

**PROFINITE DIRECT SUMS WITH APPLICATIONS TO PROFINITE  
GROUPS OF TYPE  $\Phi_R$**

JIACHENG TANG

ABSTRACT. We show that the “profinite direct sum” is a good notion of infinite direct sums for profinite modules having properties similar to direct sums of abstract modules. For example, the profinite direct sum of projective modules is projective, and there is a Mackey’s Formula for profinite modules described using these sums. As an application, we prove that the class of profinite groups of type  $\Phi_R$  is closed under subgroups.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $R$  be a profinite ring. The category of profinite  $R$ -modules is abelian with well-behaved limits, but categorical coproducts are not exact in general. This means that, in practice, coproducts of profinite modules are difficult to work with. Instead, [1] and [2] propose a different kind of direct sum, which we call the *profinite direct sum* (following [3]), that is much better-behaved. For example, [2, Chapter 9] uses this profinite direct sum to establish a Mayer-Vietoris sequence for profinite groups acting on profinite trees. Since its invention in [1], the profinite direct sum has been treated mostly algebraically, until a categorical formalisation was recently found in [3]<sup>1</sup>. This connection will prove useful in the development of the theory later.

**Aim and Main Results.** The aim of this paper is to show that the profinite direct sum has excellent module-theoretic and homological properties. In some sense, this should be the correct notion of a direct sum for profinite modules, rather than the categorical coproduct. The following two results give an indication of why that is the case. We point out the strong resemblance to abstract modules over an abstract ring.

Given a family of profinite  $R$ -modules  $\{M_x\}_{x \in X}$  indexed by a profinite space  $X$  (with some compatibility conditions), we denote their profinite direct sum by  $\widehat{\bigoplus}_{x \in X} M_x$  or simply  $\widehat{\bigoplus}_X M_x$ , which is also a profinite  $R$ -module (Definition 2.3). The reader should think of this as being analogous to the usual direct sum  $\bigoplus_X M_x$  of abstract modules  $M_x$  indexed by a set  $X$ .

**Corollary 2.15(ii).** *The profinite direct sum  $\widehat{\bigoplus}_X M_x$  has projective dimension  $\leq d$  if and only if for each  $x \in X$ ,  $M_x$  has projective dimension  $\leq d$ .*

**Theorem 2.19** (Profinite Mackey’s Formula). *Let  $G$  be a profinite group and  $H, K$  closed subgroups (which are not necessarily open). If  $M$  is a profinite right  $R[[H]]$ -module, then there is an isomorphism of profinite right  $R[[K]]$ -modules*

$$\text{Res}_K^G \text{Ind}_H^G M = \widehat{\bigoplus}_{g \in H \backslash G / K} \text{Ind}_{K \cap g^{-1} H g}^K \text{Res}_{K \cap g^{-1} H g}^{g^{-1} H g} M g.$$

Email: jiacheng.tang@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk, University of Manchester.

<sup>1</sup>A similar theory has been independently developed in [4].

Although these results seem purely algebraic, [3] proves an equivalence between profinite direct sums (algebraic viewpoint) and “spaces of global cosections of cosheaves” (categorical viewpoint), which we state formally in Proposition 2.6. The ability to switch between the two perspectives will prove to be extremely valuable, as proofs are often easier from one perspective than the other.

We highlight a concrete application of profinite direct sums/Mackey’s Formula to profinite groups of type  $\Phi_R$ . To avoid clogging the introduction with technical backgrounds, we will simply define type  $\Phi_R$  here and leave the motivations to the start of Section 3.1.

Let  $G$  be a profinite group and  $R$  a profinite ring. We say that  $G$  is of type  $\Phi_R$  (Definition 3.1) if a profinite  $R[[G]]$ -module has finite projective dimension whenever its restriction to every finite subgroup of  $G$  has finite projective dimension. For some of the proofs to work, the ring  $R$  needs to satisfy some conditions, which we will state in Section 3, but examples include  $R = \mathbb{F}_p$  and  $R = \mathbb{Z}_p$ .

**Corollary 3.7.** *Let  $G$  be a profinite group. Suppose one of the following holds:*

- (a)  $G$  has finite  $\text{vcd}_R$ .
- (b)  $G$  acts on a profinite tree  $T$  with finite (vertex and edge) stabilisers.

*Then  $G$  is of type  $\Phi_R$ .*

**Theorem 3.10.** *There exist profinite groups of type  $\Phi_{\mathbb{F}_p}$  which are not of finite  $\text{vcd}_{\mathbb{F}_p}$ .*

**Proposition 3.5.** *If a profinite group  $G$  is of type  $\Phi_R$  then so is every closed subgroup  $H$  of  $G$ .*

The proofs of the results above will use facts about profinite direct sums that we develop along the way.

**Outline of Paper.** We will assume basic knowledge of profinite groups (refer to [5]), profinite graphs (refer to [2]), category theory (refer to [6]), sheaf theory (refer to [7]) and homological algebra (refer to [8]). Profinite graphs are used only in the last subsection (Section 3.3) to construct examples, so readers who are unfamiliar with the topic should not feel deterred.

In Section 2.1, we define sheaves and cosheaves over profinite rings (categorical viewpoint) and explain their connections to profinite direct sums (algebraic viewpoint). The ability to switch between the two viewpoints will allow us to easily establish categorical properties of cosheaves (Section 2.2). In Appendix A, we also construct a tensor product for cosheaves. Section 2.3 contains our main results, including Mackey’s Formula (Theorem 2.19).

The results we prove in Section 2 are then applied in Section 3 to understand profinite groups of type  $\Phi_R$ . Section 3.2 is devoted to exploring the properties of profinite groups of type  $\Phi_R$ , whilst the reader can find examples of such groups in Section 3.3, which include all profinite groups of finite  $\text{vcd}_R$  (with some conditions on  $R$ ).

Remark: Whenever we write “=” in this paper, we mean isomorphic, usually canonically isomorphic (or equivalent in the case of categories).

Convention: All rings are associative with a 1 but are not necessarily commutative (except in Section 3). When unspecified, all of our one-sided modules are right modules.

**Acknowledgements.** The author would like to thank his supervisor Peter Symonds for his constant guidance, the following people (in alphabetical order) for helpful discussions on the subject matter: Matthew Antrobus, Calum Hughes, Gregory Kendall, Adrian Miranda, Gareth Wilkes, and Julian Wykowski, as well as the following people for reading drafts of this paper and giving useful feedback: Matthew Antrobus, Gregory Kendall.

## 2. (CO)SHEAVES OVER PROFINITE RINGS

In this section, we shall define sheaves and cosheaves over profinite rings and study their properties. The first two subsections are more categorical, so readers looking for algebraic applications might want to move swiftly on to Section 2.3, where we discuss properties of the profinite direct sum  $\hat{\oplus}$ . The only crucial definition is that of the profinite direct sum, which can be found in Definition 2.3.

**2.1. Definitions and Equivalence.** In this subsection, we will give the categorical definition of cosheaves (Definition 2.1) and the algebraic viewpoint (Definition 2.3) and explain how these are equivalent.

Let **Top** and **Pro** denote the categories of topological spaces and profinite spaces respectively. Given a profinite ring  $R$ , let **DMod**( $R$ ) and **PMod**( $R$ ) denote the categories of discrete and profinite  $R$ -modules respectively, which are dual by Pontryagin Duality. Given a topological space  $X$ , let  $O_c(X)$  denote the poset category of clopen subspaces of  $X$ .

**Definition 2.1** ([3]). Let  $R$  be a profinite ring. A *presheaf of discrete (topological)  $R$ -modules* is a pair  $(\mathcal{M}, X)$ , where  $X$  is a profinite space and  $\mathcal{M}$  is a functor  $O_c(X)^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{DMod}(R)$ . A *morphism of presheaves*  $(\Phi, f): (\mathcal{M}, X) \rightarrow (\mathcal{N}, Y)$  consists of a continuous map  $f: Y \rightarrow X$  and a natural transformation  $\Phi: \mathcal{M} \circ p_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{N} \circ f^*$  between the functors

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M} \circ p_1: O_c(X)^{\text{op}} \times O_c(Y)^{\text{op}} &\rightarrow \mathbf{DMod}(R), & (U, V) &\mapsto \mathcal{M}(U), \\ \mathcal{N} \circ f^*: O_c(X)^{\text{op}} \times O_c(Y)^{\text{op}} &\rightarrow \mathbf{DMod}(R), & (U, V) &\mapsto \mathcal{N}(f^{-1}(U) \cap V). \end{aligned}$$

A presheaf  $(\mathcal{M}, X)$  is a *sheaf* if for every clopen subspace  $U \subseteq X$  and every finite clopen cover  $U = U_1 \cup \cdots \cup U_n$ , the following canonical diagram is an equaliser:

$$\mathcal{M}(U) \rightarrow \prod_i \mathcal{M}(U_i) \rightrightarrows \prod_{i,j} \mathcal{M}(U_i \cap U_j).$$

By [3, Proposition 1.4], this is equivalent to saying that for every clopen subspace  $U \subseteq X$  and every decomposition  $U = U_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup U_n$  into finitely many clopen subspaces, the natural map  $\mathcal{M}(U) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}(U_i)$  is an isomorphism.

