

# An upper bound for the Lusternik-Schnirelmann category of relative Sullivan algebras

Jiawei Zhou

April 24, 2024

## Abstract

This paper addresses a question posed by Félix, Halperin and Thomas. We prove that the Lusternik-Schnirelmann category of a relative Sullivan algebra is finite if such invariants of the base algebra and fiber algebra are both finite. Furthermore, we provide a similar estimation for the Toomer invariant.

## 1 Introduction

The Lusternik-Schnirelmann category (LS category), denoted as  $cat(X)$ , of a topological space  $X$ , is defined as the smallest non-negative integer  $m$  such that  $X$  can be covered by  $m + 1$  contractible open subsets. This concept was originally introduced in [6] with the aim of estimating the number of critical points of smooth functions on a manifold.

While the definition is straightforward, computing the LS category is generally not easy. To estimate it, several other invariants are introduced, such as the cone length, the Toomer invariant, and the cup length. In rational homotopy theory, these invariants also have their rational versions, which are defined as the smallest among all equivalent spaces. This equivalence is established by continuous maps that induce isomorphisms on rational homologies.

Sullivan [7] employed commutative differential graded algebras (CDGA) as models to represent these equivalence classes. Every equivalence class contains a special type of CDGAs, which are called the Sullivan algebras, along with the Sullivan models of the corresponding spaces. For simply connected spaces, the rational LS category and other rational invariants can be computed from the algebraic structures of their Sullivan models. This approach extends to defining analogous invariants of quasi-isomorphisms for all CDGAs.

Many fibrations can be represented by relative Sullivan algebras. Consider a fibration  $F \rightarrow E \rightarrow B$ . If  $\Lambda Z$  and  $\Lambda Z \otimes \Lambda W$  are Sullivan models of  $B$  and  $E$  respectively, then  $\Lambda W$  is a Sullivan model of

$F$  under certain conditions, for example, that  $F$  and  $B$  are simply connected with either  $H^*(F, \mathbb{Q})$  or  $H^*(B, \mathbb{Q})$  being of finite type. However, when these conditions are not met, the Sullivan model of  $F$  can differ significantly from  $\Lambda W$ .

It is easy to see that  $cat(E) \leq (cat(F) + 1)(cat(B) + 1) - 1$ . Consequently, in their book [2], Félix, Halperin and Thomas posed the question of whether the LS category of  $\Lambda Z \otimes \Lambda W$  can also be bounded by those of  $\Lambda Z$  and  $\Lambda W$ . This paper will give a positive answer.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\Lambda Z \otimes \Lambda W$  be a relative Sullivan algebra. Suppose that  $cat(\Lambda Z) = m$  and  $cat(\Lambda W) = n$ , then  $cat(\Lambda Z \otimes \Lambda W) \leq (m + 1)(n + 2) - 2$ . Moreover, if  $\Lambda Z \otimes \Lambda W$  itself is a minimal Sullivan algebra, then  $cat(\Lambda Z \otimes \Lambda W) \leq (m + 1)(n + 1) - 1$ .*

The proof pertains to the module category  $mcat$ , initially introduced by Halperin and Lemaire [3], which offers an analogy to the LS category for differential graded modules (DG modules). Hess' theorem [5] shows that the LS category and the module category of a minimal Sullivan algebra are same. So Theorem 1.1 is a special case of Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2, which are statements concerning module categories.

A minimal Sullivan algebra  $\Lambda V$  can be interpreted as a relative Sullivan algebra, where its base  $\Lambda V^1$  is generated by degree-1 generators, and its fiber  $\Lambda V^{\geq 2}$  is generated by the generators of higher degrees. Thus, the corollary below follows from Theorem 1.1, addressing the first part of the question by Félix, Halperin and Thomas.

**Corollary 1.2.** *Let  $\Lambda V$  be a minimal Sullivan algebra. Then  $cat(\Lambda V) < \infty$  if and only if both  $cat(\Lambda V^1)$  and  $cat(\Lambda V^{\geq 2})$  are finite.*

Using the same idea, we can also give an estimation for the Toomer invariant. Theorem 3.8 is its generalization to module categories.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $\Lambda V = \Lambda Z \otimes \Lambda W$  be a relative Sullivan algebra. Suppose that  $e_{\Lambda Z}(\Lambda V) = m$  and  $e_{\Lambda W}(\Lambda^{\geq q}W) = n$  for all  $q \geq 0$ , then  $e_{\Lambda V}(\Lambda V) \leq (m + 1)(n + 2) - 2$ . If  $\Lambda V$  itself is a minimal Sullivan algebra, then  $e_{\Lambda V}(\Lambda V) \leq (m + 1)(n + 1) - 1$ .*

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review the basic definitions and former results. Trying to make this paper self-contained, we provide proofs of certain consequences that are not covered in [1] and [2]. The fact that DG modules form a model category is not directly used, although some statements follow from it immediately. In Section 3, we prove the main Theorems: Theorem 3.1, Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.8, which lead to the conclusions outlined in Theorem 1.1, Corollary 1.2 and Theorem 1.3.

The author would like to thank Ruizhi Huang for helpful discussions. This research is supported by the National Key Research and Development Program of China No. 2020YFA0713000.

## 2 Preliminary

### 2.1 Notations and Conventions

In this paper, Notations and conventions generally follow from [4], [1] and [2].

As in the introduction, we will abbreviate commutative differential graded algebra as CDGA, differential graded modules as DG modules, and Lusternik-Schnirelmann category as LS category.

The ground ring is assumed to be a field  $\mathbb{k}$  of characteristic 0. CDGAs are assumed to be non-negatively graded, while DG modules is allowed to be  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded. When referring to a morphism over a CDGA  $A$ , we may simply use the terms  $A$ -module morphism or morphism. If the map is only a morphism as graded modules, we will specify this.

We will use  $\cong$  to denote isomorphisms,  $\simeq$  to denote quasi-isomorphisms, and  $\sim$  to denote homotopic DG module morphisms. In this section, we will also provide the definition of the latter.

Let  $(\Lambda V, d)$  be a CDGA which is also a free graded algebra generated by a graded vector space  $V$  of non-negative degree. We call it a **KS complex**, short for Koszul-Sullivan complex, if it satisfies the Sullivan condition, i.e.  $V$  is the union of an increasing family of subspaces

$$0 = V(-1) \subset V(0) \subset V(1) \subset \dots \subset V(k) \subset \dots$$

such that  $dV(k) \subset \Lambda V(k-1)$ . We will simply write it as  $\Lambda V$  when there is no ambiguity about the differential.

For  $v \in V$  with homogeneous degree, we denote its degree as  $|v|$ . The subspace of all  $v \in V$  with  $|v| = n$  will be written as  $V^n$ . We also use  $\Lambda^m V$  to represent the subspace of  $\Lambda V$  consisting of elements with wordlength  $m$ , and use  $\Lambda V^n$  to denote the graded algebra generated by  $V^n$ . Note that the latter is distinct from the subspace of  $\Lambda V$  concentrated in degree  $n$ , which is usually written as  $(\Lambda V)^n$ . For the subspace of  $V$  spanned by elements with degree smaller than  $n$ , we use  $V^{<n}$ . Similar notations, such as  $\Lambda^{\leq m} V, \Lambda V^{\geq n}$  and so on, will also be employed.

When  $V^0$  is non-trivial, we assume that there is an augmentation  $\epsilon : V^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$ . This augmentation, which is necessary for Theorem 2.2 of [4], is only used to prove Theorem 2.18.

We mainly focus on the case that  $V = V^{\geq 1}$ . A KS complex generated by such  $V$  is referred to as a **Sullivan algebra**.

A KS complex  $\Lambda V$  is termed **minimal** if it also satisfies  $dV^n \subset \Lambda V^{\leq n}$ . If  $\Lambda V$  is a Sullivan algebra, this is equivalent to  $dV \subset \Lambda^{\geq 2} V$ . It is a well-known result that given any connected CDGA  $A$  (i.e.  $H^0(A) = \mathbb{k}$ ), there exists a quasi-isomorphism from a Sullivan algebra  $\Lambda V$  to  $A$ , which is called the **Sullivan model** of  $A$ . Furthermore,  $\Lambda V$  can be chosen to be minimal up to isomorphism, and in this case, it is called the **minimal Sullivan model** or **minimal model** of  $A$ .

