Abstract

We show that the Tamarkin–Tsygan calculus of an associative algebra can be computed using a cofibrant replacement of it, by giving explicit formulas for the action of the 2-colored operad of such calculi on Hochschild (co)chains in terms of the chosen model. Following Baues–Lemaire we also produce a spectral sequence from a cofibration of weight graded differential graded associative (dga) algebras, of independent interest for computations, and recover a result of B. Keller on the existence of minimal models for associative algebras. Finally, we briefly explain how one could extend the work done here to produce precalculi for algebras over operads and calculi for algebras over cyclic operads.
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**Introduction**

To every associative algebra we may associate its Hochschild homology and cohomology groups. These are a priori graded spaces, but in fact are acted upon by several operads. In the simplest level, Hochschild cohomology is a graded commutative algebra under the cup product, and in fact a Gerstenhaber algebra, and Hochschild homology is a module for both of these algebra structures. It is the case that the Hochschild complex admits higher brace operations [44], generalizing the Gerstenhaber bracket, and the dg operad of such braces along with the cup product is quasi-isomorphic to the dg operad of singular chains on the little disks operad. In this way J. McClure and J. Smith were the first to give, in [44], a solution to Deligne’s conjecture. We remark that that another approach to the conjecture was proposed by D. Tamarkin in [51]. In [23], V. Hinich provided further details to the approach of D. Tamarkin.

As originally observed in [12], there is another operad that acts on Hochschild cohomology and homology, the 2-colored operad Calc of Tamarkin–Tsygan calculi [49, §3.6], and in this paper we focus our attention on giving formulas for the action of it in terms of cofibrant resolutions in Alg, the category of dga algebras with the projective model structure or, what is the same, a homotopy invariant description of the action on the chain level. Initially, we focused our attention on the Gerstenhaber bracket on Hochschild cohomology, originally defined in [17], since computing the resulting Gerstenhaber algebra structure on Hochschild cohomology has been of interest [20, 36, 37, 46, 54], and is agreed to be a non-trivial task; the reason for this nicely explained in [46]. In [45], J. Stasheff gave a definition of the Gerstenhaber bracket of an algebra as the Lie bracket of coderivations of its bar construction, which deserves to be thought of as intrinsic to the category of algebras. Interest for a description of the Tamarkin–Tsygan calculus of an algebra à la Stasheff appears in [57, Remark 7]. We give such a homotopy invariant description of the action of Calc which is intrinsic to Alg. Our result is the following:

**Theorem.** The Tamarkin–Tsygan calculus of an algebra $A$ can be computed using the datum $(V^B, V_B, -, -, [-,-],)$ obtained from a quasi-free model $B = (TV, \partial) \longrightarrow A$ as described in Theorems 2.4, 2.6, 2.8 and 2.10.

More precisely, the space $V_B$ is spanned by forms $\omega = b + b' dv$ where $b, b' \in B$ are scalars and $v \in V$ a coordinate vector and the space $V^B$ is spanned by fields $X = \lambda + f$ where $\lambda \in B$ is a scalar and $f$ is a derivation.

In terms of this pair of complexes,
C1. (Contraction) we have \( \omega(X) = b \lambda + (-1)^{|f||v|+1} b' f v + (-1)^{|\lambda||v|+1} b' \lambda d v, \)

C2. (Product) \( X \circ - = \mu(X \otimes -) \partial_2 \) is obtained from the quadratic part of \( \partial, \)

C3. (Bracket) \([X, -] \) is the Lie bracket of derivations, and

C4. (Boundary) \( d \omega = d b, \) where \( d b \) is expanded by the cyclic Leibniz rule.

In doing so, we argue that it is natural to shift our computational viewpoint of such calculus: when attempting to compute the bracket, for example, one usually proceeds by resolving algebras as bimodules over their enveloping algebras, identifying Hochschild cohomology as an abelian derived functor. Then, one computes comparison maps between the two sided bar resolution and the projective resolution of choice, and then transports the definition of the Gerstenhaber bracket and, more generally, of other operations, to this last resolution. The caveat is that the computation of the comparison maps is quite non-trivial, and is, perhaps, the most complicated step in this procedure. Naturally, there is a preservation of difficulty, since computing cofibrant resolutions in \( \text{Alg} \) is remarkably complicated. The author has solved the problem of computing models of monomial algebras in [52], and using this and some ideas of deformation theory, it is possible to attempt to compute models of certain algebras with a Gröbner basis, although the general description of the minimal model of such algebras is, at the moment, missing. However, it is not impossible to compute models of algebras of interest that admit a Gröbner basis, and we provide an example, following the work of A. Solotar and S. Reca in [40].

**Related work and other approaches to the bracket.** We want to stress the idea of computing invariants of objects by replacing linear resolutions of \( A \) with non-linear resolutions, the *models of \( A \)*, which are internal to \( \text{Alg} \) and, following the philosophy of V. Hinich in [22, §1.2], live in the correct homological level: projective resolutions have, a priori, no extra algebraic structure, being cofibrant replacements in the category of \( A \)-bimodules and not in \( \text{Alg} \), so it is not clear how they can produce a bracket as they appear in the wild. Alternatively, one may choose a free resolution \( P \longrightarrow A \) modeled as a double twisted tensor product \( A \otimes C \otimes A \) over some dg coalgebra \( C \), and then use the dg Lie algebra of coderivations \( \text{Coder}(C) \), or in some other way introduce on projective resolutions some coalgebra structure. This seems to be implicitly done in the article [54], where Y. Volkov uses a diagonal map \( \Delta : P \longrightarrow P \otimes A P \) to lift linear maps \( f : P \longrightarrow A \) to coderivations \( \phi_f : P \longrightarrow P \), and then shows how to compute \([f, g] \) as the projection of the bracket \([\phi_f, \phi_g] \). In some way, the author produces an incomplete “homotopy coalgebra structure” on a projective resolution to com-
pute the bracket as a Lie bracket of coderivations. Formulas for Connes’ boundary, an operator independently discovered by B. Tsygan, are also given.

Another approach is provided by [46], where M. Suárez-Álvarez gives a description of the Lie action of degree one cocycles on Hochschild cohomology through arbitrary projective resolutions, by replacing the functor of linear maps with that of derivations. More precisely, the author’s method of lifting derivations of $A$ to derivations of a projective resolution is equivalent to lifting 1-cocycles of $\text{Der}(B, A)$ to cocycles of $\text{Der}(B)$ to obtain the action of $\text{HH}^1(A)$ on $\text{HH}^*(A)$ if we take $B = \Omega_\infty C$ where $A \otimes C \otimes A \to A$ is a free resolution of $A$ built up form an $A_\infty$-coalgebra $C$ which is $A_\infty$-quasi-isomorphic to $\text{Tor}_A$. The idea of identifying cohomology groups as the derived functor of derivations is already present in [5, 6], while the approach of defining the deformation complex of a monoid with coefficients in a module as a complex of derivations with coefficients is present in [35, §4].

The approach of using an equivalent cochain complex to $\mathcal{C}_A$ to compute the Gerstenhaber bracket is pursued in [36], where C. Negron and S. Witherspoon show how to compute the Gerstenhaber bracket using a resolution $K$ which is, in a way, a subcoalgebra of the double sided bar resolution $A \otimes \pi BA \otimes \pi A$ of $A$. Among other things, it is implicitly shown one may replace $\mathcal{C}_A$ with the complex of derivations on the cobar construction of the Koszul dual of $A$ whenever $A$ is Koszul. This is a particular case of Theorem 2.4, since in this case $\Omega A^i$ is a minimal model of $A$, where $A^i$ is the Koszul dual coalgebra of $A$. As mentioned in [36], this approach fails if $A$ is not Koszul, but this may be fixed by considering $A_\infty$-coalgebras and the $\infty$-cobar construction, instead of dga coalgebras and the usual cobar construction or, what is the same, arbitrary models of $A$.

Finally, we cannot avoid to remark that the first proof of derived invariance of the Gerstenhaber bracket appeared in [10], where B. Keller shows that Hochschild cohomology of $A$ is the Lie algebra associated to the functor that assigns to a commutative dga $R$ the relative derived Picard group of $A$ with respect to $R$, generalizing the interpretation of the first Hochschild cohomology group as the Lie algebra of outer automorphisms of $A$.

**Recent work of Negron, Witherspoon and Volkov.** When discussing the results in a final version of this article with E. Herscovich, we were made aware of the fact the picture in [54] was successfully completed by C. Negron, Y. Volkov and S. Witherspoon in [38] to produce, by homotopy transfer, an $A_\infty$-coalgebra structure on a chosen projective resolution of bimodules. One then observes that the space of derivations on
the $\infty$-cobar construction of this $A_\infty$-coalgebra gives us a dg Lie algebra that computes the Hochschild cohomology of $A$ along with the Gerstenhaber bracket. We point out this is also explained, albeit briefly, in [52, §4.1], and thank Estanislao for pointing us to [38].

The extension to operads and cyclic operads. We believe the arguments laid out here can be extended to produce a similar internal and homotopy invariant description of a suitable version of a Tamarkin–Tsygan precalculus of an algebra over an operad. To obtain a circle action or, what is the same, a calculus, one has to consider the cyclic operads of E. Getzler and M. M. Kapranov [19]. Since they have already addressed the production of the corresponding (co)homological invariants and the analogous ISB sequence relating these, we expect to be able to extend our work to their setting. In the case of quadratic cyclic operads we expect to obtain manageable formulas like the ones appearing here. We remark that, as in the case of classical cyclic homology, operadic cyclic homology arises as the non-abelian derived functor of the one assigning an algebra to the target of the universal invariant bilinear form [19].

Structure. The paper is organized as follows. In Section 1 we recall the classical definitions of Hochschild homology and cohomology, and of cyclic homology. This includes the cup product, the cap product and the Gerstenhaber bracket, along with the boundary of Connes arising from the ISB sequence relating cyclic and Hochschild homology. After this is set up, we recall the basics from [49], where the authors introduced the notion of a precalculus and a calculus, motivated by the classical Cartan calculus on manifolds and its non-commutative analog for associative algebras. In Section 2 we recall the elements of the homotopy theory of dga algebras, in particular the notion of a model of a usual, non-dg associative algebra. With this at hand we give first a way of computing the (co)homology invariants of Section 1 in terms of models, and then give the promised formulas for the Tamarkin-Tsygan calculus of an algebra in terms of these, arriving at the final and main result of this paper. Finally, in Section 3, we give some examples of computations, and introduce a spectral sequence to aid computations in non-monomial situations.

