

Approximating higher algebra by derived algebra

William Balderrama

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

<https://faculty.math.illinois.edu/~balderr2/>

September 29, 2020

Intro

Goal of talk

Describe some obstruction theories and related algebra via an example.

Intro

Goal of talk

Describe some obstruction theories and related algebra via an example.

Definition

A *complex orientation* of R is a homotopy ring map $MU \rightarrow R$.

Intro

Goal of talk

Describe some obstruction theories and related algebra via an example.

Definition

A *complex orientation* of R is a homotopy ring map $MU \rightarrow R$.

Big question

If R is \mathbb{E}_∞ , can $MU \rightarrow R$ be made \mathbb{E}_∞ ?

Highly structured orientations

Focus on $R = E$ a Lubin-Tate spectrum.

Facts about E

- Different E for every finite height formal group over perfect field.
- Turns out to be canonically \mathbb{E}_∞ (Goerss-Hopkins-Miller).
Problem: \mathbb{E}_∞ structure not related to MU .

Highly structured orientations

Focus on $R = E$ a Lubin-Tate spectrum.

Facts about E

- Different E for every finite height formal group over perfect field.
- Turns out to be canonically \mathbb{E}_∞ (Goerss-Hopkins-Miller).
Problem: \mathbb{E}_∞ structure not related to MU .

\mathbb{H}_∞ orientations (Ando, Ando-Hopkins-Strickland, Zhu)

- Exist for any E ;
- Describable in terms of formal group theory.

Highly structured orientations

Focus on $R = E$ a Lubin-Tate spectrum.

Facts about E

- Different E for every finite height formal group over perfect field.
- Turns out to be canonically \mathbb{E}_∞ (Goerss-Hopkins-Miller).
Problem: \mathbb{E}_∞ structure not related to MU .

\mathbb{H}_∞ orientations (Ando, Ando-Hopkins-Strickland, Zhu)

- Exist for any E ;
- Describable in terms of formal group theory.

\mathbb{E}_∞ orientations

- Height $n = 1$: “ $\mathbb{H}_\infty = \mathbb{E}_\infty$ ” (Walker, Möllers);
- Height $n = 2$: Understanding starts to break down.

Highly structured orientations (cont.)

Extra complication: E is even-periodic, so want MUP orientations.

What's known

- \mathbb{H}_∞ orientations: just as well-understood.
- \mathbb{E}_∞ orientations: known exist at $n = 1, p = 2$ (Hahn-Yuan).

Highly structured orientations (cont.)

Extra complication: E is even-periodic, so want MUP orientations.

What's known

- \mathbb{H}_∞ orientations: just as well-understood.
- \mathbb{E}_∞ orientations: known exist at $n = 1, p = 2$ (Hahn-Yuan).

Theorem (B.)

- $\mathbb{H}_\infty(MUP, R) = \mathbb{E}_\infty(MUP, R)$ for $K(1)$ -local even-periodic R , so in particular can get \mathbb{E}_∞ orientation $MUP \rightarrow KU$;
- $\text{Surj } \mathbb{E}_\infty(MUP, E) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{H}_\infty(MUP, E)$ for E at height 2.

Better yet: proof only really uses smoothness of $\pi_0(E \otimes MUP)$ over E_0 .

Proof of theorem

The proof is obstruction-theoretic.

Proof

- 1 Set up an obstruction theory;
- 2 Describe the obstruction groups;
- 3 Show the obstructions vanish.

Proof of theorem

The proof is obstruction-theoretic.

Proof

- 1 Set up an obstruction theory;
- 2 Describe the obstruction groups;
- 3 Show the obstructions vanish.

Comments

- Height $n \leq 2$ restriction will come in at step (3);
- Goal: describe some of what goes into (1) and (2).

Zeroth obstruction

Want to replace the \mathbb{H}_∞ condition with something purely algebraic.

Zerth obstruction

Want to replace the \mathbb{H}_∞ condition with something purely algebraic.

Replacement for \mathbb{H}_∞

- E_*MUP is E_* -free, so homotopy maps $MUP \rightarrow E$ are the same as E_* -module maps $E_*MUP \rightarrow E_*$;
- Now replace “ \mathbb{H}_∞ map $MUP \rightarrow E$ ” with “map $E_*MUP \rightarrow E_*$ compatible with E -power operations”.

