

# MANY FACETS OF COHOMOLOGY

## DIFFERENTIAL COMPLEXES AND STRUCTURE-AWARE FORMULATIONS

KAIBO HU

**ABSTRACT.** Complexes and cohomology, traditionally central to topology, have emerged as fundamental tools across applied mathematics and the sciences. This survey explores their roles in diverse areas, from partial differential equations and continuum mechanics to reformulations of the Einstein equations and network theory. Motivated by advances in compatible and structure-preserving discretisation such as Finite Element Exterior Calculus (FEEC), we examine how differential complexes encode critical properties such as existence, uniqueness, stability and rigidity of solutions to differential equations. We demonstrate that various fundamental concepts and models in solid and fluid mechanics are essentially formulated in terms of differential complexes.

### CONTENTS

1. Complexes and cohomology: a perspective from solving equations	2
2. De Rham and BGG complexes	11
2.1. De Rham complexes: algebraic topology	12
2.2. Complexes from complexes	17
2.3. Twisted complex: Riemann-Cartan geometry	20
2.4. Conformal complex: conformal geometry	22
2.5. The BGG machinery	24
3. Analysis and PDEs	25
3.1. Adjoint operators and Hodge–Laplacian problems	26
3.2. Hodge decomposition	27
3.3. Poincaré-Korn inequalities	28
3.4. Other applications in linear and nonlinear analysis	30
4. Solid mechanics	30
4.1. Classical elasticity and compatible continuum: a nonlinear complex	31
4.2. Higher-order forms: defects and incompatibility	34
4.3. Twisted complexes: microstructure and micropolar models	36
4.4. Mixed dimensional models: Čech complexes	40
5. Topological hydrodynamics and magnetohydrodynamics	42
5.1. Divergence-constraints and advection-diffusion by differential forms	42
5.2. Helicity and topological hydrodynamics	44
6. General relativity and the Einstein equations	47
7. Graphs, networks, and data analysis	51
8. Outlook and discussions	54
Acknowledgement	55

---

*Date:* April 8, 2025.

The work of KH was supported by a Royal Society University Research Fellowship (URF\R1\221398), an ERC Starting Grant (project 101164551, GeoFEM), and a Royal Society International Exchanges Grant (IEC\NSFC\233594).

## 1. COMPLEXES AND COHOMOLOGY: A PERSPECTIVE FROM SOLVING EQUATIONS

A basic question in the sciences is to clarify the relationships among physical observables. Newton’s law

$$(1.1) \quad \mathbf{f} = m\mathbf{a} = m\ddot{\mathbf{x}},$$

indicates that the force exerted on a body is proportional to its acceleration. The (incompressible) Navier–Stokes equations

$$\mathbf{u}_t + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u} - R_e^{-1} \Delta \mathbf{u} + \nabla p = \mathbf{f}, \quad (1.2a)$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0, \quad (1.2b)$$

indicate a relationship between the velocity  $\mathbf{u}$ , the pressure  $p$ , and the external force  $\mathbf{f}$  on a flow. This is a nonlinear differential and algebraic relationship. Solving differential equations is fundamental: Newton’s famous statement, often paraphrased as “The laws of nature are expressed by differential equations” [16], emphasises their fundamental roles.

Both (1.1) and (1.2) involve continuous space and time. Through the developments from Newton and Leibniz to Cauchy, Bolzano, and Weierstrass, *calculus* established rigorous concepts of limits and convergence of discrete objects (such as values on a lattice) to continuous counterparts (such as functions) via infinitesimal calculus. Since then, the interaction between discrete and continuous has been a central topic in mathematics and physics [24].

Starting in the 20th century, a reverse trend of translating continuous theories back to discrete ones emerged. Quantum theory and numerical computation have been two major motivations: the former aims to quantise continuous theories such as general relativity, and the latter aims to reduce continuous problems to a finite number of degrees of freedom to fit them into computer simulations. Both directions raised the fundamental question of finding discrete counterparts to continuous systems. A natural idea would be to revisit the invention of calculus and replace derivatives and limits with finite differences. Indeed, this led to the rise of finite difference methods, playing a crucial role from the early days of von Neumann’s applications [140] to modern computational fluid dynamics and numerous other areas.

**Compatible discretisation.** Numerical methods may face subtle and serious issues. Puzzling examples come from computational electromagnetism and fluid dynamics. Extending finite element or finite difference schemes (that are standard for scalar problems) to solving the Maxwell equations or the Navier–Stokes equations can lead to spurious (wrong) numerical solutions. These issues reflect a fundamental question:

*how to discretise a system with multiple variables?*

The problem of discretising a multi-field system fits into the broader topic of *compatible discretisation*.

The examples of discretising Maxwell’s equations and the Navier–Stokes equations show that discretisations of different variables must satisfy certain conditions, rather than being chosen arbitrarily (such as replacing all derivatives by standard finite differences). Consequently, a long line of research has sought to identify such conditions and design *discrete patterns* (proper staggered grids or finite elements – for the latter, how to distribute degrees of freedom over a triangulation and how to construct local shape functions to match those degrees of freedom) for different variables and problems.

The principle of identifying such compatibility conditions for multi-variable systems has been established in what is known as the Ladyzhenskaya-Babuška-Brezzi (LBB) condition. Different problems have different versions of the LBB condition, typically involving conditions on differential operators connecting the spaces of different variables. For incompressible fluids, for example, the velocity space must map *onto* the pressure space via the div operator. Such relations are summarised in diagrams and complexes like

$$(1.3) \quad 0 \longrightarrow V^0 \xrightarrow{\text{grad}} V^1 \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} V^2 \xrightarrow{\text{div}} V^3 \longrightarrow 0$$

velocity
pressure

electric field
magnetic field

Recall that a sequence of spaces  $V^k, k = 0, 1, \dots$  and operators  $d^k : V^k \rightarrow V^{k+1}, k = 0, 1, \dots$  is called a *complex* if  $d^{k+1} \circ d^k = 0$ , for any  $k$ . The  $k$ -th cohomology is defined as the quotient space  $\mathcal{H}^k := \ker(d^k) / \text{Ran}(d^{k-1})$ . Roughly speaking, the  $k$ -th cohomology includes those fields  $u \in V^k$  satisfying  $d^k u = 0$  but not in the range of the previous operator  $d^{k-1} V^{k-1}$ <sup>a</sup>.

In fact, *differential complexes* (sequences of spaces connected by differential operators) such as (1.3) and the homological algebra for them not only hold for special cases, but reflects rather general principles for solving equations, such as existence, uniqueness and stability of solutions.

### Homological algebra for solving equations

Natural mathematical questions arising from solving equations are related to the *existence*, *uniqueness*, and *stability* of solutions. We can illustrate these concepts somewhat formally using *diagrams*. Suppose we want to solve

$$(1.4) \quad \mathcal{L}(w) = f,$$

where  $f$  is an external force and  $w$  is the variable to solve for. Note that  $w$  may be a combination of several physical quantities. For example, in (1.1), given the mass  $m$  and the external force  $\mathbf{f}$ , one solves for the position  $w := \mathbf{x}$ , where  $\mathcal{L} := \frac{d^2}{dt^2}$  is the second order derivative; in the Navier–Stokes equations (1.2), given the force  $\mathbf{f}$ , one solves for velocity and pressure  $w := (\mathbf{u}, p)$ , and the (nonlinear) operator  $\mathcal{L}$  is defined by those equations, mapping  $(\mathbf{u}, p)$  to  $\mathbf{f}$ .

Solving the equation (1.4) can be stated as: given  $f$  in a data space  $G$ , does there exist a solution  $w$  in a solution space  $W$ ? Then *existence* is equivalent to whether the map  $\mathcal{L} : W \rightarrow G$  is surjective. In diagram form, we say

$$W \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} G \longrightarrow 0$$

is *exact* at  $G$ , meaning that any element in  $G$  mapped to zero must come from  $\mathcal{L}$  of some element in  $W$ . By definition of the two arrows, exactness is precisely the surjectivity of  $\mathcal{L}$ , thus the existence of solutions to (1.4) (for general right hand sides). *Uniqueness* (injectivity

<sup>a</sup>For example, (1.3) is a complex since  $\text{curl} \circ \text{grad} = 0$  and  $\text{div} \circ \text{curl} = 0$ . The cohomology at  $V^0$  can be represented by the kernel of grad; the cohomology at  $V^1$  can be represented by curl-free fields which cannot be written as a gradient; the cohomology at  $V^2$  is represented by div-free fields that cannot be written as a curl; and the cohomology at  $V^3$  is represented by those elements in  $V^3$  that are not in the range  $\text{div} V^2$

of  $\mathcal{L}$ ) is similarly equivalent to the exactness of

$$0 \longrightarrow W \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} G,$$

i.e., anything in  $W$  mapped to 0 by  $\mathcal{L}$  must be the zero element in  $W$ . In summary, the existence and uniqueness of (1.4) boil down to the exactness at both  $W$  and  $G$  of

$$0 \longrightarrow W \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} G \longrightarrow 0.$$

If the uniqueness does not hold, we may talk about *rigidity*:

$$0 \longrightarrow V \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}} W \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} G \longrightarrow 0.$$

Here we add another space  $V$ , and elements in  $V$  are mapped into  $W$  by  $\mathcal{T}$ . Relevant to our problem, we require that the image of  $\mathcal{T}$  is mapped to zero by  $\mathcal{L}$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{L} \circ \mathcal{T} = 0$ . Then the nonuniqueness of  $\mathcal{L}$  can be expressed by the exactness at  $W$ : if  $w \in W$  satisfies  $\mathcal{L}(w) = 0$ , there exists  $v \in V$  such that  $w = \mathcal{T}(v)$ . In other words, the solution to (1.4) is unique only up to elements in  $V$ . Another way of putting this is: if  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  have the same image under  $\mathcal{L}$ , then  $w_1 - w_2$  is in the image of  $\mathcal{T}$ .

Nonexistence or nonuniqueness can be also phrased as the presence of nontrivial cohomology. *Stability* means that small perturbations in the data yield only small errors in the solutions. Assume  $W$  and  $G$  are Banach spaces with norms  $\|\cdot\|_W$  and  $\|\cdot\|_G$ , respectively. Stability can be expressed by boundedness of the solution operator  $\mathcal{L}^{-1}$ : there exists a positive constant  $C$  such that  $\|\mathcal{L}^{-1}\|_{G \rightarrow W} \leq C$ , where

$$\|\mathcal{L}^{-1}\|_{G \rightarrow W} := \sup_{0 \neq g \in G} \frac{\|\mathcal{L}^{-1}(g)\|_W}{\|g\|_G}.$$

In other terms, if  $\|f\|_G$  is small, then the corresponding solution  $\|w\|_W$  remains small when  $\mathcal{L}$  is invertible with a bounded inverse. Another standard form is the *Ladyzhenskaya-Babuška-Brezzi inf-sup condition*:

$$\exists \gamma > 0 \quad \text{such that} \quad \inf_{g \in G} \sup_{v \in W} \frac{(\mathcal{L}v, g)}{\|v\|_W \|g\|_G} \geq \gamma > 0.$$

All these considerations indicate that complexes and cohomology are fundamental for equations and models behind them, as we will discuss in detail in this paper.

On the discrete level, the LBB conditions guide the design of finite element spaces or discrete patterns. Concretely, the LBB condition requires that discrete spaces (e.g., finite elements)  $V^i$  fit into (1.3) and satisfy corresponding algebraic relations (for instance,  $\text{div } V^2 = V^3$ ). Pioneering numerical analysts such as Nédélec, Raviart, and Thomas developed these finite elements individually [38, 105, 106, 122]. Later, Bossavit observed that they can be interpreted as a complex and are special cases of *Whitney forms* [32, 77, 141]. This observation led to finite element differential forms and the foundation of finite element exterior calculus [7, 10, 11, 77].

Although numerics is not the focus of this paper, as a motivation, we include a numerical example to demonstrate the significance of compatible discretisation (particular with respect to differential complex structures) for computation.

**Example 1** (compatible discretisation of multi-fields). *Let  $\Omega$  be a bounded polyhedral domain. We recall the finite element methods for solving the Poisson equation on  $\Omega$  with homogeneous boundary*

condition

$$-\Delta u = f, \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{1.5a}$$

$$u = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \tag{1.5b}$$

Testing the equation with  $v$  and integrate by parts, we get the weak form: find  $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ , such that

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \, dx = \int_{\Omega} f v, \quad \forall v \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

The Galerkin method is a discretisation of the weak formulation by replacing the infinite dimensional space  $H_0^1$  by a finite dimensional subspace  $V_h \subset H_0^1$ : find  $u_h \in V_h$ , such that

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla u_h \cdot \nabla v_h \, dx = \int_{\Omega} f v_h, \quad \forall v_h \in V_h.$$

Different choices of  $V_h$  lead to different numerical methods. Let  $\mathcal{T}_h$  be a triangulation of  $\Omega$ . The Lagrange finite element space consists of continuous functions which are piecewise polynomials:

$$V_h := \{u_h|_T \in \mathcal{P}_1(T), \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h\} \cap H_0^1(\Omega).$$

This definition implies that  $V_h \subset C^0(\Omega)$ . If  $\mathcal{T}_h$  consists of simplices (more precisely, if  $\mathcal{T}_h$  is a simplicial complex), then  $V_h$  is spanned by the hat function at each interior vertex which is equal to one at this vertex and linearly decays in the patch of the vertex (see Figure 1). Detailed discussions on finite element methods can be found in standard textbooks, e.g., [36, 37, 116].




FIGURE 1. Hat function on a triangulation  $\mathcal{T}_h$ .

Consider an example where  $f = 1$  and  $\Omega$  is the unit square. The following solution is obtained with NGSolve [129] (see Figure 2).




FIGURE 2. Poisson problem on unit square with  $f = 1$ . Left: plot of  $u_h$ , Lagrange elements of second order. Right: plot of the magnitude of  $\nabla u_h$ .

We may consider another formulation. Introduce  $\boldsymbol{\sigma} := -\text{grad } u$ . Then the Poisson equation (1.5) has an equivalent form, which we refer to as the mixed form:

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} + \text{grad } u = 0, \quad (1.6a)$$

$$\text{div } \boldsymbol{\sigma} = f. \quad (1.6b)$$

When we numerically solve (1.6), we immediately encounter the problem of how to discretize  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$  and  $u$ . In the following, we explore several combinations<sup>b</sup>. In particular, we investigate combinations of the Lagrange finite element space  $V_h$  and its vector version, piecewise polynomials of degree less than or equal to  $k$ , denoted by  $\text{DG}_k$ , and the Raviart-Thomas space

$$\text{RT}_k := \{\boldsymbol{\sigma}|_T = \mathbf{a} + b\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{a} \in [\mathcal{P}_k]^2, b \in \mathcal{P}_k, \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h; \boldsymbol{\sigma} \in H(\text{div})\}.$$




FIGURE 3. Mixed Poisson problem on unit square with  $f = 1$ . Finite element pair:  $u_h \in \text{RT}_1$ , the first order Raviart-Thomas element;  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h \in \text{DG}_0$ , piecewise constants. Left: plot of  $u_h$ . Right: plot of the magnitude of  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h$ . Error  $u$ : 0.0038, error  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ : 0.0017. Mesh size = 0.1.

One may explore other possibilities. For example, one can discretise each component of  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$  by the Lagrange element of degree 1, and  $u$  by the Lagrange element of degree 2. The solver fails. In fact, the resulting matrix is singular in this case.

These numerical results demonstrate that only proper combinations of finite element spaces lead to correct convergence.

**Structure-preserving discretisation** Another general philosophy in numerical mathematics is *structure-preserving discretisation*. The importance of this subject is based on the fact that formulations that are equivalent at the continuous level can exhibit rather different numerical behaviours [73, 91]. A striking example is geometric integrators [63, 73]: for the numerical solutions of classical mechanics with ordinary differential equations (ODEs), discretising the Newtonian formulation directly can lead to significant errors in the long-term evolution; meanwhile, discretising a Hamiltonian formulation to preserve the symplectic structure yields stable computations. Below, we demonstrate a related example demonstrating similar issues in computing the long-term behaviour of magnetohydrodynamics, where both *temporal* and *spatial* discretisations are crucial for obtaining physically correct solutions.

<sup>b</sup>When we computed the errors, we used the primal formulation with mesh size 0.01 and piecewise polynomials of degree 3 as the reference solution.




FIGURE 4. Mixed Poisson problem on unit square with  $f = 1$ . Finite element pair:  $u_h \in \text{RT}_1$ , the first order Raviart–Thomas element;  $\sigma_h \in \text{DG}_0$ , piecewise constants. Left: plot of  $u_h$ . Right: plot of the magnitude of  $\sigma_h$ . Error  $u$ : 0.0019, error  $\sigma$ : 0.0005. Mesh size = 0.05.




FIGURE 5. Mixed Poisson problem on unit square with  $f = 1$ . Finite element pair:  $u_h \in C^0\mathcal{P}^1$ , the vector version of the Lagrange spaces;  $\sigma_h \in \text{DG}_0$ , piecewise constants. Left: plot of  $u_h$ . Right: plot of the magnitude of  $\sigma_h$ . Mesh size = 0.05.

There are many kinds of structures. A broad class of structure-preserving problems focus on preserving certain conserved quantities, such as mass, energy, helicity, or enstrophy of fluid systems [18, 58, 67]. Another major class focuses on constraints. In many field theories (electromagnetism, general relativity, Yang-Mills fields, etc.), evolution equations are accompanied by algebraic and/or differential constraints, which are automatically satisfied by the continuous evolution. Preserving those constraints numerically is often crucial (e.g., in magnetohydrodynamics and numerical relativity) [2, 34, 72, 136], because violating them may destroy essential mathematical properties and lead to numerical instability. There are many additional examples, such as positivity preservation [83, 101] or asymptotic preservation [88].

As we have seen, the existence and uniqueness of solutions can be viewed as certain cohomologies being trivial. Therefore, ensuring the well-posedness of numerical formulations can be viewed as a special type of structure-preservation, i.e., *cohomology-preservation*. Moreover, nontrivial topologies

of computational domains lead to nontrivial cohomology. Failure of dealing with such nontrivial cohomology properly also leads to spurious solutions [7,11]. The key to all these cases is *respecting the algebraic and differential relations among the variables*, often summarised as *preserving differential complexes* such as (1.3).

**Example 2** (long-term evolution). *A fundamental problem in plasma physics is to study how a magnetic field given at the initial time evolves in a long time (whether a stationary state exists and if so, what are the asymptotic properties etc.). This problem is sometimes referred to as magnetic relaxation. Below we provide a numerical example and compare a plain algorithm with an algorithm that preserves a conserved quantity [74]. In the following, we solve a slightly simplified equation of the full MHD system, called the magneto-frictional system [46]:*

$$(1.7a) \quad \partial_t \mathbf{B} + \text{curl } \mathbf{E} = \mathbf{0},$$

$$(1.7b) \quad \mathbf{E} + \mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{0},$$

$$(1.7c) \quad \mathbf{j} = \text{curl } \mathbf{B},$$

$$(1.7d) \quad \mathbf{u} = \tau \mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{B},$$

with initial data  $\mathbf{B}|_{t=0} = \mathbf{B}_0$  satisfying the magnetic Gauss law  $\text{div } \mathbf{B}_0 = 0$ . Here, the system is closed by the last equation for given  $\tau > 0$  which guarantees the energy decay

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\mathbf{B}\|^2 = -\tau \|\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{j}\|^2,$$

whereas the full MHD system is closed by coupling with the Navier–Stokes equation.

We use the Hopf fibration [133] as initial data:

$$\mathbf{B}_0 = \frac{4\sqrt{a}}{\pi(1+r^2)^3} (2y(y-xz), -2(x+yz), (-1+x^2+y^2-z^2)).$$

The Hopf fibration is highly helical, as every single field line of this field is a perfect circle, and every single field line is linked with every other one [133]. We use  $\tau = 10$ ,  $dt = 1$  and  $T = 1000$ . Quadratic-invariant-preserving temporal schemes [5] are used to preserve the helicity.

The results were presented in [74]. The figure on the left shows that history of the evolution by a scheme conserving the helicity  $\int \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{B} dx$ , and the figure on the right shows a standard scheme that does not preserve this quantity. The two schemes show rather different results. This is because




FIGURE 6. Helicity-preserving scheme




FIGURE 7. Galerkin scheme based on Lagrange finite elements (non-preserving)

*the scheme not preserving helicity fails to mimic a crucial topology mechanism for the relaxation problem. Details of this mechanism, as an example of the appearance of complexes and cohomology in fluid dynamics, will be discussed in Section 5.*

**Discrete theories v.s. discretisation.** We return to another motivation for developing discrete notations: discrete theories.

Numerous efforts have sought to reconcile the incompatibility between general relativity and quantum theory, producing various notions of discrete field theories. For theoretical or computational purposes, various models have been investigated in discrete mechanics [99, 100], lattice gauge theory [60, 127], and quantum field theory and discrete gravity [61, 84] etc. Regge calculus [123] is one example. Other important motivation emerges from discrete differential geometry (DDG) and computer graphics, where one develops a discrete theory which mimics fundamental principles of the continuous version. The main message, as indicated in [27], is to *discretize the whole theory, not just the equations*.

In these areas, compatible discretisation and discrete patterns can be even more vital for at least two reasons. First, *convergence to true solutions* may be secondary. For instance, in computer graphics, obeying physical laws (often certain conservation laws) is vital for realistic visualisation, whereas exact convergence might be less critical. In data sciences or complex systems such as biology [86], first-principle models are often unavailable; so one must rely on coarser structures (e.g., topological connectivity of nodes) rather than precise geometric distances. In such cases, modelling and algorithms built on discrete structures that enforce discrete conservation laws are crucial. Second, if the natural of the world were discrete, then one should regard discrete models as fundamental objects and investigate their convergence in the continuum limit, rather than first having the continuum models and discretising them.

In numerical analysis, these two traditions also coexist. Traditional finite element methods can be generalised to arbitrary order with a rigorous theory that mirrors the continuous structures. However, these function-space-based methods can be more rigid (e.g., it is challenging to handle higher-order operators). On the other hand, lattice theories (finite difference with MAC/Yee grids, Discrete Exterior Calculus, discrete differential geometry, lattice gauge theory) encode topological or geometric structures in a purely discrete form, are flexible (sometimes extendable to graphs), and are physically intuitive; yet their convergence and many properties may be less understood.

**This survey paper: structure-aware formulations.** The first question in structure-preserving numerical computation is *which structures* should be preserved. For specific problems, this typically boils down to understanding the key mathematical or physical principles and *choosing suitable variables*. Concerning the fundamental role of differential complexes, we emphasise *structure-aware formulations via differential complexes* in this paper. First, the resulting models and formulations enjoy the well-posedness encoded in complexes. Second, *compatible and structure-preserving discretisation naturally follows by discretising the underlying complexes and preserving the cohomology*.

Each physical problem has its own structural features, encoded in different complexes. Thus, to make the above idea a practical programme, we discuss differential complexes and cohomology in various contexts. On the one hand, for specific applications one investigates the differential structures therein and formulates the problem using complexes. On the other hand, one examines the construction and properties of complexes to guide modelling and computation. Sometimes surprising connections arise that merge the two directions. Many results from pure mathematical research turn out to coincide with models constructed from a rather different consideration. This demonstrates unified structures in sciences, engineering and mathematics, and the belief that *elegant mathematical structures are useful*.

We briefly mention linear elasticity to demonstrate the above idea. Designing stable finite elements for the Hellinger-Reissner principle (in which both stress and displacement are used as variables) demands a complex that captures the divergence of a symmetric matrix field. This motivated Arnold, Falk, and Winther [9, 15] to seek *elasticity complexes* around 2000:

$$(1.8) \quad C^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \xrightarrow{\text{sym grad}} C^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}) \xrightarrow{\text{curl} \circ \text{T} \circ \text{curl}} C^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}_{\text{sym}}^{3 \times 3}) \xrightarrow{\text{div}} C^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3).$$

displacement (vector)                  strain (sym matrix)                  stress (sym matrix)                  load (vector)

The complex (2.3) is often referred to as the Kröner complex [93, 95, 97] in mechanics or the Calabi complex [40] in geometry. These efforts led to fruitful interactions between numerical analysts and differential geometers on the so-called Bernstein-Gelfand-Gelfand (BGG) construction, which is a mechanism for deriving various new complexes from the de Rham complex [12]. This eventually led to a breakthrough in constructing finite elements for elasticity [15].

Most early developments on BGG complexes in numerical analysis, however, focused on specific examples in linear elasticity. It remained unclear whether the entire elasticity complex (and other complexes) enjoy desired algebraic and analytic properties such as those in [11]. Part of the difficulty arose from bridging algebraic and analytic structures, i.e., establishing the BGG construction (a method to derive new complexes from the de Rham complex) with Sobolev spaces. These challenges were addressed in [12], where a systematic way to build new complexes with analytic foundations was established. It turns out that not only does a diverse *zoo of complexes* emerge, but the *machinery* itself is useful. Through the BGG construction, one can transport results proven for the de Rham complex (electromagnetism) to many other complexes (elasticity, differential geometry, general relativity etc.). An example of this paradigm is the derivation of Poincaré operators. Carrying over these results from the de Rham complex to the elasticity complex, one reproduces the same integral formula discovered by Cesarò and Volterra in 1906 and 1907 in elasticity and defect theory [44, 139] as a special case [41, 51]. The BGG complexes and the so-called *twisted complexes* (intermediate steps in deriving BGG complexes) encode rich physics, thus opening the door to *continuum modelling via differential complexes and homological algebra* (see Section 4 below).

**Scope and organization of this paper.** This survey does not attempt to give a comprehensive review of the application of differential complexes to any single scientific topic, which will demand extensive treatments on their own. Moreover, although structure-preserving discretisation, particularly finite element exterior calculus, serves as an important motivation for the development, we will not discuss numerics (except for some motivating examples). This is because the advances in finite element exterior calculus require a separate review. Instead, in this paper, we aim to give a light overview of multiple topics to illustrate the many facets of differential complexes and cohomology, and their role and potential as fundamental tools for structure-aware formulations and structure-preserving computation.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the notion of differential complexes and several important examples, including the de Rham complex and other examples derived from it through the Bernstein-Gelfand-Gelfand (BGG) construction. These complexes provide the foundation for subsequent discussions in specific areas. Section 3 discusses how the algebraic structures imply analytic properties. Section 4 addresses how differential complexes can be applied in modelling solid mechanics, covering variational principles for elasticity, continuum defects, microstructure, dimension reduction, and multidimensional problems. Although much of this material is classical, we highlight a differential perspective (twisted and BGG complexes, high-order forms, trace complexes, and Čech double complexes). Section 5 focuses on fluid mechanics, particularly

topological hydrodynamics. The differential structures encoded in the de Rham complex allow us to define topological concepts such as helicity, knots, and topological mechanisms in fluid and magnetohydrodynamic flows that are crucial for questions in solar and astrophysics (e.g., the Parker hypothesis). Section 6 discusses various formulations of the Einstein equations and their links to differential complexes. Section 7 then focuses on a discrete theory, covering graph-based models.

