# L<sup>p</sup>-cohomology

P. Pansu

January 19, 2017

(ロ)、(型)、(E)、(E)、 E) の(の)

Advertisement: http://analysis-situs.org

- topological space  $\rightarrow$  cohomology
  - manifold  $\rightarrow$  de Rham cohomology

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

topological space	$\rightarrow$	cohomology
manifold	$\rightarrow$	de Rham cohomology
metric space	$\rightarrow$	cohomology with decay condition
Riemannian manifold	$\rightarrow$	de Rham cohomology with decay condition

topological space	$\rightarrow$	cohomology
manifold	$\rightarrow$	de Rham cohomology
metric space	$\rightarrow$	cohomology with decay condition
Riemannian manifold	$\rightarrow$	de Rham cohomology with decay condition

Let M be a Riemannian manifold. Let p > 1.  $L^p$ -cohomology of M is the cohomology of the complex of  $L^p$ -differential forms on M whose exterior differentials are  $L^p$  as well,

 $H^{k,p}$  = closed k-forms in  $L^p/d((k-1)-forms in L^p)$ ,

topological space	$\rightarrow$	cohomology
manifold	$\rightarrow$	de Rham cohomology
metric space	$\rightarrow$	cohomology with decay condition
Riemannian manifold	$\rightarrow$	de Rham cohomology with decay condition

Let M be a Riemannian manifold. Let p > 1.  $L^p$ -cohomology of M is the cohomology of the complex of  $L^p$ -differential forms on M whose exterior differentials are  $L^p$  as well,

 $R^{k,p}$  is called the reduced cohomology.  $T^{k,p}$  is called the torsion.

Here  $H^{0,p} = 0 = H^{2,p}$  for all *p*.



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

$$H^{1,2} = R^{1,2}$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

$$\begin{aligned} H^{1,2} &= R^{1,2} \\ &= \{L^2 \text{ harmonic 1-forms}\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{array}{lll} H^{1,2} &=& R^{1,2} \\ &=& \{L^2 \text{ harmonic 1-forms}\} \\ &=& \{\text{harmonic functions } h \text{ on } H^2_{\mathbb{R}} \text{ with } \nabla h \in L^2\}/\mathbb{R} \,. \end{array}$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ □臣 = のへで

$$\begin{array}{lll} H^{1,2} &=& R^{1,2} \\ &=& \{L^2 \text{ harmonic 1-forms}\} \\ &=& \{\text{harmonic functions } h \text{ on } H^2_{\mathbb{R}} \text{ with } \nabla h \in L^2\}/\mathbb{R}. \end{array}$$

Using conformal invariance, switch from hyperbolic metric to euclidean metric on the disk D.

$$H^{1,2}$$
 = {harmonic functions  $h$  on  $D$  with  $\nabla h \in L^2$ }/ $\mathbb{R}$ 

$$\begin{array}{lll} H^{1,2} &=& R^{1,2} \\ &=& \{L^2 \text{ harmonic 1-forms}\} \\ &=& \{\text{harmonic functions } h \text{ on } H^2_{\mathbb{R}} \text{ with } \nabla h \in L^2\}/\mathbb{R} \,. \end{array}$$

Using conformal invariance, switch from hyperbolic metric to euclidean metric on the disk D.

$$\begin{aligned} H^{1,2} &= \{ \text{harmonic functions } h \text{ on } D \text{ with } \nabla h \in L^2 \} / \mathbb{R} \\ &= \{ \text{Fourier series } \Sigma a_n e^{in\theta} \text{ with } a_0 = 0, \Sigma |n| |a_n|^2 < +\infty \}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{array}{lll} H^{1,2} &=& R^{1,2} \\ &=& \{L^2 \text{ harmonic 1-forms}\} \\ &=& \{\text{harmonic functions } h \text{ on } H^2_{\mathbb{R}} \text{ with } \nabla h \in L^2\}/\mathbb{R}. \end{array}$$

Using conformal invariance, switch from hyperbolic metric to euclidean metric on the disk D.

$$\begin{aligned} H^{1,2} &= \{ \text{harmonic functions } h \text{ on } D \text{ with } \nabla h \in L^2 \} / \mathbb{R} \\ &= \{ \text{Fourier series } \Sigma a_n e^{in\theta} \text{ with } a_0 = 0, \Sigma |n| |a_n|^2 < +\infty \}, \end{aligned}$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

which is Sobolev space  $H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z})$  mod constants.

$$\begin{array}{lll} H^{1,2} &=& R^{1,2} \\ &=& \{L^2 \text{ harmonic 1-forms}\} \\ &=& \{\text{harmonic functions } h \text{ on } H^2_{\mathbb{R}} \text{ with } \nabla h \in L^2\}/\mathbb{R} \end{array}$$

Using conformal invariance, switch from hyperbolic metric to euclidean metric on the disk D.

$$\begin{aligned} H^{1,2} &= \{ \text{harmonic functions } h \text{ on } D \text{ with } \nabla h \in L^2 \} / \mathbb{R} \\ &= \{ \text{Fourier series } \Sigma a_n e^{in\theta} \text{ with } a_0 = 0, \Sigma |n| |a_n|^2 < +\infty \}, \end{aligned}$$

which is Sobolev space  $H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z})$  mod constants.

More generally, for p > 1,  $T^{1,p} = 0$  and  $H^{1,p}$  is equal to the Besov space  $B_{p,p}^{1/p}(\mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z})$  mod constants.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ □臣 = のへで

<□ > < @ > < E > < E > E のQ @

 $H^{0,p} = 0.$ 

<□ > < @ > < E > < E > E のQ @

$$H^{0,p} = 0.$$

 $R^{1,p} = 0,$ 

 $H^{0,p} = 0.$ 

 $R^{1,p} = 0,$ 

since every function in  $L^{p}(\mathbb{R})$  can be approximated in  $L^{p}$  with derivatives of compactly supported functions. Therefore  $H^{1,p}$  is only torsion.

 $H^{0,p} = 0.$ 

 $R^{1,p} = 0,$ 

since every function in  $L^{p}(\mathbb{R})$  can be approximated in  $L^{p}$  with derivatives of compactly supported functions. Therefore  $H^{1,p}$  is only torsion.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

 $T^{1,p}$  is non zero and thus infinite dimensional.

 $H^{0,p} = 0.$ 

 $R^{1,p} = 0,$ 

since every function in  $L^{p}(\mathbb{R})$  can be approximated in  $L^{p}$  with derivatives of compactly supported functions. Therefore  $H^{1,p}$  is only torsion.

 $T^{1,p}$  is non zero and thus infinite dimensional.

Indeed, the 1-form  $\frac{dt}{t}$  (cut off near the origin) is in  $L^p$  for all p > 1 but it is not the differential of a function in  $L^p$ .

- L<sup>p</sup>-cohomology has been used (L. Saper, S. Zucker) to study manifolds with thin ends. The answer is related to the topology of a compactification.
- ▶ In this talk: manifolds with large ends, e.g. groups. L<sup>p</sup>-cohomology is related to analytic features of a compactification.

 ${\rm cohomology} \ \ \rightarrow \ \ {\rm continuous\ maps}$ 



- cohomology  $\rightarrow$  continuous maps
- $L^p$ -cohomology  $\rightarrow$  uniform maps.

<□ > < @ > < E > < E > E のQ @

cohomology	$\rightarrow$	continuous maps
$L^p\text{-}\mathrm{cohomology}$	$\rightarrow$	uniform maps.

A map  $f : X \to Y$  between metric spaces is uniform if d(f(x), f(x')) is bounded from above in terms of d(x, x') only.

cohomology	$\rightarrow$	continuous maps
$L^p\text{-}\mathrm{cohomology}$	$\rightarrow$	uniform maps.

A map  $f : X \to Y$  between metric spaces is uniform if d(f(x), f(x')) is bounded from above in terms of d(x, x') only.

## Examples

The obvious map  $\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R}$  is uniform. Any homomorphism between groups (with left invariant metrics) is uniform. The parametrization of a cusp by a punctured disk is not uniform.

cohomology	$\rightarrow$	continuous maps
$L^p$ -cohomology	$\rightarrow$	uniform maps.

