THE RELATIVE HELLER OPERATOR AND RELATIVE COHOMOLOGY FOR THE KLEIN 4-GROUP.
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Abstract. Let $G$ be the Klein Four-group and let $k$ be an arbitrary field of characteristic 2. A classification of indecomposable $kG$-modules is known. We calculate the relative cohomology groups $H^i_G(N)$ for every indecomposable $kG$-module $N$, where $\chi$ is the set of proper subgroups in $G$. This extends work of Pamuk and Yalcin to cohomology with non-trivial coefficients. We also show that all cup products in strictly positive degree in $H^*_G(k)$ are trivial.

1. Introduction

Let $G$ be a finite group and $k$ a field of characteristic $p > 0$. If $p \nmid |G|$, then every representation of $G$ over $k$ is projective. Thus, by decomposing the regular module $kG$ we can obtain all isomorphism classes of $kG$-modules immediately.

From now on assume $p || G |$. Then the above is no longer true. However, it is well-known that, given a $kG$-module $M$, we can find a projective module $P_0$ and a surjective $kG$-morphism $\pi_0 : P_0 \to M$.

If we choose $P_0$ and $\pi_0$ so that $P_0$ has smallest possible dimension, then this pair is unique, and known as the projective cover of $M$. The kernel of $\pi_0$ is denoted $\Omega(M)$. This construction can be iterated. For each $i > 0$, let $\pi_i : P_i \to \Omega_i(M)$ be the projective cover of $\Omega_i(M)$. By composing these maps with the inclusions $\Omega_i(M) \to P_{i-1}$, we obtain an exact sequence

$$\cdots \to P_i \to P_{i-1} \to \cdots \to P_0 \to M \to 0.$$ (1)

This is an example of a projective resolution for $M$. If $N$ is any $kG$-module, then the above induces a complex

$$0 \to \text{Hom}_{kG}(P_0, M) \to \cdots \to \text{Hom}_{kG}(P_i, M) \to \cdots$$

which is not exact in general. The homology groups of this complex are by definition the groups $\text{Ext}^i_{kG}(M, N)$. A special case is

$$H^i(G, N) := \text{Ext}^i_{kG}(k, N).$$

We call this the cohomology of $G$ with coefficients in $N$.

There is a long and fruitful history of study of the cohomology groups $H^i(G, N)$ in modular representation theory. Further, one may define a pairing

$$\sim : H^i(G, k) \otimes H^j(G, k) \to H^{i+j}(G, k).$$
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which gives $H^*(G, k)$ the structure of a graded-commutative graded ring. A celebrated theorem of Evens (see [3, Theorem 4.2.1]) states that, for any $G$, the ring $H^*(G, k)$ is finitely generated.

Now let $\chi$ be a set of proper subgroups of $G$. A $kG$-module $M$ is said to be projective relative to $\chi$ if $M$ is a direct summand of $\bigoplus_{X \in \chi} M \downarrow X \uparrow G$. Other equivalent definitions will be given in section 2. It is less well-known, but still true, that every $kG$-module has a unique relative projective cover with respect to $\chi$. This is defined to be a $kG$-module $Q_0$ of smallest dimension such that

1. $Q_0$ is projective relative to $\chi$;
2. There is a surjective $kG$-morphism $\pi_0 : Q_0 \to M$ which splits on restriction to each $X \in \chi$.

The kernel of $Q_0$ is denoted $\Omega_\chi(M)$ and called the relative Heller shift of $M$ with respect to $\chi$. We can mimic the construction of (11) to obtain a relative projective resolution of $M$, that is, an exact sequence

$$\cdots Q_i \to Q_{i-1} \to \cdots \to Q_0 \to M \to 0.$$ 

of $kG$ modules which are projective relative to $\chi$ and in which the connecting homomorphisms split over each $X \in \chi$. Given any $kG$-module $M$, the above induces a complex

$$0 \to \text{Hom}_{kG}(Q_0, M) \to \cdots \to \text{Hom}_{kG}(Q_i, M) \to \cdots$$

which is in general no longer exact. The homology groups of this complex are by definition the relative Ext-groups $\text{Ext}^i_{kG, \chi}(M, N)$. The relative cohomology of $G$ with respect to $\chi$ with coefficients in $N$ is the special case

$$H^i_\chi(G, N) := \text{Ext}^i_{kG, \chi}(k, N).$$

Further, one may define a pairing

$$\cdot : H^i_\chi(G, k) \otimes H^j_\chi(G, k) \to H^{i+j}_\chi(G, k)$$

which gives $H^*(G, k)$ the structure of a graded-commutative graded ring.

Computations of $H^*_\chi(G, N)$ are rare in the literature. It is notable that the ring $H^*_\chi(G, k)$ is not finitely generated in general. This was first discovered by Blowers [4], who showed that if $G_1$ and $G_2$ are finite groups of order divisible by $p$, and $\chi_1, \chi_2$ are sets of subgroups of $G_1, G_2$ respectively with order divisible by $p$, then all products of elements of positive degree in $H^*_\chi(G, k)$ are zero, where $G = G_1 \times G_2$ and $\chi = \{G_1 \times X : X \in \chi_2\} \cup \{X \times G_2 : X \in \chi_1\}$. See also [5].

For the rest of this section, let $G = \langle \sigma, \tau \rangle$ denote the Klein four-group, and let $k$ be a field of characteristic 2. We set $\chi = \{H_1, H_2, H_3\}$, the set of all proper nontrivial subgroups of $G$, where $H_1 = \langle \sigma \rangle, H_3 = \langle \tau \rangle, H_3 = \langle \sigma \tau \rangle$.

The cohomology groups $H^*_\chi(G, k)$ were computed, by indirect means, by Pamuk and Yalcin [9]. In the present article we recover their result, and also compute $H^*_\chi(G, k)$ for any $kG$-module $N$. Our methods are more direct; we compute an explicit relative projective resolution for each $N$. Of course we are helped enormously by the fact that the representations of $G$ are completely classified. Our first result is:

**Theorem 1.** Let $M$ be an indecomposable $kG$-module, which is not projective relative to $\chi$. Then we have

$$\Omega_\chi(M) \cong \Omega^{-2}(M)$$

if $M$ has odd dimension, and

$$\Omega_\chi(M) \cong M$$

otherwise.
The ring structure of $H^\ast_\chi(G, k)$ was not considered in [9]. Note, however, that if $\chi'$ is a subset of $\chi$ with size 2, then all products in $H^\ast_\chi(G, k)$ are zero, by a special case of Blowers’ result. It is perhaps not surprising, therefore, that we have

**Theorem 2.** Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in H^\ast_\chi(G, k)$, where both have strictly positive degree. Then $\alpha_1 \smile \alpha_2 = 0$.

