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ON BEHAVIOR OF THE ALGEBRAIC TRANSFER

ROBERT R. BRUNER, LÊ M. HÀ AND NGUYỄN H. V. HƯNG

Dedicated to Professor Huỳnh Mùi on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday

Abstract. Let $T_r^k : \mathbb{F}_2 \otimes_{GL_k} PH_i(BV_k) \to Ext^{k,k+i}_A(\mathbb{F}_2, \mathbb{F}_2)$ be the algebraic transfer, which is defined by W. Singer as an algebraic version of the geometrical transfer $\text{tr}_k : \pi^*_S((BV_k)_+) \to \pi^*_S(S^0)$. It has been shown that the algebraic transfer is highly nontrivial and, more precisely, that $T_r^k$ is an isomorphism for $k = 1, 2, 3$. However, Singer showed that $T_r^5$ is not an epimorphism. In this paper, we prove that $T_r^4$ does not detect the non zero element $g_s \in Ext_A^{4,12}((\mathbb{F}_2, \mathbb{F}_2)$ for every $s \geq 1$. As a consequence, the localized $(Sq^0)^{-1}T_r^4$ given by inverting the squaring operation $Sq^0$ is not an epimorphism. This gives a negative answer to a prediction by Minami.

1. Introduction and statement of results

The subject of the present paper is the algebraic transfer

$$T_r^k : \mathbb{F}_2 \otimes_{GL_k} PH_i(BV_k) \to Ext^{k,k+i}_A(\mathbb{F}_2, \mathbb{F}_2),$$

which is defined by W. Singer as an algebraic version of the geometrical transfer $\text{tr}_k : \pi^*_S((BV_k)_+) \to \pi^*_S(S^0)$ to the stable homotopy groups of spheres. Here $BV_k$ denotes a $k$--dimensional $\mathbb{F}_2$--vector space, $PH_i(BV_k)$ is the primitive part consisting of all elements in $H_*(BV_k)$, which are annihilated by every positive-degree operation in the mod 2 Steenrod algebra, $A$. Throughout the paper, the homology is taken with coefficients in $\mathbb{F}_2$.

It has been proved that $T_r^k$ is an isomorphism for $k = 1, 2$ by Singer [13] and for $k = 3$ by Boardman [3]. These data together with the fact that $T_r = \oplus_{k \geq 0} T_r^k$ is an algebra homomorphism (see [3]) show that $T_r^k$ is highly nontrivial. Therefore, the algebraic transfer is considered to be a useful tool for studying the mysterious cohomology of the Steenrod algebra, $Ext_A^*(\mathbb{F}_2, \mathbb{F}_2)$. In [3], Singer also gave computations to show that $T_r^4$ is an isomorphism up to a range of internal degrees. However, he proved that $T_r^5$ is not an epimorphism.

Based on these data, we are particularly interested in the behavior of the fourth algebraic transfer. The following theorem is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 1.1. $T_r^4$ does not detect the non zero element $g_s \in Ext_A^{4,12}((\mathbb{F}_2, \mathbb{F}_2)$ for every $s \geq 1$. 

---
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The localization of the fourth algebraic transfer

Corollary 1.2. The localization of the fourth algebraic transfer

\[(Sq^0)^{-1}Tr_4 : (Sq^0)^{-1}F_2 \otimes PH_4(BV_4) \to (Sq^0)^{-1}Ext^{4,4+i}_4(F_2, F_2)\]

given by inverting \(Sq^0\) is not an epimorphism.

It is well-known (see [9]) that there are squaring operations \(Sq^i\) \((i \geq 0)\) acting on the cohomology of the Steenrod algebra, which share most of the properties \(Sq^i\) to Section 2 for the precise meaning of the operation \(Sq^i\) given by inverting \(Sq^0\). As a consequence, we get a negative answer to a prediction by Minami [12].

Proposition 1.3. Let \(k\) and \(r\) be positive integers. Suppose that each monomial \(x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_k^{i_k}\) of \(P_k\) in degree \(2r + k\) with at least one exponent \(i_t\) even is hit. Then \(\tilde{Sq}^{0}_k : (F_2 \otimes P_k)_{2r+k} \to (F_2 \otimes P_k)_r\)
is an isomorphism of \(GL_k\)-modules.

The reader is referred to May [10] for the generator \(g_1\) and to Lin [7] or [8] for the generators \(g_*\).

As a consequence, we get a negative answer to a prediction by Minami [12].

Theorem 1.1. The localization of the fourth algebraic transfer

\[
F_k := H^*(B\mathbb{V}_k) \text{ be the polynomial algebra of } k \text{ variables, each of degree 1.}
\]

Then, the domain of \(Tr_k, F_2 \otimes P_{4k} / B\mathbb{V}_k\), is dual to \((F_2 \otimes P_k)^{k}_{GL_k}\). In order to prove Theorem 1.1, it suffices to show that \((F_2 \otimes P_k)^{k}_{GL_k}\) is an isomorphism of \(GL_k\)-modules for any \(k \geq 1\). This isomorphism is obtained by applying repeatedly the following proposition.

Theorem 1.4. \(Tr_4\) is not an isomorphism.

This theorem is proved by observing that, on the one hand,

\[(F_2 \otimes P_4)^{GL_4}_{20} \cong (F_2 \otimes P_4)^{GL_4}_8,
\]
and on the other hand,

\[Ext^{4,4+20}_A(F_2, F_2) = F_2 \cdot g_1 \not\cong Ext^{4,4+8}_A(F_2, F_2) = 0.\]
The paper is divided into six sections and organized as follows. Section 2 starts with a recollection of the squaring operation and ends with a proof of the isomorphism \((\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_4)^{12} \cong (\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_4)^8\). Theorem 1.4 is proved in Section 3. We compute \((\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_4)^8\) and its \(GL_4\)-invariants in Section 4. We prove Theorem 1.3 in Section 5. Finally, in Section 6, we describe the \(GL_4\)-module structure of \((\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_4)^8\).

Acknowledgment: The research was in progress during the second named author’s visit to the IHES (France) and the third named author’s visit to Wayne State University, Detroit (Michigan) in the academic year 2001-2002. The third named author is grateful to Daniel Frohardt, David Handel, Lowell Hansen, John Klein, Charles McGibbon, Claude Schochet and all colleagues at the Department of Mathematics, Wayne State University for their hospitality and for the warm working atmosphere.

The authors express their hearty thanks to Trần N. Nam for helpful discussion.

