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## Introduction

The purpose of this note is to demonstrate some simple facts about the set of free homotopy classes. An application will be found in the construction of G-CW approximations of $G$-spaces through Brown's construction.

Throughout this note, let $[A, B]$ denote the set of all free homotopy classes of continuous maps of $A$ to $B$ for any spaces $A$ and $B$. Then, we have the following two theorems.

Theorem 1. Let $X$ and $Y$ be spaces and $f: X \rightarrow Y$ a continuous map. Suppose that $X$ and $Y$ are arcwise connected and

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{*}: \pi_{1}(X, x) \longrightarrow \pi_{1}(Y, f(x))(x \in X) \text { is surjective. } \tag{*}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then, $f_{*}: \pi_{n}(X, x) \rightarrow \pi_{n}(Y, f(x))$ is injective or surjective if and only if $f_{*}:\left[S^{n}, X\right]$ $\rightarrow\left[S^{n}, Y\right]$ is injective or surjective, respectively.

Theorem 2. Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a continuous map and $N \geqq 1$. Then, the following three conditions are equivalent to each other:
(1) For any $x \in X$, the induced homomorphism $(n \geqq 1)$ or map $(n=0)$

$$
f_{*}: \pi_{n}(X, x) \longrightarrow \pi_{n}(Y, f(x))
$$

is bijective when $n<N$ and surjective when $n=N$.
(2) For any CW complex K, the induced map

$$
f_{*}:[K, X] \longrightarrow[K, Y]
$$

is bijective when $\operatorname{dim} K<N$ and surjective when $\operatorname{dim} K=N$.
(2)' (2) is valid for $K=*$ or $S^{n}(n \geqq 1)$ and, in addition, $f_{*}$ in (2) is surjective for $K=\vee_{\lambda \in \Lambda} S_{\lambda}^{1}$, the wedge of circles $S_{\lambda}^{1}=S^{1}$, where $\Lambda$ is any set.

Theorem 2 is a corollary to Theorem 1, because (*) is a consequence of the last condition in (2)'. Here, we notice that $\Lambda$ in (2)' can be taken to be each conjugate class of $\pi_{1}(Y, f(x))$ (see Lemma 1.3), and to be the one-point-set when
$\pi_{1}(Y, f(x))$ is finite or nilpotent (see Proposition 3.1). So, we can restrict $K$ in Theorem 2 to finite CW complexes under some finiteness conditions on the fundamental groups; but this is not the case in general. Such conditions and counter-examples will be given in $\S 3$ and $\S 4$, respectively.

Now, we present some results in the theory of $G$-spaces. Let $G$ be a topological group. By a $G$-space $X$, we mean a space $X$ together with a continuous $G$-action on $X$. For a subgroup $H$ of $G$, the $H$-stationary subspace $\{x \in X: g x=x$ for every $g \in H\}$ is denoted by $X^{H}$. Let $\mathscr{F}$ be an orbit type family for $G ; \mathscr{F}$ consists of subgroups of $G$, and $g{H g^{-1} \in \mathscr{F}}$ if $H \in \mathscr{F}$ and $g \in G$. A (not necessarily Hausdorff) $G$-CW complex $K$ is called a $G-\mathrm{CW}_{\mathscr{F}}$ complex if the isotropy subgroups of $G$-cells in $K$ are contained in $\mathscr{F}$ (see [5]). Let [, ] $]_{G}$ denote the set of all free $G$-homotopy classes of $G$-maps. Then, an equivariant version of Theorem 2 is given by the following theorem, which is equivalent to Theorem 5.2*) of [4] when $\mathscr{F}$ consists of all closed subgroups of $G$.

Theorem 3. Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a $G$-map between $G$-spaces and $N \geqq 1$. Then, the following four conditions are equivalent to each other:
(1) For any $H \in \mathscr{F}, X^{H}$ is non-empty if and only if so is $Y^{H}$, and moreover, for any $x \in X^{H}$, the induced homomorphism ( $n \geqq 1$ ) or map $(n=0)$

$$
f_{*}: \pi_{n}\left(X^{H}, x\right) \longrightarrow \pi_{n}\left(Y^{H}, f(x)\right)
$$

is bijective when $n<N$ and surjective when $n=N$.
(2) For any $G-\mathrm{CW}_{\mathcal{F}}$ complex $K$, the induced map

$$
f_{*}:[K, X]_{G} \longrightarrow[K, Y]_{G}
$$

is bijective when $\operatorname{dim} K / G<N$ and surjective when $\operatorname{dim} K / G=N$.
(2)' (2) is valid for $K=(G / H) \times L$ where $H \in \mathscr{F}$ and $L$ is a CW complex with trivial G-action.
(2)" (2) is valid for $K=G / H$ or $(G / H) \times S^{n}(n \geqq 1)$ and, in addition, $f_{*}$ in (2) is surjective for $K=(G / H) \times \vee_{\lambda \in \Lambda} S_{\lambda}^{1}\left(S_{\lambda}^{1}=S^{1}\right)$, where $H \in \mathscr{F}$ and $G$ acts trivially on the second factors.

By using the construction of E. H. Brown [1] and by the above theorem, we have the following

Theorem 4. Let $\mathscr{F}$ be an orbit type family for $G$. Then, for any $G$-space $X$, there exists a pair of a $G-\mathrm{CW}_{\mathscr{F}}$ complex $K_{\mathscr{F}}(X)$ and a G-map $\rho_{X}: K_{\mathcal{F}}(X) \rightarrow X$ such that

$$
\left(\rho_{X}\right)_{*}: \pi_{n}\left(K_{\mathscr{F}}(X)^{H}, v\right) \longrightarrow \pi_{n}\left(X^{H}, \rho_{X}(v)\right) \quad(n \geqq 0)
$$

[^0]is bijective for any $H \in \mathscr{F}$ and $v \in K_{\mathscr{F}}(X)^{H}$. Moreover, for any G-map $f: X \rightarrow Y$, there exists a G-cellular map $K_{\mathcal{F}}(f): K_{\mathcal{F}}(X) \rightarrow K_{\mathcal{F}}(Y)$, unique up to homotopy, such that $\rho_{Y} \circ K_{\mathcal{F}}(f)$ is $G$-homotopic to $f \circ \rho_{X}$.

