THE $P_1^2$ MARGOLIS HOMOLOGY OF $tmf$
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Abstract. $P_1^2$ is a non-primitive element of the mod 2 Steenrod algebra $A$ with the property $(P_1^2)^2 = 0$. This property allows one to view $P_1^2$ as a differential on $H_*(X; \mathbb{F}_2)$ for any spectrum $X$. Homology with respect to this differential, $\mathcal{M}(X, P_1^2)$, is called the $P_1^2$ Margolis homology of $X$. In this paper we give a complete calculation of the $P_1^2$ Margolis homology of the 2-local spectrum of topological modular forms $tmf$ and identify its $\mathbb{F}_2$ basis via an iterated algorithm. We apply the same techniques to calculate $\mathcal{M}(tmf^\wedge r, P_1^2)$ for any $r$.
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Convention. Throughout this paper we work in the stable homotopy category of spectra localized at the prime 2.

1. Introduction

The connective $E_\infty$ ring spectrum of topological modular forms $tmf$ has played a vital role in computational aspects of chromatic homotopy theory over the last two decades [Goe10], [DFHH14]. It is essential in detecting information about the chromatic height 2, and it has the rare quality of having rich Hurewicz image. There is a $K(2)$-local equivalence [HM14]

$$L_{K(2)}tmf \simeq E_2^{hG_{48}}$$

where $E_2$ is the second Morava $E$-theory and $G_{48}$ is the maximal finite subgroup of the Morava Stabilizer group $G_2$. The spectrum $E_2^{hG_{48}}$ can be used to build the $K(2)$-local sphere spectrum (see [BG18] for details). Its homotopy groups approximate both the stable homotopy groups of spheres and the ring of integral modular forms. In many senses, $tmf$ is the chromatic height 2 analogue of connective real $K$-theory $ko$. The cohomology of $tmf$, as a module over the Steenrod algebra $A$, is isomorphic to (see [HM14], [Mat16])

$$H^*(tmf; \mathbb{F}_2) \cong A/A(2)$$
where $A(2)$ is the subalgebra of $A$ generated by $Sq^1, Sq^2$ and $Sq^4$, which is a convenient input for the Adams spectral sequence, a popular computational tool in the subject. Further, the homotopy groups of $tmf$ are completely known [Bau08].

Let us now recall the definition of the element $P^1_2 \in A$. Milnor described the mod 2 dual Steenrod algebra $A_*$ as the graded polynomial algebra [Mil58, App. 1]

$$A_* \cong \mathbb{F}_2[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3, \ldots],$$

where $|\zeta_i| = 2^i - 1$. The elements in the Steenrod algebra $A$ which are dual to $\zeta_2^r$ are denoted by $P^r_1$ and the elements $P^0_1$ are denoted by $Q_{t-1}$. When $s < t$, the elements $P^s_t$ are exterior power generators, i.e. $(P^s_t)^2 = 0$. Thus, any left $A$-module $K$ can be regarded as a complex with differential given by the left multiplication by $P^s_t$ (for $s < t$). This leads to the following definition [Mar83]:

**Definition 1.2.** Let $K$ be any left $A$-module and $0 \leq s < t$. Let

$$L^{P^s_t} : K \rightarrow K$$

denote the left action by $P^s_t$. The left $P^s_t$ Margolis homology group of $K$, $M^L(K, P^s_t)$, is defined as

$$M^L(K, P^s_t) := \frac{\text{Ker } L^{P^s_t} : K \rightarrow K}{\text{Im } L^{P^s_t} : K \rightarrow K}.$$

For a right $A$-module $K$, one can similarly define the right $P^s_t$ Margolis homology group of $K$ as

$$M^R(K, P^s_t) := \frac{\text{Ker } R^{P^s_t} : K \rightarrow K}{\text{Im } R^{P^s_t} : K \rightarrow K}$$

where $R^{P^s_t}$ is the right action by $P^s_t$ on $K$.

**Notation 1.3.** For a spectrum $X$, $M(X, P^s_t)$ will denote $M^L(H^s(X), P^s_t)$ or equivalently $M^R(H_*(X), P^s_t)$.

Computations of Margolis homology underly many essential computations in homotopy theory. For example, Adams work on $BP(1)$ cooperations [Ada95] relies on the computations of $M(BP(1), Q_i)$ for $i = 0, 1$. Calculations like $M((bo, Q_i)$ for $i = 0, 1$ are essential ingredients in the work of Mahowald on ho-resolutions [Mah81]. More recently, Culver described $BP(2)$ resolutions [Cul] by understanding $M(BP(2), Q_i)$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$. Computation of $M(tmf^{2m}, Q_2)$ is an essential ingredient in [BBR+ b].

Since $Q_i$ is a primitive, i.e. $\Delta(Q_i) = Q_i \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes Q_i$, $Q_i$ acts as a derivation, meaning it follows the Leibniz rule

$$Q_i(xy) = Q_i(x) \cdot y + x \cdot Q_i(y).$$

As a result, computation of $Q_i$ Margolis homology is often fairly straightforward. In general, the action of $P^s_t$ for $s > 0$ is not a derivation, as $P^s_t$ is not a primitive element of $A$. In fact, since $\Delta(P^1_2) = P^1_2 |1 + Q_1| Q_1 + 1|P^1_2$, we have

$$P^1_2(xy) = P^1_2(x)y + Q_1(x)Q_1(y) + xP^1_2(y).$$

(1.4)

This is the main reason why the $P^1_2$ Margolis homology calculations are significantly more complicated. Moreover, unlike in the case of $Q_i$ Margolis homology, the Künneth isomorphism does not hold for $P^1_2$ Margolis homology.

Let us now consider the spectrum $tmf$. It follows from (1.1) that

$$H_*(tmf; \mathbb{F}_2) \cong \mathbb{F}_2[\zeta^8, \zeta^4, \zeta^2, \zeta_4, \zeta_5, \ldots].$$
The right action of $Q_i$ is given by the formula (see [Cul, §2] for details)

$$Q_i(\zeta_n) = \zeta_n^{2^{i+1}}.$$  

Then, since the $Q_i$ are derivations, it can be easily seen that

(1.5) \[ \mathcal{M}(tmf, Q_0) = \mathbb{F}_2[\zeta_1^2, \zeta_2^2] \]

(1.6) \[ \mathcal{M}(tmf, Q_1) = \mathbb{F}_2[\zeta_1^2, \zeta_2^2, \zeta_4^2, \zeta_4^4, \ldots]/(\zeta_4^4, \zeta_4^4, \ldots) \]

(1.7) \[ \mathcal{M}(tmf, Q_2) = \mathbb{F}_2[\zeta_2^2, \zeta_3^2, \zeta_4^2, \zeta_4^4, \zeta_8^2, \zeta_8^4, \ldots]/(\zeta_2^2, \zeta_3^2, \zeta_4^2, \zeta_4^4, \zeta_8^2, \zeta_8^4, \ldots). \]

In this paper, we give a complete calculation of the $P_i^1$ Margolis homology for $tmf$; in fact, we compute $\mathcal{M}(tmf^{nr}, P_i^1)$ for arbitrary $r$. More specifically, we give an iterated algorithm (see Definition 4.3) that constructs an $\mathbb{F}_2$-basis of $\mathcal{M}(tmf, P_i^1)$.

The methods developed in this paper can be considered as a blueprint for computations of $P_i^1$ Margolis homology of a variety of other $A$-modules. To demonstrate this point, we also calculate $\mathcal{M}((B\mathbb{Z}/2^n)^+, P_i^1)$. However, we specifically choose to work with the spectrum $tmf^{nr}$ as it lies in the confluence of various problems that the authors are interested in. We will describe them after we make the following observation. Because of (1.1) and a change of ring isomorphism, the $E_2$ page of the Adams spectral sequence converging to $tmf_*, X$ (for a spectrum $X$) is

$$E_2^{s,t} := Ext_{A(2)}^{s,t}(H^*(X), \mathbb{F}_2).$$

One can detect infinite families in the $E_2$ page via the map

$$q : Ext_{A(2)}^{s,t}(H^*(X), \mathbb{F}_2) \rightarrow Ext_{A(P_i^1)}^{s,t}(H^*(X), \mathbb{F}_2).$$

The codomain of $q$ can be understood by calculating $\mathcal{M}(X, P_i^1)$. Note that

$$Ext_{A(P_i^1)}^{s,t}(\mathbb{F}_2, \mathbb{F}_2) \cong \mathbb{F}_2[h_{2,1}],$$

where $|h_{2,1}| = (1,6)$. Note that

$$\mathbb{F}_2[h_{2,1}] \otimes \mathcal{M}(X, P_i^1) \subset Ext_{A(P_i^1)}^{s,t}(H^*(X), \mathbb{F}_2)$$

accounts for all the elements with positive $s$ filtration. This shows that the knowledge of $\mathcal{M}(X, P_i^1)$ is crucial in detecting patterns in the $E_2$-page of (1.8).

