

# Explicit Acyclic Models and (Co)Chain Operations

Greg Brumfiel and John Morgan

## Contents

<b>PART I: Contractions and Construction of Chain Maps</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>0 Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1 Review of Acyclic Models</b>	<b>8</b>
1.1 Contraction Based Acyclic Model Methods . . . . .	8
1.2 Preview of Examples . . . . .	9
<b>2 Preview of Parts I, II, and III</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1 Preview of Part I . . . . .	13
2.2 Preview of Part II . . . . .	16
2.3 Preview of Part III . . . . .	18
<b>3 Conventions with Chain and Cochain Complexes</b>	<b>23</b>
3.1 Tensor and Hom Complexes . . . . .	23
3.2 Group Actions on Tensor and Hom Complexes . . . . .	28
<b>4 Contractions</b>	<b>30</b>
4.1 Contractions of Augmented Based Chain Complexes . . . . .	30
4.2 Contractions with $h^2 = 0$ . . . . .	31
<b>5 Examples of Contractions</b>	<b>33</b>
5.1 Simplices, Products, and MacLane Models . . . . .	33
5.2 The Minimal Model for Cyclic Groups . . . . .	35
5.3 Tensor and Hom Complexes . . . . .	36
5.4 Twisted Coefficients . . . . .	39

<b>6</b>	<b>Using Contractions to Construct Chain Maps</b>	<b>41</b>
6.1	The Basic Standard Procedure . . . . .	41
6.2	Fundamental Uniqueness Theorems . . . . .	42
6.3	<i>AW</i> and <i>EZ</i> Maps for MacLane Models . . . . .	46
6.4	Tensor Products of Standard Procedure Maps . . . . .	52
6.5	The Standard Procedure Maps $M_* \leftrightarrow N_*(EC)$ . . . . .	54
6.6	A Standard Procedure Map Related to $\ell^{th}$ Powers . . . . .	59
<b>7</b>	<b>Diagonal Chain Maps from Contractions</b>	<b>60</b>
7.1	Diagonals for MacLane Models . . . . .	60
7.2	Diagonals for Minimal Models . . . . .	61
<b>8</b>	<b>Functorial Standard Procedure Chain Maps</b>	<b>64</b>
8.1	Uniqueness Theorems for Functorial Chain Maps . . . . .	65
8.2	The Functorial <i>AW</i> and <i>EZ</i> Standard Procedure Maps . . . . .	66
8.3	Functorial Diagonals for Multisimplicial Sets . . . . .	71
<b>9</b>	<b>The Universal <i>EZ</i> Chain Homotopy</b>	<b>73</b>
9.1	Using Joins to Construct Chain Homotopies . . . . .	74
9.2	Examples Related to Diagonals and $\ell^{th}$ Power Maps . . . . .	77
	<b>PART II: The Surjection Complexes</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Preview of the Surjection Complexes.</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>The Twisted Complex <math>\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_*(n)</math></b>	<b>84</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>The Untwisted Complex <math>\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)</math></b>	<b>85</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>The Berger-Fresse Complex <math>\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)</math></b>	<b>87</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>The McClure-Smith Complex <math>\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)</math></b>	<b>90</b>
<b>15</b>	<b>The Isomorphisms <math>\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \simeq \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n) \simeq \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)</math></b>	<b>96</b>
15.1	The isomorphism $\phi: \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ . . . . .	97
15.2	The isomorphism $\phi: \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ . . . . .	99
<b>16</b>	<b>The Chain Maps <math>\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n), \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n), \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n) \leftrightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_n)</math></b>	<b>104</b>
16.1	The Maps $N_*(E\Sigma_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n), \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n), \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ . . . . .	105
16.2	The Maps $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n), \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n), \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n) \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ . . . . .	110
16.3	Further Results on the maps <i>TR</i> and <i>PR</i> . . . . .	116

<b>PART III: The Barratt-Eccles and Surjection Operads</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>17 The Functorial Chain Map <math>\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}</math></b>	<b>128</b>
17.1 The Berger-Fresse Map . . . . .	128
17.2 Compositions $A_*(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \rightarrow HOM_{func}(N_*(X), N_*(X)^{\otimes n})$	140
<b>18 Preliminaries on Operads</b>	<b>146</b>
18.1 The Symmetric Group Operad . . . . .	147
18.2 The CoEnd Operad . . . . .	155
<b>19 The Barratt-Eccles Operad</b>	<b>158</b>
19.1 Candidates for Operad Structure Maps . . . . .	158
19.2 The Barratt-Eccles Operad Structure Maps . . . . .	164
<b>20 The Surjection Operad</b>	<b>166</b>
20.1 The Surjection Operad Structure Maps . . . . .	167
20.2 The Operad Morphism $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ . . . . .	189
<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>194</b>

# I: Contractions and Construction of Chain Maps

## 0 Introduction

The purpose of this elementary and largely expository four part project is to record some observations about acyclic model methods and their use for constructing chain maps between chain complexes, related to an operadic approach to cochain operations and cohomology operations. More specifically, we were originally interested in making more explicit the construction of Steenrod operations for all primes and establishing their properties at the cochain level. Classically the development of cohomology operations was carried out in the 1940's and 1950's. Steenrod began the study using direct cochain constructions, the  $\cup_i$  operations leading to the Steenrod Squares, but subsequently homotopy theoretical methods proved more powerful. More recently, in the 1990's and early 2000's, certain classical methods of Steenrod were extended to give a general treatment of multivariable cochain operations using the machinery of operads, [3], [19]. Although the authors of those works understood that they were generalizing early constructions of Steenrod for the Steenrod Squares, and providing a framework for a more explicit cochain level discussion of odd prime Steenrod  $p^{th}$  power operations than was carried out in the 1950's, their primary interest was not necessarily Steenrod operations, but rather other problems involving cochain algebras and operations for which operad machinery was relevant.

In the papers [22] and [7], cochain level proofs of the Cartan formula and Adem relations for Steenrod Squares were presented, using the operad methods. Substantial difficulties remained for giving analogous cochain level proofs of the Cartan formula and the Adem relations for odd prime Steenrod operations. In Part IV of this project we plan to give explicit cochain level proofs of properties of the Steenrod operations, including additivity, the odd prime Cartan formula,  $P^0 = Id$ , stability under suspension, and the Adem relations, using the operad methods.

However, in the process, we realized that many explicit chain maps involved in the operadic discussion could be 'explained' using a universal procedure, based on classical ideas behind acyclic model methods. Our basic procedure and many examples are detailed in Part I of our project. This includes some clarification of the classical Alexander-Whitney and Eilenberg-Zilber chain maps. Our procedure also includes the operad structure maps of the operads known as the Barratt-Eccles operad  $\mathcal{E}$  and the surjection operad  $\mathcal{S}$ , and

certain morphisms between them  $\mathcal{E} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ , where  $\mathcal{Z}$  is the Eilenberg-Zilber operad. We introduce a version of the surjection operad that seems quite natural.<sup>1</sup> The operad results are covered in Part III of the project. Part II should be viewed as a mini-course that organizes in a self-contained manner three versions of the surjection complexes, and establishes their basic properties relatively painlessly. In the end, we found the observations in Parts II and III interesting by themselves, and perhaps more useful than our original goals of explicit cochain level proofs of the Cartan formula and the Adem relations.

This paper consists of Parts I, II, and III of our project, which accounts for its length. Parts II and III are largely independent of Part I, once some basic ideas about contractions  $h$  of chain complexes with  $h^2 = 0$ , and their use for constructing chain maps, are absorbed from Part I. We contemplated submitting three separate articles. Instead, we strongly encourage readers to view this long paper as three separate papers, skip around, discover what is accomplished in the separate parts. Some of the technical results in Part I are only used in Part IV, to establish properties of Steenrod operations at the cochain level. Part IV of our project will be submitted separately.

What is the point of explicit cochain level arguments concerning cohomology operations that we pursue in Part IV? The actual cochain formulas for Steenrod operations and relations between operations turn out to be hopelessly large to be of any use. The homological and homotopy theoretical methods that were used to develop the Steenrod algebra in the 1950's were profound and exquisite. The classical applications and computations in examples don't use underlying cochain formulas. Originally we believed cochain level formulas for Steenrod operations and Adem relations between compositions of operations would be useful for studying explicit cochain level simplicial set models of two and three stage Postnikov towers, as in our papers [9], [10] on low dimensional Spin bordism and [11] on  $\text{Pin}^-$  structures.

But it became clear that was not going to go very far. It is already rather difficult to find cocycle formulas  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  for the first two  $k$ -invariants of a three stage Postnikov tower  $E$ . This is where explicit cochain formulas for cohomology operations and relations between operations are required to produce simplicial set models for three stage Postnikov towers. Among other

---

<sup>1</sup>Much of our development of this complex can certainly be found in the more ambitious paper [1] of M. Adamaszek and J.D.S. Jones.

things, one needs *names* for cochain operations that go far beyond Steenrod's two variable  $\cup_i$  operations. Once one has enough names, maps  $X \rightarrow E$  for simplicial sets  $X$  are then described by triples of cochains  $(w, p, a)$  on  $X$  with  $da = 0, dp = k_1 = k(a)$  and  $dw = k_2 = k(p, a)$ . The simplicial sets  $E$  that we define using explicit cochain formulas for  $k$ -invariants are minimal Kan complexes.

But it is not enough to simply enumerate the simplicial maps  $X \rightarrow E$  in this way. One also wants to describe with formulas the homotopy equivalence relation on triples  $(w, p, a)$ . This becomes a harder problem at the cochain level. Even if it is known that  $E$  is an  $H$ -space, it is an added level of difficulty to describe with formulas an explicit simplicial set product map  $E \times E \rightarrow E$ , and prove that it is homotopy commutative and associative. Essentially one wants some kind of explicit simplicial presentation of the abelian group of homotopy classes of maps  $[X, E]$ . In the case of a loop space  $E = \Omega \widehat{E}$  one also wants to understand the isomorphism  $[\Sigma X, \widehat{E}] \simeq [X, E]$  in terms of formulas involving cochain operations and cochain suspension. Our papers on the Pontrjagin duals of 3 and 4 dimensional Spin bordism provide examples that confirm how difficult all this gets.<sup>2</sup> For  $k$ -stage Postnikov towers with  $k > 3$  these problems seem almost hopeless.

The operad methods produce much more than an alternate development of Steenrod operations and their properties. The full structure of the normalized cochain algebra  $N^*(X)$  as an algebra over the Barratt-Eccles operad  $\mathcal{E}$  or the surjection operad  $\mathcal{S}$  actually determines the homotopy type of a finite type simply connected simplicial set  $X$ .<sup>3</sup> Versions of this theorem, including deep results relating the homotopy category of spaces and homotopy categories of operad algebras, are often referred to as Mandell's Theorem [16], [17]. Much work on such issues was also carried out by Justin R. Smith [27], [28], [29]. Earlier attempts were made by the Russian mathematician V. A. Smirnov [26]. Several researchers have contributed to further refinements. So the  $\mathcal{E}$ -operad algebra structure of  $N^*(X)$  determines in some difficult to make precise manner not only the module structure of  $H^*(X)$  over the

---

<sup>2</sup>Our results on Spin bordism are closely related to explicit simplicial set models for the first three stages of the Postnikov towers of  $S^3, S^4, S^5$ , mostly based on the Adem relation  $Sq^2Sq^2 + Sq^3Sq^1 = 0$ . How much simpler could it get? Viewing  $K(\mathbb{Z}/8, n)$  as a three stage explicit simplicial tower with building blocks  $K(\mathbb{Z}/2, n)$ , based on the relation  $Sq^1Sq^1 = 0$ , sounds simpler but is also provocatively complicated even for small  $n$ .

<sup>3</sup>Only a very small part of this structure is needed to define Steenrod operations and establish their properties at the cochain level.

Steenrod algebra but also higher order cohomology operations, differentials in Adams spectral sequences, the homotopy groups of  $X$ , and Postnikov towers for  $X$ . It was always a mantra that the functorial structure of the  $H^*(X)$  as algebras and modules over the Steenrod algebra was not enough to fully deal with such questions, one needed to dig deeper into the chain and cochain level. The operad results can be viewed as a modern take on the development of (semi)simplicial methods for homotopy theory in the 1950's, including E. H. Brown's result that homotopy groups of finite simply connected complexes were algorithmically computable by simplicial methods. One cannot predict what the power of future computers might bring to the table in the study of direct simplicial methods, but the complexity of algorithms is seriously exponential.

Perhaps our project of a cochain level study of Steenrod operations in Part IV should sort of be viewed as meeting a challenge, like climbers scaling some mountain by a new difficult route. Of what use is that? Not to get to the top. You could maybe hike up steps, drive up a road, or take a helicopter. But beyond the challenge, we found that some of the computations we made, and some of the connections between older and newer ideas related to cochain operations, acyclic models, and operads, were rather interesting to us, and might interest others.

Our paper is lengthy, because we include many details and examples and give essentially complete proofs of the major results, which takes many pages. But it is conceptually relatively elementary compared to thousands of other papers on operads and homotopy theory written by many hundreds of authors during the last 50 or more years. We find versions of some of our results included in some of these recent and not so recent papers. Our goal in Parts II and III is to organize systematically a new development of the surjection and Barratt-Eccles operads, and their relation to chain and cochain operations, that unifies what is found in the original sources. It seems clear that the operad algebra approach to the homotopy category and stable homotopy category deserves a permanent place in algebraic topology, of which our goal of a cochain level development of the Steenrod algebra and its action on cohomology rings is a very small piece. Our paper can be viewed as a reformulation of some history, an introductory work, or an insert, that should come before the deeper results, which likely have still not reached a final form.

# 1 Review of Acyclic Models

## 1.1 Contraction Based Acyclic Model Methods

Let us review the acyclic model method. First, suppose given a chain complex  $B_*$  that is free over some ground ring  $\mathbb{F}$  or a group ring  $\mathbb{F}[G]$ , and a contractible chain complex<sup>4</sup>  $C_*$ , with a  $G$ -action in the equivariant case. Differentials in chain complexes are always  $\mathbb{F}[G]$  linear. If  $B_*$  is graded in non-negative degrees then beginning with a suitable map in degree 0 one can construct equivariant chain maps  $\phi: B_* \rightarrow C_*$  unique up to equivariant chain homotopy. By freeness of the domain, one just needs to define  $\phi(b)$  for a set of basis elements  $\{b\} \subset B_*$ . One does this recursively on degree, using the fact that a cycle in  $C_{n-1}$  is the boundary of an element of  $C_n$ . Given a basis element  $b \in B_n$ , one chooses  $\phi(b) \in C_n$  so that  $d\phi(b) = \phi(db)$ , this latter element being a cycle by induction. If  $C_*$  is merely contractible, not acyclic, ‘suitability’ of  $\phi: B_0 \rightarrow C_0$  will include  $\phi(dB_1) \subset dC_1$ . One then extends  $\phi$  in degree  $n$  by linearity or equivariant linearity, and moves on to the next degree. In a similar recursive manner one can construct (equivariant) chain homotopies between two (equivariant) chain maps.

Now, there are three levels of explicitness that one can consider. First, if one uses only the fact that  $C_*$  is contractible, then the construction is not at all explicit. But if one has an explicit contraction, roughly a chain homotopy  $h: C_* \rightarrow C_{*+1}$  with  $dh + hd = Id$  in non-zero degrees and also on  $\phi(dB_1) \subset dC_1$ , then one has a somewhat explicit formula for basis generators  $b$ , namely  $\phi(b) = h\phi(db)$ . One calculates by induction

$$d\phi(b) = dh\phi(db) = \phi(db) - hd\phi(db) = \phi(db) - h\phi(ddb) = \phi(db).$$

In practice however, this method only gives an explicit recursive procedure for defining  $\phi(b)$ . The third level of explicitness then is that one might be lucky and be able to find a ‘closed’ formula for the recursively defined  $\phi(b)$ .<sup>5</sup> Once one has a candidate for a formula, an inductive proof can often be found.

The constructed map  $\phi$  may depend on the choice of basis in  $B_*$ . However, in practice, our complexes  $B_*$  come with a preferred choice of basis. Also,  $\phi$

---

<sup>4</sup>An acyclic complex means zero homology, and contractible complex means chain homotopy equivalent to the complex  $\mathbb{F}$  concentrated in degree 0. In this introductory section we will be somewhat casual with this distinction.

<sup>5</sup>Closed formulas are appealing. However, for computer work when formulas get large, it isn’t so clear that a closed formula is better than a recursive procedure.



will certainly depend on the choice of the contraction chain homotopy  $h$  of  $C_*$ . Again, in practice, our complexes  $C_*$  come with preferred contractions. In fact, they come with preferred contractions that satisfy  $h^2 = 0$ , which turns out to be a remarkably useful assumption for establishing many results.

The above paragraphs are a precursor to the functorial acyclic model method that constructs natural transformation chain maps

$$\phi_{f_{unc}}: F_*(X_1, \dots, X_k) \rightarrow K_*(X_1, \dots, X_k)$$

between functors using acyclic models. For us, the  $X_i$  will be simplicial sets, and  $F_*(X_1, \dots, X_k)$  will be a functor that is free over  $\mathbb{F}$  or  $\mathbb{F}[G]$ . A basis  $\{u\}$  will have the form  $\{u = \sigma_*^F(\bar{u})\}$ , where the  $\{\bar{u}\}$  are certain universal elements  $\bar{u} \in F_*(\Delta^{n_1}, \dots, \Delta^{n_k})$ , and  $\sigma_i: \Delta^{n_i} \rightarrow X_i$  are ‘simplices’ in the  $X_i$ , *canonically determined by  $u$* . ‘Universality’ of the  $\{\bar{u}\}$  is meant to express that the constructed sets of basis elements of the  $F_*(X_1, \dots, X_k)$  are ‘functorial’ for simplicial maps in the variables  $X_j$ . Since simplicial maps can send non-degenerate simplices to degenerate simplices, it will be the sets  $\{u, 0\}$  of basis elements together with 0 that are actually functorial. We will also have preferred contractions  $h_K$  of the complexes  $K_*(\Delta^{n_1}, \dots, \Delta^{n_k})$ , and in the equivariant case a  $G$ -action.

Then  $\phi_{f_{unc}}: F_*(X_1, \dots, X_k) \rightarrow K_*(X_1, \dots, X_k)$  is constructed recursively as follows. One always begins with some functorial map in degree 0, and assumes a functorial chain map has been constructed in degrees less than  $n$ . Given a basis element  $u = \sigma_*^F(\bar{u}) \in F_n(X_1, \dots, X_k)$ , one defines

$$\phi_{f_{unc}}(u) = \sigma_*^K \circ h_K \circ \phi_{f_{unc}}(d\bar{u}) \in K_n(X_1, \dots, X_k).$$

As before, extend by linearity over  $\mathbb{F}$  or  $\mathbb{F}[G]$ . It is the assumption that the universal elements  $\bar{u}$  and simplices  $\sigma_i$  are canonically determined by  $u$  that guarantees that  $\phi$  is well-defined. A routine argument shows that this procedure defines a chain map that is equivariant and functorial in the  $X_i$ .<sup>6</sup>

## 1.2 Preview of Examples

Here are a couple of examples. For a simplicial set  $X$ , let  $N_*(X)$  denote the normalized simplicial set chain complex. There are iconic functorial chain

---

<sup>6</sup>In practice our examples are rather simple compared to this somewhat vague attempt to describe a multivariable functorial acyclic model process in general.

homotopy equivalences of Alexander-Whitney and Eilenberg-Zilber

$$AW: N_*(X \times Y) \rightarrow N_*(X) \otimes N_*(Y)$$

$$EZ: N_*(X) \otimes N_*(Y) \rightarrow N_*(X \times Y).$$

Formulas for these maps are well-known, but where do they come from really?

Preferred basis elements in degree  $k$  of the normalized chain complex  $N_*(X \times Y)$  arise uniquely from a pair of simplices  $\Delta^k \rightarrow X$  and  $\Delta^k \rightarrow Y$ , so that composition with the diagonal  $\Delta^k \rightarrow \Delta^k \times \Delta^k \rightarrow X \times Y$  is non-degenerate. Preferred basis elements of degree  $k$  in  $N_*(X) \otimes N_*(Y)$  are uniquely written as tensors of pairs of non-degenerate simplices  $\Delta^i \rightarrow X$  and  $\Delta^j \rightarrow Y$  with  $i + j = k$ . If  $\Delta, \Delta'$  are simplices, there are canonical contractions of  $N_*(\Delta) \otimes N_*(\Delta')$  and  $N_*(\Delta \times \Delta')$ . The standard functorial procedure using these bases and these contractions produces exactly the classical  $AW$  and  $EZ$  formulas.<sup>7</sup> One also has functorial  $AW$  and  $EZ$  maps for three or more simplicial set variables, directly defined using our preferred contractions of multiple tensor products of normalized chains on simplices or normalized chains on multiple cross products of simplices.

We point out that some texts write down formulas for  $AW$  and  $EZ$ , followed by rather awkward proofs that they are chain maps. Our procedure recursively defines functorial chain maps using explicit contractions of models, then observes without much work that these functorial chain maps are given by the classical  $AW$  and  $EZ$  formulas.

Of course the recognition of the abstract acyclic model method in the early 1950's was a major conceptual advance in algebraic topology. It explains rather quickly many things, such as why the cohomology of a space is a (skew)-commutative graded ring. The ring structure was initially regarded as sort of a mystery, dependent on properties of odd little formulas. Acyclic models instantly gives diagonal approximations, unique up to chain homotopy, and the associativity and commutativity of the cohomology product becomes obvious. On the other hand, the fact that a cochain complex itself is a differential graded algebra, that is, with good cochain formulas multiplication is strictly associative and the coboundary is a derivation, was

---

<sup>7</sup>The  $EZ$  chain map can be 'found', more or less inductively, by thinking about the geometry and combinatorics of triangulating prisms. The paper [31] of Whitney describes in some detail the early history in the 1930's of cup products and the dual  $AW$  map.

recognized as important. So some diagonals are better than others. Before even calculating the formulas, the explicit contraction based method we use to define maps trivially yields that the  $AW$  and  $EZ$  maps are strictly associative,  $EZ$  is strictly commutative, and  $AW \circ EZ = Id$ .

A more dramatic example than the  $AW$  and  $EZ$  formulas is given by a functorial  $\Sigma_n$ -equivariant chain map  $\phi_{func}^{(n)}: N_*(E\Sigma_n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$  constructed by the explicit functorial acyclic model procedure, also using canonical contractions of  $n$ -fold tensor products of normalized chains on simplices. Here,  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$  denotes normalized chains on the MacLane model of a free contractible  $\Sigma_n$  simplicial set. An  $\mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$ -basis of  $N_*(E\Sigma_n) \otimes N_*(X)$  in degree  $k$  is given by tensors of  $\mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$  generators of  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$  of degree  $i$  with non-degenerate simplices  $\Delta^j \rightarrow X$ ,  $i + j = k$ . The map  $\phi_{func}^{(n)}$  is a  $\Sigma_n$ -equivariant extension of the Alexander-Whitney multidagonal  $\delta^{(n)}: N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$ . The map  $\delta^{(n)}$  is not fixed by the  $\Sigma_n$  action on the range and equivariant extensions defined on  $N_*(E\Sigma_n) \otimes N_*(X)$ , unique up to equivariant chain homotopy, were very important in the development of Steenrod operations. But again, some equivariant extensions, like the maps  $\phi_{func}^{(n)}$  we construct, are better than others. We discuss this further.

The chain complex components of the Barratt-Eccles operad  $\mathcal{E}$  are given by  $\mathcal{E}(n) = N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ . The chain complex components of the Eilenberg-Zilber operad  $\mathcal{Z}(n)$  are given by (functorial) operations  $HOM_{func}(N_*(X), N_*(X)^{\otimes n})$ , or dually  $HOM_{func}(N^*(X)^{\otimes n}, N^*(X))$ . One of our main points is that the adjoints  $\Phi^{(n)}: \mathcal{E}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}(n)$  of our functorial chain maps  $\phi_{func}^{(n)}$  defined by the canonical recursive procedure factor through the surjection operad components  $\mathcal{S}_*(n)$  and coincide with the operad morphisms  $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$  constructed by hand by Berger-Fresse in [4], expanding on work of McClure-Smith in [20]. The collection of maps  $\phi_{func}^{(n)}$  produced by the standard contraction procedure satisfy serious strict associativity and strict equivariance properties, equivalent to the strictly commutative diagrams expressing operad morphism axioms.

Justin R. Smith [28] was clearly aware that an operad morphism  $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$  could be recursively constructed by essentially the same method as ours, including using the same contraction of tensor products of normalized chains on a simplex. But his primary interests were elsewhere, and it is not clear if he wrote down full details. After the duality, these maps define operadic actions of  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$  on tensors of cochains that can be used to define and

study Steenrod operations at the cochain level, as well as clarifying much additional homotopy theory.

We do not reach the full explanation of these examples until the end of Part III. Among other things, the full explanation includes the facts that the operad structure maps themselves for the Barratt-Eccles and surjection operads coincide with maps between contractible complexes constructed by a standard recursive contraction procedure, as does the operad morphism  $\mathcal{E}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(n)$  and a section  $\mathcal{S}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(n)$ .

In a long paper like this it can be difficult to see the forest for the trees. In an attempt to illuminate at least a part of the forest, we will insert here, perhaps prematurely, some comments concerning  $E_\infty$  operads, elaborating somewhat on the two preceding paragraphs. Roughly, the classical definition of an  $E_\infty$  operad is a collection of contractible, augmented, based, free  $\mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$  chain complexes  $\epsilon, \iota: B_*(n) \rightleftarrows \mathbb{F}$ , together with structure maps  $\mathcal{O}_B: B_*(r) \otimes B_*(s_1) \otimes \dots \otimes B_*(s_r) \rightarrow B_*(s)$ ,  $s = \sum s_i$ , that satisfy certain identity, equivariance, and associativity axioms. We propose replacing the operad structure maps in some special cases by choices of contractions  $h_n: B_*(n) \rightarrow B_{*+1}(n)$  with  $hd + dh = Id - \iota\epsilon$ , where  $\epsilon: B_*(n) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$  is the augmentation and  $\iota: \mathbb{F} \rightarrow B_*(n)$  is the basepoint. We also assume the contractions satisfy  $h_n^2 = 0$  and  $h_n\iota = 0$ , and that  $\mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$  bases of the  $B_*(n)$  can be chosen in  $Im(h_n) = Ker(h_n)$ , including  $\iota(1) = e \in B_0(n) = \mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$ . With these assumptions, a twisted variant of our basic recursive contraction procedure for constructing chain maps produces candidates for operad structure maps  $\mathcal{O}_B$  that satisfy everything except possibly the associativity axiom. The associativity axiom holds if for all elements  $c_0 \in h_r B_*(r)$  and  $c_i \in h_{s_i} B_*(s_i)$  one has  $\mathcal{O}_B(c_0 \otimes c_1 \otimes \dots \otimes c_r) \in h_s B_*(s)$ . So operad structure *emerges* from contraction structure.

All these additional assumptions hold trivially for the Barratt-Eccles chain complexes  $B_*(n) = N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ . The extra structure, including the associativity condition, holds less trivially for the surjection complexes  $B_*(n) = \mathcal{S}_*(n)$ . Focusing just on the enhanced chain complex structure, one more assumption, namely that  $h_n B_*(n)$  coincides *exactly* with the  $\mathbb{F}$  span of a  $\mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$  basis, characterizes  $(N_*(E\Sigma_n), h_n)$  uniquely among such complexes. Any chain complex  $B_*(n)$  with the basic extra structure is canonically a direct summand of  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ . If the associativity condition holds for the operad structure candidate maps  $\mathcal{O}_B$  then the  $B_*(n)$  operad is canonically a quotient of the Barratt-Eccles operad. In this sense, the Barratt-Eccles operad

is a kind of universal model for (contraction based)  $E_\infty$  operads.

We will give many examples in the course of this work, some rather surprising, of using the explicit contraction based recursive procedures to construct maps between chain complexes. Many times it is quite easy to find closed formulas for the results of the recursive procedures. Other times, as in the examples involving the operads  $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}$ , this is harder, so we are content to show our procedure leads to closed formulas already found by others.<sup>8</sup> However, it seems plausible that some low degree initial computations and perseverance would have lead to a guess of the closed formulas. Also, even given the formulas, our proofs that the maps are chain maps and have other desired properties simplify substantially parts of the original arguments.

## 2 Preview of Parts I, II, and III

### 2.1 Preview of Part I

Section 3 is a digression before we really begin the paper that summarizes some basic properties of tensor products of chain complexes  $C_* \otimes D_*$  and chain complexes of homomorphisms  $HOM(C_*, D_*)$ . The latter include dual cochain complexes. We state a number of adjoint relationships and duality relationships between such complexes. We also discuss actions of symmetric groups on multitensor products of chain and cochain complexes. It seemed reasonable to just set our conventions on signs and other aspects of chain and cochain complexes and tensor products early on. Section 3 can be skimmed, or essentially ignored, before moving on.

In Section 4 we make precise the notion of a contraction of an augmented, base pointed chain complex. Roughly, a contraction is a chain homotopy  $h: C_* \rightarrow C_{*+1}$  that identifies the homology of  $C_*$  with the homology of a point. So  $dh + hd = Id$  in non-zero degrees. We show that one can always find a contraction satisfying  $h^2 = 0$ , which is an extremely useful property that plays a major role throughout the paper. The symmetrical structure consisting of a graded module and two self-maps  $d, h$  of degrees  $-1$  and  $+1$  satisfying  $d^2 = 0, h^2 = 0, dh + hd = Id$  seems provocative.<sup>9</sup> Any contraction says more than that a chain complex with differential  $d$  has the same homology as a point. It provides a specific somewhat sophisticated reason

---

<sup>8</sup>We do not know how these formulas were originally found.

<sup>9</sup>Symmetry is broken if one works primarily with complexes  $C_*$  that are bounded below. Also, with  $G$ -complexes,  $d$  is equivariant but  $h$  is not.

why that is true as part of the structure. It is more mysterious why the additional property  $h^2 = 0$  is so useful.

In Section 5 we give many examples of contractions. Given contractions of  $C_*$  and  $D_*$ , we construct preferred contractions of the tensor product complex and the hom complex. The contraction we choose of a tensor complex plays a key role in many results of our paper. We study a standard contraction  $h_G$  of MacLane models  $N_*(EG)$ , similar to a standard contraction  $h_\Delta$  of chains on a simplex  $N_*(\Delta)$ . We also study a contraction of a minimal model  $M_*$  of chains on a contractible free  $C$ -complex, where  $C$  is a cyclic group of order  $n$ .  $M_*$  is much smaller than the MacLane model  $N_*(EC)$ . In fact,  $M_k = \mathbb{Z}[C]\{y_k\}$  is free on one generator.  $M_*$  is a very useful complex when  $n = p$  is prime in our study of Steenrod operations in Part IV. There is nothing new about  $M_*$ . It is the chain complex associated to a free action of  $C$  on a regular cell complex structure on the infinite sphere  $S^\infty$ , with  $n$  cells in each degree. This complex played a major role in the history of classifying spaces, group homology, and cohomology operations.

In the case of  $\mathbb{F}[G]$  complexes, we discuss in Section 5 contractible complexes as acyclic resolutions of the trivial  $G$ -module  $\mathbb{F}$ , but also possibly of some other module structure on  $\mathbb{F}$ . This turns out to be useful in Part IV for studying Steenrod operations acting on odd degree cocycles.

Section 6 begins what should be regarded as the main point of Part I of the project, namely, the use of explicit contractions to construct chain maps  $B_* \rightarrow C_*$  by the methods outlined in Section 1. We prove two very useful uniqueness theorems that provide conditions that guarantee that a map between complexes is necessarily the standard procedure chain map. Our basic uniqueness theorem says that if the contraction of the range satisfies  $h^2 = 0$  then an equivariant map in degree 0 has a *unique* extension to an equivariant chain map with the property that basis generators of the domain map to elements in the image of the contraction of the range. This result has useful extensions to functorial chain maps and to ‘twisted’ equivariant chain maps that are of importance in later sections.

Also of particular importance is the following uniqueness phenomenon. Suppose  $B_*$  and  $C_*$  are  $\mathbb{F}[G]$ -complexes, both with contractions satisfying  $h^2 = 0$  and with  $B_*$  free. Then with mild hypotheses, *any* equivariant map  $B_* \rightarrow C_*$  that commutes with the contractions is automatically a chain map and is identical to the chain map constructed by the recursive contraction pro-

cedure. In particular, the necessary hypotheses always hold when  $B_* = N_*(EG)$  is a MacLane model. All the maps  $\phi: N_*(EG) \rightarrow C_*$  that have roles in our work when  $C_*$  is contractible commute with contractions. In fact, basis elements of  $N_*(EG)$  are in the image of  $h_G$  and the chain maps can be defined recursively by  $\phi h_G(x) = h_C \phi(x)$ , for all  $x$ .

As examples of chain maps important in our paper, we mention the standard contraction procedure equivariant chain map  $M_* \rightarrow N_*(EC)$  for a cyclic group, and a retraction  $N_*(EC) \rightarrow M_*$ . The retraction commutes with contractions. We also give in Section 6 the explanation that the Alexander-Whitney map  $AW: N_*(EH \times EG) \rightarrow N_*(EH) \otimes N_*(EG)$  is a special case of our standard contraction constructions. The Alexander-Whitney map commutes with contractions. The Eilenberg-Zilber map  $EZ: N_*(EH) \otimes N_*(EG) \rightarrow N_*(EH \times EG)$  for MacLane models is also described as a special case of our procedure. The functorial versions of  $AW$  and  $EZ$  are postponed until Section 8.

We also discuss in Section 6 some delicate issues about compositions of standard procedure chain maps. These need not be standard procedure maps. But we establish a number of conditions that imply such compositions are standard procedure maps. The most useful of these condition is that the second map sends the image of the contraction of the domain to the image of the contraction of the range, again always assuming  $h^2 = 0$ . This is weaker than the condition that the second map commutes with contractions. There are equivariant, functorial, and twisted equivariant versions of this composition result that become quite important in Parts II and III.

Section 7 continues the construction of chain maps using the standard contraction procedure to construct diagonal maps and equivariant diagonal maps  $C_* \rightarrow C_* \otimes C_*$  for various complexes  $C_*$ . We also extend the constructions to multidiagonals  $C_* \rightarrow C_*^{\otimes n}$ . These multidiagonals and certain equivariant enhancements  $N_*(E\Sigma_n) \otimes C_* \rightarrow C_*^{\otimes n}$  were absolutely crucial in the study of cohomology operations from the very beginning.

Section 8 deals with the construction of natural transformations between functors. We use our explicit contractions for chains on simplices, chains on products of simplices, and tensor products of chains on simplices, to define functorial chain maps using minimal contractible carriers. Of course this is just a reformulation of the classical acyclic model method, but made more explicit functorially at the chain level. We give two uniqueness the-

orems in the functorial context that extend the uniqueness theorems from Section 6. As two important examples, we discuss in detail the functorial Alexander-Whitney map  $AW: N_*(X \times Y) \rightarrow N_*(X) \otimes N_*(Y)$  and the functorial Eilenberg-Zilber map  $EZ: N_*(X) \otimes N_*(Y) \rightarrow N_*(X \times Y)$  when  $X$  and  $Y$  are arbitrary simplicial sets. Our methods easily imply that both  $AW$  and  $EZ$  are associative,  $EZ$  is commutative, and  $AW \circ EZ = Id$ . Our method also produces a canonical chain homotopy between  $EZ \circ AW$  and  $Id$ . The details of both the Alexander-Whitney map and the Eilenberg-Zilber map are used in fundamental ways in Parts II and III in our study of the Barratt-Eccles and surjection operads.

Finally in Section 9 we review the method from [7] of using joins of chains on MacLane models to define equivariant chain homotopies between pairs of maps  $B_* \rightarrow N_*(EG)$  for certain complexes  $B_*$ . We discuss in detail some examples that will link results in Part I to results on cochain operations in Part IV. Specifically, the examples involve relations between the minimal model  $M_*$  for the cyclic group  $C_p$  of prime order  $p$  and the MacLane models  $N_*(EC_p)$  and  $N_*(E\Sigma_p)$  for the cyclic group and the symmetric group. The applications in Part IV will be to a cochain level proof of the Cartan formula for Steenrod operations, extending the arguments of Medina-Mardones [22] in the  $p = 2$  case, and to an analysis of which cycles in  $N_*(EC_p)$  map to explicit boundaries in  $N_*(E\Sigma_p)$ , and therefore determine zero cohomology operations.

Some of the examples and remarks in Part I, especially toward the end, are somewhat complicated, but worth following. We chose examples for their historical context, to illustrate the ubiquity of the contraction procedure, and for later use in Parts II, III, and IV in our study of some operads and in our cochain development of Steenrod operations.

## 2.2 Preview of Part II

In Section 10 we make a few introductory remarks about common features of three versions of surjection chain complexes  $\mathcal{S}_*(n)$  that underlie the surjection operad. These complexes are acyclic free  $\mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$  resolutions of  $\mathbb{F}$  with the trivial group action.

Sections 11 and 12 develop details of the version of the surjection complex that we call  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$  because it appears in the paper of Adamaszek and Jones [1]. The rough geometric idea is that the ordinary normalized relative simpli-



cial singular chain complex of a simplex modulo its boundary, shifted down in degrees, can be viewed as an acyclic free  $\mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$  resolution of  $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$ , where  $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$  is a twisted module structure on  $\mathbb{F}$ . A simple untwisting construction then produces the surjection complex  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$ . The boundary operator is simpler and more geometrically motivated than that of other surjection complexes. It is immediate from basic topology that our complex is contractible, but somewhat challenging to produce a contraction with  $h^2 = 0$ .

Section 13 develops properties of the surjection complex  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$  studied by Berger and Fresse [4], [5]. Their boundary operator  $d$  is not so easy to motivate, and it is not completely trivial to even see why  $d^2 = 0$ . Also, the Berger-Fresse complex was known to be contractible but we go beyond that and produce an explicit contraction, closely related to our contraction of  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$ .

Section 14 develops properties of the surjection complex  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  studied by McClure and Smith [19]. We focus from the outset on clear geometric motivation for both the boundary operator and the  $\mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$  action, although this was certainly implicit in their original work. We show that  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  is in a very natural way the chain complex associated to a geometric cell complex whose open cells are interiors of prisms. A contraction is given by exactly the same formula as the contraction of  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$ .

In Section 15 we establish isomorphisms between the three surjection complexes that preserve all the structure. We find all three surjection complexes interesting. Also, it is sometimes more natural, and easier, to first express and prove a result using a specific one of the surjection complexes.

The Sections 11-15 provide some details about the three surjection complexes that are not found in the original references. In particular, we mention the contractions with  $h^2 = 0$ , the isomorphisms between the complexes commuting with contractions, and additional geometric motivation for the boundary operators and the symmetric group actions. We found all these things deserving of a simple unified treatment. But readers need not get bogged down with every detail, a light reading suffices for continuing with the rest of Part II and then Part III.

Section 16 is one of the longest sections of the paper. We develop and study in great detail the equivariant chain maps  $N_*(E\Sigma_n) \rightleftharpoons \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n), \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n), \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  that arise from the standard procedure constructions, using our bases and

contractions of the various complexes. We prove that our maps for the Berger-Fresse complex are the same as the maps they found and studied, but we provide additional motivation and insight using the explicit contraction procedure ideas. In particular, we give independent self-contained proofs that the Berger-Fresse maps *are* equivariant chain maps. In the case of the newer surjection complex  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$ , the geometric viewpoint that generators are given by actual simplicial maps between simplices, and the resulting identification of the inverse image of the base barycenter with a geometric prism, allows us to motivate clearly the equivariant chain maps  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n) \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_n)$  as expressing facts about prisms and the Eilenberg-Zilber map that triangulates prisms. Berger and Fresse also described their map  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_n)$  in terms of prisms, which is where we learned it, but their discussion focused somewhat less on the geometry of prisms. That said, at the end of the day the use of geometric simplices, simplicial maps, and triangulations of prisms is a mental crutch, everything is ultimately just algebra and combinatorics.

In the last subsection of Section 16 we treat in detail some interesting additional facts about the surjection complexes  $\mathcal{S}_*(n)$  and their relation with the MacLane complexes  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$  that were briefly hinted at by Berger and Fresse in [5]. This technical subsection is not needed to continue to Part III.

### 2.3 Preview of Part III

In Section 17, which is also long, the equivariant functorial map of Berger-Fresse  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$  is proved to coincide with our standard procedure construction. This is a relatively difficult result, although the argument is formally similar to the argument in Part I that the classic *EZ* map is produced by our standard procedure. It is also somewhat tricky to prove that the standard procedure map  $N_*(E\Sigma_n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$  factors through the surjection complex. These maps were studied by Berger-Fresse by seemingly ad hoc methods, partly based on a reorganization of the work of McClure and Smith. We also describe as compositions the standard procedure maps  $A_* \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$  for  $A_* = \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n), \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n), M_*$ . All these maps give rise by duality to multilinear actions of the various complexes on tensors of cochains, which is the starting point for our study of Steenrod operations in Part IV.

Towards the end of Section 17 we compute the Berger-Fresse map in the specific degrees  $M_{m(p-1)} \otimes N_m(\Delta^m) \rightarrow (N_*(\Delta^m)^{\otimes p})_{mp}$ , namely we show

$\Phi(y_{m(p-1)} \otimes \Delta^m) = c_{m,p}(\Delta^m)^{\otimes p}$  for specific constants  $c_{m,p}$ . In the classic reference [30], determination of these constants is also carried out by a long chain level computation. It is one of the few direct chain level computations in that book. The constants are needed in order to define the Steenrod  $p^{\text{th}}$  powers  $P^j$  on cocycles in terms of the Berger-Fresse map, to prove  $P^0 = Id$  and to prove the Cartan formula for the  $P^j$ .

It seems appropriate here to recall a little history, although we do not know it well. The basic functorial map  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$  was first studied by McClure-Smith using their surjection complex. They also found the operad interpretation, which was a major advance. Their method was to establish their complex as a suboperad of the Eilenberg-Zilber operad  $\mathcal{Z}(n) = HOM_{func}(N_*(X), N_*(X)^{\otimes n})$ . They did point out that there was earlier separate work in the 1990's and before by D. Benson, R.J. Milgram, and E. Getzler, using multilinear cochain formulas to generalize Steenrod's original two variable  $\cup_i$  products, with the goal of studying odd prime Steenrod operations. As mentioned previously, Justin R. Smith also studied an operad action of the  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$  on tensors of cochains, although not with explicit formulas. His work seems to use some of the same contractions that we use to recursively construct chain maps. In particular, he realized that the operad structure maps on the collection of complexes  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ , including the verification of the operad axioms and the operad map to the Eilenberg-Zilber operad, could be formulated recursively using explicit contractions and a uniqueness theorem for chain maps with certain properties. But his primary interest was elsewhere and we do not know if he wrote down full details.

A question, more philosophical than mathematical, might be how many functorial chain operations  $HOM_{func}(N_*(X), N_*(X)^{\otimes n})$ , or cochain operations  $HOM_{func}(N^*(X)^{\otimes n}, N^*(X))$ , do we really need? A reasonable answer might be exactly the suboperad given by surjection complexes  $\mathcal{S}_*(n)$ . This suboperad seems to contain all that is needed to fully and faithfully capture a lot of homotopy theory. Also, the chain and cochain operations defined by the surjection complexes are very natural direct extensions of Steenrod's seminal discovery of the explicit two-variable  $\cup_i$  operations and the Steenrod Squares, which, it could be argued, launched homotopy theory into the modern era.

In Section 18, to prepare for our treatment of the Barratt-Eccles and surjection operads, we review some basic definitions concerning operads and we

develop carefully the permutation group operad in the category of sets, with components the symmetric groups  $\Sigma_n$ . We also review the Eilenberg-Zilber operad  $\mathcal{Z}$  of functorial chain maps  $HOM_{func}(N_*(X), N_*(X)^{\otimes n})$ . Experts will find nothing new here, but we found some of the details, which are taken for granted in nearly all papers on operads, trickier than we expected. These details are needed in our non-standard treatment of the Barratt-Eccles and surjection operads.

Section 19 contains our treatment of the Barratt-Eccles operad with components  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ . Our approach is to use a ‘twisted’ variant of our equivariant standard contraction procedure to define candidates for operad structure maps

$$\mathcal{O}_B: B_*(r) \otimes B_*(s_1) \otimes \dots \otimes B_*(s_r) \rightarrow B_*(s), \quad s = s_1 + \dots + s_r,$$

for certain complexes  $B_*(n)$ . The candidates always satisfy the unit and equivariance axioms for operads. A closer look is needed to establish the associativity axiom. For that purpose, we extend previous uniqueness theorems to the twisted equivariant case, which provides a criterion for the strict commutativity of various diagrams involving the  $B_*(n)$ . The criterion is easy to check for the  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ . We also reconcile our treatment of the Barratt-Eccles operad with the treatment expressed in terms of *symmetric monoidal functors*, found for example in [3] and many other places.

In Section 20 the complexes  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$  are proved to form an operad, again using our contraction based constructions and our twisted candidates for operad structure maps. It is somewhat trickier to use our twisted uniqueness theorem to establish the criterion for associativity than it is for the Barratt-Eccles operad. Using essentially the same uniqueness theorem, we recover the Berger-Fresse result that the surjection operad is a quotient of the Barratt-Eccles operad. We also prove using the uniqueness theorem that the inclusion map studied in Section 17 from the surjection operad  $\mathcal{S}$  to the Eilenberg-Zilber operad  $\mathcal{Z}$  is an operad morphism.

Many details in Section 17 through Section 20 of our paper are not easy. But we believe the details in the original papers by Berger-Fresse [4], [5] and McClure-Smith [19] are also not easy, in different ways than ours. One might say “pick your poison”. Replication of results should have a place in mathematics. One can read and check the details in the original papers or read and check our details. Or both. All these chain maps, operad structure maps, and operad morphisms seemed originally to depend on brute

force analysis of complicated formulas, which was not always included.<sup>10</sup> We believe we provide an alternate self-contained context for many of these important results. Every single one of these maps is an example of our standard contraction based procedure for constructing equivariant chain maps. One could argue that the actual formulas are secondary, although it is certainly good to know them. In fact, we combine partial information about the formulas of others with our inductive method. Many of the properties of the maps drop out relatively painlessly from general results about our contraction procedure that we develop in Part I.

We will conclude this preview section with a brief summary of some common features of many of the chain maps  $\phi: B_* \rightarrow C_*$  that we study in Parts I, II, and III. This includes the *AW* and *EZ* maps, multidiagonal maps, tensor products of maps, maps involving functions between groups, and all the maps related to the operads  $\mathcal{E}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{Z}$ . Sometimes we look at familiar maps that are known to be chain maps, and we observe directly that they coincide with our standard procedure maps, either by means of a little computation and an easy induction or as an application of a uniqueness theorem. Other times formulas for maps are ‘known’ but are much less familiar, seem rather ad hoc, and it is sometimes rather difficult to check that the formulas even define chain maps. But we can often prove by induction that these maps coincide with our standard procedure chain maps, without much difficult computation. So this simultaneously proves certain complicated maps are chain maps, and establishes a natural conceptual framework for the origin of these maps.

In important cases this second, more dramatic, situation arises as follows. The standard procedure map applied to generators will be sums of terms of a certain form, along with  $\pm$  signs. That is,  $\phi(x) = \sum \pm \mathcal{T}x$ . In standard equivariant situations the parameter set for the operators  $\mathcal{T}$  is the same for  $x$  and  $gx$ . The terms  $\mathcal{T}x$  are often easily described, and satisfy a crude equivariant property  $g(\mathcal{T}x) = \pm \mathcal{T}(gx)$ . Once one has a candidate formula for the  $\mathcal{T}x$ , an inductive proof that such a formula for the standard procedure map  $\phi$  is correct can be given, without knowing the signs.

Namely, on basis generators  $b$  of the domain the standard procedure map is given recursively by the formula  $\phi(b) = h\phi(db)$ , where  $h$  is the contraction of the range. Now  $d$  and  $h$  may each involve many summands. But sur-

---

<sup>10</sup>The papers of Adamaszec-Jones [1] and of McClure-Smith [21] are more conceptual.

prisingly often most of these are seen to contribute 0. In fact, in important cases  $h\phi(db)$  reduces to a sum of  $h$  applied to a small number of boundary terms of  $b$ , sometimes just two. Moreover, on those boundary terms only a small number of summands of  $h$  are non-zero, sometimes just one, and their evaluation is easy to understand. Thus, if by some stroke of insight or theft one is given the candidates  $\mathcal{T}x$  in all degrees, an inductive proof that such a formula for  $\phi(b)$  is correct can be fairly easy. One just needs to match the formula for  $\phi(b)$  with a sum of  $h$  applied to a few similar looking terms from one degree lower. Then for other generators  $x = gb$

$$\phi(x) = g\phi(b) = \sum \pm g(\mathcal{T}b) = \sum \pm \mathcal{T}(gb)$$

also has the desired form.

The formula  $\phi(b) = h\phi(db)$  for basis elements always recursively forces the signs. The contractions  $h$  often involve no signs and signs in  $db$  terms are generally standard signs occurring in boundary formulas. Thus if one also has candidate formulas for the  $\phi$  signs, one has the possibility of showing relatively painlessly by induction that these signs behave correctly in the verification of  $\phi(b) = h\phi(db)$  and  $\phi(gx) = g\phi(x)$ . This completes an inductive proof that the asserted full formula for  $\phi(x)$  is an equivariant standard procedure chain map, correct for all  $x$ .

A saving of labor is seen if one compares our arguments with a direct computation that  $d\phi = \phi d$ . Direct computations can be awkward and seem to rely on large amounts of fortuitous cancellation of terms with opposite signs. Our arguments require no such cancellation. As three examples we mention

$$\begin{aligned} EZ: N_*(X) \otimes N_*(Y) &\rightarrow N_*(X \times Y) \\ \phi_{func}: N_*(E\Sigma_n) \otimes N_*(X) &\rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n} \\ \mathcal{O}_S: S_*(r) \otimes S_*(s_1) \otimes \dots \otimes S_*(s_r) &\rightarrow S_*(s). \end{aligned}$$

The third example, a twisted equivariant standard procedure map, is somewhat more complicated, but the same basic strategy applies.

It is true that if one checks or repeats or simply accepts previous arguments that  $d\phi = \phi d$ , and that  $\phi$  is equivariant in a group action case, then the statement that  $\phi$  coincides with the standard procedure map is quite easy. One just observes that for basis elements  $b$  of the domain the terms  $\mathcal{T}b$  are in the image of the contraction of the range and therefore the basic uniqueness

theorems apply. This by itself is interesting. But we believe our alternate proofs add value by simplifying some arguments, revealing hidden structure, and putting results in a new context.

Other issues involving complicated chain maps arise in the operad context. One needs to understand why certain diagrams strictly commute. These commutative diagrams correspond to operad axioms for a collection of maps. For this our uniqueness theorems seem very useful, since the compositions in question often are seen to be compositions of standard procedure chain maps. Therefore criteria that imply compositions of standard procedure chain maps are themselves standard procedure chain maps can be used to prove two different compositions around a diagram must coincide.

Of course the above few paragraphs are rather vague. But having read them should make it easier to be motivated and follow details in specific examples.

Readers who are interested in deciphering what we are doing are strongly advised to not try to initially follow all details in the order written. Become familiar with what is done in Parts II and III before getting bogged down in Part I. Look at paragraphs, remarks, statements of results, and examples with a first goal of just getting the gist of what they say. Many of these are included because a goal of our treatment is to be comprehensive, but often statements and results are not used again until later sections. Keep turning pages, skip ahead to later sections, don't get stuck and quit.

### 3 Conventions with Chain and Cochain Complexes

First we make some comments about our conventions for functions and permutations. We write functions on the left of their arguments,  $f(x)$ . Thus  $fg$  means apply  $g$  first, then  $f$ , so  $f(g(x))$ . Permutations are functions, so we compose permutations  $\sigma\tau$  by performing  $\tau$  first, then  $\sigma$ , as in  $\{1, \dots, n\} \xrightarrow{\tau} \{1, \dots, n\} \xrightarrow{\sigma} \{1, \dots, n\}$ . We generally write permutations as a sequence of values  $(\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(n)) = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$ .

#### 3.1 Tensor and Hom Complexes

We will be making extensive use of constructions such as tensor products of chain complexes, complexes of linear maps between chain complexes, including dual cochain complexes, and various sorts of maps between such constructions. Among other things, there are sign conventions needed in all

these constructions. Historically, various sign conventions have been used. We feel that there is a consensus of preferred conventions and we will clarify in this section the conventions we will use throughout the paper. There is no reason for a reader to get bogged down early with a myriad of details, so this section can be skimmed,<sup>11</sup> but it is important for us to not be vague. Many articles use language such as “with the usual sign conventions”, when it is not always clear what that means.

Since our interest is topology we do not strive for great algebraic generality. We work primarily with positively graded chain complexes  $C_*$  over a ground ring  $\mathbb{F}$ , which will usually be the integers or a field. In the presence of group actions, complexes will be graded differential modules over a group ring  $\mathbb{F}[G]$ . In particular, the differential is equivariant.

Positively graded means 0 in negative degrees. We usually have in mind complexes that are free in each degree. However, cochain complexes are negatively graded chain complexes and occasionally we work with more general  $\mathbb{Z}$  graded hom complexes. Neither of these will be free without additional finiteness assumptions or assumptions about  $\mathbb{F}$ .

Given *arbitrary* chain complexes  $C_*$  and  $D_*$  over  $\mathbb{F}$  we have the graded tensor product module  $C_* \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} D_*$ , which in degree  $n$  is given by  $\bigoplus_{i+j=n} C_i \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} C_j$ . It is free if  $C_*$  and  $D_*$  are free. The preferred boundary operator is

$$d(a \otimes b) = da \otimes b + (-1)^{|a|} a \otimes db,$$

where  $|a|$  denotes the degree of  $a$ . Replacing the  $+$  sign by a  $-$  sign also gives a differential with  $d^2 = 0$ . The preferred choice is basically a unit choice in the monoidal category of chain complexes. One wants  $\mathbb{F} \otimes C_* = C_* = C_* \otimes \mathbb{F}$ , where  $\mathbb{F}$  is regarded as a complex concentrated in degree 0. Geometrically, the preferred boundary choice is related to the point being a unit for spaces,  $* \times X = X = X \times *$ . Also, for manifolds, one wants orientations to satisfy  $\partial(M \times N) = \partial M \times N \cup (-1)^{|M|} M \times \partial N$ , where boundaries are oriented by the “outward normal first” convention, which “one never forgets”. Products are oriented by following an orientation tangent basis of the first factor by an orientation tangent basis of the second factor.

There is also a complex of homomorphisms,  $HOM(C_*, D_*)$ , which in degree  $n$  is given by  $\prod_k Hom_{\mathbb{F}}(C_k, D_{k+n})$ . These complexes are more complicated

---

<sup>11</sup>In fact, every section of this paper can be skimmed.



because they can be non-zero in all degrees  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , even if  $C_*$  and  $D_*$  are positively graded. Included are the dual cochain complexes  $C^* = \text{HOM}(C_*, \mathbb{F})$ , which are negatively graded when the  $C_*$  are positively graded.

In general, even if  $C_*$  and  $D_*$  are free complexes,  $\text{HOM}(C_*, D_*)$  is not usually free unless  $C_*$  has finite type, or other assumptions are made about  $\mathbb{F}$ . This will not be an issue because we will be mapping other complexes to hom complexes, and freeness of the target is not needed for our constructions.

As mentioned previously, we write functions on the left of their arguments, with the consequential understanding about compositions. The preferred boundary formula in a hom complex is

$$du = d_D \circ u - (-1)^{|u|} u \circ d_C.$$

One also gets a differential if the  $-$  sign between the two terms is replaced by a  $+$  sign. The preferred choice of the  $-$  sign results in  $d(\text{Id}) = 0$ . More generally, cycles of degree 0 in  $\text{HOM}_*(C_*, D_*)$  correspond to chain complex homomorphisms,  $d_D \circ u = u \circ d_C$ . Also, given a composition  $B_* \xrightarrow{u} C_* \xrightarrow{v} D_*$  one has  $d(v \circ u) = dv \circ u + (-1)^{|v|} v \circ du$ . Thus, if either  $u$  or  $v$  is an identity morphism, one gets what one wants.

If  $C_* = D_*$ , the preferred differential  $du$  is the bracket  $[d, u]$  in the graded world. The formula for  $d(v \circ u)$  shows that  $\text{HOM}(C_*, C_*)$  becomes a differential graded algebra. That is, the composition product is a chain map  $\text{HOM} \otimes \text{HOM} \rightarrow \text{HOM}$ . Also,  $C_*$  becomes a differential graded left module over  $\text{HOM}(C_*, C_*)$ .

As a special case, the (co)boundary operator in a cochain complex  $C^* = \text{HOM}(C_*, \mathbb{F})$  is defined for  $u \in C^*$ ,  $x \in C_*$  by

$$\langle du, x \rangle = (-1)^{|x|} \langle u, dx \rangle .$$

This differs by a sign from the simple adjoint of the boundary operator in  $C_*$ .<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>This sign convention for the coboundary in the topological case forces the cochain cup product formula to include the ‘‘Dold sign’’, in order that the coboundary is a derivation and the cochains on a space form a differential graded algebra.

There are several important chain maps between iterations of tensor and hom complexes. We list some of them here. In all these statements the serious point is that the signs in the boundary formulas work out. The first two state desired adjoint relationships between tensor and hom.

**Proposition 3.1.**

- The map

$$HOM(B_* \otimes C_*, D_*) \simeq HOM(B_*, HOM(C_*, D_*))$$

$$u \leftrightarrow \mu \text{ where } \mu(b)(c) = u(b \otimes c)$$

is a chain isomorphism.

- There is a chain map that is an isomorphism if  $B_*$  and  $C_*$  are finitely generated and free in each degree

$$B_* \otimes C^* \simeq HOM(C_*, B_*) \text{ where } (b \otimes \gamma)(c) = b \gamma(c).$$

- Function composition

$$HOM(C_*, D_*) \otimes HOM(B_*, C_*) \rightarrow HOM(B_*, D_*) \quad u \otimes v \mapsto u \circ v$$

is a chain map of degree 0. That is,  $d(u \otimes v) \mapsto du \circ v + (-1)^{|u|} u \circ dv$ . In particular, taking  $B_* = \mathbb{F}$ , the evaluation

$$HOM(C_*, D_*) \otimes C_* \rightarrow D_* \quad u \otimes c \mapsto u(c)$$

is a chain map. The adjoint of evaluation is the identity chain map  $Id: HOM(C_*, D_*) \rightarrow HOM(C_*, D_*)$ , hence evaluation is also a chain map for that reason.

If  $u \in HOM(C_*, D_*)$  is a degree 0 chain map then  $v \mapsto u \circ v$  is a chain map  $HOM(B_*, C_*) \rightarrow HOM(B_*, D_*)$ .

- Tensor complexes satisfy the following commutativity property:

$$C_* \otimes D_* \simeq D_* \otimes C_* \quad c \otimes d \leftrightarrow (-1)^{|c||d|} d \otimes c$$

is a chain isomorphism.

- The map

$$HOM(A_*, C_*) \otimes HOM(B_*, D_*) \rightarrow HOM(A_* \otimes B_*, C_* \otimes D_*) \quad f \otimes g \mapsto f \underline{\otimes} g$$

$$\text{where } (f \underline{\otimes} g)(a \otimes b) = (-1)^{|a||g|} f(a) \otimes g(b)$$

is a chain map. If  $deg(g) = 0$  there is no sign. If  $f$  and  $g$  are chain maps, so is  $f \underline{\otimes} g$ , with no sign. The adjoint of the  $\underline{\otimes}$  map is the composition

$$HOM(A_*, C_*) \otimes HOM(B_*, D_*) \otimes A_* \otimes B_* \rightarrow$$

$$HOM(A_*, C_*) \otimes A_* \otimes HOM(B_*, D_*) \otimes B_* \rightarrow C_* \otimes D_*,$$

obtained by permuting two factors then tensoring two degree zero chain map evaluations.

- There are chain maps relating hom complexes and dual complexes. Both of the maps below are chain maps:

$$C_* \rightarrow HOM(C^*, \mathbb{F}) = C^{**} : c \mapsto \gamma, \text{ where } \gamma(\alpha)(c) = (-1)^{|c|} \alpha(c)$$

and

$$HOM(C_*, D_*) \rightarrow HOM(D^*, C^*) : u \mapsto \mu,$$

$$\text{where } \mu(\alpha)(c) = (-1)^{|u|(|c|+|u|)} \alpha(u(c)) = (-1)^{|u||\alpha|} \alpha(u(c)).$$

The equality of the last two terms holds because the evaluation is 0 unless  $-|\alpha| = |u(c)| = |c| + |u|$ . With finite free assumptions, these last two chain maps are isomorphisms.

*Proof.* The proof that all the maps above are chain maps just requires very careful unraveling of the definitions.<sup>13</sup> For the last map, it is also possible to make use of the previous maps:

$$\begin{aligned} HOM(C_*, D_*) &\rightarrow HOM(C_*, HOM(D^*, \mathbb{F})) \rightarrow HOM(C_* \otimes D^*, \mathbb{F}) \\ &\rightarrow HOM(D^* \otimes C_*, \mathbb{F}) \rightarrow HOM(D^*, C^*). \end{aligned}$$

Beginning with  $u \in HOM(C_*, D_*)$  and  $c \in C_*$ , there is a sign  $(-1)^{(|c|+|u|)}$  in the first map, coming from the  $D_* \rightarrow D^{**}$  map. Then there is a sign  $(-1)^{|c|(|c|+|u|)}$  coming from the commutation isomorphism. There are no signs in the two adjoint isomorphisms. The two signs multiply to give the desired sign  $(-1)^{|u|(|c|+|u|)}$  for the composite map.  $\square$

<sup>13</sup>But it is very easy to make mistakes!

**Remark 3.2.** There is one more composite map that will be important. It is a special case of the next to last map above, with  $C_* = D_* = \mathbb{F}$ .

- The map

$$A^* \otimes B^* \rightarrow (A_* \otimes B_*)^* \text{ where } \langle \alpha \otimes \beta, a \otimes b \rangle = (-1)^{|\alpha||\beta|} \alpha(a) \beta(b)$$

defines a chain map, which is an isomorphism with finite free assumptions.

In a topological situation, this last map will become the pairing between tensors of cochains and tensors of chains used to define cup products.

The sign in this last map is required, once we agree on the sign in the differential in general cochain complexes. If the differential in a cochain complex  $C^*$  is chosen to be  $\delta$ , the simple adjoint of the differential in  $C_*$ , then the sign is dropped in the above duality pairing. In topology we want the cochain algebras of spaces to be differential graded algebras. Cup products  $N^*(X) \otimes N^*(X) \rightarrow N^*(X)$  are defined in terms of the duality pairing above along with the Alexander-Whitney diagonal  $\Delta: N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X) \otimes N_*(X)$ , which has no signs. The conventions with no signs at all might seem simpler, and is historically the way coboundaries and cup products were defined in topology. But it is not the “right” way to do things, because, among other reasons, one wants the coboundary to agree with the general choice for hom complexes.

We point out that there is an isomorphism of cochain complexes  $(C^*, \delta) \simeq (C^*, d)$ , defined by  $\alpha \leftrightarrow (-1)^{|\alpha|(|\alpha|+1)/2} \alpha$ . In the topological situation, this isomorphism becomes an isomorphism between the two versions of the cup product differential graded cochain algebras of spaces with a fixed diagonal.  $\square$

### 3.2 Group Actions on Tensor and Hom Complexes

Finally in this section we discuss some aspects of group actions on chain complexes. If a group  $G$  acts on the left as chain maps of a chain complex  $C_*$  and a group  $H$  acts on the left on  $D_*$  then  $G \times H$  acts on  $C_* \otimes D_*$  by  $(g, h)(a \otimes b) = ga \otimes hb$ . If  $H = G$  then there is the associated diagonal  $G$  action on  $C_* \otimes D_*$ , namely  $g(a \otimes b) = ga \otimes gb$ .

The group  $G \times H$  also acts on the left of  $HOM(C_*, D_*)$  by  $((g, h)u)(c) = h(ug^{-1}(c))$ , which is the composition of functions  $h \circ u \circ g^{-1}: C_* \rightarrow C_* \rightarrow D_* \rightarrow D_*$ . For example, with trivial group action on  $\mathbb{F}$  and a left  $G$  action on  $C_*$ , the left action on the dual complex  $HOM(C_*, \mathbb{F})$  is  $(g\alpha)(x) = \alpha(g^{-1}(x))$ , which is the composition of functions  $g\alpha = \alpha \circ g^{-1}: C_* \rightarrow C_* \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ .

Of course right group actions can always be converted to left group actions, and vice-versa, by the definition  $gy = yg^{-1}$ . For example, the most natural way to view the action on a dual complex is a right action,  $\alpha g^{-1} = \alpha \circ g^{-1}$ , which converts to the left action  $g\alpha = \alpha \circ g^{-1}$  defined above.

The natural action of  $\Sigma_p$  on a tensor power  $C_*^{\otimes p}$ , as a group of chain complex automorphisms, is also a right action,

$$(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_p)g = (-1)^k a_{g(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{g(p)}, k = k(a, g).$$

To understand this, it is convenient to first view the data of a basic tensor  $a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_p$  as a function  $a: \{1, \dots, p\} \rightarrow C_*$ . Then  $ag = (-1)^k (a \circ g)$  as functions. We need a sign because the automorphism of the tensor complex determined by the permutation  $g$  must commute with the boundary operator. The sign, from Proposition 3.1, is the Koszul sign that counts the parity of the number of odd degree pairs that are swapped by the permutation  $g$ . That is,  $(-1)^{k(a, g)} = \tau(g|_{|a_i|=\text{odd}})$ , where  $\tau$  is the parity sign of the permutation  $g$  restricted to the indicated ordered subset of the  $\{a_i\}$ . The conversion of the right action on the tensor power to a left action is thus  $g(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_p) = (-1)^{k(a, g)} (a_{g^{-1}(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{g^{-1}(p)})$ .

**Remark 3.3.** Suppose  $B_*$  is a free left  $\Sigma_p$  complex and suppose  $\phi: B_* \otimes C_* \rightarrow C_*^{\otimes p}$  is a  $\Sigma_p$ -equivariant chain map. Then the adjoint chain map  $B_* \rightarrow HOM(C_*, C_*^{\otimes p})$  from Proposition 3.1 is also equivariant. We can compose this equivariant adjoint map with the last duality map from Proposition 3.1 and the duality map  $(C^*)^{\otimes p} \rightarrow (C_*^{\otimes p})^*$  from Remark 3.2 to get

$$B_* \rightarrow HOM(C_*, C_*^{\otimes p}) \rightarrow HOM(C_*^{\otimes p}, C^*) \rightarrow HOM(C^*)^{\otimes p}, C^*).$$

All maps in this sequence are left equivariant chain maps, with the suitably formed left actions. There are signs in the second two maps, given at the end of Proposition 3.1 and implicitly in Remark 3.2.

This composition has an adjoint  $\Phi: B_* \otimes (C^*)^{\otimes p} \rightarrow C^*$ , which has the form

$$\Phi(b \otimes (\alpha_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_p))(c) = (-1)^{|b|(1+|c|)} \langle \alpha_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_p, \phi(b \otimes c) \rangle.$$

In particular, if  $|b|$  is even the sign goes away. The term  $\phi(b \otimes c) \in C_*^{\otimes p}$  will be a sum of  $p$ -tensors and from Remark 3.2 the last evaluation is computed using

$$\langle \alpha_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_p, c_1 \otimes \dots \otimes c_p \rangle = (-1)^{\ell(\ell-1)/2} \prod \langle \alpha_j, c_j \rangle$$

This evaluation is 0 unless  $|\alpha_j| = -|c_j|$ . From Remark 3.2,  $\ell$  is the number of  $c_j$  of odd degree. The  $G$  action on  $C^*$  is trivial here, so the equivariance property of  $\Phi$  is

$$\Phi = \Phi \circ g: B_* \otimes (C^*)^{\otimes p} \rightarrow B_* \otimes (C^*)^{\otimes p} \rightarrow C^*.$$

Alternate formulations are

$$\Phi(gb \otimes g(\alpha_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_p)) = \Phi(b \otimes \alpha_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_p)$$

$$\Phi(gb \otimes \alpha_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_p) = \Phi(b \otimes g^{-1}(\alpha_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_p)).$$

Note there are Koszul signs in the evaluations of any  $g'(\alpha_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_p)$ .

Chain maps of form  $\phi: B_* \otimes C_* \rightarrow C_*^{\otimes p}$  and  $\Phi: B_* \otimes (C^*)^{\otimes p} \rightarrow C^*$  will turn up in Parts II, III, and IV when we discuss how chains  $C_* = N_*(X)$  on simplicial sets are coalgebras over certain operads with components  $B_*$ , and how cochains  $C^* = N^*(X)$  are algebras over those same operads. The operad algebra structures on tensors of cochains lead to explicit cochain level definitions of Steenrod operations and proofs of their properties in Part IV.  $\square$

## 4 Contractions

We will repeat some sentences from the beginning of the previous section. We work primarily with positively graded chain complexes  $C_*$  over a ground ring  $\mathbb{F}$ , which will usually be the integers  $\mathbb{Z}$  or a field  $\mathbb{F}$  or a group ring  $\mathbb{F}[G]$ . Positively graded means 0 in negative degrees. However, cochain complexes are negatively graded chain complexes and occasionally we work with more general  $\mathbb{Z}$  graded hom complexes. For completeness, we will define contractions for *arbitrary*  $\mathbb{Z}$  graded chain complexes.