2. A SUFFICIENT CONDITION FOR THE SQURING OPERATION TO BE AN ISOMORPHISM

This section starts with a recollection of Kameko’s squaring operation

\[ S_q^0 : \mathbb{F}_2 \otimes PH_*(BV_k) \to \mathbb{F}_2 \otimes PH_*(BV_k). \]

The most important property of Kameko’s \(S_q^0\) is that it commutes with the classical \(S_q^0\) on \(Ext^*_A(\mathbb{F}_2, \mathbb{F}_2)\) (defined in [1]) through the algebraic transfer (see [1], [12]).

This squaring operation is constructed as follows.

As well known, \(H^*(BV_k)\) is the polynomial algebra, \(P_k := \mathbb{F}_2[x_1, \ldots, x_k]\), on \(k\) generators \(x_1, \ldots, x_k\), each of degree 1. By dualizing,

\[ H_*(BV_k) = \Gamma(a_1, \ldots, a_k) \]

is the divided power algebra generated by \(a_1, \ldots, a_k\), each of degree 1, where \(a_i\) is dual to \(x_i \in H^1(BV_k)\). Here the duality is taken with respect to the basis of \(H^*(BV_k)\) consisting of all monomials in \(x_1, \ldots, x_k\).

In [1] Kameko defined a homomorphism

\[ \widetilde{S}_q^0 : H_*(BV_k) \to H_*(BV_k), \]

\[ a_1^{(i_1)} \cdots a_k^{(i_k)} \mapsto a_1^{(2i_1+1)} \cdots a_k^{(2i_k+1)}, \]

where \(a_1^{(i_1)} \cdots a_k^{(i_k)}\) is dual to \(x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_k^{i_k}\). The following lemma is well known. We give a proof to make the paper self-contained.

**Lemma 2.1.** \(\widetilde{S}_q^0\) is a \(GL_k\)-homomorphism.

**Proof.** We use the explanation of \(\widetilde{S}_q^0\) by Crabb and Hubbuck [3], which does not depend on the chosen basis of \(H_*(BV_k)\). The element \(a(V_k) = a_1 \cdots a_k\) is nothing but the image of the generator of \(\Lambda^k(V_k)\) under the (skew) symmetrization map

\[ \Lambda^k(V_k) \to H_k(BV_k) = \Gamma_k(V_k) = (V_k \otimes \cdots \otimes V_k)_S_k, \]

where the symmetric group \(S_k\) acts on \(V_k \otimes \cdots \otimes V_k\) by permutations of the factors. Let \(c : H_*(BV_k) \to H_*(BV_k)\) be the degree-halving epimorphism, which is dual to
the Frobenius monomorphism $F : H^*(BV_k) \to H^*(BV_k)$ defined by $F(x) = x^2$ for any $x$. We have

$$\tilde{S}^0_q(c(y)) = a(V_k)y,$$

for $y \in H_*(BV_k)$. To prove that this is well defined we need to show that if $c(y) = 0$, then $a(V_k)y = 0$. Indeed, $c(y) = 0$ implies $<c(y),x> = <y,x^2> = 0$ for every $x \in H^*(BV_k)$. Here $<\cdot,\cdot>$ denotes the dual pairing between $H_*(BV_k)$ and $H^*(BV_k)$. So, if we write $y = \sum a_1^{(i_1)} \cdots a_k^{(i_k)}$, then there is at least one $i_t$ which is odd in each term of the sum. Therefore,

$$a(V_k)y = a_1 \cdots a_k \left(\sum a_1^{(i_1)} \cdots a_k^{(i_k)}\right) = 0,$$

because $a_ia_t^{(i_t)} = 0$ for any odd $i_t$. So, $\tilde{S}^0_q$ is well defined.

As $c$ is a $GL_k$-epimorphism, the map $\tilde{S}^0_q$ is a $GL_k$-homomorphism. The lemma is proved. 

Further, it is easy to see that $cS_2q^{2t+1} = 0$, $cS_2q^{2t} = S_2q^tc$. So we have

$$S_2q^{2t+1}\tilde{S}^0_q = 0, \quad S_2q^{2t}\tilde{S}^0_q = \tilde{S}^0_q S_2q^t.$$

(See [4] for an explicit proof.) Therefore, $\tilde{S}^0_q$ maps $PH_*(BV_k)$ to itself. Kameko’s $S_q^0$ is defined by

$$S_q^0 = 1 \otimes \tilde{S}^0_q : \mathbb{F}_2 \otimes_{GL_k} PH_*(BV_k) \to \mathbb{F}_2 \otimes_{GL_k} PH_*(BV_k).$$

The dual homomorphism $\tilde{S}^0_q : P_k \to P_k$ of $\tilde{S}^0_q$ is obviously given by

$$\tilde{S}^0_q(x_1^{j_1} \cdots x_k^{j_k}) = \begin{cases} x_1^{\frac{j_1-1}{2}} \cdots x_k^{\frac{j_k-1}{2}}, & j_1, \ldots, j_k \text{ odd}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

Hence

$$\text{Ker}(\tilde{S}^0_q) = \text{Even},$$

where $\text{Even}$ denotes the vector subspace of $P_k$ spanned by all monomials $x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_k^{i_k}$ with at least one exponent $i_t$ even.

Let $s : P_k \to P_k$ be a left inverse of $\tilde{S}^0_q$ defined as follows:

$$s(x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_k^{i_k}) = x_1^{2i_1+1} \cdots x_k^{2i_k+1}.$$  

It should be noted that $s$ does not commute with the doubling map on $A$, that is, in general

$$S_q^{2t}s \neq sS_q^t.$$

However, in one particular circumstance we have the following.

**Lemma 2.2.** Under the hypothesis of Proposition 1.3, the map

$$\pi : (\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_k)_r \to (\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_k)_{2r+k}\quad A^{\pi[X]} = [sX]^4$$

is a well-defined linear map.
Proof. We start with an observation that
\[ \text{Im}(Sq^{2t}s - sSq^t) \subseteq \text{Even}. \]
We prove this by showing equivalently that
\[ \widetilde{Sq}_s^0(Sq^{2t}s - sSq^t) = 0. \]
Indeed,
\[
\begin{align*}
\widetilde{Sq}_s^0(Sq^{2t}s - sSq^t) &= \widetilde{Sq}_s^0Sq^{2t}s - \widetilde{Sq}_s^0sSq^t \\
&= Sq^t\widetilde{Sq}_s^0s - \widetilde{Sq}_s^0sSq^t \\
&= Sq^t\cdot id - id\cdot Sq^t \\
&= 0.
\end{align*}
\]
As a consequence, \( s \) maps \((A^+P_k)_r\) to \((A^+P_k + \text{Even})_{2r+k}\). Here and in what follows, \( A^+ \) denotes the submodule of \( A \) consisting of all positive degree operations. Further, by the hypothesis of Proposition 2.3, we have
\[ (A^+P_k + \text{Even})_{2r+k} \subseteq (A^+P_k)_{2r+k}. \]
Hence, \( s \) maps \((A^+P_k)_r\) to \((A^+P_k)_{2r+k}\). So the map \( \bar{\pi} \) is well-defined. Then it is a linear map, as \( s \) is.