A map  $f : X \to Y$  between metric spaces is uniform if d(f(x), f(x')) is bounded from above in terms of d(x, x') only.

## Examples

The obvious map  $\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R}$  is uniform. Any homomorphism between groups (with left invariant metrics) is uniform. The parametrization of a cusp by a punctured disk is not uniform.



#### Proposition

Among contractible Riemannian manifolds admitting a cocompact isometric group action, L<sup>p</sup>-cohomology is natural under uniform maps.

# L<sup>p</sup>-cohomology of discrete groups

 $L^p$ -cohomology can be discretized.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

 $L^p$ -cohomology can be discretized. It makes sense for discrete groups, and cannot see any difference between a cocompact lattice in a semi-simple Lie group *G*, the Lie group *G* itself or the Riemannian homogeneous space *G*/*K*, *K* compact.  $L^p$ -cohomology can be discretized. It makes sense for discrete groups, and cannot see any difference between a cocompact lattice in a semi-simple Lie group *G*, the Lie group *G* itself or the Riemannian homogeneous space G/K, *K* compact.

In conclusion,

- ► *L<sup>p</sup>*-cohomology is a tool to investigate discrete groups.
- It shares nearly all properties of usual cohomology.
- Nevertheless, it is not easy to calculate it.
- In the case of cocompact lattices in Lie groups, it can probably be computed by analytic means.

▲ロト ▲帰ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト 三日 - の々ぐ

 $L^p$ -cohomology can be discretized. It makes sense for discrete groups, and cannot see any difference between a cocompact lattice in a semi-simple Lie group *G*, the Lie group *G* itself or the Riemannian homogeneous space G/K, *K* compact.

In conclusion,

- ► *L<sup>p</sup>*-cohomology is a tool to investigate discrete groups.
- It shares nearly all properties of usual cohomology.
- Nevertheless, it is not easy to calculate it.
- In the case of cocompact lattices in Lie groups, it can probably be computed by analytic means.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

 $L^2$ -invariants are a huge subject. In this course, we explain a few applications of  $L^p$ -cohomology,  $p \neq 2$ , to negatively curved Riemannian manifolds and groups.

- 1. Hopf Euler characteristic conjecture
- 2. Cannon conjecture on hyperbolic groups with boundary a 2-sphere
- 3. Classification of hyperbolic compactly generated groups
- 4. Coarse and large scale conformal embeddings
- 5. Curvature pinching

- 1. Hopf Euler characteristic conjecture
- 2. Cannon conjecture on groups with boundary a 2-sphere
- 3. Classification of hyperbolic compactly generated groups

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

- 4. Coarse and large scale conformal embeddings
- 5. Curvature pinching

### Remark

- Compact 2-dimensional negatively curved manifolds have negative Euler characteristic.
- ▶ 2m-dimensional compact hyperbolic manifolds have Euler characteristic proportional to (-1)<sup>m</sup>.
- This generalizes to all compact negatively curved locally symmetric spaces (Gauss-Bonnet).

## Remark

- Compact 2-dimensional negatively curved manifolds have negative Euler characteristic.
- ▶ 2m-dimensional compact hyperbolic manifolds have Euler characteristic proportional to (-1)<sup>m</sup>.
- This generalizes to all compact negatively curved locally symmetric spaces (Gauss-Bonnet).

## Conjecture (H. Hopf)

If M is 2m-dimensional compact negatively curved, then  $(-1)^m \chi(M) > 0$ .

The conjecture is often extended to all aspherical manifolds. See M. Davies and B. Eckman's surveys in *Guido's book of conjectures*, and W. Lück's survey in *Bulletin of the Manifold Atlas*.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

## Remark

- Compact 2-dimensional negatively curved manifolds have negative Euler characteristic.
- ▶ 2m-dimensional compact hyperbolic manifolds have Euler characteristic proportional to (-1)<sup>m</sup>.
- This generalizes to all compact negatively curved locally symmetric spaces (Gauss-Bonnet).

## Conjecture (H. Hopf)

If M is 2m-dimensional compact negatively curved, then  $(-1)^m \chi(M) > 0$ .

The conjecture is often extended to all aspherical manifolds. See M. Davies and B. Eckman's surveys in *Guido's book of conjectures*, and W. Lück's survey in *Bulletin of the Manifold Atlas*.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Theorem (*M. Gromov, 1991*). This is true provided *M* also admits a Kähler metric.

A Riemannian manifold M is Kähler if it admits a parallel complex structure.

A Riemannian manifold M is Kähler if it admits a parallel complex structure.

Then M is a complex manifold. Every complex submanifold in complex projective space admits a Kähler metric.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ □臣 = のへで

A Riemannian manifold M is Kähler if it admits a parallel complex structure.

Then M is a complex manifold. Every complex submanifold in complex projective space admits a Kähler metric.

#### Proposition

(Part of hard Lefschetz theorem). Let  $M^{2m}$  be a compact Kähler manifold with Kähler form  $\omega$ . Then wedging with  $\omega$  maps harmonic forms to harmonic forms,

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ □臣 = のへで
# Definition

A Riemannian manifold M is Kähler if it admits a parallel complex structure.

Then M is a complex manifold. Every complex submanifold in complex projective space admits a Kähler metric.

#### Proposition

(Part of hard Lefschetz theorem). Let  $M^{2m}$  be a compact Kähler manifold with Kähler form  $\omega$ . Then wedging with  $\omega$  maps harmonic forms to harmonic forms, and this induces an injection in cohomology  $H^k(M, \mathbb{R}) \to H^{k+2}(M, \mathbb{R})$  for all k < m.

▲ロト ▲帰ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト 三日 - の々ぐ

# Definition

A Riemannian manifold M is Kähler if it admits a parallel complex structure.

Then M is a complex manifold. Every complex submanifold in complex projective space admits a Kähler metric.

#### Proposition

(Part of hard Lefschetz theorem). Let  $M^{2m}$  be a compact Kähler manifold with Kähler form  $\omega$ . Then wedging with  $\omega$  maps harmonic forms to harmonic forms, and this induces an injection in cohomology  $H^k(M, \mathbb{R}) \to H^{k+2}(M, \mathbb{R})$  for all k < m.

## Corollary

Let  $M^{2m}$  be a complete Kähler manifold with Kähler form  $\omega$ . Then wedging with  $\omega$  maps  $L^2$ -harmonic forms to  $L^2$ -harmonic forms, and this induces an injection in reduced  $L^2$ -cohomology  $R^{k,2}(M) \rightarrow R^{k+2}(M)$  for all k < m.

(*M.* Gromov). Let  $\tilde{M}$  be a complete simply connected negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Let  $k \ge 2$ .

Coning of cycles). Every k − 1-cycle z spans a k-chain c with vol(c) ≤ const. vol(z).

(*M.* Gromov). Let  $\tilde{M}$  be a complete simply connected negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Let  $k \geq 2$ .

- (Coning of cycles). Every k 1-cycle z spans a k-chain c with  $vol(c) \leq const. vol(z)$ .
- (Coning of forms). Every closed bounded differential k-form α on M̃ is the differential of a bounded (k − 1)-form β with || β ||<sub>1</sub>∞ ≤ const. || α ||<sub>1</sub>∞.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

(*M.* Gromov). Let  $\tilde{M}$  be a complete simply connected negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Let  $k \ge 2$ .

- (Coning of cycles). Every k 1-cycle z spans a k-chain c with  $vol(c) \leq const. vol(z)$ .
- (Coning of forms). Every closed bounded differential k-form α on M̃ is the differential of a bounded (k − 1)-form β with || β ||<sub>1</sub>∞ ≤ const. || α ||<sub>1</sub>∞.

## Corollary

Assume  $\tilde{M}^{2m}$  covers both a compact Kähler manifold and a compact negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Then  $R^{k,2}(\tilde{M}) = 0$  for all  $k \neq m$ .

(*M.* Gromov). Let  $\tilde{M}$  be a complete simply connected negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Let  $k \ge 2$ .

