

ALGEBRAIC K-THEORY OF FINITE ALGEBRAS OVER HIGHER LOCAL FIELDS

RIXIN FANG

ABSTRACT. It is known that the truncated Brown–Peterson spectra can be equipped with certain nice algebra structure, by the work of J. Hahn and D. Wilson, and these ring spectra can be viewed as rings of integers of local fields in the chromatic homotopy theory. Furthermore, they satisfy both Rognes’ redshift conjecture and Lichtenbaum–Quillen property. For lower-height cases, the K-theory of the truncated polynomial algebras over these ring spectra is well understood through the work of L. Hesselholt, I. Madsen, et al. In this paper, we demonstrate that the Segal conjecture fails for truncated polynomial algebras over higher local fields, and consequently, the Lichtenbaum–Quillen property fails. However, the weak redshift conjecture remains valid. Additionally, we provide some other examples where Segal conjecture holds.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Motivation and History	1
1.2. Main Results	4
1.3. Future Work	5
1.4. Structure of the Paper	5
1.5. Notations and Conventions	6
1.6. Acknowledgments	6
2. Truncated Polynomials and Infinitesimal Thickening	6
3. Negative Topological Cyclic Homology	15
4. Segal Conjecture	18
5. Descent Spectral Sequence	33
6. Computation for Height One Case	35
References	37

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Motivation and History. Algebraic K-theory is an important invariant for rings and even for ring spectra, it captures some arithmetic information of the input ring, and it reflects chromatic information of the input ring spectrum. Even more, it is not only an invariant for objects, but a localizing invariant in the sense of [BGT13], it also can output the sphere spectrum which is the initial object in stable homotopy theory.

To be more precise about the information that algebra K-theory captures, we let \mathcal{O} be a $\mathbb{Z}[1/\ell]$ -algebra, where ℓ is a prime number, then Quillen conjectured that there is a spectral

sequence

$$E_2^{*,*} = H_{\text{ét}}^*(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{Z}/\ell^n(*)) \implies K_*(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{Z}/\ell^n)$$

converges to the target at large degrees. If moreover, \mathcal{O} contains an ℓ^n th root of unity, then Thomason proved that

$$E_2^{p,q} = \begin{cases} H_{\text{ét}}^p(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{Z}/\ell^n(i)), & q = 2i, \\ 0, & q \text{ odd.} \end{cases} \implies K_{q-2p}(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{Z}/\ell^n)[\beta^{-1}].$$

Where the above $\beta \in K_2(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{Z}/\ell^n)$ is given by a ℓ^n th root of unity. In this case, the Bott inverted K-theory is the same as étale K-theory. People prove that the Bott inverted K-theory is the same as $L_1^f K(\mathcal{O}) \otimes \mathbb{S}/\ell \simeq L_{K(1)} K(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{Z}_p) \simeq K(\mathcal{O}) \otimes \mathbb{S}/\ell[v_1^{-1}]$ for $\ell > 2$. Actually, when \mathcal{O} does not contains ℓ^n th roots of unity, there is a spectral sequence with the same E_2 -page converges to étale K-theory.

Hence the conjecture is reduce to the comparison of étale K-theory and K-theory, or the comparison of $K(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{Z}/\ell)$ and $L_1^f(K(\mathcal{O})) \otimes \mathbb{Z}/\ell \simeq L_{K(1)} K(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{Z}/\ell)$. Actually, there is motivic spectral sequence

$$E_2^{p,q} = H_{\text{mot}}^{p-q}(X, \mathbb{Z}/\ell(-q)) \implies K_{-p-q}(X, \mathbb{Z}/\ell),$$

where X is a smooth scheme over a field k . This can be proved using motivic homotopy theory, where motivic cohomology is represented by motivic Eilenberg–MacLane spectrum, and the above spectral sequence is an analogue of Atiyah–Hirzebruch spectral sequence. If moreover, $\ell \in k^\times$, then the E_2 -page above is equivalent to $H_{\text{ét}}^p(X, \mathbb{Z}/\ell(q))$ for all $p \leq q \leq 0$ (norm-residue theorem), see [Voe11]. And, Waldhausen reformulated the Lichtenbaum–Quillen conjecture as following.

Conjecture 1.1 ([Wal84]). *For nice ring \mathcal{O} ,*

$$K(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{Z}/\ell) \rightarrow L_1^f K(\mathcal{O}) \otimes \mathbb{S}/\ell \simeq K(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{Z}/\ell)[v_1^{-1}] \simeq L_{K(1)}(K(\mathcal{O})) \otimes \mathbb{S}/\ell$$

is an equivalence on large degrees.

The original Lichtenbaum–Quillen conjecture may has some arithmetic background, related to the theory of zeta values. While the last formulation is more topological, and lies naturally in chromatic homotopy theory. The author was surprised by this phenomenon. One could say that, K-theory of certain nice ring has v_1 -periodicity, since the localization is merely an equivalence. Now, one may ask, is there chromatic higher level phenomenon which is a analogue of that. That is Rognes’ red-shift conjecture (philosophy). There are actually many forms of this philosophy, the key point is, for a ring spectrum which has v_n -periodicity, then the K-theory of it should have v_{n+1} -periodicity.

As seen, in these phenomena, we first fixed a prime number p . A spectrum X is said to be fp spectrum, if it is p -complete, bounded below, and there is a p -local finite spectrum F such that $F \otimes X$ is bounded, and the homotopy groups are finite groups. We say X is fp-type at most n , if there is a type $n + 1$ finite complex, such that $F \otimes X$ is bounded, and homotopy groups are finite.

Conjecture 1.2. *Let R be an \mathbb{E}_1 -ring of pure fp type n , $K(R)_p^\wedge$ have pure fp type $n + 1$, or $\text{TC}(R, p)$ have pure fp type $n + 1$.*

By Theorem 4.5, Conjecture 1.2, will be exactly the analogue of Conjecture 1.1. In [HW22], the authors proved that $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle_p^\wedge$ satisfies Conjecture 1.2, for any $n \geq -1$.

In chromatic homotopy theory, v_n is detected by Morava K-theory, $K(n)$. One could use Morava K-theory to define the height for spectra, although, in general, this is not a very nice concept. We say an \mathbb{E}_∞ -ring R is height n , if $L_{K(n)}R \not\simeq 0$, and $L_{K(n+1)}R \simeq 0$. Hahn [Hah22] showed that for an \mathbb{E}_∞ -ring, if $L_{K(i)}R \simeq 0$, then $L_{K(j)}R \simeq 0$, for all $j \geq i$. Thus, in this case, the height is well defined. So, one might define the height to be the number n , such that $L_{K(i)}R \not\simeq 0$, for $0 \leq i \leq n$, and $L_{K(n+1)}R \simeq 0$.

Conjecture 1.3. *Let R be a ring spectrum of height n , then $K(R)$ is height $n + 1$.*

The conjecture is true, for R be any \mathbb{E}_∞ -ring, by [Yua21], [BSY22], [CMNN24]. The first conjecture, actually related to $T(n)$ -localized theory, see Theorem 4.5. While the second conjecture more related to $K(n)$ -localized theory. As known, for $n \geq 2$, the telescope conjecture fails [BHLS23], the proof used many ingredients in algebraic K-theory and things related to these two conjectures.

The method to prove Conjecture 1.2 was presented in [HW22] and also appeared in [AN21], mainly reduce to prove following two questions.

Question 1.4 (Segal conjecture). Suppose R be a nice ring spectrum, which is fp spectrum of type n . Let F be a p -local type $n + 2$ finite complex, do we have the Frobenius map

$$F_*(\mathrm{THH}(R)) \rightarrow F_*(\mathrm{THH}(R)^{tC_p})$$

induce isomorphism in large degrees.

Question 1.5 (Weak canonical vanishing). Suppose R be a nice ring spectrum, which is fp spectrum of type n . Let F be a p -local type $n + 2$ finite complex, is there a $d \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that the maps

$$F_*(\mathrm{THH}(R)^{hC_{p^k}}) \rightarrow F_*(\mathrm{THH}(R)^{tC_{p^k}})$$

is trivial for $* > d$, and for any $k \geq 1$.

Sometimes, people refer boundedness of TR, as the Lichtenbaum–Quillen Property.

Definition 1.6. Let F be a p -local type $n + 2$ finite complex, and R be a ring spectrum which is fp of type n . We say that R satisfies Lichtenbaum–Quillen Property if $F \otimes \mathrm{TR}(R)$ is bounded.

The method to prove Conjecture 1.3, basically is first to construct a nice ring map $R \rightarrow S$, this will induce a ring map $K(R) \rightarrow K(S)$, and thus $L_{K(n+1)}K(R) \rightarrow L_{K(n+1)}K(S)$. And the target is more familiar, or say, one could know that $L_{K(n+1)}K(S) \not\simeq 0$, then one could conclude that the source is not 0.

The K-theory of truncated polynomial algebras over perfect fields were studied in [HM97a], and note that $\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e$ is just $\mathrm{BP}\langle -1 \rangle[x]/x^e$. Thus it is natural to consider the K-theory of $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e$, which are chromatic higher level case of $\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e$. This paper is thus try to answer Conjecture 1.2, 1.3, Question 1.4, 1.5, for $R = \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e$, and more other rings related to that. In particular, in the proof of Proposition 4.9 and [HM97a, Theorem A], shows that $K(\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e)$ is not a fp spectrum of type 0. And Proposition 6.4, shows that $K((\ell[x]/x^e)_p^\wedge)_p^\wedge$ is not a fp spectrum of type 2.

1.2. **Main Results.** As mentioned before, we will consider $\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]/x^e$, we proved following.

Theorem 1.7 (see Proposition 2.28, Proposition 4.4). *There are \mathbb{E}_3 -algebras*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]/x^e, \mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle \otimes_{\mathrm{MU}} \mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e. \\ & \Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle}(x), \mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle \otimes_{\mathrm{MU}} \Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x). \\ & \mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle/v_n^e. \end{aligned}$$

See Convention 2.12, 2.19. Any of them is a finite $\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle$ -module for some n , thus we can view them as finite algebras over $\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle$ (the ring of integers of a height n local field). Moreover $\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]/x^e$, $\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle \otimes_{\mathrm{MU}} \mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e$ and $\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle}(x)$, $\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle \otimes_{\mathrm{MU}} \Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x)$ are fp spectra of type n , the spectrum $\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle/v_n^e$ is fp spectrum of type $n - 1$.

Using the methods mentioned before, and the results in [HW22], we found the redshift phenomena for the above constructed ring spectra.

Theorem 1.8 (Proposition 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.7, 3.8). *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} & L_{K(n+1)}(\mathrm{K}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]/x^e)) \not\cong 0, L_{K(n+1)}(\mathrm{K}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle \otimes_{\mathrm{MU}} \mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e)) \not\cong 0, \\ & L_{K(n+1)}(\mathrm{K}(\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle}(x))) \not\cong 0, L_{K(n+1)}(\mathrm{K}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle \otimes_{\mathrm{MU}} \Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x))) \not\cong 0 \\ & L_{K(n)}(\mathrm{K}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle/v_n^e)) \not\cong 0. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we learn that v_{n+1} is non-nilpotent in $\mathrm{TC}^-(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]/x^e/\mathrm{MU}[x])$ and $\mathrm{TC}^-(\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle}(x)/\Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x))$. And v_n is non-nilpotent in $\mathrm{TC}^-(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle/v_n^e/\mathrm{MU})$.

Using functor $\mathrm{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p}$, we can approximate the Frobenius map of $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x])$ by graded, thus proved following.

Theorem 1.9 (Proposition 4.16). *Let F be any type $n + 1$ finite complex, then the Frobenius*

$$F_*(\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x])) \rightarrow F_*(\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x])^{tC_p})$$

induces isomorphism on large degrees. In particular, if F is of type $n + 2$, the above also holds.

As a consequence, and combining the \mathbb{A}^1 -invariance of K-theory, we are enable to prove following.

Theorem 1.10 (Proposition 4.18). *Let F be any p -local finite type 3 complex, then the following spectra are bounded.*

$$\begin{aligned} & F \otimes \mathrm{TC}(\mathrm{BP}\langle 1\rangle[x]), \\ & F \otimes \mathrm{K}(\mathrm{BP}\langle 1\rangle[x])_p^\wedge. \end{aligned}$$

One could say, even in ring spectra case, algebra K-theory still has \mathbb{A}^1 -invariance property.

By decomposing $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e)$ into sum of spectra, and analyzing the Frobenius map, we found the following Theorem. Actually, the base case is Proposition 4.9.

Theorem 1.11 (see Proposition 4.20, 4.23). *Let F be any type $n + 2$ finite complex, then the fiber of the Frobenius*

$$F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]/x^e) \rightarrow F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]/x^e)^{tC_p}$$

is not bounded, where $e > 1$. Moreover, $W \not\cong 0$, where W is the fiber of the Frobenius map of $F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)$. And consequently, $F \otimes \mathrm{TR}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)$ is not bounded, where $e > 1$. In other-words, the Lichtenbaum–Quillen property defined in Definition 1.6 fails for $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e$, when $e > 1$.

In the spectral context, one could argue that algebraic K-theory remains sensitive to singularities. By the work in [LP24], in height 1, $\mathrm{BP}\langle 1 \rangle[x]/x^e$ are the most simple examples of fp spectra violating Lichtenbaum–Quillen property, since as spectra, these spectra are just sum of $\mathrm{BP}\langle 1 \rangle$, which generates the thick sub-category of fp spectra of type 1. And this phenomenon happens in general, see Proposition 4.26, Corollary 4.28. However, we found that if one replaces $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle$ with BP or MU , the Segal conjecture holds, i.e. we have following theorem.

Theorem 1.12 (Proposition 4.31, 4.32). *The Frobenius maps*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e) &\rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e), \\ \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}[x]/x^e) &\rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}[x]/x^e), \\ \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{MU}[\Omega S^3]) &\rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{MU}[\Omega S^3])^{tC_p}, \\ \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}[\Omega S^3]) &\rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}[\Omega S^3])^{tC_p}. \end{aligned}$$

are p -adic equivalences. In general, for Y a space satisfies condition (1), (2), (3) in Proposition 4.26, then the Frobenius maps

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{MU}[\Omega Y]) &\rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{MU}[\Omega Y])^{tC_p}, \\ \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}[\Omega Y]) &\rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}[\Omega Y])^{tC_p}. \end{aligned}$$

are p -adic equivalences.

1.3. Future Work. It seems that one could use the method presented in this paper to investigate some other examples about Segal conjecture, and using the cyclic decomposition, i.e. decomposition of $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[M])$ or $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[\Omega Y])$ to carry out more computations, where M is a commutative monoid, Y is a \mathbb{E}_1 -group. For instance, we try to compute $\mathrm{TC}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x, y]/(xy))$ for lower height cases, in a upcoming work. And one could also do the same things replace $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle$ by $K(n)$ or $k(n) = \tau_{\geq 0}K(n)$.

It should be also noted that, there are some similarities between this paper and [HLS24]. In that paper, the authors use the decomposition of THH for square zero extension to compute $\mathrm{mod}(p, v_1^{p^{n-2}})$ syntomic cohomology of $\mathbb{Z}/p^n \simeq \mathrm{BP}\langle 0 \rangle/(v_0)^n$. The key point is, they found that taking an animated ring R to its $\mathrm{mod}(p, v_1^{p^n})$ syntomic cohomology factor though the construction $R \mapsto R/p^{n+2}$. It would be interesting to see this phenomenon extended to some higher algebras.

In particular, one could try to explore the following question, first by considering $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle$.

Question 1.13 ([HLS24, Question 1.23]). Does $\mathrm{mod}(p, v_1, \dots, v_{n+1})$ syntomic cohomology for height n ring spectra, factor though its $\mathrm{mod}(p^{i_0}, v_i^{i_1}, \dots, v_n^{i_n})$ for some sequence i_0, \dots, i_n ?

1.4. Structure of the Paper. In Section 2, we use several \mathbb{E}_∞ -ring maps to construct several \mathbb{E}_3 -algebras over some base ring spectra other than \mathbb{S} , and we also use the tower of \mathbb{E}_∞ -algebras in [HW22, §2] to get an \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^e$. And all these algebras are

finite algebras over $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle$, see Proposition 2.28. In Section 3, we use several \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra to prove the Conjecture 1.3, the main goal is to prove Theorem 1.8. In Section 4, we use the descent functor $\mathrm{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p}$ to prove Segal conjecture, and we use the decompositions of $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e)$, $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[\Omega S^3])$ to prove the failure of Segal conjecture of some ring spectra. The primary goal is to prove Theorem 1.9, 1.10, 1.11. In Section 5, we use the evenly free map $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{MU}[x]) \rightarrow \mathrm{MU}[x]$ to compute the E_2 -page of descent spectral sequence which computing $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e; \mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e)$. We show that the spectral sequence degenerates at E_2 -page in some cases, see Proposition 5.4. In Section 6, we use the decomposition of $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e)$ try to carry out some computations for $V(2)_* \mathrm{TC}(\ell[x]/x^e)$, we prove Proposition 6.4.

1.5. Notations and Conventions. We use the language of ∞ -category developed in [Lur09], and the theory of higher algebra developed in [Lur17], for convenience. We denote the category of spectra by Sp , and category of spaces by \mathcal{S} . And for an \mathbb{E}_n -monoidal category \mathcal{C} , $n \geq 2$, the category of \mathbb{E}_m -algebras over \mathcal{C} is denoted by $\mathrm{Alg}_{\mathbb{E}_m}(\mathcal{C})$, where $0 \leq m \leq n$. And for $R \in \mathrm{Alg}_{\mathbb{E}_n}(\mathrm{Sp})$, we will use $\mathrm{Alg}_R^{(m)}$ to denote $\mathrm{Alg}_{\mathbb{E}_m}(\mathrm{Mod}_R)$. And when $m = 1$, we write as Alg_R , when $m = \infty$, we write as CAlg_R . And we use the symbol $\otimes_R^{\mathbb{E}_m}$ to indicate the tensor product in $\mathrm{Alg}_R^{(m)}$. When R is the unit $\mathbb{S} \in \mathrm{Sp}$, we simply omitted R . We use \mathbb{E}_m - R -algebra to indicate an object in $\mathrm{Alg}_R^{(m)}$, when $m = 1$, we will simply refer to it as R -algebra, when $m = \infty$, we refer to the notation as commutative R -algebra, when $R = \mathbb{S}$, we simply omitted the word ' R ', or we will say \mathbb{E}_m -ring spectrum. A (discrete) ring will simply indicate a classical ring. Let R be a ring, we will use $\otimes^{\mathbb{L}}$ to denote the derived tensor product. We will use $\Lambda_R(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ to denote exterior algebra over R generated by x_1, \dots, x_n . And we will use $\Gamma_R(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ to denote divided power algebra generated by x_1, \dots, x_n , sometimes we will also write as $R\langle x_1, \dots, x_n \rangle$. For a stable ∞ -category \mathcal{C} with a t -structure, we will use $\tau_{\leq n}$ to denote the localization functor and also $\tau_{\geq n}$. When $\mathcal{C} = \mathrm{Sp}$, $X \in \mathrm{Sp}_{\leq n}$, if the localization $X \rightarrow \tau_{\leq n}X$ is an equivalence, and $X \in \mathrm{Sp}_{\geq m}$, if $\tau_{\geq m}X \rightarrow X$ is an equivalence. When $X \in \mathrm{Sp}_{\leq n}$, for some n , we will say X is bounded above, and $X \in \mathrm{Sp}_{\geq m}$, for some m , we say that X is bounded below. If there is a, b such that $X \in \mathrm{Sp}_{[a,b]} = \mathrm{Sp}_{\geq a} \cap \mathrm{Sp}_{\leq b}$, then X is said to be bounded. Let \mathcal{C} be a symmetrical monoidal category, and $A \in \mathrm{Alg}(\mathcal{C})$, we will use [NS18, Definition III.2.3], to define $\mathrm{THH}(A)$, for instance, $A \in \mathrm{Alg}$, $\mathrm{THH}(A) = A \otimes_{A \otimes A^{\mathrm{op}}} A$.