**Motivation I - Towards homotopy groups of $K(2)$-local sphere.** Computation of the homotopy groups of $L_{K(n)}S^0$ — the sphere spectrum localized with respect to Morava $K$-theories $K(n)$ at various primes $p$ and heights $n$ — is the central question of chromatic homotopy theory. It is sometimes easier to compute $\pi_*L_{K(n)}X$ for finite complexes other than the sphere, although very little data like this is known at $n = p = 2$ anyway. Recently, Bhattacharya and Egger introduced a family of finite spectra $Z$ [BEa], and $\pi_*L_{K(2)}Z$ has been also been completely computed [BBB+b, BEb], the first example of a finite complex at $p = 2$ whose $\pi_*L_{K(2)}$ is completely determined. The finite complex $Z$ can be constructed from the sphere spectrum, by a succession of cofiber sequences of self-maps (see [BEa], the last one of which is

$$\Sigma^5 A_1 \wedge C\nu \xrightarrow{w} A_1 \wedge C\nu \rightarrow Z.$$
In a quest to leverage the knowledge of $\pi_*\Omega K(2)\mathbb{Z}$ to $\pi_*\Omega K(2)\mathbb{S}^0$, one must first attempt to compute the $K(2)$-local homotopy groups of $A_1 \wedge \mathbb{C}^\nu$. Very briefly, our strategy is to use the $v_2$-local $tmf$-based Adams spectral sequence

$$E_1^{s,t} = v_2^{-1} \pi_{t-s}((tmf \wedge \mathbb{C}^\nu) \wedge A_1 \wedge \mathbb{C}^\nu) \Rightarrow \pi_{t-s}(\Omega K(2)A_1 \wedge \mathbb{C}^\nu)$$

and compare it with that of $Z$. One can identify the $E_1$-page of the above spectral sequence using the classical Adams spectral sequence

$$E_2^{s,t} = \text{Ext}^{s,t}_{A}(H^*(tmf \wedge \mathbb{C}^\nu A_1 \wedge \mathbb{C}^\nu), \mathbb{F}_2) \Rightarrow \pi_{t-s}(tmf \wedge \mathbb{C}^\nu A_1 \wedge \mathbb{C}^\nu).$$

Because of (1.1) and the fact that $H^*(A_1 \wedge \mathbb{C}^\nu) \cong A(2)/\mathbb{A}(Q, P_1^1)$, and the change of rings isomorphism, the $E_2$-page of the spectral sequence (1.9) has the form

$$\text{Ext}^{s,t}_{A(Q, P_1^1)}(H^*(tmf^\wedge r), \mathbb{F}_2)$$

Hence, computation of $\mathcal{M}(tmf^\wedge r, P_1^1)$ is essential for understanding the $E_2$-page of (1.9).

**Motivation II - $tmf$ resolution of the sphere spectrum.** The connective spectrum $bo$ is not a flat ring spectrum, hence the $E_2$ page of the $bo$-based Adams spectral sequence does not have a straightforward expression like the classical Adams spectral sequence. However, Lellmann and Mahowald [LM87] were able to calculate the $d_i$ differentials (also see [BBB+88]) and gave a description of the “$v_1$-periodic part” of the $E_2$-page. They identified the free Eilenberg–MacLane summand of $bo^\wedge r$. To identify this free summand one needs to identify the $A(1)$ free summand of $H^*(bo^\wedge r) \cong A(1)^\wedge r$.

This can be done by calculating $\mathcal{M}(bo^\wedge r, Q_0)$ and $\mathcal{M}(bo^\wedge r, Q_1)$ and using the following theorem due to Margolis.

**Theorem 1.10 ([Mar83, Chapter 19, Theorem 6]).** An $A(n)$-module $K$ is free if and only if $\mathcal{M}(K, P_i^1) = 0$ whenever $s + t \leq n + 1$ with $s < t$.

To emulate the strategy of Lellmann and Mahowald to understand the $tmf$-based Adams spectral sequence for $S^0$ one needs to first identify the $A(2)$-free part of $H^*(tmf^\wedge r) \cong (A(2))^\wedge r$.

This can be identified using Theorem 1.10 and the knowledge of $\mathcal{M}(tmf^\wedge r, P_i^1)$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$ and $\mathcal{M}(tmf^\wedge r, P_2^1)$.

**Motivation III - Infinite loop space of $tmf$.** There are $A$-modules $J(k)$, called Brown–Gitler modules [BG73], which assemble into a doubly graded $A$-algebra, denoted here by $J(\star)^\wedge r$. Moreover, there is an $A$-module isomorphism $J(\star)^\wedge r \cong \mathbb{F}_2[x_1, x_2, \ldots]$ where $x_i \in J(2^i)^\wedge r$ and the left $A$ action on $J(\star)^\wedge r$ is [Sch94]

$$\text{Sq}(x_i) = x_i + x_i^{2i-1}.$$ 

In fact, $J(k)^\wedge r$ can be thought of as inheriting this action by virtue of being a subobject of $A^\wedge r$. Because of this, minor modifications to methods of this paper apply to the calculation of $\mathcal{M}(J(k), P_2^1)$. By work of [KM13], there is a spectral sequence, obtained by studying Goodwillie towers, relating the knowledge of $H_*(tmf; \mathbb{F}_2)$ to that of $H_*(\Omega^\infty tmf; \mathbb{F}_2)$. Roughly speaking, this relies on computing certain derived
functors, usually labeled $\Omega_s^{\infty}$, in the category of unstable modules over $\mathcal{A}$. It turns out that there is an isomorphism (see [Goe86] or [HK00])
\[
\Omega_s^{\infty} \Sigma^{-t}(\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{A}(2))_* \cong \text{Ext}_A^{s,t}(\mathbb{F}_2, J(*)(s)),
\]
so that these computations require an understanding of the $J(k)$ as modules over $\mathcal{A}(2)$, the hardest part of which is understanding how $P^1_2$ acts.

**Summary of the main results and the organization of the paper.** In Section 2, we recall some facts about the Steenrod algebra and its dual. We introduce the *length* function $L$, which leads to an increasing filtration called the length filtration and consequently the length spectral sequence (2.10), which computes the $P^1_2$ Margolis homology of $tmf$. While $d_0$ differentials are easy to calculate, the $d_2$ differentials are significantly harder. We denote the $E_2$ page of (2.10) by $R$.

In Section 3, we introduce the notion of reduced length, denoted $\ell$. We define $\mathcal{S}$ to be the subalgebra of $R$ generated by those elements for which $\ell(r) = L(r)$, and prove the following two results which form the backbone of this paper:

(i) $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{M}(tmf, P^1_2)$ (see Corollary 3.5), and
(ii) the $d_2$ differential of the length spectral sequence is $\mathcal{S}$ linear (Lemma 3.6).

Then we observe that $R/\mathcal{S}$ is a direct sum of finite dimensional $\Lambda(Q_1, P^1_2)$-modules $M_J$ (see Lemma 3.9). We end the section with Theorem 3.17 where we count the dimension of $\mathcal{M}(M_J, P^1_2)$.

In Section 4, we identify the basis of $\mathcal{M}(M_J, P^1_2)$ and denote it by $\mathcal{B}_J$ (see Definition 4.3, Theorem 4.5 and Corollary 4.6). We establish the relationship of $\mathcal{M}(tmf, P^1_2)$ with $\mathcal{M}(M_J, P^1_2)$ and $\mathcal{S}$ in Theorem 4.9. We also use the knowledge of $\mathcal{B}_J$ to provide a basis for $\mathcal{M}(tmf, P^1_2)$, which is also a part of Theorem 4.9.

In Section 5, we show how to calculate $P^1_2$ Margolis homology for $tmf^{\wedge r}$ and $(BZ/2^{xk})_+$. It turns out that the calculations are very similar to that of $tmf$ and Theorem 4.9 essentially gives complete answer in these cases.
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## 2. Action of $P^1_2$ and the Length Spectral Sequence

The dual Steenrod algebra $\mathcal{A}_* = \pi_*(HF_2 \wedge HF_2)$ has the structure of a graded commutative algebra which Milnor [Mil58] showed to be a polynomial algebra
\[
\mathcal{A}_* \cong \mathbb{F}_2[\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \ldots]
\]
where $|\xi_i| = 2^i - 1$. The anti-automorphism $\chi : \mathcal{A}_* \to \mathcal{A}_*$ is induced by the ‘flip map’ on $HF_2 \wedge HF_2$. The anti-automorphic image of $\chi(\xi_i)$ is usually denoted by $\xi_i$. Milnor defined $Sq(r_1, r_2, \ldots) \in \mathcal{A}$ as the dual of $\xi_1^{r_1} \xi_2^{r_2} \ldots$ and showed that they form a basis of $\mathcal{A}$, known as the Milnor basis. The $P^t_0$ elements are defined as
\[
P^t_0 = Sq(r_1, \ldots), \text{ where } r_i = \begin{cases} 
0, & i \neq t \\
2^t, & i = t.
\end{cases}
\]
The action of an element \( a \in \mathcal{A} \) on an \( \mathcal{A} \)-algebra follows the product rule given by the Cartan formula, i.e.
\[
a(x \cdot y) = \sum a_i' (x) \cdot a_i'' (y),
\]
where \( \Delta (a) = \sum a_i' \otimes a_i \) is the diagonal.

Let us now consider the spectrum \( \text{tmf} \). It follows from (1.1) that
\[
H_*(\text{tmf}; \mathbb{F}_2) \cong \mathbb{F}_2 [\zeta_1^8, \zeta_2^4, \zeta_3^2, \zeta_4, \zeta_5, \ldots].
\]

Thus the action of \( \mathcal{A} \) on \( \mathcal{A} \) is determined by the action of the total squaring operation \( \text{Sq} = 1 + \sum_{i>0} \text{Sq}^i \)  [Pea14, Lemma 3.6]
\[
(\zeta_i) \text{Sq} = \zeta_i + \zeta_i^2 - 1 + \cdots + \zeta_i^{i-1} + 1
\]
which is a ring homomorphism.

