

# Coassociative submanifolds in Joyce's generalised Kummer constructions

Dominik Gutwein

May 10, 2023

## Abstract

This article constructs coassociative submanifolds in  $G_2$ -manifolds arising from Joyce's generalised Kummer construction. The novelty compared to previous constructions is that these submanifolds all lie within the critical region of the  $G_2$ -manifold in which the metric degenerates. This forces the volume of the coassociatives to shrink to zero when the orbifold-limit is approached.

## 1. Introduction

Associative and Coassociative submanifolds are the natural subobjects in 7-dimensional  $G_2$ -manifolds. Besides having minimal volume among all submanifolds realising a fixed homology class (and therefore being minimal, cf. [HL82, Sections 2.4 and 4.1.A-B]), they play a prominent role in the extensively studied gauge theory on  $G_2$ -manifolds (see for example [Tia00] and [DS11]). Furthermore, Halverson and Morrison proposed that associative and coassociative submanifolds might play a role in characterising the ideal boundary of the cone consisting of the cohomology classes of torsion-free  $G_2$ -structures on a compact 7-manifold. More precisely, assume that  $Y$  is a simply-connected, compact, and oriented 7-manifold that admits torsion-free  $G_2$ -structures. In analogy to the Kähler cone of a Calabi–Yau 3-fold, Halverson and Morrison [HM15, Section 3] (see also the formulation in [DPW22, Introduction]) proposed that the Lagrangian<sup>1</sup> cone

$$\mathcal{C}(Y) := \{([\phi], [*_\phi\phi]) \in H^3(Y) \oplus H^4(Y) \mid \phi \text{ is a torsion-free } G_2\text{-structure} \\ \text{that induces the given orientation}\}$$

might be fully characterised by the following inequalities:<sup>2</sup>

1. A topological condition:  $\int_Y \alpha \wedge \alpha \wedge \phi < 0$  for every nonzero  $[\alpha] \in H^2(Y)$ .

<sup>1</sup>see [Joy96b, Lemma 1.1.3] for a proof that  $\mathcal{C}(Y)$  is indeed Lagrangian.

<sup>2</sup>Ignoring for the moment the issue that the notions of  $G_2$ -instanton, associative-, and coassociative submanifold itself depends on  $\phi$ . Furthermore, there is no obvious cohomological relation between the classes  $[\phi] \in H^3(Y)$  and  $[*_\phi\phi] \in H^4(Y)$ .

2. A characteristic class condition:  $\int_Y p_1(E) \wedge \phi < 0$  for any vector bundle  $E$  over  $Y$  admitting a non-flat  $G_2$ -instanton.
3. Two calibrated submanifold conditions:
  - $\int_P \phi > 0$  for any associative submanifold  $P$ .
  - $\int_M * \phi > 0$  for any coassociative submanifold  $M$ .

As a first step towards Point 3, Dwivedi, Platt, and Walpuski constructed in [DPW22] associative submanifolds in degenerating families of  $G_2$ -manifolds arising from Joyce’s generalised Kummer construction [Joy96a, Joy96b]. As the family of  $G_2$ -manifolds approaches its orbifold-limit, the volume of these associatives shrinks to zero. (This is equivalent to  $\int_P \phi_t \rightarrow 0$  where  $P$  denotes the mentioned associative and  $\phi_t$  corresponds to the degenerating path of  $G_2$ -structures.) The purpose of the article at hand is to extend their construction to coassociative submanifolds. We hereby proceed as follows:

In Section 2 we review the necessary background on the generalised Kummer construction and asymptotically locally Euclidean spaces. Section 3 is devoted to the analysis of our construction. In Theorem 3.8 we prove a perturbation result for coassociative submanifolds whose spirit is well-known from gluing constructions in gauge theory. It roughly states that whenever two closed  $G_2$ -structures  $\phi$  and  $\phi_0$  on a 7-manifold  $Y$  are ‘close’ (in a quantified sense) to one another, then a  $\phi_0$ -coassociative submanifold can be perturbed to a  $\phi$ -coassociative. The main contribution of this article is then to show (see Proposition 4.2) that this theorem can be applied to a simple model (described in Example 3.2) sitting inside a generalised Kummer construction. Subsequently, we therefore find in Section 4 examples of coassociative submanifolds in various  $G_2$ -manifolds constructed in [Joy96b] and [Rei17].

There already exists a vast literature on the construction of coassociative submanifolds (see [Joy07, Chapter 12] and [Lot20, Section 6] for an overview). Here we only mention that Joyce [Joy96b, Section 4.2] constructed coassociative submanifolds inside his generalised Kummer constructions as fixed-point sets of anti  $G_2$ -involutions. At least one part of their support lies outside the critical region of the ambient manifold in which the orbifold singularities develop. In contrast, the coassociatives in the article at hand are all constructed to lie completely within this region. This is ultimately the reason why their volume shrinks to zero.

## Acknowledgments

I am grateful to my PhD-supervisor Thomas Walpuski for suggesting this problem to me. Many ideas in this article arose from countless meetings we had which are invaluable to me. Furthermore, I am indebted to Gorapada Bera and Viktor Majewski for their constructive tips, discussions, and proofreading. Ultimately, I would like to thank Dominic Joyce and Daniel Platt for answering my questions on [Joy99] and [Pla20], respectively. This material is based upon work supported by the Simons Collaboration “Special Holonomy in Geometry, Analysis, and Physics”.

## 2. Background

### 2.1. Joyce's generalised Kummer construction

The generalised Kummer construction, as developed (and extended) by Joyce in [Joy96a, Joy96b, Joy00], produces compact manifolds with holonomy contained in  $G_2$  as desingularisations of certain  $G_2$ -orbifolds. This section follows the presentation in [DPW22] very closely. The following class of examples serve as models for the singularities considered in this article:

**Example 2.1.** Let  $(X, \underline{\omega})$  be a hyperkähler 4-orbifold with hyperkähler structure  $\underline{\omega} \in \Omega^2(X, \text{Im } \mathbb{H}^*)$ . Denote by  $\text{Vol} \in \Omega^3(\text{Im } \mathbb{H})$  and  $\underline{\sigma} \in \Omega^1(\text{Im } \mathbb{H}, \text{Im } \mathbb{H})$  the volume form and the canonical isomorphism  $T\text{Im } \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \text{Im } \mathbb{H} \times \text{Im } \mathbb{H}$ , respectively. In the following we mean by  $\langle \underline{\sigma} \wedge \underline{\omega} \rangle$  the 3-form on  $\text{Im } \mathbb{H} \times X$  obtained by wedging and pairing  $\text{Im } \mathbb{H} \otimes \text{Im } \mathbb{H}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

1. The product  $\text{Im } \mathbb{H} \times X$  carries a torsion-free  $G_2$ -structure defined by

$$\phi := \text{Vol} - \langle \underline{\sigma} \wedge \underline{\omega} \rangle \in \Omega^3(\text{Im } \mathbb{H} \times X). \quad (2.1)$$

2. Assume there is a group action  $\rho: G \rightarrow \text{Isom}(X)$  by  $G < \text{SO}(\text{Im } \mathbb{H}) \ltimes \text{Im } \mathbb{H}$  that preserves the hyperkähler structure in the sense that for any  $(R, v) \in G$

$$(\rho(R, v)^* \otimes R^*)\underline{\omega} = \underline{\omega}. \quad (2.2)$$

The 3-form  $\phi$  is invariant under the product action on  $\text{Im } \mathbb{H} \times X$  and descends to a torsion-free  $G_2$ -structure on the quotient  $Y := (\text{Im } \mathbb{H} \times X)/G$ . We denote the corresponding 3-form on  $Y$  by  $\phi$  as well. Note that whenever  $G$  is Bieberbach (i.e. discrete, cocompact, and torsion-free) then the action is free and taking the quotient does not introduce additional singularities in  $Y$ .

Let now  $(Y_0, \phi_0)$  be a compact and flat  $G_2$ -orbifold such that its singularities are locally modelled on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{H}/\Gamma$  for a finite group  $\Gamma < \text{Sp}(1)$ . More precisely, we demand:

**Assumption 2.2.** Denote by  $\mathcal{S}$  the set of connected components of the singular set of  $Y_0$ . We assume that for every  $S \in \mathcal{S}$  there exist

1. A finite subgroup  $\Gamma_S < \text{Sp}(1)$ , a Bieberbach group  $G_S < \text{SO}(\text{Im } \mathbb{H}) \ltimes \text{Im } \mathbb{H}$ , and a group action  $\rho: G_S \rightarrow N_{\text{SO}(\mathbb{H})}(\Gamma_S) \subset \text{Isom}(\mathbb{H}/\Gamma_S)$ . Denote by

$$(Y_S := (\text{Im } \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}/\Gamma_S)/G_S, \phi_S)$$

the corresponding  $G_2$ -orbifold from Example 2.1.

2. An open set

$$U_S := (\text{Im } \mathbb{H} \times B_{2R_S}(0)/\Gamma_S)/G_S \subset Y_S$$

for  $R_S > 0$  and an open embedding  $J_S: U_S \rightarrow Y_0$  with  $S \subset J_S(U_S)$  and  $J_S^*\phi_0 = \phi_S$ . The  $R_S$  are chosen such that  $J_{S_1}(U_{S_1}) \cap J_{S_2}(U_{S_2}) = \emptyset$  for any two  $S_1 \neq S_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ .

*Remark 2.3.* All (non-trivial) finite subgroups  $\Gamma < \mathrm{Sp}(1)$  were classified by Klein [Kle19]. These are isomorphic to:

( $A_k$ ) The cyclic group  $C_{k+1}$  for  $k \geq 1$

( $D_k$ ) The dicyclic group  $\mathrm{Dic}_{k-2}$  for  $k \geq 3$

( $E_6$ ) The binary tetrahedral group  $2T$

( $E_7$ ) The binary octahedral group  $2O$

( $E_8$ ) The binary icosahedral group  $2I$

(See also [Rei17, Section 2] for a description on how these groups lie inside  $\mathrm{Sp}(1)$ .)

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $(Y_0, \phi_0)$  be a flat  $G_2$ -orbifold satisfying Assumption 2.2. A set of resolution data consists for every  $S \in \mathcal{S}$  of the following:

1. An asymptotically locally euclidean (ALE) hyperkähler manifold asymptotic to  $\mathbb{H}/\Gamma_S$ . That is, a hyperkähler 4-manifold  $(\hat{X}_S, \hat{\omega}_S)$  together with a diffeomorphism  $\tau_S: \hat{X}_S \setminus \hat{K}_S \rightarrow (\mathbb{H} \setminus B_{R_S}(0))/\Gamma_S$  outside a compact set  $\hat{K}_S \subset \hat{X}_S$  that satisfies

$$|\nabla^k(\tau_{S*}\hat{\omega}_S - \underline{\omega})| = \mathcal{O}(r^{-4-k}).$$

The norm and covariant derivatives are hereby taken with respect to the flat metric on  $(\mathbb{H} \setminus \{0\})/\Gamma_S$ .

2. A group action  $\rho_S: G_S \rightarrow \mathrm{Isom}(\hat{X}_S)$  which leaves  $\hat{K}_S$  and  $\hat{\omega}_S$  invariant (in the sense of (2.2)) and makes  $\tau_S$  equivariant.

