

**THE SIMPLICIAL VOLUME OF CLOSED MANIFOLDS  
COVERED BY  $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2$**

MICHELLE BUCHER-KARLSSON

ABSTRACT. We compute the value of the simplicial volume for closed, oriented Riemannian manifolds covered by  $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2$  explicitly, thus in particular for products of closed hyperbolic surfaces. This gives the first exact value of a nonvanishing simplicial volume for a manifold not admitting a hyperbolic structure.

1. INTRODUCTION

Our main result is the computation of the Gromov norm, that is the sup norm, of the Riemannian volume form on the product  $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2$ , where  $\mathbb{H}^2$  denotes the hyperbolic plane of constant curvature  $-1$ :

**Main Theorem.** *Let  $\omega_{\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2} \in H_c^4(\mathrm{PSL}_2\mathbb{R} \times \mathrm{PSL}_2\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  be the image, under the Van Est isomorphism, of the Riemannian volume form on  $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2$ . Then*

$$\|\omega_{\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2}\|_\infty = \frac{2}{3}\pi^2.$$

Recall that the simplicial volume  $\|M\|$  of a closed, oriented manifold  $M$  is a topological invariant introduced by Gromov in [Gr82] and is defined as

$$\|M\| = \inf \{ \sum |a_\sigma| \mid \sum a_\sigma \sigma \text{ represents the real fundamental class } [M] \}.$$

As an immediate consequence of our main theorem, we obtain in Theorem 1 below the explicit proportionality constant relating simplicial volume and volume of closed, oriented, Riemannian manifolds covered by  $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2$ . Indeed, we prove in [Bu06, Theorem 2] that the proportionality constant of the proportionality principle for closed, oriented locally symmetric space of noncompact type  $M^n = \Gamma \backslash G/K$  is precisely the Gromov norm of the volume form in  $H_c^n(G, \mathbb{R})$ . Explicit finite values of the proportionality constant were up to now only known for hyperbolic manifolds ([Gr82],[Th78]): It is in this case equal to the maximum volume of ideal geodesic simplices in  $\mathbb{H}^n$ , a constant which has been computed explicitly up to dimension  $n = 6$  only.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $M$  be a closed, oriented Riemannian manifold whose universal cover  $\widetilde{M}$  is isometric to  $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2$ . Then*

$$\|M\| = \frac{3}{2\pi^2} \mathrm{Vol}(M).$$

In view of Hirzebruch's proportionality principle [Hi56] relating the volume and the Euler characteristic  $\chi$  of locally symmetric spaces of noncompact type, the conclusion of Theorem 1 can be rewritten as

$$\|M\| = 6\chi(M).$$

In particular, using the result of Ivanov and Turaev [IvTu82] that the sup norm of the Euler class  $\epsilon$  of flat  $\mathrm{SL}(4, \mathbb{R})$ -bundles satisfies the inequality  $\|\epsilon\|_\infty \leq 1/2^4$ , the following consequence of Theorem 1 is immediate:

---

Supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation, Grant number PBEZ2-106962.

**Corollary 2.** *Let  $M$  be a closed, oriented Riemannian manifold whose universal cover  $\widetilde{M}$  is isometric to  $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2$ . Let  $\xi$  be an  $\mathrm{SL}(4, \mathbb{R})$ -bundle over  $M$ . If  $\xi$  admits a flat structure, then*

$$\chi(\xi) = \langle \epsilon(\xi), [M] \rangle \leq \frac{3}{2^3} \chi(M).$$

Note that if  $M$  is a product of hyperbolic surfaces and the bundle  $\xi$  is a product of flat bundles, then the stronger inequality  $\chi(\xi) \leq \frac{1}{2^2} \chi(M)$  follows from Milnor's celebrated inequality [Mi58]. This is probably the correct bound in the general case also. However, Corollary 2 is good enough to conclude that the considered manifolds do not admit an affine structure. Indeed, if this was the case, the  $\mathrm{SL}(4, \mathbb{R})$ -bundle associated to the tangent bundle  $TM$  could be endowed with a flat structure, and we would get the impossible inequality  $\chi(M) = \chi(TM) \leq (3/2^3) \chi(M)$ .

Another consequence of Theorem 1 is the following product formula:

**Corollary 3.** *Let  $M$  and  $N$  be closed, oriented surfaces. Then*

$$\|M \times N\| = \frac{3}{2} \|M\| \cdot \|N\|.$$

Since the simplicial volume of a surface  $\Sigma_g$  of genus  $g \geq 1$  is equal to  $\|\Sigma_g\| = 4(g-1) = 2|\chi(\Sigma_g)|$ , we obtain, for  $g, h \geq 1$ ,

$$\|\Sigma_g \times \Sigma_h\| = 24 \cdot (g-1)(h-1),$$

which gives the first exact value of a nonvanishing simplicial volume for a manifold not admitting a constant curvature metric.

*Proof of Corollary 3.* If either of  $M$  or  $N$  is the 2-sphere or the 2-torus, then both sides of the equality vanish trivially. If  $M$  and  $N$  are endowed with a hyperbolic structure, then the proportionality principle for 2-dimensional hyperbolic manifolds gives us  $\pi \|M\| = \mathrm{Vol}(M)$  and  $\pi \|N\| = \mathrm{Vol}(N)$ , so that by Theorem 1,

$$\|M \times N\| = \frac{3}{2\pi^2} \mathrm{Vol}(M \times N) = \frac{3}{2\pi^2} \mathrm{Vol}(M) \mathrm{Vol}(N) = \frac{3}{2} \|M\| \cdot \|N\|,$$

as claimed.  $\square$

This is the first instance of an exact product formula for the simplicial volume. Previously known were the rather elementary inequalities

$$\|M\| \cdot \|N\| \leq \|M \times N\| \leq \binom{m+n}{m} \|M\| \cdot \|N\|,$$

where  $M$  and  $N$  are any closed, oriented manifolds of dimension  $m$  and  $n$  respectively. Furthermore, when  $M$  and  $N$  are hyperbolic surfaces, the upper bound of  $6 \cdot \|M\| \cdot \|N\|$  was improved to  $3, 25 \cdot \|M\| \cdot \|N\|$  by Bowen et al. in [Bo&al04] by exhibiting explicit triangulations of products of polygons. The authors also give lower bounds for the minimal number of simplices in such triangulations, which we improve in [Bu07] using the explicit cocycle  $\Theta$  representing the volume form  $\omega_{\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2}$ . Since those triangulations produce fundamental cycles for the fundamental class  $[M \times N]$  which in view of Corollary 3 have strictly greater  $\ell^1$ -norm than  $\|M \times N\|$ , this indicates the existence of triangulations of products of hyperbolic surfaces not arising from triangulations of fundamental domains of the form of a product of polygons. (Note however that the lower bound for the simplicial volume given in [Bo&al04] is incorrect as it relies on the invalid Lemma 2.7.)

In the same way as a hyperbolic surface  $M$  can be covered by precisely  $\|M\|$  ideal triangles, one could ask if such a covering can be found for products of hyperbolic surfaces. In fact, the cocycle representing  $\omega_{\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2}$  that we exhibit gives natural candidates for the building blocks of such an ideal tessellation, since it takes extremal values on very specific 5-tuples of points of  $\partial\mathbb{H}^2 \times \partial\mathbb{H}^2$ .

The present computations are used in [LoSa07] to give the exact value of the simplicial volume of Hilbert modular surfaces. Those are *open*, finite volume,  $\mathbb{Q}$ -rank 1 manifolds with universal cover isometric to  $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2$ .

This paper is structured as follows: In Section 2, we recall the definition of continuous cohomology, and give an explicit cocycle  $\Theta$  representing the volume form  $\omega_{\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2}$  in Proposition 4. In Section 3, we introduce continuous bounded cohomology, and show how our Main Theorem reduces to computing the norm of our explicit representative  $\Theta$  in the cohomology group  $H_{c,b}^4(H, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})$ , where  $H$  is the (full) isometry group of  $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2$  and  $\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$  is the real line endowed with the action of  $H$  given by orientation. In Section 4, we compute the norm of  $\Theta$  both as a cocycle in Proposition 7 and as a cohomology class of  $H_{c,b}^4(H, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})$  in Theorem 6. Finally, we prove that the comparison map  $H_{c,b}^4(H, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}) \rightarrow H_c^4(H, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})$  is an isomorphism in Section 5.

*Acknowledgements.* I am indebted to Nicolas Monod for his useful comments on preliminary versions of this paper.

## 2. THE VOLUME FORM $\omega_{\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2}$ IN $H_c^4(\mathrm{PSL}_2\mathbb{R} \times \mathrm{PSL}_2\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$

Let  $G$  be a topological group and  $E$  a  $G$ -module. Recall (for example from [Gui80] or [BoWa00]) that the continuous cohomology  $H_c^*(G, E)$  of  $G$  with coefficients in  $E$  can be computed as the cohomology of the cocomplex  $C^*(G, E)^G$  endowed with its natural symmetric coboundary operator, where

$$C^q(G, E) = \{ f : G^{q+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid f \text{ is alternating, measurable} \},$$

and  $C^q(G, E)^G$  denotes the subspace of  $G$ -invariant cochains, where the action of  $G$  on  $C^q(G, E)$  is given by

$$(g \cdot f)(g_0, \dots, g_q) = g \cdot f(g^{-1}g_0, \dots, g^{-1}g_q),$$

for every  $(g_0, \dots, g_q)$  in  $G^{q+1}$ ,  $f$  in  $C^q(G, E)$  and  $g$  in  $G$ .

Let now  $G$  be a Lie group,  $K < G$  a maximal compact subgroup and  $X = G/K$  the associated symmetric space. The Van Est isomorphism

$$\mathcal{J} : A^*(X, E)^G \xrightarrow{\cong} H_c^*(G, E)$$

between the  $G$ -invariant  $E$ -valued differential forms on  $X$  (where the  $G$ -action on  $A^*(G, E)$  is defined analogously to that on  $C_c^*(G, E)$ ) and the continuous cohomology of  $G$  with coefficients in  $E$  is both natural and multiplicative. Note furthermore that Dupont gave it an explicit description at the cochain level in [Du76].

