
Rough Geometric Integration

May 28, 2024

Ajay Chandra¹  and Harprit Singh² 

¹ Imperial College London, UK, Email: a.chandra@imperial.ac.uk

² University of Edinburgh, UK, Email: harprit.singh@ed.ac.uk

Abstract

We introduce a notion of distributional k -forms on d -dimensional manifolds which can be integrated against suitably regular k -submanifolds. Our approach combines ideas from Whitney's geometric integration [Whi57] with those of sewing approaches to rough integration [Gub04, FdLP06].

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Main results and past work	2
1.2	Outline of the article	3
2	Preliminary geometric notions	5
2.1	Simplices and chains	5
2.2	Controls on simplices	8
2.3	Functions on chains	9
2.4	Simplicial sewing lemma	10
3	Distributional k-forms	11
3.1	Estimates on chains and a generalised flat norm	12
3.2	Further (α, β) -flat norm estimates	13
4	Multiplication with regular functions	14
5	Pullback and Stokes' theorem	16
5.1	Simplicial approximation	17
6	Embeddings into distribution spaces	20

7 Application to random fields	22
7.1 A Kolmogorov criterion	22
7.2 Rough Gaussian k -forms	24
8 Methods of subdivision	25
8.1 Proof of Proposition 2.10	27
A Symbolic Index	29

1 Introduction

In this work we introduce Banach spaces of generalised/rough differential forms (or cochains) which are analogous to Hölder distributions. Following the approach of geometric integration, pioneered by Whitney [Whi57] and further developed by Harrison [HN92, Har05], an element A of such a space is characterized by its evaluation on simplices $\sigma \mapsto A(\sigma)$. We work in a rougher setting where these elements can be of “infinite variation”, that is we allow $\sup_{\mathcal{K}|\sigma} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{K}} |A(\sigma')| = \infty$ where the supremum is over subdivisions \mathcal{K} of σ into smaller simplices. In particular, we can make sense of a class of k -forms formally given by $f = \sum_I f_I dx^I$ where the $(f_I)_I$ are genuine distributions.

Our work here can be seen as formulating a geometric analogue of the integration theory of Young [You36], building on earlier work such as [Züs11, ST21, AST24, Che18, Har18, CCHS22]. It is also motivated by the study of random fields in probability theory where one is often interested in integrating rough random distributions on \mathbb{R}^d over $k < d$ dimensional objects, for instance circle averages of the Gaussian Free Field [BP24] or Wilson loop observables for quantum gauge fields [Che18, CCHS22].

1.1 Main results and past work

We introduce a space $\Omega_{(\alpha,\beta)}^k$ of generalised k -forms in d -dimensional ambient space for $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, $\beta \in [0, 1] \cup \{\infty\}$. Our results for this space are as follows:

- Elements of $\Omega_{(\alpha,\beta)}^k$ be integrated in the sense geometric integration theory over embedded k -manifolds.
- Under point-wise multiplication $\Omega_{(\alpha,\beta)}^k$ is C^γ -module for $\gamma \in (1 - \alpha + \beta, 1]$.
- Whenever $\alpha > 1/2$, these forms can be pulled-back which allows them to be defined intrinsically on manifolds. This allows for a notion of integration by pull-back for which a corresponding Stokes’ theorem holds.
- For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, there is a natural embedding $\Omega_{\alpha,\beta}^k(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow \prod_I C^{\alpha-1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ which extends the mapping $f = \sum_I f_I(x) dx^I \mapsto \{f_I\}_I$ on smooth forms f .
- We give a Kolmogorov criterion for the spaces $\Omega_{(\alpha,\beta)}^k$, which is checked for a class of (distributional) Gaussian fields.

Along the way, a useful tool that we formulate and prove is a “simplicial sewing lemma”, Proposition 2.10, which might be of independent interest as it provides a coordinate invariant formulation¹ of the multidimensional sewing lemma of [Har18] and [CG14].

This work also unifies several previous constructions, below we compare our spaces $\Omega_{(\alpha,\beta)}^k$ and results about them to past work.

- For $\alpha = \beta = 1$ these spaces agree with the flat cochains of Whitney, [Whi57], and for $\alpha = 1, 0 < \beta < 1$ with the class of $(k - 1 + \beta)$ -cochains introduced in [HN92], see Remark 3.3.
- They contain the generalised d -forms $f \cdot dg_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dg_d$ introduced in [Züs11] and recently studied in [AST24] for $d = 2$ by discrete approximation. We extend several results therein, see Remark 2.13, Corollary 4.1.2, and Theorem 4.1.
- In dimension $d = 2$ and for $k = 1$, they are very similar to the spaces in [Che18], [CCHS22, Sec. 3], see Remark 3.2, Remark 5.4, Proposition 6.1 and Section 7.

1.2 Outline of the article

In Section 2 we introduce geometric notions, such as the set \mathfrak{X}^k of oriented k -simplices in \mathbb{R}^d and a corresponding space of chains $\mathcal{X}^k = \mathbb{Z}[\mathfrak{X}^k]/\sim$ where $\mathbb{Z}[\mathfrak{X}^k]$ denotes the free \mathbb{Z} -module generated by \mathfrak{X}^k and the equivalence relation \sim identifies the operators of addition and negation on $\mathbb{Z}[\mathfrak{X}^k]$ with the geometric operations of gluing simplices and inverting orientation. The subset Ω^k of measurable elements of the algebraic dual of \mathcal{X}^k provides us with a ‘universe’ of differential forms/cochains.

The first novelty that appears is our notion of size/mass of a simplex $\mathbf{m}_\alpha^k : \mathfrak{X}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, given by the maximum of $\text{Vol}^{k-1}(F) \cdot h_F^\alpha$ over faces F of the simplex, where h_F is the height measured from F .

In Section 3 we define spaces $\Omega_{(\alpha,\beta)}^k \subset \Omega^k$ of ‘distributional’ forms by imposing for $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^k$ and $\omega \in \mathfrak{X}^{k+1}$ the inequalities

$$|A(\sigma)| \lesssim \mathbf{m}_\alpha^k(\sigma), \quad |\partial A(\omega)| \lesssim \mathbf{m}_\alpha^k(\omega).$$

Here $\partial : \mathcal{X}^{k+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^k$ is the linear extension of the boundary operator on oriented simplices, which by duality maps Ω^k to Ω^{k+1} . Lemma 2.8 provides equivalent characterisations of the spaces $\Omega_{(\alpha,\beta)}^k$ by controlling $A(\sigma)$ either in terms of the diameter of σ , or in terms of the value of A on cubes. Subsection 3.1 then introduces a norm $|\cdot|_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ on \mathcal{X}^k which for $\alpha = \beta = 1$ is equivalent to Whitney’s flat norm, see [Whi57], and for $\alpha = 1, \beta \in (0, 1)$ equivalent to the $(k - 1 + \beta)$ -norm of Harrison, [HN92, Sec. 2]. We then establish an integration theory in the spirit of geometric integration by showing that $\Omega_{(\alpha,\beta)}^k$ is contained in the continuous dual of $\mathcal{B}_{\alpha,\beta}^k$, the completion of $(\mathcal{X}^k, |\cdot|_{(\alpha,\beta)})$, which in particular canonically contains closed manifolds.

Section 4 establishes the Young type multiplication theorem, Theorem 4.1, which in particular generalises [AST24, Thm. 4.4] from dimension 2 to arbitrary dimension.

¹See also Remark 2.12.

In Corollary 4.1.2, we generalise [Züs11, Thm. 3.2] and establish that spaces of forms considered there are contained in our spaces.

The main result of Section 5 shows that the notion of pull-back on smooth forms can be extended to $\Omega_{(\alpha,\beta)}^k$. As a consequence one can canonically define spaces $\Omega_{(\alpha,\beta)}^k(M)$ on any $C^{1,\eta}$ -manifold M as soon as $\alpha > 1/(1+\eta)$. Furthermore, the Stokes' theorem extends to forms in $\Omega_{(\alpha,\beta)}^k$.

In Section 6, analogously to [Che18, Prop. 3.21], we show that the spaces $\Omega_{(\alpha,\beta)}^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$ embed into spaces of Hölder distributions and, for codimension $d - k = 0$, this embedding is an isomorphism.

Section 7 states and proves the promised Kolmogorov criterion which is then checked for a class of Gaussian fields.

Lastly, Section 8 contains a proof of the simplicial sewing lemma, Proposition 2.10. We present the proof, which only requires notions from Section 2, at the end of the article in order to streamline exposition. For the proof we define the notion of a “strongly regular method of subdivision” (see Definition 13) – the existence of such a method is non-trivial and follows from [EG00].

Notation: We shall often use for the notation \lesssim to mean that an inequality holds up to multiplication by a constant which may change from line to line but is uniform over any stated quantities. We furthermore write \lesssim_C to emphasise the dependance of that constant on C . We write $a \vee b := \max\{a, b\}$ and $a \wedge b := \min\{a, b\}$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$.

For $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we equip \mathbb{R}^m with the Borel sigma algebra and a norm $|\cdot|$ which is fixed throughout the article. We write Vol^k for the k -dimensional Hausdorff measure. For a function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, we shall use the notation $Df = \{\partial_i f\}_{i=1}^d$ to denote its derivative, as well as multi-index notation $D^I f := \partial_1^{i_1}, \dots, \partial_d^{i_d} f$ for $I = (i_1, \dots, i_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$. We extend differentiation to distributions in the usual way. For $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and a function $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ we write $\|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} := \sup_{x \in \Omega} |f|$. For $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, we denote by $C^\alpha(\Omega)$ the usual space of Hölder continuous functions equipped with the norm

$$\|f\|_{C^\alpha(\Omega)} := \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \sup_{x,y \in \Omega} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{|x - y|^\alpha \wedge 1}.$$

As standard, $C^{k,\alpha}(\Omega)$ denotes k -times differentiable function such that the k - derivatives is are elements of C^α . For $\alpha < 0$, we work with the standard distribution spaces C^α as in [Hai14].

Acknowledgements: HS would like to thank Máté Gerencsér for his hospitality during a stay at TU Wien and gratefully acknowledges financial support from the EPSRC via Ilya Chevyrev's New Investigator Award EP/X015688/1. AC gratefully acknowledges partial support by the EPSRC through the “Mathematics of Random Systems” CDT EP/S023925/1.

2 Preliminary geometric notions

In this section we recall standard notation and facts about simplices and chains, c.f. [Hat02, Mun18, Lee10, HN92]. Unless mentioned otherwise, we shall be working in the ambient space \mathbb{R}^d .

2.1 Simplices and chains

Vectors $v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are called *affinely independent* if they lie in a unique k -dimensional affine subspace of \mathbb{R}^d , or equivalently, if the vectors $\{v_i - v_0\}_{i=1}^k$ are linearly independent.

Definition 1. *The (unoriented) k -simplex σ spanned by affinely independent vectors $v_0, \dots, v_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is defined as*

$$\sigma := \llbracket v_0, \dots, v_k \rrbracket := \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^k t_i v_i \in \mathbb{R}^d : t_i \in [0, 1], \sum_{i=0}^k t_i = 1 \right\}.$$

The points v_i are called the vertices of σ and we write $V(\sigma)$ for this set. A simplex spanned by a non-empty subset of $V(\sigma)$ is called a face of σ . A face which is a $k-1$ -simplex is called a boundary face.

Definition 2. *We say a collection $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_N$ of k -simplices are non-overlapping if $\text{Vol}^k(\sigma_i \cap \sigma_j) = 0$ for every $1 \leq i < j \leq N$.*

A subdivision of a simplex σ consists of a finite set of non-overlapping k -simplices \mathcal{K} such that $\sigma = \bigcup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{K}} \mathbf{w}$.

The mesh of the subdivision \mathcal{K} is defined as $\text{diam}(\mathcal{K}) := \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{K}} \text{diam}(\mathbf{w})$. We call a sequence of subdivisions $(\mathcal{K}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of a k -simplex σ regular if, for any $\beta > k$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{K}_n} \text{diam}(\mathbf{w})^\beta \rightarrow 0.$$

An orientation of a simplex spanned by affinely independent vectors $v_0, \dots, v_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is an ordering of its vertices (v_0, \dots, v_k) , where two orderings are declared equivalent if they differ by an even permutation.

Definition 3. *An oriented simplex σ consists of an unoriented simplex σ together with an orientation o of its vertices, that is $\sigma = (\sigma, o)$. We shall use the notation $\llbracket v_0, \dots, v_k \rrbracket$ to denote the simplex $\llbracket v_0, \dots, v_k \rrbracket$ with the orientation inherited from the ordering (v_0, \dots, v_k) .*

We denote by \mathfrak{X}^k the set of all oriented k -simplices. Given $\mathfrak{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we define $\mathfrak{X}^k(\mathfrak{K})$ to be the set of oriented simplices $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^k$ with $\sigma \subset \mathfrak{K}$. For $R > 0$, we also write $\mathfrak{X}_{\leq R}^k(\mathfrak{K})$ for the set of all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^k(\mathfrak{K})$ with $\text{diam}(\sigma) \leq R$.

Note that 0-simplices only have one orientation. For $k \geq 1$ a k -simplex σ can carry one of two distinct orientations and for a given an orientation o , we write $-o$ to denote the other orientation on σ . We observe that the orientation o of a simplex σ can be canonically identified with an orientation of the (unique) k -dimensional hyperplane containing σ – we shall freely use this identification and compare the orientation of two simplices contained in the same hyperplane. We also extend the notion of non-overlapping to oriented simplices in the natural way.

Definition 4. For a simplex $\sigma = [v_0, \dots, v_k]$, we denote by $\sigma_{\setminus v_i} := (-1)^i [v_0, \dots, \hat{v}_i, \dots, v_k]$ the (oriented) face which does not contain $v_i \in V(\sigma)$, where we have used standard notation which means leaving out the term with a hat. We set $\text{Bd}(\sigma) := \{\sigma_{\setminus v} : v \in V(\sigma)\}$.

Given an oriented simplex σ , we write $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ for the underlying non-oriented simplex. We sometimes overload notation by allowing functions which take unoriented simplices σ as arguments to also take oriented simplices $\sigma = (\boldsymbol{\sigma}, o)$ as arguments by just disregarding the orientation o .

