

# GROUP ACTIONS, SECTIONAL CATEGORY RELATED INVARIANTS AND SEQUENTIAL TOPOLOGICAL COMPLEXITY OF FIBRE BUNDLE

RAMANDEEP SINGH ARORA, NAVNATH DAUNDKAR, AND SOUMEN SARKAR

**ABSTRACT.** For a  $G$ -space  $X$ , we introduce the notion of sectional category with respect to  $G$ . We establish properties analogous to those of the classical sectional category. As a consequence of the sectional category with respect to the group  $G$ , we obtain  $G$ -homotopy invariants: the LS category with respect to  $G$ , the sequential topological complexity with respect to  $G$ , and the strong sequential topological complexity with respect to  $G$ , denoted by  $\text{cat}_G^\#(X)$ ,  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^\#(X)$ , and  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X)$ , respectively. We explore several relationships between these invariants and well-known ones, such as the LS category, the sequential (equivariant) topological complexity, and the sequential strong equivariant topological complexity. We also prove some fundamental properties of these invariants. Additionally, we derive several additive upper bounds on the sequential topological complexity of the total spaces of fibre bundles involving these newly introduced invariants. As applications of these results, we compute the sequential topological complexity of various generalized projective product spaces.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The *sectional category* (or Schwarz genus) of a fibration  $p: E \rightarrow B$ , denoted  $\text{secat}(p)$ , is the smallest integer  $n$  such that there exists an open cover  $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^n$  of  $B$ , where each  $U_i$  admits a continuous section of  $p$ . This concept, introduced by Schwarz in [24], generalizes the notion of the Lusternik–Schnirelmann category (or LS category), a homotopy invariant of topological spaces. A subset  $X_0$  of a topological space  $X$  is said to be *categorical* if  $X_0$  is contractible in  $X$ , meaning that the inclusion map  $X_0 \hookrightarrow X$  is null-homotopic. The *LS category* of a topological space  $X$ , denoted  $\text{cat}(X)$ , is the smallest integer  $n$  such that  $X$  can be covered by  $n$  categorical open subsets of  $X$ .

Farber [11] introduced a homotopy invariant for a topological space  $X$  called the topological complexity of  $X$ , denoted  $\text{TC}(X)$ , to study the difficulty of the motion planning problem in  $X$ . Later, Rudyak [21] defined its sequential analogue called the sequential (or higher) topological complexity defined as follows. Suppose  $X^I$  is the free path space of  $X$  (with compact open topology) and  $e_{k,X}: X^I \rightarrow X^k$  is the generalized free path space fibration defined by

$$e_{k,X}(\alpha) = \left( \alpha(0), \alpha\left(\frac{1}{k-1}\right), \dots, \alpha\left(\frac{i}{k-1}\right), \dots, \alpha\left(\frac{k-2}{k-1}\right), \alpha(1) \right).$$

Then the *sequential topological complexity* of  $X$ , denoted  $\text{TC}_k(X)$ , is defined to be the sectional category of  $e_{k,X}$ , i.e., the smallest integer  $n$  such that there exists an open cover  $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^n$  of  $X^k$ , where each  $U_i$  admits a continuous section of  $e_{k,X}$ . Note that  $\text{TC}(X) = \text{TC}_2(X)$ .

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 55M30, 55R91, 55S40.

*Key words and phrases.* LS category, sequential topological complexity, fibre bundle, sectional category, generalized projective product spaces.

Further, if  $X$  is assumed to be a  $G$ -space, the equivariant version of topological complexity, denoted  $\mathrm{TC}_G(X)$ , was established by Colman and Grant in [3]. Later, Bayeh and Sarkar in [2] defined its sequential counterpart called the *sequential equivariant topological complexity* of  $X$ , denoted  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,G}(X)$ , as the smallest integer  $n$  such that there exists a  $G$ -invariant open cover  $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^n$  of  $X^k$ , with a continuous  $G$ -equivariant section  $s_i: U_i \rightarrow X^I$  of  $e_{k,X}$  over each  $U_i$ , where  $G$  acts on  $X^k$  diagonally and on  $X^I$  as  $(g\alpha)(t) = g\alpha(t)$  for all  $g \in G, \alpha \in X^I$  and  $t \in I$ .

Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be path-connected spaces. The product inequality for the Lusternik–Schnirelmann category was established in [14, Theorem 9]:

$$\mathrm{cat}(X \times Y) \leq \mathrm{cat}(X) + \mathrm{cat}(Y) - 1, \quad (1)$$

while, Farber in [11, Theorem 11], proved a similar inequality for topological complexity

$$\mathrm{TC}(X \times Y) \leq \mathrm{TC}(X) + \mathrm{TC}(Y) - 1. \quad (2)$$

It is worth noting that a product space is an example of a fibre bundle, see [23]. A notable problem in this area is determining how the topological complexity (respectively LS category) of the total space of a fibre bundle relates to the topological complexity (respectively LS category) of its fibre and base space. Several attempts have been made to tackle this problem. For a fibre bundle  $F \hookrightarrow E \xrightarrow{p} B$ , Farber and Grant showed the following inequality in [13, Lemma 7]:

$$\mathrm{TC}(E) \leq \mathrm{TC}(F) \cdot \mathrm{cat}(B \times B). \quad (3)$$

Farber and Grant used the inequality (3) to obtain a sharp upper bound on the topological complexity of lens spaces. Later, Grant improved this bound in [16, Theorem 3.1] by using the concept of subspace topological complexity. The corresponding sequential analogues of these results were established by the second author in [5]. Additionally, it was noted in [5] that the sequential topological complexity of lens spaces cannot be determined using these results.

In general, these multiplicative upper bounds are not particularly effective for estimating the topological complexity of total spaces of fibre bundles. As a result, the pursuit of improved bounds becomes more significant. Dranishnikov [10] introduced the notion of strong equivariant topological complexity, denoted  $\mathrm{TC}_G^*(X)$ , to get an additive upper bound on  $\mathrm{TC}(E)$  for a fibre bundle  $F \hookrightarrow E \xrightarrow{p} B$  with the structure group  $G$ . Later, Paul and Sen defined its sequential version called the *sequential strong equivariant topological complexity*, denoted  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^*(X)$ , to be the smallest integer  $n$  such that there exists a  $G^k$ -invariant open cover  $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^n$  of  $X^k$ , with a continuous  $G$ -equivariant section  $s_i: U_i \rightarrow X^I$  of  $e_{k,X}$  over each  $U_i$ , where  $G^k$  acts on  $X^k$  componentwise. They also proved the sequential analogue of additive upper bound on  $\mathrm{TC}_k(E)$  given by

$$\mathrm{TC}_k(E) \leq \mathrm{TC}_k(B) + \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^*(F) - 1, \quad (4)$$

where  $E, B$  are locally compact metric ANR-spaces and  $G$  is acting properly on  $F$ , see [20].

In their effort to improve bounds for the topological complexity of total spaces of fibre bundles, the second and third authors obtained an additive upper bound on  $\mathrm{TC}(E)$  in [6, Theorem 2.2]. In Section 3, we extend their work by establishing the sequential version of their result.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let  $F \hookrightarrow E \xrightarrow{p} B$  be a fibre bundle where  $E^k$  is a completely normal space. Let  $\{U_1, \dots, U_m\}$  and  $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$  be open covers of  $B^k$  and  $F^k$  with sequential motion planners  $s_i: U_i \rightarrow B^I$  and  $t_j: V_j \rightarrow F^I$  respectively. If

- (i) there exists a cover  $\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}$  of  $B$  with local trivializations  $f_i: p^{-1}(R_i) \rightarrow R_i \times F$  of  $F \hookrightarrow E \xrightarrow{p} B$  such that  $s_i(U_i) \subseteq R_i^I$ , and
- (ii) the induced local trivializations  $h_i: (p^k)^{-1}(U_i) \rightarrow U_i \times F^k$  with respect to  $s_i$  and  $R_i$  extends to local trivializations over  $\overline{U_i}$  such that  $(\overline{U_i} \cap \overline{U_{i'}}) \times V_j$  is invariant under  $h_{i'} \circ h_i^{-1}$  for all  $1 \leq i, i' \leq m$  and  $1 \leq j \leq n$ ,

then  $\text{TC}_k(E) \leq m + n - 1$ .

Moreover, we introduce new invariants for a  $G$ -space  $X$ : the LS category with respect to  $G$  and the strong sequential topological complexity with respect to  $G$ , denoted by  $\text{cat}_G^\#(X)$  and  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X)$ , respectively. The invariant  $\text{cat}_G^\#(X)$  is the smallest number  $n$  such that there exists a  $G$ -invariant categorical open cover  $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^n$  of  $X$ . The invariant  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X)$  is the smallest number  $n$  such that there exists a  $G^k$ -invariant open cover of  $X^k$  (with  $G^k$  acting on  $X^k$  componentwise), where each  $U_i$  admits a continuous section of  $e_{k,X}$ . In terms of these new invariants we get the following corollary in Section 3.

**Corollary 1.2.** Let  $F \hookrightarrow E \xrightarrow{p} B$  be a fibre bundle with structure group  $G$  where  $E^k$  is a completely normal space. Let  $\{U_1, \dots, U_m\}$  be a sequential motion planning open cover of  $B^k$ . If there exists a closed cover  $\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}$  of  $B$  with local trivializations  $f_i: p^{-1}(R_i) \rightarrow R_i \times F$  of  $F \hookrightarrow E \xrightarrow{p} B$  such that  $f_i$ 's forms a  $G$ -atlas of  $F \hookrightarrow E \xrightarrow{p} B$  and  $s_i(U_i) \subseteq R_i^I$ , then

$$\text{TC}_k(E) \leq m + \text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(F) - 1. \quad (5)$$

In particular,  $\text{TC}_k(E) \leq m + \text{cat}_{G^k}^\#(F^k) - 1$  and  $\text{TC}_k(E) \leq m + \text{TC}_{k,G}^*(F) - 1$ .

It is clear that  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X) \leq \text{TC}_{k,G}^*(X)$ . In Remark 2.40, we show that  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^*(X)$  can be infinite, but  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X)$  is finite. Hence, the upper bound (5) could be more appropriate to use for computations than (4) in certain cases, see Theorem 5.5. Furthermore, we prove a similar result for  $\text{cat}(E)$  in Section 4 following [19, Theorem 2.6].

The invariants discussed in the previous paragraph are specific cases of a broader concept, which we define as the sectional category with respect to  $G$ . For a  $G$ -space  $B$ , the sectional category with respect to  $G$  of a fibration  $p: E \rightarrow B$ , denoted  $\text{secat}_G^\#(p)$ , is the smallest number  $n$  such that there exists a  $G$ -invariant open cover  $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^n$  of  $B$ , where each  $U_i$  admits a continuous section of  $p$ . In particular, if  $X$  is a  $G$ -space and  $e_X: P_{x_0}X \rightarrow X$  is the path space fibration given by  $e_X(\alpha) = \alpha(1)$ , then  $\text{secat}_G^\#(e_X) = \text{cat}_G^\#(X)$ , see Corollary 2.22. Similarly, if  $X^k$  has componentwise  $G^k$ -action, then for the generalized free path space fibration  $e_{k,X}: X^I \rightarrow X^k$  we have  $\text{secat}_{G^k}^\#(e_{k,X}) = \text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X)$ . Moreover, if  $X^k$  has diagonal  $G$ -action, then we define  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^\#(X) = \text{secat}_G^\#(e_{k,X})$ , see Definition 2.26. In Proposition 2.11 and Proposition 2.28, we list several inequalities relating  $\text{cat}_G^\#(X)$ , and  $\text{TC}_{k,G}(X)$ ,  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^\#(X)$ ,  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X)$  and  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^*(X)$  to their respective non-equivariant counterparts  $\text{cat}(X)$  and  $\text{TC}_k(X)$  respectively. Then we prove the homotopy invariance of these invariants in Theorem 2.12 and Theorem 2.29, and obtain their product inequalities in Proposition 2.23 and Proposition 2.30. In Proposition 2.32 and Proposition 2.34, we prove inequalities

$$\text{cat}_H^\#(X^{k-1}) \leq \text{TC}_{k,H}^\#(X) \leq \text{TC}_{k,G}^\#(X) \leq \text{cat}_G^\#(X^k)$$

and

$$\text{cat}_{G^{k-1}}^{\#}(X^{k-1}) \leq \text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X) \leq \text{cat}_{G^k}^{\#}(X^k)$$

respectively, where  $H$  is a stabilizer subgroup of a point in  $X$ . For a path-connected topological group  $A$  with an action of  $G$  via topological group homomorphisms, we show that

$$\text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#}(A) = \text{cat}_G^{\#}(A^{k-1})$$

in Theorem 2.38. For any finite group  $G$  acting on  $S^n$ , we compute the exact value of  $\text{cat}_G^{\#}(S^n)$  in Example 2.13, and exact values of  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#}(S^n)$  and  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(S^n)$  when  $n$  is even and both of these invariants can either be  $k$  or  $k + 1$  when  $n$  is odd, see Example 2.39. Similar computations are also done for  $S^1$  acting on  $S^n$ , see Example 2.17 and Example 2.41. Various other results are given in Section 2 including the cohomological lower bound on  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#}(X)$  in Proposition 2.42 and the dimension-connectivity upper bound on  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#}(X)$  in Proposition 2.43.