The lemma is proved. \( \Box \)

The following proposition is also numbered as Proposition 1.3

**Proposition 2.3.** Let \( k \) and \( r \) be positive intergers. Suppose that each monomial \( x_1^{i_1}\cdots x_k^{i_k} \) of \( P_k \) in degree \( 2r + k \) with at least one exponent \( i_t \) even is hit. Then \( Sq^0_s : (\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_k)_{2r+k} \to (\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_k)_r \)
is an isomorphism of \( GL_k \)-modules.

**Proof.** On the one hand, we have \( Sq^0_s \pi = id_{(\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_k)_r} \). Indeed, from \( \widetilde{Sq}_s^0 = id_{P_k} \), it implies
\[ Sq^0_s[X] = Sq^0_s[sX] = [\widetilde{Sq}_s^0sX] = [X], \]
for any \( X \) in degree \( r \) of \( P_k \).

On the other hand, we have \( \pi Sq^0_s = id_{(\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_k)_{2r+k}} \). Indeed, by the hypothesis, any monomial with at least one even exponent represents the 0 class in \((\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_k)_{2r+k}\), so we need only to check on the classes of monomials with all exponents odd. We have
\[
\begin{align*}
\pi Sq^0_s[x_1^{2i_1+1}\cdots x_k^{2i_k+1}] &= \pi[s[x_1^{i_1}\cdots x_k^{i_k}]] \\
&= [s[x_1^{i_1}\cdots x_k^{i_k}]] \\
&= [x_1^{2i_1+1}\cdots x_k^{2i_k+1}],
\end{align*}
\]
for any \( x_1^{2i_1+1}\cdots x_k^{2i_k+1} \) in degree \( 2r + k \) of \( P_k \).

Combining the above two equalities, \( Sq^0^s = id_{(\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_k)_r} \) and \( \pi Sq^0_s = id_{(\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_k)_{2r+k}} \), we see that \( Sq^0_s : (\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_k)_{2r+k} \to (\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_k)_r \)
is an isomorphism with inverse \( \bar{\pi} : (\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_k)_r \to (\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_k)_{2r+k} \).

The proposition is proved. \( \Box \)
The target of this section is the following.

**Lemma 2.4.** For every positive integer $s$,

$$(Sq^0)^s : (\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_4)_{12 \cdot 2^s - 4}^A \rightarrow (\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_4)_{8}^A$$

is an isomorphism of $GL_4$-modules.

**Proof.** By using Proposition 2.3 repeatedly, it suffices to show that any monomial of $P_4$ in degree $m = 12 \cdot 2^s - 4$ with at least one even exponent is hit. Since $m$ is even, the number of even exponents in such a monomial must be either 2 or 4. If all exponents of the monomial are even, then it is hit by $Sq^1$. Hence we need only to consider the case of a monomial $R$ with exactly two even exponents (and so exactly two odd exponents). We can write, up to a permutation of variables, $R = x_1 x_2 Q$, where $Q$ is a monomial in degree $6 \cdot 2^s - 3$.

Let $\chi$ be the anti-homomorphism in the Steenrod algebra. The so-called $\chi$-trick, which is known to Brown and Peterson in the mid-sixties, states that

$$u Sq^i(v) \equiv \chi(Sq^i)(u)v \mod A^+ M,$$

for $u, v$ in any $A$-algebra $M$. (See also Wood [14].) In our case, it claims that $R = x_1 x_2 Q$ is hit if and only if $\chi(Sq^6 \cdot 2^s - 3)(x_1 x_2)Q$ is. We will show $\chi(Sq^6 \cdot 2^s - 3)(x_1 x_2) = 0$ for any $s > 0$.

As $A$ is a commutative coalgebra, $\chi$ is a homomorphism of coalgebras (see [11, Proposition 8.6]). Then we have the Cartan formula

$$\chi(Sq^i)(uv) = \sum_{i+j=n} \chi(Sq^i)(u)\chi(Sq^j)(v).$$

Furthermore, it is shown by Brown and Peterson in [1] that

$$\chi(Sq^i)(x_j) = \begin{cases} x_j^{2^p} & \text{if } i = 2^p - 1 \text{ for some } p, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for $x_j$ in degree 1. So, in order to prove $\chi(Sq^6 \cdot 2^s - 3)(x_1 x_2) = 0$ we need only to show that $6 \cdot 2^s - 3$ can not be written in the form

$$6 \cdot 2^a - 3 = (2^b - 1) + (2^a - 1)$$

with $a \geq b$. Indeed, if we have this equality, then $b = 0$ as the left hand size is odd. So $6 \cdot 2^a - 3 = 2^a - 1$, or equivalently $3 \cdot 2^a = 2^a - 1 + 1$. As $s > 0$, the left hand side is even, hence $a - 1 = 0$. It implies $3 \cdot 2^a = 2$. This equality has no solution $s$.

The lemma is proved.

---

3. **The fourth algebraic transfer is not an isomorphism**

The target of this section is to prove the following theorem, which is also numbered as Theorem 1.4.

**Theorem 3.1.**

$$Tr_4 : \mathbb{F}_2 \otimes PH_4(BV_4) \rightarrow Ext_{GL_4}^4 A P H_4(BV_4)$$

is not an isomorphism.

**Proof.** For any $r$, we have a commutative diagram
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
(F_2 \otimes \text{PH}_1(BV_4))_{r} & \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}_4} & \text{Ext}_{A}^{4,4+r}(F_2,F_2) \\
S\eta^0 & & S\eta^0 \\
(F_2 \otimes \text{PH}_1(BV_4))_{2r+4} & \xrightarrow{\text{Tr}_4} & \text{Ext}_{A}^{4,8+2r}(F_2,F_2),
\end{array}
\]
where the first vertical arrow is the Kameko $S\eta^0$ and the second vertical one is the classical $S\eta^0$.

