Q}) & \xrightarrow{\Delta^*} & H^d(X; \mathbb{Q}) \\ \cup & & \cup & & \cup \\ v \oplus v & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & \alpha_i & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & v - v = 0 \end{array}$$

On the top-right, $w - w = 0$ because the top (resp. bottom) row when restricted to either of the components $H^d(Y; \mathbb{Q})$ (resp. $H^d(X; \mathbb{Q})$) is an isomorphism. Due to [Ru, Proposition 3.5], we have

$$\alpha_1 \smile \cdots \smile \alpha_{m-1} \neq 0.$$

Hence, taking $k_i = d$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m-1$, we have $\alpha_i^* \in H^{k_i}(SP^{(m-1)!}(X^m); \mathbb{Q})$ as in the statement of Theorem 4.4. Therefore, $\text{dTC}_m(X) \geq m-1$. \square

7.2. Remark. In general, for any finite CW complex X for which $H^d(X; \mathbb{Q}) \neq 0$ for some $d \geq 1$, the above technique can be used to conclude $\text{dTC}_m(X) \geq m-1$.

The following simple consequence generalizes Example 6.5.

7.3. Corollary. *For any $k \geq 1$ and $m \geq 2$, $\text{dTC}_m(S^{2k-1}) = m-1$.*

Proof. From [Ru, Section 4], $\text{TC}_m(S^{2k-1}) = m-1$. So, we obtain

$$m-1 \leq \text{dTC}_m(S^{2k-1}) \leq \text{TC}_m(S^{2k-1}) = m-1$$

due to Propositions 7.1 and 3.4. \square

7.4. Remark. In view of Corollary 7.3, the lower bounds obtained in Theorem 4.4 and Proposition 7.1 are sharp for all $m \geq 2$. Also, the inequality in Proposition 3.6 can be strict for each $m \geq 2$: this is due to Corollary 7.3 and [DJ, Proposition 6.7]. Furthermore, the inequality in Proposition 3.7 can be strict, and $\{\text{dTC}_m(X)\}_{m \geq 2}$ can be a strictly increasing linear sequence.

The following statement for closed orientable surfaces Σ_g of genus $g \geq 2$ generalizes [DJ, Proposition 6.9] for all $m, g \geq 2$.

7.5. Proposition. *For any $m, g \geq 2$, $\text{dTC}_m(\Sigma_g) = 2m$.*

Proof. Let us fix some $m, g \geq 2$. Let $a_i, b_i \in H^1(\Sigma_g; \mathbb{Q})$ be the generators for $1 \leq i \leq g$ such that $a_i b_j = a_i a_j = b_i b_j = 0$ for $i \neq j$ and $a_i^2 = b_i^2 = 0$. Due to Proposition 4.1, there exist $a_i^*, b_i^* \in H^1(SP^{(2m)!}(\Sigma_g); \mathbb{Q})$ such that $\partial_{2m}^*(a_i^*) = a_i$ and $\partial_{2m}^*(b_i^*) = b_i$. We take the projections proj_i and let $r_i = SP^{(2m)!}(\text{proj}_i)$. For brevity, take $X = \Sigma_g$, $Y = SP^{(2m)!}(\Sigma_g)$ and $Z = SP^{(2m)!}(\Sigma_g^m)$. For each $2 \leq i \leq m$, let us define the maps $\phi_i : H^1(X; \mathbb{Q}) \oplus H^1(X; \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow H^1(X^m; \mathbb{Q})$ and $\Phi_i : H^1(Y; \mathbb{Q}) \oplus H^1(Y; \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow H^1(Z; \mathbb{Q})$ as follows.

$$\phi_i(c \oplus d) = \text{proj}_1^*(c) - \text{proj}_i^*(d) \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_i(u \oplus v) = r_1^*(u) - r_i^*(v).$$

For each $2 \leq i \leq m$, let $\alpha_i = \phi_i(a_1 \oplus a_1)$ and $\beta_i = \phi_i(b_1 \oplus b_1)$, and $\gamma_1 = \phi_2(a_2 \oplus a_2)$ and $\gamma_2 = \phi_2(b_2 \oplus b_2)$. Similarly, let $\alpha_i^* = \Phi_i(a_1^* \oplus a_1^*)$ and $\beta_i^* = \Phi_i(b_1^* \oplus b_1^*)$, and $\gamma_1^* = \Phi_2(a_2^* \oplus a_2^*)$ and $\gamma_2^* = \Phi_2(b_2^* \oplus b_2^*)$. For each i , we have the following commutative diagram.

