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### Abstract

We develop some of the basic operadic theory of derived $A$-infinity algebras, building on the work of [LRW13]. In particular, we study the coalgebras over the Koszul dual cooperad to the operad $dA$s, and provide a simple description of these. We study representations of derived $A$-infinity algebras and explain how these are a two-sided...
version of Sagave’s modules over derived $A$-infinity algebras. We also give a new explicit example of a derived $A$-infinity algebra.
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1 Introduction

Strongly homotopy associative algebras, also known as $A_\infty$-algebras, were invented at the beginning of the sixties by Stasheff as a tool in the study of group-like topological spaces. Since then it has become clear that $A_\infty$-structures are relevant in algebra, geometry and mathematical physics. In particular, Kadeishvili used the existence of $A_\infty$-structures in order to classify differential graded algebras over a field up to quasi-isomorphism. When the base field is replaced by a commutative ring, however, Kadeishvili’s result no longer holds. If the homology of the differential graded algebra is not projective over the ground ring there need no longer be a minimal $A_\infty$-algebra quasi-isomorphic to the given differential graded algebra.

In order to bypass the projectivity assumptions, Sagave developed the notion of derived $A_\infty$-algebras. Compared to classical $A_\infty$-algebras, derived $A_\infty$-algebras are equipped with an additional grading. The structure of a derived $A_\infty$-algebra arises on some projective resolution of the homology of a differential graded algebra and Sagave uses this to establish a notion of minimal model for differential graded algebras (dgas) whose homology is not necessarily projective.

In this paper, we continue the work of [LRW13], developing the description of these structures using operads. The operads we use are non-symmetric operads in the category $\text{BiCompl}_v$ of bicomplexes with zero horizontal differential. We have an operad $dA_s$ in this category encoding bidgas, which are simply monoids in bicomplexes. It is shown in [LRW13] that derived $A_\infty$-algebras are precisely algebras over the operad

$$dA_\infty = (dA_s)_\infty = \Omega((dA_s)^{!)\})$$

In this manner, we view a derived $A_\infty$-algebra as the infinity version of a bidga, just as an $A_\infty$-algebra is the infinity version of a dga.

We further investigate the operad $dA_s$, in particular studying $(dA_s)^{!}$-coalgebras. The structure of an $A_s$-coalgebra is well-known to be equivalent, via a suspension, to that of a usual coassociative coalgebra. Analogously, $(dA_s)^{!}$-coalgebras are equivalent, via an appropriately modified suspension, to coassociative coalgebras which are equipped with an extra piece of structure.

A substantial part of this paper is concerned with representations of derived $A_\infty$-algebras. Besides being an important part of the basic operadic theory of these algebras, we will use this theory in subsequent work to develop the Hochschild cohomology of derived $A_\infty$-algebras with coefficients. In section 4 we give a general result expressing a representation of a $\mathcal{P}_\infty$-algebra for any Koszul operad $\mathcal{P}$ in terms of a square-zero coderivation. Then we work this out explicitly for the derived $A_\infty$ case. We explain how this relates to Sagave’s derived $A_\infty$-modules: the operadic notion of representation yields a two-sided version of Sagave’s modules.

Finally, we present a new, explicit example of a derived $A_\infty$-algebra. The construction is based on some examples of $A_\infty$-algebras due to Allocca and Lada.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we begin with a brief review of previous work on derived $A_\infty$-algebras and establish our notation and conventions. Sections 3
and Section 3 presents our example. A brief appendix establishes the relationship between two standard sign conventions and gives details of cooperadic suspension in our bigraded setting.

2 Review of derived $A_\infty$-algebras

In this section we establish our notation and conventions. We review Sagave’s definition of derived $A_\infty$-algebras from [Sag10] and we explain the operadic approach of [LRW13].

2.1 Derived $A_\infty$-algebras

Let $k$ denote a commutative ring unless otherwise stated. We start by considering $(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z})$-bigraded $k$-modules

$$ A = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}, j \in \mathbb{Z}} A^i_j. $$

We will use the following grading conventions. An element in $A^i_j$ is said to be of bidegree $(i, j)$. We call $i$ the horizontal degree and $j$ the vertical degree. We have two suspensions:

$$(sA^i_j)^{j} = A^{i+1}_{j-1} \quad \text{and} \quad (SA^i_j)^{i} = A^{i-1}_{j+1}.$$ 

A morphism of bidegree $(u, v)$ maps $A^i_j$ to $A^{i+v}_{j+u}$, hence is a map

$$ s^{-u} S^{-v} A \to A. $$

We remark that this is a different convention to that adopted in [LRW13]. Note also that our objects are graded over $(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z})$. The reason for the change will be explained below.

The following definition of (non-unital) derived $A_\infty$-algebra is that of [Sag10], except that we generalize to allow a $(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z})$-bigrading, rather than an $(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Z})$-bigrading. (Sagave avoids $(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z})$-bigrading because of potential problems taking total complexes, but this is not an issue for the purposes of the present paper.)

**Definition 2.1.** A derived $A_\infty$-algebra is a $(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z})$-bigraded $k$-module $A$ equipped with $k$-linear maps

$$ m_{ij} : A^{\otimes j} \to A $$

of bidegree $(-i, 2 - i - j)$ for each $i \geq 0$, $j \geq 1$, satisfying the equations

$$ \sum_{u=i+r, v=j+q-1 \atop j=1+r+t} (-1)^{r+q+t+p} m_{ij}(1^{\otimes r} \otimes m_{pq} \otimes 1^{\otimes t}) = 0 \quad (1) $$

for all $u \geq 0$ and $v \geq 1$. 
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Examples of derived $A_\infty$-algebras include classical $A_\infty$-algebras, which are derived $A_\infty$-algebras concentrated in horizontal degree 0. Other examples are bicomplexes, bidgas and twisted chain complexes (see below).

We remark that we follow the sign conventions of Sagave \[Sag10\]. For a derived $A_\infty$-algebra concentrated in horizontal degree 0, one obtains one of the standard sign conventions for $A_\infty$-algebras. The appendix contains a discussion of alternative sign conventions, with a precise description of the relationship between them.

2.2 Twisted chain complexes

The notion of twisted chain complex is important in the theory of derived $A_\infty$-algebras. The terminology multicomplex is also used for a twisted chain complex.

**Definition 2.2.** A twisted chain complex $C$ is a $(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z})$-bigraded $k$-module with $k$-linear maps $d^C_i : C \rightarrow C$ of bidegree $(-i, 1-i)$ for $i \geq 0$, satisfying $\sum_{i+p=u} (-1)^i d^C_i d^C_p = 0$ for $u \geq 0$. A map of twisted chain complexes $C \rightarrow D$ is a family of maps $f_i : C \rightarrow D$, for $i \geq 0$, of bidegree $(-i, -i)$, satisfying

$$\sum_{i+p=u} (-1)^i f_i d^C_p = \sum_{i+p=u} d^D_i f_p.$$

The composition of maps $f : E \rightarrow F$ and $g : F \rightarrow G$ is defined by $(gf)_u = \sum_{i+p=u} g_i f_p$ and the resulting category is denoted $tCh_k$.

A derived $A_\infty$-algebra has an underlying twisted chain complex, specified by the maps $m_{i1}$ for $i \geq 0$.

2.3 Vertical bicomplexes and operads in vertical bicomplexes

The underlying category for the operadic view of derived $A_\infty$-algebras is the category of vertical bicomplexes.

**Definition 2.3.** An object of the category of vertical bicomplexes $BiCompl_v$ is a bigraded $k$-module as above equipped with a vertical differential

$$d_A^v : A^i_j \rightarrow A^i_{j+1}$$

of bidegree $(0, 1)$. The morphisms are those morphisms of bigraded modules commuting with the vertical differential. We denote by $\text{Hom}(A, B)$ the set of morphisms (preserving the bigrading) from $A$ to $B$.

The category $BiCompl_v$ is isomorphic to the category of $\mathbb{Z}$-graded chain complexes of $k$-modules.

For the suspension $s$ as above, we have $d_A^v(sx) = -s(d_A^v x)$.

The tensor product of two vertical bicomplexes $A$ and $B$ is given by

$$(A \otimes B)_u^v = \bigoplus_{i+p=u, j+q=v} A^i_j \otimes B^q_p.$$
with $d_{A\otimes B} = d_A \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes d_B : (A \otimes B)^v_u \to (A \otimes B)^{v+1}_u$. This makes $\text{BiCompl}_v$ into a symmetric monoidal category.

Let $A$ and $B$ be two vertical bicomplexes. We write $\text{Hom}_k$ for morphisms of $k$-modules. We will denote by $\text{Mor}(A, B)$ the vertical bicomplex given by

$$\text{Mor}(A, B)^v_u = \prod_{\alpha, \beta} \text{Hom}_k(A^\beta_{\alpha}, B^{\beta+v}_{\alpha+u}),$$

with vertical differential given by $\partial_{\text{Mor}}(f) = d_B f - (-1)^j f d_A$ for $f$ of bidegree $(l, j)$.

The reason for the change of grading conventions is that, with the convention adopted here, $\text{Mor}$ is now an internal Hom on $\text{BiCompl}_v$.

2.4 The operad $dA_s$

We now describe an operad in $\text{BiCompl}_v$. All operads considered in this paper are non-symmetric. A non-symmetric operad in $\text{BiCompl}_v$ is defined in the usual way, as a monoid in the category of collections of vertical bicomplexes endowed with the monoidal structure given by plethysm of collections; further details can be found in [LRW13, Section 2].

We adopt standard operad notation, so that $P(M, R)$ denotes the operad defined by generators and relations $F(M)/\langle R \rangle$, where $F(M)$ is the free (non-symmetric) operad on the collection $M$.

