

HOMOGENIZATION ON PARALLELIZABLE RIEMANNIAN MANIFOLDS

DANIEL FARACO, LUIS GUIJARRO, YAROSLAV KURYLEV, AND ALBERTO RUIZ

Dedicated to the memory of our colleague and friend Slava Kurylev

ABSTRACT. We consider the problem of finding the homogenization limit of oscillating linear elliptic equations in an arbitrary parallelizable manifold (M, g, Γ) . We replicate the concept of two-scale convergence by pulling back tensors defined on the torus bundle $\mathbb{T}M$ to the manifold M . The process consists of two steps: localization in the slow variable through Voronoi domains, and inducing local periodicity in the fast variable from the local exponential map in combination with the geometry of the torus bundle. The procedure yields explicit cell formulae for the homogenization limit, and as a byproduct a theory of two-scale convergence of tensors of arbitrary order.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000): 35R30, 35J15, 30C62, 53C21.

1. INTRODUCTION

The mathematical model known as the theory of periodic homogenization is used to describe the overall behavior of microscopic structures. Its roots can be traced back to the concept of G -convergence introduced by Spagnolo, generalized later by the H -convergence of Murat and Tartar, and it has since become a fundamental concept in the field of partial differential equations over the past four decades. The archetypal example comes from considering a unit cube Y and a bounded domain Ω in \mathbb{R}^n , a Y -periodic function $\sigma : \Omega \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and the corresponding differential operators $A_\epsilon := \operatorname{div}(\sigma(x, \frac{x}{\epsilon})\nabla)$. As $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, the solutions u_ϵ to the corresponding elliptic problem $A_\epsilon u_\epsilon = f$ converge to some function u that solves the limit equation $\operatorname{div}(\sigma^*\nabla u) = f$, where σ^* is given by the classical cell formula

$$\sigma_{ij}^*(x) = \int_Y \sigma(x, y) [\nabla_y w_i(x, y) + e_i, \nabla_y w_j(x, y) + e_j] dy.$$

Here $w_i(x, y)$ is the Y -periodic solution to the cell problem

$$-\operatorname{div}_y(\sigma(x, y) [\nabla_y w_i(p, v) + e_i]) = 0$$

See for example the monographs [2, 5, 8, 10, 17, 27, 34, 44] for basic reference, although the number of variants and applications is enormous.

The aim of our research is to investigate from an intrinsic viewpoint such oscillating PDE's in a general Riemannian manifold (M, g) , and more importantly, to obtain explicit cell formulae which are amenable to computations. Notice that a frontal obstacle for this is the lack of the concept of periodicity in a general Riemannian manifold. Partial advances in this direction appear in [16], where the authors put conditions on the fundamental group of the manifold that allows them to homogenize on certain Abelian covers of the original manifold. Interestingly, the probabilistic approach to homogenization (see e.g [6]) has been adapted to manifolds with ergodic geodesic flow by Pak [38]. This is done using the tangent space at one fixed point and mapping it to the manifold with the exponential map.

Date: April 22, 2024.

D.Faraco, L.Guijarro and A.Ruiz acknowledge financial support from the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation through the Severo Ochoa Program for Centers of Excellence in R&D (CEX2019-000904-S) and by the PID2021-124195NB-C32, from the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness through research program MTM2017-85934-C3-2-P2, from CAM through the Line of Excellence for University Teaching Staff between CAM and UAM, and from ERC Advanced Grant 834728. Y.Kurylev was partially funded by EP/R002207/1 (Nonlinear geometric inverse problems) funded by EPSRC.

Our starting point is the observation that tangent spaces can be always endowed with the symmetries of Euclidean geometry. Interestingly, this naturally leads to consider models where at each point in the manifold the symmetries might differ. The notion of parallelizable manifold seems tailored to describe this situation. An n -dimensional manifold (M, g) is *parallelizable* if there is a smooth non-degenerate frame $\Gamma(p) = \{e_i(p)\}_{i=1}^n$ of vector fields defined in the whole manifold; in more geometrical terms, this can also be formulated as the tangent bundle of the manifold being trivial. This condition can be topologically restrictive (for instance, it forces the vanishing of every characteristic class of M), but it allows nonetheless for numerous examples that were not considered in previous approaches. For instance, all closed 3-dimensional manifolds and all Lie groups are parallelizable. Moreover, even if M is not parallelizable, we could always work with subdomains where a frame does not degenerate. We also think that parallelizability is the first step that needs to be taken in order to handle homogenization for Riemannian manifolds *without any restrictions*. We expect to complete this project in future work.

All in all, the notion of parallelizable manifold allows us to formalize our previous intuition. Even if M does not admit symmetries, the tangent plane $T_p M$ admits those given by the lattice $\Gamma(p)$. Thus, it is natural to consider functions defined on the tangent bundle of M which are $\Gamma(p)$ periodic on the second variable. The best way to codify periodicity is to work on the so-called torus bundle $\mathbb{T}M$ (see Section 2 for precise definitions). For variables, $[p, v] \in \mathbb{T}M$, the manifold variable p will play the role of a slow variable, which we handle by discretization. The variable v in the torus fiber will play the role of the periodic fast variable and will be handled by a local exponential map. Such idea leads to a manifold version of the by now classical two-scale convergence [1, 37]. In fact, we recover the classical two scale convergence theory in the Euclidean space as a particular case. Let us remark that furthermore, our result is new even in the Euclidean case, as we are allowing the periodicity to vary smoothly from point to point. (See Remark 5).

Indeed, we will obtain a satisfactory two-scale convergence theory on manifolds, but we believe that our main contribution is to obtain explicit formulae for homogenization limits of rapidly oscillating equations on the manifold. We will use the standard terminology on the analysis of the torus bundle $\mathbb{T}M$ which will be carefully revisited in Section 2. For example \mathcal{V} stands for the vertical part of the tangent to the torus bundle and therefore $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{V})$ for vertical vector fields (tangent to the fibers of $\mathbb{T}M$) and correspondingly $T^{m,n}(\mathcal{V})$ for vertical (m, n) -tensors.

In order to define oscillating tensors in the spirit of the Euclidean case $\sigma(x, \frac{x}{\epsilon})$, we will bring the periodic frame structure of the tangent plane to the manifold via the exponential. For a fine enough net of points in M , p_1, \dots, p_N , the diffeomorphisms $H_{\epsilon, j} : M \rightarrow T_{p_j} M$,

$$H_{\epsilon, j}(q) = \frac{\exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)}{\epsilon}$$

will play a crucial role.¹ In order to bring to M a function \tilde{f} defined on $\mathbb{T}M$ we declare

$$f^\epsilon(q) = \sum_j \psi_j \tilde{f}\left(p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon\right) = \sum_k \psi_j H_{\epsilon, j}^* \tilde{f}$$

where ψ_j is a suitably constructed partition of unity.

It turns out that one can pull back vertical tensors $A \in T^{m,n}(\mathcal{V})$ of the torus bundle similarly. In particular for vertical $(1, 1)$ -tensors $A \in T^{1,1}(\mathcal{V})$ with coordinates $A_i^j[p, v]$, we define a sequence of oscillating tensor $\bar{A}^\epsilon \in T^{1,1}(M)$ by pulling back its coordinates, that is

$$(1.1) \quad (\bar{A}^\epsilon)_i^j = (A_i^j)^\epsilon.$$

Alternatively, as in the case of functions, one can use $H_{\epsilon, j}$ and define

$$(A^\epsilon(q) = \sum \psi_j(q) H_{\epsilon, j}^*(A),$$

¹The domain of these maps is not the whole of M , but we will write it as so in order to facilitate the reading.

(see section 6 for precise definitions of tensors in the torus bundle and their pullbacks).

Notice that, even in \mathbb{R}^n , our definition circumvents the measurability issues which are nagging with the classical $\sigma(x, \frac{x}{\epsilon})$. In any case, both oscillating tensors $A^\epsilon, \bar{A}^\epsilon$ (more precisely their symmetric parts) are homogenized to an explicit tensor A^* . The tensor $A^* \in T^{1,1}(M)$ is obtained from $A \in T^{1,1}(\mathcal{V})$ by explicit cell formulae. In the case that the metric g and the frame Γ are linked, in the sense that Γ is an orthonormal frame respect to g , the cell formula parallels the Euclidean situation discussed earlier. We call such metric the frame metric.

Definition 1.1 (The homogenized problem - frame metric). Given $A \in T^{1,1}(\mathcal{V})$, we define $A^* \in T^{1,1}(M)$ by stating that for any $e_i, e_j \in T_p M$

$$A^*(p)[e_i, e_j] = \int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} A[p, v][\text{grad}_v w_i(p, v) + e_i^\uparrow, \text{grad}_v w_j(p, v) + e_j^\uparrow] dv$$

Here $w_i(p, v) \in L^2(M, H_{per}^1(\mathbb{T}M_p))$ are the $\Gamma(p)$ -periodic solutions to the cell problems

$$-\text{div}_v(A(p, v)[\text{grad}_v w_i(p, v) + e_i^\uparrow]) = 0$$

The vector $e_j^\uparrow[p, v]$ is a vertical vector, obtained by lifting e_j to the fiber (See definition 2.5). In the case that the metric and the parallelization are arbitrary, the homogenized problem incorporates the metric and its formula is given in equation (10.5)

All in all, we obtain the following clean homogenization theorem on manifolds.

Theorem 1.2. *Let Ω be a bounded smooth domain in M . Given $f \in H^{-1}(M)$, the unique solution $u_\epsilon \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ of the problem*

$$\text{div}(A_{\text{sym}}^\epsilon[\text{grad } u_\epsilon]) = f$$

converges weakly to $u^ \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, defined as the unique solution to*

$$\text{div}(A^*[\text{grad } u^*]) = f$$

The same homogenization result holds if we replace A^ϵ by \bar{A}^ϵ as defined in (1.1). As a matter of fact, being technical for a moment, as soon as we have an arbitrary sequence $A_\epsilon \in T^{1,1}(M)$ which two scale converges in the strong sense to $A \in T^{1,1}(\mathcal{V})$ (c.f section 6 for definition of two strong convergence of tensor fields) the same homogenization result holds. In fact, the homogenization theorem is a corollary of the corresponding two scale homogenization Theorem 9.3. Notice that, loosely speaking, strong two scale convergence amounts to ϵ being the scale of oscillation. An analogous theory of multiscale convergence that deals with various scales of oscillations, and leading to reiterated homogenization is also possible, but we defer its development to future work. Similarly, our approach should work for nonlinear equations, but for brevity, we include here only the linear case.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 2 gives some background on parallelizable manifolds, and shows how to construct its associated torus bundle; the main idea is that its fibers will detect in the limit the periodicity phenomena, thus resulting in the right setting where two-scale limits abide. Notice that pulling back functions from the tangent bundle is relatively easy, but pulling back vector fields and forms is rather complicated, and it requires a careful understanding of the torus bundle and its vertical fibers. In this section we introduce the vertical framing $\{e_1^\uparrow, \dots, e_n^\uparrow\}$ which will be fundamental to understand two scale convergence of vector fields. The other key idea to study oscillatory phenomena at a very small scale is to approximate the manifold by discrete versions. This is attained through metric ϵ -nets, $\{p_j\}$ and more precisely, through their Voronoi decompositions. Associated to them, it is important to construct partitions of unity $\{\psi_j\}$ with a good control on the size of the gradients of the functions appearing in them. We do this in Section 3, with Theorem 3.15 as the final statement that is used at latter points in the paper. We think that this construction can be of independent interest and certainly useful in other contexts. For example, we need to control the angles between geodesics emanating from the points in the metric net (See lemma 3.8) and to describe the boundary of the Voronoi domains rather precisely (see lemma 3.12). Voronoi domains also

appeared in the reference [23], although their authors did not need such an accurate description of their geometry.

Part 3 of the paper contains Sections 4 to 8, dedicated to introducing two-scale convergence of functions, vector fields, and differential forms. As explained before, in the spirit of [37] and [1], given $\tilde{f} : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we declare test functions

$$f^\epsilon(q) = \sum_j \psi_j \tilde{f} \left(p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon \right) = \sum_k \psi_j H_{\epsilon,j}^* \tilde{f}$$

With such functions at hand, a suitable notion of two-scale convergence can be defined. Indeed, we can replicate some of the similar results for functions in the Euclidean space. This takes most of Sections 4 and 5. The careful choice of the partition of unity allows us to replicate all results in the Euclidean setting, without problems of measurability. It also allows us to calibrate the Euclidean setting, shifting the origin as desired. To make a theory of two scale convergence of vector fields is more subtle. Morally, if in order to define test functions in M we need to pull back functions defined in the torus bundle $\mathbb{T}M$ back to M through the use of the maps $H_{\epsilon,j}$, for vector fields, we will push forward vertical vector fields tangent to the torus fibers of $\mathbb{T}M$ towards M . This is convenient for integrating by parts, and at the end of the day equivalent to the two scale convergence of the coordinate functions. It takes some effort to prove that all these alternative definitions of two scale convergence for vector fields are indeed equivalent, and this constitutes the bulk of Section 6. All in all, a solid and flexible theory of two-scale convergence of vector fields is established there. As two scale convergence of two tensors is also needed to deal with elliptic equations we develop the theory for arbitrary (k, m) -tensors, which could be of interest in other contexts, e.g. in linear elasticity. We warn the reader just interested in the application to elliptic equations that, for that purpose, most of the section can be skipped. It suffices with definition 6.1 and sections 7.5 and 8.

In the Euclidean case, it holds that $\nabla f(x, \frac{x}{\epsilon}) = (\nabla f_x + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \nabla f_y)(x, \frac{x}{\epsilon})$, namely, for the obvious framing, gradients of test functions and test vector fields in M coming from the vertical gradient of a function agree. A similar relation in the manifold case holds only approximately as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$; see Theorem 7.3. This is, indeed, a rather difficult fact to establish, and its proof takes all of Sections 7.1 and 7.5. Section 8 examines the relation between convergence of functions and of their gradients. In addition to the integration by parts formula, we needed to establish a vertical Hodge decomposition type of argument.

The last part of the paper, part 4, deals with second order elliptic equations in manifolds. Section 9 introduces carefully the classes of tensors that we are able to homogenize and gives the proof of the theorem 9.3. Finally, Section 10 uses all the previous results in order to prove the Main Theorem 1.2 (in the most general case of unrelated frames and metrics) relating two scale convergence with homogenization. This section is parallel to the Euclidean one, but one needs to be careful in the Riemannian setting.

To help the reader, the appendixes review some general facts of tangent bundles of manifolds, as well as discussing well-posedness of the two scale homogenized problem. It also reviews the weak and strong formulation of both homogenized problems.

We conclude this introduction by pointing out ideas for future research. From the manifold viewpoint, it would be interesting to investigate whether allowing a degeneracy set for the frame, we could deal with any Riemannian manifold (thus getting rid of the parallelizability restriction). Similarly, our theory possibly extends to a reiterated homogenization. From the point of view of applications, the ideas expressed here should yield various types of Darcy Law valid on manifolds with a heterogeneous distribution of pores, resulting in a point dependent permeability tensor. For problems related to microscopic crystalline structures in elasticity (e.g. [18]), it might be also important that the periodicity frame is allowed to vary from point to point. From the viewpoint of partial differential equations, it will be desirable to make our homogenization results quantitative alike in the Euclidean situation (see e.g [28, 42, 41])

Finally, the original motivation of our research was to study the combination of collapse and homogenization in general geometries. Collapsing happens naturally when considering Riemannian manifolds with geometric conditions that guarantee Gromov-Hausdorff convergence to a lower dimension metric space. The more natural geometric conditions are bounds on the sectional curvature, as was considered originally in the seminal work of Cheeger, Gromov and Fukaya in [13], [14], [12], or [22]. An excellent introduction to collapsing under these conditions is the survey paper of X.Rong [40]. We are interested in this aspect from a Riemannian manifold view point, but this approach should also be interesting in dimension reduction theories in nonlinear elasticity, particularly the non-Euclidean case (see the recent available rigidity estimate [15] in the line of Friesecke-James-Muller theory ([4, 20, 19, 21, 31, 32, 35, 36])). Consider, for example, the theory of non-Euclidean plates and the works combining homogenization with dimension reduction in elasticity (e.g [25, 26]) e.g. where oscillating variational problems are considered. These are all exciting lines of research that we leave for future work.

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank Juan Luis Vázquez for general discussion about partial differential equations on manifolds and useful suggestions to improve the readability of the paper. They also thank Marcos Solera for interesting discussions. We also thank the hospitality of University College of London for our various visits along the years. D.F acknowledges as well the hospitality and financial support of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, where part of this research took place.

Part 1. Parallelizable manifolds

2. PARALLELIZABLE MANIFOLDS

Definition 2.1. We say that a differentiable manifold M is *parallelizable* if there exists a vector bundle isomorphism $\Theta : M \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow TM$. Such an isomorphism is called a parallelization. In other words, there are vector fields X_1, \dots, X_n in M (where $n = \dim M$) such that at each point $p \in M$, the vectors $X_{1,p}, \dots, X_{n,p}$ form a basis of T_pM .

A parallelization provides a set $\Gamma = \Theta(M \times \mathbb{Z}^n)$ that becomes a linear lattice of T_pM for each $p \in M$. Let $e_i \in \mathcal{X}(M)$ be the vector field defined as

$$e_i(p) = \Theta(p, \mathbf{e}_i), \quad \mathbf{e}_i = (0, \dots, 1, \dots, 0).$$

Notice that the collection of possible lattices Γ can be parametrized by smooth sections of the trivial bundle $M \times GL(n, \mathbb{R})$. Since frames are non-degenerate and M is compact, volumes of cells associated to two different lattices are comparable.

Being parallel is, in general, a rather restrictive topological condition to set on a manifold. For instance, it forces every Pontryaguin number of the manifold to vanish (see [33]). Nonetheless, it allows for a rather large set of examples. For instance, every orientable three-dimensional manifold is parallelizable, every torus of any dimension, as well as Lie groups and the 7-dimensional sphere [30].

2.1. The torus bundle associated to a lattice. Since periodicity with respect to a lattice Γ is a key notion in our work, we will consider the torus bundle $\mathbb{T}M$ associated to a frame. Let (M, g) a parallelizable Riemannian manifold with lattice Γ defined as above. There is a free, properly discontinuous action $\theta : \mathbb{Z}^n \times TM \rightarrow TM$ defined as

$$\theta((k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n), (p, v)) = (p, v + \sum k_i e_i).$$

Definition 2.2. *The torus bundle associated to Γ* is the quotient manifold $\mathbb{T}M = TM/\mathbb{Z}^n$.

For a tangent vector $(p, v) \in TM$, we will denote by $[p, v]$ the corresponding point in $\mathbb{T}M$, and by $\Phi : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{T}M$ the quotient map sending (p, v) to $[p, v]$. It is clear that Φ is a local diffeomorphism that restricts to the covering map $T_pM \rightarrow \mathbb{T}M_p \simeq \mathbb{T}^n$ for each $p \in M$. This can be summarized in the following diagram.




FIGURE 1. Relation between the tangent and the torus bundles

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 M \times \mathbb{R}^n & \xrightarrow{\Theta} & TM \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \Phi \\
 M \times \mathbb{T}^n & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{T}M
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 (p, (x_1, \dots, x_n)) & \longrightarrow & (p, \sum_{i=1}^n x_i e_i(p)) \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 (p, [x_1, \dots, x_n]) & \longrightarrow & [p, \sum_{i=1}^n x_i]
 \end{array}$$

Let Q be an open cube in \mathbb{R}^n with unit length sides. If (U, ϕ) are coordinates in M and $\tilde{\phi}$ is the chart in TM associated to the frame defined in (A.1), then in the open set $W := \tilde{\phi}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n \times Q)$, the quotient map Φ is injective, and we can define coordinates in $\mathbb{T}M$ as $\tilde{\phi} \circ (\Phi|_W)^{-1}$. By changing Q we can obtain a full coordinate atlas of $\mathbb{T}M$.

The projection $\pi : TM \rightarrow M$, $(p, v) \rightarrow p$, induces a map $\pi : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow M$, $[p, v] \rightarrow p$. Observe that with this map, $\mathbb{T}M$ is a fiber bundle over M with fiber the torus $\mathbb{T}^n = \mathbb{R}^n / \mathbb{Z}^n$.

Since the action θ leaves the fibers $T_p M$ invariant, the decomposition of the tangent bundle to TM into horizontal and vertical parts induces a similar decomposition in the tangent spaces at points in $\mathbb{T}M$; we will use the same notation for them. Namely

$$(2.1) \quad T_{[p,v]} \mathbb{T}M = \mathcal{H}_{[p,v]} \oplus \mathcal{V}_{[p,v]},$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}_{[p,v]} = \Phi_* \mathcal{H}_{(p,v)}, \quad \mathcal{V}_{[p,v]} = \Phi_* \mathcal{V}_{(p,v)}.$$

It is also clear that $\mathcal{V}_{[p,v]}$ is tangent to the fibers of $\mathbb{T}M$ and $\mathcal{H}_{[p,v]}$ is transverse to them. The decomposition

$$(2.2) \quad T_{[p,v]} \mathbb{T}M = \mathcal{H}_{[p,v]} \oplus \mathcal{V}_{[p,v]},$$

gives vector bundles

$$\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}M, \quad \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}M.$$

Observe that \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{V} are subbundles of the tangent bundle to $\mathbb{T}M$.

Definition 2.3. The *Sasaki metric* in $\mathbb{T}M$ is the Riemannian metric such that for vectors ξ, η in $T_{[p,v]} \mathbb{T}M$, we define

$$g_{[p,v]}(\xi, \eta) := g_p(\xi^h, \eta^h) + g_p(\xi^v, \eta^v),$$

where $\xi = \xi^h + \xi^v$, $\eta = \eta^h + \eta^v$ are the horizontal-vertical splittings.

The metric is induced by the usual Sasaki metric in the tangent bundle TM (see Appendix A or the excellent introduction in [39]), and with them, the quotient map $\Phi : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{T}M$ becomes a local isometry.

2.2. Vertical tensors in $\mathbb{T}M$. When working with certain objects in $\mathbb{T}M$, it is usually more convenient to think of them as objects in TM satisfying certain periodicity conditions. We make this explicit in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.4. *Let M be a parallelizable manifold and $\mathbb{T}M$ the torus bundle associated to a given lattice. Then there is a one-to-one correspondence between functions (vector fields, k -forms) in $\mathbb{T}M$ and functions (vector fields, k -forms) in TM that are invariant under the \mathbb{Z}^n action.*

Proof. For any \mathbb{Z}^n -invariant function $f : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, define $\tilde{f} : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as $\tilde{f}(p, v) := f([p, v])$. For any integer n -tuple $\bar{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $[p, v] = [p, v + \sum k_i e_i]$, thus \tilde{f} is \mathbb{Z}^n -periodic. The reciprocal is obvious. Similar proofs apply to the other cases. \square

We will be specially interested on tensors related to the vertical bundle \mathcal{V} , since two-scale limits are tensors of this type. Thus, we will denote by $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{V})$ the vertical vectors, and by $\Lambda^k(\mathcal{V})$ the vertical alternating k -multilinear maps; that is, for $X \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{V})$ and $\omega \in \Lambda^k(\mathcal{V})$, we have that

$$X_{[p,v]} \in \mathcal{V}_{[p,v]}, \quad \omega_{[p,v]} : \mathcal{V}_{[p,v]} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{V}_{[p,v]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ multilinear and alternating,}$$

at each point $[p, v] \in \mathbb{T}M$. The sections of these bundles will be the vertical vector fields and the vertical k -forms. The set of 0-forms can be identified with the functions $f : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

We describe now how to use the frame associated to a parallelization to construct framings of $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{V})$ and $\Lambda^k(\mathcal{V})$.

Definition 2.5. Let $e \in T_p M$. For any $[p, v] \in \mathbb{T}M$, we define the vertical vector field $e^\uparrow \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{V})$ as

$$(2.3) \quad e^\uparrow[p, v] = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} [p, v + te].$$

The above definition is correct, since the corresponding vertical lift e^\uparrow to TM is invariant by the \mathbb{Z}^n -action, and thus, by Lemma 2.4 defines a vector field in $\mathbb{T}M$. More precisely, if $[p, v] = [p, w]$, i.e, if $v - w \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ in coordinates with respect the frame, then $[p, v + te] = [p, w + te]$, and $e^\uparrow[p, v] = e^\uparrow[p, w]$ as claimed.

2.2.1. Vertical vector field framing. Let e_i be the vector fields in the frame of M .

Definition 2.6. The vertical framing of $\mathbb{T}M$ is the collection of vertical vector fields $e_1^\uparrow, \dots, e_n^\uparrow$.

It is clear that $e_1^\uparrow, \dots, e_n^\uparrow$ form a basis of $\mathcal{V}_{[p,v]}$ at each $[p, v]$, since the fields e_i form a basis of $T_p M$ at each p . Notice that if we have the coordinates

$$(2.4) \quad \tilde{\varphi}(p, v) = (x^1(p), \dots, x^n(p), v^1(p, v), \dots, v^n(p, v))$$

in TM , where (x_1, \dots, x_n) are coordinates in M , and for $v \in T_p M$, the v^i are given by

$$v = \sum_{j=1}^n v^j(p, v) e_j,$$

then for the corresponding coordinates in $\mathbb{T}M$, we have that

$$(2.5) \quad e_{i,[p,v]}^\uparrow = \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} \right|_{[p,v]}$$

Therefore, if $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ has coordinates $X_p = \sum_i X^i(p) e_i$, then

$$(2.6) \quad X_{[p,v]}^\uparrow = \sum_i X^i(p) \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i}$$

More in general, any vector field in $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{V})$ can be written as a linear combination of the vertical frame e_i^\uparrow , although in this case, the coefficients of the e_i^\uparrow may vary in $[p, v]$.