This paper is organised as follows. In section 2 we define relative projectivity and derive the results we will need to do the computations in later sections. This section follows [8, Section 2] fairly closely. As most proofs can be constructed by adapting familiar results projectivity to the relative case, they are omitted. In section 3 we describe the classification of modules for the Klein-four group and prove Theorem 1. We also compute $H^i_\chi(G, N)$ for every $kG$-module $N$ and prove Theorem 2.

1.1. **Notation.** All groups under consideration are finite groups, and for any group $G$, by a $kG$-module we mean a finitely-generated $k$-vector space with compatible $G$ action. The one-dimensional trivial $kG$-module will be denoted by $kG$ or simply $k$ when the group acting is obvious, and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $M$ a $kG$-module we write $nM$ for the direct sum of $n$ copies of $M$.

2. **Relative projectivity**

In this section, let $p > 0$ be a prime and let $G$ be a finite group of order divisible by $p$. Let $k$ be a field of characteristic $p$ and let $\chi$ be a set of subgroups of $G$. Now let $M$ be a finitely generated $kG$-module. $M$ is said to be *projective relative to $\chi$* if the following holds: let $\phi : M \to Y$ be a $kG$-homomorphism and $j : X \to Y$ a surjective $kG$-homomorphism which splits on restriction to any subgroup of $H \in \chi$. Then there exists a $kG$-homomorphism $\psi$ making the following diagram commute.

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
X & \longrightarrow & Y \\
\downarrow \phi & & \downarrow \\
0 & & 0
\end{array}
$$

Dually, one says that $M$ is *injective relative to $\chi$* if the following holds: given an injective $kG$-homomorphism $i : X \to Y$ which splits on restriction to each $H \in \chi$ and a $kG$-homomorphism $\phi : X \to M$, there exists a $kG$-homomorphism $\psi$ making the following diagram commute.

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & X \\
\downarrow \phi & & \downarrow i \\
M & \longrightarrow & Y
\end{array}
$$

These notions are equivalent to the usual definitions of projective and injective $kG$-modules when we take $\chi = \{1\}$. We will say a $kG$-homomorphism is $\chi$-split if it splits on restriction to each $H \in \chi$. Since a $kG$-module is projective relative to $H$ if and only if it is also projective relative to the set of all subgroups of $H$, we usually assume $\chi$ is closed under taking subgroups.
We denote the set of $G$-fixed points in $M$ by $M^G$. For any $H \leq G$ there is a $kG$-map $M^H \to M^G$ defined as follows:

$$\text{Tr}_G^H(x) = \sum_{\sigma \in S} \sigma x$$

where $x \in M$ and $S$ is a left-transversal of $H$ in $G$. This is called the relative trace or transfer. It is clear that the map is independent of the choice of $S$. If $H = 1$ we usually write this as $\text{Tr}_G^G$ and call it simply the trace or transfer. For any set of subgroups $\chi$ of $G$ we define the subspace

$$M_{G,\chi}^G := \sum_{H \in \chi} \text{Tr}_G^H(M^H)$$

and quotient

$$M_{\chi}^G := \frac{M^G}{M_{G,\chi}^G}.$$

Now let $N$ be another $kG$-module. We can define an action of $G$ on $\text{Hom}_{kG}(M,N)$:

$$(g \cdot \phi)(x) = g\phi(g^{-1}x) \text{ for } g \in G, x \in M.$$ Notice that with this action we have $\text{Hom}_{kG}(M,N)^G = \text{Hom}_{kG}(M,N)$. Further, the transfer construction gives a map

$$\text{Tr}_H^G : \text{Hom}_{kH}(M,N) \to \text{Hom}_{kG}(M,N).$$

There are various ways to characterize relative projectivity:

**Proposition 3.** Let $G$ be a finite group of order divisible by $p$, $\chi$ a set of subgroups of $G$ and $M$ a $kG$-module. Then the following are equivalent:

(i) $M$ is projective relative to $\chi$;

(ii) Every $\chi$-split epimorphism of $kG$-modules $\phi : N \to M$ splits;

(iii) $M$ is injective relative to $\chi$;

(iv) Every $\chi$-split monomorphism of $kG$-modules $\phi : M \to N$ splits;

(v) $M$ is a direct summand of $\bigoplus_{H \in \chi} M^H \uparrow^G$;

(vi) $M$ is a direct summand of a direct sum of modules induced from subgroups in $\chi$;

(vii) There exists a set of homomorphisms $\{\beta_H : H \in \chi\}$ such that $\beta_H \in \text{Hom}_{kH}(M,M)$ and $\sum_{H \in \chi} \text{Tr}_H^G(\beta_H) = \text{id}_M$.

The last of these is called Higman’s criterion.

**Proof.** The proof when $\chi$ consists of a single subgroup of $G$ can be found in [2, Proposition 3.6.4]. This can easily be generalised. □

For homomorphisms $\alpha \in \text{Hom}_{kG}(M,N)$ we have the following:

**Lemma 4.** Let $M$, $N$ be $kG$-modules, $\chi$ a collection of subgroups of $G$, and $\alpha \in \text{Hom}_{kG}(M,N)$. Then the following are equivalent:

(i) $\alpha$ factors through $\bigoplus_{H \in \chi} M^H \downarrow^G$;

(ii) $\alpha$ factors through some module which is projective relative to $\chi$;

(iii) There exist homomorphisms $\{\beta_H : H \in \chi\}$ such that $\beta_H \in \text{Hom}_{kH}(M,N)$ and $\sum_{H \in \chi} \text{Tr}_H^G(\beta_H) = \text{id}_M$.

**Proof.** This is easily deduced from [2, Proposition 3.6.6]. □

The above tells us that $\text{Hom}_{kG}(M,N)^{G,\chi}$ consists of the $kG$-homomorphims which factor through a module which is projective relative to $\chi$. We write

$$\text{Hom}_{kG}^\chi(M,N) := \text{Hom}_{kG}(M,N)^{G,\chi}.$$
Let $M$ be a $kG$-module and let $X$ be a $kG$-module that is projective relative to $\chi$. It is easily shown, using Proposition 4 that $M \otimes X$ is projective relative to $\chi$. For example, the module $M \otimes X$ where $X = \bigoplus_{H \in \chi} k_H \uparrow^G$ is projective relative to $\chi$. Moreover, the natural map $\sigma : M \otimes X \to M$ given by

$$\sigma(m \otimes x) = mn$$

is a $\chi$-split $kG$-epimorphism (to see the splitting, use the Mackey Theorem). It follows that for each $M$, there exists a $kG$-module $Q_0$ which is projective relative to $\chi$ and a $\chi$-split $kG$-epimorphism $\pi_0 : Q_0 \to M$.

