

# Dynamics, Cohomology and Topology

Dan Burghilea \*

## Abstract

For a smooth Morse-Smale vector field with Lyapunov constraints (Lyapunov function) one shows how and why the non-triviality of the cohomology, as concluded from its additive structure, detects rest points and the multiplicative structure of the cohomology detects instantons (trajectories between rest points). The same remains true for Lyapunov closed one form, a more general Lyapunov constraint, but in this presentation this fact is discussed only informally. These observations are based on the smooth *manifold with corner structures* of the stable/unstable sets and of the set of trajectories of such vector fields.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Cohomology</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Dynamics</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Differential topology- manifolds with corners</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>The completion / compactification theorem</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Orientability and orientations associated with a M-S vector field</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Dynamics, cohomology and integration of forms</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Proof of Theorem (4.1)</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Appendix</b>	<b>15</b>

## 1 Introduction

This talk <sup>1</sup> is about a large class of dynamics, M-S (Morse–Smale) dynamics or M-S vector fields, whose basic elements are *rest points*, *instantons* and *periodic trajectories*. I intend to explain how the cohomology permits to conclude existence of these elements (and to some extent derive information about their amount) under the hypotheses of the existence of a Lyapunov function or of a Lyapunov closed one form. Very

---

\*Department of Mathematics, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210,USA. Email: burghilea@math.ohio-state.edu

<sup>1</sup>Lecture given at IMAR Bucharest, November 2023

many dynamics in physics satisfy such Lyapunov constraints. Note that M-S vector fields are generic, as explained in section 3. For reasons of simplicity I will suppose that the underlying manifold of the M-S dynamics is *closed* but this hypothesis is not necessary and can be removed with appropriate modifications in definitions.

The detection of the rest points, in the case of a Lyapunov function resp. of a Lyapunov closed differential one form of cohomology class  $\xi$ , is derived from the additive structure of the cohomology  $H^*(M)$  resp. of the Novikov cohomology  $H_N^*(M; \xi)$ ; i.e. from the dimensions of components of the graded  $\kappa$  resp.  $\kappa(\xi)$ -vector space structure of these cohomologies<sup>2</sup>, cf. Theorem 4.1. This is a well known result in topology and treated by what is usually referred to as elementary Morse theory resp. Morse–Novikov theory.

The detection of instantons is a consequence of the multiplicative structure of the cohomology  $H^*(M)$  (i.e. the graded algebra structure of the cohomology  $H^*(M)$ ) resp. the left  $H^*(M)$ -module structure of  $H_N^*(M; \xi)$ , cf. Theorem 4.1. This last fact was not known to me until very recently, and apparently not explicit in literature but, I understand it was known to S. Donaldson as suggested by [1].

The purpose of this talk is to explain these facts based on the *manifold with corners*-structures and the explicit description of the corners of the unstable sets and of the spaces of trajectories of a M-S vector field in the presence of Lyapunov constraints. In this paper we will treat in details only the case of Lyapunov function. The details in the case of Lyapunov closed differential one form is based essentially on similar arguments and will be presented elsewhere.

## 2 Cohomology

For a space  $X$  and a field  $\kappa$  the collection of vector spaces  $H^r(X) := H^r(X; \kappa)$ ,  $r = 0, 1, \dots$ ,<sup>3</sup> provides a graded  $\kappa$ -vector space. Equipped with the products  $H^r(X) \otimes H^p(X) \xrightarrow{\cup} H^{r+p}(X)$ , called cup-products<sup>4</sup>, this graded vector space becomes a commutative graded algebra.

If  $\xi \in H^1(X; \mathbb{R}) = \text{Hom}(H_1(M, \mathbb{Z}), \mathbb{R})$ , since  $M$  is a closed manifold, then  $\text{img } \xi$  is a finite rank abelian group  $\Gamma$  embedded in  $\mathbb{R}$ , hence isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}^p$  for some integer  $p$ . This group defines the extension field  $\kappa(\xi)$  of the field  $\kappa$ , known as the Novikov field cf. [8], and the  $\Gamma$ -principal covering  $\pi : \tilde{M} \rightarrow M$  which makes  $H^*(\tilde{M})$  a left  $\kappa[\Gamma]$ -module for the left action,  $x \cup u := \pi^*(x) \cup u$ ,  $x \in H^*(\tilde{M})$ ,  $u \in H^*(\tilde{M})$ . Here  $\cup$  denotes the cup-product in  $\tilde{M}$ . The Novikov cohomology  $H_N^r(M; \xi) := H^r(\tilde{M}) \otimes_{\kappa[\Gamma]} \kappa(\xi)$  is a  $\kappa(\xi)$ -vector space after the right-side tensor product with  $\kappa(\xi)$ , equipped with a structure of left  $H^*(M)$ -module, derived from the left  $H^*(M)$ -module structure of  $H^*(\tilde{M})$ . This module structure is provided by the linear map  $\tilde{\Delta} : \tilde{M} \rightarrow M \times \tilde{M}$ ,  $\tilde{\Delta}(x) = (\pi(x), x)$  which induces  $H^*(M) \otimes_{\kappa} H^*(\tilde{M}) \otimes_{\kappa[\Gamma]} \kappa(\xi) \rightarrow H^*(\tilde{M}) \otimes_{\kappa[\Gamma]} \kappa(\xi)$ . If  $\omega \in \Omega^1(M)$ ,  $d\omega = 0$ , representing the cohomology class  $\xi$ , then  $\pi^*\omega = df$  with  $f : \tilde{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  called *lift of  $\omega$* , unique up to an additive constant. For more details consult [8], [6].

## 3 Dynamics

A smooth dynamics on a smooth manifold  $M^n$  is a one parameter group of diffeomorphisms  $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \times M \rightarrow M$ , equivalently a complete smooth vector field  $X$  on  $M$ .

The elements of the dynamics  $X$  are the set of rest points  $\mathcal{X} := \{x \in M \mid X(x) = 0\}$  and the set of its trajectories, i.e. smooth maps  $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$  with  $d\gamma(t)/dt = X(\gamma(t))$ . One writes  $\gamma_p(t)$ ,  $p \in M$ , for the trajectory with  $\gamma_p(0) = p$ , and  $\gamma_p^\pm$  for the restrictions of  $\gamma_p$  to  $(-\infty, 0]$  resp.  $[0, \infty)$ .

Among these trajectories one specifies :

<sup>2</sup>here the cohomology  $H^*(M)$  is a  $\kappa$ -graded vector space while Novikov cohomology is a  $\kappa(\xi)$ -vector spaces, with  $\kappa(\xi)$  the Novikov field, as discussed in section 2

<sup>3</sup>when the field  $\kappa$  is understood from the context it will be deleted from notations

<sup>4</sup>the cup-product is the linear map induced in cohomology by the diagonal map  $\Delta : X \rightarrow X \times X$

- the **instantons**  $\mathcal{T} := \{\gamma \mid \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty/\infty} \gamma(x) = x/y \mid x, y \in \mathcal{X}\}$ , trajectories between rest points, and
- the **periodic trajectories**  $\mathcal{P} := \{\gamma \mid \gamma(t+T) = \gamma(t) \text{ for some } T\}$ .

as trajectories of interest.

Note that one also has:

- for any  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  two relevant subsets of  $M$ , the **unstable** resp. **stable set**

$$W_x^\mp : \{y \in M \mid \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty/+ \infty} \gamma_y(t) = x\},$$

- for any  $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$  the subset  $\mathcal{M}(x, y) \subset M$ ,

$$\mathcal{M}(x, y) := W_x^- \cap W_y^+,$$

consisting of the points located on the instantons from  $x$  to  $y$ , and

- when  $x \neq y$ , the quotient space,

$$\mathcal{T}(x, y) := \mathcal{M}(x, y)/\mathbb{R},$$

with respect to the free action of  $\mathbb{R}$  on  $\mathcal{M}(x, y)$  induced by  $\varphi$ , and with  $\pi : \mathcal{M}(x, y) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(x, y)$  denoting the quotient map.

Let

$$\pi \times f : \mathcal{M}(x, y) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(x, y) \times (f(y), f(x)) \simeq \mathcal{T}(x, y) \times (0, 1),$$

be the canonical identification of  $\mathcal{M}(x, y)$  to  $\mathcal{T}(x, y) \times (f(y), f(x))$ , ultimately to  $\mathcal{T}(x, y) \times (0, 1)$ , once an identification of the interval  $(f(y), f(x))$  to  $(0, 1)$  is chosen.

For  $x \neq y$  one writes  $x > y$  if  $\mathcal{T}(x, y) \neq \emptyset$ .