The dual statement of Lemma 2.4 for $s = 2$ claims that
\[S\eta^0 : (F_2 \otimes \text{PH}_1(BV_4))_s \to (F_2 \otimes \text{PH}_1(BV_4))_{20}\]
is an isomorphism. On the other hand, it is known (May [10]) that
\[\text{Ext}_{A}^{4,4+8}(F_2,F_2) = 0 \neq \text{Ext}_{A}^{4,4+20}(F_2,F_2) = F_2 \cdot g_1.\]
This implies that $\text{Tr}_4$ is not an isomorphism. The theorem is proved.\hfill \Box

**Remark 3.2.** This proof does not show whether $\text{Tr}_4$ fails to be a monomorphism or fails to be an epimorphism. We will see that actually $\text{Tr}_4$ is not an epimorphism in Section 5 below.

4. **GL$_4$-invariants of the indecomposables of $P_4$ in degree 8**

From now on, let us write $x = x_1$, $y = x_2$, $z = x_3$ and $t = x_4$ and denote the monomial $x^a y^b z^c t^d$ by $(a, b, c, d)$ for abbreviation.

**Proposition 4.1.** $(F_2 \otimes P_4)_8$ is an $F_2$-vector space of dimension 55 with a basis consisting of the classes represented by the following monomials:

(A) $(7,1,0,0), (7,0,1,0), (7,0,0,1), (1,7,0,0), (1,0,7,0), (1,0,0,7),$ $(0,7,1,0), (0,7,0,1), (0,1,7,0), (0,1,0,7), (0,0,7,1), (0,0,1,7),$ $(3,3,1,1), (3,1,3,1), (3,1,1,3), (1,3,3,1), (1,3,1,3), (1,1,3,3),$ $(6,1,1,0), (6,1,0,1), (6,0,1,1), (1,6,1,0), (1,6,0,1), (1,1,6,0),$ $(1,1,0,6), (1,0,6,1), (1,0,1,6), (0,6,1,1), (0,1,6,1), (0,1,1,6),$ $(5,3,0,0), (5,0,3,0), (5,0,0,3), (0,5,3,0), (0,5,0,3), (0,0,5,3),$ $(5,2,1,0), (5,2,0,1), (5,0,2,1), (2,5,1,0), (2,5,0,1), (2,1,5,0),$ $(2,1,0,5), (2,0,5,1), (2,0,1,5), (0,5,2,1), (0,2,5,1), (0,2,1,5),$ $(5,1,1,1), (1,5,1,1), (1,1,5,1), (1,1,1,5),$ $(4,2,1,1), (4,1,2,1), (1,4,2,1).$

The proposition is proved by combining a couple of lemmas.

**Lemma 4.2.** $(F_2 \otimes P_4)_8$ is generated by the 55 elements listed in Proposition 4.1.
The 55 elements listed in Proposition 4.1 are linearly independent in $\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_4 \langle A \rangle$.

The only monomials $(a, b, c, d)$ in degree 8 with at least one of $a, b, c, d$ odd are the following up to permutations of the variables:

$$(7, 1, 0, 0), (3, 3, 1, 1), (6, 1, 1, 0), (5, 3, 0, 0), (5, 2, 1, 0), (5, 1, 1, 1), (4, 2, 1, 1), (4, 3, 1, 0), (3, 3, 2, 0), (3, 2, 2, 1).$$

The last 3 monomials and their permutations are expressed in terms of the first 7 monomials and their permutations as follows:

$$
\begin{align*}
(4, 3, 1, 0) &= (2, 5, 1, 0) + Sq^4(1, 2, 1, 0) + Sq^7(2, 3, 1, 0), \\
(3, 3, 2, 0) &= (5, 2, 1, 0) + (2, 5, 1, 0) + Sq^4(2, 1, 1, 0) + Sq^7(1, 2, 1, 0) \\
& \quad + Sq^2(3, 2, 1, 0) + Sq^2(2, 3, 1, 0) + Sq^1(3, 3, 1, 0), \\
(3, 2, 2, 1) &= (5, 1, 1, 1) + (4, 2, 1, 1) + (4, 1, 2, 1) \\
& \quad + Sq^2(3, 1, 1, 1) + Sq^2(4, 1, 1, 1) + Sq^1(3, 2, 1, 1) + Sq^1(3, 1, 2, 1).
\end{align*}
$$

Hence, $(\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_4) \langle A \rangle$ is generated by the following 7 monomials and their permutations:

$$(7, 1, 0, 0), (3, 3, 1, 1), (6, 1, 1, 0), (5, 3, 0, 0), (5, 2, 1, 0), (5, 1, 1, 1), (4, 2, 1, 1).$$

By the family of a monomial $(a, b, c, d)$ we mean the set of all monomials which are obtained from $(a, b, c, d)$ by permutations of the variables.

The monomials in the 7 families above which are not in Proposition 4.1 can be expressed in terms of the 55 elements listed there as follows. (We give only one expression from each symmetry class.)

$$
\begin{align*}
(3, 5, 0, 0) &= (5, 3, 0, 0) + Sq^4(2, 2, 0, 0) + Sq^2(3, 3, 0, 0), \\
(5, 1, 2, 0) &= (6, 1, 1, 0) + (5, 2, 1, 0) + Sq^4(5, 1, 1, 0), \\
(4, 1, 1, 2) &= (4, 2, 1, 1) + (4, 1, 2, 1) + Sq^3(4, 1, 1, 1), \\
(2, 4, 1, 1) &= (4, 2, 1, 1) + Sq^4(1, 1, 1, 1) + Sq^2(2, 2, 1, 1), \\
(2, 1, 1, 4) &= (4, 2, 1, 1) + (4, 1, 2, 1) \\
& \quad + Sq^4(1, 1, 1, 1) + Sq^2(2, 1, 1, 2) + Sq^1(4, 1, 1, 1), \\
(1, 4, 1, 2) &= (4, 2, 1, 1) + (1, 4, 2, 1) \\
& \quad + Sq^4(1, 1, 1, 1) + Sq^2(2, 2, 1, 1) + Sq^1(1, 4, 1, 1), \\
(1, 2, 1, 4) &= (4, 2, 1, 1) + (1, 4, 2, 1) \\
& \quad + Sq^4(2, 2, 1, 1) + Sq^2(1, 2, 1, 2) + Sq^1(1, 4, 1, 1), \\
(1, 1, 4, 2) &= (4, 1, 2, 1) + (1, 4, 2, 1) \\
& \quad + Sq^2(2, 1, 2, 1) + Sq^2(1, 2, 2, 1) + Sq^1(1, 1, 4, 1), \\
(1, 1, 2, 4) &= (4, 1, 2, 1) + (1, 4, 2, 1) + Sq^4(1, 1, 1, 1) \\
& \quad + Sq^2(2, 1, 2, 1) + Sq^2(1, 2, 2, 1) + Sq^2(1, 1, 2, 2) + Sq^1(1, 1, 4, 1).
\end{align*}
$$