When $\mathscr{F}$ consists of all subgroups of $G, K_{\mathscr{F}}(X)$ is constructed more canonically in [5]. A variant of Brown's construction used in Hastings-Waner [2] also seems applicable to the proof of Theorem 3; but our construction given in $\S 2$ is much simpler. Besides, even when $G=\{e\}$, our construction which uses only the free homotopy classes is newly justified.

## §1. Elementary study of free homotopy sets and proofs of Theorems $\mathbf{1 , 2}$ and 3

We shall prove Theorem 1 by an elementary lemma. Let $K$ and $X$ be arcwise connected spaces with base points $v_{0} \in K$ and $x_{0} \in X$. Let $\left[K, v_{0} ; X, x_{0}\right.$ ] denote the set of all based homotpy classes of (continuous) maps of ( $K, v_{0}$ ) to ( $X, x_{0}$ ). Then, we have the forgetful map

$$
\psi:\left[K, v_{0} ; X, x_{0}\right] \longrightarrow[K, X]
$$

to the free homotopy set. Assume that $K$ is a CW complex and $v_{0}$ is a vertex of $K$. Then, for any maps $f:\left(K, v_{0}\right) \rightarrow\left(X, x_{0}\right)$ and $\alpha:(I, \dot{I}) \rightarrow\left(X, x_{0}\right)$, we have a homotopy $f_{t}: K \rightarrow X$ with $f_{0}=f$ and $f_{t}\left(v_{0}\right)=\alpha(t)(t \in I)$, and denote $f_{1}:\left(K, v_{0}\right) \rightarrow$ ( $X, x_{0}$ ) by $\alpha \cdot f$. The following lemma can be proved by a standard homotopy argument:

Lemma 1.1. $\pi_{1}\left(X, x_{0}\right)$ operates on $\left[K, v_{0} ; X, x_{0}\right]$ by $[\alpha] \cdot[f]=[\alpha \cdot f]$ and the set $\left[K, v_{0} ; X, x_{0}\right] / \pi_{1}\left(X, x_{0}\right)$ of all orbits is identified with $[K, X]$ by the forgetful map $\psi$.

Proof of Theorem 1. Consider the commutative diagram

where $\psi$ 's are the forgetful maps and the lower $f_{*}$ is denoted by $f_{\#}$ to distinguish it from the upper $f_{*}$.

Injectivity: Assume that $f_{\#}$ is injective. Take $g:\left(S^{n}, *\right) \rightarrow(X, x)$ with $f_{*}[g]=0$ in $\pi_{n}(Y, f(x))$. Then, $f_{\#}[g]=0$ in $\left[S^{n}, Y\right]$ and hence $[g]=0$ in $\left[S^{n}, X\right]$. Since the orbit of 0 in $\pi_{n}(X, x)$ consists of 0 alone, we see that $[g]=0$ in $\pi_{n}(X, x)$ by Lemma 1.1. Thus the group homomorphism $f_{*}$ is injective.

Conversely, assume that $f_{*}$ is injective. Let $g, g^{\prime}: S^{n} \rightarrow X$ be two maps such that $f_{\#}[g]=f_{\#}\left[g^{\prime}\right]$ in $\left[S^{n}, Y\right]$. We may assume that $g(*)=g^{\prime}(*)=x$. By Lemma 1.1, there is a $\beta \in \pi_{1}(Y, f(x))$ with $\beta \cdot[f \circ g]=\left[f \circ g^{\prime}\right]$. Take an element $\alpha \in$ $\pi_{1}(X, x)$ with $f_{*} \alpha=\beta$ by the assumption (*) in the theorem. Then, $f_{*}(\alpha \cdot[g])=$ $f_{*}\left[g^{\prime}\right]$. So, $\alpha \cdot[g]=\left[g^{\prime}\right]$ by the assumption, which implies $[g]=\left[g^{\prime}\right]$ in $\left[S^{n}, X\right]$. Thus $f_{\#}$ is injective.

Surjectivity: If $f_{*}$ is surjective, then so is $f_{\#}$ by Lemma 1.1.
Assume that $f_{\#}$ is surjective, and take any $h:\left(S^{n}, *\right) \rightarrow(Y, f(x))$. Then, there is a map $g: S^{n} \rightarrow X$ with $f_{\#}[g]=[h]$ in $\left[S^{n}, Y\right]$, where we may assume that $g(*)=x$. By Lemma 1.1, there is a $\beta \in \pi_{1}(Y, f(x))$ such that $\beta \cdot[f \circ g]=[h]$. Take $\alpha \in \pi_{1}(X, x)$ with $f_{*} \alpha=\beta$ by the assumption (*) in the theorem. Then $f_{*}(\alpha \cdot[g])=[h]$; and $f_{*}$ is surjective.
q.e.d.