**Remark 2.2 (Action of the total squaring operation).** There are multiple ways to define action of \( \mathcal{A} \) on \( \mathcal{A} \). We would like to collect other commonly used actions here. By [Mah81], the right and left actions of \( \text{Sq} \) on \( \zeta_i \) are given by the formulas
\[
\text{Sq}(\zeta_i) = \zeta_i + \zeta_i^2 - 1 + \cdots + \zeta_i^{i-1} + 1
\]
while the left action on \( \zeta_i \) is
\[
\text{Sq}(\zeta_i) = \zeta_i + \zeta_i - 1 + \cdots + \zeta_i + 1.
\]

From these formulas we can derive
\[
Q_{i-1}(\zeta_n) = \zeta_n^{2^{i}}
\]
\[
(\zeta_n) Q_{i-1} = \zeta_n^{2^{i}}
\]
the second equation can also be found in [Cul].

**Important Notation 2.3.** Since we only work with the right action of \( \text{Sq} \) in this paper, we will write \( a(x) \) to denote the right action of \( a \in \mathcal{A} \) on \( x \in H_*(\text{tmf}) \) for the rest of the paper. Thus, from now on
\[
\underbrace{a(x)} := (x)a.
\]

Hopkins and Mahowald [HM14] computed the homology of \( \text{tmf} \) to be the subalgebra of \( \mathcal{A} \) (also see [Mat16, Theorem 5.13])
\[
T := H_*(\text{tmf}; \mathbb{F}_2) \cong (\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{A}(2))^* = \mathbb{F}_2 [\zeta_1^8, \zeta_2^4, \zeta_3^2, \zeta_4, \zeta_5, \ldots].
\]
Thus the action of \( \mathcal{A} \) on \( T \) is simply the restriction of the action of \( \mathcal{A} \) on \( \mathcal{A} \).

We now focus on the action of \( P_2^1 = \text{Sq}(0,2) = \text{Sq}^2 \text{Sq}^4 + \text{Sq}^4 \text{Sq}^2 \) on \( T \). It follows from (2.1) that \( \text{Sq}^{2i} \) acts trivially on \( \zeta_n \), when \( i > 0 \) and \( n \neq 1 \). It follows immediately that
\[
P_2^1(\zeta_i) = 0.
\]
Beware! This does not mean that \( P_2^1(\zeta_i \zeta_j) = 0 \), as the Leibniz rule does not hold. Since the diagonal map of \( P_2^1 \) is
\[
\Delta(P_2^1) = P_2^1 | 1 + Q_1 | Q_1 + 1 | P_2^1,
\]
we obtain the product formula as
\[
P_2^1(xy) = P_2^1(x)y + Q_1(x)Q_1(y) + xP_2^1(y).
\]
Applying the product formula, we get
\begin{equation}
P_2^1(\zeta_i \zeta_j) = \zeta_i^{4} - 2\zeta_{j-2}
\end{equation}
and
\begin{equation}
P_2^1(\zeta_i^2) = \zeta_{i-2}^8.
\end{equation}
Formulas become more complicated for triple products, e.g.
\[P_2^1(\zeta_i \zeta_j \zeta_k) = \zeta_i^{4} - 2\zeta_{j-2}\zeta_k + \zeta_i^{4} - 2\zeta_j \zeta_k^{4} + \zeta_i \zeta_j^{4} - 2\zeta_{k-2},\]
and in general we have the following result.

**Lemma 2.6.** The action of $P_2^1$ on $T$ is given by the formula
\[P_2^1(\zeta_{i_1} \ldots \zeta_{i_n}) = \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq n} \zeta_{i_1} \ldots \zeta_{i_n} \frac{Q_1(\zeta_{i_j}) Q_1(\zeta_{i_k})}{\zeta_{i_j} \zeta_{i_k}}
= \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq n} \zeta_{i_1} \ldots \zeta_{i_{j-1}} \zeta_{i_j}^{4} - 2\zeta_{i_{j+1}} \ldots \zeta_{i_k-1} \zeta_{i_k}^{4} - 2\zeta_{i_{k+1}} \ldots \zeta_{i_n},\]
where indices are allowed to repeat.

**Proof.** Follows from an inductive argument on $n$, using the facts that $P_2^1(\zeta_i) = 0$ and $Q_1(\zeta_i) = \zeta_{i-2}^8$. \(\square\)

The technique developed in this paper begins with the following observation. Consider the subalgebra
\[E = \mathbb{F}_2[\zeta_1^8, \zeta_2^4, \zeta_3^4, \zeta_4^2, \zeta_5^2, \ldots] \subset T\]
which we will call the even subalgebra of $T$, as every element in $E$ has even grading. Since $|Q_1| = 3$ and every element in $E$ has even grading, $Q_1$ must act trivially on $E$. Thus, $P_2^1$ restricted to $E$ follows the Leibniz isomorphism for a derivation, we can easily deduce the following result.

**Lemma 2.7.** The $P_2^1$ Margolis homology of $E$ is given by
\[\mathcal{M}(E, P_2^1) \cong \Lambda(\zeta_1^4, \zeta_2^4, \ldots).\]
Moreover
\[\mathcal{M}(E \otimes^r P_2^1) \cong \mathcal{M}(E, P_2^1)^{\otimes r} \cong (\Lambda(\zeta_1^4, \zeta_2^4, \ldots))^\otimes r.\]

**Definition 2.8.** Let $I$ be a finite subset of $\mathbb{N}^\mathbb{N}$, and for $I = \{i_1, \ldots, i_n\}$ let $\zeta^I$ denote the monomial $\zeta_{i_1}^4 \ldots \zeta_{i_n}^4$. Then the length $L$ of $\zeta^I$ is defined by
\[L(\zeta^I) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} (i_j \mod 2).\]
In other words, $L(\zeta^I)$ counts the number of odd exponents in $\zeta^I$.

The length function $L$ measures “how far” a given monomial in $T$ is from the even subalgebra $E$. The notion of length leads to an increasing filtration of $T$, $\{G_p : p \in \mathbb{N}\}$, called the length filtration, where
\[G_p(T) = \{\zeta^I | L(\zeta^I) \leq p\}.\]
This filtration was recently used in [Cul] and is essentially the filtration introduced in [CK89]. Note that, as an $\mathbb{F}_2$ vector space, $T$ is isomorphic to $E \otimes K$, where $K = \Lambda(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \ldots, \zeta_5, \ldots)$. In other words, any monomial $m \in T$ can be uniquely written.
as \( e \cdot k \) where \( e \in E \) and \( k \in K \). For example, if \( m = \zeta_1 \zeta_2^3 \zeta_8 \), then \( e = \zeta_1^4 \zeta_2^3 \zeta_8^2 \) and \( k = \zeta_5 \zeta_8 \). Note that \( L(m) = L(k) \).

\textbf{Lemma 2.9.} Let \( m = \zeta_1^{i_1} \cdots \zeta_n^{i_n} \in T \) be a monomial. If \( m \notin E \) then \( Q_1(m) \neq 0 \) and

\[
L(Q_1(m)) = L(m) - 1.
\]

If \( P_2^1(m) \neq 0 \), then

\[
L(P_2^1(m)) = \begin{cases} L(m), & \text{if } m \in E \\ L(m) - 2, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
\]

\textbf{Proof.} When \( m \in E \), it is easy to check that \( Q_1(e) = 0 \) and \( L(P_2^1(m)) = L(m) \). So assume \( m \notin E \), which means \( m = e \cdot k \) for some \( e \in E \) and some \( 1 \neq k \in K \). Note that any \( k \) is of the form \( \zeta_1 \cdots \zeta_n \) where indices do not repeat.

The action of \( Q_1 \) is given by the formula

\[
Q_1(\zeta_1 \cdots \zeta_n) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \zeta_1 \cdots \zeta_{k-1} \zeta_{k+1}^4 \zeta_{k+2} \cdots \zeta_n
\]

where we allow repetition of indices. Since \( Q_1 \) acts trivially on \( E \), it follows that

\[
Q_1(e \cdot k) = e \cdot Q_1(k).
\]

From the formula above we see that \( Q_1(k) \neq 0 \) and \( L(Q_1(k)) = L(k) - 1 \). Hence,

\[
L(Q_1(m)) = L(e \cdot Q_1(k)) = L(Q_1(k)) = L(k) - 1 = L(e \cdot k) - 1 = L(m) - 1.
\]

Next, note that

\[
P_2^1(m) = P_2^1(e) \cdot k + Q_1(e) \cdot Q_1(k) + e \cdot P_2^1(k) = e \cdot P_2^1(k)
\]

From the formula of Lemma 2.6, we see that \( L(P_2^1(k)) = L(P_2^1(k)) - 2 \) assuming \( P_2^1(k) \neq 0 \), and hence

\[
L(P_2^1(m)) = L(e \cdot P_2^1(k)) = L(P_2^1(k)) = L(k) - 2 = L(e \cdot k) - 2 = L(m) - 2.
\]

By Lemma 2.9, \( P_2^1 \) respects the length filtration. This means that we obtain a spectral sequence

\[
E_0^r := \bigoplus \frac{G \ast^{r+1}(T)}{G \ast^r(T)} \Rightarrow M(T, P_2^1) = M tmf, P_2^1
\]

where the differentials \( d_r \) are given by the action of \( P_2^1 \) on the \( E_r \) page. We call this spectral sequence the \textit{length spectral sequence}. By Lemma 2.9 when \( P_2^1 \) acts non-trivially, it drops the length filtration by either 0 or by 2, hence the only nontrivial differentials are \( d_0 \) and \( d_2 \) and the spectral sequence collapses at the \( E_3 \) page.