2.2.2. Framing for vertical k -forms. Given a 1-form ω in M , we can lift ω_p to each point $(p, v) \in TM$ as

$$(2.7) \quad \omega_{(p,v)}^\uparrow(e^\uparrow) = \omega_p(e), \quad e \in T_p M.$$

Observe that we have only defined ω^\uparrow over vectors tangent to the fibers of TM , thus on elements of $\mathcal{V}TM$. Once again, we notice that the 1-form ω^\uparrow is invariant under the \mathbb{Z}^n -action, and it defines a vertical 1-form on $\mathbb{T}M$. It is clear that if $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, $\omega \in \Lambda^1(M)$, then

$$(\omega^\uparrow, X^\uparrow)[p, v] = (\omega, X)(p).$$

Definition 2.7. Given the frame e_1, \dots, e_n of Γ , we denote by $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$ the associated dual basis of 1-forms in M ; i.e, $\theta_i(e_j) = \delta_{ij}$ where δ_{ij} are the Kronecker symbols. We say that the basis of vertical k -forms defined as

$$\theta_{i_1}^\uparrow \wedge \dots \wedge \theta_{i_k}^\uparrow, \quad 1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq n,$$

is the associated framing for $\Lambda^k(\mathcal{V})$.

With respect to the coordinates in $\mathbb{T}M$ induced from those in TM as before, we have that $\theta_i^\uparrow = dv_i$, where dv_i is applied only to vertical vectors.²

2.2.3. Vertical lifting of arbitrary tensors. The above definition yields a canonical way to lift tensors in M to vertical tensors. Along the paper we will use multi-index notation I, J , for $I = i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k$, $J = j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m$ when no confusion arises. Thus, e.g. $X_I \in \mathfrak{X}(M)^k$ stands for the k -tuple of vector fields $X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}, \dots, X_{i_k}$

Definition 2.8. Let $T \in T^{k,m}(M)$ be a (k, m) -tensor in M . Consider arbitrary k -tuples of vector fields $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^k \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, and arbitrary m -tuples of 1-forms, $\{\omega_j\}_{j=1}^m \in \Lambda^1(M)$. Then $T^\uparrow \in T^{k,m}(\mathcal{V})$ is defined by,

$$T^\uparrow((X_1^\uparrow, \dots, X_k^\uparrow, \omega_1^\uparrow, \dots, \omega_m^\uparrow) := T(X_1, \dots, X_n, \omega_1, \dots, \omega_m)$$

2.3. Integration in $\mathbb{T}M$. We give $\mathbb{T}M$ the Sasaki metric induced by the metric in M . Recall that integration in manifolds is always defined with regard to a volume form in the manifold. In the case of Riemannian manifolds, the most natural volume form is that assigning to each positively oriented orthonormal basis the value one.³

To construct such a form on $\mathbb{T}M$, we will take the wedge product of two n -forms. The first one will be $\pi^*\omega$, the pullback of the Riemannian volume form in M by the projection map $\pi : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow M$. For the second one, we start by taking the 1-forms induced by the vertical frame fields e_i^\uparrow , i.e, θ_i^\uparrow extended also to nonvertical vectors as

$$\theta_i^\uparrow(X) = \langle e_i^\uparrow, X \rangle,$$

where we use the Sasaki metric. Then we construct the n -form

$$\eta := g^{1/2} \theta_1^\uparrow \wedge \dots \wedge \theta_n^\uparrow$$

where g is the determinant of the matrix whose entries are

$$(2.8) \quad \langle e_i^\uparrow, e_j^\uparrow \rangle [p, v] = g(e_i, e_j) = g_{ij}(p).$$

This $g^{1/2}$ - term is necessary since the vectors e_i^\uparrow do not constitute an orthonormal set. Alternatively, if we denote by dV_M the Riemannian volume form for M , it is clear that $\eta = (dV_M)^\uparrow$,

²To be precise, since v_i is a function in $\mathbb{T}M$, dv_i could be applied also to any vector in $\mathbb{T}M$, whether vertical or not; our use of dv_i above means that we are taking its restriction to \mathcal{V} .

³Nonorientable manifolds require passing to the orientable double cover, but we will ignore them here since M being parallelizable implies $\mathbb{T}M$ being orientable.

with the terminology from the last section. Thus, the volume form in $\mathbb{T}M$ with the Sasaki metric is given by

$$dV_{\mathbb{T}M} = \pi^* \omega \wedge \eta = \pi^*(dV_M) \wedge (dV_M)^\dagger$$

Integration with respect to this form will be denoted as $\int f[p, v] dv dp$.

For each $p \in M$, and coordinates v^1, \dots, v^n on $\mathbb{T}M_p$ in the frame at p , the corresponding volume element in each torus fiber of $\mathbb{T}M$ is just given by $dV := g^{1/2} dv^1 \wedge \dots \wedge dv^n$, thus $\text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p) = g^{1/2}(p)$, where $g(p) = \det g_{ij}(p)$.

Definition 2.9 (Normalized integrals on $\mathbb{T}M$). For $f \in L^1(\mathbb{T}M)$, define

$$\oint_{\mathbb{T}M} f dv dp := \int_{\mathbb{T}M} \text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p)^{-1} f[p, v] dv dp$$

where the volume on $\mathbb{T}M$ is induced from the above metric.

There is an "integration along the fiber" formula that will be useful later.

Lemma 2.10. *Let $f : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ an integrable function such that, for almost any $p \in M$, the function $v \rightarrow f[p, v]$ is integrable in $\mathbb{T}M_p$; let $\tilde{f}(p) = \int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} f[p, v] dv$. Then*

$$\oint_{\mathbb{T}M} f[p, v] dv dp = \int_M \tilde{f}(p) dp$$

Proof. We can take parametrizations in $\mathbb{T}M$ of the form

$$\Psi(x_1, \dots, x_n, v_1, \dots, v_n) = [\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n), v_1 e_1 + \dots + v_n e_n].$$

Then $\Psi^* dV_{\mathbb{T}M} = (g^{1/2} \circ \phi) (\phi^* dV_M) \wedge dv_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dv_n$, and

$$\int_{\Psi(U \times [0,1]^n)} \text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p)^{-1} f[p, v] dv dp = \int_{U \times [0,1]^n} (g^{-1/2} \circ \phi)(x) f \circ \Psi(x, v) (g^{1/2} \circ \phi)(x) dv dx,$$

where the right-hand side is just usual integration in \mathbb{R}^{2n} . After cancellations, the result then follows from Fubini's Theorem. \square

Corollary 2.11. *Let $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, $\omega \in \Lambda^1(M)$. Then*

$$\int_M (X, \omega) dp = \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} (X^\dagger, \omega^\dagger) dv dp$$

Proof. From the definition of ω^\dagger and X^\dagger , it holds that

$$(X^\dagger, \omega^\dagger)[p, v] = (X, \omega)(p);$$

the corollary follows integrating along each fiber, since $\text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p) = \det g^{1/2}$. \square

Definition 2.12 (Tensor average on the fibers). Let $T \in T^{k,m}(\mathcal{V})$ be a vertical (k, m) -tensor; then we define its average $\tilde{T} \in T^{k,m}(M)$ by

$$\tilde{T}(X_I, \omega^J) = \text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} T(X_I^\dagger, \omega_J^\dagger) dv := \int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} T(X_I^\dagger, \omega_J^\dagger) dv$$

Notice that if

$$T = \sum_i T_I^J[p, v] e_I^\dagger \otimes \theta_J^\dagger$$

in coordinates with respect to the vertical frames, then setting

$$(2.9) \quad \tilde{T}_I^J(p) = \int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} T_I^J[p, v] dv,$$

we obtain that

$$(2.10) \quad \tilde{T} = \sum_I \tilde{T}_I^J e_I \otimes \theta_J.$$

2.4. Vertical differential and vertical gradient. Let $f : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a smooth function. Its *vertical gradient* is the vertical vector field $\text{grad}_v f$ along $\mathbb{T}M$ such that

$$\langle \text{grad}_v f, e^\uparrow \rangle [p, v] = e^\uparrow(f),$$

where the inner product comes from the Sasaki metric. It is clear that in coordinates associated to the frame,

$$\text{grad}_v f = \sum_{i,j} e_i^\uparrow(f) g^{ij}(p) e_j^\uparrow$$

Similarly, we define its vertical differential $d^v f$ as the element of $\Lambda^1(\mathcal{V})$ satisfying

$$d^v f_{[p,v]}(X) = X(f)[p, v] = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial f}{\partial v_i} \cdot X_i,$$

where $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \cdot e_i^\uparrow [p, v]$ in frame coordinates (we are using (2.5)).

2.5. Vertical divergence of vertical vector fields. Let X be a vertical vector field in $\mathbb{T}M$ with $X = \sum_i f_i [p, v] \frac{\partial}{\partial v_i}$. If Y is some other vertical tangent vector at $[p, v] \in \mathbb{T}M$, we define

$$\nabla_Y^\mathcal{V} X(p, v) = \sum_i Y(f_i) \frac{\partial}{\partial v_i},$$

or equivalently,

$$\nabla_Y^\mathcal{V} X[p, v] = \frac{d}{dt} X_{[p, v+tY]},$$

where the derivative is taken at $t = 0$.

Definition 2.13. The *vertical divergence* of X is the function defined as

$$(\text{div}^v X)[p, v] = \text{trace}(Y \mapsto \nabla_Y^\mathcal{V} X)$$

where $Y \in \mathcal{V}_{[p,v]}$.⁴

When $\{e_i\}$ is the frame basis of $\mathcal{V}_{(p,v)}\mathbb{T}M$, and $X = \sum_i f_i [p, v] \frac{\partial}{\partial v_i}$, the above formula yields

$$(\text{div}^v X)[p, v] = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial v_i}$$

Lemma 2.14. For any $e \in T_p M$, and any smooth $f : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\text{div}^v(f e^\uparrow) = e^\uparrow(f)$$

Proof. It is immediate to check that the standard formula

$$\text{div}^v(f X) = X(f) + f \text{div}^v X$$

still holds, so the lemma follows from $\text{div}^v e^\uparrow \equiv 0$. \square

In the next lemma and the rest of the paper, whenever we speak about the divergence of a vector field in the torus bundle, we will consider the divergence with respect to the Sasaki metric in $\mathbb{T}M$ (see Definition 2.3 for the definition).

Lemma 2.15. For any $X \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{V})$, and the Sasaki metric on $\mathbb{T}M$,

$$\text{div} X = \text{div}^v X.$$

⁴When TM is given the Sasaki metric with flat fibers, this agrees with the standard vertical divergence for semibasic vector fields, as defined, for instance, in [29, Section 6.1].

Proof. The proof follows from a standard argument, since for any $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}M)$,

$$\langle \text{grad } f, X \rangle = \langle \text{grad}_v f, X \rangle,$$

and the definitions of divergence, vertical divergence and the integration by parts formula

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}M} \langle \text{grad } f, X \rangle \, dv \, dp = - \int_{\mathbb{T}M} f \cdot \text{div } X \, dv \, dp.$$

□

2.6. Vertical derivative and divergence of one-forms. Recall that, in a closed Riemannian manifold, the divergence of a 1-form ω is defined as the function $\text{div } \omega$ such that for any smooth function $f \in C^\infty(M)$,

$$\int_M (\omega, \text{grad } f) \, dp = - \int_M f \, \text{div } \omega \, dp.$$

In the above formula, the parentheses denote the usual pairing; alternatively, using the L^2 -product in one forms induced from the metric, we could have written the above as

$$\int_M \langle \omega, df \rangle \, dp = - \int_M f \, \text{div } \omega \, dp.$$

For a one-form ω_0 in the torus bundle $\mathbb{T}M$, we will define its *vertical divergence* as the unique function $\text{div}^v \omega_0 \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}M)$ that satisfies

$$(2.11) \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}M} (\omega_0, \text{grad}_v f) \, dp \, dv = - \int_{\mathbb{T}M} f \, \text{div}^v \omega_0 \, dp \, dv$$

where $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}M)$, and $\text{grad}_v f$ is just the vertical part of the gradient ∇f .

2.7. Spaces of functions and tensors. For functions defined on the manifold M or in the torus bundle $\mathbb{T}M$, we will use the classical notation $C(M), L^2(M), L^2(\mathbb{T}M)$. For vector fields or tensors in M we will use $L^2\mathfrak{X}(M), L^2T^{k,m}(M)$ and for vertical vector fields and vertical tensors, we use $L^2\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{V}), L^2T^{k,m}(\mathcal{V})$.

In addition, for functions defined on $\mathbb{T}M$, we will use mixed spaces to consider different regularities on the base and the fibers of the torus bundle.

Definition 2.16. Let \mathcal{A} be a function space in M , and \mathcal{B} be some Banach space at each torus fiber $\mathbb{T}M_p$.

- (1) We say that $f \in \mathcal{A}(M, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T}M_p))$ if the function $f^*(p) \rightarrow \|f[p, *]\|_{\mathcal{B}}$ belongs to \mathcal{A} .
- (2) If \mathcal{A} is given by a norm $\|*\|_{\mathcal{A}}$, then we define a norm in $\mathcal{A}(M, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T}M_p))$ as

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{A}(M, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T}M_p))} := \|f^*\|_{\mathcal{A}}.$$

Likewise we will denote vertical vector fields or vertical tensor fields such that their frame coordinate functions belong to $\mathcal{A}(M, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T}M_p))$ by $\mathcal{A}(M, \mathcal{B}\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{V}_p)), \mathcal{A}(M, \mathcal{B}T^{k,m}(\mathcal{V}_p))$.

Throughout the paper, we will always take \mathcal{A} to be continuous functions, as this simplifies the presentation and avoids some technical details. \mathcal{B} will typically be either continuous, L^r spaces or Sobolev spaces in the fibers. As a matter of fact, since the fibers of $\mathbb{T}M$ are tori, we have that $L^r(\mathbb{T}M_p) \subseteq L^1(\mathbb{T}M_p)$ for any $1 \leq r$. A recurrent choice for us will be functions $C(M, L^2(\mathbb{T}M_p))$ and vector and tensors fields in $C(M, L^2\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{V}_p)), C(M, L^2T^{k,m}(\mathcal{V}_p))$. Notice that sometimes mixed spaces agree with standard spaces. For example, by Fubini's Theorem, $L^2(M, L^2(\mathbb{T}M_p)) = L^2(\mathbb{T}M)$.

Finally, in each torus fiber $\mathbb{T}M_p$, we will consider the space $H_{per}^1(\mathbb{T}M_p)$ of functions with zero vertical mean, that is $\int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} u[p, v] \, dv = 0$ for almost every p . Thus, Poincarè-Wirtinger inequality in the fiber $\mathbb{T}M_p$ allows us to consider the following norm for the space $L^2(M, H_{per}^1(\mathbb{T}M_p))$:

$$(2.12) \quad \|u\|_{L^2(M, H_{per}^1(\mathbb{T}M_p))} = \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} |\text{grad}_v u(p, v)|^2 \, dp \, dv$$

Finally, by $\|\cdot\|$ we will indicate the supremum norm in M or $\mathbb{T}M$.

Part 2. Nets and Voronoi decompositions

3. VORONOI DOMAINS AND BUMP FUNCTIONS

The results in this section apply to arbitrary closed Riemannian manifolds; we will not assume parallelizability anywhere.

3.1. Normal charts. Recall that given a point $p \in M$, we can always consider a totally normal neighborhood U of p in M and the diffeomorphism

$$\phi_p = \exp_p^{-1} : U \rightarrow V \subset T_p M.$$

We will drop the p whenever no confusion may arise. By choosing orthonormal coordinates in $T_p M$, we have a coordinate chart (U, ϕ) in a neighbourhood of p such that $\phi(p) = 0$, and such that the metric satisfies

$$(3.1) \quad g_{ij}(0) = \delta_{ij}, \quad \partial_k g_{ij}(0) = 0, \quad \det g_{ij}(v) = 1 + O(|v|^2).$$

In fact, in these coordinates, the differential

$$d\phi : TM|_U \rightarrow T\mathbb{R}^n$$

is C^1 -close to the identity whenever U is a small neighbourhood of p . To make this more precise, recall that $\phi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a diffeomorphism onto its image $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, and the tangent bundle of \mathbb{R}^n over V trivializes as $V \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Thus, $d\phi : TU \rightarrow TV$ is a diffeomorphism. If, for instance, we take the Sasaki metric \hat{g} induced by g on TU (although many other metrics could be used at this point), and the Euclidean metric on $TV = V \times \mathbb{R}^n$, \hat{g}_0 , then the map $d\phi : TU \rightarrow TV$ can be taken as close as we want to an isometry in the C^1 -topology by reducing the size of U . This argument can be used to give a formal proof of the following Lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let M be a compact Riemannian manifold. Then for every positive constant C , there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any normal chart (U, ϕ) as above in M with $\text{diam } U \leq \delta$, we have that*

$$(3.2) \quad \|d\phi_p(q) - I\| \leq C(d(p, q)),$$

Notice that (3.2) yields that, by choosing δ small enough, we have that, \exp and $d\exp$ are arbitrarily close to the identity in a bilipschitz sense, uniformly in the manifold. In particular, they are L^∞ close to the identity.

3.2. Nets and Voronoi domains in manifolds. We consider a compact Riemannian manifold (M, g) with distance function denoted by $d(p, q)$.

Definition 3.2. Let $\varepsilon > 0$.

- (1) A maximal ε -separated set is a maximal set of points $\{x_i\}_{i \in I}$ in M such that $d(x_i, x_j) \geq \varepsilon$.
- (2) An ε -minimal net is a set of points $\{x_i\}_{i \in I}$ in M with a minimal number of elements such that any point in M lies in an ε -ball $B(x_i, \varepsilon)$.

Lemma 3.3. *A maximal ε -separated set is a ε -minimal net*

Proof. If there was an x with $d(x, x_i) \geq \varepsilon$, then we could add x to $\{x_i\}$ to get an ε -separated set with one element more, contradicting maximality. This shows that maximal ε -separated sets are ε -minimal nets. □

Definition 3.4. Let $\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon) = \{p_i, 1 \leq i \leq N(\varepsilon)\}$, a maximal ε -separated set. The Voronoi domain corresponding to p_i is defined as

$$D_i := \{q \in M : \text{dist}(q, p_i) \leq \text{dist}(q, p_j) \text{ for all } 1 \leq j \leq N\}$$

Standard counting arguments show that the cardinal of $\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon)$ grows as ε^{-n} as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ with $n = \dim M$.

Lemma 3.5. *If $q \in D_i$, $\text{dist}(q, p_i) \leq \varepsilon$.*

Proof. Suppose otherwise; then $\varepsilon < \text{dist}(q, p_i) \leq \text{dist}(q, p_j)$ for any j , and we could add q to $\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon)$ to get a larger maximal ε -separated set. \square

The sets D_i cover all of M , intersecting only in sets of empty interior.

Lemma 3.6. *For any i , the ball $B(p_i, \varepsilon/2)$ is contained in D_i .*

Proof. If $\text{dist}(p_i, q) < \varepsilon/2$, and $q \in D_j$, then $\text{dist}(p_j, q) \leq \text{dist}(p_i, q)$; thus

$$\text{dist}(p_i, p_j) \leq \text{dist}(p_i, q) + \text{dist}(p_j, q) < \varepsilon,$$

contradicting the separation condition except if $i = j$. \square

We will say that two Voronoi domains are *adjacent* if $D_i \cap D_j \neq \emptyset$.

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose D_i and D_j are adjacent Then*

$$\varepsilon \leq \text{dist}(p_i, p_j) \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

Proof. The first inequality comes from the definition of ε -separated set; the second is an immediate consequence of the triangle inequality and Lemma 3.5 after choosing some $q \in D_i \cap D_j$. \square

In what follows we will assume ε is smaller than half the injectivity radius of M so that there are unique geodesics between p_i 's belonging to adjacent Voronoi domains.

Lemma 3.8. *Let M be a closed Riemannian manifold. Then there are positive numbers ε_0 and δ such that for any $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ and for any points $q_i, q_j, q_k \in M$ with*

$$\varepsilon \leq \text{dist}(q_i, q_j), \text{dist}(q_i, q_k), \text{dist}(q_j, q_k) \leq 2\varepsilon$$

we have that

$$\angle_{p_i}(p_j, p_k) \geq \delta,$$

*where $\angle_{p_i}(p_j, p_k)$ is the angle at p_i of the minimal geodesic triangle $\Delta(q_i, q_j, q_k)$.*⁵

Proof. Since the geodesics are minimal, we can use Toponogov's theorem [11] to compare angles with those in the corresponding triangle in the simply connected space form of constant curvature $k_0 < 0$, where k_0 is a lower bound for the sectional curvature of M , and then use hyperbolic trigonometry. Namely, we consider a corresponding triangle in $\mathbb{H}(k_0)$ where the side lengths are $l_{ij} = a$, $l_{ik} = b$, $l_{jk} = c$ are the corresponding hyperbolic distances between the vertices, and assume the worst case $a = b = 2\varepsilon$ and $c = \varepsilon$. We denote by α_i the angle at the vertex p_i (still in the space form) and use the following law of cosines.

$$\cos \alpha = \frac{\cosh(\sqrt{|k_0|}a) \cosh(\sqrt{|k_0|}b) - \cosh(\sqrt{|k_0|}c)}{\sinh(\sqrt{|k_0|}a) \sinh(\sqrt{|k_0|}b)}.$$

As $\sinh(x) = x + O(x^3)$, $\cosh x = 1 + x^2 + O(x^4)$ for small x , we have that there exists $\varepsilon_0(k_0) > 0$ such that for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, there exists a universal constant $c_0 > 0$ with

$$\cos \alpha \leq 1 - c_0.$$

Toponogov's theorem states that

$$\angle_{p_i}(p'_j, p'_k) \geq \alpha$$

and the proof follows. \square

Lemma 3.9. *Let D_j and D_k be Voronoi domains adjacent to D_i . Denote by p'_j and p'_k the unit vectors at p_i tangent to geodesics from p_i to p_j and p_k respectively. Then there is a $\delta = \delta(M) > 0$ such that*

$$\angle_{p_i}(p'_j, p'_k) \geq \delta.$$

⁵i.e, every side is a minimal segment.




FIGURE 2. A geodesic triangle of size comparable to ϵ .

Proof. We consider the geodesic triangle with vertices p_i, p_j, p_k . By Lemma 3.7, the length of the corresponding geodesic $\epsilon \leq l_{ij}, l_{ik}, l_{jk} \leq 2\epsilon$, thus the claim is a corollary of lemma 3.8 \square

In fact, α_0 can be estimated precisely; for instance, for $k_0 = 0$, $\tan \alpha_0 = 1/2$.

Lemma 3.10. *Let D_i be a given Voronoi domain generated by a maximal ϵ -separated net; the number of its adjacent domains is bounded above by a constant I_0 independent of ϵ .*

Proof. Lemma 3.9 shows that, if D_{i_1}, \dots, D_{i_k} are adjacent to D_i , then the set of directions $p'_{i_1}, \dots, p'_{i_k}$ form an $\alpha_0/2$ -separated net in the unit tangent sphere at p_i . Since this unit sphere has dimension $n - 1$, a simple volume counting argument shows that the amount of these points is bounded above by $C\omega_{n-1}/\alpha_0^{n-1}$ for some $C = C_{n-1} > 0$ independent of ϵ and ω_{n-1} the volume of the unit $(n - 1)$ -dimensional sphere. \square

We reformulate the last Lemma in a form more useful for the future.

Lemma 3.11 (Finite overlapping property). *Let (M, g) be a closed Riemannian manifold and $\epsilon > 0$ be small enough. If $\{p_i\}$ is a maximal ϵ -separated set in M , then there exists some $K > 0$ independent of ϵ such that $\sum_i \chi_{B(p_i, \epsilon)} \leq K$, where χ_A is the characteristic function of the set A .*

Finally, in order to create a convenient partition of unity we need to study the boundary of each Voronoi domain, and estimate the measure of a tubular neighborhood.

Lemma 3.12. *Let D_i be one of the Voronoi domains. Then its boundary ∂D_i is a piecewise smooth submanifold of dimension $n - 1$. Indeed, there exist constants c, C' independent of ϵ such that*

$$(3.3) \quad \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial D_i) \leq C' \epsilon^{n-1}$$

and for $\delta \leq c\epsilon$,

$$\text{vol}(\cup_{p \in \partial D_i} B(p, \delta)) \leq C' \epsilon^{n-1} \delta.$$

Proof. Assume that D_i and D_k are adjacent Voronoi domains, and consider the common boundary denoted by

$$(3.4) \quad B_{ik} := D_i \cap \{q : \text{dist}(q, p_i) = \text{dist}(q, p_k)\}$$

Let $f_{ik} : B(p_i, \epsilon) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function defined as $f_{ik}(q) = \text{dist}(q, p_i) - \text{dist}(q, p_k)$; thanks to Lemma 3.5, it is clear that $B_{ik} \subset f_{ik}^{-1}(0)$. The function f_{ik} has gradient

$$(3.5) \quad \nabla f_{ik}(q) = v_{i,q} - v_{k,q},$$

where $v_{i,q}$ is the unit vector at q tangent to the unique geodesic from q to p_i , and $v_{k,q}$ is defined analogously. In order to apply the coarea formula, we need a lower bound on the gradient of f_{ik} . The argument is again of geometric nature. For $q \in B_{ik}$ we consider the corresponding geodesic triangle $\triangle(p_i, p_k, q)$. Recall that lemma 3.7 implies that $\varepsilon \leq \text{dist}(p_i, p_k) \leq 2\varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon \leq \text{dist}(p_i, p_k) \leq 2 \text{dist}(p_i, q) = 2 \text{dist}(p_k, q) \leq 2\varepsilon$, where the first inequality follows from the triangle inequality and the second because $q_i \in \mathring{D}_i$ and lemma 3.5. Therefore, lemma 3.8 yields an upper bound $1 - c_0$ for the cosine of the angle between $v_{i,q}$ and $v_{k,q}$. Since both vectors are of unit length, we obtain that if $f_{ik}(q) = 0$

$$|\nabla f_{ik}(q)|^2 \geq 2c_0$$

Now, if $f_{i,k}(q) \leq \delta$, $\varepsilon \leq 2 \text{dist}(p_i, q) + \delta$. Thus, if $q \in B(p_i, 2\varepsilon)$ the geodesics in the corresponding triangle, $\triangle(p_i, p_k, q)$, have length between $\frac{1}{C(\delta)}\varepsilon$ and $C(\delta)\varepsilon$ with $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} C(\delta) = 2$. Hence for ε small enough, there exists a uniform δ , independent of ε , and such that for every i, k ,

$$(3.6) \quad |\nabla f_{ik}(q)|^2 \geq c_0$$

The same argument, interchanging p_i and p_k , provides a similar bound when $-\delta < f_{ik}(q)$.

