

Sobolev regularity of compactified 3-manifolds and the ADM Center of Mass

Rodrigo Avalos
Email: rdravalos@gmail.com *

Abstract

In this paper we address the existence of preferred asymptotic coordinates on asymptotically Euclidean (AE) manifolds (M^3, g) such that g admits an asymptotically Schwarzschildian first order expansion, based purely on a priori geometric conditions, which will then be used to establish geometric criteria guaranteeing the convergence of the ADM center of mass (COM). This question is analysed relating it to the study of the regularity of conformal compactifications of such manifolds, which is itself explored via elliptic theory for operators with coefficients of very limited regularity. With these related problems in mind, we shall first establish regularity properties of L^q -solutions associated to the operator $\Delta_{\hat{g}} : W^{k,p}(S_2\hat{M}) \rightarrow W^{k-2,p}(S_2\hat{M})$, for $k = 1, 2$ and $1 < p \leq q$, where \hat{M}^n is a closed manifold, $\hat{g} \in W^{2,q}(\hat{M})$, with $q > \frac{n}{2}$ and $S_2\hat{M}$ denotes the bundle of symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor fields. Appealing to these results, we establish Sobolev regularity of conformally compactified AE 3-manifolds via the decay of the Cotton tensor, improving on previous results. This allows us to construct preferred asymptotic coordinates on such AE manifolds where the metric has a first order Schwarzschildian expansion, which in turn will allow us to address a version of a conjecture posed by C. Cederbaum and A. Sakovich concerning the convergence of the COM of such manifolds.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Main results	6
2	Preliminaries	9
2.1	Geometric conventions	9
2.2	Analytic tools	10
2.2.1	Sobolev spaces	10
2.3	Mapping properties of $\mathcal{L}^2(W^{2,q})$ -operators - $q > \frac{n}{2}$	18
2.4	AE Manifolds	23
2.4.1	ADM definitions	24
3	Semi-Fredholm properties of $\mathcal{L}^2(W^{2,q})$-Elliptic operators	25
4	Regularity theory for Δ_g on S_2M	34
4.1	$W^{2,p}$ -regularity theory	39
4.2	$W^{1,p}$ -regularity theory	43
4.3	Conformal properties of low regularity closed Riemannian manifolds	48
5	Compactification of AE 3-manifolds - improved regularity	53
6	Decompactification	64
7	The center of mass of an AE 3-manifold	70

*Universität Tübingen, Mathematisch-Naturwissenschaftliche Fakultät, Fachbereich Mathematik, Tübingen, Deutschland.

Appendices	72
A Appendix I: Fredholmness of Δ_g on certain weighted spaces	73
B Appendix II: Compactification and decompactification of rough metrics	83
References	88

1 Introduction

In this paper we shall address a few related problems concerning regularity of geometric structures. In order to motivate this analysis, let us start with two problems well-known within geometric analysis. The first one of these is related to the ADM center of mass (COM) associated to a 3-dimensional asymptotically Euclidean (AE) Riemannian manifold (M^3, g) . Let us briefly recall that an AE manifold is a non-compact manifold which (in the case of one end) outside a compact set $K \subset M^n$ is diffeomorphic to the exterior of a closed ball in \mathbb{R}^n , that is $M^n \setminus K \cong \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}$, and the corresponding diffeomorphism induces a set of asymptotic coordinates, in which the Riemannian metric g approaches the Euclidean metric as we move towards infinity. There are different ways to measure this decay, and while full details are provided within Section 2.4, let us now say that an AE manifold is of order $\tau > 0$ if

$$g_{ij}(x) = \delta_{ij} + O_k(|x|^{-\tau}), \quad (1.1)$$

on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}$ for some $k \geq 0$.¹ In this context, in the case of an AE 3-manifold with one end and asymptotic coordinates $\{x^i\}_{i=1}^3$, the ADM energy is defined as²

$$E \doteq \frac{1}{16\pi} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \int_{S_r} (\partial_i g_{ij} - \partial_j g_{ii}) \nu^j d\omega_r ; \quad (1.2)$$

whenever the limit exists, and where $S_r \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}(0)}$ denotes a topological sphere of radius $r > R_0$ contained within the end of M^3 , while ν denotes the outward-pointing Euclidean unit normal to it and $d\omega_r$ the volume form on S_r induced by the Euclidean metric. Let us highlight that precise geometric conditions can be formulated to guarantee the convergence of (1.2) as well as the independence of this limit on the asymptotic coordinates (see, for instance, [6]). Also, it is a consequence of the Riemannian positive mass theorem that for 3-dimensional AE manifolds of order $\tau > \frac{1}{2}$ with non-negative scalar curvature $E \geq 0$, and $E = 0$ iff $(M^3, g) \cong \mathbb{E}^3$ (See [54, 61, 6]).

In the above context, the COM of a 3-dimensional AE manifold (M^3, g) is given by a vector $C_{BOM} = (C^1, C^2, C^3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, whose components are defined by the limits

$$C_{BOM}^k \doteq \frac{1}{16\pi E} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{S_r} x^k (\partial_i g_{ij} - \partial_j g_{ii}) \nu^j d\omega_r - \int_{S_r} (g_{ik} \nu^i - g_{ii} \nu^k) d\omega_r \right), \quad (1.3)$$

whenever the limits exist, and where we have appealed to the same notations introduced above.³ Just as with other asymptotic charges associated to isolated gravitational systems, the COM has proven to be related to highly interesting problems in geometry, most notably the existence of geometric foliations of infinity in AE manifolds and the convergence of the center of such foliations, which has been proposed as a geometric way of defining the COM. A non-exhaustive list of related important references is given by [36, 47, 23, 50, 49, 14, 22], which treat constant mean curvature foliations, constant expansion foliations, constant space-time mean curvature foliations and foliations by Willmore surfaces. Nevertheless, in particular for the convergence of the COM and the center of these associated foliations, one typically needs to impose very precise asymptotic behaviour for the metric g .

¹In this context, a function f is said to be of class $O_k(|x|^{-\tau})$ if $\partial^\alpha f = O(|x|^{-\tau-|\alpha|})$ for any multi-index α such that $|\alpha| \leq k$.

²The Einstein summation convention along repeated indices will be assumed through the paper.

³More detailed definitions concerning AE manifolds and ADM asymptotic charges are provided within Section 2.4.

Namely, certain asymptotic parity conditions need to be imposed, which in the literature are known as the Regge-Teitelboim (RT) conditions. In their simplest form, such conditions are given by the assumption that there are asymptotic coordinates $\{x^i\}_{i=1}^3$ for M where the AE metric g can be written as

$$g_{ij}(x) = \delta_{ij} + O_2(|x|^{-\tau}), \quad g_{ij}^{\text{odd}}(x) = O_2(|x|^{-\tau-1}), \quad R_g^{\text{odd}}(x) = O(|x|^{-\tau-3}), \quad (1.4)$$

for some $\tau > \frac{1}{2}$, where the superscript ‘‘odd’’ refers to the odd-part of the given function, and R_g denotes the scalar curvature of the metric g . Actually, in many cases a *Schwarzschildian* expansion near infinity is demanded, which implies that the above expansion is actually replaced by

$$g_{ij} = \left(1 + \frac{A}{|x|}\right) \delta_{ij} + O_2(|x|^{-2}), \quad (1.5)$$

where A is a constant, related to the ADM energy of g . Clearly, the Schwarzschildian case implies a strong version of the RT parity conditions. In this context, a generally recognised problem is that the existence of such an a priori expansion with these parity properties is not known to be a consequence of some set of geometric hypotheses, but is typically merely assumed to exist. Although it is true that in sufficiently weak topologies metrics obeying the RT conditions are known to form a dense subset of the space of solutions to the Einstein constraint equations (ECE) of general relativity (GR) due to the work in [17], these topologies are not strong enough to guarantee convergence of the associated COM. It is therefore an interesting open question to determine geometric conditions which guarantee the existence of an asymptotic coordinate system where an AE manifold (M^3, g) is guaranteed to have an expansion of the form of (1.4), and this question relates to [14, Conjecture 1], which we take as one of the motivations for this paper. Let us highlight that this can also be motivated as a question within GR, since the expansion of g near infinity is associated to the decay of the gravitational field at infinity for an isolated system. The known explicit solutions modelling such idealised systems obey expansions like (1.5), and from the weak Newtonian limit this kind of decay could be expected more generically. Nevertheless, proving clear-cut geometric conditions which a priori guarantee such an expansion seems to be quite subtle.

Let us notice that one may construct AE manifolds satisfying (1.5) in a very geometric way via decompactification of certain closed Riemannian manifolds. That is, let (\hat{M}^3, \hat{g}) be a smooth closed Riemannian manifold, and assume that \hat{g} is Yamabe positive. Then, given a point $p \in \hat{M}$, it is well-known that there exists a conformally related metric g such that $(M^3 \doteq \hat{M}^3 \setminus \{p\}, g)$ is AE (with p being the point at infinity) and g has an expansion of the form of (1.5) near infinity due to results in [41]. This classic result is obtained since the Yamabe condition guarantees the existence of a positive Green function $G_{L_{\hat{g}}}$ for the conformal Laplacian $L_{\hat{g}} = -8\Delta_{\hat{g}} + R_{\hat{g}}$ of each element in $[\hat{g}]$, and then one can look for a suitable element within $[\hat{g}]$ where $G_{L_{\hat{g}}}$ has a very explicit expansion in normal coordinates near its singularity at the selected point p . Then, the inversion of coordinates $z = \frac{x}{|x|^2}$ around p induces an asymptotic chart for M^3 where (1.5) is valid in the z -coordinate system. Furthermore, by construction $R_g \equiv 0$ and thus (M^3, g) can be regarded as a time-symmetric vacuum initial data set for the evolution problem in GR. This procedure provides an interesting connection between special classes of closed Riemannian manifolds and AE manifolds obeying the RT conditions. Notice, in particular, that in the case of AE manifolds obtained in this manner, the conditions which guaranteed the existence of an expansion like (1.5) were strictly geometric, and no reference to special coordinates with parity conditions needed to be invoked. Generalising this kind of construction to more general AE manifolds will be one of our main motivations.

Concerning the above description on how to obtain AE manifolds which naturally admit asymptotic coordinates where the RT conditions are satisfied, we would like to focus on the relation between an AE manifold and (in the case of manifolds with one end) its one-point compactification. Ideally, one would like to be able to start with an AE manifold and guarantee that under a certain set of geometric criteria there is an asymptotic chart where the RT conditions are satisfied, instead of starting already from a closed manifold and decompactifying it. One strategy one may adopt could be to start with a given AE manifold (M^3, g) , then attempt to conformally compactify it into a closed Riemannian manifold (\hat{M}^3, \hat{g}) , then move within the conformal class $[\hat{g}]$ so as to find a suitable element in the class

whose conformal decompactification (M^3, γ) has an explicit asymptotic expansion, say like (1.5), and finally estimate the conformal factor between g and γ so as to extract a similar expansion for g .

The above strategy brings us to the second geometric problem motivating this paper, since it is immediately faced with very interesting regularity issues, which have been highlighted in [26] and [21], where it has been pointed out that the compactification of a smooth AE manifold will, in general, be only of very limited regularity around the point of compactification. In [26] the author has studied how additional control on conformal objects can be used to improve the regularity of the compactified manifold. In particular, for a 3-dimensional AE manifold (M^3, g) , the decay of the Cotton tensor C_g is tightly related to the regularity of its one-point conformal compactification (\hat{M}^3, \hat{g}) . Conditions to obtain C^2 -regularity for \hat{g} were studied in detail in [26], while in [21] the authors guarantee that, a priori, \hat{g} can be shown to have $W^{2,p}(\hat{M})$ Sobolev regularity, with $p > \frac{3}{2}$, under minimal conditions on g and with no extra requirements on C_g . Therefore, in order to pursue the existence of RT expansions following the reasoning described in the above paragraph, one will need first to address regularity issues concerning conformal compactifications. In particular, we would aim to obtain $\hat{g} \in W^{2,p}(\hat{M})$ with $p > 3$, but without imposing a priori decays which might be too strong to be interesting. For instance, such regularity is guaranteed from [21] if one starts with a smooth AE manifold of order $\tau > 1$, but this decay implies that the ADM energy of g is zero, and therefore no AE metric with non-negative scalar curvature can obey these conditions due to the positive mass theorem. Therefore, we would like to pursue the validity of the strategy described in the above paragraph, but for decay rates $\tau \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$.

Having the above paragraph in mind, to impose geometric conditions as weak as possible on (M^3, g) , we would like to pursue Sobolev-type controls on its compactification, interpolating more subtly in between C^k -spaces, and furthermore demanding controls on decays in an integral sense, rather than point-wise. In some sense, we attempt to interpolate in between the results of [21] and [26]. The strategy to do so is to appeal to a sequence of bootstraps. First, one may appeal to the general results of [21] to obtain, a priori, a conformal compactification (\hat{M}^3, \bar{g}) , with $\bar{g} \in W^{2,p}(\hat{M})$ and $2 < p < 3$. Then, several results on the Yamabe problem for low regularity metrics can be used to select an element $\hat{g} \in [\bar{g}]$ such that its scalar curvature has improved regularity, given by $R_{\hat{g}} \in W^{2,p}(\hat{M})$. The next goal is to improve the regularity of the Ricci tensor. For that, we shall appeal to the conformal invariance of the Cotton tensor $C_{\hat{g}}$ in three dimensions. In particular, an a priori weighted L^p -control of C_g will translate on an a priori L^p control of $C_{\hat{g}}$, in turn translating into $W^{-1,p}(\hat{M})$ -control for $\text{div}_{\hat{g}} C_{\hat{g}}$, and finally providing the same type of control for $\Delta_{\hat{g}} \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}}$. For this last step, the a priori control on $R_{\hat{g}}$ will be important. Once $W^{-1,p}$ -control for $\Delta_{\hat{g}} \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}}$ is obtained, the remaining improvements of regularity will be through elliptic theory.

The above strategy is our motivation for the first problem we shall study in this paper, which concerns the elliptic regularity theory that is to be applied, where some caution must be taken due to the limited regularity of the coefficients of $\Delta_{\hat{g}} \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}}$. In fact, regularity questions associated to a bootstrap from an a priori L^r solution u (with r sufficiently large) for an equation of the form $\Delta_g u \in W^{-1,q}$ (or even in L^p) for metrics $g \in W^{2,p}$ and $\frac{n}{2} < p < n$, seem to be very close to critical cases in regularity theory. We would like to highlight that this type of regularity statements seem to be outside of the scope of classical references, such as [25, 58, 32, 33]. Notice that when treating equations with coefficients of limited regularity, it is typical to impose a priori $W^{1,p}$ controls on the a priori solution,⁴ and we shall need to start with weaker solutions than that. In a broader context, a related problem is the conjecture posed by J. Serrin [55] in the case of weak solutions of scalar equations of the form

$$\text{div}(a^{ij} \nabla_i u) = 0 \tag{1.6}$$

on a bounded regular domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ where a^{ij} are bounded and measurable coefficients. These equations have well-established regularity properties for weak $W_{loc}^{1,2}$ -solutions, and in [55] the author provided an example of a weak solution $W_{loc}^{1,p}$ to (1.6) with $1 < p < 2$, such that $u \notin L_{loc}^\infty$, showing that the $W_{loc}^{1,2}$ requirement was necessary to obtain L_{loc}^∞ control for the solution. The author then

⁴See, for instance, [25, Chapter 8], [58, Chapter 3] and [48, Chapter 5].

conjectured that if the coefficients $a^{ij} \in C^{0,\alpha}(\Omega)$, then any $W_{loc}^{1,1}$ -solution to (1.6) should be $W_{loc}^{1,2}$. This conjecture was solved by H. Brezis in [10], actually showing a stronger statement. That is, it was shown that under a Dini condition on a^{ij} , a weak solution of (1.6) which is a priori of bounded variation must actually be in $W_{loc}^{1,2}$. Since this result, refinements contemplating different kinds of Sobolev regularity on the coefficients and the a priori solution have been established, for instance in [39, 63], and also counterexamples to borderline cases have been presented [37]. Concerning these results, let us comment that in [63] the authors analyse (1.6) and establish that if $a^{ij} \in C_{loc}^{0,1}$ and $u \in L_{loc}^1$, then $u \in W_{loc}^{2,p}$ for any $p < \infty$, while in [39] it is established that if $a^{ij} \in W^{1,n}(\Omega)$ also satisfies a Dini-type condition and $u \in L_{loc}^{n'}$, then $u \in W_{loc}^{1,2}$.

We would like to highlight that bootstrapping an a priori L^q -solution to the tensor equation

$$\Delta_g u = f \tag{1.7}$$

for a $W^{2,q}(M)$ metric on a closed manifold M , with $q > \frac{n}{2}$, u a symmetric $(0,2)$ -tensor field, and $f \in L^p$, is a related problem to the one described above, although out of the scope of the referenced papers. The geometric problem put forward above for the compactification of an AE manifold naturally poses this regularity question as the requirement to bootstrap $\text{Ric}_{\hat{g}}$ to $L^p(\hat{M}^3)$ for some $p > 3$. Once this is established, we can appeal to harmonic coordinates $\{y^i\}_{i=1}^3$ around the point of compactification to bootstrap this extra regularity gained for the Ricci tensor into the metric and obtain $\hat{g} \in W^{2,p}(\hat{M})$, with $p > 3$, which was our target. This last process is also filled with subtle issues, since the harmonic coordinates associated to \hat{g} will be a priori only $C^{1,\alpha}$ -compatible with the differentiable structure induced by the inversion of coordinates $x^i = \frac{z^i}{|z|^2}$. Nonetheless, these extra subtle issues can be overcome.

Let us highlight how the above problems became naturally interrelated. We started with an open question in geometry and mathematical GR, concerning the existence of geometric conditions such that an AE 3-manifold admits asymptotic coordinates so that the metric has an expansion satisfying (1.4). We then noticed the relation between this problem and the problem of the regularity of the compactification of such AE manifolds, and finally we pointed out that this last problem poses a relevant question within elliptic regularity theory, related to recent developments in the area. Let us then notice that, after solving the last two of these problems, there is still work to be done in order to solve the questions associated to the COM and expansions like (1.4). In particular, one then needs to conformally decompactify (\hat{M}^3, \hat{g}) into (M^3, γ) , with $\gamma \in [g]$, and analyse these questions. The main idea is that if \hat{g} is shown to be $W^{2,p}(\hat{M})$ with $p > 3$, one may then use normal coordinates $\{\bar{y}^i\}_{i=1}^3$ around the point of compactification p_∞ to obtain an expansion of the form:

$$\hat{g}_{ij}(\bar{y}) = \delta_{ij} + O_1(|\bar{y}|^{1+\alpha}), \text{ for some } \alpha > 0. \tag{1.8}$$

Then, we may decompactify following the ideas of [21] and inducing a structure of infinity around p_∞ via the inversion $\bar{z} = \frac{\bar{y}}{|\bar{y}|^2}$. Along this process, we will need to keep track of the relation between the coordinates $\{\bar{z}^i\}_{i=1}^3$ and the original asymptotic coordinates $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^3$ on M , at least up to sufficiently high order, which will depend on similar questions concerning the intermediary coordinate systems on \hat{M} around p_∞ , given by the inversion $x = \frac{z}{|z|^2}$, then the change of coordinate to harmonic coordinates $\{y^i\}_{i=1}^3$, and finally the change to the normal coordinates $\{\bar{y}^i\}_{i=1}^3$ described above. Through (1.8) this process will allow us to estimate

$$\gamma_{ij}(\bar{z}) = \delta_{ij} + O_1(|\bar{z}|^{-1-\alpha})$$

and, writing $g = u^4 \gamma$, also grant that $u - 1$ belongs to some weighted $L_{-\epsilon}^p(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}})$ -space with $\epsilon > 0$, where $\Phi_{\bar{z}}$ denotes the structure of infinity induced by the \bar{z} -coordinates. Then, the conformal covariance of the scalar curvature, together with a priori controls on $u - 1$, R_g and R_γ give us an expansion

$$u = 1 + \frac{C}{|\bar{z}|} + O_1(|\bar{z}|^{-1-\alpha}), \text{ for some } \alpha > 0. \tag{1.9}$$

All this together, guarantees the existence of a structure of infinity with coordinates $\{\bar{z}^i\}_{i=1}^3$, such that

$$g(\partial_{\bar{z}^i}, \partial_{\bar{z}^j}) = \left(1 + \frac{4C}{|\bar{z}|}\right) \delta_{ij} + O_1(|\bar{z}|^{-1-\alpha}), \quad (1.10)$$

$$\bar{z}(z) - \text{Id}(z) \in C_{1-\alpha}^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}(0)}).$$

Notice the above expansion will settle the question initially posed concerning (1.4), at least for expansions up to first order. We should highlight that higher order expansions could be extracted requiring further decay for the derivatives of the Cotton tensor C_g . In the above case, we need only a weighted L^p condition on C_g . Moreover, from the above expansion one may read quite explicitly the ADM energy, and, under an L^p -integrability condition on $z^i R_g$, the above expansion is enough to guarantee the convergence of the COM in the coordinates $\{\bar{z}^i\}_{i=1}^3$, which settles a Riemannian and L^p -version of the conjecture posed by Cederbaum-Sakovich in [14, Conjecture 1], under an additional control on C_g . We would like to highlight that the proof of this version of the conjecture in [14] presents a relevant advance in the geometric understanding of the COM of AE 3-manifolds, since, besides the case of asymptotically conformally flat manifolds treated in [19], to the best of our knowledge, it is the first time such convergence condition is formulated purely in geometric terms, without invoking RT parity conditions a priori.

1.1 Main results

In this section we shall present the main results obtained in this paper. Based on the topics discussed above and their relation, let us start with the regularity results, the first of which is given by the following theorem.

Theorem A. *Let (M^n, g) be a closed Riemannian manifold with $g \in W^{2,q}(M)$, $q > \frac{n}{2}$, and $n \geq 3$. Then, given $1 < p \leq q$, the Laplace-Beltrami operator*

$$\Delta_g : W^{2,p}(M; S_2M) \rightarrow L^p(M; S_2M),$$

is Fredholm of index zero, $\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,p}}) \subset W^{2,q}(M)$ and the following regularity implication follows:

$$\text{if } u \in L^{q'}(S_2M), \text{ and } \Delta_g u \in L^p(S_2M) \implies u \in W^{2,p}(S_2M).$$

Establishing the above theorem relies as a first step on general semi-Fredholm results for elliptic operators with low regularity coefficients on closed manifolds, then approximation arguments by smooth metrics can be combined with stability properties for the index of a semi-Fredholm operator to prove the full Fredholm statement, and finally the regularity statements require duality arguments, which for coefficients of low regularity are rather subtle. Theorem A above can actually be refined into the following result for operators acting from $W^{1,p} \rightarrow W^{-1,p}$.

Theorem B. *Let (M^n, g) be a closed Riemannian manifold with $g \in W^{2,q}(M)$, $q > \frac{n}{2}$, and $n \geq 3$. Then, for all $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} < \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{n}$ the Laplace-Beltrami operator*

$$\Delta_g : W^{1,p}(S_2M) \rightarrow W^{-1,p}(S_2M),$$

is Fredholm of index zero, $\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{1,p}}) \subset W^{2,q}(S_2M)$ and the following regularity implication follows:

$$\text{if } u \in L^{q'}(S_2M), \text{ and } \Delta_g u \in W^{-1,p}(S_2M) \implies u \in W^{1,p}(S_2M).$$

The proof of Theorem B is obtained along the same general lines to those described for Theorem A, although now the duality arguments become even more subtle. It is interesting to highlight the $L^{q'}$ a priori regularity needed in both theorems above in order to start the bootstrap. This condition seems to be rather optimal within the duality arguments needed in our proofs, and it is interesting to compare the above results with theorems 1.2 and 4.1 of [63], where one can find similar requirements. Let us also notice that similar results could also be reached appealing to the results of [28, Section 2], and related results can also be found in [38, Appendix A].

The regularity results presented within Theorems A and B will then be applied to address our geometric questions on the regularity of compactified AE 3-manifolds, which are understood to have only 1-end. The main result within this analysis is the following:

Theorem C. *Let (M^3, g) be a smooth $W_\tau^{k,p}$ -AE manifold, relative to a structure of infinity Φ_z with coordinates $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^3$ and $p > 2$, $\tau \in (-1, -\frac{1}{2})$, $k \geq 4$. If $C_g \in L_\sigma^{p_1}(M, \Phi_z)$ with $-6 < \sigma < -4$ and $p_1 = \frac{3}{6+\sigma}$, then (M^3, g) can be conformally compactified into (\hat{M}, \hat{g}) , where \hat{M} stands for the 1-point compactification of M , and \hat{M} can be equipped with a preferred differentiable structure $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M})$ which is $W^{2,q}$ -compatible with the differentiable structure provided by the inverted coordinates $x = \frac{z}{|z|^2}$, such that $\hat{g} \in W^{2,q}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M}))$ for some $q > 3$. In particular $\hat{g} \in C^{1,\alpha}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M}))$, for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.*

As stated in the introduction, the above theorem should be compared with the results of [21] and [26]. In comparison with [21, Lemma 5.2], the above theorem obtains improved regularity of the metric \hat{g} under an additional weighted L^p -control on the Cotton tensor of the AE metric g . In the case of [26], since we are concerned with $C^{1,\alpha}$ -regularity we should compare with [26, Theorem A], in which case the above theorem demands weaker assumptions on the decay of the Cotton tensor (see Remark 5.2) and obtains intermediate Sobolev control for the compactified metric. More explicitly, in [26, Theorem A] a point wise control of the form $C_g = O(|z|^{-5-\epsilon})$ ($\epsilon > 0$) is demanded to obtain a C^2 -compactification, while $C_g = O(|z|^{-5})$ is demanded to obtain a $C^{1,\alpha}$ -compactification. These conditions are strictly stronger than the ones imposed in Theorem C, both regarding the strength of the decay and the integral versus point wise character. Along these lines, let us also comment that in [26, Theorem C] the author also analyses the existence of a $C^{0,\alpha}$ compactification under the decay $C_g = O(|z|^{-3-\epsilon})$. During our work we have not pursued establishing refinements to the $C^{0,\alpha}$ -compactification for two reasons: Firstly, the applications to the existence of refined expansions like (1.5) require $C^{1,\alpha}$ -controls for the compactification. Secondly, $C^{0,\alpha}$ -regularity for the compactification can be deduced from [21, Lemma 5.2] under even weaker conditions, for instance, no point wise a priori control on C_g . Finally, as stated in the introduction, further control can be obtained from the same methods by demanding further control on the Cotton tensor C_g . Finally, let us highlight that in the process of developing the tools necessary for Theorem C, in Section 4.3 we will provide some results concerning low regularity conformal deformations of scalar curvature related to the Yamabe problem which complement results presented in [44, 30].

The above theorem plays a key role in the proof of the following result, which concerns the existence of a preferred structure of infinity where an AE 3-manifold is granted to have a *first order Schwarzschildian expansion*:

Theorem D. *Let (M^3, g) be a smooth $W_\tau^{4,p}$ -AE manifold with respect to a structure of infinity with coordinates $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^3$, with $\tau \in (-1, -\frac{1}{2})$ and $p > 2$. Assume furthermore that:*

1. $R_g \in L_{-3-\epsilon}^r(M, \Phi_z)$ for some $r > 3$ and $\epsilon > 0$;
2. $C_g \in L_\sigma^{p_1}(M, \Phi_z)$ for some $-6 < \sigma < -4$ and $p_1 = \frac{3}{6+\sigma}$.

Then, there is a structure of infinity with coordinates $\{\bar{z}^i\}_{i=1}^3$, which is $C^{1,\alpha}$ -compatible with the original one, such that

$$g(\partial_{\bar{z}^i}, \partial_{\bar{z}^j}) = \left(1 + \frac{4C}{|\bar{z}|}\right) \delta_{ij} + O_1(|\bar{z}|^{-1-\alpha}), \quad (1.11)$$

$$\bar{z}(z) - \text{Id}(z) \in C_{1-\alpha}^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}(0)}),$$

for some $\alpha > 0$.

The above theorem provides purely geometric conditions which guarantee the existence of asymptotic coordinates where a type of RT parity conditions are satisfied, up to first order. Remarkably, this will be enough to guarantee convergence of the COM in the given coordinates. Let us also notice that the existence of this preferred structure of infinity is related to asymptotic conformal properties of the AE manifold (M^3, g) . In that sense, the above result could be compared with results in [19], where asymptotically conformally flat manifolds were analysed. Along those lines, Theorem D above provides a measure of how far from asymptotic conformal flatness one can be in order to still obtain (at least to first order) a Schwarzschildian expansion, such measure being provided by the asymptotic

L^p -control on the Cotton tensor. An interesting open question, which shall be addressed in future work, is the extension of the above theorem to higher dimensions.

Before moving on to the application of Theorem D to the analysis of the COM, let us also refer the reader to the discussion presented after the proof of Theorem 6.1, where a family of examples is presented showing that the expansion (1.11) cannot be extracted actually from [6, Proposition 3.3] alone, and that in order to extract such expansions from the Ricci tensor tensor alone within that family some rather restrictive assumptions would need to be made.

Finally, the above theorem will be used to address (at least partly) a conjecture posed by C. Cederbaum and A. Sakovich concerning the convergence of the COM of a general relativistic initial data set. Before stating the result, let us notice that the conjecture posed in [14] concerns a novel proposed definition for the COM via space-time constant mean curvature foliations of infinity, where the extrinsic geometry of the initial data set within the evolving space-time plays an important role. Nevertheless, whenever the initial data set is *time-symmetric* (totally geodesic), the problem becomes properly Riemannian. That is, the initial data set reduces to the prescription of a Riemannian manifold (M^3, g) (with some scalar curvature constraint), and the definition for the COM proposed in [14] reduces to (1.3). In this context, the Riemannian version of [14, Conjecture 1] can be stated as follows:

Conjecture 1.1 (Cederbaum-Sakovich [14]). *Given an AE manifold (M^3, g) of order $\tau \in (-1, -\frac{1}{2})$ with respect to a structure of infinity Φ_z with coordinates $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^3$, there is a geometric condition on the coordinates $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^3$ ensuring that (1.3) converges in the z -coordinates, provided the assumption that $z^i R_g \in L^1(M, \Phi_z)$ holds.*

We shall address the above conjecture from a slightly different angle, in particular weakening the claim. From a conceptual level, the main difference in our approach will be that we will look for a condition on the coordinates $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^3$, such that if $z^i R_g \in L^1(M, \Phi_z)$ one can guarantee the existence of *compatible* asymptotic coordinates $\{\bar{z}^i\}_{i=1}^3$ where the COM (1.3) converges.⁵ We believe this approach is a possible reformulation of Conjecture 1.1 based on the examples produced in [35]. In this last reference, the author produces a family of scalar flat (and thus solutions to the time-symmetric vacuum ECE) AE manifolds (M^3, g) of order $\tau = 1$ with respect to a given asymptotic coordinate system $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^3$, but for which the COM (1.3) fails to converge in the given coordinates.⁶ Thus, such family would present a counterexample to the strongest possible version of Conjecture 1.1, but one may still consider the following alternative:

Conjecture 1.2 (Weak version of Conjecture 1.1). *Given an AE manifold (M^3, g) of order $\tau \in (-1, -\frac{1}{2})$ with respect to a structure of infinity Φ_z with coordinates $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^3$, if $z^i R_g \in L^1(M, \Phi_z)$, then there is a geometric condition on the coordinates $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^3$ ensuring the existence of a compatible asymptotic chart $\{\bar{z}^i\}_{i=1}^3$ such that (1.3) converges in the \bar{z} -coordinates.*

We shall pursue the validity of Conjecture 1.2. Although this does not guarantee the convergence with respect to the originally given $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^3$ coordinates, one can think that this weaker version of Conjecture 1.1 actually identifies preferred asymptotic coordinates $\{\bar{z}^i\}_{i=1}^3$ where the Conjecture 1.1 is true. In that precise sense, one may consider that the weaker claim we shall address provides an answer to Conjecture 1.1.

On the more technical side, we shall address an L^p -version of Conjecture 1.2. That is, we replace $z^i R_g \in L^1(M, \Phi_z)$ with $z^i R_g \in L^p(M, \Phi_z)$ for some $p > 1$, and the answer we shall provide below to this question is that the desired geometric condition is given by a weighted L^p -control of the Cotton tensor. That is, the coordinates $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^3$ should provide a structure of infinity Φ_z such that $L_\sigma^{p_1}(M, \Phi_z)$ for some $-6 < \sigma < -4$ and $p_1 = \frac{3}{6+\sigma}$. This will grant the existence of coordinate $\{\bar{z}^i\}_{i=1}^3$ satisfying (1.11) and $\bar{z}^i R_g \in L^p(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}})$ as well, where the COM converges.

⁵By compatible coordinates, we mean that the coordinate change is given by a transformation which is asymptotic to the identity, such as those described by (1.11).

⁶See [35, Proposition 3.6 and Corollary 3.7].

Theorem E. *Let (M^3, g) be an AE Riemannian manifold satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem D. If moreover $R_g \in L_{-4-\epsilon}^r(M, \Phi_z)$, with $r > 3$ and $\epsilon > 0$, then the center of mass (1.3) converges in the coordinates given by (1.11).*

We would like to once more stress that the above theorem relies on purely geometric hypotheses to grant convergence of the COM. Although the coordinates $\{\bar{z}^i\}_{i=1}^3$ will not be given explicitly, one can have explicit control over them up to first order under the hypotheses presented in Theorem E. This kind of control is enough to provide an explicit computation of the ADM energy and COM, and as commented before, higher order controls should be expected if one demands higher order controls for the Cotton tensor.

With all the above in mind, the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we will present detailed definitions concerning analytic tools to be used in the core of the paper. We will also set up our geometric conventions, and review some important results related mapping properties of linear partial differential operators with low regularity coefficients. Experts in the associated fields can certainly skip most of this section and use it just for reference purposes about our notations. In Section 3 we shall then establish semi-Fredholm properties of elliptic operators with low regularity coefficients on closed manifolds. Section 4 is then devoted to the proofs of Theorems A and B, and some application of this theory to the low regularity Yamabe problem. Section 5 is dedicated to the proof of Theorem C, Section 6 to the proof of Theorem D, and finally Section 7 is devoted to the proof of Theorem E.

We also include two appendices: Appendix A is motivated by [6, Proposition 1.6], where a key part of the proof is related to regularity theory of scalar elliptic operators with low regularity coefficients. Due to subtleties associated to the corresponding regularity theory which are explained in this appendix, we have decided to provide a self-contained proof of the associated statements within the context that will be used in this paper, which concerns a special case of the operators treated in [6]. Finally, within Appendix B we rephrase [21, Lemma 5.2] with some explicit details which we believe may help the reader, since we shall appeal to subtleties of this result within Section 6. Because our statement is slightly different than the one presented in [21, Lemma 5.2], we provide a sketch of the proof for the benefit of the reader.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Geometric conventions

To avoid any ambiguity, let us make explicit the curvature conventions we follow in this text, where, given an $(n+1)$ -dimensional pseudo-Riemannian manifold (M^{n+1}, g) and denoting by ∇ its associated Riemannian connection, the curvature tensor is defined as:

$$R(X, Y)Z = \nabla_X \nabla_Y Z - \nabla_Y \nabla_X Z - \nabla_{[X, Y]} Z, \text{ for all } X, Y, Z \in \Gamma(TM).$$

Also, given an arbitrary coordinate system $\{x^i\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ on M , we label its components as follows:

$$R_{ijkl}^i = dx^i(R(\partial_k, \partial_l)\partial_j) = \partial_k \Gamma_{lj}^i - \partial_l \Gamma_{kj}^i + \Gamma_{ku}^i \Gamma_{jl}^u - \Gamma_{lu}^i \Gamma_{jk}^u.$$

where Γ stands for the corresponding Christoffel symbols of the Riemannian connection associated with g . From this we get the Ricci tensor from the following contraction:

$$\text{Ric}_{ij} \doteq R_{ilj}^l.$$

We shall also consider the $(0, 4)$ -curvature tensor, given by

$$R(V, X, Y, Z) = g(R(Y, Z)X, V).$$

Let us also recall the following local formulae the Ricci tensor, presented in arbitrary local coordinates $\{x^i\}_{i=1}^n$, which is known to be useful to understand optimal regularity for a Riemannian metric based on the regularity of its Ricci tensor:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{ij}(g) &= -\frac{1}{2}g^{ab}\partial_{ab}g_{ij} + \frac{1}{2}(g_{ia}\partial_j F^a + g_{ja}\partial_i F^a) + f_{ij}(g, \partial g), \\ F^a &\doteq g^{kl}\Gamma_{kl}^a(g) \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where f_{ij} is a quadratic form on ∂g , explicitly given by

$$f_{ij}(g, \partial g) \doteq -\frac{1}{2}\{\partial_i g^{ab}\partial_a g_{bj} + \partial_j g^{ab}\partial_a g_{bi}\} + \frac{1}{2}F^a\partial_a g_{ij} - \Gamma_{bi}^a\Gamma_{aj}^b. \quad (2.2)$$

Let us now introduce the Cotton tensor associated to a Riemannian manifold (M^n, g) , which in an arbitrary coordinate system is given by:

$$C_{ijk}(g) \doteq \nabla_k \text{Ric}_{ij} - \nabla_j \text{Ric}_{ik} + \frac{1}{4}(\nabla_j R_{g_{ik}} - \nabla_k R_{g_{ij}}). \quad (2.3)$$

It is important to recall the well-known fact that in three dimensions the Cotton tensor is a conformal invariant, which presents the main obstruction for a 3-manifold to be conformally flat.

2.2 Analytic tools

In this section we shall elaborate on several analytic tools needed for the PDE analysis of the next section. We will exploit this space to set up several notations and conventions, and review both well-known as well as some more subtle properties associated with Sobolev spaces and elliptic operators with coefficients of limited regularity. Experienced readers in PDEs and geometric analysis can easily skip the details of this section and use it just as a source for our conventions.

2.2.1 Sobolev spaces

Definition 2.1. *Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an arbitrary domain, k be a non-negative integer and $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ a real number. We define the Sobolev space $W^{k,p}(U)$ as the space of functions $f \in L^p(U)$ which possess weak derivatives $\{\partial^\alpha f\}_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq k}$ of order up to k in $L^p(U)$. That is,*

$$W^{k,p}(U) \doteq \{f \in L^p(U) : \partial^\alpha f \in L^p(U) \forall 0 \leq |\alpha| \leq k\}. \quad (2.4)$$

We equip this vector subspaces of L^p with the norm

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{W^{k,p}(U)} &\doteq \left(\sum_{|\alpha|=0}^k \|\partial^\alpha f\|_{L^p(U)}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad \text{if } 1 \leq p < \infty, \\ \|f\|_{W^{k,\infty}(U)} &\doteq \max_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq k} \|\partial^\alpha u\|_{L^\infty(U)}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

Definition 2.2. *Let M^n be a closed smooth manifold, $n \geq 3$. Let $E \xrightarrow{\pi} M$ be a vector bundle over M with fibre dimension r , let $\{U_i, \phi_i, \rho_i, \eta_i\}_{i=1}^N$ be a cover of M by coordinate charts $\{U_i, \phi_i\}_{i=1}^N$ trivialising E over each coordinate chart, with bundle charts $\{U_i, \phi_i, \rho_i\}_{i=1}^N$, where $\rho_i : \pi^{-1}(U_i) \rightarrow U_i \times \mathbb{R}^r$ denotes the bundle trivialisation, and $\{\eta_i\}$ is a partition of unity subordinate to such cover. Given a real number $1 \leq p < \infty$ and a non-negative integer $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we then define the Sobolev spaces $W^{k,p}(E)$ of section of E as*

$$W^{k,p}(E) = \{u \in L^p(E) : \tilde{\rho}_i^l \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \phi_i^{-1} \in W^{k,p}(\phi(U_i)) \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, N \text{ and all } 1 \leq l \leq r\}, \quad (2.6)$$

where $\tilde{\rho}_i$ denotes the projection of ρ_i onto its second factor, equipped with the norm

$$\|u\|_{W^{k,p}(E)} \doteq \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{l=0}^r \|\tilde{\rho}_i^l \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \phi_i^{-1}\|_{W^{k,p}(\phi(U_i))}. \quad (2.7)$$

The above spaces are seen to be equivalently defined as the space of $L^p(E, dV_g)$ sections having weak covariant derivatives in a given smooth background metric g up to order k in $L^p(E, dV_g)$. Let us now notice that for negative integer value $-k$ and $1 < p < \infty$, on any domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we have the definition of Sobolev spaces $W^{-k,p'}(\Omega) \doteq (W_0^{k,p}(\Omega))'$ for scalar functions, where $W_0^{k,p}(\Omega)$ denotes the closure of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ in the Sobolev norm (2.5) and $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$. If one looks at distributional sections of a vector bundle $E \rightarrow M$ of rank r , as maps which are locally described as mappings from a

local coordinate domain $U \rightarrow [\mathcal{D}'(\varphi(U))]^r$, we can still use the scalar version of Sobolev spaces to give meaning to negative order Sobolev spaces of sections of vector bundles as distributional sections whose local components take values in $W^{-k,p'}(\varphi(U))$. In order to make this more precise, let us introduce the following conventions, which we are extracting from [8]. In this reference, the reader will find a very detailed description of Sobolev spaces of vector bundle sections on compact manifolds.

Let us start considering a smooth Riemannian manifold (M^n, g_0) and a vector bundle $E \xrightarrow{\pi} M$ and denote by $(U_i, \rho_i)_{i=1}^N$ a set bundle charts for E . That is, $\rho_i : \pi^{-1}(U_i) \rightarrow U_i \times \mathbb{R}^r$ are the local trivialisation maps. Then, consider the density bundle over M given by

$$|\Lambda|(M) = \coprod_{p \in M} |\Lambda|(T_p M)$$

where $|\Lambda|(T_p M)$ denotes the space of 1-densities on $T_p M$. On a coordinate domain (U_i, φ_i) , with coordinates x^i , we fix μ_g to be the unique 1-density satisfying $\mu_g = |\sqrt{\det(g_0)} dx^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx^n|$, and we fix the associated bundle charts to $|\Lambda|(M)$ over U_i by

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho_\Lambda)_i &: \pi_\Lambda^{-1}(U_i) \rightarrow U_i \times \mathbb{R}, \\ (p, \nu_p = a\mu_g|_p) &\mapsto (p, a). \end{aligned}$$

Let us now introduce the bundle $E^\vee \doteq \text{Hom}(E, |\Lambda|(M))$, given by

$$E^\vee \doteq \coprod_{p \in M} \text{Hom}(E_p, |\Lambda|_p(M)),$$

where $\text{Hom}(E_p, |\Lambda|_p(M))$ denotes the set of linear maps from E_p to $|\Lambda|_p(M)$, and, given a cover $\{U_i, \varphi_i\}_{i=1}^N$ by coordinate charts, the associated bundle charts to E^\vee are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_i^\vee &: \pi_{E^\vee}^{-1}(U_i) \rightarrow U_i \times \mathbb{R}^r \\ (p, A) &\mapsto (p, \Phi \circ (\tilde{\rho}_\Lambda)_i|_{\pi_\Lambda^{-1}(p)} \circ A \circ (\rho_i|_{E_p})^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where ρ_i and ρ_Λ were fixed above, $\tilde{\rho}_\Lambda$ denotes the projection of ρ_Λ onto its second factor, $A \in \text{Hom}(E_p, |\Lambda|_p(M))$, and, fixing a canonical basis $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^r$ for \mathbb{R}^r , $\Phi : (\mathbb{R}^r)' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^r$ is the usual isomorphism identifying $(\mathbb{R}^r)' \cong \mathbb{R}^r$, via⁷

$$\Phi(u) = \sum_{i=1}^r u(e_i)e_i.$$

We then take the space of test sections associated to E to be the set $C_0^\infty(M; E^\vee)$ equipped, as usual, with the inductive limit topology induced by the C^k family of semi-norms on compact subsets. We denote this topological vector space by $\mathcal{D}(M; E^\vee)$ and then define the set of distributions as $\mathcal{D}'(E) \doteq (\mathcal{D}(M; E^\vee))'$. There are a few things to highlight, whose details can be found in [8, Section 6]. First of all, over given a chart (U, φ) , let us denote

$$[\mathcal{D}(\varphi(U))]^r \doteq \underbrace{\mathcal{D}(\varphi(U)) \times \cdots \times \mathcal{D}(\varphi(U))}_{r\text{-times}}$$

and notice that the linear map

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_{E^\vee, U, \varphi} &: \mathcal{D}(U, E_U^\vee) \rightarrow [\mathcal{D}(\varphi(U))]^r \\ \xi &\mapsto \tilde{\rho}^\vee \circ \xi \circ \varphi^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

is a topological isomorphism due to [8, Theorem 46] and we denote its (continuous) inverse by

$$T_{E^\vee, U, \varphi} \doteq \tilde{T}_{E^\vee, U, \varphi}^{-1} : [\mathcal{D}(\varphi(U))]^r \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(U, E_U^\vee)$$

⁷Notice that $(\tilde{\rho}_\Lambda)_i|_{\pi_\Lambda^{-1}(p)} \circ A \circ (\rho_i|_{E_p})^{-1} : \mathbb{R}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defines an element of $(\mathbb{R}^r)'$.

It then follows that the adjoint map

$$T_{E^\vee, U, \varphi}^* : (\mathcal{D}(U, E_U^\vee))' \rightarrow [\mathcal{D}(\varphi(U))]^r',$$

$$u \mapsto (T_{E^\vee, U, \varphi}^* u)(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) = u(T_{E^\vee, U, \varphi}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r))$$

is also a linear topological isomorphism, where

$$T_{E^\vee, U, \varphi}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) = (\tilde{\rho}^\vee)^{-1} \circ (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \circ \varphi.$$

Let us also introduce the linear map:

$$L : ([\mathcal{D}(\varphi(U))]^r)' \rightarrow [\mathcal{D}'(\varphi(U))]^r,$$

$$v \mapsto Lv = (v \circ i_1, \dots, v \circ i_r)$$

where

$$i_j : \mathcal{D}(\varphi(U)) \rightarrow [\mathcal{D}(\varphi(U))]^r,$$

$$f \mapsto (0, \dots, \underbrace{f}_{j\text{-th slot}}, \dots, 0)$$

which is also a topological isomorphism due to [8, Theorem 24]. Then, define

$$H_{E^\vee, U, \varphi} \doteq L \circ T_{E^\vee, U, \varphi}^* : (\mathcal{D}(U, E_U^\vee))' \rightarrow [\mathcal{D}'(\varphi(U))]^r,$$

which assigns to a distribution on $\mathcal{D}(U, E_U^\vee)$ a vector of r -distributions on $\mathcal{D}'(\varphi(U))$, which we understand as the components of the vector bundle distributions in $(\mathcal{D}(U, E_U^\vee))'$.

Since multiplication by smooth functions is a continuous map on $\mathcal{D}(M, E^\vee)$, then we can localise a distribution $\mathcal{D}'(E)$ in a coordinate chart (U, φ) multiplying by a cut-off function $\eta \in C_0^\infty(U)$, so that

$$m_\eta : \mathcal{D}'(E) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}(U, E_U^\vee))',$$

$$u \mapsto \eta u,$$

where ηu is defined as usual by duality:

$$(\eta u)(v) = u(\eta v), \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{D}(U, E_U^\vee),$$

where we understand $\eta v \in \mathcal{D}(M, E^\vee)$ extended by zero outside of U . All this notation gives us a natural way to introduce Sobolev sections of negative degree of regularity: Since we have a well-understood meaning for spaces $W^{-k, p}(\varphi(U))$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $1 < p < \infty$, in the case of scalar functions, in analogy to (2.7), we can define

$$W^{-k, p}(E) = \{u \in \mathcal{D}'(E) : H_{E^\vee, U_i, \phi}^l \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \phi_i^{-1} \in W^{-k, p'}(\phi(U_i)) \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, N \text{ and all } 1 \leq l \leq r\},$$
(2.8)

equipped with the norm (2.7), with (k, p) replaced by $(-k, p)$ understood in the usual scalar case for each component. That is, $W^{-k, p}(E)$ denotes the subspace of $\mathcal{D}'(E)$ consisting of vector bundle distributions which components (understood via the maps $H_{E^\vee, U_i, \varphi}$ described above) belong to $W^{-k, p}(\varphi(U_i))$.

Let us end these definitions highlighting a few important details. First, given a smooth closed Riemannian manifold (M, g_0) and a vector bundle $E \rightarrow M$ with fibre metric $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_E$, regular distributions are given by maps

$$l_u : \mathcal{D}(M; E^\vee) \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

$$v \mapsto l_u(v) = \int_M v(u)$$

associated to $u \in C^\infty(M; E)$. In this context one has the maps

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(U) &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^r \\ x &\mapsto (\tilde{\rho}^1 \circ u \circ \varphi^{-1}(x), \dots, \tilde{\rho}^r \circ u \circ \varphi^{-1}(x)), \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

attaching a vector valued map to $u|_U$, and

$$H_{E^\vee, U, \varphi}^1 l_u = \left((H_{E^\vee, U, \varphi} \circ l_u)^1, \dots, (H_{E^\vee, U, \varphi} \circ l_u)^r \right) \quad (2.10)$$

attaching r -distributions on $\varphi(U) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ to $l_u|_U$. One might wonder whether the k -th component of the regular distribution l_u given in (2.10) agrees with the regular distribution $l_{\tilde{u}^k}$ defined by the k -th component $\tilde{u}^k \doteq \tilde{\rho}^k \circ u \circ \varphi^{-1}$ of u as given in (2.9). Using all the above definitions, one can see that this is actually the case (see [8, Remark 32]):

$$(H_{E^\vee, U, \varphi} \circ l_u)^k = l_{\tilde{\rho}^k \circ u \circ \varphi^{-1}}, \text{ for all } u \in C^\infty(M; E).$$

This makes it possible to use Definition 2.8 for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $1 < p < \infty$, which in the case of regular distributions agrees with Definition 2.7.

Finally, notice that if in addition to a (smooth) Riemannian metric g_0 on M we have a fibre metric $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_E$ on E , with the conventions established above, the map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T} : \mathcal{D}(M; E) &\rightarrow \mathcal{D}(M; E^\vee), \\ v &\mapsto \langle v, \cdot \rangle_E dV_{g_0} \end{aligned}$$

is a linear topological isomorphism [8, Lemma 13], where $\mathcal{T}(v)_p \in \text{Hom}(E_p, |\Lambda|_p(M))$ is given by

$$\mathcal{T}(v)_p(u_p) = \langle v, u \rangle_E|_p dV_{g_0}.$$

As a consequence, the adjoint map

$$\mathcal{T}^* : \mathcal{D}'(E) \doteq (\mathcal{D}(M; E^\vee))' \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}(M; E))'$$

is a linear continuous bijective map, which can be used to identify $\mathcal{D}'(E) \cong (\mathcal{D}(M; E))'$ with the aid of these additional Riemannian structures.

Let us highlight that in the case of vector bundles, from the definitions above, the relation between $W^{k,p}(E)$ and $W^{-k,p'}(E)$ does not come by definition as in the scalar case, although the following result holds (see [8, Theorem 100]):

Theorem 2.1. *Let (M^n, \bar{g}) be a closed Riemannian manifold, \bar{g} smooth, $E \xrightarrow{\pi} M$ a vector bundle over M equipped with a smooth fibre metric $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_E$. Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $1 < p < \infty$ and denote by*

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{L^2(M, \bar{g})} = \int_M \langle u, v \rangle_E dV_{\bar{g}}$$

the associated L^2 inner product. Then,

1. $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{L^2(M, \bar{g})} : \mathcal{D}(M; E) \times \mathcal{D}(M; E) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ extends by continuity to a bilinear pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{(M, \bar{g})} : W^{-k,p'}(E) \times W^{k,p}(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$;
2. The map

$$\begin{aligned} S_{k,p} : W^{-k,p'}(M; E) &\rightarrow (W^{k,p}(M; E))', \\ u &\mapsto S_{k,p}(u) = \mathcal{L}_u : W^{s,p}(M; E) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \\ v &\mapsto \langle u, v \rangle_{(M, \bar{g})} \end{aligned}$$

is a topological isomorphism.

Let us now recall the following lemma about composition with Sobolev functions, which proof follows along the lines of [44, Lemma 2.2]:

Lemma 2.1 (Composition Lemma). *Let U be a smooth bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^n , and let $F : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function of class C^m on some open interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $f \in W^{m,p}(U)$ with $m > \frac{n}{p}$ and $1 \leq p < \infty$, satisfying $\overline{f(U)} \subset I$. Then, $F \circ f \in W^{m,p}(U)$.*

Before presenting further results, let us highlight that, although during most of this paper we will only use Sobolev spaces with *integer degree of regularity*, we will need in a few situations to appeal to interpolating spaces. We have then decided to present all the above definitions and results in the context of $W^{k,p}$ -spaces with $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ to avoid unnecessary complications. Nevertheless, we will now introduce our conventions for the interpolating spaces, and appeal to them whenever necessary. With this in mind, let us introduce the space of Bessel potentials $H^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $1 < p < \infty$:

$$H^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) = \{u \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n) : \mathcal{F}^{-1}((1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{s}{2}} \hat{u}) \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)\}, \quad (2.11)$$

where above $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denotes the space of Schwartz functions, $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ the space of tempered distributions, $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ the Fourier transform, and we have denoted by $\hat{u} \doteq \mathcal{F}(u)$. We furthermore equip $H^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with the norm:

$$\|u\|_{H^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \doteq \left\| \mathcal{F}^{-1}((1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{s}{2}} \hat{u}) \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \quad (2.12)$$

These are known to be Banach spaces which coincide with $W^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ whenever $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ (see, for instance, [57, Chapter 13, Proposition 6.1]), and also $H^{-k,p'}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cong (H^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}^n))'$. Moreover, for $s \in \mathbb{R}$, the usual Sobolev embeddings extend to this setting under the same conditions, as can be seen from [57, Proposition 6.3 and Proposition 6.4], and a summary of all these properties can be found in [2, Chapter VII, Theorem 7.63]. An additional important property of Bessel potential spaces, is that these are known to coincide with the interpolation spaces via complex interpolation, as introduced by A. P. Calderón, between $W^{k,p}$ -spaces. Below, we shall appeal to a few of the properties which follow from such characterisation. For detailed descriptions of the corresponding interpolation theory, we refer the reader to [12, 59], although most of the properties we shall use are contained in the concise description of [56, Chapter 4, Section 2].

