## Vector fields, derivations

## Exercise 1.

Lemma. Let $M$ be a a smooth manifold. Then there exists a smooth proper function $g: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Let $\left(U_{i}, \varphi_{i}\right)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ ba a partition of unity subordinate to a locally finite open cover $\left(U_{i}\right)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then $g=\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} i \varphi_{i}$ is a solution.

Let $X$ be a vector field on $M$ and $g \in \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(M ; \mathbb{R})$ be a smooth and proper function. Define

$$
\begin{aligned}
f: & M
\end{aligned} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}, ~=e^{-(\mathrm{d} g(x) \cdot X(x))^{2}}
$$

or, in short, $f=\exp \left(-(X \cdot g)^{2}\right)$. It is a positive function. Let $Y=f X$. Then

$$
Y \cdot g=(f X) \cdot g=f(X \cdot g)=e^{-(X \cdot g)^{2}}(X \cdot g)
$$

so that $|(Y \cdot g)(x)|=\left|e^{-(X \cdot g)^{2}(x)}(X \cdot g)(x)\right| \leqslant 1$ (since $y \mapsto y e^{-y^{2}}$ is bounded by 1 ). Let $\gamma$ be an integral curve of $Y$, defined on a bounded interval $(a, b)$ containing 0 . Then $g \circ \gamma$ is smooth on $(a, b)$ and

$$
\forall t \in(a, b), \quad \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{~d} t}(g \circ \gamma)(t)=\mathrm{d} g(\gamma(t)) \cdot \gamma^{\prime}(t)=\mathrm{d} g(\gamma(t)) \cdot Y(\gamma(t))=(Y \cdot g)(\gamma(t))
$$

and it follows that $\left|\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d} t}(g \circ \gamma)\right| \leqslant 1$ on $(a, b)$. Integrating this last inequality shows that $g \circ \gamma$ is bounded on $(a, b)$, and since $g$ is proper, so is $\gamma((a, b))$ is relatively compact in $M$.

From TD4, exercise 3, (which is also a Lemma taught in the lectures) $(a, b)$ cannot be the maximal interval of definition of $\gamma$. It follows that $Y$ is complete.

Remark. The integral curves of $Y$ and $X$ have the same image in $M$. The only difference is that $Y$ has been reduced small enough so that it takes an infinite time for its integral curves to achieve points that are achieved in finite time by the integral curves of $X$.

## Exercise 2.

1. (a) The map

$$
\begin{array}{r|rll}
f: & \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} & \longrightarrow & M \times M \\
& (s, t) & \longmapsto & \left(\varphi^{-1}(s), \psi^{-1}(t)\right)
\end{array}
$$

is continuous, and $\Delta=\{(x, x) \in M \times M \mid x \in M\}$ is closed sinde $M$ is Hausdorff. It follows that $\Gamma=f^{-1}(\Delta)$ is closed in $\mathbb{R}^{2}$.
(b) Let $(s, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{2}$. Then

$$
(s, t) \in \Gamma \Longleftrightarrow \varphi^{-1}(s)=\psi^{-1}(t) \Longleftrightarrow t=\left(\psi \circ \varphi^{-1}\right)(s)
$$

so that $\Gamma$ is the graph of $\psi \circ \varphi^{-1}$.
(c) Since $\left.\psi \circ \varphi^{-1}\right|_{I}$ is a diffeomorphism onto its image and since $I$ is an interval, $\psi \circ \varphi^{-1}$ is monotonous. It follows that it has a limit when $s \rightarrow a$. If this limit were a real number, then its graph $\Gamma$ would not be closed, in contradiction with 1.(b). It follows that $\lim _{s \rightarrow a} \psi \circ \varphi^{-1}(s)= \pm \infty$.

Suppose by contradiction that $\varphi(U \cap V)$ has at least three connected components. Then one of them is of the form $(a, b)$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. It follows that $\left.\psi \circ \varphi^{-1}\right|_{(a, b)}$ diverges to infinity at the limit points $a$ and $b$, and it realizes a homeomorphism from $(a, b)$ onto $\mathbb{R}$. But as $\psi \circ \varphi^{-1}$ is injective, $\varphi(U \cap V)$ cannot take any value on the other connected components, which is a contradiction.
(d) If $\varphi(U \cap V)$ has one connected components, then $\psi \circ \varphi^{-1}$ is monotonous so that its derivative has constant sign.
If $\varphi(U \cap V)$ has two connected components, then $\varphi(U \cap V)=I_{1} \cup I_{2}$ with $I_{1}$ and $I_{2}$ intervals and $-\infty<\sup I_{1}=a \leqslant b=\inf I_{2}<+\infty$, and $\psi \circ \varphi^{-1}$ is monotonous on both intervals. Since it has infinite limits at $a$ and $b$ and since it is injective, they cannot be equal. It follows that $\psi \circ \varphi^{-1}$ is either increasing on $I_{1}$ and $I_{2}$, or decreasing on $I_{1}$ and $I_{2}$ (sketch the situation), and $\left(\psi \circ \varphi^{-1}\right)^{\prime}$ has constant sign.
2. Define by induction $\sigma(0)=0$ and