Zerth obstruction

Want to replace the \mathbb{H}_∞ condition with something purely algebraic.

Replacement for \mathbb{H}_∞

- E_*MUP is E_* -free, so homotopy maps $MUP \rightarrow E$ are the same as E_* -module maps $E_*MUP \rightarrow E_*$;
- Now replace “ \mathbb{H}_∞ map $MUP \rightarrow E$ ” with “map $E_*MUP \rightarrow E_*$ compatible with E -power operations”.

Question

What does it mean to be compatible with E -power operations?

Zerth obstruction

Want to replace the \mathbb{H}_∞ condition with something purely algebraic.

Replacement for \mathbb{H}_∞

- E_*MUP is E_* -free, so homotopy maps $MUP \rightarrow E$ are the same as E_* -module maps $E_*MUP \rightarrow E_*$;
- Now replace “ \mathbb{H}_∞ map $MUP \rightarrow E$ ” with “map $E_*MUP \rightarrow E_*$ compatible with E -power operations”.

Question

What does it mean to be compatible with E -power operations?

Better question

What encodes operations?

Zeroth obstruction

Want to replace the \mathbb{H}_∞ condition with something purely algebraic.

Replacement for \mathbb{H}_∞

- E_*MUP is E_* -free, so homotopy maps $MUP \rightarrow E$ are the same as E_* -module maps $E_*MUP \rightarrow E_*$;
- Now replace “ \mathbb{H}_∞ map $MUP \rightarrow E$ ” with “map $E_*MUP \rightarrow E_*$ compatible with E -power operations”.

Question

What does it mean to be compatible with E -power operations?

Better question

What encodes operations?

Answer

Operations are encoded by algebraic theories.

Algebraic theories

Definition

A (bounded Mal'cev algebraic) theory is a category \mathcal{P} such that

- 1 \mathcal{P} has all small coproducts;
- 2 \mathcal{P} satisfies a size condition;
- 3 \mathcal{P} satisfies the Mal'cev condition.

The category of *models* of \mathcal{P} is the category $\text{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}$ of presheaves X on \mathcal{P} such that $X(\coprod_{i \in I} P_i) \simeq \prod_{i \in I} X(P_i)$.

Algebraic theories

Definition

A (bounded Mal'cev algebraic) theory is a category \mathcal{P} such that

- 1 \mathcal{P} has all small coproducts;
- 2 \mathcal{P} satisfies a size condition;
- 3 \mathcal{P} satisfies the Mal'cev condition.

The category of *models* of \mathcal{P} is the category $\text{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}$ of presheaves X on \mathcal{P} such that $X(\coprod_{i \in I} P_i) \simeq \prod_{i \in I} X(P_i)$.

Comments

- From (1), theories are encoding “product theories”, or structures with operations with set-indexed arities and equational axioms;
- Theory can be ∞ -category; models are $X: \mathcal{P}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Gpd}_{\infty}$

Algebraic theories

Definition

A (bounded Mal'cev algebraic) theory is a category \mathcal{P} such that

- 1 \mathcal{P} has all small coproducts;
- 2 \mathcal{P} satisfies a size condition;
- 3 \mathcal{P} satisfies the Mal'cev condition.

The category of *models* of \mathcal{P} is the category $\text{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}$ of presheaves X on \mathcal{P} such that $X(\coprod_{i \in I} P_i) \simeq \prod_{i \in I} X(P_i)$.

Comments

- From (1), theories are encoding “product theories”, or structures with operations with set-indexed arities and equational axioms;
- Theory can be ∞ -category; models are $X: \mathcal{P}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Gpd}_{\infty}$

Facts

- $\text{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}$ freely adjoins geometric realizations to \mathcal{P} ;
- \mathcal{P} a 1-cat: $\text{Model}_{\mathcal{P}} = \text{Quillen's homotopy theory of sSet-models.}$

Categories of algebraic approximations

General recipe

- Input: homotopy theory \mathcal{M} with free objects $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{M}$;
- Output: theory $\mathrm{h}\mathcal{P}$ and homotopy functor $\pi: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{Model}_{\mathrm{h}\mathcal{P}}$.