## 2. DE RHAM AND BGG COMPLEXES

We use three examples of complexes to motivate this section – the de Rham complex, the elasticity complex, and the conformal complex. They represent three different classes, namely, topology, Riemannian geometry and conformal geometry, and yet fit in a unified picture. This section only focuses on smooth functions.

As a warm up, we consider the *de Rham complex in 1D*. Consider the domain  $I = (0, 1)$ . The 1D de Rham complex reads

$$(2.1) \quad 0 \longrightarrow C^\infty(I) \xrightarrow{\frac{d}{dx}} C^\infty(I) \longrightarrow 0.$$

As before, the first and the last arrows are zero maps. The cohomology at the two  $C^\infty$  spaces isomorphic to  $\mathbb{R}$  and 0, respectively, reflecting the fact that  $\ker(\frac{d}{dx})$  consists of constants, and  $\frac{d}{dx}$  maps  $C^\infty$  onto  $C^\infty$  (the inverse map is given by integral).

Let  $\Omega$  be a bounded domain in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . The de Rham complex in 3D involves the grad, curl, and div operators:

$$(2.2) \quad 0 \longrightarrow C^\infty(\Omega) \xrightarrow{\text{grad}} C^\infty(\Omega) \otimes \mathbb{R}^3 \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} C^\infty(\Omega) \otimes \mathbb{R}^3 \xrightarrow{\text{div}} C^\infty(\Omega) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Here  $C^\infty(\Omega) \otimes \mathbb{R}^3$  denotes the space of vector-valued smooth functions. The complex property holds as  $\text{curl grad} = 0$  (gradient fields have no rotation) and  $\text{div curl} = 0$  (rotation fields have no source). As we shall see later, the exactness of the complex (except at index 0, where the cohomology is isomorphic to  $\ker(\text{grad})$ , consisting of a constant on each connected component of the domain) holds on domains with trivial topology, i.e., contractible domains. This means that  $\text{curl } u = 0$  implies  $u = \text{grad } \phi$  for some  $\phi$ , and  $\text{div } v = 0$  implies  $v = \text{curl } \psi$  for some  $\psi$ .

De Rham complexes can be formulated on general differential manifolds in any dimensions. The spaces consist of *differential forms*, and the operators are *exterior derivatives*. Differential forms are skew-symmetric tensor fields and exterior derivatives are the skew-symmetric components of full derivatives. The formalism was introduced by Élie Cartan [43] and now is referred to as *exterior calculus*. The skew-symmetry turns out to be the source of many magics. The above examples (2.1) and (2.2) can be viewed as this general construction written in coordinates.

Different problems involve different operators and variables. In elasticity, the displacement is a vector field (when a metric is in place, a vector field can be identified as a 1-form). The linearised deformation is  $e := \text{def}(u) = \text{sym grad } u$ . The *elasticity complex* extends vector fields and symmetric gradient:

$$(2.3) \quad 0 \longrightarrow C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V} \xrightarrow{\text{def}} C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{S} \xrightarrow{\text{inc}} C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{S} \xrightarrow{\text{div}} C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Here  $\mathbb{V} := \mathbb{R}^3$ ,  $\mathbb{S}$  denotes the (finite dimensional) space of  $3 \times 3$  symmetric matrices, and  $\text{inc } u := \text{curl} \circ \text{T} \circ \text{curl } u$  takes column-wise curl, transpose, and take column-wise curl again. Equivalently,  $\text{inc } u = \nabla \times u \times \nabla$ , which denotes a column-wise curl of  $u$  composed with a row-wise curl (the order is irrelevant). Finally,  $\text{div}$  is a column-wise divergence in our convention. In the index notation, we have  $(\text{def } u)_{ij} = 1/2(\partial_i u_j + \partial_j u_i)$ ,  $(\text{inc } g)^{ij} = \epsilon^{ikl} \epsilon^{jst} \partial_k \partial_s g_{lt}$ , and  $(\text{div } v)_i = \partial^j u_{ij}$ . One can readily check that (2.3) is a complex, i.e.,  $\text{inc} \circ \text{def} = 0$  and  $\text{div} \circ \text{inc} = 0$ .

If  $g$  is the metric of a Riemannian manifold, then  $\text{inc } g := \nabla \times g \times \nabla$  is the linearised Einstein tensor of  $g$  around the Euclidean metric  $g_0$  (up to a constant multiple). More precisely, the Einstein tensor of the perturbed metric  $\tilde{g} := g_0 + tg$  is  $t \text{inc } g + o(t)$ . In three space dimensions, the Einstein tensor carries the same information as the Ricci and Riemann curvature tensors.

We will show that the cohomology of the elasticity complex (2.3) is isomorphic to six copies of the de Rham cohomology. Therefore (2.3) is exact when the domain is contractible, except at index 0, where the cohomology is isomorphic to the space of infinitesimal rigid body motions

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{RM} := \{\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} \times \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^3\} = \ker(\text{def}),$$

which is a six-dimensional space.

The next example is the *conformal deformation complex*:

$$(2.5) \quad 0 \longrightarrow C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{R}^3 \xrightarrow{\text{dev def}} C^\infty \otimes (\mathbb{S} \cap \mathbb{T}) \xrightarrow{\text{cot}} C^\infty \otimes (\mathbb{S} \cap \mathbb{T}) \xrightarrow{\text{div}} C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{R}^3 \longrightarrow 0.$$

Here  $\mathbb{T} := \mathbb{R}_{\text{traceless}}^{3 \times 3}$  is the linear space of traceless matrices,  $\text{dev } \mathbf{w} := \mathbf{w} - \frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(\mathbf{w})\mathbf{I}$  is the deviator and therefore  $\text{dev def } \mathbf{u}$  is symmetric and traceless. Moreover,  $\text{cot} := \text{curl} \circ \mathbb{S}^{-1} \circ \text{curl} \circ \mathbb{S}^{-1} \circ \text{curl}$ , where  $\mathbb{S}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\sigma} := \boldsymbol{\sigma}^T - \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\mathbf{I}$ , is the linearised Cotton-York operator (tensor), which plays the role of curvature in conformal geometry. In gravitational-wave models, the variables usually satisfy the transverse-traceless (TT) gauge conditions, i.e., the variable is symmetric, traceless and divergence-free. This gauge condition is precisely encoded in (2.5).

The three complexes (2.2), (2.3), and (2.5) can be compared from several perspectives. Firstly, these complexes involve vectors, symmetric matrices and symmetric traceless matrices, respectively. Secondly, the second operators in the three complexes are of the first, second and third order, respectively, which can all be constructed as a composition of curl; these three complexes are all formally self-adjoint (see Section 3 below). Thirdly, these three complexes encode topology, Riemannian geometry and conformal geometry, respectively.

**2.1. De Rham complexes: algebraic topology.** The cohomology of the de Rham complex is closely related to the topology of a domain. In particular, three concepts are linked with each other: homology (topology of a domain), cohomology (a dual concept of homology), and the de Rham cohomology. Showing the detail of this connection in this section will not only allow us to understand the cohomology of (2.2), but will also guide the design of discretisation.

Topology studies whether one object can be deformed to another by *continuous* maps. For example, Figure 8 depicts two domains. One cannot deform to another continuously, as there is a hole in one domain but not in another. In topology, one develops invariants to classify such objects: if a quantity is proved to be the same among all objects that can be continuously deformed to each other, then it is called a topological invariant. If two objects have different values, then they are not topologically equivalent. However, note that having the same values of the invariant does not guarantee two objects to be equivalent.

*Homology* is such a topological invariant. The idea of homology theory is to find out circles that are not the boundary of a disk, and generalisations to objects of any dimension (such as spheres that are not the boundary of a ball). This can be made precise by using simplicial complexes or triangulation of a domain.

**Definition 1** (Simplex). *Given  $k+1$  points  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  in general position (no  $m+2$  points on a common  $m$ -dimensional plane), the convex hull  $\sigma := [x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k]$  is called a  $k$ -simplex.*

For example, a point is a 0-simplex ( $k = 0$ ); a line is a 1-simplex ( $k = 1$ ); a triangle is a 2-simplex ( $k = 2$ ); and a tetrahedron is a 3-simplex ( $k = 3$ ).

**Definition 2** (Simplicial complex). *A simplicial complex  $\Sigma$  is the union of simplices such that*




FIGURE 8. Two manifolds: a disk and an annulus. One cannot continuously deform to another due to the hole in the annulus. From a homology perspective, a loop around the hole is not the boundary of any patch; while any closed loop in the disk is a boundary.

- (1) if a simplex  $\sigma \subset \Sigma$ , then all subsimplices of  $\sigma$  belongs to  $\Sigma$ ;
- (2) if two simplices  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \subset \Sigma$ , then their intersection is either empty or their common face.

An example of a simplicial complex is a triangulation, counting all the vertices, edges, faces etc. Now we will define a complex

$$(2.6) \quad \cdots \longrightarrow C_{i+1} \xrightarrow{\partial_{i+1}} C_i \xrightarrow{\partial_i} C_{i-1} \longrightarrow \cdots,$$

where, roughly speaking, each  $C_k$  is the collection of  $k$ -dimensional simplices, and  $\partial_k \sigma$  is the boundary of  $\sigma$  for  $\sigma \in C_k$ . The fact that (2.6) is a complex comes from the intuition that the boundary of boundary vanishes (for example, for boundary of a disk is a circle; a circle does not have a boundary). Next we make this idea precise.

**Definition 3** (*k-chain*). Given a simplicial complex  $\Sigma$ , a *k-chain* is a (formal) combination of all *k-simplices*, i.e.,

$$\sum_i c_i \sigma_i, \quad c_i \in \mathbb{R}.$$

**Definition 4** (chain groups). All *k-chains* form an Abelian group, denoted by  $C_k$ , by

$$\sum \alpha_j \sigma_j + \sum \beta_j \sigma_j = \sum (\alpha_j + \beta_j) \sigma_j.$$

**Definition 5** (boundary operator  $\partial_\bullet$ ).  $\partial_k : C_k(\Sigma) \rightarrow C_{k-1}(\Sigma)$  is a morphism which on each simplex

$$\partial_k[v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k] = \sum_i (-1)^i [v_0, \dots, v_{i-1}, \widehat{v}_i, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_k],$$

and on chains

$$\partial_k \sum_i \alpha_i \sigma_i = \sum_i \alpha_i \partial_k \sigma_i, \quad \alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Here the hat in  $[v_0, \dots, v_{i-1}, \widehat{v}_i, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_k]$  indicates that the vertex  $v_i$  is omitted.

The following result can be shown by a straightforward computation.


**Theorem 1.** Boundary of boundary vanishes, i.e.,  $\partial_{k-1} \circ \partial_k = 0$ .

For example, consider  $T = [x_0, x_1, x_2]$ . Then

$$\partial T = [x_1, x_2] - [x_0, x_2] + [x_0, x_1],$$

and

$$\partial \partial T = (x_2 - x_1) - (x_2 - x_0) + (x_1 - x_0) = 0.$$



The simplicial homology is defined to be the quotient space  $H_i := \ker(\partial_i)/\text{Ran}(\partial_{i+1})$ . The  $k$ -th Betti number is defined to be the dimension of the  $k$ -th homology space  $b_k := \dim H_k$ , i.e., the dimension of  $k$ -dimensional closed loops that are not boundaries. Here are some examples of homology:

- disk  $D^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ :  $b_0 = 1$  (boundary of any point vanishes),  $b_1 = 0$ ,  $b_2 = 0$ .
- sphere  $S^2$ :  $b_0 = 1$ ,  $b_1 = 0$ ,  $b_2 = 1$  (boundary of a sphere vanishes).

### A crash course on differential forms

**Cartan's Formalism.** Differential forms arise naturally when trying to generalise the concept of oriented area (and higher-dimensional volumes). For instance, consider the integral

$$\int_{\Omega} f(x, y) dx dy.$$

From the exterior calculus perspective, the infinitesimal area element  $dx dy$  can be interpreted as the wedge product  $dx \wedge dy$ , which satisfies  $dx \wedge dy = -dy \wedge dx$ . This skew-symmetry carries the orientation of the area element.

**Exterior Calculus Perspective.** A  $k$ -form in  $n$ -dimensional space is a linear combination of terms of the form

$$dx^{j_1} \wedge dx^{j_2} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx^{j_k}, \quad j_1, \dots, j_k \leq n,$$

where each term is fully skew-symmetric:

$$dx^{j_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx^{j_i} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx^{j_\ell} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx^{j_k} = -dx^{j_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx^{j_\ell} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx^{j_i} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx^{j_k}.$$

In particular,  $dx^i \wedge dx^i = 0$ , and

$$dx^i \wedge dx^j = -dx^j \wedge dx^i.$$

Because of this skew-symmetry, any  $k$ -form with  $k > n$  must vanish in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

For example, in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , the following sets form bases for the space of  $k$ -forms  $\text{Alt}^k \mathbb{R}^3$ :

$k$	Basis for $\text{Alt}^k \mathbb{R}^3$
0	1
1	$dx^1, dx^2, dx^3$
2	$dx^1 \wedge dx^2, dx^2 \wedge dx^3, dx^3 \wedge dx^1$
3	$dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dx^3$

A differential  $k$ -form is an alternating  $k$ -form with function coefficients, i.e., any differential  $k$ -form  $\omega$  can be written as a linear combination

$$\omega = \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_k} \sigma_{j_1, \dots, j_k}(x) dx^{j_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx^{j_k}.$$

**Proxies in 3D.** A 0-form is simply a scalar function. A 1-form  $\omega$  of the form

$$\omega = w_1 dx^1 + w_2 dx^2 + w_3 dx^3$$

corresponds to the vector  $(w_1, w_2, w_3)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . A 2-form  $v$  given by

$$v = v_1 dx^2 \wedge dx^3 + v_2 dx^3 \wedge dx^1 + v_3 dx^1 \wedge dx^2$$

has the proxy vector  $(v_1, v_2, v_3)$ . Finally, any 3-form in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  must be a multiple of  $dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dx^3$ , which corresponds to a single scalar.

We summarise this correspondence in the following table, where we slightly abuse notation by using the same symbol ( $\omega$  or  $v$ ) to denote both the differential form and its vector (or scalar) proxy:

$k$	Differential form	Proxy
0	$f$	$f$
1	$w = w_1 dx^1 + w_2 dx^2 + w_3 dx^3$	$(w_1, w_2, w_3)$
2	$v = v_1 dx^2 \wedge dx^3 + v_2 dx^3 \wedge dx^1 + v_3 dx^1 \wedge dx^2$	$(v_1, v_2, v_3)$
3	$u dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dx^3$	$u$

**Wedge Products in 3D.** The *wedge product* of a  $k$ -form and an  $\ell$ -form is a  $(k + \ell)$ -form. For 1-form bases, define  $(f dx^i) \wedge (g dx^j) = fg dx^i \wedge dx^j$ . Similar rules apply to general cases. Let  $u = u_1 dx^1 + u_2 dx^2 + u_3 dx^3$  and  $v = v_1 dx^1 + v_2 dx^2 + v_3 dx^3$  be 1-forms in  $\text{Alt}^1 \mathbb{R}^3$ . Also let

$$(2.7) \quad w = w_1 dx^2 \wedge dx^3 + w_2 dx^3 \wedge dx^1 + w_3 dx^1 \wedge dx^2$$

be a 2-form in  $\text{Alt}^2 \mathbb{R}^3$ . Then:

$$u \wedge v = (u_1 v_2 - u_2 v_1) dx^1 \wedge dx^2 + (u_2 v_3 - u_3 v_2) dx^2 \wedge dx^3 + (u_3 v_1 - u_1 v_3) dx^3 \wedge dx^1,$$

and

$$u \wedge w = (u_1 w_1 + u_2 w_2 + u_3 w_3) dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dx^3.$$

In (2.7), the term  $(u_1 v_2 - u_2 v_1) dx^1 \wedge dx^2$  is because we have two terms  $u_1 dx^1 \wedge v_2 dx^2$  and  $u_2 dx^2 \wedge v_1 dx^1 = -u_2 v_1 dx^1 \wedge dx^2$ . The computation leading to other terms is similar. In vector proxy form, these translate to cross and dot products, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} u \wedge v &\longleftrightarrow \mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{v}, \\ u \wedge w &\longleftrightarrow \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{w}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}$  denote the respective vector proxies.

More generally, combining different degrees of forms yields the following wedge-product behavior (abusing notation as before):

		$\omega \wedge \mu$			
		$\ell = 0$	$\ell = 1$	$\ell = 2$	$\ell = 3$
$k = 0$	$\omega \mu$	$\omega \mu$	$\omega \mu$	$\omega \mu$	$\omega \mu$
$k = 1$	$\omega \mu$	$\omega \times \mu$	$\omega \cdot \mu$	0	0
$k = 2$	$\omega \mu$	$\omega \cdot \mu$	0	0	0
$k = 3$	$\omega \mu$	0	0	0	0

**Exterior Derivatives.** For differential forms, we define the exterior derivatives  $d^k : \Lambda^k(\Omega) \rightarrow \Lambda^{k+1}(\Omega)$ . In coordinates, if

$$\omega = \sum_{1 \leq \sigma_1 \leq \dots \leq \sigma_k \leq n} f_\sigma dx^{\sigma_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dx^{\sigma_k},$$

then

$$d^k \omega = \sum_{1 \leq \sigma_1 \leq \dots \leq \sigma_k \leq n} \frac{\partial f_\sigma}{\partial x^j} dx^j \wedge dx^{\sigma_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dx^{\sigma_k}.$$

In  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , this definition matches up with the standard vector calculus operators when using the proxy identifications:

- For a 0-form  $u$ ,

$$d^0 u = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^1} dx^1 + \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^2} dx^2 + \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^3} dx^3,$$

which corresponds to the gradient  $\nabla u$  in vector calculus.

- For a 1-form

$$v = v_1 dx^1 + v_2 dx^2 + v_3 dx^3,$$

$$d^1 v = \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial x^2} dx^2 \wedge dx^1 + \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial x^3} dx^3 \wedge dx^1 + \frac{\partial v_2}{\partial x^1} dx^1 \wedge dx^2 + \frac{\partial v_2}{\partial x^3} dx^3 \wedge dx^2 + \frac{\partial v_3}{\partial x^1} dx^1 \wedge dx^3 + \frac{\partial v_3}{\partial x^2} dx^2 \wedge dx^3.$$

Using  $dx^i \wedge dx^j = -dx^j \wedge dx^i$  (and  $dx^i \wedge dx^i = 0$ ), we can rewrite this as

$$d^1 v = \left( \frac{\partial v_2}{\partial x^1} - \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial x^2} \right) dx^1 \wedge dx^2 + \left( \frac{\partial v_3}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial v_2}{\partial x^3} \right) dx^2 \wedge dx^3 + \left( \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial x^3} - \frac{\partial v_3}{\partial x^1} \right) dx^3 \wedge dx^1,$$

which corresponds to  $\nabla \times \mathbf{v}$  in the vector proxy.

- It remains as an exercise to show that for a 2-form in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , the exterior derivative  $d^2$  corresponds to the divergence operator  $\nabla \cdot$ .

Having introduced chains, boundaries, and homology, we now move to the dual picture. Instead of working directly with simplices and their boundaries, we can assign to each  $k$ -simplex a real value and track how these “dual values” change under a dual operator called the *coboundary*. This leads to *cochains* and *cohomology*, which capture the same topological information as homology but often prove more convenient for certain theoretical and computational tasks.

**Definition 6** (*k-cochain*). Let  $\Sigma$  be a simplicial complex. A  $k$ -cochain is a function that assigns a real value to each  $k$ -simplex of  $\Sigma$ . Formally,

$$\varphi : \{k\text{-simplices in } \Sigma\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

The set of all such  $k$ -cochains is denoted by  $C^k(\Sigma)$ .

**Definition 7** (*coboundary operator*). The coboundary operator

$$\delta_k : C^k(\Sigma) \rightarrow C^{k+1}(\Sigma)$$

is defined so that for each  $(k+1)$ -simplex  $\sigma$ ,

$$(\delta_k \varphi)(\sigma) = \varphi(\partial_{k+1} \sigma),$$

where  $\partial_{k+1} \sigma$  is the boundary of  $\sigma$  considered as a  $k$ -chain. Concretely, if  $\sigma = [v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k, v_{k+1}]$  then

$$(\delta_k \varphi)(\sigma) = \sum_{i=0}^{k+1} (-1)^i \varphi([v_0, \dots, \widehat{v}_i, \dots, v_{k+1}]),$$

matching the definition of the boundary  $\partial_{k+1}$  reflected in the simplex that  $\varphi$  acts on.

As a direct consequence of the properties of the boundary operator of chains, we have

$$\delta_{k+1} \delta_k = 0, \quad \forall k.$$

Hence we get a cochain complex

$$\dots \longrightarrow C^k(\Sigma) \xrightarrow{\delta_k} C^{k+1}(\Sigma) \xrightarrow{\delta_{k+1}} C^{k+2}(\Sigma) \longrightarrow \dots$$

**Definition 8** (cohomology groups). *The  $k$ -th cohomology group is defined by*

$$H^k(\Sigma) = \ker(\delta_k) / \text{Ran}(\delta_{k-1}).$$

*Namely,  $k$ -cohomology classes capture those cochains whose coboundary vanishes (i.e.  $\ker \delta_k$ ) but which themselves are not a coboundary of some  $(k-1)$ -cochain.*

The homology, cohomology (of cochains), and the de Rham cohomology are related to each other. The homology and cohomology are related through the Poincaré duality  $H^k(\Omega) \cong H_{n-k}(\Omega)$  for compact manifolds without boundary (and the Poincaré–Lefschetz duality  $H^k(\Omega, \partial\Omega) \cong H_{n-k}(\Omega)$  and  $H^k(\Omega) \cong H_{n-k}(\Omega, \partial\Omega)$  for manifolds with boundary). Here  $H^k(\Omega, \partial\Omega)$  is the so-called relativity cohomology, for which all the cochains lying on the boundary  $\partial\Omega$  are treated as zero. Finally, cohomology and the de Rham cohomology are related through the de Rham map. More precisely, a differential  $k$ -form  $\omega$  induces a  $k$ -cochain: given a  $k$ -simplex  $\sigma$ , the cochain maps it to the integral  $\int_\sigma \omega$ . The *de Rham theorem* states that for a smooth manifold  $\Omega$ ,  $H_{\text{dR}}^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R}) \cong H^k(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$  and  $H_{\text{dR}}^k(\Omega, \partial\Omega; \mathbb{R}) \cong H^k(\Omega, \partial\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ . Through the above results, we can directly relate de Rham cohomology to the topology of a domain. Particularly, we consider two versions of de Rham complexes

$$(2.8) \quad 0 \longrightarrow C^\infty \Lambda^0 \xrightarrow{d} C^\infty \Lambda^1 \xrightarrow{d} \dots \xrightarrow{d} C^\infty \Lambda^n \longrightarrow 0,$$

$$(2.9) \quad 0 \longrightarrow C_0^\infty \Lambda^0 \xrightarrow{d} C_0^\infty \Lambda^1 \xrightarrow{d} \dots \xrightarrow{d} C_0^\infty \Lambda^n \longrightarrow 0,$$

where  $C_0^\infty \Lambda^k$  denotes the space of compactly supported  $k$ -forms (in coordinates, the coefficients are in  $C_0^\infty$ ). The cohomology of (2.8) is isomorphic to  $H_{n-k}(\Omega, \partial\Omega)$ ; the cohomology of (2.9) is isomorphic to  $H_{n-k}(\Omega)$ . This result can be seen in some special cases. Let  $\Omega$  be a contractible domain (e.g., a ball). Then for (2.8), the 0-th cohomology is isomorphic to  $H_n(\Omega, \partial\Omega) \cong \mathbb{R}$ ; and the  $n$ -th cohomology of (2.9) is  $H_0(\Omega) \cong \mathbb{R}$ . The former reflects that the kernel of grad consists of constants, and the latter reflects the fact that the divergence of a compactly supported field has vanishing integral (thus  $\text{div} : [C_0^\infty(\Omega)]^n \rightarrow C_0^\infty$  has a one-dimensional cokernel).

**2.2. Complexes from complexes.** More complexes can be derived from the de Rham complex. The simplest case would be deriving a complex with a second-order operator from two de Rham complexes in 1D (2.1). We connect the tail of the one complex to the head of another one:

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & C^\infty(I) & \xrightarrow{\frac{d}{dx}} & C^\infty(I) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & & & \nearrow I & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & C^\infty(I) & \xrightarrow{\frac{d}{dx}} & C^\infty(I) & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array}$$

This derives

$$(2.11) \quad 0 \longrightarrow C^\infty(I) \xrightarrow{\frac{d^2}{dx^2}} C^\infty(I) \longrightarrow 0.$$

We can make some observations even in this simple example. We observe that the cohomology of the derived complex (2.11) is isomorphic to the input – the sum of the cohomology of the two rows in (2.10). First,  $\ker(\frac{d^2}{dx^2}) \cong \mathbb{R}^2 = \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R} \cong \ker(\frac{d}{dx}) \oplus \ker(\frac{d}{dx})$ , which is the cohomology at the first  $C^\infty(I)$  space in (2.11). Second,  $\frac{d}{dx} : C^\infty(I) \rightarrow C^\infty(I)$  in both rows of (2.10) are surjective.

This implies that  $\frac{d^2}{dx^2}$  is also surjective. The second observation is that to generalise (2.10) to more general function spaces, such as Sobolev spaces, restrictions will be added to such spaces. For example, a natural generalisation of (2.10) to Sobolev spaces is

$$(2.12) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & H^2(I) & \xrightarrow{\frac{d}{dx}} & H^1(I) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & & & \nearrow I & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & H^1(I) & \xrightarrow{\frac{d}{dx}} & L^2(I) & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array}$$

The second row has lower regularity than the first as the first space of the second row is connected to the last space in the first row, and the regularity of spaces decrease in a de Rham complex.