$$(7.c) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} H^1(Y; \mathbb{Q}) \oplus H^1(Y; \mathbb{Q}) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_i} & H^1(Z; \mathbb{Q}) & \xrightarrow{\Delta_{2m}^*} & H^1(Y; \mathbb{Q}) \\ \partial_{2m}^* \oplus \partial_{2m}^* \downarrow & & (\partial_{2m}^m)^* \downarrow & & \partial_{2m}^* \downarrow \\ H^1(X; \mathbb{Q}) \oplus H^1(X; \mathbb{Q}) & \xrightarrow{\phi_i} & H^1(X^m; \mathbb{Q}) & \xrightarrow{\Delta^*} & H^1(X; \mathbb{Q}) \end{array}$$

We note that $(\partial_{2m}^m)^*(\alpha_i^*) = \alpha_i$ and $(\partial_{2m}^m)^*(\beta_i^*) = \beta_i$ for all $2 \leq i \leq m$, and $(\partial_{2m}^m)^*(\gamma_j^*) = \gamma_j$ for $j = 1, 2$. Also, we have

$$\Delta^*(\alpha_i) = a_1 - a_1 = 0 = b_1 - b_1 = \Delta^*(\beta_i), \quad \Delta^*(\gamma_1) = a_2 - a_2 = 0 = b_2 - b_2 = \Delta^*(\gamma_2),$$

$$\text{and} \quad \alpha_2 \smile \cdots \smile \alpha_m \smile \beta_2 \smile \cdots \smile \beta_m \smile \gamma_1 \smile \gamma_2 \neq 0$$

due to the proof of [GGGHMR, Proposition 3.2]. Hence, by arguments similar to those used in Proposition 7.1, we conclude that $\alpha_i^*, \beta_i^*, \gamma_j^* \in \text{Ker}(\Delta_{2m}^*)$ for $2 \leq i \leq m$ and $j = 1, 2$. Thus, the $2m$ cohomology classes are as in Theorem 4.4. Therefore, we have $\text{dTC}_m(\Sigma_g) \geq 2m$. But $\text{TC}_m(\Sigma_g) = 2m$ by [GGGHMR, Proposition 3.2]. Hence, $\text{dTC}_m(\Sigma_g) = 2m$ follows from Proposition 3.4. \square

7.B. dTC_m of spheres and their products.

7.6. Proposition. *For any $k \geq 1$ and $m \geq 2$, $\text{dTC}_m(S^{2k}) = m$.*

Proof. Let $u \in H^{2k}(S^{2k}; \mathbb{Q})$ such that $u \neq 0$. By Proposition 4.1, there exists $w \in H^{2k}(SP^{m!}(S^{2k}); \mathbb{Q})$ such that $\partial_m^*(w) = u$. For each $1 \leq i \leq m$, we let $r_i = SP^{m!}(\text{proj}_i)$ for the projection maps proj_i . For $X = S^{2k}$, define a map

$$\phi : \bigoplus_{i=1}^m H^{2k}(X; \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow H^{2k}(X^m; \mathbb{Q})$$

using the homomorphisms proj_i^* as

$$\phi(a_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus a_m) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m-1} \text{proj}_i^*(a_i) - \text{proj}_m^*(a_m).$$

Again, we let $Y = SP^{m!}(X)$ and $Z = SP^{m!}(X^m)$. Similarly, define a map

$$\psi : \bigoplus_{i=1}^m H^{2k}(Y; \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow H^{2k}(Z; \mathbb{Q})$$

using the homomorphisms r_i^* as

$$\psi(b_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus b_m) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m-1} r_i^*(b_i) - r_m^*(b_m).$$

Let $\alpha = \phi(u \oplus \cdots \oplus u \oplus (m-1)u)$ and $\alpha^* = \psi(w \oplus \cdots \oplus w \oplus (m-1)w)$. Then we get the following commutative diagram.

(7.d)

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m-1} w \oplus (m-1)w & \longmapsto & \alpha^* & \longmapsto & (m-1)w - (m-1)w = 0 \\ \cap & & \cap & & \cap \\ \bigoplus_{i=1}^m H^{2k}(Y; \mathbb{Q}) & \xrightarrow{\psi} & H^{2k}(Z; \mathbb{Q}) & \xrightarrow{\Delta_m^*} & H^{2k}(Y; \mathbb{Q}) \\ \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \partial_m^* \downarrow & & (\partial_m^m)^* \downarrow & & \partial_m^* \downarrow \\ \bigoplus_{i=1}^m H^{2k}(X; \mathbb{Q}) & \xrightarrow{\phi} & H^{2k}(X^m; \mathbb{Q}) & \xrightarrow{\Delta^*} & H^{2k}(X; \mathbb{Q}) \\ \psi & & \psi & & \psi \\ \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m-1} u \oplus (m-1)u & \longmapsto & \alpha & \longmapsto & (m-1)u - (m-1)u = 0 \end{array}$$

