

# Cheeger-Gromov Theory and Applications to General Relativity

Michael T. Anderson

- §1. Background: Examples and Definitions.
- §2. Convergence/Compactness.
- §3. Collapse/Formation of Cusps.
- §4. Applications to Static and Stationary Space-Times.
- §5. Lorentzian Analogues and Open Problems.
- §6. Future Asymptotics and Geometrization of 3-Manifolds.

## §1. Background: Examples and Definitions.

$\mathbf{M}$  = space of Riemannian metrics on a given manifold  $M$ ,  
a highly non-compact space.

Two **simple** sources of non-compactness:

- *Diffeomorphisms.*  $\mathcal{D} = \text{Diff}(M)$ , a non-compact group; acts properly on  $\mathbf{M}$ : if  $g \in \mathbf{M}$ ,  $\phi_i \in \mathcal{D}$ ,

$$\phi_i \rightarrow \infty \text{ in } \mathcal{D},$$

then

$$g_i = \phi_i^* g \rightarrow \infty \text{ in } \mathbf{M}.$$

All metrics  $g_i$  isometric — indistinguishable metrically.

Locally  $g_i$  just different local coordinate reps of fixed metric  $g$ .

Consider then moduli space

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathbf{M}/\mathcal{D}.$$

- *Scaling.* Given  $g \in \mathbf{M}$ ,  $\lambda > 0$ , let

$$g_\lambda = \lambda^2 \cdot g.$$

Distances all rescaled by factor of  $\lambda$ . Suppose  $M$  compact. If

$$\lambda \rightarrow \infty,$$

then  $(M, g_\lambda)$  becomes arbitrarily large:

$$\text{vol}_{g_\lambda} M \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{diam}_{g_\lambda} M \rightarrow \infty, \text{ etc.}$$

No limit metric on  $M$ .

Similarly, if

$$\lambda \rightarrow 0,$$

then  $(M, g_\lambda)$  becomes arbitrarily small:  $(M, g_\lambda) \rightarrow \{pt\}$  as metric spaces. Again, no limiting metric on  $M$ .

Can combine two divergent behaviors to obtain convergence.

Set  $g_\lambda = \lambda^2 \cdot g$  and suppose  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ . Fix  $p \in M$ , and for any fixed  $k > 0$ , let

$$B_p = B_p(k/\lambda) = \text{geodesic ball.}$$

Observe

$$\text{radius} = \begin{cases} k/\lambda \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } g \text{ metric} \\ k \text{ in } g_\lambda \text{ metric} \end{cases}$$

Choose chart  $\mathcal{U} = \{u_\alpha\}$  for  $B_p$ ,  $u_\alpha(p) = 0$ . Define

$$\phi_\lambda(x) = \lambda x.$$

Divergent family of diffeomorphisms. Set

$$u_\alpha^\lambda = \lambda u_\alpha = \phi_\lambda \circ u_\alpha.$$

Then have

$$g_\lambda(\partial/\partial u_\alpha^\lambda, \partial/\partial u_\beta^\lambda) = g(\partial/\partial u_\alpha, \partial/\partial u_\beta) = g_{\alpha\beta}.$$

As  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $B_p \rightarrow p$  and

$$g_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow g_{\alpha\beta}(p) = \text{const.}$$

But metrics  $g_\lambda$  defined on their intrinsic geodesic ball of radius  $k$ . Thus,

$$(M, \phi_\lambda^*(g_\lambda)) \rightarrow (T_p(M), g_0),$$

the flat metric on  $T_p(M)$  induced by  $g_p = g|_{T_p(M)}$ .

**“blowing up” process:**

restrict to smaller and smaller balls, and blow up to definite size.

The part of  $M$  at a definite  $g$ -distance to  $p$  escapes to infinity: not detected in the limit  $g_0$ . Thus,

attach base points to the blow-ups;

different base points may give rise to different limits, (although here all pointed limits are isometric).

**Penrose Limits:** analogous blow-up process for Lorentz metrics; non-isotropic blow-up in directions orthogonal to null geodesic. Limits are plane gravitational waves — non-flat.