Definition 5. Given an oriented simplex $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^k$, we say $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathfrak{X}^k$ is a subdivision of σ if every $\tau \in \mathcal{K}$ has the same orientation as σ and $\{\tau : \tau \in \mathcal{K}\}$ is a subdivision of the non-oriented simplex $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ (Definition 2).

We write $\mathcal{K}|\sigma$ to denote that \mathcal{K} is a subdivision of the oriented simplex σ . Note that the notions of mesh and of regularity clearly extend to the subdivisions of oriented simplices.

Definition 6. The set of k -chains is given by $\mathcal{X}^k = \mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{X}^k) / \sim$ where the equivalence relation \sim for $k = 0$ is trivial and equivalence classes consist of singletons. For $k \geq 1$

- $-\sigma \sim (\boldsymbol{\sigma}, -o)$ for every $\sigma = (\boldsymbol{\sigma}, o) \in \mathfrak{X}^k$.
- $\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{K}} \tau \sim \sigma$ for any $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^k$ and subdivision $\mathcal{K}|\sigma$.

We recall the boundary operator

$$\partial : \mathfrak{X}^k \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^{k-1}, \quad \sigma \mapsto \partial\sigma := \sum_{v \in V(\sigma)} \sigma_{\setminus v} = \sum_{F \in \text{Bd}(\sigma)} F. \quad (2.1)$$

Note that this induces a map $\partial : \mathcal{X}^k \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^{k-1}$ which satisfies $\partial \circ \partial = 0$, c.f. [Hat02].

Definition 7. We call $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ a (non-oriented) k -cube of side length $r > 0$ if it is the image of $[0, r]^k \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ under an isometric embedding. An oriented cube is specified by $Q = (\mathbf{Q}, o)$, where o is an orientation of the k -hyperplane containing Q . For a set $\mathfrak{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $R > 0$, we write $\mathfrak{Q}_{\leq R}^k(\mathfrak{K})$ for the set of oriented cubes $Q = (\mathbf{Q}, o)$, where $\mathbf{Q} \subset \mathfrak{K}$ has side-length bounded by R .

We view $Q = (\mathbf{Q}, o)$ as an element of \mathcal{X}^k by setting $Q = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{K}} (\tau, o)$ for any $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathfrak{X}^k$ consisting of non-overlapping simplices which satisfy $\bigcup_{\tau \in \mathcal{K}} \tau = \mathbf{Q}$.

Note that the notion of non-overlapping clearly extends to cubes.

Working with cubes or simplices both offer distinct advantages. While cubes are advantageous when working on fibered spaces, c.f. [Har18], simplices are combinatorially simpler. For example the boundary faces of a simplex can easily be explicitly expressed and any polygon can be decomposed into finitely many simplices. We recall here a special case of Whitney's covering theorem [Whi34], which will allow us to interchange between control over simplices and control over cubes, see Lemma 2.8.

Lemma 2.1. *Given any non-oriented k -simplex σ , there exists a family of non-overlapping k -cubes $(Q_{2^{-n}}^i : n \in \mathbb{N}, i \in I_n)$ where each I_n is a finite set, $Q_{2^{-n}}^i$ is k -cube of side length 2^{-n} , and*

$$\sigma = \overline{\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \bigcup_{i \in I_n} Q_{2^{-n}}^i} \quad \text{and} \quad 2^{-n} \sqrt{k} \leq \text{dist}(Q_{2^{-n}}^i, \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \sigma) \leq 4 \cdot 2^{-n} \sqrt{k}.$$

Moreover, the Whitney decomposition can be chosen so that for any σ , we can find index sets $(J_N : N \in \mathbb{N})$ and collections of non-overlapping simplices $\{\sigma_j : j \in J_N\}$ of diameter at most 2^{-N} such that

$$\sigma = \sum_{n=0}^N \sum_{i \in I_n} Q_{2^{-n}}^i = \sum_{j \in J_N} \sigma_j \quad \text{and} \quad |J_N| \lesssim_k 2^{N(k-1)}, \quad (2.2)$$

where the first equality above is between elements in \mathcal{X}^k and the second inequality above is uniform in N .

Remark 2.2. We extend the notion of Whitney decomposition to oriented simplices σ in the obvious way, that is, one has a family of oriented cubes $(Q_{2^{-n}}^i : n \in \mathbb{N}, i \in I_n)$ where the $Q_{2^{-n}}^i$ form a Whitney decomposition of σ , and the $Q_{2^{-n}}^i$ are oriented as σ is.

Remark 2.3. Lastly, we explain how to construct a smooth partition of unity subordinate to the Whitney decomposition of a d -simplex $\sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. For an axis parallel cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ we denote by $x_Q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ resp. $r_Q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the center, respectively the side length of Q which are characterised by $Q = x_Q + r_Q \cdot [-1/2, 1/2]^d$. Let $\phi \in C^\infty$ be compactly supported on $[-2/3, 2/3]^d$ such that $\phi|_{[-1/2, 1/2]^d} = 1$, we define

$$\phi_Q(x) = \phi\left(\frac{x - x_Q}{r_Q}\right).$$

For a given Whitney decomposition $\sigma = \overline{\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \bigcup_{i \in I_n} Q_{2^{-n}}^i}$ set

$$\phi_{n,i}(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{\phi_{Q_{2^{-n}}^i}(x)}{\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}, i \in I_n} \phi_{Q_{2^{-n}}^i}(x)} & \text{if } x \in \text{Int}(\sigma) \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

We call by $\{\phi_{n,i}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}, i \in I_n}$ the partition of unity subordinate to the above Whitney decomposition constructed from $\phi \in C^\infty$. Finally, one notes that by construction

$$\|D^k \phi_{n,i}\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim_k 2^{nk}$$

uniformly over σ , and $n \in \mathbb{N}, i \in I_n$.

2.2 Controls on simplices

For any non-oriented j -simplex \mathbf{F} , we denote by $\langle \mathbf{F} \rangle \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ the j -hyperplane containing \mathbf{F} . We define for $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and any k -simplex σ ,

$$h_\sigma := \min_{\mathbf{F} \in \text{Bd}(\sigma)} \sup\{d(x, \langle \mathbf{F} \rangle) : x \in \sigma\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{m}_\alpha^k(\sigma) := \max_{\mathbf{F} \in \text{Bd}(\sigma)} \text{Vol}^{k-1}(\mathbf{F}) h_\sigma^\alpha. \quad (2.3)$$

We observe that

$$h_\sigma^{1-\alpha} \mathbf{m}_\alpha^k(\sigma) = \frac{1}{k} \text{Vol}^k(\sigma), \quad \mathbf{m}_\alpha^k(\sigma) \leq \text{diam}(\sigma)^{k-1+\alpha} \wedge \text{Vol}^k(\sigma)^\alpha. \quad (2.4)$$

We also set $\mathbf{m}_\infty^k(\sigma) = 0$ and $\mathbf{m}_0^k(\sigma) = 1$.

Remark 2.4. We observe that the left side of the inequality (2.4) is close to sharp when either the simplex σ is equilateral or when σ is a cone of small height over an equilateral simplex.

Lemma 2.5. *Suppose that we have k -simplices $\sigma, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$ such that $\text{diam}(\sigma) \leq 1$ and $\sigma = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \sigma_i$, then*

$$\mathbf{m}_\alpha^k(\sigma) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{m}_\alpha^k(\sigma_i).$$

Proof. Using the first equality in (2.4) we have

$$\mathbf{m}_\alpha^k(\sigma) = \frac{\text{Vol}^k(\sigma)}{k h_\sigma^{1-\alpha}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\text{Vol}^k(\sigma_i)}{k h_\sigma^{1-\alpha}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{m}_\alpha^k(\sigma_i) \frac{k h_{\sigma_i}^{1-\alpha}}{k h_\sigma^{1-\alpha}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{m}_\alpha^k(\sigma_i)$$

where we used that $h_{\sigma_i}^{1-\alpha} \leq h_\sigma^{1-\alpha}$ and that $\text{Vol}^k(\cdot)$ is additive. \square

Lemma 2.6. *There exists a constant $C = C(k)$, such that*

$$\mathbf{m}_\alpha^k(\sigma) \leq \inf \left\{ \sum_{j \in J} \text{diam}(\sigma_j)^{k-1+\alpha} : \sigma = \bigcup_{j \in J} \sigma_j \right\} \leq C \mathbf{m}_\alpha^k(\sigma).$$

for all k -simplices σ with $\text{diam}(\sigma) \leq 1$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1]$.

Proof. The first inequality above follows by combining the inequality in (2.4) and Lemma 2.5. For the second inequality above, observe that one can write $\sigma = \bigcup_{i \in I} \sigma_i$ where $\{\sigma_i\}_{i \in I}$ are non-overlapping, $\text{diam}(\sigma_i) \leq h_\sigma$, and $|I| \lesssim_k \frac{\text{Vol}^{k-1}(\mathbf{F})}{h_\sigma^{k-1}}$ – here $\mathbf{F} \in \text{Bd}(\sigma)$ is where the maximum in the second definition of (2.3) is achieved.²

Using this subdivision, we have

$$\sum_{i \in I} \text{diam}(\sigma_i)^{k-1+\alpha} \lesssim_k \text{Vol}^{k-1}(\mathbf{F}) h_\sigma^\alpha = \mathbf{m}_\alpha^k(\sigma).$$

\square

²Such a subdivision of σ can be generated by appropriately subdividing \mathbf{F} and taking simplicial cones.

2.3 Functions on chains

Definition 8. We denote by $\Omega^k \subset (\mathcal{X}^k)^*$ the subspace of the algebraic dual of \mathcal{X}^k consisting of all elements $A \in (\mathcal{X}^k)^*$ such that the map $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k+1} \ni (v_0, \dots, v_k) \mapsto A[v_0, \dots, v_k] \in \mathbb{R}$ is Borel-measurable.

Remark 2.7. Observe that any $A \in \Omega^k$ can canonically be identified with a (measurable) map $A: \mathfrak{X}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the following two properties

- If $k \geq 1$, then for any oriented k -simplex σ one has $A(-\sigma) = -A(\sigma)$.
- Given $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^k$ and $\mathcal{K}|\sigma$,

$$A(\sigma) = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{K}} A(\tau).$$

Note that there is a natural corresponding space of k -chains $\mathcal{X}^k(\mathfrak{R})$ and additive maps $\Omega^k(\mathfrak{R})$.

Lemma 2.8. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. Then, for any $A \in \Omega^k$, the following three conditions are equivalent:

1. $|A(Q)| \lesssim \text{diam}(Q)^{k-1+\alpha}$ uniformly over $Q \in \mathfrak{Q}_{\leq 1}^k$ and, for any Whitney decomposition $(Q_{2^{-n}}^i : n \in \mathbb{N}, i \in I_n)$ of σ , $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{i \in I_n} A(Q_{2^{-n}}^i)$ converges absolutely to $A(\sigma)$.
2. $|A(\sigma)| \lesssim \mathbf{m}_\alpha^k(\sigma)$, uniformly over $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}_{\leq 1}^k$.
3. $|A(\sigma)| \lesssim \text{diam}(\sigma)^{k-1+\alpha}$, uniformly over $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}_{\leq 1}^k$.

Remark 2.9. Note that the additional assumption in Item 1 on additivity over Whitney decompositions is needed due to the fact that one can in general not write a simplex as a union of finitely many cubes.

Proof. Below, we write $\eta = k - 1 + \alpha$. We first prove Item 1 implies Item 2. We apply Lemma 2.1 and write $(Q_{2^{-n}}^i : n \in \mathbb{N}, i \in I_n)$ for a Whitney decomposition of σ .

We define w

$$\partial_n \sigma := \{p \in \sigma : 2^{-n-1} \sqrt{k} \leq \text{dist}(p, \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \sigma) \leq 4 \cdot 2^{-n+1} \sqrt{k}\},$$

Next we note that $2^{-n} > h_\sigma \Rightarrow I_n = \emptyset$ and for uniform in $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $|I_n| \lesssim_k \text{Vol}^k(\partial_n \sigma) 2^{nk}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |A(\sigma)| &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i \in I_n} |A(Q_{2^{-n}}^i)| \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |I_n| 2^{-n\eta} \lesssim \sum_{n \geq -\log_2(h_\sigma)} \text{Vol}^k(\partial_n \sigma) 2^{-n(\eta-k)} \quad (2.5) \\ &\lesssim \text{Vol}^k(\sigma) \max_{n \geq -\log_2(h_\sigma)} 2^{-n(\eta-k)} \leq \text{Vol}^k(\sigma) h_\sigma^{\eta-k} = \frac{\text{Vol}^k(\sigma)}{h_\sigma h_\sigma^{\eta-k-1}} \leq \mathbf{m}_{\eta-(k-1)}^k(\sigma), \end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality on the second line above we used that $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \text{Vol}^k(\partial_n \sigma) \leq 4 \cdot \text{Vol}^k(\sigma)$. This concludes showing Item 1 implies Item 2.

The fact that Item 2 implies Item 3 follows from the last inequality in 2.4.

Finally, to argue that Item 1 follows from Item 3 we first observe that we can realize any $Q \in \Omega_{\leq 1}^k$ of diameter r as a sum of $k!$ oriented simplices of diameter at most r and thus the estimate on $A(Q)$ in Item 1 follows directly.

For the rest of Item 1, given a Whitney decomposition of σ we note that the absolute convergence of $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{i \in I_n} A(Q_{2^{-n}}^i)$ follows from the estimate from the first part of Item 1 and proceeding as in (2.5). To show convergence to $A(\sigma)$, using the notation of (2.2) we have

$$\left| A(\sigma) - \sum_{n=0}^N \sum_{i \in I_n} Q_{2^{-n}}^i A(Q_{2^{-n}}^i) \right| \leq \sum_{j \in J_N} |A(\sigma_j)| \lesssim 2^{-N(k-1+\alpha)} 2^{N(k-1)} \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

□

2.4 Simplicial sewing lemma

In this subsection we state the promised simplicial sewing lemma – Proposition 2.10. This tool will be used frequently in our analysis, but as mentioned earlier the proof is deferred to Section 8.