Recall that the generalized projective product spaces are total spaces of fibre bundles, see Proposition 5.1. In Section 5, we use Corollary 1.2 to provide bounds on the sequential topological complexity of several generalized projective product spaces when the base space is  $\mathbb{R}P^1$ , see Proposition 5.3. In Theorem 5.5, we obtain a lower bound on the sequential topological complexity of generalized projective product spaces when the fibre is the product of various dimensional spheres, see Equation (14). Also, we obtain an upper bound on the sequential topological complexity and compute the LS category for these spaces when the base space is  $\mathbb{R}P^1$ , see Equation (16) and Equation (15).

## 2. LS CATEGORY, TOPOLOGICAL COMPLEXITY AND RELATED INVARIANTS

For a  $G$ -space  $B$  and a fibration  $p: E \rightarrow B$ , we introduce the notion of sectional category with respect to  $G$ . For specific fibrations and  $G$ -actions, we obtain the notions of LS category with respect  $G$ , sequential topological complexity with respect  $G$  and strong sequential topological complexity with respect  $G$ , which will be used to give upper bounds on sequential topological complexity of the total space of a fibre bundle. Further, we state the relations between these invariants and well-known invariants: (equivariant) sectional category, LS category, (equivariant) topological complexity, and strong equivariant topological complexity.

**2.1. Sectional category with respect to  $G$ .** In this subsection, we establish some properties of the sectional category with respect to  $G$ . For example, we establish the fibre-homotopy equivalence and the product inequality.

**Definition 2.1.** *Suppose  $B$  is a  $G$ -space and  $p: E \rightarrow B$  is a fibration. The sectional category of  $p$  with respect to  $G$ , denoted  $\text{secat}_G^{\#}(p)$ , is the smallest number  $n$  such that there exists a  $G$ -invariant open cover  $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^n$  of the base  $B$  such that over each  $U_i$  there exists a continuous section  $s_i$  of  $p$ . If no such  $n$  exists, we say  $\text{secat}_G^{\#}(p) = \infty$ .*

**Remark 2.2.** *Suppose that  $E$  and  $B$  are  $G$ -spaces and  $p: E \rightarrow B$  is a  $G$ -fibration. If the sections  $s_i$ 's in Definition 2.1 are  $G$ -maps, then the number  $n$  is called the equivariant sectional category of  $p$ , denoted  $\text{secat}_G(p)$ , see [3, Definition 4.1].*

We will now state the immediate consequence of Definition 2.1.

**Proposition 2.3.** *Suppose that  $B$  is a  $G$ -space and  $p: E \rightarrow B$  is a fibration. Then  $p$  has a global section if and only if  $\text{secat}_G^{\#}(p) = 1$ . In general,  $\text{secat}(p) \leq \text{secat}_G^{\#}(p)$ , and the equality holds if  $G$  acts trivially on  $B$ . Furthermore,*

- (1) If  $H$  is a subgroup of  $G$ , then  $\text{secat}_H^\#(p) \leq \text{secat}_G^\#(p)$ .
- (2) If  $E$  is also a  $G$ -space and  $p$  is a  $G$ -fibration, then  $\text{secat}_G^\#(p) \leq \text{secat}_G(p)$ .
- (3) If  $B'$  is also a  $G$ -space and  $p': E' \rightarrow B'$  is a fibration, then

$$\text{secat}_G^\#(p_1 \times p_2) \leq \text{secat}_{G \times G}(p_1 \times p_2),$$

where  $G$  acts on  $B \times B'$  diagonally, and  $G \times G$  acts on  $B \times B'$  componentwise.

**Proposition 2.4.** Consider the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E_1 & \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}} & E_2 \\ p_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow p_2 \\ B_1 & \xrightarrow{f} & B_2, \end{array}$$

where  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  are fibrations, and  $f$  is a  $G$ -map between  $G$ -spaces  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ .

- (1) If  $B_1 = B_2 = B$  and  $f$  is the identity map, then  $\text{secat}_G^\#(p_1) \geq \text{secat}_G^\#(p_2)$ . In particular, the sectional category with respect to a group is a fibre-homotopy equivalence invariant of a fibration.
- (2) If the diagram is a pullback, then  $\text{secat}_G^\#(p_1) \leq \text{secat}_G^\#(p_2)$ .
- (3) If  $f$  has a left homotopy inverse  $g: B_2 \rightarrow B_1$  with a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E_2 & \xrightarrow{\tilde{g}} & E_1 \\ p_2 \downarrow & & \downarrow p_1 \\ B_2 & \xrightarrow{g} & B_1, \end{array}$$

then  $\text{secat}_G^\#(p_1) \leq \text{secat}_G^\#(p_2)$ .

*Proof.* (1) If  $U$  is a  $G$ -invariant open subset of  $B$  with a section  $s_1: U \rightarrow E_1$  of  $p_1$ , then  $\tilde{f} \circ s_1: U \rightarrow E_2$  is section of  $p_2$ .

(2) If  $U$  is a  $G$ -invariant open subset of  $B_2$  with a section  $s_2: U \rightarrow E_2$  of  $p_2$ , then  $V = f^{-1}(U)$  is  $G$ -invariant open subset of  $B_1$  with a map  $s_2 \circ f: V \rightarrow E_2$  satisfying  $p_2 \circ (s_2 \circ f) = f$ . Hence, by the universal property of pullback, there exists a section  $s_1: V \rightarrow E_1$  of  $p_1$ .

(3) Suppose  $U$  is a  $G$ -invariant open subset of  $B_2$  with a section  $s_2: U \rightarrow E_2$  of  $p_2$ . Let  $V = f^{-1}(U)$  and  $s_1 = \tilde{g} \circ s_2 \circ f \circ i_V$ , where  $i_V: V \hookrightarrow B_1$  is the inclusion map. Then  $V$  is  $G$ -invariant open subset of  $B_1$  and  $s_1$  satisfies  $p_1 \circ s_1 = g \circ f \circ i_V \simeq i_V$ . As  $p_1$  is a fibration, there exists a section  $\tilde{s}_1$  of  $p_1$  such that  $p_1 \circ \tilde{s}_1 = i_V$ . □

**Definition 2.5.** (1) A topological space  $X$  is said to be completely normal if there exist disjoint open subsets containing  $A$  and  $B$  for every two subsets  $A$  and  $B$  of  $X$  satisfying  $\overline{A} \cap B = A \cap \overline{B} = \emptyset$ .

- (2) A  $G$ -space  $X$  is said to be  $G$ -completely normal if there exist disjoint  $G$ -invariant open subsets containing  $A$  and  $B$  for every two  $G$ -invariant subsets  $A$  and  $B$  of  $X$  satisfying  $\overline{A} \cap B = A \cap \overline{B} = \emptyset$ .

**Lemma 2.6** ([3, Lemma 3.12]). Suppose  $G$  is a compact Hausdorff topological group acting continuously on a Hausdorff topological space  $X$ . If  $X$  is completely normal, then  $X$  is  $G$ -completely normal.

**Proposition 2.7.** *Suppose  $B_i$  is a  $G_i$ -space and  $p_i: E_i \rightarrow B_i$  is a fibration for  $i = 1, 2$ . If  $B_1 \times B_2$  is  $(G_1 \times G_2)$ -completely normal, then*

$$\text{secat}_{G_1 \times G_2}^\#(p_1 \times p_2) \leq \text{secat}_{G_1}^\#(p_1) + \text{secat}_{G_2}^\#(p_2) - 1,$$

where  $G_1 \times G_2$  acts on  $B_1 \times B_2$  componentwise.

*Proof.* Suppose  $\text{secat}_{G_1}^\#(p_1) = m$  and  $\text{secat}_{G_2}^\#(p_2) = n$ . Suppose  $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^m$  is a  $G_1$ -invariant open cover of  $B_1$  with sections  $s_i: U_i \rightarrow E_1$  of  $p_1$  and  $\{V_j\}_{j=1}^n$  is a  $G_2$ -invariant open cover of  $B_2$  with sections  $t_j: V_j \rightarrow E_2$  of  $p_2$ . Let  $\{X_i\}_{i=0}^{m+n-1}$  be the sequence given by  $X_0 = \emptyset$ ,  $X_i = U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and  $X_i = B_1$  for  $m \leq i \leq m+n-1$ . Similarly, let  $\{Y_j\}_{j=0}^{m+n-1}$  be the sequence given by  $Y_0 = \emptyset$ ,  $Y_j = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq n$  and  $Y_j = B_2$  for  $n \leq j \leq m+n-1$ .

For each  $l \in \{1, 2, \dots, m+n-1\}$ , define  $Z_{i,l} := (X_i \setminus X_{i-1}) \times (Y_{l-i+1} \setminus Y_{l-i})$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m+n-1$ . Note that  $Z_{i,l}$  are  $(G_1 \times G_2)$ -invariant and  $Z_{i,l} = \emptyset$  for  $m+1 \leq i \leq m+n-1$ . Define

$$Q_l := \bigcup_{i=1}^l Z_{i,l} \tag{6}$$

for  $1 \leq l \leq m+n-1$ . We claim that the terms in the right hand side of equation (6) are separated, i.e.,

$$Z_{i,l} \cap \overline{Z_{i',l}} = \emptyset$$

for  $i \neq i'$ . Suppose  $z = (x, y) \in Z_{i,l} \cap \overline{Z_{i',l}}$ . Note that

$$z \in \overline{Z_{i',l}} = \overline{(X_{i'} \setminus X_{i'-1}) \times (Y_{l-i'+1} \setminus Y_{l-i'})} \subseteq \overline{(X_{i'} \setminus X_{i'-1})} \times \overline{(Y_{l-i'+1} \setminus Y_{l-i'})}.$$

We claim that  $x \notin X_{i'-1}$ . If  $x \in X_{i'-1}$ , then  $x \notin X_{i'-1}^c$ . As  $X_{i'-1}^c$  is closed, it follows there exists an open subset  $G$  containing  $x$  such that  $G \cap X_{i'-1}^c = \emptyset$ . Hence  $x \in G \subseteq X_{i'-1}$  implies  $G \cap (X_{i'} \setminus X_{i'-1}) = \emptyset$ . A contradiction to the fact that  $x \in \overline{(X_{i'} \setminus X_{i'-1})}$ . Similarly, we have  $y \notin Y_{l-i'}$ . If  $i < i'$ , then  $i \leq i' - 1$  implies  $X_i \subseteq X_{i'-1}$ . This is a contradiction since  $x \in X_i \setminus X_{i-1} \subseteq X_i$  but  $x \notin X_{i'-1}$ . If  $i' < i$ , then  $l - i' \geq l - i + 1$  implies  $Y_{l-i+1} \subseteq Y_{l-i'}$ . This is a contradiction since  $y \in Y_{l-i+1} \setminus Y_{l-i} \subseteq Y_{l-i+1}$  but  $y \notin Y_{l-i'}$ .

Then, by using the property of  $(G_1 \times G_2)$ -complete normality for the space  $B_1 \times B_2$  repeatedly, there exist  $(G_1 \times G_2)$ -invariant open sets  $W_{i,l}$  containing  $Z_{i,l}$  such that  $W_{i,l} \cap W_{i',l} = \emptyset$  for  $i \neq i'$ . Let

$$C_{i,l} := W_{i,l} \cap (U_i \times V_{l-i+1}).$$

It is clear that  $C_{i,l}$  are  $(G_1 \times G_2)$ -invariant and  $Z_{i,l} \subseteq C_{i,l} \subseteq U_i \times V_{l-i+1}$  and  $C_{i,l} \cap C_{i',l} = \emptyset$  for  $i \neq i'$ . Let

$$C_l := \bigsqcup_{i=1}^l C_{i,l}.$$

for  $1 \leq l \leq m+n-1$ . Note that  $C_l$  are  $(G_1 \times G_2)$ -invariant and  $Q_l \subseteq C_l$ . The composition

$$C_{i,l} \hookrightarrow U_i \times V_{l-i+1} \xrightarrow{s_i \times t_{l-i+1}} E_1 \times E_2,$$

gives a section of  $p_1 \times p_2$  on  $C_{i,l}$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and  $1 \leq l \leq m+n-1$ . As  $C_l$  is a disjoint union of open sets  $C_{i,l}$ , we get a section of  $p_1 \times p_2$  on  $C_l$  for each  $1 \leq l \leq m+n-1$ . Furthermore,

$$\bigcup_{l=1}^{m+n-1} Q_l = \bigcup_{l=1}^{m+n-1} \bigcup_{i=1}^l ((X_i \setminus X_{i-1}) \times (Y_{l-i+1} \setminus Y_{l-i}))$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \bigcup_{i=1}^{m+n-1} \bigcup_{l=i}^{m+n-1} ((X_i \setminus X_{i-1}) \times (Y_{l-i+1} \setminus Y_{l-i})) \\
&= \bigcup_{i=1}^{m+n-1} ((X_i \setminus X_{i-1}) \times Y_{m+n-i}) \\
&= \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^m ((X_i \setminus X_{i-1}) \times Y_{m+n-i}) \right) \cup \left( \bigcup_{i=m+1}^{m+n-1} ((X_i \setminus X_{i-1}) \times Y_{m+n-i}) \right) \\
&= \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^m ((X_i \setminus X_{i-1}) \times B_2) \right) \cup \left( \bigcup_{i=m+1}^{m+n-1} (\emptyset \times Y_{m+n-i}) \right) \\
&= \bigcup_{i=1}^m (X_i \setminus X_{i-1}) \times B_2 \\
&= B_1 \times B_2
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $B_1 \times B_2 = \bigcup_{l=1}^{m+n-1} Q_l \subseteq \bigcup_{l=1}^{m+n-1} C_l$  implies  $\{C_l\}_{l=1}^{m+n-1}$  is an  $(G_1 \times G_2)$ -invariant open cover of  $B_1 \times B_2$  with sections of  $p_1 \times p_2$ . Hence,  $\text{secat}_{G_1 \times G_2}^\#(p_1 \times p_2) \leq m+n-1$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.8.** *Suppose  $B$  is a  $G$ -space and  $p_i: E_i \rightarrow B$  is a fibration for  $i = 1, 2$ . Let  $E_1 \times_B E_2 = \{(e_1, e_2) \in E_1 \times E_2 \mid p_1(e_1) = p_2(e_2)\}$  and let  $p: E_1 \times_B E_2 \rightarrow B$  be the fibration given by  $p(e_1, e_2) = p_1(e_1) = p_2(e_2)$ . If  $B \times B$  is  $(G \times G)$ -completely normal, then*

$$\text{secat}_G^\#(p) \leq \text{secat}_G^\#(p_1) + \text{secat}_G^\#(p_2) - 1.$$

*Proof.* Observe that

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
E_1 \times_B E_2 & \hookrightarrow & E_1 \times E_2 \\
p \downarrow & & \downarrow p_1 \times p_2 \\
B & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & B \times B
\end{array}$$

is a pullback diagram, where  $\Delta$  is the diagonal map. Hence,

$$\text{secat}_G^\#(p) \leq \text{secat}_G^\#(p_1 \times p_2) \leq \text{secat}_{G \times G}^\#(p_1 \times p_2) \leq \text{secat}_G^\#(p_1) + \text{secat}_G^\#(p_2) - 1$$

by Proposition 2.4 (2), Proposition 2.3 (3) and Proposition 2.7.  $\square$

If  $I$  is an ideal in a commutative ring  $R$ , then let  $\text{nil}(I)$  denote the maximum number of factors in a nonzero product of elements from  $I$ .