### M-S (Morse–Smale) vector fields, cf. [7], [9]

In this paper we call *M-S vector field*, or *M-S dynamics*, a complete smooth vector field <sup>5</sup>  $X$  on a smooth manifold  $M$  which satisfies the following properties.

1. The rest points  $\mathcal{X} = \{x \in M \mid X(x) = 0\}$  are hyperbolic <sup>6</sup>, hence isolated and with a well defined index  $i(x) \in \{0, 1, \dots, \dim M\}$  and with the sets  $W_x^-$  resp.  $W_x^+$  manifolds diffeomorphic to  $\mathbb{R}^k$  resp.  $\mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ ,  $k = i(x)$ . One has  $\mathcal{X} = \sqcup \mathcal{X}_k$ ,

$$\mathcal{X}_k = \{x \in \mathcal{X} \mid i(x) = k\}$$

and one denotes by

$$i_x^\pm : W_x^\pm \rightarrow M$$

the corresponding injective immersion <sup>7</sup>. Note that If for any  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  there exists coordinates  $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n)$  in a neighborhood of  $x$ , s.t.

$$X(t_1, \dots, t_n) = - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} t_i \partial / \partial t_i + \sum_{k+1 \leq i \leq n} t_i \partial / \partial t_i$$

then this property is satisfied and  $i(x) = k$ .

<sup>5</sup>when  $M$  is closed any vector field in complete

<sup>6</sup>the linearization of the vector field  $X$  at any rest point is invertible, cf. [7]

<sup>7</sup>which exists by Hadamard–Perron theorem, cf [7]

2. For each periodic trajectories  $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}$  the vector field  $X$  is hyperbolic in normal directions to  $\gamma$ , which implies that the trajectory  $\gamma$  is isolated and has a well defined index  $i(\gamma) \in \{0, 1, \dots, \dim M - 1\}$ . This is indeed the case and  $i(\gamma) = k$ , if for any  $x \in \gamma$  there exists coordinates  $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n)$  in a neighborhood of  $x$  s.t.

$$X(t_1, \dots, t_n) = - \sum_{2 \leq i \leq k+1} t_i \partial / \partial t_i + \sum_{k+2 \leq i \leq n} t_i \partial / \partial t_i.$$

3. For any  $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$  the maps  $i_x^-$  and  $i_y^+$  are transversal, equivalently the unstable manifold  $W_x^-$  and the stable manifold  $W_y^+$  are transversal, which implies that the set  $\mathcal{M}(x, y)$  is a smooth manifold of dimension  $i(x) - i(y)$  which is stably parallelizable, as explained in section 7. This implies that for  $x \neq y$  the set  $\mathcal{T}(x, y)$  is also a smooth stably parallelizable manifold and has dimension  $i(x, y) - 1$ .

One writes

$$\mathcal{T} = \sqcup_r \mathcal{T}(r)$$

where

$$\mathcal{T}(r) := \sqcup_{\{x, y \in \mathcal{X} | i(x) - i(y) = r\}} \mathcal{T}(x, y)$$

and one denotes by

$$i_{x, y} : \mathcal{M}(x, y) \rightarrow M$$

the corresponding injective smooth immersion.

Usually there are more transversality conditions assumed in item 3. in order to qualify the dynamics  $X$  to be M-S, cf. [7], [9] or [10]; one requires that the stable and the unstable sets for both rest points and closed trajectories, which in view of item 1. and item 2. above are all manifolds, be transversal. For the purpose of this paper item 3. as formulated suffices and we stick with this shorter list of requirements for the concept of M-S vector field.

The following weaker version of Kupka-Smale theorem holds true.

**Theorem 3.1 (Kupka-Smale)**

*The set of M-S vector fields on a closed manifold  $M$  is generic in the set of all smooth vector fields w.r. to any  $C^r$ -topology,  $r \geq 1$ .*

*More precisely, for any smooth vector field  $X$  and any  $\epsilon > 0$  one can find M-S vector fields  $\epsilon$ -closed to  $X$ , and for any smooth M-S vector field  $X$  there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  s.t. any smooth vector field  $X'$ ,  $\epsilon$ -closed to  $X$ , remains a M-S vector field. Moreover, there exists homeomorphism  $\varphi : M \rightarrow M$  which intertwines the rest points, the instantons and the periodic trajectories of  $X$  with those of  $X'$  keeping their indexes.*

**Lyapunov constraints**

A smooth function  $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called *Lyapunov* for the vector field  $X$  if  $df(X)(x) \neq 0$  iff  $x \notin \mathcal{X}$  and  $df(X)(x) < 0$ , and

a closed differential one form  $\omega \in \Omega^1(M)$ ,  $d\omega = 0$  is called *Lyapunov* for the vector field  $X$  provided  $\omega(X)(x) \neq 0$  iff  $x \notin \mathcal{X}$  and  $\omega(X)(x) < 0$ .

Note that :

–the vector fields which admit Lyapunov function do not have closed trajectories (,hence the requirement 2 is not applicable),

– the vector fields which admit Lyapunov closed one form, equivalently whose trajectories minimize an *action* defined locally by a smooth function, can have closed trajectories. Concluding the existence of and counting the periodic trajectories is an interesting problem in dynamics cf. [4]. Many dynamics of physical interest are mathematically described by such vector fields.

## 4 Results

**Theorem 4.1** *Suppose  $M^n$  is a closed smooth manifold and  $X$  is an  $M$ -S vector field.*

1. *If  $X$  admits a Lyapunov function, then*

- (a)  $\mathcal{P} = \emptyset$ ,  $\#\pi_0(\mathcal{T}) < \infty$ <sup>8</sup> and  $\#\mathcal{X} < \infty$ ,
- (b) for any field  $\kappa$   $\#\mathcal{X}_r \geq \dim H^r(M)$  and  $(-1)^k \sum_{r \leq k} \#\mathcal{X}_r \geq (-1)^k \sum_{r \leq k} \dim H^r(M)$ , with  $\#\cdots$  denoting the cardinality of the set  $\cdots$ ,
- (c)  $H^r(M) \cup H^*(X) \neq 0$  implies  $\mathcal{T}(r) \neq \emptyset$ , in particular if  $u_i \in H^{r_i}(M)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  with  $u = u_1 \cup u_2$  and the cup-product with  $u$  (in  $H^*(M)$ ) is nontrivial, then both  $\mathcal{T}(r_i) \neq \emptyset$ .

2. *If  $X$  admits a Lyapunov closed differential one form  $\omega \in \Omega^1(M)$  of cohomology class  $\xi = [\omega]$  then*

- (a)  $\#\mathcal{X}_r < \infty$  and for any  $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$   $\pi_0(\mathcal{T}(x, y)) < \infty$ ,
- (b) For any field  $\kappa$ ,  $\#\mathcal{X}_r \geq \dim H_N^r(M, \xi)$  and  $(-1)^k \sum_{r \leq k} \#\mathcal{X}_r \geq (-1)^k \sum_{r \leq k} \dim H_N^r(M, \xi)$ ,
- (c) If the multiplication  $H^r(M) \otimes H_N^*(M, \xi) \rightarrow H_N^*(M; \xi)$  is nontrivial then  $\mathcal{T}(r) \neq \emptyset$ . In particular if  $u_i \in H^{r_i}(M)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ ,  $u = u_1 \cup u_2$  and the multiplication by  $u$  in  $H_N^*(M; \xi)$  is nontrivial then  $\mathcal{T}(r_i) \neq \emptyset$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , (actually results about non triviality of  $\mathcal{T}(x, y)$  for specified  $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$  can be also derived )

Items a. and b. in parts 1 and part 2 are well known and represent statements referred to as elementary Morse resp. Morse-Novikov theory. In this paper only part 1 will be argued in details, part 2 will be only superficially discussed.

## 5 Differential topology- manifolds with corners

Denote by  $\mathbb{R}_+^n := [0, \infty)^n$  with  $\mathbb{R}_+^n(k)$  the subset of  $\mathbb{R}_+^n$  with exactly  $k$  coordinates equal to 0.

### Definition 5.1

1. An  $\mathbb{R}_+^n$ -manifold  $W$  is a space equipped with a sheaf of continuous functions locally isomorphic to  $\mathbb{R}_+^n$  equipped with the sheaf of smooth functions.

Let  $W(k)$  denotes the subspace of points corresponding to  $\mathbb{R}_+^n(k)$  and observe that  $W(k)$  is a smooth  $(n - k)$  dimensional manifold referred to as the  $k$ -corner of  $W$ .