Lemma 2.9 also implies that \( Q_1 \) respects the length filtration as well. Consequently, \( Q_1 \) acts on the \( E_0 \) page. A map between two chain complexes is a map that commutes with the differential, and such a map induces a map between the homology of the chain complexes. Now note that \( Q_1 \) commutes with \( P_2^1 \), hence an inductive argument shows that \( Q_1 \) acts on \( E_r \) page of the length spectral sequence 2.10 and commutes with the \( d_r \) differentials for all \( r \). Thus one should think of each page of (2.10) as an \( \Lambda(Q_1, P_2^1) \) module, where the \( d_r \) differential is precisely the action of \( P_2^1 \) on that page.
Observe that, as an algebra and as an \( \Lambda(P_1^\cdot) \)-module,
\[
E_0^\cdot = \bigoplus G^{*+1}(T)G^*(T) \cong E \otimes K,
\]
where \( P_1^\cdot \) acts trivially on \( K \) and \( E \) inherits the action of \( P_1^\cdot \) from \( T \). It is worth spelling out below the definition of the tensor product that we use, from \cite[p.186]{Mar83}.

**Definition 2.11.** Let \( \Gamma \) be any Hopf algebra. For two \( \Gamma \)-modules \( M \) and \( N \), the underlying \( \mathbb{F}_2 \) vector space of \( M \otimes N \) is simply \( M \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_2} N \), and \( \Gamma \) acts via the diagonal map, i.e.
\[
a(m \otimes n) = \sum_i a_i(m) \otimes a'_i(n).
\]
where \( a \in \Gamma \) and \( \Delta(a) = \sum_i a_i \otimes a'_i \), where \( \Delta \) is the coproduct of the Hopf algebra.

The \( \Lambda(Q_1, P_2^\cdot) \)-module structure on \( E_0^\cdot \cong E \otimes K \) is specified once we establish the \( Q_1 \) action. In fact, the action of \( Q_1 \) can be extended from the formula
\[
Q_1(\zeta_i) = \zeta_i^{4-2}
\]
using the Leibniz rule and \( E \) linearity of \( Q_1 \) action.

Next, we compute the \( E_1 \) page. For an element \( e \otimes k \in E_1^\cdot \), notice that \( P_1^\cdot(e \cdot k) = P_1^\cdot(e) \otimes k \). Moreover, \( P_2^\cdot \) acts by derivation on \( E \). Thus as an algebra
\[
E_1^\cdot \cong \mathcal{M}(E_0^\cdot, P_2^\cdot) \cong \mathcal{M}(E, P_2^\cdot) \otimes K \cong \Lambda(\zeta_2^4, \zeta_3^4, \ldots) \otimes \Lambda(\zeta_4, \zeta_5, \ldots).
\]
It follows from Lemma 2.9 that the action of \( P_2^\cdot \) is trivial on \( E_1^\cdot \) and action of \( Q_1 \) can be extended to the entire \( E_1 \) page from (2.12), using Leibniz rule and \( \mathcal{M}(E, P_2^\cdot) \) linearity of the \( Q_1 \) action.

Since \( P_2^\cdot \) acts trivially on \( E_1^\cdot \), i.e. \( d_1 \) differential is trivial, we see that \( E_2^\cdot \cong E_1^\cdot \) as an algebra and the action of \( Q_1 \) remains as is.

However, the action of \( P_2^\cdot \) is vastly different from \( E_1^\cdot \) and leads to nontrivial \( d_2 \) differentials. In the next section we understand some key properties of this \( d_2 \) differential which will allow us to calculate the \( E_3 \) page.

### 3. The Reduced Length

In this section we establish a family of nonzero permanent cycles in the length spectral sequence (2.10), which leads to the notion of **reduced length**. For simplicity, we introduce new notation.

**Notation 3.1.** In \( E^\cdot_2 \cong E \otimes K \) of (2.10), we denote \( x_i := \zeta_{i+3} \) and \( t_i := \zeta_i^4 \). For finite subsets \( I = \{i_1, \ldots, i_n\} \subset \mathbb{N} \) and \( J = \{j_1, \ldots, j_m\} \subset \mathbb{N} \), let \( t_I \) and \( x_J \) denote the monomials \( t_{i_1} \cdots t_{i_n} \) and \( x_{j_1} \cdots x_{j_n} \) respectively. Moreover, let \( t_I x_J \) denote the element \( t_I \otimes x_J \in E \otimes K \).

Using this new notation, we have \( \mathcal{M}(E, P_2^\cdot) = \Lambda(t_1, t_2, \ldots) \) and \( \mathcal{M}(K, P_2^\cdot) = \Lambda(x_1, x_2, \ldots) \), and the \( E_2 \) page of (2.10) is thus
\[
E_2^\cdot \cong \Lambda(t_i : i \geq 1) \otimes \Lambda(x_i : i \geq 1) \Rightarrow \mathcal{M}(T, P_2^\cdot).
\]

With this notation, we have \( Q_1(\zeta_i) = t_i \). Of course, \( Q_1(t_i) = 0 \) as \( Q_1 \) is a derivation. More generally,
\[
Q_1(t_I x_J) = \sum_{j \in J} t_j t_I x_{J \setminus \{j\}}.
\]
From Lemma 2.6, it follows that
\begin{equation}
(3.3) \quad d_2(t_1 x_J) = P_2^1(t_1 x_J) = \sum_{K \in J[2]} t_K t_1 x_{J-K}
\end{equation}
where $J[2]$ is the collection of order 2 subsets of $J$.

**Lemma 3.4.** Let $S := \Lambda(t_i : i \geq 1) \subset E_2^1$. Then every element of $S$ is a nonzero permanent cycle in the LSS for $T$.

**Proof.** For any element $t_1 x_I \in S$, it is clear from (3.3) that $d_2(t_1 x_I) = 0$. Thus every element in $S$ is a permanent cycle. Observe from (3.3) that no monomial $t_1 x_J \in S$ is a summand in $d_2(t_I x_{J'})$ for any choice of $I'$ and $J'$. Thus none of the elements of $S$ are a target of the $d_2$ differential, hence nonzero in the $E_3$ page. Then the result follows from the fact that (2.10) collapses at the $E_3$ page. \qed

**Corollary 3.5.** $S$ is a subalgebra of $M(T, P_2^1)$.

**Lemma 3.6.** The $d_2$ differentials (3.3) in the length spectral sequence (2.10), are $S$ linear.

**Proof.** It is enough to show that
\begin{equation}
(3.7) \quad d_2(t_i x_i \cdot t_1 x_J) = (t_i x_i) \cdot d_2(t_1 x_J).
\end{equation}
If $i \in I$, then $t_i t_I = 0$. Hence both the LHS and the RHS are zero. If $i \in J$, then $x_i x_J = 0$, hence LHS is zero. On the other hand,
\[
RHS = t_i x_i \cdot \sum_{K \in J[2]} t_K t_1 x_{J-K} = \sum_{i \in K \in J[2]} t_i t_K t_1 x_i x_{J-K} + \sum_{i \not\in K \in J[2]} t_i t_1 x_i x_{J-K} = 0,
\]
as $t_i t_K = 0$ when $i \in K$ and $x_i x_{J-K} = 0$ when $i \not\in K$.

Now consider the case when $i \not\in I \cup J$. Let $I' = I \cup \{i\}$ and $J' = J \cup \{i\}$. Then,
\[
d_2(t_i x_i \cdot t_1 x_J) = d_2(t_{I'} x_{J'}) = \sum_{K \in J'[2]} t_K t_{I'} x_{J'-K} = \sum_{i \in K \in J'[2]} t_K t_{I'} x_{J'-K} + \sum_{i \not\in K \in J'[2]} t_K t_{I'} x_{J'-K} = \sum_{i \not\in K \in J'[2]} t_K t_{I'} x_{J'-K} = t_i x_i \cdot \sum_{K \in J[2]} t_K t_1 x_{J-K} = t_i x_i \cdot d_2(t_1 x_J). \quad \square
\]

As a result of Lemma 3.6, we only need to understand the $d_2$ differentials in the spectral sequence (2.10) on the generators of
\[
\mathcal{R} := \Lambda(t_i : i \geq 1) \otimes \Lambda(x_i : i \geq 1)
\]
when viewed as an $S$ module (note that $S$ is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{R}$, so this makes sense).

In order to approach this problem we introduce the notion of reduced length.
Definition 3.8. For any monomial \( t_I x_J \in \mathcal{R} \) the reduced length \( \ell \) is the cardinality of \( J - I \), i.e.

\[
\ell(t_I x_J) = |J \cap I^c| = |J| - |J \cap I|,
\]

where \( I^c \) denotes the complement of \( I \).