To prove Theorem 2, we notice the following lemma, where

$$
\vee_{A} S^{1}=\vee_{\lambda \in \Lambda} S_{\lambda}^{1}\left(S_{\lambda}^{1}=S^{1}\right), \quad \Pi_{\Lambda} \pi=\prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \pi_{\lambda} \quad\left(\pi_{\lambda}=\pi\right)
$$

Lbmma 1.2. For any set $\Lambda$, any map $f: X \rightarrow Y$ between arcwise connected spaces and $x \in X$, the induced map $f_{\#}\left(=f_{*}\right):\left[\vee_{A} S^{1}, X\right] \rightarrow\left[\vee_{A} S^{1}, Y\right]$ can be identified with the map

$$
\left(\Pi_{\Lambda} f_{*}\right)_{\#}:\left(\Pi_{\Lambda} \pi\right) / \mathrm{ad} \pi \longrightarrow\left(\Pi_{\Lambda} \pi^{\prime}\right) / \mathrm{ad} \pi^{\prime}
$$

induced from the product $\Pi_{A} f_{*}$ of the induced homomorphism

$$
f_{*}: \pi=\pi_{1}(X, x) \longrightarrow \pi^{\prime}=\pi_{1}(Y, f(x)),
$$

where /ad denotes the set of orbits by the conjugation-action $\alpha \cdot\left(\alpha_{\lambda}\right)=\left(\alpha \alpha_{\lambda} \alpha^{-1}\right)$.
Proof. $\left[\vee_{A} S^{1}, * ; X, x\right]$ can be identified naturally with $\Pi_{\Lambda} \pi$. Thus, the lemma follows immediately from Lemma 1.1. q.e.d.

Lemma 1.3. In Lemma 1.2, assume that $f_{\#}=\left(\Pi_{A} f_{*}\right)_{\#}$ is surjective for any $\Lambda=\pi^{\prime} \cdot \beta$, where $\pi^{\prime} \cdot \beta=\left\{b \beta b^{-1}: b \in \pi^{\prime}\right\}$ is the conjugate class of $\beta \in \pi^{\prime}$. Then, $f_{*}: \pi \rightarrow \pi^{\prime}$ is also surjective.

Proof. Take any $\beta \in \pi^{\prime}$ and consider $\Pi_{\Lambda} f_{*}: \Pi_{\Lambda} \pi \rightarrow \Pi_{\Lambda} \pi^{\prime}$ for $\Lambda=\pi^{\prime} \cdot \beta$. Then the assumption means that for any $\left(\beta_{\lambda}\right) \in \Pi_{\lambda} \pi^{\prime}$, some conjugate $b \cdot\left(\beta_{\lambda}\right)=$ $\left(b \beta_{\lambda} b^{-1}\right)\left(b \in \pi^{\prime}\right)$ is contained in the image of $\Pi_{\Lambda} f_{*}$. Now, take $\left(\beta_{\lambda}\right)$ to be

$$
\beta_{\lambda}=\lambda \quad \text { for any } \quad \lambda \in \Lambda=\pi^{\prime} \cdot \beta
$$

Then, $\beta=b \beta_{\lambda_{0}} b^{-1}$ for $\lambda_{0}=b^{-1} \beta b \in \Lambda$ and so $\beta \in \operatorname{Im} f_{*}$. Thus $f_{*}$ is surjective.
q. e. d.

Proof of Theorem 2. The implication (1) $\Rightarrow(2)$ is well-known in the theory
of CW complexes. (2)' is a special case of (2). (2)' for $K=*$ implies (1) for $n=0$. Lemma 1.3 shows that the last condition in (2)' implies the assumption $(*)$ in Theorem 1. The implication $(2)^{\prime} \Rightarrow(1)$ now follows from Theorem 1.

Proof of Thborem 3. Let $L$ be a CW complex with trivial $G$-action. Then, for any $H \in \mathscr{F}, K=(G / H) \times L$ is a $G-\mathrm{CW}_{\mathscr{F}}$ complex and we can identify naturally as $K / G=L$ and $[K, Z]_{G}=\left[L, Z^{H}\right]$ for any $G$-space $Z$. So, (2)' is a special case of (2), and Theorem 2 shows the equivalence of (1), (2)' and (2)". The implication $(1) \Rightarrow(2)$ is due to a standard argument in the theory of $G-\mathrm{CW}$ complexes. q.e.d.

## § 2. Proof of Theorem 4 through Brown's construction

We shall construct $K_{\mathcal{F}}(X)$ in Theorem 4. Let $\mathscr{C}$ be the category of $G-\mathrm{CW}_{\mathscr{F}}$ complexes and free $G$-homotopy classes of $G$-maps. The sum in this category stands for the disjoint union. Consider the equalizer $E\left(g_{0}, g_{1}\right)$ of two maps $g_{0}, g_{1}: A \rightarrow B$, defined to be the identification space
$E\left(g_{0}, g_{1}\right)=A \times I+B / \sim \quad$ with $(a, t) \sim g_{t}(a)$ for any $a \in A$ and $t \in \dot{I}$.
If $A, B \in \mathscr{C}$ and $g_{0}, g_{1}$ are $G$-cellular, then $E\left(g_{0}, g_{1}\right) \in \mathscr{C}$.
Choose one representative for each class of conjugate subgroups in $\mathscr{F}$ and put $\mathscr{F}^{\prime}=\{$ representatives $\} \subset \mathscr{F}$. Then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathscr{C}_{0}^{\prime}=\left\{G / H,(G / H) \times S^{n}: H \in \mathscr{F}^{\prime}, n \geqq 1\right\} \quad \text { and } \\
& \mathscr{C}_{1}^{\prime}=\mathscr{C}_{0}^{\prime} \cup\left\{(G / H) \times \vee_{A} S^{1}: H \in \mathscr{F}^{\prime}, \Lambda \subset \operatorname{Map}\left(S^{1}, X\right)\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

$\left(\vee_{A} S^{1}=\vee_{\lambda \in A} S_{\lambda}^{1}, S_{\lambda}^{1}=S^{1}\right)$ are small subcategories of $\mathscr{C}$. Let $\mathscr{C}_{0}$ (resp. $\left.\mathscr{C}_{1}\right)$ be a minimal subcategory which contains $\mathscr{C}_{0}^{\prime}$ (resp. $\mathscr{C}_{1}^{\prime}$ ) and is closed under the operation of taking finite sum and equalizer. Then, $\mathscr{C}_{0}$ and $\mathscr{C}_{1}$ are small, full subcategories of $\mathscr{C}$.