1.6. Acknowledgments. The author would like to thank his advisor Professor Guozhen Wang for carefully reading the early drafts. In particular, the author would like to thank Professor Lars Hesselholt, for telling the author Proposition 4.9, 4.19, and things related to that. Finally, the author thank Jingbang Guo, Wei Yang, for useful conversations.

2. TRUNCATED POLYNOMIALS AND INFINITESIMAL THICKENING

The main goal of this section is to precisely describe the algebras will be concerned in the next sections. Basically all of them should be viewed as finite algebras over $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle$, see Proposition 2.28. We fix a prime number p for the remaining context. First, we recall the definitions and results in [HW22, §2].

Definition 2.1. Let $1 \leq k \leq \infty$ and $n \geq 0$. Let B be a p -local \mathbb{E}_k -MU-algebra. We say that B is an \mathbb{E}_k -MU-algebra form of $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle$ if the composite

$$\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n] \subseteq \mathrm{BP}_* \subseteq \pi_* \mathrm{MU}_{(p)} \rightarrow \pi_* B$$

is an isomorphism.

Theorem 2.2 ([HW22, Theorem 2.0.6]). *For $n \geq -1$, there exists an \mathbb{E}_3 -MU-algebra form of $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle$.*

Construction 2.3. We define $\mathbb{S}[x] := \Sigma_+^\infty \mathbb{N}$. In a same fashion, we may consider the truncated version. Let $e \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, and $M_e := \{1, x, \dots, x^{e-1}\} \simeq \mathbb{N}/[e, \infty)$ where the multiplication defined in an obvious way. Since the multiplication is strictly commutative, unwinding the definitions in [Lur17, Definition 2.4.2.1, Remark 2.4.2.2], we learn that \mathbb{N}, M_e are commutative monoid objects in \mathcal{S} , and hence commutative algebra objects in \mathcal{S} . Let $\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e := \Sigma_+^\infty M_e \in \text{Sp}$. There are \mathbb{E}_∞ -ring maps

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{S}[x] &\rightarrow \mathbb{S}[x]/x^e, \\ \mathbb{S}[x]/x^e &\rightarrow \mathbb{S}. \end{aligned}$$

induced by maps of commutative monoid

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{N} &\rightarrow \mathbb{N}/[e, \infty) \\ n &\mapsto [n], \\ \mathbb{N}/[e, \infty) &\rightarrow \mathbb{N}/[1, \infty) \\ [1] &\mapsto [0]. \end{aligned}$$

Then for any spectrum $A \in \text{Sp}$, we can define the polynomial spectrum and truncated polynomial spectra over A as $A[x] := A \otimes \mathbb{S}[x]$, $A[x]/x^e := A \otimes \mathbb{S}[x]/x^e$. In generally, one can also define spectral polynomials of multiple variables. Concretely,

$$\begin{aligned} A[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n] &:= A[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n-1}] \otimes \mathbb{S}[x_n], \\ A[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]/(x_1^{e_1}, \dots, x_n^{e_n}) &:= A[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n-1}]/(x_1^{e_1}, \dots, x_{n-1}^{e_{n-1}}) \otimes \mathbb{S}[x_n]/x_n^{e_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we take A to be MU . Since $\Sigma_+^\infty : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \text{Sp}$ is a symmetric monoidal functor [Lur17, Proposition 4.8.2.18, Corollary 4.8.2.19], we know that $\mathbb{S}[x], \mathbb{S}[x]/x^e$ are commutative algebras in Sp . Recall that MU is an \mathbb{E}_∞ -ring, and we have a symmetric monoidal functor $\text{Mod}_{\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow \text{Mod}_{\text{MU}}$ given by tensor with MU , see [Lur17, Proposition 7.1.2.7, Proposition 4.6.2.17]. We thus conclude that $\text{MU}[x], \text{MU}[x]/x^e$ are commutative algebras in Mod_{MU} , and by [Lur17, Variant 7.1.3.8], $\text{MU}[x], \text{MU}[x]/x^e$ are also commutative algebras in Sp .

Since the underlying spectrum of $\mathbb{S}[x]$ is nothing but a direct sum of \mathbb{S} , and this is also true for $\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e$, using the multiplication on \mathbb{N}, M_e , we can get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MU}[x]_* &\simeq \text{MU}_*[x], \\ \pi_* \text{MU}[x]/x^e &\simeq \text{MU}_*[x]/x^e. \end{aligned}$$

Variant 2.4. In general, let M be a commutative monoid, one can define $A[M] := A \otimes \Sigma_+^\infty M$, and for any spectrum A . For example, M is a sub monoid of $\mathbb{N}^{\times m}$, or a quotient monoid of $\mathbb{N}^{\times m}$. In a upcoming paper, we will consider $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle[x, y]/(xy)$.

Definition 2.5. Let $1 \leq k \leq \infty$ and $n \geq 0$. Let B be a p -local \mathbb{E}_k - $\text{MU}[x]/x^e$ -algebra. We say that B is an \mathbb{E}_k - $\text{MU}[x]/x^e$ -algebra form of $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e$ if the composite

$$\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n][x]/x^e \subseteq \text{BP}_*[x]/x^e \subseteq \pi_* \text{MU}_{(p)}[x]/x^e \rightarrow \pi_* B$$

is an isomorphism. By convention, $\text{BP}\langle -1 \rangle := \mathbb{F}_p$, and $\text{BP}\langle -1 \rangle[x]/x^e$ is $\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e$.

Definition 2.6. Let $1 \leq k \leq \infty$ and $n \geq 0$. Let B be a p -local \mathbb{E}_k -MU $[x]$ -algebra. We say that B is an \mathbb{E}_k -MU $[x]$ -algebra form of $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e$ if the composite

$$\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n][x] \subseteq \mathrm{BP}_*[x] \subseteq \pi_* \mathrm{MU}_{(p)}[x] \rightarrow \pi_* B$$

is a surjection and has kernel generated by x^e .

We can view $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle_p^\wedge$ as height n version of \mathbb{Z}_p , we should think $(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)_p^\wedge$ as height n version of $\mathbb{Z}_p[x]/x^e$. Putting all the things above together, we have following fact.

Proposition 2.7. *There is an \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra A , and A is the image of an \mathbb{E}_3 -MU $[x]$ -algebra form of $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e$ under the forgetful functor.*

Proof. By the definition of MU $[x]$ -algebra form of $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e$, it suffice to show there is an \mathbb{E}_3 -MU $[x]/x^e$ -algebra form of $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e$. This is because we have an \mathbb{E}_∞ -ring map $\mathrm{MU}[x] \rightarrow \mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e$ by Construction 2.3, and according to [Lur17, Proposition 7.1.2.7] we know the forgetful functor $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e} \rightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{MU}[x]}$ is lax symmetric monoidal.

According to Theorem 2.2, we get an object in $\mathrm{Alg}_{\mathrm{MU}}^{(3)}$, and by Construction 2.3 we learn that there is a map of commutative algebras $\mathrm{MU} \rightarrow \mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e$, so there is a symmetric monoidal functor $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{MU}} \rightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e}$. We thus get an \mathbb{E}_3 -MU $[x]$ -algebra $B[x]/x^e$, and it is clear that $B[x]/x^e$ satisfies the condition in Definition 2.5. Now, let A be the image of $B[x]/x^e$ under the lax symmetric monoidal functor $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{MU}[x]} \rightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{S}}$. \square

Remark 2.8. We denote A to be the \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra in Proposition 2.7, B to be the underlying \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra of the \mathbb{E}_3 -MU-algebra $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle$ constructed in Theorem 2.2. We know that

$$(B \otimes^{\mathbb{E}_3} \mathbb{S}[x]/x^e) \simeq A$$

as spectra, this essentially is [Lur17, Proposition 4.6.2.17]. To show that the equivalence is an \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra equivalence, it suffice to produce an \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra map $B \otimes^{\mathbb{E}_3} \mathbb{S}[x]/x^e \rightarrow A$ which induce isomorphism as spectra, see [Lur17, Remark 7.1.1.8]. However, this **would not** be an equivalence of \mathbb{E}_3 -algebras in general, unless, $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle$ admits an \mathbb{E}_∞ -MU-algebra structure. But we can still say a bit more.

Claim 2.9. We have an \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra map $B \otimes \mathbb{S}[x]/x^e \rightarrow A$, and we have an equivalence of \mathbb{E}_∞ -algebra $B \otimes \mathbb{S}[x]/x^e \rightarrow A$ when $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle$ admits an \mathbb{E}_∞ -MU-algebra structure.

Note that we have adjunction pairs

$$\begin{aligned} f^* : \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{S}} &\rightleftarrows \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{MU}} : f_* \\ g^* : \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{MU}} &\rightleftarrows \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e} : g_* \end{aligned}$$

induced from the \mathbb{E}_∞ -ring maps $f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathrm{MU}, g : \mathrm{MU} \rightarrow \mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e$. So $B = f_*(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle), A \simeq f_* g_*(g^*(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle))$. The second equivalence follows from following facts

- We have \mathbb{E}_∞ -ring maps $\mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathrm{MU} \rightarrow \mathrm{MU}[x] \rightarrow \mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e$.
- Computing the forgetful functor $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{MU}[x]} \rightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{S}}$ is equivalent to compute the composite $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e} \rightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{MU}} \rightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{S}}$.

Claim 2.10. We claim that $\mathrm{MU} \otimes \mathbb{S}[x]/x^e \simeq f^*(\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e)$ as \mathbb{E}_∞ -MU-algebras.

Proof. Note that for an commutative algebra R , CAlg_R may identifies with $\text{CAlg}_{R/}$, see [Lur17, Variant 7.1.3.8]. Now note that the left adjoint of the forgetful functor $\text{CAlg}_{\text{MU}} \rightarrow \text{CAlg}_{\mathbb{S}}$ is given by

$$\text{CAlg}_{\mathbb{S}} \simeq \text{CAlg}_{\mathbb{S}/} \xrightarrow{\sqcup^{\text{MU}}} \text{CAlg}_{\text{MU}/} \simeq \text{CAlg}_{\text{MU}},$$

see [Lur09, Proposition 5.2.2.8]. Hence, $f^*(\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e) \simeq \mathbb{S}[x]/x^e \sqcup \text{MU} \simeq \mathbb{S}[x]/x^e \otimes \text{MU}$. \square_{Claim}

Claim 2.11. We have equivalence of \mathbb{E}_3 -MU-algebras $A \simeq f_*(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes_{\text{MU}}^{\mathbb{E}_3} \text{MU}[x]/x^e)$.

Proof. It suffice to prove that $g_*g^*(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle) \simeq \text{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes_{\text{MU}}^{\mathbb{E}_3} \text{MU}[x]/x^e$, which is clear an equivalence of MU-modules. We only need to produce \mathbb{E}_3 -MU-algebra map $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes_{\text{MU}}^{\mathbb{E}_3} \text{MU}[x]/x^e \rightarrow g_*g^*(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle)$. According to [Lur17, Proposition 7.1.2.6], [Lur09, Proposition 5.2.2.8], we have a natural transformation of lax symmetrical monoidal functor $\text{id} \rightarrow g_*g^*$, hence we have an adjunction pair between category of algebras

$$g^* : \text{Alg}_{\mathbb{E}_3}(\text{Mod}_{\text{MU}}) \rightleftarrows \text{Alg}_{\mathbb{E}_3}(\text{Mod}_{\text{MU}[x]/x^e}) : g_*.$$

Hence we have an equivalence of mapping spaces $\text{Map}_{\text{Alg}_{\text{MU}[x]/x^e}^{(3)}}(g^*c, d) \simeq \text{Map}_{\text{Alg}_{\text{MU}}^{(3)}}(c, g_*d)$, now take $c = \text{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes_{\text{MU}}^{\mathbb{E}_3} \text{MU}[x]/x^e$, $d = g^*(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle)$. Since g^* is symmetric monoidal, thus $g^*(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes_{\text{MU}}^{\mathbb{E}_3} \text{MU}[x]/x^e) \simeq g^*(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes_{\text{MU}[x]/x^e}^{\mathbb{E}_3} \text{MU}[x]/x^e \simeq g^*(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle)$, therefore we have an equivalence of \mathbb{E}_3 -MU-algebras $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes_{\text{MU}}^{\mathbb{E}_3} \text{MU}[x]/x^e \simeq g_*g^*(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle)$. \square_{Claim}

Proof of Claim 2.9. Now we need to produce an \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra map

$$f_*(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes^{\mathbb{E}_3} \mathbb{S}[x]/x^e \rightarrow f_*(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes_{\text{MU}}^{\mathbb{E}_3} \text{MU}[x]/x^e),$$

since f_* is lax symmetric monoidal, and according to [Lur17, Proposition 7.1.2.7], [Lur09, Proposition 5.2.2.8 (2)], Claim 2.10, 2.11, we have \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra maps

$$f_*(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes^{\mathbb{E}_3} \mathbb{S}[x]/x^e \rightarrow f_*(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes^{\mathbb{E}_3} f_*f^*\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e \rightarrow f_*(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes_{\text{MU}}^{\mathbb{E}_3} \text{MU}[x]/x^e) \simeq A.$$

If $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle$ has an \mathbb{E}_{∞} -MU-algebra structure, we may write $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes_{\text{MU}}^{\mathbb{E}_{\infty}} \text{MU}[x]/x^e$ as coproduct in $\text{CAlg}_{\text{MU}} \simeq \text{CAlg}_{\text{MU}/}$, see [Lur17, Proposition 3.2.4.7, Variant 7.1.3.8]. Hence $f_*(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes_{\text{MU}}^{\mathbb{E}_{\infty}} \text{MU}[x]/x^e)$ may identifies as push-out $B \sqcup_{\text{MU}} (\text{MU} \sqcup \mathbb{S}[x]/x^e)$ in $\text{CAlg}_{\mathbb{S}} \simeq \text{CAlg}_{\mathbb{S}/}$ hence equivalent to $B \sqcup \mathbb{S}[x]/x^e \simeq B \otimes \mathbb{S}[x]/x^e$. \square_{Claim}

Convention 2.12. Hence, as an \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra we may write A as $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes_{\text{MU}} \text{MU}[x]/x^e$, and we will denote $B \otimes \mathbb{S}[x]/x^e$ as $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e$. When $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle$ admits an \mathbb{E}_{∞} -MU-algebra structure or $e = 0$ we will not distinguish these two notations, when we refer the \mathbb{E}_m -MU[x]/x^e-algebra or \mathbb{E}_m -MU[x]-algebra in Proposition 2.7 we still denote the form as $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e$, where $0 \leq m \leq 3$.

Remark 2.13. One can also use the strategy in [HW22, §2] to construct an MU[x]-algebra form of $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e$, i.e. by computing $\mathcal{U}_{\text{MU}[x]}^{(m)}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)$. And it seems one could only get an \mathbb{E}_1 -form, due to computational difficulties. And we have following commutative

diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle \in \mathrm{Alg}_{\mathrm{MU}}^{(1)} & \xleftarrow{=} & \mathrm{Alg}_{\mathrm{MU}}^{(1)} \ni \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle & \xleftarrow{} & \mathrm{Alg}_{\mathrm{MU}}^{(3)} \ni \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x] \in \mathrm{Alg}_{\mathrm{MU}[x]}^{(1)} & & \mathrm{Alg}_{\mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e}^{(1)} \ni \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e & \xleftarrow{} & \mathrm{Alg}_{\mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e}^{(3)} \ni \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e \in \mathrm{Alg}_{\mathrm{MU}[x]}^{(1)} & \xleftarrow{} & \mathrm{Alg}_{\mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e}^{(1)} \ni \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e & & \mathrm{Alg}_{\mathrm{MU}[x]}^{(3)} \ni \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e \\
& \searrow & \downarrow & \swarrow & \\
& & \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes_{\mathrm{MU}} \mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e \in \mathrm{Alg} & &
\end{array}$$

Construction 2.14.¹ For any spectrum A , We define $\Lambda_A(x)$ to be the spectrum $A \otimes (\mathbb{S} \otimes_{\mathbb{S}[x]} \mathbb{S})$ where \mathbb{S} view as an $\mathbb{S}[x]$ -module via Construction 2.3 when $e = 1$. If moreover, $A \in \mathrm{Alg}_{\mathbb{E}_n}$, where $1 \leq n \leq \infty$. By the same argument, this gives rise an \mathbb{E}_n -algebra $\Lambda_A(x)$ in Sp . For instance, $\mathrm{MU} \in \mathrm{CAlg}$, then $\Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x)$ is also a commutative algebra. Using Tor spectral sequence, one computes the homotopy group of $\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}(x)$ as $\Lambda_{\pi_* \mathbb{S}}(x)$, where $|x| = 1$, see for instance [Ang08, Proposition 3.6]. We learn that $\pi_*(\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}(x))$ is a free $\pi_*(\mathbb{S})$ -module. Then if $A \in \mathrm{Alg}_{\mathbb{E}_2}$, we have isomorphism $\pi_* \Lambda_A(x) \simeq \Lambda_{\pi_* A}(x)$.

Definition 2.15. Let $1 \leq k \leq \infty$ and $n \geq 0$. Let B be a p -local \mathbb{E}_k - $\Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x)$ -algebra. We say that B is an \mathbb{E}_k - $\Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x)$ -algebra form of $\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle}(x)$ if the composite

$$\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n] \otimes \Lambda(x) \subseteq \pi_* \Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle}(x) \subseteq \pi_* \Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x) \rightarrow \pi_* B$$

is an isomorphism. By convention $\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle -1 \rangle}(x) := \Lambda_{\mathbb{F}_p}(x)$.

Proposition 2.16. *There is an \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra A , and A is the image of an \mathbb{E}_3 - $\Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x)$ -algebra form of $\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle}(x)$ under the forgetful functor.*

Proof. This is clear, the proof is similar to the proof of Proposition 2.7. \square

Remark 2.17. Similar to Remark 2.8, we have the following claim.

