

0.1 Homotopic maps induce the same map in cohomology

Let $f, g : M \rightarrow N$ be smooth maps between smooth manifolds. A (smooth) *homotopy* between f and g is a smooth map $F : M \times [0, 1] \rightarrow N$ such that

$$\begin{cases} F(p, 0) = f(p) \\ F(p, 1) = g(p) \end{cases}$$

for $p \in M$. If there exists a homotopy between f and g , we say that they f and g are *homotopic*.

0.1.1 Proposition *Let f, g be homotopic maps. Then the induced maps in cohomology*

$$f^*, g^* : H_{\text{dR}}^k(N) \rightarrow H_{\text{dR}}^k(M)$$

are equal.

The proof of this proposition is given below. First, we need to make some remarks. For $t \in [0, 1]$, consider the inclusions i_t given by

$$i_t(p) = (p, t)$$

for $p \in M$, and consider the natural projection $\pi : M \times [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ given by $\pi(p, t) = p$. Then, obviously,

$$\pi \circ i_t = \text{id}_M$$

implying that

$$i_t^* \pi^* = \text{id} \quad \text{in } \Omega^k(M) \text{ and } H_{\text{dR}}^k(M).$$

We consider the projection $t : M \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$. Then there exists a “vertical” vector field $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ and a 1-form dt . Note that $\ker d\pi$ is spanned by $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$.

0.1.2 Lemma *Let $\omega \in \Omega^k(M \times [0, 1])$. Then we can write*

$$(0.1.3) \quad \omega = \zeta + dt \wedge \eta$$

where $\zeta \in \Omega^k(M \times [0, 1])$ has the property that it vanishes if some of its arguments belongs to $\ker d\pi$, and $\eta \in \Omega^{k-1}(M \times [0, 1])$ has the same property.

Proof. Set $\eta = i_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t}} \omega$ and $\zeta = \omega - dt \wedge \eta$. Since

$$i_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t}} \eta = i_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t}} i_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t}} \omega = 0,$$

it is clear that η has the claimed property. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} i_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t}} \zeta &= i_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t}} \omega - i_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t}} (dt \wedge \eta) \\ &= \eta - i_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t}} dt \wedge \eta + dt \wedge i_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t}} \eta \\ &= \eta - \eta + 0 \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

We define the homotopy operator

$$H_k : \Omega^k(M \times [0, 1]) \rightarrow \Omega^{k-1}(M)$$

by the formula

$$(H_k \omega)_p(v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}) = \int_0^1 \eta_{(p,t)}(di_t(v_1), \dots, di_t(v_{k-1})) dt,$$

where ω is decomposed as in (0.1.3) and $p \in M$, $v_1, \dots, v_{k-1} \in T_p M$. Note that H_k is “integration along the fiber of π ”. For simplicity, we henceforth drop the subscript and just write H for the homotopy operator.

Proof of Propostion 0.1.1. Let $\omega \in H_{\text{dR}}^k(M \times [0, 1])$. We first claim that

$$(0.1.4) \quad dH\omega + Hd\omega = i_1^* \omega - i_0^* \omega.$$

The proof is by direct computation: since this is a pointwise identity, we can work in a coordinate system. Let (U, x_1, \dots, x_n) be a coordinate system in M . Then $(U \times [0, 1], x_1 \circ \pi, \dots, x_n \circ \pi, t)$ is a coordinate system in $M \times [0, 1]$ and we can write

$$\omega|_{U \times [0,1]} = \sum_I a_I dx_I + dt \wedge \sum_J b_J dx_J$$

where a_i, b_J are smooth functions on $U \times [0, 1]$ and I, J are increasing multi-indices. In $U \times [0, 1]$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} H\omega &= \sum_J \left(\int_0^1 b_J dt \right) dx_J, \\ dH\omega &= \sum_{J,i} \left(\int_0^1 \frac{\partial b_J}{\partial x_i} dt \right) dx_i \wedge dx_J, \\ d\omega &= \sum_{I,i} \frac{\partial a_I}{\partial x_i} dx_i \wedge dx_I + \sum_I \frac{\partial a_I}{\partial t} dt \wedge dx_I - dt \wedge \sum_{J,i} \frac{\partial b_J}{\partial x_i} dx_i \wedge dx_J, \\ Hd\omega &= \sum_I \left(\int_0^1 \frac{\partial a_I}{\partial t} dt \right) dx_I - \sum_{J,i} \left(\int_0^1 \frac{\partial b_J}{\partial x_i} dt \right) dx_i \wedge dx_J. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} dH\omega + Hd\omega|_p &= \sum_I \left(\int_0^1 \frac{\partial a_I}{\partial t}(p, t) dt \right) dx_I \\ &= \sum_I (a_I(p, 1) - a_I(p, 0)) dx_I \\ &= i_1^* \omega - i_0^* \omega|_p, \end{aligned}$$

as claimed.