Now, we fix a $G$-space $X$ and put $H(\cdot)=[\cdot, X]_{G}$. We see that $\left(\mathscr{C}, \mathscr{C}_{0}\right)$ is a homotopy category and $H$ is a homotopy functor in the sense of E . H. Brown [1]. To construct $K_{\mathscr{F}}(X) \in \mathscr{C}$ in Theorem 4, we use Brown's construction given there.

If $\gamma$ is anything and $Y \in \mathscr{C},(Y, \gamma) \in \mathscr{C}$ will denote a copy of $Y$ and $t_{\gamma}:(Y, \gamma) \rightarrow$ $Y$ will be an identification. By induction on $n$, we define $K_{n} \in \mathscr{C}$ and $u_{n} \in H\left(K_{n}\right)$ so that

$$
K_{n} \subset K_{n+1} \quad \text { and } \quad H\left(f_{n}\right) u_{n+1}=u_{n}
$$

where $f_{n}: K_{n} \rightarrow K_{n+1}$ is the inclusion. Put

$$
K_{0}=\Sigma(Y, u) \quad \text { and } \quad u_{0}=\Sigma H\left(t_{u}\right) u \in H\left(K_{0}\right)
$$

where the sum ranges over all $Y \in \mathscr{C}_{1}$ and all $u \in H(Y)$. Note that the choice of $K_{0}$ and $u_{0}$ in [1] is arbitrary. So, we specify them as above to get the following

Lemma 2.1. $T_{u_{0}}:\left[Y, K_{0}\right]_{G} \rightarrow H(Y)$ is surjective for any $Y \in \mathscr{C}_{1}$.
Suppose that $K_{n}$ and $u_{n}(n \geqq 0)$ have been defined. Let $K_{n+1} \in \mathscr{C}$ be the equalizer of

$$
\sum g_{i} \circ t_{\left(g_{0}, g_{1}\right)}: \sum\left(Y,\left(g_{0}, g_{1}\right)\right) \longrightarrow K_{n} \quad \text { for } \quad i=0,1
$$

where the sum ranges over all $Y \in \mathscr{C}_{0}$ and all pairs of $G$-cellular maps $g_{0}, g_{1}$ : $Y \rightarrow K_{n}$ such that $g_{0}$ is not freely $G$-homotopic to $g_{1}$ and $H\left(g_{0}\right) u_{n}=H\left(g_{1}\right) u_{n}$. Then, it is easy to see that there is a $u_{n+1} \in H\left(K_{n+1}\right)$ with $H\left(f_{n}\right) u_{n+1}=u_{n}$.

From the way of the construction of $K_{n}(n \geqq 1)$ together with Lemma 2.1 and $\mathscr{C}_{0} \subset \mathscr{C}_{1}$, we see the following

Lemma 2.2. $\lim T_{u_{n}}: \lim \left[Y, K_{n}\right]_{G} \rightarrow H(Y)$ is bijective for any $Y \in \mathscr{C}_{0}$ and surjective for any $Y \in \mathscr{C}_{1}$.

Let $K_{\mathcal{F}}(X)=\cup K_{n}$ be the direct limit and $h_{n}: K_{n} \rightarrow K_{\mathcal{F}}(X)$ the inclusion. Then, $K_{\boldsymbol{F}}(X) \in \mathscr{C}$ and there is a $u_{X} \in H\left(K_{\mathcal{F}}(X)\right)$ such that $H\left(h_{n}\right) u_{X}=u_{n}$. Furthermore,

Lemma 2.3. $T_{u_{X}}:\left[Y, K_{\mathcal{F}}(X)\right]_{G} \rightarrow H(Y)$ is bijective for any $Y \in \mathscr{C}_{0}$ and surjective for any $Y \in \mathscr{C}_{1}$.

In fact, $\lim T_{u_{n}}$ in lemma 2.2 is the composition of

$$
\lim \left(h_{n}\right)_{*}: \lim \left[Y, K_{n}\right]_{G} \longrightarrow\left[Y, K_{\mathscr{F}}(X)\right]_{G}
$$

and $T_{u_{X}}$; and $\lim \left(h_{n}\right)_{*}$ is bijective for any $Y \in \mathscr{C}_{0}$, because the image of $Y$ or $Y \times I\left(Y \in \mathscr{C}_{0}\right)$ is contained in a finite $G-\mathrm{CW}_{\mathscr{F}}$ subcomplex of $K_{\mathscr{F}}(X)$. Thus, Lemma 2.3 is a consequence of Lemma 2.2.

Take a $G$-map $\rho_{X}: K_{\mathcal{F}}(X) \rightarrow X$ representing $u_{X} \in H\left(K_{\boldsymbol{F}}(X)\right)=\left[K_{\boldsymbol{F}}(X), X\right]_{G}$. Then

$$
\left(\rho_{X}\right)_{*}=T_{u_{X}}:\left[Y, K_{\mathscr{F}}(X)\right]_{G} \longrightarrow[Y, X]_{G}=H(Y)
$$

which satisfies Lemma 2.3. So, the first half of Theorem 4 is a consequence of the implication (2)" $\Rightarrow(1)$ in Theorem 3 by the definition of $\mathscr{C}_{0}$ and $\mathscr{C}_{1}$. The last half of Theorem 4 is clear by construction; and Theorem 4 is proved completely.

## §3. Some finiteness conditions

In this section, we shall prove two propositions to give a condition that $K$ in Theorem 2 can be restricted to finite CW complexes.