Let us denote the category of sheaves of discrete  $R$ -modules by **Sh**( $R$ ).

Dually, a *precosheaf of profinite  $R$ -modules* is a pair  $(\mathcal{M}, X)$ , where  $X$  is a profinite space and  $\mathcal{M}$  is a functor  $O_c(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{PMod}(R)$ . A *morphism of precosheaves*  $(\Psi, f): (\mathcal{M}, X) \rightarrow (\mathcal{N}, Y)$  consists of a continuous map  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  and a natural transformation  $\Psi: \mathcal{M} \circ f^* \rightarrow \mathcal{N} \circ p_2$  between the functors

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M} \circ f^*: O_c(X) \times O_c(Y) &\rightarrow \mathbf{PMod}(R), & (U, V) &\mapsto \mathcal{M}(U \cap f^{-1}(V)), \\ \mathcal{N} \circ p_2: O_c(X) \times O_c(Y) &\rightarrow \mathbf{PMod}(R), & (U, V) &\mapsto \mathcal{N}(V). \end{aligned}$$

A precosheaf  $(\mathcal{M}, X)$  is a *cosheaf* if for every clopen subspace  $U \subseteq X$  and every decomposition  $U = U_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup U_n$  into finitely many clopen subspaces, the natural map  $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}(U_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(U)$  is an isomorphism.

Let us denote the category of cosheaves of profinite  $R$ -modules by **CoSh**( $R$ ).

(Sometimes, we will abuse notation and write  $\mathcal{M}$  for a (co)sheaf instead of  $(\mathcal{M}, X)$  when  $X$  is understood.)

By [3, Proposition 1.5], the cosheaf category **CoSh**( $R$ ) is dual to the sheaf category **Sh**( $R$ ) via Pontryagin Duality. Although sheaves are perhaps more common than cosheaves in the literature, many of our results later will be from the perspective of cosheaves, since that was the viewpoint when cosheaves of profinite modules were first considered (see [1]).

As pointed out in [3, Section 1], the main differences between  $\mathbf{Sh}(R)$  and usual sheaf categories are that the space  $X$  can vary, and that the sheaf condition talks about finite clopen covers (rather than arbitrary open covers). Note that, by compactness of profinite spaces, we can change “finite clopen cover” to “arbitrary clopen cover” in the definition if we want. Let us now see that  $\mathbf{Sh}(R)$  really is closely related to usual sheaf categories.

First observe that we could have just considered sheaves  $O(X)^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{DMod}(R)$ , where  $O(X)$  is the poset category of open subspaces of  $X$ , instead of  $O_c(X)^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{DMod}(R)$ . Indeed, there is an obvious map of Grothendieck sites  $O(X) \rightarrow O_c(X)$  (given by the inclusion of clopen subsets into open subsets). This induces an equivalence between sheaves on  $O(X)$  and sheaves on  $O_c(X)$ : as every open subset of a profinite space is a union of clopen subsets (see [5, Theorem 1.1.12]), the value of a sheaf  $\mathcal{F}(U)$  on an open  $U$  is uniquely determined by its values  $\mathcal{F}(V)$  on clopen subsets  $V$ . One benefit, however, of using  $O_c(X)$  is that the sheaf condition can be reduced to one which mentions only disjoint finite covers, rather than all finite covers.

Suppose we have two sheaves  $(\mathcal{M}, X)$  and  $(\mathcal{N}, Y)$ . A map of Grothendieck sites from  $O_c(X)$  to  $O_c(Y)$  is precisely a continuous map  $f: Y \rightarrow X$ . Let  $\mathbf{Sh}(R)'$  be the category whose objects are sheaves  $(\mathcal{M}, X)$ , and where a morphism  $(\Theta, f): (\mathcal{M}, X) \rightarrow (\mathcal{N}, Y)$  consists of a continuous map  $f: Y \rightarrow X$  (i.e. a map of sites) and a natural transformation  $\Theta: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N} \circ f^{-1}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} O_c(X)^{\text{op}} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{M}} & \mathbf{DMod}(R) \\ & \searrow f^{-1} & \Downarrow \Theta \\ & & O_c(Y)^{\text{op}} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \nearrow \mathcal{N} \end{array}$$

This is the most natural way to define a category of sheaves where the space can vary. Although it seems a priori that  $\mathbf{Sh}(R)'$  and  $\mathbf{Sh}(R)$  are different, they turn out to be the same:

**Proposition 2.2.** *The categories  $\mathbf{Sh}(R)'$  and  $\mathbf{Sh}(R)$  are equivalent (even isomorphic).*

*Proof.* Define a functor  $\alpha: \mathbf{Sh}(R)' \rightarrow \mathbf{Sh}(R)$  which is the identity on objects. Given a morphism  $(\Theta, f): (\mathcal{M}, X) \rightarrow (\mathcal{N}, Y)$  in  $\mathbf{Sh}(R)'$ , define  $\alpha(\Theta, f) = (\Phi, f): (\mathcal{M}, X) \rightarrow (\mathcal{N}, Y)$  in  $\mathbf{Sh}(R)$ , where  $\Phi: \mathcal{M} \circ p_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{N} \circ f^*$  is the following natural transformation. Its component  $\Phi_{(U,V)}$  on  $(U, V) \in O_c(X)^{\text{op}} \times O_c(Y)^{\text{op}}$  is the composite

$$\mathcal{M}(U) \xrightarrow{\Theta_U} \mathcal{N}(f^{-1}(U)) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(f^{-1}(U) \cap V).$$

On the other hand, define a functor  $\beta: \mathbf{Sh}(R) \rightarrow \mathbf{Sh}(R)'$  which is also the identity on objects. Given a morphism  $(\Phi, f): (\mathcal{M}, X) \rightarrow (\mathcal{N}, Y)$  in  $\mathbf{Sh}(R)$ , define  $\beta(\Phi, f) = (\Theta, f): (\mathcal{M}, X) \rightarrow (\mathcal{N}, Y)$  in  $\mathbf{Sh}(R)'$ , where  $\Theta: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N} \circ f^{-1}$  is the following natural transformation. Its component on  $U \in O_c(X)$  is simply  $\Theta_U = \Phi_{(U,Y)}$ .

It is easy to check that  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are inverse to each other. □

From now on, we will work mostly with  $\mathbf{CoSh}(R)$  rather than  $\mathbf{Sh}(R)$ , because that is the viewpoint of [1] and [2]. Results about sheaves of discrete  $R$ -modules may be obtained by duality. By [3, Theorem 3.3], the category  $\mathbf{CoSh}(R)$  is equivalent to the category of “sheaves of profinite  $R$ -modules”, analogous to “sheaves of profinite groups” defined in [2, Chapter 5]. Let us define “sheaves of  $R$ -modules” here and explain the equivalence briefly. “Sheaves” should be regarded as the more algebraic viewpoint of cosheaves.

**Warning:** As pointed out in [3], the “sheaves of profinite  $R$ -modules” we are about to define are really cosheaves, dual to genuine sheaves of discrete  $R$ -modules. We shall stick to the (unfortunate) historical terminology of “sheaves”, but to avoid confusion, we will always use quotation marks to refer to these “sheaves”.

**Definition 2.3** ([2] Section 5.1). Let  $R$  be a profinite ring. A “sheaf of (profinite, right)  $R$ -modules” is a triple  $(M, p, X)$ , where  $M$  and  $X$  are profinite spaces and  $p: M \rightarrow X$  is a continuous surjection, such that each fibre  $M_x = p^{-1}(x)$  has the structure of a profinite  $R$ -module making the following maps continuous:

$$\begin{aligned} M \times R &\rightarrow M, & (m, r) &\mapsto mr, \\ M \times_X M &\rightarrow M, & (m, n) &\mapsto m + n. \end{aligned}$$

A morphism of “sheaves”  $(M, p, X) \rightarrow (N, q, Y)$  consists of continuous maps  $\psi: M \rightarrow N$  and  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  such that  $q\psi = fp$  and such that each  $\psi|_x: M_x \rightarrow N_{f(x)}$  is an  $R$ -module homomorphism.

Every profinite  $R$ -module can be canonically viewed as a “sheaf” over the one-point space. Given a “sheaf”  $(M, p, X)$ , its *profinite direct sum* is a profinite  $R$ -module  $\widehat{\bigoplus}_{x \in X} M_x$  together with a morphism  $M \rightarrow \widehat{\bigoplus}_X M_x$ , which is universal with respect to this property i.e. such that for every profinite  $R$ -module  $N$  and every “sheaf” morphism  $M \rightarrow N$ , there is a unique map (of profinite  $R$ -modules)  $\widehat{\bigoplus}_X M_x \rightarrow N$  making the relevant triangle commute.

(Sometimes, we will abuse notation and write  $M$  for a “sheaf” instead of  $(M, p, X)$  when  $X$  and  $p$  are understood. In fact, we have already done this in the above definition!)

**Proposition 2.4** ([2] Proposition 5.1.2). *Let  $(M, p, X)$  be a “sheaf” of profinite  $R$ -modules. Then its profinite direct sum  $\widehat{\bigoplus}_X M_x$  exists (and can be constructed as a completion of the abstract direct sum).*

Remark: We are using the symbol  $\widehat{\bigoplus}$  for the profinite direct sum as it is a completion of the usual direct sum. The symbol  $\bigoplus$  is used in [1], [2] and [9], while the symbol  $\boxplus$  is used in [3] and [10]. Results in [2, Section 5] are mostly stated for “sheaves” of profinite groups rather than modules. The corresponding results for modules can be found in [10, Appendix A].