Categories of algebraic approximations

General recipe

- Input: homotopy theory \mathcal{M} with free objects $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{M}$;
- Output: theory $\mathrm{h}\mathcal{P}$ and homotopy functor $\pi: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{Model}_{\mathrm{h}\mathcal{P}}$.

Examples

- G a finite group, A a G -equivariant \mathbb{A}_∞ ring, $\mathcal{P} = \mathrm{LMod}_A^{\mathrm{free}} = \{\bigoplus \Sigma^\alpha A \otimes (G/H)_+\}$, get $\mathrm{Model}_{\mathrm{h}\mathcal{P}} = \mathrm{LMod}_{\underline{\pi}_* A}$;
- R an \mathbb{E}_∞ ring, $\mathcal{P} =$ free associative R -algebras, get $\mathrm{Model}_{\mathrm{h}\mathcal{P}} = R_*$ -algebras (you can even add in G);
- $R \in \mathcal{CAlg}_{H\mathbb{F}_p}$, $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{CAlg}_R^{\mathrm{free}}$, get $\mathrm{Model}_{\mathrm{h}\mathcal{P}} =$ commutative R_* -rings with Dyer-Lashof operations.

Categories of algebraic approximations

General recipe

- Input: homotopy theory \mathcal{M} with free objects $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{M}$;
- Output: theory $\mathrm{h}\mathcal{P}$ and homotopy functor $\pi: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{Model}_{\mathrm{h}\mathcal{P}}$.

Examples

- G a finite group, A a G -equivariant \mathbb{A}_∞ ring, $\mathcal{P} = \mathrm{LMod}_A^{\mathrm{free}} = \{\bigoplus \Sigma^\alpha A \otimes (G/H)_+\}$, get $\mathrm{Model}_{\mathrm{h}\mathcal{P}} = \mathrm{LMod}_{\underline{\pi}_* A}$;
- R an \mathbb{E}_∞ ring, $\mathcal{P} =$ free associative R -algebras, get $\mathrm{Model}_{\mathrm{h}\mathcal{P}} = R_*$ -algebras (you can even add in G);
- $R \in \mathcal{CAlg}_{H\mathbb{F}_p}$, $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{CAlg}_R^{\mathrm{free}}$, get $\mathrm{Model}_{\mathrm{h}\mathcal{P}} =$ commutative R_* -rings with Dyer-Lashof operations.

Example of choice of \mathcal{P}

- Take $\mathcal{M} = \mathrm{Mod}_{H\mathbb{Z}_p}^{\mathrm{Cpl}(p)}$, $\mathcal{P} = \{(\bigoplus \Sigma^\alpha H\mathbb{Z})_p^\wedge\}$, $\mathcal{P}' = \{\bigoplus \Sigma^\alpha H\mathbb{Z}/(p)\}$;
- $\mathrm{Model}_{\mathrm{h}\mathcal{P}} = \mathrm{Ext}$ - p -completes in $\mathrm{Mod}_{H\mathbb{Z}_*}$, $\mathrm{Model}_{\mathrm{h}\mathcal{P}'} = \mathrm{Mod}_{\Lambda_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\beta)}$.

More homotopical structure

Homotopy theories

- In all examples, $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{M}$ is a theory before taking $\mathrm{h}\mathcal{P}$;
- In all examples, $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}$ is not an equivalence.
- Intuition: want operations indexed over higher-dimensional shapes.

More homotopical structure

Homotopy theories

- In all examples, $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{M}$ is a theory before taking $\mathrm{h}\mathcal{P}$;
- In all examples, $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}$ is not an equivalence.
- Intuition: want operations indexed over higher-dimensional shapes.

Definition: resolution theories

- 1 \mathcal{P} such that for $P \in \mathcal{P}$, the tensor $S^1 \otimes P = \mathrm{colim}_{x \in S^1} P$ exists in \mathcal{P} .
- 2 $\mathrm{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}^{\Omega} =$ models X such that $X(S^1 \otimes P) \simeq X(P)^{S^1}$.

More homotopical structure

Homotopy theories

- In all examples, $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{M}$ is a theory before taking $\mathrm{h}\mathcal{P}$;
- In all examples, $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}$ is not an equivalence.
- Intuition: want operations indexed over higher-dimensional shapes.