Let us recall that, given a pair of Banach spaces E and F such that $F \hookrightarrow E$, complex interpolation produces a family of Banach spaces, denoted by $[E, F]_\theta \hookrightarrow E$, parametrised by $\theta \in (0, 1)$, which interpolate between E and F . In particular, given $1 < p < \infty$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and setting $E = L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $F = W^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ one has (see, for instance, [57, Proposition 6.2]):

$$[L^p(\mathbb{R}^n), W^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)]_\theta = H^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^n), \text{ for } s = \theta k \text{ and } \theta \in (0, 1). \quad (2.13)$$

These last set of properties can then be used to *define* these spaces on bounded domains, for instance following [1, Chapter VII, Section 7.66]. That is, letting Ω be a smooth bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^n , $1 < p < \infty$, $\theta \in (0, 1)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we define:

$$H^{s,p}(\Omega) \doteq [L^p(\Omega), W^{k,p}(\Omega)]_\theta, \text{ for } s = \theta k. \quad (2.14)$$

We then denote by $H_0^{s,p}(\Omega)$ the closure of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ in $H^{s,p}(\Omega)$, and for $1 < p < \infty$ and $s < 0$ a real number, we define

$$H^{s,p'}(\Omega) \doteq [H_0^{-s,p}(\Omega)]'. \quad (2.15)$$

In the above setting, we extend these definitions for functions and vector bundle sections defined on a closed manifold M appealing to a coordinate cover by coordinate balls, a partition of unity subordinate to it, trivialisations over it whenever necessary, and then using the same definitions as above for the $W^{k,p}(M)$ -spaces, but this time demanding the coordinate expressions to belong to $H^{s,p}(\Omega)$ -spaces instead of $W^{k,p}(\Omega)$.

It shall now be crucial for us to understand multiplication properties of Sobolev sections of tensor bundles, even for negative Sobolev regularity. Such properties are key when analysing continuity properties of partial differential operators acting on Sobolev-type spaces, and have been analysed in several references, such as [52, Section 9], [16, Chapter VI, Section 3], [28, Section 2] and [7], establishing related results under a variety of hypotheses. The relevant results for us can be deduced from the following theorem, which is very close to the ones of [52, Section 9]. We shall present a detailed proof for the sake of completeness.

Theorem 2.2. *Consider a smooth bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Let s_1, s_2 be real numbers and $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, satisfying $s_1 + s_2 \geq 0$, $s_i \geq s$ for $i = 1, 2$, and let p_1, p_2 and p be real numbers $1 < p, p_i < \infty$, $i = 1, 2$. If $s_1, s_2, s \geq 0$, then the following continuous multiplication property holds*

$$H^{s_1, p_1}(\Omega) \otimes H^{s_2, p_2}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H^{s, p}(\Omega) \quad (2.16)$$

as long as

$$s_i - s \geq n \left(\frac{1}{p_i} - \frac{1}{p} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad s_1 + s_2 - s > n \left(\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} - \frac{1}{p} \right), \quad (2.17)$$

Furthermore, under the same conditions, it also holds that

$$H^{s_1, p_1}(\Omega) \otimes H_0^{s_2, p_2}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H_0^{s, p}(\Omega) \quad (2.18)$$

In case that $\min(s_1, s_2) < 0$, then (2.16) holds if additionally one imposes

$$s_1 + s_2 \geq n \left(\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} - 1 \right) \quad (2.19)$$

Proof. Let us first establish the claim for $s = 0$. That is, given $1 < p_i, p \leq \infty$ and s_1, s_2 non-negative real numbers, it must hold that:

$$\begin{aligned} H^{s_1, p_1}(\Omega) \times H^{s_2, p_2}(\Omega) &\rightarrow L^p(\Omega), \\ (f, g) &\mapsto fg \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

and $\|fg\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{H^{s_1, p_1}(\Omega)} \|g\|_{H^{s_2, p_2}(\Omega)}$ for a fixed given constant $C > 0$. We will divide this in two cases:

1. (s_i, p_i) satisfying (2.17) and at least one $s_i \geq \frac{n}{p_i}$, $i = 1, 2$.

Assume without loss of generality that $s_1 \geq \frac{n}{p_1}$. If actually $s_1 > \frac{n}{p_1}$,⁸ and also $s_2 \geq \frac{n}{p_2}$, then $H^{s_2, p_2}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^q(\Omega)$ for any $q < \infty$ and since $H^{s_1, p_1}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\Omega)$, then $fg \in L^q(\Omega)$ for any $q < \infty$. If $s_2 < \frac{n}{p_2}$, then $H^{s_2, p_2}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^p(\Omega)$, for all $p \leq \frac{np_2}{n - s_2 p_2}$ and hence $fg \in L^p(\Omega)$ for such p . This condition is equivalent to

$$p \leq \frac{np_2}{n - s_2 p_2} \iff \frac{1}{p} \geq \frac{n - s_2 p_2}{np_2} = \frac{1}{p_2} - \frac{s_2}{n} \iff s_2 \geq n \left(\frac{1}{p_2} - \frac{1}{p} \right), \quad (2.21)$$

which is satisfied by hypothesis.

It remains to examine the cases where $s_1 = \frac{n}{p_1}$. Notice that if $s_2 > \frac{n}{p_2}$, then the same argument as above, but with (s_1, p_1) and (s_2, p_2) in inverted roles establishes the result. Thus, the remaining cases are given by $s_2 \leq \frac{n}{p_2}$. Assume first that $s_2 = \frac{n}{p_2}$, and notice that Sobolev embeddings guarantee $H^{s_i, p_i}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{q_i}(\Omega)$ for all $q_i < \infty$. Since we intend to use Hölder's generalised inequality $L^{q_1}(\Omega) \otimes L^{q_2}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^p(\Omega)$, one needs to have $\frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2} = \frac{1}{p}$. Since $1 \leq q_i < \infty$ are arbitrary, this constrains p only to the condition $\frac{1}{p} > 0$, excluding the critical value $p = \infty$. Notice that the conditions $s_i = \frac{n}{p_i}$ together with (2.17) grant $p < \infty$, and thus one can appeal to Hölder's multiplication to obtain the result.

⁸This condition together with $s_2 \geq n \left(\frac{1}{p_2} - \frac{1}{p} \right)$ already implies $s_1 + s_2 > n \left(\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} - \frac{1}{p} \right)$

We still need to consider the cases $s_1 = \frac{n}{p_1}$ and $n\left(\frac{1}{p_2} - \frac{1}{p}\right) \leq s_2 < \frac{n}{p_2}$. First, notice that the limit case of $s_2 = n\left(\frac{1}{p_2} - \frac{1}{p}\right)$ is excluded by (2.17), since it implies $s_1 + s_2 = n\left(\frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{1}{p_1} - \frac{1}{p}\right)$ and thus it implies the non-strict version of both inequalities. Hence, we need only consider the case $n\left(\frac{1}{p_2} - \frac{1}{p}\right) < s_2 < \frac{n}{p_2}$ and we see this case is accounted by (2.17), where we have $H^{s_2, p_2}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{r_2}(\Omega)$ for all $r_2 \leq \frac{np_2}{n-s_2p_2}$, $H^{s_1, p_1}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{r_1}(\Omega)$ for all $1 \leq r_1 < \infty$. We want to use Hölder's generalised inequality to guarantee that $L^{r_1}(\Omega) \otimes L^{r_2}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^p(\Omega)$. For this, given $g \in L^{r_2}(\Omega)$, we need to guarantee $f \in L^{r_1}(\Omega)$ with $\frac{1}{r_1} \doteq \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{r_2} > 0$. Since r_1 can be taken arbitrary within $1 \leq r_1 < \infty$, then the only constraint to apply Hölder's inequality is that $\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{r_2} > 0$. This is compatible iff

$$\frac{1}{p} > \frac{1}{r_2} \geq \frac{1}{p_2} - \frac{s_2}{n} \iff s_2 > n\left(\frac{1}{p_2} - \frac{1}{p}\right),$$

which, as discussed above, holds by hypothesis.

2. (s_i, p_i) satisfy (2.17) with $n\left(\frac{1}{p_i} - \frac{1}{p}\right) \leq s_i < \frac{n}{p_i}$.

First, notice that in the critical case $s_1 = n\left(\frac{1}{p_1} - \frac{1}{p}\right)$ the condition $s_1 + s_2 \geq n\left(\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} - \frac{1}{p}\right)$ implies $s_2 \geq \frac{n}{p_2}$ and hence this case was already treated above. Therefore, one can assume $n\left(\frac{1}{p_i} - \frac{1}{p}\right) < s_i < \frac{n}{p_i}$ for both $i = 1, 2$, with the remaining critical cases having been treated above. In these cases $H^{s_1, p_1}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{r_1}(\Omega)$ for $r_1 \doteq \frac{np_1}{n-s_1p_1}$. We want to use Hölder's generalised inequality to guarantee that $L^{r_1}(\Omega) \otimes L^{r_2}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^p(\Omega)$. For this, given $f \in L^{r_1}(\Omega)$, we need to guarantee $g \in L^{r_2}(\Omega)$ with $\frac{1}{r_2} \doteq \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{r_1} > 0$. This is compatible iff

$$\begin{aligned} r_1 > p &\iff \frac{1}{p} > \frac{1}{p_1} - \frac{s_1}{n} \iff s_1 > n\left(\frac{1}{p_1} - \frac{1}{p}\right), \\ \frac{1}{r_2} \doteq \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{r_1} &\geq \frac{1}{p_2} - \frac{s_2}{n} \iff s_1 + s_2 \geq n\left(\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} - \frac{1}{p}\right), \end{aligned}$$

which are satisfied by hypotheses.

The above discussions establish the multiplication property (2.20) under the conditions given by (2.17), with an inequality:

$$\|fg\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq \|f\|_{L^{r_1}(\Omega)} \|g\|_{L^{r_2}(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{H^{s_1, p_1}(\Omega)} \|g\|_{H^{s_2, p_2}(\Omega)}, \quad (2.22)$$

Let us now consider (2.16) when $s \in \mathbb{N}$. First assume $f \in C^\infty(\Omega)$, $g \in H^{s_2, p_2}(\Omega)$, and notice that for $s_i \geq s \geq |\alpha|$:

$$\partial^\alpha(fg) = \sum_{|\beta|=0}^{|\alpha|} C_\beta \partial^{|\beta|} f \partial^{|\alpha|-|\beta|} g, \quad (2.23)$$

where C_β denote constants and $\partial^{|\beta|}$ stands for some derivative of order $|\beta|$ while the summation runs through all multi-indices of each order up to $|\alpha|$, for some $|\alpha| \leq s$. For any given term in (2.23), we have

$$\partial^{|\beta|} f \in H^{s_1-|\beta|, p_1}(\Omega) \ ; \ \partial^{|\alpha|-|\beta|} g \in H^{s_2-|\alpha|+|\beta|, p_2}(\Omega).$$

Thus, from our preliminary claim, as long as

$$s_1 - |\beta| \geq n\left(\frac{1}{p_1} - \frac{1}{p}\right), \quad s_2 - (|\alpha| - |\beta|) \geq n\left(\frac{1}{p_2} - \frac{1}{p}\right), \quad s_1 + s_2 - |\alpha| > n\left(\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} - \frac{1}{p}\right),$$

the continuity estimate (2.22) holds. Since $|\beta| \leq |\alpha| \leq s \leq s_i$, then (2.17) implies that the above set of conditions must hold. Therefore, in these cases it follows that

$$\|fg\|_{H^{s, p}(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{H^{s_1, p_1}(\Omega)} \|g\|_{H^{s_2, p_2}(\Omega)}. \quad (2.24)$$

Now, for $f \in H^{s_1, p_1}(\Omega)$ and $g \in H^{s_2, p_2}(\Omega)$ arbitrary, we can approximate by smooth functions $\{f_j\} \subset C^\infty(\Omega)$ converging to f in $H^{s_1, p_1}(\Omega)$ and use (2.24) to show that $f_j g$ is Cauchy in $H^{s, p}(\Omega)$, thus converging to a limit $h \in H^{s, p}(\Omega)$. On the other hand, one knows from the preliminary claim associated to (2.20) that $fg \in L^p(\Omega)$, and in this case (2.22) shows that

$$\|fg - f_j g\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C \|f - f_j\|_{H^{s_1, p_1}(\Omega)} \|g\|_{H^{s_2, p_2}(\Omega)} \xrightarrow{j \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

That is, $f_j g \xrightarrow{j \rightarrow \infty} fg$. But since, in particular, $f_j g \xrightarrow{j \rightarrow \infty} h$, then $fg = h \in H^{s, p}(\Omega)$, and furthermore

$$\|fg\|_{H^{s, p}(\Omega)} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|f_j g\|_{H^{s, p}(\Omega)} \leq C \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|f_j\|_{H^{s_1, p_1}(\Omega)} \|g\|_{H^{s_2, p_2}(\Omega)} = C \|f\|_{H^{s_1, p_1}(\Omega)} \|g\|_{H^{s_2, p_2}(\Omega)} \quad (2.25)$$

Establishing (2.18) then follows, in a first step, from $H_0^{s_2, p_2}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H^{s_2, p_2}(\Omega)$, which guarantees that $H^{s_1, p_1}(\Omega) \otimes H_0^{s_2, p_2}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H^{s, p}(\Omega)$. But then, if $f \in H^{s_1, p_1}(\Omega)$ and $g \in H_0^{s_2, p_2}(\Omega)$, we have sequences $\{f_i\} \subset C^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\{g_j\} \subset C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ such that

$$f_i \xrightarrow{H^{s_1, p_1}(\Omega)} f ; \quad g_j \xrightarrow{H_0^{s_2, p_2}(\Omega)} g.$$

Then $\{f_i g_j\} \subset C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ is seen to converge $f_i g_j \xrightarrow{H^{s, p}(\Omega)} fg$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_i g_j - fg\|_{H^{s, p}(\Omega)} &\leq \|(f_i - f)g_j\|_{H^{s, p}(\Omega)} + \|f(g_j - g)\|_{H^{s, p}(\Omega)} \\ &\lesssim \|f_i - f\|_{H^{s_1, p_1}(\Omega)} \|g_j\|_{H^{s_2, p_2}(\Omega)} + \|f\|_{H^{s_1, p_1}(\Omega)} \|g_j - g\|_{H^{s_2, p_2}(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we have used the already established (2.16), and the right-hand side goes to zero by hypothesis.

To establish the multiplication property for $\min(s_1, s_2) < 0$, assume without loss of generality that $s_2 = \min(s_1, s_2) < 0$. Since $s_1 + s_2 \geq 0$ and $s_i \geq s$, we know that $s_1 > 0$ and $s < 0$. Furthermore, the objective is to show that fg is well-defined as an element of $H^{s, p}(\Omega)$ by duality. That is, that $(fg)(\phi) = g(f\phi)$ is well defined for all $\phi \in H_0^{-s, p'}(\Omega)$. This implies that $fg \in H^{s, p}(\Omega)$ iff $f\phi \in H_0^{-s_2, p'_2}(\Omega)$ for all $\phi \in H_0^{-s, p'}(\Omega)$. Since $0 > s_2 \geq s$, then we can appeal to the previous analysis to see that

$$H^{s_1, p_1}(\Omega) \otimes H_0^{-s, p'}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H_0^{-s_2, p'_2}(\Omega)$$

is guaranteed by

$$\begin{aligned} s_1 + s_2 &\geq n \left(\frac{1}{p_1} - \frac{1}{p'_2} \right) = n \left(\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} - 1 \right), \\ s_2 - s &\geq n \left(\frac{1}{p'} - \frac{1}{p'_2} \right) = n \left(\frac{1}{p_2} - \frac{1}{p} \right), \\ s_1 - s + s_2 &> n \left(\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p'} - \frac{1}{p'_2} \right) = n \left(\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} - \frac{1}{p} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

where (2.26) are required by (2.17). Notice that the last two conditions are just extending (2.17) to the case of negative values for s and s_2 , while the first condition corresponds to (2.19). \square

Let us now appeal to the above theorem to establish the following multiplication properties for tensor bundles:

Corollary 2.1. *Consider a closed manifold M^n , let $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfy $s_1 + s_2 \geq 0$, $s_i \geq s$ for $i = 1, 2$, and let p_1, p_2 and p be real numbers $1 < p, p_i < \infty$, $i = 1, 2$. If $s_1, s_2, s \geq 0$, then the following continuous multiplication property holds for sections of tensor bundles $T_m^l M$ and $T_r^q M$:*

$$H^{s_1, p_1}(T_m^l M) \otimes H^{s_2, p_2}(T_r^q M) \hookrightarrow H^{s, p}(T_m^l M \otimes T_r^q M) \quad (2.27)$$

as long as

$$s_i - s \geq n \left(\frac{1}{p_i} - \frac{1}{p} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad s_1 + s_2 - s > n \left(\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} - \frac{1}{p} \right), \quad (2.28)$$

In case that $\min(s_1, s_2) < 0$, then (2.27) holds if additionally one imposes

$$s_1 + s_2 \geq n \left(\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} - 1 \right) \quad (2.29)$$

Furthermore, if $u \in H^{s_1, p_1}(T_m^l M)$, $v \in H^{s_2, p_2}(T_r^q M)$ and we denote an arbitrary contraction between these two tensors by $u.v$, then, under the same conditions as above, $u.v \in H^{s, p}$ and there is a fixed constant $C > 0$ such that $\|u.v\|_{H^{s, p}} \leq C \|u\|_{H^{s_1, p_1}} \|v\|_{H^{s_2, p_2}}$.

Proof. Considering a covering $\{U_i, \varphi_i\}_{i=1}^N$ of M by coordinate charts where we take U_i to be bounded domains with smooth boundary (for instance, small coordinate balls), and a partition of unity subordinate to the cover $\{\eta_i\}$, let us denote by ρ_1, ρ_2 and ρ_3 the trivialisation maps of $T_m^l M$, $T_r^q M$ and $T_m^l M \otimes T_r^q M$ respectively. Then introduce the partition of unity $\left\{ \tilde{\eta}_i \doteq \frac{\eta_i^2}{\sum_j \eta_j^2} \right\}_{i=1}^N$:

$$\begin{aligned} [(\tilde{\rho}_3)_i \circ (\tilde{\eta}_i u \otimes v) \circ \varphi_i^{-1}] &= \frac{1}{\sum_j \eta_j^2} \left((\rho_1)_i \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \varphi_i^{-1} \otimes (\rho_2)_i \circ (\eta_i v) \circ \varphi_i^{-1} \right), \\ &= \frac{1}{\sum_j \eta_j^2} (\eta_i \circ \varphi_i^{-1} u_{b_1 \dots b_m}^{a_1 \dots a_l} \eta_i \circ \varphi_i^{-1} v_{d_1 \dots d_r}^{c_1 \dots c_q})_{1 \leq a_j, b_j, c_j, d_j \leq n} \end{aligned}$$

Fixing a particular order for the components in the last line, we have by definition that

$$(\eta_i \circ \varphi_i^{-1} u_{b_1 \dots b_m}^{a_1 \dots a_l}) (\eta_i \circ \varphi_i^{-1} v_{d_1 \dots d_r}^{c_1 \dots c_q}) \in H^{s_1, p_1}(\varphi_i(U_i)) \otimes H^{s_2, p_2}(\varphi_i(U_i)) \hookrightarrow H^{s, p}(\varphi_i(U_i)), \quad (2.30)$$

where the continuous embedding follows from Theorem 2.2, which implies $[(\tilde{\rho}_3)_i \circ (\tilde{\eta}_i u v) \circ \varphi_i^{-1}]^l \in H^{s, p}(\varphi_i(U_i))$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \|[(\tilde{\rho}_3)_i \circ (\tilde{\eta}_i u \otimes v) \circ \varphi_i^{-1}]^l\|_{H^{s, p}(\varphi_i(U_i))} &\lesssim \|[(\rho_1)_i \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \varphi_i^{-1}]_{b_1 \dots b_m}^{a_1 \dots a_l}\|_{H^{s_1, p_1}(\varphi_i(U_i))} \\ &\quad \|[(\rho_2)_i \circ (\eta_i v) \circ \varphi_i^{-1}]_{d_1 \dots d_r}^{c_1 \dots c_q}\|_{H^{s_2, p_2}(\varphi_i(U_i))} \end{aligned} \quad (2.31)$$

Using then the definition of (2.7), we can establish (2.27) quite straight-forwardly. Similarly, with the same constructions as above, an arbitrary tensor contraction implies the contraction a selected indices in (2.30), which is again estimated by (2.31), with summation along the corresponding indices, which is once more estimated by the product of the norms in (2.27) with simple manipulations. \square

2.3 Mapping properties of $\mathcal{L}^2(W^{2, q})$ -operators - $q > \frac{n}{2}$

In this section we shall recapitulate quite general mapping properties related to partial differential operators which apply in fairly low regularity. Related results have been analysed previously in the literature, for instance in relation to rough solutions to the Einstein constraint equations. Among such references, we highlight the recent paper [28, Section 2], where more general results than those presented here have been established. We shall follow some of the notations in this last paper, although we will try to provide a self-contained presentation for the benefit of the reader, which is more narrowly tailored to the results needed in the core of this paper. In the end, the associated local elliptic estimates in this section will be obtained through different techniques to those of [28].

With the above goals in mind, let us start considering a closed manifold M^n and a vector bundle $E \rightarrow M$ over M . We are interested in the class of second order linear operators L on $C^\infty(E)$, which over any given coordinate patch trivialising E via (U, φ, ρ) , can locally be written as

$$(Lu) \circ \varphi^{-1} = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} A_\alpha \partial^\alpha (\tilde{\rho} \circ u \circ \varphi^{-1}), \quad \text{with } A^\alpha \in W_{loc}^{|\alpha|, q}(U, \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}), \quad (2.32)$$

where above $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ denotes an arbitrary multi-index, $|\alpha| = \sum_i^n \alpha_i$, $\partial_\alpha = \partial_{(x^1)^{\alpha_1} \dots (x^n)^{\alpha_n}}$ and r is the dimension of the fibre of $E \rightarrow M$. Along the lines of [28], we shall denote the set of such operators by $\mathcal{L}^2(W^{2,q})$. One can then establish the following lemma concerning the mapping properties of such an operator:

Lemma 2.2. *Let L be a differential operator of class $\mathcal{L}^2(W^{2,q})$. Then, given $1 < p < \infty$ and an integer $0 \leq k \leq 2$, L can be extended as a bounded linear map*

$$L : W^{k,p}(E) \rightarrow W^{k-2,p}(E) \quad (2.33)$$

as long as $q > \frac{n}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{k-2}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{q} + \frac{k}{n}$.

Remark 2.1. *Concerning the condition $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{k-2}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{q} + \frac{k}{n}$, let us highlight that:*

- If $k = 2$ we we obtain $\frac{1}{q} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{2}{n}$, which is equivalent to $\frac{nq'}{n+2q'} \leq p \leq q$. Notice then that

$$\frac{nq'}{n+2q'} \leq 1 \iff 1 - \frac{1}{q} + \frac{2}{n} \geq 1 \iff \frac{1}{q} \leq \frac{2}{n},$$

where the last inequality holds by hypothesis. That is, in this case the restrictions on p are $1 < p \leq q$;

- If $k = 1$, we find $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{1}{n}$. Thus, if $q \geq n$, this translates into $\frac{nq'}{n+q'} \leq p < \infty$, while if $\frac{n}{2} < q < n$, we then find $\frac{nq'}{n+q'} \leq p < \frac{nq}{n-q}$;
- If $k = 0$, then $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{2}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q'}$ holds for all $p \geq q'$, since $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{2}{n} < 0$ by hypothesis.
- If $q \geq 2$, then $q' \leq 2 \leq q$ and $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{k-2}{n} \leq \frac{1}{q} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{k}{n}$ for all $k = 0, 1, 2$. Therefore, when $q \geq 2$, we see that $p = q$ is always allowed.

Proof. Let $u \in C^\infty$ be compactly supported in a coordinate neighbourhood (U, φ) where L acts as in (2.32), and let (U, φ, ρ, η) be part of a trivialisation of E by coordinate charts. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}^l \circ (\eta Lu) \circ \varphi_x^{-1} &= \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\rho}^l \circ (\eta L(\eta_i u)) \circ \varphi^{-1}, \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \tilde{\rho}^l \circ (\eta A_\alpha) \circ \partial_x^\alpha (\tilde{\rho}_i(\eta_i u) \circ \varphi^{-1}), \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \sum_{j=1}^r \eta \circ \varphi^{-1} (A_\alpha)_j^l \partial_x^\alpha (\eta_j w^j \circ \varphi^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

By hypothesis, $\rho_i^a \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \varphi_i^{-1} \in W^{k,p}(\varphi_i(U_i))$ for each $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $a = 1, \dots, k$. In fact, $\rho_i^a \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \varphi_i^{-1} \in W_0^{k,p}(\varphi_i(U_i))$, and so, in a neighbourhood of $\text{supp}(\eta_i u) \subset U_i \cap U$,

$$\varphi_i \circ \varphi^{-1} : \varphi(U_i \cap U) \rightarrow \varphi_i(U_i \cap U)$$

is a bounded diffeomorphism, and therefore by [1, Theorem 3.35]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_i &\doteq (\varphi_i \circ \varphi^{-1})^* : W^{k,p}(\varphi_i(U_i \cap U)) \rightarrow W^{k,p}(\varphi(U_i \cap U)), \\ &f \mapsto f \circ \varphi_i \circ \varphi^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

is a bounded invertible map. Therefore, since

$$\text{supp}(\rho_i^a \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \varphi_i^{-1}) \subset \subset \varphi_i(U_i \cap U),$$

we have

$$\mathcal{A}_i(\rho_i^a \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \varphi_i^{-1}) = \rho_i^a \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \varphi^{-1} \in W_0^{k,p}(\varphi(U_i \cap U)).$$

Let us then chose a cut-off function χ_i such that $\text{supp}(\chi_i) \subset\subset U_i \cap U$ and $\chi_i \equiv 1$ in a neighbourhood of $\text{supp}(\eta_i u) \subset\subset U_i \cap U$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}^l \circ (\eta A_\alpha \circ \varphi^{-1}) \circ \partial_x^\alpha (\tilde{\rho}(\eta_i u) \circ \varphi^{-1}) &= (\eta A_\alpha \circ \varphi^{-1})_a^l \partial_x^\alpha (\tilde{\rho}^a(\eta_i u) \circ \varphi^{-1}), \\ &= \chi_i (\eta A_\alpha \circ \varphi^{-1})_a^l \partial_x^\alpha (\mathcal{A}_i(\rho_i^a \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \varphi_i^{-1})) \\ &\in W_0^{|\alpha|,q}(\varphi(U \cap U_i)) \otimes W_0^{k-|\alpha|,p}(\varphi(U \cap U_i)) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we need to establish the embedding $W_0^{|\alpha|,q}(\varphi(U \cap U_i)) \otimes W_0^{k-|\alpha|,p}(\varphi(U \cap U_i)) \hookrightarrow W^{k-2,p}(\varphi(U \cap U_i))$. Appealing to Theorem 2.2, one needs to guarantee

$$\begin{aligned} |\alpha| + k - |\alpha| &= k \geq 0, \quad (s_1 + s_2 \geq 0) \\ |\alpha|, k - |\alpha| &\geq k - 2 \quad \forall |\alpha| = 0, 1, 2 \iff k \leq 2, \quad (s_1, s_2 \geq s) \end{aligned}$$

and then from (2.17), the following conditions guarantee the embedding:

$$\begin{aligned} |\alpha| - k + 2 &\geq n \left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p} \right) \iff \frac{1}{p} \geq \frac{1}{q} + \frac{k-2-|\alpha|}{n}, \\ 2 - |\alpha| &\geq 0, \\ |\alpha| + k - |\alpha| - k + 2 &> \frac{n}{q} \iff q > \frac{n}{2}, \\ |\alpha| + k - |\alpha| &\geq n \left(\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} - 1 \right) \iff \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} \leq 1 + \frac{k}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the last three conditions above are satisfied by hypotheses, and for the first one to hold for all $0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 2$, we must have

$$\frac{1}{p} \geq \frac{1}{q} + \frac{k-2}{n} \geq \frac{1}{q} + \frac{k-2-|\alpha|}{n},$$

which is satisfied by hypothesis. Therefore $W_0^{|\alpha|,q} \otimes W_0^{k-|\alpha|,p} \hookrightarrow W^{k-2,p}$ holds and thus,⁹

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\rho}^l \circ (\eta A_\alpha \circ \varphi^{-1}) \circ \partial_x^\alpha (\tilde{\rho}(\eta_i u) \circ \varphi^{-1})\|_{W^{k-2,p}(\varphi(U_i \cap U))} &\leq \\ &\leq C \|\chi_i (\eta A_\alpha \circ \varphi^{-1})_a^l\|_{W^{|\alpha|,q}(\varphi(U_i \cap U))} \|\partial_x^\alpha (\mathcal{A}_i(\rho_i^a \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \varphi_i^{-1}))\|_{W^{k-|\alpha|,p}(\varphi(U_i \cap U))} \\ &\leq C \|\chi_i (\eta A_\alpha \circ \varphi^{-1})_a^l\|_{W^{|\alpha|,q}(\varphi(U_i \cap U))} \|\mathcal{A}_i(\rho_i^a \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \varphi_i^{-1})\|_{W^{k,p}(\varphi(U_i \cap U))} \\ &\leq C \|\chi_i (\eta A_\alpha \circ \varphi^{-1})_a^l\|_{W^{|\alpha|,q}(\varphi(U_i \cap U))} \|\rho_i^a \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \varphi_i^{-1}\|_{W^{k,p}(\varphi_i(U_i \cap U))} \\ &\leq C \|(\eta A_\alpha \circ \varphi^{-1})_a^l\|_{W^{|\alpha|,q}(\varphi(U))} \|\rho_i^a \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \varphi_i^{-1}\|_{W^{k,p}(\varphi_i(U_i))} \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\rho} \circ (\eta Lu) \circ \varphi^{-1}\|_{W^{k-2,p}(\varphi(U))} &= \sum_{l=1}^r \|\tilde{\rho}^l \circ (\eta Lu) \circ \varphi^{-1}\|_{W^{k-2,p}(\varphi(U))}, \\ &\leq \sum_{l=1}^r \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \|\tilde{\rho}^l \circ (\eta A_\alpha) \circ \partial_x^\alpha (\tilde{\rho}(\eta_i u) \circ \varphi^{-1})\|_{W^{k-2,p}(\varphi(U))}, \\ &\leq C \sum_{l=1}^r \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \sum_{a=1}^r \|(\eta A_\alpha \circ \varphi^{-1})_a^l\|_{W^{|\alpha|,q}(\varphi(U))} \sum_i \|\rho_i^a \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \varphi_i^{-1}\|_{W^{k,p}(\varphi_i(U_i))}, \\ &\leq C \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \sum_{l=1}^r \sum_{a=1}^r \|(\eta A_\alpha \circ \varphi^{-1})_a^l\|_{W^{|\alpha|,q}(\varphi(U))} \|u\|_{W^{k,p}(E)}, \\ &\leq C \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \|\tilde{\rho} \circ (\eta A_\alpha) \circ \varphi^{-1}\|_{W^{|\alpha|,q}(\varphi(U))} \|u\|_{W^{k,p}(E)} \end{aligned}$$

⁹Below, the constant C appearing in the estimates may vary from line to line, keeping its independence on u .

Appealing to a partition of unity to localise an arbitrary section $u \in C^\infty$ into a sum $u = \sum_i u_i$ with u_i supported in coordinate patches trivialising the bundle, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|Lu\|_{W^{k-2,p}(E)} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \|Lu_i\|_{W^{k-2,p}(E)} = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \|\tilde{\rho}_j \circ (\eta_j Lu_i) \circ \varphi_j^{-1}\|_{W^{k-2,p}(\varphi_j(U_j))}, \\ &\leq \sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} C_{i,j,\alpha} \|\tilde{\rho}_j \circ (\eta_j A_\alpha) \circ \varphi_j^{-1}\|_{W^{|\alpha|,q}(\varphi(U))} \|u\|_{W^{k,p}(E)} \\ &\leq C \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \|\tilde{\rho}_j \circ (\eta_j A_\alpha) \circ \varphi_j^{-1}\|_{W^{|\alpha|,q}(\varphi(U))} \right) \|u\|_{W^{k,p}(E)} \end{aligned} \quad (2.34)$$

which establishes that

$$L : (C^\infty(M; E), \|\cdot\|_{W^{k,p}}) \rightarrow W^{k-2,p}(M; E)$$

is continuous under our hypotheses on L , p and k . Finally, since C^∞ is dense in $W^{k,p}(M; E)$, the general claim follows. \square

Let us consider also first order operators, acting on smooth sections like

$$(Lu) \circ \varphi^{-1} = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} A_\alpha \partial^\alpha (\tilde{\rho} \circ u \circ \varphi^{-1}), \quad \text{with } A_\alpha \in W_{loc}^{|\alpha|,q}(U, \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}), \quad (2.35)$$

where above $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ denotes an arbitrary multi-index, $|\alpha| = \sum_i \alpha_i$, $\partial_\alpha = \partial_{(x^1)^{\alpha_1} \dots (x^n)^{\alpha_n}}$ and r is the dimension of the fibre of $E \rightarrow M$. Following [28], we shall denote the set of such elliptic operators by $\mathcal{L}^1(W^{1,q})$. One can then establish the following lemma concerning the mapping properties of such an operator:

Lemma 2.3. *Let L be a differential operator of class $\mathcal{L}^1(W^{1,q})$. Then, given $1 < p < \infty$ and an integer $0 \leq k \leq 1$, L can be extended as a bounded linear map*

$$L : W^{k,p}(E) \rightarrow W^{k-1,p}(E) \quad (2.36)$$

as long as $q > n$ and $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{k-1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{q} + \frac{k}{n}$.

Proof. Let $u \in C^\infty$ be compactly supported in a coordinate neighbourhood (U, φ) where L acts as in (2.32), and let (U, φ, ρ, η) be part of a trivialisation of E by coordinate charts. Then,

$$\tilde{\rho}^l \circ (\eta Lu) \circ \varphi_x^{-1} = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \sum_{j=1}^r \eta \circ \varphi^{-1} (A_\alpha)_j^l \partial_x^\alpha (\eta_j u^j \circ \varphi^{-1}).$$

By hypothesis, $\rho_i^a \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \varphi_i^{-1} \in W^{k,p}(\varphi_i(U_i))$ for each $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $a = 1, \dots, k$. In fact, $\rho_i^a \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \varphi_i^{-1} \in W_0^{k,p}(\varphi_i(U_i))$, and, once more appealing to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_i &\doteq (\varphi_i \circ \varphi^{-1})^* : W^{k,p}(\varphi_i(U_i \cap U)) \rightarrow W^{k,p}(\varphi(U_i \cap U)), \\ &f \mapsto f \circ \varphi_i \circ \varphi^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

being a bounded invertible map, we have

$$\mathcal{A}_i(\rho_i^a \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \varphi_i^{-1}) = \rho_i^a \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \varphi^{-1} \in W_0^{k,p}(\varphi(U_i \cap U)).$$

Choosing a cut-off function χ_i such that $\text{supp}(\chi_i) \subset \subset U_i \cap U$ and $\chi_i \equiv 1$ in a neighbourhood of $\text{supp}(\eta_i u) \subset \subset U_i \cap U$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}^l \circ (\eta A_\alpha \circ \varphi^{-1}) \circ \partial_x^\alpha (\tilde{\rho}(\eta_i u) \circ \varphi^{-1}) &= (\eta A_\alpha \circ \varphi^{-1})_a^l \partial_x^\alpha (\tilde{\rho}^a(\eta_i u) \circ \varphi^{-1}), \\ &= \chi_i (\eta A_\alpha \circ \varphi^{-1})_a^l \partial_x^\alpha (\mathcal{A}_i(\rho_i^a \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \varphi_i^{-1})) \\ &\in W_0^{|\alpha|,q}(\varphi(U \cap U_i)) \otimes W_0^{k-|\alpha|,p}(\varphi(U \cap U_i)) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we need to establish the embedding $W_0^{|\alpha|,q}(\varphi(U \cap U_i)) \otimes W_0^{k-|\alpha|,p}(\varphi(U \cap U_i)) \hookrightarrow W^{k-1,p}(\varphi(U \cap U_i))$. Appealing to Theorem 2.2, one needs to guarantee

$$\begin{aligned} |\alpha| + k - |\alpha| &= k \geq 0, \quad (s_1 + s_2 \geq 0) \\ |\alpha|, k - |\alpha| &\geq k - 1 \quad \forall |\alpha| = 0, 1 \iff k \leq 1, \quad (s_1, s_2 \geq s) \end{aligned}$$

and then from (2.17), the following conditions guarantee the embedding:

$$\begin{aligned} |\alpha| - k + 1 &\geq n \left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p} \right) \iff \frac{1}{p} \geq \frac{1}{q} + \frac{k-1-|\alpha|}{n}, \\ 1 - |\alpha| &\geq 0, \\ |\alpha| + k - |\alpha| - k + 1 &> \frac{n}{q} \iff q > n, \\ |\alpha| + k - |\alpha| &\geq n \left(\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} - 1 \right) \iff \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} \leq 1 + \frac{k}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice again that the last three conditions above are satisfied by hypotheses, while for the first one to hold for all $0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 1$, we need to have

$$\frac{1}{p} \geq \frac{1}{q} + \frac{k-1}{n} \geq \frac{1}{q} + \frac{k-1-|\alpha|}{n},$$

which does hold by hypothesis. Therefore the embedding $W_0^{|\alpha|,q} \otimes W_0^{k-|\alpha|,p} \hookrightarrow W^{k-2,p}$ holds and thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\rho}^l \circ (\eta A_\alpha \circ \varphi^{-1}) \circ \partial_x^\alpha (\tilde{\rho}(\eta_i u) \circ \varphi^{-1})\|_{W^{k-1,p}(\varphi(U_i \cap U))} &\leq \\ &\leq C \|\chi_i (\eta A_\alpha \circ \varphi^{-1})_a^l\|_{W^{|\alpha|,q}(\varphi(U_i \cap U))} \|\partial_x^\alpha (\mathcal{A}_i(\rho_i^a \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \varphi_i^{-1}))\|_{W^{k-|\alpha|,p}(\varphi(U_i \cap U))} \\ &\leq C \|\chi_i (\eta A_\alpha \circ \varphi^{-1})_a^l\|_{W^{|\alpha|,q}(\varphi(U_i \cap U))} \|\mathcal{A}_i(\rho_i^a \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \varphi_i^{-1})\|_{W^{k,p}(\varphi(U_i \cap U))} \\ &\leq C \|\chi_i (\eta A_\alpha \circ \varphi^{-1})_a^l\|_{W^{|\alpha|,q}(\varphi(U_i \cap U))} \|\rho_i^a \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \varphi_i^{-1}\|_{W^{k,p}(\varphi_i(U_i \cap U))} \\ &\leq C \|(\eta A_\alpha \circ \varphi^{-1})_a^l\|_{W^{|\alpha|,q}(\varphi(U))} \|\rho_i^a \circ (\eta_i u) \circ \varphi_i^{-1}\|_{W^{k,p}(\varphi_i(U_i))} \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\rho} \circ (\eta L u) \circ \varphi^{-1}\|_{W^{k-1,p}(\varphi(U))} &= \sum_{l=1}^r \|\tilde{\rho}^l \circ (\eta L u) \circ \varphi^{-1}\|_{W^{k-1,p}(\varphi(U))}, \\ &\leq \sum_{l=1}^r \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \|\tilde{\rho}^l \circ (\eta A_\alpha) \circ \partial_x^\alpha (\tilde{\rho}(\eta_i u) \circ \varphi^{-1})\|_{W^{k-1,p}(\varphi(U))}, \\ &\leq C \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \|\tilde{\rho} \circ (\eta A_\alpha) \circ \varphi^{-1}\|_{W^{|\alpha|,q}(\varphi(U))} \|u\|_{W^{k,p}(E)} \end{aligned}$$

Appealing to a partition of unity to localise an arbitrary section $u \in C^\infty$ into a sum $u = \sum_i u_i$ with u_i supported in coordinate patches trivialising the bundle, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|Lu\|_{W^{k-1,p}(E)} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \|\tilde{\rho}_j \circ (\eta_j L u_i) \circ \varphi_j^{-1}\|_{W^{k-1,p}(\varphi_j(U_j))}, \\ &\leq C \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \|\tilde{\rho}_j \circ (\eta_j A_\alpha) \circ \varphi_j^{-1}\|_{W^{|\alpha|,q}(\varphi(U))} \right) \|u\|_{W^{k,p}(E)} \end{aligned}$$

which establishes that

$$L : (C^\infty(M; E), \|\cdot\|_{W^{k,p}}) \rightarrow W^{k-1,p}(M; E)$$

is continuous under our hypotheses on L , p and k . Finally, since C^∞ is dense in $W^{k,p}(M; E)$, the general claim follows. \square

2.4 AE Manifolds

Let us now introduce some definitions and technical results concerning AE manifolds. First, we will consider manifolds M^n which consist of a compact core K such that $M \setminus K$ is the disjoint union of a finite number of open sets U_i , such that each U_i is diffeomorphic to the complement of a closed ball in Euclidean space. Such manifolds, in part of the classic literature, are referred to as *Euclidean at infinity* (see [15]). The diffeomorphisms $\Phi_i : U_i \subset M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{B}$ induce charts, which are referred to as *end coordinate systems* and are said to provide a *structure of infinity* [6].

On these model manifolds we want to control the behaviour of fields near infinity. This can be done in different ways. For instance, some authors opt to fix the end coordinate systems and impose decay rates for fields written in those coordinates. Another common option is to introduce function spaces with weights adapted to our manifold structure which provide good controls of the asymptotic behaviour of the fields (see, for instance, [15, 13, 6, 45]). For our purposes, the latter option is best, since, as we will see below, we can also tailor such weighted spaces to have good analytic properties useful for our PDE analysis. Such spaces have been investigated for a long time by different authors, such as [51, 46, 42, 15, 6]. In what follows, we will adopt the conventions given in [6] for the weight parameters, which has become the most common one in current literature. Let us start with the following definition on \mathbb{R}^n .

Definition 2.3 (Weighted Spaces). *Let $E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be tensor bundle over \mathbb{R}^n . The weighted Sobolev space $W_\delta^{k,p}$, with k a non-negative integer, $1 < p < \infty$ and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, of sections u of E , is defined as the subset of $W_{loc}^{k,p}$ for which the norm*

$$\|u\|_{W_\delta^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \doteq \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} \|\sigma^{-\delta - \frac{n}{p} + |\alpha|} \partial^\alpha u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \quad (2.37)$$

is finite, where $\sigma(x) \doteq (1 + |x|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and α denotes an arbitrary multi-index.

Similarly, the weighted C_δ^k -spaces are given by sections $u \in \Gamma(E)$, whose components are k -times continuously differentiable and which satisfy

$$\|u\|_{C_\delta^k} \doteq \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \sigma^{-\delta + |\alpha|} |\partial^\alpha u(x)| < \infty. \quad (2.38)$$

Below we collect the main properties of these spaces, which proofs can be found in the previously cited references.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a tensor bundle as in (2.3). Then, the following continuous embeddings hold:*

1. If $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ and $\delta_2 < \delta_1$, then $L_{\delta_2}^q \hookrightarrow L_{\delta_1}^p$;
2. If $kp < n$, then $W_\delta^{k,p} \hookrightarrow L_\delta^q$ for all $p \leq q \leq \frac{np}{n-kp}$;
3. If $kp = n$, then $W_\delta^{k,p} \hookrightarrow L_\delta^q$ for all $q \geq p$;
4. If $kp > n$, then $W_\delta^{k+l,p} \hookrightarrow C_\delta^l$ for any $l = 0, 1, 2, \dots$;
5. For any given $\epsilon > 0$ there is a constant $C_\epsilon > 0$ such that, for all $u \in W_\delta^{2,p}$, $1 < p < \infty$ the following inequality holds

$$\|u\|_{W_\delta^{1,p}} \leq \epsilon \|u\|_{W_\delta^{2,p}} + C_\epsilon \|u\|_{L_\delta^p}. \quad (2.39)$$

6. If $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ and $k_1 + k_2 > \frac{n}{q} + k$ where $k_1, k_2 \geq k$ are non-negative integers, then, we have a continuous multiplication property $W_{\delta_1}^{k_1, p} \otimes W_{\delta_2}^{k_2, q} \hookrightarrow W_{\delta}^{k, p}$ for any $\delta > \delta_1 + \delta_2$. In particular, $W_{\delta}^{k, p}$ is an algebra under multiplication for $k > \frac{n}{p}$ and $\delta < 0$.

Let us now consider a manifold M^n Euclidean at infinity (recall that this only fixed the differential structure of the ends of M). Notice that we have a finite number of end charts, say $\{U_i, \Phi_i\}_{i=1}^{N_0}$, with $\Phi(U_i) \simeq \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B}$, and a finite number of coordinate charts covering the compact region K , say $\{U_i, \Phi_i\}_{i=N_0+1}^N$. We can consider a partition of unity $\{\eta_i\}_{i=1}^N$ subordinate to the coordinate cover $\{U_i, \Phi_i\}_{i=1}^N$. Then, given a tensor bundle $E \xrightarrow{\pi} M$, consider the tuple $\{U_i, \Phi_i, \eta_i, \rho_i\}_{i=1}^N$, where usual ρ_i denote the trivialisations of the tensor bundle E over U_i , so that we can define $W_{\delta}^{k, p}(M; E)$ to be the subset of $W_{loc}^{k, p}(M; E)$ such that

$$\|u\|_{W_{\delta}^{k, p}} \doteq \sum_{i=1}^{N_0} \|\Phi_i^{-1*}(\tilde{\rho}_i \circ \eta_i u)\|_{W_{\delta}^{k, p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \sum_{i=N_0+1}^N \|\Phi_i^{-1*}(\tilde{\rho}_i \circ \eta_i u)\|_{W^{k, p}(U_i)} < \infty. \quad (2.40)$$

We can now extend the embedding and multiplication properties to a general manifold M^n Euclidean at infinity by an appeal to localisation of fields using a partition of unity, to obtain:

Theorem 2.4. *Let M^n be a manifold Euclidean at infinity and $E \rightarrow M$ a tensor bundle over M . Then, all the properties of Theorem 2.3 hold for $W_{\delta}^{k, p}(E)$ under the same conditions stated in those theorems.*

Finally, let us highlight that the same type of localisation properties prove that $C_0^{\infty}(M)$ is dense in $W_{\delta}^{k, p}$ for all $k \geq 0$, $1 < p < \infty$ and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$.

Now that we can measure the behaviour of fields at infinity appealing to Sobolev spaces, let us introduce the key concept of AE manifolds.

Definition 2.4 (AE manifolds). *We will say that a Riemannian manifold (M^n, g) is asymptotically Euclidean if:*

1. M^n is Euclidean at infinity, with end charts $\{\Phi_i\}$;
2. $g \in W_{loc}^{k, p}$ for some $k > \frac{n}{p}$;
3. $g - \Phi_i^* e \in W_{\delta}^{k, p}(E_i)$ for some $\delta < 0$ and all end charts Φ_i ,

where, above, “ e ” denotes the Euclidean metric on \mathbb{R}^n .

2.4.1 ADM definitions

Let us recall that an initial data set for GR is a tuple of the form $\mathcal{I} \doteq (M^n, g, K, \mu, S)$, where (M^n, g) is an n -dimensional Riemannian manifold; $K \in \Gamma(T_2^0 M)$ is a symmetric tensor field, while μ and S are, respectively, a function and a 1-form which stand for the energy and momentum densities induced by physical sources. These quantities are constrained via the ECE, which are given on M^n by

$$\begin{aligned} R_g - |K|_g^2 + (\text{tr}_g K)^2 &= 2\mu, \\ \text{div}_g (K - \text{tr}_g K g) &= S. \end{aligned} \quad (2.41)$$

In many situations, the above constraints stand as necessary and sufficient conditions for the initial data to admit a well-posed evolution problem. In this context, isolated gravitational systems are modelled by initial data sets which are asymptotic to the initial data of Minkowski’s space-time \mathbb{M}^{n+1} , which is given by $(\mathbb{R}^n, \delta, K = 0, \mu = 0, S = 0)$, where $\mathbb{E}^n = (\mathbb{R}^n, \delta)$ denotes the usual Euclidean space. These kinds of initial data sets are typically referred to as AE initial data sets. Although in general within GR notions of conserved total energy and momenta are quite subtle, in the case of AE initial data sets, these are well-understood.

Let us consider 3-dimensional AE initial data satisfying the following asymptotic conditions:

$$g_{ij} = \delta_{ij} + O_k(|x|^{-\tau}), \quad K_{ij} = O_{k-1}(|x|^{-\tau-1}), \quad \mu, S_i = O_{k-2}(|x|^{-\rho}), \quad (2.42)$$

for some $\tau, \rho > 0$, where the above expressions are meant to hold on some fixed asymptotic chart $\{x^i\}_{i=1}^3$. In particular, following [14], we will focus our attention on the case where $\frac{1}{2} < \tau \leq 1$ and $\rho > 3$ and refer to these initial data sets as $C_{1/2+\epsilon}^2$ -AE, with $\epsilon \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. This choice of decaying conditions is made to guarantee that the ADM energy and momentum of the initial data sets are well-defined [5]. Let us recall that, on some end $E_i \cong \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}(0)}$, these quantities are defined in asymptotic rectangular coordinates by:

$$E \doteq \frac{1}{16\pi} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \int_{S_r} (\partial_i g_{ij} - \partial_j g_{ii}) \nu^j d\omega_r; \quad P_i \doteq \frac{1}{8\pi} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \int_{S_r} \pi_{ij} \nu^j d\omega_r, \quad (2.43)$$

where S_r denotes an euclidean sphere of radius r embedded in E_i ; ν stands for the euclidean outward pointing unit normal; $d\omega_r$ the Euclidean area measure induced on S_r and $\pi_{ij} \doteq K_{ij} - \text{tr}_g K g_{ij}$. These quantities have been shown to be well-defined under clear geometric conditions, namely L^1 -integrability of the sources μ and S (see, for instance, [5]). On the other hand, the angular momentum J and center of mass $C_{B\acute{O}M}$ are typically defined as [18, 9]¹⁰

$$J_i \doteq \frac{1}{8\pi} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \int_{S_r} \pi_{jk} Y_i^j \nu^k d\omega_r, \quad (2.44)$$

$$C_{B\acute{O}M}^k \doteq \frac{1}{16\pi E} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{S_r} x^k (\partial_i g_{ij} - \partial_j g_{ii}) \nu^j d\omega_r - \int_{S_r} (g_{ik} \nu^i - g_{ii} \nu^k) d\omega_r \right), \quad (2.45)$$

whenever the limits exist, and where we have denoted by Y_j the basic rotation fields in \mathbb{R}^3 .¹¹ In contrast to the energy-momentum of an AE initial data set, these quantities are not well-defined for general $C_{1/2+\epsilon}^2$ -vacuum initial data sets. In fact, certain asymptotic symmetry conditions are typically imposed on the initial data set in order to guarantee that the limits exist. These symmetry assumptions are called the Regge-Teitelboim conditions and (for vacuum initial data sets) their most common form is given by (see [53, 18, 34])

$$g_{ij}^{odd} = O_k(|x|^{-2}), \quad K_{ij}^{even} = O_{k-1}(|x|^{-3}), \quad (2.46)$$

where the even/odd superscripts refer to the even/odd parts of the corresponding functions.

3 Semi-Fredholm properties of $\mathcal{L}^2(W^{2,q})$ -Elliptic operators

In Section 2.3 we analysed the mapping properties of the general classes $\mathcal{L}^k(W^{k,q})$ ($k = 1, 2$) of linear operators. We now intend to analyse Fredholm properties of the subclass of elliptic operators. Related statements to the ones we present below can be found in the literature. In particular, [27, Lemma 34] would cover a broader class of operators, but, as stated by two of the authors in the introduction to [28], there is a mistake within [27, Lemma 32] on which [27, Lemma 34] relies. Thus, we prefer to provide a self-contained proof of the results we need. We would also like to comment that the following results could also be derived using the techniques and results of [28, Section 2]. In this last reference, the authors have developed substantial analytic machinery to deal with local regularity of solutions to linear elliptic equations with low regularity coefficients in a variety of Sobolev-type spaces. In our case, we seek for related regularity results for very specific operators, and our strategy to obtain them is somewhat different, more strictly tailored to the operators we shall treat in the core of the paper. In particular, our strategy is first to prove some a-priori semi-Fredholm results, and then use this in combination with the theory associated to more regular operators to obtain regularity statements directly for the Laplace-Beltrami operator acting on sections of S_2M . We shall

¹⁰B \acute{O} M stands for Beig - \acute{O} Murchadha, who introduced the expression $C_{B\acute{O}M}$ in [9].

¹¹For example $Y_1 = x^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x^3} - x^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial x^2}$.

thus provide a nearly self-contained presentation here, although we would like to draw the reader's attention to [28, Proposition 2.20 and Theorem 2.21], which deal with related results.

With all the above in mind, let us first present the following two results, dealing with local elliptic estimates for the class of operators we are interested in. Due to the subtleties highlighted above, we shall present rather detailed proofs.

Lemma 3.1. *Consider an elliptic operator L of the form of (2.32) with $q > \frac{n}{2}$ defined on an open domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with smooth boundary. Fixing $1 < p \leq q$ and $R > 0$ such that $\overline{B_R(0)} \subset \Omega$, there is some constant $C = C(L, p, n, R) > 0$ such that the following estimate holds*

$$\|u\|_{W^{2,p}(B_R(0))} \leq C (\|Lu\|_{L^p(B_R(0))} + \|u\|_{L^p(B_R(0))}), \text{ for all } u \in W_0^{2,p}(B_R(0); \mathbb{R}^r). \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. Let us first fix an arbitrary point $x_i \in \overline{B_R(0)}$ and define the constant coefficient operator $L_i \doteq A_2(x_i)\partial^2$. Then, given $r > 0$, for any function $u_i \in W_0^{2,p}(B_r(x_i))$, define $v_i \doteq Lu_i$, and rewrite

$$v_i = L_i u_i + (A_2(x) - A_2(x_i))\partial^2 u_i + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} A_\alpha(x)\partial^\alpha u_i. \quad (3.2)$$

Notice that L_i is a constant coefficient operator defined in all of Ω and $u_i \in W_0^{2,p}(B_r(x_i)) \subset W^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, so we can apply the theory of constant coefficient operators to find a constant $C_i = C(L_i) > 0$, independent of r , for which a local elliptic estimate holds. This can be deduced, for instance, from [28, Lemma 2.19], and thus we obtain:¹²

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_i\|_{W^{2,p}(\Omega)} &\leq C_i \left(\|v_i\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|(A_2 - A_2(x_i))\partial^2 u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \|A_\alpha \partial^\alpha u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Let us now estimate the different terms in the right-hand side of the above expression. First, notice that since $A_2 \in W^{2,q}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow C^{0,\alpha}(\Omega)$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} \|(A_2 - A_2(x_i))\partial^2 u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^p &= \int_{B_r(x_i)} |(A_2(x) - A_2(x_i))\partial^2 u_i|^p dx, \\ &\leq \|A_2 - A_2(x_i)\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(\Omega)}^p r^{p\alpha} \|u_i\|_{L^p(B_r(x_i))}^p. \end{aligned}$$

Concerning the lower order terms, we will appeal to interpolating Bessel potential spaces $H^{s,p}(\Omega)$, and notice that

$$\sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \|A_\alpha \partial^\alpha u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C' \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \|A_\alpha\|_{W^{|\alpha|,q}(\Omega)} \|\partial^\alpha u_i\|_{H^{s-|\alpha|,p}(\Omega)},$$

holds for a constant $C' > 0$ independent of r due to Theorem 2.2, as long as α and $|\alpha| \leq s \leq 2$ satisfy

$$|\alpha| \geq n \left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p} \right), \text{ and } s > \frac{n}{q}.$$

The first of the above conditions follows since $p \leq q$, while the second one imposes $s > \frac{n}{q}$. Since $2 > \frac{n}{q}$, then any choice of $s \in (\frac{n}{q}, 2)$ works, and assuming without loss of generality that $\frac{n}{2} < q < n$, this also implies $s > 1$ and thus $s > |\alpha|$ for both $|\alpha| = 0, 1$. Let us then fix some $s < 2$ in this interval, and write

$$\sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \|A_\alpha \partial^\alpha u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C' \left(\sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \|A_\alpha\|_{W^{|\alpha|,p}(\Omega)} \right) \|u_i\|_{H^{s,p}(\Omega)}.$$

¹²If we follow [28, Lemma 2.19], then the constant C appearing in (3.3) depends on the symbol $\sigma(L_i)(\xi)$ thus actually depending on the point x_i .