2. An  $n$ -dimensional manifold with corner  $(W, W(k))$  is an  $\mathbb{R}_+^n$ -manifold such that the topological closure of each connected component of  $W(k)$  is an  $\mathbb{R}_+^{n-k}$ -manifold.

The product of two manifolds with corners  $(W_1, W_1(k))$  and  $(W_2, W_2(k))$  is a manifold with corners  $(W, W(k))$  with  $W = W_1 \times W_2$  and  $W(k)$  given by

$$W(k) = \sqcup_{0 \leq r \leq k} W_1(r) \times W_2(k - r). \quad (1)$$

The extension of the differential calculus from manifolds and manifolds with boundary to manifolds with corners, like transversality, the integration theory for differential forms including Stokes theorem are straightforward. In particular one has:

---

<sup>8</sup> $\pi_0(\mathcal{T})$  denotes the set of connected components of the space  $\mathcal{T}$

**Observation 5.2**

If  $(W, W(k))$  is a compact oriented (smooth) manifold with corners of dimension  $n$  and  $\omega$  is a differential form of degree  $n - 1$  then  $\int_{W(1)} \omega$  is convergent and

$$\int_{W(1)} \omega = \int_W d\omega. \quad (2)$$

If  $f : W \rightarrow M^p$  is a smooth map from a manifold with corners  $(W, W(k))$  to a manifold  $M^p$  and  $N^{p-r} \subset M^p$  is the image by an injective immersion of a manifold,  $l : N \rightarrow M$ , one says that  $f$  is transversal to  $N$  or to  $l$  and one writes  $f \pitchfork N$  or  $f \pitchfork l$ , if the restriction  $f|_{W(k)}$  of  $f$  to  $W(k)$  remains transversal to  $N$  or  $l$  for any  $k$ . If this is the case one has:

**Observation 5.3**

If  $f \pitchfork N$  then  $f^{-1}(N)$  is a manifold with corners whose  $k$ -corner is  $(f|_{W(k)})^{-1}(N)$ .

For a manifold with corners  $(W, W(k))$  one denotes by  $\partial W = \sqcup_{k \geq 1} W(k)$  the *boundary* of  $W$ ; actually  $(W, \partial W)$  is a topological manifold with boundary which is smoothable. Precisely, it admits a rounding-corner homeomorphisms to a smooth manifold with boundary. A **rounding-corners** homeomorphism is a smooth homeomorphism  $h : (W, \partial W) \rightarrow (N, \partial N)$ , with  $(N, \partial N)$  a smooth manifold with boundary which for any  $k$  restricts to a diffeomorphism onto the image and the stratification of  $\partial N$  defined by  $h(W(k))$  is regular (=Whitney) stratification. All rounding-corners homeomorphism provide a unique smooth structure of smooth manifold with boundary on  $(W, \partial W)$ <sup>9</sup>.

## 6 The completion / compactification theorem

Recall that given  $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $x \neq y$  one writes  $x > y$  iff  $\mathcal{T}(x, y) \neq \emptyset$  and if the vector field  $X$  is a M-S vector field one defines  $i(x, y) := i(x) - i(y)$ .

Suppose  $X$  is an M-S vector field.

- A point  $p \in W_x^\mp$  can be specified by the restrictions to  $(-\infty, 0]$  resp.  $[0, \infty)$  of the trajectory  $\gamma_p(t)$  with  $\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \gamma_p(t) = x$  resp.  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \gamma_p(t) = x$ , restrictions denoted by  $\gamma_p^\mp$ , and a point  $p \in \mathcal{M}(x, y)$  can be specified by an instanton  $\gamma \in \mathcal{T}(x, y)$  with a marked point  $p \in \gamma$ . See Figure 1 (a).
- A  $k$ -broken instanton from  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  to  $y \in \mathcal{X}$  at breaking points  $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k \in \mathcal{X}, x > y_1 > \dots > y_k > y$  is an element of the set

$$\mathcal{T}(x, y_1) \times \mathcal{T}(y_1, y_2) \cdots \mathcal{T}(y_{k-1}, y_k) \times \mathcal{T}(y_k, y),$$

hence a juxtaposition of instantons  $(\gamma^1, \gamma^2, \dots, \gamma^{k+1}), \gamma^i \in \mathcal{T}(y_{i-1}, y_i)$ . *Juxtaposition* here means  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \gamma^i(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \gamma^{i+1}(t) = y_i$ , with  $y_0 = x$  and  $y_{k+1} = y$  cf. Figure 1. (b).

- A  $k$ -broken trajectory from  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  to  $p \in M \setminus \mathcal{X}$  at breaking points  $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k \in \mathcal{X}, x > y_1 > \dots > y_k$ , is an element of the set

$$\mathcal{T}(x, y_1) \times \mathcal{T}(y_1, y_2) \cdots \times \mathcal{T}(y_{k-1}, y_k) \times W_{y_k}^-,$$

hence a juxtaposition  $(\gamma^1, \gamma^2, \dots, \gamma^k, \gamma_p^-), \gamma^i \in \mathcal{T}(y_{i-1}, y_i), p \in W_{y_k}^-, y_0 = x$ , cf. Figure 1 (c).

<sup>9</sup>Precisely, for two such rounding-corners homeomorphisms  $h_i : (W, \partial W) \rightarrow (N, \partial N), i = 1, 2$  there exists diffeomorphisms  $\lambda : N_1 \rightarrow N_2$ , unique up to isotopy s.t.  $\lambda \cdot h_2$  and  $h_1$  are isotopic as homeomorphisms

Similarly, a  $k$ -broken trajectory from  $p \in M \setminus \mathcal{X}$  to  $y \in \mathcal{X}$  at breaking points  $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $y_1 > y_2 > \dots > y_k > y$ , is an element of the set

$$\mathcal{W}_{y_1}^+ \times \mathcal{T}(y_1, y_2) \cdots \times \mathcal{T}(y_k, y),$$

hence a juxtaposition  $(\gamma_p^+, \gamma^1, \dots, \gamma^{k+1})$ ,  $p \in \mathcal{W}_{y_1}^+$ ,  $\gamma^i \in \mathcal{T}(y_{i-1}, y_i)$ ,  $y_{k+1} = y$ , cf. Figure 1 (d).

- A pointed  $k$ -broken instantons from  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  to  $y \in \mathcal{X}$  at breaking points  $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $x > y_1 > \dots > y_k > y$ , with marked point  $p \in \mathcal{M}(y_r, y_{r+1})$ , is an element of the set

$$\mathcal{T}(x, y_1) \cdots \times \mathcal{T}(y_{r-1}, y_r) \times \mathcal{M}(y_r, y_{r+1}) \times \mathcal{T}(y_{r+1}, y_{r+2}) \cdots \times \mathcal{T}(y_k, y).$$

It can be also represented by a pair of two elements the first  $(\gamma^1, \gamma^2, \dots, \gamma^r, \gamma_p^-)$  and  $(\gamma_p^+, \gamma^{r+2}, \dots, \gamma^{k+1})$ ,  $p \in \mathcal{M}(y_r, y_{r+1})$ ,  $x = y_0$ ,  $y = y_{k+1}$ , cf. Figure 1 (e).

- A pointed  $k$ -broken instantons from  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  to  $y \in \mathcal{X}$  at breaking points  $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k$ , with marked point  $p = y_r \in \mathcal{X}$   $r = 0, 1, \dots, y_{k+1}$ , is an element of the set

$$= \mathcal{T}(y_0, y_1) \cdots \times \mathcal{T}(y_{r-1}, y_r) \times \mathcal{M}(y_r, y_r) \times \mathcal{T}(y_r, y_{r+1}) \times \cdots \times \mathcal{T}(y_k, y_{k+1}),$$

$y_0 = x$ ,  $y_{k+1} = y$ .

Note that for any  $y_r \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}(y_r, y_r) = \{y_r\}$ .




Figure 1: a.c.b,d,e,f

Define :

- $\hat{\mathcal{T}}(x, y)$  by

1.  $\hat{\mathcal{T}}(x, y)(0) = \mathcal{T}(x, y)$ ,
2.  $\hat{\mathcal{T}}(x, y)(k) := \sqcup_{\{y_1, \dots, y_k | x > y_1 > \dots, y_k > y\}} \mathcal{T}(x, y_1) \times \mathcal{T}(y_1, y_2) \times \dots \times \mathcal{T}(y_k, y)$
3.  $\hat{\mathcal{T}}(x, y) := \sqcup_{\{k=0,1,\dots, i(x,y)-1\}} \hat{\mathcal{T}}(x, y)(k)$ .