**Definition 2.4.** The operad $dA_s$ in $\text{BiCompl}_v$ is defined as $P(M_{dA_s}, R_{dA_s})$ where

$$M_{dA_s}(n) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } n > 2, \\ km_{02} \text{ concentrated in bidegree } (0, 0), & \text{if } n = 2, \\ km_{11} \text{ concentrated in bidegree } (-1, 0), & \text{if } n = 1, \end{cases}$$

and

$$R_{dA_s} = k(m_{02} \circ m_{02} - m_{02} \circ m_{02}) \oplus km_{02}^2 \oplus k(m_{11} \circ m_{02} - m_{02} \circ m_{11} - m_{02} \circ m_{11}),$$

with trivial vertical differential.

The algebras for this operad are easily seen to be the bidgas, that is associative monoids in bicomplexes; see [LRW13, Proposition 2.5]. Note that one differential comes from the vertical differential on objects in the underlying category, while the operad encodes the other differential and the multiplication.

The operad $dA_s$ is Koszul and one of the main results of [LRW13] identifies the associated infinity algebras.

**Theorem 2.5.** [LRW13, Theorem 3.2] A derived $A_\infty$-algebra is precisely a $(dA_s)_\infty = \Omega((dA_s)^v)_1$-algebra.
3 Coalgebras over the Koszul dual cooperad

In this section we initiate a study of the operad $dA_\infty$ and related objects. In particular we consider the category of coalgebras over the Koszul dual cooperad of $dA_\infty$ and coderivations of such coalgebras. This will allow us to give an operadic explanation of Sagave’s reformulation of a derived $A_\infty$-algebra structure in terms of certain structure on the cotensor algebra. We begin by setting up cooperads and their coalgebras. Then we recall the classical case for the associative operad $A_\infty$, before considering the derived case.

3.1 Cooperads and coalgebras

We briefly set up our conventions for non-symmetric cooperads and (conilpotent) coalgebras over cooperads.

A non-symmetric cooperad in a symmetric monoidal category is a comonoid in the associated category of collections endowed with the monoidal structure given by plethysm $\circ$ of collections. Thus a non-symmetric cooperad $C$ has a structure map $\Delta : C \to C \circ C = \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} C(k) \otimes C(k) \otimes D^k$.

The plethysm we use is the non-symmetric version, with the direct sum $C \circ D = \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} C(k) \otimes D^k$.

One could alternatively replace the direct sum by a product and this would allow one to drop conilpotent hypotheses on coalgebras below.

A conilpotent coalgebra $C$ over a cooperad $C$ has structure map $\Delta_C : C \to \mathcal{C}(C) = \bigoplus_k \mathcal{C}(k) \otimes C(k)^{\otimes k}$, satisfying the standard compatibility with the cooperad structure of $C$.

3.2 Cooperadic suspension

The notion of suspension of an operad as in [GJ94, Section 1.3] can be adapted to collections.

We define the operation $\Lambda R$ for any collection $R$ in BiCompl as follows:

$$\Lambda R(n) = s^{1-n} R(n).$$

If $R$ is a non-symmetric (co)operad so is $\Lambda R$ and if $R(V)$ denotes the free (co)algebra generated by $V$ then

$$(\Lambda R)(sV) \cong sR(V).$$

Consequently, $V$ is an $R$-(co)algebra if and only if $sV$ is a $\Lambda R$-(co)algebra. Equivalently $V$ is a $\Lambda R$-(co)algebra if and only if $s^{-1}V$ is an $R$-(co)algebra. Indeed this construction gives rise to an isomorphism of (co)algebra categories.

Further details about cooperadic suspension can be found in the appendix, explaining in detail the signs involved in our bigraded setting.
3.3 The classical case, $A_{sl}$-coalgebras

We denote by $A_{sl}$ the usual operad for associative algebras. This can be viewed either as an operad in differential graded modules, which is the usual classical context, or equivalently in vertical bicomplexes (in which case it is concentrated in horizontal degree zero). In the case of this operad, there is a well-known nice relationship, via suspension, between the operadic notion of coalgebra over the cooperad $A_{sl}$ and ordinary coassociative coalgebras.

**Proposition 3.1.** Cooperadic suspension gives rise to an isomorphism of categories between the category of conilpotent coalgebras over the cooperad $A_{sl}$ and the category of conilpotent coassociative coalgebras.

Under this isomorphism the notion of coderivation $d : C \to C$ on a coassociative coalgebra $C$ corresponds to the operadic notion of coderivation on the corresponding $A_{sl}$-coalgebra, $s^{-1}C$.

We note that one can remove the conilpotent hypothesis at the expense of using a completed version of the cotensor algebra.

Recall that $A_{sl}(A) = s^{-1}T(sA)$, the shifted reduced tensor coalgebra on $sA$.

We can see the basic idea of how the isomorphism works on objects very explicitly: given a coassociative coalgebra $C$ with comultiplication $\Delta : C \to C \otimes C$, this completely determines an $A_{sl}$-coalgebra structure on $s^{-1}C$.

$$\Delta : s^{-1}C \to A_{sl}(s^{-1}C) = s^{-1}T(sA).$$

The components of this map are forced to be (shifted) iterations of the coassociative comultiplication $\Delta$, that is, we have $\Delta = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} s^{-i} \Delta^{(i)}$. (Here we make the conventions $\Delta^{(0)} = s^{-1}1_C$, $\Delta^{(1)} = s^{-1}1_A$.)

And, on the other hand, an $A_{sl}$-coalgebra structure has to be of this form.

More conceptually, Proposition 3.1 is an instance of the isomorphism of coalgebra categories given by cooperadic suspension. In this case, we have $\Lambda A_{sl} = A_{sl}$ and coalgebras for this cooperad are coassociative coalgebras.

Applying this to the special case of the cofree $A_{sl}$-coalgebra $C = s^{-1}T(sA)$, this structure corresponds to an ordinary coassociative comultiplication on $T(sA)$. The comultiplication map on here is deconcatenation, possibly with some signs, depending on the sign convention adopted. There is a choice of convention for which one obtains deconcatenation with no signs and we refer to the appendix for further discussion of signs.

We also obtain that the operadic notion of coderivation in this case corresponds to the usual coalgebra one on $T(sA)$.

Now we have the general theorem that for a suitable operad $P$, a $P_\infty$-algebra structure on $A$ is equivalent to a square-zero coderivation of degree one on the $P$-coalgebra $P(A)$; see [LV12, 10.1.13].

So in the case $P = A_{sl}$, we get that an $A_{sl}$-structure on $A$ is equivalent to a square-zero coderivation of degree one on the $A_{sl}$-coalgebra $A_{sl}(A) = s^{-1}T(sA)$.
And, by the above, this is equivalent to a square-zero coderivation of degree one on the coassociative coalgebra $T(sA)$.

### 3.4 The operad of dual numbers

We recall the situation for the operad of dual numbers, since the operad $dAs$ can be built from the operad $As$ and the operad of dual numbers, via a distributive law.

The operad of dual numbers only contains arity one operations, so it can be thought of as just a $k$-algebra, and algebras over this operad correspond to (left) modules over this $k$-algebra. So let $D = k[x]/(x^2)$ be the algebra of dual numbers. We consider this as a bigraded algebra, where the bidegree of $\epsilon$ is $(-1,0)$.

Then consider the Koszul dual cooperad $D^i$. Again this is concentrated in arity one and can be thought of as just a $k$-co-algebra. We have $D^i = k[x]$, where $x = se$, $x$ has bidegree $(-1,-1)$ and the comultiplication is determined by $\Delta(x^n) = \sum_{i+j=n} x^i \otimes x^j$.

A $D^i$-co-algebra is a comodule $C$ over this coalgebra and this turns out to just be a pair $(C,f)$, where $C$ is a $k$-module and $f$ is a linear map $f : C \to C$ of bidegree $(1,1)$. (Given a coaction $\rho : C \to D^i \otimes C = k[x] \otimes C$, write $f_1$ for the projection onto $k\{x^1\} \otimes C$; then coassociativity gives $f_{m+n} = f_m f_n$, so the coaction is determined by $f_1$.) A coderivation is a linear map $d : C \to C$ of bidegree $(r,s)$ such that $df = (-1)^{\langle r,s\rangle} \langle 1,1 \rangle fd$, that is $df = (-1)^{r+s} fd$. In particular, if $d$ has bidegree $(0,1)$ then it anti-commutes with $f$.

### 3.5 The derived case, $(dAs)^i$-coalgebras

We recall from [LRW13, Lemma 2.6] that the operad $dAs$ can be built from the operad $As$ and the operad of dual numbers, via a distributive law, so that we have $dAs = As \circ D$.

We have, on underlying collections, $(dAs)^i = D^i \circ (As)^i$. Since $D^i$ is concentrated in arity one, applying $\Lambda$ gives $\Lambda(dAs)^i = D^i \circ \Lambda(As)^i$. It thus seems natural that a $\Lambda(dAs)^i$-coalgebra should correspond to a coassociative coalgebra (coming from the $\Lambda(As)^i$-coalgebra structure), plus a compatible linear map (coming from the $D^i$-coalgebra structure). This works out as follows.

Consider triples $(C,\Delta,f)$ where $(C,\Delta)$ is a conilpotent coassociative coalgebra and $f : C \to C$ is a linear map of bidegree $(1,1)$ satisfying $(f \otimes 1)\Delta = (1 \otimes f)\Delta = \Delta f$. A morphism between two such triples is a morphism of coalgebras commuting with the given linear maps.

**Proposition 3.2.** Cooperadic suspension gives rise to an isomorphism of categories between the category of conilpotent coalgebras over the cooperad $(dAs)^i$ and the category of triples $(C,\Delta,f)$ as above.

An operadic coderivation of bidegree $(0,1)$ of a $(dAs)^i$-coalgebra $s^{-1}C$ corresponds on $(C,\Delta,f)$ to a coderivation of bidegree $(0,1)$ of the coalgebra $C$, anti-commuting with the linear map $f$.