**Example 2.5.** The following fundamental examples of “sheaves” and profinite direct sums are given in [2, Examples 5.1.1, 5.1.3 and 5.6.4].

- (i) Suppose we have a family of profinite  $R$ -modules  $\{M_x\}_{x \in X}$  indexed by a finite set  $X$ . Then we obtain a “sheaf”  $(\bigsqcup_X M_x, p, X)$ , where  $\bigsqcup_X M_x$  has the disjoint union topology and  $p: \bigsqcup_X M_x \rightarrow X$  is the obvious projection map. The profinite direct sum  $\widehat{\bigoplus}_X M_x$  is the usual finite direct sum  $\bigoplus_X M_x$ .
- (ii) Suppose  $M$  is any profinite  $R$ -module and  $X$  is any profinite space. Then we obtain a “sheaf”  $(M \times X, p, X)$ , where  $p: M \times X \rightarrow X$  is the natural projection from the product space. This is called the *constant “sheaf” with value  $M$*  and its profinite direct sum  $\widehat{\bigoplus}_X M \times \{x\}$  is the profinite tensor product  $M \widehat{\otimes}_R R[[X]]$ , where  $R$  acts on  $R[[X]]$  on the right.
- (iii) Suppose we have a family of profinite  $R$ -modules  $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$  indexed by a (possibly infinite) set  $I$ . Let  $X = I \sqcup \{\infty\}$  be the one-point compactification of the discrete space  $I$ . There is a canonical profinite topology we can define on  $M = (\bigsqcup_I M_i) \sqcup \{0\}$  so that  $(M, p, X)$  becomes a “sheaf”, and such that the profinite direct sum  $\widehat{\bigoplus}_X M_x$  is the direct *product*  $\prod_I M_i$  (see [2, Examples 5.1.1(c) and 5.6.4(c)]). We will give more details of this topology in Example 2.17, since it is there that we actually need these details.

Crucially, although the profinite direct sum should be viewed as a notion of direct sums for profinite modules, it actually generalises categorical products of profinite modules, which are known to be well-behaved.

We now describe the equivalence between  $\mathbf{CoSh}(R)$  (the category of cosheaves of profinite  $R$ -modules) and the category of “sheaves of  $R$ -modules”; more details can be found on [3, pages 9-10]. Given a “sheaf”  $(M, p, X)$ , we obtain a cosheaf  $(\mathcal{M}, X)$  given by  $\mathcal{M}(U) = \widehat{\bigoplus}_{u \in U} M_u$  for each clopen  $U \subseteq X$ . Conversely, given a cosheaf  $(\mathcal{M}, X)$ , we obtain a “sheaf”  $(M, p, X)$ , where  $M = \bigsqcup_{x \in X} \left( \varprojlim_{U \ni x} \mathcal{M}(U) \right)$  and  $p: M \rightarrow X$  is the obvious projection map. This equivalence identifies the space of cosections  $\mathcal{M}(U)$  ( $U \subseteq X$  clopen) of a cosheaf  $\mathcal{M}$  with the partial profinite direct sum  $\widehat{\bigoplus}_U M_u$  of the corresponding “sheaf”, and identifies the fibre  $M_x$  ( $x \in X$ ) of a “sheaf”  $(M, p, X)$  with the costalk  $\varprojlim_{U \ni x} \mathcal{M}(U)$  of the corresponding cosheaf. Henceforth, we will freely use this equivalence.

**2.2. Properties of  $\mathbf{CoSh}(R)$ .** We will now investigate the categorical properties of  $\mathbf{CoSh}(R)$ , illustrating the usefulness of having two perspectives on  $\mathbf{CoSh}(R)$ . Very often, we will prove a result from only one perspective. What we implicitly mean is that the result is also true in the other (equivalent) category using the equivalence just discussed.

**Proposition 2.6.** *The natural functor  $\mathbf{PMod}(R) \rightarrow \mathbf{CoSh}(R)$  (which sends  $M$  to the cosheaf  $M$  over the one-point space) is fully faithful and has a left adjoint which is given by:*

- the “global cosections functor”  $(\mathcal{M}, X) \mapsto \mathcal{M}(X)$  from the viewpoint of cosheaves;
- the profinite direct sum functor  $\widehat{\bigoplus}$  from the viewpoint of “sheaves”.

Thus,  $\mathbf{PMod}(R)$  is a reflective subcategory of  $\mathbf{CoSh}(R)$ .

*Proof.* This follows directly from definitions. □

**Proposition 2.7.** *The category  $\mathbf{CoSh}(R)$  has all (small) limits and finite coproducts, which are computed “pointwise”.*

*Proof.* We use the perspective of “sheaves”. The limit of the “sheaves”  $(M_i, p_i, X_i)$  is given by  $(\lim M_i, \lim p_i, \lim X_i)$ , where the later limits are taken in **Top** (or equivalently in **Pro**). This works because limits commute with limits and because the forgetful functor  $\mathbf{PMod}(R) \rightarrow \mathbf{Pro}$  preserves limits. Finite coproducts are given by  $(M, p, X) \sqcup (N, q, Y) = (M \sqcup N, p \sqcup q, X \sqcup Y)$ .

A subtle point is that it may not be immediately obvious that  $\lim p_i: \lim M_i \rightarrow \lim X_i$  is surjective. This is clear for products and less clear for equalisers, but it is true because “sheaf” maps are module homomorphisms on fibres. □

**Proposition 2.8** ([3] Theorem 4.6). *Profinite direct sums commute with restriction of scalars. That is, suppose  $(M, p, X)$  is a “sheaf” of  $R$ -modules and there is a map  $S \rightarrow R$  of profinite rings (which induces a functor  $\lambda: \mathbf{CoSh}(R) \rightarrow \mathbf{CoSh}(S)$ ). Then  $\lambda(\widehat{\bigoplus}_X M_x) = \widehat{\bigoplus}_X (\lambda M)_x$  as  $S$ -modules.*

*Proof.* This is obvious from the perspective of cosheaves, since the profinite direct sum functor simply sends a cosheaf  $(\mathcal{M}, X) \in \mathbf{CoSh}(R)$  to its global cosections space  $\mathcal{M}(X) \in \mathbf{PMod}(R)$ . Now observe that the equivalence from cosheaves to “sheaves” respects restriction of scalars. □

**Proposition 2.9** ([2] Proposition 5.1.6). *Let  $(M, p, X)$  be a “sheaf”. Then the canonical map  $M \rightarrow \widehat{\bigoplus}_X M_x$  is injective when restricted to each fibre  $M_x$ . In particular, if there is at least one non-zero fibre  $M_x$ , then the profinite direct sum  $\widehat{\bigoplus}_X M_x$  is also non-zero.*

(Slogan: Every costalk injects into the space of global cosections.)

**Proposition 2.10** ([2] Proposition 5.1.7). *Profinite direct sums commute with inverse limits.*

We say that a “sheaf”  $(M, p, X)$  of  $R$ -modules is *finite* if both  $M$  and  $X$  are finite spaces.

**Proposition 2.11** ([2] Theorem 5.3.4). *Every “sheaf”  $(M, p, X)$  is an inverse limit of finite “sheaves”  $(M_i, p_i, X_i)$ , where the inverse system can be chosen such that the projection maps  $(M, p, X) \rightarrow (M_i, p_i, X_i)$  are surjective.*

The following result is a generalisation of [2, Lemma 5.1.8].

**Lemma 2.12.** *Let  $(M, p, X) = \varprojlim_{i \in I} (M_i, p_i, X_i)$  be an inverse limit of “sheaves” and let  $(N, q, Y)$  be a finite “sheaf”. Then every morphism  $(\psi, f): (M, p, X) \rightarrow (N, q, Y)$  factors through some  $(M_k, p_k, X_k)$ .*

*Proof.* We may assume that the projection maps  $(M, p, X) \rightarrow (M_i, p_i, X_i)$  are surjective. When  $Y = *$ , this was proved in [2, Lemma 5.1.8]. For the general case, it is easy to see that there exists  $j \in I$  such that  $(\psi, f)$  factors through continuous maps  $\psi_j: M_j \rightarrow N$ ,  $f_j: X_j \rightarrow Y$  which are compatible with  $p_j$  and  $q$ . The only issue is that the restrictions  $\psi_j|_x$  might not be  $R$ -module homomorphisms for  $x \in X_j$ . But by the case  $Y = *$ , we can find some  $k \geq j$  such that the composite  $(M, p, X) \rightarrow (N, q, Y) \rightarrow \widehat{\bigoplus}_Y N_y = \bigoplus_Y N_y$  factors through a “sheaf” map  $(M_k, p_k, X_k) \rightarrow \bigoplus_Y N_y$ . Composing  $\psi_j$  and  $f_j$  with the transition maps of the inverse system gives continuous maps  $\psi_k: M_k \rightarrow N$  and  $f_k: X_k \rightarrow Y$ . These now define a “sheaf” map which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.13.** *The category  $\mathbf{CoSh}(R)$  is the pro-completion of the category of finite “sheaves” of  $R$ -modules.*

Recall that there is a profinite tensor product  $\widehat{\otimes}_R$  on  $\mathbf{PMod}(R)$ . It was shown in [2, Corollary 9.1.2] that the profinite tensor product commutes with profinite direct sums. We can define a tensor product (also denoted by  $\widehat{\otimes}_R$ ) on  $\mathbf{CoSh}(R)$  which extends the one on  $\mathbf{PMod}(R)$ , but since this is not needed in the rest of the paper (except to simplify the proof of Theorem 2.19), we will develop it in the appendix.