For a function $\Xi : \mathfrak{X}^k(\mathfrak{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, a simplex $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^k$ and a subdivision $\mathcal{K}|\sigma$ we introduce the following quantity which measures to what degree Ξ fails to be additive over \mathcal{K} :

$$\delta_{\mathcal{K};\sigma} \Xi := \Xi(\sigma) - \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{K}} \Xi(\sigma').$$

We now introduce a space of “almost additive” Ξ which will be the codomain of our sewing map.

Definition 9. Let $C_{2,k}^{\eta,\gamma}(\mathfrak{R})$ consist of all functions $\Xi : \mathfrak{X}^k(\mathfrak{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\Xi(\sigma) = -\Xi(-\sigma)$ and

$$\llbracket \Xi \rrbracket_{(\eta,\gamma);\mathfrak{R}} := \llbracket \Xi \rrbracket_{\eta,\mathfrak{R}} + \llbracket \delta \Xi \rrbracket_{\gamma,\mathfrak{R}} < +\infty,$$

where

$$\llbracket \Xi \rrbracket_{\eta,\mathfrak{R}} := \sup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^k(\mathfrak{R})} \frac{|A(\sigma)|}{\text{diam}(\sigma)^\eta}, \quad \llbracket \delta \Xi \rrbracket_{\gamma,\mathfrak{R}} := \sup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^k(\mathfrak{R})} \sup_{\mathcal{K}|\sigma} \frac{|\delta_{\mathcal{K};\sigma} \Xi|}{|\mathcal{K}| \text{diam}(\sigma)^\gamma},$$

and the supremum over $\mathcal{K}|\sigma$ in the second expression runs over all subdivisions \mathcal{K} of σ .

Proposition 2.10. Let $0 < \eta \leq k < \gamma$. There exists a unique linear map $\mathcal{I} : C_{2,k}^{\eta,\gamma}(\mathfrak{R}) \rightarrow \Omega^k(\mathfrak{R})$, satisfying

$$|\mathcal{I}\Xi(\sigma) - \Xi(\sigma)| \lesssim \llbracket \delta \Xi \rrbracket_{\gamma,\mathfrak{R}} \text{diam}(\sigma)^\gamma, \quad |\mathcal{I}\Xi(\sigma)| \lesssim \llbracket \Xi \rrbracket_{(\eta,\gamma);\mathfrak{R}} \text{diam}(\sigma)^\eta, \quad (2.6)$$

uniformly in $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}_{\leq 1}^k(\mathfrak{R})$. Furthermore, for any regular sequence of subdivisions $(\mathcal{K}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^k(\mathfrak{R})$,

$$\mathcal{I}\Xi(\sigma) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{K}_n} \Xi(\sigma').$$

Remark 2.11. Note that the condition $\Xi(\sigma) = -\Xi(-\sigma)$ in Definition 9 could be replaced by $|\Xi(\sigma) + \Xi(-\sigma)| = o(\text{diam}(\sigma)^k)$. If one did not impose any relation between $\Xi(\sigma)$ and $\Xi(-\sigma)$ an analogue of Proposition 2.10 still holds, but $\mathcal{I}\Xi$ would only be additive but not an element of Ω^k in general.

Remark 2.12. Strictly speaking, our sewing lemma is less general than the one in [Har18] where one is allowed to scale different directions differently. However, we believe our results could be formulated on \mathbb{R}^d is equipped with a non-trivial scaling ε c.f. [FS82, Hai14, MS23], but we refrain from doing so as it would distract from the main ideas.

We state the following corollary of Proposition 2.10.

Corollary 2.12.1. *In the setting of Proposition 2.10, if $\alpha := \eta - k + 1 \in (0, 1]$,*

$$|\mathcal{I}\Xi(\sigma)| \lesssim \|\Xi\|_{(\eta, \gamma); \mathfrak{R}} \mathbf{m}_\alpha^k(\sigma).$$

Proof. This follows immediately from Proposition 2.10 and Lemma 2.8 □

Remark 2.13. In [AST24], the authors write “It is worth emphasizing that this result might seem counter-intuitive...It is therefore not at all clear how one can expect to be nonatomic a limit of sums of germs which are essentially not so.” The proof of the corollary above clarifies this point.

We also note that the threshold $\eta > k - 1$ above is expected to be sharp, c.f. Proposition 6.3.

3 Distributional k -forms

Definition 10. *For $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $\mathfrak{R} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we define the following norm on $\Omega^k(\mathfrak{R})$*

$$\|A\|_{\alpha; \mathfrak{R}} = \sup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}_{\leq 1}^k(\mathfrak{R})} \frac{|A(\sigma)|}{\mathbf{m}_\alpha^k(\sigma)} \quad \text{and} \quad \|A\|_{\infty; \mathfrak{R}} = \begin{cases} +\infty & \text{if } A \neq 0, \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

For $\alpha, \beta \in [0, 1] \cup \{\infty\}$ set $\|A\|_{\alpha, \beta; \mathfrak{R}} := \|A\|_{\alpha; \mathfrak{R}} + \|\partial A\|_{\beta; \mathfrak{R}}$ and

$$\Omega_{(\alpha, \beta)}^k(\mathfrak{R}) := \left\{ A \in \Omega^k : \|A\|_{\alpha, \beta; \mathfrak{R}} < +\infty \right\}.$$

Remark 3.1. Note that $\Omega_{\alpha, \beta}^0 = \Omega_{0, \beta}^0$ is canonically identified with β -Hölder functions whenever $\beta \in (0, 1]$. Also observe the inclusions $\Omega_{\alpha', \beta'}^k \subset \Omega_{\alpha, \beta}^k$ whenever $\alpha' \geq \alpha, \beta' \geq \beta$.

By construction the linear map

$$\partial : \Omega_{(\alpha, \beta)}^k \rightarrow \Omega_{(\beta, \infty)}^{k+1}. \quad (3.1)$$

is bounded and the spaces $A \in \Omega_{(\alpha, \infty)}^k$ are a natural analogue of closed forms.

When $\mathfrak{R} = \mathbb{R}^d$ we often suppress it from the notation, for instance writing $\|A\|_\alpha$ for $\|A\|_{\alpha, \mathbb{R}^d}$. We also state most of our estimates below in terms of global norms $\|\cdot\|_\alpha$ to lighten notation, but it will be clear how they can be localized to compact $\mathfrak{R} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

Remark 3.2. When taking $k = 1$ and $n = 2$, the first term in the above definition corresponds to the growth norm $|\cdot|_{\alpha\text{-gr}}$ as in [CCHS22, Def. 3.7], and the second term serves a similar purpose as $|\cdot|_{\alpha\text{-tri}}$ in [CCHS22, Def. 3.10].

3.1 Estimates on chains and a generalised flat norm

In order to do analysis on \mathcal{X}^k , we introduce, for $X \in \mathcal{X}^k$,

$$|X|_{\alpha;k} := \inf \left\{ \sum_{j \in J} |c_j| \cdot \mathbf{m}_\alpha^k(\sigma_j) : X = \sum_{j \in J} c_j \sigma_j, \sigma_j \in \mathfrak{X}_{\leq 1}^k \right\}.$$

Clearly $|\cdot|_{\alpha;k}$ satisfies the triangle inequality.

Using the above control, we now define a ‘‘Hölder flat-norm’’ on $\mathcal{X}^k(\mathfrak{R})$.

Definition 11. For $\alpha, \beta \in [0, 1] \cup \{\infty\}$ define the (α, β) -flat norm on $\mathcal{X}^k(\mathfrak{R})$ as

$$|X|_{(\alpha,\beta);\mathfrak{R}} = \inf_{Z \in \mathcal{X}^{k+1}(\mathfrak{R})} \left\{ |X - \partial Z|_{\alpha;k} + |Z|_{\beta;k+1} \right\}. \quad (3.2)$$

Remark 3.3. The definition (3.2) for $\alpha = \beta = 1$ is equivalent to the ‘‘flat-norm’’ introduced in [Whi57]. For $\alpha = 1, 0 < \beta < 1$ it is seen to be equivalent to the $(k - 1 + \beta)$ -flat norm introduced in [HN92] using Lemma 2.6.

It is clear $|\cdot|_{(\alpha,\beta);\mathfrak{R}}$ satisfies the triangle inequality, that is for $X, Y \in \mathcal{X}^k(\mathfrak{R})$

$$|X + Y|_{(\alpha,\beta);\mathfrak{R}} \leq |X|_{(\alpha,\beta);\mathfrak{R}} + |Y|_{(\alpha,\beta);\mathfrak{R}}. \quad (3.3)$$

Similarly, for $Z \in \mathcal{X}^{k+1}(\mathfrak{R})$,

$$|X|_{(\alpha,\beta);\mathfrak{R}} \leq |X + \partial Z|_{(\alpha,\beta);\mathfrak{R}} + |Z|_{\beta;k+1}. \quad (3.4)$$

Lemma 3.4. For $A \in \Omega^k$ we have that

$$\sup_{X \in \mathcal{X}^k(\mathfrak{R})} \frac{|A(X)|}{|X|_{(\alpha,\beta);\mathfrak{R}}} \leq \|A\|_{(\alpha,\beta);\mathfrak{R}}.$$

Proof. For $X \in \mathcal{X}^k$ and any decomposition $X = \sum_i c_i \sigma_i$

$$|A(X)| \leq \sum_i |c_i| |A(\sigma_i)| \leq \|A\|_\alpha \sum_i |c_i| \mathbf{m}_\alpha^k(\sigma_i)$$

and thus taking an infimum over all decompositions gives $|A(X)| \leq \|A\|_\alpha |X|_\alpha$. Similarly, for any $Z \in \mathcal{X}^{k+1}$

$$|A(\partial Z)| \lesssim \|\partial A\|_\beta |Z|_\beta.$$

Thus,

$$|A(X)| \leq |A(X + \partial Z)| + |A(\partial Z)| \leq \|A\|_\alpha |X + \partial Z|_\alpha + \|\partial A\|_\beta |Z|_\beta \leq \|A\|_{(\alpha,\beta)} (|X + \partial Z|_\alpha + |Z|_\beta).$$

Taking the infimum over $Z \in \mathcal{X}^{k+1}(\mathfrak{R})$ concludes the claim. \square

Corollary 3.4.1. $|\cdot|_{(\alpha,\beta)} : \mathcal{X}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a norm.

Proof. Consider $0 \neq X \in \mathcal{X}^k$. Without loss of generality we can write for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$X = \sum_{i=0}^n c_i \sigma_i$$

where $\text{Vol}^k(\sigma_i \cap \sigma_j) = 0$ whenever $i \neq j$. Note that smooth differential forms are contained in $\Omega_{(1,1)}^k \subset \Omega_{(\alpha,\beta)}^k$, thus one easily constructs $A \in \Omega_{(\alpha,\beta)}^k$ such that $|A(X)| > 0$. In view of Lemma 3.4, this implies $|X|_{(\alpha,\beta)} > 0$. \square

Definition 12. Let $\mathcal{B}_{(\alpha,\beta)}^k$ be the completion of the normed Z -module $(\mathcal{X}^k, |\cdot|_{(\alpha,\beta)})$.

Corollary 3.4.2. The pairing $\mathcal{X}^k \times \Omega_{(\alpha,\beta)}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ continuously extends to a pairing $\mathcal{B}_{\alpha,\beta}^k \times \Omega_{(\alpha,\beta)}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Lemma (3.4) shows that elements of $\Omega_{(\alpha,\beta)}^k$ are elements of the continuous dual of $(\mathcal{X}^k, |\cdot|_{(\alpha,\beta)})$. \square

Definition 12 together with Corollary 3.4.2 gives a geometric integration theory similar to [Whi57, HN92], see also more generally [Har98, Har05]. For $\alpha = 1$, $\beta \in (0, 1]$ it agrees with the one in [HN92].

Remark 3.5. By covering a closed manifold by images of (say) squares and approximating as in [Har98, Sec. 2.1, Ex. 4] one sees that closed, oriented, $C^{1,\eta}$ -manifolds are canonically contained in $\mathcal{B}_{\alpha,\beta}^k$ as soon as $\eta > 0$. Similarly to the proof of Lemma 5.5, one can check that a compact oriented $C^{1,\eta}$ -manifold with boundary is in $\mathcal{B}_{\alpha,\beta}^k$ as soon as $\alpha > \frac{1}{1+\eta}$, see also Theorem 5.2 and Remark 5.3.

3.2 Further (α, β) -flat norm estimates

We collect some Lemmata about the (α, β) -flat norm which will be useful later on.

Lemma 3.6. Let $v_0, \dots, v_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $v'_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ all be contained in a ball of radius $r > 0$. Then,

$$\left| [v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k] - [v'_0, v_1, \dots, v_k] \right|_{(\alpha,\beta)} \lesssim_k r^{k-1} d(v_0, v'_0)^\alpha + r^k d(v_0, v'_0)^\beta.$$

Proof. Consider $Z = [v'_0, v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k]$ and write $X = [v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k] - [v'_0, v_1, \dots, v_k]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |X|_{(\alpha,\beta)} &\leq |X - \partial Z|_{\alpha;k} + |Z|_{\beta;k+1} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^k |[v'_0, v_0, v_1, \dots, \hat{v}_j, \dots, v_k]|_{\alpha;k} + |Z|_{\beta;k+1} \\ &\leq k r^{k-1} d(v'_0, v_0)^\alpha + r^k d(v'_0, v_0)^\beta. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 3.7. Consider simplices $\sigma = [v_0, \dots, v_k]$, $\sigma' = [v'_0, \dots, v'_k]$ contained in a ball of radius $r > 0$. Let $\mu = \max\{|v_i - v'_i| \in \mathbb{R} : i = 0, \dots, k\}$. Then,

$$|\sigma - \sigma'|_{(\alpha, \beta)} \lesssim r^{k-1} \mu^\alpha + r^k \mu^\beta.$$

Proof. We define $\sigma_i = [v_0, \dots, v_{i-1}, v'_i, \dots, v'_k]$ and note that $\sigma = \sigma_{k+1}$ and $\sigma' = \sigma_0$. The statement follows from the using (3.3) to write $|\sigma - \sigma'|_{(\alpha, \beta)} \leq \sum_{i=0}^k |\sigma_i - \sigma_{i+1}|_{(\alpha, \beta)}$ and then applying Lemma 3.6. \square

Fix a family of maps $(\pi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, with $\pi_n : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow 2^{-n} \mathbb{Z}^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, such that, uniform in $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$d(x, \pi_n x) \lesssim 2^{-n},$$

uniformly in $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We extend this map to a map on simplices by setting

$$\pi_n[v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k] = [\pi_n v_0, \pi_n v_1, \dots, \pi_n v_k].$$

Note π_n naturally extends to \mathcal{X}^k . The following is a direct corollary of Lemma 3.7.

