$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Mission statement}\\ \mbox{Approaches for computing Cohomology}\\ \mbox{Degree-wise approximation of } H^{*}(G;\mathbb{F}_{p})\\ \mbox{Benson's Completeness Criterion}\\ \mbox{Implementation in SAGE}\\ \mbox{Summary of computational results} \end{array}$ 

# The Cohomology of finite *p*-Groups

### Simon King (joint work with David J. Green)

### DFG project GR 1585/4–1 Friedrich–Schiller–Universität Jena

January 22, 2009

 $\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Mission statement}\\ \mbox{Approaches for computing Cohomology}\\ \mbox{Degree-wise approximation of $H^+(G, \mathbb{F}_p)$\\ \mbox{Benson's Completeness Criterion}\\ \mbox{Implementation in SAGE}\\ \mbox{Summary of computational results} \end{array}$ 

# Outline

- Mission statement
- 2 Approaches for computing Cohomology
  - Spectral Sequences vs. Projective Resolutions
- 3 Degree-wise approximation of  $H^*(G; \mathbb{F}_p)$ 
  - Constructing minimal projective resolutions
  - Finding relations
  - Chosing generators
- 4 Benson's Completeness Criterion
- 5 Implementation in SAGE
  - Digression: Why C-MEATAXE?
- 6 Summary of computational results
  - Minimal generating sets and relations
  - How good is Benson's criterion?

#### Mission statement

Approaches for computing Cohomology Degree-wise approximation of  $H^*(G; \mathbb{F}_p)$ Benson's Completeness Criterion Implementation in SAGE Summary of computational results

# What is a Cohomology ring?

Let G be a finite p-group (i.e., p prime,  $|G| = p^n$ ). We study the modular cohomology ring  $H^*(G; \mathbb{F}_p)$ .

- *H*<sup>\*</sup>(*G*; 𝔽<sub>*p*</sub>) is a graded commutative finitely presented 𝔽<sub>*p*</sub>-algebra (*x* · *y* = (−1)<sup>deg(x)·deg(y)</sup>*y* · *x*).
- $H^*(G; \mathbb{F}_p)$  is determined by G up to isomorphism.
- Any group homomorphism φ: G<sub>1</sub> → G<sub>2</sub> gives rise to an algebra homomorphism φ<sup>\*</sup>: H<sup>\*</sup>(G<sub>2</sub>; F<sub>p</sub>) → H<sup>\*</sup>(G<sub>1</sub>; F<sub>p</sub>)
- Any subgroup  $U \leq G$  gives rise to a restriction map  $H^*(G; \mathbb{F}_p) \to H^*(U; \mathbb{F}_p)$

### J. F. Carlson, 1997-2001(?)

Groups of order 64, long computation time, using  $\rm MAGMA$ 

#### Mission statement

Approaches for computing Cohomology Degree-wise approximation of  $H^*(G; \mathbb{F}_p)$ Benson's Completeness Criterion Implementation in SAGE Summary of computational results

# DFG Project "Computational Group Cohomology"

### Aim

- Compute the cohomology for many groups, including all 2328 groups of order 128 (provide minimal generating sets and relations)
- Test the Strong Benson Conjecture.
- Collect results in a data base.
- Present the results on Web pages

Web: http://users.minet.uni-jena.de/~king/cohomology/

#### Mission statement

Approaches for computing Cohomology Degree-wise approximation of  $H^*(G; \mathbb{F}_p)$ Benson's Completeness Criterion Implementation in SAGE Summary of computational results

# Performance of our software

2-groups:

- For all 267 groups of order 64:
  - $\sim 27$  CPU-min,  $\sim 38$  clock-min (Intel Pentium M, 1.73 GHz)
- Very roughly 10 months for the 2328 groups of order 128:
  - 21 days for all but four groups of order 128 (parallel on two Dual Core AMD Opteron Processor 270 with 2 GHz, 16 Gb)
  - 2 months for the four exceptional cases (parallely)

We also have all but 8 cohomology rings for 3-, 5-, and 7-groups of order at most 625,