- (Coning of cycles). Every k 1-cycle z spans a k-chain c with  $vol(c) \leq const. vol(z)$ .
- (Coning of forms). Every closed bounded differential k-form α on M̃ is the differential of a bounded (k − 1)-form β with || β ||<sub>1</sub>∞ ≤ const. || α ||<sub>1</sub>∞.

## Corollary

Assume  $\tilde{M}^{2m}$  covers both a compact Kähler manifold and a compact negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Then  $R^{k,2}(\tilde{M}) = 0$  for all  $k \neq m$ . Furthermore,  $T^{*,2}(\tilde{M}) = 0$ .

(*M.* Gromov). Let  $\tilde{M}$  be a complete simply connected negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Let  $k \ge 2$ .

- (Coning of cycles). Every k 1-cycle z spans a k-chain c with  $vol(c) \leq const. vol(z)$ .
- (Coning of forms). Every closed bounded differential k-form α on M̃ is the differential of a bounded (k − 1)-form β with || β ||<sub>1</sub>∞ ≤ const. || α ||<sub>1</sub>∞.

## Corollary

Assume  $\tilde{M}^{2m}$  covers both a compact Kähler manifold and a compact negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Then  $R^{k,2}(\tilde{M}) = 0$  for all  $k \neq m$ . Furthermore,  $T^{*,2}(\tilde{M}) = 0$ . Proof. Lift Kähler form to universal cover  $\tilde{M}$ . Write  $\omega = db$  with b bounded.

(*M.* Gromov). Let  $\tilde{M}$  be a complete simply connected negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Let  $k \ge 2$ .

- (Coning of cycles). Every k − 1-cycle z spans a k-chain c with vol(c) ≤ const. vol(z).
- (Coning of forms). Every closed bounded differential k-form α on M̃ is the differential of a bounded (k − 1)-form β with || β ||<sub>1</sub>∞ ≤ const. || α ||<sub>1</sub>∞.

#### Corollary

Assume  $\tilde{M}^{2m}$  covers both a compact Kähler manifold and a compact negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Then  $R^{k,2}(\tilde{M}) = 0$  for all  $k \neq m$ . Furthermore,  $T^{*,2}(\tilde{M}) = 0$ . Proof. Lift Kähler form to universal cover  $\tilde{M}$ . Write  $\omega = db$  with b bounded. Let k < m. For  $\alpha$  a closed k-form in  $L^2$ ,

 $\omega \wedge \alpha = d(b \wedge \alpha)$  and  $b \wedge \alpha \in L^2$ ,

(M. Gromov). Let  $\tilde{M}$  be a complete simply connected negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Let  $k \geq 2$ .

- (Coning of cycles). Every k − 1-cycle z spans a k-chain c with vol(c) ≤ const. vol(z).
- (Coning of forms). Every closed bounded differential k-form α on M̃ is the differential of a bounded (k − 1)-form β with || β ||<sub>1</sub>∞ ≤ const. || α ||<sub>1</sub>∞.

#### Corollary

Assume  $\tilde{M}^{2m}$  covers both a compact Kähler manifold and a compact negatively curved Riemannian manifold. Then  $R^{k,2}(\tilde{M}) = 0$  for all  $k \neq m$ . Furthermore,  $T^{*,2}(\tilde{M}) = 0$ . Proof. Lift Kähler form to universal cover  $\tilde{M}$ . Write  $\omega = db$  with b bounded. Let k < m. For  $\alpha$  a closed k-form in  $L^2$ ,

 $\omega \wedge \alpha = d(b \wedge \alpha)$  and  $b \wedge \alpha \in L^2$ ,

thus  $\omega \wedge \alpha = 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{k+2,2}(\tilde{M})$ . If  $\alpha$  is harmonic, conclude that  $\alpha = 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{k,2}(\tilde{M})$ .

Let  $\alpha$  be a k-form in  $L^2$ , k < m. Let us show that  $\|\alpha\|_2^2 \leq C \langle \Delta \alpha, \alpha \rangle$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \|\alpha\|^2 &= \|\omega \wedge \alpha\|^2 = \langle \omega \wedge \alpha, db \wedge \alpha \rangle = \langle \omega \wedge \alpha, d(b \wedge \alpha) \rangle + \langle \omega \wedge \alpha, b \wedge d\alpha \rangle \\ &\leq \|b\|_{\infty} \|\alpha\| (\|d^*(\omega \wedge \alpha)\| + \|d\alpha\|). \end{aligned}$$

◆□ ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 • 의 Q @</p>

Let  $\alpha$  be a k-form in  $L^2$ , k < m. Let us show that  $\|\alpha\|_2^2 \leq C \langle \Delta \alpha, \alpha \rangle$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \|\alpha\|^2 &= \|\omega \wedge \alpha\|^2 = \langle \omega \wedge \alpha, db \wedge \alpha \rangle = \langle \omega \wedge \alpha, d(b \wedge \alpha) \rangle + \langle \omega \wedge \alpha, b \wedge d\alpha \rangle \\ &\leq \|b\|_{\infty} \|\alpha\| (\|d^*(\omega \wedge \alpha)\| + \|d\alpha\|). \end{aligned}$$

$$\|\boldsymbol{d}^*(\omega \wedge \alpha)\|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{d}(\omega \wedge \alpha)\|^2 = \langle \Delta(\omega \wedge \alpha), \omega \wedge \alpha \rangle = \langle \omega \wedge \Delta\alpha, \omega \wedge \alpha \rangle = \langle \Delta\alpha, \alpha \rangle.$$

◆□ ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 • 의 Q @</p>

Let  $\alpha$  be a k-form in  $L^2$ , k < m. Let us show that  $\|\alpha\|_2^2 \leq C \langle \Delta \alpha, \alpha \rangle$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \|\alpha\|^2 &= \|\omega \wedge \alpha\|^2 = \langle \omega \wedge \alpha, db \wedge \alpha \rangle = \langle \omega \wedge \alpha, d(b \wedge \alpha) \rangle + \langle \omega \wedge \alpha, b \wedge d\alpha \rangle \\ &\leq \|b\|_{\infty} \|\alpha\| (\|d^*(\omega \wedge \alpha)\| + \|d\alpha\|). \end{aligned}$$

 $\|d^*(\omega \wedge \alpha)\|^2 + \|d(\omega \wedge \alpha)\|^2 = \langle \Delta(\omega \wedge \alpha), \omega \wedge \alpha \rangle = \langle \omega \wedge \Delta \alpha, \omega \wedge \alpha \rangle = \langle \Delta \alpha, \alpha \rangle.$ thus

・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・

$$\|\alpha\|^2 \leq 4\|b\|_{\infty}^2 \langle \Delta \alpha, \alpha \rangle = C^2 \left(\|d\alpha\|^2 + \|d^*\alpha\|^2\right).$$

Let  $\alpha$  be a k-form in  $L^2$ , k < m. Let us show that  $\|\alpha\|_2^2 \leq C \langle \Delta \alpha, \alpha \rangle$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \|\alpha\|^2 &= \|\omega \wedge \alpha\|^2 = \langle \omega \wedge \alpha, db \wedge \alpha \rangle = \langle \omega \wedge \alpha, d(b \wedge \alpha) \rangle + \langle \omega \wedge \alpha, b \wedge d\alpha \rangle \\ &\leq \|b\|_{\infty} \|\alpha\| (\|d^*(\omega \wedge \alpha)\| + \|d\alpha\|). \end{aligned}$$

$$\|d^*(\omega \wedge \alpha)\|^2 + \|d(\omega \wedge \alpha)\|^2 = \langle \Delta(\omega \wedge \alpha), \omega \wedge \alpha \rangle = \langle \omega \wedge \Delta\alpha, \omega \wedge \alpha \rangle = \langle \Delta\alpha, \alpha \rangle.$$

thus

$$\|\alpha\|^{2} \leq 4\|b\|_{\infty}^{2} \langle \Delta \alpha, \alpha \rangle = C^{2} \left(\|d\alpha\|^{2} + \|d^{*}\alpha\|^{2}\right).$$

We show that  $T^{k,2} = 0$  by induction on k. On 0-forms,  $d^{\alpha} = 0$ , hence  $\|\alpha\| \le C \|d\alpha\|$ , and  $dL^2\Omega^0$  is closed in  $L^2\Omega^1$ . If  $\alpha \in L^2\Omega^2$ ,  $\alpha = d\beta$  is an exact 2-form, there exists  $\beta' \in L^2\Omega^1$  of minimal norm such that  $d\beta' = \alpha$ . Since  $d^*\beta' = 0$ ,  $\|\beta'\| \le C \|d\beta'\| = \|\alpha\|$ , and  $dL^2\Omega^1$  is closed in  $L^2\Omega^2$ , and so on.