Definition: resolution theories

- ① \mathcal{P} such that for $P \in \mathcal{P}$, the tensor $S^1 \otimes P = \mathrm{colim}_{x \in S^1} P$ exists in \mathcal{P} .
- ② $\mathrm{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}^{\Omega} = \text{models } X \text{ such that } X(S^1 \otimes P) \simeq X(P)^{S^1}$.

History

- Examples first seen in Hopkins-Lurie's work on Brauer groups;
- Finitary pointed version used by Pstrągowski to reinterpret Blanc-Dwyer-Goerss obstruction theory for Π -algebras.

Purpose of construction

Metatheorem I

If \mathcal{M} is a category in stable homotopy theory with a good subcategory $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{M}$ of free objects, then $\mathcal{M} \simeq \text{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}^{\Omega}$.

Idea

Check directly for \mathcal{M} stable, then extend to algebras over good monads.

Purpose of construction

Metatheorem I

If \mathcal{M} is a category in stable homotopy theory with a good subcategory $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{M}$ of free objects, then $\mathcal{M} \simeq \text{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}^{\Omega}$.

Idea

Check directly for \mathcal{M} stable, then extend to algebras over good monads.

Metatheorem II

Studying the context

$$\text{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}^{\Omega} \rightleftarrows \text{Model}_{\mathcal{P}} \rightleftarrows \text{Model}_{\text{h}\mathcal{P}}$$

makes it easy to produce obstruction theories, spectral sequences, etc.

$$\{\text{Derived algebra of } \text{Model}_{\text{h}\mathcal{P}}\} \Rightarrow \{\text{Homotopy theory of } \text{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}^{\Omega}\}.$$

Examples

Left-derived functor spectral sequences

\mathcal{P} “stable” if $\Sigma: \mathcal{P} \simeq \mathcal{P}$. Gives $\text{Model}_{\mathcal{P}} \subset \text{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{Sp}}$ and explicit localization $L: \text{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{Sp}} \rightarrow \text{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{Sp}, \Omega}$. Get “left-derived functor spectral sequences”:

- Künneth spectral sequences, including multiplicativity;
- Bosterra spectral sequences for TAQ of ring spectra;
- For $X \in \text{Sp}_{\geq 0}$ and $M \in \text{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}^{\Omega}$, $H_*(X; \pi_* M) \Rightarrow \pi_*(X \otimes M)$.

Examples

Left-derived functor spectral sequences

\mathcal{P} “stable” if $\Sigma: \mathcal{P} \simeq \mathcal{P}$. Gives $\text{Model}_{\mathcal{P}} \subset \text{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{Sp}}$ and explicit localization $L: \text{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{Sp}} \rightarrow \text{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{Sp}, \Omega}$. Get “left-derived functor spectral sequences”:

- Künneth spectral sequences, including multiplicativity;
- Bosterra spectral sequences for TAQ of ring spectra;
- For $X \in \text{Sp}_{\geq 0}$ and $M \in \text{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}^{\Omega}$, $H_*(X; \pi_* M) \Rightarrow \pi_*(X \otimes M)$.

Mapping space obstruction theory

Given \mathcal{P} resolution theory, $A, B \in \text{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}^{\Omega}$ and $\phi: \pi_0 A \rightarrow \pi_0 B$, get

- Obstructions in $H_{\text{h}\mathcal{P}/\pi_0 B}^{m+1}(\pi_0 A; \pi_0 B^{S^m})$ to realizing ϕ ;
- Given a lift f , fringed $H_{\text{h}\mathcal{P}/\pi_0 B}^{p-q}(\pi_0 A; \pi_0 B^{S^p}) \Rightarrow \pi_q(\text{Map}(A, B), f)$.

We can apply this one to E -theory.

Getting back to orientations

Where we're at

- Want \mathbb{E}_∞ orientation $MUP \rightarrow E$, have \mathbb{H}_∞ orientations;
- \mathbb{H}_∞ orientation equivalent to $E_*^\wedge MUP \rightarrow E_*$ in $\text{Model}_{\text{h}\mathcal{P}}$;
- Here $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{CAlg}_E^{\text{loc,free}}$, and $\text{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}^\Omega \simeq \mathcal{CAlg}_E^{\text{loc}}$;
- Get obstructions to lifting in $H_{\text{h}\mathcal{P}/E_*}^{m+1}(E_*^\wedge MUP; \pi_* E^{S^m})$.