•  $\hat{W}_x^-, \hat{i}_x^- : \hat{W}_x^- \rightarrow M$  by

1.  $\hat{W}_x^-(0) = W_x^-$ ,
2.  $\hat{W}_x^-(k) := \sqcup_{\{y_1 > y_2 > \dots > y_k | x > y_1\}} \mathcal{T}(x, y_1) \times \mathcal{T}(y_1, y_2) \times \dots \times \mathcal{T}(y_{k-1}, y_k) \times W_{y_k}^-$ ,
3.  $\hat{W}_x^- := \sqcup_{k=0,1,\dots, i(x)} \hat{W}_x^-(k)$ ,
4.  $\hat{i}_x^- |_{\hat{W}_x^-(k)} := i_{y_k}^- \cdot p_{W_{y_k}^-}$  with  $p_{W_{y_k}^-}$  the projection on  $W_{y_k}^-$ .

•  $\hat{W}_y^+, \hat{i}_y^+ : \hat{W}_y^+ \rightarrow M$  by

1.  $\hat{W}_y^+(0) = W_y^+$ ,
2.  $\hat{W}_y^+(k) := \sqcup_{\{y_1 > y_2 > \dots > y_k | y_k > y\}} W_{y_1}^+ \times \mathcal{T}(y_1, y_2) \times \mathcal{T}(y_2, y_3) \times \dots \times \mathcal{T}(y_k, y)$ ,
3.  $\hat{W}_y^+ := \sqcup_{\{k=0,1,\dots, n-i(y)\}} \hat{W}_y^+(k)$ ,
4.  $\hat{i}_y^+ |_{\hat{W}_y^+(k)} := i_{y_1}^+ \cdot p_{W_{y_1}^+}$  with  $p_{W_{y_1}^+}$  the projection on  $W_{y_1}^+$ .

In order to describe  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}(x, y)$ , and  $\hat{i}_{x,y} : \hat{\mathcal{M}}(x, y) \rightarrow M$  consider first

- (a)  $\mathcal{M}(x, x) := \{x\}$ ,
- (b)  $\mathcal{M}(y_0 > y_1 > \dots > y_{k+1}) := \sqcup_{r=0,1,\dots, k} \mathcal{T}(y_0, y_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{T}(y_{r-1}, y_r) \times \mathcal{M}(y_r, y_{r+1}) \times \mathcal{T}(y_{r+1}, y_{r+2}) \times \dots \times \mathcal{T}(y_k, y_{k+1})$ ,
- (c)  $\mathcal{M}'(y_0 > y_1 > \dots > y_{k+1}) := \sqcup_{r=0,1,\dots, k+1} \mathcal{T}(y_0, y_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{T}(y_{r-1}, y_r) \times \mathcal{M}(y_r, y_r) \times \mathcal{T}(y_r, y_{r+1}) \times \dots \times \mathcal{T}(y_k, y_{k+1})$ ,

and define

•  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}(x, y)$ , and  $\hat{i}_{x,y} : \hat{\mathcal{M}}(x, y) \rightarrow M$  by

1.  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}(x, y)(0) := \mathcal{M}$
2.  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}(x, y)(k) := \begin{cases} \sqcup_{\{y_1 > \dots > y_k | x > y_1, y_k > y\}} \mathcal{M}(x > y_1 > \dots > y_k > y) \sqcup \\ \sqcup_{\{y_1 > \dots > y_k | y_0 = x > y_1, y_k > y_{k+1} = y\}} \mathcal{M}'(y_0 > y_1 > \dots > y) \end{cases}$
3.  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}(x, y) := \sqcup_{k=0,1,\dots, i(x,y)} \hat{\mathcal{M}}(x, y)(k)$
4.  $\hat{i}_{x,y}$  restricted to any component of  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}(x, y)$ , is the composition of the projection on the  $\mathcal{M}(\dots)$  followed by the injective maps  $i \dots$

Since  $X$  is an M-S vector field all  $\hat{W}_x^\pm(k)$ ,  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}(x, y)(k)$ ,  $\hat{\mathcal{T}}(x, y)(k)$  are smooth manifolds of dimension  $\dim W_x^\pm - k$ ,  $\dim \mathcal{M}(x, y) - k$ ,  $\dim \mathcal{T}(x, y) - k$  respectively. In view of the above definitions one has:



**Observation 6.1**

For any  $x, y \in \mathcal{X}, x > y$  the set  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}(x, y)$  identifies to the set of marked instantons from  $x$  to  $y$  which is the subset  $(\hat{i}_x^- \times \hat{i}_y^+)^{-1}(\Delta(M))$  of  $\hat{W}_x^- \times \hat{W}_y^+$  as described by the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \hat{W}_x^- \times \hat{W}_y^+ & \xrightarrow{\hat{i}_x^- \times \hat{i}_y^+} & M \times M \\ \uparrow \subseteq & & \uparrow \Delta \\ \hat{\mathcal{M}}(x, y) & \xrightarrow{\hat{i}_{x,y}} & M \end{array} \quad (3)$$

with  $\Delta$  the diagonal map.

**Theorem 6.2** (cf. [3],[5], [6])

1. Suppose  $X$  is an M-S vector field. Then  $\hat{W}_x^\mp, \hat{\mathcal{M}}(x, y), \hat{\mathcal{T}}(x, y)$  have a structure of orientable smooth manifolds with corners whose  $k$ -corners are  $\hat{W}_x^\mp(k), \hat{\mathcal{M}}(x, y)(k), \hat{\mathcal{T}}(x, y)(k)$  and  $\hat{i}_x^\mp$  and  $\hat{i}_{x,y}$  described above are smooth maps. Moreover all these manifolds have stably trivial tangent bundle and the maps  $\hat{i}_\dots$  restricted to any component of the  $k$ -corner are of constant rank and submersion over their image in  $M$ .
2. If  $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a Lyapunov function for the vector field  $X$ , which is either proper and bounded from below or the lift of a closed differential one form on a closed manifold (cf. section 2), then each  $\hat{W}_x^\mp, \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{x,y}, \hat{\mathcal{T}}(x, y)$  is compact.

*Proof:*

1. The proof that  $(\hat{W}_x^-, \hat{W}_x^-(k))$  and  $(\hat{\mathcal{T}}(x, y), \hat{\mathcal{T}}(x, y)(k))$  are manifold with the corners and  $\hat{i}_x^-$  and  $\hat{i}_{x,y}$  are smooth maps with the properties as stated in Theorem 6.2 was done in details in [2], [5] and [6]. The same remains true for  $(\hat{W}_x^+, \hat{W}_x^+(k))$  and  $\hat{i}_x^+$  in view of the observation that  $W_x^+$ , with respect to the vector field  $X$ , is actually  $W_x^-$  with respect to the vector field  $-X$ , which remains M-S with  $-f$  as Lyapunov function. The statements for  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}(x, y)$  and  $\hat{i}_{x,y} : \hat{\mathcal{M}}(x, y) \rightarrow M$  follow from Observation 6.1, once one verifies the transversality  $\hat{i}_x^- \times \hat{i}_y^+ \pitchfork \Delta(M)$ . Indeed, the transversality at  $p = \Delta(x) \in \Delta(M), x \in \mathcal{X}$ , follows from the transversality of  $W_x^-$  and  $W_x^+$  and at  $p \in \Delta(\mathcal{M}(y_{r-1}, y_r))$  from the transversality of  $W_{y_{r-1}}^-$  and  $W_{y_r}^+$ .

In order to establish that  $\mathcal{M}(x, y)$  and then of  $\mathcal{T}(x, y)$  have stably trivial tangent bundle one proceeds as follows. One denotes by :

1.  $\tau$  the tangent bundle of  $\mathcal{M}(x, y)$ ,
2.  $\nu^-$  the normal bundle  $\mathcal{M}(x, y)$  in  $W_x^-$ ,
3.  $\nu^+$  the normal bundle  $\mathcal{M}(x, y)$  in  $W_y^+$ .

Since the tangent bundles of  $W_x^-$  and  $W_y^+$  restricted to  $\mathcal{M}(x, y)$  are trivial of rank  $i(x)$  and  $n - i(y)$  one has:

- (i)  $\tau \oplus \nu_x^-$ , the tangent bundle of  $W_x^-$  restricted to  $\mathcal{M}(x, y)$ , is isomorphic to  $\epsilon^{i(x)}$ ,
- (ii)  $\tau \oplus \nu_y^+ \sim \epsilon^{n-i(y)}$ , the tangent bundle of  $W_y^+$  restricted to  $\mathcal{M}(x, y)$ , is isomorphic to  $\epsilon^{n-i(y)}$ ,

with  $\epsilon^k$  denoting the trivial vector bundle of rank  $k$ .