Let  $\alpha$  be a k-form in  $L^2$ , k < m. Let us show that  $\|\alpha\|_2^2 \leq C \langle \Delta \alpha, \alpha \rangle$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \|\alpha\|^2 &= \|\omega \wedge \alpha\|^2 = \langle \omega \wedge \alpha, db \wedge \alpha \rangle = \langle \omega \wedge \alpha, d(b \wedge \alpha) \rangle + \langle \omega \wedge \alpha, b \wedge d\alpha \rangle \\ &\leq \|b\|_{\infty} \|\alpha\| (\|d^*(\omega \wedge \alpha)\| + \|d\alpha\|). \end{aligned}$$

$$\|d^*(\omega \wedge \alpha)\|^2 + \|d(\omega \wedge \alpha)\|^2 = \langle \Delta(\omega \wedge \alpha), \omega \wedge \alpha \rangle = \langle \omega \wedge \Delta\alpha, \omega \wedge \alpha \rangle = \langle \Delta\alpha, \alpha \rangle.$$

thus

$$\|\alpha\|^2 \leq 4\|b\|_{\infty}^2 \langle \Delta \alpha, \alpha \rangle = C^2 \left(\|d\alpha\|^2 + \|d^*\alpha\|^2\right).$$

We show that  $T^{k,2} = 0$  by induction on k. On 0-forms,  $d^{\alpha} = 0$ , hence  $\|\alpha\| \le C \|d\alpha\|$ , and  $dL^2\Omega^0$  is closed in  $L^2\Omega^1$ . If  $\alpha \in L^2\Omega^2$ ,  $\alpha = d\beta$  is an exact 2-form, there exists  $\beta' \in L^2\Omega^1$  of minimal norm such that  $d\beta' = \alpha$ . Since  $d^*\beta' = 0$ ,  $\|\beta'\| \le C \|d\beta'\| = \|\alpha\|$ , and  $dL^2\Omega^1$  is closed in  $L^2\Omega^2$ , and so on.

Furthermore  $\Delta$  is invertible on  $(\ker \Delta)^{\perp}$ . Indeed, Hodge decomposition  $L^2\Omega^m = \ker \Delta \oplus \overline{dL^2\Omega^{m-1}} \oplus \overline{d^*L^2\Omega^{m+1}}$ , which holds in general for complete Riemannian manifolds, reads  $L^2\Omega^m = \ker \Delta \oplus \overline{dL^2\Omega^{m-1}} \oplus \overline{dL^2\Omega^{m-1}}$ . Since  $\Delta$  commutes with d and  $\star$ , inequality  $\|\alpha\|^2 \leq C^2 \langle \Delta \alpha, \alpha \rangle$  persists on  $(\ker \Delta)^{\perp}$  in degree m.

Let  $\tilde{M}$  cover a compact manifold M. If nonzero,  $R^{k,2}(\tilde{M})$  is infinite dimensional.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

# L<sup>2</sup>-Betti numbers

Let  $\tilde{M}$  cover a compact manifold M. If nonzero,  $R^{k,2}(\tilde{M})$  is infinite dimensional. Nevertheless, M. Atiyah has defined a von Neumann dimension

$$b^{k,2}(M) = \dim_{vN} R^{k,2}(\tilde{M}),$$

called the k-th  $L^2$ -Betti number of M.

# L<sup>2</sup>-Betti numbers

Let  $\tilde{M}$  cover a compact manifold M. If nonzero,  $R^{k,2}(\tilde{M})$  is infinite dimensional. Nevertheless, M. Atiyah has defined a von Neumann dimension

$$b^{k,2}(M) = \dim_{vN} R^{k,2}(\tilde{M})$$

called the k-th  $L^2$ -Betti number of M.

Example (W. Lück)

If M admits a tower of finite degree  $d_j$  normal coverings  $M_j$  such that  $\bigcap_j \pi_1(M_j) = \{1\},$  then

$$b^{k,2}(M) = \lim_{j \to \infty} \frac{b^k(M_j, \mathbb{R})}{d_j}.$$

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

# L<sup>2</sup>-Betti numbers

Let  $\tilde{M}$  cover a compact manifold M. If nonzero,  $R^{k,2}(\tilde{M})$  is infinite dimensional. Nevertheless, M. Atiyah has defined a von Neumann dimension

$$b^{k,2}(M) = \dim_{vN} R^{k,2}(\tilde{M})$$

called the k-th  $L^2$ -Betti number of M.

# Example (W. Lück)

If M admits a tower of finite degree  $d_j$  normal coverings  $M_j$  such that  $\bigcap_j \pi_1(M_j) = \{1\}$ , then

$$b^{k,2}(M) = \lim_{j\to\infty} \frac{b^k(M_j,\mathbb{R})}{d_j}.$$

#### Proposition

Let  $\tilde{M}$  cover a compact manifold M. Then

$$\chi(M) = \sum_{k} (-1)^{k} b^{k,2}(M).$$

(Relative index theorem, M. Gromov-B. Lawson). Let  $\tilde{M}$  be a simply connected nonpositively curved Riemannian manifold. Then there exists k such that  $H^{k,2}(\tilde{M}) \neq 0$ .

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

(Relative index theorem, M. Gromov-B. Lawson). Let  $\tilde{M}$  be a simply connected nonpositively curved Riemannian manifold. Then there exists k such that  $H^{k,2}(\tilde{M}) \neq 0$ .

See Pansu's notes on  $L^2$  Betti numbers.

Proof of Gromov's theorem. Assume M is compact and admits both a negatively curved metric and a Kähler metric. Then all  $b^{k,2}(M)$  vanish except  $b^{m,2}(M)$ , which is nonzero, thus  $(-1)^m \chi(M) = b^{m,2}(M) > 0$ .

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

(Relative index theorem, M. Gromov-B. Lawson). Let  $\tilde{M}$  be a simply connected nonpositively curved Riemannian manifold. Then there exists k such that  $H^{k,2}(\tilde{M}) \neq 0$ .

See Pansu's notes on  $L^2$  Betti numbers.

Proof of Gromov's theorem. Assume M is compact and admits both a negatively curved metric and a Kähler metric. Then all  $b^{k,2}(M)$  vanish except  $b^{m,2}(M)$ , which is nonzero, thus  $(-1)^m \chi(M) = b^{m,2}(M) > 0$ .

In conclusion, we have used

Lefschetz mechanism, L<sup>2</sup>-Betti numbers.

(Relative index theorem, M. Gromov-B. Lawson). Let  $\tilde{M}$  be a simply connected nonpositively curved Riemannian manifold. Then there exists k such that  $H^{k,2}(\tilde{M}) \neq 0$ .

See Pansu's notes on  $L^2$  Betti numbers.

Proof of Gromov's theorem. Assume M is compact and admits both a negatively curved metric and a Kähler metric. Then all  $b^{k,2}(M)$  vanish except  $b^{m,2}(M)$ , which is nonzero, thus  $(-1)^m \chi(M) = b^{m,2}(M) > 0$ .

In conclusion, we have used

- Lefschetz mechanism, L<sup>2</sup>-Betti numbers.
- ► Vanishing of L<sup>∞</sup>-cohomology.

(Relative index theorem, M. Gromov-B. Lawson). Let  $\tilde{M}$  be a simply connected nonpositively curved Riemannian manifold. Then there exists k such that  $H^{k,2}(\tilde{M}) \neq 0$ .

See Pansu's notes on  $L^2$  Betti numbers.

Proof of Gromov's theorem. Assume M is compact and admits both a negatively curved metric and a Kähler metric. Then all  $b^{k,2}(M)$  vanish except  $b^{m,2}(M)$ , which is nonzero, thus  $(-1)^m \chi(M) = b^{m,2}(M) > 0$ .