For a given orbifold  $Y_0$ , a set of resolution data, and a positive parameter  $t > 0$  we define the following sets:

$$V := \bigsqcup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} V_S \quad \text{for} \quad V_S := (\mathrm{Im} \mathbb{H} \times B_{R_S}(0)/\Gamma_S)/G_S \subset (\mathrm{Im} \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}/\Gamma_S)/G_S$$

$$U := \bigsqcup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} U_S \quad \text{for} \quad U_S := (\mathrm{Im} \mathbb{H} \times B_{2R_S}(0)/\Gamma_S)/G_S \subset (\mathrm{Im} \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}/\Gamma_S)/G_S$$

$$\hat{V} := \bigsqcup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \hat{V}_S \quad \text{for} \quad \hat{V}_S := (\mathrm{Im} \mathbb{H} \times \hat{K}_S)/G_S \subset (\mathrm{Im} \mathbb{H} \times \hat{X}_S)/G_S$$

$$\hat{U}_t := \bigsqcup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \hat{U}_S^t \quad \text{for} \quad \hat{U}_S^t := (\mathrm{Im} \mathbb{H} \times (t\tau_S)^{-1}(B_{2R_S}(0)/\Gamma_S))/G_S \subset (\mathrm{Im} \mathbb{H} \times \hat{X}_S)/G_S$$

Denote by  $\mathbf{J}: U \rightarrow Y_0$  and  $t\tau: \hat{U}_t \rightarrow U$  the maps induced by all  $\{\mathbf{J}_S\}_{S \in \mathcal{S}}$  and  $\{t\tau_S\}_{S \in \mathcal{S}}$ , respectively.

**Definition 2.5** ([Joy96b, proof of Theorem 2.2.1]). Given a flat  $G_2$ -orbifold  $(Y_0, \phi_0)$  and a set of resolution data, Joyce defines a 1-parameter family of smooth manifolds by

$$\hat{Y}_t := (Y_0 \setminus \mathbf{J}(V)) \cup (\hat{U}_t \cup \hat{V}) / \sim$$

where  $\hat{U}_t \ni x \sim \mathbf{J}(t\tau(x)) \in \mathbf{J}(U \setminus V)$ .

Furthermore, Joyce equips each  $\hat{Y}_t$  with a closed  $G_2$ -structure  $\tilde{\phi}_t$  that has the following property: On any  $\hat{V}_S \subset \hat{Y}_t$ ,  $\tilde{\phi}_t$  agrees with the Model Structure (2.1) associated to the (rescaled) hyperkähler structure  $t^2\hat{\omega}_S$  on  $\hat{K}_S$ .

*Remark 2.6.* Instead of working with  $\tilde{\phi}_t$  we follow [DPW22] and work with the rescaled  $G_2$ -structure  $t^{-3}\tilde{\phi}_t$ .

The following existence theorem was first proven by Joyce in [Joy96a] and later re-proven with improved estimates by Platt in [Pla20]. The following formulation is taken from [DPW22, Theorem 2.19].

**Theorem 2.7** ([Pla20, Theorem 4.58]). *Let  $(Y_0, \phi_0)$  be a compact and flat  $G_2$ -orbifold satisfying Assumption 2.2 and let  $\mathcal{R}$  be a set of resolution data. Furthermore, let  $\alpha \in (0, 1/16)$  be a chosen Hölder exponent. Then there are  $T_0 = T_0(\mathcal{R})$  and  $c = c(\mathcal{R}, \alpha) > 0$  such that for any  $t \in (0, T_0)$  there exists a torsion-free  $G_2$ -structure  $\phi_t$  on  $\hat{Y}_t$  with*

$$\|t^{-3}(\phi_t - \tilde{\phi}_t)\|_{C^{1,\alpha}} < ct^{5/2}.$$

The  $C^{1,\alpha}$ -norm above is taken with respect to the metric  $t^{-2}\tilde{g}_t$  (induced by  $t^{-3}\tilde{\phi}_t$ ).

## 2.2. Asymptotically locally euclidean 4-manifolds

Recall from Definition 2.4 that a resolution of a flat  $G_2$ -orbifold requires the choice of an ALE space together with a lift of the action of the Bieberbach group. In the following section we review how these can be constructed. All these spaces contain holomorphic spheres which are the main ingredient in our construction of coassociative submanifolds later in this article.

Note that Section 2.2.2 is only relevant for Example 4.9 and may be skipped at the reader's preference.

### 2.2.1. The Gibbons–Hawking Ansatz

For  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  let  $C_N < \mathrm{Sp}(1)$  be the cyclic subgroup generated by right-multiplication with  $e^{2\pi i/N}$ . Concrete models of ALE spaces asymptotic to  $\mathbb{H}/C_N$  were first constructed for  $N = 2$  by Eguchi and Hanson [EH78] and then by Gibbons and Hawking [GH78] for general  $N$ . A detailed treatment of the following material can be found in [Wal, Section 59] (see also [DPW22, Remark 2.12] and [GRG97, Section 3.5]):

1. For any

$$\zeta \in \Delta := \{[\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_N] \in (\mathrm{Im} \mathbb{H})^N / S_N \mid \zeta_1 + \dots + \zeta_N = 0\}$$

define  $Z_\zeta := \{\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_N\} \subset \mathrm{Im} \mathbb{H}$ ,  $B_\zeta := \mathrm{Im} \mathbb{H} \setminus Z_\zeta$ , and  $f_\zeta \in C^\infty(B_\zeta)$  by

$$f_\zeta(q) := \sum_{a=1}^N \frac{1}{2|q - \zeta_a|}.$$

The function  $f_\zeta$  is a sum of Newtonian kernels and therefore harmonic. One can furthermore check that the cohomology class  $[\ast_3 df_\zeta]$  lies inside the image of the canonical inclusion  $H^2(B_\zeta, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) \hookrightarrow H^2(B_\zeta, \mathbb{R})$ . This implies that there exists a (up to isomorphism) unique principal  $U(1)$ -bundle  $\pi_\zeta: X_\zeta^\circ \rightarrow B_\zeta$  together with a connection 1-form  $i\theta \in \Omega^1(X_\zeta^\circ, i\mathbb{R})$  that satisfies  $d\theta = \pi_\zeta^\ast(\ast_3 df_\zeta)$ .

For  $\zeta_i \in \zeta$  denote by  $N_{\zeta_i}$  the number of entries of  $\zeta$  equal to  $\zeta_i$ . Around any sphere  $S^2 \subset B_\zeta$  whose inner ball only contains  $\zeta_i \in Z_\zeta$ , the restriction  $(X_\zeta^\circ)|_{S^2}$  is isomorphic to the quotient of the Hopf-fibration by  $C_{N_{\zeta_i}}$ .

2. The Gibbons–Hawking Ansatz defines a hyperkähler structure on the total space  $X_\zeta^\circ$  as follows: The connection induces a horizontal distribution  $X_\zeta^\circ \times \text{Im } \mathbb{H} \subset TX_\zeta^\circ$ . Furthermore, we identify the vertical tangent bundle  $X_\zeta^\circ \times i\mathbb{R}$  with  $X_\zeta^\circ \times \text{Re } \mathbb{H}$  via  $(x, it) \mapsto (x, t/f_\zeta(x))$ . This induces a canonical hypercomplex structure  $\underline{L}_\zeta$  on  $TX_\zeta^\circ \cong X_\zeta^\circ \times \mathbb{H}$  which is compatible with the metric defined by

$$g_\zeta^\circ := f_\zeta^{-1} \cdot \theta \otimes \theta + f_\zeta \cdot \pi_\zeta^\ast(g_{\text{Im } \mathbb{H}}).$$

The corresponding hyperhermitian form  $\underline{\omega}_\zeta$  is closed and therefore hyperkähler.

3. It turns out that  $(X_\zeta^\circ, \underline{\omega}_\zeta)$  can be extended to a complete hyperkähler orbifold  $(X_\zeta, \underline{\omega}_\zeta)$  by adding  $\#Z_\zeta$  points, one over each element in  $Z_\zeta$ . In fact, whenever

$$\zeta \in \Delta^\circ := \{[\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_N] \in \Delta \mid \zeta_i \neq \zeta_j \text{ for } i \neq j\},$$

then  $X_\zeta$  is a manifold.

Outside a ball  $B_{R^2}(0)$  containing all of  $Z_\zeta$ , the bundle  $(X_\zeta)|_{\text{Im } \mathbb{H} \setminus B_{R^2}(0)}$  has Chern class  $-N \in \mathbb{Z} \cong H^2(\text{Im } \mathbb{H} \setminus B_{R^2}(0))$ . It is therefore isomorphic to the principal  $U(1)$ -bundle

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_0: (\mathbb{H} \setminus B_R(0))/C_N &\rightarrow \text{Im } \mathbb{H} \setminus B_{R^2}(0) \\ [q] &\mapsto qi\bar{q}. \end{aligned}$$

With the right choice of such an isomorphism  $\tau_\zeta$  (e.g. using parallel transport in radial direction and 'matching' the connections  $\theta_\zeta$  and  $\theta_0$  at the sphere at infinity) one can show that  $\underline{\omega}_\zeta$  approaches the standard hyperkähler structure on  $\mathbb{H}/C_N$  as in Definition 2.4 Point 1. The Gibbons–Hawking spaces are therefore ALE asymptotic to  $\mathbb{H}/C_N$ .

4. Let  $R \in N_{\text{SO}(\mathbb{H})}(C_N)$ . Identify<sup>3</sup> the space of self-dual 2-vectors  $\Lambda_+^2 \mathbb{H}$  with  $\text{Im } \mathbb{H}$  and denote by  $\Lambda_+^2 R \in \text{SO}(\text{Im } \mathbb{H})$  the induced map. Furthermore, define

$$\alpha_R := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } R \in Z_{\text{SO}(\mathbb{H})}(C_N) \\ -1 & \text{if } R \in N_{\text{SO}(\mathbb{H})}(C_N) \setminus Z_{\text{SO}(\mathbb{H})}(C_N) \end{cases}$$

<sup>3</sup>via  $\text{Im } \mathbb{H} \ni \xi \mapsto \langle \underline{\omega}, \xi \rangle \in \Omega^2(\mathbb{H})$  where  $\underline{\omega} = dq \wedge d\bar{q} \in \Omega^2(\mathbb{H}, (\text{Im } \mathbb{H})^*)$  is the standard hyperkähler structure on  $\mathbb{H}$ .

where  $Z_{\mathrm{SO}(\mathbb{H})}(C_N)$  denotes the centralizer of  $C_N$  in  $\mathrm{SO}(\mathbb{H})$ . If  $\zeta \in \Delta$  satisfies  $\Lambda_+^2 R\zeta = \alpha_R \zeta$ , then there exists an  $\hat{R} \in \mathrm{Isom}(X_\zeta)$  satisfying

$$(\Lambda_+^2 R^* \otimes R^*)\omega_\zeta = \omega_\zeta \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_\zeta \circ \hat{R} = R \circ \tau_\zeta$$

where  $R$  acts on  $\mathbb{H}/C_N$  in the obvious way. This is explained in more detail in Section 2.2.2 Point 3. However, note that whenever  $R \in N_{\mathrm{SO}(\mathbb{H})}(C_3) = N_{\mathrm{SO}(\mathbb{H})}(C_4) = \dots$  (which holds in all examples of Section 4), then  $\hat{R}$  acts as a bundle (anti-)isomorphism. In this case it can be uniquely characterised by the lift of  $R$  along  $\tau_\zeta$  and demanding that the connection  $i\theta_\zeta$  gets mapped onto itself.

5. Let  $\zeta_0 \neq \zeta_1 \in Z_\zeta$  and assume that the line segment

$$\ell := \{t\zeta_1 + (1-t)\zeta_0 \mid t \in [0, 1]\} \subset \mathrm{Im} \mathbb{H}$$

intersect  $Z_\zeta$  only in its endpoints. The preimage  $\Sigma := \pi_\zeta^{-1}(\ell) \subset X_\zeta$  is a smoothly embedded sphere, which is holomorphic with respect to the complex structure  $I_{\zeta, \hat{\xi}} := \langle \underline{I}_\zeta, \hat{\xi} \rangle$  for  $\hat{\xi} := \frac{\zeta_1 - \zeta_0}{|\zeta_1 - \zeta_0|} \in \mathrm{Im} \mathbb{H}$ .