So we need to understand $\text{Model}_{\text{h}\mathcal{P}}$.

Getting back to orientations

Where we're at

- Want \mathbb{E}_∞ orientation $MUP \rightarrow E$, have \mathbb{H}_∞ orientations;
- \mathbb{H}_∞ orientation equivalent to $E_*^\wedge MUP \rightarrow E_*$ in $\text{Model}_{\mathfrak{h}\mathcal{P}}$;
- Here $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{CAlg}_E^{\text{loc, free}}$, and $\text{Model}_{\mathcal{P}}^\Omega \simeq \mathcal{CAlg}_E^{\text{loc}}$;
- Get obstructions to lifting in $H_{\mathfrak{h}\mathcal{P}/E_*}^{m+1}(E_*^\wedge MUP; \pi_* E^{S^m})$.

So we need to understand $\text{Model}_{\mathfrak{h}\mathcal{P}}$.

Rezk's monad

- Rezk studies a monad \mathbb{T} on Mod_{E_*} encoding E -power operations;
- $\text{Model}_{\mathfrak{h}\mathcal{P}} \subset \text{Ring}_{\mathbb{T}}$ is reflective subcategory of \mathfrak{m} -complete objects;
- In particular can identify $H_{\mathfrak{h}\mathcal{P}}^* = H_{\mathbb{T}}^*$.

So we can work with $\text{Ring}_{\mathbb{T}}$ instead.

Well-behaved theories

$\mathcal{R}\text{ing}_{\mathbb{T}}$ is a “well-behaved” theory of operations.

Fundamental facts

- Forgetful functor $\mathcal{R}\text{ing}_{\mathbb{T}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}\mathcal{R}\text{ing}_{E_*}$ is monadic and comonadic;
- Free \mathbb{T} -rings are (formally) smooth as E_* -rings.

Well-behaved theories

$\mathbf{Ring}_{\mathbb{T}}$ is a “well-behaved” theory of operations.

Fundamental facts

- Forgetful functor $\mathbf{Ring}_{\mathbb{T}} \rightarrow \mathbf{CRing}_{E_*}$ is monadic and comonadic;
- Free \mathbb{T} -rings are (formally) smooth as E_* -rings.

Another example

- Let $R = \mathbb{E}_\infty$ ring with $p = 0$ in $\pi_0 R$, and $\mathcal{P} = \mathbf{CAlg}_R^{\text{free}}$;
- Get $\mathbf{Model}_{\text{h}\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow \mathbf{CRing}_{R_*}$ with same properties.

Well-behaved theories

$\mathbf{Ring}_{\mathbb{T}}$ is a “well-behaved” theory of operations.

Fundamental facts

- Forgetful functor $\mathbf{Ring}_{\mathbb{T}} \rightarrow \mathbf{CRing}_{E_*}$ is monadic and comonadic;
- Free \mathbb{T} -rings are (formally) smooth as E_* -rings.

Another example

- Let $R = \mathbb{E}_\infty$ ring with $p = 0$ in $\pi_0 R$, and $\mathcal{P} = \mathbf{CAlg}_R^{\text{free}}$;
- Get $\mathbf{Model}_{\mathbf{h}\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow \mathbf{CRing}_{R_*}$ with same properties.

General context

- Bimonadicity says $\mathbf{Ring}_{\mathbb{T}}$ is “algebra over the theory of E_* -rings”;
- Examples can be unified using this notion (due to Freyd, Wraith).

θ -rings

Definition: θ -rings

Ring R with $\theta: R \rightarrow R$ so $\psi(x) = x^p + p\theta(x)$ generically a ring map:

$$\theta(x + y) = \theta(x) + \theta(y) - p^{-1}((a + b)^p - a^p - b^p);$$

$$\theta(xy) = \theta(x)y^p + x^p\theta(y) + p\theta(x)\theta(y);$$

$$\theta(1) = 0.$$

Relevance

In height 1, even objects of $\mathcal{R}\text{ing}_{\mathbb{T}} = \theta\text{-rings}$ under E_0 .