Next, by using the implicit function theorem and Lemma 3.1, there are uniform constant C', δ_0 such that for every i, k , and for every $\delta \leq \delta_0$ it holds that,

$$(3.7) \quad \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(|f_{ik}|^{-1}(\delta) \cap B(p_i, 2\varepsilon)) \leq C'\varepsilon^{n-1}.$$

Denoting

$$R_{ik}(\delta) := B(p_i, 2\varepsilon) \cap \{-\delta < f_{ik} < \delta\},$$

we insert estimates (3.6), (3.7) into the coarea formula

$$\text{vol}(R_{ik}(\delta)) \leq \int_{-\delta}^{\delta} \int_{f_{ik}^{-1}(t)} \frac{1}{|\nabla f_{ik}(q')|} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(q') dt$$

to obtain that

$$(3.8) \quad \text{vol } R_{ik}(\delta) < C_n \varepsilon^{n-1} \delta.$$

where the constant C_n is independent of ε .

For the first part of the Lemma, use that the relative interior of each set B_{ik} appearing in (3.4) is a smooth manifold, since it is the level set of a regular value of the function f_{ik} . The proof of the second part follows from inequality (3.8), together with the uniform upper bound on the number of possible faces of D_i obtained in Lemma 3.10. \square

For the reader's convenience, we collect the results obtained in this section in the next Theorem, where we denote by $r_0 > 0$ a positive number that assures that any open set of diameter less than r_0 is a totally normal neighborhood of each of its points.

Theorem 3.13 (Voronoi decomposition Theorem). *Let (M, g) a closed Riemannian manifold, and $\varepsilon \ll r_0$. For any maximal ε -separated set, let $\{D_i\}$ denote the corresponding Voronoi decomposition. Then*

- (1) $M = \cup_i D_i$;
- (2) the interiors \mathring{D}_i are disjoint sets and $B(p_i, \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon) \subset \mathring{D}_i$;
- (3) The boundary ∂D_i is a piecewise smooth submanifold of dimension $n-1$, with the bound $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial D_i) \leq C'\varepsilon^{n-1}$ and thus,

$$\text{vol}(\cup_{p \in \partial D_i} B(p, \delta)) \leq C\varepsilon^{n-1} \delta,$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of ε ;

- (4) every D_i is a totally normal neighborhood of each of its points.

3.3. A refined partition of unity. Our goal is to associate a smooth function ψ_i for any $p_i \in \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon)$ and any sufficiently small $\delta > 0$. Moreover, we will require that ψ_i is supported in D_i , and $\psi_i(x) \equiv 1$ in points of D_i with $\text{dist}(x, \partial D_i) \geq \delta$.

3.3.1. Construction. Consider $p_i \in \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon)$ and let $I(p_i)$ be a set of indexes corresponding to adjacent regions to D_i . For each $k \in I(p_i)$, define

$$d_{ik}(x) := \text{dist}(p_k, x) - \text{dist}(p_i, x),$$

and

$$\phi_{ik,\delta}(x) = H_\delta \circ d_{ik}(x)$$

where $H_\delta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function with

- $H_\delta(t) = 1$ for $t > \delta$, and $H_\delta(t) = 0$ for $t < -\delta$;
- H_δ is strictly increasing with $H'_\delta(t) \leq 2/\delta$ in $[-\delta, \delta]$.

Then it is clear that

- (1) $\phi_{ik}(x) = 1$, if $\text{dist}(p_i, x) < \text{dist}(p_k, x) - \delta$;
- (2) $\phi_{ik}(x) = 0$, if $\text{dist}(p_i, x) \geq \text{dist}(p_k, x) + \delta$.

Moreover, the bounds of the gradient of d_{ik} as in (3.5) and the choice of H_δ yields that $|\nabla \phi_{ik}| \leq C\delta^{-1}$ for some constant C that is independent of ε and δ .

Define next

$$(3.9) \quad \phi_i(x) = \prod_{k \in I(i)} \phi_{ik}(x).$$

Then $|\nabla \phi_i| < C\delta^{-1}$ where $C > 0$ is, again, ε and δ independent.

The sets

$$(3.10) \quad D_i^{\delta,+} := \cap_{k \in I(i)} \{x : \text{dist}(p_i, x) \leq \text{dist}(p_k, x) + \delta\}$$

and

$$(3.11) \quad D_i^{\delta,-} := \cap_{k \in I(i)} \{x : \text{dist}(p_i, x) \leq \text{dist}(p_k, x) - \delta\}$$

satisfy that

$$D_i^{\delta,-} \subset D_i \subset D_i^{\delta,+};$$

moreover, by the choice of the ϕ_{ik} 's, we have that

$$(3.12) \quad \text{supp } \phi_i \subset D_i^{\delta,+}, \quad \phi_i = 1 \text{ in } D_i^{\delta,-},$$

Let $R_i := \{0 < \phi_i < 1\}$, and notice that, from the above,

$$R_i \subset \cup_{p \in \partial D_i} B(p, \delta),$$

and from Theorem 3, we get that

$$(3.13) \quad \text{vol } R_i \leq C'\varepsilon^{n-1}\delta,$$

At last, we define

$$(3.14) \quad \psi_i(x) := \frac{\phi_i(x)}{\sum_{p_k \in \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon)} \phi_k(x)}$$

Theorem 3.14. *Let (M, g) be a closed Riemannian manifold, and $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$ as chosen before, and $\{p_i\}$ a maximal ε set with associated Voronoi decomposition D_i . Then*

- (1) $\{\psi_i\}_i$ is a smooth partition of unity with

$$\psi_i = 1 \text{ in } D_i^{\delta,-}, \quad \psi_i = 0 \text{ in } M \setminus D_i^{\delta,+}.$$

- (2) For each i , the set $\{\nabla \psi_i \neq 0\} \subset D_i^{\delta,+} \setminus D_i^{\delta,-} \subset \cup_{p \in \partial D_i} B(p, \delta)$, hence

$$(3.15) \quad \text{vol}\{\nabla \psi_i \neq 0\} \leq C'\varepsilon^{n-1}\delta$$

for some $C' > 0$.

(3) We have an inequality

$$(3.16) \quad \text{vol}(\cup_i \text{supp } \nabla \psi_i) \leq C'' \delta \varepsilon^{-1}.$$

for some constant $C'' > 0$.

(4) For any multi-index $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}^n$,

$$(3.17) \quad |D^\gamma \psi_j(x)| \leq C_\gamma \delta^{-|\gamma|}.$$

Proof. Every statement follows from the previous comments. The first is immediate. For the second, observe that, by construction,

$$\text{supp } \psi_i \subset (D_i^+ \setminus D_i^-) \cup \cup_j [(D_j^+ \setminus D_j^-) \cap D_i];$$

inequality (3.15) follows then from the third part of Theorem 3.13. The third follows because, for small ε , the number of points in the net grows as ε^{-n} , by a standard volume counting argument. To prove the last one, we can just work in normal coordinates and apply induction. \square

3.4. Application: the main Theorem. For the rest of the paper, we will need to use Theorem 3.14 with specials ε and δ . This is due because, as the reader will see, the crucial step for our approach to homogenization is the projection of the prototype test functions from $\mathbb{T}M$ to M , which requires a proper microlocalization procedure parametrized by $\varepsilon \ll 1$. To this end we introduce, for $1/2 < \beta < 1$, a maximal ε^β -separated net $\{p_i(\varepsilon)\}_{i=1}^{J(\varepsilon)}$. Assuming that $\text{inj}_M > 3\varepsilon^\beta$, where inj_M is the injectivity radius of (M, g) , we see using simple volume-based arguments that

$$(3.18) \quad J(\varepsilon) \leq C \text{vol}(M) \varepsilon^{-\beta n}.$$

Theorem 3.15. *Let (M, g) be a closed Riemannian manifold, and constants $1/2 < \beta < \alpha < 1$ such that ε^β and ε^α satisfy the conditions in Theorem 3.14 for ε and δ respectively. Let $\{p_i\}$ be a maximal ε^β -separated net with associated Voronoi decomposition D_i . Then*

(1) $\{\psi_i\}_i$ is a smooth partition of unity with

$$\psi_i = 1 \text{ in } D_i^-, \quad \psi_i = 0 \text{ in } M \setminus D_i^+,$$

where we denote $D_i^+ = D_i^{\varepsilon^\alpha, +}$ and $D_i^- = D_i^{\varepsilon^\alpha, -}$

(2) For each i , there is an inclusion $\{\nabla \psi_i \neq 0\} \subset D_i^+ \setminus D_i^-$, hence

$$(3.19) \quad \text{vol}\{\nabla \psi_i \neq 0\} \leq C' \varepsilon^{\beta(n-1)+\alpha}$$

for some $C' > 0$.

(3) We have an inequality

$$(3.20) \quad \text{vol}(\cup_i \text{supp } \nabla \psi_i) \leq C'' \varepsilon^{\alpha-\beta}.$$

(4) For any multi-index $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}^n$,

$$(3.21) \quad |D^\gamma \psi_j(x)| \leq C_\gamma \varepsilon^{-\alpha|\gamma|}.$$

(5)

$$(3.22) \quad \{p : \psi_j \cdot \psi_\ell(p) \neq 0\} \subset \{\nabla \psi_j \neq 0\}$$

(6)

$$(3.23) \quad \{p : \psi_j - \psi_j^2(p) \neq 0\} \subset \{\nabla \psi_j \neq 0\}$$

Proof. The first four parts of the Theorem are a direct application of Theorem 3.14; the last two follow immediately from the construction. \square




FIGURE 3. A Voronoi domain and its corresponding function in the partition of unity.

Part 3. Two scale convergence

4. OSCILLATING TEST FUNCTIONS

The key concept of the two-scale convergence in a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is associated with a fixed cell Y and smooth functions $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that are periodic on the second variable with period Y . Such functions generate test functions simply as $f_\epsilon(x) = f(x, \frac{x}{\epsilon})$. However, on a manifold there is, in general, no such concept as periodicity. Our approach consists on “pulling back” the notion of periodicity, with respect to the lattice Γ , from $\mathbb{T}M$ to TM to M . The diffeomorphisms (onto its image) $H_{\epsilon,j} : D_j \rightarrow T_{p_j}M$ where D_j is a small enough neighbourhood of p_j (as the one provided by the Voronoi decomposition) and defined as

$$H_{\epsilon,j}(q) = \frac{\exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)}{\epsilon}$$

will play a crucial role.

Given a function $f : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, denote by $\tilde{f} : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the function defined as $\tilde{f} := f \circ \Phi$, where $\Phi : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{T}M$ is the quotient map that sends each fiber T_pM to the torus $\mathbb{T}M_p$ after modding out the lattice defined by the frame $\{e_i(p)\}$ (see Section 2.1).

The following definition gives a method to generate rapidly oscillating functions in the manifold M from functions in the torus bundle $\mathbb{T}M$.

Definition 4.1. Let $f : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function in $C(M, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T}M_p))$. For any $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, we define $f^\epsilon : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$(4.1) \quad f^\epsilon(q) = \sum_j \psi_j(q) \tilde{f}(p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon) = \sum_j \psi_j(q) H_{\epsilon,j}^* \tilde{f}(p_j, \cdot)(q), \quad q \in M.$$

In the definition of two scale convergence we just require smooth test functions. However, we can enlarge the class of test functions with the following notion

Definition 4.2. A function $f \in C(M, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T}M_p))$ is an *admissible test function* if the sequence f^ϵ satisfies

$$(4.2) \quad \int_M |f^\epsilon(q)|^2 dq \leq C \|f\|_{C(M, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T}_p M))}^2$$

for some $C > 0$, and

$$(4.3) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M |f^\epsilon(q)|^2 dq = \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} |f(p, v)|^2 dv dp$$

where we use for $v \in \mathbb{T}_p M$ the coordinates associated to the frame, as in (2.4), and $\text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p) = g^{1/2}$ for $g(p) = \det g_{ij}(p)$. We say that the sequence f^ϵ is **realized by** f .

We first introduce the following differential operator, which will often be encountered after integration by parts.

Lemma 4.3. Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. For $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we set $P_k f$ as

$$P_k f = \frac{\langle k, \nabla f \rangle}{2\pi i |k|^2}.$$

Then it holds that

$$|P_k f| \leq \frac{|\nabla f|}{2\pi |k|}.$$

Many of our arguments rely on the fact that after integrating by parts, we can discard Fourier modes with non constant character. This is a consequence of the following basic estimate, which follows from the properties of the partition of unity. Since it will appear recurrently we state it as a separate lemma, where we need to explain some notation: suppose ψ_j is one of the functions belonging to the partition of unity constructed in Section 3.3; assume that its support lies inside the ϵ^α -neighbourhood of the Voronoi domain D_j corresponding to the point p_j . Then $\exp_{p_j}^{-1}$ is well-defined in $\text{supp } \psi_j$, and therefore we can define unambiguously $f(\exp_{p_j}^{-1} q) \cdot \psi_j(q)$ for any function $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by extending it as zero outside of $\text{supp } \psi_j$.

Lemma 4.4. Let ψ_j be one of the functions belonging to the partition of unity and α, β as in Theorem 3.15. Then for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $C_N > 0$ such that

$$(4.4) \quad \left| \int_M \psi_j(p) e^{2\pi i k \cdot \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(p)/\epsilon} dp \right| \leq C_N |k|^{-N} \epsilon^{\beta(n-1) + N(1-\alpha) + \alpha}.$$

Proof. We write the above integral in the chart $\exp_{p_j} : T_{p_j} M \simeq \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow M$ (where we are reducing the domain and codomain to open sets, where the exponential is a diffeomorphism). Then, using $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as coordinate and $g := g(v) = \det g_{ij}(v)$, the left-hand side integral is written as

$$(4.5) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \psi_j(\exp_{p_j} v) g^{1/2}(v) e^{2\pi i k \cdot v/\epsilon} dv$$

Due to the compact support of ψ_j , we can integrate by parts N times to get

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \psi_j(\exp_{p_j} v) g^{1/2}(v) e^{2\pi i k \cdot v/\epsilon} dv \right| \\ &= \left| (-\epsilon)^N \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} P_k^N \left[\psi_j(\exp_{p_j} v) g^{1/2}(v) \right] e^{2\pi i k \cdot v/\epsilon} dv \right| \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{\epsilon}{|k|} \right)^N |\{x : D\psi_j \neq 0\}| \sup |D^N(\psi_j)| \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{\epsilon}{|k|} \right)^N \epsilon^{-N\alpha} \epsilon^{\beta(n-1) + \alpha} \leq C_N |k|^{-N} \epsilon^{N(1-\alpha) + n\beta + \alpha - \beta} \end{aligned}$$

where we have used part (3.19) in Theorem 3.15, equation (3.21) and the uniform bounds on the derivatives of the metric and the exponentials. \square

To study the admissibility condition, we start with an important result:

Lemma 4.5 (Riemann-Lebesgue Lemma). Let $f \in C(M, L^1(\mathbb{T}M_p))$ and f^ϵ as in (4.1). Then it holds that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M f^\epsilon(q) dq = \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} f[q, v] dv dq.$$

Proof. Since ϵ is small enough, we can use normal coordinates in M associated with p_j . Moreover, in $T_{p_j} M$ we use the coordinates $\{v^i\}_{i=1}^n$ given by the frame Γ_{p_j} . Then we have

$$\int_M \psi_j(q) \tilde{f}(p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon) dq = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \psi_j(\exp_{p_j} v) \tilde{f}(p_j, v/\epsilon) g^{1/2}(v) dv,$$

where $g(v) = g_j(v)$ is the Jacobian of the Riemannian normal coordinates centered at p_j . Recall from Section 3.1 that $g(v) = 1 + O(|v|^2)$.

Since $\tilde{f}(p, v)$ is \mathbb{Z}^n -periodic with respect to the frame, we take its Fourier series

$$\tilde{f}(p, v) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \hat{f}(p; k) e^{2\pi i k \cdot v},$$

where recall that

$$\hat{f}(p; k) = \int_{[0,1]^n} f(p, \xi) e^{-2\pi i k \cdot \xi} d\xi.$$

Then, from the weak convergence of the Fourier series,

$$(4.7) \quad \int_M \psi_j(q) \tilde{f}(p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon) dq = \int_{[0,1]^n} \psi_j(\exp_{p_j} v) \sum_k \hat{f}_j(k) e^{2\pi i k \cdot v/\epsilon} g^{1/2}(v) dv,$$

where we abbreviate $\hat{f}_j(k) = \hat{f}(p_j; k)$. We split the right-hand side as

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{[0,1]^n} \psi_j(\exp_{p_j} v) \hat{f}_j(0) g^{1/2}(v) dv + \sum_{k \neq 0} E_{k,j}(\epsilon) \\ &= \int_M \psi_j(q) \left(\int_{[0,1]^n} f(p_j, \xi) d\xi \right) dq + \sum_{k \neq 0} E_{k,j}(\epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Now, the terms with $k \neq 0$ are estimated by a direct application of Lemma 4.4. We obtain that

$$|E_{k,j}| \leq C'_N \epsilon^{\beta(n-1)+1} \frac{|\hat{f}(p_j, k)|}{|k|^N}$$

where $C'_N = \epsilon^{N(1-\alpha)+\alpha-1} C_N$. Notice that since $\alpha < 1$ and $N \geq 1$, $N(1-\alpha) + \alpha - 1 \geq 0$.

On the other hand, using that $0 \leq \psi_j \leq 1$ everywhere, we get that

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left| \int_M \int_{[0,1]^n} \psi_j(q) f(p_j, \xi) d\xi dq - \int_M \int_{[0,1]^n} \psi_j(q) f(q, \xi) d\xi dq \right| \leq \\ & \sup_{q \in D_j^\dagger} \left| \int_{[0,1]^n} f(p_j, \xi) d\xi - \int_{[0,1]^n} f(q, \xi) d\xi \right| \end{aligned}$$

Thus using the finite overlapping property (see Lemma 3.11), and the fact that $d\xi = g^{-1/2} dv$ we get

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \left| \int_M f^\epsilon dq - \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} f(q, v) dq dv \right| &\leq C_N \epsilon^{\beta(n-1)+1} \max_{p \in M} \sum_{|k| \geq 1} \frac{|\hat{f}(p; k)|}{|k|^N} \\ &+ \max_{p, q \in M, d(p, q) \leq \epsilon^\beta} \left| \int_{[0,1]^n} f(p, \xi) d\xi - \int_{[0,1]^n} f(q, \xi) d\xi \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Now $f(p, v) \in C(M, L^1(\mathbb{T}M_p))$ implies that the second term tends to zero by definition. It also implies that the Fourier coefficients are bounded and thus taking $N = n + 1$ the sum in the first term is bounded and hence tends to zero as ϵ goes to zero. \square

The definition of test functions in a manifold seems a priori very rigid, in difference to the Euclidean situation. For example, in \mathbb{R}^n , $f(x, \frac{x}{\epsilon})g(x, \frac{x}{\epsilon}) = fg(x, \frac{x}{\epsilon})$ and thus $f^\epsilon g^\epsilon = (fg)^\epsilon$. The next lemma shows that this is still the case in manifolds up to a vanishing error, and thus test functions behave like an algebra.

Proposition 4.6 (Test functions are almost an algebra). *Let $f, g \in C(\mathbb{T}M)$. Then*

$$(4.11) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left| \int_M f^\epsilon g^\epsilon dq - \int_M (fg)^\epsilon dq \right| = 0.$$

Proof. Fix ϵ and write $f^\epsilon = \sum \psi_j f_j$, $g^\epsilon = \sum \psi_\ell g_\ell$ where

$$f_j(q) = f(p_j, \frac{1}{\epsilon} \exp^{-1}(q)), \quad g_\ell(q) = g(p_\ell, \frac{1}{\epsilon} \exp^{-1}(q)),$$

so that,

$$(4.12) \quad \int_M f^\epsilon g^\epsilon dq = \int_M \left(\sum \psi_j f_j \right) \left(\sum \psi_\ell g_\ell \right) dq.$$

Now Parts (3) and (5) in Theorem 3.15, combined with the finite overlapping property of the Voronoi domains imply that

$$(4.13) \quad \left| \int_M \sum_{j \neq \ell} \psi_j \psi_\ell f_j g_\ell dq \right| \leq \|f\|_{C(\mathbb{T}M)} \|g\|_{C(\mathbb{T}M)} \cdot \int_M \sum_{j \neq \ell} \psi_j \psi_\ell dq \leq C \epsilon^{\alpha-\beta} \|f\|_{C(\mathbb{T}M)} \|g\|_{C(\mathbb{T}M)}$$

Thus, we are mainly concerned with computing the limit of $\sum_j \psi_j^2 f_j g_j$. In order to do that, we now combine parts (3) and (6) of Theorem 3.15 to estimate

$$(4.14) \quad \int_M \sum_j (\psi_j(q) - \psi_j^2(q)) f_j g_j(q) dq \leq C \epsilon^{\alpha-\beta} \|f\|_{C(\mathbb{T}M)} \|g\|_{C(\mathbb{T}M)}$$

Therefore

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left| \int_M f^\epsilon g^\epsilon dq - \int_M \sum \psi_j f_j g_j dq \right| \rightarrow 0$$

since $(fg)_j = f_j g_j$ and $(fg)^\epsilon = \sum \psi_j f_j g_j$. Thus, (4.11) is proven. \square

Remark. We warn the reader that indeed for an analytic function $F : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and f_1, \dots, f_N smooth test functions, the above argument implies that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int |(F(f_1, \dots, f_N))^\epsilon - F(f_1^\epsilon, \dots, f_N^\epsilon)| dp = 0$$

If we take $g = f$ the above proposition implies that any $f \in C(\mathbb{T}M)$ is an admissible function but we can have unbounded test functions as well. The technical detail is that instead of $|\int_U f dq| \leq \|f\|_\infty \text{vol}(U)$, we need the following lemma, which takes advantage of the periodicity of f . For a set $U \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we will denote by $U_\epsilon = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ dist}(y, U) \leq \epsilon\}$ its ϵ -tubular neighborhood.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be $[0, 1]^n$ -periodic and in $L^1([0, 1]^n)$. Then for any open set U ,*

$$\int_U f(x/\epsilon) dx \leq \|f\|_{L^1([0, 1]^n)} \text{vol}(U_\epsilon)$$

Proof. We can assume, replacing f by $|f|$ if necessary, that f is nonnegative. Declare $y = x/\epsilon$. Then

$$\int_U f(x/\epsilon) dx = \epsilon^n \int_{\frac{1}{\epsilon}U} f(y) dy$$

By the periodicity of f , this is bounded above by

$$N(\epsilon) \epsilon^n \int_{[0, 1]^n} f(y) dy$$

where $N(\epsilon)$ is the number of $[0, 1]^n$ cells with corner in \mathbb{Z}^n which intersect $\frac{1}{\epsilon}U$. This is, exactly, the number of ϵ -cells which intersect U . Such cells are disjoint and contained in U_ϵ , thus $N(\epsilon)\epsilon^n \leq \text{vol}(U_\epsilon)$. The result follows. \square

Theorem 4.8. *Any function $f \in C(M; L^2(\mathbb{T}M_p))$ is an admissible test function.*

Proof. We will first prove inequality (4.2) for this case. Once again, write $\tilde{f} : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for the lifted function $f \circ \Phi$ with $\Phi : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{T}M$ the quotient projection, and let

$$f_j(q) := \tilde{f}(p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon), \quad \hat{f}_j(v) := f_j \circ \exp_{p_j}(v),$$

so that

$$(4.15) \quad (f^\epsilon)^2 = \sum_j \psi_j^2 f_j^2 + \sum_{j \neq \ell} \psi_j \psi_\ell f_j f_\ell.$$

For the first summand, after taking exponential coordinates at p_j for each j -th term and integrating, its integral reads as

$$(4.16) \quad \sum_j \int_M \psi_j^2 f_j^2 dq = \sum_j \int_{\text{supp}(\psi_j \circ \exp_{p_j})} \psi_j^2 \circ \exp_{p_j}(v) \hat{f}_j^2(v/\epsilon) g_j^{1/2}(v) dv,$$

where g_j is the determinant of the metric in exponential coordinates centered at p_j . By Lemma 3.1, we can assume that $1/2 < g_j(v) \leq 2$. Since $\psi_j^2 < 1$ and $\epsilon \ll \epsilon^\beta$, a direct application of Lemma 4.7 yields that

$$\int_M \psi_j^2 f_j^2 dq \leq C \epsilon^{\beta n} \|f(p_j, *)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}M_{p_j})}^2$$

Finally, recall that $\{p_j\}$ is an ϵ^β -net; thus standard volume counting arguments show that, in an n -dimensional compact manifold,

$$(4.17) \quad \sum_j \int_M \psi_j^2 f_j^2 dq \leq C \text{vol}(M) \sup_p \|f(p, *)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}M_p)}^2 = C \text{vol}(M) \|f\|_{C(M, L^2(\mathbb{T}M_p))}^2$$

for some constant $C > 0$.