Putting everything together, from (3.3) we find:

$$\|u_i\|_{W^{2,p}(\Omega)} \leq C_i \left(\|Lu_i\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + r^\alpha \|u_i\|_{L^p(B_r(x_i))} + \|u_i\|_{H^{s,p}(\Omega)} \right), \quad (3.4)$$

for some constant C_i , still independent of $r > 0$. Fixing then r small enough, for instance so that $r_i^\alpha < \frac{1}{2C_i}$, we find:

$$\|u_i\|_{W^{2,p}(\Omega)} \leq C_i \left(\|Lu_i\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|u_i\|_{H^{s,p}(\Omega)} \right). \quad (3.5)$$

for some other constant $C_i > 0$. The above estimate shows that, given an arbitrary point $x_i \in \overline{B_R(0)}$, there is a ball $B_{r_i}(x_i)$ and a constant $C_i > 0$ such that (3.5) holds for any $u_i \in W_0^{2,p}(B_{r_i}(x_i))$. Then, we can cover $\overline{B_R(0)}$ by the corresponding balls $\{B_{r_x}(x) : x \in \overline{B_R(0)}\}$ and extract a finite subcover $\{B_{r_i}(x_i) : x_i \in \overline{B_R(0)}\}_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}}$, where in each $B_{r_i}(x_i)$ (3.5) holds for any $u_i \in W_0^{2,p}(B_{r_i}(x_i))$. Then, consider a partition of unity $\{\eta_i\}_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}}$ subordinate to such a cover, so that, given an arbitrary $u \in W_0^{2,p}(B_R(0))$, after the localisation $u = \sum_i \eta_i u$, each $\eta_i u \in W_0^{2,p}(B_{r_i}(x_i))$, and thus we can apply (3.5) to each of them. After doing so, we find

$$\|\eta_i u\|_{W^{2,p}(\Omega)} \leq C_i \left(\|L(\eta_i u)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|\eta_i u\|_{H^{s,p}(\Omega)} \right). \quad (3.6)$$

We now estimate the first term in the right-hand side of (3.6). Notice that

$$L(\eta_i u) = \eta_i Lu + [L, \eta_i]u, \quad (3.7)$$

where $[L, \eta_i]u = 2\partial\eta_i A_2 \partial u + (\partial^2 \eta_i A_2 + \partial\eta_i A_1)u$ is an operator of order first order, with coefficients $\tilde{A}_1 = 2\partial\eta_i A_2 \in W^{2,q}(\Omega)$ and $\tilde{A}_0 = \partial^2 \eta_i A_2 + \partial\eta_i A_1 \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$. Thus,

$$\|[L, \eta_i]u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C' \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \|\tilde{A}_\alpha\|_{W^{|\alpha|,p}(\Omega)} \|u\|_{H^{s,p}(\Omega)}$$

follows for the same choice of $\frac{n}{q} < s < 2$ made above, and thus (3.6) implies:

$$\|\eta_i u\|_{W^{2,p}(\Omega)} \leq C_i \left(\|\eta_i Lu\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|\eta_i u\|_{H^{s,p}(\Omega)} \right) \leq C'_i \left(\|Lu\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{H^{s,p}(\Omega)} \right)$$

for some other constants $C_i, C'_i > 0$. Adding all the contribution for $i = 1, \dots, \mathcal{N}$ in the localisation $u = \sum_i \eta_i u$ produces the estimate

$$\|u\|_{W^{2,p}(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\|Lu\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{H^{s,p}(\Omega)} \right), \quad (3.8)$$

for some constant $C > 0$, independent of $u \in W_0^{2,p}(B_R(0))$.

Finally, since for our choice of $s \in (\frac{n}{q}, 2)$ one has a chain of compact embeddings $W^{2,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H^{s,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^p(\Omega)$,¹³ by Erhling-Lion's lemma we have an interpolation inequality so that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is a constant $C_\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\|f\|_{H^{s,p}(\Omega)} \leq \epsilon \|f\|_{W^{2,p}(\Omega)} + C_\epsilon \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}, \quad \text{for all } f \in W^{2,p}(\Omega).$$

Thus, picking $\epsilon < \frac{1}{2C}$, the above interpolation inequality together with (3.8) gives

$$\|u\|_{W^{2,p}(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\|Lu\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \right), \quad (3.9)$$

for some other constant $C > 0$. Then, (3.1) follows from (3.9) since by hypothesis u is supported in $B_R(0)$, implying that also $\text{supp}(Lu) \subset B_R(0)$. \square

¹³See, for instance, [57, Chapter 13, Section 6].

We now address the related elliptic estimates for operators acting on $W^{1,p}$ -spaces. The general idea of the proof is similar to the above lemma, although the techniques to go through some of the initial estimates will be somewhat different.

Lemma 3.2. *Consider an elliptic operator L of the form of (2.32) with $q > \frac{n}{2}$ defined on an open domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Fixing $p \in (1, \infty)$ such that $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} < \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{n}$ and $R > 0$ such that $\overline{B_R(0)} \subset \Omega$, there is some constant $C = C(L, p, n, R) > 0$ such that the following estimate holds*

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,p}(B_R(0))} \leq C (\|Lu\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{L^p(B_R(0))}), \text{ for all } u \in W_0^{1,p}(B_R(0); \mathbb{R}^r). \quad (3.10)$$

Proof. We begin with the same strategy as in Lemma 3.1 above. Thus, first of all, we start considering a fixed point $x_i \in \overline{B_R(0)}$ the frozen coefficient operator $L_i = A_2(x_i)\partial^2$ defined on \mathbb{R}^n , some $\bar{r} > 0$ defining a ball $B_{\bar{r}}(x_i) \subset \Omega$ and any $u_i \in W_0^{1,p}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))$. Defining again $v_i \doteq Lu_i$, we have (3.2) and then again the theory of constant coefficient operators gives:¹⁴

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_i\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} &\leq C_i \left(\|v_i\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} + \|(A_2 - A_2(x_i))\partial^2 u_i\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 1} \|A_\alpha \partial^\alpha u_i\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} + \|u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

To estimate the different terms, let $\phi \in W_0^{1,p'}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^r)$ and notice that

$$\begin{aligned} [(A_2 - A_2(x_i))\partial^2 u_i](\phi) &= [\partial^2 u_i]((A_2 - A_2(x_i))^* \phi), \\ &= -[\partial u_i]((A_2 - A_2(x_i))^* \partial \phi) - [\partial u_i](\partial(A_2 - A_2(x_i))^* \phi), \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

where since $\partial u_i \in L^p(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))$, $\partial \phi \in L^{p'}(\Omega)$ and $A_2 - A_2(x_i) \in W_{loc}^{2,q}(\Omega)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |[\partial u_i]((A_2 - A_2(x_i))^* \partial \phi)| &= \left| \int_{\Omega} \partial u_i \cdot (A_2 - A_2(x_i))^* \partial \phi dx \right|, \\ &= \left| \int_{B_{\bar{r}}(x_i)} (A_2 - A_2(x_i)) \partial u_i \cdot \partial \phi dx \right|, \\ &\leq C_1 \|A_2 - A_2(x_i)\|_{C^0(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|\partial u_i\|_{L^p(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|\partial \phi\|_{L^{p'}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))}, \\ &\leq C_1 \|A_2 - A_2(x_i)\|_{C^0(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|u_i\|_{W^{1,p}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|\phi\|_{W^{1,p'}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

where above the constant C_1 , which comes from applying Hölder's inequality, is independent of \bar{r} , and we have used the notation $A \cdot B$ to denote the Euclidean dot-product between vectors. Along the same lines,

$$|[\partial u_i](\partial(A_2 - A_2(x_i))^* \phi)| = \left| \int_{\Omega} \partial u_i \cdot \partial A_2^* \phi dx \right| = \left| \int_{B_{\bar{r}}(x_i)} \partial A_2 \partial u_i \cdot \phi dx \right|.$$

Let us now assume that $p' < n$, and notice that $\phi \in W_0^{1,p'}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{np'}{n-p'}}(\Omega)$. Above, we intend to apply Hölder's inequality, for which we need to know that $\partial A_2 \partial u_i \in L_{loc}^{\left(\frac{np'}{n-p'}\right)'(\Omega)}$. This will follow from Hölder's generalised inequality if $\partial A_2 \in L_{loc}^t(\Omega)$ for $t > 1$ satisfying:

$$\frac{1}{t} + \frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{\left(\frac{np'}{n-p'}\right)'} = 1 - \frac{n-p'}{np'} = 1 - \frac{1}{p'} + \frac{1}{n} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{n}.$$

That is, one needs to have $\partial A_2 \in L_{loc}^n(\Omega)$. Notice that this is clear in the case $q \geq n$, so restricting to $\frac{n}{2} < q < n$, we see this is implied by the embedding $W_{loc}^{1,q}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L_{loc}^{\frac{nq}{n-q}}(\Omega)$, since

$$\frac{nq}{n-q} > n \iff q > \frac{n}{2}.$$

¹⁴Just as in Lemma 3.1, in order to obtain (3.11), we may apply [28, Lemma 2.19].

Therefore, we find

$$\begin{aligned} |[\partial u_i](\partial(A_2 - A_2(x_i))^* \phi)| &\leq C_2 \|\partial A_2 \partial u_i\|_{L\left(\frac{np'}{n-p'}\right)'(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|\phi\|_{L\frac{np'}{n-p'}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C_3 \|\partial A_2\|_{L^n(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|u_i\|_{W^{1,p}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|\phi\|_{W^{1,p'}(\Omega)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

where the constant C_3 is again independent of \bar{r} . The case $p' \geq n$ is actually more straightforward, since in this case $\phi \in W^{1,p'}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{s'}(\Omega)$ for any $s' < \infty$. Thus, all we need is to be able to guarantee is that $\partial A_2 \in L^t_{loc}(\Omega)$ for some $t > 1$ such that $\frac{1}{s} \doteq \frac{1}{t} + \frac{1}{p} < 1$. If we can find such $t > 1$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} |[\partial u_i](\partial(A_2 - A_2(x_i))^* \phi)| &\leq C'_2 \|\partial A_2 \partial u_i\|_{L^s(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|\phi\|_{L^{s'}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C'_3 \|\partial A_2\|_{L^t(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|u_i\|_{W^{1,p}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|\phi\|_{W^{1,p'}(\Omega)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

which is the same type of estimate as (3.14). Thus, to establish the above estimate, we just need to justify that $\partial A_2 \in L^t_{loc}(\Omega)$ for some $t > 1$ such that $\frac{1}{t} < 1 - \frac{1}{p}$. Recalling then that $\partial A_2 \in W^{1,q}_{loc}(\Omega)$, we see that if $q \geq n$, then $\partial A_2 \in L^t_{loc}(\Omega)$ for any $t < \infty$ and thus this case is covered, so we can concentrate on $q < n$. In this case we know that $\partial A_2 \in L^{\frac{nq}{n-q}}_{loc}(\Omega)$ and therefore fixing $\frac{1}{t} \doteq \frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n}$ we see that

$$\frac{1}{t} < 1 - \frac{1}{p} \iff \frac{1}{p} < \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{1}{n},$$

which holds by hypothesis, and this establishes (3.15) in the remaining cases.

Putting together (3.12)-(3.15), we find (for the value t corresponding to each case)

$$|[(A_2 - A_2(x_i)) \partial^2 u_i](\phi)| \leq (C_1 \|A_2 - A_2(x_i)\|_{C^0(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} + C_3 \|\partial A_2\|_{L^t(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))}) \|u_i\|_{W^{1,p}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|\phi\|_{W^{1,p'}(\Omega)},$$

for all $\phi \in W_0^{1,p'}(\Omega)$, which implies

$$\|(A_2 - A_2(x_i)) \partial^2 u_i\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} \leq C_4 (\|A_2 - A_2(x_i)\|_{C^0(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} + \|\partial A_2\|_{L^t(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))}) \|u_i\|_{W^{1,p}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))}, \quad (3.16)$$

for a constant C_4 independent of \bar{r} .

A similar analysis can now be performed for the first order term, starting with:

$$\sup_{\|\phi\|_{W^{1,p'}(\Omega)}=1} |[A_1 \partial u_i](\phi)| = \sup_{\|\phi\|_{W^{1,p'}(\Omega)}=1} \left| \int_{B_{\bar{r}}(x_i)} A_1 \partial u_i \cdot \phi \, dx \right|,$$

which follows since $A_1 \partial u_i \in L^1_{loc}$ is a regular distribution. Since $A_1 \in W^{1,q}_{loc}(\Omega)$, the same arguments as in (3.14)-(3.15) show that

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_1 \partial u_i\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} &\leq C_5 \sup_{\|\phi\|_{W^{1,p'}(\Omega)}=1} \|A_1\|_{L^t(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|u_i\|_{W^{1,p}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|\phi\|_{L\frac{np'}{n-p'}(\Omega)}, \\ &\leq C_6 \|A_1\|_{L^t(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|u_i\|_{W^{1,p}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

for a constant C_6 independent of \bar{r} .

Finally, for the zero order term, we need to estimate:

$$\sup_{\|\phi\|_{W^{1,p'}(\Omega)}=1} |[A_0 u_i](\phi)| = \sup_{\|\phi\|_{W^{1,p'}(\Omega)}=1} \left| \int_{B_{\bar{r}}(x_i)} A_0 u_i \cdot \phi \, dx \right|.$$

Again, let us first assume that $p' < n$. Thus we know that $\phi \in L^{\frac{np'}{n-p'}}(\Omega)$, and we intend to guarantee that $A_0 u_i \in L\left(\frac{np'}{n-p'}\right)'(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))$. If additionally $p < n$, then $u_i \in W_0^{1,p}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i)) \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{np}{n-p}}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))$, and $A_0 u_i \in L\left(\frac{np'}{n-p'}\right)'(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))$ will follow from Hölder's inequality if $q \geq t$ with:

$$\frac{1}{t} + \frac{1}{\frac{np}{n-p}} = \frac{1}{\left(\frac{np'}{n-p'}\right)'} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{n} \iff \frac{1}{t} = \frac{2}{n}.$$

That is, we need $q \geq \frac{n}{2}$, which is granted by hypothesis. Therefore, via the generalised Hölder inequality one finds:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{B_{\bar{r}}(x_i)} A_0 u_i \cdot \phi \, dx \right| &\leq C_7 \|A_0 u_i\|_{L^{\left(\frac{np'}{n-p'}\right)'}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|\phi\|_{L^{\frac{np'}{n-p'}}(\Omega)}, \\ &\leq C_8 \|A_0\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|u_i\|_{L^{\frac{np}{n-p}}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|\phi\|_{L^{\frac{np'}{n-p'}}(\Omega)}, \\ &\leq C_9 \|A_0\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|u_i\|_{W^{1,p}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|\phi\|_{W^{1,p'}(\Omega)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

for a constant C_9 independent of \bar{r} .¹⁵ Still assuming $p' < n$, if now we assume $p > n$, then actually $u_i \in W_0^{1,p}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i)) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))$ and thus $A_0 u_i \in L^{\left(\frac{np'}{n-p'}\right)'}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))$ will follow from Hölder's inequality if $q \geq t$ with:¹⁶

$$\frac{1}{t} = \frac{1}{\left(\frac{np'}{n-p'}\right)'} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{n}.$$

That is, one needs to guarantee that $\frac{1}{q} \leq \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{n} \iff \frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p}$, which holds by hypothesis. In this case we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{B_{\bar{r}}(x_i)} A_0 u_i \cdot \phi \, dx \right| &\leq C'_8 \|A_0\|_{L^{\frac{np}{n+p}}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|u_i\|_{L^\infty(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|\phi\|_{L^{\frac{np'}{n-p'}}(\Omega)}, \\ &\leq C'_9 \bar{r}^{1-\frac{n}{p}} \|A_0\|_{L^{\frac{np}{n+p}}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|u_i\|_{W^{1,p}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|\phi\|_{W^{1,p'}(\Omega)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

for a constant C'_9 independent of \bar{r} .¹⁷ Then, for the case $p = n$, we notice that $u_i \in L^s(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))$ for any $s < \infty$, and thus $A_0 u_i \in L^{\left(\frac{np'}{n-p'}\right)'}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))$ will follow from Hölder's inequality if

$$\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{s} = \frac{1}{\left(\frac{np'}{n-p'}\right)'} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{n} = \frac{2}{n},$$

for some $1 < s < \infty$, which is equivalent to $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{2}{n} - \frac{1}{s}$. Since $\frac{1}{q} < \frac{2}{n}$ by hypothesis, we can fix $\frac{1}{s} \doteq \frac{2}{n} - \frac{1}{q} > 0$, and estimate:

$$\left| \int_{B_{\bar{r}}(x_i)} A_0 u_i \cdot \phi \, dx \right| \leq C''_8 \|A_0\|_{L^q(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|u_i\|_{L^s(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|\phi\|_{L^{\frac{np'}{n-p'}}(\Omega)}.$$

Now, since $u_i \in W_0^{1,n}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))$, then $u_i \in W_0^{1,\sigma}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))$ for any $1 \leq \sigma < n$, which implies that there is a constant C , independent of u_i and \bar{r} , such that $\|u_i\|_{L^{\frac{n\sigma}{n-\sigma}}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \leq C \|\nabla u_i\|_{L^\sigma(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))}$. Applying Hölder's inequality then produces:

$$\|u_i\|_{L^{\frac{n\sigma}{n-\sigma}}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \leq C (\mu(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i)))^{\frac{1}{\sigma} - \frac{1}{n}} \|\nabla u_i\|_{L^n(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))},$$

where above $\mu(B_r(x_i))$ denotes the volume of the ball $B_r(x_i)$. We now intend to fix σ so that $\frac{n\sigma}{n-\sigma} = s$, which is equivalent to $\frac{1}{\sigma} = \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{s}$.¹⁸ Then,

$$\|u_i\|_{L^{\frac{n\sigma}{n-\sigma}}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \leq C' \bar{r}^{\frac{n}{s}} \|\nabla u_i\|_{L^n(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))},$$

¹⁵Here we have used that, given a bounded open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, from the Sobolev inequality when $p < n$, there is a constant C independent of U , such that $\|u\|_{L^{\frac{np}{n-p}}(U)} \leq C \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(U)}$, for all $u \in W_0^{1,p}(U)$.

¹⁶Notice that our current hypothesis $p > n$ guarantees that $t > 1$.

¹⁷In this case we have used that, given a bounded open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, from the Sobolev inequality when $p > n$, there is a constant C independent of U , such that $\|u\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq C \text{diam}(U)^{1-\frac{n}{p}} \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(U)}$, for all $u \in W_0^{1,p}(U)$.

¹⁸Notice that since $\frac{1}{s} = \frac{2}{n} - \frac{1}{q} > 0$, we have $\sigma < n$, and also that $\frac{1}{\sigma} = \frac{3}{n} - \frac{1}{q} < 1$ for any $n \geq 3$, implying that $1 \leq \sigma < n$.

for a constant C' independent of u_i and \bar{r} . This implies that in this case where $p = n$, we have

$$\left| \int_{B_{\bar{r}}(x_i)} A_0 u_i \cdot \phi \, dx \right| \leq C_9'' \bar{r}^{\frac{n}{s}} \|A_0\|_{L^q(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|u_i\|_{W^{1,p}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|\phi\|_{W^{1,p'}(\Omega)}, \quad (3.20)$$

with C_9'' independent of u_i and \bar{r} . Putting together (3.18)-(3.21), when $p' < n$ and $\bar{r} < 1$, we find that

$$\left| \int_{B_{\bar{r}}(x_i)} A_0 u_i \cdot \phi \, dx \right| \leq C_{10} \|A_0\|_{L^q(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|u_i\|_{W^{1,p}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|\phi\|_{W^{1,p'}(\Omega)}, \quad \forall u_i \in W_0^{1,p}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i)), \quad (3.21)$$

with $C_{10} > 0$ independent of \bar{r} and u_i .

Finally, in the case $p' \geq n$ we have $\phi \in L^{s'}(\Omega)$ for all $s' < \infty$, and we must have $p < n$. Thus, we first aim to guarantee that $A_0 u_i \in L^s(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))$ for some $s > 1$ via Hölder's inequality. Since $u_i \in L^{\frac{np}{n-p}}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))$ and $A_0 \in L_{loc}^q(\Omega)$, this holds as long as

$$\frac{1}{s} \doteq \frac{1}{q} + \frac{n-p}{np} < 1 \iff \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{n} < 1 \iff \frac{1}{p} < \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{1}{n},$$

where the last inequality holds by hypothesis. Therefore, with s fixed as above, we have $\phi \in L^{s'}(\Omega)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{B_{\bar{r}}(x_i)} A_0 u_i \cdot \phi \, dx \right| &\leq K_1 \|A_0 u_i\|_{L^s(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|\phi\|_{L^{s'}(\Omega)}, \\ &\leq K_2 \|A_0\|_{L^q(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|u_i\|_{L^{\frac{np}{n-p}}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|\phi\|_{L^{s'}(\Omega)}, \\ &\leq K_3 \|A_0\|_{L^q(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|u_i\|_{W^{1,p}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|\phi\|_{W^{1,p'}(\Omega)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

for another constant K_3 , also independent of \bar{r} and u_i , which extends (3.21) to the case $p' \geq n$. Therefore, putting together (3.21)-(3.22), we finally find:

$$\|A_0 u_i\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} \leq C_{11} \|A_0\|_{L^q(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} \|u_i\|_{W^{1,p}(B_{\bar{r}}(0))}, \quad (3.23)$$

where $C_{11} > 0$ is independent of u_i and $\bar{r} < 1$.

Putting now (3.16),(3.17) and (3.23) together with (3.11), we find

$$\|u_i\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \leq C_i \left(\|v_i\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} + \mathcal{C}(\bar{r}) \|u_i\|_{W^{1,p}(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} + \|u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \right),$$

for some other constant $C_i > 0$, independent of $\bar{r} < 1$, where we have defined

$$\mathcal{C}(\bar{r}) \doteq \|A_2 - A_2(x_i)\|_{C^0(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} + \|\partial A_2\|_{L^t(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} + \|A_1\|_{L^t(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))} + \|A_0\|_{L^q(B_{\bar{r}}(x_i))}.$$

Since $\mathcal{C}(\bar{r}) \searrow 0$ as $\bar{r} \searrow 0$, we can choose \bar{r} small enough so that $\mathcal{C}(\bar{r}) < \frac{1}{2C_i}$, and thus

$$\|u_i\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \leq C_i' (\|Lu_i\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} + \|u_i\|_{L^p(\Omega)}). \quad (3.24)$$

Having established the above estimate, we now proceed with the same strategy as after (3.5). That is, we cover $\overline{B_R(0)}$ by the balls $\{B_{r_x}(x) : x \in \overline{B_R(0)}\}$, where there is a constant $C_x > 0$ such that for all $u_x \in W_0^{1,p}(B_{r_x}(x))$ the estimate (3.24) holds. We then proceed to take a finite subcover $\{B_{r_i}(x_i) : i = 1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ and a partition of unity $\{\eta_i : i = 1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ subordinate to such subcover, so that given $u \in W_0^{1,p}(B_R(0))$ we can localise $u = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \eta_i u$ with $\eta_i u \in W_0^{1,p}(B_{r_i}(x_i))$. We can therefore use (3.24) to estimate

$$\|\eta_i u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \leq C_i (\|L(\eta_i u)\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} + \|\eta_i u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}). \quad (3.25)$$

We now proceed to estimate the first term in the right-hand side. For this, we once more notice that

$$L(\eta_i u) = \eta_i Lu + [L, \eta_i]u, \quad (3.26)$$

where $[L, \eta_i]u$ is an operator of first order, with coefficients $\tilde{A}_1 \in W^{2,q}(\Omega)$ and $\tilde{A}_0 \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$. To estimate these terms, we shall appeal to interpolation spaces $H^{s,p}$ of Bessel potentials. In particular, we know that $u \in H^{s,p}(\Omega)$ for any real $s \leq 1$ and therefore we analyse the multiplication

$$H^{1,q}(\Omega) \otimes H^{s-1,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H^{-1,p}(\Omega), \quad (3.27)$$

which by Theorem 2.2 is valid as long as $s \geq 0$ and

$$2 \geq n \left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p} \right), \quad 1 + s > \frac{n}{q}, \quad s \geq n \left(\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p} - 1 \right).$$

The first condition above is equivalent to $\frac{1}{p} \geq \frac{1}{q} - \frac{2}{n}$, which holds since $\frac{1}{p} \geq \frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n}$ by hypothesis. Concerning the second one, the case $q \geq n$ is trivial for any $s > 0$, and for $n > q > \frac{n}{2}$ it is satisfied for any $\frac{n}{q} - 1 < s \leq 1$. Finally, in order for the last condition to be non-empty, we need to guarantee

$$s \geq n \left(\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p} - 1 \right) \iff \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{s}{n} + 1 - \frac{1}{q} = \frac{s}{n} + \frac{1}{q'}.$$

By hypothesis we know that $\frac{1}{p} < \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{q'}$, and therefore for $s < 1$, but sufficiently close to 1, $\frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{s}{n} + \frac{1}{q'}$ holds. That is, we have seen that for there is some $s_0 < 1$ such that for all $s \in (s_0, 1]$ (3.27) holds, and therefore

$$\|\tilde{A}_1 \partial u\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} \leq C \|\tilde{A}_1\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega)} \|\partial u\|_{H^{s-1,p}(\Omega)} \leq C \|\tilde{A}_1\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega)} \|u\|_{H^{s,p}(\Omega)}.$$

Dealing with the zero order term is similar, in this case analysing the multiplication

$$L^q(\Omega) \otimes H^{s,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H^{-1,p}(\Omega), \quad (3.28)$$

which now produces the restrictions $s \geq 0$ and

$$1 \geq n \left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p} \right), \quad 1 + s > \frac{n}{q}, \quad s \geq n \left(\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p} - 1 \right).$$

which are all again satisfied under our choice $s \in (s_0, 1]$, and thus

$$\|\tilde{A}_0 u\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} \leq C \|\tilde{A}_0\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \|u\|_{H^{s,p}(\Omega)}.$$

Thus, picking $s_0 < s < 1$, we have

$$\|[L, \eta_i]u\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\|\tilde{A}_1\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{A}_0\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \right) \|u\|_{H^{s,p}(\Omega)}. \quad (3.29)$$

We can then put (3.25),(3.26) and (3.29) together to obtain:

$$\|\eta_i u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \leq C_i (\|\eta_i L u\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{H^{s,p}(\Omega)}), \quad (3.30)$$

for some other constant $C_i > 0$. Since multiplication by η_i is a bounded map from $W^{-1,p}(\Omega) \rightarrow W^{-1,p}(\Omega)$, we rewrite the above as

$$\|\eta_i u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \leq C_i (\|L u\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{H^{s,p}(\Omega)}), \quad (3.31)$$

Applying these estimates to $u = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \eta_i u$, we find

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \leq C (\|L u\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{H^{s,p}(\Omega)}), \quad (3.32)$$

for a constant $C > 0$, independent of u .

Finally, since $W^{1,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow H^{s,p}(\Omega)$ is compact for any $s < 1$, we then have an interpolation inequality so that, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a constant $C_\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\|u\|_{H^{s,p}(\Omega)} \leq \epsilon \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} + C_\epsilon \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}.$$

Using this interpolation in (3.32), and noticing that clearly $\|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} = \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(B_R(0))}$ for any $u \in W_0^{1,p}(B_R(0))$, we find

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,p}(B_R(0))} \leq C \left(\|Lu\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} + \epsilon \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(B_R(0))} + C_\epsilon \|u\|_{L^p(B_R(0))} \right),$$

for a constant C independent of ϵ . One can choose $\epsilon < \frac{1}{2C}$, so that

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,p}(B_R(0))} \leq C' \left(\|Lu\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{L^p(B_R(0))} \right), \quad (3.33)$$

for some other constant $C' > 0$, which proves (3.10) and finishes the proof. \square

We can now establish the following general semi-Fredholm result for the types of operators treated above:

Theorem 3.1. *Let $L \in \mathcal{L}^2(W^{2,q}; E)$ be an elliptic operator satisfying $q > \frac{n}{2}$, where E stands for some tensor bundle over the closed manifold M . Then, the operator*

$$L : W^{2,p}(E) \rightarrow L^p(E), \quad (3.34)$$

is semi-Fredholm for all $1 < p \leq q$, while

$$L : W^{1,p}(E) \rightarrow W^{-1,p}(E), \quad (3.35)$$

is semi-Fredholm for all $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} < \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{n}$.

Remark 3.1. *Concerning (3.35), notice that the condition $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} < \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{n}$ is non-empty as a condition on p iff*

$$\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} < \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{1}{n} \iff \frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} < 1 - \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{n} \iff \frac{2}{q} < 1 + \frac{2}{n}.$$

Since $q > \frac{n}{2}$, then $\frac{2}{q} < \frac{4}{n}$, and noticing that

$$\frac{4}{n} \leq 1 + \frac{2}{n} \iff n \geq 2,$$

we see that $\frac{2}{q} < \frac{4}{n} \leq 1 + \frac{2}{n}$ for all $q > \frac{n}{2}$ and $n \geq 2$, and therefore (3.35) is always non-empty under our hypotheses.

Proof. Let us start by writing (3.34)-(3.35) together as $L : W^{k,p}(E) \mapsto W^{k-2,p}(E)$ with $k = 1, 2$. Then consider a cover of M by coordinate balls $\{B_{R_i}(x_i) : x_i \in M, i = 1, \dots, \mathcal{N}\}$ trivialising E , and a partition of unity $\{\eta_i\}_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}}$ subordinate to such a cover. Given $u \in W^{k,p}(E)$, we localise it via $u = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \eta_i u$, where now $\eta_i u \in W_0^{k,p}(B_{R_i}(x_i))$. Thus, under the conditions of this theorem, we can apply Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 to each $\eta_i u$, in the corresponding cases for $k = 2$ and $k = 1$ respectively. From these local estimates, one can produce the following global one following the same lines of arguments as in the last parts of Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2:

$$\|u\|_{W^{k,p}(E)} \leq C \left(\|Lu\|_{W^{k-2,p}(E)} + \|u\|_{L^p(E)} \right), \quad (3.36)$$

for a fixed constant $C > 0$, independent of u . Once (3.36) has been established, the semi-Fredholm properties follow by functional analytical arguments. For instance, due to [33, Proposition 19.1.3], this is equivalent to showing that every bounded sequence $\{u_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \subset W^{k,p}$ such that Lu_j is convergent admits a convergent $W^{k,p}$ -subsequence. Notice then that the compact embedding $W^{k,p}(M) \hookrightarrow L^p(M)$, valid for both $k = 1, 2$, guarantees that any such bounded sequence $\{u_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \subset W^{k,p}$ admits an L^p -convergent subsequence $\{u_{j_l}\}_{l=1}^{\infty} \subset W^{k,p}$. Then, since $\{Lu_{j_l}\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$ is convergent by hypothesis, from (3.36) one sees that

$$\|u_{j_l} - u_{j_i}\|_{W^{k,p}(E)} \leq C \left(\|Lu_{j_l} - Lu_{j_i}\|_{W^{k-2,p}(E)} + \|u_{j_l} - u_{j_i}\|_{L^p(E)} \right),$$

where the right-hand side goes to zero as $l, i \rightarrow \infty$ by hypothesis, and thus $\{u_{j_l}\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$ is Cauchy in $W^{k,p}$, which finishes the proof. \square

4 Regularity theory for Δ_g on S_2M

In this section we shall establish the main regularity results needed in this paper. Let start with the following result related to Lemma 2.1, but for the case of metrics of limited regularity.

Lemma 4.1. *Let (M^n, g) be a closed Riemannian manifold with $g \in W^{2,q}(M)$, $q > \frac{n}{2}$, and let $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cap [0, 2]$ satisfy $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{2-k}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q} + \frac{2+k}{n}$. Then, the inner product*

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{L^2(M, dV_g)} = \int_M \langle u, v \rangle_g dV_g \quad (4.1)$$

extends from $C^\infty(T_r M) \times C^\infty(T_r M)$ to a bilinear map

$$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{(M, g)} : W^{-k, p'}(T_r M) \times W^{k, p}(T_r M) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.2)$$

Furthermore, given $(u, v) \in W^{-k, p'}(T_r M) \times W^{k, p}(T_r M)$, there is a sequence $\{u_k\} \subset L^{p'}(T_l M)$ such that

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{(M, g)} = \lim_k \langle u_k, v \rangle_{L^2(M, dV_g)} \quad (4.3)$$

and this pairing induces an isomorphism $W^{-k, p'}(T_r M) \cong (W^{k, p}(T_r M))'$ via

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{k, p} : W^{-k, p'}(T_r M) &\rightarrow (W^{k, p}(T_r M))', \\ u &\mapsto \mathcal{S}_{k, p}(u) : \begin{array}{ccc} W^{k, p}(T_r M) & \rightarrow & \mathbb{R}, \\ v & \mapsto & [\mathcal{S}_{k, p} u](v) = \langle u, v \rangle_{(M, g)} \end{array} \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Finally, if $v \in \Gamma(T_r M)$ is compactly supported in a coordinate chart (U, φ) , then

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{(M, g)} = \langle \sqrt{\det(g)} u^{\sharp i_1 \dots i_r}, v_{i_1 \dots i_r} \rangle_{(U, \delta)},$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{(U, \delta)}$ denotes the usual pairing in \mathbb{R}^n between $W^{-k, p'}(U)$ and $W^{k, p}(U)$ induced by the Euclidean metric; while $\tilde{\rho} \circ v \circ \varphi^{-1} = v_{i_1 \dots i_r} \in W^{k, p}(\varphi(U))$ denote the components of v with respect to the trivialisation (U, φ, ρ) , while $u^\sharp \in W^{-k, p'}(T^r M)$ denotes the tensor field obtained from U by raising its indices with g , and $u^{\sharp i_1 \dots i_r}$ denote the components of u^\sharp with respect to the corresponding trivialisation $(U, \varphi, \rho^\sharp)$.

Proof. From Theorem 2.1, fixing a smooth background metric \bar{g} on M , we know that (4.2) and (4.4) hold for the pairing induced by $dV_{\bar{g}}$. Notice then that given $u, v \in C^\infty(T_r M)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u, v \rangle_{L^2(M, dV_g)} &= \int_M \langle u, v \rangle_g dV_g = \int_M u^\sharp(v) dV_g = \int_M \left\langle \frac{\sqrt{\det(g)}}{\sqrt{\det(\bar{g})}} u^{\sharp \bar{b}}, v \right\rangle_{\bar{g}} dV_{\bar{g}}, \\ &= \left\langle \frac{\sqrt{\det(g)}}{\sqrt{\det(\bar{g})}} u^{\sharp \bar{b}}, v \right\rangle_{L^2(M, dV_{\bar{g}})} \end{aligned}$$

where u^\sharp denotes the tensor field obtained by raising the indices of u with g , and thus, by Corollary 2.1, $u^\sharp \in W^{2, q}(T^l M)$, while $u^{\sharp \bar{b}} \in W^{2, q}(T_l M)$ denotes the tensor field on obtained by lowering the indices of u^\sharp with \bar{g} . Thus, again by Corollary 2.1, $\frac{\sqrt{\det(g)}}{\sqrt{\det(\bar{g})}} u^{\sharp \bar{b}} \in W^{2, q}(T_l M)$. In fact, the map

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi : (C^\infty(T_l M), \|\cdot\|_{W^{k, p}}) &\rightarrow W^{2, q}(T_l M), \\ u &\mapsto \frac{\sqrt{\det(g)}}{\sqrt{\det(\bar{g})}} u^{\sharp \bar{b}}, \end{aligned}$$

is a bounded injective map, which extends to a bounded isomorphism:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{k, p} : W^{k, p}(T_l M) &\rightarrow W^{k, p}(T_l M), \\ u &\mapsto \frac{\sqrt{\det(g)}}{\sqrt{\det(\bar{g})}} u^{\sharp \bar{b}}, \end{aligned}$$

for each (k, p) such that $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $0 \leq k \leq 2$ as long as $2 > \frac{n}{q}$ and

$$2 - k \geq n \left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p} \right) \iff \frac{1}{p} \geq \frac{1}{q} + \frac{k-2}{n}.$$

In the case of negative exponents $k < 0$, then the above holds if in addition we have $k \geq -2$ and

$$2 + k \geq n \left(\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p} - 1 \right) \iff \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q} + \frac{2+k}{n}.$$

Therefore, if $k = 0, 1, 2$, $q > \frac{n}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{2-k}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q} + \frac{2+k}{n}$, then notice that

$$1 - \frac{1}{q'} - \frac{2+k}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p'} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{q} + \frac{2-k}{n} \implies \frac{1}{q} - \frac{2-(-k)}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p'} \leq \frac{1}{q} + \frac{2+(-k)}{n}$$

That is, the pair $(-k, p')$ satisfied the hypotheses required for $\Phi_{-k, p'} : W^{-k, p'}(T_l M) \rightarrow W^{-k, p'}(T_l M)$ to be a bounded isomorphism. Thus, given $(u, v) \in W^{-k, p'}(T_l M) \times W^{k, p}(T_l M)$,

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{(M, g)} \doteq \langle \Phi_{-k, p'}(u), v \rangle_{(M, \bar{g})} \quad (4.5)$$

agrees with (4.1) for $(u, v) \in C^\infty(T_l M) \times C^\infty(T_l M)$, and we know from Theorem 2.1,

$$|\langle u, v \rangle_{(M, g)}| \leq C \|\Phi_{-k, p'}(u)\|_{W^{-k, p'}} \|v\|_{W^{k, p}} \leq C' \|u\|_{W^{-k, p'}} \|v\|_{W^{k, p}}, \quad \forall u, v \in C^\infty.$$

Being C^∞ dense in both $W^{-k, p'}(T_l M)$ and $W^{k, p}(T_l M)$, it follows that (4.5) extends uniquely by continuity to a bounded bilinear map as in (4.2). Also, given $\phi \in L^{p'}$ and $v \in W^{k, p}$, by definition one has

$$\langle \phi, v \rangle_{(M, g)} = \lim_{k, j} \langle \phi_k, v_j \rangle_{(M, g)} = \lim_{k, j} \langle \phi_k, v_j \rangle_{L^2(M, dV_g)}$$

where $\{\phi_k\}, \{v_k\} \subset C^\infty$ and $\phi_k \xrightarrow{L^{p'}} \phi$, $v_k \xrightarrow{W^{k, p}} v$. It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \phi, v \rangle_{L^2(M, dV_g)} - \langle \phi_k, v_k \rangle_{L^2(M, dV_g)}| &\leq |\langle \phi - \phi_k, v \rangle_{L^2(M, dV_g)}| + |\langle \phi, v - v_k \rangle_{L^2(M, dV_g)}| \\ &\leq \|\phi - \phi_k\|_{L^{p'}} \|v\|_{L^p} + \|\phi\|_{L^{p'}} \|v - v_k\|_{L^p} \end{aligned}$$

which shows that, whenever $\phi \in L^{p'}$ and $v \in W^{k, p}$:

$$\langle \phi, v \rangle_{(M, g)} = \lim_{k, j} \langle \phi_k, v_j \rangle_{L^2(M, dV_g)} = \langle \phi, v \rangle_{L^2(M, dV_g)}.$$

Therefore, given $u \in W^{-k, p'}(T_l M)$, $v \in W^{k, p}(T_l M)$ and a sequence $\{u_k\} \subset C^\infty(T_l M)$ such that $u_k \xrightarrow{W^{-k, p'}} u$, we have

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{(M, g)} = \lim_k \langle u_k, v \rangle_{(M, g)} = \lim_k \langle u_k, v \rangle_{L^2(M, dV_g)}$$

which establishes (4.3). Now using (4.5) together with the map S defined in Theorem 2.1, we have the isomorphism claim of (4.4) defining $\mathcal{S}_{k, p} \doteq S_{k, p} \circ \Phi_{-k, p'} : W^{-k, p'}(T_l M) \rightarrow (W^{k, p}(T_l M))'$, which is a composition of bounded linear isomorphisms, which provides a topological isomorphism $W^{-k, p'}(T_l M) \cong (W^{k, p}(T_l M))'$.

Finally, if $v \in W^{k, p}(T_l M)$ is compactly supported in a coordinate chart as described in the theorem, then, from (4.5) we have a sequence $u_k \subset L^{p'}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u, v \rangle_{(M, g)} &= \lim_k \langle u_k, v \rangle_{L^2(M, dV_g)} = \lim_k \int_U \langle u_k, v \rangle_g dV_g = \lim_k \int_{\varphi(U)} \langle u_k, v \rangle_g \sqrt{\det(g)} dx, \\ &= \lim_k \int_{\varphi(U)} \sqrt{\det(g)} u_k^\sharp(v) dx = \langle \sqrt{\det(g)} u^\sharp, v_{i_1 \dots i_l} \rangle_{(U, \delta)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Let us now continue by noticing that, given a Riemannian manifold (M^n, g) , $g \in W^{2,q}$, $q > \frac{n}{2}$, and a tensor field $u \in L^p(M, dV_g)$, from Lemma 2.2 we can make sense of covariant derivatives of u up to second order, which shall be defined from its local coordinate form, where both partial derivatives as well as multiplication by Christoffel symbols are operations defined by duality. For instance, let us explicitly present the following proposition:

Proposition 4.1. *Let (M^n, g) be a Riemannian manifold, with $n \geq 3$, $g \in W^{2,q}$ for $q > \frac{n}{2}$. If $u \in L^p(S_2M)$, where S_2M denotes the bundle of symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor fields and $q' \leq p$, then $\nabla^2 u \in W^{-2,p}(T_4M)$ and also the following usual commutation of second derivatives holds, so that for any $u \in L^p(M)$ compactly supported in a coordinate system (U, φ) :*

$$\nabla_j \nabla_i u_{ab} = \nabla_i \nabla_j u_{ab} - R_{aji}^k u_{kb} - R_{bji}^k u_{ak} \quad (4.6)$$

Proof. Using Remark 2.1, we first notice that exponents q and p satisfy the conditions of Lemma 2.2 in the case $k = 0$. Thus, to establish $\nabla^2 u \in W^{-2,p}(T_4M)$ appealing to Lemma 2.2, we need to consider the local expression of $\nabla^2 u$ for $u \in C^\infty$ and then check they satisfy the hypotheses of the lemma. Thus, noticing that in a given local coordinate chart (U, φ) the action of the linear operator ∇^2 on u is given by:

$$\nabla_j \nabla_i u_{ab} = \partial_{ij} u_{ab} + A_{abij}^{cdl} \partial_c u_{dl} + B_{abij}^{dl} u_{dl} \quad (4.7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{abij}^{cdl} &= - \left(\Gamma_{ia}^d \delta_j^c \delta_b^l + \Gamma_{ib}^d \delta_j^c \delta_a^l + \Gamma_{ji}^c \delta_a^d \delta_b^l + \Gamma_{ja}^d \delta_i^c \delta_b^l + \Gamma_{jb}^d \delta_i^c \delta_a^l \right), \\ B_{abij}^{dl} &= \left(\Gamma_{ja}^c \Gamma_{ic}^d \delta_b^l + \Gamma_{ja}^d \Gamma_{ib}^l + \Gamma_{jb}^l \Gamma_{ia}^d + \Gamma_{jb}^c \Gamma_{ic}^d \delta_a^l - \partial_j \Gamma_{ia}^d \delta_b^l - \partial_j \Gamma_{ib}^d \delta_a^l + \Gamma_{ji}^c \Gamma_{ca}^d \delta_b^l + \Gamma_{ji}^c \Gamma_{cb}^d \delta_a^l \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if we show that the above operator has coefficients satisfying (2.32), then Lemma 2.2 shows that ∇^2 extends to a bounded linear map from $L^p \rightarrow W^{-2,p}$ as long as $q' \leq p$. Since the top order coefficient is constant, it is clearly in $W_{loc}^{2,q}$, and thus we must only check that $A_{abij}^{cdl} \in W_{loc}^{1,q}$ and $B_{abij}^{dl} \in L_{loc}^q$. For the first one of these, just notice that since $\Gamma_{jk}^i(g) \in W_{loc}^{1,q}(U)$, then $A_{abij}^{cdl} \in W_{loc}^{1,q}(U)$.

Finally, concerning the zero order term in (4.7), we have $\partial \Gamma \in L_{loc}^q(U)$, so we need only show that products of the form $\Gamma \cdot \Gamma \in L_{loc}^q(U)$. For that pick any function $\chi \in C_0^\infty(U)$ and then chose $\eta \in C_0^\infty(U)$ a cut-off function such that $\eta \equiv 1$ on $\text{supp}(\chi)$, so that

$$\chi \Gamma \cdot \Gamma = \chi \Gamma \cdot \eta \Gamma \in W^{1,q}(U) \otimes W^{1,q}(U) \hookrightarrow L^q(U)$$

which shows that $\Gamma \cdot \Gamma \in L_{loc}^q(U)$ and thus $\nabla^2 : L^p(S_2M) \rightarrow W^{-2,p}(S_2M)$ continuously as a consequence of Lemma 2.2.

Concerning the commutation rule for second covariant derivatives, we need only notice that, even for $g \in W^{2,q}$, this is an algebraic result which follows from the local expression on (U, φ) for any $u \in C_0^\infty(U)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_j \nabla_i u_{ab} &= \partial_{ji} u_{ab} - \Gamma_{ia}^l \partial_j u_{lb} - \Gamma_{ja}^l \partial_i u_{lb} - \Gamma_{ib}^l \partial_j u_{al} - \Gamma_{ji}^l \partial_i u_{ab} - \Gamma_{jb}^l \partial_i u_{al} \\ &\quad + \Gamma_{ja}^l \Gamma_{ib}^k u_{lk} + \Gamma_{jb}^l \Gamma_{ia}^k u_{kl} + \Gamma_{ji}^l \Gamma_{la}^k u_{kb} + \Gamma_{ji}^l \Gamma_{lb}^k u_{ak} \\ &\quad - \partial_j \Gamma_{ia}^l u_{lb} - \partial_j \Gamma_{ib}^l u_{al} + \Gamma_{jb}^l \Gamma_{il}^k u_{ak} + \Gamma_{ja}^l \Gamma_{il}^k u_{kb}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first two lines in the last expression are explicitly symmetric under the interchange of indices $i \longleftrightarrow j$. Therefore,

$$\nabla_j \nabla_i u_{ab} - \nabla_i \nabla_j u_{ab} = -R_{aji}^k u_{kb} - R_{bji}^k u_{ak}, \quad \forall u \in C_0^\infty(U). \quad (4.8)$$

Then, since $\text{Riem}_g \in L^q$ and $u \in C^\infty$, from Corollary 2.1 we know the contractions in the right-hand side of the the above expression satisfy

$$\|(\text{Riem}_g) \cdot u\|_{W^{-2,p}} \leq C \|\text{Riem}_g\|_{L^q} \|u\|_{L^p}, \quad \forall u \in C_0^\infty(U), \quad p \geq q'$$

Since both sides in (4.8) extend by continuity to $u \in L^p(U)$, the result follows. \square

The above will be particularly useful in the next section, but it also serves as a warm-up for the next proposition, where we study precise mapping properties of the tensor Laplacian, given by the trace of the second covariant derivative, on symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor fields.

Proposition 4.2. *Let (M^n, g) be a Riemannian manifold with $g \in W^{2,q}(M)$, $q > \frac{n}{2}$. Let us consider the bundle of $(0, 2)$ -symmetric tensor fields, denoted by S_2M , and the natural induced covariant derivative ∇ on it by g . Consider then the Laplacian*

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_g : C^\infty(S_2M) &\rightarrow W^{1,q}(S_2M), \\ u &\mapsto \Delta_g u = g^{ij} \nabla_i \nabla_j u = \nabla_i (g^{ij} \nabla_j u) \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Then, $\Delta_g \in \mathcal{L}^2(W^{2,q})$ and given $1 < p \leq q$, (4.9) extends to a continuous operator

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_g : W^{2,p}(S_2M) &\rightarrow L^p(S_2M), \\ u &\mapsto \Delta_g u = g^{ij} \nabla_i \nabla_j u = \nabla_i (g^{ij} \nabla_j u). \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

Furthermore, if $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{n}$, then (4.9) extends to a continuous operator

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_g : W^{1,p}(S_2M) &\rightarrow W^{-1,p}(S_2M), \\ u &\mapsto \Delta_g u = g^{ij} \nabla_i \nabla_j u = \nabla_i (g^{ij} \nabla_j u). \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

Finally, if $q' \leq p$, then (4.9) extends to a continuous operator

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_g : L^p(S_2M) &\rightarrow W^{-2,p}(S_2M), \\ u &\mapsto \Delta_g u = g^{ij} \nabla_i \nabla_j u = \nabla_i (g^{ij} \nabla_j u). \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

In all of the above cases, the following local formula, valid from smooth sections, extends to (4.10), (4.11) and (4.12) for u compactly supported in a coordinate domain:

$$\nabla_i (g^{ij} \nabla_j u^{ab}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det(g)}} \partial_i \left(\sqrt{\det(g)} \nabla^i u^{ab} \right) + \Gamma_{il}^a \nabla^i u^{lb} + \Gamma_{il}^b \nabla^i u^{al}, \quad (4.13)$$

Remark 4.1. *Recall from Remark 2.1, that in the case of (4.11) the restrictions on p are given by*

- $p \geq \frac{nq'}{n+q'}$ if $q \geq n$;
- $\frac{nq'}{n+q'} \leq p \leq \frac{nq}{n-q}$ if $\frac{n}{2} < q < n$.

Proof. Let $(U, x^i)_{i=1}^n$ be a local coordinate system, U a bounded open set with smooth boundary, and let $u \in C^\infty(S_2M)$ be compactly supported in U . Then, locally (4.9) is given by

$$\Delta_g u_{ab} = g^{ij} \partial_{ij} u_{ab} + \mathcal{A}_{ab}^{cdl} \partial_c u_{dl} + \mathcal{B}_{ab}^{dl} u_{dl}, \quad (4.14)$$

with

$$\mathcal{A}_{ab}^{cdl} = g^{ij} A_{abij}^{cdl}, \quad \mathcal{B}_{ab}^{dl} = g^{ij} B_{abij}^{dl}, \quad (4.15)$$

where the functions A_{abij}^{cdl} and B_{abij}^{dl} are those given in (4.7). In order to establish (4.10), (4.11) and (4.12), we shall appeal to Lemma 2.2. Thus, let us first establish that $\Delta_g \in \mathcal{L}^2(W^{2,q})$. For this we need to establish the following claim:

Claim 1. *The coefficients in (4.15) satisfy $\mathcal{A}_{ab}^{cdl} \in W_{loc}^{1,q}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{ab}^{dl} \in L_{loc}^q$*

Proof. From the analysis after (4.7), we know that $A_{abij}^{cdl} \in W_{loc}^{1,q}(U)$ and $B_{abij}^{dl} \in L_{loc}^q(U)$, and hence the claim amounts to showing that $W_{loc}^{2,q} \otimes W_{loc}^{1,q} \hookrightarrow W_{loc}^{1,q}$ and $W_{loc}^{2,q} \otimes L_{loc}^q \hookrightarrow L_{loc}^q$, both following directly from Theorem 2.2 and Corollary 2.1, due to $q > \frac{n}{2}$. \square

Given the above claim, since $g^{ij} \in W_{loc}^{2,q}$, then we see that $\Delta_g \in \mathcal{L}^2(W^{2,q})$ and therefore Lemma 2.2 establishes our continuity properties (4.10), (4.11) and (4.12) are granted as long as $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{k-2}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{k}{n}$ for $k = 2, 1, 0$ respectively. Using Remark 2.1, we know that for $k = 2$ this holds as long as $1 < p \leq q$, while in the case of $k = 0$, since $q > \frac{n}{2}$, this reduces to $p \geq q'$. In the case of $k = 1$ the condition is optimally expressed as $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{1}{n}$.

Finally, to establish (4.13), let us notice that locally one can write the *contravariant* version of (4.14) more compactly as

$$\nabla_i(g^{ij}\nabla_j u^{ab}) = \partial_i \nabla^i u^{ab} + \Gamma_{il}^i \nabla^l u^{ab} + \Gamma_{il}^a \nabla^i u^{lb} + \Gamma_{il}^b \nabla^i u^{al}. \quad (4.16)$$

Now, the following formula for the derivative of a determinant extends to $W^{2,q}$ metrics, $q > \frac{n}{2}$,¹⁹

$$\frac{\partial_l \sqrt{\det(g)}}{\sqrt{\det(g)}} = \frac{1}{2\det(g)} \partial_l \det(g) = \frac{1}{2} g^{ij} \partial_l g_{ij} = \Gamma_{li}^i.$$

Putting this together with (4.16), proves (4.13). \square

We shall be interested in the regularity theory for the operators (4.10) and (4.11), which shall be established appealing to Fredholm theory. For that, we will pivot around the theory for the case of smooth metrics to obtain properties about the Fredholm index of these operators. Thus, the following general properties of these operators in the case of smooth metrics shall be of interest.