Note that the length of \( t_I x_J \in \mathcal{R} \) is given by the formula \( L(t_I x_J) = |J| \); in other words, it is counting the number of factors of \( x_J \). Whereas, the reduced length \( \ell \) counts only those factors \( x_j \) in \( x_J \) for which \( t_j \) is not a factor of \( t_I \). For example,

\[
\ell(x_1) = \ell(t_1 x_1 x_2) = \ell(t_1 t_2 x_1 x_2 x_3) = \ell(t_1 t_2 t_3 x_4) = 1
\]

and

\[
\ell(x_1 x_2) = \ell(t_1 x_1 x_2 x_3) = \ell(t_1 t_2 t_3 t_4 x_5 x_6) = 2.
\]

Let \( \mathcal{W} \) be the collection

\[
\mathcal{W} = \{ t_I x_J : \ell(t_I x_J) = L(t_I x_J) \}.
\]

Note that a monomial \( t_I x_J \in \mathcal{W} \) if and only if \( I \cap J = \emptyset \). Since any monomial \( t_I x_J \) can be (uniquely) written as a product of an element in \( \mathcal{W} \) with an element in \( \mathcal{S} \), \( \mathcal{W} \) forms a generating set for \( \mathcal{R} \) as an \( \mathcal{S} \)-module. Indeed,

\[
t_I x_J = t_{I \cap J} x_{I \cap J} \cdot t_{I \cap J^c} x_{I \cap J^c}
\]

where \( t_{I \cap J} x_{I \cap J} \in \mathcal{S} \) and \( t_{I \cap J^c} x_{I \cap J^c} \in \mathcal{W} \). Let \( U \) be the ideal generated by the set \( \mathcal{S} - \{1\} \). For an element \( u \in U \) of the form \( u = sr \), where \( r \in \mathcal{R} \) and \( s \in \mathcal{S} - \{1\} \), we have

\[
P_2^1(u) = P_2^1(sr) = s P_2^1(r)
\]

due to Lemma 3.6 and

\[
Q_1(u) = Q_1(sr) = s Q_1(r)
\]

as \( Q_1(s) = 0 \) for any \( s \in \mathcal{S} \). Consequently, \( U \) is closed under the action of \( Q_1 \) and \( P_2^1 \) and the inclusion map

\[
U \hookrightarrow \mathcal{R}
\]

is a map of \( \Lambda(Q_1, P_2^1) \)-modules. Therefore, the quotient

\[
\mathcal{R} / \mathcal{S} \cong \mathcal{R} \otimes_\mathcal{S} \mathbb{F}_2 \cong \mathbb{F}_2 \otimes_\mathcal{S} \mathcal{R} \cong \mathcal{R} / U \cong \mathbb{F}_2(\mathcal{W})
\]

inherits a \( \Lambda(Q_1, P_2^1) \)-module structure. Let \( \mathcal{W}_K = \{ t_I x_J : I \cup J = K \} \). Thus, as a set

\[
\mathcal{W} = \bigsqcup_{K \subset \mathcal{N}^+ \text{ finite}} \mathcal{W}_K.
\]

An astute reader will observe that

\[
\mathbb{F}_2(\mathcal{W}) \cong \bigoplus_{K \subset \mathcal{N}^+ \text{ finite}} \mathbb{F}_2(\mathcal{W}_K)
\]

not only as an \( \mathbb{F}_2 \) vector space, but also as a \( \Lambda(Q_1, P_2^1) \)-module, as \( \mathbb{F}_2(\mathcal{W}_K) \) is closed under the action of \( Q_1 \) and \( P_2^1 \). Now consider the \( \Lambda(Q_1, P_2^1) \)-module \( M_i \) which consists of two \( \mathbb{F}_2 \) generators \( t_i \) and \( x_i \) such that \( Q_1(x_i) = t_i \) (see Figure 1), where \( i \in \mathcal{N}^+ \). For an indexing set \( J \subset \mathcal{N}^+ \), let

\[
M_J := \bigotimes_{j \in J} M_j.
\]
Lemma 3.9. There is an isomorphism of \( \Lambda(Q_1, P^1_2) \)-modules

(3.10) \[ F_2^i W_J \cong M_J \]

Proof. Note that \( Q_1(x_i) = t_i \) and \( P^1_2(t_j) = P^1_2(x_j) = 0 \) on both sides of (3.10). By (1.4), the \( P^1_2 \) action on both \( W_J \) and \( M_J \) is completely determined by the action of \( Q_1 \) and the action of \( P^1_2 \) on the generators. Therefore, (3.10) is indeed an isomorphism of \( \Lambda(Q_1, P^1_2) \)-modules. \( \Box \)

Because of Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.9, the problem of computing the \( E_3 \) page of (2.10) is equivalent to the problem of computing \( M(M_J, P^1_2) \). Thus, we first need to understand the structure of \( M_J \) as a \( \Lambda(Q_1, P^1_2) \)-module.

Often our indexing set will be the subset \( \{1, \ldots, n\} \subset \mathbb{N} \) which we will denote by \( [n] \). In Figure 2 and Figure 3 we describe \( M_J \), when \( J = [2] \) and \( J = [3] \) respectively. The blue curved lines depict the action of \( Q_1 \) and red boxed lines depict the action of \( P^1_2 \). We observe that there is an isomorphism of \( \Lambda(Q_1, P^1_2) \)-modules

(3.11) \[ M_{[3]} \cong \Lambda(Q_1)\{t_1 t_2 t_3 + t_2 t_3 t_1\} \oplus \Lambda(Q_1)\{t_1 t_3 x_2 + t_1 t_2 x_3\} \oplus \Lambda(Q_1, P^1_2)\{t_1 t_2 t_3\}. \]
This observation becomes the key to understanding the structure of $M_J$ along with the following fact about finite dimensional Hopf algebras.

**Theorem 3.12 ([NZ89]).** If $E$ is a finite dimensional Hopf algebra over a field $\mathbb{F}$, then for any $E$-module $M$, $E \otimes M$ is a free $E$-module.

**Remark 3.13.** There are multiple ways to choose a basis for $M_J$. The basis of $M_{[3]}$ we chose in Figure 3 is $B_{[3]}$ which we will define below in Section 4. However, for the purposes of this section, this choice will not play any role other than the fact that it is convenient to see the isomorphism of (3.11).

**Definition 3.14.** Let $E$ be any $\mathbb{F}_2$-algebra. Let $M$ and $N$ be $E$-modules. We say that $M$ is stably isomorphic to $N$ if

$$F \oplus M \cong F' \oplus N$$

where $F$ and $F'$ are free $E$-modules.

**Lemma 3.15.** When $k = 2t + 1$, $M_{[k]}$ is stably isomorphic as a $\Lambda(Q_1, P^1_2)$-module to a direct sum of $2^t$ copies of $\Lambda(Q_1)$, all of whose generators have reduced length $t+1$. Whereas when $k = 2t$, $M_{[k]}$ is stably isomorphic to a direct sum of $2^{t-1}$ copies of $M_{[2]}$, all of whose generators have reduced length $t+1$.

**Proof.** Our proof is by induction on $k$. From Figure 1, Figure 2 and Figure 3, the claim is true for $k = 1, 2, 3$. Now assume that the result is true for $k = 2t - 1$, i.e.

$$M_{[2t-1]} \cong F \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq 2^{t-1}} \Lambda(Q_1)\{g_i\}$$

where $g_i$ are the generators with $\ell(g_i) = t$ and $F$ is a free $\Lambda(Q_1, P^1_2)$-module. It follows that

$$M_{[2t]} \cong M_{[2t-1]} \otimes \Lambda(Q_1)\{x_{2t}\} \cong F \otimes \Lambda(Q_1)\{x_{2t}\} \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq 2^{t-1}} (M_{[2]}){g_i x_{2t}}.$$

By Theorem 3.12, $F \otimes \Lambda(Q_1)\{x_{2t}\}$ is free and $\ell(g_i x_{2t}) = \ell(g_i) + \ell(x_{2t}) = t + 1$.

To complete the inductive argument, notice that

$$M_{[2t+1]} \cong M_{[2t-1]} \otimes (M_{[2]}\{x_{2t} x_{2t+1}\})$$

$$\cong (F \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq 2^{t-1}} \Lambda(Q_1)\{g_i\}) \otimes (M_{[2]}\{x_{2t} x_{2t+1}\})$$

$$\cong F' \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq 2^{t-1}} (M_{[3]}\{g_i x_{2t} x_{2t+1}\})$$

where $F$ and $F'$ are free. The result follows from the $\Lambda(Q_1, P^1_2)$ module structure of $M_{[3]}$ (see Figure 3).

Note that, $M_J \cong M_{[n]}$, where $|J| = n$. Therefore we can conclude that:

**Corollary 3.16.** Let $J = \{i_1, \ldots, i_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$. If $n = 2t + 1$ then $M_J$ is stably isomorphic to a direct sum of $2^t$ copies of $\Lambda(Q_1)$. If $n = 2t$, then $M_J$ is stably isomorphic to a direct sum of $2^{t-1}$ copies of $M_{[2]}$. 
Theorem 3.17. Let $\mathcal{M}(M_J, P^1_2) = \{ x \in \mathcal{M}(M_J, P^1_2) : \ell(x) = l \}$.
If $|J| = 2t$, then
$$\dim \mathcal{M}(M_J, P^1_2)_l = \begin{cases} 2^t, & \text{if } l = t \\
0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
If $|J| = 2t + 1$, then
$$\dim \mathcal{M}(M_J, P^1_2)_l = \begin{cases} 2^t, & \text{if } l = t, t + 1 \\
0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Proof. When $|J| = 2t$, Corollary 3.16 implies
$$M_J \cong F \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq 2^{t-1}} M_{[2]} \{ g_i \}$$
where $F$ is a free $\Lambda(Q_1, P^1_2)$-module and $\ell(g_i) = t + 1$. It is clear that for each $M_{[2]} \{ g \}$ with generator $g$, $\dim \mathcal{M}(M_{[2]} \{ g \}, P^1_2) = 2$ where the basis elements have reduced length $|g| - 1$. Thus the result follows for the even case.