Let  $B$  be a connected CDGA. The inclusion  $B \rightarrow B \otimes \Lambda W$  is termed a  **$\Lambda$ -extension** if it is a CDGA

morphism satisfying the following condition.  $W$  is the union of an increasing family of subspaces

$$0 = W(-1) \subset W(0) \subset W(1) \subset \dots \subset W(k) \subset \dots$$

such that  $d(1 \otimes W(k)) \subset (\mathbb{k} \oplus B^{\geq 1}) \otimes \Lambda W(k-1)$ . This  $\Lambda$ -extension induces a KS complex  $(\Lambda W, \bar{d})$  where  $\bar{d}$  is the  $\mathbb{k} \otimes \Lambda W$  component of  $d$ . The KS complex  $(\Lambda W, \bar{d})$  is referred to as the **fiber** of the  $\Lambda$ -extension, and the CDGA  $B$  is called the **base**.

If in addition  $d(1 \otimes W^n) \subset B \otimes W^{\leq n}$ , the  $\Lambda$ -extension is referred to as **Sullivan extension**.

When  $W$  is concentrated in positive degrees, the  $\Lambda$ -extension is called a **Sullivan extension**, and the CDGA  $B \otimes \Lambda W$  is termed a **relative Sullivan algebra**.

## 2.2 Semifree Resolutions

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $P$  be a DG module over a CDGA  $A$ . We call  $P$  **semifree** if it can be written as the union of an increasing sequence

$$0 = P(-1) \subset P(0) \subset P(1) \subset \dots \subset P(k) \subset \dots$$

of sub  $A$ -modules, such that  $P(k)/P(k-1) \simeq A \otimes W(k)$  with  $dW(k) = 0$ , i.e.  $P(k)/P(k-1)$  is a free DG module over  $A$ .

As the ground ring is assumed to be a field, the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow P(k-1) \rightarrow P(k) \rightarrow P(k)/P(k-1) \rightarrow 0$$

splits. So by induction  $P$  can be written as  $A \otimes V$  where  $V = \bigcup_k V(k)$  for an increasing sequence of vector spaces  $V(k)$  such that  $dV(k) \subset A \otimes V(k-1)$ .

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $M$  be a DG module over a CDGA  $A$ . An  **$A$ -semifree resolution** is a semifree  $A$ -module  $P$  together with a quasi-isomorphism  $P \xrightarrow{\simeq} M$ .

According to Proposition 6.6 of [1], every DG module has a semifree resolution. Actually, the quasi-isomorphic of the semifree resolution can be made surjective.

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let  $A$  be a CDGA. Every  $A$ -module  $M$  has a semifree resolution  $f : P \xrightarrow{\simeq} M$  such that  $f$  is surjective.*

*Proof.* Proposition 6.6 of [1] gives a semifree resolution  $f : P \xrightarrow{\simeq} M$ , and  $P(0)$  is identified as  $A \otimes V(0)$  where  $V(0)$  is the space of cocycles in  $M$ . So for each  $x \in M$ ,  $dx \in V(0)$  and there exists a cocycle in  $\alpha \in P$  such that  $f(\alpha) = dx$ . As  $f$  is a quasi-isomorphism,  $\alpha = d\beta$  for some  $\beta \in P$ . Then  $d(x - f(\beta)) = dx - f(d\beta) = 0$ . Hence,  $x - f(\beta) \in V(0) \subset \text{im } f$ . It follows that  $x \in \text{im } f$ .  $\square$

**Definition 2.4.** Two DG module morphisms  $f$  and  $g$  from  $M$  to  $N$  over a CDGA  $A$  are called **homotopic**, if  $f - g = d\theta + \theta d$  for some graded module morphism  $\theta : M \rightarrow N$  over  $A$ . We will write  $f \sim g$ .

**Proposition 2.5.** Suppose  $A$  is a CDGA, and  $P$  is a semifree  $A$ -module, Let  $\phi : P \rightarrow N$  and  $f : M \xrightarrow{\simeq} N$  be  $A$ -module morphisms with  $f$  being quasi-isomorphic.

(i) (Proposition 6.4(ii) of [1]) There is a unique homotopy class of morphisms  $\psi : P \rightarrow M$  such that  $\phi \sim f \circ \psi$ .

(ii) (Exercise 4 of Section 6 of [1]) If  $f$  is surjective, we can choose  $\psi$  such that  $\phi = f \circ \psi$ . Such  $\psi$  is called a **lift** of  $\phi$  through  $f$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & & M \\
 & \nearrow \psi & \downarrow f \simeq \\
 P & \xrightarrow{\phi} & N
 \end{array}$$

*Proof.* (i) The proof is provided in [1].

(ii) Write  $P$  as the union of  $P(k) = A \otimes V(k)$  with  $dV(k) \subset P(k-1)$ . Suppose we have constructed  $\psi$  on  $P(k-1)$  such that  $\psi \circ f = \phi$  when restricted to  $P(k-1)$ , we will extend it to  $P(k)$ .

Choose a linearly independent set  $\{v_\alpha\}$  such that  $V(k)$  is the direct sum of  $V(k-1)$  and the space spanned by  $\{v_\alpha\}$ . By hypothesis  $\psi(dv_\alpha)$  is defined as a cocycle in  $M$ , and satisfies

$$f(\psi(dv_\alpha)) = \phi(dv_\alpha) = d(\phi(v_\alpha)).$$

As  $f$  is a quasi-isomorphism,  $\psi(dv_\alpha)$  is a coboundary in  $M$ . Choose some  $m_\alpha \in M$  such that  $dm_\alpha = \psi(dv_\alpha)$ . Set  $\psi(v_\alpha) = m_\alpha$ . Then  $\psi$  can be extended to  $P(k)$  as an  $A$ -module morphism.

By induction, we obtain a morphism  $\psi$  defined on  $P$  satisfying  $\phi = f \circ \psi$ . □

### 2.3 Lusternik-Schnirelmann category

**Definition 2.6.** Let  $\Lambda V$  be a minimal Sullivan algebra. Its **LS category**  $cat(\Lambda V)$  is the least integer  $m$  such that there is a minimal relative  $\Lambda$ -algebra  $\Lambda V \otimes \Lambda W$  with base  $\Lambda V$ , together with CDGA morphisms  $f : \Lambda V \rightarrow \Lambda V \otimes \Lambda W$ ,  $g : \Lambda V \otimes \Lambda Z \rightarrow \Lambda V$  and  $\phi : \Lambda V \otimes \Lambda Z \rightarrow \Lambda V / \Lambda^{>m} V$  making the following diagram commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \Lambda V & \xrightarrow{id_{\Lambda V}} & \Lambda V \\
 \searrow f & & \nearrow g \\
 & \Lambda V \otimes \Lambda W & \\
 \searrow q & \downarrow \phi \simeq & \\
 & \Lambda V / \Lambda^{>m} V &
 \end{array}$$

Here  $f$  needs to be the natural inclusion,  $\phi$  needs to be quasi-isomorphic, and  $q$  is the natural projection.

**Remark 2.7.** As mentioned in [2], the condition  $gf = id_{\Lambda V}$  can be weakened as that  $gf$  and  $id_{\Lambda V}$  are homotopic as CDGA morphisms from Sullivan algebras.

Every connected CDGA has a unique minimal Sullivan model up to isomorphism. So its LS category can be defined by the minimal Sullivan model.

**Definition 2.8.** Let  $A$  be a connected CDGA and  $\Lambda V$  be its minimal Sullivan model. Then  $cat(A)$  is defined as  $cat(\Lambda V)$ .

**Definition 2.9.** Let  $\Lambda V$  be a minimal Sullivan algebra and  $P$  be a  $\Lambda V$ -semifree module. The **module category** of  $P$ ,  $mcat_{\Lambda V}(P)$ , is the least number  $m$  such that there is a semifree  $\Lambda V$ -module  $Q$  together with DG module morphisms  $f : P \rightarrow Q$ ,  $g : Q \rightarrow P$ , and  $\phi : Q \rightarrow P/(\Lambda^{>m}V \cdot P)$  satisfying the following conditions.  $\phi$  is quasi-isomorphic,  $g \circ f \sim id_P$ , and  $\phi \circ f \sim q$  where  $q : P \rightarrow P/(\Lambda^{>m}V \cdot P)$  is the natural projection. In other words, the following diagram is homotopy commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 P & \xrightarrow{id_P} & P \\
 & \searrow f & \nearrow g \\
 & & Q \\
 & \searrow q & \downarrow \phi \simeq \\
 & & P/(\Lambda^{>m}V \cdot P)
 \end{array} \tag{2.1}$$

We will simply write  $mcat_{\Lambda V}(P)$  as  $mcat(P)$  when there is no ambiguity.

As shown in the appendix of [3], the homotopy commutative diagram above can be made commutative. This also follows from Proposition 2.14 below, which will be frequently used to prove our main Theorem.