Let (M^n, g) be a closed smooth Riemannian manifold. From (4.10)-(4.11) we know that $\Delta_g : W^{k,p}(S_2M) \rightarrow W^{k-2,p}(S_2M)$, $k = 1, 2$, is a bounded map for any $1 < p < \infty$, since $g \in W^{2,q}$ for any $q < \infty$. Notice then that the adjoint maps, given by

$$\Delta_g^* : \left(W^{k-2,p}(S_2M)\right)' \rightarrow \left(W^{k,p}(S_2M)\right)'$$

and defined by duality

$$[\Delta_g^*(u)](v) = u(\Delta_g v) \text{ for all } u \in \left(W^{k-2,p}(S_2M)\right)' \text{ and all } v \in W^{k,p}(S_2M),$$

can be computed explicitly. To see this, let $u \in (W^{k-2,p})'$ be given by $u = S_{k-2,p} \tilde{u}$ with $\tilde{u} \in C^\infty(S_2M)$ and $S_{k-2,p} : W^{2-k,p'}(S_2M) \rightarrow (W^{k-2,p}(S_2M))'$ is the isomorphism described in Lemma 2.1. Then, for all $v \in C^\infty(S_2M)$ we have

$$[\Delta_g^*|_{(W^{k-2,p})' u}](v) = \langle \tilde{u}, \Delta_g v \rangle_{(M,g)} = \langle \Delta_g \tilde{u}, v \rangle_{(M,g)} = [S_{k,p} \Delta_g \tilde{u}](v) = [S_{k,p} \circ \Delta_g \circ S_{k-2,p}^{-1}(u)](v),$$

where in the second identity we have just appealed to standard integration by parts. Thus,

$$[\Delta_g^*|_{(W^{k-2,p}(S_2M))' u}]|_{C^\infty(S_2M)} = S_{k,p} \circ \Delta_g \circ S_{k-2,p}^{-1}(u)|_{C^\infty(S_2M)},$$

which by density of $C^\infty(S_2M)$ in $W^{k,p}(S_2M)$ implies $[\Delta_g^*|_{(W^{k-2,p})' u}]|_{W^{k,p}(S_2M)} = S_{k,p} \circ \Delta_g \circ S_{k-2,p}^{-1}(u)|_{W^{k,p}(S_2M)}$. Finally, since

$$S_{k-2,p} : W^{2-k,p'} \rightarrow (W^{k-2,p})'$$

is a topological isomorphism and C^∞ is dense in $W^{2-k,p'}$, then the elements $u = S_{k-2,p} \tilde{u} \in (W^{k-2,p})'$ with $\tilde{u} \in C^\infty$ are dense in $(W^{k-2,p})'$. Since both Δ_g^* and $S_{k,p} \circ \Delta_g|_{W^{2-k,p'}} \circ S_{k-2,p}^{-1}$ are bounded maps on $(W^{k-2,p})'$ and agree on a dense subset, they agree on all of $(W^{k-2,p})'$. That is, we have shown that for this case of smooth metrics, it holds that

$$\Delta_g^*|_{(W^{k-2,p}(S_2M))'} = S_{k,p} \circ \Delta_g|_{W^{2-k,p'}} \circ S_{k-2,p}^{-1} \quad (4.17)$$

When the metric g has limited regularity, suitably extending the above formula will be of importance to understand regularity properties. For that, we will need to justify ‘‘integration by parts’’ type formulas for objects of very limited regularity.

¹⁹The composition lemma for Sobolev functions allows us to use the chain rule in the same way as in the smooth case and therefore standard proofs extend to this level of regularity.

4.1 $W^{2,p}$ -regularity theory

The mapping properties (4.12) and (4.13) give us the necessary tools to prove the following duality property, which generalises an integration by parts type formula to the regularity setting of this section:

Proposition 4.3. *Let (M^n, g) be closed Riemannian manifold with $g \in W^{2,q}$, $q > \frac{n}{2}$. Given $u \in L^{p'}(S_2M)$, and $v \in W^{2,p}(S_2M)$ with $1 < p \leq q$, the following integration by parts type formula holds:*

$$-\langle \Delta_g u, v \rangle_{(M,g)} = \langle \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle_{(M,g)} = -\langle u, \Delta_g v \rangle_{(M,g)}. \quad (4.18)$$

Proof. Since by hypotheses $u \in L^{p'}(S_2M)$ with $q' \leq p'$, then Proposition 4.2 establishes that $\Delta_g u \in W^{-2,p'}(S_2M)$. Also, Lemma 4.1 guarantees that $W^{-2,p'}(S_2M) \cong_{S_2,p} (W^{2,p}(S_2M))'$ as long as $\frac{1}{q} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{4}{n}$. Notice that

$$\frac{1}{q'} + \frac{4}{n} = 1 - \frac{1}{q} + \frac{4}{n} = 1 + \frac{2}{n} + \frac{2}{n} - \frac{1}{q} > 1 + \frac{2}{n} > 1.$$

That is, the condition $\frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{4}{n}$ is trivially satisfied for all $p \geq 1$, while $p \leq q$ holds by hypothesis. Therefore, the pairing $\langle \Delta_g u, v \rangle_{(M,g)}$ is well defined for all $v \in W^{2,p}$. Furthermore, given $u \in L^{p'}(S_2M)$ compactly supported in a bounded coordinate patch $(\Omega, x^i)_{i=1}^n$ with smooth boundary, then

$$\nabla_i u_{ab} = \partial_i u_{ab} - \Gamma_{ia}^l u_{lb} - \Gamma_{ib}^l u_{al} = \partial_i u_{ab} - \left(\Gamma_{ia}^l \delta_b^k + \Gamma_{ib}^k \delta_a^l \right) u_{lk} \quad (4.19)$$

Therefore, to guarantee that $\nabla u \in W^{-1,p'}(T_3M)$ we can appeal to Lemma 2.3, as long as we verify its hypotheses. For that, we need to check that the coefficients satisfy the hypotheses of (2.35), with $A_\alpha \in W_{loc}^{|\alpha|,r}$ for $r > n$, and that $\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p'} \leq \frac{1}{r'}$, but since $r > n$ the only non-trivial inequality to be checked in this case is $\frac{1}{p'} \leq \frac{1}{r'}$. Notice then that the top order coefficients in (4.19) are constant and hence clearly in $W_{loc}^{1,r}(U)$, for any r . Now, the regularity of the zero order coefficients is given by that of $\Gamma_{ij}^l(g) \in W_{loc}^{1,q}(U)$. If $\frac{n}{2} < q < n$, then $W_{loc}^{1,q}(U) \hookrightarrow L_{loc}^{\frac{nq}{n-q}}(U)$, and notice that

$$\frac{nq}{n-q} > n \iff q > \frac{n}{2},$$

and thus, in the notations of (2.35), we can find some $r > n$, such that $A_{|\alpha|} \in W_{loc}^{|\alpha|,r}$. We now need to guarantee that $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{p'} \leq 1$, but since $r \geq q$ and $p' \geq q'$, then

$$\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{p'} \leq \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{q'} = 1,$$

and thus we are under the hypotheses of Lemma 2.3, and we can deduce then that $\nabla u \in W^{-1,p'}(T_3M)$. Moreover, from Lemma 4.4, to guarantee $W^{-1,p'}(T_3M) \cong_{S_1,p} (W^{1,p}(T_3M))'$, we need to guarantee $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{3}{n}$. The first of these inequalities follows since actually $\frac{1}{p} \geq \frac{1}{q} > \frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n}$ by hypothesis. For the second one, we again notice that

$$\frac{1}{q'} + \frac{3}{n} = 1 - \frac{1}{q} + \frac{3}{n} = 1 + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{2}{n} - \frac{1}{q} > 1 + \frac{1}{n} > 1,$$

and therefore $\frac{1}{p} < 1 < \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{3}{n}$ holds for all $p \geq 1$. We can therefore conclude that

$$\nabla u \in W^{-1,p'}(T_3M) \cong_{S_1,p} (W^{1,p}(T_3M))' \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla v \in W^{1,p}(T_3M).$$

Since $\Delta_g v \in L^p$, if v is compactly supported in a coordinate patch $(\Omega, x^i)_{i=1}^n$ the following computation is justified:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle_{(M,g)} &= \langle \sqrt{\det(g)} g^{ij} g^{ab} g^{cd} \nabla_i u_{ac}, \nabla_j v_{bd} \rangle_{(\Omega,\delta)}, \\ &= -\langle u_{ac}, \partial_i \left(\sqrt{\det(g)} \nabla^i v^{ac} \right) + \Gamma_{il}^a \sqrt{\det(g)} \nabla^i v^{lc} + \Gamma_{il}^c \sqrt{\det(g)} \nabla^i v^{al} \rangle_{(\Omega,\delta)}, \\ &= -\langle u_{ac}, \sqrt{\det(g)} \nabla_i \nabla^i v^{ac} \rangle_{(\Omega,\delta)}, \\ &= -\langle u, \Delta_g v \rangle_{(M,g)}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

where we have used (4.13). Similarly, we know $\langle \Delta_g u, v \rangle_{(M,g)}$ is well-defined and gives:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \Delta_g u, v \rangle_{(M,g)} &= \langle \sqrt{\det(g)} g^{ij} g^{ab} \Delta_g u_{ia}, v_{jb} \rangle_{(\Omega,\delta)}, \\
&= \langle \partial_c \left(\sqrt{\det(g)} \nabla^c u_{ia} \right) - \sqrt{\det(g)} \Gamma_{ci}^l \nabla^c u_{la} - \sqrt{\det(g)} \Gamma_{ca}^l \nabla^c u_{il}, v^{ia} \rangle_{(\Omega,\delta)}, \\
&= -\langle \sqrt{\det(g)} \nabla^c u_{ia}, \partial_c v^{ia} + \Gamma_{cl}^i v^{la} + \Gamma_{cl}^a v^{il} \rangle_{(\Omega,\delta)}, \\
&= -\langle \sqrt{\det(g)} \nabla^c u_{ia}, \nabla_c v^{ia} \rangle_{(\Omega,\delta)}, \\
&= -\langle \sqrt{\det(g)} g^{cd} g^{ij} g^{ab} \nabla_c u_{ia}, \nabla_d v_{jb} \rangle_{(\Omega,\delta)}, \\
&= -\langle \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle_{(M,g)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

where in the second step, to justify the duality arguments, one is appealing to the arguments of Lemma 2.2. Therefore, putting together (4.20), (4.21) and using a partition of unity to localise the argument, one finds that (4.18) holds. \square

The above integration by parts formula can now be used to find the explicit action of the adjoint operator $\Delta_g^* : (L^p(S_2M))' \rightarrow (W^{2,p}(S_2M))'$ on a Riemannian manifold (M^n, g) , $g \in W^{2,q}$, $q > \frac{n}{2}$.

Corollary 4.1. *Let (M^n, g) be closed Riemannian manifold with $g \in W^{2,q}$, $q > \frac{n}{2}$. Consider the Laplacian $\Delta_g : W^{2,p}(S_2M) \rightarrow L^p(S_2M)$ with $1 < p \leq q$ and its adjoint operator*

$$\Delta_g^* : (L^p(S_2M))' \rightarrow (W^{2,p}(S_2M))',$$

which is defined via the relation

$$(\Delta_g^* \phi)(\varphi) \doteq \phi(\Delta_g \varphi) \text{ for all } \phi \in (L^p(S_2M))' \text{ and all } \varphi \in W^{2,p}(S_2M).$$

Then,

$$\Delta_g^* = \mathcal{S}_{2,p} \circ \Delta_g|_{L^{p'}} \circ \mathcal{S}_{0,p}^{-1} : (L^p(S_2M))' \rightarrow (W^{2,p}(S_2M))', \tag{4.22}$$

where $\Delta_g|_{L^{p'}} : L^{p'}(S_2M) \rightarrow W^{-2,p'}(S_2M)$ is the map given in (4.12) and $\mathcal{S}_{k,p} : W^{-k,p'}(S_2M) \rightarrow (W^{k,p}(S_2M))'$ given in Lemma 4.1 by (4.4).

Proof. From the isomorphism

$$\mathcal{S}_{k,p} : W^{-k,p'} \rightarrow (W^{k,p})'$$

established in Lemma 4.1 by (4.4), we have that

$$u(v) = \langle \mathcal{S}_{0,p}^{-1} u, v \rangle_{(M,g)} \quad \forall u \in (L^p)' \text{ and } v \in L^p,$$

and thus, for all $u \in (L^p)'$ and $v \in W^{2,p}$:

$$(\Delta_g^* u)(v) \stackrel{def}{=} u(\Delta_g v) = \langle \mathcal{S}_{0,p}^{-1} u, \Delta_g v \rangle_{(M,g)} = \langle \Delta_g \mathcal{S}_{0,p}^{-1} u, v \rangle_{(M,g)} = \left(\mathcal{S}_{2,p}(\Delta_g|_{L^{p'}} \mathcal{S}_{0,p}^{-1} u) \right)(v),$$

where in the third identity above we have used the integration by parts established in Proposition 4.3. Thus, we find $\Delta_g^* = \mathcal{S}_{2,p} \circ \Delta_g|_{L^{p'}} \circ \mathcal{S}_{0,p}^{-1} : (L^p)' \rightarrow (W^{2,p})'$. \square

We will now appeal to the above analysis when establishing the following regularity result:

Theorem 4.4. *Let (M^n, g) be a closed Riemannian manifold with $g \in W^{2,q}(M)$, $q > \frac{n}{2}$. Then, the Laplace-Beltrami operator*

$$\Delta_g : W^{2,p}(M; S_2M) \rightarrow L^p(M; S_2M), \text{ for all } 1 < p \leq q \tag{4.23}$$

is Fredholm of index zero, $\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,p}}) \subset W^{2,q}(M)$ and the following regularity implication follows:

$$\text{if } u \in L^q(S_2M), \text{ and } \Delta_g u \in L^p(S_2M) \implies u \in W^{2,p}(S_2M). \tag{4.24}$$

Proof. First notice that (4.23) is continuous due to Proposition 4.2 and belongs to $\mathcal{L}^2(W^{2,q})$. Thus, from Lemma 3.1, we know this operator is semi-Fredholm. Therefore, to show it is actually a Fredholm operator, one must only show its cokernel is finite dimensional. With this in mind, first notice that when $g \in C^\infty$, then the L^2 -theory implies that $\text{Ker}(\Delta_g : L^p \rightarrow W^{-2,p}) \subset C^\infty$ is independent of $p > 1$. Therefore, since $\Delta_g^*|_{(L^p)'} = S_{2,p} \circ \Delta_g|_{L^{p'}} \circ S_{0,p}^{-1} : (L^p)' \rightarrow (W^{2,p})'$ and the maps $\mathcal{S}_{k,p}$ are isomorphism,

$$\dim(\text{Ker}(\Delta_g^* : (L^p)' \rightarrow (W^{2,p})')) = \dim(\text{Ker}(\Delta_g : L^{p'} \rightarrow W^{-2,p'})) = \dim(\text{Ker}(\Delta_g : W^{2,p} \rightarrow L^p)),$$

where the last equality follows by the previous discussion. Hence, these maps are all Fredholm of index zero.²⁰ In the general case, let $\{g_k\} \subset C^\infty$ such that $g_k \xrightarrow{W^{2,q}} g$, and notice that since $q > \frac{n}{2}$, $1 < p \leq q$ and $\frac{1}{p} < 1 < 1 + \left(\frac{2}{n} - \frac{1}{q}\right)$, we can appeal to the same computations of (2.34) to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_g - \Delta_{g_k}\|_{\text{Op}(W^{2,p}, L^p)} &\lesssim \sum_{r=1}^N \sum_{i,j=1}^n \|\eta_r(g^{ij} - g_k^{ij})\|_{W^{2,q}(U_r)} + \sum_{r=1}^N \sum_{a,b,c,d,l=1}^n \|\eta_r(\mathcal{A}_{ab}^{cdl}(g) - \mathcal{A}_{ab}^{cdl}(g_k))\|_{W^{1,q}(U_r)} \\ &+ \sum_{r=1}^N \sum_{a,b,c,d,l=1}^n \|\eta_r(\mathcal{B}_{ab}^{dl}(g) - \mathcal{B}_{ab}^{dl}(g_k))\|_{L^q(U_r)} \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

where the coefficients \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are the ones appearing in (4.15), $\{U_r\}_{r=1}^N$ is a covering by coordinate systems of M and $\{\eta_r\}_{r=1}^N$ is a partition of unity subordinate to such a cover, and we have already used the standard trivialisation for associated tensor bundles in a given coordinate system, associating to u its components in the given coordinate system. The fact that $g_k \xrightarrow{W^{2,q}} g$ clearly implies the first set of sums in the right-hand side of (4.25) is going to zero as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Concerning the two other sets of sums, we appeal to the explicit expressions given in (4.15) and (4.7), to deduce that since

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_r \Gamma_{jl}^i(g_k) &\xrightarrow{W^{1,q}(U_r)} \eta_r \Gamma_{jl}^i(g), \\ \eta_r \Gamma_{jl}^i(g_k) \Gamma_{bc}^a(g_k) &\xrightarrow{L^q(U_r)} \eta_r \Gamma_{jl}^i(g) \Gamma_{bc}^a(g), \end{aligned}$$

then all of the right-hand side in (4.25) goes to zero, and hence Δ_{g_k} converges to Δ_g in the operator norm form $W^{2,p} \rightarrow L^p$. Since each Δ_{g_k} is Fredholm of index zero and the index of a semi-Fredholm map is locally constant (see, for instance, [33, Theorem 19.1.5]), then (4.23) has also index zero and is therefore also Fredholm.

The regularity claim for the kernel can now be established as follows. Since $\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,q}}) \subset \text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,p}})$ for any $1 < p \leq q$, then

$$\dim(\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,q}})) \leq \dim(\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,p}})) = \dim(\text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^p)'})) \leq \dim(\text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^q)'})) = \dim(\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,q}})),$$

where the first identity follows since the index of the operator is zero, the second inequality since $(L^p)' \hookrightarrow (L^q)'$ and the last identity again by the index property. Therefore, all of the above dimensions are equal. Putting this together with the inclusions

$$\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,q}}) \subset \text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,p}}), \quad \text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^p)'}) \subset \text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^q)'}),$$

it follows that

$$\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,q}}) = \text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,p}}) \cong \text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^p)'}) = \text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^q)'}), \quad (4.26)$$

where the isomorphism in the middle follows since all these spaces have the same (finite) dimension. This isomorphism can be made explicit, since by Corollary 4.1 it holds that

$$\Delta_g^*|_{(L^q)'} = \mathcal{S}_{2,q} \circ \Delta_g|_{L^{q'}} \circ \mathcal{S}_{0,q}^{-1} : (L^q)' \rightarrow (W^{2,q})', \quad (4.27)$$

²⁰For details about the smooth theory, see, for instance [33, Theorem 19.2.1].

implying

$$\text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^q)'}) = \mathcal{S}_{0,q}(\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{L^{q'}})). \quad (4.28)$$

Also, since $W^{2,q} \hookrightarrow L^{q'}$, we have $\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,q}}) \subset \text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{L^{q'}})$. But then, from (4.26)-(4.28), these last spaces must have the same dimension, and thus we conclude $\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,q}}) = \text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{L^{q'}})$, implying

$$\text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^p)'}) = \text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^q)'}) = \mathcal{S}_{0,q}(\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,q}})). \quad (4.29)$$

We can actually extract some further information from the above arguments, since actually from Corollary 4.1 it holds that:

$$\Delta_g^*|_{(L^p)' } = \mathcal{S}_{2,p} \circ \Delta_g|_{L^{p'}} \circ \mathcal{S}_{0,p}^{-1} : (L^p)' \rightarrow (W^{2,p})', \text{ for all } 1 < p \leq q, \quad (4.30)$$

which implies

$$\text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^p)'}) = \mathcal{S}_{0,p}(\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{L^{p'}})), \text{ for all } 1 < p \leq q. \quad (4.31)$$

Again, since $W^{2,q}(M) \hookrightarrow L^{p'} \implies \text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,q}}) \subset \text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{L^{p'}})$, but this time we already know that $\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{L^{p'}}) \subset \text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{L^{q'}}) = \text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,q}})$, where the last inclusion follows since $p' \geq q'$ by hypothesis. Therefore $\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,q}}) = \text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{L^{p'}})$, and putting this together with (4.31), we find the following generalisation of (4.29):

$$\text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^p)'}) = \text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^q)'}) = \mathcal{S}_{0,p}(\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,q}})). \quad (4.32)$$

Finally, because Δ_g is Fredholm, we know that $\text{Im}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,p}}) = \text{Ker}^\perp(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^p)'}) \subset L^p$, where $\text{Ker}^\perp(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^p)'})$ stands for the annihilator space of $\text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^p)'})$. That is, $f \in \text{Im}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,p}})$ iff $v(f) = 0$ for all $v \in \text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^p)'})$. Since $\text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^p)'}) = \text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^q)'}) = \mathcal{S}_{0,p}(\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,q}}))$, given $v \in \text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^p)'})$, we know that there is some $\tilde{v} \in W^{2,q}$ such that $v = \mathcal{S}_{0,p}(\tilde{v}) \in (L^q)'$. Thus, if $u \in L^{q'}$ one can justify integration by parts through Proposition 4.3:

$$\langle \Delta_g u, \tilde{v} \rangle_{(M,g)} = \langle u, \Delta_g \tilde{v} \rangle_{(M,g)} = \langle u, \Delta_g \circ \mathcal{S}_{0,p}^{-1} v \rangle_{(M,g)},$$

where the above expression is well-defined, since by hypothesis $u \in L^{q'}$, $\tilde{v} \in W^{2,q}$, and thus $\Delta_g \tilde{v} \in L^q$. Furthermore, from (4.29) we know that $v \in \text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^p)'})$ iff $v \in \text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^q)'})$, which by (4.30) means

$$\Delta_g^* v = 0 \iff \Delta_g|_{L^{p'}} \circ \mathcal{S}_{0,p}^{-1} v = 0,$$

which implies that

$$\langle \Delta_g u, \tilde{v} \rangle_{(M,g)} = 0, \text{ for all } v \in \text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^p)'}).$$

Noticing now that

$$v(\phi) = (\mathcal{S}_{0,p} \tilde{v})(\phi) = \langle \tilde{v}, \phi \rangle_{(M,g)} \text{ for all } \phi \in L^p,$$

if $u \in L^{q'}$ and $\Delta_g u \in L^p$ a priori, using the above relations we find

$$v(\Delta_g u) = \langle \tilde{v}, \Delta_g u \rangle_{(M,g)} = 0, \text{ for all } v \in \text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^p)'})$$

proving that actually $\Delta_g u \in \text{Ker}^\perp(\Delta_g^*|_{(L^p)'}) \subset L^p$, and therefore there is some $\varphi \in W^{2,p}$ such that

$$\Delta_g \varphi = \Delta_g u \iff \varphi - u \in \text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{L^{q'}}) = \text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,q}}) \implies u = \varphi + (u - \varphi) \in W^{2,p}. \quad \square$$

Let us highlight that, clearly, everything we have done above for the tensor Laplacian Δ_g acting on $S_2 M$ holds under the same conditions for the scalar Laplacian. Therefore, we can state the following:

Corollary 4.2. *Let (M^n, g) be a closed Riemannian manifold with $g \in W^{2,q}(M)$, $q > \frac{n}{2}$. Then, the Laplace-Beltrami operator*

$$\Delta_g : W^{2,p}(M) \rightarrow L^p(M), \text{ for all } 1 < p \leq q \quad (4.33)$$

is Fredholm of index zero, $\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,p}}) \subset W^{2,q}(M)$ and the following regularity implication follows:

$$\text{if } u \in L^{q'}(M), \text{ and } \Delta_g u \in L^p(M) \implies u \in W^{2,p}(M). \quad (4.34)$$

4.2 $W^{1,p}$ -regularity theory

We can now sharpen the regularity results of the previous section to the $W^{1,p}$ -setting, which shall follow along similar lines of arguments, but before doing that we need suitable extensions of Proposition 4.3 and Corollary 4.1 to this setting.

Proposition 4.5. *Let (M^n, g) be closed Riemannian manifold with $g \in W^{2,q}$, $q > \frac{n}{2}$. Given $p \in (1, \infty)$ satisfying $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{1}{n}$, $u \in W^{1,p'}(S_2M)$ and $v \in W^{1,p}(S_2M)$, the following integration by parts type formula holds:*

$$-\langle \Delta_g u, v \rangle_{(M,g)} = \langle \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle_{(M,g)} = -\langle \Delta_g v, u \rangle_{(M,g)}. \quad (4.35)$$

Proof. Proposition 4.2 establishes that $\Delta_g u \in W^{-1,p'}(S_2M)$ as long as

$$\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p'} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{1}{n} \iff 1 - \frac{1}{q'} - \frac{1}{n} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{p'} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{n} \iff \frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{1}{n},$$

which holds by hypothesis. Also, Lemma 4.1 grants that $W^{-1,p'}(S_2M) \cong_{\mathcal{S}_{1,p}} (W^{1,p}(S_2M))'$ if $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{1}{n}$, which also holds by hypothesis. Therefore, the pairing $\langle \Delta_g u, v \rangle_{(M,g)}$ is well-defined for all $v \in W^{1,p}$. In the same way as in (4.19), to guarantee that $\nabla u \in L^{p'}(T_3M)$ we can appeal to Lemma 2.3, as long as we verify its hypotheses. For that, we need to check that the coefficients satisfy the hypotheses of (2.35), with $A_\alpha \in W_{loc}^{|\alpha|,r}$ for $r > n$, and that $\frac{1}{r} \leq \frac{1}{p'} \leq \frac{1}{r'} + \frac{1}{n}$. From (4.19), we need only concentrate on the zero order term, whose local regularity is given by the Christoffel symbols $\Gamma_{jk}^i(g) \in W_{loc}^{1,q}$. Notice that if $q \geq n$, then $\Gamma_{jk}^i(g) \in L_{loc}^r$ for $r < \infty$, and so taking $r > \max\{q, p'\} \geq n$ the condition $r > p'$ guarantees $\frac{1}{r} < \frac{1}{p'}$, while the condition $r > q$ implies $r' < q'$, which together with $\frac{1}{p'} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{1}{n}$ established above guarantees $\frac{1}{p'} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{1}{n} < \frac{1}{r'} + \frac{1}{n}$, and hence the case $q \geq n$ is covered. Thus, we need only concentrate on the cases $\frac{n}{2} < q < n$, where $W_{loc}^{1,q} \hookrightarrow L_{loc}^{\frac{nq}{n-q}}$ and $r \doteq \frac{nq}{n-q} > n$ for any $q > \frac{n}{2}$. In this cases we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{r} \leq \frac{1}{p'} \leq \frac{1}{r'} + \frac{1}{n} &\iff \frac{1}{r} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{r'} + \frac{1}{n} \iff -\frac{1}{r'} \leq -\frac{1}{p} \leq -\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{n}, \\ &\iff \frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{r'}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $r > n$, the first condition above is obvious for any $p \in (1, \infty)$, and also

$$\frac{1}{r'} = 1 - \frac{1}{r} = 1 - \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{n} = \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{1}{n} \geq \frac{1}{p},$$

where the last inequality holds by hypothesis. We are therefore under the hypotheses of Lemma 2.3, and we can deduce then that $\nabla u \in L^{p'}(T_3M)$. Finally, also notice that Lemma 4.1 grants that $L^{p'}(T_3M) \cong_{\mathcal{S}_{0,p}} (L^p(T_3M))'$ as long as $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{2}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{2}{n}$, both inequalities satisfied by hypotheses.

The above analysis implies that

$$\nabla u \in L^{p'}(T_3M) \cong_{\mathcal{S}_{0,p}} (L^p(T_3M))' \text{ and } \nabla v \in L^p(T_3M).$$

Since $\Delta_g v \in W^{-1,p}$, if v is compactly supported in a coordinate patch $(\Omega, x^i)_{i=1}^n$ the following computation is justified:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle_{(M,g)} &= \langle \sqrt{\det(g)} g^{ij} g^{ab} g^{cd} \nabla_i u_{ac}, \nabla_j v_{bd} \rangle_{(\Omega,\delta)}, \\ &= -\langle \partial_i \left(\sqrt{\det(g)} \nabla^i v^{ac} \right) + \Gamma_{il}^a \sqrt{\det(g)} \nabla^i v^{lc} + \Gamma_{il}^c \sqrt{\det(g)} \nabla^i v^{al}, u_{ac} \rangle_{(\Omega,\delta)}, \\ &= -\langle \sqrt{\det(g)} \nabla_i \nabla^i v^{ac}, u_{ac} \rangle_{(\Omega,\delta)}, \\ &= -\langle \Delta_g v, u \rangle_{(M,g)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (4.13). Similarly, we know $\langle \Delta_g u, v \rangle_{(M,g)}$ is well-defined and gives:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \Delta_g u, v \rangle_{(M,g)} &= \langle \sqrt{\det(g)} g^{ij} g^{ab} \Delta_g u_{ia}, v_{jb} \rangle_{(\Omega,\delta)}, \\
&= \langle \partial_c \left(\sqrt{\det(g)} \nabla^c u_{ia} \right) - \sqrt{\det(g)} \Gamma_{ci}^l \nabla^c u_{la} - \sqrt{\det(g)} \Gamma_{ca}^l \nabla^c u_{il}, v^{ia} \rangle_{(\Omega,\delta)}, \\
&= -\langle \sqrt{\det(g)} \nabla^c u_{ia}, \partial_c v^{ia} + \Gamma_{cl}^i v^{la} + \Gamma_{cl}^a v^{il} \rangle_{(\Omega,\delta)}, \\
&= -\langle \sqrt{\det(g)} \nabla^c u_{ia}, \nabla_c v^{ia} \rangle_{(\Omega,\delta)}, \\
&= -\langle \sqrt{\det(g)} g^{cd} g^{ij} g^{ab} \nabla_c u_{ia}, \nabla_d v_{jb} \rangle_{(\Omega,\delta)}, \\
&= -\langle \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle_{(M,g)}.
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second step, to justify the duality arguments, one is appealing to the arguments of Lemma 2.2. \square

Up to this point we have been working very explicitly with the different operators involved and their corresponding domains, at the expense of carrying some extra notations making explicit certain natural isomorphisms. We shall now present a proposition which is intended to unify and simplify certain notations concerning these isomorphisms, which would otherwise get increasingly heavy. Also in that spirit, let us adopt the following standard convention. Since the spaces $W^{k,p}$ are reflexive whenever $1 < p < \infty$, we know that the evaluation map

$$E : W^{k,p} \rightarrow (W^{k,p})'',$$

given by

$$(Eu)(v) \doteq v(u), \text{ for all } u \in W^{k,p} \text{ and all } v \in (W^{k,p})'$$

is a topological isomorphism that allows us to identify $(W^{k,p})'' \cong W^{k,p}$. We shall adopt this identification below, and thus, for instance, given $u \in W^{1,p} \cong (W^{1,p})''$ and $v \in (W^{1,p})'$, we understand the action of u as an element of $(W^{1,p})''$ on v by

$$u(v) \doteq v(u) \tag{4.36}$$

where the right-hand side of the above expression is naturally well-defined, and we do not make explicit the evaluation map on the left-hand side.

Proposition 4.6. *Given $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $1 < p < \infty$, let $\mathcal{S}_{k,p} : W^{-k,p'} \rightarrow (W^{k,p})'$ be a topological isomorphism. Then, the map*

$$\mathcal{S}_{k,p}^* : W^{k,p} \rightarrow (W^{-k,p'})', \tag{4.37}$$

described by duality is also a topological isomorphism. Moreover, $(\mathcal{S}_{k,p}^)^{-1} = (\mathcal{S}_{k,p}^{-1})^*$.*

Proof. First, since $\mathcal{S}_{k,p}$ is bounded, then the map (4.37) is bounded by definition. Let us then show that this map is invertible. With this in mind, just notice that since $\mathcal{S}_{k,p}^{-1} : (W^{k,p})' \rightarrow W^{-k,p'}$ is a bounded map, we also get a bounded adjoint map,

$$(\mathcal{S}_{k,p}^{-1})^* : (W^{-k,p'})' \rightarrow W^{k,p},$$

for which

$$[(\mathcal{S}_{k,p}^{-1})^* (\mathcal{S}_{k,p}^*(u))](v) = [\mathcal{S}_{k,p}^*(u)](\mathcal{S}_{k,p}^{-1}v) = u(v), \text{ for all } u \in W^{k,p} \text{ and all } v \in (W^{k,p})',$$

That is, $(\mathcal{S}_{k,p}^{-1})^* \circ \mathcal{S}_{k,p}^* = \text{Id} : W^{k,p} \rightarrow W^{k,p}$. Similarly, we can show that

$$[\mathcal{S}_{k,p}^* \circ (\mathcal{S}_{k,p}^{-1})^*](\phi) = [(\mathcal{S}_{k,p}^{-1})^*](\phi)(\mathcal{S}_{k,p}\phi) = \phi(\phi), \text{ for all } \phi \in (W^{-k,p'})' \text{ and all } \varphi \in W^{-k,p'},$$

and thus $(\mathcal{S}_{k,p}^*)^{-1} = (\mathcal{S}_{k,p}^{-1})^*$. Finally, the continuity of the inverse also follows from that of $\mathcal{S}_{k,p}^{-1}$. \square

With the above proposition in mind, we extend the definition of the isomorphisms of Lemma 4.1 to the cases of negative k in a way which unifies notations:

Definition 4.1. Let (M^n, g) be a closed Riemannian manifold with $g \in W^{2,q}$, $q > \frac{n}{2}$, and let $k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cap [0, 2]$ and $p \in (1, \infty)$ satisfy $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{2-k}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{2+k}{n}$. Then, the family of topological isomorphisms

$$\mathcal{S}_{k,p} : W^{-k,p'} \rightarrow (W^{k,p})'$$

described by (4.4) in Lemma 4.1, can be extended to incorporate values $k \in \mathbb{Z} \cap [-2, 2]$ defining

$$\mathcal{S}_{-k,p} \doteq \mathcal{S}_{k,p'}^* : W^{k,p'} \rightarrow (W^{-k,p})', \text{ for } -k < 0. \quad (4.38)$$

We can now extend Corollary 4.1 to this setting:

Corollary 4.3. Let (M^n, g) be closed Riemannian manifold with $g \in W^{2,q}$, $q > \frac{n}{2}$. Assume that $p \in (1, \infty)$ satisfies $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{1}{n}$ and consider the Laplacian $\Delta_g : W^{1,p}(S_2M) \mapsto W^{-1,p}(S_2M)$ and its adjoint operator

$$\Delta_g^* : (W^{-1,p}(S_2M))' \rightarrow (W^{1,p}(S_2M))',$$

which is defined via the relation

$$(\Delta_g^* \phi)(\varphi) \doteq \phi(\Delta_g \varphi) \text{ for all } \phi \in (W^{-1,p}(S_2M))' \text{ and all } \varphi \in W^{1,p}(S_2M).$$

Then,

$$\Delta_g^* = \mathcal{S}_{1,p} \circ \Delta_g|_{W^{1,p'}} \circ \mathcal{S}_{-1,p}^{-1} : (W^{-1,p}(S_2M))' \rightarrow (W^{1,p}(S_2M))', \quad (4.39)$$

where $\Delta_g|_{W^{1,p'}} : W^{1,p'}(S_2M) \rightarrow W^{-1,p'}(S_2M)$ is the map given in (4.12) and $\mathcal{S}_{k,p} : W^{-k,p'}(S_2M) \rightarrow (W^{k,p}(S_2M))'$ given in Definition 4.1.

Proof. Using the conventions of Definition 4.1, we have a topological isomorphism

$$\mathcal{S}_{-1,p} : W^{1,p'}(S_2M) \rightarrow (W^{-1,p}(S_2M))',$$

whose properties were established in Proposition 4.6. Thus, given $u \in (W^{-1,p}(S_2M))'$, there is a unique $\tilde{u} \in W^{1,p'}(S_2M)$ such that $u = \mathcal{S}_{-1,p}(\tilde{u})$. Since $\mathcal{S}_{-1,p} = \mathcal{S}_{1,p'}^*$, we have

$$(\Delta_g^* u)(v) = [\mathcal{S}_{-1,p}(\tilde{u})](\Delta_g v) = \tilde{u}(\mathcal{S}_{1,p'} \circ \Delta_g v), \text{ for all } v \in W^{1,p}(S_2M).$$

Notice then that $\Delta_g v \in W^{-1,p}(S_2M)$ follows from Proposition 4.2 since $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{1}{n}$, and $\mathcal{S}_{1,p'} : W^{-1,p} \rightarrow (W^{1,p'})'$, thus $\mathcal{S}_{1,p'} \circ \Delta_g v \in (W^{1,p'}(S_2M))'$ and we recall that the above is meant to be understood via (4.36), so that

$$(\Delta_g^* u)(v) = [\mathcal{S}_{1,p'} \circ \Delta_g v](\tilde{u}).$$

Lemma 4.1 now guarantees that $W^{-1,p} \cong_{\mathcal{S}_{1,p'}} (W^{1,p'})'$ as long as

$$\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p'} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{3}{n} \iff 1 - \frac{1}{q'} - \frac{1}{n} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{p} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{q} + \frac{3}{n} \iff \frac{1}{q} - \frac{3}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{1}{n},$$

which holds by hypothesis. Therefore, we can compute:

$$(\Delta_g^* u)(v) = [\mathcal{S}_{1,p'} \circ \Delta_g v](\tilde{u}) = \langle \mathcal{S}_{1,p'}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{S}_{1,p'} \circ \Delta_g v, \tilde{u} \rangle_{(M,g)} = \langle \Delta_g v, \tilde{u} \rangle_{(M,g)}.$$

Appealing then to Proposition 4.5 to integrate by parts, and once more to the isomorphism $W^{-1,p} \cong_{\mathcal{S}_{1,p'}} (W^{1,p'})'$ we find:

$$(\Delta_g^* u)(v) = \langle \Delta_g \tilde{u}, v \rangle_{(M,g)} = [\mathcal{S}_{1,p}(\Delta_g \tilde{u})](v) = [\mathcal{S}_{1,p} \circ \Delta_g|_{W^{1,p'}} \circ \mathcal{S}_{-1,p}^{-1}(u)](v), \text{ for all } v \in W^{1,p}(S_2M).$$

That is,

$$\Delta_g^* u = \mathcal{S}_{1,p} \circ \Delta_g|_{W^{1,p'}} \circ \mathcal{S}_{-1,p}^{-1}(u), \text{ for all } u \in (W^{-1,p}(S_2M))',$$

from which (4.39) follows. \square

With the above results, we can now follow the strategy of Theorem 4.4 to prove the following refined version of it.

Theorem 4.7. *Let (M^n, g) be a closed Riemannian manifold with $g \in W^{2,q}(M)$, $q > \frac{n}{2}$, and let $p \in (1, \infty)$ be a real number such that $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} < \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{1}{n}$. Then, the Laplace-Beltrami operator*

$$\Delta_g : W^{1,p}(S_2M) \rightarrow W^{-1,p}(S_2M), \quad (4.40)$$

is Fredholm of index zero, $\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{1,p}}) \subset W^{2,q}(S_2M)$ and the following regularity implication follows:

$$\text{if } u \in L^{q'}(S_2M), \text{ and } \Delta_g u \in W^{-1,p}(S_2M) \implies u \in W^{1,p}(S_2M). \quad (4.41)$$

Proof. The proof of this statement follows along the same lines as that of Theorem 4.4. That is, under our conditions on the exponents p and q we know (4.40) is continuous map from (4.11), which belongs to $\mathcal{L}^2(W^{2,q})$, and from Lemma 3.1 we furthermore know that this is a semi-Fredholm map. In the case of smooth coefficients, notice that $\text{Ker}(\Delta_g : W^{1,p} \rightarrow W^{-1,p}) \subset \text{Ker}(\Delta_g : L^p \rightarrow W^{-2,p}) \subset C^\infty$ is independent of $p > 1$, which follows by the discussion in the proof of Theorem 4.4. Using that

$$\Delta_g^*|_{(W^{-1,p})'} = S_{1,p} \circ \Delta_g|_{W^{1,p'}} \circ S_{-1,p}^{-1},$$

and the maps $S_{k,p}$ are isomorphisms,

$$\dim(\text{Ker}(\Delta_g^* : (W^{-1,p})' \rightarrow (W^{1,p})')) = \dim(\text{Ker}(\Delta_g : W^{1,p'} \rightarrow W^{-1,p'})) = \dim(\text{Ker}(\Delta_g : W^{1,p} \rightarrow W^{-1,p})),$$

Hence, these maps are Fredholm of index zero. In the general case, let $\{g_k\} \subset C^\infty$ such that $g_k \xrightarrow{W^{2,q}} g$. Since $q > \frac{n}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{1}{n}$, we can once more appeal to the same computations of (2.34) to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_g - \Delta_{g_k}\|_{\text{Op}(W^{1,p}, W^{-1,p})} &\lesssim \sum_{r=1}^N \sum_{i,j=1}^n \|\eta_r(g^{ij} - g_k^{ij})\|_{W^{2,q}(U_r)} + \sum_{r=1}^N \sum_{a,b,c,d,l=1}^n \|\eta_r(\mathcal{A}_{ab}^{cdl}(g) - \mathcal{A}_{ab}^{cdl}(g_k))\|_{W^{1,q}(U_r)} \\ &+ \sum_{r=1}^N \sum_{a,b,c,d,l=1}^n \|\eta_r(\mathcal{B}_{ab}^{dl}(g) - \mathcal{B}_{ab}^{dl}(g_k))\|_{L^q(U_r)} \end{aligned} \quad (4.42)$$

where the coefficients \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are the ones appearing in (4.15), $\{U_r\}_{r=1}^N$ is a covering by coordinate systems of M and $\{\eta_r\}_{r=1}^N$ is a partition of unity subordinate to such a cover, and we have already used the standard trivialisation for associated tensor bundles in a given coordinate system, associating to u its components in the given coordinate system. Then, the same arguments as in Theorem 4.4 show that all the terms in the right-hand side in (4.42) go to zero, and hence Δ_{g_k} converges to Δ_g in the operator norm from $W^{1,p} \rightarrow W^{-1,p}$. Since each Δ_{g_k} is Fredholm of index zero and the index of a semi-Fredholm map is locally constant, then (4.40) has also index zero and is therefore also Fredholm.

Concerning the regularity claims, we first assert that the regularity of $\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{1,p}})$ can be deduced from Theorem 4.4. To see this, first notice that $W^{1,p} \hookrightarrow L^{q'}$ holds. This is clear if $p \geq n$, so we can restrict to the case $p < n$, where by Sobolev embeddings we have $W^{1,p} \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{np}{n-p}}$, and we notice that

$$\frac{np}{n-p} \geq q' \iff \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{q'} \iff \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{1}{n},$$

which is satisfied by hypothesis. Therefore, we find that $\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{1,p}}) \subset \text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{L^{q'}}) \subset W^{2,q}$, where the last inclusion follows from Theorem 4.4. Let us furthermore notice that $W^{2,q} \hookrightarrow W^{1,p}$, which follows automatically if $q \geq n$, and so we concentrate now in the case $\frac{n}{2} < q < n$, where $W^{1+1,q} \hookrightarrow W^{1, \frac{nq}{n-q}}$, and

$$\frac{nq}{n-q} \geq p \iff \frac{1}{p} \geq \frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n}$$

which holds by hypothesis. Therefore, we also have that $\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,q}}) \subset \text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{1,p}})$, and thus $\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{1,p}}) = \text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,q}})$ for all p satisfying the hypotheses of the theorem. Moreover, let us notice the following symmetry under duality of our hypotheses:

$$\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{1}{n} \iff 1 - \frac{1}{q'} - \frac{1}{n} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{p'} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{n} \iff \frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p'} \leq \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{1}{n}.$$

Therefore, we see that $W^{1,p'}$ satisfies the same hypotheses as a domain for Δ_g as $W^{1,p}$ does, implying that $\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{1,p'}}) = \text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,q}})$ by the result obtained above.

Finally, for the full regularity claim (4.44), since $\Delta_g : W^{1,p} \mapsto W^{-1,p}$ is Fredholm, we know that $\text{Im}(\Delta_g|_{W^{1,p}}) = \text{Ker}^\perp(\Delta_g^*|_{(W^{-1,p})'})$. That is, $f \in \text{Im}(\Delta_g|_{W^{1,p}})$ iff $v(f) = 0$ for all $v \in \text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(W^{-1,p})'})$. Notice then that under our hypotheses we can appeal to Corollary 4.3 to guarantee that:

$$v \in \text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(W^{-1,p})'}) \iff \tilde{v} \doteq \mathcal{S}_{-1,p}^{-1}v \in \text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{1,p'}}) = \text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{2,q}}),$$

where the last identity follows by the observation in the previous paragraph. Then, since $\tilde{v} \in W^{2,q}$, if $u \in L^{q'}$ a priori, the following integration by parts is justified via Proposition 4.3:

$$\langle \Delta_g u, \tilde{v} \rangle_{(M,g)} = \langle u, \Delta_g \tilde{v} \rangle_{(M,g)} = \langle u, \Delta_g \circ \mathcal{S}_{-1,p}^{-1}v \rangle_{(M,g)} = 0, \text{ for all } v \in \text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{(W^{-1,p})'}).$$

Notice now that since $W^{2,q} \hookrightarrow W^{1,p'}$ holds, then, if $\Delta_g u \in W^{-1,p}$ a priori, the pairing $\langle \Delta_g u, \tilde{v} \rangle_{(M,g)}$ is defined as a pairing on $W^{-1,p} \times W^{1,p'}$, and thus using the above identities and the isomorphism $\mathcal{S}_{1,p'} : W^{-1,p} \rightarrow (W^{1,p'})'$ of Lemma 4.1, we find

$$0 = \langle \Delta_g u, \tilde{v} \rangle_{(M,g)} = [\mathcal{S}_{1,p'} \circ \Delta_g u](\tilde{v}) = [(\mathcal{S}_{-1,p}^{-1})^* \circ \mathcal{S}_{1,p'} \circ \Delta_g u](\tilde{v}),$$

and, by Definition 4.1 and Proposition 4.6, we have that $\mathcal{S}_{-1,p}^{-1} = (\mathcal{S}_{1,p'}^*)^{-1} = (\mathcal{S}_{1,p'}^{-1})^*$, implying that $(\mathcal{S}_{-1,p}^{-1})^* = (\mathcal{S}_{1,p'}^{-1})^{**} = \mathcal{S}_{1,p'}^{-1}$, where the last identity holds by reflexivity of $W^{1,p'}$. Therefore, $(\mathcal{S}_{-1,p}^{-1})^* \circ \mathcal{S}_{1,p'} = \text{Id}|_{W^{-1,p}}$, and the above computations imply:

$$0 = \langle \Delta_g u, \tilde{v} \rangle_{(M,g)} = [\Delta_g u](v) = v(\Delta_g u)$$

where in the last steps we used that $\Delta_g u \in W^{-1,p}$ defined an element of $(W^{-1,p})''$ via (4.36).

The above proves that actually $\Delta_g u \in \text{Ker}^\perp(\Delta_g^*|_{(W^{-1,p})'}) \subset W^{-1,p}$, and hence there is some $\varphi \in W^{1,p}$ such that

$$\Delta_g \varphi = \Delta_g u \iff \varphi - u \in \text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{L^{q'}}) \subset W^{2,q} \implies u = \varphi + (u - \varphi) \in W^{1,p}.$$

□

Similarly to the case of Corollary 4.34, Theorem 4.7 immediately implies the following result for the scalar Laplacian:

Corollary 4.4. *Let (M^n, g) be a closed Riemannian manifold with $g \in W^{2,q}(M)$, $q > \frac{n}{2}$, and let $p \in (1, \infty)$ be a real number such that $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} < \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{1}{n}$. Then, the Laplace-Beltrami operator*

$$\Delta_g : W^{1,p}(M) \rightarrow W^{-1,p}(M), \tag{4.43}$$

is Fredholm of index zero, $\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W^{1,p}}) \subset W^{2,q}(M)$ and the following regularity implication follows:

$$\text{if } u \in L^{q'}(M), \text{ and } \Delta_g u \in W^{-1,p}(M) \implies u \in W^{1,p}(M). \tag{4.44}$$

The above results can be used to establish the following useful local result, which we shall state for the scalar Laplacian since it will be useful for us later on.

Corollary 4.5. *Let (M^n, g) be Riemannian manifold with $g \in W_{loc}^{2,q}(M)$, $q > \frac{n}{2}$, and let us consider the the scalar Laplace-Beltrami operator Δ_g . If p is a real number satisfying $1 < p \leq q$ and $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} < \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{n}$, then the following regularity implication follows:*

$$\text{if } u \in L_{loc}^{q'}(M) \text{ and } \Delta_g u \in L_{loc}^p(M) \implies u \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(M). \quad (4.45)$$

Proof. Letting $\eta \in C_0^\infty(M)$, with $\text{supp}(\eta) \subset \Omega \subset\subset M$ such that $\partial\Omega$ is smooth, we can cover $\bar{\Omega}$ by finitely many small coordinate balls $\{B_i \doteq B_{\epsilon_i}(p_i)\}_{i=1}^N$, $p_i \in \Omega$, and then consider a partition of unity $\{\chi_i\}_{i=1}^N$ subordinate to such a cover, and obtain $\eta u = \sum_i \chi_i \eta u$. Denoting $u_i \doteq \chi_i \eta u$, we have $u_i \in L^{q'}(B_i)$ and one has $\Delta_g u_i \in W^{-2,q'}(B_i)$ a priori by the same arguments as for (4.12) in Proposition 4.2. Furthermore, one can compute

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_g u_i &= \chi_i \Delta_g(\eta u) + 2\langle \nabla \chi_i, \nabla \eta u \rangle_g + \eta u \Delta_g \chi_i, \\ &= \chi_i \eta \Delta_g u + 2\chi_i \langle \nabla \eta, \nabla u \rangle_g + \chi_i u \Delta_g \eta + 2\langle \nabla \chi_i, \nabla \eta \rangle_g u + 2\eta \langle \nabla \chi_i, \nabla u \rangle_g + \eta u \Delta_g \chi_i. \end{aligned}$$

From the hypotheses $u \in L_{loc}^{q'}$ and $\Delta_g u \in L_{loc}^p$, one has $\chi_i \eta \Delta_g u, \chi_i u \Delta_g \eta, 2\langle \nabla \chi_i, \nabla \eta \rangle_g u, \eta u \Delta_g \chi_i \in L^{\min\{q', p\}}(B_i)$. We need to consider the remaining terms, which can be written as $\langle \chi_i \nabla \eta + \eta \nabla \chi_i, \nabla u \rangle_g$. With this in mind, notice that $du \in W^{-1,q'}(B_i)$, and thus $g^{ij} \partial_j u \in W^{-1,q'}(B_i)$. Now, let us consider box $[-L, L]^n$ in \mathbb{R}^n containing the coordinate ball B_i . Then, extend g to a $W^{2,q}$ Riemannian metric \tilde{g} in a neighbourhood U_ϵ of $B_i \subset [-L, L]^n$ containing a collar $\partial B_i \times [0, \epsilon)$ and consider a cut-off function $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$ satisfying $\chi = 1$ on a sufficiently small neighbourhood B_i while $\chi = 0$ on $[-L, L]^n \setminus U_{\epsilon'}$ for some $\epsilon' < \epsilon$. Then $\bar{g} = \chi \tilde{g} + (1 - \chi)\delta$ is a $W^{2,q}$ Riemannian metric in the interior of the box, which is exactly Euclidean near the boundary of the box. Thus, compactifying $[-L, L]^n$ into a torus T^n , the metric \bar{g} glues smoothly into a $W^{2,q}(T^n)$ metric, which we still call by \bar{g} . The above analysis shows that $\chi_i \eta \Delta_{\bar{g}} u, \chi_i u \Delta_{\bar{g}} \eta, 2\langle \nabla \chi_i, \nabla \eta \rangle_{\bar{g}} u, \eta u \Delta_{\bar{g}} \chi_i \in L^{\min\{q', p\}}(B_i) \hookrightarrow L^{\min\{q', p\}}(T^n)$, while $g^{ij} \partial_j u \in W^{-1,q'}(B_i)$. Denoting $\phi \doteq \chi_i \nabla \eta + \eta \nabla \chi_i \in C_0^\infty(B_i; \mathbb{R}^n)$, then $\phi_k g^{kl} \partial_l u$ extends by duality to a distribution on T^n . Actually, given any $v \in W^{1,q}(T^n)$, multiplication by $C_0^\infty(B_i)$ gives a continuous map

$$C_0^\infty(B_i) \otimes W^{1,q}(T^n) \rightarrow W_0^{1,q}(B_i),$$

and thus, by duality, one has that $C_0^\infty(B_i) \otimes W^{-1,q'}(B_i) \rightarrow W^{-1,q'}(T^n)$ continuously and thus $\phi_i g^{ij} \partial_j u \in W^{-1,q'}(T^n)$. Therefore, $\Delta_{\bar{g}}(\eta \chi_i u) \in W^{-1, \min\{p, q'\}}(T^n)$ and Corollary 4.4 implies that $\eta \chi_i u \in W^{1, \min\{p, q'\}}(T^n)$, which in turn implies $\Delta_{\bar{g}}(\eta \chi_i u) \in L^{\min\{p, q'\}}(T^n)$, and then Corollary 4.4 guarantees $\chi_i \eta u \in W^{2, \min\{p, q'\}}(T^n)$. From this we now get

$$\chi_i \eta \Delta_{\bar{g}} u \in L^p(T^n) \text{ and } \chi_i u \Delta_{\bar{g}} \eta, 2\langle \nabla \chi_i, \nabla \eta \rangle_{\bar{g}} u, \eta u \Delta_{\bar{g}} \chi_i \in W^{2, \min\{q', p\}}(T^n),$$

and also $\phi_i g^{ij} \partial_j u \in W^{1, \min\{q', p\}}(T^n)$. Thus, if $\min\{p, q'\} = p$, then we already obtain $\Delta_{\bar{g}}(\eta \chi_i u) \in L^p(T^n)$, from which we conclude $\eta \chi_i u \in W^{2,p}(T^n)$ from Corollary 4.2. On the other hand, if $\min\{p, q'\} = q'$, then first notice that $q' < n$, since this is equivalent to $\frac{1}{q} < 1 - \frac{1}{n}$, and since $\frac{1}{q} < \frac{2}{n}$ and $\frac{2}{n} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{n}$ for all $n \geq 3$, then $\frac{1}{q} < 1 - \frac{1}{n}$ holds. Therefore, appealing to $W^{1,q'} \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{nq'}{n-q'}}$, and setting $q_1 \doteq \frac{nq'}{n-q'} > q'$, obtain

$$\Delta_{\bar{g}}(\eta \chi_i u) \in L^{\min\{p, q_1\}}(T^n) \implies \eta \chi_i u \in W^{2, \min\{p, q_1\}}$$

improving the regularity by $q_1 - q' = \frac{q'}{n-q'} q'$. Iterating from there, after finitely many steps we obtain $\eta \chi_i u \in W^{2,p}(T^n)$. Therefore, since $\text{supp}(\chi_i \eta u) \subset B_i \subset T^n$, implies $\chi_i \eta u \in W^{2,p}(B_i)$ for all $i = 1$. Thus, $\eta u \in W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ and we conclude $u \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(M)$. \square

4.3 Conformal properties of low regularity closed Riemannian manifolds

In this section we shall apply some of the above regularity results to establish a low regularity Yamabe-type classification which is of interest to us for upcoming sections, where we shall be interested in analysing the controls that conformal objects provide to bootstrap regularity and decay properties of

a metric. Although the scalar curvature alone cannot fully control the metric, low regularity Yamabe-type classifications point in this direction. Such classifications have been studied in the literature under a variety of hypotheses, and, to the best of our knowledge, the original reference is [44], establishing a classification for rough metrics in $H^{s,2}(M)$ -spaces, with $s > \frac{n}{2}$. Although the full Yamabe problem seems to remain open for rough metrics, this classification establishes the existence of a conformal metric with continuous scalar curvature with sign given by the corresponding Yamabe invariant.²¹ Related to our topic of interest, in this case, moving within the conformal class allows one to improve the a priori regularity of the scalar curvature. Below, we shall closely follow the strategy presented in [44, Section 3], but within the regularity class of metrics $g \in W^{2,p}$, with $p > \frac{n}{2}$, and our objective will be to guarantee such a conformal improvement on the scalar curvature regularity (see Theorem 4.8). Let us notice that the results of [44, Section 3] have clear overlap with the ones presented here, but do not directly imply them.²²

With the above motivations in mind, let us consider a closed Riemannian manifold (M^n, γ) with $n \geq 3$, $\gamma \in W^{2,p}$ and $p > \frac{n}{2}$, and define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} : W^{1,2}(M) \times W^{1,2}(M) &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (\varphi_1, \varphi_2) &\mapsto \int_M (a_n \langle \nabla \varphi_1, \nabla \varphi_2 \rangle_\gamma + R_\gamma \varphi_1 \varphi_2) dV_\gamma \end{aligned}$$

Sobolev embeddings guarantee that the above is a well-defined bilinear functional on $W^{1,2}(M)$. Related to the associated quadratic form, for each $1 \leq q \leq \frac{n}{n-2}$, we define:

$$J_{\gamma,q}(\varphi) \doteq \frac{\mathcal{A}(\varphi, \varphi)}{\|\varphi\|_{L^{2q}(M, dV_\gamma)}^2} = \frac{\int_M (a_n |\nabla \varphi|_\gamma^2 + R_\gamma \varphi^2) dV_\gamma}{\left(\int_M \varphi^{2q} dV_\gamma\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}}. \quad (4.46)$$

Following the same ideas of [44, Section 3], we shall show $J_{\gamma,q}$ are all bounded from below for any $1 \leq q \leq \frac{n}{n-2}$. First, let us present the following result:

Lemma 4.2. *Let (M^n, γ) be a closed Riemannian manifold with $\gamma \in W^{2,p}$, $p > \frac{n}{2}$, and $n \geq 3$. Then, the map $W^{1,2}(M) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by*

$$u \mapsto \int_M R_\gamma u^2 dV_\gamma \quad (4.47)$$

is weakly sequentially continuous. Moreover, given $\epsilon > 0$, there are constants $C, C_\epsilon > 0$ such that the following estimate holds:

$$\left| \int_M R_\gamma u^2 dV_\gamma \right| \leq C \|R_\gamma\|_{L^p(M)} \left(\epsilon^2 \|u\|_{W^{1,2}(M)}^2 + C_\epsilon \|u\|_{L^2(M)}^2 \right), \quad \forall u \in W^{1,2}(M) \quad (4.48)$$

Proof. Consider any number $0 < \eta < 1$ such that

$$0 < 2\eta < \min \left\{ 2 - \frac{n}{p}, 1 - n \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right\}, \quad (4.49)$$

and notice that

$$n \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2} \right) < 1 \iff p > \frac{2n}{n+2}$$

and $\frac{n}{2} \geq \frac{2n}{n+2}$ for all $n \geq 3$. Thus, since $p > \frac{n}{2}$, $n \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2} \right) < 1$ holds and the allowed interval in (4.49) is non-empty. Then, appealing to Theorem 2.2, we analyse the embedding:

$$H^{1-\eta,2}(M) \otimes H^{1-\eta,2}(M) \hookrightarrow L^{p'}(M) \quad (4.50)$$

²¹For recent important advances related to the full resolution of this problem, we also highlight [62], where T. Aubin's criteria for the Yamabe problem to be solved was extended to rough metrics.