In the notations of Lemma 1.2, consider the induced homomorphism

$$
\varphi=f_{*}: \pi=\pi_{1}(X, x) \longrightarrow \pi^{\prime}=\pi_{1}(Y, f(x)) \quad(f: X \rightarrow Y, x \in X),
$$

and the induced $\operatorname{map} f_{\#}\left(=f_{*}\right):\left[\vee_{A} S^{1}, X\right] \rightarrow\left[\vee_{A} S^{1}, Y\right]$ identified with the map

$$
\left(\Pi_{\Lambda} \varphi\right)_{\#}:\left(\Pi_{\Lambda} \pi\right) / \mathrm{ad} \pi \longrightarrow\left(\Pi_{\Lambda} \pi^{\prime}\right) / \mathrm{ad} \pi^{\prime}
$$

induced from the product homomorphism $\Pi_{\Lambda} \varphi$, where /ad denotes the set of orbits by the conjugation-action $\alpha \cdot\left(\alpha_{\lambda}\right)=\left(\alpha \alpha_{\lambda} \alpha^{-1}\right)$. Then, we have the following proposition, where ( $s n$ ) (resp. (bn)) means that
( $\mathrm{s} n$ ) (resp. (bn)) $\quad f_{\#}=\left(\Pi_{\Lambda} \varphi\right)_{\#}$ is surjective (resp. bijective) when $|\Lambda|=n$.
Proposition 3.1. (i) When $\pi^{\prime}$ (resp. $\pi$ ) is finite or nilpotent, (s1) (resp. ( $\mathrm{s} n$ ) for all $n$ ) implies the assumption (*) in Theorem 1 that $f_{*}=\varphi$ is surjective.
(ii) When $\pi$ is nilpotent, (b1) and (s2) imply that $\varphi$ is bijective.

Proof. (i) Put $\bar{\pi}=\operatorname{Im} \varphi \subset \pi^{\prime}$. Then (s1) means that $\pi^{\prime}=\{e\} \cup \cup_{\beta \in \pi^{\prime}} \beta$. ( $\bar{\pi}-\{e\}$ ). So, when $\pi^{\prime}$ is finite, this implies that $\left|\pi^{\prime}\right| \leqq 1+(|\bar{\pi}|-1)\left|\pi^{\prime}\right| \bar{\pi} \mid=1+$ $\left|\pi^{\prime}\right|-\left|\pi^{\prime}\right| \bar{\pi} \mid$ and $\pi^{\prime}=\bar{\pi}$.

When $\pi^{\prime}$ is nilpotent, take the upper central series $\{e\}=Z_{0}^{\prime} \subset Z_{1}^{\prime} \subset \cdots \subset Z_{n}^{\prime}=\pi^{\prime}$. Let $\beta \in Z_{i+1}^{\prime}$. Then, $b \cdot \beta \in \bar{\pi}$ for some $b \in \pi^{\prime}$ by (s1), and $b \cdot \beta \equiv \beta \bmod Z_{i}^{\prime}$ since $Z_{i+1}^{\prime} / Z_{i}^{\prime}=Z\left(\pi^{\prime} \mid Z_{i}^{\prime}\right)$. So, if $Z_{i}^{\prime} \subset \bar{\pi}$, then $\beta \in \bar{\pi}$ and $Z_{i+1}^{\prime} \subset \bar{\pi}$. Thus we see $Z_{i}^{\prime} \subset \bar{\pi}$ by induction; and $\pi^{\prime}=Z_{n}^{\prime}=\bar{\pi}$.

Assume that (sn) holds for all $n$. Let $\beta \in \pi^{\prime}$. Then $b \cdot(\{\beta\} \cup(\bar{\pi}-\{e\})) \subset \bar{\pi}$ for some $b \in \pi^{\prime}$ by ( $\mathrm{s}|\bar{\pi}|$ ) when $\pi$ is finite. This shows $\beta \in \bar{\pi}$ and $\pi^{\prime}=\bar{\pi}$. Now consider the lower central series given by $\bar{\pi}_{0}=\bar{\pi}, \bar{\pi}_{i+1}=\left[\bar{\pi}, \bar{\pi}_{i}\right]$ and $\pi_{0}^{\prime}=\pi^{\prime}, \pi_{i+1}^{\prime}=$ $\left[\pi^{\prime}, \pi_{i}^{\prime}\right]$. Then, for any $\beta_{\lambda} \in \pi_{i(\lambda)}^{\prime}(1 \leqq \lambda \leqq n)$, there is a $b \in \pi^{\prime}$ with $b \cdot \beta_{\lambda} \in \bar{\pi}_{i(\lambda)}$. This is the assumption when $i=\max i(\lambda)$ is 0 , and is proved by induction on $i$ and by the definition of commutator subgroups. So, $\pi_{m}^{\prime}=\{e\}$ if $\bar{\pi}_{m}=\{e\}$. Thus, when $\pi$ is nilpotent, so is $\pi^{\prime}$ and we have $\pi^{\prime}=\bar{\pi}$ as is shown already.
(ii) $\varphi$ is injective by (b1) and we regard $\varphi$ as the inclusion. Take the upper central series $\{e\}=Z_{0} \subset Z_{1} \subset \cdots \subset Z_{n}=\pi$. Then, we see by induction that $Z_{i}$ is a normal subgroup of $\pi^{\prime}$; and so is $\pi=Z_{n}$ and $\pi^{\prime}=\pi$ by (s1). In fact, take any $\alpha \in Z_{i+1}$ and $\beta \in \pi^{\prime}$. Then $b^{\prime} \cdot(\alpha, \beta) \in \pi \times \pi$ for some $b^{\prime} \in \pi^{\prime}$ by (s2), and so $b^{\prime} \cdot \alpha=a \cdot \alpha$ for some $a \in \pi$ by (b1). Thus $b \cdot(\alpha, \beta)=\left(\alpha, \alpha_{1}\right)$ where $b=a^{-1} b^{\prime} \in \pi^{\prime}$ and $\alpha_{1} \in \pi$. So, $\quad b \cdot(\beta \cdot \alpha)=\left(\alpha_{1} b\right) \cdot \alpha=\alpha_{1} \cdot \alpha \equiv \alpha \bmod Z_{i}$ since $Z_{i+1} / Z_{i}=Z\left(\pi / Z_{i}\right)$, and $\beta \cdot \alpha \equiv b^{-1} \cdot \alpha=\alpha \bmod Z_{i}$ by inductive assumption. Hence $\beta \cdot \alpha \in Z_{i+1}$ and
$Z_{i+1}$ is normal in $\pi^{\prime}$, as desired.
q.e.d.