The lemma is proved. \(\square\)

**Lemma 4.3.** The 55 elements listed in Proposition 4.1 are linearly independent in $(\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_4) \langle A \rangle$. 
ON BEHAVIOR OF THE ALGEBRAIC TRANSFER

Proof. We will use an equivalence relation defined by saying that, for two polynomials $P$ and $Q$, $P$ is equivalent to $Q$, denoted by $P \sim Q$, if $P - Q$ is hit.

If $X$ is one of the letters from $A$ to $G$, let $X_i$ be the $i$-th element in family $X$ according to the order listed in Proposition 4.1. (This is the lexicographical order in each family.)

Suppose there is a linear relation between the 55 elements listed there

$$\sum_{i=1}^{12} a_i A_i + \sum_{i=1}^{6} b_i B_i + \sum_{i=1}^{12} c_i C_i + \sum_{i=1}^{6} d_i D_i + \sum_{i=1}^{12} e_i E_i + \sum_{i=1}^{4} f_i F_i + \sum_{i=1}^{3} g_i G_i = 0,$$

where $a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i, e_i, f_i, g_i \in \mathbb{F}_2$. We need to show all these coefficients are zero.

The proof is divided into 4 steps.

**Step 1.** We call a monomial a spike if each of its exponents is of the form $2^n - 1$ for some $n$. It is well known that spikes do not appear in the expression of $Sq^i Y$ for any $i$ positive and any monomial $Y$, since the powers $x^{2^n - 1}$ are not hit in the one variable case. Hence, the coefficient of any spike is zero in every linear relation in $\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_k$.

Among the 55 elements of Proposition 4.1, the classes of families $A$ and $B$ are spikes. So $a_i = b_j = 0$, for every $i$ and $j$. Then, we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{12} c_i C_i + \sum_{i=1}^{6} d_i D_i + \sum_{i=1}^{12} e_i E_i + \sum_{i=1}^{4} f_i F_i + \sum_{i=1}^{3} g_i G_i = 0.$$

**Step 2.** Consider the homomorphism $\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_4 \to \mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_2$ induced by the projection $P_4 \to P_4/(z, t) \cong P_2$. Under this homomorphism, the image of the above linear relation is $d_1(5, 3) = 0$.

In order to show $d_1 = 0$, we need to prove that $(5, 3)$ is non zero in $\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_2$. The linear transformation $x \mapsto x, y \mapsto x + y$ sends $(5, 3)$ to $(8, 0) + (7, 1) + (6, 2) + (5, 3) \sim (7, 1) + (5, 3)$. As the action of the Steenrod algebra commutes with linear maps, if $(5, 3)$ is hit then so is $(7, 1) + (5, 3)$. But it is impossible, because $(7, 1)$ is a spike. Hence, $(5, 3) \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_2$ and $d_1 = 0$.

Similarly, using all the projections of $P_4$ to its quotients by the ideals generated by each pair of the four variables, we get $d_i = 0$ for every $i$. So we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{12} c_i C_i + \sum_{i=1}^{12} e_i E_i + \sum_{i=1}^{4} f_i F_i + \sum_{i=1}^{3} g_i G_i = 0.$$

**Step 3.** Consider the homomorphism $\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_4 \to \mathbb{F}_3 \otimes P_3$ induced by the projection $P_4 \to P_4/(t) \cong P_3$. Under this homomorphism, the linear relation above is sent to

$$c_1(6, 1, 1) + c_4(1, 6, 1) + c_6(1, 1, 6) + c_1(5, 2, 1) + c_4(2, 5, 1) + c_6(2, 1, 5) = 0.$$

Applying the linear map $x \mapsto x, y \mapsto x, z \mapsto y$ to this relation, we obtain

$$(c_1 + c_4 + e_1 + e_4)(7, 1) + c_6(2, 6) + c_6(3, 5) = 0.$$

Since $(7, 1)$ is a spike, $(c_1 + c_4 + e_1 + e_4) = 0$, hence $e_6(3, 5) = 0$. As for $(5, 3)$, we can show $(3, 5) \neq 0 \in \mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_2$ and get $e_6 = 0$. 

By similar arguments, we have \( e_1 = e_4 = e_6 = 0 \). The equality \((c_1 + c_4 + e_1 + e_4) = 0\) shows \( c_1 + c_4 = 0 \) or \( c_1 = c_4 \). By similar arguments, \( c_1 = c_4 = c_6 \). We denote this common coefficient by \( c \) and get
\[
c\{(6, 1, 1) + (1, 6, 1) + (1, 1, 6)\} = 0.
\]
We prove \( c = 0 \) by showing \((6, 1, 1) + (1, 6, 1) + (1, 1, 6) \neq 0\). Suppose the contrary, that \((6, 1, 1) + (1, 6, 1) + (1, 1, 6)\) is hit. Then, by the unstable property of the action of \( A \) on the polynomial algebra, we have
\[
(6, 1, 1) + (1, 6, 1) + (1, 1, 6) = Sq^3(P) + Sq^2(Q) + Sq^4(R),
\]
for some polynomials \( P, Q, R \). By the degree information, \( Sq^4(R) = R^2 \) and this element is hit by \( Sq^1 \). Therefore, it suffices to suppose \((6, 1, 1) + (1, 6, 1) + (1, 1, 6) = Sq^3(P) + Sq^2(Q)\).

Let \( Sq^2 Sq^2 Sq^2 \) act on the both sides of this equality. The right hand side is sent to zero, as \( Sq^2 Sq^2 Sq^2 \) annihilates \( Sq^1 \) and \( Sq^2 \). On the other hand,
\[
Sq^2 Sq^2 Sq^2 \{ (6, 1, 1) + (1, 6, 1) + (1, 1, 6) \} = (8, 4, 2) + \text{symmetries} \neq 0.
\]
This is a contradiction. So, it implies \((6, 1, 1) + (1, 6, 1) + (1, 1, 6) \neq 0 \) and \( c = 0 \).