Let $\pi_0 : Q_0 \to M$ and $\pi'_0 : Q'_0 \to M$ be two such pairs. The proof of Schanuel’s Lemma (see [2, Lemma 1.5.3, Lemma 3.9.1]) extends more or less verbatim to the relative case; if $K_0 = \ker(\pi)$ and $K'_0 = \ker(\pi'_0)$ then $K_0 \oplus Q_0 \cong K'_0 \oplus Q_0$.

If we choose among all such pairs, one in which the dimension of $Q_0$ is minimal, the kernel $K_0$ is defined uniquely. This pair $(Q_0, \pi_0)$ is called the relative projective cover of $M$. For this choice we set $\Omega_\chi(M) = K_0$. We can interate this construction, setting $\Omega_\chi(M) = \Omega_\chi(\Omega_\chi^{-1}(M))$. Minimality implies that if $K_0'$ is the kernel of any other $\chi$-split $kG$-epimorphism $Q'_0 \to M$, then $K_0 \cong \Omega_\chi(M) \oplus (\text{rel proj})$, where (rel. proj) is some module which is projective relative to $\chi$.

Dually, we always have that $M$ is a submodule of $M \otimes X$ with $X = \bigoplus_{H \in \chi} k_H \uparrow^G$, and the inclusion $\rho : M \to M \otimes X$ splits on restriction to each $H \in \chi$. It follows that for each $M$, there exists a $kG$-module $J_0$ and a $\chi$-split $kG$-monomorphism $\rho_0 : M \to J_0$.

Let $\rho_0 : M \to J_0$ and $\rho'_0 : M \to J'_0$ be two such pairs. Again, by the relative version of Schanuel’s Lemma, if $C_0 = \coker(\pi)$ and $C'_0 = \coker(\pi'_0)$ then $C_0 \oplus J_0 \cong C'_0 \oplus J'_0$.

If we choose among all such pairs, one in which the dimension of $J_0$ is minimal, the cokernel $C_0$ is defined uniquely. The pair $(J_0, \rho_0)$ is called a relative injective hull of $M$ with respect to $\chi$. For this choice we set $\Omega_\chi^{-1}(M) = K_0$. We can iterate this construction, setting $\Omega_\chi^{-1}(M) = \Omega_\chi^{-1}(\Omega_\chi^{-1}(M))$. Minimality implies that if $K_0'$ is the kernel of any other $\chi$-split $kG$-monomorphism $M \to J_0$, then $K_0 \cong \Omega_\chi^{-1}(M) \oplus (\text{rel proj})$, where (rel. proj) is some module which is projective relative to $\chi$.

The following gives some properties of the operators $\Omega_\chi^i$.

**Proposition 5.** Let $M_1, M_2$ be $kG$-modules without summands which are projective relative to $\chi$, and $i, j$ nonzero integers. Then:

(i) $\Omega_\chi^i(M_1 \oplus M_2) \cong \Omega_\chi^i(M_1) \oplus \Omega_\chi^i(M_2)$;

(ii) $\Omega_\chi^i(M)^* \cong \Omega_\chi^{-1}(M^*)$;

(iii) $M \cong \Omega_\chi(\Omega_\chi^{-1}(M)) \oplus (\text{rel. proj}) \cong \Omega_\chi^{-1}(\Omega_\chi^{-1}(M)) \oplus (\text{rel. proj})$.

**Proof.** (i) is obvious. (ii,iii) are easily deduced from the relative version of Schanuel’s Lemma. \(\square\)

(i) above shows that $\Omega_\chi^i$ is a well-defined operator on the set of indecomposable $kG$-modules which are not relatively projective to $\chi$. Note that (iii) does not say that $\Omega_\chi \circ \Omega_\chi^{-1}$ is the identity in general. If we define $\Omega_\chi(M)$ to be the direct sum of all summands of $M$ which are not projective relative to $\chi$, then we have $\Omega^{i+j} = \Omega^i \circ \Omega^j$ for all $i$ and $j$.

The following result is sometimes useful.

**Lemma 6.** Let $M$ be a $kG$-module which is projective relative to a set $\chi$ of subgroups of $G$. Then $M[G] = \sum_{H \in \chi} \Tr_H^G(M[H])$.

**Proof.** See [3, Lemma 2.9] \(\square\)
As a consequence of the above, if \( M = N \oplus \) (rel. proj.), we get that \( M'_\chi = N'_\chi \).

The operators \( \Omega_i^\chi \) extend in a natural way to homomorphisms between modules. Let \( f \in \text{Hom}_kG(M, N) \). Let \((Q, \pi), (Q', \pi')\) be the relative projective covers of \( M, N \). Then the relative projectivity of \( Q \) ensures the existence of a homomorphism \( \bar{f} \in \text{Hom}_kG(Q, Q') \) making the following diagram commute

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\Omega_\chi(M) & \xrightarrow{\pi} & Q & \xrightarrow{\pi} & M & \xrightarrow{0} \\
\Omega_\chi(f) & \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} & \bar{f} & \xrightarrow{f} & f \\
\Omega_\chi(N) & \xrightarrow{Q'} & \pi' & \xrightarrow{N} & 0
\end{array}
\]

and an easy diagram chase shows that the image of \( \Omega_\chi(f) : \bar{f}|_{\ker(\pi)} \) is contained in \( \ker(\pi') \). In this way, \( f \) induces a homomorphism \( \Omega_\chi(f) \in \text{Hom}_kG(\Omega_\chi(M), \Omega_\chi(N)) \).