### 2.2.2. Kronheimer's construction of ALE spaces

All hyperkähler ALE 4-manifolds asymptotic to  $\mathbb{H}/\Gamma$  for any finite subgroup  $\Gamma < \mathrm{Sp}(1)$  were constructed and classified by Kronheimer in [Kro89a] and [Kro89b]. The following summary follows the one given in [DPW22, Remark 2.15]. Note also that for  $\Gamma = C_N$  this treatment is equivalent to Section 2.2.1.

1. Let  $\mathbb{C}[\Gamma] := \mathrm{Maps}(\Gamma, \mathbb{C})$  denote the regular representation equipped with its standard hermitian inner product. Furthermore, define

$$S := (\mathbb{H} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathfrak{u}(\mathbb{C}[\Gamma]))^\Gamma \quad \text{and} \quad G := \mathbb{P}\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{C}[\Gamma])^\Gamma$$

and equip  $S$  with the canonical flat hyperkähler structure. The adjoint action of  $G$  on  $S$  has a distinguished hyperkähler moment map

$$\mu: S \rightarrow (\mathrm{Im} \mathbb{H})^* \otimes \mathfrak{g}^*.$$

Let  $\mathfrak{z}^* \subset \mathfrak{g}^*$  be the annihilator of  $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$ , i.e. all elements in  $\mathfrak{g}^*$  fixed by the coadjoint action of  $G$ . For any value  $\zeta \in (\mathrm{Im} \mathbb{H})^* \otimes \mathfrak{z}^*$ , the hyperkähler quotient  $X_\zeta := \mu^{-1}(\zeta)/G$  is a hyperkähler orbifold asymptotic to  $\mathbb{H}/\Gamma$  ([Kro89a, Lemma 3.3 and Proposition 3.14]).

2. Remark 2.3 associates a root system  $\Phi$  to  $\Gamma$ . Kronheimer [Kro89a, Proposition 4.1] defines an isomorphism between  $\mathfrak{z}^*$  and the associated Cartan algebra  $\mathfrak{h} := (\mathbb{R}\Phi)^*$ . For any root  $\theta \in \Phi$  let  $D_\theta := \ker \theta \subset \mathfrak{h}$  be the associated wall of the Weyl chambers. If

$$\zeta \in \tilde{\Delta}^\circ := ((\mathrm{Im} \mathbb{H})^* \otimes \mathfrak{h}) \setminus \cup_{\theta \in \Phi} ((\mathrm{Im} \mathbb{H})^* \otimes D_\theta),$$

then  $X_\zeta$  is a manifold ([Kro89a, Proposition 2.8]).

3. Any  $R \in N_{\mathrm{SO}(\mathbb{H})}(\Gamma)$  acts on  $\Gamma$  by conjugation. We extend this to a complex linear map  $C_R \in \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{C}[\Gamma])$ . The standard representation of  $R$  on  $\mathbb{H}$  tensored with the Adjoint action of  $C_R$  on  $\mathfrak{u}(\mathbb{C}[\Gamma])$  induces an action on  $S$ . The hyperkähler moment map satisfies

$$\mu \circ (R \otimes \mathrm{Ad}_{C_R}) = (\Lambda_+^2 R \otimes \mathrm{Ad}_{C_R}) \circ \mu$$

where  $\Lambda_+^2 R$  is as in Section 2.2.1 Point 4 and  $\mathrm{Ad}_{C_R}$  denotes the coadjoint representation of  $C_R$  on  $\mathfrak{h} \cong \mathfrak{z}^* \subset \mathfrak{g}^*$ . (See also [Joy99, Section 3] where Joyce interprets  $\mathrm{Ad}_{C_R}: \mathfrak{h} \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}$  as being induced by an automorphism of the underlying Dynkin diagram.) Thus, if

$$(\Lambda_+^2 R \otimes \mathrm{Ad}_{C_R})\zeta = \zeta,$$

we obtain an induced isometry  $\hat{R} \in \mathrm{Isom}(X_\zeta)$  satisfying

$$(\Lambda_+^2 R^* \otimes R^*)\omega_\zeta = \omega_\zeta \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_\zeta \circ \hat{R} = R \circ \tau_\zeta.$$

4. Let  $\zeta \in \tilde{\Delta}^\circ$  be fixed and  $\theta \in \Phi$  be a root. Define  $\xi \in \mathrm{Im} \mathbb{H}$  by

$$\langle \xi, \cdot \rangle = \zeta(\theta) \in (\mathrm{Im} \mathbb{H})^*$$

and let  $\hat{\xi} := \xi/|\xi|$ . Inside  $X_\zeta$  lies a nodal Riemann surface  $\Sigma_\theta$  which is holomorphic with respect to the complex structure  $I_{\zeta, \hat{\xi}} := \langle I_\zeta, \hat{\xi} \rangle$ .

If  $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Phi$  are two roots such that  $\theta = \theta_1 + \theta_2$  and  $|\zeta(\theta)| = |\zeta(\theta_1)| + |\zeta(\theta_2)|$ , then  $\Sigma_\theta$  is the union of the (nodal)  $I_{\hat{\xi}}$ -holomorphic curves  $\Sigma_{\theta_1}$  and  $\Sigma_{\theta_2}$  attached along one new pair of nodes. If no decomposition with this property exists, then  $\Sigma_\theta$  is itself an embedded 2-sphere.

5. Denote by  $W$  the Weyl group of  $\Phi$ . If two elements  $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \Delta^\circ$  are related by an element in  $W$ , then  $X_{\zeta_1}$  and  $X_{\zeta_2}$  are isomorphic as hyperkähler ALE spaces (cf. [Kro89b, Section 3] and [AB02, Section 3]). This isomorphism identifies the holomorphic spheres  $\Sigma_\theta \subset X_{\zeta_1}$  and  $\Sigma_{w\theta} \subset X_{\zeta_2}$  where  $w \in W$  satisfies  $\zeta_2 = w\zeta_1$ . Furthermore, one can arrange for this isomorphism to intertwine the asymptotic coordinates  $\tau_{\zeta_1}$  and  $\tau_{\zeta_2}$ . We can therefore replace  $\zeta \in \tilde{\Delta}^\circ$  in the previous discussion by

$$[\zeta] \in \Delta^\circ := \tilde{\Delta}^\circ/W.$$

### 3. Perturbing coassociative submanifolds

Throughout this section,  $(Y, \phi)$  denotes a 7-manifold equipped with a closed  $G_2$ -structure.

**Definition 3.1** ([HL82, Corollary IV.1.20]). A 4-dimensional immersed submanifold  $\iota: M \rightarrow Y$  is called coassociative if  $\iota^*\phi = 0$ . If we want to emphasize the underlying  $G_2$ -structure we will write  $\phi$ -coassociative.



**Example 3.2.** Let  $(X, \omega)$  be a hyperkähler 4-manifold together with an action  $\rho: G \rightarrow \text{Isom}(X)$  by a Bieberbach group  $G$ . We denote the corresponding  $G_2$ -manifold from Example 2.1 by  $(Y, \phi)$ . Furthermore, note that the normal subgroup  $\Lambda := G \cap \text{Im } \mathbb{H} < \text{Im } \mathbb{H}$  is a lattice. An immersed coassociative submanifold inside of  $Y$  can now be constructed from the following data:

1. An embedded Riemann surface  $\iota_\Sigma: \Sigma \rightarrow X$  which is holomorphic with respect to  $I_{\hat{\xi}_1} = \langle \underline{I}, \hat{\xi}_1 \rangle$  for  $\hat{\xi}_1 \in S^2 \subset \text{Im } \mathbb{H}$ .
2. Two linearly independent  $\xi_2, \xi_3 \in \{\hat{\xi}_1\}^\perp \cap \Lambda \subset \text{Im } \mathbb{H}$  such that  $\rho(\xi_2)(\Sigma) = \Sigma = \rho(\xi_3)(\Sigma)$ .

Namely, we define

$$M := ((\mathbb{R}\xi_2 + \mathbb{R}\xi_3) \times \Sigma) / \langle \xi_2, \xi_3 \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}}$$

and  $\iota_q: M \rightarrow Y$  for any  $q \in \text{Im } \mathbb{H}$  as  $\iota_q([y, z]) := [q + y, \iota_\Sigma(z)]$ . It immediately follows from (2.1) that  $\iota_q$  is coassociative. Note that  $\iota_q$  is an embedding if and only if the following two conditions are met:

3.  $\xi_2, \xi_3$  are primitive.
4. Any  $g \in G$  with  $\rho(g)(\Sigma) \cap \Sigma \neq \emptyset$  either satisfies  $g \in \langle \xi_2, \xi_3 \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}}$  or  $g \cdot (\mathbb{R}\xi_2 + \mathbb{R}\xi_3) \cap (\mathbb{R}\xi_2 + \mathbb{R}\xi_3) = \emptyset$ .

*Remark 3.3.* Note that the construction in the previous Example leaves the freedom of varying the arbitrarily chosen base-point  $q \in \text{Im } \mathbb{H}$  of the immersion  $\iota_q: M \rightarrow Y$  as well as the  $I_{\hat{\xi}_1}$ -holomorphic embedding  $\iota_\Sigma: \Sigma \rightarrow X$ . By doing so one produces a (up to reparametrisation)  $(1 + b_1(\Sigma))$ -dimensional family of coassociative immersions (one dimension comes from varying  $q$  and  $b_1(\Sigma)$  from varying  $\iota_\Sigma$ ). This is of course in accordance with [McL98, Theorem 4.5] which implies that the moduli space of coassociative immersions  $\iota: M \rightarrow Y$  is itself an orbifold of dimension  $b_+^2(M) = 1 + b_1(\Sigma)$ .

The following well-known lemma can for example be found in [McL98, Proposition 4.2]:

**Lemma 3.4.** *The normal bundle of a coassociative immersion  $\iota: M \rightarrow Y$  is isomorphic to  $\Lambda_+^2 T^*M$ .*

*Proof.* The mapping

$$\iota^*TY \ni v \mapsto \iota^*(i_v\phi)$$

descends to the normal bundle and one can check (e.g. in a local basis) that it defines an isomorphism onto  $\Lambda_+^2 T^*M$ .  $\square$

**Definition 3.5.** A tubular neighborhood of the coassociative immersion  $\iota: M \rightarrow Y$  is a convex open neighborhood  $U \subset \Lambda_+^2 T^*M$  of the zero section together with an open immersion  $J: U \rightarrow Y$  which restricts to  $\iota$  at the zero section. Additionally, we demand that for any  $u \in U$  the image of  $\partial_t(J(tu))|_{t=0} \in \iota^*TY$  in  $\Lambda_+^2 T^*M \cong N_\iota$  (the normal bundle) is again  $u$ .

For any  $\omega \in \Gamma(U)$  we denote by  $J_\omega: M \rightarrow Y$  the immersion  $x \mapsto J(\omega_x)$ . Furthermore, we define  $F_J: \Gamma(U) \rightarrow \Omega^3(M)$  by  $F_J(\omega) = J_\omega^*\phi$ .

*Remark 3.6.* Subsequently, we may simply use the tubular neighborhood induced by the Levi–Civita connection of the ambient manifold  $Y$ .

By definition, the immersed submanifold  $J_\omega: M \rightarrow Y$  for  $\omega \in \Gamma(U)$  is coassociative if and only if  $F_J(\omega) = 0$ . The following proposition states that the deformation theory of coassociative immersions is on the linear level controlled by the elliptic operator  $d: \Omega_+^2(M) \rightarrow d\Omega^2(M)$ .