The advantage of the definition by homotopy commutative is that  $P$  can be replaced by any quasi-isomorphic  $\Lambda V$ -semifree modules. Applying Proposition 2.5, it is easy to see that all the quasi-isomorphic semifree modules have the same module category. Thus, we can define the module category on general DG modules by their semifree resolutions.

**Definition 2.10.** Let  $\Lambda V$  be its minimal Sullivan model,  $M$  be a  $\Lambda V$ -module and  $P$  be a  $\Lambda V$ -semifree resolution of  $M$ . Then  $mcat_{\Lambda V}(M)$  is defined as  $mcat_{\Lambda V}(P)$ .

**Definition 2.11.** Let  $\Lambda V$  be a minimal Sullivan algebra and  $P$  be a  $\Lambda V$ -semifree module. The **Toomer invariant**,  $e_{\Lambda V}(P)$  or simply written as  $e(P)$  when there is no ambiguity, is the least integer  $m$  such that the projection  $P \rightarrow P/(\Lambda^{>m}V \cdot P)$  is injective on cohomology.

In particular,  $e(\Lambda V)$  is the least integer  $m$  such that the morphism  $H(\Lambda V) \rightarrow H(\Lambda V/\Lambda^{>m}V)$  induced by the projection is injective.

For a general  $\Lambda V$ -module  $M$ ,  $e(M)$  is also defined as the Toomer invariant of its semifree resolution.

**Proposition 2.12** (Proposition 9.3 of [2]). *Let  $\Lambda V$  be a minimal Sullivan algebra and  $M$  be a  $\Lambda V$ -module. Then  $e(M) \leq \text{mcat}(M) \leq \text{mcat}(\Lambda V)$ .*

**Theorem 2.13** (Hess, [5]; Theorem 9.4 of [2]). *Let  $\Lambda V$  be a minimal Sullivan algebra. Then  $\text{cat}(\Lambda V) = \text{mcat}_{\Lambda V}(\Lambda V)$ .*

**Proposition 2.14.** *Let  $A$  be a CDGA and  $P = A \otimes V$  be a semifree  $A$ -module.*

(i) *Suppose that  $f : P \rightarrow Q$  is an  $A$ -module morphism. Then it factors as  $f = p \circ F$ , where  $p : \tilde{Q} \xrightarrow{\cong} Q$  is a surjective quasi-isomorphism and  $F : P \rightarrow \tilde{Q}$  is injective.*

(ii) *Suppose in addition that there exist  $A$ -module morphisms  $g : Q \rightarrow M$  and  $h : P \rightarrow M$  such that  $g \circ f \sim h$ . Then there is an  $A$ -module quasi-isomorphism  $p : \tilde{Q} \xrightarrow{\cong} Q$ , together with morphisms  $F : P \rightarrow \tilde{Q}$  and  $G : \tilde{Q} \rightarrow M$  such that  $p \circ F = f$  and  $G \circ F = h$ .*

(iii) *With the hypothesis of (i), let  $I \subset A$  be an ideal and  $q : P \rightarrow P/(I \cdot P)$  be the projection. Suppose that there exists an  $A$ -module morphism  $g : Q \rightarrow P$  such that  $gf \sim id_P$ , and a quasi-isomorphism  $\phi : Q \xrightarrow{\cong} P/(I \cdot P)$  such that  $q \sim \phi \circ f$  and  $gf \sim id_P$ . Then  $Q, f, g, \phi$  can be replaced by  $\tilde{Q}, F : P \rightarrow \tilde{Q}, G : \tilde{Q} \rightarrow P$ , and  $\Phi : \tilde{Q} \xrightarrow{\cong} P/(I \cdot P)$  respectively, such that  $\tilde{Q}$  is quasi-isomorphic to  $Q$ ,  $q = \Phi \circ F$  and  $G \circ F = id_P$ .*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 P & \xrightarrow{id_P} & P \\
 & \searrow F & \nearrow G \\
 & & \tilde{Q} \\
 & \searrow q & \downarrow \Phi \cong \\
 & & P/(I \cdot P)
 \end{array}$$

(iv) *All the  $\tilde{Q}$  in the above statements can be assumed to be semifree.*

*Proof.* (i) Set  $\tilde{Q} = P \oplus Q \oplus (A \otimes sV)$ , where  $(sV)^n = V^{n+1}$ . Then  $s : V \rightarrow sV$  induces a graded module morphism  $S : P \rightarrow A \otimes sV$  over  $A$ , i.e.  $S(a \cdot v) = (-1)^{|a|} a \otimes sv$  for  $a \in A, v \in V$ . The differential  $D$  on  $\tilde{Q}$  is given as follows.  $Dx = dx$  for  $x \in P$ ,  $D\alpha = d\alpha$  for  $\alpha \in Q$ , and  $D(sv) = v + f(v) - S(dv)$ . A straightforward calculation shows that  $D$  is well defined.

Set  $F : P \rightarrow \tilde{Q}$  as the natural inclusion. Let  $p : \tilde{Q} \rightarrow Q$  be  $f$  when restricted to  $P$ , be  $-id_Q$  when restricted to  $Q$ , and be 0 when restricted to  $A \otimes sV$ . For  $sv \in sV$  we have

$$p \circ D(sv) = f(v) - id_Q \circ f(v) = 0 = D \circ p(sv).$$

It follows that  $p$  is a surjective DG module morphism over  $A$ . We will show that it is a quasi-isomorphism.

Let  $x + \alpha + \sum a_i \otimes sv_i$  be a cocycle in  $\tilde{Q}$  with  $x \in P, \alpha \in Q, a_i \in A$  and  $sv_i \in sV$ . Suppose  $p(x + \alpha + \sum a_i \otimes sv_i) = d\beta$  for some  $\beta \in Q$ . Then  $f(x) - \alpha = p(x + \alpha + \sum a_i \otimes sv_i) = d\beta$ . On the other hand,  $D(x + \alpha + \sum a_i \otimes sv_i) = 0$  implies that

$$dx + \sum (-1)^{|a_i|} a_i \otimes v_i = 0, \quad d\alpha + \sum (-1)^{|a_i|} a_i \otimes f(v_i) = 0, \quad \sum da_i \otimes v_i - (-1)^{|a_i|} a_i \cdot S(dv_i) = 0.$$

Write  $x$  as  $\sum b_j \otimes w_j$  for  $b_j \in A, w_j \in V$ . Then  $S(x) = \sum (-1)^{|b_j|} b_j \otimes sw_j$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} D(Sx) &= \sum b_j \otimes w_j + \sum b_j \otimes f(w_j) + \sum [(-1)^{|b_j|} db_j \otimes sw_j - b_j \cdot S(dw_j)] \\ &= x + f\left(\sum b_j \otimes w_j\right) + \sum [-S(db_j \otimes w_j) - (-1)^{|b_j|} S(b_j \cdot dw_j)] \\ &= x + f(x) - S\left(\sum d(b_j \otimes w_j)\right) \\ &= x + f(x) - S(dx). \end{aligned}$$

As  $dx = -\sum (-1)^{|a_i|} a_i \otimes v_i$ ,  $S(dx) = -\sum a_i \otimes sv_i$ . Thus,

$$x + \alpha + \sum a_i \otimes sv_i = [\alpha - f(x)] + [x + f(x) - S(dx)] = D(-\beta + Sx).$$

This proves that  $p$  injective is on cohomology.

For each cocycle  $\alpha \in Q$ ,  $-\alpha$  is a cocycle in  $\tilde{Q}$  and  $p(-\alpha) = \alpha$ . So  $p$  surjective is on cohomology.

(ii) Construct  $p : \tilde{Q} \xrightarrow{\cong} Q$ , and  $F : P \rightarrow \tilde{Q}$  as in (i). Then  $p \circ F = f$ . Since  $gf \sim h$ , there exists a graded module morphism  $\theta : P \rightarrow P$  over  $A$  such that  $gf - h = d\theta + \theta d$ . Set  $G(x) = h(x)$  for  $x \in P$ ,  $G(\alpha) = -g(\alpha)$  for  $\alpha \in Q$ , and  $G(sv) = -\theta(v)$  for  $sv \in sV$ . Then

$$G \circ S(a \otimes v) = (-1)^{|a|} G(a \otimes sv) = -(-1)^{|a|} a \otimes \theta(v) = -\theta(a \otimes v)$$

for any  $a \in A$ . So  $G \circ S = -\theta$  on  $P$ , and we have

$$G \circ D(sv) = G(v + f(v) - S(dv)) = h(v) - gf(v) + \theta(dv) = -d \circ \theta(v) = d \circ G(sv).$$

It follows that  $G$  is a DG module morphism over  $A$ . By construction clearly  $G \circ F = h$ .

