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## 1 Introduction

There are three Lie algebras $\mathfrak{l}_{g}, \mathfrak{a}_{g}, \mathfrak{c}_{g}$ defined by Kontsevich [7]. They are related to various geometric objects, e.g. moduli spaces of graphs and Riemann surfaces. In particular, $\mathfrak{c}_{g}$, the main topic in this paper, is used in perturbative Chern-Simons theory, which provides the extension of Vassiliev invariants [1, 6].

Each of three Lie algebras, denoted by $\mathfrak{h}_{g}$ here, has a certain ideal $\mathfrak{h}_{g}^{+}$. By an argument of a spectral sequence,

$$
H_{\bullet}\left(\mathfrak{h}_{g}\right) \cong H_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{s p}(2 g ; \mathbb{Q})) \otimes H_{\bullet}\left(\mathfrak{h}_{g}^{+}\right)^{\mathrm{Sp}}
$$

holds in the stable range. Here $H_{\bullet}\left(\mathfrak{h}_{g}^{+}\right)^{\mathrm{Sp}}$ is the symplectic invariant part of $H_{\bullet}\left(\mathfrak{h}_{g}^{+}\right) . \mathfrak{h}_{g}^{+}$ is relatively easy to compute, and enable us to construct cohomology classes of higher degree by taking duals or cup products. This method is applied to $\mathfrak{l}_{g}$ and $\mathfrak{a}_{g}$ to study them by Morita [8].

Kontsevich's theorem shows each of three corresponds to a kind of graph complex. In the case of $\mathfrak{c}_{g}$,

$$
P H_{\bullet}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{\infty}\right) \cong P H_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{s p}(2 \infty ; \mathbb{Q})) \oplus(\text { commutative graph homology }) .
$$

In fact, both homology groups of $\mathfrak{c}_{\infty}:=\lim _{g \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{c}_{g}$ and $\mathfrak{s p}(2 \infty ; \mathbb{Q}):=\lim _{g \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{s p}(2 g ; \mathbb{Q})$ have natural Hopf algebra structures. We denote by $P H_{\bullet}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{\infty}\right)$ and $P H_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{s p}(2 \infty ; \mathbb{Q}))$ the primitive parts of $H_{\bullet}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{\infty}\right)$ and $H_{\bullet}(\mathfrak{s p}(2 \infty ; \mathbb{Q}))$ respectively. There are some computational results from the viewpoint of graph homology theory (e.g. [2]). Conant-Gerlits-Vogtmann [3] computed the part up to degree 12. Willwacher-Živković [9] determined the generating function of Euler characteristic and displayed it up to weight 60 .

The homology group $H_{\bullet}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)$has a $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0^{-}}$-grading called weight. It decomposes $H_{\bullet}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)$ into direct summands $H_{\bullet}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)_{w}$, which is generated by homogeneous elements of weight $w$. It is easy to see that $H_{1}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)=S^{3} \mathbb{Q}^{2 g}$, however, the higher degree of $H_{\bullet}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)$is still
unknown. We proved $H_{2}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)_{w}=0$ for $g, w \geq 4$. Moreover, we determined $H_{2}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)$in terms of Sp-modules as a corollary.

This paper is a summary of [5], in which more details of the proof are.

## 2 The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{c}_{g}$

Let $g \geq 4$ be an integer. We write $H:=\mathbb{Q}^{2 g}$ and consider the canonical $\operatorname{Sp}(2 g ; \mathbb{Q})$ action. Let $\mu: H \otimes H \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ be the canonical symplectic form, and $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{g}, b_{1}, \ldots, b_{g}$ be a symplectic basis with respect to $\mu$.

Definition 2.1. For $w \geq 0$, let $\mathfrak{c}_{g}(w):=S^{w+2} H$, which is the $(w+2)$-nd symmetric power, and set

$$
\mathfrak{c}_{g}:=\bigoplus_{w \geq 0} \mathfrak{c}_{g}(w) \supset \bigoplus_{w \geq 1} \mathfrak{c}_{g}(w)=: \mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}
$$

We regard $\mathfrak{c}_{g}$ or $\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}$as sets of polynomial functions on $H$ of degree higher than 2 or 3 respectively. Let [,] be the classical Poisson bracket on $H$, i.e.

$$
[f, h]=\sum_{i=1}^{g}\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial a_{i}} \frac{\partial h}{\partial b_{i}}-\frac{\partial f}{\partial b_{i}} \frac{\partial h}{\partial a_{i}}\right) \quad\left(f, h \in \mathfrak{c}_{g}\right) .
$$

Then $\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+} \subset \mathfrak{c}_{g}$ becomes a Lie subalgebra. We consider the Chevalley-Eilenberg chain complex $\left(\wedge^{\bullet} \mathfrak{c}_{g}, \partial\right)$. Then $\wedge^{\bullet} \mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+} \subset \wedge^{\bullet} \mathfrak{c}_{g}$ becomes a chain subcomplex.