We now consider the following finiteness condition (**) for any group $\pi$ :
(**) There exists a finite subset $A$ of $\pi$ such that $Z(A) \cdot \alpha=\left\{a \alpha a^{-1}: a \in Z(A)\right\}$ is finite for any $\alpha \in \pi . \quad(Z(A)$ is centralizer of $A$.)

Example 3.2. $\pi$ satisfies (**), when
(1) $\pi$ is a FC-group, i.e., each conjugate class $\pi \cdot \alpha$ of $\alpha \in \pi$ consists of finite elements (e.g., $\pi$ is abelian or finite), or
(2) $\pi$ is finitely generated group or a free group.

In fact, any FC-group $\pi$ satisfies (**) by taking the empty set for $A$. If $\pi$ is generated by a finite set $A$, then $Z(A)=Z(\pi)$. If $\pi$ is free and $A=\left\{a_{1}, a_{2}\right\}\left(a_{1} \neq a_{2}\right)$ is a subset of a system of free generators of $\pi$, then $Z(A)=\{e\}$. So, $Z(A) \cdot \alpha=\{\alpha\}$ in these cases.

Proposition 3.3. When $\pi$ or $\pi^{\prime}$ satisfies ( $* *$ ), $\varphi=f_{*}$ is bijective if ( bn ) holds for all $n$.

By the proof of Theorem 2, we have the following
Corollary 3.4. In cases of Propositions 3.1 and 3.3, Theorem 2 is valid by restricting $K$ to finite CW complexes.

In Proposition 3.3, $\varphi$ is injective by (b1) (see the proof of Theorem 1), and we regard $\varphi: \pi \subset \pi^{\prime}$ as the inclusion hereafter. When $\Lambda \subset \pi$, we denote by $d_{\Lambda}=$ $\left(d_{\lambda}\right) \in \Pi_{\Lambda} \pi$ the element with $d_{\lambda}=\lambda$ for any $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Then, $\alpha \cdot d_{\Lambda}=d_{\Lambda}$ means $\alpha \in Z(\Lambda)$ when $\alpha \in \pi$ and $\alpha \in Z\left(\Lambda, \pi^{\prime}\right)=\left\{\beta \in \pi^{\prime}: \beta \lambda=\lambda \beta\right.$ for any $\left.\lambda \in \Lambda\right\}$ (the centralizer of $\Lambda$ in $\pi^{\prime}$ ) when $\alpha \in \pi^{\prime}$, respectively.

Lemma 3.5. Assume that (bn) holds, and let $A$ and $B$ be finite sets with $A \subset \pi,|A|=n$ and $|B|=m-n$, and $\beta_{B} \in \prod_{B} \pi^{\prime}$ be any element.
(i) If ( $\mathrm{s} m$ ) holds, then there exists $\alpha_{B} \in\left(\prod_{B} \pi\right) \cap Z\left(A, \pi^{\prime}\right) \cdot \beta_{B}$.
(ii) If $(\mathrm{bm})$ holds in addition, then $Z(A) \cdot \alpha_{B}=\left(\prod_{B} \pi\right) \cap Z\left(A, \pi^{\prime}\right) \cdot \beta_{B}$.

Proof. (i) For $\left(d_{A}, \beta_{B}\right) \in \prod_{A} \pi^{\prime} \times \prod_{B} \pi^{\prime}$, there is a $\left(x_{A}, x_{B}\right) \in\left(\prod_{A} \pi \times\right.$ $\left.\Pi_{B} \pi\right) \cap \pi^{\prime} \cdot\left(d_{A}, \beta_{B}\right)$ by ( sm ), and so $x_{A}=\alpha \cdot d_{A}$ for some $\alpha \in \pi$ by (bn) since $d_{A} \in \prod_{A} \pi$. Thus, $\alpha_{B}=\alpha^{-1} \cdot x_{B} \in \prod_{B} \pi$ and $\left(d_{A}, \alpha_{B}\right)=\beta \cdot\left(d_{A}, \beta_{B}\right)$ for some $\beta \in \pi^{\prime}$. This means that $\beta \in Z\left(A, \pi^{\prime}\right)$ and (i).
(ii) If $\alpha_{B}^{\prime} \in\left(\prod_{B} \pi\right) \cap Z\left(A, \pi^{\prime}\right) \cdot \beta_{B}$ in addition, then $\left(d_{A}, \alpha_{B}^{\prime}\right) \in \pi^{\prime} \cdot\left(d_{A}, \beta_{B}\right)$ and so $\left(d_{A}, \alpha_{B}^{\prime}\right)=\alpha^{\prime} \cdot\left(d_{A}, \alpha_{B}\right)$ for some $\alpha^{\prime} \in \pi$ by ( bm ). This means $\alpha^{\prime} \in Z(A)$ and $\alpha_{B}^{\prime} \in Z(A) \cdot \alpha_{B}$.
q.e.d.

Proof of Proposition 3.3. Assume that $\pi^{\prime}$ satisfies (**) by a finite subset $B$ of $\pi^{\prime}$. Then, there is a $\left(\alpha_{b}\right) \in\left(\prod_{B} \pi\right) \cap \pi^{\prime} \cdot d_{B}$ by $(\mathrm{s}|B|)$. So, $A=\left\{\alpha_{b}: b \in B\right\} \subset \pi$
satisfies $A=\beta_{0} \cdot B$ for some $\beta_{0} \in \pi^{\prime}$. Take any $\beta \in \pi^{\prime}$. Then $B^{\prime}=Z\left(A, \pi^{\prime}\right) \cdot \beta=$ $\beta_{0} \cdot\left(Z(B) \cdot\left(\beta_{0}^{-1} \cdot \beta\right)\right)$ is finite by (**). By (b|A|), (s(|A|+|B'|)) and Lemma 3.5 (i), we have $b \cdot d_{B^{\prime}} \in \prod_{B^{\prime}} \pi$ for some $b \in Z\left(A, \pi^{\prime}\right)$. So, for $b^{\prime}=b^{-1} \cdot \beta \in B^{\prime}$, we see that $\beta=b \cdot b^{\prime}=b \cdot d_{b^{\prime}} \in \pi$; and $\pi^{\prime}=\pi$.