**Proposition 3.7** ([McL98, Theorem 4.5]). *Let  $J: U \subset \Lambda_+^2 M \rightarrow Y$  be a tubular neighborhood of a coassociative immersion  $\iota: M \rightarrow Y$ . Then the map  $F_J$  has image contained in  $d\Omega^2(M)$ . Furthermore, there exists a constant  $c = c(J) > 0$  and a smooth map  $\mathcal{N}_J \in C^\infty(\Gamma(U), d\Omega^2(M))$  such that*

$$F_J(\omega) = d\omega + \mathcal{N}_J(\omega)$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{N}_J(\omega) - \mathcal{N}_J(\eta)\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \leq c(\|\omega\|_{C^{1,\alpha}} + \|\eta\|_{C^{1,\alpha}})\|\omega - \eta\|_{C^{1,\alpha}}$$

for any  $\omega, \eta \in \Gamma(U)$ .

The proof of this proposition except the estimate on  $\mathcal{N}_J$  can be found in [McL98, proof of Theorem 4.5]. As the arguments are short, we have included them here for the reader's convenience.

*Proof.* Since  $F_J(0) = 0$  and the cohomology class doesn't change under homotopies, we have that  $[F_J(t\omega)] = 0 \in H^3(M)$  for every  $t \in [0, 1]$ . This proves the first point.

For the second point we observe that the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus and  $F_J(0) = 0$  imply

$$F_J(\omega) = D_0 F_J(\omega) + \int_0^1 \partial_t F_J(t\omega) - D_0 F_J(\omega) dt$$

where  $D_0 F_J$  denotes the linearisation of  $F_J$  at the zero section. It therefore remains to check that  $D_0 F_J(\omega)$  equals  $d\omega$  and

$$\mathcal{N}_J(\omega) := \int_0^1 \partial_t F_J(t\omega) - D_0 F_J(\omega) dt$$

satisfies the quadratic estimate.

For every point  $x \in M$  there exists a vector field  $v \in \Gamma(TY)$  such that in an open neighborhood around  $x$  we have  $\omega = \iota^*(i_v \phi)$  and  $\varphi_t^v \circ \iota = J_{t\omega}$  for  $t \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$  where  $\varphi^v$  denotes the flow of  $v$ . Since  $\phi$  is closed, we obtain around  $x$ :

$$D_0 F_J(\omega) = \partial_t (\iota^*(\varphi_t^v)^* \phi)|_{t=0} = \iota^* d(i_v \phi) = d\omega.$$

The estimate for  $\mathcal{N}_J$  is standard but rather lengthy and can be found in Appendix A.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.8.** *Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  be a fixed Hölder-exponent and  $\beta, \gamma, c, R > 0$  be constants with  $\beta > 2\gamma$ . Then there are  $T, c_v > 0$  depending only on  $\beta, \gamma, c, R$  with the following significance: Let  $\phi, \phi_0$  be two closed  $G_2$ -structures on  $Y$  and  $\iota: M \rightarrow Y$  be an immersed  $\phi_0$ -coassociative submanifold with tubular neighborhood  $J: U \subset \Lambda_+^2 M \rightarrow Y$  that satisfy*

1.  $B_R(0) \subset U$
2.  $\iota^*[\phi] = 0 \in H^3(M)$
3.  $\|\mathcal{J}^*(\phi - \phi_0)\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \leq ct^\beta$
4.  $d: (\mathcal{H}_+^2)^\perp \subset \Omega_+^2(M) \rightarrow \Omega^3(M)$  satisfies  $\|\omega\|_{C^{1,\alpha}} \leq ct^{-\gamma} \|d\omega\|_{C^{0,\alpha}}$ , where  $\mathcal{H}_+^2$  denotes the space of all harmonic self-dual 2-forms
5.  $\|\mathcal{N}_J(\omega) - \mathcal{N}_J(\eta)\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \leq c(\|\omega\|_{C^{1,\alpha}} + \|\eta\|_{C^{1,\alpha}})\|\omega - \eta\|_{C^{1,\alpha}}$

for some  $t \in (0, T)$ . Then there is a section  $\omega \in \Gamma(U)$  with  $\|\omega\|_{C^{1,\alpha}} \leq c_0 t^{\beta-\gamma}$  such that  $\mathcal{J}_\omega$  is  $\phi$ -coassociative.

The analogue statement for associative submanifolds can be found in [DPW22, Proposition 3.19] and its proof carries over with only minor adaptations. We have included it here for the convenience of the reader.

*Proof.* To ease notation we drop the subscript  $J$  and instead denote by  $F_{(0)}(\omega) := \mathcal{J}_\omega^* \phi_{(0)}$ . Since  $d|_{\Omega_+^2(M)}: \Omega_+^2(M) \rightarrow d\Omega^2(M)$  is surjective and  $\text{image}(F_{(0)}) \subset d\Omega^2(M)$  by Proposition 3.7 and the second assumption, we can define

$$E(\omega) := d|_{(\mathcal{H}_+^2)^\perp \cap \Omega_+^2(M)}^{-1}(F_0(\omega) - F(\omega) - \mathcal{N}_0(\omega)).$$

By our assumptions there is a positive constant  $c_E = c_E(c, R)$  such that for every  $r \in (0, R)$  and  $\omega, \eta \in \overline{B_r(0)} \subset C^{1,\alpha}(M, U)$  the following two inequalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \|E(0)\|_{C^{1,\alpha}} &\leq c_E t^{\beta-\gamma} \\ \|E(\omega) - E(\eta)\|_{C^{1,\alpha}} &\leq c_E (r + t^\beta) t^{-\gamma} \|\omega - \eta\|_{C^{1,\alpha}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $E$  restricts to a contraction on  $\overline{B_r(0)}$  provided that

$$c_E (r + t^\beta) t^{-\gamma} < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad c_E t^{\beta-\gamma} + c_E (r + t^\beta) t^{-\gamma} r \leq r.$$

This holds if we choose  $T = T(\beta, \gamma, c, R)$  sufficiently small and for  $t \in (0, T)$  the radius  $r := 2c_E t^{\beta-\gamma}$ .

Let now  $\omega \in \overline{B_r(0)}$  be the unique fixpoint of  $E$ . By definition, this satisfies

$$0 = d\omega + \mathcal{N}_0(\omega) - F_0(\omega) + F(\omega) = F(\omega)$$

and gives therefore rise to a  $\phi$ -coassociative submanifold.  $\square$

*Remark 3.9.* If  $M$  in the previous theorem is compact and  $\iota: M \rightarrow Y$  an embedding, then  $\mathcal{J}_\omega$  will also be an embedding once  $t$  is sufficiently small.

### 3.1. The linear estimate for surface fibrations over tori

The following subsection establishes Point 4 of Theorem 3.8 in the case of Example 3.2. We quickly review the relevant set-up: Let  $\Sigma$  be a closed Riemann surface equipped with a Riemannian metric  $g_\Sigma$  and  $\xi_2, \xi_3 \in \mathbb{R}^2$  be linearly independent. Furthermore, assume that there is a group action  $\rho: \langle \xi_2, \xi_3 \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \text{Isom}(\Sigma)$ . Our coassociative submanifold in Example 3.2 was then defined as

$$M = (\mathbb{R}^2 \times \Sigma) / \langle \xi_2, \xi_3 \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}}$$

equipped with the induced metric coming from  $g_\Sigma$  and  $g_{\mathbb{R}^2}$ . We will also need the following rescaled version:

$$M_t := (\mathbb{R}^2 \times \Sigma) / \langle t^{-1}\xi_2, t^{-1}\xi_3 \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}}$$

for  $t > 0$  where  $\rho_t: \langle t^{-1}\xi_2, t^{-1}\xi_3 \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \text{Isom}(\Sigma)$  is given by  $\rho(t)$ . The induced metric on  $M_t$  is denoted by  $g_t$ .

Observe that the natural projection  $p_t: M_t \rightarrow T_t^2 := \mathbb{R}^2 / \langle t^{-1}\xi_2, t^{-1}\xi_3 \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}}$  gives rise to a fiber bundle. The orthogonal complement  $H_t := V_t^\perp$  of its vertical tangent bundle  $V_t = \ker(Dp_t)$  defines a flat Ehresmann connection. This induces a decomposition  $\Omega^\ell(M_t) = \bigoplus_{p+q=\ell} \Omega^{p,q}$  with  $\Omega^{p,q} := \Gamma(\Lambda^p H^* \otimes \Lambda^q V^*)$ . Furthermore, the operator  $d + d^*: \Omega^k(M_t) \rightarrow \Omega^{k+1}(M_t) \oplus \Omega^{k-1}(M_t)$  splits into

$$d_H + d_H^*: \Omega^{p,q} \rightarrow \Omega^{p+1,q} \oplus \Omega^{p-1,q} \quad \text{and} \quad d_V + d_V^*: \Omega^{p,q} \rightarrow \Omega^{p,q+1} \oplus \Omega^{p,q-1}.$$

**Definition 3.10.** We define the following operators acting on  $\Omega^\ell(M_t)$ :

1. Denote by  $\Pi_t \in \text{End}(\Omega^\ell(M_t))$  the  $L^2$ -projection onto  $\ker(d + d^*)$ .
2. For any  $y \in T_t^2$ , let  $\text{res}_y: \Omega^{p,q}(M_t) \rightarrow \Lambda^p T_y^* T_t^2 \otimes \Omega^q(p_t^{-1}(y))$  be the composition

$$\Omega^{p,q}(M_t) \rightarrow \Gamma(p_t^{-1}(y), \Lambda^p H^* \otimes \Lambda^q V^*) \cong \Lambda^p T_y^* T_t^2 \otimes \Omega^q(p_t^{-1}(y)).$$

3. The operator  $d_V + d_V^*$  restricts for every  $y \in T_t^2$  to an elliptic operator on  $\Lambda^p T_y^* T_t^2 \otimes \Omega^q(p_t^{-1}(y))$ . Denote by  $\pi_y$  the  $L^2$ -orthogonal projection onto its kernel.
4. Finally, denote by  $\hat{\pi} \in \text{End}(\Omega^\ell(M_t))$  the operator which maps  $\omega \in \Omega^\ell(M_t)$  to the unique  $\hat{\pi}(\omega) \in \Omega^\ell(M_t)$  with  $\text{res}_y \hat{\pi}(\omega) := \pi_y(\text{res}_y \omega)$  for every  $y \in T_t^2$ .

*Remark 3.11.* In all examples of Section 4 the fiber bundle  $M_t = T_t^2 \times \Sigma$  is trivial. In this case  $\Omega^{p,q} \cong \Omega^p(T_t^2, \Omega^q(\Sigma))$  and  $d_V + d_V^*$  becomes  $d_\Sigma + d_\Sigma^*$  acting upon  $\Omega^q(\Sigma)$ . The operator  $\hat{\pi}: \Omega^{p,q} \rightarrow \Omega^{p,q}$  is then simply the  $L^2$ -projection onto  $\ker(d_\Sigma + d_\Sigma^*)$ . Furthermore,  $d_H + d_H^* = d_{T_t^2} + d_{T_t^2}^*$ .

The main result of this section is the following Fredholm estimate:

**Proposition 3.12.** *For every  $\alpha \in (0, 1), k \geq 1$  there is a constant  $c = c(k, \alpha, M_1, g_1)$  such that for every  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$  and  $\omega \in \Omega^\ell(M_t)$ ,*

$$\|\omega\|_{C^{k,\alpha}} \leq c((1 + t^{-1}) \|d\omega + d^*\omega\|_{C^{k-1,\alpha}} + \|\Pi_t \omega\|_{C^{k,\alpha}}).$$

For this we use the following results on harmonic forms on  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \Sigma$  and  $M_t$  which are an immediate consequence of [Wal13, Lemma A.1].

