We obtain a mixed complex simpler than the canonical one that computes the cyclic type homologies of a crossed product with invertible cocycle $A \rtimes_f H$, of a weak module algebra $A$ by a weak Hopf algebra $H$. This complex is endowed with a filtration. The spectral sequence of this filtration generalizes the spectral sequence obtained in [13]. When $f$ takes its values in a separable subalgebra of $A$ that satisfies suitable conditions, the above mentioned mixed complex is provided with another filtration, whose spectral sequence generalize the Feigin-Tsygan spectral sequence.
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Introduction

Given a differential or algebraic manifold $M$, each group $G$ acting on $M$ acts in a natural way on the ring $A$ of regular functions of $M$, and the algebra $G^A$ of invariants of this action consists of the functions that are constants on each of the orbits of $M$. This suggest to consider $G^A$ as a replacement for $M/G$ in noncommutative geometry. Under suitable conditions the invariant algebra $G^A$ and the smash product $A \# k[G]$, associated with the action of $G$ on $A$, are Morita equivalent. Since K-theory, Hochschild homology and cyclic homology are Morita invariant, there is no loss of information if $G^A$ is replaced by $A \# k[G]$. In the general case the experience has shown that smash products are better choices than invariant rings for algebras playing the role of noncommutative quotients. In fact, except when the invariant algebra and the smash product are Morita equivalent, the first one never is considered in noncommutative geometry. The problem of developing tools to compute the cyclic homology of smash products algebras $A \# k[G]$, where $A$ is an algebra and $G$ is a group, was considered in [16,19,30]. For instance, in the first paper the authors obtained a spectral sequence converging to the cyclic homology of $A \# k[G]$, and in [19] this result was derived from the theory of paracyclic modules and cylindrical modules developed by the authors. The main tool for this computation is a version for cylindrical modules of the Eilenberg-Zilber theorem. More recently, and also due to its connections with noncommutative geometry, the cyclic homology of algebras obtained through more general constructions involving Hopf algebras (Hopf crossed products, Hopf Galois extensions, Braided Hopf crossed products, etcetera) has been extensively studied. See for instance [1,14,25,52,53]. Weak Hopf algebras (also called quantum groupoids) are an important generalization of Hopf algebras in which the counit is not required to be an algebra homomorphism and the unit is not required to be a coalgebra homomorphism, these properties being replaced by weaker axioms. Examples of weak Hopf algebras are groupoid algebras and their duals, face algebras [24], quantum groupoids constructed from subfactors [29], generalized Kac algebras of Yamanouchi [33], etcetera. It is natural to try to extend the results of [16] to noncommutative quotients $A \# H$ of algebras $A$ by actions of weak Hopf algebras $H$. More generally, in this paper we use the results obtained in [23] to study the Hochschild (co)homology and the cyclic type homologies of weak crossed products with invertible cocycle. Specifically, for a unitary crossed
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product $E := A \times_{\rho} H$, of an algebra $A$ by a weak Hopf algebra $H$ and a subalgebra $K$ of $A$ satisfying suitable conditions, we construct a chain complex, a cochain complex and a mixed complex, simpler than the canonical ones (and also simpler that the ones constructed in [23]), that compute the Hochschild (co)homology of $E$ with coefficients in an $E$-bimodule $M$ relative to $K$, and the cyclic, negative and periodic homologies of $E$, relative to $K$. It well know that when $K$ is separable, then these relative groups coincide with the absolute groups. These complexes are endowed with canonical filtrations whose spectral sequences generalize the Hochschild-Serre spectral sequence and the Feigin and Tsygan spectral sequence. By example, applying these results, we obtain that when $A = K$, the Hochschild homology of $E$ with coefficients in $M$, relative to $K$, coincide with the homology of $H$ with coefficients in the group $M/[M,K]$, considered as a left $H$-module via conjugation. A similar result is obtained for the Hochschild cohomology (see Subsection 1.2 and Examples 2.19 and 3.14).

The paper is organized as follows:

In Section 1 we review the notions of weak Hopf algebra and of crossed products of algebras by weak Hopf algebras, and we recall the concept of mixed complex and the perturbation lemma. In sections 2 and 3 we obtain complexes that compute the Hochschild homology and the Hochschild cohomology of a weak crossed products with invertible cocycle $E := A \times_{\rho} H$ with coefficients in an $E$-bimodule $M$. Then, in Section 5 we study the cup and the cap products of $E$, and in Section 6 we obtain a mixed complex that computes the cyclic type homologies of $E$.

Remark. In this paper we consider the notion of weak crossed products introduced in [6], but this is not the unique concept of weak crossed product of algebras by weak Hopf algebras in the literature. There is a notion of crossed product of an algebra $A$ with a Hopf algebroid introduced by Böhm and Brzeziński in [7]. It is well known that weak Hopf algebras $H$ provide examples of Hopf algebroids. The crossed products considered by us in this paper are canonically isomorphic to the Böhm-Brzeziński crossed products $A \#_{\rho} H$ with invertible cocycle whose action satisfies $h \cdot (l \cdot 1_A) = hl \cdot 1_A$ for all $h \in H$ and $l \in H^L$ (see [21]). So, our results also apply to these algebras.

## 1 Preliminaries

In this article we work in the category of vector spaces over a field $k$. Hence we assume implicitly that all the maps are $k$-linear maps. The tensor product over $k$ is denoted by $\otimes_k$. Given an arbitrary algebra $K$, a $K$-bimodule $V$ and an $n \geq 0$, we let $V^{\otimes^n_k}$ denote the $n$-fold tensor product $V \otimes_k \cdots \otimes_k V$, which is considered as a $K$-bimodule via

$$\lambda \cdot (v_1 \otimes_K \cdots \otimes_K v_n) \cdot \lambda' := \lambda \cdot v_1 \otimes_K \cdots \otimes_K v_n \cdot \lambda'.$$

Given $k$-vector spaces $U, V, W$ and a map $g: V \to W$ we write $U \otimes_k g$ for $id_U \otimes_k g$ and $g \otimes_k U$ for $g \otimes_k id_U$. We assume that the reader is familiar with the notions of weak Hopf algebra introduced in [8,9] and of weak crossed products introduced in [6] and studied in a series of papers (see for instance [2,4,17,22,31]). We are specifically interested in the case in which $A$ is a weak module algebra and the cocycle of the crossed product is convolution invertible (see [22, Sections 4–6]).

### 1.1 Weak Hopf algebras

Weak bi-algebras and weak Hopf algebras are generalizations of bi-algebras and Hopf algebras, introduced in [8,9], in which the axioms about the unit, the counit and the antipode are replaced by weaker properties. Next we give a brief review of the basic properties of these structures.

**Definition 1.1.** Let $k$ be a field. A weak bi-algebra is a $k$-vector space $H$, endowed with an algebra structure and a coalgebra structure, such that $\Delta(hl) = \Delta(h)\Delta(l)$ for all $h, l \in H$, and the equalities

$$\Delta^2(1) = 1^{(1)} \otimes_k 1^{(2)}$$

and

$$\epsilon(hlm) = \epsilon(hl^{(1)})\epsilon(l^{(2)}m) = \epsilon(hl^{(2)})\epsilon(l^{(1)}m)$$

are fulfilled, where we are using the Sweedler notation for the coproduct, with the summation symbol omitted. A weak bi-algebra morphism is a function $g: H \to L$ that is an algebra and a coalgebra map.

In the rest of this subsection we assume that $H$ weak bi-algebra $H$.

**Remark 1.2.** The maps $\Pi^L, \Pi^R, \Pi^L, \Pi^R \in \text{End}_k(H)$, defined by

$$\Pi^L(h) := \epsilon(1^{(1)}h)1^{(2)}, \quad \Pi^R(h) := \epsilon(1^{(1)}h)1^{(2)},$$

respectively, are idempotent (for a proof see [8,12]). We set $H^L := \text{Im}(\Pi^L)$ and $H^R := \text{Im}(\Pi^R)$. In [12] it was also proven that $\text{Im}(\Pi^R) = H^L$ and $\text{Im}(\Pi^L) = H^R$. 

Remark 1.3. Arguing as in [8, equality (2.8b)], we obtain that \( \Pi^R(h^{(1)}) \otimes_k h^{(2)} = 1^{(1)} \otimes_k 1^{(2)} h, \) for all \( h \in H. \)

**Proposition 1.4.** \( H^L \) and \( H^R \) are separable unitary subalgebras of \( H \) and \( hl = lh \) for all \( l \in H^L \) and \( h \in H^R. \)

**Proof.** This is [8, Propositions 2.4 and 2.11]. □

**Proposition 1.5.** We have \( \Delta(H^R) \subseteq H \otimes_k H^L \) and \( \Delta(H^R) \subseteq H^R \otimes_k H. \)

**Proof.** This is [8, (2.6a) and (2.6b)]. □

**Proposition 1.6.** The following facts hold:

1. \( t^{(1)} h^{(1)} \otimes_k t^{(2)} h^{(2)} = h^{(1)} \otimes_k t h^{(2)} \) and \( h^{(1)} t^{(1)} \otimes_k h^{(2)} t^{(2)} = h^{(1)} \otimes_k h^{(2)} t, \) for each \( h \in H \) and \( l \in H^R. \)
2. \( h^{(1)} t^{(1)} \otimes_k h^{(2)} t^{(2)} = h^{(1)} l \otimes_k h^{(2)} \) and \( h^{(1)} t^{(1)} \otimes_k l^{(1)} h^{(2)} = l h^{(1)} \otimes_k h^{(2)}, \) for each \( h \in H \) and \( l \in H^L. \)

**Proof.** This follows from [8, (2.7a) and (2.7b)]. □

**Proposition 1.7.** For all \( h, l \in H \) and \( m \in H^L, \) we have \( \Pi^R(hl) = \Pi^R(\Pi^L(h)l), \) \( \Pi^R(hl) = \Pi^R(\Pi^L(h)l) \) and \( \Pi^R(hm) = \Pi^R(h)m. \)

**Proof.** Left to the reader. □

**Proposition 1.8.** For \( h, m \in H \) and \( l \in H^L, \) the equality \( \Pi^L(h^{(1)}) \Pi^L(h^{(2)} m) = \Pi^L(h m) \) holds.

**Proof.** In fact, we have \( \Pi^L(h^{(1)}) \Pi^L(h^{(2)} m) = \Pi^L(\Pi^L(h^{(1)}) \Pi^L(h^{(2)} l^{(1)} m)) = \Pi^L(\Pi^L(h^{(1)} l^{(1)} h^{(2)} l^{(1)} m)) = \Pi^L(h m), \)

where the first equality holds by Proposition 1.6(2); the second one, by [8, equality (2.5a)] and the last one, because \( \Pi^L \circ \text{id} = \text{id}. \)

An antipode of \( H \) is a map \( S: H \to H \) (or \( S_H \) if necessary), such that \( h^{(1)} S(h^{(2)}) = \Pi^L(h), \) \( S(h^{(1)}) h^{(2)} = \Pi^R(h) \) and \( S(h^{(1)}) h^{(2)} S(h^{(3)}) = S(h), \)

for all \( h \in H. \) As it was shown in [8], if an antipode \( S \) exists, then it is unique. It was also shown in [8] that \( S \) is an antipode, anticommutative and leaves the unit and counit invariant. A weak Hopf algebra is a weak bialgebra that has an antipode. A morphism of weak Hopf algebras \( g: H \to L \) is simply a bialgebra morphism from \( H \) to \( L. \) In [5, Proposition 1.4] it was proven that if \( g: H \to L \) is a weak Hopf algebra morphism, then \( g \circ S_H = S_L \circ g. \)

**Proposition 1.9.** Let \( H \) be a weak Hopf algebra. We have \( \Pi^L = S \circ \Pi^L \) and \( \Pi^R = S \circ \Pi^R. \)

**Proof.** This is [8, equalities (2.24a) and (2.24b)]. □

1.2 (Co)homology of crossed products by weak Hopf algebras

Consider \( H^R \) as a right \( H \)-module via \( l \cdot h := \Pi^R(l h) \) (by [8, equality (2.5b)] this is an action and the map \( \Pi^R: H \to H^R \) is a morphism of right \( H \)-modules). By definition, the homology of \( H \) with coefficients in a left \( H \)-module \( N \) is \( H_s(H, N) := \text{Tor}^H_1(H^R, N), \) while the cohomology of \( H \) with coefficients in a right \( H \)-module \( N \) is \( H^s(H, N) := \text{Ext}^H_1(H^R, N). \)

**Notations 1.10.** We will use the following notations:

1. We set \( \mathcal{H} := H/H^L. \) Moreover, given \( h \in H \) we let \( \overline{h} \) denote its class in \( \mathcal{H}. \)
2. Given \( h_1, \ldots, h_s \in H \) we set \( \overline{h}_s := \overline{h}_1 \otimes_{H^L} \cdots \otimes_{H^L} \overline{h}_s. \)

**Proposition 1.11.** The chain complex of right \( H \)-modules

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccccccc}
H^R & \rightarrow & \mathcal{H}^n & \rightarrow & \mathcal{H}^{n-1} & \rightarrow & \cdots & \rightarrow & \mathcal{H}^{1} & \rightarrow & \mathcal{H}^{0} & \rightarrow & 0 \\
\mathcal{H}^n & \rightarrow & \mathcal{H}^{n-1} & \rightarrow & \cdots & \rightarrow & \mathcal{H}^{1} & \rightarrow & \mathcal{H}^{0} & \rightarrow & 0 & \rightarrow & 0
\end{array}
\]

where \( \mathcal{H}^{s}_{H^L} \otimes_{H^L} H \) is a right \( H \)-module via the canonical action, \( d^1_s (\overline{h}_1 \otimes_{H^L} h_{s+1}) := \Pi^R(h_1) h_{s+1} - h_1 h_{s+1} \)

\[
d^s_s (\overline{h}_1 \otimes_{H^L} h_{s+1}) := \Pi^R(h_1) h_{s+1} - h_1 h_{s+1}
\]

for \( s \geq 2, \) is contractible as a chain complex of right \( H^L \)-modules.
Proposition 1.12. Let \( \Pi^R \) be a left and right \( H^L \)-module. The cohomology of \( H \) with coefficients in \( N \) is the homology of the chain complex

\[
N \xrightarrow{d_1} \Pi \otimes_{H^L} N \xrightarrow{d_2} \Pi \otimes_{H^L} N \xrightarrow{d_3} \Pi \otimes_{H^L} N \xrightarrow{d_4} \Pi \otimes_{H^L} N \xrightarrow{d_5} \cdots ,
\]

where \( d_1 (h_1 \otimes_{H^L} n) := \Pi^R (h_1) \cdot n - h_1 \cdot n \) and, for \( s > 1 \),

\[
d_s (h_{s+1} \otimes_{H^L} n) := \Pi^R (h_{s+1}) h_2 \otimes_{H^L} h_{s+1} \otimes_{H^L} n
+ \sum_{i=1}^{s-1} (-1)^i h_{i+1} \otimes_{H^L} h_2 \otimes_{H^L} h_{i+1} \otimes_{H^L} h_{s+1} \otimes_{H^L} n + (-1)^s h_{s+1} \otimes_{H^L} h_2 \otimes_{H^L} h_{s+1} \cdot n.
\]

Proof. Use that \( \Pi \otimes_{H^L} H \otimes_{H^L} N \simeq \Pi \otimes_{H^L} N \) and Proposition 1.11.