Claim 2.18. We denote B as the underlying \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra of $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle$, and A is denoted to be the algebra in Proposition 2.16. We have an \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra map

$$B \otimes \Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}(x) \rightarrow A.$$

And there is an equivalence of commutative algebras $B \otimes \Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}(x) \simeq A$, when $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle$ has an \mathbb{E}_∞ -MU-algebra structure.

Convention 2.19. Hence as an \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra, we may write A as $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes_{\mathrm{MU}} \Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x)$, we will denote $B \otimes \Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}(x)$ to be $\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle}(x)$. When $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle$ admits an \mathbb{E}_∞ -MU-structure we will not distinguish these two notations, when we refer the \mathbb{E}_m - $\Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x)$ -algebra in Theorem 2.7 we still denote the form as $\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle}(x)$, where $0 \leq m \leq 3$.

¹The author observed this construction from [HLS24, §5].

Note that $v_n^e \in \pi_* \text{BP}\langle n \rangle$, we can form the quotient $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle / v_n^e$. By [Bur22, Theorem 1.4] and Theorem 2.2, we find that $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle / v_n^e$ can be equipped with an \mathbb{E}_2 -algebra structure, as long as $e > 2$. Actually, the strategy in [HW22, §2] says that we can construct an \mathbb{E}_3 -MU[y]/y^e-algebra form of $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle / v_n^e$. And we will have a similar diagram as in Remark 2.13.

Definition 2.20. Let $1 \leq k \leq \infty$ and $n \geq 0$. Let B be a p -local \mathbb{E}_k -MU-algebra. We say that B is an \mathbb{E}_k -MU-algebra form of $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle / v_n^e$ if the composite

$$\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n] \subseteq \pi_* \text{BP} \subseteq \pi_* \text{MU} \rightarrow \pi_* B$$

is a surjection and the kernel is generated by v_n^e , for $e \geq 1$.

In order to prove there is an \mathbb{E}_3 -MU-algebra form of $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle / v_n^e$, we need to recall the results in [HW22, §2], and briefly sketch the strategy. In [HW22, §2], the authors constructed a tower of \mathbb{E}_∞ -MU-algebras

$$(2.1) \quad \text{MU}[y] \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \text{MU}[y]/y^k \rightarrow \text{MU}[y]/y^{k-1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \text{MU}[y]/y^2 \rightarrow \text{MU}$$

where the y lies in degree $2j \in 2\mathbb{N}_{>0}$. The commutative algebra $\text{MU}[y]$ is very different from the Construction 2.3 unless $j = 0$. We construct the \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra form of $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle$ by induction on n . When $n = -1, 0$, the \mathbb{E}_3 -form (actually \mathbb{E}_∞) of $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle$ can be constructed via Postnikov truncation and note that [Lur17, Theorem 7.1.3.15]. Suppose we have an \mathbb{E}_3 -MU-algebra form of $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle$, we will inductively construct an \mathbb{E}_3 -MU[y]/y^k-algebra form B_k using the square zero extension $\text{MU}[y]/y^k \rightarrow \text{MU}[y]/y^{k-1}$ and some information of the cotangent complex, where $|y| = 2(p^{n+1} - 1)$. More precisely, we have following fact.

Proposition 2.21 ([HW22, Proposition 2.6.2]). *Fix $n \geq 0$, and let B be an \mathbb{E}_3 -MU-algebra form of $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle$, then there exists a sequence of maps*

$$\dots \rightarrow B_k \rightarrow B_{k-1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow B_2 \rightarrow B_1 = B$$

satisfying following properties.

- (1) B_k is given an \mathbb{E}_3 -MU[y]/y^k-algebra structure.
- (2) Each map $B_k \rightarrow B_{k-1}$ is an \mathbb{E}_3 -MU[y]/y^k-algebra map.
- (3) The map $B_k \rightarrow B_{k-1}$ induce an equivalence of \mathbb{E}_3 -MU[y]/y^{k-1}-algebras

$$\text{MU}[y]/y^{k-1} \otimes_{\text{MU}[y]/y^k} B_k \simeq B_{k-1}.$$

- (4) The map $B \rightarrow \text{cofib}(B_2 \rightarrow B_1) \simeq \Sigma^{|y|+1} B$ is detected by δv_{n+1} in

$$E_2 = E_\infty \simeq \text{Ext}_{\text{MU}_*}^{*,*}(B_*, B_*) \implies \pi_* \text{map}_{\text{MU}}(B, B)$$

Proposition 2.22. *There is an \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra A , and A is the image of an \mathbb{E}_3 -MU-algebra form of $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle / v_n^e$ under the forgetful functor, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $e \geq 1$.*

Proof. By Theorem 2.2, we take B to be an \mathbb{E}_3 -MU-algebra form of $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle$, and then by Proposition 2.21, we get a tower

$$B_e \rightarrow B_{e-1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow B_2 \rightarrow B$$

satisfies the conditions in Proposition 2.21. By the construction, or properties in Proposition 2.21 we know that $\text{cofib}(B_k \rightarrow B_{k-1}) \simeq \Sigma^{k|y|} B_{k-1}$. Therefore the associated graded has homotopy group as

$$\pi_* \text{gr } B_e \simeq B_*[y]/y^e.$$

Note that the tower in (2.1) has the similar graded

$$\pi_* \text{gr MU}[y]/y^e \simeq \text{MU}_*[y]/y^e.$$

Therefore by our assumption on B , we know that

$$\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[v_1, \dots, v_n][y]/y^e \subseteq \text{MU}_*[y]/y^e \rightarrow \pi_* B_e$$

is an isomorphism. According to Proposition 2.21, we know that the image of $y \in \pi_* \text{MU}[y]/y^2$ in $\pi_* B_2$ is same as the image $v_{n+1} \in \text{MU}_* \rightarrow \pi_* B_2 \simeq B_*[y]/y^2$. Thus $v_{n+1} \in \text{MU}_*$ maps to y in $\pi_* B_e \simeq B_*[y]/y^e$, so the map $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{n+1}] \subseteq \text{MU}_* \rightarrow \pi_* \text{MU}[y]/y^e \rightarrow \pi_* B_e$ is a surjection and has kernel generated by v_{n+1}^e . Now we let A be the image of B_e under the forgetful functor $\text{Mod}_{\text{MU}} \rightarrow \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{S}}$ which is a lax symmetric monoidal functor. \square

Convention 2.23. Sometimes, we will denote $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^e$ constructed above as $\text{BP}\langle n, e \rangle$ for simplicity.

Construction 2.24. Let $\text{MU}[y]/y^e$ be the \mathbb{E}_∞ -MU-algebra (can also be viewed as a graded commutative MU-algebra) in the tower (2.1), where $|y| = 2j \in 2\mathbb{N}_{>0}$, and we also have an \mathbb{E}_∞ -ring map $\text{MU} \rightarrow \text{MU}[y]/y^e$. And let B be the form constructed in Proposition 2.22, then $B \otimes_{\text{MU}} \text{MU}[y]/y^e$ gives arise an \mathbb{E}_3 -MU[y]/ y^e -algebra. We will denote it to be $B[y]/y^e$, then using the \mathbb{E}_∞ -map $\text{MU}[y] \rightarrow \text{MU}[y]/y^e$, one gets an \mathbb{E}_3 -MU[y]-algebra $B[y]/y^e$, where $|y| = 2j$. This construction is different from Proposition 2.7, unless $j = 0$. Since $\text{MU}[y]/y^e$ is free as MU-module, thus one computes $\pi_*(B[y]/y^e) \simeq \text{BP}\langle n \rangle_*[y]/y^e$, where $|y| = 2j$.

We therefore have proved following fact.

Proposition 2.25. *There is an \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra A , and A is the image of an \mathbb{E}_3 -MU[y]-algebra form B of $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle[y]/y^e$ under the forgetful functor. And B has the property such that the map*

$$\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n][y] \subseteq \pi_* \text{MU}[y] \rightarrow B_*$$

is a surjection and the kernel is generated by y^e .

Construction 2.26. Let $\Lambda_{\text{MU}}(y) := \text{MU} \otimes_{\text{MU}[y]} \text{MU}$, since the $\text{MU} \rightarrow \text{MU}[y]$ is an \mathbb{E}_∞ map, therefore $\Lambda_{\text{MU}}(y)$ is an \mathbb{E}_∞ -ring. One computes the homotopy group $\pi_* \Lambda_{\text{MU}}(y) \simeq \Lambda_{\text{MU}_*}(y)$, where $|y| = 2j + 1$. With the same argument before, we can construct an \mathbb{E}_3 - $\Lambda_{\text{MU}}(y)$ -algebra form of $\Lambda_{\text{BP}\langle n \rangle}(y)$.

Remark 2.27. By carefully checking the argument of constructing an \mathbb{E}_3 -MU-algebra form of $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle$ and Proposition 2.21, one can actually prove that, there is an \mathbb{E}_3 -MU-algebra form B of $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle$ such that the map

$$\pi_* \text{MU}_{(p)} \rightarrow \pi_* B$$

is a surjection, and has kernel generated by $\{v_m, x_j | m \geq n + 1, \forall k, j \neq p^k - 1\}$. And the similar statement is also hold for \mathbb{E}_3 -MU-form of $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^e$, and \mathbb{E}_3 -MU[x]-form $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e$.

So far, we have constructed several types of \mathbb{E}_3 -algebras. Basically, all of them can be viewed as truncated polynomial algebras over $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle$ for some n , but the polynomial generators may not live in the degree 0. The forms in Proposition 2.7, $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e$ is just finite direct sum of $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle$ (note that $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e \simeq \text{BP}\langle n \rangle_{\text{MU}} \text{MU}[x]/x^e$ as spectra). The form in Proposition 2.16 is equivalent to $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle \bigoplus \Sigma^1 \text{BP}\langle n \rangle$ as $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle$ -module. And the form in Proposition 2.22, by construction, the cofiber $\text{cofib}(B_k \rightarrow B_{k-1}) \simeq \Sigma^{k(2p^{n+1}-2)} \text{BP}\langle n \rangle$, thus

$\mathrm{BP}\langle n+1 \rangle / v_{n+1}^e$ is finite as $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle$ -module. And since $\mathrm{MU}[y]/y^e$ is finite as MU -module, we therefore conclude that the forms in Proposition 2.25 are finite as $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle$ -modules. We thus have proved following fact.

Proposition 2.28. *Any form in Proposition 2.7, 2.16, 2.22, 2.25, is a finite $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle$ -module for some n . And thus we can view them as finite algebras over $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle$ (the ring of integers of a height n local field).*

In the following, we will use the conventions in Convention 2.12, 2.19, we will use the name of the form constructed in the Proposition 2.22, 2.25. For instance, we will refer $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle / v_n^e$ to both algebra and MU -algebra in Proposition 2.22. We now present some computational results of these algebras, before that, we present a well known lemma.

Lemma 2.29. *Let R be an ordinary commutative ring, then we have following equivalence of graded rings:*

$$\mathrm{THH}_*((R[x]/x^e)/R[x]) \simeq \Gamma_{R[x]/x^e}(\sigma^2 x^e).$$

Proof. We need to compute $\mathrm{THH}(R[x]/x^e/R[x]) \simeq \mathrm{HH}((R[x]/x^e)/R[x])$. To this end, we first compute $\mathcal{U}_{R[x]}^{(1)}(R[x]/x^e) \simeq R[x]/x^e \otimes_{R[x]}^{\mathbb{L}} R[x]/x^e$, we can resolve $R[x]/x^e$ by $\Lambda_{R[x]}(\sigma x^e)^2$ as an $R[x]$ -module, this is because x^e is not a zero-divisor. Therefore $\mathcal{U}_{R[x]}^{(1)}(R[x]/x^e) \simeq \Lambda_{R[x]/x^e}(\sigma x^e)$, this can be also obtained by using [Ang08, Proposition 3.6]. Then, we compute $R[x]/x^e \otimes_{\Lambda_{R[x]/x^e}(\sigma x^e)}^{\mathbb{L}} R[x]/x^e$. As a $\Lambda_{R[x]/x^e}(\sigma x^e)$ -algebra, $R[x]/x^e$ is equivalent to $\Gamma_{\Lambda_{R[x]/x^e}(\sigma x^e)}(\sigma^2 x^e)$ which can be also written as $\Lambda_{R[x]/x^e}(\sigma x^e)\langle \sigma^2 x^e \rangle$. We therefore have $\mathrm{HH}_*((R[x]/x^e)/R[x]) \simeq (R[x]/x^e)\langle \sigma^2 x^e \rangle$. \square

Proposition 2.30. *The commutative algebra $\mathrm{THH}_*((\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e)/\mathrm{MU}[x])$ has homotopy as*

$$P_{\mathbb{F}_p} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \Gamma_{\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e}(\sigma^2 x^e),$$

where $P_{\mathbb{F}_p}$ is a polynomial algebra over \mathbb{F}_p , and one of the generators is detected by $\sigma^2 p$. In particular, $\mathrm{THH}((\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e)/\mathrm{MU}[x])$ is even.

Proof. By the multiplicative property of THH for \mathbb{E}_∞ -rings, we have following equivalences:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{THH}((\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e)/\mathrm{MU}[x]) &\simeq \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p/\mathrm{MU}) \otimes \mathrm{THH}((\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e)/\mathbb{S}[x]), \\ &\simeq \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p/\mathrm{MU}) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} (\mathbb{F}_p \otimes \mathrm{THH}((\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e)/\mathbb{S}[x])), \\ &\simeq \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p/\mathrm{MU}) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathrm{THH}((\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e)/\mathbb{F}_p[x]). \end{aligned}$$

All the equivalence above are equivalence of commutative algebras. We view $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p/\mathrm{MU})$ as \mathbb{E}_∞ - \mathbb{F}_p -algebra via \mathbb{E}_∞ -algebra maps $\mathbb{F}_p \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p) \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p/\mathrm{MU})$. Then the second equivalence right above follows from following facts.

- For an \mathbb{E}_∞ -algebra R , we have equivalence of categories $\mathrm{CAlg}_R \simeq \mathrm{CAlg}_{R/}$, see [Lur17, Variant 7.1.3.8].
- The symmetrical monoidal structure on CAlg_R is coCartesian, see [Lur17, Proposition 3.2.4.7], hence computing tensor product is the same as computing push-out.

Now the desire statement follows from Lemma 2.29 and [HW22, Proposition 2.4.2]. \square

²The notation σ can be defined using factorization homology which we will update this later.

Proposition 2.31. *The commutative algebra $\mathrm{THH}_*((\mathrm{BP}\langle 0\rangle[x]/x^e)/\mathrm{MU}[x])$ has homotopy as*

$$\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[w_{1,i} : i \geq 0] \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}} \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[y_{j,i} : j \not\equiv -1 \pmod{p}, i \geq 0] \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}} \Gamma_{\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[x]/x^e}(\sigma^2 x^e).$$

In particular $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle 0\rangle[x]/x^e/\mathrm{MU}[x])$ is even.

Proof. The proposition follows from the same argument as above, together with [HW22, Proposition 2.5.3], and note that $\mathrm{HH}_*(\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[x]/x^e/\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[x])$ is free as $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ -module. \square

Proposition 2.32. *There is an spectral sequence*

$$E^2 \implies \mathrm{THH}_*((\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]/x^e)/\mathrm{MU}[x]),$$

whose E^∞ -page is given by

$$E^\infty \simeq \Gamma_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle_*[x]/x^e}(\sigma x^e, \sigma^2 v_i : i \geq n+1) \otimes_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle_*[x]/x^e} \Gamma_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle_*[x]/x^e}(\sigma^2 x_j : \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, j \neq p^k - 1).$$

And $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]/x^e/\mathrm{MU}[x])$ is even.

Proof. We need to compute $\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]/x^e \otimes_{\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{MU}[x]}^{(1)}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]/x^e)} \mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]/x^e$. By [Ang08, Proposition 3.6] and Remark 2.27,

$$\pi_*(\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{MU}[x]}^{(1)}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]/x^e)) \simeq \Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle_*[x]/x^e}(\sigma x^e, \sigma v_i : i \geq n+1) \otimes \Lambda(\sigma x_j : j \neq p^k - 1).$$

Then the Tor spectral sequence has the formula:

$$E^2 \simeq E^\infty \simeq \Gamma_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle_*[x]/x^e}(\sigma^2 x^e, \sigma^2 v_i, \sigma x_j : i \geq n+1, j \neq p^k - 1) \implies \pi_*(\mathrm{THH}((\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]/x^e)/\mathrm{MU}[x])).$$

Since every thing is concentrated in even degree, thus $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]/x^e/\mathrm{MU}[x])$ is even. \square

Remark 2.33. Let $A_* = \mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle_*[x]/x^e$, We can constructed a ring map

$$A_*[w_{n+1,i}, y_{j,i} : i \geq 0, j \not\equiv p-1 \pmod{p}] \otimes_{A_*} A_*[\gamma_{p^m}(\sigma^2 x^e) : m \geq 0] \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}_*(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]/x^e/\mathrm{MU}[x])$$

by choosing lifts of classes $\gamma_{p^i}(\sigma^2 v_{n+1}), \gamma_{p^i}(\sigma^2 x_j), \gamma_{p^i}(\sigma^2 x^e)$ in the Tor spectral sequence. Since the $\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]/x^e \rightarrow \mathrm{BP}\langle 0\rangle[x]/x^e$ has the fiber lies in $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{MU}[x]}^{\geq |v_1|}$, we therefore conclude that the fiber of $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]/x^e/\mathrm{MU}[x]) \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[x]/x^e/\mathrm{MU}[x])$ lies in $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{MU}[x]}^{\geq |v_1|}$. Assume $p < |v_1| = 2p - 2$, then $\mathrm{THH}_p(\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[x]/x^e/\mathrm{MU}[x]) \simeq \mathrm{THH}_p(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]/x^e/\mathrm{MU}[x])$, then according to the functoriality of Tor spectral sequence, we conclude that $p\gamma_1^p(\sigma^2 x^e) = \gamma_p(\sigma^2 x^e)$.

Conjecture 2.34. *From the above remark, we conjecture that for $n \geq 0, p > 2$ the ring spectrum $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]/x^e/\mathrm{MU}[x])$ has homotopy as*

$$A_*[w_{n+1,i}, y_{j,i} : i \geq 0, j \not\equiv p-1 \pmod{p}] \otimes_{A_*} A_*[1/p^m(\sigma^2 x^e)^{p^m} : m \geq 0],$$

i.e. the ring map in the remark is an surjection and the kernel is generated by $\{p^m \gamma_1(\sigma^2 x^e) - \gamma_{p^m}(\sigma^2 x^e)\}$. This is true for $n = 0$.