(iii) First apply (i) to construct  $F : P \rightarrow \tilde{Q}$ . This process is only depending on  $f$ . So we can apply the remaining step in (ii) twice on the homotopies  $q \sim \phi \circ f$  and  $id_P \sim g \circ f$ . Then we obtain two morphisms  $\Phi : \tilde{Q} \rightarrow P/(I \cdot P)$  and  $G : \tilde{Q} \rightarrow P$  such that  $q = \Phi \circ F$  and  $id_P = G \circ F$ .

(iv) By Proposition 2.3 there exists a surjective semifree resolution  $p' : \tilde{Q}' \rightarrow \tilde{Q}$ , and by Proposition 2.5(ii) there exists a lift  $F' : P \rightarrow \tilde{Q}'$  of  $f$  through  $p'$  such that  $p' \circ F' = F$ . Then  $\tilde{Q}, p, F, G, \Phi$  can be replaced by  $\tilde{Q}', p \circ p', F', G \circ p', \Phi \circ p'$  respectively. Since  $F$  is injective, it follows that  $F'$  is also injective. As both  $p$  and  $p'$  are surjective, so is  $p \circ p'$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.15.** *Let  $\Lambda V$  be a minimal Sullivan algebra and  $P$  be a semifree  $\Lambda V$ -module. If  $mcat(P) = m$ , then there is a  $\Lambda V$ -module  $Q$ , together with  $\Lambda V$ -module morphisms  $f : P \rightarrow Q$ ,  $g : Q \rightarrow P$ , and a quasi-isomorphism  $\phi : Q \xrightarrow{\cong} P/(\Lambda^{>m} V \cdot P)$  making the graph (2.1) commutative, i.e.  $\phi \circ f$  is the natural projection  $q : P \rightarrow P/(\Lambda^{>m} V \cdot P)$  and  $g \circ f = id_P$ .*

## 2.4 Module Categories over general KS complex

In [1], for a general Sullivan algebra  $\Lambda V$ ,  $cat(\Lambda V)$  can also be defined following the format of Definition 2.6. Its can be shown that this definition matches the definition by its minimal model. Similarly,  $e(\Lambda V)$  can be defined following the format of Definition 2.11. In this subsection, we will prove that the module category and Toomer invariant of DG modules over non-minimal Sullivan algebras can also be defined in a similar way. Such invariants will be used to prove the main theorems.

**Definition 2.16.** Let  $\Lambda V$  be a connected KS complex (not necessarily being Sullivan or minimal), and  $P$  be a  $\Lambda V$ -module.  $mcat_{\Lambda V}(P)$  is defined as the least number  $m$  such that there is a semifree  $\Lambda V$ -module  $Q$  together with DG module morphisms  $f : P \rightarrow Q$ ,  $g : Q \rightarrow P$ , and  $\phi : Q \rightarrow P/(\Lambda^{>m}V \cdot P)$  making the diagram (2.1) commutative (or just homotopy commutative according to Proposition 2.14).

$e_{\Lambda V}(P)$  is defined as the least number  $m$  such that the projection  $q : P \rightarrow P/(\Lambda^{>m}V \cdot P)$  is injective on cohomology.

For a general  $\Lambda V$ -module  $M$ , we also define  $mcat_{\Lambda V}(M)$  as the module category of its semifree resolution, since it is independent of the choice of the resolution. Similarly,  $e_{\Lambda V}(M)$  is defined as the Toomer invariant of its semifree resolution.

**Remark 2.17.** We may also give such definitions even if  $\Lambda V$  is not connected. In this case there exists a cocycle  $v \in V^0$ . Then the cohomology classes of all  $v^m$  are non-trivial and  $q^* : H^*(\Lambda V) \rightarrow H^*(\Lambda V/\Lambda^{>m}V)$  can never be injective. So  $e_{\Lambda V}(\Lambda V) = mcat_{\Lambda V}(\Lambda V) = \infty$ .

When  $\Lambda V$  is connected, it has a minimal model  $\Lambda Z$ . Let  $\psi : \Lambda Z \xrightarrow{\simeq} \Lambda V$  be the quasi-isomorphism. The  $\Lambda V$ -semifree module  $P$  naturally has a  $\Lambda Z$ -module structure, defined as  $z \cdot x := \psi(z) \cdot x$  for  $z \in Z, x \in P$ .

**Theorem 2.18.** *With the hypotheses and notations above,  $mcat_{\Lambda V}(P) = mcat_{\Lambda Z}(P)$ .*

*Proof.* We will use the fact that  $\Lambda V$  can be written as a tensor product of two KS complexes  $(\Lambda Z, d) \otimes (\Lambda(U \oplus dU), d)$ , where  $\Lambda Z$  is its minimal model and  $\Lambda(U \oplus dU)$  is contractible (i.e.  $d : U \rightarrow dU$  is an isomorphism) [4, Theorem 2.2]. When  $\Lambda V$  is a Sullivan algebra, a proof can also be found in Theorem 14.9 of [1]. Without loss of generalization, we may assume that  $\psi : \Lambda Z \xrightarrow{\simeq} \Lambda V$  is just the inclusion.

Observe that  $P$  is also  $\Lambda Z$ -semifree. Indeed, write it as  $\Lambda Z \otimes \Lambda(U \oplus dU) \otimes W$  such that  $W$  is the union of an increasing sequence of vector space satisfying  $dW(k) \subset \Lambda Z \otimes \Lambda(U \oplus dU) \otimes W(k-1)$ . As  $\Lambda(U \oplus dU)$  is a KS complex, we can give  $\Lambda(U \oplus dU) \otimes W$  a filtration  $\widetilde{W}(k)$  such that  $d\widetilde{W}(k) \subset \Lambda Z \otimes \widetilde{W}(k-1)$ . Namely, let  $\widetilde{W}(-1) = 0$  and inductively set  $\widetilde{W}(k)$  as the subspace of elements whose image under  $d$  is in  $\Lambda Z \otimes \widetilde{W}(k-1)$ . Then use induction on the filtrations of  $\Lambda(U \oplus dU)$  and  $W$  to show  $\Lambda(U \oplus dU) \otimes W \subset \bigcup \widetilde{W}(k)$ .

So when  $mcat_{\Lambda V}(P) = m$ , the commutative diagram (2.1) of  $\Lambda V$ -modules is also of of  $\Lambda Z$ -modules.

The projection  $q$  factors as  $P \xrightarrow{q_1} P/(\Lambda^{>m}Z \cdot P) \xrightarrow{q_2} P/(\Lambda^{>m}V \cdot P)$ . We will show that  $q_2$  is a quasi-isomorphism, so that  $P/(\Lambda^{>m}V \cdot P)$  in (2.1) can be replaced by  $P/(\Lambda^{>m}Z \cdot P)$ . This proof does not use the condition  $mcat_{\Lambda V}(P) = m$ , so  $q_2$  is a quasi-isomorphism for any  $m$ .

Equip  $P$  with a filtration by setting  $P(m) = \Lambda^{\geq m}V \cdot P$ , which is isomorphic to  $\Lambda^{\geq m}(Z \oplus U \oplus dU) \otimes W$ . This also gives filtrations on the quotient spaces  $P/(\Lambda^{>m}Z \cdot P)$  and  $P/(\Lambda^{>m}V \cdot P)$ , which are preserved by  $q_2$ . The induced  $E_0$  pages of spectral sequences are

$$(\Lambda^{\leq m}Z, 0) \otimes (\Lambda(U \oplus dU), d) \otimes (W, \bar{d})$$

and

$$\bigoplus_{0 \leq i \leq m} (\Lambda^{m-i}Z, 0) \otimes (\Lambda(U \oplus dU)/\Lambda^{>i}(U \oplus dU), d) \otimes (W, \bar{d})$$

respectively. Here  $\bar{d} : W(k) \rightarrow W(k-1)$  is induced by the differential on  $W$ .

Note that the projection  $\Lambda(U \oplus dU) \rightarrow \Lambda(U \oplus dU)/\Lambda^{>i}(U \oplus dU)$  is quasi-isomorphic for all  $i \geq 0$ , as  $\Lambda^{>i}(U \oplus dU)$  has a trivial cohomology. Actually, since  $\Lambda(U \oplus dU)$  is contractible, for any cocycle  $x \in \Lambda^{>i}(U \oplus dU)$ , there exist a constant  $c \in \mathbb{k}$  and some  $y \in \Lambda(U \oplus dU)$  such that  $x - c = dy$ . As  $d$  does not change the wordlength,  $x$  is equal to  $d$  acting on the part of  $y$  whose wordlength is greater than  $i$ . It follows that  $x$  is a coboundary in  $\Lambda^{>i}(U \oplus dU)$  (and  $c$  has to be 0).