(known) Sylow–2 of the Higman-Sims group (order 512), (new) Sylow–2 of the third Conway group (order 1024)  $\begin{array}{c} Mission statement\\ \textbf{Approaches for computing Cohomology}\\ Degree-wise approximation of <math>H^{r}(G;\mathbb{F}_p)\\ Benson's Completeness Criterion\\ Implementation in SAGE\\ Summary of computational results \end{array}$ 

Spectral Sequences vs. Projective Resolutions

# Approaches for computing Cohomology

### Spectral Sequences

- Lyndon–Hochschild–Serre
   → extraspecial 2–groups [D. Quillen, 1971]
- Eilenberg–Moore ~→ groups of order 32 [D. J. Rusin, 1989]

#### Projective resolutions

Yields approximation in increasing degree Main problem: When is the computation finished?

- Carlson's Completeness Criterion (depends on a conjecture)
- Use spectral sequences (→ HAP, G. Ellis, P. Smith 2008)
- Benson's Completeness Criterion (see below)

Mission statement Approaches for computing Cohomology Degree-wise approximation of  $H^{*}(G, \mathbb{F}_{p})$ Benson's Completeness Criterion Implementation in SAGE Summary of computational results

Constructing minimal projective resolutions Finding relations Chosing generators

# Constructing minimal projective resolutions

### D. Green 2001

Use n. c. Gröbner basis techniques for modules over  $\mathbb{F}_p G$ 

- Negative monomial orders (for minimality)
- Two-speed replacement rules: Type I precedes Type II

# $\mathbb{F}_3C_3 \cong \mathbb{F}_3[t]/\langle t^3 \rangle, \ M = (F_3C_3 \cdot a \otimes F_3C_3 \cdot b)/\langle t \cdot a - t^2 \cdot a + t \cdot b \rangle$

Type I rule:  $t^3 \rightsquigarrow 0$ . Type II rule:  $t \cdot a \rightsquigarrow t^2 \cdot a - t \cdot b$ . Reduce  $t \cdot a + t \cdot b$ :  $\rightsquigarrow t^2 \cdot a - t \cdot b + t \cdot b = t^2 \cdot a$  $\rightsquigarrow t^3 \cdot a - t^2 \cdot b \rightsquigarrow -t^2 \cdot b$  (Type I precedes Type II!).

Existence and uniqueness of reductions, Gröbner bases, computing kernels of homomorphisms...

 $\begin{array}{c} Mission statement\\ Approaches for computing Cohomology\\ \textbf{Degree-wise approximation of } H^{*}(G, \mathbb{F}_{p})\\ Benson's Completeness Criterion\\ Implementation in SAGE\\ Summary of computational results \end{array}$ 

Constructing minimal projective resolutions Finding relations Chosing generators

# Finding relations

### Assume we know the cohomology out to degree n; hence:

- *R<sub>n</sub>*: Free graded-commutative algebra over 𝔽<sub>p</sub>, given by minimal generators of *H*<sup>\*</sup>(*G*; 𝔽<sub>p</sub>) of degree ≤ *n*.
- $I_n \subset R_n$ , generated by degree- $\leq n$ -part of ker $(R_n \rightarrow H^*(G))$ .

#### Compute the next degree as follows:

- Standard monomials of *I<sub>n</sub>* of degree *n* + 1
   → decomposable (*n* + 1)-classes in cohomology.
- Find new relations in degree  $n + 1 \longrightarrow I_{n+1}$ .
- Indecomposable classes  $\rightsquigarrow$  new generators  $\rightsquigarrow R_{n+1}$

 $\begin{array}{c} Mission statement\\ Approaches for computing Cohomology\\ \textbf{Degree-wise approximation of } H^{*}(G;\mathbb{F}_{p})\\ Benson's Completeness Criterion\\ Implementation in SAGE\\ Summary of computational results \end{array}$ 

Constructing minimal projective resolutions Finding relations Chosing generators

#### Special choice of generators

- O Nilpotent generators ↔ Restrictions to all maximal elem.
   ab. subgroups of G are nilpotent (easy to test!)
- Boring" generators: Not nilpotent, but restriction to the greatest central elem. ab. subgroup is nilpotent.
- Remaining: Duflot regular generators