**Proof.** We will see that a triple $(C,\Delta,f)$ as above corresponds to a $(dAs)^i$-coalgebra structure on $s^{-1}C$, or equivalently to a $\Lambda(dAs)^i$-coalgebra structure on $C$. 
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The cooperad structure of \((dA_s)^i\) is given explicitly in \([LRW13, \text{Proposition 2.7}]\) and the corresponding structure of \(\Lambda(dA_s)^i\) is given in the appendix; see Corollary \([5.2]\). In particular, as a \(k\)-module, it is free on generators \(a_{uv}\), with bidegree \((-u, -u)\).

It follows that we can identify \(\Lambda(dA_s)^i(C)\) with \(k[x] \otimes T^c(C)\), where, for \(a \in C^\otimes^v\), \(a_{uv} \otimes a \in \Lambda(dA_s)^i(C)\) is identified with \(x^u \otimes a \in k[x] \otimes T^c(C)\).

Let \(C\) be a coalgebra for the cooperad \(\Lambda(dA_s)^i\), with coaction

\[
\rho : C \to \Lambda(dA_s)^i(C) = k[x] \otimes T^c(C).
\]

Write \(\rho_{i,j} : C \to C^\otimes^j\) for the composition of \(\rho\) with the projection to the component \(k\{x^i\} \otimes C^\otimes^j\). Define \(\Delta = \rho_{0,2} : C \to C \otimes C\) and \(f = \rho_{1,1} : C \to C\). Then one can check that \(\Delta\) is coassociative (essentially as in the classical case) and that

\[
-\rho_{1,2} = (f \otimes 1)\Delta = (1 \otimes f)\Delta = \Delta f.
\]

More generally, one has \(\rho_{i,j} = (-1)^{i(j+1)}\Delta^{(j-1)}f^i\). Thus the \(\Lambda(dA_s)^i\)-coalgebra structure is completely determined by \(\Delta\) and \(f\).

On the other hand, given a triple \((C, \Delta, f)\) as above, we can define

\[
\rho_{i,j} = (-1)^{i(j+1)}\Delta^{(j-1)}f^i
\]

and let \(\rho : C \to (dA_s)^i(C)\) be the corresponding map. Using the fact that \((f \otimes 1)\Delta = (1 \otimes f)\Delta = \Delta f\), we see that \(\rho_{i,j} = (-1)^{i(j+1)}(f^i \otimes 1)\Delta^{(j-1)}f^i\) and with this relation we can check that \(\rho\) does make \(C\) into a \(\Lambda(dA_s)^i\)-coalgebra.

It is straightforward to check the statement about coderivations; we get a coderivation of the coalgebra as in the classical case, together with compatibility with \(f\). \(\square\)

**Example 3.3**

Consider the cofree example, \(\Lambda(dA_s)^i(C) = k[x] \otimes T^c(C)\). The \(\Lambda(dA_s)^i\)-coalgebra structure on this corresponds to a coalgebra structure on \(k[x] \otimes T^c(C)\), together with compatible linear map \(f\).

The formulas for these structure maps can be calculated from the cooperad structure given in Corollary \([5.2]\). The coalgebra structure is given by

\[
\Delta(x^r \otimes a_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes a_n) = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \sum_{r+s=i} (-1)^\epsilon x^r \otimes a_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes a_k \otimes x^s \otimes a_{k+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes a_n,
\]

where \(\epsilon = rn + ik + (s, s)(|a_1| + \cdots + |a_k|)\).

The linear map

\[
f : k[x] \otimes T^c(C) \to k[x] \otimes T^c(C)
\]

is determined by \(f(x^n \otimes a) = (-1)^{j+1}x^{n-1} \otimes a\), for \(a \in C^\otimes^j\).

Now an operadic coderivation is a coderivation of the coalgebra \(k[x] \otimes T^c(C)\), anticommuting with the map \(f\). Let \(d : k[x] \otimes T^c(C) \to k[x] \otimes T^c(C)\) and write

\[
d(x^n \otimes a) = \sum_i x^i \otimes d^{n,i}(a),
\]
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where $d^{n,i} : \mathcal{T}(C) \to \mathcal{T}(C)$ and $a \in C^{\otimes j}$.

Write $d^{n,i}(a) = \sum_k d^{n,i,k}(a)$ with $d^{n,i,k}(a) \in C^{\otimes k}$. Then anti-commuting with $f$ means that

$$d^{n,i,k}(a) = (-1)^{j+k+1} d^{n-1,i-1,k}(a),$$

where $a \in C^{\otimes j}$ and hence that

$$d^{n,i,k}(a) = (-1)^{i(j+k+1)} d^{n-i,0,k}$$

for $i \leq n$ and $d^{n,i,k} = 0$ for $i > n$. So $d$ is completely determined by the family of maps $d^{n,0,k}$.

Define $\delta^n : \mathcal{T}(C) \to \mathcal{T}(C)$ by $\delta^n(a) = (-1)^{nj} d^{n,0}(a)$, where $a \in C^{\otimes j}$. (So if one writes $\delta^n(a) = \sum_k \delta^{n,k}(a)$ with $a \in C^{\otimes j}$ and $\delta^{n,k}(a) \in C^{\otimes k}$, then $\delta^{n,k}(a) = (-1)^{nj} d^{n,0,k}(a)$.)

The coderivation condition for $d$ makes each $\delta^n$ a coderivation of $\mathcal{T}(C)$. So we obtain a family of coderivations $\delta^n$ on $\mathcal{T}(C)$.

Using this we have an operadic explanation of the following formulation of a derived $A_\infty$-algebra structure: this is part of [Sag10, Lemma 4.1].

**Proposition 3.4.** A derived $A_\infty$-algebra structure on a bigraded $k$-module $A$ is equivalent to specifying a family of coderivations $\mathcal{T}(sA) \to \mathcal{T}(sA)$ making $\mathcal{T}(sA)$ into a twisted chain complex.

**Proof.** As recalled above, a $P_\infty$-algebra structure on $A$ is equivalent to a square-zero coderivation on the $P$-coalgebra $P(A)$. Applying this to the example $P = dAs$, and with $A = s^{-1}C$, we see that a coderivation $d$ of $(dAs)(A)$ corresponds to a family of coderivations $\delta^n$ on $\mathcal{T}(sA)$.

Now one can check that if we further impose the condition $d^2 = 0$ on the map $P(A) \to P(A)$, this corresponds to saying that the maps $\delta^n$ make $\mathcal{T}(sA)$ into a twisted chain complex.

In more detail, with $a \in C^{\otimes j}$ and using the same notation as in Example 3.3,

$$d^2(x^n \otimes a) = \sum_{r,s} x^r \otimes d^r.s d^{n,r}(a).$$

In particular, considering $s = 0$, we see that $d^2 = 0$ implies:

$$\sum_r d^{r,0} d^{n,r}(a) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \sum_r \sum_k (-1)^{r(j+k+1)} d^{r,0} d^{n-r,0,k}(a) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \sum_r \sum_k (-1)^{r(j+k+1)+rk+(n-r)j} d^r \delta^{n-r,k}(a) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \sum_r (-1)^{r+nj} d^r \delta^n(a) = 0 \Leftrightarrow (-1)^{nj} \sum_r (-1)^r d^r \delta^n(a) = 0.$$
Thus \( d^2 = 0 \) implies the twisted chain complex conditions \( \sum_r (-1)^r \delta^r \delta^{n-r}(a) = 0 \) on the maps \( \delta^r \).

Furthermore, by [LV12, 6.3.8], \( d^2 \) is completely determined by its projection to the \( x^0 \) part and it follows that the condition \( d^2 = 0 \) holds if and only if the maps \( \delta^r \) satisfy the twisted chain complex conditions.

\[ \square \]

### 4 Representations of derived \( A_\infty \)-algebras

The aim of this section is to study representations of \( dA_\infty \)-algebras. We establish some general results on coderivations of representations of coalgebras and then show that representations of homotopy algebras correspond to square-zero coderivations on a certain cofree object. We use these results to give a description of \( dA_\infty \)-representations similar to Sagave’s description of \( dA_\infty \)-algebras in terms of a twisted chain complex of coderivations on the tensor coalgebra as in Proposition 3.4.

#### 4.1 Coderivations on representations of coalgebras

One way to describe \( P_\infty \)-structures is via coderivations on cofree coalgebras. We will see that analogously \( P_\infty \)-representations can be described via coderivations on cofree representations of coalgebras, which we will introduce now. We work in the category \( \text{BiCompl}_v \) of vertical bicomplexes.

**Definition 4.1.** Let \( X \) and \( Y \) be vertical bicomplexes and let \( M \) be a collection in \( \text{BiCompl}_v \). The vertical bicomplex \( M(X; Y) \) is given by

\[
M(X; Y) = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} M(n) \otimes \left( \bigoplus_{a + b + 1 = n} X^{\otimes a} \otimes Y \otimes X^{\otimes b} \right).
\]

If \( f: M \to M' \) is a map of collections and \( g: X \to X' \) and \( h: Y \to Y' \) are maps of vertical bicomplexes, the map

\[
f(g; h): M(X; Y) \to M'(X'; Y')
\]

is defined as the direct sum of the maps \( f(a + b + 1) \otimes g^{\otimes a} \otimes h \otimes g^{\otimes b} \).

**Remark 4.2.** In this section for convenience we drop the symbol \( \circ \) for plethysm of collections and just write \( CC \) for \( C \circ C \).

One has to be careful when working with \( M(X; Y) \). For example if \( N \) is another collection,

\[
(MN)(X; Y) \neq M(N(X; Y))
\]

However it is true that \( (MN)(X; Y) = M(N(X); N(X; Y)) \) and we will make frequent use of this.