**The volume form in  $\mathbb{H}^2$ .** Let  $\omega_{\mathbb{H}^2}$  denote the volume form in  $A^2(\mathbb{H}^2, \mathbb{R})^{\mathrm{PSL}_2\mathbb{R}}$ . While  $\mathcal{J}(\omega_{\mathbb{H}^2}) \in H_c^2(\mathrm{PSL}_2\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  can, by Dupont's description of the Van Est isomorphism be represented by the cocycle sending a triple of points  $(g_0, g_1, g_2)$  in  $(\mathrm{PSL}_2\mathbb{R})^3$  to the signed volume of the geodesic triangle with vertices  $(g_0x, g_1x, g_2x)$ , for some fixed point  $x$  in  $\mathbb{H}^2$ , let us now describe another cocycle representing  $\mathcal{J}(\omega_{\mathbb{H}^2})$ . Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Or} : \quad (S^1)^3 &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (\xi_0, \xi_1, \xi_2) &\longmapsto \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if } \xi_0, \xi_1, \xi_2 \text{ are positively oriented,} \\ -1 & \text{if } \xi_0, \xi_1, \xi_2 \text{ are negatively oriented,} \\ 0 & \text{if } \xi_i = \xi_j \text{ for } i \neq j. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Fix a point  $\xi$  in  $S^1$  and let  $\mathrm{Or}_\xi : (\mathrm{PSL}_2\mathbb{R})^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the cocycle defined by

$$\mathrm{Or}_\xi(g_0, g_1, g_2) = \mathrm{Or}(g_0\xi, g_1\xi, g_2\xi).$$

It is well known and easy to check that

$$\mathcal{J}(\omega_{\mathbb{H}^2}) = \pi[\text{Or}_\xi].$$

Thus, the cocycle  $\pi\text{Or}_\xi$  representing  $\mathcal{J}(\omega_{\mathbb{H}^2})$  can be thought of as sending a triple of points  $(g_0, g_1, g_2)$  to the signed volume of the *ideal* geodesic triangle with vertices  $(g_0\xi, g_1\xi, g_2\xi)$ . It is the limit of the above described cocycle when  $x \in \mathbb{H}^2$  tends to  $\xi \in \partial\mathbb{H}^2 = S^1$ .

**The volume form in  $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2$ .** Let  $\omega_{\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2}$  denote the volume form in  $A^4(\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2, \mathbb{R})^{\text{PSL}_2\mathbb{R} \times \text{PSL}_2\mathbb{R}}$ . We will abuse notation and write  $p_i : Y \times Y \rightarrow Y$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ , for the projections on the first and second factors for  $Y = \mathbb{H}^2$ ,  $Y = \partial\mathbb{H}^2$  or  $Y = \text{PSL}_2\mathbb{R}$ . Which of those spaces is meant should be clear from the context. For  $i = 1, 2$ , set

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_i &= p_i^*(\omega_{\mathbb{H}^2}) \in A^2(\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2, \mathbb{R})^{\text{PSL}_2\mathbb{R} \times \text{PSL}_2\mathbb{R}} \quad \text{and} \\ \text{Or}_i &= p_i^*(\text{Or}) : (S^1 \times S^1)^3 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that the standard cup product  $f_1 \cup f_2$  of a  $p$ -cochain  $f_1 : Y^{p+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and a  $q$ -cochain  $f_2 : Y^{q+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the *nonalternating*  $(p+q)$ -cochain sending the  $(p+q+1)$ -tuple  $(y_0, \dots, y_{p+q})$  to the product  $f_1(y_0, \dots, y_p) \cdot f_2(y_p, \dots, y_{p+q})$ . Moreover, given a non necessarily alternating  $p$ -cochain  $f : Y^{p+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , its alternation is the alternating cochain  $\text{Alt}(f) : Y^{p+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$\text{Alt}(f)(y_0, \dots, y_p) = \frac{1}{(p+1)!} \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(p+1)} \text{sign}(\sigma) f(y_{\sigma(0)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(p)}),$$

for every  $(y_0, \dots, y_p)$  in  $Y^{p+1}$ . Set

$$\Theta = \text{Alt}(\text{Or}_1 \cup \text{Or}_2) : (S^1 \times S^1)^5 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

Fix a point  $\xi$  in  $S^1$  and let  $\Theta_\xi : (\text{PSL}_2\mathbb{R} \times \text{PSL}_2\mathbb{R})^5 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the cocycle defined by

$$\Theta_\xi((g_0, h_0), \dots, (g_4, h_4)) = \Theta((g_0\xi, h_0\xi), \dots, (g_4\xi, h_4\xi)),$$

for every  $((g_0, h_0), \dots, (g_4, h_4))$  in  $(\text{PSL}_2\mathbb{R} \times \text{PSL}_2\mathbb{R})^5$ . Note that by construction,

$$\Theta_\xi = \text{Alt}(p_1^*(\text{Or}_\xi) \cup p_2^*(\text{Or}_\xi)).$$

**Proposition 4.**  $\mathcal{J}(\omega_{\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2}) = \pi^2 [\Theta_\xi]$ .

*Proof.* By definition of the Riemannian product metric, the volume form on the product, is the wedge product of the volume forms on the factors, so that  $\omega_{\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2} = \omega_1 \wedge \omega_2$ . Since the van Est isomorphism  $\mathcal{J}$  is multiplicative, we thus have

$$\mathcal{J}(\omega_{\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2}) = \mathcal{J}(\omega_1 \wedge \omega_2) = \mathcal{J}(\omega_1) \cup \mathcal{J}(\omega_2).$$

But by naturality of  $\mathcal{J}$ , we now obtain, for  $i = 1, 2$ ,

$$\mathcal{J}(\omega_i) = \mathcal{J}(p_i^*(\omega_{\mathbb{H}^2})) = p_i^*(\mathcal{J}(\omega_{\mathbb{H}^2})) = p_i^*(\pi[\text{Or}_\xi]).$$

In particular, we get

$$\mathcal{J}(\omega_{\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2}) = \pi^2 [p_1^*(\text{Or}_\xi)] \cup [p_2^*(\text{Or}_\xi)] = \pi^2 [\Theta_\xi],$$

since the cup product is given, at the cochain level, by alternating the standard cup product.  $\square$

3. THE CONTINUOUS (BOUNDED) COHOMOLOGY OF  $H = \text{Isom}(\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2)$ 

For more details on continuous, bounded cohomology, we invite the reader to consult [Mo01]. Let  $G$  be a topological group and  $E$  a Banach  $G$ -module. Recall that the continuous cohomology of  $G$  with coefficients in  $E$  was defined in the previous section as the cohomology of the cocomplex  $C_c^*(G, E)^G$ . Now that  $E$  is moreover assumed to be a Banach space, with norm  $\|-\|_E$ , say, we can consider the sup norm

$$\|f\|_\infty = \sup \{ \|f(g_0, \dots, g_q)\|_E \mid (g_0, \dots, g_q) \in G^{q+1} \}$$

of any cochain  $f$  in  $C^q(G, E)^G$ . Clearly, the coboundary operator restricts to the cocomplex  $C_b^*(G, E)^G$  of bounded  $G$ -invariant cochains, where

$$C_b^q(G, E) = \{f \in C_c^q(G) \mid \|f\|_\infty < +\infty\},$$

and the *continuous bounded cohomology*  $H_{c,b}^*(G, E)$  of  $G$  with coefficients in  $E$  is defined as the cohomology of this cocomplex. The inclusion of cocomplexes  $C_{c,b}^*(G, E)^G \subset C_c^*(G, E)^G$  induces a *comparison map*  $c : H_{c,b}^*(G, E) \rightarrow H_c^*(G, E)$ . The sup norm defines both a seminorm on  $H_c^*(G, E)$  and  $H_{c,b}^*(G, E)$  and we continue to denote those by  $\|-\|_\infty$ . (Note that on  $H_c^*(G, E)$  we allow the value  $+\infty$ .) We will abuse terminology and refer to those seminorms as (sup) norms. By definition, we have for any  $\alpha$  in  $H_c^q(G, E)$ :

$$\|\alpha\|_\infty = \inf \left\{ \|\alpha_b\|_\infty \mid \alpha_b \in H_{c,b}^q(G, E), c(\alpha_b) = \alpha \right\},$$

where the right hand side of the above equation is understood to be equal to infinity when the infimum is taken over the empty set.

Let now  $G$  be a Lie group,  $K < G$  a maximal compact subgroup and  $X = G/K$  the associated symmetric space. We have already come across, in the previous section, a very convenient cocomplex for the computation of  $H_c^*(G, E)$ , namely the degenerate cocomplex  $A^*(X, E)^G$  (its differential is zero since  $G$ -invariant forms are always closed). Let us now describe another useful cocomplex for both continuous and continuous, bounded cohomology: Define

$$C_c^q(X, E) = \{f : X^{q+1} \rightarrow E \mid f \text{ continuous, alternating}\}$$

and as above, let  $C_{c,b}^q(X, E)$  denote its subspace of bounded cochains, that is the subspace of  $C_c^q(X, E)$  consisting of elements with finite sup norm. The coboundary operator on  $C_c^*(X, E)$ , which is the canonical symmetric operator, clearly restricts to  $C_{c,b}^*(X, E)$ . The action of  $G$  on  $C_c^*(X, E)$  is defined analogously to the one on  $C^*(G, E)$ . It is a standard fact, that the continuous cohomology  $H_c^*(G, E)$  of  $G$  with coefficients in  $E$  is isomorphic to the cohomology of the cocomplex  $(C_c^*(X, E)^G, \delta)$  (see for example [Gui80, Chapitre III, Proposition 2.3] for a proof). As for the bounded case, it is proven in [Mo01, Corollary 7.4.10] that the continuous bounded cohomology  $H_{c,b}^*(G, E)$  of  $G$  with coefficients in  $E$  is isomorphic to the cohomology of the cocomplex  $(C_{c,b}^*(X, E)^G, \delta)$ . Furthermore, the comparison map  $c : H_{c,b}^*(G, E) \rightarrow H_c^*(G, E)$  is induced by the natural inclusion  $C_{c,b}^*(X, E) \subset C_c^*(X, E)$  and the sup norm of  $C_c^*(X, E)$  induces the same seminorms on the cohomology groups  $H_c^*(G, E)$  and  $H_{c,b}^*(G, E)$ .

Set  $G = \text{PSL}_2\mathbb{R} \times \text{PSL}_2\mathbb{R}$  and  $H = \text{Isom}(\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2)$  and note that  $G$  is a subgroup of  $H$  of index 8. Indeed,  $\text{PSL}_2\mathbb{R}$  has index 2 in  $\text{Isom}(\mathbb{H}^2)$ , so that  $G$  has index 4 in the product  $\text{Isom}(\mathbb{H}^2) \times \text{Isom}(\mathbb{H}^2)$  and the latter group together with the isometry  $\tau$  of  $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2$  permuting the factors (i.e.  $\tau(x, y) = (y, x)$  for  $(x, y)$  in  $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2$ ) generate  $H$ . Consider the absolute value norm on  $\mathbb{R}$  and denote by  $\mathbb{R}$  the Banach space  $\mathbb{R}$  endowed with the following action of  $H$ : an element  $h$  of  $H$  acts by multiplication

by  $+1$ , respectively  $-1$ , if  $h$  preserves, resp. reverses, the orientation in  $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2$ . Observe that restricted to  $G$ , this action is trivial, and we denote by  $\mathbb{R}$ , the Banach space  $\mathbb{R}$  endowed with the trivial action of  $G$ .

The subgroup inclusion  $G < H$  induces maps  $i : H_c^*(H, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}) \rightarrow H_c^*(G, \mathbb{R})$  and  $i_b : H_{c,b}^*(H, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}) \rightarrow H_{c,b}^*(G, \mathbb{R})$  which are realized, at the cochain level, by the canonical inclusions of cocomplexes  $C_c^*(\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H \subset C_c^*(\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2, \mathbb{R})^G$  and  $C_{c,b}^*(\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H \subset C_{c,b}^*(\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2, \mathbb{R})^G$  respectively. In particular, both  $i$  and  $i_b$  can not increase norms.