**Proposition 2.9.** *Suppose  $B$  is a  $G$ -space and  $p: E \rightarrow B$  is a fibration. For any commutative ring  $R$ , we have*

$$\text{nil}(\ker p^*) + 1 \leq \text{secat}(p) \leq \text{secat}_G^\#(p),$$

where  $p^*: H^*(B; R) \rightarrow H^*(E; R)$  is the induced map of cohomology rings.

*Proof.* It follows from [4, Theorem 9.14] that  $\text{nil}(\ker p^*) + 1 \leq \text{secat}(p)$ . The right inequality is from Proposition 2.3.  $\square$

We would like to mention that we can also obtain an upper bound for the sectional category with respect to  $G$  for the  $G$ -fibrations satisfying certain hypotheses by using [17, Theorem 3.5] and Proposition 2.3.

## 2.2. LS category with respect to $G$ .

**Definition 2.10.** Suppose  $X$  is a  $G$ -space. The Lusternik–Schnirelmann category (LS category) of  $X$  with respect to  $G$ , denoted  $\text{cat}_G^\#(X)$ , is the smallest number  $n$  such that there exists a  $G$ -invariant categorical open cover  $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^n$  of  $X$ . If no such  $n$  exists, we say  $\text{cat}_G^\#(X) = \infty$ .

We will now state the immediate consequence of Definition 2.10.

**Proposition 2.11.** Suppose  $X$  is  $G$ -space. Then  $X$  is contractible if and only if  $\text{cat}_G^\#(X) = \text{cat}(X) = 1$ . In general,  $\text{cat}(X) \leq \text{cat}_G^\#(X)$ , and the equality holds if  $G$  acts trivially on  $X$ . If  $H$  is a subgroup of  $G$ , then  $\text{cat}_H^\#(X) \leq \text{cat}_G^\#(X)$ . Furthermore, if  $Y$  is another  $G$ -space, then

$$\text{cat}_G^\#(X \times Y) \leq \text{cat}_{G \times G}^\#(X \times Y)$$

where  $G$  acts on  $X \times Y$  diagonally, and  $G \times G$  acts on  $X \times Y$  componentwise.

The following theorem proves the  $G$ -homotopy invariance of  $\text{cat}_G^\#(X)$ .

**Theorem 2.12.** Suppose  $X$  and  $Y$  are  $G$ -spaces. If there exists a  $G$ -map  $g: Y \rightarrow X$  with a left homotopy inverse, then  $\text{cat}_G^\#(X) \geq \text{cat}_G^\#(Y)$ . In particular, the LS category with respect to  $G$  of a topological  $G$ -space is a  $G$ -homotopy invariant.

*Proof.* The proof is similar to [4, Lemma 1.29]. It just uses the fact that if  $U_i$  is  $G$ -invariant subset of  $X$  and  $V_i = g^{-1}(U_i)$ , as in [4, Lemma 1.29], then  $V_i$  is also  $G$ -invariant since  $g$  is a  $G$ -map.  $\square$

**Example 2.13.** If  $G$  is a finite group acting on  $S^n$ , where  $n \geq 1$ . If  $p \in S^n$  and  $q \in S^n \setminus Gp$ , where  $Gp := \{gp \mid g \in G\}$  is the orbit of  $p$  under  $G$ -action, then  $U_1 = S^n \setminus Gp$  and  $U_2 = S^n \setminus Gq$  forms a  $G$ -invariant categorical open cover of  $S^n$ , i.e.,  $\text{cat}_G^\#(S^n) \leq 2$ . Hence,  $\text{cat}_G^\#(S^n) = 2$  since  $S^n$  is not contractible.

**Example 2.14.** If  $\tau_1$  is the antipodal involution on  $S^n$  given by  $\tau_1(x) = -x$ , then the quotient space  $S^n / \langle \tau_1 \rangle$  is the real projective space  $\mathbb{R}P^n$  with  $\text{cat}(\mathbb{R}P^n) = n + 1$ , see [4, Example 1.8]. If  $\tau_2$  is the reflection involution on  $S^n$  given by  $\tau_2((x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_n)) = (x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}, -x_n)$ , then the quotient space  $S^n / \langle \tau_2 \rangle$  is the closed disc  $D^n$  with  $\text{cat}(D^n) = 1$ , as  $D^n$  is contractible. Hence,  $\text{cat}_G^\#(X)$  and  $\text{cat}(X/G)$  are independent of each other.

**Proposition 2.15.** Let  $X$  be a  $G$ -space such that the  $G$ -action on  $X$  is transitive. If  $X$  is not contractible, then  $\text{cat}_G^\#(X) = \infty$ .

*Proof.* As the  $G$ -action on  $X$  is transitive, the only non-empty  $G$ -invariant subset of  $X$  is  $X$ . Hence, there does not exist a  $G$ -invariant categorical open cover of  $X$  since  $X$  is not contractible.  $\square$

**Example 2.16.** If a topological group  $G$  acts on itself by left multiplication (or right multiplication by inverse), then we have

$$\text{cat}_G^\#(G) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } G \text{ is contractible,} \\ \infty & \text{if } G \text{ is not contractible,} \end{cases}$$

since the action is transitive.

**Example 2.17.** Let  $S^1$  act on  $S^n \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  by matrix multiplication via the embedding

$$e^{i\theta} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in SO(n+1).$$

If  $n = 1$ , then by Example 2.16, we have  $\text{cat}_{S^1}^\#(S^1) = \infty$ . If  $n \geq 2$ , then the coordinate  $x_n$  is fixed by the action of  $S^1$  on  $x = (x_0, \dots, x_n) \in S^n$ . Then  $U = \{(x_0, \dots, x_n) \in S^n \mid x_n \neq 1\}$  and  $V = \{(x_0, \dots, x_n) \in S^n \mid x_n \neq -1\}$  forms a  $S^1$ -invariant categorical open cover of  $S^n$ . Hence,  $\text{cat}_{S^1}^\#(S^n) = 2$  as  $S^n$  is not contractible.

**Definition 2.18.** Let  $X$  be a  $G$ -space. A sequence  $\emptyset = O_0, O_1, \dots, O_k = X$  of  $G$ -invariant open sets is called a categorical sequence with respect to  $G$  of length  $k$  if for each  $1 \leq i \leq k$  there exists a  $G$ -invariant categorical open set  $U_i$  such that  $O_i \setminus O_{i-1} \subseteq U_i$ .

**Proposition 2.19.** A  $G$ -space  $X$  has a categorical sequence with respect to  $G$  of length  $k$  if and only if  $\text{cat}_G^\#(X) \leq k$ .

*Proof.* The proof is similar to the proof of [4, Lemma 1.36] □

**Lemma 2.20.** If  $B$  is a  $G$ -space and  $p: E \rightarrow B$  is a surjective fibration, then

$$\text{secat}_G^\#(p) \leq \text{cat}_G^\#(B).$$

*Proof.* This is similar to the proof of the identity  $\text{secat}(p) \leq \text{cat}(B)$  for any surjective fibration  $p: E \rightarrow B$ , we just need to consider  $G$ -invariant subsets. Suppose that  $U$  is a  $G$ -invariant categorical open subset of  $B$ . Suppose  $H: U \times I \rightarrow B$  is a homotopy such that  $H(b, 0) = b_0$  and  $H(b, 1) = b$  for some  $b_0 \in B$ . Let  $e_0 \in p^{-1}(b_0)$ . As  $p$  is a fibration, there exists a homotopy  $G: U \times I \rightarrow E$  such that  $G(b, 0) = e_0$  and  $p \circ G = H$ . Hence,  $G_1$  is a section of  $p$  over  $U$ . □

**Proposition 2.21.** Let  $B$  be a  $G$ -space and  $p: E \rightarrow B$  be a surjective fibration with  $E$  contractible. Then  $\text{secat}_G^\#(p) = \text{cat}_G^\#(B)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $U$  be a  $G$ -invariant open subset of  $B$  with a continuous section  $s: U \rightarrow E$  of  $p$ . To show  $U$  is contractible, consider the homotopy  $H: U \times I \rightarrow B$  defined by  $H(b, t) = p(F(s(b), t))$ , where  $F: E \times I \rightarrow E$  such that  $F(e, 0) = e$  and  $F(e, 1) = e_0$  for some  $e_0 \in E$ . Observe that  $H(b, 0) = p(s(b)) = b$  and  $H(b, 1) = p(e_0)$ . We conclude that  $U$  is categorical. This shows  $\text{cat}_G^\#(B) \leq \text{secat}_G^\#(p)$ . The other inequality follows from Lemma 2.20. □

Suppose  $X$  is a  $G$ -space and  $x_0 \in X$ . If  $P_{x_0}X$  is the path space of  $(X, x_0)$ , i.e.,

$$P_{x_0}X = \{\alpha: I \rightarrow X \mid \alpha(0) = x_0\},$$

then the map  $e_X: P_{x_0}X \rightarrow X$  given by  $e_X(\alpha) = \alpha(1)$  is a fibration. Furthermore, if  $x_0$  is fixed under the  $G$ -action, then  $e_X$  is a  $G$ -fibration.

**Corollary 2.22.** If  $X$  is a path-connected  $G$ -space and  $x_0 \in X$ , then

$$\text{secat}_G^\#(e_X) = \text{cat}_G^\#(X).$$

*Proof.* As  $X$  is path-connected, the fibration  $e_X$  is surjective. Hence, the claim follows from Proposition 2.21 since the path space  $P_{x_0}X$  is contractible. □

**Proposition 2.23.** *Suppose  $X$  is a path-connected  $G_1$ -space and  $Y$  is a path-connected  $G_2$ -space. If  $X \times Y$  is  $(G_1 \times G_2)$ -completely normal, then*

$$\text{cat}_{G_1 \times G_2}^\#(X \times Y) \leq \text{cat}_{G_1}^\#(X) + \text{cat}_{G_2}^\#(Y) - 1,$$

where  $G_1 \times G_2$  acts on  $X \times Y$  componentwise.

*Proof.* Suppose  $x_0 \in X$  and  $y_0 \in Y$ . Then  $e_{X \times Y} = e_X \times e_Y$  under the natural identifications of  $P_{(x_0, y_0)}(X \times Y)$  and  $P_{x_0}X \times P_{y_0}Y$ . Hence, by Corollary 2.22 and Proposition 2.7, the claim follows.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.24.** *If  $G$  is a compact Hausdorff topological group acting continuously on a path-connected Hausdorff topological space  $X$  such that  $X^k$  is completely normal, then*

$$\text{cat}_{G^k}^\#(X^k) \leq k(\text{cat}_G^\#(X) - 1) + 1.$$

*Proof.* As a subspace of completely normal space is completely normal, it follows  $X^{k-1}, \dots, X^2$  are completely normal. Hence, by Lemma 2.6,  $X^i$  is  $G^i$ -completely normal for  $2 \leq i \leq k$ . Hence, by the repeated use of Proposition 2.23, the result follows.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.25.** *Suppose  $X$  is a  $G$ -space. If  $R$  is a commutative ring, then*

$$\text{cup}_R(X) + 1 \leq \text{cat}_G^\#(X)$$

where  $\text{cup}_R(X)$  denotes  $\text{nil}(\tilde{H}^*(X; R))$ .