We introduce a $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0^{-}}$grading on $\wedge^{\bullet} \mathfrak{c}_{g}$.
Definition 2.2. - For $f_{1} \in \mathfrak{c}_{g}\left(w_{1}\right), \ldots, f_{k} \in \mathfrak{c}_{g}\left(w_{k}\right)$, we say that $f_{1} \wedge \cdots \wedge f_{k} \in \wedge^{k} \mathfrak{c}_{g}$ is of weight $w_{1}+\cdots+w_{k}$.

- $\left(\wedge^{k} \mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)_{w}:=\operatorname{Span}\left\{\omega \in \wedge^{k} \mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+} \mid \omega\right.$ is of weight $\left.w\right\}$

If $f_{1} \in \mathfrak{c}_{g}\left(w_{1}\right)=S^{w_{1}+2} H$ and $f_{2} \in \mathfrak{c}_{g}\left(w_{2}\right)=S^{w_{2}+2} H$, then

$$
\left[f_{1}, f_{2}\right] \in S^{\left(w_{1}+2\right)-1+\left(w_{2}+2\right)-1} H=\mathfrak{c}_{g}\left(w_{1}+w_{2}\right)
$$

In other words, the bracket [,] preserves weights. We see that the symplectic action on $\wedge^{\bullet} \mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}$preserves weights and that so does the differential $\partial$, hence we have a decomposition $\bigoplus_{w \geq 1}\left(\wedge^{\bullet} \mathbf{c}_{g}^{+}\right)_{w}=\wedge^{\bullet} \mathbf{c}_{g}^{+}$as a chain complex.

Definition 2.3. $H_{\bullet}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)_{w}:=H_{\bullet}\left(\left(\left(\wedge_{\bullet} \mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)_{w}, \partial\right)\right)$
Hence $H_{n}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)=\bigoplus_{w \geq 1} H_{n}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)_{w}$. Now we state the main theorem.
Theorem 2.1 (H., 2020). $H_{2}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)_{w}=0$ if $g, w \geq 4$.
The proof is done by showing all the cycles are boundaries.

If $g, w \geq 2$ then $H_{1}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)=S^{3} H=\mathfrak{c}_{g}(1)$ because the differential map

$$
\partial=[,]: \wedge^{2} \mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{w \geq 2} \mathfrak{c}_{g}(w) .
$$

is surjective. This follows from the equation

$$
\partial_{2}\left(a_{1}^{w} a_{g} \wedge a_{1}^{2} b_{g}\right)=\left[a_{1}^{w} a_{g}, a_{1}^{2} b_{g}\right]=a_{1}^{w+2} \in \mathfrak{c}_{g}(w)
$$

and the fact that each $\mathfrak{c}_{g}(w)=S^{w+2} H$ is Sp -irreducible. We want to adopt the similar method, however, the chain space $\left(\wedge^{2} \mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)_{w}$ is not Sp-irreducible for general $w$. Therefore, we must find its Sp -irreducible decomposition and their generators.

## 3 Representation theory of $\operatorname{Sp}(2 g ; \mathbb{Q})$

Let us review the classical representation theory (see e.g. [4]).
The following is an important fact for the proof of the main theorem.

## Theorem 3.1.

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left\{\begin{array}{c}
\text { Finite dimensional polynomial } \\
\text { irreducible } \operatorname{Sp}(2 g ; \mathbb{Q}) \text { representation }
\end{array}\right\} / \cong \stackrel{1: 1}{\longleftrightarrow}\left\{\begin{array}{c}
\text { Young diagram with } \\
\text { at most } g \text { rows }
\end{array}\right\} \\
{\left[V_{\lambda}\right] \longleftrightarrow \lambda}
\end{gathered}
$$

