Fine structures inside the PreLie operad
Frédéric Chapoton

To cite this version:

HAL Id: hal-00526685
https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00526685
Submitted on 15 Oct 2010

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L’archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire HAL, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d’enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.
Fine structures inside the PreLie operad

F. Chapoton

October 15, 2010

Abstract

This article aims at a detailed analysis of the PreLie operad. We obtain a more concrete description of the relationship between the anticyclic structure of PreLie and the generators of PreLie as a Lie-module, which was known before only at the level of characters. Building on this, we obtain an inclusion of the cyclic Lie module in the PreLie operad. We conjecture that the image of this inclusion generates an interesting free sub-operad.

0 Introduction

The aim of this article is to make a step forward in the study a specific operad, called the PreLie operad, and to unravel some unexpected relations with the Lie operad. The PreLie operad describes pre-Lie algebras, which have been useful in various contexts, and were introduced independently in the works of Gerstenhaber [9] in deformation theory and in the works of Vinberg [15] on convex homogeneous cones. The PreLie operad itself has been described in [6] in terms of combinatorial objects called rooted trees. This description is strongly connected to the use of rooted trees in numerical analysis [3], because the space of vector fields on the affine space is naturally a pre-Lie algebra.

Many results are already known on the PreLie operad. It was proved in [6] that it is a Koszul operad, and this result has been reproved since then by other methods [14, 10]. Another important property is the fact, first proved by Foissy in [8], that free pre-Lie algebras are free Lie algebras, where the Lie bracket comes from antisymmetrising the pre-Lie product. Another proof has been obtained in [5], in the setting of operads rather than algebras. This property translates into the fact that the PreLie operad is a free left Lie-module, so that there exists a factorisation

\[ \text{PreLie} = \text{Lie} \circ X \]

in the category of \( \mathfrak{S} \)-modules, where \( \circ \) is the composition of \( \mathfrak{S} \)-modules. Our principal aim is to understand better the \( \mathfrak{S} \)-module \( X \).

Surprisingly enough, the \( \mathfrak{S} \)-module \( X \) is related to another structure on the PreLie operad. It was shown in [3] that PreLie is an anticyclic operad. This means in particular that the \( \mathfrak{S} \)-module PreLie admits a primitive CycPreLie, which means that CycPreLie\((n+1)\) \( \simeq \) PreLie\((n)\) as modules over the symmetric group \( \mathfrak{S}_n \). It has been proved in [8, Th. 5.3] that for \( n \geq 2 \) there is an isomorphism of modules over the symmetric group \( \mathfrak{S}_n \),

\[ X(n) \simeq \text{Reflex}(n) \otimes \text{CycPreLie}(n), \]
where \( \text{Reflex}(n) = Q^n/Q \) is the quotient of the natural action of \( \mathfrak{S}_n \) on \( Q^n \) by the diagonal subspace. This was proved using explicit formulas for the characters of these modules. The main result of the present article is to better explain this relation, by the definition of an explicit isomorphism. This will be achieved in section \( \PageIndex{2} \).

The other main result of the article is the following. It is well known that the Lie operad is a cyclic operad \( \cite{11} \), so that in particular there exists a primitive \( \text{CycLie} \) to the \( \mathfrak{S} \)-module \( \text{Lie} \). We obtain, using the previous parts of the article, an injective morphism of \( \mathfrak{S} \)-modules from \( \text{CycLie} \) to \( \text{PreLie} \).

We expect that this inclusion of \( \text{CycLie} \) into \( \text{PreLie} \) should have very nice properties. We conjecture that it generates a free sub-operad of \( \text{PreLie} \). A recent result by N. Bergeron and Loday \( \cite{2} \) would be a direct corollary of this more general conjecture. Moreover, we conjecture that the sub-operad of \( \text{PreLie} \) generated by the image of \( \text{CycLie} \) should be isomorphic to \( X \) as a \( \mathfrak{S} \)-module and should give a distinguished space of generators of \( \text{PreLie} \) as a \( \text{Lie} \)-module.

### 1 General setting and notations

We will use the description of operads using \( \mathfrak{S} \)-modules over \( Q \). The reader may want to consult \( \cite{12} \) for further details on the theory of operads.

Recall that the category of \( \mathfrak{S} \)-modules over \( Q \) is the category of functors from the groupoid of finite sets to the category of \( Q \)-vector spaces. By choosing an equivalent model for the groupoid of finite sets, \( \mathfrak{S} \)-modules can also be described as collections of vector spaces \( P(n) \) with an action of the symmetric group \( \mathfrak{S}_n \) on \( P(n) \) for \( n \geq 0 \). We will freely use both descriptions.

We will denote \( S_1 \) the \( \mathfrak{S} \)-module corresponding to the trivial representation of \( S_1 \).

The derivative \( P' \) of an \( \mathfrak{S} \)-module \( P \) is defined as follows. For every \( n \), the space \( P'(n-1) \) is \( P(n) \), with the action of the symmetric group \( \mathfrak{S}_{n-1} \) given by restriction of the action of the symmetric group \( \mathfrak{S}_n \) on \( P(n) \). A primitive of a \( \mathfrak{S} \)-module \( P \) is a \( \mathfrak{S} \)-module \( Q \) such that \( Q' = P \).

The category of \( \mathfrak{S} \)-modules is endowed with a nonsymmetric tensor product \( \odot \) which is called the composition. An operad \( \mathcal{P} \) is a monoid for this tensor product. We will also consider right and left modules over operads, for the same monoidal structure.