**2.3. Key Results.** In this subsection, we will see that the projective dimension of a profinite direct sum is entirely determined by its fibres (Corollary 2.15), as well as a general Mackey’s decomposition formula for profinite groups (Theorem 2.19).

We mentioned at the end of the last subsection that the profinite direct sum  $\widehat{\bigoplus}$  commutes with  $\widehat{\otimes}_R$ . It turns out that profinite direct sums don’t just commute with  $\widehat{\otimes}_R$ , but more generally with  $\mathrm{Tor}_i^R$  for every  $i$  ([2, Theorem 9.1.1]). The dual notion to profinite direct sums is termed *continuous products* ([3, Definition 2.4]). Given a genuine sheaf  $(A, p, X)$  of discrete  $R$ -modules, we denote its continuous product (i.e. space of global sections) by  $\prod_X A_x$ . Continuous products satisfy properties dual to those satisfied by profinite direct sums. In addition, continuous products commute with  $\mathrm{Ext}_R^i(M, -)$ , where  $M$  is a profinite  $R$ -module ([3, Corollary 4.7]). In fact, we can prove slightly more.

**Proposition 2.14.** *Let  $R$  be a profinite ring.*

(i) *Suppose  $(M, p, X)$  is a “sheaf” of profinite right  $R$ -modules and  $N$  is a profinite left  $R$ -module. Then*

$$\mathrm{Tor}_*^R \left( \widehat{\bigoplus}_X M_x, N \right) = \widehat{\bigoplus}_X \mathrm{Tor}_*^R(M_x, N).$$

(ii) Suppose  $(M, p, X)$  is a “sheaf” of profinite  $R$ -modules and  $A$  is a discrete  $R$ -module. Then

$$\mathrm{Ext}_R^* \left( \widehat{\bigoplus}_X M_x, A \right) = \prod_X \mathrm{Ext}_R^*(M_x, A).$$

(iii) Suppose  $(A, p, X)$  is a sheaf of discrete  $R$ -modules and  $M$  is a profinite  $R$ -module. Then

$$\mathrm{Ext}_R^* \left( M, \prod_X A_x \right) = \prod_X \mathrm{Ext}_R^*(M, A_x).$$

*Proof.* Parts (i) and (iii) were proved in [2, Theorem 9.1.1] and [3, Corollary 4.7] respectively. For (ii), we use the perspective of cosheaves and (genuine) sheaves. Note that  $\mathrm{Ext}_R^*(-, A)$  induces a functor  $\mathbf{CoSh}(R)^{\mathrm{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Sh}(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}})$  by defining  $\mathrm{Ext}_R^*(\mathcal{M}, A)(U) = \mathrm{Ext}_R^*(\mathcal{M}(U), A)$ . We obtain the statement of (ii) by taking global (co)sections.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.15** (Key Corollary). *Let  $R$  be a profinite ring.*

- (i) *If  $(M, p, X)$  is a “sheaf” of profinite  $R$ -modules, then  $\widehat{\bigoplus}_X M_x$  has flat dimension  $\leq d$  if and only if each fibre  $M_x$  has flat dimension  $\leq d$  (with respect to  $\widehat{\otimes}_R$ ). In particular, any product of flat profinite modules is flat.*
- (ii) *If  $(M, p, X)$  is a “sheaf” of profinite  $R$ -modules, then  $\widehat{\bigoplus}_X M_x$  has projective dimension  $\leq d$  if and only if each fibre  $M_x$  has projective dimension  $\leq d$ . In particular, any product of projective profinite modules is projective.*
- (iii) *If  $(A, p, X)$  is a sheaf of discrete  $R$ -modules, then  $\prod_X A_x$  has injective dimension  $\leq d$  if and only if each fibre  $A_x$  has injective dimension  $\leq d$ . In particular, any direct sum of injective discrete modules is injective.*

(Slogan for (ii): Projective dimension of space of global cosections equals maximum projective dimension of costalks.)

*Proof.* This was basically proved in [9, Lemma 1.6]. Part (iii) is the dual of (ii). Moreover, for the “in particular” claims, note that  $\prod_I M_i = \widehat{\bigoplus}_{I^*} M_i$ , where  $I^*$  is the one-point compactification of the discrete index set  $I$  (see Example 2.5(iii)).

For (i), note that a profinite module  $N$  has flat dimension  $\leq d$  if and only if  $\mathrm{Tor}_{d+1}^R(N, -) = 0$ , and that profinite direct sums commute with  $\mathrm{Tor}_i^R$  for every  $i$  (Proposition 2.14(i)). Recall also that by Proposition 2.9, a profinite direct sum is zero if and only if every fibre is zero.

For (ii), note that a profinite  $R$ -module  $N$  has projective dimension  $\leq d$  if and only if  $\mathrm{Ext}_R^{d+1}(N, F) = 0$  for all finite  $R$ -modules  $F$ . The case  $d = 0$  follows from [5, Lemma 5.4.1], and the general case follows by dimension shifting. Now use Proposition 2.14(ii).  $\square$

*Remark 2.16.* (i) Let  $(M, p, X)$  be a “sheaf”. In the language of cosheaves, it is clear from Corollary 2.15(ii) that every costalk  $M_x$  ( $x \in X$ ) has projective dimension  $\leq d$  if and only if every cosections space  $\widehat{\bigoplus}_U M_u$  ( $U \subseteq X$  clopen) has projective dimension  $\leq d$ . Thus, the property of “having projective dimension  $\leq d$ ” transfers between costalks and cosections spaces (i.e. it is in this sense a (co)local property!). This is analogous to the fact that for abstract modules, a direct sum has projective dimension  $\leq d$  if and only if every summand does.

- (ii) It is natural to ask if the property of “having projective dimension  $\leq d$ ” also transfers between costalks and the entire cosheaf  $M$ . For this question to make sense, fix a profinite space  $X$  and consider the category  $\mathbf{CoSh}(R, X)$  of usual cosheaves on  $X$  with coefficients in  $\mathbf{PMod}(R)$ . (Warning: This is **not** the full subcategory of  $\mathbf{CoSh}(R)$ )

where the profinite space happens to be  $X$ , because we do not allow any non-identity endomorphisms of  $X$  in  $\mathbf{CoSh}(R, X)$ .)

It is easy to check that  $\mathbf{CoSh}(R, X)$  is an abelian subcategory of the precosheaf category  $[O_c(X), \mathbf{PMod}(R)]$  closed under all limits and colimits. We can ask whether it is true that for any cosheaf  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbf{CoSh}(R, X)$ , every costalk  $\mathcal{M}_x \in \mathbf{PMod}(R)$  is projective if and only if  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbf{CoSh}(R, X)$  is itself projective. The answer is no, as the next example shows. Thus, Corollary 2.15(ii) “skips” the level of cosheaves and directly relates the projective dimensions of costalks in  $\mathbf{PMod}(R)$  with the projective dimensions of cosection spaces in  $\mathbf{PMod}(R)$ .

**Example 2.17.** Let  $X = \mathbb{Z}^+ \sqcup \{\infty\}$  be the one-point compactification of  $\mathbb{Z}^+$  and suppose  $P \in \mathbf{PMod}(R)$  is any non-zero projective module (say  $P = R$ ). Consider two cosheaves  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  on  $X$  as follows. The cosheaf  $\mathcal{M}$  is the constant cosheaf with value  $P$ . Explicitly, from the perspective of “sheaves”, it is given by  $(P \times X, p, X)$ , where  $p: P \times X \rightarrow X$  is the natural projection from the product space (see Example 2.5(ii)). Every fibre (i.e. costalk) of  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $P$ , which is projective.

On the other hand,  $\mathcal{N}$  is the *cosheaf with value  $P$  converging to 0*. Explicitly, from the perspective of “sheaves”, it is given by  $((P \times \mathbb{Z}^+) \sqcup \{0\}, q, X)$ , with the following topology on  $(P \times \mathbb{Z}^+) \sqcup \{0\}$ . A subset  $U \subseteq (P \times \mathbb{Z}^+) \sqcup \{0\}$  not containing 0 is open if and only if it is open in the product  $P \times \mathbb{Z}^+$ , whilst the open subsets containing 0 are precisely those of the form  $(P \times Y) \sqcup \{0\}$ , where  $Y \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^+$  is cofinite. The map  $q$  projects  $P \times \mathbb{Z}^+$  onto  $\mathbb{Z}^+$  and sends 0 to  $\infty$  (cf. Example 2.5(iii)). Every fibre of  $\mathcal{N}$  is either  $P$  or 0, so is projective.