Clearly, $(\partial_m^m)^*(\alpha^*) = \alpha$. Due to the computations done in [Ru, Section 4], $\alpha^m \neq 0$. Therefore, taking $k_i = 2k$ and $\alpha_i^* = \alpha^*$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ in the statement of Theorem 4.4, we get $d\text{TC}_m(S^{2k}) \geq m$. But $\text{TC}_m(S^{2k}) = m$ due to [Ru, Section 4]. Hence, $d\text{TC}_m(S^{2k}) = m$ follows from Proposition 3.4. \square

For cases $g = 0, 1$, since $\Sigma_0 = S^2$ and $\Sigma_1 = T^2$, we have from Proposition 7.6 and Example 6.6, respectively, that $d\text{TC}_m(\Sigma_0) = m$ and $d\text{TC}_m(\Sigma_1) = 2(m-1)$.

7.7. Remark. In view of Proposition 7.6 and [DJ, Proposition 6.7], the upper bound of $d\text{TC}_m$ in Proposition 3.6 is sharp for all $m \geq 2$. Also, the inequalities in Propositions 3.5 and 7.1 can be strict for all $m \geq 2$.

Example 6.6 is recovered from the following more general result which, in particular, extends [DJ, Proposition 6.8] to finite products of spheres.

7.8. Proposition. *For any $m \geq 2$ and $n \geq 1$,*

$$d\text{TC}_m \left(\prod_{j=1}^n S^{k_j} \right) = n(m-1) + l_n,$$

where l_n is the number of k_j that are even.

Proof. For $n = 1$, this holds due to Corollary 7.3 and Proposition 7.6. Here, we prove this result for $n = 2$. Let us fix some $m \geq 2$ and take $X = S^{k_1} \times S^{k_2}$. For $j = 1, 2$, define a map $\pi_j : X \rightarrow S^{k_j}$ as the projection onto the j^{th} coordinate, $\Delta_j : S^{k_j} \hookrightarrow (S^{k_j})^m$ as the diagonal embedding, and for each $1 \leq t \leq m$, define a map $p_t^j : (S^{k_j})^m \rightarrow S^{k_j}$ as the projection onto the t^{th} copy of S^{k_j} . For each t , define $r_t = p_t^1 \times p_t^2 : X^m = (S^{k_1})^m \times (S^{k_2})^m \rightarrow S^{k_1} \times S^{k_2} = X$. Let

$$d_j = \begin{cases} m & : k_j \text{ is even} \\ m-1 & : k_j \text{ is odd} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad e_j = \begin{cases} m & : k_j \text{ is even} \\ 2 & : k_j \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

Let $d = d_1 + d_2$. Define $\partial : X \rightarrow Y$ and $\partial_m : X^m \rightarrow Z$ as the diagonal embeddings, where $Y = SP^{d_1}(X)$ and $Z = SP^{d_1}(X^m)$. Define $R_t^j = SP^{d_1}(r_t^j) : Z \rightarrow Y$. For each $j = 1, 2$ and all $1 \leq t \leq m$, let $(\text{proj}_t^j)^* : H^{k_j}(S^{k_j}; \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow H^{k_j}((S^{k_j})^m; \mathbb{Q})$ be the maps induced by the projections $\text{proj}_t^j : (S^{k_j})^m \rightarrow S^{k_j}$. For each fixed $j = 1, 2$, we define homomorphisms

$$\phi_i^j : \bigoplus_{t=1}^{e_j} H^{k_j}(S^{k_j}; \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow H^{k_j}((S^{k_j})^m; \mathbb{Q})$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq d_j$ as

$$\phi_i^j \left(\bigoplus_{t=1}^{e_j} a_t \right) = \begin{cases} \bigoplus_{t=1}^{m-1} (\text{proj}_t^j)^*(a_t) - (\text{proj}_m^j)^*(a_m) & : k_j \text{ is even} \\ (\text{proj}_1^j)^*(a_1) - (\text{proj}_m^j)^*(a_2) & : k_j \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