In order to deal with the mixed terms in (4.15) and also to obtain (4.3) we need to deal carefully with tubular neighborhoods of boundaries of the Voronoi domains. Recall that for each j , the second part in Theorem 3.14 implies that $\text{supp} \nabla \psi_j$ is contained in an ϵ^α tubular neighbourhood of ∂D_i , a piecewise regular $(n-1)$ -hypersurface of measure at most $C \epsilon^{\beta(n-1)}$. Since ϵ is small enough, the same holds for $\text{supp}(\nabla \psi_j \circ \exp_{p_j}) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ due to Lemma 3.1. Hence, since $\epsilon < \epsilon^\alpha$, it follows that $\text{supp}(\nabla \psi_j \circ \exp_{p_j})_\epsilon$ is contained in a tubular neighbourhood of radius $\epsilon^\alpha + \epsilon \leq 2\epsilon^\alpha$ of the same $n-1$ hypersurface in Euclidean space. Thus, another use of the coarea formula yields that

$$(4.18) \quad \text{vol}[(\text{supp}(\nabla \psi_j \circ \exp_{p_j})_\epsilon)] \leq C \epsilon^\alpha \epsilon^{\beta(n-1)}$$

Therefore, for each pair $j \neq \ell$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M \psi_j \psi_\ell f_j f_\ell dq &\leq \int_{\text{supp}(\nabla \psi_j) \cap (\text{supp} \nabla \psi_\ell)} \psi_j \psi_\ell f_j f_\ell dq \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\text{supp}(\nabla \psi_j)} \psi_j^2 f_j^2 dq \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\text{supp}(\nabla \psi_\ell)} \psi_\ell^2 f_\ell^2 dq \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

Next, we treat each of the terms by localizing, using that g_j is almost constant and that $\psi_j \leq 1$, exactly as in (4.16). A direct application of Lemma 4.7 and the estimate (4.18) yields that

$$\left(\int_{\text{supp}(\nabla \psi_\ell)} \psi_\ell^2 f_\ell^2 dq \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \|f(p_\ell, *)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}_{p_\ell} M)} (C \epsilon^\alpha \epsilon^{\beta(n-1)})^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

Thus,

$$(4.19) \quad \left| \int_M \sum_{j,\ell} \psi_j \psi_\ell f_j f_\ell dq \right| \leq K \|f\|_{C(M, L^2(\mathbb{T}M_{p_j}))}^2 \sum_j C \epsilon^\alpha \epsilon^{\beta(n-1)} \leq C \epsilon^{\alpha-\beta} \|f\|_{C(M, L^2(\mathbb{T}M_p))}^2$$

where K is the finite overlapping constant from Lemma 3.11 where we have merged several constants independent of ϵ in the final C . Thus (4.17) and (4.19) provides the proof of condition (4.2) on admissibility.

Because of (4.19), in order to prove (4.3), we just need to upgrade (4.17) to

$$(4.20) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M \sum_j \psi_j^2 f_j^2 dq = \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} f(p, v)^2 dv dp$$

However notice that now (3.23) plays the role in (3.22) and thus, we can repeat word by word the estimation on the cross terms to get that

$$(4.21) \quad \int_M \sum_j (\psi_j(q) - \psi_j^2(q)) f_j^2(q) dq \leq C \epsilon^{\alpha-\beta} \|f\|_{C(M, L^2(\mathbb{T}M_p))}^2.$$

Thus, instead of (4.20), we show that

$$(4.22) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M \sum_j \psi_j f_j^2 = \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} f(p, v)^2 dv dp.$$

But when $f \in C(M; L^2(\mathbb{T}M_p))$, then $f^2 \in C(M; L^1(\mathbb{T}M_p))$ and the limit in (4.22) follows from Proposition 4.5. □

5. TWO-SCALE CONVERGENCE OF FUNCTIONS

Definition 5.1. A sequence of functions $u_\epsilon \in L^2(M)$ two-scale converges to $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{T}M)$ if u_ϵ are uniformly bounded in $L^2(M)$ and, for any test function $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}M)$,

$$(5.1) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M u_\epsilon f^\epsilon dq = \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} u_0(p, v) f(p, v) dv dp,$$

where f^ϵ is as in Definition 4.1.

We will denote two-scale convergence by

$$u_\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} u_0.$$

If, in addition, u_ϵ satisfies that

$$(5.2) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M |u_\epsilon|^2 dq = \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} |u_0(p, v)|^2 dv dp,$$

then we say that u_ϵ *strongly two-scale converges* to u_0 and denote it as

$$u_\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} u_0$$

Remark. Notice that, in general, two-scale convergence does not imply strong two-scale convergence. A counterexample is given in the circumference \mathbb{S}^1 with the standard framing when $u_\epsilon(p) = \sin(p/\epsilon^2)$. A simple computation, using the ϵ -net placed at points $p_j = j\epsilon$, yields that $u_\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} 0$, while $\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} |u_\epsilon|^2 dp \rightarrow \pi$.

Our definitions already provide a wealth of two-scale convergent sequences.

Lemma 5.2 (Examples of two scale convergent sequences). *Let $f, g : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $h : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ functions, and $\pi : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow M$ the bundle projection.*

(1) If $h \in C(M)$, consider the constant sequence $h_\epsilon = h$. Then

$$(5.3) \quad h_\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} h \circ \pi$$

(2) If $g \in C(M, L^2(\mathbb{T}M_p))$, then,

$$(5.4) \quad g^\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} g$$

(3) If $f, g \in C(\mathbb{T}M)$, then

$$(5.5) \quad f^\epsilon g^\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} fg$$

Proof. We start with (1). Since

$$\int |h|^2 dp = \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} |h(p)|^2 dv dp,$$

we only need to deal with two-scale convergence. Then for any $f(p, v) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}M)$

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M h f^\epsilon = \int (h(p) f(p, v))^\epsilon dq + \int_M \sum_j \psi_j(q) (h(q) - h(p_j)) f(p_j, \exp_{p_j} q / \epsilon) dq$$

By continuity of h , $|h(q) - h(p_j)| = O(|q - p_j|)$; thus, the second term in the right-hand side approaches zero, and the result follows from Lemma 4.5.

As for (2), the two-scale convergence follows from Proposition 4.6 and the Riemann Lebesgue Lemma 4.5 (or directly from 4.5 applied to $f \pm g$), and the strong convergence follows from Theorem 4.8.

Finally, part (3) follows from part (2), Proposition 4.6, and the boundedness of f and g . Alternatively, given any $\bar{h} \in C(\mathbb{T}M)$ we apply Proposition 4.6 twice to get that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M f^\epsilon g^\epsilon \bar{h}^\epsilon dq = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M (fg\bar{h})^\epsilon dq = \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} fg\bar{h} dv dp$$

where the last equality follows from Lemma 4.5. As for the strong convergence, we are concerned with the limit of $\int (f^\epsilon g^\epsilon)^2 dp$. Applying Proposition 4.6 for consecutive times, we get that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M |(f^\epsilon)^2 (g^\epsilon)^2 - (f^2 g^2)^\epsilon| dq \rightarrow 0$$

and since $f^2 g^2$ is smooth, the strong convergence follows again from Lemma 4.5. \square

Lemma 5.3. *Let $g_\epsilon, h_\epsilon \in L^2(M)$. Suppose that*

$$(5.6) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M |g_\epsilon - h_\epsilon|^2 dq \rightarrow 0.$$

Then g_ϵ and h_ϵ have the same two-scale limit, in case the limit exists. The statement also holds for strong two-scale convergence.

Proof. For two-scale convergence, we take $f \in C(\mathbb{T}M)$. Then since f is bounded

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left| \int_M g_\epsilon f^\epsilon dq - \int_M h_\epsilon f^\epsilon dq \right| = 0$$

(Recall that M is compact and thus L^2 convergence implies L^1). For the strong limit, simply notice that,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int (|g_\epsilon|^2 - |h_\epsilon|^2) dq = 0$$

\square

There are many variants of the result; for example, if there is L^1 convergence to zero replacing (5.6), we get the same two-scale limit, which will be a strong two-scale limit if both sequences have equiintegrable L^2 powers.

Next we prove the compactness of L^2 with respect to two-scale convergence. The proof is very similar to that of the Euclidean space.

Proposition 5.4. *Assume that u_ϵ is a bounded sequence in $L^2(M)$. Then there exists a subsequence u_{ϵ_k} and a function $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{T}M)$ such that u_{ϵ_k} two-scale converges to u_0 .*

Proof. For any admissible test function, let us define

$$T_\epsilon : \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{T}M) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad T_\epsilon(f) = \int_M u_\epsilon f^\epsilon dq$$

Since f is admissible, condition (4.2) in Definition 4.2 yields

$$(5.7) \quad |T_\epsilon(f)| \leq \left(\int_M |u_\epsilon|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_M |f^\epsilon|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C \|u_\epsilon\|_2 \|f\|_{\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{T}M)} \leq C' \|f\|_{\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{T}M)}$$

Hence T_ϵ is in the dual of $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{T}M)$ which can be identified with $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}M)$. Thus, there exists a Borel measure μ_ϵ on $\mathbb{T}M$ such that $T_\epsilon(f) = (\mu_\epsilon, f)$ (dual pairing).

Since $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{T}M)$ is separable, and the family μ_ϵ is uniformly bounded in its dual, there exists a subsequence μ_ϵ and a measure μ_0 such that $\mu_\epsilon \rightarrow \mu_0$, in the weak* topology of $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}M)$. This means that there exists μ_0 such that

$$\langle \mu_0, f \rangle = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \langle \mu_\epsilon, f \rangle.$$

Moreover, using (4.3), we also get

$$(5.8) \quad |T_\epsilon(f)| \leq \left(\int_M |u_\epsilon|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_M |f^\epsilon|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C'' \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}M)}$$

Thus, going to the limit in (5.8), we see that, for an admissible test function f ,

$$|\langle \mu_0, f \rangle| \leq C \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}M)}$$

Since the class of the admissible test-functions is dense in $L^2(\mathbb{T}M)$, the limit measure is given by a function $\tilde{u}_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{T}M)$. Hence,

$$\langle \mu_0, f \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{T}M} \tilde{u}_0 f dv dp.$$

Take $u_0 = \text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p) \tilde{u}_0$. □

The next lemma relates two-scale convergence with the usual weak convergence.

Lemma 5.5. *Let v_ϵ be a bounded sequence in $L^2(M)$ that two-scale converges to $v \in L^2(\mathbb{T}M)$. Then v_ϵ converges weakly in $L^2(M)$ to the function $\tilde{v}(p) = \int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} v(p, \xi) d\xi$.*

Proof. Let $\phi \in C^1(M)$. Lift it to a function $f_\phi \in C^1(\mathbb{T}M)$ by $f_\phi(p, \xi) = \phi(p)$. Then

$$(5.9) \quad \int_M v_\epsilon(q) f_\phi^\epsilon(q) dq \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{T}M} v(p, \xi) \phi(p) d\xi dp = \int_M \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} v(p, \xi) d\xi \right) \phi(p) dp.$$

Observe that

$$f_\phi^\epsilon = \sum_j \psi_j \phi(p_j), \quad \text{and} \quad f_\phi^\epsilon - \phi = \sum_j \psi_j \cdot (\phi(p_j) - \phi).$$

Since $\text{supp } \psi_j \subset B(p_j, \epsilon^\beta)$ and the ψ_j 's add to one,

$$|f_\phi^\epsilon - \phi| \leq \epsilon^\beta \|\phi\|_{C^1(M)}$$

Thus $\|f_\phi^\epsilon - \phi\|_{L^2(M)} \leq C \epsilon^\beta \|\phi\|_{C^1(M)}$, and it follows from (5.9) that

$$\int_M v_\epsilon(q) \phi(q) dq \rightarrow \int_M \tilde{v}(q) \phi(q) dq, \quad \tilde{v}(q) = \int_{\mathbb{T}M_q} v(q, \xi) d\xi.$$

At last, due to the density of $C^1(M)$ in $L^2(M)$ and the uniform boundedness of $\|v_\epsilon\|_{L^2(M)}$, the above equation implies the desired result. \square

Remark. In the Euclidean setting, the classical two-scale convergence uses test functions of the form $f(x, \frac{x}{\epsilon})$ which are $[0, 1]^n$ -periodic with respect to the canonical lattice (placed at the origin). However, these choices are amenable to changes. For instance, the lattice of periodicity could change from point to point and the origin could be shifted. For a smooth $GL(\mathbb{R}^n)$ -valued function $A(x)$ and a sequence x_0^ϵ , we could define, for f as above, test functions $f^\epsilon(x) = f(x, A(x)[\frac{x-x_0^\epsilon}{\epsilon}])$. Our choice of the underlying net provides yet an additional degree of freedom.

Notice that by a careful choice of the net in the definition of Voronoi domains, our definition of two-scale convergence in the Euclidean setting coincides with the classical one. For example, given $\frac{1}{2} < \beta < 1$, one considers the net with coordinates $\ell\epsilon^\beta$, for $0 \leq \ell \leq \epsilon^{-\beta}$. Then, if we choose ϵ so that $\epsilon^{-\beta} \in \mathbb{N}$, it is straightforward to see that definition 5.1 agrees with the classical notion.

Remark. In principle, although the weak limit in 5.5 is always unique, the two-scale limit may depend on the chosen sequences of nets. Indeed, for $M = S^1$, we can consider $N := \epsilon^\beta/2\pi$, $f[p, v] = \sin v$, and the nets given as

$$p_\ell = \frac{2\pi\ell}{N}, \quad \tilde{p}_\ell = \frac{2\pi\ell}{N} + \frac{\pi}{2\epsilon}.$$

In this case, we can see that $\tilde{f}^\epsilon(q)$ in the second net, 2-scale converges to the function $v_0[p, v] = \cos v$. However, this corresponds to a simple shift of the origin in the classical definition of test functions in the two scale convergence.

Next, we take a closer look at strong two scale convergence.

Lemma 5.6. *Let $u_\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} a$ and f be admissible. Then,*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M |u_\epsilon - f^\epsilon|^2 dq = \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} |a - f|^2 dv dp$$

Proof. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M |u_\epsilon - f^\epsilon|^2 dq &= \int_M |u_\epsilon|^2 dq + \int_M |f^\epsilon|^2 dq - 2 \int_M u_\epsilon f^\epsilon dq \\ &\rightarrow \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} |a|^2 dv dp + \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} |f|^2 dv dp - 2 \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} a f dv dp \\ &= \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} |a(p, \xi) - f(p, \xi)|^2 dp d\xi, \end{aligned}$$

as stated. \square

The following lemma is the analogue of Lemma 5.2 for sequences of functions

Lemma 5.7 (Compensated compactness). *Assume that u_ϵ strongly two-scale converges to u_0 and v_ϵ two-scale converges to v_0 .*

(a) *Then*

$$u_\epsilon(p)v_\epsilon(p) \rightarrow \text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} u_0(p, v) v_0(p, v) dv \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(M).$$

(b) *If $u_0 \in \mathcal{C}(M; L^2(\mathbb{T}M_p))$, then $\|u_\epsilon - u_0^\epsilon\|_{L^2(M)} \rightarrow 0$.*

Proof. We want to show that for a test function $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(M)$,

$$\int_M \varphi u_\epsilon v_\epsilon dq \rightarrow \int_M \varphi \left(\text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{T}p} u_0(p, \xi) v_0(p, \xi) d\xi \right) dp.$$

Let $\psi_k(p, \xi)$ be a sequence in $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}M)$ which is $L^2(\mathbb{T}M)$ -convergent to $u_0(p, \xi)$. It follows from lemma 5.6 that,

$$(5.10) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M |u_\epsilon - \psi_k^\epsilon|^2 dq = \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} |u_0 - \psi_k|^2 dp d\xi.$$

To continue, write

$$(5.11) \quad \int_M \varphi u_\epsilon v_\epsilon dq = \int_M \varphi (u_\epsilon - \psi_k^\epsilon) v_\epsilon dq + \int_M \varphi \psi_k^\epsilon v_\epsilon dq.$$

Due to the smoothness of φ , the function $\varphi(p) \psi_k(p, \xi)$ is a test-function. Using the two-scale-convergence of v_ϵ , the last term in (5.11) converges to $\oint_{\mathbb{T}M} \varphi \psi_k v_0 dp d\xi$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Then

$$(5.12) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left| \int_M \varphi u_\epsilon v_\epsilon dq - \int_M \varphi(p) \left(\text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{T}_p} u_0(p, \xi) v_0(p, v) dv \right) dq \right| \\ & \leq \left| \int_M \varphi v_\epsilon (u_\epsilon - \psi_k^\epsilon) dq \right| + \left| \int_M \varphi \psi_k^\epsilon v_\epsilon dq - \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} \varphi(p) \psi_k(p, v) v_0(p, v) dv dp \right| + \\ & \quad + \left| \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} \varphi v_0 (\psi_k - u_0) dv dp \right| \leq \\ & \leq \|\varphi v_\epsilon\|_{L^2(M)} \|u_\epsilon - \psi_k^\epsilon\|_{L^2(M)} + \left| \int_M \varphi \psi_k^\epsilon v_\epsilon dq - \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} \varphi \psi_k v_0 dv dp \right| + \\ & \quad + \|\text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p)^{-1} \varphi v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}M)} \cdot \|u_0 - \psi_k\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}M)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now let $\delta > 0$ be arbitrary, and define C as the maximum of the following two numbers $\|\text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p)^{-1} \varphi v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}M)}$ and $\sup_{\epsilon > 0} \|\varphi v_\epsilon\|_{L^2(M)}$. Take also some k such that $\|u_0 - \psi_k\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}M)} \leq \frac{\delta}{2C}$. Using (5.10), we then choose ϵ_0 such that for $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$ we have $\|u_\epsilon - \psi_k^\epsilon\|_{L^2(M)} \leq \frac{\delta}{2C}$. Since $\phi(p) \psi_k(p, v)$ is a proper test-function, for a fixed k ,

$$\left| \int_M \varphi \psi_k^\epsilon v_\epsilon dq - \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} \varphi \psi_k v_0 dv dp \right| \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Summarizing the above, we see that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left| \int_M \varphi u_\epsilon v_\epsilon - \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} \varphi u_0 v_0 \right| \leq \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left| \int_M \varphi \psi_k^\epsilon v_\epsilon - \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} \varphi \psi_k v_0 \right| + \delta = \delta,$$

thus proving the first part of the Proposition.

To prove the second statement, assume that u_0 is an admissible test function and argue as in the proof of (5.10) with $\psi_k = u_0$. □

Remark. Notice that the above theorem implies that, if v_ϵ two-scale converges to v_0 , then for every admissible $f \in C(M, \mathcal{B}_p(\mathbb{T}M))$, we have that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M \varphi v_\epsilon f^\epsilon dp = \int_M \varphi \text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{T}_p M} v_0 f dv dp$$

for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(M)$. This follows directly from part (a) of Lemma 5.7 because, as discussed in Lemma 5.2, f^ϵ strongly two-scale converges to f .

Compensated compactness lemma is stated for bilinear quantities, i.e. it analyzes the limits of products a_ϵ, b_ϵ of two sequences. In fact, if we have a family of sequences $\{a_\epsilon^i\}_{i=1}^n$ such that $a_\epsilon^i \xrightarrow{2s} a^i$ and $b_\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} b$, the same lemma describes the distributional limit of $\prod_{i=1}^n a_\epsilon^i b_\epsilon$ thanks to our next result

Lemma 5.8. *Let a_ϵ and b_ϵ be bounded sequences of functions on M which strongly two-scale converge to a and b respectively, Then $a_\epsilon b_\epsilon$ strongly two scale converges to ab .*

Proof. Take smooth $L^2(\mathbb{T}M)$ approximations a_k and b_k of a and b respectively. Firstly, observe that by boundedness of a, b it holds

$$(5.13) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} |a_k b_k|^2 dv dp = \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} |ab|^2 dv dp$$

As in the proof of Lemma 5.7, strong two scale convergence and Lemma 5.6 imply that

$$(5.14) \quad \lim_{\epsilon} \int_M |a_\epsilon - (a_k)^\epsilon|^2 dq = \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} |a - a_k|^2 dv dp \text{ and}$$

$$(5.15) \quad \lim_{\epsilon} \int_M |b_\epsilon - (b_k)^\epsilon|^2 dq = \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} |b - (b_k)|^2 dv dp$$

Now we write

$$a_\epsilon b_\epsilon = (a_\epsilon - (a_k)^\epsilon + a_k^\epsilon)(b_\epsilon - (b_k)^\epsilon + (b_k)^\epsilon)$$

and using the L^∞ -boundedness of the sequences $a_\epsilon, b_\epsilon, f_k^\epsilon$ and g_k^ϵ together with Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and (5.14) we have that

$$(5.16) \quad \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left| \int_M |a_\epsilon b_\epsilon|^2 dq - \int_M |(a_k)^\epsilon (b_k)^\epsilon|^2 dq \right| \leq C(\|a - a_k\|_{L^2} + \|b - b_k\|_{L^2}),$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 4.6

$$(5.17) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M |(a_k)^\epsilon (b_k)^\epsilon|^2 dq = \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} |a_k b_k|^2 dv dp$$

Finally, we write,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} |ab|^2 dq - \int_M |a_\epsilon b_\epsilon|^2 dq \right| &\leq \left| \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} (|ab|^2 - |a_k b_k|^2) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_M |(a_k)^\epsilon (b_k)^\epsilon|^2 dq - \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} |a_k b_k|^2 \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_M (|a_\epsilon b_\epsilon|^2 - |(a_k)^\epsilon (b_k)^\epsilon|^2) \right| \end{aligned}$$

and conclude by choosing k large enough to make the first and third term as small as we wish by (5.13) and (5.16) and for such k choose ϵ to make the second term small as well. \square

6. TWO-SCALE CONVERGENCE OF TENSORS

Along the entire section, $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^k \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ will be a set of k arbitrary vector fields, and $\{\omega^j\}_{j=1}^m \in \Lambda^1(M)$ will be a set of m arbitrary 1-forms. We will use the shortcuts X_I, ω^J , where no confusion is possible.

Definition 6.1. Let $T_\epsilon \in L^2 T^{k,m}(M)$ be a sequence of (k, m) -tensors, and $T \in L^2 T^{k,m}(\mathcal{V})$ be a vertical (k, m) -tensor. Then we say that T_ϵ two-scale (strongly) converges to T ,

$$T_\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} T, \quad (T_\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} T)$$

if for every $(X_I, \omega^J) \in \mathfrak{X}(M)^k \times \Lambda(M)^m$ the functions $T_\epsilon(X_I, \omega^J)$ two-scale (strongly) converge to $T(X_I^\uparrow, \omega^{J^\uparrow})$.

Notice that the convergence is invariant under raising or lowering indexes of forms and vector fields. Thus, we can consider $Y_\epsilon \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ as linear functionals on Λ^1 or $Y_\epsilon \in T^{0,1}(M)$ through the scalar product

$$\langle Y_\epsilon, X \rangle = Y_\epsilon^b(X).$$

Notice also that if $T_\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} T$, it follows that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int |T_\epsilon|^2 dq = \oint |T|^2 dv dp$$

Lemma 6.2. Let $T \in L^2 T^{k,m}(M)$ and declare $T_\epsilon = T$. Then

$$T_\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} T^\uparrow$$

Proof. Let $T \in T^{k,m}(M)$ and $(X_I, \omega^J) \in \mathfrak{X}(M)^k \times \Lambda(M)^m$. If $\pi : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow M$ denotes the bundle projection, then, by Lemma 5.2, the constant sequence two-scale converges to

$$T(X_I, \omega^J) \xrightarrow{2s} T(X_I, \omega^J) \circ \pi = T^\uparrow(X_I^\uparrow, \omega^{J^\uparrow})$$

which is precisely the definition. □

Next, we state a compensated compactness lemma for tensor and vector fields.

Lemma 6.3 (Compensated compactness for tensors). *Suppose we have sequences $A_\epsilon \in T^{2,0}(M)$, $X_\epsilon, Y_\epsilon \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, such that*

$$A_\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} A, \quad X_\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} X, \quad Y_\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} Y.$$

Assume further than A_ϵ and Y_ϵ are uniformly bounded in M . Then

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M A_\epsilon[X_\epsilon, Y_\epsilon] dq = \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} A[X, Y] dv dp$$

Proof. After expanding on the frame basis, we obtain that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M A_\epsilon[X_\epsilon, Y_\epsilon] dq = \sum_{i,j} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M (X_\epsilon)_i (Y_\epsilon)_j A_\epsilon[e_i, e_j] dq$$

We have the convergences $(X_\epsilon)_i \xrightarrow{2s} X_i$, $(Y_\epsilon)_j \xrightarrow{2s} Y_j$ and $A_\epsilon[e_i, e_j] \xrightarrow{2s} A[e_i^\uparrow, e_j^\uparrow]$. Then by Lemma 5.8, $A_\epsilon[e_i, e_j] (Y_\epsilon)_j \xrightarrow{2s} A[e_i^\uparrow, e_j^\uparrow] Y_j$ since both are bounded. Therefore by Lemma 5.7, that is, the compensated compactness lemma for functions, it holds that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M (X_\epsilon)_i (Y_\epsilon)_j A_\epsilon[e_i, e_j] dq = \int_M \int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} \text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p)^{-1} X_i Y_j A[e_i^\uparrow, e_j^\uparrow] dv dp$$

and the result follows. □

As discussed before, our notion of two-scale convergence is invariant under lowering and raising indexes, thus the result holds for (1,1) tensors as well. We have stated the result for (2,0)-tensors as the notation becomes slightly easier, but there is a corresponding statement for tensors of arbitrary order.

6.1. Oscillating tensor fields via pullback of its coordinate functions. Next, we send vertical tensors to oscillating tensor fields in the base manifold in the spirit of what we already did for functions; this is natural, since we can consider functions as (0,0)-tensors. There are various possibilities to do this. The first one is simply to oscillate the coordinate functions with respect to the frame.