Proposition 1.13. Let \( N \) be a right \( H \)-module. The cohomology of \( H \) with coefficients in \( N \) is the cohomology of the chain complex

\[
N \xrightarrow{d_1} \text{Hom}_{H^L} (\Pi, N) \xrightarrow{d_2} \text{Hom}_{H^L} (\Pi \otimes_{H^L} N) \xrightarrow{d_3} \text{Hom}_{H^L} (\Pi \otimes_{H^L} N) \xrightarrow{d_4} \text{Hom}_{H^L} (\Pi \otimes_{H^L} N) \xrightarrow{d_5} \cdots ,
\]

where \( d_1 (n) (h_1) := n \cdot \Pi^R (h_1) - n \cdot h_1 \) and, for \( s > 1 \),

\[
d_s (\beta) (h_{s+1}) := \beta (\Pi^R (h_{s+1}) h_2 \otimes_{H^L} h_{s+1}) + \sum_{i=1}^{s-1} (-1)^i \beta (h_{i+1} \otimes_{H^L} h_2 \otimes_{H^L} h_{i+1} \otimes_{H^L} h_{s+1}) + (-1)^s \beta (h_{s+1}) : h_s.
\]

Proof. Use that \( \text{Hom}_H (\Pi \otimes_{H^L} N) \simeq \Pi \otimes_{H^L} N \) and Proposition 1.11.

1.3 Crossed products by weak Hopf algebras

Let \( H \) be a weak-Hopf algebra, \( A \) an algebra and \( \rho : H \otimes_k A \to A \) a linear map. For \( h \in H \) and \( a \in A \), we set \( h \cdot a := \rho (h \otimes a) \). We say that \( \rho \) is a weak measure of \( H \) on \( A \) if

\[
h \cdot (aa') = (h^{(1)}) \cdot (h^{(2)} \cdot a') \quad \text{for all } h \in H \text{ and } a, a' \in A.
\]

(1.4)

From now on \( \rho \) denotes a weak measure of \( H \) on \( A \). Let \( \chi_{\rho} : H \otimes_k A \to A \otimes_k H \) be the map defined by \( \chi_{\rho} (h \otimes a) := h^{(1)} \cdot a \otimes_k h^{(2)} \). By equality (1.4) the triple \( (A, H, \chi_{\rho}) \) is a twisted space (see 22 Definition 1.6). By 22 Subsection 1.2 we know that \( A \otimes H \) is a non unitary \( A \)-bimodule via

\[
(a' \otimes h) \cdot a := a' \otimes h \quad \text{and} \quad (a \otimes h) \cdot a' := a (h^{(1)} \cdot a') \otimes h^{(2)},
\]

and that the map \( \nabla_{\rho} : A \otimes H \to A \otimes H \), defined by \( \nabla_{\rho} (a \otimes h) := a \cdot \chi_{\rho}(h \otimes 1_{A}) \), is a left and right \( A \)-linear idempotent. In the sequel we will write \( a \times h := \nabla_{\rho}(a \otimes h) \). It is easy to check that the \( A \)-subbimodule
A \times H := \nabla_f(A \otimes_k H) of A \otimes_k H is unitary. Let \( \gamma : H \to A \times H, \nu : k \to A \otimes_k H \) and \( j_\nu : A \to A \times H \), be the maps defined by \( \gamma(h) := 1_A \times h, \nu(\lambda) := \lambda 1_A \times 1 \) and \( j_\nu(a) := a \times 1 \), respectively. Given a morphism \( f : H \otimes_k H \to A \), we define \( F_f : H \otimes_k H \to A \otimes_k H \) by \( F_f(h \otimes_k l) := f(h^{(1)} \otimes_k l^{(1)}) \otimes_k h^{(2)}(l^{(2)}) \). Assume that \( f(h \otimes_k l) = f(h^{(1)} \otimes_k l^{(1)})(h^{(2)})^{(2)} \cdot 1_A \) for all \( h, l \in H \).

By [22, Proposition 2.4] we know that \((A, H, \chi_\rho, F_f)\) is a crossed product system (see [22, Definition 1.7]). We say that \( f \) satisfies the twisted module condition if

\[
\begin{align*}
\quad & f(h^{(1)} \otimes_k l^{(1)})(h^{(2)}(l^{(2)}) \cdot a) = (h^{(1)} . (l^{(1)} \cdot a))f(h^{(2)} \otimes_k l^{(2)}) \quad \text{for all } h, l \in H \text{ and } a \in A,
\quad \text{and that } f \text{ is a cocycle if } \\
& f(h^{(1)} \otimes_k l^{(1)})f(h^{(2)}(l^{(2)} \otimes_k m)) = f(h^{(1)} \cdot (l^{(1)} \cdot m^{(1)}))f(h^{(2)} \otimes_k l^{(2)} m^{(2)}) \quad \text{for all } h, l, m \in H.
\end{align*}
\]

Let \( E \) be \( A \times H \) endowed with the multiplication map \( \mu_E \) introduced in [22, Notation 1.9]. A direct computation using the twisted module condition shows that \((a \times h) (b \times l) = a(h^{(1)} . b)f(h^{(2)} \otimes_k l^{(1)}) \times h^{(3)}(l^{(2)})\).

**Theorem 1.14.** Assume that

1. \( f(h \otimes_k l) = f(h^{(1)} \otimes_k l^{(1)})(h^{(2)}(l^{(2)} \cdot 1_A) \text{ for all } h, l \in H., \\
2. h \cdot 1_A = (h^{(1)} \cdot (1_A \cdot 1_A)f(h^{(2)} \otimes_k 1^{(2)}) \text{ for all } h \in H., \\
3. h \cdot 1_A = (1_A \cdot (1_A)f(h^{(2)} \otimes_k h) \text{ for all } h \in H., \\
4. a \times 1 = (1_A \cdot a)f(1^{(2)} \otimes_k 1^{(2)}) \text{ for all } a \in A., \\
5. f \text{ is a cocycle that satisfies the twisted module condition.}

Then,

1. \((A, H, \chi_\rho, F_f, \nu)\) is a crossed product system with precunit (see [22, Definition 1.11]),
2. \( F_f \) is a cocycle that satisfies the twisted module condition (see [22 Definitions 1.8]),
3. \( \mu_E \) is left and right \( A \)-linear, associative and has unit \( 1_A \times 1, \\
4. The \( \text{morphism } j_\nu : A \to E \) is left and right \( A \)-linear, multiplicative and unitary,
5. \( j_\nu(a) = a \times \chi_\rho(a) \text{ for all } a \in A. \text{ and } x \in E, \\
6. \chi_\rho(h \otimes_k x) = \gamma(h)j_\nu(a) \text{ and } F_f(h \otimes_k l) = \gamma(h)\gamma(l) \text{ for all } h, l \in H \text{ and } a \in A.

**Proof.** By [22, Propositions 2.4, 2.6 and 2.10, and Theorems 1.12(7) and 2.11].

In the rest of this subsection we assume that the hypotheses of Theorem 1.14 are fulfilled, and we say that \( E \) is the unitary crossed product of \( A \) with \( H \) associated with \( \rho \) and \( f \). Note that by item (10) of that theorem we have

\[
\nu(a) = a \cdot \nabla_\rho(1_A \otimes_k h) = \nabla_\rho(a \otimes_k h) = a \times h.
\]

**Proposition 1.15.** For all \( h, l \in H \text{ and } a \in A, \\
\gamma(h)j_\nu(a) = j_\nu(h^{(1)} . a)f(l^{(2)} \otimes_k 1^{(1)}) \gamma(h^{(2)}(l^{(2)}). \\
\gamma(h) = j_\nu(f(h^{(1)} \otimes_k l^{(1)}))\gamma(h^{(2)}(l^{(2)}).

**Proof.** This follows from [23, Equalities (1.6) and (1.7)] and the definitions of \( \chi_\rho \) and \( F_f.\)

### 1.3.1 The weak comodule structure of \( E \)

Let \( B \) be a right \( H \)-comodule. The tensor product \( B \otimes_k B \) is a (not necessarily counitary) right \( H \)-comodule, via \( \delta_B \otimes B \otimes_k c := b^{(0)} \otimes_k c^{(0)} \otimes_k b^{(1)}c^{(1)}. \)

**Proposition 1.16.** Let \( B \) be a right \( H \)-comodule which is also an unitary algebra. If \( \mu_B \) is right \( H \)-colinear, then the following assertions are equivalent:

1. \( 1_B^{(0)} \otimes 1_B^{(1)} \otimes 1_B^{(2)} = 1_B^{(0)} \otimes 1_B^{(1)} 1_B^{(1)} \otimes 1_B^{(2)} \).
2. \( 1_B^{(0)} \otimes 1_B^{(1)} \otimes 1_B^{(2)} = 1_B^{(0)} \otimes 1_B^{(1)} 1_B^{(1)} \otimes 1_B^{(2)} \).
3. \( b^{(0)} \otimes \Pi^R(b^{(1)}) = b^{(0)} \otimes 1_B^{(1)} \text{ for all } b \in B. \\
4. \( b^{(0)} \otimes \Pi^L(b^{(1)}) = 1_B^{(0)} b \otimes 1_B^{(1)} \text{ for all } b \in B. \\
5. \( b^{(0)} \otimes \Pi^L(b^{(1)}) = 1_B^{(0)} b \otimes 1_B^{(1)}. \)

**Proof.** This is [22, Propositions 2.24.]

**Definition 1.17.** A unitary associative algebra \( B \), which is also a counitary right \( H \)-comodule, is a right \( H \)-comodule algebra if \( \mu_B \) is right \( H \)-coinear and the statements of the previous proposition are satisfied.
Proposition 1.18 (Comodule algebra structure on $E$). Assume that the hypotheses of Theorem 1.14 are satisfied. Then $E$ is a weak $H$-comodule algebra via the map $\delta_E : E \to E \otimes_k H$ defined by

$$\delta_E\left(\sum a_i \otimes_k h_i\right) := \sum \nabla_\rho (a_i \otimes_k h_i) \otimes_k h_i^{(2)} = \sum (a_i \times h_i^{(1)}) \otimes_k h_i^{(2)}.$$  

Proof. See [22 Proposition 2.27]. \qed

Proposition 1.19. For all $a \in A$ and $h \in H$ it is true that $\delta_E(\rho(a)\gamma(h)) = \rho(a)\gamma(h^{(1)}) \otimes_k h^{(2)}$.

Proof. By equality (1.5), the definition of $\delta_E$, and the fact that $\rho(A)\gamma(H) \subseteq E$,

$$\delta_E(\rho(a)\gamma(h)) = \nabla_\rho (a \times h^{(1)}) \otimes_k h^{(2)} = \nabla_\rho (\rho(a)\gamma(h^{(1)})) \otimes_k h^{(2)} = \rho(a)\gamma(h^{(1)}) \otimes_k h^{(2)},$$

as desired. \qed

Remark 1.20. Since $\rho(1_A) = 1_E$, the previous proposition says in particular that $\gamma$ is $H$-collinear.

1.4 Weak crossed products of weak module algebras

Let $H$ be a weak bialgebra, $A$ an algebra and $\rho : H \otimes A \to A$ a map. In this subsection we study the weak crossed products of $A$ with $H$ in which $A$ is a left weak $H$-module algebra.

Definition 1.21. We say that $A$ is a left weak $H$-module algebra via $\rho$, if

1. $1 \cdot a = a$ for all $a \in A$,
2. $h \cdot (a' a) = (h^{(1)} a)(h^{(2)} a')$ for all $h \in H$ and $a, a' \in A$,
3. $h \cdot (l \cdot 1_A) = (hl) \cdot 1_A$ for all $h, l \in H$ and $a \in A$.

In this case we say that $\rho$ is a weak left action of $H$ on $A$. If we also have

$$h \cdot (l \cdot a) = (hl) \cdot a \quad \text{for all } h, l \in H \text{ and } a \in A,$$  

then we say that $A$ is a left $H$-module algebra.