In view of transversality  $W_x^- \pitchfork W_y^+$  one has  $\epsilon^{i(x)} \oplus \epsilon^{n-i(y)} \simeq T(M)|_{\mathcal{M}(x,y)} \oplus \tau \sim \epsilon^n \oplus \tau$ <sup>10</sup>.

Items (i) and (ii) above implies  $\epsilon^{n+i(x)-i(y)} \sim \epsilon^n \oplus \tau$ , which implies that  $\tau$  is stably trivial, hence  $\mathcal{M}(x, y)$  is a stably parallelizable manifold, hence  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}(x, y)$  is a stably parallelizable manifold. The same holds for  $\mathcal{T}(x, y)$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{T}}(x, y)$ .

2. The compacity statements follow from the compacity of  $\hat{W}_x^\pm$ ,  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}(x, y)$  and of  $\hat{\mathcal{T}}(x, y)$  established in [3], [5], or [6]. ■

## 7 Orientability and orientations associated with a M-S vector field

For a rank  $k$  real vector bundle  $\xi : E \rightarrow M$  over a space  $M$  denote by  $\Lambda(\xi)$  the line bundle  $\Lambda(\xi) := \Lambda^k(E) \rightarrow M$ . Recall that one calls the bundle  $\xi$  orientable iff  $\Lambda(\xi)$  has nonzero sections (equivalently is trivial), and in this case, an equivalence class of nonzero sections<sup>11</sup> is called *orientation* and denoted by  $o$ . If the vector bundle  $\xi$  is orientable then its dual  $\xi^*$  is orientable, and an orientation  $o$  for  $\xi$  determines an orientation  $o^{-1}$  of  $\xi^*$ .

If the space  $M$  is connected, and the vector bundle  $E \rightarrow M$  is orientable an orientation  $o(p)$  for the vector space  $E_p, p \in M$  determines and is determined by an orientation  $o$  for the vector bundle  $E \rightarrow M$ . Clearly only two orientations are possible; if one,  $o$ , is represented by the section  $s$  in  $\Lambda(\xi)$  then the other one (the opposite,  $-o$ ,) is represented by the section  $-s$ . Note that  $\Lambda(\xi_1 \oplus \xi_2) = \Lambda(\xi_1) \otimes \Lambda(\xi_2)$ . Then, in consistency with this formula the orientations  $o_1$  for  $\xi_1$  and  $o_2$  for  $\xi_2$  determine the orientation  $o = o_1 \cdot o_2$  for  $\xi_1 \oplus \xi_2$ .

If  $0 \longrightarrow E_1 \xrightarrow{i} E \xrightarrow{\pi} E_2 \longrightarrow 0$  is a short exact sequence of vector bundles then a splitting  $s : E_2 \rightarrow E$  or a projection  $\pi' : E \rightarrow E_1$  provides an isomorphism of vector bundle  $E_1 \oplus E_2 \rightarrow E$  or  $E \rightarrow E_1 \oplus E_2$ . Such isomorphisms although non canonical, since they depend on  $s$  or on  $\pi'$ , ultimately provides a canonical identification of the orientation  $o_1 \otimes o_2$ , with  $o_1$  and  $o_2$  orientations for  $E_1$  and  $E_2$ , to an orientation  $o$  for  $E$ , equivalently written

$$o_1 \cdot o_2 = o, \quad o_1 = o \cdot o_2^{-1}, \quad o_2 = o_1^{-1} \cdot o.$$

In particular the orientability / orientations of two of the vector bundles  $E_1, E_2, E$  determine the orientability / orientation in the third. Note that the orientation  $o \otimes o^{-1} = o \cdot o^{-1}$ , induced by the canonical isomorphism  $\Lambda(\xi) \otimes \Lambda(\xi^*) = \epsilon$ , is the canonical orientation for the trivial line bundle ( $\epsilon : \mathbb{R} \times M \rightarrow M$ ) given by the section provided by the constant map equal to 1 on  $M$ .

With the notations above the isomorphism  $E_1 \oplus E_2 \rightarrow E_2 \oplus E_1, (x, y) \rightarrow (y, x)$ , implies  $o_1 \cdot o_2 = (-1)^{k_1 k_2} o_2 \cdot o_1$  where  $k_i = \text{rank} E_i$ .

### Proposition 7.1

Two orientations  $o_x^-$  and  $o_y^-$  for the unstable manifolds  $W_x^-$  and  $W_y^-$ ,  $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$  with  $x > y$ , induce an orientation  $o_{x,y}$  for the manifold  $\mathcal{M}(x, y)$ .

*Proof:*

For any  $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ , denote by:

- (a)  $T$ , the tangent bundle of  $M$ ,
- (b)  $\tau_x^-$  the tangent bundle of  $W_x^-$ ,

<sup>10</sup>since  $\mathcal{M}(x, y)$  is a subset of contractible space

<sup>11</sup>One says that the sections  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  are equivalent iff  $s_1 = f \cdot s_2$  for some  $f$  a positive real-valued function

- (c)  $\tau_y^+$ , the tangent bundle of  $W_y^+$   
and continue to use the same notations for the restrictions of these bundles to  $\mathcal{M}(x, y)$ ,
- (d)  $\tau$ , the tangent bundle of  $\mathcal{M}(x, y)$ ,
- (e)  $\tau_y^-$ , the tangent bundle of  $W_y^-$ ,

In view of the transversality  $W_x^- \pitchfork W_y^+$  one has: the short exact sequence of vector bundles over  $\mathcal{M}(x, y)$

$$0 \rightarrow \tau \rightarrow \tau_x^- \oplus \tau_y^+ \rightarrow T \rightarrow 0, \quad (4)$$

and the isomorphism of vector spaces  $\tau_y^+(y) \oplus \tau_y^-(y) = T(y)$ .

Consider the orientations  $o_x$  and  $o_y$  for  $\tau_x^-$  resp.  $\tau_y^-$  and choose the orientation  $o$  for  $T|_{\mathcal{M}(x,y)}$ .

Since  $W_y^+$  is orientable and connected the orientations  $o$  and  $o_y$  provide an orientation  $o^+(o, o_y)$  for  $W_y^+$  s.t.  $-o^+(o, o_y) = o^+(-o, o_y)$ . In view of (4) one obtains  $o_\tau \cdot o = o_x \cdot o_y^+(o, o_y)$  which in view of the equality above makes  $o_\tau$  independent on  $o$ . ■

### A few consequences

Suppose  $X$  is a M-S vector field and  $\mathcal{O} = \{o_x\}$  a collection of orientations. The collection  $\mathcal{O}$  induces by Proposition (7.1) the collection of orientation  $\{o_{x,y}\}$  on  $\mathcal{M}(x, y)$  and in view of the free action  $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{M}(x, y) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(x, y)$ , whose quotient space is the manifold  $\mathcal{T}(x, y)$  provides

1. an orientation on  $\mathcal{T}(x, y)$  and implicitly on each component of  $\mathcal{T}(x, y)$ , in particular
2. a sign-orientation  $\epsilon(\gamma) \in \{\pm 1\}$  for each component  $\gamma$  of  $\mathcal{T}(x, y)$  when  $i(x) - i(y) = 1$ , precisely  $\epsilon(\gamma) = +1$  if the induced orientation on  $\gamma$  is from  $x$  to  $y$  and  $\epsilon(\gamma) = -1$  otherwise.

As a straightforward consequence of Theorem (6.2), Proposition (7.1) and of Stokes's theorem one has:

### Observation 7.2

*If the manifold  $\mathcal{M}(x', y')$  is part of  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}(x, y)(1)$  then either one of the two situations hold true*

1.  $x' = x$  and  $x > \text{or} = y' > y$ , with  $i(y') = i(y) + 1$ , in which case the orientation  $o_{x,y}$  induces on  $\mathcal{M}(x, y') \times \gamma$  the orientation  $\epsilon(\gamma)o_{x,y'}$  or
2.  $y' = y$  and  $x > x' \text{or} = y$ , with  $i(x') = i(x) - 1$ , in which case the orientation  $o_{x,y}$  induces on  $\gamma \times \mathcal{M}(x', y)$  the orientation  $(-1)^{i(x,y')+\epsilon(\gamma)}o_{x',y}$ .