There is a natural epimorphism  $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$  in  $\mathbf{CoSh}(R, X)$  which does not split. Indeed, the only possible candidate for such a splitting  $\psi: (P \times \mathbb{Z}^+) \sqcup \{0\} \rightarrow P \times X$  has to be the identity on  $P \times \mathbb{Z}^+$  and send 0 to  $(0, \infty) \in P \times X$ . However,  $\psi$  is not continuous: if  $Q \subsetneq P$  is any open subset containing 0, then  $\psi^{-1}(Q \times X) = (Q \times \mathbb{Z}^+) \sqcup \{0\}$  is not open in  $(P \times \mathbb{Z}^+) \sqcup \{0\}$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{N} \in \mathbf{CoSh}(R, X)$  is not projective even though it has projective fibres.

Next, we shall prove the profinite Mackey’s Formula. Let  $R$  be a ring,  $G$  be a group, and  $X$  be a (right)  $G$ -set. Then we can always decompose the  $R[G]$ -module  $R[X]$  as  $R[X] = \bigoplus_{x \in X/G} R[xG]$ . If  $R, G, X$  are all profinite, then a direct analogue of this works if  $X/G$  is finite. In general, we can still get such a decomposition, but we need to use the profinite direct sum instead of the usual direct sum.

**Proposition 2.18** ([9] Corollary 1.11/[10] Proposition A.14). *Let  $R$  be a profinite ring,  $G$  a profinite group, and  $X$  a profinite  $G$ -space. Then there is an isomorphism of profinite  $R[[G]]$ -modules*

$$R[[X]] = \widehat{\bigoplus}_{x \in X/G} R[[xG]].$$

The same method shows that we get a Mackey’s decomposition formula for profinite groups if we use the profinite direct sum. This was essentially done in [11, Section 3] but without the language of cosheaves. Although most of our modules so far have been one-sided, there is a completely analogous way to define “sheaves” of  $R$ - $S$ -bimodules and their profinite direct sums.

**Theorem 2.19** (Profinite Mackey’s Formula). *Let  $G$  be a profinite group and  $H, K$  closed subgroups (which are not necessarily open). If  $M$  is a profinite right  $R[[H]]$ -module, then there is an isomorphism of profinite right  $R[[K]]$ -modules*

$$\mathrm{Res}_K^G \mathrm{Ind}_H^G M = \widehat{\bigoplus}_{g \in H \backslash G / K} \mathrm{Ind}_{K \cap g^{-1} H g}^K \mathrm{Res}_{K \cap g^{-1} H g}^{g^{-1} H g} M g.$$

*Proof.* There is an  $R[[H]]$ - $R[[K]]$ -bimodule isomorphism

$$R[[G]] = \widehat{\bigoplus}_{g \in H \backslash G / K} R[[HgK]],$$

which is easy to prove by following the argument of [10, Proposition A.14]. We then apply the functor  $M \widehat{\otimes}_{R[[H]]} (-)$  (from the category of  $R[[H]]$ - $R[[K]]$ -bimodules to the category of right  $R[[K]]$ -modules) to the above. Note that  $M \widehat{\otimes}_{R[[H]]} (-)$  commutes with profinite direct sums of bimodules: one may prove this directly just like in Proposition 2.14(i), but in Remark A.4(iv) of the appendix, we will provide a formal reason why this follows from the corresponding result for one-sided modules (Proposition 2.14(i)).

It remains to show that  $M \widehat{\otimes}_{R[[H]]} R[[HgK]] = \text{Ind}_{K \cap g^{-1}Hg}^K \text{Res}_{K \cap g^{-1}Hg}^{g^{-1}Hg} Mg$  as right  $R[[K]]$ -modules, which would follow from the isomorphism  $R[[HgK]] = R[[Hg]] \widehat{\otimes}_{R[[K \cap g^{-1}Hg]]} R[[K]]$ . To prove the last isomorphism, write  $G = \varprojlim_i G_i$  ( $G_i$  finite), with surjective projection maps  $\varphi_i: G \rightarrow G_i$ . Let  $H_i = \varphi_i(H)$ ,  $K_i = \varphi_i(K)$  and  $g_i = \varphi_i(g)$ . Then  $H = \varprojlim H_i$ ,  $K = \varprojlim K_i$  and  $HgK = \varprojlim \varphi_i(HgK) = \varprojlim H_i g_i K_i$ . Moreover, we have

$$K \cap g^{-1}Hg = \varprojlim \varphi_i(K) \cap \varprojlim \varphi_i(g^{-1}Hg) = \varprojlim (\varphi_i(K) \cap \varphi_i(g^{-1}Hg)) = \varprojlim (K_i \cap g_i^{-1}H_i g_i).$$

Combining all of these, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} R[[Hg]] \widehat{\otimes}_{R[[K \cap g^{-1}Hg]]} R[[K]] &= \varprojlim \left( R[[H_i g_i]] \otimes_{R[[K_i \cap g_i^{-1}H_i g_i]]} R[[K_i]] \right) \\ &= \varprojlim R[[H_i g_i K_i]] \\ &= R[[HgK]], \end{aligned}$$

as required.  $\square$

Remark: If  $H$  or  $K$  is open, so that the quotient  $H \backslash G / K$  is finite, then  $\widehat{\otimes}$  agrees with  $\otimes$  (Example 2.5(i)) and we get the standard Mackey's decomposition formula ([5, Proposition 6.11.2]).

### 3. PROFINITE GROUPS OF TYPE $\Phi_R$

In this section, we will apply results from Section 2.3 to profinite groups of type  $\Phi_R$ . First, let us explain why one might care about these groups.

**3.1. Motivations and Definition.** Groups of type  $\Phi$  were first introduced in [12] as a potential algebraic characterisation of those groups  $G$  which admit a finite dimensional model for  $\underline{EG}$ , the classifying space for finite subgroups of  $G$ . We say that an abstract group  $G$  is of *type  $\Phi_R$*  (over a ring  $R$ ) if an  $R[G]$ -module has finite projective dimension whenever its restriction to every finite subgroup of  $G$  has finite projective dimension. It was later shown in [13, Theorem 3.10] that over many rings, these groups have well-behaved ‘‘stable module categories’’, which make their representation theory particularly nice. There is an obvious way to adapt the definition of type  $\Phi_R$  to the profinite setting.

**Throughout Section 3,  $R$  will be a commutative profinite ring of finite global dimension  $n$**  (i.e. every profinite  $R$ -module has projective dimension at most  $n$ ). Important examples include  $\mathbb{F}_p$  and  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ .

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $G$  be a profinite group. We say that  $G$  is of *type  $\Phi_R$*  if a profinite  $R[[G]]$ -module has finite projective dimension whenever its restriction to every finite subgroup of  $G$  has finite projective dimension.

In the definition above, we could have changed the last part to “whenever its restriction to every finite subgroup of  $G$  has projective dimension  $\leq n$ ” (recall that  $n$  is the global dimension of  $R$ ). This is because of the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Suppose  $G$  is a finite group and  $M$  is a profinite  $R[[G]]$ -module of finite projective dimension. Then  $M$  has projective dimension  $\leq n$ .*

*Proof.* This is the same argument as [13, Lemma 2.3], but we include it for completeness. Suppose instead that  $M$  has finite  $R[[G]]$ -projective dimension  $m > n$ . Consider the  $R[[G]]$ -short exact sequence  $P \hookrightarrow Q \rightarrow K$ , where  $P$  and  $Q$  are projective and  $K$  is a (non-projective)  $(m - 1)$ th syzygy of  $M$ . Then  $K$  is projective over  $R$ , so this sequence is  $R$ -split, but  $P$  is projective over  $R[[G]]$  and  $G$  is finite, so  $P$  is injective relative to the trivial subgroup. Hence, this sequence is actually  $R[[G]]$ -split and  $K$  is  $R[[G]]$ -projective, a contradiction.  $\square$

**3.2. Properties of type  $\Phi_R$ .** We now study the properties of the class of profinite groups of type  $\Phi_R$ . All of these properties have abstract counterparts, whose proofs often use infinite direct sums in a seemingly essential way. Fortunately, the profinite direct sum is enough to play the role of the abstract direct sum in the following results. In the next subsection, we will show that the class of profinite groups of type  $\Phi_R$  is fairly large.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Suppose  $G$  is a profinite group of type  $\Phi_R$ . Then there exists some constant  $c$  such that every profinite  $R[[G]]$ -module of finite projective dimension has projective dimension at most  $c$ .*

*Proof.* The idea is similar to [13, Lemma 2.4], but we need to use products instead of direct sums. Recall that products are just special cases of profinite direct sums (Example 2.5(iii)). Suppose instead that for each positive integer  $i$ , there is a module  $M_i$  of projective dimension at least  $i$ . Then the product  $M = \prod_i M_i$  has projective dimension  $\leq n$  when restricted to any finite subgroup of  $G$ , but  $M$  does not have finite projective dimension over  $R[[G]]$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Definition 3.4.** The smallest such  $c$  from the above lemma is called the *finitistic dimension* of  $R[[G]]$  and denoted by  $\text{fin. dim } R[[G]]$ .