Corollary 3.7.1. For any $\sigma \in \mathcal{X}^k$ and $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|\pi_m \sigma - \pi_n \sigma|_{(\alpha, \beta)} \lesssim \text{diam}(\sigma)^{k-1} 2^{-\alpha(m \wedge n)} + \text{diam}(\sigma)^k 2^{-\beta(m \wedge n)}.$$

4 Multiplication with regular functions

For a smooth function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a smooth differential k -form A , one can easily see that the pointwise product $f \cdot A$ is characterised by

$$\int_\sigma f \cdot A = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{K}_n} \left(\frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{i=0}^k f(v_i) \cdot \int_{\sigma'} A \right) \quad (4.1)$$

where $(\mathcal{K}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is any regular sequence of subdivisions of σ . In order to define a product

$$C^\beta \times \Omega_\alpha^k \rightarrow \Omega_\alpha^k, \quad (f, A) \mapsto f \cdot A$$

we mimic the right hand side of (4.1), but allow for slightly more general approximations.³ For this consider a family $\mu = \{\mu_\sigma\}_{\sigma \in \mathcal{X}^k}$ of probability measures where each μ_σ is supported on σ and independent of the orientation of σ , and set

$$\Xi_\mu^{f \cdot A}(\sigma) := \mu_\sigma(f) \cdot A(\sigma). \quad (4.2)$$

Theorem 4.1. Let $\alpha, \gamma \in (0, 1]$ such that $\alpha + \gamma > 1$ and $\mu = \{\mu_\sigma\}_{\sigma \in \mathcal{X}^k}$ as above. Then, $\Xi_\mu^{f \cdot A} \in C_{2, k}^{\alpha, \gamma + k - 1 + \alpha}$ for every $f \in C^\gamma$, $A \in \Omega_{\alpha, \beta}^k$.

It follows that, with the map \mathcal{I} as in Proposition 2.10,

$$f \cdot A := \mathcal{I} \Xi_\mu^{f \cdot A} \in \Omega_{\alpha, (\alpha + \gamma - 1) \wedge \beta}^k,$$

is in fact independent of the choice of μ and satisfies

$$\|f \cdot A\|_\alpha \lesssim \|f\|_{C^\gamma} \|A\|_\alpha, \quad \|\partial(f \cdot A)\|_{(\alpha + \gamma - 1) \wedge \beta} < \|f\|_{C^\gamma} \|A\|_{(\alpha, \beta)}. \quad (4.3)$$

³Note that $\Xi^{f \cdot A}[v_0, \dots, v_k] = \frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{i=0}^k f(v_i) A[v_0, \dots, v_k]$ is clearly a special case of (4.2).

Proof. To verify that $\Xi^{f \cdot A} \in C_{2,k}^{\alpha, \gamma+k-1+\alpha}$, observe that

$$|\Xi_{\mu}^{f \cdot A}(\sigma)| \leq \|f\|_{L^{\infty}} |A(\sigma)| \leq \|f\|_{L^{\infty}} \|A\|_{\alpha} \mathbf{m}_{\alpha}^k(\sigma) \leq \|f\|_{L^{\infty}} \|A\|_{\alpha} \text{diam}(\sigma)^{k-1+\alpha},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta_{\mathcal{K};\sigma} \Xi^{f \cdot A}(\sigma)| &= \left| \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{K}} (\mu_{\sigma}(f) - \mu_{\sigma'}(f)) A(\sigma') \right| \\ &\leq |\mathcal{K}| \cdot \|f\|_{C^{\gamma}} \text{diam}(\sigma)^{\gamma} \|A\|_{\alpha} \mathbf{m}_{\alpha}^k(\sigma) \\ &\leq |\mathcal{K}| \cdot \|f\|_{C^{\gamma}} \|A\|_{\alpha} \text{diam}(\sigma)^{\gamma+k-1+\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

The first estimate of (4.3) then follows from the first estimate of (2.6).

The fact that $f \cdot A$ does not depend on the particular choice of μ , follows from the uniqueness in Proposition 2.10 and the fact and observing that given a second family $\mu' = \{\mu'_{\sigma}\}_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^k}$ of measures,

$$|\Xi_{\mu}^{f \cdot A}(\sigma) - \Xi_{\mu'}^{f \cdot A}(\sigma)| \leq \|f\|_{C^{\gamma}} \text{diam}(\sigma)^{\gamma} \|A\|_{\alpha} \mathbf{m}_{\alpha}^k(\sigma).$$

We now turn to the second inequality of (4.3). For a family of measures $\mu = \{\mu_w\}_{w \in \mathfrak{X}^k}$ as before we define $\Xi_{\mu}^{\partial(f \cdot A)}(\sigma) := \sum_{F \in \text{Bd}(\sigma)} \Xi_{\mu}^{f \cdot A}(F)$ for $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^{k+1}$.

Given another family of measures on $k+1$ simplices $\bar{\mu} = \{\bar{\mu}_{\sigma}\}_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^{k+1}}$, we set, for $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^{k+1}$.

$$\Xi_{\mu, \bar{\mu}}^{(\partial f) \wedge A}(\sigma) := \sum_{F \in \text{Bd}(\sigma)} (\mu_F(f) - \bar{\mu}_{\sigma}(f)) A(F).$$

Since $\Xi_{\mu}^{\partial(f \cdot A)} = \Xi_{\mu, \bar{\mu}}^{(\partial f) \wedge A} + \Xi_{\bar{\mu}}^{f \cdot \partial A}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Xi_{\mu}^{\partial(f \cdot A)}(\sigma)| &\leq \|f\|_{C^{\gamma}} \|A\|_{\alpha} \text{diam}(\sigma)^{\gamma+k-1+\alpha} + \|f\|_{L^{\infty}} \|\partial A\|_{\beta} \text{diam}(\sigma)^{k+\beta} \\ &\leq \|f\|_{C^{\gamma}} \|A\|_{(\alpha, \beta)} \text{diam}(\sigma)^{k+(\gamma+\alpha-1) \wedge \beta}, \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial(f \cdot A)(\sigma)| &\leq |\Xi_{\mu}^{\partial(f \cdot A)}(\sigma) - \partial(f \cdot A)(\sigma)| + |\Xi_{\mu}^{\partial(f \cdot A)}(\sigma)| \\ &\leq (k+1) [\delta \Xi_{\mu}^{f \cdot A}]_{\gamma+k-1+\alpha} \text{diam}(\sigma)^{\gamma+k-1+\alpha} + \|f\|_{C^{\gamma}} \|A\|_{(\alpha, \beta)} \text{diam}(\sigma)^{k+(\gamma+\alpha-1) \wedge \beta} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{C^{\gamma}} \|A\|_{(\alpha, \beta)} \text{diam}(\sigma)^{k+(\gamma+\alpha-1) \wedge \beta}, \end{aligned}$$

which is the second inequality of (4.3). In the first inequality above, we used that $|\Xi_{\mu}^{\partial(f \cdot A)}(\sigma) - \partial(f \cdot A)(\sigma)| \leq \sum_{F \in \text{Bd}(\sigma)} |\Xi_{\mu}^{f \cdot A}(F) - (f \cdot A)(F)|$ and we have already estimates the terms on the right hand side. \square

The theorem above allows us to extend a wedge product on differential forms to our rough setting.

Corollary 4.1.1. *Let $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in (0, 1]$ with $\tilde{\alpha} := \alpha + \gamma - 1 > 0$ and $\tilde{\beta} := \beta + \gamma - 1 > 0$. Then the identity $df \wedge A := d(f \cdot A) - f \cdot dA$ for smooth forms extends to a continuous bilinear map*

$$C^{\gamma} \times \Omega_{\alpha, \beta} \rightarrow \Omega_{\tilde{\alpha} \wedge \beta, \tilde{\beta}}^{k+1}, \quad (f, A) \mapsto df \wedge A := d(f \cdot A) - f \cdot dA \quad (4.4)$$

Proof. This follows from Theorem 4.1 which gives $d(f \cdot A) \in \Omega_{(\alpha+\gamma-1)\wedge\beta,\infty}^{k+1}$ and $f \cdot dA \in \Omega_{\beta,\beta+\gamma-1}^{k+1}$. \square

We state another corollary, which in the view of Remark 3.1 and the preceding corollary, reproduces [Züs11, Thm. 3.2] when specialized to $n = k - 1$.

Corollary 4.1.2. *Let $n \leq k$. Fix $\alpha, \gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_n \in (0, 1]$ and $\beta \in (0, 1] \cup \{\infty\}$ such that*

$$\alpha + \sum_{i=0}^n \gamma_i > n \quad \text{and} \quad \beta + \sum_{i=0}^n \gamma_i > n - 1.$$

Then, writing $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha + \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i - (n - 1)$, $\tilde{\beta} = (\alpha + \sum_{i=0}^n \gamma_i - n) \wedge (\beta + \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i - (n - 1))$, one has that the mapping

$$C^{\gamma_0} \times \left(\prod_{i=1}^n C^{\gamma_i} \right) \times \Omega_{\alpha,\beta}^{k-n} \rightarrow \Omega_{\tilde{\alpha},\tilde{\beta}}^k, \quad (g_0, \dots, g_n, A) \mapsto g_0 \cdot dg_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dg_n \wedge A$$

is a bounded multi-linear map.

Proof. We write $\alpha_{k-n} = \alpha, \beta_{k-n} = \beta$ and $A_{k-n} = A$. Then, for $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, inductively define $\alpha_{k-n+l} = (\alpha_{k-n+l-1} + \gamma_{k-l} - 1) \wedge \beta_{k-n+l-1}$ and $\beta_{k-n+l} = \beta_{k-n+l-1} + \gamma_{k-l} - 1$. Note that $\alpha_{k-n+l}, \beta_{k-n+l} > 0$ by assumption and thus $A_{k-n+l} := dg_n \wedge A_{k-n+l-1} \in \Omega_{\alpha_{k-n+l}, \beta_{k-n+l}}^{k-n+l}$ by (4.4). For $l = n$, we have $A_k = dg_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dg_n \wedge A$ and $\alpha_k = \tilde{\alpha}$ and $\beta_k = \beta + \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i - (n - 1)$. Applying Theorem 4.1 once more to control $g_0 \cdot A_k$ finishes the proof. \square

5 Pullback and Stokes' theorem

For $F : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and a simplex $\sigma = [v_0, \dots, v_k] \in \mathfrak{X}^k(\mathbb{R}^m)$, write $F_* \sigma = [F(v_0), \dots, F(v_k)]$. For $A \in \Omega_{\alpha,\beta}^k$, we shall (under appropriate regularity assumptions) define

$$(F^* A)(\sigma) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{K}_n} A(F_* \sigma') \quad (5.1)$$

along any regular sequence of subdivisions \mathcal{K}_n of σ . This is easily seen to agree with the classical definition whenever F and A are smooth.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{1+\eta}, 1]$, $\beta > 0$. Then, for $A \in \Omega_{\alpha,\beta}$ and $F \in C^{1,\eta}$, the limit in (5.1) is well defined and for $\tilde{\beta} = (\alpha(1+\eta) - 1) \wedge \beta$ the linear map*

$$F^* : \Omega_{\alpha,\beta}^k \rightarrow \Omega_{\tilde{\alpha},\tilde{\beta}}^k, \quad A \mapsto F^* A$$

is bounded.

Furthermore, for $\bar{F} \in C^{1,\eta}$, $F^(\bar{F}^* A) = (\bar{F} \circ F)^* A$, and, for $\phi \in C^\gamma$ with $\gamma \in (1 - \alpha, 1]$, $F^*(\phi \cdot A) = (F^* \phi) \cdot F^* A$.*

Finally, for $\tilde{\alpha} < \alpha$, $\tilde{\beta} < (\alpha(1+\eta) - 1) \wedge \beta$ the following map is continuous

$$C^{1,\eta} \times \Omega_{\alpha,\beta}^k \rightarrow \Omega_{\tilde{\alpha},\tilde{\beta}}^k, \quad (F, A) \mapsto F^* A.$$

Proof. Combine Lemma 5.5, Lemma 5.6 and Proposition 5.8. \square

Note that this implies that for $\eta > 0$, $\alpha > \frac{1}{1+\eta}$, $\beta < \alpha(1+\eta) - 1$, and an oriented $C^{1,\eta}$ -manifold M (possibly with boundary) we can define a space $\Omega_{(\alpha,\beta)}^k(M)$ in the usual way. In particular, this provides a notion of integration by pull-back and mimicking standard proofs of Stokes' theorem, c.f. [Lee10], one obtains the following theorem.

Theorem 5.2. *Let M be a compact $(k+1)$ -dimensional, oriented, $C^{1,\eta}$ -manifold with boundary. For any $\alpha > \frac{1}{1+\eta}$, $\beta > 0$, and $A \in \Omega_{(\alpha,\beta)}^k(M)$, it holds that*

$$\int_M dA = \int_{\partial M} A.$$

Remark 5.3. Contrast the stronger regularity assumptions required to build integration by pull-back, Theorem 5.1, compared to Remark 3.5. It is not hard to see that when both notions apply, the resulting integrals are equal.