We will also need the symmetric tensor structure \( \otimes \) on the category of \( \mathfrak{S} \)-modules defined by

\[
(P \otimes Q)(I) = \bigoplus_{I = J \cup K} P(J) \otimes Q(K).
\]

Using this tensor product, one can also define exterior and symmetric powers of \( \mathfrak{S} \)-modules.

There is a third tensor product on the category of \( \mathfrak{S} \)-modules, sometimes called the Hadamard product, defined by

\[
(P \odot Q)(I) = P(I) \otimes Q(I).
\]

There is an equivalent way to describe an operad \( \mathcal{P} \), using partial compositions instead of the global composition map \( \mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P} \). We will denote by
2 The Lie operad

Recall that a Lie algebra is a vector space \( V \) endowed with an antisymmetric bracket \( (x, y) \mapsto [x, y] \) such that
\[
[x, [y, z]] + [x, [y, z]] + [x, [y, z]] = 0.
\]
(1)

This relation is called the Jacobi identity.

Let \( \text{Lie} \) be the operad describing Lie algebras.

The operad \( \text{Lie} \) admits a presentation by generators and relations, which amounts to the axiomatic description of Lie algebras given above. There is an antisymmetric generator in two variables, and a relation between compositions of two generators, given by (1).

Recall now that a symmetric bilinear form \((, )\) on a Lie algebra is called invariant if
\[
([x, y], z) = (x, [y, z]).
\]
(2)

This invariance condition is classical and comes from the natural invariance condition for bilinear forms under group actions.

This notion of invariant bilinear form leads to a structure of cyclic operad on \( \text{Lie} \), first introduced by Kontsevich [11]. The \( \mathcal{S} \)-module \( \text{CycLie} \) (cyclic Lie module) is the right Lie-module defined by the exact sequence of right Lie-modules
\[
K_L \rightarrow S^2 \text{Lie} \xrightarrow{(\cdot)} \text{CycLie} \rightarrow 0,
\]
(3)
where \( K_L \) is the sub right Lie-module of \( S^2 \text{Lie} \) generated by the relation (2).

As an \( \mathcal{S} \)-module, \( \text{CycLie} \) is a primitive of \( \text{Lie} \).

Remark 2.1 The \( \mathcal{S} \)-module \( \text{CycLie} \) is also called the Whitehouse module.

The following statement is a general property of cyclic operads.

Proposition 2.2 Let \( I \) be a finite set. For every element \( \ell \) in \( \text{CycLie}(I) \) and every element \( i \in I \), there is a unique element \( \ell_i \) in \( \text{Lie}(I \setminus \{i\}) \) such that
\[
\ell = (i, \ell_i).
\]
(4)

For example, if \( \ell = ([x, y], z) \) and \( i = x \) then \( \ell_i = [y, z] \) by (2).

3 The PreLie operad

Recall that a pre-Lie algebra is a vector space \( V \) endowed with a bilinear map \((x, y) \mapsto x \circ y\) such that
\[
(x \circ y) \circ z - x \circ (y \circ z) = (x \circ z) \circ y - x \circ (z \circ y).
\]
(5)

Let \( \text{PreLie} \) be the operad describing pre-Lie algebras.

The operad \( \text{PreLie} \) admits a combinatorial description using rooted trees [6]. Let us recall this briefly here.
For a finite set $I$, a rooted tree on $I$ is a connected and simply connected graph with vertex set $I$, together with a distinguished vertex called the root. One can then orient every edge towards the root. Then $\text{PreLie}(I)$ is the vector space spanned by rooted trees on $I$. The composition of two rooted trees $S \circ_i T$ is the sum of all rooted trees obtained from the disjoint union of $S \setminus \{i\}$ and $T$ by adding one edge for every edge that was incident to $i$ in $S$, as follows. Edges that were incoming at $i$ must keep the same start and end at some vertex of $T$. The edge that was outgoing at $i$ (if it exists) must keep the same end and start at the root of $T$. The root of every tree in the sum is the unique vertex with no outgoing edge.

The operad $\text{PreLie}$ admits a presentation by generators and relations, which amounts to the axiomatic description of pre-Lie algebras given above. There is a generator in two variables, and a relation between compositions of two generators, given by (5).

From the description above by rooted trees of the operad $\text{PreLie}$, one can get the following rule for the product $S \triangleright T$ of two rooted trees $S$ and $T$: this is the sum of all rooted trees obtained from the disjoint union of $S$ and $T$ by adding one edge from the root of $T$ to a vertex of $S$. The root of each tree in this sum is the root of $S$.

Recall now [4, §5.3] that an antisymmetric bilinear form $\langle , \rangle$ on a pre-Lie algebra is called invariant if

$$\langle x, y \triangleright z \rangle = -\langle z, y \triangleright x \rangle$$

and

$$\langle x, y \triangleright z \rangle =\langle y, x \triangleright z \rangle -\langle z, x \triangleright y \rangle.$$  

(7)

This invariance condition is less classical than its Lie analogue, but has been used in the study of left-invariant affine and symplectic structures on Lie groups. It is also related to the notion of quasi-Frobenius Lie algebra.