#### Reason for that choice of generators

David Green's monomial order on  $R_n$  relies on the generator types. It simplifies the computations by magic! Also, it is used in the completeness criterion below.  $\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Mission statement}\\ \mbox{Approaches for computing Cohomology}\\ \mbox{Degree-wise approximation of $H^+(G, \mathbb{F}_p)$\\ \mbox{Benson's Completeness Criterion}\\ \mbox{Implementation in SAGE}\\ \mbox{Summary of computational results} \end{array}$ 

# Benson's Completeness Criterion

G abelian  $\Rightarrow$  degree 2 suffices. Otherwise:

- Let r be the p-Rank of G and let  $R_n/I_n$  approximate  $H^*(G)$
- Let  $P_1, \ldots, P_r \in R_n/I_n$  be a filter-regular HSOP,  $\deg(P_i) \ge 2$ l.e., the multiplication by  $P_i$  on  $R_n/(I_n + \langle P_1, ..., P_{i-1} \rangle)$ has finite kernel, for i = 1, ..., r.
- Maximal degrees of the kernels and of  $R_n/(I_n + \langle P_1, ..., P_r \rangle)$  $\rightsquigarrow$  "filter degree type"  $(d_1, ..., d_{r+1})$  (after easy computation)

#### Theorem [D. J. Benson, 2004]

$$n > \max(0, d_{i} + i - 1)_{i=1,...,r} + \sum_{i} \deg(P_{i}) - r \implies R_{n}/I_{n} \cong H^{*}(G)$$
  
**Remark** " $n \ge ...$ " suffices if  $\operatorname{rk}(Z(G)) \ge 2$   
**Conj.** If  $R_{n}/I_{n} \cong H^{*}(G)$  then  $(d_{1},...,d_{r+1}) = (-1, -2, ..., -r, -r)$ 

 $\begin{array}{c} Mission statement\\ Approaches for computing Cohomology\\ Degree-wise approximation of <math>H^{*}(G;\mathbb{F}_{p})\\ \textbf{Benson's Completeness Criterion}\\ Implementation in SAGE\\ Summary of computational results \end{array}$ 

# Constructing a filter-regular HSOP

- Let r = p-rk(G) and z = rk(Z(G)). Find **Duflot regular** generators  $g_1, ..., g_z \in H^*(G)$ .
- Let  $U_1, ..., U_m \subset G$  be the maximal elementary abelian subgroups.

Using **Dickson invariants**: Compute classes  $D_{i,j}$  in the polynomial part of  $H^*(U_j)$ , for i = 1, ..., r - z and j = 1, ..., m.

- There are classes Δ<sub>i</sub> ∈ H<sup>\*</sup>(G) for i = 1, ..., r − z, simultaneously restricting to the p<sup>k<sub>i</sub></sup>-th power of D<sub>i,j</sub> for j = 1, ..., m. Very often, k<sub>i</sub> = 0.
- g<sub>1</sub>,..., g<sub>z</sub>, Δ<sub>1</sub>,..., Δ<sub>r-z</sub> is a filter-regular HSOP of H<sup>\*</sup>(G)
   [D. J. Benson]. Computable in R<sub>n</sub>/I<sub>n</sub> !!

 $\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Mission statement}\\ \mbox{Approaches for computing Cohomology}\\ \mbox{Degree-wise approximation of $H^+(G, \mathbb{F}_p)$\\ \mbox{Benson's Completeness Criterion}\\ \mbox{Implementation in SAGE}\\ \mbox{Summary of computational results} \end{array}$ 

### Improvement by existence proof

#### Problem: Dickson invariants may be of large degree

- We take minimal factors of the  $\Delta_i$ , for decreasing the degrees.
- We use the Dickson classes *only* for computing the filter degree type (which is the same for any f. r. HSOP)!
- We prove the presence of a small-degree filter-regular HSOP

#### non-constructively

In  $R_n/I_n$ , mod out  $g_1, ..., g_z$ , possibly some  $\Delta_1, ..., \Delta_{i_0}$ , and all monomials of some degree d. If the quotient is finite, then there exist parameters in degree d that extend  $g_1, ..., g_z, \Delta_1, ..., \Delta_{i_0}$  to a filter-regular HSOP [D. Green, S. K. 2008].