In conclusion, we have used

- Lefschetz mechanism, L<sup>2</sup>-Betti numbers.
- ► Vanishing of L<sup>∞</sup>-cohomology.
- Cup-product  $H^{k,2} \otimes H^{2,\infty} \to H^{k+2,\infty}$ .

Gromov calls Kähler manifolds  $(M, \omega)$  such that  $\omega = db$ ,  $b \in L^{\infty}$ , Kähler hyperbolic manifolds. Hermitian symmetric spaces are Kähler hyperbolic. Teichmüller space is Kähler hyperbolic (S. Kruskal).

For such manifolds, Gromov's theorem determines the sign of the Euler characteristics of all the sheaves  $\Omega^q$  of exterior powers of the complex cotangent bundle.

Nonvanishing of  $L^2$ -cohomology is equivalent to 0 belonging to the  $L^2$  spectrum of  $\Delta$ . J. Lott's *zero in the spectrum conjecture* states that this should be the case for the universal coverings of all compact aspherical manifolds. There is a non-aspherical counterexample (M. Farber and S. Weinberger).

1. Hopf Euler characteristic conjecture Interlude: more on  $L^{\infty}/L^{p}$  cohomology of hyperbolic groups

- 2. Cannon conjecture on groups with boundary a 2-sphere
- 3. Classification of hyperbolic compactly generated groups
- 4. Coarse and large scale conformal embeddings
- 5. Curvature pinching

Remark  $H^{0,\infty}$  counts connected components. For unbounded metric spaces,  $H^{1,\infty} \neq 0$ .

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

 $H^{0,\infty}$  counts connected components. For unbounded metric spaces,  $H^{1,\infty} \neq 0$ .

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

# Theorem (M. Gromov 1986)

For a finitely generated group G, G is hyperbolic  $\Leftrightarrow H^{2,\infty}(G) = 0 \Leftrightarrow H^{k,\infty}(G) = 0$  for all  $k \ge 2$ .

 $H^{0,\infty}$  counts connected components. For unbounded metric spaces,  $H^{1,\infty} \neq 0$ .

# Theorem (M. Gromov 1986)

For a finitely generated group G, G is hyperbolic  $\Leftrightarrow H^{2,\infty}(G) = 0 \Leftrightarrow H^{k,\infty}(G) = 0$  for all  $k \ge 2$ .

# **Step 1. Duality Lemma**. For a manifold M, $H^{k,\infty}(M) = 0 \Leftrightarrow$ linear filling in dimension k, i.e. every k-cycle S bounds a k + 1-current T with $Mass(T) \leq C Mass(S)$ .

 $H^{0,\infty}$  counts connected components. For unbounded metric spaces,  $H^{1,\infty} \neq 0$ .

# Theorem (M. Gromov 1986)

For a finitely generated group G, G is hyperbolic  $\Leftrightarrow H^{2,\infty}(G) = 0 \Leftrightarrow H^{k,\infty}(G) = 0$  for all  $k \ge 2$ .

**Step 1. Duality Lemma**. For a manifold M,  $H^{k,\infty}(M) = 0 \Leftrightarrow$  linear filling in dimension k, i.e. every k-cycle S bounds a k + 1-current T with  $Mass(T) \leq C Mass(S)$ .

Step 2. Filling inequalities are quasi-isometry invariant. Pass from current to disk...

 $H^{0,\infty}$  counts connected components. For unbounded metric spaces,  $H^{1,\infty} \neq 0$ .

# Theorem (M. Gromov 1986)

For a finitely generated group G, G is hyperbolic  $\Leftrightarrow H^{2,\infty}(G) = 0 \Leftrightarrow H^{k,\infty}(G) = 0$  for all  $k \ge 2$ .

**Step 1. Duality Lemma**. For a manifold M,  $H^{k,\infty}(M) = 0 \Leftrightarrow$  linear filling in dimension k, i.e. every k-cycle S bounds a k + 1-current T with  $Mass(T) \leq C Mass(S)$ .

Step 2. Filling inequalities are quasi-isometry invariant. Pass from current to disk...

**Step 3**. Bonk-Schramm show that G hyperbolic is quasi-isometric to a convex subset of  $H_{\mathbb{R}}^n$ , n large.

 $H^{0,\infty}$  counts connected components. For unbounded metric spaces,  $H^{1,\infty} \neq 0$ .

# Theorem (M. Gromov 1986)

For a finitely generated group G, G is hyperbolic  $\Leftrightarrow H^{2,\infty}(G) = 0 \Leftrightarrow H^{k,\infty}(G) = 0$  for all  $k \ge 2$ .

**Step 1. Duality Lemma**. For a manifold M,  $H^{k,\infty}(M) = 0 \Leftrightarrow$  linear filling in dimension k, i.e. every k-cycle S bounds a k + 1-current T with  $Mass(T) \leq C Mass(S)$ .

Step 2. Filling inequalities are quasi-isometry invariant. Pass from current to disk...

**Step 3**. Bonk-Schramm show that G hyperbolic is quasi-isometric to a convex subset of  $H_{\mathbb{R}}^n$ , n large.

**Step 4**. In a convex subset of  $H^n_{\mathbb{R}}$ , the cone over S has Mass  $\leq C$  Mass(S).

 $H^{0,\infty}$  counts connected components. For unbounded metric spaces,  $H^{1,\infty} \neq 0$ .

# Theorem (M. Gromov 1986)

For a finitely generated group G, G is hyperbolic  $\Leftrightarrow H^{2,\infty}(G) = 0 \Leftrightarrow H^{k,\infty}(G) = 0$  for all  $k \ge 2$ .

**Step 1. Duality Lemma**. For a manifold M,  $H^{k,\infty}(M) = 0 \Leftrightarrow$  linear filling in dimension k, i.e. every k-cycle S bounds a k + 1-current T with  $Mass(T) \leq C Mass(S)$ .

Step 2. Filling inequalities are quasi-isometry invariant. Pass from current to disk...

**Step 3**. Bonk-Schramm show that G hyperbolic is quasi-isometric to a convex subset of  $H_{\mathbb{R}}^n$ , n large.

**Step 4**. In a convex subset of  $H^n_{\mathbb{R}}$ , the cone over S has Mass  $\leq C$  Mass(S).

**Conclusion**.  $H^{2,\infty}(M) = 0 \Rightarrow$  linear filling of loops  $\Rightarrow G$  hyperbolic. Conversely, G hyperbolic  $\Rightarrow$  linear filling in all dimensions  $k \ge 2 \Rightarrow H^{k,\infty}(M) = 0$ .

#### Lemma

 $H^{k,\infty} = 0 \Leftrightarrow \forall$  bounded closed k-form  $\alpha$ ,  $\exists \beta$  with  $\|\beta\|_{\infty} \leq C \|\alpha\|_{\infty}$  s. t.  $d\beta = \alpha$ .

**Proof.** Use norm  $\|\alpha\|_{\infty} + \|d\alpha\|_{\infty}$  to complete smooth differential forms into a Banach space C. Then  $d : C \to C$  is continuous, with kernel Z. It descends to a continuous operator  $\overline{d} : C/Z \to Z$ . If  $L^{\infty}$ -cohomology vanishes, this is a continuous bijection between Banach spaces, hence an isomorphism. Get a smooth  $\beta$ ...

#### Proof of Duality Lemma.

A k-cycle S of finite mass  $M(S) := \sup\{\langle S, \beta \rangle; \|\beta\|_{\infty} \leq 1\}$  defines a functional on smooth bounded k-forms, which vanishes on exact forms. If  $L^{\infty}$ -cohomology vanishes, one can define a functional T on smooth bounded exact k + 1-forms by  $\langle T, \alpha \rangle = \langle S, \beta \rangle$  for some  $\beta$  such that  $d\beta = \alpha$ . Then T is bounded above by  $CM(S)\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ . By Hahn-Banach, T extends to a linear functional on smooth k + 1-forms, i.e. a current, of finite mass  $M(T) \leq CM(S)$  and such that  $\partial T = S$ .