Here $V_{\lambda}$ is the submodule of $\left(\wedge^{\lambda_{1}^{\prime}} H\right) \otimes \cdots \otimes\left(\wedge_{d}^{\lambda_{d}^{\prime}} H\right)$ generated by

$$
a_{\lambda}:=\left(a_{1} \wedge \cdots \wedge a_{\lambda_{1}^{\prime}}\right) \otimes \cdots \otimes\left(a_{1} \wedge \cdots \wedge a_{\lambda_{d}^{\prime}}\right) \in\left(\wedge^{\lambda_{1}^{\prime}} H\right) \otimes \cdots \otimes\left(\wedge^{\lambda_{d}^{\prime}} H\right)
$$

as an $\operatorname{Sp}(2 g ; \mathbb{Q})$-module and ${ }^{t} \lambda=\left[\lambda_{1}^{\prime} \cdots \lambda_{d}^{\prime}\right] \quad\left(g \geq \lambda_{1}^{\prime} \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_{d}^{\prime} \geq 1\right)$ is the transpose of $\lambda$.

Example 3.1. - If $\lambda=[4] \cong S^{4} H$, then $a_{\lambda}=a_{1}^{\otimes 4 .}$

- If $\lambda=[1111]$, then $a_{\lambda}=a_{1} \wedge a_{2} \wedge a_{3} \wedge a_{4}$.
- Let $\lambda=[31]$, then ${ }^{t} \lambda=[211]$. Thus $a_{\lambda}=\left(a_{1} \wedge a_{2}\right) \otimes a_{1} \otimes a_{1}$.


We easily see that the chain space $\wedge^{2} \mathbf{c}_{g}^{+}$decomposes into

$$
\wedge^{2} \mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+} \cong \bigoplus_{w \geq 2}\left(\bigoplus_{\substack{k>l \geq 1 \\ k+l=w}} \mathfrak{c}_{g}(k) \otimes \mathfrak{c}_{g}(l) \oplus \bigoplus_{\substack{k \geq 1 \\ 2 k=w}} \mathfrak{c}_{g}(k) \wedge \mathfrak{c}_{g}(k)\right)
$$

It is enough to discuss for each of the components $\mathfrak{c}_{g}(k) \otimes \mathfrak{c}_{g}(l)$ and $\mathfrak{c}_{g}(k) \wedge \mathfrak{c}_{g}(k)$ because it is finite dimensional so that its Sp-irreducible decomposition always exists. We identify each of its irreducible components with a corresponding Young diagram through Theorem 3.1 for fixed $k$ and $l$.

## Lemma 3.1.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (i) For } k>l \geq 1, \mathfrak{c}_{g}(k) \otimes \mathfrak{c}_{g}(l) \cong \bigoplus_{\substack{0 \leq \lambda_{2} \leq l+2}} \bigoplus_{\substack{0 \leq \rho \leq l+2-\lambda_{2}}}\left[\left(k+l+4-\lambda_{2}-2 \rho\right)\right. \\
& \text { (ii) For } k \geq 1, \boldsymbol{c}_{g}(k) \wedge \mathfrak{c}_{g}(k) \cong \bigoplus_{0 \leq \lambda_{2} \leq k+2} \bigoplus_{\substack{0 \leq \rho \leq k+2-\lambda_{2} \\
\rho+\lambda_{2} \text { is odd }}}\left[\left(2 k+4-\lambda_{2}-2 \rho\right)\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

This lemma follows from the Littlewood-Richardson rule and branching rules. In particular, the multiplicity of Sp-irreducible components of $\mathfrak{c}_{g}(k) \otimes \mathfrak{c}_{g}(l)$ or $\mathfrak{c}_{g}(k) \wedge \mathfrak{c}_{g}(k)$ is always 1. We regard each irreducible component of $\mathfrak{c}_{g}(k) \otimes \mathfrak{c}_{g}(l)$ or $\mathfrak{c}_{g}(k) \wedge \mathfrak{c}_{g}(k)$ as a Young diagram

satisfying the same conditions as ones in the lemma. The part described by dashed lines means the part "chopped off" by the branching rules.

## 4 Sketch of the proof

Note that the differential $\partial$ is Sp-equivariant so that it maps an Sp -irreducible component to another Sp-irreducible component isomorphically, otherwise to 0 .