Averaging the value of a  $G$ -invariant cocycle on a fundamental domain for  $H/G$ , it is readily seen that both  $i$  and  $i_b$  admit left inverses. In fact, those transfer maps can be described explicitly as follows: Fix an orientation reversing isometry  $\sigma$  of  $\mathbb{H}^2$  and let  $\sigma_1$  (respectively  $\sigma_2$ ) be the orientation reversing isometry of  $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2$  acting as  $\sigma$  (resp. the identity) on the first factor and the identity (resp.  $\sigma$ ) on the second factor. As above, let  $\tau \in H$  be the orientation preserving isometry permuting the two factors in  $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2$ . Define

$$m : C_c^q(\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2, \mathbb{R})^G \longrightarrow C_c^*(\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$$

as

$$\begin{aligned} m(f)(z_0, \dots, z_q) &= \frac{1}{8} [f(z_0, \dots, z_q) - f(\sigma_1 z_0, \dots, \sigma_1 z_q) \\ &\quad - f(\sigma_2 z_0, \dots, \sigma_2 z_q) + f(\sigma_1 \sigma_2 z_0, \dots, \sigma_1 \sigma_2 z_q) \\ &\quad + f(\tau z_0, \dots, \tau z_q) - f(\sigma_1 \tau z_0, \dots, \sigma_1 \tau z_q) \\ &\quad - f(\sigma_2 \tau z_0, \dots, \sigma_2 \tau z_q) + f(\sigma_1 \sigma_2 \tau z_0, \dots, \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \tau z_q)], \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

for every  $f$  in  $C^q(\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2, \mathbb{R})^G$  and  $(z_0, \dots, z_q)$  in  $(\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2)^{q+1}$ . To check that  $m$  is well defined, we need to verify that  $m(f)$  is  $H$ -invariant whenever  $f$  is  $G$ -invariant: First, note that since  $\tau$  has order 2,  $m(f)$  is invariant with respect to  $\tau$ . Second, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} m(f)(\sigma_1 z_0, \dots, \sigma_1 z_q) &= \frac{1}{8} [f(\sigma_1 z_0, \dots, \sigma_1 z_q) - f(\sigma_1^2 z_0, \dots, \sigma_1^2 z_q) \\ &\quad - f(\sigma_2 \sigma_1 z_0, \dots, \sigma_2 \sigma_1 z_q) + f(\sigma_1 \sigma_2 \sigma_1 z_0, \dots, \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \sigma_1 z_q) \\ &\quad + f(\tau \sigma_1 z_0, \dots, \tau \sigma_1 z_q) - f(\sigma_1 \tau \sigma_1 z_0, \dots, \sigma_1 \tau \sigma_1 z_q) \\ &\quad - f(\sigma_2 \tau \sigma_1 z_0, \dots, \sigma_2 \tau \sigma_1 z_q) + f(\sigma_1 \sigma_2 \tau \sigma_1 z_0, \dots, \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \tau \sigma_1 z_q)]. \end{aligned}$$

Using the facts that  $\sigma_1$  commutes with  $\sigma_2$ , that  $\sigma_1 \tau = \tau \sigma_2$ , that both  $\sigma_1^2$  and  $\sigma_2^2$  belong to  $G$  and that  $f$  is  $G$ -invariant, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(\sigma_1^2 z_0, \dots, \sigma_1^2 z_q) &= f(z_0, \dots, z_q), \\ f(\sigma_2 \sigma_1 z_0, \dots, \sigma_2 \sigma_1 z_q) &= f(\sigma_1 \sigma_2 z_0, \dots, \sigma_1 \sigma_2 z_q), \\ f(\sigma_1 \sigma_2 \sigma_1 z_0, \dots, \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \sigma_1 z_q) &= f(\sigma_2 z_0, \dots, \sigma_2 z_q), \\ f(\tau \sigma_1 z_0, \dots, \tau \sigma_1 z_q) &= f(\sigma_2 \tau z_0, \dots, \sigma_2 \tau z_q), \\ f(\sigma_1 \tau \sigma_1 z_0, \dots, \sigma_1 \tau \sigma_1 z_q) &= f(\sigma_1 \sigma_2 \tau z_0, \dots, \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \tau z_q), \\ f(\sigma_2 \tau \sigma_1 z_0, \dots, \sigma_2 \tau \sigma_1 z_q) &= f(\tau z_0, \dots, \tau z_q), \\ f(\sigma_1 \sigma_2 \tau \sigma_1 z_0, \dots, \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \tau \sigma_1 z_q) &= f(\sigma_1 \tau z_0, \dots, \sigma_1 \tau z_q). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the above expression for  $m(f)(\sigma_1 z_0, \dots, \sigma_1 z_q)$  is equal to  $-m(f)(z_0, \dots, z_q)$ , which proves the invariance of  $m(f)$  with respect to  $\sigma_1$ . The invariance with respect to  $\sigma_2$  is proven symmetrically. Third, let  $g$  be an isometry in  $G$  and observe that since  $G$  is normal in  $H$ , there exists  $g_1, g_2$  and  $g_3$  in  $G$  such that  $\sigma_1 g = g_1 \sigma_1$ ,

$\sigma_2 g = g_2 \sigma_2$  and  $\sigma_1 \sigma_2 g = g_3 \sigma_1 \sigma_2$ . For  $k$  in  $G$ , define  $\bar{k}$  in  $G$  as  $\bar{k} = \tau k \tau$ . Note that if  $k = (k_1, k_2) \in \mathrm{PSL}_2 \mathbb{R} \times \mathrm{PSL}_2 \mathbb{R}$ , then  $\bar{k} = (k_2, k_1)$ . We now have

$$\begin{aligned}
m(f)(gz_0, \dots, gz_q) &= \frac{1}{4} [f(gz_0, \dots, gz_q) - f(\sigma_1 gz_0, \dots, \sigma_1 gz_q) \\
&\quad - f(\sigma_2 gz_0, \dots, \sigma_2 gz_q) + f(\sigma_1 \sigma_2 gz_0, \dots, \sigma_1 \sigma_2 gz_q) \\
&\quad + f(\tau gz_0, \dots, \tau gz_q) - f(\sigma_1 \tau gz_0, \dots, \sigma_1 \tau gz_q) \\
&\quad - f(\sigma_2 \tau gz_0, \dots, \sigma_2 \tau gz_q) + f(\sigma_1 \sigma_2 \tau gz_0, \dots, \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \tau gz_q)] \\
&= \frac{1}{4} [f(gz_0, \dots, gz_q) - f(g_1 \sigma_1 z_0, \dots, g_1 \sigma_1 z_q) \\
&\quad - f(g_2 \sigma_2 z_0, \dots, g_2 \sigma_2 z_q) + f(g_3 \sigma_1 \sigma_2 z_0, \dots, g_3 \sigma_1 \sigma_2 z_q) \\
&\quad + f(\bar{g} \tau z_0, \dots, \bar{g} \tau z_q) - f(\bar{g}_2 \sigma_1 \tau z_0, \dots, \bar{g}_2 \sigma_1 \tau z_q) \\
&\quad - f(\bar{g}_1 \sigma_2 \tau z_0, \dots, \bar{g}_1 \sigma_2 \tau z_q) + f(\bar{g}_3 \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \tau z_0, \dots, \bar{g}_3 \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \tau z_q)] \\
&= m(f)(z_0, \dots, z_q),
\end{aligned}$$

where for the last equality we have used eight times the  $G$ -invariance of  $f$ . Finally, the  $H$ -invariance of  $m(f)$  follows from that  $H$  is generated by  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \tau$  and  $G$ . Observe also that, by the  $G$ -invariance of  $f$ , the definition of  $m(f)$  is independent of the choice of  $\sigma$ .

It is readily seen that  $m$  is a cochain map which moreover restricts to a map

$$m_b : C_{c,b}^q(\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2, \mathbb{R})^G \longrightarrow C_{c,b}^q(\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2, \tilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$$

between the respective bounded cocomplexes. In particular,  $m$  and  $m_b$  induce maps, which we still denote by  $m$  and  $m_b$  between the corresponding cohomology groups. It is clear that neither  $m$  nor  $m_b$  can increase norms. Furthermore, since both the inclusion of cocomplexes  $C_c^*(\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2, \tilde{\mathbb{R}})^H \subset C_c^*(\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2, \mathbb{R})^G$  composed with  $m$  and  $C_{c,b}^*(\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2, \tilde{\mathbb{R}})^H \subset C_{c,b}^*(\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2, \mathbb{R})^G$  composed with  $m_b$  are the identity maps, we have obtained a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & \xrightarrow{\quad \mathrm{Id} \quad} & & \\
H_c^*(H, \tilde{\mathbb{R}}) & \xrightarrow{i} & H_c^*(G, \mathbb{R}) & \xrightarrow{m} & H_c^*(H, \tilde{\mathbb{R}}) \\
\uparrow c & & \uparrow c & & \uparrow c \\
H_{c,b}^*(H, \tilde{\mathbb{R}}) & \xrightarrow{i_b} & H_{c,b}^*(G, \mathbb{R}) & \xrightarrow{m_b} & H_{c,b}^*(H, \tilde{\mathbb{R}}) \\
& & \xrightarrow{\quad \mathrm{Id} \quad} & & 
\end{array}$$

Going back to the definition of the above cohomology groups in terms of the cocomplexes  $C^*(G, \mathbb{R})^G$  and  $C^*(H, \tilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$  and their bounded subcocomplexes, we see that, for any  $\xi$  in  $S^1$ , the cochain  $\Theta_\xi \in C^4(G, \mathbb{R})^G$  encountered in the previous section has sup norm  $\|\Theta_\xi\|_\infty \leq 1$  and hence belongs to  $C_b^4(G, \mathbb{R})^G$ . (In fact, we will show in Proposition 7 that  $\|\Theta_\xi\|_\infty = \|\Theta\|_\infty = 2/3$ .) Denote by  $[\Theta] \in H_c^4(G, \mathbb{R})$  and  $[\Theta]_b \in H_{c,b}^4(G, \mathbb{R})$  the corresponding cohomology classes.

Since  $H$  acts on  $S^1 \times S^1 = \partial \mathbb{H}^2 \times \partial \mathbb{H}^2$ , we can as well extend our definition of  $\Theta_\xi$  to a cocycle on  $H$  which maps a 5-tuple  $(h_0, \dots, h_4)$  in  $H^5$  to  $\Theta(h_0(\xi, \xi), \dots, h_4(\xi, \xi))$ . The extended  $\Theta_\xi$  is clearly  $H$ -invariant and hence belongs to  $C^4(H, \tilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$  and also to  $C_b^4(H, \tilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$ . Denote by  $[\Theta]^H \in H_c^4(H, \tilde{\mathbb{R}})$  and  $[\Theta]_b^H \in H_{c,b}^4(H, \tilde{\mathbb{R}})$  the corresponding cohomology classes.