Dual to the notion of representation (see e.g. [Fre09]) of an algebra over an operad is the notion of representation of a coalgebra over a cooperad. In the following let \( (\mathcal{C}, \Delta, \epsilon) \) be a cooperad and let \( B \) be a \( \mathcal{C} \)-coalgebra with coalgebra structure map \( \rho: B \to \mathcal{C}(B) \).
**Definition 4.3.** A bigraded module $C$ is called a representation of $B$ over $C$ if there is a map

$$\omega: C \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(B; C)$$

such that the diagrams commute.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
C & \xrightarrow{\omega} & \mathcal{C}(B; C) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathcal{C}(B; C) & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & \mathcal{C}(B; C) \times \mathcal{C}(B; C)
\end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
C & \xrightarrow{\omega} & \mathcal{C}(B; C) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathcal{C}(B; C) & \xrightarrow{\epsilon} & C
\end{array}$$

**Example 4.4**

The example we will be primarily interested in is the following cofree representation. Let $B = \mathcal{C}(N)$ be the cofree coalgebra cogenerated by $N$. Then to a bigraded module $M$ we can associate the representation $\mathcal{C}(N; M)$. The structure map is given by the comultiplication on $\mathcal{C}$, i.e.

$$\mathcal{C}(N; M) \rightarrow (\mathcal{C})(N; M) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{C}(N); \mathcal{C}(N; M)).$$

Over an arbitrary coalgebra cofree representations are not that simple, see for instance the result on free representations in [Fre09, 4.3.2].

Next we will define what a coderivation of a representation is. To do this we need to extend the infinitesimal composite $\circ'$ of maps as defined in [LV12, 6.1.3].

**Definition 4.5.** Let $M, X$ and $Y$ be as in Definition 4.1. For $g: X \rightarrow X$ and $h: Y \rightarrow Y$ the map

$$M \circ'(g; h): M(X; Y) \rightarrow M(X; Y)$$

is defined on $M(a + b + 1) \otimes X^a \otimes Y \otimes X^b$ as the sum

$$\sum_{i=1, i \neq a+1}^{a+b+1} 1_M \otimes 1^{\otimes i-1} \otimes g \otimes 1^{\otimes n-i-1} + 1_M \otimes 1^{\otimes a} \otimes h \otimes 1^{\otimes b}.$$

Let $d_C$ denote the (vertical) differential of the cooperad $\mathcal{C}$, $(B, \rho)$ a $\mathcal{C}$-coalgebra in bigraded modules equipped with a coderivation $\partial_B$ and $(C, \omega)$ a bigraded module equipped with a map $\omega$ making it a representation of $B$.

**Definition 4.6.** A map $g: C \rightarrow C$ is called a coderivation if

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
C & \xrightarrow{g} & C \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{C}(B; g) + d_C) & \xrightarrow{\omega} & \mathcal{C}(B; C)
\end{array}$$

commutes.
We will need analogues of well known results for coderivations on coalgebras. To simplify formulas we encode coderivations via a distributive law; see [Bec69].

**Definition 4.7.** Let \((\mathcal{P}, \gamma, \eta)\) be an operad and \((\mathcal{C}, \Delta, \epsilon)\) a cooperad. A mixed distributive law is a morphism of collections

\[
\beta : \mathcal{P}\mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}\mathcal{P}
\]

such that the diagrams commute.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & \mathcal{P}\mathcal{C} \\
\downarrow_{\beta\mathcal{P}} & & \downarrow_{\beta} \\
\mathcal{P}\mathcal{C}\mathcal{P} & \xrightarrow{\epsilon\gamma} & \mathcal{C}\mathcal{P}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{P}\mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{\beta\mathcal{C}} & \mathcal{C}\mathcal{P} \\
\downarrow_{\beta} & & \downarrow_{\epsilon}\Delta \\
\mathcal{C}\mathcal{P} & \xrightarrow{\epsilon\beta} & \mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}
\end{array}
\]

The operad \((\mathcal{D}, \gamma_D, \eta_D)\) that will help us describe coderivations is the operad freely generated by a single unary operation \(x\). In all of our examples \(x\) will be of bidegree \((0,1)\).

**Definition 4.8.** We define a distributive law

\[
\beta : \mathcal{D}\mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}\mathcal{D}
\]

by requiring that

\[
\beta(x;c) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (-1)^{|c||x|} c; 1_D^{\otimes i-1} \otimes x \otimes 1_D^{\otimes n-i} + d\epsilon(c); 1_D^{\otimes n}
\]

for \(c \in \mathcal{C}(n)\).

Since \(\mathcal{D}\) is freely generated we only need to check that

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{K}x \otimes \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}\Delta} & \mathcal{D}\mathcal{C} \\
\downarrow_{\beta} & & \downarrow_{\epsilon}\beta \\
\mathcal{C}\mathcal{D} & \xrightarrow{\Delta\mathcal{D}} & \mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}\mathcal{D}
\end{array}
\]

commutes and that \(\epsilon\mathcal{D}(\beta(x(c))) = x(\epsilon c)\), which can be easily calculated. The other two defining conditions of a mixed distributive law determine \(\beta\) on the whole of \(\mathcal{D}\mathcal{C}\).

As one would expect it is possible to characterise coderivations via \(\beta\). Since a coderivation on a representation depends on the coderivation on the coalgebra we also state the corresponding result for coalgebras.
Proposition 4.9. Giving a coderivation on a \( C \)-coalgebra \((B, \rho)\) is equivalent to defining a \( D \)-algebra structure \( \gamma_B \) on \( B \) such that

\[
\begin{align*}
D(B) & \xrightarrow{\partial_B} D(C(B)) \\
\gamma_B & \downarrow \\
\mathcal{E}(D(B)) & \\
\vdots & \\
B & \xrightarrow{\rho} \mathcal{E}(B)
\end{align*}
\]

commutes. Explicitly, the coderivation defined by \( \gamma_B \) is \( \gamma_B(x) \).

We omit the proof of this proposition since it is analogous to the proof of the result for representations which we will state and prove now. Let \( \gamma_B : DB \to B \) as above correspond to the coderivation \( \partial_B \).

Observe that since \( D \) is concentrated in arity one we have

\[
(\mathcal{D}(C)(B; C) \equiv \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{C}(B; C)) \quad \text{as well as} \quad (\mathcal{E}\mathcal{D})(B; C) \equiv \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{D}(B); \mathcal{D}(C)).
\]

Proposition 4.10. Giving a coderivation on \( C \) is equivalent to giving a \( D \)-algebra structure map \( \gamma_C : \mathcal{D}(C) \to C \) such that

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{D}(C) & \xrightarrow{\partial_C} \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E}(B; C)) = (\mathcal{D}\mathcal{E})(B; C) \\
\gamma_C & \downarrow \\
(\mathcal{E}\mathcal{D})(B; C) & \equiv \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{D}(B); \mathcal{D}(C)) \\
\vdots & \\
\mathcal{C}(\gamma_B; \gamma_C) & \\
\mathcal{E}(B; C) & \xrightarrow{\omega} \mathcal{E}(B; C)
\end{align*}
\]

commutes. The coderivation defined by \( \gamma_C \) is \( \gamma_C(x) \).

Proof. Since \( D \) is free as an operad, making \( C \) a \( D \)-algebra is equivalent to specifying \( \gamma_C(x) \). Observe that the condition that the diagram commutes is trivial restricted to \( IC \subset D\mathcal{C} \). On the other hand, one easily checks that restricted to \( kx \otimes C \) the diagram expresses exactly that \( g = \gamma_C(x) \) is a coderivation: The left hand side composition of the maps in the diagram then equals \( \omega g \), while the right hand side equals \( (\mathcal{E}\mathcal{E}'(\partial_B; g))\omega + d\mathcal{E} \).

To show that this implies the general case we proceed by induction. Suppose that \( \Box \)
holds restricted to $D_n$ as well as restricted to $D_m$. We need to show that

\[
\begin{array}{c}
D_n D_m(C) \\ \downarrow \gamma_D \\
D_{n+m}(C) \\ \downarrow D_\omega \\
D_{n+m}(\mathcal{C}(B; C)) = (D_{n+m} \mathcal{C})(B; C) \\
\downarrow \beta \\
(\mathcal{C}D_{n+m})(B; C) = \mathcal{C}(D_{n+m}(B); D_{n+m}(C))
\end{array}
\]

commutes. Keep in mind that $\gamma_C$ defines an algebra structure and note that we have the identities

\[(D_\omega)\gamma_D = (\gamma_D \mathcal{C})(D_\mathcal{D}_\omega)\]

and

\[\beta(\gamma_D \mathcal{C}) = (\mathcal{C}\gamma_D)(\beta D)(1\mathcal{D}).\]

Then using that (2) holds restricted to $D_m$ and $D_n$ we find that the right and the upper square in the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{c}
D_n D_m(C) \\ \downarrow D_\omega \\
D_n D_m(\mathcal{C}(B; C)) \\
\downarrow D_\beta \\
D_n(\mathcal{C}D_m)(B; C) = D_n \mathcal{C}(D_m(B); D_m(C)) \\
\downarrow \beta \\
\mathcal{C}D_n D_m(B; C) = \mathcal{C}(D_n(B); D_n(C))
\end{array}
\]

commute. Commutativity of the lower left square follows from the fact that $\gamma_B$ and $\gamma_C$ are $D$-algebra structure maps.

Let Coder($C$) denote the set of coderivations on the representation $C$. For cofree representations over cofree coalgebras we have the following result.

**Proposition 4.11.** Let $M$ and $N$ be bigraded modules, and let $\mathcal{C}$ be as above. Let $\mathcal{C}(N)$ be equipped with a coderivation $\partial \mathcal{C}(N)$. There is a bijection

\[\text{Coder}(\mathcal{C}(N; M)) \cong \text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}(N; M), M).\]
Explicitly, the bijection is given by composing a coderivation with \( \mathcal{C}(N; M) \longrightarrow M \).