So, if k_j is even, then the m number of homomorphisms ϕ_i^j are all the same as the homomorphism ϕ from Proposition 7.6. Choose $u_j \in H^{k_j}(S^{k_j}; \mathbb{Q})$ such that $u_j \neq 0$. Then, it follows from Diagrams 7.b and 7.d (depending on the parity of k_j) that

$$(7.e) \quad \left(\Delta_j^* \phi_i^j \right) \left(\bigoplus_{t=1}^{e_j-1} u_j \oplus (e_j - 1)u_j \right) = (e_j - 1)u_j - (e_j - 1)u_j = 0$$

for each i and j . In the same spirit, for each $j = 1, 2$, we define homomorphisms

$$\psi_i^j : \bigoplus_{t=1}^{e_j} H^{k_j}(X; \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow H^{k_j}(X^m; \mathbb{Q})$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq d_j$ as

$$\psi_i^j \left(\bigoplus_{t=1}^{e_j} b_t \right) = \begin{cases} \bigoplus_{t=1}^{m-1} r_t^*(b_t) - r_m^*(b_m) & : k_j \text{ is even} \\ r_i^*(b_1) - r_m^*(b_2) & : k_j \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

Finally, we for each fixed $j = 1, 2$, we define homomorphisms

$$\Psi_i^j : \bigoplus_{t=1}^{e_j} H^{k_j}(Y; \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow H^{k_j}(Z; \mathbb{Q})$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq d_j$ as

$$\Psi_i^j \left(\bigoplus_{t=1}^{e_j} z_t \right) = \begin{cases} \bigoplus_{t=1}^{m-1} R_t^*(z_t) - R_m^*(z_m) & : k_j \text{ is even} \\ R_i^*(z_1) - R_m^*(z_2) & : k_j \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

Let $\eta = SP^{d_1}(\Delta_1 \times \Delta_2) : Y \rightarrow Z$. Then for any fixed $j \in \{1, 2\}$, the following diagram commutes for each $1 \leq i \leq d_j$.

$$(7.f) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \bigoplus_{t=1}^{e_j} H^{k_j}(Y; \mathbb{Q}) & \xrightarrow{\Psi_i^j} & H^{k_j}(Z; \mathbb{Q}) & \xrightarrow{\eta^*} & H^{k_j}(Y; \mathbb{Q}) \\ \downarrow \bigoplus_{t=1}^{e_j} \partial^* & & \partial_m^* \downarrow & & \partial^* \downarrow \\ \bigoplus_{t=1}^{e_j} H^{k_j}(X; \mathbb{Q}) & \xrightarrow{\psi_i^j} & H^{k_j}(X^m; \mathbb{Q}) & \xrightarrow{(\Delta_1 \times \Delta_2)^*} & H^{k_j}(X; \mathbb{Q}) \\ \uparrow \bigoplus_{t=1}^{e_j} \pi_j^* & & (\pi_j^m)^* \uparrow & & \pi_j^* \uparrow \\ \bigoplus_{t=1}^{e_j} H^{k_j}(S^{k_j}; \mathbb{Q}) & \xrightarrow{\phi_i^j} & H^{k_j}((S^{k_j})^m; \mathbb{Q}) & \xrightarrow{\Delta_j^*} & H^{k_j}(S^{k_j}; \mathbb{Q}) \end{array}$$

Let $y_j = \pi_j^*(u_j) \in H^{k_j}(X; \mathbb{Q})$. For each $1 \leq p \leq d_1$ and $1 \leq q \leq d_2$, let us write

$$\alpha_p = \psi_p^1 \left(\bigoplus_{t=1}^{e_1-1} y_1 \oplus (e_1-1)y_1 \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_q = \psi_q^2 \left(\bigoplus_{t=1}^{e_2-1} y_2 \oplus (e_2-1)y_2 \right).$$

We note that if k_1 is even, then $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \dots = \alpha_m$, and if k_2 is even, then $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \dots = \beta_m$. It follows from the proof of [BGRT, Theorem 3.10] that

$$\alpha_1 \smile \dots \smile \alpha_{d_1} \smile \beta_1 \smile \dots \smile \beta_{d_2} \neq 0.$$

Also, in view of Equation 7.e and Diagram 7.f, we have for each p and q that

$$(7.g) \quad (\Delta_1 \times \Delta_2)^*(\alpha_p) = 0 = (\Delta_1 \times \Delta_2)^*(\beta_q).$$

Due to Proposition 4.1, there exist some $y_j^* \in H^{k_j}(Y; \mathbb{Q})$ such that $\partial^*(y_j^*) = y_j$. For each $1 \leq p \leq d_1$ and $1 \leq q \leq d_2$, let

$$\alpha_p^* = \Psi_p^1 \left(\bigoplus_{t=1}^{e_1-1} y_1^* \oplus (e_1-1)y_1^* \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_q^* = \Psi_q^2 \left(\bigoplus_{t=1}^{e_2-1} y_2^* \oplus (e_2-1)y_2^* \right).$$