Notation and conventions. In what follows $k$ is a field, and all unadorned $\otimes$ and hom are with respect to this base field. All algebras are non-negatively homologically graded unless stated otherwise, and are defined over the base field.
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1 Classical definitions

In this section we quickly recall the classical definitions of Hochschild homology and cohomology, and cyclic homology of algebras. For details, the reader is referred to [30] and [32].

1.1 Hochschild cohomology and homology

(1.1.1) Let us fix an associative algebra \( A \). We write \( \mathcal{B}(A, A, A) \) for the double sided bar resolution of \( A \), \( \mathcal{B}A \) for the bar construction of \( A \) and \( \pi : \mathcal{B}A \to A \) for the canonical twisting cochain representing the counit \( \varepsilon_A : \Omega \mathcal{B}A \to A \) of the bar–cobar adjunction; this is simply the projection from \( \mathcal{B}A \) to its generators. There is a natural isomorphism induced by the usual adjunction isomorphism

\[
\text{hom}_{A^e}(\mathcal{B}(A, A, A), A) \rightarrow \text{hom}_\pi(\mathcal{B}A, A) =: C^*(A)
\]

where \( \text{hom}_\pi(\mathcal{B}A, A) \) is the twisted hom-complex associated to \( \pi : \mathcal{B}A \to A \). The Hochschild cohomology of \( A \) is the cohomology of this complex, and we denote it by \( \text{HH}^*(A) \). Remark that other authors denote this by \( H^*(A, A) \) or even \( \text{HH}^*(A, A) \).

(1.1.2) In view of its definition, whenever \( A \) is \( \mathbb{k} \)-projective, \( \text{HH}^*(A) \) is an Ext functor, namely, we have a canonical isomorphism \( \text{HH}^*(A) \to \text{Ext}^*_{A^e}(A, A) \), which identifies Hochschild cohomology of \( A \) as an abelian derived functor in the category of \( A \)-bimodules. In particular it has a cup product, \( \cup : \text{HH}^*(A) \otimes \text{HH}^*(A) \to \text{HH}^*(A) \) that makes it into a graded algebra, induced from the composition of maps in the derived category of bimodules or, equivalently, from the Yoneda product on extensions; from an Eckmann-Hilton argument one can deduce immediately that this cup product is, in fact, graded commutative [47]. One may also verify that this map is induced from the coproduct \( \Delta \) of the coalgebra \( \mathcal{B}A \) by the composition

\[
\text{hom}(\mathcal{B}A, A) \otimes \text{hom}(\mathcal{B}A, A) \to \text{hom}(\mathcal{B}A \otimes \mathcal{B}A, A \otimes A) \xrightarrow{\mu \Delta^*} \text{hom}(\mathcal{B}A, A).
\]

(1.1.3) In [17], Gerstenhaber famously introduced his bracket, proving in particular that the cup product of \( \text{HH}^*(A) \) is graded commutative, and endowing \( \text{HH}^*(A) \) with what is known, naturally, as a Gerstenhaber algebra structure. Concretely, he defined a degree \( -1 \) binary operation \( [-,-] \) on the Hochschild complex \( C^*(A) \), the Gerstenhaber bracket, and proved it is it a derivation for the cup product.
One may define this bracket in an intrinsic way as follows, as first observed by J. Stasheff in [45]. The cobar construction $BA$ is the cofree conilpotent coalgebra over $\tilde{sA}$, so there is a natural bijection $A \oplus \text{Coder}(BA) \longrightarrow C^*(A)$ where $\text{Coder}(BA)$ is the dg Lie algebra of coderivations of $BA$. This has its usual Lie bracket, and one can check that under this isomorphism, it gives us the original definition of the Gerstenhaber bracket; for further details see [21, §3.2.9].

Dually, we have an arrow $A \longrightarrow \text{Der}(\Omega BA, A)$ and, if $A \oplus \text{Der}(\Omega BA, A)[-1]$ is its cone shifted to the right, a natural isomorphism

$$A \oplus \text{Der}(\Omega BA, A)[-1] \longrightarrow \text{hom}_\pi(BA, A).$$

This identification presents Hochschild cohomology as a weak form of non-abelian derived functor, since $\Omega BA \longrightarrow A$ is a cofibrant resolution of $A$ in the category of dga algebras. To be more precise, consider the functor $D : \text{Alg}^x \longrightarrow \text{Lie}^x$, that assigns a dga algebra $B$ to the cone of the canonical map $i_B : B \longrightarrow \text{Der} B$. Then Hochschild cohomology is the functor $\text{Ho}(D) : \text{Ho}(\text{Alg})^x \longrightarrow \text{Ho}(\text{Lie})^x$ from the homotopy category of dga algebras and isomorphisms to the homotopy category of dg Lie algebras and isomorphisms; see [22, Theorem 8.5.3].

Dual to the cohomological setting, there is a natural isomorphism

$$A \otimes_{\text{Ae}} B(A, A, A) \longrightarrow A \otimes_{\pi, \pi} BA =: C_*(A)$$

where $C_*(A)$ is the cyclic bar complex of $A$. As our notation suggests, this is the complex $A \otimes BA$ whose differential has been doubly twisted by $\pi : BA \longrightarrow A$: its differential is $b = 1 \otimes \partial_{BA} + [\pi, -]$, where $[\pi, -]$ is the adjoint action of $\text{hom}_\pi(BA, A)$ on $A \otimes BA$. We define the Hochschild homology of $A$ as the homology of $(C_*(A), b)$, and denote it by $\text{HH}_*(A)$. From the definitions, the cap product action of $\text{hom}_\pi(BA, A)$ on $A \otimes_{\pi, \pi} BA$ descends to an action of $\text{HH}^*(A)$ on $\text{HH}_*(A)$, so that $\text{HH}_*(A)$ is an $\text{HH}^*(A)$-module. More generally, if $M$ is an $A$-bimodule, there is a complex $C_*(A, M)$ that computes $\text{H}_*(A, M)$ and is a $\text{hom}_\pi(BA, A)$-module, so this action descends to an $\text{HH}^*(A)$-module structure on $\text{HH}_*(A, M)$. In view of its definition, whenever $A$ is $k$-projective, $\text{H}^*(A, M)$ is a Tor functor, namely, we have a canonical isomorphism $\text{H}_*(A, M) \longrightarrow \text{Tor}^\text{Ae}_*(A, M)$, which identifies Hochschild homology as an abelian derived functor in the category of $A$-bimodules.
1.2 Cyclic homology and the LES of Connes

(1.2.1) Finally, we turn on to the classical definitions of cyclic homology and the long exact sequence relating it to Hochschild homology; it is useful to introduce, in addition to the Hochschild boundary map $b$ in $C_*(A)$, the acyclic Hochschild boundary map $b'$, which is just $b' = \pi - + \partial_{BA} \otimes 1$. As its name suggests, the complex $(C_*(A), b')$ is acyclic whenever $A$ is unital, which we always assume, and gives us a free resolution of $A$ as a left $A$-bimodule.

(1.2.2) For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the cyclic group $\mathbb{Z}/(n+1) = \langle t \rangle$ acts on $A \otimes A^{\otimes n}$ by cyclically permuting its coordinates $t(a_0[a_1] \cdots [a_n]) = (-1)^{n-1} a_n[a_0] \cdots [a_{n-1}]$. One readily checks that if $N = 1 + t + \cdots + t^n$ is the usual norm element of $\mathbb{Z}/(n+1)$, we have that $b'N = bN$ and that $(1-t)b' = b(1-t)$ so we may form a 2-periodic double complex by putting $(C_*(A), b)$ and $(C_*(A), b')$ as columns $(C_*(A), b) \xrightarrow{1-t} (C_*(A), b') \xleftarrow{N} \cdots$. We denote the total complex associated to this double complex by $CC_*(A)$; its homology is the cyclic homology of $A$, and we write it $HC_*(A)$. Remark that in [14], the authors call this the additive $K$-functor of $A$, and denote it $K_*(A)$, shifting the degree up by one, but we will not follow this convention. Note that, by a standard spectral sequence argument, the map from $CC_*(A)$ to the space of coinvariants $(C_*(A), b)/\text{im}(1-t)$ is a quasi-isomorphism when the underlying field $\mathbb{k}$ is of characteristic zero and, in this case, we may compute $CC_*(A)$ as the homology of the invariants of $(C_*(A), b)$.

(1.2.3) Finally, let us recall how Hochschild homology and cyclic homology of an algebra are related by a long exact sequence. The first two columns of the double complex $CC_*(A)$ compute the Hochschild homology groups of $A$, and the quotient of $CC_*(A)$ by this subcomplex is $CC_*(A)[2,0]$, the same double complex shifted to the right. This gives us a long exact sequence, called the ISB-sequence: $S$ is the periodicity map, $I$ arises from the inclusion, and $B$ is the connecting morphism of

$$
\cdots \longrightarrow \text{HH}_*(A) \xrightarrow{I} \text{HC}_*(A) \xrightarrow{S} \text{HC}_{*-2}(A) \xrightarrow{B} \text{HH}_{*-1}(A) \longrightarrow \cdots.
$$

The operator $d := BI : \text{HH}_*(A) \longrightarrow \text{HH}_{*-1}(A)$ is a differential, and we call it Connes’ differential. The relation between the cup product, the cap product, the bracket and this operator is as follows, see [12, 50].

**Proposition 1.1.** Let $A$ be an associative algebra. Then $(\text{HH}^*(A), \langle - , - \rangle)$ is a Gerstenhaber algebra, $(\text{HH}_*(A), \langle - \rangle)$ is a module over $(\text{HH}^*(A), \langle - \rangle)$, and if for each $X \in \text{HH}^*(A)$ we write $i_X$ for the action of $X$, for $Y \in \text{HH}^*(A)$, we have $[[d, i_X], i_Y] = i_{[X,Y]}$. ▸
1.3 The differential graded case

(1.3.1) One may effortlessly extend the definitions above for dga algebras and their dg modules by the judicious use of double complexes that incorporate the internal differential of dga algebras and that of their dg modules. For details, we refer the reader to [32, §7.1] and also to [1, §1,§2].