Because the four cohomology classes  $[\Theta]$ ,  $[\Theta]^H$ ,  $[\Theta]_b$  and  $[\Theta]_b^H$  are the equivalence classes of the same cocycle  $\Theta_\xi$ , it is obvious that

$$\begin{aligned}
c([\Theta]_b) &= [\Theta], & c([\Theta]_b^H) &= [\Theta]^H & \text{and} \\
i([\Theta]^H) &= [\Theta], & i([\Theta]_b^H) &= [\Theta]_b.
\end{aligned}$$

**Proposition 5.**  $\|[\Theta]\|_\infty = \left\| [\Theta]^H \right\|_\infty$ .

*Proof.* We use the facts that both  $i$  and  $m$  can not increase norms and that  $m \circ i$  is the identity on  $H_c^4(H, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})$  to obtain

$$\left\| [\Theta]^H \right\|_\infty = \left\| (m \circ i) \left( [\Theta]^H \right) \right\|_\infty \leq \left\| i \left( [\Theta]^H \right) \right\|_\infty \leq \left\| [\Theta]^H \right\|_\infty.$$

In particular, all the above inequalities are equalities. The proposition is now immediate from that  $i \left( [\Theta]^H \right) = [\Theta]$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 6.** *The comparison map  $c : H_{cb}^*(H, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}) \rightarrow H_c^*(H, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})$  is an isomorphism in degree 4 sending  $[\Theta]_b^H$  to  $[\Theta]^H$ .*

Note that if the comparison map is an isomorphism, it is automatically isometric. Theorem 6 is proven in Section 5 in a constructive way: given a cocycle representing a cohomology class of degree 4 in the kernel of the comparison map, we can explicitly express it as a coboundary. This isomorphism allows us to reduce the proof of our Main Theorem to the computation of the norm of  $\Theta$  in  $H_{cb}^*(H, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})$ , as stated in the next theorem, which we will prove in Section 4.

**Theorem 6.** *The norm of  $\Theta$  in  $H_{cb}^*(H, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})$  is equal to  $\left\| [\Theta]_b^H \right\|_\infty = 2/3$ .*

*Proof of Main Theorem.* Recall that we showed in Proposition 4 that  $\omega_{\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2} \in H_c^4(G, \mathbb{R})$  (which was there denoted by  $\mathcal{J}(\omega_{\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2})$ ) is equal to  $\pi^2[\Theta_\varepsilon] = \pi^2[\Theta]$ . Applying successively Proposition 5, Theorem 6 and Theorem 6, we obtain

$$\frac{\|\omega_{\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2}\|}{\pi^2} = \|[\Theta]\|_\infty = \left\| [\Theta]^H \right\|_\infty = \left\| [\Theta]_b^H \right\|_\infty = 2/3.$$

$\square$

We now introduce yet another cocomplex for the computation of the continuous, bounded cohomology groups: Let  $C_b^q(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})$  denote the space of alternating, measurable, bounded, real-valued functions on  $(S^1 \times S^1)^{q+1}$  endowed with its natural symmetric coboundary operator  $\delta$ . The action of  $H$  on  $C_b^q(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})$  is defined analogously to the one of  $H$  on  $C^q(H, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})$ . Its subspaces of  $H$ -invariant and  $G$ -invariant functions are denoted by  $C_b^q(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$  and  $C_b^q(S^1 \times S^1, \mathbb{R})^G$  respectively. It is proven in [Mo01, Corollary 7.5.9] that the cohomology of the latter cocomplexes are isomorphic to  $H_{cb}^*(H, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})$  and  $H_{cb}^*(G, \mathbb{R})$  respectively, that the map  $i_b : H_{cb}^*(H, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}) \rightarrow H_{cb}^*(G, \mathbb{R})$  is realized at the cochain level by the canonical inclusion  $C_b^q(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H \subset C_b^q(S^1 \times S^1, \mathbb{R})^G$ , and that the sup norm on  $C_b^q(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})$  gives rise to the desired seminorms on the continuous, bounded cohomology groups. Furthermore, it is easy to verify, that the map  $m_b : H_{cb}^*(G, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H_{cb}^*(H, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})$  is realized at the cochain level by the map

$$m_b : C_b^q(S^1 \times S^1, \mathbb{R})^G \longrightarrow C_b^q(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$$

defined exactly as in (5) except that  $f$  is now taken in  $C_b^q(S^1 \times S^1, \mathbb{R})^G$  and  $(z_0, \dots, z_q)$  in  $(S^1 \times S^1)^{q+1}$ . Finally, note that the cohomology classes  $[\Theta]_b^H$  and  $[\Theta]_b$  are represented in the cocomplexes  $C_b^q(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$  and  $C_b^q(S^1 \times S^1, \mathbb{R})^G$  by the cocycle  $\Theta : (S^1 \times S^1)^5 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .



4. THE NORM OF  $\Theta$ 

Recall that  $\Theta \in C_b^4(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$  is defined as the cocycle

$$\Theta = \text{Alt}(\text{Or}_1 \cup \text{Or}_2),$$

where  $\text{Or}_1$  and  $\text{Or}_2$  are the pullbacks under the first and second projection respectively of the orientation cocycle on  $S^1$ .

**Proposition 7.**  $\|\Theta\|_\infty = 2/3$ .

*Proof.* By definition, we have, for any 5-tuple  $((x_0, y_0), \dots, (x_4, y_4))$  in  $(S^1 \times S^1)^5$ , that  $\Theta((x_0, y_0), \dots, (x_4, y_4))$  is equal to

$$\frac{1}{120} \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(5)} \text{sign}(\sigma) \text{Or}(x_{\sigma(0)}, x_{\sigma(1)}, x_{\sigma(2)}) \cdot \text{Or}(y_{\sigma(2)}, y_{\sigma(3)}, y_{\sigma(4)}).$$

Set  $\tau = (0 \ 1 \ \dots \ 4)$  and observe that every permutation  $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(5)$  can be written uniquely as  $\sigma = \tau^k \circ \alpha$ , where  $\alpha \in \text{Sym}(5)$  maps 2 to 0, and  $k$  is an integer between 0 and 4. Now, exploiting the fact that  $\text{Or}$  is alternating, we can rewrite the above expression for  $\Theta((x_0, y_0), \dots, (x_4, y_4))$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{30} \sum_{\substack{\tau=(0 \ 1 \ \dots \ 4)^k \\ k \in \{0,1,\dots,4\}}} & [\text{Or}(x_{\tau(0)}, x_{\tau(1)}, x_{\tau(2)}) \cdot \text{Or}(y_{\tau(0)}, y_{\tau(3)}, y_{\tau(4)}) \\ & + \text{Or}(x_{\tau(0)}, x_{\tau(3)}, x_{\tau(4)}) \cdot \text{Or}(y_{\tau(0)}, y_{\tau(1)}, y_{\tau(2)}) \\ & - \text{Or}(x_{\tau(0)}, x_{\tau(1)}, x_{\tau(3)}) \cdot \text{Or}(y_{\tau(0)}, y_{\tau(2)}, y_{\tau(4)}) \\ & - \text{Or}(x_{\tau(0)}, x_{\tau(2)}, x_{\tau(4)}) \cdot \text{Or}(y_{\tau(0)}, y_{\tau(1)}, y_{\tau(3)}) \\ & + \text{Or}(x_{\tau(0)}, x_{\tau(1)}, x_{\tau(4)}) \cdot \text{Or}(y_{\tau(0)}, y_{\tau(2)}, y_{\tau(3)}) \\ & + \text{Or}(x_{\tau(0)}, x_{\tau(2)}, x_{\tau(3)}) \cdot \text{Or}(y_{\tau(0)}, y_{\tau(1)}, y_{\tau(4)})]. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Let us now compute the absolute value of the evaluation of  $\Theta$  on an arbitrary 5-tuple  $((x_0, y_0), \dots, (x_4, y_4))$  in  $(S^1 \times S^1)^5$ . If the  $x_i$ 's are all distinct, we can, since  $\Theta$  is alternating, up to permuting the  $x_i$ 's assume that they are cyclically ordered according to their numbering. Thus,  $\text{Or}(x_i, x_j, x_k) = +1$  whenever  $0 \leq i < j < k \leq 4$ , and all the orientation cocycles involving the  $x_i$ 's in the expression (2) are equal to +1, so that  $\Theta((x_0, y_0), \dots, (x_4, y_4))$  is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{30} \sum_{\substack{\tau=(0 \ 1 \ \dots \ 4)^k \\ k \in \{0,1,\dots,4\}}} & [\text{Or}(y_{\tau(0)}, y_{\tau(3)}, y_{\tau(4)}) + \text{Or}(y_{\tau(0)}, y_{\tau(1)}, y_{\tau(2)}) \\ & - \text{Or}(y_{\tau(0)}, y_{\tau(2)}, y_{\tau(4)}) - \text{Or}(y_{\tau(0)}, y_{\tau(1)}, y_{\tau(3)}) \\ & + \text{Or}(y_{\tau(0)}, y_{\tau(2)}, y_{\tau(3)}) + \text{Or}(y_{\tau(0)}, y_{\tau(1)}, y_{\tau(4)})] \\ = \frac{1}{30} \sum_{\substack{\tau=(0 \ 1 \ \dots \ 4)^k \\ k \in \{0,1,\dots,4\}}} & [\text{Or}(y_{\tau(2)}, y_{\tau(3)}, y_{\tau(4)}) + \text{Or}(y_{\tau(0)}, y_{\tau(1)}, y_{\tau(2)}) \\ & - \text{Or}(y_{\tau(0)}, y_{\tau(1)}, y_{\tau(3)}) + \text{Or}(y_{\tau(0)}, y_{\tau(1)}, y_{\tau(4)})], \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the cocycle relation

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \delta \text{Or}(y_{\tau(0)}, y_{\tau(2)}, y_{\tau(3)}, y_{\tau(4)}) \\ &= \text{Or}(y_{\tau(2)}, y_{\tau(3)}, y_{\tau(4)}) - \text{Or}(y_{\tau(0)}, y_{\tau(3)}, y_{\tau(4)}) \\ &\quad + \text{Or}(y_{\tau(0)}, y_{\tau(2)}, y_{\tau(4)}) - \text{Or}(y_{\tau(0)}, y_{\tau(2)}, y_{\tau(3)}). \end{aligned}$$

It is now immediate that  $|\Theta((x_0, y_0), \dots, (x_4, y_4))| \leq 2/3$ , since the last expression for  $\Theta((x_0, y_0), \dots, (x_4, y_4))$  is a sum of  $5 \cdot 4 = 20$  elements admitting the values  $\pm 1/30$  and 0.