A nontrivial example is the derivation of the elasticity complex (2.3).

The first step is to *connect complexes*. We fit two vector-valued de Rham complexes in a commuting diagram:

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{R}^3 & \xrightarrow{\text{grad}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{R}^3 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & & \nearrow -\text{mskw} & & \nearrow \mathcal{S} & & \nearrow 2 \text{vskw} & & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{R}^3 & \xrightarrow{\text{grad}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{R}^3 & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

Here a vector-valued de Rham complex in 3D means that we start with a vector-valued function space  $C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{R}^3$  (a vector with three components, each component being a  $C^\infty$  function). Then taking column-wise grad, curl and div, we obtain a complex with vectors, matrices, matrices, and vectors. The operators connecting the two rows are algebraic: mskw maps a vector to a skew-symmetric matrix in 3D and vskw is the inverse which takes the skew-symmetric part of a matrix and identify it with a vector:

$$\text{mskw} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \\ c \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -c & b \\ c & 0 & -a \\ -b & a & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{vskw} \sigma := \text{mskw}^{-1} \circ \text{skw} \sigma.$$

The operator in the middle is  $\mathcal{S}u := u^T - \text{tr}(u)I$ . Note that mskw,  $\mathcal{S}$  and vskw are surjective, bijective, and injective, respectively.

The second step is to *eliminate as much as possible in the diagram*. This means that we eliminate spaces or components connected by the connecting maps. In the above example, we decompose each matrix into its symmetric and skew-symmetric parts:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R}^3 & \xrightarrow{\text{grad}} & \mathbb{S} + \mathbb{K} & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & \mathbb{R}^3 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & & \nearrow -\text{mskw} & & \nearrow \mathcal{S} & & \nearrow 2 \text{vskw} & & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R}^3 & \xrightarrow{\text{grad}} & \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & \mathbb{S} + \mathbb{K} & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & \mathbb{R}^3 & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array}$$

Here  $\mathbb{S}$  denotes symmetric matrices and  $\mathbb{K}$  denotes skew-symmetric matrices. To emphasise the algebraic structures, we have omitted  $C^\infty \otimes$  in the notation, and thus  $\mathbb{R}^3$  means  $C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{R}^3$  etc. The second (nonzero) space on the top row is divided into  $\mathbb{S}$  and  $\mathbb{K}$ . The  $\mathbb{K}$  part matches  $\mathbb{V}$  from the bottom row by the incoming mskw. Then we eliminate  $\mathbb{V}$  and  $\mathbb{K}$  from the diagram. Similarly, the second last space in the bottom row splits into  $\mathbb{S}$  and  $\mathbb{K}$ . The  $\mathbb{K}$  part matches  $\mathbb{V}$  at the end of the top row. They are both eliminated from the diagram. In the middle,  $\mathcal{S}$  is surjective. Therefore the two spaces connected by it are completely removed from the diagram. What we are left with is the

following:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 0 & & \mathbb{R}^3 & & \mathbb{S} & & \\
 & & & & & & \\
 & & & & \mathbb{S} & & \mathbb{R}^3 & & 0.
 \end{array}$$

Then the final step of reading out the derived complex is to *connect rows by a zig-zag*:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R}^3 & \xrightarrow{\text{def}} & \mathbb{S} & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & \\
 & & & & & \searrow & \\
 & & & & & \swarrow & \\
 & & & & \mathbb{S} & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & \mathbb{R}^3 & \longrightarrow & 0.
 \end{array}$$

Recall again that here  $\mathbb{R}^3$  means  $C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{R}^3$  etc. for short.

A major conclusion is that, under some conditions (which hold for all the examples in this paper), *the above algebraic process of eliminating and connecting is cohomology-preserving*: the cohomology of the output complex is isomorphic to the input. In the 1D example (2.11), the cohomology is two copies of the de Rham cohomology; in the 3D elasticity example (2.3), the cohomology is six copies of the de Rham cohomology (each row in the diagram (2.13) consists of three copies of the de Rham complex, and therefore in total six copies). In particular, this means that the dimension of the cohomology of (2.3) is six times the corresponding Betti number. The kernel of *def* has dimension six (the explicit form (2.4) gives a straightforward verification).

The 3D elasticity complex (2.3) is an example of a family of (infinitely many) complexes. The diagram (2.13) can be generalised with the following diagram, where  $\text{Alt}^{k,\ell} := \text{Alt}^k \otimes \text{Alt}^\ell$  is the space of *alternating  $\ell$ -form-valued  $k$ -forms* (skew-symmetric multilinear maps which take in  $k$  vectors and return an alternating  $\ell$ -form), and again, we omitted  $C^\infty \otimes$  in each space:

$$(2.14) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc}
 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Alt}^{0,J-1} & \xrightarrow{d} & \text{Alt}^{1,J-1} & \xrightarrow{d} & \dots & \xrightarrow{d} & \text{Alt}^{n,J-1} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & & \nearrow S^{0,J} & & \nearrow S^{1,J} & & \nearrow S^{n-1,J} & & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Alt}^{0,J} & \xrightarrow{d} & \text{Alt}^{1,J} & \xrightarrow{d} & \dots & \xrightarrow{d} & \text{Alt}^{n,J} & \longrightarrow & 0.
 \end{array}$$

The connecting maps are naturally given by an alternating sum:

$$S^{i,J} \mu(v_0, \dots, v_i)(w_1, \dots, w_{J-1}) := \sum_{l=0}^i (-1)^l \mu(v_0, \dots, \widehat{v}_l, \dots, v_i)(v^l, w_1, \dots, w_{J-1}),$$

$$\forall v_0, \dots, v_i, w_1, \dots, w_{J-1} \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

These maps satisfy the anti-commutativity  $d \circ S = -S \circ d$ .

In  $nD$ , all the  $k$ -forms for  $k > n$  vanish. Therefore the diagram has finite numbers of rows and columns. We can write down all the cases in 3D:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Alt}^{0,0} & \xrightarrow{d^0} & \text{Alt}^{1,0} & \xrightarrow{d^1} & \text{Alt}^{2,0} & \xrightarrow{d^2} & \text{Alt}^{3,0} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
& & & \nearrow_{S^{0,1}} & & \nearrow_{S^{1,1}} & & \nearrow_{S^{2,1}} & & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Alt}^{0,1} & \xrightarrow{d^0} & \text{Alt}^{1,1} & \xrightarrow{d^1} & \text{Alt}^{2,1} & \xrightarrow{d^2} & \text{Alt}^{3,1} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
& & & \nearrow_{S^{0,2}} & & \nearrow_{S^{1,2}} & & \nearrow_{S^{2,2}} & & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Alt}^{0,2} & \xrightarrow{d^0} & \text{Alt}^{1,2} & \xrightarrow{d^1} & \text{Alt}^{2,2} & \xrightarrow{d^2} & \text{Alt}^{3,2} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
& & & \nearrow_{S^{0,3}} & & \nearrow_{S^{1,3}} & & \nearrow_{S^{2,3}} & & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Alt}^{0,3} & \xrightarrow{d^0} & \text{Alt}^{1,3} & \xrightarrow{d^1} & \text{Alt}^{2,3} & \xrightarrow{d^2} & \text{Alt}^{3,3} & \longrightarrow & 0.
\end{array}$$

Here each space  $\text{Alt}^{k,\ell}$  has two indices  $k$  and  $\ell$ . In vector/matrix proxies, we can think of the  $k$ -index as rows and  $\ell$  as columns of a matrix. Then we obtain proxies of  $\text{Alt}^{k,\ell}$  as the tensor product between scalars and vectors. For example, for  $\text{Alt}^{0,1}$ ,  $\text{Alt}^0$  corresponds to a scalar and  $\text{Alt}^1$  corresponds to the vector, leading to  $\text{Alt}^{k,\ell}$  as a vector;  $\text{Alt}^2$  corresponds to a vector, and therefore  $\text{Alt}^{2,2}$  gives a matrix. Connecting the first two rows, we obtain a Hessian operator, leading to the Hessian complex [12]. The second and third rows lead to the elasticity complex (2.13), and the last two rows lead to the div div complex [12].

**2.3. Twisted complex: Riemann-Cartan geometry.** It worth diving deeper into the derivation of the BGG complexes for at least two reasons (in addition to the insights it provides in understanding the cohomology of complexes). First, an intermediate step in the derivation, called the *twisted de Rham complexes*, have important and a bit surprising applications in their own right. Second, the derivation leads to a general *machinery* which can be used in more general contexts: *we can carry over results for the de Rham complex (electromagnetic fields etc.) to objects modelled by the BGG or the twisted complexes (strain and stress tensors in continuum mechanics, metric and curvature tensors in differential geometry etc.) by chasing the diagrams.*

A BGG diagram consists of complexes connected by algebraic operators  $S^\bullet$  in a (anti)commuting diagram ( $dS = -Sd$ ):

(2.15)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc}
\cdots & \longrightarrow & V^{k-2} & \xrightarrow{d^{k-2}} & V^{k-1} & \xrightarrow{d^{k-1}} & V^k & \xrightarrow{d^k} & V^{k+1} & \longrightarrow & \cdots \\
& & & \nearrow_{S^{k-2}} & & \nearrow_{S^{k-1}} & & \nearrow_{S^k} & & & \\
\cdots & \longrightarrow & W^{k-2} & \xrightarrow{d^{k-2}} & W^{k-1} & \xrightarrow{d^{k-1}} & W^k & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & W^{k+1} & \longrightarrow & \cdots
\end{array}$$

In typical applications, there exists an index  $J$  such that the first several  $S^k$  operators are injective for  $k \leq J$ , and the last several are surjective for  $k \geq J$ , with a bijective  $S^J$  in the middle.

We can read out two kinds of complexes from the BGG diagram (2.15): the twisted complex (2.16)

$$\cdots \longrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} V^{k-1} \\ W^{k-1} \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} d^{k-1} & -S^{k-1} \\ 0 & d^{k-1} \end{pmatrix}} \begin{pmatrix} V^k \\ W^k \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} d^k & -S^k \\ 0 & d^k \end{pmatrix}} \begin{pmatrix} V^{k+1} \\ W^{k+1} \end{pmatrix} \longrightarrow \cdots,$$

and the following BGG complex is obtained by eliminating components connected by  $S^\bullet$ :

(2.17)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdots & \longrightarrow & \ker(S_{\dagger}^{J-2}) & \xrightarrow{Q \circ d} & \ker(S_{\dagger}^{J-1}) & \xrightarrow{Q \circ d} & \ker(S_{\dagger}^J) & \xrightarrow{d} & \\ & & & & & & & \searrow & \\ & & & & & & & \xrightarrow{S^{-1}} & \\ & & & & & & & \xrightarrow{d} & \ker(S^{J+1}) & \xrightarrow{d} & \ker(S^{J+2}) & \xrightarrow{d} & \cdots, \end{array}$$

where  $S_{\dagger}^k : V^k \rightarrow W^{k-1}$  is the adjoint of  $S^{k-1} : W^{k-1} \rightarrow V^k$  (for example,  $\text{vskw}$  is the adjoint of  $\text{mskw}$ ), and  $Q$  is the projection to  $\ker(S_{\dagger})$  (for example, if  $S$  is  $\text{mskw}$ , then  $S_{\dagger}$  is  $\text{vskw}$ , and  $Q$  is the symmetrisation of a matrix). Note that (2.16) is a complex, i.e.,

$$\begin{pmatrix} d & -S \\ 0 & d \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} d & -S \\ 0 & d \end{pmatrix} = 0,$$

since  $dS = -Sd$ . The anti-commutativity also implies that  $d^k$  maps  $\ker(S^k)$  to  $\ker(S^{k+1})$  in (2.17).

The derivation of the 1D BGG complex and the 3D elasticity complex is summarised in the following diagrams:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \begin{pmatrix} C^\infty \\ C^\infty \end{pmatrix} & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} \frac{d}{dx} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{d}{dx} \end{pmatrix}} & \begin{pmatrix} C^\infty \\ C^\infty \end{pmatrix} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow \mathcal{F}^0 & & \downarrow \mathcal{F}^1 & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \begin{pmatrix} C^\infty \\ C^\infty \end{pmatrix} & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} \frac{d}{dx} & -I \\ 0 & \frac{d}{dx} \end{pmatrix}} & \begin{pmatrix} C^\infty \\ C^\infty \end{pmatrix} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow \pi^0 & & \downarrow \pi^1 & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & C^\infty & \xrightarrow{\frac{d}{dx}} & C^\infty & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & & \swarrow \frac{d}{dx} I & & & \\ & & & C^\infty & \longrightarrow & & 0. \end{array}$$

(2.18)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \begin{pmatrix} C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V} \\ C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V} \end{pmatrix} & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} \text{grad} & 0 \\ 0 & \text{grad} \end{pmatrix}} & \begin{pmatrix} C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{M} \\ C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{M} \end{pmatrix} & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} \text{curl} & 0 \\ 0 & \text{curl} \end{pmatrix}} & \begin{pmatrix} C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{M} \\ C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{M} \end{pmatrix} & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} \text{div} & 0 \\ 0 & \text{div} \end{pmatrix}} & \begin{pmatrix} C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V} \\ C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V} \end{pmatrix} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow \mathcal{F}^0 & & \downarrow \mathcal{F}^1 & & \downarrow \mathcal{F}^2 & & \downarrow \mathcal{F}^3 & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \begin{pmatrix} C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V} \\ C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V} \end{pmatrix} & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} \text{grad} & \text{mskw} \\ 0 & \text{grad} \end{pmatrix}} & \begin{pmatrix} C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{M} \\ C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{M} \end{pmatrix} & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} \text{curl} & -s \\ 0 & \text{curl} \end{pmatrix}} & \begin{pmatrix} C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{M} \\ C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{M} \end{pmatrix} & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} \text{div} & -2 \text{vskw} \\ 0 & \text{div} \end{pmatrix}} & \begin{pmatrix} C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V} \\ C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V} \end{pmatrix} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow \pi^0 & & \downarrow \pi^1 & & \downarrow \pi^2 & & \downarrow \pi^3 & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V} & \xrightarrow{\text{def}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{S} & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{S} & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & & & & \swarrow \text{curl } S^{-1} & & & & & \\ & & & & & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{S} & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V} & \longrightarrow & & 0. \end{array}$$

Here the first row consists of a direct sum of de Rham complexes. The second row is an example of the twisted complex (2.16).

The twisted version of the elasticity complex has a neat correspondence to Riemann–Cartan geometry [50]:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \text{embedding} & \xrightarrow{\text{grad}} & \text{coframes} & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & \text{torsion} & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & \dots \\
 & \nearrow^{-\text{mskw}} & & \nearrow^{\text{s}} & & \nearrow^{2 \text{ vskw}} & \\
 \text{rotation} & \xrightarrow{\text{grad}} & \text{connection} & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & \text{curvature} & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & \text{(co)vector (in Bianchi identity),}
 \end{array}$$

The twisted complex involves both curvature and torsion, while the elasticity (BGG) complex derived from the twisted complex only involves curvature. The BGG process is thus a cohomology-preserving elimination of torsion from Riemann–Cartan geometry. In Section 4, we will investigate the mechanics meaning of this elimination – the first space in the bottom row representing a rotational degree of freedom in generalised continuum is eliminated to obtain the standard elasticity model.

**2.4. Conformal complex: conformal geometry.** Before discussing the construction, we first show the geometric meaning of the conformal deformation complex (2.5). Given a metric  $g$ , a vector field  $v \in \mathcal{X}(M)$  is called a *conformal Killing field* if  $\mathcal{L}_v g = \varphi g$ , where  $\varphi$  is some scalar function. That is, the change of a metric along a conforming Killing field is proportional to itself. By the formulas for Lie derivatives,  $(\nabla v)_{ij} + (\nabla v)_{ji} = \varphi g_{ij}$ . Taking the trace, we have  $\varphi = \frac{2}{n} \text{div } v$ . Thus,  $v$  is a conformal Killing field if and only if  $\nabla v + \nabla^T v - \frac{2}{n} \text{div } v g = 0$ . If  $g$  is the Euclidean metric, i.e.,  $g = I$ , then  $\nabla v + \nabla^T v - \frac{1}{n} \text{div } v I = 2 \text{dev def } v$  is (two times) the traceless symmetric gradient. For the 1D case ( $n = 1$ ),  $\text{dev def } v$  is trivial as  $\text{def } v$  is a scalar. For  $n = 2$ , let  $u = (u^1, u^2)$ . Then

$$\text{dev sym grad } u = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}(\partial_x u_1 - \partial_y u_2) & \frac{1}{2}(\partial_y u_1 + \partial_x u_2) \\ \frac{1}{2}(\partial_y u_1 + \partial_x u_2) & -\frac{1}{2}(\partial_x u_1 - \partial_y u_2) \end{pmatrix},$$

which exactly consists of the components of the Cauchy–Riemann operator. This is a clear indication that the conformal Killing field is closely related to complex analysis in 2D.

A Riemannian metric  $g$  is conformally flat if it can be locally written as a conformal rescaling of the Euclidean metric, i.e., there exists  $\phi(x)$  such that  $g_{ij} = e^{\phi(x)} \delta_{ij}$ . The Cotton tensor measures the deviation of a metric from being conformally flat. In terms of the Ricci curvature  $R_{ij}$  and the scalar curvature  $R$ , the Cotton tensor is a third order tensor defined by

$$C_{ijk} = \nabla_k R_{ij} - \nabla_j R_{ik} + \frac{1}{2(n-1)} (\nabla_j R g_{ik} - \nabla_k R g_{ij}).$$

Clearly,  $C_{ijk}$  is skew-symmetric with respect to the indices  $j$  and  $k$ . Identifying a skew-symmetric 2-tensor with a vector in 3D (taking the Hodge dual), one obtains a 2-tensor

$$C_i^j = \epsilon^{k\ell j} \nabla_k (R_{\ell i} - \frac{1}{4} R g_{ij}).$$

In the linearised case, this is exactly the second operator  $\text{cot}$  in the conformal deformation complex.

Finally,  $\text{div}$  is a compatibility condition analogous to the differential Bianchi identity for the Riemann tensor.

The construction of the conformal deformation complex (2.5) follows from the following diagram. (2.19)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
 0 & \longrightarrow & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V} & \xrightarrow{\text{grad}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{M} & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{M} & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \uparrow & \nearrow & \uparrow & \nearrow & \uparrow & \nearrow & \uparrow & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & C^\infty \otimes (\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{V}) & \xrightarrow{\text{grad}} & C^\infty \otimes (\mathbb{V} \oplus \mathbb{M}) & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & C^\infty \otimes (\mathbb{V} \oplus \mathbb{M}) & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & C^\infty \otimes (\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{V}) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \uparrow & \nearrow & \uparrow & \nearrow & \uparrow & \nearrow & \uparrow & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V} & \xrightarrow{\text{grad}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{M} & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{M} & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V} & \longrightarrow & 0.
 \end{array}$$

$(\iota - \text{mskw})$        $(-\text{mskw } \mathcal{S})^T$        $(I - 2 \text{vskw})^T$   
 $(I - \text{mskw})$        $(2 \text{vskw } \mathcal{S})$        $(\text{tr } 2 \text{vskw})$

The diagram has three rows. The first and the last rows are vector-valued de Rham complexes, while the row in the middle is a sum of a scalar and a vector version. To understand this, recall that we want to obtain a symmetric and traceless ( $\mathbb{S} \cap \mathbb{T}$ ) matrix. We want to remove the trace part (scalar) and the skew-symmetric part (identified with a vector  $\mathbb{R}_{\text{skw}}^{3 \times 3} \cong \mathbb{V}$ ) from the matrix in the second space of the first row. This is why a  $(\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{V})$ -valued de Rham complex is used for the second row. The  $\mathbb{R}$  value eliminates the trace, and  $\mathbb{V}$  eliminates the skew-symmetric part of the matrix. The construction follows a similar recipe as the cases with two rows, i.e., we eliminate components connected by the diagonal maps as much as possible. For example, in the following sequence

$$\begin{array}{c}
 C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{M} \\
 \nearrow \\
 C^\infty \otimes (\mathbb{V} \oplus \mathbb{M}) \\
 \nearrow \\
 C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V}
 \end{array}$$

$C^\infty \otimes (\mathbb{V} \oplus \mathbb{M})$  splits into two parts: the  $\mathbb{V}$  part eliminates with  $C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V}$  from downstairs, and the  $\mathbb{M}$  part cancels with  $C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{M}$  from upstairs. Therefore, this sequence is completely eliminated in the diagram. What remains after this elimination process is the conformal complex (2.5). Another way to think about this construction is to observe that each sequence in the diagonal direction is also a complex (which trivially holds for diagrams with two rows). Then each space has an algebraic Hodge decomposition according to this diagonal complex (see Section 3.2). The final BGG complex consists of the ‘‘harmonic forms’’ (cohomology) of this decomposition.

Similarly, we can construct another complex with tracefree and symmetric matrices, referred to as the *conformal Hessian complex*. We start from the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
 0 & \longrightarrow & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{R} & \xrightarrow{\text{grad}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V} & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V} & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{R} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \uparrow & \nearrow & \uparrow & \nearrow & \uparrow & \nearrow & \uparrow & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V} & \xrightarrow{\text{grad}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{M} & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{M} & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \uparrow & \nearrow & \uparrow & \nearrow & \uparrow & \nearrow & \uparrow & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{R} & \xrightarrow{\text{grad}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V} & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{V} & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{R} & \longrightarrow & 0.
 \end{array}$$

$x \cdot$        $x \cdot$        $x \cdot$        $x \cdot$        $x \cdot$   
 $x \otimes$        $x \otimes$        $x \otimes$        $x \otimes$        $x \otimes$

The elimination leads to the following *conformal Hessian complex*:

$$(2.20) \quad 0 \longrightarrow C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{R} \xrightarrow{\text{dev hess}} C^\infty \otimes (\mathbb{S} \cap \mathbb{T}) \xrightarrow{\text{sym curl}} C^\infty \otimes (\mathbb{S} \cap \mathbb{T}) \xrightarrow{\text{div div}} C^\infty \otimes \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow 0$$

**2.5. The BGG machinery.** The connecting maps between the de Rham complexes, the twisted complexes and the BGG complexes are available and explicit (such as those in (4.2); see [12, (67)], [42, (21), (30)]). The existence of these maps not only indicates that these complexes all have isomorphic cohomology, but they also provide a machinery for carrying over results for the de Rham complexes (e.g., in electromagnetism) to results for other applications related to the twisted and BGG complexes. In this section, we show an example of using this idea to derive the Poincaré operators.

Given a complex

$$\dots \longrightarrow V^{i-1} \xrightleftharpoons[P^i]{d^{i-1}} V^i \xrightleftharpoons[P^{i+1}]{d^i} V^{i+1} \longrightarrow \dots,$$

the Poincaré operators  $P^k : V^k \mapsto V^{k-1}$  are defined to satisfy the null-homotopy property

$$d^{k-1}P^k + P^{k+1}d^k = I_{V^k},$$

The existence of Poincaré operators immediately implies the exactness of the complex, as

$$du = 0 \implies u = (dP + Pd)u = d(Pu).$$

The Poincaré operators are widely used for PDE analysis [1, 57] and construct finite element spaces [10, 49, 76].

For the first slot of a de Rham complex, suppose  $\mathbf{u} = \text{grad } \varphi$ . Once we know  $\mathbf{u}$ , then  $\varphi$  can be recovered by integrating along a curve. This is the 0-th Poincaré operator in the de Rham complex. The construction for higher form degrees is also given by integration.

A natural question related to elasticity is the following: suppose that the strain tensor  $\mathbf{e} = \text{def } \mathbf{v}$ , where  $\mathbf{v}$  is the displacement. Can we recover  $\mathbf{v}$  from  $\mathbf{e}$ ? In fact, this question was answered by the formulas by Cesàro and Volterra in 1906 and 1907 [44, 139]. The formula of recovering  $\mathbf{e}$  from  $\mathbf{v}$  not only involves integration along curves, but also involves derivatives of  $\mathbf{e}$ . The Cesàro–Volterra formula is a crucial ingredient for intrinsic theories of elasticity [54, 55, 137].

From a complex and BGG point of view, the question boils down to constructing Poincaré operators for the elasticity complex. The BGG machinery comes into play here [41, 51]: since the Poincaré operators  $P^\bullet$  for the de Rham complexes are known, one may follow the BGG diagrams (2.21) to obtain the Poincaré operators  $\mathcal{P}^\bullet$  for the elasticity complex  $(\Upsilon^\bullet, \mathcal{D}^\bullet)$  as

$$\mathcal{P}^{i+1} = \pi^i F^i P^{i+1} (F^{i+1})^{-1} A^{i+1}.$$

$$(2.21) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{ccc} \xleftarrow{P^{i+1}} Y^i & \xrightleftharpoons[d^i]{} & Y^{i+1} \\ F \downarrow & & F \downarrow \\ Y^i & \xrightleftharpoons[P_V^{i+1}]{} & Y^{i+1} \\ \pi^i \uparrow A^i & \xrightleftharpoons[d_V^i]{} & \pi^{i+1} \uparrow A^{i+1} \\ \Upsilon^i & \xrightleftharpoons[\mathcal{D}^i]{} & \Upsilon^{i+1} \end{array} & \begin{array}{l} (Y^\bullet, d^\bullet): \text{ de Rham complex} \\ (Y^\bullet, d_V^\bullet): \text{ twisted complex} \\ (\Upsilon^\bullet, \mathcal{D}^\bullet): \text{ BGG complex} \end{array} \end{array}$$

This rather different homological algebraic approach recovers the classical Casàro–Volterra formula

$$\mathcal{P}^1(e) = \int_0^x e(y) \cdot dy - \int_0^x (\text{mskw} \int_0^y (e(z) \times \nabla)^T \cdot dz) \cdot dy$$

as a special case.

### 3. ANALYSIS AND PDES

In the previous section, we considered complexes built from smooth functions and vector fields. However, one can also construct similar complexes using more general function spaces, which allows algebraic properties (particularly the finite-dimensionality of cohomology) to yield various analytic consequences.