Proposition 1.22. For each weak $H$-module algebra $A$ the following assertions hold:

1. $\Pi^L(h) \cdot a = (h \cdot 1_A) a$ for all $h \in H$ and $a \in A$.
2. $\Pi^L(h) \cdot a = a(h \cdot 1_A)$ for all $h \in H$ and $a \in A$.
3. $\Pi^L(h) \cdot 1_A = h \cdot 1_A$ for all $h \in H$.
4. $\Pi^L(h) \cdot 1_A = h \cdot 1_A$ for all $h \in H$.
5. $h \cdot (l \cdot 1_A) = (h^{(1)} \cdot 1_A) e(h^{(2)} l)$ for all $h, l \in H$.
6. $h \cdot (l \cdot 1_A) = (h^{(2)} \cdot 1_A) e(h^{(1)} l)$ for all $h, l \in H$.

Proof. In [12] it was proven that these items are equivalent and the proof of item (3) was kindly communicated to us by José Nicanor Alonso Álvarez and Ramón González Rodríguez (see [22 Proposition 4.2]). \qed

Example 1.23. The algebra $H^L$ is a left $H$-module algebra via $h \cdot l := \Pi^L(hl)$. In fact item (1) of Definition 1.21 is trivial, item (2) follows from Proposition 1.15 and equality (1.6) follows from [8 equality (2.5a)]. This example is known as the trivial representation.

Example 1.24. Let $A$ be a left $H$-module algebra. The map $f(h \otimes k) := hl \cdot 1_A$, named the trivial cocycle of $A$, satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 1.14.

Definition 1.25. A subalgebra $K$ of $A$ is stable under $\rho$ if $h \cdot \lambda \in K$ for all $h \in H$ and $\lambda \in K$.

Remark 1.26. A subalgebra $K$ of $A$ is stable under $\rho$ if and only if $\chi_\rho(H \otimes_k K) \subseteq K \otimes_k H$.

Example 1.27. Let $K := \{ h \cdot 1_A : h \in H \}$. By Definition 1.21 and Proposition 1.22 we know that $K$ is a subalgebra of $A$, which is stable under $\rho$, and $K = \{ h \cdot 1_A : h \in H^L \} = \{ h \cdot 1_A : h \in H^R \}$. Moreover, the map $\pi^L : H^L \to K$, defined by $\pi^L(h) := h \cdot 1_A$, is a surjective morphism of algebras, and the map $\pi^R : H^R \to K$, defined by the same formula, is a surjective anti-morphism of algebras. By Proposition 1.14 this implies that $K$ is separable.

Remark 1.28. Each stable under $\rho$ subalgebra of $A$ includes $\{ h \cdot 1_A : h \in H \}$.

From here until the end of this subsection $A$ is a left weak $H$-module algebra and $E$ is the unitary crossed product of $A$ by $H$ associated with $\rho$ and a map $f : H \otimes H \to A$. Thus, we assume that the hypotheses of Theorem 1.14 are fulfilled. In particular $\nu, \rho_2$ and $\gamma$ are as at the beginning of Subsection 1.3.

Proposition 1.29. $f(h \otimes k m) = f(h \otimes_k ln)$ for all $h, m \in H$ and $l \in H^L \cup H^R$. 

Proof. For \( l \in H^L \) this follows from \([22] \) Proposition 2.7. We next consider the case \( l \in H^R \). By the third equality in Definition 1.21, the maps \( u_2, v_2 : H \otimes_k A \to A \), defined by \( u_2(h \otimes l) := hl \cdot 1_A \) and \( v_2(h \otimes k) := h \cdot (l \cdot 1_A) \) coincide. Thus the result follows immediately from \([22] \) Propositions 2.8 and Remarks 2.16 and 2.17.

**Proposition 1.30.** \( \gamma(h(S(1^{(1)}))) \gamma(1^{(2)}) = \gamma(h)\gamma(l) \), for all \( h, l \in H \).

**Proof.** This is \([22] \) Proposition 2.20.

**Proposition 1.31.** \( \gamma(a) \gamma(h(1^{(1)})) \gamma(S(1^{(2)})) = \gamma(a) \gamma(h) \gamma(l) \), for all \( a, b \in A \) and \( h, l \in H \).

**Proof.** This is \([22] \) Proposition 2.21.

**Proposition 1.32.** \( \gamma(h) \gamma(l) = \gamma(hl) \) and \( \gamma(l) \gamma(h) = \gamma(lh) \), for all \( h \in H \) and \( l \in H^L \cup H^R \).

**Proof.** This is \([22] \) Proposition 2.22.

**Proposition 1.33.** The following assertions hold:

1. \( \gamma(l) = \gamma(l) \) for all \( l \in H^L \).
2. \( \gamma(a) \gamma(l) = \gamma(l) \gamma(a) \) for all \( l \in H^R \) and \( a \in A \).

**Proof.** These are \([22] \) Propositions 4.5 and 4.6.

### 1.4.1 Invertible cocycles and cleft extensions

Let \( u_2 : H \otimes_k H \to A \) be the map defined by \( u_2(h \otimes l) := hl \cdot 1_A \). We say that the cocycle \( f \) is invertible if there exists a (unique) map \( f^{-1} : H \otimes_k H \to A \) such that \( u_2 \circ f^{-1} = f^{-1} \circ u_2 = f^{-1} \) and \( f^{-1} \circ f = f \circ f^{-1} = u_2 \).

**Remark 1.34.** Condition (1) in Theorem 1.14 says that \( f \circ u_2 = f \). By \([22] \) Remark 2.17 and the comment above Proposition 4.4, this implies that \( u_2 \circ f = f \).

**Example 1.35.** Assume that \( A \) is a left \( H \)-module algebra and that \( f \) is the trivial cocycle. By the previous remark and Definition 1.21, the cocycle \( f \) is invertible and \( f^{-1} = f \).

**Definition 1.36.** A map \( g : H \otimes_k H \to A \) is normal if \( g(1 \otimes_k h) = g(h \otimes_k 1) = h \cdot 1_A \) for all \( h \).

**Remark 1.37.** By \([22] \) Proposition 2.17 and Remark 2.19 we know that \( f \) is normal if and only if the equalities in items (2) and (3) of Theorem 1.14 hold.

When the cocycle \( f \) is invertible, we define \( \gamma^{-1} : H \to E \) by

\[
\gamma^{-1}(h) := \gamma_\nu(f^{-1}(S(h^{(2)}) \otimes_k h^{(3)}) \gamma(S(h^{(1)}))).
\]

**Example 1.38.** Assume that \( A \) is a left \( H \)-module algebra and that \( f \) is the trivial cocycle. By Example 1.35 and the fact that \( S \ast \text{id} = \Pi^R \), we have

\[
\gamma^{-1}(h) = \gamma_\nu(S(h^{(2)} \otimes_k h^{(3)}) \gamma(S(h^{(1)}))) = \gamma_\nu(\Pi^R(S(h^{(2)}) \cdot 1_A) \gamma(S(h^{(1)}))).
\]

Using this, Proposition 1.22(3) and the fact that \( \Pi^L \circ \Pi^R = \Pi^L \circ \Pi^R \circ S = \Pi^L \circ S \), we obtain

\[
\gamma^{-1}(h) = \gamma_\nu(\Pi^L(S(h^{(2)})) \cdot 1_A) \gamma(S(h^{(1)})) = \gamma(S(h^{(1)})) = \gamma(S(h^{(1)})) = \gamma(S(h)),
\]

where the second equality holds by Proposition 1.32 and Proposition 1.33(1); and the last one, since \( S \) is antimultiplicative and \( \Pi^L \ast \text{id} = \text{id} \).

**Proposition 1.39.** Assume that the cocycle \( f \) is invertible. Then

\[
(\gamma \ast \gamma^{-1})(h) = \gamma(\Pi^L(h)) \quad \text{and} \quad (\gamma^{-1} \ast \gamma)(h) = \gamma(\Pi^R(h)) \quad \text{for all} \ h \in H.
\]

**Proof.** This is \([22] \) Proposition 5.19.

**Proposition 1.40.** Let \( \delta_E \) be as in Proposition 1.18. Then \( \delta_E(\gamma^{-1}(h)) = \gamma^{-1}(h^{(2)}) \otimes_k S(h^{(1)}) \) for all \( h \in H \).

**Proof.** By the definition of \( \gamma^{-1} \) and Proposition 1.19 we have

\[
\delta_E(\gamma^{-1}(h)) = \delta_E(\gamma_\nu(f^{-1}(S(h^{(2)}) \otimes_k h^{(3)}))) \gamma(S(h^{(1)})))
\]

\[
= \gamma_\nu(f^{-1}(S(h^{(2)} \otimes_k h^{(3)}))) \gamma(S(h^{(1)})) \otimes_k S(h^{(1)})^{(2)}
\]

\[
= \gamma_\nu(f^{-1}(S(h^{(3)} \otimes_k h^{(4)}))) \gamma(S(h^{(2)})) \otimes_k S(h^{(1)})
\]

\[
= \gamma^{-1}(h^{(2)}) \otimes_k S(h^{(1)}),
\]

as desired.
1.5 Mixed complexes

In this subsection we recall briefly the notion of mixed complex. For more details about this concept we refer to [11] and [26].

A mixed complex $X := (X, b, B)$ is a graded $k$-module $(X_n)_n \geq 0$, endowed with morphisms

$$b : X_n \rightarrow X_{n-1} \quad \text{and} \quad B : X_n \rightarrow X_{n+1},$$

such that $b \circ b = 0$, $B \circ B = 0$ and $B \circ b + b \circ B = 0$. A morphism of mixed complexes $g : (X, b, B) \rightarrow (Y, d, D)$ is a family of maps $g_n : X_n \rightarrow Y_n$, such that $d \circ g = g \circ b$ and $D \circ g = g \circ B$. Let $u$ be a degree 2 variable. A mixed complex $X := (X, b, B)$ determines a double complex

$$
\begin{array}{cccc}
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \\
B & X_3 u^{-1} B & X_2 u^0 B & X_1 u B & X_0 u^2 B \\
B & b & b & b & b \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \\
B & X_2 u^{-1} B & X_1 u^0 B & X_0 u B \\
B & b & b & b & b \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \\
B & X_1 u^{-1} B & X_0 u^0 B \\
B & b & b & b & b \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \\
B & X_0 u^{-1} B \\
\end{array}
$$

where $b(xu^n) := b(x)u^n$ and $B(xu^n) := B(x)u^{-1}$. By deleting the positively numbered columns we obtain a subcomplex $BN(X)$ of $BP(X)$. Let $BN'(X)$ be the kernel of the canonical surjection from $BN(X)$ to $(X, b)$. The quotient double complex $BP(X)/BN'(X)$ is denoted by $BC(X)$. The homology groups $HC_*(X)$, $HN_*(X)$ and $HP_*(X)$, of the total complexes of $BC(X)$, $BN(X)$ and $BP(X)$, respectively, are called the cyclic, negative and periodic homology groups of $X$. Finally, it is clear that a morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ of mixed complexes induces a morphism from the double complex $BP(X)$ to the double complex $BP(Y)$.

Let $C$ be an algebra. If $K$ is a subalgebra of $C$ we will say that $C$ is a $K$-algebra. Given a $K$-bimodule $M$, we let $M \otimes K$ denote the quotient $M/[M, K]$, where $[M, K]$ is the $K$-submodule of $M$ generated by all the commutators $m\lambda - \lambda m$, with $m \in M$ and $\lambda \in K$. Moreover, for $m \in M$, we let $[m]$ denote the class of $m$ in $M \otimes K$. By definition, the normalized mixed complex of the $K$-algebra $C$ is $(C \otimes K C \otimes K, b_s, B_s)$, where $C := C/K, b_s$ is the canonical Hochschild boundary map and the Connes operator $B_s$ is given by

$$B_s([c_0 \otimes_K \cdots \otimes_K c_r]) := \sum_{i=0}^r (-1)^i [1 \otimes_K c_i \otimes_K \cdots \otimes_K c_r] \otimes_K c_0 \otimes_K c_1 \otimes_K \cdots \otimes_K c_{i-1}].$$

The cyclic, negative, periodic and Hochschild homology groups $HC^{K}_*(C)$, $HN^{K}_*(C)$, $HP^{K}_*(C)$ and $HH^{K}_*(C)$ of $C$ are the respective homology groups of $(C \otimes K C \otimes K, b_s, B_s)$.