If the  $x_i$ 's are not all distinct, then we can without loss of generality assume that  $x_0 = x_1$ . If the  $y_i$ 's were all distinct, then by symmetry we could apply the above argument to show that  $|\Theta((x_0, y_0), \dots, (x_4, y_4))| \leq 2/3$ . Let us thus assume that the  $y_i$ 's are not all distinct. If  $y_0 = y_1$  then  $(x_0, y_0) = (x_1, y_1)$  and hence  $\Theta((x_0, y_0), \dots, (x_4, y_4)) = 0$  since  $\Theta$  is alternating. We can now, again without loss of generality assume that  $y_2 = y_k$ , for  $k$  in  $\{0, 3, 4\}$ . In the expression (2) there are exactly 9 summands which have as a factor  $\text{Or}(x_0, x_1, x_j)$ , up to permutation of the entries, for  $j \geq 2$ , and hence vanish. Furthermore, the summand  $\text{Or}(x_0, x_3, x_4) \cdot \text{Or}(y_1, y_2, y_k)$  (which exists in (2) again up to permutation of the entries) also vanishes and clearly has not yet been counted among the summands having a factor of the form  $\text{Or}(x_0, x_1, x_j)$ , so at least 10 of the 30 summands in (2) vanish and

$$|\Theta((x_0, y_0), \dots, (x_4, y_4))| \leq 2/3.$$

We have thus proven  $\|\Theta\|_\infty \leq \frac{2}{3}$ . To prove equality, observe that if  $x_0, \dots, x_4$  in  $S^1$  are positively cyclically ordered according to their numbering and  $y_0, \dots, y_4$  in  $S^1$  are  $\varepsilon$ -cyclically ordered, for  $\varepsilon$  in  $\{-1, +1\}$ , according to their numbering, then

$$\Theta((x_0, y_0), (x_1, y_2), (x_2, y_4), (x_3, y_1), (x_4, y_3)) = \varepsilon \cdot \frac{2}{3},$$

which finishes the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

Let us now state and prove three easy lemmas which will furthermore be useful again in the next section. For the moment, they will allow us a better understanding of the spaces  $C_b^*(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$  in low degree.

**Lemma 8.** *Let  $f$  be a cochain in  $C_b^q(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$  and let  $\underline{z} = ((x_0, y_0), \dots, (x_q, y_q))$  be a  $(q+1)$ -tuple in  $(S^1 \times S^1)^{q+1}$ . If there exists  $\sigma$  in  $\text{Sym}(q+1)$  such that the permutations  $x_i \mapsto x_{\sigma(i)}$  and  $y_i \mapsto y_{\sigma(i)}$ , for  $0 \leq i \leq q$ , can be realized by isometries  $g$  and  $h$  of  $\mathbb{H}^2$  respectively, then*

$$f(\underline{z}) = \text{sign}(\sigma)\text{sign}(g)\text{sign}(h)f(\underline{z}),$$

where  $\text{sign}(k) = +1$ , respectively  $-1$ , if  $k$  is an orientation preserving, resp. reversing, isometry of  $\mathbb{H}^2$ .

*Proof.* On the one hand, we have, since  $f$  is alternating,

$$f(\underline{z}) = \text{sign}(\sigma)f((x_{\sigma(0)}, y_{\sigma(0)}), \dots, (x_{\sigma(q)}, y_{\sigma(q)})).$$

On the other hand, using the  $H$ -invariance of  $f$ , we get

$$f(\underline{z}) = \text{sign}(g)\text{sign}(h)f((gx_0, hy_0), \dots, (gx_q, hy_q)).$$

But by assumption,  $(x_{\sigma(i)}, y_{\sigma(i)}) = (gx_i, hy_i)$ , for every  $0 \leq i \leq q$ , and the lemma follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 9.** *Let  $x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3$  be distinct points on  $S^1$ . Denote by  $\langle x_i, x_j \rangle$ , for  $i \neq j$ , the geodesic in  $\mathbb{H}^2$  between  $x_i$  and  $x_j$  in  $\partial\mathbb{H}^2 = S^1$ .*

- (1) *If  $\langle x_0, x_1 \rangle \cap \langle x_2, x_3 \rangle \neq \emptyset$ , then there exists an orientation preserving isometry of  $\mathbb{H}^2$  realizing the permutation (0 1)(2 3).*
- (2) *If  $\langle x_0, x_1 \rangle \cap \langle x_2, x_3 \rangle = \emptyset$ , then there exists an orientation reversing isometry of  $\mathbb{H}^2$  realizing the permutation (0 1)(2 3).*

*Proof.* This is elementary from hyperbolic geometry:

- (1) Since the points are all distinct, if the geodesics intersect, they intersect in precisely one point. Then the rotation by  $\pi$  centered at the intersection realizes the permutation  $x_0 \leftrightarrow x_1, x_2 \leftrightarrow x_3$  and clearly preserves orientation.
- (2) There exists a unique geodesic  $\gamma$  perpendicular to both  $\langle x_0, x_1 \rangle$  and  $\langle x_2, x_3 \rangle$ . The reflection along  $\gamma$  is a reversing orientation isometry of  $\mathbb{H}^2$  realizing the permutations  $x_0 \leftrightarrow x_1, x_2 \leftrightarrow x_3$ .

□

It is easy to conclude, from Lemma 8, that  $C_b^q(S^1 \times S^1, \tilde{\mathbb{R}})^H = 0$  for  $0 \leq q \leq 2$ , and consequently also  $H_{c,b}^q(H, \tilde{\mathbb{R}}) = 0$  for  $0 \leq q \leq 2$ . In degree 3, the space of cochain  $C_b^3(S^1 \times S^1, \tilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$  is not zero, but we have the following useful vanishing criterion:

**Lemma 10.** *Let  $f$  be a cochain in  $C_b^3(S^1 \times S^1, \tilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$  and let  $\underline{z} = ((x_0, y_0), \dots, (x_3, y_3))$  be a 4-tuple in  $(S^1 \times S^1)^4$  such that  $\langle x_0, x_2 \rangle \cap \langle x_1, x_3 \rangle \neq \emptyset$  and  $\langle y_0, y_2 \rangle \cap \langle y_1, y_3 \rangle = \emptyset$ . Then*

$$f(\underline{z}) = 0.$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 9 there exists an orientation preserving isometry  $g$  of  $\mathbb{H}^2$  realizing the permutation (0 2)(1 3) of the points  $x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3$  and an orientation reversing isometry  $h$  of  $\mathbb{H}^2$  realizing the permutation (0 2)(1 3) of the points  $y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3$ . Thus, by Lemma 8 we obtain  $f(\underline{z}) = -f(\underline{z})$ , and the lemma is proven. □

**Theorem 6.**  $\|[\Theta]_b^H\|_\infty = 2/3$ .

*Proof.* From Proposition 7, one equality is already immediate, namely  $\|[\Theta]_b^H\|_\infty \leq \|\Theta\|_\infty = 2/3$ . For the other inequality, let  $b \in C_b^3(S^1 \times S^1, \tilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$  be an arbitrary cochain. As in the end of the proof of Proposition 7, let  $x_0, \dots, x_4$ , and respectively  $y_0, \dots, y_4$ , be positively cyclically ordered points in  $S^1$  and consider the 5-tuple

$$((x_0, y_0), (x_1, y_2), (x_2, y_4), (x_3, y_1), (x_4, y_3))$$

(which we already know has value  $2/3$  on  $\Theta$ ). Whatever coordinate one removes from this given 5-tuple, the remaining 4-tuple satisfies the conditions of Lemma 10, so that

$$\delta b((x_0, y_0), (x_1, y_2), (x_2, y_4), (x_3, y_1), (x_4, y_3)) = 0.$$

In particular, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Theta + \delta b\|_\infty &\geq |(\Theta + \delta b)((x_0, y_0), (x_1, y_2), (x_2, y_4), (x_3, y_1), (x_4, y_3))| \\ &= |\Theta((x_0, y_0), (x_1, y_2), (x_2, y_4), (x_3, y_1), (x_4, y_3))| = 2/3, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\|[\Theta]_b^H\|_\infty = \inf \left\{ \|\Theta + \delta b\|_\infty \mid b \in C_b^3(S^1 \times S^1, \tilde{\mathbb{R}})^H \right\} \geq 2/3,$$

which finishes the proof of the theorem. □

## 5. THE COMPARISON MAP $c : H_{cb}^*(H, \tilde{\mathbb{R}}) \rightarrow H_c^*(H, \tilde{\mathbb{R}})$

In this last section, we prove Theorem 6, that is, we prove that the comparison map  $c : H_{cb}^*(H, \tilde{\mathbb{R}}) \rightarrow H_c^*(H, \tilde{\mathbb{R}})$  is an isomorphism in degree 4 sending  $[\Theta]_b^H$  to  $[\Theta]^H$ . Since  $H_c^*(H, \tilde{\mathbb{R}})$  injects in the 1-dimensional cohomology group  $H_c^4(G, \mathbb{R})$  and contains the nonzero class  $[\Theta]^H$ , it is clearly also 1-dimensional, generated by  $[\Theta]^H$ . Moreover, we have already seen that  $c([\Theta]_b^H) = [\Theta]^H$ . Thus, it only remains to prove that the comparison map is injective in degree 4.

Let  $p_i : S^1 \times S^1 \rightarrow S^1$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ , denote the projection on the first and second factor respectively. For any  $(q+1)$ -tuple  $(z_0, \dots, z_q)$  in  $(S^1 \times S^1)^{q+1}$ , define

$$n_i(z_0, \dots, z_q) = \#\{p_i(z_0), \dots, p_i(z_q)\},$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ . We will now prove inductively on  $(n_1, n_2)$  that if a cocycle  $f \in C_b^4(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$  represents a cohomology class which is mapped to zero by the comparison map, then  $f = \delta h$  on 5-tuples  $\underline{z}$  satisfying  $n_1(\underline{z}) \leq n_1$ ,  $n_2(\underline{z}) \leq n_2$ . Observe that the fact that  $c([f]) = 0$  will only be used in Step 1, where we show that  $f = \delta h$  on 5-tuples  $\underline{z}$  verifying  $n_1(\underline{z}) = n_2(\underline{z}) = 3$ . Thus, Step 2 and Step 3 amount to proving that a cocycle vanishing on 5-tuples  $\underline{z}$  satisfying  $n_1(\underline{z}) = n_2(\underline{z}) = 3$  is a coboundary.

**Step 0.** *Let  $f$  be a cochain in  $C_b^q(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$  and  $\underline{z}$  be a  $(q+1)$ -tuple in  $(S^1 \times S^1)^{q+1}$ . If  $n_1(\underline{z}) \leq 2$  or  $n_2(\underline{z}) \leq 2$ , then  $f(\underline{z}) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* By symmetry, it is enough to treat the case  $n_1(\underline{z}) \leq 2$ . If  $n_1(\underline{z}) \leq 2$ , for  $\underline{z} = ((x_0, y_0), \dots, (x_q, y_q))$  in  $(S^1 \times S^1)^{q+1}$ , then there exists an orientation reversing isometry of  $\mathbb{H}^2$  fixing  $x_0, \dots, x_q$ , while the identity fixes  $y_0, \dots, y_q$ . In particular, by Lemma 8,  $f(\underline{z}) = 0$ .  $\square$

Let now  $f \in C_b^4(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$  be a cocycle satisfying  $c([f]) = 0$ . Define  $h_1 : (S^1 \times S^1)^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as

$$h_1((x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_4, y_4)) = \begin{cases} f((x_i, y_j), (x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_4, y_4)), \\ \quad \text{if } \exists i \neq i', j \neq j' \text{ with } x_i = x_{i'}, y_j = y_{j'}, \\ 0, \quad \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let us check that  $h_1$  is well defined: If the condition  $x_i = x_{i'}$  is satisfied for different pairs  $i_1 \neq i'_1$  and  $i_2 \neq i'_2$  (thus  $\{i_1, i'_1\} \neq \{i_2, i'_2\}$ ), then  $\#\{x_1, \dots, x_4\} \leq 2$  and

$$n_1((x_{i_\ell}, y_j), (x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_4, y_4)) \leq 2, \quad \text{for } \ell = 1, 2.$$

By Step 0, this now implies that  $f$  vanishes on both of those 5-tuples and hence  $h_1((x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_4, y_4)) = 0$  is well defined. The case when the condition  $y_j = y_{j'}$  is satisfied for different pairs of indices is treated symmetrically. Observe furthermore that  $h_1$  belongs to  $C_b^3(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$  because  $f$  belongs to  $C_b^4(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$ .