*Proof.* It follows from [4, Proposition 1.5] that  $\text{cup}_R(X) + 1 \leq \text{cat}(X)$ . Then we get the desired inequality from Proposition 2.11.  $\square$

**2.3. Sequential topological complexity and strong sequential topological complexity with respect to  $G$ .** Let  $X$  be a  $G$ -space. Then the free path space  $X^I$  is a  $G$ -space with the following action,

$$G \times X^I \rightarrow X^I, \quad (g\alpha)(t) = g(\alpha(t)).$$

Also,  $X^k$  is a  $G$ -space with respect to the diagonal action and the componentwise  $G$ -action makes  $X^k$  a  $G^k$ -space. Consider the  $k$ -points  $0 < \frac{1}{k-1} < \dots < \frac{i}{k-1} < \dots < \frac{k-2}{k-1} < 1$  on the interval  $I$ . Define

$$e_{k,X}: X^I \rightarrow X^k$$

by  $e_{k,X}(\alpha) = (\alpha(0), \alpha(\frac{1}{k-1}), \dots, \alpha(\frac{i}{k-1}), \dots, \alpha(\frac{k-2}{k-1}), \alpha(1))$ . Then  $e_{k,X}$  is a  $G$ -fibration, see [2, Lemma 3.5]. Next, we introduce two different types of ‘higher equivariant topological complexities’.

**Definition 2.26.** *Suppose  $X$  is a  $G$ -space.*

- (1) *The  $k$ -th topological complexity of  $X$  with respect to  $G$ , denoted  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^\#(X)$ , is the smallest number  $n$  such that there exists a  $G$ -invariant open cover  $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^n$  of  $X^k$  (where  $G$  acts diagonally on  $X^k$ ) such that over each  $U_i$  there exists a continuous motion planning  $s_i: U_i \rightarrow X^I$ , i.e.,  $s_i$  is a section of  $e_{k,X}$ . If no such  $n$  exists, we say  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^\#(X) = \infty$ . In other words,  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^\#(X) = \text{secat}_G^\#(e_{k,X})$ .*
- (2) *The  $k$ -th strong topological complexity of  $X$  with respect to  $G$ , denoted  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X)$ , is the smallest number  $n$  such that there exists a  $G^k$ -invariant open cover  $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^n$  of  $X^k$  (where  $G^k$  acts componentwise on  $X^k$ ) such that over each  $U_i$  there exists a continuous motion planning  $s_i: U_i \rightarrow X^I$ , i.e.,  $s_i$  is a section of  $e_{k,X}$ . If no such  $n$  exists, we say  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X) = \infty$ . In other words,  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X) = \text{secat}_{G^k}^\#(e_{k,X})$ .*

**Remark 2.27.** If the sections  $s_i$ 's in Definition 2.26 (1) are  $G$ -maps, then the number  $n$  is called the higher equivariant topological complexity, denoted  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,G}(X)$ , see [2]. If the sections  $s_i$ 's in Definition 2.26 (2) are  $G$ -maps with diagonal action of  $G$  on  $U_i$ 's, then the number  $n$  is called the higher strong equivariant topological complexity, denoted  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^*(X)$ , see [20]. We note that the non-higher versions of these notions were introduced in [3] and [10].

We will now state the immediate consequences of Definition 2.26.

**Proposition 2.28.** Let  $X$  be a  $G$ -space.

(1)  $X$  is contractible if and only if  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^\#(X) = \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X) = 1$ .

(2) In general,

$$\mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^\#(X) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}(X) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^*(X), \text{ and} \\ \mathrm{TC}_k(X) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^\#(X) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^*(X).$$

(3) If  $G$  acts trivially on  $X$ , then  $\mathrm{TC}_k(X) = \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}(X) = \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^\#(X) = \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X) = \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^*(X)$ .

(4) If  $X$  and  $Y$  are  $G$ -spaces, then

$$\mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^\#(X \times Y) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,G \times G}^\#(X \times Y), \text{ and } \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X \times Y) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,G \times G}^{\#,*}(X \times Y)$$

where  $G$  acts on  $X \times Y$  diagonally, and  $G \times G$  acts on  $X \times Y$  componentwise.

(5) If  $H$  is a subgroup of  $G$ , then  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,H}^\#(X) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^\#(X)$  and  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,H}^{\#,*}(X) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X)$ .

*Proof.* Proofs of (2), (3), (4) and (5) follow from their respective definitions. (1) can be proved by a similar argument as in [12, Theorem 1].  $\square$

**Theorem 2.29.** Suppose  $X$  and  $Y$  are  $G$ -spaces. If there exists a  $G$ -map  $g: Y \rightarrow X$  with left homotopy inverse, then  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^\#(X) \geq \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^\#(Y)$  and  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X) \geq \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(Y)$ . In particular, the  $k$ -th topological complexity with respect to  $G$  and the  $k$ -th strong topological complexity with respect to  $G$  of a topological  $G$ -space are  $G$ -homotopy invariants.

*Proof.* The proof is similar to the proof for  $\mathrm{TC}_k$ , i.e., if  $U$  is an open subset of  $X^k$  with a section of  $e_{k,Y}$  over  $U$ , then there is a section of  $e_{k,X}$  over  $V = (g^k)^{-1}(U)$ . It just uses the fact that if  $U$  is a  $G$ -invariant (resp.  $G^k$ -invariant), then  $V$  is also  $G$ -invariant (resp.  $G^k$ -invariant) since  $g^k: Y^k \rightarrow X^k$  is a  $G^k$ -map.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.30.** Suppose  $X$  is a  $G_1$ -space and  $Y$  is a  $G_2$  space. If  $X^k \times Y^k$  is a  $(G_1 \times G_2)$ -completely normal, then

$$\mathrm{TC}_{k,G_1 \times G_2}^\#(X \times Y) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,G_1}^\#(X) + \mathrm{TC}_{k,G_2}^\#(Y) - 1,$$

If  $X^k \times Y^k$  is a  $(G_1^k \times G_2^k)$ -completely normal, then

$$\mathrm{TC}_{k,G_1 \times G_2}^{\#,*}(X \times Y) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,G_1}^{\#,*}(X) + \mathrm{TC}_{k,G_2}^{\#,*}(Y) - 1,$$

where  $G_1 \times G_2$  acts on  $X \times Y$  componentwise.

*Proof.* Under the natural identifications of  $(X \times Y)^I = X^I \times Y^I$  and  $(X \times Y)^k = X^k \times Y^k$ , we have  $e_{k,X \times Y} = e_{k,X} \times e_{k,Y}$ . Then, by Proposition 2.7, the result follows.  $\square$

Let  $X$  be a  $G$ -space. For a subgroup  $H$ , the fixed set  $X^H$  is defined as follows:

$$X^H := \{x \in X \mid hx = x \text{ for all } h \in H\}.$$

Colman and Grant in [3] showed that  $\mathrm{TC}_G(X)$  dominates  $\mathrm{TC}_K(X^H)$ , where  $X^H$  is  $K$ -invariant. The corresponding higher analogue of this result was established by Bayeh and the third author in [2]. We now observe that  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,G}(X)$  dominates  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,K}^\#(X^H)$ .

**Proposition 2.31.** *Suppose  $G$  is a compact Hausdorff topological group and  $X$  is a Hausdorff  $G$ -space. If  $H$  and  $K$  be closed subgroups of  $G$  such that  $X^H$  is  $K$ -invariant, then*

$$\mathrm{TC}_{k,K}^\#(X^H) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}(X) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{TC}_{k,K}^{\#,*}(X^H) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^*(X).$$

*Proof.* It follows from [2, Proposition 3.14] that  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,K}(X^H) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}(X)$ . Similarly for strong equivariant topological complexity we have  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,K}^*(X^H) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^*(X)$ , see [20, Proposition 5.6]. Then we get the desired inequalities from part-2 of Proposition 2.28.  $\square$

Under certain conditions, it was shown in [15, Proposition 5.7] that the equivariant category of a  $G$ -space is bounded above by the equivariant topological complexity. We prove similar results in the context of sequential topological complexity and sequential strong topological complexity with respect to groups.

**Proposition 2.32.** *Let  $X$  be a path-connected  $G$ -space and  $H$  be a stabilizer of some  $x_0 \in X$ . Then*

$$\mathrm{cat}_H^\#(X^{k-1}) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,H}^\#(X) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^\#(X) \leq \mathrm{cat}_G^\#(X^k).$$

*Proof.* The middle inequality follows from Proposition 2.28 (5), and the right inequality follows from Lemma 2.20.

We will now prove the left inequality. Define a map  $f: X^{k-1} \rightarrow X^k$  by  $f(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}) = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1})$ . Then note that  $f$  is an  $H$ -equivariant map. Now consider the following pullback diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Q & \longrightarrow & X^I \\ q \downarrow & & \downarrow e_{k,X} \\ X^{k-1} & \xrightarrow{f} & X^k \end{array}$$

where the space  $Q := \{\gamma \in X^I \mid \gamma(0) = x_0\}$  and  $q: Q \rightarrow X^{k-1}$  is the map given by  $q(\gamma) = (\gamma(\frac{1}{k-1}), \dots, \gamma(\frac{i}{k-1}), \dots, \gamma(\frac{k-2}{k-1}), \gamma(1))$ . Then, by Proposition 2.4 (2), we have  $\mathrm{secat}_H^\#(q) \leq \mathrm{secat}_H^\#(e_{k,X}) = \mathrm{TC}_{k,H}^\#(X)$ .

Let  $\bar{x}_0 = (x_0, \dots, x_0) \in X^{k-1}$ . Define a map  $\phi: Q \rightarrow P_{\bar{x}_0}X^{k-1}$  by  $\phi(\gamma) = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{k-1})$ , where  $\gamma_i: [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  is the path  $\gamma$  restricted to the interval  $[0, \frac{i}{k-1}]$ . Note that  $\gamma_i(0) = x_0$  and  $\gamma_i(1) = \gamma(\frac{i}{k-1})$ . Hence, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Q & \xrightarrow{\phi} & P_{\bar{x}_0}X^{k-1} \\ q \searrow & & \swarrow e_{X^{k-1}} \\ & X^{k-1} & \end{array}$$

commutes. Thus, by Corollary 2.22 and Proposition 2.4 (1), it follows that  $\mathrm{cat}_H^\#(X^{k-1}) = \mathrm{secat}_H^\#(e_{X^{k-1}}) \leq \mathrm{secat}_H^\#(q)$ . Hence, we get the left inequality  $\mathrm{cat}_H^\#(X^{k-1}) \leq \mathrm{secat}_H^\#(q) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,H}^\#(X)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.33.** *Suppose  $X$  is a path-connected  $G$ -space with  $X^G \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^\#(X) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k+1,G}^\#(X)$  for all  $k \geq 2$ .*

*Proof.* If  $x_0 \in X^G$ , then the stabilizer subgroup of  $x_0$  is  $G$ . Hence,

$$\mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^\#(X) \leq \mathrm{cat}_G^\#(X^k) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k+1,G}^\#(X).$$

by Proposition 2.32.  $\square$

The proof of the following proposition is similar to that of Proposition 2.32.

**Proposition 2.34.** *Let  $X$  be a path-connected  $G$ -space. Then*

$$\text{cat}_{G^{k-1}}^{\#}(X^{k-1}) \leq \text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X) \leq \text{cat}_{G^k}^{\#}(X^k).$$

*Proof.* The right inequality follows from Lemma 2.20. We will now prove the left inequality. Let  $x_0 \in X$  and  $f: X^{k-1} \rightarrow X^k$  be a map defined as  $f(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}) = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1})$ . Then note that  $f$  is an  $(G^{k-1})$ -equivariant map where  $G^{k-1}$  acts on  $X^k$  as a subgroup  $\{e\} \times G^{k-1}$  of  $G^k$  (here  $e \in G$  is the identity element). Considering the same pullback diagram as the previous proposition, by Proposition 2.4 (2) and Proposition 2.3, we have  $\text{secat}_{G^{k-1}}^{\#}(q) \leq \text{secat}_{G^{k-1}}^{\#}(e_{k,X}) \leq \text{secat}_{G^k}^{\#}(e_{k,X}) = \text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X)$ . Using the same argument as in the previous proposition, we have  $\text{cat}_{G^{k-1}}^{\#}(X^{k-1}) = \text{secat}_{G^{k-1}}^{\#}(e_{X^{k-1}}) \leq \text{secat}_{G^{k-1}}^{\#}(q)$ . Hence, we get the left inequality  $\text{cat}_{G^{k-1}}^{\#}(X^{k-1}) \leq \text{secat}_{G^{k-1}}^{\#}(q) \leq \text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.35.** *Suppose  $X$  is a path-connected  $G$ -space, then  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X) \leq \text{TC}_{k+1,G}^{\#,*}(X)$  for all  $k \geq 2$ .*

*Proof.* By Proposition 2.34, it follows that  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X) \leq \text{cat}_{G^k}^{\#}(X^k) \leq \text{TC}_{k+1,G}^{\#,*}(X)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.36.** *Let  $X$  be a path-connected  $G$ -space such that the  $G$ -action on  $X$  is transitive. If  $X$  is not contractible, then  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X) = \infty$ . Furthermore, if  $X$  has a fixed point, then  $\text{TC}_{2,G}^{\#,*}(X) = \infty$ .*

*Proof.* By Proposition 2.15 and Proposition 2.34, we have  $\infty = \text{cat}_{G^{k-1}}^{\#}(X^{k-1}) \leq \text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X)$ , as the action of  $G^{k-1}$  on  $X^{k-1}$  is transitive.