### 4.1 Contractions of Augmented Based Chain Complexes

We regard  $\mathbb{F}$  as a chain complex concentrated in degree 0. Our chain complexes will have an augmentation chain map  $\epsilon: C_* \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ , that is  $\epsilon d_1 = 0$ , and

a base point chain map  $\iota: \mathbb{F} \rightarrow C_0$ , that is  $d_0 \iota = 0$ , with  $\epsilon \circ \iota = Id_{\mathbb{F}}$ . A base point is the same data as a cycle  $c_0 = \iota(1) \in C_0$ , with  $\epsilon(c_0) = 1$ . We set  $\rho = \iota \circ \epsilon: C_* \rightarrow \mathbb{F} \rightarrow C_0 \subset C_*$ , and sometimes also refer to the chain map  $\rho$  as the base point. Of course if  $C_*$  is positively graded then any  $\iota(1) \in C_0$  is a cycle.

**DEFINITION 4.0.** A *contraction* is a chain homotopy  $h: C_* \rightarrow C_{*+1}$  with  $dh + hd = Id - \rho$ . Thus  $\epsilon$  and  $\iota$  are chain homotopy inverses of each other. If a contraction exists we call  $C_*$  a *contractible complex*. If a contraction is chosen, we call  $C_*$  a *contracted complex*.

One can also form an augmented complex  $\widehat{C}_*$  by adding a summand  $\mathbb{F}$  in degree  $-1$ . Set  $\hat{d}_0 = d_0 \oplus \epsilon$  and set  $\hat{d}_{-1} = d_{-1} \oplus 0$ . Extend the contraction  $h$  to  $\hat{h}$  by setting  $\hat{h}_{-1} = h_{-1} \oplus \iota$  and  $\hat{h}_{-2} = h_{-2} \oplus 0$ . Then the degree 1 map  $\hat{h}$  becomes a chain homotopy between the identity and zero on the augmented complex. That is,  $\hat{d}\hat{h} + \hat{h}\hat{d} = Id$  in all degrees. Thus the augmented complex is acyclic, meaning 0 homology in all degrees. We slightly prefer the former viewpoint since the chain complexes we work with usually have preferred augmentations and also preferred base points.

## 4.2 Contractions with $h^2 = 0$

Of course when contractions exist, they are usually highly non-unique. It turns out that a very useful additional property of contractions is  $h\iota = 0$  and  $h^2 = 0$ , which we will show in the next proposition can always be assumed. This is the same as  $\hat{h}^2 = 0$  for the associated null-homotopy of the augmented complex  $\widehat{C}_*$ .

In the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded based augmented case, we will show that  $h^2 = 0$  implies  $\epsilon h = 0$ . Since  $\iota$  is injective, it is equivalent to show  $\iota \epsilon h = 0$ . If  $x \in C_{-1}$ , then  $(dh + hd)hx = hx - \iota \epsilon hx$ . But  $h^2 = 0$  implies  $(dh + hd)hx = hdhx = h(x - hdx) = hx$ . Of course  $\epsilon h = 0$  is a vacuous statement in the positively graded case since there is no  $h_{-1}$ .

Contraction data  $\mathbb{F} \rightleftarrows C_* \xrightarrow{h} C_{*+1}$ , with  $Id = \epsilon \iota: \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ ,  $dh + hd = Id - \iota \epsilon$ , and  $h^2 = 0, h\iota = 0, \epsilon h = 0$ , is a special case of what Rubio and Serveraert [25] call a *reduction* of a complex  $C_*$  in their work on constructive algebraic topology. Specifically,  $D_* \rightleftarrows C_* \xrightarrow{h} C_{*+1}$  for some complex  $D_*$ , with the same composition formulas as ours. Such data also occurs in homological perturbation theory. Lambe and Stasheff [14] refer to it as *strong deformation*.

tion retract data and Real [24] uses the term *contraction* even in this more general case. We think it likely that many of the constructions in our paper can be extended somehow to this more general setting. The following result is a known example.

**Proposition 4.1.** *If a chain complex admits a contraction then it admits a contraction  $h$  with  $h^2 = 0$  and  $h\iota = 0$ . Then  $\text{Ker}(h) = \text{Im}(h)$  in degrees  $\neq 0$  and  $\text{Ker}(h) = \text{Im}(h) \oplus \text{Im}(\iota)$  in degree 0.*

*Proof.* Any contraction of  $C_*$  defines a null-homotopy  $\hat{h}$  of the augmented complex  $\hat{C}_*$ . There are then split short exact sequences for the augmented complex,

$$0 \rightarrow \hat{Z}_n \rightarrow \hat{C}_n \rightleftarrows \hat{B}_{n-1} \rightarrow 0,$$

where the backwards arrow on the right is  $\hat{h}$ , and where the boundaries in  $\hat{C}_*$  coincide with the cycles in all degrees. Given such splittings, one has direct sum decompositions of  $\hat{C}_n$ . In fact,  $c_n = \hat{d}hc_n + \hat{h}dc_n = z_n + \hat{h}z_{n-1}$ . Then  $\tilde{h}|_{\hat{Z}_n} = \hat{h}$  and  $\tilde{h}|_{\hat{h}\hat{Z}_{n-1}} = 0$  also defines a null-homotopy of the augmented complex.

In fact,  $\tilde{h}(c_n) = \tilde{h}(z_n) = \hat{h}(z_n)$ , so  $\tilde{d}\tilde{h}(c_n) = \tilde{d}\hat{h}(z_n) = z_n = \hat{d}hc_n$ . Also  $d(c_n)$  is a cycle, so  $hd(c_n) = \hat{h}dc_n$ . Clearly  $\tilde{h}^2 = 0$ . This produces a contraction  $h = \tilde{h}$  of  $C_*$  with  $h^2 = 0$  and  $h\iota = 0$ . The last statement of the proposition follows easily from  $dh(x) + hd(x) = x - \iota\epsilon(x)$  and  $\epsilon h = 0$ .  $\square$

**Remark 4.2.** For the positively graded complexes of interest to us,  $C_0$  is not only free over  $\mathbb{F}$ , but has a preferred basis. Therefore there is an obvious choice of augmentation, sending basis elements to  $1 \in \mathbb{F}$ .

We briefly discuss change of basepoint, even for  $\mathbb{Z}$  graded  $C_*$ , with a fixed preferred augmentation  $\epsilon$ . Suppose we have two basepoint cycles in  $C_0$ , say  $\iota(1) = c_0$  and  $\iota'(1) = c'_0$ , with  $\epsilon(c_0) = \epsilon(c'_0) = 1$ . Suppose  $h$  is a contraction for the basepoint  $\iota$ . That is,  $dh + hd = Id - \iota\epsilon$ . Define  $h': C_* \rightarrow C_{*+1}$  by  $h'(c) = h(c) - \epsilon(c)h(c'_0)$ . So  $h = h'$  except in degree 0. The following is just an exercise in all the definitions, but it is a little trickier than it might look.

**Proposition 4.3.**  *$h'$  is a contraction for the basepoint  $\iota'$ . That is,  $dh' + h'd = Id - \iota'\epsilon$ . If  $h^2 = 0$  and  $h\iota = 0$  then  $(h')^2 = 0$  and  $h'\iota' = 0$ .  $\square$*

In practice this remark could be useful when  $\iota'$  is a complicated basepoint that we really want to use, and  $\iota$  is a much simpler basepoint, but one for which it is fairly easy to find a contraction.  $\square$



For the remainder of the paper we will assume all contractions satisfy  $h^2 = 0$  and  $h\iota = 0$ , which we sometimes abbreviate as simply  $h^2 = 0$ . When appropriate we will try to point out in various situations why this assumption holds or just how this assumption is being used.

## 5 Examples of Contractions

We often work with simplicial sets  $X$ . We denote by  $N_*(X)$  the normalized simplicial set chain complex of  $X$  with  $\mathbb{Z}$  coefficients (or sometimes a field  $\mathbb{F}$  of coefficients), obtained from the full simplicial set chain complex by dividing by the subcomplex spanned by degenerate simplices. If  $N_*(X)$  is contractible and  $X$  is simply connected then the geometric realization  $|X|$  is topologically contractible by the Whitehead Theorem.

### 5.1 Simplices, Products, and MacLane Models

**Example 5.1. The Simplex.** If  $\Delta$  is an ordered simplex with vertices  $\{0, 1, \dots, k, k+1, \dots\}$  then there is a contraction  $h(i_0, \dots, i_n) = (0, i_0, \dots, i_n)$  of  $N_*(\Delta)$ . The base point is vertex  $0 \in N_0(\Delta)$ , and the augmentation sends all vertices to  $1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ . A routine calculation using the boundary formula

$$d(i_0, \dots, i_n) = \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j (i_0, \dots, \widehat{i_j}, \dots, i_n)$$

implies  $h$  is a contraction. Also  $h^2 = 0$  and  $h\iota = 0$  since  $(0, 0, x)$  is degenerate.

We point out that if  $C_*(\Delta)$  is the unnormalized augmented, based, simplicial set chain complex associated to the ordered simplex then the same map  $h$  is a contraction, but  $h^2 \neq 0$ . The procedure of Proposition 4.1 yields a contraction with square 0, but it is a big mess.  $\square$

**Example 5.2. Products of Simplicial Sets.** If  $X$  and  $Y$  are simplicial sets then  $X \times Y$  is a simplicial set, with  $(X \times Y)_n = X_n \times Y_n$ . The face and degeneracy operators act in the obvious diagonal way on pairs of simplices, and the full boundary operator is the usual alternating sum of the codimension one face operators,  $d(\sigma, \tau) = \sum_j (-1)^j (d_j \sigma, d_j \tau)$ .

If  $N_*(X)$  and  $N_*(Y)$  are contractible then  $N_*(X \times Y)$  is contractible because it is free and we know the homology by the Eilenberg-Zilber/Kunneth Theorem. But it is not so easy to give an explicit contraction in general. The

tricky point is that a pair of  $n$ -simplices  $(\sigma, \tau)$  can define a non-degenerate simplex in  $X \times Y$  even if both  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  are degenerate. Thus a contraction for  $N_*(X \times Y)$  must be defined at the level of all simplices in the separate factors, not just on the normalized chain complexes.

If  $X$  and  $Y$  are both ordered simplices, a contraction is given by

$$h((i_0, \dots, i_n), (j_0, \dots, j_n)) = ((0, i_0, \dots, i_n), (0, j_0, \dots, j_n)).$$

The proof just amounts to the easy calculation of  $dh + hd$ , which is the same calculation as in the case of one simplex. Obviously  $h^2 = 0$ .

We occasionally use the notation  $I = \Delta^1$  for the 1-simplex. There are fairly obvious geometric contractions, in fact, simplicial set homotopies  $I \times \Delta \rightarrow \Delta$  and  $I \times \Delta \times \Delta \rightarrow \Delta \times \Delta$  between the identities and the constant base point maps. These homotopies factor through simplicial maps  $CX \rightarrow X$ , where  $CX$  is the cone on  $X = \Delta$  or  $\Delta \times \Delta$ . The maps from cones induce the above contractions on normalized chain complexes of simplices and products of simplices via the obvious maps  $N_*(X) \rightarrow N_{*+1}(CX) \rightarrow N_{*+1}(X)$ .  $\square$

**Example 5.3. MacLane Models.** We look at  $N_*(EG)$ , where  $EG$  is a standard construction of a contractible free simplicial  $G$ -set for a group  $G$ . Specifically  $EG_n = G^{n+1}$ . There is a canonical base point  $e = 1e \in N_0(EG) = \mathbb{Z}[G]$ , where  $e \in G$  is the identity element. The augmentation sends all group elements to  $1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

A contraction is  $h_G(x) = (e, x)$ , where  $x = (g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n) \in N_n(EG)$  is an  $n$ -simplex generator. Again  $h_G^2 = 0$ . The boundary formula is the same as that of a simplex,  $dx = \sum (-1)^j (g_0, \dots, \hat{g}_j, \dots, g_n)$ , as is the proof that  $h_G$  is indeed a contraction. The contraction  $h_G$  also arises from a simplicial set homotopy  $I \times EG \rightarrow CEG \rightarrow EG$ .

The boundary operator in  $N_*(EG)$  is  $G$ -equivariant, where the left group action is given by  $g(g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n) = (gg_0, gg_1, \dots, gg_n)$ . Thus the augmented complex  $N_*(EG) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  is a free  $\mathbb{Z}[G]$  resolution of  $\mathbb{Z}$  regarded as a trivial  $G$ -module. The coinvariant complex  $G \backslash N_*(EG) = N_*(BG)$ , where  $BG = G \backslash EG$  is a simplicial set classifying space for  $G$ .

The contractions  $h_G$  are functorial in  $G$ . In fact, *any* function  $G \rightarrow G'$  corresponding identity elements will first induce a simplicial map  $EG \rightarrow EG'$  and then a chain map  $N_*(EG) \rightarrow N_*(EG')$  commuting with contractions.

Of course these chain maps are not equivariant unless the function between groups is a homomorphism. There will be some partial equivariance if the function  $G \rightarrow G'$  is a homomorphism on certain subgroups of  $G$ . This happens in the important case of certain maps

$$N_*(E(\Sigma_r \times \Sigma_{s_1} \times \dots \times \Sigma_{s_r})) \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_{s_1+\dots+s_r})$$

related to the operad structure maps for the Barratt-Eccles operad  $\mathcal{E}$  to be studied in Part III.

If  $K$  and  $H$  are two groups, there is an obvious identification  $E(K \times H) \simeq EK \times EH$ . The canonical contraction for the product group identifies with the product contraction of the factors, defined just as for the product of two simplices. But somewhat more is true. Suppose  $G = K \rtimes H$  is a semidirect product of subgroups, with  $H \triangleleft G = KH$  a normal subgroup and with  $K \cap H = \{e\}$ . Then elements of  $G$  can be uniquely written as products of subgroup elements,  $g = kh$ , which can be identified with pairs  $(k, h) \in K \times H$ . The product in  $G$  in terms of pairs then becomes  $(k', h')(k, h) = (k'k, (k^{-1}h'k)h)$ . Thus there is still an obvious identification  $E(K \rtimes H) \simeq EK \times EH$  as simplicial sets, hence there is a canonical product contraction of the normalized chain complex. What is different is the action of the twisted group  $K \rtimes H$  on  $EK \times EH$ .

As an example, the  $p$ -Sylow subgroup of  $\Sigma_{p^2}$  is a semidirect product  $C_p \rtimes (C_p)^p$ , where each  $C_p \subset \Sigma_{p^2}$  is a cyclic group of prime order  $p$ . The corresponding MacLane models and their contractions play a key role in the explicit cochain level study of Steenrod operations. The Eilenberg-Zilber inclusion that we study in Section 6,

$$N_*(C_p) \otimes N_*(C_p)^{\otimes p} \xrightarrow{EZ} N_*(E(C_p \rtimes (C_p)^p)) \subset N_*(E\Sigma_{p^2}),$$

is part of the operad structure of the Barratt-Eccles operad  $\{\mathcal{E}(n) = N_*(E\Sigma_n)\}$ .  
 $\square$

## 5.2 The Minimal Model for Cyclic Groups

**Example 5.4. Minimal Models for Cyclic Groups.** Here is the first of a number of examples not directly related to simplicial sets. Let  $C = \langle T \rangle$ , the cyclic group of order  $n$ . Our next augmented chain complex will be  $M_* \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ , the standard minimal free  $\mathbb{Z}[C]$  left module resolution of  $\mathbb{Z}$ , with

$C$  acting trivially on  $\mathbb{Z}$ . So  $M_j \simeq \mathbb{Z}[C]$ , with generator  $y_j$ . The  $C$ -equivariant boundary operator is given on generators for  $k \geq 1$  by

$$dy_{2k-1} = (T - 1)y_{2k-2} \text{ and } dy_{2k} = (T^{n-1} + \dots + T^2 + T^1 + 1)y_{2k-1}.$$

Although  $M_*$  is not the chain complex associated to a simplicial set, it is the cellular chain complex  $C_*(W)$  associated to a free  $C$  action on a regular cell complex  $W$ , obtained from a regular cell structure on the infinite sphere  $S^\infty$ , with  $n$  cells in each degree. Thus the coinvariant complex  $C \setminus M_*$  is a model for the chains on a cellular classifying space  $BC = C \setminus W$ , which is an infinite dimensional lens space.

The base point of  $M_*$  is  $\iota(1) = y_0$  and the augmentation is  $\epsilon(T^i y_0) = 1$ , so  $\rho(T^i y_0) = y_0$ . A contraction  $h: M_* \rightarrow M_*$  with  $dh + hd = Id - \rho$  is given by

$$h(T^i y_{2k}) = \sum_{0 \leq j < i} T^j y_{2k+1} \quad [So \ h(y_{2k}) = 0 \text{ and } h(Ty_{2k}) = y_{2k+1}]$$

$$h(T^i y_{2k+1}) = 0 \text{ if } i < n - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad h(T^{n-1} y_{2k+1}) = y_{2k+2}.$$

The proof that  $h$  is a contraction, including  $h^2 = 0$ , is a simple computation, that divides into even degree and odd degree cases. Also, the contraction  $h$  arises from a geometric cellular homotopy  $I \times W \rightarrow CW \rightarrow W$ .  $\square$

### 5.3 Tensor and Hom Complexes

**Example 5.5. Tensor Complexes.** Here we construct contractions of tensor products of contractible complexes. Tensor products of complexes were discussed in Section 3. The augmentation of the tensor product of two augmented complexes is the tensor product of the two separate augmentations,  $C_* \otimes D_* \rightarrow \mathbb{F} \otimes \mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}$ . The base point of the tensor product of two based complexes is also the tensor product of the two base points,  $\mathbb{F} \otimes \mathbb{F} \rightarrow C_0 \otimes D_0$ . We then have the composition of augmentations and base points,  $\rho = \rho_C \otimes \rho_D: C_* \otimes D_* \rightarrow \mathbb{F} \otimes \mathbb{F} \rightarrow C_0 \otimes D_0$ . If  $C_*$  and  $D_*$  are free, then so is  $C_* \otimes D_*$ .

Given contractions  $h_C, h_D$  of  $C_*$  and  $D_*$ , one can use general methods for dealing with compositions of chain equivalences and tensor products of chain equivalences to construct a contraction  $h$  of  $C_* \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} D_*$ . Combining chain homotopy equivalences

$$C_* \otimes D_* \hookrightarrow \mathbb{F} \otimes D_* \hookrightarrow \mathbb{F} \otimes \mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F},$$

one can derive a resulting contraction formula for  $C_* \otimes D_*$ , namely  $h = h_C \otimes Id_D + \rho_C \otimes h_D$ . Explicitly,

$$h(a \otimes b) = h_C(a) \otimes b + \rho_C(a) \otimes h_D(b).$$

One can also just begin with this formula and compute directly that it is a contraction of  $C_* \otimes D_*$ . If the contractions of  $C_*$  and  $D_*$  satisfy the conditions  $h^2 = 0, hu = 0$ , then so does the contraction of  $C_* \otimes D_*$ .

Symmetry is necessarily broken here, but this turns out to be the preferred choice for our purposes. Using  $C_* \otimes D_* \hookrightarrow C_* \otimes \mathbb{F} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{F} \otimes \mathbb{F}$  instead, the resulting formula is

$$h'(a \otimes b) = h_C(a) \otimes \rho_D(b) + (-1)^{|a|} a \otimes h_D(b).$$

This second contraction can also be obtained by conjugating the first contraction method by the isomorphism  $D_* \otimes C_* \simeq C_* \otimes D_*$  from Proposition 3.1, which includes Koszul signs.

The reason we prefer the first formula is that in topological situations it leads to the classical Alexander-Whitney diagonal map  $N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X) \otimes N_*(X)$ , as we will see in Sections 6 and 8. The other formula leads to an alternate diagonal, which perhaps has some merit.

If  $C_* = D_*$  we have a contraction  $h^{(2)} = h \otimes Id + \rho \otimes h$  of  $C_* \otimes C_*$ . Then one can repeat the construction and define a contraction  $h^{(3)}$  of  $C_* \otimes C_* \otimes C_*$ . The formula, viewing  $C_*^{\otimes 3} = C_* \otimes C_*^{\otimes 2}$ , is

$$h^{(3)} = h \otimes Id^{\otimes 2} + \rho \otimes h^{(2)} = h \otimes Id \otimes Id + \rho \otimes h \otimes Id + \rho \otimes \rho \otimes h.$$

The formula makes sense not just for tensor powers but for any triple tensor product of contractible complexes  $C'_* \otimes C''_* \otimes C'''_*$ .

This construction can be iterated to define preferred contractions of  $(C_*)^{\otimes(k+1)}$ , or of any  $(k+1)$ -fold tensor product,

$$h^{(k+1)} = h \otimes Id^{\otimes k} + \rho \otimes h^{(k)} = \sum_{i \geq 0} \rho^{\otimes i} \otimes h \otimes Id^{\otimes(k-i)} = \sum_{i \geq 0} h_i^{(k+1)}.$$

If all contractions of the tensor factors satisfy  $h^2 = 0$  and  $hu = 0$  then these last summands  $h_i$  for any tensor product satisfy  $h_i h_j = 0$ , since  $\rho h = 0$  and  $h\rho = 0$  on each tensor factor. Hence  $(h^{(k)})^2 = 0$  for all  $k$ , and  $h^{(k)} \iota^{\otimes k} = 0$ .

It follows that  $Ker(h^{(k)}) = Im(h^{(k)}) = \sum Im(h_i^{(k)})$  for any  $k$ .

This sum decomposition of contractions of tensor products is remarkably similar to the structure of contractions of surjection complexes that we will study in Part II. Anticipating some later terminology, we will refer to tensors in the image of any  $h_i = \rho \otimes \dots \otimes \rho \otimes h \otimes Id \otimes \dots \otimes Id$  as *clean* tensors. The span of these clean tensors is always the image of the preferred contraction of a tensor product. In order to apply some of our uniqueness theorems later it is important to be able to recognize elements in the image of contractions.

The preferred contractions of tensor products also satisfy an easily verified associativity property. Namely, for  $i + j = k$  and  $h^{(1)} = h$ :

$$h^{(k+1)} = \rho^{\otimes i} \otimes h^{(j)} + h^{(i)} \otimes Id^{\otimes j}.$$

These same contractions of tensor products, and more general versions, can be found in J. R. Smith [28], Real [24], and no doubt other places.  $\square$

**Example 5.6. Hom Complexes.** Representing adjoints of tensor product functors  $B_* \mapsto B_* \otimes C_*$  are complexes of homomorphisms  $HOM(C_*, D_*)$ , which in degree  $n$  are given by  $\prod_k Hom_{\mathbb{F}}(C_k, D_{k+n})$ . These were discussed in detail in Section 3. In particular, these complexes are more complicated because they can be non-zero in all degrees  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Included are the dual cochain complexes  $C^* = HOM(C_*, \mathbb{F})$ . In general, even if  $C_*$  and  $D_*$  are free complexes,  $HOM(C_*, D_*)$  is not free unless  $C_*$  has finite type, or other assumptions are made about  $\mathbb{F}$ . This would not be an issue because we would only map other complexes to hom complexes, and freeness of the target is not needed.

In the dual cochain complex of a based augmented chain complex, the base point and the augmentation now become switched adjoints  $\iota_{C^*} = \epsilon^*: \mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}^* \rightarrow C^0$ , and  $\epsilon_{C^*} = \iota^*: C^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^* = \mathbb{F}$ .

In the general case of two based augmented complexes, the augmentation of  $HOM(C_*, D_*)$  is  $\epsilon(u) = \epsilon_D \circ u \circ \iota_C$ , which is a map  $HOM(C_*, D_*) \rightarrow HOM(\mathbb{F}, \mathbb{F}) = \mathbb{F}$ . A base point is  $\iota(x) = \iota_D \circ x \circ \epsilon_C$ , which is a map  $\mathbb{F} = HOM(\mathbb{F}, \mathbb{F}) \rightarrow HOM(C_*, D_*)$ . In the form  $\rho = \iota \circ \epsilon: HOM(C_*, D_*) \rightarrow HOM(C_*, D_*)$ , the basepoint is  $\rho(u) = \rho_D \circ u \circ \rho_C$ .

Suppose  $h_C, h_D$  are contractions of  $C_*, D_*$ . Then keeping track of the chain

homotopies in the induced chain equivalences

$$HOM(C_*, D_*) \simeq HOM(\mathbb{F}, D_*) \simeq HOM(\mathbb{F}, \mathbb{F}) = \mathbb{F},$$

a contraction of  $HOM(C_*, D_*)$  with  $dh + hd = Id - \rho$  is given by

$$h(u) = h_D \circ u \circ \rho_C + (-1)^{|u|} u \circ h_C.$$

If the contractions of  $C_*$  and  $D_*$  satisfy the conditions  $h^2 = 0, hu = 0$ , then so does the contraction of  $HOM(C_*, D_*)$ .

If the middle term  $HOM(\mathbb{F}, D_*)$  in the sequence above is replaced by  $HOM(C_*, \mathbb{F})$ , the resulting contraction of  $HOM(C_*, D_*)$  is

$$h'(u) = h_D \circ u + (-1)^{|u|} \rho_D \circ u \circ h_C.$$

In the case of the dual  $C^* = HOM(C_*, \mathbb{F})$  of a contractible complex, both contraction formulas yield the contraction  $h^*(u) = (-1)^{|u|} u \circ h_C$ . The second contraction  $h'$  of  $HOM(C_*, D_*)$  can also be obtained from the inclusion  $HOM(C_*, D_*) \rightarrow HOM(D^*, C^*)$ , using the dual complex contractions and the first contraction method on the right, then restricting.

We include this brief summary of hom complex contractions because of the reasonably pleasant parallels with tensor complex contractions. We will not use hom complex contractions in our paper. For one thing, in situations where we might use  $HOM(C_*, D_*)$ , the appropriate basepoint is not the simple one given here, but rather a more complicated cycle in  $HOM_0(C_*, D_*)$ . We would then need to use the change of basepoint method of Remark 4.2.

Regarding the adjoint isomorphism

$$Ad: HOM(B_* \otimes C_*, D_*) = HOM(B_*, HOM(C_*, D_*))$$

for three complexes with contractions, the desired relation  $h(Ad u) = Ad(hu)$  does hold, and similarly if all tensor and hom contractions are replaced by their  $h'$  alternates. However, it seems surprisingly difficult to relate a single map  $B_* \otimes C_* \rightarrow D_*$  constructed using a contraction of  $D_*$  to its adjoint map  $B_* \rightarrow HOM(C_*, D_*)$ , using contractions of  $C_*$  and  $D_*$ .  $\square$

## 5.4 Twisted Coefficients

**Example 5.7. Twisted Coefficients.** Suppose a based augmented complex  $C_* \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \mathbb{F} \rightarrow 0$  is a free  $\mathbb{F}[G]$  acyclic resolution of the trivial  $G$ -module  $\mathbb{F}$ .

Suppose  $1 \neq -1 \in \mathbb{F}$ . A non-trivial homomorphism  $\tau: G \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$  defines another  $G$  action on  $\mathbb{F}$ , by  $g * a = \tau(g)a$ . With  $\tau$  fixed, we refer to this twisted  $G$ -module as  $\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}$ .<sup>14</sup> We can go from free acyclic resolutions of  $\mathbb{F}$  to free acyclic resolutions of  $\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}$ , by the correspondence  $C_* \leftrightarrow \widetilde{C}_* = C_* \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}$ , with diagonal  $G$ -action on  $\widetilde{C}_*$ . That is, the action on  $\widetilde{C}_*$  is

$$g * (x \otimes 1) = gx \otimes \tau(g)1 = \tau(g)gx \otimes 1$$

for all  $g \in G$ ,  $x \in C_*$ .

We regard  $\widetilde{C}_* = C_* \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}$  as a tensor product of two based augmented  $G$ -complexes. The tensor product augmentation is  $\widetilde{\epsilon}(x \otimes 1) = \epsilon(x) \otimes 1$ , and the tensor product base point is  $\widetilde{\iota}(1) = \iota(1) \otimes 1$ . We see  $\widetilde{\epsilon}$  is indeed equivariant for a twisted  $G$ -action on  $C_0$  and the twisted action on  $\mathbb{F}$ . That is,

$$\widetilde{\epsilon}(g*(x \otimes 1)) = \widetilde{\epsilon}(\tau(g)gx \otimes 1) = \tau(g)(\epsilon(gx) \otimes 1) = \tau(g)(\epsilon(x) \otimes 1) = \tau(g)\widetilde{\epsilon}(x \otimes 1).$$

The two chain complexes  $C_*$  and  $\widetilde{C}_*$  are canonically identified as chain complexes of  $\mathbb{F}$ -modules, with  $x \leftrightarrow x \otimes 1$ , so there is no real harm writing simply  $\widetilde{C}_* = C_*$  as chain complexes of  $\mathbb{F}$ -modules, with a new group action  $g*x = \tau(g)gx$ . The augmentation and base point remain the same, but now the computation just above shows that the augmentation is  $G$ -equivariant for the twisted action on  $C_0$  and the action on the twisted module  $\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}$ .

If  $h$  is a contraction of  $C_*$  then  $h$  also defines a contraction of  $\widetilde{C}_* = C_* \otimes \mathbb{F}$ , namely  $\widetilde{h}(x) = h(x) \otimes Id$ . This is a special case of a contraction of a tensor product.

Note as  $G$ -modules  $\widetilde{\mathbb{F}} \otimes \widetilde{\mathbb{F}} = \mathbb{F}$ , so tensoring a  $G$ -resolution  $\widetilde{C}_* \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathbb{F}} \rightarrow 0$  with  $\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}$  yields a resolution  $C_*$  of the trivial module  $\mathbb{F}$ . The two constructions are obviously inverses of each other.

We will have occasion to use the twisting and untwisting construction described here in the case  $G = \Sigma_n$  and  $\tau$  the unique non-trivial  $\{\pm 1\}$ -valued “parity” character. A specific example, given in Part II, leads to an alternate version of the surjection operad. We regard the details of that surjection operad and its relations with other operads, as an interesting part of our work. Also, the twisted complexes arising from the parity character are used in

---

<sup>14</sup>More generally one can twist by homomorphisms  $G \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^*$ , the units in  $\mathbb{F}$ , or even by  $G \rightarrow Aut(\mathbb{F})$ , the automorphisms of the abelian group  $\mathbb{F}$ . We could even study  $C_* \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} L_* \rightarrow \mathbb{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} L_* = L_*$  for  $G$ -complexes  $L_*$ .



Part IV to explain quite naturally some subtle differences between cochain level Steenrod operations applied to even and odd degree cocycles.  $\square$

## 6 Using Contractions to Construct Chain Maps

### 6.1 The Basic Standard Procedure

There is a standard recursive procedure that gets used in many different situations to construct chain maps  $\phi: B_* \rightarrow C_*$ . The common ingredients are that  $C_*$  has a given contraction and that  $B_*$  is positively graded and free, either over a ground ring  $\mathbb{F}$  or a group ring  $\mathbb{F}[G]$ , with a chosen basis. In the equivariant case,  $C_*$  will also be a  $G$ -complex and the constructed chain maps will be equivariant.

The constructions usually begin quite simply in degree 0, exploiting base points and augmentations in both domain and range. In the equivariant case we assume the augmentations to be  $G$ -maps, usually with the trivial action on  $\mathbb{F}$ , but possibly with the same  $G$  action arising from some  $\tau: G \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$ , as studied in Example 5.7, for both the  $B_*$  and  $C_*$  augmentations. We always assume the basepoint  $\iota_B(1)$  is a basis element in degree 0.

In degree 0, the canonical map will be defined by  $\phi_0(b) = \iota_C \circ \epsilon_B(b)$  on basis elements of the domain, and then extended equivariantly. Since dealing with chain maps can be a little tricky in low degrees, we point out here a couple of useful observations about canonical maps. If  $b \in B_0$  is a basis element and  $g \in G$  then directly applying the definitions of  $\phi_0, \rho_C$ , and  $\rho_B$ , along with  $\tau$ -equivariance, we get

$$\rho_C \phi_0(gb) = \tau(g) \phi_0(b) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_0 \rho_B(gb) = \tau(g) \phi_0(b).$$

That is,  $\rho_C \phi_0 = \phi_0 \rho_B$ . Thus canonical maps commute with basepoints, in a strong way. We now formalize what we mean by the standard canonical procedure for extending maps in degree 0, given a basis of the domain and a contraction  $h_C$  of the range.

**DEFINITION 6.0.** For a basis element  $b \in B_n$ , with  $n \geq 1$ , the recursive definition of the canonical chain map, or standard procedure chain map, is

$$\phi(b) = h_C(\phi(d_B b)).$$

One extends  $\mathbb{F}$ -linearly or  $\mathbb{F}[G]$ -linearly. By properties of  $h_C$ , the extension  $\phi$  is automatically a chain map. It is an equivariant chain map in the  $G$  case

because if  $x = g'b$  then  $\phi(x) = g'\phi(b)$ , so  $\phi(gx) = \phi(gg'b) = gg'\phi(b) = g\phi(x)$ .

Note that in the language of augmented complexes from Section 4, with  $B_{-1} = C_{-1} = \mathbb{F}$ , the canonical map begins with  $\phi_{-1} = Id$  in degree  $-1$  and then  $\phi_0 = h_C \circ \phi_{-1} \circ d_B = h_C \circ d_B = \iota_C \circ \epsilon_B$  on basis elements of the domain. But we can actually begin with any equivariant  $\phi_0$  such that  $\epsilon_C \phi_0 = \epsilon_B$ <sup>15</sup> and extend using the same recursive definition.  $\square$

Although the recursive procedure does not easily yield a closed formula for  $\phi$  in all degrees, it turns out that in many cases one can compute  $\phi$  in low degrees, then see a pattern that suggests a closed formula, which can be proved by induction once it is written down. Or, maybe someone else already claimed a chain map formula and one can prove by induction that their formula is the result of the standard recursive procedure. Several examples will be given.

**Example 6.1.** The first example is a bit silly. If we use the contraction of the simplex given in Example 5.1, along with the standard  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis, the standard procedure produces a map  $N_*(\Delta) \rightarrow N_*(\Delta)$ . In degree zero, this map sends all vertices to the base point 0, and is the zero map in all positive degrees. So the construction just gives the map of chain complexes induced by the constant map from the simplex to the base point.

On the other hand, if  $B_*$  is a free contractible  $G$ -complex with  $B_0 = \mathbb{F}[G]$  with the canonical augmentation  $\epsilon(g) = 1$  and base point  $\iota(1) = e$ , and if the chosen basis of  $B_*$  belongs to  $Im(h) = Ker(h)$  in positive degrees, then the canonical equivariant chain map  $\phi: B_* \rightarrow B_*$  is the identity. Namely,  $\phi_0 = Id$ , and then by induction if  $b$  is a basis element of positive degree,

$$\phi(b) = h\phi(db) = h(db) = b - d(hb) = b - d0 = b. \quad \square$$

## 6.2 Fundamental Uniqueness Theorems

We will insert here some uniqueness results that seem very useful and interesting, and reinforce our emphasis that there are strongly preferred maps at the chain level that clarify various homological results. The following two uniqueness results are very important.

---

<sup>15</sup>If  $rank(B_0) = 1$ , beginning with such a  $\phi_0$  is equivalent to a change of the base point  $\iota_C$  and a change of the contraction  $h_C$  in degree 0, as described in Remark 4.2, and then proceeding with the canonical map for those choices.

**Proposition 6.2.** *Suppose  $C_*$  is a  $G$ -complex with a contraction  $h_C$  with  $h_C^2 = 0$  and suppose  $B_*$  is free over  $\mathbb{F}[G]$ , with basis elements  $\{b\}$ . Suppose  $\psi: B_* \rightarrow C_*$  is an equivariant chain map with  $\epsilon_C \psi_0 = \epsilon_B$  and with  $\psi(b) \in \text{Im}(h_C) = \text{Ker}(h_C)$ , for all basis elements  $b$  in positive degrees. Then  $\psi$  is necessarily the standard procedure extension  $\phi$  of  $\psi_0$ .*

*Proof.* Both  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  are equivariant, so it suffices to compute on basis elements. Since  $\psi$  is a chain map, by induction the standard procedure extension of  $\psi_0$  is defined recursively on basis elements  $b$  of positive degree by

$$\phi(b) = h_C \phi(d_B b) = h_C \psi(d_B b) = h_C d_C \psi(b) = \psi(b) - d_C h_C \psi(b) = \psi(b) - 0.$$

Note the last step in this uniqueness result requires  $h_C^2 = 0$ , which we are universally assuming for all contractions.  $\square$

**Proposition 6.3.** *Suppose  $B_*$  is free over  $\mathbb{F}[G]$ , with a contraction  $h_B$ , and suppose  $C_*$  is contractible with a contraction  $h_C$ . Further suppose that  $B_*$  has a chosen  $\mathbb{F}[G]$  basis consisting of elements  $h_B(x)$ , including in degree 0 with basis element  $e = i_B(1) \in B_0 = \mathbb{F}[G]$ . Suppose  $\psi: B_* \rightarrow C_*$  is an equivariant map of graded modules with  $h_C \circ \psi = \psi \circ h_B$ . If either  $h_B^2 = 0$  or  $h_C^2 = 0$  then  $\psi = \phi$ , the canonical equivariant chain map constructed using  $h_C$  and the chosen  $\mathbb{F}[G]$  basis of  $B_*$ .*

*In particular, there is a unique equivariant map  $B_* \rightarrow C_*$  commuting with contractions (if one such exists) and it is automatically a standard procedure chain map independent of the choice of  $\mathbb{F}[G]$  basis of  $B_*$  in the image of  $h_B$ . If  $C_*$  satisfies the same hypotheses as  $B_*$  then  $\psi = \phi$  is surjective. If  $C_* = B_*$  then  $\psi = \phi = \text{Id}$ .*

*Proof.* The hypothesis is meant to include that in degree 0, both  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  coincide with the equivariant map extending  $e \mapsto \iota_C(1) \in C_0$ . Now we proceed by induction on degree, assuming the result holds in degrees less than  $n$ . Again, by equivariance it suffices to compute on basis elements. We first use the hypothesis  $h_B^2 = 0$ . Consider a basis element  $b \in \text{Im}(h_B)$ , so  $h_B(b) = 0$ . Then

$$\phi(b) = h_C \phi(d_B b) = h_C \psi(d_B b) = \psi h_B(d_B b) = \psi(b - d_B h_B b) = \psi(b) - 0.$$

Next we assume  $h_C^2 = 0$ , including  $h_C \iota_C = 0$ . Write basis element  $b = h_B x$ . Note that if  $\text{deg}(x) = 0$  then  $\rho_B x = a e$  for some scalar  $a \in \mathbb{F}$ , hence  $\psi(\rho_B x) = \iota_C(a)$  and  $h_C \psi(\rho_B x) = 0$ . By induction,

$$\phi(b) = h_C \phi(d_B h_B x) = h_C \psi(d_B h_B x) = h_C \psi(x - h_B d_B x - \rho_B x)$$

$$= h_C\psi(x) - h_C h_C\psi(d_Bx) - h_C\psi(\rho_Bx) = h_C\psi(x) = \psi(h_Bx) = \psi(b).$$

Of course we generally assume both  $h_B^2 = 0$  and  $h_C^2 = 0$ , but the two independent arguments are amusing.

The final statements in the proposition follow by trivial induction on degree. One notes that by the hypotheses and induction, basis elements of  $C_*$  can be written  $h_C(y) \in C_*$ , and these are all in the image of  $\psi$ .  $\square$

The pair  $(N_*(E_G), h_G) = (B_*, h_B)$ , where  $h_G(x) = (e, x)$ , has the following obvious properties. First,  $h_B^2 = 0$  and  $h_B\iota = 0$ . Second,  $B_*$  is free over  $\mathbb{F}[G]$ , with a basis consisting of elements  $b \in \text{Im}(h_B) = \text{Ker}(h_B)$ , including in degree 0 with  $B_0 = \mathbb{F}[G]$  and basis element  $\iota_B(1) = e$ . Third,  $\text{Im}(h_B)$  coincides with the  $\mathbb{F}$ -span of the basis elements  $\{b\}$ . Note in positive degrees a basis element  $b = h_B(db)$ , since  $dh_B(b) = d0 = 0$ .

**Proposition 6.4.** (i). *Assume the three properties above for a contracted complex  $(B_*, h_B)$ . Let  $C_*$  be a  $G$ -complex with a contraction  $h_C$ , of course with  $h_C^2 = 0$ . The standard procedure map  $\phi: B_* \rightarrow C_*$ , given on basis elements by  $\phi(b) = h_C\phi(db)$  and then extended equivariantly, commutes with contractions. That is,  $\phi h_B(z) = h_C\phi(z)$  for all  $z$ .*

(ii). *If  $C_*$  also has a basis in  $\text{Im}(h_C)$  then one has a standard procedure splitting  $B_* \rightleftharpoons C_*$ , expressing  $C_*$  as a canonical direct summand of  $B_*$ .*

(iii). *The three properties above uniquely characterize the pair  $(B_*, h_B)$ , up to canonical equivariant isomorphism. That is,  $(B_*, h_B) \simeq (N_*(E_G), h_G)$ .*

(iv). *Now just assume  $(B_*, h_B)$  satisfies the first two properties above and assume the standard procedure map  $\phi: B_* \rightarrow C_*$  satisfies the weaker condition  $h_C\phi h_B = 0$ . Equivalently  $\phi(\text{Im}(h_B)) \subset \text{Im}(h_C)$  and  $\phi(\text{Im}(\iota_B)) \subset \text{Im}(\iota_C)$ . Then  $\phi(b) = h_C\phi(x)$  for any  $x$  with  $b = h_B(x)$ .*

*Proof.* We first prove (i) by induction. From the hypothesis any element  $h_B(z) = \sum \epsilon_i b_i = h_B(\sum \epsilon_i db_i)$  for basis elements  $b_i$  and constants  $\epsilon_i \in \mathbb{F}$ . Since  $\text{Im}(h_B) = \text{Ker}(h_B)$ , we get  $z = \sum \epsilon_i db_i + h_B(y)$  for some  $y$ . Then

$$\phi h_B(z) = \phi(\sum \epsilon b_i) = h_C\phi(\sum \epsilon_i db_i) = h_C\phi(z) - h_C\phi h_B(y) = h_C\phi(z),$$

since by induction  $\phi h_B(y) = h_C\phi(y)$ .

Parts (ii) and (iii) follow by combining part (i) with Proposition 6.3. For part (iii), one sees two maps  $(B_*, h_B) \rightleftarrows (N_*(EG), h_G)$  with both compositions identity maps.

For part (iv), write  $x = db + h_B y$ . Then  $\phi(x) = h_C \phi(db) + h_C \phi h_B(y) = h_C \phi(db) = \phi(b)$ . Of course one can always discard summands of  $db$  that are themselves basis elements, but being able to discard other summands in  $Im(h_B)$  will prove to be very useful in Parts II and III. □

We insert here some easily checked statements that will turn out to be important later. These are related to compositions of standard procedure chain maps. In fact, it is exactly variants of parts (iii) and (iv) of the following proposition that allow us in Part III to prove relatively painlessly that the surjection complexes form an operad  $\mathcal{S}$ , that  $\mathcal{S}$  is a quotient of the Barratt-Eccles operad  $\mathcal{E}$ , and that  $\mathcal{S}$  is a suboperad of the Eilenberg-Zilber operad  $\mathcal{Z}$ .

**Proposition 6.5.** *Consider a composition of chain maps  $A_* \xrightarrow{\alpha} B_* \xrightarrow{\beta} C_*$ , perhaps in the equivariant context.*

(i). *If both maps commute with contractions then so does the composition.*

(ii). *If the second map commutes with contractions and the first map is a standard procedure chain map, then the composition is the standard procedure chain map. In particular, this always holds if  $B_* = N_*(EG)$ , since a standard procedure map with domain  $N_*(EG)$  will always commute with contractions by Proposition 6.4.*

(iii). *If both maps are standard procedure chain maps and if for basis elements  $a \in A_*$  one has  $\alpha(a) = \sum \epsilon_i b_i$  for constants  $\epsilon_i \in \mathbb{F}$  and basis elements  $b_i \in B_*$ , then the composition is the standard procedure chain map. (This includes cases other than  $B_* = N_*(EG)$ ).*

(iv). *If both maps are standard procedure chain maps and if for basis elements  $a \in A_*$  it holds that  $\beta\alpha(a) \in Im(h_C)$ , then the composition is the standard procedure chain map. Note this hypothesis holds if  $\beta(Im(h_B)) \subset Im(h_C)$ , that is, if  $h_C \phi h_B = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Part (i) is trivial. For part (ii), if  $a \in A_*$  is a basis element,  $\beta\alpha(a) = \beta h_B(\alpha(da)) = h_C(\beta\alpha(da))$ . The point of part (iii) is that it is

easy to compute the second standard procedure chain map  $\beta$  on images  $\alpha(a) = \sum \epsilon_i b_i$ . This doesn't work if the  $\alpha(a)$  require non-trivial group action summands  $g_i b_i \in B_*$ . Part (iv) is immediate from the uniqueness result Proposition 6.2.  $\square$

It is not true in general that if the two maps are both standard procedure chain maps then the composition is a standard procedure chain map, even if the first map does commute with contractions. For example, if  $C_* = A_*$  and if  $B_*$  is much smaller, perhaps the only standard procedure chain map  $A_* \rightarrow A_*$  extending the map in degree 0 is the identity, which couldn't factor through  $B_*$ .

For certain interesting compositions we will have to work pretty hard later to show they are indeed standard procedure chain maps.

### 6.3 $AW$ and $EZ$ Maps for MacLane Models

We turn to more examples.

**Example 6.6. Alexander-Whitney Maps for MacLane Models.** Given two groups, the standard procedure using the contraction of the range produces an  $H \times G$  equivariant chain map

$$AW: N_*(EH \times EG) \rightarrow N_*(EH) \otimes N_*(EG).$$

Since the domain is a MacLane model,  $AW$  will commute with contractions. The construction begins in degree 0 with  $AW(x, y) = x \otimes y \in \mathbb{F}[H] \otimes \mathbb{F}[G]$ , which defines the obvious isomorphism  $\mathbb{F}[H \times G] = \mathbb{F}[H] \otimes \mathbb{F}[G]$ . The  $\mathbb{F}[H \times G]$ -basis of the domain is given by non-degenerate pairs of sequences of group elements, with both initial entries identity elements. The standard procedure recursive formula for a basis element  $b$  is  $\phi(b) = h_\otimes \phi(db)$ , where the contraction of the range is  $h_\otimes = h^{(2)} = h_H \otimes Id_G + \rho_H \otimes h_G$ . Some low dimensional direct computations, using the contraction of the range and equivariance, pretty quickly leads to the following guess.

**Proposition 6.7.** *For all pairs of simplices in the domain of the map  $AW: N_*(EH \times EG) \rightarrow N_*(EH) \otimes N_*(EG)$  constructed by the standard procedure, one has*

$$AW(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n), (y_0, y_1, \dots, y_n) = \sum_{i=0}^n (x_0, \dots, x_i) \otimes (y_i, \dots, y_n).$$

*Proof.* We want to illustrate a few of the above theoretical principles about standard procedure chain maps to explain this formula, so we will say much more than we need to. First, one easily checks that the map given by this formula is equivariant and commutes with contractions, so Proposition 6.3 applies. It is not necessary to verify that the formula defines a chain map. This brings out a ‘uniqueness’ aspect of the iconic  $AW$  formula.

We will also illustrate more direct inductive arguments that prove the standard recursive procedure yields the  $AW$  formula. Since the domain is a MacLane model, the standard procedure map  $\phi$  commutes with the contractions,  $h_\times$  and  $h_\otimes$ . The basis generators of the domain are given by

$$b = (e_H, x_1, \dots, x_n), (e_G, y_1, \dots, y_n) = h_\times(\vec{x}, \vec{y}).$$

Observe that  $db$  is a sum of many terms, but only  $(x_1, \dots, x_n), (y_1, \dots, y_n)$  is *not* another basis generator. Applying  $h_\otimes\phi$  to the basis boundary terms gives 0. Thus, we have two reasons why  $\phi(b) = h_\otimes\phi(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$ . The formula  $h_\otimes = h_H \otimes Id_G + \rho_H \otimes h_G$  and induction gives

$$\phi(b) = \sum_{i=1}^n (e_H, x_1, \dots, x_i) \otimes (y_i, \dots, y_n) + e_H \otimes (e_G, y_1, \dots, y_n) = AW(b),$$

as desired. The last summand is explained by  $\rho_H(x_1, \dots, x_i) = 0$  unless  $i = 1$ , in which case  $\rho_H(x_1) = e_H$ .  $\square$

The inductive arguments extend routinely to the MacLane models for products of three or more groups. In particular, with three groups one can iterate the construction with  $H \times (G \times K)$  or with  $(H \times G) \times K$  and get the same result as given by using our canonical preferred contraction of triple tensor products. But one can also view this as an application of Proposition 6.3. Just write down the iterated formula and observe that it is equivariant and commutes with contractions.

Or, even easier, use the uniqueness result Proposition 6.2. Both ways around the associativity diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} N_*(EH \times EG \times EK) & \xrightarrow{AW} & N_*(EH \times EG) \otimes N_*(EK) \\ \downarrow AW & & \downarrow AW \otimes Id \\ N_*(EH) \otimes N_*(EG \times EK) & \xrightarrow{Id \otimes AW} & N_*(EH) \otimes N_*(EG) \otimes N_*(EK) \end{array}$$

are compositions of equivariant chain maps, each of which commutes with contractions. Thus the compositions map basis elements to elements in the image of contractions. Without even knowing the full  $AW$  formula one sees that both compositions around the diagram agree with the standard procedure map. There are somewhat more general relevant results in Proposition 6.11 below and Proposition 6.5 above that clarify this, but they are not needed in this easy special case.  $\square$

**Remark 6.8.** Of course, for any simplicial sets  $X, Y$  there are two-variable functorial Alexander-Whitney maps  $AW: N_*(X \times Y) \rightarrow N_*(X) \otimes N_*(Y)$  given by exactly the same formula as in Proposition 6.7, which is the well-known sum of tensors of front faces and back faces. There is still an explanation of the general  $AW$  maps using the contraction of tensor products of chains on simplices, along with the idea of minimal acyclic carriers discussed in Section 1. We will explain this in Section 8. If  $X = \Delta^m$  and  $Y = \Delta^n$  are simplices, the map produced by directly using the contraction of  $N_*(\Delta^m) \otimes N_*(\Delta^n)$  definitely does not agree with the functorial  $AW$  map. In fact, these maps disagree already in degree 0. The issue is that the direct contraction method for a product of simplices ignores the functoriality requirement, already for vertices. In the MacLane model case, equivariance replaces functoriality.  $\square$

**Example 6.9. Eilenberg-Zilber Maps for MacLane Models.** Suppose  $X = EH$  and  $Y = EG$  for groups  $H$  and  $G$ . Then the standard procedure directly constructs an  $H \times G$  equivariant map

$$EZ: N_*(EH) \otimes N_*(EG) \rightarrow N_*(EH \times EG) = N_*(E(H \times G)),$$

using the obvious  $\mathbb{F}[H \times G]$  basis in the domain and the contraction  $h_{H \times G} = h_{\times}$  of the range. An  $\mathbb{F}$ -basis of  $N_*(EH) \otimes N_*(EG)$  is given by  $\{\vec{x} \otimes \vec{y}\}$ . Here,  $\vec{x} = (x_0, \dots, x_m)$  is a non-degenerate sequence of group elements in  $H$  and  $\vec{y} = (y_0, \dots, y_n)$  is a non-degenerate sequence of group elements in  $G$ . The preferred  $\mathbb{F}[H \times G]$ -basis is given by those tensors with  $x_0 = e_H$  and  $y_0 = e_G$ .

We can write simplex generators in  $N_{m+n}(EH \times EG)$  either as

$$((h_0, h_1, \dots, h_{m+n}), (g_0, g_1, \dots, g_{m+n})) \text{ or } ((h_0, g_0), (h_1, g_1), \dots, (h_{m+n}, g_{m+n})).$$

The simplex is non-degenerate if  $(h_i, g_i) \neq (h_{i+1}, g_{i+1})$  for all  $i$ , but the simplices  $\vec{h}$  and  $\vec{g}$  in the factors can certainly still be degenerate. The preferred  $\mathbb{F}[G]$ -basis is given by pairs with  $(h_0, g_0) = (e, e)$ . The contraction is



$$h_{\times}(\vec{h}, \vec{g}) = ((e, \vec{h}), (e, \vec{g})).$$

**The Eilenberg-Zilber Formula:** The standard procedure equivariant chain map  $EZ: N_*(EH) \otimes N_*(EG) \rightarrow N_*(EH \times EG)$  is given by

$$EZ(\vec{x} \otimes \vec{y}) = \sum_{(I, J)} (-1)^{A(I, J)} ((h_0, g_0), (h_1, g_1), \dots, (h_{m+n}, g_{m+n})) \in N_*(EH \times EG).$$

We clarify the meaning of all terms in this formula. The  $h$ 's are  $x$ 's and the  $g$ 's are  $y$ 's, with  $(h_0, g_0) = (x_0, y_0)$  and  $(h_{m+n}, g_{m+n}) = (x_m, y_n)$ . The  $(I, J)$ 's correspond to paths of length  $m+n$  in the rectangle  $[0, m] \times [0, n]$  from  $(0, 0)$  to  $(m, n)$ , increasing by one unit in either the horizontal or vertical direction at each step. We can write  $(I, J)$  either as

$$((i_0, \dots, i_{m+n}), (j_0, \dots, j_{m+n})) \text{ or } ((i_0, j_0), (i_1, j_1), \dots, (i_{m+n}, j_{m+n})).$$

An  $(I, J)$  path determines a sequence of  $h$ 's and  $g$ 's, with the  $h$  coordinate moving from one  $x_i$  to the next if the path moves horizontally and the  $g$  coordinate moving from one  $y_j$  to the next if the path moves vertically. One can also name an  $(I, J)$  path by a sequence of  $m$   $i$ 's and  $n$   $j$ 's, where an  $i$  or a  $j$  in the sequence tells you whether to move in the horizontal or vertical direction in the rectangle.

The sign exponent  $A(I, J)$  is the area between the edge path determined by  $(I, J)$  and the path across the bottom of the rectangle and up the right side. This last edge path is named  $(I, J) = ((0, 0), (1, 0), \dots, (m, 0), (m, 1), \dots, (m, n))$ . The parity of  $A(I, J)$  is clearly the same as the parity of the number of swaps of an adjacent  $i$  and  $j$  moving the sequence  $(i, i, \dots, i, j, j, \dots, j)$  to the sequence corresponding to the  $(I, J)$  path. This parity is the same as the parity of a shuffle permutation of  $(i(1), \dots, i(m), j(1), \dots, j(n))$ , keeping the  $i$ 's and  $j$ 's in order.

In Section 8 we will explain the functorial version of the Eilenberg-Zilber map and we will reinterpret the notation here in terms of simplices in a triangulation of a prism. The details are almost identical to the details here, with simplices in  $EH$  and  $EG$  replaced by acyclic model simplices  $\Delta^m$  and  $\Delta^n$ . The sign will be explained in terms of orientations of the simplices and the prism.

We turn now to the proof of the Eilenberg-Zilber formula. The following discussion is an example of the situation discussed towards the end

of preview Section 2, for standard procedure chain maps having the form  $\phi(x) = \sum \pm \mathcal{T}x$ . More serious examples involving maps related to operads will be given in Part III.

The general EZ formula is easily seen to be  $H \times G$  equivariant. Therefore it suffices to prove the formula in the special case of  $H \times G$ -basis tensors. We calculate by induction, assuming the EZ formula in lower degrees,

$$\begin{aligned} EZ((e, \vec{x}) \otimes (e, \vec{y})) &= h_{\times} [EZ(d(e, \vec{x}) \otimes (e, \vec{y}) + (-1)^m (e, \vec{x}) \otimes d(e, \vec{y}))] \\ &= h_{\times} [EZ(\vec{x} \otimes (e, \vec{y}) + (-1)^m (e, \vec{x}) \otimes \vec{y})]. \end{aligned}$$

We clarify the second equality. There are far more than two boundary summands in the first line. However, all but the two indicated in the second line have first entry of both tensor factors equal  $e$ , hence are basis generators in one lower degree. Thus the value of EZ on these generators is in  $Im(h_{\times}) = Ker(h_{\times})$ .

This is the main point, and could be used as a starting point, along with some low degree calculation, to perhaps *discover* the EZ formula, rather than to just prove the given formula is correct.

Ignoring signs, the desired formula for EZ is very easily proved by induction. The contraction  $h_{\times}$  simply places identity element  $(e, e)$  in front of each simplex tuple of the product. Then observe that the terms in the conjectured sum beginning with  $(e, x_1, \dots), (e, e, \dots)$  arise by applying  $h_{\times}$  to the boundary term  $EZ((x_1, \dots, x_m) \otimes (e, \dots, y_n))$ , and the terms  $(e, e, \dots), (e, y_1, \dots)$  arise by applying  $h_{\times}$  to the boundary term  $EZ((e, \dots, x_m) \otimes (y_1, \dots, y_n))$ .

Finally we deal with the signs  $(-1)^{A(I,J)}$ . The term  $EZ((x_1, \dots, x_m) \otimes (e, y_1, \dots, y_n))$  corresponds to allowed paths in the rectangle  $[1, m] \times [0, n]$ . The term  $EZ((-1)^m (e, x_1, \dots, x_m) \otimes (y_1, \dots, y_n))$  corresponds to allowed paths in the rectangle  $[0, m] \times [1, n]$ . The main key now is that the area in the full rectangle  $[0, m] \times [0, n]$  cut off by a path beginning with  $(0, 0), (1, 0)$  and continuing in the smaller rectangle  $[1, m] \times [0, n]$  is the same as the area cut off by the continued path. The area in the full rectangle cut off by a path beginning with  $(0, 0), (0, 1)$  and continuing in the smaller rectangle  $[0, m] \times [1, n]$  is  $m$  plus the area cut off by the continued path in  $[0, m] \times [1, n]$ . Done, the signs check.

We point out that for basis tensors,  $EZ((e, \vec{x}) \otimes (e, \vec{y}))$  has initial entry of each summand tuple equal to the identity  $(e, e)$ . These summands are basis generators of the range, up to sign.

One can consider  $EZ$  maps for products of three or more MacLane models. Results such as associativity and commutativity can be proved immediately using the uniqueness result Proposition 6.2. The point is, chain maps defined by going different ways around various diagrams share the same equivariance properties, agree in degree 0, and satisfy the property that images of basis elements are obviously in the image of contractions. First we look at the associativity diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
N_*(EH) \otimes N_*(EG) \otimes N_*(EF) & \xrightarrow{EZ \otimes Id} & N_*(EH \times EG) \otimes N_*(EF) \\
\downarrow Id \otimes EZ & & \downarrow EZ \\
N_*(EH) \otimes N_*(EG \times EF) & \xrightarrow{EZ} & N_*(EH) \times N_*(EG) \times N_*(EF)
\end{array}$$

We have observed that all arrows map basis elements to sums of basis elements. Thus both compositions around the diagram result in the same standard procedure map. This is basically an example of Proposition 6.5(iii).

In the case of three or more groups the  $EZ$  formula will include signs  $(-1)^{A(I, J, \dots, K)}$ , where  $A(I, J, \dots, K)$  is the area of any collection of rectangles in a higher dimensional box, whose boundary is the union of two edge paths with the same endpoints. This area is well defined modulo 2 because two such choices of rectangles add together to form a cycle in the box, which must be the boundary of some collection of cubes. But a cube has six rectangle faces, so the boundary of any collection of cubes has an even number of rectangular faces. The sign can also be interpreted as the sign of a shuffle permutation that moves a sequence of  $i$ 's,  $j$ 's, and  $k$ 's to  $(i, i, \dots, j, j, \dots, k, k, \dots)$  keeping identical letters in their original order.

Next we look at the commutativity diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
N_*(EH) \otimes N_*(EG) & \xrightarrow{EZ} & N_*(EH \times EG) \\
\downarrow \tau & & \downarrow \tau \\
N_*(EG) \otimes N_*(EH) & \xrightarrow{EZ} & N_*(EG \times EH)
\end{array}$$

The vertical arrows take basis elements to basis elements, and the horizontal arrows take basis elements to sums of basis elements, up to signs in both

cases. Thus again both compositions agree with the standard procedure map. Of course all these commutativities could be verified using the formula for  $EZ$ . But our point is that general results can be used to prove equality of various maps without knowing formulas.

The  $EZ$  map does not commute with contractions. However, because the map  $AW: N_*(EH \times EG) \rightarrow N_*(EH) \otimes N_*(EG)$  does commute with contractions, it is quite easy to argue, as in the proof of Proposition 6.3, that  $AW \circ EZ = Id$  without using or even knowing the formulas for  $AW$  and  $EZ$ .  $\square$

## 6.4 Tensor Products of Standard Procedure Maps

**Example 6.10. Tensor Products.** Suppose we have constructed  $H$  and  $G$  equivariant chain maps by the standard procedure  $\alpha: A_* \rightarrow C_*$  and  $\beta: B_* \rightarrow D_*$ . Assume  $A_*$  is free over  $\mathbb{F}[H]$ ,  $B_*$  is free over  $\mathbb{F}[G]$ , and suppose, as always, contractions of  $C_*$  and  $D_*$  satisfy the assumptions  $h^2 = 0, h\iota = 0$ .

**Proposition 6.11.** *(i). With the assumptions above,  $\alpha \otimes \beta: A_* \otimes B_* \rightarrow C_* \otimes D_*$ , is the standard procedure  $H \times G$  equivariant chain map constructed using the tensor product  $\mathbb{F}[H \times G]$ -basis of the domain and the tensor product contraction of the range. If  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  commute with contractions then so does  $\alpha \otimes \beta$ . By induction, the corresponding statements hold for any number of tensor product factors.*

*(ii). Assume basis elements of  $A_*$  and  $B_*$  are in  $Im(h)$ , with  $A_0 = \mathbb{F}[H]$  and  $B_0 = \mathbb{F}[G]$ . Then the canonical isomorphism  $\tau: A_* \otimes B_* \rightarrow B_* \otimes A_*$ , equivariant with respect to  $H \times G \rightarrow G \times H$ , is the standard procedure chain map. The corresponding statement holds for a permutation isomorphism with any number of tensor factors.*

*Proof.* These claims are exercises in the definitions, although they are a little tricky in low degrees where the basepoints of the complexes enter the computations. A variant of this result will play a role towards the end of Part III of our paper when we investigate certain chain complex operads, so we give some details here.

(i). In degree 0, ‘standard procedure’ means on basis elements  $\alpha(a) = \iota_C \epsilon_A(a)$  and  $\beta(b) = \iota_D \epsilon_B(b)$ . Thus  $(\iota_C \otimes \iota_D)(\epsilon_A \otimes \epsilon_B)(a \otimes b) = \alpha(a) \otimes \beta(b)$ . Also, as pointed out at the beginning of this section,  $\rho_C \alpha(a) = \alpha(a) =$

$\alpha\rho_A(a)$ , both of which follow easily from  $\epsilon\iota = Id$ .

Now we could proceed by induction on basis elements, using  $\alpha(a) = h_C\alpha(da)$  and  $\beta(b) = h_D\beta(db)$  in positive degrees. If  $\phi$  denotes the standard procedure chain map on the tensor product, then  $\phi(a\otimes b) = h_{\otimes}\phi(da\otimes b + (-1)^{|a|}a\otimes db)$ , and we can apply induction to  $\phi$  in one lower dimension.

But this proof is a little tricky in low dimensions, so we will leave that as an exercise. Instead we will deduce the result more quickly from the uniqueness result Proposition 6.2. Certainly  $\alpha\otimes\beta$  is an equivariant chain map. We need to show that for basis elements in positive degree,  $\alpha(a)\otimes\beta(b) \in Im(h_{C_*\otimes D_*})$ . If  $deg(a) = 0$  then

$$\alpha(a) \otimes \beta(b) = \rho_C\alpha(a) \otimes h_D\beta(db) = h_{\otimes}(\alpha(a) \otimes \beta(db)).$$

This does use  $h_C(\alpha(a)) = h_C\iota_C\epsilon_A(a) = 0$ . Similarly, if  $deg(b) = 0$  then

$$\alpha(a) \otimes \beta(b) = h_{\otimes}(\alpha(da) \otimes \beta(b)).$$

This uses  $h_D(\beta(b)) = h_D\iota_D\epsilon_B(b) = 0$ . Finally, if  $deg(a), deg(b)$  are both positive,

$$\alpha(a) \otimes \beta(b) = h_A\alpha(da) \otimes h_B\beta(db) = h_{\otimes}(\alpha(da) \otimes h_B\beta(db)).$$

It is routine to see that tensor products of maps that commute with contractions also commute with contractions. This does use  $\alpha \circ \rho_A = \rho_C \circ \alpha$ .

(ii). Again, it is fairly easy to see that the statement can be deduced directly from the definitions, with some care needed in degree 0 and some care with Koszul signs. That proof will be left as an exercise. But with the hypotheses about basis elements  $a$  and  $b$  belonging to  $Im(h)$  in the two complexes, it is quite easy to see that the equivariant chain map  $\tau$  with  $\tau(a \otimes b) = (-1)^{|a||b|}b\otimes a$  maps basis elements to elements in  $Im(h_{\otimes})$ . Namely,  $hx\otimes hy = h_{\otimes}(x \otimes hy)$ . Therefore Proposition 6.2 applies again. The result with more than two factors can be proved directly, or by composing isomorphisms given by switching adjacent pairs. Such compositions will be standard procedure maps by Proposition 6.5(iii), since basis elements map to basis elements in each map.

□

## 6.5 The Standard Procedure Maps $M_* \rightleftharpoons N_*(EC)$ .

**Example 6.12. A Chain Map  $\phi: M_* \rightarrow N_*(EC)$ .** In this example and the next we want to relate the Examples 5.3 and 5.4 of the previous section. With  $C = \langle T \rangle$  the cyclic group of order  $n$ , we will use the contraction of  $N_*(EC)$  from 5.3 and freeness of  $M_*$  from 5.4 to construct a  $C$ -equivariant chain map  $\phi: M_* \rightarrow N_*(EC)$ . The map  $\phi$  does not commute with contractions because an attempt to define  $\phi h_M(z) = h_C \phi(z)$  runs afoul of the equivariance requirement.  $Im(h_M)$  is not independent of the span of elements  $gIm(h_M)$ ,  $g \neq 1 \in C$ , unlike the situation of Proposition 6.3. Also, if such a  $\phi$  did commute with contractions, Proposition 6.3 would imply it is surjective, which is clearly impossible.

We need to define  $x_j = \phi(y_j) \in N_j(EC)$ . We begin with

$$x_0 = (1) \text{ and } x_1 = (1, T).$$

The recursive formula for the  $x_j$  is  $\phi(y_j) = h\phi(dy_j)$ . Using the boundary formula in  $M_*$  and the simple contraction formula  $h(x) = (1, x) \in N_*(EC)$ , this gives

$$x_{2k} = (1, (T^{n-1} + \dots + T + 1)x_{2k-1}) \text{ and } x_{2k+1} = (1, (T - 1)x_{2k}).$$

Then  $\phi$  extended  $C$ -linearly is an equivariant chain map.

Note that if  $n = p$  is prime and  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_p$  then the images  $\bar{x}_k \in N_*(BC, \mathbb{F}_p)$  are cycles, since the  $\bar{y}_k$  are cycles in  $C \setminus M_*$ .

All summands of all  $x_k$  begin  $(1, \dots)$ , so the terms  $(1, \pm x_{j-1})$  that occur in the definition of  $x_j$  give degenerate simplices. One gets rid of many degenerate terms by changing the definition of  $x_j$  by removing these terms. Here are tidy formulas for the result. Write  $\bar{N} = T^{n-1} + \dots + T$ . Then

$$x_0 = (1), \quad x_1 = (hT)x_0, \quad x_{2k} = (h\bar{N})x_{2k-1}, \quad x_{2k+1} = (hT)x_{2k}.$$

Here are the resulting closed formulas with that change, easily proved by induction:

**Proposition 6.13.** *The canonical equivariant chain map  $\phi: M_* \rightarrow N_*(EC)$  produced by the standard procedure is given by*

$$\phi(y_{2k}) = x_{2k} = \sum (1, T^{j_1}, T^{j_1+1}, T^{j_2}, T^{j_2+1}, \dots, T^{j_k}, T^{j_k+1})$$

$$\phi(y_{2k+1}) = x_{2k+1} = \sum (1, T, T^{j_1}, T^{j_1+1}, T^{j_2}, T^{j_2+1}, \dots, T^{j_k}, T^{j_k+1}).$$

Here the summation is over all  $j_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ . To remove remaining degeneracies, simply add conditions  $j_1 \neq 0$  for  $x_{2k}$ ,  $j_1 \neq 1$  for  $x_{2k+1}$ , and also  $T^{j_{i+1}} \neq T^{j_i+1}$  in both cases.