On the interval  $I = (0, 1)$ , we have the one-dimensional de Rham complex

$$0 \longrightarrow H^k(I) \xrightarrow{\frac{d}{dx}} H^{k-1}(I) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where  $H^k(I)$  is the Sobolev space of functions whose weak derivatives up to order  $k$  lie in  $L^2(I)$ :

$$H^k(I) := \left\{ u \in L^2(I) : \frac{d^j u}{dx^j} \in L^2(I), j = 1, \dots, k \right\}.$$

We also define  $H_0^k(I)$  to be the completion of  $C_0^\infty(I)$  under the  $H^k$  norm, which can be viewed as  $H^k(I)$  functions that vanish (in the appropriate sense) at the boundary. Consequently, for  $k \geq 1$ , we get another complex

$$0 \longrightarrow H_0^k(I) \xrightarrow{\frac{d}{dx}} H_0^{k-1}(I) \longrightarrow 0.$$

By convention, we set  $H^0(I) := L^2(I)$  and  $H_0^0(I) := L_0^2(I) := \{u \in L^2(I) : \int_I u dx = 0\}$ .

Similarly, in three dimensions on a domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ , the de Rham complex has the Sobolev version

$$(3.1) \quad 0 \longrightarrow H^q(\Omega) \xrightarrow{\text{grad}} H^{q-1}(\Omega) \otimes \mathbb{R}^3 \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} H^{q-2}(\Omega) \otimes \mathbb{R}^3 \xrightarrow{\text{div}} H^{q-3}(\Omega) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where  $q$  is a real number. There are also variants with boundary conditions (e.g. taking closures of  $C_0^\infty$  fields).

For the analysis of many problems in electromagnetism and other fields, another kind of regularity plays an important role:

$$(3.2) \quad 0 \longrightarrow H^1(\Omega) \xrightarrow{\text{grad}} H(\text{curl}, \Omega) \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} H(\text{div}, \Omega) \xrightarrow{\text{div}} L^2(\Omega) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where

$$H(\text{curl}, \Omega) := \left\{ u \in L^2(\Omega) \otimes \mathbb{R}^3 : \nabla \times u \in L^2(\Omega) \otimes \mathbb{R}^3 \right\},$$

and similarly for  $H(\text{div}, \Omega)$  and more general spaces  $H(d, \Omega)$ , where  $d$  is a linear differential operator. Clearly, (3.2) is only one example of many. For instance, the sequence

$$(3.3) \quad 0 \longrightarrow H^1(\Omega) \xrightarrow{\text{grad}} H^{0,1}(\text{curl}, \Omega) \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} H^1 \otimes \mathbb{R}^3 \xrightarrow{\text{div}} L^2(\Omega) \longrightarrow 0,$$

is also a complex, where  $H^{0,1}(\text{curl}, \Omega) := \{u \in L^2(\Omega) \otimes \mathbb{R}^3 : \text{curl } u \in H^1 \otimes \mathbb{R}^3\}$ .

A fundamental theorem concerning these Sobolev complexes was proved by Costabel and McIntosh [57]:

**Theorem 2** (Costabel–McIntosh). *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  be a strong Lipschitz domain. Then for any real  $q$ , the complex (3.1) has uniform cohomology representatives:*

$$\ker(d^k, H^{q-k} \Lambda^k(\Omega)) = d^k(H^{q-(k-1)} \Lambda^{k-1}(\Omega)) + \mathcal{H}^k,$$

where  $\mathcal{H}^k \subset C^\infty$  is a finite-dimensional space independent of  $q$ .

Similar statements hold when boundary conditions are imposed (i.e. taking the closure of  $C_0^\infty$ -forms in the appropriate Sobolev norms).

Theorem 2 on the cohomology of the Sobolev complex also implies the cohomology of other variants. For example, the same claim also holds for (3.2) and (3.3). The idea for showing results for complexes like (3.2) and (3.3) is to observe that, e.g.,  $H(\text{curl}, \Omega)$  is in between  $H^1(\Omega) \otimes \mathbb{R}^3$  and  $L^2(\Omega) \otimes \mathbb{R}^3$ . These two spaces fit in two de Rham complexes, one with  $q = 2$  and one with  $q = 1$ . As Theorem 2 is independent of  $q$  and works for both cases, we draw the same conclusion for spaces of  $H(\text{curl}, \Omega)$  type.

In the remainder of this section, we illustrate how the finite-dimensionality of these cohomology groups leads to a variety of analytic consequences for PDEs and their solutions. To illustrate this idea and emphasise the underlying algebraic structures, we omit many details and follow an informal style. A rigorous discussion involving unbounded operators and Hilbert complexes can be found in [7, 10, 11].

**3.1. Adjoint operators and Hodge–Laplacian problems.** Associated with each complex, we can define Hodge–Laplacian problems. First, let  $d_k^*$  be the formal  $L^2$  adjoint of  $d^{k-1}$ . For example, from the integration by parts

$$\int_{\Omega} \text{grad } u \cdot v \, dx = - \int_{\Omega} u \, \text{div } v \, dx + \text{boundary terms} ,$$

we say that the formal adjoint of  $\text{grad}$  is  $-\text{div}$  (and thus the formal adjoint of  $\text{div}$  is  $-\text{grad}$ ). Similarly, from

$$\int_{\Omega} \text{curl } v \cdot w \, dx = \int_{\Omega} v \cdot \text{curl } w \, dx + \text{boundary terms} ,$$

we say that the formal adjoint of  $\text{curl}$  is still  $\text{curl}$  ( $\text{curl}$  is formally self-adjoint). The adjoint operators also form a complex:

$$(3.4) \quad 0 \longleftarrow C^\infty(\Omega) \xleftarrow{-\text{div}} C^\infty(\Omega) \otimes \mathbb{R}^3 \xleftarrow{\text{curl}} C^\infty(\Omega) \otimes \mathbb{R}^3 \xleftarrow{-\text{grad}} C^\infty(\Omega) \longleftarrow 0.$$

It is a coincidence for the 3D de Rham complex that the adjoint complex has the same form, but this is not always the case (not even for the 2D de Rham complex). The Hodge–Laplacian at  $V^k$  is  $d_k^* d^k + d^{k-1} d_{k-1}^*$ . The *Hodge–Laplacian problem* refers to the PDE

$$(d_k^* d^k + d^{k-1} d_{k-1}^*) u = f,$$

for a given right hand side  $f$ .

Concerning the example (2.2),  $d$  and  $d^*$  at  $V^0 = C^\infty(\Omega)$  are

$$0 \longleftarrow C^\infty(\Omega) \xleftarrow[\text{-div}]{\text{grad}} C^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \quad C^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \quad C^\infty(\Omega) \quad 0.$$

Here  $d^*$  is trivial (mapping everything to zero). The Hodge–Laplacian problem at  $V^0$  is thus

$$(3.5) \quad -\text{div grad } u = f,$$

which is the Poisson equation.

Similarly, at  $V^1 = C^\infty(\Omega) \otimes \mathbb{R}^3$ , the  $d$  and  $d^*$  operators are demonstrated as follows:

$$0 \quad C^\infty(\Omega) \xleftarrow[\text{-div}]{\text{grad}} C^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \xleftarrow[\text{curl}]{\text{curl}} C^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \quad C^\infty(\Omega) \quad 0,$$

and therefore the Hodge–Laplacian problem is

$$(3.6) \quad -\text{grad div } v + \text{curl curl } v = f.$$

If  $\operatorname{div} v = 0$ , this is reduced to a curl-curl system  $\operatorname{curl} \operatorname{curl} v = f$ , which is related to the Maxwell equation.

The cases of  $V^2$  and  $V^3$  are similar. One formally obtains the same  $-\operatorname{grad} \operatorname{div} + \operatorname{curl} \operatorname{curl}$  system and the Poisson equation.

**Remark 1.** *The presentation above is somewhat formal. A more rigorous treatment uses the framework of Hilbert complexes [10, 39], in which one begins with a sequence of  $L^2$  spaces and views each differential operator as an unbounded operator:*

$$(3.7) \quad 0 \longrightarrow L^2(\Omega) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{grad}} L^2(\Omega) \otimes \mathbb{R}^3 \xrightarrow{\operatorname{curl}} L^2(\Omega) \otimes \mathbb{R}^3 \xrightarrow{\operatorname{div}} L^2(\Omega) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Here the  $\operatorname{grad}$ ,  $\operatorname{curl}$ ,  $\operatorname{div}$  operators do not map  $L^2$  spaces to  $L^2$ , but they do so on certain subspaces of  $L^2$ . Specifying the domains of these unbounded operators, along with defining their adjoints in a precise manner, automatically encodes the appropriate boundary conditions for the variables. For instance, if we specify (3.2) as the domain which does not include explicit boundary conditions, then its adjoint operator will. Consequently, the adjoint Hilbert complex for the 3D  $L^2$  de Rham sequence has the domain

$$(3.8) \quad 0 \longleftarrow L^2(\Omega) \xleftarrow{-\operatorname{div}} H_0(\operatorname{div}, \Omega) \xleftarrow{-\operatorname{curl}} H_0(\operatorname{curl}, \Omega) \xleftarrow{-\operatorname{grad}} H_0^1(\Omega) \longleftarrow 0.$$

Alternatively, one may specify (3.8) as the domain complex. Then its adjoint complex (3.7) has (3.2) as the domain.

**Remark 2.** *We have the vector identity*

$$(\operatorname{curl} \operatorname{curl} - \operatorname{grad} \operatorname{div})\mathbf{u} = -\Delta \mathbf{u},$$

where  $\Delta$  denotes the scalar Laplacian applied componentwise to  $u \in \mathbb{R}^3$ . Hence, the Hodge–Laplacian on 1-forms or 2-forms in three dimensions is often referred to as the vector Laplacian. From a de Rham complex point of view, however, working with  $\operatorname{curl} \operatorname{curl} - \operatorname{grad} \operatorname{div}$  can differ significantly from treating each component as a separate scalar Laplacian. In particular, the boundary conditions that emerge in the Hilbert complex setting are not the same as the usual Dirichlet condition  $u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$  for scalar problems.

**3.2. Hodge decomposition.** Any three-dimensional flow can be decomposed into the sum of a rational part (curl of a field) plus a potential part (gradient of a function) plus another part representing the topology of the domain. The idea can be precisely stated in terms of complexes.

Given a complex

$$\dots \longrightarrow V^{k-1} \xrightleftharpoons[d_k^*]{d^{k-1}} V^k \xrightleftharpoons[d_{k+1}^*]{d^k} V^{k+1} \longrightarrow \dots,$$

we have the Hodge decomposition at  $V^k$  as the sum of a part coming from the left (range of  $d^{k-1}$  on its domain) plus a part coming from the right (range of  $d_{k+1}^*$  on its domain) plus a harmonic part orthogonal to both, i.e.,

$$V^k = \operatorname{Ran}(d^{k-1}) \oplus \operatorname{Ran}(d_{k+1}^*) \oplus \mathcal{H}^k.$$

The above decomposition is based on the fact that  $\operatorname{Ran}(d^{k-1})$  is orthogonal to the kernel of  $d_k^*$  (as  $(d^{k-1}v, w) = (v, d_k^*w) = 0$ , for any  $v$  and  $w \in \ker(d_k^*)$ ). Furthermore, the kernel of  $d_k^*$  can be decomposed as the range of  $d_{k+1}^*$  plus the harmonic part  $\mathcal{H}^k := \ker(d^k) \cap \ker(d_k^*)$ . Alternatively, one may use a similar argument based on the fact that the range of  $d_{k+1}^*$  is orthogonal to the kernel of  $d^k$ .

The argument above requires that the formal adjoint matches the rigorous adjoint of the corresponding unbounded operators, which is precisely how boundary conditions become incorporated (see Remark 1). Typically, one first specifies a Hilbert complex of base spaces (often  $L^2$ ). The domains of  $d$  and  $d^*$  are then chosen so that boundary terms arising from integration by parts vanish. In other words, the requirement that

$$(d^{k-1}v, w) = (v, d_k^*w)$$

be well-defined forces either  $v$  or  $w$  to satisfy certain boundary conditions. Consequently, those boundary conditions emerge naturally from the adjoint operators in the Hilbert complex framework.

**Example 3** (Hodge decomposition of the de Rham complex in 3D). *Consider the  $L^2$  de Rham complex (3.7). We specify (3.2) as the domain complex. The adjoint operators also form a complex which formally has the same form as (3.7). The domain complex of this adjoint complex is (3.8). Here we did not specify boundary conditions in (3.2). Thus its adjoint (3.8) should incorporate certain vanishing boundary conditions.*

*For the “1-forms” in (3.7), we have*

$$(3.9) \quad L^2 \otimes \mathbb{R}^3 = \text{Ran}(\text{grad}) \oplus \text{Ran}(\text{curl}^*) \oplus \mathcal{H} = \text{grad } H^1(\Omega) \oplus \text{curl } H_0(\text{curl}, \Omega) \oplus \mathcal{H},$$

where  $\mathcal{H} = \ker(\text{curl}, H(\text{curl}, \Omega)) \cap \ker(\text{div}, H_0(\text{div}, \Omega))$ . Here  $\text{Ran}(\text{grad})$  is from the domain complex of  $d^\bullet$  (3.2), and  $\text{Ran}(\text{curl}^*)$  is from the domain of the adjoint complex (3.8). The decomposition also gives

$$\ker(\text{curl}, H(\text{curl}, \Omega)) = \text{grad } H^1(\Omega) \oplus \mathcal{H},$$

and

$$\ker(\text{div}, H_0(\text{div}, \Omega)) = \text{curl } H_0(\text{curl}, \Omega) \oplus \mathcal{H}.$$

*The Hodge decomposition of (3.2) at “2-forms” is*

$$L^2 \otimes \mathbb{R}^3 = \text{Ran}(\text{curl}) \oplus \text{Ran}(\text{div}^*) \oplus \mathcal{H} = \text{curl } H(\text{curl}, \Omega) \oplus \text{grad } H_0^1(\Omega) \oplus \mathcal{H}_0,$$

where  $\mathcal{H}_0 = \ker(\text{div}, H(\text{div}, \Omega)) \cap \ker(\text{curl}, H_0(\text{curl}, \Omega))$ . The decomposition gives

$$\ker(\text{curl}, H_0(\text{curl}, \Omega)) = \text{grad } H_0^1(\Omega) \oplus \mathcal{H}_0,$$

and

$$\ker(\text{div}, H(\text{div}, \Omega)) = \text{curl } H(\text{curl}, \Omega) \oplus \mathcal{H}_0.$$

**3.3. Poincaré-Korn inequalities.** On a bounded Lipschitz domain, the following inequalities hold:

- Poincaré inequalities:

$$(3.10) \quad \|u\|_{H^1} \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}, \quad u \in H^1, \quad u \perp \ker(\nabla).$$

A straightforward generalisation to a vector-valued function  $\mathbf{v}$  implies

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_{H^1} \leq C \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{L^2}.$$

The matrix  $\nabla \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$  has nine components, so controlling  $\|\mathbf{v}\|_{H^1}$  effectively uses all nine.

- Korn inequality:

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^1} \leq C \|\text{sym grad } \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2}, \quad \mathbf{u} \perp \ker(\text{sym grad}).$$

Here,  $\mathbf{u}$  is controlled by the symmetric part of its gradient  $\text{sym grad } \mathbf{u}$ . In 3D,  $\text{sym grad } \mathbf{u}$  has six independent components.

- Conformal Korn inequality:

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^1} \leq C \|\text{dev sym grad } \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2}, \quad \mathbf{u} \perp \ker(\text{dev sym grad}).$$

Recall that  $\text{dev } \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w} - \frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(\mathbf{w})\mathbf{I}$  is the deviator of a matrix  $w$ . In 3D, this means a vector field  $\mathbf{u}$  is controlled by only five components of its gradient matrix.

The conformal Korn inequality holds in  $n$ -dimensions only for  $n \geq 3$ . As discussed in Section 2.4, in 2D the operator  $\text{dev sym grad}$  corresponds to the Cauchy–Riemann operator. For applications of the conformal Korn inequality and an explanation of its failure in 2D, see [59].

The Poincaré inequality is classical. The Korn inequality plays a foundational role in linear elasticity theory, and several proofs can be found in [53]. One such proof uses the Lions lemma (analogous to (3.10), but with an  $L^2$ -norm on the left and an  $H^{-1}$ -norm on the right), plus the fact that second derivatives commute ( $\partial_i \partial_j = \partial_j \partial_i$ ).

Observe that the Poincaré, Korn, and conformal Korn inequalities all arise from the fact that the operators  $\mathcal{D} = \text{grad}, \text{sym grad}, \text{devsym grad}$  have closed range. If  $\mathcal{D} : \ker(\mathcal{D})^\perp \rightarrow \text{ran}(\mathcal{D})$  is a linear operator between Banach spaces and its range is closed, then the Banach isomorphism theorem implies  $\mathcal{D}^{-1}$  is bounded on  $\text{ran}(\mathcal{D})$ , giving

$$\|u\|_{H^1} \leq C \|\mathcal{D}u\|_{L^2} \quad \text{for } u \in \ker(\mathcal{D})^\perp.$$

Thus a unified proof for such inequalities boils down to showing closedness of  $\text{ran}(\mathcal{D})$ . Moreover, in the context of complexes, if there is exactness, then

$$\text{ran}(\mathcal{D}) = \ker(\mathcal{D}^+),$$


for some operator  $\mathcal{D}^+$ . Since  $\ker(\mathcal{D}^+)$  is clearly closed,  $\text{ran}(\mathcal{D})$  is also closed. This extends to the case of nontrivial but *finite-dimensional* cohomologies, because finite-dimensional spaces are compact [78].

From this perspective, we see:

- The Poincaré inequality is due to  $\text{curl} \circ \text{grad} = 0$  and  $\text{Ran}(\text{grad}) = \ker(\text{curl})$  in the de Rham complex, reflecting topological constraints.
- The Korn inequality follows from  $(\text{curl} \circ \text{T} \circ \text{curl}) \circ (\text{sym grad}) = 0$  and  $\text{Ran}(\text{sym grad}) = \ker(\text{curl} \circ \text{T} \circ \text{curl})$ , linking it to the elasticity complex and Riemannian geometry.
- The conformal Korn inequality in 3D is due to  $(\text{curl} \circ S^{-1} \circ \text{curl} \circ S^{-1} \circ \text{curl}) \circ (\text{dev sym grad}) = 0$  and  $\text{Ran}(\text{sym grad}) = \ker(\text{curl} \circ \text{T} \circ \text{curl})$ , connecting it to the Cotton–York tensor and conformal geometry.

Here, failure of the 2D conformal Korn inequality corresponds to the non-closed range of the Cauchy–Riemann operator.

A fix from the perspective of differential complexes is to consider an analogy of the 3D diagram (2.19)



in which we eliminate the skew-symmetric and trace components of the matrix from the two scalars in the first space in the second row. The diagram involves  $S^{0,1} = (\iota, \text{mskw})$  ( $\iota$  mapping to the diagonal component and  $\text{mskw}$  mapping to the skew-symmetric components; the operator acts on

two components and adds up them, i.e.,  $(\iota, \text{mskw})(\alpha, \beta) = \iota\alpha + \text{mskw}\beta$ ) and other operators that complete the commuting diagram.

Using a similar elimination process as in 2.4, we see that the space  $H^{q-1} \otimes (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$  cancels the trace and skew-symmetric parts of  $H^{q-1} \otimes \mathbb{M}$ , leading to a trace-free and symmetric matrix. The difference from the 3D examples in 2.4 is that the “1-forms” of the last row, i.e.,  $H^{q-3} \otimes \mathbb{M}$  cannot be completely eliminated from the diagram (only the trace and skew-symmetric components are eliminated by  $H^{q-3} \otimes (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$  that  $S^{1,2}$  connects to). Therefore the tracefree and symmetric components of  $H^{q-3} \otimes (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$  also remain in the derived complex

$$0 \longrightarrow H^q \otimes \mathbb{V} \xrightarrow{D^0} \begin{pmatrix} H^{q-1} \otimes (\mathbb{S} \cap \mathbb{T}) \\ H^{q-3} \otimes (\mathbb{S} \cap \mathbb{T}) \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{D^1} H^{q-3} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Here  $D^0$  maps  $u$  into two components: one via  $\text{dev def grad}$  and one via  $\text{grad } S_{\dagger}^{0,2} \text{ grad } S_{\dagger}^{0,1} \text{ grad}$ , where  $S_{\dagger}^{0,2}$  and  $S_{\dagger}^{0,1}$  are the adjoint of  $S^{0,2}$  and  $S^{0,1}$  (with respect to the Frobenius norm), respectively. Similarly,  $D^1$  maps two components to a scalar function: the first by a third order rot operator and the second by a rot.

We thus fix the *conformal Korn inequality in 2D* by adding a third order derivative term:

$$\|u\|_3 \leq C(\|\text{dev def grad } u\|_2 + \|\text{grad } S_{\dagger}^{0,1} \text{ grad } S_{\dagger}^{0,2} \text{ grad } u\|),$$

$$\forall u \perp [\ker(\text{dev def grad}) \cap \ker(\text{grad } S_{\dagger}^{0,1} \text{ grad } S_{\dagger}^{0,2} \text{ grad})].$$

In 3D, the Poincaré inequality effectively uses all nine entries of  $\nabla \mathbf{u}$ , Korn uses six, and the 3D conformal Korn uses five. An open question is to find the minimal set of linear functionals  $\ell_i$  such that the generalised Korn inequality

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^1} \leq C \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \|\ell_i(\nabla \mathbf{u})\|_{L^2} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2} \right)$$

holds for some finite  $N$ . For further discussion on this topic, see [45].

**3.4. Other applications in linear and nonlinear analysis.** The Poincaré–Korn inequalities illustrate how cohomological structures can lead to analytic results. Many other theorems in linear and nonlinear analysis follow the same principle.

For instance, in linear analysis we encounter *regular decompositions*. Instead of the orthogonal Hodge decompositions for  $L^2$  spaces (as in (3.9)), one obtains analogous decompositions in more regular spaces. A typical example is

$$H(\text{curl}, \Omega) = \nabla H^1(\Omega) + [H^1(\Omega)]^3,$$

and, more generally, for the de Rham complex,

$$H(d, \Omega) = dH^1(\Omega) + [H^1(\Omega)]^n,$$

with similar statements holding for other complexes.

Similarly, the div–curl lemma from compensated compactness theory essentially relies on the underlying algebraic structures in complexes. Its generalisations to a  $d$ – $d^*$  lemma appear in [12, 114].

#### 4. SOLID MECHANICS

This section focuses on the connections between continuum mechanics (particularly solid mechanics) and differential complexes. Topology interacts with elasticity in several ways. Compatibility conditions (and related concepts such as stress functions) are well known to be closely related to

the topological properties of the elastic body. See [144] for a discussion of topological obstructions to compatibility in both linear and nonlinear elasticity. Furthermore, the failure of compatibility conditions can serve as an indication of defects (e.g., dislocations and disclinations) in the material. This idea has been extensively developed in the continuum mechanics literature, from pioneers such as Kröner [94–97] and Nye [110] to more geometric treatments in [145, 146]. Nevertheless, we present this topic here from the perspective of differential complexes and the BGG machinery. In fact, differential complexes encode additional concepts in solid mechanics. Here are some examples.

- *Primal vs. dual variational principles.* In the compatible theory, primal formulations correspond to the Hodge–Laplacian of 0-forms (where “0-forms” refers to the space in the complex at index 0, and similarly for other indices). Dual formulations (e.g., the Hellinger–Reissner principle) correspond to  $n$ -forms. Intrinsic formulations [54] use compatible strain tensors that are closed 1-forms ( $\mathbf{e}$  satisfying  $\text{inc } \mathbf{e} = 0$ ). Meanwhile, the Hu–Washizu principle involves three spaces in the complex.
- *Standard vs. microstructure models.* BGG complexes model classical (displacement-based) theories, whereas *twisted* complexes also include microscopic structures (e.g., local rotations). The BGG machinery introduces a cohomology-preserving projection that removes torsion components to yield standard models (for instance, eliminating pointwise rotations from Cosserat models to recover linear elasticity).
- *Rigidity and existence.* Rigidity and existence (sometimes known as the fundamental theorem of Riemannian geometry [53]) can be phrased in terms of the exactness of complexes. This aligns with the broader perspective discussed in the Introduction, where existence and uniqueness of solutions are viewed via homological methods. Several existence and uniqueness results in geometry and mechanics can be formulated using complexes and their exactness. Formally, consider an exact sequence

$$R \xrightarrow{f_0} A \xrightarrow{f_1} B \xrightarrow{f_2} C,$$

any object  $u := f_1(A)$  satisfies a *compatibility* condition  $f_2(u) = 0$ ; for any compatible object  $v$  satisfying  $f_2(v) = 0$ , there exists an object (stress function, potential)  $w \in A$  such that  $f_1(w) = v$ , and  $w$  is unique up to  $f_0$  of objects in  $R$  (rigidity).

- *Dimension reduction and (boundary) trace complexes.* Trace complexes correspond to lower-dimensional (e.g., plate or beam) models. Hence, dimension reduction can be incorporated into the BGG framework. From an analytic perspective, such models often arise as  $\Gamma$ -limits of higher-dimensional theories (see (4.13) below).
- *Multi-dimensional or mixed-dimensional models.* Bodies of different dimensions can be coupled in ways that incorporate richer physics and additional interface variables. This leads to the construction of Čech double complexes [28, 29].

These connections not only provide new perspectives on existing models but also indicate the potential for investigating new ones. For instance, to construct a 2D Cosserat-type plate model with defects, one could consider the Hodge–Laplacian acting on 1-forms (*defects*) in the trace complex ( $2D$ ) of the twisted complex (*Cosserat*) on a surface (*plates*). By selecting different Lie structures and complexes, one might obtain new continuum models with naturally encoded symmetries. This recalls the *Erlangen programme*, wherein geometries are characterized by particular Lie structures.

**4.1. Classical elasticity and compatible continuum: a nonlinear complex.** The (linear) elasticity complex (2.3) can be viewed as the linearisation of a sequence involving nonlinear operators:

$$(4.1) \quad 0 \longrightarrow \text{displacement} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}^0} \text{strain} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}^1} \text{stress} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}^2} \text{load} \longrightarrow 0.$$

As we explain below, this sequence is also a complex in the sense that composing two consecutive operators yields zero. Although cohomology is not defined for complexes with nonlinear operators (as the zero sets and the image of the nonlinear operators are not vector spaces), the notion of exactness still applies. Next, we explain (4.1) in detail. This will also set up the background used in the rest of this section.