When $|J| = 2t + 1$, Corollary 3.16 implies
$$M_J \cong F \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq 2^t} \Lambda(Q_1) \{ g_i \}$$
where $F$ is free and $\ell(g_i) = t + 1$. Note that, every element of $\bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq 2^t} \Lambda(Q_1) \{ g_i \}$ is in $\mathcal{M}(M_J, P^1_2)$ and $\ell(Q_1 g_i) = \ell(g_i) - 1$. Thus the result follows for the odd case. □

4. A BASIS FOR $\mathcal{M}(\text{tmf}, P^1_2)$

In this section, we identify the elements of $\mathcal{M}(\text{tmf}, P^1_2)$ by providing an explicit basis $B_J$ for $\mathcal{M}(M_J, P^1_2)$. Since we will often dualize, we first describe how duality works in the category of $\Lambda(Q_1, P^1_2)$-modules.

For any (locally) finite right $\mathcal{A}$-module $M$, its dual module $DM = \text{hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(M, \mathbb{F}_2)$ is a left $\mathcal{A}$-module using the action
$$(af)(x) = f(xa).$$
Moreover, the canonical anti-automorphism $\chi$ of the Steenrod algebra induces an isomorphism between categories:
$$\overline{\chi} : \{\text{right } \mathcal{A}\text{-modules}\} \longrightarrow \{\text{left } \mathcal{A}\text{-modules}\}$$
via $a \cdot m := m \cdot \chi(a)$.

Now we focus on the sub-category of right $\Lambda(Q_1, P^1_2)$-modules. Note that $\chi(Q_1) = Q_1$, and from the diagonal map on $P^1_2$ we see that
$$\chi(P^1_2) = P^1_2 + Q_1 \chi(Q_1) = P^1_2$$
as well. Thus, we do not need to distinguish between the left action and the right action on $\Lambda(Q_1, P^1_2)$-modules, a reason for introducing Important Notation 2.3 earlier.

In particular, each $M_i$ is a self-dual $\Lambda(Q_1, P^1_2)$-module under the isomorphism $DM_i \rightarrow M_i$ which maps $t^*_i \mapsto x_i$ and $x^*_i \mapsto t_i$. Consequently, for any $K \subset \{i \in \mathbb{N}_+ \}$, $K$-finite $M_K$ is also a self-dual module, as
$$DM_K = \bigotimes_{i \in K} DM_i \cong \bigotimes_{i \in K} M_i = M_K.$$
We now define the exchange operation
\[ (-)^c : M_K \rightarrow M_K \]
which exchanges \( t_i \) and \( x_i \) in a monomial. For example, \((t_2x_1x_3)^c = t_1t_3x_2\). In general
\[ (t_jx_j)^c = t_jx_j. \]

The element \((t_jx_j)^c\) is precisely the image of \((t_jx_j)^* \in DM_K\) under the isomorphism \(DM_K \cong M_K\).

**Remark 4.1.** A curious reader may observe that the exchange operation is well defined as a map
\[ (-)^c : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R} \]
and comes from the fact that for each \( K \subseteq \mathbb{N}_+ \), \( \mathcal{R}_K := \langle t_jx_j : I \cup J = K \rangle \) is a self-dual \( \Lambda(Q, P^1_2) \)-module.

We exploit the fact that \( M_K \) is a self-dual module in the following way:

**Lemma 4.2.** An element \( m \in M_K \) is not a \( P^1_2 \)-boundary if and only if \( P^1_2(m^c) = 0 \).

**Proof.** The result follows from the fact that \( M_K \) is self-dual, \( P^1_2 \) is a self-map of a finite dimensional \( \mathbb{F}_2 \)-vector space \( M_K \) and the fact that \( \text{hom}(-, \mathbb{F}_2) \) is a contravariant exact functor.

**Definition 4.3.** We define the sets \( B_{[n]} \) inductively starting with \( B_{[0]} = \{ 1 \} \). Suppose \( B_{[2t]} = \{ b_1, \ldots, b_{2t} \} \). Then
- \( B_{[2t+1]} = \{ Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1}) \mid b \in B_{[2t]} \} \cup \{ Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1})^c \mid b \in B_{[2t]} \} \)
- \( B_{[2t+2]} = \{ Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1}) \cdot x_{2t+2} \mid b \in B_{[2t]} \} \cup \{ Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1})^c \cdot x_{2t+2} \mid b \in B_{[2t]} \} \).

For any other indexing set \( K \subseteq \mathbb{N}_+ \) with \(| J | = n \), let \( \phi_J : [n] \rightarrow J \) be the unique order preserving bijection. Define,
\[ B_J := (\phi_J)_*(B_{[n]}) = \{ (\phi_J)_*(b) | b \in B_{[n]} \}. \]

Note that the length of elements in \( B_{[n]} \) is related to \( n \):
\[ \ell(b) = \begin{cases} t, & b \in B_{[2t]} \\ t + 1, & b \in B_{[2t+1]} \end{cases}. \]

**Lemma 4.4.** For any element \( b \in B_{[2t]} \) we also have \( b^c \in B_{[2t]} \) and they satisfy the properties
- (i) \( Q_1(b) = Q_1(b^c) \)
- (ii) \( Q_1(Q_1(b)^c) = b + b^c \)
- (iii) \( P^1_2(Q_1(b)^c) = Q_1(b) \)
- (iv) \( P^1_2(b) = 0 = P^1_2(b^c) \)
- (v) \( Q_1(Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1})^c) = Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1}) \)
- (vi) \( P^1_2(Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1})) = 0, \) and
- (vii) \( P^1_2(Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1})^c) = 0 \)

**Proof.** We prove this by induction on the reduced length of the argument \( \ell(b) \) (or, equivalently, by the remark above, on \( t \)) Clearly, the assertions are true for \( \ell = 1 \).

Let \( \ell(b) = t \). Note that the argument in statements (i) – (iv) has reduced length \( \ell = t \) and the argument in statements (v) – (vii) has reduced length \( t + 1 \). Our inductive step goes as follows. We assume statements (i) – (iv) for \( \ell(b) = t \) as our
inductive hypothesis, and prove statements (v) – (viii) for \( \ell(b) = t \). Then we prove statements (i) – (iv) for \( \ell(b) = t + 1 \).

(v) Follows from (i) and (ii) as

\[
Q_1(Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1})^c) = Q_1((Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1} + b \cdot t_{2t+1})^c)
\]
\[
= Q_1(Q_1(b)^c \cdot t_{2t+1} + b^c \cdot x_{2t+1})
\]
\[
= Q_1(Q_1(b)^c) \cdot t_{2t+1} + Q_1(b^c) \cdot x_{2t+1} + b^c \cdot t_{2t+1}
\]
\[
= (b + b^c) \cdot t_{2t+1} + Q_1(b) \cdot x_{2t+1}
\]
\[
= Q_1(b) \cdot x_{2t+1}.
\]

(vi) Follows from (iii) and (iv) as

\[
P_2^1(Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1})) = Q_1(P_2^1(b \cdot x_{2t+1}))
\]
\[
= Q_1(Q_1(b) \cdot t_{2t+1})
\]
\[
= 0,
\]

(vii)

\[
P_2^1(Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1})^c) = P_2^1(Q_1(b)^c \cdot t_{2t+1} + b^c \cdot x_{2t+1})
\]
\[
= P_2^1(Q_1(b)^c) \cdot t_{2t+1} + Q_1(b^c) \cdot t_{2t+1}
\]
\[
= Q_1(b) \cdot t_{2t+1} + Q_1(b^c) \cdot t_{2t+1}
\]
\[
= 0.
\]

Now we prove (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) for \( \ell(b) = m + 1 \), i.e. for \( B_{2t+2} \). By definition, for element \( b \in B_{2t+2} \) we have \( b^c \in B_{2t+2} \). Let \( a = Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1}) \cdot x_{2t+2} \).