Note that (6) is a consequence of (7) and that these relations also imply the following relation:

$$\langle x, y \triangleright z \rangle +\langle y, z \triangleright x \rangle +\langle z, x \triangleright y \rangle = 0.$$  

(8)

This notion of invariant bilinear form leads to a structure of anticyclic operad on $\text{PreLie}$, introduced in [3]. The anticyclic $\mathcal{S}$-module $\text{CycPreLie}$ is the right $\text{PreLie}$-module defined by the exact sequence of right $\text{PreLie}$-modules

$$K_P \to \Lambda^2 \text{PreLie} \xrightarrow{\langle , \rangle} \text{CycPreLie} \to 0,$$

(9)

where $K_P$ is the sub right $\text{PreLie}$-module of $\Lambda^2 \text{PreLie}$ generated by the relations (3) and (4).

As an $\mathcal{S}$-module, $\text{CycPreLie}$ is a primitive of $\text{PreLie}$.

The following statement is a general property of anticyclic operads.

**Proposition 3.1** Let $I$ be a finite set. For every $t \in \text{CycPreLie}(I)$ and every $i \in I$, there is a unique $\Gamma_i(t) \in \text{PreLie}(I \setminus \{i\})$ such that

$$t = \langle i, \Gamma_i(t) \rangle.$$  

(10)
For example, if $t = \langle x, y \triangleleft z \rangle$ then $\Gamma_z(t) = -y \triangleleft x$ by (6).

Here is a more complicated example. If $t = \langle w, x \triangleleft (y \triangleleft z) \rangle$, then one can show that $\Gamma_z(t) = -y \triangleleft (x \triangleleft w)$.

Let us now state some lemmas for later use. For short, we will write $a \in s$ as an abbreviation for the sentence $s \in \text{PreLie}(I)$ and $a \in I$ for some finite set $I$. We will also say that $r$ and $s$ have disjoint indices if $r \in \text{PreLie}(I)$ and $s \in \text{PreLie}(J)$ for some disjoint finite sets $I$ and $J$.

**Lemma 3.2** Let $r, s, t$ in $\text{PreLie}$ with disjoint indices. Let $a \in s$ and $b \in r \cup s$ distinct from $a$. Then

$$\Gamma_b(r \wedge (s \circ a) t) = \Gamma_b(r \wedge s) \circ a t.$$  \hfill (11)

**Proof.** Indeed, one has

$$\langle b, \Gamma_b(r \wedge (s \circ a) t) \rangle = \langle r, s \circ a t \rangle = \langle r, s \rangle \circ a t = \langle b, \Gamma_b(r \wedge s) \circ a t \rangle.$$  \hfill (12)

Here one uses the definition of $\Gamma$ and the fact that $\text{CycPreLie}$ is a right $\text{PreLie}$-module. \hfill $\blacksquare$

**Lemma 3.3** Let $r, s, t$ in $\text{PreLie}$ with disjoint indices. Let $a \in s$ and $b \in t$. Then

$$\Gamma_b(r \wedge (s \circ a) t) = -\Gamma_b(\# \wedge t) \circ \# \Gamma_a(r \wedge s).$$  \hfill (13)

**Proof.** Let us compute $\langle \#, t \rangle \circ \# \Gamma_a(r \wedge s)$ in two ways. On the one hand, this is equal by definition of $\Gamma$ to

$$\langle b, \Gamma_b(\# \wedge t) \circ \# \Gamma_a(r \wedge s) \rangle,$$

which can be rewritten as

$$\langle b, \Gamma_b(\# \wedge t) \circ \# \Gamma_a(r \wedge s) \rangle.$$

On the other hand, this is equal by properties of $\Gamma$ to

$$\langle \Gamma_a(r \wedge s), t \rangle = \langle \Gamma_a(r \wedge s), a \rangle \circ a t,$$

which by definition of $\Gamma$ is

$$-(r, s) \circ a t = -(r, s \circ a t) = -(b, \Gamma_b(r \wedge (s \circ a) t)).$$

This proves the expected equality. \hfill $\blacksquare$

### 4 PreLie is free as a Lie-module

Recall that every pre-Lie algebra is also a Lie algebra for the bracket defined by

$$[x, y] = x \triangleleft y - y \triangleleft x.$$  \hfill (14)

This defines a morphism $\varphi$ of operads from $\text{Lie}$ to $\text{PreLie}$. The composition with the projection from $\text{Lie}$ to the associative operad $\text{Assoc}$ is the usual inclusion of $\text{Lie}$ in $\text{Assoc}$, hence $\varphi$ is also injective.
From this morphism, one can deduce by restriction of composition in PreLie a structure of left Lie-module on PreLie:

$$\text{Lie} \circ \text{PreLie} \xrightarrow{\gamma} \text{PreLie}. \quad (15)$$

It is clear from this definition that $\gamma$ is a morphism of right PreLie-modules.

Let $\text{Lie}_{\geq 2}$ be the restriction of Lie to degrees at least 2. One can restrict $\gamma$ to $\text{Lie}_{\geq 2} \circ \text{PreLie}$ and define a $S$-module Indec by the exact sequence of right PreLie-modules

$$\text{Lie}_{\geq 2} \circ \text{PreLie} \xrightarrow{\gamma} \text{PreLie} \xrightarrow{\pi} \text{Indec} \rightarrow 0. \quad (16)$$

The $S$-module Indec was denoted by $X$ in the introduction.

It has been shown in [5] (see also [8, 1]) that PreLie is a free left Lie-module: there exists an isomorphism of $S$-modules

$$\text{PreLie} \simeq \text{Lie} \circ \text{Indec}. \quad (17)$$

This isomorphism is not canonical, but depends on the choice of a section of the projection $\pi$.