²²We refer the reader to the discussion after Theorem 4.8 for some comments on results within the literature that would actually imply those of Theorem 4.8.

which will hold as long as $\eta \leq 1$ satisfies

$$1 - \eta \geq n \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p'} \right) = n \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad 2 - 2\eta > n \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p'} \right) = \frac{n}{p}$$

The above two conditions are granted as long as (4.49) holds, and thus the embedding (4.50) follows under our assumptions. Then, $R_\gamma \in L^p(M)$ defines a continuous bilinear functional on $H^{1-\eta,2}(M) \times H^{1-\eta,2}(M)$, given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{R_\gamma} : H^{1-\eta,2}(M) \times H^{1-\eta,2}(M) &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \\ (\varphi_1, \varphi_2) &\mapsto \Phi_{R_\gamma}(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = \langle R_\gamma, \varphi_1 \varphi_2 \rangle = \int_M R_\gamma \varphi_1 \varphi_2 dV_\gamma \end{aligned}$$

such that

$$|\langle R_\gamma, \varphi_1 \varphi_2 \rangle| \leq C \|R_\gamma\|_{L^p(M)} \|\varphi_1\|_{H^{1-\eta,2}(M)} \|\varphi_2\|_{H^{1-\eta,2}(M)}, \quad \forall \varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in H^{1-\eta,2}(M). \quad (4.51)$$

Consider then a weakly convergent sequence $\{u_k\} \subset W^{1,2}(M)$, with limit $u_k \rightharpoonup u \in W^{1,2}(M)$. Appealing to (4.51) we find:

$$|\langle R_\gamma, u^2 - u_k^2 \rangle| \leq C \|R_\gamma\|_{L^p} (\|u\|_{W^{1-\eta,2}} \|u - u_k\|_{W^{1-\eta,2}} + \|u_k\|_{W^{1-\eta,2}} \|u - u_k\|_{W^{1-\eta,2}}).$$

Then, notice that (up to restriction to a subsequence) the right-hand side of the above expression goes to zero, since $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset W^{1,2}(M)$ must be bounded, and the embedding $\iota : W^{1,2}(M) \rightarrow H^{1-\eta,2}(M)$ is compact. Thus,

$$\langle R_\gamma, u_k^2 \rangle \rightarrow \langle R_\gamma, u^2 \rangle,$$

which proves the weak sequential continuity of the map (4.47). Furthermore (4.51) also implies

$$|\langle R_\gamma, \varphi^2 \rangle| \leq C \|R_\gamma\|_{L^p(M)} \|\varphi\|_{H^{1-\eta,2}(M)}^2, \quad \forall \varphi \in H^{1-\eta,2}(M).$$

Given any $\epsilon > 0$, we may then appeal to an interpolation inequality of the form:

$$\|\varphi\|_{H^{1-\eta,2}(M)} \leq \epsilon \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,2}(M)} + C_\epsilon \|\varphi\|_{L^2(M)},$$

valid for all $\varphi \in W^{1,2}(M)$, to rewrite

$$|\langle R_\gamma, \varphi^2 \rangle| \leq 2C \|R_\gamma\|_{L^p(M)} \left(\epsilon^2 \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,2}(M)}^2 + C_\epsilon^2 \|\varphi\|_{L^2(M)}^2 \right), \quad \forall \varphi \in W^{1,2}(M)$$

which proves the estimate (4.48). \square

Appealing to the above lemma, we can now show that the functionals (4.46) are all bounded by below:

Lemma 4.3. *Let (M^n, γ) be a closed Riemannian manifold with $\gamma \in W^{2,p}$, $p > \frac{n}{2}$, and $n \geq 3$. Then, the functionals $J_{\gamma,q}$ are all bounded from below for any $1 \leq q \leq \frac{n}{n-2}$.*

Proof. Appealing to (4.48), we can write

$$\begin{aligned} E(\varphi) &= \int_M (a_n |\nabla \varphi|_\gamma^2 + R_\gamma \varphi^2) dV_\gamma \geq a_n \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2}^2 - |\langle R_\gamma, \varphi^2 \rangle|, \\ &\geq a_n \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2}^2 - C \epsilon^2 \|R_\gamma\|_{L^p} \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,2}}^2 - C C_\epsilon \|R_\gamma\|_{L^p} \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2, \\ &= (a_n - C \epsilon^2 \|R_\gamma\|_{L^p}) \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2}^2 - C (C_\epsilon + \epsilon^2) \|R_\gamma\|_{L^p} \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 \end{aligned}$$

Picking ϵ small enough, we see that there exist positive constants $C_i = (n, \|R_\gamma\|_{L^p})$, $i = 1, 2$, such that

$$E(\varphi) \geq C_1 \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2}^2 - C_2 \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2, \quad \forall \varphi \in W^{1,2}. \quad (4.52)$$

Since $L^{2q}(M) \hookrightarrow L^2(M)$ for all $1 \leq q \leq \frac{n}{n-2}$, then $\|\varphi\|_{L^2(M)} \leq C_3 \|\varphi\|_{L^{2q}(M)}$ for all such q , and thus

$$E(\varphi) \geq -C_2 \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 \geq -C_2 C_3^2 \|\varphi\|_{L^{2q}}^2, \quad \forall \varphi \in W^{1,2}(M)$$

which proves the claim in the lemma. \square

We can therefore introduce the following notation for their infima:

$$\mathcal{Y}_{\gamma,q} \doteq \inf_{\substack{\varphi \in W^{1,2} \\ \varphi \neq 0}} J_{\gamma,q}(\varphi).$$

Let us now highlight the role played by the following two especial infima.

Definition 4.2. Let (M^n, γ) be a closed Riemannian manifold with $\gamma \in W^{2,p}(M)$, $p > \frac{n}{2}$ and $n \geq 3$. Then, we denote the first eigenvalue of the conformal Laplacian by

$$\lambda_\gamma \doteq \mathcal{Y}_{\gamma,1}, \tag{4.53}$$

while we denote the Yamabe invariant by

$$\mathcal{Y}([\gamma]) \doteq \mathcal{Y}_{\gamma, \frac{n}{n-2}} \tag{4.54}$$

We can now present the main result of this section, which is key in the low-regularity Yamabe classification.

Theorem 4.8. Let (M^n, γ) be a closed Riemannian manifold with $\gamma \in W^{2,p}$, $p > \frac{n}{2}$, and $n \geq 3$. Then, there exists a $W^{2,p}$ function $\varphi > 0$ such that

$$-a_n \Delta_\gamma \varphi + R_\gamma \varphi = \lambda_\gamma \varphi. \tag{4.55}$$

In particular, in the conformal class $[\gamma]$ there is a metric $g \in W^{2,p}(M)$ such that

$$R_g = \lambda_\gamma \varphi^{-\frac{4}{n-2}}. \tag{4.56}$$

Proof. Let us first notice that (4.55) is the Euler-Lagrange equation associated to the functional

$$J_{\gamma,1}(\varphi) = \frac{\int_M (a_n |\nabla \varphi|_\gamma^2 + R_\gamma \varphi^2) dV_\gamma}{\left(\int_M \varphi^2 dV_\gamma\right)}$$

Since $J_{\gamma,1}(\varphi)$ is bounded by below on $W^{1,2}$ due to Lemma 4.3, finding a minimizer follows by standard variational arguments. That is, let us consider a minimising sequence $\{\varphi_k\} \subset W^{1,2}$ of $J_{\gamma,1}$, which we take to be L^2 -normalised (i.e. $\|\varphi_k\|_{L^2} = 1$). Then, the interpolation inequality (4.48) guarantees that such sequence must be bounded in $W^{1,2}$ and thus, by compactness of the embedding $W^{1,2} \hookrightarrow L^2$, there is an L^2 convergent subsequence to which we now restrict, with limit $\varphi_0 \in L^2$. Furthermore, since $W^{1,2}$ is reflexive, it is weakly sequentially compact (i.e., every bounded sequence has a weakly convergent subsequence), and therefore we can extract a subsequence which converges weakly in $W^{1,2}$ to some $\varphi_1 \in W^{1,2}$. Since strong convergence implies weak convergence, $\varphi_k \rightharpoonup \varphi_0$ weakly in L^2 . But this weak L^2 limit must agree with the weak $W^{1,2}$ limit due to $W^{1,2} \hookrightarrow L^2$. Then, since the weak limit is unique, we must have $\varphi_0 = \varphi_1 \doteq \varphi \in W^{1,2}$. Also, it follows that $\|\varphi\|_{L^2} = 1$ and thus $\varphi \neq 0$. Also, from [11, Chapter 3, Proposition 3.5], we see that:

$$\|\varphi\|_{W^{1,2}} \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\varphi_k\|_{W^{1,2}}.$$

Since $\|\varphi_k\|_{L^2} = \|\varphi\|_{L^2} = 1$ for all k , the above implies

$$\|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla \varphi_k\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Since the map $u \in W^{1,2} \mapsto \int_M R_\gamma u^2$ is weakly sequentially continuous, we see that

$$\lambda_\gamma = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_M (a_n |\nabla \varphi_k|_\gamma^2 + R_\gamma \varphi_k^2) dV_\gamma \geq \int_M (a_n |\nabla \varphi|_\gamma^2 + R_\gamma \varphi^2) dV_\gamma.$$

This implies that $J_{\gamma,1}(\varphi) \leq \lambda_\gamma$, with $\varphi \in W^{1,2}$, therefore $J_{\gamma,1}(\varphi) = \lambda_\gamma$ and hence $\varphi \in W^{1,2}$ is a minimizer. This, in particular, proves that φ is a weak solution of (4.55) and since $J_{\gamma,1}(\varphi) = J_{\gamma,1}(|\varphi|)$

holds from [3, Proposition 3.49],²³ then $\psi \doteq |\varphi| \in W^{1,2}$ is also a minimizer and thus also a weak solution of (4.55). Let us now notice that $W^{1,2}(M) \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{2n}{n-2}}(M) \hookrightarrow L^{p'}(M)$ holds as long as

$$\frac{2n}{n-2} \geq p' \iff 1 - \frac{1}{p} \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{n} \iff \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{n} \geq \frac{1}{p},$$

and since $p > \frac{n}{2}$ by hypothesis, then $\frac{1}{p} < \frac{2}{n}$ and $\frac{2}{n} \leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{n} \iff 2 \leq n$. Therefore, $\psi \in L^{p'}(M)$ and thus we see that Corollary 4.2 justifies the following implication

$$-a_n \Delta_g \psi = (\lambda_\gamma - R_\gamma) \psi \in L^r(M), \quad 1 < r \leq p \implies \psi \in W^{2,r}(M). \quad (4.57)$$

Notice then that $(\lambda_\gamma - R_\gamma) \psi \in L^p(M) \otimes L^{\frac{2n}{n-2}}(M) \hookrightarrow L^{r_0}(M)$ with $\frac{1}{r_0} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{n}$, and $\frac{1}{r_0} < 1 \iff p > \frac{2n}{n+2}$, which is satisfied by hypothesis since $\frac{n}{2} > \frac{2n}{n+2} \iff n > 2$. Thus (4.57) yields $\psi \in W^{2,r_0}$. If $r_0 > \frac{n}{2}$, this implies that $R_\gamma \psi \in L^p(M)$ and then applying once more (4.57) with $r = p$ gives $\psi \in W^{2,p}(M)$. Therefore, to establish the regularity claim, we need only show that $\psi \in W^{2,r}$ for some $r > \frac{n}{2}$. If $r_0 \leq \frac{n}{2}$, we assume the strict inequality holds since we have $\psi \in W^{2,r}$ for any $r \leq r_0$. Then $W^{2,r_0} \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{nr_0}{n-2r_0}}$ and (4.57) gives $\psi \in W^{2,r_1}(M)$ with $\frac{1}{r_1} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{r_0} - \frac{2}{n}$. We can now iterate this process as long as $r_i < \frac{n}{2}$ and get $\psi \in W^{2,r_i}(M)$ with $\frac{1}{r_i} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{r_{i-1}} - \frac{2}{n}$, where

$$\frac{1}{r_{i-1}} - \frac{1}{r_i} = \frac{2}{n} - \frac{1}{p} \doteq \delta > 0.$$

Then,

$$\frac{1}{r_i} = \frac{1}{r_{i-1}} - \delta = \frac{1}{r_0} - i\delta$$

This means that after a finite number of steps gives $\frac{1}{r_i} < \frac{2}{n}$. Therefore, we see that $\psi \in W^{2,p}(M)$, and we also know it satisfies $\psi \geq 0$. Thus, along the same lines as in [43, Lemma 5.3], an appeal to the weak Harnack inequality of Trudinger [60, Theorem 5.2] shows that either $\psi \equiv 0$ or $\psi > 0$. The first choice is clearly not possible, since it would imply $\varphi \equiv 0$, although by construction $\|\varphi\|_{L^2} = 1$. Thus $\psi > 0$, which finishes the first part of the proof.

Finally, to prove the scalar curvature statement, we can consider the Riemannian metric $g = \psi^{\frac{4}{n-2}} \gamma$, where $\psi \in W^{2,p}$ is the minimizer just constructed above. Appealing to the conformal covariance formula for the scalar curvature, we know that

$$R_g = \psi^{-\frac{n+2}{n-2}} (-a_n \Delta_\gamma \psi + R_\gamma \psi) = \lambda_\gamma \psi^{1-\frac{n+2}{n-2}} = \lambda_\gamma \psi^{-\frac{4}{n-2}}, \quad (4.58)$$

which, since $\psi > 0$ is continuous, proves that $R_g \in W^{2,p}(M) \hookrightarrow C^0(M)$, and has the same sing as λ_γ . \square

Remark 4.2. *With the aid of Theorem 4.8 above, one can actually parallel the discussion of [44] concerning the weak Yamabe classification in the regularity classes $g \in W^{2,p}$, $p > \frac{n}{2}$. We would like to highlight that, actually, in the literature associated to the Einstein constraint equations, even lower regularity classes have been considered and corresponding Yamabe-type classifications can be found, for instance, in [27, 31, 29]. Nevertheless, for instance in the case of [27, Theorem 12], the classification is obtained via an appeal to [27, Theorem 11], which stands as a more general version of Theorem 4.8 above. In the case of [27, Theorem 11], the bootstrap of $\psi \in W^{1,2}(M)$ to $W^{s,p}(M)$ is claimed to follow from [27, Corollary 5], which itself follows from [27, Lemma 32]. Nevertheless, this last lemma in [27] has a subtle mistake, which has been pointed out in the introduction to [28].*

²³Notice that the proof given in this reference works perfectly well for a $W^{2,p}$ -metric with $p > \frac{n}{2}$.

5 Compactification of AE 3-manifolds - improved regularity

In this section we shall be concerned with the study of the Sobolev regularity of a conformal compactification (\hat{M}^3, \hat{g}) of an AE manifold (M^3, g) , which, for simplicity, will be assumed to have only one end. From [21] one knows that under quite general conditions such a compactification can be obtained,²⁴ but that the regularity of \hat{g} around the point of compactification p_∞ is in general limited and it is closely related to the rate of decay of g at infinity. Also, from [26], one knows that improved regularity is related to the decay of the Cotton tensor C_g near infinity. Along this section, we shall establish that certain mild controls over C_g actually guarantee improved regularity of \hat{g} into a $W^{2,q}$ -metric, $q > 3$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let (M^3, g) be a smooth $W_\tau^{k,p}$ -AE manifold, relative to a structure of infinity with coordinates $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^3$ and $p > 2$, $\tau \in (-1, -\frac{1}{2})$, $k \geq 4$, and let \hat{M} be the one point compactification of M . Then, there is a conformal factor φ such that*

1. $\hat{g} \doteq \varphi^4 g$ extends to a W^{2,q_0} metric on \hat{M} , with $q_0 > 2$. Moreover, $\varphi, \hat{g} \in C^\infty(\hat{M} \setminus \{p_\infty\})$;
2. $\varphi = |z|^{-1} \phi$ in a neighbourhood of p_∞ , where $\phi \in W^{2,q_0}(\hat{M})$, $\phi \in C^\infty(\hat{M} \setminus \{p_\infty\})$ and one can furthermore take $\phi(p_\infty) = 1$. Moreover, the inversion $x(z) = \frac{z}{|z|^2}$ for the coordinates $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^3$ near infinity provides a coordinate system around p_∞ in which $x(p_\infty) = 0$ and $\hat{g}(\partial_{x^i}, \partial_{x^j})|_0 = \delta_{ij}$;
3. $R_{\hat{g}} \in W^{2,q_0}(\hat{M})$. Also, the scalar curvature has definite sign, with $\text{sign}(R_{\hat{g}}) = \lambda_{\hat{g}}$.

Furthermore, if the Cotton tensor satisfies $C_g \in L_\sigma^{p_1}(M, dV_g)$, for some $-6 < \sigma < -3$ and $p_1 = \frac{3}{6+\sigma}$, then:

4. $C_{\hat{g}} \in L^{p_1}(\hat{M})$;
5. If moreover $-6 < \sigma < -4$ and $C_{\hat{g}} \in L^{q_1}(\hat{M})$ for some $q_1 > \frac{3}{2}$, then $\Delta_{\hat{g}} \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}} \in W^{-1,q_2}(\hat{M})$ for some $\frac{3}{2} < q_2 \leq q_1$.

Remark 5.1. *Notice that the fourth item guarantees $C_{\hat{g}} \in L^{q_1}(\hat{M})$ for some $q_1 > \frac{3}{2}$ as long as $p_1 > \frac{3}{2}$, while $C_g \in L_\sigma^{p_1}(M)$ satisfies $p_1 \doteq \frac{3}{6+\sigma} > \frac{3}{2}$ as long as σ satisfies:*

$$\frac{3}{6+\sigma} > \frac{3}{2} \iff 2 > 6+\sigma \iff \sigma < -4.$$

Remark 5.2. *Assume $|C_g| = O(|z|^{-5})$, then*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \bar{B}} |C_g|^p |z|^{-\sigma p - 3} dz \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \bar{B}} |z|^{-5p} |z|^{-\sigma p - 3} dz = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \bar{B}} |z|^{-p(5+\sigma)} |z|^{-3} dz \lesssim \int_{r>1} r^{-p(5+\sigma)} r^{-1} dr,$$

which is finite for any $\sigma < -5$. That is, $|C_g| = O(|z|^{-5})$ implies $C_g \in L_\sigma^p(M)$ for all $p \geq 1$ and $\sigma < -5$. Thus, the decaying conditions used in [26] are strictly contained within the hypotheses $C_g \in L_\sigma^p(M)$ for some $-6 < \sigma < -3$ and $p = \frac{3}{6+\sigma}$.

Proof. We first claim that there is some $\tau < \delta < -\frac{1}{2}$ such that $W_\tau^{2,p} \hookrightarrow W_\delta^{2,q_0}$, where $q_0 \doteq \frac{3}{2+\delta}$. This is granted by Theorem 2.4 if we can guarantee that

$$\tau < \delta < -\frac{1}{2} \text{ and } 1 < q_0 = \frac{3}{2+\delta} \leq p.$$

Noticing that

$$1 < \frac{3}{2+\delta} \leq p \iff \frac{3}{p} - 2 \leq \delta < 1,$$

we see that if there some δ satisfying

$$-\frac{1}{2} > \delta > \max\left(\tau, \frac{3}{p} - 2\right), \tag{5.1}$$

²⁴For the sake of completeness, the relevant results are presented within Appendix B.

then the desired inclusion $W_\tau^{2,p} \hookrightarrow W_\delta^{2,q_0}$ follows. Since $\tau < -\frac{1}{2}$, this is granted provided that

$$\frac{3}{p} - 2 < -\frac{1}{2} \iff \frac{3}{p} < \frac{3}{2} \iff 2 < p,$$

which is satisfied by hypothesis.

The first item above now follows from Lemma B.1 for $q_0 = \frac{3}{2+\delta}$ as long as $q_0 > \frac{3}{2}$ and g is W_δ^{2,q_0} -AE with $\delta > -2$. Noticing that

$$q_0 > 2 \iff \frac{3}{2+\delta} > 2 \iff \frac{3}{2} > 2+\delta \iff -\frac{1}{2} > \delta.$$

from the inclusion $W_\tau^{2,p} \hookrightarrow W_\delta^{2,q_0}$ established above, we see that $\bar{g} \in W^{2,q_0}(\hat{M})$, with $2 < q_0 \leq p$ and \hat{M} compact. For the remaining statements, it is important to notice that the metric \bar{g} obtained above from Lemma B.1 is of the form $\bar{g} = u^4 g$, $u \in C^\infty(\hat{M} \setminus \{p_\infty\})$, and, in a neighbourhood of the point of compactification $p_\infty \in \hat{M}$, the conformal factor satisfies $u = |z|^{-1}$. Moreover, using the inverted coordinates $x^i = \frac{z^i}{|z|^2}$, we also know from Lemma B.1 that $\bar{g}(\partial_{x^i}, \partial_{x^j})|_{x=0} = \delta_{ij}$.

Now, from Theorem 4.8, there is some element $\tilde{g} \in [\bar{g}]$, such that $\tilde{g} = \phi^4 \bar{g}$, where $\tilde{\phi} > 0$ is a W^{2,q_0} -solution of (4.55), and the scalar curvature satisfies $R_{\tilde{g}} = \lambda_{\tilde{g}} \tilde{\phi}^{-4}$. Notice that, due to Sobolev multiplication, $\tilde{g} \in W^{2,q_0}$. Also, Lemma 2.1 actually shows that $\tilde{\phi}^{-4} \in W^{2,q_0}$, so we see that $R_{\tilde{g}} \in W^{2,q_0}(\hat{M})$. The regularity statement away of p_∞ follows since \tilde{g} constructed above is smooth away of p_∞ , and thus, given a cut-off function η supported in a coordinate ball B which does not meet p_∞ , since $\tilde{\phi}$ solves (4.55), we have that

$$-a_3 \Delta_{\tilde{g}}(\eta \tilde{\phi}) = \eta(\lambda_{\tilde{g}} - R_{\tilde{g}}) \tilde{\phi} + \Delta_{\tilde{g}} \eta \tilde{\phi} + 2\tilde{g}(\nabla \eta, \nabla \tilde{\phi}) \in W_0^{1,q_0}(B).$$

Since the coefficients of $\Delta_{\tilde{g}}$ are smooth on B , from a classical elliptic regularity bootstrap we find $\eta \tilde{\phi} \in C^\infty(B)$, and thus $\tilde{\phi} \in C^\infty(\hat{M} \setminus \{p_\infty\})$. This, in turn, also implies that $\tilde{g} \in C^\infty(\hat{M} \setminus \{p_\infty\})$.

We have therefore found that (\hat{M}, \tilde{g}) satisfies $\tilde{g}, R_{\tilde{g}} \in W^{2,q_0}(\hat{M})$, for some $q_0 > 2$, and, keeping track of our conformal transformations:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{g} &= \tilde{\phi}^4 \bar{g} = \tilde{\varphi}^4 g, \text{ with } \tilde{\phi} \in C^\infty(\hat{M} \setminus \{p_\infty\}), \\ \tilde{\varphi} &= |z|^{-1} \tilde{\phi}, \text{ in an neighbourhood of } p_\infty \text{ and } \tilde{\phi} \in W^{2,q_0}(\hat{M}). \end{aligned}$$

Now, to establish the second claim in the lemma, one can consider $\hat{g} = \tilde{\phi}^{-4}(p_\infty) \tilde{g}$, so that

$$\hat{g} = (\tilde{\phi}^{-1}(p_\infty) \tilde{\phi})^4 \bar{g} = (\tilde{\phi}^{-1}(p_\infty) \tilde{\varphi})^4 g.$$

Setting $\phi \doteq \tilde{\phi}^{-1}(p_\infty) \tilde{\phi} \in W^{2,q_0}(\hat{M})$ and $\varphi \doteq \tilde{\phi}^{-1}(p_\infty) \tilde{\varphi} = u\phi$, the metric \hat{g} now obeys the same properties as \tilde{g} did, namely properties 1. and 3. in the lemma, plus the regularity properties in the second statement, and now additionally that $\phi(p_\infty) = 1$, establishing the second property as well, since this also implies

$$\hat{g}(\partial_{x^i}, \partial_{x^j})|_{x=0} = \phi^4(p_\infty) \bar{g}(\partial_{x^i}, \partial_{x^j})|_{x=0} = \delta_{ij}.$$

Now, to analyse the behaviour of the Cotton tensor, recall that

$$C_{ijk}(g) \doteq \nabla_k \text{Ric}_{ij} - \nabla_j \text{Ric}_{ik} + \frac{1}{4}(\nabla_j R_g g_{ik} - \nabla_k R_g g_{ij}). \quad (5.2)$$

Since this is a conformal invariant in three dimensions, $C_{ijk}(\hat{g}) = C_{ijk}(g)$ on $\hat{M} \setminus \{p_\infty\}$. Our first objective is to show that $C_{\hat{g}}$ is given by an $L^q(\hat{M})$ -field. Notice that, a priori, $C_{\hat{g}} \in \mathcal{D}'$ is given by a distribution, which is represented by a smooth field on $\hat{M} \setminus \{p_\infty\}$.

Claim 2. *The Cotton tensor $C_{\hat{g}}$ satisfies $C_{\hat{g}} \in W^{-1,q_0}(\hat{M})$.*

Proof. Since $R_{\hat{g}} \in W^{2,q_0}(\hat{M})$, from the expression

$$C_{ijk}(\hat{g}) \doteq \hat{\nabla}_k \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}_{ij}} - \hat{\nabla}_i \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}_{jk}} + \frac{1}{4}(\hat{\nabla}_j R_{\hat{g}} \hat{g}_{ik} - \hat{\nabla}_k R_{\hat{g}} \hat{g}_{ij}), \quad (5.3)$$

we see that we only need to control the Ricci terms, since the scalar curvature ones are already in $W^{1,q_0}(\hat{M})$. A priori we know that $\text{Ric}_{\hat{g}} \in L^{q_0}(\hat{M})$. To guarantee that $\nabla \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}} \in W^{-1,q_0}(T_3M)$, we can appeal to Lemma 2.3. For that, we need to check that the coefficients satisfy the hypotheses of (2.35), with $A_\alpha \in W_{loc}^{|\alpha|,r}$ for $r > n$, and that $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{q_0} \leq 1$. This follows from a similar analysis to that done for (4.19), with $u = \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}}$. Noticing that the top order coefficients in $\hat{\nabla}_k \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}_{ij}}$ are constant, they are clearly in $W_{loc}^{1,r}(U)$, for any r . The regularity of the zero order coefficients is given by that of $\Gamma_{ij}^l(\hat{g}) \in W_{loc}^{1,q_0}(U)$. We already know from the analysis done for (4.19) that, if $\frac{n}{2} < q_0 < n$, then $W_{loc}^{1,q_0}(U) \hookrightarrow L_{loc}^{\frac{nq_0}{n-q_0}}(U)$, with $\frac{nq_0}{n-q_0} > n$ and thus, in the notations of (2.35), we can find some $r > n$, such that $A_{|\alpha|} \in W_{loc}^{|\alpha|,r}$. We now need to guarantee that $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{q_0} \leq 1$, but since $r \geq q_0$ and $q_0 \geq q'_0$, then

$$\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{q_0} \leq \frac{1}{q_0} + \frac{1}{q'_0} = 1,$$

and thus we are under the hypotheses of Lemma 2.3, and we can deduce then that $\nabla \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}} \in W^{-1,q_0}(T_3M)$. \square

From the above claim, we know that $C_{\hat{g}} \in W^{-1,q_0}(\hat{M})$ a priori, but also $C_{\hat{g}} \in C^\infty(\hat{M} \setminus \{p_\infty\})$. We intend to show that, if C_g decays fast enough, $C_{\hat{g}}$ can actually be extended to an L^q -field on \hat{M} .

Claim 3. *If the Cotton tensor satisfies $C_g \in L_\sigma^{p_1}(M, dV_g)$ for some $-6 < \sigma < -3$ and $p_1 = \frac{3}{6+\sigma}$, then $C_{\hat{g}} \in L^{p_1}(\hat{M})$.*

Proof. We need only to establish the result in a neighbourhood of p_∞ . Notice that on $\hat{M} \setminus \{p_\infty\}$

$$|C_{\hat{g}}|_{\hat{g}}^2 = \hat{g}^{ij} \hat{g}^{kl} \hat{g}^{ab} C_{\hat{g}_{ika}} C_{\hat{g}_{jlb}} = \varphi^{-12} g^{ij} g^{kl} g^{ab} C_{g_{ika}} C_{g_{jlb}} = \varphi^{-12} |C_g|_g^2.$$

That is, $|C_{\hat{g}}|_{\hat{g}} = \varphi^{-6} |C_g|_g$. Since near p_∞ we know that $\varphi = |z|^{-1} \phi$, with $\phi \in W^{2,q_0}(\hat{M}) \hookrightarrow C^0(\hat{M})$, then given $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small:

$$\int_{B_\epsilon} |\eta C_{\hat{g}}|_{\hat{g}}^{p_1} dV_{\hat{g}}(x) \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_{\epsilon-1}} \eta |C_g|_g^{p_1} |z|^{6p_1-6} dV_g(z) \lesssim \|C_g\|_{L_\sigma^{p_1}}^{p_1}$$

where $\eta \in C_0^\infty(B_\epsilon(p_\infty))$ is a cut-off function, $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, equal to one in a neighbourhood of p_∞ , and the last estimate holds because $6p_1 - 6 = -3 - \sigma p_1$, which follows from our hypothesis $p_1 = \frac{3}{6+\sigma}$. Since by hypothesis $C_g \in L_\sigma^{p_1}(M)$, then the integral in the right hand side of the above expression is finite, and thus $C_{\hat{g}} \in L^{p_1}(\hat{M})$. \square

The claim above thus establishes item 4 in the lemma, and finally to establish the item 5, we first consider the following claim:

Claim 4. *If $C_{\hat{g}} \in L^{q_1}$ for some $\frac{3q'_0}{3+q'_0} \leq q_1 \leq q_0$, then $\hat{\nabla} C_{\hat{g}} \in W^{-1,q}(\hat{M})$ for all $1 < q \leq q_1$.*

Proof. In Claim 2 we have already seen that the operator $\hat{\nabla}$ acting on tensor fields satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 2.3, with coefficients $A_\alpha \in W_{loc}^{|\alpha|,r}$ for $r \doteq \frac{3q_0}{3-q_0} > 3$. Therefore, from Lemma 2.3 one knows $C_{\hat{g}} \in W^{-1,q_1}$ as long as $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{q_1} \leq 1$. Notice then that

$$\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{q_1} = \frac{3-q_0}{3q_0} + \frac{1}{q_1} = \frac{1}{q_0} - \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{q_1} \leq 1 \iff \frac{1}{q_1} \leq \frac{1}{q'_0} + \frac{1}{3} \iff q_1 \geq \frac{3q'_0}{3+q'_0}.$$

\square

Let us now assume $C_{\hat{g}} \in L^{q_1}$, $q_1 > \frac{3}{2}$, and notice this implies $q_1 > \frac{3q'_0}{3+q'_0}$, since $\frac{3}{2} > \frac{3q'_0}{3+q'_0}$ iff $3 > q'_0$, which is equivalent to $q_0 > \frac{3}{2}$. Thus, we can use the above claim and $W^{2,q_0}(\hat{M}) \otimes W^{-1,q_1}(\hat{M}) \hookrightarrow W^{-1,q_1}(\hat{M})$, to deduce that $\hat{g}^{kl}\hat{\nabla}_l C_{\hat{g}_{ijk}} \in W^{-1,q_1}(U)$ for any bounded coordinate neighbourhood. Furthermore, from Proposition 4.1, we know that $\hat{\nabla}^2 \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}} \in W^{-2,q_0}(S_2\hat{M})$, and since $W^{2,q_0}(\hat{M}) \otimes W^{-2,q_0}(\hat{M}) \hookrightarrow W^{-2,q_0}(\hat{M})$, then traces of $\hat{\nabla}^2 \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}}$ belong to $W^{-2,q_0}(\hat{M})$ a priori.²⁵ Along the lines of some of the computations done above, before moving further, let us establish the following claim, which concerns the Schur lemma in this level of regularity:

Claim 5. *Given our closed W^{2,q_0} -Riemannian manifold (\hat{M}, \hat{g}) , it holds that $\text{div}_{\hat{g}}(\text{Ric}_{\hat{g}} - \frac{1}{2}R_{\hat{g}}\hat{g}) = 0$.*

Proof. From previous analysis we know that $\text{Ric}_{\hat{g}} \in L^{q_0}$, $\hat{\nabla}\text{Ric}_{\hat{g}} \in W^{-1,q_0}$, $R_{\hat{g}} \in W^{2,q_0}$ and hence $V \doteq \text{div}_{\hat{g}}(\text{Ric}_{\hat{g}} - \frac{1}{2}R_{\hat{g}}\hat{g}) \in W^{-1,q_0}$, and actually $V = 0$ on $\hat{M} \setminus \{p_\infty\}$. Thus, $\text{supp}(V)$, if non-empty, equals $\{p_\infty\}$. But Proposition B.2 shows that any $W^{-1,s}(B_1(0))$ -function with $s > \frac{3}{2}$ supported at a single point vanishes identically, and hence since $q_0 > \frac{3}{2}$ we deduce $V \equiv 0$. \square

Since $R_{\hat{g}} \in W^{2,q_0}(M)$, then we also know that $\hat{\nabla}^2 R_{\hat{g}} \in L^{q_0}(M)$ a priori, and we can make the following local computation, where the right-hand side is a priori understood (term by term) in $W^{-2,q_0}(M)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\nabla}^k C_{\hat{g}_{ijk}} &= \hat{\nabla}^k \hat{\nabla}_k \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}_{ij}} - \hat{\nabla}^k \hat{\nabla}_j \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}_{ik}} + \frac{1}{4}(\hat{\nabla}^k \hat{\nabla}_j R_{\hat{g}} \hat{g}_{ik} - \hat{\nabla}^k \hat{\nabla}_k R_{\hat{g}} \hat{g}_{ij}), \\ &= \Delta_{\hat{g}} \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}_{ij}} - (\hat{\nabla}_j \hat{\nabla}^k \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}_{ik}} - \hat{g}^{ka} \hat{R}_{iaj}^l \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}_{lk}} - \hat{g}^{ka} \hat{R}_{kaj}^l \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}_{il}}) + \frac{1}{4}(\hat{\nabla}_i \hat{\nabla}_j R_{\hat{g}} - \Delta_{\hat{g}} R_{\hat{g}} \hat{g}_{ij}), \\ &= \Delta_{\hat{g}} \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}_{ij}} + \hat{R}_{liaj} \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}}^{la} - \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}_j^l} \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}_{il}} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\nabla}_j \hat{\nabla}_i R_{\hat{g}} + \frac{1}{4}(\hat{\nabla}_i \hat{\nabla}_j R_{\hat{g}} - \Delta_{\hat{g}} R_{\hat{g}} \hat{g}_{ij}), \\ &= \Delta_{\hat{g}} \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}_{ij}} + \hat{R}_{liaj} \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}}^{la} - \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}_j^l} \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}_{il}} - \frac{1}{4}(\hat{\nabla}_i \hat{\nabla}_j R_{\hat{g}} + \Delta_{\hat{g}} R_{\hat{g}} \hat{g}_{ij}). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that in the second line we have used $\text{Ric}_{\hat{g}} \in L^{q_0}(M)$, with $q_0 > 2$, so as to appeal to Proposition 4.1 and apply the commutation rule (4.6), while in the third line we have appealed to Claim 5 to rewrite $\text{div}_{\hat{g}} \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}} = \frac{1}{2} dR_{\hat{g}}$. Therefore,

$$\Delta_{\hat{g}} \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}_{ij}} = -\hat{R}_{liaj} \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}}^{la} + \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}_j^l} \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}_{il}} + \frac{1}{4} \underbrace{(\hat{\nabla}_i \hat{\nabla}_j R_{\hat{g}} + \Delta_{\hat{g}} R_{\hat{g}} \hat{g}_{ij})}_{\in L^{q_0}} + \underbrace{\hat{\nabla}^k C_{\hat{g}_{ijk}}}_{\in W^{-1,q_1}}. \quad (5.4)$$

Since $\hat{g} \in W^{2,q_0}$, $q_0 > 2$, then $|\text{Ric}_{\hat{g}}|_{\hat{g}}^2 \in L^{\frac{q_0}{2}}$, $\frac{q_0}{2} > 1$. This also implies that $\text{Riem}_{\hat{g}} \in L^{q_0}$ and hence $-R_{\hat{g}_{liaj}} \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}}^{la} + \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}_j^l} \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}_{il}} \in L^{\frac{q_0}{2}}$. Let us now consider the following claim:

Claim 6. *If $q_0 > 2$ then $L^{\frac{q_0}{2}}(\hat{M}) \hookrightarrow W^{-1,q}(\hat{M})$ for some $q > \frac{3}{2}$.*

Proof. First, since $W^{-1,q}(\hat{M}) = (W^{1,q'}(\hat{M}))'$, then

$$L^{\frac{q_0}{2}}(\hat{M}) \hookrightarrow W^{-1,q}(\hat{M}) \iff W^{1,q'}(\hat{M}) \hookrightarrow \left(L^{\frac{q_0}{2}}(\hat{M})\right)' \cong L^{\left(\frac{q_0}{2}\right)' }(\hat{M}).$$

We first notice that

$$q > \frac{3}{2} \iff \frac{1}{q} = 1 - \frac{1}{q'} < \frac{2}{3} \iff q' < 3,$$

and therefore we are only interested in analysing the embedding $W^{1,q'}(\hat{M}) \hookrightarrow L^{\left(\frac{q_0}{2}\right)' }(\hat{M})$ for $q' < 3$.

Since $\frac{1}{\left(\frac{q_0}{2}\right)' } = 1 - \frac{2}{q_0}$ and $W^{1,q'}(\hat{M}) \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{3q'}{3-q'}}(\hat{M})$ whenever $q' < 3$, we then need to satisfy:

$$\frac{3q'}{3-q'} \geq \left(\frac{q_0}{2}\right)' \iff \frac{1}{q'} - \frac{1}{3} \leq 1 - \frac{2}{q_0} \iff \frac{1}{q'} \geq \frac{2}{q_0} - \frac{1}{3}.$$

²⁵Notice these last two claims require $q_0 \geq 2$.

Since $q_0 > 2$, then $\frac{2}{q_0} - \frac{1}{3} < \frac{2}{3}$ and then the interval $[\frac{2}{q_0} - \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})$ is non-empty. Thus, any $q \in (1, \infty)$ such that $\frac{1}{q} \in [\frac{2}{q_0} - \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})$ satisfies

$$\frac{2}{q_0} - \frac{1}{3} \leq \frac{1}{q} < \frac{2}{3}.$$

Hence, for such $q > \frac{3}{2}$, the embedding $W^{1,q'}(\hat{M}) \hookrightarrow L^{(\frac{q_0}{2})'}(\hat{M})$ holds, and therefore $L^{\frac{q_0}{2}}(\hat{M}) \hookrightarrow W^{-1,q}(\hat{M})$. □

Putting the above claim together with (5.4), if $q_1 > \frac{3}{2}$, we find

$$\Delta_{\hat{g}} \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}_{ij}} \in W^{-1,q_2}, \text{ for some } q_2 > \frac{3}{2}, \quad (5.5)$$

where $\hat{g} \in W^{2,q_0}(\hat{M})$. □

In order to use the above to improve the regularity of the metric \hat{g} on \hat{M} , we will need the following result concerning the existence of harmonic coordinates for low regularity metrics:

Theorem 5.1. *Let (M^n, g) be a Riemannian manifold with $g \in W_{loc}^{1,q}$ and $q > n$. Then, given a point $p \in M$ and a coordinate system $\{x^i\}_{i=1}^n$ around p , such that $x(p) = 0$ and $g(\partial_{x^i}, \partial_{x^j})|_{x=0} = \delta_{ij}$, there exists a harmonic coordinate system (U, y) centred at p , i.e $y(p) = 0$, with coordinate functions $y^i \in W_{loc}^{2,q}(U)$. Finally, one can choose such coordinates satisfying $\frac{\partial y^i}{\partial x^j}(0) = \delta_j^i$.*

Proof. Start by fixing the coordinate system $\{x^i\}_{i=1}^n$ around the chosen point $p \in M$. Since under our conditions $g \in C_{loc}^{0,\gamma}(M)$, for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, under our hypotheses the existence of a change of coordinates $y^i = y^i(x)$ for $C^{1,\alpha}$ -harmonic coordinates $\{y^i\}_{i=1}^n$ in a neighbourhood of $p \in M$ such that $y(p) = 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, \gamma)$ follows from [58, Section 9 in Chapter 3]. In an even more general setting, this follows from [38, Corollary 2.8]. The exact $W^{2,q}$ -regularity for these coordinate functions follows from the local regularity of $W^{1,p}$ -solutions, $1 < p \leq q$, to $\Delta_g u = 0$ for a $W^{1,q}$ -metric (see, for instance, [58, Chapter 3, Proposition 1.12]).

Finally, notice that $A_j^i \doteq \frac{\partial y^i}{\partial x^j}(0) \in GL(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Therefore, if necessary, one can consider the change of coordinates $\bar{y}^i \doteq (A^{-1})_j^i y^j \in W_{loc}^{2,q}$, which are still harmonic and also satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{y}^i(0) &= 0, \\ \frac{\partial \bar{y}^i}{\partial x^j}(0) &= (A^{-1})_l^i \frac{\partial y^l}{\partial x^j}(0) = \delta_j^i. \end{aligned}$$

□

From the above general result and Lemma 5.1, we get the following:

Corollary 5.1. *Let (M^3, g) be a smooth $W_\tau^{k,p}$ -AE manifold, relative to a structure of infinity with coordinates $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^3$ and $p > 2$, $\tau \in (-1, -\frac{1}{2})$, $k \geq 4$, and let (\hat{M}^3, \hat{g}) be the conformal compactification obtained for it in Lemma 5.1. Then, around p_∞ there is a \hat{g} -harmonic coordinate system $(U, y^i)_{i=1}^3$ with coordinate function $y^i = y^i(x)$, $y^i \in W_{loc}^{2,\bar{q}}(U)$, $\bar{q} \doteq \frac{3q_0}{3-q_0} > 3$, where x^i denote the inverted coordinates $x^i \doteq \frac{z^i}{|z|^2}$. Furthermore, we have that $\hat{g}(\partial_{y^i}, \partial_{y^j})|_{y=0} = \delta_{ij}$ and the functions $y^j \in C^\infty(U \setminus \{p_\infty\})$ satisfy $y^i(p_\infty) = 0$ and $\frac{\partial y^i}{\partial x^j}(0) = \delta_j^i$.*

Proof. From Lemma 5.1, we know that $\hat{g} \in W^{2,q_0}(\hat{M})$ for some $2 < q_0 < 3$. Thus, appealing to the embedding $W^{2,q_0}(\hat{M}) \hookrightarrow W^{1,\bar{q}}(\hat{M})$, we know that $\bar{q} > 3$ due to $q_0 > \frac{3}{2}$. Setting the a priori x -coordinates there to be our inverted coordinates $x^i = \frac{z^i}{|z|^2}$, we furthermore know from Lemma 5.1 that $\hat{g}(\partial_{x^i}, \partial_{x^j})|_{x=0} = \delta_{ij}$, and thus appealing to Theorem 5.1 we know that there exist a \hat{g} -harmonic

coordinate system $\{y^i\}$, where the functions $y^i = y^i(x) \in W_{loc}^{2,\bar{q}}(U)$ and also satisfy $y^i(p_\infty) = 0$ and $\frac{\partial y^i}{\partial x^j}(0) = \delta_j^i$. This furthermore implies that

$$\hat{g}(\partial_{y^i}, \partial_{y^j})|_{y=0} = \frac{\partial x^a}{\partial y^i}(0) \frac{\partial x^b}{\partial y^j}(0) \hat{g}(\partial_{x^a}, \partial_{x^b})|_{x=0} = \hat{g}(\partial_{x^j}, \partial_{x^i})|_{x=0} = \delta_{ij}.$$

Finally, since each function y^i satisfies

$$\Delta_{\hat{g}} y^i(x) = 0 \text{ on } U \setminus \{p_\infty\}, \quad (5.6)$$

and $\hat{g}(\partial_{x^j}, \partial_{x^i}) \in C^\infty(U \setminus \{p_\infty\})$ by Lemma 5.1, then local elliptic regularity guarantees that $y^i \in C^\infty(U \setminus \{p_\infty\})$. \square

Let us now highlight the following improved regularity for the conformally compactified $\text{Ric}_{\hat{g}}$, which follows from Lemma 5.1 and Theorem 4.7:

Lemma 5.2. *Assume the same hypotheses as in Lemma 5.1 and consider the metric \hat{g} obtained in it on \hat{M} . If $C_g \in L_\sigma^{p_1}(M, dV_g)$ with $-6 < \sigma < -4$ and $p_1 = \frac{3}{6+\sigma}$, then $\text{Ric}_{\hat{g}} \in L^q(\hat{M})$ for some $q > 3$.*

Proof. Under our conditions, from Lemma 5.1 we know that $\hat{g} \in W^{2,q_0}(\hat{M})$, $\text{Ric}_{\hat{g}} \in L^{q_0}$, with $2 < q_0 < 3$, and $\Delta_{\hat{g}} \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}} \in W^{-1,q_2}$, with $q_2 > \frac{3}{2}$. We intend to apply Theorem 4.7, and thus we must check that $\frac{1}{q_0} - \frac{1}{3} \leq \frac{1}{q_2} \leq \frac{1}{q_0'} + \frac{1}{3}$. Noticing that $\frac{1}{q_2} < \frac{2}{3}$ and

$$\frac{2}{3} \leq \frac{1}{q_0'} + \frac{1}{3} = 1 - \frac{1}{q_0} + \frac{1}{3} \iff \frac{1}{q_0} \leq \frac{2}{3},$$

which holds, since actually $\frac{1}{q_0} < \frac{1}{2}$ and thus $\frac{1}{q_2} < \frac{2}{3} \leq \frac{1}{q_0'} + \frac{1}{3}$. Also notice that $\frac{1}{q_0} - \frac{1}{3} < \frac{1}{6}$ and thus $\frac{1}{q_0} - \frac{1}{3} \leq \frac{1}{q_2}$ is granted as long as $q_2 \leq 6$. Therefore, taking $\frac{3}{2} < q_3 = \min\{q_0, q_2\} < 3$, from Theorem 4.7 the following bootstrap follows:

$$\Delta_{\hat{g}} \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}} \in W^{-1,q_3}(\hat{M}) \implies \text{Ric}_{\hat{g}} \in W^{1,q_3}(\hat{M}) \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{3q_3}{3-q_3}}(\hat{M}), \quad (5.7)$$

Noticing that

$$\frac{3q_3}{3-q_3} > 3 \iff q_3 > 3 - q_3 \iff q_3 > \frac{3}{2},$$

shows that $\text{Ric}_{\hat{g}} \in L^q(\hat{M})$ for some $q > 3$. \square

Below we intend to exploit the extra regularity just gained for $\text{Ric}_{\hat{g}}$ to improve the regularity of the metric \hat{g} itself. Since the work of [20], it is known that the regularity of the Ricci tensor provides optimal regularity for the metric by appealing to harmonic coordinates, where $\text{Ric}_{\hat{g}}$ reads as a second order quasi-linear elliptic operator on the metric. If one can properly estimate the quadratic terms on $\partial \hat{g}$ appearing in such operator, then local elliptic regularity allows us to bootstrap the regularity of the metric, as long as \hat{g} starts with some minimal $W^{1,q}$ -regularity for $q > \dim(\hat{M})$.

In our present case, there is a subtlety involved in the above procedure, which arises from Theorem 5.1. Noticing that for $\hat{g} \in W^{2,q_0}(\hat{M}) \hookrightarrow W^{1,\bar{q}}(\hat{M})$, with $\bar{q} \doteq \frac{3q_0}{3-q_0} > 3$, Corollary 5.1 grants the existence of harmonic coordinates $y^i : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in a neighbourhood of p_∞ which are $W^{2,\bar{q}}$ -functions of an a priori (smooth) coordinate system around p_∞ , which we have taken to be the inverted coordinates $x^i = \frac{z^i}{|z|^2}$, with $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^3$ defining the structure of infinity of M^3 . Therefore, the coordinates y^i are *only* $W^{2,\bar{q}}$ -compatible with the differentiable structure $\mathcal{D}_0(\hat{M})$ for \hat{M} induced by this compactification. But we intend to use the $\{y^i\}$ -coordinates constructed in Corollary 5.1 to write $\text{Ric}_{\hat{g}}$ locally as an elliptic operator and improve the regularity of \hat{g} with respect to these coordinates y^i , and therefore also with respect to any smoothly related coordinate system. That is, if we define $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M})$ to be the maximal differentiable structure for \hat{M} compatible with the harmonic coordinates $\{y^i\}$ around p_∞ constructed from Corollary 5.1, then the improved regularity will (a priori) be only with respect to coordinate

systems in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M})$. This procedure will demand us to preserve certain Sobolev regularity gained for \hat{g} in Lemma 5.1, but, since the changes of coordinates (at least around p_∞) between coordinate systems in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M})$ and $\mathcal{D}_0(\hat{M})$ are given by $W^{2,\bar{q}}$ -functions, then their Jacobian will only be $W^{1,\bar{q}}$, which will in general imply loss of Sobolev regularity when passing from $\mathcal{D}_0(\hat{M})$ to $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M})$. Nevertheless, as shown below, some level of Sobolev regularity can be retained.

Before describing precisely how much Sobolev regularity will be preserved, notice we intend to show that, for certain $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, if $f \in W^{k,p}(\mathcal{D}_0)$, then $f \in W^{k,p}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}})$. For this one needs to check that for any coordinate system $\{V_\alpha, y^i\} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M})$ and $\eta_\alpha \in C_0^\infty(V_\alpha)$, $\eta_\alpha f \in W^{k,p}(V_\alpha)$. Notice that if $p_\infty \notin V_\alpha$, then $\{V_\alpha, y^i\} \subset \mathcal{D}_0(\hat{M})$ and hence the result is true by hypothesis. Similarly, if $p_\infty \notin \text{supp}(\eta_\alpha)$, then one may shrink V_α to a neighbourhood of $\text{supp}(\eta_\alpha)$ avoiding p_∞ and then the result again follows by hypothesis. So, we need only consider the case $p_\infty \in V_\alpha \cap \text{supp}(\eta_\alpha)$. In that case, we only need to prove $f \in W^{k,p}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(B_r(p_\infty)))$ for some small ball $B_r(p_\infty)$. With all this in mind, let us introduce the following notations, so as to precisely transfer the problem to the preservation of Sobolev regularity under coordinate transformations in \mathbb{R}^n , which is a classic topic, as can be seen from [2, Theorem 3.41]. The presentation we shall provide in this analyses parallels that of [4, Section 3].