Therefore,  $q_2$  induces a quasi-isomorphism between the  $E_0$  pages, then isomorphisms on higher  $E_r$  pages. As  $P(m+1) = \Lambda^{>m}V \cdot P$ , the spectral sequence for  $P/(\Lambda^{>m}V \cdot P)$  collapses at the page  $E_{m+1}$ . Then so is the spectral sequence for  $P/(\Lambda^{>m}Z \cdot P)$ . Thus,  $q_2$  induces an isomorphism between cohomologies.

Lift  $\phi : Q \xrightarrow{\simeq} P/(\Lambda^{>m}V \cdot P)$  through the surjective quasi-isomorphism  $q_2$ . We obtain a quasi-isomorphism  $\Phi : Q \xrightarrow{\simeq} P/(\Lambda^{>m}Z \cdot P)$  such that  $q_2 \circ \Phi = \phi$ . Then  $q_2 \circ q_1 = q = \phi \circ f = q_2 \circ \Phi \circ f$ , where  $f : P \rightarrow Q$  is the morphism in (2.1). By Proposition 2.5 (i) we have  $q_1 \sim \Phi \circ f$ , and by Proposition 2.14 we can assume  $q_1 = \Phi \circ f$ , i.e. the following diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P & \xrightarrow{f} & Q \\ & \searrow^{q_1} & \downarrow \Phi \simeq \\ & & P/(\Lambda^{>m}Z \cdot P) \xrightarrow{q_2 \simeq} P/(\Lambda^{>m}V \cdot P) \end{array}$$

Therefore, we can replace  $P/(\Lambda^{>m}V \cdot P)$ ,  $q$ ,  $\phi$  by  $P/(\Lambda^{>m}Z \cdot P)$ ,  $q_1$ ,  $\Phi$  respectively. It follows that  $mcat_{\Lambda Z}(P) \leq m = mcat_{\Lambda V}(P)$ .

Conversely, suppose  $mcat_{\Lambda Z}(P) = m$ . We have a diagram of the form (2.1) of  $\Lambda Z$ -modules, where  $P/(\Lambda^{>m}V \cdot P)$  is replaced by  $P/(\Lambda^{>m}Z \cdot P)$ . Let  $\Lambda V \otimes_{\Lambda Z} -$  acting on all the modules and morphisms.

Then we obtain the following commutative diagram of  $\Lambda V$ -modules.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\Lambda V \otimes_{\Lambda Z} P & \xrightarrow{id} & \Lambda V \otimes_{\Lambda Z} P \\
& \searrow & \nearrow \\
& \Lambda V \otimes_{\Lambda Z} Q & \\
& \downarrow \simeq & \\
& \Lambda V \otimes_{\Lambda Z} (P/(\Lambda^{>m} Z \cdot P)) &
\end{array}$$

Observe that  $\Lambda V \otimes_{\Lambda Z} P \cong (\Lambda(U \oplus dU), d) \otimes (P, d)$  is  $\Lambda V$ -free and quasi-isomorphic to  $P$ . Besides,

$$\Lambda V \otimes_{\Lambda Z} (P/(\Lambda^{>m} Z \cdot P)) \cong (\Lambda(U \oplus dU) \otimes P)/(\Lambda^{>m} Z \cdot (\Lambda(U \oplus dU) \otimes P))$$

Same as the discussion about  $q_2$  above, we have a quasi-isomorphism

$$(\Lambda(U \oplus dU) \otimes P)/(\Lambda^{>m} Z \cdot (\Lambda(U \oplus dU) \otimes P)) \xrightarrow{\simeq} (\Lambda(U \oplus dU) \otimes P)/(\Lambda^{>m} V \cdot (\Lambda(U \oplus dU) \otimes P)).$$

Therefore,

$$mcat_{\Lambda V}(P) = mcat_{\Lambda V}(\Lambda(U \oplus dU) \otimes P) \leq m = mcat_{\Lambda Z}(P).$$

This proves that  $mcat_{\Lambda V}(P) = mcat_{\Lambda Z}(P)$ .

Finally, as shown above,  $q_2 : P/(\Lambda^{>m} Z \cdot P) \xrightarrow{\simeq} P/(\Lambda^{>m} V \cdot P)$  is a quasi-isomorphism for all  $m$ . So  $q_1 : P \rightarrow P/(\Lambda^{>m} Z \cdot P)$  is injective on cohomology if and only if  $q_2 \circ q_1$  is. Thus,  $e_{\Lambda V}(P) = e_{\Lambda Z}(P)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.19.** *For any connected Sullivan algebra  $\Lambda V$ ,  $mcat_{\Lambda V}(\Lambda V) = cat(\Lambda V)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\Lambda Z$  be a minimal Sullivan model of  $\Lambda V$ , then

$$mcat_{\Lambda V}(\Lambda V) = mcat_{\Lambda Z}(\Lambda V) = mcat_{\Lambda Z}(\Lambda Z) = cat(\Lambda Z) = cat(\Lambda V).$$

$\square$

## 3 Main Theorems

### 3.1 Estimate the Module Category

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $\Lambda V = \Lambda Z \otimes \Lambda W$  be a relative Sullivan algebra. Suppose that  $P$  is a  $\Lambda V$ -semifree module of the form  $\Lambda V \otimes U$ , where  $U$  is a vector space of the form  $\bigcup U(k)$  satisfying  $dU(k) \subset \Lambda Z \otimes U(k-1)$ . Then the subspace  $\overline{P} = \Lambda Z \otimes U$  is a  $\Lambda Z$ -semifree module. If  $mcat_{\Lambda Z}(\overline{P}) = m$  and  $cat(\Lambda W) = n$ , then  $mcat_{\Lambda V}(P) \leq (m+1)(n+2) - 2$ .*

*Proof.* By hypothesis, there exists a  $\Lambda Z$ -semifree module  $\bar{Q}$  quasi-isomorphic to  $\bar{P}/(\Lambda^{>m}Z \cdot \bar{P})$  such that the following diagram of  $\Lambda Z$ -modules commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\bar{P} & \xrightarrow{id} & \bar{P} \\
& \searrow & \nearrow \\
& & \bar{Q} \\
& \swarrow & \downarrow \simeq \\
& & \bar{P}/(\Lambda^{>m}Z \cdot \bar{P})
\end{array}$$

The diagram shows a commutative triangle with  $\bar{P}$  at the top left and top right,  $\bar{Q}$  at the bottom middle, and  $\bar{P}/(\Lambda^{>m}Z \cdot \bar{P})$  at the bottom right. Arrows are labeled  $id$ ,  $pr$ , and  $\simeq$ .

We use  $pr$  to denote the natural projection in this proof. Let  $\Lambda V \otimes_{\Lambda Z} -$  acting on the modules and morphisms of the above diagram. Observe that  $P = \Lambda V \otimes_{\Lambda Z} \bar{P}$ , and  $\Lambda V \otimes_{\Lambda Z} (\bar{P}/(\Lambda^{>m}Z \cdot \bar{P})) = P/(\Lambda^{>m}Z \cdot P)$ . Set  $P_{m+1} = \Lambda V \otimes_{\Lambda Z} \bar{Q}$ , which is a  $\Lambda V$ -semifree module. Then we have the following commutative diagram of  $\Lambda V$ -modules.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
P & \xrightarrow{id} & P \\
& \searrow & \nearrow \\
& & P_{m+1} \\
& \swarrow & \downarrow \simeq \\
& & P/(\Lambda^{>m}Z \cdot P)
\end{array}$$

The diagram shows a commutative triangle with  $P$  at the top left and top right,  $P_{m+1}$  at the bottom middle, and  $P/(\Lambda^{>m}Z \cdot P)$  at the bottom right. Arrows are labeled  $id$ ,  $pr$ , and  $\simeq$ .

Let  $P^{\geq p, \geq q}$  denote the subspace  $(\Lambda^p Z \otimes \Lambda^q W) \cdot P = \Lambda^{\geq p} Z \otimes \Lambda^{\geq q} W \otimes U$  of  $P$ . Note that  $P^{\geq p, \geq q}$  is not closed under differential unless  $q = 0$ . So it is not a DG submodule in general.

Denote the quotient space  $P^{\geq p, \geq q}/P^{\geq p+1, \geq q}$  by  $P^{p, \geq q}$ . It is a DG module over  $(\Lambda W, \bar{d})$ , and is isomorphic to the module  $(\Lambda^p Z, 0) \otimes (\Lambda^{\geq q} W \otimes U, \bar{d})$ , where  $\bar{d}U(j) \subset U(j-1)$ . Thus,  $P^{p, \geq q}$  is  $\Lambda W$ -semifree. Moreover, it is  $\Lambda W$ -free when  $P$  is a minimal  $\Lambda V$ -semifree module such that  $dU(j) \subset \Lambda^+ Z \otimes U(j-1)$ .