Then, $\partial_m^*(\alpha_p^*) = \alpha_p$ and $\partial_m^*(\beta_q^*) = \beta_q$ by Diagram 7.f. The top (resp. middle and bottom) row when restricted on the left to either of the components $H^{k_j}(Y; \mathbb{Q})$ (resp. $H^{k_j}(X; \mathbb{Q})$ and $H^{k_j}(S^{k_j}; \mathbb{Q})$) is an isomorphism. Thus, using Equation 7.g, we get

$$\eta^*(\alpha_p^*) = (e_1-1)y_1^* - (e_1-1)y_1^* = 0 = (e_2-1)y_2^* - (e_2-1)y_2^* = \eta^*(\beta_q^*)$$

for all $1 \leq p \leq d_1$ and $1 \leq q \leq d_2$. We note that $\Delta_1 \times \Delta_2 : X \rightarrow X^m$ is the diagonal map. Hence, the inequality $\text{dTC}_m(S^{k_1} \times S^{k_2}) \geq d = 2(m-1) + l_2$ follows from Theorem 4.4, where $l_2 \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ depending on the parity of k_1 and k_2 .

In general, for any $n \geq 3$, the same technique can be used to get the inequality

$$\text{dTC}_m \left(\prod_{j=1}^n S^{k_j} \right) \geq n(m-1) + l_n.$$

But due to [BGRT, Corollary 3.12], $\text{TC}_m(\prod_{j=1}^n S^{k_j}) = n(m-1) + l_n$. Therefore, $\text{dTC}_m(\prod_{j=1}^n S^{k_j}) = n(m-1) + l_n$ follows from Proposition 3.4. \square

For cases $g = 0, 1$, this gives $\text{dTC}_m(\Sigma_0 \times \prod_{j=1}^n S^{k_j}) = m(n+1) - n + l_n$ and $\text{dTC}_m(\Sigma_1 \times \prod_{j=1}^n S^{k_j}) = (m-1)(n+2) + l_n$.

7.9. Remark. Due to Proposition 7.8, the inequality in Proposition 3.8 can be strict for all $m \geq 2$ for non-contractible spaces X and Y .

The techniques used in the proofs of Propositions 7.8 and 7.5 can be used more generally to obtain the following.

7.10. Proposition. *For any $m, g \geq 2$ and $n \geq 1$,*

$$\text{dTC}_m \left(\Sigma_g \times \prod_{j=1}^n S^{k_j} \right) = m(n+2) - n + l_n,$$

where l_n is the number of k_j that are even.

Proof. Take $A = \Sigma_g$ and $B = \prod_{j=1}^n S^{k_j}$. From Proposition 7.5, there are $2m$ number of cohomology classes, say $\alpha_i \in H^1(A^m; \mathbb{Q})$, that vanish under the mapping $\Delta_1^* : H^1(A^m; \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow H^1(A; \mathbb{Q})$. From Proposition 7.8, there are $d = n(m-1) + l_n$ cohomology classes, say $\beta_k \in H^*(B^m; \mathbb{Q})$, that vanish under the appropriate maps $\Delta_2^* : H^*(B^m; \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow H^*(B; \mathbb{Q})$. In the proof of Proposition 7.8 for the product of two spheres, we replace the roles of the spheres S^{k_1} and S^{k_2} with A and B , respectively, and define $X = A \times B$. Then from a direct analog of Diagram 7.f for A and B , we get images $\alpha_i^* \in H^1(X^m; \mathbb{Q})$ and $\beta_k^* \in H^*(X^m; \mathbb{Q})$ such that

$$(\Delta_1 \times \Delta_2)^*(\alpha_i^*) = 0 = (\Delta_1 \times \Delta_2)^*(\beta_k^*).$$

Then using Proposition 4.1, we get $\alpha_i^{**} \in H^1(Z; \mathbb{Q})$ and $\beta_k^{**} \in H^*(Z; \mathbb{Q})$ satisfying

$$\eta^*(\alpha_i^{**}) = 0 = \eta^*(\beta_k^{**})$$

such that $\partial_m^*(\alpha_i^{**}) = \alpha_i^*$ and $\partial_m^*(\beta_k^{**}) = \beta_k^*$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 2m$ and $1 \leq k \leq d$. We recall that here, $Z = SP^{(2m+d)!}(X^m)$, $\partial_m : X^m \rightarrow Z$ is the diagonal embedding, $\Delta_1 : A \rightarrow A^m$ and $\Delta_2 : B \rightarrow B^m$ are diagonal maps, and $\eta = SP^{(2m+d)!}(\Delta_1 \times \Delta_2)$. From the proof of [BGRT, Theorem 3.10], we deduce that

$$\alpha_1^* \smile \dots \smile \alpha_{2m}^* \smile \beta_1^* \smile \dots \smile \beta_d^* \neq 0.$$