Let $U_1, U_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be two open sets and $\Phi : U_1 \rightarrow U_2$ be a diffeomorphism. Consider then the operator $A : \mathcal{L}(U_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(U_2)$, where $\mathcal{L}(\Omega)$ denotes the set of Lebesgue measurable functions on the domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, given by:

$$(Au)(y) \doteq u(\Phi^{-1}(y)), \quad (5.8)$$

which is the operator inducing the coordinate change $y = \Phi(x)$, $x \in U_1$. In the case of the harmonic coordinates y constructed in Corollary 5.1, consider $\{U_1, \Phi_x\}$, $\Phi_x : U_1 \rightarrow \Omega_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, as the chart in $\mathcal{D}_0(\hat{M})$ given by the inverted coordinates $\Phi_x(p) = x = \frac{z}{|z|^2}$, for p in a neighbourhood of p_∞ . Then, maybe by making Ω_1 smaller, Corollary 5.1 guarantees the existence of a coordinate change $\Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ given by functions $y^i = y^i(x)$. This coordinate change between subsets of \mathbb{R}^n induces the new coordinate system on U_1 (again maybe making this a smaller neighbourhood of p_∞) $\Phi_y : U_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$, $\Phi_y^i(p) \doteq y^i \circ \Phi_x(p)$, and thus we still denote the coordinates by y^i . Noticing that the coordinate change $\Phi_y \circ \Phi_x^{-1}(x) = y(x)$, then, we may limit ourselves to establishing the invariance of $W^{k,p}$ -spaces by the diffeomorphism $\Phi_y \circ \Phi_x^{-1}(x) = y(x)$, for certain given $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. The first step in this process concerns the a priori regularity of the inverse transformation $\Phi^{-1}(y) = x(y)$.²⁶

Proposition 5.2. *Let $U_i \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $i = 1, 2$, be two open sets and let $\varphi : U_1 \rightarrow U_2$ be a $W^{2,q}(U_1)$ diffeomorphism, $q > n$. Then, $\varphi^{-1} : U_2 \rightarrow U_1$ is of class $W_{loc}^{2,q}(U_2)$.*

Proof. Let us first consider the case $U_1 = B_{R_1}(0)$, $U_2 = \varphi(U_1)$ and $\varphi(0) = 0$. Then, set $A \doteq d\varphi(0) \in \text{GL}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$. Extend A and $A^{-1} = d\varphi^{-1}(0)$ to constant GL-valued fields $B_{R_1}(0) \mapsto A$ and $U_2 \mapsto A^{-1}$. In particular, $A \in W^{1,q}(B_{R_1}(0))$ and $A^{-1} \in W^{1,q}(U_2)$. Let $\Omega_1 \subset B_{R_1}(0)$ be an open set to be fixed latter and, on Ω_1 , write²⁷

$$d\varphi = A \circ (\text{Id} - A^{-1}(A - d\varphi)) = A \circ (\text{Id} - \xi),$$

where we have defined $\xi \doteq A^{-1}(A - d\varphi) \in W^{1,q}(\Omega_1; L(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^n))$, where $L(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^n)$ denotes the set of linear maps from \mathbb{R}^n to itself. Since $W^{1,q}$ is an algebra under multiplication for $q > n$, we know that the Neumann series $\{\xi_m \doteq \sum_{j=0}^m \xi^j\}_{m=0}^\infty$ converges in $W^{1,q}$ as long as $\|\xi\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega_1)} < 1$. In such a case, the limit $\psi \doteq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \xi_m \in W^{1,q}(\Omega_1)$ converges to $(\text{Id} - \xi)^{-1}$, which in turn shows that $d\varphi^{-1} = (\text{Id} - \xi)^{-1} \circ A^{-1} = \psi \circ A^{-1} \in W^{1,q}(\Omega_2)$, where $\Omega_2 \doteq \varphi(\Omega_1)$. Now, the condition $\|\xi\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega_1)} < 1$ is implied if $\|\varphi - A\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega_1)} < \|A^{-1}\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega_2)}^{-1}$, which since $\varphi - A \in W^{1,q}(\Omega_1)$, can be guaranteed by simply shrinking the domain $\Omega_1 \subset B_{R_1}(0)$ to a small enough ball $B_R(0)$, $0 < R \leq R_1$. Notice that this process also decreases the norm of $\|A^{-1}\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega_2)}$, in turn increasing $\|A^{-1}\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega_2)}^{-1}$, and thus for Ω_1 sufficiently small $\|\varphi - A\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega_1)} < \|A^{-1}\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega_2)}^{-1}$ is fulfilled. Therefore, we see that $d\varphi^{-1} \in W^{1,q}(\Omega_2)$, for such $\Omega_2 \subset U_2$. Since φ^{-1} is actually $C^1(U_2)$ by the inverse function theorem, then $\varphi^{-1} \in W^{2,q}(\Omega_2)$.

²⁶Compare with [4, Lemma 3.2].

²⁷Below, the composition symbols refer to compositions in the fibres $L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$ for maps $\Omega_1 \rightarrow L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$.

For the general case, consider any point $p \in U_1$ and $q = \varphi(p) \in U_2$, consider then a small ball $B_{R_1}(p) \subset U_1$ and set $V_2 \doteq \varphi(B_{R_1}(0))$. Then, composing (left and right) φ with translations to the origin, we can apply the above result to find $\varphi^{-1} \in W^{2,q}(\Omega_2)$ for some neighbourhood $\Omega_2 \subset V_2$ of q . Applying this result around any point $q \in U_2$, we see that $\varphi^{-1} \in W_{loc}^{2,q}(U_2)$. \square

The above proposition, for instance, guarantees that the inverse transformation of the coordinate change $x \mapsto y(x)$ provided in Corollary 5.1 is a $W^{2,\bar{q}}$ -map. Following [2, Chapter III], we will say that a C^k -diffeomorphism with C^k -bounded inverse is k -smooth.

Proposition 5.3. *Let f be a function on the compact manifold \hat{M} such that $f \in W^{1,p}(\mathcal{D}_0(\hat{M}))$ for some $1 < p < \infty$. Then, $f \in W^{1,p}(\mathcal{D}_{Har}(\hat{M}))$.*

Proof. We need only prove this result for some small ball around p_∞ . That is, we need only show that if $f \in W^{1,p}(\mathcal{D}_0(M))$ and $\eta \in C_0^\infty(B_r(p_\infty))$ for some small $r > 0$, then $(\eta f) \circ \Phi_y^{-1} \in W^{1,p}(\Phi_y(B_r(p_\infty)))$. But due to Proposition 5.2 we know $\Phi_x \circ \Phi_y^{-1} \in W^{2,\bar{q}}(\Phi_y(B_r(p_\infty)))$, $\bar{q} > n$, and hence $\Phi_x \circ \Phi_y^{-1} \in W^{2,\bar{q}}(\Phi_y(B_r(p_\infty))) \subset C^1(\Phi_y(B_r(p_\infty)))$. Thus, [2, Theorem 3.41], guarantees $(\eta f) \circ \Phi_x^{-1} \circ \Phi_x \circ \Phi_y^{-1} = (\Phi_x \circ \Phi_y^{-1})^*(\eta f) \circ \Phi_x^{-1} \in W^{1,p}(\Phi_y(B_r(p_\infty)))$. \square

With respect to either higher derivatives and higher order tensors, there may be some loss in regularity. But, up to first order the following still holds:

Proposition 5.4. *Denote by $W^{1,p}(\mathcal{D}_0(\hat{M}))$ and $W^{1,p}(\mathcal{D}_{Har}(\hat{M}))$ Sobolev spaces of tensor fields $T_l \hat{M}$, $l \geq 1$, on \hat{M} with respect to each highlighted differentiable structure. Since $\mathcal{D}_0(\hat{M})$ and $\mathcal{D}_{Har}(\hat{M})$ are $W^{2,q}$ -compatible for some $q > 3$, then*

$$u \in L^p(\mathcal{D}_0(\hat{M})) \implies u \in L^p(\mathcal{D}_{Har}(\hat{M})) \text{ for any } 1 < p < \infty, \quad (5.9)$$

and if also $p > 3$ and

$$u \in W^{1,p}(\mathcal{D}_0(\hat{M})) \implies u \in W^{1,\min\{q,p\}}(\mathcal{D}_{Har}(\hat{M})). \quad (5.10)$$

Proof. Again in this case we need only establish the result in a small enough neighbourhood of p_∞ , where we can take the inverted coordinates x^i as a chart in $\mathcal{D}_0(\hat{M})$ and the harmonic coordinates y^i constructed from them in Corollary 5.1. Then,

$$u(\partial_{y^{i_1}}, \dots, \partial_{y^{i_l}}) = \frac{\partial x^{j_1}}{\partial y^{i_1}} \cdots \frac{\partial x^{j_l}}{\partial y^{i_l}} u(\partial_{x^{j_1}}, \dots, \partial_{x^{j_l}}).$$

Since the coordinate transformation is $W_{loc}^{2,q}$ with $W_{loc}^{2,q}$ inverse due to Proposition 5.2, each Jacobian matrix is $W_{loc}^{1,q}$. Then, since $W_{loc}^{1,q}$ is an algebra under multiplication, we find that the product of Jacobian factors is in $W_{loc}^{1,q}$. Also, the functions $u(\partial_{x^{j_1}}, \dots, \partial_{x^{j_r}}) \in L_{loc}^p(\hat{M}, \mathcal{D}_0(\hat{M}))$ by hypothesis. Since the coordinate transformation is 1-smooth, then [2, Chapter 3, Theorem 3.41] guarantees that $(\Phi_y^{-1})^*(u(\partial_{x^{j_1}}, \dots, \partial_{x^{j_r}})) \in L_{loc}^p(\hat{M}, \mathcal{D}_{Har}(\hat{M}))$. Therefore, given $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\hat{M}, \mathcal{D}_{Har}(\hat{M}))$ supported in a neighbourhood of p_∞ , $(\eta u) \circ \Phi_y^{-1} \in W_{loc}^{1,q}(\hat{M}, \mathcal{D}_{Har}(\hat{M})) \otimes L_{loc}^p(\hat{M}, \mathcal{D}_{Har}(\hat{M})) \hookrightarrow L_{loc}^p(\hat{M}, \mathcal{D}_{Har}(\hat{M}))$ showing that (5.9) holds.

Concerning (5.10), the only difference is that this time 1-smoothness of the coordinate change grants $(\Phi_y^{-1})^*(u(\partial_{x^{j_1}}, \dots, \partial_{x^{j_r}})) \in W_{loc}^{1,p}(\hat{M}, \mathcal{D}_{Har}(\hat{M}))$. Thus,

$$u(\partial_{y^{i_1}}, \dots, \partial_{y^{i_r}}) \in W_{loc}^{1,q}(\hat{M}, \mathcal{D}_{Har}(\hat{M})) \otimes W_{loc}^{1,p}(\hat{M}, \mathcal{D}_{Har}(\hat{M}))$$

which, if $p > 3$, embeds in $W_{loc}^{1,\min\{p,q\}}(\hat{M}, \mathcal{D}_{Har}(\hat{M}))$ through Theorem 2.2. \square

Notice that the above proof cannot be improved to second order Sobolev spaces, since the Jacobian involved in the coordinate transformation implies that the $W^{1,p}(\mathcal{D}_{Har}(\hat{M}))$ -spaces already depend on $\partial_{y^{i_j}}^2 x^a$ and we do not have higher order control for the coordinate change. Nevertheless, the above proposition suffices to prove the following statements:

Corollary 5.2. *Let (M^3, g) be an AE manifold satisfying the hypotheses of Lemma 5.1 with $C_g \in L_\sigma^{p_1}(M, dV_g)$ with $-6 < \sigma < -4$ and $p_1 = \frac{3}{6+\sigma}$, and let (\hat{M}, \hat{g}) be the conformal compactification obtain in it. Then, $\hat{g} \in W^{1, \bar{q}}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M}))$ for $\bar{q} \doteq \frac{3q_0}{3-q_0}$ and $\text{Ric}_{\hat{g}} \in L^q(\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M}))$ for some $3 < q \leq \bar{q}$. Furthermore, $\hat{g} \in C^\infty(\hat{M} \setminus \{p_\infty\}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M}))$.*

Proof. From Lemma 5.1 and the embedding $W^{2, q_0}(\mathcal{D}_0(\hat{M})) \hookrightarrow W^{1, \bar{q}}(\mathcal{D}_0(\hat{M}))$, we know that $\hat{g} \in W^{1, \bar{q}}(\mathcal{D}_0(\hat{M}))$ and therefore, since $\bar{q} > 3$ and $\mathcal{D}_0(\hat{M})$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M})$ and $W^{2, \bar{q}}$ -compatible, Proposition 5.4 (in particular (5.10)) implies that $\hat{g} \in W^{1, \bar{q}}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M}))$. Also, from Corollary 5.1, we know that the harmonic coordinates y^i and C^∞ -compatible with $\mathcal{D}_0(\hat{M} \setminus \{p_\infty\})$ and therefore the Jacobians of the transformation $y^j = y^j(x)$ are smooth away of p_∞ , with x a coordinate system in $\mathcal{D}_0(\hat{M})$. Thus, since $\hat{g} \in C^\infty(\hat{M} \setminus \{p_\infty\})$ can be checked for coordinates in $\mathcal{D}_0(\hat{M})$, the same follows with coordinates in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M})$.

Concerning the Ricci tensor regularity in harmonic coordinates, it might be worth being more careful in the analysis. Let us first set, as usual, $\{x^i\}_{i=1}^3$ to be the inverted coordinate system defining \mathcal{D}_0 and $\{y^i\}_{i=1}^3$ the associated harmonic coordinates constructed in Corollary 5.1, and then denote by R_{jkl}^i and R'_{jkl}^i the components of the Riemann tensor associated to the $\{x^i\}$ and $\{y^i\}$ coordinate systems respectively. That is,

$$R_{jkl}^i(y) = \partial_{y^k} \Gamma_{lj}^i - \partial_{y^l} \Gamma_{kj}^i + \Gamma_{ku}^i \Gamma_{jl}^u - \Gamma_{lu}^i \Gamma_{jk}^u$$

where

$$\Gamma_{lj}^i(y) = \frac{g'^{ia}}{2} (\partial_{y^l} g'_{aj} + \partial_{y^j} g'_{al} - \partial_{y^a} g'_{lj})$$

denote the connection coefficients computed in the harmonic coordinates, where $g'_{aj}(y) \doteq g(\partial_{y^a}, \partial_{y^j})$ denotes the matrix associated to g in these coordinates. We notice that, a priori, for a $W^{1, \bar{q}}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(M))$ -metric, with $\bar{q} > 3$, we have $\Gamma_{lj}^i \in L_{loc}^{\bar{q}}$, and thus $R_{jkl}^i(y) \in W^{-1, \bar{q}} + L_{loc}^{\frac{\bar{q}}{2}}$. It is actually the transformation rule obeyed by the curvature that will allow one to retain the regularity in the inverted coordinates. A subtlety which arises at this point, is that such coordinate transformation rule basically relies on an application of the chain rule, which in this combination of distributional sections and only C^1 -diffeomorphisms might be something not completely obvious. Thus, let us explain why these results still hold in this setting.

Denoting by $\Phi : U \rightarrow V$ the $W^{2, \bar{q}}$ -diffeomorphism inducing the coordinate change from $y \mapsto x$, in the case of the metric, we know that

$$g'_{aj}(y) = \partial_{y^a} \Phi^u(y) \partial_{y^j} \Phi^v(y) g_{uv}(\Phi(y)) \in W^{1, \bar{q}}(U).$$

Also, given a function $f \in W^{1, p}(V)$, since Φ is 1-smooth, then $((\Phi)^* f)(y) = f(\Phi(y)) \in W^{1, p}(U)$ and moreover

$$\partial_{y^l} ((\Phi)^* f)(y) = \partial_{y^l} \Phi^a(y) (\partial_{x^a} f)(\Phi(y)) = \partial_{y^l} \Phi^a(y) ((\Phi)^*(\partial_{x^a} f))(y),$$

which is to say that one may follow the usual chain rule. Then, we can deduce for $\Gamma_{lj}^i(y)$ the usual transformation rule for the connection coefficients, given by:

$$\Gamma_{lj}^i(y) = \partial_{x^u} (\Phi^{-1})^i \partial_{y^l} \Phi^a \partial_{y^j} \Phi^b \Gamma_{ab}^u(\Phi(y)) + \partial_{y^l y^j} \Phi^u \partial_{x^u} (\Phi^{-1})^i(\Phi(y)).$$

Notice that, since $\Gamma_{ab}^u(x) \in W_{loc}^{1, q_0}(V)$ a priori, then the first term above actually lies in $W_{loc}^{1, q_0}(U)$ and we may apply both Leibnitz's and chain rule to it, and the same is true for the last factor $(\Phi)^*(\partial_{x^u} (\Phi^{-1})^i) \in W_{loc}^{1, \bar{q}}(U)$. Therefore, the same kind of tensor manipulations well-known when everything is smooth, do actually show that

$$R_{jkl}^i(y) = \partial_{x^u} (\Phi^{-1})^i \partial_{y^l} \Phi^a \partial_{y^j} \Phi^b \partial_{y^k} \Phi^v R_{bva}^u(\Phi(y)),$$

which, since $R_{bva}^u \in L_{loc}^{q_0}(V)$, shows that actually $R_{jkl}^i \in L_{loc}^{q_0}(U)$ via Proposition 5.4. Moreover, the above also shows that

$$\text{Ric}'_{jl}(y) = \partial_{y^l} \Phi^a \partial_{y^j} \Phi^b \text{Ric}_{ab}(\Phi(y)), \quad (5.11)$$

which, since $\text{Ric}_{ab} \in L_{loc}^q(V)$ for some $q > 3$, now implies via Proposition 5.4 that $\text{Ric}'_{jl} \in L_{loc}^{q_4}(U)$, with $q_4 = \min\{\bar{q}, q\}$. \square

Having established above that, in harmonic coordinates, we have $\hat{g} \in W_{loc}^{1,q}$ and $\text{Ric}_{\hat{g}} \in L_{loc}^q$ for some $q > 3$ around p_∞ , proves to be sufficient to bootstrap the Ricci regularity to a $W^{2,q}$ -regularity statement for \hat{g} . Actually, according to rather subtle regularity results, this could be established under even weaker conditions, for instance appealing to [57, Chapter 14, Proposition 4.10]. Below, we shall first state a more elementary regularity result, which is enough to provide a self-contained short proof of the bootstrap for \hat{g} in our setting.

Proposition 5.5. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary and $g \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)$ a Riemannian metric, with $q > n$. Assume that $\{y^i\}_{i=1}^n$ are g -harmonic coordinates, and that $\psi \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, $p > n$, satisfies the equation*

$$g^{ij} \partial_{y^i y^j} \psi = f \in L^{\frac{q}{2}}(\Omega). \quad (5.12)$$

Then $\psi \in W_{loc}^{2,\frac{q}{2}}(\Omega)$.

Proof. Since $p > n$, then $\psi \in C^0(\overline{\Omega})$ and thus, since $q > n$, by [25, Corollary 9.18] there exists a unique solution $v \in W_{loc}^{2,\frac{q}{2}}(\Omega) \cap C^0(\overline{\Omega})$ to:

$$\begin{aligned} g^{ij} \partial_{y^i y^j} v &= f \in L^{\frac{q}{2}}(\Omega), \\ v|_{\partial\Omega} &= \psi|_{\partial\Omega} \end{aligned}$$

Notice now that, since the coordinates are harmonic, $g^{ij} \Gamma_{ij}^k = 0$ for all $k = 1, \dots, n$, where Γ_{ij}^k stand for the Christoffel symbols associated to g in the $\{y\}$ -coordinate system. Therefore

$$g^{ij} \partial_{y^i y^j} (\psi - v) = g^{ij} \left(\partial_{y^i y^j} (\psi - v) - \Gamma_{ij}^k \partial_{y^k} (\psi - v) \right) = \Delta_g (\psi - v) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det(g)}} \partial_{y^i} \left(\sqrt{\det(g)} g^{ij} \partial_{y^j} (\psi - v) \right).$$

Furthermore, if $\frac{q}{2} < n$, then $v \in W_{loc}^{2,\frac{q}{2}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W_{loc}^{1,\frac{nq}{2n-q}}(\Omega)$ and $\frac{nq}{2n-q} > n$ since $q > n$. Therefore $\psi - v \in W_{loc}^{1,\min\{p,\frac{nq}{2n-q}\}}(\Omega) \cap C^0(\overline{\Omega}) \hookrightarrow W_{loc}^{1,2}(\Omega) \cap C^0(\overline{\Omega})$ is a weak solution to

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{y^i} \left(\sqrt{\det(g)} g^{ij} \partial_{y^j} (\psi - v) \right) &= 0 \text{ in } \Omega \\ (\psi - v)|_{\partial\Omega} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

Since $\sqrt{\det(g)} g^{ij} \in C^0(\overline{\Omega})$, setting $a^{ij} = \sqrt{\det(g)} g^{ij}$ we can apply [25, Theorem 8.30] to ensure that (5.13) has a unique $W_{loc}^{1,2}(\Omega) \cap C^0(\overline{\Omega})$ -solution, which must then be the trivial one, establishing $\psi = v \in W_{loc}^{2,\frac{q}{2}}(\Omega)$.

Finally, if $\frac{q}{2} \geq n$, then $v \in W_{loc}^{1,r}(\Omega) \cap C^0(\overline{\Omega})$ for any $r < \infty$. Taking $r > n$ allows one to proceed in the same manner as above to deduce $\psi = v \in W_{loc}^{2,\frac{q}{2}}(\Omega)$. \square

We are now in a position to prove the main result of this section:

Theorem 5.6. *Let (M^3, g) be a smooth $W_\tau^{k,p}$ -AE manifold, relative to a structure of infinity with coordinates $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^3$ and $p > 2$, $\tau \in (-1, -\frac{1}{2})$, $k \geq 4$, and let \hat{M} be the one point compactification of M . If $C_g \in L_\sigma^{p_1}(M, dV_g)$ with $-6 < \sigma < -4$ and $p_1 = \frac{3}{6+\sigma}$, then (M^3, g) can be conformally compactified into (\hat{M}, \hat{g}) , and \hat{M} can be equipped with a preferred differentiable structure $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M})$ which is $W^{2,q}$ -compatible with the differentiable structure provided by the inverted coordinates $x = \frac{z}{|z|^2}$, such that $\hat{g} \in W^{2,q}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M}))$ for some $q > 3$. In particular $\hat{g} \in C^{1,\alpha}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M}))$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and the following properties holds at p_∞ :*

1. $y^i(p_\infty) = 0$;
2. $\frac{\partial y^i}{\partial x^j}(0) = \delta_j^i$;
3. $\hat{g}(\partial_{y^i}, \partial_{y^j})|_0 = \delta_{ij}$,

where the coordinates $\{y^i\}_{i=1}^3$ above are the ones constructed in Corollary 5.1.

Proof. First, from Corollary 5.2 we know that $\hat{g} \in W^{1,\bar{q}}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M}))$ with $\bar{q} = \frac{3q_0}{3-q_0} > 3$. Since we need only check this improved regularity statement around p_∞ , invoking Corollary 5.1 we can consider $\{U, y^i\}_{i=1}^3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M})$ to be local harmonic coordinates with U a bounded neighbourhood of p_∞ . Writing down the Ricci tensor $\text{Ric}_{\hat{g}}$ in such harmonic coordinates around p_∞ , we find that:

$$\text{Ric}_{\hat{g}ab} = \hat{g}^{ij} \partial_{ij} \hat{g}_{ab} + f_{ab}(\hat{g}, \partial \hat{g}), \quad (5.14)$$

where $f_{ab}(\hat{g}, \partial \hat{g})$ is quadratic on $\partial \hat{g}$. If necessary, considering an open set with smooth boundary $\Omega \subset\subset U$, we have $\partial \hat{g} \in L^{\bar{q}}(\Omega)$, and thus $f_{ij} \in L^{\frac{\bar{q}}{2}}(\Omega)$. This, put together with (5.14) implies that

$$\hat{g}^{ij} \partial_{ij} \hat{g}_{ab} \in L^{\frac{\bar{q}}{2}}(\Omega), \quad (5.15)$$

where we have used Corollary 5.2 above so as to guarantee that $\text{Ric}_{\hat{g}} \in L^q(\Omega)$ for some $q > 3$. Furthermore, since $\hat{g}^{ij} \in W^{1,\bar{q}}(\Omega)$, we can apply Proposition 5.5 to obtain first $\hat{g}_{ij} \in W_{loc}^{2,\frac{\bar{q}}{2}}(\Omega)$, which implies $\hat{g} \in W^{2,\frac{\bar{q}}{2}}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M}))$ since away of p_∞ this is already known. Thus, as long as $\frac{\bar{q}}{2} < 3$, we have $\partial \hat{g} \in W^{1,\frac{\bar{q}}{2}} \hookrightarrow L^{q_1}$, where $q_1 = \frac{3\bar{q}}{6-\bar{q}}$. Then, we can go back to (5.14) where now we control the quadratic terms in $L^{\frac{q_1}{2}}$, which would give us $\hat{g} \in W^{2,\frac{q_1}{2}}$. Therefore, we can start a bootstrap, where at each step we begin with $\hat{g} \in W^{2,\frac{q_i}{2}}$ and get $g \in W^{2,\frac{q_{i+1}}{2}}$ with $q_{i+1} = \frac{3q_i}{6-q_i}$, and $q_0 = \bar{q}$, which works as long as $\frac{q_i}{2} < 3$. Notice that

$$q_{i+1} = \frac{3q_i}{6-q_i} > q_i \iff 3 > 6-q_i \iff q_i > 3,$$

since $q_0 = \bar{q} > 3$, we then see that $q_1 > \bar{q} > 3$ and hence, inductively, $q_{i+1} > q_i > \bar{q} > 3$. Furthermore, as long as the bootstrap works we have $\frac{3}{2} < \frac{q_i}{2} < 3$, implying $0 < 6-q_i < 3$, and thus

$$q_{i+1} - q_i = \left(\frac{3}{6-q_i} - 1 \right) q_i = \left(\frac{q_i - 3}{6-q_i} \right) q_i > \frac{q_i - 3}{3} q_i > \frac{\bar{q} - 3}{3} \bar{q} > 0.$$

Hence, we see that $q_{i+1} > \bar{q} + i \frac{\bar{q}-3}{3} \bar{q}$. This implies that after a finite number of iterations we must get $\frac{q_{i+1}}{2} > 3$, at which step the argument stops and we achieve $\hat{g} \in W^{2,q}$ for some $q > 3$. Finally, notice that the properties of 1. – 3. at p_∞ hold due to Corollary 5.1. \square

For future purposes, we would like to keep detailed track of the dependence of coordinates around p_∞ in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M})$ to those in $\mathcal{D}_0(\hat{M})$. In particular, we will make use of the following result which deals with normal coordinates associated to $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M})$ around p_∞ .

Corollary 5.3. *Let (M^3, g) be a $W_\tau^{k,p}$ -AE manifold relative to a structure of infinity with coordinates $\{z\}_{i=1}^3$, $-1 < \tau < -\frac{1}{2}$, $p > 2$ and $k \geq 4$. Let (\hat{M}^3, \hat{g}) be the one point conformal compactification obtained for it in Lemma 5.1, so that $\hat{g} = \varphi^4 g \in W^{2,q_0}(\hat{M})$, $2 < q_0 < 3$, with φ given as in this lemma. Then, in a neighbourhood of p_∞ , there is a normal coordinate system $\{\bar{y}^i\}_{i=1}^3 \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M})$ such that*

1. $\bar{y}^i(p_\infty) = 0$;
2. $\hat{g}(\partial_{\bar{y}^i}, \partial_{\bar{y}^j})|_0 = \delta_{ij}$ and $\frac{\partial \hat{g}(\partial_{\bar{y}^i}, \partial_{\bar{y}^j})}{\partial \bar{y}^k}|_0 = 0$;
3. The functions $\bar{y}^i = \bar{y}^i(y)$ are smooth with $\bar{y}^i = y^i + O_\infty(|y|^2)$;

where above the coordinates $\{y^i\}_{i=1}^3$ refer to harmonic coordinates in a neighbourhood of p_∞ constructed in Corollary 5.1. In particular, this implies that on a punctured ball $B_\epsilon(p_\infty) \setminus \{p_\infty\}$:

$$\bar{y}^i = x^i + O_1(|x|^{1+\alpha}) = \frac{z^i}{|z|^2} + O_1(|z|^{-1-\alpha}), \quad (5.16)$$

for some $\alpha > 0$, where $x^i = \frac{z^i}{|z|^2}$ denotes the inverted coordinate system around p_∞ defining \mathcal{D}_0 .

Proof. Since by Theorem 5.6 $\hat{g} \in C^{1,\alpha}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M}))$, the first part of the corollary is achieved following step by step the proof of [3, Proposition 1.25], and choosing therein the starting coordinate system as the harmonic coordinates constructed in Corollary 5.1. After that, we are only left with the proof of (5.16). To establish this expansion, notice that from Theorem 5.1 we know that on a punctured ball $B_\epsilon(p_\infty) \setminus \{p_\infty\}$

$$y^i(x) = x^i + O_1(|x|^{1+\alpha}) = \frac{z^i}{|z|^2} + O_1(|z|^{-1-\alpha}).$$

Therefore,

$$|y| = |x| + O_1(|x|^{1+\alpha}) = \frac{1}{|z|} + O_1(|z|^{-1-\alpha}).$$

Putting this together with $\bar{y}^i = y^i + O_\infty(|y|^2)$ implies

$$\bar{y}^i = x^i + O_1(|x|^{1+\alpha}) = \frac{z^i}{|z|^2} + O_1(|z|^{-1-\alpha}).$$

□

6 Decompactification

Lemma 6.1. *Let (\hat{M}^n, \hat{g}) be a closed manifold with $\hat{g} \in W^{2,q}(\hat{M})$, $q > n$. Given a point $p \in \hat{M}$, let $\{x^i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a normal coordinate system around p . Then, there is a conformal factor $\hat{\phi}$, smooth on $\hat{M} \setminus \{p\}$, equal to $|x|^{2-n}$ in a neighbourhood of p and such that $\gamma \doteq \hat{\phi}^{\frac{4}{n-2}} \hat{g}$ is a $W_\delta^{2,q}(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}})$ -AE metric on $M \doteq \hat{M} \setminus \{p\}$ with $\delta = \frac{n}{q} - 2$. In particular, $\delta < -1$, so that*

$$\gamma(\partial_{\bar{z}^i}, \partial_{\bar{z}^j}) = \delta_{ij} + O_1(|\bar{z}|^{-1-\alpha}), \quad (6.1)$$

for some $\alpha > 0$, and where $\bar{z}^i = \frac{x^i}{|x|^2}$ stands for the Kelvin transform of the normal coordinates x and provides the structure of infinity $\Phi_{\bar{z}}$.

Proof. All of the above lemma but for (6.1) is a restatement of the second half of Lemma B.1. To establish (6.1), just notice that the first part of the lemma and the weighted Sobolev embeddings of Theorem 2.4 imply that

$$\gamma(\partial_{\bar{z}^i}, \partial_{\bar{z}^j}) - \delta_{ij} \in W_\delta^{2,q}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}) \hookrightarrow C_\delta^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}),$$

which produces the desired expansion for any $\delta < -1 - \alpha < -1$. That is, for $0 < \alpha < -(\delta + 1)$. □

Lemma 6.2. *Let (M^3, g) be a smooth $W_\tau^{k,p}$ -AE manifold, relative to a structure of infinity with coordinates $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^3$ and $p > 2$, $\tau \in (-1, -\frac{1}{2})$, $k \geq 4$, such that $C_g \in L_\sigma^{p_1}(M, dV_g)$ with $-6 < \sigma < -4$ and $p_1 = \frac{3}{6+\sigma}$. Let (\hat{M}, \hat{g}) be the conformal compactification achieved for it in Theorem 5.6, with $\hat{g} \in W^{2,q}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{Har}}(\hat{M}))$ with $q > 3$. Assume that $\gamma = \hat{\phi}^4 \hat{g}$ is the decompactification of \hat{g} achieved in Lemma 6.1 on $M = \hat{M} \setminus \{p_\infty\}$. Then, it holds that*

$$\gamma(\partial_{z^i}, \partial_{z^j}) = \delta_{ij} + O(|z|^{-\alpha}). \quad (6.2)$$

Furthermore, letting \bar{y} stand for the normal coordinates around $p_\infty \in \hat{M}$ constructed in Corollary 5.3 and defining the asymptotic coordinates $\bar{z}^i \doteq \frac{\bar{y}^i}{|\bar{y}|^2}$ on M , then

$$\bar{z}(z) - \text{Id}(z) \in C_{1-\alpha}^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_R(0)}) \quad (6.3)$$

for some large R and some $\alpha > 0$.

Proof. Under our hypotheses, Corollary 5.3 gives us

$$\bar{y}^i = \frac{z^i}{|z|^2} + O_1(|z|^{-1-\alpha}).$$

Therefore, $|\bar{y}| = \frac{1}{|z|} + O_1(|z|^{-1-\alpha})$, which implies

$$\bar{z}^i = \frac{\bar{y}^i}{|\bar{y}|^2} = \frac{\frac{z^i}{|z|^2} + O_1(|z|^{-1-\alpha})}{\frac{1}{|z|^2} + O_1(|z|^{-2-\alpha})} = z^i + O_1(|z|^{1-\alpha}),$$

which already establishes (6.3). Also,

$$\frac{\partial \bar{z}^i}{\partial z^j} = \delta_{ij} + O(|z|^{-\alpha}).$$

Finally, using Lemma 6.1 with the normal coordinates $x^i \doteq \bar{y}^i(z)$ on \hat{M} around p_∞ so as to write $\gamma(\partial_{\bar{z}^a}, \partial_{\bar{z}^b}) = \delta_{ab} + O_1(|\bar{z}|^{-1-\alpha})$, we finally get:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(\partial_{z^i}, \partial_{z^j}) &= \frac{\partial \bar{z}^a}{\partial z^i} \frac{\partial \bar{z}^b}{\partial z^j} \gamma(\partial_{\bar{z}^a}, \partial_{\bar{z}^b}), \\ &= (\delta_{ai} + O(|z|^{-\alpha})) (\delta_{bj} + O(|z|^{-\alpha})) (\delta_{ab} + O(|z|^{-1-\alpha})), \\ &= \delta_{ij} + O(|z|^{-\alpha}), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $|\bar{z}| = |z| + O_1(|z|^{1-\alpha})$. □

Corollary 6.1. *Consider the same setting as in the previous lemma and let u be the conformal factor relating $g = u^4 \gamma$. Then, $u - 1 = O(|z|^{-\min(\tau, \alpha)})$.*

Proof. The above Lemma implies

$$g(\partial_{z^i}, \partial_{z^j}) = \delta_{ij} + O(|z|^{-\tau}) = u^4(\delta_{ij} + O(|z|^{-\alpha})).$$

Setting $\sigma_{ij} \doteq \delta_{ij} + O(|z|^{-\alpha})$ we see that for $|z|$ sufficiently large this matrix is invertible, with $\sigma^{-1} = \delta_{ij} + O(|z|^{-\alpha})$, which can be derived using a Neumann series for σ^{-1} . Therefore,

$$u^4 \delta_{ij} = \sigma_{il}^{-1} (\delta_{lj} + O(|z|^{-\tau})) = \delta_{ij} + O(|z|^{-\min(\tau, \alpha)}). \quad (6.4)$$

Tracing the equation we obtain $u^4 = 1 + O(|z|^{-\min(\tau, \alpha)})$, from which the result follows. □

Let us now present the following lemma, which is an adaptation to the inhomogeneous case of [6, Theorem 1.17] and will allow us to improve the decay of solutions to Poisson-type equations when the source of the equation decays *fast*. In this analysis, certain weight parameters in Sobolev spaces where the Laplacian loses its Fredholm properties are distinguished due to their relevance. On an n -dimensional manifold they are given by the so called *exceptional values* $\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{3-n, \dots, -1\}$ and thus one says that δ is a non-exceptional weight if it does not lie in this set of exceptional values. Furthermore, given $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, one defines $k^-(\delta)$ to be the maximum exceptional value such that $k^-(\delta) \leq \delta$.

Lemma 6.3. *Let (M^n, g) be a $W_\tau^{2,q}(M)$ -AE manifold, with $q > n$ and $\tau < 0$. Assume $u \in W_\delta^{2,q}(M)$, $\delta < 0$ non-exceptional. Assume that $f \in L_{\delta'}^q(M)$ for some $\delta' < \delta$ non-exceptional and that $\Delta_g u = f$. If $2-n < \delta < 0$ and $1-n < \delta' < 2-n$, then there is some constant C and a real number $\rho \in [\delta', 2-n)$ such that*

$$u - \frac{C}{|x|^{n-2}} \in W_\rho^{2,q}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}). \quad (6.5)$$

Proof. Let us start by transferring the problem to \mathbb{R}^n . With this in mind, we chose a cut off function η , supported in the end of M and identically equal to one in a neighbourhood of infinity. Then,

$$\Delta_g(\eta u) = \eta \Delta_g u + 2\langle \nabla \eta, \nabla u \rangle_g + u \Delta_g \eta = \eta f + 2\langle \nabla \eta, \nabla u \rangle_g + u \Delta_g \eta$$

One can also locally compute

$$\Delta_g(\eta u) = g^{ij}(\partial_{ij}(\eta u) - \Gamma_{ij}^l \partial_l(\eta u)) = \Delta(\eta u) - \Gamma_{ii}^l \partial_l(\eta u) + (g^{ij} - \delta_{ij})(\partial_{ij}(\eta u) - \Gamma_{ij}^l \partial_l(\eta u)),$$

which gives us

$$\Delta(\eta u) = \eta f + F \in L_{\max(\delta'-2, \delta-2+\tau)}^q(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad (6.6)$$

where

$$F \doteq -(g^{ij} - \delta_{ij})\partial_{ij}(\eta u) + 2\langle \nabla \eta, \nabla u \rangle_g + u \Delta_g \eta + \Gamma_{ii}^l \partial_l(\eta u) + (g^{ij} - \delta_{ij})\Gamma_{ij}^l \partial_l(\eta u) \in L_{\delta-2+\tau}^q(\mathbb{R}^n). \quad (6.7)$$

Recall that $\Delta : W_\rho^{2,q}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L_{\rho-2}^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is Fredholm as long as ρ is non-exceptional due to Corollary A.2, and, if necessary by increasing τ while keeping it negative, one has that $\delta_0 \doteq \max(\delta', \delta + \tau)$ is non-exceptional. From the Fredholm property, we know that $\Delta(\eta u) \in L_{\delta_0-2}^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is in $\text{Im}(\Delta : W_{\delta_0}^{2,q}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L_{\delta_0-2}^q(\mathbb{R}^n))$ iff $\Delta(\eta u) \in \text{Ker}^\perp(\Delta^* : L_{2-\delta_0-n}^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow W_{-\delta_0-n}^{-2,q'}(\mathbb{R}^n))$. In case $\delta_0 < 2 - n$, this cokernel will be non-empty and this property can fail for $\bar{f} \doteq \eta f + F$. But, being $\text{Ker}(\Delta^*|_{L_{2-\delta_0-n}^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^n)})$ finite dimensional, we can modify \bar{f} in a fixed compact set, say the ball $\overline{B_1(0)}$, by subtracting its projections onto the elements of the cokernel and localising these contributions with a fixed cut-off function χ supported in $B_1(0)$,²⁸ thus obtaining \hat{f} which agrees with \bar{f} outside a compact set but is actually an element of $\text{Ker}^\perp(\Delta^*|_{L_{2-\delta_0-n}^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^n)})$. Therefore, there is some element $\varphi \in W_{\delta_0}^{2,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\Delta\varphi = \hat{f}$ and thus

$$\Delta(\eta u - \varphi) = 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_R(0)} \text{ for } R > 1.$$

Since $h \doteq \eta u - \varphi \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, we may appeal to well-understood characterisation of harmonic functions vanishing at infinity to expand h into spherical harmonics Y_k :²⁹

$$h(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |x|^{2-n-k} Y_k \left(\frac{x}{|x|} \right), \quad (6.8)$$

where Y_k stand for the standard spherical harmonics, and the series above converges uniformly and absolutely. Since $1 - n < \delta' < 2 - n$, using (6.8) we see all terms except for the $k = 0$ one are in $W_{\delta'}^{2,q}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_1(0)})$, and recognising that the $k = 0$ contribution in (6.8) is of the form $\frac{C}{|x|^{n-2}}$, we have that

$$\eta u - \frac{C}{|x|^{n-2}} = \varphi \in W_{\delta_0}^{2,q}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}). \quad (6.9)$$

If $\delta_0 = \max\{\delta', \delta + \tau\} < 2 - n$, then we have already achieved the expansion (6.5). If this is not the case, we may assume $\delta + \tau > 2 - n > \delta'$, implying $\eta u = \frac{C}{|x|^{n-2}} + W_{\delta+\tau}^{2,q}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_1(0)})$ and improving the decay of u by an amount equal to τ . We can then go back to (6.6)-(6.7) and start an iteration, since such an improvement in the decay of u implies $F \in L_{\delta+2\tau-2}^q(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_1(0)})$ and thus $\Delta(\eta u) \in L_{\max\{\delta'-2, \delta+2\tau-2\}}^q(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_1(0)})$. Setting $\delta_1 \doteq \max\{\delta', \delta + 2\tau\}$ and going through the arguments in between (6.7) and (6.9) again with δ_0 replaced by δ_1 , we obtain $\eta u - \frac{C}{|x|^{n-2}} \in W_{\delta_1}^{2,q}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_R(0)})$. We can iterate this procedure to get $\eta u - \frac{C}{|x|^{n-2}} \in W_{\delta_i}^{2,q}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_R(0)})$, $i \geq 1$, with $\delta_i \doteq \delta + i\tau$, until we have

²⁸In a general situation, where $\text{Ker}(\Delta^*|_{L_{2-\delta_0-n}^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^n)})$ may not be one dimensional, this procedure would look like a Gram-Schmidt-type procedure.

²⁹For reference, see [40, Appendix A Corollary A.19] and further details can be found in [24, Chapter 2, Sections H and I].

$\delta_i \leq 2-n$. If $\delta_i < 2-n$, then we already have the expansion (6.5) setting $\rho \doteq \delta_i$, and in the outlier case where we hit $\delta_i = 2-n$, we find $\eta u \in W_{\sigma}^{2,q}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_R(0)})$ for all $\sigma > 2-n$, and thus choosing $2-n < \sigma < 2-n-\tau$, then $F \in L_{\sigma+\tau-2}^q(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_R(0)})$ with $\tau+2-n < \sigma+\tau < 2-n$ and $\Delta(\eta u) \in L_{\max\{\delta'-2, \sigma+\tau-2\}}^q$. Going through the iteration once more, we find $\eta u - \frac{C}{|x|^{n-2}} \in W_{\max\{\delta', \sigma+\tau\}}^{2,q}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_R(0)})$, where $1-n < \rho \doteq \max\{\delta', \sigma+\tau\} < 2-n$, and thus (6.5) is established also in this case. \square

Lemma 6.4. *Consider the same setting as in Lemma 6.2 and let u be the conformal factor relating $g = u^4 \gamma$. Assume $R_g \in L_{-3-\epsilon}^r(M, \Phi_z)$ for some $\epsilon > 0$ and $r > 3$. Then,*

$$u = 1 + \frac{C}{|\bar{z}|} + O_1(|\bar{z}|^{-1-\alpha}) \quad (6.10)$$

for some constant C , which is implicitly given as

$$C = \frac{1}{8\omega_2} \int_M (R_g u^5 - R_\gamma u) dV_\gamma, \quad (6.11)$$

where above ω_2 stands for the volume of the standard 2-unit sphere.

Proof. First, from Lemma 6.2, in particular equation (6.3), one knows that L_δ^r -spaces are preserved by the coordinate change $z \mapsto \bar{z}$, implying that $R_g \in L_{-3-\epsilon}^r(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}})$. Also, from Lemma 6.1 γ is $W_\delta^{2,q}(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}})$ -AE, with $\delta < -1$ and $q > 3$, and from conformal covariance of the conformal Laplacian we know that

$$-8\Delta_\gamma u = R_g u^5 - R_\gamma u. \quad (6.12)$$

Thus, from Corollary 6.1 and our first observation above, we know that $u - 1 \in W_{loc}^{2,q} \cap L_\rho^q(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}})$ for some $\tau < \rho < 0$.³⁰ Furthermore, from Corollary 6.1 we know that $u = 1 + O(|\bar{z}|^{-\rho})$, which implies that $R_g u^5 \in L_{-3-\epsilon}^r(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}})$ and $R_\gamma u \in L_{\delta-2}^q(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}})$ with $\delta < -1$. Now, since $L_{-3-\epsilon}^r(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}}) \hookrightarrow L_{-3-\epsilon'}^{r'}(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}})$ for any $3 < r' \leq r$ and $0 < \epsilon' < \epsilon$, we can (if necessary) decrease ϵ and r and assume that $3 < r \leq q$ and $\delta - 2 < -3 - \epsilon$, so that $L_{\delta-2}^q(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}}) \hookrightarrow L_{-3-\epsilon}^r(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}})$, implying $\Delta_\gamma(u - 1) \in L_{-3-\epsilon}^r(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}})$ with $u - 1 \in W_{loc}^{2,q} \cap L_\rho^q(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}})$, with $\rho > -1$ by hypothesis ($\tau > -1$). Since $L_{-3-\epsilon}^r(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}}) \hookrightarrow L_{-\epsilon}^r(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}})$, again by decreasing ϵ if necessary this implies $L_\rho^q(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}}) \hookrightarrow L_{-\epsilon}^r(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}})$. That is, we have found

$$\Delta_\gamma(u - 1) \in L_{-3-\epsilon}^r(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}}) \text{ with } u - 1 \in W_{loc}^{2,r} \cap L_{-\epsilon}^r(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}}).$$

Then, Theorem A.3 implies that $u - 1 \in W_{-\epsilon}^{2,r}(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}})$. Thus, we find $u - 1 \in W_{-\epsilon}^{2,r}(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}})$ with $\Delta_\gamma(u - 1) \in L_{-3-\epsilon}^r$ and γ a $W_\delta^{2,q}(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}})$ -AE metric. But then, Lemma 6.3 implies

$$u - 1 - \frac{C}{|\bar{z}|} \in W_{-1-\alpha}^{2,r}(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}, \Phi_{\bar{z}}), \text{ for some } \alpha > 0 \text{ and } r > 3. \quad (6.13)$$

This, in particular, implies that

$$u = 1 + \frac{C}{|\bar{z}|} + O_1(|\bar{z}|^{-1-\alpha}). \quad (6.14)$$

Finally, to compute the constant C , integrate (6.12) on a large compact set D_R such that $\partial D_R = S_R^2$, where S_R^2 denotes a topological 2-sphere of radius $|\bar{z}| = R$, for some large R . Doing this, one gets:

$$\int_{D_R} (R_g u^5 - R_\gamma u) dV_\gamma = -8 \int_{D_R} \Delta_\gamma u dV_\gamma = -8 \int_{S_R} \langle \nabla u, \nu_\gamma \rangle_\gamma d\omega_\gamma,$$

³⁰The $W_{loc}^{2,q}$ -condition actually follows since u is smooth.

where ν_γ denotes the outward-pointing γ -unit normal to $S_R^2 \hookrightarrow M$, while $d\omega_\gamma$ denotes the induced volume form on S_R^2 by γ . Since asymptotically one has

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla u, \nu_\gamma \rangle_\gamma &= \langle \nabla u, \nu_\gamma \rangle_\delta + (\gamma_{ij} - \delta_{ij}) \nabla^i u \nu_\gamma^j = \langle \nabla u, \nu_\delta \rangle_\delta + \langle \nabla u, \nu_\gamma - \nu_\delta \rangle_\delta + (\gamma_{ij} - \delta_{ij}) \nabla^i u \nu_\gamma^j, \\ &= \partial_{\nu_\delta} u + O(|\bar{z}|^{-3}). \end{aligned}$$

where above $\nu_\delta = \frac{\bar{z}^i}{|\bar{z}|}$ denotes the Euclidean unit normal to S_R^2 and $\partial_{\nu_\delta} u$ denotes the radial derivative of u in the ν_δ -direction. Thus, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{D_R} (R_g u^5 - R_\gamma u) dV_\gamma &= -8 \int_{S_R} \partial_{\nu_\delta} u d\omega_\gamma + O(R^{-1}) = -8 \int_{S_R} \partial_{\nu_\delta} u d\omega_\delta + O(R^{-1}), \\ &= 8C\omega_2 + O(R^{-\alpha}) \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit establishes (6.11):

$$C = \frac{1}{8\omega_2} \int_M (R_g u^5 - R_\gamma u) dV_\gamma$$

□

We can now present the main result of this section:

Theorem 6.1. *Let (M^3, g) be a $W_\tau^{4,p}$ -AE manifold with respect to a structure of infinity with coordinates $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^3$, with $\tau \in (-1, -\frac{1}{2})$ and $p > 2$. Assume furthermore that:*

1. $R_g \in L^r_{-3-\epsilon}(M, dV_g)$ for some $r > 3$ and $\epsilon > 0$;
2. $C_g \in L^{p_1}_\sigma(M, dV_g)$ for some $-6 < \sigma < -4$ and $p_1 = \frac{3}{6+\sigma}$.

Then, there is a structure of infinity with coordinates $\{\bar{z}^i\}_{i=1}^3$, which is $C^{1,\alpha}$ -compatible with the original one, such that

$$g(\partial_{\bar{z}^i}, \partial_{\bar{z}^j}) = \left(1 + \frac{4C}{|\bar{z}|}\right) \delta_{ij} + O_1(|\bar{z}|^{-1-\alpha}), \quad (6.15)$$

$$\bar{z}(z) - \text{Id}(z) \in C^1_{1-\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}(0)}), \quad (6.16)$$

for some $\alpha > 0$ and where the constant C is given by (6.11).

Proof. Under our hypotheses Theorem 5.6 follows. From this we obtain a conformal compactification (\hat{M}, \hat{g}) satisfying the hypotheses of Lemma 6.1, and therefore we know that g is conformal to $\gamma \in W_\delta^{2,q}(M)$, $q > 3$, satisfying (6.1). Writing $g = u^4 \gamma$, Lemma 6.4 implies u satisfies (6.10). Therefore, we can expand

$$u^4 = 1 + \frac{4C}{|\bar{z}|} + O_1(|\bar{z}|^{-1-\alpha}), \quad (6.17)$$

which put together with (6.1) implies (6.15), where the constant C is given by (6.11). Finally, the expansion (6.16) follows from Lemma 6.2. □

It is interesting to contrast the above result with the decay control one can achieve via the Ricci tensor. In particular, from [6, Proposition 3.3], one knows the Ricci tensor provides *optimal* control for the decay of the metric to the Euclidean one in harmonic coordinates, which in turn are known to provide optimal decay control among compatible end coordinate systems (see [6, Theorem 3.1] and for related results [4, Theorem 5.2]). Thus, one may think that expansions of the type of (6.15) should be readable in harmonic coordinates directly from controls on the Ricci tensor. In fact, if one knew that $\text{Ric}_g \in L^p_{\delta-2}(M, \Phi_z)$ for some $p > 3$ and $\delta < -1$, then would be able to extract (6.15) in harmonic coordinates directly from the Ricci tensor. We would like to highlight that, in fact, such an a priori decay condition on the Ricci tensor is quite strong. To see this, let us explore the case of a

metric which is known to be asymptotically *Schwarzschildian*, and show that such a decay cannot be extracted from the Ricci tensor if one does not a priori know it. That is, let us consider (M^3, g) AE with the following asymptotics:

$$g_{ij} = \delta_{ij} + \frac{A\delta_{ij}}{|z|} + O_\infty(|z|^{-2}) \quad (6.18)$$

Then, using (2.1), we find:

$$\text{Ric}_{g_{ij}} = -\frac{1}{2}g^{ab}\partial_{ab}g_{ij} + \frac{1}{2}(g_{ia}\partial_j F^a + g_{ja}\partial_i F^a) + O_\infty(|z|^{-4}),$$

with $F^a = g^{kl}\Gamma_{kl}^a(g)$. Then, since $g^{ab}\partial_{ab}g_{ij} = A\delta_{ij}\Delta|z|^{-1} + O_\infty(|z|^{-4})$, we find

$$\text{Ric}_{g_{ij}} = \frac{1}{2}(g_{ia}\partial_j F^a + g_{ja}\partial_i F^a) + O_\infty(|z|^{-4}).$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{kl}^a(g) &= \frac{g^{ba}}{2}(\partial_k g_{bl} + \partial_l g_{bk} - \partial_b g_{kl}) = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_k g_{al} + \partial_l g_{ak} - \partial_a g_{kl}) + O_\infty(|z|^{-3}), \\ &= \frac{A}{2}\left(-\delta_{al}\frac{z^k}{|z|^3} - \delta_{ak}\frac{z^l}{|z|^3} + \delta_{kl}\frac{z^a}{|z|^3}\right) + O_\infty(|z|^{-3}), \\ F^a &= g^{kl}\Gamma_{kl}^a(g) = \frac{A}{2}\left(-\delta_{ak}\frac{z^k}{|z|^3} - \delta_{al}\frac{z^l}{|z|^3} + 3\frac{z^a}{|z|^3}\right) + O_\infty(|z|^{-3}) = \frac{A}{2}\frac{z^a}{|z|^3} + O_\infty(|z|^{-3}), \\ \partial_j F^a &= -\frac{A}{2}\left(\frac{\delta_{aj}}{|z|^3} - 3\frac{z^a z^j}{|z|^5}\right) + O_\infty(|z|^{-4}), \\ g_{ia}\partial_j F^a &= -\frac{A}{2}\left(\frac{\delta_{ij}}{|z|^3} - 3\frac{z^i z^j}{|z|^5}\right) + O_\infty(|z|^{-4}), \\ g_{ia}\partial_j F^a + g_{ja}\partial_i F^a &= -A\left(\frac{\delta_{ij}}{|z|^3} - 3\frac{z^i z^j}{|z|^5}\right) + O_\infty(|z|^{-4}), \end{aligned}$$

which finally implies

$$\text{Ric}_{g_{ij}} = -\frac{A}{2}\left(\frac{\delta_{ij}}{|z|^3} - 3\frac{z^i z^j}{|z|^5}\right) + O(|z|^{-4}). \quad (6.19)$$

Notice then that, as long as $A \neq 0$, the decay rate for the Ricci tensor is critical, in the sense that Ric_g can be seen to be in $L_{\delta-2}^p$ for any $\delta > -1$, but it is not in any $\delta \leq -1$. Thus, if one were to have the metric g in any other coordinate system $\{y^i\}_{i=1}^3$ such that the transformation $y = y(z)$ is asymptotic to the identity to a sufficiently high order, but where the Schwarzschildian expansion (6.18) is not explicit,³¹ then one would not be able to deduce the existence of coordinates where (6.18) holds analysing the decay of the Ricci tensor. Nevertheless, notice that

$$R_g = O_\infty(|z|^{-4}) \quad (6.20)$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} C_{ijk}(g) &= \nabla_k \text{Ric}_{g_{ij}} - \nabla_j \text{Ric}_{g_{ik}} + \frac{1}{4}(\nabla_j R_g g_{ik} - \nabla_k R_g g_{ij}), \\ &= \nabla_k \text{Ric}_{g_{ij}} - \nabla_j \text{Ric}_{g_{ik}} + O(|z|^{-5}) = \partial_k \text{Ric}_{g_{ij}} - \partial_j \text{Ric}_{g_{ik}} + O(|z|^{-5}), \end{aligned}$$

and from (6.19), we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_k \text{Ric}_{g_{ij}} &= -\frac{A}{2}\left(-3\frac{\delta_{ij}x^k}{|z|^5} - 3\left(\frac{\delta_{ik}z^j + \delta_{jk}z^i}{|z|^5}\right) + 15\frac{z^i z^j z^k}{|z|^7}\right) + O(|z|^{-5}), \\ &= -\frac{A}{2}\left(-3\frac{\delta_{ij}x^k + \delta_{ik}z^j + \delta_{jk}z^i}{|z|^5} + 15\frac{z^i z^j z^k}{|z|^7}\right) + O(|z|^{-5}). \end{aligned}$$

³¹Notice that any transformation of the form $y^i = z^i + O_\infty(|z|^0)$ will in general introduce terms at order $\frac{1}{|y|}$ for $g(\partial_{y^i}, \partial_{y^j})$, which would spoil the Schwarzschildian decay.