This formula for a chain map  $\phi$  was also known to Medina-Mardones [13] and probably others, perhaps going all the way back to Bensen. We will give a geometric interpretation of the map  $\phi$  in Subsection 16.3 of Part II.

**Remark 6.14.** We have  $x_k \in N_*(EC) \subset N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ , where  $T \mapsto t = (2, 3, \dots, n, 1) \in \Sigma_n$ , an  $n$ -cycle. Since the inclusion  $N_*(EC) \subset N_*(E\Sigma_n)$  commutes with the contractions  $(z) \mapsto (1, z)$ , the composed map  $M_* \rightarrow N_*(EC) \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_n)$  is the map constructed by the standard procedure. Of course this is trivial to see directly in this case. Manipulation in MacLane models don't change just because everything belongs to a bigger group.

If  $n = p$  is prime, in even degrees only the homology classes of the cycles  $\bar{x}_{2i(p-1)}$  are non-zero in  $H_*(B\Sigma_p; \mathbb{F}_p)$ , which we will prove in Section 9. These give rise to the Steenrod reduced  $p^{\text{th}}$  power operations, at least on even degree cocycles.<sup>16</sup> In fact, a standard procedure functorial method introduced in Section 8 below gives rise to explicit equivariant standard procedure chain maps

$$M_* \xrightarrow{\phi} N_*(E\Sigma_p) \xrightarrow{\Phi_{func}} HOM_{func}(N^*(X)^{\otimes p}, N^*(X))$$

and the image of  $y_{2i(p-1)}$  evaluated on a cocycle  $\alpha^p$  of even degree  $-2qp$  is a cocycle that up to a constant represents the Steenrod operation  $P^{q-i}(\alpha)$ . But to establish key properties of the Steenrod operations it is important that the evaluation map factors through  $N_*(E\Sigma_p)$ . We pursue all this in Parts III and IV. The details of a dual homology version of a functorial map equivalent to  $\Phi_{func}$  are given in Section 17 of Part III.  $\square$

**Example 6.15. A Retraction**  $\pi: \mathbf{N}_*(\mathbf{EC}) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}_*$ . Again  $C$  is the cyclic group of order  $n$ . Retraction means  $\pi \circ \phi(y_k) = y_k$  all  $k$ , where  $\phi: M_* \rightarrow N_*(EC)$  is the map of Proposition 6.13. We will use the retraction  $\pi$  in a crucial way in Part IV to give a cochain level proof of the Cartan formula for Steenrod operations.

---

<sup>16</sup>The Steenrod operations on odd degree cocycles need more care. The issue is that a homology group with twisted coefficients  $H_*(B\Sigma_p; \widetilde{\mathbb{F}})$  enters the full discussion. Then in even degrees only the cycles  $\bar{x}_{(2i+1)(p-1)}$  are non-zero in  $H_*(B\Sigma_p; \widetilde{\mathbb{F}})$ , as we will also see in Section 9.

Simplex generators of  $N_*(EC)$  are named by sequences of powers of  $T$ , but it will be more efficient to just record the exponents and write a  $k$ -simplex as  $(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_k)$ . The  $i$ 's can be arbitrary integers, interpreted modulo  $n$ . The non-degenerate simplices with  $i_0 = 0$  form a basis over the group ring  $\mathbb{F}[C]$ . Of course an equivariant chain map  $\pi$  is determined by the standard recursive procedure from its values on these basis simplices. But in the recursive determination and the proof that the formula we will give is correct and is a retraction, it is better to explain the value of  $\pi$  on all simplices. We point out that since  $N_*(EC)$  is a MacLane model, Proposition 6.4 applies and we know in advance that the map produced by the standard procedure will be the (unique) equivariant map commuting with contractions. That is,

$$\pi(0, j_1, \dots, j_k) = h\pi(j_1, \dots, j_k) \quad \text{and} \quad \pi(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_k) = T^{i_0} h\pi(i_1 - i_0, \dots, i_n - i_0).$$

So, there are two approaches. We could out of the blue write down a formula for  $\pi$  and observe it is equivariant and commutes with contractions. Or we can begin computing the standard procedure map in low degrees and observe how induction continues the procedure to produce a formula in all degrees. We will carry out the latter.

Before beginning, we restate the formulas for the contraction  $h$  of  $M_*$ .

$$h(T^i y_{2k}) = \sum_{0 \leq j < i} T^j y_{2k+1} \quad [So \ h(y_{2k}) = 0 \ \text{and} \ h(Ty_{2k}) = y_{2k+1}]$$

$$h(T^i y_{2k+1}) = 0 \ \text{if} \ i < n - 1 \ \text{and} \ h(T^{n-1} y_{2k+1}) = y_{2k+2}.$$

We start the construction of the retraction with  $\pi(0) = y_0$ . Then  $\pi(i) = T^i y_0$ . Next, on basic 1-simplices  $(0, i)$  the retraction  $\pi$  is given by

$$\pi(0, i) = h\pi(i) = hT^i y_0 = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} T^j y_1.$$

Before going further, it will help to introduce some terminology. We view the powers of  $T$  on the unit circle in the complex plane, as powers of  $e^{2\pi i/n}$ . Thus these powers, which we just name by the exponent, inherit the positive cyclic (counterclockwise) order. We will write  $\prec i', i'' \succ$  for the cyclic *open* interval consisting of all powers  $i$  with  $i' \prec i \prec i''$  in the cyclic order.<sup>17</sup> That

---

<sup>17</sup>Note  $\prec$  is not a binary relation but  $i' \prec i \prec i''$  makes sense. Ordinary inequalities will still be written  $<$  and  $\leq$ .



is, start at  $i'$  and continue counterclockwise around the circle to  $i''$ . The open interval consists of all  $i$  that you pass. For example,  $\prec i', i' \succ$  consists of all  $i \neq i'$ , and  $\prec i' - 1, i' \succ$  is empty.

We use this notation to describe the value of  $\pi$  on 1-simplices  $(i_0, i_1)$ , where  $0 \leq i_0, i_1 < n$ .

$$\pi(i_0, i_1) = T^{i_0} \pi(0, i_1 - i_0) = \sum_{i \in \prec i_0 - 1, i_1 \succ} T^i y_1.$$

The formula is correct even if  $i_1 - i_0$  is negative or zero. In the degenerate case  $i_1 = i_0$ , one has the empty sum. To see it in the non-degenerate case  $i_1 < i_0$ , add  $n$  to  $i_1 - i_0$ .

It will turn out going forward that for every simplex  $\sigma \in N_*(EC)$  of even degree  $2k$ , we will have  $\pi(\sigma) = 0$  or  $\pi(\sigma) = T^i y_{2k}$  for some  $i$ . For simplices  $\sigma$  of odd degree  $2k - 1$ , we will have  $\pi(\sigma) = 0$  or  $\pi(\sigma) = \sum_{i \in \prec i' - 1, i'' \succ} T^i y_{2k-1}$  for

some  $0 \leq i', i'' < n$ . Note  $T^{n-1} y_{2k-1}$  occurs in such a sum over an interval if and only if  $i'' < i'$ . This is important for the inductive arguments because  $hT^{n-1} y_{2k-1} = y_{2k}$ , but  $hT^i y_{2k-1} = 0$  for all  $i < n - 1$ . Here are the general formulas.

**Proposition 6.16.** *Write simplex generators in  $N_*(EC)$  as sequences of exponents  $0 \leq i < n$ . The equivariant chain map map  $\pi: N_*(EC) \rightarrow M_*$  produced by the standard procedure is given on simplices of degree  $2k$  by*

$$\pi(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_{2k}) = T^{i_0} y_{2k}$$

$$\text{if } i_{2j} \prec i_{2j-1} \prec i_{2j-2} \text{ all } 1 \leq j \leq k.$$

Otherwise  $\pi(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_{2k}) = 0$ .

For simplices of degree  $2k - 1$ ,

$$\pi(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_{2k-1}) = \sum_{i \in \prec i_0 - 1, i_1 \succ} T^i y_{2k-1}$$

$$\text{if } i_{2j+1} \prec i_{2j} \prec i_{2j-1} \text{ all } 0 < j < k.$$

Otherwise  $\pi(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_{2k-1}) = 0$ . In the non-zero cases here,  $T^{n-1} y_{2k-1}$  occurs in the sum if and only if  $i_1 < i_0$ .

The map  $\pi$  defined by the formulas is equivariant and commutes with the contractions of both domain and range. Hence by Proposition 6.3 it is indeed the equivariant chain map produced by the standard construction. The map  $\pi$  is a retraction, that is,  $\pi \circ \phi(y_k) = y_k$ .

Useful observations in an inductive proof are that, for any integers, the cyclic interval  $\prec i' - i, i'' - i \succ$  is obtained by rotating  $\prec i', i'' \succ$  clockwise  $i$  units, and that the simplex

$$(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_k) = T^{i_0}(0, i_1 - i_0, \dots, i_k - i_0).$$

Also, for a basis simplex one has  $\pi(0, i_1, \dots, i_k) = h\pi(i_1, \dots, i_k)$ .  $\square$

As examples of the proposition, consider the terms that occur in the summation formulas for  $x_{2k} = \phi(y_{2k})$  and  $x_{2k+1} = \phi(y_{2k+1})$  given in Proposition 6.10. In the even degree case, written in terms of exponents, the terms are

$$(0, j_1, j_1 + 1, j_2, j_2 + 1, \dots, j_k, j_k + 1).$$

It is not hard to see that the only term not in the kernel of  $\pi$  is the term  $(0, n-1, 0, n-1, 0, \dots, n-1, 0)$ . The reason is one cannot have  $j_1 + 1 \prec j_1 \prec 0$  unless  $j_1 = n - 1$ . Then continue applying the cyclic order conditions to higher  $j_k$  and conclude all  $j_k = n - 1$ . Then one concludes from the formula above involving the single remaining term that  $\pi(x_{2k}) = y_{2k}$ .

The odd degree case is almost the same. The only summand in the formula for  $x_{2k-1}$  not in the kernel of  $\pi$  is the term  $(0, 1, 0, 1, \dots, 0, 1)$ . Then one concludes  $\pi(x_{2k-1}) = y_{2k-1}$ .

We have now verified that  $\pi\phi = Id$ , so  $\pi$  really is a retraction from  $N_*(EC)$  back to  $M_*$ . A more conceptual proof of this last result is the observation that by its very construction the map  $\pi$  here commutes with contractions. Just as in Proposition 6.3, it then follows by an easy induction on degree and the formula  $hd(y_k) = y_k - dh(y_k) = y_k$  that the composition  $\pi \circ \phi: M_* \rightarrow N_*(EC) \rightarrow M_*$  must be the identity. This argument would seem to give less information than the argument that all summands but one in  $x_k = \phi(y_k)$  are in the kernel of  $\pi$ , and the remaining summand maps by  $\pi$  back to  $y_k$ . However, there are no signs in either  $\phi$  or  $\pi$ , hence no possible cancellations in the calculation of  $\pi\phi(y_k)$ . Thus it does follow from  $\pi\phi = Id$  that for each  $k$ , exactly one of the simplices in the sum formula for  $\phi(y_k)$  is not in  $kernel(\pi)$ .  $\square$

## 6.6 A Standard Procedure Map Related to $\ell^{\text{th}}$ Powers

**Example 6.17.  $T^\ell$ -Equivariant Chain Maps.** A group homomorphism  $\iota: H \rightarrow G$  directly defines an  $\iota$ -equivariant map that we will also call  $\iota: N_*(EH) \rightarrow N_*(EG)$ . One can also use freeness of the domain over  $\mathbb{F}[H]$  and the preferred contraction of the range to construct such an equivariant chain map, beginning with  $\iota$  in degree 0. These two maps are the same.

For an abelian group  $G$ , the  $\ell$ -th power map is a homomorphism. Let us denote by  $\iota_\ell$  the  $\ell$ -th power map for the cyclic group,  $\iota_\ell(T) = T^\ell$ . Thus for the cyclic group  $C_p$  one has a preferred  $\iota_\ell$ -equivariant self-map  $\iota_\ell: N_*(EC_p) \rightarrow N_*(EC_p)$ . It is pretty easy to see when  $p$  is prime what the induced map in homology and cohomology with  $\mathbb{F}_p$  coefficients on the coinvariant complex  $N_*(BC_p)$  must be. It is the identity in degree 0 and multiplication by  $\ell$  in degrees 1 and 2. The structure of the cohomology ring then determines the cohomology map, and hence also the homology map. In degrees  $2k$  and  $2k-1$ , the homology map is multiplication by  $\ell^k$ . However, it is not so clear exactly how the images of the classes  $\bar{x}_{2k}$  and  $\bar{x}_{2k-1}$  under this map differ by explicit boundaries from  $\ell^k \bar{x}_{2k}$  and  $\ell^k \bar{x}_{2k-1}$  in  $N_*(BC_p)$ .

To begin clarifying this, we construct by the standard method an  $\iota_\ell$ -equivariant chain map  $\lambda: M_* \rightarrow M_*$  extending  $\lambda(y_0) = y_0$ . Then  $\lambda T^i y_0 = T^{i\ell} y_0$ . We remind that the contraction of  $M_*$  for the cyclic group  $C_p$  is given by the formulas:

$$h(T^i y_{2k}) = \sum_{0 \leq j < i} T^j y_{2k+1} \quad [So \ h(y_{2k}) = 0 \text{ and } h(T y_{2k}) = y_{2k+1}]$$

$$h(T^i y_{2k+1}) = 0 \text{ if } i < p-1 \text{ and } h(T^{p-1} y_{2k+1}) = y_{2k+2}.$$

Then  $dy_1 = (T-1)y_0$ , so

$$\lambda(y_1) = h\lambda(dy_1) = h(T^\ell - 1)y_0 = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} T^i y_1.$$

Next, using  $dy_2 = N y_1$ , where  $N = \sum T^i$  is the norm, one gets from  $NT^i = N$  that  $\lambda(y_2) = \ell y_2$ . The recursive continuation is easy:

**Proposition 6.18.** *The  $\iota_\ell$ -equivariant chain map  $\lambda: M_* \rightarrow M_*$  is given by*

$$\lambda(y_{2k+1}) = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \ell^k T^i y_{2k+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda(y_{2k}) = \ell^k y_{2k}.^{18}$$

---

<sup>18</sup>This  $\iota_\ell$ -equivariant chain map was exploited in Steenrod-Epstein [30] in the same way

We will postpone until Section 9 the use of Proposition 6.18 to show that the images of the classes  $\bar{x}_{2k}, \bar{x}_{2k-1} \in N_*(BC_p)$  under the  $\ell^{th}$  power map  $\iota_\ell: N_*(BC_p) \rightarrow N_*(BC_p)$  differ by explicit boundaries from  $\ell^k \bar{x}_{2k}, \ell^k \bar{x}_{2k-1}$ .  $\square$

## 7 Diagonal Chain Maps from Contractions

### 7.1 Diagonals for MacLane Models

Given a contraction of a complex  $C_*$ , we constructed preferred contractions of the multiple tensor products  $C_*^{\otimes k}$  in Example 5.5. If  $C_*$  is free, we can use the standard recursive procedure to construct (equivariant) diagonal chain maps  $C_* \rightarrow C_*^{\otimes k}$ , beginning with an obvious map in degree 0. In this section we give two examples. The first example will be the MacLane model, from Example 5.3.

**Example 7.1.** Since  $N_*(EG)$  and  $N_*(EG \times EG)$  are MacLane models, we can use the  $G$ -equivariant map  $AW$  constructed in Example 6.6 to construct a  $G$ -equivariant diagonal

$$\delta = AW \circ \delta_\times: N_*(EG) \rightarrow N_*(EG \times EG) \rightarrow N_*(EG) \otimes N_*(EG),$$

where  $\delta_\times$  is the obvious diagonal map  $N_*(EG) \rightarrow N_*(EG \times EG)$  induced by the map of cells of simplicial sets  $\gamma \mapsto (\gamma, \gamma)$ . Both  $AW$  and  $\delta_x$  are equivariant and commute with contractions, hence the same is true of  $\delta$ . Thus by Proposition 6.5(i) we get the Alexander-Whitney diagonal formula

$$\delta(g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n) = \sum_{j=0}^{j=n} (g_0, \dots, g_j) \otimes (g_j, \dots, g_n)$$

as a standard procedure map. Of course this is essentially just a special case of the two variable  $AW$  map for MacLane models, and could have been discussed directly.

Next, using the recursive contractions  $h^{(k+1)} = h \otimes Id^{(k)} + \rho \otimes h^{(k)}$  of  $N_*(EG)^{\otimes(k+1)}$ , one constructs  $G$ -equivariant higher diagonals

$$\delta^{(k+1)} = AW^{(k+1)} \circ \delta_\times^{(k+1)}: N_*(EG) \rightarrow N_*(EG \times \dots \times EG) \rightarrow N_*(EG)^{\otimes(k+1)}.$$

---

that we will use it. They wrote down a formula and proved it was a chain map. We knew the standard procedure produced a chain map and then we easily found its formula.

These also turn out to be the higher iterated Alexander-Whitney diagonals. That is,  $\delta^{(k+1)} = (Id \otimes \delta^{(k)}) \circ \delta$ . The iterated diagonals are coassociative. A simple proof is to observe that the iterated Alexander-Whitney diagonals are equivariant and commute with  $h$  and  $h^{(k+1)}$ , so Propositions 6.3 and 6.5(i) apply again. The formula for the iterated diagonal is, of course,

$$\delta^{(k+1)}(g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n) = \sum (g_0, \dots, g_{i_1}) \otimes (g_{i_1}, \dots, g_{i_2}) \otimes \dots \otimes (g_{i_k}, \dots, g_n),$$

where the sum is over all ordered overlapping splittings of  $(g_0, \dots, g_n)$  into  $k + 1$  tensor factors.  $\square$

## 7.2 Diagonals for Minimal Models

**Example 7.2.** Next we study diagonals for the minimal complex  $M_*$  of the cyclic group  $C_n$  from Example 5.4. We build a  $C_n$ -equivariant diagonal  $\Delta: M_* \rightarrow M_* \otimes M_*$  using freeness of the domain and the chosen contraction of the range. That contraction is  $h^{(2)} = h \otimes Id + \rho \otimes h$ , where  $h$  is the contraction of  $M_*$  defined previously, and given by the formulas:

$$h(T^i y_{2k}) = \sum_{0 \leq j < i} T^j y_{2k+1} \quad [So \ h(y_{2k}) = 0 \ and \ h(Ty_{2k}) = y_{2k+1}]$$

$$h(T^i y_{2k+1}) = 0 \ if \ i < n - 1 \ and \ h(T^{n-1} y_{2k+1}) = y_{2k+2}.$$

We begin the diagonal with  $\Delta y_0 = y_0 \otimes y_0$ . The recursive construction is  $\Delta y_j = h^{(2)} \Delta(dy_j)$ . We remind that the differential in  $M_*$  is given by  $dy_{2k+1} = (T - 1)y_{2k}$  and  $dy_{2k} = Ny_{2k-1}$ , where  $N = 1 + T + \dots + T^{n-1}$ .

Before writing down some formulas, let's make a prediction for  $n = p$  prime and ground ring  $\mathbb{F}_p$  the field of order  $p$ . Let  $\overline{M}_* = C_p \backslash M_*$  be the coinvariant complex. So there is one generator  $\overline{y}_j$  in each degree and the boundary operator is 0. The prediction is that the diagonal of  $M_*$  should cover the diagonal of  $\overline{M}_*$  given by

$$\Delta(\overline{y}_{2k}) = \sum_{i+j=k} \overline{y}_{2i} \otimes \overline{y}_{2j} \quad and \quad \Delta(\overline{y}_{2k+1}) = \sum_{i+j=2k+1} \overline{y}_i \otimes \overline{y}_j.$$

The reason for this prediction is the known cohomology algebra of the cyclic group.

Now let's explicitly compute the diagonal associated to the contraction  $h^{(2)} = h \otimes Id + \rho \otimes h$  of  $M_* \otimes M_*$ .

- $\Delta(y_0) = y_0 \otimes y_0, \quad \Delta(y_1) = h^{(2)}\Delta(T-1)y_0 = y_0 \otimes y_1 + y_1 \otimes Ty_0$
- $\Delta(y_2) = h^{(2)}\Delta Ny_1 = y_0 \otimes y_2 + y_2 \otimes y_0 + \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} h(T^i y_0) \otimes T^i y_1 \right)$
- $\Delta(y_3) = h^{(2)}\Delta(T-1)y_2 = y_0 \otimes y_3 + y_1 \otimes Ty_2 + y_2 \otimes y_1 + y_3 \otimes Ty_0$
- $\Delta(y_4) = h^{(2)}\Delta Ny_3 = y_0 \otimes y_4 + y_2 \otimes y_2 + y_4 \otimes y_0$   
 $+ \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} h(T^i y_0) \otimes T^i y_3 \right) + \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} h(T^i y_2) \otimes T^i y_1 \right)$

The pattern for the odd  $y_{2k+1}$  as  $2k+1$  increases is transparent. The pattern for the even  $y_{2k}$  contains the transparent terms with even subscripts, then groups of terms with odd subscripts, each group projecting to 0 in  $\overline{M}_* \otimes \overline{M}_*$  when  $n=p$  is prime. In fact, each group turns out to be a sum of  $1+2+\dots+p-1 = p(p-1)/2$  terms, all with the same projection to  $\overline{M}_* \otimes \overline{M}_*$ . The pattern of those groups of odd subscript terms is also transparent as  $2k$  increases. Specifically, for each  $j+\ell=k$ ,  $\ell>0$ , there is a group of terms

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} h(T^i y_{2j}) \otimes T^i y_{2\ell-1} = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \left( y_{2j+1} + Ty_{2j+1} + \dots + T^{i-1} y_{2j+1} \right) \otimes T^i y_{2\ell-1}.$$

So the prediction about the projection of the diagonal holds true.

The diagonal calculation method above works for any  $n$  and any ground ring  $\mathbb{F}$ . Once discovered, the formula is easily proved by induction on degrees of the  $M_*$  generators. There are really just two cases, the even degree generators and the odd degree generators. Here is the result.<sup>19</sup>

**Proposition 7.3.** *The standard contraction procedure diagonal  $\Delta: M_* \rightarrow M_* \otimes M_*$  is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(y_{2k-1}) &= y_0 \otimes y_{2k-1} + y_1 \otimes Ty_{2k-2} + y_{2k-2} \otimes y_1 + \dots + y_{2k-1} \otimes Ty_0 \\ \Delta(y_{2k}) &= y_0 \otimes y_{2k} + y_2 \otimes y_{2k-2} + \dots + y_{2k} \otimes y_0 + \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} h(T^i y_0) \otimes T^i y_{2k-1} \right) \\ &\quad + \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} h(T^i y_2) \otimes T^i y_{2k-3} \right) + \dots + \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} h(T^i y_{2k-2}) \otimes T^i y_1 \right). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

<sup>19</sup>This diagonal on the minimal model was also exploited in Steenrod-Epstein [30]. In that text they just wrote down the formula for  $\Delta$ , then proved it was a chain map. We constructed a chain map by the standard recursive procedure, then found its formula.

**Example 7.4.** Let us turn to multidagonals for  $M_*$ . In general, given a free complex  $C_*$  with a contraction  $h$ , one also has the contraction  $h^{(2)} = h \otimes Id + \rho \otimes h$  of  $C_* \otimes C_*$ , from which one constructs a diagonal  $\Delta$  on  $C_*$ . But this diagonal is not necessarily coassociative. Given  $\Delta$ , one can build by iteration various higher diagonals  $C_* \rightarrow C_*^{\otimes k}$ . For example, one choice is  $\Delta^{(k+1)} = (Id \otimes \Delta^{(k)}) \circ \Delta$ . But one also has preferred contractions of the  $C_*^{\otimes(k+1)}$  given by  $h^{(k+1)} = h \otimes Id^{\otimes k} + \rho \otimes h^{(k)}$ , and these contractions, which do have a strong associativity property, directly lead to higher diagonals. Are these contraction diagonals related to higher diagonals given by simply iterating the original  $\Delta$ ?

Some bad news is that the diagonal for  $M_*$  itself is not coassociative. The two ways of associating to form triple diagonals already disagree on  $y_2$ . Of course the two equivariant triple diagonals are equivariantly chain homotopic, which is easy to see explicitly up to  $y_2$  and perhaps in general for  $M_*$ . But we definitely have a preferred contraction of  $M_*^{\otimes(k+1)}$ , so that associated diagonal is the one we always want.

Some good news is that in the case of the cyclic group  $C$ , it works out that the preferred triple diagonal of the minimal complex,  $M_* \rightarrow M_*^{\otimes 3}$ , agrees with the iterated diagonal  $(Id \otimes \Delta) \circ \Delta$ . More generally, we have the following.

**Proposition 7.5.** *The diagonal associated to the contraction  $h^{(k)}$  of  $M_*^{\otimes k}$  is the iterated diagonal  $\Delta^{(k)} = (Id \otimes \Delta^{(k-1)}) \circ \Delta$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is an application of Proposition 6.2. We first look at the triple diagonal. On basis elements  $y_m$ , the first tensor factor of any summand of  $\Delta(y_m)$  is always in  $Im(h) = Ker(h)$ . Occasionally the first tensor factor is  $y_0$ , with  $\rho(y_0) = y_0$ , which we interpret as  $h(1) = \iota(1)$ . Then one looks at the second tensor factor of summands of  $\Delta(y_m)$  to compute  $(Id \otimes \Delta) \circ \Delta(y_m)$ . One sees the image of the iterated diagonal on basis elements  $y_m$  is a sum of clean tensors, that is, tensors in the image of the summands of  $h^{(3)} = h \otimes Id \otimes Id + \rho \otimes h \otimes Id + \rho \otimes \rho \otimes h$ . The first tensor factor of most summands of  $\Delta(y_m)$  is in  $Im(h)$ , but one also sees summands with first factor  $y_0$  and second factor in  $Im(h)$ , and one summand  $y_0 \otimes y_0 \otimes y_m$ .

Curiously, when  $n = 3$  the other triple diagonal  $(\Delta \otimes Id) \circ \Delta(y_2)$  is a sum of twelve terms, and exactly one of them,  $Ty_0 \otimes Ty_1 \otimes T^2y_1$ , is not in  $Ker(h) = Im(h)$ .

Proposition 6.3 does not help here since the various diagonals do not sufficiently commute with contractions. Computationally it seems easier to iterate the basic diagonal  $\Delta: M_* \rightarrow M_* \otimes M_*$ , rather than directly use the contraction of  $M_*^{\otimes 3}$ .

The argument for the triple diagonals of  $M_*$  extends to higher diagonals. In other words, the diagonal associated to the preferred contraction  $h^{(k)}$  of  $M_*^{\otimes k}$  is the iterated diagonal

$$\Delta^{(k)} = (Id \otimes \Delta^{(k-1)}) \circ \Delta = \dots \circ (Id \otimes Id \otimes \Delta) \circ (Id \otimes \Delta) \circ \Delta.$$

The proof is an induction, but is essentially the same as the  $k = 3$  case, also based on the uniqueness result Proposition 6.2 and the formula for  $h^{(k)}$ .  $\square$

Eventually we will need to use the  $p$ -fold tensor diagonal for the minimal model  $M_*$  in order to study the Steenrod  $p^{th}$  power operations.

## 8 Functorial Standard Procedure Chain Maps

In this section we discuss the method of ‘minimal contractible carriers’ that constructs natural transformations of functors when given preferred contractions of various complexes associated to minimal carriers.

**Remark 8.1.** Suppose that we have a free  $\mathbb{F}[G]$  chain complex functor  $F_*(X_1, \dots, X_k)$ , and an  $\mathbb{F}[G]$  chain complex functor  $K_*(X_1, \dots, X_k)$ , both of the same number of simplicial set variables. Suppose we have preferred contractions of both  $F_*$  and  $K_*$  applied to simplices  $X_i = \Delta_i$ , with  $h_F^2 = 0$  and  $h_K^2 = 0$ . We suppose that in degree 0 there is an obvious equivariant map  $F_0 \rightarrow K_0$  when the  $X_i$  are points, related to augmentations and base points for the complexes  $F_*$  and  $K_*$ . We suppose that there is a preferred  $\mathbb{F}[G]$  basis of elements  $u \in F_*(X_1, \dots, X_k) = F_*(X_i)$  so that the sets  $\{u, 0\}$  of basis elements together with 0 are functorial in the  $X_i$ . Finally we assume there are universal elements  $\bar{u} \in F_*(\Delta^{a_1(u)}, \dots, \Delta^{a_k(u)}) = F_*(\Delta^{a_i(u)})$  for suitable simplices, and minimal carrier maps  $\sigma_i: \Delta^{a_i(u)} \rightarrow X_i$  canonically associated to  $u$ , inducing chain maps  $\sigma_{\#}: F_*(\Delta^{a_i(u)}) \rightarrow F_*(X_i)$  with  $\sigma_{\#}(\bar{u}) = u$ . We then define an equivariant natural transformation

$$\phi_{func}: F_*(X_1, \dots, X_k) \rightarrow K_*(X_1, \dots, X_k)$$

inductively on degree by extending equivariantly the formula

$$\phi_{func}(u) = \sigma_{\#} h_{K_*(\Delta^{a_i(u)})}(\phi_{func}(d\bar{u})).$$



The above paragraph may be a bit vague, but we assume readers are familiar with the classical minimal acyclic carrier construction. We gave a similarly vague discussion in Section 1. The difference with the classical viewpoint is that here we don't make new arbitrary choices of chains with given boundary for the minimal contractible carriers at each inductive step. Instead our contractions  $h_K$  of  $K_*(\Delta^{a_i(u)})$  make the choices for us. The basic property of contractions,  $dh_K + h_Kd = Id$  in positive degrees, and the usual acyclic model arguments, imply that our procedure does define an equivariant chain map  $F_*(X_1, \dots, X_k) \rightarrow K_*(X_1, \dots, X_k)$  functorial in the  $X_i$ .  $\square$

### 8.1 Uniqueness Theorems for Functorial Chain Maps

There is a variant of the uniqueness result Proposition 6.2 in the functorial setting.

**Proposition 8.2.** *Suppose  $\psi: F_*(X_i) \rightarrow K_*(X_i)$  is an equivariant functorial chain map of  $\mathbb{F}[G]$  complexes, agreeing with the standard functorial procedure map  $\phi_{func}$  in degree 0. Suppose also that the universal elements in minimal carriers  $\bar{u} \in F_*(\Delta^{a_i(u)})$  satisfy  $\psi(\bar{u}) \in Im(h_K)$ . Then  $\psi = \phi_{func}$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is an induction, essentially identical to the proof of Proposition 6.2, applied to the universal basis elements  $\bar{u}$ .  $\square$

There is also a variant of the commuting with contractions result Proposition 6.3 in the functorial setting.

**Proposition 8.3.** *Suppose  $\psi: F_*(X_i) \rightarrow K_*(X_i)$  is an equivariant natural transformation of the underlying graded  $\mathbb{F}[G]$  modules that agrees with  $\phi_{func}$  in degree 0. Assume  $\psi$  commutes with contractions  $h_F$  and  $h_K$  with  $h^2 = 0$  when the  $X_i = \Delta_i$  are simplices. Finally suppose that for each degree the universal elements  $\bar{u} \in F_*(\Delta^{a_i(u)})$  consist of elements in the image of  $h_F$ . Then  $\psi = \phi_{func}$ . In particular,  $\psi$  is automatically a chain map.*

Again the proof is an induction, essentially the same as the proof of Proposition 6.3.  $\square$

**Remark 8.4.** We do not seem to have interesting examples of Proposition 8.3 when  $G$  is non-trivial, although there might be some. The sticky point is the commuting with contractions for simplices hypothesis. Regardless of whether  $\phi_{func}$  commutes with contractions on all elements when the  $X_i$  are simplices, it is sometimes possible to get  $\phi_{func}(\bar{u}) = h_K\phi_{func}(\bar{v})$  where  $h_F(\bar{v}) = \bar{u}$  and  $\bar{v}$  is much simpler than  $d\bar{u}$ . Specifically, this will hold if  $d\bar{u} = \bar{v} + \bar{w}$  and  $\phi_{func}(\bar{w}) \in Im(h_K)$ .  $\square$

## 8.2 The Functorial $AW$ and $EZ$ Standard Procedure Maps

We turn to examples of Proposition 8.3 when there are no group actions. For any simplicial sets  $X, Y$  we have classical functorial Alexander-Whitney, Eilenberg-Zilber, and diagonal approximation maps

$$AW: N_*(X \times Y) \rightarrow N_*(X) \otimes N_*(Y)$$

$$EZ: N_*(X) \otimes N_*(Y) \rightarrow N_*(X \times Y)$$

$$\delta = \delta_{\otimes}: N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X) \otimes N_*(X).$$

These complexes are not contractible in general, but there is still a common explanation of all three maps, using the preferred contraction of chains on simplices, chains on products of simplices, and tensor products of chains on simplices, along with the idea of minimal contractible carriers outlined above. There is also an obvious diagonal map

$$\delta_{\times}: N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X \times X),$$

given on simplices by  $\sigma \mapsto (\sigma, \sigma)$ .

**Example 8.5. The Map  $\delta_{\times}$ .** This map obviously commutes with the contractions of domain and range when  $X$  is a simplex. Also,  $N_n(\Delta^n)$  is generated by  $(0, 1, \dots, n) = h(1, \dots, n)$ . So Proposition 8.3 applies and  $\delta_{\times} = \phi_{func}$ . Of course this example is trivial to analyze directly.  $\square$

**Example 8.6. The Map  $AW$ .** The classical formula for  $AW(\sigma, \tau)$  is a sum of front faces of  $\sigma$  tensored with back faces of  $\tau$ . In degree 0, this begins with  $AW(x_0, y_0) = x_0 \otimes y_0$ . The general formula is

$$AW((x_0, \dots, x_n), (y_0, \dots, y_n)) = \sum_{j=0}^n (x_0 \dots, x_j) \otimes (y_j, \dots, y_n).$$

Of course simplices in a general simplicial set  $X$  are not determined by their vertices. Our notation  $(x_0, \dots, x_n)$  really refers to a map of simplicial sets  $\Delta^n \rightarrow X$ . But the notation makes it easy to denote face operators in  $X$ , which are restrictions of simplicial set maps to faces of  $\Delta^n$ . It helps to keep in mind the case that  $X$  is the singular simplicial set of a space.

It is quite easy to see that this functorial formula commutes with contractions when  $X$  and  $Y$  are simplices. Also, the universal base simplex  $(0, 1, \dots, n), (0, 1, \dots, n)$  of  $\Delta^n \times \Delta^n$  obviously belongs to  $Im(h)$ . Therefore Proposition 8.3 applies, proving the classical  $AW$  formula is the standard procedure functorial map.  $\square$

**Example 8.7. The Map  $\delta_{\otimes}$ .** The classic formula for the Alexander-Whitney diagonal is

$$\delta_{\otimes}(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{j=0}^n (x_0, \dots, x_j) \otimes (x_j, \dots, x_n).$$

This map is, of course, the composition  $AW \circ \delta_{\times}$ . Since both  $AW$  and  $\delta_{\times}$  commute with contractions for appropriate simplex domains, so does the composition. Thus  $\delta_{\otimes}$  is also the standard procedure functorial map.<sup>20</sup>  $\square$

We pointed out earlier in Remark 6.8 that when  $X = EH$  and  $Y = EG$  for groups  $H, G$ , the equivariant map  $AW: N_*(EH \times EG) \rightarrow N_*(EH) \otimes N_*(EG)$  constructed directly, using the obvious  $\mathbb{F}[H \times G]$  basis in the domain and the preferred contraction of the range, produces the same sum of front faces tensor back faces  $AW$  formula as does the functorial minimal carrier construction. In the MacLane model case, we actually carried out the inductive argument that led to the formula. A direct inductive argument using simplices also quickly leads to the functorial  $AW$  formula. The computations with simplices are essentially identical to the MacLane model case because of the similarity of the two contractions  $h_G(g_0, g_1, \dots, g_k) = (e, g_0, g_1, \dots, g_k)$  and  $h_{\Delta}(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k) = (0, x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k)$ , and the similarity of the corresponding contractions of tensor products. The equivariance requirement for MacLane models plays a similar role as the functoriality requirement involving vertices of simplices.

Another way to look at the equality of equivariant chain maps constructed directly on products of MacLane models and functorial chain maps constructed by the minimal acyclic carrier method is that the group action maps  $g: N_*(EG) \rightarrow N_*(EG)$  are simplicial maps, hence commute with maps constructed as natural transformations for all simplicial sets. This comment applies both to the  $AW$  map and the  $EZ$  map to be discussed next.

**Example 8.8. The Map  $EZ$ .** The Eilenberg-Zilber map is more complicated than the Alexander-Whitney map. We again want to use induction, functoriality, the standard contraction of chains on products of simplices,

---

<sup>20</sup>The relations between the classical  $AW$  maps and maps constructed using our preferred contractions was the main reason we chose the tensor product contraction that we did back in Example 5.5. An alternate tensor product contraction would produce a different  $AW$  map and a different diagonal.

and the tensor products of fundamental chains on simplices, which represent minimal carriers, to explain the functorial formula for  $EZ: N_m(X) \otimes N_n(Y) \rightarrow N_{m+n}(X \times Y)$ . In degree 0 there is no problem, functoriality forces  $EZ(x_0 \otimes y_0) = (x_0, y_0)$ .

Our point in the next few pages is not to produce the  $EZ$  formula, which everybody knows, but rather to explain in detail how it arises inductively using contractions of products of simplices. There is a great amount of overlap with the discussion of the  $EZ$  map for MacLane models in Example 6.9.

The formula for  $EZ(\Delta^m \otimes \Delta^n) \in N_{n+m}(\Delta^m \times \Delta^n)$  is a sum, with orientation signs, of all non-degenerate  $m+n$  simplices in a triangulation of the prism. Once that formula is found, naturality immediately gives the  $EZ$  formula for all  $X, Y$ . If one compares this formula for  $EZ$  in terms of a triangulation with the formula for the oriented geometric boundary of  $\Delta^m \times \Delta^n$ , then  $EZ$  is rather obviously a chain map. Also, inspection of the formula reveals easily that  $EZ(\Delta^m \otimes \Delta^n)$  is in the image of the contraction of  $N_{n+m}(\Delta^m \times \Delta^n)$ . Therefore Proposition 8.2 applies, hence  $EZ$  is the functorial standard procedure map.

But there is quite a bit involved in the paragraph above. We want to indicate how low degree computations with the standard procedure *lead* to the  $EZ$  formula. We have the boundary formula

$$d(\Delta^m \otimes \Delta^n) = (1, 2, \dots, m) \otimes (0, 1, \dots, n) + (-1)^m (0, 1, \dots, m) \otimes (1, \dots, n) \\ + \text{many other terms.}$$

The other terms are tensors of faces with both first entries 0. A map induced by face inclusions  $N_*(\Delta^{m_i} \times \Delta^{n_j}) \rightarrow N_*(\Delta^m \times \Delta^n)$  with  $(0, 0) \mapsto (0, 0)$  commutes with contractions. Thus functoriality and induction will imply that  $h_{\times}EZ$  vanishes on all these other terms in the boundary of a tensor of basic simplices. This is an example of the simplification discussed in Remark 8.4.

Computations with small values of  $m, n$  lead to the following ‘conjecture’, which is an example of the discussion towards the end of preview Section 2 concerning standard procedure maps of the form  $\phi(x) = \sum \pm \mathcal{T}x$ .

$$EZ(\Delta^m \otimes \Delta^n) = h_{\times}EZ(d(\Delta^m \otimes \Delta^n)) = \sum \pm(\sigma_I, \tau_J),$$

where the sum is over all pairs  $(\sigma_I, \tau_J)$  of simplices of  $\Delta^m$  and  $\Delta^n$ , both of degree  $m+n$ . Of course each of these separate simplices are degenerate

if  $m, n > 0$ . In the conjecture we can remove pairs of simplices that are degenerate in the product. This means some adjacent pair of coordinates in the separate simplices both repeat at the same time. A non-degenerate pair  $(\sigma_I, \tau_J)$  must have first entries  $(0, 0)$  and last entries  $(m, n)$ , and corresponds to an edge path  $(I, J)$  of length  $m + n$  in the box  $[0, m] \times [0, n]$  that increases one of the coordinates by 1 at each step.

The conjecture is very easily proved by induction. It is only necessary to observe that the terms in the conjectured sum of form  $(0, 1, \dots), (0, 0, \dots)$  arise by applying  $h_\times$  to the boundary term  $EZ((1, \dots, m) \otimes (0, \dots, n))$ , and the terms  $(0, 0, \dots), (0, 1, \dots)$  arise from applying  $h_\times$  to the boundary term  $EZ((0, \dots, m) \otimes (1, \dots, n))$ . As mentioned above, applying  $h_\times$  to other  $EZ$  boundary terms gives 0 by functoriality.

So the remaining issue is to determine the signs, which are of course determined recursively by the contraction procedure. For that, we bring in the inductive formula, which we have seen simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} EZ(\Delta^m \otimes \Delta^n) &= h_\times EZ(d(\Delta^m \otimes \Delta^n)) \\ &= h_\times [EZ((1, \dots, m) \otimes (0, \dots, n))] + (-1)^m h_\times [EZ((0, \dots, m) \otimes (1, \dots, n))] \end{aligned}$$

The contraction  $h_\times$  simply places  $(0, 0)$ 's in front of pairs of simplices. We have observed that  $EZ((1, \dots, m) \otimes (0, \dots, n))$  corresponds to allowed paths in the rectangle  $[1, m] \times [0, n]$ . The term  $EZ((-1)^m(0, \dots, m) \otimes (1, 2, \dots, n))$  corresponds to allowed paths in the rectangle  $[0, m] \times [1, n]$ . The key now is the observation that the area  $A(I, J)$  in the full rectangle  $[0, m] \times [0, n]$  below a path  $(I, J)$  beginning with  $(0, 0)$ ,  $(1, 0)$  and continuing in the smaller rectangle  $[1, m] \times [0, n]$  is the same as the area below the continued path in  $[1, m] \times [0, n]$ . The area  $A(I, J)$  in the full rectangle below a path  $(I, J)$  beginning with  $(0, 0)$ ,  $(0, 1)$  and continuing in the smaller rectangle  $[0, m] \times [1, n]$  is  $m$  plus the area below the continued path in  $[0, m] \times [1, n]$ .

**The Eilenberg-Zilber Formula:** We have now proved that the complete formula for the standard procedure Eilenberg-Zilber map on tensors of fundamental chains on simplices is

$$EZ(\Delta^m \otimes \Delta^n) = \sum_{(I, J)} (-1)^{A(I, J)} (\sigma_I, \tau_J) \in N_*(\Delta^m \times \Delta^n).$$

We will include here the explanation that these simplices with signs in the simplicial set product  $\Delta^m \times \Delta^n$  correspond to the non-degenerate simplices

of maximal dimension in the ordered simplicial complex associated to the product of posets  $(0 < 1, \dots < m) \times (0 < 1 < \dots < n)$ . In other words, simplices in a canonical triangulation of the prism. The signs arise from orientations.

The data  $(I, J)$  for a non-degenerate  $m + n$  simplex is also determined by a sequence consisting of  $m$   $i$ 's and  $n$   $j$ 's. Namely, such a sequence records at each step whether the  $i$  coordinate or the  $j$  coordinate increases by 1. Such a sequence can be viewed as a shuffle permutation of  $\{i, i, \dots, i, j, j, \dots, j\}$ , generated by swaps of an adjacent  $i$  and  $j$ . Such a permutation has a sign  $(-1)^{sh(I, J)} \in \{\pm 1\}$  that records the parity of the number  $sh(I, J)$  of such swaps. This sign is the parity character of a shuffle permutation of  $m + n$  distinct objects  $\{i(1), \dots, i(m), j(1), \dots, j(n)\}$  that keeps all the  $i$ 's and all the  $j$ 's in their given order. It is clear that the parity of  $sh(I, J)$  is the same as the parity of the area  $A(I, J)$  below the edge path  $(I, J)$  in  $[0, m] \times [0, n]$ .

The prism is canonically oriented as the product of two oriented manifolds. Each non-degenerate  $m + n$  simplex is a codimension 0 sub-manifold of the prism, hence is oriented as such, and is also canonically oriented in its own right as an ordered simplex. There is thus a sign  $(-1)^{o(I, J)} \in \{\pm 1\}$ , where  $o(I, J) \in \{0, 1\}$  is defined by comparing the two orientations of the simplex.

The canonical orientation of the product manifold agrees with that of the simplex corresponding to the path sequence  $(i, \dots, i, j, \dots, j)$  along the bottom then up the right side of the rectangle. Each swap of an adjacent  $i$  and  $j$  changes the comparison sign  $(-1)^o$  of the orientation of the corresponding simplices. This is because the two ordered simplices corresponding to two such path sequences have a common interior ordered  $m + n - 1$  face in the oriented product manifold, with the opposite vertices inserted in the same ordered position. Therefore  $(-1)^{sh(I, J)} = (-1)^{o(I, J)}$ .

The formula for the Eilenberg-Zilber map on tensors of fundamental chains on simplices, expressed as a sum of oriented simplices  $\gamma(I, J)$  in the prism, can thus also be written

$$EZ(\Delta^m \otimes \Delta^n) = \sum_{(I, J)} (-1)^{o(I, J)} \gamma(I, J) = \sum_{(I, J)} (-1)^{sh(I, J)} \gamma(I, J).$$

When  $m = 1$  the  $EZ$  formula becomes

$$EZ((0, 1) \otimes (0, \dots, n)) = \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j ((0, 0), \dots, (0, j), (1, j), \dots, (1, n)).$$

This is because the shuffle sign comparing  $(0, 1, \dots, 1)$  and  $(1, \dots, 1, 0, 1, \dots, 1)$ , when there are  $j$  1's before the 0, is  $(-1)^j$ .

**Remark 8.9.** Our discussions of the functorial  $AW$  and  $EZ$  maps extend rather routinely to products of three or more spaces. Both maps are associative and the  $EZ$  map is commutative. One can extend all the arguments above directly for multiple products, using the contractions of multiple products in the range. The signs  $(-1)^{A(I, J, \dots, K)}$  occurring in the  $EZ$  formula for multiple products are also orientation signs, associated to maximal dimension simplices in a canonical triangulation of a multiple product of simplices.

But associative diagrams for both the  $AW$  and  $EZ$  maps involving three or more spaces, and commutative diagrams for the  $EZ$  map, are also easy consequences of the uniqueness result Proposition 8.2. Namely, all maps in a diagram of standard procedure maps for simplices are chain maps. The diagrams are the same as the diagrams for MacLane models in Examples 6.6 and 6.9, with simplices replacing the MacLane models. Compositions of the maps in relevant diagrams easily satisfy the criteria of the uniqueness result 8.2 that basis elements map to elements in the image of contractions. Note that an attempt to prove a commutativity result for the  $AW$  map fails, from our point of view, because a permutation of tensor factors in  $N_*(\Delta^m) \otimes N_*(\Delta^n)$  does not preserve elements in the image of the contraction.  $\square$

Our rather detailed discussion of triangulations of prisms and the  $EZ$  map will play a prominent role in Part II when we study morphisms  $\mathcal{E} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{S}$  between the Barratt-Eccles operad and the surjection operad from the viewpoint of constructing canonical chain maps using preferred contractions.

### 8.3 Functorial Diagonals for Multisimplicial Sets

As another example of using contractions of models to construct functorial chain maps, we translate into our language some results of Medina-Mardones, Pizzi, and Salvatore [23] on multisimplicial sets. An  $n$ -fold *multisimplicial set*  $X$  is a contravariant functor from the  $n$ -fold product of the

simplex category with itself to sets,  $\Delta^n \rightarrow (\text{Sets})$ . The representing objects can be interpreted as prisms  $P = P(m_1, \dots, m_n) = \Delta^{m_1} \times \dots \times \Delta^{m_n}$ , with face and degeneracy operators in each variable. A multisimplicial set has a geometric realization  $|X|$ , which is a cell complex whose open cells are interiors of such prisms. The boundary operator is the prism boundary operator, which is the usual tensor product boundary operator in  $N_*(\Delta^{m_1}) \otimes \dots \otimes N_*(\Delta^{m_n})$ . This tensor product is the cellular chain complex  $C_*(P)$  of the prism and has a preferred tensor product contraction. For a multisimplicial set  $X$ , the cellular chain complexes of the prisms of  $X$  fit together to give a (normalized) chain complex  $C_*(X)$ , which is the same as the ordinary cellular chain complex of  $|X|$ .

We also have the preferred tensor product contractions of the  $C_*(P) \otimes C_*(P)$ , and therefore the functorial acyclic model recursive procedure produces functorial diagonal maps  $\delta: C_*(X) \rightarrow C_*(X) \otimes C_*(X)$  for  $n$ -fold multisimplicial sets. On the fundamental classes  $P$  of the prisms, the recursive diagonal is  $\delta(P) = h_{\otimes} \delta(dP)$ . In the spirit of comments following Proposition 6.4, only the boundary terms  $\pm \Delta^{m_1} \otimes \dots \otimes d_0 \Delta^{m_i} \otimes \dots \otimes \Delta^{m_n}$  of  $dP$  contribute non-zero terms to the diagonal. But instead of working out the diagonal recursively, we can write down a functorial chain map diagonal and apply the uniqueness result Proposition 8.3 to see that this coincides with the standard procedure diagonal. The method is to exploit the functorial Alexander-Whitney diagonals  $\delta_i$  that we already have in each simplex factor.

**Proposition 8.10.** *The composition*

$$C_*(P) = \otimes_i N_*(\Delta^{m_i}) \xrightarrow{\otimes \delta_i} \otimes_i (N_*(\Delta^{m_i}) \otimes N_*(\Delta^{m_i})) \xrightarrow{\tau} C_*(P) \otimes C_*(P),$$

where  $\tau$  is the permutation isomorphism between the indicated tensor products, is the standard procedure functorial diagonal  $\delta(P)$  of the universal prism model  $P$ .

*Proof.* The argument is to just carefully show that Proposition 8.3 applies, by checking that various formulas produce elements in the image of tensor product contractions. Note that the permutation isomorphism  $\tau$  introduces Koszul signs. If we were to directly work with the standard recursive procedure, the signs arise from signs in the relevant boundary terms in  $dP$ . But since we know the composition  $\tau \circ \otimes \delta_i$  is a functorial chain map, the uniqueness result Proposition 8.3 saves us the trouble of working directly with the recursive procedure. However, a direct discussion is not so different from a direct discussion of AW maps, as we explain next.  $\square$



**Remark 8.11.** We can make quite explicit the diagonal formula  $\delta P$  as a sum with signs of ‘front subprisms tensor back subprisms’, quite analogous to the AW diagonal formula. Specifically, look at vertices  $I$  with integer coordinates in the box  $[0, m_1] \times \dots \times [0, m_n]$ . Each vertex  $I = (i_1, \dots, i_n)$  defines a front prism face  $P_I = \{(j_1, \dots, j_n) | j_\ell \leq i_\ell\}$  and a back prism face  ${}_I P = \{(j_1, \dots, j_n) | j_\ell \geq i_\ell\}$ . Then

**Proposition 8.12.**  $\delta(P) = \sum_I \pm P_I \otimes {}_I P$ . The sign is the Koszul sign that moves the tensor of simplex faces  $([0, i_1] \otimes [i_1, m_1]) \otimes \dots \otimes ([0, i_n] \otimes [i_n, m_n])$  to the tensor  $([0, i_1] \otimes \dots \otimes [0, i_n]) \otimes ([i_1, m_1] \otimes \dots \otimes [i_n, m_n])$ .

*Proof.* The vertices  $I = (0, \dots, 0)$  and  $(1, 0, \dots, 0)$  are special. The corresponding diagonal terms arise from the contraction  $h_\otimes = \rho_P \otimes h_P + h_P \otimes Id$  of  $C_*(P) \otimes C_*(P)$  applied to the diagonal summand of  $\delta(d_0 \Delta^{m_1} \times \Delta^{m_2} \times \dots \times \Delta^{m_n})$  corresponding to the vertex  $(1, 0, \dots, 0)$  of that box. This is the only non-zero occurrence of the term  $\rho_P \otimes h_P$  in the evaluation. Diagonal terms corresponding to other vertices  $I = (i_1, \dots, i_n)$  with  $i_1 \geq 1$  or  $I = (0, \dots, 0, i_\ell, \dots, i_n)$  with  $i_\ell \geq 1$  arise as the unique non-zero term obtained by applying  $h_P \otimes Id$  to the diagonal term of  $\Delta^{m_1} \times \dots \times d_0 \Delta^{m_\ell} \times \dots \times \Delta^{m_n}$  corresponding to the same vertex  $I$  of that box.  $\square$

In Parts II and III, following [23], we will look again at this diagonal in the case  $C_*(X) = S_*^{ms}(n)$ , the McClure-Smith surjection complex, which is indeed the normalized chain complex of an  $n$ -fold multisimplicial set.

## 9 The Universal EZ Chain Homotopy

The standard recursive procedure for constructing chain maps also yields a standard procedure for constructing chain homotopies. Suppose  $\phi_0, \phi_1 : B_* \rightrightarrows C_*$  are two chain maps that agree in degree 0. Also assume  $B_*$  is free and  $C_*$  has a contraction  $h_C$ . Then there is a recursively defined chain homotopy  $H : B_* \rightarrow C_{*+1}$  with  $dH + Hd = \phi_1 - \phi_0$ . In degree 0,  $H = 0$ . On basis elements  $b \in B_n$ , note by induction  $\phi_1(b) - \phi_0(b) - H(db)$  is a cycle in  $C_*$ , hence a boundary. In fact, a specific boundary. We define recursively

$$H(b) = h_C(\phi_1(b) - \phi_0(b) - H(db)).$$

The method extends to a functorial version of chain homotopies. For example, the standard procedure produces a preferred chain homotopy between  $EZ \circ AW$  and  $Id$  that presumably agrees with a known such chain homotopy. The method also extends to produce equivariant chain homotopies.

Simply extend equivariantly the formula  $H(b)$  for  $\mathbb{F}[G]$  basis elements.

There is also a uniqueness theorem. Any (equivariant) homotopy  $H'$  that agrees with  $H$  in degree 0 and maps basis elements to  $Im(h_C)$  coincides with  $H$  in all degrees. Here is the argument. By induction

$$\begin{aligned} H(b) &= h_C(\phi_1(b) - \phi_0(b) - Hd(b)) = h_C(\phi_1(b) - \phi_0(b) - H'd(b)) \\ &= h_C[\phi_1(b) - \phi_0(b) - (\phi_1(b) - \phi_0(b) - dH'(b))] \\ &= h_C d(H'(b)) = H'(b) - dh_C(H'(b)) = H'(b) - d(0). \end{aligned}$$

It turns out we will not make much use of this standard recursive construction of chain homotopies. Instead, a rather explicit construction using joins will play a larger role. However, the recursive construction of preferred chain homotopies is completely consistent with our view that preferred choices of contractions yield preferred choices of maps between chain complexes. One might anticipate that the method extends to a standard construction of preferred higher homotopies between homotopies, and so on. Although in general closed formulas for recursive homotopies seem elusive, it is possible that the recursive construction of homotopies has better theoretical properties than the explicit chain homotopies we introduce now.

## 9.1 Using Joins to Construct Chain Homotopies

One of the primary tools in our study of Steenrod operations begun in [7] was the construction of chain homotopies between certain pairs of chain maps  $N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(EG)$ , using the join operation in the range. The join operation just writes simplices next to each other,  $(g_0, \dots, g_n) * (g'_0, \dots, g'_m) = (g_0, \dots, g_n, g'_0, \dots, g'_m)$ , and extends multilinearly. This is the same operation as the geometric join of an  $n$ -simplex and an  $m$ -simplex, resulting in an  $(n + m + 1)$ -simplex, in terms of ordered vertices. The domain should be a chain complex associated to a connected simplicial set, so that face operators are defined. The boundary formula for joins is

$$d(x * y) = dx * y - (-1)^{|x|} x * dy + \epsilon(x)y - (-1)^{|x|} x\epsilon(y),$$

where  $|x| = deg(x)$ , and  $\epsilon: N_*(EG) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$  is the augmentation.

The chain homotopies will be built from the universal functorial  $EZ$  chain homotopy  $EZ: N_*(I) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(I \times X)$ , found in Example 8.8 to be

given by

$$EZ((0, 1) \otimes (x_0, \dots, x_n)) = \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j ((0, x_0), \dots, (0, x_j), (1, x_j), \dots, (1, x_n)).$$

The simplices on the right side can be viewed as non-degenerate  $(n + 1)$ -simplices  $((0, \dots, 0, 1, \dots, 1), (x_0, \dots, x_j, x_j, \dots, x_n))$  in the simplicial set  $I \times X$ . They are also joins of simplices in a triangulation of  $I \times X$ .

**Proposition 9.1.** *Consider two chain maps  $\phi_0, \phi_1: N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(EG)$  that satisfy  $\epsilon\phi_0(x) = \epsilon\phi_1(x) = 1 \in \mathbb{F}$  for vertices  $x \in N_0(X)$ . A chain homotopy between  $\phi_0$  and  $\phi_1$ , in terms of front and back faces of simplices of  $X$ , is given by*

$$J(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j \phi_0(x_0, \dots, x_j) * \phi_1(x_j, \dots, x_n).$$

If  $\phi_0$  and  $\phi_1$  are  $G$ -equivariant for group actions on  $N_*(X)$ , then  $J$  is also  $G$ -equivariant.

*Proof.* This can be proved by a direct computation, using the boundary formula for joins. But a more conceptual proof arises from viewing the  $EZ$  map in terms of triangulations of prisms and their boundaries. Define a degree zero chain map  $H: N_*(I \times X) \rightarrow N_*(EG)$  as follows. On the top and bottom copies of  $X$ , define

$$H((1, \dots, 1), (y_0, \dots, y_{n+1})) = \phi_1(y_0, \dots, y_{n+1})$$

and

$$H((0, \dots, 0), (y_0, \dots, y_{n+1})) = \phi_0(y_0, \dots, y_{n+1}).$$

On a simplex not on the top or bottom, define

$$H((0, \dots, 0, 1, \dots, 1), (y_0, \dots, y_j, y_{j+1}, \dots, y_{n+1})) = \phi_0(y_0, \dots, y_j) * \phi_1(y_{j+1}, \dots, y_{n+1}).$$

The boundary formula for joins implies that  $H$  is indeed a chain map.

Define  $EZ_h(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n) = EZ((0, 1) \otimes (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n))$ . Since  $EZ$  is a chain map,

$$(dEZ_h + EZ_h d)(x_0, \dots, x_n) = ((1, \dots, 1), (x_0, \dots, x_n)) - ((0, \dots, 0), (x_0, \dots, x_n)).$$

Observe that  $J(x_0, \dots, x_n) = H \circ EZ_h(x_0, \dots, x_n)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} (dJ + Jd)(x_0, \dots, x_n) &= H \circ (dEZ_h + EZ_hd)(x_0, \dots, x_n) \\ &= \phi_1(x_0, \dots, x_n) - \phi_0(x_0, \dots, x_n). \end{aligned}$$

The statement concerning equivariance of  $J$  is clear from the formula.  $\square$

**Example 9.2.** Equivariant situations arise if the domain is  $N_*(EH)$  and if  $\phi_0, \phi_1$  are  $\iota$ -equivariant for some group homomorphism  $\iota: H \rightarrow G$ . Then  $J$  is  $\iota$ -equivariant. As another example, elements  $g \in G$  act by right multiplication on  $G$ . This induces a left  $G$ -equivariant map  $\cdot g: N_*(EG) \rightarrow N_*(EG)$ , defined by the right multiplication by  $g$  on simplices  $(g_0, g_1, \dots, g_n) \cdot g = (g_0g, g_1g, \dots, g_ng) \in N_*(EG)$ . The identity is also left  $G$ -equivariant. Thus there is a canonical left  $G$ -equivariant chain homotopy  $K_g$  between  $Id$  and  $\cdot g$  on  $N_*(EG)$ .

It is not necessary that either map  $\phi_0$  or  $\phi_1$  in the proposition be some kind of inclusion. As an example, the basepoint  $\rho = \iota e: N_*(EG) \rightarrow \mathbb{F} \rightarrow N_*(EG)$  is chain homotopic to the identity, and the standard chain homotopy is just the contraction  $J(g_0, \dots, g_n) = (e, g_0, \dots, g_n)$ , which can be seen to be a special case of the universal  $EZ$  homotopy, the sum degenerating to a single term.  $\square$

**Remark 9.3.** One can ask when does the join homotopy agree with the recursive standard procedure homotopy? The answer is provided by the uniqueness theorem for the standard procedure homotopy mentioned earlier in this section. If  $\phi_0: B_* \rightarrow C_*$  is the standard procedure chain map constructed using the basis of  $B_*$  and the contraction of  $C_*$  then the join homotopy  $J$  of Proposition 19.1 is the standard procedure homotopy.

To reverse the order of  $\phi_0$  and  $\phi_1$ , one can either replace  $J$  by  $-J$ , or reverse the roles of the  $\phi_i$  in the formula of 9.1. These give different homotopies. Since one of our themes is to single out preferred choices of chain maps, the same goal should apply to chain homotopies. Therefore, the join method of Proposition 19.1 is suspect unless one of  $\phi_0, \phi_1$  is the preferred chain map. In our examples above and below, it does seem to be the case that one of the chain maps  $\phi_i$  is the standard procedure map. So the join homotopy method sometimes finds closed formulas for recursively defined homotopies.  $\square$

## 9.2 Examples Related to Diagonals and $\ell^{th}$ Power Maps

Here are two other important situations where the  $EZ$  chain homotopies are very useful.

**Example 9.4.** For the cyclic group  $C$  of prime order  $p$  we have defined elements  $x_k = \phi(y_k) \in N_*(EC)$  that project to homology generators of  $N_*(BC)$  with  $\mathbb{F}_p$  coefficients. Here the equivariant chain map  $\phi: M_* \rightarrow N_*(EC)$  was constructed in Example 6.12. One of the problems encountered in proving the Cartan formula at the cochain level for odd primes is that  $\Delta_{AW}(x_k) \in N_*(EC) \otimes N_*(EC)$  is complicated, and even more complicated is its image  $EZ \circ \Delta_{AW}(x_k) \in N_*(EC \times EC)$ . We will overcome this difficulty in Part IV by exploiting the equivariant chain map retraction  $\pi: N_*(EC) \rightarrow M_*$ , constructed in Example 6.15. Retraction means  $\pi(x_k) = y_k$ . We consider the diagram of  $C$ -equivariant chain maps

$$\begin{array}{ccc} N_*(EC) & \xrightarrow{\Delta_{AW}} & N_*(EC) \otimes N_*(EC) \\ \downarrow \pi & & \uparrow \phi \otimes \phi \\ M_* & \xrightarrow{\Delta_M} & M_* \otimes M_* \end{array} \quad (9.1)$$

The diagram does not commute, but of course it commutes up to equivariant chain homotopy. That is not good enough, because we do not have joins in  $N_*(EC) \otimes N_*(EC)$ .

But if we push by  $EZ$  into  $N_*(EC \times EC)$  then we do have joins and hence a join chain homotopy  $J$  between  $EZ \circ \Delta_{AW}$  and  $EZ \circ \Delta$ , where  $\Delta = (\phi \otimes \phi) \circ \Delta_M \circ \pi$ . Here  $J$  will agree with the standard recursive homotopy. Namely, the composition  $EZ \circ \Delta_{AW}$  is a standard procedure chain map by Proposition 6.5 (iii). Also, the homotopy  $AW \circ J$  will agree with the recursive homotopy between  $\Delta_{AW}$  and  $\Delta$ .

The diagonal  $\Delta$  is exactly what we will want, because  $(\phi \otimes \phi)\Delta_M\pi(x_k) = (\phi \otimes \phi)\Delta_M(y_k)$  is a sum of known tensor products  $T^u x_i \otimes T^v x_j$ , so the  $EZ$  image is a sum of terms  $T^u x_i \times T^v x_j = EZ(T^u x_i \otimes T^v x_j)$  that can be handled by the Barratt-Eccles operad mechanism.

In particular, projecting to  $N_*(BC \times BC)$ , and writing for simplicity  $\overline{\Delta}$  for the diagonal on coinvariants induced by  $\Delta = (\phi \otimes \phi)\Delta_M\pi$ , one has extremely simple looking formulas for the chain homotopically improved diagonals of

the classes  $\bar{x}_k = \phi(\bar{y}_k)$ :

$$EZ \circ \bar{\Delta}(\bar{x}_{2k}) = \sum_{i+j=k} \bar{x}_{2i} \times \bar{x}_{2j} \quad \text{and} \quad EZ \circ \bar{\Delta}(\bar{x}_{2k+1}) = \sum_{i+j=2k+1} \bar{x}_i \times \bar{x}_j,$$

where  $\bar{x}_m \times \bar{x}_n = EZ(\bar{x}_m \otimes \bar{x}_n)$ .

One can iterate to form higher simpler diagonals, by repeatedly applying  $EZ \circ \bar{\Delta}$  and  $EZ \circ \bar{\Delta}$  to the last variable. The iterations are awkward at the  $EC$  level, but are extremely simple at the  $BC$  level.  $\square$

**Example 9.5.** We can also use the universal  $EZ$  chain homotopy to study the images of the homology classes  $[\bar{x}_{2k}], [\bar{x}_{2k-1}] \in H_*(BC_p) \rightarrow H_*(B\Sigma_p)$ , induced by the inclusion of MacLane models  $\iota: N_*(EC_p) \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_p)$ , where  $T \mapsto t = (2, 3, \dots, p, 1)$ , a  $p$ -cycle. First, we return to the discussion of  $\ell^{\text{th}}$  power maps  $\iota_\ell$  begun in Example 6.17. We will find explicit boundary formulas for the differences  $\ell^k \bar{x}_{2k} - \iota_\ell(\bar{x}_{2k})$  and  $\ell^k \bar{x}_{2k-1} - \iota_\ell(\bar{x}_{2k-1})$ . In Example 6.17 we observed that these two differences are null-homologous.

If we denote by  $\iota_\ell: N_*(EC_p) \rightarrow N_*(EC_p)$  the standard map induced by the  $\ell^{\text{th}}$  power homomorphism, then we have two  $\iota_\ell$ -equivariant chain maps,  $\iota_\ell$  and  $\phi\lambda\pi: N_*(EC_p) \rightarrow M_* \rightarrow M_* \rightarrow N_*(EC_p)$ , where  $\pi$  is the retraction of Example 6.12 and  $\lambda$  is the  $\iota_\ell$ -equivariant chain map of Example 6.17. Since we have the join operation in  $N_*(EC_p)$ , these two chain maps are  $\iota_\ell$ -equivariantly chain homotopic, by a join chain homotopy  $J$ , which coincides with the recursively defined homotopy.

From Example 6.17,  $\lambda(y_{2k}) = \ell^k y_{2k}$  and  $\lambda(y_{2k-1}) = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \ell^{k-1} T^i y_{2k-1}$ . Since  $\pi(x_n) = y_n$  and  $\phi(y_n) = x_n$  we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \ell^k x_{2k} - \iota_\ell(x_{2k}) &= (dJ + Jd)x_{2k} \quad \text{and} \\ \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \ell^{k-1} T^i x_{2k-1} - \iota_\ell(x_{2k-1}) &= (dJ + Jd)x_{2k-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the chain homotopy  $J$  covers a chain homotopy  $\bar{J}$  of  $BC_p$ , and since the classes  $\bar{x}_j$  are cycles, after passing to coinvariants we get

$$\ell^k \bar{x}_{2k} - \iota_\ell(\bar{x}_{2k}) = d(\bar{J}\bar{x}_{2k}) \in N_*(BC_p).$$

Since the  $T^i x_{2k-1}$  all have coinvariant image  $\bar{x}_{2k-1}$ , we also have

$$\ell^k \bar{x}_{2k-1} - \iota_\ell(\bar{x}_{2k-1}) = d(\bar{J}\bar{x}_{2k-1}) \in N_*(BC_p).$$

Thus we have explicit boundary formulas for the differences  $\ell^k \bar{x}_{2k} - \iota_\ell(\bar{x}_{2k})$  and  $\ell^k \bar{x}_{2k-1} - \iota_\ell(\bar{x}_{2k-1})$  in  $N_*(BC_p)$ , as promised in Example 6.17.  $\square$

**Example 9.6.** Next let  $\iota: N_*(EC_p) \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_p)$  be the map induced by the homomorphism sending  $T$  to the  $p$ -cycle  $t = (2, 3, \dots, p, 1)$ . Let  $\ell$  be a primitive  $(p-1)^{\text{th}}$  root of unity in  $\mathbb{F}_p = \mathbb{Z}/p$ . The permutation  $g(j) = j\ell \pmod{p}$  is a  $p-1$  cycle in  $\Sigma_p$  regarded as permutations of  $\mathbb{Z}/p = \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ . In this representation,  $t(j) = j+1$  and  $gt = t^\ell g$ . Thus  $g\iota = (\cdot g) \circ \iota^\ell$ . The right multiplication map  $\cdot g$  on  $N_*(E\Sigma_p)$  is  $\Sigma_p$ -equivariantly chain homotopic to the identity by a join chain homotopy  $K$ . Then

$$K\iota_\ell: N_*(EC_p) \rightarrow N_*EC_p \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_p) \rightarrow N_{*+1}(E\Sigma_p)$$

is an  $\iota_\ell$ -equivariant chain homotopy between  $\iota_\ell$  and  $(\cdot g) \circ \iota_\ell = g\iota$ . Again, this last homotopy coincides with the recursively defined homotopy.