### Observation 7.3

*Under the hypotheses of Theorem 6.2 item 2, in the presence of the collection of orientations  $\mathcal{O}$ , the following holds true:*

1. For any  $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$  with  $i(x, y) = i(x) - i(y) = p$  and  $\omega \in \Omega^p(M)$  then the integral  $\int_{\mathcal{M}(x,y)} \omega$  is convergent and equal to  $\int_{\hat{\mathcal{M}}(x,y)} \hat{i}_{x,y}^* \omega$ .
2. If in addition  $\omega|_{\hat{W}_x^-} = d\alpha$ ,  $\alpha \in \Omega^{p-1}(\hat{W}_x^-)$ , then

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}(x,y)} \omega = \sum_{\{y' | i(y')=i(y)+1\}} \int_{\mathcal{M}(x,y')} \alpha + (-1)^{i(x,y)-1} \sum_{\{x' | i(x')=i(x)-1\}} \int_{\mathcal{M}(x,y')} \alpha.$$

## 8 Dynamics, cohomology and integration of forms

Let  $X$  be a M-S vector field on the smooth manifold  $M$  and suppose that the following two properties are satisfied.

**C1:** for any  $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$  the spaces  $\hat{W}_x^\pm$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}(x, y)$  are compact,

**C2:** for any  $x \in \mathcal{X}_r$  the set  $\{y \in \mathcal{X} \mid x > y\}$  is finite <sup>12</sup>,

Note that both C1 and C2 are satisfied in case that  $f$  is a proper Lyapunov function bounded from below or is the lift of a Lyapunov (for  $X$ ) closed one form on a closed manifold as described in section 2.

Consider :

(a) for  $x \in \mathcal{X}_r, y \in \mathcal{X}_{r-1}$  the map

$$I_r : \mathcal{X}_r \times \mathcal{X}_{r-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$$

well defined in view of C2 by

$$\mathbb{I}_r(x, y) := \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{T}(x, y)} \epsilon(\gamma),$$

(b) for any  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and differential form  $\omega \in \Omega^{i(x)}(M)$  the map

$$Int_r : \Omega^r(M) \times \mathcal{X}_r \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

well defined in view of C1 by  $Int(\omega, x) := \int_{\hat{W}_x^-} i_x^* \omega = \int_{W_x^-} \omega$ ,

(c) For any  $x \in \mathcal{X}_{r+p}, y \in \mathcal{X}_p$  and differential form  $\omega \in \Omega^r(M)$  the map

$$Ent_{r,p} : \Omega^r(M) \times \mathcal{X}_p \times \mathcal{X}_{p+r} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

well defined in view of C1 by  $Ent_{r,p}(\omega, y, x) := \int_{\hat{\mathcal{M}}(x, y)} i_{x, y}^* \omega = \int_{\mathcal{M}(x, y)} \omega$ ,

(d)  $C^r(X) := Maps(\mathcal{X}_r, \mathbb{R})$ .

The maps  $\mathbb{I}_r : \mathcal{X}_r \times \mathcal{X}_{r-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $Int_r : \Omega^r(M) \times \mathcal{X}_r \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $Ent_{r,p} : \Omega^r(M) \times \mathcal{X}_p \times \mathcal{X}_{p+r} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  induce the linear maps

1.  $\delta^r : C^r(X) \rightarrow C^{r+1}(X)$  defined by

$$\delta^r(f)(x) := \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}_r} I_{r+1}(x, y) f(y)$$

for  $x \in \mathcal{X}_{r+1}$ ,

2.  $Int_r : \Omega^r(M) \rightarrow C^r(X)$  defined by

$$Int_r(\omega)(x) = \int_{W_x^+} \omega$$

for  $x \in \mathcal{X}_r$ ,

---

<sup>12</sup>actually the compactness of all  $W_x^\pm$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  is equivalent to the compactness of all  $\mathcal{M}(x, y)$  for all  $x > y, x, y \in \mathcal{X}$  hence C2 implies C1

3.  $E_{r,p} : \Omega^r(M) \otimes C^p(X) \rightarrow C^{p+r}(X)$  defined by

$$E_{r,p}(\omega \otimes f)(x) := \sum_{\{y \in \mathcal{X}_p | x > y\}} f(y) \text{Ent}_{r,p}(\omega, y, x) = \sum_{\{y \in \mathcal{X}_p | x > y\}} f(y) \int_{\mathcal{M}(x,y)} \omega$$

for any  $x \in \mathcal{X}_{p+r}$ .

**Proposition 8.1**

Suppose  $X$  is  $M$ - $S$  vector field which satisfies C1 and C2 and  $\mathcal{O} = \{o_x\}$  is a collection of orientations. The following holds true:

1.  $\delta^{r+1} \cdot \delta_r = 0$ , equivalently, for any  $x \in \mathcal{X}_{r+1}, z \in \mathcal{X}_{r-1}$  one has  $\sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}_r} \mathbb{I}_{r+1}(x, y) \cdot \mathbb{I}_r(y, z) = 0$ ,
2.  $\delta^r \cdot \text{Int}_r(\omega) = \text{Int}_{r+1}(d\omega)$ ,
3.  $\delta^{r+p}(E_{r,p}(\omega \otimes f))(x) = \text{Ent}_{r+1,p}(d\omega, f)(x) + (-1)^r E_{r,p+1}(\omega, \delta^p f)(x)$ ,  
for  $x \in \mathcal{X}_{r+1}, \omega \in \Omega^r(M), f \in C^p(X)$ .

*Proof:*

Item 1.: If  $i(x) - i(z) = 2$  then  $\hat{\mathcal{T}}(x, z)$  is a compact one dimensional manifold with boundary, hence it is (diffeomorphic to) a finite union of compact oriented intervals, Then the boundary of  $\hat{\mathcal{T}}(x, y)$  consists of the same number of points with the sign-orientations " + 1 " and of points with the sign-orientation " - 1 ", whose total sign-cardinality is 0. This cardinality, in view of the definition of  $\delta_r$ , is actually  $\sum_{\{y \in \mathcal{X} | x > y > z\}} I_{i(x)}(x, y) I_{i(x)-1}(y, z)$ , hence = 0.

In order to check items 2. and 3. recall from Theorem (6.2) that the only components of  $\hat{W}_x^-(1)$  whose image by  $\hat{i}_x$  have dimension  $i(x) - 1$  are  $\mathcal{T}(x, y) \times \mathcal{W}_y^-$  for  $x > y$  and  $i(y) = i(x) - 1$  and

the only components of  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}(x, y)(1)$  whose image by  $\hat{i}_{x,y}$  have dimension  $i(x, y) - 1$  are  $\mathcal{T}(x, x') \times \mathcal{M}(x', y)$  for  $x > x' > y$  with  $i(x') = i(x) - 1$  and  $\mathcal{M}(x, y') \times \mathcal{T}(y', y)$  for  $x > y' > y$  with  $i(y') = i(y) + 1$ . In view of Stokes's theorem and of Observations 7.2 and 7.3 one has the following:

$$\int_{W_x^-} d\omega = \sum_{\{y | i(y) = i(x) - 1\}} I(x, y) \int_{W_y^-} \omega \tag{5}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}(x,y)} d\omega = \sum_{\{x' | i(x') = i(x) - 1\}} I_{i(x)}(x, x') \int_{\mathcal{M}(x',y)} \omega + \sum_{\{y' | i(y') = i(y) + 1\}} (-1)^{i(x,y)-1} I_{i(y)}(y, y') \int_{\mathcal{M}(x,y')} \omega \tag{6}$$

Item 2. follows immediately from (5) and item 3. form (6). The verification of item 3. is eased by the following intermediate calculations:

(a)

$$\delta(E_{r,p}(\omega, f))(x) = \sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}_{r+p}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}_p} f(y) \mathbb{I}(x, x') \int_{\mathcal{M}(x',y)} \omega, \tag{7}$$

(b)

$$E_{r+1,p}(d\omega, f)(x) = \begin{cases} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}_p} \sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}_{r+p}} f(y) I(x, x') \int_{\mathcal{M}(x',y)} \omega + \\ (-1)^{r+1} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}_p} \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{X}_{p+1}} f(y) I(y', y) \int_{\mathcal{M}(x,y')} \omega \end{cases}, \tag{8}$$

(c)

$$\begin{aligned}
(-1)^r E_{r,p+1}(\omega, \delta f)(x) &= (-1)^r \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{X}_{p+1}} \delta f(y') \int_{\mathcal{M}(x,y')} \omega = \\
&= (-1)^r \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{X}_{p+1}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}_p} I(y', y) f(y) \int_{\mathcal{M}(x,y')} \omega.
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Clearly (7), (8) and (9) imply (6). ■

For three cochain complexes  $\mathcal{C}_i^* = (\mathcal{C}_i^*, d_i^*)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , a morphism of cochain complexes  $\Lambda : \mathcal{C}_1^* \otimes \mathcal{C}_2^* \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_3^*$  is provided by the linear maps  $\Lambda_{p,q} : \mathcal{C}_1^p \otimes \mathcal{C}_2^q \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_3^{p+q}$  s.t.

$$d_3(\Lambda_{p,q}(f \otimes g)) = \Lambda_{p+1,q}(d_1 f \otimes g) + (-1)^p \Lambda_{p,q+1}(f \otimes d_2 f)$$

which induces, by passing to cohomology, the linear maps  $\Lambda_{r,p} : H^r(\mathcal{C}_1) \otimes H^p(\mathcal{C}_2) \rightarrow H^{r+p}(\mathcal{C}_3)$ .