1.4 Tamarkin–Tsygan calculi

(1.4.1) We can describe all the operators of Proposition 1.1 on the cochain level using the pair of classical complexes \((C^*(A), C_*(A))\) as follows. For cochains \(\varphi, \psi \in C^*(A)\) homogeneous of degrees \(p\) and \(q\) and a chain \(z = a[a_1|\cdots|a_p+q] \in C_*(A)\) of degree \(n = p + q\), the cup product, the cap product, the Lie bracket and Connes’ differential are defined by the following formulas, where \(\circ\) is Gerstenhaber’s circle product:

\[
\begin{align*}
\varphi \cdot \psi &= \mu(\varphi \otimes \psi) \Delta, \\
\varphi \leftarrow z &= a\varphi[a_1|\cdots|a_p][a_{p+1}|\cdots|a_{p+q}] \\
\varphi \leftarrow -z &= (\varphi \circ \varphi) - \varphi \circ (-1)^{(p-1)(q-1)} \varphi \circ \varphi,
\end{align*}
\]

The homology of \((C^*(A), C_*(A), \cdot, \leftarrow, [-,-], d)\) recovers the Tamarkin–Tsygan calculus of the algebra \(A\).

(1.4.2) A precalculus is the data of a pair \((H^*, H_*)\) where \(H^*\) is a Gerstenhaber algebra and \(H_*\) is a graded space which is both a module over \((H^*, \cdot)\), whose action we write \(i\), and a module over \((H_*^+, [-,-])\), whose action we write \(L\), so that for \(X, Y \in H^*\), we have that \([L_X, i_Y] = i_{[X,Y]}\) and \(L_{X \leftarrow Y} = L_X i_Y + (-1)^{|X|} i_Y L_X\). If in addition there is a differential \(d\) on \(H_*\) such that the Cartan formula \([d, i_X] = L_X\) holds, we say that \((H^*, H_*)\) is a calculus.

(1.4.3) There is a 2-colored operad \(\text{Calc}\) whose algebras are the calculi \((H^*, H_*)\), and the result of Proposition 1.1 can be rephrased by saying that for any algebra \(A\), the pair \((HH^*(A), HH_*(A))\) is a \(\text{Calc}\)-algebra. In [27, §11], the authors define topological 2-colored operads that gives rise to the operads \(\text{Precalc}\) and \(\text{Calc}\) by taking homology, which act on the pair \((C^*(A), C_*(A))\), in this way providing a refinement of the Deligne conjecture. Concretely, if \(C\) is the operad of compactifications of configuration spaces of points in 2-space and if \(D\) is that of points in once punctured 2-space, \((C, D)\) is a topological 2-colored operad and \((H(C), H(D))\) is \(\text{Precalc}\), while taking a semi-direct product \(D \rtimes S^1\) introduces Connes’ boundary and gives rise to \(\text{Calc}\).
2 Homotopy invariant description of the calculus

2.1 Models of associative algebras

(2.1.1) Let us write $\text{Alg}$ for the category of dga algebras, and pick an algebra $A$ in it. A surjective quasi-isomorphism $B \rightarrow A$ is model of $A$. One calls $B$ a model of $A$, without explicit mention to the map $B \rightarrow A$ which is usually understood from context. We say a model is minimal if $B$ is

1. quasi-free: as a graded algebra, $B$ is free over a space $V$,
2. triangulated: there is a gradation $V = \bigoplus_{j \geq 1} V(j)$ such that for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that $d(V^{(j+1)}) \subseteq T(V^{(\leq j)})$, and
3. its differential is decomposable, that is, $d(V) \subseteq (TV)^{\geq 2}$.

There is a model structure on $\text{Alg}$ whose weak equivalences are quasi-isomorphisms, the fibrations are the degree-wise surjections, and the cofibrant algebras are the retracts of triangulated quasi-free algebras; see [53]. In particular, minimal algebras are cofibrant, and may be used to cofibrantly resolve objects in $\text{Alg}$.

(2.1.2) Minimal models of algebras, when they exist, are unique up to unique isomorphism, meaning that any solid diagram where the diagonal arrows are minimal models, can be uniquely completed to a homotopy commutative triangle where the vertical dashed map is an isomorphism in $\text{Alg}$. One can readily check that non-negatively graded dga algebras, and in particular usual associative algebras concentrated in degree zero, admit minimal models. For brevity, we will use the term model to speak about triangulated quasi-free algebras with homology concentrated in degree zero.

(2.1.3) We say a functor with source $\text{Alg}$ is homotopy invariant if it factors through the projection $\text{Alg} \rightarrow \text{Ho}(\text{Alg})$. The work of B. Keller [24, 25], and later of B. Keller and M. Armenta [2, 3] shows that the Tamarkin–Tsygan calculus of an algebra is derived invariant. Our result will provide explicit formulas for computations. Since homotopy equivalent algebras are derived equivalent, the invariance is already known: our contribution consists of computing such calculus using a choice of resolution in $\text{Alg}$. It would be interesting to find similar formulas for the action of the topological 2-colored operads of M. Kontsevich and Y. Soibelman on the pair $(C^*(A), C_*(A))$, but so far we have not pursued this line of work.
2.2 Models of monomial algebras

(2.2.1) In [52], we obtain a description of the minimal model of any monomial quiver algebra. Concretely, the model is free over the quiver with arrows the chains, also known as overlappings or ambiguities of the algebra, and the differential is given by deconcatenation. If $\gamma$ is a chain of length $r$, a decomposition of it is a sequence $(\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n)$ of chains of lengths $r_1, \ldots, r_n$ so that their concatenation, in this order, is $\gamma$, and $r - 1 = r_1 + \cdots + r_n$. What follows is the main result of [52].

Theorem. For each monomial algebra $A$ there is a minimal model $B \longrightarrow A$ where $B = (\Omega_\infty \text{Tor}_A(k, k), d)$ is the $\infty$-cobar construction on $\text{Tor}_A(k, k)$. The differential $d$ is such that for a chain $\gamma \in \text{Tor}_A(k, k)$,

$$d\gamma = -\sum_{n \geq 2} (-1)^{\binom{n+1}{2} + |\gamma_1|} \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_n,$$

where the sum ranges through all possible decompositions of $\gamma$. ▲

Observe that the differential is manifestly decomposable, and that the gradation on $\text{Tor}_A$ provides us with a triangulation of $B$, so that indeed $B$ is minimal.

2.3 Hochschild cohomology and homology

We now record the following proposition, which we will use to compute Hochschild (co)homology through models. The final result relies on two elementary homological tools: the Acyclic Assembly Lemma and the fact that free algebras have trivial Hochschild (co)homology in degrees larger or equal than two for any choice of coefficients. These are Lemma 2.7.3 and Proposition 9.1.6 in [55].

Proposition 2.1. Let $C$ be a first quadrant double complex and assume that for every $q \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $H_{\geq 2}(C_{*,q}, d_{\text{hor}}) = 0$. Let $f : C_{*, \geq 2} \longrightarrow C_{*, \leq 1, [1,0]}$ be the map induced by the horizontal differential $d_{*,2}$. Then $\text{Tot}(C)$ is naturally quasi-isomorphic to the totalization of the cokernel of $f$.

Proof. The hypothesis guarantees that $\ker f$ has acyclic rows, so it follows that the complex $\text{Tot}(\ker f)$ is acyclic. Observe, moreover, that $\text{cone}(f) = C$. There is an exact sequence $0 \longrightarrow \text{Tot}(\ker f) \longrightarrow \text{Tot}(C) \longrightarrow \text{Tot}(\text{coker}(f)) \longrightarrow 0$ so the long exact sequence shows that $\pi$ induces an isomorphism on homology. ▲
**Theorem 2.2.** Suppose that $B \longrightarrow A$ is a model of $A$, and let $\Omega_B$ be the cokernel of the boundary map $C_2(B) \longrightarrow C_1(B)$ in the complex computing $\text{HH}^*(B)$. Then $\text{HH}^*(A)$ is the homology of the cone of the map $\Omega_B \longrightarrow B$ induced from $C_1(B) \longrightarrow C_0(B)$. Dually, taking $\text{Der}(B)$ the kernel of the map $C^1(B) \longrightarrow C^2(B)$ in the complex computing $\text{HH}^*(B)$, we have that $\text{HH}^*(A)$ is the cohomology of the cone of $B \longrightarrow \text{Der}(B)$.

**Proof.** Since $B \longrightarrow A$ is a quasi-isomorphism, it is immediate that the columns of the double complex $C_*(B)_* \longrightarrow C_*(A)_0$ are acyclic, which shows that there is a quasi-isomorphism obtained by totalization that induces an isomorphism

$$H_* (\text{Tot}(C_*(B)_*)) = \text{HH}_*(B) \longrightarrow \text{HH}_*(A).$$

Moreover, since free algebras have trivial Hochschild homology in degrees greater than one, the double complex $C_*(B)_* \longrightarrow C_*(A)_0$ satisfies the hypothesis of Proposition 2.1, giving the first claim. The claim for Hochschild cohomology is proven in an analogous fashion, but requires a two step argument since $C^*(B)$ is not functorial in $B$: what we have are quasi-isomorphisms $C^*(B,B) \longrightarrow C^*(B,A)$ and $C^*(A,A) \longrightarrow C^*(B,A)$ induced by the map $B \longrightarrow A$.