$$
\sigma(n+1)=\min \left\{k \in \mathbb{N} \backslash\{\sigma(0), \ldots, \sigma(n)\} \mid U_{k} \cap\left(\bigcup_{j=0}^{n} U_{j}\right)\right\}
$$

It is well defined since $M$ is connected, so that $\left\{k \in \mathbb{N} \backslash\{\sigma(0), \ldots, \sigma(n)\} \mid U_{k} \cap\right.$ $\left.\left(\bigcup_{j=0}^{n} U_{j}\right)\right\}$ is non-empty. By construction, $\sigma$ is injective. The surjectivity is again a consequence of the connectedness of $M$ (exercise).
3. Let $\left(U_{i}, \psi_{i}\right)$ be a countable locally finite atlas, with $U_{i}$ connected, and up to reordering as in 2., assume that

$$
\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad U_{n+1} \cap\left(\bigcup_{j=0}^{n} U_{j}\right) \neq \varnothing
$$

By induction, define $\varphi_{0}=\psi_{0}$ and

$$
\varphi_{n+1}= \begin{cases}\psi_{n+1} & \text { if }\left(\psi^{n+1} \circ \varphi_{j}^{-1}\right)^{\prime}>0 \text { for } j \in\{0, \ldots, n\} \text { s.t } U_{j} \cap U_{n+1} \neq \varnothing \\ -\psi_{n+1} & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

Show that the two considered cases are the only one possible (exefcise). Then $\left(U_{i}, \varphi_{i}\right)$ satisfies the condition.

Let $\left(\theta_{i}\right)$ be a partition of unity subordinate to $\left(U_{i}, \varphi_{i}\right)$. Define

$$
\forall x \in U_{i}, \quad X_{i}(x)=\mathrm{d} \varphi_{i}(x)^{-1} \cdot 1
$$

then $X=\sum_{i} \theta_{i} X_{i}$ is a non-zero vector field on $M$. It follows that $M$ is parallelizable.
4. Let $X$ be a non-zero vector field on $M$. By Exercise 1. there exists $f>0$ such that $Y=f X$ is complete, and is non-zero.

Let $\left(\phi_{t}\right)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ be the flow of $Y$ : since $Y$ is complete, it is a one-parameter subgroup of $\operatorname{Diff}(M)$. It induces a smooth action by diffeomorphisms $\mathbb{R} \curvearrowright M$ defined by $t \cdot x=\phi_{t}(x)$. For $x \in M$, let $\mathcal{O}_{x}=\left\{\phi_{t}(x) \mid t \in \mathbb{R}\right\}$ be the orbit of $x$. First, note that $y=\phi_{t}(x) \Longleftrightarrow x=\phi_{-t}(y)$. In particular, $y \in \mathcal{O}_{x} \Longleftrightarrow x \in \mathcal{O}_{y}$, and it follows that if $x \in M$ is fixed,

$$
\begin{equation*}
M=\mathcal{O}_{x} \sqcup\left(\bigcup_{z \in M \backslash \mathcal{O}_{x}} \mathcal{O}_{z}\right) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let us show that any orbit is open. For $z \in M$, define $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ by $f(t)=\phi_{t}(z)$. Then for all $t, f^{\prime}(t)=\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d} t} \phi_{t}(z)=Y\left(\phi_{t}(z)\right) \neq 0$, and by the inverse function Theorem ( $M$ is 1-dimensional), its image is open. But $f(\mathbb{R})=\mathcal{O}_{z}$, which proves that any orbit is open. By equation (1), any orbit is also closed as the complementary of union of orbits. By connectedness of $M$, if $x \in M, M=\mathcal{O}_{x}$, and the action is transitive.