In a similar fashion, let \((J, \rho), (J', \rho')\) be the relative injective hulls of \( M, N \) respectively. Then relative injectivity of \( J' \) ensures the existence of a homomorphism \( \tilde{f} \in \text{Hom}(J, J') \) making the following diagram commute

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\Omega^{-1}_\chi(M) & \xleftarrow{\rho} & Q & \xleftarrow{\rho} & M & \xleftarrow{0} \\
\Omega^{-1}_\chi(f) & \xleftarrow{\tilde{f}} & \tilde{f} & \xleftarrow{f} & f \\
\Omega^{-1}_\chi(N) & \xleftarrow{Q'} & \rho' & \xleftarrow{N} & 0
\end{array}
\]

and a diagram chase shows that \( \tilde{f} \) induces a well-defined homomorphism \( \Omega^{-1}_\chi(f) \in \text{Hom}(\Omega^{-1}_\chi(M), \Omega^{-1}_\chi(N)) \). For a given homomorphism \( f, \Omega^{-1}_\chi(f) \) and \( \Omega^{-1}_\chi(f) \) are not equal to \( f \) in general, but \( f - \Omega^{-1}_\chi(f) \) and \( f - \Omega^{-1}_\chi(f) \) factor through a module which is projective relative to \( \chi \). By the discussion following Lemma 4, we have

**Proposition 7.** For all \( i \in \mathbb{Z} \), \( \Omega_i^\chi(\ldots) \) induces an isomorphism

\[
\text{Hom}_kG(M, N) \cong \text{Hom}_kG(\Omega_i^\chi(M), \Omega_i^\chi(N)).
\]

As explained in the introduction, the idea of a relatively projective cover can be extended to a relatively projective resolution; that is, an exact complex

\[
\ldots \rightarrow Q_i \rightarrow Q_{i-1} \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow Q_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0
\]

of relatively projective modules in which the connecting homomorphisms split over \( \chi \). If

\[
\ldots \rightarrow Q'_i \rightarrow Q'_{i-1} \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow Q'_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0
\]

is another relatively projective resolution, then it turns out that any two chain maps between them are chain homotopic (see [2, Theorem 3.9.3] for the version with \( \chi \) consisting of one subgroup - the proof of the more general version is the same). Consequently, for any \( kG \)-module \( N \), the homology groups of the induced complex
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Proposition 8. denote the map induced by ∂ and setting exact sequence ways. On the one hand, elements of equivalence classes of extensions of \( k \) in which \( \ker(\partial_{i-1}) = \Omega^i_G(k) \). We can construct this by taking for each \( i \) a short exact sequence

\[
0 \to \Omega^{i+1}_G(k) \xrightarrow{\partial_i} Q_i \xrightarrow{\pi_i} \Omega^i_G(k) \to 0
\]

and setting \( \partial_i := \rho_i \pi_{i+1} \). For each \( i \) let

\[
\delta_i : \text{Hom}_G(Q_i, k) \to \text{Hom}_G(Q_{i+1}, k)
\]
denote the map induced by \( \partial_i \).

Our main tool will be as following:

**Proposition 8.** Let \( N \) be a \( \mathbb{k}G \)-module. Then we have

(i) \( H^0_N(G, N) = N^G \);

(ii) \( H^1_N(G, N) \cong \text{Hom}_G^\chi(\Omega^1_G(k), N) \).

The proof is the same as in the case \( \chi = \{1\} \), but we give a sketch for lack of a good reference to this proof.

**Proof.** We first show that for each \( i \geq 0 \),

\[
\ker(\delta_i) \cong \text{Hom}_G(\Omega^i_G(k), N).
\]

To see this, let \( \phi \in \ker(\delta_i) \subseteq \text{Hom}_G(Q_i, N) \). For \( x \in \Omega^i_G(k) \), choose \( q \in Q_i \) such that \( \pi_i(q) = x \) and define \( \hat{\phi}(x) = \phi(q) \). Then \( \hat{\phi} \in \text{Hom}_G(\Omega^i_G(k), N) \). The assignment \( \phi \mapsto \hat{\phi} \) is well-defined: for if \( q' \in Q_i \) with \( \pi_i(q') = x \) and \( \phi(x) := \phi(q') \), then since \( q - q' \in \ker(\pi_i) \) we get \( q - q' \in \text{im}(\partial_i) \) and \( \phi(q - q') = 0 \) since \( \phi \in \ker(\delta_i) \). Conversely, given \( \phi \in \text{Hom}_G(\Omega^i_G(k), N) \) we can define \( \hat{\phi} = \phi \circ \pi_i \in \ker(\delta_i) \). It’s easy to see that the two assignments are inverse to each other.

This in particular shows that (i) holds, since \( \text{Hom}_G(\Omega^i_G(k), N) \cong N^G \). We now show that \( \text{im}(\delta_{i-1}) \) consists of the homomorphisms in \( \text{Hom}_G(\Omega^i_G(k), N) \) which factor through a module which is projective relative to \( \chi \). To see this, first suppose \( \phi \in \text{im}(\delta_{i-1}) \subseteq \text{Hom}_G(Q_i, N) \), say \( \phi = \psi \circ \partial_{i-1} \) where \( \psi \in \text{Hom}_G(Q_{i-1}, N) \). Then with \( x \in \Omega^i_G(k) \) and \( q, \hat{\phi} \) as before we note that

\[
\psi \circ \rho_{i-1}(x) = \psi \circ \rho_{i-1} \circ \pi_i(q) = \psi \circ \partial_i(q) = \phi(q) = \hat{\phi}(x)
\]

which shows that \( \hat{\phi} \) factors through the module \( Q_{i-1} \) which is projective relative to \( \chi \). Conversely, if \( \phi \in \text{Hom}_G(\Omega^i_G(k), k) \) factors through any module which is projective relative to \( \chi \), then it factors through \( Q_{i-1} \), because \( \rho_{i-1} \) is injective and \( Q_{i-1} \) is also an injective module with respect to \( \chi \) by Lemma 3.

One can define a pairing \( \sim : H^i_G(k, k) \otimes H^j_G(k, k) \to H^{i+j}_G(k, k) \) in a few different ways. On the one hand, elements of \( H^i_G(k, k) = \text{Ext}^i_G(k, k) \) can be viewed as equivalence classes of extensions of \( k \) by \( k \) split over \( \chi \), and the usual Yoneda splice gives the required pairing; see [2] Section 2.6.3.9 for details in the case \( \chi \) consisting...
of only one subgroup. Some other constructions in the case \( \chi = \{1\} \) are given in [9], and all of these extend in a natural way to arbitrary \( \chi \). Happily, all these methods give the same construction. In the present article we will use the following construction: recall that

\[
H^i_\chi(G, k) \cong \text{Hom}^\chi_k(G, k).
\]

Similarly

\[
H^j_\chi(G, k) = \text{Hom}^\chi_k(G, k) \cong \text{Hom}^\chi_k(G, k)
\]

with the second isomorphism arising from Proposition 7. Therefore we may define a product as follows: for \( \alpha \in H^i_\chi(G, k) \) and \( \beta \in H^j_\chi(G, k) \) choose \( f \in \text{Hom}^\chi_k(G, k) \) representing \( \alpha, \beta \) respectively. Then \( \Omega^i_\chi(g) \in \text{Hom}^\chi_k(G, k) \), so that

\[
f \circ \Omega^i_\chi(g) \in \text{Hom}^\chi_k(G, k).
\]

We take \( \alpha \smile \beta \) to be the cohomology class represented by \( f \circ \Omega^i_\chi(g) \). This is called the cup product of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \).