**Lemma 3.13** ([Pla20, Corollary 4.13]). *Every harmonic  $\omega \in \Omega^\ell(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \Sigma)$  with  $\|\omega\|_{C^0} < \infty$  is a sum of terms of the form  $\eta_1 \otimes \eta_2$ , where  $\eta_1 \in \Omega^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$  is constant and  $\eta_2 \in \Omega^q(\Sigma)$  is harmonic. Identifying the space of constant forms on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with  $\Lambda^*\mathbb{R}^2$  we therefore have*

$$\mathcal{H}^\ell(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \Sigma) \cap C^0\Omega^\ell(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \Sigma) = \bigoplus_{p+q} \Lambda^p\mathbb{R}^2 \otimes \mathcal{H}^q(\Sigma).$$

**Corollary 3.14.** *The pull-back of the quotient map  $q_t: \mathbb{R}^2 \times \Sigma \rightarrow M_t$  induces an isomorphism*

$$\mathcal{H}^\ell(M_t) \cong \bigoplus_{p+q=\ell} \Lambda^p\mathbb{R}^2 \otimes \mathcal{H}^q(\Sigma)^{\langle \xi_2, \xi_3 \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}}},$$

where  $\mathcal{H}^*(\Sigma)^{\langle \xi_2, \xi_3 \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}}}$  denotes the space of harmonic forms on  $\Sigma$  invariant under the action of  $\langle \xi_2, \xi_3 \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}}$  by the pull-back of  $\rho$ .

The next two lemmas prove Proposition 3.12 for elements which respectively lie inside and orthogonal to the kernel of  $d_V + d_V^*$ .

**Lemma 3.15.** *For every  $\omega \in \Omega^\ell(M_t)$*

$$\|(1 - \hat{\pi})\omega\|_{C^{k,\alpha}} \leq c_2 \|(d + d^*)(1 - \hat{\pi})\omega\|_{C^{k-1,\alpha}}$$

holds independently of  $t$ . It even holds on  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \Sigma$ .

*Proof.* We prove the estimate on  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \Sigma$ . Since the quotient maps are isometries, this implies the lemma.

Suppose the estimate does not hold on  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \Sigma$  to produce a contradiction. Then we find a sequence  $(\omega_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \Omega^\ell(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \Sigma)$  with

$$\|(1 - \hat{\pi})\omega_n\|_{C^{k,\alpha}} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|(d + d^*)(1 - \hat{\pi})\omega_n\|_{C^{k-1,\alpha}} \rightarrow 0.$$

Since both expressions are invariant under translations, we can assume that

$$\|(1 - \hat{\pi})\omega_n\|_{C^{k,\alpha}(B_1(0) \times \Sigma)} \geq \frac{1}{4(k+1)} \quad \text{for every } n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.1)$$

By the Arzelà-Ascoli Theorem we find a subsequence (again denoted by  $(\omega_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ ) such that  $((1 - \hat{\pi})\omega_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges in  $C_{\text{loc}}^{k-1}$  to  $\omega_\infty \in C^{k-1}\Omega^\ell(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \Sigma)$ . This limit satisfies  $d\omega_\infty + d^*\omega_\infty = 0$  (for  $k = 1$  in the distributional sense) and is therefore smooth by elliptic regularity. As  $\|\omega_\infty\|_{C^{k-1}} \leq 1$ , Lemma 3.13 implies that  $\omega_\infty$  is a sum of terms of the form  $\eta_1 \otimes \eta_2$  where  $\eta_1 \in \Omega^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$  is parallel and  $\eta_2 \in \Omega^q(\Sigma)$  is harmonic. Therefore,  $\omega_\infty = \hat{\pi}\omega_\infty$  and since  $\hat{\pi}(1 - \hat{\pi})\omega_n = 0$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we obtain further  $\omega_\infty = \hat{\pi}\omega_\infty = 0$ . However, bootstrapping improves the convergence inside  $B_1(0) \times \Sigma$  to  $C^{k,\alpha}$  and therefore  $\|\omega_\infty\|_{C^{k,\alpha}(B_1(0) \times \Sigma)} \geq 1/(4(k+1))$  holds by (3.1). This gives the sought contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.16.** For every  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$  and  $\omega \in \Omega^\ell(M_t)$  we have

$$\|\hat{\pi}\omega\|_{C^0} \leq c_3 t^{-1} \|(d + d^*)\hat{\pi}\omega\|_{C^0} + \|\Pi\omega\|_{C^0}$$

where  $c_3$  is independent of  $t$ .

*Proof.* We first prove the estimate for  $t = 1$  and then for arbitrary  $t$  by scaling.

**The estimate for  $t = 1$**  follows from Morrey's inequality and Fredholm theory.

**The estimate for general  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ :**

Denote by  $\Phi_t: M_1 \rightarrow M_t$  the map  $[(y, z)] \mapsto [(t^{-1}y, z)]$ . One can check that for any  $\omega \in \Omega^\ell(M_t)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi_t^* \omega|_{g_1} &= \sum_{p+q=\ell} t^{-p} (|\omega^{p,q}|_{g_t} \circ \Phi_t), \\ (d + d_1^*) \Phi_t^* \omega &= \Phi_t^* (d\omega + t^{-2} d_{H_t}^* \omega + d_{V_t}^* \omega), \\ \Pi_1 \Phi_t^* &= \Phi_t^* \Pi_t, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\omega^{p,q}$  denotes the projection onto  $\Lambda^p H^* \otimes \Lambda^q V^*$  and where the last equality uses Corollary 3.14. The following estimate uses  $\|\cdot\|_{C_t^0}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{C_1^0}$  to denote the  $C^0$ -norms with respect to the metrics  $g_t$  and  $g_1$ . Since the decomposition  $\Lambda^\ell T^* M_t = \bigoplus_{p+q=\ell} \Lambda^p H^* \otimes \Lambda^q V^*$  is orthogonal, the previous step implies that for any  $\omega \in \text{im } \hat{\pi}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \|\omega\|_{C_t^0} &= \left\| \sum_{p+q=\ell} \omega^{p,q} \right\|_{C_t^0} = \left\| \sum_{p+q=\ell} t^p \Phi_t^* \omega^{p,q} \right\|_{C_1^0} \\ &\leq c_3 \left( \left\| (d + d_1^*) \sum_{p+q=\ell} t^p \Phi_t^* \omega^{p,q} \right\|_{C_1^0} + \left\| \sum_{p+q=\ell} t^p \Pi_1 \Phi_t^* \omega^{p,q} \right\|_{C_1^0} \right) \\ &= c_3 \left( \left\| \sum_{p+q=\ell} t^p \Phi_t^* d_{H_t} \omega^{p,q} \right\|_{C_1^0} + \left\| \sum_{p+q=\ell} t^{p-2} \Phi_t^* d_{H_t}^* \omega^{p,q} \right\|_{C_1^0} + \left\| \Pi_t \omega \right\|_{C_t^0} \right) \\ &= c_3 \left( \left\| \sum_{p+q=\ell} t^{-1} d_{H_t} \omega^{p,q} \right\|_{C_t^0} + \left\| \sum_{p+q=\ell} t^{-1} d_{H_t}^* \omega^{p,q} \right\|_{C_t^0} + \left\| \Pi_t \omega \right\|_{C_t^0} \right) \\ &= c_3 (t^{-1} \|(d + d^*)\omega\|_{C_t^0} + \|\Pi_t \omega\|_{C_t^0}). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

*Proof of Proposition 3.12.* The Schauder estimate

$$\|\omega\|_{C^{k,\alpha}} \leq c_4 (\|(d + d^*)\omega\|_{C^{k-1,\alpha}} + \|\omega\|_{C^0})$$

and Lemmas 3.15 and 3.16 imply

$$\|\omega\|_{C^{k,\alpha}} \leq c_5 (1 + t^{-1}) (\|(d + d^*)\omega\|_{C^{k-1,\alpha}} + \|(d + d^*)\hat{\pi}\omega\|_{C^{k-1,\alpha}} + \|\Pi\omega\|_{C^0}).$$

The observation  $(d + d^*)\hat{\pi} = \hat{\pi}(d + d^*)$  finishes the proof.  $\square$

## 4. Examples

Let  $(Y_0, \phi_0)$  be a flat  $G_2$ -orbifold together with a chosen set of resolution data. Denote by  $\tilde{\phi}_t$  the closed  $G_2$ -structure from Definition 2.5 on the resolution  $Y_t$  and by  $\phi_t$  the torsion-free  $G_2$ -structure of Theorem 2.7.

**Assumption 4.1.** Assume that for some element  $((\hat{X}_S, \omega_S, \tau_S), (\rho_S: G_S \rightarrow \text{Isom}(\hat{X}_S)))$  of the resolution data we have

1. An embedded closed surface  $\iota_\Sigma: \Sigma \rightarrow X$  which is holomorphic with respect to  $I_{\hat{\xi}_1} = \langle \underline{I}, \hat{\xi}_1 \rangle$  for  $\hat{\xi}_1 \in S^2 \subset \text{Im } \mathbb{H}$ .
2. Two linearly independent  $\xi_2, \xi_3 \in \{\hat{\xi}_1\}^\perp \cap \Lambda \subset \text{Im } \mathbb{H}$  such that  $\rho(\xi_2)(\Sigma) = \Sigma = \rho(\xi_3)(\Sigma)$ . Here  $\Lambda_S$  is the lattice  $G_S \cap \text{Im } \mathbb{H} < \text{Im } \mathbb{H}$ .

**Proposition 4.2.** *For every triple  $(\Sigma, \xi_2, \xi_3)$  as in Assumption 4.1 there exists a  $T > 0$  such that there is an immersed  $\phi_t$ -coassociative submanifold  $\iota_t: M \rightarrow Y_t$  for  $t \in (0, T)$ . As  $t$  approaches 0, the induced volume on  $M$  shrinks to 0. Furthermore, if the triple  $(\Sigma, \xi_2, \xi_3)$  satisfies Point 3 and 4 listed at the end of Example 3.2, then  $\iota_t$  is an embedding provided that  $t$  is sufficiently small.*

*Proof.* Throughout the proof we work with the rescaled  $G_2$ -structures  $t^{-3}\tilde{\phi}_t$  and  $t^{-3}\phi_t$ . Example 3.2 gives rise to an immersed  $(t^{-3}\tilde{\phi}_t)$ -coassociative submanifold  $\tilde{\iota}_t: M \rightarrow Y_t$ . Let  $J: U \rightarrow Y_t$  be its tubular neighborhood induced by the Levi-Civita connection associated to  $t^{-2}\tilde{g}_t$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that  $J(U) \subset \hat{V}$  where  $\hat{V}$  is as in Definition 2.5.

