

# Tate spectra

Sean Tilson

May 16, 2013

## 1 “Motivation”

Let  $G$  be a finite group. A couple weird things happen at the interaction of equivariant and chromatic homotopy theory. One is that  $L_{K(n)}S^{\text{hg}} \simeq L_{K(n)}S_{\text{hg}} - K(n)$ -locally, homotopy fixed points and homotopy orbits are the same.

Another goes by the name of the **redshift conjecture**. This says that algebraic  $K$ -theory shifts chromatic levels. For example:

**Example 1.**

$$K(H\mathbb{F}_p)_p^\wedge \simeq H\mathbb{Z}_p \vee \Sigma^{-1}H\mathbb{Z}_p.$$

**Example 2.**

$$K(H\mathbb{Z}_p)_p^\wedge \simeq \Sigma ku_p^\wedge \times (\text{Im } J \times \mathbb{Z}_p) \times B(\text{Im } J \times \mathbb{Z}_p).$$

**Example 3.**  $K(ku)$  is still unknown, but it is known to have a  $v_2$ -self map.

... and that’s basically all the evidence we have for the following conjecture:

**Conjecture 4** (Redshift conjecture).

$$V(n) \wedge K(L_{K(n)}A) \xrightarrow{\sim} v_{n+1}^{-1}V(n) \wedge K(L_{K(n)}A)$$

where  $A$  is a ‘suitably finite’ commutative ring spectrum.

Part of the reason this is such a difficult problem is that algebraic  $K$ -theory is generally very hard to compute. How do we compute it? Well, there’s a map from algebraic  $K$ -theory to topological cyclic homology  $TC$ , and given a map of ring spectra  $A \rightarrow B$ , these fit into a pullback square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K(A) & \longrightarrow & TC(A) \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ K(B) & \longrightarrow & TC(B). \end{array}$$

Topological cyclic homology, in turn, comes from a tower of topological Hochschild homology spectra  $THH$ . Morally, we say “ $TC(A)_p^\wedge = THH(A)^{S^1}$ ,” and so we reduce to computing these  $S^1$ -fixed points on  $THH$ . In order to do *this*, you have to fit together data about the  $p$ -subgroups  $C_{p^n}$  of  $S^1$  in a clever way.

Frequently, we get lucky and have

$$THH(A)^{C_{p^{n-1}}} \simeq THH(A)^{tC_{p^n}},$$

where the  $t$  denotes the **Tate construction**, to be discussed below. There’s a spectral sequence

$$\widehat{H}(C_{p^n}; THH(A)) \Rightarrow \pi_* THH(A)^{tC_{p^n}},$$

where  $\widehat{H}$  is Tate cohomology.

As an aside, here's the definition of Tate cohomology. We recall that for  $M$  a  $G$ -module,  $H_0(G; M) = M_G$  and  $H^0(G; M) = M^G$ . There's a norm map  $N : M_G \rightarrow M^G$  given by  $\bar{x} \mapsto \sum_{g \in G} gx$ , which one observes is invariant and independent of the class of  $x \in M$  mod the action of  $G$ . If we take a projective resolution  $P_*$  and an injective resolution  $I_*$  for  $M$  over  $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ , and truncate them by replacing  $P_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  with  $H_0(G; M) \rightarrow 0$  and  $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow I_0$  with  $0 \rightarrow H^0(G; M)$ , then the norm map fits them together into a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded complex  $P_* \rightarrow I_*$ . The homology of this is the **Tate cohomology**  $\widehat{H}^*(G; M)$ . This is a fancy way of saying that

$$\widehat{H}^*(G; M) = \begin{cases} H^*(G; M) & * \geq 1 \\ H_{-**+1}(G; M) & * < -1 \\ \text{coker}(N) & * = 0 \\ \text{ker}(N) & * = 1. \end{cases}$$

## 2 The Tate construction

In the topological case, if  $M$  is a  $G$ -spectrum, there are spectral sequences

$$H^*(G; \pi_* M) \Rightarrow \pi_* M^{\text{h}G} \quad \text{and} \quad H_*(G; \pi_* M) \Rightarrow \pi_* M_{\text{h}G},$$

and the Tate construction on  $M$  is a spectrum that fits in between the homotopy orbits and the homotopy fixed points, so as to give you the above spectral sequence.