(2.3.1) It is worthwhile to observe that since $H_* (B) = H_0(B) = A$, there is a four term exact sequence $0 \longrightarrow \text{HH}_1(A) \longrightarrow H_0(\Omega_B) \longrightarrow H_0(B) \longrightarrow \text{HH}_0(A) \longrightarrow 0$ and it is straightforward to check that the image of the middle arrow is $[A,A] \subseteq A = H_0(B)$, which recovers the usual description of $\text{HH}_0(A)$. Moreover, we see that $\text{HH}_1(A)$ is the kernel of this map, and that for $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$, $\text{HH}_n(A) = \text{HH}_{n-1}(\Omega_B)$. Dually, we have that $\text{HH}^n(A) = H^{-n}(B \oplus \text{Der}(B)[-1]) = H^{n+1}(\text{Der}(B))$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$, and a four term exact sequence $0 \longrightarrow \text{HH}^0(A) \longrightarrow H^0(B) \overset{j^*}{\longrightarrow} H^0(\text{Der}(B)) \longrightarrow \text{HH}^1(A) \longrightarrow 0$, shows that $\text{HH}^1(A) = H^0(\text{Der}(B))/\text{im}(j^*)$. A far-reaching generalization of this, explaining the relation of operadic cohomology and Hochschild cohomology of operads under reasonable homotopical hypotheses is present in [42, Theorem 1.3.8].

(2.3.2) It also worthwhile to note that we can use the resolution $B \longrightarrow A$ in only one argument to obtain complexes with smaller coefficients — in $A$ instead of $B$ — in order to compute $\text{HH}_*(A)$ and $\text{HH}^*(A)$. This allows us to compute (co)homology with a smaller complex, and then lift generators to the large complexes to perform computations with brackets, for example. Precisely, we have the following result. We point the reader to [43] for the case of commutative algebras, and remark one can state the result, under reasonable hypotheses, for derivations of algebras over operads.
**Theorem 2.3.** The induced map on cones of the commutative diagrams

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\Omega_B & \longrightarrow & B \\
\downarrow \Omega_{1,a} & & \downarrow \alpha \\
\Omega_{B,A} & \longrightarrow & A \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
B & \longrightarrow & \text{Der}(B) \\
\downarrow \alpha & & \downarrow \alpha_* \\
A & \longrightarrow & \text{Der}(B, A) \\
\end{array}
\]

are quasi-isomorphisms. Moreover, when \( B \) is the bar-cobar resolution of \( A \), there are isomorphisms \( L_{B,A} := A \oplus \text{Der}(B, A)[-1] \longrightarrow \text{hom}(BA, A) \) and \( BA \otimes A \longrightarrow \Omega_{B,A}[1] \oplus A \).

**Proof.** The first assertion follows immediately from the fact that \( \alpha \), and thus \( \Omega_{1,a} \) and \( \text{Der}(1, \alpha) \), are quasi-isomorphisms. The second is a particular case of Lemma 2.5 when \( B = \Omega BA \longrightarrow A \) for which \( V = BA \).

\[\blacksquare\]

### 2.4 Cup product, cap product and the bracket

(2.4.1) The space of derivations \( \text{Der}(B) \), which we will write \( X_B \) and call the space of nc-vector fields on \( B \), is a dg Lie algebra under the usual bracket between derivations, with differential \( [\partial, -] \). We can now state the next theorem, which tells us that to compute Gerstenhaber brackets in \( A \) we may do so by choosing any model \( B \) of \( A \) and computing the usual Lie bracket in \( X_B \). We point out that this is a special case of [22, Theorem 8.5.3], and what we will do here is collect the details of V. Hinich’s proof, which are stated in the general language of operads and model categories, and for this reason might have gone unnoticed to non-experts.

**Theorem 2.4.** The Lie bracket of \( X_B \) is compatible with the Lie bracket of \( \text{HH}^*(A) \). More precisely, we have a functor \( \text{Ho(Alg)}^\times \longrightarrow \text{Ho(Lie)}^\times \) such that \( B \longmapsto X_B \) between the homotopy category of dga algebras to the homotopy category of dg Lie algebras.

We remark that Theorem 8.5.3 is stated for the category of dg algebras over a \( \Sigma \)-split operad \( \mathcal{O} \). We will content ourselves with the case of the associative operad, since the proof in this case does not differ from the general proof.

**Proof.** Let us consider two models \( B \longrightarrow A \) and \( B' \longrightarrow A \). Since \( B \) and \( B' \) are cofibrant, we have a map \( \alpha : B \longrightarrow B' \) that factors one model through the other. This in turn gives us a cospan \( X_B \overset{\alpha_*}{\longrightarrow} X_{B',B} \overset{\alpha^*}{\longleftarrow} X_{B'} \), and the first claim is that both of these arrows are quasi-isomorphisms.
To see this, recall that $X_{B,-} = \text{Der}(B, -)$ is represented by $\Omega^1_B$, which one can check is cofibrant in $B$-modules whenever $B$ is a cofibrant dg algebra. This implies that $\alpha_*$ is a quasi-isomorphism, since $\alpha$ is one and $\Omega_B$ is cofibrant. To see that $\alpha^*$ is a quasi-isomorphism, we note that it is represented by a map $\alpha!(\Omega^1_B') \longrightarrow \Omega^1_B$ which, again, one checks is a quasi-isomorphism of cofibrant $B$-modules.

At this point, we have not connected $X_B$ and $X_{B'}$ through quasi-isomorphisms of Lie algebras, since $X_{B',B}$ is only a Lie module. To do this, let us consider $X_\alpha$ the dg Lie subalgebra of $X_B$ consisting of derivations that preserve $I = \ker \alpha$, note this is the pullback of the cospan above. We then have an inclusion $i : X_\alpha \longrightarrow X_B$ and a map $\pi : X_\alpha \longrightarrow X_{B'}$ obtained by sending a derivation on $B$ vanishing on $I$ to the derivation it induces on $B'$. In this way we obtain a span $X_{B'} \leftarrow X_\alpha \longrightarrow X_B$ and the claim is that $i$ is an injective quasi-isomorphism while $\pi$ is a surjective quasi-isomorphism. Indeed, the kernel of $\pi$ consists of derivations $B \longrightarrow I$, and since $I$ is acyclic, such space of derivations is too. Finally, since what we have that $\alpha_* i = \alpha^* \pi$ and all but one of these arrows is a quasi-isomorphism, the map $i$ is also a quasi-isomorphism.

Moreover, the maps $i$ and $\pi$ are of dg Lie algebras, so that the homotopy type of $X_B$ and that of $X_{B'}$ is the same, and we have a map $\pi i^{-1} : X_B \longrightarrow X_{B'}$ in the homotopy category of dg Lie algebras which is an isomorphism. This proves that the bracket of $X_B$ and of $X_{B'}$ is independent of our choice of model of $A$. Moreover, we know that the choice $B = \Omega BA$ gives us the Gerstenhaber bracket. Note that we have not showed that the assignent $\alpha \longmapsto \pi i^{-1}$ is functorial. This is done in [22], and follows by taking pullbacks involving $X_\alpha$ and $X_\beta$ and using similar arguments as those above, among other details. This concludes the proof of the theorem.

(2.4.2) We now address the computation of the cup product in $\text{HH}^*(A)$ and the action of $\text{HH}^*(A)$ on $\text{HH}_*(A)$ through models. The following lemma, which is straightforward, will be of use for this.

**Lemma 2.5.** Let $B \longrightarrow A$ be a model of the form $B = (TV, d)$, and write $i : V \longrightarrow B$ for the inclusion. Then we have isomorphisms of complexes

$$i^* : \text{Der}(B) \longrightarrow \text{hom}(V, B), \quad i_* : B \otimes V \longrightarrow \Omega_B$$

that assign a derivation $f : B \longrightarrow B$ to its restriction $fi$ and $b \otimes v$ to the class of $bdv$.

**Proof.** Since $B$ is free, any derivation $f : B \longrightarrow B$ is determined by its restriction to $V$, and $i^*$ is a bijection. Since $B$ is generated by $V$, the Leibniz rule guarantees that the
arrow \( i_* : V \otimes B \to \Omega_B \) is still surjective, and because \( V \) is free in \( B \), the arrow is injective. This is simply the dual statement to the one involving derivations. To be more precise, let us recall that \( \Omega^1_B \) is the free \( B \)-bimodule over \( dB \cong B \) modulo the relation \( ad(bb')c = adbb'c + abdb'c \) for all \( a, b, b', c \in B \). It is easy to see that the map \( B \otimes_B \Omega^1_B \to \Omega_B \) such that \( b \otimes ad b' c \mapsto (−1)^{\varepsilon} cbadb' \) is an isomorphism, where \( \varepsilon = |c|(|a| + |b| + |b'|) \). Since \( B \otimes_B \Omega^1_B \) represents the same functor as \( B \otimes V \) on \( k \)-vector spaces, we obtain our claim.

(2.4.3) In view of this lemma, the complexes \( \Omega^+ = V_+ \otimes B \) and \( X^+_B = \text{hom}(V^+, B) \) where \( V_+ = \mathbb{k} \oplus V[1] \) and \( V^+ = V[−1] \oplus \mathbb{k} \) compute Hochschild homology and cohomology of \( A \), respectively. Their differentials are obtained from the previous isomorphisms and the cone operation. What we have done is incorporate an internal differential on the complex \( 0 \to TV \otimes V \to TV \to 0 \) computing Hochschild homology of the free algebra \( TV \) to compute that of \( (TV, d) \). Dually, we have incorporated an internal differential on the complex \( 0 \to V \to \text{hom}(V, TV) \to 0 \) which computes the Hochschild cohomology of \( TV \).

(2.4.4) Recall there is an action \( C_*(B) \to \text{End}(C_*(B)) \) that induces the cap product, and we now proceed to describe it in terms of the two smaller complexes above. In the non dg setting, the complexes of the previous paragraph which compute Hochschild homology and cohomology of free algebras are paired in an obvious way, and this pairing gives the action of Hochschild cohomology on Hochschild homology. The corresponding result in the dg setting is the following.

**Theorem 2.6.** Let \( B = (TV, d) \) be a quasi-free model of \( A \), and let \( \omega = b + b'dv \) be a form in \( \Omega^+ \) and \( X = \lambda + f \) a field in \( X^+_B \). In terms of the identifications of the previous lemma, the map \( X^+_B \to \text{End}(\Omega_B^+) \) such that \( \omega(X) = b\lambda + (-1)^{|f||b'+1|} b'fv + (-1)^{|\lambda|} b'd\lambda v \) gives the contraction operator on Hochschild homology.