Proposition 2.35. *The homotopy of the ring spectrum $\mathrm{THH}(\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle}(x)/\Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x))$ is isomorphic to (as a graded ring)*

$$\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle_*[w_{n+1,i}, y_{j,i}] \otimes \Lambda(x).$$

Proof. Let $f : \mathrm{MU} \rightarrow \Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x)$ be the \mathbb{E}_∞ -ring map in Construction 2.14, then $f^* : \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{MU}} \rightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{\Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x)}$ is symmetrical monoidal by [Lur17, Proposition 7.1.2.7]. Now from the definition of THH in [NS18, Definition III.2.3], we have following equivalences:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{THH}(\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle}(x)/\Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x)) &\simeq \mathrm{THH}(f^*(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)/f^*(\mathrm{MU})) \\ &\simeq f^*(\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle/\mathrm{MU})) \\ &\simeq \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle/\mathrm{MU}) \otimes_{\mathrm{MU}} \Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x). \end{aligned}$$

The second equivalence is an equivalence of \mathbb{E}_2 - $\Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x)$ -algebras, the third equivalence is an equivalence of \mathbb{E}_2 -algebras, hence according to Construction 2.14 we have

$$\pi_* \mathrm{THH}(\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle}(x)/\Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x)) \simeq \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle_*[w_{n+1,i}, y_{j,i}] \otimes \Lambda(x),$$

where $|x| = 1$. □

Proposition 2.36. *The ring spectrum $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^e/\mathrm{MU})$ is even.*

Proof. Using [Ang08, Proposition 3.6], we have

$$\pi_* \mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{MU}}^{(1)}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^e) \simeq \Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle^*/v_n^e}(\sigma v_n^e, \sigma v_i : i \geq n+1) \otimes \Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle^*/v_n^e}(\sigma x_j : j \neq p^k - 1).$$

Then the Tor spectral sequence has the formula:

$$E^2 \simeq E^\infty \simeq \Gamma_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle^*/v_n^e}(\sigma^2 v_n^e, \sigma^2 v_i, \sigma x_j : i \geq n+1, j \neq p^k - 1) \implies \pi_*(\mathrm{THH}((\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^e)/\mathrm{MU})).$$

Since everything is concentrated in even degree, therefore $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^e/\mathrm{MU})$ is even. □

3. NEGATIVE TOPOLOGICAL CYCLIC HOMOLOGY

The primary goal of this section is to investigate chromatic localized algebraic K-theory and also the v_{n+1} -periodicity of TC^- . In particular, we prove Theorem 1.8. These were also studied in [AR02], [HW22]. We denote $K(n)$ to be the n th Morava K-theory, and $k(n) := \tau_{\geq 0}K(n)$.

Definition 3.1. For a spectrum A , we define the height of A to be the number $h \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $0 \leq i \leq h$ one have $L_{K(i)}(A) \not\simeq 0$, and $L_{K(h+1)}A \simeq 0$

Proposition 3.2. *With the same notations in Section 2, the spectrum $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e \simeq \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle_{\mathrm{MU}} \mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e$ has height n . And*

$$\begin{aligned} L_{K(n+1)}K(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e) &\not\simeq 0, \\ L_{K(n+1)}(K(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes_{\mathrm{MU}} \mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e) &\not\simeq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e$ is complex orientated, hence according to [DFHH14, Chapter 6, Proposition 4.1] the localization can be computed as $(v_m^{-1} \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)_{(p, v_1, \dots, v_{m-1})}^\wedge$. Therefore for any $m \geq n+1$, $L_{K(m)} \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e \simeq 0$ by the fact v_m maps to 0 in homotopy, see Remark 2.27. According to Claim 2.9, there is an \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra map $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e \rightarrow \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes_{\mathrm{MU}} \mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e$. Now by Claim 2.10, there is an \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra map $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes_{\mathrm{MU}} \mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e \rightarrow \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle$ induced by an \mathbb{E}_3 -MU-algebra map $\mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e \rightarrow \mathrm{MU}$, using Construction 2.3. Since $K(-)$ is a lax symmetric monoidal functor [BGT13, Proposition 10.11], and $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e} \rightarrow$

$\text{Mod}_{\text{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes_{\text{MU}} \text{MU}[x]/x^e} \rightarrow \text{Mod}_{\text{BP}\langle n \rangle}$ are \mathbb{E}_2 -monoidal maps between \mathbb{E}_2 -monoidal categories [Lur17, Proposition 4.5.8.20]. We therefore have an \mathbb{E}_2 -ring maps

$$\text{K}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e) \rightarrow \text{K}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes_{\text{MU}} \text{MU}[x]/x^e) \rightarrow \text{K}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle).$$

And $L_{K(n+1)}$ is a lax symmetrical monoidal functor, applying $L_{K(n+1)}$ yields an \mathbb{E}_2 -ring maps

$$L_{K(n+1)}(\text{K}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)) \rightarrow L_{K(n+1)}(\text{K}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes_{\text{MU}} \text{MU}[x]/x^e)) \rightarrow L_{K(n+1)}(\text{K}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle)).$$

Suppose $L_{K(n+1)}(\text{K}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle_{\text{MU}} \otimes \text{MU}[x]/x^e)) \simeq 0$, then $L_{K(n+1)}(\text{K}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle)) \simeq 0$. However, according to [HW22, Corollary 5.0.2], we know that $L_{K(n+1)} \text{K}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle) \not\simeq 0$, hence we arrive at a contradiction. Hence $L_{K(n+1)}(\text{K}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes_{\text{MU}} \text{MU}[x]/x^e)) \not\simeq 0$, a same argument would arrive at the statement that

$$L_{K(n+1)}(\text{K}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)) \not\simeq 0. \quad \square$$

We can also prove the following theorem with the same argument.

Proposition 3.3. *With the same notation as in Section 2, $\Lambda_{\text{BP}\langle n \rangle}(x)$ is height n , $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^e$ is height $n - 1$. And we have*

$$L_{K(n+1)}(\text{K}(\Lambda_{\text{BP}\langle n \rangle})) \not\simeq 0, L_{K(n+1)}(\text{K}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes_{\text{MU}} \Lambda_{\text{MU}}(x))) \not\simeq 0, L_{K(n)}(\text{K}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^e)) \not\simeq 0.$$

Proof. As seen in Proposition 3.2, it suffice to produce \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra maps

$$\Lambda_{\text{BP}\langle n \rangle}(x) \rightarrow \text{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes_{\text{MU}} \Lambda_{\text{MU}}(x) \rightarrow \text{BP}\langle n \rangle, \text{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^e \rightarrow \text{BP}\langle n - 1 \rangle.$$

By Remark 2.17, there is an \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra map $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes_{\text{MU}} \Lambda_{\text{MU}}(x)$ induced by an \mathbb{E}_∞ -ring map $\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}(x) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ using Construction 2.14, 2.3. Then a similar argument would imply that $L_{K(n+1)}(\text{K}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes_{\text{MU}} \Lambda_{\text{MU}}(x))) \not\simeq 0, L_{K(n+1)}(\text{K}(\Lambda_{\text{BP}\langle n \rangle}(x))) \not\simeq 0$. For the second type ring spectra, we run induction on $e \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$.

- When $e = 1$, by construction there is an equivalence $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n \simeq \text{BP}\langle n - 1 \rangle$, thus the desired statement is hold.
- Assume that $e = k$, we have an \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra map $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^e \rightarrow \text{BP}\langle n - 1 \rangle$.
- According to the property (2) in Proposition 2.21, we have an \mathbb{E}_3 - $\text{MU}[y]/y^{k+1}$ -algebra map $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^{k+1} \rightarrow \text{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^k$. Since the forgetful functor $\text{Mod}_{\text{MU}[y]/y^{k+1}} \rightarrow \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{S}}$ is lax symmetric monoidal, therefore we get an \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra map $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^{k+1} \rightarrow \text{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^k$.
- Composing the map right above with $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^k \rightarrow \text{BP}\langle n - 1 \rangle$, yields an \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra map $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^{k+1} \rightarrow \text{BP}\langle n - 1 \rangle$.

Hence, for any $e \geq 1$, we conclude that $L_{K(n)}(\text{K}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^e)) \not\simeq 0$ by the fact that $L_{K(n)}(\text{K}(\text{BP}\langle n - 1 \rangle)) \not\simeq 0$. \square

The results above actually has a refined version.

Proposition 3.4. *The homotopy fixed point spectral sequence for $\text{THH}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e / \text{MU}[x])^{hS^1}$ collapses at E_2 -page. The map*

$$\pi_* \text{MU}_{(p)}^{hS^1} \rightarrow \pi_*(\text{MU}_{(p)}[x])^{hS^1} \rightarrow \pi_* \text{TC}^-((\text{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e) / \text{MU}[x])$$

sends the complex orientation map to an element which is detected by t , and v_{n+1} is send to $t(\sigma^2 v_{n+1})$. And v_{n+1} is not nilpotent in $\text{TC}_^-((\text{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e) / \text{MU}[x])$.*

Proof. We have the homotopy limit spectral sequence derived by the skeleton filtration on $BS^1 \simeq \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^\infty$, and the formula is given by

$$E^2 \simeq \mathrm{THH}_*((\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)/\mathrm{MU}[x])[t] \implies \mathrm{TC}_*^-((\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)/\mathrm{MU}[x]).$$

Since every thing is concentrated in even degree by Proposition 2.32, thus the spectral sequence collapses at E_2 -page. Using the same argument in [HW22, A.4..1, Remark 5.0.5], one shows that v_{n+1} is detected in $\lim_{\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1} \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e/\mathrm{MU}[x])$. There are \mathbb{E}_1 -MU-algebra maps

$$\mathrm{TC}^-((\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)/\mathrm{MU}[x]) \rightarrow \mathrm{TC}^-((\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)/\mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e) \rightarrow \mathrm{TC}^-(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle/\mathrm{MU}).$$

Claim 3.5. The first map is an \mathbb{E}_2 - MU^{hS^1} -algebra map.

Proof. Recall that we have adjunction pair $f^* : \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e} \rightleftarrows \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{MU}[x]} : f_*$, see [Lur17, Proposition 7.1.2.7]. Therefore we have lax symmetric monoidal natural transformations

$$\mathrm{THH} f_* \implies f_* f^* \mathrm{THH} f_* \simeq f_* \mathrm{THH} f^* f_* \implies f_* \mathrm{THH}.$$

and the equivalence above follows from the facts that f_* is symmetric monoidal and commutes with colimits. Therefore we have a functor in $\mathrm{Fun}_{\mathrm{lax}}(\mathrm{Alg}_{\mathbb{E}_1}(\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e})^\otimes, \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{MU}[x]}^\otimes)$, applying to $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e$ yields an \mathbb{E}_2 - $\mathrm{MU}[x]$ -algebra map. \square_{Claim}

Claim 3.6. The second \mathbb{E}_1 - MU^{hS^1} -algebra map above is induced by the an \mathbb{E}_1 -MU-algebra map and applying $-^{hS^1}$.

Proof. we could construct an \mathbb{E}_1 -MU-algebra map

$$\mathrm{THH}((\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)/\mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e) \simeq \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle/\mathrm{MU}) \otimes_{\mathrm{MU}} \mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle/\mathrm{MU}).$$

Here, the equivalence above is an equivalence of \mathbb{E}_2 - $\mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e$ -algebras, see the proof of Proposition 2.35, the \mathbb{E}_1 -MU-algebra map above is induced by Construction 2.3. \square_{Claim}

Finally, by [HW22, Proposition 5.0.1], we learn that v_{n+1} is not nilpotent in $\mathrm{TC}_*^-(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle/\mathrm{MU})$, hence v_{n+1} is not nilpotent in $\mathrm{TC}_*^-((\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)/\mathrm{MU}[x])$. \square

Proposition 3.7. *The homotopy fixed point spectral sequence of $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^e/\mathrm{MU})^{hS^1}$ collapses at E_2 -page. The map*

$$\pi_* \mathrm{MU}_{(p)}^{hS^1} \rightarrow \pi_* \mathrm{TC}^-((\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)/v_n^e/\mathrm{MU})$$

sends the complex orientation map to an element which is detected by t . And v_n is not nilpotent in $\mathrm{TC}_^-((\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)/v_n^e/\mathrm{MU})$.*

Proof. According to the proof of Proposition 3.4, and Proposition 2.36, the homotopy fixed point spectral collapses at E_2 -page. And we have \mathbb{E}_2 - MU^{hS^1} -algebra map

$$\mathrm{TC}^-((\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)/v_n^e/\mathrm{MU}) \rightarrow \mathrm{TC}^-(\mathrm{BP}\langle n-1 \rangle/\mathrm{MU})$$

induced by \mathbb{E}_3 -MU-algebra map $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^e \rightarrow \mathrm{BP}\langle n-1 \rangle$ constructed in the proof of Proposition 3.3. Since v_n is not nilpotent in $\mathrm{TC}^-(\mathrm{BP}\langle n-1 \rangle/\mathrm{MU})$, hence v_n is not nilpotent in $\mathrm{TC}^-(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^e/\mathrm{MU})$. \square

Proposition 3.8. *The map*

$$\pi_* \mathrm{MU}_{(p)}^{hS^1} \rightarrow \pi_* \Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x)^{hS^1} \rightarrow \pi_* \mathrm{TC}^-(\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle}(x)/\Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x))$$

sends the complex orientation map to an element which is detected by t , and v_{n+1} is sent to $t(\sigma^2 v_{n+1})$. And v_{n+1} is not nilpotent in $\mathrm{TC}^-(\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle}(x)/\Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x))$.

Proof. The homotopy fixed point spectral sequence has the formula:

$$E^2 \simeq \mathrm{THH}_*(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle / \mathrm{MU})[t] \otimes \Lambda(x) \implies \mathrm{TC}_*^-(\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle}(x)/\Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x)).$$

There is a ring map

$$\mathrm{TC}^-(\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle}(x)) \rightarrow \mathrm{TC}^-(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle / \mathrm{MU})$$

induced by $\mathbb{E}_1\text{-MU}^{hS^1}$ -algebra map

$$\mathrm{THH}(\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle}(x)/\Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x)) \simeq \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle / \mathrm{MU}) \otimes_{\mathrm{MU}} \Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}}(x) \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle / \mathrm{MU}).$$

Since v_{n+1} is not nilpotent in $\mathrm{TC}^-(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle / \mathrm{MU})$, so we conclude that v_{n+1} is not nilpotent in $\mathrm{TC}^-(\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle}(x))$. \square

4. SEGAL CONJECTURE

We will investigate Lichtenbaum–Quillen phenomena in this section, we reduce to prove Segal conjecture and weak canonical vanishing theorem for certain cyclotomic spectra due to Theorem 4.7. In particular, we prove Proposition 4.16, 4.20. First we review some basic concepts and related techniques.

Definition 4.1 ([MR99, Proposition 3.2]). We say a spectrum X is finite if X is bounded ($\exists a, b \in \mathbb{Z}, X \in \mathrm{Sp}_{[a,b]}$), and $\pi_k X$ is a finite group for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. A spectrum X is called **fp-spectrum** if X is bounded below, p -complete, and there exists a finite complex F such that $F \otimes X$ is finite in the previous sense.

Remark 4.2. The notation "fp" should be view as abbreviation of "finite presented", due to [MR99, Proposition 3.2], since a fp-spectrum is equivalence to the condition that X is p -complete and bounded below, and $\pi_*(\mathbb{F}_p \otimes X)$ is **finite presented** as \mathcal{A}_* -comodule.

From chromatic homotopy theory we know that we may talk about type of a p -local finite complex.

Definition 4.3. We define **fp-type** for a fp-spectrum X to be the minimum of the set $\{\mathrm{type}(F) - 1 : F \otimes X \text{ is finite, and } F \text{ is finite complex}\}$.

Proposition 4.4. *The ring spectra $(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)_p^\wedge, (\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle}(x))_p^\wedge$ in Section 2 are fp-spectra of type n , the ring spectra $(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^e)_p^\wedge$ is fp-spectrum of type $n - 1$.*

Proof. The spectra mentioned above are both p -complete and bounded below. Since $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle_p^\wedge$ is fp-spectrum of type n , now the result follows from Proposition 2.28, and note that there is equivalence $X_p^\wedge \otimes \mathbb{S}/p \simeq X \otimes \mathbb{S}/p$. \square

And we have following theorem establish the relationship between fp-spectra and Lichtenbaum–Quillen property.

Theorem 4.5 ([MR99, Proposition 8.2],[HW22, Theorem 3.1.3]). *Let X be a fp-spectrum of type at most n , then the fiber of the map*

$$X \rightarrow L_n^f X$$

is bounded above, where L_n^f denote the Bousfield localization functor with respect to the spectrum $T(0) \oplus T(1) \oplus \cdots \oplus T(n)$, and $T(k)$ is the telescope of a type k finite complex.

We want to investigate the redshift phenomena in this context, the methods to prove redshift conjecture were well understood, see [AN21, HW22]. More concretely, we have following theorem.

Convention 4.6. As in [HW22], for a connective algebra A , we will abbreviated $\mathrm{TR}^j(\mathrm{THH}(A)_p^\wedge)$ by $\mathrm{TR}^j(A)$, $\mathrm{TR}(\mathrm{THH}(A)_p^\wedge)$ by $\mathrm{TR}(A)$, and $\mathrm{TC}(\mathrm{THH}(A)_p^\wedge)$ by $\mathrm{TC}(A)$. Let X be a bounded below p -typical cyclotomic spectrum, we use following notations to indicate some statements concerning about X . Let F be a fixed finite complex.

- $\boxed{F\text{-Bounded TR for } X}$ = The spectrum $F \otimes \mathrm{TR}(X)$ is bounded.
- $\boxed{F\text{-Bounded TC for } X}$ = The spectrum $F \otimes \mathrm{TC}(X)$ is bounded.
- $\boxed{F\text{-Segal Conjecture for } X}$ = The fiber of the Frobenius $F \otimes X \rightarrow F \otimes X^{tC_p}$ is bounded above.
- $\boxed{F\text{-Weak Canonical Vanishing for } X}$ = There is an integer $d \geq 0$, such that for any $i \geq d$ the map

$$\pi_i(F \otimes \mathrm{can}) : \pi_i(F \otimes X^{hC_{p^k}}) \rightarrow \pi_i(F \otimes X^{tC_{p^k}})$$

is zero for all $0 \leq k \leq \infty$.

When the concerning object X is clear, we will simply write as $\boxed{F\text{-Bounded TR}}$ without mentioning X .

Theorem 4.7 ([HW22, Theorem 3.3.2]). *Let X be a bounded below, p -typical cyclotomic spectrum and $F \otimes X$ is p -power torsion ($\exists N, p^N = 0 \in \pi_0(\mathrm{Map}(F \otimes X, F \otimes X))$.) Then we have,*

$$\boxed{F\text{-Segal Conjecture}} \wedge \boxed{F\text{-Weak Canonical Vanishing}} \iff \boxed{F\text{-Bounded TR}}.$$

Remark 4.8. Note that $\mathrm{TC} \simeq \mathrm{fib}(1 - F : \mathrm{TR} \rightarrow \mathrm{TR})$, hence we have $\boxed{F\text{-Bounded TR}} \implies \boxed{F\text{-Bounded TC}}$. And the TR here is the usual $\mathrm{TR}(-, p)$, note we have equivalences $\mathrm{TR}(A_p^\wedge)_p^\wedge \simeq \mathrm{TR}(A)_p^\wedge \simeq \mathrm{TR}(A, p)_p^\wedge$.