We get
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{4} f_i F_i + \sum_{i=1}^{3} g_i G_i = 0.
\]

**Step 4.** Apply the linear map \( x \mapsto x, y \mapsto y, z \mapsto y, t \mapsto y \) to the above equality and we have
\[
f_1(5, 3) + (f_2 + f_3 + f_4 + g_3)(1, 7) + (g_1 + g_2)(4, 4) = f_1(5, 3) + (f_2 + f_3 + f_4 + g_3)(1, 7) = 0.
\]
As \((7, 1)\) is a spike, we obtain \((f_2 + f_3 + f_4 + g_3) = 0\) and \( f_1(5, 3) = 0 \). As \((5, 3) \neq 0\), it yields \( f_1 = 0 \).

Next, apply the linear map \( x \mapsto x, y \mapsto y, z \mapsto x, t \mapsto x \) to the equality \( \sum_{i \neq 1} f_i F_i + \sum_{i=1}^{3} g_i G_i = 0 \) and we have
\[
f_2(3, 5) + (f_3 + f_4 + g_2)(7, 1) + g_1(6, 2) + g_3(4, 4) = f_2(3, 5) + (f_3 + f_4 + g_2)(7, 1) = 0.
\]
As \((7, 1)\) is a spike, we get \((f_3 + f_4 + g_2) = 0\) and \( f_2(3, 5) = 0 \). Since \((3, 5) \neq 0\), it implies \( f_2 = 0 \).

Similarly, apply the linear map \( x \mapsto x, y \mapsto y, z \mapsto x, t \mapsto x \) to the equality \( f_3 F_3 + f_4 F_4 + \sum_{i=1}^{3} g_i G_i = 0 \) and we have
\[
f_3(3, 5) + (f_4 + g_1)(7, 1) + (g_2 + g_3)(6, 2) = f_3(3, 5) + (f_4 + g_1)(7, 1) = 0.
\]
As \((7, 1)\) is a spike, we get \( f_4 + g_1 = 0 \) and then \( f_3 = 0 \).

Finally, apply the linear map \( x \mapsto x, y \mapsto x, z \mapsto x, t \mapsto y \) to the equality \( f_4 F_4 + \sum_{i=1}^{3} g_i G_i = 0 \) and we have
\[
f_4(3, 5) + (g_1 + g_2 + g_3)(7, 1) = f_4(3, 5) + (g_1 + g_2 + g_3)(7, 1) = 0.
\]
As \((7, 1)\) is a spike, we get \( g_1 + g_2 + g_3 = 0 \) and then \( f_4 = 0 \).
Substituting \( f_1 = f_2 = f_3 = f_4 = 0 \) into the equations \( (f_2 + f_3 + f_4 + g_3) = 0 \), \( (f_3 + f_4 + g_2) = 0 \), \( f_4 + g_1 = 0 \), we get \( g_1 = g_2 = g_3 = 0 \).

We have shown that all coefficients of an arbitrary linear relation between the 55 elements listed in Proposition 4.4 are zero. The lemma follows.

Combining Lemmas 4.2 - 4.3, we get Proposition 4.4.

**Proposition 4.4.** \( (\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_4)^{GL_4}_{A} = 0 \).

**Proof.** If \( X \) is one of the letters \( A, B, C, D, E, F, G \), let \( \mathcal{L}(X) \) be the vector subspace of \( (\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_4)_A \) spanned by the elements of family \( X \) in Proposition 4.1. Let \( S_k \) denote the symmetric subgroup of \( GL_k \). According to the relations listed in the proof of Lemma 4.2, \( \mathcal{L}(A), \mathcal{L}(B), \mathcal{L}(C), \mathcal{L}(D), \mathcal{L}(F), \mathcal{L}(G) \) are \( S_4 \)-submodules. The subspace \( \mathcal{L}(E) \) is not an \( S_4 \)-submodule. However, the sum

\[
\mathcal{L}(C, E) = \mathcal{L}(C) \oplus \mathcal{L}(E)
\]

is. We have a decomposition of \( S_4 \)-modules

\[
(\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_4)_A = \mathcal{L}(A) \oplus \mathcal{L}(B) \oplus \mathcal{L}(C, E) \oplus \mathcal{L}(D) \oplus \mathcal{L}(F) \oplus \mathcal{L}(G).
\]

Let \( \alpha \) be an arbitrary \( GL_4 \)-invariant in \( (\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_4)_A \). It can uniquely be written in the form

\[
\alpha = \alpha_A + \alpha_B + \alpha_{C,E} + \alpha_D + \alpha_F + \alpha_G,
\]

where \( \alpha_X \in \mathcal{L}(X) \) for \( X \in \{ A, B, D, F, G \} \), and \( \alpha_{C,E} \in \mathcal{L}(C, E) \). Each term of this sum is \( S_4 \)-invariant.

Note that if a linear combination of elements in a family is \( S_4 \)-invariant, then all of its coefficients are equal, because each element in the family can be obtained from any other by a suitable permutation. Let \( s_X \) denote the sum of all the elements in the family \( X \) listed in Proposition 4.1. Then, we have \( \alpha_A = s_A, \alpha_B = bs_B, \alpha_D = ds_D, \alpha_F = fs_F, \alpha_G = gs_G \), and \( \alpha_{C,E} = cs_C + es_E \), where \( a, b, c, d, e, f, g \in \mathbb{F}_2 \).

Let \( p \) be the transposition given by \( p(x) = y, p(y) = x, p(z) = z, p(t) = t \). It is easy to see that

\[
\begin{align*}
    p(2, 1, 0, 5) &= (1, 2, 0, 5) = (2, 1, 0, 5) + (1, 1, 0, 6), \\
p(2, 1, 5, 0) &= (1, 2, 5, 0) = (2, 1, 5, 0) + (1, 1, 6, 0).
\end{align*}
\]

Further, the 10 elements different from \( (2, 1, 0, 5) \) and \((2, 1, 5, 0)\) in family \( E \) are divided into 5 pairs with \( p \) acting on each pair by twisting. So, \( p(s_E) = s_E + (1, 1, 0, 6) + (1, 1, 6, 0) \). On the other hand, as the family \( C \) is full, in the sense that it contains all the variable permutations of a monomial, we have \( p(s_C) = s_C \). Hence, we get

\[
p(\alpha_{C,E}) = p(cs_C + es_E) = cs_C + es_E + e(1, 1, 0, 6) + e(1, 1, 6, 0).
\]