More precisely, consider the cofiber sequence

$$EG_+ \rightarrow S^0 \rightarrow \widetilde{EG}.$$

Nonequivariantly,  $EG_+ \simeq S^0$ , so  $\widetilde{EG} \simeq *$ . On the other hand,  $(EG_+)^G \simeq *$ , so  $\widetilde{EG}^G \simeq S^0$ .

For  $X$  a  $G$ -spectrum, there's a map  $X \rightarrow F(EG_+, X)$ , inducing a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} EG_+ \wedge X & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & \widetilde{EG} \wedge X \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ EG_+ \wedge F(EG_+, X) & \longrightarrow & F(EG_+, X) & \longrightarrow & \widetilde{EG} \wedge F(EG_+, X) =: t_G X. \end{array}$$

Taking  $G$ -fixed points gives us a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X_{\text{h}G} & \longrightarrow & X^G & \longrightarrow & X^{\Phi G} \\ \sim \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ X_{\text{h}G} & \xrightarrow{N} & X^{\text{h}G} & \longrightarrow & X^{\text{t}G}, \end{array}$$

where  $X^{\text{t}G}$  is, by definition, the **Tate construction** on  $X$ . Often, the norm map is nullhomotopic, and we get an extension  $X^{\text{h}G} \rightarrow X^{\text{t}G} \rightarrow \Sigma X_{\text{h}G}$ , as we do algebraically with Tate cohomology.

**Proposition 5** (May).

$$X^{\text{t}G} \simeq F(\widetilde{EG}, \Sigma EG_+ \wedge X)^G.$$

If  $X$  is finite and has a trivial  $C_p$ -action, then

$$X^{\text{t}C_p} \simeq \text{holim}((BC_p)_{-n} \wedge \Sigma X).$$

Here  $(BC_p)_{-n}$  is defined via **James periodicity**, which says that for  $p^{n-k} | r$ ,

$$(BC_p)_{2k+1+r}^{2n+r} \simeq \Sigma^r (BC_p)_{2k+1}^{2n},$$

where  $X_m^n$  is defined for a CW-spectrum  $X$  by crushing out its  $(m-1)$ -skeleton and restricting to the  $n$ -skeleton of the result. Thus, we can crush 'negative-dimensional skeleta' of  $BC_p$  by crushing actual skeleta and desuspending. Using this, May's proposition, and the fact that  $F(X, Y \wedge Z) \simeq F(X, Y) \wedge Z$  for  $Z$  finite, we get the desired statement about  $X^{\text{t}C_p}$ .

### 3 $K(n)^{tG}$ and consequences

**Proposition 6.** *If  $G$  is a finite group acting trivially on  $K(n)$ , then*

$$K(n)^{tG} \simeq *.$$

**Corollary 7.**

$$K(n)_*BG \cong K(n)^*BG.$$

*Proof.*  $K(n)_*BG = \pi_*K(n) \wedge BG = \pi_*K(n)_{hG}$ , and likewise  $K(n)^*BG = \pi_*K(n)^{hG}$ ; since the Tate construction is trivial, these two spectra are equivalent.  $\square$

**Lemma 8.** *If  $K$  is complex-oriented and  $K_*BG$  is finitely generated over  $K_*$ , then*

$$\operatorname{holim}_{-s} K \wedge BG^{(-s\xi)} \simeq *,$$

where  $\xi$  is some complex bundle on  $BG$  and  $BG^{(-s\xi)}$  the Thom construction on  $s\xi$ .