If  $x_0 \in X$  is a fixed point of  $X$  under  $G$ -action, then the stabilizer subgroup of  $x_0$  is  $G$ . Hence, by Proposition 2.15 and Proposition 2.32, we get  $\infty = \text{cat}_G^{\#}(X) \leq \text{TC}_{2,G}^{\#,*}(X)$ .  $\square$

**Example 2.37.** *If a topological group  $G$  acts on itself by left multiplication (or right multiplication by inverse), then we have*

$$\text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(G) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } G \text{ is contractible,} \\ \infty & \text{if } G \text{ is not contractible,} \end{cases}$$

*since the action is transitive.*

It was shown in [3, Proposition 5.12] that the equivariant topological complexity of a topological group coincides with its equivariant category when the action is given by topological group homomorphisms. We will now prove a similar result in the context of sequential topological complexity with respect to the group.

**Theorem 2.38.** *Let  $A$  be a path-connected topological group with an action of  $G$  via topological group homomorphisms. Then*

$$\text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(A) = \text{cat}_G^{\#}(A^{k-1}).$$

*Proof.* Since  $G$  acts on  $A$  via topological group homomorphisms and on  $A^{k-1}$  diagonally, the identity element  $\bar{e} = (e, \dots, e) \in A^{k-1}$  becomes a fixed point of  $G$ -action on  $A^{k-1}$ . Thus, the inequality  $\text{cat}_G^{\#}(A^{k-1}) \leq \text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(A)$  follows from Proposition 2.32.

We now prove the other inequality. Suppose  $f: A^k \rightarrow A^{k-1}$  be the map given by  $f(a_1, \dots, a_k) = (a_2 a_1^{-1}, a_3 a_2^{-1}, \dots, a_k a_{k-1}^{-1})$ . Note that  $f$  is a  $G$ -map since

$$\begin{aligned} f(g(a_1, \dots, a_k)) &= f(ga_1, \dots, ga_k) \\ &= \left( (ga_2)(ga_1)^{-1}, (ga_3)(ga_2)^{-1}, \dots, (ga_k)(ga_{k-1})^{-1} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left( (ga_2)(ga_1^{-1}), (ga_3)(ga_2^{-1}), \dots, (ga_k)(ga_{k-1}^{-1}) \right) \\
&= \left( g(a_2a_1^{-1}), g(a_3a_2^{-1}), \dots, g(a_ka_{k-1}^{-1}) \right) \\
&= g(a_2a_1^{-1}, a_3a_2^{-1}, \dots, a_ka_{k-1}^{-1}) \\
&= gf(a_1, \dots, a_k).
\end{aligned}$$

It should be noted that we have used that  $G$  acts via topological group homomorphisms on  $A$  in showing  $f$  is a  $G$ -map. Now consider the pullback diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
Q & \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}} & P_{\bar{e}}A^{k-1} \\
q \downarrow & & \downarrow e_{A^{k-1}} \\
A^k & \xrightarrow{f} & A^{k-1}
\end{array}$$

where  $Q = \{(a_1, \dots, a_k, \gamma) \in A^k \times P_{\bar{e}}A^{k-1} \mid \gamma(1) = (a_2a_1^{-1}, a_3a_2^{-1}, \dots, a_ka_{k-1}^{-1})\}$  and  $q: Q \rightarrow A^k$  is the projection map. Then, by Proposition 2.4 (2) and Corollary 2.22, it follows  $\text{secat}_G^\#(q) \leq \text{secat}_G^\#(e_{A^{k-1}}) = \text{cat}_G^\#(A^{k-1})$ .

Define a map  $\phi: Q \rightarrow A^I$  by  $\phi(a_1, \dots, a_k, \gamma) = \gamma_1a_1 * \gamma_2a_2 * \dots * \gamma_{k-1}a_{k-1}$ , where  $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{k-1})$ , the path  $\gamma_i a_i$  is defined as  $(\gamma_i a_i)(t) := \gamma_i(t)a_i$  and where  $*$  denotes the concatenation of paths. Note that  $(\gamma_i a_i)(0) = \gamma_i(0)a_i = ea_i = a_i$  and  $(\gamma_i a_i)(1) = \gamma_i(1)a_i = (a_{i+1}a_i^{-1})a_i = a_{i+1}$ . Hence, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
Q & \xrightarrow{\phi} & A^I \\
q \searrow & & \swarrow e_{k,A} \\
& A^k &
\end{array}$$

commutes. Thus, by Proposition 2.3 (1), it follows  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^\#(A) = \text{secat}_G^\#(e_{k,A}) \leq \text{secat}_G^\#(q)$ . Hence, we get the right inequality  $\text{TC}_{k,G}^\#(A) \leq \text{secat}_G^\#(q) \leq \text{cat}_G^\#(A^{k-1})$ .  $\square$

**Example 2.39.** Suppose  $G$  is a finite group acting on  $S^n$ , where  $n \geq 1$ . Using Proposition 2.28, Proposition 2.34, Corollary 2.24, and Example 2.13, we get

$$\text{TC}_{k,G}^\#(S^n) \leq \text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(S^n) \leq \text{cat}_{G^k}^\#((S^n)^k) \leq k(\text{cat}_G^\#(S^n) - 1) + 1 = k + 1.$$

Moreover, by Proposition 2.28, we also have the inequality  $\text{TC}_k(S^n) \leq \text{TC}_{k,G}^\#(S^n)$ . As  $\text{TC}_k(S^n) = k$  for  $n$  odd and  $\text{TC}_k(S^n) = k + 1$  for  $n$  even, see [21, Section 4], we get

$$\text{TC}_{k,G}^\#(S^n) = \text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(S^n) = k + 1$$

for  $n$  even, and

$$k \leq \text{TC}_{k,G}^\#(S^n) \leq \text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(S^n) \leq k + 1$$

for  $n$  odd.

If  $\tau$  is the antipodal involution on  $S^n$  given by  $\tau(z) = -z$ , then  $\text{TC}_{2,\langle\tau\rangle}^\#(S^n) = 2$  for  $n$  odd. This follows because the open sets  $U_1 = \{(x, y) \in S^n \times S^n \mid x \neq -y\}$  and  $U_2 = \{(x, y) \in S^n \times S^n \mid x \neq y\}$  are  $\langle\tau\rangle$ -invariant and admits continuous motion planners, see [11, Theorem 8].

If  $\sigma$  is the conjugation involution on  $S^1 \subset \mathbb{C}$  given by  $\sigma(z) = \bar{z}$ , then  $\langle\sigma\rangle$  acts on  $S^1$  via group homomorphisms. Hence, by Theorem 2.38, Proposition 2.11, Corollary 2.24, and Example 2.13, we have

$$\text{TC}_{k,\langle\sigma\rangle}^\#(S^1) = \text{cat}_{\langle\sigma\rangle}^\#((S^1)^{k-1}) \leq \text{cat}_{\langle\sigma\rangle^{k-1}}^\#((S^1)^{k-1}) \leq (k-1)(\text{cat}_{\langle\sigma\rangle}^\#(S^1) - 1) + 1 = k.$$

As  $k = \mathrm{TC}_k(S^1) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,(\sigma)}^\#(S^1)$ , we get  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,(\sigma)}^\#(S^1) = k$ .

Similarly, if  $\eta$  is the involution on  $S^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^4$  given by  $\eta(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3) = (x_0, -x_1, x_2, -x_3)$ , then  $\langle \eta \rangle$  acts on  $S^3$  via group homomorphisms. Hence, similar computations like above show that  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,(\eta)}^\#(S^3) = k$ .

**Remark 2.40.** The previous example shows that the inequalities  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^\#(X) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}(X)$  and  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(X) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^*(X)$  can be strict. Since  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,(\sigma)}^\#(S^1) = k$  and  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,(\sigma)}^{\#,*}(S^1) \leq k + 1$  but  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,(\sigma)}(S^1)$  and  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,(\sigma)}^*(S^1)$  are infinite as  $S^1$  is not  $\langle \sigma \rangle$ -connected, see [2, Proposition 3.14 (2)] and [20, Proposition 5.6 (c)].

**Example 2.41.** Let  $S^1 \subseteq \mathrm{SO}(n+1)$  act on  $S^n \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  by matrix multiplication as in Example 2.17. If  $n = 1$ , then by Example 2.37, we have  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,S^1}^{\#,*}(S^1) = \infty$ . Note that  $\mathrm{TC}_{2,S^1}^\#(S^1) = 2$  since  $2 = \mathrm{TC}_2(S^1) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{2,S^1}^\#(S^1) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{2,S^1}(S^1) = 2$ , see [11, Theorem 8] and [3, Example 5.10].

If  $n \geq 2$ , then by Example 2.17, we have  $\mathrm{cat}_{S^1}^\#(S^n) = 2$ . Following similar computations as Example 2.39, we get

$$\mathrm{TC}_{k,S^1}^\#(S^n) = \mathrm{TC}_{k,S^1}^{\#,*}(S^n) = k + 1$$

for  $n$  even, and

$$k \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,S^1}^\#(S^n) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,S^1}^{\#,*}(S^n) \leq k + 1$$

for  $n$  odd and  $n \neq 1$ .

We will now show that the cohomological lower bound on the topological complexity can be adopted for  $\mathrm{TC}_G^\#(X)$ .

**Proposition 2.42.** Suppose  $X$  is a path-connected  $G$ -space such that  $H_i(X)$  is finitely generated for all  $i$ . Let  $\mathbb{K}$  be a field and let  $\cup_n$  denote the  $k$ -fold cup product homomorphism

$$\cup_k: H^*(X; \mathbb{K}) \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \cdots \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} H^*(X; \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow H^*(X; \mathbb{K}).$$

If  $\mathrm{zcl}_k(X)$  denotes  $\mathrm{nil}(\ker(\cup_k))$ , then  $\mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^\#(X) \geq \mathrm{zcl}_k(X) + 1$ .

*Proof.* It follows from [21, Proposition 3.4] that  $\mathrm{zcl}_k(X) + 1 \leq \mathrm{TC}_k(X)$ . Then we get the desired inequality by Proposition 2.28 (2).  $\square$

The dimension-connectivity upper bound for the equivariant sectional category was established by Grant in [17, Theorem 3.5]. We obtain the corresponding bound for the sequential equivariant topological complexity, which consequently provides us the dimension-connectivity upper bound for the sequential topological complexity with respect to the group.

**Proposition 2.43.** Let  $X$  be a  $G$ -CW-complex of dimension at least 1 such that  $X^H$  is  $m$ -connected for all subgroups  $H \leq G$ . Then

$$\mathrm{TC}_{k,G}^\#(X) \leq \mathrm{TC}_{k,G}(X) < \frac{k \dim(X) + 1}{m + 1} + 1.$$

*Proof.* Since  $e_{k,X}$  is a  $G$ -fibration, it is also a Serre  $G$ -fibration. For a closed subgroup  $H$  of  $G$  we have  $(X^I)^H = (X^H)^I$  and  $(X^k)^H = (X^H)^k$ . Thus, the fibration  $e_{k,X}^H: (X^I)^H \rightarrow (X^k)^H$  coincides with the fibration  $e_{k,X^H}: (X^H)^I \rightarrow (X^H)^k$ . Note that the fibre of  $e_{k,X^H}$  is  $(\Omega X^H)^{k-1}$  which is  $(m-1)$ -connected. Therefore, from [17, Theorem 3.5] we obtain the following

$$\mathrm{TC}_{k,G}(X) < \frac{k \dim(X) + 1}{m + 1} + 1.$$

The left inequality follows from part 2 of Proposition 2.28.  $\square$

### 3. SEQUENTIAL TOPOLOGICAL COMPLEXITY OF FIBRE BUNDLES

Let  $F \hookrightarrow E \xrightarrow{p} B$  be a fibre bundle. In [6, Theorem 2.2], the second and third author gave an additive upper bound on the topological complexity of  $E$ . In this section, we generalize that result in Theorem 3.2 to the sequential setting and obtain other additive upper bounds in terms of invariants introduced in the previous section.

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $F \hookrightarrow E \xrightarrow{p} B$  be a fibre bundle and  $U$  be a subset of  $B^k$ . Suppose  $s: U \rightarrow B^I$  is a sequential motion planner over  $U$  such that  $s(U) \subseteq R^I$  where  $f: p^{-1}(R) \rightarrow R \times F$  is a local trivialization of  $F \hookrightarrow E \xrightarrow{p} B$ . Then  $f^k: (p^k)^{-1}(R^k) \rightarrow R^k \times F^k$  gives a local trivialization of  $F^k \hookrightarrow E^k \xrightarrow{p^k} B^k$  over  $R^k$ . As  $s(U) \subseteq R^I$ , it follows that  $U \subseteq R^k$ . Hence, we obtain a local trivialization

$$h := f^k \Big|_{(p^k)^{-1}(U)} : (p^k)^{-1}(U) \rightarrow U \times F^k$$

of the fibre bundle  $F^k \hookrightarrow E^k \xrightarrow{p^k} B^k$  over  $U$ . We will call this local trivialization  $h$  the induced trivialization of the fibre bundle  $F^k \hookrightarrow E^k \xrightarrow{p^k} B^k$  with respect to the sequential motion planner  $s$  and the trivialization  $f$ .