θ -rings

Definition: θ -rings

Ring R with $\theta: R \rightarrow R$ so $\psi(x) = x^p + p\theta(x)$ generically a ring map:

$$\theta(x + y) = \theta(x) + \theta(y) - p^{-1}((a + b)^p - a^p - b^p);$$

$$\theta(xy) = \theta(x)y^p + x^p\theta(y) + p\theta(x)\theta(y);$$

$$\theta(1) = 0.$$

Relevance

In height 1, even objects of $\mathcal{R}ing_{\mathbb{T}} = \theta$ -rings under E_0 .

Facts

- $\theta\mathcal{R}ing \rightarrow \mathcal{C}Ring$ is monadic and comonadic;
- $W = \text{free } \theta\text{-ring} = \text{Hom}_{\text{Fun}(\theta\mathcal{R}ing, \text{Set})}(U, U)$ with $U = \text{forgetful}$;
- Can identify $W \cong \mathbb{Z}[a, \theta a, \theta^{\circ 2} a, \dots]$.

θ -rings: Quillen cohomology

Abelianizations

Using the fact that $\theta\mathcal{R}\text{ing}^{\text{aug}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}\text{Ring}^{\text{aug}}$ is bimonadic:

- Identify $\Delta := \text{Hom}_{\text{Fun}(\mathcal{R}\text{ing}^{\text{aug}}, \text{Set})}(Q, Q) = Q(W) = \mathbb{Z}[\theta]$;
- Have $\text{Ab}(\theta\mathcal{R}\text{ing}^{\text{aug}}) = \text{LMod}_{\Delta}$, and Q gives abelianization.

θ -rings: Quillen cohomology

Abelianizations

Using the fact that $\theta\mathcal{R}\text{ing}^{\text{aug}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}\text{Ring}^{\text{aug}}$ is bimonadic:

- Identify $\Delta := \text{Hom}_{\text{Fun}(\mathcal{R}\text{ing}^{\text{aug}}, \text{Set})}(Q, Q) = Q(W) = \mathbb{Z}[\theta]$;
- Have $\text{Ab}(\theta\mathcal{R}\text{ing}^{\text{aug}}) = \text{LMod}_{\Delta}$, and Q gives abelianization.

In general, $\text{Ab}(\theta\mathcal{R}\text{ing}/A) = \text{LMod}_{A \otimes \Delta}$, $A \otimes \Delta = A\langle\theta\rangle/(\theta \cdot a = \psi(a) \cdot \theta)$.

θ -rings: Quillen cohomology

Abelianizations

Using the fact that $\theta\mathcal{R}\text{ing}^{\text{aug}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}\text{Ring}^{\text{aug}}$ is bimonadic:

- Identify $\Delta := \text{Hom}_{\text{Fun}(\mathcal{R}\text{ing}^{\text{aug}}, \text{Set})}(Q, Q) = Q(W) = \mathbb{Z}[\theta]$;
- Have $\text{Ab}(\theta\mathcal{R}\text{ing}^{\text{aug}}) = \text{LMod}_{\Delta}$, and Q gives abelianization.

In general, $\text{Ab}(\theta\mathcal{R}\text{ing}/A) = \text{LMod}_{A \otimes \Delta}$, $A \otimes \Delta = A\langle\theta\rangle/(\theta \cdot a = \psi(a) \cdot \theta)$.

Cohomology

Using fact that W is smooth: for $A \in \theta\mathcal{R}\text{ing}^{\text{aug}}$ and $M \in \text{LMod}_{\Delta}$,

$$H_{\theta^{\text{aug}}}^*(A; M) = \text{Ext}_{\Delta}^*(\mathbb{L}Q(A); M).$$

θ -rings: Quillen cohomology

Abelianizations

Using the fact that $\theta\mathcal{R}\text{Ring}^{\text{aug}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}\text{Ring}^{\text{aug}}$ is bimonadic:

- Identify $\Delta := \text{Hom}_{\text{Fun}(\mathcal{R}\text{ing}^{\text{aug}}, \text{Set})}(Q, Q) = Q(W) = \mathbb{Z}[\theta]$;
- Have $\text{Ab}(\theta\mathcal{R}\text{ing}^{\text{aug}}) = \text{LMod}_{\Delta}$, and Q gives abelianization.