To construct a coderivation \( \partial_f \) from a map \( f : \mathcal{C}(N; M) \rightarrow M \) set

\[
\partial_f = de + (1e \circ_{(1)} (f \vee e\partial\mathcal{C}(N)))\Delta_{(1)},
\]

where \( \circ_{(1)} \) denotes the infinitesimal composite product of morphisms and \( \Delta_{(1)} : \mathcal{C}(N; M) \rightarrow (\mathcal{C} \circ_{(1)} \mathcal{C})(N; M) \) denotes infinitesimal decomposition, see \([LV12, 6.1.4]\). The map \( f \vee (e\partial\mathcal{C}(N)) \) is either \( f \) or \( e\partial\mathcal{C}(N) \) depending on whether the second copy of \( \mathcal{C} \) in \((\mathcal{C} \circ_{(1)} \mathcal{C})(N; M)\) is decorated by an element in \( N \) or \( M \).

**Proof.** Let \( f : \mathcal{C}(N; M) \rightarrow M \) be given and let \( \gamma_{\mathcal{C}(N)} : \mathcal{D}\mathcal{C}(N) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(N) \) correspond to \( \partial\mathcal{C}(N) \). We define \( \gamma_f : \mathcal{D}\mathcal{C}(N; M) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(N; M) \) by requiring that restricted to \( kx \otimes \mathcal{C}(N; M) \subset \mathcal{D}\mathcal{C}(N; M) \) it is given by

\[
\mathcal{C}(\gamma_{\mathcal{C}(N)}; \bar{f}) : \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{D}\mathcal{C}(N); \mathcal{D}\mathcal{C}(N; M)) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{D}\mathcal{C}(N; M)),
\]

where \( \bar{f} : \mathcal{D}\mathcal{C}(N; M) \rightarrow M \) resembles the sum of \( f \) and the counit. It is defined by

\[
\bar{f}((x^j; c)(b_1, ..., m, ..., b_n)) = \begin{cases} 
  e(c)(b_1, ..., m, ..., b_n), & j = 0, \\
  f(c(b_1, ..., m, ..., b_n)), & j = 1, \\
  0, & j > 1.
\end{cases}
\]

We saw in the proof of Proposition \([\text{LV12, 4.16}]\) that \([2]\) holds if it holds restricted to \( kx \otimes \mathcal{C}(N; M) \), and hence we only consider that case. First observe that

\[
(\mathcal{C}\mathcal{D}\mathcal{C})(N; M) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C}\Delta} (\mathcal{C}\mathcal{D}\mathcal{C})(A; M) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C}e} (\mathcal{C}\mathcal{D}\mathcal{C})(N; M) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C}(\gamma_{\mathcal{C}(N)}; \bar{f})} \mathcal{C}(N; M)
\]
due to Proposition \([\text{LV12, 4.16}]\) and the correspondence between coderivations on \( \mathcal{C}(B) \) and maps \( \mathcal{C}(B) \rightarrow B \); see \([LV12, 6.3.8]\).
Hence we need to examine the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{c}
x \mathcal{C}(N; M) \subset \mathcal{D}\mathcal{C}(N; M) \\
\xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}\Delta} \quad (\mathcal{D}\mathcal{C})(N; M) \\
\xrightarrow{\beta e} \quad (\mathcal{E}\mathcal{D}\mathcal{C})(N; M) \\
\xrightarrow{e\mathcal{D}\Delta} \quad (\mathcal{E}\mathcal{D}\mathcal{E})(N; M) \\
\xrightarrow{\beta e} \quad (\mathcal{E}\mathcal{E}\mathcal{D})(N; M) \\
\xrightarrow{e\beta e} \quad (\mathcal{E}\mathcal{E}\mathcal{E})(N; M) \\
\xrightarrow{e(e\gamma_{\mathcal{E}(N)}; f)} \quad \mathcal{E}(N; M) \\
\xrightarrow{\Delta} \quad (\mathcal{E}\mathcal{E})(N; M)
\end{array}
\]

That \( \Delta \) commutes with the two lower vertical maps is clear. Using that \( \beta \) is an interchange law and the coassociativity of \( \Delta \) yields the claim.

One easily checks that \( \gamma_f(x) \) coincides with \( d \mathcal{C} + (\epsilon \circ (1 \mathcal{C} \circ (\epsilon \partial_{\mathcal{E}(N)} \lor f))) \Delta_{(1)} \). It is clear that \( e \partial_f = f \). To see that \( \partial_{e \partial_f} \) is again \( \partial_f \) calculate that

\[
\begin{align*}
(1 \mathcal{C} \circ (\epsilon \partial_{\mathcal{E}(N)} \lor (e \partial_f))) \Delta_{(1)} &= 1 \mathcal{C} (1 \mathcal{C} \circ \epsilon) 1 \mathcal{C} (\epsilon \circ (\partial_{\mathcal{E}(N)} \lor \partial_f)) 1 \mathcal{C} (\epsilon \circ (1 \mathcal{C} \circ \epsilon) \partial_{\mathcal{E}(N)} \lor \partial_f)) \Delta \\
&= 1 \mathcal{C} (\epsilon \circ (1 \mathcal{C} \circ \epsilon) \partial_{\mathcal{E}(N)} \lor \partial_f)) \Delta \\
&= (1 \mathcal{C} \circ \epsilon) (\Delta \partial_f - (d \mathcal{C} \circ 1 \mathcal{C} \circ \epsilon)) \Delta \\
&= \partial_f - d \mathcal{C}.
\end{align*}
\]

Since we are interested in codifferentials we need to examine squares of coderivations. Recall that in the coalgebra case it is well known that the square of a coderivation of odd vertical degree is again a coderivation.

**Lemma 4.12.** Let \( g : C \rightarrow C \) and \( \partial_B \) be coderivations of odd vertical degree. Then \( g^2 \) is a coderivation for \( d \mathcal{C} = 0 \) with respect to the coderivation \( \partial_B^2 \) on \( B \), i.e. \( g^2 \) satisfies

\[
\begin{array}{c}
C \\
\xrightarrow{\omega} \mathcal{E}(B; C) \\
\xrightarrow{1 \mathcal{C} \circ (\partial_B^2 \circ g^2)} \mathcal{E}(B; C)
\end{array}
\]
Proof. One calculates that due to our assumptions on the degrees of the maps involved
\[ \Delta g^2 = (1_c \circ'' (\partial_B; g))^2 \Delta. \]
A closer look at the definitions together with the degree hypothesis shows that \((1_c \circ'' (\partial_B; g))^2\) maps an element \(x \in \mathcal{C}(n) \otimes \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} (A^\otimes i-1 \otimes M \otimes A^\otimes n-i)\) to
\[ \sum_{j=1}^{n} (1_c(n) \otimes 1^\otimes j-1 \otimes (\partial_B \vee g)^2 \otimes 1^\otimes k-j)(x), \]
and since \((\partial_B \vee g)^2 = \partial_B^2 \vee g^2\) we find that
\[ (1_c \circ'' (\partial_B; g))^2 = 1_c \circ'' (\partial_B^2; g^2). \]

\[ \square \]

4.2 Representations via coderivations

Let \(\mathcal{P}\) be a Koszul operad. We already recalled that \(\mathcal{P}_\infty\)-algebra structures on a vertical bicomplex \(A\) with vertical differential \(d_A\) are in bijection with the class of square-zero coderivations \(\partial_{h+d_A}e\) induced by \(h: \mathcal{P}(A) \to A\) and the internal differential \(d_A\) on \(A\). We will now prove a similar result for representations. For background on Koszul duality and the cobar construction we refer the reader to [GK94] and [LV12].

For \(M \in \text{BiCompl}_v\) to be a representation of \(A\) means that there is a morphism
\[ f_\infty: \mathcal{P}_\infty(A; M) \to M \]
of vertical bicomplexes satisfying certain properties. Since \(\mathcal{P}_\infty = \Omega(\mathcal{P})\) is free this is equivalent to giving a map
\[ f: \mathcal{P}(A; M) \to M \]
of bidegree \((0,1)\) on the augmentation ideal of \(\mathcal{P}(A; M)\) such that
\[ d_M f + f d_{\mathcal{P}(A; M)} + f_\infty d_2 s^{-1} = 0, \]
with \(d_{\mathcal{P}(A; M)}\) the differential on \(\mathcal{P}(A; M)\) induced by \(d_{\mathcal{P}}, d_A\) and \(d_M\). Here \(d_2\) denotes the twisting differential of the cobar construction and \(s^{-1}: \mathcal{P}(A; M) \to s^{-1}\mathcal{P}(A; M)\) the desuspension map.

By Proposition 4.11 the map \(d_M \epsilon + f: \mathcal{P}(A; M) \to M\) gives rise to a coderivation \(\partial_{d_M+\epsilon+f}\) on \(\mathcal{P}(A; M)\).

Proposition 4.13. For an arbitrary map \(f: \mathcal{P}(A; M) \to M\) the coderivation \(\partial_{d_M+\epsilon+f}\) squares to zero if and only if \(f\) is constructed from a \(\mathcal{P}_\infty\)-representation as above.