**Theorem 3.2.** Let  $F \hookrightarrow E \xrightarrow{p} B$  be a fibre bundle where  $E^k$  is a completely normal space. Let  $\{U_1, \dots, U_m\}$  and  $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$  be open covers of  $B^k$  and  $F^k$  with sequential motion planners  $s_i: U_i \rightarrow B^I$  and  $t_j: V_j \rightarrow F^I$  respectively. If

- (i) there exists a cover  $\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}$  of  $B$  with local trivializations  $f_i: p^{-1}(R_i) \rightarrow R_i \times F$  of  $F \hookrightarrow E \xrightarrow{p} B$  such that  $s_i(U_i) \subseteq R_i^I$ , and
- (ii) the induced local trivializations  $h_i: (p^k)^{-1}(U_i) \rightarrow U_i \times F^k$  with respect to  $s_i$  and  $R_i$  extends to local trivializations over  $\overline{U_i}$  such that  $(\overline{U_i} \cap \overline{U_{i'}}) \times V_j$  is invariant under  $h_{i'} \circ h_i^{-1}$  for all  $1 \leq i, i' \leq m$  and  $1 \leq j \leq n$ ,

then  $\text{TC}_k(E) \leq m + n - 1$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\{X_i\}_{i=0}^{m+n-1}$  be the sequence given by  $X_0 = \emptyset$ ,  $X_i = U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and  $X_i = B^k$  for  $m \leq i \leq m+n-1$ . Similarly, let  $\{Y_j\}_{j=0}^{m+n-1}$  be the sequence given by  $Y_0 = \emptyset$ ,  $Y_j = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq n$  and  $Y_j = F^k$  for  $n \leq j \leq m+n-1$ .

For each  $l \in \{1, 2, \dots, m+n-1\}$ , define  $Z_{i,l} := (X_i \setminus X_{i-1}) \times (Y_{l-i+1} \setminus Y_{l-i})$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m+n-1$ . Note that  $Z_{i,l} = \emptyset$  for  $m+1 \leq i \leq m+n-1$ . Define

$$Q_l := \bigcup_{i=1}^l h_i^{-1}(Z_{i,l}) \quad (7)$$

for  $1 \leq l \leq m+n-1$ . Note that  $h_i$ 's are defined from  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , hence the term  $h_i^{-1}(Z_{i,l})$  in equation (7) are assumed to be the empty set for each  $m+1 \leq i \leq m+n-1$  as  $Z_{i,l} = \emptyset$ . We claim that the terms in the right hand side of equation (7) are separated, i.e.,

$$h_i^{-1}(Z_{i,l}) \cap \overline{h_{i'}^{-1}(Z_{i',l})} = \emptyset$$

for  $i \neq i'$ . Suppose  $z \in h_i^{-1}(Z_{i,l}) \cap \overline{h_{i'}^{-1}(Z_{i',l})}$ . Note that  $Z_{i',l} \subseteq U_{i'} \times V_{l-i'+1} \subseteq U_{i'} \times F^k$  implies  $\overline{Z_{i',l}} \subseteq \overline{U_{i'}} \times \overline{F^k} \subseteq \overline{U_{i'}} \times F^k = \overline{U_{i'}} \times F^k$  implies  $\overline{h_{i'}^{-1}(Z_{i',l})} \subseteq h_{i'}^{-1}(\overline{Z_{i',l}})$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} h_{i'}(z) &\in h_{i'}(\overline{h_{i'}^{-1}(Z_{i',l})}) \subseteq h_{i'}(h_{i'}^{-1}(\overline{Z_{i',l}})) = \overline{Z_{i',l}} \\ &= \overline{(X_{i'} \setminus X_{i'-1}) \times (Y_{l-i'+1} \setminus Y_{l-i'})} \end{aligned}$$

$$\subseteq \overline{(X_{i'} \setminus X_{i'-1})} \times \overline{(Y_{l-i'+1} \setminus Y_{l-i'})}.$$

Suppose  $h_{i'}(z) = (x_{i'}, y_{i'})$  where  $x_{i'} = p^k(z) = x$  (say). We claim that  $x \notin X_{i'-1}$ . If  $x \in X_{i'-1}$ , then  $x \notin X_{i'-1}^c$ . As  $X_{i'-1}^c$  is closed, it follows there exists an open subset  $G$  containing  $x$  such that  $G \cap X_{i'-1}^c = \emptyset$ . Hence  $x \in G \subseteq X_{i'-1}$  implies  $G \cap (X_{i'} \setminus X_{i'-1}) = \emptyset$ . A contradiction to the fact that  $x \in \overline{(X_{i'} \setminus X_{i'-1})}$ . Similarly, we have  $y_{i'} \notin Y_{l-i'}$ .

Suppose  $h_i(z) = (x_i, y_i)$  where  $x_i = p^k(z) = x$ . Then

$$(x, y_i) = (x_i, y_i) = h_i(z) \in h_i(h_i^{-1}(Z_{i,l})) = Z_{i,l} \subseteq U_i \times V_{l-i+1}$$

and  $(x, y_{i'}) = (x_{i'}, y_{i'}) = h_{i'}(z) \in \overline{(X_{i'} \setminus X_{i'-1})} \times \overline{(Y_{l-i'+1} \setminus Y_{l-i'})} \subseteq \overline{U_{i'}} \times \overline{(Y_{l-i'+1} \setminus Y_{l-i'})}$  implies  $(x, y_i) \in (\overline{U_i} \cap \overline{U_{i'}}) \times V_{l-i+1}$ . Hence  $(x, y_{i'}) = h_{i'}(h_i^{-1}(x, y_i)) \in (\overline{U_i} \cap \overline{U_{i'}}) \times V_{l-i+1}$  as  $(\overline{U_i} \cap \overline{U_{i'}}) \times V_{l-i+1}$  is preserved under  $h_{i'} \circ h_i^{-1}$ . In particular, we have  $y_{i'} \in V_{l-i+1}$ .

If  $i < i'$ , then  $i \leq i' - 1$  implies  $X_i \subseteq X_{i'-1}$ . This is a contradiction since  $x \in X_i \setminus X_{i-1} \subseteq X_i$  but  $x \notin X_{i'-1}$ . If  $i' < i$ , then  $l-i' \geq l-i+1$  implies  $Y_{l-i+1} \subseteq Y_{l-i'}$ . This is a contradiction since  $y_{i'} \in V_{l-i+1} \subseteq Y_{l-i+1}$  but  $y_{i'} \notin Y_{l-i'}$ .

Then, by using the property of complete normality for the space  $E^k$  repeatedly, there exist open sets  $W_{i,l}$  containing  $h_i^{-1}(Z_{i,l})$  such that  $W_{i,l} \cap W_{i',l} = \emptyset$  for  $i \neq i'$ . Let

$$C_{i,l} := W_{i,l} \cap h_i^{-1}(U_i \times V_{l-i+1}).$$

It is clear that  $C_{i,l}$  satisfies  $h_i^{-1}(Z_{i,l}) \subseteq C_{i,l} \subseteq h_i^{-1}(U_i \times V_{l-i+1})$  and  $C_{i,l} \cap C_{i',l} = \emptyset$  for  $i \neq i'$ . Let

$$C_l := \prod_{i=1}^l C_{i,l}.$$

for  $1 \leq l \leq m+n-1$ . Note that  $Q_l \subseteq C_l$ . Since  $h_i$  are induced by  $f_i$ , the composition of

$$C_{i,l} \hookrightarrow h_i^{-1}(U_i \times V_{l-i+1}) \xrightarrow{h_i} U_i \times V_{l-i+1} \xrightarrow{s_i \times t_{l-i+1}} R_i^I \times F^I,$$

and

$$R_i^I \times F^I \xrightarrow{\cong} (R_i \times F)^I \xrightarrow{(f_i^{-1})^I} (p^{-1}(R_i))^I \hookrightarrow E^I$$

gives a sequential motion planner on  $C_{i,l}$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and  $1 \leq l \leq m+n-1$ . As  $C_l$  is a disjoint union of open sets  $C_{i,l}$ , we get a sequential motion planner on  $C_l$  for each  $1 \leq l \leq m+n-1$ . Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcup_{l=1}^{m+n-1} Q_l &= \bigcup_{l=1}^{m+n-1} \bigcup_{i=1}^l h_i^{-1}((X_i \setminus X_{i-1}) \times (Y_{l-i+1} \setminus Y_{l-i})) \\ &= \bigcup_{i=1}^{m+n-1} \bigcup_{l=i}^{m+n-1} h_i^{-1}((X_i \setminus X_{i-1}) \times (Y_{l-i+1} \setminus Y_{l-i})) \\ &= \bigcup_{i=1}^{m+n-1} h_i^{-1}((X_i \setminus X_{i-1}) \times Y_{m+n-i}) \\ &= \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^m h_i^{-1}((X_i \setminus X_{i-1}) \times Y_{m+n-i}) \right) \cup \left( \bigcup_{i=m+1}^{m+n-1} h_i^{-1}((X_i \setminus X_{i-1}) \times Y_{m+n-i}) \right) \\ &= \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^m h_i^{-1}((X_i \setminus X_{i-1}) \times F) \right) \cup \left( \bigcup_{i=m+1}^{m+n-1} h_i^{-1}(\emptyset \times Y_{m+n-i}) \right) \\ &= \bigcup_{i=1}^m h_i^{-1}((X_i \setminus X_{i-1}) \times F) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \bigcup_{i=1}^m (p^k)^{-1}(X_i \setminus X_{i-1}) \\
&= (p^k)^{-1}(X_m) \\
&= (p^k)^{-1}(B^k) \\
&= E^k.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $E^k = \bigcup_{l=1}^{m+n-1} Q_l \subseteq \bigcup_{l=1}^{m+n-1} C_l$  implies  $\{C_l\}_{l=1}^{m+n-1}$  is an open cover of  $E^k$  with sequential motion planners. Hence,  $\text{TC}_k(E) \leq m + n - 1$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.3.**

- (i) In Theorem 3.2, the local trivializations  $h_i$ 's have to be the one defined in Definition 3.1, otherwise the sequential motion planners for  $E$  defined via compositions in Theorem 3.2 can fail to be sections of  $e_{k,E}$  which was an oversight in [6, Theorem 2.2].
- (ii) In Theorem 3.2, it is enough to assume that  $(U_i \times \overline{U}_i) \times V_j$  is invariant under  $h_{i'} \circ h_i^{-1}$  for all  $1 \leq i, i' \leq m$  and  $1 \leq j \leq n$ .
- (iii) Suppose  $F \hookrightarrow E \xrightarrow{p} B$  is the trivial fibre bundle. Suppose  $\text{TC}(B) = m$  and  $\text{TC}(F) = n$  with sequential motion planning covers  $\{U_1, \dots, U_m\}$  and  $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$ . If  $f: E \rightarrow B \times F$  is a global trivialization for  $p$ , then we can take  $f_i$ 's to be  $f$  for all  $i$ . Then the condition (i) of Theorem 3.2 is satisfied since  $R_i = B^k$  and the condition (ii) is satisfied since  $h_{i'} \circ h_i$  is the identity map. Hence,  $\text{TC}(E) \leq \text{TC}(B) + \text{TC}(F) - 1$  and we recover the product inequality in [1, Proposition 3.11].

**Remark 3.4.**

- (i) If the  $R_i$ 's in Theorem 3.2 are closed, then we have  $\overline{U}_i \subseteq R_i^k$ . Hence,  $h_i$ 's can be extended to local trivializations over  $\overline{U}_i$  as we can take the extension to be  $f_i^k|_{(p^k)^{-1}(\overline{U}_i)}$ .
- (ii) Suppose  $G$  is the structure group of the fibre bundle  $F \hookrightarrow E \rightarrow B$ . Suppose the local trivializations  $f_i: p^{-1}(R_i) \rightarrow R_i \times F$  in Theorem 3.2 forms a  $G$ -atlas of  $F \hookrightarrow E \rightarrow B$ , i.e, the transition maps  $f_i \circ f_{i'}^{-1}: (R_i \cap R_{i'}) \times F \rightarrow (R_i \cap R_{i'}) \times F$  are given by

$$(f_i \circ f_{i'}^{-1})(x, y) = (x, t_{ii'}(x)y)$$

where  $t_{ii'}: R_i \cap R_{i'} \rightarrow G$  are continuous maps. Then the transition maps  $f_i^k \circ (f_{i'}^k)^{-1}: (R_i^k \cap R_{i'}^k) \times F^k \rightarrow (R_i^k \cap R_{i'}^k) \times F^k$  are given by

$$(f_i^k \circ (f_{i'}^k)^{-1})(x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_k) = (x_1, \dots, x_k, t_{ii'}(x_1)y_1, \dots, t_{ii'}(x_k)y_k).$$

In particular, if  $V$  is a  $G^k$ -invariant subset of  $F^k$ , then  $f_i^k \circ (f_{i'}^k)^{-1}$  preserves  $W \times V$  where  $W$  is any subset of  $R_i^k \cap R_{i'}^k$ .

**Corollary 3.5.** Let  $F \hookrightarrow E \xrightarrow{p} B$  be a fibre bundle with structure group  $G$  where  $E^k$  is a completely normal space. Let  $\{U_1, \dots, U_m\}$  be a sequential motion planning open cover of  $B^k$ . If there exists a closed cover  $\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}$  of  $B$  with local trivializations  $f_i: p^{-1}(R_i) \rightarrow R_i \times F$  of  $F \hookrightarrow E \xrightarrow{p} B$  such that  $f_i$ 's forms a  $G$ -atlas of  $F \hookrightarrow E \xrightarrow{p} B$  and  $s_i(U_i) \subseteq R_i^k$ , then

$$\text{TC}_k(E) \leq m + \text{TC}_{k,G}^{\#,*}(F) - 1.$$

In particular,  $\text{TC}_k(E) \leq m + \text{cat}_{G^k}^{\#}(F^k) - 1$  and  $\text{TC}_k(E) \leq m + \text{TC}_{k,G}^*(F) - 1$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $\text{TC}_{k,G^k}^{\#,*}(F) = n$  and  $\{V_j\}_{j=1}^n$  be a  $G^k$ -invariant open cover of  $F^k$  with sequential motion planners. By Remark 3.4, we have  $h_i \circ h_{i'}^{-1}$  preserves  $(\overline{U}_i \cap \overline{U}_{i'}) \times V_j$  as  $\overline{U}_i \subseteq R_i^k$  and  $h_i \circ h_{i'}^{-1}$  is restriction of  $f_i^k \circ (f_{i'}^k)^{-1}$ . Thus, by Theorem 3.2, it follows  $\text{TC}_k(E) \leq m + n - 1$ .  $\square$

#### 4. LS CATEGORY OF FIBRE BUNDLES

Let  $F \hookrightarrow E \xrightarrow{p} B$  be a fibre bundle. In [19, Theorem 2.6], Naskar and the third author gave an additive upper bound on the LS category of  $E$ . Due to an oversight similar to [6, Theorem 2.2], we state the modified version of [19, Theorem 2.6] in Theorem 4.3 without proof, since the proof will follow the same lines of argument as [19, Theorem 2.6] and Theorem 3.2. Then we provide an additive upper bound on  $\text{cat}(E)$  in terms of  $\text{cat}_G^\#(F)$  if the fibre bundle  $p$  has the structure group  $G$ .