This statement of freeness can be reformulated as follows. The left Lie-module structure of PreLie can be considered as a structure of Lie-algebra in the category of $S$-modules (with respect to the tensor product $\otimes$). The usual theory of Lie algebras over a field has a natural extension to this setting, including universal enveloping algebras and the Chevalley-Eilenberg complex (see for instance [3]). Freeness as a left-Lie-module then translates into freeness as a Lie algebra, which implies that the Chevalley-Eilenberg complex has homology only in degree 0.

As the image of the leftmost arrow $\gamma$ of (14) is spanned by the linear combinations of brackets of rooted trees, there is a long exact sequence of right PreLie-modules

$$\cdots \rightarrow \Lambda^3 \text{PreLie} \xrightarrow{\delta} \Lambda^2 \text{PreLie} \xrightarrow{\delta} \text{PreLie} \xrightarrow{\pi} \text{Indec} \rightarrow 0, \quad (18)$$

where $\delta$ are the Chevalley-Eilenberg differentials. The rightmost $\delta$ sends $s \wedge t$ to $s \triangleleft t - t \triangleright s$.

This gives a short exact sequence of right PreLie-modules

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Rela} \xrightarrow{\delta} \text{PreLie} \xrightarrow{\pi} \text{Indec} \rightarrow 0, \quad (19)$$

where Rela is the quotient of $\Lambda^2 \text{PreLie}$ by the image of $\delta$.

**Proposition 4.1** The right PreLie-module Rela is the quotient of $\Lambda^2 \text{PreLie}$ by the sub-right PreLie-module generated by the following 6-terms relations:

$$r \wedge (s \triangleleft t) + s \wedge (t \triangleleft r) + t \wedge (r \triangleleft s) - s \wedge (r \triangleleft t) - t \wedge (s \triangleleft r) - r \wedge (t \triangleleft s) = 0. \quad (20)$$

**Proof.** We are dealing here with the first few terms of the Chevalley-Eilenberg complex for the Lie algebra PreLie. As we know that this is a free Lie algebra, there is no homology but in degree 0. This implies that the kernel is spanned by the image of $r \wedge s \wedge t$ by $\delta$:

$$[r, s] \wedge t + [s, t] \wedge r - [r, t] \wedge s. \quad (21)$$

Using the link between the bracket and $\triangleleft$, this gives the expected relations. 

6
5 Reduction to root-valence 1

Let us define the root-valence of a rooted tree \( T \) to be the valence of the root of \( T \), i.e. the number of edges adjacent to the root.

Recall the following standard notation: for rooted trees \( T_1, \ldots, T_k \), let

\[
B^+_a(T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_k)
\]

be the rooted tree obtained by grafting \( T_1, \ldots, T_k \) on a new root with index \( a \).

If \( S \) is a rooted tree in PreLie, we will denote \([S]\) the class of \( S \) modulo the image of \( \delta \), i.e. modulo Lie brackets of rooted trees.

**Proposition 5.1** For every rooted trees \( S \) and \( T \) and \( * \in S \), one has

\[
[S \circ_* T] = [S] \circ_* T.
\]  (22)

**Proof.** This is because (19) is an exact sequence of right PreLie-modules. ■

**Proposition 5.2** Every rooted tree \( T \) in PreLie (with at least two vertices) is equivalent modulo \( \delta(A^2 \text{PreLie}) \) to a linear combination of rooted trees of root-valence 1.

The proof is by induction on the size of rooted trees and uses several lemmas, of increasing generality.

**Lemma 5.3** The statement is true if \( T \) has root-valence 2 and at least one of the two subtrees of the root is a singleton \( a \).

**Proof.** Let \( T' \) be the tree \( T \) with vertex \( a \) removed. Then \( T' \) has root-valence 1. Then one has \([T', a] = T' \circ a - a \circ T' \). The tree \( a \circ T' \) has root-valence 1. One has \( T' \circ a = T + r \), where \( r \) is a sum of trees of root-valence 1. ■

**Lemma 5.4** The statement is true if \( T \) has a leaf \( a \) such that the vertex \( b \) under \( a \) has valence 1.

**Proof.** In this case, one can write \( T = T' \circ_* (ba) \), where \( T' \) is a smaller tree with a leaf \(*\). By induction on the size, the tree \( T' \) is equivalent to a linear combination \( \sum \alpha c_\alpha T_\alpha \) of trees of root-valence 1. By Prop. 5.1, the tree \( T \) is equivalent to the linear combination \( \sum \alpha c_\alpha T_\alpha \circ_* (ba) \).

If \(*\) is not the root of \( T_\alpha \), then \( T_\alpha \circ_* (ba) \) is a sum of trees of root-valence 1. If \(*\) is the root of \( T_\alpha \), then \( T_\alpha \circ_* (ba) \) is the sum of a rooted tree of root-valence 1 plus a rooted tree of root-valence 2, which satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 5.3. ■

**Lemma 5.5** The statement is true if at most one of the subtrees of the root of \( T \) is not a leaf.

**Proof.** By induction on the root-valence \( k \). If \( k = 1 \), there is nothing to prove. If \( k = 2 \), we can use Lemma 5.3 above.

Assume now that \( k \) is at least 2 and write \( T = B^+_a(T_1, a_2, \ldots, a_k) \).

Let \( T' = B^+_a(T_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{k-1}) \) be the tree obtained from \( T \) by removing the leaf \( a_k \).