The compactness of  $M$ , Theorem 2.7, and Proposition 3.12 imply that there exist  $t$ -independent constants  $c > 0$ ,  $R > 0$ ,  $\beta := 5/2$ , and  $\gamma := 1$  such that the first three points in Theorem 3.8 are satisfied. (All  $C^{k,\alpha}$ -norms are hereby taken with respect to  $t^{-2}\tilde{g}_t$ .) Furthermore, one can check that in our set-up the estimates in Lemma A.2 are independent of  $t$ . Thus, by enlarging  $c$  if necessary we may assume that the fourth point is also satisfied. We therefore, obtain a  $(t^{-3}\phi_t)$ -coassociative submanifold (or analogously, a  $\phi_t$ -coassociative submanifold)  $\iota_t: M \rightarrow Y_t$  contained in  $\hat{V}$  that satisfies

$$\|\iota_t - \tilde{\iota}_t\|_{C_{t^{-2}\tilde{g}_t}^{1,\alpha}} \leq c_v t^{3/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\iota_t - \tilde{\iota}_t\|_{C_{\tilde{g}_t}^{1,\alpha}} \leq c_v t^{3/2-\alpha}.$$

Direct inspection reveals that with respect to the family of metrics  $\tilde{g}_t$  (and therefore also with respect to  $g_t$ ) the fibers of  $M$  collapse to points as  $t$  tends to 0. The last statement of the proposition immediately follows from Remark 3.9.  $\square$

*Remark 4.3.* The previous proposition produces coassociative submanifolds by perturbing the model-immersion from Example 3.2. This requires the choice of a base-point  $q \in \text{Im } \mathbb{H}$  which we will (arbitrarily) fix throughout all examples. By varying  $q$ , however, Proposition 4.2 produces a (up to reparametrization) 1-dimensional family of coassociative immersions. Since  $b_+^2(M) = 1$  (as  $b_1(\Sigma) = 0$  for all non-constant holomorphic curves in ALE 4-manifolds), all coassociative deformations of  $\iota_t: M \rightarrow Y_t$  are obtained this way

(cf. Remark 3.3). (Note that such 1-dimensional families constructed from different data  $(\Sigma, \xi_2, \xi_3)$  may coincide in  $\hat{Y}_t$ .)

**Example 4.4.** Joyce [Joy96b, Examples 7-14] constructs seven examples of flat  $G_2$ -orbifolds whose respective singular strata are all given by tori:  $S = T^3$ . More precisely, neighborhoods of the singularities in all these orbifolds are described by Example 2.1 with  $X = \mathbb{H}/\Gamma_S$  for  $\Gamma_S = C_2$ . The corresponding Bieberbach groups are given by lattices  $G_S = \Lambda_S \cong \mathbb{Z}^3$  (whose exact form are irrelevant for our purpose) and the group actions  $\rho_S: G_S \rightarrow \text{Isom}(\mathbb{H}/\Gamma_S)$  are trivial.

All these singularities can be resolved via Gibbons–Hawking spaces. This requires a choice of  $\zeta \in \Delta^\circ$  (cf. Section 2.2.1). To simply find *some* resolution data, any such choice suffices.

In order to construct coassociative submanifolds, we pick for every singular stratum  $S$  two primitive elements  $\xi_2, \xi_3 \in \Lambda_S$ . Furthermore, we choose any  $\zeta := [-\zeta_1, \zeta_1] \in \Delta^\circ$  with  $0 \neq \zeta_1 \in \{\xi_2, \xi_3\}^\perp$ . The corresponding Gibbons–Hawking space  $X_\zeta$  contains a holomorphic sphere  $\Sigma$  such that  $(\Sigma, \xi_2, \xi_3)$  satisfy the conditions in Proposition 4.2. We therefore obtain embedded coassociative submanifolds in all the critical loci.

*Remark 4.5.* Joyce [Joy96b, Examples 3, 4, 5, 6, 15, 16] constructs further examples of flat  $G_2$ -orbifolds whose transverse singularities are modelled upon  $\mathbb{H}/\Gamma_S$  for  $\Gamma_S \in \{C_2, C_3\}$ . [DPW22, Examples 4.3, 4.4, 4.9] describes possible choices for the resolution data and points out holomorphic spheres inside the corresponding Gibbons–Hawking spaces. It is not difficult to check that every singular stratum of these orbifolds admits at least one choice of resolution data such that Proposition 4.2 gives rise to an embedded coassociative submanifold in the resolution.

The following examples all treat  $G_2$ -orbifolds constructed in [Rei17, Section 5.4.3]. A neighborhood of the singular strata in all these orbifolds can be described by Example 2.1 together with the data in Table 1. For this we list:

- The diffeomorphism type of the singular strata  $S$ .
- The orbifold group  $\Gamma_S$  such that the transverse singularity is modeled upon  $X_S := \mathbb{H}/\Gamma_S$ .
- The generators of the Bieberbach group  $G_S$  as follows: Every  $G_S$  is generated by the lattice  $\Lambda_S = \langle i, j, k \rangle \subset \text{Im } \mathbb{H}$ . Furthermore, we indicate whether the following two additional generators appear ( $\checkmark$  = appears,  $\times$  = does not appear):

$$\left( R_+, \frac{i+k}{2} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \left( R_-, \frac{j}{2} \right)$$

where  $R_\pm \in \text{GL}(\Lambda_S) \cong \text{GL}_3(\mathbb{Z})$  are given by

$$R_\pm := \begin{pmatrix} \pm 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mp 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.1)$$



#	$S$	$\Gamma_S$	$G_S$ and $\rho_S: G_S \rightarrow \text{Isom}(\mathbb{H}/\Gamma_S)$	
			$(R_+, \frac{i+k}{2})$ with $\rho_S(R_+, \frac{i+k}{2})[q] = [iqi]$	$(R_-, \frac{j}{2})$ with $\rho_S(R_-, \frac{j}{2})[q] = [jqj]$
1.	$T^3/C_2^2$	$C_2$	✓	✓
2.	$T^3/C_2$	$C_3$	✗	✓
3.	$T^3/C_2^2$	$C_3$	✓	✓
4.	$T^3/C_2^2$	$C_4$	✓	✓
5.	$T^3/C_2^2$	$C_6$	✓	✓
6.	$T^3/C_2^2$	$\text{Dic}_3$	✓	✓

Table 1.: Description of those singular strata appearing in [Rei17, Section 5.3.4] which were not treated in [DPW22, Section 4]. For each stratum the Bieberbach group  $G_S$  is generated by  $\Lambda_S = \langle i, j, k \rangle \subset \text{Im } \mathbb{H}$ . Whether the two additional generators  $(R_+, \frac{i+k}{2})$  and  $(R_-, \frac{j}{2})$  (for  $R_\pm$  as in (4.1)) appear is indicated (✓= appears, ✗= does not appear). The homomorphism  $\rho_S: G_S \rightarrow \text{Isom}(\mathbb{H}/\Gamma_S)$  maps  $\Lambda_S$  to Id and the other generators as indicated. A neighbourhood of any singular stratum is then described by Example 2.1 together with the respective data of this table.

- The action  $\rho_S: G_S \rightarrow \text{Isom}(\mathbb{H}/\Gamma_S)$  of the generators of  $G_S$  as follows: The lattice  $\Lambda_S$  acts trivially in all examples. Furthermore,  $(R_+, \frac{i+k}{2})$  and  $(R_-, \frac{j}{2})$  act (whenever they appear as generators) via  $\rho_S(R_+, \frac{i+k}{2})[q] = [iqi]$  and  $\rho_S(R_-, \frac{j}{2})[q] = [jqj]$  for  $[q] \in \mathbb{H}/\Gamma_S$ , respectively.

**Example 4.6.** Reidegeld [Rei17, Section 5.3.4] constructs an example of a flat  $G_2$ -orbifold whose singular strata split into two types. Both types can be described via Example 2.1 together with the data of rows 2 and 3 in Table 1, respectively.

These singularities can be resolved by Gibbons–Hawking spaces. This requires a choice of parameter  $\zeta \in \Delta^\circ$  (cf. Section 2.2). All parameters such that the  $G_S$ -action lifts to the Gibbons–Hawking space  $X_\zeta$  can be found in Appendix B.

The parameter  $\zeta := [-i, 0, i]$  works for both types of singularities. The corresponding Gibbons–Hawking space contains two  $I_i$ -holomorphic spheres which together with  $\xi_2 := j$ , and  $\xi_3 := k$  satisfy the conditions of Proposition 4.2. Thus, the resolution admits coassociative submanifolds in all the critical regions. Note that by construction these submanifolds are only immersed, however, a closer inspection of Example 3.2 reveals that they all factor through double-cover over embedded coassociatives.

**Example 4.7.** Reidegeld [Rei17, Section 5.3.4] constructs an example of a flat  $G_2$ -orbifold whose singular strata split into two types. Both types can be described via Example 2.1 together with the data of rows 1 and 4 in Table 1, respectively.

We choose a set of resolution data by a collection of certain Gibbons–Hawking spaces. This requires choices of the parameter  $\zeta \in \Delta^\circ$  (cf. Section 2.2). All parameters such that the  $G_S$ -action lifts to the Gibbons–Hawking space  $X_\zeta$  can be found in Appendix B.

As an example, we pick the following:

1.  $\zeta = [-i, i]$  for strata of type described by row 1. The associated Gibbons–Hawking space contains one  $I_i$ -holomorphic sphere which together with  $\xi_2 := j$  and  $\xi_3 := k$  satisfies the conditions of Proposition 4.2. The resulting submanifold is immersed but factors as in the previous example through a double-cover over an embedded coassociative.
4.  $\zeta = [-2i, -i, i, 2i]$  for strata of type described by row 4. The associated Gibbons–Hawking space contains 3  $I_i$ -holomorphic spheres which together with  $\xi_2 := j$  and  $\xi_3 := k$  satisfy the conditions of Proposition 4.2. The resulting submanifolds are again immersed but factor through double-cover over embedded coassociatives.

**Example 4.8.** Reidegeld [Rei17, Section 5.3.4] constructs an example of a flat  $G_2$ -orbifold whose singular strata split into four types. All types can be described via Example 2.1 together with the data of rows 1, 2, 3, and 5 in Table 1, respectively.

All singularities can be resolved by certain Gibbons–Hawking spaces. This requires choices of the parameter  $\zeta \in \Delta^\circ$  (cf. Section 2.2). All parameters such that the  $G_S$ -action lifts to the Gibbons–Hawking space  $X_\zeta$  can be found in Appendix B.

The singular strata described by rows 1-3 have been treated in the previous examples. For the strata of type 5 we may exemplarily pick  $\zeta := [-3i, -2i, -i, i, 2i, 3i]$ . The corresponding Gibbons–Hawking space contains five  $I_i$ -holomorphic spheres. Each one of these together with  $\xi_2 := j, \xi_3 := k$  satisfies the conditions of Proposition 4.2. The resulting submanifolds factor as before through double-cover over embedded coassociatives.

The following example contains a singular stratum whose transverse singularity is modelled on  $\mathbb{H}/\text{Dic}_3$ . For its corresponding resolution we require Kronheimer’s construction of ALE spaces.

**Example 4.9.** Reidegeld [Rei17, Section 5.3.4] constructs an example of a flat  $G_2$ -orbifold whose singular strata split into four types. All types can be described via Example 2.1 together with the data of rows 1, 3, 4, and 6 in Table 1, respectively.

Singularities of types described by rows 1, 3, and 4 have been treated in the previous examples. We therefore focus on the strata determined by row 6. A resolving ALE spaces can be constructed via Kronheimer’s method and requires a choice of parameter  $\zeta \in \Delta^\circ$  (cf. Section 2.2.2). All parameters such that the  $G_S$ -action lifts to the ALE space  $X_\zeta$  can be found in Appendix B.

For example,  $\zeta := [0, i, 2i, 3i, 4i]$  works and the corresponding ALE space contains 5  $I_i$ -holomorphic spheres (cf. Section 2.2.2). Each one together with  $\xi_2 := j$  and  $\xi_3 := k$  satisfies the conditions of Proposition 4.2 and gives rise to a coassociative submanifold. One of these submanifolds is already embedded and the other ones factor again through double-cover over embedded coassociatives.

*Remark 4.10.* Reidegeld [Rei17, Section 5.3.4] constructs two further examples of orbifolds whose transverse singularities are modelled on  $\mathbb{H}/\Gamma_S$  for  $\Gamma_S \in \{C_2, C_4, \text{Dic}_2\}$ . These are treated in [DPW22, Examples 4.5 and 4.6] and we remark that Proposition 4.2 produces coassociative submanifolds in all critical loci.