Remark 5.4. In contrast to [CCHS22, Theorem 3.18] we do not work with a control, since it is unclear how to extend Definition 3.16 therein to $k > 1$. For $k = 1$ (and $d \geq 2$) one can still define a control by replacing $|P; \bar{P}|^{\alpha/2}$ therein by the (α', β) -flat norm for some $\alpha', \beta \in (0, 1]$, but we shall not pursue this further since our focus is on generic $k \geq 1$.

5.1 Simplicial approximation

For $F : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\sigma = [v_0, \dots, v_k] \in \mathfrak{X}^k(\mathbb{R}^m)$, let $F^\sigma : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ to be the unique map supported on σ such that $F^\sigma(\sum_i t_i v_i) = \sum_i t_i F(v_i)$ whenever $t_i \in [0, 1]$ and $\sum_i t_i = 1$. For a simplex $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^k(\mathbb{R}^m)$ let

$$\begin{aligned} |F|_{(\alpha,\beta);\sigma} &:= \sup_{\mathcal{K}|\sigma} \max_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{K}} |F_* \sigma' - F_*^\sigma \sigma'|_{(\alpha,\beta)}, \\ |F; \bar{F}|_{(\alpha,\beta);\sigma} &:= \sup_{\mathcal{K}|\sigma} \max_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{K}} |F_* \sigma' - \bar{F}_* \sigma' - F_*^\sigma \sigma' + \bar{F}_*^\sigma \sigma'|_{(\alpha,\beta)}. \end{aligned}$$

where the supremum runs over all subdivisions \mathcal{K} of σ . Let

$$\begin{aligned} \|F; \bar{F}\|_{(\alpha,\beta);\eta;k;\mathfrak{K}} &:= \sup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}_{\leq 1}^k(\mathfrak{K})} \left(\frac{|F_* \sigma - \bar{F}_* \sigma|_{(\alpha,\beta)}}{\text{diam}(\sigma)^\eta} \right), \\ \| \|F; \bar{F}\| \|_{(\alpha,\beta);\gamma;k;\mathfrak{K}} &:= \sup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}_{\leq 1}^k(\mathfrak{K})} \left(\frac{|F; \bar{F}|_{(\alpha,\beta);\sigma}}{\text{diam}(\sigma)^\gamma} \right), \end{aligned}$$

as well as $\|F\|_{(\alpha,\beta);\gamma;k;\mathfrak{K}} := \|F; 0\|_{(\alpha,\beta);\gamma;k;\mathfrak{K}}$ and $\| \|F\| \|_{(\alpha,\beta);k;\mathfrak{K}} := \| \|F; 0\| \|_{(\alpha,\beta);k;\mathfrak{K}}$. Note that it follows directly from (3.3) that $\| \cdot ; \cdot \|_{(\alpha,\beta);\eta;k;\mathfrak{K}}$ and $\| \| \cdot ; \cdot \| \|_{(\alpha,\beta);\gamma;k;\mathfrak{K}}$ satisfy the triangle inequality.

Lemma 5.5. *Whenever F is Lipschitz continuous, for every $R > 0$ it holds that*

$$\|F\|_{(\alpha,\beta);k-1+\alpha;k;\mathfrak{K}} \lesssim_R \|DF\|_{L^\infty},$$

uniformly over F satisfying $\|DF\|_{L^\infty} \leq R$. Furthermore, for $\eta < k - 1 + \alpha$ there exists $\kappa = \kappa(\alpha, \eta) > 0$ such that for every $R > 0$

$$\|F; \bar{F}\|_{(\alpha, \beta); \eta; k; \mathfrak{R}} \lesssim_R \|F - \bar{F}\|_{L^\infty}^\kappa \quad (5.2)$$

uniformly over Lipschitz continuous F, \bar{F} such that $\|F\|_{L^\infty}, \|\bar{F}\|_{L^\infty}, \|DF\|_{L^\infty}, \|D\bar{F}\|_{L^\infty} \leq R$.

Proof. The former estimate is seen directly. Next, note that on the one hand

$$|F; \bar{F}|_{(\alpha, \beta); \sigma} \leq |F|_{(\alpha, \beta); \sigma} + |\bar{F}|_{(\alpha, \beta); \sigma} \lesssim \text{diam}(\sigma)^{k-1+\alpha}$$

and on the other hand by Lemma 3.7

$$|F_*\sigma - \bar{F}_*\sigma|_{(\alpha, \beta)} \lesssim \|F - \bar{F}\|_{L^\infty}^\alpha$$

and (5.2) follows by interpolation. \square

Lemma 5.6. *Let $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{1+\eta}, 1]$, $\beta \in (0, 1]$, then $\bar{\gamma} := (k - 1 + \alpha(1 + \eta)) \wedge (k + \beta(1 + \eta)) > k$. For every $R > 0$ and $\gamma \leq \bar{\gamma}$ the bound $\|F\|_{(\alpha, \beta); \gamma; k} \lesssim_R \|F\|_{C^{1, \eta}}$ holds uniformly over F satisfying $\|F\|_{C^{1, \eta}} < R$.*

Furthermore, if $\gamma < \bar{\gamma}$, there exists $\kappa = \kappa(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \eta) > 0$ such that $\|F; \bar{F}\|_{(\alpha, \beta); \gamma} \lesssim_R \|F - \bar{F}\|_{L^\infty}^\kappa$ uniformly over F, \bar{F} satisfying $\|F\|_{C^{1, \eta}}, \|\bar{F}\|_{C^{1, \eta}} < R$.

Proof. Let $\sigma' \subset \sigma$ and observe that each vertex $v'_i \in V(\sigma')$ can uniquely be written as a convex combination $v'_i = \sum_{j=0}^k \lambda_j^i v_j$ where $v_j \in V(\sigma)$.

Thus we observe that for $r = \text{diam}(\sigma)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_j \lambda_j^i F(v_j) &= \sum_j \lambda_j^i (F(v'_i) + \nabla F(v'_i)(v_j - v'_i) + \mathcal{O}(\|D^1 F\|_{C^\eta} \|v_j - v'_i\|^{1+\eta})) \\ &= F(v'_i) + \nabla F(v'_i) \sum_j \lambda_j^i (v_j - v'_i) + \mathcal{O}(\|D^1 F\|_{C^\eta} r^{1+\eta}) \\ &= F(v'_i) + \mathcal{O}(\|D^1 F\|_{C^\eta} r^{1+\eta}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

Since both $F^\sigma(\sigma')$ and $F(\sigma')$ are contained in a ball with radius $\lesssim \|DF\|_{L^\infty} r$, we conclude by Lemma 3.7 that

$$|F^\sigma(\sigma') - F(\sigma')|_{(\alpha, \beta)} \lesssim (\|DF\|_{L^\infty} r)^{k-1} (\|DF\|_{C^\eta} r)^{\alpha(1+\eta)} + (\|DF\|_{L^\infty} r)^k (\|DF\|_{C^\eta} r)^{\beta(1+\eta)},$$

which remains bounded by r^γ whenever $\gamma \leq \bar{\gamma}$.

To see the second claim of the lemma, note that as above

$$|F^\sigma(\sigma') - F(\sigma') - \bar{F}^\sigma(\sigma') + \bar{F}(\sigma')|_{(\alpha, \beta)} \leq |F^\sigma(\sigma') - \bar{F}^\sigma(\sigma')|_{(\alpha, \beta)} + |F(\sigma') - \bar{F}(\sigma')|_{(\alpha, \beta)} \lesssim_R \|F - \bar{F}\|_{L^\infty}.$$

On the other hand by the first part of this proof

$$\|F; \bar{F}\|_{(\alpha, \beta); \bar{\gamma}; k} \leq \|F\|_{(\alpha, \beta); \bar{\gamma}; k} + \|\bar{F}\|_{(\alpha, \beta); \bar{\gamma}; k} < \infty$$

and we conclude by interpolation. \square

Remark 5.7. Note that the threshold $\alpha > 1/2$ in Theorem 5.1 is explained by the observation that even if F is smooth, generically $\|F\|_{(\alpha,\beta);k;k} < \infty$ only if $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. This can be seen by for example choosing F to be a smooth parametrisation of the closure of an open subset of an embedded k -sphere which makes (5.3) sharp.

In order to make sense of the limit in (5.1) we define the increments

$$\Xi^{F^*A}(\sigma) := A(F_*\sigma), \quad \Xi^{F^*A;\bar{F}^*A}(\sigma) := A(F_*\sigma) - A(\bar{F}_*\sigma).$$

Proposition 5.8. *Let $\eta > k - 1$, $\gamma > k$. For $A \in \Omega_{\alpha,\beta}^k$ and F, \bar{F} continuous such that $\|F\|_{(\alpha,\beta);\eta;k}, \|\bar{F}\|_{(\alpha,\beta);\eta;k}, \|F\|_{(\alpha,\beta);\gamma;k}, \|\bar{F}\|_{(\alpha,\beta);\gamma;k} < \infty$, one finds that $\Xi^{F^*A}, \Xi^{F^*A;\bar{F}^*A} \in C_{2,k}^{\eta,\gamma}$ and that $F^*A := \mathcal{I}\Xi^{F^*A} \in \Omega^k$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \|F^*A\|_{\eta-(k-1)} &\lesssim \|A\|_{(\alpha,\beta)} \left(\|F\|_{(\alpha,\beta);\eta;k} \vee \|F\|_{(\alpha,\beta);\gamma;k} \right), \\ \|F^*A - \bar{F}^*A\|_{\eta-(k-1)} &\lesssim \|A\|_{(\alpha,\beta)} \left(\|F; \bar{F}\|_{(\alpha,\beta);\eta;k} \vee \|F; \bar{F}\|_{(\alpha,\beta);\gamma;k} \right). \end{aligned}$$

If furthermore $\|F\|_{(\beta,\infty);\tilde{\gamma};k+1}, \|\bar{F}\|_{(\beta,\infty);\tilde{\gamma};k+1} < \infty$ for $\tilde{\gamma} > k$, then $F^*A \in \Omega_{\alpha,(\gamma \wedge \tilde{\gamma})-k}$ and

$$\|\partial(F^*A - \bar{F}^*A)\|_{(\gamma \wedge \tilde{\gamma})-k} \lesssim \|F; \bar{F}\|_{(\alpha,\beta);\gamma;k} \vee \|F; \bar{F}\|_{(\beta,\infty);\tilde{\gamma};k+1}. \quad (5.4)$$

Finally, $F^*(\bar{F}^*A) = (\bar{F} \circ F)^*A$ and $F^*(\phi \cdot A) = F^*\phi \cdot F^*A$ for $\phi \in C^\rho$ whenever $\rho \in (1 - \alpha, 1]$.

Proof. First note that by Lemma 3.4

$$\llbracket \Xi^{F^*A} \rrbracket_\eta \leq \|A\|_\alpha \|F\|_{(\alpha,\beta);\eta;k}, \quad \llbracket \Xi^{F^*A;\bar{F}^*A} \rrbracket_\eta \leq \|A\|_{(\alpha,\beta)} \|F; \bar{F}\|_{(\alpha,\beta);\eta;k}. \quad (5.5)$$

To see

$$\llbracket \delta \Xi^{F^*A} \rrbracket_\gamma \leq \|A\|_{(\alpha,\beta)} \|F\|_{(\alpha,\beta);\gamma;k}, \quad \llbracket \delta_{\sigma,\mathcal{K}} \Xi^{F^*A;\bar{F}^*A} \rrbracket_\gamma \leq \|A\|_{(\alpha,\beta)} \|F; \bar{F}\|_{(\alpha,\beta);\gamma;k} \quad (5.6)$$

note that for $\mathcal{K}|\sigma$

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta_{\sigma,\mathcal{K}} \Xi^F| &= \left| A(F_*(\sigma)) - \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{K}} A(F_*(\sigma')) \right| \leq \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{K}} |A(F_*^\sigma \sigma' - F_* \sigma')| \\ &\leq \|A\|_{(\alpha,\beta)} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{K}} |F_*^\sigma \sigma' - F_* \sigma'|_{(\alpha,\beta)} \\ &\leq \|A\|_{\bar{\alpha},\bar{\beta}} |\mathcal{K}| \|F\|_{(\alpha,\beta);\gamma;k} \text{diam}(\sigma)^\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality of (5.6) follows similarly. Thus, we conclude the first part of the proposition by Corollary 2.12.1.

To see (4.1), note that

$$|A(\partial F_*\sigma)| \leq \|\partial A\|_\beta \|F\|_{(\beta,\infty);\tilde{\gamma};k+1} \text{diam}(\sigma)^{\tilde{\gamma}}$$

and

$$|F^*A(\partial\sigma) - A(\partial F_*\sigma)| \leq \sum_{B \in \text{Bd}(\sigma)} |\Xi^{F^*A}(B) - F^*A(B)| \lesssim \llbracket \delta \Xi^{F^*A} \rrbracket_\gamma \text{diam}(\sigma)^{\tilde{\gamma}}.$$

Therefore by (5.6)

$$\begin{aligned} |F^* A(\partial\sigma)| &\leq |A(\partial F_* \sigma)| + |F^* A(\partial\sigma) - A(\partial F_* \sigma)| \\ &\lesssim \|A\|_{(\alpha,\beta)} (\|F\|_{(\alpha,\beta);\gamma;k} \vee \|F\|_{(\beta,\infty);\tilde{\gamma};k+1}) \text{diam}(\sigma)^{\tilde{\gamma}\wedge\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, Lemma 2.8

$$\|\partial F^* A\|_{(\gamma\wedge\tilde{\gamma})-k} \lesssim \|A\|_{(\alpha,\beta)} (\|F\|_{(\alpha,\beta);\gamma} \vee \|F\|_{(\beta,\infty);\tilde{\gamma};k+1})$$

and (5.4) follows similarly.