In continuum theories, we consider a body initially occupying a region  $\widehat{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ , called the *initial configuration*. The body is deformed to a new region  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ , called the *current configuration*. A point  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}} \in \widehat{\Omega}$  is mapped to  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$  via a diffeomorphism  $\varphi$ , i.e.  $\mathbf{x} := \varphi(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})$ . The *displacement* is the vector from the original to the new point,

$$\mathbf{u}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) = \varphi(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - \widehat{\mathbf{x}} = (\varphi - \mathbf{I})(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}).$$

The *deformation gradient* is

$$\mathbf{F} = \widehat{\nabla} \varphi = \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \widehat{\mathbf{x}}}.$$

We assume the initial configuration is equipped with the Euclidean metric  $\mathbf{g}_0 := \mathbf{I}$ . Then the deformation induces the new metric

$$\mathbf{G} := (\widehat{\nabla} \varphi) \cdot \mathbf{I} \cdot (\varphi \widehat{\nabla}) = (\widehat{\nabla} \varphi) \cdot (\varphi \widehat{\nabla}),$$

known as the (right) Cauchy–Green deformation tensor. Here,  $\widehat{\nabla} \varphi$  denotes the *column-wise* gradient (the gradient operator acts on each component of  $\varphi$  to form columns), while  $\varphi \widehat{\nabla}$  denotes the row-wise gradient. The tensor  $\mathbf{G}$  measures distances on the deformed body: if two points are separated by  $\Delta \widehat{\mathbf{x}}$  before deformation, their initial distance squared is  $\Delta \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^T \cdot \mathbf{I} \cdot \Delta \widehat{\mathbf{x}}$ , while their post-deformation distance squared is  $\Delta \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^T \cdot \mathbf{G} \cdot \Delta \widehat{\mathbf{x}}$ . In differential-geometric terms,  $\mathbf{G} = (\varphi^{-1})^* \mathbf{I}$ . We define the *change of metric* or *strain* as

$$\mathbf{e} = (\widehat{\nabla} \varphi) \cdot (\varphi \widehat{\nabla}) - \mathbf{I},$$

so that  $\mathbf{e}$  encodes how the Euclidean metric changes under deformation.

We can also express  $\mathbf{G}$  directly in terms of  $\mathbf{u}$ . Setting  $\varphi(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) = \widehat{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{u}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})$ , we introduce

$$\mathcal{D}^0(\mathbf{u}) = [\widehat{\nabla}(\mathbf{u}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) + \widehat{\mathbf{x}})] \cdot [(\mathbf{u}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) + \widehat{\mathbf{x}}) \widehat{\nabla}] - \mathbf{I} = \widehat{\nabla} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u} \widehat{\nabla} + \widehat{\nabla} \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} \widehat{\nabla}.$$

Under a *small deformation*, i.e.  $\varphi(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) = \widehat{\mathbf{x}} + \varepsilon \mathbf{v}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) + o(\varepsilon)$ , we obtain

$$(\widehat{\nabla} \varphi) \cdot (\varphi \widehat{\nabla}) - \mathbf{I} = \varepsilon (\widehat{\nabla} \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{v} \widehat{\nabla}) + o(\varepsilon).$$

Hence, the first-order term

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{lin}}^0(\mathbf{u}) = \widehat{\nabla} \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} \widehat{\nabla}$$

is the standard *linearised strain*. In the small-deformation regime, we usually identify  $\widehat{\nabla}$  with  $\nabla$  and write  $\nabla \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} \nabla$ .

The next operator  $\mathcal{D}^1$  sends a (nonlinear) strain  $\mathbf{e}$  (i.e., a metric difference) to its associated *Einstein tensor*.<sup>c</sup> Its linearisation is  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{lin}}^1 = 2 \text{inc}$ , where *inc* is the *incompatibility operator* (sometimes called the Saint–Venant operator). Given  $\mathbf{e} = (\widehat{\nabla} \varphi) \cdot (\varphi \widehat{\nabla}) - \mathbf{I}$ , we have  $\mathcal{D}^1(\mathbf{e}) = 0$  precisely because the pullback of a Euclidean metric is flat. Thus,  $\mathcal{D}^1(\mathbf{e}) = 0$  is the *compatibility condition* for strain. In the small-strain limit,  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{lin}}^1(\mathbf{e}) = 0$  becomes the well-known *Saint–Venant compatibility condition*.

In elasticity, the Cauchy stress  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$  is a symmetric matrix field whose action  $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\partial \mathcal{O}}$  on the boundary of a microelement  $\mathcal{O}$  gives the internal force. Physically,  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$  can be determined from  $\mathbf{e}$  via a constitutive law (e.g., Hooke’s law). Mathematically, stress and strain are dual to each other via the energy inner product  $\int \boldsymbol{\sigma} : \mathbf{e} \, dx$ . Here, the divergence  $\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}$  corresponds to the force; hence,  $\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} = 0$  describes force-free fields. A *stress function* (such as the Beltrami stress function) provides

<sup>c</sup>In 3D, vanishing of the Einstein tensor implies vanishing of the Riemann curvature, hence “flatness.”




FIGURE 9. Embedding (deformation) of a body induces a change of metric, i.e., strain.

a potential for stress fields satisfying equilibrium. In 3D, one classically has  $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \nabla \times \boldsymbol{\varphi} \times \nabla$  for some symmetric tensor  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ . This is one of the exactness properties of the elasticity complex (2.3).

Classical elasticity admits several variational formulations: the *displacement method* (using 0-forms) minimising the energy functional

$$\inf_{\mathbf{u} \in [H^1]^n} \frac{1}{2} \|\text{def } \mathbf{u}\|_A - (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{u}),$$

the *Hellinger–Reissner principle* seeking critical point  $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in H(\text{div}, \mathbb{S})$ ,  $\mathbf{u} \in [L^2]^n$  of the saddle point functional

$$\inf_{\mathbf{u} \in [H^1]^n} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in H(\text{div}, \mathbb{S})} \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{C^{-1}}^2 + (\text{div } \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{u}) - (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{u}),$$

and the *intrinsic elasticity model* minimising the energy functional

$$\inf_{\mathbf{e} \in H(\text{inc}, \mathbb{S}) : \text{inc } \mathbf{e} = 0} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{e}\|_A - (\mathbf{f}, \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{e})),$$

where  $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{e})$  is the Cecàro-Volterra operator satisfying  $\text{def } \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{e}) = \mathbf{e}$ . The *Hu–Washizu principle* introduces a three-field variational formulation in which displacement  $\mathbf{u}$ , strain  $\mathbf{e}$ , and stress  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$  (0-, 1-, and 2-forms) are treated as independent fields. A typical saddle-point form is

$$\inf_{\mathbf{u} \in [H^1]^n, \mathbf{e} \in L^2 \otimes \mathbb{S}} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in H(\text{div}, \mathbb{S})} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{e}\|_C^2 - (\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{e}) + (\text{div } \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{u}) - (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{u}),$$

As we have seen, many key notions in elasticity, such as displacement, strain, stress, equilibrium, compatibility, fit naturally into the (nonlinear) diagram (4.1) and its linearised version (2.3). In the discussion above, we highlighted the first part (displacement and strain) and the last part (stress and load), noting the duality between strain and stress. However, we have not yet discussed  $\mathcal{D}^1$  (or its linearised analog  $\text{inc}$ ) beyond observing the compatibility condition  $\text{inc } \mathbf{e} = 0$ . In the next subsection, we turn to the idea that violations of compatibility can model *continuum defects*, so that the strain and stress spaces in (4.1) (possibly not coming from a displacement) represent defect fields in a natural way.

**Exactness of the nonlinear complex.** Although cohomology is not defined for the nonlinear complex, we can also talk about exactness, i.e., the zero set of a map is the image of the previous operator.

The nonlinear elasticity complex in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  (4.1) can be reformulated as follows using geometric terms:

$$\text{rigid body motion} \xrightarrow{\subset} \text{map } \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ to } \mathbb{R}^3 \xrightarrow{\varphi \mapsto \varphi^* g_0 - g_0} \text{change of metric} \xrightarrow{\text{Ricci}} \text{curvature} \xrightarrow{\text{Bianchi}} (\text{co})\text{vector}$$

The exactness of the nonlinear complex corresponds to various classical results [80]. The exactness at “map from  $\mathbb{R}^3$  to  $\mathbb{R}^3$ ” corresponds to the rigidity result: If a map does not change the Euclidean metric, then it is a rigid body motion. The exactness at the “change of metric” corresponds to the “fundamental theorem of Riemannian geometry” [53]: If a metric is flat, then it can be locally written as (a pullback of) the Euclidean metric. The exactness at curvature (a tempting question – whether a tensor is the curvature of some metric if it satisfies certain Bianchi identities) is not well defined, as to formulate the Bianchi identity, one already needs a metric. See [124] for detailed discussions.

**4.2. Higher-order forms: defects and incompatibility.** Defects in materials refer to imperfections that disrupt the regular arrangement of atoms or molecules within a solid. These defects can be classified into several types, including point defects, dislocations, and disclinations, each affecting the material’s properties in different ways. Point defects, such as vacancies and interstitials, occur when atoms are missing or misplaced in the crystal lattice, leading to changes in material properties like conductivity or diffusion. Dislocations are line defects that represent the misalignment of atomic planes and are central to plastic deformation, influencing a material’s strength. Disclinations, on the other hand, are rotational defects that occur in the lattice structure. These defects are crucial in understanding the mechanical, electrical, and thermal behaviours of materials, as well as their response to external stresses, and they play a significant role in the design of advanced materials with tailored properties. In a continuum theory, defects are often described by the violation of compatibility conditions. There is a vast literature on this topic, see, e.g., [4, 95, 97, 134, 145, 146]. We by no means provide a comprehensive review, but we aim to show that (BGG) complexes precisely encode this idea of modelling and the algebraic structures therein.

In a continuum theory, defects are often described by the violation of compatibility conditions. We first summarize some key concepts and relations in classical elasticity and continuum defect

theory in the diagrams below:

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} \text{displacement} & \xrightarrow{\text{grad}} & \text{distortion} & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & \text{dislocation density tensor} & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & \dots \\ & \searrow^{-\text{mskw}} & & \searrow^{\mathcal{S}} & & \searrow^{2 \text{ vskw}} & \\ \text{rotation} & \xrightarrow{\text{grad}} & \text{wryness tensor, Nye tensor} & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & \text{disclination density, stress} & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & \text{load,} \end{array}$$

$$(4.3) \quad \text{displacement} \xrightarrow{\text{def}} \text{strain} \xrightarrow{\text{inc}} \text{internal stress, stress} \xrightarrow{\text{div}} \text{load}.$$

The notations are summarized in the following diagrams:

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathbf{u} & \xrightarrow{\text{grad}} & \boldsymbol{\beta} \ (\mathbf{e} = \boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\omega}) & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & \boldsymbol{\alpha} & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & \dots \\ & \searrow^{-\text{mskw}} & & \searrow^{\mathcal{S}} & & \searrow^{2 \text{ vskw}} & \\ \boldsymbol{\varpi} & \xrightarrow{\text{grad}} & \boldsymbol{\kappa} & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\sigma} & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & \mathbf{f}, \end{array}$$

$$(4.5) \quad \mathbf{u} \xrightarrow{\text{def}} \mathbf{e} \xrightarrow{\text{inc}} \boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\sigma} \xrightarrow{\text{div}} \mathbf{f}.$$

Now we explain the diagrams in the linearised theory. We refer to [134, 146] for the definitions below.

Let  $\varphi : \Omega \rightarrow \varphi(\Omega)$  be an isomorphism with  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ , and  $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}) := \varphi(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x}$  be the displacement of a continua. In the classical elasticity theory, the *distortion tensor*  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  is defined as  $\boldsymbol{\beta} := \mathbf{u}\nabla$ , satisfying the compatibility condition  $\boldsymbol{\beta} \times \nabla = 0$ . The distortion tensor can be decomposed into a symmetric part  $\mathbf{e}$  and a skew symmetric part  $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ , i.e.,  $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{e} + \boldsymbol{\omega}$ . Here  $\mathbf{e}$  is the classical *strain tensor* and  $\boldsymbol{\omega}$  is the *rotation tensor*. Specifically, we have

$$\mathbf{e} = \text{def } \mathbf{u} := \frac{1}{2}(\nabla \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}\nabla), \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\omega} = \text{skw}(\mathbf{u}\nabla) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{u}\nabla - \nabla \mathbf{u}).$$

The rotation tensor  $\boldsymbol{\omega}$  can be obtained as the matrix version of the axial vector  $\mathbf{u} \times \nabla$ , i.e.,  $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \text{mskw}(\mathbf{u} \times \nabla)$ . We denote the axial vector of  $\boldsymbol{\omega}$  by  $\boldsymbol{\varpi} := \text{vskw } \boldsymbol{\omega} := (\text{mskw})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\omega} = \mathbf{u} \times \nabla$ . The *wryness tensors*  $\boldsymbol{\Xi}$  (the name is often used in the context of Cosserat and micropolar continuum, see, e.g., [117]) is defined as

$$(4.6) \quad \boldsymbol{\kappa} := \boldsymbol{\varpi}\nabla = \nabla \times \mathbf{u}\nabla,$$

and satisfies the compatibility condition

$$(4.7) \quad \boldsymbol{\kappa} \times \nabla = 0.$$

The wryness tensors tensor is trace-free:  $\text{tr } \boldsymbol{\kappa} = 0$ , as  $\text{tr}(\nabla \times \mathbf{u}\nabla) = \nabla \cdot \nabla \times \mathbf{u} = 0$ .

By definition, we have  $\nabla \times \mathbf{e} = \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ . With this identity, the Saint-Venant compatibility condition for  $\mathbf{e}$ ,  $\nabla \times \mathbf{e} \times \nabla = 0$ , is equivalent to the compatibility condition (4.7) for  $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ .

The above definitions in the context of classical elasticity describe a compatible deformation. When defects are present, some compatibility conditions may be violated. The general philosophy in defect theory is to use the violation of compatibility conditions to model the defects. The violation of compatibility conditions, viewed as defect (dislocation, disclination etc.) density, is thus encoded in higher-order forms in a differential complex. We review this idea in the rest of this section.

Dislocations are detected by *Burgers circuits*: one draws a closed circuit in the reference configuration. If the deformation is compatible, then the deformed circuit remains closed. However, this is not necessarily the case if dislocations are present. The gap is called the *Burgers vector*. On the

mesoscopic level, the Burgers circuit consists of a loop of atoms, and the gap (the Burgers vector) describes the misplacements of the atoms.

In the presence of defects, it is assumed that the distortion tensor  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  is decomposed into an elastic part plus a plastic part:  $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \boldsymbol{\beta}^e + \boldsymbol{\beta}^p$  (additive for small deformation). The elastic part would vanish if all loads were removed. It stores elastic energy and is governed by some elastic stress–strain law (e.g., Hookean or hyperelastic). The plastic part reflects permanent molecular-level rearrangements – slip, twinning, dislocation motion in crystals, etc. Removing the load does not necessarily make  $\boldsymbol{\beta}^p$  vanish. This portion evolves according to plastic flow rules (yield conditions, hardening laws, etc.).

Under the above decomposition,  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  still satisfies the compatibility condition  $\boldsymbol{\beta} \times \nabla = 0$ . However, the elasticity part  $\boldsymbol{\beta}^e \times \nabla = -\boldsymbol{\beta}^p \times \nabla$  may be nonzero. The Burgers vector is now obtained as

$$\mathbf{b} = \int_{\mathcal{C}} \boldsymbol{\beta}^p d\mathbf{x} = - \int_{\mathcal{C}} \boldsymbol{\beta}^e d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\mathcal{S}} (\boldsymbol{\beta}^p \times \nabla) d\mathcal{S},$$

where  $\mathcal{S}$  is an area enclosed by  $\mathcal{C}$ . The *dislocation density tensor* is then defined by

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} := \boldsymbol{\beta}^p \times \nabla = -\boldsymbol{\beta}^e \times \nabla,$$

which represents the distribution of dislocations in the material. Clearly, the dislocation density is divergence-free (as a source-free field):  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \nabla = 0$ . This corresponds to the fact that dislocations do not have a net source. Then the *incompatibility tensor*  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$  involved in the Saint-Venant condition is

$$\boldsymbol{\eta} = \nabla \times \boldsymbol{\alpha}.$$

Note that  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$  is automatically symmetric as *inc* maps any skew-symmetric matrix to zero.

Furthermore,  $\boldsymbol{\omega}$  decomposes into elastic and plastic parts  $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \boldsymbol{\omega}^e + \boldsymbol{\omega}^p$ , with  $\boldsymbol{\omega}^e = \text{skw} \boldsymbol{\beta}^e$ . For a macroscopically stress-free configuration, the elastic distortion consists of only the elastic rotation, i.e.,  $\boldsymbol{\beta}^e = \boldsymbol{\omega}^e$ , because the symmetric part, i.e., the linearised strain  $\text{sym} \boldsymbol{\beta}^e$  is proportional to the elastic stress, which vanishes by assumption. Thus in the case of stress-free configuration, the Nye tensor [110]  $\boldsymbol{\kappa}^e := \boldsymbol{\varpi}^e \nabla$  (here  $\boldsymbol{\varpi}^e := \text{vskw} \boldsymbol{\omega}^e$  is the axial vector of the elastic rotation tensor  $\boldsymbol{\omega}^e$ ) and the dislocation density  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \boldsymbol{\beta}^e \times \nabla$  satisfies the Nye formula:  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\boldsymbol{\kappa}^e)^T - \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\kappa}^e)I$ . This is exactly a commuting identity of the diagram (4.4).

The discussions above complies with the general philosophy of using the violation of compatibility conditions to model defects. This idea can be continued, leading to high-order continuum defect theories. In particular,  $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$  obtained by  $\mathbf{u}$  via (4.6) automatically satisfies the compatibility  $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \times \nabla = 0$ . We can further assume that we are given  $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$  that is not derived from  $\mathbf{u}$  or  $\boldsymbol{\varpi}$  and does not necessarily satisfy the compatibility condition.

Disclinations describe rotational mismatches in a crystalline or continuum structure, leading to angular closure failures. In disclination theory, the Frank vector measures this rotational closure failure: if we draw a loop in the continuum and parallel transport a vector along it back to the origin, that vector may be rotated. The change in angle is captured by the Frank vector, which aligns exactly with the geometric definition of Riemannian curvature. Consequently, curvature provides a natural geometric interpretation for disclinations.

In compatible theories,  $\boldsymbol{\kappa} := \boldsymbol{\omega} \nabla$  satisfies the compatibility condition  $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \times \nabla = 0$ . In generalised continuum,  $\boldsymbol{\kappa} = \boldsymbol{\kappa}^e + \boldsymbol{\kappa}^p$  has an elastic-plastic decomposition, and  $\boldsymbol{\theta} := \boldsymbol{\kappa}^p \times \nabla$  is defined as the disclination (second-order) tensor [134, Remark 1.7]. This exactly corresponds to the curvature tensor in (4.4).

**4.3. Twisted complexes: microstructure and micropolar models.** In 1D, 2D and 3D, the Hodge–Laplacian problems of the twisted de Rham and BGG complexes also correspond to various beam, plate and elasticity models. As we shall see, the twisted complex encode extra degrees of




FIGURE 10. Beam models. In the Euler–Bernoulli beam, a line orthogonal to the mid-surface remains orthogonal after the deformation. Therefore, the vertical displacement  $u$  is the only unknown. In the Timoshenko beam, the orthogonality condition is dropped. Therefore, the model involves an additional rotational variable  $w$ .

freedom (unknowns) characterising microstructure of materials. The BGG machinery for deriving the BGG complexes from the twisted complexes thus can be interpreted as eliminating these degrees of freedom.

An often-used assumption in beam models is that a line orthogonal to the midline remains orthogonal after deformation (see Figure 10). Under this assumption, the beam can be described by a single unknown, i.e., the vertical displacement. This leads to the Euler–Bernoulli beam theory, where the solution is obtained by minimising the energy functional  $\|\frac{d^2}{dx^2}w\|_C^2$ , where  $\|\cdot\|_C$  is a weighted  $L^2$  inner product involving physical parameters of the material. In the language of complexes, this energy functional corresponds to the 0th Hodge–Laplacian of the BGG complex in 1D:

$$0 \longrightarrow H^2 \xrightarrow{\frac{d^2}{dx^2}} L^2 \longrightarrow 0.$$

If we drop the mid-surface orthogonality assumption, we introduce one more variable  $w$ , representing the rotation angle. This yields the Timoshenko beam energy functional

$$(4.8) \quad \mu_c \left\| \frac{d}{dx}u - w \right\|_{C_1}^2 + \left\| \frac{d}{dx}w \right\|_{C_2}^2,$$

which corresponds to the 0th Hodge–Laplacian of the twisted de Rham complex in 1D:

$$0 \longrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} H^1 \\ H^1 \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} \frac{d}{dx} & -I \\ 0 & \frac{d}{dx} \end{pmatrix}} \begin{pmatrix} L^2 \\ L^2 \end{pmatrix} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Here,  $\mu_c$  is a constant characterizing the coupling between vertical displacement and rotation. When  $\mu_c = 0$ , the system decouples; when  $\mu_c \rightarrow \infty$ , we enforce  $w = \frac{d}{dx}u$ , which reduces to the Euler–Bernoulli beam.

A similar situation occurs in 2D. The Hessian complex

$$(4.9) \quad 0 \longrightarrow H^2 \xrightarrow{\text{hess}} H(\text{rot}; \mathbb{S}) \xrightarrow{\text{rot}} L^2 \otimes \mathbb{V} \longrightarrow 0$$

and its twisted de Rham counterpart

$$(4.10) \quad 0 \longrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} H^1 \\ H^1 \otimes \mathbb{V} \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{d_V^0} \begin{pmatrix} H(\text{rot}) \\ H(\text{rot}) \otimes \mathbb{V} \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{d_V^1} \begin{pmatrix} L^2 \\ L^2 \otimes \mathbb{V} \end{pmatrix} \longrightarrow 0,$$




FIGURE 11. Cosserat models introduce a pointwise rotation to continuum models.

where

$$d_V^0 = \begin{pmatrix} \text{grad} & -I \\ 0 & \text{grad} \end{pmatrix}, \quad d_V^1 = \begin{pmatrix} \text{rot} & -\text{sskw} \\ 0 & \text{rot} \end{pmatrix},$$

respectively correspond to the Kirchhoff plate model and a Reissner–Mindlin plate model (see, e.g., [8, p. 1279]). The former’s energy functional (the 0th Hodge–Laplacian) is  $\|\text{hess } u\|_B^2$ , while the latter is  $\mu_c \|\text{grad } u - \phi\|_A^2 + \|\nabla \phi\|_B^2$ . Again,  $\mu_c = 0$  decouples  $u$  and  $\phi$ ; as  $\mu_c \rightarrow \infty$ , we force  $\phi = \nabla u$ , and the Reissner–Mindlin solution converges to that of the Kirchhoff plate. The Kirchhoff plate model can be also obtained from the Reissner–Mindlin plate as thickness tends to zero [14].

Cosserat (or micropolar) models, proposed by the Cosserat brothers in the early 20th century [56], extend classical continuum mechanics by allowing material points to possess orientational degrees of freedom in addition to translational ones. Thus, Cosserat models capture size effects and rotational phenomena in granular or otherwise heterogeneous media [138], whereas classical elasticity treats geometrically similar structures as having identical mechanical responses. The Cosserat model also inspired the notion of torsion in geometric contexts [130].

Next, we present a unified view of the linearised versions of these models via the twisted and BGG complexes. The linearised Cosserat elasticity model has the following energy functional, where  $\mathbf{u}$  is the displacement and  $\boldsymbol{\omega}$  is the pointwise rotation (treated as an axial vector):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^{\text{Cosserat}}(\mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\omega}) &:= \int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{1}{2} \|\text{grad } \mathbf{u} - \text{mskw } \boldsymbol{\omega}\|_{C_1}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\text{grad } \boldsymbol{\omega}\|_{C_2}^2 - \langle \mathbf{f}_u, \mathbf{u} \rangle - \langle \mathbf{f}_\omega, \boldsymbol{\omega} \rangle \right) dx \\ (4.11) \quad &= \int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{1}{2} \|\text{sym grad } \mathbf{u}\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 + \mu_c \|\frac{1}{2} \text{curl } \mathbf{u} - \boldsymbol{\omega}\|^2 + \frac{\gamma + \beta}{2} \|\text{sym grad } \boldsymbol{\omega}\|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\gamma - \beta}{4} \|\text{curl } \boldsymbol{\omega}\|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\text{div } \boldsymbol{\omega}\|^2 \right) dx - \int_{\Omega} (\langle \mathbf{f}_u, \mathbf{u} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{f}_\omega, \boldsymbol{\omega} \rangle) dx, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} C_1(\varepsilon) &= \mathcal{C}(\varepsilon) + \mu_c \text{skw}(\varepsilon), \quad \mathcal{C}(\varepsilon) = 2\mu \text{sym}(\varepsilon) + \lambda \text{tr}(\varepsilon) I, \\ C_2(\varepsilon) &= (\gamma + \beta) \text{sym}(\varepsilon) + \alpha \text{tr}(\varepsilon) I + (\gamma - \beta) \text{skw}(\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mu, \lambda$  are Lamé parameters,  $\mu_c$  is the Cosserat coupling constant, and  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$  are additional micropolar moduli.

The coupling term  $\text{grad } \mathbf{u} - \text{mskw } \boldsymbol{\omega}$  arises from linearizing the (multiplicative) action  $\exp(\text{mskw } \boldsymbol{\omega}) \in \text{SO}(3)$  on the deformation. By separating the symmetric and skew-symmetric parts, (4.11) can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{E}^{\text{Cosserat}}(\mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\omega}) = \int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{1}{2} \|\text{sym grad } \mathbf{u}\|_c^2 + \mu_c \|\frac{1}{2} \text{curl } \mathbf{u} - \boldsymbol{\omega}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\text{grad } \boldsymbol{\omega}\|_{C_2}^2 - \langle \mathbf{f}_u, \mathbf{u} \rangle - \langle \mathbf{f}_\omega, \boldsymbol{\omega} \rangle \right) dx.$$

When  $\mu_c = 0$ , the fields  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\omega}$  decouple, so  $\mathbf{u}$  solves the standard elasticity problem. In the limiting case  $\mu_c \rightarrow \infty$ , we impose  $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \frac{1}{2} \text{curl } \mathbf{u}$ . Then the energy includes a “mixed” 4th–2nd order term  $\|\text{grad curl } \mathbf{u}\|_{C_2}^2$ , describing a couple stress model [112].