Hence, according to the discussion above, to prove that $\mathrm{TC}(A)$ is bounded it suffice to prove the Segal conjecture and weak canonical vanishing. However, for $\mathrm{BP}\langle -1 \rangle[x]/x^e \simeq \mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e$ the Segal conjecture fails, when $e > 1$.

Proposition 4.9. *Let $e > 1$, the fiber of the Frobenius*

$$\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e) \otimes \mathbb{S}/p \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}[x]/x^e)^{tC_p} \otimes \mathbb{S}/p$$

is not bounded above. Actually, for any perfect field k of characteristic p , the fiber of the Frobenius

$$\mathrm{THH}(k[x]/x^e) \otimes \mathbb{S}/p \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(k[x]/x^e)^{tC_p} \otimes \mathbb{S}/p$$

is not bounded above, i.e. $\boxed{\mathbb{S}/p\text{-Segal conjecture}}$ fails for $\mathrm{THH}(k[x]/x^e)_p^\wedge$. And consequently, $\boxed{\mathbb{S}\text{-Segal conjecture}}$ also fails for both $\mathrm{THH}(k[x]/x^e)_p^\wedge$ and $\mathrm{THH}(k[x]/x^e)$.

Proof. By [HW22, Proposition 3.3.7], since $k[x]/x^e$ is a connective $\mathbb{E}_\infty\text{-BP}\langle -1 \rangle$ -algebra, then for any type 1 complex F , we have

$$\boxed{F\text{-Segal conjecture for } \mathrm{THH}(k[x]/x^e)_p^\wedge} \implies \boxed{F\text{-Bounded TR for } \mathrm{THH}(k[x]/x^e)_p^\wedge}.$$

From the computation in [HM97a, Theorem 4.2.10], one gets that $\mathrm{TC}(k[x]/x^e) \otimes \mathbb{S}/p$ is not bounded above³, therefore $\mathrm{TR}(k[x]/x^e) \otimes \mathbb{S}/p$ is not bounded above. Hence, $\mathbb{S}/p\text{-Segal conjecture}$ fails for $\mathrm{THH}(k[x]/x^e)_p^\wedge$. \square

Remark 4.10. The proposition above may appear counterintuitive, as our goal is to apply Segal conjecture to deduce the boundedness of TR, or TC. There is alternative proof of the above result, which can be further generalized. That would require a better understanding of $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e)$ which we will present later.

First, we recall a framework used in [HW22] to prove the Segal conjecture, and it also appeared in [AK21]. Let $\mathrm{Fil}(\mathrm{Sp}) := \mathrm{Fun}(\mathbb{Z}^{\mathrm{op}}, \mathrm{Sp})$ be the category of filtered spectra, which can be equipped with a symmetrical monoidal structure via Day convolution [Lur17, Example 2.2.6.17]. Then for an algebra X in $\mathrm{Fil}(\mathrm{Sp})$ one could define THH using [NS18, Definition III.2.3.], the output is a filtered spectrum. And note that for an algebra A , we can easily view A as filtered algebra via Whitehead tower which we could denote it by $\tau_{\geq \bullet} A$. Then $\mathrm{THH}(\tau_{\geq \bullet} A)$ will give us a filtration on $\mathrm{THH}(A)$, and the associated spectral sequence is given by

$$\pi_* \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{gr}_\bullet A) \implies \pi_*(\mathrm{THH}(A)).$$

There is also a well known way to produce a filtered algebra from an algebra, namely Adams descent. Let E be a connective commutative algebra, for a spectrum X , one can form then E -Adams tower (or E -synthetic analogue) $\lim_{[n] \in \Delta_{\leq \bullet}} X \otimes E^{\otimes [n]}$, then associated spectral sequence is the Adams spectral sequence. And there is a modified version, called descent tower in [HW22] or E synthetic analogue of X . The filtered spectrum is given by $\lim_{[n] \in \Delta} (\tau_{\geq \bullet}(X \otimes E^{\otimes [n]}))$. We denote this functor by $\mathrm{desc}_E : \mathrm{Sp} \rightarrow \mathrm{Fil}(\mathrm{Sp})$ which is lax symmetric monoidal, and according to [HW22, Convention C.1.1], we get a spectral sequence

$$E_2^{s,t} \simeq \pi_{t-s} \mathrm{gr}^t X$$

Here, we have used the *décalage* construction, see [GIKR22, Remark 3.7]. Especially, for $E = \mathbb{F}_p$, and X is bounded below, we have the following spectral sequence

$$E_2^{s,t} \simeq \mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^{*,*}(\mathbb{F}_p, \mathrm{H}_*(X; \mathbb{F}_p)) \implies \pi_* X_p^\wedge.$$

Now, in [HW22], to prove the $\boxed{F\text{-Segal conjecture for } \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)}$ it suffice to show the Frobenius

$$\mathbb{F}_p \otimes_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle} \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p \otimes_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle} \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{tC_p}$$

³Note for $k = \mathbb{F}_p$, the result says $\mathbf{W}_{me}(\mathbb{F}_p)/V_e(\mathbf{W}_m(\mathbb{F}_p)) \simeq \mathrm{TC}_{2m-1}(k[x]/x^e, (x))$, hence $\mathbf{W}_{me}(\mathbb{F}_p)/V_e(\mathbf{W}_m(\mathbb{F}_p)) \otimes \mathbb{Z}/p \hookrightarrow \mathrm{TC}_{2m-1}(k[x]/x^e; \mathbb{Z}/p)$. Now note that $\mathbf{W}_{me}(\mathbb{F}_p)/V_e(\mathbf{W}_m(\mathbb{F}_p)) \otimes \mathbb{Z}/p \twoheadrightarrow (\mathbb{Z}/p^{me}/p^e(\mathbb{Z}/p^m)) \otimes \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$, and $(\mathbb{Z}/p^{me}/p^e(\mathbb{Z}/p^m)) \otimes \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} \neq 0$ for $m \gg 0$, thus $\mathrm{TC}_{2m-1}(k[x]/x^e; \mathbb{Z}/p) \neq 0$. In general, combining the same argument with [HM97b, Theorem 2.1], one gets the desired statement.

is truncated, applying the descent functor desc , one eventually reduce to show for the \mathbb{E}_2 -graded algebra $\mathbb{F}_p \otimes \mathbb{S}[v_1] \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{S}[v_n]$, the Frobenius

$$\text{THH}_*(\mathbb{F}_p \otimes \mathbb{S}[v_1] \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{S}[v_n]) / (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n) \rightarrow \text{THH}_*(\mathbb{F}_p \otimes \mathbb{S}[v_1] \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{S}[v_n])^{tC_p} / (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$$

are isomorphisms for large enough degrees. Where the \mathbb{E}_2 -algebra is equivalent to the associated graded algebra of $\text{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle)$ by computing Adams E_2 -page and formal arguments.

Remark 4.11. Note that according to [Hes18, Proposition 6.6], the Segal conjecture is true for $\text{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[x])$ (and this can be also seen in [HW22]), hence it would make sense to guess that $\boxed{F\text{-Segal conjecture for } \text{THH}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle[x])}$ holds for any type $n+1$ -finite complex F . And for $\text{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e$, as seen in Proposition 4.9, it would also make sense to guess that Segal conjecture fails for $\text{THH}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)$, these all require some understanding of the graded algebras derived by \mathbb{F}_p -descent functor (\mathbb{F}_p -synthetic analogue).

According to the discussion before, we first prove the following result. Consider the \mathbb{E}_2 -graded- $\mathbb{F}_p[x]$ -algebra R , with the homotopy ring $\pi_* R \simeq \mathbb{F}_p[x][a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n]$, each a_i has degree $|a_i| \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ and positive weight.

Proposition 4.12. *The \mathbb{E}_2 -graded- $\mathbb{F}_p[x]$ -algebra is equivalent to*

$$\mathbb{F}_p[x] \otimes \mathbb{S}[a_1] \otimes \mathbb{S}[a_2] \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{S}[a_n],$$

with the corresponding degrees and weights, where $\mathbb{S}[a_i]$ is the free graded \mathbb{E}_2 -algebra generated by a_i .

Proof. The proof is the same as in [HW22, Proposition 4.2.1], we denote $\mathbb{F}_p[x] \otimes \mathbb{S}[a_1] \otimes \mathbb{S}[a_2] \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{S}[a_n]$ by A , we only need to show that

$$\mathbb{F}_p[x] \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p[x] \otimes_A \mathbb{F}_p[x]} \mathbb{F}_p[x]$$

has homotopy groups in even degrees. But this is just an application of [Ang08] or Tor spectral sequence. \square

In general, one can prove the following result.

Proposition 4.13. *Let R be a commutative ring, for any graded \mathbb{E}_2 - R -algebra $R(n)$ with the homotopy ring $\pi_* R(n) \simeq R[a_1, \dots, a_n]$, we have an equivalence of graded \mathbb{E}_2 - R -algebras*

$$R(n) \simeq R \otimes \mathbb{S}[a_1] \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{S}[a_n].$$

Proposition 4.14. *The map*

$$\pi_*(\text{THH}(R)) / (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \rightarrow \pi_*(\text{THH}(R)^{tC_p}) / (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$$

is an equivalence in degrees $ > n + 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|$.*

Proof. We use the argument in [HW22, Corollary 4.2.3], by Proposition 4.12, we may assume that $R = \mathbb{F}_p[x] \otimes \mathbb{S}[a_1] \otimes \mathbb{S}[a_2] \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{S}[a_n]$. Hence the Frobenius is equivalent to the composition of the map

$$\text{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[x]) \otimes \text{THH}(\mathbb{S}[a_1]) \otimes \cdots \otimes \text{THH}(\mathbb{S}[a_n]) \rightarrow \text{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[x])^{tC_p} \otimes \text{THH}(\mathbb{S}[a_1])^{tC_p} \otimes \cdots \otimes \text{THH}(\mathbb{S}[a_n])^{tC_p},$$

and the equivalence

$$\text{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[x])^{tC_p} \otimes \text{THH}(\mathbb{S}[a_1])^{tC_p} \otimes \cdots \otimes \text{THH}(\mathbb{S}[a_n])^{tC_p} \rightarrow (\text{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[x]) \otimes \text{THH}(\mathbb{S}[a_1]) \otimes \cdots \otimes \text{THH}(\mathbb{S}[a_n]))^{tC_p}.$$

Note that the proof in [Hes18, Proposition 6.6] shows that the Frobenius map $\varphi : \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[x]) \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[x])^{tC_p}$ is equivalent to the composition of map

$$\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[x]) \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p)^{tC_p} \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x]),$$

and the equivalence

$$\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p)^{tC_p} \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x]) \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[x])^{tC_p}.$$

Thus we only need to show that the map

$$\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[x]) \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[a_1, \dots, a_n]) \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p)^{tC_p} \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x]) \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[a_1, \dots, a_n])^{tC_p}$$

has the desired property on homotopy groups. Note that we have following facts.

- For any spectrum X , we have equivalence $X \otimes \mathbb{F}_p \simeq X_p^\wedge \otimes \mathbb{F}_p$.
- We have equivalence of \mathbb{E}_∞ -algebras $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p) \simeq \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathbb{F}_p$, and also $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p)^{tC_p} \simeq \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p)^{tC_p} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathbb{F}_p$.
- $\mathbb{F}_p \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x]) \simeq \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}[x]/\mathbb{F}_p)$. According to [Ang08], we have the homotopy groups as $\pi_*(\mathbb{F}_p \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x])) \simeq \mathbb{F}_p[x] \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \Lambda_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\sigma x)$.

Therefore we are reduce to understand the map

(4.1)

$$\mathbb{F}_p[u] \otimes \mathbb{F}[x, a_1, \dots, a_n] \otimes \Lambda_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\sigma x, \sigma a_1, \dots, \sigma a_n) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p[u^\pm] \otimes \mathbb{F}[x, a_1, \dots, a_n] \otimes \Lambda_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\sigma x, \sigma a_1, \dots, \sigma a_n).$$

Modulo a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n , the right hand side of (4.1) may has elements generated by

$$u^j (\sigma x)^{j_0} (\sigma a_1)^{j_1} \dots (\sigma a_n)^{j_n},$$

which are not in the image of the left hand side, where $j < 0, j_i \in \{0, 1\}$. If we require the total degree greater than $|\sigma x| + \sum_{i=1}^n |\sigma a_i| = n + 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|$, such elements does not appear, hence the map modulo a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n is an equivalence for $* > |\sigma x| + \sum_{i=1}^n |\sigma a_i| = n + 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|$. \square

This will coincide with [Hes18, Proposition 6.6], more generally, one can prove the following theorem for $R = \mathbb{F}_p[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ in Proposition 4.13.

Proposition 4.15. *The map induced by Frobenius*

$$\pi_*(\mathrm{THH}(R(n)))/(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \rightarrow \pi_*(\mathrm{THH}(R(n))^{tC_p})/(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$$

is an equivalence in degree $* > n + m + \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|$.

Proof. Same as before, and the statement in [Hes18, Proposition 6.6] still works. \square

With above results, we could prove the Segal conjecture for $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]$ using the strategy mentioned before, more precisely, we have following.

Theorem 4.16. *The map of algebras induced by Frobenius*

$$\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]) \otimes_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]} \mathbb{F}_p[x] \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x])^{tC_p} \otimes_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]} \mathbb{F}_p[x]$$

is an equivalence in large degrees, i.e.

$$\mathrm{THH}_*(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x])/(p, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n) \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}_*(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x])^{tC_p}/(p, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$$

is an equivalence for $* \gg 0$.

Proof. The map

$$\varphi : \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]) \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x])^{tC_p}$$

is a map of \mathbb{E}_2 -algebra, and $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x])$ equipped with a $\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]$ -module structure, hence φ can be promoted to a map of $\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]$ -modules, where the module structure of right hand side is induced by the \mathbb{E}_2 -algebra map. Consider the filtered algebras $\mathrm{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x])$, $\mathrm{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\mathbb{F}_p)$. This will give a filtration on the Frobenius map

$$\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]) \otimes_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]} \mathbb{F}_p[x] \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x])^{tC_p} \otimes_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]} \mathbb{F}_p.$$

According to [HW22, Proposition C.5.4], $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]))_{v_0}^\wedge$ converges to $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x])_p^\wedge$, and $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]))^{tC_p}$ converges to $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x])^{tC_p}$, $\mathrm{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x])$ converges to $(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x])_p^\wedge$. Hence the map

(4.2)

$$\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]))_{v_0}^\wedge \otimes_{\mathrm{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]} \mathbb{F}_p[x] \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle)^{tC_p} \otimes_{\mathrm{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x])} \mathbb{F}_p[x]$$

gives arise to a filtration on

$$(4.3) \quad \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]) \otimes_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]} \mathbb{F}_p[x] \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x])^{tC_p} \otimes_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]} \mathbb{F}_p[x].$$

Note that the associated graded has homotopy groups as

$$\pi_*(\mathrm{gr}_\bullet(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x])) \simeq \mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}^*}^{*,*}(\mathbb{F}_p, \mathrm{H}_*(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x], \mathbb{F}_p)),$$

the \mathbb{F}_p -homolgy of $\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle$ is coextended from the quotient Hopf algebra $\Lambda(\overline{\tau}_0, \overline{\tau}_1, \dots, \overline{\tau}_n)$, hence $\mathrm{H}_*(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x], \mathbb{F}_p) \simeq \mathrm{H}_*(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathrm{H}_*(\mathbb{S}[x], \mathbb{F}_p) \simeq (\mathcal{A} \square_{E_1} \mathbb{F}_p) \otimes (E_1 \square_{E_1} \mathbb{F}_p[x]) \simeq (\mathcal{A} \square_{E_1} \mathbb{F}_p \otimes E_1) \square_{E_1} \mathbb{F}_p[x] \simeq \mathcal{A} \square_{\Lambda(\overline{\tau}_0, \dots, \overline{\tau}_n)} \mathbb{F}_p[x]$, where $E_1 = \Lambda(\overline{\tau}_0, \dots, \overline{\tau}_n)$, $E_2 = \Lambda(\overline{\tau}_k | k \geq n+1)$, $P = \mathbb{F}_p[\overline{\xi}_1, \overline{\xi}_2, \dots]$. Therefore

$$\pi_* \mathrm{gr}_\bullet(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]) \simeq \mathrm{Ext}_{\Lambda(\overline{\tau}_0, \dots, \overline{\tau}_n)}(\mathbb{F}_p, \mathbb{F}_p[x]) \simeq \mathbb{F}_p[x, v_0, v_1, \dots, v_n].$$

Thus by Proposition 4.12, we have an equivalence $\mathrm{gr}_\bullet(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]) \simeq \mathbb{F}_p[x] \otimes \mathbb{S}[v_0] \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{S}[v_n]$. Now according to Proposition 4.16, we have that the fiber of (4.2) is bounded above, and hence the fiber of (4.3) is bounded above. \square

Corollary 4.17. *Let F be any finite complex of type $n+1$, then*

$$\boxed{F\text{-Segal conjecture for } \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x])}$$

is true.

Proof. Since the category of finite complex F of type $n+1$ such that

$$\boxed{F\text{-Segal conjecture for } \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x])}$$

holds is thick, and the generalized Moore complex $\mathbb{S}/(p^{i_0}, v_1^{i_1}, \dots, v_n^{i_n})$ generates the thick subcategory of type $n+1$ complex. It is enough to show that for any generalized Moore complex has that property. This will follows from Proposition 4.16. \square

Since $\mathrm{BP}\langle 1\rangle[x]$ is \mathbb{E}_∞ - $\mathrm{BP}\langle 1\rangle$ -algebra, see [BR05], hence according to [HW22, Proposition 3.3.7], we have following corollary.

Corollary 4.18. *Let F be any p -local finite type 3 complex, then the following spectra are bounded.*

$$\begin{aligned} F \otimes \mathrm{TC}(\mathrm{BP}\langle 1\rangle[x]), \\ F \otimes \mathrm{K}(\mathrm{BP}\langle 1\rangle[x])_p^\wedge. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The statement for TC follows from Corollary 4.17, [HW22, Proposition 3.3.7], Theorem 4.5. Note that we have pull back square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{K}(\mathrm{BP}\langle 1\rangle[x])_p^\wedge & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{TC}(\mathrm{BP}\langle 1\rangle[x]) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{K}(\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[x])_p^\wedge & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{TC}(\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[x]) \end{array}$$

Therefore, after applying $F \otimes -$, the above square is still a pull back square. Since $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ is $\mathbb{E}_\infty\text{-BP}\langle 0\rangle$ -algebra, hence for any F' a p -local type 2 finite complex, $F' \otimes \mathrm{TC}(\mathbb{Z}_{(p)})$ is bounded. Then $F \otimes \mathrm{TC}(\mathbb{Z}_{(p)})$ is also bounded. Note that K-theory is \mathbb{A}^1 -invariant, then we have $\mathrm{K}(\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[x]) \simeq \mathrm{K}(\mathbb{Z}_{(p)})$, and $\mathrm{K}(\mathbb{Z}_{(p)})$ is fp spectrum of type 1, then $F \otimes \mathrm{K}(\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[x])$ is bounded. Therefore $F \otimes \mathrm{K}(\mathrm{BP}\langle 1\rangle[x])_p^\wedge$ is bounded. \square

We will use the decomposition of $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e)$ to study the Frobenius map of $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]/x^e)$, we recall the following decomposition in [HM97a, Theorem B].