Proof. The results above yield that we only need to check under which conditions \(\epsilon \partial_{d_M+\epsilon+f}^2\) vanishes. We have
\[ \epsilon \partial_{d_M+\epsilon+f}^2 = d_M \epsilon \partial f + f (d_{\mathcal{P}} + (1_{\mathcal{P}} \circ (1) \circ (d_M \epsilon + f) \vee (d_A \epsilon + h))) \Delta_{(1)} \]
\[ = d_M f + f d_{\mathcal{P}} + f (1_{\mathcal{P}} \circ (1) \circ (d_M \epsilon) \vee (d_A \epsilon)) \Delta_{(1)} + f (1_{\mathcal{P}} \circ (1) (f \vee h)) \Delta_{(1)} \]
Note that
\[ f(1_{\mathcal{P}} \circ (1) (d_M \epsilon \vee d_A \epsilon)) \Delta(1) \]
equals the differential induced on $\mathcal{P}(A; M)$ by $d_A$ and $d_M$. Since $f$ is only non-zero on the augmentation ideal we hence find that
\[ \epsilon \partial_{d_M+f}^2 = f d_M + f(1_{\mathcal{P}} \circ (1) (f \vee h)) \Delta(1). \]
But
\[ f(1_{\mathcal{P}} \circ (1) (f \vee h)) \Delta(1) = f_{\infty} d_2 s^{-1} \]
and the result follows. \hfill \Box

Remark 4.14. One could also state the result saying that for a bigraded module $M$ a map $g: \mathcal{P}(A; M) \rightarrow M$ of degree $(0, 1)$ induces a square-zero coderivation on $\mathcal{P}(A; M)$ if and only if $(M, g|_M)$ viewed as a vertical bicomplex with differential $g|_M$ is a $\mathcal{P}_{\infty}$-representation of $A$ with structure map induced by $g|_{\mathcal{P}(A; M)}$. The formulation above is purely a choice of making the role of the vertical differential on $M$ explicit to emphasize the category we work in rather than keeping it implicit.

Remark 4.15. As we showed earlier conilpotent $A_{\infty}$-coalgebras and conilpotent coassociative coalgebras correspond to each other, and so do the notions of $A_{\infty}$-coderivation and traditional coderivation. Recall that under this correspondence an $A_{\infty}$-coalgebra $B$ corresponds to the traditional coalgebra $sB$.

For representations the same reasoning shows that $(C, \omega)$ is an $A_{\infty}$-representation of $B$ if and only if $sC$ is a coassociative $sB$-bicomodule. One easily checks that $A_{\infty}$-coderivations on $C$ coincide with coderivations of $sC$ as a bicomodule.

In particular, for $sB = T(sA) = sA_{\infty}(A)$ equipped with a square-zero coderivation making $A$ an $A_{\infty}$-algebra we find that representations of $A$ correspond to codifferentials on the $T(sA)$-bicomodule $T(sA) \otimes sM \otimes T(sA)$ = $sA_{\infty}(A; M)$. Hence we retrieve the notion of two-sided module over an $A_{\infty}$-algebra given by Getzler and Jones [GJ90].

4.3 Coderivations of $dA_{\infty}$-representations and representations of derived $A_{\infty}$-algebras

We already saw that making a bigraded module $B$ a $dA_{\infty}$-coalgebra corresponds to equipping $sB$ with a conilpotent coassociative comultiplication $\rho$ and a map $f_{sB}: sB \rightarrow sB$ such that certain conditions hold. We will now determine what a $dA_{\infty}$-representation of $B$ looks like. The results in this section as well as their proofs are analogous to the results for $dA_{\infty}$-coalgebras in 3.5. In particular it yields more insights to describe the structure on the suspension of a representation rather than the representation itself.

Proposition 4.16. There is an equivalence between the category of $dA_{\infty}$-representations $C$ of $B$ and the category whose objects are $sB$-bicomodules $(sC, \Delta^L, \Delta^R)$ together with a map $f_{sC}: sC \rightarrow sC$ of bidegree $(1, 1)$ such that
\[ (f_{sB} \otimes 1) \Delta^L = \Delta^L f_{sC} = (1 \otimes f_{sC}) \Delta^L \]
and
\[(1 \otimes f_{sB})\Delta^R = \Delta^R f_{sC} = (f_{sC} \otimes 1)\Delta^R\]
and whose morphisms are bicomodule morphisms commuting with \(f\). Under this equivalence a \(dA\)-coderivation of \(C\) of bidegree \((0,1)\) corresponds to a coderivation of \(sC\) as an \(sB\)-bicomodule of the same bidegree anticommuting with \(f_{sC}\).

**Proof.** We recalled that \(C\) is a \(dA\)-representation of \(B\) if and only if \(sC\) is a \(\Lambda dA\)-representation of \(sB\), hence we might as well determine what \(\Lambda dA\)-representations are. Similar considerations hold for coderivations on these structures. So suppose \(C'\) is a \(\Lambda dA\)-representations of \(B'\). Let
\[
\rho: B' \to \Lambda dA \text{ and } \omega: C' \to \Lambda dA \text{ of } (B', C')
\]
denote the structure maps and let
\[
\rho^{i,n}: B' \overset{\rho}{\longrightarrow} \Lambda dA(B') \overset{k\alpha_{in} \otimes B'^{\otimes n}}\longrightarrow B'^{\otimes n}
\]
and
\[
\omega^{i,n}: C' \overset{\omega}{\longrightarrow} \Lambda dA(B'; C') \overset{k\alpha_{in} \otimes (\bigoplus_{a+b+1=n} B'^{\otimes a} \otimes C' \otimes B'^{\otimes b})}{\longrightarrow} \bigoplus_{a+b+1=n} B'^{\otimes a} \otimes C' \otimes B'^{\otimes b}
\]
be the projections of the structure maps to the indicated components. Here \(i \geq 0\) and \(n \geq 1\) with \(\rho^{0,1}\) and \(\omega^{0,1}\) equal to the identity.

Spelling out the coassociativity condition for \(\omega\) in terms of these projections yields the condition that
\[
((\rho/\omega)^{i_1,k_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes (\rho/\omega)^{i_n,k_n})\omega^{i,n} = (-1)^\sigma \omega^{i_1+i_2+i_n+k_1+\cdots+k_n}
\]  
(3)
where \(\sigma = i(k_1 + \cdots + k_n + n) + \sum_{1 \leq x < y \leq n} (i_x k_y + i_y k_x)\), for all \(i, i_1, \ldots, i_n \geq 0\) and \(n, k_1, \ldots, k_n \geq 1\), with \((\rho/\omega)^{r,s}\) denoting \(\rho^{r,s}\) or \(\omega^{r,s}\) depending on the input. In particular
\[
((\rho/\omega)^{0,2} \otimes 1)\omega^{0,2} = (1 \otimes (\rho/\omega)^{0,2})\omega^{0,2}
\]  
(4)
because both terms coincide with \(\omega^{0,3}\) and
\[
((\rho/\omega)^{1,1} \otimes 1)\omega^{0,2} = \omega^{0,2} \omega^{1,1} = (1 \otimes (\rho/\omega)^{1,1})\omega^{0,2},
\]  
(5)
because all of these compositions are equal to \(-\omega^{1,2}\). Hence \(sC\) is an \(sB\)-bicomodule with a map \(f_{sC} = s\omega^{1,1}\) having the properties claimed above. One also sees that
\[
\omega^{r,s} = (-1)^{r(s+1)}\omega^{0,s}(\omega^{1,1})^r
\]  
(6)
with
\[
\omega^{0,s} = ((\rho/\omega)^{0,2} \otimes 1^{\otimes s-2})(\rho/\omega)^{0,2} \otimes 1^{\otimes s-3} \cdots (\rho/\omega)^{0,2} \otimes 1)\omega^{0,2}
\]
Then the proof.

\[ \text{Proposition 4.17.} \] The \( \text{dAs}^i \)-representation \( \text{dAs}^i(A; M) \) corresponds to the \( k[x] \otimes T^c(sA) \otimes sM \otimes T^c(sA) \) given by

\[
\Delta_L(x^i \otimes (sa_1, \ldots, sa_{j-1}, sm, sa_{j+1}, \ldots, sa_n)) = \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \sum_{r+s=i} (-1)^r(x^r \otimes (sa_1, \ldots, sa_k) \otimes (x^s \otimes (sa_{k+1}, \ldots, sm, \ldots, sa_n)),
\]

\[
\Delta_R(x^i \otimes (sa_1, \ldots, sa_{j-1}, sm, sa_{j+1}, \ldots, sa_n)) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{r+s=i} (-1)^r(x^r \otimes (sa_1, \ldots, sm, \ldots, sa_k)) \otimes (x^s \otimes (sa_{k+1}, \ldots, sa_n)),
\]

with \( \epsilon = r(n+k) + (s, s)(|a_1| + \ldots + |a_k|) \), together with the map

\[
f : k[x] \otimes T^c(sA) \otimes sM \otimes T^c(sA) \rightarrow k[x] \otimes T^c(sA) \otimes sM \otimes T^c(sA),
\]

\[
x^i \otimes (sa_1, \ldots, sm, \ldots, sa_n) \mapsto (-1)^{n+1}x^{i-1} \otimes (sa_1, \ldots, sm, \ldots, sa_n)
\]

with \( x^{-1} = 0 \).

\[ \text{Proposition 4.18.} \] Let \( d \) be a coderivation of \( \text{AdAs}^i(sA) \) giving rise to a family \( d_i \) of coderivations on \( T^c(sA) \) as discussed in Example \( n.1. \) Giving a \( \text{AdAs}^i \)-coderivation \( g \) on \( \text{AdAs}^i(A; sM) \) is equivalent to specifying a family of maps

\[ g_j : T^c(sA) \otimes sM \otimes T^c(sA) \rightarrow T^c(sA) \otimes sM \otimes T^c(sA), \quad j \geq 0, \]

of bidegree \( (-j, 1-j) \) such that \( g_j \) is a \( T^c(sA) \)-bicomodule coderivation with respect to \( d_j \).