We apply this to the cochain complexes  $\mathcal{C}_1^* = (\Omega^*(M), d^*)$ , the de-Rham complex of  $M$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_2^*$  and  $\mathcal{C}_3^*$  the cochain complex  $(C^*(X), \delta^*)$  and derive the linear maps  $E_{p,q} : H_{DR}^p(M) \otimes H_X^q(M) \rightarrow H_X^{p+q}(M)$ , where  $H_{DR}^*(M)$  denotes the de-Rham cohomology,  $H_X^*(M)$  the cohomology of the cochain complex  $(C^*(X), \delta^*)$ . Continue to denote by  $Int_q : H_{DR}^q(M) \rightarrow H_X^q(M)$  the linear map induced by  $Int_q$ .

**Theorem 8.2** (*elementary Morse-theory*)

If  $X$  is a  $M$ - $S$  vector field on a closed manifold which has Lyapunov function and  $\mathcal{O}$  a collection of orientations <sup>13</sup> then the linear maps  $Int_q : \Omega^q(M) \rightarrow C^q(X)$  induce the linear isomorphisms  $Int_q : H_{DR}^q(M) \rightarrow H_X^q(M)$ .

For details cf. [5].

**Theorem 8.3** *Under the same hypotheses as in Theorem 8.2, the possibly non-commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\Omega^r(M) \otimes C^q(X) & \xrightarrow{Ent_{r,q}} & C^{r+q}(X) \\
id \otimes Int_q \uparrow & & \uparrow Int_{r+q} \\
\Omega^r(M) \otimes \Omega^q(M) & \xrightarrow{\wedge^{r,q}} & \Omega^{r+q}(M)
\end{array}$$

induces, by passing to cohomology, the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
H_{DR}^r(M) \otimes H_X^q(M) & \xrightarrow{E_{r,q}} & H_M^{r+q}(X) \\
id \otimes Int_q \uparrow & & \uparrow Int_{r+q} \\
H_{DR}^r(M) \otimes H_{DR}^q(M) & \xrightarrow{\wedge^{r,q}} & H_{DR}^{r+q}(M)
\end{array}$$

with  $\wedge$  the product induced from the wedge product of forms, equivalently the analytic version of "cup-product".

*Proof:* In view of Proposition (8.1) all arrows in both diagrams are well defined with  $Int_r : H_{DR}^r(M) \rightarrow H_X^r(M)$  isomorphism. In order to conclude that the second diagram is commutative it suffices to check that

<sup>13</sup>considerably weaker hypotheses like proper Lyapunov function bounded from below suffice

for any two cohomology classes  $\xi_1 \in H_{DR}^r(M)$ , and  $\xi_2 \in H_{DR}^p(M)$  one can choose representatives, closed forms  $\omega_1 \in \Omega^r(M)$  and  $\omega_2 \in \Omega^p(M)$ , such that

$$\int_{W_x^-} \omega_1 \wedge \omega_2 = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{C}_r | x > y} \int_{W_y^-} \omega_1 \cdot \int_{\mathcal{M}(x,y)} \omega_2 \quad (10)$$

holds true. This is indeed the case with any such representative  $\omega_1$  vanishing in some neighborhood of  $\cup_{y \in \mathcal{X} < \leq r} W_y^-$  and  $\omega_2$  vanishing in some neighborhood of  $\{x\}$  and of  $\cup_{x,y | (i(x)-i(y) < p)} \mathcal{M}(x,y)$  choice always possible in view of the fact that  $\cup_{\{y \in \mathcal{X} | i(y) < r\}} W_y^-$  is a compact ANR of dimension  $\leq r - 1$  and  $\cup_{\{x,y | x > y, i(x,y) < p\}} \mathcal{M}(x,y)$ , is a compact ANR of dimension  $\leq p - 1$ . The verification is sketched in the Appendix and with more details in an updated version of [3] soon to be posted on arXiv. ■

## 9 Proof of Theorem (4.1)

Part 1.

(a): Since  $f$  is strictly decreasing on each nontrivial trajectory there are no closed trajectories, Since the set  $\mathcal{X}$  is a discrete set of points in a closed manifold  $M$  it is finite. Since  $\mathcal{X}$  is finite and each manifold with corners  $\hat{\mathcal{T}}(x,y)$  is compact then  $\pi_0(\mathcal{T}) = \pi_0(\hat{\mathcal{T}})$  is a finite set.

(b): holds true since the cochain complex  $(C^*(X), \delta_*)$  calculates the cohomology of  $M$  by Theorem (8.2).

(c): observe that nontrivial cup product with  $H^r(M)$  implies that at least for a pair of rest points  $x > y$  with  $i(x,y) = r$   $\int_{\mathcal{M}(x,y)} \omega \neq 0$ , hence  $\mathcal{T}(x,y) \neq \emptyset$  hence  $\mathcal{T}(r) \neq \emptyset$ .

Part 2.

One uses essentially the same arguments applied to the lift  $\tilde{f} : \tilde{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of the closed one form  $\omega \in \Omega^1(M)$ ,  $d\omega = 0$  on the closed manifold  $M$  to the principal covering  $\tilde{M} \rightarrow M$  discussed in section 2. The function  $\tilde{f}$  is Lyapunov for the vector field  $\tilde{X}$ , the lift of  $X$  on  $\tilde{M}$ . Details will be provided elsewhere.

## 10 Appendix

Suppose  $X$  is a M-S vector field which satisfies C1, C2 in section 8 and  $\mathcal{O}$  is a collection of orientations. Then the following holds true.

**Proposition 10.1** *If  $\omega_1$  and  $\omega_2$  are two closed forms of rank  $r$  and  $p$ , the first vanishing on a neighborhood of  $\sqcup_{\{y \in \mathcal{X} | i(y) < r\}} W_y^-$  the second on a neighborhood of  $\sqcup_{\{x,y \in \mathcal{X} | x > y, i(x,y) < p\}} \mathcal{M}(x,y)$ , then equality (10) holds true.*

First one specifies some notations.

For a space  $X$  let

- $CX = X \times [0, 1] / X \times \{1\}$  (with the space  $X \times \{1\}$  collapsed to a point  $v$ ),
- $p_X : CX \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , the map defined by  $p(x, t) = t$ , hence  $v = p^{-1}(1)$ ,
- $C^1X := p^{-1}([0, 1)) = X \times [0, 1) = CX \setminus v$ ,
- $\overset{\circ}{C}X := CX \setminus \{(X \times 0) \sqcup v\} = X \times (0, 1)$ .




Figure 2:

Clearly  $C(X) \supset C^1(X) \supset \mathring{C}(X)$ .

$CX$  is referred to as the *cone* of  $X$ ,  $v$  as the vertex of the cone and the space  $X$  as the base of the cone.

If  $X$  is a smooth manifold then  $\mathring{C}(X)$  is a smooth manifold, and  $C^1(X)$  is a smooth manifold with boundary, whose boundary is the base of the cone, and map  $p_X : CX^1 \rightarrow [0, 1)$  is smooth with any  $\epsilon \in [0, 1)$  a regular value.

The unit disc  $D^n$  in the Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , is the cone of the unit sphere  $S^{n-1}$ ,  $D^n = C(S^{n-1})$ , with the vertex  $v = 0 \in D^n$  and  $p_S(u) = 1 - \|u\|$ ,  $u \in D^n$ .