Combining the two  $\iota_\ell$ -equivariant chain homotopies  $\iota J$  and  $K\iota_\ell$ , say  $L = \iota J - K\iota_\ell$ , we get:

$$\ell^k \iota(x_{2k}) - g\iota(x_{2k}) = (dL + Ld)x_{2k} \in N_*(E\Sigma_p)$$

$$\left( \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \ell^{k-1+i} \right) \iota(x_{2k-1}) - g\iota(x_{2k-1}) = (dL + Ld)x_{2k-1} \in N_*(E\Sigma_p).$$

On coinvariants, where  $g$  and  $t$  act as the identity, we get in  $N_*(B\Sigma_p) = \Sigma_p \backslash N_*(E\Sigma_p)$

$$(\ell^k - 1)\iota(\bar{x}_{2k}) = d(\bar{L}\bar{x}_{2k}) \quad \text{and} \quad (\ell^k - 1)\iota(\bar{x}_{2k-1}) = d(\bar{L}\bar{x}_{2k-1}). \quad \square$$

**Remark 9.7.** If  $\ell$  is a primitive  $(p-1)^{\text{th}}$  root of unity mod  $p$  and if  $k$  is not a multiple of  $p-1$ , we can multiply these last formulas by a constant and obtain explicit formulas writing  $\iota(\bar{x}_{2k})$  and  $\iota(\bar{x}_{2k-1})$  as coboundaries in  $N_*(B\Sigma_p)$ . In particular, this computation will lead to a cochain level proof that the cyclic reduced  $p^{\text{th}}$  power cohomology operations determined by the classes  $\iota(\bar{x}_{2k})$  and  $\iota(\bar{x}_{2k-1})$  on even degree cocycles are 0 unless  $2k$  is an even multiple of  $(p-1)$ .

The study of the reduced powers on odd degree cocycles requires a somewhat different discussion because homology of the symmetric group with a non-trivial coefficient module enters the story. Specifically, going back to Example 5.7, let  $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}_p$  denote the  $\Sigma_p$  module  $\mathbb{F}_p$  with twisted group action arising from the parity character  $\tau: \Sigma_p \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$ . We look at  $\tilde{N}_*(E\Sigma_p) = \tilde{\mathbb{F}}_p \otimes$

$N_*(E\Sigma_p)$ , which we view as the complex  $N_*(E\Sigma_p)$ , but with twisted group action  $g * x = \tau(g)gx$ . In particular the augmentation  $\tilde{N}_*(E\Sigma_p) \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{F}}_p \rightarrow 0$  is a free acyclic resolution of the non-trivial module  $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}_p$ .

Since  $p$ -cycles are even permutations, the  $C_p$ -action on  $N_*(E\Sigma_p)$  is the same in the twisted and untwisted complexes. Therefore the discussion of the  $\iota\iota_\ell$ -equivariant chain homotopies  $\iota J$  and  $K\iota\iota_\ell$  goes through exactly as above, until the very final step concerning coinvariants. The point is, the  $(p-1)$ -cycle  $g \in \Sigma_p$  that conjugates  $t$  to  $t^\ell$  is an *odd* permutation. Therefore, in the twisted complex  $\tilde{N}_*(E\Sigma_p)$  we have  $g * \iota(x_{2k}) = -g\iota(x_{2k})$  and  $g * \iota(x_{2k-1}) = -g\iota(x_{2k-1})$ . Thus in the coinvariants  $N_*(B\Sigma_p; \tilde{\mathbb{F}}_p) = \Sigma_p \backslash \tilde{N}_*(E\Sigma_p)$  we have

$$(\ell^k + 1)\iota(\bar{x}_{2k}) = d(\bar{L}\bar{x}_{2k}) \quad \text{and} \quad (\ell^k + 1)\iota(\bar{x}_{2k-1}) = d(\bar{L}\bar{x}_{2k-1}).$$

Since  $\ell$  is a primitive  $(p-1)^{th}$  root of unity, we have  $(\ell^k + 1) = 0 \pmod{p}$  if and only if  $k$  is an odd multiple of  $(p-1)/2$ . In particular, this computation will lead to a cochain level proof that the cyclic reduced  $p^{th}$  power cohomology operations determined by the classes  $\iota(\bar{x}_{2k})$  and  $\iota(\bar{x}_{2k-1})$  on odd degree cocycles are zero unless  $2k$  is an odd multiple of  $(p-1)$ .  $\square$



## II: The Surjection Complexes

### 10 Preview of the Surjection Complexes.

We begin Part II of our paper with a brief discussion of variants of chain complexes underlying a symmetric operad in the monoidal category of chain complexes, referred to by various authors as the surjection operad, the sequence operad, or the step operad. We will postpone the discussion of operad structure until Part III, and concentrate in the first few sections of Part II only on chain complexes  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n), \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n), \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ . In the last section of Part II we compare the surjection complexes to the MacLane complexes  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ .

The superscript initials of the latter two surjection complexes refer to complexes studied by Berger-Fresse [3], [5] and McClure-Smith [19]. All three complexes are free  $\mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$  resolutions of  $\mathbb{F}$ , which is given the trivial  $\Sigma_n$  action. The complex  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$  is newer but seems quite natural. It appears as part of the paper by Adamaszek and Jones [1], and perhaps elsewhere.

We want to emphasize from the outset that although our treatment of the three complexes is self-contained, it is entirely founded on the seminal work of Berger-Fresse and McClure-Smith. We believe we have ‘cleaned up’ some details in the development of the surjection complexes, and their relations with other complexes. Of course it has been more than 20 years since the original works appeared, so it is not surprising some simplifications and reformulations could be found. In fact, McClure and Smith have given more sophisticated versions of complexes related to their original construction in [21]. We believe the surjection complexes are important in algebraic topology, and we believe our reformulation of the details will serve a purpose making their development more accessible.

For all three surjection complexes, elements of a free basis over  $\mathbb{F}$  in each degree  $k$  are named by non-degenerate surjections

$$x: \{1, 2, \dots, n+k\} \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

Degenerate means  $x(i) = x(i+1)$  for some  $i$ , and we set these equal 0. We identify a function  $x$  with the sequence  $x = (x(1), x(2), \dots, x(n+k))$ , which we often write for notational reasons as  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n+k})$ . Functions that are not surjections are also declared to be 0 in the three complexes. Note

in degree  $k = 0$  this gives  $\mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$  as an  $\mathbb{F}$ -module.

In all three complexes the boundary operator has the form

$$d(x) = d(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n+k}) = \sum_j \gamma(j)(x_1, \dots, \widehat{x}_j, \dots, x_{n+k}),$$

where  $\gamma(j) \in \{-1, 0, +1\}$  and  $\widehat{x}_j$  means that term is deleted from the surjection  $x$ .

Throughout Part II we will name the ordered vertices of the standard  $N - 1$  simplex  $(1, 2, \dots, N)$ , rather than naming the first vertex 0. The boundary of a simplex is then

$$d(x_1, \dots, x_N) = \sum (-1)^{j-1} (x_1, \dots, \widehat{x}_j, \dots, x_N).$$

The main reason for the change is to maintain consistency with the notation for surjection complex generators. But there are other reasons this makes sense. The most symmetrical view of the  $N - 1$  simplex is the convex hull of the unit basis vectors in affine space  $R^N$ , with its ordered basis. Also, the (ordered) join of such simplices in products of affine spaces is transparent as a convex hull. Tangent vectors are transparent as differences of unit basis vectors, which can also be expressed as an ordered pair (tail, head) of vertices. The canonical orientation of  $R^N$  induces, by the outward normal first convention, the standard orientation of the  $N - 1$  simplex viewed as part of the boundary of its join with the origin. The standard orientation of the simplex corresponds to the ordered list of tangent vectors  $\{12, 13, \dots, 1N\}$ . An equivalent orientation is given by the list  $\{12, 23, \dots, (N - 1)N\}$ .

It could be said that the only differences between the three surjection complexes are choices of sign conventions. Technically this may be true, but we believe that the sign differences result from some initial conceptual differences that lead to sign choices. For example, a surjection generator  $x: \{1, 2, \dots, n + k\} \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  can be interpreted geometrically in different ways. In the complex  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$ , we interpret a generator as a simplicial map  $\Delta^{n-1+k} \rightarrow \Delta^{n-1}$ , and then as an element of the normalized relative simplicial singular complex of the pair  $(\Delta^{n-1}, \partial\Delta^{n-1})$ . In  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  the data of a generator is interpreted as a prism  $\prod_{1 \leq \ell \leq n} \Delta^{k_\ell - 1}$  with a total order on the combined set of vertices of the factor simplices. The integer  $k_\ell$  is the cardinality of  $x^{-1}(\ell)$ , the number of times  $\ell$  appears in the sequence  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n+k})$ . There is a non-degeneracy condition that no two

vertices of the same simplex factor can be adjacent in the total order. In both  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$  and  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  the boundary operator and the  $\Sigma_n$  action arise from natural geometric considerations. We don't really know how to think about  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$ . It mysteriously works, and in several ways has simpler properties than the other two complexes.

The base point in all three complexes will be  $\iota(1) = 1e = e \in \mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$ , where  $e \in \Sigma_n$  is the identity element. The augmentations in the second two complexes send all permutations to  $1 \in \mathbb{F}$  and the permutation action in degree 0 is the obvious left regular representation action on  $\mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$ .

In the complex  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$  the augmentation will send a permutation  $g$  to  $\tau(g) \in \{\pm 1\}$ , where  $\tau$  is the parity character. But in this case, the permutation action on  $\mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$  in degree 0 will be  $g * g' = \tau(g)gg'$ . Note we could write this representation  $\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}[\Sigma_n] = \widetilde{\mathbb{F}} \otimes \mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$ , where  $\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}$  is the twisted  $\Sigma_n$ -module defined in Example 5.7 of Part I. We think of  $\Sigma_n$  as acting on coefficients as well as by multiplying group elements in sums  $\sum a_i g_i, a_i \in \mathbb{F}$ . Thus the  $\tau$  augmentation is indeed an equivariant map  $\widetilde{\mathbb{F}}[\Sigma_n] \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ , with the *trivial* module structure on  $\mathbb{F}$ .

We will define for all three complexes,  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$ , and  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ , a  $\Sigma_n$  action, an equivariant differential, and a contraction. Continuing our convention from Part I, contractions in Part II will always satisfy  $h^2 = 0$  and  $h\iota = 0$ . We will also establish isomorphisms between the three complexes, preserving all the structure. The details in the first several sections to follow are somewhat lengthy, because there is a lot of structure data to be given, but they are not especially difficult. Their importance will be brought out in Part III, where we explain how these complexes act on multitenors of cochains on simplicial sets  $X$ , in an operadic manner. This, of course, was part of the original motivation for introducing these complexes.

In the last section of Part II we present our approach to the equivariant chain maps  $N_*(E\Sigma_n) \rightleftharpoons \mathcal{S}_*(n)$  studied by Berger and Fresse [3], [5] for their complex. Our approach is based on the contraction and standard procedure methods of Part I.

As always, we urge readers to not get stuck. If you already know something, or if you find yourself somewhat bogged down, turn the page.

## 11 The Twisted Complex $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_*(n)$

We actually begin with a twisted coefficient complex  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_*(n)$ , which arises very naturally. Then we obtain an untwisted complex  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$  by tensoring with  $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$ , as described in Example 5.7 of Part I.

The key observation is that the  $\mathbb{F}$ -basis in degree  $k$  given by certain surjections  $x: \{1, 2, \dots, n+k\} \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  coincides *exactly* with a basis of the normalized relative simplicial singular chain group  $NSS_{n-1+k}(\Delta^{n-1}, \partial\Delta^{n-1})$  with  $\mathbb{F}$  coefficients. Generators of the simplicial singular chain group are given by the subset of the singular complex of the simplex consisting of all affine linear maps  $\Delta^{n-1+k} \rightarrow \Delta^{n-1}$  taking vertices to vertices. In the relative complex maps to the boundary of the simplex are declared 0. We then form the normalized graded  $\mathbb{F}$ -module by dividing by the subcomplex of the singular complex spanned by degenerate simplices, and shift degrees down by  $n-1$ . We call this shifted graded module  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_*(n)$ . Precisely, a function  $x$  applied to ordered vertices defines a map  $\Delta^{n-1+k} \rightarrow \Delta^{n-1}$  between simplices. If two adjacent entries of a surjection coincide the resulting singular simplex is degenerate, hence zero in the normalized complex, and if the function  $x$  is not surjective the image of the singular simplex lies in the boundary  $\partial\Delta^{n-1}$ . We see that  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_0(n) = \mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$  as  $\mathbb{F}$ -module.

We then take as the boundary operator in  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_*(n)$  the standard simplicial chain complex boundary map of the relative simplicial singular complex. That is,

$$dx = \sum_j (-1)^{j-1} (x_1, \dots, \hat{x}_j, \dots, x_{n+k}).$$

There are two ways a boundary summand could be 0, namely, the entry  $x_j$  might occur only once in  $x$  or one could have  $x_{j-1} = x_{j+1}$ . Note that it is obvious to topologists that  $d^2 = 0$ . This will also be the case for the differential in  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ , but not as much for  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$ .

For the left  $\Sigma_n$  action on  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_*(n)$  we simply post-compose simplicial maps  $\Delta^{n-1+k} \rightarrow \Delta^{n-1}$  with permutations of  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , regarded as maps of the base  $\Delta^{n-1}$  to itself. Obviously the boundary operator is equivariant, and defines a free  $\Sigma_n$  action in each degree. The relative homology of the simplex mod boundary is 0 in degrees other than  $n-1$ , and is  $\mathbb{F}$  in degree  $n-1$ . This last homology is shifted down to degree 0.

What about the augmentation  $\tilde{\epsilon}: \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_0(n) = \mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n] \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ ? The normalized long exact sequence of the pair comes with a connecting “boundary” map

$$NSS_{n-1}(\Delta^{n-1}, \partial\Delta^{n-1}) \rightarrow H_{n-2}(\partial\Delta^{n-1}) = \mathbb{F},$$

which is easily seen on an  $\mathbb{F}$ -basis to just record the degree of an automorphism of  $\Delta^{n-1}$  given by a permutation of ordered vertices. In other words, the “boundary” map for the pair identifies with the parity  $\{\pm 1\}$ -valued character  $\tau$  of  $\Sigma_n$ . Thus, we set  $\tilde{\epsilon}(g) = \tau(g) \in \tilde{\mathbb{F}}$ , where we write  $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$  to remind that  $\tilde{\epsilon}$  is equivariant for the twisted action on  $\mathbb{F}$ .

OK.  $NSS_*(\Delta^{n-1}, \partial\Delta^{n-1})$ , the normalized relative singular simplicial chain complex of a simplex mod boundary, together with the augmenting connecting homomorphism to the homology of the boundary, all shifted down in degrees, becomes an acyclic free  $\mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$  resolution of the twisted module  $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$ , and we call this complex  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_*(n)$ . The base point is  $\tilde{\iota}(1) = e$ , and then in the form  $\tilde{\rho} = \tilde{\iota}\tilde{\epsilon}: \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_0(n) \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_0(n)$  it is  $\tilde{\rho}(g) = \tau(g)e$ .

## 12 The Untwisted Complex $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$

From  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_*(n)$  we obtain  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n) = \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_*(n) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \tilde{\mathbb{F}}$ , an acyclic free resolution of the trivial module  $\mathbb{F}$ , as in Example 5.7 of Part I. Elements of the two complexes  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_*(n)$  have the ‘same’ names and boundary operator, via the correspondence  $x \leftrightarrow x \otimes 1$ . The only thing that changes from the shifted simplicial singular complex of the pair is the new  $\Sigma_n$  action, which is now  $g * x = \tau(g)gx$  for  $g \in \Sigma_n$ . The augmentation  $\epsilon: \mathcal{S}_0^{aj}(n) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$  is  $\epsilon(g) = (\tilde{\epsilon} \otimes Id)(g \otimes 1) = \tau(g) \in \tilde{\mathbb{F}} \otimes \tilde{\mathbb{F}} = \mathbb{F}$ . This augmentation is indeed equivariant for the *twisted* group action on  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$  and the *trivial* action on  $\mathbb{F}$ , as explained back in Example 5.7. The basepoint is still  $\iota(1) = e$ . In the form  $\rho = \iota\epsilon$ , the base point is  $\rho(g) \equiv (\tilde{\iota} \otimes Id)(\tilde{\epsilon} \otimes Id)(g \otimes 1) \equiv \tau(g)e$ .

Topology tells us  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$  is contractible, since the augmented complex is free over  $\mathbb{F}$  and acyclic, but we want to give a contraction with  $h^2 = 0$ . We follow an idea from McClure-Smith [19], where they proved by induction that their complexes  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  were contractible without actually giving a contraction.<sup>21</sup> The operation on surjections  $s(x) = (1, x)$  is not quite a contraction but satisfies a formula  $ds + sd = Id - i\hat{r}$ , where  $\hat{r}$  and  $i$  are maps of degree

<sup>21</sup>The formula for the contraction of the McClure-Smith complex that we present in Section 14 can also be found in the paper [13] of R. Kaufmann and A. Medina-Mardones.

0, involving  $\mathcal{S}_*(n-1)$ .

Specifically,  $\hat{r}: \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n-1)$  is 0 on any surjection  $x$  that takes the value 1 more than once. If  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n+k})$  does contain a single 1, say  $x_j = 1$ , then

$$\hat{r}(x) = (-1)^{j-1}(x_1 - 1, \dots, x_{j-1} - 1, x_{j+1} - 1, \dots, x_{n+k} - 1).$$

In words, remove the  $x_j = 1$  from  $x$ , subtract 1 from each remaining entry, and put in a sign.

The map  $i: \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n-1) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$  is defined by

$$i(y_1, \dots, y_{n-1+k}) = (1, y_1 + 1, \dots, y_{n-1+k} + 1).$$

In words, add 1 to each entry of  $y$ , and then put a 1 in front. Thus, if  $x$  contains a single 1, then  $i\hat{r}(x)$  just moves the 1 in  $x$  to the front, and puts in a sign  $(-1)^{j-1}$  depending on where the single 1 occurred in  $x$ . The exponent  $j-1$  in the sign counts the number of entries in the surjection  $x$  that  $x_j = 1$  moves past to get to the front of the new surjection  $i\hat{r}(x)$ .

**Proposition 12.1.** (i). *The maps  $\hat{r}$  and  $i$  satisfy  $d\hat{r} = -\hat{r}d$  and  $di = -id$ .*

(ii). *It holds that  $ds + sd = Id - i\hat{r}$ .*

(iii). *A contracting homotopy  $h =: \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{*+1}^{af}(n)$  is given by*

$$h = s - is\hat{r} + i^2s\hat{r}^2 - \dots \pm i^{n-2}s\hat{r}^{n-2}.$$

(iv). *It also holds that  $h\iota = 0$  and*

$$h^2 = (s - is\hat{r} + i^2s\hat{r}^2 - \dots)(s - is\hat{r} + i^2s\hat{r}^2 - \dots) = 0.$$

*Proof.* For verification of (i), one just needs to look at the simplicial boundary formula with alternating signs. The  $i$  case is quite simple.

In the  $\hat{r}$  case, one looks separately at surjections  $x$  that contain one, two, or more than two 1's. If  $x$  contains more than two 1's then  $d\hat{r}(x) = 0 = \hat{r}d(x)$ . If  $x$  contains two 1's, then  $d\hat{r}(x) = 0$ . Suppose  $x_p = x_q = 1$ , with  $p < q$ . Then  $dx$  contains two terms with a single 1, with signs  $(-1)^{p-1}$  and  $(-1)^{q-1}$ . Then  $\hat{r}d(x)$  will consist of two identical terms but with opposite signs  $(-1)^{q-2}(-1)^{p-1}$  and  $(-1)^{p-1}(-1)^{q-1}$ . So  $\hat{r}d(x) = 0$ . If  $x$  contains a single 1, then  $\hat{r}d(x)$  and  $d\hat{r}(x)$  have the same number of terms which pair up with opposite signs.

A similar argument proves (ii), again considering separately the cases where  $x$  contains one or more than one 1's. In the more than one 1 case,  $i\hat{r}(x) = 0$  and the proof that  $ds(x) + sd(x) = x$  is the same as verifying the contraction formula for a simplex in Example 5.1 of Part I. This works because the alternating sign boundary formulas and the contraction formulas are the 'same' in the two cases. In the case of a single 1, write it out and find  $ds(x) + sd(x) + i\hat{r}(x) = x$ . The difference in the two cases is that  $sd(x)$  is 'missing' a term  $(-1)^{j-1}(1, x_1, \dots, \hat{x}_j, \dots, x_N) = i\hat{r}(x)$  corresponding to the degenerate term in  $dx$  where the  $x_j = 1$  gets deleted. So you need to add back that term to get  $x$ .

Statement (iii), that  $h$  is a contracting homotopy, follows from a telescoping formula

$$(dh + hd)(x) = [x - i\hat{r}(x)] + [i\hat{r}(x) - i^2\hat{r}^2(x)] + \dots = x - i^{n-1}\hat{r}^{n-1}(x),$$

which is easily proved using the relations between  $s, \hat{r}, i$  and  $d$  in (i) and (ii). For example,

$$[d(is\hat{r}) + (is\hat{r})d](x) = -i[ds + sd](\hat{r}x) = -i(\hat{r}x - i\hat{r}\hat{r}x) = -i\hat{r}x + i^2\hat{r}^2x.$$

We also need to prove  $i^{n-1}\hat{r}^{n-1}(x) = \rho(x)$ , where  $\rho: \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_0^{aj}(n)$  is the base point. It is easy to describe in words the maps  $i^m\hat{r}^m$  and  $i^m s\hat{r}^m$ . Note  $\hat{r}^m(x) \neq 0$  only if  $x$  contains a single  $1, 2, \dots, m$ . Then  $i^m\hat{r}^m(x)$  removes those singletons from  $x$  and inserts  $1, 2, \dots, m$  at the front, along with a sign, and  $i^m s\hat{r}^m$  removes those singletons from  $x$  and inserts  $1, 2, \dots, m, m+1$  at the front with the same sign.

It is easy to see that if  $\text{deg}(x) > 0$  then  $i^{n-1}\hat{r}^{n-1}(x) = 0$ , since this sequence must end with repeated entries  $n$ . If  $\text{deg}(x) = 0$ , we must look at the sign. Now  $x$  is just a permutation in  $\Sigma_n$  and the sign associated to the compositions of  $\hat{r}$ 's in  $i^{n-1}\hat{r}^{n-1}(x)$  is the parity of the number of moves it takes to move the 1 in  $x$  to the front, then move the 2 to follow the 1, and finally move the  $n-1$ . Thus  $i^{n-1}\hat{r}^{n-1}(x) = \tau(x)(1, 2, \dots, n) = \tau(x)e = \rho(x)$ .

For statement (iv),  $h^2 = 0$  follows easily from the obvious identities  $s^2 = 0$ ,  $si = 0$ ,  $\hat{r}s = 0$ ,  $\hat{r}i = Id$ . Also  $hu(1) = h(1, 2, \dots, n) = 0$ .  $\square$

### 13 The Berger-Fresse Complex $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$

We now turn to the second surjection complex  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$ . The  $\Sigma_n$  action  $gx$  will simply post-compose surjections  $x$  with permutations  $g$ . The augmen-

tation sends all permutations  $g \in \mathcal{S}_0^{bf}(n) = \mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$  to  $\epsilon(g) = 1 \in \mathbb{F}$ . The base point is  $\iota(1) = e \in \mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$ . The fact that there are no signs in the  $\Sigma_n$  action is the reason the Berger-Fresse complex has some good properties.

The  $\Sigma_n$ -equivariant boundary operator in  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$  also has the form

$$d(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n+k}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n+k} \gamma(j)(x_1, \dots, \widehat{x}_j, \dots, x_{n+k}),$$

but the signs  $\gamma(j) \in \{-1, 0, +1\}$  are tricky.<sup>22</sup> The signs are explained clearly in Berger-Fresse [3], in terms of signs attached to the entries of what they call the ‘table form’ of a surjection. We will explain these signs below. The  $\Sigma_n$  equivariance of  $d$  will be obvious from the sign algorithm.

Divide the entries of a surjection  $x$  into rows, by inserting a separator  $|$  after each entry  $x_j$  that is *not* the final occurrence of the value  $x_j$  in the surjection. The signs  $\gamma(j) \in \{\pm 1\}$  in the boundary formula associated to these entries alternate, beginning with  $+1$ . These entries  $x_j$  are called the *caesuras* of the surjection  $x$ .

The remaining entries in the surjection, those not immediately preceding a separator  $|$ , represent the final occurrences of values  $x_i$ . Attach to such an  $x_i$  the sign  $\gamma(i)$  *opposite* to the sign already assigned to the entry  $x_j$  with  $x_j = x_i$  and  $x_j$  the *immediately preceding* caesura occurrence of the value  $x_i$  in the surjection. If a value  $x_i$  occurs only once in the surjection, a sign  $\gamma(i)$  is irrelevant, since the function with the term  $x_i$  deleted is not a surjection. One just removes these terms from the boundary formula, or sets  $\gamma(j) = 0$ . Other boundary terms may become degenerate, hence 0, even though they have an attached sign, if deleting an entry results in two equal adjacent entries.

**Example 13.1.** Consider the surjection  $x = (2, 1, 2, 3, 4, 2, 3, 1, 5, 4, 1, 2)$ . First insert the  $|$ ’s after the caesuras,  $x = (2|, 1|, 2|, 3|, 4|, 2|, 3, 1|, 5, 4, 1, 2)$ . Next place alternating signs next to the caesuras, yielding

$$(+2|, -1|, +2|, -3|, +4|, -2|, 3, +1|, 5, 4, 1, 2).$$

This leaves the final occurrences of 3, 5, 4, 1, 2 without signs. The 5 is a singleton and receives no sign, or sign 0. The signs assigned to the final occurrences of 3, 4, 1, 2 are opposites of the signs of the immediately preceding

---

<sup>22</sup>With no signs in the  $\Sigma_n$  action, something exotic must occur in the boundary operator in order that the augmentation is an equivariant map to the *trivial* module  $\mathbb{F}$ .



occurrences of 3, 4, 1, 2. So, the final result is the surjection  $x$  with a sign + or -, equivalent to  $\gamma(j)$ , written before each entry  $x_j$  that is not a singleton,

$$x = (+2|, -1|, +2|, -3|, +4|, -2|, +3, +1|, 5, -4, -1, +2).$$

From this the boundary  $dx$  is easily read off. Note deleting the first 1 entry results in a degenerate surjection, and deleting the 5 results in a function that is not a surjection, so these terms do not appear in the boundary.  $\square$

We point out that  $d^2 = 0$  is true, but somewhat awkward to verify. The most elementary proof is to group the non-degenerate terms of  $d^2(x)$  in pairs, identical except for the signs. The pairs correspond to pairs of the indices of the entries of  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n+k})$ . Then consider various cases and argue the signs are opposite for each pair. The cases are a pair of caesuras of  $x$ , a pair of non-caesuras of  $x$ , and pairs consisting of one caesura and one non-caesura.

A contraction  $h$  of  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$  is quite similar to the contraction  $h$  of  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$  in the preceding section. To begin,  $s(x) = (1, x)$  will again satisfy a relation  $ds + sd = Id - ir$ . Here the map  $r: \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n-1)$  is 0 on any surjection  $x$  that contains the entry 1 more than once. Otherwise,  $r(x)$  deletes the 1 and reduces all other entries by 1. So,  $r$  is the same as the previous  $\hat{r}$  for the complex  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$ , but without a sign. The map  $i: \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n-1) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$  is the same as the previous map  $i$ , namely increase each entry of a surjection  $y$  by 1 and put a 1 in front.

**Proposition 13.2.** (i). *The maps  $r$  and  $i$  are chain maps, that is,  $dr = rd$  and  $di = id$ .*

(ii). *It holds that  $ds + sd = Id - ir$ .*

(iii). *A contracting homotopy  $h: \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{*+1}^{bf}(n)$  is given by*

$$h = s + isr + i^2sr^2 + \dots + i^{n-2}sr^{n-2}.$$

(iv). *It also holds that  $hu = 0$  and*

$$h^2 = (s + isr + i^2sr^2 + \dots)(s + isr + i^2sr^2 + \dots) = 0.$$

*Proof.* That  $dr = rd$  and  $di = id$  is somewhat harder to verify than the corresponding results for  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$ , again because the boundary formula in  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$  is more complicated. One must pay attention to the relation between the signs in the boundary  $d$  and the caesura/non-caesura structure of  $x$ . In the

$r$  case one considers cases where  $x$  contains one, two, or more than two 1's.

Just as in the previous section, the proof that  $ds + sd = Id - ir$  proceeds by considering cases where  $x$  contains one or more than one 1's. Again one needs to be careful with the signs in the boundary map  $d$ . Note  $sx = (1, x)$  is either degenerate or places a new caesura entry 1 in front of  $x$ .

Pretty much the same telescoping sum argument as in Proposition 12.1 of the previous section shows that

$$h = s + isr + i^2sr^2 + \dots + i^{n-2}sr^{n-2}$$

is a contraction of  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$ , with  $h^2 = 0$  and  $h\iota = 0$ . The argument that  $(dh + hd)(x) = x - \rho(x)$  is slightly simpler than the corresponding argument for  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$  because there are no signs to worry about and the base point  $\rho$  is simply  $\rho(g) = e$  for  $g \in \mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n] = \mathcal{S}_0^{bf}(n)$ . The main points, similar to the argument for  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$ , are first the telescoping argument that shows  $(dh + hd)(x) = x - i^{n-1}r^{n-1}(x)$ , and then  $i^\ell r^\ell(x) = 0$  unless  $x$  contains  $1, 2, \dots, \ell$  as singletons, in which case those entries are removed from  $x$  and  $12 \dots \ell$  is placed in front, with no sign.

We also point out that  $i^\ell sr^\ell(x) = 0$  unless  $x$  contains  $1, 2, \dots, \ell$  as singletons, in which case those entries are removed from  $x$  and  $12 \dots \ell(\ell + 1)$  is placed in front, with no sign.  $\square$

## 14 The McClure-Smith Complex $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$

Finally we turn to the third complex  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ , which historically appeared first [19]. McClure and Smith developed their surjection complexes from the outset as forming a suboperad of the Eilenberg-Zilber operad  $\mathcal{Z}$  of natural multivariable cochain operations. So the boundary operator and the  $\Sigma_n$  action and the action on tensors of cochains as  $n$  varies were all blended together. This was a very natural approach, as the surjection generators acting on tensors of cochains provided a natural generalization of Steenrod's  $\cup_i$  products. In addition, they developed a filtration of their surjection operad, with terms related to the little cubes operads. All in all, a very impressive piece of work, but not so easy to digest all at once. We are less ambitious and develop at first only the surjection complex  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  itself.

The boundary operator and group action at first look complicated, but when viewed correctly they are really pretty simple, and geometrically motivated. The  $\Sigma_n$  action on surjection generators will be postponed until after we define the boundary operator. The augmentation sends all permutations  $g \in \mathcal{S}_0^{ms}(n) = \mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$  to  $1 \in \mathbb{F}$ . The base point is  $\iota(1) = e \in \mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$ .

Recall that we interpret surjection generators  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n+k})$  of  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  as prisms (abstract for now),  $Prism(x) = \prod_{1 \leq \ell \leq n} \Delta^{k_\ell - 1}$ , with a total order on the combined set of vertices of the factor simplices. There is the non-degeneracy condition that adjacent vertices in the total order cannot belong to the same simplex factor. One can interpret the corresponding simplex factor of the prism as having the  $x^{-1}(\ell)$  as vertices, where  $x: \Delta^{n-1+k} \rightarrow \Delta^{n-1}$ . The total order on the combined set of factor vertices is inherited from the domain simplex. The integer  $k_\ell$  is the cardinality of  $x^{-1}(\ell)$ , the number of times  $\ell$  appears in the sequence  $x$ . Then  $\Delta^{n-1+k}$  is the ordered join of these subsimplices.

The prism has an oriented geometric boundary, as the boundary of an ordered product of oriented manifolds,

$$\partial Prism(x) = \bigsqcup_{1 \leq \ell \leq n} \Delta^{k_1 - 1} \times \dots \times \partial \Delta^{k_\ell - 1} \times \dots \times \Delta^{k_n - 1}.$$

Each boundary factor  $\partial \Delta^{k_\ell - 1}$  is written as an alternating signed sum of oriented simplex faces. In front of that sum is another sign, namely  $(-1)^{p_\ell}$ , where  $p_\ell$  is the dimension of the product of the preceding simplex factors. We are using the ‘outward normal first’ convention twice in this description of the boundary. Thus the total boundary of the prism is a signed sum of codimension one oriented prism faces, obtained by deleting single vertices from each prism factor of positive dimension. The boundary  $\partial \Delta^0$  of a  $\Delta^0$  factor of  $Prism(x)$  is empty. The set of all vertices of the factors of the non-empty boundary prism faces of course remain totally ordered, so represent other surjection generators of one less degree. Some of these become degenerate if deleting a vertex results in two other vertices from that simplex factor becoming adjacent in the total order.

Thus the boundary operator in  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  will again have the form

$$d(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n+k}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n+k} \gamma(j)(x_1, \dots, \widehat{x}_j, \dots, x_{n+k}),$$

with signs  $\gamma(j) \in \{-1, +1\}$ . To understand the signs  $\gamma(j)$ , instead of removing entries from  $x$  one at a time, beginning on the left, one can first remove the 1's, then the 2's, etc, from left to right. The signs within each block alternate, with the first sign for an  $i + 1$  removal coinciding with the last sign for an  $i$  removal. The sign for the first 1 removal is  $+1$ . This exactly describes the boundary of the associated oriented prism as a union of codimension one oriented prism faces. Resulting degenerate terms or non-surjective terms in the boundary become 0, even though signs are attached initially to guide the full sign process. It is obvious from topology that  $d^2 = 0$ .

**Example 14.1.** If  $x = (2, 1, 2, 4, 2, 3, 1, 4, 1, 2)$  then

$$\text{Prism}(x) = (2, 7, 9) \times (1, 3, 5, 10) \times (6) \times (4, 8).$$

We can write signs  $+, -$  equivalent to  $\gamma(j)$  in front of each vertex to clarify the sign associated to the corresponding codimension one prism boundary face obtained by deleting that vertex.

$$\text{Prism}(x) = (+2, -7, +9) \times (+1, -3, +5, -10) \times (-6) \times (-4, +8).$$

We can then write these signs  $\gamma(j)$  in front of each entry of

$$x = (+2, +1, -2, -4, +2, -3, -1, +4 + 1, -2),$$

and read off the boundary. In the boundary  $dx$  there are only six non-zero terms, since deleting the first 1, either 4, or the 3, result in degenerate sequences.  $\square$

We will next describe the  $\Sigma_n$  action on  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ . It has the form

$$g * x = (-1)^{\mu(g,x)} gx,$$

where  $gx$  is the post-composition of a surjection  $x$  with a permutation  $g$ . We will give two descriptions of the sign. First, let  $k_\ell = \#\{x^{-1}(\ell)\}$ . Then

$$\mu(g, x) = \sum_{\text{certain } \ell, \ell'} (k_\ell - 1)(k_{\ell'} - 1),$$

where the sum is taken over all pairs  $1 \leq \ell < \ell' \leq n$  with  $g(\ell) > g(\ell')$ . Such a pair contributes to the sign  $(-1)^{\mu(g,x)}$  only if both  $k_\ell, k_{\ell'}$  are even. Equivalently, the dimensions of the corresponding prism factors are odd.

We turn to the second description of the sign, which is more geometric in nature, and relates the prisms of the McClure-Smith complex  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  to the complex  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$ , where we regarded surjection  $x$  as a simplicial map  $x: \Delta^{n-1+k} \rightarrow \Delta^{n-1}$ . Then  $k_\ell$  records the number of vertices in the domain that map to the  $\ell^{\text{th}}$  vertex of the range. These domain vertices span simplices  $\Delta^{k_\ell-1}$ , and the domain can be viewed as a join of  $n$  simplices

$$\Delta^{n-1+k} = \Delta^{k_1-1} * \Delta^{k_2-1} * \dots * \Delta^{k_n-1}.$$

Points of the join can be identified with convex linear combinations in some big affine space,  $\sum t_\ell a_\ell$ ,  $a_\ell \in \Delta^{k_\ell-1}$ , with  $0 \leq t_\ell \leq 1$ ,  $\sum t_\ell = 1$ . The base is a join of  $n$  vertices  $1, 2, \dots, n$ , and the join  $\Delta^{n-1+k}$  maps to the base  $\Delta^{n-1}$  by  $\sum t_\ell a_\ell \mapsto \sum t_\ell \ell$ . This map is  $x: \Delta^{n-1+k} \rightarrow \Delta^{n-1}$ , viewed as a map from the join of  $n$  simplices to the join of  $n$  points.

The inverse image  $x^{-1}(b)$  under the map  $x$  of the barycenter  $b \in \Delta^{n-1}$  of the base identifies with  $Prism(x) = \Delta^{k_1-1} \times \Delta^{k_2-1} \times \dots \times \Delta^{k_n-1} \subset \Delta^{n-1+k}$ , under the embedding  $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \mapsto \sum \frac{1}{n} a_\ell$ . Each vertex of the large simplex occurs as a vertex of one factor simplex of the prism. The vertices of the abstract prism itself are  $n$ -tuples of factor vertices  $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$  with  $x(v_\ell) = \ell$ . Each such prism vertex identifies with the barycenter of a face of the domain  $\Delta^{n-1+k}$  that maps by  $x$  isomorphically to the base  $\Delta^{n-1}$ .

We now bring in the permutation  $g \in \Sigma_n$ , which we will first view as a permutation isomorphism of the base  $\Delta^{n-1}$  with  $g(b) = b$ . Given  $x: \Delta^{n-1+k} \rightarrow \Delta^{n-1}$ , note the two prisms  $Prism(x) = x^{-1}(b) \simeq \Delta_1 \times \dots \times \Delta_n$ , and  $Prism(gx) = x^{-1}g^{-1}(b) \simeq \Delta_{g^{-1}1} \times \dots \times \Delta_{g^{-1}n}$  actually coincide as a submanifold of  $\Delta^{n-1+k}$ . The set of vertices of the factors of the two prisms are identical, hence both are totally ordered. But  $Prism(x)$  is organized as  $\prod \Delta_i$  while  $Prism(gx)$  is organized as  $\prod \Delta_{g^{-1}(i)}$ . There is an obvious geometric isomorphism  $g_x$  of one prism to another, which permutes simplex factors. This isomorphism has a degree, since both prisms are oriented, and one has

$$(-1)^{\mu(g,x)} = deg(g_x).$$

This claim is easy to prove since  $(-1)^{\mu(g,x)}$  is just the Koszul sign associated to the permutation of factors of a tensor product.

**Remark 14.2.** Another useful interpretation of the sign  $deg(g_x)$  is the following. Let  $j_1 - 1, \dots, j_m - 1$  denote the odd integers among the factor simplex dimensions  $k_1 - 1, \dots, k_n - 1$ . Then the permutation isomorphism

$g$  rearranges these odd dimension factors, which occur in specific orders in the two prisms. Then  $\deg(g_x) \in \{\pm 1\}$  is the parity sign of the associated permutation in  $\Sigma_m$  of these factors, since this parity counts mod 2 how the odd dimensional simplex factors are passed across each other in the isomorphism  $g_x$ . The even dimensional factors are irrelevant in both the  $(-1)^{\mu(g,x)}$  and the  $\deg(g_x)$  interpretations of the sign.

As an example, suppose  $n = 5$ ,  $x = (2, 4, 1, 3, 4, 2, 5, 1, 5, 2)$ , and  $g = (3, 5, 2, 1, 4)$ . Then the odd dimension factors of  $Prism(x)$  are  $\Delta_1 = \Delta^1$ ,  $\Delta_4 = \Delta^1$ , and  $\Delta_5 = \Delta^1$ . The order of the 1 and 4 factors are reversed by  $g$ , to 3 and 1. The order of the other pairs 1,5 and 4,5 are preserved. So  $\deg(g_x) = -1$ .

If  $g' = (5, 3, 1, 2, 4)$ , then the order of the pairs 1,4 and 1,5 are reversed, and the order of 4,5 is preserved. So  $\deg(g'_x) = +1$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 14.3.** *The definition  $g * x = \deg(g_x)g_x$  defines a left group action of  $\Sigma_n$  on  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ . The boundary operator  $d$  of  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  is equivariant for this  $\Sigma_n$  action.*

*Proof.* From our topological viewpoint this is more or less obvious. The first statement is clear because compositions of permutation isomorphisms of joins and prism subsets of joins behave in an obvious way.

For the second statement, our geometric bijections between oriented prisms with boundary commute with both the geometric and algebraic boundary maps. The boundary operator in  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}$  is specifically defined in terms of the prism boundary faces. The key is that the degree of a permutation isomorphism between our oriented prisms coincides with the degree of the same permutation isomorphism restricted to each non-degenerate prism boundary face, oriented by the outward normal first convention.  $\square$

**Remark 14.4.** We insert here a very nice picture of the chain complex  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ . It is the chain complex of a geometric cell complex whose open cells are the interiors of the various prisms  $Prism(x)$ . On the boundaries there is collapsing of some prism faces to codimension two prisms, whenever deleting an entry of  $x$  results in two adjacent entries with the same value. A face obtained by deleting a singleton from  $x$  is an empty face, so plays no role in the boundary, algebraically or geometrically.

In order to understand this structure, form  $|SS(\Delta^{n-1})|$ , the geometric realization of the simplicial singular complex of a simplex. There is an  $n-1+k$  simplex for each simplicial map  $x: \Delta^{n-1+k} \rightarrow \Delta^{n-1}$ , surjective or not. But the geometric realization collapses a simplex whenever two adjacent vertices in the domain have the same image. There is the tautological map  $\chi: |SS(\Delta^{n-1})| \rightarrow \Delta^{n-1}$ . Then the cell complex underlying  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  is  $\chi^{-1}(b)$ , where  $b$  is the barycenter of the base. Note singular simplices that map to the boundary of  $\Delta^{n-1}$  are disjoint from  $\chi^{-1}(b)$ .

It is more or less clear from this picture that there is a chain complex isomorphism  $\phi: \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ , of the form  $\phi(x) = p(x)x$ , with  $p(x) \in \{\pm 1\}$ . In fact, the map  $\phi$  is a kind of chain level Thom isomorphism. The sign  $p(x)$  is determined by thinking about orientations.  $Prism(x)$  is oriented as an ordered product of oriented simplices. The domain and base of  $x$  are canonically oriented simplices. Then the sign  $p(x) \in \{\pm 1\}$  is determined by the orientation equation

$$p(x) o(Prism) o(Base) = o(Domain).$$

We will look at this chain complex isomorphism  $\phi$  much more closely in the next section, including the  $\Sigma_n$  equivariance of  $\phi$ .  $\square$

Finally we turn to the contraction of  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ . The contraction  $h$  of  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  is given by exactly the same formula as the contraction of the complex  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$  given in the previous section. In fact, the full Proposition 13.2 remains true for  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ . Again,  $rx = 0$  unless  $x$  contains a unique 1, in which case  $r$  removes the 1 and reduces all other entries by 1, and  $ix$  increases all entries of  $x$  by 1 and puts a 1 in front. There are no signs. Both  $r$  and  $i$  are chain maps,  $dr = rd$  and  $di = id$ . For a surjection  $x$ , set  $s(x) = (1, x)$  and get  $(ds + sd)(x) = x - ir(x)$ . Of course all these facts need to be checked using the description of the boundary  $d$ . One can either use the prisms and their geometric boundary in the definition of  $d$  or the algorithm described above for placing signs  $\gamma(j)$  in front of boundary summation terms obtained by deleting entries  $x_j$  of  $x$ . Note the number of 1's in any  $x$  shows up in the first simplex prism factor  $\Delta^{k_1-1}$  of  $Prism(x)$ . So  $rx = 0$  unless that first prism factor is  $\Delta^0$ . Also, for  $sx$  the dimension of the initial prism factor is increased by one unless the initial entry of  $x$  is 1 in which case  $sx = 0$ .

The contraction is again

$$h = s + isr + \dots + i^{n-2}sr^{n-2}.$$

The telescoping argument and analysis of  $i^{n-1}r^{n-1}$  go through as in the  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$  case to show  $dh + hd = Id - \rho$  and  $h^2 = 0$ .

**Remark 14.5.** Since all the surjection complexes  $\mathcal{S}_*(n)$  are free over  $\mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$  and have preferred contractions, there are preferred equivariant diagonals  $\mathcal{S}_*(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*(n) \otimes \mathcal{S}_*(n)$ . In fact, there are preferred multidagonals  $\mathcal{S}_*(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*(n)^{\otimes k}$ . Exploiting the equivariant isomorphisms  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \simeq \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n) \simeq \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$  of the next section, which commute with contractions, these diagonals become the ‘same’. Also, these diagonals are coassociative. All this can be seen by applying the basic uniqueness result Proposition 6.2 and other results of Section 6 to various diagrams.

The McClure-Smith complex  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n) = C_*(X)$  is the cellular chain complex of the geometric realization of an  $n$ -fold multisimplicial set  $X$ , as indicated in Remark 14.4 above. To form  $X(m_1 - 1, \dots, m_n - 1)$  one first looks at *all* surjections  $x: \{1, \dots, n + k\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$  with  $m_i = x^{-1}(i)$  and  $\sum m_i = n + k$ , including the degenerate surjections with repeated adjacent values. Face operators delete an  $i$ -value and degeneracy operators repeat an  $i$ -value. Thus on  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  there is also a multisimplicial functorial diagonal studied in [23]. We treated the general multisimplicial functorial diagonal of [23] in Subsection 8.3. The two diagonals for  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  coincide, which can be seen by applying Proposition 6.2 to the sum of front subprisms tensor back subprisms formula of Proposition 8.12. In particular, one checks in this case that the formula of 8.12 is indeed equivariant.<sup>23</sup>  $\square$

## 15 The Isomorphisms $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \simeq \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n) \simeq \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$

**Remark 15.1.** We will want to construct equivariant maps with domains the surjection complexes. For this we need a  $\Sigma_n$ -basis. A very convenient choice in all three surjection complexes  $\mathcal{S}_*(n)$  consists of all surjections  $b$  so that the initial occurrences of  $1, 2, \dots, n$  occur in that order.

Basis generators are special cases of what we will call *clean* surjection generators, by which we mean  $c = (12 \dots \ell \dots \ell \dots)$  where  $\ell$  is the first caesura of  $c$ . In degree 0 permutations have no caesuras, so the only clean permutation is  $e = (12 \dots n)$ . The following result is rather important.

---

<sup>23</sup>This claim is very likely a special case of a rather general equivariant fact about the multisimplicial functorial diagonal expressed in terms of compositions of functors  $\mathbf{\Delta}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{\Delta}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{Sets}$ , where  $\mathbf{\Delta}$  is the simplex category and the first functor is a permutation.



**Proposition 15.2.** (i). For clean surjections  $c \in \mathcal{S}_*(n)$ ,  $i^j sr^j(c) = 0$  for all  $j$ . Thus  $hc = 0$  for clean  $c$ . Therefore  $c = hdc + dhc = hdc$  belongs to  $Im(h)$ .

(ii). For any  $x$  and any  $\ell$ ,  $i^{\ell-1} sr^{\ell-1}(x) = 0$  unless  $1, 2, \dots, \ell - 1$  are singletons in  $x$  and  $\ell - 1$  is not immediately followed by  $\ell$ . In the non-zero case,  $i^{\ell-1} sr^{\ell-1}(x) = (12\dots\ell\dots\ell\dots)$  is clean. Hence  $Im(h) = Ker(h)$  is the  $\mathbb{F}$ -span of all clean generators.

(iii). Basis generators  $b$  have clean form  $b = (12\dots\ell(\ell+1)\dots\ell\dots)$ , where  $\ell$  is the first caesura, and initial entries of  $1, 2, \dots, n$  occur in that order. Any clean generator can be uniquely written  $c = gb$ , where  $b$  is a basis generator and  $g \in \Sigma_n$  fixes  $1, 2, \dots, \ell$ .

(iv). For basis generators  $b$ , in the ‘composition of two sums’ formula for  $hdb$ , it holds that  $i^{\ell-1} sr^{\ell-1}(d_j b) = 0$  unless  $j = \ell$  and  $b_j = \ell$  is the first caesura of  $b = (12\dots\ell(\ell+1)\dots\ell\dots)$ . Thus only one composed term is non-zero in the double summation formula for  $hdb = b$ .

(v). If  $b \in \mathcal{S}_*(n)$  is a basis generator of positive degree and  $c \in \mathcal{S}_*(q)$  is a clean generator, let  $c[n]$  be the result of adding  $n$  to each entry of  $c$ . Then the concatenation  $bc[n] \in \mathcal{S}_*(n+q)$  is a clean generator and the conclusion of (iv) holds for  $bc[n]$ .

*Proof.* This is a long exercise in reviewing the definitions. In general for clean generators  $c$ , the double sum  $hdc$  can have summands that cancel out in the formula  $hdc = c$ . An example is  $c = (1, 2, 3, 2, 5, 4)$ . The results (iv) and (v) will be important in the final section of Part III, where we study the operad structure associated to the complexes  $\mathcal{S}_*(n)$ .  $\square$

### 15.1 The isomorphism $\phi: \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ .

We will now construct an equivariant chain map isomorphism between the two surjection complexes  $\phi: \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ . For surjections  $x$  the map will have the form  $\phi(x) = c(x)x$ , where  $c(x) \in \{\pm 1\}$ . Denote the caesuras of  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n+k})$  by  $(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k)$  and let  $sh(C_x)$  denote the number<sup>24</sup> of transpositions of adjacent entries that rewrites the caesuras in order  $(1, \dots, 1, 2, \dots, 2, \dots, n, \dots, n)$ , keeping the caesuras of the same value in their original order. Of course not all values  $\ell$  will occur as caesura values if there are singletons in  $x$ . The number of  $\ell$ 's, in either ordered form of the caesuras,

<sup>24</sup>Strictly speaking, only the parity of  $sh(C_x)$  is well-defined.

is the dimension of the simplex factor  $\Delta_\ell = \Delta^{k_\ell-1}$  of  $Prism(x)$ . Then we define  $c(x) = (-1)^{sh(C_x)}$  to be the parity sign of the shuffle permutation that rewrites the caesuras in the non-decreasing order.

**Proposition 15.3.** *The map  $\phi: \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  defined by*

$$\phi(x) = (-1)^{sh(C_x)}x = c(x)x$$

*is the equivariant chain map given by the standard procedure, using the chosen basis of the domain and the contraction of the range. Moreover,  $\phi$  commutes with the contractions  $h$  in the two complexes.*

*Proof.* If  $g \in \Sigma_n$ , we have the map of prisms  $g_x: Prism(x) \rightarrow Prism(gx)$  that permutes the simplex factors of the prisms. The  $\Sigma_n$  action on  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  is given by  $g*x = deg(g_x)gx$ . The equivariance of the map  $\phi$  of the proposition is immediate from the following.

**LEMMA 15.4.**  $c(gx) = deg(g_x)c(x)$ .

Because then

$$g * \phi(x) = g * c(x)x = c(x)deg(g_x)gx = c(gx)gx = \phi(gx).$$

To prove the lemma, if  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n+k})$  has caesuras  $(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k)$  then the caesuras of  $gx$  are  $(gc_1, gc_2, \dots, gc_k)$ . We put these in non-decreasing order in two steps. First in  $sh(C_x)$  steps, we reorder the caesuras of  $gx$  to  $(g1, \dots, g1, g2, \dots, gn)$ . Next we put these caesuras of  $gx$  in non-decreasing order by permuting the blocks of  $g\ell$ 's. For computing signs, only the blocks of odd size are relevant. For these, one counts the pairs  $1 \leq i < j \leq n$  with  $gi > gj$ . From Remark 14.2, one sees the sign associated to the second step is  $deg(g_x)$ . The lemma is thus proved.  $\square$

To complete the proof of Proposition 15.3, it suffices by Proposition 6.3 of Part I to show that  $\phi$  commutes with contractions, that is,

$$\phi\left(\sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq n-1} i^{\ell-1} sr^{\ell-1} x\right) = \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq n-1} i^{\ell-1} sr^{\ell-1} \phi(x).$$

There is actually a form of commutativity with each term of the contractions.

**LEMMA 15.5.** *For surjection generators  $z, y, x \in \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$  the following commutativities hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(iz) &= i\phi(z) \\ \phi(sy) &= s\phi(y) \\ \phi(rx) &= r\phi(x). \end{aligned}$$

Assuming the lemma, Proposition 15.3 is proved by repeatedly applying the different parts of the lemma to calculate  $\phi(hx)$ . First,  $\phi(sx) = s\phi(x)$ . Next,

$$\phi(isrx) = i \phi(srx) = is \phi(rx) = isr \phi(x).$$

Next, an induction gives  $\phi(i^m sr^m x) = i^m sr^m \phi(x)$ .

The lemma itself is immediate from the definitions of  $i, s, r$  and the observations  $c(iz) = c(z)$ ,  $c(sy) = c(y)$ , and  $c(rx) = c(x)$ . These last equalities are consequences of the facts that the operators  $i, s, r$  don't affect the positions of relevant caesuras that get permuted.  $\square$

**Remark 15.6.** We could have more directly shown that  $\phi$  is the standard procedure chain map by using Proposition 15.2(iv). On basis generators we want  $c(b)b = \phi(b) = h\phi(db)$ . From 15.2(iv) and the definition  $\phi(d_\ell b) = c(d_\ell b)d_\ell b$ , we see that the double sum expansion of  $h\phi(db)$  reduces to a single term,  $h\phi(db) = c(d_\ell b)b$ , where  $d_\ell b$  is the boundary term given by deleting the first caesura of  $b$ . But obviously  $c(d_\ell b) = c(b)$ , since deleting the first caesura of a basis generator doesn't affect the process of putting the caesuras in the relevant order.  $\square$

## 15.2 The isomorphism $\phi: \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ .

We will next construct an equivariant chain map isomorphism between the two surjection complexes  $\phi: \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ . For a surjection

$$x: \{1, 2, \dots, n+k\} \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, n\},$$

the map will again have the form  $\phi(x) = p(x)x$ , where  $p(x) \in \{\pm 1\}$ . In degree 0, that is when  $k = 0$ , then  $x = g$  is a permutation in  $\Sigma_n$  and  $p(g) = \tau(g)$ , the parity character of  $g$ .

To define  $p(x)$  in general, we refer to the prism

$$Prism(x) = \Delta^{k_1-1} \times \dots \times \Delta^{k_n-1} \subset \Delta^{n-1+k},$$

identified with the inverse image of the barycenter under  $x: \Delta^{n-1+k} \rightarrow \Delta^{n-1}$ . We compare two orientations of the domain simplex of  $x$ . First, it has its standard orientation as an ordered simplex. The prism submanifold also has a standard orientation as an ordered product of oriented simplices. The normal bundle of the prism identifies with the tangent bundle of the base simplex of  $x$ . We can amalgamate the prism and base orientations to

define a second orientation of the domain and define the sign  $p(x) \in \{\pm 1\}$  by the orientation equation

$$p(x) o(Prism) o(Base) = o(Domain).$$

**Proposition 15.7.** (i). *The map  $\phi(x) = p(x)x$  is a  $\Sigma_n$ -equivariant isomorphism of graded modules  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ .*

(ii). *The map  $\phi$  coincides with the standard procedure chain map constructed using the contraction  $h$  of  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  and the basis of  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$ , consisting of surjections  $b$  for which the first occurrences of  $1, 2, \dots, n$  occur in that order.*

(iii). *The map  $\phi$  commutes with the contractions  $h$  in the two complexes.*

*Proof.* For the equivariance we need  $\phi(g * x) = g * \phi(x)$ , which says

$$\tau(g)p(gx)gx = \deg(g_x)p(x)gx.$$

The prisms of  $x$  and  $gx$  in the domain  $\Delta^{n-1+k}$  are identical submanifolds, but their simplex factors are permuted by the isomorphism  $g_x$ . This introduces a sign  $\deg(g_x)$  comparing the two prism orientations. But also the vertices of the base  $\Delta^{n-1}$  are permuted by  $g$ , which introduces a sign  $\tau(g)$  comparing the two base orientations. These two signs yield the desired equivariance equation.

Of course statements (iii) and (i) imply statement (ii), but we want to bring in alternate arguments and emphasize a point essentially made in Part I that there are levels of increasing strength in assertions that certain maps are equivariant chain maps. In particular, in the present setting, statement (iii) does not follow automatically from statement (ii), as it would if the domain was a MacLane model. Also, the proof that  $\phi$  commutes with contractions here is quite a bit more subtle than the corresponding situation in results 15.3 through 15.6 for the isomorphism  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf} \simeq \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}$ .

So, to prove (ii) first, we use Proposition 15.2(iv) and follow the argument of Remark 15.6. For a basis generator  $b \in \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$  we need  $p(b)b = \phi(b) = h\phi(db)$ . But from 15.2(iv), there is only one term in the double sum on the right side, namely  $h\phi(db) = p(d_\ell b)b$ , where  $b_\ell$  is the first caesura of  $b$ . But  $p(d_\ell b) = p(b)$ . Because deleting the first caesura names the first non-trivial boundary face of  $Prism(b)$ , which has coefficient  $+1$  in the  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  boundary formula and coefficient  $(-1)^{\ell-1}$  in the  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$  boundary formula. But in

the domain  $\Delta^{n-1+k}$ , the face opposite vertex  $x_\ell$  has a change of orientation sign  $(-1)^{\ell-1}$  by the simplex boundary formula. Thus the two signs cancel when comparing the orientation equations for  $p(b)$  and  $p(d_\ell b)$ .

Finally, we turn to commutativity of  $\phi$  with the contractions  $h = s - is\hat{r} + i^2 s\hat{r}^2 - \dots \pm i^{n-2} s\hat{r}^{n-2}$  and  $h = s + isr + \dots + i^{n-2} sr^{n-2}$ . As in Lemma 15.5 there is a form of commutativity with each term of the contractions.

**LEMMA 15.8.** *For surjection generators  $z, y, x \in \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$ , the following commutativities hold, with  $|z|$  and  $|x|$  denoting the degrees of  $z$  and  $x$ :*

$$\phi(iz) = (-1)^{|z|} i\phi(z)$$

$$\phi(sy) = s\phi(y)$$

$$\phi(\hat{r}x) = (-1)^{|x|} r\phi(x).$$

Assuming the lemma, Proposition 15.7 is proved by repeatedly applying the different parts of the lemma to calculate  $\phi(hx)$ . First,  $\phi(sx) = s\phi(x)$ . Next, since  $|rx| = |x|$  and  $|sr x| = |x| + 1$ ,

$$\phi(-is\hat{r}x) = (-1)(-1)^{|x|+1} i\phi(s\hat{r}x) = (-1)^{|x|} is\phi(\hat{r}x) = isr\phi(x).$$

Then by an induction  $\phi((-1)^m i^m s\hat{r}^m x) = i^m sr^m \phi(x)$ .

The lemma itself follows from the definitions of  $i, s, \hat{r}$  and  $r$ , and the prism sign relations

$$p(iz) = (-1)^{|z|} p(z), \quad p(sy) = p(y), \quad \text{and} \quad p(rx) = (-1)^{\ell-1} (-1)^{|x|} p(x) \text{ if } rx \neq 0.$$

We interpret the third of these prism sign relations as follows. We can regard  $r$  as an operator with no sign on surjection generators of any of the surjection complexes. Then  $rx = 0$  unless  $x$  has a singleton 1 entry,  $x_\ell = 1$ . This is the  $\ell$  appearing in the third relation.

The three prism sign formulas follow from close scrutiny of the geometry behind various prism sign orientation equations. Alternatively, they can be deduced relatively easily from Proposition 15.9 below.

Using these prism sign relations, the only tricky deduction for the lemma is the third line. Recall  $\hat{r}x$  and  $rx$  are either both 0 or differ by a sign  $(-1)^{\ell-1}$

if  $x$  has a singleton 1 entry,  $x_\ell = 1$ . Then either both  $\phi(\hat{r}x)$  and  $r\phi(x)$  are 0 or

$$\phi(\hat{r}x) = (-1)^{\ell-1}\phi(rx) = (-1)^{\ell-1}p(rx)rx = (-1)^{|x|}p(x)rx = (-1)^{|x|}r\phi(x).$$

□

The prism sign  $p(x)$  has a nice geometric definition, but it is not expressed directly in terms of the surjection  $x$ . To calculate  $p(x)$  we refer to the organization of the prism associated to  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{n+k})$ ,

$$Prism(x) = (x_{11}, \dots, x_{1k_1}) \times \dots \times (x_{n1}, \dots, x_{nk_n}).$$

All the integers between 1 and  $n+k$  occur exactly once as subscripts of these  $x$  entries. The entries in each simplex factor are increasing and the last entries of each are the non-caesura entries of  $x$ . In the interest of slightly cleaner notation, write  $x_{\ell k_{\ell-1}} = x_{\ell k'_\ell}$ . Of course if  $k_\ell = 1$  there are no caesura vertices  $x_{\ell j}$  and the corresponding prism factor is  $\Delta^0$ .

Let  $p_x \in \Sigma_{n+k}$  denote the permutation read off from the *subscripts* of the  $x$  entries written in the order

$$p_x \equiv (x_{11}, \dots, x_{1k'_1}, \dots, x_{n1}, \dots, x_{nk'_n}, x_{1k_1}, \dots, x_{nk_n}).$$

We recognize  $p_x$  as the result of three shuffles of the entries of  $x$ . First move all caesuras of  $x$  in front of non-caesuras in  $sh(C, N)$  steps, without changing the order of the caesuras. Then put the caesuras in order in  $sh(C)$  steps, as before. Finally, the non-caesuras of  $x$  are put in the order  $(x_{1k_1}, \dots, x_{nk_n})$ , which essentially amounts to viewing the non-caesuras as they occur in  $x$ , one for each value  $\ell$ , as a permutation  $f_x$  of  $(1, \dots, n)$ .

**Proposition 15.9.** *The prism sign associated to  $x$  is given by*

$$p(x) = \tau(p_x) = (-1)^{sh(C, N)}(-1)^{sh(C)}\tau(f_x).$$

*Proof.* An automorphism of a simplex given by a permutation of vertices has a geometric degree, which is simultaneously the parity sign of the permutation and the orientation sign obtained by comparing two lists of tangent vectors arising from two vertex orderings. The proposition follows from the fact that the orientation  $o(Prism)o(Base)$  of the domain coincides with the orientation given by the list of tangent vectors arising from permutation  $p_x$ .

Specifically, we are naming simplex vertices by unit basis vectors in an affine space. A pair of vertices then determines a tangent vector  $uv = v - u$ . Notice  $uv + vw = uw$ . The tangent orientation associated to a vertex ordering  $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{n+k})$  is given by the ordered list of tangent vectors

$$(v_1v_2, v_2v_3, \dots, v_{n+k-1}v_{n+k}).$$

The tangent orientation does not change if a vector early in the list is changed by adding a later vector. For example, by adding to  $v_i v_{i+1}$  some consecutive following vectors, we can replace  $v_i v_{i+1}$  by  $v_i v_j$  for any  $j > i$ .

Now we look at the tangent vectors in the order prescribed by adjacent vertices in permutation  $p(x)$ . We replace each adjacent pair of caesura vertices of form  $x_{ik'_i} x_{j1}$  by  $x_{ik'_i} x_{ik_i}$ . A non-caesura vertex  $x_{ik_i}$  follows any caesura vertex  $x_{j1}$ . The new list of tangent vectors obviously corresponds to the  $o(Prism)o(Base)$  orientation of the domain, since the first blocks now name in order the orientations of the non-trivial factors  $\Delta^{k_i-1}$  of the prism and the last block projects to the standard orientation of the base  $\Delta^{n-1}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 15.10.** We comment on the terms in the formula for  $p(x)$  in Proposition 15.9. Of course  $(-1)^{sh(C)} = c(x)$  is the sign occurring previously in the isomorphism between  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$  and  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ . Specifically,  $sh(C)$  counts the number of moves needed to put the caesura values of  $x$  in non-decreasing order, without changing the order of cesuras of the same value.

There are interesting alternate interpretations of the parity of  $sh(C, N)$ . The caesuras can be organized in blocks, the  $\ell^{th}$  block consisting of those preceding the first non-caesura if  $\ell = 1$ , and between the  $(\ell - 1)^{th}$  and  $\ell^{th}$  non-caesura if  $\ell > 1$ . A block may be empty, but it still receives a number as a block. Then the parity of  $sh(C, N)$  is the same as the parity of the total number of caesuras in even numbered blocks.

Another interpretation of the parity sign  $(-1)^{sh(C, N)}$  is as the parity sign  $\delta(x) \in \{\pm 1\}$  of the number of subscripts  $1 \leq j \leq n + k$  where the signs  $\gamma(j)$  in front of boundary terms  $dx = \sum \gamma(j) d_j x$  in the two complexes  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$  and  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$  differ. Thus we have  $p(x) = c(x)\delta(x)\tau(f_x)$ .  $\square$

**Example 15.11.** Consider the surjection  $x = (2, 1, 2, 3, 4, 2, 3, 1, 5, 4, 1, 2)$ . We found the caesura signs  $\gamma(j)$  in the complex  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(5)$  in Example 13.1 which were  $(+2|, -1|, +2|, -3|, +4|, -2|, 3, +1|, 5, 4, 1, 2)$ . These agree with the alternating signs in  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(5)$ , except for the final caesura  $+1|$ . Thus  $\delta(x) = -1$ .

We also see  $sh(C, N) = 1$ , since only the final caesura entry 1 needs to be moved in front of a single non-caesura entry 3.

The caesura shuffle for  $x$  is given by  $(2, 1, 2, 3, 4, 2, 1) \mapsto (1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 3, 4)$ , with  $sh(C) = 8$ . The caesura blocks are  $(2, 1, 2, 3, 4, 2)$  and  $(1)$ . So again we see  $sh(C, N) = 1$ . The non-caesuras permutation is  $f_x = (3, 5, 4, 1, 2)$ , with  $\tau(f_x) = -1$ .

We have  $Prism(x) = (2, 8, 11) \times (1, 3, 6, 12) \times (4, 7) \times (5, 10) \times (9)$ . The  $\Sigma_{12}$  permutation  $p_x = (2, 8, 1, 3, 6, 4, 5, 11, 12, 7, 10, 9)$ , obtained by writing the 7 caesura entries in the prism in order, followed by the 5 non-caesura entries. One can check  $\tau(p_x) = +1$ .

Summarizing,  $c(x) = (-1)^8$ ,  $(-1)^{sh(C, N)} = (-1)^1 = \delta(x)$ ,  $\tau(f_x) = -1$ . Finally,  $p(x) = \tau(p_x) = c(x)\delta(x)\tau(f_x) = (+1)(-1)(-1) = +1$ .  $\square$

We can combine the above results to construct an equivariant chain map isomorphism between the other pair of surjection complexes  $\phi: \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$ .

**Proposition 15.12.** *The map  $\phi: \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$  given by*

$$\phi(x) = p(x)c(x)x = (-1)^{sh(C, N)}\tau(f_x)x = \delta(x)\tau(f_x)x$$

*is an equivariant chain map commuting with contractions, hence is the standard procedure chain map constructed from the basis of the domain and the contraction of the range.*

## 16 The Chain Maps $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n), \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n), \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n) \rightleftharpoons N_*(E\Sigma_n)$

The complex  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$  provides quite a large acyclic resolution of the trivial  $\Sigma_n$  module  $\mathbb{F}$ . The three surjection complexes provide rather small resolutions, perhaps even minimal in some interesting sense. The comparisons we make in this section are rather similar to the comparisons  $M_* \rightleftharpoons N_*(EC_n)$  we made in Examples 6.12 and 6.15 of Part I between the minimal model and the MacLane model for the cyclic group. There are also interesting connections with cases of the Eilenberg-Zilber map and deformations of the Alexander-Whitney map that we will bring out in Subsection 16.3.

Following Part I, we will use contractions of the ranges and  $\mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$ -bases of the domains to construct equivariant chain maps representing each arrow



in the title line of this section. From Proposition 6.3 and Proposition 6.4 of Part I, for any of the surjection complexes the compositions  $\mathcal{S}_*(n) \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*(n)$  will be identity maps, regardless of the choices of bases. In the  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$  case, our maps are the same as those found by Berger-Fresse [3], [5]. In particular, we prove the Berger-Fresse formulas are chain maps and result from the standard procedure.