The first identity in the final part follows from the fact that $G_*(F_*(\sigma)) = (G \circ F)_* \sigma$. For the second identity, note that $\Xi_\mu^{(\phi \circ F) \cdot F^* A}(\sigma) = \mu_\sigma(F^* \phi) \cdot (F^* A)(\sigma)$,

$$\Xi^{F^*(\phi \cdot A)}(\sigma) = (\phi \cdot A)(F_* \sigma),$$

and that

$$\Xi_\mu^{\phi \cdot A}(F_* \sigma) = \mu_\sigma(F^* \phi) A(F_* \sigma) = \mu_\sigma(F^* \phi) \Xi^{F^* A}(\sigma).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} |\Xi^{F^*(\phi \cdot A)}(\sigma) - \Xi_\mu^{(F^* \phi) \cdot F^* A}(\sigma)| &\leq |\Xi^{F^*(\phi \cdot A)}(\sigma) - \Xi_\mu^{\phi \cdot A}(F_* \sigma)| + |\Xi_\mu^{\phi \cdot A}(F_* \sigma) - \Xi_\mu^{(F^* \phi) \cdot F^* A}(\sigma)| \\ &= |(\phi \cdot A)(F_* \sigma) - \Xi_\mu^{\phi \cdot A}(F_* \sigma)| + |\mu_\sigma(F^* \phi) (\Xi^{F^* A} - F^* A)(\sigma)| \end{aligned}$$

and the claim follows by (5.6) together with Theorem 4.1. \square

6 Embeddings into distribution spaces

For $1 \leq k \leq d$, we write $\mathfrak{C}_k^d := \{J \subset \{1, \dots, d\} : |J| = k\}$. Given $J \in \mathfrak{C}_k^d$ we also write $J^c = \{1, \dots, d\} \setminus J$ and denote by E^J the hyperplane spanned by $\{e_j : j \in J\}$ equipped with its canonical orientation. Given $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we write $\llbracket w, v \rrbracket := [w_1, v_1] \times \dots \times [w_d, v_d]$.

Given $A \in \Omega^k$, $J \in \mathfrak{C}_k^d$ and $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we define

$$\langle \pi_J A, \psi \rangle := (-1)^{|J|} \int_{E^{J^c}} \int_{E^J} A(\llbracket w, w + v \rrbracket) D^J \psi(v + w) dv dw. \quad (6.1)$$

The following is a higher dimensional analogue of [Che18, Prop. 3.21].

Proposition 6.1. *In the setting above, the map characterised by (6.1) restricts to a bounded linear map $\pi_J : \Omega_{\alpha,0}^k \rightarrow C^{\alpha-1}$. Furthermore the map*

$$\pi : \Omega_{\alpha,0}^k \rightarrow (C^{\alpha-1})^{\mathfrak{C}_k^d}, \quad A \mapsto \pi(A) = (\pi_J(A) : J \in \mathfrak{C}_k^d)$$

is injective.

Recall that $\mathbf{m}_0(\sigma) = 1$ whenever $\sigma \neq 0$ and thus $\Omega_{\alpha,0}^k = \{A \in \Omega^k : \|A\|_\alpha < +\infty\}$,

Remark 6.2. Note that this suggests notation $A = \sum_{J \in \mathfrak{C}_k^d} (\pi_J A)(x) dx^J$ which is clearly an identity if A arose from a smooth k -form.

Proof. Noting that for any simplex $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^k$ one has $\int_{E^{J^c}} \int_{E^J} A(\sigma) D^J \psi(v+w) dv dw = 0$ and thus

$$\int_{E^{J^c}} \int_{E^J} A(\llbracket w, w+v \rrbracket) D^J \psi(v+w) dv dw = \int_{E^{J^c}} \int_{E^J} A(\llbracket w+x, w+x+v \rrbracket) D^J \psi(v+w) dv dw.$$

Let $\psi \in C_c^{k+1}(B_{1/2}(0))$ satisfy $|\psi|_{C^{k+1}} \leq 1$ and write $\psi_x^\lambda := \lambda^{-d} \psi((\cdot - x)/\lambda)$, then

$$|\langle \pi_J A, \psi_x^\lambda \rangle| \leq \lambda^{-k} \sup_{v \in E^J, w \in E^{J^c}, v+w \in \text{supp}(\psi_x^\lambda)} |A(\llbracket w+x, w+x+v \rrbracket)| \lesssim \|A\|_\alpha \lambda^{-k} \lambda^{k-1+\alpha}.$$

It remains to check the map is injective. Indeed if $\pi_J A = 0$ for all $J \in \mathfrak{C}_k^d$, this implies by the fundamental Lemma of calculus of variations that for almost every w the function $E^J \ni v \mapsto A(\llbracket w, w+v \rrbracket) \in \mathbb{R}$ is the constant function. Since $A[w, w] = 0$ this concludes the proof. \square

Proposition 6.3. *In the special case $k = d$ the map π is surjective with bounded inverse.*

Proof. Fix an orientation o on \mathbb{R}^d . Given any oriented d -simplex $\sigma = (\sigma, o_\sigma)$ we define $\text{sign}(\sigma) = 1$ if $o_\sigma = o$ and $\text{sign}(\sigma) = -1$ otherwise. We also set $\mathbf{1}_\sigma := \text{sign}(\sigma) \mathbf{1}_\sigma$. Furthermore fix ϕ as in Remark 2.3 and denote by $(\phi_{n,i}^\sigma)_{n \in \mathbb{N}, i \in I_n}$ the partition of unity constructed from $\phi \in C^\infty$ subordinate to a Whitney decomposition of σ .

Then, for $F \in C^{\alpha-1}$ one can set⁴

$$A_F(\sigma) := F(\mathbf{1}_\sigma) := \text{sign}(\sigma) \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}, i \in I_n} F(\phi_{n,i}^\sigma).$$

Let $\eta = d - 1 + \alpha$, one then finds that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}, i \in I_n} |F(\phi_{n,i}^\sigma)| &\lesssim \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}, i \in I_n} \|F\|_{C^{\alpha-1}} 2^{-nd} 2^{-n(\alpha-1)} \lesssim \|F\|_{C^{\alpha-1}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}: 2^{-n} < \text{diam}(\sigma)} |I_n| 2^{-n\eta} \\ &\lesssim \|F\|_{C^{\alpha-1}} \text{diam}(\sigma)^\eta, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step one argues ad verbatim like in (2.5). Thus, the following linear map is bounded

$$\iota: C^{\alpha-1} \rightarrow \Omega_{\alpha,0}, \quad F \mapsto A_F.$$

When F is smooth, it is easily checked that

$$(\pi \circ \iota)(F)(w) = \pi A_F(w) = D_v^J F(\mathbf{1}_{\llbracket w, w+v \rrbracket}) = F(w).$$

Thus, by continuity of ι , it is a right inverse to π which implies that π is surjective. \square

⁴One can check that the definition is independent of the specific choice of ϕ .

7 Application to random fields

7.1 A Kolmogorov criterion

Proposition 7.1. Fix a compact set $\mathfrak{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $A = (A_\sigma : \sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^k(\mathfrak{K}))$ be a $\mathfrak{X}^k(\mathfrak{K})$ -indexed stochastic process such that the map $S \ni \sigma \mapsto A(\sigma) = A_\sigma$ satisfies the relations in Remark 2.7 for any finite subset $S \subset \mathfrak{X}^k(\mathfrak{K})$ almost surely. Assume furthermore that for some $\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta} \in (0, 1]$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$M_q = \sup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}_{\leq 1}^k(\mathfrak{K})} \frac{\mathbb{E}[|A(\sigma)|^q]}{\mathbf{m}_{\tilde{\alpha}}^k(\sigma)^q} + \sup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}_{\leq 1}^{k+1}(\mathfrak{K})} \frac{\mathbb{E}[|A(\partial\sigma)|^q]}{\mathbf{m}_{\tilde{\beta}}^{k+1}(\sigma)^q} < +\infty \quad (7.1)$$

Then, for any $(\alpha, \beta) \in (0, \tilde{\alpha} \wedge \tilde{\beta} - d(k+1)/q) \times (0, \tilde{\beta} - d(k+2)/q)$, there exists a modification $\hat{A} \in \Omega_{(\alpha, \beta)}^k(\mathfrak{K})$ with

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{A}\|_{\alpha, \beta; \mathfrak{K}}^q] \leq M_q. \quad (7.2)$$

As is standard, outside of the proof below we just write A to refer to the modification \hat{A} .

Remark 7.2. Note that the conclusion of Proposition 7.1 remains true when (7.1) is replaced by

$$M_q^{\text{diam}} = \sup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}_{\leq 1}^k(\mathfrak{K})} \frac{\mathbb{E}[|A(\sigma)|^q]}{\text{diam}(\sigma)^{q(k-1+\tilde{\alpha})}} + \sup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}_{\leq 1}^{k+1}(\mathfrak{K})} \frac{\mathbb{E}[|A(\partial\sigma)|^q]}{\text{diam}(\sigma)^{q(k+\tilde{\beta})}} < +\infty. \quad (7.3)$$

Additionally, the statement also holds if, for $j \in \{0, 1\}$, one replaces the suprema over $\mathfrak{X}_{\leq 1}^{k+j}(\mathfrak{K})$ in (7.3) with suprema over $\mathfrak{Q}_{\leq 1}^{k+j}(\mathfrak{K})$.

Proof. We write $(\tilde{\alpha}_k, \tilde{\alpha}_{k+1}) = (\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta})$, $(\alpha_k, \alpha_{k+1}) = (\alpha, \beta)$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j \in \{k, k+1\}$ we write

$$\mathfrak{Y}_n^j = \{\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}_{\leq 1}^j(\mathfrak{K}) : \mathbf{m}_{\alpha_j}^j(\sigma) \in (2^{-(n-1)\alpha_j}, 2^{-n\alpha_j}]\}.$$

Note that $(\mathfrak{Y}_n^j : n \in \mathbb{N})$ is a partition of $\mathfrak{X}_{\leq 1}^j(\mathfrak{K})$. For any $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}_{\leq 1}^j(\mathfrak{K})$, we define n_σ so that $\sigma \in \mathfrak{Y}_{n_\sigma}^j$. We shall show that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} 2^{mq\alpha} \sup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{Y}_m^k} \left(|A(\pi_m \sigma)|^q + \sum_{n>m} |A(\pi_n \sigma) - A(\pi_{n-1} \sigma)|^q \right) \right] < \infty. \quad (7.4)$$

This will imply that, with probability 1, for any $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}_{\leq 1}^k(\mathfrak{K})$, the limit $\hat{A}(\sigma) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A(\pi_n \sigma)$ exists and one can extend \hat{A} to $\mathfrak{X}^k(\mathfrak{K})$. Since measurability is preserved in this limit, we have $\hat{A} \in \Omega^k$. In particular, for $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^{k+1}(\mathfrak{K})$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A(\pi_n \partial\sigma) = \hat{A}(\partial\sigma)$, which together with showing

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} 2^{mq\alpha} \sup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{Y}_m^{k+1}} \left(|A(\pi_m \partial\sigma)|^q + \sum_{n>m} |A(\pi_n \partial\sigma) - A(\pi_{n-1} \partial\sigma)|^q \right) \right] < \infty, \quad (7.5)$$

will prove that \hat{A} satisfies the estimate (7.2).

We use the parameter $j \in \{k, k+1\}$ so we can write discuss estimates (7.4) and (7.5) at the same time. We claim that, uniformly in $m, \sigma \in \mathfrak{Y}_m^j$ and $n \geq m$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|A(\pi_m \sigma_j)|^q] \lesssim M_q 2^{-qm\hat{\alpha}_j} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[|A(\pi_n \sigma_j) - A(\pi_{n-1} \sigma_j)|^q] \lesssim M_q 2^{-nq\hat{\alpha}_j}, \quad (7.6)$$

where, $\sigma_k = \sigma$, $\hat{\alpha}_k = \tilde{\alpha} \wedge \tilde{\beta}$, and $\sigma_{k+1} = \partial\sigma$, $\hat{\alpha}_{k+1} = \tilde{\beta}$.

To prove the inequality (7.6) we argue as in Corollary 3.7.1. For any $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}_{\leq 1}^j$ and $n, n' \in \mathbb{Z}$, there exists $Z^j = Z^j(\sigma, n, n') \in \mathcal{X}^{j+1}(\mathfrak{X})$ such that, uniform in such σ, n, n' ,

$$\left| \pi_n(\sigma) - \pi_{n'}(\sigma) - \partial Z^j \right|_{\tilde{\alpha}; j} \lesssim 2^{-(n \wedge n')\tilde{\alpha}_j},$$

and, for $j = k$, we also have

$$\left| Z^k \right|_{\tilde{\beta}; k+1} \lesssim 2^{-(n \wedge n')\tilde{\beta}}.$$

Continuing in the case $j = k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|A(\pi_n(\sigma) - \pi_{n'}(\sigma))|^q] &\lesssim \mathbb{E}[|A(\pi_n(\sigma) - \pi_{n'}(\sigma) - \partial Z^k)|^q] + \mathbb{E}[|A(\partial Z^k)|^q] \quad (7.7) \\ &\lesssim M_q \left(\left| \pi_n(\sigma) - \pi_{n'}(\sigma) - \partial Z^k \right|_{\tilde{\alpha}; k}^q + \left| Z^k \right|_{\tilde{\beta}; k+1}^q \right) \\ &\lesssim M_q (2^{-\tilde{\alpha}(n \wedge n')q} + 2^{-\tilde{\beta}(n \wedge n')q}) = M_q 2^{-nq\hat{\alpha}_k}. \end{aligned}$$

For $j = k+1$, since $\partial\partial Z^{k+1} = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|A(\partial\pi_n(\sigma) - \partial\pi_{n'}(\sigma))|^q] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left| A\left(\partial(\pi_n(\sigma) - \pi_{n'}(\sigma) - \partial Z^{k+1}) \right) \right|^q \right] \\ &\lesssim M_q \left| \pi_n(\sigma) - \pi_{n'}(\sigma) - \partial Z^{k+1} \right|_{\tilde{\beta}; k+1}^q \lesssim M_q 2^{-\tilde{\beta}(n \wedge n')q} = M_q 2^{-\hat{\alpha}_k(n \wedge n')q}. \end{aligned}$$

Now that (7.6) is proved, let $\mathfrak{Y}_{m,n}^j = \{\pi_n \sigma : \sigma \in \mathfrak{Y}_{m,n}^j\}$, and note that $|\mathfrak{Y}_{m,n}^j| \leq \text{diam}(\mathfrak{K})^d 2^{n(j+1)}$ since each such simplex is determined by $j+1$ vertices in $\mathfrak{K} \cap (2^{-n}\mathbb{Z}^d)$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} 2^{mq\alpha_j} \sup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{Y}_m^j} \left(|A(\pi_m \sigma_j)|^q + \sum_{n>m} |A(\pi_n \sigma_j) - A(\pi_{n-1} \sigma_j)|^q \right) \right] \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} 2^{mq\alpha_j} \left(\sum_{\tilde{\sigma} \in \mathfrak{Y}_{m,m}^k} |A(\tilde{\sigma}_j)|^q + \sum_{n>m} \sum_{\tilde{\sigma} \in \mathfrak{Y}_{m,n}^k} |A(\tilde{\sigma}_j) - A(\pi_{n-1} \tilde{\sigma}_j)|^q \right) \right] \\ &\lesssim M_q \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} 2^{mq\alpha_j} \left(2^{-qm\hat{\alpha}_j} 2^{(j+1)dm} + \sum_{n>m} 2^{-nq\hat{\alpha}_j} 2^{(j+1)dn} \right) \\ &\lesssim M_q \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} 2^{qm(\alpha_j - \hat{\alpha}_j) + (j+1)dm} \lesssim M_q, \end{aligned}$$

where in the third inequality we used that $\tilde{\alpha}_j > (j+1)d/q$ and in the final inequality we used that $\alpha_j < \hat{\alpha}_j - d(j+1)/q$. \square

7.2 Rough Gaussian k -forms

In this section we exhibit a criterion for fractional Gaussian fields, c.f. [LSSW16], to belong to the spaces $\Omega_{\alpha,\beta}^k$. We start with the following generalisation of [CCHS22, Lemma 4.9].