**Proof.** These are simply the usual formulas on \( C_*(B) \) and \( C_*(B) \), truncated according to the results of Proposition 2.1 and Theorem 2.2. The isomorphisms of Lemma 2.5 give the last claim, and one can readily check that \( \partial(\omega X) = (\partial\omega)(X) + (-1)^{|\omega|}\omega(\partial X) \), so we have a well defined action on homology.

(2.4.5) If the base field \( \mathbb{k} \) is of positive characteristic \( p \), and if \( A \) is a \( \mathbb{k} \)-algebra, we can also recover the restricted Lie algebra structure in \( \text{HH}^*(A) \) by using the \( p \)th power map on derivations of the model. We recall from \([56]\) that when \( p = 2 \) the whole space \( \text{HH}^*(A) \) inherits the structure of a restricted Lie algebra, and when \( p > 2 \), we
only consider $\text{HH}^{\text{odd}}(A)$. We then have the following result, which again is a weak form of the known result of derived invariance of loc. cit. The author of that paper attributes the result for $B = \Omega BA$ to B. Keller.

**Theorem 2.7.** The $p$-operation on $\text{HH}^\ast(A)$ if $p = 2$, respectively on $\text{HH}^{\text{odd}}(A)$ if $p \neq 2$, is induced from the Frobenius map on $B \oplus \text{Der}(B)[-1]$.

**Proof.** From Proposition 4.3 in [56] we know that the claim is true for Coder$(BA)$, that is, the $p$th power map on coderivations induces the restricted Lie algebra structure in both cases. The same argument as that in Theorem 2.4, identifying $\text{Der}(\Omega BA, A)$ with Coder$(BA)$, gives the claim for an arbitrary model $B$ of $A$. □

(2.4.6) Finally, we recall that the cup product operation on $\text{HH}^\ast(A)$ is induced from the quadratic part of the differential of $B$. This is well known, and we give a proof now, and point the reader to [28]. In fact, the differential of $B$ induces a finer $A_\infty$-algebra structure on $X_B$, and we have the following result. We will extend this to a $B_\infty$-algebra structure on $X_B$ in the next subsection.

**Theorem 2.8.** Suppose that $B = (TV, d) \longrightarrow A = (TW, d)$ is a quasi-isomorphism of quasi-free dga algebras. Then the cospan $\text{hom}(V, B) \longrightarrow \text{hom}(V, A) \leftarrow \text{hom}(W, A)$ consists of maps quasi-isomorphisms so that $\alpha^\ast$ is a strict map of $A_\infty$-algebras, while $\alpha^\ast$ can be extended to a non-strict map of $A_\infty$-algebras. In particular, the cup product on Hochschild cohomology is homotopy invariant.

(2.4.7) Remark than when $B = \Omega BA$, so that $V = \overline{BA}$, the quadratic part $d_2$ coincides with the reduced comultiplication $\Delta : \overline{BA} \longrightarrow \overline{BA} \otimes \overline{BA}$, and this gives us the usual definition of the cup product.

### 2.5 Homotopy bialgebra structure on nc-vector fields

(2.5.1) Let $V$ be a graded vector space. A $B_\infty$-algebra structure on $V$ is the datum of a structure of dg bialgebra on $T(V[1])$ where the comultiplication is given by deconcatenation. It follows that the data required to define such structure amounts to a differential on $T(V[1])$, which gives $V$ the structure of an $A_\infty$-algebra, along with a multiplication on $T(V[1])$. The fact this is a map of coalgebras means it is completely determined by a map $T(V[1]) \otimes T(V[1]) \longrightarrow V[1]$. These define, for each $(p, q) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$, a map $\mu_{p,q} : V^\otimes p \otimes V^\otimes q \longrightarrow V$ of degree $1 - p - q$. 
(2.5.2) Let \( B \) be a quasi-free dga algebra. We proceed to show that its space of nc-vector fields admits a \( B_\infty \)-structure. We have already noted it is equipped with an \( A_\infty \)-structure, so it suffices we define the family of maps corresponding to the multiplication. We will show, as it similarly happens for Hochschild cochains, that we can arrange it so that for each \( (p, q) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \) we have \( \mu_{p,q} = 0 \) whenever \( q > 1 \).

(2.5.3) For linear maps \( f_1, \ldots, f_n, g \), we define \([f_1, \ldots, f_n]g\) as follows. Let \( \text{sh}(f_1, \ldots, f_n) \) be the unique derivation on \( B \) that acts by zero on monomials of length less than \( n \), and acts, for \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) on monomials of length \( n + k \) by the sum \( \sum_{\sigma} \sigma(f_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes f_n \otimes 1 \otimes k) \) as \( \sigma \) runs through \( (n, k) \)-shuffles in \( S_{n+k} \). If \( G \) is the derivation that corresponds to \( g \), we set \([f_1, \ldots, f_n]g\) to be the linear map corresponding to the derivation \( \text{sh}(f_1, \ldots, f_n) \circ g \).

(2.5.4) We recall from [18] that if \( A \) is an associative algebra, there are brace operations defined on \( C^*(A) \) that make it, along with its usual structure of a dga algebra, into a \( B_\infty \)-algebra. Concretely, for each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and for homogeneous \( f, g_1, \ldots, g_n \in C^*(A) \) with \( |f| = k \), we have that \( f\{g_1, \ldots, g_n\} = f(\text{sh}(g_1, \cdots, g_n, 1 \otimes (k-n))) \). In other words, we are inserting \( g_1, \ldots, g_n \) into \( f \) in all possible ways preserving their order. For example, \( f\{g\} \) is the circle product whose antisymmetrization gives the bracket.

### 2.6 Cyclic homology and Connes’ boundary

(2.6.1) Recall from Section 2.3 that if \( \alpha : B \longrightarrow A \) is a model of \( A \), there is an arrow \( \Omega_B \longrightarrow B \) whose cone computes \( \text{HH}_*(A) \). The universal derivation \( d : B \longrightarrow \Omega_B \) induces a map \( \overline{d} : B \longrightarrow \Omega_B \) in such a way that the composition of two consecutive arrows in the diagram \( B \leftarrow \Omega_B \leftarrow B \leftarrow \Omega_B \leftarrow \cdots \) is zero. This may be arranged this into a 2-periodic double complex \( C_{*,*}(B) \) using the internal grading of \( B \). We will also use the identification of \( \Omega_B \) with \( V \otimes B \) when dealing with cyclic homology of \( A \), and the following result of [14]. It exhibits cyclic homology as a non-abelian derived functor \( \text{Alg} \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}\text{-Mod} \) in the sense of Quillen, and is of course useful when one can exhibit an explicit model of \( A \) that allows for computations.

**Theorem 2.9** (Feigin–Tsygan). The complex \( \text{Tot}(C_{*,*}(B)) \) computes the cyclic homology of \( A \). Moreover, if the underlying ring \( \mathbb{k} \) is of characteristic zero, the double complex \( C_{*,*}(B) \) is such that for every \( q \in \mathbb{N}_0 \), \( H_{q+1}(C_{*,q}(B), d_{\text{hor}}) = 0 \). It follows that \( \text{HC}_{*}(A) \) is the homology of the abelianization \( B/[B, B] \) of \( B \).

(2.6.2) We now address the computation of Connes’ long exact sequence, or ISB-sequence, through a model of an algebra, and of Connes’ operator \( d \) on \( \text{HH}_*(A) \). The
double complex which computes $\text{HH}_\ast(A)$ is a sub-double complex $C'_\ast,\ast(B)$ of $C_\ast,\ast(B)$. This gives an exact sequence $0 \longrightarrow C'_\ast,\ast(B) \longrightarrow C_\ast,\ast(B) \longrightarrow C_\ast,\ast(B)[2,0] \longrightarrow 0$. Our result is the following, the reader can compare our last claim with Propositions 2.2.3 and 2.2.4 in [30].

**Theorem 2.10.** The long exact homology sequence associated to the totalization of the exact sequence in (2.6.2) is Connes’ exact sequence, and $d : \text{HH}_\ast(A) \longrightarrow \text{HH}_{\ast+1}(A)$ corresponds to the operator $d : \Omega_B^1 \longrightarrow \Omega_B^1$ of degree $+1$ such that $d(b + b'dv) = db$. More explicitly, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $b \in B$ of the form $b = v_0v_1 \cdots v_n$,

$$db = \sum_{i=0}^{n} (-1)^\varepsilon v_{i+1} \cdots v_n v_0 \cdots v_{i-1} dv_i$$

**Proof.** Our first claim follows from the fact all the constructions are functorial in $B$, and the work of [14]. The second claim follows from the explicit construction of the connecting morphism of the exact sequence obtained from the totalization of the sequence of (2.6.2). We observe that since $d$ vanishes on commutators and commutes with the internal differential of $V_B$, it is a map of complexes. To see the last formula holds, we recall that in $\Omega_B^1$ there is a cyclic Leibniz rule: for $a, b, c \in B$ we have that $ad(bc) = abdc + (-1)^{|a||b|+|c|}cadb$ so, by induction, we obtain the desired formula for $d$. The sign $\varepsilon$ corresponding to the term $v_{i+1} \cdots v_n v_0 \cdots v_{i-1} dv_i$ is $\left(|v_{i+1}| + \cdots + |v_n|\right)\left(|v_0| + \cdots + |v_i|\right)$. ▶

### 2.7 Homotopy invariance and the final result

(2.7.1) It is well known [48] that if two algebras $A$ and $A'$ have equivalent derived categories then their Hochschild cohomology groups are isomorphic as graded algebras. In [25] it was shown that they are in fact isomorphic as Gerstenhaber algebras, and further in [24] that the Hochschild cochain complexes of $A$ and $A'$ are isomorphic in the homotopy category of $B_\infty$-algebras. It was further shown in [2] that the cap product action of Hochschild cohomology on Hochschild homology is derived invariant, and finally in [3] that the same is true for the Tamarkin–Tsygan calculus of such pair. However, actually computing such calculus is markedly difficult, and we hope that our work provides with tools to attack this problem.