**Step 1.** *Set  $f_1 = f - \delta h_1 \in C_b^4(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$ . If  $\underline{z} \in (S^1 \times S^1)^5$  satisfies  $n_1(\underline{z}) = n_2(\underline{z}) = 3$ , then  $f_1(\underline{z}) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Because  $f$  is alternating and  $H$ -invariant, and since  $\text{Isom}(\mathbb{H}^2)$  acts transitively on oriented triples of distinct points of  $S^1$ , the value of  $f$  on 5-tuples  $\underline{z}$  with  $n_1(\underline{z}) = n_2(\underline{z}) = 3$  only depends on the configuration of the coordinates of  $\underline{z}$ . There are, up to permutation, five such configurations. Thus, there exists  $\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_4$  in  $\mathbb{R}$  such that for every triple  $(x_0, x_1, x_2)$  and  $(y_0, y_1, y_2)$  of distinct points of  $S^1$ , the following equalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} f((x_0, y_0), (x_0, y_1), (x_1, y_0), (x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)) &= \lambda_0 \cdot \text{Or}(x_0, x_1, x_2) \cdot \text{Or}(y_0, y_1, y_2), \\ f((x_0, y_0), (x_1, y_0), (x_2, y_0), (x_2, y_1), (x_2, y_2)) &= \lambda_1 \cdot \text{Or}(x_0, x_1, x_2) \cdot \text{Or}(y_0, y_1, y_2), \\ -f((x_0, y_0), (x_1, y_0), (x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_1), (x_2, y_2)) &= \lambda_2 \cdot \text{Or}(x_0, x_1, x_2) \cdot \text{Or}(y_0, y_1, y_2), \\ f((x_0, y_0), (x_1, y_0), (x_1, y_1), (x_1, y_2), (x_2, y_2)) &= \lambda_3 \cdot \text{Or}(x_0, x_1, x_2) \cdot \text{Or}(y_0, y_1, y_2), \\ f((x_0, y_0), (x_0, y_1), (x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_1), (x_2, y_2)) &= \lambda_4 \cdot \text{Or}(x_0, x_1, x_2) \cdot \text{Or}(y_0, y_1, y_2). \end{aligned}$$

Note that by Step 0, the above relations also hold when  $n_1(\underline{z}) \leq 2$  or  $n_2(\underline{z}) \leq 2$  since both sides of the equations are then equal to 0.

We start by invoking Lemma 8 to show that  $\lambda_0 = 0$ : The even permutation exchanging the first with the second and the third with the fourth coordinate of

$$((x_0, y_0), (x_0, y_1), (x_1, y_0), (x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2))$$

is realized on the first factor by the identity and on the second by the reversing orientation isometry permuting  $y_0$  with  $y_1$  and fixing  $y_2$ . In particular,  $f$  has to vanish on this 5-tuple.

Furthermore, note that  $\lambda_3 = \lambda_4$  since  $f$  is invariant under the orientation preserving isometry  $\tau$  of  $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{H}^2$  permuting the two factors.

From the cocycle relation  $\delta f = 0$ , we compute

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \delta f((x_0, y_0), (x_1, y_0), (x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_1), (x_2, y_2), (x_2, y_0)) \\ &= (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4) \text{Or}(x_0, x_1, x_2) \cdot \text{Or}(y_0, y_1, y_2), \end{aligned}$$

and we see that

$$\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 + \lambda_4 = 2\lambda_3. \quad (3)$$

**Claim 11.** *If  $f \in C_b^4(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$  is such that  $c([f]) = 0$ , then*

$$2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4 = 2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) = 0.$$

*Proof of Claim.* Let

$$\Gamma_2 = \langle a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2 \mid [a_1, b_1][a_2, b_2] = 1 \rangle < \text{PSL}_2\mathbb{R}$$

be a representation of the fundamental group  $\Gamma_2$  of the genus 2 surface  $\Sigma_2$  in  $\text{PSL}_2\mathbb{R}$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} z &= (1, a_1, b_1) + (1, a_1 b_1, a_2) + (1, a_1 b_1 a_2, b_2) \\ &\quad - (1, b_2, a_2) - (1, b_2 a_2, b_1) - (1, b_2 a_2 b_1, a_1) \end{aligned}$$

is a cycle in  $C_2(\Gamma_2) \hookrightarrow C_2(\text{PSL}_2\mathbb{R})$  representing the fundamental class  $[\Sigma_2] \in H_2(\Sigma_2) \cong H_2(\Gamma_2)$ . Recall that given two 2-chains  $(g_0, g_1, g_2)$  and  $(k_0, k_1, k_2)$  in  $C_2(\text{PSL}_2\mathbb{R})$ , their product  $(g_0, g_1, g_2) \times (k_0, k_1, k_2)$  in  $C_4(\text{PSL}_2\mathbb{R} \times \text{PSL}_2\mathbb{R})$  is defined as the 4-chain

$$\begin{aligned} &((g_0, k_0), (g_0, k_1), (g_0, k_2), (g_1, k_2), (g_2, k_2)) \\ &- ((g_0, k_0), (g_0, k_1), (g_1, k_1), (g_1, k_2), (g_2, k_2)) \\ &+ ((g_0, k_0), (g_0, k_1), (g_1, k_1), (g_2, k_1), (g_2, k_2)) \\ &+ ((g_0, k_0), (g_1, k_0), (g_1, k_1), (g_1, k_2), (g_2, k_2)) \\ &- ((g_0, k_0), (g_1, k_0), (g_1, k_1), (g_2, k_1), (g_2, k_2)) \\ &+ ((g_0, k_0), (g_1, k_0), (g_2, k_0), (g_2, k_1), (g_2, k_2)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $z \times z$  is a 4-cycle in  $C_4(G) \hookrightarrow C_4(H)$ .

For any cocycle  $f$  in  $C_b^4(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$ , the cohomology class  $c([f]) \in H_{cb}^4(H, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})$  is represented in  $C^4(H, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})$  by the cocycle

$$\begin{aligned} f_\xi : \quad H^5 &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (h_0, \dots, h_4) &\longmapsto f(h_0(\xi, \xi), \dots, h_4(\xi, \xi)), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\xi$  is a fixed base point in  $S^1$ . For any  $(g_0, g_1, g_2)$  and  $(k_0, k_1, k_2)$  in  $C_2(\text{PSL}_2\mathbb{R})$ , we have

$$f_\xi((g_0, g_1, g_2) \times (k_0, k_1, k_2)) = (2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4) \text{Or}(g_0\xi, g_1\xi, g_2\xi) \cdot \text{Or}(k_0\xi, k_1\xi, k_2\xi). \quad (4)$$

Upon conjugating  $\Gamma_2$ , we can without loss of generality assume that  $a_1\xi = \xi$ . Now, remember that, as seen in Section 2,  $\text{Or}_\xi$  is a cocycle in  $C^2(\text{PSL}_2\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  representing  $(1/\pi)\omega_{\mathbb{H}^2}$ . In particular, its evaluation on the fundamental class  $[\Sigma_2]$  is equal to  $(1/\pi) \cdot \text{Vol}(\Sigma_2) = 4$ , so that

$$\begin{aligned} 4 &= \langle \text{Or}_\xi, z \rangle = \text{Or}(\xi, a_1\xi, b_1\xi) + \text{Or}(\xi, a_1 b_1\xi, a_2\xi) + \text{Or}(\xi, a_1 b_1 a_2\xi, b_2\xi) \\ &\quad - \text{Or}(\xi, b_2\xi, a_2\xi) - \text{Or}(\xi, b_2 a_2\xi, b_1\xi) - \text{Or}(\xi, b_2 a_2 b_1\xi, a_1\xi) \\ &= \text{Or}(\xi, a_1 b_1\xi, a_2\xi) + \text{Or}(\xi, a_1 b_1 a_2\xi, b_2\xi) - \text{Or}(\xi, b_2\xi, a_2\xi) - \text{Or}(\xi, b_2 a_2\xi, b_1\xi), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

since  $a_1\xi = \xi$ . Because the cocycle  $\text{Or}$  takes its values in  $\{-1, 0, +1\}$ , it is now immediate that

$$\text{Or}(\xi, a_1b_1\xi, a_2\xi) = \text{Or}(\xi, a_1b_1a_2\xi, b_2\xi) = -\text{Or}(\xi, b_2\xi, a_2\xi) = -\text{Or}(\xi, b_2a_2\xi, b_1\xi) = 1.$$

Note that alternatively, the above equalities can be checked directly by studying the action of  $\Gamma_2$  on  $\partial\mathbb{H}^2$ .