Noticing the leading order in the above expression is symmetric under the interchange $j \longleftrightarrow k$, we find

$$C_{ijk}(g) = O(|z|^{-5}). \quad (6.21)$$

We then see from (6.20)-(6.21) that g satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 6.1, and therefore from it we can deduce the existence of a Schwarzschild-type expansion up to first order in some other coordinate system. Notice this implies that Theorem 6.1 is able to detect if a metric has an asymptotically Schwarzschild expansion in some coordinate system from the decay of R_g and C_g , something we have seen is not possible from the analysis of the Ricci-tensor alone. Some interesting and physically relevant examples related to this analysis will be presented in subsequent work.

7 The center of mass of an AE 3-manifold

In this section we aim to address a slightly strengthened version of Conjecture 1.2 stated in the introduction and motivated by [14]. The proof of our result, which is an L^p -version ($p > 1$) of Conjecture 1.2, is based on the results of the previous section, in particular on Theorem 6.1.

Let (M^3, g) be an AE manifold, with $\tau > \frac{1}{2}$, and assume then there is a structure of infinity with coordinates x^i where metric obeys the following decaying conditions:

$$g_{ij} = \delta_{ij} + \frac{A_{ij}}{|x|} + O_1(|x|^{-1-\alpha}) \quad (7.1)$$

We would like to prove that the asymptotics (7.1) imply the associated COM

$$C_{BOM}^k \doteq \frac{1}{16\pi E} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{S_r} x^k (\partial_i g_{ij} - \partial_j g_{ii}) \nu^j d\omega_r - \int_{S_r} (g_{ik} \nu^i - g_{ii} \nu^k) d\omega_r \right) \quad (7.2)$$

is well-defined, where above we are using the same notations adopted in Section 2.4.1.

Lemma 7.1. *If (M^3, g) is a smooth AE manifold satisfying the decaying conditions (7.1) for some $\alpha > 0$ and $R_g \in L^1_{-4}(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{B_1(0)})$, then the center of mass (7.2) is well-defined.*

Proof. Let us start by writing the scalar curvature as

$$R_g = g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_{ik} g_{jl} - g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_{ij} g_{kl} + O(g \cdot (\partial g)^2), \quad (7.3)$$

and consider an annulus $A_R = B_R \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}}$ for R_0, R sufficiently large, $R > R_0$. Then, due to symmetry of A_R :

$$\int_{A_R} x^a R_g dx = \int_{A_R} x^a R_g^{\text{odd}} dx. \quad (7.4)$$

To compute the above integrals, notice that in (7.3) we are interested in the odd part of the $O(g \cdot (\partial g)^2)$, but to analyse it one needs a more explicit form. From (2.1) and (2.2), we know this expression is a linear combination of quadratic forms on ∂g , which one can generically write as

$$Q = (g^{-1} g^{-1} g^{-1}) \cdot (\partial g \otimes \partial g) = (\delta \cdot \delta \cdot \delta) \cdot (\partial g \otimes \partial g) + O(|x|^{-5}),$$

where the lower dots denote some specific contraction. So,

$$Q^{\text{odd}} = (\delta \cdot \delta \cdot \delta) \cdot (\partial g \otimes \partial g)^{\text{odd}} + O(|x|^{-5}) = O((\partial g)^{\text{odd}}) O((\partial g)^{\text{even}}) + O(|x|^{-5}).$$

Noticing that (7.1) implies $\partial_k g_{ij} = -\frac{A_{ij} x^k}{|x|^3} + O(|x|^{-2-\alpha})$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial g)^{\text{odd}} &= -\frac{A_{ij} x^k}{|x|^3} + O(|x|^{-2-\alpha}) = O(|x|^{-2}), \\ (\partial g)^{\text{even}} &= O(|x|^{-2-\alpha}), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$Q^{\text{odd}} = O(|x|^{-4-\alpha}). \quad (7.5)$$

Therefore,

$$\int_{A_R} x^a \left(g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_{ik} g_{jl} - g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_{ij} g_{kl} \right) dx = \int_{A_R} x^a R_g dx + O(R^{-\alpha}) + C, \quad (7.6)$$

where the constant C above depends on R_0 , which is fixed. Below, we shall change this constant appropriately, as long as it remains fixed once R_0 is fixed.

Now, it also holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_{ik} g_{jl} - g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_{ij} g_{kl} \right) &= \partial_i \left(g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_k g_{jl} - g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_j g_{kl} \right) - g^{ij} \partial_i g^{kl} \partial_k g_{jl} - g^{kl} \partial_i g^{ij} \partial_k g_{jl} \\ &\quad + g^{kl} \partial_i g^{ij} \partial_j g_{kl} + g^{ij} \partial_i g^{kl} \partial_j g_{kl}, \\ &= \partial_i \left(g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_k g_{jl} - g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_j g_{kl} \right) + f(g, \partial g). \end{aligned}$$

One can make the above useful by noticing that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A_R} x^a \left(g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_{ik} g_{jl} - g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_{ij} g_{kl} \right) dx &= \int_{A_R} x^a \partial_i \left(g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_k g_{jl} - g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_j g_{kl} \right) dx + \int_{A_R} x^a f^{\text{odd}}(g, \partial g) dx, \\ &= \int_{A_R} x^a \partial_i \left(g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_k g_{jl} - g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_j g_{kl} \right) dx + O(R^{-\alpha}) + C, \\ &= \int_{S_R} x^a \left(g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_k g_{jl} - g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_j g_{kl} \right) \nu^i d\omega_r \\ &\quad - \int_{A_R} \left(g^{aj} g^{kl} \partial_k g_{jl} - g^{aj} g^{kl} \partial_j g_{kl} \right) dx + O(R^{-\alpha}) + C \end{aligned}$$

where the f^{odd} -terms have been estimated using using (7.5) and $\partial_k g^{ij} = -g^{ia} g^{jb} \partial_k g_{ab}$. One can similarly see that

$$g^{aj} g^{kl} \partial_k g_{jl} - g^{aj} g^{kl} \partial_j g_{kl} = \partial_l g_{al} - \partial_a g_{ll} + h(\delta, (g^{-1} - \delta), \partial g).$$

Above, the function $h(\delta, (g^{-1} - \delta), \partial g)$ is a linear combination of terms which have either the form $\delta \cdot (g^{-1} - \delta) \cdot \partial g$ or $(g^{-1} - \delta) \cdot (g^{-1} - \delta) \cdot \partial g$. Then, notice that

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta \cdot (g^{-1} - \delta) \cdot \partial g)^{\text{even}} &= \delta \cdot (g^{-1} - \delta)^{\text{even}} (\partial g)^{\text{even}} + \delta \cdot (g^{-1} - \delta)^{\text{odd}} (\partial g)^{\text{odd}} = O(|x|^{-3-\alpha}), \\ (g^{-1} - \delta) \cdot (g^{-1} - \delta) \cdot \partial g &= O(|x|^{-4}). \end{aligned} \quad (7.7)$$

Therefore $h^{\text{even}} = O(|x|^{-3-\alpha})$ implying

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A_R} \left(g^{aj} g^{kl} \partial_k g_{jl} - g^{aj} g^{kl} \partial_j g_{kl} \right) dx &= \int_{A_R} (\partial_l g_{al} - \partial_a g_{ll}) dx + \int_{A_R} h^{\text{even}} dx, \\ &= \int_{A_R} (\partial_l g_{al} - \partial_a g_{ll}) dx + O(R^{-\alpha}) + C, \\ &= \int_{S_R} \left(g_{al} \nu^l - g_{ll} \nu^a \right) d\omega_r + O(R^{-\alpha}) + C. \end{aligned}$$

Putting all the above together, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A_R} x^a \left(g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_{ik} g_{jl} - g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_{ij} g_{kl} \right) dx &= \int_{S_R} x^a \left(g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_k g_{jl} - g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_j g_{kl} \right) \nu^i d\omega_r - \int_{S_R} \left(g_{al} \nu^l - g_{ll} \nu^a \right) d\omega_r \\ &\quad + O(R^{-\alpha}) + C. \end{aligned}$$

Notice now that

$$\left(g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_k g_{jl} - g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_j g_{kl} \right) \nu^i = (\partial_l g_{jl} - \partial_j g_{ll}) \nu^j + \tilde{h}_i(\delta, g^{-1} - \delta, \partial g) \nu^i,$$

where again the functions $\tilde{h}_i(\delta, g^{-1} - \delta, \partial g)$ have the same structure as the function h studied above. Being $\nu^i x^a$ even, we again care about the even parts, which satisfy (7.7), implying

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S_R} x^a \left(g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_k g_{jl} - g^{ij} g^{kl} \partial_j g_{kl} \right) \nu^i d\omega_r &= \int_{S_R} (\partial_l g_{jl} - \partial_j g_{ll}) \nu^j x^a d\omega_r + \int_{S_R} \tilde{h}_i^{\text{even}} \nu^i x^a d\omega_r, \\ &= \int_{S_R} (\partial_l g_{jl} - \partial_j g_{ll}) \nu^j x^a d\omega_r + O(R^{-\alpha}). \end{aligned}$$

Putting the above together with (7.6), we finally find

$$\int_{S_R} (\partial_l g_{jl} - \partial_j g_{ll}) \nu^i x^a d\omega_r - \int_{S_R} (g_{al} \nu^l - g_{ll} \nu^a) d\omega_r = \int_{A_R} x^a R_g dx + O(R^{-\alpha}) + C. \quad (7.8)$$

Let us then define, for each $a = 1, 2, 3$, the sequence $\{C_{R_k}^a\}_{k=1}^\infty$ by

$$C_{R_k}^a \doteq \int_{S_{R_k}} (\partial_l g_{jl} - \partial_j g_{ll}) \nu^i x^a d\mu - \int_{S_{R_k}} (g_{al} \nu^l - g_{ll} \nu^a) d\mu \quad (7.9)$$

for R_k a sequence of monotonically increasing real numbers. Since $R_g \in L_{-4}^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{B_1})$, notice that

$$\|R_g\|_{L_{-4}^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}})} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}}} |R_g| \sigma^{-(4+3)} dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}}} |R_g| \sigma dx,$$

where $\sigma(x) = (1 + |x|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Thus,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}}} |R_g| |x| dx \lesssim \|R_g\|_{L_{-4}^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}})},$$

Thus, we see that (7.8) together with $R_g \in L_{-4}^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{B_1})$ implies that $\{C_{R_k}^a\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is Cauchy, and therefore the limit (7.2) exists. \square

We can now establish the main result of this section, which is basically a restatement of Theorem 6.1, accompanied with the convergence of the associated center of mass.

Theorem 7.1. *Let (M^3, g) be a $W_\tau^{4,p}$ -AE manifold with respect to a structure of infinity with coordinates $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^3$, satisfying*

1. $\tau \in (-1, -\frac{1}{2})$;
2. $R_g \in L_{-4-\epsilon}^r(M, \Phi_z)$ for some $r > 3$ and $\epsilon > 0$;
3. $C_g \in L_\sigma^{p_1}(M, \Phi_z)$ for some $-6 < \sigma < -4$ and $p_1 = \frac{3}{6+\sigma}$.

Then, there is a structure of infinity with coordinates $\{\bar{z}^i\}_{i=1}^3$, which is $C^{1,\alpha}$ -compatible with the original one, such that

$$\begin{aligned} g(\partial_{\bar{z}^i}, \partial_{\bar{z}^j}) &= \left(1 + \frac{4C}{|\bar{z}|}\right) \delta_{ij} + O_1(|\bar{z}|^{-1-\alpha}), \\ \bar{z}(z) - \text{Id}(z) &\in C_{1-\alpha}^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}(0)}), \end{aligned} \quad (7.10)$$

for some $\alpha > 0$ and where the constant C is given by (6.11). Moreover, in this coordinates the center of mass (7.2) is well defined.

Proof. The first part of the theorem is derived from Theorem 6.1 since our hypotheses are even stronger in this case. Once (7.10) has been established, we have the following implication³²

$$R_g \in L_{-4-\epsilon}^p(M, \Phi_z) \text{ and } \bar{z}(z) - \text{Id}(z) \in C_{1-\alpha}^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}(0)}) \implies R_g \in L_{-4-\epsilon}^p(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}}).$$

Noticing that $L_{-4-\epsilon}^p(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}}) \hookrightarrow L_{-4}^1(M, \Phi_{\bar{z}})$, then Lemma 7.1 establishes that the center of mass is well-defined with respect to the structure of infinity given by $\Phi_{\bar{z}}$, in the sense that the limit in (7.2) exists. \square

³²For details about this, the reader can consult [4, Corollary 3.1].

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Jan Metzger, Carla Cederbaum, Paul Laurain, Albachiara Cogo and Andoni Royo Abrego for helpful discussions and references related to this paper, as well as reading preliminary versions of it. Also, the author would like to thank the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation for financial support during the writing of this paper.

A Appendix I: Fredholmness of Δ_g on certain weighted spaces

Let (M^n, g) be a $W_\tau^{2,q}$ -AE manifold with $q > \frac{n}{2}$ and $\tau < 0$. The objective of this appendix is to review the Fredholm properties of the operator Δ_g acting on $W_\delta^{2,p}$ -spaces. In order to motivate the relevance of such a revision, let us first notice that these properties have been the focus of attention of several highly influential papers. We would like to stress that precise Fredholm properties of the Euclidean Laplacian are known since the work of Robert C. McOwen in [46]. In the literature one can find several generalisations of such properties to general AE-manifolds with metrics of different degree of regularity, specially in the case where Δ_g acts on spaces $W_\delta^{2,p}$ with $\delta \in (2 - n, 0)$. In this last case, under mild assumptions Δ_g actually becomes an isomorphism as can be consulted, for instance, in [45]. Nevertheless, we are interested in understanding such properties outside of the interval $\delta \in (2 - n, 0)$, and the classical reference for such a treatment clearly is the celebrated paper by Robert Bartnik [6], which covers such generalisations contemplating also low regularity metrics (see [6, Proposition 2.2]). In this last paper, one of the ingredients along the analysis of the Fredholm properties of Δ_g is [6, Proposition 1.6], which concerns regularity properties of a priori very weak solutions of a class of second order equations with coefficients of very weak regularity. Although the proof of this result appears as a result of standard elliptic regularity combined with scaling techniques, actually, in our opinion, the regularity statement seems to be out of the scope of the regularity theory one may find in standard references, such as [25] (compare with Theorem 8.8 in Chapter 8 and Theorems in Chapter 9 of [25]). Typically, the results in such references require an a priori solution of $W^{1,2}$ -regularity, which are most of the time presented with stronger regularity conditions on the coefficients (such as local L^∞ -bounds on all of them). Actually finding a result which accommodates all the local regularity hypotheses of the operators treated in [6, Definition 1.5] does not seem to be so easy.

Let us also comment that the analysis of the regularity of weak solutions to equations with coefficients of the regularity classes proposed in [6, Definition 1.5] seems to be rather close to the recent treatment of regularity of solutions to elliptic problems with coefficients of very limited regularity given in [10, 39, 63] (among others), which was motivated by a conjecture of J. Serrin [55]. Within the PDE program associated to these papers, there seem to be very interesting counterexamples limiting the extent of possible regularity theory, such as [55, 37]. In that spirit, we believe it is instructive to present a self-contained version of the regularity properties stated in [6, Proposition 1.6] and their application to obtain Fredholm statements for $\Delta_g : W_\delta^{2,p} \rightarrow L_{\delta-2}^p$, for metrics of low regularity and outside the interval $\delta \in (2 - n, 0)$. We anticipate that we are unable to recover the full statement of [6, Proposition 1.6], which should be compared with Theorem A.3 below. Nevertheless, the regularity we do obtain seems to be enough to get the full extent of [6, Proposition 2.2] (compare with Corollary A.3).

With the above motivations in mind, we start by noticing that locally:

$$\Delta_g = g^{ij} \partial_{ij} - g^{ij} \Gamma_{ij}^l \partial_l.$$

Therefore, using the notations of Section 2, on any bounded chart with smooth boundary $\{U, x^i\}_{i=1}^n$ we have $\Delta_g \in \mathcal{L}^2(W^{2,q})$, and hence $\Delta_g : W_0^{2,p}(U) \rightarrow L^p(U)$ is a bounded map for any $1 < p \leq q$ due to the same reasoning as in Lemma 2.2. Furthermore, the multiplication property of Theorem 2.3 also shows that $\|\Delta_g(\eta u)\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(M)} \leq C \|\eta u\|_{W_\delta^{2,p}(M)}$ for any $u \in W_\delta^{2,p}(M)$, η a cut-off function supported in an end of M equal to one near infinity, $1 < p \leq q$ and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, appealing to a partition of unity, we see that:

Proposition A.1. *Let (M^n, g) be a $W_\tau^{2,q}$ -AE manifold with $q > \frac{n}{2}$ and $\tau < 0$. Then, the operator Δ_g is a continuous map from $W_\delta^{2,p}(M) \rightarrow L_{\delta-2}^p(M)$ for all $1 < p \leq q$ and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$.*

We will now concentrate in proving a priori estimates, regularity and decay properties for solutions to $\Delta_g u = f$. Our presentation will be based on the classical paper [51], adapting their results to our notations and extending them to our context.

Lemma A.1. *For any given real number ρ , if $u \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L_\rho^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $1 < p < \infty$, and $\Delta u \in L_{\rho-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then $u \in W_\rho^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and there is a fixed constant $C > 0$, independent of u , such that:*

$$\|u\|_{W_\rho^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \left(\|\Delta u\|_{L_{\rho-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|u\|_{L_\rho^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Proof. We will appeal to the scaling properties associated to weighted spaces. First, let $A_r = B_{2r} \setminus \overline{B_r}$ and notice that using $(S_r u)(x) = u(rx)$ and $\partial_x^\beta (S_r u)(x) = r^{|\beta|} \partial^\beta u(rx)$ for all $|\beta| \leq 2$, we find that $r^{|\beta|p-n} \|\partial^\beta u\|_{L^p(A_r)}^p = \|\partial^\beta (S_r u)\|_{L^p(A_1)}^p$. Then, we use interior elliptic estimates to write

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A_r} r^{|\beta|p-n} |\partial_x^\beta u(x)|^p dx &= \int_{A_1} |\partial_x^\beta (S_r u)(x)|^p dx \leq \|S_r u\|_{W^{2,p}(A_1)}^p, \\ &\leq C \int_{\frac{1}{4} \leq |x| \leq 4} (|\Delta (S_r u)(x)|^p + |(S_r u)(x)|^p) dx, \\ &= C \int_{\frac{r}{4} \leq |x| \leq 4r} (r^{2p-n} |\Delta u(x)|^p + r^{-n} |u(x)|^p) dx, \end{aligned}$$

where the important point is that $C > 0$ depends on Δ, p, n but neither on u nor $r > 0$. Let us now multiply the above inequality by $r^{-\rho p}$, to get

$$\int_{r \leq |x| \leq 2r} |r^{-(\rho-|\beta|+\frac{n}{p})} \partial_x^\beta u(x)|^p dx \leq C \int_{\frac{r}{4} \leq |x| \leq 4r} \left(|r^{-(\rho-2+\frac{n}{p})} \Delta u(x)|^p + |r^{-\rho-\frac{n}{p}} u(x)|^p \right) dx,$$

Notice now that above implies that there is another constant C' , which may now also depend on ρ and $|\beta| \leq m$ (but is still independent of r), for which we have

$$\int_{r \leq |x| \leq 2r} ||x|^{-(\rho-|\beta|+\frac{n}{p})} \partial_x^\beta u(x)|^p dx \leq C' \int_{\frac{r}{4} \leq |x| \leq 4r} \left(||x|^{-(\rho-2+\frac{n}{p})} \Delta u(x)|^p + ||x|^{-\rho-\frac{n}{p}} u(x)|^p \right) dx.$$

For $r \geq 1$, by modifying C' we can replace in the above inequality $|x|$ by $\sigma(x)$. Then, we can pick $r = 2^j$, $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and sum over j to get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1} ||\sigma(x)|^{-(\rho-|\beta|+\frac{n}{p})} \partial_x^\beta u(x)|^p dx \leq C' \left(\|\Delta u\|_{L_{\rho-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}^p + \|u\|_{L_\rho^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}^p \right),$$

where the right-hand side is finite by hypotheses. Summing over $|\beta| \leq 2$, we find

$$\|u\|_{W_\rho^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1)} \leq C'' \left(\|\Delta u\|_{L_{\rho-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|u\|_{L_\rho^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

for some other constant $C'' > 0$, which implies the desired statements. \square

The above lemma will be useful to produce estimates near infinity in more general AE manifolds, and will be combined with the following local result given by Lemma 3.1. The final goal is to establish:

Theorem A.2. *Consider the Laplacian operator Δ_g of a $W_\tau^{2,q}$ -AE metric, with $q > \frac{n}{2}$ and $\tau < 0$, defined on \mathbb{R}^n . If $1 < p \leq q$ and $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$, then there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $u \in W_\rho^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ we have the following elliptic estimate:*

$$\|u\|_{W_\rho^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \left(\|\Delta_g u\|_{L_{\rho-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|u\|_{L_\rho^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Proof. First, use a cut-off function χ_R equal to one on $\overline{B_R(0)}$ and supported in $B_{2R}(0)$, constructed such that $|\partial^k \chi_R(x)| \leq C_k R^{-k}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and a constant $C_k > 0$ independent of R , and then decompose

$$u = \chi_R u + (1 - \chi_R)u = u_1 + u_2,$$

where $u_1 = \chi_R u$ and $u_2 = (1 - \chi_R)u$. Since on $B_{2R}(0)$ we have $u_1 \in W_0^{2,p}(B_{2R}(0))$ and the coefficients of Δ_g satisfy the regularity assumptions of Lemma 3.1, there is a constant $C = C(g, p, n, R) > 0$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_1\|_{W^{2,p}(B_{2R}(0))} &\leq C(\|\Delta_g u_1\|_{L^p(B_{2R}(0))} + \|u_1\|_{L^p(B_{2R}(0))}), \\ &\leq C(\|\chi_R \Delta_g u\|_{L^p(B_{2R}(0))} + \|[\Delta_g, \chi_R]u\|_{L^p(B_{2R}(0))} + \|u_1\|_{L^p(B_{2R}(0))}). \end{aligned}$$

Then, from

$$[\Delta_g, \chi_R]u = 2\langle \nabla \chi_R, \nabla u \rangle_g + u \Delta_g \chi_R, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

since the derivatives of χ_R are bounded to any order, one finds

$$\|[\Delta_g, \chi_R]u\|_{L^p(B_{2R}(0))} \leq 2\|\langle \nabla \chi_R, \nabla u \rangle_g\|_{L^p(B_{2R}(0))} + \|u \Delta_g \chi_R\|_{L^p(B_{2R}(0))} \leq C(g, R)\|u\|_{W^{1,p}(B_{2R}(0))}.$$

Therefore, we then get a constant $C' = C(g, p, n, R) > 0$ such that

$$\|u_1\|_{W^{2,p}(B_{2R}(0))} \leq C'(\|\Delta_g u\|_{L^p(B_{2R}(0))} + \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(B_{2R}(0))}).$$

Using the equivalence of the L^p and L^p -weighted norms on bounded domains, we deduce that there is a fixed constant $C_1 > 0$, independent of u , and which is fixed once R is fixed to any finite number, such that

$$\|u_1\|_{W_\rho^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_1(g, n, p, R) \left(\|\Delta_g u\|_{L_\rho^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|u\|_{W_\rho^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

To estimate u_2 , we start decomposing

$$\Delta_g u_2 = \Delta u_2 + (g^{ij} - \delta_{ij})\partial_{ij} u_2 + g^{ij} \Gamma_{ij}^l \partial_l u_2.$$

Since $u_2 \in W_\rho^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by hypothesis, we can apply (A.1) to Δ and use the above decomposition to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_2\|_{W_\rho^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} &\leq C(\|\Delta u_2\|_{L_{\rho-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|u_2\|_{L_\rho^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}), \\ &\leq C(\|\Delta_g u_2\|_{L_{\rho-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|(g^{ij} - \delta_{ij})\partial_{ij} u_2\|_{L_{\rho-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|g^{ij} \Gamma_{ij}^l \partial_l u_2\|_{L_{\rho-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|u_2\|_{L_\rho^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}). \end{aligned}$$

Noticing that $\text{supp}(u_2) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_R(0)}$ and $W_\tau^{2,q} \hookrightarrow C_\tau^0$, gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \|(g^{ij} - \delta_{ij})\partial_{ij} u_2\|_{L_{\rho-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} &= \|(g^{ij} - \delta_{ij})\partial_{ij} u_2\|_{L_{\rho-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_R(0)})}, \\ &\leq \left(\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_R(0)}} |g^{ij} - \delta_{ij}| \right) \|\partial^2 u_2\|_{L_{\rho-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_R(0)})}, \\ &\leq (\|g^{-1} - \delta\|_{C_\tau^0}) \sigma(R)^\tau \|u_2\|_{W_\rho^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_R(0)})} \\ &= C(g) R^\tau \|u_2\|_{W_\rho^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_R(0)})}. \end{aligned}$$

Concerning the lower order terms, first notice that $g^{ij} \Gamma_{ij}^l \in W_{\tau-1}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow W_{\gamma-1}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for any $0 > \gamma > \tau$. Since $\text{supp}(u_2) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_R(0)}$, let us pick a fixed cut-off function $\eta \in C_0^\infty(B_1(0))$, $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, $\eta \equiv 1$ on $\overline{B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0)}$, and then scale it to $\eta_R(x) \doteq \eta(R^{-1}x) \in C_0^\infty(B_R(0))$, and $\eta_R|_{\overline{B_{\frac{R}{2}}(0)}} \equiv 1$. Then

$(1 - \eta_R)$ is supported in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_{\frac{R}{2}}(0)}$ and is identically equal to one on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_R(0)}$, implying that $(1 - \eta_R)|_{\text{supp}(u_2)} \equiv 1$. Therefore

$$g^{ij}\Gamma_{ij}^l \partial_l u_2 = (1 - \eta_R)g^{ij}\Gamma_{ij}^l \partial_l u_2.$$

Then, appealing to the multiplication property in Theorem 2.4, we find that

$$W_{\gamma-1}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n) \otimes W_{\rho-1}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow L_{\rho-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

holds as long as $\tau < \gamma < 0$, since $q > \frac{n}{2}$. Thus, there is a constant $C > 0$, independent of u_2 and R , such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|g^{ij}\Gamma_{ij}^l \partial_l u_2\|_{L_{\rho-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} &\leq C\|(1 - \eta_R)g^{ij}\Gamma_{ij}^l\|_{W_{\gamma-1}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|\partial_l u_2\|_{W_{\rho-1}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\leq C'(g) \left(\sum_{|i,j,l|\leq n} \|(1 - \eta_R)\Gamma_{ij}^l\|_{W_{\gamma-1}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right) \|u_2\|_{W_{\rho}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Notice now that

$$\|(1 - \eta_R)\Gamma_{ij}^l\|_{L_{\gamma-1}^q(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq 2\|\Gamma_{ij}^l\|_{L_{\gamma-1}^q(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_{\frac{R}{2}}(0)})}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Similarly, since

$$\begin{aligned} \partial((1 - \eta_R)\Gamma_{ij}^l) &= (1 - \eta_R)\partial\Gamma_{ij}^l - \partial\eta_R\Gamma_{ij}^l, \\ &= (1 - \eta_R)\partial\Gamma_{ij}^l - R^{-1}(\partial\eta)(R^{-1}x)\Gamma_{ij}^l, \end{aligned}$$

we find

$$\|\partial((1 - \eta_R)\Gamma_{ij}^l)\|_{L_{\gamma-2}^q(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \|(1 - \eta_R)\partial\Gamma_{ij}^l\|_{L_{\gamma-2}^q(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|R^{-1}(\partial\eta)(R^{-1}\cdot)\Gamma_{ij}^l\|_{L_{\gamma-2}^q(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

But since

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |R^{-1}(\partial\eta)(R^{-1}x)\Gamma_{ij}^l|^q \sigma^{-(\gamma-2+\frac{n}{q})q} dx &= \int_{B_R \setminus \overline{B_{\frac{R}{2}}}} |R^{-1}(\partial\eta)(R^{-1}x)\Gamma_{ij}^l|^q \sigma^{-(\gamma-2+\frac{n}{q})q} dx, \\ &\leq \left(\sup_{x \in B_R \setminus \overline{B_{\frac{R}{2}}}} |\partial\eta(R^{-1}x)| \right)^q \int_{B_R \setminus \overline{B_{\frac{R}{2}}}} R^{-q} |\Gamma_{ij}^l|^q \sigma^{-(\gamma-2+\frac{n}{q})q} dx, \\ &\leq \|\partial\eta\|_{L^\infty(B_1(0))}^q \int_{B_R \setminus \overline{B_{\frac{R}{2}}}} |\Gamma_{ij}^l|^q |x|^{-q} \sigma^{-(\gamma-2+\frac{n}{q})q} dx, \\ &\leq C\|\partial\eta\|_{L^\infty(B_1(0))}^q \int_{B_R \setminus \overline{B_{\frac{R}{2}}}} |\Gamma_{ij}^l|^q \sigma^{-q} \sigma^{-(\gamma-2+\frac{n}{q})q} dx, \\ &\leq C\|\partial\eta\|_{L^\infty(B_1(0))}^q \int_{B_R \setminus \overline{B_{\frac{R}{2}}}} |\Gamma_{ij}^l|^q \sigma^{-(\gamma-1+\frac{n}{q})q} dx, \end{aligned}$$

where the constant $C = C(q) > 0$ appearing in the fourth-line above arises from the estimate $|x|^{-q} \leq C(q)(1 + |x|^2)^{-\frac{q}{2}}$ for any $|x| \geq 1$. The above estimate implies that

$$\|R^{-1}(\partial\eta)(R^{-1}\cdot)\Gamma_{ij}^l\|_{L_{\gamma-2}^q(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C(n, q)\|\Gamma_{ij}^l\|_{L_{\gamma-1}^q(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_{\frac{R}{2}}(0)})},$$

which put together with (A.8) implies

$$\|\partial((1 - \eta_R)\Gamma_{ij}^l)\|_{L_{\gamma-2}^q(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C'(n, q)\|\Gamma_{ij}^l\|_{W_{\gamma-1}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_{\frac{R}{2}}(0)})}.$$

This can be put together with (A.7) to obtain

$$\|((1 - \eta_R)\Gamma_{ij}^l)\|_{W_{\gamma-1}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C''(n, q)\|\Gamma_{ij}^l\|_{W_{\gamma-1}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_{\frac{R}{2}}(0)})}. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Now, since $\tau < \gamma < 0$, choosing R large enough, we furthermore have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Gamma_{ij}^l\|_{W_{\gamma-1}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_{\frac{R}{2}}(0)})} &\leq \sigma^{-(\gamma-\tau)} \left(\frac{R}{2}\right) \|\Gamma_{ij}^l\|_{W_{\tau-1}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_{\frac{R}{2}}(0)})}, \\ &\leq CR^{-(\gamma-\tau)} \|\Gamma_{ij}^l\|_{W_{\tau-1}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_{\frac{R}{2}}(0)})}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

for a constant independent of $R > 1$. Therefore, putting (A.6) together with (A.9) and (A.10), we find:

$$\|g^{ij}\Gamma_{ij}^l \partial_l u_2\|_{L_{\rho-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_R(0)})} \leq C(n, p, q, g)R^{-(\gamma-\tau)}\|u_2\|_{W_{\rho}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Thus, there are constants $C, C' > 0$, independent booth of u and R , such that,

$$\|u_2\|_{W_{\rho}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C(\|\Delta_g u_2\|_{L_{\rho-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + C'(n, p, q, g)(R^\tau + R^{-(\gamma-\tau)})\|u_2\|_{W_{\rho}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|u_2\|_{L_{\rho}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)})$$

Picking R sufficiently large, we can absorb the highest order term in the right-hand side into the left-hand side and obtain

$$\|u_2\|_{W_{\rho}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_2(n, p, q, g, R)(\|\Delta_g u_2\|_{L_{\rho-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|u_2\|_{L_{\rho}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}).$$

Once R has been fixed so that the above estimate holds, we deduce that

$$\|u_2\|_{W_{\rho}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_2(\|(1 - \chi_R)\Delta_g u\|_{L_{\rho-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|[\Delta_g, 1 - \chi_R]u\|_{L_{\rho-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|u\|_{L_{\rho}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}).$$

Using that $[\Delta_g, 1 - \chi_R]u = -2\langle \nabla \chi_R, \nabla u \rangle_g - u\Delta_g \chi_R$ is of first order on u and is supported in $B_{2R}(0)$ (since each term involved at least one derivative on χ_R), with the same kind of computations done after (A.4), we find

$$\|u_2\|_{W_{\rho}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_2(\|\Delta_g u\|_{L_{\rho-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(B_{2R}(0))} + \|u\|_{L_{\rho}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}).$$

Noticing now that the bounded set $B_{2R}(0)$ is fixed, since R has been fixed already, we once more appeal to the equivalence of weighted and unweighted norms on compacts to estimate $\|u\|_{W^{1,p}(B_{2R}(0))} \leq C(R)\|u\|_{W_{\rho}^{1,p}(B_{2R}(0))}$, and thus we find

$$\|u_2\|_{W_{\rho}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_3(n, p, q, g, R) \left(\|\Delta_g u\|_{L_{\rho-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|u\|_{W_{\rho}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right).$$

Recalling once more that the constant in (A.5) is also fixed, putting all of this together

$$\|u\|_{W_{\rho}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \|u_1\|_{W_{\rho}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|u_2\|_{W_{\rho}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \left(\|\Delta_g u\|_{L_{\rho-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|u\|_{W_{\rho}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right)$$

Finally, the interpolation inequality of Theorem 2.3 finishes the proof. \square

Let us now recall the following interpolation result, extracted from [51, Lemma 3.1]:

Lemma A.2. *Let $\chi \in C_0^\infty(B_2(0))$ be a cut-off function which is equal to one on $\overline{B_1(0)}$, and define $\chi_R(x) \doteq \chi(\frac{x}{R})$ for any $R > 1$. Given any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a constant $C_\epsilon > 0$, such that*

$$\sum_{|\alpha|=1} \|\chi_R \sigma^{1-\delta-\frac{n}{p}} \partial^\alpha u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \epsilon \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \|\chi_R^2 \sigma^{|\alpha|-\delta-\frac{n}{p}} \partial^\alpha u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + C_\epsilon \|u\|_{L_\delta^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

holds for all $u \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L_\delta^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Remark A.1. *Let us highlight that [51, Lemma 3.1] is stated under the stronger assumption that $u \in W^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, although it follows from the proof that the same result holds if $u \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L_{\delta}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

We shall exploit the above lemma in the following theorem, which represents our version of [6, Proposition 1.6].

Theorem A.3. *Let (M^n, g) be a $W_{\tau}^{2,q}$ -AE manifold with $q > \frac{n}{2}$ and $\tau < 0$. Letting p be a real number $1 < p \leq q$ such that $\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p} < \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{n}$, if $u \in L_{\delta}^p \cap L_{loc}^q$, $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\Delta_g u \in L_{\delta-2}^p$, then $u \in W_{\delta}^{2,p}$ and*

$$\|u\|_{W_{\delta}^{2,p}} \leq C \left(\|\Delta_g u\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p} + \|u\|_{L_{\delta}^p} \right). \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Proof. First, under our hypotheses, locally we have $\Delta_g = g^{ij} \partial_{ij} - g^{ij} \Gamma_{ij}^l \partial_l \in \mathcal{L}^2(W^{2,q})$ and thus Corollary 4.5 applies to it to show that $u \in L_{loc}^q$ and $\Delta_g u \in L_{loc}^p$ implies $u \in W_{loc}^{2,p}$. Then, assuming for simplicity M has only one end, we consider a partition of unity $\{\eta_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha=1}^N$, with $\{\eta_i\}_{i=1}^{N-1}$ covering the compact core of M and $\text{supp}(\eta_i) \subset U_i$,³³ while η_N is supported in the end $M \setminus \mathcal{K}$ of M , so that $u = \sum_{\alpha} \eta_{\alpha} u$, and fixing $\eta \doteq \eta_N$ we concentrate on the case of $v \doteq \eta u$, which we treat as an element of $W_{loc}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L_{\delta}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ which is supported on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}$. Consider then a cut-off function $\chi \in C_0^{\infty}(B_2(0))$ which is equal to one on $B_1(0)$, and then define $\chi_R(x) \doteq \chi\left(\frac{x}{R}\right)$ for some $R > 1$. Then, $\chi_R v$ is supported on $B_{2R}(0) \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial(\chi_R^2 v)(x) &= \chi_R^2(x) \partial v(x) + \partial \chi_R^2(x) v(x) = \chi_R^2(x) \partial v(x) + 2R^{-1} \chi_R \partial \chi \left(\frac{x}{R} \right) v(x), \\ \partial^2(\chi_R^2 v)(x) &= \chi_R^2(x) \partial^2 v(x) + 4R^{-1} \chi_R \partial \chi \left(\frac{x}{R} \right) \partial v(x) + 2R^{-2} \partial \chi \left(\frac{x}{R} \right) \partial \chi \left(\frac{x}{R} \right) v(x) \\ &\quad + 2R^{-2} \chi_R \partial^2 \chi \left(\frac{x}{R} \right) v(x) \end{aligned}$$

and we aim to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \|\chi_R^2 \sigma^{|\alpha| - \delta - \frac{n}{p}} \partial^{\alpha} v\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} &= \|\sigma^{2 - \delta - \frac{n}{p}} \chi_R^2 \partial^2 v\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\sigma^{1 - \delta - \frac{n}{p}} \chi_R^2 \partial v\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\chi_R^2 \sigma^{-\delta - \frac{n}{p}} v\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}, \\ &\leq C \left(\|\sigma^{2 - \delta - \frac{n}{p}} \partial^2(\chi_R^2 v)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|R^{-1} \chi_R \sigma^{2 - \delta - \frac{n}{p}} \partial v\|_{L^p(A_R)} \right. \\ &\quad + \|\sigma^{2 - \delta - \frac{n}{p}} R^{-2} v\|_{L^p(A_R)} + \|R^{-2} \chi_R \sigma^{2 - \delta - \frac{n}{p}} v\|_{L^p(A_R)} \\ &\quad + \|\sigma^{1 - \delta - \frac{n}{p}} \partial(\chi_R^2 v)\|_{L^p(B_{2R}(0))} + \|R^{-1} \chi_R \sigma^{1 - \delta - \frac{n}{p}} \partial v\|_{L^p(A_R)} \\ &\quad \left. + \|\sigma^{-\delta - \frac{n}{p}} \chi_R^2 v\|_{L^p(B_{2R}(0))} \right), \\ &\leq C' \left(\|\chi_R^2 v\|_{W_{\delta}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\chi_R \sigma^{1 - \delta - \frac{n}{p}} \partial v\|_{L^p(B_{2R}(0))} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\chi_R \sigma^{-\delta - \frac{n}{p}} v\|_{L^p(B_{2R}(0))} + \|\sigma^{-\delta - \frac{n}{p}} v\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where above $C, C' > 0$ are independent of R , and in the second estimate we have denoted by $A_R \doteq B_{2R}(0) \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}$ highlighting that $\text{supp}(\partial \chi_R) \subset A_R$. Also, in the third estimate we have made use of the fact that on A_R one has $|x| \leq 2R$ and thus, there is a constant $C'' > 0$, independent of R , such that:

$$\begin{aligned} \|R^{-1} \chi_R \sigma^{2 - \delta - \frac{n}{p}} \partial v\|_{L^p(A_R(0))} &\leq 2 \|(2R)^{-1} \chi_R \sigma^{2 - \delta - \frac{n}{p}} \partial v\|_{L^p(A_R(0))} \leq 2 \| |x|^{-1} \chi_R \sigma^{2 - \delta - \frac{n}{p}} \partial v \|_{L^p(A_R(0))}, \\ &\leq C'' \|\chi_R \sigma^{1 - \delta - \frac{n}{p}} \partial v\|_{L^p(A_R(0))}, \\ \|\sigma^{2 - \delta - \frac{n}{p}} R^{-2} v\|_{L^p(A_R)} &\leq C'' \|\sigma^{-\delta - \frac{n}{p}} v\|_{L^p(A_R)} \leq C'' \|\sigma^{-\delta - \frac{n}{p}} v\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}, \\ \|R^{-2} \chi_R \sigma^{2 - \delta - \frac{n}{p}} v\|_{L^p(A_R(0))} &\leq C'' \|\sigma^{-\delta - \frac{n}{p}} \chi_R v\|_{L^p(A_R(0))}, \\ \|R^{-1} \chi_R \sigma^{1 - \delta - \frac{n}{p}} \partial v\|_{L^p(A_R(0))} &\leq C'' \|\sigma^{-\delta - \frac{n}{p}} \chi_R \partial v\|_{L^p(A_R(0))} \leq C'' \|\sigma^{1 - \delta - \frac{n}{p}} \chi_R \partial v\|_{L^p(A_R(0))} \end{aligned}$$

³³We take the U_i sets as bounded subsets with smooth boundary, which is always possible.

We can apply the estimates Theorem A.2 to the first term in the right-hand side of (A.13), so that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\chi_R^2 v\|_{W_\delta^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} &\leq C_0(\|\Delta_g(\chi_R^2 v)\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\chi_R^2 v\|_{L_\delta^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}), \\ &\leq C_0(\|\chi_R^2 \Delta_g v\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|[\Delta_g, \chi_R^2]v\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\chi_R^2 v\|_{L_\delta^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$[\Delta_g, \chi_R^2]v = 2\langle \nabla \chi_R^2, \nabla v \rangle_g + v \Delta_g \chi_R^2,$$

which is compactly supported in the annulus $A_R = B_{2R}(0) \setminus \overline{B_R(0)}$. Therefore,

$$\|[\Delta_g, \chi_R^2]v\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(A_R)} \leq 2\|\nabla \chi_R^2\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(A_R)} \|\nabla v\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(A_R)} + \|v \Delta_g \chi_R^2\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(A_R)}, \quad (\text{A.14})$$

and using that

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_k \chi_R^2 &= 2R^{-1} \chi_R \partial_k \chi \left(\frac{x}{R} \right), \\ \partial_{lk} \chi_R^2 &= 2R^{-2} \chi_R \partial_{lk} \chi \left(\frac{x}{R} \right) + 2R^{-2} \partial_l \chi \left(\frac{x}{R} \right) \partial_k \chi \left(\frac{x}{R} \right),\end{aligned}$$

we find a constant $C = C(g) > 0$, independent of R , such that:

$$\begin{aligned}\|v \Delta_g \chi_R^2\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(A_R)} &\leq C(g)(\|v \partial^2 \chi_R^2\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(A_R)} + \|v \Gamma \partial \chi_R^2\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(A_R)}), \\ &\leq C'(g)(R^{-2} \|v\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(A_R)} + R^{-1} \|\partial \chi(R^{-1} \cdot) \Gamma \chi_R v\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}), \\ &\leq C''(n, p, q, g)(R^{-2} \|v\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(A_R)} + R^{-1} \|\partial \chi(R^{-1} \cdot) \Gamma\|_{W_{\tau-1}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_1})} \|\chi_R v\|_{W_\delta^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_1})}), \\ &\leq C'''(n, p, q, g) \left(R^{-2} \|v\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(A_R)} + R^{-1} \left(\|\chi_R v\|_{L_{\delta-1}^p(B_{2R} \setminus \overline{B_1})} + \|\partial(\chi_R v)\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(B_{2R} \setminus \overline{B_1})} \right) \right), \\ &\leq C'''(n, p, q, g)(R^{-2} \|v\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(A_R)} + R^{-1} \|\chi_R v\|_{L_{\delta-1}^p(B_{2R} \setminus \overline{B_1})} + R^{-1} \|\chi_R \partial v\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(B_{2R} \setminus \overline{B_1})}),\end{aligned}$$

where in the third inequality we used the multiplication property on \mathbb{R}^n , then the compact support of χ to localise, and then the factor $\|\partial \chi(R^{-1} \cdot) \Gamma\|_{W_{\tau-1}^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_1})}$ is estimated along the same lines as (A.9).

Using these expressions back in (A.14), we find a new constant $C = C(n, p, q, g) > 0$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned}\|[\Delta_g, \chi_R^2]v\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(A_R)} &\leq C(R^{-1} \|\chi_R \nabla v\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(B_{2R} \setminus \overline{B_1})} + R^{-2} \|v\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(B_{2R} \setminus \overline{B_1})} + R^{-1} \|\chi_R v\|_{L_{\delta-1}^p(B_{2R} \setminus \overline{B_1})}), \\ &= C(R^{-1} \|\chi_R \nabla v \sigma^{-\delta+2-\frac{n}{p}}\|_{L^p(B_{2R} \setminus \overline{B_1})} + R^{-2} \|v \sigma^{-\delta+2-\frac{n}{p}}\|_{L^p(B_{2R} \setminus \overline{B_1})} \\ &\quad + R^{-1} \|\chi_R v \sigma^{-\delta+1-\frac{n}{p}}\|_{L^p(B_{2R} \setminus \overline{B_1})}), \\ &\leq C(\|\chi_R \nabla v |x|^{-1} \sigma^{-\delta+2-\frac{n}{p}}\|_{L^p(B_{2R} \setminus \overline{B_1})} + \|v |x|^{-2} \sigma^{-\delta+2-\frac{n}{p}}\|_{L^p(B_{2R} \setminus \overline{B_1})} \\ &\quad + \|v |x|^{-1} \sigma^{-\delta+1-\frac{n}{p}}\|_{L^p(B_{2R} \setminus \overline{B_1})}), \\ &\leq C'(n, p, q, g)(\|\chi_R \nabla v \sigma^{-\delta+1-\frac{n}{p}}\|_{L^p(B_{2R} \setminus \overline{B_1})} + \|v \sigma^{-\delta-\frac{n}{p}}\|_{L^p(B_{2R} \setminus \overline{B_1})}), \\ &\leq C'(n, p, q, g)(\|\chi_R \nabla v \sigma^{1-\delta-\frac{n}{p}}\|_{L^p(B_{2R} \setminus \overline{B_1})} + \|v\|_{L_\delta^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}),\end{aligned}$$

We therefore find another constant $C = C(n, p, q, g) > 0$ such that

$$\|\chi_R^2 v\|_{W_\delta^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C(\|\chi_R^2 \Delta_g v\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\chi_R \partial v \sigma^{1-\delta-\frac{n}{p}}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|v\|_{L_\delta^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}),$$

which gives us

$$\sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \|\chi_R^2 \sigma^{|\alpha|-\delta-\frac{n}{p}} \partial^\alpha v\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \left(\|\chi_R^2 \Delta_g v\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\chi_R \sigma^{1-\delta-\frac{n}{p}} \partial v\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|v\|_{L_\delta^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right)$$

We can estimate the first order term above using (A.11), so as to obtain

$$\sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \|\chi_R^2 \sigma^{|\alpha|-\delta-\frac{n}{p}} \partial^\alpha v\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \left(\|\chi_R^2 \Delta_g v\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \epsilon \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \|\chi_R^2 \sigma^{|\alpha|-\delta-\frac{n}{p}} \partial^\alpha u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + (1 + C_\epsilon) \|u\|_{L_\delta^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right)$$

Therefore, picking $\epsilon < \frac{1}{C(n,p,q,g)}$ in (A.11), we find that there is some other constant $C' > 0$ independent of $R > 1$ and v such that

$$\sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \|\chi_R^2 \sigma^{|\alpha| - \delta - \frac{n}{p}} \partial^\alpha v\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C' \left(\|\chi_R^2 \Delta_g v\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|u\|_{L_\delta^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right)$$

As long as $\Delta_g v \in L_{\delta-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we can take the limit $R \rightarrow \infty$ in the above inequality to obtain $v \in W_\delta^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, with the estimate:

$$\|v\|_{W_\delta^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2} \|\sigma^{|\alpha| - \delta - \frac{n}{p}} \partial^\alpha v\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C' \left(\|\Delta_g v\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|u\|_{L_\delta^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right).$$

Now recalling that $v = \eta u$, this already proves that $u \in W_\delta^{2,p}(M)$, and putting together the above estimate with the corresponding interior estimates for each $\eta_i u$ supported in the compact core, we find (A.12). \square

Corollary A.1. *Let (M^n, g) be a C_τ^∞ -AE manifold with $\tau < 0$. If $u \in L_\delta^p(M)$, $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, $p > 1$, and $\Delta_g u \in W_{\delta-2}^{k,p}(M)$, then $u \in W_\delta^{k+2,p}(M)$.*

Proof. The case $k = 0$ is given by Theorem A.3, and to establish the general case we work by induction. Assuming the claim holds for some $k \geq 0$ and that $\Delta_g u \in W_{\delta-2}^{k+1,p}$, we have a priori from the inductive hypothesis that $u \in W_\delta^{k+2,p}$. Considering a cut-off function η equal to zero in the compact core of M and to one in a neighbourhood of infinity, we have

$$\Delta_g(\eta \partial_i u) = \eta \Delta_g(\partial_i u) + 2\langle \nabla \eta, \nabla(\partial_i u) \rangle_g + \partial_i u \Delta_g \eta. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Noticing that

$$\begin{aligned} \eta \Delta_g(\partial_i u) &= \eta \left(g^{ab} \partial_{ab}(\partial_i u) - g^{ab} \Gamma_{ab}^l \partial_{li} u \right), \\ &= \eta \left(\partial_i \left(g^{ab} \partial_{ab} u \right) - \partial_i g^{ab} \partial_{ab} u - \partial_i \left(g^{ab} \Gamma_{ab}^l \partial_{li} u \right) + g^{ab} \partial_i \Gamma_{ab}^l \partial_{li} u + \partial_i g^{ab} \Gamma_{ab}^l \partial_{li} u \right), \\ &= \eta \left(\partial_i (\Delta_g u) - \partial_i g^{ab} \partial_{ab} u + g^{ab} \partial_i \Gamma_{ab}^l \partial_{li} u + \partial_i g^{ab} \Gamma_{ab}^l \partial_{li} u \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since the last two terms in (A.15) are compactly supported and

$$\begin{aligned} \eta \partial_i g^{ab} \partial_{ab} u &\in C_{\tau-1}^\infty \otimes W_{\delta-2}^{k,p} \hookrightarrow W_{\delta-3}^{k,p}, \\ \eta g^{ab} \partial_i \Gamma_{ab}^l \partial_{li} u &\in L^\infty \otimes C_{\tau-2}^\infty \otimes W_{\delta-1}^{k+1,p} \hookrightarrow W_{\delta-3}^{k,p}, \\ \eta \partial_i g^{ab} \Gamma_{ab}^l \partial_{li} u &\in C_{\tau-1}^\infty \otimes C_{\tau-1}^\infty \otimes W_{\delta-1}^{k+1,p} \hookrightarrow W_{\delta-3}^{k,p} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\Delta_g(\eta \partial_i u) - \eta \partial_i (\Delta_g u) \in W_{\delta-3}^{k,p}$, and $\Delta_g u \in W_{\delta-2}^{k+1,p}$. Then, the inductive hypothesis implies

$$\Delta_g(\eta \partial_i u) \in W_{\delta-3}^{k,p} \implies \eta \partial_i u \in W_{\delta-1}^{k+2,p}.$$

Therefore, we find

$$\Delta_g u \in W_{\delta-2}^{k+1,p} \implies \eta u \in W_\delta^{k+2,p} \text{ and } \eta \partial_i u \in W_{\delta-1}^{k+2,p} \implies \eta u \in W_\delta^{k+3,p},$$

which proves the inductive step and general claim follows. \square

We shall now present semi-Fedholm properties for Δ_g , but it is exactly at this point that the *exceptional values* of the weight-parameter come into play crucially. Let recall that on an n -dimensional manifold they are given by the the real numbers $\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{3-n, \dots, -1\}$ and thus one says that δ is a non-exceptional weight if it does not lie in such a set of exceptional values. Furthermore, given $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, one defines $k^-(\delta)$ to be the maximum exceptional value such that $k^-(\delta) \leq \delta$.

Theorem A.4. *Let (M^n, g) be a $W_\tau^{2,q}$ -AE manifold with $q > \frac{n}{2}$ and $\tau < 0$. If $1 < p \leq q$ and δ is non-exceptional, then the map $\Delta_g : W_\delta^{2,p} \rightarrow L_{\delta-2}^p$ is semi-Fredholm.*

Proof. The proof in this case follows from the arguments of [6, Theorem 1.10]. First, let $S_R \hookrightarrow M$ be a large sphere contained in the end of M , define Ω_R to be the interior domain such that $\partial\Omega_R = S_R$ and $A_R \doteq \Omega_{2R} \setminus \overline{\Omega_R}$. Then use a cut-off function χ_R such that $0 \leq \chi_R \leq 1$ satisfies $\chi_R(x) = 1$ on $\overline{\Omega_R}$ while $\text{supp}(\chi_R) \subset \Omega_{2R}$. Let $\|\cdot\|_{O_{p,R}}$ denote the operator norm for maps $W_\delta^{2,p}(M) \rightarrow L_{\delta-2}^p(M)$ restricted to functions with support in $M \setminus \overline{\Omega_R}$, so that multiplication properties guarantee that $\|\Delta_g - \Delta\|_{O_{p,R}} = o(1)$ as $R \rightarrow \infty$.³⁴ Then, one can follow the proof of [6, Theorem 1.10] between equations (1.27) and (1.28) to obtain

$$\|u_\infty\|_{W_\delta^{2,p}(M)} \leq C \left(\|\Delta_g u\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(M)} + \|u\|_{W_\delta^{1,p}(A_R)} \right),$$

where $u_\infty = (1 - \chi_R)u$, although one subtle clarification is in order. In [6, Theorem 1.10], the first estimate after equation (1.27) appeals to a sharp estimate obtained in [6, Theorem 1.7, equation (1.22)]. This last sharp estimate is obtained (among other things) appealing to [6, Proposition 1.6, equation (1.19)],³⁵ which (as stated within the proposition) we have commented seems to be out of the scope of standard regularity results, motivating all this revision in the first place. Notice nonetheless, that Theorem A.3 is our self-contained version of [6, Proposition 1.6] with the estimate (A.12) replacing equation (1.19) in [6]. In such a case, when Theorem A.3 is applied to the Euclidean Laplacian, then the exponent p can be taken in the interval $1 < p < \infty$, which would agree with [6, Proposition 1.6] in this special case, which is the one used within the proof of [6, Theorem 1.7, equation (1.22)], and thus the argument in between equations (1.27) and (1.28) within the proof of [6, Theorem 1.10] is sound.