Then \([T', a_k] = T' \circ a_k - a_k \circ T' \). The tree \( a_k \circ T' \) has root-valence 1. One has \( T' \circ a_k = T + r \), where \( r \) is a sum of two kinds of trees: either \( a_k \) is grafted on one of the leaves \( a_i \), in which case one can apply Lemma 5.4, or \( a_k \) is grafted on \( T_1 \), in which case one can use the induction on \( k \). ■
Lemma 5.6 The statement is true for any rooted tree $T$ with at least 2 vertices.

Proof. Pick in $T$ a vertex $a$ of maximal height, where the height of a vertex is the number of edges in the unique path to the root. Let $b$ be the vertex under $a$. The set of all vertices over $b$ is then a corolla $C_b$.

In this case, $T$ can be written $T' \circ_a C_b$. By induction on the size, $T'$ is equivalent to a linear combination $\sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} T_{\alpha} \circ_a C_b$.

If $*$ is not the root of $T_\alpha$, then $T_\alpha \circ_a C_b$ is a sum of trees of root-valence 1. If $*$ is the root of $T_\alpha$, then $T_\alpha \circ_a C_b$ is a sum of rooted trees which satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 5.5.

This concludes the proof of Prop. 5.1. \qed

Remark 5.7 What we used in the proof of Lemma 5.6 is a top corolla, i.e. a vertex $b$ with only leaves above it. Instead of choosing one such vertex of maximal height, it may be more convenient for purposes of practical computation of $\rho$ to choose one with the smallest number of attached leaves.

Let $\text{PreLie}_{v=1}$ be the sub-$\mathcal{S}$-module of $\text{PreLie}$ spanned by rooted trees with root-valence 1.

Remark 5.8 The $\mathcal{S}$-module $\text{PreLie}_{v=1}$ is not a right $\text{PreLie}$-module.

Let $\text{Rela}_{v=1}$ be the subspace of $\text{Rela}$ that is mapped by $\delta$ to $\text{PreLie}_{v=1}$.

Let $\text{Indec}_{\geq 2}$ be the sub-$\mathcal{S}$-module of $\text{Indec}$ obtained by removing the degree 1 component of $\text{Indec}$.

From Prop. 5.2 and the short exact sequence (19), one obtains a short exact sequence of $\mathcal{S}$-modules

\[ 0 \rightarrow \text{Rela}_{v=1} \xrightarrow{\delta} \text{PreLie}_{v=1} \xrightarrow{\pi} \text{Indec}_{\geq 2} \rightarrow 0. \]  \hspace{1cm} (23)

Let us now describe another short exact sequence, and then compare them.

6 A simple short exact sequence

Let $\text{Comm}$ be the underlying $\mathcal{S}$-module of the commutative operad. For every finite set $I$, $\text{Comm}(I) = \mathbb{Q}$.

Let $\text{Perm}$ be the underlying $\mathcal{S}$-module of the permutative operad. For every finite set $I$, $\text{Comm}(I) = \mathbb{Q}I$.

There is an inclusion $i$ from $\text{Comm}$ to $\text{Perm}$ that sends $1 \in \text{Comm}(I)$ to $\sum_{i \in I} i \in \text{Perm}(I)$.

Let $\text{Reflex}$ be the quotient $\mathcal{S}$-module, so that there is a short exact sequence

\[ 0 \rightarrow \text{Comm} \xrightarrow{i} \text{Perm} \xrightarrow{\pi} \text{Reflex} \rightarrow 0. \]  \hspace{1cm} (24)

By (Hadamard) tensor product with Cyc$\text{PreLie}$, one gets a short exact sequence

\[ 0 \rightarrow \text{CycPreLie} \xrightarrow{i} \text{Perm} \odot \text{CycPreLie} \xrightarrow{\pi} \text{Reflex} \odot \text{CycPreLie} \rightarrow 0. \]  \hspace{1cm} (25)

There exists a section of the projection map $p$ in the short exact sequence (24), that maps the class of $i - j$ to $i - j$. This gives a similar section of the projection $p$ in the short exact sequence (25).
7 Isomorphism of exact sequences

In this section, we will obtain the following isomorphism of short exact sequences:

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \rightarrow & \text{CycPreLie} & \xrightarrow{\rho} & \text{Perm} \odot \text{CycPreLie} & \xrightarrow{\psi} & \text{Reflex} \odot \text{CycPreLie} & \rightarrow & 0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \rightarrow & \text{Rela}_{v=1} & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \text{PreLie}_{v=1} & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \text{Indec}_{\geq 2} & \rightarrow & 0 \\
\end{array}
\]

(26)

7.1 Middle column

Let us start with the isomorphism between middle terms. There is a simple isomorphism \( \psi \) from \( \text{Perm} \odot \text{CycPreLie} \) to \( \text{PreLie}_{v=1} \) defined for \( t \) in \( \text{CycPreLie} \) and \( a \in t \) by

\[
\psi(a \odot t) = a \triangleleft \Gamma_a(t),
\]

(27)

where \( \Gamma_a(t) \) is the function introduced in Prop. 3.1.

The inverse morphism maps a rooted tree of root-valence 1, written as \( a \odot (a, T) \), to the expression \( a \odot (a, T) \).

Note that the composite morphism \( \psi \iota \) has therefore the following description:

\[
\psi(\iota(t)) = \sum_j j \triangleleft \Gamma_j(t).
\]

(28)

7.2 Left column (up)

Proposition 7.1 There exists a morphism \( \langle \, , \rangle \) from \( \text{Rela} \) to \( \text{CycPreLie} \).