Finally, the assumption that  $c([f]) = 0$  tells us that  $f_\xi$  is a coboundary and hence vanishes on cycles. In particular, we get  $f_\xi(z \times z) = 0$ . But from (4) and (5), we straightforwardly compute

$$f_\xi(z \times z) = 16 \cdot (2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4),$$

which proves the claim.  $\square$

Denote by  $\lambda'_0, \dots, \lambda'_4$  the real numbers in the defining equations for  $f$  on the 5-tuples  $\underline{z}$  with  $n_1(\underline{z}) = n_2(\underline{z}) = 3$  we would obtain by replacing  $f$  by  $f_1$ . Note that, as for  $f$ , we have  $\lambda'_0 = 0$ . From the definition of  $f_1$  as  $f - \delta h_1$ , we furthermore obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda'_1 &= \lambda_1 - \lambda_1 = 0, & \lambda'_2 &= \lambda_1 + \lambda_2, \\ \lambda'_3 &= \lambda_3, & \lambda'_4 &= \lambda_4. \end{aligned}$$

But from (3) and the claim, it now follows that  $\lambda'_j = 0$ , for every  $0 \leq j \leq 4$ , which proves that  $f_1$  vanishes on all 5-tuples  $\underline{z}$  with  $n_1(\underline{z}) = n_2(\underline{z}) = 3$ .  $\square$

Define  $h_2 : (S^1 \times S^1)^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as

$$h_2((x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_4, y_4)) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} [f_1((x_i, y_k), (x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_4, y_4)) + f_1((x_i, y_\ell), (x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_4, y_4))], \\ \quad \text{if } \{i, j, k, \ell\} = \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \text{ and } x_i = x_j, \\ \frac{1}{2} [f_1((x_k, y_i), (x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_4, y_4)) + f_1((x_\ell, y_i), (x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_4, y_4))], \\ \quad \text{if } \{i, j, k, \ell\} = \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \text{ and } y_i = y_j, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

To check that  $h_2$  is well defined, we verify that if the first or the second condition are verified by different sets of indices, then  $h_2$  is in both cases defined as 0: If the condition  $x_i = x_j$  is satisfied for different pairs  $i_1 \neq j_1$  and  $i_2 \neq j_2$  (thus  $\{i_1, j_1\} \neq \{i_2, j_2\}$ ), then as in the proof that  $h_1$  is well defined, we get

$$n_1((x_{i_\ell}, y_*), (x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_4, y_4)) \leq 2,$$

for  $\ell = 1, 2$  and  $y_* \in \{y_1, \dots, y_4\}$ . By Step 0, this implies that  $f_1$  evaluated on those 5-tuples vanishes, and  $h_2((x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_4, y_4)) = 0$  is well defined. The case when the condition  $y_i = y_j$  is satisfied for different pairs of indices is treated symmetrically. Finally, suppose that  $\{i, j, k, \ell\} = \{i', j', k', \ell'\} = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$  with  $x_i = x_j$  and  $y_{i'} = y_{j'}$ . Then we have both

$$\#\{x_1, \dots, x_4\} \leq 3 \quad \text{and} \quad \#\{y_1, \dots, y_4\} \leq 3.$$

In particular, both  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  are at most equal to 3 when evaluated on the 5-tuples appearing in the definition of  $h_2$ . Since by Step 1,  $f_1$  vanishes on those 5-tuples, we obtain, in this case also, that  $h_2((x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_4, y_4)) = 0$  is well defined. Observe furthermore that  $h_2$  belongs to  $C_b^3(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$  because  $f_1$  belongs to  $C_b^4(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$ .

**Step 2.** Set  $f_2 = f_1 - \delta h_2 \in C_b^4(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$ . If  $\underline{z} \in (S^1 \times S^1)^5$  satisfies  $n_1(\underline{z}) + n_2(\underline{z}) \leq 7$ , then  $f_2(\underline{z}) = 0$ .

*Proof.* By Step 0,  $f_2(\underline{z}) = 0$  whenever  $n_1(\underline{z}) \leq 2$  or  $n_2(\underline{z}) \leq 2$ . If  $n_1(\underline{z}) = n_2(\underline{z}) = 3$ , then  $f_1(\underline{z}) = 0$  by Step 1. Furthermore, in this case  $\delta h_2(\underline{z})$  is also equal to 0 since all the 5-tuples  $\underline{z}'$  evaluated on by  $f_1$  in the definition of  $h_2(\widehat{z}^i)$ , where  $\widehat{z}^i$  denotes the 4-tuple obtained from  $\underline{z}$  by removing its  $i$ -th coordinate, for  $0 \leq i \leq 4$ , satisfy  $n_1(\underline{z}') = n_2(\underline{z}') = 3$ . Thus,  $f_2$  vanishes in this case also. By symmetry, it now remains to treat the case  $n_1(\underline{z}) = 3, n_2(\underline{z}) = 4$ .

Up to permutation, we have two possibilities for the first factor:

- (1)  $x_0 = x_1 = x_2 \neq x_3 \neq x_4$ ,
- (2)  $x_0 = x_1 \neq x_2 = x_3 \neq x_4$ .

- (1) In the first case, we then have, again up to permutation, three options for the second factor:

(a)  $y_0 = y_1$ : Trivially,  $f_2(\underline{z}) = 0$  since the two first coordinates of  $\underline{z}$  are equal.

(b)  $y_0 = y_4$ : We consider two subcases:

- $\langle y_0, y_3 \rangle \cap \langle y_1, y_2 \rangle \neq \emptyset$ : By Lemma 9, there exists an orientation preserving isometry  $h$  of  $\mathbb{H}^2$  exchanging  $y_0$  with  $y_3$  and  $y_1$  with  $y_2$ . Furthermore, there exists an orientation reversing isometry  $g$  of  $\mathbb{H}^2$  with  $gx_0 = x_0, gx_3 = x_4$  and  $gx_4 = x_3$ . Since  $f_2$  is alternating and  $H$ -invariant, we get on the one hand, applying the even permutation (1 2)(3 4) and the action by  $(g, h)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & f_2((x_0, y_0), (x_0, y_1), (x_0, y_2), (x_3, y_3), (x_4, y_0)) \\ &= f_2((x_0, y_0), (x_0, y_2), (x_0, y_1), (x_4, y_0), (x_3, y_3)) \\ &= -f_2((gx_0, hy_0), (gx_0, hy_2), (gx_0, hy_1), (gx_4, hy_0), (gx_3, hy_3)) \\ &= -f_2((x_0, y_3), (x_0, y_1), (x_0, y_2), (x_3, y_3), (x_4, y_0)). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

On the other hand, apply the cocycle relation of  $f_2$  to the 6-tuple

$$\underline{w} = ((x_0, y_3), (x_0, y_0), (x_0, y_1), (x_0, y_2), (x_3, y_3), (x_4, y_0)).$$

If one removes the 3-rd or the 4-th variable of  $\underline{w}$ , then the remaining 5-tuple has  $n_1 = n_2 = 3$  and thus  $f_2$  vanishes on it. If one removes the 5-th or the 6-th variable of  $\underline{w}$ , then the remaining 5-tuple has  $n_1 = 2$  and here also  $f_2$  vanishes on it. The cocycle relation  $\delta f_2(\underline{w})$  hence simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} & f_2((x_0, y_0), (x_0, y_1), (x_0, y_2), (x_3, y_3), (x_4, y_0)) \\ &= f_2((x_0, y_3), (x_0, y_1), (x_0, y_2), (x_3, y_3), (x_4, y_0)). \end{aligned}$$

Together with (6), this shows that  $f_2$  vanishes on 5-tuples of the form  $((x_0, y_0), (x_0, y_1), (x_0, y_2), (x_3, y_3), (x_4, y_0))$ .

- $\langle y_0, y_3 \rangle \cap \langle y_1, y_2 \rangle = \emptyset$ : By Lemma 9, there exists an orientation reversing isometry  $h$  of  $\mathbb{H}^2$  exchanging  $y_0$  with  $y_3$  and  $y_1$  with  $y_2$ . As above, there exists an orientation reversing isometry  $g$  of  $\mathbb{H}^2$  with  $gx_0 = x_0, gx_3 = x_4$  and  $gx_4 = x_3$ . Since  $f_1$  is alternating and  $H$ -invariant, we get, applying the even permutation (1 2)(3 4) and the action by  $(g, h)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & f_1((x_0, y_0), (x_0, y_1), (x_0, y_2), (x_3, y_3), (x_4, y_0)) \\ &= f_1((x_0, y_0), (x_0, y_2), (x_0, y_1), (x_4, y_0), (x_3, y_3)) \\ &= f_1((gx_0, hy_0), (gx_0, hy_2), (gx_0, hy_1), (gx_4, hy_0), (gx_3, hy_3)) \\ &= f_1((x_0, y_3), (x_0, y_1), (x_0, y_2), (x_3, y_3), (x_4, y_0)). \end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta h_2((x_0, y_0), (x_0, y_1), (x_0, y_2), (x_3, y_3), (x_4, y_0)) \\ &= h_2((x_0, y_1), (x_0, y_2), (x_3, y_3), (x_4, y_0)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} [f_1((x_0, y_3), (x_0, y_1), (x_0, y_2), (x_3, y_3), (x_4, y_0)) \\ &\quad + f_1((x_0, y_0), (x_0, y_1), (x_0, y_2), (x_3, y_3), (x_4, y_0))] \\ &= f_1((x_0, y_0), (x_0, y_1), (x_0, y_2), (x_3, y_3), (x_4, y_0)), \end{aligned}$$

and hence  $f_2$  vanishes on this 5-tuple.

(c)  $y_3 = y_4$ : Our 5-tuple  $\underline{z}$  has the form

$$\underline{z} = ((x_0, y_0), (x_0, y_1), (x_0, y_2), (x_3, y_3), (x_4, y_3)).$$

Set

$$\underline{w} = (\underline{z}, (x_0, y_3)).$$

The cocycle relation  $\delta f_2(\underline{w}) = 0$  gives

$$f_2(\underline{z}) = \sum_{i=0}^4 (-1)^i f_2(\widehat{w}^i),$$

where  $\widehat{w}^i$  denotes the 5-tuple obtained from  $\underline{w}$  by removing its  $i$ -th coordinate, for  $0 \leq i \leq 4$ . But  $f_2(\widehat{w}^i) = 0$  for  $i = 0, 1, 2$ , since in this case  $n_1(\widehat{w}^i) = n_2(\widehat{w}^i) = 3$ , and for  $i = 3, 4$ , since then  $n_1(\widehat{w}^i) = 2$ . In particular,  $f_2(\underline{z}) = 0$ .

(2) In the second case, we have up to permutation, three options for the second factor:

(a)  $y_0 = y_1$ : Again, trivially,  $f_2(\underline{z}) = 0$ .

(b)  $y_0 = y_4$ : Our 5-tuple  $\underline{z}$  has the form

$$\underline{z} = ((x_0, y_0), (x_0, y_1), (x_2, y_2), (x_2, y_3), (x_4, y_0)).$$

Set

$$\underline{w} = (\underline{z}, (x_2, y_0)).$$

The cocycle relation  $\delta f_2(\underline{w}) = 0$  gives

$$f_2(\underline{z}) = \sum_{i=0}^4 (-1)^i f_2(\widehat{w}^i).$$

But  $f_2(\widehat{w}^i) = 0$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , since in this case  $n_1(\widehat{w}^i) = n_2(\widehat{w}^i) = 3$ , and for  $i = 4$ , since then  $n_1(\widehat{w}^i) = 2$ . Finally, for  $i = 0$ , we have  $(n_1(\widehat{w}^i), n_2(\widehat{w}^i)) = (3, 4)$ , but  $\widehat{w}^i$  is of the form treated in (1) since its first coordinates consists of the 5-tuple  $(x_0, x_2, x_2, x_4, x_2)$  and hence vanishes when evaluated on  $f_2$ . It follows that  $f_2(\underline{z}) = 0$ .