Suppose now that $F : M \times [0, 1] \rightarrow N$ is a homotopy between f and g . Let α be a closed k -form in N representing the cohomology class $[\alpha] \in H_{\text{dR}}^k(N)$. Applying identity (0.1.4) to $\omega = F^* \alpha$ yields

$$dHF^* \alpha + HF^* d\alpha = i_1^* F^* \alpha - i_0^* F^* \alpha.$$

Since $d\alpha = 0$ and $F \circ i_0 = f$, $F \circ i_1 = g$, we get

$$d(HF^* \alpha) = g^* \alpha - f^* \alpha.$$

Hence $g^* \alpha$ and $f^* \alpha$ are cohomologous. □

0.2 Hairy ball theorem

Consider Euclidean space \mathbf{R}^{n+1} with coordinates (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n) and the unit sphere $\iota : S^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$. Consider the n -form in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}

$$\omega = \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^i x_i dx_0 \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{dx_i} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_n.$$

Note that ω vanishes only at the origin. In particular,

$$(0.2.1) \quad \alpha = \iota^* \omega = \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^i (x_i \circ \iota) d(x_0 \circ \iota) \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{d(x_i \circ \iota)} \wedge \cdots \wedge d(x_n \circ \iota)$$

is a nowhere vanishing n -form on S^n , hence it defines an orientation there. Of course,

$$d\omega = (n+1)dx_0 \wedge dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_n$$

and

$$\int_{S^n} \alpha = \int_{S^n} \omega = \int_{\bar{B}^n} d\omega = (n+1)\text{vol}(\bar{B}^n) > 0$$

(where the orientation of S^n is induced from \bar{B}^n) so α is not exact by Stokes theorem. Thus $[\alpha] \neq 0$ in $H_{\text{dR}}^n(S^n)$.

In the sequel, we consider $n = 2m$.

0.2.2 Theorem *Let X be a smooth vector field on S^{2m} . Then there exists $p \in S^{2m}$ such that $X_p = 0$. In other words, every smooth vector field on an even-dimensional sphere has a zero.*

Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that X never vanishes. By rescaling, we may assume that X is a unit vector field with respect to the metric induced from Euclidean space. Set

$$F_t : S^{2m} \rightarrow S^{2m}, \quad F_t(p) = \cos t x + \sin t X(p).$$

It is clear that F_t defines a homotopy between the identity map and the antipodal map of S^{2m} :

$$F_0 = \text{id}_{S^{2m}} \quad \text{and} \quad F_\pi = -\text{id}_{S^{2m}}.$$

Note that

$$F_\pi^*(x_i \circ \iota) = -x_i \circ \iota.$$

It follows that

$$F_\pi^* \alpha = (-1)^{2m+1} \alpha = -\alpha.$$

On the other hand,

$$F_0^* \alpha = \alpha,$$

and by Proposition 0.1.1, $[F_0^* \alpha] = [F_\pi^* \alpha]$, which contradicts the fact that $[\alpha] \neq 0$. \square

0.2.3 Remark The theorem can be extended to the case of continuous vector fields by using an approximation result.

0.3 The smooth Brouwer fixed point theorem

Let \bar{B}^n be the closed ball in \mathbf{R}^n , and denote its boundary by $\partial\bar{B}^n$; of course, $\partial\bar{B}^n$ is diffeomorphic to S^{n-1} . We first prove

0.3.1 Lemma *There exists no smooth retraction $r : \bar{B}^n \rightarrow \partial\bar{B}^n$ (that is, there exists no smooth map $r : \bar{B}^n \rightarrow \partial\bar{B}^n$ whose restriction to $\partial\bar{B}^n$ is the identity).*

Proof. The case $n = 1$ is easy as the closed interval \bar{B}^1 is connected and its boundary is disconnected. Assume $n \geq 2$ and suppose, to the contrary, that such a retraction r exists. Recall that n -form α defined in (0.2.1). Since r is the identity along $\partial\bar{B}^n$,

$$\int_{\partial\bar{B}^n} r^*\alpha = \int_{\partial\bar{B}^n} \alpha \neq 0.$$

On the other hand, by Stokes theorem,

$$\int_{\partial\bar{B}^n} r^*\alpha = \int_{\bar{B}^n} dr^*\alpha = \int_{\bar{B}^n} r^*d\alpha = 0,$$

since $d\alpha = 0$, which is a contradiction. □

0.3.2 Theorem *Let $f : \bar{B}^n \rightarrow \bar{B}^n$ be a smooth map. Then there exists $p \in \bar{B}^n$ such that $f(p) = p$. In other words, every smooth self-map of the closed n -ball admits a fixed point.*

Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that $f(x) \neq x$ for all $x \in \bar{B}^n$. The half-line originating at x and going through $f(x)$ meets $\partial\bar{B}^n$ at a unique point; call it $r(x)$. It is easy to see that this defines a smooth retraction $r : \bar{B}^n \rightarrow \partial\bar{B}^n$ which is prohibited by Lemma 0.3.1. □

0.3.3 Remark The theorem is not true in the case of the open ball B^n , as is easily seen.