The converse follows from the symmetry between differential forms and currents,  $\|\alpha\|_{\infty} = \sup\{\langle T, \alpha \rangle; M(T) \leq 1\}.$ 

# Example

Let M be n-dimensional, 1-connected, curvature  $-a^2 \le K \le -1$ . Then  $H^{1,p}(M) \ne 0$  provided p > (n-1)a.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

In horospherical coordinates  $(r, \theta)$ ,  $u = u(\theta)$  has  $|\nabla u| \leq C e^{-r}$ ,  $vol \leq e^{(n-1)ar}$ .

# Example

Let M be n-dimensional, 1-connected, curvature  $-a^2 \le K \le -1$ . Then  $H^{1,p}(M) \ne 0$  provided p > (n-1)a.

In horospherical coordinates  $(r, \theta)$ ,  $u = u(\theta)$  has  $|\nabla u| \leq C e^{-r}$ ,  $vol \leq e^{(n-1)ar}$ .

This is sharp. Functions with  $\|\nabla u\|_p < \infty$  on  $H^n_{\mathbb{R}}$  have a limit  $u_{\infty}$  along almost every ray,  $u \in L^p \Leftrightarrow u_{\infty} = 0$ . If  $p \le n-1$ ,  $\|\nabla u_{\partial B(r)}\|_p$  tends to 0, hence  $H^{1,p}(H^n_{\mathbb{R}}) = 0$  if  $p \le n-1$ .

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

#### Example

Let M be n-dimensional, 1-connected, curvature  $-a^2 \le K \le -1$ . Then  $H^{1,p}(M) \ne 0$  provided p > (n-1)a.

In horospherical coordinates  $(r, \theta)$ ,  $u = u(\theta)$  has  $|\nabla u| \leq C e^{-r}$ ,  $vol \leq e^{(n-1)ar}$ .

This is sharp. Functions with  $\|\nabla u\|_p < \infty$  on  $H^n_{\mathbb{R}}$  have a limit  $u_{\infty}$  along almost every ray,  $u \in L^p \Leftrightarrow u_{\infty} = 0$ . If  $p \le n-1$ ,  $\|\nabla u_{\partial B(r)}\|_p$  tends to 0, hence  $H^{1,p}(H^n_{\mathbb{R}}) = 0$  if  $p \le n-1$ .

# Theorem (Bourdon-Pajot)

Let G be a hyperbolic group.

1. There exists p(G) such that  $H^{1,p}(G) \neq 0$  for p > p(G).
# Example

Let M be n-dimensional, 1-connected, curvature  $-a^2 \le K \le -1$ . Then  $H^{1,p}(M) \ne 0$  provided p > (n-1)a.

In horospherical coordinates  $(r, \theta)$ ,  $u = u(\theta)$  has  $|\nabla u| \leq C e^{-r}$ ,  $vol \leq e^{(n-1)ar}$ .

This is sharp. Functions with  $\|\nabla u\|_p < \infty$  on  $H^n_{\mathbb{R}}$  have a limit  $u_{\infty}$  along almost every ray,  $u \in L^p \Leftrightarrow u_{\infty} = 0$ . If  $p \le n-1$ ,  $\|\nabla u_{\partial B(r)}\|_p$  tends to 0, hence  $H^{1,p}(H^n_{\mathbb{R}}) = 0$  if  $p \le n-1$ .

# Theorem (Bourdon-Pajot)

Let G be a hyperbolic group.

- 1. There exists p(G) such that  $H^{1,p}(G) \neq 0$  for p > p(G).
- 1, p-cohomology classes on hyperbolic groups have well-defined boundary values, so H<sup>1,p</sup>(G) identifies with a function space on ∂G.

Fix a visual metric on  $\partial G$ . Pick a maximal ball packing of  $\partial G$  at each scale  $2^{-k}$  and work on the incidence graph X whose vertices v correspond to balls  $B(x_v, r_v)$ . Then X is quasi-isometric to G. Given a Lipschitz function u on  $\partial G$ , set  $u(v) = u(x_v)$ . Then  $|\nabla u|(v) \sim r_v$ . If metric is Q-Ahlfors-regular,  $||\nabla u||_p < \infty$  if p > Q.

- 1. Hopf Euler characteristic conjecture
- 2. Cannon conjecture on groups with boundary a 2-sphere
- 3. Classification of hyperbolic compactly generated groups

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

- 4. Coarse and large scale conformal embeddings
- 5. Curvature pinching

# Theorem (W. Thurston 1979, G. Perelman 2002)

A closed 3-manifold group which is infinite, does not split as a free product and does not contain  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  is a cocompact lattice in SO(3,1).

# Theorem (W. Thurston 1979, G. Perelman 2002)

A closed 3-manifold group which is infinite, does not split as a free product and does not contain  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  is a cocompact lattice in SO(3,1).

If G is a lattice in SO(n, 1), then G is hyperbolic and its ideal boundary is an n-1-sphere.

# Theorem (W. Thurston 1979, G. Perelman 2002)

A closed 3-manifold group which is infinite, does not split as a free product and does not contain  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  is a cocompact lattice in SO(3,1).

If G is a lattice in SO(n, 1), then G is hyperbolic and its ideal boundary is an n-1-sphere.

# Conjecture (J. Cannon, circa 1988)

Let G be a hyperbolic group whose ideal boundary is a topological 2-sphere. Then G is virtually a cocompact lattice in SO(3, 1).

Before Perelman, it was thought of as an alternative to Thurston's methods. Avatar of Riemann mapping theorem: uniqueness of a (coarse) conformal structure on the 2-sphere with a large conformal group.

The ideal boundary of a hyperbolic group carries a natural conformal structure (technically, a quasi-Möbius structure), but no canonical metric.

(ロ)、(型)、(E)、(E)、 E) の(の)

The ideal boundary of a hyperbolic group carries a natural conformal structure (technically, a quasi-Möbius structure), but no canonical metric.

# Definition (Bourdon-Pajot)

Define the conformal dimension of a hyperbolic group as the least Hausdorff dimension of an Ahlfors-regular metric in the natural quasi-Möbius structure.

The ideal boundary of a hyperbolic group carries a natural conformal structure (technically, a quasi-Möbius structure), but no canonical metric.

# Definition (Bourdon-Pajot)

Define the conformal dimension of a hyperbolic group as the least Hausdorff dimension of an Ahlfors-regular metric in the natural quasi-Möbius structure.

Strategy (B. Kleiner). Prove that this infimum is achieved. Then prove that dimension minimizing metrics are Riemannian if boundary is 2-dimensional. Then apply a result of D. Sullivan (1978): every uniformly quasiconformal group of the standard 2-sphere is conjugate to a subgroup of SO(3, 1).

The ideal boundary of a hyperbolic group carries a natural conformal structure (technically, a quasi-Möbius structure), but no canonical metric.

# Definition (Bourdon-Pajot)

Define the conformal dimension of a hyperbolic group as the least Hausdorff dimension of an Ahlfors-regular metric in the natural quasi-Möbius structure.

Strategy (B. Kleiner). Prove that this infimum is achieved. Then prove that dimension minimizing metrics are Riemannian if boundary is 2-dimensional. Then apply a result of D. Sullivan (1978): every uniformly quasiconformal group of the standard 2-sphere is conjugate to a subgroup of SO(3, 1).

## Theorem (S. Keith-T. Laakso, M. Bonk-B. Kleiner 2005)

Let G be a hyperbolic group whose ideal boundary is a 2-sphere. If conformal dimension is achieved, then G is virtually a cocompact lattice in SO(3, 1).

For hyperbolic groups,  $H^{1,p}$  is nonzero for p large, but zero for p small.

# Definition

Define the  $L^p$ -dimension of a group as the least p > 1 such that its  $H^{1,p}$  is nonzero. For instance,  $L^p$ -dimension of hyperbolic *n*-space is n - 1.

For hyperbolic groups,  $H^{1,p}$  is nonzero for p large, but zero for p small.

# Definition

Define the  $L^p$ -dimension of a group as the least p > 1 such that its  $H^{1,p}$  is nonzero.

For instance,  $L^p$ -dimension of hyperbolic *n*-space is n - 1.

# Theorem (Same people + M. Bourdon-H. Pajot 2003)

Let G be a hyperbolic group. Then  $L^p$ -dimension is less than or equal to conformal dimension.