**Lemma 4.1** ([19, Lemma 2.5]). *Suppose  $B$  is a hereditary paracompact space. Let  $F \hookrightarrow E \rightarrow B$  be a fibre bundle and  $U \subseteq B$  be a categorical subset of  $B$ . Then there exists a local trivialization  $\phi: p^{-1}(U) \rightarrow U \times F$  such that if  $V \subseteq F$  is categorical, then  $\phi^{-1}(U \times V)$  is categorical in  $E$ .*

For the sake of understanding we will mention how the trivialization  $\phi$  is constructed. If  $H: U \times I \rightarrow B$  is a homotopy between the inclusion map of  $U$  into  $B$  and the constant map, then the image  $H(U \times I)$  is contractible and  $U = H(U, 0)$  is categorical in  $H(U \times I)$ . The trivialization  $\phi$  is obtained by the restriction of the bundle  $E$  over the contractible set  $H(U \times I)$ . We will call the trivialization  $\phi$  to be an *induced trivialization of fibre bundle  $p$  with respect to the categorical subset  $U$* .

**Remark 4.2.** *If  $U$  in Lemma 4.1 is contractible, then any trivialization of  $p$  over  $U$  is an induced trivialization of  $p$  with respect to  $U$ .*

**Theorem 4.3** ([19, Theorem 2.6]). *Let  $F \hookrightarrow E \xrightarrow{p} B$  be a fibre bundle where  $E$  is a completely normal path-connected space and  $B$  is a hereditary paracompact space. Let  $\{U_1, \dots, U_m\}$  and  $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$  be categorical open covers of  $B$  and  $F$  respectively. If there exists induced local trivializations  $\phi_i: p^{-1}(U_i) \rightarrow U_i \times F$  of  $p$  with respect to  $U_i$ 's which extends to local trivializations over  $\overline{U}_i$  such that  $(\overline{U}_i \cap \overline{U}_{i'}) \times V_j$  is invariant under  $\phi_{i'} \circ \phi_i^{-1}$  for all  $1 \leq i, i' \leq m$  and  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , then  $\text{cat}(E) \leq m + n - 1$ .*

**Corollary 4.4.** *Let  $F \hookrightarrow E \xrightarrow{p} B$  be a fibre bundle with structure group  $G$  where  $E$  is a completely normal path-connected space and  $B$  is a hereditary paracompact space. Let  $\{U_1, \dots, U_m\}$  be a categorical open cover of  $B$ . If there exists induced local trivializations  $\phi_i: p^{-1}(U_i) \rightarrow U_i \times F$  of  $p$  with respect to  $U_i$ 's extends to local trivializations  $\tilde{\phi}_i$  over  $\overline{U}_i$  such that the  $\tilde{\phi}_i$ 's forms a  $G$ -atlas of  $p$ , then  $\text{cat}(E) \leq m + \text{cat}_G^\#(F) - 1$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\text{cat}_G^\#(F) = n$  and  $\{V_j\}_{j=1}^n$  be a  $G$ -invariant categorical open cover of  $F$ . As the transition maps  $\tilde{\phi}_{i'} \circ \tilde{\phi}_i^{-1}: (\overline{U}_i \cap \overline{U}_{i'}) \times F \rightarrow (\overline{U}_i \cap \overline{U}_{i'}) \times F$  are given by

$$\tilde{\phi}_{i'} \circ \tilde{\phi}_i^{-1}(x, y) = (x, \tau_{i'i}(x)y)$$

for some continuous maps  $\tau_{i'i}: \overline{U}_i \cap \overline{U}_{i'} \rightarrow G$  for all  $1 \leq i, i' \leq m$ . Hence,  $(\overline{U}_i \cap \overline{U}_{i'}) \times V_j$  is invariant under  $\tilde{\phi}_{i'} \circ \tilde{\phi}_i^{-1}$  for all  $1 \leq i, i' \leq m$  and  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , since  $V_j$ 's are  $G$ -invariant. Thus, by Theorem 4.3, it follows  $\text{cat}(E) \leq m + n - 1$ .  $\square$

#### 5. APPLICATION TO GENERALIZED PROJECTIVE PRODUCT SPACES

Let  $M$  and  $N$  be topological spaces with involutions  $\tau: M \rightarrow M$  and  $\sigma: N \rightarrow N$  such that  $\sigma$  is fixed-point free. Sarkar and Zvengrwocki in [22] introduced the following identification spaces

$$X(M, N) := \frac{M \times N}{(x, y) \sim (\tau(x), \sigma(y))}. \quad (8)$$

These identification spaces are called *generalized projective product spaces*. Note that this class of spaces contains projective product spaces, introduced by Donald Davis in [7] and Dold manifolds by Dold in [9].

Suppose  $\pi_2: M \times N \rightarrow N$  be the projection map onto  $N$ , and  $q_2: N \rightarrow N/\langle\sigma\rangle$  and  $q: M \times N \rightarrow X(M, N)$  be the natural quotient maps. As  $q_2(\pi_2(\tau(x), \sigma(y))) = q_2(\sigma(y)) = q_2(y) = q_2(\pi_2(x, y))$ , there exists a continuous map  $\mathfrak{p}: X(M, N) \rightarrow N/\langle\sigma\rangle$ , given by  $\mathfrak{p}([x, y]) = q_2(y)$ , such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M \times N & \xrightarrow{\pi_2} & N \\ \downarrow q & & \downarrow q_2 \\ X(M, N) & \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{p}} & N/\langle\sigma\rangle \end{array}$$

commutes.

**Proposition 5.1.** *If  $N$  is Hausdorff, then  $q_2$  is a covering map. Moreover,*

$$M \hookrightarrow X(M, N) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{p}} N/\langle\sigma\rangle, \quad (9)$$

*is a fibre bundle with structure group  $\langle\tau\rangle$ , and a  $\langle\tau\rangle$ -atlas for  $\mathfrak{p}$  is given over all evenly covered open subsets of  $N/\langle\sigma\rangle$  with respect to  $q_2$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $z_0 \in N/\langle\sigma\rangle$ . Since the action of  $\langle\sigma\rangle$  on  $N$  is free and  $N$  is Hausdorff, by [18, Exercise 23, Page 81 and Proposition 1.40],  $q_2$  is a 2-sheeted covering map. Hence, there exists an open set  $U$  of  $N/\langle\sigma\rangle$  such that  $q_2^{-1}(U) = V \amalg \sigma(V)$  and  $q_2|_V: V \rightarrow U$  is a homeomorphism, where  $V$  is an open subset of  $N$ . As

$$q^{-1}(\mathfrak{p}^{-1}(U)) = \pi_2^{-1}(q_2^{-1}(U)) = \pi_2^{-1}(V \amalg \sigma(V)) = (M \times V) \amalg (M \times \sigma(V))$$

and  $q$  is surjective, it follows

$$\mathfrak{p}^{-1}(U) = q(q^{-1}(\mathfrak{p}^{-1}(U))) = \frac{(M \times V) \amalg (M \times \sigma(V))}{(x, y) \sim (\tau(x), \sigma(y))}$$

Define  $\phi: (M \times V) \amalg (M \times \sigma(V)) \rightarrow M \times U$  by

$$\phi(x, y) = \begin{cases} (x, q_2(y)) & \text{if } (x, y) \in M \times V, \\ (\tau(x), q_2(y)) & \text{if } (x, y) \in M \times \sigma(V). \end{cases}$$

The map  $\phi$  is well-defined since  $V \cap \sigma(V) = \emptyset$ . Moreover,  $\phi$  satisfies  $\phi(x, y) = \phi(\tau(x), \sigma(y))$ , and hence induces

$$\Phi_U: \frac{(M \times V) \amalg (M \times \sigma(V))}{(x, y) \sim (\tau(x), \sigma(y))} \rightarrow M \times U.$$

Define

$$\Psi_U: M \times U \rightarrow \frac{(M \times V) \amalg (M \times \sigma(V))}{(x, y) \sim (\tau(x), \sigma(y))}$$

as the composition of maps

$$M \times U \xrightarrow{\text{id}_M \times (q_2|_V)^{-1}} M \times V \hookrightarrow (M \times V) \amalg (M \times \sigma(V)) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{p}} \frac{(M \times V) \amalg (M \times \sigma(V))}{(x, y) \sim (\tau(x), \sigma(y))}.$$

Then  $\Phi_U$  and  $\Psi_U$  are inverses of each other and define a trivialization of  $\mathfrak{p}$ .

Suppose  $U'$  is another evenly covered neighborhood with  $q_2^{-1}(U') = V' \amalg \sigma(V')$  such that  $U \cap U' \neq \emptyset$ . If  $q_2^{-1}(U \cap U') = (V \cap V') \amalg (\sigma(V) \cap \sigma(V'))$ , then the transition function  $\Phi_U \circ \Psi_{U'}: M \times (U \cap U') \rightarrow M \times (U \cap U')$  is given by

$$\Phi_U(\Psi_{U'}(x, z)) = \Phi_U\left(\left[x, (q_2|_{V'})^{-1}(z)\right]\right) = \left(x, q_2((q_2|_{V'})^{-1}(z))\right) = (x, z).$$

If  $q_2^{-1}(U \cap U') = (V \cap \sigma(V')) \amalg (\sigma(V) \cap V')$ , then  $\Phi_U \circ \Psi_{U'}: M \times (U \cap U') \rightarrow M \times (U \cap U')$  is given by

$$\Phi_U(\Psi_{U'}(x, z)) = \Phi_U\left(\left[\tau(x), (q_2|_{V'})^{-1}(z)\right]\right) = \left(\tau(x), q_2((q_2|_{V'})^{-1}(z))\right) = (\tau(x), z).$$

Thus, the family  $\{\Phi_U\}$  defines a  $\langle \tau \rangle$ -atlas for  $\mathfrak{p}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 5.2.** Any set (need not be open) which is evenly covered by the covering map  $q_2$  can also be taken as a part of  $\langle \tau \rangle$ -atlas for the fibre bundle  $\mathfrak{p}$ .

**Proposition 5.3.** Suppose  $M$  is a path-connected Hausdorff topological space such that  $M^k$  is completely normal. If  $\tau: M \rightarrow M$  is an involution on  $M$  and  $\sigma: S^1 \rightarrow S^1$  is the antipodal involution on  $S^1$  given by  $\sigma(z) = -z$ , then

$$\text{cat}(X(M, S^1)) \leq \text{cat}_{\langle \tau \rangle}^{\#}(M) + 1, \text{ and}$$

$$\text{TC}_k(X(M, S^1)) \leq k + \text{TC}_{k, \langle \tau \rangle}^{\#, *}(M) \leq k \text{cat}_{\langle \tau \rangle}^{\#}(M) + 1.$$

*Proof.* We will use the same notation as Proposition 5.1. Note that  $q_2: S^1 \rightarrow S^1 / \langle \sigma \rangle = \mathbb{R}P^1$  is the natural quotient map. If  $\zeta: \mathbb{R}P^1 \rightarrow S^1$  is the homeomorphism given by  $\zeta(q_2(z)) = z^2$ , then we can replace  $\mathfrak{p}: X(M, S^1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}P^1$  with  $\zeta \circ \mathfrak{p}: X(M, S^1) \rightarrow S^1$  to get a fibre bundle

$$M \hookrightarrow X(M, S^1) \xrightarrow{\zeta \circ \mathfrak{p}} S^1.$$

Let  $C_1 = \left\{ e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta} \in S^1 \mid \theta \in \left[ \frac{\pi}{6}, \frac{11\pi}{6} \right] \right\}$  and  $C_2 = \left\{ e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta} \in S^1 \mid \theta \in \left[ 0, \frac{5\pi}{6} \right] \cup \left[ \frac{7\pi}{6}, 2\pi \right] \right\}$ . Clearly  $\{C_1, C_2\}$  forms a closed cover of  $S^1$  and  $\{C_1^\circ, C_2^\circ\}$  forms an open cover of  $S^1$ , where  $C_r^\circ$  is the interior of  $C_r$ . As  $C_r$ 's are evenly covered by the covering map  $\zeta \circ q_2$ , by Proposition 5.1, it follows that  $\Phi_{C_r}: (\zeta \circ \mathfrak{p})^{-1}(C_r) \rightarrow M \times C_r$  forms a  $\langle \tau \rangle$ -atlas for  $\zeta \circ \mathfrak{p}$ . If  $\phi_r$  is the restriction of the trivialization  $\Phi_{C_r}$  on  $C_r^\circ$ , then  $\phi_r$  is an induced trivialization of  $p$  with respect to  $C_r^\circ$ , see Remark 4.2. Thus, the hypothesis of Corollary 4.4 are satisfied and we get

$$\text{cat}(X(M, S^1)) \leq 2 + \text{cat}_{\langle \tau \rangle}^{\#}(M) - 1 = \text{cat}_{\langle \tau \rangle}^{\#}(M) + 1.$$