We use  $P^{p, [q, r]}$  denote the quotient  $\Lambda W$ -module  $P^{p, \geq q}/P^{p, \geq r+1}$ . It is isomorphic to  $\bigoplus_{q \leq j \leq r} \Lambda^p Z \otimes \Lambda^j W \otimes U$  as graded modules.

Then let  $I_{m+1} = P^{\geq m+1, \geq 0}$  and define  $I_k = I_{k+1} + P^{\geq k, \geq (m+1-k)(n+2)-1}$  inductively for  $0 \leq k \leq m$ . As  $dP^{\geq p, \geq q} \subset P^{\geq p+1, \geq q-1} + P^{\geq p, \geq q}$ ,  $I_{m+1} = P^{\geq m+1, \geq 0}$  is closed under the differential. Then it is a DG submodule.

Now suppose we have constructed  $\Lambda V$ -semifree modules  $P_{k+1}, P_{k+2}, \dots, P_{m+1}$  for some  $k < m+1$ , such that for  $k < i \leq m+1$ , there are surjective quasi-isomorphisms  $P_i \xrightarrow{\simeq} P/I_i$ , and morphisms

$P_{i+1} \rightarrow P_i, P_i \rightarrow P_{i+1}$  make the following diagram commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
P_{i+1} & \xrightarrow{id} & P_{i+1} \\
& \searrow & \nearrow \\
& & P_i \\
\cong \downarrow & & \downarrow \cong \\
P/I_{i+1} & \xrightarrow{pr} & P/I_i
\end{array}$$

Here we put  $P_{m+2} = P$  and  $I_{m+2} = 0$ . We will construct  $P_k$  and the corresponding morphisms.

First observe that any surjective quasi-isomorphism  $\tilde{P}_{k+1} \rightarrow P_{k+1}$  gives a lift  $P_{k+2} \rightarrow \tilde{P}_{k+1}$  which makes the following diagram commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
P_{k+2} & \xrightarrow{id} & P_{k+2} \\
& \searrow & \nearrow \\
& & \tilde{P}_{k+1} \\
& \searrow & \downarrow \cong \\
& & P_{k+1} \\
\cong \downarrow & & \downarrow \cong \\
P/I_{k+2} & \xrightarrow{pr} & P/I_{k+1}
\end{array}$$

So we can replace  $P_{k+1}$  by  $\tilde{P}_{k+1}$ .

Next consider the subspace  $(P^{\geq k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)} + I_{k+1})/I_{k+1}$ . As

$$dP^{\geq k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)} \subset P^{\geq k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)} + P^{\geq k+1, \geq (m-k)(n+2)-1} \subset P^{\geq k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)} + I_{k+1}$$

and  $Z \cdot P^{\geq k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)} \subset I_{k+1}$ , this subspace is a DG submodule over  $\Lambda W$  where the  $\Lambda^+ Z$ -action is trivial. So it is also a DG module over  $(\Lambda W, \bar{d})$ , and is isomorphic to  $(\Lambda^k Z, 0) \otimes (\Lambda^{\geq (m-k)(n+2)} W \otimes U, \bar{d}) \cong P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)}$ .

By  $mcat_{\Lambda W}(P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)}) \leq cat(\Lambda W) = n$ , there exists a  $\Lambda W$ -semifree module  $Q_k$  quasi-isomorphic to  $P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)}/(\Lambda^{>n} W \cdot P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)})$  such that the following diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)} & \xrightarrow{id} & P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)} \\
& \searrow & \nearrow \\
& & Q_k \\
pr \searrow & & \downarrow \cong \\
& & P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)}/(\Lambda^{>n} W \cdot P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)})
\end{array}$$

$Q_k$  can also be recognized as a  $\Lambda V$ -module where the  $Z$ -action is trivial. So we can construct surjective  $\Lambda V$ -semifree resolutions  $F(P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)}$  and  $F(P^{k, [(m-k)(n+2), (m-k)(n+2)+n]}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} Q_k$ . The latter notation follows from  $\Lambda^{>n} W \cdot P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)} = P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)+n+1}$ , which implies that  $F(P^{k, [(m-k)(n+2), (m-k)(n+2)+n]})$  is also a  $\Lambda V$ -semifree resolution of  $P^{k, [(m-k)(n+2), (m-k)(n+2)+n]}$ . Then we have lifts  $f$  and  $g$  which make the following diagram commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
F(P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)}) & \xrightarrow{f} & F(P^{k, [(m-k)(n+2), (m-k)(n+2)+n]}) & \xrightarrow{g} & F(P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)}) \\
\downarrow p \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow p \simeq \\
P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & Q_k & \xrightarrow{\quad} & P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)} \\
& \searrow pr & \downarrow \simeq & & \\
& & P^{k, [(m-k)(n+2), (m-k)(n+2)+n]} & & 
\end{array}$$

Then  $(g \circ f) \circ p = p \circ id = p$ . As  $p$  is a quasi-isomorphism, we have  $g \circ f \sim id$  by Proposition 2.5 (i). Applying Proposition 2.14 (ii), we can replace  $F(P^{k, [(m-k)(n+2), (m-k)(n+2)+n]})$  by a larger module, and make the replacements  $F, G$  of  $f, g$  satisfy  $G \circ F = id$ .  $F$  and  $G$  also make the above commutative. So without loss of generality we can assume that  $g \circ f = id$ .

On the other hand,  $P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)+n+1} = P^{k, \geq (m+1-k)(n+2)-1} \cong I_k/I_{k+1}$ . So  $P^{k, [(m-k)(n+2), (m-k)(n+2)+n]} \cong (P^{\geq k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)} + I_{k+1})/I_k$  can be recognized as a subspace of  $P/I_k$ . It is actually a  $\Lambda V$ -submodule since differential and  $\Lambda V$ -action preserves this subspace. So we have the following commutative diagram of  $\Lambda V$ -modules.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
F(P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)}) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & P_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & P_{k+1} \\
\downarrow f & \searrow \simeq & \downarrow & \searrow \simeq & \downarrow \simeq \\
F(P^{k, [(m-k)(n+2), (m-k)(n+2)+n]}) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)} & \xrightarrow{\iota} & P/I_{k+1} \\
& \searrow \simeq & \downarrow pr & & \downarrow pr \\
& & P^{k, [(m-k)(n+2), (m-k)(n+2)+n]} & \xrightarrow{\iota} & P/I_k
\end{array}$$

Here  $\iota$  is the inclusion and  $h$  is a lift obtained by Proposition 2.5(ii). According to Proposition 2.14(i)  $h$  can be factored as a injective morphism  $H : F(P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)}) \rightarrow \tilde{P}_{k+1}$  and a surjective quasi-isomorphism  $\tilde{P}_{k+1} \xrightarrow{\simeq} P_{k+1}$ . Then  $P_{k+1}$  and  $h$  can be replaced by  $\tilde{P}_{k+1}$  and  $H$  respectively. So without loss of generality we assume that  $h$  is injective.

Let  $(F(P^{k, [(m-k)(n+2), (m-k)(n+2)+n]}) \times P_{k+1})/\sim$  denote the pushout of  $f$  and  $h$ , with  $(f(x), 0) \sim (0, h(x))$ , i.e.  $(f(x), -h(x)) \sim 0$  for  $x \in F(P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)})$ . Use  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  denote the following maps.

$$\phi : F(P^{k, [(m-k)(n+2), (m-k)(n+2)+n]}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} P^{k, [(m-k)(n+2), (m-k)(n+2)+n]} \xrightarrow{\iota} P/I_k$$

$$\psi : P_{k+1} \xrightarrow{\simeq} P/I_{k+1} \xrightarrow{pr} P/I_k$$

The morphism  $F(P^{k,[(m-k)(n+2),(m-k)(n+2)+n]}) \times P_{k+1} \rightarrow P/I_k$ ,  $(a, b) \mapsto \phi(a) + \psi(b)$  vanishes on  $(f(x), -h(x))$ . So it induces a morphism  $(\phi, \psi)$  from  $(F(P^{k,[(m-k)(n+2),(m-k)(n+2)+n]}) \times P_{k+1})/\sim$  to  $P/I_k$ . We claim that  $(\phi, \psi)$  is a quasi-isomorphism.