(i)

\[
Q_1(a) = Q_1(Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1}) \cdot x_{2t+2})
\]
\[
= Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1}) t_{2t+2}
\]
\[
= Q_1(Q_1(b) \cdot x_{2t+1})^c t_{2t+2}
\]
\[
= Q_1(Q_1(b) \cdot x_{2t+1})^c \cdot t_{2t+2}
\]
\[
= Q_1(a^c).
\]

(ii)

\[
Q_1(Q_1(a)^c) = Q_1(Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1} \cdot x_{2t+2})^c)
\]
\[
= Q_1((Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1}) \cdot t_{2t+2})^c)
\]
\[
= Q_1(Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1})^c \cdot x_{2t+2})
\]
\[
= Q_1(Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1})^c) \cdot x_{2t+2} + Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1})^c \cdot t_{2t+2}
\]
\[
= Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1}) \cdot x_{2t+2} + Q_1(Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1})^c) \cdot t_{2t+2}
\]
\[
= a + a^c.
\]
(iii) 
\[ P^1_2(Q_1(a)^e) = P^1_2((Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1})t_{2t+2})^e) = P^1_2((Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1})^e)x_{2t+2}) = P^1_2(Q_1(b)^e \cdot t_{2t+1}x_{2t+2} + b^e \cdot x_{2t+1}x_{2t+2}) \]
\[ = P^1_2(Q_1(b)^e) \cdot t_{2t+1}x_{2t+2} + Q_1(Q_1(b)^e) \cdot Q_1(t_{2t+1}x_{2t+2}) \]
\[ + Q_1(b)^e \cdot P^1_2(t_{2t+1}x_{2t+2}) + P^1_2(b^e) \cdot x_{2t+1}x_{2t+2} \]
\[ + Q_1(b)^e \cdot Q_1(x_{2t+1}x_{2t+2}) + b^e \cdot P^1_2(x_{2t+1}x_{2t+2}) \]
\[ = Q_1(b) \cdot t_{2t+1}x_{2t+2} + (b + b^e) \cdot t_{2t+1}t_{2t+2} + 0 + 0 \]
\[ + Q_1(b) \cdot (t_{2t+1}x_{2t+2} + t_{2t+2}x_{2t+1}) + b^e \cdot t_{2t+1}t_{2t+2} \]
\[ = b \cdot t_{2t+1}t_{2t+2} + Q_1(b) \cdot t_{2t+2}x_{2t+1} \]
\[ = Q_1(b \cdot x_{2t+1}) \cdot t_{2t+2} \]
\[ = Q_1(a). \]

(iv) It is easy to check that (vi) and (vii) implies
\[ P^1_2(a) = 0 = P^1_2(a^e) \]
completing the inductive step.

\[ \square \]

**Theorem 4.5.** The set \( B_{[n]} \) forms a basis for \( \mathcal{M}(M_{[n]}, P^1_2) \).

**Proof.** Firstly we need to show that any element in \( B_{[n]} \) belongs to \( \mathcal{M}(M_{[n]}, P^1_2) \). In Lemma 4.4, we have already shown that \( P^1_2(b) = 0 \) for any \( b \in B_n \). Therefore any \( b \in B_{[n]} \) is a \( P^1_2 \) cycle. What remains to show that, none of the \( b \in B_{[n]} \) is not a \( P^1_2 \) boundary. By Lemma 4.2, it is enough to show that \( P^1_2(b^e) = 0 \). But \( P^1_2(b^e) = 0 \) as \( B_{[n]} = B_{[n]}^e \) by Lemma 4.4. Thus every element of \( B_{[n]} \) is a nonzero element of \( \mathcal{M}(M_{[n]}, P^1_2) \). All that is left to show is \( B_{[n]} \) is a linearly independent set. Because linear independent of \( B_{[n]} \) along with the knowledge of \( \dim \mathcal{M}(M_{[n]}, P^1_2) \) from Theorem 3.17 it will follow that \( B_{[n]} \) is a basis of \( \mathcal{M}(M_{[n]}, P^1_2) \).

We prove the linear independence of \( B_{[n]} \) by induction. Clearly, \( B_{[0]} \) is a basis. Now assume \( B_{[2^t]} = \{b_1, \ldots, b_{2^t}\} \) is a basis. Each \( b_i \in B_{[2^t]} \) has reduced length \( t \). \( B_{[2^t+1]} \) has exactly \( 2^t \) elements of reduced length \( t + 1 \), \( \{Q_1(b_1 \cdot x_{2t+1}), \ldots, Q_1(b_{2^t} \cdot x_{2t+1})\} \) which are linearly independent because
\[ r_1 Q_1(b_1 \cdot x_{2t+1}) + \cdots + r_{2^t} Q_1(b_{2^t} \cdot x_{2t+1}) = 0 \]
\[ (r_1 Q_1(b_1) + \cdots + r_{2^t} Q_1(b_{2^t} \cdot x_{2t+1}) \cdot x_{2t+1}) + (r_1 b_1 + \cdots + r_{2^t} b_{2^t} \cdot x_{2t+1}) = 0 \]
which implies \( (r_1 b_1 + \cdots + r_{2^t} b_{2^t}) = 0 \). Since \( B_{[2^t]} \) is a basis, \( r_i = 0 \) for all \( i \in \{1, \ldots, 2^t\} \). Similar arguments show that elements \( B_{[2^t+1]} \) of reduced length \( t + 1 \), \( \{Q_1(b_1 \cdot x_{2t+1})^e, \ldots, Q_1(b_{2^t} \cdot x_{2t+1})^e\} \) are linearly independent as well. An easy argument using the fact that \( B_{2t+1} \) is linearly independent set shows that \( B_{2t+2} \) is also linearly independent, concluding the inductive argument. \( \square \)

**Corollary 4.6.** The set \( B_J \) forms a basis for \( \mathcal{M}(M_J, P^1_2) \) where \( J \subset \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \) with \( \lvert J \rvert \) finite.
Proof. Let $\phi_J : [n] \to J$ be an order preserving bijection. Such a bijection induces an isomorphism $(\phi_J)_* : M_{[n]} \to M_J$ of $\Lambda(Q_1, P^1_2)$-modules. Hence, $(\phi_J)_*(B_{[n]}) = B_J$ forms a basis of $\mathcal{M}(M_J, P^1_2)$.

Example 4.7 (Sample examples of $B_J$). We explicitly identify $B_{[n]}$ using Definition 4.3 for $n \leq 4$.

- $B_{[1]} = \{t_1, x_1\}$,
- $B_{[2]} = \{t_1x_2, t_2x_1\}$,
- $B_{[3]} = \{t_1t_2x_3 + t_1t_3x_2, t_1t_2x_3 + t_2t_3x_1\} \cup \{t_3x_1 + t_2x_1x_3, t_3x_1x_2 + t_1x_2x_3\}$, and
- $B_{[4]} = \{t_1t_2x_3x_4 + t_1tx_2x_3x_4 + t_2tx_3x_2x_4, t_3tx_1x_2x_3, t_3tx_1x_2x_4 + t_1t_4x_2x_3\}$.

Now suppose $J = \{2, 4, 6, 9\}$. We now use $\phi_J : [4] \to J$ to obtain

$B_J = \{t_2t_4x_6x_9 + t_2t_6x_4x_9 + t_4t_6x_2x_9 + t_6t_9x_2x_4 + t_6t_9x_2x_4 + t_2t_6x_4x_9, t_4t_6x_2x_9, t_6t_9x_2x_4\}$

which is also a basis for $\mathcal{M}(M_J, P^1_2)$.

Remark 4.8. We do not need $\phi_J$ in Definition 4.3 to be order preserving per se, it can be just any bijection. In fact, we can use any non-order preserving bijection say

$\psi : [4] \to J$

where $J$ is the indexing set of Example 4.7. Say if $\psi(1) = 9, \psi(2) = 4, \psi(3) = 1$ and $\psi(4) = 6$ then we would have obtained

$\psi_*(B_{[4]}) = \{t_4t_9x_2x_6 + t_2t_5x_4x_6, t_4t_9x_2x_6 + t_2t_5x_4x_6, t_4t_9x_4x_9 + t_4t_6x_2x_9, t_2t_6x_4x_9 + t_6t_9x_2x_4\}$

which is also a basis for $\mathcal{M}(M_J, P^1_2)$.

Theorem 4.9. Let $J$ be a finite subset of $\mathbb{N}_+$. Let $SB_J = \{t_Ix_I : I \cap J = \emptyset \text{ and } b \in B_J\} \subset R$. Then

$B = \bigcup_{J \subset \mathbb{N}_+} SB_J$

forms a basis of the $F_2$ vector space $\mathcal{M}(tmf, P^1_2)$. In fact,

$\mathcal{M}(tmf, P^1_2) \cong \bigoplus_{J \subset \mathbb{N}_+} S_J \otimes F_2(B_J) \cong \bigoplus_{J \subset \mathbb{N}_+} S_J \otimes \mathcal{M}(M_J, P^1_2)$

where $S_J = \Lambda(t_i x_i : i \notin J)$ and $B_J$ as defined in Definition 4.3.

Proof. Lemma 3.9 implies that we have isomorphisms of $\Lambda(Q_1, P^1_2)$-module

$S \otimes (\bigoplus_{J \subset \mathbb{N}_+} M_J) \cong S \otimes (\bigoplus_{J \subset \mathbb{N}_+} F_2(W_J))$

$\cong S \otimes F_2(W)$

$\cong S \otimes (F_2 \otimes S R)$

$\cong (S \otimes F_2) \otimes S R$

$\cong S \otimes S R$

$\cong R$.

Note that, $S$ as a $\Lambda(Q_1, P^1_2)$-module is direct sum of trivial modules $F_2$. Moreover, every element of $S$ is a nonzero permanent cycle in (2.10)(see Corollary 3.5), and
$d_2$ (or equivalently the action of $P_2^1$) is linear with respect to multiplication by $S$
(see Lemma 3.6). Combining all these facts gives us
\[ M(tm\text{f}, P_2^1) \cong H(R, d_2) \cong M(S \otimes \left( \bigoplus_{J \subseteq \mathbb{N}_+} M_J \right), P_2^1) \cong S \otimes \left( \bigoplus_{J \subseteq \mathbb{N}_+} M(M_J, P_2^1) \right) \cong \bigoplus_{J \subseteq \mathbb{N}_+} S_J \otimes M(M_J, P_2^1). \]

The last isomorphism above follows from the fact that for $m \in S$ and $w \in F_2(\mathcal{W}_J)$ $m \cdot w \neq 0$ if and only if $m \in S_J$. Consequently $\mathcal{B}$ is a basis of $M(tm\text{f}, P_2^1)$. \qed

Remark 4.10. Recall that $H_*(tm\text{f})$ was described in terms of $\zeta_i$. We can convert an element of the Margolis homology expressed in terms of $t_i$ and $x_i$ back to an expression involving $\zeta_i$ using the identifications of Notation 3.1. For example, $t_4 t_3 x_2 x_6 + t_2 t_9 x_4 x_6$ can be identified with the element $\zeta_5^2 \zeta_7^3 \zeta_9 + \zeta_4^3 \zeta_7 \zeta_9$.