(2.7.2) We recall from [22] that if two dg algebras are quasi-isomorphic, then their derived categories are equivalent, and this equivalence is established by the pair of adjoint functors obtained by deriving the adjoint pair of pull-back and push-forward
functors, so that homotopy invariance is weaker than the derived invariance result of B. Keller and M. Armenta. We remark, again, that the result for cyclic homology, for example, was already known to B. Feigin and B. Tsygan, and that our interest is not on the invariance of such structures, but rather on their computation through models. Naturally, the computation of models of algebras is a non-trivial step in our program; the work done in [52] and the conjectural method suggested there for algebras with a Gröbner basis should help to do this. We now merely record here the main result of these notes.

**Theorem 2.11.** The Tamarkin–Tsygan calculus of an algebra $A$ can be computed using the datum $(V^B, V_B, \sim, [-, -], d)$ obtained from a model $B \rightarrow A$ as described in Theorems 2.4, 2.6, 2.8 and 2.10.

### 2.8 Duality of calculi

(2.8.1) In [21], E. Herscovich fixes an augmented weight graded connected dg algebra $A$ and proceeds to show that, writing $E A$ the dual of the dg coalgebra $B A$, the Tamarkin–Tsygan calculi of $A$ and $E A$ are dual to each other. In the same context, let us pick a quasi free model $(TV, d) = B \rightarrow A$ of $A$, where $V$ is a weight graded connected $A_\infty$-coalgebra. It then makes sense to consider the Tamarkin–Tsygan calculus of the $A_\infty$-algebra $E A = (sV)^\#$. From our main theorem, one obtains the, now tautological, extension of Herscovich’s result.

**Theorem 2.12.** The Tamarkin–Tsygan calculi of $A$ and $E A$ are dual to each other.

**Proof.** We already know that to compute the Tamarkin–Tsygan calculus of $A$ we may use nc-fields and nc-forms obtained from $B$. To compute the Tamarkin–Tsygan calculus of $E A$, we may use a quasi-free dg model of the dg coalgebra $B_\infty E A$ and nc-cofields, that is, coderivations, and nc-coforms on it: this is just the classical definition. These two constructions are dual to each other: the space $\text{hom}(B_\infty E A, E A)$ is isomorphic to $\text{hom}(V, TV)$ while $B_\infty E A \otimes E A$ is dual to $V \otimes TV$, and as explained in [21], or by direct inspection, these isomorphisms are compatible with the cup and cap products, the Lie bracket, and Connes’ boundary.
3 Computations, a spectral sequence and comments

3.1 Monomial examples

We now give two examples where, in the spirit of [16], we compute Hochschild cohomology of an algebra $A$ using a (minimal) model of it. We will also compute, in some cases, Hochschild homology and cyclic homology, and the action of Hochschild cohomology on Hochschild homology using the results of the previous sections.

A crown quiver algebra. Let us consider the quiver as in the next figure with the single relation $\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \cdots \alpha_r \alpha_1$, and its associated algebra $A$. In [41], the authors compute its Hochschild cohomology, including the Gerstenhaber bracket and the cup product. We will recover their results using the minimal model of $A$.

(3.1.1) We begin by noting that for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that $\text{Tor}^{n+1}_A$ is one dimensional generated by the class of the chain $\varepsilon_n = [\alpha_1 | \alpha_2 \cdots \alpha_r \alpha_1 | \cdots | \alpha_2 \cdots \alpha_r \alpha_1]$ while, as usual, $\text{Tor}^1_A$ is generated by the arrows. The minimal model has then $r$ generators in degree 0, and we write $\varepsilon_0$ the one corresponding to $[\alpha_1]$, and for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ a generator $\varepsilon_n$ in degree $n$ whose differential is, by the main result of [52], as follows:

$$\partial(\varepsilon_n) = \sum_{s+t=n-1} (-1)^s \varepsilon_s \alpha_2 \cdots \alpha_r \varepsilon_t.$$

We are intentionally suppressing the sign given by the binomial coefficient since in this case there is exactly one non-vanishing higher coproduct, $\Delta_{r+1}$. In particular, there is no $\Delta_2$ for weight degree reasons, so that the cup product structure of $\text{HH}^*(A)$ is trivial.

(3.1.2) To find $\text{HH}^*(A)$, observe that for each natural number $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ there is an obvious cycle $f_n$ of degree $-n$ in $\text{Der}(B, A)$ such that $f_n(\varepsilon_n) = \varepsilon_0$, and one can check, as it is done in [41], that it provides a generator for $\text{HH}^{n+1}(A)$, which is therefore one dimensional. We will now find a derivation of $B$ that covers $f_n$ under $\alpha : B \longrightarrow A$, and then compute the Gerstenhaber bracket with these cycles: since the arrow $\alpha_*$ is a quasi-isomorphism, we deduce that these cycles represent generators for the cohomology groups of $\text{Der}(B)$.
(3.1.3) To do this, let us fix \( n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \) and let \( F \) be a derivation of degree \(-n\) such that \( F(\epsilon_n) = \epsilon_0 \). Recursively solving for the values of \( F \) on generators using the equation 
\[
\partial F = (-1)^n F \partial,
\]
shows that the following works:
\[
F_{2n}(\epsilon_t) = (t - 2n + 1) \epsilon_{t-2n}, \quad F_{2n+1}(\epsilon_t) = \begin{cases} 
\epsilon_{t-2n-1}, & \text{for } t \text{ odd} \\
0, & \text{for } t \text{ even.}
\end{cases}
\]

With this choice of generators of \( \text{HH}^*(A) \), we compute that
\[
[F_m, F_n] = \begin{cases} 
(m - n)F_{m+n}, & \text{for } m, n \text{ even,} \\
0, & \text{for } m, n \text{ odd,} \\
mF_{m+n}, & \text{for } n \text{ even, } m \text{ odd.}
\end{cases}
\]

(3.1.4) This coincides with the formulas obtained in [41]. However, observe that since we are using the natural grading in \( \text{Der}(B) \), the derivations in odd degree represent elements of even degree in \( \text{HH}^*(A) \), and those of even degree represent elements of odd degree in \( \text{HH}^*(A) \), which explains the shift in our formulas.

(3.1.5) Note that since \( B \) has no quadratic part in its differential, the cup product structure in \( \text{HH}^*(A) \) is trivial. This means, in particular, that the Gerstenhaber algebra structure on \( \text{HH}^*(A) \) is independent of the parameter \( r \), but one can check that the higher products can be used to distinguish them: the \( A_\infty \)-structures on Hochschild cohomology are not quasi-isomorphic for distinct parameters, which shows in particular that these algebras are not derived equivalent.

(3.1.6) We now observe that \( \text{HC}^*_*(A) \) is easily computable by means of Theorem 2.9. Let us begin by noting that since \( B \) is quasi-free, the space \( B^{ab} \) is spanned by equivalence classes of cyclic words in \( B \) with respect to cyclic shifts. Moreover, the differential of \( B \) in (3.1.1) lands in \([B, B] \): this follows from the fact that \( \epsilon_n \) lies in the commutator subspace, and the differential preserves it, hence we deduce that \( \text{HC}^*_*(A) = B^{ab} \).

**A non-3-Koszul algebra.** Let us consider the following quiver \( Q \) with relations \( R = \{ xy^2, y^2z \} \). We will compute its minimal model and with it its Hochschild cohomology, including the bracket. We will also compute the cup product; since the coproduct on \( \text{Tor}_A \) is non-vanishing only on the generator which we call \( \Gamma \), this computation is straightforward.
(3.1.7) By the main result in [52], the algebra \( A = kQ/(xy^2, y^2z) \) has minimal model \( B \) given by the free algebra over \( k \) with set of homogeneous generators \( \{x, y, z, \alpha, \beta, \Gamma, \Lambda\} \) such that \( \partial \) vanishes on \( \{x, y, z\} \) while

\[ \partial \alpha = xy^2, \quad \partial \beta = y^2z, \quad \partial \Gamma = \alpha z - x\beta, \quad \partial \Lambda = xy\beta - \alpha yz \]

Here \( \Gamma \) corresponds to the overlap \( xy^2z \) while \( \Lambda \) corresponds to the overlap \( xy^3z \), and \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) correspond to the relations they cover under the differential \( \partial \) of the model, so that \( x, y \) and \( z \) are in degree 0, \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) in degree 1, and \( \Gamma \) and \( \Lambda \) in degree 2. Thus \( B \) is the path algebra of the dg quiver in the next figure.

(3.1.8) The elements in \( B \) are the following, where \( r, t \) are elements of \( \{0, 1\} \) and \( s \in \mathbb{N}_0 \):

- **degree zero**: \( x^r y^s z^t \),
- **degree one**: \( \alpha y^s z^t, x^r y^t \beta \),
- **degree two**: \( \Gamma, \Lambda, \alpha y^s \beta \).

Since we know that \( \text{Tor}^{\geq 4}_A \) is zero, it follows that \( \text{HH}^{\geq 4}(A) \) is zero. Moreover, it is straightforward to see that \( \text{HH}^0(A) = Z(A) \) has basis \( \{xyz, xz, y^2, y^3, \ldots\} \), so we may focus our attention on derivations of degree 0, \(-1\) and \(-2\) to obtain bases for \( \text{HH}^1(A), \text{HH}^2(A) \) and \( \text{HH}^3(A) \).