*Remark 4.11.* In [JK21] Joyce and Karigiannis extended the generalised Kummer construction to certain non-flat  $G_2$ -orbifolds. If similar estimates as in Theorem 2.7 continue to hold, then it seems plausible that the construction method for coassociative submanifolds presented in the current article can be extended to these new manifolds.

*Remark 4.12.* Assume for simplicity the following situation: Let  $(Y_0, \phi_0)$  be a flat  $G_2$ -orbifold whose singularities are all modelled upon  $T^3 \times \mathbb{H}/C_2$  where  $T^3 = \text{Im } \mathbb{H}/\mathbb{Z}^3$  (this is for example the case in [Joy96b, Example 3]). These singularities can be resolved by Gibbons–Hawking spaces  $X_\zeta$  for any choice of parameter  $\zeta := [-x, x] \in (\text{Im } \mathbb{H} \setminus \{0\})^2/\{\pm 1\}$ . However, in order to apply Proposition 4.2, we need the line  $\ell := \mathbb{R}x$  to intersect  $\mathbb{Z}^3 \subset \text{Im } \mathbb{H}$  (this is precisely the second condition of Assumption 4.1). One natural question therefore is: What can be said about coassociative submanifolds whenever  $\ell$  is 'irrational' (i.e. does not intersect  $\mathbb{Z}^3$ )? Of particular interest would be those coassociatives whose volume shrink to zero as the metric degenerates.

When addressing this question one has to overcome the following two issues:

1. Let  $x, x' \in \text{Im } \mathbb{H} \setminus \{0\}$  be two elements such that the lines  $\mathbb{R}x \subset \text{Im } \mathbb{H}$  and  $\mathbb{R}x' \subset \text{Im } \mathbb{H}$  are rational and irrational, respectively. Proposition 4.2 gives then rise to a coassociative submanifold in  $T^3 \times X_\zeta$  for the rational  $\zeta := [-x, x]$ . Using the Implicit Function Theorem one might hope to perturb this coassociative submanifold to a coassociative in  $T^3 \times X_{\zeta'}$  for  $\zeta' := [-x', x']$  once  $\zeta$  and  $\zeta'$  are sufficiently close. However, a short calculation shows that the second condition of Theorem 3.8 is always violated and such a perturbation can therefore never exist.
2. Let again  $x' \in \text{Im } \mathbb{H} \setminus \{0\}$  be such that the line  $\mathbb{R}x' \subset \text{Im } \mathbb{H}$  is irrational. One could then approximate  $\mathbb{R}x'$  by a sequence of rational lines  $(\mathbb{R}x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  for  $x_n \in \text{Im } \mathbb{H} \setminus \{0\}$ . (See [BRV16] for an overview on the measure-theoretic properties of the set of lines that are approximable with a given rate.) However, the coassociatives inside  $T^3 \times X_{\zeta_n}$  with  $\zeta_n := [-x_n, x_n]$  constructed in Proposition 4.2 become infinitely large as one approaches  $T^3 \times X_\zeta$ .

## A. The quadratic estimate

This section establishes the quadratic estimate for the map  $\mathcal{N}_J$  in Proposition 3.7.

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $v, w \in \Gamma(TM)$  be vector fields and  $\eta \in \Omega^\ell(M)$  be an  $\ell$ -form. Then the following identities hold for any torsion free connection  $\nabla$ :*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_w \eta &= \nabla_w \eta + \langle \nabla w \wedge \eta \rangle \\ \mathcal{L}_v \mathcal{L}_w \eta &= \nabla_v \nabla_w \eta + \langle \nabla w \wedge \nabla_v \eta \rangle + \langle \nabla_{v, \cdot}^2 w \wedge \eta \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \nabla v \wedge \nabla_w \eta \rangle + \langle \nabla v \wedge \langle \nabla w \wedge \eta \rangle \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where  $\langle \cdot \wedge \cdot \rangle: T^*M \otimes TM \otimes \Lambda^k T^*M \rightarrow \Lambda^k T^*M$  contracts the second and third  $TM \otimes T^*M \cong \mathbb{R}$  component and takes the wedgeproduct afterwards. Furthermore,  $\nabla_{v,w}^2 = \nabla_v \nabla_w - \nabla_{\nabla_v w}$  denotes the second covariant derivative.

*Proof.* Since  $\nabla$  is torsion-free, the equality

$$(\mathcal{L}_w \eta)(u_1, \dots, u_k) = (\nabla_w \eta)(u_1, \dots, u_k) + \sum_i (-1)^{i+1} \eta(\nabla_{u_i} w, u_1, \dots, \hat{u}_i, \dots, u_k)$$

holds. This is the first identity and the second is proven similarly.  $\square$

Recall from Section 3 that  $\iota: M \rightarrow Y$  is a coassociative immersion equipped with a tubular neighborhood  $J: U \rightarrow Y$ . Furthermore, let  $F_J$  and  $\mathcal{N}_J$  be defined as in Proposition 3.7.

**Lemma A.2.** *Let  $u, v, w \in \Gamma(U)$ . The second derivative of  $F_J$  can be estimated by*

$$\|(D_u D F_J)(v)(w)\|_{C^{k,\alpha}} \leq c(1 + \|u\|_{C^{k+1,\alpha}}) \|v\|_{C^{k+1,\alpha}} \|w\|_{C^{k+1,\alpha}}$$

where we regard the differential  $D F_J$  as a map from  $\Gamma(U)$  to  $\text{Hom}(\Gamma(N_i), \Omega^3(M))$  and accordingly,  $(D_u D F_J)(v) \in \text{Hom}(\Gamma(N_i), \Omega^3(M))$ .

*Proof.* Lift the sections  $v, w \in \Gamma_M(U)$  to vector fields  $\hat{v}, \hat{w} \in \Gamma_U(TU)$  via  $\hat{v}(u_m) := \frac{d}{dt} u_m + tv(m)|_{t=0}$  where  $m \in M$  denotes the basepoint of  $u_m$  (and analogously for  $\hat{w}$ ). Denote their respective flows by  $\varphi^{\hat{v}}$ , and  $\varphi^{\hat{w}}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} (D_u D F_J)(v)(w) &= \partial_t \partial_s F_J(u + tv + sw) = \partial_t \partial_s u^*(\varphi_t^{\hat{v}})^*(\varphi_s^{\hat{w}})^*(J^* \phi) \\ &= u^* \mathcal{L}_{\hat{v}} \mathcal{L}_{\hat{w}} (J^* \phi). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\|D_u D f(v)(w)\|_{C^{k,\alpha}} \leq c_1 \|Du\|_{C^{k,\alpha}} \|\mathcal{L}_{\hat{w}} \mathcal{L}_{\hat{v}} (J^* \phi)\|_{C^{k,\alpha}}$ .

The connection on  $\Lambda_+^2 T^*M$  induces a decomposition of the tangent bundle  $TU$  into vertical  $V$  and horizontal component  $H$ . The vertical part of the differential  $Du \in \Gamma(\text{Hom}(TM, u^*TU))$  is given (up to the identification of  $u^*V$  with  $\Lambda_+^2 T^*M$ ) by  $\nabla u$  and the horizontal component is up to the identification  $u^*H \cong TM$  given by the identity map. Therefore,  $\|D_u D f(v)(w)\|_{C^{k,\alpha}} \leq c_2 (1 + \|\nabla u\|_{C^{k,\alpha}}) \|\mathcal{L}_{\hat{w}} \mathcal{L}_{\hat{v}} (J^* \phi)\|_{C^{k,\alpha}}$ .

To estimate the Lie derivative, we invoke the previous lemma. The only two terms that might require an explanation are  $\nabla_{\hat{v}} \nabla_{\hat{w}} (J^* \phi)$  and  $\langle \nabla_{\hat{v}}^2 \hat{w} \wedge (J^* \phi) \rangle$ . The first can be estimated by

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_{\hat{v}} \nabla_{\hat{w}} (J^* \phi)\|_{C^{k,\alpha}} &\leq \|i_{\hat{w}} (\nabla_{\hat{v}} \nabla (J^* \phi))\|_{C^{k,\alpha}} + \|\nabla_{\nabla_{\hat{v}} \hat{w}} (J^* \phi)\|_{C^{k,\alpha}} \\ &\leq c_3 \|w\|_{C^{k,\alpha}} \|v\|_{C^{k,\alpha}} (\|\nabla \nabla (J^* \phi)\|_{C^{k,\alpha}} + \|\nabla (J^* \phi)\|_{C^{k,\alpha}}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that in the second line there is no additional derivative of  $\hat{w}$  coming from  $\nabla_{\hat{v}} \hat{w}$ . This is because  $(\nabla_{\hat{v}} \hat{w})(u_m)$  only depends on  $v(m)$  and  $w(m)$ . (In fact, one can define a map  $\Phi: U \times_M U \rightarrow TU$  by  $(u_1, u_2) \mapsto \nabla_{\hat{u}_1} \hat{u}_2$ .)

Similarly,

$$\|\langle \nabla_{\hat{v}}^2 \hat{w} \wedge (J^* \phi) \rangle\|_{C^{k,\alpha}} \leq c_4 (\|v\|_{C^{k,\alpha}} \|w\|_{C^{k,\alpha}} + \|v\|_{C^{k+1,\alpha}} \|w\|_{C^{k+1,\alpha}}) \|J^* \phi\|_{C^{k,\alpha}}$$

which together with the observation that  $\|J^* \phi\|_{C^{k+2,\alpha}}$  is bounded finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition A.3.** *The quadratic estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{N}_J(v) - \mathcal{N}_J(w)\|_{C^{k,\alpha}} &\leq c(1 + \|v\|_{C^{k+1,\alpha}} + \|w\|_{C^{k+1,\alpha}} + \|v - w\|_{C^{k+1,\alpha}}) \\ &\quad \|v - w\|_{C^{k+1,\alpha}} (\|v\|_{C^{k+1,\alpha}} + \|w\|_{C^{k+1,\alpha}}) \end{aligned}$$

holds.

*Proof.* This follows immediately from the previous lemma and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_J(v) - \mathcal{N}_J(w) &= \int_0^1 D_{tw}F_J(v - w) - D_0F_J(v - w) + (D_{tw}F_J - D_{tw}F_J)(w) dt \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_0^t (D_{sv}DF_J)(v)(v - w) + (D_{tw+s(v-w)}DF_J)(v - w)(w) ds dt. \end{aligned}$$

□

## B. Resolution data for Reidegeld's orbifolds

In this section we describe how to construct resolution data for those flat  $G_2$ -orbifolds in [Rei17, Section 5.3.4] which were not treated in [DPW22, Section 4]. A neighborhood of the singular strata in all these orbifolds can be described by Example 2.1 using the data from Table 1 (cf. Section 4).