Definition 6.4. Let $T \in T^{k,m}(\mathcal{V})$ and $(X_I, \omega^J) \in \mathfrak{X}(M)^k \times \Lambda(M)^m$. Then we define the sequence of tensors $\overline{T}^\epsilon \in T^{k,m}(M)$ by

$$\overline{T}^\epsilon(X_I, \omega^J) = (T(X_I^\uparrow, \omega^{J^\uparrow}))^\epsilon$$

In order to obtain an explicit description of \overline{T}^ϵ it suffices to use Definition 6.4 in some basis, canonically the frame $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and its dual 1-forms frame $\{\theta_i\}_{i=1}^n$. For example, if $X \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{V})$ is a smooth vertical vector field in $\mathbb{T}M$, X can be written as

$$(6.1) \quad X[q, v] = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i[q, v] e_i^\uparrow[q, v],$$

for some smooth functions $f_i : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Given that $X(\theta_i^\uparrow) = f_i$ Definition 6.4 yields that $\bar{X}^\epsilon(\theta_i) = f_i^\epsilon$. Letting i run from 1 to n , we obtain the following explicit expression for \bar{X}_q^ϵ ,

$$(6.2) \quad \bar{X}_q^\epsilon := \sum_j \psi_j(q) \sum_{i=1}^n f_i[p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon] e_i(q).$$

Similarly for $(X_I, \omega^J) \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{V})^k \times \Lambda(\mathcal{V})^m$, we will consider $(\bar{X}_I)^\epsilon, (\bar{\omega}^J)^\epsilon \in \mathfrak{X}(M)^k \times \Lambda(M)^m$ to extend this observation to the general case.

Lemma 6.5. *For $T \in T^{k,m}(\mathcal{V})$, $T = \sum T_J^I e_I^\uparrow \otimes \theta^{J^\uparrow}$ for multi-indexes $I = i_1, \dots, i_k$, $J = j_1, \dots, j_m$, we have that*

$$(6.3) \quad \bar{T}^\epsilon = \sum \psi_j \sum T_J^I [p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon] e_I \otimes \theta^J$$

The next lemma will be useful to prove that the two-scale strong limit of \bar{T}_q^ϵ is T as it is natural.

Lemma 6.6. *Let $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{T}M)$ and $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$. Then,*

$$(6.4) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \|X^{\uparrow^\epsilon} - X\| = 0, \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \|(fX^{\uparrow^\epsilon})^\epsilon - f^\epsilon X\| = 0$$

Proof. Notice that for $X = \sum x^i(q) e_i(q)$

$$(X^\uparrow)^\epsilon = \sum_j \psi_j(q) \sum_{i=1}^n x^i(p_j) e_i(q).$$

Hence by the finite overlapping property and Theorem 3.15,

$$\|(X^\uparrow)^\epsilon(q) - X(q)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \sup_{j,i} |x^i(p_j) - x^i(q)| \leq C' \epsilon^\beta$$

which yields the first limit.

The second limit follows in the same way, since we have that

$$(fX^\uparrow)^\epsilon = \sum_j \psi_j(q) \sum_{i=1}^n x^i(p_j) f[p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon] e_i(q).$$

and

$$f^\epsilon X = \sum_j \psi_j(q) \sum_{i=1}^n x^i(q) f[p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon] e_i(q)$$

which is identical except for $x^i(q)$ taking the place of $x^i(p_j)$. □

All in all, we have the following direct consequence of lemma 5.2.

Proposition 6.7. *Let $T \in C(M, L^2 T^{k,m}(\mathcal{V}_p))$. Then it holds that,*

$$\bar{T}^\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} T.$$

Proof. The coordinate functions imply the convergences of (k, m) -tuples formed from the frame and the dual frame. Since the manifold is parallelizable, every field and form is a linear combination of these elements, and the result follows. □

Notice that the above allows us to describe two-scale convergence of tensors, by pairing with test vector fields and forms. That is the statement of the following lemma.

Lemma 6.8. *Let $(X_I, \omega^J) \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{V})^k \times \Lambda(\mathcal{V})^m$ be vertical vector fields and forms, $T_\epsilon \in L^2 T^{k,m}(M)$ and $T \in L^2 T^{k,m}(\mathcal{V})$. Then $T_\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} T$ if and only if*

$$(6.5) \quad \int_M T_\epsilon((X_I)^\epsilon, (\omega^J)^\epsilon) dq \rightarrow \oint T(X_I, \omega^J) dv dp.$$

In particular, if $Y_\epsilon \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ and $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{V})$, then $Y_\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} Y$ if and only if for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{V})$

$$(6.6) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M \langle Y_\epsilon, X^\epsilon \rangle dq \rightarrow \oint \langle Y, X \rangle dv dp.$$

Proof. Let us start by proving that two-scale convergence implies (6.5). By multilinearity, for each choice of multi-indexes appearing in the definition of T we need to deal with the limit of sums of integrals of terms like

$$(T_\epsilon)_{i_1, \dots, i_k}^{j_1, \dots, j_m} (x_1^{i_1})^\epsilon \cdots (x_k^{i_k})^\epsilon \cdot (\omega_{1, j_1})^\epsilon \cdots (\omega_{m, j_m})^\epsilon$$

where $x_l^{i_l}$ stands for the coordinates of the vector field X_l , ω_{r, j_r} are the coordinates of the form ω_r , and

$$(T_\epsilon)_{i_1, \dots, i_k}^{j_1, \dots, j_m} = T_\epsilon(e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_k}, \theta_{j_1}, \dots, \theta_{j_m})$$

are the coordinates of T_ϵ with respect to the frame and the dual frame.

Notice that $T_\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} T$ implies that

$$(T_\epsilon)_{i_1, \dots, i_k}^{j_1, \dots, j_m} \xrightarrow{2s} T(e_{i_1}^\uparrow, \dots, e_{i_k}^\uparrow, \theta_{j_1}^\uparrow, \dots, \theta_{j_m}^\uparrow).$$

By an iterated use of Proposition 4.6 we have that

$$(6.7) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M ((x_1^{i_1})^\epsilon \cdots (x_k^{i_k})^\epsilon \cdot (\omega_1)_{j_1}^\epsilon \cdots (\omega_m)_{j_m}^\epsilon - (x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_k^{i_k} \cdot \omega_{1, j_1} \cdots \omega_{m, j_m})^\epsilon) dq = 0$$

and notice that the last expression under the integral, $(x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_k^{i_k} \cdot \omega_{1, j_1} \cdots \omega_{m, j_m})^\epsilon$ is a test function. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M (T_\epsilon)_{i_1, \dots, i_k}^{j_1, \dots, j_m} (x_1^{i_1})^\epsilon \cdots (x_k^{i_k})^\epsilon \cdot (\omega_{1, j_1})^\epsilon \cdots (\omega_{m, j_m})^\epsilon dq = \\ & \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M T_\epsilon(e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_k}, \theta_{j_1}, \dots, \theta_{j_m}) (x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_k^{i_k} \cdot \omega_{1, j_1} \cdots \omega_{m, j_m})^\epsilon dq = \\ & \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} T(e_{i_1}^\uparrow, \dots, e_{i_k}^\uparrow, \theta_{j_1}^\uparrow, \dots, \theta_{j_m}^\uparrow) x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_k^{i_k} \cdot \omega_{1, j_1} \cdots \omega_{m, j_m} dv dp \end{aligned}$$

where in the equality of the limits we have used (6.7) and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and in the second equality that by Definition 6.1, $T_\epsilon(e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_k}, \theta_{j_1}, \dots, \theta_{j_m})$ two-scale converges to the expression $T(e_{i_1}^\uparrow, \dots, e_{i_k}^\uparrow, \theta_{j_1}^\uparrow, \dots, \theta_{j_m}^\uparrow)$ and also that $(x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_k^{i_k} \cdot \omega_{1, j_1} \cdots \omega_{m, j_m})^\epsilon$ is a test function. Therefore, as our (k, m) -tuple of vectors and forms was arbitrary, we obtain (6.5).

Assume now that (6.5) holds, and let us obtain two-scale convergence. Let $X_1, X_{I_1}, \omega_J \in \mathfrak{X}(M) \times \mathfrak{X}(M)^{k-1} \times \Lambda M^m$ and $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}M)$. Then by multilinearity of the tensor,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M T_\epsilon(X_1, X_{I_1}, \omega_J) f^\epsilon dq = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M T_\epsilon(f^\epsilon X_1, X_{I_1}, \omega_J) dq$$

By Lemma 6.6, this equals to

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M T_\epsilon(f X_1^\uparrow)^\epsilon, (X_{I_1}^\uparrow)^\epsilon, (\omega_J)^\epsilon dq = \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} T(f X_1^\uparrow, X_{I_1}^\uparrow, \omega^\uparrow) dv dp = \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} f T(X_1^\uparrow, X_{I_1}^\uparrow, \omega^\uparrow) dv dp$$

which yields the two-scale convergence of the functions $T_\epsilon(X_1, X_{I_1}, \omega_J)$ and thus the two-scale convergence of T_ϵ . □

6.2. Oscillating tensor fields via pullbacks of vertical tensors. Here we will consider a second form to obtain oscillating tensor fields in the base manifold M from vertical tensor fields. Although our new definition will be somewhat different from that appearing in Definition 6.4, we will show that the difference will disappear with higher oscillations.

Recall that

$$(6.8) \quad f^\epsilon = \sum \psi_j(q) H_{\epsilon,j}^* \tilde{f}(p_j, \cdot)(q), \quad q \in M.$$

In order to extend this view to tensors, we start by elaborating on the definition of $H_{\epsilon,j}$.

We consider the map

$$H_{\epsilon,j} : D_j \rightarrow \mathbb{T}M, \quad H_{\epsilon,j}(q) = [p_j, \frac{1}{\epsilon} \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)]$$

defined in the Voronoi set D_j corresponding to p_j constructed in Section 3.3. If ψ_j is the member of the partition of unity related to the Voronoi set D_j ,

$$H_{\epsilon,j}(q) = [p_j, \psi_j(q) \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon} \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)]$$

yields an extension

$$H_{\epsilon,j} : M \rightarrow \mathbb{T}M,$$

that we do not relabel. This extended $H_{\epsilon,j}$ maps everything outside of D_j to $[p_j, 0]$. More important, observe that the image of $H_{\epsilon,j}$ is entirely contained in the vertical torus $\mathbb{T}M_{p_j}$. Next, we specify how $H_{\epsilon,j}$ acts on tensors. We denote $[p_j, v] = H_{\epsilon,j}(q)$.

Definition 6.9. Let $T \in T^{k,m}(\mathcal{V})$ a vertical tensor. Then for $q \in D_j$, we define a (k, m) -tensor with support in D_j as

$$(6.9) \quad (H_{\epsilon,j})_*(T[p_j, v])(X_I, \omega^J)(q) = (T \circ H_{\epsilon,j}(q))(\epsilon(H_{\epsilon,j})_*(X_I), \epsilon^{-1}(H_{\epsilon,j}^{-1})^*(\omega^J))$$

Recall that, in frame coordinates, we have that

$$X = \sum x^i e_i, \quad \omega = \sum \omega_i (\exp_{p_j}^{-1})^* \theta^i, \quad \text{and } v = H_{\epsilon,j}(q)$$

then a simple computation yields

$$(6.10) \quad ((H_{\epsilon,j})_* X)_v = \epsilon^{-1} \sum x^i(q) d \exp_{p_j}^{-1} e_i, \quad ((H_{\epsilon,j}^{-1})^* \omega)_v = \epsilon \sum \omega_i(q) \exp_{p_j}^* \theta^i.$$

This leads to the following alternative definition of oscillating tensors:

Definition 6.10. Let T be a smooth vertical tensor field in $T^{k,m}(\mathcal{V})$. For $\epsilon > 0$, and for any ϵ -net $\{p_j\}_j$ as in Theorem 3.13, we define $T^\epsilon \in T^{k,m}(M)$ by the sum

$$(6.11) \quad T_q^\epsilon = \epsilon^{k-m} \sum_j \psi_j(q) (H_{\epsilon,j})_*(T[p_j, v])$$

Let us look at equation (6.11) in coordinates. We start with vector fields. Since by definition $(X, (H_{\epsilon,j}^{-1})^* \theta) = (\theta, (H_{\epsilon,j}^{-1})_* X)$ we obtain that

$$X^\epsilon = \sum \psi_j (H_{\epsilon,j}^{-1})_* X$$

In order to express in coordinates, we carefully explain how $d \exp_{p_j}$ acts on the lifted frame. Recall, that we are considering parallelizable manifolds, with the corresponding frame $\{e_i\}_1^n$ forming a basis of the tangent space at every point of M . Denote by $\{e_i^\uparrow\}$ their vertical lifts to $\mathbb{T}M$ as indicated in Definition 2.3. For $\epsilon > 0$, and for any ϵ -net $\{p_j\}_j$ as in Theorem 3.13, define for $q = \exp_{p_j}(v)$

$$(6.12) \quad e_i^\downarrow(p_j; q) := (d \exp_{p_j})_v(e_i(p_j)).$$

in the Voronoi set D_j , and zero otherwise.

Notice that here we are somewhat abusing notation, identifying the tangent space to $T_{p_j}M$ at $\exp^{-1}(q)$ with $T_{p_j}M$. To be more rigorous, as $\exp : TM \rightarrow M$, we should have written

$$(6.13) \quad e_i^\downarrow(p_j; q) := (d \exp_{p_j})_v(e_i^\uparrow(p_j, v)) = \epsilon^{-1}(H_{\epsilon, j}^{-1})^*(e_i^\uparrow(p_j, v)),$$

since $(d \exp_{p_j})_v : T_v(T_{p_j}M) \rightarrow T_qM$, and $e_i(p_j) \in T_{p_j}M$, while $e_i^\uparrow(p_j, v) \in T_vT_{p_j}M$.

Observe that, if $\{\psi_j\}_j$ is the partition of unity associated to D_j , the fields $\psi_j e_i^\downarrow[p_j; \cdot]$ are smooth vector fields well-defined everywhere in M , since $\text{supp } \psi_j \subset D_j$. Writing

$$X = \sum_i f_i[p, v] e_i^\uparrow,$$

we get that

$$(6.14) \quad X_q^\epsilon := \sum_j \psi_j(q) \sum_{i=1}^n f_i[p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon] e_i^\downarrow(p_j; q)$$

Similarly, for elements of the dual frame θ^i , we define

$$(6.15) \quad \theta_i^\downarrow(p_j; q) := (\epsilon(H_{\epsilon, j})^*(\theta_i^\uparrow(p_j, v))),$$

and notice that in coordinates, abusing the notation in a self-explanatory way for a second,

$$(6.16) \quad \theta_i^\downarrow(p_j; q) := (d \exp_{p_j}^{-1})_v(\theta_i(p_j)).$$

In any case we obtain, the expression

$$(6.17) \quad \omega_q^\epsilon := \sum_j \psi_j(q) \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i[p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon] \theta_i^\downarrow(p_j; q)$$

Once we understand vectors and forms, the result for general tensors follows easily. To simplify the writing, we are following Einstein's summation convention of adding over repeated indexes.

Lemma 6.11. *Let $T \in T^{n, m}(\mathcal{V})$, with $T = T_{j_1, \dots, j_m}^{i_1, \dots, i_n} e_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{i_n} \otimes \theta^{j_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \theta^{j_n}$. Then, it holds that,*

$$T^\epsilon = (T_{j_1, \dots, j_m}^{i_1, \dots, i_n})^\epsilon e_{i_1}^\downarrow \otimes \dots \otimes e_{i_n}^\downarrow \otimes (\theta^{j_1})^\downarrow \otimes \dots \otimes (\theta^{j_n})^\downarrow$$

Notice that, comparing with equation (6.3), we are shifting the frame. However, the next lemma shows that for ϵ small enough, both basis are very close.

Lemma 6.12. *Let e_i, θ_i be members of the frame and its dual 1-forms, and consider $e_i^\downarrow[p_j; q] \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ be defined by (6.12) and $\theta_i^\downarrow[p_j; q] \in \Lambda(M)$ be defined by (6.16) We have that*

$$|e_i^\downarrow[p_j; q] - e_i(q)| + |\theta_i^\downarrow[p_j; q] - \theta_i(q)| \leq C\epsilon^\beta$$

for any $q \in D_j$.

Proof. It follows immediately from Lemma 3.1 since normal coordinates ϕ are written in terms of the exponential map centered at p_j . \square

Lemma 6.13. *Let $T \in T^{n, m}(\mathcal{V})$. Then*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow \infty} \int_M |\bar{T}^\epsilon - T^\epsilon| dq = 0$$

Therefore, we get the following corollary of Proposition 6.7 and Lemma 6.8.

Lemma 6.14. *Let $T \in C(M, L^2 T^{k, m}(\mathcal{V}_p))$. Then*

i) For T^ϵ as in Definition 6.10, we have that $T^\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} T$.

ii) Furthermore, $T_\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} T$ if and only if

$$(6.18) \quad \int_M T_\epsilon(X_1^\epsilon, \dots, X_k^\epsilon, \omega_1^\epsilon, \dots, \omega_m^\epsilon) dp \rightarrow \oint T(X_1, \dots, X_k, \omega_1, \dots, \omega_m) dv dq$$

In particular, if $Y_\epsilon \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ and $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{V})$, $Y_\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} Y$ if and only if for every $X \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{V})$

$$(6.19) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M \langle Y_\epsilon, X^\epsilon \rangle dq \rightarrow \oint \langle Y, \bar{X} \rangle dv dp$$

The following Lemma extends Proposition 5.4 and Lemma 5.5 from functions to arbitrary tensors.

Lemma 6.15. *Let $T_\epsilon \in T^{k,m}(M)$ be an L^2 -bounded sequence.*

- (1) *Up to a subsequence, T_ϵ two-scale converges to a vertical tensor $T_0 \in L^2(T^{k,m}(\mathcal{V}))$.*
- (2) *Up to a subsequence T_ϵ converges weakly in L^2 to the average on the fiber \tilde{T} .*

Proof. The statement of the Lemma is a direct corollary of Proposition 5.4 and Lemma 5.5. \square

6.3. Gradients and differential of oscillating functions. We have the following result relating the sequence of gradients of functions f^ϵ and the ϵ -sequence obtained from the vertical differential of a function $f : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which will be important in relating two-scale limits of functions and their gradients.

Proposition 6.16. *Let $f : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a differentiable function, Then*

$$(6.20) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \|\epsilon \operatorname{grad}_q(f^\epsilon) - (\operatorname{grad}_v f)^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(M)} = 0.$$

We separate the proof into two parts. The first lemma proves a similar statement for differentials, where the commutation between pullbacks and exterior derivatives makes the proof specially simple. The second takes into account the metric, and says that, in the limit, the musical isomorphisms and our way of pulling back vector fields and forms commute.

Lemma 6.17. *Let $f : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be smooth function. Then*

$$(6.21) \quad \|\epsilon \cdot d_q(f^\epsilon) - (d^v f)^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(M)} = O(\epsilon^{1-\alpha}),$$

as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. Apply the exterior differential to formula (6.8) to obtain that

$$df_q^\epsilon = \sum \psi_j(q) dH_{\epsilon,j}^* f[p_j, \cdot](q) + d\psi_j \cdot H_{\epsilon,j}^* f[p_j, \cdot](q), \quad q \in M.$$

Notice that since $dH_{\epsilon,j}^* f[p_j, \cdot](q) = H_{\epsilon,j}^* df[p_j, \cdot](q)$, it follows from Definition 6.10 that

$$\epsilon \sum \psi_j(q) dH_{\epsilon,j}^* f[p_j, \cdot](q) = (d_v f)^\epsilon$$

Therefore,

$$d(f^\epsilon)_q - \frac{1}{\epsilon} (d^v f)_q^\epsilon = \sum_j f[p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon] d\psi_j.$$

Multiplying both sides by ϵ , using (3.21) and the finite overlapping of the partition of unity, prove the Lemma. \square

For the second part, recall that in a Riemannian manifold (M, g) , we can define the musical isomorphisms

$$X \in \chi(M) \rightarrow X^\flat \in \Lambda^1(M), \quad X^\flat(Y) := g(X, Y),$$

and

$$\theta \in \Lambda^1(M) \rightarrow \theta^\sharp \in \chi(M), \quad g(\theta^\sharp, Y) := \theta(Y)$$

to raise and lower indexes. In particular, recall that for a smooth function f in a Riemannian manifold, $(df)^\sharp = \text{grad } f$. Because exterior derivative commutes with pullbacks, it is somewhat easier to deal with differentials and then lower indexes. The following lemma states that this is a legitimate operation for oscillating sequences.

Lemma 6.18. *Let $\omega \in \Lambda^1(\mathcal{V})$. Then*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \|(\omega^\epsilon)^\sharp - (\omega^\sharp)^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(M)} = 0,$$

Proof. It suffices to prove that

$$\langle (\omega^\epsilon)^\sharp, e_\ell \rangle - \langle (\omega^\sharp)^\epsilon, e_\ell \rangle \rightarrow 0$$

for any vector e_ℓ in the frame. If $\omega = \sum_k \omega_k[p, v] \theta^{k\uparrow}$ is the form in coordinates with respect to the dual frame $\theta^{k\uparrow}$ given by the parallelization, we have that

$$(\omega^\sharp)^\epsilon = \sum_j \psi_j(p) \sum_{i,k} \omega_k[p_j, \frac{\exp_{p_j}^{-1}(p)}{\epsilon}] g^{ki}(p_j) e_i$$

Then, on one hand we have

$$(6.22) \quad \langle (\omega^\sharp)^\epsilon, e_\ell \rangle = \sum_j \psi_j(p) \sum_{i,k} \omega_k[p_j, \frac{\exp_{p_j}^{-1}(p)}{\epsilon}] g^{ki}(p_j) g_{i\ell}(p).$$

Observe that, when $p \in \text{supp } \psi_j$, $|g_{i\ell}(p) - g_{i\ell}(p_j)| \leq C \cdot d(p, p_j) \leq C\epsilon^\beta$, thus we can replace (6.22) by

$$\sum_j \psi_j(p) \sum_{i,k} \omega_k[p_j, \frac{\exp_{p_j}^{-1}(p)}{\epsilon}] g^{ki}(p_j) g_{i\ell}(p_j) = \sum_j \psi_j(p) \cdot \omega_\ell[p_j, \frac{\exp_{p_j}^{-1}(p)}{\epsilon}]$$

as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (\omega^\epsilon)^\sharp, e_\ell \rangle &= \omega^\epsilon(e_\ell) = \epsilon \sum_j \psi_j(p) H_{\epsilon,j}^*(\omega)(e_\ell) \\ &= \epsilon \sum_j \psi_j(p) \sum_k \omega_k[p_j, \frac{\exp_{p_j}^{-1}(p)}{\epsilon}] (\theta^{k\uparrow})((dH_{\epsilon,j})_p(e_\ell)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, it suffices to show that

$$(6.23) \quad \sum_j \psi_j(p) \cdot \left(\omega_\ell[p_j, \frac{\exp_{p_j}^{-1}(p)}{\epsilon}] - \epsilon \sum_k \omega_k[p_j, \frac{\exp_{p_j}^{-1}(p)}{\epsilon}] (\theta^{k\uparrow})((dH_{\epsilon,j})_p(e_\ell)) \right) \rightarrow 0$$

as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. But thanks to Lemma 3.1, we have that

$$(dH_{\epsilon,j})_p(e_\ell) = \frac{1}{\epsilon} d_p \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(e_\ell) = 1/\epsilon(e_\ell^\uparrow + O(d(p, p_j)))$$

for $p \in \text{supp } \psi_j$, and therefore

$$(\theta^{k\uparrow})((dH_{\epsilon,j})_p(e_\ell)) = \delta_\ell^k + O(d(p, p_j)).$$

Replacing in (6.23), the desired limit follows. □

Now, we are ready to transfer the information from Lemma 6.17 to gradients.

Proof of Proposition 6.16. We have

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \|\epsilon \operatorname{grad}(f^\epsilon)_q - (\operatorname{grad}^v f)^\epsilon\| = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \|\epsilon (d_q f^\epsilon)^\sharp - ((d^v f)^\sharp)^\epsilon\|$$

Then from lemma 6.18:

$$= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \|\epsilon (d_q f^\epsilon)^\sharp - ((d^v f)^\epsilon)^\sharp\| = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \|\epsilon \cdot d_q(f^\epsilon) - (d^v f)^\epsilon\| = 0$$

where we used Lemma 6.17. □

7. INTEGRATION BY PARTS

7.1. Integration by parts: Prerequisites. In this section, we collect, for the reader's convenience, a set of results that are necessary for the proof of Theorem 7.3. They can be skipped in a first reading, and return to them when going through Section 7.5.

7.2. A technical lemma. Let $\tilde{f} : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function, and for $p \in M$ consider an open neighborhood U of p where \exp_p^{-1} exists. Define the map

$$f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad f(q) := \tilde{f}(p, \exp_p^{-1}(q)/\epsilon),$$

where $\epsilon > 0$. Recall from definitions 2.3 and (6.12) that given a tangent vector $e \in T_p M$, we have fields $e^\uparrow(p, v) \in \mathcal{V}_{p,v}$ and $e^\downarrow(p; q)$ in $T_p M$ and a neighborhood of p respectively.

Lemma 7.1. *With the above notation, we have*

$$df_q(e^\downarrow(p; q)) = \frac{1}{\epsilon} e_{(p, (\exp_p^{-1} q)/\epsilon)}^\uparrow(\tilde{f}).$$

Proof. Let $v = \exp_p^{-1}(q)$; recall that $e^\downarrow(p; q) = (d \exp_p)_v(e^\uparrow(p, v))$ and that $e^\uparrow(p, v)$ is tangent to $t \rightarrow (p, v + te)$ at $t = 0$. Thus,

$$df_q(e^\downarrow(p; q)) = df_q(d \exp_p)_v(e^\uparrow(p, v)) = d(f \circ \exp_p)_v(e^\uparrow),$$

and this agrees at $t = 0$ with

$$\frac{d}{dt} f \circ \exp_p(v + te) = \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{f}(p, (v + te)/\epsilon) = \frac{1}{\epsilon} e_{(p, v/\epsilon)}^\uparrow(\tilde{f})$$

as we wanted to show. □

7.3. Divergence of down vectors. With our notation of nets as in Theorem 3.15, given a vector $e \in T_{p_j} M$, construct, as in equation (6.12), the vector fields $e^\downarrow := e^\downarrow(p_j; q)$ for q in the Voronoi set D_j .