Fix $x \in M$ and let $G_{x}=\left\{t \in \mathbb{R} \mid \phi_{t}(x)=x\right\}$ be the isotropy subgroup of $x . G_{x}$ is a subgroup of $\mathbb{R}$, and since $G_{x}=h^{-1}(\{x\})$ with $h: t \mapsto \phi_{t}(x)$ continuous, $G_{x}$ is closed. It follows that either $G_{x}=\mathbb{R}$, or $G_{x}=\alpha \mathbb{Z}$ for some $a \geqslant 0$. The case $G_{x}=\mathbb{R}$ is impossible since $\mathbb{R} \curvearrowright M$ is transitive. Therefore, we have a surjective smooth map

$$
\mathbb{R} \longrightarrow M
$$

that descends to the quotient as a diffeomorphism

$$
\mathbb{R} / \alpha \mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{\sim} M
$$

If $\alpha=0$, then $M \simeq \mathbb{R}$. Otherwise, $M \simeq \mathbb{S}^{1}$.
Remark. For another proof, see Topology from the differentiable viewpoint, Milnor.

## Exercise 3.

Let $x \in U$ be fixed and $\varphi$ be a cut-off function with compact support in $U$ with $\varphi(x)=1$. Then

$$
\forall y \in M, \quad(f(y)-g(y)) \varphi(y)=0
$$

since either $y \in U$ and $f(y)=g(y)$, or $y \notin U$ and $\varphi(y)=0$. Hence, $(f-g) \varphi=0$ and since $D 0=0$, it follows that

$$
0=D((f-g) \varphi)=\varphi D(f-g)+(f-g) D \varphi
$$

Evaluating this last equality at $x$ yields

$$
0=D(f-g)(x)
$$

This being true for all $x \in U$, then $\left.(D(f-g))\right|_{U}=\left.(D f)\right|_{U}-\left.(D g)\right|_{U}=0$, and the proof is complete.

## Exercise 4.

Let $f$ and $g$ be smooth functions on $N$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\varphi_{*} D\right)(f \times g) & =D((f \times g) \circ \varphi) \circ \varphi^{-1} \\
& =D((f \circ \varphi) \times(g \circ \varphi)) \circ \varphi^{-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $D$ is a derivation of $\mathcal{C}^{\infty}(M ; \mathbb{R})$ and since $f \circ \varphi$ and $g \circ \varphi$ are smooth on $M$, it follows that

$$
D((f \circ \varphi) \times(g \circ \varphi))=(g \circ \varphi) D(f \circ \varphi)+(f \circ \varphi) D(g \circ \varphi)
$$

Thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\varphi_{*} D\right)(f g) & =((g \circ \varphi) D(f \circ \varphi)+(f \circ \varphi) D(g \circ \varphi)) \circ \varphi^{-1} \\
& =\left(g \circ \varphi \circ \varphi^{-1}\right) D(f \circ \varphi) \circ \varphi^{-1}+\left(f \circ \varphi \circ \varphi^{-1}\right) D(g \circ \varphi) \circ \varphi^{-1} \\
& =g(D(f \circ \varphi) \circ \varphi-1)+f\left(D(g \circ \varphi) \circ \varphi^{-1}\right) \\
& =g\left(\left(\varphi_{*} D\right) f\right)+f\left(\left(\varphi_{*} D\right) g\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

The result follows.

## Exercise 5.

Let $f$ and $g$ be smooth functions on $M$. Then

$$
\begin{array}{rlrl}
D \circ D^{\prime}(f g) & =D\left(g D^{\prime} f+g D^{\prime} g\right) & \text { by definition of } D^{\prime} \\
& =D\left(g D^{\prime} f\right)+D\left(f D^{\prime} g\right) & & \text { by linearity of } D \\
& =D^{\prime} f D g+g D\left(D^{\prime} f\right)+D^{\prime} g D f+f D\left(D^{\prime} g\right) & & \text { by definition of } D \\
& =g\left(D \circ D^{\prime}\right) f+f\left(D \circ D^{\prime}\right) g+D^{\prime} f D g+D f D^{\prime} g &
\end{array}
$$

It follows that $D \circ D^{\prime}(f, g)(x) \neq\left[g\left(D \circ D^{\prime}\right) f+f\left(D \circ D^{\prime}\right) g\right](x)$ as long as $D f(x), D^{\prime} f(x), D g(x)$ and $D^{\prime} g(x)$ are non-zero. But the same computations show that

$$
\left[D \circ D^{\prime}-D^{\prime} \circ D\right](f g)=g\left[D \circ D^{\prime}-D^{\prime} \circ D\right] f+f\left[D \circ D^{\prime}-D^{\prime} \circ D\right] g
$$

so that $D \circ D^{\prime}-D^{\prime} \circ D$ is a derivation of $\mathcal{C}^{\infty}(M ; \mathbb{R})$.