5. $P_2^1$ Margolis homology of $tm\text{f}^{\wedge r}$ and $B(\mathbb{Z}/2^x)^+$

5.1. $P_2^1$ Margolis homology of $tm\text{f}^{\wedge r}$. Note that
\[ H_*(tm\text{f}^{\wedge r}) \cong H_*(tm\text{f})^{\otimes r} \cong T^{\otimes r}. \]

We first extend the notion of length to $T^{\otimes r}$. For a monomial $\zeta_{l_1} \cdots \zeta_{l_r}$ for $\zeta_{l_i} \in T^{\otimes r}$, which is a tensor product of monomials in $T$, we define
\[ L(\zeta_{l_1} \cdots \zeta_{l_r}) = L(\zeta_{l_1}) + \cdots + L(\zeta_{l_r}). \]

We define the even subalgebra $E_\varepsilon$ of $T^{\otimes r}$ as the span of those monomials in $T^{\otimes r}$ whose lengths are zero. Observe that,
\[ E_\varepsilon \cong E^{\otimes r}. \]

Notion of length leads to an increasing filtration on $T^{\otimes r}$, call it the length filtration, by setting
\[ G^p(T^{\otimes r}) = \langle (\zeta_{l_1} \cdots \zeta_{l_r}) : L(\zeta_{l_1} \cdots \zeta_{l_r}) \leq p \rangle. \]

Let $\mathbb{K}_r = K^{\otimes r}$, where $K$ is as defined in Section 2. Just like in the case $r = 1$, we get a length spectral sequence and its $E_1$ page is
\[ E_1^{ij} \cong M(\mathbb{K}_r, P_2^1) \otimes \mathbb{K}_r \Rightarrow M(tm\text{f}^{\wedge r}, P_2^1). \]

Since action of $P_2^1$ follows Liebniz rule when restricted to $E$, we get
\[ M(\mathbb{K}_r, P_2^1) \cong M(E, P_2^1)^{\otimes r} \]

\[ \text{Notation 5.2.} \text{ For shorthand, we denote } x_{i,j} = (1) \cdots (1) \vert \zeta_{i+3} \vert (1) \cdots (1) \text{ and } t_{i,j} = (1) \cdots (1) \vert \zeta_{i+1}^4 \vert (1) \cdots (1). \text{ With this notation we have} \]
\[ Q_1(x_{i,j}) = t_{i,j}. \]
Using the notations of Notation 5.2 we see that $E_1$ page of the length spectral sequence (5.1), as an algebra, is isomorphic to

$$\Lambda(t_{i,j} : i \in \mathbb{N} - \{0\}, 1 \leq j \leq r) \otimes \Lambda(x_{i,j} : i \in \mathbb{N} - \{0\}, 1 \leq j \leq r).$$

It is easy to see that reindexing using the reindexing map

$$\iota : (i, j) \mapsto r(i - 1) + j,$$

not only produces an isomorphism of $E_1$ page but an isomorphism between the spectral sequence (5.1) and (2.10), the length spectral sequence for the case when $r = 1$. This is because the reindexing induces a map of algebras

$$\iota_* : T^{\otimes r} \rightarrow T$$

which is not only an isomorphism of algebras but also an isomorphism of $\Lambda(Q_1, P^1_2)$-modules. Moreover, the length filtration in $T^{\otimes r}$ can be thought of as the pullback of the length filtration on $T$ via the reindexing map $\iota_*$. Thus we have an isomorphism

$$\iota_* : \mathcal{M}(tmf, P^1_2) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{M}(tmf^{\wedge r}, P^1_2)$$

induced by the $\iota$. Therefore Theorem 4.9 essentially gives a complete calculation for $\mathcal{M}(tmf^{\wedge r}, P^1_2)$. Of course, $\iota_*$ does not preserve internal grading of elements.

**Example 5.3**. For example, let us assume $r = 3$. Then the element $t_2t_4x_6x_9 + t_2t_6x_4x_9 \in \mathcal{M}(tmf, P^1_2)$ (see Example 4.7) corresponds to the element

$$t_1, t_2, t_1 x_2, 3 x_3, 3 + t_1, t_2 x_2, 3 x_2, 3, 3 \in \mathcal{M}(tmf^{\wedge 3}, P^1_2)$$

under the bijection obtained from the above reindexing. When expressed in terms of $\zeta_i$s (see Notation 5.2), the same element can expressed as

$$\zeta_4^4 | \zeta_2^4 | \zeta_6 | 1 + \zeta_5 | \zeta_4^4 | \zeta_6 | 1.$$

**Remark 5.4** ($P^1_2$ Margolis homology of Brown-Gitler spectra). It is well-known that

$$H_*(tmf) \cong \bigoplus_{i \geq 0} H_*(\Sigma^{8i}bo_i)$$

where $bo_i$ are certain Brown-Gitler spectra associated with $bo$. Mahowald defined a multiplicative weight function, which is given by $w(\zeta_i) = 2^{i-1}$. $H_*(\Sigma^{8i}bo_i)$ is the summand of $H_*(tmf)$ which consists of elements of Mahowald weight exactly equal to $8i$. Since, $t_{i,j}$ and $x_{i,j}$ represents $\left(1 \ldots 1 \zeta_{i+1}^j | 1 \ldots 1\right)$ and $\left(1 \ldots 1 \zeta_{i+3}^j | 1 \ldots 1\right)$ respectively, we assign Mahowald weight of $t_{i,j}$ and $x_{i,j}$ as

$$w(t_{i,j}) = w(x_{i,j}) = 2^{i+1}.$$

It follows that the Margolis homology $\mathcal{M}(bo_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge bo_{i_k}, P^1_2)$ is a summand of $\mathcal{M}(tmf^{\wedge k}, P^1_2)$. It consists of all polynomials of $\mathcal{M}(tmf^{\wedge k}, P^1_2)$ expressed in terms of $x_{i,j}$ and $t_{i,j}$ such that $w(x_{i,j}) = w(t_{i,j}) = 4i_j$. 
5.2. $P^1_2$ Margolis homology of $(B\mathbb{Z}/2^\times k)_+$. The space $B\mathbb{Z}/2$ is also known as $\mathbb{R}P^\infty$, the real infinite-dimensional projective space. It is well-known that

$$H^*((B\mathbb{Z}/2)_+, \mathbb{F}_2) \cong \mathbb{F}_2[x]$$

and therefore

$$H^*((B\mathbb{Z}/2^\times k)_+, \mathbb{F}_2) \cong \mathbb{F}_2[x_1, \ldots, x_k].$$

It can be easily seen that $P^1_2(x_i) = 0$ and $Q_1(x_i) = x^4_i$. We again define the length function on the monomials in the usual way

$$L(x^{i_1}_1 \cdots x^{i_k}_k) = (i_1 \text{ mod } 2) + \cdots + (i_k \text{ mod } 2).$$

The even complex $E$, which is the span of elements of length zero, is isomorphic to

$$E = \mathbb{F}_2[x_1^2, \ldots, x_k^2].$$

It can be seen that $P^1_2(x_i)^2 = x^8_i$. Now observe that $Q_1$ acts trivially on $E$, hence $P^1_2$ acts as a derivation and, therefore,

$$\mathcal{M}(E, P^1_2) \cong \Lambda(x^1_1, \ldots, x^4_k).$$

Now the length function gives us an increasing length filtration once we set $p$-th filtration as

$$G_p(\mathbb{F}_2[x_1, \ldots, x_k]) = \langle x^{i_1}_1 \cdots x^{i_k}_k : L(x^{i_1}_1 \cdots x^{i_k}_k) \leq p \rangle.$$

This results in a length spectral sequence which only has $d_0$ and $d_2$ differential. If we denote $x^i_t$ by $t_i$ for convenience. It is not hard to see that the length spectral sequence

$$E^\bullet_1 = \Lambda(t_1, \ldots, t_k) \otimes \Lambda(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \Rightarrow \mathcal{M}((B\mathbb{Z}/2^\times k)_+, P^1_2)$$

is a sub spectral sequence of (2.10) and is, in fact, isomorphic to it when $k = \infty$. Thus, when $k$ is finite, we can recover a complete description of $\mathcal{M}((B\mathbb{Z}/2^\times k)_+, P^1_2)$ from Theorem 4.9. More precisely, we obtain

$$\mathcal{M}((B\mathbb{Z}/2^\times k)_+, P^1_2) \cong \bigoplus_{J \subseteq [k]} S_J \otimes \mathcal{M}(M_J, P^1_2)$$

where $S_J = \Lambda(t_ix_i : i \in [k] - J)$. Details are straightforward and left to the readers to verify.
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