Remark: In general, for a profinite ring  $S$ , we define its *finitistic dimension*  $\text{fin. dim } S$  to be the supremum of the projective dimensions of all  $S$ -modules with finite projective dimension. Lemma 3.3 shows that if a profinite group  $G$  is of type  $\Phi_R$ , then  $\text{fin. dim } R[[G]] < \infty$ .

The following is the profinite analogue of [12, Proposition 2.3(i)] and is a first application (to the author’s knowledge) of the general Mackey’s decomposition formula for profinite groups (Theorem 2.19).

**Proposition 3.5.** *If a profinite group  $G$  is of type  $\Phi_R$  then so is every closed subgroup  $H$  of  $G$ . Moreover,  $\text{fin. dim } R[[H]] \leq \text{fin. dim } R[[G]]$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\text{fin. dim } R[[G]] = c$ . Suppose  $M$  is an  $R[[H]]$ -module whose restriction to every finite subgroup of  $H$  has projective dimension  $\leq n$ . We want to show that  $M$  has  $R[[H]]$ -projective dimension  $\leq c$ . If  $K$  is any closed subgroup of  $G$ , then by Mackey’s Formula (Theorem 2.19), we have

$$\text{Res}_K^G \text{Ind}_H^G M = \widehat{\bigoplus}_{g \in H \backslash G / K} \text{Ind}_{K \cap g^{-1} H g}^K \text{Res}_{K \cap g^{-1} H g}^{g^{-1} H g} M g.$$

Importantly, if  $K$  is finite, then  $\text{Res}_{K \cap g^{-1} H g}^{g^{-1} H g} M g$  has projective dimension  $\leq n$  by assumption, so the entire right hand side has projective dimension  $\leq n$  by Corollary 2.15(ii). As  $G$  is of type  $\Phi_R$ , we conclude that  $\text{Ind}_H^G M$  has projective dimension  $\leq c$  over  $R[[G]]$ , so  $\text{Res}_H^G \text{Ind}_H^G M$  has

projective dimension  $\leq c$  over  $R[[H]]$ . We used the fact that restriction and induction preserve projective dimensions (see [5, Corollary 5.7.2 and Theorem 6.10.8]).

We use Mackey's Formula again with  $K = H$ , which reads

$$\text{Res}_H^G \text{Ind}_H^G M = \widehat{\bigoplus}_{g \in H \backslash G / H} \text{Ind}_{H \cap g^{-1} H g}^H \text{Res}_{H \cap g^{-1} H g}^{g^{-1} H g} M g.$$

Importantly, taking  $g = 1$  shows that the  $R[[H]]$ -module  $M$  appears as a fibre on the right hand side. By Corollary 2.15(ii),  $M$  has  $R[[H]]$ -projective dimension  $\leq c$ , as required.  $\square$

Remark: In the abstract case, Mackey's decomposition formula shows in particular that a  $H$ -module  $M$  is a direct summand of  $\text{Res}_H^G \text{Ind}_H^G M$ . In the profinite case, we may not be able to make this conclusion, but what we can say is that  $M$  appears as a fibre in some profinite direct sum decomposition of  $\text{Res}_H^G \text{Ind}_H^G M$ . This is sufficient for the proof above.

**3.3. Examples of type  $\Phi_R$ .** We shall see in this subsection that for some profinite rings  $R$  (such as  $\mathbb{F}_p$ ), the class of profinite groups of finite  $vcd_R$  is strictly contained in the class of profinite groups of type  $\Phi_R$ . The example we provide for the "strictly" part will use some profinite Bass-Serre Theory, for which an excellent reference is [2].

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $G$  be a profinite group. Suppose the trivial module  $R$  has a finite length  $R[[G]]$ -resolution  $0 \hookrightarrow N_l \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow N_0 \twoheadrightarrow R$  (of length  $l$ ) such that:*

- (i) *Each  $N_i$  is of the form  $R[[U_i]]$ , where  $U_i$  is a profinite  $G$ -space, and the  $R[[G]]$ -action on  $N_i$  is induced by the  $G$ -action on  $U_i$ , and*
- (ii) *The  $G$ -stabiliser  $G_u$  of each  $u \in U_i$  is finite.*

*Then  $G$  is of type  $\Phi_R$  with  $\text{fin. dim } R[[G]] \leq n + l$ .*

*Proof.* By Proposition 2.18, we can write each  $R[[U_i]]$  as  $R[[U_i]] = \widehat{\bigoplus}_{u \in U_i / G} R[[G_u \backslash G]]$ , where each  $G_u$  is finite by assumption. Suppose  $M$  is an  $R[[G]]$ -module whose restriction to every finite subgroup of  $G$  has projection dimension  $\leq n$ . Applying the functor  $M \widehat{\otimes}_R (-)$  to the given  $R$ -split resolution  $N_* \twoheadrightarrow R$  gives a finite length  $R[[G]]$ -resolution  $M \widehat{\otimes}_R N_* \twoheadrightarrow M$  (with  $G$  acting diagonally), where each term (except  $M$ ) looks like

$$\begin{aligned} M \widehat{\otimes}_R \left( \widehat{\bigoplus}_{u \in U_i / G} R[[G_u \backslash G]] \right) &= \widehat{\bigoplus}_{u \in U_i / G} (M \widehat{\otimes}_R R[[G_u \backslash G]]) \\ &= \widehat{\bigoplus}_{u \in U_i / G} (M \widehat{\otimes}_{R[[G_u]]} R[[G]]) \\ &= \widehat{\bigoplus}_{u \in U_i / G} \text{Ind}_{G_u}^G \text{Res}_{G_u}^G M, \end{aligned}$$

which has projective dimension  $\leq n$  over  $R[[G]]$  by Corollary 2.15(ii). The first isomorphism above follows from Proposition 2.14(i) and the second follows from [5, Proposition 5.8.1]. By dimension shifting,  $M$  has projective dimension  $\leq n + l$  over  $R[[G]]$ .  $\square$

Recall that given a profinite group  $G$ , its *cohomological dimension over  $R$* , or  $cd_R$ , is the  $R[[G]]$ -projective dimension of the trivial module  $R$ , whilst its *virtual cohomological dimension over  $R$* , or  $vcd_R$ , is the cohomological dimension of any open subgroup with finite  $cd_R$  (or  $\infty$  if no such subgroup exists).

The following is the profinite analogue of [13, Corollary 2.6].

**Corollary 3.7.** *Let  $G$  be a profinite group,  $\pi$  a non-empty set of prime numbers and  $p$  a fixed prime. Suppose one of the following holds:*

- (a)  $G$  has finite  $vcd_R$ , where  $R$  is commutative profinite local ring (of finite global dimension) with finite residue field of characteristic  $p$  (this includes  $R = \mathbb{F}_p$  and  $R = \mathbb{Z}_p$ ).
- (b)  $G$  acts on a  $\pi$ -tree  $T$  with finite (vertex and edge) stabilisers, and  $R$  is a commutative pro- $\pi$  ring (of finite global dimension).

Then  $G$  is of type  $\Phi_R$ .

*Proof.* (a) [14, Corollary 6.17] gives an  $R[[G]]$ -resolution of  $R$  satisfying the hypotheses of Proposition 3.6.

- (b) Let  $\mathbb{Z}_\pi = \prod_{q \in \pi} \mathbb{Z}_q$ . By definition ([2, Section 2.4]), there is a split exact sequence of  $\mathbb{Z}_\pi$ -modules

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_\pi[[E^*, *]] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_\pi[V] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_\pi \rightarrow 0,$$

where  $V$  is the vertex set of  $T$ ,  $E$  is the edge set, and  $E^* = T/V$ . Applying  $R \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{Z}_\pi} (-)$  to the above sequence gives an exact sequence of  $R$ -modules

$$0 \rightarrow R[[E^*, *]] \rightarrow R[V] \rightarrow R \rightarrow 0.$$

The action of  $G$  on  $T$  naturally makes the above modules into  $R[[G]]$ -modules, and the stabilisers are finite by assumption. We note that the module  $R[[E^*, *]]$  is defined over a *pointed* profinite space, but the argument of Proposition 3.6 still works for pointed spaces. (In fact, [9, Corollary 1.11] is the pointed version of Proposition 2.18.) □

Remark: In part (b) of the proof above, we used the existence of a two-term resolution of  $R$ . There is of course nothing special about “two” here, so  $G$  is of type  $\Phi_R$  if it “acts on a finite dimensional contractible  $\pi$ -CW complex with finite stabilisers”, in the sense that there is a longer exact sequence of  $R$ -modules similar to what we had above.

Let us now show that for some  $R$ , there are profinite groups of type  $\Phi_R$  which have infinite  $vcd_R$ . Note that if  $G$  is a torsion-free profinite group, then it is of type  $\Phi_R$  if and only if it has finite  $cd_R$ , so we should only search for profinite groups with non-trivial torsion.

First, let us recall some basic profinite Bass-Serre Theory from [2]. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an extension-closed pseudovariety of finite groups, that is,  $\mathcal{C}$  is a (non-empty) class of finite groups which is closed under subgroups, images, finite products and extensions. Let  $\pi = \pi(\mathcal{C})$  be the set of primes which divide the order of some group in  $\mathcal{C}$ . For example,  $\mathcal{C}$  might be the class of all finite  $p$ -groups, in which case  $\pi(\mathcal{C}) = \{p\}$ .