Proposition 4.19. *Let $V_d = \mathbb{C}(\xi_m) \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbb{C}(\xi_m^d)$, where ξ_m is the m th primitive root of unity, S^{V_d} will denote to be the one-point compactification of V_d . Then $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e) \simeq \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} B_m$, as S^1 -spectra, where*

$$B_m \simeq S^{V_{\lfloor \frac{m-1}{e} \rfloor}} \otimes \Sigma_+^\infty S^1 / C_m,$$

if $e \nmid m$, and

$$B_m \simeq S^{V_{\lfloor \frac{m-1}{e} \rfloor}} \otimes \mathrm{cofib}(\Sigma_+^\infty S^1 / C_{m/e} \rightarrow \Sigma_+^\infty S^1 / C_m)$$

if $e \mid m$.

Now we could prove the following proposition, according to above discussion.

Proposition 4.20. *Let F be any p -local type $n + 2$ finite complex, and if $W \neq 0$, then the fiber of the Frobenius*

$$F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]/x^e) \rightarrow F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle[x]/x^e)^{tC_p}$$

is not bounded, where $e > 1$, W is the fiber of Frobenius map $F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle)$. In particular, if F is a sum of generalized Moore complexes $\mathbb{S}/(p^{i_0}, v_1^{i_1}, \dots, v_{n+1}^{i_{n+1}})$, then $W \neq 0$. Actually, for any F a p -local type $n + 2$ finite complex, $W \neq 0$.

Lemma 4.21. *The unstable Frobenius induces an equivalence*

$$F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle)^{tC_p} \otimes B_{m/p} \rightarrow F \otimes (\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n\rangle) \otimes B_m)^{tC_p}$$

Proof. Note that the Frobenius map can be induced by the genuine cyclotomic structure, and the two Frobenius maps are equivalent. We have following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_{m/p} & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & \Phi^{C_p}(\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)) \otimes B_{m/p} \\
\downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \\
\Phi^{C_p}(\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)) \otimes B_m^{C_p} & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{tC_p} \otimes B_m^{C_p} \\
\downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq \\
\Phi^{C_p}(\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_m) & \longrightarrow & (\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_m)^{tC_p}
\end{array}$$

The left vertical maps are equivalence, which are induced by the genuine cyclotomic structure on $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)$, and also for the upper horizontal map. The right vertical map is an equivalence by [HM97b, Lemma 9.1]. Finally, we have $B_m^{C_p} \simeq B_{m/p}$ where both sides are S^1 -spaces, by [HM97a, (4.2.2)]. Therefore the Frobenius map is equivalent to

$$\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_{m/p} \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{tC_p} \otimes B_{m/p} \rightarrow (\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_m)^{tC_p},$$

where the second map is an equivalence. \square

Proof of Proposition 4.20. We have following equivalences,

$$F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e) \simeq F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e) \simeq \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_m,$$

where B_m was described in Proposition 4.19, and the connectivity of B_m tends to ∞ , when $m \rightarrow \infty$, hence we have the following equivalence (note that the summand has connectivity tends to ∞ , then the direct sum is equivalent to the product).

$$F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e) \simeq \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_m \simeq \prod_{m \geq 0} F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_m.$$

Hence the Frobenius factor as following,

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e) & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)^{tC_p} \\
\downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq \\
\prod_{m \geq 0} F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_m & \xrightarrow{\varphi'} & F \otimes \prod_{m \geq 0} (\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_m)^{tC_p} \\
\downarrow \mathrm{id} \otimes \varphi \otimes \mathrm{id} & & \downarrow \simeq \\
\prod_{m \geq 0} F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{tC_p} \otimes B_m & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \prod_{m \geq 0} F \otimes (\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_m)^{tC_p}
\end{array}$$

The right lower map is an equivalence, by the fact that F is finite and then dualizable in Sp (see for instance [Rav92, Theorem 5.2.1]), and hence $F \otimes -$ commutes with products (it has a left adjoint). From the above diagram, it suffice to understand the map φ' , suppose φ' induce isomorphism on homotopy group on large degrees, then we will have the factor

$$F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_m \xrightarrow{\mathrm{id} \otimes \varphi \otimes \mathrm{id}} F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{tC_p} \otimes B_m \xrightarrow{\simeq} F \otimes (\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_m)^{tC_p}$$

induce isomorphism on large degrees, and the equivalence is due to Lemma 4.21.

Claim 4.22. We claim that $\exists b, \pi_b W \otimes \Sigma_+^\infty S^1 \neq 0$ for some $b \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Proof. Otherwise, $W \otimes \Sigma_+^\infty S^1 \simeq 0$. Actually, one computes $\pi_*(\Sigma_+^\infty S^1) \simeq \pi_*(\Sigma^\infty S^1) \oplus \pi_*(\mathbb{S})$, hence the Tor spectral sequence for $W \otimes \Sigma_+^\infty S^1$ has a summand $\pi_*(W) \not\cong 0$, a contradiction. \square Claim

Now, we know that $\pi_{b+\lfloor \frac{m-1}{e} \rfloor} W \otimes B_m \neq 0$, for $e \nmid m$, and for $m \rightarrow \infty$, this would give a sequence of nonzero homotopy classes, a contradiction.

Now, we show that $W \not\cong 0$, first if F is the generalized Moore complex, by using $\text{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p}$, we learn that $\text{THH}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{tC_p}$ has graded equivalent to $\text{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[v_0, v_1, \dots, v_n])^{tC_p}$ has homotopy groups as

$$\mathbb{F}_p[u^\pm, v_0, \dots, v_n] \otimes \Lambda_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\sigma v_0, \dots, \sigma v_n).$$

See [HW22, Proposition 4.2.2]. Therefore, we know that v_0, \dots, v_n is detected by the same elements above. Then $\text{THH}(\text{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle))^{tC_p} \otimes_{\text{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p} \text{BP}\langle n \rangle} \text{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p} \text{BP}\langle n \rangle / (v_0^{i_0}, \dots, v_n^{i_n})$ will have graded as

$$(4.4) \quad \mathbb{F}_p[u^\pm, v_0, \dots, v_n] / (v_0^{i_0}, \dots, v_n^{i_n}) \otimes \Lambda(\sigma v_0, \dots, \sigma v_n),$$

and u has degree 2, weight 0, $|v_{n+1}^{i_{n+1}}| = (2p^{n+1} - 2)^{i_{n+1}}$, and lies in weight $(2p^{n+1} - 1)^{i_{n+1}}$. If modulo v_{n+1} , the graded is connective, then $\pi_{-2N-(2p^{n+1}-2)^{i_{n+1}}, -(2p^{n+1}-1)^{i_{n+1}}} \text{gr} \simeq \pi_{-2N,0} \text{gr}$, however, when $N \rightarrow \infty$, the left hand side is zero (since when degree is small enough, it can be only generated by u^{-j} , but this lies in weight 0), while the right hand side is generated by u^{-N} . A contradiction, meaning that $\text{THH}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{tC_p} / (p^{i_0}, v_0^{i_1}, \dots, v_{n+1}^{i_{n+1}})$ is not connective. Then one sees that the fiber of Frobenius map cannot be an equivalence, hence $W \not\cong 0$. In general, since u^{-N} lives in $\pi_{-2N,0} \text{gr } W_1$, where the W_1 is the W for which F is a generalized Moore complex. Then by a thick sub-category argument, one proves that $W \not\cong 0$ \square

As a corollary, we have following.

Corollary 4.23. *Let F be any p -local type $n + 2$ finite complex, and if $W \not\cong 0$, where W is the fiber of the Frobenius map $F \otimes \text{THH}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle)$, then $F \otimes \text{TR}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)$ is not bounded. Actually, $W \not\cong 0$.*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 4.20 and Theorem 4.7. \square

Use the argument before we could actually prove the following.

Proposition 4.24. *The fiber of the Frobenius map*

$$\mathbb{F}_p \otimes_{\text{BP}\langle n \rangle} \text{THH}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p \otimes_{\text{BP}\langle n \rangle} \text{THH}(\text{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)^{tC_p}$$

is not bounded above.

As usual, we prove the graded version of this.

Proposition 4.25. *Let A be the \mathbb{E}_2 -graded algebra, $A = \mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e \otimes \mathbb{S}[a_0] \otimes \mathbb{S}[a_1] \otimes \mathbb{S}[a_n]$, where $|a_i| \in 2\mathbb{Z}$, and in some weights. Modulo a_0, \dots, a_n the fiber of the Frobenius map*

$$\text{THH}(A)/(a_0, \dots, a_n) \rightarrow \text{THH}(A)^{tC_p}/(a_0, \dots, a_n)$$

is still not bounded above.

Proof. Same as before, the Frobenius map for $\text{THH}(A)$ is equivalent to

$$\text{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e) \otimes \text{THH}(\mathbb{S}[a_0]) \otimes \dots \otimes \text{THH}(\mathbb{S}[a_n]) \rightarrow \text{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e)^{tC_p} \otimes \text{THH}(\mathbb{S}[a_0])_p^\wedge \otimes \dots \otimes \text{THH}(\mathbb{S}[a_n])_p^\wedge.$$

And hence equivalent to

$$\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e) \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[a_0, \dots, a_n]/\mathbb{F}_p) \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e) \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[a_0, \dots, a_n]/\mathbb{F}_p).$$

Let W be the fiber of $\varphi_p : \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e) \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e)^{tC_p}$, then we would like to understand $W \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[a_0, \dots, a_n]/\mathbb{F}_p)$. Note that $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e) \simeq \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} B_m$, where B_m is stated in Proposition 4.19. And hence the when $e \nmid m$, the unstable Frobenius map is equivalent to

$$\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p) \otimes B_{m/p} \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p)^{tC_p} \otimes B_{m/p} \rightarrow (\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p) \otimes B_m)^{tC_p}$$

where the second map is an equivalence. Let W_m be the fiber of the first map, then $W \simeq \prod_{m \geq 0} W_m$. Note that when $m \rightarrow \infty$, $e \nmid m$, we have that $\pi_{[m-1/e]-2} W_m \not\cong 0$,⁴ by the fact that the fiber of Frobenius map of $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p)$ is $\tau_{<0} \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p)^{tC_p}$. And $\mathrm{THH}_*(\mathbb{F}_p[a_0, \dots, a_n]/\mathbb{F}_p)/(a_0, \dots, a_n) \simeq \Lambda_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\sigma a_0, \dots, \sigma a_n)$. Hence $\pi_{[\frac{m-1}{e}]+|a_0|-1}(W \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathrm{HH}(\mathbb{F}_p[a_0, \dots, a_n]/\mathbb{F}_p)/(a_0, \dots, a_n)) \not\cong 0$. When m tends to ∞ , we get the desired statement. \square

Proof of Proposition 4.24. Let the fiber of the map in the statement be W_1 . Since $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)$ can be viewed as an \mathbb{E}_1 -BP $\langle n \rangle$ -algebra, and we have \mathbb{E}_2 -algebra map

$$\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e) \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)^{tC_p}.$$

Then the target of the map can be promoted to a BP $\langle n \rangle$ -module, therefore the map is well defined. We then apply $\mathrm{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p}$ to the algebras above. Thus the map is approximate by

$$\mathbb{F}_p \otimes_{\mathrm{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)} \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p \otimes_{\mathrm{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)} \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e))^{tC_p}.$$

Hence the fiber is approximate by the fiber of this map of filtered spectra. The associated graded $\pi_* \mathrm{gr} \mathrm{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \simeq \mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e[v_0, \dots, v_n]$, then by Proposition 4.13,

$$\mathrm{gr} \mathrm{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e) \simeq \mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e \otimes \mathbb{S}[v_0] \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{S}[v_n] = A.$$

Then W_1 has graded given by the fiber of the map

$$\mathrm{THH}(A)/(v_0, \dots, v_n) \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(A)^{tC_p}/(v_0, \dots, v_n)$$

which we denoted by W_2 . According to Proposition 4.25, W_2 is not bounded above. Hence, if the W_1 is bounded above, this will cause a contradiction. \square

Actually, the statement applied in a general setting.

Proposition 4.26. *Let Y be a pointed simply connected space, by [NS18, Corollary IV.3.3], we know that $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[\Omega Y]) \simeq \Sigma_+^\infty \mathcal{L}Y$. Suppose we have decomposition*

$$\Sigma_+^\infty \mathcal{L}Y \simeq \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} B_m$$

as S^1 -spectrum. Let $p > 2$, and F be any type $n + 2$ p -local generalized Moore complex, i.e. $F = \mathbb{S}/(p, v_1^{k_1}, \dots, v_{n+1}^{k_{n+1}})$. And assume further

- (1) When $m \rightarrow \infty$, the connectivity of B_m tends to ∞ .
- (2) The Frobenius of is given by product of $B_m \rightarrow B_{mp}^{tC_p}$, and $(B_m)^{tC_p} \simeq 0$ when $p \nmid m$.
- (3) For each B_m as a C_p -spectrum, lies in the thick subcategory that generated by \mathbb{S} and $\Sigma_+^\infty C_p$.

⁴Actually, by Proposition 4.9, we know that there is a sequence, $\{a_m\}$, with $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} a_m = \infty$, such that $\pi_{a_m}(W) \not\cong 0$.

Then the Frobenius map of $F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[\Omega Y])$ is equivalent to the product of maps

$$F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_m \rightarrow F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{tC_p} \otimes B_m^{tC_p} \rightarrow F \otimes (\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_m)^{tC_p}$$

where the second map is an equivalence, and the first map is a p -adic equivalence. If further more, there are sequences $\{a_k\}, \{f(a_k)\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$, such that $\pi_{f(a_k)} \mathbb{S}/p \otimes W \otimes B_{a_k} \neq 0$, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f(a_k) = \infty$, where W is the fiber of the Frobenius map of $F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)$, then

$$\boxed{F\text{-Segal conjecture for } \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[\Omega Y])}$$

fails. As a by-product, $F \otimes \mathrm{TR}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[\Omega Y])$ is not bounded.

Proof. The argument is same as before, first we have following equivalences by (1).

$$F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[\Omega Y]) \simeq \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_m \simeq \prod_{m \geq 0} F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_m.$$

And then by condition (1), (2), we have following commutative diagram. Hence the Frobenius factor as following,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[\Omega Y]) & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[\Omega Y])^{tC_p} \\ \simeq \downarrow & & \simeq \downarrow \\ \prod_{m \geq 0} F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_{m/p} & \xrightarrow{\varphi'} & F \otimes \prod_{m \geq 0} (\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_m)^{tC_p} \\ \mathrm{id} \otimes \varphi \otimes \varphi_m \downarrow & & \simeq \downarrow \\ \prod_{m \geq 0} F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{tC_p} \otimes B_m^{tC_p} & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \prod_{m \geq 0} F \otimes (\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_m)^{tC_p} \end{array}$$

The right lower map is an equivalence, by the fact F is finite then dualizable is Sp , thus commutes with products. Therefore, the total Frobenius map is product of maps

$$(4.5) \quad F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_m \rightarrow F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{tC_p} \otimes B_m^{tC_p} \rightarrow F \otimes (\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_m)^{tC_p}$$

where the second map is an equivalence by condition (3) and combining with the argument in [HW22, Proof of Proposition 4.2.2]. Now we are reduce to understand the first map in (4.5), we make following claim.

Claim 4.27. The first map in (4.5) is p -adically equivalent to

$$F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_m \rightarrow F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{tC_p} \otimes B_m$$

Proof. Note that according to [NS18, Theorem IV.3.7], we know that the Frobenius map

$$\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[\Omega Y]) \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[\Omega Y])^{tC_p}$$

is a p -adic equivalence, and then by smashing \mathbb{S}/p the map is also an equivalence. Since \mathbb{S}/p is compact, then it commutes with limits, hence

$$\mathbb{S}/p \otimes \varphi_m : \mathbb{S}/p \otimes B_{m/p} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}/p \otimes B_m^{tC_p}$$

is a equivalence. And note the after smashing \mathbb{S}/p with the first map in (4.5) the resulting map is equivalent to the original map, because $p > 2$. Then we arrive at the desired statement. □Claim

Suppose

$$\boxed{F\text{-Segal conjecture for } \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[\Omega Y])}$$

is true. By the previous discussion, the map in Claim 4.27 has bounded above fiber. However, this would cause a contradiction by condition (4). The last statement now follows from Theorem 4.7. \square

Corollary 4.28. *Let F be any p -local type $n+2$ finite complex, if $\mathbb{F}_p \otimes W \neq 0$. Where W is the fiber of $\varphi : F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \rightarrow F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{tC_p}$. Then $F \otimes \mathrm{TR}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[\Omega S^3])$ is not bounded, and also the F -Segal conjecture fails for $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[\Omega S^3])$. Actually, $\mathbb{F}_p \otimes W \neq 0$.*

Proof. By [BnrM22, §5, Lemma 4.9, Lemma 5.5], $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[\Omega S^3]) \simeq \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} B_m$, and then condition (1), (2), (3) in Proposition 4.26 hold.⁵ First, we claim following fact.

Claim 4.29. As spectra, $B_m \simeq \mathrm{Ind}_{C_m}^{S^1} S^{2m}$.