3. Representations of \( C_2 \times C_2 \)

In this section, let \( G = \langle \sigma, \tau \rangle \) denote the Klein four-group, and let \( k \) be a field of characteristic 2 (not necessarily algebraically closed). We set \( \chi = \{ H_1, H_2, H_3 \} \), the set of all proper nontrivial subgroups of \( G \), where \( H_1 = \langle \sigma \rangle, H_2 = \langle \tau \rangle, H_3 = \langle \sigma \tau \rangle \).

Let \( X := \sigma - 1 \in kG, Y := \tau - 1 \in kG \). Then \( X^2 = Y^2 = 0, kG \) is isomorphic to the quotient ring

\[
R := k[X, Y]/(X^2, Y^2),
\]

and \( kG \)-modules can be viewed as \( R \) modules. We will describe \( R \)-modules by means of the diagrams for modules first introduced by Alperin in [1]. In these diagrams, nodes represent basis elements, and two nodes labelled \( a \) and \( b \) are joined by a south-west directed arrow if \( Xa = b \), and by a south-east directed arrow if \( Ya = b \). If no south-west arrow begins at \( a \) then it is understood that \( Xa = 0 \), similarly for \( Y \).

Our statement of the classification of \( kG \)-modules resembles that found in [7] and we recommend this reference as an easily accessible proof.

**Proposition 9.** Let \( M \) be an indecomposable \( kG \)-module. Then \( M \) is isomorphic to one of the following:

1. The module \( V_{2n+1} \) \((n \geq 0)\), with odd dimension \( 2n + 1 \) and diagram

   \[
   a_0 \quad a_1 \quad \cdots \quad a_{n-1} \quad a_n
   \]

   \[
b_1 \quad \cdots \quad b_n
   \]

2. The module \( V_{-(2n+1)} \) \((n \geq 0)\), with odd dimension \( 2n + 1 \) and diagram

   \[
b_0 \quad a_1 \quad \cdots \quad a_n
   \]

   \[
b_1 \quad \cdots \quad b_n
   \]

   Note that \( V_1 \cong V_{-1} \cong k \), with trivial \( G \)-action, but otherwise these modules are pairwise non-isomorphic.
(3) The module $V_{2n, \infty}$, $(n \geq 1)$, with even dimension $2n$ and diagram

(4) The module $V_{2n, \theta}$, $(n \geq 1)$, with even dimension $2n$ and diagram,

Here, $\theta(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \lambda_i x^{n-i}$ is a power of an irreducible monic polynomial with coefficients in $k$ and the dotted line labelled by $\theta$ indicates that $Xa_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n-i} \lambda_i b_i$.

(5) The projective indecomposable module $P$, with dimension 4 and diagram

The following, also taken from [7], may be proved directly from the classification above.

**Proposition 10.** Let $M$ be an indecomposable $kG$-module. Then we have

1. $M \cong M^*$ if $M$ is even-dimensional.
2. $M^* \cong V_{-(2n+1)}$ if $M \cong V_{2n+1}$ is odd dimensional.
3. $M^* \cong V_{2n+1}$ if $M \cong V_{-(2n+1)}$ is odd-dimensional.

Clearly (3) follows from (2) above, but we include it for completeness. In addition,

**Proposition 11.** Let $M$ be an indecomposable $kG$-module. Then we have

1. $\Omega(M) \cong M^*$ if $M$ is even-dimensional.
2. $\Omega^{-1}(M) \cong V_{-(2n+3)}$ if $M \cong V_{-(2n+1)}$ is odd dimensional.
3. $\Omega(M) \cong V_{2n+3}$ if $M \cong V_{2n+1}$ is odd-dimensional.

Again (3) follows from (2) when we take into account that $\Omega(M)^* \cong \Omega^{-1}(M^*)$ in general.

3.1. Relative shifts. The goal of this subsection is to prove Theorem 11.

Among the indecomposable $kG$-modules listed in the previous section, only four are projective relative to $\chi$. These are the projective indecomposable $P^*$, and the three modules $V_{2, \infty}$, $V_{2, x}$ and $V_{2, x+1}$. Here the last two are the indecomposable modules $V_{2, \theta}$ where $\theta(x)$ is the monic irreducible $x$ or $x+1 \in k[x]$. Note that $\tau$ acts trivially on $V_{2, \infty} = kH_2 \uparrow^G$, while $\sigma$ acts trivially on $V_{2, x} = kH_2 \uparrow^G$ and $\sigma \tau$ acts trivially on $V_{2, x+1} = kH_3 \uparrow^G$. As these three play in important role in what follows, we denote them by $Q_\sigma$, $Q_\tau$ and $Q_{\sigma \tau}$ respectively. We set $Q = Q_\sigma \oplus Q_\tau \oplus Q_{\sigma \tau}$.

We begin by considering odd-dimensional modules.

**Lemma 12.** Let $n \geq 0$:

1. The relative projective cover of $V_{-(2n+1)}$ is $Q \oplus nP$. 

[Diagram not shown in the natural text representation]
(2) We have $\Omega_\chi(V^{-(2n+1)}) \cong V^{-(2n+5)}$.

Proof. Let $M \cong V^{-(2n+1)}$ and let $\pi : N \to M$ be its relative projective cover with respect to $\chi$. $N$ must decompose as a direct sum of modules of the form $P$, $Q_\sigma$, $Q_\tau$ and $Q_{\sigma\tau}$.

Let $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n, b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_n$ be a basis of $M$, with action given by the diagram as in Proposition [9]. Since $\pi$ is a surjective $kG$-map and no $a_i$ is fixed by any element of $G$, the same must be true of their unique pre-images. The modules $Q_\sigma$, $Q_\tau$ and $Q_{\sigma\tau}$ all have non-trivial kernels. Therefore $N$ contains at least $n$ copies of $P$.