Given a connected profinite graph  $\Gamma$  and a graph of pro- $\mathcal{C}$  groups  $(\mathcal{G}, \varpi, \Gamma)$  over  $\Gamma$ , we obtain its fundamental pro- $\mathcal{C}$  group  $\Pi = \Pi_1^{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ , the  $\mathcal{C}$ -standard graph  $S = S^{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ , and a canonical action of  $\Pi$  on  $S$  (see [2, Sections 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3]). Moreover, the stabilisers of this action are finite if all the fibres  $\mathcal{G}(m)$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  are finite ([2, Lemma 6.3.2]), and  $S$  is a  $\mathcal{C}$ -tree or equivalently a  $\pi$ -tree ([2, Corollary 6.3.6]). Thus, if the fibres of  $\mathcal{G}$  are finite, then by Corollary 3.7(b),  $\Pi$  is of type  $\Phi_R$ , where  $R$  is any commutative pro- $\pi$  ring (of finite global dimension).

An example of this is given in [2, Example 6.2.3(b)]. Indeed, if  $G = \prod_X G_x$  is any free pro- $\mathcal{C}$  product of finite  $\mathcal{C}$ -groups  $G_x$  (continuously indexed by the profinite space  $X$ ), then  $G = \Pi_1^{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{G}, T)$  is the fundamental group over some  $\mathcal{C}$ -tree  $T$ . Furthermore, each fibre of  $\mathcal{G}$  is either some  $G_x$  or trivial, and so finite. Hence, we have shown the following.

**Proposition 3.8.** *Any free pro- $\mathcal{C}$  product of finite groups is of type  $\Phi_R$ , where  $R$  is a commutative pro- $\pi(\mathcal{C})$  ring (of finite global dimension).*

Remark: In Section 2, we defined a “sheaf” of profinite  $R$ -modules and its profinite direct sum. There is a completely analogous definition for a “sheaf” of pro- $\mathcal{C}$  groups and its free pro- $\mathcal{C}$  product ([2, Section 5.1]), which is what we used above.

Fix a prime  $p \in \pi = \pi(\mathcal{C})$ . When  $R = \mathbb{F}_p$ , we write  $vcd_p$  for  $vcd_{\mathbb{F}_p}$  and write  $\Phi_p$  for  $\Phi_{\mathbb{F}_p}$ . Next, we construct a free pro- $p$  product of finite groups which does not have finite  $vcd_p$ . Let

$$G = \mathbb{Z}/p \amalg \mathbb{Z}/p^2 \amalg \mathbb{Z}/p^3 \amalg \cdots$$

be the free pro- $p$  product over the one-point compactification  $X = \mathbb{Z}^+ \sqcup \{\infty\}$  (see [2, Example 5.1.1(c)]). The fact that  $G$  does not have finite  $vcd_p$  follows from the following simple observation:

**Lemma 3.9.** *If a profinite group  $G$  has finite  $p$ -subgroups of unbounded order, then it has infinite  $vcd_p$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose instead that  $G$  has finite  $vcd_p$ , with an open subgroup  $H$  of finite  $cd_p$ . Then the normal core  $H_G$  of  $H$  is also open and has finite  $cd_p$ . Take a finite  $p$ -subgroup  $K \leq G$  of order larger than  $|G : H_G|$ . Then  $K \cap H_G \neq 1$ , so  $H_G$  is not  $p$ -torsion-free, a contradiction to having finite  $cd_p$ .  $\square$

Hence, we finally have the following.

**Theorem 3.10.** *The class of profinite groups of finite  $vcd_p$  is strictly contained in the class of profinite groups of type  $\Phi_p$ . Any free pro- $p$  product of finite groups with unbounded torsion is of type  $\Phi_p$  but not of finite  $vcd_p$ .*

#### APPENDIX A. TENSOR PRODUCTS OF COSHEAVES

Let  $R$  be a profinite ring. Recall that there is a profinite tensor product  $\widehat{\otimes}_R$  on  $\mathbf{PMod}(R)$  (see [5, Section 5.5]). In this appendix, we will define a tensor product  $\widehat{\otimes}_R$  on  $\mathbf{CoSh}(R)$  which extends the one on  $\mathbf{PMod}(R)$ . We have kept the following results separate from the main paper so that they do not interrupt its flow.

Let us first define the tensor product from the viewpoint of “sheaves”, which more closely resembles the usual tensor product  $\widehat{\otimes}_R$  on  $\mathbf{PMod}(R)$ . Given a finite “sheaf” of right  $R$ -modules  $(M, p, X)$  and a finite “sheaf” of left  $R$ -modules  $(N, q, Y)$ , we define their *tensor product*, denoted by  $(M, p, X) \otimes_R (N, q, Y) \in \mathbf{CoSh}(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}})$ , or simply  $M \otimes_R N$ , as follows. The second profinite space of the tensor product is  $X \times Y$  and the first profinite space is  $\bigsqcup_{(x,y) \in X \times Y} M_x \otimes_R N_y$ , with the obvious projection map. This is a finite “sheaf” of abelian groups with fibres given by  $(M \otimes_R N)_{(x,y)} = M_x \otimes_R N_y$ .

Given general “sheaves” of right  $R$ -modules  $(M, p, X) = \varprojlim_i (M_i, p_i, X_i)$  and left  $R$ -modules  $(N, q, Y) = \varprojlim_j (N_j, q_j, Y_j)$  which are written as inverse limits of finite “sheaves”, we define their *tensor product* as

$$(M, p, X) \widehat{\otimes}_R (N, q, Y) = \varprojlim_{i,j} ((M_i, p_i, X_i) \otimes_R (N_j, q_j, Y_j)),$$

which is a “sheaf” of profinite abelian groups i.e. an object of  $\mathbf{CoSh}(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}})$ . Note that the second profinite space of the tensor product  $(M, p, X) \widehat{\otimes}_R (N, q, Y)$  is  $X \times Y$ . To describe the fibres, given  $(x, y) \in X \times Y$ , let us write  $x = (x_i) \in \varprojlim X_i$  and  $y = (y_j) \in \varprojlim Y_j$ . The fibres of the tensor product are then given by  $(M \widehat{\otimes}_R N)_{(x,y)} = \varprojlim ((M_i)_{x_i} \otimes_R (N_j)_{y_j}) = M_x \widehat{\otimes}_R N_y$ .

To see that the tensor product of two “sheaves” is (up to isomorphism) independent of the way they are written as inverse limits, we need the following universal property. Given “sheaves” of right  $R$ -modules  $(M, p, X)$  and left  $R$ -modules  $(N, q, Y)$ , as well as a “sheaf” of profinite abelian

groups  $(K, r, Z)$ , an  $R$ -middle linear map from  $(M, p, X) \times (N, q, Y)$  to  $(K, r, Z)$  is a map in  $\mathbf{CoSh}(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}})$  whose restriction to each fibre is middle linear. Spelt out, an  $R$ -middle linear map consists of continuous maps  $\psi: M \times N \rightarrow K$  and  $f: X \times Y \rightarrow Z$  such that  $r\psi = f(p \times q)$  and such that for each  $(x, y) \in X \times Y$ , the restriction  $\psi|_{(x,y)}: M_x \times N_y \rightarrow K_{f(x,y)}$  is an  $R$ -middle linear map i.e.  $\psi|_{(x,y)}$  is bilinear and satisfies  $\psi|_{(x,y)}(mr, n) = \psi|_{(x,y)}(m, rn)$ . We can now state the universal property of the tensor product, which is exactly what one might expect.

**Proposition A.1.** *Let  $(M, p, X)$  and  $(N, q, Y)$  be “sheaves” of appropriately sided  $R$ -modules. Then their tensor product  $(M, p, X) \widehat{\otimes}_R (N, q, Y) \in \mathbf{CoSh}(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}})$  satisfies the following universal property:*

*There is an  $R$ -middle linear map  $(M, p, X) \times (N, q, Y) \rightarrow (M, p, X) \widehat{\otimes}_R (N, q, Y)$ , such that for any  $(K, r, Z) \in \mathbf{CoSh}(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}})$  and any  $R$ -middle linear map  $(M, p, X) \times (N, q, Y) \rightarrow (K, r, Z)$ , there exists a unique “sheaf” map  $(M, p, X) \widehat{\otimes}_R (N, q, Y) \rightarrow (K, r, Z)$  in  $\mathbf{CoSh}(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}})$  making the relevant triangle commute.*

*Proof.* The middle linear map  $(M, p, X) \times (N, q, Y) \rightarrow (M, p, X) \widehat{\otimes}_R (N, q, Y)$  is the inverse limit of the middle linear maps  $(M_i, p_i, X_i) \times (N_j, q_j, Y_j) \rightarrow (M_i, p_i, X_i) \otimes_R (N_j, q_j, Y_j)$ . Since every “sheaf” can be written as an inverse limit of finite “sheaves”, it suffices to verify the universal property for a finite “sheaf” of abelian groups  $(K, r, Z)$ . In this case, a middle linear map  $(M, p, X) \times (N, q, Y) \rightarrow (K, r, Z)$ , by Lemma 2.12, factors through some  $(M_i, p_i, X_i) \times (N_j, q_j, Y_j)$  as a map in  $\mathbf{CoSh}(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}})$ . We may assume that the projections  $(M, p, X) \rightarrow (M_i, p_i, X_i)$  and  $(N, q, Y) \rightarrow (N_j, q_j, Y_j)$  are surjective, in which case the factorisation  $(M_i, p_i, X_i) \times (N_j, q_j, Y_j) \rightarrow (K, r, Z)$  is automatically middle linear. As all spaces are now finite, it is clear that we have an induced map  $(M_i, p_i, X_i) \otimes_R (N_j, q_j, Y_j) \rightarrow (K, r, Z)$ , which in turn gives a “sheaf” map  $(M, p, X) \widehat{\otimes}_R (N, q, Y) \rightarrow (K, r, Z)$  having the required property. Uniqueness of this map is clear.  $\square$