Proof. Let us start with the morphism \( \langle \, , \rangle \) from \( \Lambda^2 \text{PreLie} \) to \( \text{CycPreLie} \) that defines the anticyclic structure. By Prop. 4.1, it is enough to check that the 6-terms relations (20) are mapped to 0. These relations are mapped in \( \text{CycPreLie} \) to

\[
(r \odot s \triangleleft t) + (s \odot r \triangleleft t) + (t \odot r \triangleleft s) - (s \triangleright r \triangleleft t) - (t \triangleright s \triangleleft r) - (r \triangleright t \triangleleft s).
\]

Using (8) twice, one obtains that this vanishes in \( \text{CycPreLie} \).

By restriction of the morphism \( \langle \, , \rangle \) from \( \text{Rela} \) to \( \text{CycPreLie} \), one has a morphism from \( \text{Rela}_{v=1} \) to \( \text{CycPreLie} \), still denoted \( \langle \, , \rangle \).

7.3 Left column (down)

Theorem 7.2 There exists a unique morphism \( \rho \) from \( \text{CycPreLie} \) to \( \text{Rela}_{v=1} \) such that \( \delta \rho \) equals \( \psi \iota \), i.e.

\[
\delta(\rho(x)) = \sum_i i \triangleleft \Gamma_i(x).
\]

(29)

The morphism \( \rho \) has the following property:

\[
\rho((r \triangleleft s) \circ_i t) = \rho(r \triangleleft s) \circ_i t - \rho(\# \triangleleft t) \circ_i \Gamma_i(r \triangleleft s) + \Gamma_i(r \triangleleft s) \triangleleft t,
\]

(30)

for \( r, s, t \) in \( \text{PreLie} \) with disjoint indices and \( i \in r \sqcup s \).
Proof. Let us start by remarking that the uniqueness of \( \rho \) is clear because \( \delta \) is an injection.

Assuming now for a moment that \( \rho \) has been defined, let us prove the last statement, using uniqueness. Let us apply \( \delta \) to the right side of (30):

\[
\sum_{j \in r,s} (j \triangleright \Gamma_j(r \land s)) \circ_i t - \sum_{j \in \# \cup t} (j \triangleright \Gamma_j(\# \land t)) \circ_\# \Gamma_i(r \land s) + \lfloor \Gamma_i(r \land s), t \rfloor. \tag{31}
\]

The term with \( j = i \) in the first sum and the term with \( j = \# \) in the second sum annihilates with the bracket term. One can then use Lemma 3.3 to rewrite the second sum and obtain

\[
\sum_{j \in r,s} j \triangleright \Gamma_j((r \land s) \circ_i t) + \sum_{j \in t} j \triangleright \Gamma_j((r \land s) \circ_i t), \tag{32}
\]

which is exactly \( \psi(\iota((r \land s) \circ_i t)) \).

Remark 7.3 One can also interpret this argument as follows: if the equation (29) is satisfied by the terms entering the right hand side of (30), then it is also satisfied by the left hand side.

Let us now enter the existence proof of \( \rho \).

It is enough to define a morphism from \( \Lambda^2 \) PreLie to Rela_{v=1} satisfying (29), as it will then automatically pass to the quotient CycPreLie.

As the set of elements \( T \land T' \) (for rooted trees \( T \) and \( T' \) with disjoint indices) spans \( \Lambda^2 \) PreLie, it is sufficient to define \( \rho(T \land T') \).

The definition is by induction on the cardinality of the finite set \( I \), and, at fixed cardinality, by a four-steps process for pairs of trees of increasing generality.

**First Step.**

Let us define \( \rho \) when \( I \) has cardinality 2 or 3 as

\[
\rho(a \land b) = a \land b, \tag{33}
\]

and

\[
\rho(a \land (b \triangle c)) = a \land (b \triangle c) - c \land (b \triangle a). \tag{34}
\]

One can easily check that indeed \( \delta \rho = \psi \iota \) in these cases.

**Second Step.**

Assume now that \( T = a \) and that \( T' = b \triangleright T'' \) where \( T'' \) has at least two vertices.

One then defines \( \rho(T \land T') \) using induction on the number of vertices by the following formula:

\[
\rho(a \land (b \triangleright T'')) = \rho(a \land (b \triangle s)) \circ_* T'' - \rho(\# \land T'') \circ_\# \Gamma_*(a \land (b \triangle s)) + \Gamma_*(a \land (b \triangle s)) \land T''. \tag{35}
\]

As this formula is an instance of formula (30), one deduces from Remark 7.3 that (29) holds in this case.

**Third Step.**

Assume now that \( T = a \) and that \( T' \) has root-valence at least 2. One write \( T' = B^+_v(T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_k) \). Let \( T''' = B^{+}_v(T_2, \ldots, T_k) \). In this case, one has

\[
T' = T''' \circ_* (b \triangleright T_1) - \sum_\alpha T_\alpha, \tag{36}
\]
where the sums runs over terms of smaller root-valence.

One then defines \( \rho(T \land T') \) using induction on the root-valence of \( T' \) by the following formula:

\[
\rho(a \land T') = \rho(a \land T'') \circ \ast (b \lhd T_1) - \rho(\# \land (b \lhd T_1)) \circ \# \Gamma_s(a \land T'') + \Gamma_s(a \land T'') \land (b \lhd T_1) - \sum_\gamma \rho(a \land T_s) \tag{37}
\]

As this formula is an instance of formula (30), one deduces from Remark 7.3 that (29) holds in this case.

**Fourth Step.**

Assume now that neither \( T \) nor \( T' \) is a singleton.