Hence, $\alpha_i^{**}, \beta_k^{**} \in H^*(Z; \mathbb{Q})$ are $2m + d$ number of cohomology classes satisfying the conditions of Theorem 4.4. Therefore, $d\text{TC}_m(X) \geq 2m + d = m(n+2) - n + l_n$. Note that X^m is a normal space, $\text{TC}_m(A) = 2m$ by [GGGHR, Proposition 3.2], and $\text{TC}_m(B) = n(m-1) + l_n$ by [BGRT, Corollary 3.12]. So,

$$m(n+2) - n + l_n \leq d\text{TC}_m(X) \leq \text{TC}_m(X) \leq \text{TC}_m(A) + \text{TC}_m(B) = m(n+2) - n + l_n,$$

where the third inequality is due to [BGRT, Proposition 3.11]. \square

For classical TC_m , the above set of inequalities immediately implies that

$$\text{TC}_m \left(\Sigma_g \times \prod_{j=1}^n S^{k_j} \right) = m(n+2) - n + l_n.$$

7.11. Remark. The sequences $\{d\text{TC}_m(X)\}_{m \geq 2}$ and $\{\text{TC}_m(X)\}_{m \geq 2}$ coincide for each of the following classes of closed manifolds X : spheres, finite products of spheres, closed orientable surfaces Σ_g , and products of Σ_g with finite products of spheres. In particular, the upper bound of $d\text{TC}_m$ in Proposition 3.4 is sharp for all these spaces.

8. THE ANALOG INVARIANTS

For a metric space (X, d) and $n \geq 1$, let us consider the following quotient map from [KW, Definition 2.1]:

$$q : \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n (X^i \times \Delta^{i-1}) \rightarrow \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n (X^i \times \Delta^{i-1}) / \sim =: \mathcal{P}_n(X).$$

Let \mathcal{T}_1 be the quotient topology on $\mathcal{P}_n(X)$. For any fibration $p : X \rightarrow B$, define $\mathcal{P}_n(p) := \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_n(X) \mid |p(\text{supp}(\mu))| = 1\}$. See that as sets, $\mathcal{P}_n(X) = \mathcal{B}_n(X)$

and $\mathcal{P}_n(p) = X_n(p)$. Let us choose some $\mu = \lambda_x x \in \mathcal{B}_n(X)$ and fix it. Let $\delta = \min\{d(x, y) \mid x, y \in \text{supp}(\mu), x \neq y\}$. Then for $\epsilon < \delta/2$, the collection of the sets

$$\mathcal{U}(\mu, \epsilon) = \left\{ \sum s_y y \mid -\frac{\epsilon}{n} < \sum_{y \in B(x, \epsilon)} s_y - \lambda_x < \frac{\epsilon}{n} \right\}$$

defines a local basis at μ in the topology induced by the Lévy–Prokhorov metric on $\mathcal{B}_n(X)$, [DJ]. These sets are also considered in [KW, Construction 8.3], and it follows from the proof of the first part of Lemma 8.4 in [KW] that the sets $\mathcal{U}(\mu, \epsilon)$ are open in the quotient topology on $\mathcal{P}_n(X)$. We denote the Lévy–Prokhorov topology by \mathcal{T}_2 . Hence, $\mathcal{T}_2 \subset \mathcal{T}_1$. This can also be shown by proving that the projection

$$\bigsqcup_{i=1}^n (X^i \times \Delta^{i-1}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{B}_n(X), \mathcal{T}_2)$$

is continuous. In any case, the identity map $\mathcal{I}' : (\mathcal{P}_n(X), \mathcal{T}_1) \rightarrow (\mathcal{B}_n(X), \mathcal{T}_2)$ is continuous and thus, so is its restriction $\mathcal{I} : (\mathcal{P}_n(p), \mathcal{T}_1) \rightarrow (\mathcal{B}_n(p), \mathcal{T}_2)$.

8.A. Comparison between the invariants. For a fibration $p : E \rightarrow B$, its *analog sectional category*, denoted $\text{asecat}(p)$, is the minimal number n such that the continuous map $\varphi_{n+1}(p) : (\mathcal{P}_{n+1}(p), \mathcal{T}_1) \rightarrow B$, defined as $\varphi_{n+1}(p) : \mu \mapsto p(\text{supp}(\mu))$, admits a section, see [KW, Definition 5.1].