The proof of this claim is a dual version of Lemma 13.3 in [1]. As  $h$  and  $\iota : P^{k, \geq(m-k)(n+2)} \rightarrow P_{k+1}$  are injective, we have the following commutative diagram of short exact sequences.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & F(P^{k, \geq(m-k)(n+2)}) & \xrightarrow{h} & P_{k+1} & \longrightarrow & \text{coker } h & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \simeq \downarrow & & \simeq \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & P^{k, \geq(m-k)(n+2)} & \xrightarrow{\iota} & P/I_{k+1} & \longrightarrow & \text{coker } \iota & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

By the five Lemma the induced morphism  $\text{coker } h \rightarrow \text{coker } \iota$  is quasi-isomorphic.

Observe that the morphism  $\chi : F(P^{k,[(m-k)(n+2),(m-k)(n+2)+n]}) \rightarrow (F(P^{k,[(m-k)(n+2),(m-k)(n+2)+n]}) \times P_{k+1})/\sim$ ,  $a \mapsto (a, 0)$  is injective with cokernel  $\text{coker } h$ . Indeed, if  $(a_1, 0) \sim (a_2, 0)$ , there exists some  $x \in F(P^{k, \geq(m-k)(n+2)})$  such that  $f(x) = a_1 - a_2$  and  $-h(x) = 0$ . As  $h$  is injective, we have  $x = 0$  and  $a_1 = a_2$ . So  $\chi$  is injective. Its image is identified with  $(F(P^{k,[(m-k)(n+2),(m-k)(n+2)+n]}) \times \text{im } h)/\sim$ , then the cokernel is identified with

$$(F(P^{k,[(m-k)(n+2),(m-k)(n+2)+n]}) \times P_{k+1})/(F(P^{k,[(m-k)(n+2),(m-k)(n+2)+n]}) \times \text{im } h) \cong \text{coker } h.$$

On the other hand,  $\text{coker } \iota$  is also the cokernel of the other  $\iota$  from  $P^{k,[(m-k)(n+2),(m-k)(n+2)+n]}$  to  $P/I_k$ . This follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \text{coker } \iota &= (P/I_{k+1})/P^{k, \geq(m-k)(n+2)} \\ &\cong (P/I_{k+1})/((P^{\geq k, \geq(m-k)(n+2)} + I_{k+1})/I_{k+1}) \\ &\cong (P/I_k)/((P^{\geq k, \geq(m-k)(n+2)} + I_{k+1})/I_k) \\ &\cong (P/I_k)/P^{k,[(m-k)(n+2),(m-k)(n+2)+n]}. \end{aligned}$$

The composition  $(\phi, \psi) \circ \chi$  is exactly  $\phi$ . So we have the following commutative diagram of short exact sequences.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & F(P^{k,[(m-k)(n+2),(m-k)(n+2)+n]}) & \xrightarrow{\chi} & (F(P^{k,[(m-k)(n+2),(m-k)(n+2)+n]}) \times P_{k+1})/\sim & \longrightarrow & \text{coker } h & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \simeq \downarrow & & \downarrow (\phi, \psi) & & \simeq \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & P^{k,[(m-k)(n+2),(m-k)(n+2)+n]} & \xrightarrow{\iota} & P/I_k & \longrightarrow & \text{coker } \iota & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

Apply the five lemma again, we have that  $(\phi, \psi)$  is a quasi-isomorphism. So the claim is proved.

Now we construct a morphism from  $F(P^{k,[(m-k)(n+2),(m-k)(n+2)+n]}) \times P_{k+1} \rightarrow P_{k+1}$  by  $(a, b) \mapsto h \circ g(a) + b$ . Then the image of  $(f(x), -h(x))$  where  $x \in F(P^{k, \geq(m-k)(n+2)})$  is  $h \circ g \circ f(x) - h(x) =$

$h(x) - h(x) = 0$ . So it induces a morphism from  $(F(P^k, [(m-k)(n+2), (m-k)(n+2)+n]) \times P_{k+1}) / \sim$  to  $P_{k+1}$ . By definition, this morphism sends  $(0, b)$  to  $b$ , so it is surjective. Construct a surjective  $\Lambda V$ -semifree resolution  $P_k \xrightarrow{\simeq} (F(P^k, [(m-k)(n+2), (m-k)(n+2)+n]) \times P_{k+1}) / \sim$ . Then we obtain a lift  $P_{k+1} \rightarrow P_k$  which makes the following diagram commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
P_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{id} & P_{k+1} \\
\downarrow \simeq & \searrow & \downarrow \simeq \\
P_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & P_k \\
& & \downarrow \simeq \\
& & (F(P^k, [(m-k)(n+2), (m-k)(n+2)+n]) \times P_{k+1}) / \sim \\
& & \downarrow \simeq (\phi, \psi) \\
P/I_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{pr} & P/I_k
\end{array}$$

Therefore, we can construct  $P_i \simeq P/I_i$  inductively and factor the identify map as  $P_{i+1} \rightarrow P_i \rightarrow P_{i+1}$  for  $i \leq m+1$ . It leads to the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
P & \xrightarrow{id} & P \\
& \searrow \xi & \downarrow \simeq \\
& & P_0 \\
& \searrow pr & \downarrow \eta \\
& & P/I_0
\end{array}$$

Finally, since  $\Lambda^{\geq(m+1)(n+2)-1} V \cdot P \subset I_0$ , the projection  $P \rightarrow P/I_0$  factors through  $P/(\Lambda^{>(m+1)(n+2)-2} V \cdot P)$ . Choose a surjective  $\Lambda V$ -semifree resolution  $Q \xrightarrow{\simeq} P/(\Lambda^{>(m+1)(n+2)-2} V \cdot P)$ . We have the following commutative diagrams with lifts  $\zeta$  and  $\lambda$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
P & \overset{\zeta}{\dashrightarrow} & Q & \overset{\lambda}{\dashrightarrow} & P_0 \\
& \searrow pr & \downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \eta \\
& & P/(\Lambda^{>(m+1)(n+2)-2} V \cdot P) & \xrightarrow{pr} & P/I_0
\end{array}$$

So we have  $\eta \circ (\lambda \circ \zeta) = \eta \circ \xi$ . Since  $\eta$  is a quasi-isomorphism, we have  $\lambda \circ \zeta \sim \xi$  by Proposition 2.5 (i). Apply Proposition 2.14 (ii) again to replace  $Q$  by a larger module, we can make  $\lambda \circ \zeta = \xi$ . Then we

obtain the following commutative diagram, which implies  $mcat_{\Lambda V}(P) \leq (m+1)(n+2) - 2$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
P & \xrightarrow{id} & P & & \\
\zeta \searrow & & & & \nearrow \\
& & Q & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & P_0 \\
pr \searrow & & \downarrow \simeq & & \\
& & P/(\Lambda^{>(m+1)(n+2)-2}V \cdot P) & & 
\end{array}$$

□

When  $\Lambda V$  itself is a minimal Sullivan algebra, we have  $dP^{\geq p, \leq q} \subset P^{\geq p+2, \leq q-1}$ . In this case we can make  $I_k$  a little larger. Precisely, set  $I_k = I_{k+1} + P^{\leq k, \leq (m+1-k)(n+1)}$ . Then the subspace  $P^{\geq k, \geq (m-k)(n+1)} + I_{k+1}$  is closed under the differential. It follows that  $(P^{\geq p+2, \leq q-1} + I_{k+1})/I_{k+1}$  is a DG module over  $\Lambda W$ , and its submodule  $\Lambda^{n+1}W \cdot [(P^{\geq p+2, \leq q-1} + I_{k+1})/I_{k+1}]$  is isomorphic to  $I_k/I_{k+1}$ . Following the construction in Theorem 3.1, we can factor  $id_P$  as

$$P \rightarrow F(P/(\Lambda^{\geq (m+1)(n+1)}V \cdot P)) \rightarrow F(P/I_0) \rightarrow P.$$

So we have the following estimation.

**Theorem 3.2.** *With the hypothesis of Theorem 3.1, suppose in addition that  $\Lambda V$  itself is a minimal Sullivan algebra. If  $mcat_{\Lambda Z}(\overline{P}) = m$  and  $cat(\Lambda W) = n$ , then  $mcat_{\Lambda V}(P) \leq (m+1)(n+1) - 1$ .*

A minimal Sullivan algebra  $\Lambda V$  can be interpreted as a relative Sullivan algebra  $\Lambda V^1 \otimes \Lambda V^{\geq 2}$ . So  $cat(\Lambda V)$  is finite if both  $cat(\Lambda V^1)$  and  $cat(\Lambda V^{\geq 2})$  are. The converse statement follows from Proposition 9.6 and Theorem 9.3 of [2]. So we have obtained Corollary 1.2.