One then defines \( \rho(T \land T') \) by the following formula:

\[
\rho(T \land T') = \rho(T \land \ast) \circ \ast T' + \rho(\# \land T') \circ \# T - T \land T'. \tag{38}
\]

As this formula is an instance of formula (30), the equation (29) holds in this case by Remark 7.3.

For example, one can compute in this way that

\[
\rho([a, b \lhd (c \lhd d)]) = a \land b \lhd (c \lhd d) - c \lhd d \land b \lhd a - d \land c \lhd (b \lhd a). \tag{39}
\]

**Theorem 7.4** The morphism \( \rho \) satisfies \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle(\rho(x)) = (n - 1)x \) for every \( x \) in CycPreLie(I), where \( n = |I| \).

**Proof.** The property is easy to check for small \( n \). By the proof of Th. 7.2, it is then enough to check that this property is preserved by the formula (30) in the following sense: if it is true for the terms entering the right-hand side, it is true for the left-hand side.

Applying \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) on the right-hand side of (30), one finds

\[
(|r| + |s| - 1)\langle r, s \rangle \circ_t t - |t|\langle \# \land s \rangle \circ \# \Gamma_s(r \land s) + \langle \Gamma_s(r \land s), t \rangle. \tag{40}
\]

This can be rewritten as

\[
(|r| + |s| + |t| - 2)\langle r, s \rangle \circ_t t, \tag{41}
\]

which is indeed the correct value for the left-hand side. \( \blacksquare \)

### 7.4 Proof of the isomorphism

By Theorem 7.2, we therefore have a morphism \((\rho, \psi, \mu)\) from the short exact sequence

\[
0 \to \text{CycPreLie} \xrightarrow{\iota} \text{Perm} \circ \text{CycPreLie} \xrightarrow{p} \text{Reflex} \circ \text{CycPreLie} \to 0 \tag{42}
\]

to the short exact sequence

\[
0 \to \text{Rela}_{=1} \xrightarrow{\delta} \text{PreLie}_{=1} \xrightarrow{\pi} \text{Indec}_{\geq 2} \to 0, \tag{43}
\]

where \( \mu \) is defined as the quotient morphism from Reflex \( \circ \) CycPreLie to Indec\(_{\geq 2}\).
Proposition 7.5  The morphism \( \rho \) is injective.

Proof. This follows from Th. 7.4.

Note that it is necessary here to work over the field \( \mathbb{Q} \).

Proposition 7.6  The triple \((\rho, \psi, \mu)\) is an isomorphism of short exact sequences.

Proof. We already know that \( \psi \) is an isomorphism (§ 7.1) and that \( \rho \) is injective.

To conclude, it is enough to note that the dimensions of the right-most terms are the same, both given by
\[
(n - 1)^{n-1}
\]
for \( n \geq 2 \), where \( n = |I| \). Therefore the dimensions of the left-most terms coincide. This implies that \( \rho \) is an isomorphism, hence the statement.

Corollary 7.7  One therefore has an isomorphism \( \mu \):
\[
\text{Indec} \cong S_1 \oplus \text{Reflex} \oplus \text{CycPreLie}.
\]  

Proof. One just need to check what happens in degree 1. The component of degree 1 of the \( \mathfrak{S} \)-module Indec is just \( S_1 \).

This equivalence has been proved in [3, Th. 5.3] by a computation of characters. We have obtained here an isomorphism that explains why the characters are the same.

8  Inclusion of CycLie in Perm \( \odot \) CycPreLie

Let us now define a map \( \theta \) from CycLie to Perm \( \odot \) CycPreLie.

As Lie is a cyclic operad with CycLie as cyclic structure, there is a surjective morphism of right PreLie-modules
\[
S^2 \text{Lie} \to \text{CycLie}.
\]  

We will first define \( \theta \) on \( S^2 \text{Lie} \) and then check that it is well defined on the quotient CycLie.

From the morphism of operads \( \varphi \) from Lie \( \to \) PreLie, one has a map \( S^2 \varphi \):
\[
S^2 \text{Lie} \to S^2 \text{PreLie}.
\]  

Let \( \ell \) be an element of \( S^2 \text{Lie} \). Then one decomposes its image by \( S^2 \varphi \) in \( S^2 \text{PreLie} \) according to the roots of the trees:
\[
S^2 \varphi(\ell) = \sum_{a,b} c_{a,b} T_a T_b,
\]
where \( T_\# \) denotes a tree with root \( \# \). Then one can define
\[
\theta(\ell) = \sum_{a,b} c_{a,b} (a - b) \otimes \langle T_a, T_b \rangle
\]
with values in Perm \( \odot \) CycPreLie.
Remark 8.1 Let us note that the image of $\theta$ is contained in the image of the section from Reflex $\circ$ CycPreLie to Perm $\circ$ CycPreLie.

Proposition 8.2 The map $\theta$ is well defined on $\text{CycLie}$.

Proof. One just has to check that relation (2) holds.