8.1. Lemma. *For any fibration $p : E \rightarrow B$, $\text{dsecat}(p) \leq \text{asecat}(p)$.*

Proof. Let $\text{asecat}(p) = n - 1$. So, there exists a section of $\varphi_n(p)$, say

$$\kappa : B \rightarrow (\mathcal{P}_n(p), \mathcal{T}_1).$$

Consider $\kappa' = \mathcal{I}\kappa : B \rightarrow (E_n(p), \mathcal{T}_2)$. Since \mathcal{I} is continuous, so is κ' . It is clear that $\varphi_n(p) = \mathcal{B}_n(p)\mathcal{I}$. Next, see that

$$\mathbb{1}_B = \varphi_n(p)\kappa = \mathcal{B}_n(p)\mathcal{I}\kappa = \mathcal{B}_n(p)\kappa'.$$

So, κ' is a section of $\mathcal{B}_n(p) : (E_n(p), \mathcal{T}_1) \rightarrow B$. Thus, $\text{dsecat}(p) \leq n - 1$. \square

Since dsecat , asecat , and secat are all homotopy invariants, we have for any continuous map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ the inequalities

$$(8.a) \quad \text{dsecat}(f) \leq \text{asecat}(f) \leq \text{secat}(f),$$

where the last inequality is because of [KW, Corollary 5.5].

8.2. Corollary. $\text{dcat}(X) \leq \text{acat}(X)$ and $\text{dTC}_m(X) \leq \text{ATC}_m(X)$ for all $m \geq 2$.

Proof. For the evaluation fibrations $p_0^X : P_0(X) \rightarrow X$ and $\pi_m^X : P(X) \rightarrow X^m$, we have $\text{dcat}(X) = \text{dsecat}(p_0^X)$ and $\text{dTC}_m(X) = \text{dsecat}(\pi_m^X)$ from Section 5, and $\text{acat}(X) = \text{asecat}(p_0^X)$ and $\text{ATC}_m(X) = \text{asecat}(\pi_m^X)$ from [KW, Definition 6.1]. Thus, the required inequalities follow directly from Lemma 8.1. \square

8.3. Example. Corollary 8.2 and [KW, Corollary 6.6] together imply that

$$\text{dTC}_m(\mathbb{R}P^n) \leq \text{ATC}_m(\mathbb{R}P^n) \leq 2m + 1$$

for all $n \geq 1$, thereby significantly improving our bound from Proposition 3.9.

We note that for the cases $m = 3, 4$, the upper bounds $\text{dTC}_3(\mathbb{R}P^n) \leq 3$ and $\text{dTC}_4(\mathbb{R}P^n) \leq 7$ obtained in Proposition 3.9 are still better than the respective upper bounds $\text{dTC}_3(\mathbb{R}P^n) \leq 7$ and $\text{dTC}_4(\mathbb{R}P^n) \leq 9$ obtained in Example 8.3.

8.4. **Example.** For a finite group Γ , we get

$$(8.b) \quad \text{dTC}_m(\Gamma) = \text{dTC}_m(B\Gamma) \leq \text{ATC}_m(B\Gamma) = |\Gamma| - 1$$

due to Corollary 8.2 and [KW, Corollary 7.3]. Thus, taking $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}_2$, we conclude $\text{dTC}_m(\mathbb{R}P^\infty) = 1$, which is another major improvement to our calculation.

Equation 8.b may provide more examples of spaces X for which the inequality in Proposition 3.4 will be strict for some $m \geq 2$.

8.B. **Completing some computations for acat and ATC_m .** With the help of our computations from Sections 6 and 7, and [DJ, Section 6], we complete some computations of [KW] using Corollary 8.2.

8.5. **Remark.** For a torsion-free discrete group Γ , $\text{ATC}_m(B\Gamma) \leq \text{cd}(\Gamma^m)$ holds for all $m \geq 2$, [KW, Corollary 7.7]. For closed orientable surfaces Σ_g with $g \geq 1$, this gives $\text{ATC}_m(\Sigma_g) \leq 2m$. However, this is obvious in light of Equation 8.a and doesn't help much in finding the exact value ATC_m unless one gets into the technicalities of [KW, Theorem 7.9] for cases $g \geq 2$. Also, for the n -torus T^n , the above inequality yields $\text{ATC}_m(T^n) \leq nm$. This upper bound is poorer than the bound $n(m-1)$ implied by Equation 8.a. Hence, it is also not helpful.

For non-aspherical spaces X , such as spheres S^n for $n \geq 2$ and their products, there is no general recipe as such for computing $\text{acat}(X)$ or $\text{ATC}_m(X)$.

We now show in the following two examples that the exact values of sequential analog topological complexities can be determined easily for various closed manifolds, most of which are not aspherical.