If  $(M, g)$  complete and non-compact, do “blow-down”, with

$$\lambda \rightarrow 0:$$

geodesic balls, of large radius  $B_p(k/\lambda)$  rescaled down to fixed size  $k$ .

This useful in understanding the large scale or asymptotic behavior of the metric.

**Definition: Convergence of Metrics.** Let  $L^{k,p} = L^{k,p}(\Omega) =$  Sobolev space:  $k$  weak derivatives in  $L^p$ ,  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ .

A sequence of metrics  $g_i$  on manifolds  $M_i$  converges in  $L^{k,p}$  topology to limit metric  $g$  on manifold  $M$  if  $\exists$  charts  $\Phi = \{\phi_k\}$ , covering  $M$ , and diffeomorphisms  $F_i : M \rightarrow M_i$ , s.t.

$$(F_i^* g_i)_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow g_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (1.1)$$

in the  $L^{k,p}$  topology.

Same definition holds for convergence in the  $C^{k,\alpha}$  topology, as well as the weak  $L^{k,p}$  topology.

(Recall  $f_i \rightarrow f$  weakly in  $L^p(\Omega)$  iff  $\int f_i g \rightarrow \int f g$ ,  $\forall g \in L^q(\Omega)$ ,  $p^{-1} + q^{-1} = 1$ .)

To obtain local control on a metric, or sequence of metrics, assume  
**curvature bounds.**

Cheeger-Gromov theory requires a bound on the full Riemann curvature tensor

$$|Riem| \leq K, \quad (1.2)$$

for some  $K < \infty$ . Since  $\{\# \text{ components of Riem}\} \gg \{\# \text{ components of metric}\}$ , (in dimensions  $\geq 4$ ), this is overdetermined set of constraints on the metric and so overly restrictive.

Much more natural to impose bounds on the Ricci curvature

$$|Ric| \leq k. \quad (1.3)$$

Of course, bounds on Ricci natural in general relativity, via the Einstein equations. So emphasize (1.3) over (1.2) whenever possible.

Can view Cheeger-Gromov theory as generalization of Teichmüller theory to higher dimensions and variable curvature.

Teichmüller theory describes the moduli space  $\mathcal{M}_c$  of constant curvature metrics on surfaces. On closed surfaces, have a

### basic trichotomy

for behavior of sequences in  $\mathcal{M}_c$ , normalized to unit area:

- *Compactness/Convergence.* A sequence  $g_i \in \mathcal{M}_c$  has a subsequence converging to a limit  $g \in \mathcal{M}_c$ . Convergence is understood to be modulo diffeomorphisms. For instance this is always the case on  $S^2$ , since  $\mathcal{M}_c = \{pt\}$  on  $S^2$ .
- *Collapse.* The sequence  $g_i \in \mathcal{M}_c$  collapses everywhere, in that

$$inj_{g_i}(x) \rightarrow 0$$

at every  $x$ . Occurs only on torus  $T^2$ . Metrics become very long and very thin.

No limit metric on  $T^2$ . Choosing base points  $x_i$ , consider based sequences  $(T^2, g_i, x_i)$ ; limits are then the collapsed space  $(\mathbb{R}, g_\infty, x_\infty)$ .

- *Cusp Formation.* Mixture of the two previous cases. Occurs only for hyperbolic metrics, i.e. on surfaces  $\Sigma_g$  of genus  $g \geq 2$ .

Some based sequences  $(\Sigma_g, g_i, x_i) \rightarrow \text{limit } (\Sigma, g_\infty, x_\infty) = \text{complete non-compact hyperbolic surface of finite volume. Ends collapse.}$

Other based sequences  $(\Sigma, g_i, y_i)$  collapse — long thin annuli collapse to  $\mathbb{R}$ .

## §2. Convergence/Compactness.

**Issue:** (Pre)-compactness of a family of metrics on manifold  $M$ .

**Main Point.** Establish a lower bound on the radius of balls on which have apriori control of the metric in a given topology —  $C^{k,\alpha}$  or  $L^{k,p}$ .

Given such uniform local control, then usually easy to obtain global control, via suitable global assumptions on size of  $M$ : volume, diameter, etc. — Choice of scale.