Lemma 7.2. *With the above notation, we have that*

$$|(\operatorname{div} e^\downarrow)(q)| \leq C \operatorname{dist}(p_j, q)$$

Proof. Recall that $e^\downarrow(p_j; q) = d \exp_{p_j}(e^\uparrow(p_j, v))$, thus in the normal coordinate chart (U, \exp_{p_j}) the coordinates of $e^\downarrow(p_j; q)$ are those of $e^\uparrow(p_j, v)$, that is a constant vector field in $T_{p_j} M$.

Shorten the notation by denoting $V_q = e^\downarrow(p_j; q)$, thus, its i -th component $V^i(q)$ is constant for every i . Then, using the formula for the divergence of a vector field in coordinates, we get

$$\operatorname{div} V(q) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \partial_i(\sqrt{g} V^i)(v) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} V^i \partial_i(\sqrt{g})(v)$$

where $v = \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)$, and $\|v\| = d(p_j, q)$. Since $\partial_i(\sqrt{g})(0) = 0$,

$$|\partial_i(\sqrt{g})(v)| \leq C \|v\| = C d(p_j, q)$$

and the inequality follows. □

7.4. **The P_k operator.** Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a multi-index. Recall from Lemma 4.3 the definition of the P_k operator in functions \tilde{u} of \mathbb{R}^n ,

$$P_k \tilde{u} := \frac{\langle k, \nabla \tilde{u} \rangle}{2\pi i |k|^2}.$$

We will often use the following basic integration by parts formula in \mathbb{R}^n , that we label for future use: given $\tilde{u} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with compact support, it holds that

$$(7.1) \quad \int \tilde{u}(v) \cdot \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i}{\epsilon} \langle v, k \rangle\right) dv = -\epsilon \int P_k \tilde{u}(v) \cdot \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i}{\epsilon} \langle v, k \rangle\right) dv.$$

The following estimates are trivial for our operator P_k . Let $\psi_j : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, a member of the partition of unity from Theorem 3.15 and define $\tilde{\psi}_j : T_{p_j}M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as $\tilde{\psi} := \psi_j \circ \exp_{p_j}$. Therefore, in normal coordinates at p_j , the pairing $(d\psi_j, e(p_j; \cdot))$ has the local expression $(d\tilde{\psi}_j, e^\uparrow)$. Similarly, for any function $u : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the n -form $u \cdot d \text{vol}_M$ lifts to a form $\tilde{u}(v) g(v)^{1/2} dv$, where $g(v) = \det(g_{ij})_q$ with $q = \exp_{p_j}(v)$, and $\tilde{u} = u \circ \exp_{p_j}$.

Then, we claim that

$$(7.2) \quad P_k^m((d\tilde{\psi}_j, e^\uparrow)) \leq C_1 \frac{\sup_{|\gamma|=m+1} |D^\gamma \psi_j|}{|k|^m} \leq C'_1 \frac{\epsilon^{-\alpha(m+1)}}{|k|^m}$$

and

$$(7.3) \quad P_k(\tilde{u} g^{1/2}) \leq C_2 \frac{|\nabla \tilde{u}| + |\tilde{u}|}{|k|},$$

for some constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$.

To see this, observe first that, in any basis of $T_{p_j}M$, e^\uparrow has constant coordinates. Thus, the function $(d\tilde{\psi}_j, e^\uparrow)$ is just a linear combination of the derivatives of $\tilde{\psi}$ with constant coefficients, when taking its gradient, we will get another linear combination of terms in $D^2\tilde{\psi}$, etc. Hence, we get the first inequality in (7.2); the second follows from inequality (3.21). Finally, in order to prove (7.3), use (3.1) combined with the product rule for derivatives.

Additionally, we observe that, when $u : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function in $H^1(M)$, and choose some p_j in the net, and use the exponential normal coordinates to write $\tilde{u} = u \circ \exp_{p_j}$, then the gradient of u is written locally as

$$\nabla \tilde{u}(v) = \sum_i \sum_j g^{ij}(v) \frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial v_j} \frac{\partial}{\partial v_i}$$

Therefore, use once again, (3.1), we get the following estimate:

$$(7.4) \quad \int_{\{\nabla \tilde{\psi}_j \neq 0\}} |\tilde{u}| + |\nabla \tilde{u}| dv \leq C \int_{\{\nabla \psi_j \neq 0\}} |u| + |\nabla u| dp$$

for some universal constant C .

7.5. **Integration by parts for test vector fields.** The usual formula of integration by parts in a Riemannian manifold without boundary states that

$$(7.5) \quad \int_M X(u) + u \operatorname{div} X dq = 0,$$

since $\int_M \operatorname{div}(uX) dq = 0$. The key difference between our situation and this case is that integrating by parts will not be that obvious in the presence of two-scale convergence.

Let X be a smooth vertical vector field in $\mathbb{T}M$, written as

$$X_{[p,v]} = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i[p,v] e_i^\uparrow,$$

and recall the formulas in equation (6.14) and Definition 2.12,

$$(7.6) \quad X_q^\epsilon := \sum_j \psi_j(q) \sum_{i=1}^n f_i[p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon] e_i^\perp(p_j; q).$$

$$(7.7) \quad \tilde{X}_q := \text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_q)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{T}M_q} X[q, v] dv = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_q)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{T}M_q} f_i[q, v] dv \right) \cdot e_i \in \mathfrak{X}(M).$$

We show that for our test functions and vector fields, integration by parts works up to an error tending to zero with ϵ . In order to state the result, we will shorten notation denoting by $h[p, v] = (\text{div}^v X)[p, v]$.

Theorem 7.3. *Let $u \in H^1(M)$. Then, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$,*

$$(7.8) \quad \left| - \int_M \langle \text{grad } u, X^\epsilon \rangle dq - \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_M u \cdot h^\epsilon dq - \int_M u \cdot \text{div } \tilde{X} dq \right| \rightarrow 0,$$

Moreover, this convergence is uniform when u lies in a bounded set in $H^1(M)$.

This has the immediate consequence

Corollary 7.4. *Let $u \in H^1(M)$ and X a smooth vertical vector field in $\mathbb{T}M$. Then,*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M u \cdot (\text{div}^v X)^\epsilon dq = 0.$$

Moreover, this convergence is uniform over bounded sets in $H^1(M)$. In other words

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \|(\text{div}^v X)^\epsilon\|_{H^{-1}(M)} = 0$$

Proof of the Corollary. Multiply equation (7.8) by ϵ , and let it tend to zero. \square

The proof of Theorem 7.3 requires not only the tools appearing in the previous sections, but also new ones. We will give the proof later, but to motivate what follows, observe that, when applying equation (7.5) to a test vector field X^ϵ and the function u , we obtain

$$(7.9) \quad - \int_M (du, X^\epsilon) dq = \int_M u \text{div } X^\epsilon dq.$$

Recall that $(du, X^\epsilon) = \langle \text{grad } u, X^\epsilon \rangle$ pointwise.

From the above, we will need to compute the divergence of a test vector field as in (7.6). For the reader's convenience, we consider the simpler case when $X_{[p, v]} = f[q, v] e^\uparrow$ for some function $f : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and some vector field in the frame, giving the parallelization of M . Then equation (7.6) reads

$$X_q^\epsilon := \sum_j \psi_j(q) f[p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon] e^\perp(p_j; q),$$

Thus, writing $\bar{f}_j(q) = f[p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon]$, we get

$$(7.10) \quad - \int_M (du, X^\epsilon) dq = \sum_j \int_M u(q) \bar{f}_j(q) (d_q \psi_j(q), e^\perp(p_j; q)) dq \\ + \sum_j \int_M u(q) \psi_j(q) (d_q f(p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon), e^\perp(p_j; q)) dq \\ + \sum_j \int_M u(q) \psi_j(q) \bar{f}_j(q) \text{div}(e^\perp(p_j; q)) dq.$$

We will treat each of the terms appearing in the right of (7.10) separately.

7.6. Oscillation of the coefficients. For each p_j in the net, we consider normal coordinates at p_j ,

$$\exp_{p_j} : U_j \subset T_{p_j}M \rightarrow M, \quad v \rightarrow \exp_{p_j}(v).$$

In these coordinates, the function \bar{f}_j is written as $v \rightarrow f[p_j, v/\epsilon]$. For each p in M , we take the \mathbb{Z}^n -periodic function induced by $f[p, v]$ in TM , and its Fourier expansion

$$(7.11) \quad f(p, v) = \hat{f}(p, 0) + \sum_{|k| \geq 1} \hat{f}(p, k) e^{2\pi i \langle v, k \rangle}.$$

In these coordinates, the first term in equation (7.10) reads as

$$(7.12) \quad \sum_j \int_M u(q) f(p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon) (d_q \psi_j(q), e^\downarrow(p_j; q)) dq = \sum_j \int_{T_{p_j}M} \bar{u}(v) f(p_j, v/\epsilon) e^\uparrow(\tilde{\psi}_j) g^{1/2}(v) dv,$$

where $\bar{u} = u \circ \exp_{p_j}$, $\tilde{\psi}_j = \psi_j \circ \exp_{p_j}$ and $g(v) = \det(g_{ij})$, where (g_{ij}) is just the metric tensor in these coordinates.

Replacing f by its Fourier expansion as in (7.11), leaves two types of terms, depending on whether $|k| \geq 1$ or $k = 0$. We will need to be a bit more delicate to discard non-constant Fourier modes as we have to deal with derivatives of the cut-off function, which yields powers of $\epsilon^{-\alpha}$. We start by proving the following key lemma.

Lemma 7.5. *Let k be a nonzero multi-index in \mathbb{Z}^n . For any function u in $H^1(M)$, it holds that*

$$(7.13) \quad \left| \int_{T_{p_j}M} \bar{u}(v) \left(\exp \frac{2\pi i}{\epsilon} \langle k, v \rangle \right) e^\uparrow(\tilde{\psi}_j) g^{1/2}(v) dv \right| \leq C |k|^{-1} \int_{\nabla \psi_j \neq 0} |u| + |\nabla u| dp$$

Proof. The proof of the lemma follows by integrating parts sufficiently many times and using that (7.2) provides the bound

$$(7.14) \quad |P_k^m(e^\uparrow(\tilde{\psi}_j))| \leq C \frac{\epsilon^{-\alpha(m+1)}}{|k|^m};$$

As a matter of fact, we claim that for $m \geq 1$ it holds that

$$(7.15) \quad \left| \int_{T_{p_j}M} \bar{u}(v) \left(\exp \frac{2\pi i}{\epsilon} \langle k, v \rangle \right) e^\uparrow(\tilde{\psi}_j) g^{1/2}(v) dv \right| \leq \sum_{n=1}^m \frac{\epsilon^{n(1-\alpha)}}{|k|^n} \left(\int_{\nabla \psi_j \neq 0} |u| + |\nabla u| dp \right) + \epsilon^m \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \bar{u}(v) \exp \left(\frac{2\pi i}{\epsilon} \langle k, v \rangle \right) P_k^m(e^\uparrow(\tilde{\psi}_j)) g^{1/2}(v) dv \right|,$$

Due to (7.14), the last term is bounded by $C\epsilon^{m-(m+1)\alpha}$, that tends to zero as m goes to infinity. Observe also that for every m , we have a bound $\sum_{n=1}^m \frac{\epsilon^{n(1-\alpha)}}{|k|^n} \leq C|k|^{-1}$ for some constant C . Thus, if (7.15) holds, we have proven Lemma 7.5.

In order to prove inequality (7.15), we will argue by induction. The case $m = 1$ follows from a direct integration by parts for the integral

$$\int_{T_{p_j}M} \bar{u}(v) \exp \left(\frac{2\pi i}{\epsilon} \langle k, v \rangle \right) e^\uparrow(\tilde{\psi}_j) g^{1/2}(v) dv,$$

which yields

$$(7.16) \quad \epsilon \int_{T_{p_j}M} \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i}{\epsilon} \langle k, v \rangle\right) e^\uparrow(\tilde{\psi}_j) P_k(\bar{u}g^{1/2})(v) dv + \\ + \epsilon \int_{T_{p_j}M} \bar{u}(v) \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i}{\epsilon} \langle k, v \rangle\right) P_k(e^\uparrow(\tilde{\psi}_j)) g^{1/2}(v) dv$$

It is therefore enough to bound the first term by

$$\frac{C}{|k|} \epsilon^{1-\alpha} \int_{\{\nabla\psi_j \neq 0\}} (|u| + |\nabla u|) dp.$$

This follows by a use of inequality (7.3) for the term $P_k(\bar{u}g^{1/2})$ and (3.21) for $e^\uparrow(\tilde{\psi}_j)$. Observe also that the integrand vanishes whenever $\nabla\tilde{\psi}_j = 0$, since it contains a factor $e^\uparrow(\tilde{\psi}_j)$; finally, we use (7.4) to change the integral to the manifold.

For general m , suppose now that (7.15) holds for a given m , and we want to prove it for $m + 1$. We integrate the last term by parts using again (7.1) to obtain the expression

$$(7.17) \quad \epsilon \sum_j \int_{T_{p_j}M} \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i}{\epsilon} \langle k, v \rangle\right) P_k^m(e^\uparrow(\tilde{\psi}_j)) P_k(\bar{u}g^{1/2})(v) dv + \\ + \epsilon \sum_j \int_{T_{p_j}M} \bar{u}(v) \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i}{\epsilon} \langle k, v \rangle\right) P_k^{m+1}(e^\uparrow(\tilde{\psi}_j)) g^{1/2}(v) dv$$

Once again, in the first term, we bound $P_k^m(e^\uparrow(\tilde{\psi}_j))$ and $P_k(\bar{u}g^{1/2})$ using (7.2) and (7.3) respectively, changing the integrals to the manifold by (7.4), thus finishing the proof. \square

Lemma 7.6. *Let $u \in H^1(M)$, and let $f : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function. Then for any $s > \frac{n}{2} - 1$, there exists a constant $C_s > 0$ such that*

$$(7.18) \quad \left| \sum_j \sum_{|k| \geq 1} \hat{f}(p_j, k) \int_{T_{p_j}M} \bar{u}(v) \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i}{\epsilon} \langle k, v \rangle\right) e^\uparrow(\tilde{\psi}_j) g^{1/2}(v) dv \right| \\ \leq C_s \epsilon^{(\alpha-\beta)/2} \|u\|_{H^1(M)} \|f\|_{C(M, H^s(\mathbb{T}M_p))}$$

Proof. By applying the triangle inequality in (7.18), and Lemma 7.5 to each term in the resulting sum, we obtain the following upper bound (up to a constant) for the left-hand side in (7.18):

$$\sum_j \left(\int_{\nabla\psi_j \neq 0} |u| + |\nabla u| dp \right) \cdot \sum_k \frac{|\hat{f}(p_j, k)|}{|k|}.$$

By Hölder inequality we get that for each j and exponent s

$$\sum_k \frac{|\hat{f}(p_j, k)|}{|k|} \leq \|f\|_{C(M, H^s(\mathbb{T}M_p))} \left(\sum |k|^{-2(s+1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

which converges if $s > \frac{n}{2} - 1$. Thus, the left-hand side of (7.18) is bounded by

$$\|f\|_{C(M, H^s(\mathbb{T}M_p))} \sum_j \int_{\{\nabla\psi_j \neq 0\}} |u| + |\nabla u| dp = \|f\|_{C(M, H^s(\mathbb{T}M_p))} \int_{\cup_j \{\nabla\psi_j \neq 0\}} |\nabla u| + |u| dp$$

which applying Cauchy-Schwarz in M is bounded by

$$\|f\|_{C(M, H^s(\mathbb{T}M_p))} \|u\|_{H^1(M)} \cdot \text{vol}(\cup_j \text{supp } \nabla\psi_j)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and thus, the Lemma follows from inequality (3.20) in part 3 of Theorem 3.15. \square

Once higher Fourier modes are discarded, the 0-th order Fourier modes will have a contribution in the limit. To simplify the writing, we will again state the result for the vertical vector field $X[p, v] = f[p, v]e^\uparrow$ for some frame vector field e in M .

Lemma 7.7. *Let $u \in H^1(M)$ and $X[p, v] = f[p, v]e^\uparrow$ a vertical vector field in $\mathbb{T}M$, where e is some vector field in the frame defining the parallelization of M . If \tilde{X} is the average vector field of X in M as it appears in Definition (7.7), then*

$$(7.19) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \sum_j \int_M u(q) \hat{f}(p_j, 0) e^\downarrow(p_j; q)(\psi_j) dq = \int_M u \operatorname{div} \tilde{X} dq.$$

Proof. It is clear that

$$\operatorname{div}(u\psi_j e^\downarrow(p_j, \cdot)) = u \cdot e^\downarrow(p_j; \cdot)(\psi_j) + \psi_j \cdot e^\downarrow(p_j; \cdot)(u) + u\psi_j \operatorname{div} e^\downarrow(p_j; \cdot)$$

Thus, using that the integral of a divergence vanishes in a manifold without boundary, we get that each of the integrals above equals

$$(7.20) \quad \int_M u(q) \hat{f}(p_j, 0) e^\downarrow(p_j; \cdot)(\psi_j) dq = \\ = - \int_M \psi_j \hat{f}(p_j, 0) \cdot e^\downarrow(p_j; \cdot)(u) dq - \int_M u \psi_j \hat{f}(p_j, 0) \operatorname{div} e^\downarrow(p_j; \cdot) dq$$

We start by examining the first integral in the right-hand side of the above equation (7.20), trying to write it in a more compact form. To these aim, we claim first that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left| \sum_j \int_M \psi_j \hat{f}(p_j, 0) \cdot e^\downarrow(p_j; \cdot)(u) dq - \int_M \psi_j \hat{f}(q, 0) \cdot e^\downarrow(p_j; \cdot)(u) dq \right| = 0$$

To see this, observe that the function $q \in M \rightarrow \hat{f}(q, 0)$ is uniformly continuous, since f itself can be considered continuous, M is compact and $\hat{f}(p, 0) = \int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} f[p, v] dv$ is given integrating over a compact fiber. Thus, for any $\eta > 0$, we can find some $\epsilon > 0$ such that $|\hat{f}(p, 0) - \hat{f}(q, 0)| < \eta$ whenever $d(p, q) \leq \epsilon^\beta$. Therefore,

$$(7.21) \quad \sum_j \int_M \psi_j |\hat{f}(p_j, 0) - \hat{f}(q, 0)| \cdot |e^\downarrow(p_j; \cdot)(u)| dq \\ \leq \eta \cdot \sum_j \int_M \psi_j \cdot |e^\downarrow(p_j; \cdot)(u)| dq \leq \eta \cdot \sum_j \int_M \psi_j |e^\downarrow(p_j; \cdot)| \cdot |\nabla u| dq$$

But on the support of ψ_j , we can estimate by above $|e^\downarrow(p_j, \cdot)| \leq 2|e_{p_j}|$, since $e^\downarrow(p_j, \cdot) = (d \exp_{p_j})_v(e_{p_j})$, and from Lemma 3.1 we had an upper bound $\|d \exp_{p_j}\| \leq 2$. Thus, using that $\sum_j \psi_j = 1$, the above integral can be bound above by

$$\eta \cdot \max_q \|e(q)\| \cdot \int_M |\nabla u| dq \leq C\eta$$

where we have also used that u is in $H^1(M)$ and Cauchy-Schwarz. Since η is arbitrary, this proves our claim.

A similar argument using again Lemma 6.12 shows also that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left| \int_M \hat{f}(q, 0) \cdot e(u)(q) dq - \sum_j \int_M \psi_j \hat{f}(q, 0) \cdot e^\downarrow(p_j; \cdot)(u) dq \right| = 0$$

where in the first term, we have used again that $\sum_j \psi_j = 1$. Thus, we get that

$$(7.22) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \sum_j \int_M \psi_j \hat{f}(p_j, 0) \cdot e^\downarrow(p_j; \cdot)(u) dq = \int_M \hat{f}(q, 0) \cdot e(u)(q) dq$$

and, using integration by parts on the right side, we get

$$(7.23) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \sum_j \int_M \psi_j \hat{f}(p_j, 0) \cdot e^\perp(p_j; \cdot)(u) dq = - \int_M u \operatorname{div}(\hat{f} \cdot e) dq,$$

in which we recognize $\hat{f} \cdot e$ as the average vector field \tilde{X} .

We now turn our attention to the second integral in (7.20). We claim now that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \sum_j \int_M u \psi_j \hat{f}(p_j, 0) \operatorname{div} e^\perp(p_j; \cdot) dq = 0$$

To see this, observe that $\psi_j \operatorname{div} e^\perp(p_j; \cdot) = 0$ outside of the support of ψ_j , that lies in a ball of radius less than $C\epsilon^\beta$. Furthermore, by Lemma 7.2, $|\operatorname{div} e^\perp(p_j, \cdot)(q)| \leq Cd(p_j, q)$ inside the support of ψ_j . Thus,

$$\left| \sum_j \int_M u \psi_j \hat{f}(p_j, 0) \operatorname{div} e^\perp(p_j; \cdot) dq \right| \leq C\epsilon^\beta \sum_j \int_M |u| |\psi_j| |\hat{f}(p_j, 0)| dq \leq C_1 \epsilon^\beta$$

where we are bounding above $|\hat{f}(p_j, 0)|$ by the maximum of the function $q \rightarrow |\hat{f}(q, 0)|$, and we have used once Cauchy-Schwarz to obtain the L^2 norm of u .

The combination of these two claims yields

$$(7.24) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \sum_j \int_M u(q) \hat{f}(p_j, 0) e^\perp(p_j; \cdot)(\psi_j) dq = \int_M u \operatorname{div} \tilde{X} dq,$$

as desired. \square

7.7. Proof of Theorem 7.3. We have finally all the elements necessary to prove the main Theorem of Section 7.5.

Proof of Theorem 7.3. We will start with the simpler case $X = f[q, v]e^\uparrow$. As mentioned before, we write

$$- \int_M (du, X^\epsilon) dq = \int_M u \operatorname{div} X^\epsilon dq,$$

and replace X^ϵ by its formula to derive equation 7.10, that we recall here for the reader's convenience:

$$(7.25) \quad - \int_M (du, X^\epsilon) dq = \sum_j \int_M u(q) f(p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon) (d_q \psi_j(q), e^\perp(p_j; q)) dq \\ + \sum_j \int_M u(q) \psi_j(q) (d_q f(p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon), e^\perp(p_j; q)) dq \\ + \sum_j \int_M u(q) \psi_j(q) f(p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon) \operatorname{div}(e^\perp(p_j; q)) dq.$$

We explain now how to treat each of the three terms in the right:

- Once we expand f in its Fourier series, the first integral breaks in two types depending on whether $k = 0$ or $|k| \geq 1$, k being the multi-index in the series:

$$\sum_j \int_M u(q) f(p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon) (d_q \psi_j(q), e^\perp(p_j; q)) dq \\ = \sum_j \sum_k \hat{f}(p_j, k) \int_{T_{p_j} M} \bar{u}(v) \left(\exp \frac{2\pi i}{\epsilon} \langle k, v \rangle \right) e^\uparrow(\tilde{\psi}_j) g^{1/2}(v) dv$$

Lemma 7.6 implies that the sum of all terms with $|k| \geq 1$ is bounded by a constant times $\epsilon^{\alpha-\beta}$ and thus tends to zero with ϵ .

Furthermore, Lemma 7.7 shows that the remaining integral containing $\hat{f}(0, \cdot)$ approaches $\int_M u \operatorname{div} \tilde{X} dq$.

- For the second integral in (7.25), we use Lemma 7.1; namely,

$$(d_p f(p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon), e^\downarrow(p_j; q)) = \frac{1}{\epsilon} e^\uparrow(\tilde{f})_{\exp_{p_j}^{-1} q/\epsilon}.$$

Observe that, since $\operatorname{div}^v e^\uparrow = 0$, this agrees with

$$\operatorname{div}^v(f \cdot e^\uparrow) = f \cdot \operatorname{div}^v(e^\uparrow) + e^\uparrow(\tilde{f})$$

at the point $[p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1} q/\epsilon]$.

Plugging this in the integral at hand, we obtain

$$(7.26) \quad \sum_j \int_M u(q) \psi_j(q) (d_q f(p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon), e^\downarrow(p_j; q)) dq = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_M u(q) \left(\sum_j \psi_j \cdot \operatorname{div}^v(f \cdot e^\uparrow)[p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1} q/\epsilon] \right) dq = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_M u(q) h^\epsilon(q) dq$$

where recall that we were denoting $h[q, v] = (\operatorname{div}^v X)[p, v]$.

- Finally, the last integral in (7.25) will approach zero when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. The argument is entirely similar to that at the end of the previous section. Namely, by lemma 7.2, $|\operatorname{div}(e^\downarrow(p_j; q))| \leq Cd(p_j, q) \leq C'\epsilon^\beta$ in the support of ψ_j . Using Cauchy-Schwarz will result in an upper bound of the form $C\|u\|_{H^1(M)}\epsilon^\beta$.

The case for general X is now immediate: just write it as $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i \cdot e_i^\uparrow$ for e_i in the frame, and use linearity. \square

8. TWO-SCALE CONVERGENCE OF GRADIENTS

In this section, we establish the relationship between the two-scale convergence of functions and its gradients. We recall the function space $L^2(M, H_{per}^1(\mathbb{T}M_p))$ introduced in Section 2.7 and the corresponding norm,

$$\|u\|_{L^2(M, H_{per}^1(\mathbb{T}M_p))}^2 = \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} |\operatorname{grad}_v u(p, v)|^2 dv dp$$

We start by a lemma that resembles the orthogonal decomposition of gradients and divergence free vector fields, but we will establish it only on the vertical part of $\mathbb{T}M$. Here we work in the L^2 setting, and thus we need to give a distributional definition of divergence free vector fields. Namely, we say that $Y \in L^2(\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{V}))$ satisfies that $\operatorname{div}^v Y = 0$ if

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}M} \langle \operatorname{grad}_v u, Y \rangle dv dp = 0,$$

for every $u \in L^2(\Omega, H_{per}^1(\mathbb{T}M_p))$. In the next proposition we state the orthogonality relationship against smooth vector fields but, since being divergence free is a linear condition, it is equivalent to state the orthogonality condition for general L^2 vector fields.