Assume now that $\pi$ satisfies (**) by a finite subset $A$ of $\pi$. Take any $\beta \in \pi^{\prime}$. Then there is an $\alpha \in \pi \cap Z\left(A, \pi^{\prime}\right) \cdot \beta$ by (b|A|), (s $\left.(|A|+1)\right)$ and Lemma 3.5 (i). Put $A^{\prime}=Z(A) \cdot \alpha$ which is a finite subset of $\pi$ by (**). Take again $\alpha^{\prime} \in \pi$ with $\alpha^{\prime}=b \cdot \beta$ for some $b \in Z\left(A, \pi^{\prime}\right) \cap Z\left(A^{\prime}, \pi^{\prime}\right)$ by $\left(\mathrm{b}\left(|A|+\left|A^{\prime}\right|\right)\right)$ and $(\mathrm{s}(|A|+|A|+1))$. Then, $\alpha^{\prime} \in Z(A) \cdot \alpha=A^{\prime}$ by $(\mathrm{b}(|A|+1))$ and Lemma 3.5 (ii). So, $\beta=b^{-1} \cdot \alpha^{\prime}=$ $\alpha^{\prime} \in \pi ;$ and $\pi^{\prime}=\pi$.
q.e.d.

## §4. Counter-examples

In this section, we shall show that Proposition 3.3 and Corollary 3.4 do not hold in general without any assumption on $\pi$ or $\pi^{\prime}$, that is, $K$ in Theorem 2 cannot be restricted to finite CW complexes.

Counter-examples are given by using the infinte symmetric group $S_{\infty}=$ $\cup_{n \in N} S_{n}$, where $N$ is the set of positive integers and $S_{n}$ is the symmetric group of $n$ letters $\{1,2, \ldots, n\}$. Any element $\sigma \in S_{\infty}$ is a bijection $\sigma: N \rightarrow N$ such that $m(\sigma)=$ $\{n \in N: \sigma(n) \neq n\}$ is a finite subset of $N$.

Proposition 4.1. For any injection $\varphi: N \rightarrow N$, let $\bar{\varphi}: S_{\infty} \rightarrow S_{\infty}$ be the homomorphism defined by

$$
\bar{\varphi} \sigma|N-\varphi N=\operatorname{id}, \quad \bar{\varphi} \sigma| \varphi N=\varphi \circ \sigma \circ \varphi^{-1} \quad\left(\sigma \in S_{\infty}\right)
$$

Then the induced map $\left(\Pi_{\Lambda} \bar{\varphi}\right)_{\#}$ of $\left(\Pi_{\Lambda} S_{\infty}\right) / \mathrm{ad} S_{\infty}$ to itself is bijective for any finite set $\Lambda$.

Corollary 4.2 Let $X$ be the Eilenberg-MacLane complex $K\left(S_{\infty}, 1\right)$, and $f: X \rightarrow X$ be the map such that $f_{*}=\bar{\varphi}$ on $\pi_{1}(X)=S_{\infty}$. Then, the induced map $f_{\#}\left(=f_{*}\right)$ of the free homotopy set $[K, X]$ to itself is bijective for any finite CW complex $K$.
$\bar{\varphi}$ is not surjective unless $\varphi$ is surjective. So, these give counter-examples.
We see that $f_{\#}$ in Corollary 4.2 is bijective for the 1 -skeleton $K^{1}$ of any finite CW complex $K$ by Proposition 4.1 and Lemma 1.2, and so for $K$ by a standard homotopy argument because $\pi_{n}(X)=0$ for $n \geqq 2$.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. By the definition of $\bar{\varphi}$, it is clear that $\bar{\varphi}$ is injective and that $\sigma \in \operatorname{Im} \bar{\varphi}$ if and only if $m(\sigma) \subset \varphi N$ for $\sigma \in S_{\infty}$.

Let $\Lambda$ be a finite set. Take any $\left(\sigma_{\lambda}\right) \in \Pi_{\Lambda} S_{\infty}$ and put $M=\cup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} m\left(\sigma_{\lambda}\right)$. Then, $M$ is a finite subset of $N$ and there exists a $\sigma \in S_{\infty}$ such that $\sigma(M) \subset \varphi N$. So,
$m\left(\sigma \sigma_{\lambda} \sigma^{-1}\right) \subset \varphi N$ and $\sigma \sigma_{\lambda} \sigma^{-1} \in \operatorname{Im} \bar{\varphi}$ for any $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Thus, $\left(\Pi_{\Lambda} \bar{\varphi}\right)_{\#}$ is surjective.
Now, assume that $\left(\sigma_{\lambda}\right),\left(\sigma_{\lambda}^{\prime}\right) \in \Pi_{\Lambda} S_{\infty}$ are contained in $\operatorname{Im} \Pi_{\Lambda} \bar{\varphi}$ and $\left(\sigma_{\lambda}^{\prime}\right)=$ $\sigma \cdot\left(\sigma_{\lambda}\right)$ for some $\sigma \in S_{\infty}$. When $m(\sigma) \not \subset \varphi N$, take $n \in m(\sigma)-\varphi N$ and put $\sigma^{\prime}=$ $\left(n n^{\prime}\right) \sigma$, where $\left(n n^{\prime}\right)$ is the transposition of $n$ and $n^{\prime}=\sigma(n)(\neq n)$. Then,

$$
m\left(\sigma^{\prime}\right) \subset m(\sigma)-\{n\}, \quad\left(\sigma_{\lambda}^{\prime}\right)=\sigma^{\prime} \cdot\left(\sigma_{\lambda}\right)
$$