Then, we can apply estimate (A.12) to $u_0 \doteq \chi_R u \in W_\delta^{2,p}$ so as to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_0\|_{W_\delta^{2,p}(M)} &\leq C \left(\|\Delta_g u_0\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(M)} + \|u_0\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(\Omega_{2R})} \right), \\ &\leq C' \left(\|\chi_R \Delta_g u\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(M)} + \|u\|_{W_\delta^{1,p}(A_R)} + \|\chi_R u\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(\Omega_{2R})} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for some other constant $C > 0$ independent of u , it follows that:

$$\|u\|_{W_\delta^{2,p}(M)} \leq C \left(\|\Delta_g u\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(M)} + \|u\|_{W_\delta^{1,p}(A_R)} + \|u\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(\Omega_{2R})} \right),$$

Having already fixed R in the above procedure, the above estimate implies the following one:

$$\|u\|_{W_\delta^{2,p}(M)} \leq C' \left(\|\Delta_g u\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(M)} + \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega_{2R})} \right), \quad (\text{A.16})$$

for a constant C' depending on such a choice of R . We may then apply the interpolation inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega_{2R})} &\leq \epsilon \|u\|_{W^{2,p}(\Omega_{2R})} + C_\epsilon \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega_{2R})} \leq \epsilon C''(R) \|u\|_{W_\delta^{2,p}(\Omega_{2R})} + C_\epsilon \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega_{2R})}, \\ &\leq \epsilon C''(R) \|u\|_{W_\delta^{2,p}(M)} + C_\epsilon \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega_{2R})}, \end{aligned}$$

and absorb the second order term into the left hand side of (A.16) by picking ϵ small enough, finally obtaining:

$$\|u\|_{W_\delta^{2,p}} \leq C \left(\|\Delta_g u\|_{L_{\delta-2}^p(M)} + \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega_{2R})} \right),$$

for sufficiently large R . This *broken scale estimate* allows one to continue as in [6, Theorem 1.10] to establish the semi-Fredholm property via standard functional analytic methods. \square

³⁴This is a difference between our proof and the one in [6, Theorem 1.10]: there, the functional hypotheses on the coefficients are weaker. In particular, there the author admits operators with zero order coefficients in L_{r-2}^r for $r > \frac{n}{2}$. Nevertheless, our multiplication properties do not guarantee $L_{r-2}^r(\mathbb{R}^n) \otimes W_\delta^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow L_{\delta-2}^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, even for $p > \frac{n}{2}$, unless one assumes a priori $r \geq p > \frac{n}{2}$ as well.

³⁵See [6, Page 669].

We now want to present Fredholm properties of Δ_g , and for that one needs a more explicit characterisation of its adjoint map. With this in mind, let us recall:

$$W_{-\delta-n}^{-k,p'}(M) \doteq \left(W_{\delta}^{k,p}(M) \right)'.$$

Proposition A.5. *Let (M^n, g) be a $W_{\tau}^{2,q}$ -AE manifold, with $q > \frac{n}{2}$ and $\tau < 0$. Letting $1 < p \leq q$ and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, the Laplace operator extends by duality to a bounded map $\Delta_g : L_{2-\delta-n}^{p'}(M) \rightarrow W_{-\delta-n}^{-2,p'}(M)$ and, moreover, $\Delta_g^*|_{L_{2-\delta-n}^{p'}(M)} = \sqrt{\det(g)}\Delta_g|_{L_{2-\delta-n}^{p'}(M)}$.*

Proof. Let U denote either a bounded coordinate patch in M or the domain of an asymptotic coordinate chart on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}$, and in either case associate coordinates $\{x^i\}_{i=1}^n$, where we write $\Delta_g u = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det(g)}} \partial_i \left(\sqrt{\det(g)} g^{ij} \partial_j u \right)$. By duality, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_i &= (-\partial_i)^* : L_{2-\delta-n}^{p'}(U) \rightarrow W_{1-\delta-n}^{-1,p'}(U), \\ \partial_i &: W_{1-\delta-n}^{-1,p'}(U) \rightarrow W_{-\delta-n}^{-2,p'}(U) \end{aligned}$$

are bounded maps. Similarly, given a function $f \in W_{\tau}^{2,q}(U)$, the multiplication map

$$M_f : W_{1-\delta-n}^{-1,p'}(U) \rightarrow W_{1-\delta-n}^{-1,p'}(U),$$

acting via $(M_f u)(v) = u(fv)$ for all $v \in \mathring{W}_{\delta-1}^{1,p}(U)$, will be bounded provided that M_f is bounded on $\mathring{W}_{\delta-1}^{1,p}(U)$.³⁶ Using the multiplication property of Theorem 2.4, this holds as long as $1 < p \leq q$, $q > \frac{n}{2}$ and $\tau < 0$, which hold by hypothesis. Therefore, we see that the map

$$\begin{aligned} L_{2-\delta-n}^{p'}(U) &\rightarrow W_{1-\delta-n}^{-1,p'}(U), \\ u &\mapsto \sqrt{\det(g)} g^{ij} \partial_j u, \end{aligned}$$

is well-defined and bounded, and then

$$\begin{aligned} L_{2-\delta-n}^{p'}(U) &\rightarrow W_{-\delta-n}^{-2,p'}(U), \\ u &\mapsto \partial_i \left(\sqrt{\det(g)} g^{ij} \partial_j u \right), \end{aligned}$$

is again well-defined and bounded. Finally, we analyse the case of the multiplication map M_f acting on $W_{-\delta-n}^{-2,p'}(U)$, which by duality will be a bounded map with range in $W_{-\delta-n}^{-2,p'}(U)$ iff $M_f : \mathring{W}_{\delta}^{2,p}(U) \rightarrow \mathring{W}_{\delta}^{2,p}(U)$ is a bounded map. Once more from Theorem 2.4, this holds as long as $1 < p \leq q$, $q > \frac{n}{2}$ and $\tau < 0$. These statements and a partition of unity argument then show that $\Delta_g : L_{2-\delta-n}^{p'}(M) \rightarrow W_{\delta-n}^{-2,p'}(M)$ is a bounded map.

Let us then appeal to the Riemannian measure induced by g to identify $L_{2-\delta-n}^{p'}(M) \cong (L_{\delta-2}^p(M))'$ via the $L^2(M, dV_g)$ inner-product:

$$u(v) = \int_M uv dV_g, \quad u \in L_{2-\delta-n}^{p'}(M) \text{ and } v \in L_{\delta-2}^p(M).$$

Then, take a coordinate cover of the form $\{U_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha=1}^{N+1}$, with $\{U_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha=1}^N$ covering the compact core of M and $U_{N+1} \cong \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}$, and then consider a partition of unity $\{\eta_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha=1}^{N+1}$ subordinate to it, and decompose any $\phi \in W_{\delta}^{2,p}(M)$ via $\phi = \sum_{\alpha} \eta_{\alpha} \phi$. Given $u \in L_{2-\delta-n}^{p'}(M)$, it then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} [u](\Delta_g \phi) &= \sum_{\alpha} [u](\Delta_g \phi_{\alpha}) = \sum_{\alpha} \langle u, \Delta_g \phi_{\alpha} \rangle_{L^2(M, dV_g)} = \sum_{\alpha} \langle \sqrt{\det(g)} u, \Delta_g \phi_{\alpha} \rangle_{(U_{\alpha}, \delta)}, \\ &= \sum_{\alpha} \langle \partial_i \left(\sqrt{\det(g)} g^{ij} \partial_j u \right), \phi_{\alpha} \rangle_{(U_{\alpha}, \delta)} = \sum_{\alpha} \langle \sqrt{\det(g)} \Delta_g u, \phi_{\alpha} \rangle_{(U_{\alpha}, \delta)}, \\ &= (\sqrt{\det(g)} \Delta_g u)(\phi), \end{aligned}$$

which proves that $\sqrt{\det(g)} \Delta_g|_{L_{2-\delta-n}^{p'}(M)} = \Delta_g^*|_{L_{2-\delta-n}^{p'}(M)}$, which is a bounded map. \square

³⁶ $\mathring{W}_{\delta}^{k,p}(U)$ denotes the closure of $C_0^{\infty}(U)$ in the $\mathring{W}_{\delta}^{k,p}$ -norm.

Using the above results, we find that:

Corollary A.2. *Let (M^n, g) be a C_τ^∞ -AE manifold with $\tau < 0$. If $1 < p < \infty$ and δ is non-exceptional, then the map $\Delta_g : W_\delta^{2,p}(M) \rightarrow L_{\delta-2}^p(M)$ is Fredholm.*

Proof. We know this map is semi-Fredholm, so we need only establish that $\text{Ker}(\Delta_g^* : L_{2-\delta-n}^{p'}(M) \rightarrow W_{-\delta-n}^{-2,p'}(M))$ is finite dimensional. Proposition A.5 guarantees that

$$u \in \text{Ker} \left(\Delta_g^*|_{L_{2-\delta-n}^{p'}(M)} \right) \iff u \in \text{Ker} \left(\Delta_g|_{L_{2-\delta-n}^{p'}(M)} \right),$$

thus, Theorem A.3 guarantees that $u \in \text{Ker}(\Delta_g : L_{2-\delta-n}^{p'} \rightarrow W_{-\delta-n}^{-2,p'}) \subset W_{2-n-\delta}^{2,p'}$. Then, Theorem A.4 shows that $\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W_{2-n-\delta}^{2,p'}}) = \text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{L_{2-\delta-n}^{p'}})$ is finite dimensional. That is,

$$\dim(\text{Ker}(\Delta_g^*|_{L_{2-\delta-n}^{p'}(M)})) = \dim(\text{Ker}(\Delta_g|_{W_{2-\delta-n}^{2,p'}(M)})) < \infty,$$

which shows that $\Delta_g : W_\delta^{2,p}(M) \rightarrow L_{\delta-2}^p(M)$ is Fredholm. \square

Finally, by approximation arguments we find:

Corollary A.3. *Let (M^n, g) be a $W_\tau^{2,q}$ -AE manifold with $q > \frac{n}{2}$ and $\tau < 0$. If $1 < p \leq q$ and δ is non-exceptional, then the map $\Delta_g : W_\delta^{2,p} \rightarrow L_{\delta-2}^p$ is Fredholm.*

Proof. First of all, from Theorem A.4 we know $\Delta_g : W_\delta^{2,p} \rightarrow L_{\delta-2}^p$ is semi-Fredholm. Furthermore, we can consider a sequence $\{g_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ of C_τ^∞ -AE metrics such that $g - g_j \xrightarrow{W_\tau^{2,q}} 0$, from which it follows

$$\|\Delta_g - \Delta_{g_j}\|_{\text{Op}(W_\delta^{2,p}; L_{\delta-2}^p)} \xrightarrow{j \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Thus, since by Corollary A.2 we know that each Δ_{g_j} is Fredholm, appealing to the stability of the index of a semi-Fredholm operator [33, Theorem 19.1.5], we know that the index of Δ_g is finite and thus its cokernel must also be finite dimensional, establishing that that Δ_g is Fredholm under our hypotheses. \square

B Appendix II: Compactification and decompactification of rough metrics

The goal of this appendix is to present Lemma 5.2 of [21], but we shall state this lemma highlighting some details which follow from its proof as it appears in this reference, although this additional information does not appear in the statement of [21, Lemma 5.2]. Therefore, for the benefit of the reader, we shall outline the main ideas of the proof, highlighting the role of the additional structure which enters into our statement.

Lemma B.1. *Let $p > \frac{n}{2}$ and $\tau = \frac{n}{p} - 2$ be a real numbers, so that $\tau \in (-2, 0)$, and suppose that (M^n, g) is a $W_\tau^{2,p}$ -AE manifold with respect to a structure of infinity with coordinates $\{z^i\}_{i=1}^n$. Then, there is a conformal factor ϕ , which is equal to $|z|^{2-n}$ in a neighbourhood of infinity, such that the metric $\bar{g} \doteq \phi^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g$ extends to a $W^{2,p}(\bar{M})$ metric on the one-point compactification \bar{M} of M , and $\phi \in C^\infty(\hat{M} \setminus \{p_\infty\})$, where $p_\infty \in \hat{M}^n$ denotes the added point at infinity. Moreover, the inversion $x = \frac{z}{|z|^2}$ provides a coordinate system around p_∞ with the properties that $x(p_\infty) = 0$ and $\bar{g}(\partial_{x^i}, \partial_{x^j})|_{p_\infty} = \delta_{ij}$.*

Conversely, suppose that (\bar{M}^n, \bar{g}) is a closed manifold with $\bar{g} \in W^{2,p}$, $p > \frac{n}{2}$ and $p \neq n$. Given a point $p \in \bar{M}$ and a coordinate system $\{x^i\}_{i=1}^n$ around p such that $\bar{g}(\partial_{x^i}, \partial_{x^j})|_p = \delta_{ij}$, which in the case $p > n$ we furthermore demand to be a normal coordinate system, then there is a conformal factor $\phi \in C^\infty(\bar{M} \setminus \{p\})$ such that $\phi = |x|^{2-n}$ in a neighbourhood of p and $(M \doteq \bar{M} \setminus \{p\}, g \doteq \phi^{\frac{4}{n-2}} \bar{g})$ is a $W_\tau^{2,p}$ -AE manifold, with $\tau = \frac{n}{p} - 2$, with respect to the structure of infinity given by the inverted coordinates $z^i = \frac{x^i}{|x|^2}$.

Proof. We shall follow the proof given in [21, Lemma 5.2], highlighting some key steps. To prove the first claim, one starts noticing that outside a compact set we have

$$g_{ij} \doteq g(\partial_{z^i}, \partial_{z^j}) = \delta_{ij} + k_{ij},$$

where $k_{ij} \in W_{\tau}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}, \Phi_z)$. Then, we define the conformal factor as $\phi = |z|^{2-n}$ in a neighbourhood of infinity and extend this function to a smooth function on the rest of M , and we consider the inversion $x^i \doteq \frac{z^i}{|z|^2}$, mapping $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_1(0)} \rightarrow B_1(0) \setminus \{0\}$. In a neighbourhood of $0 \in B_1(0)$, one then notices that:

$$\bar{g}_{ij} \doteq \phi^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g(\partial_{x^i}, \partial_{x^j}) = \delta_{ij} + k_{ij} - \frac{2}{|x|^2} (k_{aj} x^a x^j + k_{ai} x^a x^i) + \frac{4k_{ab} x^a x^b x^i x^j}{|x|^4}.$$

Clearly, since $k \rightarrow 0$ as $|z| \rightarrow \infty$, the above shows that we can define $\bar{g}_{ij}(0) = \delta_{ij}$, $\bar{k}_{ij}(0) = 0$, and extend $\phi^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g$ continuously to the one point compactification of M . The goal is now to show that

$$\bar{k}_{ij}(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x = 0 \\ k_{ij} - \frac{2}{|x|^2} (k_{aj} x^a x^j + k_{ai} x^a x^i) + \frac{4k_{ab} x^a x^b x^i x^j}{|x|^4}, & \text{if } x \neq 0, \end{cases}$$

is in $W^{2,p}(B_1(0))$ with respect to the differential structure given by the inverted coordinates $\{x^i\}_{i=1}^n$. Clearly, $\bar{g} \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(\bar{M} \setminus \{p\})$, so establishing the above regularity claim provides the desired result. Also, since this only needs to be shown in a neighbourhood of the origin, we can assume that \bar{k}_{ij} is compactly supported within $B_1(0)$, if necessary by first using a cut-off function. Finally, since a point is removable for $W^{1,p}(B_1(0))$ for any $n \geq 3$, we need to show first that $\bar{k}_{ij} \in W^{1,p}(B_1(0) \setminus \{p\})$, establishing $\bar{k}_{ij} \in W^{1,p}(B_1(0))$, and then $\partial \bar{k}_{ij} \in W^{1,p}(B_1(0) \setminus \{p\})$, establishing $\partial \bar{k}_{ij} \in W^{1,p}(B_1(0))$ and hence $\bar{k}_{ij} \in W^{2,p}(B_1(0))$. This amounts to showing that the weak derivatives computed on $B_1(0) \setminus \{0\}$ and given by

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_x \bar{k}| &= O(|\partial_z k|)O(|z|^2) + O(|k|)O(|z|) \doteq \bar{k}', \\ |\partial_x^2 \bar{k}| &= O(|\partial_z^2 k|)O(|z|^4) + O(|\partial_z k|)O(|z|^3) + O(|k|)O(|z|^2) \doteq \bar{k}'', \end{aligned}$$

define $L^p(B_1(0))$ functions. The computations of [21, Lemma 5.2] between equations (5.5)-(5.7) show that this is actually the case, and therefore the first claim holds.

To prove the converse statement, we start considering a closed Riemannian manifold (\bar{M}^n, \bar{g}) , with $\bar{g} \in W^{2,p}$, we select a point $p \in \bar{M}$ and a coordinate system $\{x^i\}_{i=1}^n$ around p such that $\bar{g}_{ij} \doteq \bar{g}(\partial_{x^i}, \partial_{x^j})|_p = \delta_{ij}$. In case $p > n$, we furthermore demand such coordinate system to be normal, so that $\partial_x g_{ij}|_0 = 0$ as well. Within some small coordinate ball B of p we then write

$$\bar{g}_{ij}(x) = \delta_{ij} + \bar{k}_{ij}(x),$$

with $\bar{k}_{ij} \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(B)$, and in case $p > n$ we also have $\partial_x k_{ij}|_0 = 0$. Since below we shall be only interested in establishing local properties of \bar{k} around 0, we can assume that \bar{k} is compactly supported within B , if necessary by multiplying by an appropriate cut-off function. Now, following [21, Lemma 5.2], one claims that there is a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_B \frac{|\bar{k}|^p}{|x|^{2p}} dx &\leq C \int_B |\partial_x^2 \bar{k}|^p dx, \\ \int_B \frac{|\partial_x \bar{k}|^p}{|x|^p} dx &\leq C \int_B |\partial_x^2 \bar{k}|^p dx \end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

Then, we consider the inversion $B \setminus \{p\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B'}$, given by $z(x) = \frac{x}{|x|^2}$, which provides a structure of infinity Φ_z for $M \doteq \bar{M} \setminus \{p\}$. We furthermore set ϕ to be a smooth positive function on M such that $\phi = |x|^{2-n}$ on $B \setminus \{p\}$, and then define $g \doteq \phi^{\frac{4}{n-2}} \bar{g}$. The goal is then to prove that $g(\partial_{z^i}, \partial_{z^j}) \in W_{\tau}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B'}, \Phi_z)$, with $\tau = \frac{n}{p} - 2$. Accepting (B.1), this follows along similar lines than in the previous

implication and can be checked explicitly in [21, Lemma 5.2] between equations (5.10)-(5.14). Let us then comment on the proof of (B.1).

In [21, Lemma 5.2, equation (5.15)] it is shown that [6, Theorem 1.3] implies that

$$\int_B \frac{|f|^p}{|x|^{2p}} dx \leq C_1 \int_B \frac{|\partial f|^p}{|x|^p} dx \leq C_2 \int_B |\partial_x^2 f|^p dx \quad (\text{B.2})$$

holds for all smooth function $f \in C_0^\infty(B)$ which vanish in a neighbourhood of p . The next key step is then to build a sequence $\{\bar{k}_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset C_0^\infty(B)$ such that each \bar{k}_j vanishes in a neighbourhood of p and such that $\bar{k}_j \xrightarrow{W^{2,p}(B)} \bar{k}$, then apply the above inequality to the sequence and pass to the limit appropriately. The last step is done within [21, Lemma 5.2, equation (5.16)], and the corresponding sequence can be built as a consequence, for instance, of Proposition B.1 below. \square

Proposition B.1. *Let $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ stand for a ball around the origin and $n \geq 3$. Then:*

1. *Given $1 < p < n$ and a function $\bar{k} \in W_0^{1,p}(B)$, there is a sequence $\{\bar{k}_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset C_0^\infty(B)$ such that all \bar{k}_j vanish in a neighbourhood of the origin and $\bar{k}_j \xrightarrow{W^{1,p}} \bar{k}$;*
2. *If $p > n$, $\bar{k} \in W_0^{1,p}(B)$ and $\bar{k}|_0 = 0$, there is a sequence $\{\bar{k}_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset C_0^\infty(B)$ such that all \bar{k}_j vanish in a neighbourhood of the origin and $\bar{k}_j \xrightarrow{W^{1,p}} \bar{k}$;*
3. *Given $\frac{n}{2} < p < n$ and a function $\bar{k} \in W_0^{2,p}(B)$ such that $\bar{k}|_0 = 0$, there is a sequence $\{\bar{k}_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset C_0^\infty(B)$ such that all \bar{k}_j vanish in a neighbourhood of the origin and $\bar{k}_j \xrightarrow{W^{2,p}} \bar{k}$;*
4. *Finally, if $p > n$, $\bar{k} \in W_0^{2,p}(B)$, $\bar{k}|_0 = 0$, and $\partial \bar{k}|_0 = 0$, then there is a sequence $\{\bar{k}_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset C_0^\infty(B)$ such that all \bar{k}_j vanish in a neighbourhood of the origin and $\bar{k}_j \xrightarrow{W^{2,p}} \bar{k}$.*

Proof. As a common framework for all the above items, since $\bar{k} \in W_0^{l,p}(B)$ with $l = 1, 2$, we know there is some sequence $\{\tilde{k}_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset C_0^\infty(B)$ such that

$$\tilde{k}_j \xrightarrow{W^{l,p}(B)} \bar{k}.$$

Let us then consider a cut-off function $\eta \in C_0^\infty(B_2(0))$ which is equal to one on $\overline{B_1(0)}$, and then, given $\epsilon > 0$, the scaled function $\eta_\epsilon(x) \doteq \eta(\epsilon^{-1}x) \in C_0^\infty(B_{2\epsilon}(0))$ which is equal to one on $B_\epsilon(0)$. We can then consider the cut-off

$$\chi_\epsilon(x) \doteq 1 - \eta_\epsilon(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } |x| \leq \epsilon, \\ 1, & \text{if } |x| \geq 2\epsilon, \end{cases}$$

and the sequence $\{\bar{k}_j \doteq \chi_{\epsilon_j} \tilde{k}_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset C_0^\infty(B)$ with $\epsilon_j \doteq 2^{-j}$. This sequence has the property that each element vanishes in a neighbourhood of the origin, and we aim to show that it still converges to \bar{k} in $W^{l,p}(B)$ under each restriction on p mentioned above.

With the above in mind, first notice that

$$\|\bar{k}_j - \bar{k}\|_{L^p(B)} \leq \|(\chi_{\epsilon_j} - 1)\tilde{k}_j\|_{L^p(B)} + \|\tilde{k}_j - \bar{k}\|_{L^p(B)} = \|\eta_{\epsilon_j} \tilde{k}_j\|_{L^p(B)} + \|\tilde{k}_j - \bar{k}\|_{L^p(B)}, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

the second term in the right-hand side of the above expression goes to zero by hypothesis, while for the first term we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\eta_{\epsilon_j} \tilde{k}_j\|_{L^p(B)} &= \|\eta_{\epsilon_j} \tilde{k}_j\|_{L^p(B_{2\epsilon_j})} \leq \|\tilde{k}_j\|_{L^p(B_{2\epsilon_j})} \leq \|\tilde{k}_j - \bar{k}\|_{L^p(B_{2\epsilon_j})} + \|\bar{k}\|_{L^p(B_{2\epsilon_j})}, \\ &\lesssim \|\tilde{k}_j - \bar{k}\|_{L^p(B)} + \|\bar{k}\|_{L^p(B_{2\epsilon_j})} \xrightarrow{j \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain that $\tilde{k}_j \xrightarrow[j \rightarrow \infty]{L^p(B)} \bar{k}$. Then, notice that

$$\partial_x \bar{k}_j(x) = \chi_{\epsilon_j}(x) \partial_x \tilde{k}_j(x) + \partial_x \chi_{\epsilon_j}(x) \tilde{k}_j(x) = \chi_{\epsilon_j}(x) \partial_x \tilde{k}_j(x) - \epsilon_j^{-1} \partial_x \eta(\epsilon_j^{-1} x) \tilde{k}_j(x).$$

Now, the fact that $\chi_{\epsilon_j} \partial_x \tilde{k}_j \xrightarrow[j \rightarrow \infty]{L^p(B)} \partial_x \bar{k}$ follows along the same lines as in the case of (B.3). Thus, we need to show that the second term in the right-hand side of the above expression converges to zero under each of the conditions in the proposition.

We first notice that $\text{supp}(\partial \eta(\epsilon_j^{-1} \cdot)) \subset A_{\epsilon_j} \doteq B_{2\epsilon_j} \setminus \overline{B_{\epsilon_j}}$ and is uniformly bounded on it. Let us simplify notations by denoting $u_j \doteq \partial \eta(\epsilon_j^{-1} \cdot) \tilde{k}_j \in W_0^{1,p}(B_{2\epsilon_j})$, and notice that

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon_j^p} \int_B |u_j|^p dx = \frac{1}{\epsilon_j^p} \int_{A_{\epsilon_j}} |u_j|^p dx.$$

If $1 < p < n$, then we estimate the above appealing to $W_0^{1,p}(B_{2\epsilon_j}) \hookrightarrow L^q(B_{2\epsilon_j}) \hookrightarrow L^p(B_{2\epsilon_j})$, for $q = \frac{np}{n-p}$, with explicit estimates

$$\int_{A_{\epsilon_j}} |u_j|^p dx \leq (\mu(B_{2\epsilon_j}))^{1-\frac{p}{q}} \|u_j\|_{L^q(B_{2\epsilon_j})}^p \lesssim \epsilon_j^{\frac{n-np}{q}} \|u_j\|_{L^q(B_{2\epsilon_j})}^p,$$

where $\mu(B_{2\epsilon_j})$ stands for the volume of the ball of radius $2\epsilon_j$. Then, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon_j^p} \int_B |u_j|^p dx \leq C(n) \epsilon_j^{\frac{n-np}{q}-p} \|u_j\|_{L^q(B_{2\epsilon_j})}^p \leq C(n) \|u_j\|_{L^q(B_{2\epsilon_j})}^p,$$

where we have used that $\frac{np}{q} = n - p$ and thus $n - \frac{np}{q} - p = 0$. Notice then that since $\partial \eta(\epsilon_j^{-1} \cdot)$ are uniformly bounded, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_j\|_{L^q(B_{2\epsilon_j})} &\leq \|\partial \eta(\epsilon_j^{-1} \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(B_{2\epsilon_j})} \|\tilde{k}_j\|_{L^q(B_{2\epsilon_j})}, \\ &\leq \|\partial \eta\|_{L^\infty(B_2)} \left(\|\bar{k}\|_{L^q(B_{2\epsilon_j})} + \|\bar{k} - \tilde{k}_j\|_{L^q(B_{2\epsilon_j})} \right) \xrightarrow[j \rightarrow \infty]{} 0 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

All this shows that $\partial_x \bar{k}_j \xrightarrow[j \rightarrow \infty]{L^p(B)} \partial_x \bar{k}$ when $1 < p < n$, and thus establishes item 1.

If $p > n$, then we have $W_0^{1,p}(B) \hookrightarrow C^{0,\alpha}(B)$ for $\alpha = 1 - \frac{n}{p}$ [2, Chapter 4, Theorem 4.12, Part II], and since $\bar{k}|_0 = 0$, this implies that $|\bar{k}| = O(|x|^\alpha)$, and from $\tilde{k}_j \xrightarrow{C^{0,\alpha}} \bar{k}$ we can actually chose the sequence $\{\tilde{k}_j\}$ satisfying $\tilde{k}_j(0) = 0$ for all j . Thus,

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon_j^p} \int_B |u_j|^p dx = \frac{1}{\epsilon_j^p} \int_{B_{2\epsilon_j}} |u_j|^p dx \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon_j^p} \sup_{x \in B_{2\epsilon_j}} |\partial \eta(\epsilon_j^{-1} x)|^p \int_{B_{2\epsilon_j}} |\tilde{k}_j|^p dx = \frac{1}{\epsilon_j^p} \sup_{y \in B_2} |\partial \eta(y)|^p \int_{B_{2\epsilon_j}} |\tilde{k}_j|^p dx.$$

To proceed further, we can estimate

$$\int_{B_{2\epsilon_j}} |\tilde{k}_j|^p(x) dx \leq \left(\sup_{\substack{x \in B_{2\epsilon_j} \\ |x| \neq 0}} \frac{|\tilde{k}_j(x)|}{|x|^{1-\frac{n}{p}}} \right)^p \int_{B_{2\epsilon_j}} |x|^{p-n} dx \leq \left(\sup_{\substack{x, y \in B_{2\epsilon_j} \\ |x-y| \neq 0}} \frac{|\tilde{k}_j(x) - \tilde{k}_j(y)|}{|x-y|^{1-\frac{n}{p}}} \right)^p C(n, p) \epsilon_j^p,$$

where we have used that the chosen sequence \tilde{k}_j satisfies $\tilde{k}_j(0) = 0$ for all j . Putting the above estimates together, we find a constant $C'(n, p)$, depending only on n and p , such that

$$\|\epsilon_j^{-1} u_j\|_{L^p(B)} \leq C'(n, p) \sup_{\substack{x, y \in B_{2\epsilon_j} \\ |x-y| \neq 0}} \frac{|\tilde{k}_j(x) - \tilde{k}_j(y)|}{|x-y|^{1-\frac{n}{p}}}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

In order to further estimate the right-hand side of the above expression we appeal to a rather sharp estimate, which follows from [2, Chapter 4, Lemma 4.28]. Denoting by $Q_{4\epsilon_j}$ the n -cube centred at the

origin and with sides of size $4\epsilon_j$, examination of the first part of the proof of this lemma guarantees that, given points $(x, y) \in Q_{4\epsilon_j}$ such that $|x - y| < 4\epsilon_j$, there is a constant $K = K(n, p) > 0$ such that the following estimate holds for all functions $u \in C^\infty(Q_{4\epsilon_j})$:

$$\sup_{\substack{x, y \in Q_{4\epsilon_j} \\ 0 < |x - y| < 4\epsilon_j}} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|^{1 - \frac{n}{p}}} \leq K(n, p) \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(Q_{4\epsilon_j})}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Noticing then that for $(x, y) \in B_{2\epsilon_j} \subset Q_{4\epsilon_j}$ we always have $|x - y| < 4\epsilon_j$, the estimate (B.6) implies:

$$\sup_{\substack{x, y \in B_{2\epsilon_j} \\ |x - y| \neq 0}} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|^{1 - \frac{n}{p}}} \leq K(n, p) \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(Q_{4\epsilon_j})}. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Putting together (B.5) with (B.7) applied to \tilde{k}_j we find

$$\|\epsilon_j^{-1} u_j\|_{L^p(B)} \leq K'(n, p) \|\nabla \tilde{k}_j\|_{L^p(Q_{4\epsilon_j})} \leq K'(n, p) \left(\|\nabla \tilde{k}_j - \nabla \tilde{k}\|_{L^p(B)} + \|\nabla \tilde{k}\|_{L^p(Q_{4\epsilon_j})} \right) \xrightarrow{j \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad (\text{B.8})$$

finally establishing

$$\partial_x \bar{k}_j \xrightarrow{j \rightarrow \infty} \partial_x \bar{k}, \quad (\text{B.9})$$

which proves item 2.

Let us now consider items 3 and 4, and thus analyse the convergence of

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x^i x^a}^2 \bar{k}_j(x) &= \chi_{\epsilon_j}(x) \partial_{x^i x^a}^2 \tilde{k}_j(x) - \epsilon_j^{-1} (\partial_{x^i} \eta(\epsilon_j^{-1} x) \partial_{x^a} \tilde{k}_j(x) + \partial_{x^a} \eta(\epsilon_j^{-1} x) \partial_{x^i} \tilde{k}_j(x)) \\ &\quad - \epsilon_j^{-2} \partial_{x^i x^a}^2 \eta(\epsilon_j^{-1} x) \tilde{k}_j(x). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.10})$$

First of all, the same arguments as in (B.3) show that $\chi_{\epsilon_j}(x) \partial_x^2 \tilde{k}_j(x) \xrightarrow{j \rightarrow \infty} \partial^2 \bar{k}$, and also since $\partial_x \eta(\epsilon_j^{-1} x) \partial_x \tilde{k}_j(x) \in W_0^{1,p}(B_{2\epsilon_j})$, the same arguments as in (B.4) (when $\frac{n}{2} < p < n$) and (B.8) (when $p > n$) can be applied to show that

$$\epsilon_j^{-1} \partial_x \eta(\epsilon_j^{-1} \cdot) \partial_x \tilde{k}_j \xrightarrow{j \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

To analyse the last term in (B.10), first assume that $\frac{n}{2} < p < n$, so that $W_0^{2,p}(B_{2\epsilon_j}) \hookrightarrow W_0^{1,q}(B_{2\epsilon_j})$, with $q \doteq \frac{np}{n-p} > n$. We can then estimate

$$\epsilon_j^{-2p} \int_{B_{2\epsilon_j}} |\partial_x^2 \eta(\epsilon_j^{-1} x) \tilde{k}_j(x)|^p dx \leq \epsilon_j^{-2p} \|\partial_x^2 \eta(\epsilon_j^{-1} \cdot)\|_{C^0(B_{2\epsilon_j})}^p \int_{B_{2\epsilon_j}} |\tilde{k}_j|^p dx = \epsilon_j^{-2p} \|\partial^2 \eta\|_{C^0(B_2)}^p \int_{B_{2\epsilon_j}} |\tilde{k}_j|^p dx,$$

where as in the proof of the estimates before (B.5), we have

$$\int_{B_{2\epsilon_j}} |\tilde{k}_j|^p dx \leq \left(\sup_{\substack{x \in B_{2\epsilon_j} \\ |x| \neq 0}} \frac{|\tilde{k}_j(x)|}{|x|^{1 - \frac{n}{q}}} \right)^p \int_{B_{2\epsilon_j}} |x|^{p - \frac{np}{q}} dx \leq \left(\sup_{\substack{x, y \in B_{2\epsilon_j} \\ |x - y| \neq 0}} \frac{|\tilde{k}_j(x) - \tilde{k}_j(y)|}{|x - y|^{1 - \frac{n}{q}}} \right)^p C(n, p) \epsilon_j^{p - \frac{np}{q} + n}.$$

Putting together the above estimates, we find a constant $C' = C'(n, p) > 0$, such that

$$\epsilon_j^{-2} \|\tilde{k}_j\|_{L^p(B_{2\epsilon_j})} \leq C'(n, p) \sup_{\substack{x, y \in B_{2\epsilon_j} \\ |x - y| \neq 0}} \frac{|\tilde{k}_j(x) - \tilde{k}_j(y)|}{|x - y|^{1 - \frac{n}{q}}} \epsilon_j^{-1 - \frac{n}{q} + \frac{n}{p}} = C'(n, p) \sup_{\substack{x, y \in B_{2\epsilon_j} \\ |x - y| \neq 0}} \frac{|\tilde{k}_j(x) - \tilde{k}_j(y)|}{|x - y|^{1 - \frac{n}{q}}}.$$

Using once more the estimate (B.7), we find

$$\epsilon_j^{-2} \|\tilde{k}_j\|_{L^p(B_{2\epsilon_j})} \leq K'(n, p) \|\nabla \tilde{k}_j\|_{L^q(Q_{4\epsilon_j})} \leq K'(n, p) \left(\|\nabla \tilde{k}_j - \nabla \tilde{k}\|_{L^q(B)} + \|\nabla \tilde{k}\|_{L^q(Q_{4\epsilon_j})} \right) \xrightarrow{j \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

which establishes case 3.

Finally, if $p > n$, we use $\partial_x \bar{k}|_0 = 0$, so that we can take the sequence \tilde{k}_j satisfying $\tilde{k}_j|_0, \partial_x \tilde{k}_j|_0 = 0$. We furthermore have the optimal embedding $W_0^{2,p}(B_{2\epsilon_j}) \hookrightarrow C^{1,\alpha}(B_{2\epsilon_j})$, this time with $\alpha \doteq 1 - \frac{n}{p}$, and thus from the mean value inequality

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{k}_j(x)| &\leq |\partial_x \tilde{k}_j(cx)||x|, \text{ for any } x \in B_{2\epsilon_j} \text{ and some } 0 \leq c \leq 1, \\ &\leq \left(\sup_{\substack{x \in B_{2\epsilon_j} \\ |x| \neq 0}} \frac{|\partial_x \tilde{k}_j(cx)|}{|x|^{1-\frac{n}{p}}} \right) |x|^{1+1-\frac{n}{p}} \leq c^{1-\frac{n}{p}} |x|^{2-\frac{n}{p}} \left(\sup_{\substack{x \in B_{2\epsilon_j} \\ |x| \neq 0}} \frac{|\partial_x \tilde{k}_j(cx)|}{|cx|^{1-\frac{n}{p}}} \right), \\ &\leq C(n, p) |x|^{2-\frac{n}{p}} \sup_{\substack{x, y \in B_{2\epsilon_j} \\ |x-y| \neq 0}} \frac{|\partial_x \tilde{k}_j(x) - \partial_x \tilde{k}_j(y)|}{|x-y|^{1-\frac{n}{p}}} \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_j^{-2p} \int_{A_{\epsilon_j}} |\partial_x^2 \eta(\epsilon_j^{-1}x) \tilde{k}_j(x)|^p dx &\leq \epsilon_j^{-2p} \sup_{x \in B_{2\epsilon_j}} |\partial_x^2 \eta(\epsilon_j^{-1}\cdot)|^p \int_{B_{2\epsilon_j}} |\tilde{k}_j|^p dx = \epsilon_j^{-2p} \sup_{y \in B_2} |\partial^2 \eta(y)|^p \int_{B_{2\epsilon_j}} |\tilde{k}_j|^p dx, \\ &\leq C'''(n, p) \epsilon_j^{-2p} \left(\sup_{\substack{x, y \in B_{2\epsilon_j} \\ |x-y| \neq 0}} \frac{|\partial_x \tilde{k}_j(x) - \partial_x \tilde{k}_j(y)|}{|x-y|^{1-\frac{n}{p}}} \right)^p \int_{B_{2\epsilon_j}} |x|^{(2-\frac{n}{p})p} dx, \\ &\leq C''''(n, p) \left(\sup_{\substack{x, y \in B_{2\epsilon_j} \\ |x-y| \neq 0}} \frac{|\partial_x \tilde{k}_j(x) - \partial_x \tilde{k}_j(y)|}{|x-y|^{1-\frac{n}{p}}} \right)^p. \end{aligned}$$

Using once more (B.7) applied to $\partial_x \tilde{k}_j \in C^\infty(Q_{4\epsilon_j})$, we find

$$\|\epsilon_j^{-2} \partial_x^2 \eta(\epsilon_j^{-1}\cdot) \tilde{k}_j\|_{L^p(B_{2\epsilon_j})} \leq K'(n, p) \|\nabla^2 \tilde{k}_j\|_{L^p(Q_{4\epsilon_j})} \leq K'(n, p) \left(\|\nabla^2 \tilde{k}_j - \nabla^2 \tilde{k}\|_{L^p(B)} + \|\nabla^2 \tilde{k}\|_{L^p(Q_{4\epsilon_j})} \right),$$

where the right-hand side of the above expression goes to zero as $j \rightarrow \infty$, since $\tilde{k}_j \xrightarrow{j \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{k}$ by hypothesis, which finally establishes case 4 in the proposition. \square

The above approximation argument can be used to deduce the following result:

Proposition B.2. *Let $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ stand for a ball around the origin and $n \geq 3$. Letting $p > \frac{n}{2}$, if $V \in W^{-1,p}(B)$ is supported at the origin, then $V \equiv 0$.*

Proof. Recalling that $W^{-1,p}(B) = (W_0^{1,p'}(B))'$, under our present conditions we can compute that

$$\frac{1}{p'} = 1 - \frac{1}{p} > 1 - \frac{2}{n} = \frac{n-2}{n} \iff p' < \frac{n}{n-2}.$$

Since $\frac{n}{n-2} \leq n \iff n \geq 3$, we always obtain $p' < n$. Therefore, given any $\phi \in W_0^{1,p'}(B)$, we can use item 1 of Proposition B.1 to obtain a sequence $\{\phi_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset C_0^\infty(B)$ such that $\phi_j \xrightarrow{j \rightarrow \infty} \phi$ and all the elements in the sequence are supported away from the origin. Therefore,

$$V(\phi) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} V(\phi_j) = 0,$$

where the last equality follows since V is supported at the origin by hypothesis. Since in the above argument $\phi \in W_0^{1,p'}(B)$ was arbitrary, it then follows that $V \equiv 0$. \square

References

- [1] Robert A. Adams. *Sobolev spaces*. English. Vol. 65. Pure Appl. Math., Academic Press. Academic Press, New York, NY, 1975.
- [2] Robert A. Adams and John J. F. Fournier. *Sobolev spaces*. English. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Academic Press, 2003. ISBN: 0-12-044143-8.
- [3] Thierry Aubin. *Some nonlinear problems in Riemannian geometry*. English. Springer Monogr. Math. Berlin: Springer, 1998. ISBN: 3-540-60752-8.
- [4] Rodrigo Avalos, Paul Laurain, and Nicolas Marque. “Rigidity Theorems for Asymptotically Euclidean Q -singular Spaces”. In: *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2204.03607 (Apr. 2022), arXiv:2204.03607. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2204.03607. arXiv: 2204.03607 [math.DG].
- [5] Robert Bartnik. “Phase space for the Einstein equations”. In: *Comm. Anal. Geom* 13.5 (2005), pp. 845–885.
- [6] Robert Bartnik. “The mass of an asymptotically flat manifold”. In: *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 39.5 (1986), pp. 661–693. ISSN: 0010-3640. DOI: 10.1002/cpa.3160390505. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpa>
- [7] A. Behzadan and M. Holst. “Multiplication in Sobolev spaces, revisited”. In: *Arkiv för Matematik* 59.2 (). DOI: 10.4310/ARKIV.2021.v59.n2.a2. URL: <https://par.nsf.gov/biblio/10376426>.
- [8] Ali Behzadan and Michael Holst. “Sobolev-Slobodeckij Spaces on Compact Manifolds, Revisited”. In: *Mathematics* 10.3 (2022). ISSN: 2227-7390. DOI: 10.3390/math10030522. URL: <https://www.mdpi>.
- [9] R Beig and N óMurchadha. “The Poincaré group as the symmetry group of canonical general relativity”. In: *Annals of Physics* 174.2 (1987), pp. 463–498. ISSN: 0003-4916. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-4916\(87\)90037-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-4916(87)90037-6). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0003491687900376>.
- [10] Haim Breyis. “On a conjecture of J. Serrin”. In: *Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl* 19 (2008), pp. 335–338.
- [11] Haim Brezis. *Functional analysis, Sobolev spaces and partial differential equations*. English. Universitext. New York, NY: Springer, 2011. ISBN: 978-0-387-70913-0.
- [12] A. P. Calderón. “Intermediate spaces and interpolation, the complex method”. English. In: *Stud. Math.* 24 (1964), pp. 113–190. ISSN: 0039-3223. DOI: 10.4064/sm-24-2-113-190.
- [13] Murray Cantor. “Elliptic operators and the decomposition of tensor fields”. In: *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 5 (1981), pp. 235–262. DOI: 10.1090/S0273-0979-1981-14934-X.
- [14] Carla Cederbaum and Anna Sakovich. “On center of mass and foliations by constant space-time mean curvature surfaces for isolated systems in General Relativity”. In: *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 60.214 (2015).
- [15] Yvonne Choquet-Bruhat and Demetrios Christodoulou. “Elliptic Systems in $H_{s,\delta}$ Spaces on Manifolds Which are Euclidean at Infinity”. In: *Acta Mathematica* 146 (1981), pp. 129–150. DOI: 10.1007/BF02392460.
- [16] Yvonne Choquet-Bruhat and Cécile DeWitt-Morette. *Analysis, manifolds and physics. Part II: 92 applications*. English. Amsterdam etc.: North-Holland, 1989. ISBN: 0-444-87071-7.
- [17] J. Corvino and R. M. Schoen. “On The Asymptotics for the Vacuum Einstein Constraint Equations”. In: *J. Differential Geom.* 73.2 (2006), pp. 185–217.
- [18] Justin Corvino and Richard M. Schoen. “On the Asymptotics for the Vacuum Einstein Constraint Equations”. In: *Journal of Differential Geometry* 73.2 (2006), pp. 185–217. DOI: 10.4310/jdg/1146169910. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4310/jdg/1146169910>.
- [19] Justin Corvino and Haotian Wu. “On the center of mass of isolated systems”. In: *Classical and Quantum Gravity* 25.8 (2008), p. 085008. DOI: 10.1088/0264-9381/25/8/085008. URL: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0264-9381/25/8/085008>.
- [20] Dennis M. Deturck and Jerry L. Kazdan. “Some regularity theorems in riemannian geometry”. In: *Annales scientifiques de l’École Normale Supérieure Ser. 4*, 14.3 (1981), pp. 249–260. DOI: 10.24033/asens.1405. URL: <http://www.numdam.org/articles/10.24033/asens.1405/>.

- [21] James Dilts and David Maxwell. “Yamabe classification and prescribed scalar curvature in the asymptotically Euclidean setting”. English. In: *Commun. Anal. Geom.* 26.5 (2018), pp. 1127–1168. ISSN: 1019-8385. DOI: 10.4310/CAG.2018.v26.n5.a5.
- [22] M. Eichmair and T. Koerber. “The Willmore Center of Mass of Initial Data Sets”. In: *Commun. Math. Phys.* 392 (2022), 483–516. DOI: 10.1007/s00220-022-04349-2.
- [23] M. Eichmair and J. Metzger. “Unique isoperimetric foliations of asymptotically at manifolds in all dimensions”. In: *Invent. Math.* 194 (2013), 591–630.
- [24] G.B. Folland. *Introduction to Partial Differential Equations*. Mathematical Notes Series. Princeton University Press, 1995. ISBN: 9780691043616. URL: <https://books.google.de/books?id=c0WFd3X\R20>
- [25] D. Gilbarg and N. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Classics in Mathematics. Reprint of the 1998 edition. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001, pp. xiv+517. ISBN: 3-540-41160-7.
- [26] Marc Herzlich. “Compactification conforme des variétés asymptotiquement plates”. fre. In: *Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France* 125.1 (1997), pp. 55–92. URL: <http://eudml.org/doc/87758>.
- [27] M. Holst, G. Nagy, and G. Tsogtgerel. “Rough solutions of the Einstein constraints on closed manifolds without near-CMC conditions”. In: *Comm. Math. Phys.* 288.2 (2009), pp. 547–613. ISSN: 0010-3616. DOI: 10.1007/s00220-009-0743-2. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-009-0743-2>
- [28] Michael Holst, David Maxwell, and Gantumur Tsogtgerel. “A Scaling Approach to Elliptic Theory for Geometrically-Natural Differential Operators with Sobolev-Type Coefficients”. In: *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2306.15842 (June 2023), arXiv:2306.15842. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2306.15842. arXiv: 2306.15842 [math.AP].
- [29] Michael Holst, Caleb Meier, and Gantumur Tsogtgerel. “Non-CMC Solutions of the Einstein Constraint Equations on Compact Manifolds with Apparent Horizon Boundaries”. In: *Comm. Math. Phys.* 357 (2018), pp. 467–517.
- [30] Michael Holst, Gabriel Nagy, and Gantumur Tsogtgerel. “Rough solutions of the Einstein constraint equations on Closed Manifolds without Near CMC Conditions”. In: *Comm. Math. Phys.* 288 (2009), pp. 547–613.
- [31] Michael Holst and Gantumur Tsogtgerel. “The Lichnerowicz Equation on Compact Manifolds with Boundary”. In: *Class. Quantum Grav.* 30 (2013), p. 205011.
- [32] Lars Hörmander. *The analysis of linear partial differential operators. II: Differential operators with constant coefficients. Reprint of the 1983 edition*. English. Reprint of the 1983 edition. Berlin: Springer, 2005, pp. viii + 390. ISBN: 3-540-22516-1/pbk.
- [33] Lars Hörmander. *The analysis of linear partial differential operators. III: Pseudo-differential operators*. English. Vol. 274. Grundlehren Math. Wiss. Springer, Cham, 1985.
- [34] Lan-Hsuan Huang. “On the center of mass of isolated systems with general asymptotics”. In: *Classical Quantum Gravity* 26.1 (2009), pp. 015012, 25. ISSN: 0264-9381. DOI: 10.1088/0264-9381/26/1/015012. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1088/0264-9381/26/1/015012>.
- [35] Lan-Hsuan Huang. “Solutions of special asymptotics to the Einstein constraint equations”. In: *Classical Quantum Gravity* 27.24 (2010), pp. 245002, 10. ISSN: 0264-9381. DOI: 10.1088/0264-9381/27/24/245002. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1088/0264-9381/27/24/245002>.
- [36] G. Huisken and S. T. Yau. “Definition of center of mass for isolated physical systems and unique foliations by stable spheres with constant mean curvature”. In: *Invent. Math.* 124 (1996), 281–311.
- [37] Tianling Jin, Vladimir Maz’ya, and Jean Van Schaftingen. “Pathological solutions to elliptic problems in divergence form with continuous coefficients”. In: *Comptes Rendus Mathématique* 347.13 (2009), pp. 773–778. ISSN: 1631-073X. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crma.2009.05.008>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1631073X09001952>.
- [38] Vesa Julin, Tony Liimatainen, and Mikko Salo. “p-harmonic coordinates for Hölder metrics and applications”. In: *Comm. Anal. and Geom.* 25.2 (2017), 395–430.

- [39] D.A. La Manna, C. Leone, and R Schiattarella. “On the regularity of very weak solutions for linear elliptic equations in divergence form”. In: *Nonlinear Differ. Equ. Appl.* 27 (2020), p. 43.
- [40] D.A. Lee. *Geometric Relativity*. Graduate studies in mathematics. American Mathematical Society, 2019. ISBN: 9781470454050. URL: <https://books.google.de/books?id=qXwkzAEACAAJ>.
- [41] John M. Lee and Thomas H. Parker. “The Yamabe problem”. In: *Bulletin (New Series) of the American Mathematical Society* 17.1 (1987), pp. 37–91.
- [42] Robert B. Lockhart. “Fredholm properties of a class of elliptic operators on non-compact manifolds”. In: *Duke Mathematical Journal* 48.1 (1981), pp. 289–312. DOI: 10.1215/S0012-7094-81-04817-1. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1215/S0012-7094-81-04817-1>.
- [43] David Maxwell. “Rough solutions of the Einstein constraint equations”. In: *J. reine angew. Math.* 590 (2006), pp. 1–29.
- [44] David Maxwell. “Rough solutions of the Einstein constraint equations on Compact Manifolds”. In: *J. Hyper. Differ. Eqns* 2 (2005), pp. 521–546.
- [45] David Maxwell. “Solutions of the Einstein Constraint Equations with Apparent Horizon Boundaries”. In: *Commun. Math. Phys.* 253 (2005), pp. 561–583.
- [46] Robert C. McOwen. “The behavior of the laplacian on weighted sobolev spaces”. In: *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 32.6 (1979), pp. 783–795. DOI: 10.1002/cpa.3160320604. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/cpa.3160320604>.
- [47] J. Metzger. “Foliations of asymptotically flat 3-manifolds by 2-surfaces of prescribed mean curvature”. In: *Journal of Differential Geometry* 77.2 (2007), pp. 201–236. DOI: 10.4310/jdg/1191860394. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4310/jdg/1191860394>.
- [48] C.B. Morrey. *Multiple Integrals in the Calculus of Variations*. American Mathematical Society, 1964. URL: <https://books.google.de/books?id=NCzvAAAAMAAJ>.
- [49] C. Nerz. “Foliations by spheres with constant expansion for isolated systems without asymptotic symmetry”. In: *J. Differential Geom.* 109.2 (2018), p. 257289.
- [50] C. Nerz. “Foliations by stable spheres with constant mean curvature for isolated systems without asymptotic symmetry”. In: *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 52.2 (2015), p. 19111946.
- [51] Louis Nirenberg and Homer F Walker. “The null spaces of elliptic partial differential operators in \mathbb{R}^n ”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 42.2 (1973), pp. 271–301. ISSN: 0022-247X. DOI: 10.1016/0022-247X(73)90138-8. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022247X73901388>.
- [52] R. S. Palais. *Foundations of global non-linear analysis*. English. Math. Lect. Note Ser. The Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Company, Reading, MA, 1968.
- [53] Tullio Regge and Claudio Teitelboim. “Role of surface integrals in the Hamiltonian formulation of general relativity”. In: *Annals of Physics* 88.1 (1974), pp. 286–318. ISSN: 0003-4916. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-4916\(74\)90404-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-4916(74)90404-7). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0003491674904047>.
- [54] Richard Schoen and Shing Tung Yau. “On the proof of the positive mass conjecture in general relativity”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 65.1 (1979), pp. 45–76.
- [55] James Serrin. “Pathological solutions of elliptic differential equations”. In: *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa - Scienze Fisiche e Matematiche* 18.3 (1964), pp. 385–387.
- [56] Michael E. Taylor. *Partial differential equations I. Basic theory*. Second. Vol. 115. Applied Mathematical Sciences. Springer, New York, 2011, pp. xxii+654. ISBN: 978-1-4419-7054-1. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4419-7055-8. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-7055-8>.
- [57] Michael E. Taylor. *Partial differential equations. III: Nonlinear equations*. English. 2nd ed. Vol. 117. Appl. Math. Sci. New York, NY: Springer, 2011. ISBN: 978-1-4419-7048-0; 978-1-4419-7049-7. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4419-7049-7.
- [58] Michael E. Taylor. *Tools for PDE. Pseudodifferential operators, paradifferential operators, and layer potentials*. English. Vol. 81. Math. Surv. Monogr. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2000. ISBN: 0-8218-2633-6.

- [59] Hans Triebel. *Interpolation theory, function spaces, differential operators*. English. 2nd rev. a. enl. ed. Leipzig: Barth, 1995. ISBN: 3-335-00420-5.
- [60] N. Trudinger. “Linear elliptic operators with measurable coefficients”. In: *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (3)* 27 (1973), pp. 265–308. ISSN: 0391-173X.
- [61] Edward Witten. “A new proof of the positive energy theorem”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 80.1 (1981), 381–402.
- [62] H. Zhang. “The Yamabe Problem for Distributional Curvature”. In: *J. Geom. Anal.* 33.312 (2023). DOI: 10.1007/s12220-023-01366-y.
- [63] Wei Zhang and Jiguang Bao. “Regularity of very weak solutions for elliptic equation of divergence form”. In: *Journal of Functional Analysis* 262 (2011), pp. 1867–1878.