In general, $\text{Ab}(\theta\mathcal{R}\text{ing}/A) = \text{LMod}_{A \otimes \Delta}$, $A \otimes \Delta = A\langle\theta\rangle/(\theta \cdot a = \psi(a) \cdot \theta)$.

Cohomology

Using fact that W is smooth: for $A \in \theta\mathcal{R}\text{ing}^{\text{aug}}$ and $M \in \text{LMod}_{\Delta}$,

$$H_{\theta^{\text{aug}}}^*(A; M) = \text{Ext}_{\Delta}^*(\mathbb{L}Q(A); M).$$

Comment

All of this is generic for “smooth algebras over theories”.

θ -rings: Additive operations

The additive bialgebra

- Identify $\Gamma := \text{Hom}_{\text{Fun}(\theta\mathcal{R}\text{ing}, \mathcal{A}\text{b})}(U, U) = \text{Prim}(W) = \mathbb{Z}[\psi]$;
- Identity $\psi(xy) = \psi(x)\psi(y)$ encoded by coproduct $\Delta(\psi) = \psi \otimes \psi$;
- Coproduct equivalent to: $\text{LMod}_\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Mod}_\mathbb{Z}$ symmetric monoidal.

θ -rings: Additive operations

The additive bialgebra

- Identify $\Gamma := \text{Hom}_{\text{Fun}(\theta\mathcal{R}\text{ing}, \mathcal{A}\text{b})}(U, U) = \text{Prim}(W) = \mathbb{Z}[\psi]$;
- Identity $\psi(xy) = \psi(x)\psi(y)$ encoded by coproduct $\Delta(\psi) = \psi \otimes \psi$;
- Coproduct equivalent to: $\text{LMod}_{\Gamma} \rightarrow \text{Mod}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ symmetric monoidal.

Comment

Recipe works for “algebras over theories of commutative rings”.

θ -rings: Additive operations

The additive bialgebra

- Identify $\Gamma := \text{Hom}_{\text{Fun}(\theta\text{Ring}, \text{Ab})}(U, U) = \text{Prim}(W) = \mathbb{Z}[\psi]$;
- Identity $\psi(xy) = \psi(x)\psi(y)$ encoded by coproduct $\Delta(\psi) = \psi \otimes \psi$;
- Coproduct equivalent to: $\text{LMod}_\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Mod}_\mathbb{Z}$ symmetric monoidal.

Comment

Recipe works for “algebras over theories of commutative rings”.

Remember $\psi(x) = x^p + p\theta(x)$.

The Wilkerson criterion

- If R is torsion-free, then ψ and θ determine each other;
- $\text{Ring}_\theta \rightarrow \text{CMon}(\text{LMod}_\Gamma)$ is fully faithful on torsion-free objects, image characterized by the congruence $\psi(x) \equiv x^p \pmod{p}$;
- As W is torsion-free, congruence determines structure of θRing .

T-rings

Fix E height n . Everything from $\theta\mathcal{R}\text{ing}$ generalizes to $\mathcal{R}\text{ing}_{\mathbb{T}}$: have additive bialgebra Γ and algebra Δ acting on indecomposables.

T-rings

Fix E height n . Everything from $\theta\mathcal{R}\text{ing}$ generalizes to $\mathcal{R}\text{ing}_{\mathbb{T}}$: have additive bialgebra Γ and algebra Δ acting on indecomposables.

Strickland's theorem

$\Gamma = \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} \Gamma[m]$ with $\text{Spf } \Gamma[m]^{\vee} = \text{rank } p^m \text{ subgroups of } \mathbb{G}_E$.

All of Γ 's structure is encoded by formal group theory.

T-rings

Fix E height n . Everything from $\theta\mathcal{R}\text{ing}$ generalizes to $\mathcal{R}\text{ing}_{\mathbb{T}}$: have additive bialgebra Γ and algebra Δ acting on indecomposables.

Strickland's theorem

$\Gamma = \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} \Gamma[m]$ with $\text{Spf } \Gamma[m]^{\vee} = \text{rank } p^m \text{ subgroups of } \mathbb{G}_E$.

All of Γ 's structure is encoded by formal group theory.

Rezk's theorems

- T.f. objects of $\mathcal{R}\text{ing}_{\mathbb{T}}$ = t.f. objects of $\text{CMon}(\text{LMod}_{\Gamma})$ satisfying $Q(x) \equiv x^p \pmod{p}$ for certain $Q \in \Gamma$. Heuristic: \mathbb{T} -rings are like θ -rings, but with more additive operations and relations.