To obtain local control, first important step: choose

“good gauge” = local coord. system for  $g$

Look at coordinates built from the geometry of the metric itself.

(i) geodesic normal coordinates

(ii) distance coordinates

Entail loss of derivatives: 2 or 1 resp.

Optimal choice:

(iii) harmonic coordinates

**Definition: harmonic radius**  $r_h$ . Fix a function topology, say  $L^{k,p}$  and a constant  $C > 1$ . Given  $x \in (M, g)$ , the  $L^{k,p}$  harmonic radius

$$r_h(x) = r_h^{k,p}(x)$$

= largest radius s.t. on ball  $B_x(r_h(x))$  have harmonic coordinate chart  $U = \{u_\alpha\}$  in which the metric  $g = g_{\alpha\beta}$  is controlled in  $L^{k,p}$  norm: thus,

$$C^{-1}\delta_{\alpha\beta} \leq g_{\alpha\beta} \leq C\delta_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (\text{as bilinear forms}), \quad (2.1)$$

$$[r_h(x)]^{kp-n} \int_{B_x(r_h(x))} |\partial^k g_{\alpha\beta}|^p dV \leq C. \quad (2.2)$$

$kp > n$ , so that  $L^{k,p} \subset C^0$ . Estimates are scale invariant, (rescale harmonic coordinates also), so  $r_h$  scales as a distance.

**Important fact:**

$r_h$  is continuous in (strong)  $L^{k,p}$  topology on  $\mathbf{M}$ .

Similar definition and properties for  $C^{k,\alpha}$  harmonic radii.

Suppose  $g_i$  is a sequence of metrics on a manifold  $M$  with a uniform lower bound on  $r_h$ ,

$$r_h(x, g_i) \geq r_0 > 0,$$

some fixed  $r_0$ .

On each  $r_0$ -ball, have then  $L^{k,p}$  control of  $(g_i)_{\alpha\beta}$  - in harmonic coords.

Banach-Alaoglu theorem: bounded sequences are weakly compact in Banach spaces. So, on each ball,

$$(g_i)_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow (g_\infty)_{\alpha\beta}$$

weakly in  $L^{2,p}$ .

Easy to see that harmonic charts for  $g_i \rightarrow$  harmonic chart for  $g_\infty$  weakly in  $L^{k+1,p}$ . Also, overlaps of charts are in  $L^{k+1,p}$ .

Thus get limit  $L^{k,p}$  metric  $g_\infty$ : convergence to limit is in weak  $L^{k,p}$  topology.

[Same type of arguments hold w.r.t  $C^{k,\alpha}$  topology, via the Arzela-Ascoli theorem; use  $C^{k,\alpha'}$ ,  $\alpha' < \alpha$ , in place of weak  $L^{k,p}$ .]

Thus, main issue to obtain convergence:

obtain lower bound on  $r_h$

under bounds on geometry. Next result is one typical example.

**Theorem 2.1 Convergence I.** *Let  $M$  be an  $n$ -manifold and let  $\mathcal{M}(\lambda, i_o, D)$  be the space of Riemannian metrics such that*

$$|\text{Ric}| \leq k, \quad \text{inj} \geq i_o, \quad \text{diam} \leq D. \quad (2.3)$$

*Then  $\mathcal{M}(\lambda, i_o, D)$  is precompact in the  $C^{1,\alpha}$  and weak  $L^{2,p}$  topologies, any  $\alpha < 1$  and  $p < \infty$ .*

**Sketch of Proof:** Prove a uniform lower bound on the  $L^{2,p}$  harmonic radius  $r_h = r_h^{2,p}$ , i.e.

$$r_h(x) \geq r_o = r_o(k, i_o, D), \quad (2.4)$$

under the bounds (2.3).