### 16.1 The Maps $N_*(E\Sigma_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n), \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n), \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$

The contractions  $h$  of  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$  from Proposition 12.1 and  $h$  of  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$  and  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  from Proposition 13.2 and Section 14, along with the  $\mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$  basis in degree  $k$  of the MacLane model  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$  given by  $\{(e, g_1, \dots, g_k)\}$ , yield by the standard procedure of Definition 6.0 of Part I equivariant chain maps  $tr: N_*(E\Sigma_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$ ,  $TR: N_*(E\Sigma_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$ , and  $TR: N_*(E\Sigma_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ . We steal the name  $TR$  from Berger-Fresse [3], where they called their map  $TR$  ‘Table Reduction’. In all cases we can exploit Proposition 6.3 and Proposition 6.4 of Part I, which bring out that  $tr$  and  $TR$  are the unique equivariant maps commuting with contractions. Specifically,  $tr$  and  $TR$  are equivariant and are defined recursively on basis elements in degree  $k$  by

$$tr(e, g_1, \dots, g_k) = h tr(g_1, \dots, g_k) = (s - is\hat{r} + \dots \pm i^{n-2} s\hat{r}^{n-2})tr(g_1, \dots, g_k)$$

$$TR(e, g_1, \dots, g_k) = h TR(g_1, \dots, g_k) = (s + isr + \dots + i^{n-2} sr^{n-2})TR(g_1, \dots, g_k).$$

Then we extend these formulas on basis generators to other elements by equivariance and linearity. Although the formulas for  $TR$  on basis elements are identical in the  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$  and  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  cases, there are signs in the  $\Sigma_n$  action on  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  that make that case a little more complicated. As usual, we have shifted the burden from coming up with formulas and proving they are equivariant chain maps to beginning with recursively defined equivariant chain maps and then finding formulas.

We can write out the fully iterated formula for  $TR$  in the  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$  case as follows:

**Proposition 16.1.** *The equivariant chain map  $TR: N_*(E\Sigma_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$  is described by:*

- In degree 0,  $TR(g_0) = g_0$ .
- In degree 1,

$$TR(g_0, g_1) = g_0 TR(e, g_0^{-1} g_1) = g_0 h(TR(g_0^{-1} g_1)) = g_0 h(g_0^{-1} g_1).$$

- In degree 2,

$$\begin{aligned} TR(g_0, g_1, g_2) &= g_0 TR(e, g_0^{-1}g_1, g_0^{-1}g_2) \\ &= g_0 h(TR(g_0^{-1}g_1, g_0^{-1}g_2)) = g_0 h(g_0^{-1}g_1 h(g_1^{-1}g_2)). \end{aligned}$$

- In degree  $k$ ,  $TR(g_0, g_1, \dots, g_k) =$

$$g_0 h(g_0^{-1}g_1 h(g_1^{-1}g_2 h(\dots h(g_{k-2}^{-1}g_{k-1} h(g_{k-1}^{-1}g_k))\dots)).$$

The  $\Sigma_n$  actions here simply mean post-compose surjection generators with permutations. There are no signs in either the  $\Sigma_n$  action or the  $h$  evaluations. Thus the formula reveals that  $TR(g_0, g_1, \dots, g_k)$  will be a positive coefficient sum of surjection generators. The algorithm is certainly programmable.

Nonetheless, this is a clunky formula. There are many  $\Sigma_n$  evaluations in the formula. There are  $k$  evaluations of  $h$ , so potentially a sum of  $(n-1)^k$  surjection generators in the end. But many terms are zero because evaluations of  $i^\ell sr^\ell$  are zero on surjections that do not contain  $1, 2, \dots, \ell$  as singletons. Many other terms will be degenerate.

The algorithm of Proposition 16.1 also applies to the other two surjection complexes. However, there are quite a few signs, in the  $h$  formula for  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$  and in the  $\Sigma_n$  action on both complexes. Therefore it is harder to translate 16.1 to a closed formula in the cases  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$  and  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ .

We will now *derive*<sup>25</sup> the direct description Berger-Fresse gave for the map  $TR: N_*(E\Sigma_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$ , which is more of a closed formula than that given by Proposition 16.1. Again, our point is not just to verify that the Berger-Fresse map  $TR$  is an equivariant chain map, but rather to show that their  $TR$  formula agrees with the canonical equivariant chain map constructed by the standard procedure, and that it commutes with contractions.

The following notation will be useful. If  $X = (g_0, g_1, \dots, g_k) \in N_k(E\Sigma_n)$  and  $1 \leq \ell \leq n-1$ , we denote by  $X < 12 \dots \ell - 1 > \in N_k(E\Sigma_{n-\ell+1})$ . the result of deleting all entries  $1, 2, \dots, \ell-1$  from the  $k+1$  permutations  $g_j$  that form  $X$ . So if  $\ell = 1$ , this is just  $X$ . Otherwise we interpret  $\Sigma_{n-\ell+1}$  as permutations of  $\{\ell, \dots, n\}$ . We first note that in degree 1,

$$TR(e, g) = h(g) = (s + isr + \dots + i^{n-2}sr^{n-2})(g).$$

---

<sup>25</sup>Shamelessly benefitting from the fact that we already know the answer from [3].

Since  $i^{\ell-1}sr^{\ell-1}(g) = (12 \dots \ell g < 12 \dots \ell - 1 >)$ , we have

$$TR(e, g) = \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq n-1} (12 \dots \ell g < 1, 2, \dots, \ell - 1 >).$$

Note that the indexing set of this last sum of surjections can be thought of as being over ordered partitions  $a_0 + a_1 = n + 1$  with  $0 < a_0 = \ell < n$  and hence  $a_1 > 1$ . The initial sequence entries  $12 \dots \ell$  are the first  $a_0 = \ell$  entries of the identity permutation  $e = (12 \dots n)$ , and the final sequence entries  $g < 1, 2, \dots, \ell - 1 >$  are the  $a_1 = n + 1 - \ell$  entries of  $g$  that remain after  $1, 2, \dots, \ell - 1$  are removed from  $g$ .

Next we bring in the equivariance and look at  $TR(g_0, g_1) = g_0 TR(e, g_0^{-1} g_1)$ . A brief computation shows that  $TR(g_0, g_1)$  is a sum of surjections in  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$  of degree 1 described as follows. The sum is over ordered partitions  $a_0 + a_1 = n + 1$  with  $0 < a_0 < n$ . The corresponding surjections are described as the first  $a_0$  entries of  $g_0$ , followed by the  $a_1$  entries of  $g_1$  that remain after the first  $a_0 - 1$  entries of  $g_0$  are removed.

To continue the search for a pattern, look at  $TR(e, g_1, g_2) = h TR(g_1, g_2)$  and then at  $TR(g_0, g_1, g_2) = g_0 TR(e, g_0^{-1} g_1, g_0^{-1} g_2)$ . After some computations, one might rediscover the Berger-Fresse procedure for the map  $TR$ .

**Proposition 16.2.** *View  $X = (g_0, g_1, \dots, g_k) \in N_k(E\Sigma_n)$  as a table, with rows the permutations  $g_j$ . The image*

$$TR(X) = \sum_{\text{partitions } a} x_a \in \mathcal{S}_k^{bf}(n)$$

*is computed as a sum of surjections indexed by positive partitions  $a_0 + a_1 + \dots + a_k = n + k$  with  $a_k > 1$ . Given a partition  $a$ , the corresponding surjection summand  $x_a$  of  $TR(X)$  is described in sequence form as follows. Begin the sequence with the first  $a_0$  entries of  $g_0$ . Remove the first  $a_0 - 1$  of these entries, that is, all but the last one, from the remaining  $g_j, j \geq 1$ . Continue the sequence with the first remaining  $a_1$  entries of  $g_1$ , and then remove all but the last of those entries from what remains of the  $g_j, j \geq 2$ . And so on....*

Note the sequence  $x_a$  ends with all the entries of  $g_k$  that remain after the first  $k$  steps. Berger-Fresse describe each summand surjection  $x_a$  in terms of separate rows of length  $a_j$ , which are initial segments of remnants of the permutation rows  $g_j$  of the table  $X$ . The final entries of all but the last of

these rows are the caesuras of the surjection  $x_a$ , in the language of Section 13. This observation makes it obvious that  $TR(X)$  is a sum of distinct surjections  $x_a$ , and the row form of a surjection  $x$  determines whether  $x$  is an  $x_a$ , and for which partition  $a$ . Also note that if  $a_k = 1$  then the described sequence is degenerate, and note that  $a_k > 1$  implies  $a_j < n$  for  $j < k$ .

*Proof.* What we will prove is that the formula on the right side of the equation for  $TR(X)$  in Proposition 16.2 is equivariant and commutes with contractions. Then we employ Proposition 6.3 of Part I. The equivariance is clear from the description of the procedure. The reason this is easy is because of the simple post-composition interpretation of the  $\Sigma_n$  action on  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$ , with no signs.

We then need to prove  $TR(e, g_1, \dots, g_k) = h TR(g_1, \dots, g_k)$ . We have by definition of the contraction  $h$

$$h TR(g_1, \dots, g_k) = (s + isr + \dots + i^{n-2}sr^{n-2})TR(g_1, \dots, g_k).$$

Set  $Y = (g_1, \dots, g_k) \in N_{k-1}(E\Sigma_n)$ . By definition of the  $TR$  procedure

$$TR(e, g_1, \dots, g_k) = \sum_{\ell} (12 \dots \ell TR(Y < 12 \dots \ell - 1 >)),$$

where recall  $Y < 12 \dots \ell - 1 >$  means entries  $1, 2, \dots, \ell - 1$  are removed from the permutations that form  $Y$ . Proposition 16.2 is then immediate from the following:  $\square$

**LEMMA 16.3.** *For  $Y \in N_{k-1}(E\Sigma_n)$  and  $1 \leq \ell \leq n - 1$ , it holds that*

$$i^{\ell-1} s r^{\ell-1} TR(Y) = (12 \dots \ell TR(Y < 12 \dots \ell - 1 >)) \in \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n).$$

*Proof.* On the right side, the  $TR$  application yields a sum of surjections indexed by partitions of  $n + k - \ell$  into  $k$  summands. All integer entries of the resulting surjections are now from the set  $\{\ell, \dots, n\}$ . Then  $12 \dots \ell$  is placed in front of each surjection, putting the expression back in  $\mathcal{S}_k^{bf}(n)$ .

On the left side,  $TR(Y)$  is a sum of surjections in  $\mathcal{S}_{k-1}^{bf}(n)$ , with index set partitions  $a_1 + \dots + a_k = n + k - 1$ . Applying  $i^{\ell-1} s r^{\ell-1}$  kills all partition terms other than those that yield surjections that contain  $1, 2, \dots, \ell - 1$  as singletons. If  $s_j$  of these singletons in such a surjection occur as an entry of the remnant of the  $g_j$  row of  $Y$  then the partition term  $a_j > s_j$ . If we reduce all such terms  $a_j$  by  $s_j$ , we get a partition of  $n + k - \ell$  into  $k$  summands.

Going the other direction, given a partition  $a'$ , say  $a'_1 + \dots + a'_k = n + k - \ell$ , form the corresponding surjection  $x_{a'}$  summand of  $TR(Y < 12 \dots \ell - 1 >)$ . We want to construct a partition of  $n + k - 1$  into  $k$  summands that yields a surjection containing  $1, 2, \dots, \ell - 1$  as singletons. In the original table  $Y$ , place a separating bar in all except the last permutation row, just after the permutation entry corresponding to the last entry of the  $a'$  surjection on that row. If  $s_1$  of the desired singletons occur before the separating bar on the first row, increase the partition term  $a'_1$  by  $s_1$ . Then remove those singleton entries from all lower rows in the  $Y$  table. If  $s_2$  of the remaining desired singletons occur before the separating bar on the second row, increase the partition term  $a'_2$  by  $s_2$ . Remove those singleton entries from all lower rows in the  $Y$  table and continue the process in this manner. On the last row there is no separating bar. If  $s_k$  desired singletons remain on the last row, increase  $a'_k$  by  $s_k$ . We have now constructed a partition of  $n + k - 1$  into  $k$  summands for which the corresponding surjection contains  $1, 2, \dots, \ell - 1$  as singletons. The constructions of this paragraph and the preceding paragraph are inverses of each other.

The two paragraphs above describe the correspondence between surjections  $x_a$  and  $x_{a'}$  in terms of partitions  $a$  and  $a'$ . But it is easy to directly see the correspondence in terms of the Berger-Fresse row form of surjections. Given  $x_a$  in row form in which  $1, 2, \dots, \ell - 1$  occur as singletons, simply remove those singletons to form  $x_{a'}$ . These singletons occur before the caesura entries on the rows of  $x_a$ , or on the last row. Given  $x_{a'}$  in row form, insert the singletons  $1, 2, \dots, \ell - 1$  in front of the caesura entries of  $x_{a'}$  in the positions they *first* occur in front of an  $x_{a'}$  caesura in the corresponding row of the original  $Y$  table, or on the last row.  $\square$

**Remark 16.4.** The statements of Proposition 16.2 and Lemma 16.3 have direct analogues for the maps  $tr: N_*(E\Sigma_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$  and  $TR: N_*(E\Sigma_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ . But now the surjection summands  $x_a$ , which turn out to be the same as the surjection summands of  $TR(X)$ , will be accompanied by signs  $\{\pm 1\}$ . Rather than struggle with these signs at the level of tables of permutations, we will exploit the isomorphisms  $\phi: \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n) \simeq \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$  and  $\phi: \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n) \simeq \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$  of the previous section. These isomorphisms are equivariant and commute with the contractions. Thus from Proposition 6.3 and Proposition 6.5(i) of Part I, composing these isomorphisms with  $TR$  will give the equivariant chain maps constructed by the standard procedure between the MacLane model and the other surjection complexes.

**Proposition 16.5.** *The equivariant chain maps  $tr: N_*(E\Sigma_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$  and  $TR: N_*(E\Sigma_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  commuting with contractions are given by*

$$tr(X) = \phi TR(X) = \sum_{\text{partitions } a} p(x_a)x_a \in \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$$

$$TR(X) = \phi TR(X) = \sum_{\text{partitions } a} c(x_a)x_a \in \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n),$$

where the partitions  $a$  and the surjections  $x_a$  are as in Proposition 16.2, and where the signs  $p(x_a)$  and  $c(x_a)$  are as in Proposition 15.5 and Proposition 15.1.  $\square$

**Remark 16.6.** It is relatively easy to give a direct proof of the second formula here, following the steps in the proof of Proposition 16.3. The first step is equivariance, which follows quickly from Lemma 15.4. The second inductive step is also pretty easy, since the coefficients  $c(x_a)$  defined in terms of caesura shuffles behave very simply when singletons are dropped from surjection generators. The coefficients  $p(x_a)$  in the first formula in Proposition 16.5 are much harder to deal with directly.  $\square$

## 16.2 The Maps $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n), \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n), \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n) \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_n)$

The contraction  $h$  of  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$  defined by  $h(x) = (e, x)$ , along with chosen  $\Sigma_n$  bases of the surjection complexes, yield by the standard procedure of Definition 6.0 of Part I equivariant chain maps  $pr: \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n) \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ ,  $PR: \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ , and  $PR: \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n) \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ . We compute these maps in this section. The initials  $PR$  refer to ‘prisms’. The map  $PR: \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_n)$  agrees with the map called  $TC$  in the Berger-Fresse paper describing a prismatic decomposition of the Barratt-Eccles operad [5]. In the previous subsection we copied the Berger-Fresse terminology  $TR$  for a map they called ‘table reduction’. But we don’t know what their initials  $TC$  were supposed to refer to, so we have chosen to more directly reference prisms.

We have already chosen preferred bases of the three surjection complexes in Remark 15.1. In degree  $k$ , bases consist of surjections  $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n+k})$  such that the initial entries of the values  $1, 2, \dots, n$  in  $b$  occur in that order. From Proposition 15.2 these basis elements are in the kernel, hence also in the image, of the contractions of the three surjection complexes. The maps  $PR$  do not commute with contractions. If they did, by Proposition 6.3 of

Part I the compositions  $PR \circ TR$  would be identities, which is impossible.

In degree 0 the canonical maps defined on permutations  $g \in \Sigma_n$  are the equivariant extensions of  $e \mapsto e$ .<sup>26</sup> One can begin computing recursively the canonical maps in higher degrees, but it is obscure what is happening. So we will give a somewhat lengthy discussion of prisms associated to generators of the surjection complexes and then show that the standard procedure chain maps  $pr$  and  $PR$  are defined in terms of the Eilenberg-Zilber triangulations of these prisms. The prism connection was found by Berger-Fresse [5], although in our opinion prisms are more naturally associated to the McClure-Smith surjection complex. Our approach provides an alternate proof that the formula  $TC$  of Berger-Fresse defines a chain map, but in our view it is more interesting in general to identify chain maps and equivariant chain maps arising elsewhere with maps constructed by the standard procedure.

Given a surjection generator, say  $x: \Delta^{n-1+k} \rightarrow \Delta^{n-1}$ , for  $1 \leq \ell \leq n$  let  $k_\ell$  denote the number of vertices of the domain of  $x$  above vertex  $\ell$  of the base. Then  $n+k = \sum k_\ell$  and  $k = \sum (k_\ell - 1)$ . The inverse images of vertices of the base are simplex faces of the domain,  $x^{-1}(\ell) \simeq \Delta^{k_\ell-1}$ . There is a canonical isomorphism because the vertices of any face of the domain inherit an order from the order of the domain vertices. The full domain simplex is the join of these faces above vertices of the base.

The inverse image under  $x$  of the barycenter of the base is isomorphic to a prism  $\prod_\ell x^{-1}(\ell) \simeq \prod_\ell \Delta^{k_\ell-1}$  of dimension  $k$ , which we call  $Prism(x)$ , discussed in detail in Section 14. Geometrically, the vertices of  $Prism(x)$  are barycenters of  $(n-1)$ -dimensional faces of the domain that map isomorphically to the base. Thus they are named by vertex sequences  $v = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$  of the domain, with each  $v_\ell$  a vertex of the face  $x^{-1}(\ell) \simeq \Delta^{k_\ell-1}$ . Vertices of the prism are also named by sequences  $i = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n)$ , where  $1 \leq i_\ell \leq k_\ell$ . The corresponding vertices  $v_\ell$  of the domain are the  $i_\ell$ -th vertices of the faces  $x^{-1}(\ell)$  in the inherited order.

The vertices of the product prism form a poset, with  $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n) \leq (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n)$  if  $v_\ell \leq w_\ell$  for all  $\ell$ . Equivalently, in the other vertex notation,  $(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n) \leq (j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n)$  if  $i_\ell \leq j_\ell$  for all  $\ell$ . The prism is then triangulated as the poset triangulation of  $\prod_\ell \Delta^{k_\ell-1}$ , which we will also refer

---

<sup>26</sup>So this is  $pr(g) = \tau(g)g$  in  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$  and  $PR(g) = g$  in the other two complexes.

to as the Eilenberg-Zilber triangulation.

There are a few ways to name the maximal  $k$ -dimensional simplices of the triangulated prism. They can be named by sequences of vertices using the second vertex notation

$$(1, 1, \dots, 1) < \dots (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n) \dots < (k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n).$$

There are  $k$  steps, where at each step one of the coordinates increases by one and the others remain unchanged. Thus  $k$ -simplices correspond to integral edge paths of length  $k$  in a box  $\prod_{\ell}[1, 2, \dots, k_{\ell}]$ , as in the discussion of the functorial Eilenberg-Zilber map in Section 8 of Part I.

These edge paths can also be named by a single sequence  $j = (j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k)$  consisting of  $(k_{\ell} - 1)$   $\ell$ 's,  $1 \leq \ell \leq n$ . The index  $j_m$  names the coordinate direction in the box that is increased by one at the  $m^{\text{th}}$  step. Geometrically the  $k$ -simplices of  $Prism(x)$  are embedded in the domain simplex  $\Delta^{n-1+k}$  of  $x$  as the join, or hull, of their corresponding prism vertices, which are barycenters of faces of the domain.

$Prism(x) = \prod \Delta^{k_{\ell}-1}$  is canonically oriented as a product of oriented manifolds. Each  $k$ -simplex of the triangulated prism is thus oriented in two ways, first as a codimension 0 submanifold of the oriented prism and secondly by the ordering of the  $k$ -simplex vertices. The Eilenberg-Zilber triangulation map includes the signs given by comparing the two simplex orientations. As discussed in Section 8 of Part I, the comparison sign can be viewed as the sign of a shuffle permutation or as the parity sign of the area of a collection of unit rectangles spanning the union of the path  $(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k)$  and the path  $(1, \dots, 1, 2, \dots, 2, \dots, n, \dots, n)$  with  $(k_{\ell} - 1)$   $\ell$ 's,  $1 \leq \ell \leq n$ .

Since the vertices of the domain of  $x$  are ordered, each prism vertex yields a permutation. To the vertex  $v = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$  of  $Prism(x)$ , with  $x(v_{\ell}) = \ell$ , we associate a permutation  $\gamma = \gamma_v \in \Sigma_n$  by rewriting the  $v_{\ell}$  in the order they occur in the domain of  $x$ . Thus  $v_{\gamma(1)} < v_{\gamma(2)} < \dots < v_{\gamma(n)}$ . Another way to view the permutation  $\gamma_v$  is to circle the entries  $x(v_{\ell})$  in  $x = (x(1), x(2), \dots, x(n+k))$ . These entries will be the numbers  $1, 2, \dots, n$  in the order given by the permutation  $\gamma_v$ .

For example, if  $x = (2, 1, 2, 3, 4, 2, 3, 1, 5, 4, 1, 2)$  and we use for  $v$  the single occurrence of value 5 and the second occurrence of each value 1,2,3,4, then



$v = (8, 3, 7, 10, 9)$  and the permutation  $\gamma_v = (23154)$ .

We regard the permutation  $\gamma_v$  as a vertex of the simplicial set  $E\Sigma_n$ . Note the simplicial set  $E\Sigma_n$  is just a kind of singular simplicial set canonically associated to a simplex with vertices the elements of  $\Sigma_n$ .<sup>27</sup> By ‘convexity’, the assignment  $v \mapsto \gamma_v$  extends to a map of simplicial sets  $\gamma_x: Prism(x) \rightarrow E\Sigma_n$ . Below we will also use the name  $\gamma_x$  to denote the induced maps on normalized chains and on subcomplexes of the normalized chain complexes. There is some risk to this because  $\gamma_x$  of a non-degenerate prism simplex can be degenerate and these become 0 in the normalized chain complex. But context makes this pretty harmless.

We use the notation

$$[Prism(x)] = EZ\left(\bigotimes_{\ell} [\Delta^{k_{\ell}-1}]\right) \in N_*\left(\prod_{\ell} \Delta^{k_{\ell}-1}\right) = N_*(Prism(x)),$$

in order to write the oriented manifold  $Prism(x)$  as a sum of signed ordered simplices of dimension  $k$ . We now have linear maps from each of the three surjection complexes to  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ , defined on generators by  $x \mapsto \gamma_x[Prism(x)]$ .

**Proposition 16.7.** *The maps*

$$PR: \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n) \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_n) \text{ given by } PR(x) = \gamma_x[Prism(x)]$$

$$PR: \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_n) \text{ given by } PR(x) = c(x)\gamma_x[Prism(x)]$$

$$pr: \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n) \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_n) \text{ given by } pr(x) = p(x)\gamma_x[Prism(x)]$$

are the equivariant chain maps arising from the standard procedures. Here,  $c(x), p(x) \in \{\pm 1\}$  are the signs studied in Section 15.

*Proof.* We only need to prove the first statement. The other two will follow quickly by pre-composing with isomorphisms between surjection complexes established in Section 15.

The first statement is rather easy. The Eilenberg-Zilber triangulation is a chain map. The boundary operator in  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  is the prism boundary formula. The equivariance also follows easily from the  $\Sigma_n$  action in  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}$ , which

---

<sup>27</sup>These vertices are not ordered, but there is a basepoint  $e$ . A singular simplex here means any *simplicial* map from the standard ordered simplex to the simplex with vertices  $\Sigma_n$ .

is given in terms of degree signs of maps that permute factors of a prism. The Eilenberg-Zilber formula also commutes with these signs.

One might think it could still be non-trivial to argue that this equivariant chain map is indeed the map given by the standard procedure. It certainly does not commute with contractions. But, for a basis generator  $b \in \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ , the first entries of  $1, 2, \dots, n$  in  $b$  occur in that order. Therefore the initial vertex of every maximal dimension simplex of  $\gamma_b([Prism(b)])$  is  $(1, 2, \dots, n) = e \in \Sigma_n$ , the identity permutation. By the definition of  $PR$  in terms of the Eilenberg-Zilber triangulation,  $PR(b)$  is a signed sum of such simplices, which are in the image of the contraction of  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ . Therefore the very easy uniqueness result Proposition 6.2 of Part I implies that  $PR$  is necessarily the standard procedure equivariant chain map.

The argument in the paragraph above is also one way to see why the pre-composition of  $PR$  with an isomorphism between surjection complexes also yields a standard procedure map. This is not automatic because  $PR$  does not commute with contractions, and in general compositions of standard procedure maps need not be standard procedure maps. This was discussed following Proposition 6.5 of Part I. But from Proposition 6.5(iii), the fact that the maps between surjection complexes take basis generators to basis generators (up to sign) also implies the compositions with  $PR$  are standard procedure maps.  $\square$

**Remark 16.8.** From Section 15, the sign  $c(x) \in \{\pm 1\}$  in the formula for  $PR: \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_n)$  is determined by the caesuras of  $x$ . Suppose the caesuras of  $x$  regarded as a generator of  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$  are in order  $(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k)$ . Then  $c(x) \in \{\pm 1\}$  is the parity sign of the shuffle permutation in  $\Sigma_k$  that rewrites the  $c_j$  in the order  $(1, \dots, 1, 2, \dots, 2, \dots, n, \dots, n)$ , preserving the order in  $x$  of  $c_j$ 's of the same value.<sup>28</sup> This sign  $c(x)$  is also the Eilenberg-Zilber orientation sign of the maximal dimension  $k$ -simplex of  $Prism(x)$  corresponding to the edge path with the name  $(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k)$ . Its vertices are found by beginning with the permutation given by the first occurrences of  $1, 2, \dots, n$  in  $x$ , then at the  $j^{th}$  step,  $1 \leq j \leq k$ , take the next highest occurrence of the  $c_j$  value. Berger-Fresse call this simplex the *fundamental simplex* of  $Prism(x)$ . We call the simplex corresponding to  $(1, \dots, 1, 2, \dots, 2, \dots, n, \dots, n)$  the *base simplex* of the prism. A base simplex always has orientation sign  $+1$  because an orientation sequence of its tangent vectors is seen to coincide with an

---

<sup>28</sup>If surjection  $x$  contains singletons, not all integers between 1 and  $n$  occur as caesuras.

orientation sequence of tangent vectors of  $Prism(x)$ . The relation between vertex sequences and orientation signs in the Eilenberg-Zilber triangulation is part of the discussion of  $EZ$  map in Example 8.8 of Part I.  $\square$

**Example 16.9.** If  $x = (2, 1, 2, 3, 4, 2, 3, 1, 5, 4, 1, 2)$  then the caesura sequence is  $(2, 1, 2, 3, 4, 2, 1)$ . We calculate  $\gamma_x$  of the fundamental simplex. The initial vertex is  $(2, 1, 3, 4, 5)$ . Then take the second occurrence of 2, giving  $(1, 2, 3, 4, 5)$ . Then move the 1 coordinate, then the 2 coordinate again, then the 3 coordinate, etc. The full fundamental 7-simplex in  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$  is

$$\begin{aligned} &[(2, 1, 3, 4, 5), (1, 2, 3, 4, 5), (2, 3, 4, 1, 5), (3, 4, 2, 1, 5), \\ &(4, 2, 3, 1, 5), (2, 3, 1, 5, 4), (3, 1, 5, 4, 2), (3, 5, 4, 1, 2)]. \end{aligned}$$

The shuffle sign moving the caesura sequence to  $(1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 3, 4)$ , is  $c(x) = (-1)^8 = +1$ . Fundamental simplices are always non-degenerate in  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ . The base simplex vertices, corresponding to the sequence  $(1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 3, 4)$ , are found by the same procedure. In this example  $\gamma_x$  maps the base simplex to a degenerate simplex. The fourth and fifth permutations coincide.  $\square$

We will have occasion to use the following result of Berger-Fresse in Part III when we compare the Barratt-Eccles and surjection operads.

**Proposition 16.10.** *For a generator  $x \in \mathcal{S}_k^{bf}(n)$ , if  $X = (g_0, \dots, g_k)$  is the fundamental simplex summand of  $PR(x)$  then  $TR(X) = x$ . If  $Z$  is any other maximal dimension simplex summand of  $PR(x)$  then  $TR(Z) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* This can certainly be proved by a lot of direct computation, thinking about  $TR$  as a sum over partitions. However, we will use more finesse. There is nothing to prove if  $k = 0$ . By equivariance, we can assume  $x$  is a basis generator of the surjection complex. Then  $g_0 = e$  and each maximal dimension simplex has form  $X = (e, Y) = h_{\Sigma_n}(Y)$ , where  $Y = (g_1, \dots, g_k)$ . Then  $TR(X) = h(TR(Y))$ . If  $k = 1$  then  $x$  is given by inserting one additional entry  $j$  in the identity permutation  $e$ . Then  $X = (e, g_1)$  where  $g_1$  is given by shifting the entry  $j$  in  $e$  to the right. Of course a  $\Delta^1$  prism is its own fundamental simplex. By an easy computation that is essentially a part of Proposition 15.2,  $TR(X) = h(g_1) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-2} i^\ell sr^\ell(g_1) = x$ .

Assume the proposition in degrees less than  $k$ . Any maximal dimension simplex  $X$  is named by a sequence  $(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k)$ , where the  $1 \leq i_\ell \leq n$  are the caesura values of  $x$  in some order. The fundamental simplex corresponds to the ordered sequence  $(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k)$  of caesuras of  $x$ . Since  $x$  is a basis

generator,  $i_1 \geq c_1$ . Let  $x_{j_1}$  denote the first caesura of  $x$  with value  $i_1$ . Then  $Y$  is a maximal dimension simplex of  $PR(d_{j_1}x)$ , corresponding to the sequence  $(i_2, \dots, i_k)$ . Hence by induction  $TR(Y) = d_{j_1}x$  or  $0$ . If  $i_1 > c_1$  then  $hTR(Y) = 0$  in either case, by Proposition 15.2. Hence  $TR(X) = hTR(Y) = 0$ . If  $i_1 = c_1$ , then again by 15.2,  $hd_{j_1}x = x$ . But now  $X$  is fundamental if and only if  $Y$  is fundamental. If fundamental, then  $TR(Y) = d_{j_1}x$  and  $TR(X) = hTR(Y) = x$ . If not fundamental, then  $TR(Y) = 0$  and  $TR(X) = 0$ .  $\square$

**Remark 16.11.** The map  $PR: \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n) \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_n)$  is an associative coalgebra map, that is, it commutes with the standard procedure diagonals. The easiest proof is to look at the appropriate diagram of equivariant chain maps and show both directions around the diagram take basis generators of  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  to elements in the image of the contraction of  $N_*(E\Sigma_n) \otimes N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ . Alternatively, one can use the formulas of Subsection 7.1 and Proposition 8.12 of Part I for the diagonals, and Proposition 16.7 above for  $PR$ . Another proof that  $PR$  is a coalgebra map is given in [23].

The map  $TR: N_*(E\Sigma_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  is not a coalgebra map. For example, if  $Z = ((123), (132), (312))$  is the non-fundamental 2-dimensional simplex of  $Prism(12312)$ , then  $TR(Z) = 0$ , so  $\delta TR(Z) = 0$ . But  $\delta(Z)$  contains the summand  $((123), (132)) \otimes ((132), (312))$ . Applying  $TR \otimes TR$  yields  $((1232) \otimes (1312)) \neq 0$ .  $\square$

### 16.3 Further Results on the maps $TR$ and $PR$

In this final subsection of Section 16 we want to record some other interesting observations concerning the maps  $TR, PR$  made by Berger-Fresse in [5]. The discussions and examples in this subsection are not central to our overall goals, but we found the issues involved to be quite interesting. The details are rather intricate and lengthy. There would be no loss of continuity skipping to Section 17 that begins Part III.

We look at three issues. We investigate some geometric cell complexes underlying the algebraic chain maps  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n) \xrightarrow{PR} N_*(E\Sigma_n) \xrightarrow{TR} \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ . Of course Berger-Fresse used their complex  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$ , but the McClure-Smith complex seems more natural. We find interesting comparisons between the cell structures underlying  $PR$  and  $TR$  and cell structures underlying the maps  $M_* \xrightarrow{\phi} N_*(EC) \xrightarrow{\pi} M_*$  for the minimal model and MacLane model for the cyclic group from Section 6 of Part I. We also relate the maps  $PR$  and

$TR$  to the Eilenberg-Zilber and Alexander-Whitney maps for prisms, that is, products of simplices,  $\otimes N_*(\Delta^{m_\ell-1}) \xrightarrow{EZ} N_*(\prod \Delta^{m_\ell-1}) \xrightarrow{AW} \otimes N_*(\Delta^{m_\ell-1})$ .

The next several remarks, propositions, and examples, are related to the very final statements of [5]. However, we find their discussion rather brief.

**Remark 16.12.** Every  $k$ -simplex  $Z \in E\Sigma_n$  belongs to the image of some prism, in fact, many prisms. For example, say  $Z = (g_0, g_1, \dots, g_k)$ , a sequence of permutations. Regard the concatenation  $z = g_0g_1 \dots g_k$  as a surjection in  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$ , of degree  $n(k+1)$ . If the first entry of  $g_{i+1}$  equals the last entry of  $g_i$ , remove one of those entries so that the resulting surjection is non-degenerate. Then one sees  $Z$  as the simplex summand of  $PR(z)$  corresponding roughly to taking the first entries of all  $j$ -values of  $z$ , then the second entries of all  $j$ -values, and so on. A simple modification is needed in cases where the initial concatenation has duplicated entries.  $\square$

We want to be more precise about a certain issue. First, the chain complex  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  is the chain complex associated to an explicit geometric cell complex with open cells the interiors of prisms, as explained in Remark 14.4. How are the cells of that complex related to images of prisms that cover the geometric realization  $|E\Sigma_n|$  by the maps  $\gamma_x: Prism(x) \rightarrow E\Sigma_n$  of Subsection 16.2?

The cells of the prism cell structure are named by the generators  $x$  of  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ , and we think of the open cells as interiors of the  $Prism(x)$ 's. These cells are canonically oriented. But some of the codimension one prism boundary faces become degenerate algebraically in the surjection complex. So the topology of the resulting cell complex is defined by identifying common boundary faces of prisms, and also by collapsing some codimension one boundary faces of  $Prism(x)$  to codimension two boundary faces by deleting one of a pair of equal adjacent entries in degenerate boundary prism faces. The interiors of cells are interiors of prisms, and the closures are obtained as just described. In Remark 14.4 we gave a global description of this cell complex as the inverse image of the barycenter under the tautological map  $\chi: |SS(\Delta^{n-1})| \rightarrow \Delta^{n-1}$ , where  $|SS(\Delta^{n-1})|$  is the geometric realization of the singular complex consisting of simplicial maps from simplices to  $\Delta^{n-1}$ . The boundary operator in the associated chain complex is the McClure-Smith boundary. The Eilenberg-Zilber triangulation of prisms induces the structure of an  $s\Delta$ -complex<sup>29</sup> on this cell complex for  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ .

<sup>29</sup>  $s\Delta$ -complexes are defined in an appendix in Hatcher's topology text [12].  $\Delta$ -complexes

It is much more unclear if the collection of images in  $|E\Sigma_n|$  of the closed cells has a clean global geometric interpretation. Examples show that an intersection can contain simplices interior to both prisms. It is also possible for boundary intersections to consist of less than full boundary prism faces, and for general intersections to contain some interior simplices of one of the prisms and some partial boundary faces of the other.

Here is our precise statement about how prisms intersect. The picture is geometrically pretty clear in the case that both maps  $\gamma_x, \gamma_y$  are injective on the respective prisms  $Prism(x), Prism(y)$ . In general these maps can be non-injective on vertices and many simplices in the prisms can map to degenerate simplices. The shape of the images of cells and the intersection picture then becomes more obscure.

**Proposition 16.13.** *Let  $V(x, y)$  denote the collections of vertices in  $E\Sigma_n$  in the images of both prisms. Then let  $Hull_x(V(x, y))$  and  $Hull_y(V(x, y))$  denote all the simplices in the images of the Eilenberg-Zilber triangulation of the respective prisms whose vertices belong to  $V(x, y)$ . Then*

$$\gamma_x(Prism(x)) \cap \gamma_y(Prism(y)) = Hull_x(V(x, y)) \cap Hull_y(V(x, y)).$$

**Example 16.14.** Let  $x = (123143)$  and  $y = (121343)$ . Both prisms are isomorphic to  $\Delta^1 \times \Delta^0 \times \Delta^1 \times \Delta^0$ . There are three vertices in common in the two images,  $(1234), (1243), (2143)$ . The fourth vertices are distinct,  $(2314)$  and  $(2134)$ . The boundary intersection consists of two intervals from each rectangular prism, but both hulls contain the interior triangle  $((1234), (1243), (2143))$ .

If  $x' = (1231431)$  and  $y' = (1213431)$  then both prisms are isomorphic to  $\Delta^2 \times \Delta^0 \times \Delta^1 \times \Delta^0$ . Five of the six vertices of the image prisms are shared. The boundary intersection consists of one triangular face, one rectangular face, and one triangle in the rectangular faces  $x \subset x'$  and  $y \subset y'$ . There is also an interior tetrahedron in common.

The intersection of the prisms of  $x$  and  $y'$  consists of an interior triangle in the rectangle  $Prism(x)$ , which is part of a boundary rectangle of  $Prism(y')$ .  $\square$

---

are CW complexes whose characteristic cells are standard simplices and whose attaching maps are strict order preserving simplicial maps on boundary faces.  $s\Delta$ -complexes allow weakly order preserving attaching maps on boundary faces, hence allow collapsing simplices to lower dimension simplices.

We generally think of  $E\Sigma_n$  as a simplicial set. But it has a geometric realization, which is an  $s\Delta$ -complex. The prisms of the cell structure underlying  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$ , which collapse somewhat on boundaries, map to unions of simplices in the geometric realization  $|E\Sigma_n|$ . These images, which exhibit much additional collapsing, are contractible cells. Each such contains a unique fundamental simplex of maximal dimension. These cells can intersect in interior simplices, but the intersections are contractible subcomplexes. So we have some kind of variant of a ‘cell complex’, structure on  $|E\Sigma_n|$ , with cells parametrized by fundamental simplices. The symmetric group acts freely on the cell structures of both  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  and  $|E\Sigma_n|$ , and the equivariant boundary operators agree on the chain complexes underlying the two collapsed prism cell structures. Thus these algebraic chain complexes are isomorphic, although the geometry of the cells and their intersections in  $|E\Sigma_n|$  is complicated.  $\square$

We now take up another topic. The Berger-Fresse remarks at the end of [5] hint at a relation between  $TR$  and the Alexander-Whitney map  $AW$  that we find quite surprising and interesting. We find it slightly more convenient to use the McClure-Smith version of the surjection complex in our next proposition.

**Proposition 16.15.** *Let  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{n+m}) \in \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  be a generator. Say  $Prism(x) = \prod_{\ell=1}^n \Delta^{m_\ell-1}$ ,  $\sum m_\ell = m$ . Then there is a commutative diagram of chain maps*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\bigotimes N_*(\Delta^{m_\ell-1}) & \xrightarrow{EZ} & N_*(\prod \Delta^{m_\ell-1}) & \xrightarrow{AW_x} & \bigotimes N_*(\Delta^{m_\ell-1}) \\
\downarrow \gamma_x & & \downarrow \gamma_x & & \downarrow \gamma_x \\
\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n) & \xrightarrow{PR} & N_*(E\Sigma_n) & \xrightarrow{TR} & \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)
\end{array}$$

*The map  $AW_x$  is canonically chain homotopic to  $AW$ . If the fundamental simplex of  $Prism(x)$  coincides with the base simplex, then  $AW_x = AW$ .*

*Proof.* We will clarify the vertical maps  $\gamma_x$  below. Before we begin the proof we point out that if  $x'$  is a non-degenerate boundary face of  $x$  of any codimension then there is an obvious commutative diagram that maps the diagram for  $x'$  to the diagram for  $x$ . Also, in the diagram for  $x$  there is no  $\Sigma_n$  action on the top row. But there is a commutative diagram mapping the diagram for  $x$  to the diagram for  $gx$ . At each node the connecting map is an action of  $g$ , hence an isomorphism. For the tensor complexes in the top rows, there are Koszul signs in the  $g$  maps that permute tensor factors.

There are no signs in the  $g$  maps between normalized chain complexes of products of simplices that permute simplex factors.

Suppose  $\tilde{Y}$  is a  $k$ -simplex of  $Prism(x)$ , with the  $EZ$  triangulation, Then  $\tilde{Y}$  corresponds to a  $(k + 1) \times n$  matrix. The rows are vertices of  $Prism(x)$  whose entries are named by tuples consisting of one vertex from each prism factor simplex. We record the entry in the  $i^{th}$  row and  $\ell^{th}$  column as an integer between 1 and  $m_\ell$ . That is, we name the vertices of the prism factors  $\Delta^{m_\ell-1}$  beginning with 1 rather than 0. The entries reading down a column are non-decreasing. The columns are  $k$ -simplices of the factors  $\Delta^{m_\ell-1}$ . These individual column simplices are typically degenerate.

The vertical arrows  $\gamma_x$  exploit the total order on the set of factor vertices of  $Prism(x)$ . The center arrow assigns to each row of  $\tilde{Y}$  a permutation in  $\Sigma_n$ , as part of the  $PR$  map. The left and right arrows take a tensor product of faces of simplices to the element of  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  obtained as the subsequence of  $x$  given by the vertices of those faces. The maps  $\gamma_x$  are chain maps and the left square commutes because we are using the McClure-Smith surjection complex, which is especially tuned to prisms. There are hidden signs in the  $TR$  map, which would disappear if we were to use  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}$ , but then signs would appear in the  $PR$  map and one would need to put signs in front of the left and right  $\gamma_x$  map as well.

We will now define  $AW_x$ . We view  $Y = \gamma_x(\tilde{Y})$  is a table of permutations. In the McClure-Smith complex  $TR(Y) = \sum c(y_a)y_a$  where the  $y_a$  are surjections parametrized by partitions  $a_0 + \dots + a_k = n + k$ , and the signs  $c(y_a)$  are as in Proposition 16.5. But  $\tilde{Y}$  contains more information than the table of permutations  $Y$ . Specifically, an entry in the  $i^{th}$  row of  $\tilde{Y}$  is in a column  $\ell$ , which is a value of  $x$ , and the entry itself records the position of that value in  $x$ . That is, the first value of  $\ell$ , or the second value of  $\ell$ , etc, Thus, we can enhance the table of permutations  $Y = \gamma_x(\tilde{Y})$  by putting a subscript on each permutation entry value that records the relative position in  $x$  of that entry value. We call the enhanced table of permutations  $\hat{Y}$ .

Then to each partition  $a$  associated to the table reduction of  $Y = \gamma_x(\tilde{Y})$  we calculate the surjection summand  $c(y_a)y_a$  of  $TR(Y)$ , following the method of Proposition 16.2. The entries of  $y_a$  retain their subscripts from  $\hat{Y}$ . We denote by  $\hat{y}_a$  these enhanced surjection terms and set  $TR(\hat{Y}) = \sum c(y_a)\hat{y}_a$ . Using the subscripts of repeated values of the entries of  $\hat{y}_a$ , we associate a tensor of faces of simplex factors,  $\tilde{y}_a \in \bigotimes N_*(\Delta^{m_\ell-1})$ , and then observe



$y_a = \gamma_x(\tilde{y}_a)$ . (See Example 16.17 below for specific illustrations of this procedure.) We then set

$$AW_x(\tilde{Y}) = \sum_a c(y_a)\tilde{y}_a.$$

Clearly the right square in the diagram in Proposition 16.15 commutes,  $\gamma_x \circ AW_x(\tilde{Y}) = \sum c(y_a)y_a = TR \circ \gamma_x(\tilde{Y})$ . The tensor factors of  $\tilde{y}_a$  might or might not be degenerate, and then after that the image of the full tensor  $\tilde{y}_a$  under  $\gamma_x$  might or might not be degenerate.

**Remark 16.16.** Early on in [5] Berger and Fresse remark without discussion that given two surjection generators  $x, y$ , if  $\gamma_y Prism(y) \subset \gamma_x Prism(x)$  then  $y$  is a subsequence of  $x$ , that is, a face of  $x$ . The converse is obvious. But a stronger statement than theirs follows easily from Proposition 16.10 and the construction of  $AW_x$ . If the fundamental simplex of  $\gamma_y Prism(y)$  belongs to  $\gamma_x Prism(x)$  then  $y$  is a face of  $x$ . Namely, if the fundamental simplex is  $Y = \gamma_x(\tilde{Y})$ , then  $TR(Y) = y$  and by construction  $AW_x(\tilde{Y})$  identifies a tensor that names a face of  $x$  coinciding with  $y$ .  $\square$

Why is  $AW_x$  a chain map? Both  $EZ$  and  $PR$  are injective chain maps, hence if the center  $\gamma_x$  map is injective then so is the left and right  $\gamma_x$  map. Commutativity of the diagram then implies  $AW_x$  is a chain map. One can insert new singleton entries in any  $x$ , forming some  $x'$ , and arrange that the center map is injective on vertices, which implies it is injective on all simplices. Thus  $AW_{x'}$  is a chain map.

Adding singletons only changes the prism by adding  $\Delta^0$  factors. The image of the top row of the diagram in the bottom row only sees subcomplexes generated by  $x$  and its faces. The top row of the diagram for the new enlarged  $x'$  is isomorphic to the original top row for  $x$ . Looking carefully at the relevant table reductions, one sees that  $AW_x$  and  $AW_{x'}$  are also identified. Thus  $AW_x$  is a chain map for any  $x$ .

Why do we use the notation  $AW_x$ ? The Alexander-Whitney map  $AW$  is another map in the top row of the diagram with the same domain and range. Both maps are essentially identity maps in degree 0. Following a remark at the beginning of Section 9 of Part I, there is a canonical chain homotopy  $H_x$  between  $AW_x$  and  $AW$  given in terms of the contraction  $h_\otimes$  of the range. On generators  $\tilde{Y}$  of the domain of degree 0,  $H_x = 0$ . In higher degrees

$$H_x(\tilde{Y}) = h_\otimes(AW_x(\tilde{Y}) - AW(\tilde{Y}) - H_x(d\tilde{Y})).$$

Then by induction  $dH_x(\tilde{Y}) + H_x d(\tilde{Y}) = AW_x(\tilde{Y}) - AW(\tilde{Y})$ . We do not know a closed formula for  $H_x$ , but the map  $AW_x$  that lifts  $TR$  can be viewed as some kind of twisting of the Alexander-Whitney map  $AW$ , related to the order of the caesuras of  $x$ . One has of course  $AW \circ EZ = Id$ . It also holds that  $AW_x \circ EZ = Id$ .

For maximal dimension simplex generators  $\tilde{X}$  of the domain  $Prism(x)$ , all summands of the multidagonal formula  $AW(\tilde{X})$  are zero unless  $\tilde{X}$  is the base simplex. In that case, exactly one multidagonal summand is non-zero, and returns the value  $\tilde{x}$ , which means the tensor of all simplex factors of  $Prism(x)$ . On the other hand, all summands of  $AW_x(\tilde{X})$  are zero unless  $\tilde{X}$  is the fundamental simplex of  $Prism(x)$ . In that case, exactly one summand is non-zero and returns the value  $c(x)\tilde{x}$ . This behavior of  $AW_x$  on maximal dimension simplices of course exactly matches the behavior of  $TR$  on  $X = \gamma_x(\tilde{X})$  from Proposition 16.10.

For any  $x$  and for  $\tilde{Y}$  of any degree there is a fairly natural bijection between the multidagonal partitions that determine summands of  $AW(\tilde{Y})$  and the partitions that determine summands of  $TR(Y)$ , or equivalently  $AW_x(\tilde{Y})$ . But the relation between this bijection and the two formulas seems obscure. In general not even the number of non-zero summands in the two cases, which typically are very few, need agree. Even when the number of non-zero summands does coincide, one does not expect  $AW(\tilde{Y})$  to equal  $AW_x(\tilde{Y})$ , unless the base simplex and fundamental simplex of  $Prism(x)$  coincide.

**Example 16.17.** Let  $x = (3123413)$ , so as an abstract prism

$$Prism(x) \simeq \Delta^1 \times \Delta^0 \times \Delta^2 \times \Delta^0 \simeq \{1, 2\} \times \{1\} \times \{1, 2, 3\} \times \{1\}.$$

There are two triangular boundary prism faces corresponding to the prisms of  $d_2x = (323413)$  and  $d_6x = (312343)$ . There are three rectangular faces on the boundary corresponding to the prisms of  $d_1x = (123413)$ ,  $d_4x = (312413)$ ,  $d_7x = (312341)$ . Base simplices equal fundamental simplices except for  $d_4x$  and  $d_7x$ , and of course for  $x$  itself.

In degree 0 both maps in the top row of the diagram in Proposition 16.12 are essentially identities, as are the two maps in the bottom row. There are twelve 1-simplices in  $Prism(x)$ . Nine of them are edges of the boundary prisms of  $x$ , which are themselves simple prisms. Calculation of all the maps in the diagram is rather simple for these. The compositions in the two rows

of the diagram are identities and  $AW = AW_x$  for  $\Delta^1$  prisms.

The other three 1-simplices are diagonals of the rectangular boundary face prisms. We make some calculations for the diagonal of  $Prism(d_1x) = Prism(123413)$ , which in  $Prism(x) = Prism(3123413)$  is named by

$$\tilde{Y} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 & 3 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \gamma_x(\tilde{Y}) = Y = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 2 & 4 & 1 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \quad \hat{Y} = \begin{bmatrix} 1_1 & 2_1 & 3_2 & 4_1 \\ 2_1 & 4_1 & 1_2 & 3_3 \end{bmatrix}$$

We see  $TR(\hat{Y}) = 1_1 2_1 3_2 4_1 3_3 + 1_1 2_1 4_1 1_2 3_3$  and then

$$AW(\tilde{Y}) = 1 \otimes 1 \otimes 23 \otimes 1 + 12 \otimes 1 \otimes 3 \otimes 1 = AW_x(\tilde{Y}), \quad H_x(\tilde{Y}) = 0.$$

This example is simple because the base simplex coincides with the fundamental simplex for  $d_1x = 123413$ .

More interesting is the diagonal of  $Prism(d_4x) = Prism(312413)$ . In  $Prism(x) = Prism(3123413)$  this is named by

$$\tilde{Y}' = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 & 3 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \gamma_x(\tilde{Y}') = Y = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 1 & 2 & 4 \\ 2 & 4 & 1 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \quad \hat{Y}' = \begin{bmatrix} 3_1 & 1_1 & 2_1 & 4_1 \\ 2_1 & 4_1 & 1_2 & 3_3 \end{bmatrix}$$

We see  $TR(\hat{Y}') = 3_1 2_1 4_1 1_2 3_3 + 3_1 1_1 2_1 4_1 1_2$  and

$$AW_x(\tilde{Y}') = 2 \otimes 1 \otimes 13 \otimes 1 + 12 \otimes 1 \otimes 1 \otimes 1.$$

We also see

$$AW(\tilde{Y}') = 1 \otimes 1 \otimes 13 \otimes 1 + 12 \otimes 1 \otimes 3 \otimes 1$$

$$H_x(\tilde{Y}') = h_{\otimes}(AW_x(\tilde{Y}') - AW(\tilde{Y}')) = 12 \otimes 1 \otimes 13 \otimes 1.$$

So  $H_x(\tilde{Y}')$  is the tensor form of the rectangular prism face of  $Prism(x)$  corresponding to  $d_4x$  and  $AW_x(\tilde{Y}') - AW(\tilde{Y}')$  is its boundary.

The fundamental simplex of  $d_4x$  is named in  $Prism(x) = Prism(3123413)$  by

$$\tilde{Z} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 3 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 & 3 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \gamma_x(\tilde{Z}) = Z = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 1 & 2 & 4 \\ 1 & 2 & 4 & 3 \\ 2 & 4 & 1 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \quad \hat{Z} = \begin{bmatrix} 3_1 & 1_1 & 2_1 & 4_1 \\ 1_1 & 2_1 & 4_1 & 3_3 \\ 2_1 & 4_1 & 1_2 & 3_3 \end{bmatrix}$$

We see  $AW(\tilde{Z}) = 0$  and  $TR(\hat{Z}) = (-1)3_1 1_1 2_1 4_1 1_2 3_3$ . Then  $AW_x(\tilde{Z}) = (-1)12 \otimes 1 \otimes 13 \otimes 1$ . The sign is from the single non-zero term  $z_a = 312413$ ,

with  $c(z_a) = -1$ .

The base simplex of  $d_4x$  is

$$\widetilde{Z}' = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 & 3 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \gamma_x(\widetilde{Z}') = Z' = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 1 & 2 & 4 \\ 3 & 2 & 4 & 1 \\ 2 & 4 & 1 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \quad \widehat{Z}' = \begin{bmatrix} 3_1 & 1_1 & 2_1 & 4_1 \\ 3_1 & 2_1 & 4_1 & 1_2 \\ 2_1 & 4_1 & 1_2 & 3_3 \end{bmatrix}$$

We see  $AW(\widetilde{Z}') = 12 \otimes 1 \otimes 13 \otimes 1$  and  $TR(\widehat{Z}') = 0$ ,  $AW_x(\widetilde{Z}') = 0$ .

We will do one more computation for an interior 2-simplex of  $Prism(x)$ .

$$\widetilde{Z}'' = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 & 3 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \gamma_x(\widetilde{Z}'') = Z'' = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 1 & 2 & 4 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 2 & 4 & 1 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \quad \widehat{Z}'' = \begin{bmatrix} 3_1 & 1_1 & 2_1 & 4_1 \\ 1_1 & 2_1 & 3_2 & 4_1 \\ 2_1 & 4_1 & 1_2 & 3_3 \end{bmatrix}$$

Then  $AW(\widetilde{Z}'') = 1 \otimes 1 \otimes 123 \otimes 1$ . Also  $TR(\widehat{Z}'') = 3_1 1_1 2_1 3_2 4_1 3_3 + 3_1 1_1 2_1 4_1 1_2 3_3$ , so  $AW_x(\widetilde{Z}'') = 1 \otimes 1 \otimes 123 \otimes 1 + 12 \otimes 1 \otimes 13 \otimes 1$ . Then

$$H_x(\widetilde{Z}'') = h_\otimes(AW_x(\widetilde{Z}'') - AW(\widetilde{Z}'') - H_x(d\widetilde{Z}'')).$$

We have already computed  $H_x$  on the three boundary edges of  $\widetilde{Z}''$ . The only non-zero result is  $H_x(\widetilde{Y}') = 12 \otimes 1 \otimes 13 \otimes 1$ . Thus  $H_x(\widetilde{Z}'') = h_\otimes(0) = 0$ . This example shows that for interior simplices of prisms the relation between  $AW$  and  $AW_x$  is pretty obscure if the base simplex and fundamental simplex of  $Prism(x)$  do not coincide.  $\square$

It can happen, although it is somewhat rare, that the fundamental simplex and base simplex of  $Prism(x)$  do coincide. Examples are  $x = (1234321)$  and  $x = (151262343214)$ . The caesuras must occur in non-decreasing order. In such a case note that the same situation holds for all prism faces of  $Prism(x)$ . For these  $x$  it turns out that  $AW_x(\widetilde{Y}) = AW(\widetilde{Y})$  for all  $\widetilde{Y}$ . The surprising point is that this holds for *every* simplex of  $Prism(x)$ , not just for the fundamental simplex which coincides with the base simplex.

By composing with a permutation in  $\Sigma_n$ , there is no loss of generality assuming the caesura entry values of  $\widetilde{Y}$  are  $1, \dots, \ell$  and the singleton entry values occur in the order  $\ell + 1, \dots, n$ . It is a rather amazing fact that there is any connection at all between table reduction and the Alexander-Whitney map. We sketch a proof of the last statement of Proposition 16.14.

We form a bijection between the non-zero summands of  $AW(\widetilde{Y})$  and  $AW_x(\widetilde{Y})$ . Given the  $(k+1) \times n$  matrix  $\widetilde{Y}$ , a non-zero summand of  $AW(\widetilde{Y})$  is named

by a sequence of integers  $1 \leq i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_k \leq \ell$  where the  $i_j$  name the columns where one drops down one row in a path connecting the upper left entry to the lower right entry of  $\tilde{Y}$ . When one drops down a row, the entry in that column must increase. We associate to such a path a summand of  $AW_x(\tilde{Y})$ . These can be named by partitions  $a_0 + \dots + a_k = n + k$ . But they can also be named by simply indicating the last (caesura) entries in the first  $k$  rows of the table form of the enhanced surjection generators  $\hat{y}_a$ . These are computed from the enhanced permutation matrix  $\hat{Y}$ , using the partition  $a$  and the method of Proposition 16.2. All the signs  $c(y_a) = +1$  because the caesuras of  $x$  and all its faces occur in increasing order. It is also an exercise using this hypothesis that the tensors  $\tilde{y}_a$  occurring in the formula for  $AW_x(\tilde{Y})$  that arise from non-zero  $AW(\tilde{Y})$  summands are non-zero.

Going the other direction, given a partition  $a$  that determines a non-zero summand of  $AW_x(\tilde{Y})$ , we take the  $i_j$  to be the caesura entry values of the associated enhanced surjection generator  $\hat{y}_a$ . Again, the hypothesis implies the resulting  $AW(\tilde{Y})$  summand is non-zero. □

**Example 16.18.** Consider  $x = (151262343214)$ . We look at the following 3-simplex in  $Prism(x)$ .

$$\tilde{Y} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 3 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \hat{Y} = \begin{bmatrix} 1_1 & 5_1 & 6_1 & 2_2 & 3_1 & 4_1 \\ 5_1 & 1_2 & 6_1 & 2_2 & 3_1 & 4_1 \\ 5_1 & 1_2 & 6_1 & 3_1 & 4_1 & 2_3 \\ 5_1 & 6_1 & 3_2 & 2_3 & 1_3 & 4_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

There are two sequences of column moves that produce non-zero  $AW(\tilde{Y})$  terms, namely 123 and 124. These yield the tensor terms

$$12 \otimes 23 \otimes 12 \otimes 2 \otimes 1 \otimes 1 \quad \text{and} \quad 12 \otimes 23 \otimes 1 \otimes 12 \otimes 1 \otimes 1.$$

On the  $\hat{Y}$  side, we compute the summands of  $TR(\hat{Y})$  with caesura entries  $1_1, 2_2, 3_1$  and  $1_1, 2_2, 4_1$ , respectively, in the first three rows. The results are

$$(1_1 5_1 1_2 6_1 2_2 3_1 3_2 2_3 4_2) \quad \text{and} \quad (1_1 5_1 1_2 6_1 2_2 3_1 4_1 2_3 4_2),$$

which yield the same tensors as the  $AW(\tilde{Y})$  calculation. Note the first of these tensors maps by  $\gamma_x$  to a degenerate surjection element  $(151623324)$ , while the second maps to  $TR\gamma_x(\tilde{Y}) = (151623424)$ . □

**Remark 16.19.** We now take up another interesting aspect of the pair of maps  $PR$  and  $TR$ . We know for very simple reasons the fact that  $TR$  commutes with contractions implies  $TR \circ PR = Id$ . This is part of Proposition 6.3 of Part I. The dichotomy from Proposition 16.10 that  $TR(X) = x$  for one summand of  $PR(x)$  and  $TR(Y) = 0$  for all other summands of  $PR(x)$  is analogous to the situation for the two maps  $\phi: M_* \rightarrow N_*(EC_n)$  and  $\pi: N_*(EC_n) \rightarrow M_*$  with  $\pi \circ \phi = Id$ , for the minimal model and MacLane model of the cyclic group, from Section 6 of Part I. In that case the dichotomy was forced because there were no signs and thus no possible cancellation in the double sum formula for  $\pi\phi(y) = y$ . There are signs in the map  $PR$ , so possible cancellations could have occurred.

It might seem somewhat mysterious why these two pairs of maps share such similar properties. But there are strong geometric similarities. The minimal complex  $M_*$  is the chain complex of a cell complex, with  $n$  cells  $T^i y_k$  in each dimension  $k$  with known descriptions as triangulated geometric cells. In fact, in even dimensions the cells have the form  $T^i e_k * S^{2k-1}$ ,  $0 \leq k$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ , which is a  $2k$ -disk<sup>30</sup>, and in odd dimensions the cells have the form of a join with an interval  $[T^i e_k, T^{i+1} e_k] * S^{2k-1}$ , which is a  $2k+1$  disk. The  $T^i e_k$  are vertices. The spheres  $S^{2k-1}$ ,  $1 \leq k$ , are triangulated as simplicial sets as ordered iterated joins of  $k$  circles, with the  $j^{th}$  circle for  $0 \leq j \leq k-1$  triangulated with  $n$  vertices  $T^i e_j$  and  $n$  edges  $[T^i e_j, T^{i+1} e_j]$ . These triangulated cells are analogous to the triangulated prisms that map to  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ .

The explicit map  $\phi: M_* \rightarrow N_*(EC)$  from Section 6 of Part I can be interpreted as a ‘lensmatic decomposition’ of  $N_*(EC)$  analogous to the Berger-Fresse interpretation of the map  $PR: S_*^{bf}(n) \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_n)$  as a ‘prismatic decomposition’ [5]. Precisely, each vertex  $T^i e_j$  of a triangulated cell of  $M_*$  maps to the vertex  $T^i$  of  $EC_n$ . By convexity, the map on vertices extends to the simplices of the triangulated cells, and then to normalized chain complexes of the triangulated cells. The result yields the map  $\phi: M_* \rightarrow N_*(EC_n)$  given on generators  $y_{2k} = e_k * S^{2k-1}$  of  $M_*$  and  $y_{2k+1} = [e_k, T e_k] * S^{2k-1}$  by the formulas in Proposition 6.13 of Part I. These generators  $y_j \in M_*$  are interpreted as the sums of the maximal dimension simplices of the corresponding triangulated cells. It turns out there are no orientation signs needed as there are in the  $EZ$  map for prisms. This is because the natural orientations of the simplices as ordered iterated joins of points

---

<sup>30</sup>If  $k = 0$  the sphere  $S^{2k-1}$  is empty, but join with the empty set is the identity operation.

and intervals agrees with the full cell orientations. Some of the simplices of the triangulated cells map to degenerate simplices in  $EC_n$ . These match the degeneracies seen in the recursive formulas  $\phi(y_\ell) = h_C \phi(dy_\ell)$  from Section 6.

Every simplex of  $EC_n$  is in the image of various triangulated cells  $y_\ell$ . For example, consider  $\sigma = (T^{a_0} T^{a_1} \dots T^{a_k})$ , with  $a_{j+1} \neq a_j$ . Form the concatenation

$$(T^{a_0} T^{a_0+1} T^{a_1} T^{a_1+1} \dots T^{a_k} T^{a_k+1}).$$

If all  $a_j \neq a_{j-1} + 1$  this will be the image of a codimension 1 simplex in the triangulated  $y_{2k+2}$  if  $a_0 \neq 1$  and the image of a codimension 0 simplex in the triangulated  $y_{2k+1}$  if  $a_0 = 1$ . If some  $a_j = a_{j-1} + 1$ , delete pairs  $T^{a_j} T^{a_j+1}$  from the concatenation. Call the resulting non-degenerate simplex  $\hat{\sigma}$ . Then  $\sigma$  is a face of  $\hat{\sigma}$ . This construction is analogous to a previous argument that all simplices of  $E\Sigma_n$  belong to prisms associated to surjection generators.  $\square$

**Remark 16.20.** There are also analogues of fundamental simplices in the  $M_*$  case. The proof of Proposition 16.10 above shows that the fundamental simplices of the  $Prism(x)$ 's can be defined by induction and equivariance, using the fact that  $TR$  commutes with contractions. Back in Section 6 of Part I, we identified the analogous fundamental simplices  $\sigma_{2k} = (1, T^{n-1}, 1, \dots, T^{n-1}, 1)$  and  $\sigma_{2k+1} = (1, T, \dots, 1, T)$  associated to the  $y_{2k}$  and  $y_{2k+1}$  by directly analyzing the formula for the retraction  $\pi: N_*(EC_n) \rightarrow M_*$ . We showed  $\pi(\sigma_{2k}) = y_{2k}$  and  $\pi(\sigma_{2k+1}) = y_{2k+1}$  and  $\pi$  vanishes on all other simplex summands of the  $\phi(y_j)$ . This is analogous to a proof of Proposition 16.10 that would directly use the sum over partitions formula for the retraction  $TR: N_*(E\Sigma_n) \rightarrow S_*^{bf}(n)$ . But we can also give an inductive proof in the  $\pi: N_*(EC_n) \rightarrow M_*$  case, using the same method we used for Proposition 16.10 above.

Note  $\sigma_{2k} = h_C(T^{n-1}\sigma_{2k-1})$  and  $\sigma_{2k+1} = h_C(T\sigma_{2k})$ . The main point now is that  $\pi$  is equivariant and commutes with contractions. The inductions go

$$\pi(\sigma_{2k}) = \pi h_C(T^{n-1}\sigma_{2k-1}) = h_M \pi(T^{n-1}\sigma_{2k-1}) = h_M(T^{n-1}y_{2k-1}) = y_{2k}$$

and

$$\pi(\sigma_{2k+1}) = \pi h_C(T\sigma_{2k}) = h_M \pi(T\sigma_{2k}) = h_M(Ty_{2k}) = y_{2k+1}.$$

Non-fundamental simplex summands of the  $\phi(y_j)$  also pair up in adjacent dimensions and the same inductions imply  $\pi$  vanishes on these. Again, this is similar to the non-fundamental simplex part of Proposition 16.10.  $\square$

### III: The Barratt-Eccles and Surjection Operads

#### 17 The Functorial Chain Map $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$

In this section we return to our main program and recover the Berger-Fresse equivariant functorial chain map of [3],

$$\phi: \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n},$$

as a special case of the explicit equivariant functorial acyclic model construction discussed in Section 8 of Part I. We can replace  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$  by  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$  or  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  by composing with the isomorphisms between surjection complexes constructed in Section 15, since up to sign these isomorphisms preserve the chosen basis elements. It is somewhat trickier but true that the composition

$$\phi \circ (TR \otimes Id): N_*(E\Sigma_n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$$

is also the standard procedure map. In this section, we deal only with the chain complex structures. In Sections 19 and 20 below we return to the discussion and bring in the operad structures of the Barratt-Eccles and surjection operads, following a review of some basic concepts about operads in Section 18. Subsection 18.2 carefully treats the Eilenberg-Zilber operad.

We choose the  $\mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$  basis of  $\mathcal{S}_k^{bf}(n)$  consisting of  $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n+k})$  so that the initial occurrences of  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  occur in that order. With  $e = 1 \in \mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n] = \mathcal{S}_0^{bf}(n)$ , the map  $\phi: \mathcal{S}_0^{bf}(n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$  is the equivariant extension of the  $n$ -fold Alexander-Whitney multidagonal map  $\delta^{(n)}: \{e\} \otimes N_*(X) = N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$ , in both the Berger-Fresse and functorial standard procedure contexts. The left action of  $g \in \Sigma_n$  on  $N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$  is given by

$$g(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n) = (-1)^{k(a,g)}(a_{g^{-1}(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{g^{-1}(n)}),$$

where  $(-1)^k$  is a Koszul sign, as explained in Section 3 of Part I.

##### 17.1 The Berger-Fresse Map

For each universal simplex generator  $\Delta^m \in N_m(\Delta^m)$  and basis generator  $b \in \mathcal{S}_k^{bf}(n)$  with  $k > 0$  we need to define  $\phi(b \otimes \Delta^m) \in (N_*(\Delta^m)^{\otimes n})_{k+m}$ , and then extend equivariantly and functorially, according to the acyclic model



procedure of Remark 8.1 of Part I. The inductive formula for the standard procedure map is

$$\phi(b \otimes \Delta^m) = h_{\otimes^n}(\phi(db \otimes \Delta^m + (-1)^k b \otimes d\Delta^m)),$$

where  $h_{\otimes^n}$  is the preferred contraction of  $N_*(\Delta^m)^{\otimes n}$ . It is important to pay attention to functoriality of  $\phi$  and interpret boundary summands  $\phi(b \otimes d\Delta^m)$  as lying in the images of various minimal carrier face maps  $N_*(\Delta^{m-1})^{\otimes n} \rightarrow N_*(\Delta^m)^{\otimes n}$ .

Throughout Part III the simplices  $\Delta^m$  are unrelated to generators of surjection complexes. Therefore we will name vertices beginning with 0,  $\Delta^m = (0, 1, \dots, m)$ , as that seems notationally cleaner in the current context.

We will now define the Berger-Fresse map  $\Phi(x \otimes \Delta^m)$  in all degrees. This will require introducing quite a bit of notation. We have the sum of monomial tensors  $\delta^{(n+k)}(\Delta^m) \in N_*(\Delta^m)^{\otimes(n+k)}$ , where  $\delta^{(n+k)}$  is the Alexander-Whitney multidagonal. We will use the notation  $M \in \delta^{(n+k)}(\Delta^m)$  to refer to the monomial summands. These have the form  $M = M_1 \otimes M_2 \otimes \dots \otimes M_{n+k}$ , where the blocks  $M_j = (m_{j-1}, \dots, m_j)$  are faces of  $\Delta^m$  given by strings of consecutive vertices. For each such multidagonal term  $M$  we have  $0 = m_0 \leq m_1 \leq \dots \leq m_{n+k} = m$ . These strings partition the interval  $[0, m]$  into subintervals  $[m_{j-1}, m_j]$ . It is allowed that some  $m_{j-1} = m_j$  in the multidagonal formula, that is, the faces  $M_j$  can be single vertices.