For hyperbolic groups,  $H^{1,p}$  is nonzero for p large, but zero for p small.

## Definition

Define the  $L^p$ -dimension of a group as the least p > 1 such that its  $H^{1,p}$  is nonzero.

For instance,  $L^p$ -dimension of hyperbolic *n*-space is n - 1.

# Theorem (Same people + M. Bourdon-H. Pajot 2003)

Let G be a hyperbolic group. Then  $L^p$ -dimension is less than or equal to conformal dimension. If conformal dimension is achieved, then G does not split over a virtually cyclic subgroup, and  $L^p$ -dimension and conformal dimension coincide.

For hyperbolic groups,  $H^{1,p}$  is nonzero for p large, but zero for p small.

## Definition

Define the  $L^p$ -dimension of a group as the least p > 1 such that its  $H^{1,p}$  is nonzero.

For instance,  $L^p$ -dimension of hyperbolic *n*-space is n - 1.

# Theorem (Same people + M. Bourdon-H. Pajot 2003)

Let G be a hyperbolic group. Then  $L^p$ -dimension is less than or equal to conformal dimension. If conformal dimension is achieved, then G does not split over a virtually cyclic subgroup, and  $L^p$ -dimension and conformal dimension coincide.

# Examples (M. Bourdon-H. Pajot)

There exist hyperbolic groups for which conformal dimension  $> 2 \ge L^{p}$ -dimension (and which do not split over virtually cyclic subgroups). For such groups, conformal dimension cannot be achieved.

Let  $G = A \star_C B$  where A and B are hyperbolic, C is quasi-convex and malnormal in both A and B. Then G is hyperbolic, A and B are quasi-convex in G, hence

 $\operatorname{ConfDim}(G) \ge \max{\operatorname{ConfDim}(A), \operatorname{ConfDim}(B)}.$ 

Mayer-Vietoris implies that

$$b^{1,2}(G) \ge b^{1,2}(A) + b^{1,2}(B) - b^{1,2}(C) > 0,$$

if  $b^{1,2}(A) > b^{1,2}(C)$ . For instance, let A and B be lattices of isometries of Bourdon buildings, A of large covolume and negative Euler characteristic, B of large conformal dimension, and C a free group on 2 generators. Then  $H^{1,2}(G) \neq 0$ , hence  $L^p - \dim(G) \leq 2 < \operatorname{ConfDim}(G)$ .

For a Bourdon building with *p*-sided right-angled faces and thickness *q*, Euler characteristic is proportional to  $q^2 - p(q-1)$ , conformal dimension equals  $1 + \frac{\log q}{\arg \cosh(\frac{p-2}{2})}$ .

Let  $G = A \star_C B$  where A and B are hyperbolic, C is quasi-convex and malnormal in both A and B. Then G is hyperbolic, A and B are quasi-convex in G, hence

 $\operatorname{ConfDim}(G) \ge \max{\operatorname{ConfDim}(A), \operatorname{ConfDim}(B)}.$ 

Mayer-Vietoris implies that

$$b^{1,2}(G) \ge b^{1,2}(A) + b^{1,2}(B) - b^{1,2}(C) > 0,$$

if  $b^{1,2}(A) > b^{1,2}(C)$ . For instance, let A and B be lattices of isometries of Bourdon buildings, A of large covolume and negative Euler characteristic, B of large conformal dimension, and C a free group on 2 generators. Then  $H^{1,2}(G) \neq 0$ , hence  $L^p - \dim(G) \leq 2 < \operatorname{ConfDim}(G)$ .

(日) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

For a Bourdon building with *p*-sided right-angled faces and thickness *q*, Euler characteristic is proportional to  $q^2 - p(q-1)$ , conformal dimension equals  $1 + \frac{\log q}{\arg \cosh(\frac{p-2}{2})}$ .

In conclusion, we have used

- ▶ Mayer-Vietoris and L<sup>2</sup>-Betti numbers.
- Expression of  $H^{1,p}$  as a function space on the ideal boundary.

Bourdon-Kleiner show that conformal dimension is equal to the infimum of p such that the continuous part of  $L^p$  cohomology separates points of the ideal boundary.

Continuous part means continuous functions on  $\partial G$  which continuously extend to functions on G with finite  $\ell^p$  norm of gradient.

# Theorem (Bourdon 2008)

Consider the continuous part of  $L^p$  cohomology of G as a Banach algebra  $\mathcal{A}_p(G)$  with norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\infty} + \|\cdot\|_{H^{1,p}(G)}$ . Let  $G_1$ ,  $G_2$  be hyperbolic groups which do not split over finite groups. Let  $p > \max\{\operatorname{ConfDim}(G_1), \operatorname{ConfDim}(G_1)\}$ . Then any Banach algebra isomorphism  $\mathcal{A}_p(G_1) \to \mathcal{A}_p(G_2)$  is induced by a quasi-isometry.

Bourdon-Kleiner show that conformal dimension is equal to the infimum of p such that the continuous part of  $L^p$  cohomology separates points of the ideal boundary.

Continuous part means continuous functions on  $\partial G$  which continuously extend to functions on G with finite  $\ell^p$  norm of gradient.

# Theorem (Bourdon 2008)

Consider the continuous part of  $L^p$  cohomology of G as a Banach algebra  $\mathcal{A}_p(G)$  with norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\infty} + \|\cdot\|_{H^{1,p}(G)}$ . Let  $G_1$ ,  $G_2$  be hyperbolic groups which do not split over finite groups. Let  $p > \max\{\operatorname{ConfDim}(G_1), \operatorname{ConfDim}(G_1)\}$ . Then any Banach algebra isomorphism  $\mathcal{A}_p(G_1) \to \mathcal{A}_p(G_2)$  is induced by a quasi-isometry.

**Question**. Is  $\partial G$  retrievable from the whole  $H^{1,p}(G)$ , and not its continuous part ?

In 2015, Bourdon-Kleiner implemented succesfully Kleiner's strategy for Coxeter groups. They fully describe the equivalence relations on  $\partial G$  induced by  $H^{1,p}(G)$  when  $L^p - \dim(G) \le p \le ConfDim(G)$  in this special case.

- 1. Hopf Euler characteristic conjecture
- 2. Cannon conjecture on groups with boundary a 2-sphere
- 3. Classification of hyperbolic compactly generated groups

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

- 4. Coarse and large scale conformal embeddings
- 5. Curvature pinching

Rank one symmetric spaces are hyperbolic spaces over the reals  $H^n_{\mathbb{R}}$ , the complex numbers  $H^m_{\mathbb{C}}$ , the quaternions  $H^m_{\mathbb{H}}$ , and the octonions  $H^0_{\mathbb{C}}$ . Real hyperbolic space has sectional curvature -1. Other rank one symmetric spaces are  $-\frac{1}{4}$ -pinched, i.e. their sectional curvature ranges between -1 and  $-\frac{1}{4}$ .

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

Rank one symmetric spaces are hyperbolic spaces over the reals  $H^n_{\mathbb{R}}$ , the complex numbers  $H^m_{\mathbb{C}}$ , the quaternions  $H^m_{\mathbb{H}}$ , and the octonions  $H^0_{\mathbb{C}}$ . Real hyperbolic space has sectional curvature -1. Other rank one symmetric spaces are  $-\frac{1}{4}$ -pinched, i.e. their sectional curvature ranges between -1 and  $-\frac{1}{4}$ .

# Definition

Define the optimal pinching  $\delta(G)$  of a discrete (or Lie) group G as the least  $\delta > -1$  such that G is bi-uniformly equivalent to a  $\delta$ -pinched Riemannian manifold.

Rank one symmetric spaces are hyperbolic spaces over the reals  $H^n_{\mathbb{R}}$ , the complex numbers  $H^m_{\mathbb{C}}$ , the quaternions  $H^m_{\mathbb{H}}$ , and the octonions  $H^0_{\mathbb{C}}$ . Real hyperbolic space has sectional curvature -1. Other rank one symmetric spaces are  $-\frac{1}{4}$ -pinched, i.e. their sectional curvature ranges between -1 and  $-\frac{1}{4}$ .