2 Hochschild homology of cleft extensions

Let $H$ be a weak Hopf algebra, $A$ an algebra, $\rho : H \rightarrow A$ a weak left action and $f : H \otimes_k H \rightarrow A$ a linear map. Let $\chi, \gamma, \nu, \varphi$ and $F_f$ be as at the beginning of Subsection 1.3. Assume that the hypotheses of Theorems 1.14 are fulfilled. Let $E$ be the crossed product associated with $\rho$ and $f$ and let $K$ be a stable under $\rho$ subalgebra of $A$. For instance we can take $K$ as the minimal stable under $\rho$ subalgebra of $A$ (see Example 1.17). By Theorem 1.14 the tuple $(A, \chi, F_f, \nu)$ is a crossed product system with preunit, $F_f$ is a cocycle that satisfies the twisted module condition and $E$ is an associative algebra with unit $1_E := 1_A \times 1_A$. Moreover, by Remark 1.28 we know that $1_E \in K \otimes_k H$. So, the hypothesis of [23] Section 3 are satisfied. Let $M$ be an $E$-bimodule. By definition the Hochschild homology $H^k(E, M)$, of the $K$-algebra $E$ with coefficients in $M$, is the homology of the normalized Hochschild chain complex $(M \otimes E \otimes K, b_s)$, where $b_s$ is the canonical Hochschild boundary map. In [23] Section 3 was obtained a chain complex $(\tilde{X}_*(M), \tilde{d}_*)$ simpler than the canonical one, that gives the Hochschild homology $H^k(E, M)$, of the $K$-algebra $E$ with coefficients in $M$. From now on we assume that the cocycle $f$ is convolution invertible. In this Section we prove that $(\tilde{X}_*(M), \tilde{d}_*)$ is isomorphic to a simpler complex $(\hat{X}_*(M), \hat{d}_*)$. If $K$ is separable (for instance when $K = H \cdot 1_A$), then $(\hat{X}_*(M), \hat{d}_*)$ gives the absolute Hochschild homology of $E$ with coefficients in $M$. Recall that $M$ is an $A$-bimodule via the map $j_M : A \rightarrow E$. 

\[ j_M : A \rightarrow E \]
Notations 2.1. We will use the following notations:

Proof. tions 1.5 and 1.32; the third one, by Proposition 1.19 and the fourth one, by Propositions 1.5, 1.6(2) and 1.32.

where the first and last equality hold by Theorem 1.14(9) and Proposition 1.15; the second one, by Propositions 1.5, 1.6(2) and 1.32.
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where the first and last equality hold by the definition of \( \gamma^{-1} \); the second one, by Propositions 1.5 and 1.6(2); the third one, by Proposition 1.32 and the fact that \( S \) is antimultiplicative; and the fourth one, by Proposition 1.33(2).

\[ \gamma^{-1}(h_{1}^{(1)}) \otimes_{A} \gamma\alpha(h_{1}^{(2)}) = \gamma^{-1}(h_{1}^{(1)}) \otimes_{A} \gamma\alpha(h_{1}^{(2)}) \]

**Lemma 2.4.** Let \( h_{1}, \ldots, h_{s} \in H \) and \( a \in A \). The following equality holds:

\[ \gamma^{-1}(h_{1}^{(1)}) \otimes_{A} \gamma\alpha(h_{1}^{(2)}) = \gamma^{-1}(h_{1}^{(1)}) \otimes_{A} \gamma\alpha(h_{1}^{(2)}) \]

**Proof.** We proceed by induction on \( s \). By Proposition 1.15 and Lemma 2.2, for \( s = 1 \) we have

\[ \gamma^{-1}(h_{1}^{(1)}) \otimes_{A} \gamma\alpha(h_{1}^{(2)}) = \gamma^{-1}(h_{1}^{(1)}) \otimes_{A} \gamma\alpha(h_{1}^{(2)}) \]

Assume \( s > 1 \) and that the result is valid for \( s - 1 \). Let \( T := \gamma^{-1}(h_{1}^{(1)}) \otimes_{A} \gamma\alpha(h_{1}^{(2)}) \). By Proposition 1.15

\[ T = \gamma^{-1}(h_{1}^{(1)}) \otimes_{A} \gamma\alpha(h_{1}^{(2)}) \]

Consequently, by the inductive hypothesis and Lemma 2.2, we have

\[ T = \gamma^{-1}(h_{1}^{(1)}) \otimes_{A} \gamma\alpha(h_{1}^{(2)}) \]

as desired.

Let \( r, s \geq 0 \). By Propositions 1.32 and 1.33(2), we know that \( \mathcal{H}^{\otimes_{\mathcal{H}} \mathcal{K}} \) is a right \( H^{l} \)-module and \( M \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\otimes_{\mathcal{H}}} \) is a left \( H^{l} \)-module via

\[ \mathcal{H}_{r,s}(M) := \mathcal{H}^{\otimes_{\mathcal{H}} \mathcal{K}} \otimes_{M} (M \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\otimes_{\mathcal{H}}}) \]

Since \( \mathcal{H}^{\otimes_{\mathcal{H}} \mathcal{K}} = H^{l} \) and \( \mathcal{A}^{\otimes_{\mathcal{H}}} = K \), we have

\[ \mathcal{H}_{r,s}(M) \simeq M \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\otimes_{\mathcal{H}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}_{0,s}(M) \simeq \mathcal{H}^{\otimes_{\mathcal{H}} \mathcal{K}} \otimes_{M} (M \otimes H^{s}) \]

Let \( \Theta_{r,s} : M \otimes_{k} E^{1,1}_{r,s} \otimes_{k} \mathcal{A}^{\otimes_{\mathcal{H}}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{r,s}(M) \) and \( \Lambda_{r,s} : H^{s} \otimes_{k} M \otimes_{k} \mathcal{A}^{\otimes_{\mathcal{H}}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{r,s}(M) \) be the maps defined by

\[ \Theta(x) := (-1)^{s} \mathcal{H}_{r,s}(M) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}} [m \otimes a_{1,s}] \]

and

\[ \Lambda(y) := (-1)^{s} \mathcal{H}^{\otimes_{\mathcal{H}} \mathcal{K}} \otimes_{\mathcal{H}} [a_{1,s} \otimes a_{1,s} \otimes a_{1,s}] \]

Let \( \Theta_{r,s} : \mathcal{H}_{r,s}(M) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{r,s}(M) \) and \( \Lambda_{r,s} : \mathcal{H}_{r,s}(M) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{r,s}(M) \) be the maps defined by

\[ \Theta(x) := \Theta(x) \cdot \lambda = \Theta(x) \cdot \lambda \]

where \( \lambda \) is the \( s \)-th tensor of \( M \otimes_{k} E^{1,1}_{r,s} \) and \( \mathcal{A}^{\otimes_{\mathcal{H}}} \).
\[ \lambda(a) = \Theta^r(m \otimes \kappa \nu(a)) \gamma(h_1) \otimes \kappa \cdot \otimes \kappa \nu(a) \gamma(h_k) \otimes \kappa \lambda(a_{s+1}) \otimes \kappa \lambda(2,s+r). \]

Finally, when \( r \geq 1 \) the fourth assertion is trivial, while, when \( r = 0 \) it follows from Lemma 2.22. We next show that \( \Lambda_{rs} \) is well defined. Let \( y \) be as in the definition of \( \Lambda_{rs} \). We must prove that

1. If some \( h_i \in H^2 \), then \( \Lambda'(y) = 0 \),
2. \( \Lambda' \) is \( H^2 \)-balanced in the first \( (s - 1) \)-th tensor of \( H^{\otimes s} \otimes k M \otimes k \overline{\Lambda}^{\otimes r} \),
3. If \( r > 0 \), then \( \Lambda' \) is \( K \)-balanced in the \( (s + 1) \)-th tensor of \( H^{\otimes s} \otimes k M \otimes k \overline{\Lambda}^{\otimes r} \),
4. \( \Lambda'(h_{1s} \otimes k \nu(a) \cdot m \otimes k \lambda_i) = \Lambda'_{rs}(h_{1s} \otimes k m \otimes k \lambda_i) \lambda \) for all \( \lambda \in K \),
5. If \( s > 0 \), then \( \Lambda'(h_{1s} \otimes m \cdot \gamma(S(l)) \otimes k \lambda_i) = \Lambda'(h_{1s} \otimes l \cdot m \otimes k \lambda_i) \) for all \( l \in H^2 \).

Item (1) holds since, by Propositions 1.3 and 1.33(1), \( \gamma^{-1}(t^{(1)}) \otimes k \gamma(t^{(2)}) \in E \otimes k \nu(a) \) for all \( l \in H^2 \). In order to prove item (2) we must check that \( \Lambda'(h_{1s} \otimes k \nu(a_{i+1}) \otimes m \otimes k \lambda) = \Lambda'(h_{1s} \otimes k l \cdot i+1 \otimes k m \otimes k \lambda) \), for all \( i < s \) and \( l \in H^2 \). But this follows from Proposition 1.6(2) and Lemma 2.3. Item (3) holds since, by Lemma 2.4

\[
\Lambda'(h_{1s} \otimes k \nu(a) \cdot m) = m \cdot \gamma_S(l) \gamma^{-1}(h_{1s}) \otimes k \gamma(h_{2s}) \]

When \( r \geq 1 \), Item (4) is trivial, while, when \( r = 0 \), it holds since, by Lemma 2.4

\[
\Lambda'(h_{1s} \otimes k \nu(a) \cdot m) = m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(h_{1s}) \otimes k \gamma(h_{2s}) \]

Finally, for Item (5) we have

\[
\Lambda'(h_{1s} \otimes m \cdot \gamma(S(l)) \otimes k \lambda) = m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(h_{1s}) \otimes k \gamma(h_{2s}) \]

Remark 2.6. Under the first identifications in [23] (3.1) and [29], the morphisms \( \Theta \nu_0 \) and \( \Lambda \nu_0 \) become the identity maps.

Our next purpose is to show that the maps \( \Theta_{rs} \) and \( \Lambda_{rs} \) are inverse of one another.

Lemma 2.7. Let \( s \geq 1 \). for all \( h_1, \ldots, h_s \in H \), we have \( \gamma_{h_1}^{-1} \gamma_{h_2}^{-1} h_{1s} \otimes k \gamma(h_{1s}) = 1_E \otimes k \gamma(h_{1s}) \).

Proof. We proceed by induction on \( s \). For \( s = 1 \) we have

\[
\gamma(h_1) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) h_1 = \gamma(h_1) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) = \gamma(S(h_1)) \otimes k \gamma(h_1) = 1_E \otimes k \gamma(h_1),
\]

where the first equality holds by Proposition 1.3, the second one, by Remark 1.3 and Proposition 1.9 and the last one, by Propositions 1.33(1) and 1.30. Assume now that \( s > 1 \) and that the result is true for \( s - 1 \). Set \( T := \gamma_{h_1} \gamma_{h_2} \gamma_{h_3} \otimes k \gamma(h_{1s}). \) By Remark 1.3 and Propositions 1.9, 1.33(1) and 1.30

\[
\gamma(h_1) \gamma^{-1}(h_2) h_3 = \gamma(S(h_1)) \otimes k h_3 = j_S(S(h_1) \cdot 1_A) \otimes k h_3.
\]

Hence

\[
T = \gamma_{h_1} \gamma_{h_2} \gamma_{h_3} \otimes k h_3 = j_S(S(h_1) \cdot 1_A) \gamma(h_1) \gamma(h_2) \gamma(h_3) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) \gamma^{-1}(h_2) \gamma^{-1}(h_3) \gamma(2,h_3).
\]

Using the equality in Definition 1.21(3) and Proposition 1.15 again and again, we obtain

\[
T = j_S(S(h_1) \cdot 1_A) \gamma_{h_1} \gamma_{h_2} \gamma_{h_3} \gamma(2,h_3) = 1_E \otimes k \gamma(h_{1s-1}) \otimes k \gamma(h_3) .
\]

Consequently, by the inductive hypothesis,

\[
T = j_S(S(h_1) \cdot 1_A) \otimes k \gamma(h_{1s-1}) \otimes k \gamma(2,h_3) = 1_E \otimes k \gamma(h_{1s-1} \otimes k \gamma(h_3).
\]

Hence, by Propositions 1.33(1) and 1.30 we have \( T = 1_E \otimes k \gamma(h_{1s}) \), as desired.
Lemma 2.8. Let \( s \geq 1 \). For all \( z \in H^R \) and \( h_1, \ldots, h_s \in H \), we have
\[
\gamma^{-1}(h^{(1)}_1) \gamma(z) \gamma(h^{(2)}_1) \otimes \gamma(h^{(3)}_1) = \gamma(1^{(1)}) \otimes \gamma(h^{(2)}_1) \otimes \gamma(h^{(3)}_1). 
\]

Proof. Set \( T := \gamma^{-1}(h^{(1)}_1) \gamma(z) \gamma(h^{(2)}_1) \otimes \gamma(h^{(3)}_1) \). We proceed by induction on \( s \). Consider the case \( s = 1 \). By Propositions 1.32, 1.6(1) and 1.39, we have
\[
T = \gamma^{-1}(h^{(1)}_1) \gamma(z) \gamma(h^{(2)}_1) \otimes \gamma(h^{(3)}_1). 
\]
Consequently, by the definition of \( \Pi^R \), equality (1.2) and Propositions 1.5 and 1.6(2), we have
\[
T = \gamma(1^{(1)}) \otimes \gamma(z) \gamma(h^{(1)}_1) \otimes \gamma(h^{(3)}_1). 
\]
So, by the definition of \( \Pi^R \),
\[
T = \gamma(1^{(1)}) \otimes \gamma(z) \gamma(h^{(3)}_1) = \gamma(1^{(1)}) \otimes \gamma(h^{(3)}_1). 
\]
Assume now that \( s > 1 \) and the result holds by \( s - 1 \). By the inductive hypothesis, we have
\[
T = \gamma^{-1}(h^{(1)}_1) \gamma(1^{(1)}) \gamma(h^{(2)}_1) \otimes \gamma(h^{(3)}_1) 
\]
Thus, by the case \( s = 1 \) and Propositions 1.32 and 1.39, we have
\[
T = \gamma^{-1}(h^{(1)}_1) \gamma(1^{(1)}) \gamma(h^{(2)}_1) \otimes \gamma(h^{(3)}_1) 
\]
\[
= \gamma^{-1}(h^{(1)}_1) \gamma(h^{(2)}_1) \otimes \gamma(h^{(3)}_1) 
\]
as desired.\( \square \)

Proposition 2.9. The morphisms \( \Theta_{rs} \) and \( \Lambda_{rs} \) are inverse one of each other.