Lemma 7.3. *Let $\mathbf{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a k -cube of side length $r \in (0,1]$. We associate to \mathbf{Q} the distribution $\delta_{\mathbf{Q}}$ on \mathbb{R}^d by setting, for any smooth f on \mathbb{R}^d ,*

$$\langle \delta_{\mathbf{Q}}, f \rangle = \int_{[0,r]^k} f(\gamma(x)) d^k x,$$

where $\gamma : [0,r]^k \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}$ is an isometric embedding and $d^k x$ the Lebesgue measure. There exists $C > 0$ independent of r such that $\|\delta_{\mathbf{Q}}\|_{H^{-\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq Cr^{(k+(2\theta-d+k)\wedge k)/2}$ for any $\theta > (d-k)/2$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we take $\mathbf{Q} = [0,r]^k \times \{0\}^{d-k} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. We then have

$$\widehat{\delta_{\mathbf{Q}}}(p_1, \dots, p_n) = \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{e^{2\pi i p_j r} - 1}{2\pi i p_j}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\delta_{\mathbf{Q}}\|_{H^{-\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + \sum_{j=1}^d |p_j|)^{-2\theta} |\widehat{\delta_{\mathbf{Q}}}(p)|^2 d^d p \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + \sum_{j=1}^d |p_j|)^{-2\theta} \prod_{j=1}^k (r^2 \wedge p_j^{-2}) d^d p \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} (1 + \sum_{j=1}^k |p_j|)^{(d-k)-2\theta} \prod_{j=1}^k (r^2 \wedge p_j^{-2}) d^k p. \end{aligned}$$

The estimate then follows from noting that for any $0 \leq m \leq k$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^k} (1 + \sum_{j=1}^k |p_j|)^{(d-k)-2\theta} \prod_{j=1}^m (p_j^{-2} \mathbf{1}\{|p_j| \geq r^{-1}\}) \prod_{j=m+1}^k (r^2 \mathbf{1}\{|p_j| < r^{-1}\}) d^k p \lesssim r^{k+(2\theta-d+k)\wedge k}.$$

□

Proposition 7.4. *Fix $k < d$, $(d-k)/2 < \theta$. Let $(A_I : I \in \mathfrak{C}_k^d)$ be a collection of centred, jointly Gaussian, random fields on $H^{-\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for which there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[A_I(f)^2] \leq C \|f\|_{H^{-\theta}}^2 \quad \text{uniformly over } I \text{ and } f \in H^{-\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Let $\bar{\alpha} = (\theta - d/2 + 1) \wedge 1$ and $\bar{\beta} = (\theta - d/2) \wedge 1$. Then, there exists $A \in \Omega_{\alpha,\beta}^k(\mathfrak{K})$ such that $\pi(A)$ is a modification of $(A_I : I \in \mathfrak{C}_k^d)$ and $\mathbb{E}[\llbracket A \rrbracket_{(\alpha,\beta);\mathfrak{K}}^2] \lesssim_{\mathfrak{K}} C$ for every $\alpha \in (0, \bar{\alpha}]$, $\beta \in (0, \bar{\beta}]$ and compact $\mathfrak{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof. By Proposition 7.1 and Remark 7.2 with the choice $\bar{\alpha} = \theta/2 - d/2 + 1$ and $\bar{\beta} = \zeta$ and combined with equivalence of moments for Gaussian random variables, it suffices to prove the estimate

$$\sup_{Q \in \mathfrak{Q}_{\leq 1}^k(\mathfrak{K})} \frac{\mathbb{E}[|A(Q)|^2]}{\text{diam}(Q)^{2(k-1+\bar{\alpha})}} + \sup_{Q \in \mathfrak{Q}_{\leq 1}^{k+1}(\mathfrak{K})} \frac{\mathbb{E}[|A(\partial Q)|^2]}{\text{diam}(Q)^{2(k+\bar{\beta})}} \lesssim C. \quad (7.8)$$

For $Q \in \mathfrak{Q}_{\leq 1}^k(\mathfrak{K})$ of side length r , let $A(Q) = \frac{1}{r^k} \sum_I dx^I(Q) \delta_Q(A_I)$. To estimate the first term on the left hand side of (7.8) we note that by Lemma 7.3 we have, uniform in $Q \in \mathfrak{Q}_{\leq 1}^k(\mathfrak{K})$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\delta_Q(A_I)^2] \leq C \|\delta_Q\|_{H^{-\theta}}^2 \lesssim C \text{diam}(Q)^{k+(2\theta-d+k) \wedge k} = C \text{diam}(Q)^{2(k+\theta-d/2) \wedge 2k}.$$

We turn to estimating the second term of (7.8). The desired estimate follows from applying Stokes' Theorem estimate to write $|A(\partial Q)| = |(\partial A)(Q)|$ and then observing that, for any I and $j \in [d] \setminus I$, and uniform in $Q \in \mathfrak{Q}_{\leq 1}^{k+1}(\mathfrak{K})$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\delta_Q(\partial_j A_I)^2] \lesssim C \|\partial_j \delta_Q\|_{H^{-\theta}}^2 \lesssim C \|\delta_Q\|_{H^{-\theta+1}}^2 \lesssim C \text{diam}(Q)^{k+1+(2(\theta-1)-d+k+1) \wedge (k+1)}.$$

□

8 Methods of subdivision

We define the eccentricity $\epsilon(\sigma)$ of $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^k$ as

$$\epsilon(\sigma) := \frac{\text{diam}(\sigma)^k}{\text{Vol}^k(\sigma)}. \quad (8.1)$$

Definition 13. We call a family of maps $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathcal{M}_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ where for each $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathcal{M}_\ell : \mathfrak{X}^k \mapsto 2^{\mathfrak{X}^k},$$

a method of subdivision (for k simplices), if for each $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^k$, $\mathcal{M}_\ell(\sigma)$ is a subdivision of σ and

$$\mathcal{M}_{\ell+\ell'}(\sigma) = \bigcup_{w \in \mathcal{M}_{\ell'}(\sigma)} \mathcal{M}_\ell(w), \quad \text{for every } \ell, \ell' \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (8.2)$$

We call $\text{card}(\mathcal{M}) := \sup_\sigma |\mathcal{M}_1(\sigma)|$ the cardinality of \mathcal{M} and write

$$\|\mathcal{M}\| := \sup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^k} \sup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{w \in \mathcal{M}_\ell(\sigma)} \frac{\epsilon(w)}{\epsilon(\sigma)} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{c}_\mathcal{M} := \sup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^k} \max_{w \in \mathcal{M}_1(\sigma)} \left(\frac{\text{diam}(w)}{\text{diam}(\sigma)} \right)$$

as well as

$$\|\|\mathcal{M}\|\| := \inf_{\mu > 0} \sup_{I \in \mathbb{N}} \ell^{-\mu} \sup \left\{ \frac{\text{Vol}^k(w')}{\text{Vol}^k(w)} : \sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^k, w, w' \in \mathcal{M}_\ell(\sigma) \right\}.$$

We call \mathcal{M} strongly regular if $\text{card}(\mathcal{M}) \vee \|\mathcal{M}\| \vee \|\|\mathcal{M}\|\| < \infty$ and $\mathfrak{c}_\mathcal{M} < 1$.

Remark 8.1. Enforcing $\|\mathcal{M}\| < \infty$ rules out methods of iterative subdivision that would be problematic for our analysis, such as slicing a triangle into thinner and thinner strips without significantly reducing the length of the strips.

Remark 8.2. The main theorem of [EG00] states that there exists a strongly regular method of subdivision with $\|\mathcal{M}\| = 1$.

Remark 8.3. Another natural method of subdivision is longest edge bisection, but the question of whether $\|\mathcal{M}\| < \infty$ for this method appears to be an open problem, see [KPS16].

Remark 8.4. For any strongly regular method of subdivision \mathcal{M} , $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^k$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}_n(\sigma)} \text{diam}(\sigma')^k \leq \left(\max_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}_n(\sigma)} \epsilon(\sigma') \right) \text{Vol}^k(\sigma) \leq \|\mathcal{M}\| \epsilon(\sigma) \text{Vol}^k(\sigma) \leq \|\mathcal{M}\| \text{diam}(\sigma)^k.$$

In particular, then sequence $(\mathcal{M}_l(\sigma))_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a regular sequence of subdivisions of σ in the sense of Definition 2 since, for $\gamma > k$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}_n(\sigma)} \text{diam}(\sigma')^\gamma &\leq \max_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}_n(\sigma)} \text{diam}(\sigma')^{\gamma-k} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}_n(\sigma)} \text{diam}(\sigma')^k \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{M}\| \text{diam}^k(\sigma) \max_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{K}_\sigma^{(n)}} \text{diam}(\sigma')^{\gamma-k} \\ &\leq c_{\mathcal{M}}^{n(\gamma-k)} \|\mathcal{M}\| \text{diam}^\gamma(\sigma). \end{aligned} \quad (8.3)$$

Given two subdivisions $\mathcal{K}|\sigma$ and $\mathcal{K}'|\sigma$, we say \mathcal{K}' is a refinement of \mathcal{K} if, for every $\tau \in \mathcal{K}$, there exists $\mathcal{K}'' \subset \mathcal{K}'$ with $\mathcal{K}''|\tau$.

Lemma 8.5. *Consider two strongly regular methods of subdivision $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}'$. Then, there exists $\mu = \mu(\mathcal{M}) > 0$, $C = C(\mathcal{M})$ such that, for any σ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a common refinement $\mathcal{K}_n = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}', \sigma, n)$ of both $\mathcal{M}_n(\sigma)$ and $\mathcal{M}'_n(\sigma)$ satisfying*

$$\max_{w' \in \mathcal{M}'_n(\sigma)} |\{\tilde{w} \in \mathcal{K}_n : \tilde{w} \subset w'\}| \lesssim_k C(\mathcal{M}) \epsilon(\sigma) n^{\mu(\mathcal{M})} \left(1 + \frac{\text{diam}(\mathcal{M}'_n(\sigma))}{\text{diam}(\mathcal{M}_n(\sigma))} \right)^k.$$

Note that by symmetry one can reverse the roles of \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M}' in the estimate above.

Proof. Set

$$\mathcal{D}_{n;\sigma}^{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}'}(w') := |\{w \in \mathcal{M}_n(\sigma) : \text{Vol}^k(w \cap w') \neq 0\}|.$$

The lemma follows by combining the following claim with the fact that for any two simplices, their intersection can be written as a union of a bounded (k -dependent) number of simplices.

Claim 8.6. *There exists $\mu(\mathcal{M}), C(\mathcal{M}) > 0$ such that*

$$\mathcal{D}_{n;\sigma}^{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}'}(w') \leq C(\mathcal{M}) \epsilon(\sigma) n^\mu \left(1 + \frac{\text{diam}(w')}{\text{diam}(\mathcal{M}_n(\sigma))} \right)^k$$

uniformly in $n \in \mathbb{N}$

We now prove this claim. Write $\mathcal{K}_n(w') := \{w \in \mathcal{M}_n(\sigma) : \text{Vol}^k(w \cap w') \neq 0\}$ and let $\bar{w} \in \mathcal{M}(\sigma)$ be such that $\text{diam}(\mathcal{M}_n(\sigma)) = \text{diam}(\bar{w})$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{K}_n(w')| \text{diam}(\bar{w})^k &\leq |\mathcal{K}_n(w')| \epsilon(\bar{w}) \text{Vol}^k(\bar{w}) \leq \epsilon(\bar{w}) \|\mathcal{M}\| n^{\mu(\mathcal{M})} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{K}_n(w')} \text{Vol}^k(w) \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{M}\| \cdot \|\mathcal{M}\| \epsilon(\sigma) n^{\mu(\mathcal{M})} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{K}_n(w')} \text{Vol}(w) \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{M}\| \cdot \|\mathcal{M}\| \epsilon(\sigma) n^{\mu(\mathcal{M})} (\text{diam}(\bar{w}) + \text{diam}(w'))^k \end{aligned}$$

and therefore, $|\mathcal{K}_n(w')| \leq \|\mathcal{M}\| \|\mathcal{M}\| \epsilon(\sigma) n^{\mu(\mathcal{M})} \left(1 + \frac{\text{diam}(w')}{\text{diam}(\bar{w})}\right)^k$. \square

8.1 Proof of Proposition 2.10

We shall suppress $\mathfrak{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ throughout the proof.