Conway(3) and others would be unfeasible without that trick!

Mission statement Approaches for computing Cohomology Degree-wise approximation of H\*(G; F<sub>p</sub>) Benson's Completeness Criterion **Implementation in SAGE** Summary of computational results

Digression: Why C-MEATAXE?

## Important SAGE features

### GAP, SMALLGROUPS library

 ${\rm GAP}$  functions and C-executables of David Green yield data on the group and its elementary abelian subgroups.

#### Cython

- Wrapper MTX for C-MEATAXE matrices (see below)
- Compute resolutions (wrapping C-programs of David Green)
- Provide new extension classes for Cochains, Chain Maps, Cohomology Rings and methods for cup product, restriction, degree-wise approximation, Benson's test, creating Web pages, etc.

Cython yields very good speed!

Mission statement Approaches for computing Cohomology Degree-wise approximation of H\* (G; F<sub>P</sub>) Benson's Completeness Criterion **Implementation in SAGE** Summary of computational results

Digression: Why C-MEATAXE?

### Important SAGE features

#### SINGULAR

Used for all graded commutative stuff. It rocks!

- Gröbner basis of the relation ideal of group 836 of order 128:
  - $\bullet$  > 1 month with self-made implementation (D. Green), but
  - only few hours with SINGULAR.
- Lift Dickson classes: Either by linear algebra (MTX), or by elimination (SINGULAR).
- Detection of filter regular HSOPs.

### You

Your comments led to huge speed-ups by making better use of SINGULAR interface and CYTHON — Thank you!

Mission statement Approaches for computing Cohomology Degree-wise approximation of H\*(G:F<sub>2</sub>) Benson's Completeness Criterion **Implementation in SAGE** Summary of computational results

Why C-MEATAXE?

#### MTX matrices

Purpose: Linear Algebra over fields of order < 256Wraps a modified version of C-MEATAXE 2.2.3.

#### Reasons:

• David Green's programs for computing resolutions rely on C-MEATAXE 2.2.3. Re-implementation or conversion sucks.

Digression: Why C-MEATAXE?

- We need the following operations to be fast:
  - Copying, pickling, hash, equality test, element access, conversion into lists
  - Sum, difference, skalar multiplication
  - Nullspace
- Almost no need for matrix inversion or multiplication.

Mission statement Approaches for computing Cohomology Degree-wise approximation of  $H^*(G; \mathbb{F}_p)$ Benson's Completeness Criterion Implementation in SAGE Summary of computational results

Digression: Why C-MEATAXE?

# MTX vs. usual SAGE-3.2.3 matrices

On AMD Athlon 64 Processor 3700+ with 2.2 GHz, 1 GB RAM, and 2 GB Swap

#### $\mathbb{F}_7$ , random 500 imes 500

Hash, sum and difference was slow in  $\operatorname{SAGE}\nolimits$  , is now ok.

	SAGE	MTX	
copy(M)	1.29 <i>ms</i>	0.27 <i>ms</i>	
loads(dumps(M))	199 <i>ms</i>	30.3 <i>ms</i>	
==	571 <i>ns</i>	795 <i>ns</i>	(different matrices)
	1.16 <i>ms</i>	0.27 <i>ms</i>	(equal matrices)
M[i,j]	5.69 <i>µs</i>	2.24 <i>µs</i>	
M.list()	529 <i>ms</i>	15.4 <i>ms</i>	
skalar mult.	9.1 <i>ms</i>	1.6 <i>ms</i>	
nullspace	23.5 <i>s</i>	4.2 <i>s</i>	(1000 imes 500)

Mission statement Approaches for computing Cohomology Degree-wise approximation of  $H^*(G; \mathbb{F}_p)$ Benson's Completeness Criterion Implementation in SAGE

Summary of computational results

Digression: Why C-MEATAXE?