We show the main theorem by the following steps:

1. Fix $w \geq 4$ and $k \geq l \geq 1$ such that $k+l=w$.

2-1. Take an irreducible component $\lambda=\left[\lambda_{1} \lambda_{2}\right] \neq[w+2]$ of $\mathfrak{c}_{g}(k) \otimes \mathfrak{c}_{g}(l)$ or $\mathfrak{c}_{g}(k) \wedge \mathfrak{c}_{g}(k)$. 2-2. Find $\omega_{3} \in\left(\wedge^{3} \mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)_{w}$ such that $\left.\left(\partial \omega_{3}\right)\right|_{\lambda}$ generates $\lambda$ as an $\operatorname{Sp}(2 g ; \mathbb{Q})$-module.
$\underline{2^{\prime}}$. Find the kernel of $\partial:\left(\wedge^{2} \mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)_{w} \rightarrow\left(\wedge^{1} \mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)_{w}=\mathfrak{c}_{g}(w)$ restricted to the isotypical component corresponding to $\lambda=[w+2]$.

The way to find $\omega_{3}$ varies depending on the conditions which $k, l, \rho, \lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2}$ satisfies. We do not discuss here the details of the construction of $\omega_{3}$ but how to determine if $\partial\left(\omega_{3}\right)$ generates $\lambda$ as an Sp -module.

We define two homomorphisms.

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
\mu_{\text {end }}: & H^{\otimes(w+2)} \longrightarrow H^{\otimes w}, \\
& x_{1} \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{w+2} \longmapsto \mu\left(x_{1}, x_{w+2}\right) x_{2} \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{w+1} \\
\Lambda_{\text {end }}: & H^{\otimes(w+2)} \longrightarrow\left(\wedge^{2} H\right) \otimes H^{\otimes w} . \\
& x_{1} \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{w+2} \longmapsto\left(x_{1} \wedge x_{w+2}\right) \otimes x_{2} \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{w+1}
\end{array}
$$

We consider $\mathfrak{c}_{g}(k)=S^{k+2} H \subset H^{\otimes(k+2)}$ and $\mathfrak{c}_{g}(k) \otimes \mathfrak{c}_{g}(l) \subset H^{\otimes(k+l+4)}$. Similarly we consider $\mathfrak{c}_{g}(k) \wedge \mathfrak{c}_{g}(k) \subset H^{\otimes(2 k+4)}$, like $a_{1}^{3} \wedge a_{2}^{4}=a_{1}^{3} \otimes a_{2}^{4}-a_{2}^{4} \otimes a_{1}^{3} \in H^{\otimes 7}$ for example. Hence $\mu_{\text {end }}$ and $\Lambda_{\text {end }}$ can be applied to an element of $\wedge^{2} \mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}$.

Let $\eta \in \mathfrak{c}_{g}(k) \otimes \mathfrak{c}_{g}(l)$ and let $\lambda \subset \mathfrak{c}_{g}(k) \otimes \mathfrak{c}_{g}(l)$ be an Sp-irreducible component. Let us consider the situation that $\eta$ is mapped to $a_{\lambda}$ (in Theorem 3.1) by some compositions of $\mu_{\text {end }} \mathrm{S}$ and $\Lambda_{\text {end }} \mathrm{S}$. Then the isotypical component of $\eta$ corresponding to $\lambda$, which is denoted by $\left.\eta\right|_{\lambda}$, generates $\lambda$ because both $\mu_{\text {end }}$ and $\Lambda_{\text {end }}$ are Sp-equivariant. We use this technique for the proof.

Example 4.1. Consider the case $w=7, k=4, l=3$, and $\lambda=\left[\begin{array}{ll}2 & 1\end{array}\right]$.


Since $\lambda \neq[9]$, we have to find $\omega_{3} \in\left(\wedge^{3} \mathbf{c}_{g}^{+}\right)_{7}$ with $\left.\left(\partial \omega_{3}\right)\right|_{\lambda}$ generating $\lambda$. In fact, it is enough to define $\omega_{3}:=a_{1}^{2} a_{4} \wedge a_{3}^{4} b_{4} \wedge a_{2} b_{3}^{4}$. Then $\partial \omega_{3}=a_{1}^{2} a_{3}^{4} \wedge a_{2} b_{3}^{4}-16 a_{1}^{2} a_{4} \wedge a_{2} a_{3}^{3} b_{3}^{3} b_{4}$.