*Proof.*  $K_*BG^{(r)} \rightarrow K_*BG$  is surjective for sufficiently large  $r$ , by the finite generation hypothesis. So there's a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K_*(BG^{(r)})^{-(s+j)\xi} & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & K_*BG^{-s\xi} \\ & \searrow & \nearrow \\ & K_*BG^{-(s+j)\xi} & \end{array}$$

with the left map surjective. But  $(BG^{(r)})^{-(s+j)\xi}$  has a top cell in some finite dimension, and  $BG^{-s\xi}$  has a top cell in some finite dimension. For sufficiently large  $j$ , we can thus make the top map zero, so that  $K_*BG^{-(s+j)\xi} \rightarrow K_*BG^{-s\xi}$  is zero as well.  $\square$

**Lemma 9.** *Let  $V$  be a finite dimensional  $G$ -representation and  $K$  a complex-oriented spectrum with  $K_*BH$  finitely generated over  $K$  for all  $H \leq G$ . Then  $F(S^{\infty V}, K \wedge EG_+)$  is equivariantly contractible.*

*Proof.*

$$F(S^{\infty V}, K \wedge EG_+) \simeq F(\operatorname{hocolim} S^{nV}, K \wedge EG_+) \simeq \operatorname{holim} F(S^{nV}, K \wedge EG_+) \simeq \operatorname{holim} S^{-nV} \wedge K \wedge EG_+.$$

Now, for any  $H \leq G$ ,  $V$  is an  $H$ -representation by restriction, and likewise  $EG_+$  is a model for  $EH_+$ . Therefore,  $(K \wedge EG_+ \wedge S^{-nV})^H \simeq K \wedge BH^{-n\xi}$  and for  $n \gg 0$ , this is contractible since  $K_*BH$  is finitely generated, using the previous lemma.  $\square$

In particular,  $K(n)$  satisfies the above conditions, so  $K(n)^{tG} \simeq *$ . As a corollary, if  $X$  is type  $n$ , then  $(L_{K(n)}X)^{tG} \simeq *$ , so  $(L_{K(n)}X)^{hG} \simeq (L_{K(n)}X)_{hG}$ .

**Proposition 10.** *If  $K$  is a  $p$ -local  $v_n$ -periodic spectrum, with  $v_n$  a unit and  $v_i$  acting nilpotently for all  $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ , then  $K^{tG} \simeq *$ .*

This allows us to access a phenomenon known as **blueshift**, which says that the Tate construction with respect to trivial finite group actions tends to decrease chromatic levels.

**Theorem 11** (Greenlees-Sadofsky). *If  $K$  is as above without the nilpotence assumption, then  $t_G(K)$  is  $v_{n-1}$ -periodic.*

**Theorem 12** (Hovey-Sadofsky). *If  $X$  is  $E(n)$ -local and  $G$  acts trivially, then  $X^{tG}$  is  $E(n-1)$ -local, and in fact,*

$$\langle (L_n X)^{tG} \rangle = \langle L_{n-1} X \rangle$$

where angle brackets denote Bousfield classes.

Work of Ando, Morava, and Sadofsky gives us a weak equivalence

$$(E(n)[w]^{tC_p})_{I_{n-1}}^\wedge =: TE \xrightarrow{\simeq} HW(\mathbb{F}_p((y))^{\text{sep}}) \widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{Z}_p} E_{n-1}.$$

Here  $E(n)[w]$  is basically  $E(n)$  with a  $p^{n-1} - 1$ th root of  $v_{n-1}$ , called  $w$ , added to its homotopy. We then have  $\pi_0 TE = W(\mathbb{F}_p((y))^{\text{sep}})[[w_1, \dots, w_{n-2}]]$ , where  $w_i$  is the image of  $v_i x^{p^i - 1}$ .

**Proposition 13.** *For  $E$  complex-oriented,  $\pi_*(E^{tC_p}) = E_*((x))/[p](x)$ .*