8.6. **Example.** If X is a sphere, a finite product of spheres, a closed orientable surface Σ_g , or a product of Σ_g with a finite product of spheres, then in view of Remark 7.11, Equation 8.a, and Corollary 8.2, we have

$$\text{TC}_m(X) = \text{dTC}_m(X) \leq \text{ATC}_m(X) \leq \text{TC}_m(X).$$

8.7. **Example.** Similarly, if X is a closed surface, a sphere, a finite product of spheres, or $\mathbb{C}P^n$, then due to [DJ, Propositions 6.1, 6.4, 6.6, and 6.7], we have

$$\text{cat}(X) = \text{dcat}(X) \leq \text{acat}(X) \leq \text{cat}(X).$$

8.8. **Remark.** We note that if Γ is a torsion-free discrete group, then due to [KW, Theorem 7.4], $\text{acat}(\Gamma) = \text{cd}(\Gamma)$ holds. Hence, $\text{acat}(T^n) = \text{cat}(T^n) = n$ and $\text{acat}(\Sigma_g) = \text{cat}(\Sigma_g) = 2$ for $g \geq 1$ are obtained directly from that.

In light of the above examples, all the lower bounds in Corollary 8.2 are sharp.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author would like to thank Alexander Dranishnikov for his kind guidance and various insightful and helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [BGRT] I. Basabe, J. González, Y. B. Rudyak, D. Tamaki, Higher topological complexity and its symmetrization. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.* **14** (2014), 2103–2124.
- [Br] K. Brown, *Cohomology of groups*, Springer, New York-Heidelberg-Berlin, 1982.
- [CFW] D. C. Cohen, M. Farber, S. Weinberger, Topology of parametrized motion planning algorithms. *SIAM J. Appl. Algebra Geometry* **103** (2021), no. 2, 229–249.
- [CLOT] O. Cornea, G. Lupton, J. Oprea, D. Tanré, *Lusternik–Schnirelmann Category*, Math. Surveys Monogr., 103, AMS, Providence, 2003.
- [DJ] A. Dranishnikov, E. Jauhari, Distributional topological complexity and LS-category. In *Topology and AI*, M. Farber and J. González (eds.), EMS Ser. Ind. Appl. Math., 4, EMS Press, Berlin, 2024, pp. 363–385. arXiv:2401.04272 [math.GT].
- [Far1] M. Farber, Topological complexity of motion planning. *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **29** (2003), no. 2, 211–221.
- [Far2] M. Farber, Topology of robot motion planning. In *Morse Theoretic Methods in Non-linear Analysis and in Symplectic Topology*, P. Biran *et al* (eds.), NATO Sci. Ser. II Math. Phys. Chem., 217, Springer, Dordrecht, 2006, pp. 185–230.
- [FO] M. Farber, J. Oprea, Higher topological complexity of aspherical spaces. *Topology Appl.* **258** (2019), 142–160.
- [FP] M. Farber, A. K. Paul, Sequential parametrized motion planning and its complexity. *Topology Appl.* **321** (2023), 108256, pp. 23.
- [GGGHMR] J. González, B. Gutiérrez, A. Guzmán, C. Hidber, M. Mendoza, C. Roque, Motion planning in tori revisited. *Morfismos* **19** (2015), no. 1, 7–18.
- [Ha] A. Hatcher, *Algebraic Topology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.
- [Ja] I. M. James, On category, in the sense of Lusternik–Schnirelmann. *Topology* **17** (1978), 331–348.
- [KW] B. Knudsen, S. Weinberger, Analog category and complexity. To appear in *SIAM J. Appl. Algebra Geom.* **8** (2024), no. 3, pp. 20. arXiv:2401.15667 [math.AT].
- [LS] G. Lupton, S. Scherer, Topological complexity of H -spaces. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **141** (2013), no. 5, 1827–1838.
- [Pr] Y. V. Prokhorov, Convergence of random processes and limit theorems in probability theory. *Theory Probab. Appl.* **1** (1956), 157–214.
- [Ru] Y. B. Rudyak, On higher analogs of topological complexity. *Topology Appl.* **157** (2010), no. 5, 916–920.
- [Sch] A. S. Schwarz, The genus of a fiber space. *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2* **55** (1966), 49–140.
- [Sh] R. Short, Relative topological complexity of a pair. *Topology Appl.* **248** (2010), 7–23.
- [Sp] E. H. Spanier, *Algebraic Topology*, McGraw-Hill Inc., New York, 1966.

EKANSH JAUHARI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, 358 LITTLE HALL, GAINESVILLE, FL 32611-8105, USA.

Email address: ekanshjauhari@ufl.edu