Proposition 8.1. *Let $X[p, v] \in L^2(\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{V}))$ such that*

$$(8.1) \quad \int \langle X, Y \rangle dv dp = 0$$

for every $Y \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{V})$ such that $\operatorname{div}_v Y = 0$. Then there exists a unique $u \in L^2(M, H_{per}^1(\mathbb{T}M_p))$

$$X = \operatorname{grad}_v u$$

Proof. Let $X[p, v] = X^i[p, v]\partial_{v_i}$, where we have used coordinates v_i such that $X^i[p, v]$ is \mathbb{Z}^n periodic. (For the sake of clarity, we identify coordinates in $\mathbb{T}M_p$ with those in TM_p and we identify \tilde{X}^i with X^i .)

Then we use classical Fourier series to write for each coordinate,

$$X^i[p, v] = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \hat{X}^i(p; k) e^{2\pi i k \cdot v},$$

Now, if the metric in the frame were the identity, the multiplier of the Laplacian would be $|k|^2$. Instead, we define $|k|_p^2 = k_i k_j g^{ij}[p]$. Then we fix p and declare

$$u[p, v] = \sum_{|k|>0} \frac{k_i}{|k|_p^2} \hat{X}^i(p; k) e^{2\pi i k \cdot v},$$

which is measurable in $[p, v]$ and satisfies that

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} u \, dv = 0$$

for almost every p . Moreover, by construction,

$$\operatorname{div}^v(\operatorname{grad}_v u - X) = 0$$

as distributions. Thus, for $Y = \operatorname{grad}_v u - X$, it holds that

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}M} \langle \operatorname{grad} u, Y \rangle \, dv \, dp = 0$$

while by approximation with smooth vector fields, (8.1) still implies that

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}M} \langle X, Y \rangle \, dv \, dp = 0.$$

Therefore we get that

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}M} |\operatorname{grad}_v u - X|_{G(p)}^2 \, dv \, dp = 0,$$

that is $X[p, v] = \operatorname{grad}_v u$ as L^2 functions. Finally, we estimate

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}M} |\operatorname{grad}_v u|^2 \, dp \, dv = \int \sum_i \sum_k |\hat{X}_i[p, v]|^2 \, dp \, dv \leq \|X\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}M)}$$

which yields the required bound in the space $L^2(M, H_{per}^1(\mathbb{T}M_p))$ \square

The next Theorem is the main result of this section.

Theorem 8.2 (Convergence of gradients and divergence-free fields). *Let M be a closed Riemannian manifold and let $u_\epsilon : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a sequence of functions in $H^1(M)$.*

- (1) *If $u_\epsilon \rightharpoonup u$ in $H^1(M)$, then u_ϵ two-scale converges to $\tilde{u} = u \circ \pi$, where $\pi : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow M$ is the projection $[p, v] \rightarrow p$. Moreover, $\operatorname{grad} u_\epsilon(p)$ two-scale converges to $(\operatorname{grad}_p u)^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1(p, v)$, for some function $u_1 \in L^2(M, H^1(\mathbb{T}M_p))$.*
- (2) *Let $u_\epsilon \in H^1(M)$ uniformly bounded. Then, there is $u_0 \in L^2(M, H^1(\mathbb{T}M_p))$ such that, up to a subsequence, u_ϵ two-scale converges to u_0 , and $\epsilon \operatorname{grad}_p u_\epsilon$ two-scale converges to $\operatorname{grad}_v u_0$.*
- (3) *Let $X_\epsilon \in L^2\mathfrak{X}(M) \xrightarrow{2s} X_0 \in L^2\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{V})$ and $\operatorname{div}_q X_\epsilon = 0$. Then, $\operatorname{div}^v X_0 = 0$ and $\operatorname{div}_q \tilde{X} = 0$, where \tilde{X} is the average of X over the fibers of $\mathbb{T}M$.*

Proof. Corollary 7.4 states that for any function u in $H^1(M)$, and for any smooth vertical test vector field X it holds that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M u \cdot (\operatorname{div}^v X)^\epsilon \, dq = 0,$$

and the convergence is uniform for u 's lying in a compact set in $H^1(M)$. Hence, we have that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M u_\epsilon \cdot (\operatorname{div}^v X)^\epsilon \, dq = 0,$$

and if $u_0[p, v]$ is the two-scale limit of u_ϵ , then

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}M} \text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p)^{-1} u_0 \cdot \text{div}^v X \, dv \, dp = 0.$$

We claim that this actually implies that u_0 is constant along the fibers of $\mathbb{T}M$, that is, $u_0[p, v] = u(p)$ for some function $u : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. One way to see this is to use Lemma 2.15 to get that for a vertical vector field X , $\text{div}^v X = \text{div} X$. Then

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}M} X(\text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p)^{-1} u_0) \, dv \, dp = - \int_{\mathbb{T}M} \text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p)^{-1} u_0 \cdot \text{div} X \, dv \, dp = 0,$$

and since X is an arbitrary smooth vertical field, we get our claim on $u_0 = u \circ \pi$ for some function u on M .

Let now X be a vertical vector field with $\text{div}^v X = 0$. Observe that in (7.8), the term with h^ϵ vanishes since $h = \text{div}^v X$. Using once again uniform convergence in compact sets in Theorem 7.3, we obtain that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M \langle \text{grad} u_\epsilon, X^\epsilon \rangle \, dq = - \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M u_\epsilon \cdot \text{div} \tilde{X} \, dq$$

If we denote by $Y \in L^2(\mathbb{T}M)$ the two-scale limit of $\text{grad} u_\epsilon$, the above yields

$$\oint_{\mathbb{T}M} \langle Y, X \rangle [p, v] \, dp \, dv = - \int_M u \, \text{div} \tilde{X} \, dp = \int_M \tilde{X}(u) \, dp$$

where we have integrated by parts in M . Recalling that for a vertical vector field of the form $X = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i[q, v] e_i^\uparrow$, its average \tilde{X} is defined as

$$\tilde{X}_q := \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_q)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{T}M_q} f_i[q, v] \, dv \right) \cdot e_i,$$

we obtain, using (2.7),

$$(8.2) \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}M} \text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p)^{-1} \langle Y, X \rangle [p, v] \, dp \, dv = \sum_{i=1}^n \int_M \left(\text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} f_i[p, v] \, dv \right) \cdot e_i(u) \, dp = \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{T}M} \text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p)^{-1} f_i[p, v] \langle \text{grad} u^\uparrow, e_i^\uparrow \rangle \, dv \, dp = \int_{\mathbb{T}M} \text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p)^{-1} \langle \text{grad} u^\uparrow, X \rangle \, dv \, dp.$$

This implies that the vector field $\text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p)^{-1}((Y) - (\text{grad} u)^\uparrow)$ integrates to zero when paired with an arbitrary vertical vector field with $\text{div}^v X = 0$. Then, from Proposition 8.1, we deduce the existence of a unique function $\tilde{u}_1 \in L^2(M, H^1(\mathbb{T}M_p))$ such that

$$\text{grad}_v \tilde{u}_1 = \text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p)^{-1}((Y) - (\text{grad} u)^\uparrow)$$

which yields that Y , the two-scale limit of $\text{grad} u_\epsilon$ satisfies that

$$Y = \text{vol} \mathbb{T}M_p (\text{grad} u)^\uparrow + \text{grad}_v \tilde{u}_1,$$

for $u_1 = \text{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p) \tilde{u}_1$.

To prove (2), denote by Y the two-scale limit of $\epsilon \cdot \text{grad} u_\epsilon$. Multiplying equation (7.8) by ϵ and passing to the limit, we obtain

$$(8.3) \quad \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} u_0 \cdot h[p, v] \, dv \, dp = - \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} \langle Y, X \rangle [p, v] \, dp \, dv.$$

Integrating by parts in v in the left-hand side of this equation, we see that, since $h[p, v] = \text{div}^v X[p, v]$ and X is vertical,

$$(8.4) \quad \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} u_0 \cdot \text{div}^v X[p, v] \, dv \, dp = \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} \langle \text{grad}_v u_0, X \rangle [p, v] \, dv \, dp$$

From (8.3) and (8.4), and since X is an arbitrary vertical vector field, and Y as well as $(\text{grad}_v u_0)$ are vertical vector fields, we obtain that $Y = (\text{grad}_v u_0)$. This concludes the first two parts of the Theorem.

To prove the last, recall first that Lemma 6.15 states that $\tilde{X} \in L^2\mathfrak{X}(M)$ is the weak limit of the sequence X_ϵ . Then for any function $f \in C^\infty(M)$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M f \cdot \text{div} X_\epsilon dq = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M \langle X_\epsilon, \text{grad} f \rangle dq = \int_M \langle \tilde{X}, \text{grad} f \rangle dq = \int_M f \cdot \text{div} \tilde{X} dq,$$

and since $\text{div} X_\epsilon = 0$ and f is arbitrary, $\text{div} \tilde{X} = 0$.

In order to deal with the vertical divergence, observe that $\mathbb{T}M \simeq M \times \mathbb{T}^n$, and under this identification we can consider functions $f : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the form $f[p, v] = \phi(p)\xi(v)$; more precisely, if $\varphi : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow M \times \mathbb{T}^n$ is this fiber preserving diffeomorphism, we define $f[p, v] = \phi(p) \cdot \xi(\pi_2 \circ \varphi[p, v])$, where $\pi_2 : M \times \mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$ is the projection onto the second factor. These functions satisfy the hypothesis of Proposition 6.16, thus

$$(8.5) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M \|\epsilon \text{grad}_q(f^\epsilon) - (\text{grad}_v f)^\epsilon\| dq = 0.$$

Then

$$(8.6) \quad 0 = \epsilon \int_M \text{div} X_\epsilon \cdot f^\epsilon dq = - \int_M \langle X_\epsilon, \epsilon \text{grad} f^\epsilon \rangle dq,$$

and from (8.5),

$$(8.7) \quad 0 = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M \langle X_\epsilon, (\text{grad}_v f)^\epsilon \rangle dq = \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} \langle X_0, \text{grad}_v f \rangle dq dv,$$

since X_0 is the two-scale limit of the X_ϵ . Integrating by parts,

$$(8.8) \quad \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} \text{div}^v X_0 \cdot f dq dv = 0,$$

and since the choices of ξ and ϕ are arbitrary in the formula for f , by density we get $\text{div}^v X_0 \equiv 0$ in the weak sense. □

Part 4. Elliptic equations

9. TWO SCALE CONVERGENCE AND ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS

We start by defining the correct analogue in the manifold M and in the torus bundle to matrices which are elliptic and symmetric. We will use the horizontal-vertical decomposition of the tangent space of $\mathbb{T}M$ as explained in (2.1) and the general theory of vertical tensors developed in Section 6.

Definition 9.1. We denote by $T_K^{1,1}(M)$ the class of sections of the bundle of linear endomorphisms of $\mathfrak{X}(M)$ which are uniformly elliptic with constant K and self-adjoint with respect to the metric g , i.e. $A \in T_K^{1,1}(M)$ if

$$K^{-1}\langle X, X \rangle \leq \langle A[q]X, X \rangle \leq K\langle X, X \rangle$$

and, taking coordinates respect to the frame, we have that

$$(9.1) \quad \sum_{\ell} A_i^\ell[q] g_{\ell k}(q) = \sum_{\ell} A_k^\ell[q] g_{\ell i}(q)$$

for $q \in M$.

Given A in $T^{1,1}(M)$ a non necessarily self-adjoint endomorphism, we define its adjoint A^{ad} by the formulas

$$(9.2) \quad \sum_{\ell} A_i^{\ell}[q]g_{\ell k}(q) = \sum_{\ell} (A^{ad})_k^{\ell}[q]g_{\ell i}(q)$$

That is to say, in matrix form $A^{ad} = GA^tG^{-1}$, where A^t is the transpose of A . When we are considering a domain $\Omega \subset M$, we use the notation $T_K^{1,1}(\Omega)$.

Definition 9.2. We denote by $T_K^{1,1}(\mathcal{V})$ the class of sections of vertical linear bundle endomorphism of \mathcal{V} which are uniformly elliptic with constant K and which are self-adjoint with respect to the scalar product given in (2.8). That is, for each $[p, v] \in \mathbb{T}M$, we have a linear map

$$A[p, v] : \mathcal{V}_{[p, v]} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_{[p, v]}$$

depending on $[p, v]$ which satisfies that for $w \in \mathcal{V}_{[p, v]}$

$$\frac{1}{K} \langle w, w \rangle \leq \langle A[p, v]w, w \rangle \leq K \langle w, w \rangle.$$

We recall that $\langle *, * \rangle$ is the vertical inner product given in (2.8), where we are using the frame $e_i(p)$ to construct the frame $e_i^{\uparrow}[p, v]$. Thus, we can write A in matrix form as

$$(9.3) \quad A[p, v]e_i^{\uparrow} := \sum_{\ell} A_i^{\ell}[p, v]e_{\ell}^{\uparrow},$$

for some functions $A_i^{\ell} : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(9.4) \quad \sum_{\ell} A_i^{\ell}g_{\ell k} = \sum_{\ell} A_k^{\ell}g_{\ell i}.$$

Explicitly, if $\tilde{X} = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i[p, v]e_i^{\uparrow}$, then

$$A\tilde{X} = \sum_{\ell} \sum_i \left(A_i^{\ell}[p, v]f_i \right) e_{\ell}^{\uparrow}.$$

For the regularity on the coordinate functions of A , we will use the terminology of subsection 2.7.

Notice that we have stated the result for (1,1)-tensors for readers with a Euclidean mind. Since we are dealing with self-adjoint maps, we could also identify A with the symmetric (2,0)-tensor given by

$$A[w_1, w_2] = \langle Aw_1, w_2 \rangle, \quad \text{where } w_1, w_2 \in \mathcal{V}_{[p, v]}$$

When working on a specific domain Ω of M , we will denote by $T_K^{1,1}(\mathcal{V}_{\Omega})$ the vertical (1,1)-tensors on the torus bundle over Ω .

Given a sequence $A_{\epsilon} \in T_K^{1,1}(M)$, we denote by $u_{\epsilon} \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ the unique solution to

$$(9.5) \quad \operatorname{div}(A_{\epsilon} \operatorname{grad} u_{\epsilon}) = f,$$

where we have dropped the f -dependence on the notation.

The next theorem is central in the paper, for it is where we identify the weak limit (and the two-scale limit) of u_{ϵ} .

Theorem 9.3. *Let Ω be a domain in M . Let $A_{\epsilon} \in T_K^{1,1}(\Omega)$ be strongly two-scale convergent to $A \in T_K^{1,1}(\mathcal{V}_{\Omega})$. Consider u_{ϵ} the solution of*

$$(9.6) \quad \operatorname{div}(A_{\epsilon})(\operatorname{grad} u_{\epsilon}) = f.$$

with $f \in H^{-1}(M)$. Then, the sequence u_{ϵ} converges weakly to u in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and the sequence $\operatorname{grad} u_{\epsilon}$ two-scale converges to $(\operatorname{grad}_q u)^{\uparrow} + \operatorname{grad}^v u_1$ where u, u_1 is the unique solution in the set $H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega, H_{per}^1(\mathbb{T}M))$ of the following two-scale homogenized system:

$$(9.7) \quad \operatorname{div}^v(A[p, v][(\operatorname{grad}_p u)^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1]) = 0 \text{ in } \pi^{-1}(\Omega),$$

$$(9.8) \quad \operatorname{div}_p \left(\operatorname{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} A[p, v][(\operatorname{grad}_p u)^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1] dv \right) = f,$$

$$(9.9) \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega,$$

where $\pi : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow M$ is the standard projection.

Proof. By the uniform ellipticity of A_ϵ , $u_\epsilon \in H^1$ uniformly. Therefore by Theorem 8.2, and up to a subsequence which we do not relabel, the sequence $\operatorname{grad} u_\epsilon(p)$ two-scale converges to $(\operatorname{grad}_p u)^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1(p, v)$. On the other hand, by the weak formulation of (9.5) it holds that

$$(9.10) \quad \int A_\epsilon[\operatorname{grad} u_\epsilon, \operatorname{grad} \varphi] dq = \int \varphi f dq$$

for every $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$. Notice that, as mentioned earlier, we are alternating at our convenience the writing of A_ϵ as a $(1, 1)$ or as a $(2, 0)$ -tensor, since from the context and the notation, this should not create confusion.

Let φ be an arbitrary test function in Ω and let $\varphi_1 \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}M)$. By Proposition 6.16,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M A_\epsilon[\operatorname{grad} u_\epsilon, \operatorname{grad} \varphi + \epsilon \operatorname{grad}_p \varphi_1^\epsilon] dq = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M A_\epsilon[\operatorname{grad} u_\epsilon, \operatorname{grad} \varphi + (\operatorname{grad}_v \varphi_1)^\epsilon] dq$$

Now by Lemma 6.2, $\operatorname{grad} \varphi \xrightarrow{2s} (\operatorname{grad} \varphi)^\uparrow$, and by Lemma 6.14, $(\operatorname{grad}_v \varphi_1)^\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} \operatorname{grad}_v \varphi_1$. Therefore, we can apply compensated compactness for tensors as in Lemma 6.3 to pass to the limit and conclude that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_M A_\epsilon[\operatorname{grad} u_\epsilon, \operatorname{grad} \varphi + \epsilon \operatorname{grad}_p (\varphi_1)^\epsilon] dp = \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} A[\operatorname{grad} u^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1, \operatorname{grad} \varphi^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v \varphi_1] dp dv$$

which deals with the limit of the left-hand side of (9.10). Since the right-hand side is constant, we arrive to

$$(9.11) \quad \int_\Omega \operatorname{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_q)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{T}M_q} \langle A(\operatorname{grad} u^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1), \operatorname{grad} \varphi^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v \varphi_1 \rangle dv dq = \int_\Omega f \cdot \varphi dq,$$

which is the weak formulation of the homogenized system.

To uncouple the system, take first $\varphi_1 = 0$. Since $\operatorname{grad} \varphi^\uparrow$ is constant along each fiber $\mathbb{T}M_q$, thus we can write the left-hand side of (9.11) as

$$(9.12) \quad \int_\Omega \left\langle \operatorname{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_q)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{T}M_q} A(\operatorname{grad} u^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1) dv, \operatorname{grad} \varphi \right\rangle dq = \int_\Omega f \cdot \varphi dq,$$

which is the weak formulation of (9.8),

$$\operatorname{div}_q \left(\operatorname{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_q)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{T}M_q} A(\operatorname{grad} u^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1) dv \right) = f,$$

as desired.

To obtain (9.7), we switch to the case $\varphi = 0$ and $\varphi_1 : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ arbitrary to obtain

$$(9.13) \quad \int_\Omega \operatorname{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{T}M_q} \left(A(\operatorname{grad} u^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1), d^v \varphi_1 \right) dv dq = 0.$$

Then, we can integrate by parts (taking product test functions as in the end of the proof of Theorem 8.2) to arrive to the desired

$$\operatorname{div}^v(A(\operatorname{grad} u^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1)) = 0$$

on $\pi^{-1}(\Omega)$. □

Theorem 9.3 truly generalizes [1, Theorem 1.14] to the manifold setting.

Let us finish the section with the explicit examples arising from Section 6. For A as in Definition 9.2, we define

$$(9.14) \quad A^\epsilon = \sum_j \psi_j(q) (H_{\epsilon,j})_*(A[p_j, v]), \quad 2A_{\text{sym}}^\epsilon = A^\epsilon + (A^\epsilon)^{\text{ad}}$$

and

$$(9.15) \quad \bar{A}^\epsilon = \sum_{i,\ell}^n \sum \psi_j A_\ell^i[p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)/\epsilon] e_i \otimes \theta^\ell, \quad 2\bar{A}_{\text{sym}}^\epsilon = \bar{A}^\epsilon + (\bar{A}^\epsilon)^{\text{ad}}$$

Observe that a routine computation using Definitions 6.4 and 6.10 shows that A_{sym}^ϵ and $\bar{A}_{\text{sym}}^\epsilon$ are uniformly elliptic with a constant K' dependent of ϵ but converging to K as ϵ tends to 0.

Let us emphasize that for any (1, 1)-vertical tensors, Lemma 6.14 implies that $A^\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} A$, and Proposition 6.7 implies that $\bar{A}^\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} A$ as well. However, we can not apply directly Theorem 9.3 to them because they are not symmetric. In spite of this, we have the following lemma:

Lemma 9.4. *Let $A \in C(M, L^2 T^{1,1}(\mathcal{V}_p)) \cap T_K^{1,1}(\mathcal{V})$ and $A^\epsilon, \bar{A}^\epsilon$ be defined by (9.14), (9.15). Then*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow \infty} \int_M |A^\epsilon - (A^\epsilon)^{\text{ad}}| dp + \int_M |\bar{A}^\epsilon - (\bar{A}^\epsilon)^{\text{ad}}| dp = 0$$

Proof. We start with \bar{A}^ϵ . Recall that $(\bar{A}^\epsilon)^{\text{ad}}(q)$ is obtained from $\bar{A}^\epsilon(q)$ through the metric g at q by (9.2). Since $A \in T_K^{1,1}(\mathcal{V})$ (9.4) implies that

$$A_\ell^i[p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)] g_{ik}(p_j) = A_k^i[p_j, \exp_{p_j}^{-1}(q)] g_{i\ell}(p_j).$$

Thus, by the continuity of the metric and the bounded overlapping property it holds that

$$|\bar{A}^\epsilon - (\bar{A}^\epsilon)^{\text{ad}}| \leq C\epsilon^\beta$$

pointwise.

In order to deal with A^ϵ recall that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow \infty} \int_M |A^\epsilon - \bar{A}^\epsilon| dq = 0$$

Thus, it follows that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow \infty} \int_M |A^\epsilon - (A^\epsilon)^{\text{ad}}| dq = 0$$

as well. □

Corollary 9.5. *Let Ω be a domain in M . Let $A_\epsilon = A_{\text{sym}}^\epsilon$ or $A_\epsilon = \bar{A}_{\text{sym}}^\epsilon$ be strongly two scale convergent to $A \in T_K^{1,1}(\mathcal{V}_\Omega)$. Let u_ϵ , the solution of equation (9.5). Then, the sequence u_ϵ converges weakly to u in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and the sequence $\text{grad} u_\epsilon$ two-scale converges to $(\text{grad}_q u)^\uparrow + \text{grad}_v u_1$ where u, u_1 is the unique solution to the system (9.7) (9.8)*

Proof. Lemma 6.14 implies that for $A^\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} A$, and thus Lemma 9.4 implies that $A_{\text{sym}}^\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} A$ as well. Similarly, Proposition 6.7 and Lemma 9.4 guarantee that $\bar{A}_{\text{sym}}^\epsilon \xrightarrow{2s} A$. The corollary then follows from theorem 9.3 □

10. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

With the previous section at hand, we are in position to obtain the homogenization result stated in the introduction. Furthermore, we prove a more general statement without assuming orthonormality of the frame with respect to the metric.

Our strategy is to show that the solution of the homogenized problem agrees with the unique solution to the two-scale homogenized problem by incorporating a u_1 built from the w_i 's solutions to the cell problem. We start by fixing the terminology to avoid later confusion. Weak formulation and existence and uniqueness of solutions is explained in appendix B

Definition 10.1 (The two scale homogenized problem). Let $A \in T_K^{1,1}(\mathcal{V}_\Omega)$, and $f \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$, We say that the function pair $u, u_1 \in H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega, H_{per}^1(\mathbb{T}M_p))$ is the unique solution to the two-scale homogenized problem if

$$(10.1) \quad \operatorname{div}_v(A[p, v][(\operatorname{grad}_p u)^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1]) = 0 \text{ in } \pi^{-1}(\Omega),$$

$$(10.2) \quad \operatorname{div}_p \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} A[p, v][(\operatorname{grad}_p u)^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1] dv \right) = f,$$

$$(10.3) \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega,$$

Definition 10.2 (The homogenized problem). Let $w_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$, be solutions to the following cell equations, in the functions space $L^2(M, H_{per}^1(\mathbb{T}M_p))$ introduced in Section 2.7. Here $\{o_i\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $T_p M$,

$$(10.4) \quad -\operatorname{div}^v(A_{[p,v]}[\operatorname{grad}_v w_i + o_i^\uparrow]) = 0.$$

We define the homogenized tensor $A^* \in T^{1,1}(M)$ by the symmetric (2,0)-tensor

$$(10.5) \quad A^*[p][X, Y] = \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} (I + (D_v w)^{\operatorname{ad}}) A[p, v](I + (D_v w)) X^\uparrow dv, Y^\uparrow \right\rangle,$$

where $(D_v w)^{\operatorname{ad}} = G D_v w^t G^{-1}$ for the matrix $D_v w$ with i -column $\operatorname{grad}_v w_i$.

Definition 10.3. We say that $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ is the solution of the homogenized system if

$$(10.6) \quad -\operatorname{div} A_p^*(\operatorname{grad} u) = f$$

The following lemma states that given any function u in M we can lift it to a solution of equation (10.1) in the manifold through the solutions to the cell equations (10.4). It yields a way to relate u and u_1 .

Lemma 10.4. Given $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ and $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^n$ the solution of the cell equation (10.4). Let us denote $u_1 \in L^2(\Omega, H_{per}^1(T_p))$ as $u_1[p, v] = \langle X^\uparrow, w \rangle$ where,

$$(10.7) \quad w = \sum_i w_i[p, v] \cdot o_i^\uparrow.$$

Then it holds that for almost every p

$$(10.8) \quad \operatorname{div}_v A(X^\uparrow(p) + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1) = 0.$$

In particular for $u \in H^1(M)$ choosing $X = \operatorname{grad} u$ and

$$(10.9) \quad u_1[p, v] = \langle \operatorname{grad} u^\uparrow, w \rangle$$

gives a solution of

$$(10.10) \quad \operatorname{div}_v A(\operatorname{grad} u^\uparrow(p) + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1) = 0.$$

which satisfies

$$(10.11) \quad \operatorname{grad}_v u_1 = D_v w(\operatorname{grad} u)^\uparrow.$$

Proof. The condition $u_1 \in L^2(\Omega, H_{per}^1(T_p))$ follows from the same condition of the solutions of the cell equation.