Proof. We leave the case \( s = 0 \) to the reader (use Remark 2.6). Assume \( s \geq 1 \) and let \( m \in M \), \( h_1, \ldots, h_s \in H \) and \( a_1, \ldots, a_r \in A \). Set \( x := [m \otimes \gamma_A(h_{1s}) \otimes \pi_{1r}] \in \tilde{X}_{rs}(M) \) and \( y := \tilde{H}_{1s} \otimes \mu \ [m \otimes \pi_{1r}] \in \tilde{X}_{rs}(M) \). By Lemma 2.7
\[
\Lambda(\Theta(x)) = (-1)^{rs} \Lambda(\tilde{H}_{1s} \otimes \mu \cdot [m \cdot \gamma_A(h_{1s}) \otimes a_{1r}]) 
\]
\[
= [m \cdot \gamma_A(h_{1s}) \otimes \gamma_A(h_{1s}) \otimes \pi_{1r}] 
\]
as desired. For the other composition, by Lemma 2.8 and Proposition 1.30, we have
\[
\Theta(\Lambda(y)) = (-1)^{rs} \Theta([m \cdot \gamma_A(h_{1s}) \otimes \gamma_A(h_{1s}) \otimes \pi_{1r}]) 
\]
\[
= \tilde{H}_{1s} \otimes \mu \cdot [m \cdot \gamma_A(h_{1s}) \otimes \pi_{1r}] 
\]
which finishes the proof.\( \square \)

For each \( 0 \leq l \leq s \) and \( r \geq 0 \) such that \( r + l \geq 1 \), let \( \tilde{d}_r : \tilde{X}_{rs}(M) \rightarrow \tilde{X}_{r+l-1,s-l}(M) \) be the map defined by \( \tilde{d}_r := \Theta_{rs+l-1,s-l} \circ \tilde{d}_{r} \circ \Lambda_{rs} \).

Theorem 2.10. The Hochschild homology of the \( K \)-algebra \( E \) with coefficients in \( M \) is the homology of the chain complex \( (\tilde{X}_*(M), \tilde{d}_*) \), where
\[
\tilde{X}_n(M) := \bigoplus_{r+s=n} \tilde{X}_{rs}(M) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{d}_n(x) := \begin{cases} 
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{d}_{0i}(x) & \text{if } x \in \tilde{X}_0, \\
\sum_{i=0}^{n-r} \tilde{d}_{r,n-r}(x) & \text{if } x \in \tilde{X}_{r,n-r} \text{ with } r > 0.
\end{cases}
\]

Proof. By Proposition 2.9 and the definition of \( (\tilde{X}_*(M), \tilde{d}_*) \), the maps
\[
\Theta_* : (\tilde{X}_*(M), \tilde{d}_*) \rightarrow (\tilde{X}_*(M), \tilde{d}_*) \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_* : (\tilde{X}_*(M), \tilde{d}_*) \rightarrow (\tilde{X}_*(M), \tilde{d}_*),
\]
given by \( \Theta_n := \bigoplus_{r+s=n} \Theta_{rs} \) and \( \Lambda_n := \bigoplus_{r+s=n} \Lambda_{rs} \), are inverse one of each other.\( \square \)
Remark 2.11. By \cite{23} Remark 3.2 if $f$ takes its values in $K$, then $(X_\ast(M), \mathcal{U}_\ast)$ is the total complex of the double complex $(X_{\ast\ast}(M), \delta^1_\ast, \delta^2_\ast)$.

Remark 2.12. If $K = A$, then $(X_\ast(M), \mathcal{U}_\ast) = (X_{0\ast}(M), \delta^0_\ast)$.

Remark 2.13. For each $i, n \geq 0$, let $F^i(X_n(M)) := \bigoplus_{s=0}^i X_{n-s,s}(M)$. The chain complex $(X_\ast(M), \mathcal{U}_\ast)$ is filtrated by

$$0 = F^{-1}(X_\ast(M)) \subseteq F^0(X_\ast(M)) \subseteq F^1(X_\ast(M)) \subseteq F^2(X_\ast(M)) \subseteq F^3(X_\ast(M)) \subseteq \ldots \quad (2.10)$$

Moreover the isomorphism $\Theta_\ast : (X_\ast(M), \mathcal{U}_\ast) \rightarrow (X_{0\ast}(M), \mathcal{U}_\ast)$ preserve filtrations, where we consider the chain complex $(X_\ast(M), \mathcal{U}_\ast)$ endowed with the filtration at the beginning of \cite{23} Subsection 3.2. So the spectral sequence of \cite{23} (3.3) coincide with the spectral sequence determined by the filtration (2.10).

Lemma 2.14. Let $m \in M$, $a, a_1, \ldots, a_r \in A$, $h_1, \ldots, h_s \in H$ and $z \in H^R$.

1) For $x := [m \cdot \gamma^{-1}_s(h_1) \otimes_A \tilde{\gamma}_A(h_2) \otimes_A \gamma(h_3)j_r(a) \otimes \mathfrak{A}_1]$, we have

$$\Theta(x) = (-1)^{r+s} \tilde{H}_1 \otimes_H [m \cdot j_r(a) \otimes \mathfrak{A}_1].$$

2) For $x := [m \cdot \gamma^{-1}_s(h_1) \otimes_A \tilde{\gamma}_A(h_2) \otimes_A \gamma(h_3)j_r(a) \otimes \mathfrak{A}_1]$, we have

$$\Theta(x) = (-1)^{r+s} \left( \tilde{H}_{1, i-1} \otimes_H \tilde{H}_{h_{1+1}} \otimes_H \tilde{H}_{1+2, s} \otimes_H [m \cdot \mathfrak{A}_1] \right),$$

(of course, we are assuming that $s \geq 2$ and $i \leq s$).

3) For $x := [m \cdot \gamma^{-1}_s(h_1) \otimes_A \gamma(z) \otimes_A \gamma(h_2) \otimes \mathfrak{A}_1]$, we have $\Theta(x) = (-1)^{r+s} \mathbb{P}^R(z) \cdot \tilde{H}_1 \otimes_H [m \cdot \mathfrak{A}_1]$.

Proof. 1) Under the first identifications in \cite{23} (3.1) and (2.9) for $s = 0$ the equality in item (1) becomes $\Theta([m \cdot j_r(a) \otimes \mathfrak{A}_1]) = [m \cdot j_r(a) \otimes \mathfrak{A}_1]$, which follows immediately from Remark 2.6. Assume now that $s \geq 1$. By the definition of the actions in (2.8), Lemma 2.8 and Propositions 1.5, 1.15 and 1.31, we have

$$\Theta(x) = \Theta \left( \left[ m \cdot \gamma^{-1}_s(h_1) \otimes_A \tilde{\gamma}_A(h_2) \otimes_A \gamma(h_3)j_r(a) \otimes \mathfrak{A}_1 \right] \right) = (-1)^{r+s} \tilde{H}_1 \otimes_H \tilde{H}_1 \otimes_H \tilde{H}_1 \otimes_H [m \cdot \mathfrak{A}_1],$$

as desired.

2) By the definition of the actions in (2.8), Lemma 2.8 and Propositions 1.5, 1.15 and 1.31 we have

$$\Theta(x) = \Theta \left( \left[ m \cdot \gamma^{-1}_s(h_1) \otimes_A \tilde{\gamma}_A(h_2) \otimes_A \gamma(h_3)j_r(a) \otimes \mathfrak{A}_1 \right] \right) = (-1)^{r+s} \tilde{H}_1 \otimes_H \tilde{H}_1 \otimes_H \tilde{H}_1 \otimes_H [m \cdot \mathfrak{A}_1],$$

as desired.

3) Under the first identifications in \cite{23} (3.1) and (2.9), for $s = 0$ item (3) becomes

$$\Theta([m \cdot \gamma(z) \otimes \mathfrak{A}_1]) = [m \cdot \gamma(S(1^R(z))) \otimes \mathfrak{A}_1],$$

which follows immediately from Proposition 1.9 and Remark 2.6. Assume now that $s \geq 1$. We have

$$\Theta(x) = (-1)^{r+s} \mathbb{P}^R(z) \cdot \tilde{H}_1 \otimes_H [m \cdot \mathfrak{A}_1],$$

where the first equality holds by the definition of $\Theta$ and Lemma 2.8, the second one, by Proposition 1.5 and the definition of the actions in (2.8); and the last one, by Proposition 1.31.

Notation 2.15. Given a $k$-subalgebra $R$ of $A$ and $0 \leq u \leq r$, we let $\mathfrak{A}_{u\ast}(R, M)$ denote the $k$-submodule of $\mathfrak{A}_{r\ast}(M)$ generated by all the elements $\tilde{H}_1 \otimes_H [m \otimes \mathfrak{A}_1]$ with $m \in M$, $a_1, \ldots, a_r \in A$, $h_1, \ldots, h_s \in H$, and at least $u$ of the $a_j$’s in $R$. 

\qed
Theorem 2.16. Let \( y = \overline{u}_{1s} \otimes \mu \cdot [m \otimes \overline{u}_{1r}] \in \overline{X}_{rs}(M) \), where \( m \in M \), \( a_1, \ldots, a_r \in A \) and \( h_1, \ldots, h_s \in H \). The following assertions hold:

1. For \( r \geq 1 \) and \( s \geq 0 \), we have
   \[
   d_f(y) = \overline{u}_{1s} \otimes \mu \cdot [m \cdot j_\mu(a_1) \otimes \overline{u}_{1r}] \\
   + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} (-1)^{i+1} \overline{u}_{1s} \otimes \mu \cdot [m \otimes \overline{u}_{1,i-1} \otimes \overline{a}_i \otimes \overline{u}_{i+2,r}] \\
   + (-1)^r \overline{u}_{1s} \otimes \mu \cdot [j_\mu(a_r) \cdot m \otimes \overline{u}_{1,r-1}].
   \]

2. For \( r \geq 0 \) and \( s = 1 \), we have
   \[
   d_f(y) = (-1)^r \Pi^R(h_1) \cdot \overline{u}_{2s} \otimes \mu \cdot [m \otimes \overline{u}_{1r}] \\
   + \sum_{i=1}^{s-1} (-1)^{1-r+i} \left( \overline{u}_{1,i-1} \otimes \mu \cdot \overline{h}_i h_{i+1} \otimes \mu \cdot \overline{u}_{i+2,s} \otimes \mu \cdot [m \otimes \overline{u}_{1r}] \\
   + (-1)^{r+s} \overline{u}_{1,s-1} \otimes \mu \cdot [\gamma(h_3^{(3)}) \cdot m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(h_1^{(1)}) \otimes h_2^{(2)} \otimes \overline{u}_{1r}] \\
   \right)
   \]

3. For \( r \geq 0 \) and \( s \geq 2 \), we have
   \[
   d_f(y) = -\overline{u}_{1,s-2} \otimes \mu \cdot [\gamma(h_2^{(3)}) \cdot m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(h_1^{(1)}) \gamma^{-1}(h_1^{(1)}) \otimes \overline{u}_{1,s-1} \otimes \overline{u}_{1r}] \\
   = (-1)^r \Pi^R(h_1) \cdot \overline{u}_{2s-2} \otimes \mu \cdot [m \otimes \overline{u}_{1r}] \\
   + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} (-1)^{1-r+i} \left( \overline{u}_{1,i-1} \otimes \mu \cdot \overline{h}_i h_{i+1} \otimes \mu \cdot [m \otimes \overline{u}_{1r}] \\
   + (-1)^{r+s} \overline{u}_{1,s-2} \otimes \mu \cdot [\gamma(h_3^{(3)}) \cdot m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(h_1^{(1)}) \otimes h_2^{(2)} \otimes \overline{u}_{1r}] \\
   \right)
   \]

4. Let \( R \) be a \( k \)-subalgebra of \( A \). If \( R \) is stable under \( \rho \) and \( f \) takes its values in \( R \), then
   \[
   d_f(\overline{X}_{rs}(M)) \subseteq \overline{X}_{r+1,s-1}(R, M)
   \]

Proof. 1) By the definition of \( \Lambda \) and [23, Theorem 3.5(1)], we have
   \[
   d_f(y) = (-1)^r \Theta \circ d_f \left( \left[ m \cdot \gamma_\ast^{-1}(h_1^{(1)}) \otimes A \cdot \overline{g}_A(h_2^{(2)}) \otimes \overline{u}_{1r} \right] \right) \\
   = (-1)^r \Theta \left( \left[ m \cdot \gamma_\ast^{-1}(h_1^{(1)}) \otimes A \cdot \overline{g}_A(h_2^{(2)}) \cdot j_\mu(a_1) \otimes \overline{u}_{1r} \right] \right) \\
   + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} (-1)^{1-r+i} \left( \overline{u}_{1,i-1} \otimes \mu \cdot \overline{h}_i h_{i+1} \otimes \mu \cdot [\gamma(h_3^{(3)}) \cdot m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(h_1^{(1)}) \otimes A \cdot \overline{g}_A(h_2^{(2)}) \otimes \overline{u}_{i+2,r}] \\
   + (-1)^{r+s} \overline{u}_{1,s-1} \otimes \mu \cdot [\gamma(h_3^{(3)}) \cdot m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(h_1^{(1)}) \otimes h_2^{(2)} \otimes \overline{u}_{1r}] \right).
   \]

The formula for \( d_f \) follows from this using Lemma 2.14(1).

2) By the definition of \( \Lambda \) and [23, Theorem 3.5(2)] and Proposition 1.39 we have
   \[
   d_f(y) = (-1)^r \Theta \circ d_f \left( \left[ m \cdot \gamma_\ast^{-1}(h_1^{(1)}) \otimes A \cdot \overline{g}_A(h_2^{(2)}) \otimes \overline{u}_{1r} \right] \right) \\
   = (-1)^r \Theta \left( \left[ m \cdot \gamma_\ast^{-1}(h_1^{(1)}) \otimes A \cdot \overline{g}_A(h_2^{(2)}) \otimes \overline{u}_{1r} \right] \right) \\
   + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} (-1)^{1-r+i} \left( \overline{u}_{1,i-1} \otimes \mu \cdot \overline{h}_i h_{i+1} \otimes \mu \cdot \overline{g}_A(h_3^{(3)}) \cdot m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(h_1^{(1)}) \otimes \overline{u}_{i+2,r} \right) \\
   + (-1)^{r+s} \overline{u}_{1,s-1} \otimes \mu \cdot [\gamma(h_3^{(3)}) \cdot m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(h_1^{(1)}) \otimes h_2^{(2)} \otimes \overline{u}_{1r}] \right).
   \]

The formula for \( d_f \) follows from this using Lemma 2.14 and the fact that \( \Pi^R \circ \Pi^R = \Pi^R \).