Proof. Denote by \( g_{i,j} \) the component

\[
kx^i \otimes T^c(sA) \otimes sM \otimes T^c(sA) \rightarrow kx^j \otimes T^c(sA) \otimes sM \otimes T^c(sA)
\]

of \( g \). Since \( g \) has to anti-commute with \( f \) we see that

\[
f^j g_{i,j} = \begin{cases} (-1)^j g_{i-j,0} f^j, & i \geq j, \\ 0, & j > i \end{cases}
\]

and hence that \( g \) is completely determined by the maps \( g_{r,0} \). Define \( g_r \) by

\[
g_r(sa_1, \ldots, sa_{i-1}, sm, sa_{i+1}, \ldots, sa_n) = (-1)^r g_{r,0}(x^r \otimes (sa_1, \ldots, sm, \ldots, sa_n)).
\]

Then the \( g_r \) are bicomodule coderivations if and only if \( g \) is a \( \text{AdAs}^i \)-coderivation. \( \square \)
**Theorem 4.19.** Let \( A \) be a \( dA_\infty \)-algebra, and let \( h_i : T^c(sA) \to T^c(sA) \) be the corresponding coderivations making \( T^c(sA) \) a twisted chain complex as discussed in Proposition 3.4. Then endowing a bigraded \( k \)-module with the structure of a \( dA_\infty \)-representation of \( A \) is equivalent to giving maps \( g_i : T^c(sA) \otimes sM \otimes T^c(sA) \to T^c(sA) \otimes sM \otimes T^c(sA), \ i \geq 0, \) of bidegree \((-i, 1-i)\) such that

- the \( g_i \) make \( T^c(sA) \otimes M \otimes T^c(sA) \) a twisted chain complex,
- for all \( i \geq 0 \) the map \( g_i \) is a bicomodule coderivation with respect to \( h_i \).

**Proof.** We saw how to construct the maps \( g_i \) from a coderivation \( g : \Lambda^dA^\Lambda_{A}(A; M) \to \Lambda^dA^\Lambda_{A}(A; M) \) in the proof of Proposition 4.18. The \( g_i \) define a twisted chain complex if and only if for all \( u \geq 0 \) and all \((sA_1, ..., sm, ..., sA_n) \in T^c(sA) \otimes sM \otimes T^c(sA)\)

\[
0 = \sum_{i+p=u} (-1)^i g_i g_p(sA_1, ..., sm, ..., sA_n)
\]

\[
= \sum_{i+p=u} (-1)^{i+p} g_i g_{p,0}(x^p \otimes (sA_1, ..., sm, ..., sA_n))
\]

\[
= \sum_{i+p=u} (-1)^{i+p+i(n+1)} g_i g_{p,0} f^i(x^{p+i} \otimes (sA_1, ..., sm, ..., sA_n))
\]

\[
= \sum_{i+p=u} (-1)^{p+i(n+1)} g_i f^i g_{p+i,i}(x^{p+i} \otimes (sA_1, ..., sm, ..., sA_n)).
\]

But \( g_i f^i = (-1)^i g_{i,0} \) on \( kx^i \otimes T^c(sA) \otimes sM \otimes T^c(sA) \), hence the \( g_i \) yield a twisted chain complex if and only if

\[
0 = \sum_{i+p=u} (-1)^{u} g_{i,0} g_{p+i,i}.
\]

Hence the projection of \( g^2 \) to \( kx^0 \otimes T^c(sA) \otimes sM \otimes T^c(sA) \) is zero, and Proposition 4.11 yields that \( g^2 = 0 \) in general. \(\square\)

**Remark 4.20.** In [Sag10, 6.2] Sagave defines a module over a \( dA_{\infty} \)-algebra \( A \) as a bigraded \( k \)-module \( M \) such that \( sM \otimes T^c(sA) \) is a twisted chain complex whose \( i \)-th structure map \( g_i \) is a right \( T^c(sA) \)-coderivation with respect to \( h_1 \). The operadic notion of representation hence yields a two-sided variant of Sagave’s definition.

## 5 New example of a derived \( A_{\infty} \)-algebra

In this section, we will use a family of examples of finite dimensional \( A_{\infty} \)-algebras given by Alloca and Lada in [AL10] in order to build a new example of a 3-dimensional derived \( A_{\infty} \)-algebra.
5.1 Examples of finite dimensional $A_\infty$-algebras

Alloca and Lada give in [AL10] a family of examples of $A_\infty$-algebras. Taking a subalgebra, one gets the following result as a corollary of [AL10, Theorem 2.1]. Here, the sign conventions for $A_\infty$-algebras are those of Loday-Vallette.

**Proposition 5.1.** The free graded $k$-module $V$ spanned by $x$ of degree 0 and $y$ of degree 1 is an $A_\infty$-algebra with $k$-linear structure maps satisfying:

$$m_1(x) = y,$$
$$m_n(x \otimes y^\otimes k \otimes x \otimes y^{(n-2)-k}) = (-1)^k s_n x,$$  
for $0 \leq k \leq n - 2$,  
$$m_n(x \otimes y^{n-1}) = s_{n+1} y,$$  
where $s_n = (-1)^{(n+1)(n+2)/2}$, and $m_n(z) = 0$ for any $n$ and any basis element $z \in V^\otimes n$ not listed above.

**Remark:** If we modify the above example, so that $m_1 = 0$, but everything else is unchanged, then $V$ is still an $A_\infty$-algebra. That is, we can construct a minimal example from the one above.

5.2 Example of a derived $A_\infty$-algebra

We describe an example of a derived $A_\infty$-structure on a rank 3 free bigraded $k$-module $V$ spanned by $u, v, w$ where $|u| = (0, 0), |v| = (-1, 0), \text{ and } |w| = (0, 1)$.

Note that if $V$ is as above, the bidegree $(-k, l)$ of an element $z \in V^\otimes j$ satisfies $0 \leq k, 0 \leq l$ and $k + l \leq j$. Since the structure map $m_{in} : V^\otimes n \rightarrow V$ is of bidegree $(-i, 2 - i - n)$, the element $m_{in}(z)$ has bidegree $(-k - i, 2 - i - n + l)$. This has the following consequence.

**Proposition 5.2.** If the bigraded $k$-module $V$ as above is endowed with a derived $A_\infty$-structure then, for reasons of bidegree, $m_{in}(z)$ with $z \in V^\otimes n$ can be potentially non-zero only if $0 \leq i \leq 1$. Furthermore, letting $z = x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_n$ where each $x_i$ is one of the basis elements of $V$, we have the following.

1. If $m_{in}(z) \neq 0$, then there exist $i \neq j$ such that $x_k = w$ for $k \not\in \{i, j\}$ and $(x_i, x_j) \in \{(u, u), (u, w), (w, u), (u, v), (v, u)\}$.
2. If $m_{1n}(z) \neq 0$, then there exists $i$ such that $x_i = u$ and $x_k = w$ for $k \neq i$.

**Proposition 5.3.** Let $V$ be the rank 3 free bigraded $k$-module as above. Then $V$ is endowed with the following derived $A_\infty$-structure. For $n \geq 2$, we let

$$m_{0n}(u \otimes w^\otimes k \otimes u \otimes w^{(n-2)-k}) = (-1)^k s_n u,$$  
for $0 \leq k \leq n - 2$,  
$$m_{0n}(u \otimes w^{\otimes n-1}) = s_{n+1} w,$$  
$$m_{0n}(u \otimes w^{\otimes n-2} \otimes v) = (-1)^{n-2} s_n v,$$
and for \( n \geq 1 \), we let

\[
m_{11}(u) = v, \quad m_{1n}(u \otimes w^{\otimes n-1}) = s_{n+1}v,
\]

where \( s_n = (-1)^{(n+1)(n+2)/2} \) and we let \( m_{ij}(z) = 0 \) for any \( i, j \) and for any basis element \( z \in V^{\otimes j} \) not covered by the cases above.

Proof. The proof is just a computation. We will not give full details, but we supply enough ingredients so that the computation can be carried out quickly.

Note that to check that \( V \) is a derived \( A_{\infty} \)-algebra we only need to check that, for \( l \geq 1 \) and \( z \in V^{\otimes l+1} \), the following three conditions hold.

\[
\sum_{j+q=l+1} m_{0j} \star m_{0q}(z) = 0,
\]

\[
\sum_{j+q=l+1} (m_{0j} \star m_{1q} + m_{1j} \star m_{0q})(z) = 0,
\]

\[
\sum_{j+q=l+1} m_{1j} \star m_{1q}(z) = 0,
\]

with the \( \star \)-product defined in the formula (7) of the appendix.

We consider the three relations in turn, outlining the checking required for each.

Relation I \( \sum_{j+q=l+1} m_{0j} \star m_{0q}(z) = 0. \)

Let \( V_0 = \langle u, w \rangle \) be the subspace of \( V \) spanned by the elements of bidegree \((0, r)\), for \( r \in \mathbb{Z} \). If \( V \) is a derived \( A_{\infty} \)-algebra, then \( V_0 \) is an \( A_{\infty} \)-algebra. As a consequence checking the equation on tensors \( z \) not containing \( v \) is equivalent to checking that \( V_0 \) is an \( A_{\infty} \)-algebra. This is true by Proposition 5.1.

It remains to check the equation on tensors containing \( v \). For terms containing at least one \( v \), \( m_{0j}(1^{\otimes \ast} \otimes m_{0q} \otimes 1^{\otimes \ast}) \) is possibly non-zero only on tensors of the form

\[
u \otimes w^{\otimes k} \otimes u \otimes w^{\otimes l-k-3} \otimes v,
\]

for \( 0 \leq k \leq l-3 \), where \( j + q = l + 1 \), and a sign computation shows that the expression vanishes on those terms.

Relation II \( \sum_{j+q=l+1} (m_{0j} \star m_{1q} + m_{1j} \star m_{0q})(z) = 0. \)

This case is similar to the previous one; \( m_{0j}(1^{\otimes \ast} \otimes m_{1q} \otimes 1^{\otimes \ast}) + m_{1j}(1^{\otimes \ast} \otimes m_{0q} \otimes 1^{\otimes \ast}) \) is possibly non-zero only on tensors of the form

\[
u \otimes w^{\otimes k} \otimes u \otimes w^{\otimes l-k-2},
\]

for \( 0 \leq k \leq l-2 \), where \( j + q = l + 1 \).