**Corollary 3.3.** *Let  $\Lambda V$  be a minimal Sullivan algebra. Then  $cat(\Lambda V) < \infty$  if and only if both  $cat(\Lambda V^1)$  and  $cat(\Lambda V^{\geq 2})$  are finite.*

The following two simple examples show that this corollary can not be generalized to arbitrary relative Sullivan algebras.

**Example 3.4.** Let  $Z$  spanned by  $z$  of degree 3, and  $W$  spanned by  $w$  of degree 2. Set  $dz = 0, dw = z$ . Then  $cat(\Lambda Z \otimes \Lambda W) = 0$  but  $cat(\Lambda W) = \infty$ .

Although  $cat(\Lambda W) \leq cat(\Lambda Z \otimes \Lambda W)$  if  $\Lambda Z \otimes \Lambda W$  is a minimal Sullivan algebra [2, Theorem 9.3], it is still possible that  $cat(\Lambda Z) = \infty$  but  $cat(\Lambda Z \otimes \Lambda W)$  is finite.

**Example 3.5.** Let  $Z$  spanned by  $z$  of degree 2, and  $W$  spanned by  $w$  of degree 3. Set  $dz = 0, dw = z^2$ . Then  $\Lambda Z \otimes \Lambda W$  is minimal and its LS category is 1, but  $cat(\Lambda Z) = \infty$ .

For any fixed  $m$  and  $n$ , there are examples such that  $\text{cat}(\Lambda Z) = m$ ,  $\text{cat}(\Lambda W) = n$  and  $\text{cat}(\Lambda Z \otimes \Lambda W) = (m+1)(n+1) - 1$ .

**Example 3.6** (Example 1 of Section 30(b), [1]). Let  $Z$  spanned by  $x, y$ , and  $W$  spanned by  $u, v$ , where  $|x| = 2(n+1)$ ,  $|y| = 2(m+1)(n+1) - 1$ ,  $u = 2$ ,  $v = 2(n+1) - 1$ . Set  $dx = du = 0$ ,  $dy = x^{m+1}$ , and  $dv = u^{n+1} - x$ . Then  $\text{cat}(\Lambda Z) = m$ , and  $\text{cat}(\Lambda W) = n$ .  $\Lambda Z \otimes \Lambda W$  is quasi-isomorphic to  $\Lambda u/(u^{(m+1)(n+1)})$ , whose LS category is  $(m+1)(n+1) - 1$ .

In this example  $\Lambda Z \otimes \Lambda W$  is not a minimal Sullivan algebra. So it remains open whether there are better estimations for Theorem 3.1 and 3.2.

### 3.2 Estimate the Toomer invariant

The idea of Theorem 3.1 can also be used to estimate the Toomer invariant of relative Sullivan algebras, although the hypothesis is a little different. This proof is simpler, as we can apply the four lemma.

**Lemma 3.7** (Four lemma). *In the following commutative diagram of abelian groups, if  $\eta, \lambda$  are injective and  $\xi$  is surjective, then  $\zeta$  is injective.*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} A & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & C & \longrightarrow & D \\ \xi \downarrow & & \eta \downarrow & & \zeta \downarrow & & \lambda \downarrow \\ A' & \longrightarrow & B' & \longrightarrow & C' & \longrightarrow & D' \end{array}$$

**Theorem 3.8.** *Let  $\Lambda V = \Lambda Z \otimes \Lambda W$  be a relative Sullivan algebra, and  $P$  be a  $\Lambda V$ -semifree module. Then  $P$  has a  $\Lambda Z$ -module structure and assume that  $e_{\Lambda Z}(P) = m$ . Additionally,  $P^{p, \geq q}$  is a  $\Lambda W$ -module. If  $e_{\Lambda W}(P^{p, \geq q}) \leq n$  for any  $p$  and  $q$ , then  $e_{\Lambda V}(P) \leq (m+1)(n+2) - 2$ . Moreover, if  $\Lambda V$  itself is a minimal Sullivan algebra, then  $e_{\Lambda V}(P) \leq (m+1)(n+1) - 1$ .*

*Proof.* First observe that  $P$  is  $\Lambda Z$ -semifree, and all  $P^{p, \geq q}$  are  $\Lambda W$ -semifree. So by the hypothesis that  $e_{\Lambda Z}(P) = m$ , the projection  $P \rightarrow P/(\Lambda^m Z \cdot P)$  is injective on cohomology. Then similar to the Proof of Theorem 3.1, let  $I_{m+1} = P^{\geq m+1, \geq 0}$  and  $I_k = I_{k+1} + P^{\geq k, \geq (m+1-k)(n+2)-1}$  inductively for  $0 \leq k \leq m$ , or  $I_k = I_{k+1} + P^{\geq k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)}$  if  $\Lambda V$  is minimal.

By hypothesis all  $e_{\Lambda W}(P^{p, \geq q}) \leq n$ . Thus, the projection

$$P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)} \rightarrow P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)} / (\Lambda^{\geq n} W \cdot P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)}) = P^{k, [(m-k)(n+2), (m-k)(n+2)+n]}$$

(respectively  $P^{k, \geq (m-k-1)(n+1)} \rightarrow P^{k, [(m-k-1)(n+1), (m-k)(n+1)-1]}$  when  $\Lambda V$  is minimal) is injective on cohomology.

As discussed in the proof of Theorem 3.1,  $P^{k, [(m-k)(n+2), (m-k)(n+2)+n]} \cong (P^{\geq k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)} + I_{k+1}) / I_k$  can be recognized as a submodule of  $P/I_k$ . Also  $P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)} = (P^{\geq k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)} + I_{k+1}) / I_{k+1}$ . So

we have the following commutative diagram of short exact sequences.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & P^{k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)} & \longrightarrow & P/I_{k+1} & \longrightarrow & P/(P^{\geq k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)} + I_{k+1}) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
& & \downarrow pr & & \downarrow pr & & \downarrow \cong & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & P^{k, [(m-k)(n+2), (m-k)(n+2)+n]} & \longrightarrow & P/I_k & \longrightarrow & P/(P^{\geq k, \geq (m-k)(n+2)} + I_{k+1}) & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}$$

The left vertical morphism is injective on cohomology, and the right one is isomorphic. By the four lemma, the middle one is also injective on cohomology. Therefore, we have obtained a sequence of projections

$$P \rightarrow P/I_{m+1} \rightarrow P/I_m \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow P/I_1 \rightarrow P/I_0$$

which are all injective on cohomologies. The composition of these projections can be factored as  $P \rightarrow P/(\Lambda^{\geq (m+1-k)(n+2)-1}V \cdot P) \rightarrow P/I_0$ , which implies that the projection  $P \rightarrow P/(\Lambda^{\geq (m+1)(n+2)-1}V \cdot P)$  is injective on cohomology. Therefore,  $e_{\Lambda V}(P) \leq (m+1)(n+2) - 2$ . A similar discussion shows that  $e_{\Lambda V}(P) \leq (m+1)(n+1) - 1$  if  $\Lambda V$  is minimal.  $\square$

In the case that  $P = \Lambda V$ ,  $P^{p, \geq q} \cong (\Lambda^p Z, 0) \otimes (\Lambda^{\geq q} W, \bar{d})$ . So  $e_{\Lambda W}(P^{p, \geq q}) \leq n$  if and only if  $e_{\Lambda W}(\Lambda^{\geq q} W) \leq n$ . Then Theorem 1.3 follows.

## References

- [1] Yves Félix, Stephen Halperin, and Jean-Claude Thomas. *Rational homotopy theory*, volume 205. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [2] Yves Félix, Steve Halperin, and Jean-Claude Thomas. *Rational homotopy theory II*. World Scientific, 2015.
- [3] S Halperin and J-M Lemaire. Notions of category in differential algebra. *Algebraic Topology Rational Homotopy*, page 138, 1988.
- [4] Stephen Halperin. *Lectures on minimal models*, volume 9. Gauthier-Villars, 1983.
- [5] Kathryn P Hess. A proof of ganea’s conjecture for rational spaces. *Topology*, 30(2):205–214, 1991.
- [6] L Ljusternik and Lev Schnirelmann. *Méthodes topologiques dans les problèmes variationnels: Espaces à un nombre fini de dimensions. 1ère partie*, volume 188. Hermann, 1934.
- [7] Dennis Sullivan. Infinitesimal computations in topology. *Publications Mathématiques de l’IHÉS*, 47:269–331, 1977.

Beijing Institute of Mathematical Sciences and Applications, Huairou District, Beijing, China 101408  
*Email address:* `jiaweizhou@bimsa.cn`