This model can be recognised as the 0th Hodge–Laplacian of the twisted complex (4.10). Precisely, for the 0-forms in (4.10), the variable has two components:  $\mathbf{u}$  (displacement, top row) and  $\boldsymbol{\omega}$  (rotation, bottom row). The corresponding Hodge–Laplacian problem has the energy

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \text{grad} & \text{mskw} \\ 0 & \text{grad} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \boldsymbol{\omega} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_C^2 &= \|\text{sym}(\text{grad } \mathbf{u} + \text{mskw } \boldsymbol{\omega})\|_{C_1}^2 + \mu_c \|\text{skw}(\text{grad } \mathbf{u} + \text{mskw } \boldsymbol{\omega})\|_{C_2}^2 + \|\text{grad } \boldsymbol{\omega}\|_{C_3}^2 \\ (4.12) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= \|\text{sym grad } \mathbf{u}\|_{C_1}^2 + \mu_c \|\text{curl } \mathbf{u} + \boldsymbol{\omega}\|_{C_2}^2 + \|\text{grad } \boldsymbol{\omega}\|_{C_3}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which precisely corresponds to the linearised Cosserat model [108]. For  $\mu \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\omega}$  decouples, reducing to classical linear elasticity; for  $\mu \rightarrow \infty$ , we get  $\boldsymbol{\omega} = -\text{curl } \mathbf{u}$  and hence a higher-order couple-stress type model [112]. The BGG machinery provides an algebraic viewpoint on eliminating or reintroducing the rotation variable.

Such micropolar models involve multiple scalings and constants, leading to challenges for parameter-robust numerical schemes. Notably, parameter-robust methods for Cosserat models should also handle the couple-stress regime.

In summary, the twisted de Rham and BGG complexes in 1D, 2D, and 3D correspond to various beam, plate, and elasticity models:

	Twisted Complex	BGG Complex
1D	Timoshenko beam	Euler–Bernoulli beam
2D	Reissner–Mindlin plate	Kirchhoff–Love plate
3D	Cosserat elasticity	Classical elasticity

From this perspective, the cohomology-preserving projection [12] can be viewed as the process of eliminating rotational degrees of freedom from the Cosserat model to recover classical elasticity. The mappings that takes the BGG complex back to the twisted de Rham complex reflect adding back the rotation field. An analogous interpretation holds for the Kirchhoff and Reissner–Mindlin plates. Moreover, both Reissner–Mindlin and Kirchhoff plate models can be obtained as dimension reductions of Cosserat and standard elasticity, respectively, with rigorous  $\Gamma$ -limit derivations in [52, 107]. These relationships are sketched in the following diagram:

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{Cosserat elasticity} & \xrightarrow{\text{BGG (elasticity)}} & \text{classical elasticity} \\ \downarrow \text{dimension reduction} & & \downarrow \text{dimension reduction} \\ \text{(modified) Reissner–Mindlin plate} & \xrightarrow{\text{BGG (hessian)}} & \text{Kirchhoff plate} \end{array}$$

This cohomological viewpoint on the linear Cosserat model yields well-posed Hodge–Laplacian boundary-value problems and valuable tools for analysis and numerical approximation. Each BGG complex leads to a Hodge–Laplacian formulation (energy functional), and other complexes or diagrams may further generalise the Cosserat theory to other microstructures.

**4.4. Mixed dimensional models: Čech complexes.** The Čech–de Rham double complex is another commonly used tool in algebraic topology (as well as in topological data analysis) [33]. In addition to the exterior derivatives in the de Rham complex, the double complex introduces overlapping subdomains (where domains either partly or completely overlap, or only intersect at the interfaces) and an alternating sum of the restriction or trace operators on these subdomains. These “jump operators”  $\delta^\bullet$  led by the alternating sum also form a complex. Moreover, we can combine the exterior derivatives  $d^\bullet$  and the jump operators  $\delta^\bullet$  to form a new complex. The double complex and other complexes derived from it incorporate richer interface and multiphysics information. Below, we present basic definitions of Čech–de Rham double complexes and demonstrate some examples.

Let  $\{U_j\}_j$  be an open cover of  $\Omega$ , and denote

$$U_{ij} := U_i \cap U_j, \quad U_{ijk} := U_i \cap U_j \cap U_k,$$

etc. Let  $\Lambda^k(U_{i_1 \dots i_\ell})$  be the space of  $k$ -forms on  $U_{i_1} \cap \dots \cap U_{i_\ell}$ . We introduce

$$\mathcal{W}^{k,s} := \bigoplus_{i_0, \dots, i_s} \Lambda^k(U_{i_0, \dots, i_s}),$$

the direct sum of  $k$ -forms on all intersections involving  $(s+1)$  indices. The exterior derivative  $d^k$  acts by

$$d^k : \mathcal{W}^{k,s} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}^{k+1,s},$$

since applying  $d$  does not change the domain of definition (only the degree of the form).

The Čech–de Rham complex (sometimes called the Čech complex) adds a “vertical differential”  $\delta$  that goes in the other direction of a double complex. We define

$$\delta : \mathcal{W}^{k,s} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}^{k,s+1}$$

as follows. If  $\alpha \in \mathcal{W}^{k,s}$ , write  $\alpha_{i_0, \dots, i_s}$  for the component of  $\alpha$  on  $U_{i_0} \cap \dots \cap U_{i_s}$ . Then

$$(\delta\alpha)_{i_0, \dots, i_{s+1}} = \sum_{j=0}^{s+1} (-1)^j \alpha_{i_0, \dots, i_{j-1}, i_{j+1}, \dots, i_{s+1}} \Big|_{U_{i_0, \dots, i_{s+1}}}.$$

The factor  $(-1)^j$  indicates the usual alternating sum.

**Example 4.** If  $\Omega$  is covered by  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  only, then  $\mathcal{W}^{k,1}$  has just one intersection  $U_{1,2}$ . For  $\alpha \in \mathcal{W}^{k,0}$ ,

$$(\delta\alpha)_{1,2} = (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) \Big|_{U_{1,2}},$$

where  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  are the components of  $\alpha$  on  $U_1$  and  $U_2$ . For three subdomains  $U_0, U_1, U_2$ , one similarly obtains

$$(\delta\alpha)_{0,1,2} = \alpha_{1,2} \Big|_{U_{0,1,2}} - \alpha_{0,2} \Big|_{U_{0,1,2}} + \alpha_{0,1} \Big|_{U_{0,1,2}}.$$

It is straightforward to check that  $\delta \circ d = d \circ \delta$ , and  $\delta^2 = 0$  just as with boundary operators. Hence we obtain a diagram:

$$(4.14) \quad \begin{array}{cccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{W}^{0,0} & \xrightarrow{d} & \mathcal{W}^{1,0} & \xrightarrow{d} & \mathcal{W}^{2,0} & \xrightarrow{d} & \mathcal{W}^{3,0} & \longrightarrow & \dots \\ & & \downarrow \delta & & \downarrow \delta & & \downarrow \delta & & \downarrow \delta & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{W}^{0,1} & \xrightarrow{d} & \mathcal{W}^{1,1} & \xrightarrow{d} & \mathcal{W}^{2,1} & \xrightarrow{d} & \mathcal{W}^{3,1} & \longrightarrow & \dots \\ & & \downarrow \delta & & \downarrow \delta & & \downarrow \delta & & \downarrow \delta & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{W}^{0,2} & \xrightarrow{d} & \mathcal{W}^{1,2} & \xrightarrow{d} & \mathcal{W}^{2,2} & \xrightarrow{d} & \mathcal{W}^{3,2} & \longrightarrow & \dots \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \dots \end{array}$$

Define

$$\mathcal{W}^k := \bigoplus_{p+q=k} \mathcal{W}^{p,q}, \quad D^k := d + (-1)^k \delta.$$

Since  $d$  and  $\delta$  commute and each squares to zero, one checks  $D^k \circ D^{k-1} = 0$ . Thus

$$\dots \longrightarrow \mathcal{W}^{k-1} \xrightarrow{D^{k-1}} \mathcal{W}^k \xrightarrow{D^k} \mathcal{W}^{k+1} \longrightarrow \dots$$

is a complex, called the *Čech–de Rham complex*.

The above Čech–de Rham complex also extends to degenerate structures in which different sets  $U_i, U_{ij}, \dots$  can have varying dimensions. For instance, in a combinatorial elastic structure, beams (1D) may be coupled with shells (2D). Another example is a simplicial complex, where each  $U_i$  is a top-dimensional cell, and  $U_{ij}$  incorporates faces of codimension 1, etc. In such cases, the vertical operator  $\delta$  involves trace operators on the intersections, which makes the analytic theory of the Čech–de Rham complex more delicate. We refer to [30] for further discussions in this direction.

Ignoring the analytic subtleties, in the rest of this section, we show a *formal* Hodge–Laplacian problem of the Čech complex to demonstrate connections between the Čech complex and mechanics models. Consider the cover  $\{U_1, U_2\}$ . The sub-diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{W}^{0,0} & \xrightarrow{d} & \mathcal{W}^{1,0} \\ & & \downarrow \delta \\ & & \mathcal{W}^{0,1} \end{array}$$

suggests an energy functional for  $u \in \mathcal{W}^{0,0}$ :

$$\|\nabla u\|_{U_1}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{U_2}^2 + \|u|_{U_1} - u|_{U_2}\|_{U_1 \cap U_2}^2 + (f, u).$$

Minimizing it formally yields an Euler–Lagrange system,

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta(u|_{U_1}) + 1_{U_{1,2},U_1}(u|_{U_1} - u|_{U_2}) &= (f, u|_{U_1}), \\ -\Delta(u|_{U_2}) - 1_{U_{1,2},U_2}(u|_{U_1} - u|_{U_2}) &= (f, u|_{U_2}), \end{aligned}$$

together with boundary conditions. Here  $1_{U_{1,2},U_i}$  is the characteristic function:  $1_{U_{1,2},U_i}$  is a function defined on  $U_i$ , which equals to 1 on  $U_{1,2}$  and 0 elsewhere in  $U_i$ . These terms containing  $1_{U_{1,2},U_i}$  incorporates contributions from the interactions between  $U_1$  and  $U_2$ . Such constructions are quite flexible regarding how the cover is chosen (e.g. one can even set  $U_1 = U_2 = \Omega$  to mimic a double-continuum model in porous media [28, Sec. 3.2]).

Mixed dimensional modelling has also been used in other applications such as brain's waterscape [126], reinforced structures [98] and viscoelasticity and gels van der Waals heterostructures [85].

**Remark 3.** *In his paper in the 1970s, Feng Kang discussed finite elements on combinatorial manifolds with applications to combinatorial elastic structures. Some of the open questions listed in the paper include*

- *the regularity of solutions to elliptic equations on combinatorial manifolds,*
- *the generalisation of the de Rham–Hodge theory to combinatorial manifolds.*

*These issues are still of significant interest, especially given modern mixed-dimensional and heterogeneous modeling applications. Particularly, developing a Čech-complex-based approach for modelling and computation of multidimensional models complies with the second question above.*

## 5. TOPOLOGICAL HYDRODYNAMICS AND MAGNETOHYDRODYNAMICS

In this section, we review the connections between fluid mechanics and differential complex and cohomology. Specifically, we formulate the divergence-constraint of incompressible flows and advection-diffusion of fluids using differential forms; we discuss the notation of helicity and a topological mechanism underlying long-term evolution of these systems, explaining the striking difference of numerical behaviours in Example 2.

**5.1. Divergence-constraints and advection-diffusion by differential forms.** We view fluid dynamics, particularly incompressible Navier–Stokes equations and magnetohydrodynamics, in terms of differential complexes and differential forms. The shift of point of view will provide new insights in designing structure-preserving numerical schemes.

A straightforward application of differential complexes in fluid mechanics is the incompressibility condition  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0$  in incompressible flow (1.2), which plays an important role in mathematical and numerical analysis. Written in a weak form, (1.2) becomes: seek  $\mathbf{u} : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_0^1(\Omega)$ , such that for all  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}_0^1(\Omega)$ ,

$$(5.1a) \quad (\mathbf{u}_t, \mathbf{v}) + ((\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) + R_e^{-1}(\nabla\mathbf{u}, \nabla\mathbf{v}) - (p, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) = (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}),$$

$$(5.1b) \quad (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}, q) = 0.$$

The divergence operator  $\nabla \cdot : \mathbf{H}_0^1 \rightarrow L^2/\mathbb{R}$  is onto. More precisely, the Ladyzhenskaya-Babuška-Brezzi (inf-sup) condition holds

$$\inf_{q \in L^2/\mathbb{R}} \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}_0^1} \frac{(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}, q)}{\|\mathbf{v}\|_{H^1} \|q\|_{L^2}} \geq \gamma > 0.$$

The surjectivity and the norm control in the inf-sup condition are consequences of the fact that the de Rham complex (with proper Sobolev spaces) is exact at  $L^2/\mathbb{R}$ . These results imply the well-posedness of the weak form. To see the role played by the algebraic structure, let's suppose that the divergence operator is not surjective, but has a nontrivial cokernel (which may happen on the discrete level if inappropriate finite element spaces for the velocity and pressure are chosen). That is, there exists a subspace  $Q^\perp \subset L^2/\mathbb{R}$  such that  $(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}, q) = 0, \forall q \in Q^\perp$ . Since  $p$  in (5.1) is only involved in the term  $(p, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})$ , adding any element of  $Q^\perp$  to  $p$  does not affect the equation. Therefore,  $p$  is not unique unless  $Q^\perp$  is trivial, i.e., the divergence operator is surjective.

The magnetohydrodynamics (MHD) system describes the macroscopic motion of conducting fluids with wide applications to plasma and astrophysics. The governing equation of incompressible

MHD system is

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u} \times (\nabla \times \mathbf{u}) - R_e^{-1} \Delta \mathbf{u} - s \mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{B} + \nabla P = \mathbf{f} \quad \text{momentum equation,} \quad (5.2a)$$

$$\mathbf{j} - \nabla \times \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{Ampere's law,} \quad (5.2b)$$

$$\partial_t \mathbf{B} + \nabla \times \mathbf{E} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{Faraday's law,} \quad (5.2c)$$

$$R_m^{-1} \mathbf{j} - (\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{B}) = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{Ohm's law,} \quad (5.2d)$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0 \quad \text{Gauss law,} \quad (5.2e)$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0, \quad (5.2f)$$

with initial conditions  $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, 0) = \mathbf{u}_0(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}, 0) = \mathbf{B}_0(\mathbf{x})$ , and boundary conditions on  $\partial\Omega$ :  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$ ,  $\mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$ ,  $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0}$ . Note that we have used the Lamb form of the convection term  $\mathbf{u} \times (\nabla \times \mathbf{u})$  and  $P$  is the total pressure. Eliminating  $\mathbf{E}$  and  $\mathbf{j}$ , we can derive the equation of  $\mathbf{B}$ :

$$(5.3) \quad \partial_t \mathbf{B} - \nabla \times (\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{B}) + R_m^{-1} \nabla \times \nabla \times \mathbf{B} = 0.$$

The equation (5.3) is often called the advection-diffusion of the magnetic field. The term  $-\nabla \times (\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{B})$  describes how the magnetic field is transported by the velocity field; the term  $R_m^{-1} \nabla \times \nabla \times \mathbf{B}$  describes diffusion since  $-\Delta \mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \nabla \times -\nabla \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B}$ , and we have  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$ . The equation has a similar form as the vorticity equation

$$(5.4) \quad \partial_t \boldsymbol{\omega} - \nabla \times (\mathbf{u} \times \boldsymbol{\omega}) + R_m^{-1} \nabla \times \nabla \times \boldsymbol{\omega} = 0.$$

The difference is that in (5.3),  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  are independent (in the full MHD system,  $\mathbf{u}$  is determined through the coupling with the Navier–Stokes equation); while in (5.4),  $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \nabla \times \mathbf{u}$ .

In fluid mechanics and MHD, advection-diffusion equations of differential forms arise: seeking  $k$ -forms  $\omega$  such that

$$\mathcal{L}_u \omega + \Delta_{\text{HL}} \omega = f,$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_u \omega$  is the Lie derivative (the flow derivatives or ‘fisherman derivatives’ [18]) of  $\omega$  along a vector field  $u$ , and  $\Delta_{\text{HL}}$  is the Hodge–Laplacian.

Given a vector field  $u$  on a manifold  $\Omega$ , the *flow* generated by  $u$  is a map  $\Phi : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  such that  $\partial_t \Phi(t, x) = u(\Phi(t, x), t)$  with  $\Phi(0, x) = x$ . Let  $\omega \in C^\infty \Lambda^k$  be a  $k$ -form on  $\Omega$ . The *Lie derivative* of  $\omega$  along  $u$  is defined by

$$(5.5) \quad L_u \omega = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{\tau=0} \Phi_\tau^* \omega = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Phi_\tau^* \omega - \omega}{\tau}.$$

For a 0-form (function)  $\omega$ , the above definition boils down to

$$L_u \omega(x) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{\tau=0} \omega = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{\omega(\Phi_\tau x) - \omega(x)}{\tau}.$$

This is just the derivative along the direction of  $u$ . *Cartan’s magic formula*, or the *homotopy formula*, provides a connection between Lie derivatives and exterior derivatives, and gives new insights to the above seemingly involved formulas.

**Theorem 3** (Cartan’s magic formula). *Let  $\beta$  be a smooth vector field on  $\Omega$ . Then we have*

$$(5.6) \quad L_\beta = d\iota_\beta + \iota_\beta d,$$

where  $\iota_\beta$  is the contraction of a differential form by the vector field  $\beta$ , i.e.,  $\iota_\beta : C^\infty \Lambda^k \rightarrow C^\infty \Lambda^{k-1}$  is defined by

$$\iota_\beta \omega(v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}) := \omega(\beta, v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}), \quad \forall \omega \in C^\infty \Lambda^k.$$

Cartan’s magic formula has the following proxies in 3D:

$$\begin{aligned}
 k = 0: & \quad L_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} u = \boldsymbol{\beta} \cdot \text{grad } u, \\
 k = 1: & \quad L_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} v = -\boldsymbol{\beta} \times \text{curl } v + \text{grad}(v \cdot \boldsymbol{\beta}), \\
 k = 2: & \quad L_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} w = (\text{div } w)\boldsymbol{\beta} + \text{curl}(w \times \boldsymbol{\beta}), \\
 k = 3: & \quad L_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} g = \text{div}(g\boldsymbol{\beta}).
 \end{aligned}$$

The case  $k = 0$  corresponds to the standard scalar advection-diffusion equation;  $k = 2$  corresponds to the advection-diffusion of the magnetic field in MHD (5.3) or the vorticity (5.4); and  $k = 1$  corresponds to the advection-diffusion of the magnetic potential.

Catan’s magic formula indicates that there are at least two ways to compute the Lie derivative: one is by the definition (5.5) and another is by the exterior derivatives (5.6). In fact, they give two different approaches for numerical discretisation of the advection equations of differential forms: one is to use a finite difference to replace the limit in the definition (5.5) (this involves solving the flow maps using an ODE solver), and another is to discretize differential operators appearing in the magic formula (5.6). The former corresponds to Lagrangian (or semi-Lagrangian) methods [75,111], and the latter corresponds to Eulerian methods.

**5.2. Helicity and topological hydrodynamics.** As a second example of the appearance of de Rham complexes in fluid dynamics, we consider the notion of helicity describing knots of fields and the topological mechanism encoded in helicity conservation.

Topological structures in fluid flows and other physical models, particularly vortex knots and linked vortex tubes, have drawn attention since the 19th century, when Lord Kelvin proposed that atoms might be modelled as knotted vortex rings [92]. Later, Thomson discovered the electron (for which he received a Nobel Prize) and proposed his plum pudding model. The development vortex atomic theory was thus paused. However, this development inspired knot theory as a mathematical theory, and the idea of knotting later thrived in the study of fluid dynamics: knots reflect deep topological properties and conservation laws within fluid dynamics.

A key quantity capturing the “knottedness” or linking of flow fields is *helicity*, first formalised in the mid-20th century. In the context of MHD, Lodewijk Woltjer [143] defined the magnetic helicity, known as Woltjer’s invariant. Keith Moffatt [103] and others further established the concept of helicity as a topological measure in fluid flows, emphasising its role in describing knottedness or linkage in field lines. Figure 12 shows two linking tubes of a divergence-free field. The helicity is proportional to the product of the fluxes of the tubes and a topological constant (the linking number). In general, helicity is the averaging asymptotic linking number, which can be derived as a continuum version of linked tubes [19]. Helicity remains invariant under ideal (nondissipative) flow motions. This makes helicity a powerful tool for understanding the evolution of complex structures in both classical fluid dynamics and plasma physics, where the interplay between geometry, topology, and dynamics often governs the stability and behaviour of flows.

Helicity can be defined for any divergence-free field in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  with a potential, i.e., for  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$  satisfying  $\text{div } \boldsymbol{\xi} = 0$ , the corresponding helicity  $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$  is defined by

$$\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}} := \int_{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\xi} \cdot \text{curl}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi} \, dx,$$

where  $\Omega$  is a subdomain of  $\mathbb{R}^3$  and  $\text{curl}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}$  is a potential of  $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$  satisfying  $\text{curl}(\text{curl}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}) = \boldsymbol{\xi}$ . First, we note that  $\text{curl}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}$  is not unique (up to gradient fields and 1-form cohomology representatives), and the above definition does not depend on the specific choice of  $\text{curl}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}$  as long as  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$  is tangent to the boundary of  $\Omega$ . To see this, let  $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \text{curl}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\eta}' := \boldsymbol{\xi} + \text{grad } \varphi + \boldsymbol{h}$ , where  $\boldsymbol{h}$  is a harmonic




FIGURE 12. Two tubes of a field  $\xi$  linked with each other. Let  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  be the fluxes of the two tubes, respectively. Then the helicity is  $\mathcal{H}_\xi = 2\ell Q_1 \cdot Q_2$ , where  $\ell$  is the Gauss linking number only depending on the topology of the knot ( $\ell = 1$  in the figure).

form. Then

$$\int_{\Omega} \eta' \cdot \xi \, dx = \int_{\Omega} (\eta + \text{grad } \varphi + h) \cdot \xi \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \eta \cdot \xi \, dx,$$

where we have used the fact that  $\int_{\Omega} \text{grad } \varphi \cdot \xi \, dx = -\int_{\Omega} \varphi \cdot \text{div } \xi \, dx = 0$  (integration by parts) and  $\int_{\Omega} h \cdot \xi \, dx = 0$  by the definition of harmonic forms. Second, the definition of helicity involves a potential, which only exists when harmonic 2-forms are trivial, though various generalisations exist [19].

For a divergence-free field  $\xi$ , its energy is defined to be  $\mathcal{E}(\xi) := \int_{\Omega} |\xi|^2 \, dx$ . We have the following:

**Theorem 4** (Arnold inequality [17]). *The helicity provides a lower bound for the energy:*

$$(5.7) \quad \left| \int \text{curl}^{-1} \xi \cdot \xi \, dx \right| \leq C \int |\xi|^2 \, dx.$$

*Proof.* The desired result is a consequence of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\left| \int \text{curl}^{-1} \xi \cdot \xi \, dx \right| \leq \|\text{curl}^{-1} \xi\|_{L^2} \|\xi\|_{L^2},$$

and the Poincaré inequality

$$\|\text{curl}^{-1} \xi\|_{L^2} \leq C \|\nabla \times (\text{curl}^{-1} \xi)\|_{L^2},$$

which is again a corollary of finite dimensional cohomology; see Section 3. □

The Arnold inequality is based on a simple proof. However, its consequence is significant. We view  $\xi$  as a 2-form, and the potential  $\text{curl}^{-1} \xi$  is a 1-form. Then the inequality (5.7) is the coordinate form of the following inequality of forms:

$$\left| \int \text{curl}^{-1} \xi \wedge \xi \, dx \right| \leq C \int \xi \wedge \star \xi \, dx.$$

The left hand side does not involve metric and is thus topological. The right hand side involves the Hodge star and therefore a metric, which is geometric. The inequality further clarifies the fact that knots provide a topological barrier for the energy to decay.

In the context of fluids, the (fluid) helicity is defined to be  $\int_{\Omega} \mathbf{u} \cdot \boldsymbol{\omega} dx$ . In MHD, the magnetic field  $\mathbf{B}$  is divergence-free, and thus a magnetic helicity is defined:

$$\mathcal{H}_m := \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{B} dx,$$

where the magnetic potential  $\mathbf{A}$  satisfies  $\nabla \times \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{B}$ . Another quantity is the *cross helicity*

$$\mathcal{H}_c := \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{B} dx.$$

**Theorem 5.** *In the absence of magnetic diffusion (the magnetic Reynolds number  $R_m = \infty$ ), the magnetic helicity is conserved*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H}_m = 0.$$

*If further for ideal fluids ( $R_e = R_m = \infty$ ) and  $\mathbf{f}$  is a gradient field, then the cross helicity is conserved*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H}_c = 0.$$

The MHD system (5.2) satisfies energy dissipation or conservation:

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\mathbf{u}\|_0^2 + \frac{s}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\mathbf{B}\|_0^2 + R_e^{-1} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_0^2 + s R_m^{-1} \|\mathbf{j}\|_0^2 = (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{u}),$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} (\|\mathbf{u}\|_0^2 + s \|\mathbf{B}\|_0^2) + R_e^{-1} \int_0^T \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_0^2 d\tau + 2s R_m^{-1} \int_0^T \|\mathbf{j}\|_0^2 d\tau \\ \leq \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_0^2 + s \|\mathbf{B}_0\|_0^2 + R_e \int_0^T \|\mathbf{f}\|_{-1}^2 d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

With  $\mathbf{f} = 0$  and  $R_m^{-1} = 0$ , the total energy is non-increasing. However, some key information is not clear:

- whether the total energy decays to zero?
- how does the total energy split into the fluid part ( $\|\mathbf{u}\|^2$ ) and the magnetic part ( $s\|\mathbf{B}\|^2$ )?

Helicity provides further information for these questions and thus characterise finer structures of MHD. Below we show the significance of helicity by a problem from solar physics.

In 1972, Eugene N. Parker made a conjecture about the evolution of initial states in magnetically-ideal plasmas [113]. Although several versions and different statements have been discussed in the literature [118], the Parker conjecture essentially claims that *for almost all possible flows, the magnetic field develops tangential discontinuity (current sheets) during ideal magnetic relaxation to a force-free equilibrium*. This conjecture has many important consequences in solar physics, including explaining the mechanism of coronal heating. For a comprehensive literature review, see [118].