For a generator  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n+k}) \in \mathcal{S}_k^{bf}(n)$  and  $1 \leq \ell \leq n$ , say the value  $\ell$  occurs  $k_\ell$  times in  $x$ . Thus  $\sum k_\ell = n + k$ . Denote by  $M_{\ell_1}, M_{\ell_2}, \dots, M_{\ell_{k_\ell}}$  the blocks of  $M$ , in order, corresponding to those  $M_j$  with  $x_j = \ell$ . Denote by  $F_\ell(M) = F_\ell(M, x) = M_{\ell_1} M_{\ell_2} \dots M_{\ell_{k_\ell}}$  the face of  $\Delta^m$  named by the subset of vertices, in order, of all the blocks  $M_j$  of  $M$  with  $x_j = \ell$ . If  $x$  is degenerate one of the faces  $F_i(M)$  is degenerate for every  $M$ .<sup>31</sup> We point out that the face  $F_\ell(M)$  is the join of its component subfaces  $M_{\ell_i}$ .

The Berger-Fresse definition is

$$\Phi(x \otimes \Delta^m) = \sum_{M \in \delta^{(n+k)}(\Delta^m)} \epsilon(M) F_1(M) \otimes F_2(M) \otimes \dots \otimes F_n(M) \in (N_*(\Delta^m)^{\otimes n})_{m+k},$$

---

<sup>31</sup>Such a face will also be degenerate if all the blocks of  $M$  between two blocks associated to consecutive occurrences of  $\ell$  in  $x$  are single vertices. But there is no real harm in including these faces in formulas. Such faces become 0 in a normalized chain complex.

where  $\epsilon(M) = \epsilon(M, x) \in \{\pm 1\}$  is a sign that we will now define. The sign  $\epsilon(M)$  will be the product of two signs  $sh(M)pos(M)$ , both also depending on  $x$ .

We point out that this formula is an important case of the discussion towards the end of preview Section 2.3 of Part I concerning chain maps of form  $\phi(x) = \sum \pm \mathcal{T}x$ .

Note the block  $M_{\ell k_\ell}$  corresponds to the non-caesura entry of  $x$  of value  $\ell$ . All other blocks  $M_{\ell i}$  correspond to caesura entries of  $x$  of value  $\ell$ . Assign ‘lengths’  $\|M_{\ell i}\|$  to the blocks as follows. If  $M_{\ell i}$  is a caesura block,  $\|M_{\ell i}\|$  is the number of vertices in the block. This is one more than the geometric dimension of the corresponding face simplex. For non-caesura blocks  $\|M_{\ell k_\ell}\|$  is one less than the number of vertices, which is the same as the geometric dimension of the corresponding face. Note that the geometric dimension of an amalgamated face  $F_\ell(M)$  is exactly the sum of the ‘lengths’ of its component blocks, since  $F_\ell(M)$  is the join of its component faces  $M_{\ell i}$ .

For any monomial  $M$  we can rearrange by a shuffle permutation the blocks  $M_1 M_2 \dots M_{n+k}$  in the order

$$M_{11} M_{12} \dots M_{1k_1} M_{21} \dots M_{2k_2} \dots M_{n1} \dots M_{nk_n}.$$

Define the *shuffle sign*  $sh(M) \in \{\pm 1\}$  to be the ‘Koszul sign’ associated to this shuffle permutation of blocks, using the product of two ‘lengths’  $\|M_{ij}\|$  to determine a sign when one block is passed by another block.

An alternate view of  $sh(M)$  is obtained by discarding the final entries of all non-caesura blocks and replacing all other entries of blocks  $M_j$  by  $x_j$ . This produces a string of  $(m+k)$  numbers  $(x_1 \dots x_1 x_2 \dots x_2 \dots x_{n+k} \dots x_{n+k})$ , each of which is in the interval  $(1, 2, \dots, n)$ . Then  $sh(M)$  is the parity sign of the shuffle permutation that rewrites the  $x_j$ -string in the order  $(1 \dots 1 2 \dots 2 \dots n \dots n)$ , keeping all entries of the same value  $x_j$  in their original order. This parity sign is determined by the parity count of the number of pairs in the  $x_j$  string consisting of an entry  $x_j$  and an entry  $x_i$  with  $i < j$  and  $x_j < x_i$ .

The other sign  $pos(M)$  in the definition  $\epsilon(M) = sh(M)pos(M)$  is called the *position sign* by Berger-Fresse. It is given by

$$pos(M) = \prod_{\text{caesuras } x_j} (-1)^{m_j},$$

where the caesura blocks are  $(m_{j-1}, \dots, m_j)$ . The position sign is determined by the parity count of all pairs consisting of a final entry of a caesura block and an earlier entry that is not a final entry of any block. This invariant interpretation will be useful later when dealing with faces of  $\Delta^m$  and functoriality.

We will give an example to illustrate the above conventions.

**Example 17.1.** Let  $n = 3$ ,  $k = 4$ ,  $m = 5$ . Consider  $x = (1213213)$  and multidagonal term  $M = M_1 M_2 \dots M_7 = (0|01|12|2|234|45|5)$ . Then

$$F_1 = M_1 M_3 M_6 = (0 \ 12 \ 45), \quad F_2 = M_2 M_5 = (01 \ 234), \quad F_3 = M_4 M_7 = (2 \ 5).$$

The caesura blocks  $M_1, M_2, M_3, M_4$  have ‘lengths’ 1,2,2,1 respectively. The non-caesura blocks  $M_5, M_6, M_7$  have ‘lengths’ 2,1,0 respectively. The shuffle permutation  $M_1 M_2 M_3 M_4 M_5 M_6 M_7 \mapsto M_1 M_3 M_6 M_2 M_5 M_4 M_7$  has sign  $sh(M) = (-1)^4 (-1)^5 (-1)^2 = -1$  since  $M_3$  moves past  $M_2$ , then  $M_6$  moves past  $M_2, M_4, M_5$ , then  $M_5$  moves past  $M_4$ . Alternatively, the  $x_j$  sequence with final entries of non-caesura blocks removed is (122113221), with corresponding shuffle sign  $(-)^{11} = -1$ . Finally the position sign is seen to be  $pos(M) = (-1)^0 (-1)^1 (-1)^2 (-1)^2 = -1$ .

The term of degree 9 in  $N_*(\Delta^5)^{\otimes 3}$  corresponding to  $x$  and  $M$  is thus

$$\epsilon(M) F_1(M) \otimes F_2(M) \otimes F_3(M) = (-1)(-1)(01245) \otimes (01234) \otimes (25).$$

□

**Remark 17.2.** It is appropriate to review the step-diagram picture of the data consisting of a generator  $x \in \mathcal{S}_*(n)$  and a monomial  $M$ . We place closed intervals  $M_j$  in a box  $[1, n] \times [0, m]$  with  $n$  rows and  $m + 1$  columns. All intervals  $M_j = [m_{j-1}, m_j]$  with  $x_j = \ell$  are placed on row  $\ell$ , with endpoint coordinates  $(\ell, m_{j-1})$  and  $(\ell, m_j)$ . These intervals are single points if  $m_{j-1} = m_j$ . It is preferred to include in diagrams only those  $M$  so that the faces  $F_\ell(x)$  are non-degenerate. The picture itself certainly determines  $M$ , but does not determine  $x$  if there are columns containing more than one singleton interval. Those corresponding  $x$  entries could be permuted without changing the diagram. One can include additional decoration in the diagrams to clarify the order in  $x$  in which multiple singletons occur in columns.

In the non-degenerate cases the number of integer coordinate points in the box that are covered by intervals is  $n + k + m$ . The box itself has  $n(m + 1)$  integral points. So with  $n$  and  $m$  fixed, all points can be covered non-degenerately if  $n + k + m = nm + n$ , that is, if  $k = m(n - 1)$ . In this case  $\phi(x \otimes \Delta^m)$  will be either 0 or  $\pm(\Delta^m)^{\otimes n} \in (N_*(\Delta^m))^{\otimes n}$ . The only pairs  $(M, x)$  that produce a non-degenerate term are

$$M = (0 | \dots | 0 | 01 | 1 | \dots | 1 | 12 | \dots | (m-1)m | m | \dots | m)$$

with  $n$  occurrences each of  $0, 1, \dots, m$ , and  $x$  formed by concatenating  $m + 1$  permutations  $g_i$  of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq m$ , with  $g_i(n) = g_{i+1}(1)$ , and removing one of each adjacent repeated entry.

In this case we can calculate the signs  $sh(M, x)$  and  $pos(M, x)$  using the descriptions of these signs given above. The non-caesura entries of  $x$  are the last  $n$  entries, corresponding to the final permutation  $g_m$ . Inspection of  $M$  shows that the values of  $m_i$  corresponding to final entries of caesura blocks consist of  $n - 1$  values each of  $1, 2, \dots, (m - 1)$ . Thus  $pos(M, x) = (-1)^{(n-1)m(m-1)/2}$ . Thus if  $n$  is odd all these position signs are  $+1$ .

We make use of the second description given above for  $sh(M, x)$ . We need the shuffle sign for putting the concatenation of the first  $m$  permutations  $g_i \in \Sigma_n$  in the order  $(1 \dots 1 \ 2 \dots 2 \dots n \dots n)$ . Here we recall that the entries of  $M$  are also labeled by entries of  $x$ . We can first just put the entries of each  $g_i$ ,  $i < m$ , in the order  $(12 \dots n) = Id_n$ . These moves do not change the order of  $M$  entries labeled with the same  $x$  value. The parity sign for this first step is  $\prod_{i < m} \tau(g_i)$ . Then we want to rearrange the entries of  $m$  copies  $(Id_n \ Id_n \ \dots \ Id_n)$  in non-decreasing order. Move the 1's to the front, then the 2's to follow the 1's, and so on. A simple count gives the parity sign  $(-1)^{(n(n-1)/2)(m(m-1)/2)}$ . Thus  $sh(M, x) = \prod_{i < m} \tau(g_i) (-1)^{(n(n-1)/2)(m(m-1)/2)}$ .

For example, take  $m = 2$  and  $x = (1452312451234)$ , thus permutations  $g_0 = (14523)$ ,  $g_1 = (31245)$ ,  $g_2 = (51234)$ . So  $n = 5$ ,  $\tau(g_0) = +1$ ,  $\tau(g_1) = +1$ . Labeling  $M$  with  $x$ -entries produces  $M_x = (145233124551234)$ . Remove the final 5 entries, corresponding to the final entries of non-caesura blocks of  $M$ , yielding  $(1452331245)$ . We get  $pos(M, x) = +1$  since  $n$  is odd, and  $sh(M, x) = +1$ .

If  $k > m(n-1)$  then all terms in the Berger-Fresse formula are degenerate. If  $k = 0$  then  $x$  is a permutation in  $\Sigma_n$ ,  $M = (0, m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}, m)$ , and the diagram consists of a single interval on each row  $\ell = x_j$  with column coordinates  $[m_{j-1}, m_j]$ . The observations in this remark are related to evaluations of certain cochain operations that we take up in Part IV.  $\square$

We now take up the main result of this section.

**Proposition 17.3.** *The Berger-Fresse map  $\Phi$  agrees with the standard functorial procedure equivariant chain map  $\phi: \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$ .*

The proof that follows is an induction, comparing the Berger-Fresse formula with the standard procedure chain map in each new degree. An early step is that the Berger-Fresse map is equivariant. After that, the result would follow from Proposition 17.9 below, which is a special case of the uniqueness result Proposition 8.2 of Part I. But this would require establishing that the Berger-Fresse formula is a chain map. We believe that is harder and less informative than the proof we give. By identifying the somewhat mysterious Berger-Fresse map with the standard procedure map, our proof shows the Berger-Fresse formula is a chain map. Also, the steps of our proof bring out some rather appealing structure that shows up in other contexts. This structure is part of the general discussion towards the end of preview Section 2.3 of Part I concerning chain maps of form  $\phi(x) = \sum \pm \mathcal{T}x$ .

*Proof. Step 0.* It is an observation that if  $k = 0$  the Berger-Fresse map and the functorial procedure map on  $\mathcal{S}_0^{bf}(n) \otimes \Delta^m$  both agree with the equivariant extension of the  $n$ -fold multidagonal  $\phi(e \otimes \Delta^m) = \delta^{(n)}(\Delta^m)$ . Permutations  $g \in \mathcal{S}_0^{bf}$  have no caesuras, so  $pos(M, g) = 1$  for all monomials  $M$  and  $sh(M, g)$  is the Koszul sign of a permutation of tensors. If  $m = 0$  and  $k > 0$  then  $(N_*(\Delta^0)^{\otimes n})_k = 0$ , hence both the Berger-Fresse map and the standard procedure map are trivial.  $\square$

**Step 1.** The Berger-Fresse map is equivariant. Given a surjection generator  $x$  and a permutation  $g \in \Sigma_n$ , we need to show  $g\Phi(x \otimes \Delta^m) = \Phi(gx \otimes \Delta^m)$ . From the definition, for each monomial  $M$ ,

$$g \bigotimes_{\ell=1}^n F_\ell(M, x) = (-1)^k \bigotimes_{\ell=1}^n F_{g^{-1}\ell}(M, x) = (-1)^k \bigotimes_{\ell=1}^n F_\ell(M, gx).$$

Namely, the face  $F_\ell(M, gx)$  coincides with the face  $F_{g^{-1}\ell}(M, x)$  since these faces just amalgamate blocks  $M_j$  of  $M$  with  $g(x_j) = \ell$  and  $x_j = g^{-1}\ell$  respectively. The sign  $(-1)^k$  is the Koszul sign of the permutation  $g$  acting

on the  $n$ -tensor.

The caesuras in the two generators  $x$  and  $gx$  are in the same positions, so the position signs agree  $pos(M, x) = pos(M, gx)$ . Finally we need to compare the shuffle signs  $sh(M, x)$  and  $sh(M, gx)$  with the sign associated to  $g$  acting on the  $n$ -tensor. The relation we want is  $(-1)^k sh(M, x) = sh(M, gx)$ .

After the shuffle of the  $M_j$  using  $x$ , the blocks corresponding to  $j$  with  $x_j = \ell$  are adjacent and form the face  $F_\ell(M, x)$ . The shuffle sign  $sh(M, x)$  is determined using the ‘lengths’ of the blocks  $M_j$ . The key now is that the sum of the ‘lengths’ of the blocks forming  $F_\ell(M, x)$  is the dimension of the face. Now permute these faces in the tensor by  $g$ , including the true Koszul sign  $(-1)^k$  which depends on the dimension of the faces. The result is the same as the signed shuffle of the blocks  $M_j$  that uses their individual ‘lengths’ to form the faces  $F_\ell(M, gx)$ . That is, one obtains the same sign moving an entire face block across another face block using dimensions, as one obtains moving the separate subfaces across subfaces using ‘lengths’.

Perhaps this equivariance argument for the shuffle sign is easier to follow using the second description of the shuffle sign, in terms of sequences  $(x_1$ 's  $x_2$ 's  $\dots$   $x_{n+k}$ 's) and  $(x_{g1}$ 's  $x_{g2}$ 's  $\dots$   $x_{g(n+k)}$ 's) of length  $m + k$  obtained from  $M$  by deleting final entries of caesura blocks and replacing remaining entries of  $M_j$  by  $x_j$  or  $x_{gj}$ . Shuffle permute the first sequence to  $(1$ 's  $2$ 's  $\dots$   $n$ 's), with parity sign  $sh(M, x)$ . Then shuffle permute this string to the order  $(g^{-1}(1)$ 's  $g^{-1}(2)$ 's  $\dots$   $g^{-1}(n)$ 's), with parity sign  $(-1)^k$ . The composed shuffle is conjugate as a permutation of  $m+k$  objects to the shuffle that moves  $(x_{g1}$ 's  $x_{g2}$ 's  $\dots$   $x_{g(n+k)}$ 's) to  $(1$ 's  $2$ 's  $\dots$   $n$ 's), with sign  $sh(M, gx)$ .  $\square$

Consider a basis generator  $b$  of degree  $k > 0$ , which from Remark 15.1 of Part II means the initial entries of  $1, 2, \dots, n$  in  $b$  occur in that order. Assume the proposition is proved in surjection degrees less than  $k$ . By Step 0 we may assume  $m > 0$ . By induction and Step 1, it suffices to prove

$$\Phi(b \otimes \Delta^m) = h_{\otimes^n} \Phi(db \otimes \Delta^m + (-1)^k b \otimes d\Delta^m)$$

for basis generators, where  $h_{\otimes^n}$  is the contraction of  $N_*(\Delta^m)^{\otimes n}$ . In the next five steps we will prove by induction that this formula is correct if we ignore signs. In the last step we deal with the signs.

We remind that

$$h_{\otimes^n} = h \otimes Id^{\otimes(n-1)} + \rho \otimes h \otimes Id^{\otimes(n-2)} + \dots + \rho^{\otimes(n-1)} \otimes h,$$

where  $h$  is the contraction of  $N_*(\Delta^m)$  and  $\rho(j) = 0$  is the basepoint map of  $N_*(\Delta^m)$ . Thus evaluating an  $h_{\otimes^n}$  term could result in as many as  $n$  summands and this will play a role in the proof evaluating  $h_{\otimes^n}(b \otimes d\Delta^m)$ .

Note  $Im(h_{\otimes^n}) = Ker(h_{\otimes^n})$  is spanned by all ‘clean’ tensors  $(0) \otimes \dots \otimes (0) \otimes (0a\dots) \dots$ , where  $a > 0$ , since these are clearly in  $Ker(h_{\otimes^n})$ . Also, if  $a' > 0$

$$h_{\otimes^n}[(0)'s.. \otimes (a' \dots) \otimes ..(0)'s.. \otimes (0a\dots) \dots] = [(0)'s.. \otimes (0a' \dots) \otimes ..(0)'s.. \otimes (0a\dots) \dots]$$

This formula is correct even if the  $(a' \dots)$  term is a singleton and more  $h_{\otimes^n}$  summands must be evaluated. These additional summands will be 0.

**Step 2.** Suppose  $c = (0, 1, \dots, \ell, \dots, \ell, \dots)$  is a clean surjection generator, as in Remark 15.1. So  $\ell$  is the first caesura and the smaller entries are singletons. Then for any monomial  $M$  it is easy to see that the tensor

$$F(M, c) = F_1(M) \otimes F_2(M) \dots \otimes F_n(M) = (0) \otimes \dots \otimes (0) \otimes (0a\dots) \otimes \dots,$$

where the  $(0a\dots)$  term occurs before or at the  $\ell^{th}$  position. Thus  $\Phi(c \otimes \Delta^m) \in Im(h_{\otimes^n})$ , and  $h_{\otimes^n} \Phi(c \otimes \Delta^m) = 0$ .  $\square$

**Step 3.** If  $b$  is a basis generator then the only terms in  $h_{\otimes^n} \phi(db \otimes \Delta^m)$  that can be non-zero are the terms arising from the boundary term  $d_\ell b$  obtained by deleting the first caesura  $b_\ell$  of  $b$ .

Since the initial entries of  $1, 2, \dots, n$  in  $b$  occur in that order, if  $db_j$  is *not* one of the boundary terms obtained by deleting a first occurrence of  $1, 2, \dots, n$ , then  $d_j b$  is either degenerate or is also a basis generator. In the basis generator case  $\phi(d_j b \otimes \Delta^m)$  is in  $Im(h_{\otimes^n}) = Ker(h_{\otimes^n})$ , so  $h_{\otimes^n} \phi(d_j b, \Delta^m) = 0$ .

If  $b_j < \ell$  precedes the first caesura  $b_\ell = \ell$ , then that entry of  $b$  is a singleton and  $d_j b = 0$ . If  $b_j > \ell$  is a first occurrence of  $\ell + 1, \dots, n$  following the first caesura, then  $d_j b = (1, 2, \dots, \ell, \dots, \ell \dots)$  is either degenerate or a clean generator of lower degree, as defined in Remark 15.1 of Part II. In the clean generator case, as observed in Step 2,  $\Phi(d_j b \otimes \Delta^m) \in Im(h_{\otimes^n}) = Ker(h_{\otimes^n})$

$\square$

**Step 4.** The only terms in  $h_{\otimes^n}\phi(b \otimes d\Delta^m)$  that can be non-zero are the terms arising from the boundary face  $d_0\Delta^m = (12\dots m)$ .

Consider a face  $d_j\Delta^m = (0, \dots, \hat{j}, \dots, m)$ , with  $j > 0$ . We must pay attention to functoriality. From the characterization of clean tensors preceding Step 2, the map  $N_*(\Delta^{m-1})^{\otimes n} \rightarrow N_*(\Delta^m)^{\otimes n}$  induced by the face inclusion carries  $Im(h_{\otimes^n})$  to  $Im(h_{\otimes^n})$ , since  $0 \mapsto 0$  and any  $c \mapsto c$  or  $c + 1$ . In fact, such a face inclusion commutes with contractions. Then  $\phi(b \otimes \Delta^{m-1})$ , which is in  $Im(h_{\otimes^n})$  for  $\Delta^{m-1}$ , is carried by the face inclusion to  $\phi(b \otimes d_j\Delta^m)$ , which is in  $Im(h_{\otimes^n})$  for  $\Delta^m$ . Hence  $h_{\otimes^n}$  vanishes on this element.  $\square$

**Step 5.** This is the main step. We will observe that induction implies that if  $b$  is a basis generator then the standard procedure map  $\phi$  satisfies

$$\phi(b \otimes \Delta^m) = \sum_{M \in \delta^{n+k}(\Delta^m)} \pm F_1(M, b) \otimes \dots \otimes F_n(M, b).$$

The monomials  $M \in \delta^{(n+k)}(\Delta^m)$  divide into two types for each possibility for the first caesura  $b_\ell$  of  $b$ . If the first caesura is  $b_1 = 1$  then, ignoring signs, the sum of the terms in  $\phi(b \otimes \Delta^m)$  corresponding to monomials of the form  $M = (0|0\dots)$  coincides with  $h_{\otimes^n}\phi(d_1b \otimes \Delta^m)$ . The sum of the terms in  $\phi(b \otimes \Delta^m)$  corresponding to monomials of the form  $M = (01\dots)$  coincides with  $h_{\otimes^n}\phi(b \otimes d_0\Delta^m)$ .

If the first caesura of  $b$  is  $b_\ell$  then  $b$  must begin  $b = (12\dots\ell, \ell + 1, \dots\ell\dots)$ , with  $b_\ell = \ell$  and the entries before the  $\ell$  being singletons. The sum of the terms in  $\phi(b \otimes \Delta^m)$  corresponding to monomials of the form  $M = (0|0|\dots|0|\dots)$  with at least  $\ell$  singleton 0's coincides with  $h_{\otimes^n}\phi(d_\ell b \otimes \Delta^m)$ . The sum of the terms in  $\phi(b \otimes \Delta^m)$  corresponding to monomials  $M$  with fewer than  $\ell$  singleton 0's coincides with  $h_{\otimes^n}\phi(b \otimes d_0\Delta^m)$ .  $\square$

**Step 6.** We discuss the proof of the statements in Step 5. Assume the first caesura is  $b_1 = 1$ . If  $M' = (0\dots) \in \delta^{(n+k-1)}\Delta^m$  is obtained from  $M = (0|0\dots)$  by dropping the first singleton 0 then the summand of  $\phi(b \otimes \Delta^m)$  corresponding to  $M$  equals the summand of  $h_{\otimes^n}\phi(d_1b \otimes \Delta^m)$  corresponding to  $M'$ . In fact,

$$F(M', d_1b) = (a'..) \otimes (0) \otimes \dots \otimes (0) \otimes (0a\dots) \dots$$

is obtained from  $F(M, b)$  by dropping the first 0. Here  $a'$  is the first entry of the monomial block corresponding to the second occurrence of 1 in  $b$ . Then



applying  $h_{\otimes^n}$  puts that 0 back. Note only the first summand of  $h_{\otimes^n}$  acts nontrivially.

It is possible that the summand of  $\phi(b \otimes \Delta^m)$  corresponding to  $M$  is degenerate. This can happen in a few ways. But then the term obtained from  $F(M, b)$  by dropping the first 0 is also degenerate, or it is of the form  $(0) \otimes \dots \otimes (0) \otimes (0a\dots)\dots$ . Either way applying  $h_{\otimes^n}$  gives 0.

A simple example of the interesting case is  $b = (1, 2, 1, 3)$  and  $M = (0|0|0|012)$ . Then  $F(d_1 b, M') = (0) \otimes (0) \otimes (012)$  and  $F(M, b) = (00) \otimes (0) \otimes (012)$ .

Continuing to assume the first caesura of  $b$  is  $b_1$ , consider a monomial of the second type  $M = (01\dots|\dots)$  and set  $M'' = (1\dots|\dots)$  by dropping the first (and only) 0 from  $M$ . Then the tensor summand of  $\phi(b \otimes d_0 \Delta^m)$  corresponding to monomial  $M''$  is obtained from the tensor  $F(M, b)$  by dropping the first (and only) 0. That  $M''$  tensor begins  $(1\dots a\dots) \otimes \dots$ , where the  $a$  is the first entry in the block of  $M$  coming from the second occurrence of 1 in  $b$ . Applying  $h_{\otimes^n}$  gives back  $F(M, b)$ , the  $n$ -tensor of  $\phi(b \otimes \Delta^m)$  corresponding to  $M$ . Again only one summand of  $h_{\otimes^n}$  acts non-trivially.

Moving on, assume the first caesura of  $b$  is  $b_\ell = \ell$ . Then  $b = (12\dots\ell\dots\ell\dots)$ , with singletons before the first  $\ell$ . Consider a first type monomial  $M = (0|0|0\dots)$  with at least  $\ell$  singleton 0's. Again obtain  $M' = (0|0\dots)$  by dropping the  $\ell^{th}$  0. Then the tensor  $F(M', d_\ell b)$  is obtained from the tensor  $F(M, b)$  by dropping the  $\ell^{th}$  0. Again this makes sense even if  $F(M, b)$  is degenerate. Applying  $h_{\otimes^n}$  formally puts that 0 back, the result of which will be degenerate exactly if  $F(m, b)$  is degenerate.

Next consider the second type monomials  $M \in \delta^{(n+k)}(\Delta^m)$ . These have the form  $M = (0|0|\dots|01\dots|\dots)$  where there are fewer than  $\ell$  singleton 0's. Form  $M'' = (1|1\dots|1\dots|\dots) \in \delta^{(n+k-1)}(d_0 \Delta^m)$  by deleting the final occurring 0 and changing all earlier (singleton) 0's to 1's. Now something new happens. Let  $j + 1$ , with  $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ , denote the total number of 0 and 1 entries in  $M$ , in or before the  $\ell^{th}$  block of  $M$ . We notice that there are  $j - 1$  singleton (1) tensor factors in  $F(M'', b)$ , the summand of  $\phi(b \otimes d_0 \Delta^m)$  corresponding to  $M''$ . In fact, the tensor  $F(M'', b)$  is obtained from the tensor  $F(M, b)$  by deleting the final occurrence of 0, and changing any previous singleton (0) tensor factors to (1)'s. Also there are  $j$  different second type  $M$ 's yielding this same  $M''$ . Namely, the first  $j + 1$  entries of  $M$  (not blocks) could consist of  $j'$  0's and  $(j + 1 - j')$  1's, where  $1 \leq j' \leq j$ .

At the same time, evaluating  $h_{\otimes^n}$  on the  $n$ -tensor summand of  $\phi(b \otimes d_0 \Delta^m)$  corresponding to  $M''$  yields a sum of  $j$  terms. It can happen that  $F(M, b)$  is degenerate, but not before the  $\ell^{\text{th}}$  tensor factor. Then  $F(M'', b)$  is also degenerate, so all summands of  $h_{\otimes^n} F(M'', b)$  are degenerate.

For example, if  $\ell = 5$  and  $M'' = (1|1|1|12|2|...)$ , then  $j = 4$  and the term in  $\phi(b \otimes d_0 \Delta^m)$  corresponding to  $M''$  is  $(1) \otimes (1) \otimes (1) \otimes (12) \otimes (2a...)$ , where  $a$  is the first entry of the second block of  $M$  corresponding to a  $b$  value  $\ell = 5$ . Evaluating  $h_{\otimes}$  gives exactly the sum of the 4 terms in  $\phi(b \otimes \Delta^m)$  corresponding to all the  $M$  terms yielding the same  $M''$ . If  $a = 2$ , these are all degenerate.  $\square$

**Remark 17.4.** Notice that given an  $n$ -tensor summand  $\pm F_1 \otimes \dots \otimes F_n \in N_*(\Delta^m)^{\otimes n}$  of  $\Phi(x \otimes \Delta^m)$ , one can unravel the  $n$ -tensor to see exactly which  $M \in \delta^{(n+k)}(\Delta^m)$  it came from. Namely, just write in non-decreasing order all the vertices of  $\Delta^m$  occurring in all the faces  $F_j$ . Then put separating bars between repeated entries. For example, from Example 17.1, consider the 3-tensor  $(01245) \otimes (01234) \otimes (25)$ , with  $x = (1213213)$ . Unravel to  $M = (0|01|12|2|234|45|5)$ . Then  $F(M, x)$  is the named 3-tensor.

In general, assuming the tensor arises from  $M$  and a basis generator  $b$ , it is immediate to read off from a single tensor summand the first caesura of  $b$  and whether the monomial  $M$  is of first type or second type. If  $m$  is not too small  $b$  itself can be recovered from relatively few tensor summands of  $\Phi(b \otimes \Delta^m)$ . One can pursue this and prove that the adjoint  $Ad(\Phi): \mathcal{S}_*(n) \rightarrow HOM_{func}(N_*(X), N_*(X)^{\otimes n})$  is injective. In fact, in degree  $k$  it suffices to take  $m = n + k$  and a single  $M = (01|12| \dots |(m-1)m)$ . Then the  $M$ -coordinate alone of  $\Phi(x \otimes \Delta^m)$  is sufficient to see that  $Ad(\Phi)$  is injective on the  $\mathbb{F}$  vector space  $\mathcal{S}_*(n)$ .  $\square$

**Step 7.** Finally we need to deal with the shuffle signs and the position signs in the Berger-Fresse map in all the steps above. The contraction  $h_{\otimes^n}$  introduces no signs. The standard procedure recursively determines all associated signs. Again we use induction. Both  $\phi$  and  $\Phi$  are equivariant, so we only need to deal with basis elements  $b$ . Assuming the signs for  $\phi$  and  $\Phi$  agree in lower degrees, we need to see why the Berger-Fresse sign of terms in  $\Phi(d_\ell b \otimes \Delta^m)$  and  $\Phi((-1)^{|b|} b \otimes d_0 \Delta^m)$  arising from monomials  $M'$  and  $M''$  agree with the Berger-Fresse signs of terms in  $\Phi(b \otimes \Delta^m)$  arising from

monomials  $M$  that correspond to  $M'$  and  $M''$  by the process of the proof.

This turns out to be not too hard. The process in the proof drops a 0 from  $M$  monomials to produce  $M'$  monomials, or in the second type case drops a 0 and changes other 0's to 1's to form  $M''$  monomials. The shuffles of blocks that occur in forming the  $n$ -tensors leave the first block in a monomial alone and just shuffle later blocks that follow the first block. Later blocks do not change 'lengths'. Thus the shuffle signs  $sh(M')$  or  $sh(M'')$  and  $sh(M)$  agree in all cases.

The position signs  $pos(M')$  and  $pos(M)$  also agree in terms arising from  $\phi(d_\ell b \otimes \Delta^m)$ . This is because dropping the  $\ell^{th}$  singleton 0 from  $M$  to form  $M'$  does decrease by one the number of caesura blocks when  $d_\ell b$  is applied to  $M'$ , so a sign  $(-1)^0 = 1$  is 'lost' comparing  $pos(M')$  and  $pos(M)$ . But the process does not change the final vertices in other caesura blocks of  $M$  and  $M'$ .

For example, if  $b = (1213213)$  and  $M = (0|01|12|2|2|234|45)$  then the caesura blocks of  $M$  are  $(0), (01), (12), (2)$  and the caesura blocks of  $M' = (01|12|2|2|234|45)$  with respect to  $d_1 b = (213213)$  are  $(01), (12), (2)$ . Examples where the first caesura of  $b$  is  $b_\ell = \ell$ , with  $\ell > 1$  behave similarly, since the  $M$  of first type begin with  $\ell$  singleton 0's, only the last of which is a caesura block.

The position signs  $pos(M'')$  and  $pos(M)$  arising from  $\phi(b \otimes d_0 \Delta^m)$  and monomials  $M$  of the second type do not necessarily agree. There are the same total number of blocks, namely  $n + k$ , and number of caesura blocks, namely  $k = deg(b)$ , when  $b \otimes \Delta^m$  is applied to  $M$  as when  $b \otimes d_0 \Delta^m$  is applied to  $M''$ , since blocks  $M_j$  and  $M''_j$  both correspond to the entries  $b_j$  of  $b$ . Monomial  $M''$  is obtained from  $M$  by dropping the 0 from a block  $(01..)$  and changing previous singleton 0's in  $M$  to 1's. But the position sign is obtained by counting how many times entries that are not final entries of blocks occur in front of final entries of caesura blocks. Since the dropped 0 occurs in front of all final caesura block entries, the count is reduced by  $k$ .

But also recall that there is a sign  $(-1)^k b \otimes d_0 \Delta^m$  in the boundary  $d(b \otimes \Delta^m)$ , where  $deg(b) = k$ . Since the contraction  $h_{\otimes^n}$  introduces no signs, one sees that indeed the signs in  $h_{\otimes^n} \Phi((-1)^{|b|} b \otimes d_0 \Delta^m)$  agree exactly with the signs in the terms in  $\Phi(b \otimes \Delta^m)$  arising from monomials  $M$  of the second type. This completes our long discussion of the proof of Proposition 17.3.  $\square$

## 17.2 Compositions $A_*(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \rightarrow HOM_{func}(N_*(X), N_*(X)^{\otimes n})$

We next want to use Proposition 17.3 to find the canonical functorial procedure maps  $A_*(n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow (N_*(X))^{\otimes n}$  for  $A_*(n) = \mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n), \mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n), N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ , and  $M_*(n)$ . The hard one is  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ , the others will follow easily from two lemmas. The results are not unexpected, but seem to require some arguments. The issue is that compositions of standard procedure chain maps need not be standard procedure chain maps. Therefore, when such a composition does turn out to be a standard procedure map, some proof must be given.

**Proposition 17.5.** *The functorial standard procedure map  $N_*(E\Sigma_n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$  is the composition*

$$\phi \circ (TR \otimes Id): N_*(E\Sigma_n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}.$$

We postpone the proof. But the first step will be an application of the following general result.

**LEMMA 17.6.** *Suppose  $\phi: A_* \rightarrow B_*$  is a standard procedure equivariant chain map, with  $A_*$  free over  $\mathbb{F}[G]$ ,  $h_B^2 = 0$ , and  $h_B \circ \iota_B = 0$ . Then the map  $\phi \otimes Id: A_* \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow B_* \otimes N_*(X)$  is a standard procedure equivariant functorial chain map.*

*Proof.* The argument we give here is basically a special case of a functorial version of Proposition 6.11 of Part I, which dealt with tensor products of standard procedure chain maps. That argument can be reviewed to motivate the following lines. The lemma is also a consequence of the uniqueness result Proposition 8.2 of Section 8 of Part I, but establishing the hypothesis of Proposition 8.2 is not so different from the direct argument here.

In total degree 0 there is nothing to prove. In positive degrees it suffices to show for basis generators  $a \in A_*$  that

$$(\phi \otimes Id)(a \otimes \Delta^m) = \phi(a) \otimes \Delta^m = h_{\otimes}(\phi(da) \otimes \Delta^m + (-1)^{|a|} \phi(a) \otimes d\Delta^m),$$

where  $h_{\otimes} = h_B \otimes Id_{\Delta} + \rho_B \otimes h_{\Delta}$ . Recall  $\rho_B = \iota_B \epsilon_B$ . If  $m = 0$  and  $|a| > 0$  the claim is obvious. If  $|a| = 0$  the assumptions imply  $\phi(a) = \iota_B \epsilon_A(a)$ , hence  $\rho_B \phi(a) = \phi(a)$  and  $h_B \phi(a) = 0$ . Also  $h_{\Delta}(d\Delta^m) = \Delta^m$ . If  $|a| > 0$  then  $\phi(a) \otimes \Delta^m = h_B \phi(da) \otimes \Delta^m$ , and  $\phi(a) \otimes d\Delta^m \in Ker(h_{\otimes})$ , since  $\phi(a) \in Im(h_B) = Ker(h_B)$ . Thus the sum of four terms on the right side reduces to  $\phi(a) \otimes \Delta^m$  in all cases.  $\square$

**LEMMA 17.7.** *Suppose  $\phi: A_* \rightarrow B_*$  is a standard procedure equivariant chain map, with  $A_*$  free over  $\mathbb{F}[G]$  and  $B_*$  free over  $\Sigma_n \supseteq G$ , such that for  $G$ -basis elements  $a \in A_*$  it holds that  $\phi(a) = \sum \epsilon_i b_i \in B_*$  for constants  $\epsilon_i \in \mathbb{F}$  and  $\Sigma_n$ -basis elements  $b_i \in B_*$ . If  $\Phi: B_* \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$  is a functorial standard procedure map then  $\Phi \circ (\phi \otimes Id): A_* \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow B_* \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$  is also a functorial standard procedure map.*

*Proof.* This is essentially a functorial version of the composition situation discussed in Proposition 6.5(iii) of Part I. It suffices to consider generators  $a \otimes \Delta^m$ . The point is, the images  $\phi(a)$  are  $\mathbb{F}$ -linear combinations of basis elements of  $B_*$ , hence

$$\Phi(\phi(a) \otimes \Delta^m) = h_{\otimes n} \Phi d_{\otimes}(\phi(a) \otimes \Delta^m) = h_{\otimes} \Phi(\phi \otimes Id) d_{\otimes}(a \otimes \Delta^m).$$

□

**Proposition 17.8.** *The following compositions*

$$\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$$

$$\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$$

$$M_*(n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$$

*are standard procedure functorial maps.*

*Proof.* The first two claims are immediate from Lemma 17.7 and results from Section 15 where we compared surjection complexes. The third claim follows from the calculation of  $M_*(n) \rightarrow N_*(EC_n) \subset N_*(E\Sigma_n)$  in Example 6.13 of Part I, Lemma 17.7, and Proposition 17.5. □

We now return to the proof of Proposition 17.5.

*Proof.* This result is somewhat tricky to prove. The first step is to observe that Lemma 17.6 implies  $TR \otimes Id$  is the standard procedure functorial chain map between its domain and range.

Proposition 17.5 concerns two functorial equivariant chain maps  $N_*(E\Sigma_n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$ . Each is determined by a collection of maps  $N_*(E\Sigma_n) \otimes \Delta^m \rightarrow N_*(\Delta^m)^{\otimes n}$  for fundamental classes of simplices  $\Delta^m$ . The two maps agree in degree 0. We need the functorial version of our key uniqueness result, Proposition 8.2 of Part I. We will restate and prove a simple case relevant for us here.

**Proposition 17.9.** *Suppose  $B_*$  is free over  $\mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$ . Consider an equivariant functorial chain map  $\psi: B_* \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$  with the property that the images of basis generators  $\psi(b \otimes \Delta^m)$  all belong to  $Im(h_{\otimes^n}) = Ker(h_{\otimes^n})$ . Then  $\psi$  is the standard procedure equivariant functorial chain map  $\Phi$  that agrees with  $\psi$  in degree 0.*

*Proof.* The proof is an induction. The claim about the functorial maps follows from computations with the acyclic model  $\Delta^m$ . We assume  $\psi$  and  $\Phi$  agree up to some degree and consider basis elements in the next degree

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(b \otimes \Delta^m) &= h_{\otimes^n} \Phi d_{\otimes}(b \otimes \Delta^m) = h_{\otimes^n} \psi d_{\otimes}(b \otimes \Delta^m) = \\ h_{\otimes^n} d_{\otimes} \psi(b \otimes \Delta^m) &= \psi(b \otimes \Delta^m) - d_{\otimes} h_{\otimes^n} \psi(b \otimes \Delta^m) = \psi(b \otimes \Delta^m). \end{aligned}$$

□

To complete the proof of Proposition 17.5 we need to show that

$$\psi = \phi \circ (TR \otimes Id): N_*(E\Sigma_n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$$

satisfies the hypothesis of Proposition 17.9. The troublesome issue is that for basis elements  $(e, X) \in N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ , some summands of  $TR(e, X)$  may not be basis elements of  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$ .

Recall from Section 16 of Part I that the map  $TR$  commutes with contractions. Therefore  $TR(e, X)$  belongs to the image of the contraction of  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$ , which we have characterized as the span of clean surjection generators. More specifically, the summands of  $TR(e, X)$  are parametrized by partitions. Consider a partition  $a_0 + \dots + a_k = n + k$  with first summand  $a_0 = \ell$ . The corresponding surjection generator  $x_a$  then has the form  $x_a = (1, 2, \dots, \ell, \dots, \ell \dots)$ , where  $\ell$  is the first caesura entry. Such  $x_a$  are clean surjection generators. Therefore,  $\phi(TR(e, X) \otimes \Delta^m) \in Im(h_{\otimes^n})$  follows from Step 2 of the proof of Proposition 17.3. □

**Remark 17.10.** In Part IV we will exploit the  $C_p$ -equivariant functorial standard procedure map  $\phi_{func}: M_*(p) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes p}$  to define and study the odd prime  $p$  Steenrod operations  $P^j$  of degree  $2j(p-1)$ . When  $p = 2$  the fact that the degree 0 operation  $Sq^0 = Id$  is obvious from the definition of the Steenrod operations in terms of the cochain  $\cup_i$ 's, which are nothing more than duals of the adjoint of  $\phi_{func}$  when  $p = 2$ . In the odd prime case, somewhat more is required to define the reduced powers  $P^j$  and to prove  $P^0 = Id$ . Here is the result needed to prove  $P^0 = Id$ , in terms of

certain even dimensional generators  $y_{2k} \in M_{2k}(p)$  and fundamental classes  $\Delta^m \in N_m(\Delta^m)$ .

**Proposition 17.11.** *Set  $q = (p-1)/2$  and  $c_{m,p} = (-1)^{(m(m-1)/2)(p(p-1)/2)} (q!)^m \in \mathbb{F}_p$ . Then*

$$\phi_{func}(y_{m(p-1)} \otimes \Delta^m) = c_{m,p}((\Delta^m)^{\otimes p}) \in N_*(\Delta^m)^{\otimes p}.$$

*Proof.* The main step is the computation in Remark 17.2 of  $\Phi(x \otimes \Delta^m)$  for certain surjection generators  $x$  of degree  $2k = m(p-1)$ , where  $\Phi$  is the Berger-Fresse map. We combine here various results proved in Section 6 of Part I, Section 16 of Part II, and Section 17. From Propositions 17.8 and 17.5, the map  $\phi_{func}$  is a composition of three maps

$$M_*(p) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(EC_p) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_p) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes p}.$$

All chain complexes have  $\mathbb{F}_p$  coefficients. The first map is  $\phi \otimes Id$ , where in Section 6 we computed the standard procedure map  $\phi: M_*(p) \rightarrow N_*(EC_p)$ . In particular,

$$\phi(y_{2k}) = \sum (1, T^{b_1-1}, T^{b_1}, \dots, T^{b_k-1}, T^{b_k}) \in N_*(EC_p),$$

where the sum is taken over all  $b_j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ . Of course degenerate summands can be removed. Then we compose with the map  $i_* \otimes Id$ , where  $i_*: N_*(EC_p) \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_p)$  is induced by  $T \mapsto t = (23\dots p1) \in \Sigma_p$ . The third map is  $\Phi \circ (TR \otimes Id)$ . The standard procedure table reduction map  $TR: N_{2k}(E\Sigma_p) \rightarrow S_{2k}^{bf}(p)$  was computed in Section 16 of Part II, and the Berger-Fresse map  $\Phi: S_{2k}^{bf}(p) \otimes (\Delta^m) \rightarrow (N_*(\Delta^m)^{\otimes p})_{2k+p}$  was defined at the beginning of Subsection 17.1, prior to the proof of Proposition 17.3 which asserts that the Berger-Fresse map is the standard procedure map.

With  $2k = m(p-1)$  this last map  $\Phi(x \otimes \Delta^m) = \sum_M pos(x)sh(x)F(M, x)$  was computed in Remark 17.2. The only non-zero terms arise from the monomial

$$M = (0| \dots |0|01||1| \dots |1||12| \dots |(m-1)m||m| \dots |m)$$

with  $p$  occurrences each of  $0, 1, \dots, m$ , and  $x \in \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(p)$  formed by concatenating  $m+1$  permutations  $g_i$  of  $\{1, \dots, p\}$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq m$ , with  $g_i(p) = g_{i+1}(1)$ , and removing one of each adjacent repeated entry.

The table reductions  $TR(e, t^{b_1-1}, t^{b_1}, \dots, t^{b_k-1}, t^{b_k})$ , where  $k = m(p-1)/2 = mq$  and  $b_i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ , are sums of many surjection generators  $x_a$ . These generators are parametrized by partitions  $a_0 + a_1 + \dots + a_{m(p-1)} = mp$ . The non-caesura entries of the surjection generators  $x$  described in the paragraph above are the  $p$  entries of the final permutation  $g_m$ . Thus any table reduction surjection generator  $x_a$  that can be such an  $x$  must have  $p$  entries in the last row, hence  $a_i = 1$  for  $i < m(p-1)$  and  $g_m = t^{b_k}$

Next, for which sequences of  $b_j$ 's does this particular  $TR$  summand  $x_a$  have the form of  $m+1$  concatenated permutations? Note  $t^b = (b+1, b+2, \dots, b)$ . The first  $p$  entries of  $x_a$ , namely,  $(1, b_1, b_1+1, \dots, b_q, b_q+1)$  must be named by one of the  $q!$  permutations of  $q$  adjacent pairs  $(2, 3), (4, 5), \dots, ((p-1), p)$ . As a permutation  $g_0 \in \Sigma_p$ , this is an even permutation. Then  $b_q+1$  followed by the next  $p-1$  entries must be named by one of the  $q!$  permutations of  $q$  adjacent pairs from the cyclically ordered set  $(1, 2, \dots, p)$  with  $b_q+1$  removed. Such a permutation  $g_1 \in \Sigma_p$  is also an even permutation

The process continues, and we see that the allowable  $b_j$  sequences are named by  $m$  permutations of  $q$  pairs, each of which corresponds to an even permutation  $g_i \in \Sigma_p$ . There are  $(q!)^m$  such collections of permutations. Since  $p$  is odd, from Remark 17.2 the position sign of all the resulting Berger-Fresse terms is  $+1$ . Since all parity signs  $\tau(g_i) = +1$ , again from Remark 17.2 the shuffle signs are all  $(-1)^{(m(m-1)/2)(p(p-1)/2)}$ . These calculations complete the proof of Proposition 17.11.  $\square$

**Example 17.12.** Take  $p = 5, q = 2, m = 2, M = (0|0|0|0|01|1|1|1|12|2)$ . There are  $4 = (2!)^2$  relevant  $TR$  summands. The  $b$  sequence  $(b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4)$  must begin with  $(b_1, b_2) = (2, 4)$  or  $(4, 2)$ . In the first case,  $(b_3, b_4) = (1, 3)$  or  $(3, 1)$ . In the second case  $(b_3, b_4) = (1, 4)$  or  $(4, 1)$ .

The corresponding surjection generators are

$$x_a = (1234512345123), (1234534123451), (1452312451234), (1452345123451).$$

The position signs and shuffle signs are all  $+1$ . Thus  $\phi_{func}(y_8 \otimes \Delta^2) = 4(\Delta^2)^{\otimes 5}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 17.13.** We conclude this section with some remarks about the  $k$ -fold multisimplicial category that relate our methods to results of Medina-Mardones, Pizzi, and Salvatore in [23]. In Remark 14.5 we discussed multidiagonals for the surjection complexes  $\delta: \mathcal{S}_*(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*(n)^{\otimes k}$ . Combining



with the Berger-Fresse maps  $\Phi$  of Proposition 17.3, or the corresponding maps for other surjection operads of Proposition 17.8, there are composition equivariant chain maps, functorial on the  $k$ -fold product category  $\Delta^k$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_*(n) \otimes [N_*(\Delta^{m_1}) \otimes \dots \otimes N_*(\Delta^{m_k})] &\xrightarrow{\delta \otimes Id} \mathcal{S}_*(n)^{\otimes k} \otimes [N_*(\Delta^{m_1}) \otimes \dots \otimes N_*(\Delta^{m_k})] \\ &\simeq \bigotimes_i (\mathcal{S}_*(n) \otimes N_*(\Delta^{m_i})) \xrightarrow{\otimes \Phi_i} \bigotimes_i [N_*(\Delta^{m_i})^{\otimes n}] \simeq [(N_*(\Delta^{m_1}) \otimes \dots \otimes N_*(\Delta^{m_k}))^{\otimes n}]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain functorial maps  $\mathcal{S}_*(n) \otimes C_*(X) \rightarrow C_*(X)^{\otimes n}$  for  $k$ -fold multisimplicial sets  $X$ , where the normalized cellular chain complex  $C_*(X)$  for multisimplicial sets is defined in Subsection 8.5 of Part I. Generators  $b = x \otimes \bigotimes_i \Delta^{m_i}$  map to elements in the image of the target contraction. Thus, by a variant of Proposition 8.2, these composition maps coincide with standard procedure functorial maps defined by  $\Phi(b) = h_{\otimes} \Phi(db)$  and then extended equivariantly.

In Subsection 20.2 below we prove that the adjoints of the Berger-Fresse maps  $\mathcal{S}_*(n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$  for *simplicial* sets  $X$  define an operad morphism  $\mathcal{S}_*(n) \rightarrow HOM_{func}(N_*(X), N_*(X)^{\otimes n})$  from the surjection operad to the Eilenberg-Zilber operad. That argument extends to the adjoints of the maps just described for *multisimplicial* sets  $X$ , that is  $\mathcal{S}_*(n) \rightarrow HOM_{func}(C_*(X), C_*(X)^{\otimes n})$ . The extension does not start from scratch, but uses the above composition formula above that relates the multisimplicial set case to the simplicial set case. We will not include details of these arguments in Subsection 20.2. They are based on extensions of various uniqueness theorems for standard procedure chain maps that are important in our approach.

In [23] it is shown that the  $C_*(X)$  for multisimplicial sets are coalgebras over a certain  $E_\infty$ -operad different from the surjection operad. We do not know how that operad is related to the surjection operad  $\mathcal{S}$  or the Barratt-Eccles operad  $\mathcal{E}$  with components  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ . We study the two operads  $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{E}$  in Sections 19 and 20 below, along with an operad morphism  $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$  defined by the maps  $TR: N_*(E\Sigma_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*(n)$  of Subsection 16.1. In any event, as mentioned in the paragraph above, our methods in Subsection 20.2 do extend to prove the cellular chain complexes  $C_*(X)$  for multisimplicial sets are  $E_\infty$ -coalgebras over the  $E_\infty$ -operads  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{E}$ , parallel to results of [23].  $\square$

## 18 Preliminaries on Operads

The goal of the section after this one is to show that the operad structure maps for the Barratt-Eccles operad in the category of chain complexes,

$$N_*(E\Sigma_r) \otimes N_*(E\Sigma_{s_1}) \otimes \dots \otimes N_*(E\Sigma_{s_r}) \rightarrow N_*(E\Sigma_s) \quad s = s_1 + \dots + s_r,$$

are (modified) special cases of our standard procedure for constructing equivariant chain maps, using the preferred basis of the domain over a product of symmetric groups and the preferred contraction of the range. Our methods prove this collection of maps indeed satisfies the operad axioms. In the section after that we do the same thing for the surjection operad.

But first we want to record our conventions and some preliminary facts about operads in general. Experienced readers may feel like they know everything they want to know about operads. But in the following sections we do present some completely different constructions that seem rather surprising, motivated, and attractive. We prove our constructions yield the same results as the original constructions, and in the process eliminate quite a lot of what the original authors referred to as ‘tedious computations’, which were even sometimes not included. But there is no free lunch. We try to be careful with details, of which there are still many.

In fact, a single construction shows that a collection of chain complexes  $B_*(n)$  that are free over  $\Sigma_n$ , satisfy  $B_0(n) = \mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$ , and have bases in the image of contractions satisfying  $H_n^2 = 0$ , can be fit together to form maps

$$\mathcal{O}_B: B_*(r) \otimes B_*(s_1) \otimes \dots \otimes B_*(s_r) \rightarrow B_*(s) \quad s = s_1 + \dots + s_r,$$

that ‘almost’ form an operad. From Proposition 6.3 and Proposition 6.4 of Part I, such complexes  $B_*(n)$  are canonically direct summands of  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ .

There is a difference between what we will do here and our previous examples of the equivariant standard procedure construction. Namely, the product of symmetric groups  $\widehat{G}$  that acts freely on the domain sides embeds as a subset, but not a subgroup, of  $\Sigma_s$ . We will recursively define the structure map  $\mathcal{O}_B$  on basis elements  $b$  of the domain in the usual way by  $\mathcal{O}_B(b) = H_s \mathcal{O}_B(db)$ , where  $H_s$  is the contraction of the range. But then in order to satisfy the operad equivariance axiom for the structure maps, to be discussed below, we need to extend  $\mathcal{O}_B$  by a twisted form of equivariance on product elements  $\hat{g}b$ . We then need to prove our map is a chain map

and satisfies the operad equivariance axiom for arbitrary product elements  $\hat{g}x$ . The operad associativity axiom seems to require additional assumptions about the  $B_*(n)$ , which easily holds for the  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ , and less easily for the surjection complexes  $\mathcal{S}_*(n)$ . The troublesome issue is that compositions of standard procedure chain maps need not be standard procedure chain maps, as discussed back in Proposition 6.5 of Part I.

There is more than one way to do all this, but we like best an approach that extends some of our uniqueness results from Sections 6 and 8 of Part I to the twisted equivariant context. Justin R. Smith also made similar use of uniqueness results in parts of his work [28], [29], which interestingly he traced back to Cartan's original method of computation of the cohomology of Eilenberg-MacLane spaces.

## 18.1 The Symmetric Group Operad

We first need to set out some conventions with operads. Then we need to develop carefully what is known as the *symmetric group operad* in the category of sets. In the next subsection we also develop carefully the Eilenberg-Zilber symmetric operad, which is the functorial *CoEnd* operad, in the category of chain complexes. Of course experts know all this stuff, but for completeness we will start from scratch.

A *symmetric operad* is a collection of objects  $P(n)$ ,  $n \geq 1$ , in a symmetric monoidal category, together with structure maps

$$\mathcal{O}_P: P(r) \otimes P(s_1) \otimes \dots \otimes P(s_r) \rightarrow P(s_1 + \dots + s_r)$$

that satisfy a number of conditions. There should be a *left* group action of  $\Sigma_r$  on each  $P(r)$ . In all cases of interest to us, the component  $P(1)$  is a unit object for the product in the category. The maps  $\mathcal{O}_P$  should satisfy a *unit axiom*, an *associativity axiom*, and an *equivariance axiom*. The unit axiom is usually pretty obvious and deals with cases where  $r = 1$  or all of the  $s_i = 1$ . In both cases corresponding  $\mathcal{O}_P$  maps are identities. The associativity axiom states that a certain big diagram commutes. That diagram is built given sums  $s = \sum_{i=1}^r s_i$  and  $s_i = \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} s_{ij}$ . The equal sign on the left side of the diagram below refers to the canonical isomorphism that permutes factors in the symmetric monoidal category. For example, in categories of chain complexes, there will be some Koszul signs.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
P(r) \otimes \bigotimes_{i=1}^r [P(r_i) \bigotimes_{j=1}^{r_i} P(s_{ij})] & \xrightarrow{Id \otimes \otimes \mathcal{O}_P} & P(r) \otimes \bigotimes_{i=1}^r P(s_i) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}_P} P(s) \\
\| \sigma & \boxed{18.1} & \| \\
[P(r) \otimes \bigotimes_{i=1}^r P(r_i)] \otimes \bigotimes_{j=1}^{r_i} P(s_{ij}) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}_P \otimes Id} & P(\Sigma r_i) \otimes \bigotimes_{j=1}^{r_i} P(s_{ij}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}_P} P(s)
\end{array}$$

The equivariance axiom is somewhat more complicated and important and requires some preliminary constructions to even state.

Before that, we acknowledge that we will only be considering a few special operads and we ignore all issues involving a  $P(0)$ . We also ignore the unit axiom concerning  $P(1)$ , which is trivial in all our examples. Perhaps more relevant is the fact that most treatments work with right actions of the symmetric groups. But one of our main examples is (any of) the surjection operads  $\mathcal{S}$ , with components  $\mathcal{S}_*(n)$ , in a symmetric monoidal category of chain complexes. The symmetric group  $\Sigma_n$  acts on the left of surjection generators  $x: \{1, \dots, n+k\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$  by post composition, sometimes with signs. Another crucial example for our purposes is the Barratt-Eccles operad  $\mathcal{E}$ , with components  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ . Here the symmetric group could equally well act on the left or the right, but because of the importance of our comparisons  $\mathcal{S}_*(n) \xrightarrow{PR} N_*(E\Sigma_n) \xrightarrow{TR} \mathcal{S}_*(n)$  we want the left action.

Also, another key example for us is the Eilenberg-Zilber operad of functorial maps of normalized chain or cochain complexes of simplicial sets. The right action viewpoint may be better suited for viewing a cochain complex  $N^*(X)$  as an *algebra* over an  $E_\infty$  operad  $\mathcal{P}$ , such as  $\mathcal{P}(n) = N_*(E\Sigma_n)$  or  $\mathcal{P}(n) = \mathcal{S}_*(n)$ , via  $\mathcal{P}(n) \rightarrow \text{End}(n) = \text{HOM}(N^*(X)^{\otimes n}, N^*(X))$ . But we regard the cochain algebra structure to be an *emergent* phenomenon. The underlying phenomenon is the structure of a chain complex  $N_*(X)$  as a *coalgebra* over  $\mathcal{P}$ , via  $\mathcal{P}(n) \rightarrow \text{CoEnd}(n) = \text{HOM}(N_*(X), N_*(X)^{\otimes n})$ . One obtains the  $\text{End}(n)$  algebra structure as an image of the  $\text{CoEnd}(n)$  coalgebra structure, by composing  $\mathcal{P}(n) \rightarrow \text{CoEnd}(n)$  studied in the previous section with duality chain maps  $\text{CoEnd}(n) \rightarrow \text{End}(n)$  from Propositions 3.1 and 3.2 of Part I. Diagonal maps of chains precede cup products of cochains. For the chain operations the left group action viewpoint seems more natural.

**Remark 18.1.** Now we will develop the equivariance axiom for symmetric operads. First we will review an operad  $\Sigma$  in the category of sets called the *symmetric group operad*. We have  $\Sigma(r) = \Sigma_r$ , the permutation group as a set. The operad structure map

$$\mathcal{O}_\Sigma: \Sigma_r \times \Sigma_{s_1} \times \dots \times \Sigma_{s_r} \rightarrow \Sigma_s, \quad s = s_1 + \dots + s_r,$$

is defined as follows. Given  $u \in \Sigma_r$  and  $v_i \in \Sigma_{s_i}$  we define a modified kind of block permutation  $u_*(v_1, \dots, v_r) = \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(u; v_i) \in \Sigma_s$ . We partition the integral interval  $[1, s]$  into blocks

$$B_1 = [1, s_1], B_2 = [s_1 + 1, s_1 + s_2], \dots, B_r = [s_1 + \dots + s_{r-1}, s_1 + \dots + s_r].$$

We regard each  $v_i$  as a permutation of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  block in the obvious way, and we act accordingly on these blocks. We then permute the rearranged blocks  $v_i B_i$  according to how  $u \in \Sigma_r$  acts on the left of the ordered set of  $r$  blocks. We could equally well first permute the original blocks by  $u$  to  $[B_{u(1)}, \dots, B_{u(r)}]$ , then apply the  $v_i$  to the new locations of the  $B_i$ . We can write the resulting permutation as a concatenation of blocks

$$\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(u; v_i) = (v_{u(1)} B_{u(1)}, \dots, v_{u(r)} B_{u(r)}) \in \Sigma_s.$$

Note that if all  $s_i = 1$  then  $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(u; v_i) = u$ .

**Example 18.2.** Let  $u = (231), v_1 = (21), v_2 = (3124), v_3 = (321)$ . Then we first form a permutation in  $\Sigma_9$  by applying the  $v_i$  to the initial blocks of size 2,4,3 in that order. This yields the permutation  $(21\ 5346\ 987) \in \Sigma_9$ . (Recall we name a permutation by writing  $(12\dots s)$  in some order.) Then we permute the new first, second, and third blocks by  $u$ , yielding the permutation

$$u_*(v_1, v_2, v_3) = u(v_1 B_1, v_2 B_2, v_3 B_3) = (v_2 B_2, v_3 B_3, v_1 B_1) = (5346\ 987\ 21) \in \Sigma_9.$$

Here the  $s_i$  are distinct. In general it is not quite enough to write  $v_i \in \Sigma_{s_i}$ , if  $s_i$  occurs more than once in the ordered set  $\{s_j\}$ , it is necessary to keep track of which block of size  $s_i$  is associated with which permutation  $v_i$ . We abbreviate  $u_*(Id_{s_1}, \dots, Id_{s_r}) = u_*(s_1, \dots, s_r)$ , when the  $v_i$  are all identity permutations. In the example,  $u_*(2, 4, 3) = (3456\ 789\ 12)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 18.3.** We will write down two composition formulas in the permutation group  $\Sigma_s = \Sigma_{s_1 + \dots + s_r}$ .

$$\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(u; v_i) = (v_1 \oplus \dots \oplus v_r) \circ u_*(s_1, \dots, s_r)$$

$$= u_*(s_1, \dots, s_r) \circ (v_{u1} \oplus \dots \oplus v_{ur}).$$

The direct sum notation for permutations means a permutation of an ordered union of disjoint sets. So in the first formula,  $v_1$  acts on the initial block  $B_1$  of size  $s_1$ , wherever it occurs in the output of  $u_*(s_1, \dots, s_r)$ ,  $v_2$  acts on the second initial block  $B_2$  of size  $s_2$ , and so on. This is the second description of the permutation operad action above.

Then in the other formula,  $v_{u1}$  acts on an *initial* block of size  $s_{u1}$ , that is,  $[1, \dots, s_{u1}]$ ,  $v_{u2}$  acts on the following block of size  $s_{u2}$ , and so on. This is followed by the permutation  $u_*(s_1, \dots, s_r)$ . So that is a little tricky. It is perhaps easier to understand conjugating  $(v_1 \oplus \dots \oplus v_r)$  by  $u_*(s_1 \dots s_r)^{-1}$ , and seeing that you get  $(v_{u1} \oplus \dots \oplus v_{ur})$ . Thus, in the Example 18.2 above,

$$(21\ 5346\ 987) \circ (3456\ 789\ 12) = (5346\ 987\ 21) = (3456\ 789\ 12) \circ (3124\ 765\ 98) \quad \square$$

**Remark 18.4.** We will next write down the general equivariance axiom for operads, as it is often stated. One can give two separate formulas or combine them into a single formula. For  $g \in \Sigma_r$ ,  $u \in P(r)$ , and  $h_i \in \Sigma_{s_i}$ ,  $v_i \in P(s_i)$ ,  $s = s_1 + \dots + s_r$ , the axiom states

$$\mathcal{O}_P(gu; v_1, \dots, v_r) = g_*(s_1, \dots, s_r) \mathcal{O}_P(u; v_{g1}, \dots, v_{gr}) \in P(s)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_P(u; h_1 v_1, \dots, h_r v_r) = (h_1 \oplus \dots \oplus h_r) \mathcal{O}_P(u; v_1, \dots, v_r) \in P(s)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_P(gu; h_1 v_1, \dots, h_r v_r) = \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(g; h_1, \dots, h_r) \mathcal{O}_P(u; v_{g1}, \dots, v_{gr}) \in P(s).$$

But there are some issues with what these statements mean, and with the consistency of these properties, that many articles about operads seem to ignore. The first formula really means that a certain diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P(r) \otimes \bigotimes_{i=1}^r P(s_{gi}) & \xrightarrow{g \otimes \tau(g)} & P(r) \otimes \bigotimes_{i=1}^r P(s_i) \\ \downarrow \mathcal{O}_P & \boxed{18.4} & \downarrow \mathcal{O}_P \\ P(s) & \xrightarrow{g_*(s_1, \dots, s_r)} & P(s) \end{array}$$

The diagram includes the canonical monoidal category permutation isomorphism  $\tau(g): \bigotimes_i P(s_{gi}) \simeq \bigotimes_i P(s_i)$ , where we think of  $\Sigma_r$  acting on the *left* of the direct sum (coproduct) of all the  $\bigotimes_{j=1}^r P(s_j)$ , the sum taken over all ordered partitions  $s = s_1 + \dots + s_r$ . In particular, for the left group action on a tensor product of chain complexes,  $\tau(g)$  acts as  $g^{-1}$  on subscripts that

name the *ordered position*<sup>32</sup> of a tensor term factor in a multi-tensor, along with Koszul signs in order that the permutation isomorphism defines a chain map. But at least in chain complexes a tensor product of elements  $u \otimes \bigotimes v_i$  makes sense. Who knows what  $\bigotimes P(s_i)$  and  $\tau(g)$  mean in abstract monoidal categories. In the categories Sets and Vector Spaces, the first formulation of the first equivariant axiom is fine. The second formula in the equivariant axiom is somewhat more straightforward.

Note that the permutation identity in Remark 18.3 implies we get the same answer computing  $\mathcal{O}_P(gu; h_1 v_1, \dots, h_r v_r)$  by using the first two equivariance rules in either order. This then explains the equivalence of the first two formulas with the third.

There is no problem simply composing  $h$ 's in each  $\Sigma_{s_i}$  in the second formula in Remark 18.4. But there is an issue composing  $g$ 's in  $\Sigma_r$  in the first formula. We will show the first formula is always consistent with the left group action on  $P(r)$ . That is,  $\mathcal{O}_P((hg)u; v_1, \dots, v_r) = \mathcal{O}(h(gu); v_1, \dots, v_r)$  must hold, but iterated computation of the second term yields a different looking formula. At the same time, we will show the general operad equivariance axiom does hold for the permutation operad  $\Sigma$ . Of course experts know all this, but we found it less obvious than we expected. The key for both issues is the following.

**LEMMA 18.5.** *For  $h, g \in \Sigma_r$  and positive  $s_1, \dots, s_r$  with  $s = s_1 + \dots + s_r$ , it holds that  $(hg)_*(s_1, \dots, s_r) = h_*(s_1, \dots, s_r) \circ g_*(s_{h1}, \dots, s_{hr}) \in \Sigma_s$ .*

Before proving the lemma, we address the two points raised just above. First, for the consistency of the first operad equivariance formula in Remark 18.4, we use the formula three times and then use Lemma 18.5. We also use  $\tau(g^{-1})(\otimes v_{hi}) = \otimes v_{hgi}$ . Suppressing the categorical  $\otimes$  symbols in the subtleties of Diagram 18.4, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_P(h(gu); v_1, \dots, v_r) &= h_*(s_1, \dots, s_r) \mathcal{O}_P(gu; v_{h1}, \dots, v_{hr}) \\ &= h_*(s_1, \dots, s_r) g_*(s_{h1}, \dots, s_{hr}) \mathcal{O}_P(u; v_{hg1}, \dots, v_{hgr}). \\ \mathcal{O}_P((hg)u; v_1, \dots, v_r) &= (hg)_*(s_1, \dots, s_r) \mathcal{O}_P(u; v_{hg1}, \dots, v_{hgr}). \end{aligned}$$

Instead of referring to elements  $u, v_i$ , one can nicely prove the consistency of the equivariance axiom for general  $P$  by concatenating two Diagrams 18.4.

---

<sup>32</sup>Thus, in the top row the point is  $\tau(h)(\otimes_i v_{gi}) = \pm \otimes_i v_{gh^{-1}i}$ , since  $i$  names the ordered position. See Section 3 of Part I for a discussion of left group actions on tensor products.

There is something we find a bit odd about Lemma 18.5 and the above paragraph. Suppose one finds an operad  $P = \{P(n)\}$ , so the first equivariant property in Remark 18.4 holds in all cases, and for which one can find elements  $u \in P(r), v_i \in P(s_i)$  so that the elements  $\mathcal{O}_P(u; v_{f_1}, \dots, v_{f_r}) \in P(s)$  have trivial  $\Sigma_s$  isotropy groups for all  $f \in \Sigma_r$ . Then the lines in the paragraph above *prove* Lemma 18.5, since for an operad,  $\mathcal{O}_P(h(gu); v_1, \dots, v_r) = \mathcal{O}_P((hg)u; v_1, \dots, v_r)$  certainly holds.