For the manifold  $M$  equipped with the vector field  $X$  as above and any  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  the validity of the Poincaré conjecture implies that there exists *rounding-corner* homeomorphisms (cf. section 5),  $h_x : (\hat{W}_x^-, \partial\hat{W}_x^-) \rightarrow (D^{i(x)}, S^{i(x)-1})$ . Such homeomorphism induces a *conic structure* for  $\hat{W}_x^-$ , precisely a homeomorphism

$$\theta_x : C(\partial\hat{W}_x^-) \rightarrow \hat{W}_x^-$$

such that the restriction to any  $\hat{W}_x^-(k)$   $h_x \cdot \theta_x^{-1}$  is a diffeomorphism onto its image. One can choose  $h_x$  s.t.

$$h_x(\mathring{C}(y \times \mathcal{T}(x, y))) = \mathcal{M}(x, y)$$

Recall from Theorem (6.2) that

$$\partial\hat{W}_x^- = \sqcup_{k \geq 1} \hat{W}_x^-(k),$$

$$\hat{W}_x^-(1) = \sqcup_{y|x>y} W_y^- \times \mathcal{T}(x, y),$$

$$\mathcal{M}(x, y) = \mathcal{T}(x, y) \times (0, 1).$$

Define define, see Figure 2 below,

- $\boxed{\hat{W}_{x,y} := \theta_x(C(W_y^- \times \mathcal{T}(x, y)))} \subset \hat{W}_x^-$ ,
- $\boxed{\hat{W}_{x,y}^1 := \theta_x(C^1(W_y^- \times \mathcal{T}(x, y)))} = \theta_x(W_y^- \times \mathcal{T}(x, y) \times [0, 1)) \subset \text{open subset of } \hat{W}_x^- \setminus x$ , which is a smooth manifold with boundary, whose boundary is diffeomorphic to  $W_y^- \times \mathcal{T}(x, y)$ ,
- $\boxed{W_{x,y} := \theta_x(\mathring{C}(W_y^- \times \mathcal{T}(x, y)))} = \theta_x(W_y^- \times \mathcal{T}(x, y) \times (0, 1))$  diffeomorphic to  $W_y^- \times \mathcal{M}(x, y) \subset W_x^-$  which is an open subset of  $W_x^-$  see Figure 2. below.

Since the sets  $\hat{W}_{x,y}^-$  are disjoint, a collection of differential closed forms with compact support  $\omega_y \in \Omega^k(\hat{W}_{x,y}^1)$  define a differential closed form with compact support on  $\hat{W}_x^-$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega^k(\hat{W}_x^-)$ .



For a form  $\omega \in \Omega^k(M)$  and  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  with  $i(x) = k$ , let  $\underline{\omega} := i_x^*(\omega) \in \Omega^k(\hat{W}_x^-)$  and observe that  $\int_{W_x^-} \omega$  is convergent and equal to  $\int_{\hat{W}_x^-} \underline{\omega}$ . Observe also that if  $\underline{\omega} \in \Omega^k(\hat{W}_x^-)$  is a closed form which when restricted to  $\partial\hat{W}_x^-$  vanishes then  $\int_{\hat{W}_x^-} \underline{\omega} = 0$ . This because  $\hat{W}_x^-$  is contractible hence  $\underline{\omega}$  is exact and Stokes Theorem applies; in particular if  $\underline{\omega}_i \in \Omega^k(\hat{W}_x^-)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  are two such closed forms whose restrictions to  $\partial\hat{W}_x^-$  agree then  $\int_{\hat{W}_x^-} \underline{\omega}_1 = \int_{\hat{W}_x^-} \underline{\omega}_2$ .

*Proof of Proposition (10.1):*

Define

$$\underline{\omega}_1 := \hat{i}_x^*(\omega_1) \in \Omega^r(\hat{W}_x^-), \quad \underline{\omega}_2 := \hat{i}_x^*(\omega_2) \in \Omega^p(\hat{W}_x^-)$$

and denote by

$$\underline{\omega}_{1,y} := \underline{\omega}_1|_{\hat{W}_{x,y}^-}, \quad \underline{\omega}_{2,y} := \underline{\omega}_2|_{\hat{W}_{x,y}^-},$$

their restrictions to  $\hat{W}_{x,y}^1$ .

Let  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  be the projection of  $W_y^- \times (\mathcal{T}(x, y) \times [0, 1])$  on the first and second factor and recall from section 3 the canonical identification of  $\mathcal{M}(x, y)$  to the product  $\mathcal{T}(x, y) \times (0, 1)$ . Define

$$\underline{\omega}'_{1,y} := \pi_1^*(\underline{\omega}_{1,y}|_{\theta_x(W_y^- \times \mathcal{T}(x,y) \times 0)}) = \pi_1^*(\omega_1|_{W_y^-})$$

and

$$\underline{\omega}'_{2,y} := \pi_2^*(\underline{\omega}_{2,y}|_{\theta_x(y \times \mathcal{T}(x,y) \times [0,1])})$$

These definitions simply mean that for any  $u \in W_y^-$ ,  $\gamma \in \mathcal{T}(x, y)$ ,  $t \in [0, 1)$  one has

$$\underline{\omega}'_{1,y}(\theta_x(u, \gamma, t)) = \omega_1(u)$$

and

$$\underline{\omega}'_{2,y}(\theta_x(y, \gamma, t)) = \begin{cases} \omega_2(p), & \text{if } t \neq 0 \\ \omega_2(y), & \text{if } t = 0 \end{cases},$$

with  $p = (\gamma, t)$  the point on the instanton  $\gamma$  corresponding to  $t$  by the identification of  $\mathcal{M}(x, y)$  with  $\mathcal{T}(x, y) \times (0, 1)$ . when  $t \neq 0$

One observes first that  $\underline{\omega}'_{1,y} \wedge \underline{\omega}'_{2,y}$  is an  $(r+p)$ -form with compact support in  $W_{x,y}^1$ , hence the collection for all  $y$  with  $x > y$  defines a closed form  $\underline{\omega}' = (\underline{\omega}_1 \wedge \underline{\omega}_2)'$  on  $\hat{W}_x^-$  which agrees with  $\underline{\omega}_1 \wedge \underline{\omega}_2$  on  $\partial\hat{W}_x^-$ , hence as pointed out above

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{W_x^-} \omega_1 \wedge \omega_2 &= \int_{\hat{W}_x^-} \underline{\omega}_1 \wedge \underline{\omega}_2 = \int_{\hat{W}_x^-} \underline{\omega}' = \sum_{y|x>y} \int_{\hat{W}_{x,y} \setminus x} \underline{\omega}'_{y,1} \wedge \underline{\omega}'_{y,2} \\ &= \sum_{y|x>y} \int_{\hat{W}_{x,y} \setminus x} \underline{\omega}'_{y,1} \wedge \underline{\omega}'_{y,2} = \sum_{y|x>y} \int_{W_y^- \times \mathcal{M}(x,y)} \underline{\omega}'_{y,1} \wedge \underline{\omega}'_{y,2} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Since  $\underline{\omega}'_{y,1}$  and  $\underline{\omega}'_{y,2}$  have separated variables one has

$$\int_{W_y^- \times \mathcal{M}(x,y)} \underline{\omega}'_{y,1} \wedge \underline{\omega}'_{y,2} = \int_{W_y^-} \omega_1 \cdot \int_{\mathcal{M}(x,y)} \omega_2 \quad (12)$$

Combining (11) and (12) one obtains (10).

## References

- [1] D.M.Austin . P.J.Braam *Morse-Bott theory and equivariant cohomology* Floer Memorial Volume, 123-183, Progr. Math., 133 Birkhäuser, Basel,1995.
- [2] Dan Burghilea, *Alternative to Morse Novikov. Theory for a closed one form (I)*, *European Journal of Mathematics*, Volume 6, issue 3 September 2020 pp 713-730
- [3] Dan Burghilea, *Smooth Structure on the Moduli Space of Instantons of a Generic Vector Field* Geometry, Exploratory Workshop on differential geometry and its Applications, Iasi, Romania, September 2-4, 2009 arXiv
- [4] Burghilea, D., Haller, S.*Dynamics, Laplace transform and spectral geometry J. Topol. 1, 2008. pp 115?151*
- [5] D.Burghilea, L.Friedlander, Th Kappeler *On the Space of Trajectories of a Generic Vector Field* Analele Universitatii de Vest din Timisoara, seria matematica -informatica, vol.XLVIII, Fasc.1, 2, 2010. pp 45- 126.
- [6] D.Burghilea, S.Haller*On the topology and analysis of a closed one form.I, (Novikov theory revisited)* Monographie d L'Enseignement Mathematique 38 (2001) 133-175.
- [7] Anatole Katok , Boris Hasselblat *Introduction to the modern theory of Dynamical Systems*, Cambridge University Press, 1993
- [8] M.Farber, *Topology of closed one-forms* Mathematical Surveys an Monographs , Vol 108, American mathematical Society, Providence R.I., 2004
- [9] M.C. Irwin, *Smooth Dynamical Systems*, Academic Press,1980
- [10] M.M. Peixoto *On an approximation Theorem of Kupka and Smale* Journal of Differential equations 3, 1966, 214-227