Below we focus on the case where in conducting fluids, fluid diffusion exists to dissipate the energy (the fluid Reynolds number  $R_e < \infty$ ), while the magnetic part is ideal (the magnetic Reynolds number  $R_m = \infty$ ). The canonical energy estimate indicates that the total energy of the fluid and the magnetic field is non-increasing. Furthermore, the magnetic helicity  $\mathcal{H}_m$  is conserved. A significant consequence of the Arnold inequality is that, *despite dissipation in the energy, initial data with nonzero  $\mathcal{H}$  cannot relax to zero*. This reflects a crucial topological mechanism in magnetic relaxation (free evolution of the MHD system).




FIGURE 13. Knots of field lines provide a topological barrier for the decay of energy. Helicity conservation and the Arnold inequality imply that topologically nontrivial initial data cannot relax to a trivial state.

This explains the reason for helicity-preserving algorithms and plain algorithms behaving dramatically differently in Example 2: algorithms that do not preserve helicity lost the topological mechanism (knots as barriers presenting the energy from decaying) on the discrete level, and thus lead to physically wrong solution in long-term evolution.

In fact, topology-preservation is a well known challenge in computational plasma physics. Quoting [118]:

Direct computational assessment of Parker’s hypothesis brings a number of challenges. Foremost among these is the requirement to *precisely maintain the magnetic topology during the simulated evolution*, i.e., precisely maintain the magnetic field line mapping between the two line-tied boundaries. ... In the following sections two methods are described which seek to mitigate against these difficulties. However, in all cases the *representation of current singularities remains problematic...*

As the curl structure is the key for the definition and properties of helicity, it is not hard to imagine that the de Rham complex plays a significant role in studying questions related to helicity. In fact, the algorithm that preserves helicity used in Example 2 is based on finite element de Rham complexes and finite element exterior calculus. Methods based on de Rham complexes naturally address both issues mentioned in the quote above:

- They preserve helicity, providing a discrete Arnold inequality (thus enforcing topological barriers).
- The Raviart–Thomas (RT) finite element space allows tangential discontinuities, and  $\nabla \times \text{RT}$  accommodates current sheets.

Topology-preserving discretisation based on the de Rham complex sheds light on tackling computational challenges in topological hydrodynamics [19].

## 6. GENERAL RELATIVITY AND THE EINSTEIN EQUATIONS

In general relativity, spacetime geometry is governed by the Einstein equations, which are complicated and challenging to solve: in John Wheeler’s famous summary, “spacetime tells matter how to move; matter tells spacetime how to curve”. Since controlled experiments are impossible and analytical solutions are only available in exceptional cases, it is essential to simulate the Einstein equations on computers, a subject referred to as numerical relativity. Early attempts of numerical simulations of black holes (see, e.g., [132, 142]) suffer from severe instabilities. Numerical relativity witnessed a breakthrough in 2005 when accurate long-term evolutions of black holes were

achieved [119]. Researchers realised that mathematical properties, particularly the hyperbolicity and the constraint equations, of the Einstein equations played a vital role in the success of these numerical methods. Only certain reformulations with carefully chosen coordinates and gauge conditions are strongly hyperbolic, which lead to stable numerical discretisation [22, 125, 131]. Nowadays numerical computation for the Einstein equations is a fast-growing area and plays a vital role in modern astrophysics by providing templates in the detection of gravitational waves.

General relativity is governed by the Einstein equations, which are nonlinear geometric PDEs and read in compact notation:

$$(6.1) \quad G_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = \kappa T_{\mu\nu}.$$

Here  $g_{\mu\nu}$  is a spacetime metric, which is the unknown;  $G_{\mu\nu}$  is the Einstein tensor obtained from  $g_{\mu\nu}$ ;  $\Lambda$  is the cosmological constant;  $\kappa$  is the Einstein gravitational constant; and  $T_{\mu\nu}$  is the stress–energy tensor.

High complexity is hidden in the compact notation (6.1). Recall that the Christoffel symbols  $\Gamma_{ij}^k$  can be obtained from the Riemann tensor:

$$\Gamma_{ij}^k = g^{k\ell} \left( \frac{\partial g_{\ell i}}{\partial x^j} + \frac{\partial g_{\ell j}}{\partial x^i} - \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial x^\ell} \right),$$

and the Riemann tensor can be obtained from the Christoffel symbols:

$$R^\ell{}_{ijk} = \frac{\partial \Gamma_{ik}^\ell}{\partial x^j} - \frac{\partial \Gamma_{ij}^\ell}{\partial x^k} + \Gamma_{jm}^\ell \Gamma_{ik}^m - \Gamma_{km}^\ell \Gamma_{ij}^m.$$

The Ricci tensor is the trace of the Riemann tensor:  $R_{ik} = R^\ell{}_{ilk}$ ; while the Einstein tensor is further obtained by modifying the trace of Ricci:

$$G_{ik} = R_{ik} - \frac{1}{2} R g_{ik},$$

with the scalar curvature  $R := g^{ik} R_{ik}$ . With spacetime coordinates, the metric is a 4-by-4 symmetric matrix field with the Lorenzian signature. The above calculation shows that the Einstein tensor  $G_{k\ell}$  is a highly complicated nonlinear function of the metric  $g_{ij}$ .

Another complication of the Einstein equations comes from the fact that the Einstein equation is a geometric PDE. One may choose different coordinates to describe the same geometry. This means that once one writes down the Einstein equation in coordinates, solutions to the PDEs will not be unique. Any  $\tilde{g}_{ij}$  obtained from  $g_{ij}$  by a coordinate transform will also solve the equations. *Gauge conditions*, or coordinates, can be fixed to select a unique solution. The properties of the PDEs depend on the chosen coordinates and gauge conditions. This will be a particularly important issue in numerical computation, as equivalent formulations on the continuous level can lead to rather different numerical performance. In the study of geometric dynamics of spacetime and for the purpose of computation, one often carries out a 3+1 decomposition of the spacetime into space and time components. Choosing such decompositions is often equivalent to choosing coordinates.

The well known formulation with a spacetime decomposition is the Arnowitt–Deser–Misner (ADM) formalism, which is a Hamiltonian formulation of general relativity and plays an important role in quantum gravity.

Even though the Einstein equations have a highly complicated form, one may still observe the equations through linearisation. The linearised Arnowitt–Deser–Misner (ADM) formulation (around the Minkowski metric) is the following:

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{tt} + \mathcal{S} \operatorname{inc} \boldsymbol{\gamma} - 2 \operatorname{hess} \alpha - 2 \operatorname{def} \boldsymbol{\beta}_t &= 0 \\ \operatorname{div} \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_t - 2 \operatorname{def} \boldsymbol{\beta}) &= 0 \\ \operatorname{div} \operatorname{div} \mathcal{S} \boldsymbol{\gamma} &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$  is the perturbation of the spatial metric,  $\alpha$  is the lapse indicating the separation of spacial hypersurfaces, and  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  is the shift vector characterising the shift of each spacial hypersurface. As before,  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{A}) := \mathbf{A}^\top - \text{tr}(\mathbf{A})\mathbf{I}$ . The lapse  $\alpha$  and the shift  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  can be chosen arbitrarily as they reflect the freedom to choose coordinates. The first equation of (6.2) is the evolutionary equation, and the rest are the constraint equations, which are automatically preserved by the time evolution.

Although the ADM formulation has a clear geometric and physical structure, it is not well suited for numerical discretisation in its original form, as it is not strongly hyperbolic. Various modifications of the ADM formulation have been proposed and used in numerical computation, such as the successful BSSNOK formulation [2, 22, 104, 131] and the approaches based on generalised harmonic coordinates [119]. The equation (6.2) allows us freedom of reformulation. In fact, one can choose proper lapse  $\alpha$  and shift  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ , and add certain forms of the constraint equations to the evolution equations to obtain better mathematical properties.

Various formulations of the Einstein equations have been studied in the literature with different use of unknowns and different spacetime decompositions etc. In particular, first-order hyperbolic formulations are attractive for numerical purposes. One may obtain formulations with a similar structure as the Maxwell equations. One of such examples is the *Einstein–Bianchi formulation* [3, 47, 64] that has been recently investigated in various numerical works [79, 120]. Next, we briefly discuss the derivation of the Einstein–Bianchi formulation.

From the Bianchi identity, we have

$$\nabla_\alpha R^\alpha_{\beta, \lambda\mu} + \nabla_\mu R_{\lambda\beta} - \nabla_\lambda R_{\mu\beta} = 0.$$

Using the Einstein equations  $R_{\alpha\beta} = \rho_{\alpha\beta}$ ,

$$\nabla_\alpha R^\alpha_{\beta, \lambda\mu} = \nabla_\lambda \rho_{\mu\beta} - \nabla_\mu \rho_{\lambda\beta}.$$

The constraint and evolutionary equations come from different components.

Define

$$\mathbf{E}_{ij} = R^0_{i0j}, \quad \mathbf{D}_{ij} = \frac{1}{4} \eta_{ihk} \eta_{jlm} R^{hk, lm},$$

$$\mathbf{H}_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} N^{-1} \eta_{ihk} R^{hk}_{0j}, \quad \mathbf{B}_{ji} = \frac{1}{2} N^{-1} \eta_{ihk} R_{0j}{}^{hk}.$$

Now  $\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{B}$  satisfy an equation of Maxwell’s type. Linearization around the Minkowski spacetime gives

$$\mathbf{B}_t + \nabla \times \mathbf{E} = 0, \tag{6.3a}$$

$$\mathbf{E}_t - \nabla \times \mathbf{B} = 0. \tag{6.3b}$$

Here  $\mathbf{E}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  are Traceless-Transverse (TT) tensors, i.e., symmetric, tracefree, and divergence-free matrix fields. These conditions are automatically preserved by the time evolution.

The Einstein–Bianchi system (6.3) has a similar form as the Maxwell equations, except that the variables are TT tensors, rather than vector fields or differential forms. Correspondingly, the differential structures of (6.3) are encoded in other complexes than the de Rham complex. The curl of TT tensors are encoded in the conformal Hessian complex (2.20). The relevant Hodge wave equation (a wave version of the Hodge–Laplacian [120]) reads

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_t &= \text{div div } \mathbf{E}, \\ \mathbf{E}_t &= -\text{dev hess } \sigma - \text{curl } \mathbf{B}, \\ \mathbf{B}_t &= \text{sym curl } \mathbf{E}, \end{aligned}$$

where the variables are taken as below (here we use  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{S} \cap \mathbb{T}$  to denote the corresponding scalar and  $\mathbb{S} \cap \mathbb{T}$ -valued function spaces etc.):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{R} & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{dev hess}} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{div div}} \end{array} & \mathbb{S} \cap \mathbb{T} & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{sym curl}} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{curl}} \end{array} & \mathbb{S} \cap \mathbb{T} \\ & & \sigma & & \mathbf{E} & & \mathbf{B} \end{array}$$

As discretising conformal complexes leads to significant challenge, for numerical purposes, one may relax some symmetry conditions and let them free propagate (on the continuous level, if these conditions hold at the initial time, then they are preserved at any later time – this property may not hold on the discrete level precisely though, due to discretisation errors). Two such formulations are based on the de Rham complex and the Hessian complex (or the divdiv complex) respectively:

- Option 1 for relaxed symmetries: using the de Rham complex

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_t &= \text{div } \mathbf{E}, \\ \mathbf{E}_t &= -\text{grad } \sigma - \text{curl } \mathbf{B}, \\ \mathbf{B}_t &= \text{curl } \mathbf{E}. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{V} & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{grad}} \\ \xleftarrow{-\text{div}} \end{array} & \mathbb{M} & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{curl}} \end{array} & \mathbb{M} \\ & & \sigma & & \mathbf{E} & & \mathbf{B} \end{array}$$

- Option 2 for relaxed symmetries: using the divdiv or the Hessian complex

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_t &= \text{div div } \mathbf{E}, \\ \mathbf{E}_t &= -\text{hess } \sigma - \text{sym curl } \mathbf{B}, \\ \mathbf{B}_t &= \text{curl } \mathbf{E}. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{R} & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{hess}} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{div div}} \end{array} & \mathbb{S} & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{sym curl}} \end{array} & \mathbb{T} \\ & & \sigma & & \mathbf{E} & & \mathbf{B} \end{array}$$

Before closing this section, we recall some other connections between general relativity and differential complexes.

In electromagnetism and Maxwell equations, one often uses a magnetic potential  $\mathbf{A}$  satisfying  $\nabla \times \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{B}$ . At least in the linearised case, it is not hard to imagine that one can obtain potential fields for the Einstein equations. For example, the conformal deformation complex (2.5) exactly claims that TT tensors can be written as the Cotton-York tensors of symmetric and traceless tensors when there is no nontrivial cohomology. Einstein constraint equations for linearised gravity were investigated in [23], where the authors developed various complexes on Einstein manifolds from scratch. The “scalar”, “momentum”, and “conformal” complexes developed in [23] correspond to the div div, curl div, and the elasticity complex in this paper and in the BGG construction [12, 42], respectively.

Another connection roots in the analogy between general relativity and generalised continuum models. General relativity and the Cosserat models are the two main motivations for Cartan’s development of the concept of torsion [130]. Quoting Kröner in this habilitation [93, Section 18],

Every expert on general relativity theory who studies the general continuum theory of dislocations and internal stresses will recognise the great similarity between the two theories, which will considerably enhance his understanding of the latter one.  
... we believe that an ongoing investigation of the connections between general

relativity and the general continuum theory of dislocations and internal stresses can be of considerable benefit to both theories.

The Einstein-Cartan theory can be regarded as a space-time defect theory [128].

## 7. GRAPHS, NETWORKS, AND DATA ANALYSIS

Finite elements are piecewise polynomials on a triangulation. The lowest order Whitney  $k$ -forms have degrees of freedom on  $k$ -cells. These degrees of freedom reflect a discrete topological structure. Particularly, the cohomology of the discrete de Rham complex is isomorphic to the continuous version. Such topological structures can be established on other discrete structures as well. In this section, we briefly review the construction on graphs.

Let  $G = (V, E)$  be an undirected graph with vertex set  $V = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and edge set  $E \subset \{[i, j] : i < j\}$ .

**Definition 9** (Cliques). *Let  $G = (V, E)$  be an undirected graph with vertex set  $V$  and edge set  $E$ . A subset of vertices  $Q \subseteq V$  is called a  $k$ -clique if, for  $Q$  has  $k$  vertices and every pair of distinct vertices  $u, v \in Q$ , the edge  $(u, v)$  is in  $E$ .*

We denote  $K_k$  to be the set of  $k$ -cliques. One can generalise the definition of boundary operators to cliques:

$$\partial[i_1, \dots, i_k] = \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^{j+1} [i_1, \dots, \widehat{i}_j, \dots, i_k].$$

Consequently, cliques form a simplicial complex. Similarly, we denote by  $C^q(G, \mathbb{R})$  the space of real-valued  $q$ -cochains on  $G$ . Here a  $q$ -cochain  $f$  is a skew-symmetric function on  $q$ -cliques, i.e.,

$$f([i_1, \dots, i_k, \dots, i_\ell, \dots, i_q]) = -f([i_1, \dots, i_\ell, \dots, i_k, \dots, i_q]).$$

Note that in the definition above, a  $q$ -clique or a  $q$ -cochain involves  $q$  vertices. In simplicial homology theory, this is often referred to as a  $(q - 1)$ -simplex or  $(q - 1)$ -cochain. The dimension of the  $q$ -th homology space  $\mathcal{H}_q := \ker(\partial_q)/\text{Ran}(\partial_{q+1})$  is called the  $q$ -th Betti number.

Similar to simplicial cohomology, the *coboundary operator*  $d^q : C^q(G, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow C^{q+1}(G, \mathbb{R})$  is defined by

$$d^q f([i_1, \dots, i_{p+1}]) = \sum_{j=1}^{q+1} (-1)^{j+1} f([i_1, \dots, \widehat{i}_j, \dots, i_{q+1}]).$$

Assume that the space of  $p$ -cochains are equipped with an inner product:

$$\langle f, g \rangle := \sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_q} \omega_{i_1, \dots, i_q} f([i_1, \dots, i_q]) g([i_1, \dots, i_q]),$$

where  $\omega_{i_1, \dots, i_q}$  is the weight on the  $q$ -clique  $[i_1, \dots, i_q]$ . Then the *codifferential operator*  $\delta^q : C^q(G, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow C^{q-1}(G, \mathbb{R})$  is defined as the adjoint of  $d^{q-1}$  with respect to the given inner product, i.e.,

$$\langle d^q f, g \rangle_{C^{q+1}} = \langle f, \delta^{q+1} g \rangle_{C^q}, \quad f \in C^q(G, \mathbb{R}), \quad g \in C^{q+1}(G, \mathbb{R}),$$

where two levels of inner product are used. With the coboundary (exterior derivative) and the codifferential operators, one can define the  $q$ -th Hodge–Laplacian operator as usual:

$$\Delta^q = d^{q-1} \delta^q + \delta^{q+1} d^q.$$

Then many definitions and properties follow as the the case of simplicial cohomology. For example, we have a complex

$$\dots \longrightarrow C^{q-1}(G, \mathbb{R}) \xrightarrow{d^{q-1}} C^q(G, \mathbb{R}) \xrightarrow{d^q} C^{q+1}(G, \mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow \dots$$




FIGURE 14. Average Betti numbers ( $\beta_0$  to  $\beta_4$ ) of random graphs with 25 vertices as a function of edge probability  $p$ . For small  $p$ , the graphs are sparse, and higher Betti numbers vanish. As  $p$  increases, Betti numbers grow, peak, and decrease to zero when the graph becomes fully connected. The figure and computation are part of Lázár Bertók’s MSc thesis [25].

Correspondingly, we have the Hodge decomposition

$$C^q(G, \mathbb{R}) = \text{Ran}(d^{q-1}) \oplus \text{Ran}(\delta^{q+1}) \oplus \ker(\Delta^q).$$

Cliques and cochains on graphs can be represented by vectors and matrices. Then the coboundary and the codifferential operators can be expressed by matrix operations, enabling computation with these concepts. Problems of significant mathematical and scientific importance arise and can be potentially investigated numerically. Below, we show an example of *topology of random graphs*.

Random graphs has many important applications. There are various models incorporating randomness in graphs. A classical one is the Erdős–Rényi model, where each edge has a fixed probability  $p$  of being present or absent, independently of the other edges. Topology and spectral properties of random graphs are of great interest. A celebrated result in the theory of random graphs is the Erdős–Rényi theorem on the threshold for connectivity [62].

**Theorem 6** (Erdős and Rényi). *If  $p = (\log n + \omega(n))/n$  and  $\omega \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $G(n, p)$  is almost always connected. If  $\omega(n) \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $G(n, p)$  is almost always disconnected.*

The Erdős–Rényi theorem can be viewed as a statement on the 0-th homology of the graph. A natural question would be its higher dimensional analogues, i.e., how the  $k$ -th Betti number  $\beta_k$  behaves as  $p$  changes. Intuitively, one can imagine that for small and large  $p$ ,  $\beta_k$  is almost always zero (see Figure 14). This is because for small  $p$ , the connection is so weak that no  $k$ -dimensional cliques are formed; while for large  $p$ , the graph is highly connected and is therefore topologically trivial. Further questions include when the Betti number starts to grow and when to vanish (points of *phase transition*). Various results in this direction can be found in [89]. For example, it was shown that if  $p = n^\alpha$  with  $\alpha < 1/k$ , then the  $k$ -th homology is almost always zero [89]. We also refer to [90] for a survey of topology of random simplicial complexes.

In Singer’s words, the spirit of investigating topological properties of random graphs is summarised as follows: [90, 121]:

I predict a new subject of statistical topology. Rather than count the number of holes, Betti numbers, etc., one will be more interested in the distribution of such

objects on noncompact manifolds as one goes out to infinity.

– Isadore Singer, [121]

“Statistical topology” leaves open questions to answer. From a computational perspective, there are open questions such as improving the computational efficiency for finding cliques (see Figure 14).

In many real-world applications, such as social networks and biological networks, interactions often go beyond simple pairwise links. This is a motivation for developing *hypergraphs* [6, 26] and higher dimensional cliques and discrete differential forms. Back to our discussions on (co)homology of graphs (not necessarily random graphs), we mention several applications in data sciences, and particularly, in Topological Data Analysis (TDA).

**Example 5** (Ranking problem). *A classical application of Hodge theory in data science is the ranking problem, see, e.g., [20, 87]. Suppose that we have nodes  $x_i, i = 1, \dots, N$  and want to rank them. A voter may vote for each pair of the nodes. For example, voter  $\alpha$  may assign a number  $Y_{ij}^\alpha$  to the pair of node  $i$  and node  $j$ . The node  $i$  is preferred if  $Y_{ij}^\alpha > 0$ , and  $j$  is preferred if  $Y_{ij}^\alpha < 0$ . The voter may not compare all the nodes. We set  $Y_{ij}^\alpha = 0$  if  $i$  and  $j$  are not compared by  $\alpha$ . As a convention, we require  $Y_{ij}^\alpha = -Y_{ji}^\alpha$ . We may do an average for  $\alpha$ , leading to a pairwise ranking function  $Y_{ij}$ . We still have  $Y_{ij} = -Y_{ji}$ . Therefore  $Y_{ij}$  is an alternating function on 2-cliques, which fits with the definition of 2-cochains on graphs. For a consistent ranking, we should have  $Y_{ij} + Y_{jk} = Y_{ik}$ , or, in another form,*

$$(7.1) \quad Y_{ij} + Y_{jk} + Y_{ki} = 0.$$

*This is exactly the exterior derivative (curl) of  $Y$  acting on the 3-clique  $[i, j, k]$ . Therefore the curl of  $Y$  measures the local inconsistency of the ranking. The ranking is consistent if  $Y_{ij}$  is obtained by a pointwise comparison, i.e.,  $Y_{ij} = s_i - s_j$  for some function  $s$  defined at vertices (here  $s_i := s([i])$  is the evaluation of  $s$  on 1-cliques), i.e.,  $Y$  is a gradient field. The above discussions give an intuitive interpretation for the Hodge decomposition:*

$$(7.2) \quad Y = \text{grad } s + \text{curl } z + H,$$

*where  $H$  is the harmonic form which is both curl-free and div-free. Now  $\text{grad } s$  and  $H$  are curl-free and thus are the consistent components; while  $\text{curl } Y = \text{curl } \text{curl } Z$  characterises the local consistency. The gradient component  $\text{grad } s$  is the best place where we can rank the nodes. Therefore as an algorithm, one computes the Hodge decomposition (7.2), and  $s$  can be regarded as the score for the ranking.*

*We mention similarities between continuum defects discussed in Section 4 and the ranking problem, which seem to be two rather distinct areas. In fact, in continuum mechanics, for compatible deformations, we have compatibility conditions expressed by curl-free or inc-free conditions (see Section 4). In general, we use the violation of these conditions to model continuum defects. In the ranking problem, consistent ranking satisfies the curl-free condition (7.1). In general, we can use curl of the edge flow to measure the inconsistency. The analogue between these two different areas is exactly one of the many facets of the common cohomological structure, or the discrete topological structure, which is emphasised in this article.*

**Example 6** (Persistent homology and topological data analysis). *Although topological data analysis (TDA) often uses homology directly, the harmonic space  $\ker(\Delta^p)$  is intimately related to homology groups. Therefore understanding and computing the discrete de Rham complex on graphs and their cohomologies can be relevant to topological feature detection (e.g. loops, holes) in high-dimensional data.*




FIGURE 15. A finite element de Rham complex consisting of Whitney forms.

*In typical contexts of persistent homology, one can build a sequence of complexes  $C_\alpha^\bullet$  with a family of parameters  $\alpha$ . For example,  $\alpha$  can be distance thresholds (i.e., two points with distance less than  $\alpha$  will be considered to be connected to each other). Then, one may track events of homology classes as  $\alpha$  changes. This is a quite general idea, though. For example, one can also track cohomological information, such as the Betti numbers. We refer to [21, 135] for recent discussions on combining the idea of persistent homology with Hodge–Laplacian and cohomology theories.*

We refer to [102] and the references therein for further applications of Hodge–Laplacian on graphs.

## 8. OUTLOOK AND DISCUSSIONS

The article discussed various topics from a differential complex and cohomological point of view. As complexes and cohomology encode notions of existence, uniqueness, stability and rigidity, it is not surprising that differential complexes play a fundamental role in these seemingly unrelated topics, justifying *many facets of cohomology*. Each problem has unique algebraic structures, and their role differs from case to case. Therefore, a programme pursued in recent years is to investigate algebraic and geometric structures systematically and discretise the whole theory. The development of differential complexes also finds connections and sheds light on a structured and discretisation-friendly approach for modelling (such as modelling continuum microstructures and defects via complexes).

Structure-preserving discretisation serves as an important motivation for structure-aware formulations, or more precisely, clarifying the underlying differential structures. Discretisation or discrete theories are not the focus of this article. However, we provide some remarks highlighting some connections between numerics (particularly finite elements) and other areas.

For the de Rham complex, the Whitney forms [31, 77, 141] are widely accepted as the canonical discretisation of differential forms. In the lowest order case (Figure 15),  $k$ -forms are discretised on  $k$ -cells; the finite elements are unisolvent (the cochains are extended to the interior of simplices to polynomials); and the discrete forms have continuous traces across the faces of the cells; and importantly, the cohomology of the discrete de Rham complex is isomorphism to the continuous version, reflecting topology of the underlying domain.

In this article, we demonstrated that different problems involve different structures. However, seeking analogues of the Whitney forms for these structures (more precisely, for other complexes than the de Rham sequences) is a challenging question with important applications in continuum mechanics, differential geometry, and general relativity. As the development of canonical finite elements for the de Rham complex, some ingredients for addressing this problem have already been in place for specific applications. Particularly, Christiansen [48] interpreted Regge calculus, a discrete scheme for quantum and numerical gravity, as a finite element and fitted it into a discrete elasticity complex. There is perhaps little hesitation in appreciating the construction in [48] as the canonical discretisation for the elasticity complex. The discrete metric is piecewise constant, and correspondingly, the discrete curvature is distributional with conic singularities (represented by an angle deficit). The Christiansen-Regge complex is formally self-adjoint and the degrees of freedom

enjoy a simple and elegant form. In another direction of research, Schöberl and collaborators systematically investigated distributional finite elements for solving problems in continuum mechanics and a posteriori error estimators [35, 69, 115]. These finite elements have relaxed continuity, and de Rham's currents appear in derivatives and thus in the complexes.