Relation III \( \sum_{j+q=l+1} m_{1j} \star m_{1q}(z) = 0. \)

Since \( m_{1n} \) takes values zero or \( \pm v \) on basis elements and since \( m_{1n} \) applied to a tensor containing a \( v \) vanishes, it follows that \( \sum_{j+q=l+1} m_{1j} \star m_{1q}(z) = 0. \)
Remark 5.4. In this example, we have \( m_{01} = 0 \); that is, we have a minimal derived \( A_\infty \)-algebra.

For bidegree reasons, the only alternative would be letting \( m_{01}(u) \) be (some multiple of) \( w \). However, modifying the above example so that \( m_{01}(u) = w \), with everything else unchanged, does not give a derived \( A_\infty \)-algebra. A direct computation shows that we would have

\[
\sum_{j+q=4} (m_{0j} \star m_{1q} + m_{1j} \star m_{0q})(u \otimes w \otimes u) = v \neq 0
\]

and

\[
\sum_{j+q=4} (m_{0j} \star m_{1q} + m_{1j} \star m_{0q})(u \otimes u \otimes w) = -v \neq 0.
\]

On the other hand, if we ‘truncate’ the above example, setting \( m_{ij} = 0 \) for \( i+j \geq 3 \), then it can be checked, using SAGE, that we get a bidga, both in the case with \( m_{01} = 0 \) and also in the case where we modify the example so that \( m_{01}(u) = w \).

6 Appendix: sign conventions

6.1 Different conventions for derived \( A_\infty \)-algebras

We recall that a derived \( A_\infty \)-structure on \( A \) consists of \( k \)-linear maps \( m_{ij} : A^{\otimes j} \to A \) of bidegree \( (-i, 2-i-j) \) for each \( i \geq 0 \), \( j \geq 1 \), satisfying the equations (11) of Definition 2.1:

\[
\sum_{v \geq j+q-1 \atop u=i+p, v=j+q-1 \atop j=1+r+t} (-1)^{rq+tp+j} m_{ij}(1 \otimes m_{pq} \otimes 1 \otimes t) = 0.
\]

Consequently the family of maps \( m_{0n} \) satisfies the equation

\[
\sum_{v=j+q-1 \atop j=1+r+t} (-1)^{rq+t} m_{0j}(1 \otimes m_{0q} \otimes 1 \otimes t) = 0,
\]

which is the sign convention of Getzler and Jones in [GJ90]. In the definition of derived \( A_\infty \)-algebra if we pick the generators

\[
\tilde{m}_{ij} = (-1)^{ij-1} m_{ij}
\]

one gets

\[
\sum_{u=i+p, v=j+q-1} \tilde{m}_{ij} \star \tilde{m}_{pq} = 0,
\]

with

\[
\tilde{m}_{ij} \star \tilde{m}_{pq} = \sum_{k=1}^{j} (-1)^{ij+(q-1)(k+j)+p(j-1)} \tilde{m}_{ik} \circ_k \tilde{m}_{pq} \tag{7}
\]
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The family $\tilde{m}_{0n}$ satisfies
\[ \sum_{u=i+p, v=j+q-1}^{j} (-1)^{vq+k(q-1)} \tilde{m}_{0j} \circ_k \tilde{m}_{0q} = 0, \]
which is the original definition of $A_\infty$-algebras by Stasheff [Sta63].

6.2 Different sign conventions for the cooperad $dA_s^i$

For any graded cooperad $\mathcal{C}$, if one has generators $a_{uv} \in \mathcal{C}(v)$ and one writes the cooperad structure as
\[ \Delta(a_{uv}) = \sum_{q_1 + \cdots + q_i = v} (-1)^{X(I)} a_{ij}; a_I \]
with $a_I = a_{p_1, q_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes a_{p_j, q_j}$, then setting $\tilde{a}_{uv} = (-1)^{v(q - 1)} a_{uv}$, one gets
\[ \Delta(\tilde{a}_{uv}) = \sum (-1)^{X(I)} (-1)^{\phi(I)} \tilde{a}_{ij}; \tilde{a}_I, \]
where $\phi(I)$ is obtained modulo 2 as
\[ \phi(I) = \frac{1}{2} \left( j(j - 1) + \sum_{k} q_k \left( \sum_{l} q_l - 1 \right) + \sum_{k} q_k^2 - \sum_{l} q_l \right) = \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} k + \sum_{k<l} q_k q_l. \]

Recall that the cooperad $dA_s^i$ has generators $\mu_{uv}$ of bidegree $(-u, 1 - u - v)$ with structure map given by
\[ \Delta(\mu_{uv}) = \sum_{i+p_1+\cdots+p_j=u} (-1)^{X((p_1, q_1), \ldots, (p_j, q_j))} \mu_{ij}; \mu_{p_1, q_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mu_{p_j, q_j}, \]
with $X((p_1, q_1), \ldots, (p_j, q_j)) = \sum_{1 \leq k \leq l \leq j} (p_k + q_k(p_l + q_l + 1))$ (see formula (4) in [LRW13]). Consequently the bigraded $k$-module generated by the family $(\tilde{\mu}_{0v})_{v \geq 0}$ is a subcooperad of $dA_s^i$ and satisfies
\[ \Delta(\tilde{\mu}_{0v}) = \sum_{q_1 + \cdots + q_i = v} (-1)^{X'(q_1, \ldots, q_i)} \tilde{\mu}_{0j}; \tilde{\mu}_{0q_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \tilde{\mu}_{0q_j}, \]
with
\[ X'(q_1, \ldots, q_j) = \sum_{1 \leq k < l \leq j} (q_k(q_l+1)+q_k q_l) + \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} k = \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} (q_k(k+1)+k) = \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} (q_k+1)(k+j), \]
where the computation is performed modulo 2. We recover the signs obtained by Loday and Vallette in [LV12] in their definition of the cooperad $A_s^i$. 28
Note that if we choose $\widetilde{\mu}_{uv}$ as generators for the cooperad $dAs^i$, the structure map is given by

$$\Delta(\widetilde{\mu}_{uv}) = \sum_{i+p_1+\ldots+p_j=u,\quad q_1+\ldots+q_j=v} (-1)^{X'}((p_1,q_1),\ldots,(p_j,q_j)) \widetilde{\mu}_{ij}; \widetilde{\mu}_{p_1,q_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \widetilde{\mu}_{p_j,q_j},$$

where $X'((p_1,q_1),\ldots,(p_j,q_j)) = \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} (p_k + q_k + 1)(k + j) + \sum_{k<l}(q_k p_l)$.

### 6.3 Description of the cooperad $\Lambda dAs^i$

The notion of suspension of a cooperad was explained in Section 3.2. Here we establish the sign conventions for the cooperad structure of $\Lambda C$ for a cooperad $C$ in BiCompl$_{\cdot\cdot}$.

**Proposition 6.1.** Let $C$ be a cooperad in BiCompl$_{\cdot\cdot}$. Then $\Lambda C$ is the cooperad with

$$(\Lambda C)(n) = s^{1-n}C(n).$$

The cooperad structure of $\Lambda C$ is given by

$$s^{1-n}C \mapsto \sum (-1)^{k+1} |s|^{1-j} c' + \sum_{k=2}^{j-1} |s|^{k+1} |sc''|^k s^{1-j} c'_1, \ldots, s^{1-l} c''_1, s^{1-l} c'_2, \ldots, s^{1-l} c''_2,$$

where the decomposition map of $C$ maps $c \in C(n)$ to the sum $\sum c' c'_1, \ldots, c''_j$ with $c' \in C(j)$ and $c''_i \in C(i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq j$.

**Proof.** We explain the algorithm for distributing $s^{1-n}$ over the different tensor products.

Firstly put $s^{1-j}$ in front of $c'$. This operation is sign free.

Secondly, distribute one $s$, that will be in front of $c'_k$, for $k$ going from 1 to $j$: first $s$ jumps over $s^{1-j} c'$ and is placed in front of $c''_1$; second $s$ jumps over $s^{1-j} c' \otimes sc''_1$ and is placed in front of $c''_2$. The sign involved is obtained as $(-1)^x$ where $x \mod 2$ is $\sum_{k=1}^{j} |s|^{1-j} c' + \sum_{k=2}^{j} |s| |sc''|^k |s|^{k-1} |sc''_k|).

Finally, for $k$ going down from $j$ to 1 distribute $s^{-tk}$ over $s^{1-j} c' \otimes sc''_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes sc''_{k-1}$. The sign involved is obtained as $(-1)^x$ where $x \mod 2$ is $\sum_{k=1}^{j} |s|^{k} |s|^{1-j} c' + \sum_{k=2}^{j} |s| |sc''|^k |s|^{k-1} |sc''_k|.$

**Corollary 6.2.** The cooperad $\Lambda dAs^i$ has generators $\alpha_{uv}$ of bidegree $(-u,-u)$ and the cooperad structure is given by

$$\Delta(\alpha_{uv}) = \sum_{i+p_1+\ldots+p_j=u,\quad q_1+\ldots+q_j=v} (-1)^{i+1} |s|^{1-j} \alpha_{ij}; \alpha_{p_1,q_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \alpha_{p_j,q_j},$$

Note that if $u = 0, i = 0, p_k = 0$ one gets exactly the cooperad $As^*$.
Proof. This is a short sign computation. Let $I = (p_1, q_1), \ldots, (p_j, q_j))$ and let $S(I)$ be the sum such that $(-1)^{S(I)}$ is the sign defined in Proposition 6.1. We recall that $\alpha_{uv} = s^{1-v}\mu_{uv}$ and that $s\mu_{uv}$ has bidegree $(-u, -u-v)$. Computing mod 2, one gets

$$X(I) + S(I) \equiv \sum_{1 \leq k < l \leq j} (p_k + q_k(p_l + q_l + 1)) + \sum_{k=1}^{j} (q_k + 1)i + \sum_{1 \leq k < l \leq j} (p_k + q_k)(q_l + 1)$$

$$\equiv i(v + j) + \sum_{1 \leq k < l \leq j} q_k p_l + p_k q_l.$$

\[\blacksquare\]
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