Such  $P$  are not that hard to find. Big operads do exist. For example, take a big set  $X$  and the *CoEnd* operad  $P(n) = \text{Map}(X, X^n)$ . Or an operad with  $P(n)$  given as the set of isotopy classes of planar rooted trees with  $n$  labeled leaves. Probably the best choice is to exploit the fact that if  $A$  is a monoid, or associative algebra, there is a natural equivariant map  $\Sigma_n \rightarrow \text{Map}(A^n, A) = \text{End}(A)$ , with  $Id_n$  mapping to the product map for the monoid. In fact, algebras over the operad  $\Sigma$  in Sets *are* monoids. The operad  $\Sigma$  is also known as the *Associative* operad in the category Sets. One could take  $A$  to be the free monoid on a big set. Essentially one is using the equivariance axiom compatibility of the representations of the  $\Sigma_n$  on sets of monomials in  $n$  non-commuting variables for all  $n$ . That establishes  $\Sigma$  as a suboperad of  $\text{End}(A)$ , and proves Lemma 18.5. This is the point of view taken by Loday and Vallette in [15]. Perhaps that argument already works if  $A$  is the free monoid on just two elements, or is any finite non-abelian group. It certainly also works for other big operads  $P$ .

Nonetheless, few of the many articles about operads that we looked at gave any details about Lemma 18.5, or why the symmetric group operad was indeed an operad. The reference of Barratt-Eccles [2] does begin with some stated but unproved facts about permutations, but even there the proof that the symmetric group operad is an operad seemed to be hidden. When one tries to directly prove Lemma 18.5, it seems rather non-trivial. Therefore, we will go ahead and include a direct proof below, although readers can opt to ignore it. We would not disagree with experts who believe the right way to look at Lemma 18.5 is to relate the  $\Sigma_n$  to known big operads, as indicated above, for which the equivariance axiom of Remark 18.4 does hold. But why is it not easy to translate that argument into a direct proof inside one symmetric group?

Before giving a direct proof of Lemma 18.5 we will use it to establish the



operad equivariance axiom for  $\Sigma$ . We have from 18.5 and 18.3,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(gu, v_1, \dots, v_r) &= (v_1 \oplus \dots \oplus v_r)(gu)_*(s_1, \dots, s_r) \\
&= (v_1 \oplus \dots \oplus v_r)g_*(s_1, \dots, s_r)u_*(s_{g1}, \dots, s_{gr}) \\
&= g_*(s_1, \dots, s_r)(v_{g1} \oplus \dots \oplus v_{gr})u_*(s_{g1}, \dots, s_{gr}) \\
&= g_*(s_1, \dots, s_r)\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(u; v_{g1}, \dots, v_{gr}).
\end{aligned}$$

Here,  $g, u \in \Sigma_r$  and  $v_j \in \Sigma_{s_j}$ . We turn now to a direct proof of Lemma 18.5.

*Proof.* We will prove 18.5 is true for all  $g$  when  $h$  is a transposition of adjacent integers  $h = (1 \dots (i-1)(i+1)i(i+2) \dots r)$ . Also we will prove that if 18.5 is true for some  $h'$  and all  $g$ , then it is true for  $hh'$  and all  $g$  when  $h$  is such a transposition. But any  $h$  is a product of such transpositions, so the lemma follows by induction.

Assuming the first claim, we derive the second claim

$$\begin{aligned}
(hh'g)_*(s_1, \dots, s_r) &= h_*(s_1, \dots, s_r)(h'g)_*(s_{h1}, \dots, s_{hr}) \\
&= h_*(s_1, \dots, s_r)h'_*(s_{h1}, \dots, s_{hr})g_*(s_{hh'1}, \dots, s_{hh'r}) \\
&= (hh')_*(s_1, \dots, s_r)g_*(s_{hh'1}, \dots, s_{hh'r}).
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to prove 18.5 when  $h$  is a transposition of adjacent integers  $i, i+1$ . We fix the consecutive blocks  $B_\ell$  of length  $s_\ell$ . We find the argument slightly more readable if  $i = 5, i+1 = 6$ , but a reader who doesn't like that can just replace all 5's by  $i$  and all 6's by  $i+1$  and nothing changes. The argument below simplifies considerably if  $s_5 = s_6$ , so we omit that case. Suppose  $s_5 > s_6$ . Write the concatenated block  $B_5B_6 = B'B''B_6$  where  $B'$  has length  $s_6$  and  $B''$  has length  $s_5 - s_6$ . Then the permutation  $h_*(s_1, \dots, s_5, s_6, \dots, s_r)$  is the identity except for  $B_5B_6 \mapsto B_6B_5$ , which can be rewritten  $B'(B''B_6) \mapsto B_6(B'B'')$ , with  $B' \mapsto B_6$  and  $B''B_6 \mapsto B'B'' = B_5$ .

Suppose  $j < k$  with  $g(j) = 5$  and  $g(k) = 6$ . Then  $hg(\ell) = g(\ell)$  if  $\ell \neq j, k$ , and  $hg(j) = 6$ ,  $hg(k) = 5$ . The argument below is essentially the same if  $k < j$  and/or  $s_6 > s_5$ , so we leave those cases as exercises. We do give an example below. We observe

$$g_*(s_{h1}, \dots, s_{hr}) = g_*(s_1 \dots s_6 s_5 \dots s_r) = (B_{g1} \dots B_{g(j-1)} B' \dots B_{g(k-1)} B'' B_6 \dots B_{gr}).$$

Recall permutations in  $\Sigma_s$  are just expressed by writing the integers from 1 to  $s$  in some order, which a concatenation of blocks does achieve. The

tricky point in the above identity is that one is expressing the permutation by  $g$  of new consecutive blocks, the 5<sup>th</sup> of which has length  $s_6$ . So that is the block we called  $B'$  above. The following 6<sup>th</sup> block has length  $s_5$ , so that is the block we called  $B''B_6$  above.

Now follow the permutation  $g_*(s_{h1}, \dots, s_{hr})$  by  $h_*(s_1, \dots, s_r)$  which was also described above. The result is

$$(B_{g1} \dots B_{g(j-1)} B_6 \dots B_{g(k-1)} B_5 \dots B_{gr}) = (hg)_*(s_1, \dots, s_r),$$

as desired. □

**Example 18.6.** Consider  $(s_1 \dots s_8) = (5, 2, 3, 6, 4, 9, 6, 5)$  with  $s = 40$ . The basic blocks are

$$B_1 \dots B_8 = [1, 5][6, 7][8, 10][11, 16][17, 20][21, 29][30, 35][36, 40].$$

Take  $h = (1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 5, 7, 8)$ , the transposition that switches 5 and 6, and take  $g = (2, 6, 4, 7, 8, 3, 5, 1)$  so  $hg = (2, 5, 4, 7, 8, 3, 6, 1)$ . Here  $s_6 > s_5$ , so we split  $B_5B_6 = [17, 29]$  as  $B_5B'B'' = [17, 20][21, 25][26, 29]$ , with  $|B''| = s_5 = 4$ . Then  $h_*(s_1 \dots s_8)$  is the identity except for  $(B_5B')B'' \mapsto (B'B'')B_5$ , which on specific blocks is  $[17, 25][26, 29] \mapsto [21, 29][17, 20]$ .

Next compute  $g_*(s_{h1} \dots s_{h8})$ . The new 5<sup>th</sup> block is  $[17, 25]$  of length 9 and the new 6<sup>th</sup> block is  $[26, 29]$  of length 4. The other blocks are unchanged. Permute the new blocks by  $g$ , giving

$$g_*(5, 2, 3, 6, 9, 4, 6, 5) = [6, 7][26, 29][11, 16][30, 35][36, 40][8, 10][17, 25][1, 5].$$

Follow this by the permutation  $h_*(s_1 \dots s_8)$ , yielding

$$h_*(s_1 \dots s_8)g_*(s_{h1} \dots s_{h8}) = [6, 7][17, 20][11, 16][30, 35][36, 40][8, 10][21, 29][1, 5]$$

$$= B_2B_5B_4B_7B_8B_3B_6B_1 = (hg)_*(s_1 \dots s_8). \quad \square$$

**Remark 18.7.** We also need to establish the associativity axiom for  $\Sigma$ . From Diagram 18.1, the axiom amounts to a somewhat formally complicated identity in a permutation group  $\Sigma_s$ . It seems best to just think about the block permutation form of the permutations arising from the top and bottom rows of Diagram 18.1. Divide the interval  $[1, s]$  first into  $r$  blocks  $B_i$  of length  $s_i$ . Then subdivide each block  $B_i$  into  $r_i$  subblocks  $B_{ij}$  of length  $s_{ij}$ .

On the top row, first simultaneously permute the elements of block  $B_i$  by applying separate permutations in  $\Sigma_{s_{ij}}$  to the subblocks  $B_{ij}$ , then permute those subblocks by a permutation in  $\Sigma_{r_i}$ . Finally permute the resulting rearranged blocks  $B_i$  by a permutation in  $\Sigma_r$ .

Going down and then across the bottom row, first rearrange the subblocks  $B_{ij}$  of each  $B_i$  by permutations in  $\Sigma_{r_i}$ . Then permute the rearranged blocks  $B_i$  by a permutation in  $\Sigma_r$ . Finally apply permutations in  $\Sigma_{s_{ij}}$  to each block  $B_{ij}$  in its new location. The two described permutations in  $\Sigma_s$  are seen to be the same.  $\square$

## 18.2 The CoEnd Operad

In this subsection we will establish the operad properties of the *CoEnd* chain complex operad of linear maps

$$CoEnd(n) = HOM(N_*(X), N_*(X)^{\otimes n}).$$

This operad is a central ingredient in the approach to cochain operations underlying Steenrod cohomology operations that we take up in Part IV. The Eilenberg-Zilber operad  $\mathcal{Z}$  has components the chain complex of *functorial* linear maps  $\mathcal{Z}(n) = HOM_{func}(N_*(X), N_*(X)^{\otimes n})$ .

Operad structure maps

$$\mathcal{O}: CoEnd(r) \otimes \bigotimes_i CoEnd(s_i) \rightarrow CoEnd(s), \quad s = \sum s_i,$$

will roughly be compositions of functions. We will suppress the  $HOM_{func}$  notation in the next several paragraphs, but every step in the discussion is natural, so they make sense if  $HOM(N_*(X), N_*(X)^{\otimes n})$  is interpreted directly for fixed  $X$  or as “natural transformations of functors”.

**Remark 18.8.** Note from Proposition 3.1 in Section 3 of Part I, we have a chain map

$$\bigotimes_i HOM(N_*(X), N_*(X)^{\otimes s_i}) \rightarrow HOM(N_*(X)^{\otimes r}, N_*(X)^{\otimes s}), \quad \otimes v_i \mapsto \underline{\otimes} v_i,$$

where signs are needed when evaluating the homomorphism  $\underline{\otimes} v_i$  on a tensor.

Also from Proposition 3.1, composition of functions is a chain map, but one must be careful with the order. The correct chain map order, with  $d(\alpha \circ \beta) = d\alpha \circ \beta + (-1)^{|\alpha|}\alpha \circ d\beta$ , is

$$HOM(C_*, D_*) \otimes HOM(B_*, C_*) \rightarrow HOM(B_*, D_*), \quad \alpha \otimes \beta \mapsto \alpha \circ \beta.$$

Given  $u: N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes r}$  and  $v_i: N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes s_i}$ , the operad structure map value  $\mathcal{O}(u \otimes \otimes_i v_i): N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^s$ ,  $s = \sum s_i$ , is defined *up to sign* to be the composition  $\underline{\otimes} v_i \circ u$ .

In order for  $\mathcal{O}$  to be a chain map, we need to pre-compose with the permutation of tensor factors  $\tau(u \otimes \otimes_i v_i) = (-1)^{|u||\otimes v_i|} \otimes_i v_i \otimes u$ , with the Koszul sign, then take the composition of functions. Thus  $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}'\tau$ ,

$$CoEnd(r) \otimes \bigotimes_i CoEnd(s_i) \xrightarrow{\tau} \bigotimes_i CoEnd(s_i) \otimes CoEnd(r) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}'} CoEnd(s),$$

where  $\mathcal{O}'(\otimes_i v_i \otimes u) = \underline{\otimes} v_i \circ u$ .

Other authors have noticed that it would be sometimes advantageous to change the order of tensor factors in the basic definition of operad structure maps  $\mathcal{O}_P$ , but it seemed like this would cause us more trouble than it was worth.

The associativity axiom for the *CoEnd* operad, represented by Diagram [18.1](#), is fairly easy, amounting to little more than function composition associativity in the definition.  $\square$

**Remark 18.9.** To make sense of the equivariance axiom we first need to review the left  $\Sigma_n$  action on  $CoEnd(n)$ . This will be post-composition

$$gu: N_*(X) \xrightarrow{u} N_*(X)^{\otimes n} \xrightarrow{g} N_*(X)^{\otimes n}.$$

But what is the map  $g$  here? It must be the *left chain map* action on the  $n$ -fold tensor product,  $g(x_1 \otimes \dots \otimes x_n) = \pm(x_{g^{-1}1} \otimes \dots \otimes x_{g^{-1}n})$ , which includes a Koszul sign. Left action so that  $(hg)u = h(gu)$ , chain map so that  $d(gu) = gdu \in HOM(N_*(X), N_*(X)^{\otimes n})$ .

The second equivariance property in Remark 18.4 is a very easy consequence of function associativity. The first equivariance property of Remark 18.4 requires a closer look. In the notation of Diagram [18.4](#) in Remark 18.4, we need to prove the diagram below commutes. Strictly speaking there are

preliminary signs caused by the reversal of order of tensors in the basic operad structure map  $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}'\tau$ . But  $|gu||\underline{\otimes}_i v_i| = |u||\underline{\otimes}_i v_{gi}|$ , so those signs are harmless.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
N_*(X) & \xrightarrow{u} & N_*(X)^{\otimes r} & \xrightarrow{g} & N_*(X)^{\otimes r} \\
& & \downarrow (-1)^k \underline{\otimes} v_{gi} & & \downarrow \underline{\otimes} v_i \\
N_*(X)^{\otimes s} & = \underline{\otimes}_i N_*(X)^{\otimes s_{gi}} & \xrightarrow{g_*(s_1, \dots, s_r)} & \underline{\otimes}_i N_*(X)^{\otimes s_i} & = N_*(X)^{\otimes s}
\end{array}$$

The sign in the left down arrow is the Koszul sign associated to the permutation chain map  $\tau(g^{-1})(\underline{\otimes} v_i) = (-1)^k \underline{\otimes} v_{gi}$ .<sup>33</sup> The maps  $u$  and  $v_i$  can take  $\mathbb{F}$ -basis elements to sums of basic tensors, but linearity of all the operations takes care of that.

The desired commutativity can be written

$$g_*(s_1, \dots, s_r)((-1)^k \underline{\otimes} v_{gi} \circ g^{-1})(x_1 \otimes \dots \otimes x_r) = \underline{\otimes} v_i(x_1 \otimes \dots \otimes x_r).$$

Both domain and range in the bottom row equal  $N_*(X)^{\otimes s}$ , but with tensors organized differently in blocks. The key is to carefully keep track of evaluation signs and the *left* group chain map actions of  $g$  on  $N_*(X)^{\otimes r}$  and  $g_*(s_1, \dots, s_r)$  on  $N_*(X)^{\otimes s}$ . The *inverse* of permutation group elements are applied to position subscripts of basic tensors. We thus have, up to an evaluation sign for  $g$ ,

$$\underline{\otimes} v_{gi} \circ g^{-1}(x_1 \otimes \dots \otimes x_r) = \underline{\otimes} v_{gi}(x_{g1} \otimes \dots \otimes x_{gr}).$$

The block permutation  $g_*(s_1, \dots, s_r)$  rearranges concatenated blocks  $B_1 \dots B_r$  of tensors of respective lengths  $s_1 \dots s_r$  in the order  $B_{g1} \dots B_{gr}$ . Applying the inverse of  $g_*(s_1, \dots, s_r)$  to subscripts one gets, again up to an evaluation sign,

$$g_*(s_1, \dots, s_r) \underline{\otimes} v_{gi}(x_{g1} \otimes \dots \otimes x_{gr}) = \underline{\otimes} v_i(x_1 \otimes \dots \otimes x_r).$$

Ignoring all signs, this is the desired commutativity. In addition to the Koszul sign  $(-1)^k$ , and the evaluation Koszul signs for  $g$  and  $g_*(s_1, \dots, s_r)$ , there are signs from Proposition 3.1 of Part I needed for the evaluation on tensors of the maps  $\underline{\otimes} v_i$  and  $\underline{\otimes} v_{gi}$  in the diagram. All these evaluation signs are necessary to convert permutations of tensors and the  $\underline{\otimes}$  operation into chain maps. Since these signs are natural for compositions, they automatically work out in the diagram.  $\square$

<sup>33</sup>We used the simpler notation  $g$  instead of  $\tau(g)$  for the permutation chain map  $N_*(X)^{\otimes r} \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes r}$ , where the domain and range are actually identical tensor products.

**Example 18.10.** Suppose  $r = 2, g = (21)$ . Then

$$g^{-1}(x_1 \otimes x_2) = (-1)^{|x_1||x_2|} x_2 \otimes x_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \tau(g^{-1})(v_1 \otimes v_2) = (-1)^{|v_1||v_2|} v_2 \otimes v_1.$$

Also, from Proposition 3.1 of Part I,

$$v_1 \underline{\otimes} v_2(x_1 \otimes x_2) = (-1)^{|x_1||v_2|} v_1 x_1 \otimes v_2 x_2$$

$$v_2 \underline{\otimes} v_1 x_2 \otimes x_1 = (-1)^{|x_2||v_1|} v_2 x_2 \otimes v_1 x_1.$$

Finally

$$g_*(s_1, s_2)(v_2 x_2 \otimes v_1 x_1) = (-1)^{(|v_1|+|x_1|)(|v_2|+|x_2|)} v_1 x_1 \otimes v_2 x_2.$$

The sign part of the desired commutativity of the diagram then amounts to  $|v_1||v_2| + |x_2||v_1| + (|v_1| + |x_1|)(|v_2| + |x_2|) \equiv |x_1||x_2| + |x_1||v_2| \pmod{2}$ .  $\square$

## 19 The Barratt-Eccles Operad

We now take up the operad structure of the Barratt-Eccles operad, with components  $\mathcal{E}(n) = N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ . In the next section we take up the surjection operads. We will define candidates for operad structure maps using a modified version of the standard procedure of Part I of our paper that constructed equivariant chain maps. It turns out that this can be done rather generally. Let  $B_*(n)$  be arbitrary free  $\mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$  complexes with  $B_0(n) = \mathbb{F}[\Sigma_n]$  and with the obvious augmentation and basepoint. Assume contractions  $H_n$  satisfying  $H_n^2 = 0$  and  $H_n \circ \iota_B = 0$ . We also assume  $\Sigma_n$ -bases in the image of  $H_n$ . For the  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$  we use as basis the tuples of permutations with first entry the identity. For the  $\mathcal{S}_*(n)$  we will use as basis the surjections so that the first entries of  $1, 2, \dots, n$  occur in that order.

### 19.1 Candidates for Operad Structure Maps

**Remark 19.1.** We will define operad structure map candidates

$$\mathcal{O}_B: B_*(r) \otimes B_*(s_1) \otimes \dots \otimes B_*(s_r) \rightarrow B_*(s),$$

when the  $B_*(n)$  satisfy the conditions in the paragraph above. The domain is free over  $\widehat{G} = \Sigma_r \times \Sigma_{s_1} \times \dots \times \Sigma_{s_r}$ , with the basis  $\{b = (b_0 \otimes b_1 \otimes \dots \otimes b_r)\}$  where each  $b_j$  is a basis element of the corresponding  $B_*(n)$  factor. So this is just the product of separate  $\Sigma_n$ -bases of the tensor factors  $B_*(n)$ . Product basis elements  $b$  are in the image of the tensor product contractions. An

$\mathbb{F}$ -basis is given by all products  $\hat{g}b$ ,  $\hat{g} = (g; h_1, \dots, h_r) \in \Sigma_r \times \Sigma_{s_1} \times \dots \times \Sigma_{s_r}$ .

In degree 0,  $\mathcal{O}_B$  will be the operad structure map  $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma$  of the permutation group operad  $\Sigma$ . We then define recursively  $\mathcal{O}_B(b) = H_s \mathcal{O}_B(db)$ , where  $H_s$  is the contraction of  $B_*(s)$ . Let us abbreviate

$$Id \otimes \tau(g^{-1}) = \tau_g: B_*(r) \otimes B_*(s_1) \otimes \dots \otimes B_*(s_r) \rightarrow B_*(r) \otimes B_*(s_{g1}) \otimes \dots \otimes B_*(s_{gr}).$$

So  $\tau_{gg'} = \tau_{g'} \tau_g$ . It will be key that  $\tau_g$  is a chain map and that it is equivariant for  $\Sigma_r \times \Sigma_{s_1} \times \dots \times \Sigma_{s_r} \rightarrow \Sigma_r \times \Sigma_{s_{g1}} \times \dots \times \Sigma_{s_{gr}}$ . Then we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_B(\hat{g}b) &= \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\hat{g}) \mathcal{O}_B(\tau_g b) \\ &= \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(g; h_1, \dots, h_r) \mathcal{O}_B(\pm b_0 \otimes b_{g1} \otimes \dots \otimes b_{gr}). \end{aligned}$$

Here we are playing close attention to Remark 18.4, especially Diagram 18.4.

Note the argument of the last  $\mathcal{O}_B$  evaluation is a basis element of a different tensor product domain. So we are really defining the maps  $\mathcal{O}_B$  simultaneously by induction on  $\mathbb{F}$ -basis elements for all positive ordered partitions  $s = s_1 + \dots + s_r$ . Then we extend all these maps  $\mathbb{F}$ -linearly.

Of course the definition of  $\mathcal{O}_B(\hat{g}b)$  is just a special case of the equivariance axiom for operads. We need to extend that to all products  $\hat{g}x$ . This turns out to be a consequence of permutation identities from Remark 18.3 and Lemma 18.5. We will then use the general equivariance result to prove that  $\mathcal{O}_B$  is a chain map.  $\square$

**Proposition 19.2.** *Let  $\hat{g} = (g; h_1, \dots, h_r)$  and  $x = (x_0 \otimes x_1 \otimes \dots \otimes x_r)$ .*

(i). *It holds that  $\mathcal{O}_B(\hat{g}x) = \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\hat{g}) \mathcal{O}_B(\tau_g x)$ .*

(ii). *It also holds that  $d\mathcal{O}_B(x) = \mathcal{O}_B(dx)$ .*

*Proof.* We assume the  $x_j$  are  $\mathbb{F}$ -basis elements, not sums of such. Then there is a unique formula  $x = \hat{g}'b$ , where  $b = (b_0 \otimes b_1 \otimes \dots \otimes b_r)$  is a basis element and  $\hat{g}' = (g'; h'_1, \dots, h'_r) \in \hat{G}$ . We have on the left side of (i)

$$\mathcal{O}_B(\hat{g}x) = \mathcal{O}_B(\hat{g}\hat{g}'b) = \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(gg'; h_1 h'_1, \dots, h_r h'_r) \mathcal{O}_B(\tau_{gg'} b).$$

To compare with the right side of (i), we first observe

$$\tau_g x = \tau_g(\hat{g}'b) = (g'; h'_{g1}, \dots, h'_{gr}) \tau_g b.$$

We compute

$$\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\hat{g})\mathcal{O}_B(\tau_g x) = \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(g; h_1, \dots, h_r)\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(g'; h'_{g1}, \dots, h'_{gr})\mathcal{O}_B(\tau_{g'}\tau_g b).$$

From 18.3 and 18.5, which amount to the fact that  $\Sigma$  is indeed an operad, we have

$$\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(gg'; h_1 h'_1, \dots, h_r h'_r) = \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(g; h_1, \dots, h_r)\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(g'; h'_{g1}, \dots, h'_{gr}),$$

which proves (i) since  $\tau_{gg'} = \tau_{g'}\tau_g$ .

To prove (ii), we work by induction. In degree 0 there is nothing to prove, although it is relevant that  $\mathcal{O}_B = \mathcal{O}_\Sigma$  does commute with augmentations and base points in that degree. Inductively we first compute for basis elements, using the full boundary property in one lower dimension.

$$d\mathcal{O}_B(b) = dH_s\mathcal{O}_B(db) = \mathcal{O}_B(db) - H_s d\mathcal{O}_B(db) = \mathcal{O}_B(db) - H_s 0 = \mathcal{O}_B(db).$$

If  $|b| = 1$ , the second equality uses  $\rho\mathcal{O}_B(db) = \mathcal{O}_B\rho(db) = \mathcal{O}_B(0) = 0$ , where  $\rho$  is the basepoint.

For the general element  $x = \hat{g}b$  we make use of the fact that the boundary operators satisfy the ordinary group equivariance. Thus

$$d\mathcal{O}_B(\hat{g}b) = d(\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\hat{g})\mathcal{O}_B(\tau_g b)) = \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\hat{g})\mathcal{O}_B(d\tau_g b).$$

On the other side,

$$\mathcal{O}_B(d\hat{g}b) = \mathcal{O}_B(\hat{g}db) = \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\hat{g})\mathcal{O}_B(\tau_g db).$$

Since  $\tau_g$  is a chain map, (ii) is proved.  $\square$

Finally we want to ask when do the  $\mathcal{O}_B$  satisfy the associativity axiom of Diagram [18.1](#)? The first observation is that in degree 0, the commutativity of Diagram [18.1](#) is exactly the associativity axiom for the symmetric group operad  $\Sigma$ , discussed in Remark 18.7.

To go further, we review and extend the uniqueness result of Proposition 6.2 of Part I. That result asserted that an equivariant map  $\psi_0: B_0 \rightarrow C_0$  has a unique equivariant chain map extension to  $\psi: B_* \rightarrow C_*$  satisfying  $\psi(b) \in \text{Im}(h_C) = \text{Ker}(h_C)$  on basis elements, namely the standard procedure map  $\phi$ . The proof was an easy induction,

$$\phi(b) = h_C\phi(db) = h_C\psi(db) = h_C d\psi(b) = \psi(b) - dh_C\psi(b) = \psi(b) - 0.$$



Then equivariance forces  $\psi(gb) = \phi(gb)$ . The proof of this uniqueness result extends easily to the twisted  $\widehat{G}$ -equivariant situation

$$\mathcal{O}_B: B_*(r) \otimes B_*(s_1) \otimes \dots \otimes B_*(s_r) \rightarrow B_*(s)$$

of Proposition 19.2.

**Proposition 19.3.** *The standard procedure map  $\mathcal{O}_B$  of Proposition 19.2 is the unique twisted  $\widehat{G}$ -equivariant chain map that extends  $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma$  in degree 0 and takes basis elements of the domain to elements in  $Im(H_s) = Ker(H_s) \subset B_*(s)$ .  $\square$*

Proving the associativity axiom, that is, commutativity of Diagram [18.1](#), involves some more complicated versions of twisted equivariance maps  $\Phi$  than occurs in the basic situation  $\mathcal{O}_B$  of Proposition 19.2. There are two basic ingredients in all versions. First, a product of symmetric groups  $\widehat{G}$  that acts freely on the domain of  $\Phi$ , which will be a tensor product, embeds non-homomorphically in a symmetric group or product of symmetric groups that acts on the range of  $\Phi$ , by a map  $\mathcal{O}$  that is a variant or extension of the structure map  $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma$  for the permutation group operad. Secondly, the group  $\widehat{G}$  will also permute tensor factors of domain basis elements, say by some operation  $b \mapsto \tau_{\hat{g}}b$  with  $\tau_{\hat{g}}\tau_{\hat{h}} = \tau_{\widehat{hg}}$ .

In degree 0,  $\Phi_0 = \mathcal{O}_\Sigma$ . Then the map  $\Phi$  will always be defined in two steps. On basis elements of the domain,  $\Phi(b) = H\Phi(db)$ , where  $H$  is the contraction of the range. Then  $\Phi(\hat{g}b) = \mathcal{O}(\hat{g})\Phi(\tau_{\hat{g}}b)$ . The occurrence of  $\tau_{\hat{g}}$  in this preliminary equivariance formula means  $\Phi$  is really being defined by induction not on a single tensor product but on a direct sum of tensor products related by permutations of factors.

The proofs of Proposition 19.2(i),(ii) extend routinely, once the map  $\mathcal{O}$  generalizing  $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma$  is clarified. In words, the preliminary equivariance in the definition extends to full equivariance  $\Phi(\hat{g}x) = \mathcal{O}(\hat{g})\Phi(\tau_{\hat{g}}x)$ , where  $x = \hat{g}'b$ . Also  $\Phi$  is a chain map. The uniqueness result Proposition 19.3 also extends quite routinely to the more complicated twisted contexts.

We will give some examples related to Diagram [18.1](#) in the case of interest to us where  $P(n) = B_*(n)$ . We will see that the first map  $\Phi' = Id \otimes \otimes \mathcal{O}_B$  in the top row is a standard procedure twisted equivariant map for the inclusion

$$\mathcal{O}' = Id \times \prod_i \mathcal{O}_\Sigma: \widehat{G}' \rightarrow \Sigma_r \times \prod_i \Sigma_{s_i}, \text{ where } \widehat{G}' = \Sigma_r \times \prod_i [\Sigma_{r_i} \times \prod_j \Sigma_{s_{ij}}].$$

We will also see that the first map  $\Phi'' = \mathcal{O}_B \otimes \bigotimes Id$  in the bottom row is a standard procedure twisted equivariant map for the inclusion

$$\mathcal{O}'' = \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \times \prod_{i,j} Id: \widehat{G}'' \rightarrow \Sigma_{\oplus ri} \times \prod_{i,j} \Sigma_{sij}, \text{ where } \widehat{G}'' = [\Sigma_r \times \prod_i \Sigma_{ri}] \times \prod_{i,j} \Sigma_{sij}.$$

The second map in both rows are standard twisted equivariant maps  $\mathcal{O}_B$  from Proposition 19.2.

We have mentioned that in degree 0 in our case Diagram [18.1](#) commutes, the result being the one map  $\widehat{G}' \rightarrow \Sigma_s$  produced by the associativity axiom for the symmetric group operad. That is, one gets the same map, say  $\mathcal{O}$ , by following  $\mathcal{O}'$  by the symmetric group operad map  $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma: \Sigma_r \times \prod_i \Sigma_{si} \rightarrow \Sigma_s$  or by first applying the reordering of factors isomorphism  $\widehat{G}' \simeq \widehat{G}''$  and then following  $\mathcal{O}''$  by  $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma: \Sigma_{\oplus ri} \times \prod_{i,j} \Sigma_{sij} \rightarrow \Sigma_s$ . Thus there is a well-defined twisted equivariant standard procedure map from the top left to the lower right of Diagram [18.1](#), twisted with respect to the non-homomorphic embedding  $\mathcal{O}$ . We would like to prove that both compositions around Diagram [18.1](#) coincide with this standard map. It is just a check using  $\Sigma$  operad associativity that both compositions satisfy the same twisted equivariance.

**Proposition 19.4.** (i). *The first map*

$$\Phi' = Id \otimes \bigotimes \mathcal{O}_B: B_*(r) \otimes \bigotimes_{i=1}^r [B_*(r_i) \otimes \bigotimes_{j=1}^{r_i} B_*(s_{ij})] \rightarrow B_*(r) \otimes \bigotimes_{i=1}^r B_*(s_i)$$

on the top row of Diagram [18.1](#) is a standard procedure chain map that satisfies the basic twisted equivariance formulas as in Proposition 19.2 separately on each tensor factor  $\mathcal{O}_B: [B_*(r_i) \otimes \bigotimes_{j=1}^{r_i} B_*(s_{ij})] \rightarrow B_*(s_i)$ , and ordinary equivariance on the first  $Id$  factor.

(ii). *The first map*

$$\Phi'' = \mathcal{O}_B \otimes \bigotimes Id: [B_*(r) \otimes \bigotimes_{i=1}^r B_*(r_i)] \otimes \bigotimes_{j=1}^{r_i} B_*(s_{ij}) \rightarrow B_*(\Sigma r_i) \otimes \bigotimes_{j=1}^{r_i} B_*(s_{ij})$$

on the bottom row of Diagram [18.1](#) is a standard procedure chain map that satisfies the basic twisted equivariance formula on the first tensor factor  $\mathcal{O}_B: B_*(r) \otimes \bigotimes_{i=1}^r B_*(r_i) \rightarrow B_*(\Sigma r_i)$ , and ordinary equivariance on all the  $Id$  factors.

(iii). *The vertical isomorphism*

$$\sigma: B_*(r) \otimes \bigotimes_{i=1}^r [B_*(r_i) \otimes \bigotimes_{j=1}^{r_i} B_*(s_{ij})] \rightarrow [B_*(r) \otimes \bigotimes_{i=1}^r B_*(r_i)] \otimes \bigotimes_{j=1}^{r_i} B_*(s_{ij})$$

on the left side of Diagram [18.1](#) that permutes tensor factors is a standard procedure chain map that satisfies ordinary equivariance with respect to an isomorphism between products of symmetric groups that permutes factors.

*Proof.* All three statements are modified cases of untwisted versions of tensor products of chain maps that we studied in Proposition 6.11(i), (ii) of Part I. We offered two proofs of the various parts of that result. One proof was an inductive proof for basis elements, beginning in degree 0, that used explicit formulas for contractions of tensor products. Two formulas are equal if they agree on basis elements and satisfy the same equivariance. The other proof was simpler and made use of the uniqueness result Proposition 6.2 of Part I. The key is that tensor products of elements in the image of contractions are in the image of the tensor product contraction. Both proofs carry over to all parts of the present proposition, with an extended Proposition 19.3 replacing Proposition 6.2. We leave the relatively easy details as exercises.  $\square$

It follows immediately from the extended Proposition 19.3 that the collection of maps  $\mathcal{O}_B$  define an operad structure on the components  $B_*(n)$  if the two routes around Diagram [18.1](#), which we have named  $\mathcal{O}_B \circ \Phi'$  and  $\mathcal{O}_B \circ \Phi'' \circ \sigma$ , have the property that both composed maps send basis elements of the domain to elements in  $Im(H_s)$ . Going back to Proposition 6.5 of Part I, we know that compositions of standard procedure maps need not be standard procedure maps, but there are various hypotheses that imply compositions are standard procedure maps. However, the real issue for establishing associativity for the candidate operad structure maps  $\mathcal{O}_B$  is not so much the extension of Proposition 6.11 and Proposition 6.5 to twisted equivariant situations, which is pleasant enough and one way to look at it, but rather the following more direct criterion for associativity of the  $\mathcal{O}_B$ .

**Proposition 19.5.** *Suppose the maps  $\mathcal{O}_B$  have the property that for all  $c \in B_*(r) \otimes \bigotimes B_*(s_i)$  that are tensor products of elements in the image of contractions of the factors, it holds that  $\mathcal{O}_B(c) \in Im(H_s) \subset B_*(s)$ . Then both compositions naming the two routes around Diagram [18.1](#) do send basis elements to elements in  $Im(H_s)$ , and therefore the  $B_*(n)$  form an operad.*

*Proof.* Starting with a big tensor product of basis elements in either row of Diagram [\[18.1\]](#), the first map  $\Phi'$  or  $\Phi''$  will carry that tensor to a tensor of elements in the image of contractions. Therefore by the assumed criterion applying another  $\mathcal{O}_B$  map produces an element in  $Im(H_s)$ .  $\square$

## 19.2 The Barratt-Eccles Operad Structure Maps

We first observe that in the case  $B_*(n) = N_*(E\Sigma_n)$  the criterion of Proposition 19.5 trivially holds. Namely, for each factor  $N_*(E\Sigma_r)$  or  $N_*(E\Sigma_{s_i})$  separately of a tensor product,  $Im(H)$  is exactly the same thing as the  $\mathbb{F}$ -span of basis elements, because of the contraction formula  $H(X) = (e, X)$  for a tuple of permutations  $X$ . Applying  $\mathcal{O}_B$  to a tensor product of basis elements is by definition in the image of  $H_s$ . Therefore, we have proved

**Proposition 19.6.** *The  $\mathcal{E}(n) = N_*(E\Sigma_n)$  form an operad, using the standard twisted equivariant procedure chain maps of Proposition 19.2 as structure maps.  $\square$*

In the case  $B_*(n) = \mathcal{S}_*(n)$ , for any of the surjection complexes, there are elements in  $Im(H_n)$  that are not  $\mathbb{F}$ -linear combinations of basis elements. For example, from Section 13,  $H_4(14324) = (s + isr + i^2sr^2)(14324) = (124324) + (123434)$ , but  $(124324)$  is not a basis element. We will need to work harder to establish the hypothesis of Proposition 19.5.

We will next reconcile our approach to the Barratt-Eccles operad with the standard approach found in the literature. Among other things, this provides a closed formula for the operad maps, something the recursive approach does not do immediately. Barratt-Eccles in [2] first defined a symmetric operad  $W$  in the category of simplicial sets with components  $W(n) = E\Sigma_n$ , the contractible MacLane models for the symmetric group. The operad structure maps are induced from the symmetric operad  $\Sigma$  of sets. The degree 0 simplices (vertices) of the  $E\Sigma_n$  are the symmetric groups  $\Sigma_n$ . So in degree 0 the structure map  $\mathcal{O}_W: W(r) \times W(s_1) \times \dots \times W(s_r) \rightarrow W(s)$  is just the  $\Sigma$  operad structure map  $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma$ .

We point out that

$$W(r) \times W(s_1) \times \dots \times W(s_r) = E\Sigma_r \times E\Sigma_{s_1} \times \dots \times E\Sigma_{s_r} = E(\Sigma_r \times \Sigma_{s_1} \times \dots \times \Sigma_{s_r}).$$

In degree  $k$ , a ‘simplex’ in  $W(n)_k$  is just a  $(k+1)$ -tuple of permutations in  $\Sigma_n$ . ‘Simplices’ in products of simplicial sets are tuples of ‘simplices’ in the

factors. We thus also view a  $k$ -simplex of the simplicial set product as a  $(k + 1)$ -tuple of vertices of the MacLane model for the product group. We define  $\mathcal{O}_W$  to be  $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma$  on each vertex of the  $(k + 1)$ -tuple of product vertices. It is routine to see that  $\mathcal{O}_W$  commutes with face and degeneracy maps, which just delete or repeat vertices. Since  $\Sigma$  is an operad in sets, it is immediate that  $W$  is an operad in simplicial sets. The operad structure map  $\mathcal{O}_W$  can then be viewed as the inclusion of MacLane models induced by the inclusion of groups (*not* a homomorphism)  $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma: \Sigma_r \times \Sigma_{s_1} \times \dots \times \Sigma_{s_r} \rightarrow \Sigma_s$ .

**Remark 19.7.** Next we apply the normalized chain complex functor, which is a symmetric monoidal functor, and define the components of the Barratt-Eccles operad in the category of chain complexes to be  $\mathcal{E}(n) = N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ . The term *symmetric monoidal functor* refers to properties of the functorial Eilenberg-Zilber maps  $EZ: N_*(X) \otimes N_*(Y) \rightarrow N_*(X \times Y)$ . Recall that any set theoretic inclusion of groups  $G \rightarrow G'$  that corresponds identity elements induces a map of normalized chain complexes  $N_*(EG) \rightarrow N_*(EG')$  that commutes with the contractions  $h_G, h_{G'}$ . This fact was discussed in Example 5.3 of Part I. Combined with the Eilenberg-Zilber map  $EZ$ , we then obtain alternate candidates  $\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{E} = N_*(\mathcal{O}_W) \circ EZ$  for the operad structure maps of the Barratt-Eccles symmetric operad in the category of chain complexes,

$$\begin{aligned} N_*(E\Sigma_r) \otimes N_*(E\Sigma_{s_1}) \otimes \dots \otimes N_*(E\Sigma_{s_r}) &\xrightarrow{EZ} N_*(E(\Sigma_r \times \Sigma_{s_1} \times \dots \times \Sigma_{s_r})) \\ &\xrightarrow{N_*(\mathcal{O}_W)} N_*(E\Sigma_{s_1+\dots+s_r}). \end{aligned}$$

Of course it is necessary to prove these structure maps of chain complexes do satisfy the operad axioms. There are very easy proofs that simply show these  $\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{E}$  coincide with the standard procedure twisted equivariant chain maps that we have already proved define an operad.

**Proposition 19.8.** *The map  $N_*(\mathcal{O}_W) \circ EZ$  coincides with the standard twisted equivariant procedure chain map between domain and range from Proposition 19.2, using the preferred basis of the domain over products of symmetric groups and the preferred contraction of the range.*

*Proof.* We give two proofs. Our first proof is simply the observation that the uniqueness result Proposition 19.3 applies directly.

Here is a second proof. We proved in Section 8 of Part I that the map  $EZ$  is the ordinary equivariant standard procedure map. We observed in Remark 19.7 that  $N_*(\mathcal{O}_W)$  commutes with contractions and is twisted equivariant.

The composition is thus the twisted standard procedure chain map, by an easy argument essentially identical to that of Proposition 6.5(ii) of Part I.  $\square$

We make some comments that relate our constructions more directly to the symmetric monoidal functor viewpoint. Since  $EZ$  is ordinary equivariant and  $N_*(\mathcal{O}_W)$  is twisted equivariant, the composition  $\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{E} = N_*(\mathcal{O}_W) \circ EZ$  is twisted equivariant. All that remains is the associativity axiom. The original point of view is that associativity follows from symmetric monoidal functor properties of the  $EZ$  maps and the symmetric operad properties of  $W$ . We studied the  $EZ$  maps for MacLane models extensively in Sections 6 of Part I, in the context of our standard procedures for defining chain maps using bases of the domain and contractions of the range. In particular, basic properties of the  $EZ$  maps for MacLane models, such as full associativity and commutativity, drop out directly from the uniqueness result Proposition 6.2 of Part I. The explicit closed formula is not needed.

The operad properties of  $W$  are trivial consequences of the operad properties of the symmetric group operad  $\Sigma$ . Then  $EZ$  maps Diagram [18.1](#) for the  $\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{E}$  maps to  $N_*$  applied to Diagram [18.1](#) for the  $\mathcal{O}_W$  maps. This latter diagram certainly commutes. The terminal target in all rows of both diagrams is  $N_*(E\Sigma_s)$ . The full commutativity and associativity properties of  $EZ$  can be used to show the full diagram commutes, which implies the operad associativity of the  $\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{E}$ . This is just the argument that symmetric monoidal functors in general produce operads in one category from operads in another category.

## 20 The Surjection Operad

In this section we show that the candidate structure maps  $\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{S}$  of Proposition 19.2 for the various surjection complexes  $\mathcal{S}_*(n)$  satisfy the associativity axiom, and hence the surjection complexes form operads. Of course since the surjection complexes are all isomorphic, we can work with any one of them. The signs are simplest for the Berger-Fresse complexes.

We will actually prove more, namely we will prove the diagram below commutes. Each map, including the tensor product of  $TR$  maps, is a standard

procedure map.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
N_*(E\Sigma_r) \otimes N_*(E\Sigma_{s_1}) \otimes \cdots \otimes N_*(E\Sigma_{s_r}) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{E}} & N_*(E\Sigma_s) \\
\downarrow TR \otimes \downarrow TR \otimes \cdots \otimes \downarrow TR & & \downarrow TR \\
\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(r) \otimes \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(s_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(s_r) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{S}} & \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(s).
\end{array}$$

Associativity for the Barratt-Eccles operad then provides another proof of associativity for the surjection operad. But the diagram also says that the surjection operad is a quotient operad of the Barratt-Eccles operad, that is,  $\mathcal{TR}: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$  is a surjective operad morphism.

We will also show that the adjoints of the Berger-Fresse functorial standard procedure maps  $\phi: \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$  studied in Section 17 fit together to define an operad map from the surjection operad to the *CoEnd* operad,  $\Phi: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow CoEnd$ , where  $CoEnd(n) = HOM_{func}(N_*(X), N_*(X)^{\otimes n})$ .

## 20.1 The Surjection Operad Structure Maps

**Remark 20.1.** In order to study the candidate structure maps  $\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{S}$  of Proposition 19.2 we need quite a bit of notation. Given a tuple of integers  $y$ , denote by  $y[t]$  the result of adding  $t$  to each entry of  $y$ . A  $k$ -division of  $y$  is obtained by repeating  $k - 1$  not necessarily distinct entries of  $y$  and inserting dividers between the repeated entries. For example, if  $y = (1, 2, 3, 2, 4)$  then one 3-division of  $y[2] = (3, 4, 5, 4, 6)$  is given by  $(3, 4|4, 5, 4, 6|6)$ . We refer to the  $k$  delineated subtuples of a  $k$ -division as the *division subtuples*. In the example, these are  $(3, 4)$ ,  $(4, 5, 4, 6)$ ,  $(6)$ . The tuple consisting of a single integer  $(n)$  has a unique  $k$ -division  $(n | \dots | n)$ . Any  $y$  has a unique 1-division, namely  $y$  itself. Obviously  $k$ -divisions of  $y$  and  $y[t]$  are equivalent concepts.

Given a generator  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{r+k}) \in \mathcal{S}_*(r)$ , with  $k_i$  occurrences of the values  $i$ , and given generators  $y_i \in \mathcal{S}_*(s_i)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$  along with a  $k_i$ -division  $\mathcal{D}_i$  of each  $y_i[t_i]$ , where  $t_i = s_1 + \dots + s_{i-1}$ , we define  $\mathcal{D}x = (\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_r)x \in \mathcal{S}_*(s)$ ,  $s = s_1 + \dots + s_r$ , to be the result of replacing the successive occurrences of the  $i$ -entries of  $x$  by the successive division subtuples of the  $y_i[t_i]$ . In all discussions in this section, the integer  $k_i$  will always denote the number of  $i$ 's occurring in a generator  $x$  that is part of the discussion.

We also want to associate a  $\pm$  sign to each term  $\mathcal{D}x$ . The signs depend on which surjection complex we use, but the terms  $\mathcal{D}x$  do not. The sign will be related to a shuffle permutation of caesura *positions* of the caesuras of  $x$

and the  $y_i$ . The values of entries of  $\mathcal{D}x$  are what they are, but the positions of the caesuras of  $\mathcal{D}x$  only depend on the positions of the caesuras of  $x$  and the positions of the caesuras of the  $y_i$  with respect to the  $k_i$ -divisions of the  $y_i$ . There are different ways to describe the relevant shuffle of caesuras and a sign, but here is one.

The number of caesuras of  $\mathcal{D}x$  is the degree, which is  $|x| + \sum |y_i|$ . The entries of the  $y_i$  that are final entries of division subtuples that are repeated in a following subtuple generate caesura entries of  $\mathcal{D}x$  because they are repeated later in  $\mathcal{D}x$ . These correspond to the caesura entries of  $x$ . The caesura entries of the  $y_i$  in division subtuples that come before the final entry of subtuples correspond bijectively to the caesuras of the  $y_i$ . These are then moved to positions in  $\mathcal{D}x$  that precede the positions of the corresponding final subtuple entry. These non-final  $y_i$ -caesuras also generate caesura entries of  $\mathcal{D}x$ . Define  $sh(C_x, C_{\mathcal{D}})$  to be the number of pairs consisting of an  $x$ -caesura of  $\mathcal{D}x$  and a  $y$ -caesura of  $\mathcal{D}x$  that precedes it. The sign associated to  $\mathcal{D}x$  in the surjection complex  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(s)$  will be  $(-1)^{sh(C_x, C_{\mathcal{D}})}$ .

Note that this discussion simplifies somewhat if  $y_j = (1) \in \mathcal{S}_0(1)$  for all  $j \neq i$  and a  $k_i$ -division is chosen for  $y_i \in \mathcal{S}_*(s_i)$ . For  $j \neq i$  there is still an implicit  $k_j$ -division  $(1|1|\dots|1)$  of  $y_j$ . These simple cases are all that is needed in the *partial compositions* treatment of operads that we will discuss further below.

**Example 20.2.** Take  $x = (1, 2, 1, 3, 2)$ , and  $y_1 = (1231)$ ,  $y_2 = (1, 2, 1, 4, 3)$  and  $y_3 = (1, 2, 1)$ . Consider the  $k_1 = 2$ -division  $\mathcal{D}_1 y_1[0] = (1, 2|2, 3, 1)$ , the  $k_2 = 2$ -division  $\mathcal{D}_2 y_2[3] = (4, 5, 4, 7|7, 6)$ , and the  $k_3 = 1$ -division  $\mathcal{D}_3 y_3[7] = (8, 9, 8)$ . Then

$$\mathcal{D}x = (\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2, \mathcal{D}_3)x = (\underline{1}, \underline{2}, \underline{4}, \underline{5}, \underline{4}, \underline{7}, \underline{2}, \underline{3}, \underline{1}, \underline{8}, \underline{9}, \underline{8}, \underline{7}, \underline{6}).$$

The two  $x$ -caesura entries of  $\mathcal{D}x$  are the 2 and 7, corresponding to final entries of  $y_i[t_i]$  subtuples that replace caesuras of  $x$ . The three  $y$ -caesura entries are the 1, 4, and 8. The order of these caesuras in  $\mathcal{D}x$  is 1 2 4 7 8. Thus  $sh(C_x, C_{\mathcal{D}}) = 1 + 2$  and the sign associated to  $\mathcal{D}x$  is  $-1$ .

For a partial composition example, take  $x = (1, 2, 1, 3, 2)$ ,  $y_1 = (1)$ ,  $y_3 = (1)$ ,  $y_2 = (1, 2, 1, 4, 3)$  with the 2-division  $\mathcal{D}_2 y_2[1] = (2, 3, 2, 5|5, 4)$ . We also use the  $k_1 = 2$ -division  $(1|1)$  of  $y_1$ . Then  $\mathcal{D}x = (\underline{1}, \underline{2}, \underline{3}, \underline{2}, \underline{5}, \underline{1}, \underline{6}, \underline{5}, \underline{4})$ . The  $x$ -caesuras are 1, 5 and the  $y$ -caesura is 2, in the order 1 2 5. The sign associated to  $\mathcal{D}x$  is  $-1$ .  $\square$



We now give a formula for the surjection operad map for  $x \in \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(r), y_i \in \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(s_i) s = \sum s_i$ .

**Proposition 20.3.** (i). *With the  $\mathcal{D}_i$  indicating  $k_i$ -divisions of  $y_i[t_i]$ , as above, it holds that with suitable signs the equivariant twisted standard procedure map  $\mathcal{O}_S$  of Proposition 19.2 coincides with a map*

$$\Phi(x; y_1, \dots, y_r) = \sum_{\text{all } \mathcal{D}=(\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_r)} \pm \mathcal{D}x \in \mathcal{S}_*(s).$$

(ii). *For the surjection complex  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(s)$  the sign of the  $\mathcal{D}x$  term is  $(-1)^{sh(C_x, C_{\mathcal{D}})}$ .*

The signs are recursively determined by the standard procedure process. We state the proposition in two parts because we will first prove by induction that a formula (i) holds for all the surjection complexes. Then we will verify the signs given in (ii) are correct for the Berger-Fresse complex. The steps in the proof very much resemble the steps in the proof of Proposition 17.3 that identified the functorial standard procedure map  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$  with a Berger-Fresse map. As in that case, the result here provides an example of the general method described towards the end of preview Section 2.3 of Part I for studying standard procedure maps of form  $\phi(x) = \sum \pm \mathcal{T}x$ .

**Step 0.** In degree 0,  $x$  and the  $y_i$  are permutations, all  $k_i = 1$ , and the map  $\Phi = \mathcal{O}_S$  coincides with the operad structure map  $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma$  of Section 18.1. Since permutation  $x$  has no caesuras, all signs are +1.  $\square$

**Step 1.** The map  $\Phi$  is twisted equivariant. It is best to look at the separate formulas in Remark 18.4, where the twisted equivariant property was defined. The second formula  $\Phi(x; h_i y_i) = (\oplus h_i) \Phi(x; y_i)$  is trivial, on each  $\mathcal{D}x$  summand, because one is just permuting the entries of each  $y_i[t_i]$  and their division subtuples, which can be done either before or after replacing occurrences of  $i$  in  $x$  by division subtuples of  $y_i[t_i]$ . The signs in part (ii) also match because the relative positions of  $y_i$  and  $h_i y_i$ -caesuras, compared to  $x$ -caesuras, coincide in corresponding  $\mathcal{D}$  terms.

The first formula  $\Phi(gx; y_i) = g_*(s_i) \Phi(x; y_{g_i})$  is also seen by matching  $\mathcal{D}gx$  summands on the left with  $\mathcal{D}x$  summands on the right. On the left, choosing a  $k_{g^{-1}(i)}$ -division of each  $y_i[t_i]$  is equivalent to choosing on the right a  $k_i$ -division of each  $y_{g_i}[t'_i]$ , where the entries of the  $y_{g_i}[t'_i]$  and their division subtuples are from successive intervals of length  $s_{g_i}$  ending at  $s_{g_1} + \dots + s_{g_i}$ . Use

these to form a summand of  $\Phi(x; y_{gi})$  in  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(s)$ , then act by the permutation  $g_*(s_i)$ . That permutation  $g_*(s_i) = (B_{g_1}B_{g_2} \dots B_{g_r})$  takes successive intervals of length  $s_{gi}$  to the blocks  $B_{gi}$ , where  $(1, 2, \dots, s) = (B_1, B_2, \dots, B_r)$  with each block  $B_i$  having length  $s_i$ . The result is the element of  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(s)$  obtained by replacing occurrences of  $i$  in  $gx$  by division subtuples of  $y_i[t_i]$ , which is a summand of  $\Phi(gx; y_i)$ .

An advantage of the complexes  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$  is that the permutation group  $\Sigma_n$  acts with no signs. Therefore the signs in part (ii) of the formula for  $\Phi$  also match because the relative positions of  $x$  and  $y_{gi}$ -caesuras match those of  $gx$  and  $y_i$ -caesuras in corresponding  $\mathcal{D}$  summands.

It requires some diligence to parse this last argument because of the subtlety of the permutation  $g_*(s_i)$ . Surprisingly it does not really seem easier to follow in the case of partial compositions with a single non-trivial  $y_i$ .  $\square$

**Example 20.4.** Take  $r = 3$ ,  $x = (1, 2, 1, 3, 2)$ ,  $y_1 = (1, 2, 3, 2, 4, 1)$ ,  $y_2 = (1, 2, 1)$ , and  $y_3 = (1, 2, 1, 3, 1)$ . Take  $g = (231) \in \Sigma_3$ , so  $gx = (2, 3, 2, 1, 3)$ . To build a typical summand of  $\Phi(x; y_2, y_3, y_1)^{34}$ , consider 2-divisions  $(1|121)$  of  $y_2[0]$  and  $(3, 4, 3, 5|5, 3)$  of  $y_3[2]$ . Since 3 is a singleton in  $x$ , we use the trivial division  $y_1[5] = (6, 7, 8, 7, 9, 6)$ .

The associated summand of  $\Phi(x; y_2, y_3, y_1)$  is

$$(\underline{1}, \underline{3}, \underline{4}, \underline{3}, \underline{5}, \underline{1}, \underline{2}, \underline{1}, \underline{6}, \underline{7}, \underline{8}, \underline{7}, \underline{9}, \underline{6}, \underline{5}, \underline{3}).$$

Act on this by  $g_*(4, 2, 3) = (5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 1, 2, 3, 4)$ . The result is

$$(\underline{5}, \underline{7}, \underline{8}, \underline{7}, \underline{9}, \underline{5}, \underline{6}, \underline{5}, \underline{1}, \underline{2}, \underline{3}, \underline{2}, \underline{4}, \underline{1}, \underline{9}, \underline{7})$$

which is the associated term of  $\Phi(gx; y_1, y_2, y_3)$ , using the 1-division of  $y_1[0]$  and the chosen 2-divisions of  $y_2[4]$  and  $y_3[6]$ . It is easy to observe the similar structure and relative positions of  $x$ -caesuras and  $y$ -caesuras in the two  $\mathcal{D}$  terms, not just in this example but in all cases.  $\square$

**Remark 20.5.** Recall from Remark 15.1 of Part II that to say  $x$  is a clean generator means in degree 0 that  $x$  is the identity permutation  $Id_r = (1, 2, \dots, r)$  and in higher degrees  $x = (1, 2, \dots, \ell, \dots, \ell, \dots)$ , where  $x_\ell = \ell$  is the first caesura. We will use the terminology  $x$  is clean at  $\ell$  to describe

---

<sup>34</sup>We remind that it is the *order* the  $y_i$ 's appear in  $\Phi(x; y)$ , not their subscripts, that determines which  $y_i$  subtuples replace which  $x$  entries.

such generators. From Proposition 15.2 of Part II,  $Im(H_s)$  is exactly the  $\mathbb{F}$ -span of the clean generators, where  $H_s$  is the contraction of  $\mathcal{S}_*(s)$ .

Of great importance is the following fact about the formula for  $\Phi$  in Proposition 20.3(i). If  $x$  and the  $y_i$  are clean surjection generators then  $\Phi(x; y_1, \dots, y_r)$  is a sum of clean generators. This will be an easy consequence of Lemma 20.6 below. The fact that  $\Phi = \mathcal{O}_S$  maps tensors of clean generators to sums of clean generators is the key to proving the associativity axiom for the surjection operad because that fact is exactly the criterion of Proposition 19.5. The same fact is used to prove the surjection operad is a quotient of the Barratt-Eccles operad. The signs in Proposition 20.3(ii) are not needed for the associativity or for the comparison with the Barratt-Eccles operad.  $\square$

**Step 2.** The map  $\Phi$  coincides with  $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma$  in degree 0, so cleanliness is no issue. In higher degrees we have the following different cases, each of which is proved by simply reviewing the definitions. Recall  $t_i = s_1 + \dots + s_{i-1}$ . Let  $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_r)$  denote fixed  $k_i$ -divisions of the  $y_i$ .

**LEMMA 20.6.** (i). *If  $x = Id_r$  and if  $n$  is least so that  $y_n \neq Id_{s_n}$ , with  $y_n$  clean at  $m$ , then  $\mathcal{D}x$  is clean at  $t_n + m$ .*

(ii). *If all  $y_i = Id_{s_i}$  and  $x$  is clean at  $\ell$  then  $\mathcal{D}x$  is clean at  $t_\ell + j$ , where  $j$  is the length of the first division subtuple of  $y_\ell = Id_{s_\ell}$ .*

(iii). *If  $x$  is clean at  $\ell$  and if  $n$  is least so that  $y_n \neq Id_{s_n}$ , with  $y_n$  clean at  $m$ , let  $j$  denote the length of the first division subtuple of  $y_\ell$ . Then there are cases. If  $n < \ell$  then  $\mathcal{D}x$  is clean at  $t_n + m$ . If  $n > \ell$  then  $\mathcal{D}x$  is clean at  $t_\ell + j$ . If  $n = \ell$  and  $j \leq m$  then  $\mathcal{D}x$  is clean at  $t_\ell + j$ . If  $n = \ell$  and  $j > m$  then  $\mathcal{D}x$  is clean at  $t_\ell + m$ .*

It is perhaps surprising that for  $i > n$  the generators  $y_i$  can be arbitrary and the conclusions still hold. It is an obvious consequence of the lemma that if  $x$  and the  $y_i$  are all clean, for example basis generators, then  $\Phi(x; y_i)$  is clean.  $\square$

We interrupt the proof of Proposition 20.3 to explain some important things. First, from Step 0 and Step 1 above the map  $\Phi$  agrees with  $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma$  in degree 0 and is twisted equivariant. It is also possible to directly prove that  $\Phi$  with the signs given in 20.3(ii) is a chain map. Therefore, it follows from Lemma 20.6 and the twisted equivariant uniqueness result Proposition 19.3 that  $\Phi$

is the standard procedure map. However, it is not so easy to directly prove that  $\Phi$  is a chain map. This was accomplished by McClure-Smith in [19] for their surjection complex, with different signs, by essentially brute force computation. We believe our proof of Proposition 20.3 below, although long and complicated in its own way, offers a more structured viewpoint. The steps in the proof are interesting by themselves and bring together quite a few things.

We will also explain here how Lemma 20.6 and Proposition 20.3(i) imply that the surjection complex operad structure maps from Proposition 19.2 satisfy all the operad axioms, especially the associativity axiom, that is, the commutativity of Diagram [18.1]. In particular we do not need to know the signs in Proposition 20.3(ii).

The first parts of the argument are the same as the corresponding discussion for the Barratt-Eccles operad in the previous section, and is a universal argument that applies to any collection of complexes  $B_*(n)$  to which Proposition 19.2 applies. The remaining issue then is why do the two maps around Diagram [18.1] for the surjection complexes, which are both compositions of standard procedure maps, agree with the standard procedure twisted equivariant map from upper left to lower right? The reason is because Lemma 20.6 and Proposition 20.3(i), establish the criterion of Proposition 19.5 for the surjection complexes. The composed standard procedure maps in Diagram [18.1] take basis generators to elements in  $Im(H_s) \subset \mathcal{S}_*(s)$ . Thus we have proved

**Proposition 20.7.** *The surjection complexes  $\mathcal{S}_*(n)$  form an operad, using the standard twisted equivariant procedure chain maps of Proposition 19.2 as structure maps.  $\square$*

We also explain how the same reasoning implies the following.

**Proposition 20.8.** *The diagram below commutes.*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
N_*(E\Sigma_r) \otimes N_*(E\Sigma_{s_1}) \otimes \cdots \otimes N_*(E\Sigma_{s_r}) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon} & N_*(E\Sigma_s) \\
\downarrow TR \otimes \downarrow TR \otimes \cdots \otimes \downarrow TR & & \downarrow TR \\
\mathcal{S}_*(r) \otimes \mathcal{S}_*(s_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{S}_*(s_r) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}_s} & \mathcal{S}_*(s).
\end{array}$$

*Thus the surjection operad is a quotient operad of the Barratt-Eccles operad.*

*Proof.* The proof is the same argument for all versions of the surjection operad and the table reduction map. We have shown that the map  $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon$  in the

top row is a twisted equivariant standard procedure chain map. The vertical ordinary  $\Sigma_s$ -equivariant map  $TR$  on the right commutes with contractions. Therefore by the twisted equivariant version of Proposition 6.5(ii), the composition across the top and down is the standard procedure map.

The tensor product of  $TR$  maps on the left is the standard procedure map by Proposition 6.11 of Part I, so in going down and across the bottom of the diagram we again need to deal with a composition of standard procedure maps. The vertical map is an ordinary equivariant map and the  $\mathcal{O}_S$  map is twisted equivariant. So the composition is twisted equivariant.

We will again use the basic uniqueness result Proposition 19.3 for twisted equivariant chain maps. The key point is that for a basis generator  $(e, X)$  of any  $N_*(E\Sigma_n)$ , the summands of  $TR(e, X)$  are parametrized by partitions, as described in Section 16.1. Consider a partition  $a_0 + \dots + a_k = n + k$  with  $a_0 = \ell$ . The corresponding surjection summand  $\pm x_a \in \mathcal{S}_*(n)$  then has the form  $x_a = (1, 2, \dots, \ell, \dots, \ell, \dots)$ , where  $\ell$  is the first caesura entry. Such  $x_a$  are clean surjection generators, hence in the image of the contraction  $H_n$ . A tensor product of such generators is in the image of the tensor product contraction. Then, by Lemma 20.6 and Proposition 20.3(i), applying  $\mathcal{O}_S$  to such a tensor lands in  $Im(H_s)$ , hence the uniqueness result Proposition 19.3 applies.

Note this argument is very similar to the proof of Proposition 17.5 that the composition  $N_*(E\Sigma_n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_*(n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$  is the functorial standard procedure map.  $\square$

**Remark 20.9.** Proposition 20.8 provides an indirect proof that the surjection operad structure maps satisfy the associativity axiom, although the ideas used are essentially the same as in the direct proof. We have not yet established the signs in the operad structure map of Proposition 20.3(ii), but the signs are provided, in a somewhat hidden form, by the Barratt-Eccles operad.

Given basis surjection generators  $x, y_i \in \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n)$ , let  $X, Y_i \in N_*(E\Sigma_n)$  denote the corresponding fundamental simplices in the Barratt-Eccles operad, as discussed in Remark 16.8 of Part II. Then from Proposition 16.10 of Part II,  $TR(X) = x$  and  $TR(Y_i) = y_i$ . The  $\mathcal{O}_E$  map is the composition of the map  $EZ$ , which of course has explicit signs, followed by the non-homomorphic

inclusion  $N_*(E(\Sigma_r \times \coprod \Sigma_{si})) \subset N_*(E\Sigma_s)$ , which has no signs. Thus

$$\mathcal{O}_S(x; y_i) = TR \circ N_*(\mathcal{O}_W) \circ EZ(X \otimes \bigotimes Y_i) \in \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(s)$$

is a formula that contains the signs. It is possible, but not easy, to keep track of the  $EZ$  signs and reconcile the implicit signs in the formula above with the signs in Proposition 20.3(ii). But we prefer to establish the signs as part of our inductive proof of Proposition 20.3.

It might seem that the implicit signs in this last formula for  $\mathcal{O}_S(x; y_i)$  involving  $EZ$  is not sensitive to which surjection complex is meant. But from Proposition 16.5 of Part II, for the complexes  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  and  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$ , the vertical  $TR$  maps do have signs attached to summands  $x_a$  of an image  $TR(e, X)$ . These are the same signs that occur in the isomorphisms between surjection complexes in Section 15. The strategy of using the uniqueness result Proposition 19.3 to prove certain diagrams commute obviously also works to prove that the isomorphisms between surjection complexes are operad isomorphisms. The signs in the isomorphisms between surjection complexes could be used along with Proposition 20.3(ii) to determine the signs in the operad structure maps for  $\mathcal{S}_*^{ms}(n)$  and  $\mathcal{S}_*^{aj}(n)$ .  $\square$

We now resume the proof of Proposition 20.3. Suppose  $x$  and all the  $y$ 's are basis surjection generators. That is, the first occurrences of  $1, 2, \dots$  occur in that order. Basis generators in positive degrees are clean at the first caesura. We attack Proposition 20.3 by induction. Thus in the first unknown degree the standard procedure map on basis generators can be written

$$\mathcal{O}_S(x; y_1, \dots, y_r) = H_s \Phi \left[ (dx; y_1, \dots, y_r) + \sum_i \pm(x; y_1, \dots, dy_i, \dots, y_r) \right],$$

where  $H_s$  is the contraction of  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(s)$ .

**Step 3.** If basis generator  $x \neq Id_r \in \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(r)$  has first caesura at  $\ell$  then, just as in Step 3 of the proof of Proposition 17.3, the only boundary term of  $dx$  that is not clean or degenerate is  $d_\ell x$ . The same holds true for the  $y_i \neq Id_{si}$ , which let us assume have first caesuras at  $m_i$ . Since  $H_s$  vanishes on clean generators, a conclusion from Lemma 20.6 in one lower degree is that only two boundary terms are relevant. To be precise

$$\mathcal{O}_S(x; y_1, \dots, y_r) = H_s \Phi(d_\ell x; y_1, \dots, y_r) + \sum_i H_s \Phi(\pm(x; y_1, \dots, d_{m_i} y_i, \dots, y_r))$$

$$= H_s \Phi(d_\ell x; y_1, \dots, y_r) + (-1)^{|x|} H_s \Phi(x; y_1, \dots, d_m y_n, \dots, y_r),$$

where  $n$  is least with  $y_n \neq Id_{s_n}$  and  $m$  is the first caesura of  $y_n$ . The point of the last equality is that for  $i > n$  the boundary term  $d_{m_i} y_i$  may not be clean, but by Lemma 20.6 that doesn't matter. If  $x = Id_r$  then only the second term occurs. If all  $y_i = Id_{s_i}$  then only the first term occurs. The sign is  $(-1)^{|x|}$  because  $|y_i| = 0$  for  $i < n$ .  $\square$

**Remark 20.10.** By induction we have formulas for the two  $\Phi$  evaluations in one lower degree. To prove Proposition 20.3(i) we will apply  $H_s$  to the two boundary terms and match the result with the asserted value of  $\Phi(x; y_1, \dots, y_r)$ , up to signs. Signs for the standard procedure map are forced recursively. We will also deal with signs inductively, hence prove cases of Proposition 20.3(ii) at the same time that we prove cases of part (i). Note that for the Berger-Fresse surjection complex the contraction  $H_s$  introduces no signs.

There are some additional cases where all  $\mathcal{D}$  summands of the boundary term  $\Phi(d_\ell x, y_1, \dots, y_r)$  or  $\Phi(x; y_1, \dots, d_m y_n, \dots, y_r)$  are clean. We are assuming here that  $x$  and the  $y_i$  are basis generators,  $n$  is least with  $y_n \neq Id_{s_n}$ , the first caesura of  $x$  is  $\ell$ , and the first caesura of  $y_n$  is  $m$ . We will denote by  $\mathcal{D}''$  choices of  $k_i$ -divisions of  $y_i$  for  $i \neq \ell$  and a  $(k_\ell - 1)$ -division of  $y_\ell$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{D}'$  choices of  $k_i$ -divisions of  $y_i$  for  $i \neq n$  and a  $k_n$ -division of  $d_m y_n$ .