Overall, prove (2.4) by contradiction. Thus, if (2.4) is false,  $\exists \{g_i\}$  on  $M$ , satisfying (2.3), but

$$r_h(x_i) \rightarrow 0,$$

for some  $x_i \in M$ . Assume  $x_i$  realize the minimal value of  $r_h$  on  $(M, g_i)$ . Then rescale the metrics  $g_i$  by this minimal harmonic radius, i.e. set

$$\bar{g}_i = r_h(x_i)^{-2} \cdot g_i. \quad (2.5)$$

For  $\bar{r}_h =$  harmonic radius w.r.t.  $\bar{g}$ , scaling properties give

$$\bar{r}_h(x_i) = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{r}_h(y_i) \geq 1, \quad (2.6)$$

for all  $y_i \in (M, \bar{g}_i)$ .

Thus, pointed Riemannian manifolds  $(M, \bar{g}_i, x_i)$  have a subsequence converging in the *weak*  $L^{2,p}$  topology to a limit  $L^{2,p}$  Riemannian manifold  $(N, \bar{g}_\infty, x_\infty)$ .

So far, nothing essential has been done —the construction above more or less amounts to just renormalizations.

There are two basic ingredients in obtaining further control however, one geometric and one analytic.

## Geometric argument

Limit space  $(N, \bar{g}_\infty)$  is Ricci-flat: in scale  $\bar{g}_i$ ,

$$|\text{Ric}_{\bar{g}_i}| \leq k \cdot r_h(x_i) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } i \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.7)$$

Next, injectivity radius in scale  $\bar{g}_i$  satisfies

$$\text{inj}_{\bar{g}_i} \geq i_o \cdot r_h(x_i)^{-1} \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{as } i \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.8)$$

So roughly, limit  $(N, \bar{g}_\infty)$  has  $\text{inj}_{g_\infty} = \infty$ .

In fact, (2.8) implies  $(M, \bar{g}_i)$  contains arbitrarily long, (depending on  $i$ ), minimizing geodesics, centered at  $x_i$ , in all directions. So limit  $(N, \bar{g}_\infty)$  has line thru  $x_\infty$  in all directions.

Splitting theorem (Cheeger-Gromoll):

A complete manifold  $(N, g)$ ,  $\text{Ric}_g \geq 0$ , splits isometrically along any line.

Hence,

$$(N, \bar{g}_\infty) = (\mathbb{R}^n, g_o).$$

But, of course,

$$r_h(\mathbb{R}^n, g_o) = \infty.$$

If the convergence  $(M, \bar{g}_i, x_i) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^n, g_o, x_\infty)$  is in **strong**  $L^{2,p}$  topology, then the continuity of  $r_h$  gives contradiction, since have normalized

$$\bar{r}_h(x_i) = 1$$

.

## Analytic argument

Idea here: use elliptic regularity to bootstrap or improve smoothness of the convergence.

In harmonic coordinates, Ricci curvature has especially simple form:

$$-\frac{1}{2}\Delta g_{\alpha\beta} + Q_{\alpha\beta}(g, \partial g) = Ric_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (2.9)$$

where  $\Delta = g^{\alpha\beta}\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta$ .

If  $r_h(x) = 1$  and  $r_h(y) \geq r_o > 0, \forall y \in \partial B_x(1)$ , then have uniform  $L^{1,p}$  bound on  $Q$  and uniform  $L^{2,p}$  bounds on the coefficients for the Laplacian within  $B_x(1 + \frac{1}{2}r_o)$ .

Suppose  $Ric$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^\infty$ . Then elliptic regularity applied to (2.9) implies that

$$\|g_{\alpha\beta}\|_{L^{2,q}} \leq C = C(q),$$

for any  $q < \infty, (q > p!)$ .

More importantly, if  $g_i$  is a sequence of metrics s.t.

$$(Ric_{g_i})_{\alpha\beta} \Rightarrow (Ric_{g_\infty})_{\alpha\beta},$$

strongly in  $L^p$ , then elliptic regularity again implies that

$$(g_i)_{\alpha\beta} \Rightarrow (g_\infty)_{\alpha\beta}.$$

This essentially proves that the  $L^{2,p}$  harmonic radius is continuous w.r.t. the strong  $L^{2,p}$  topology. Further, when applied to the sequence  $\bar{g}_i$  — using  $\bar{r}_h \geq 1$  everywhere — it implies that the metrics  $\bar{g}_i$  converge strongly in  $L^{2,p}$  to the limit  $\bar{g}_\infty$ .