Lemma 8.7. *In the setting of Proposition 2.10, for any strongly regular method of subdivision \mathcal{M} , the map*

$$\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}}\Xi : \mathfrak{X}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \sigma \mapsto \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}}\Xi(\sigma) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}_n(\sigma)} \Xi(\sigma')$$

satisfies

$$|\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}}\Xi(\sigma) - \Xi(\sigma)| \leq \frac{\|\mathcal{M}\|}{1 - c_{\mathcal{M}}^{(\gamma-k)}} \|\delta\Xi\|_{\gamma, \mathfrak{K}} \text{diam}(\sigma)^\gamma.$$

as well as $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}}\Xi(\sigma) = \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}_n(\sigma)} \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}}\Xi(\sigma')$.

Proof. Using (8.3) in the last line we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}_{n+1}(\sigma)} \Xi(\sigma') - \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}_n(\sigma)} \Xi(\sigma') \right| &\leq \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}_n(\sigma)} \left(\Xi(\sigma') - \sum_{\sigma'' \in \mathcal{M}_1(\sigma')} \Xi(\sigma'') \right) \\ &\leq \|\delta\Xi\|_{\gamma, \mathfrak{K}} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}_n(\sigma)} \text{diam}(\sigma')^\gamma \\ &\leq c_{\mathcal{M}}^{n(\gamma-k)} \|\mathcal{M}\| \|\delta\Xi\|_{\gamma, \mathfrak{K}} \text{diam}(\sigma)^\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Since $c_{\mathcal{M}} < 1$ and $\gamma > k$, this is summable in n . The remaining claim follows from (8.2). \square

We define the following equivalence relation between methods of subdivisions: we say that $\mathcal{M} \sim \mathcal{M}'$, whenever there exists $C > 0$ such that $\frac{1}{C} \leq \sup_n \frac{\text{diam}(\mathcal{M}_n(\sigma))}{\text{diam}(\mathcal{M}'_n(\sigma))} \leq C$ uniformly over $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}_{\leq 1}^k$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 8.8. *For two strongly regular methods of subdivision \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M}' the maps $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}}\Xi(\sigma)$ and $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}'}\Xi(\sigma)$ agree whenever $\mathcal{M} \sim \mathcal{M}'$.*

Proof. For any two strongly regular methods of subdivision $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}'$. By Lemma 8.5 there exists $\mu = \mu(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}')$ and a common refinement \mathcal{K}_n of $\mathcal{M}_n(\sigma), \mathcal{M}'_n(\sigma)$ such that, if we write $\mathcal{K}_n(w) := \{\tilde{w} \in \mathcal{K}_n : \tilde{w} \subset w\}$ for $w \in \mathcal{M}_n(\sigma) \cup \mathcal{M}'_n(\sigma)$, then

$$|\mathcal{K}_n(w)| \lesssim_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}', \sigma} n^\mu.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}}\Xi(\sigma) - \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}'}\Xi(\sigma) &= \sum_{w \in \mathcal{M}_n(\sigma)} \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}}\Xi(w) - \sum_{w \in \mathcal{M}'_n(\sigma)} \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}'}\Xi(w) \\ &= \sum_{w \in \mathcal{M}_n(\sigma)} (\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}}\Xi(w) - \Xi(w)) - \sum_{w' \in \mathcal{M}'_n(\sigma)} (\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}'}\Xi(w') - \Xi(w')) \\ &\quad + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{M}_n(\sigma)} \left(\Xi(w) - \sum_{\tilde{w} \in \mathcal{K}_n(w)} \Xi(\tilde{w}) \right) - \sum_{w' \in \mathcal{M}'_n(\sigma)} \left(\Xi(w') - \sum_{\tilde{w} \in \mathcal{K}_n(w')} \Xi(\tilde{w}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The first two sums in the last expression above converge to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ by definition, and for the third sum we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \Xi(w) - \sum_{\tilde{w} \in \mathcal{K}_n^{M, \tilde{M}}(\sigma); \tilde{w} \subset w} \Xi(\tilde{w}) \right| &= |\delta_{w, \mathcal{K}_n(w)} \Xi| \leq |\mathcal{K}_n(w)| \|\delta \Xi\|_\gamma \text{diam}(w)^\gamma \\ &\lesssim n^\mu \|\delta \Xi\|_\gamma \text{diam}(w)^\gamma \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one estimates the summands in the fourth sum. We conclude by (8.3). \square

Remark 8.9. We leave the following observation as an exercise to the reader: Given a strongly regular method of subdivision \mathcal{M} , a simplex σ and \mathcal{K} a subdivision of σ . Then there exists a strongly regular method $\mathcal{M}' \sim \mathcal{M}$ such that $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{M}'_1(\sigma)$.

Lemma 8.10. *For any strongly regular method of subdivision $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}}\Xi$ is an element of Ω^k .*

Proof. Note that the first condition of Definition 8 follows directly, and it remains to check that for any $\sigma \in \mathfrak{X}^k$ and subdivision $\mathcal{K}|\sigma$, one has

$$\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}}\Xi(\sigma) = \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}}\Xi(\sigma').$$

The flexibility in Definition 13 allows us to choose a strongly regular method of subdivision \mathcal{M}' as in Remark 8.9. It follows by Lemma 8.8 that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}}\Xi(\sigma) &= \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}'}\Xi(\sigma) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}'_{n+1}(\sigma)} \Xi(\sigma') = \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}'_1(\sigma)} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\sigma'' \in \mathcal{M}'_n(\sigma')} \mathcal{I}'_{\mathcal{M}}\Xi(\sigma'') \\ &= \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}}\Xi(\sigma'). \end{aligned}$$

\square

Proof of Proposition 2.10. We first note that any map $\mathcal{I} : C_{2,k}^{\eta,\gamma}(\mathfrak{R}) \rightarrow \Omega^k(\mathfrak{R})$, satisfying

$$|\mathcal{I}\Xi(\sigma) - \Xi(\sigma)| \lesssim \|\delta\Xi\|_{\gamma,\mathfrak{R}} \text{diam}(\sigma)^\gamma$$

also satisfies

$$|\mathcal{I}\Xi(\sigma)| \leq |\Xi(\sigma)| + |\Xi(\sigma) - \mathcal{I}\Xi(\sigma)| \lesssim \|\Xi\|_{(\eta,\gamma)} \text{diam}(\sigma)^\eta.$$

Considering a regular sequence of subdivisions $\{\mathcal{K}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of σ any such map also satisfies

$$|\mathcal{I}\Xi(\sigma) - \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{K}_n} \Xi(\sigma')| \lesssim \|\delta\Xi\|_{\gamma,\mathfrak{R}} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{K}_n} \text{diam}(\sigma')^\gamma \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus, in view of the preceding lemmas we have constructed for any strongly regular method of subdivision a map \mathcal{I} satisfying the properties in Proposition 2.10. It remains to prove uniqueness of the map \mathcal{I} . Assume \mathcal{I}' is a second such map and let \mathcal{M} be a strongly regular method of subdivision. Then, by additivity

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{I}\Xi(\sigma) - \mathcal{I}'\Xi(\sigma)| &\leq \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}_n} |\mathcal{I}\Xi(\sigma') - \mathcal{I}'\Xi(\sigma')| \\ &\leq \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}_n} (|\mathcal{I}\Xi(\sigma') - \Xi(\sigma')| + |\mathcal{I}'\Xi(\sigma') - \Xi(\sigma')|) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}_n} \text{diam}(\sigma')^\gamma \end{aligned}$$

which converges to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ by (8.3). □

Appendix A Symbolic Index

Object	Meaning	Ref.
Vol^k	k -dimensional Hausdorff measure	Page 5
$\boldsymbol{\sigma}$	non-oriented simplex	Def. 1
σ	oriented simplex	Def. 3
$V(\sigma)$	vertices of σ	Def. 1
diam	diameter of a simplex or cube and mesh of a subdivision	Def. 2
$\mathcal{K} \sigma$	\mathcal{K} is a subdivision of σ	Def. 5
\mathfrak{X}^k	set of oriented simplices	Def. 3
\mathcal{X}^k	\mathbb{Z} module of chains	Def. 6
\mathbf{m}_α^k	α -mass	Eq. 2.3
Ω^k	universe of (measurable) cochains	Def. 8
$\Omega_{\alpha,\beta}^k$	elements $A \in \Omega^k$ such that $\ A\ _{\alpha,\beta} < +\infty$	Def. 10
\mathfrak{Q}^k	set of oriented cubes	Def. 7
$\text{Bd}(\sigma)$	oriented faces of σ	Def. 3
∂	boundary operator $\delta\sigma = \sum_{F \in \text{Bd}(\sigma)} F$	Eq. 2.1

Object	Meaning	Ref.
$\mathcal{B}_{\alpha,\beta}$	completion of $(\mathcal{X}^k, \cdot _{(\alpha,\beta)})$	Def. 12
$C_2^{\eta,\gamma}$	certain functions on simplices/germs	Def. 9
Ξ	element of $C_2^{\eta,\gamma}$	Def. 9
μ_σ	family of probability measure supported on σ	Page 14
$\delta\Xi$	generalised increment of Ξ	Def. 9
\mathcal{I}	sewing/reconstruction operator $C_2^{\eta,\gamma} \rightarrow \Omega^k$	Prop. 2.10
$ \cdot _{(\alpha,\beta)}$	(α, β) -flat norm	Def. 11
$\delta\mathcal{Q}$	element of D' which integrates functions over \mathcal{Q}	Def. 7
\mathcal{M}	method of subdivision	Def. 13
ϵ	eccentricity of a simplex $\epsilon(\sigma) = \frac{\text{diam}(\sigma)^k}{\text{Vol}^k(\sigma)}$	Eq. 8.1

References

- [AST24] G. ALBERTI, E. STEPANOV, and D. TREVISAN. Integration of nonsmooth 2-forms: From Young to Itô and Stratonovich. *Journal of Functional Analysis* **286**, no. 2, (2024), 110212.
- [BP24] N. BERESTYCKI and E. POWELL. Gaussian free field and Liouville quantum gravity. *arXiv e-prints* (2024), arXiv:2404.16642. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2404.16642.
- [CCHS22] A. CHANDRA, I. CHEVYREV, M. HAIRER, and H. SHEN. Langevin dynamic for the 2D Yang–Mills measure. *Publications mathématiques de l’IHÉS* (2022), 1–147.
- [CG14] K. CHOUK and M. GUBINELLI. Rough sheets, 2014. arXiv:1406.7748.
- [Che18] I. CHEVYREV. Yang–Mills Measure on the Two-Dimensional Torus as a Random Distribution. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **372**, (2018), 1027 – 1058.
- [EG00] H. EDELSBRUNNER and D. R. GRAYSON. Edgewise subdivision of a simplex. *Discrete & Computational Geometry* **24**, no. 4, (2000), 707–719. doi:10.1007/s004540010063.
- [FdLP06] D. FEYEL and A. DE LA PRADELLE. Curvilinear Integrals Along Enriched Paths. *Electronic Journal of Probability* **11**, no. none, (2006), 860 – 892. doi:10.1214/EJP.v11-356.
- [FS82] G. B. FOLLAND and E. M. STEIN. *Hardy spaces on homogeneous groups*, vol. 28 of *Mathematical Notes*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.; University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1982, xii+285.
- [Gub04] M. GUBINELLI. Controlling rough paths. *Journal of Functional Analysis* **216**, no. 1, (2004), 86–140. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfa.2004.01.002.
- [Hai14] M. HAIRER. A theory of regularity structures. *Inventiones mathematicae* **198**, no. 2, (2014), 269–504. doi:10.1007/s00222-014-0505-4.

- [Har98] J. HARRISON. Continuity of the integral as a function of the domain. *The Journal of Geometric Analysis* **8**, (1998), 769–795.
- [Har05] J. HARRISON. Lectures on chainlet geometry - new topological methods in geometric measure theory, 2005. [arXiv:math-ph/0505063](https://arxiv.org/abs/math-ph/0505063).
- [Har18] F. A. HARANG. An extension of the sewing lemma to hyper-cubes and hyperbolic equations driven by multi-parameter young fields. *Stochastics and Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Computations* **9**, (2018), 746–788.
- [Hat02] A. HATCHER. *Algebraic Topology*. Algebraic Topology. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [HN92] J. HARRISON and A. NORTON. The Gauss-Green theorem for fractal boundaries. *Duke Mathematical Journal* **67**, no. 3, (1992), 575 – 588. doi:10.1215/S0012-7094-92-06724-X.
- [KPS16] S. KOROTOV, A. PLAZA, and J. P. SUAREZ. Longest-edge n-section algorithms: Properties and open problems. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* **293**, (2016), 139–146.
- [Lee10] J. LEE. *Introduction to topological manifolds*, vol. 202. Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.
- [LSSW16] A. LODHIA, S. SHEFFIELD, X. SUN, and S. S. WATSON. Fractional Gaussian fields: A survey. *Probability Surveys* **13**, no. none, (2016), 1 – 56. doi:10.1214/14-PS243.
- [MS23] A. MAYORCAS and H. SINGH. Singular SPDEs on Homogeneous Lie Groups. *arXiv preprint* (2023). [arXiv:2301.05121](https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.05121).
- [Mun18] J. R. MUNKRES. *Elements of algebraic topology*. CRC press, 2018.
- [ST21] E. STEPANOV and D. TREVISAN. Towards geometric integration of rough differential forms. *The Journal of Geometric Analysis* **31**, no. 3, (2021), 2766–2828.
- [Whi34] H. WHITNEY. Analytic extensions of differentiable functions defined in closed sets. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **36**, no. 1, (1934), 63–89.
- [Whi57] H. WHITNEY. *Geometric integration theory*. Courier Corporation, 1957.
- [You36] L. C. YOUNG. An inequality of the Hölder type, connected with Stieltjes integration. *Acta Mathematica* **67**, no. none, (1936), 251 – 282. doi:10.1007/BF02401743.
- [Züs11] R. ZÜST. Integration of hölder forms and currents in snowflake spaces. *Calculus of variations and partial differential equations* **40**, no. 1-2, (2011), 99–124.