On the other hand, we have, for any $i$,

\begin{align}
M \downarrow_{H_i} &\cong kH_i \oplus nkH_i
\end{align}

The restrictions to $H_i$ of $P$, $Q_\sigma$ and $Q_{\sigma\tau}$ contain no trivial $H_i$-summands. So $N$ must contain a direct summand isomorphic to $Q_\sigma$ if $\pi$ is to split on restriction to $H_1$.

A similar argument (restricting to $H_2, H_3$) shows that $N$ must contain summands isomorphic to $Q_\tau$ and $Q_{\sigma\tau}$.

We will construct a surjective $kG$-homomorphism $Q \oplus nP \to M$. The following diagrams label the basis elements:

\begin{align}
Q_\sigma &\quad Q_\tau &\quad Q_{\sigma\tau}
\end{align}

(The diagram for $Q_{\sigma\tau}$ is not as described in Proposition [9] but self-explanatory.)

We now define a linear map $\pi : Q \oplus nP \to M$ by

- $\pi(w_i) = a_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.
- $\pi(x_i) = b_{i-1}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.
- $\pi(y_i) = b_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.
- $\pi(z_i) = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.
- $\pi(s_i) = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.
- $\pi(r_1) = \pi(r_3) = a_0$.
- $\pi(r_2) = a_n$.

The reader should check that $\pi$ is a $kG$-homomorphism. The kernel of $\pi$ is spanned by

$$\{z_i : i = 1, \ldots, n\} \cup \{s_1, s_2, s_3\} \cup \{x_i + y_i : i = 2, \ldots, n\} \cup \{x_1 + r_1, x_1 + r_3, y_n + r_2\}.$$

It has dimension $2n + 5$, and the fixed-point space within this module is spanned by \{\(z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_n, s_1, s_2, s_3\), so it has dimension $n + 3$. It is easily checked that no element of the kernel outside of the fixed-point space is fixed by any subgroup $H_i$.

Therefore

$$\ker(\pi) \downarrow_{H_i} \cong kH_i \oplus (n + 2)kH_i$$

for any $i$. This, combined with [10] and the fact that

$$Q \oplus nP \downarrow_{H_i} \cong 2kH_i \oplus (2n + 2)kH_i$$

shows that $\pi$ splits on restriction to any $H_i$. The construction ensures the minimality of $Q \oplus nP$, so $Q \oplus nP = N$, proving (1). Further, $\Omega_\chi(M) = \ker(\pi)$, and the classification of $kG$-modules, together with the fact that $\ker(\pi)$ must be indecomposable, implies that $\ker(\pi) \cong V^{-(2n+5)}$, proving (2).

The following follows immediately the above using Propositions [10] and [3].

**Lemma 13.** Let $n \geq 0$: Then we have $\Omega_\chi(V^{(2n+5)}) \cong V^{(2n+1)}$. 

To complete the picture for odd-dimensional modules, it remains only to show that

**Lemma 14.** Let $M \cong V_3$. Then:
1. The relative projective cover of $M$ is $Q$;
2. We have $\Omega_\chi(M) \cong V_{-3}$.

**Proof.** We have $M \downarrow H_i \cong k_{H_i} \oplus kH_i$, for $i = 1, 2, 3$, so once more the projective cover must contain a summand isomorphic to $Q$. We shall construct a $kG$-homomorphism $\pi : Q \to M$. We retain the notation for a basis of $Q$ used in Lemma 12 a basis for $M$ is $\{a_0, a_1, b_1\}$ with action given as in the classification.

Define:
- $\pi(r_1) = a_0$
- $\pi(r_2) = a_1$
- $\pi(r_3) = a_0 + a_1$
- $\pi(s_1) = \pi(s_2) = \pi(s_3) = b_1$.

The reader should check this is a $kG$-homomorphism. The kernel of $\pi$ is spanned by $\{s_1 + s_2, s_2 + s_3, r_1 + r_2 + r_3\}$, and the fixed-point space of the kernel is two-dimensional, spanned by $\{s_1 + s_3, s_2 + s_3\}$. Noting that

$$X(r_1 + r_2 + r_3) = s_2 + s_3, Y(r_1 + r_2 + r_3) = s_1 + s_3,$$

we see that the kernel of $\pi$ is indecomposable, and as a $kG$-module is isomorphic to $V_{-3}$. Therefore

$$\ker(\pi)_{H_i} \oplus k_{H_i} \oplus kH_i$$

for all $i$, from which we deduce that $\pi$ splits on restriction to each $H_i$. Our construction ensures the minimality of $Q$, so $Q$ is indeed the relative projective cover of $M$, proving (1), and $\ker(\pi) = \Omega_\chi(M) \cong V_{-3}$, proving (2). \[\square\]

We now turn to even dimensional modules. Note that $V_{2,\infty} = Q_\tau$ is already projective relative to $\chi$, so $\Omega_\chi(V_{2,\infty})$ is not defined.

**Lemma 15.** Let $n \geq 2$ and $M \cong V_{2n,\infty}$. Then:
1. The relative projective cover of $M$ is $2Q_\tau \oplus (n - 1)P$;
2. We have $\Omega_\chi(M) \cong M$.

**Proof.** Let $\pi : N \to M$ be the relative projective cover of $M$. Notice that

$$M \downarrow H_i = nkH_i$$

for $i = 1, 3$ whereas

$$M \downarrow H_2 = 2kH_2 \oplus (n - 1)kH_2.$$ 

So if $\pi : N \to M$ is to split on restriction to $H_2$, $N$ must contain a pair of direct summands isomorphic to $Q_\tau$. On the other hand, retaining the notation from Proposition 9 the basis elements $a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1}$ are not fixed by any element of $G$, so the same must be true of their unique pre-images in $N$. From this it follows that $N$ must contain $n - 1$ direct summands isomorphic to $P$.

We will construct a $kG$-homomorphism $2Q_\tau \oplus (n - 1)P \to M$. The following diagram gives the labelling for a basis of the domain:

```
Q_\tau   Q_\tau
\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow
s_1    s_2
\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow
r_1    r_2
\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow
x_1    w_1
\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow
z_1    y_1
\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow
x_{n-1}  y_{n-1}
\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow
z_{n-1}
```
We define:

- \( \pi(w_i) = a_i \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n - 1 \).
- \( \pi(x_i) = b_i \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n - 1 \).
- \( \pi(y_i) = b_{i+1} \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n - 1 \).
- \( \pi(z_i) = 0 \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n - 1 \).
- \( \pi(r_1) = b_1 \).
- \( \pi(s_1) = 0 \).
- \( \pi(r_2) = a_n \).
- \( \pi(s_2) = b_n \).