Let us check $\left.\left(\partial \omega_{3}\right)\right|_{\lambda}$ generates $\lambda$. For the first term of $\partial \omega_{3}$, we have

$$
\left.a_{1}^{2} a_{3}^{4} \xrightarrow{\left(\mu_{\text {end }}\right)^{\circ 4}} 24^{2} a_{1}^{2} \otimes a_{2} \xrightarrow{\Lambda_{\text {end }}} 2 \cdot 24^{2}\left(a_{1} \wedge a_{2}\right) \otimes a_{1}=24^{2} a_{[2} 1\right] \in\left(\wedge^{2} H\right) \otimes H
$$

Here $\left(\mu_{\text {end }}\right)^{\circ 4}$ is the 4 -time compositions of $\mu_{\text {end }}$. Hence $\left.\left(a_{1}^{2} a_{3}^{4}\right)\right|_{[21]}$ generates [21] as an Sp-module. For the second term, we have $\left.\left(a_{1}^{2} a_{4} \wedge a_{2} a_{3}^{3} b_{3}^{3} b_{4}\right)\right|_{[21]}=0$ because $\mathfrak{c}_{g}(1) \otimes \mathfrak{c}_{g}(6)$ does not contain Sp -irreducible components isomorphic to [2 1] by Lemma 3.1.

Therefore, $\left.\left(\partial \omega_{3}\right)\right|_{\lambda}$ generates $[21] \subset \mathfrak{c}_{g}(4) \otimes \mathfrak{c}_{g}(3)$. This shows that $[21] \subset\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}(4) \otimes\right.$ $\left.\mathfrak{c}_{g}(3)\right) \cap \operatorname{Im}\left(\partial: \wedge^{3} \mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+} \rightarrow \wedge^{2} \mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)$.

## 5 Lower weight cases

By Theorem 2.1, we have

$$
H_{2}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)=\bigoplus_{w \geq 1} H_{2}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)_{w}=\bigoplus_{w=1}^{3} H_{2}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)_{w}
$$

In order to determine $H_{2}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)$, it is enough to discuss the case $w=1,2,3$.
Lemma 5.1. If $g \geq 4$, then $H_{2}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)_{1}=0, H_{2}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)_{2}=[51]+[33]+[22]+[11]+[0]$, and $H_{2}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)_{3}=[1]$.

Proof. $H_{2}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)_{1}=0$ is obvious because no $k \geq l \geq 1$ satisfy $k+l=1$.
Since the weight 2 part of $\wedge^{3} \mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}$is zero and since $\partial_{2}=[]:, \wedge^{2} \mathfrak{c}_{g}(1) \rightarrow \mathfrak{c}_{g}(2)=S^{4} H=[4]$ is surjective, we have $H_{2}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)_{2}=\wedge^{2} \mathfrak{c}_{g}(1) / \mathfrak{c}_{g}(2)$. The Sp -irreducible decomposition of $\wedge^{2} \mathbf{c}_{g}(1)$ is $[51]+[33]+[4]+[22]+[11]+[0]$, therefore the statement follows.

The Sp-irreducible decomposition of $\mathfrak{c}_{g}(2) \otimes \mathfrak{c}_{g}(1)$ is

$$
\mathfrak{c}_{g}(2) \otimes \mathfrak{c}_{g}(1)=[7]+[61]+[52]+[43]+[5]+[41]+[32]+[3]+[21]+[1] .
$$

The space $\wedge^{3} \mathbf{c}_{g}(1)$ does not have [5] and [1] as its Sp-irreducible components. We can use the same method as in the case $w \geq 4$ for all the other Sp-irreducible components and obtain appropriate $\omega_{3} \mathrm{~S}$ for each of them. Again, since $\partial_{2}=$ [, ]: $\mathfrak{c}_{g}(2) \wedge \mathfrak{c}_{g}(1) \rightarrow \mathfrak{c}_{g}(3)=S^{5} H=[5]$ is surjective, we have $H_{2}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)_{3}=\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}(2) \otimes\right.$ $\left.\mathfrak{c}_{g}(1)\right) /\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}(3) \oplus \operatorname{Im}\left(\partial_{3}: \wedge^{3} \mathfrak{c}_{g}(1) \rightarrow \mathfrak{c}_{g}(2) \wedge \mathfrak{c}_{g}(1)\right)\right)=[1]$.

Corollary 5.1. If $g \geq 4$, then $H_{2}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)=[51]+[33]+[22]+[11]+[1]+[0]$ as an Sp-module.
From the proof of Lemma 5.1, we also have the following.
Corollary 5.2. If $g \geq 4$, then $H_{3}\left(\mathfrak{c}_{g}^{+}\right)_{3}=[711]+[63]+[531]+[333]+[52]+[421]+[322]+$ $[41]+2[311]+2[3]$ as an Sp-module.
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