The resolution data for singular strata which are described in rows 1.-5. of Table 1 can be constructed via the Gibbons–Hawking Ansatz (cf. Section 2.2.1) or, equivalently, via Kronheimer's construction (cf. Section 2.2.2). Recall that in order to obtain a smooth manifold we need to choose for either method a parameter  $\zeta$  from

$$\Delta^\circ := \{[\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_N] \in (\text{Im } \mathbb{H})^N / S_N \mid \zeta_1 + \dots + \zeta_N = 0 \text{ and } \zeta_i \neq \zeta_j \text{ for } i \neq j\}.$$

To lift the action of  $G_S$  we need to restrict further to the following sets:

1.  $(\Delta^\circ)^{R_+, (-R_-)} = \{[\zeta_1, R_+\zeta_1] \in \Delta^\circ \mid \zeta_1 \in ((\mathbb{R}j)^\perp \cup (\mathbb{R}k)^\perp) \setminus \mathbb{R}i\} \cup \{[-\zeta_1, \zeta_1] \in \Delta^\circ \mid \zeta_1 \in \mathbb{R}i\}$
2.  $(\Delta^\circ)^{(-R_-)} = \{[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, -R_-\zeta_2] \in \Delta^\circ \mid \zeta_1 \in (\mathbb{R}j)^\perp, \zeta_2 \notin (\mathbb{R}j)^\perp\} \cup \{[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3] \in \Delta^\circ \mid \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3 \in (\mathbb{R}j)^\perp\}$
3.  $(\Delta^\circ)^{R_+, (-R_-)} = \{[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, R_+\zeta_2] \in \Delta^\circ \mid \zeta_1 \in \mathbb{R}i, \zeta_2 \in ((\mathbb{R}j)^\perp \cup (\mathbb{R}k)^\perp) \setminus \mathbb{R}i\} \cup \{[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3] \in \Delta^\circ \mid \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3 \in \mathbb{R}i\}$
4.  $(\Delta^\circ)^{R_+, (-R_-)} = \{[\zeta_1, R_+\zeta_1, -R_-\zeta_1, -R_+R_-\zeta_1] \in \Delta^\circ \mid \zeta_1 \notin (\mathbb{R}j)^\perp \cup (\mathbb{R}k)^\perp\} \cup \{[\zeta_1, R_+\zeta_1, \zeta_2, R_+\zeta_2] \in \Delta^\circ \mid \zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in ((\mathbb{R}j)^\perp \cup (\mathbb{R}k)^\perp) \setminus \mathbb{R}i\} \cup \{[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3, R_+\zeta_3] \in \Delta^\circ \mid \zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathbb{R}i, \zeta_3 \in ((\mathbb{R}j)^\perp \cup (\mathbb{R}k)^\perp) \setminus \mathbb{R}i\} \cup \{[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3, \zeta_4] \in \Delta^\circ \mid \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3, \zeta_4 \in \mathbb{R}i\}$

$$\begin{aligned}
5. (\Delta^\circ)^{R_+, (-R_-)} = & \{[\zeta_1, R_+\zeta_1, \zeta_2, R_+\zeta_2, -R_-\zeta_2, -R_+R_-\zeta_2] \in \Delta^\circ \mid \\
& \zeta_1 \in ((\mathbb{R}j)^\perp \cup (\mathbb{R}k)^\perp) \setminus \mathbb{R}i, \zeta_2 \notin (\mathbb{R}j)^\perp \cup (\mathbb{R}k)^\perp\} \cup \\
& \{[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3, R_+\zeta_3, -R_-\zeta_3, -R_+R_-\zeta_3] \in \Delta^\circ \mid \\
& \zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathbb{R}i, \zeta_3 \notin (\mathbb{R}j)^\perp \cup (\mathbb{R}k)^\perp\} \cup \\
& \{[\zeta_1, R_+\zeta_1, \zeta_2, R_+\zeta_2, \zeta_3, R_+\zeta_3] \in \Delta^\circ \mid \\
& \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3 \in ((\mathbb{R}j)^\perp \cup (\mathbb{R}k)^\perp) \setminus \mathbb{R}i\} \cup \\
& \{[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3, R_+\zeta_3, \zeta_4, R_+\zeta_4] \in \Delta^\circ \mid \\
& \zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathbb{R}i, \zeta_3, \zeta_4 \in ((\mathbb{R}j)^\perp \cup (\mathbb{R}k)^\perp) \setminus \mathbb{R}i\} \cup \\
& \{[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3, \zeta_4, \zeta_5, R_+\zeta_5] \in \Delta^\circ \mid \\
& \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3, \zeta_4 \in \mathbb{R}i, \zeta_5 \in ((\mathbb{R}j)^\perp \cup (\mathbb{R}k)^\perp) \setminus \mathbb{R}i\} \cup \\
& \{[\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3, \zeta_4, \zeta_5, \zeta_6] \in \Delta^\circ \mid \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3, \zeta_4, \zeta_5, \zeta_6 \in \mathbb{R}i\}.
\end{aligned}$$

To resolve singular strata described in row 6. of Table 1 we need Kronheimer's construction as reviewed in Section 2.2.2.

The root system of  $D_5$  is given by (cf. [Bou08, Chapter VI.4.8])

$$\Phi = \{\pm e_i \pm e_j \in \mathbb{R}^5 \mid i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, 5\}\}$$

and one possible choice of simple roots consists of

$$\alpha_i := e_i - e_{i+1} \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, 4 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_5 := e_5 + e_4.$$

Its Weyl group  $W = C_2^4 \rtimes S_5$  acts on  $\mathbb{R}^5$  by permuting and changing the signs of an even number of coordinates. Thus, in order to obtain a smooth manifold, we must choose the value of the moment map from

$$\Delta^\circ = \{[\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_5] \in ((\text{Im } \mathbb{H})^* \otimes \mathbb{R}^5)/W \mid \zeta_i \neq \pm \zeta_j \text{ for } i \neq j\}.$$

In order to lift the action of  $G_S$ , we need to restrict further to the set

$$\begin{aligned}
6. (\Delta^\circ)^{R_+, R_-} = & \{[0, \zeta_1, R_+\zeta_1, R_-\zeta_1, R_+R_-\zeta_1] \in \Delta^\circ \mid \zeta_1 \notin (\mathbb{R}i)^\perp \cup (\mathbb{R}j)^\perp \cup (\mathbb{R}k)^\perp\} \cup \\
& \{[0, \zeta_1, R_a\zeta_1, \zeta_2, R_b\zeta_2] \in \Delta^\circ \mid \\
& \zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in ((\mathbb{R}i)^\perp \cup (\mathbb{R}j)^\perp \cup (\mathbb{R}k)^\perp) \setminus (\mathbb{R}i \cup \mathbb{R}j \cup \mathbb{R}k) \text{ and} \\
& R_a, R_b \in \{R_+, R_-, R_+R_-\}\} \cup \\
& \{[0, \zeta_1, t\zeta_1, \zeta_2, R_b\zeta_2] \in \Delta^\circ \mid \\
& \zeta_1 \in \mathbb{R}i \cup \mathbb{R}j \cup \mathbb{R}k, t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0, -1\}, \\
& \zeta_2 \in ((\mathbb{R}i)^\perp \cup (\mathbb{R}j)^\perp \cup (\mathbb{R}k)^\perp) \setminus (\mathbb{R}i \cup \mathbb{R}j \cup \mathbb{R}k) \text{ and} \\
& R_a \in \{R_+, R_-, R_+R_-\}\} \cup \\
& \{[0, \zeta_1, t_1\zeta_1, \zeta_2, t_2\zeta_2] \in \Delta^\circ \mid \zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathbb{R}i \cup \mathbb{R}j \cup \mathbb{R}k, t_1 t_2 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0, -1\}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

## References

- [AB02] Michael Atiyah and Roger Bielawski. Nahm’s equations, configuration spaces and flag manifolds. *Bull. Braz. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 33(2):157–176, 2002.
- [Bou08] Nicolas Bourbaki. *Elements of mathematics. Lie groups and Lie algebras. Chapters 4–6. Transl. from the French by Andrew Pressley*. Berlin: Springer, paperback reprint of the hardback edition 2002 edition, 2008.
- [BRV16] Victor Beresnevich, Felipe Ramírez, and Sanju Velani. *Metric Diophantine Approximation: Aspects of Recent Work*, page 1–95. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [DPW22] Shubham Dwivedi, Daniel Platt, and Thomas Walpuski. Associative submanifolds in Joyce’s generalised Kummer constructions. *preprint*, 2022. <https://walpu.ski/Research/AssociativesInGeneralisedKummerConstructions.pdf> accessed 23.11.2022.
- [DS11] Simon Donaldson and Ed Segal. Gauge theory in higher dimensions. II. In *Geometry of special holonomy and related topics*, page 1–41. Somerville, MA: International Press, 2011.
- [EH78] Tohru Eguchi and Andrew J. Hanson. Asymptotically flat self-dual solutions to euclidean gravity. *Physics Letters B*, 74(3):249–251, 1978.
- [GH78] Gary W. Gibbons and Stephen W. Hawking. Gravitational multi-instantons. *Physics Letters B*, 78(4):430–432, 1978.
- [GRG97] Gary W. Gibbons, Paulina Rychenkova, and Ryushi Goto. Hyper-Kähler quotient construction of BPS monopole moduli spaces. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 186(3):581–599, 1997.
- [HL82] Reese Harvey and H. Blaine Lawson. Calibrated geometries. *Acta Math.*, 148:47–157, 1982.
- [HM15] James Halverson and David Morrison. On gauge enhancement and singular limits in  $G_2$  compactifications of M-theory. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2016, 07 2015.
- [JK21] Dominic D. Joyce and Spiro Karigiannis. A new construction of compact torsion-free  $G_2$ -manifolds by gluing families of Eguchi-Hanson spaces. *J. Differ. Geom.*, 117(2):255–343, 2021.
- [Joy96a] Dominic D. Joyce. Compact Riemannian 7-manifolds with holonomy  $G_2$ . I. *J. Differ. Geom.*, 43(2):291–328, 1996.
- [Joy96b] Dominic D. Joyce. Compact Riemannian 7-manifolds with holonomy  $G_2$ . II. *J. Differ. Geom.*, 43(2):329–375, 1996.

- [Joy99] Dominic D. Joyce. Deforming Calabi-Yau orbifolds. *Asian J. Math.*, 3(4):853–867, 1999.
- [Joy00] Dominic D. Joyce. *Compact manifolds with special holonomy*. Oxford Math. Monogr. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- [Joy07] Dominic D. Joyce. *Riemannian holonomy groups and calibrated geometry*, volume 12 of *Oxf. Grad. Texts Math.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- [Kle19] Felix Klein. *Lectures on the icosahedron and the solution of equations of the fifth degree*. Translated by George Gavin Morrice. With a new introduction and commentaries by Peter Slodowy. Translated by Lei Yang, volume 5 of *CTM, Class. Top. Math.* Beijing: Higher Education Press, reprint of the English translation of the 1884 German original edition, 2019.
- [Kro89a] Peter B. Kronheimer. The construction of ALE spaces as hyper-Kähler quotients. *J. Differ. Geom.*, 29(3):665–683, 1989.
- [Kro89b] Peter B. Kronheimer. A Torelli-type theorem for gravitational instantons. *J. Differ. Geom.*, 29(3):685–697, 1989.
- [Lot20] Jason D. Lotay. Calibrated submanifolds. In *Lectures and surveys on  $G_2$ -manifolds and related topics*. Minischool and workshop on  $G_2$ -manifolds, Fields Institute, Toronto, Canada, August 19–25, 2017, page 69–101. New York, NY: Springer, 2020.
- [McL98] Robert C. McLean. Deformations of calibrated submanifolds. *Commun. Anal. Geom.*, 6(4):705–747, 1998.
- [Pla20] Daniel Platt. Improved estimates for  $G_2$ -structures on the generalised Kummer construction. *arXiv preprint*, 2020. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.00482>.
- [Rei17] Frank Reidegeld.  $G_2$ -orbifolds with ADE-singularities. *Habilitation Thesis, Fakultät für Mathematik, TU Dortmund*, 2017. [https://eldorado.tu-dortmund.de/bitstream/2003/36941/1/Habilitation\\_Reidegeld.pdf](https://eldorado.tu-dortmund.de/bitstream/2003/36941/1/Habilitation_Reidegeld.pdf).
- [Tia00] Gang Tian. Gauge theory and calibrated geometry. I. *Ann. Math. (2)*, 151(1):193–268, 2000.
- [Wal] Thomas Walpuski. Riemannian Geometry II (lecture notes). <https://walpuski/Teaching/RiemannianGeometry.pdf>. Online; accessed 23.11.2022.
- [Wal13] Thomas Walpuski.  $G_2$ -instantons on generalised Kummer constructions. *Geom. Topol.*, 17(4):2345–2388, 2013.