As \( \alpha_{C,E} \) is \( S_4 \)-invariant, \( e(1, 1, 0, 6) + e(1, 1, 6, 0) = 0 \). So \( e = 0 \), because the two elements are linearly independent by Lemma 4.3. We obtain

\[
\alpha = \alpha_A + \alpha_B + \alpha_C + \alpha_D + \alpha_F + \alpha_G,
\]

where \( \alpha_C = \alpha_{C,E} = cs_C \).
Let us now consider the transvection $\varphi$ given by $\varphi(x) = x$, $\varphi(y) = y$, $\varphi(z) = z$, $\varphi(t) = x + t$. A routine computation shows

\[
\varphi(s_A) = s_A + (7, 1, 0, 0) + (7, 0, 1, 0) + (7, 0, 0, 1) + (1, 7, 0, 0) + (1, 0, 7, 0) + (6, 1, 0, 1) + (6, 0, 1, 1) + (1, 1, 0, 6) + (1, 0, 1, 6),
\]

\[
\varphi(s_B) = s_B + (6, 1, 1, 0) + (1, 6, 1, 0) + (1, 1, 6, 0) + (2, 5, 1, 0) + (2, 1, 5, 0) + (5, 1, 1, 1) + (1, 5, 1, 1) + (4, 2, 1, 1) + (4, 1, 2, 1) + (3, 3, 1, 1),
\]

\[
\varphi(s_C) = s_C + (6, 1, 1, 0) + (1, 6, 1, 0) + (1, 1, 6, 0),
\]

\[
\varphi(s_D) = s_D + (7, 0, 0, 1) + (1, 6, 0, 1) + (1, 0, 6, 1) + (5, 3, 0, 0) + (5, 0, 3, 0),
\]

\[
\varphi(s_F) = s_F + (2, 5, 1, 0) + (2, 1, 5, 0) + (5, 1, 1, 1) + (4, 2, 1, 1) + (4, 1, 2, 1),
\]

\[
\varphi(s_G) = s_G + (6, 1, 1, 0).
\]

Let $r_X = \varphi(s_X) - s_X$ where $X$ is one of the letters $A, B, C, D, F, G$. The equality $\varphi(\alpha) = \alpha$ is rewritten as

\[
\varphi(as_A + bs_B + cs_C + ds_D + fs_F + gs_G) = as_A + bs_B + cs_C + ds_D + fs_F + gs_G,
\]

or equivalently

\[
ar_A + br_B + cr_C + dr_D + fr_F + gr_G = 0.
\]

In this linear combination, $r_B$ and $r_D$ are the only terms containing $(3, 3, 1, 1)$ in family $B$ and $(5, 3, 0, 0)$ in family $D$ respectively. From Lemma 4.3, we get $b = d = 0$, and therefore $ar_A + cr_C + fr_F + gr_G = 0$.

In the new linear combination, as $r_A$, $r_C$ and $r_F$ are the only terms containing $(7, 1, 0, 0)$ in family $A$, $(1, 6, 1, 0)$ in family $C$ and $(4, 2, 1, 1)$ in family $F$ respectively, we have $a = c = f = 0$. As a consequence, $gr_G = 0$, so we finally get $g = 0$.

In summary, we have shown that every $GL_4$-invariant $\alpha$ in $(F_2 \otimes P_4)_A$ equals zero. The proposition is proved.

\[\square\]

5. The Fourth Algebraic Transfer is Not an Epimorphism

The goal of this paper is to prove the following theorem, which is also numbered as Therem 1.1.

**Theorem 5.1.**

\[
Tr_4 : F_2 \otimes_{GL_4} PH_i(BV_A) \to Ext^{4,4+i}_A(F_2, F_2)
\]

does not detect the non zero elements $g_s \in Ext^{4,12-2s}_A(F_2, F_2)$ for every $s \geq 1$.

**Proof.** Combining Lemma 4.4 and Proposition 4.4 we get

\[
(F_2 \otimes P_4)^{GL_4}_{12-2s-4} = 0,
\]

for every non negative integer $s$.

On the other hand, it is well known that $Ext^{4,24}_A(F_2, F_2)$ is spanned by the generator $g_1$ (see May [10]). Further, $g_s = (Sq^0)^{s-1}(g_1)$ is non zero in $Ext^{4,12-2s}_A(F_2, F_2)$ (see Lin [8] and also [9]).
As $\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes_{GL_4} PH_{12,2^r-4}(BV_4)$ is dual to $(\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_4)^{GL_4}_{A}^{12,2^r-4}$,

$$Tr_4 : \mathbb{F}_2 \otimes_{GL_4} PH_{12,2^r-4}(BV_4) \to Ext^4_{A}^{12,2^r}(\mathbb{F}_2, \mathbb{F}_2)$$

does not detect the generator $g_s$, for every non negative integer $s$.

The theorem is proved. \hfill \Box

As a consequence, we get a negative answer to a prediction by Minami \[12\]. (This corollary is also numbered as Corollary 1.2.)

**Corollary 5.2.** The localization of the fourth algebraic transfer

$$(Sq^0)^{-1}Tr_4 : (Sq^0)^{-1}\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes_{GL_4} PH_i(BV_4) \to (Sq^0)^{-1}Ext^4_{A}^{4+i}(\mathbb{F}_2, \mathbb{F}_2)$$
given by inverting $Sq^0$ is not an epimorphism.

**Proof.** Indeed, it does not detect the non zero element $g$, which is represented by the family $(g_s)_{s>0}$ with $g_s = (Sq^0)^{s-1}(g_1)$. The corollary follows. \hfill \Box

**Remark 5.3.** Our result does not affect Singer’s conjecture that the $k$-th algebraic transfer is a monomorphism for every $k$. (See \[13\].)

6. **Final Remark: GL$_4$-module structure**

Boardman’s study of the 3 variable problem shows that the $GL_k$ module structure of $\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_k$ may be a useful tool. In this vein we close with a description of the module $(\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_4)^{A}_{8}$ as a $GL_4$-module. From the “Modular Atlas” \[5\] we find that there are 8 irreducible modules for $GL_4$ in characteristic 2, of dimensions 1, 4, 4, 6, 14, 20, 20, and 64. With a little calculation we find the following description of them:

1: the trivial module $\mathbb{F}_2$,

$N$: the natural module $\mathbb{F}_2^A$,

$N^*$: the dual of the natural module,

$\Lambda$: the alternating square of $N$ or $N^*$,

$S$: the nontrivial constituent of $N \otimes N^*$, which has composition factors $1, S, 1$,

$T$: a constituent of $N \otimes \Lambda$, which has composition factors $N^*$ and $T$,

$T^*$: a constituent of $N^* \otimes \Lambda$, which has composition factors $N$ and $T^*$,

$St$: the Steinberg module.