The reader should check that \( \pi \) is a \( kG \)-homomorphism. The kernel of \( \pi \) is spanned by

\[
\{ z_i : i = 1, \ldots, n - 1 \} \cup \{ x_i + y_{i-1} : i = 2, \ldots, n - 1 \} \cup \{ s_1, x_1 + r_2, y_{n-1} + s_2 \}.
\]

This has dimension \( 2n \). The fixed points within this module are spanned by

\[
\{ z_i : i = 1, \ldots, n - 1 \} \cup \{ s_1 \}.
\]

These span the fixed points of \( H_1 \) and \( H_3 \), while \( H_2 \) has a fixed point space of dimension \( n + 1 \), spanned by the above and \( y_{n+1} + s_2 \). Therefore we have

\[
\ker(\pi) \downarrow_{H_i} \cong nkH_i
\]

for \( i = 1, 3 \) and

\[
\ker(\pi) \downarrow_{H_2} \cong 2kH_2 \oplus (n-1)kH_2.
\]

Note that

\[
(2Q \oplus (n-1)P) \downarrow_{H_i} \cong 2nkH_i
\]

for \( i = 1, 3 \) and

\[
(2Q \oplus (n-1)P) \downarrow_{H_2} \cong 4kH_2 \oplus (2n-2)kH_2.
\]

Thus, \( \pi \) splits on restriction to each \( H_i \). The construction ensures the minimality of \( 2Q \oplus (n-1)P \), so this is equal to \( N \) and we have (1). Further, \( \ker(\pi) = \Omega^i(M) \) must be indecomposable. By the classification (looking at the dimension of the fixed point space of each subgroup of \( G \) to distinguish among modules of even dimension) we must have \( \Omega^i(M) \cong M \) as required for (2).

Notice that if \( \theta(x) = x^n \), then \( V_{2n,\theta} \) can be obtained from \( V_{2n,\infty} \) by applying the automorphism of \( G \) which swaps \( \sigma \) and \( \tau \). Similarly if \( \theta(x) = (x+1)^n \), then \( V_{2n,\theta} \) can be obtained from \( V_{2n,\infty} \) by applying the automorphism of \( G \) which swaps \( \sigma \tau \) and \( \tau \). We therefore obtain immediately from Lemma 15 above that \( \Omega^i(M) \cong M \) if \( M \) is one of these.

It remains only to prove the following:

**Lemma 16.** Let \( n \geq 1 \) and let \( M \cong V_{2n,\theta} \), where \( \theta \) is neither \( x^n \) nor \( (x+1)^n \). Then:

1. The relative projective cover of \( M \) is \( nP \);
2. \( \Omega^i(M) \cong M \).

**Proof.** Observe that \( M \downarrow_{H_i} \cong nkH_i \) for each \( i \). The proof of [7, Proposition 3.1] shows that the projective (as opposed to relatively projective) cover of \( M \) is \( nP \) and \( \Omega(M) \cong M \), so there is a surjective \( kG \)-homomorphism \( \pi : nP \rightarrow M \) with kernel isomorphic to \( M \). Noting that \( nP \downarrow_{H_i} \cong 2nkH_i \) for each \( i \), we see that \( \pi \) splits on restriction to each \( H_i \). On the other hand, if \( N \) is a \( kG \)-module having \( Q \) (resp. \( Q_\sigma, Q_\sigma\tau \)) as a direct summand then \( N \downarrow_{H_i} \) contains a pair of trivial \( kH_i \)-modules as direct summand, and no surjective homomorphism \( N \rightarrow M \) may split. This shows
Recall that for Proposition 18. Let $H$ relative to $\chi$ is projective relative to $N$ if for any $i$ (> 0), then $H_i = 0$ for all $i > 0$: this is an immediate consequence of Proposition 2. Further, recall from part (i) of the same that $H^0(G, N) = N^G$ for any $kG$-module. It follows that:

**Proposition 18.** Let $N \in \{ P, Q_\sigma, Q_\tau, Q_{\sigma\tau} \}$. Then,

$$\dim(H^i(G, N)) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Now we consider even-dimensional modules which are not relatively projective. Recall that for $i > 0$ we have

$$H^i(G, N) = \text{Hom}_{kG}(\Omega^i(k), N) \cong \text{Hom}_{kG}(k, \Omega^{-i}(N)) \cong \text{Hom}_{kG}(k, N) \cong N^G$$

using the fact that, for these modules $N$, we have $\Omega^{-i}(N) \cong N$. We obtain by direct calculation:

**Proposition 19.** Let $N$ be an even-dimensional $kG$-module which is not projective relative to $\chi$. Then,

$$\dim(H^i(G, N)) = \begin{cases} n & \text{if } i = 0, \\ n - 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

if $N \cong V_{2n,0}$ or $N \cong V_{2n,\theta}$ where $\theta(x) = x^n$ or $\theta(x) = (x + 1)^n$, while

$$\dim(H^i(G, N)) = n$$

for any $i$, if $V \cong V_{2n,\theta}$ for some other choice of $\theta$.

For odd-dimensional modules we proceed as follows. Let $N$ be an odd-dimensional indecomposable module and let $i > 0$. Then

$$H^i(G, N) = \text{Hom}_{kG}(\Omega^i(k), N) \cong \text{Hom}_{kG}(k, \Omega^{-i}(N)) \cong \text{Hom}_{kG}(k, N) \cong \Omega^i(N)^G$$

using Theorem 1. Suppose $N \cong V_{2n+1}$ where $n \geq 0$. Then $\Omega^i(N) \cong V_{2(n+2i)+1}$. A basis for $V_{2(n+2i)+1}$ is given by $\{a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_{n+2i}, b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_{n+2i}\}$, with action given by the diagram in Proposition 9. The $b_i$ are all fixed points, and in addition $a_0$ is fixed by $H_1$, $a_{n+2i}$ by $H_2$, and $a_0 + a_1 + \ldots + a_{n+2i}$ by $H_3$. Therefore, $b_1, b_{n+2i}$, and $b_1 + b_2 + \ldots + b_{n+2i}$ lie in $\Omega^i(N)^G$. We therefore have

**Proposition 20.** Let $N \cong V_{2n+1}$ for some $n \geq 0$. Then

1. $\dim(H^0(G, N)) = n$ if $n > 0$, and 1 if $n = 0$.
2. $\dim(H^i(G, N)) = \max(0, n + 2i - 3)$ for $i > 0$.