(c)  $y_0 = y_2$ : Our 5-tuple  $\underline{z}$  has the form

$$\underline{z} = ((x_0, y_0), (x_0, y_1), (x_2, y_0), (x_2, y_3), (x_4, y_4)).$$

Set

$$\underline{w} = (\underline{z}, (x_2, y_4)).$$

The cocycle relation  $\delta f_2(\underline{w}) = 0$  gives

$$f_2(\underline{z}) = \sum_{i=0}^4 (-1)^i f_2(\widehat{w}^i).$$

We see that: for  $i = 1, 3$ ,  $n_1(\widehat{w}^i) = n_2(\widehat{w}^i) = 3$ ; for  $i = 4$ ,  $n_1(\widehat{w}^i) = 2$ ; for  $i = 0$ ,  $(n_1(\widehat{w}^i), n_2(\widehat{w}^i)) = (3, 4)$ , but  $\widehat{w}^i$  is of the form treated in (1)



since its first coordinates consists of the 5-tuple  $(x_0, x_2, x_2, x_4, x_2)$ ; for  $i = 2$ , again  $(n_1(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i), n_2(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i)) = (3, 4)$ , but

$$\widehat{\underline{w}}^0 = ((x_0, y_0), (x_0, y_1), (x_2, y_3), (x_4, y_4), (x_2, y_4))$$

is of the form treated in (2b). In all those cases, we thus obtain  $f_2(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i) = 0$  and hence  $f_2(\underline{z}) = 0$ .

□

Define  $h_3 : (S^1 \times S^1)^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as

$$h_3((x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_4, y_4)) = \frac{1}{12} \sum_{i,j=1}^4 f_2((x_i, y_j), (x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_4, y_4)).$$

Observe furthermore that  $h_3$  belongs to  $C_b^3(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$  because  $f_2$  belongs to  $C_b^4(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$ .

**Step 3.** Set  $f_3 = f_2 - \delta h_3 \in C_b^4(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$ . For any  $\underline{z} \in (S^1 \times S^1)^5$ , we have  $f_3(\underline{z}) = 0$ .

*Proof.* We start with a preliminary computation.

**Claim 12.** For any  $((x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_4, y_4))$  in  $(S^1 \times S^1)^4$  and any  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 4$  and  $1 \leq i' \neq j' \leq 4$ , we have

$$f_2((x_i, y_j), (x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_4, y_4)) = f_2((x_{i'}, y_{j'}), (x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_4, y_4)).$$

*Proof of Claim.* By symmetry, if we prove the claim for  $i = i'$ , then it is also proven for  $j = j'$ . Furthermore, the general case then follows since if  $i \neq j'$ , we can go from  $(i, j)$  to  $(i, j')$  and then to  $(i', j')$ , and similarly if  $i' \neq j$ . Finally, if  $i = j'$  and  $i' = j$ , there exists  $k \neq i, j$  so that we can go from  $(i, j)$  to  $(i, k)$  to  $(i', k)$  and to  $(i', j')$ . Thus, it is now enough to prove the claim for  $i = i'$ .

Consider the 6-tuple

$$\underline{z} = ((x_i, y_j), (x_{i'}, y_{j'}), (x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_4, y_4)).$$

From the cocycle relation  $\delta f_2(\underline{z})$  we see that the claim would follow from the equality

$$0 = \sum_{k=1}^4 (-1)^k f_2((x_i, y_j), (x_{i'}, y_{j'}), (x_1, y_1), \dots, \widehat{(x_k, y_k)}, \dots, (x_4, y_4)). \quad (7)$$

But  $n_1$  evaluated on those 5-tuple is smaller or equal to 4 when  $k = i$  and to 3 otherwise, while  $n_2$  is smaller or equal to 4 when  $k = j$  or  $j'$  and to 3 otherwise. Because  $k$  can not simultaneously be equal to  $i$  and  $j$  or  $j'$  it follows that  $n_1 + n_2 \leq 7$  on all of the 5-tuples appearing in (7), so that, by Step 2, each of the summand in (7) is equal to 0. □

Note that it follows that

$$h_3((x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_4, y_4)) = f_2((x_i, y_j), (x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_4, y_4)), \quad (8)$$

for any  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 4$ .

Observe that by Step 2, both  $f_2$  and  $\delta h_3$  vanish on 5-tuples  $\underline{z}$  satisfying  $n_1(\underline{z}) + n_2(\underline{z}) \leq 7$ , so that the same holds for  $f_3$ . We now will prove step by step, that  $f_3$  also vanishes on 5-tuples  $\underline{z}$  with  $(n_1(\underline{z}), n_2(\underline{z})) = (3, 5), (4, 4), (4, 5)$  and  $(5, 5)$ . In all but one subcase, the strategy is the same as in most of the proof of Step 2: 1) Start with an arbitrary 5-tuple with given  $(n_1(\underline{z}), n_2(\underline{z}))$ . 2) Apply the cocycle relation

$\delta f_3 = 0$  to an appropriately chosen 6-tuple  $\underline{w} = (\underline{z}, (x, y))$ , for  $(x, y)$  in  $S^1 \times S^1$ , so that

$$f_3(\underline{z}) = \sum_{i=0}^4 (-1)^i f_3(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i),$$

where  $\widehat{\underline{w}}^i$  denotes, for  $0 \leq i \leq 5$ , the 5-tuple obtained from  $\underline{w}$  by removing its  $i$ -th coordinate. (In particular,  $\widehat{\underline{w}}^5 = \underline{z}$ .) 3) Show that  $f_3(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i) = 0$  for  $0 \leq i \leq 4$ .

**(3,5):** Let  $\underline{z}$  be a 5-tuple with  $n_1(\underline{z}) = 3$  and  $n_2(\underline{z}) = 5$ . We distinguish two subcases:

- The 5-tuple  $\underline{z}$  has, up to permutation, the form

$$\underline{z} = ((x_0, y_0), (x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), (x_2, y_3), (x_2, y_4)).$$

Set

$$\underline{w} = (\underline{z}, (x_2, y_0)).$$

We have  $f_3(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i) = 0$  for  $i = 0, 1$  because  $n_1(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i) = 2$ , and for  $i = 2, 3, 4$  because  $n_1(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i) + n_2(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i) = 3 + 4$ .

- The 5-tuple  $\underline{z}$  has, up to permutation, the form

$$\underline{z} = ((x_0, y_0), (x_0, y_1), (x_2, y_2), (x_2, y_3), (x_4, y_4)).$$

Set

$$\underline{w} = (\underline{z}, (x_0, y_4)).$$

We have  $n_1(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i) = 3$  for  $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$  and  $n_1(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i) = 2$  for  $i = 4$ . Also,  $n_2(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i) = 4$  for  $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$  and  $n_2(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i) = 5$  for  $i = 4$ . In any case,  $n_1(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i) + n_2(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i) = 7$  so that  $f_3(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i) = 0$  for every  $i$ .

Note that it follows that  $f_3(\underline{z}) = 0$  whenever  $n_1(\underline{z}) = 3$  or  $n_2(\underline{z}) = 3$ .

**(4,4):** We distinguish two subcases:

- The 5-tuple  $\underline{z}$  has, up to permutation, the form

$$\underline{z} = ((x_1, y_2), (x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_4, y_4)).$$

In this case we have

$$\delta h_3(\underline{z}) = h_3((x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_4, y_4)) = f_2(\underline{z}),$$

where the last equality follows from (8). In particular,  $f_3(\underline{z}) = f_2(\underline{z}) - \delta h_3(\underline{z}) = 0$ , as desired.

- The 5-tuple  $\underline{z}$  has, up to permutation, the form

$$\underline{z} = ((x_0, y_0), (x_0, y_1), (x_2, y_2), (x_3, y_2), (x_4, y_4)).$$

Set

$$\underline{w} = (\underline{z}, (x_0, y_2)).$$

We have  $f_3(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i) = 0$  for  $i = 0, 1$  because  $n_2(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i) = 3$ , and for  $i = 2, 3, 4$  because  $n_1(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i) = 3$ .

**(4,5):** We can assume that  $\underline{z}$  has the form

$$\underline{z} = ((x_0, y_0), (x_0, y_1), (x_2, y_2), (x_3, y_3), (x_4, y_4)).$$

Set

$$\underline{w} = (\underline{z}, (x_3, y_4)).$$

We have  $f_3(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i) = 0$  for  $i = 0, 1, 3$  because  $n_1(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i) = n_2(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i) = 4$ , and for  $i = 2, 4$  because  $n_1(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i) = 3$ .

**(5,5):** Let finally  $\underline{z}$  be a generic 5-tuple. Set

$$\underline{w} = (\underline{z}, (x_3, y_4)).$$

We have  $f_3(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i) = 0$  for  $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$  because  $n_2(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i) = 4$ , and for  $i = 4$  because  $n_1(\widehat{\underline{w}}^i) = 4$ .

□

**In conclusion**, the arbitrary cocycle  $f \in C_b^4(S^1 \times S^1, \widetilde{\mathbb{R}})^H$  satisfying  $c([f]) = 0$  we started with is a coboundary since

$$f = f_1 + \delta h_1 = f_2 + \delta h_2 + \delta h_1 = f_3 + \delta h_3 + \delta h_2 + \delta h_1 = \delta(h_1 + h_2 + h_3),$$

and Theorem 6 is hence proven.

## REFERENCES

- [BoWa00] A. Borel, N. Wallach. *Continuous cohomology, discrete subgroups, and representations of reductive groups*. Second edition. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 67. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000.
- [Bo&al04] L. Bowen, J. A. De Loera, M. Develin, F. Santos, *The Gromov norm of the product of two surfaces*, *Topology* 44 (2005), 321-339.
- [Bu06] M. Bucher-Karlsson. *The proportionality constant for the simplicial volume of locally symmetric spaces*. To appear in *Colloq. Math.*
- [Bu07] M. Bucher-Karlsson. *On minimal triangulations of products of convex polygons*. Preprint (2007).
- [Du76] J.L. Dupont, *Simplicial de Rham cohomology and characteristic classes of flat bundles*. *Topology* 15 (1976), no. 3, 233–245.
- [Gr82] M. Gromov. *Volume and bounded cohomology*, *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* No. 56, (1982), 5–99 (1983).
- [Gui80] A. Guichardet. *Cohomologie des groupes topologiques et des algèbres de Lie*. Textes Mathématiques, 2. CEDIC, Paris, 1980.
- [Hi56] F. Hirzebruch, *Automorphe Formen und der Satz von Riemann-Roch*, in *Symp. Intern. Top. Alg.* 1956, 129-144, Universidad de Mexico 1958.
- [IvTu82] N.V. Ivanov, V.G. Turaev, *A canonical cocycle for the Euler class of a flat vector bundle*. *Soviet Math. Dokl.* Vol. 26 (1982), No. 1, 78-81.
- [Lo05] C. Löh-Strohm. *The proportionality principle of simplicial volume*. Diploma Thesis, Münster University (2005).
- [LoSa07] C. Löh, R. Sauer, *Simplicial volume of Hilbert modular varieties*, arXiv:math/0706.3904v2.
- [Mi58] J. Milnor, *On the existence of a connection with curvature zero*. *Comment. Math. Helv.* 32, 1958, 215-223.
- [Mo01] N. Monod. *Continuous bounded cohomology of locally compact groups*. *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, 1758. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.
- [Th78] W. Thurston. *Geometry and topology of 3-manifolds*, *Lecture Notes*, Princeton (1978).

MATH. DEPT, KTH, SE-100 44 STOCKHOLM

*E-mail address*: mickar@math.kth.se

*URL*: <http://www.math.kth.se/~mickar/>