3) By the definition of \( \Lambda \) and [23, Theorem 3.6], we have
   \[
   d_f(y) = (-1)^r \Theta \circ d_f \left( \left[ m \cdot \gamma_\ast^{-1}(h_1^{(1)}) \otimes A \cdot \overline{g}_A(h_2^{(2)}) \otimes \overline{u}_{1r} \right] \right) \\
   = (-1)^r \Theta \left( \left[ m \cdot \gamma_\ast^{-1}(h_1^{(1)}) \otimes A \cdot \overline{g}_A(h_2^{(2)}) \otimes \overline{u}_{1r} \right] \right) \\
   + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} (-1)^{1-r+i} \left( \overline{u}_{1,i-1} \otimes \mu \cdot \overline{h}_i h_{i+1} \otimes \mu \cdot \overline{g}_A(h_3^{(3)}) \cdot m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(h_1^{(1)}) \otimes \overline{u}_{i+2,r} \right) \\
   + (-1)^{r+s} \overline{u}_{1,s-1} \otimes \mu \cdot [\gamma(h_3^{(3)}) \cdot m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(h_1^{(1)}) \otimes h_2^{(2)} \otimes \overline{u}_{1r}] \right).
   \]

The formula for \( d_f \) follows from this using Lemma 2.14(1).

4) Let \( \hat{X}_{r+1,s-1}(R, M) \) be as in [23, Notation 3.4]. By Remark 1.26 and [23, Theorem 3.5(3)] this item follows from the fact that \( \overline{X}_{r+1,s-1}(R, M) = \Theta(\hat{X}^{r+1}_{r-1,s-1}(R, M)) \).

\[ \square \]
Proposition 2.17. For each \( h \in H \), the map \( F^h_1 : (M \otimes \overline{X}^0, b_\ast) \to (M \otimes \overline{X}^0, b_\ast) \), defined by
\[
F^h_1((m \otimes \overline{a}_1r)) := [\gamma(h(3)) \cdot m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(h(1)) \otimes h(2) \cdot \overline{a}_1r],
\]
is a morphism of complexes.

Proof. It is easy to see using the first equality in Proposition 1.15 and Lemma 2.2(4), that the maps \( F^h_1 \) are well defined. In order to prove that they are morphisms of complexes use the equality in Definition 1.21(2), the first equality in Proposition 1.15 and Lemma 2.2(4).

\( \Box \)

Proposition 2.18. For each \( h, l \in H \), the endomorphism of \( H^*_K(A, M) \) induced by \( F^h_1 \circ F^l_1 \) and \( F^h_1 \circ F^l_1 \) coincide. Moreover \( F^1_1 \) is the identity map. Consequently \( H^*_K(A, M) \) is a left \( H \)-module.

Proof. We claim that the family of maps \( \{b_r : M \otimes \overline{X}^0 \to M \otimes \overline{X}^0 \}_{r \geq 0} \) defined by
\[
b_r((m \otimes \overline{a}_1r)) := [\gamma(h(3)) \cdot m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(h(1)) \otimes h(2) \cdot \overline{a}_1r],
\]
where \( \overline{X}(h, l, \overline{a}_1r) \) is as in Theorem 2.16(3), is a homotopy from \( F^h_1 \) to \( F^h_1 \circ F^l_1 \). In order to check this we must prove that
\[
(F^h_1 - F^h_1 \circ F^l_1)((m \otimes \overline{a}_1r)) = \begin{cases} (b \circ b_1)(m) & \text{if } r = 0, \\ (b \circ b_r + b_{r-1} \circ b)(m \otimes \overline{a}_1r) & \text{if } r > 0. \end{cases}
\]

(2.11)

Let \( y := (R \otimes \mu) \otimes \mu [m \otimes \overline{a}_1r] \in X_{r2}(M) \). Since \( (X_r, M), \overline{a}_1r \) is a chain complex,
\[
\overrightarrow{d}(\overrightarrow{d}(y)) = \begin{cases} \overrightarrow{d}(\overrightarrow{d}(y)) & \text{if } r = 0, \\ \overrightarrow{d}(\overrightarrow{d}(y)) + \overrightarrow{d}(\overrightarrow{d}(y)) & \text{if } r > 0. \end{cases}
\]

By this fact and Theorem 2.16 in order to prove equality (2.11) it suffices to show that
\[
\overrightarrow{d}(\overrightarrow{d}(y)) = \begin{cases} \gamma(h(3)) \gamma(l(3)) \cdot m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(l(1)) & \text{if } r = 0, \\ \gamma(\gamma(h(3)) \gamma(l(3)) \cdot m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(l(1)) & \text{if } r > 0. \end{cases}
\]

(2.12)

Now, a direct computation shows that
\[
\overrightarrow{d}(\overrightarrow{d}(y)) = (-1)^r \overrightarrow{d}(\overrightarrow{d}(y)) - (-1)^r \overrightarrow{d}(\overrightarrow{d}(y)) \\
+ (-1)^r \overrightarrow{d}(\overrightarrow{d}(y)) - (-1)^r \overrightarrow{d}(\overrightarrow{d}(y)) \\
= [m \cdot \gamma(\overrightarrow{d}(\overrightarrow{d}(y))) \otimes \overline{a}_1r] \\
= [\gamma(h(3)) \gamma(l(3)) \cdot m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(l(1)) & \text{if } r = 0, \\ \gamma(\gamma(h(3)) \gamma(l(3)) \cdot m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(l(1)) & \text{if } r > 0. \end{cases}
\]

Using the second equality in Proposition 1.17 and that, by Lemma 2.3 and Propositions 1.6(2) and 1.9
\[
\gamma(h(3)) \gamma(l(3)) \cdot m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(l(1)) \gamma(\overrightarrow{d}(\overrightarrow{d}(y))) \otimes \overline{a}_1r] = \gamma(h(3)) \gamma(l(3)) \cdot m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(l(1)) \gamma(\overrightarrow{d}(\overrightarrow{d}(y))) \otimes \overline{a}_1r] \\
= \gamma(h(3)) \gamma(l(3)) \cdot m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(l(1)) \gamma(\overrightarrow{d}(\overrightarrow{d}(y))) \otimes \overline{a}_1r] \\
= \gamma(h(3)) \gamma(l(3)) \cdot m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(l(1)) \gamma(\overrightarrow{d}(\overrightarrow{d}(y))) \otimes \overline{a}_1r],
\]
we obtain that equality (2.12) holds. Finally we prove that \( F^1_1 \) is the identity map. For \( r = 1 \), we have
\[
F^1_1([m]) = \gamma(1(2)) \cdot m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(1(1))[m] = [m \cdot \gamma(1(2)) \cdot m],
\]
where the second equality holds by Remark 1.28 and Propositions 1.3 and 1.33(1); and the second one, by Proposition 1.39. Assume that \( r \geq 1 \). To begin note that
\[
F^1_1([m \otimes \overline{a}_1r]) = [m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(1(1)) \otimes 1(2) \otimes \overline{a}_1r, \\
1(1) \otimes \overline{a}_1r] = 1(1) \otimes 1(2) \otimes 1(3) \otimes \overline{a}_1r, \\
\overline{a}_1r, r \geq 1 \otimes 1(3) \otimes \overline{a}_1r],
\]
where the first equality holds by Propositions 1.33(1) and Remark 1.28 and the second one, by the equality in Definition 1.21(2). We claim that
\[
1(1) \otimes \overline{a}_1r = 1(1) \otimes 1(2) \otimes 1(3) \otimes \overline{a}_1r, \\
\overline{a}_1r]
\]
By Propositions 1.3 and 1.22(1),
\[
1(1) \otimes 1(2) \otimes 1(3) \otimes \overline{a}_1r, r \geq 1 = \overline{a}_1r = 1(1) \otimes 1(2) \otimes 1(3) \otimes \overline{a}_1r, \\
1(1) \otimes 1(2) \otimes 1(3) \otimes \overline{a}_1r, r \geq 1 = \overline{a}_1r = 1(1) \otimes 1(2) \otimes 1(3) \otimes \overline{a}_1r.
\]

If \( r = 1 \) this ends the proof of the claim. Assume that \( r > 1 \). In this case, by Remark 1.28 and the equality in Definition 1.21(2),
\[
1(1) \otimes 1(2) \otimes 1(3) \otimes \overline{a}_1r, r \geq 1 = \overline{a}_1r = 1(1) \otimes 1(2) \otimes 1(3) \otimes \overline{a}_1r, \\
\overline{a}_1r]
\]
and the claim follows from an evident inductive argument. Thus, again by Remark 1.28
\[ F^1_\gamma([m \otimes a_1]) = [m \otimes \gamma^{-1}(1(1)) \otimes (1(2)_A \otimes 1_A) a_1 \otimes a_2], \]
and so, by Propositions 1.33 1 and 1.39
\[ F^1_\gamma([m \otimes a_1]) = [m \otimes \gamma(H^1(1)) \otimes a_1] = [m \otimes a_1] \text{, as desired.} \]

**Example 2.19.** If \( A = K \), then \( H^1_K(E) = M_\gamma(H, M) \), where \( M \otimes \) is considered as a left \( H \)-module via \( h \cdot [m] := [\gamma(h^{(2)}) \cdot m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(h^{(1)})] \) (see Proposition 2.17).

**Proposition 2.20.** The spectral sequence of \([23, (3.3)]\) satisfies
\[ E^1_{rs} = H^r(E, M) \otimes_M H^s(M) \quad \text{and} \quad E^2_{rs} = H_s(H, H^r(E, M)). \]

**Proof.** By Remark 2.13 Proposition 2.18 and Theorem 2.16 \( \square \)

### 3 Hochschild cohomology of cleft extensions

Let \( H, A, \nu, f, \nu, J, K, L, \nu, \gamma \), and \( \gamma \) be as in the previous section. Assume that the hypotheses of that section are fulfilled. In particular \( H \) is a weak Hopf algebra, \( A \) is a weak module algebra and \( f \) is convolution invertible. Let \( \gamma^{-1} \) be as in equality (1.7). By definition the Hochschild cohomology \( H^*_K(E, M) \), of the \( K \)-algebra \( E \) with coefficients in an \( E \)-bimodule \( M \), is the cohomology of the normalized Hochschild cochain complex \( (\text{Hom}_K(E^*, M), d^*) \), where \( d^* \) is the canonical Hochschild boundary map. In \([23, \text{Section 4}]\) a cochain complex \((\tilde{X}^*(M), \tilde{d}^*)\) was obtained, simpler than the canonical one, that gives the Hochschild cohomology of \( E \) with coefficients in \( M \). In this section we prove that \((\tilde{X}^*(M), \tilde{d}^*)\) is isomorphic to a simpler complex \((X^*(M), d^*)\). When \( K \) is separable, the complex \((X^*(M), d^*)\) gives the absolute Hochschild cohomology of \( E \) with coefficients in \( M \). We recall from \([23, \text{Section 4}]\) that
\[ \tilde{X}^n(M) = \bigoplus_{r+s \geq 0} \tilde{X}^{r,s}(M), \]
where \( \tilde{X}^{r,s}(M) := \text{Hom}_{(A,K)}(\tilde{E}^s \otimes \tilde{X}^r, M) \), and that there exist maps \( \tilde{d}^r_s : \tilde{X}^{r+s-l}(M) \to \tilde{X}^{r,s}(M) \) such that
\[ \tilde{d}^r_s(a) := \sum_{l=0}^{r+s-1} \tilde{d}^{r-l,s-n-r+l-1}(a) \quad \text{for all } a \in \tilde{X}^{r,n-r-1}(M). \]

By Propositions 1.32 and 1.33 2, we know that \( M \) is a \((K,K \otimes_k H^2)\)-bimodule via
\[ \lambda \cdot m \cdot (\lambda' \otimes_k l) := j_\nu(\lambda) \cdot (S(l)) \cdot j_\nu(\lambda'). \]

For each \( r,s \geq 0 \), we set \( X^{r,s}(M) := \text{Hom}_{(K,K \otimes_k H^2)}(\tilde{E}^s \otimes_k \tilde{X}^r, M) \), where we consider \( \tilde{E}^s \otimes_k \tilde{X}^r \) as a \((K,K \otimes_k H^2)\)-bimodule via
\[ \lambda \cdot (\tilde{E}^s \otimes_k \tilde{X}^r) \cdot (\lambda' \otimes_k l) := \tilde{E}^s \otimes_k \tilde{X}^r \lambda \cdot (\lambda' \otimes_k l). \]

Let \( M^K := \{ m \in M : \lambda \cdot m = m \cdot \lambda \text{ for all } \lambda \in K \} \). Since \( \tilde{E}^s \otimes_k \tilde{X}^r = K \), we have
\[ \tilde{X}^{0,0}(M) \simeq \text{Hom}_K(\tilde{X}^r, M) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{X}^{0,0}(M) = \text{Hom}_K(\tilde{E}^s \otimes_k \tilde{X}^r, M^K). \]

**Proposition 3.2.** For each \( r,s \geq 0 \) there exist maps
\[ \Theta^{rs} : \tilde{X}^{r,s}(M) \to \tilde{X}^{r,s}(M) \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda^{rs} : \tilde{X}^{r,s}(M) \to \tilde{X}^{r,s}(M), \]
such that for each
\[ x := j_\nu(a_1) \gamma(h_1) \otimes_A \cdots \otimes_A j_\nu(a_s) \gamma(h_s) \otimes_k \Pi_{s+1,s+r} \in \tilde{E}^s \otimes_k \tilde{X}^r \quad \text{and} \quad y := \Pi_{1,s} \otimes_k \Pi_{1,r} \in \tilde{E}^s \otimes_k \tilde{X}^r, \]
the equalities
\[ \Theta^{rs}(\beta(x)) := (-1)^{rs} j_\nu(a_1) \gamma(h_1) \cdots j_\nu(a_s) \gamma(h_s) \cdot \beta(\Pi_{1,s} \otimes_k \Pi_{s+1,s+r}) \]
and
\[ \Lambda^{rs}(\alpha)(y) := (-1)^{rs} \gamma^{-1}(h_1) \gamma(h_2) \cdots \alpha(\gamma(h_1) \gamma(h_2) \cdots) \otimes \Pi_{1,r} ) \]
hold.