Using a “meataxe” program written in MAGMA, together with a MAGMA program to compute Brauer characters, we have found that $(\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_4)^{A}_{8}$ is an extension

$$0 \longrightarrow N^* \oplus T \longrightarrow (\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_4)^{A}_{8} \longrightarrow \Lambda \oplus M \longrightarrow 0,$$

where the 25-dimensional module $M$ is an extension

$$0 \longrightarrow 1 \oplus \Lambda \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow N \oplus S \longrightarrow 0.$$

The corresponding lattice of submodules of $(\mathbb{F}_2 \otimes P_4)^{A}_{8}$ is shown in Figure 1. We name the submodules by their dimension, using a prime to distinguish the two submodules of dimension 30. We label the edges by the corresponding quotient module. In it, intersections are shown, but sums are omitted for clarity. That is, the intersection of the submodules $30'$ and 35 is the submodule 24, but the sum
Figure 1. Some $GL_4$-submodules of $(F_2 \otimes P_4)_A$.

of $30'$ and $35$ (a submodule of dimension 41) is not shown. The two extensions above can be seen in the lattice, in the sense that, for example, the submodule of dimension 24 is the direct sum of the submodules of dimensions 4 and 20, since their intersection is trivial. Further, the quotient of 55 by 24 is the direct sum of the quotients of $30'$ by 24 and of 49 by 24.

The generators for these submodules are provided by the same computer program used to find this decomposition and are listed below. When all the monomials in one of the seven families listed in Proposition 4.1 appear, we simply write the name of the family, so that, for example, all the monomials in family $A$ are in the submodule of dimension 20. Also, recall the element

$$s_G = (4, 2, 1, 1) + (4, 1, 2, 1) + (1, 4, 2, 1)$$

used in the proof of Proposition 4.4. Finally note that elements which form bases for the subquotients can be read off by comparing these lists of generators. For example, the quotient of the module $30$ by the submodule 24 is $\Lambda$, and the elements of family $D$ generate it.

4: $(6, 1, 1, 0) + (1, 6, 1, 0) + (1, 1, 6, 0), (6, 1, 0, 1) + (1, 6, 0, 1) + (1, 1, 0, 6), (6, 0, 1, 1) + (1, 0, 6, 1) + (1, 0, 1, 6), (0, 6, 1, 1) + (0, 1, 6, 1) + (0, 1, 1, 6).$
20: \((A), (6, 1, 1, 0) + (1, 1, 6, 0), (6, 1, 0, 1) + (1, 1, 0, 6), (6, 0, 1, 1) + (1, 0, 1, 6), (1, 6, 1, 0) + (1, 1, 6, 0), (1, 6, 0, 1) + (1, 1, 0, 6), (1, 0, 6, 1) + (1, 0, 1, 6), (0, 6, 1, 1) + (0, 1, 1, 6), (0, 1, 6, 1) + (0, 1, 1, 6)\).

24: \((A)\) and \((C)\).

25: \((A), (C), \) and \(s_G\).

30: \((A), (C), \) and \((D)\).

30': \((A), (C)\) and \((5, 1, 1, 1) + (1, 5, 1, 1) + s_G + (3, 3, 1, 1),\)

\((5, 1, 1, 1) + (1, 1, 5, 1) + s_G + (3, 1, 3, 1), (5, 1, 1, 1) + (1, 1, 1, 5) + s_G + (3, 1, 3, 1),\)

\((1, 5, 1, 1) + (1, 1, 5, 1) + s_G + (1, 3, 3, 1), (1, 5, 1, 1) + (1, 1, 1, 5) + s_G + (1, 3, 3, 1),\)

\((1, 1, 5, 1) + (1, 1, 1, 5) + s_G + (1, 1, 3, 3)\).

31: \((A), (C), (D)\) and \(s_G\).

35: \((A), (C), (D), s_G\) and \(s_G\).

49: \((A), (C), (D), (E), (F)\) and \((G)\).

49: \((A), (C), (D), (E), (F)\) and \((G)\).

\[\text{References}\]

[1] J. M. Boardman, Modular representations on the homology of powers of real projective space, Algebraic Topology: Oaxtepec 1991, M. C. Tangora (ed.), Contemp. Math. 146 (1993), 49–70.

[2] E. Brown and F. P. Peterson, \(H^*(MO)\) as an algebra over the Steenrod algebra, Notas Mat. Simpos. 1 (1975), 11–21.

[3] M. C. Crabb and J. R. Hubbuck, Representations of the homology of BV and the Steenrod algebra II, Algebraic Topology: New Trends in Localization and Periodicity (Sant Feliu de Guíxols, 1994; C. Broto et al., eds.), Progr. Math. 136, Birkhäuser, 1996, pp. 143–154.

[4] Nguyễn H. V. Hưng, Spherical classes and the algebraic transfer, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 349 (1997), 3893–3910.

[5] C. Jansen, K. Lux, R. Parker, R. Wilson, An atlas of Brauer characters, (Appendix 2 by T. Breuer and S. Norton), London Mathematical Society Monographs. New Series, 11, Oxford Science Publications. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1995.

[6] M. Kameko, Products of projective spaces as Steenrod modules, Thesis, Johns Hopkins University 1990.

[7] W. H. Lin, Some differentials in Adams spectral sequence for spheres, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., to appear.

[8] W. H. Lin and M. Mahowald, The Adams spectral sequence for Minami’s theorem, Contemp. Math. 220 (1998), 143–177.

[9] A. Liulevicius, The factorization of cyclic reduced powers by secondary cohomology operations, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 42 (1962).

[10] J. Peter May, The cohomology of restricted Lie algebras and of Hopf algebras; applications to the Steenrod algebra, Ph. D. thesis, Princeton University, 1964.

[11] J. Milnor and J. Moore, On the structure of Hopf algebras, Ann. of Math. 81 (1965), 211–264.

[12] N. Minami, The iterated transfer analogue of the new doomsday conjecture, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 351 (1999), 2325–2351.

[13] W. M. Singer, The transfer in homological algebra, Math. Zeit. 202 (1989), 493–523.

[14] R. M. W. Wood, Steenrod squares of polynomials and the Peterson conjecture, Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. 105 (1989), 307–309.