## MTX vs. usual SAGE-3.2.3 matrices

$\mathbb{F}_2$ , random 5000 $ imes$ 5000					
	SAGE	MTX			
copy(M)	4 <i>ms</i>	4.67 <i>ms</i>			
loads(dumps( $M$ )) 10.6s 623ms					
==	608 <i>ns</i>	869 <i>ns</i>	(different matrices)		
	2.01 <i>ms</i>	3.13 <i>ms</i>	(equal matrices)		
M[i,j] 1.95μs 2.28μs					
M.list()	1.3 <i>s</i>	1.4 <i>s</i>			
nullspace	fails!	55.2 <i>s</i>	(10000 imes 5000)		
M.kernel().basis() was running out of memory.					

#### Conclusion

Conversion would not pay off (at least for now).

Simon King, Schiller-Universität Jena The Cohomology of finite p-Groups

Mission statement Approaches for computing Cohomology Degree-wise approximation of  $H^{*}(G; \mathbb{F}_{p})$ Benson's Completeness Criterion Implementation in SAGE Summary of computational results

Minimal generating sets and relations How good is Benson's criterion?

### Typical generating sets

#### Minimal number of generators

34         3         generators           36         1	#Gen	#gps	2322 groups have less than 34 minimal
36         1           39         1         The winner is:           67         1         Group 836	34	3	generators
39 1 I he winner is: Group 836	36	1	<b>-</b> , , ,
Group 836	39	1	I he winner is:
05 1 0.000	65	1	Group 836

#### Maximal degree of minimal generators

Deg	#gps	2301 groups have generator degree less
13	1	than 12
14	3	
16	22	I he winner is:
17	1	Group 562

Mission statement Approaches for computing Cohomology Degree-wise approximation of H<sup>\*1</sup> (G.F.p.) Benson's Completeness Criterion Implementation in SAGE Summary of computational results

Minimal generating sets and relations How good is Benson's criterion?

## Typical relation ideals

Minimal number of relations			
nal			

Maximal degree of minimal relations			
Deg	#gps	2319 groups have relation degree less	
28	4	than 27	
30	3	The winner is:	
32	1	Group 562	
34	1	But 2298 and 2300 are hardest to obtain.	

Mission statement Approaches for computing Cohomology Degree-wise approximation of  $H^*(G; \mathbb{F}_p)$ Benson's Completeness Criterion Summary of computational results

How good is Benson's criterion?

## How good is Benson's criterion?

#### Failure of Improved Benson's Completeness Criterion

Excess	#gps	The loser is: Group 2320,
0	1779	which is the direct product of $D_8$
1	341	with an elementary abelian group.
2	168	
3	39	
4	1	

### Failure of Duflot's Depth Bound (2313 non-abelian groups)

depth - $rk(Z(G))$	∉gps	The rank of the center is a
0	1767	lower bound for the depth of
1	508	$H^*(G)$ .
2	37	The winner is: Group 2326,
3	1	extraspecial of type $+$
	$\frac{\text{depth} - \text{rk}(Z(G))}{0}$ 1 2 3	$ \frac{\text{depth} - rk(Z(G))}{0}  \frac{\#gps}{1767} \\ \frac{1}{508} \\ 2  37 \\ 3  1 $

Mission statement Approaches for computing Cohomology Degree-wise approximation of H<sup>\*</sup>(G, F<sub>P</sub>) Benson's Completeness Criterion Implementation in SAGE Summary of computational results

Minimal generating sets and relations How good is Benson's criterion?

### To Do

- Search counterexamples for Strong Benson Conjecture. Currently: Group 299 of order 256, which is of defect 4. It shows unexpected behaviour: 77 generators up to degree 11, ~ 3000 relations up to degree 22, but still incomplete — and blocks 158 Gb hard disk...
- Add more features: Interesting invariants, Steenrod actions,  $\mathbb{F}_p$  cohomology of general finite groups
- Build a data base and create a package

#### Status

- $\bullet~\ensuremath{\mathsf{Various}}$  CYTHON modules, almost full doctest coverage
- A lot of C-code, various executables

### — please help! THANK YOU!