**Remark 21.** This includes Theorem 1.2 as a special case ($n = 0$).

For the remaining odd dimensional modules things are a little more complicated, since $\Omega^i(N)$ eventually moves into the “positive” part of the spectrum. We begin by noting that if $n \geq 0$, then $V_{-(2n+1)}^G = V_{-(2n+1)}^G$. Therefore $(V_{-(2n+1)}^G)^G = 0$. 

Now let $N \cong V_{-(2n+1)}$ where $n \geq 1$. For $i \leq n/2$ we have $\Omega^{2i}(N) \cong V_{-(2(n-2i)+1)}$. Therefore

$$H^1_G(N) = \text{Hom}_G(\Omega^1_G(k), N) \cong \text{Hom}_G(k, \Omega^{i+1}_G(N)) \cong \text{Hom}_G(k, \Omega^{2i}(N))^G.$$ 

For $i > n/2$ we have $\Omega^{2i}(N) \cong V_{2(2i-n)+1}$. We therefore obtain the following:

**Proposition 22.** Let $N \cong V_{-(2n+1)}$ where $n \geq 1$. Then

$$\dim(H^1_G(N)) = \begin{cases} 
  n + 1 - 2i & i \leq n/2 \\
  \max(0, 2i - n - 3) & i > n/2.
\end{cases}$$

3.3. **Calculating cup products.** The aim of this section is to prove Theorem 2. We begin with a lemma:

**Lemma 23.** Let $M \cong V_{-(2m+1)}$ and $N \cong V_{-(2n+1)}$ for some $m > n \geq 0$. Let $\phi \in \text{Hom}_G(M, N)$. Then

1. $\text{im}(\phi) \subseteq N^G$;
2. $M^G \subseteq \ker(\phi)$.

**Proof.** Note first that $\phi(M^G) \subseteq N^G$ for arbitrary $G$ and $\mathbb{k}G$-modules $M$ and $N$. Let $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m, b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_n$ and $a'_1, a'_2, \ldots, a'_m, b'_0, b'_1, \ldots, b'_n$ be bases of $M$ and $N$ respectively, with action given by the diagrams in proposition 9. Note that if $n = 0$, then (1) is immediate. So suppose $n > 0$ and (1) does not hold: then we can find a maximal $k \geq 1$ such that $\phi(a_k) \notin N^G$.

We claim that $k = m$. To see this, write

$$\phi(a_k) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i a'_i \mod N^G.$$ 

Then

$$\phi(b_k) = \phi(Ya_k) = Y \phi(a_k) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i b'_i.$$ 

If $k < m$ then also

$$\phi(b_k) = \phi(Xa_{k+1}) = X \phi(a_{k+1}) = 0$$ 

since $\phi(a_{k+1}) \in N^G$. So $\lambda_i = 0$ for all $i$ and $\phi(a_k) \in N^G$, a contradiction.

Now we claim that, for all $0 \leq j \leq n$, we have

$$\phi(a_{m-j}) = \sum_{i=j+1}^n \lambda_i a'_{i-j} \mod N^G$$

and $\lambda_i = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, j$. We prove this by induction on $j$. The base case $j = 0$ is true by definition. Assuming the above for some $0 \leq j < n$ and noting that $n < m$, we have

$$\phi(b_{m-j-1}) = \phi(Xa_{m-j}) = X \phi(a_{m-j}) = \sum_{i=j+1}^n \lambda_i b'_{i-j-1}.$$ 

But

$$\phi(b_{m-j-1}) = \phi(Ya_{m-j-1}) = Y \phi(a_{m-j-1}) \in YN = \langle b'_1, \ldots, b'_n \rangle$$

which shows that $\lambda_{j+1} = 0$. Therefore

$$\phi(b_{m-j-1}) = \sum_{i=j+2}^n \lambda_i b'_{i-j-1}$$

which shows that

$$\phi(a_{m-j-1}) = \sum_{i=j+2}^n \lambda_i a'_{i-j-1} \mod N^G.$$
proving our claim. Taking \( j = n \) in \((9)\) shows that \( \phi(a_m) \in N^G \), a contradiction. This proves (1).

For (2), let \( x \in M^G \). We may write
\[
x = \sum_{i=0}^{m} \mu_i b_i
\]
for some coefficients \( \mu_i \). Then
\[
\phi(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{m} \mu_i \phi(b_i) = \mu_0 \phi(Xa_0) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mu_i \phi(Ya_{i-1}) = \mu_0 X\phi(a_0) + Y\phi(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mu_i a_i) = 0
\]
by (1).

\[\square\]

The following is immediate:

**Corollary 24.** Let \( L \cong V_{-(2l+1)} \), \( M \cong V_{-(2m+1)} \) and \( N \cong V_{-(2n+1)} \) for some \( l > m > n \geq 0 \). Let \( \phi \in \text{Hom}_k(G, N) \) and \( \psi \in \text{Hom}_k(G, M) \). Then \( \phi \circ \psi = 0 \).

We may now proceed with the proof of Theorem 2:

**Proof.** Let \( i, j > 0 \). Let \( \alpha \in H^i_k(G, \mathbb{k}) \) and \( \beta \in H^j_k(G, \mathbb{k}) \). Choose \( \phi \in \text{Hom}_k(G, \Omega^i_k(k), \mathbb{k}) \) and \( \psi \in \text{Hom}_k(G, \Omega^j_k(k), \mathbb{k}) \), such that the equivalence classes
\[
[\phi] \in \text{Hom}_k^\chi(H^i_k(G, \mathbb{k}), \mathbb{k}), [\psi] \in \text{Hom}_k^\chi(H^j_k(G, \mathbb{k}), \mathbb{k})
\]
represent \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) respectively. By definition, \( \alpha \sim \beta \) is represented by \( [\phi \circ \Omega^i_k(\psi)] \).

By Lemma 12 we have
\[
\phi \in \text{Hom}(V_{-(2i+1)}, V_{-(i+1)}), \Omega^i_k(\psi) \in \text{Hom}(V_{-(2i+2j+1)}, V_{-(2i+1)})
\]
and by Corollary 24 the composition of these two is the trivial map. \[\square\]
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