(3.1.9) The following is a basis of derivations for the \( k \)-bilinear 0-cycles, where \( s \in \mathbb{N}_0 \), and we adopt the convention that \( \alpha y^{-1} \beta = \Lambda \) and \( \alpha y^{-2} \beta = \Gamma \):

\[
\begin{align*}
E_s(x) &= 0, & E_s(y) &= y^{s+1}, & E_s(z) &= 0, & E_s(\alpha) &= 2\alpha y^s, \\
E_s(\beta) &= 2y^s \beta, & E_s(\Lambda) &= 3\alpha y^{s-1} \beta, & E_s(\Gamma) &= -2\alpha y^{s-2} \beta, \\
F_s(x) &= xy^s, & F_s(y) &= 0, & F_s(z) &= 0, & F_s(\alpha) &= \alpha y^s, \\
F_s(\beta) &= 0 & F_s(\Lambda) &= \alpha y^{s-1} \beta, & F_s(\Gamma) &= -\alpha y^{s-2} \beta, \\
G_s(x) &= 0, & G_s(y) &= 0, & G_s(z) &= y^s z, & G_s(\alpha) &= 0, \\
G_s(\beta) &= y^s \beta, & G_s(\Lambda) &= \alpha y^{s-1} \beta, & G_s(\Gamma) &= -\alpha y^{s-2} \beta.
\end{align*}
\]

(3.1.10) We now compute the \( k \)-bilinear 0-boundaries. A basis for them is given by
the following family of derivations, where \( s \in \mathbb{N}_0 \):

\[
\begin{align*}
T_s(x) &= xy^{s+2}, & T_s(y) &= 0, & T_s(z) &= 0, & T_s(\alpha) &= ay^{s+2}, \\
T_s(\beta) &= 0, & T_s(\Lambda) &= ay^{s+1}\beta, & T_s(\Gamma) &= -a y^s \beta, \\
R_s(x) &= 0, & R_s(y) &= 0, & R_s(z) &= y^{s+2}z, & R_s(\alpha) &= 0, \\
R_s(\beta) &= y^{s+2}\beta, & R_s(\Lambda) &= -a y^{s+1}\beta, & R_s(\Gamma) &= a y^s \beta, 
\end{align*}
\]

By direct inspection, we have that \( F_{s+2} = T_s, G_{s+2} = R_s \) for \( s \in \mathbb{N}_0 \), and no other relations, so that \( H^0(\text{Der}(B)) \) has infinite dimension and is spanned the classes of the elements in the set \( \{F_0, F_1, G_0, G_1, E_s : s \in \mathbb{N}_0\} \). Moreover, a basis for \( H^0(B) \) is course given by the monomials belonging to \( A \). We may only worry about the adjoint action on \( B \) of \( y \) and \( e_2 \), since they are the only ones that are \( \mathbb{R} \)-bilinear. We have that

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ad}_y(x) &= -xy, & \text{Ad}_y(y) &= 0, & \text{Ad}_y(z) &= yz, \\
\text{Ad}_y(\alpha) &= -ay, & \text{Ad}_y(\beta) &= y\beta, \\
\text{Ad}_y(\Lambda) &= 0, & \text{Ad}_y(\Gamma) &= 0.
\end{align*}
\]

so that \( F_1 + \text{Ad}_y = G_1 \). Similarly, \( F_0 + \text{Ad}_{e_2} = G_0 \), so that \( HH^1(A) \) is infinite dimensional with basis the classes of the elements in \( \{F_0, G_0, E_s : n \in \mathbb{N}_0\} \). Moreover, it is straightforward to compute that for each \( s, t \in \mathbb{N}_0 \), \( [E_s, E_t] = -(s-t)E_{s+t} \), and that \( [F_0, -] \) and \( [G_0, -] \) are identically zero. This determines \( HH^1(A) \) as a Lie algebra: it is a semi-direct product of a two dimensional abelian algebra acting trivially on the Witt algebra.

(3.1.11) The following derivations form a basis of the 1-cycles in \( \text{Der}(B) \), where unspecified values are zero, \( s \in \mathbb{N}_0 \), and we agree that \( y^{-1} = y^{-2} = 0 \):

\[
\begin{align*}
\Phi_s(\alpha) &= xy^s, & \Phi_s(\beta) &= y^sz, & \Phi_s(\Lambda) &= ay^{s-1}z, & \Phi_s(\Gamma) &= -a y^{s-2}z, \\
\Phi'_s(\alpha) &= 0, & \Phi'_s(\beta) &= y^{s+2}z, & \Phi'_s(\Lambda) &= -a y^{s+1}z, & \Phi'_s(\Gamma) &= a y^sz, \\
\Pi_s(\alpha) &= 0, & \Pi_s(\beta) &= y^{s+2}, & \Pi_s(\Lambda) &= ay^{s+1}, & \Pi_s(\Gamma) &= ay^s, \\
\Pi'_s(\alpha) &= xy^s, & \Pi'_s(\beta) &= 0, & \Pi'_s(\Lambda) &= 0, & \Pi'_s(\Gamma) &= 0, \\
\Psi_s(\alpha) &= 0, & \Psi_s(\beta) &= y^{s+2}z, & \Psi_s(\Lambda) &= -a y^{s+1}z, & \Psi_s(\Gamma) &= xy^s \beta, \\
\Theta_s(\alpha) &= 0, & \Theta_s(\beta) &= 0, & \Theta_s(\Lambda) &= ay^sz - xy^s \beta, & \Theta_s(\Gamma) &= 0, \\
\Xi_s(\alpha) &= 0, & \Xi_s(\beta) &= 0, & \Xi_s(\Lambda) &= 0, & \Xi_s(\Gamma) &= \Theta_s(\Lambda).
\end{align*}
\]

(3.1.12) Let us now compute the 1-boundaries of \( \text{Der}(B) \). We observe that for every
\[ s \in \mathbb{N}_0, \Xi_s, \Phi'_s, \Psi_s, \Theta_s \text{ have zero projection onto } A \text{ under } \alpha : B \rightarrow A, \text{ so these are boundaries. It is easy to check that the following set of derivations completes the list of 1-boundaries, where } s \in \mathbb{N}_0:\]

\[
X_s(\alpha) = xy^{s+2}, \quad X_s(\beta) = 0 \quad X_s(\Lambda) = xy^{s+1} \beta, \quad X_s(\Gamma) = -xy^s \beta
\]

\[
Y_s(\alpha) = 2xy^{s+1}, \quad Y_s(\beta) = 2y^{s+1}z, \quad Y_s(\Lambda) = xy^s \beta - ay^sz, \quad Y_s(\Gamma) = 0,
\]

Moreover, we have that \(\alpha(\Phi_{s+2} + \Phi'_s) = 0\), so \(\Phi_{s+2}\) is a boundary for \(s \in \mathbb{N}_0\). It follows that a basis of \(H^1(\text{Der}(B))\) is given by the classes of the derivations \(\Phi_0, \Phi_1\) so that \(\text{HH}^2(A)\) is two dimensional.

(3.1.13) Every derivation of degree \(-2\) is a cycle and vanishes on every generator except, possibly, \(\Lambda\) and \(\Gamma\), so that a basis for the 2-cycles is given by the following family of derivations, where \(s \in \mathbb{N}_0\) and \(t \in \{0, 1\}:\)

\[
\Omega^t_s(\Lambda) = 0, \quad \Omega^t_s(\Gamma) = x y^s z^t, \quad Y^t_s(\Lambda) = x y^s z^t, \quad Y^t_s(\Gamma) = 0.
\]

It is straightforward to check that all of these are boundaries except for \(Y^1_0\) and \(Y^0_0\). More precisely, the following is a complete list of the 2-boundaries, where \(s \in \mathbb{N}_0\) and \(t \in \{0, 1\}:\)

\[
\Omega^t_s(\Lambda) = 0, \quad \Omega^t_s(\Gamma) = x y^s z^t, \quad Y^t_{s+1}(\Lambda) = x y^{s+1} z^t, \quad Y^t_{s+1}(\Gamma) = 0.
\]

From this it follows that \(\text{HH}^3(A)\) is also two dimensional.

(3.1.14) Finally, we compute the Gerstenhaber algebra structure. We already determined the bracket in \(\text{HH}^1(A)\), while the bracket in \(\text{HH}^2(A)\) is trivial, since both generators vanish on \(\Lambda\) and \(\Gamma\). The action of \(\text{HH}^1(A)\) on \(\text{HH}^2(A)\) and \(\text{HH}^3(A)\) is as follows, where \(s, t \in \mathbb{N}_0\) and \(r \in \{0, 1\}\). We are computing in \(\text{Der}(B)\) to stress one obtains very explicit formulas for the brackets.

\[
\begin{align*}
[E_{s+2}, \Phi_t] &= 3\Xi_{s+t+1} - 2\Theta_{s+t}, & [F_{s+2}, \Phi_t] &= \Theta_{t+s+1} - \Xi_{t+s}, \\
[G_{s+2}, \Phi_t] &= \Theta_{t+s+2} - \Xi_{t+s+2}, & [F_1, \Phi_t] &= [G_1, \Phi_t] = \Theta_t, \\
[E_s, Y^t_s] &= (t - 3\delta_s, 0) Y^r_{s+1}, & [E_s, \Omega^t_s] &= (t + 2\delta_s, 0) \Omega^r_{s+1}, \\
[F_0, -] &= [G_0, -] = 2 & \text{on } \langle \Omega^t_s, \Omega^r_s : s \in \mathbb{N}_0 \rangle, \\
[F_0, -] &= [G_0, -] = [E_0, -] = 0 & \text{on } \langle Y^t_s, Y^r_s, \Phi_s : s \in \mathbb{N}_0 \rangle, \\
[E_1, \Phi_t] &= 3\Xi_t.
\end{align*}
\]
(3.1.15) Let us now compute the cup product in $HH^*(A)$. To do this, we will project the generating cycles of $\text{Der}(B)$ to the twisted complex of $A$ through the map $\alpha$, and use the quadratic part of the differential $\partial$. Observe that we have used the map $\alpha$ to detect derivations that are boundaries: if $F$ is a cycle and if $\alpha F = 0$ in $T_A$, then certainly it is a boundary. This gives a way to proceed in discarding, as we did, certain infinite families of boundaries. It also allows one to compute with a smaller complex, namely $T_A$, and then, hopefully without too much effort, lift the generators derivations, as in the first example.

(3.1.16) Write the projection of a derivation in $\text{Der}(B)$ with the corresponding lower case letter, and let us note that the only chain that has non-zero coproduct is $\Gamma$, for which $\Delta_2(\Gamma) = \alpha \otimes z + x \otimes \beta$. This means, in particular, that the cup product in $HH^1(A)$ is trivial, and one checks that the following is the list of products of elements in $HH^1(A)$ with elements of $HH^2(A)$, which are the only remaining nontrivial products. In the following display, $s \in \mathbb{N}_0$:

$$\varphi_1 - g_0 = f_0 - \varphi_1 = \omega_1, \quad \varphi_1 - e_s = \varphi_0 - e_s = 0, \quad \varphi_0 - g_0 = f_0 - \varphi_0 = \nu'_1.$$

(3.1.17) To compute cyclic and Hochschild homology of $A$, we begin by noting that for $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that $[B, B]_i = B_i$, and that $(B/[B, B])_0$ is generated by the classes of $y^j$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$. This means that $HC_*(A)$ is concentrated in degree zero where it coincides with $A/[A, A] = k[\bar{y}]$. The long exact sequence shows that $HH_*(A)$ is trivial in degrees larger than 1, and that $d : HH_0(A) \to HH_1(A)$ is an isomorphism.