If  $n < \ell$  then for each relevant division  $\mathcal{D}''$  the summand  $\mathcal{D}'' d_\ell x$  is a clean generator, since  $y_n[t_n]$  is inserted early into  $d_\ell x$ . Thus in this case we want  $\Phi(x; y_i) = H_s \Phi(x; y_1, \dots, d_m y_n, \dots, y_r)$ , which can be written

$$\sum_{\mathcal{D}} \pm \mathcal{D} x = (-1)^{|x|} H_s \left( \sum_{\mathcal{D}'} \pm \mathcal{D}' x \right).$$

If  $\ell < n$  then for each relevant division  $\mathcal{D}'$  the summand  $\mathcal{D}' x$  will be clean at some shifted value  $t_\ell + \ell$ . Thus in this case we want  $\Phi(x; y_i) = H_s \Phi(d_\ell x; y_i)$ , which can be written

$$\sum_{\mathcal{D}} \pm \mathcal{D} x = H_s \left( \sum_{\mathcal{D}''} \pm \mathcal{D}'' d_\ell x \right).$$

**Remark 20.11.** We need a digression to explain how  $H_s$  will be computed on the two lower degree terms. We recall that for the Berger-Fresse complex  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(s)$  the contraction<sup>35</sup>  $H_s = \sum_{j=0}^{s-2} i^j s r^j$  is described in Section 13. If  $z$

---

<sup>35</sup>We apologize for the double meaning of  $s$  here, the first term in the contraction formula,  $s(z) = (1, z)$ , and the arity of a surjection complex.

is a surjection generator  $i^q sr^q(z) = 0$  unless  $1, 2, \dots, q$  are singletons in  $z$ , in which case  $i^q sr^q(z)$  is described by removing those singletons from  $z$  and putting the sequence  $12 \dots q(q+1)$  at the front. Thus if the first entry of  $z$  after those singletons are removed is  $q+1$  then still  $i^q sr^q(z) = 0$ .

We will encounter two types of  $H_s$  evaluations. All cases of the evaluations of summands  $H_s(\mathcal{D}'x)$  of  $H_s\Phi(x; y_1, \dots, d_m y_n, \dots, y_r)$  will be variants of the results from Proposition 15.4(iv),(v) of Part II that for basis generators  $y$  with first caesura  $m$ , the formula  $y = Hdy$  consists of a single non-zero term  $y = i^{m-1} sr^{m-1} d_m y$ . More generally, if  $z$  is such a  $y$  followed by a shifted clean generator with larger entries, then the same conclusion holds. That is,  $z = Hdz$  consists of a single non-zero term  $z = i^{m-1} sr^{m-1} d_m z$ .<sup>36</sup>

In our variants  $H_s(\mathcal{D}'x)$ , the entries of  $d_m y_n$  are shifted by some amount  $t$ , a string of consecutive singletons  $1, 2, \dots, t$  will occur in front, and larger entries forming a shifted clean generator will be adjoined after the shifted  $d_m y_n$  sequence. But the corresponding  $\mathcal{D}x$  will be a basis generator followed by a shifted clean generator, with  $\mathcal{D}'x = d_{t+m} \mathcal{D}x$ . Only the single  $H_s$  term  $i^{t+m-1} sr^{t+m-1} \mathcal{D}'x = \mathcal{D}x$  will be non-zero.

All cases of the evaluations of summands  $H_s(\mathcal{D}''d_\ell x)$  of  $H_s\Phi(d_\ell x; y_1, \dots, y_r)$  evaluations will be variants of  $H_s z$ , where  $z = (\text{larger}, 1, 2, \dots, j, \text{larger}, j, \dots)$  or  $z = (\text{larger}, 1, 2, \dots, j, \text{larger}, \dots)$ . Here ‘larger’ means entries greater than  $j$ . In both cases,  $1, \dots, j-1$  are singletons. In the second case,  $j$  is a singleton but removing  $1, \dots, j$  will result in a shifted clean generator beginning with  $j+1$ . In both cases  $H_s z$  will consist of a sum of  $j$  terms  $\sum_{q=0}^{j-1} i^q sr^q z$ . In our variants  $H_s(\mathcal{D}''d_\ell x)$  these entries of  $z$  are shifted by some amount  $t$  and a string of consecutive singletons will occur in front. But the  $H_s(\mathcal{D}''d_\ell x)$  evaluation will still consist of a similar sum of  $j$  terms.  $\square$

**Step 4.** At the end of this subsection we prove various cases of Proposition 20.3. In the various cases, we will write some sentences then give examples. The examples are supposed to help understand the sentences. It is all rather lengthy, but not hard once you get the hang of it. The structure is actually rather attractive, and quite similar to the structure in the proof of Proposi-

---

<sup>36</sup>In the case  $d_m y = (1, 2, \dots, m-1, m+1, \dots, m, \dots)$  there is either no repeated entry or the first repeated entry is another  $m$  or it is some  $m+q$ , following a string  $(m+1, m+2, \dots)$  that increases except possibly straddling a singleton  $m$ . From this, calculation of  $Hdy$  is clear. The same argument works for the more general  $z$ .



tion 17.3 clarifying the functorial map  $\mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$ .

We divide the analysis of tensor products of basis generators  $x \otimes \bigotimes_i y_i$  of positive degree into six cases. There are two cases, (a) where  $x = Id_r$  and some  $y_n \neq Id_{sn}$ , and (b) where all  $y_i = Id_{si}$  and  $x \neq Id_r$ . In the remaining four cases, say  $x$  has first caesura  $\ell$  and  $n$  is least with  $y_n \neq Id_{sn}$ , with first caesura  $m$ . Two of these cases are (a') where  $n < \ell$ , and (b') where  $\ell < n$ . Finally, when  $\ell = n$ , let  $j$  denote the length of the first division subtuple of  $y_\ell$ . Then we have the final cases (a'') where  $j > m$ , and (b'') where  $j \leq m$ .

We will formally introduce in Remark 20.12 just below an alternate ‘partial operad composition map’ method, which simplifies the proof of Proposition 20.3. In the partial composition situations a single  $y_n \neq (1)$  and all other  $y_i = (1)$ . Thus only the  $y_n$  has non-trivial  $k_n$ -divisions. The other  $y_i$  have only the trivial  $k_i$ -divisions  $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ . In these special cases the relevant  $H_s$  evaluations are also simplified.

The partial composition approach also relies on Lemma 20.6 in order to justify that certain compositions of standard procedure partial operad chain maps are standard procedure chain maps. We do not rely solely on the partial composition proof because it seemed a little surprising to us that the direct proof for the full operad map was essentially no harder than the usually simpler partial operad map arguments.

Readers who prefer partial compositions are invited to digest Remark 20.12, and then think about the six cases and examples for Proposition 20.3 only for partial compositions. Less timid readers can follow the full discussions of all the cases and examples.  $\square$

**Remark 20.12.** Of importance in the operad structure map and division mechanism is the case

$$\mathcal{O}_S(x; 1, \dots, 1, y_i, 1, \dots, 1),$$

when all but one  $y_j = (1)$ , the unit element in  $\mathcal{S}_*(1) = \mathbb{F}$ . These are usually called *partial operad compositions* and abbreviated  $\mathcal{O}_i(x; y)$ . It is understood that  $y_j = (1)$  for  $j \neq i$  and the  $k_j = 1$ -divisions for these  $y_j[t_j]$  must be the unique trivial one. Note  $t_j = j - 1$  for  $j \leq i$ , and  $t_j = s_i + j - 2$  for  $j > i$ .

**Example 20.13.** Take  $x = (1, 2, 1, 3, 2)$  and  $y = y_2 = (1, 2, 1)$ . There are three  $k_2 = 2$ -divisions of  $y_2[1] = (2, 3, 2)$ , namely  $(2|2, 3, 2)$ ,  $(2, 3|3, 2)$  and

$(2, 3, 2|2)$ . Then  $y_1[t_1] = (1)$  and  $y_3[t_3] = (4)$ . We obtain

$$\mathcal{O}_2(x; y) = (1, \underline{2}, 1, 4, \underline{2, 3, 2}) - (1, \underline{2, 3}, 1, 4, \underline{3, 2}) - (1, \underline{2, 3, 2}, 1, 4, \underline{2}).$$

The  $y$ -caesura is the second 2 in the first summand and the first 2 in the other two summands. The  $x$ -caesuras are the other two caesuras in all summands. These precede the  $y$ -caesura in the first summand and straddle the  $y$ -caesura in the last two summands, which accounts for the signs.  $\square$

The partial composition operations  $\mathcal{O}_i(x; y) \in P(s + r - 1)$  are defined for any operad  $P$ , with  $x \in P(r)$  and  $y = y_i \in P(s)$ . It is understood that there are really  $r - 1$  other  $y_j = (1) \in P(1)$ ,  $j \neq i$ . It has long been understood that such partial operations satisfying certain axioms determine full operad compositions. Often results about operads can be proved more easily by focusing on the partial compositions. All we might use of that method is a formula equating the full operad operation to a composition of partial operations. That identity, which can be proved in any operad by repeated use of the associativity axiom and unit axiom in special cases, is the following composition representation of  $\mathcal{O}_P(x; y_1 \dots, y_r) \in P(s)$ , where  $x \in P(r)$ ,  $y_i \in P(s_i)$ ,  $s = \sum s_i$ :

$$\begin{aligned} P(r) \otimes P(s_1) \otimes \dots \otimes P(s_r) &\xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}_1 \otimes Id} P(s_1 + r - 1) \otimes P(s_2) \otimes \dots \otimes P(s_r) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}_{s_1+1} \otimes Id} \\ &P(s_1 + s_2 + r - 2) \otimes P(s_3) \otimes \dots \otimes P(s_r) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}_{s_1+s_2+1} \otimes Id} \dots \rightarrow P(s). \end{aligned}$$

In the case of the surjection complexes it is easy to connect this composition with Proposition 20.3. One first uses the  $k_1$ -divisions  $\mathcal{D}_1$  to replace the 1's in  $x$  by  $k_1$ -divisions of  $y_1$ . Then one replaces the original 2's in  $x$ , which have now become  $(s_1 + 1)$ 's, by the  $k_2$ -divisions  $\mathcal{D}_2$  of  $y_2[s_1]$ , and so on.

The signs in the full operad map from Proposition 20.3(ii) associated to divisions  $\mathcal{D}x$  are just the products of the signs in the composition steps for the individual  $\mathcal{D}_i$ . This is clear since after the  $j^{th}$  step of the composition, each  $y_i[t_i]$ -caesura,  $i < j$ , still precedes the same number of  $x$ -caesuras, and new  $y_j[t_j]$ -caesuras only precede  $x$ -caesuras of (original) value at least  $j$ .

It is easier to prove some of the results and handle examples in the six cases of Proposition 20.3 for partial operad composition maps than it is for the full operad composition map. We have proved enough, especially Lemma 20.6, to argue that the composition of partial operation standard procedure maps is itself a standard procedure map, which is not automatic. So that is

interesting, and does provide an alternate proof of Proposition 20.3, including the signs. But we are able to handle the full standard procedure map of Proposition 20.3 directly, so we do so.  $\square$

We now continue Step 4 and begin the analysis of the six cases for Proposition 20.3. Since we include many examples, this will take several pages.

Case (a): Suppose  $x = Id_r$  and suppose  $n$  is least so that  $y_n \neq Id_{sn}$ , with first caesura  $m$ . Then from Remark 20.10 we want  $\Phi(x; y_1, \dots, y_r) = +H_s\Phi(x; y_1, \dots, d_my_n, \dots, y_r)$ . The sign is  $+1$  because  $|x| = 0$ . Now all  $k_i = 1$ , and there are only the unique 1-divisions  $\mathcal{D}x, \mathcal{D}'x$  on both sides. One observes that  $\mathcal{D}x = \Phi(x; y_1, \dots, y_r)$  is a basis generator with first caesura  $t + m$ , where  $t = t_n$ . In the partial composition case this is obvious. Then  $t = n - 1$  and

$$\mathcal{D}x = (1, \dots, n - 1, y_n[n - 1], n + s_n, \dots, s).$$

Also,

$$\mathcal{D}'x = (1, \dots, n - 1, (d_my_n)[n - 1], n + s_n, \dots, s) = d_{t+m}\mathcal{D}x$$

$$\text{and } H_s(\mathcal{D}'x) = i^{t+m-1}sr^{t+m-1}\mathcal{D}'x = \mathcal{D}x.$$

In the general case, the  $y_i$ ,  $i < n$ , can be higher  $Id_{s_i}$  and the basis generators  $y_i$ ,  $i > n$ , can be arbitrary. But the shifts in the insertions guarantee that  $\mathcal{D}x$  is a basis generator. Also  $\mathcal{D}'x = \Phi(x; y_1, \dots, d_my_n, \dots, y_r) = d_{t+m}\Phi(x; y_1, \dots, y_r)$ . Again the only the summand  $i^{t+m-1}sr^{t+m-1}$  of  $H_s$  evaluates non-trivially and inserts the missing  $t + m$  back where it belongs in  $\mathcal{D}x = \Phi(x; y_i)$ .

In all cases, since  $x = Id_r$  has no caesuras, the shuffle counts are 0 on both sides of the equation and the desired signs check out.

Example (a): A partial composition example is provided by  $x = (1, 2, 3, 4)$ ,  $y_1 = y_3 = y_4 = (1)$ , and  $y_2 = (1, 2, 3, 4, 3)$ . Then  $\mathcal{D}x = (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 4, 6, 7)$ . Also  $d_3y_2 = (1, 2, 4, 3)$  and

$$\mathcal{D}'x = \Phi(x; (1), d_3y_2, (1), (1)) = (1, 2, 3, 5, 4, 6, 7) = d_4\mathcal{D}x.$$

Applying the single  $H_s$  summand  $i^3sr^3$  yields the desired result.

For a more general example, take  $x = (1, 2, 3, 4)$ ,  $y_1 = (1, 2)$ ,  $y_2 = (1, 2, 3, 4, 3)$ . Then  $n = 2$ ,  $m = 3$  and  $(d_3y_2)[2] = (3, 4, 6, 5)$ . We find

$$\mathcal{D}x = \Phi(x; y_i) = (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 5, y_3[6], y_4[t_4]),$$

where the entries of  $y_4[t_4]$  are greater than entries of  $y_3[6]$ , which has first entry 7. We still see  $\mathcal{D}x$  is a basic generator since the first occurrences of all entries, including those of  $y_3[6]$  and  $y_4[t_4]$ , occur in increasing order. Also

$$\mathcal{D}'x = \Phi(x, y_1, d_3y_2, y_3, y_4) = (1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 5, y_3[6], y_4[t_4]) = d_5\mathcal{D}x.$$

Applying the single  $H_s$  summand  $i^4sr^4$  yields the desired result. If  $y_2$  had more than two 3 entries, it would have been more obvious that only one summand of  $H_s\mathcal{D}'x$  was non-zero.  $\square$

Case (a'): Suppose basis generator  $x$  is clean at  $\ell$  and suppose  $n$  is least so that  $y_n \neq Id_{sn}$ , with first caesura  $m$ . Assume  $n < \ell$ . From Remark 20.10 we want

$$\begin{aligned} \sum \pm \mathcal{D}x &= \Phi(x; y_1, \dots, y_r) = \\ &(-1)^{|x|} H_s \Phi(x; y_1, \dots, d_m y_n, \dots, y_r) = (-1)^{|x|} \sum H_s(\pm \mathcal{D}'x). \end{aligned}$$

In this case there should be a sign change by  $(-1)^{|x|}$  between all pairs of corresponding  $\mathcal{D}x$  and  $\mathcal{D}'x$  terms. Part of the argument resembles Case (a) above. Since  $n < \ell$  implies  $k_n = 1$ , a shifted  $y_n$  or  $d_m y_n$  is inserted into  $x$  in the part of  $x$  that still looks like  $Id$ . For  $i \neq n$  inserting choices of  $k_i$ -divisions of  $y_i[t_i]$  on both sides match up the choices of  $\mathcal{D}x$  and  $\mathcal{D}'x$  terms.

Case (a') does become simpler in a partial composition situation, with only  $y_n \neq (1)$ . Then there is only a single, trivial, pair of divisions  $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'$ , since  $n < \ell$  implies  $y_n$  is not divided. Also, it is not hard to see that  $\mathcal{D}x$  will be a basic surjection generator, which simplifies the  $H_s(\mathcal{D}'x)$  analysis.

In the general Case (a'),  $\mathcal{D}x$  is not necessarily a basis generator, but it is a basis generator followed by a shifted clean generator of larger values. The first caesura is  $t + m$ , where  $t = t_n$ , and  $\mathcal{D}'x = d_{t+m}\mathcal{D}x$ . For  $i < n$  inserting  $y_i[t_i]$  terms just inserts a sequence of singletons. For  $n \leq i < \ell$ , inserting the shifted basis elements  $y_i[t_i]$  terms does not interfere with the claim that the first occurrences of all entries of  $\mathcal{D}x$  up to that point occur in increasing order. Inserting division subtuples of the  $y_i[t_i]$  for  $\ell \leq i$  appends a shifted clean

generator with larger entries. The  $H_s(\mathcal{D}'x)$  calculation reduces to the single term  $i^{t+m-1}sr^{t+m-1}\mathcal{D}'x = \mathcal{D}x$ , which puts a  $t+m$  back where it belongs.

The additional entry  $t+m$  is a  $y$ -caesura that comes before all the  $x$ -caesuras in every summand  $\mathcal{D}x$ . That  $y$ -caesura is not present in the corresponding  $\mathcal{D}'x$  term in  $\Phi(x; y_1, \dots, d_m y_n, \dots, y_r)$ . The other  $y$ -caesuras are in the same positions relative to  $x$ -caesuras on both sides. This confirms the desired sign change,  $sh(C_x, C_{\mathcal{D}}) = |x| + sh(C_x, C_{\mathcal{D}'})$  in this case.

Example (a'): We first give a partial composition example. Take  $x = (1, 2, 3, 4, 3, 4)$ ,  $y_1 = (1, 2, 3, 1)$  and  $y_2 = y_3 = y_4 = (1)$ . Then  $\mathcal{D}x = (1, 2, 3, 1, 4, 5, 6, 5, 6)$ , a basic surjection generator. Replacing  $y_1$  by  $d_1 y_1$  gives the corresponding  $\mathcal{D}'x = (2, 3, 1, 4, 5, 6, 5, 6) = d_1 \mathcal{D}x$ . Then  $H_6(\mathcal{D}'x) = s\mathcal{D}'x = (1, \mathcal{D}'x) = \mathcal{D}x$ . In  $\mathcal{D}'x$  there are two  $x$ -caesuras and no  $y$ -caesuras. In  $\mathcal{D}x$  there is the  $y$  caesura 1 in front of the two  $x$ -caesuras 5, 6. The shuffle counts and signs are in agreement with  $|x| = 2$ .

As a more general example, take  $x = (1, 2, 3, 4, 3)$ ,  $y_1 = (1, 2, 3, 1)$ ,  $y_2 = (1, 2)$ ,  $y_3 = (1, 2, 3, 4)$  with 2-division  $(1, 2|, 2, 3, 4)$ , and  $y_4 = (1, 2, 1)$ . Then  $\mathcal{D}x = (1, 2, 3, 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 10, 7, 8, 9)$ . We see that  $\mathcal{D}x$  is a basic generator  $(1, 2, 3, 1, 4, 5)$  followed by a shifted clean generator  $(6, 7, 10, 11, 10, 7, 8, 9)$ .

The difference from the partial composition case is that with  $y_\ell \neq (1)$ , a  $k_\ell$ -division will split the entries and larger entries from a shifted  $y_j, j > \ell$ , can come before the first occurrences of some of the shifted  $y_\ell$  entries. In the specific example, we see an initial 10 and 11, before the first occurrences of 8 and 9.

Replacing  $y_1$  with  $d_1 y_1$  gives  $\mathcal{D}'x = (2, 3, 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 10, 7, 8, 9) = d_1 x$ . Then  $H_{11}\mathcal{D}'x = s\mathcal{D}'x = (1, \mathcal{D}'x) = \mathcal{D}x$ . There is one  $x$ -caesura, 7, in  $\mathcal{D}x$  and two  $y$ -caesuras, 1 and 10, in the order 1,7,10. In  $\mathcal{D}'x$  there is the  $x$ -caesura, 7, and only one  $y$ -caesura, 10. The shuffle counts are 1 and 0 respectively, confirming the desired sign relation since  $|x| = 1$ .

Case (b): Suppose all  $y_i = Id_{s_i}$  and  $x$  is clean at  $\ell$ . Then from Remark 20.10 we want

$$\sum \mathcal{D}x = \Phi(x; y_i) = H_s \Phi(d_\ell x, y_i) = \sum H_s(\mathcal{D}'' d_\ell x).$$

The  $y_i = Id_{s_i}$  have no caesuras, so in this case all shuffle counts are 0 and

the signs are correct.

In Case (b) there will not be a bijection between  $\mathcal{D}x$  summands and  $\mathcal{D}''d_\ell x$  summands. For each choice of  $\mathcal{D}''$  so that the first division subtuple of  $y_\ell$  has length  $j$  it will happen that  $H_s(\mathcal{D}''d_\ell x)$  is a sum of  $j$  summands  $\mathcal{D}x$ . We explain this assertion.

For  $i < \ell$  the substitutions of the 1-divisions  $y_i[t_i]$  into  $x$  and  $d_\ell x$ , just introduce identical strings of initial singletons on both sides, and do not materially affect the comparisons. If  $i > \ell$ , inserting  $k_i$ -divisions of  $y_i[t_i]$  on both sides inserts entries larger than the first repeated entry. These do not mess up the  $H_s$  evaluation.

So to compare all terms on both sides we only need to look closely at the  $k_\ell$ -divisions of  $y_\ell = Id_{s_\ell}$  in  $\Phi(x; y_i)$  and the  $(k_\ell - 1)$ -divisions in  $H_s\Phi(d_\ell x; y_i)$ . The only relevant  $(k_\ell - 1)$ -division subtuple of  $y_\ell = Id_{s_\ell}$  for the evaluation  $H_s\Phi(d_\ell x; y_i)$  is the first subtuple, say  $(1, 2, \dots, j)$ , with an appropriate shift of those entry values. One computes  $H_s\Phi(d_\ell x; y_i)$  to be the sum of terms corresponding to terms in  $\Phi(x; y_i)$  with the first two division subtuples of  $y_\ell$  being  $(1|1, \dots, j), (1, 2|2, \dots, j), \dots, (1, 2, \dots, j|j)$ , also shifted. Of course  $j$  varies unless  $k_\ell - 1 = 1$  in which case  $j = s_\ell$ , but the total result is confirmation of  $\Phi(x; y_i) = H_s\Phi(d_\ell x, y_i)$ .

The prototype here for  $H_s\Phi(d_\ell x, y_i)$  is the case

$$z = (\textit{larger}, 1, 2, \dots, j, \textit{larger}, j\dots) \textit{ or } (\textit{larger}, 1, 2, \dots, j, \textit{larger}, \dots)$$

discussed in Remark 20.11, with a shift of entries and initial singletons at the beginning of such  $z$ . The second form occurs when  $k_\ell = 2$ . Then it is important for the  $H_s$  evaluation that if the entries of the insertions of the  $y_i[t_i]$  for  $i < \ell$  and the 1-division  $y_\ell[t_\ell]$  are removed from  $\mathcal{D}''d_\ell x$ , the result is a shifted clean generator. In cases where  $k_\ell > 2$  it is more obvious that  $H_s$  is a sum of  $j$  terms because of a repeated entry which is a shift of the  $j$ .

The following examples illustrate the essential features.

Example (b): We first look at a partial composition example. Take  $x = (1, 2, 3, 4, 2, 3, 2, 4)$ ,  $y_1 = (1)$ ,  $y_2 = (1, 2, 3, 4)$ ,  $y_3 = (1)$ ,  $y_4 = (1)$ . Then  $\ell = 2$ ,  $k_2 = 3$ , and  $d_2x = (1, 3, 4, 2, 3, 2, 4)$ . The first  $k_2 - 1 = 2$ -division subtuple of  $y_2[1]$  can be  $(2), (2, 3), (2, 3, 4), (2, 3, 4, 5)$ . In the first case, the 2-division

is  $(2|2, 3, 4, 5)$ . Then  $H_s\Phi(d_2x, y_i)$  has a summand  $H_s\mathcal{D}''d_2x$  given by

$$H_s(1, 6, 7, 2, 6, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7) = (1, 2, 6, 7, 2, 6, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7),$$

which is the summand of  $\Phi(x; y_i)$  corresponding to the 3-division  $(2|2|2, 3, 4, 5)$  of  $y_2[1]$ .

Next, look at the 2-division of  $y_2[1]$  given by  $(2, 3|3, 4, 5)$ . Then  $\Phi(d_2x, y_i)$  has a summand  $(1, 6, 7, 2, 3, 6, 3, 4, 5, 7)$ . The  $H_s$  application will involve two non-zero summands  $isr + i^2sr^2$ , yielding a sum

$$(1, 2, 6, 7, 2, 3, 6, 3, 4, 5, 7) + (1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 3, 6, 3, 4, 5, 7).$$

These two terms are seen in  $\Phi(x; y_i)$ , with  $y_2[1]$  subdivisions  $(2|2, 3|3, 4, 5)$  and  $(2, 3|3|3, 4, 5)$ . The first two division subtuples amalgamate to  $(2, 3)$ .

Look at the next 2-division of  $y_2[1]$ , namely  $(2, 3, 4|4, 5)$ . Then compute

$$\begin{aligned} H_s(1, 6, 7, 2, 3, 4, 6, 4, 5, 7) &= (1, 2, 6, 7, 2, 3, 4, 6, 4, 5, 7) \\ &+ (1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 3, 4, 6, 4, 5, 7) + (1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 4, 6, 4, 5, 7), \end{aligned}$$

giving three more terms from  $\Phi(x; y_i)$ , corresponding to 2-divisions of  $(2, 3, 4)$ .

Finally, the 2-division  $(2, 3, 4, 5|5)$  of  $y_2[1]$  will yield

$$H_s(1, 6, 7, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 5, 7),$$

giving four terms of  $\Phi(x; y_i)$ , corresponding to 2-divisions of  $(2, 3, 4, 5)$ .

If  $x$  is replaced by  $(1, 2, 3, 4, 2, 3, 5, 4)$  then  $k_2 - 1 = 1$  and we only look at the 1-division  $(2, 3, 4, 5)$  of  $y_2[1]$  in  $\Phi(d_2x; y_i)$ . There will now be four summands in  $H_s(1, 6, 7, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 7)$  corresponding to the 2-divisions of  $y_2[1]$  in  $\Phi(x; y_i)$ . The reason is, if  $1, \dots, 5$  are all removed, the sequence  $(6, 7, 6, 8, 7)$  is a shifted clean sequence beginning with a 6.

For a general example, take  $x = (1, 2, 3, 4, 2, 3, 2, 4)$ ,  $y_1 = (1, 2)$ ,  $y_2 = (1, 2, 3, 4)$ ,  $y_3 = Id_{s_3}$ ,  $y_4 = Id_{s_4}$ . Then  $\ell = 2$ ,  $k_2 = 3$ , and  $d_2x = (1, 3, 4, 2, 3, 2, 4)$ . The first 2-division subtuple of  $y_2[2]$  can be  $(3)$ ,  $(3, 4)$ ,  $(3, 4, 5)$ , or  $(3, 4, 5, 6)$ . In the first case, the 2-division is  $(3|3, 4, 5, 6)$ . We get a term of  $H_s\Phi(d_2x; y_i)$  given by the summand  $i^2sr^2$  of  $H_s$ ,

$$H_s\mathcal{D}''x = H_s(1, 2, Y'_3, Y'_4, 3, Y''_3, 3, 4, 5, 6, Y''_4) = (1, 2, 3, Y'_3, Y'_4, 3, Y''_3, 3, 4, 5, 6, Y''_4),$$

which is a summand of  $\Phi(x; y_i)$  corresponding to the 3-division  $(3|3|3, 4, 5, 6)$  of  $y_2[2]$ . The  $Y_3$  and  $Y_4$  terms involve higher entries and depend on chosen subdivisions of shifts of  $y_3 = Id_{s3}$  and  $y_4 = Id_{s4}$ .

Next, look at the 2-division of  $y_2[2]$  given by  $(3, 4|4, 5, 6)$ . Then  $\Phi(d_2x, y_i)$  has terms  $(1, 2, Y'_3, Y'_4, 3, 4, Y''_3, 4, 5, 6, Y''_4)$ . The  $H_s$  application will involve two non-zero summands  $i^2sr^2 + i^3sr^3$ , yielding a sum

$$(1, 2, 3, Y'_3, Y'_4, 3, 4, Y''_3, 4, 5, 6, Y''_4) + (1, 2, 3, 4, Y'_3, Y'_4, 4, Y''_3, 4, 5, 6, Y''_4).$$

These two terms are seen in  $\Phi(x; y_i)$ , with  $y_2[2]$  subdivisions  $(3|3, 4|4, 5, 6)$  and  $(3, 4|4|4, 5, 6)$ . The first two subtuples amalgamate to  $(3, 4)$ .

Look at the next 2-division of  $y_2[2]$ , namely  $(3, 4, 5|5, 6)$ . Then compute

$$\begin{aligned} H_s(1, 2, Y'_3, Y'_4, 3, 4, 5, Y''_3, 5, 6, Y''_4) &= (1, 2, 3, Y'_3, Y'_4, 3, 4, 5, Y''_3, 5, 6, Y''_4) \\ &+ (1, 2, 3, 4, Y'_3, Y'_4, 4, 5, Y''_3, 5, 6, Y''_4) + (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, Y'_3, Y'_4, 5, Y''_3, 5, 6, Y''_4), \end{aligned}$$

giving three more terms from  $\Phi(x; y_i)$ , corresponding to 2-divisions of  $(3, 4, 5)$ .

Finally, the 2-division  $(3, 4, 5, 6|6)$  of  $y_2[1]$  will yield

$$H_s(1, 2, Y'_3, Y'_4, 3, 4, 5, 6, Y''_3, 6, Y''_4),$$

giving four terms of  $\Phi(x; y_i)$ , corresponding to 2-divisions of  $(3, 4, 5, 6)$ .

If  $x$  is replaced by  $(1, 2, 3, 4, 2, 3, 5, 4)$  then  $k_2 - 1 = 1$  and we only look at the 1-division  $(3, 4, 5, 6)$  of  $y_2[2]$  in  $\Phi(d_2x; y_i)$ . There will now be four summands in  $H_s(1, 2, Y'_3, Y'_4, 3, 4, 5, 6, Y''_3, Y''_5, Y''_4)$  corresponding to the 2-divisions of  $y_2[2]$  in  $\Phi(x; y_i)$ . The reason there are not more is, with  $1, \dots, 6$  removed, the sequence  $(Y'_3, Y'_4, Y''_3, Y''_5, Y''_4)$  is a shifted clean sequence beginning with a 7. This cuts off other possible non-zero summands of  $H_s$ .  $\square$

Case (b'): Again suppose basis generator  $x$  is clean at  $\ell$  and suppose  $n$  is least so that  $y_n \neq Id_{sn}$ , with first caesura  $m$ . Assume now  $\ell < n$ . Then from Remark 20.10 we again want  $\Phi(x; y_i) = H_s\Phi(d_\ell x; y_i)$ . The argument in part resembles Case (b) above. Again  $y_\ell = Id_{s\ell}$  and we compare  $k_\ell$ -divisions on the left with  $(k_\ell - 1)$ -divisions on the right. Only the first division subtuples  $(1, \dots, j)$  of  $y_\ell$  on the  $\Phi(d_\ell x; y_i)$  side are relevant. The calculation of the summands of  $H_s\Phi(d_\ell x; y_i)$  proceeds exactly as in Case (b).



Partial compositions in Case (b') are rather trivial since  $y_\ell = (1)$ , so only  $j = 1$  is possible. All relevant  $H_s$  evaluations reduce to single terms.

To see that there is no sign change between corresponding terms in the  $H_s$  evaluation we need to look at shuffle counts. The only difference between caesuras of  $x$  and  $d_\ell x$  is the initial  $\ell$  caesura of  $x$ . Since  $\ell < n$  the only  $y$ -caesuras in summands on both sides correspond to caesuras of  $y_i$ , with  $\ell < i$ . None of these precede the first  $\ell$  caesura of  $x$ . Therefore the shuffle counts of  $y$ -caesuras preceding  $x$ -caesuras or  $d_\ell x$ -caesuras are the same for each summand on both sides of the equation.

Example (b'): We first give a partial composition example. Take  $x = (1, 2, 3, 2, 3)$  and  $y_1 = y_2 = (1), y_3 = (1, 2, 1)$ . Then  $\ell = 2 < 3 = n$  and  $d_2 x = (1, 3, 2, 3)$ . There are three 2-divisions of  $y_3[2] = (3, 4, 3)$ , namely  $(3|3, 4, 3)$ ,  $(3, 4|4, 3)$  and  $(3, 4, 3|3)$ . We calculate

$$\Phi(x; (1), (1), y_3) = (1, 2, 3, 2, 3, 4, 3) - (1, 2, 3, 4, 2, 4, 3) - (1, 2, 3, 4, 3, 2, 3).$$

The  $y$  caesura is the second 3 in the first summand, which comes before no  $x$ -caesuras. The  $y$ -caesura is the first 3 in the last two summands, which comes before one  $x$ -caesura. This explains the signs.

We also calculate

$$\Phi(d_2 x; (1), (1), y_3) = (1, 3, 2, 3, 4, 3) - (1, 3, 4, 2, 4, 3) - (1, 3, 4, 3, 2, 3).$$

The  $H_4$  calculation reduces to one term,  $isr$ , for each summand. The shuffle counts and signs also check.

We also give a more general example of Case (b'). Let  $x = (1, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2)$   $y_1 = (12), y_2 = (1, 2, 3), y_3 = (1, 2, 1, 3, 4, 2, 3)$ . Then  $\ell = 2 < 3 = n$  and  $d_2 x = (1, 3, 2, 3, 2)$ . For the  $d_2 x$  calculation we will focus on just one 2-division of  $y_2[2]$ , say  $(3, 4|4, 5)$  with  $j = 2$ , and one 2-division of  $y_3[5]$ , say  $(6, 7, 6, 8|8, 9, 7, 8)$ .

The corresponding summand of  $\Phi(d_2 x; y_i)$  is

$$(1, 2, 6, 7, 6, 8, 3, 4, 8, 9, 7, 8, 4, 5) \text{ with } sh(C_{d_2 x}, C_{\mathcal{D}''}) = 4.$$

Applying  $H_9$  gives two terms

$$(1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 6, 8, 3, 4, 8, 9, 7, 8, 4, 5) + (1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 6, 8, 4, 8, 9, 7, 8, 4, 5),$$

also each with  $sh(C_x, C_{\mathcal{D}}) = 4$ . These are the two terms of  $\Phi(x; y_i)$  corresponding to the two 3-divisions  $(3|3, 4|5)$  and  $(3, 4|4|4, 5)$  of  $y_2[2]$  and the fixed 2-division of  $y_3[5]$ .

Final Cases: Lastly we assume  $x$  is clean at  $\ell$  and also that  $\ell$  is least so that  $y_\ell \neq Id_{s\ell}$ . Assume  $y_\ell$  is clean at  $m$ . Then we want

$$\Phi(x, y_i) = H_s\Phi(d_\ell x; y_1, \dots, y_r) + (-1)^{|x|} H_s\Phi(x; y_1, \dots, d_m y_\ell, \dots, y_r).$$

In this case, there will be summands from both terms on the right. Again, the divisions of  $y_i$  for  $i < \ell$  and  $i > \ell$  just come along for the ride. The summands  $\mathcal{D}x$  of  $\Phi(x; y_i)$  will separate according to the first division subtuple of  $y_\ell$ . If that subtuple is  $(1, 2, \dots, j)$  with  $j > m$  then the terms come from  $H_s\Phi(x; y_1, \dots, d_m y_\ell, \dots, y_r)$ , and the computations are similar to Case (a'). If  $j \leq m$  then the terms come from  $H_s\Phi(d_\ell x, y_i)$ . The computations are similar to Case (b').

Case (a''): The terms  $H_s\Phi(x; y_1, \dots, d_m y_\ell, \dots, y_r)$  are the easiest to clarify. Given a division  $\mathcal{D}$  in which the first  $y_\ell$  subtuple is  $(1, 2, \dots, m-1, m, m+1, \dots)$  of length  $j > m$ , observe that  $\mathcal{D}x$  is a basis generator followed by a shifted clean generator with larger entries. The first caesura is  $t+m$ , where  $t = t_\ell$ . Remove the first  $m$  from the first  $y_\ell$  subtuple, to form the first subtuple of a  $k_\ell$ -division of  $d_m y_\ell$ . Leave all other subtuples of the division  $\mathcal{D}_\ell$  alone, and also leave alone all divisions  $\mathcal{D}_i$  of the  $y_i$  for  $i \neq \ell$ . This produces a collection of divisions  $\mathcal{D}'$  paired up with the described divisions  $\mathcal{D}$ . For these  $\mathcal{D}'$ , the first division subtuple of  $d_m y_\ell$  has length at least  $m$ , and  $\mathcal{D}'x = d_{t+m}\mathcal{D}x$ . Then  $H_s\mathcal{D}'x = i^{t+m-1}sr^{t+m-1}\mathcal{D}'x = \mathcal{D}x$ . Any divisions  $\mathcal{D}'$  for which the first division subtuple of  $d_m y_\ell$  has length less than  $m$  will result in a clean term  $\mathcal{D}'x$  on which  $H_s$  vanishes.

The term  $\mathcal{D}x$  has one new first  $y$ -caesura  $t+m$  that comes before all the  $x$ -caesuras. Other caesuras of  $\mathcal{D}'x$  and  $\mathcal{D}x$  are in the same relative positions. Thus  $sh(C_x, C_{\mathcal{D}}) = |x| + sh(C_x, C_{\mathcal{D}'})$ , as in Case (a'). This confirms the desired sign relation, involving terms  $(-1)^{|x|} H_s(\Phi(x; y_1, \dots, d_m y_\ell, \dots, y_r))$  as summands of  $\Phi(x; y_i)$ .

Example (a''): Take  $x = (1, 2, 3, 4, 2, 3, 2)$ ,  $y_1 = (1)$ ,  $y_2 = (1, 2, 3, 4, 3)$ , with  $y_3, y_4$  arbitrary basis generators. Then  $\ell = n = 2$ ,  $k_2 = 3$ , and  $m = 3$ . For a partial composition example, take  $y_3 = y_4 = (1)$ . In the partial composition case the division subtuples called  $Y'_3, Y''_3, Y_4$  below simplify to singletons

(6), (6), (7), respectively, which contribute no  $y$ -caesuras and make the example a little easier to follow.

We have  $d_3y_2[1] = (2, 3, 5, 4)$ , and we first consider all  $k_2 = 3$ -divisions of  $d_3y_2[1]$  with first subtuple of length  $i \geq m = 3$ . These are the 3-divisions

$$(2, 3, 5|5, 4|4), (2, 3, 5|5|5, 4), (2, 3, 5, 4|4|4).$$

For each there will be exactly one non-zero  $H_s$  summand  $i^3sr^3$ , which are

$$H_s(1, 2, 3, \underline{5}, \underline{Y'_3}, Y_4, 5, \underline{4}, Y''_3, 4) = (1, 2, 3, \underline{\underline{4}}, \underline{\underline{5}}, \underline{Y'_3}, Y_4, 5, \underline{4}, Y''_3, 4)$$

$$H_s(1, 2, 3, \underline{5}, \underline{Y'_3}, Y_4, \underline{5}, Y''_3, 5, 4) = (1, 2, 3, \underline{\underline{4}}, \underline{\underline{5}}, \underline{Y'_3}, Y_4, \underline{5}, Y''_3, 5, 4)$$

$$H_s(1, 2, 3, 5, \underline{4}, \underline{Y'_3}, Y_4, \underline{4}, Y''_3, 4) = (1, 2, 3, \underline{\underline{4}}, 5, \underline{\underline{4}}, \underline{Y'_3}, Y_4, \underline{4}, Y''_3, 4).$$

These account for all the summands  $\mathcal{D}x$  for which the first subtuple of  $y_2$  has length  $j > m = 3$ . Summands of  $\Phi(x; y_1, d_3y_2, y_3, y_4)$  for which the first division subtuple of  $d_3y_2$  has length  $i < 3$  will result in clean surjection generators  $\mathcal{D}'x$ , so  $H_s$  will vanish on those. For example  $(2, 3|3, 5|5, 4)$  results in  $\mathcal{D}'x = (1, 2, 3, Y'_3, Y_4, 3, 5, Y''_3, 5, 4)$ .

In these examples with  $i \geq m = 3$ , we have underlined the  $x$ -caesuras on both sides. In the case of the underlined  $Y'_3$ , the  $x$ -caesura will be the last entry of that division subtuple. We have not given specific generators  $y_3, y_4$  in this example. There could be  $y$ -caesuras in the  $Y'_3, Y''_3, Y_4$  terms, but these are in the same positions relative to  $x$ -caesuras, so do not create any differences between the signs associated to the terms on the two sides.

$d_3y_2[1]$  has no  $y$ -caesuras, so there are no further  $y$ -caesuras on the left. But  $y_2[1]$  has a caesura 4, and we have double underlined that  $y$ -caesura on the right. Note  $|x| = 3$ . On the right the  $y$ -caesura is in front of the three  $x$ -caesuras. This is consistent with the term  $(-1)^{|x|}H_s\Phi(x; y_1, \dots, d_my_n, \dots, y_r)$  that is part of the formula for  $\Phi(x; y_i)$ .  $\square$

Case ( $b''$ ): Now we discuss  $k_i$  divisions  $\mathcal{D}$  of the  $y_i$  for which the first division subtuple of  $\mathcal{D}_\ell$  has length  $j \leq m$ . Define divisions  $\mathcal{D}''$  of the  $y_i$  by leaving all  $\mathcal{D}_i$  alone if  $i \neq \ell$  and forming a  $(k_\ell - 1)$ -division  $\mathcal{D}''_\ell$  of  $y_\ell$  whose first subdivision tuple is the amalgamation of the first two division subtuples of  $\mathcal{D}_\ell$ . Later division subtuples of  $\mathcal{D}_\ell$  are left unchanged in  $\mathcal{D}''_\ell$ . Then  $H_s(\mathcal{D}''d_\ell x)$  will consist of  $\min\{j, m\}$  summands, including  $\mathcal{D}x$ . Note there are exactly

$\min\{j, m\}$  such  $\mathcal{D}_\ell$  with the same ‘amalgamation’  $\mathcal{D}''_\ell$ .

The shuffle counts  $sh(C_x, C_{\mathcal{D}})$  and  $sh(C_{d_\ell x}, C_{\mathcal{D}''})$  are the same because even though  $\mathcal{D}x$  has an additional first  $x$ -caesura, the  $y$ -entries that precede it are singletons, not caesuras.

Example ( $b''$ ): We continue with the same  $x, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4$  as in Example ( $a''$ ), including the partial composition example where  $y_3 = y_4 = (1)$ . Again the terms called  $Y'_3, Y''_3, Y_4$  below then become singletons (6), (6), (7). We have  $d_2x = (1, 3, 4, 2, 3, 2)$ . There are five  $(k_2 - 1) = 2$ -divisions of  $y_2[1]$ , used to compute  $\mathcal{D}''d_2x$  summands. These will account for the summands  $\mathcal{D}x$  for which the first subtuple of  $y_2[1]$  has length  $j \leq m = 3$ . First  $(2|2, 3, 4, 5, 4)$ ,  $(2, 3|3, 4, 5, 4)$ , and  $(2, 3, 4|4, 5, 4)$  are the 2-divisions of  $y_2[1]$  with length of the first subtuple 1, 2, or 3. Applying  $H_s$  to the corresponding  $\mathcal{D}''d_2x$  terms we get

$$H_s(1, \underline{Y}'_3, Y_4, \underline{2}, Y''_3, 2, 3, \underline{\underline{4}}, 5, 4) = (1, \underline{2}, \underline{Y}'_3, Y_4, \underline{2}, Y''_3, 2, 3, \underline{\underline{4}}, 5, 4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} H_s(1, \underline{Y}'_3, Y_4, 2, \underline{3}, Y''_3, 3, \underline{\underline{4}}, 5, 4) &= (1, \underline{2}, \underline{Y}'_3, Y_4, 2, \underline{3}, Y''_3, 3, \underline{\underline{4}}, 5, 4) + \\ &\quad (1, 2, \underline{3}, \underline{Y}'_3, Y_4, \underline{3}, Y''_3, 3, \underline{\underline{4}}, 5, 4) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} H_s(1, \underline{Y}'_3, Y_4, 2, 3, \underline{4}, Y''_3, \underline{\underline{4}}, 5, 4) &= (1, \underline{2}, \underline{Y}'_3, Y_4, 2, 3, \underline{4}, Y''_3, \underline{\underline{4}}, 5, 4) + \\ &\quad (1, 2, \underline{3}, \underline{Y}'_3, Y_4, 3, \underline{4}, Y''_3, \underline{\underline{4}}, 5, 4) + (1, 2, 3, \underline{4}, \underline{Y}'_3, Y_4, \underline{4}, Y''_3, \underline{\underline{4}}, 5, 4). \end{aligned}$$

The number of summands on the right is the number of 2-divisions of (2), (2, 3), or (2, 3, 4).

The  $y$ -caesuras in  $Y'_3, Y''_3$  and  $Y_4$  occur in the same relative position to the  $x$ -caesuras on both sides. We have double underlined the one  $y_2$ -caesura, a 4, in all terms. It appears after the two single underlined  $x$ -caesuras on the left and after all three  $x$ -caesuras on the right. So the associated shuffle signs are the same for every term, the  $y_2$  caesura is not involved.

Then there are the 2-divisions  $(2, 3, 4, 5|5, 4)$ , and  $(2, 3, 4, 5, 4|4)$  of  $y_2[1]$  with length of the first subtuple 4 or 5. Applying  $H_s$  to the corresponding  $\mathcal{D}''d_2x$  terms gives three  $\mathcal{D}x$  summands each on the right. In each summand the amalgamation of the first two  $\mathcal{D}x$   $y_2[1]$  division subtuples is  $(2, 3, 4, 5)$  or  $(2, 3, 4, 5, 4)$ , subject to the constraint that the first subtuple is of length  $j = 1, 2$ , or 3.

$$\begin{aligned}
H_s(1, \underline{Y}_3', Y_4, 2, 3, \underline{\underline{4}}, \underline{\underline{5}}, Y_3'', 5, 4) &= (1, \underline{2}, \underline{Y}_3', Y_4, 2, 3, \underline{\underline{4}}, \underline{\underline{5}}, Y_3'', 5, 4) + \\
&(1, 2, \underline{\underline{3}}, \underline{Y}_3', Y_4, 3, \underline{\underline{4}}, \underline{\underline{5}}, Y_3'', 5, 4) + (1, 2, 3, \underline{\underline{4}}, \underline{Y}_3', Y_4, \underline{\underline{4}}, \underline{\underline{5}}, Y_3'', 5, 4). \\
H_s(1, \underline{Y}_3', Y_4, 2, 3, \underline{\underline{4}}, 5, \underline{\underline{4}}, Y_3'', 4) &= (1, \underline{2}, \underline{Y}_3', Y_4, 2, 3, \underline{\underline{4}}, 5, \underline{\underline{4}}, Y_3'', 4) + \\
&(1, 2, \underline{\underline{3}}, \underline{Y}_3', Y_4, 3, \underline{\underline{4}}, 5, \underline{\underline{4}}, Y_3'', 4) + (1, 2, 3, \underline{\underline{4}}, \underline{Y}_3', Y_4, \underline{\underline{4}}, 5, \underline{\underline{4}}, Y_3'', 4).
\end{aligned}$$

In all terms of these last two examples the  $y_2$ -caesura double underlined 4 precedes the final  $x$ -caesura, which is a single underlined 5 in the first example and a single underlined 4 in the second example. Thus in each example the shuffle signs associated to all terms on both sides are the same, as they should be. But the sign in these last two examples is opposite the sign in the first three examples. The  $y_2$ -caesura now contributes +1 to all shuffle counts.

To repeat the pattern (without signs) in this last somewhat complicated Case ( $b''$ ), for each  $\mathcal{D}x$  term with first  $y_\ell$  subtuple of length  $j \leq m$ , amalgamate the first two  $y_\ell$  subtuples, producing a  $\mathcal{D}''d_\ell x$  term, and calculate  $H_s$ . Each such  $H_s$  calculation will be a sum of  $\min(j, m)$   $\mathcal{D}x$  terms, namely, the terms with the same amalgamation of the first two  $y_\ell$  subtuples. The signs are what they are, but are the same for a given  $\mathcal{D}''d_\ell x$  term and all associated  $\mathcal{D}x$  terms.  $\square$

## 20.2 The Operad Morphism $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$

In this final subsection of Part III we prove that the equivariant functorial maps  $\Phi: \mathcal{S}_*(n) \otimes N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes n}$  studied in Section 17 fit together to give an operad morphism  $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$  from the surjection operad to the Eilenberg-Zilber operad  $\mathcal{Z}$ , which is the functorial *CoEnd* operad studied in Subsection 18.2. In other words, we will prove the diagram below commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{S}_*(r) \otimes \mathcal{S}_*(s_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{S}_*(s_r) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{S}}} & \mathcal{S}_*(s) \\
\downarrow \phi \otimes \downarrow \phi \otimes \cdots \otimes \downarrow \phi & & \downarrow \phi \\
\mathcal{Z}_*(r) \otimes \mathcal{Z}_*(s_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{Z}_*(s_r) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}} & \mathcal{Z}_*(s)
\end{array}$$

where  $\mathcal{Z}_*(n) = \text{HOM}_{\text{func}}(N_*(X), N_*(X)^{\otimes n})$  and the vertical maps  $\phi$  are adjoints of the maps  $\Phi$ .

The vertical maps are equivariant chain maps with respect to appropriate groups and the horizontal maps are twisted equivariant chain maps. The

two compositions around the diagram are thus twisted equivariant chain maps. In degree 0 both compositions are the twisted equivariant extension of the map that takes identity elements  $(e_r; e_{s_i})$  to the Alexander-Whitney diagonal  $\delta^{(s)}: N_*(X) \rightarrow N_*(X)^{\otimes s}$ .

It suffices to work with the universal acyclic model  $X = \Delta^m$ , in fact with the fundamental class  $\Delta^m \in N_m(\Delta^m)$ , and take adjoints with respect to the lower right corner, giving an equivalent diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(r) \otimes \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(s_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(s_r) \otimes N_*(\Delta^m) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}_S \otimes Id} & \mathcal{S}_*^{bf}(s) \otimes N_*(\Delta^m) \\ \downarrow \phi \otimes \downarrow \phi \otimes \cdots \otimes \downarrow \phi \otimes \downarrow Id & & \downarrow \Phi \\ \mathcal{Z}_*(r) \otimes \mathcal{Z}_*(s_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{Z}_*(s_r) \otimes N_*(\Delta^m) & \xrightarrow{Ad \mathcal{O}_Z} & N_*(\Delta^m)^{\otimes s}. \end{array}$$

Now we are in position to use results about contractions and twisted equivariant standard procedure chain maps. Specifically we want to use the results from Section 17 and Subsections 18.2 and 20.1 to show that both ways around the diagram take basis elements to elements in the image of the contraction of the range. Then the uniqueness result Proposition 17.9, extended routinely to a twisted equivariant version, implies both maps coincide with the standard twisted equivariant chain map.

**Proposition 20.14.** *Suppose  $x \in \mathcal{S}_*(r)$  and  $y_i \in \mathcal{S}_*(s_i)$  are basis elements. Then both*

$$\Phi \circ (\mathcal{O}_S \otimes Id)(x \otimes \otimes_i y_i \otimes \Delta^m)$$

and

$$Ad \mathcal{O}_Z \circ (\phi \otimes \otimes_i \phi \otimes Id)(x \otimes \otimes_i y_i \otimes \Delta^m)$$

belong to  $Im(h_{\otimes^s}) \subset N_*(\Delta^m)^{\otimes s}$ .

*Proof.* We first go across the top and down in the diagram. In the notation of Section 17 and the previous subsection,

$$\Phi \circ (\mathcal{O}_S \otimes Id)(x \otimes \otimes_i y_i \otimes \Delta^m) = \sum_{\mathcal{D}} \Phi(\pm \mathcal{D}x \otimes \Delta^m) = \sum_{\mathcal{D}} \sum_{\widehat{M}} \pm F(\widehat{M}, \pm \mathcal{D}x)$$

where the  $\widehat{M}$  are monomial summands of the multidagonal  $\delta^{(s+|\mathcal{D}x|)}(\Delta^m)$  and  $F(\widehat{M}, \mathcal{D}x)$  are tensors in  $N_*(\Delta^m)^{\otimes s}$ . From Lemma 20.6 the  $\mathcal{D}x$  are clean surjection generators. Then from Step 2 of the proof of Proposition 17.3, the tensors  $F(\widehat{M}, \mathcal{D}x)$  are in the image of the contraction of  $N_*(\Delta^m)^{\otimes s}$ .

Going down and across in the diagram requires a closer look. Recall from Subsection 18.2 that  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}(u \otimes \otimes_i v_i) = \pm \underline{\otimes} v_i \circ u$ . Then  $Ad \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}(u \otimes \otimes_i v_i \otimes \Delta^m) = \pm \underline{\otimes} v_i(u(\Delta^m))$ , where  $u(\Delta^m) \in N_*(\Delta^m)^{\otimes r}$ .

In our case,  $u = \phi(x)$  and  $v_i = \phi(y_i)$ . So  $u(\Delta^m) = \Phi(x \otimes \Delta^m) = \sum_M \pm F(M, x)$ , where the  $M$  are monomial summands of the multidagonal  $\delta^{(r+|x|)}(\Delta^m)$ , and the  $F(M, x)$  are  $r$ -tensors. Specifically, we can write  $F(M, x) = F_1(M, x) \otimes \cdots \otimes F_r(M, x)$ , where each  $F_i(M, x) \in N_{m_i}(\Delta^m)$  is a face of some dimension, depending on the recipe of Section 17 for turning  $M$  and  $x$  into the tensor  $F(M, x)$ . Then we need to calculate the terms

$$\underline{\otimes} \phi(y_i)(\otimes F_i(M, x)) \in \bigotimes N_*(\Delta^m)^{\otimes s_i} = N_*(\Delta^m)^{\otimes s}$$

as sums of amalgamated  $s_i$ -tensors. In particular, we could identify the face  $F_i(M, x)$  with a standard  $\Delta^{m_i} \subset \Delta^m$  and use functoriality to compute

$$\Phi(y_i \otimes \Delta^{m_i}) = \sum_{M(i)} \pm F(M(i), y_i) \in N_*(\Delta^{m_i})^{\otimes s_i} \subset N_*(\Delta^m)^{\otimes s_i},$$

where the monomials  $M(i)$  are monomials in appropriate multidagonals of the  $\Delta^{m_i}$ .

But the vertices of the faces  $F_i(M, x)$  are already named as vertices of  $\Delta^m$ , so there is no real need to work with the standard simplex  $\Delta^{m_i}$ . One can just interpret the monomials  $M(i)$  directly in terms of  $\Delta^m$  vertices.

**Example 20.15.** Let  $x = (1, 2, 1, 2)$ ,  $y_1 = (1, 2, 1, 3, 2)$   $y_2 = (1, 2, 3, 2, , 3)$ . Take  $m = 9$  and monomial  $M = (01234|456|67|789)$ . Calculate the summand of  $\Phi(x, \Delta^9)$  given by

$$F(M, x) = F_1(M, x) \otimes F_2(M, x) = (01234 \ 67) \otimes (456 \ 789) \in N_*(\Delta^9)^{\otimes 2}.$$

So the face dimensions are  $m_1 = 6$  and  $m_2 = 5$ . We have separated the vertices of the faces to emphasize that the faces have subfaces revealed in the calculation of  $F(M, x)$ .

Take monomials

$$M(1) = (0|012|23|346|67) \quad \text{and} \quad M(2) = (45|56|67|789|9)$$

and form the summand of  $\Phi(y_1 \otimes F_1(M, x)) \otimes \Phi(y_2 \otimes F_2(M, x)) \in N_*(\Delta^9)^{\otimes 3} \otimes N_*(\Delta^9)^{\otimes 3}$  produced by the monomials  $M(1), M(2)$ . This 6-tensor is

$$(023) \otimes (012 \ 67) \otimes (346) \otimes (45) \otimes (56 \ 789) \otimes (67 \ 9). \quad \square$$

The first thing we notice is that this tensor does belong to  $Im(h_{\otimes 6})$ . In fact, we can complete the proof of Proposition 20.14. In complete generality it is easy to see that the tensors  $F(M(i), y_i) \in N_*(\Delta^{m_i})^{\otimes s_i}$  are in the image of the contractions, where we interpret the  $M(i)$  as monomials in the vertices of the faces.<sup>37</sup> In fact, this is nothing but the definition of these tensors as summands of the standard procedure map of Proposition 17.3 applied to a basis surjection generator. In our case we have an amalgamation of  $r$  such tensors. The first one, with  $i = 1$ , always begins with a 0. It is possible that this first tensor is just a tensor of (0)'s. But then the first vertex of the second face will be 0 and the second tensor will begin with a 0. In positive degrees, eventually one sees  $(0) \otimes \dots \otimes (0) \otimes (0a\dots) \in Im(h_{\otimes s})$  as desired.

**Example 20.16.** Let  $x = (1, 2, 3, 2)$ ,  $y_1 = (1, 2, 3)$ ,  $y_2 = (1, 2, 3, 1)$ ,  $y_3 = (1)$ . Take  $m = 5$  and monomial  $M = (0|012|234|45)$ . Calculate the summand of  $\Phi(x, \Delta^5)$  given by

$$F(M, x) = F_1(M, x) \otimes F_2(M, x) \otimes F_3(M, x) = (0) \otimes (012\ 45) \otimes (234) \in N_*(\Delta^5)^{\otimes 3}.$$

Take monomials  $M(1) = (0|0|0)$ ,  $M(2) = (01|1|124|45)$ , and  $M(3) = (234)$ . Form the summand of

$$\Phi(y_1 \otimes F_1(M, x)) \otimes \Phi(y_2 \otimes F_2(M, x)) \otimes \Phi(y_3, \otimes F_3(M, x))$$

produced by the monomials  $M(i)$ . This 7-tensor is

$$(0) \otimes (0) \otimes (0) \otimes (01\ 45) \otimes (1) \otimes (124) \otimes (234).$$

□

Although we have now proved Proposition 20.14, and thus proved that the maps  $\mathcal{S}_*(n) \rightarrow CoEnd(n)$  form an operad morphism, it is not much harder to actually get inside the identity

$$\sum_{\mathcal{D}} \sum_{\widehat{M}} F(\widehat{M}, \mathcal{D}x) = \sum_M \sum_{M(i)} \bigotimes_i F(M(i), y_i)$$

that directly expresses the commutativity of the operad morphism diagram, at least ignoring signs. The terms in the two sums match up as follows.

Beginning with  $\widehat{M}$  and a  $\mathcal{D}x$ , the term  $F(\widehat{M}, \mathcal{D}x)$  is a tensor in  $N_*(\Delta^m)^{\otimes s} = \otimes_i N_*(\Delta^m)^{\otimes s_i}$ . The factors, taken in consecutive blocks of  $s_i$ -tensors, are the

---

<sup>37</sup>So for the tensor associated to  $M(2)$ , the initial vertex is the 4.



terms  $F(M(i), y_i)$ , and we need to identify the associated monomials  $M$  and  $M(i)$ .  $\mathcal{D}x$  is a string of entries between 1 and  $s$ , organized in shifted subblocks  $(y_1^{(1)}, y_2^{(1)}[t_2], \dots, y_i^{(j)}[t_i], \dots, y_r^{(k_r)}[t_r])$ , where the  $y_i^{(j)}$  are the division subtuples of the  $y_i$  determined by  $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_r)$ . We unravel the blocks of  $s_i$ -tensors to produce monomials, as described in Remark 17.4. These monomials are the  $M(i)$ .

The monomial  $M$  is determined as follows. The monomial blocks of  $\widehat{M}$  can be labelled by entries of  $x$ . Namely, each  $\mathcal{D}x$  entry is an entry of one of the subblocks  $y_i^{(j)}[t_i]$ , so the corresponding subblock of  $\widehat{M}$  receives label  $i$ . Amalgamating adjacent subblocks of  $\widehat{M}$  with the same  $x$  entry label determines the subblocks of monomial  $M$ , and hence determines  $M$ .

**Example 20.17.** Take  $x = (1, 2, 1, 2)$  and  $y_1 = (1, 2, 1, 3, 2)$ ,  $y_2 = (1, 2, 3, 2, 3)$ , with the 2-divisions  $(1, 2, 1, 3|3, 2)$  and  $(1, 2, 3|3, 2, 3)$ . So  $s_1 + s_2 = 3 + 3 = 6 = s$ . Then

$$\mathcal{D}x = (1, 2, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 3, 2, 6, 5, 6).$$

Take  $m = 9$  and monomial  $\widehat{M} = (0|01|1|1|123|34|4|4|456|6|678|89)$ . Then

$$F(\widehat{M}, \mathcal{D}x) = (0\ 1) \otimes (01\ 456) \otimes (1\ 4) \otimes (123) \otimes (34\ 678) \otimes (4\ 6\ 89) \in N_*(\Delta^9)^{\otimes 6}.$$

Unraveling the product of the first three tensor terms and then the second three tensor terms gives

$$M(1) = (0|01|1|14|456) \quad \text{and} \quad M(2) = (123|34|46|678|89).$$

The first three tensor terms themselves form  $F(M(1), y_1)$ , a summand of  $\Phi(y_1 \otimes (01456))$ . Similarly, the second three tensor terms form  $F(M(2), y_2)$ , a summand of  $\Phi(y_2, (12346789))$ .

The subblocks of  $\widehat{M}$  have  $x$ -labels  $(1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2)$ . Amalgamating those subblocks, we get the subblocks of  $M$  to be  $M = (01|1234|456|6789)$  and  $F(M, x) = (01\ 456) \otimes (1234\ 6789)$ .  $\square$

Finally, to go the other direction, beginning with  $M$  and the  $M(i)$ , the tensor  $\bigotimes_i F(M(i), y_i) \in N_*(\Delta^m)^{\otimes s}$  can be unraveled to form  $\widehat{M}$ . We need to identify  $\mathcal{D}x$ , which means identify the lengths of the division subtuples of the  $y_i$ . Equivalently, we need to put labels  $1, 2, \dots, r$  on the subblocks of  $\widehat{M}$ . The blocks of  $M$  also have labels, with  $k_i$  blocks labeled  $i$ . Consider the  $j^{\text{th}}$  block of  $M$  labeled  $i$ , say  $M(ij)$ . Note  $M(i)$  will have  $s_i + |y_i|$  blocks.

Count the number of those blocks that intersect the block  $M(ij)$ . This is the length of the division subtuple  $y_i^{(j)}$ .

In the example above we have  $M(11) = (01)$ ,  $M(12) = (456)$ ,  $M(21) = (1234)$ ,  $M(22) = (6789)$ . We see  $M(11)$  intersects four blocks of  $M(1) = (0|01|1|14|456)$ , and  $M(12)$  intersects two blocks of  $M(1)$ . The division subtuples of  $y_1$  thus have lengths 4 and 2, and the 2-division  $\mathcal{D}y_1 = (1, 2, 1, 3|3, 2)$ . The blocks  $M(21)$  and  $M(22)$  intersect three and three blocks of  $M(2) = (123|34|46|678|89)$ , respectively. Thus the 2-division  $\mathcal{D}y_2 = (1, 2, 3|3, 2, 3)$ .  
□

**Exercise.** Take  $x = (1, 2, 1, 3, 2, 1, 3)$  and  $y_1 = (1, 2, 3, 2, 1)$   $y_2 = (1, 2, 1, 2)$  and  $y_3 = (1, 2, 3, 4, 2)$ . Take  $m = 5$  and  $M = (0|01|1|12|23|345|5)$ . Then  $F(M, x) = (0 \ 1 \ 345) \otimes (01 \ 23) \otimes (12 \ 5)$ . Take  $M(1) = (0|13|34|4|45)$ ,  $M(2) = (0|012|23|3)$ ,  $M(3) = (12|2|2|25|5)$ . Find  $\mathcal{D}x$  and  $\widehat{M}$  so that

$$F(\widehat{M}, \mathcal{D}x) = F(M(1), y_1) \otimes F(M(2), y_2) \otimes F(M(3), y_3) \in N_*(\Delta^5)^{\otimes 9}.$$

We have proved the operad morphism diagram for  $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$  commutes, therefore signs of matched up summands will agree. At various points we have clarified all signs in the separate morphisms of the operad morphism diagram. Separately calculate the signs associated to the two matched expressions in this exercise.

□ □ □ □ □ □

## REFERENCES

1. M. Adamaszek and J.D.S. Jones, The Symmetric Join Operad, arXiv:1110.2989, 2011.
2. M. Barratt and P. Eccles,  $\Gamma^+$ -Structures - I: A Free Group Structure for Stable Homotopy Theory, Topology, Vol 13, 1974, pp. 25-45.
3. C. Berger and B. Fresse, Combinatorial Operad Actions on Cochains, arXiv:math/0109158v2, 2002.
4. C. Berger and B. Fresse, Combinatorial Operad Actions on Cochains, Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society, Vol. 137,

Issue 1, July 2004, pp. 135-174.

5. C. Berger and B. Fresse, Une Decomposition Prismatique de l'Operade de Barratt-Eccles, arXiv:math/0204326v1, 2002.
6. C. Berger and B. Fresse, Une Decomposition Prismatique de l'Operade de Barratt-Eccles, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris 335(4), 365–370 (2002).
7. G. Brumfiel, A. Medina-Mardones, J. Morgan, A cochain level proof of Adem relations in the mod 2 Steenrod algebra, arXiv:2006.09354v2, 2021.
8. G. Brumfiel, A. Medina-Mardones, J. Morgan, A cochain level proof of Adem relations in the mod 2 Steenrod algebra, Journal of Homotopy and Related Structures (2021) 16:517–562 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40062-021-00287-3>.
9. G. Brumfiel and J. Morgan, The Pontrjagin Dual of 3-Dimensional Spin Bordism, arXiv:1612.02860v2, 2018.
10. G. Brumfiel and J. Morgan, The Pontrjagin Dual of 4-Dimensional Spin Bordism, arXiv:1803.08147, 2018.
11. G. Brumfiel and J. Morgan, Quadratic Functions of Cocycles and Pin Structures, arXiv:1808.10484, 2018.
12. A. Hatcher, Algebraic Topology, 2001.
13. R.M. Kaufman and A.M. Medina-Mardones, Cochain Level May-Steenrod Operations, arXiv:2010.02571v4, 2021.
14. L. Lambe and J. Stasheff, Applications of Perturbation Theory to Iterated Fibrations, Manuscripta Mathematica, (1987) Volume :58, page 363-376.
15. J. Loday and B. Vallette, Algebraic Operads, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften 346.
16. M. Mandell,  $E_\infty$  Algebras and  $p$ -adic Homotopy Theory, Topology 40 (2001), no. 1, pp. 43-94.

17. M. Mandell, Cochains and Homotopy Type, arXiv:math/0311016, 2002.
18. M. Mandell, Cochains and Homotopy Type, Publications Mathématique de l'Institut des Hautes études Scientifiques, 103 (2006), pp. 213-246.
19. J.E. McClure and J. H. Smith, Multivariable Cochain Operations and Little n-Cubes, arXiv:math/0106024v3, 2002.
20. J. E. McClure and J. H. Smith, Multivariable Cochain Operations and Little n-Cubes, J. Am. Math. Soc. 16(3), 681–704 (2003).
21. J.E. McClure and J. H. Smith, Operads and Cosimplicial Objects: An Introduction, arXiv:math/0402117v1, 2004.
22. A. M. Medina-Mardones, An effective proof of the Cartan formula: the even prime, J. Pure Appl. Algebra, 224(12):106444, 18, (2020).
23. A.M. Medina-Mardones, A. Pizzi, and P. Salvatore, Multisimplicial chains and configuration spaces, arXiv:2012.02060v2, 2023.
24. P. Real, Homotopy Perturbation Theory and Associativity, Homology, Homotopy, and Applications, Vol. 2, No.5, 2000, pp 51-88.
25. J. Rubio and F. Sergeraert, Algebraic Models for Homotopy Types, Homology, Homotopy and Applications, vol.7(2), 2005, pp.139–160.
26. V. A. Smirnov, Homotopy Theory of Coalgebras, Mathematics of the USSR-Izvestiya (1986)27(3): 575.
27. J. R. Smith, M-Structures Determine Integral Homotopy Type, arXiv:math/9809151, 1998.
28. J. R. Smith, Operads and Algebraic Homotopy, arXiv:math/0004003v7, 2000.
29. J. R. Smith, Cellular Coalgebras Over the Barratt-Eccles Operad I, arXiv:1304.6328v4 2013.
30. N. E. Steenrod, Cohomology Operations, written and revised by D.B.A.Epstein, Annals of Math Studies vol 50, Princeton University Press, 1962.

31. H. Whitney, Moscow 1935: Topology Moving Toward America, Hassler Whitney Collected Papers Volume I, J. Eels, Domingo Toledo editors, 1992.