**Proof.** Mimic the proof of Proposition 1.39.
Remark 3.3. Under the first identifications in \[23\] (4.2) and \(3.14\) the maps \(\Theta^0\) and \(\Lambda^0\) become the identity maps. Similarly, under the last identifications in \[23\] (4.2) and \(3.14\), the maps \(\Theta^n\) and \(\Lambda^n\) become

\[\Theta^n(\beta)(j_0(a_1)\gamma(h_1) \otimes_A \cdots \otimes_A j_0(a_s)\gamma(h_s)) = j_0(a_1)\gamma(h_1^{(1)}) \cdots j_0(a_s)\gamma(h_s^{(1)}) \cdot \beta(h_1^{(2)})\]

and

\[\Lambda^n(a)(\overline{1}_s) = \gamma^{-1}_s(h_1^{(1)}) \cdot \alpha(h_1^{(2)}),\]

respectively.

**Proposition 3.4.** The morphisms \(\Theta^n\) and \(\Lambda^n\) are inverse one of each other.

**Proof.** Mimic the proof of Proposition \(2.9\). □

For each \(0 \leq l \leq s\) and \(r \geq 0\) such that \(r + l \geq 1\), let \(\overline{d}_l^n: \overline{X}^{r-1,s-l}(M) \rightarrow \overline{X}^{r,s}(M)\) be the map \(\overline{d}_l^n := \Lambda^{r-1,s-l} \circ \overline{d}_l^n \circ \Theta^n\).

**Theorem 3.5.** The Hochschild cohomology of the \(K\)-algebra \(E\) is the cohomology of \((\overline{X}(M), \overline{d})\), where

\[\overline{X}^n(M) := \bigoplus_{r+s=n} \overline{X}^{r,s}(M) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{d}(\beta) := \sum_{i=0}^{r+1} \overline{d}_i^{r+1,n-r-1}(\beta) \quad \text{for all } \beta \in \overline{X}^{r,n-r-1}(M).\]

**Proof.** By Proposition \(3.4\) and the definition of \((\overline{X}(M), \overline{d}_l^n)\), the map \(\Theta^n: (\overline{X}(M), \overline{d}) \rightarrow (\overline{X}(M), \overline{d}^0)\), given by \(\Theta^n := \bigoplus_{r+s=n} \Theta^n\), is an isomorphism of complexes. □

**Remark 3.6.** If \(f\) takes its values in \(K\), then \((\overline{X}(M), \overline{d})\) is the total complex of the double complex \((\overline{X}(M), \overline{d}_0^n, \overline{d}_1^n)\).

**Remark 3.7.** If \(K = \mathbb{A}\), then \((\overline{X}(M), \overline{d}) = (\overline{X}(M), \overline{d}_1^n)\).

**Remark 3.8.** For each \(s, n \geq 0\), let \(F_i(\overline{X}^n(M)) := \bigoplus_{s=1}^n \overline{X}^{n-s,s}(M)\). The cochain complex \((\overline{X}(M), \overline{d})\) is filtrated by

\[F_0(\overline{X}^n(M)) \supseteq F_1(\overline{X}^n(M)) \supseteq F_2(\overline{X}^n(M)) \supseteq F_3(\overline{X}^n(M)) \supseteq \ldots.\] (3.15)

Since the isomorphism \(\Theta^n: (\overline{X}(M), \overline{d}) \rightarrow (\overline{X}(M), \overline{d}_0^n)\) preserve filtrations, the spectral sequence of \[23\] (4.3) coincide with the one determined by the filtration \(3.15\).

**Lemma 3.9.** Let \(\beta \in \overline{X}^{r,s}(M), a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_r \in A, h_1, \ldots, h_s \in H\) and \(z \in H^r\).

1. We have \(\gamma^{-1}_s(h_1^{(1)}) \cdot \Theta^n(\beta)(\overline{1}_s) = (-1)^r j_0(a) \cdot \beta(h_1 \otimes_k \overline{1}_r).\)
2. For \(s \geq 2\) and \(1 \leq i < s\), we have

\[\gamma^{-1}_s(h_1^{(1)}) \cdot \Theta^n(\beta)(\overline{1}_s) = (-1)^r \beta(h_1 \otimes_k h_i \otimes_k \overline{1}_{r+i} \otimes_k \overline{1}_{s-i}).\]

3. We have \(\gamma^{-1}_s(h_1^{(1)})(\gamma(z) \cdot \Theta^n(\beta)(\overline{1}_s) = (-1)^r \beta(z) \cdot \overline{1}_s \otimes_k \overline{1}_r).\)

**Proof.** Mimic the proof of Lemma \(2.14\). □

**Notation 3.10.** For each \(k\)-subalgebra \(R\) of \(A\) and \(0 \leq u \leq r\), we set \(\overline{X}_u^r(R, M) := \Lambda(\overline{X}_u^r(M, R, M))\), where \(\overline{X}_u^r(R, M)\) is as in \[23\] Notation \(4.4\).

**Theorem 3.11.** Let \(\gamma = \overline{1}_s \otimes_k \overline{1}_r\), where \(h_1, \ldots, h_s \in H\) and \(a_1, \ldots, a_r \in A\). The following assertions hold:

1. For \(r \geq 1\) and \(s \geq 0\), we have

\[d_0(\gamma)(y) = j_0(a) \beta(h_1 \otimes_k \overline{1}_r) + \sum_{i=1}^{s} (-1)^i \beta(h_1 \otimes_k (h_i \otimes_k \overline{1}_r) + \beta(h_1 \otimes_k \overline{1}_r \cdot j_0(a_i)).\]

2. For \(r \geq 0\) and \(s = 1\), we have

\[\overline{d}(\gamma)(y) = (-1)^r (\gamma(\overline{1}_r \otimes_k \overline{1}_r) - \gamma^1(h_1^{(1)}) \cdot \beta(1_{H^r} \otimes_k \overline{1}_r) - \gamma^{-1}(h_1^{(1)}) \cdot \beta(1_{H^r} \otimes_k h_1^{(2)} \otimes_k \overline{1}_r) \cdot \gamma(h_1^{(3)}))\]

while for \(r \geq 0\) and \(s > 1\), we have

\[\overline{d}(\gamma)(y) = (-1)^r \beta((h_1 \otimes_k \overline{1}_r) + \sum_{i=1}^{s-1} (-1)^i \beta(h_i \otimes_k \overline{1}_r) + \gamma^{-1}(h_1^{(1)}) \cdot \beta(h_1 \otimes_k h_1^{(2)} \otimes_k \overline{1}_r) \cdot \gamma(h_1^{(3)}).\]
(3) For \( r \geq 0 \) and \( s \geq 2 \), we have
\[
d_2(\beta)(y) = -\gamma^{-1}(h_s^{(1)})\gamma^{-1}(h_s^{(1)})\cdot \beta(\mathfrak{h}_{s-2} \otimes k \mathcal{T}(h_{s-2}^{(2)}, \mathfrak{h}_{1r})) \cdot \gamma(h_{s-1}^{(1)}h_s^{(3)}),
\]
where \( \mathcal{T}(h_{s-1}, h_s, \mathfrak{h}_{1r}) \) is as in Theorem 2.16(3).

(4) Let \( R \) be a \( k \)-subalgebra of \( A \). If \( R \) is stable under \( \rho \) and \( f \) takes its values in \( R \), then
\[
d_l(\mathfrak{X}^{r+l-1-s-1}(M)) \subseteq \mathfrak{X}_{1-1}(R, M),
\]
for each \( r \geq 0 \) and \( 1 < l \leq s \).

Proof. Mimic the proof of Theorem 2.19. \( \square \)

Proposition 3.12. For each \( h \in H \) the map \( F_h^r : (\text{Hom}_K(\mathfrak{X}^{r'}, \mathfrak{M}^*), b^r) \rightarrow (\text{Hom}_K(\mathfrak{X}^{r'}, \mathfrak{M}^*), b^r) \), defined by \( F_h^r(\beta)(\mathfrak{h}_{1r}) := \gamma^{-1}(h_1^{(1)}) \cdot \beta(h_2^{(2)} \cdot \mathfrak{h}_{1r}) \cdot \gamma(h_3^{(3)}) \), is a morphism of complexes.

Proof. Mimic the proof of Proposition 2.17. \( \square \)

Proposition 3.13. For each \( h, l \in H \), the endomorphism of \( H^*_H(A, M) \) induced by \( F_h^l \) is the identity map. Consequently, \( H^*_H(A, M) \) is a right \( H \)-module.

Proof. Mimic the proof of Proposition 2.18. \( \square \)

Example 3.14. If \( A = K \), then \( H^*_H(E, M) = H^*_H(M) \), where \( M \) is considered as a right \( H \)-module via \( m \cdot h = \gamma(h_1^{(2)}) \cdot m \cdot \gamma^{-1}(h_1^{(1)}) \) (for the well definition use the first equality in Proposition 1.15 and Lemma 2.24)).

Proposition 3.15. The spectral sequence of [21, (4.3)] satisfies
\[
E_1^{rs} = \text{Hom}_{A_0}(\mathfrak{H}^{\mathfrak{M}^*}, H^*_H(A, M)) \quad \text{and} \quad E_2^{rs} = H^*(H, H^*_H(A, M)).
\]

Proof. By Remark 3.8, Proposition 3.13 and Theorem 3.14. \( \square \)

4 The cup and cap products for cleft extensions

Let \( H, A, \rho, f, E, K, M, \nu, \gamma \) be as in Section 2. Thus \( H \) is a weak Hopf algebra, \( A \) is a weak module algebra and \( f \) is convolution invertible. In this section we obtain formulas involving the complexes \( (\mathfrak{X}^r(E), \mathfrak{d}) \) and \( (\mathcal{X}_s(M), \mathfrak{d}_s) \) that induce the cup product of \( HH^*_H(E) \) and the cap product of \( H^*_H(E, M) \). We will use freely the operators \( \mathfrak{d}^r \) and \( \mathfrak{d}_s \) in [21, Section 5].

Notations 4.1. Given \( h_1, \ldots, h_s \in H \) and \( a_1, \ldots, a_r \in A \) we set \( h_{1s} \cdot \mathfrak{h}_{1r} := h_1 \cdot h_2 \cdot (\ldots (h_s \cdot \mathfrak{h}_{1r})) \ldots ) \).

Definition 4.2. Let \( \beta \in \mathfrak{X}^{r'}(E) \) and \( \beta' \in \mathfrak{X}^{s'}(E) \). We define \( \beta \cdot \beta' \) by
\[
(\beta \cdot \beta')(y) := (-1)^{r's'}\gamma^{-1}(h_{s+1}^{(1)}) \cdot \beta(\mathfrak{h}_{1s} \otimes k h_{s+1}^{(2)}), \mathfrak{h}_{1r}) \cdot \gamma(h_{s+1}^{(3)}) \cdot \beta'(\mathfrak{h}_{s+1}^{(4)}), \mathfrak{h}_{1r}'),
\]
where \( r'' := r + r', s'' := s + s', h_1, \ldots, h_{s'} \in H \), \( a_1, \ldots, a_{r'} \in A \) and \( y := \mathfrak{h}_{1s} \otimes k \mathfrak{h}_{1r} \).

Proposition 4.3. For each \( \beta \in \mathfrak{X}^{r'}(E) \), \( \beta' \in \mathfrak{X}^{s'}(E) \), we have \( \Theta(\beta \cdot \beta') = \Theta(\beta) \cdot \Theta(\beta') \).

Proof. Let \( \mathfrak{X} := \mathfrak{h}_{1s} \otimes \mathfrak{h}_{1r} \), where \( r'' := r + r', s'' := s + s', h_1, \ldots, h_{s'} \in H \) and \( a_1, \ldots, a_{r'} \in A \). By Lemma 2.7 and the definitions of \( \Theta \), \( \mathfrak{d} \), and \( \mathfrak{d}_r \),
\[
(\Theta(\beta) \cdot \Theta(\beta'))(x) = (-1)^{r's'}(\Theta(\beta')(\mathfrak{h}_{1s} \otimes h_{s+1}^{(1)}, \mathfrak{h}_{1r})(\Theta(\beta)(\mathfrak{h}_{1s} \otimes h_{s+1}^{(1)}, \mathfrak{h}_{1r})) = (-1)^{r's'}(-1)^{r''} \cdot \gamma(h_{s+1}^{(1)}) \cdot \beta(\mathfrak{h}_{1s} \otimes k h_{s+1}^{(2)}, \mathfrak{h}_{1r}) \cdot \gamma(h_{s+1}^{(3)}) \cdot \beta'(\mathfrak{h}_{s+1}^{(4)}), \mathfrak{h}_{1r}'),
\]
as desired. \( \square \)

Corollary 4.4. If \( f \) takes its values in \( K \), then the cup product in \( HH^*_H(E) \) is induced by the operation \( \cdot \) in \( (\mathfrak{X}^r(E), \mathfrak{d}) \).