We shall now describe the tensor product  $\widehat{\otimes}_R$  from the viewpoint of cosheaves. Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be profinite spaces. First note that every clopen subspace  $U$  of  $X \times Y$  can be written as a finite disjoint union  $U = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n X_i \times Y_i$ , where  $X_i \subseteq X$  and  $Y_i \subseteq Y$  are clopen. Given two appropriately sided cosheaves  $(\mathcal{M}, X)$  and  $(\mathcal{N}, Y)$ , we define  $(\mathcal{M} \widehat{\otimes}_R \mathcal{N})(U) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\mathcal{M}(X_i) \widehat{\otimes}_R \mathcal{N}(Y_i))$ . This indeed defines a cosheaf of profinite abelian groups (so is in particular functorial) and is independent of the decomposition of  $U$  since we can pass to a common refinement of two given decompositions. It is not difficult to see that this tensor product  $\widehat{\otimes}_R$  on cosheaves agrees with the one we just defined on “sheaves” by using the following proposition:

**Proposition A.2** ([2] Corollary 9.1.2). *The profinite tensor product  $\widehat{\otimes}_R$  on  $\mathbf{PMod}(R)$  commutes with profinite direct sums, that is, for  $(M, p, X)$  and  $(N, q, Y)$  appropriately sided “sheaves” of  $R$ -modules, we have an isomorphism of profinite abelian groups*

$$\left( \widehat{\bigoplus}_X M_x \right) \widehat{\otimes}_R \left( \widehat{\bigoplus}_Y N_y \right) = \widehat{\bigoplus}_{X \times Y} (M_x \widehat{\otimes}_R N_y).$$

**Corollary A.3.** *The two tensor products  $\widehat{\otimes}_R$  on  $\mathbf{CoSh}(R)$  we have just defined agree under the equivalence of cosheaves and “sheaves”.*

*Proof.* Recall that the equivalence  $F$  from “sheaves” to cosheaves sends a “sheaf”  $(M, p, X)$  to the cosheaf  $(F(M), X)$  defined by  $F(M)(V) = \widehat{\bigoplus}_V M_v$ , where  $V \subseteq X$  is clopen. Let  $(M, p, X)$  and  $(N, q, Y)$  be “sheaves” and write a clopen subspace  $U \subseteq X \times Y$  as a finite disjoint union

$U = \bigsqcup X_i \times Y_i$ , where the  $X_i$  and  $Y_i$  are clopen. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
F(M \widehat{\otimes}_R N)(U) &= \widehat{\bigoplus}_{u \in U} (M \widehat{\otimes}_R N)_u \\
&= \bigoplus_i \widehat{\bigoplus}_{(x,y) \in X_i \times Y_i} (M \widehat{\otimes}_R N)_{(x,y)} \\
&= \bigoplus_i \widehat{\bigoplus}_{(x,y) \in X_i \times Y_i} (M_x \widehat{\otimes}_R N_y) \\
&= \bigoplus_i \left( \left( \widehat{\bigoplus}_{x \in X_i} M_x \right) \widehat{\otimes}_R \left( \widehat{\bigoplus}_{y \in Y_i} N_y \right) \right) \\
&= \bigoplus_i (F(M)(X_i) \widehat{\otimes}_R F(N)(Y_i)) \\
&= (F(M) \widehat{\otimes}_R F(N))(U).
\end{aligned}$$

□

*Remark A.4.* (i) Suppose  $R$  is commutative, so that  $M \widehat{\otimes}_R N$  is a cosheaf of profinite  $R$ -modules (rather than just profinite abelian groups). Then both  $\mathbf{PMod}(R)$  and  $\mathbf{CoSh}(R)$  become symmetric monoidal categories under the tensor product  $\widehat{\otimes}_R$  with tensor unit  $R$ . Moreover, the adjunction of Proposition 2.6 is a strong monoidal adjunction, by Proposition A.2.

(ii) More generally, suppose  $R$  is still a commutative profinite ring and let  $G$  be a profinite group. Consider profinite modules over the complete group algebra  $R[[G]]$ . This is a symmetric monoidal category under the tensor product  $\widehat{\otimes}_R$ , where  $G$  acts on  $M \widehat{\otimes}_R N$  diagonally. We can define an analogous tensor product  $\widehat{\otimes}_R$  on  $\mathbf{CoSh}(R[[G]])$  with  $G$  acting diagonally, which makes  $\mathbf{CoSh}(R[[G]])$  symmetric monoidal. Then the adjunction between  $\mathbf{PMod}(R[[G]])$  and  $\mathbf{CoSh}(R[[G]])$  of Proposition 2.6 is still strong monoidal.

(iii) Taking  $R = \widehat{\mathbb{Z}}$  in (i), we obtain the symmetric monoidal category  $(\mathbf{CoSh}(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}), \widehat{\otimes}_{\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}})$ . This allows us to talk about monoid objects and module objects in  $\mathbf{CoSh}(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}})$ . In fact, a profinite ring  $R$  is a special instance of a monoid object in  $\mathbf{CoSh}(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}})$ , and a “sheaf” of profinite  $R$ -modules is a special instance of an  $R$ -module object in  $\mathbf{CoSh}(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}})$ , almost by definition. Observe that if  $(M, p, X) \in \mathbf{CoSh}(R)$  has its  $R$ -module structure given by a map  $\rho: M \widehat{\otimes}_{\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}} R \rightarrow M$  in  $\mathbf{CoSh}(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}})$ , then the  $R$ -module structure on  $\widehat{\bigoplus}_X M_x$  is given by the composite

$$\left( \widehat{\bigoplus}_X M_x \right) \widehat{\otimes}_{\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}} R = \widehat{\bigoplus}_X (M_x \widehat{\otimes}_{\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}} R) \rightarrow \widehat{\bigoplus}_X M_x,$$

where the second map is obtained by applying the profinite direct sum functor to  $\rho$ .

(iv) The following isomorphism given in Proposition A.2

$$\left( \widehat{\bigoplus}_X M_x \right) \widehat{\otimes}_R \left( \widehat{\bigoplus}_Y N_y \right) = \widehat{\bigoplus}_{X \times Y} (M_x \widehat{\otimes}_R N_y) \tag{1}$$

is natural in the “sheaves”  $M$  and  $N$ . It follows formally that if  $(M, p, X)$  is a “sheaf” of  $S'$ - $R$ -bimodules and  $(N, q, Y)$  is “sheaf” of  $R$ - $S$ -bimodules, then the isomorphism in (1) is automatically an  $S'$ - $S$ -bimodule isomorphism. Indeed, the  $S'$ -module structure on  $M$  is given by a right  $R$ -module “sheaf” map  $S' \widehat{\otimes}_{\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}} M \rightarrow M$ , and similarly the  $S$ -module

structure on  $N$  is given by a left  $R$ -module “sheaf” map  $N \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{Z}} S \rightarrow N$ . Applying the naturality of (1) to these maps gives what we claimed.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Oleg Vladimirovich Mel’nikov. Subgroups and the homology of free products of profinite groups. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 53(1):97–120, 1989.
- [2] Luis Ribes. *Profinite graphs and groups*, volume 66 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*. Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [3] Gareth Wilkes. Pontryagin duality and sheaves of profinite modules. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.13059*, 2024.
- [4] Marco Boggi. Lannes’  $T$ -functor and mod- $p$  cohomology of profinite groups. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.12488*, 2024.
- [5] Luis Ribes and Pavel Zalesskii. *Profinite groups*. Springer, 2000.
- [6] Saunders Mac Lane. *Categories for the working mathematician*, volume 5. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [7] Saunders MacLane and Ieke Moerdijk. *Sheaves in geometry and logic: A first introduction to topos theory*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [8] Charles A. Weibel. *An introduction to homological algebra*, volume 38 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.
- [9] Oleg Vladimirovich Mel’nikov. Aspherical pro-groups. *Sbornik: Mathematics*, 193(11):1639, 2002.
- [10] Gareth Wilkes. Relative cohomology theory for profinite groups. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 223(4):1617–1688, 2019.
- [11] Peter Symonds. Double coset formulas for profinite groups. *Communications in Algebra*, 36(3):1059–1066, 2008.
- [12] Olympia Talelli. On groups of type  $\phi$ . *Archiv der Mathematik*, 89(1):24–32, 2007.
- [13] Nadia Mazza and Peter Symonds. The stable category and invertible modules for infinite groups. *Adv. Math.*, 358:106853, 26, 2019.
- [14] Peter Symonds. Permutation complexes for profinite groups. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 82(1):1–37, 2007.