By gathering these results and incorporating some new ingredients, the recent work [81] investigated an extended version of the periodic table of finite elements [13] (see Figure 16 for the lowest-order case in 3D). Symmetries and decompositions of tensors (particularly for those arising in geometry, such as the metric and various notions of curvature) are encoded in finite element spaces and fit in discrete versions of BGG diagrams, extending results on differential forms (fully skew-symmetric tensors).

The tensorial finite elements, particularly the Regge element and generalisations, provide a new perspective for investigating discrete differential geometry. Recent progress on approximating geometric quantities with Regge-like finite elements can be found in [65, 66, 68, 70, 71]. Extending the Christiansen–Regge complex to the twisted complex, a pattern connected to Riemann–Cartan geometry emerged in [50]. In addition to being theoretically elegant, these intrinsic finite elements also shed light on challenging computational problems with complex geometry, such as shells [109].

However, detailed discussions of these advances are beyond the scope of this paper.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Part of the article is based on short courses that the author gave at Institut Montpellierain Alexander Grothendieck (IMAG), Université de Montpellier, hosted by ERC NEMESIS project PIs Daniele Di Pietro and Jérôme Droniou, and at University of Luxembourg (Spotlights in Computational Physics and Engineering), hosted by Adam Sky. The author would like to thank the invitations. The author also thanks Yuechen Zhu for reading a first version of the article with helpful comments.




FIGURE 16. An extended periodic table of finite elements for form-valued forms in 3D [81, 82].

## REFERENCES

- [1] *Estimation of the continuity constants for Bogovskiĭ and regularized poincaré integral operators.*
- [2] M. ALCUBIERRE, *Introduction to 3+1 numerical relativity*, vol. 140, Oxford University Press, 2008.
- [3] A. ANDERSON, Y. CHOQUET-BRUHAT, AND J. W. YORK JR, *Einstein-bianchi hyperbolic system for general relativity*, arXiv preprint gr-qc/9710041, (1997).
- [4] P. M. ANDERSON, J. P. HIRTH, AND J. LOTHE, *Theory of dislocations*, Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [5] B. D. ANDREWS AND P. E. FARRELL, *High-order conservative and accurately dissipative numerical integrators via auxiliary variables*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.11904, (2024).
- [6] A. ANTELMi, G. CORDASCO, M. POLATO, V. SCARANO, C. SPAGNUOLO, AND D. YANG, *A survey on hypergraph representation learning*, ACM Computing Surveys, 56 (2023), pp. 1–38.
- [7] D. N. ARNOLD, *Finite element exterior calculus*, SIAM, 2018.
- [8] D. N. ARNOLD AND R. S. FALK, *A uniformly accurate finite element method for the Reissner–Mindlin plate*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 26 (1989), pp. 1276–1290.



Discrete Differential Geometry (DDG):  
frame (edges lengths, angle etc.)

curvature:  
Dirac measure on hinges

piecewise constant metric  
represented by edge lengths



Finite elements: piecewise functions  
(measure)

FIGURE 17

- [9] D. N. ARNOLD, R. S. FALK, AND R. WINTHER, *Differential complexes and stability of finite element methods II: The elasticity complex*, Compatible spatial discretizations, (2006), pp. 47–67.
- [10] D. N. ARNOLD, R. S. FALK, AND R. WINTHER, *Finite element exterior calculus, homological techniques, and applications*, Acta numerica, 15 (2006), p. 1.
- [11] ———, *Finite element exterior calculus: from Hodge theory to numerical stability*, Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society, 47 (2010), pp. 281–354.
- [12] D. N. ARNOLD AND K. HU, *Complexes from complexes*, Foundations of Computational Mathematics, (2021), pp. 1–36.
- [13] D. N. ARNOLD AND A. LOGG, *Periodic table of the finite elements*, SIAM News, 47 (2014).
- [14] D. N. ARNOLD, A. L. MADUREIRA, AND S. ZHANG, *On the range of applicability of the Reissner-Mindlin and Kirchhoff-Love plate bending models*, Journal of elasticity and the physical science of solids, 67 (2002), pp. 171–185.
- [15] D. N. ARNOLD AND R. WINTHER, *Mixed finite elements for elasticity*, Numerische Mathematik, 92 (2002), pp. 401–419.
- [16] V. I. ARNOLD, *Ordinary differential equations*, Springer Science & Business Media, 1992.
- [17] V. I. ARNOLD AND V. I. ARNOLD, *The asymptotic hopf invariant and its applications*, Vladimir I. Arnold- Collected Works: Hydrodynamics, Bifurcation Theory, and Algebraic Geometry 1965-1972, (1974), pp. 357–375.
- [18] V. I. ARNOLD AND B. A. KHESIN, *Topological methods in hydrodynamics*, vol. 125, Springer Science & Business Media, 1999.
- [19] V. I. ARNOLD AND B. A. KHESIN, *Topological Methods in Hydrodynamics*, vol. 125 of Applied Mathematical Sciences, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2021.
- [20] D. AUSTIN, *Who's number 1? Hodge theory will tell us*, AMS Feature Column, December, (2012).
- [21] S. BASU AND N. COX, *Harmonic persistent homology*, SIAM Journal on Applied Algebra and Geometry, 8 (2024), pp. 189–224.
- [22] T. W. BAUMGARTE AND S. L. SHAPIRO, *Numerical integration of Einstein's field equations*, Physical Review D, 59 (1998), p. 024007.
- [23] R. BEIG AND P. T. CHRUSCIEL, *On linearised vacuum constraint equations on Einstein manifolds*, Classical and Quantum Gravity, (2020).
- [24] J. L. BELL, *The continuous, the discrete and the infinitesimal in philosophy and mathematics*, vol. 82, Springer, 2019.
- [25] L. BERTÓK, *Random Graph Topology and Phase Transition*, Master's thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2024.
- [26] C. BICK, E. GROSS, H. A. HARRINGTON, AND M. T. SCHAUB, *What are higher-order networks?*, SIAM review, 65 (2023), pp. 686–731.
- [27] A. I. BOBENKO AND Y. B. SURIS, *Discrete differential geometry: Integrable structure*, vol. 98, American Mathematical Soc., 2008.
- [28] W. M. BOON, D. F. HOLMEN, J. M. NORDBOTTEN, AND J. E. VATNE, *The Hodge-Laplacian on the Čech-de Rham complex governs coupled problems*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.04556, (2022).
- [29] W. M. BOON AND J. M. NORDBOTTEN, *Mixed-dimensional poromechanical models of fractured porous media*, Acta Mechanica, 234 (2023), pp. 1121–1168.

- [30] W. M. BOON, J. M. NORDBOTTEN, AND J. E. VATNE, *Functional analysis and exterior calculus on mixed-dimensional geometries*, Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata (1923-), 200 (2021), pp. 757–789.
- [31] A. BOSSAVIT, *Whitney forms: A class of finite elements for three-dimensional computations in electromagnetism*, IEE Proceedings A (Physical Science, Measurement and Instrumentation, Management and Education, Reviews), 135 (1988), pp. 493–500.
- [32] A. BOSSAVIT, *Computational Electromagnetism*, Academic Press (Boston), 1998.
- [33] R. BOTT AND L. W. TU, *Differential forms in algebraic topology*, vol. 82, Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [34] J. U. BRACKBILL AND D. C. BARNES, *The effect of nonzero  $\nabla \cdot B$  on the numerical solution of the magnetohydrodynamic equations*, Journal of Computational Physics, 430 (1980), pp. 426–430.
- [35] D. BRAESS AND J. SCHÖBERL, *Equilibrated residual error estimator for edge elements*, Mathematics of Computation, 77 (2008), pp. 651–672.
- [36] S. C. BRENNER AND R. SCOTT, *The mathematical theory of finite element methods*, vol. 15, Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [37] F. BREZZI, D. BOFFI, L. DEMKOWICZ, R. DURÁN, R. FALK, AND M. FORTIN, *Mixed finite elements, compatibility conditions, and applications*, Springer, 2008.
- [38] F. BREZZI, J. DOUGLAS JR, AND L. D. MARINI, *Two families of mixed finite elements for second order elliptic problems*, Numerische Mathematik, 47 (1985), pp. 217–235.
- [39] J. BRU, M. LESCH, ET AL., *Hilbert complexes*, Journal of Functional Analysis, 108 (1992), pp. 88–132.
- [40] E. CALABI, *On compact riemannian manifolds with constant curvature*, in I, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math, vol. 3, 1961, pp. 155–180.
- [41] A. ČAP AND K. HU, *Bounded Poincaré operators for twisted and BGG complexes*, Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées, 179 (2023), pp. 253–276.
- [42] ———, *BGG sequences with weak regularity and applications*, Foundations of Computational Mathematics, 24 (2024), pp. 1145–1184.
- [43] É. CARTAN, *Sur certaines expressions différentielles et le problème de pfaff*, in Annales scientifiques de l’École normale supérieure, vol. 16, 1899, pp. 239–332.
- [44] E. CESÀRO, *Sulle formole del volterra fondamentali nella teoria delle distorsioni elastiche*, Il Nuovo Cimento (1901-1910), 12 (1906), pp. 143–154.
- [45] M. CHIPOT, *On inequalities of Korn’s type*, Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées, 148 (2021), pp. 199–220.
- [46] R. CHODURA AND A. SCHLÜTER, *A 3D code for MHD equilibrium and stability*, Journal of Computational Physics, 41 (1981), pp. 68–88.
- [47] Y. CHOQUET-BRUHAT, *General relativity and the Einstein equations*, OUP Oxford, 2008.
- [48] S. H. CHRISTIANSEN, *On the linearization of regge calculus*, Numerische Mathematik, 119 (2011), pp. 613–640.
- [49] S. H. CHRISTIANSEN AND K. HU, *Generalized finite element systems for smooth differential forms and Stokes’ problem*, Numerische Mathematik, 140 (2018), pp. 327–371.
- [50] S. H. CHRISTIANSEN, K. HU, AND T. LIN, *Extended Regge complex for linearized Riemann-Cartan geometry and cohomology*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11709, (2023).
- [51] S. H. CHRISTIANSEN, K. HU, AND E. SANDE, *Poincaré path integrals for elasticity*, Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées, 135 (2020), pp. 83–102.
- [52] P. G. CIARLET, *Mathematical Elasticity: Volume II: Theory of Plates*, Elsevier, 1997.
- [53] ———, *Linear and nonlinear functional analysis with applications*, vol. 130, SIAM, 2013.
- [54] P. G. CIARLET, L. GRATIE, AND C. MARDARE, *Intrinsic methods in elasticity: a mathematical survey*, Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems-A, 23 (2009), p. 133.
- [55] P. G. CIARLET, L. GRATIE, AND M. SERPILLI, *Cesàro–Volterra path integral formula on a surface*, Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences, 19 (2009), pp. 419–441.
- [56] E. M. P. COSSERAT AND F. COSSERAT, *Théorie des corps déformables*, A. Hermann et fils, 1909.
- [57] M. COSTABEL AND A. MCINTOSH, *On Bogovskiĭ and regularized Poincaré integral operators for de Rham complexes on Lipschitz domains*, Mathematische Zeitschrift, 265 (2010), pp. 297–320.
- [58] C. J. COTTER, *Compatible finite element methods for geophysical fluid dynamics*, Acta Numerica, 32 (2023), pp. 291–393.
- [59] S. DAIN, *Generalized Korn’s inequality and conformal Killing vectors*, Calculus of variations and partial differential equations, 25 (2006), pp. 535–540.
- [60] M. DALMONTE AND S. MONTANGERO, *Lattice gauge theory simulations in the quantum information era*, Contemporary Physics, 57 (2016), pp. 388–412.

- [61] M. DUPUIS, J. P. RYAN, S. SPEZIALE, ET AL., *Discrete gravity models and loop quantum gravity: a short review*, SIGMA. Symmetry, Integrability and Geometry: Methods and Applications, 8 (2012), p. 052.
- [62] P. ERDŐS AND A. RÉNYI, *On random graphs i*, Publicationes Mathematicae Debrecen, 6 (1959), p. 18.
- [63] K. FENG AND M.-Z. QIN, *The symplectic methods for the computation of Hamiltonian equations*, in Numerical Methods for Partial Differential Equations: Proceedings of a Conference held in Shanghai, PR China, March 25–29, 1987, Springer, 1987, pp. 1–37.
- [64] H. FRIEDRICH, *On the hyperbolicity of Einstein's and other gauge field equations*, Communications in Mathematical Physics, 100 (1985), pp. 525–543.
- [65] E. GAWLIK AND M. NEUNTEUFEL, *Finite element approximation of scalar curvature in arbitrary dimension*, Mathematics of Computation, (2024).
- [66] E. S. GAWLIK, *High-order approximation of gaussian curvature with regge finite elements*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 58 (2020), pp. 1801–1821.
- [67] E. S. GAWLIK AND F. GAY-BALMAZ, *A finite element method for MHD that preserves energy, cross-helicity, magnetic helicity, incompressibility, and  $\operatorname{div} B = 0$* , Journal of Computational Physics, 450 (2022), p. 110847.
- [68] E. S. GAWLIK AND M. NEUNTEUFEL, *Finite element approximation of the Einstein tensor*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.18802, (2023).
- [69] J. GOPALAKRISHNAN, P. L. LEDERER, AND J. SCHÖBERL, *A mass conserving mixed stress formulation for the Stokes equations*, IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis, 40 (2020), pp. 1838–1874.
- [70] J. GOPALAKRISHNAN, M. NEUNTEUFEL, J. SCHÖBERL, AND M. WARDETZKY, *Analysis of distributional Riemann curvature tensor in any dimension*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.01603, (2023).
- [71] ———, *On the improved convergence of lifted distributional Gauss curvature from Regge elements*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12734, (2024).
- [72] E. GOURGOULHON, *3+ 1 formalism in general relativity: bases of numerical relativity*, vol. 846, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [73] E. HAIRER, C. LUBICH, AND G. WANNER, *Geometric numerical integration: structure-preserving algorithms for ordinary differential equations*, vol. 31, Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [74] M. HE, P. E. FARRELL, K. HU, AND B. D. ANDREWS, *Topology-preserving discretization for the magneto-frictional equations arising in the Parker conjecture*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.11654, (2025).
- [75] H. HEUMANN, R. HIPTMAIR, K. LI, AND J. XU, *Fully discrete semi-Lagrangian methods for advection of differential forms*, BIT Numerical Mathematics, 52 (2012), pp. 981–1007.
- [76] R. HIPTMAIR, *Canonical construction of finite elements*, Mathematics of Computation of the American Mathematical Society, 68 (1999), pp. 1325–1346.
- [77] ———, *Higher order whitney forms*, Progress in Electromagnetics Research, 32 (2001), pp. 271–299.
- [78] L. HÖRMANDER, *The analysis of linear partial differential operators III: Pseudo-differential operators*, vol. 274, Springer Science & Business Media, 1994.
- [79] J. HU, Y. LIANG, AND R. MA, *Conforming finite element DIVDIV complexes and the application for the linearized Einstein-Bianchi system*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.00088, (2021).
- [80] K. HU, *Nonlinear elasticity complex and a finite element diagram chase*, in INdAM Meeting: Approximation Theory and Numerical Analysis meet Algebra, Geometry, Topology, Springer, 2022, pp. 231–252.
- [81] K. HU AND T. LIN, *Finite element form-valued forms (I): Construction*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.03243, (2025).
- [82] K. HU, T. LIN, AND Q. ZHANG, *Distributional Hessian and divdiv complexes on triangulation and cohomology*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.15482, (2023).
- [83] X. Y. HU, N. A. ADAMS, AND C.-W. SHU, *Positivity-preserving method for high-order conservative schemes solving compressible Euler equations*, Journal of Computational Physics, 242 (2013), pp. 169–180.
- [84] G. IMMIRZI, *Quantum gravity and Regge calculus*, Nuclear Physics B-Proceedings Supplements, 57 (1997), pp. 65–72.
- [85] D. JARIWALA, T. J. MARKS, AND M. C. HERSAM, *Mixed-dimensional van der Waals heterostructures*, Nature materials, 16 (2017), pp. 170–181.
- [86] O. E. JENSEN, E. JOHNS, AND S. WOOLNER, *Force networks, torque balance and Airy stress in the planar vertex model of a confluent epithelium*, Proceedings of the Royal Society A, 476 (2020), p. 20190716.
- [87] X. JIANG, L.-H. LIM, Y. YAO, AND Y. YE, *Statistical ranking and combinatorial hodge theory*, Mathematical Programming, 127 (2011), pp. 203–244.
- [88] S. JIN, *Asymptotic-preserving schemes for multiscale physical problems*, Acta Numerica, 31 (2022), pp. 415–489.
- [89] M. KAHLE, *Topology of random clique complexes*, Discrete mathematics, 309 (2009), pp. 1658–1671.

- [90] M. KAHLE ET AL., *Topology of random simplicial complexes: a survey*, AMS Contemp. Math, 620 (2014), pp. 201–222.
- [91] F. KANG, *Finite difference schemes based on variational principles (in chinese)*, Applied Mathematics and Computational Mathematics, (1965).
- [92] L. KELVIN, *On vortex atoms*, in Proc. R. Soc. Edin, vol. 6, 1867, pp. 94–105.
- [93] E. KRÖNER, *General continuum theory of dislocations and proper stresses*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal, 4 (1960), pp. 273–334.
- [94] ———, *Dislocation: a new concept in the continuum theory of plasticity*, Studies in Applied Mathematics, 42 (1963), pp. 27–37.
- [95] E. KRÖNER, *Incompatibility, defects, and stress functions in the mechanics of generalized continua*, International journal of solids and structures, 21 (1985), pp. 747–756.
- [96] ———, *Dislocations in crystals and in continua: a confrontation*, International journal of engineering science, 33 (1995), pp. 2127–2135.
- [97] E. KRÖNER ET AL., *Continuum theory of defects*, Physics of defects, 35 (1981), pp. 217–315.
- [98] B. LÉ, G. LEGRAIN, AND N. MOËS, *Mixed dimensional modeling of reinforced structures*, Finite elements in Analysis and Design, 128 (2017), pp. 1–18.
- [99] T. LEE, *Discrete mechanics*, in How far are we from the gauge forces, Springer, 1985, pp. 15–114.
- [100] ———, *Difference equations and conservation laws*, Journal of Statistical Physics, 46 (1987), pp. 843–860.
- [101] B. LEONARD, M. MACVEAN, AND A. LOCK, *Positivity-preserving numerical schemes for multidimensional advection*, tech. rep., 1993.
- [102] L.-H. LIM, *Hodge Laplacians on graphs*, SIAM Review, 62 (2020), pp. 685–715.
- [103] H. K. MOFFATT, *The degree of knottedness of tangled vortex lines*, Journal of Fluid Mechanics, 35 (1969), pp. 117–129.
- [104] T. NAKAMURA, K. OOHARA, AND Y. KOJIMA, *General relativistic collapse to black holes and gravitational waves from black holes*, Progress of Theoretical Physics Supplement, 90 (1987), pp. 1–218.
- [105] J. NÉDÉLEC, *Mixed finite elements in  $\mathbb{R}^3$* , Numerische Mathematik, 35 (1980), pp. 315–341.
- [106] ———, *A new family of mixed finite elements in  $\mathbb{R}^3$* , Numerische Mathematik, 50 (1986), pp. 57–81.
- [107] P. NEFF, K.-I. HONG, AND J. JEONG, *The Reissner–Mindlin plate is the  $\Gamma$ -limit of Cosserat elasticity*, Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences, 20 (2010), pp. 1553–1590.
- [108] P. NEFF AND J. JEONG, *The linear isotropic cosserat (micropolar) model*, [https://www.uni-due.de/~hm0014/cosserat\\_files/web\\_lin\\_coss.pdf](https://www.uni-due.de/~hm0014/cosserat_files/web_lin_coss.pdf), (2008).
- [109] M. NEUNTEUFEL AND J. SCHÖBERL, *Avoiding membrane locking with Regge interpolation*, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 373 (2021), p. 113524.
- [110] J. F. NYE, *Some geometrical relations in dislocated crystals*, Acta metallurgica, 1 (1953), pp. 153–162.
- [111] C. PAGLIANTINI, *Computational Magnetohydrodynamics with Discrete Differential Forms*, PhD thesis, 2016.
- [112] S. PARK AND X.-L. GAO, *Variational formulation of a modified couple stress theory and its application to a simple shear problem*, Zeitschrift für angewandte Mathematik und Physik, 59 (2008), pp. 904–917.
- [113] E. N. PARKER, *Topological dissipation and the small-scale fields in turbulent gases*, The Astrophysical Journal, 174 (1972), p. 499.
- [114] D. PAULY, *A global div-curl-lemma for mixed boundary conditions in weak Lipschitz domains and a corresponding generalized  $A_0^*$ - $A_1$ -lemma in Hilbert spaces*, Analysis, 39 (2019), pp. 33–58.
- [115] A. PECHSTEIN AND J. SCHÖBERL, *Tangential-displacement and normal-normal-stress continuous mixed finite elements for elasticity*, Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences, 21 (2011), pp. 1761–1782.
- [116] G. C. PHILIPPE, *The finite element method for elliptic problems*, 1978.
- [117] W. PIETRASZKIEWICZ AND V. EREMEYEV, *On natural strain measures of the non-linear micropolar continuum*, International Journal of Solids and Structures, 46 (2009), pp. 774–787.
- [118] D. I. PONTIN AND G. HORNIG, *The Parker problem: existence of smooth force-free fields and coronal heating*, Living Reviews in Solar Physics, 17 (2020), p. 5.
- [119] F. PRETORIUS, *Evolution of binary black-hole spacetimes*, Physical review letters, 95 (2005), p. 121101.
- [120] V. QUENNEVILLE-BÉLAIR, *A New Approach to Finite Element Simulations of General Relativity*, PhD thesis, University of Minnesota, 2015.
- [121] M. RAUSSEN AND C. SKAU, *Interview with Michael Atiyah and Isadore Singer*, Notices of the AMS, 52 (2005).
- [122] P. RAVIART AND J. THOMAS, *A mixed finite element method for second order elliptic problems*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 606 (1977), pp. 292–315.
- [123] T. REGGE, *General relativity without coordinates*, Il Nuovo Cimento (1955-1965), 19 (1961), pp. 558–571.

- [124] A. D. RENDALL, *Insufficiency of the ricci and bianchi identities for characterising curvature*, Journal of Geometry and Physics, 6 (1989), pp. 159–163.
- [125] O. A. REULA, *Hyperbolic methods for Einstein’s equations*, Living Reviews in Relativity, 1 (1998), p. 3.
- [126] M. E. ROGNES, *Waterscales: Mathematical and computational foundations for modelling cerebral fluid flow*, European Mathematical Society Magazine, (2022), pp. 13–26.
- [127] H. J. ROTHE, *Lattice gauge theories: an introduction*, World Scientific Publishing Company, 2012.
- [128] M. L. RUGGIERO AND A. TARTAGLIA, *Einstein–cartan theory as a theory of defects in space–time*, American Journal of Physics, 71 (2003), pp. 1303–1313.
- [129] J. SCHÖBERL, *C++ 11 implementation of finite elements in NGSolve*, Institute for analysis and scientific computing, Vienna University of Technology, 30 (2014).
- [130] E. SCHOLZ, *E. Cartan’s attempt at bridge-building between Einstein and the Cosserats—or how translational curvature became to be known as torsion*, The European Physical Journal H, 44 (2019), pp. 47–75.
- [131] M. SHIBATA AND T. NAKAMURA, *Evolution of three-dimensional gravitational waves: Harmonic slicing case*, Physical Review D, 52 (1995), p. 5428.
- [132] L. SMARR, *Space-times generated by computers: Black holes with gravitational radiation*, Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 302 (1977), pp. 569–604.
- [133] C. B. SMIET, S. CANDELARESI, AND D. BOUWMEESTER, *Ideal relaxation of the Hopf fibration*, Physics of Plasmas, 24 (2017).
- [134] P. STEINMANN, *Geometrical foundations of continuum mechanics*, Lecture Notes in Applied Mathematics and Mechanics, 2 (2015).
- [135] Z. SU, Y. TONG, AND G.-W. WEI, *Persistent de Rham–Hodge Laplacians in Eulerian representation for manifold topological learning*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00220, (2024).
- [136] G. TÓTH, *The  $\nabla \cdot B = 0$  constraint in shock-capturing magnetohydrodynamics codes*, Journal of Computational Physics, (2000), pp. 1–24.
- [137] N. VAN GOETHEM, *The Frank tensor as a boundary condition in intrinsic linearized elasticity*, Journal of Geometric Mechanics, 8 (2016), pp. 391–411.
- [138] I. VARDOULAKIS, *Cosserat continuum mechanics*, Lecture Notes in Applied and Computational Mechanics, 87 (2019).
- [139] V. VOLTERRA, *Sur l’équilibre des corps élastiques multiplement connexes*, in Annales scientifiques de l’École normale supérieure, vol. 24, Société mathématique de France, 1907, pp. 401–517.
- [140] J. VONNEUMANN AND R. D. RICHTMYER, *A method for the numerical calculation of hydrodynamic shocks*, Journal of applied physics, 21 (1950), pp. 232–237.
- [141] H. WHITNEY, *Geometric integration theory*, Courier Corporation, 2012.
- [142] J. R. WILSON, *A numerical method for relativistic hydrodynamics*, Sources of gravitational radiation, (1979), pp. 423–445.
- [143] L. WOLTJER, *A theorem on force-free magnetic fields*, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 44 (1958), pp. 489–491.
- [144] A. YAVARI, *Applications of algebraic topology in elasticity*, in Geometric Continuum Mechanics, Springer, 2020, pp. 143–183.
- [145] A. YAVARI AND A. GORIELY, *Riemann–Cartan geometry of nonlinear dislocation mechanics*, Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis, 205 (2012), pp. 59–118.
- [146] ———, *Riemann–Cartan geometry of nonlinear disclination mechanics*, Mathematics and Mechanics of Solids, 18 (2013), pp. 91–102.

THE MAXWELL INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES & SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH, JAMES CLERK MAXWELL BUILDING, PETER GUTHRIE TAIT RD, EDINBURGH EH9 3FD, UK.

*Email address:* `kaibo.hu@ed.ac.uk`