From the orthogonality of $\{o_i\}$ it holds $X^\uparrow = \sum_i \langle X^\uparrow, o_i^\uparrow \rangle o_i^\uparrow$. Observe that, with the vertical inner product in the fibers of $\mathbb{T}M$, since each entry $\langle X^\uparrow, o_i^\uparrow \rangle$ is constant in the fiber, we have

$$\text{grad}_v u_1 = \sum_i \langle X^\uparrow, o_i^\uparrow \rangle \text{grad}_v w_i = D_v w X^\uparrow,$$

where $D_v w$ denotes the matrix with columns $\text{grad}_v w_i$.

We obtain

$$X^\uparrow + \text{grad}_v u_1 = (I + D_v w)X^\uparrow = \sum_i \langle X^\uparrow, o_i^\uparrow \rangle \cdot (o_i^\uparrow + \text{grad}_v w_i),$$

and from the cell equations (10.4), we have that each term in the following sum vanishes:

$$\text{div}^v A(X^\uparrow + \text{grad}_v u_1) = \sum_i \langle X^\uparrow, o_i^\uparrow \rangle \cdot \text{div}^v (A(o_i^\uparrow) + \text{grad}_v w_i) = 0$$

□

Theorem 10.5. *Assume that u solves the homogenized problem (10.6) and define $u_1[p, v] = \langle \text{grad} u^\uparrow, w \rangle$ as in lemma 10.4, then (u, u_1) is the solution of the two scale homogenized problem. Reciprocally assume that (u, u_1) is the solution of the two scale homogenized problem, then u solves the homogenized equation and $u_1 = \langle \text{grad} u^\uparrow, w \rangle$.*

Proof. Before addressing the proof, we start by recalling the weak version of both systems (see B for further details) and some preliminary observations.

For the decoupled homogenized system we have the cell equations,

$$(10.12) \quad - \int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} \langle A_{[p, v]}[\text{grad}_v w_i(p, v) + o_i^\uparrow], \text{grad}_v \phi(v) \rangle dv = 0,$$

and the homogenized equation

$$(10.13) \quad \int_M \langle A_p^* \text{grad} u, \text{grad} \varphi(p) \rangle dp = \int_\Omega f \varphi.$$

For the two-scale homogenized system we have for a test pair $(\varphi, \varphi^1) \in H^1(M) \times H^1(\mathbb{T}M)$

(10.14)

$$B[(u, u_1), (\varphi, \varphi^1)] := \oint_{\pi^{-1}(\Omega)} \langle A[p, v](\text{grad} u^\uparrow + \text{grad}_v u_1), \text{grad} \varphi^\uparrow + \text{grad}_v \varphi^1 \rangle dv dp = \int_M f \varphi$$

We can split the above in two equations corresponding to weak versions of (10.1) and (10.2).

Assume first that u is the solution of the homogenized system in the weak sense, i.e. for any $\varphi \in H^1(M)$

$$(10.15) \quad \int_M \langle A_p^* \text{grad} u, \text{grad} \varphi(p) \rangle dp = \int_\Omega f \varphi.$$

Inserting definition (10.5) we have

$$(10.16) \quad \int_M \int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} \langle (I + (D_v w)^{ad})A[p, v](I + D_v w)(\text{grad} u)^\uparrow, (\text{grad} \varphi)^\uparrow \rangle dv dp = \int_M f \varphi$$

Taking $u_1 = \langle \text{grad} u^\uparrow, w \rangle$ and using 10.11 we have on one hand

$$(10.17) \quad = \int_M \int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} \langle A[p, v](\text{grad} u)^\uparrow + \text{grad}_v u_1, (I + D_v w)(\text{grad} \varphi)^\uparrow \rangle dv dp = \int_M f \varphi.$$

On the other hand by the weak version of (10.10) in lemma (10.4) we have for any $\varphi^1 \in H^1(\mathbb{T}M)$

$$(10.18) \quad \oint_{\mathbb{T}M} \langle A[p, v](\text{grad} u)^\uparrow + \text{grad}_v u_1, \text{grad}_v \varphi^1 \rangle dv dp = 0.$$

Declare $\tilde{\varphi} : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$(10.19) \quad \tilde{\varphi}[p, v] = \langle \text{grad } \varphi^\uparrow, w \rangle$$

Take $\varphi^1 = \tilde{\varphi}[p, v]$ in (10.18), this gives

$$\oint_{TM} \langle A[p, v]((\text{grad } u)^\uparrow + \text{grad}_v u_1), D_v w \text{ grad } \varphi^\uparrow \rangle dpdv = 0,$$

where we used $\text{grad}_v \tilde{\varphi} = D_v w \text{ grad } \varphi^\uparrow$ as in the Lemma. We can then write (10.17) as

$$(10.20) \quad = \oint_{TM} \langle A[p, v]((\text{grad } u)^\uparrow + \text{grad}_v u_1), (\text{grad } \varphi)^\uparrow \rangle dpdv = \int_M f \varphi.$$

which is the weak version of (10.2) in the two scale homogenized system. To finish, just notice that (10.18) is just the weak version of (10.1) in the two scale homogenized system.

Assume now that $(u, u_1) \in H^1(M) \times L^2(\Omega, H_{per}^1(\mathbb{T}_p M))$ is the solution of the two scale homogenized problem. By choosing $\varphi = 0$ in (10.14), we obtain that u_1 satisfies (10.18) for any $\varphi^1 : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then by uniqueness in $L^2(\Omega, H_{per}^1(\mathbb{T}_p M))$, $u_1 = \langle \text{grad } u^\uparrow, w \rangle$ given in the lemma.

Now take $\varphi^1 = 0$ in (10.14), then

$$(10.21) \quad \oint_{\pi^{-1}(\Omega)} \langle A[p, v](\text{grad } u^\uparrow + \text{grad}_v u_1), \text{grad } \varphi^\uparrow \rangle dv dp = \int_M f \varphi.$$

Take $\varphi^1 = \tilde{\varphi}$ in (10.18) as in (10.19). Then

$$\oint_{TM} \langle A[p, v]((\text{grad } u)^\uparrow + \text{grad}_v u_1), D_v w \text{ grad } \varphi^\uparrow \rangle dpdv = 0.$$

Adding this identity to (10.21) and using (10.11), we obtain that u satisfies the homogenized equation. □

APPENDIX A. THE TANGENT BUNDLE

Let (M, g) be a Riemannian n -manifold. The *tangent bundle of M* , TM , is the set

$$TM := \{ (p, v) : p \in M, v \in T_p M \}$$

with the natural differentiable structure induced from M .

Whenever $v \in T_p M$, we use (p, v) to denote the corresponding point in the tangent bundle of M . We will use $\pi : TM \rightarrow M$ to denote the bundle projection $\pi(p, v) = p$. Given $(U, \varphi) \in M$ with $\varphi = (x^1, x^2, \dots, x^n)$ we define a chart $\tilde{\varphi} : \pi^{-1}U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ adapted to the frame $\Gamma(p) = (e_1, \dots, e_n)$ by

$$(A.1) \quad \tilde{\varphi}(p, v) = (x^1(p), \dots, x^n(p), v^1(p, v), \dots, v^n(p, v))$$

where for $v \in T_p M$,

$$v = \sum_{j=1}^n v^j(p, v) e_j.$$

There is an exponential map

$$\exp : TM \rightarrow M, \quad \exp(p, v) = \exp_p(v),$$

where $\exp_p(v)$ is $\gamma_v(1)$, and γ_v is the geodesic in M with initial condition $\gamma_v'(0) = v$. Another map that is often useful is

$$\text{Exp} : TM \rightarrow M \times M, \quad \text{Exp}(p, v) = (p, \exp_p(v)).$$

By the Inverse Function Theorem, Exp is a diffeomorphism from a neighbourhood of the zero section in TM to a neighbourhood of the diagonal $\Delta_M \subset M \times M$.




FIGURE 4. The vertical decomposition of TM

The differential of all these maps require us to consider the manifold TTM , the *tangent bundle of the tangent bundle*. For each $(p, v) \in TM$, there are n -dimensional subspaces $\mathcal{H}_{(p,v)}$, $\mathcal{V}_{(p,v)}$ in $T_{(p,v)}TM$ called the *horizontal* and *vertical* subspaces, and defined as follows:

- $\mathcal{V}_{(p,v)}$ is obtained from vectors tangent to curves of the form $\alpha_w(t) = (p, v + tw)$, where w ranges over vectors in T_pM . In our terminology, this would be the vector $w^\uparrow(p, v)$. When W is a vector field in M , we get an induced vector field W^\uparrow in TM . Notice that $\ker(\pi_*) = \mathcal{V}_{(p,v)}$, where $\pi : TM \rightarrow M$ is the bundle projection.
- $\mathcal{H}_{(p,v)}$ is obtained as follows: for each vector $w \in T_pM$, we consider the geodesic γ_w tangent to w , and take the parallel transport $P_t(v)$ of v along $\gamma_w(t)$. This defines a smooth curve $\beta_w(t)$ in TM with $\beta_w(0) = v$; thus, its tangent vector $\beta'_w(0)$ belongs to $T_{(p,v)}TM$, and it is easy to see that the set of $\beta'_w(0)$ obtained when $w \in T_pM$ form an n -dimensional subspace of $T_{(p,v)}TM$ that we denote as $\mathcal{H}_{(p,v)}$.

It is well known that

$$T_{(p,v)}TM = \mathcal{H}_{(p,v)} \oplus \mathcal{V}_{(p,v)} \simeq T_pM \times T_pM,$$

where the last identification just follows from the construction outlined previously. For a vector $\xi \in T_{(p,v)}TM$ we will write

$$\xi = \xi_h + \xi_v, \quad \xi_h \in \mathcal{H}_{(p,v)}, \quad \xi_v \in \mathcal{V}_{(p,v)}$$

Similarly, for covectors in TM ,

$$T_{(p,w)}^*TM = \mathcal{H}_{(p,v)}^* \oplus \mathcal{V}_{(p,v)}^*.$$

That is, for a one form $\omega \in \Lambda^1(TM)$ we can write $\omega = \omega_h + \omega_v$ where for $\xi \in T_{(p,v)}TM$

$$(\omega_h, \xi) = (\omega, \xi_h), \quad (\omega_v, \xi) = (\omega, \xi_v).$$

We say that $\omega \in \Lambda^1(TM)$ is vertical if and only if $\omega_h = 0$.

In general, an (m, n) -tensor T is vertical if

$$T(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m, \omega_1, \dots, \omega_n) = T((\xi_1)_v, \dots, (\xi_m)_v, (\omega_1)_v, \dots, (\omega_n)_v).$$

Finally, we notice that in the coordinate chart $(\pi^{-1}U, \tilde{\phi})$, a vertical tensor has the expression

$$T_{(p,v)} = \sum_{I,J} t_{I,J}^I(p, v) \frac{\partial}{\partial v^I} \otimes dv^J,$$

where I, J are suitable multi-indexes.

In this paper, we usually consider a metric tensor defined only on vertical vector fields. But whenever we consider a metric on the whole of $\mathbb{T}M$, we consider the *Sasaki metric*. An excellent introduction to it appears in [39], but we describe it here for completeness and to facilitate the reading: given vectors ξ, η in $T_{(p,v)}\mathbb{T}M$, the Sasaki metric is defined as

$$g_{(p,v)}(\xi, \eta) := g_p(\xi^h, \eta^h) + g_p(\xi^v, \eta^v),$$

where $\xi = \xi^h + \xi^v$, $\eta = \eta^h + \eta^v$ in the horizontal-vertical splitting. It is clear that with this metric, the horizontal and vertical subspaces are orthogonal complements of each other. Moreover, the projection map $\pi : \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow M$ becomes a Riemannian submersion, although we will not use this fact in the rest of the paper. More important for us, is that the Sasaki metric, although originally defined in $\mathbb{T}M$, descends to a metric on the torus bundle $\mathbb{T}M$ with a similar decomposition in terms of the vertical and horizontal components. With this metric (that we will keep calling the Sasaki metric), the vertical torus fibers are orthogonal to the horizontal distribution.

APPENDIX B. WEAK FORMULATION OF THE HOMOGENIZED SYSTEM

In this section, we explore carefully the two scale homogenized system within the tangent bundle formalism. In particular, we state its weak formulation, and prove the existence of unique solutions. For completeness, we also recall the weak formulation of the homogenized problem.

B.1. The two-scale homogenized problem.

Definition B.1 (The two-scale homogenized system). Let $A \in \Sigma_K^V$, and $f \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$. We say that the function pair $u, u_1 \in H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega, H_{per}^1(\mathbb{T}M_p))$ is the unique solution to the two-scale homogenized problem if

$$(B.1) \quad \operatorname{div}_v(A[p, v][(\operatorname{grad}_p u)^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1]) = 0 \text{ in } \pi^{-1}(\Omega),$$

$$(B.2) \quad \operatorname{div}_p \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} A[p, v]((\operatorname{grad}_p u)^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1) dv \right) = f,$$

$$(B.3) \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega,$$

As we are dealing with weak solutions, the pointwise definition does not make sense, and therefore we interpret it through the variational formulation:

Definition B.2. We say that u, u_1 solves the above system weakly if for every $(\varphi, \varphi_1) \in H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega, H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega, H_{per}^1(\mathbb{T}M_p)))$ it holds that,

$$(B.4) \quad \int_{\pi^{-1}(\Omega)} \langle A[p, v](\operatorname{grad} u^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1), \operatorname{grad} \varphi^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v \varphi_1 \rangle dv dp = \int f \varphi dp$$

The bilinear form at the left-hand side of equation (B.4) will be denoted by $B[(u, u_1), (\varphi, \varphi_1)]$.

Proposition B.3. *For smooth coefficients, the definitions of strong and weak solution agree.*

Proof. In what follows, we use some of the properties of vertical divergence that appear in Section 2.6. We integrate by parts in both variables to obtain that

$$(B.5) \quad \int_{\pi^{-1}(\Omega)} \langle A[p, v](\operatorname{grad} u^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1), \operatorname{grad} \varphi^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v \varphi_1 \rangle dv dp = \\ - \int_{\pi^{-1}(\Omega)} \varphi^\uparrow \cdot \operatorname{div} A[p, v](\operatorname{grad} u^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1) dv dp \\ - \int_{\Omega} \int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} \varphi_1 \cdot \operatorname{div}^v A[p, v](\operatorname{grad} u^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1) dv dp$$

Since ϕ^\uparrow is constant in each $\mathbb{T}M_p$ fiber, we have that the first term is equal to

$$(B.6) \quad - \int_{\Omega} \varphi \cdot \int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} \operatorname{div} A[p, v](\operatorname{grad} u^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1) dv dp$$

and here we use that, since $A[p, v](\operatorname{grad} u^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1)$ is a vertical field, the integral along a fiber of its vertical divergence vanishes, thus

$$(B.7) \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} \operatorname{div} A[p, v](\operatorname{grad} u^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1) dv = \int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} \operatorname{div}^H A[p, v](\operatorname{grad} u^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1) dv = \\ \operatorname{div} \int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} A[p, v](\operatorname{grad} u^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v u_1) dv = f$$

by the properties of divergence. On the other hand, the integrand in the second term in (B.5) vanishes, and the result is obvious. \square

Proposition B.4. *There is a unique solution to the two-scaled homogenized problem*

Proof. Uniqueness and existence follows from the classical Lax-Milgram theorem applied to the bilinear form B in the space $H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega, H_{per}^1(\mathbb{T}M_p))$. Notice that

$$\int_{\pi^{-1}\Omega} \langle \operatorname{grad} \varphi, \operatorname{grad} \varphi_1 \rangle dv dp = 0$$

Next, by the ellipticity of A it holds that for $\Phi = (\varphi, \varphi_1)$

$$B(\Phi, \Phi) \geq c \int_{\pi^{-1}\Omega} |\operatorname{grad} \varphi + \operatorname{grad} \varphi_1|^2 dv dp \geq c \cdot V \int_{\Omega} |\operatorname{grad} \varphi|^2 + c \int_{\pi^{-1}\Omega} |\operatorname{grad} \varphi_1|^2,$$

where $V = \max_p \operatorname{vol}(\mathbb{T}M_p)$. \square

B.2. The homogenized system. We recall the definition of the homogenized problem for arbitrary metric g and frame Γ .

Definition B.5 (The homogenized problem). We define a symmetric tensor $A^* \in \mathcal{T}^{1,1}(M)$

$$(B.8) \quad A^*[p][X, Y] = \int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} \langle (I + (D_v w)^{ad})A[p, v](I + (D_v w))X^\uparrow, Y^\uparrow \rangle$$

where $(D_v w)^{ad} = GD_v w^t G^{-1}$ for the matrix $D_v w$ with i -column $\operatorname{grad}_v w_i$.

Definition B.6. We say that $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ is a solution of the homogenized system if

$$(B.9) \quad - \operatorname{div} A_p^*(\operatorname{grad} u) = f$$

For later uses we notice that equation (10.4) implies that for every $\varphi_1 \in H_{per}^1(\mathbb{T}M_p)$ it holds that

$$(B.10) \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}M_p} \langle A[p, v](o_k^\uparrow + \operatorname{grad}_v w_k), \operatorname{grad}_v \varphi_1 \rangle dv = 0$$

and similarly, from equation B.9, for every $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ it holds that

$$(B.11) \quad \int_{\Omega} \langle A^* \operatorname{grad} u, \operatorname{grad} \varphi \rangle dp = \int_{\Omega} f \cdot \varphi dp$$

Existence and uniqueness of the w_i 's and u for both the cell problem and the homogenized system, follows from the Lax-Milgram theorem applied to each of the corresponding bilinear forms.

REFERENCES

- [1] Allaire, G., *Homogenization and two-scale convergence*. SIAM J. Math. Anal. 23 (1992), no. 6, 1482–1518.
- [2] Allaire, G., *Shape optimization by the homogenization method*. Applied Mathematical Sciences, 146. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.
- [3] Allaire, G.; Briane, M., *Multiscale convergence and reiterated homogenization*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A 126 (1996), no. 2, 297–342.
- [4] Benešová B., Campbell, D., Hencl, S., Kružík, M., *Non-interpenetration of rods derived by Γ -limits*, Preprint 2024, [arXiv:2402.05601](https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.05601) [math:AP].
- [5] Bensoussan, A., Lions, J.L., Papanicolaou, G., *Asymptotic analysis for periodic structures*. Studies in Mathematics and its Applications, 5. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York, 1978.
- [6] Bensoussan, A., Lions, J.L., Papanicolaou, G., *Homogenization and ergodic theory*, Banach center publications, 5. (1979), no.1, 15–25.
- [7] Besse, A. L., *Einstein manifolds*, reprint of the 1987 edition. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2008.
- [8] Braides, A., *Γ -convergence for beginners*. Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, 22. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002
- [9] Braides, A., Cancedda, A., Piat, V.C., *Homogenization of metrics in oscillating manifolds*. ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. 23 (2017), no. 3, 889–912.
- [10] Braides, A., Defranceschi, A., *Homogenization of multiple integrals*. Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, 12. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1998.
- [11] Cheeger, J. and Ebin, D. G., *Comparison theorems in Riemannian geometry*, revised reprint of the 1975 original AMS Chelsea Publishing, Providence, RI, 2008. x+168 pp.
- [12] Cheeger, J., Fukaya, K., Gromov, M. *Nilpotent structures and invariant metrics on collapsed manifolds*. J. Amer. Math. Soc. 5 (1992), no.2, 327–372.
- [13] Cheeger, J.; Gromov, M., *Collapsing Riemannian manifolds while keeping their curvature bounded. I*. J. Differential Geom.23(1986), no.3, 309–346.
- [14] Cheeger, J.; Gromov, M., *Collapsing Riemannian manifolds while keeping their curvature bounded. II*. J. Differential Geom.32(1990), no.1, 269–298.
- [15] Conti, S. Dolzmann, G. Müller, S. *Optimal rigidity estimates for maps of a compact Riemannian manifold to itself*, preprint. [arXiv:2402.06448](https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.06448) [math:AP].
- [16] Contreras, G., Iturriaga, R., Siconolfi, A., *Homogenization on arbitrary manifolds*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 52 (2015), no. 1-2, 237–252.
- [17] Dal Maso, G., *An introduction to Γ -convergence*. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, 8. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1993.
- [18] Francfort, G., Giacomini, A., *On periodic homogenization in perfect elasto-plasticity* J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) 16 (2014), no. 3, 409–461.
- [19] Friesecke, G., James, R. D., Mora, M. G., Müller, S., *Derivation of nonlinear bending theory for shells from three-dimensional nonlinear elasticity by Gamma-convergence*. C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris 336 (2003), no. 8, 697–702.
- [20] Friesecke, G., James, R., Müller S., *A theorem on geometric rigidity and the derivation of nonlinear plate theory from three-dimensional elasticity* Comm Pure and Applied Maths 55, no 11 (2002) 1461-1506.
- [21] Friesecke, G., James, R., Müller S., *A hierarchy of plate models derived from nonlinear elasticity by gamma-convergence* Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 180 (2006), no. 2, 183–236.
- [22] Fukaya, K., *Collapsing of Riemannian manifolds and eigenvalues of Laplace operator*, Invent. Math.87(1987), no.3, 517–547.
- [23] Girouard, A., Lagacé, J., *Large Steklov eigenvalues via homogenization on manifolds*. Invent. Math. 226 (2021), no. 3, 1011–1056
- [24] Grove, K., Shiohama, K., *A generalized sphere theorem*, Ann. of Math. **106** (1977) no. 1 201–211.
- [25] Hornung, P., Neukamm, S., Velcic, I., *Derivation of a homogenized nonlinear plate theory from 3D elasticity*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 51 (2014).
- [26] Hornung, P., Velcic, I., *Derivation of a homogenized von Karman shell theory from 3D elasticity*. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, 32 (2015).
- [27] Jikov, V. V., Kozlov, S. M., Oleĭnik, O. A., *Homogenization of differential operators and integral functionals* Translated from the Russian by G. A. Yosifian. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994.
- [28] Kenig, C. E.; Lin, F., Shen, Z., *Convergence rates in L^2 for elliptic homogenization problems*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 203 (2012), no. 3, 1009–1036.
- [29] Knieper, G., *Hyperbolic dynamics and Riemannian geometry*, Handbook of Dynamical Systems, vol. 1A (2002), pp. 453–545.
- [30] Lee, John M., *Introduction to smooth manifolds*. Second edition, Grad. Texts in Math., 218 Springer, New York, 2013. xvi+708 pp.
- [31] Lewicka, M., *Calculus of variations on thin prestressed films –asymptotic methods in elasticity*, vol. 101 of Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications. Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2023.

- [32] Lewicka, M., Mora, M.G., Pakzad, M.R., *A nonlinear theory for shells with slowly varying thickness*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris 347 (2009), no. 3-4, 211–216.
- [33] Milnor, J. W.; Stasheff, J. D., *Characteristic classes*. Annals of Mathematics Studies, No. 76. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J 1974.
- [34] Milton, W., *The theory of composites*. Cambridge Monographs on Applied and Computational Mathematics, 6. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.
- [35] Mora, M.G., Müller, S., *A nonlinear model for inextensible rods as a low energy Γ -limit of three-dimensional nonlinear elasticity* Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire 21 (2004), no. 3, 271–293.
- [36] Müller, S., *Mathematical problems in thin elastic sheets: scaling limits, packing, crumpling and singularities*. In Vector-valued partial differential equations and applications, vol. 2179 of Lecture Notes in Math. Springer, Cham, 2017, pp. 125–193.
- [37] Nguetseng, G., *A general convergence result for a functional related to the theory of homogenization*. SIAM J. Math. Anal. 20 (1989), no. 3, 608–623.
- [38] Pak, H. Ch., *Geometric two-scale convergence on forms and its applications to Maxwell’s equations*. Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, 135A, (2005) 133–147.
- [39] Paternain, G., *Geodesic flows*. Progress in Mathematics (PM, volume 180), Birkhäuser 1999.
- [40] Rong, X., *Convergence and collapsing theorems in Riemannian geometry*, Adv. Lect. Math. (ALM), 13 International Press, Somerville, MA, 2010, 193–299.
- [41] Shen, Z., *Quantitative homogenization of elliptic operators with periodic coefficients* IAS/Park City Math. Ser., 27 American Mathematical Society, [Providence], RI, 2020, 73–129. ISBN: 978-1-4704-6127-0.
- [42] Shen, Z., *Sharp convergence rates for Darcy’s law* Comm. Partial Differential Equations 47 (2022), no. 6, 1098–1123.
- [43] Tartar, L., *Compensated compactness and applications to partial differential equations*. Nonlinear analysis and mechanics: Heriot-Watt Symposium, Vol. IV, pp. 136–212, Res. Notes in Math., 39, Pitman, Boston, Mass.-London, 1979.
- [44] Tartar, L., *The general theory of homogenization. A personalized introduction*. Lecture Notes of the Unione Matematica Italiana, 7. Springer-Verlag, Berlin; UMI, Bologna, 2009
- [45] Warner, Frank W. *Foundations of differentiable manifolds and Lie groups*. Corrected reprint of the 1971 edition. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 94. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1983.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS - UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE MADRID AND INSTITUTO DE CIENCIAS MATEMÁTICAS CSIC-UAM-UC3M-UCM, 28049 MADRID, SPAIN
Email address: daniel.faraco@uam.es

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS - UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE MADRID AND INSTITUTO DE CIENCIAS MATEMÁTICAS CSIC-UAM-UC3M-UCM, 28049 MADRID, SPAIN
Email address: luis.guijarro@uam.es

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON, GOWER STREET, LONDON UK, WC1E 6BT

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS - UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE MADRID AND INSTITUTO DE CIENCIAS MATEMÁTICAS CSIC-UAM-UC3M-UCM, 28049 MADRID, SPAIN
Email address: alberto.ruiz@uam.es