Now we prove the inequality concerning the sequential topological complexity of  $X(M, S^1)$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , let  $R_i$  be closed subsets of  $S^1$  whose complement is given by

$$R_i^c := \left\{ e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta} \in S^1 \mid \frac{2(i-1)\pi}{2(k+1)} < \theta < \frac{(2i-1)\pi}{2(k+1)} \right\}.$$

Clearly  $\{R_1, \dots, R_{k+1}\}$  forms a closed cover of  $S^1$ . If  $U_i$  is the interior of  $R_i$ , then  $\{U_1^k, \dots, U_{k+1}^k\}$  forms an open cover of  $(S^1)^k$ . As  $U_i$  is contractible, there exists a global section  $s_i: U_i^k \rightarrow U_i^I$  of  $e_{k, U_i}: U_i^I \rightarrow U_i^k$ . In particular,  $s_i$  is a section of  $e_{k, S^1}$  over  $U_i^k$ , via the inclusion  $U_i^I \hookrightarrow (S^1)^I$ . Thus,  $\{U_1^k, \dots, U_{k+1}^k\}$  forms a sequential motion planning open cover of  $(S^1)^k$ . Moreover, the section  $s_i$  satisfies  $s_i(U_i) \subseteq R_i^I$ , via the inclusion  $U_i^I \hookrightarrow R_i^I$ . As  $R_i$ 's are evenly covered under the covering map  $\zeta \circ q_2: S^1 \rightarrow S^1$ , by Proposition 5.1, it follows that  $\Phi_{R_i}: (\zeta \circ \mathfrak{p})^{-1}(R_i) \rightarrow M \times R_i$  forms a  $\langle \tau \rangle$ -atlas for  $\zeta \circ \mathfrak{p}$ . Thus, the conditions of Corollary 3.5 are satisfied and we have

$$\text{TC}_k(X(M, S^1)) \leq (k+1) + \text{TC}_{k, \langle \tau \rangle}^{\#, *}(M) - 1 = k + \text{TC}_{k, \langle \tau \rangle}^{\#, *}(M).$$

Thus, it follows that

$$\mathrm{TC}_k(X(M, S^1)) \leq k + \mathrm{cat}_{\langle \tau \rangle}^{\#k}(M^k) \leq k + k(\mathrm{cat}_{\langle \tau \rangle}^{\#}(M) - 1) + 1 = k \mathrm{cat}_{\langle \tau \rangle}^{\#}(M) + 1$$

by Proposition 2.34 and Corollary 2.24.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $G_j$  be a finite group acting on  $S^{n_j}$ , where  $n_j \geq 1$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ . If  $G := G_1 \times \dots \times G_r$  is the product group acting on  $S^{n_1} \times \dots \times S^{n_r}$  componentwise, then*

$$\mathrm{cat}_G^{\#} \left( \prod_{j=1}^r S^{n_j} \right) = r + 1.$$

*Proof.* By Example 2.13, we have  $\mathrm{cat}_{G_j}^{\#}(S^{n_j}) = 2$ . Therefore, from Corollary 2.24, we get the following inequality

$$\mathrm{cat}_G^{\#} \left( \prod_{j=1}^r S^{n_j} \right) \leq \left( \sum_{j=1}^r \mathrm{cat}_{G_j}^{\#}(S^{n_j}) \right) - (r - 1) = r + 1.$$

As  $\mathrm{cat} \left( \prod_{j=1}^r S^{n_j} \right) = r + 1$ , it follows  $\mathrm{cat}_G^{\#} \left( \prod_{j=1}^r S^{n_j} \right) = r + 1$ .  $\square$

Consider an involution  $\tau_j$  on  $S^{n_j} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_j+1}$  defined as follows:

$$\tau_j((y_1, \dots, y_{p_j}, y_{p_j+1}, \dots, y_{n_j+1})) := (y_1, \dots, y_{p_j}, -y_{p_j+1}, \dots, -y_{n_j+1}), \quad (10)$$

for some  $0 \leq p_j \leq n_j$  and  $1 \leq j \leq r$ . Note that if  $p_j = 0$ , then  $\tau_j$  acts antipodally on  $S^{n_j}$ ; and if  $p_j = n_j$ , then  $\tau_j$  is a reflection across the hyperplane  $y_{n_j+1} = 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n_j+1}$ . Then we have  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -action on the product  $S^{n_1} \times \dots \times S^{n_r}$  via the product involution

$$\tau := \tau_1 \times \dots \times \tau_r. \quad (11)$$

Let  $N$  be a topological space with a free involution  $\sigma$ . Consider the identification space:

$$X((n_1, p_1), \dots, (n_r, p_r), N) := \frac{S^{n_1} \times \dots \times S^{n_r} \times N}{(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_r, y) \sim (\tau_1(\mathbf{x}_1), \dots, \tau_r(\mathbf{x}_r), \sigma(y))}, \quad (12)$$

where  $\tau_j$  is a reflection defined as in (10) for  $1 \leq j \leq r$ . So,  $X((n_1, p_1), \dots, (n_r, p_r), N)$  is a generalized projective product space.

**Theorem 5.5.** *Let  $1 \leq n_1 \leq \dots \leq n_r$  and  $p_j \geq 1$  for  $j = 1, \dots, r$ . Then*

$$\mathrm{cup}_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(N/\langle \sigma \rangle) + r + 1 \leq \mathrm{cat}(X((n_1, p_1), \dots, (n_r, p_r), N)), \text{ and} \quad (13)$$

$$\mathrm{zcl}_k(N/\langle \sigma \rangle) + (k - 1)r + 1 \leq \mathrm{TC}_k(X((n_1, p_1), \dots, (n_r, p_r), N)). \quad (14)$$

*In particular, if  $N = S^1$  and  $\sigma: S^1 \rightarrow S^1$  is the antipodal involution, then*

$$\mathrm{cat}(X((n_1, p_1), \dots, (n_r, p_r), S^1)) = r + 2, \text{ and} \quad (15)$$

$$(k - 1)(r + 1) + 1 \leq \mathrm{TC}_k(X((n_1, p_1), \dots, (n_r, p_r), S^1)) \leq k(r + 1) + 1. \quad (16)$$

*Proof.* The inequality (13) follows from [6, Proposition 4.3]. Hence, the equality (15) follows from Proposition 5.3 and Lemma 5.4 since  $\mathrm{cat}(X((n_1, p_1), \dots, (n_r, p_r), S^1)) \leq \mathrm{cat}_{\langle \tau \rangle}^{\#}(\prod_{j=1}^r S^{n_j}) + 1 = (r + 1) + 1 = r + 2$ .

We now show the inequalities concerning the sequential topological complexity starting with the inequality (14). Note [6, Theorem 4.1] states that

$$H^*(X((n_1, p_1), \dots, (n_r, p_r), N); \mathbb{Z}_2) \cong H^*(N/\langle \sigma \rangle; \mathbb{Z}_2) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_2} \Lambda(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r)$$

where  $\Lambda(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r)$  is the exterior algebra on  $r$  generators over  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ . Thus, we have

$$\mathrm{zcl}_k(X((n_1, p_1), \dots, (n_r, p_r), N)) = \mathrm{zcl}_k(N/\langle \sigma \rangle) + \mathrm{nil}(\ker(\phi_k)),$$

where

$$\phi_k : \Lambda(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_2} \cdots \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_2} \Lambda(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r) \rightarrow \Lambda(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r)$$

is the  $k$ -fold product homomorphism of  $\Lambda(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r)$ .

Let  $y_j^i = 1 \otimes \cdots \otimes 1 \otimes \beta_j \otimes 1 \otimes \cdots \otimes 1 \in \Lambda(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r)^{\otimes k}$ , where  $\beta_j$  occurs at  $i^{\text{th}}$  position. Then  $y_j^i + y_j^{i'} \in \ker(\phi_k)$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq r$  and  $1 \leq i, i' \leq k$ , since  $\phi_k(y_j^i + y_j^{i'}) = \beta_j + \beta_j = 0$ . Consider the product

$$P := \prod_{j=1}^r \prod_{i=2}^k (y_j^{i-1} + y_j^i) \in \ker(\phi_k).$$

This product is nonzero as this contains a nonzero term  $\prod_{j=1}^r \prod_{i=2}^k y_j^i$  which can't be killed by any other term in the product  $P$ . Hence,  $\text{nil}(\ker(\phi_k)) \geq (k-1)r$ .

Therefore, from [21, Proposition 3.4], we get the inequality (14). Now the left inequality of (16) follows from the observation  $\text{zcl}_k(\mathbb{R}P^1) = k-1$ . The right inequality of (16) follows from Proposition 5.3 and Lemma 5.4.  $\square$

**Remark 5.6.** Note that if  $n_j = 1 = p_j$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq r$  and  $N = S^1$  with the antipodal involution, then  $X((n_1, p_1), \dots, (n_r, p_r), N)$  is the  $(r+1)$ -dimensional Klein bottle. Then (15) recovers Davis's result [8, Corollary 2.3].

## 6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The first author would like to acknowledge IISER Pune - IDEaS Scholarship and Siemens-IISER Ph.D. fellowship for economical support. The second author acknowledges the support of NBHM through grant 0204/10/(16)/2023/R&D-II/2789.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Ibai Basabe, Jesús González, Yuli B. Rudyak, and Dai Tamaki. Higher topological complexity and its symmetrization. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 14(4):2103–2124, 2014.
- [2] Marzieh Bayeh and Soumen Sarkar. Higher equivariant and invariant topological complexities. *J. Homotopy Relat. Struct.*, 15(3-4):397–416, 2020.
- [3] Hellen Colman and Mark Grant. Equivariant topological complexity. *Algebraic & Geometric Topology*, 12(4):2299–2316, 2013.
- [4] Octav Cornea, Gregory Lupton, John Oprea, and Daniel Tanré. *Lusternik-Schnirelmann category*, volume 103 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.
- [5] Navnath Daundkar. Group actions and higher topological complexity of lens spaces. *J Appl. and Comput. Topology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41468-024-00171-y>, 2024.
- [6] Navnath Daundkar and Soumen Sarkar. LS-category and topological complexity of several families of fibre bundles. *to appear in Homology, Homotopy and Applications, arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.00468v3*, 2023.
- [7] Donald M. Davis. Projective product spaces. *J. Topol.*, 3(2):265–279, 2010.
- [8] Donald M. Davis. An  $n$ -dimensional Klein bottle. *Proc. R. Soc. Edinb., Sect. A, Math.*, 149(5):1207–1221, 2019.
- [9] Albrecht Dold. Erzeugende der Thomschen Algebra  $\mathcal{N}$ . *Math. Z.*, 65:25–35, 1956.
- [10] Alexander Dranishnikov. On topological complexity of twisted products. *Topology Appl.*, 179:74–80, 2015.
- [11] Michael Farber. Topological complexity of motion planning. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 29(2):211–221, 2003.
- [12] Michael Farber. *Invitation to topological robotics*. Zurich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2008.
- [13] Michael Farber and Mark Grant. Robot motion planning, weights of cohomology classes, and cohomology operations. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 136(9):3339–3349, 2008.
- [14] Ralph H. Fox. On the Lusternik-Schnirelmann category. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 42:333–370, 1941.
- [15] Jesús González, Mark Grant, Enrique Torres-Giese, and Miguel Xicoténcatl. Topological complexity of motion planning in projective product spaces. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 13(2):1027–1047, 2013.

- [16] Mark Grant. Topological complexity, fibrations and symmetry. *Topology Appl.*, 159(1):88–97, 2012.
- [17] Mark Grant. Symmetrized topological complexity. *Journal of Topology and Analysis*, 11(02):387–403, 2019.
- [18] Allen Hatcher. *Algebraic topology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.
- [19] Bikramaditya Naskar and Soumen Sarkar. On LS-category and topological complexity of some fiber bundles and Dold manifolds. *Topology Appl.*, 284:107367, 14, 2020.
- [20] Amit Kumar Paul and Debasis Sen. An upper bound for higher topological complexity and higher strongly equivariant complexity. *Topology Appl.*, 277:107172, 18, 2020.
- [21] Yuli B. Rudyak. On higher analogs of topological complexity. *Topology Appl.*, 157(5):916–920, 2010.
- [22] Soumen Sarkar and Peter Zvengrowski. On generalized projective product spaces and Dold manifolds. *Homology Homotopy Appl.*, 24(2):265–289, 2022.
- [23] Norman Steenrod. *The Topology of Fibre Bundles*. Princeton Mathematical Series, vol. 14. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1951.
- [24] Albert S. Švarc. The genus of a fiber space. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR (N.S.)*, 119:219–222, 1958.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH PUNE, INDIA  
*Email address:* ramandeepsingh.arora@students.iiserpune.ac.in  
*Email address:* ramandsa@gmail.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH PUNE, INDIA.  
*Email address:* navnath.daundkar@acads.iiserpune.ac.in

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY MADRAS, CHENNAI, 600036, INDIA.  
*Email address:* soumen@iitm.ac.in