Proof. Note that we can construct a map

$$B_m \rightarrow \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} B_m \simeq \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[\Omega S^3]) \simeq \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} \mathrm{Ind}_{C_m}^{S^1} (S^2)^{\otimes m} \simeq \prod_{m \geq 0} \mathrm{Ind}_{C_m}^{S^1} (S^2)^{\otimes m} \rightarrow \mathrm{Ind}_{C_m}^{S^1} S^{2m}.$$

Now, applying $\mathbb{Z} \otimes -$, we have maps

$$\mathbb{Z} \otimes B_m \rightarrow \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} \mathbb{Z} \otimes B_m \simeq \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} \mathbb{Z} \otimes \mathrm{Ind}_{C_m}^{S^1} (S^2)^{\otimes m} \simeq \prod_{m \geq 0} \mathbb{Z} \otimes \mathrm{Ind}_{C_m}^{S^1} (S^2)^{\otimes m} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \otimes \mathrm{Ind}_{C_m}^{S^1} S^{2m}.$$

And this map induce equivalence on homotopy groups, by [BnrM22, Lemma 5.5], and the fact that $\mathrm{Ind}_{C_m}^{S^1} S^{2m} \simeq S^{2m} \oplus \Sigma S^{2m}$. Now both sides are connective spectra, then we conclude $B_m \simeq \mathrm{Ind}_{C_m}^{S^1} S^{2m} \simeq S^{2m} \oplus S^{2m+1}$ (this can be seen by filtering \mathbb{S} as $\tau_{\geq *}\mathbb{S}$, and consider the graded). \square_{Claim}

Now, let W be the fiber of the Frobenius map of $F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)$, suppose the F -Segal conjecture for $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[\Omega S^3])$ is true. Then there is $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that $W'(m) \in \mathrm{Sp}_{\leq k_0}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, where $W'(m)$ is the fiber of following map

$$F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_m \rightarrow F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{tC_p} \otimes (B_m)^{tC_p}.$$

This would imply that $W'(m) \otimes \mathbb{S}/p \in \mathrm{Sp}_{\leq k_0+1}$, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. And $W'(m) \otimes \mathbb{S}/p \simeq W \otimes B_m \otimes \mathbb{S}/p$, therefore $\mathbb{S}/p \otimes W \otimes B_m \in \mathrm{Sp}_{\leq k_0+1}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. However, by Claim 4.29, we have $\mathbb{S}/p \otimes W \otimes B_m \simeq \Sigma^{2m}(\mathbb{S}/p \otimes W) \oplus \Sigma^{2m+1}(\mathbb{S}/p \otimes W)$. By assumption, there is $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\pi_a(\mathbb{S}/p \otimes W) \neq 0$, hence $\pi_{a+2m}(\mathbb{S}/p \otimes W \otimes B_m) \neq 0$, when $a+2m > k_0$, this contradicts to $W \otimes \mathbb{F}_p \otimes B_m \in \mathrm{Sp}_{\leq k_0+1}$. Hence, F -Segal conjecture for $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[\Omega S^3])$ fails.

Now, we need to show that $\mathbb{S}/p \otimes W$ is not 0. Suppose $\mathbb{S}/p \otimes W \simeq 0$, then $\mathbb{F}_p \otimes W \simeq \mathbb{Z} \otimes \mathbb{S}/p \otimes W \simeq 0$. But this will contradicts to following fact, therefore $\mathbb{S}/p \otimes W \neq 0$.

Claim 4.30. $\mathbb{F}_p \otimes W \neq 0$

Sketch of Proof. One could use the argument in the proof of Proposition 4.20 to prove $W \otimes \mathbb{F}_p \neq 0$. One filtered $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{tC_p}$ using $\mathrm{desc}_{\mathbb{F}_p}$, the graded is $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[v_0, \dots, v_n])^{tC_p}$. Then one need to prove modulo $v_0^{i_0}, \dots, v_{n+1}^{i_{n+1}}$, $\mathbb{F}_p \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[v_0, \dots, v_n]^{tC_p}) \simeq \mathbb{F}_p \otimes \mathbb{F}_p \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p}$

⁵Actually, note that as \mathbb{E}_1 -algebras $\mathbb{S}[\Omega S^3]$ is equivalent to $\bigoplus_{k \geq 0} (S^2)^{\otimes k}$. By [Mat21, Theorem 3.8], we know that $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[\Omega S^3]) \simeq \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} \mathrm{Ind}_{C_m}^{S^1} (S^2)^{\otimes m}$ in $\mathrm{Fun}(\mathrm{BS}^1, \mathrm{Sp})$. So the decompositions seems equivalent.

$\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p[v_0, \dots, v_n])^{tC_p}$ has negative homotopy groups, which is literally the same proof with different symbols. □_{Claim}

□

However, when we replace $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle$ by BP the Segal conjecture holds, and even for MU . First recall that in [LeNR11, Theorem 1.1] they showed that the following Frobenius maps are p -adic equivalences.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{MU}) &\rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{MU})^{tC_p}, \\ \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}) &\rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP})^{tC_p}. \end{aligned}$$

Now using the argument before, we can prove the following.

Proposition 4.31. *The Frobenius maps*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{MU}[\Omega S^3]) &\rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{MU}[\Omega S^3])^{tC_p} \\ \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}[\Omega S^3]) &\rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}[\Omega S^3])^{tC_p} \end{aligned}$$

are p -adic equivalences. In general, for Y a space satisfies condition (1), (2), (3) in Proposition 4.26, then the Frobenius maps

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{MU}[\Omega Y]) &\rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{MU}[\Omega Y])^{tC_p} \\ \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}[\Omega Y]) &\rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}[\Omega Y])^{tC_p} \end{aligned}$$

are p -adic equivalences.

Proof. We only prove the BP case, for MU case, one only need to replace the symbol. As seen, S^3 satisfies the condition (1), (2), (3) in Proposition 4.26. Thus the Frobenius map is the product of following map

$$\mathbb{S}/p \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}) \otimes B_m \rightarrow \mathbb{S}/p \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP})^{tC_p} \otimes B_m \rightarrow \mathbb{S}/p \otimes (\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}) \otimes B_{mp})^{tC_p}$$

where the second map is an equivalence. The fiber of $\mathbb{S}/p \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}/p \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP})^{tC_p}$ is 0. Hence the first map induce isomorphism on homotopy groups. Thus the total Frobenius map induces isomorphism on homotopy groups. □

Now, in a same fashion, we can prove the following.

Proposition 4.32. *Let $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e) \simeq \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} B_m$ in Proposition 4.19. The Frobenius maps*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}[x]/x^e) &\rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}[x]/x^e), \\ \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e) &\rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{MU}[x]/x^e). \end{aligned}$$

are p -adic equivalences.

Proof. We only prove the cases for BP , according to Lemma 4.21, the Frobenius map is product of following maps

$$\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}) \otimes B_m \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP})^{tC_p} \otimes B_m \rightarrow (\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}) \otimes B_{mp})^{tC_p}$$

where the second map is an equivalence. After tensor with \mathbb{S}/p the first map has fiber equivalent to 0 by [LeNR11, Theorem 1.1], then the Frobenius map is a p -adic equivalence.⁶ \square

Now, we try to investigate the Frobenius of $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^e)$, as seen we first try to compute the Adams E_2 -page of $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^e$. Note that

$$\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^e \otimes \mathbb{F}_p \simeq \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^e \otimes \mathrm{BP} \otimes_{\mathrm{BP}} \mathbb{F}_p.$$

Since $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle/v_n^e$ is complex orientable, then the Tor spectral sequence has the formula

$$\mathrm{Tor}_{**}^{\mathrm{BP}*}(R_*[t_i], \mathbb{F}_p).$$

where $R_* = \mathrm{BP}\langle n, e \rangle_*$ and we have used the notation in Convention 2.23. Now write $S_* = \mathrm{BP}_*/(p, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1})$, we could identify the derived tensor products

$$(- \otimes_{\mathrm{BP}_*}^{\mathbb{L}} S_*) \otimes_{S_*}^{\mathbb{L}} \mathbb{F}_p \simeq - \otimes_{\mathrm{BP}_*}^{\mathbb{L}} \mathbb{F}_p.$$

Hence we get Cartan–Eilenberg (Grothendieck) spectral sequence

$$\mathrm{Tor}_{**}^{S_*}(\mathrm{Tor}_{**}^{\mathrm{BP}*}(R_*[t_i], S_*), \mathbb{F}_p) \implies \mathrm{Tor}_{**}^{\mathrm{BP}*}(R_*[t_i], \mathbb{F}_p).$$

Note that the image of p, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1} through the map $\mathrm{BP}_* \rightarrow \mathrm{BP}_*(\mathrm{BP}) \rightarrow R_*(\mathrm{BP}) \simeq R_*[t_i]$ forms a regular sequence, hence the higher tor groups of $\mathrm{Tor}_{**}^{\mathrm{BP}*}(R_*[t_i], S_*)$ vanish. And $R_*[t_i] \otimes_{\mathrm{BP}_*} S_* \simeq \mathbb{F}_p[v_n]/v_n^e[t_i]$, thus the spectral sequence has the formula

$$\mathbb{F}_p[v_n]/v_n^e[t_i] \otimes \Lambda(x_n, x_{n+1}, \dots).$$

This should be an sub-algebra of $(\mathbb{F}_p)_*(\mathbb{F}_p \otimes \mathbb{S}[v_n]/v_n^e)$, where $\mathbb{S}[v_n]$ is a free graded \mathbb{E}_2 -algebra, and the quotient of v_n^e is a truncation with respect to the weight, see [HW22, Appendix B.0.6]. Although, we couldn't compute the Adams E_2 -page of $\mathrm{BP}\langle n, e \rangle$ for $e > 1$ ⁷, but we could still investigate the Frobenius of $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p \otimes \mathbb{S}[v_0] \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{S}[v_{n-1}] \otimes \mathbb{S}[v_n]/v_n^e)$, in particular, one could ask the following question.

Question 4.33. Is there k_0 , such that $\forall k > k_0$ the map

$$\mathrm{THH}_k(\mathbb{F}_p \otimes \mathbb{S}[v_0] \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{S}[v_{n-1}] \otimes \mathbb{S}[v_n]/v_n^e) \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}_k(\mathbb{F}_p \otimes \mathbb{S}[v_0] \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{S}[v_{n-1}] \otimes \mathbb{S}[v_n]/v_n^e)^{tC_p}$$

is an isomorphism.

Remark 4.34. To investigate the above question, one may need to understand the structure of $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[v_n]/v_n^e)$. A natural expectation is that a similar decomposition exists. Alternatively, it is necessary to analyze the behavior of the Frobenius

$$\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p \otimes \mathbb{S}[v_n]/v_n^e) \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p \otimes \mathbb{S}[v_n]/v_n^e)^{tC_p},$$

as this constitutes the only remain unknown part.

Next, we analyze the behavior of the Frobenius of $\mathrm{THH}(\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle}(x))$. According to construction in Section 2, $\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle} = \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes \Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}(x)$. It is known that $\pi_*(\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}(x)) \simeq \Lambda_{\pi_*(\mathbb{S})}(\sigma x)$, and it is easy to construct a map from $\mathbb{S} \oplus \Sigma \mathbb{S}$ to $\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}_*}(\sigma x)$, namely taking the homotopy

⁶Note that, using the above argument, if one replaces $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP})$ with $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}) \simeq \mathbb{S}$, then one proves that $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e) \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e)^{tC_p}$ is an p -adic equivalence.

⁷It seems that the Adams E_2 -page should be $\mathbb{F}_p[v_n]/v_n^e[v_0, \dots, v_{n-1}]$.

classes $1, \sigma x$. And this map will induce an isomorphism between the homotopy groups of $\mathbb{S} \oplus \Sigma \mathbb{S}$ and homotopy groups of $\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}(x)$, therefore we have equivalence of spectra (\mathbb{S} -modules)

$$\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}(x) \simeq \mathbb{S} \oplus \Sigma \mathbb{S}.$$

And the same thing holds for $\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle}(x)$. Hence by [HLS24, Remark 5.7], we have following decomposition

$$\mathrm{THH}(\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle}(x)) \simeq \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \oplus \bigoplus_{k \geq 1} \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes \mathrm{Hom}((S^1/C_k)_+, (\Sigma^2 \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{\otimes k}).$$

And since $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)$ is connective, then the summand $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes \mathrm{Hom}((S^1/C_k)_+, (\Sigma^2 \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{\otimes k})$ is $2k - 1$ connected, so when $k \rightarrow \infty$, the connectivity of the summand tends to infinity, therefore we have following equivalences.

$$\mathrm{THH}(\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle}(x)) \simeq \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \oplus \prod \mathrm{Hom}((S^1/C_k)_+, (\Sigma^2 \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{\otimes k}),$$

$$\mathrm{THH}(\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle}(x))^{tC_p} \simeq \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{tC_p} \oplus \prod_{k \geq 1} (\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes \mathrm{Hom}((S^1/C_k)_+, (\Sigma^2 \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{\otimes k}))^{tC_p}.$$

This is because the direct sum is equivalent to the product, and then taking homotopy orbit and homotopy fixed point would commute with colimits and limits. So, as seen before the Frobenius map is the product of the following maps.

(1)

$$\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{tC_p}.$$

(2)

$$\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes \mathrm{Hom}((S^1/C_k)_+, (\Sigma^2 \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{\otimes k}) \rightarrow (\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes \mathrm{Hom}((S^1/C_k)_+, (\Sigma^2 \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{\otimes kp}))^{tC_p}.$$

As seen before, one could expect that for k sufficient large the fiber of type (2) map should have highly enough connectivity. Hence, one may expect the following.

Conjecture 4.35. *According to the above discussion, let F be a type $n + 2$ finite complex, assume that the fiber of the Frobenius map*

$$\begin{array}{c} F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes \mathrm{Hom}((S^1/C_k)_+, (\Sigma^2 \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{\otimes k}) \\ \downarrow \\ F \otimes (\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes \mathrm{Hom}((S^1/C_k)_+, (\Sigma^2 \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{\otimes kp}))^{tC_p} \end{array}$$

has connectivity $f(k)$, then $f(k) \rightarrow \infty$, when $k \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, one should have that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(p^n) = \infty$.

Or, one could expect the following.

Conjecture 4.36. *Let F be any type $n + 2$ finite complex, then*

$$\boxed{F\text{-Segal conjecture for } \mathrm{THH}(\Lambda_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle}(x))}$$

fails.

5. DESCENT SPECTRAL SEQUENCE

In this section, we study descent spectral sequences (and even filtration) computing THH of finite algebras over $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle$ constructed in Section 2. And also, we would like to investigate the canonical vanishing problem.

Note that $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{MU}[x]) \rightarrow \mathrm{MU}[x]$ is evenly free. We need to show that for any map of \mathbb{E}_1 -rings $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{MU}[x]) \rightarrow A$, where A is even, the push-out $\mathrm{MU}[x] \otimes_{\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{MU}[x])} A$ is even and free over A . Recall that $\mathrm{MU}[x] \otimes \mathrm{MU}[x]$ has homotopy as $(\mathrm{MU}_* \mathrm{MU})[x, y] \simeq \mathrm{MU}_*[x, x'] [x_i | i \in \mathbb{N}]$. Therefore $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{MU}[x])_* \simeq \Lambda_{\mathrm{MU}_*[x]}(\sigma x_i, \sigma x)$, which is odd. Hence the classes $\sigma x_i, \sigma x$ maps to 0 in $\pi_* A$, therefore the Tor spectral sequence computes $\mathrm{MU}[x] \otimes_{\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{MU}[x])} A$ is $A_* \otimes_{\mathrm{MU}_*[x]} \Gamma_{\mathrm{MU}_*[x]}(\sigma^2 x_i, \sigma^2 x; i \in \mathbb{N})$ which is concentrated on even degrees, hence the push-out $\mathrm{MU}[x] \otimes_{\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{MU}[x])} A$ is even. Now, combining with Proposition 2.32, we have following fact.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $\mathrm{fil}_{\mathrm{mot}}^*$ be the motivic filtration, then we have the following equivalence of filtered spectra.*

$$\mathrm{fil}_{\mathrm{mot}}^*(\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)) \simeq \lim_{\Delta} \tau_{\geq 2*}(\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e) \otimes \mathrm{MU}[x]^{\otimes_{\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e / \mathrm{MU}[x])} \bullet + 1})$$

Remark 5.2. In general, if A is an \mathbb{E}_3 -algebra, and B is an \mathbb{E}_2 - A -algebra, then we could view A, B as filtered algebras via Whitehead tower. And form the cosimplicial filtered object

$$[n] \mapsto B^{\otimes_A [n]},$$

then the geometrical realization of that cosimplicial sometimes gives some information about A . Then one can play the Adams tower trick, and apply Hopf algebroid method. In [LW22], the authors use the map $\mathrm{THH}(\mathcal{O}_K/\mathbb{S}_{W(k)}) \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathcal{O}_K/\mathbb{S}_{W(k)}[z])$ to get a descent tower. However, to compute $\mathrm{TC}(\mathcal{O}_K)_p^\wedge$, one need to show the mentioned two relative THH are actually cyclotomic spectra, i.e. to show the bases are cyclotomic bases. In the setting of motivic (even) filtration, one do not need cyclotomic bases, since the motivic filtration for THH is automatically cyclotomic.

As in [HW22], we make use of the following notations.

Convention 5.3. If A is an \mathbb{E}_2 -algebra, and M is a right A -module, hence M can be viewed as a A -bi module, and we have following equivalences.

$$\mathrm{THH}(A; M) = M \otimes_{A \otimes A^{\mathrm{op}}} A \simeq M \otimes_A \mathrm{THH}(A).$$

Hence we will have the $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e; \mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e) \simeq \mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e \otimes_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e} \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)$.

In the following, we assume that $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle$ equipped with an \mathbb{E}_∞ -algebra structure, for instance, $n \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$, or $p = 3, n = 2$, see [BR05], [HW22]. Using the calculation in [HW22, §6], we have the following result.

Proposition 5.4. *The E_2 -page of descent spectral sequence for*

$$\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e; \mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e) \rightarrow \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e / \mathrm{MU}[x]; \mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e)$$

is

$$E_2 = \mathbb{F}_p[\sigma^2 v_{n+1}] \otimes \Lambda(\sigma t_1, \sigma t_2, \dots, \sigma t_{n+1}) \otimes \Lambda_C(\sigma(x_1 - x_2))$$

where $\sigma^2 v_{n+1}, \sigma t_i$ are the same elements appeared in [HW22, Proposition 6.1.6], and $C = \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e / \mathbb{F}_p[x])$. When $p|e$, then spectral sequence collapses at E_2 -page.