### 3.2 The spectral sequence of a cofibration

To conclude these notes, we will show that one may very well compute the minimal model of non-monomial algebras. These may have, of course, more complicated differentials, but the underlying generators of the minimal model can be, as usual, obtained by the overlaps of leading terms of a Gröbner basis, and thus coincide with those of its associated monomial algebra. Although obtaining an explicit general description of the minimal model of an arbitrary algebra with a Gröbner basis is perhaps too ambitious, one may always apply perturbative methods to the monomial case to obtain a model of a chosen non-monomial algebra. We give an example of this now.

(3.2.1) Let us consider the *super Jordan plane*, which is the associative algebra $A$ with two generators $x$ and $y$ subject to the relations $x^2 = 0$ and $y^2 x = xy^2 + xyx$. Some of its
homological invariants were studied in detail in [40], where a minimal free resolution of \( A \) as an \( A \)-bimodule is given and, among other things, the Gerstenhaber algebra \( \text{HH}^*(A) \) is completely described.

(3.2.2) The resolution is constructed, as in many cases, using the graded \( \mathbb{k} \)-module \( C \) of ambiguities of \( A \) relative to a Gröbner basis, which in this case has leading terms \( \{x^2, y^2x\} \), and for each \( n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \), \( C_n \) has basis \( \{x^{n+1}, y^2x^n\} \). Using the methods outlined in [52], one can construct an homotopy retract data from \( BA \) to \( C \), endow it with a (non-minimal) \( A_\infty \)-coalgebra structure, and obtain the following description of its minimal model.

**Theorem 3.1.** The minimal model of the super Jordan plane is given by the \( \infty \)-cobar construction \( X = T(x_0, y_0, x_1, y_1, \ldots) \) of the \( A_\infty \)-coalgebra \( C \). Its differential vanishes on degree 0 and for each \( n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \), we have that

\[
\partial y_{n+1} = [y^2, x_n] - \sum_{s+t=n} x_s y x_t - \sum_{s+t=n, t \geq 1} (x_s y_t - (-1)^t y t x_s),
\]

\[
\partial x_{n+1} = \sum_{s+t=n} (-1)^s x_s x_t.
\]

For \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), \( x_n \) and \( y_n \) have underlying monomials \( x^{n+1} \) and \( y^2 x^n \) respectively, and \( Y = T(x_0, x_1, \ldots) \subseteq X \) is a model for the subalgebra \( \mathbb{k}\langle x \mid x^2 \rangle = B \subseteq A \).

**Proof.** Ordering the chains lexicographically with respect to \( y > x \), the resulting morphism \( B' \rightarrow A' \) between the associated graded algebras is the model of [52] for the monomial algebra \( A' = \mathbb{k}\langle x, y \mid x^2, y^2 x \rangle \), so our theorem follows.

(3.2.3) We record here the existence of a finer version of the spectral sequence for a cofibration of [8], suitably modified to our situation, where our dga algebras are not connected. To fix this, we assume our dga algebras are weight graded connected. A finer grading in the spectral sequence of [8] that takes this into account will suit our purposes. The reader can compare the shape of the resulting spectral sequence with the one appearing in [31, Lemma 2.5.1]. One can use it to reprove the last theorem, but unfortunately the gradation we used in its proof refines the gradation we will use to build the sequence, so there is not much to gain in doing this. Nevertheless, the spectral sequence should be useful when we find ourselves in contexts where these finer gradations are not available. Its shape also provides us with a useful analog
Figure 1: The spectral sequence of a cofibration of weight graded dga algebras.

of the spectral sequence for a fibration of spaces, although the appearance of free products may prove cumbersome at points.

3.2.4 Let us put ourselves in the situation where we have cofibration $Y \to X$ of connected weight graded dga algebras with generators $W$. Let us recall that this means that $X$ is obtained from $Y$ as the free product $Y \ast TW$, and write $X//Y$ for the quotient of $X$ by the ideal generated by $Y$. We filter $X$ as follows: for each $n, p \in \mathbb{N}$, let $F_p X^{(n)}$ consist of elements of total weight $m$ and total homological degree $d$ in $W$ so that $m + d \leq p$, that is

$$F_p X^{(n)} = \bigoplus_{m + d \leq p} X^{(m, \ast)}_{d, \ast}.$$

If $s, t \in \mathbb{N}$, then $(n)E^{0}_{s,t}$ consists of elements that have, for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$, weight $i$ and degree $s - i$ in $W$, and weight $n - i$ and degree $t + i$ in $Y$, which we write

$$(n)E^{0}_{s,t} = \bigoplus_{i + j = n} X_{s - i, t + i}^{(i, j)}.$$

3.2.5 Looking at the differentials, one notices that the second page is given by

$$(n)E^{2}_{s,t} = \bigoplus_{i + j = n} (H_{t+i} Y \ast H_{s-i} (X//Y))^{(i, j)}.$$
where ★ denotes the free product of algebras. When \( s = 0 \), we obtain \( H_*(Y)^{(n)} \) on the \( t \)-axis, and the edge morphism corresponds to inclusion. When \( t + n = 0 \), we obtain \( H_{s-n}(X/V Y)^{(n)} \) on that line, and the edge morphism corresponds to the projection; see Figure 1. We record this in the

**Theorem 3.2.** Let \( Y \rightarrow X \) be a cofibration of connected weight graded dga algebras, and let \( X/V Y \) be the quotient of \( X \) by the ideal generated by \( Y \). For each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), there is a convergent spectral sequence with

\[
E^2_{s,t} = \bigoplus_{i+j=n} (H_{t+i} Y \star H_{s-i}(X/V Y))^{(i,j)} \xrightarrow{s} H_{s+t}(X)^{(n)}.
\]

When \( s = 0 \), we obtain \( H_t(Y)^{(n)} \) on this axis, and the edge morphism corresponds to the inclusion \( Y \rightarrow X \). When \( t + n = 0 \), we obtain \( H_{s-n}(X/V Y)^{(n)} \) on this line, and the edge morphism corresponds to the projection \( X \rightarrow X/V Y \).

(3.2.6) We now observe that, with this spectral sequence at hand, the results from [8] extend to the case of weight graded connected associative algebras, so that we obtain the following result. We point out B. Keller has obtained the same result through a different approach in [11].

**Theorem 3.3.** For each weight graded connected associative algebra \( A \) there is a quasi-free model \( B = (TV, d) \rightarrow A \) which is triangulated and minimal.

(3.2.7) We remark that, following the ideas of H. J. Baues in [7], one can produce spectral sequences of different flavors, including that of the Serre spectral sequence, to compute operadic cohomology of algebras through a model. We intend to pursue these ideas in the future.

### 3.3 Short comment on the extension to algebras over operads

(3.3.1) Let us fix an operad \( O \) and an \( O \)-algebra \( A \). The module \( \Omega_A \) of Kähler differentials along with the universal derivation \( d : A \rightarrow \Omega_A \) is the data representing the functor of derivations in the category of left \( U = U(O, A) \) modules. The derived functor \( RDer_O(A, A) \) is operadic cohomology \( H_O(A) \), and it is naturally isomorphic to \( R\text{hom}_U(\Omega_A, A) \), while \( L(A \otimes_U \Omega_A) \) gives us operadic homology \( H^O(A) \).

(3.3.2) In case that \( O \) is the associative operad, we obtain what we expect. Indeed, the module \( \Omega_A \) is simply the free \( A \)-bimodule on \( A \), spanned by forms \( adza'a \), modulo the
non-cyclic Leibniz rule, and it is immediate to check we have a natural isomorphism
\[ A \otimes A \rightarrow \Omega_A, \]
so that we can compute \( H^\Theta(A) \) as the homology of \( \Omega_B \) where \( B \) is a quasi-free model. It is immediate also that \( \text{Der}(B, B) \) gives us a representative of \( \mathbb{R} \text{Der}(A, A) \) in the homotopy category, and thus computes \( H_\Theta(A) \).

(3.3.3) We expect that the previous observation will allow us to extend the framework of this work to the operadic setting, to obtain a version of Tamarkin–Tsygan precalculi for \( \Theta \). We also expect that whenever \( \Theta \) is cyclic we will obtain the necessary circle action on \( H^\Theta(A) \) that gives rise to Connes’ boundary. To support this idea, it is useful to observe that in the case \( (B, d) \) is a quasi-free dga algebra, we can think of an element \( v_1 \cdots v_n d v_0 \in \Omega_B \) as a corolla with a marked input, and that our formula for \( db \) is simply obtained from the action of the norm element associated to the cyclic action on the associative operad. Our hopes is that this description carries on to the case of cyclic operads to describe the circle action on Hochschild homology.

(3.3.4) We remark that, since operadic cohomology of a free algebra vanishes in non-negative degrees, the work of Section 2.3 extends to operads satisfying the hypotheses appearing in [22] and thus having the corresponding projective model structure on their category of algebras. The universal property of free algebras and that of the module of Kähler differentials then allow us to obtain a suitable version of Lemma 2.5, and thus of the pairing of Theorem 2.6 and the bracket.

(3.3.5) We expect the cup product to be obtained from either the quadratic part of the differential of the model, as is the case here, or as part of an \( \infty \)-structure obtained by resolving \( \Theta \). For example, in the case that \( \Theta \) is quadratic Koszul, it is known that operadic cohomology is an \( \Theta^1 \)-algebra [31, 34]. The study of cup products and other operations in operadic cohomology appears in the work of J.-L. Loday in [29], of F. Bagherzadeh and M. Bremner in [9], and of M. Markl in [34], among others.
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