T-rings

Fix E height n . Everything from $\theta\mathcal{R}\text{ing}$ generalizes to $\mathcal{R}\text{ing}_{\mathbb{T}}$: have additive bialgebra Γ and algebra Δ acting on indecomposables.

Strickland's theorem

$\Gamma = \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} \Gamma[m]$ with $\text{Spf } \Gamma[m]^{\vee} = \text{rank } p^m \text{ subgroups of } \mathbb{G}_E$.

All of Γ 's structure is encoded by formal group theory.

Rezk's theorems

- T.f. objects of $\mathcal{R}\text{ing}_{\mathbb{T}} = \text{t.f. objects of } \text{CMon}(\text{LMod}_{\Gamma})$ satisfying $Q(x) \equiv x^p \pmod{p}$ for certain $Q \in \Gamma$. Heuristic: \mathbb{T} -rings are like θ -rings, but with more additive operations and relations.
- Δ is Koszul, and $H^m(\Delta) = 0$ for $m > n$. Thus every $M \in \text{LMod}_{\Delta}$ projective over E_* admits length n projective resolution.

Application

Theorem (B.)

Fix height $n \leq 2$, and $A, B \in \mathcal{CAlg}_E^{\text{loc}}$ with $A_1 = 0 = B_1$ and A_* “completed smooth” over E_* . Then

- Every \mathbb{T} -ring map $A_* \rightarrow B_*$ lifts to $A \rightarrow B$;
- $\pi_* \mathcal{CAlg}_E(A, B)$ is algebraic, up to extensions at $n = 2$.

Application

Theorem (B.)

Fix height $n \leq 2$, and $A, B \in \mathcal{CAlg}_E^{\text{loc}}$ with $A_1 = 0 = B_1$ and A_* “completed smooth” over E_* . Then

- Every \mathbb{T} -ring map $A_* \rightarrow B_*$ lifts to $A \rightarrow B$;
- $\pi_* \mathcal{CAlg}_E(A, B)$ is algebraic, up to extensions at $n = 2$.

Proof sketch

- 1 Obstructions in $H_{\mathbb{T}/B_*}^{k+1}(A_*; \pi_* B^{S^k})$ for $k \geq 1$ to lifting;
- 2 By algebraic story + smoothness, this is $\text{Ext}_{A_* \otimes \Delta}^{k+1}(\widehat{\Omega}_{A_*|E_*}; \pi_* \Omega^k B)$;
- 3 Can upgrade Rezk’s theorem to show group vanishes for $k \geq n$;
- 4 $\text{Ext}_{A_* \otimes \Delta}^2(\widehat{\Omega}_{A_*|E_*}; \pi_* \Omega B) = 0$ as source is even and target is odd.

Application

Theorem (B.)

Fix height $n \leq 2$, and $A, B \in \mathcal{CAlg}_E^{\text{loc}}$ with $A_1 = 0 = B_1$ and A_* “completed smooth” over E_* . Then

- Every \mathbb{T} -ring map $A_* \rightarrow B_*$ lifts to $A \rightarrow B$;
- $\pi_* \mathcal{CAlg}_E(A, B)$ is algebraic, up to extensions at $n = 2$.

Proof sketch

- 1 Obstructions in $H_{\mathbb{T}/B_*}^{k+1}(A_*; \pi_* B^{S^k})$ for $k \geq 1$ to lifting;
- 2 By algebraic story + smoothness, this is $\text{Ext}_{A_* \otimes \Delta}^{k+1}(\widehat{\Omega}_{A_*|E_*}; \pi_* \Omega^k B)$;
- 3 Can upgrade Rezk’s theorem to show group vanishes for $k \geq n$;
- 4 $\text{Ext}_{A_* \otimes \Delta}^2(\widehat{\Omega}_{A_*|E_*}; \pi_* \Omega B) = 0$ as source is even and target is odd.

Corollary with $A = E \widehat{\otimes} MUP$ and $B = E$

Every \mathbb{H}_∞ orientation $MUP \rightarrow E$ at $n \leq 2$ lifts to an \mathbb{E}_∞ orientation.