## Definition

Define the optimal pinching  $\delta(G)$  of a discrete (or Lie) group G as the least  $\delta > -1$  such that G is bi-uniformly equivalent to a  $\delta$ -pinched Riemannian manifold.

# Conjecture

The optimal pinching of SU(m, 1), Sp(m, 1) ( $m \ge 2$ ) and  $F_4^{-20}$  is  $-\frac{1}{4}$ .

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲圖▶ ▲圖▶ → 圖 - 釣�?

# Theorem If $M^n$ is simply connected and $\delta$ -pinched for some $\delta \in [-1,0)$ , then

$$p < 1 + \frac{n-k}{k-1}\sqrt{-\delta} \quad \Rightarrow \quad T^{k,p}(M) = 0.$$

### Theorem

If  $M^n$  is simply connected and  $\delta$ -pinched for some  $\delta \in [-1,0)$ , then

$$p < 1 + \frac{n-k}{k-1}\sqrt{-\delta} \quad \Rightarrow \quad T^{k,p}(M) = 0.$$

This is sharp. For instance, consider the semidirect product  $G = \mathbb{R}^3 \rtimes_{\alpha} \mathbb{R}$  where  $\alpha = diag(1, 1, 2)$ .

▶ It admits a  $-\frac{1}{4}$ -pinched left-invariant Riemannian metric, therefore  $\delta(G) \leq -\frac{1}{4}$ .

▶ It has  $T^{2,p}(G) \neq 0$  for  $2 . This implies that <math>\delta(G) = -\frac{1}{4}$ .

#### Theorem

If  $M^n$  is simply connected and  $\delta$ -pinched for some  $\delta \in [-1,0)$ , then

$$p < 1 + \frac{n-k}{k-1}\sqrt{-\delta} \quad \Rightarrow \quad T^{k,p}(M) = 0.$$

This is sharp. For instance, consider the semidirect product  $G = \mathbb{R}^3 \rtimes_{\alpha} \mathbb{R}$  where  $\alpha = diag(1, 1, 2)$ .

- ▶ It admits a  $-\frac{1}{4}$ -pinched left-invariant Riemannian metric, therefore  $\delta(G) \leq -\frac{1}{4}$ .
- ▶ It has  $T^{2,p}(G) \neq 0$  for  $2 . This implies that <math>\delta(G) = -\frac{1}{4}$ .

### Remark

Complex hyperbolic plane  $H^2_{\mathbb{C}}$  is isometric to  $G' = \text{Heis}^3 \rtimes_{\alpha} \mathbb{R}$  where  $\alpha = \text{diag}(1, 1, 2)$ and Heis denotes the Heisenberg group. Therefore it is very close to G.

#### Theorem

If  $M^n$  is simply connected and  $\delta$ -pinched for some  $\delta \in [-1,0)$ , then

$$p < 1 + rac{n-k}{k-1}\sqrt{-\delta} \quad \Rightarrow \quad T^{k,p}(M) = 0.$$

This is sharp. For instance, consider the semidirect product  $G = \mathbb{R}^3 \rtimes_{\alpha} \mathbb{R}$  where  $\alpha = diag(1, 1, 2)$ .

- ▶ It admits a  $-\frac{1}{4}$ -pinched left-invariant Riemannian metric, therefore  $\delta(G) \leq -\frac{1}{4}$ .
- ▶ It has  $T^{2,p}(G) \neq 0$  for  $2 . This implies that <math>\delta(G) = -\frac{1}{4}$ .

### Remark

Complex hyperbolic plane  $H^2_{\mathbb{C}}$  is isometric to  $G' = \text{Heis}^3 \rtimes_{\alpha} \mathbb{R}$  where  $\alpha = \text{diag}(1, 1, 2)$ and Heis denotes the Heisenberg group. Therefore it is very close to G.

Theorem  $T^{2,p}(H^2_{\mathbb{C}}) = 0$  for 2 .

#### Proof of torsion comparison theorem

Use the gradient vectorfield  $\xi$  of a Busemann function and its flow  $\phi_t$ , whose derivative is controlled by sectional curvature. For  $\alpha$  a closed k-form in  $L^p$ ,

$$\phi_t^* \alpha = \alpha + d \left( \int_0^t \phi_s^* \iota_\xi \alpha \, ds \right)$$

has a limit as  $t \to +\infty$  under the assumptions of the theorem. This boundary value map injects  $H^{k,p}$  into a function space of closed forms on the ideal boundary, showing that  $H^{k,p}$  is Hausdorff.

#### Proof of torsion comparison theorem

Use the gradient vectorfield  $\xi$  of a Busemann function and its flow  $\phi_t$ , whose derivative is controlled by sectional curvature. For  $\alpha$  a closed k-form in  $L^p$ ,

$$\phi_t^* \alpha = \alpha + d \left( \int_0^t \phi_s^* \iota_\xi \alpha \, \mathrm{d} s \right)$$

has a limit as  $t \to +\infty$  under the assumptions of the theorem. This boundary value map injects  $H^{k,p}$  into a function space of closed forms on the ideal boundary, showing that  $H^{k,p}$  is Hausdorff.

#### Proof of torsion vanishing for $H^2_{\mathbb{C}}$

For  $p \notin \{4/3, 2, 4\}$ , differential forms  $\alpha$  on  $H^2_{\mathbb{C}}$  split into components  $\alpha_+$  and  $\alpha_+$  which are contracted (resp. expanded) by  $\phi_t$ . Then

$$B_t: \alpha \mapsto \int_0^t \phi_s^* \iota_\xi \alpha_+ \, ds - \int_{-t}^0 \phi_s^* \iota_\xi \alpha_- \, ds$$

converges as  $t \to +\infty$  to a bounded operator *B* on  $L^p$ . P = 1 - dB - Bd retracts the  $L^p$  de Rham complex onto a complex of differential forms on *Heis*<sup>3</sup> with missing components and weakly regular coefficients. If 2 , this complex is nonzero in degrees 1 and 2, but it is so small that its cohomology can be shown to be Hausdorff.

Use Poincaré duality. Let p'=p/p-1 denote the conjugate exponent. In order to prove that a closed k-form  $\alpha$  is nonzero in cohomology, it suffices to construct a sequence  $\psi_j$  of (n-k)-forms such that  $\parallel d\psi_j \parallel_{L^{p'}}$  tends to zero but  $\int \alpha \wedge \psi_j$  does not tend to zero.

Use Poincaré duality. Let p'=p/p-1 denote the conjugate exponent. In order to prove that a closed k-form  $\alpha$  is nonzero in cohomology, it suffices to construct a sequence  $\psi_j$  of (n-k)-forms such that  $\parallel d\psi_j \parallel_{L^{p'}}$  tends to zero but  $\int \alpha \wedge \psi_j$  does not tend to zero.

In conclusion, we have used

- Poincaré duality.
- A deformation retraction of space onto a subspace, with controlled effect on the L<sup>p</sup>-norms of forms. For certain ranges of p, this provides a boundary value.

Use Poincaré duality. Let p' = p/p - 1 denote the conjugate exponent. In order to prove that a closed k-form  $\alpha$  is nonzero in cohomology, it suffices to construct a sequence  $\psi_j$  of (n-k)-forms such that  $\| d\psi_j \|_{L^{p'}}$  tends to zero but  $\int \alpha \wedge \psi_j$  does not tend to zero.

In conclusion, we have used

- Poincaré duality.
- A deformation retraction of space onto a subspace, with controlled effect on the L<sup>p</sup>-norms of forms. For certain ranges of p, this provides a boundary value.

# Conjecture

- ▶ For rank 1 symmetric spaces, T<sup>k,p</sup> = 0 except for at most 1 value of p in each degree.
- ▶ For higher rank symmetric spaces,  $H^{k,p} = 0$  for k < rank,  $T^{k,p} = 0$  for k = rank.
- For k = rank, R<sup>k,p</sup> ≠ 0 for p large, and R<sup>k,p</sup> is a function space on the maximal boundary.
- For each p > 1, there exists k such that  $H^{k,p} \neq 0$ .

◆□ ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 • 의 Q @</p>

・ロン・1回シュロシュロシー 加 くのくの