Proof. We write $A = \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e; \mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e)$, $B = \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e / \mathrm{MU}[x]; \mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e)$, $A' = \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle; \mathbb{F}_p)$, $B' = \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle / \mathrm{MU}; \mathbb{F}_p)$. Then we viewed A, B as filtered algebras, via the Whitehead filtration, we could form the cosimplicial filtered spectrum

$$[n] \mapsto B^{\otimes_A [n]}.$$

Note that we have equivalences⁸

$$B \simeq \mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e \otimes_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle \otimes \mathbb{S}[x]/x^e} (\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle / \mathrm{MU}) \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e / \mathbb{S}[x])) \simeq B' \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e / \mathbb{S}[x]),$$

similarly, we have equivalence

$$A \simeq A' \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e) \simeq A' \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathbb{F}_p \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e).$$

So, $B \otimes_A B \simeq B' \otimes_{A'} B' \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathbb{F}_p \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e / \mathbb{S}[x]) \otimes_{\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e)} \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e / \mathbb{S}[x]) \simeq B' \otimes_{A'} B' \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathbb{F}_p \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{S}[x]/x^e / \mathbb{S}[x_1, x_2])$. Hence using Lemma 2.29, we have

$$\pi_*(B \otimes_A B) \simeq \pi_*(B' \otimes_{A'} B') \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \Gamma_{\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e}(\sigma^2 x^e, \sigma^2(x_1 - x_2)),$$

and

$$\pi_* B \simeq \pi_* B' \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e / \mathbb{F}_p[x]),$$

thus $\pi_*(B \otimes_A B)$ is flat over $\pi_* B$. Now we could compute the Ext group

$$\mathrm{Ext}_{\Sigma}^*(\pi_* B, \pi_* B),$$

where we denote $\Sigma := \pi_*(B \otimes_A B) \simeq \pi_*(B' \otimes_{A'} B') \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \Gamma_{\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e}(\sigma^2 x^e, \sigma^2(x_1 - x_2))$. Therefore the Ext group is computed by

$$\mathrm{Ext}_{\Sigma}(\pi_* B, \pi_* B) \simeq \mathrm{Ext}_{\pi_*(B' \otimes_{A'} B')}(\pi_* B', \pi_* B') \otimes \mathrm{Ext}_D(C, C),$$

where $C = \Gamma_{\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e}(\sigma^2 x^e)$, $D = \Gamma_{\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e}(\sigma^2 x^e, \sigma^2(x_1 - x_2))$.⁹ Finally, the Ext group is equivalence to

$$\mathbb{F}_p[\sigma^2 v_{n+1}] \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \Lambda_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\sigma t_1, \sigma t_2, \dots, \sigma t_{n+1}) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \Lambda_C(\sigma(x_1 - x_2)).$$

Note that in [HM97a], we have

$$\mathrm{HH}_*(\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e / \mathbb{F}_p) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e, & * = 0; \\ x\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e & * > 0 \text{ and even}; \\ \mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^{e-1} & * \text{ odd, and } (e, p) = 1; \\ \mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^{e-1} \oplus \mathbb{F}_p\{x^{e-1}\}, & * \text{ odd, and } p|e. \end{cases}$$

Therefore when $p|e$, then E_2 -page of the descent spectral sequence has the size same as $\pi_* A$, then in this case the spectral sequence collapses. \square

Remark 5.5. From the above proposition, and combining with the proof of canonical vanishing theorem in [HW22, §6], one could not directly prove canonical vanishing theorem for $\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)$, since the E_2 -page above is not a finitely generated $\mathbb{F}_p[\sigma^2 v_{n+1}]$ -module.

We can prove the following by a thick sub-category argument.

⁸It seems that the equivalence above could be only happen in Sp , however, if $n \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$, then $\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle$ are \mathbb{E}_{∞} -algebra, thus the equivalence would happen in CAlg .

⁹Note that D is relative injective, and D is free as C -module.

Proposition 5.6. *Suppose $p|e$, and let F be a type $n + 1$ finite complex, and F has a homotopy ring structure, then the elements in the kernel of the map*

$$F_*(\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)) \rightarrow F_*(\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e / \mathrm{MU}[x]))$$

are nilpotent.

Let M be the finite p -local \mathbb{E}_1 -ring constructed in [HW22, Proposition 6.2.1], note that we have $M \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e) \simeq \prod_{m \geq 0} M \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle) \otimes B_m$, and $B_0 \simeq \mathbb{S}$. We try to show following.

Proposition 5.7. *There is an element $z \in \pi_*(M \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e))$ such that the following holds.*

- (1) z is central.
- (2) z maps to a power of $\sigma^2 v_{n+1}$ inside $\pi_*(M \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e / \mathrm{MU}[x]))$.
- (3) There is a $m \geq 0$, such that $t^m z$ in the E_2 -page of homotopy fixed point spectral sequence detects the image of an central v_{n+1} -element from $\pi_* M$ inside $\pi_* M \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle)^{hS^1}$, and hence detects the image of v_{n+1} -element in $\pi_*(M \otimes \mathrm{TC}^-(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e))$.
- (4) $\pi_* M \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)$ is a $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}[z]$ -module.

Proof. Note that we have

$M \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e / \mathrm{MU}[x]) \simeq M \otimes \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e \otimes_{\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e} \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e / \mathrm{MU}[x])$, and $M \otimes \mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e$ is a sum of shift of $\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e$, and

$$\mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/\mathrm{MU}[x]; \mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e) \simeq \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle/\mathrm{MU}; \mathbb{F}_p) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathrm{HH}(\mathbb{F}_p[x]/x^e/\mathbb{F}_p[x]).$$

So, one could find a such lift z of $\sigma^2 v_{n+1}$ in $\pi_*(M \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e / \mathrm{MU}[x]))$ satisfies the condition (1), (2), (3), (4), by [HW22, Lemma 6.3.5]. \square

6. COMPUTATION FOR HEIGHT ONE CASE

In height -1 case, the computation of $\mathrm{TC}(\mathrm{BP}\langle n \rangle[x]/x^e)$ was presented in [HM97a], we will use the strategy and the computations in [AR02] to carry out some computations for $\mathrm{TC}(\ell[x]/x^e)$, where we use ℓ to denote $\mathrm{BP}\langle 1 \rangle$.

By Proposition 4.19, we have the following equivalence

$$\mathrm{THH}(\ell[x]/x^e) \simeq \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} \mathrm{THH}(\ell) \otimes B_m \simeq \prod_{m \geq 0} \mathrm{THH}(\ell) \otimes B_m,$$

and since the summand has connectivity tends to ∞ , we therefore have following equivalences

$$(6.1) \quad F \otimes \mathrm{TC}^-(\ell[x]/x^e) \simeq \prod_{m \geq 0} F \otimes (\mathrm{THH}(\ell) \otimes B_m)^{hS^1},$$

$$(6.2) \quad F \otimes \mathrm{TP}(\ell[x]/x^e) \simeq \prod_{m \geq 0} F \otimes (\mathrm{THH}(\ell) \otimes B_m)^{tS^1}.$$

Where F is a p -local type 2 generalized Moore spectrum, for instance, $F = V(1) = \mathbb{S}/(p, v_1)$, (we may assume $p > 3$ in the remaining context), and we know that

$$F \otimes \mathrm{TC}(\ell[x]/x^e) \simeq F \otimes \mathrm{TC}(\ell[x]/x^e, \mathbb{Z}_p) \simeq \mathrm{fib}(\mathrm{can}_p - \varphi_p : F \otimes \mathrm{TC}^-(\ell[x]/x^e, \mathbb{Z}_p) \rightarrow F \otimes \mathrm{TP}(\ell[x]/x^e, \mathbb{Z}_p)).$$

Recall a theorem that allow us to compute (6.1) and (6.2).

Proposition 6.1 ([HN20, Proposition 3]). *Let G be a compact Lie group, $H \subset G$ be a closed subgroup, let $\lambda = T_H(G/H)$ be the tangent space at $H = eH$ with adjoint left H -action. Let S^λ denote the compactification of λ , then for any G -spectrum X , we have the following equivalences which are natural.*

$$\begin{aligned} (X \otimes (G/H)_+)^{hG} &\simeq (X \otimes S^\lambda)^{hH}, \\ (X \otimes (G/H)_+)^{tG} &\simeq (X \otimes S^\lambda)^{tH}. \end{aligned}$$

In our case, X is $\mathrm{THH}(\ell) \otimes S^{V_a}$, $H = C_m$, and $G = S^1$, hence applying Proposition 6.1, Proposition 4.19, we have the following equivalences.

$$\begin{aligned} F \otimes \mathrm{TC}^-(\ell[x]/x^e, \mathbb{Z}_p) &\simeq \prod_{e \nmid m} (\Sigma^{\lfloor \frac{m-1}{e} \rfloor + 1} (F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\ell)^{hC_p^{v_p(m)}})) \times \prod_{k=m/e \geq 1} \mathrm{cofib}(\Sigma^{\lfloor \frac{m-1}{e} \rfloor + 1} V_{v_p(e), v_p(m)}); \\ F \otimes \mathrm{TP}(\ell[x]/x^e, \mathbb{Z}_p) &\simeq \prod_{e \nmid m} (\Sigma^{\lfloor \frac{m-1}{e} \rfloor + 1} (F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\ell)^{tC_p^{v_p(m)}})) \times \prod_{k=m/e \geq 1} \mathrm{cofib}(\Sigma^{\lfloor \frac{m-1}{e} \rfloor + 1} V_{v_p(e), v_p(m)}). \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 4.23, $V(2) \otimes \mathrm{TR}(\ell[x]/x^e)$ is not bounded, so one would not expect that $V(2) \otimes \mathrm{TC}(\ell[x]/x^e)$ is not bounded, however, this is still not clear. According to the above decomposition, we will mainly focus on the easy part. First recall the calculations in [AR02], we have following.

Proposition 6.2 ([AR02, Proposition 6.2, 6.5]). *The associated graded of the Tate spectral sequence computing $V(1)_*(\mathrm{THH}(\ell)^{tC_{p^{n+1}}})$ is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{E}^\infty(C_{p^{n+1}}) &= \Lambda_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \otimes P_{r(2n)+1}(t\mu) \otimes P(t^{p^{2n+2}}, t^{-p^{2n+2}}) \oplus \\ &\bigoplus_{k=3}^{2n+2} \Lambda(u_{n+1}, \lambda'_{[k]}) \otimes P_{r(k-2)}(t\mu) \otimes \mathbb{F}_p\{\lambda_{[k]} t^i | v_p(i) = k-1\}. \end{aligned}$$

The associated graded of the homotopy fixed pointed spectral sequence computing $V(1)_(\mathrm{THH}(\ell)^{hC_{p^n}})$ maps by a $(2p-2)$ -coconnected map to*

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^{-1} E^\infty(C_{p^n}) &= \Lambda(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \otimes P_{r(2n)+1}(t\mu) \otimes P(\mu^{p^{2n}}, \mu^{-p^{2n}}) \oplus \\ &\bigoplus_{k=1}^{2n} \Lambda(u_n, \lambda'_{[k]}) \otimes P_{r(k)}(t\mu) \otimes \mathbb{F}_p\{\lambda_{[k]} \mu^j | v_p(j) = k-1\}. \end{aligned}$$

The Frobenius map sends $\lambda_1 \mu^{p^{2n-2}}, \lambda_2 \mu^{p^{2n-1}}, \mu^{p^{2n}}$ respectively to $\lambda_1 t^{-p^{2n}}, \lambda_2 t^{-p^{2n+1}}, t^{-p^{2n+2}}$.

Remark 6.3. We have an equivalence

$$F \otimes \mathrm{TC}(\ell[x]/x^e) \simeq \mathrm{fib}(\mathrm{can}_p - \varphi : F \otimes \mathrm{TC}^-(\ell[x]/x^e) \rightarrow F \otimes \mathrm{TP}(\ell[x]/x^e)).$$

A summand of this is

$$\mathrm{fib}(\mathrm{can}_p - \varphi_p : \prod_{e \nmid m} (\Sigma^{\lfloor \frac{m-1}{e} \rfloor + 1} (F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\ell)^{hC_p^{v_p(m)}})) \rightarrow \prod_{e \nmid m} (\Sigma^{\lfloor \frac{m-1}{e} \rfloor + 1} (F \otimes \mathrm{THH}(\ell)^{tC_p^{v_p(m)}})))$$

We know that v_2 is detected by $t\mu$ in $V(1)_* \mathrm{TC}^-(\ell)$. Let $A = \Lambda_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \otimes P(t^{p^{2n+2}})$, $B = \bigoplus_{k=3}^{2n+2} \Lambda(u_{n+1}, \lambda'_{[k]}) \otimes \mathbb{F}_p\{\lambda_{[k]} t^i | v_p(i) = k-1\}$, then $\hat{E}^\infty(C_{p^{n+1}})/(t\mu) = A \oplus B$. We know that both canonical map and Frobenius map send λ_1, λ_2 to the same name elements in the target.

Hence these classes will contribute to the homotopy groups on $V(1)_* \mathrm{TC}(\ell[x]/x^e)/(v_2)$, i.e. we have following fact.

Proposition 6.4. *Let $e > 1$. $\pi_{[\frac{m-1}{e}] + 2p-1}(V(1) \otimes \mathrm{TC}(\ell[x]/x^e)/(v_2)) \not\cong 0$, and one of the generator is λ_1 as \mathbb{F}_p -vector space, and $\pi_{[\frac{m-1}{e}] + 2p^2-1}(V(1) \otimes \mathrm{TC}(\ell[x]/x^e)/(v_2)) \not\cong 0$, one of the generator is λ_2 , and $\pi_{[\frac{m-1}{e}] + 2p^2-2}(V(1) \otimes \mathrm{TC}(\ell[x]/x^e)/(v_2)) \not\cong 0$, one of the generator is $\partial\lambda_2$. Hence, when $m \rightarrow \infty$, we get that $\mathrm{TC}(\ell[x]/x^e)/(p, v_1, v_2)$ is not bounded. Therefore the spectrum $\mathrm{TC}(\ell[x]/x^e)/(p, v_1, v_2)$ is not bounded, hence $\mathrm{TC}((\ell[x]/x^e)_p^\wedge)_p^\wedge$ is not a fp spectrum of type 2.*

REFERENCES

- [AK21] Gabriel Angelini-Knoll. On topological Hochschild homology of the $K(1)$ -local sphere. *J. Topol.*, 14(1):258–290, 2021.
- [AKHW24] Gabriel Angelini-Knoll, Jeremy Hahn, and Dylan Wilson. Syntomic cohomology of Morava K -theory, 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.07048>.
- [AN21] Benjamin Antieau and Thomas Nikolaus. Cartier modules and cyclotomic spectra. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 34(1):1–78, 2021.
- [Ang08] Vignleik Angeltveit. Topological Hochschild homology and cohomology of A_∞ ring spectra. *Geom. Topol.*, 12(2):987–1032, 2008.
- [AR02] Christian Ausoni and John Rognes. Algebraic K -theory of topological K -theory. *Acta Math.*, 188(1):1–39, 2002.
- [BGT13] Andrew J. Blumberg, David Gepner, and Gonçalo Tabuada. A universal characterization of higher algebraic K -theory. *Geom. Topol.*, 17(2):733–838, 2013.
- [BHLS23] Robert Burklund, Jeremy Hahn, Ishan Levy, and Tomer M. Schlank. K -theoretic counterexamples to Ravenel’s telescope conjecture, 2023. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.17459>.
- [BnrM22] Haldun Özgür Bayındır and Tasos Moulinos. Algebraic K -theory of $\mathrm{THH}(\mathbb{F}_p)$. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 375(6):4177–4207, 2022.
- [BR05] Andrew Baker and Birgit Richter. On the Γ -cohomology of rings of numerical polynomials and E_∞ structures on K -theory. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 80(4):691–723, 2005.
- [BSY22] Robert Burklund, Tomer M. Schlank, and Allen Yuan. The chromatic nullstellensatz, 2022. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.09929>.
- [Bur22] Robert Burklund. Multiplicative structures on Moore spectra, 2022. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.14787>.
- [CMNN24] Dustin Clausen, Akhil Mathew, Niko Naumann, and Justin Noel. Descent and vanishing in chromatic algebraic K -theory via group actions. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 57(4):1135–1190, 2024.
- [DFHH14] Christopher L. Douglas, John Francis, André G. Henriques, and Michael A. Hill, editors. *Topological modular forms*, volume 201 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2014.
- [GIKR22] Bogdan Gheorghe, Daniel C. Isaksen, Achim Krause, and Nicolas Ricka. \mathbb{C} -motivic modular forms. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 24(10):3597–3628, 2022.
- [Hah22] Jeremy Hahn. On the Bousfield classes of H_∞ -ring spectra, 2022. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1612.04386>.
- [Hes18] Lars Hesselholt. Topological Hochschild homology and the Hasse-Weil zeta function. In *An alpine bouquet of algebraic topology*, volume 708 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 157–180. Amer. Math. Soc., [Providence], RI, [2018] ©2018.
- [HLS24] Jeremy Hahn, Ishan Levy, and Andrew Senger. Crystallinity for reduced syntomic cohomology and the mod (p, v_1^{n-2}) K -theory of \mathbb{Z}/p^n , 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.20543>.
- [HM97a] Lars Hesselholt and Ib Madsen. Cyclic polytopes and the K -theory of truncated polynomial algebras. *Invent. Math.*, 130(1):73–97, 1997.

- [HM97b] Lars Hesselholt and Ib Madsen. On the K -theory of finite algebras over Witt vectors of perfect fields. *Topology*, 36(1):29–101, 1997.
- [HN20] Lars Hesselholt and Thomas Nikolaus. Algebraic K -theory of planar cuspidal curves. In *K -theory in algebra, analysis and topology*, volume 749 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 139–148. Amer. Math. Soc., [Providence], RI, [2020] ©2020.
- [HRW24] Jeremy Hahn, Arpon Raksit, and Dylan Wilson. A motivic filtration on the topological cyclic homology of commutative ring spectra, 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.11208>.
- [HW22] Jeremy Hahn and Dylan Wilson. Redshift and multiplication for truncated Brown–Peterson spectra. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 196(3):1277–1351, 2022.
- [LeNR11] Sverre Lunø e Nielsen and John Rognes. The Segal conjecture for topological Hochschild homology of complex cobordism. *J. Topol.*, 4(3):591–622, 2011.
- [LP24] David Jongwon Lee and Piotr Pstragowski. The monochromatic Hahn-Wilson conjecture, 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.08029>.
- [Lur09] Jacob Lurie. *Higher topos theory*, volume 170 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2009.
- [Lur17] Jacob Lurie. Higher algebra, 2017. <https://www.math.ias.edu/~lurie/papers/HA.pdf>.
- [LW22] Ruochuan Liu and Guozhen Wang. Topological cyclic homology of local fields. *Invent. Math.*, 230(2):851–932, 2022.
- [Mat21] Akhil Mathew. On $K(1)$ -local TR. *Compos. Math.*, 157(5):1079–1119, 2021.
- [MR99] Mark Mahowald and Charles Rezk. Brown-Comenetz duality and the Adams spectral sequence. *Amer. J. Math.*, 121(6):1153–1177, 1999.
- [NS18] Thomas Nikolaus and Peter Scholze. On topological cyclic homology. *Acta Math.*, 221(2):203–409, 2018.
- [Rav92] Douglas C. Ravenel. *Nilpotence and periodicity in stable homotopy theory*, volume 128 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1992. Appendix C by Jeff Smith.
- [Voe11] Vladimir Voevodsky. On motivic cohomology with \mathbb{Z}/l -coefficients. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 174(1):401–438, 2011.
- [Wal84] Friedhelm Waldhausen. Algebraic K -theory of spaces, localization, and the chromatic filtration of stable homotopy. In *Algebraic topology, Aarhus 1982 (Aarhus, 1982)*, volume 1051 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 173–195. Springer, Berlin, 1984.
- [Yua21] Allen Yuan. Examples of chromatic redshift in algebraic K -theory, 2021. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.10837>.

Email address: rxfang21@m.fudan.edu.cn

SHANGHAI CENTER FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, FUDAN UNIVERSITY, 2005 SONGHU ROAD 200438, SHANGHAI, CHINA