Consider the image of $m_1[m_2,m_3]$. This is

$$\sum_{a,b,c} (a-b) \otimes (\varphi(m_1)_{a} \varphi(m_2)_{b} \varphi(m_3)_{c}) - (a-c) \otimes (\varphi(m_1)_{a} \varphi(m_3)_{c} \varphi(m_2)_{b}).$$

(50)

Consider now the image of $[m_1,m_2]m_3$. This is

$$\sum_{a,b,c} (a-c) \otimes (\varphi(m_1)_{a} \varphi(m_2)_{b} \varphi(m_3)_{c}) - (b-c) \otimes (\varphi(m_2)_{b} \varphi(m_1)_{a} \varphi(m_3)_{c}).$$

(51)

Then one can rewrite this using the anticyclic structure of CycPreLie, thanks to (6) and (7), to obtain

$$\sum_{a,b,c} (a-c) \otimes (\varphi(m_3)_{c} \varphi(m_2)_{b} \varphi(m_1)_{a})$$

$$- (a-c) \otimes (\varphi(m_2)_{b} \varphi(m_1)_{a} \varphi(m_3)_{c})$$

$$+ (b-c) \otimes (\varphi(m_2)_{b} \varphi(m_3)_{c} \varphi(m_1)_{a}).$$

This is exactly (51).

Proposition 8.3 The map $\theta$ is injective. The composite map $p\theta$ is also injective.

Proof. Let us prove the first statement.

Let us fix a finite set $I$ and let $x$ be an element of CycLie($I$) in the kernel of $\theta$. Let us also choose an element $i \in I$. There is a unique element $y$ of Lie($I \setminus \{i\}$) such that

$$x = (i, y).$$

(52)

By definition, one has

$$\theta(x) = \sum_{j \neq i} (i-j) \otimes (i, \varphi(y)_{j}),$$

(53)

where $\varphi(y)_{j}$ is the projection of $\varphi(y)$ on the span of trees with root $j$. The hypothesis $\theta(x) = 0$ implies that for every $j \neq i$,

$$\varphi(y)_{j} = 0.$$ 

(54)

So we obtain

$$\sum_{j \neq i} \varphi(y)_{j} = 0 = \varphi(y).$$

(55)

But $\varphi$ is injective, hence $y = 0$ and $x = 0$.

The second statement follows from Remark 8.1.

\[ \square \]
9 Inclusion of CycLie in PreLie\(_{v=1}\) and conjectures

Using the previous inclusion \(\theta\) and Proposition 7.6, one gets a map \(\lambda\) from CycLie to PreLie\(_{v=1}\), hence to PreLie.

**Proposition 9.1** The map \(\lambda\) is injective.

**Proof.** This is because \(\lambda\) is the composition of \(\theta\) (injective) and the isomorphism \(\psi\) from \(\text{Perm} \circ \text{CycPreLie}\) to PreLie\(_{v=1}\).  

Let \(M\) be the suboperad of PreLie generated by the image of CycLie by \(\lambda\) in PreLie.

**Conjecture 9.2** The sub-operad \(M\) of PreLie is a module of generators of PreLie as a free left Lie-module, i.e.

\[
\text{PreLie} \simeq \text{Lie} \circ M
\]

and

\[
M \simeq \text{Indec}.
\]

**Conjecture 9.3** The sub-operad \(M\) of PreLie is isomorphic to the free operad on CycLie, i.e.

\[
\text{FreeOp}(\text{CycLie}) \simeq M.
\]

In the direction of Conjecture 9.3, Loday and N. Bergeron [2] have proved that the suboperad of PreLie generated by \(x \triangleright y + y \triangleright x\) is free. The element \(x \triangleright y + y \triangleright x\) is the image by \(\lambda\) of the element \((x, y) \in \text{CycLie}\).

Let us summarise these conjectures in words. The image of the inclusion of CycLie in PreLie should generate a free sub-operad of PreLie. This free sup-operad should give a distinguished set of generators of PreLie as a left Lie-module. One should therefore have a canonical isomorphism

\[
\text{PreLie} \simeq \text{Lie} \circ \text{FreeOp}(\text{CycLie})
\]

and an isomorphism

\[
\text{FreeOp}(\text{CycLie}) \simeq \text{Indec} \simeq S_1 \oplus \text{Reflex} \circ \text{CycPreLie},
\]

where the last isomorphism is Corollary 7.7.

Let us explain now how conjecture 9.3 would follow from conjecture 9.2 by an argument of dimension.

Indeed, there exists a surjective morphism of operads from the free operad \(F\) on CycLie to \(M\), as \(M\) is generated by CycLie. To prove that this is an isomorphism, it is enough to compute the generating series. On the one hand, the generating series \(f_M\) of \(M\) is defined by

\[
f_{\text{PreLie}}(x) = f_{\text{Lie}}(f_M(x)) = -\log(1 - f_M(x)).
\]

and therefore one has

\[
1 - f_M(x) = \exp(-f_{\text{PreLie}}(x)).
\]
On the other hand, the generating series of the free operad $F$ on CycLie is the unique solution with zero constant term of the fixed-point equation
\[ f_F(x) = x + f_{\text{CycLie}}(f_F(x)) = x + (1 - f_F(x)) \log(1 - f_F(x)) + f_F(x). \] (63)
which amounts to
\[ x = (1 - f_F(x))(- \log(1 - f_F(x))). \] (64)

One can then use the equality
\[ f_{\text{PreLie}}(x) = x \exp(f_{\text{PreLie}}(x)) \] (65)
to show that
\[ x = (1 - f_M(x))(- \log(1 - f_M(x))). \] (66)
and deduce from this that one must have $f_M = f_F$.

**Remark 9.4** If these conjectures are true, they give a way to define a bigrading on the vector spaces $\text{PreLie}(n)$, where one degree comes from the free operad structure and the other from the free Lie-module structure. This seems to be related to classical polynomial analogues of $n^{n-1}$ and combinatorial statistics on rooted trees considered in [7].

**Remerciements**: l’auteur a bénéficié du soutien du projet PEPS “Calcul moulien et MuPAD-Combinat”.
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