

Department of Mathematics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong
Geometric Analysis Working Seminar 2015/MATH4400C

Cassandra Lee, supervised by Professor Martin Li

Text: Liviu Nicolaescu, *An Invitation To Morse Theory*

December 1, 2015: Section 2.7 Min-max theory, p. 87 – 99.

Our objective now is to extract information about critical points using topological means. Unless otherwise indicated, in this set of notes, we let $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function on a compact, connected manifold M without boundary equipped with a Riemannian metric g . (If M is not compact, the principles to be presented below involve more technicalities.)

If f has critical points, Morse theory has shown us that we can estimate how many critical points f has at least. In particular, for a Morse function – all its critical points are nondegenerate by definition – the lower bound for the number of critical points is the sum of the Betti numbers of M . (This follows from the Morse inequalities in Section 2.3, esp. p.59. We omit the discussion here. Wikipedia "Morse Theory" has a less formal discussion.) How about smooth functions with degenerate critical points? Can we estimate nontrivially the least number of critical points?

Trivially, a smooth function on a compact manifold M (immersed in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} in which n is the smallest dimension of Euclidean space M could be in) has at least two critical points: a maximum and a minimum. There couldn't be more or fewer because, naively speaking, the height function applied to an n -sphere also has two critical points. Reeb showed that if f only has nondegenerate maxima and minima as critical points, then M must be homeomorphic to an n -sphere. This generalization omits all information about other types of critical points, such as saddle points, which **min-max theory** can recover.

Set-up: Denote $M^c := \{f \leq c\}$ where $c \in \mathbb{R}$. We shall lay some groundwork on the min-max principle and its applications in locating nontrivial critical points, and build everything up to the nontrivial estimate of critical points we've been seeking.

Definition 2.50. A collection of *min-max data* for f is a pair $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{S})$ satisfying the following criteria:

- (a) $\mathcal{H} \subset \text{Homeo}(M)$: $\forall a \in M \setminus \Delta_f, \exists \varepsilon > 0, \exists h \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $h(M^{a+\varepsilon}) \subset M^{a-\varepsilon}$, and
- (b) $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{P}(M)$: $h(S) \in \mathcal{S}, \forall h \in \mathcal{H}, \forall S \in \mathcal{S}$. (\mathcal{S} is invariant under \mathcal{H} .)

Theorem 2.51 (Min-max principle: the key existence result here). If $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{S})$ is a collection of min-max data for the smooth function $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then the

following real number (real-valued function of $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{S})$) is a critical value of f :

$$c = c(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{S}) := \inf_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \sup_{x \in S} f(x).$$

Proof: Basically we're copying the statements above and using very elementary analysis to reach a contradiction.

Suppose c is a regular value. Then $\exists \varepsilon > 0, \exists h \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $h(M^{c+\varepsilon}) \subset M^{c-\varepsilon}$. Now, c being an infimum, $\exists S \in \mathcal{S}$ such that

$$\sup_{x \in S} f(x) < c + \varepsilon \implies S \subset M^{c+\varepsilon}.$$

Therefore, $S' := h(S) \in \mathcal{S}$ and $S' = h(S) \subset M^{c-\varepsilon}$

$$\implies \sup_{y \in S'} f(y) \leq c - \varepsilon \implies \inf_{S' \in \mathcal{S}} \sup_{y \in S'} f(y) \leq c - \varepsilon$$

but that leads to the contradiction

$$c = \inf_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \sup_{x \in S} f(x) \leq c - \varepsilon.$$

■