Proof. This follows from [21, Corollary 5.3] and Proposition 4.3. \( \square \)

Definition 4.5. Let \( \beta \in \mathfrak{X}^{r'}(E) \) and let \( y := h_{1s} \otimes h_{1r} \cdot [m \otimes \mathfrak{h}_{1r}] \in \mathfrak{X}_s(M) \), where \( m \in M \), \( a_1, \ldots, a_r \in A \) and \( h_1, \ldots, h_s \in H \). Assume that \( r \geq r' \) and \( s \geq s' \). We define \( y \cdot \beta \) by
\[
y \cdot \beta := (-1)^{r's'} \gamma^{-1}(h_{s+1}^{(1)}) \cdot \beta(\mathfrak{h}_{1s} \otimes k h_{s+1}^{(2)}, \mathfrak{h}_{1r}) \cdot \gamma(h_{s+1}^{(3)}) \cdot \mathfrak{h}_{1r+1}, \mathfrak{h}_{1r+1} \).
\]
Proposition 4.6. For each $y \in X_{\ast}(M)$ and $\beta \in X^{\prime \prime}(E)$, we have $\Lambda(y \ast \beta) = \Lambda(y) \otimes \Theta(\beta)$.

Proof. Let $\beta$ and $y$ be as in Definition 4.5. We have,

$$\Lambda(y) \otimes \Theta(\beta) = (-1)^{rs} \left[ m \cdot \gamma_{r-1}(h_{1,s}^{1}) \otimes h_{s,r} \gamma_{t}(h_{t,s}^{0}) \otimes \Lambda_{rt} \right] \otimes \Theta(\beta)$$

$$= (-1)^{rs + r(s-r)} \left[ m \cdot \gamma_{r-1}(h_{1,s}^{1}) \otimes \Lambda_{rt} \gamma_{t}(h_{t,s}^{0}) \otimes \Lambda_{rt} \gamma_{t}(h_{t,s}^{0}) \otimes \Lambda_{rt} \right]$$

$$= (-1)^{r(s-r)} \left[ m \cdot \gamma_{r-1}(h_{1,s}^{1}) \otimes \Lambda_{rt} \gamma_{t}(h_{t,s}^{0}) \otimes \Lambda_{rt} \gamma_{t}(h_{t,s}^{0}) \otimes \Lambda_{rt} \right]$$

$$= (-1)^{r(s-r)} \left[ m \cdot \gamma_{r-1}(h_{1,s}^{1}) \otimes \Lambda_{rt} \gamma_{t}(h_{t,s}^{0}) \otimes \Lambda_{rt} \gamma_{t}(h_{t,s}^{0}) \otimes \Lambda_{rt} \right]$$

$$= (-1)^{r(s-r)} \Lambda \left( \gamma_{r-1}(h_{1,s}^{1}) \otimes \Lambda_{rt} \gamma_{t}(h_{t,s}^{0}) \otimes \Lambda_{rt} \gamma_{t}(h_{t,s}^{0}) \otimes \Lambda_{rt} \right)$$

where the first equality holds by the definition of $\Lambda$; the second one, by the definition of $\Theta(\beta)$; the fourth one, by Lemma 2.8; the fifth one, since $\beta$ is a right $H^{2}$-module morphism and $\gamma(1 \otimes S(1^{2})) = 1_{E}$; the fifth one, by the definition of $\Lambda$ and Lemma 2.7 and the last one, by the definition of $\ast$.

\[ \square \]

Corollary 5.1. If $f$ takes its values in $K$, then in terms of the complexes $(X_{\ast}(M), \tilde{\Lambda}_{\ast})$ and $(X^{\prime}(E), \tilde{\Theta}_{\ast})$, the cap product is induced by the operation $\ast$.

Proof. This follows from [23] Corollary 5.7 and Proposition 4.6.

5 Cyclic homology of cleft extensions

Let $H, A, \rho, f, E, K, M, \nu, \gamma$ and $\gamma^{-1}$ be as in Section 2. Thus $H$ is a weak Hopf algebra, $A$ is a weak module algebra and $f$ is convolution invertible. In this section we prove that the mixed complex $(\tilde{X}_{\ast}(E), \tilde{\Lambda}_{\ast}, \tilde{D}_{\ast})$ of [23] Section 6 is isomorphic to a simpler mixed complex $(\tilde{X}_{\ast}(E), \tilde{\Lambda}_{\ast}, \tilde{D}_{\ast})$. Let

$$\Theta_{\ast} : (\tilde{X}_{\ast}(E), \tilde{\Lambda}_{\ast}) \longrightarrow (\tilde{X}_{\ast}(E), \tilde{\Lambda}_{\ast}) \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_{\ast} : (\tilde{X}_{\ast}(E), \tilde{\Lambda}_{\ast}) \longrightarrow (\tilde{X}_{\ast}(E), \tilde{\Lambda}_{\ast})$$

be the maps introduced in the proof of Theorem 2.10. For each $n \geq 0$, let $\tilde{D}_{n} : \tilde{X}_{n}(E) \longrightarrow \tilde{X}_{n+1}(E)$ be the map defined by $\tilde{D}_{n} := \Theta_{n+1} \circ \tilde{D}_{n} \circ \Lambda_{n}$.

Theorem 5.1. The triple $(\tilde{X}_{\ast}(E), \tilde{\Lambda}_{\ast}, \tilde{D}_{\ast})$ is a mixed complex that gives the Hochschild and that cyclic homologies of the $K$-algebra $E$. More precisely, the mixed complexes $(\tilde{X}_{\ast}(E), \tilde{\Lambda}_{\ast}, \tilde{D}_{\ast})$ and $(E \otimes E^{\ast}, b_{\ast}, \Lambda_{\ast})$ are homotopically equivalent.

Proof. Since $\Theta_{\ast}$ and $\Lambda_{\ast}$ are inverse one of each other it is clear that $(\tilde{X}_{\ast}(E), \tilde{\Lambda}_{\ast}, \tilde{D}_{\ast})$ is a mixed complex and that $\Theta_{\ast} : (\tilde{X}_{\ast}(E), \tilde{\Lambda}_{\ast}, \tilde{D}_{\ast}) \longrightarrow (\tilde{X}_{\ast}(E), \tilde{\Lambda}_{\ast}, \tilde{D}_{\ast})$ is an isomorphism of mixed complexes. Consequently the result follows from [23] Theorem 6.3.

Definition 5.2. For each $r, s \geq 0$, let $\tilde{D}_{r}^{0} : \tilde{X}_{r,s}(E) \longrightarrow \tilde{X}_{r,s+1}(E)$ and $\tilde{D}_{r}^{1} : \tilde{X}_{r,s}(E) \longrightarrow \tilde{X}_{r,s+1}(E)$ be the maps introduced in [23] Definition 6.5. We define $\tilde{D}_{r} : \tilde{X}_{r,s}(E) \longrightarrow \tilde{X}_{r,s+1}(E)$ and $\tilde{D}_{r}^{1} : \tilde{X}_{r,s}(E) \longrightarrow \tilde{X}_{r,s+1}(E)$ by

$$\tilde{D}_{r,s} := \Theta_{r+1} \circ \tilde{D}_{r}^{0} \circ \Lambda_{s} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{D}_{r}^{1} := \Theta_{r+1} \circ \tilde{D}_{r}^{1} \circ \Lambda_{s},$$

respectively.

Proposition 5.3. Let $R$ be a stable under a subalgebra of $A$ and let $y := \tilde{D}_{s} \otimes H_{t}^{\ast}$ be the map into $X_{r,s}(E)$. If $f$ takes its values in $R$, then $D(y) = D_{r}^{0}(y) + D_{r}^{1}(y)$, module $\bigoplus_{s=0}^{\infty} X_{s+1-n}(R, M)$.

Proof. This follows by Remark 1.26 and [23] Proposition 6.6.1.

Corollary 5.4. If $f$ takes its values in $K$, then $\tilde{D} = \tilde{D}_{r}^{0} + \tilde{D}_{r}^{1}$.

We next compute the maps $\tilde{D}_{r}^{0}$ and $\tilde{D}_{r}^{1}$. We will need the following proposition.

Notation 5.5. Given $h_{1}, \ldots, h_{s} \in S$ and $1 \leq j \leq s$, we set

$$S_{j}^{i} \left( h_{1,s} \right) := S_{j} \left( h_{1,s} \right) S_{j} \left( h_{1,s-1} \right) \cdots S_{j} \left( h_{1,s} \right)$$

and $F_{j}^{i} \left( h_{1,s} \right) := F_{j} \left( h_{1,s} \right)$.

Proposition 5.6. For each $s \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a map $T_{s} : H_{\otimes^{s+1}} \longrightarrow A$ such that

$$\gamma(h_{0}) \gamma_{-1}(h_{1,s}) = F_{s+1} \left( T_{s} \left( h_{1,s}^{1} \otimes h_{1,s}^{2} \right) \right)$$

and $T_{s} \left( h_{1,s}^{1} \otimes h_{1,s}^{2} \right) \left( h_{1,s}^{2} S_{j} \left( h_{1,s} \right) \right) \left( 1_{A} \right) = T_{s} \left( h_{1,s} \right)$.

\[ (5.16) \]
Proof. We will proceed by a inductive argument. Assume first that \( s = 1 \). By equality \( (1.7) \), Proposition \ref{proposition:inductive} and Theorem \ref{theorem:main}, we have
\[
\gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) = \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) = \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) = \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1)
\]
and Theorem \ref{theorem:main}. Assume now that \( s = 1 \) and there exists \( T_s \) as in the statement.

So, we have \( T_s(h_0) = (h_0, S(h_1) \otimes_k h_1^2) \). The first equality in \ref{equation:main} follows immediately from the equality in Theorem \ref{theorem:main}. Assume now that \( s \geq 1 \). The same argument as above proves the second equality in \ref{equation:main}. \( \square \)

Remark 5.7. By Theorem \ref{theorem:main} and Propositions \ref{proposition:inductive}, \ref{proposition:recursive} and \ref{proposition:recursive2}, we have
\[
\gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) = \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) = \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) = \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1)
\]
and
\[
\gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) = \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) = \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) = \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1)
\]

Proposition 5.8. For \( y = \Pi_{i_1} \otimes_{H'} [\nu(a_0) \gamma(h_0) \otimes \pi_{i_1}] \in \Phi_{s}, s \), we have
\[
\mathcal{D}^0(y) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (-1)^{js + r + s} (\Pi_{i_1})^{(3)} \otimes_{H'} h_1^{2j} \otimes_{H'} h_1^{2j} \otimes_{H'} F^{h_1^2, s, s}((\nu(a_0) \gamma(h_0) \otimes \pi_{i_1}))
\]
and
\[
\mathcal{D}^4(y) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (-1)^{js + r + s} (\Pi_{i_1})^{(3)} \otimes_{H'} h_1^{2j} \otimes_{H'} h_1^{2j} \otimes_{H'} F^{h_1^2, s, s}((\nu(a_0) \gamma(h_0) \otimes \pi_{i_1}))
\]

Proof. By definition
\[
\Lambda(y) = (-1)^{r s} \left[ \nu(a_0) \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) \otimes_a \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) \right] = (-1)^{r s} \left[ \nu(a_0) \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) \otimes_a \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) \right]
\]
and so
\[
\mathcal{D}^0(\Lambda(y)) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (-1)^{js + r + s} \left[ 1_E \otimes_a \gamma(h_1)^{(3)} \otimes_a \nu(a_0) \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) \otimes_a \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) \right] = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (-1)^{js + r + s} \left[ 1_E \otimes_a \gamma(h_1)^{(3)} \otimes_a \nu(a_0) \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) \otimes_a \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) \right]
\]
and
\[
\mathcal{D}^4(\Lambda(y)) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (-1)^{js + r + s} \left[ \gamma(h_1)^{(3)} \otimes_a \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) \otimes_a \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) \right] = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (-1)^{js + r + s} \left[ \gamma(h_1)^{(3)} \otimes_a \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) \otimes_a \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) \right]
\]
Since, by the definition of \( \Theta \), Proposition \ref{proposition:theta}, Lemma \ref{lemma:theta} and the definitions of the actions in \ref{notation:actions} and Propositions \ref{proposition:inductive} and \ref{proposition:recursive}, the actions in \ref{equation:recursive} and Propositions \ref{proposition:inductive} and \ref{proposition:recursive}, we have
\[
(-1)^{r s + r} \Theta \left[ 1_E \otimes_a \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) \otimes_a \nu(a_0) \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) \right] = \left( R^{(3)}_{j+1,s} \otimes_{H'} h_1^{2j+1} \otimes_{H'} h_1^{2j+1} \otimes_{H'} \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) \otimes_a \nu(a_0) \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) \right)
\]
and
\[
(-1)^{r s + r} \Theta \left[ \gamma(h_1)^{(3)} \otimes_a \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) \otimes_a \nu(a_0) \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) \right] = \left( R^{(3)}_{j+1,s} \otimes_{H'} h_1^{2j+1} \otimes_{H'} h_1^{2j+1} \otimes_{H'} \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) \otimes_a \nu(a_0) \gamma(h_0) \gamma^{-1}(h_1) \right)
\]
\[
\gamma_{h_4} \left( S_h \left( h_1 \right) \right) = \gamma_{h_3} \left( h_4 \right) \otimes \gamma_{h_2} \left( h_1 \right) \otimes \alpha_0 T_s \left( h_0 \otimes h_1 \right) \otimes \left( h_1 \otimes h_2 \right) \cdot \left( h_3 \otimes h_4 \right),
\]

the formulas in the statement are true. \(\square\)
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