In fact, the first one is clear. Since $\sigma_{\lambda}, \sigma_{\lambda}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{Im} \bar{\varphi}$ and $n \notin \varphi N, n$ and $n^{\prime}$ are fixed by $\sigma_{\lambda}^{\prime}=\sigma \sigma_{\lambda} \sigma^{-1}$, which shows the second one. Since $m(\sigma)$ is finite, the repeating use of this process shows that $\left(\sigma_{\lambda}^{\prime}\right)=\tau \cdot\left(\sigma_{\lambda}\right)$ for some $\tau \in S_{\infty}$ with $m(\tau) \subset \varphi N$, i.e., $\tau \in \operatorname{Im} \bar{\varphi} . \quad$ Thus, $\left(\Pi_{\Lambda} \bar{\varphi}\right)_{\#}$ is injective.
q.e.d.

In the end of this section, we note the following counter-example, which is given by T. Ohkawa before we obtain Corollary 4.2, where spaces are assumed to be arcwise connected CW complexes.

Remark 4.3. (T. Ohkawa). For any based map $f: X \rightarrow Y$, we can construct $X_{\infty} \supset X, Y_{\infty} \supset Y$ and an extension $f_{\infty}: X_{\infty} \rightarrow Y_{\infty}$ of $f$ with the following properties:
(1) $f_{\infty *}:\left[K, X_{\infty}\right] \rightarrow\left[K, Y_{\infty}\right]$ is bijective for any finite CW complex $K$.
(2) For the induced homomorphisms $\pi_{1}(X) \xrightarrow{f_{*}} \pi_{1}(Y) \xrightarrow{i_{*}} \pi_{1}\left(Y_{\infty}\right) \xrightarrow{f_{\infty} *} \pi_{1}\left(X_{\infty}\right)$ ( $i: Y \subset Y_{\infty}$ ), $i_{*}$ is injective and $\operatorname{Im} f_{\infty *} \cap \operatorname{Im} i_{*}=\operatorname{Im}\left(i_{*} \circ f_{*}\right)$, (and so $f_{\infty *}$ is not surjective when $f_{*}$ is not surjective).

The construction is done by modifying the one given in $\S 2$ so as to satisfy (2), and is sketched as follows: Let $X_{1}=X \vee \vee(K, h), Y_{1}$ be the equalizer of

$$
\vee h \circ t_{h}, j \text { (the inclusion) }: \vee(K, h) \longrightarrow Y^{\prime}=Y \vee \vee(K, h),
$$

and $f_{1}: X_{1} \rightarrow Y^{\prime} \subset Y_{1}$ be defined by $f$ and the identity map, where the wedge ranges over all finite CW complexes $K$ with base points and all based maps $h: K \rightarrow Y$ (up to free homotopy). Furthermore, let $X_{2}, Y_{2}$ be the equalizers of

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum g_{i} \circ t_{\left(g_{0}, g_{1}\right)}: \sum\left(K,\left(g_{0}, g_{1}\right)\right) \longrightarrow X_{1} \quad(i=0,1), \\
\sum f_{1} \circ g_{i} \circ t_{\left(g_{0}, g_{1}\right)}: \sum\left(K,\left(g_{0}, g_{1}\right)\right) \longrightarrow Y_{1} \quad(i=0,1),
\end{aligned}
$$

respectively, and $f_{2}: X_{2} \rightarrow Y_{2}$ be defined by the identity map and $f_{1}$, where the sum (disjoint union) ranges over all $K$ of above and all pairs of based maps $g_{0}, g_{1}$ : $K \rightarrow X_{1}$ such that $f_{1} \circ g_{0}$ is freely homotopic to $f_{1} \circ g_{1}$. Let $X_{n}, Y_{n}$ and $f_{n}: X_{n} \rightarrow Y_{n}$ be defined inductively by the first or second construction according to $n$ is odd or even. Then, $X_{\infty}=\cup X_{n}, Y_{\infty}=\cup Y_{n}$ and $f_{\infty}=\cup f_{n}: X_{\infty} \rightarrow Y_{\infty}$ are the desired ones. In fact, (1) is clear. (2) is seen by the following result:

Let $E=E\left(g_{0}, g_{1}\right)$ be the equalizer of based maps $g_{0}, g_{1}: A \rightarrow B$ and consider

$$
\pi_{1}(A) \xrightarrow{g_{i *}} \pi_{1}(B) \xrightarrow{i_{1} *} \pi_{1}(E) \xrightarrow{i_{2} *} \pi_{1}\left(S^{1}\right) \quad(i=0,1)
$$

where $i_{1}$ and $i_{2}: S^{1}=* \times I / \sim \subset E$ are the inclusions. Then, the isomorphism

$$
\pi_{1}(E) \cong \pi_{1}(B) * \pi_{1}\left(S^{1}\right) /\left\langle\left(g_{0 *} \alpha\right)^{-1} s\left(g_{1 *} \alpha\right) s^{-1}: \alpha \in \pi_{1}(A)\right\rangle
$$

is induced from $i_{1 *}$ and $i_{2 *}$, where $s \in \pi_{1}\left(S^{1}\right)$ is a generator, (which is shown by using van Kampen's theorem). Furthermore, if $\operatorname{Ker} g_{0 *}=\operatorname{Ker} g_{1 *}$, then $i_{1 *}$ is injective and the right hand side is an HNN-extension which satisfies the Normal Form Theorem (cf., e.g., [3, Ch. IV, Th. 2.1]).
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[^0]:    *) We remark that a missing part of the proof of this theorem is covered by that in this note.

