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We present a new technique that employs partial differential equations in order to explicitly construct primitives in the continuous bounded cohomology of Lie groups. As an application, we prove a vanishing theorem for the continuous bounded cohomology of $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ in degree 4, establishing a special case of a conjecture of Monod.
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1 Introduction

Ever since Gromov’s seminal paper [24], bounded cohomology of discrete groups has proved a useful tool in geometry, topology and group theory. In recent years the scope of bounded cohomology has widened considerably. An important step was taken by Burger and Monod [13] and Monod [37], who extended the theory to the category of locally compact second countable groups under the name of continuous bounded cohomology. Not only did this lead to a breakthrough in the understanding of bounded cohomology of lattices in Lie groups [13], but also triggered a series of discoveries in rigidity theory (eg Burger, Monod and Iozzi [14], Burger and Iozzi [8; 9], Bucher, Burger and Iozzi [6], Monod and Shalom [41; 42] Chatterji, Fernós and Iozzi [17] and Hamenstädt [25; 26]), higher Teichmüller theory (eg Burger, Iozzi and Wienhard [10; 11; 12] and Ben Simon, Burger, Hartnick, Iozzi and Wienhard [1]) and symplectic geometry (eg Polterovich [44] and Entov and Polterovich [19]). At the same time, our understanding of the second bounded cohomology has improved. In particular, the approach originally developed for surface groups by Brooks [4], free groups by Grigorchuk [23] and hyperbolic groups by Epstein and Fujiwara [20] has been extended to larger classes of groups including mapping class groups by Bestvina and Fujiwara [2] and acylindrically hyperbolic groups by Hull and Osin [29] and Fujiwara, Bestvina and Bromberg [21]. Moreover, there has been some progress in constructing bounded cohomology classes in higher degree due to Mineyev [36], Hartnick and Ott [27], Bucher and Monod [7] and Goncharov [22].
On the other hand, our knowledge on vanishing results for bounded cohomology in higher degree is still very poor. It was already known to Johnson [31] that the bounded cohomology of an amenable group vanishes in all positive degrees. Here the primitive of a given cocycle is obtained by applying an invariant mean. In contrast, for non-amenable groups no general technique for constructing primitives is available so far. In particular, there is not a single non-amenable group whose bounded cohomology is known in all degrees. Actually, the situation is even worse. One may define the bounded cohomological dimension of a group $\Gamma$ to be

$$\text{bcd}(\Gamma) := \sup \{ n \mid H^n_b(\Gamma; \mathbb{R}) \neq 0 \},$$

where $H^n_b(\Gamma; \mathbb{R})$ is the $n$th bounded cohomology of $\Gamma$ with coefficients in the trivial module $\mathbb{R}$. At present we do not even know whether there exists any group $\Gamma$ with $\text{bcd}(\Gamma) \notin \{0, \infty\}$.

The few vanishing results we have for the bounded cohomology of non-amenable groups are all based on the vanishing of all cocycles in the respective degree in some resolution. The most far-reaching results in this direction were achieved by Monod [39] by choosing efficient resolutions. However, no such resolutions are known for dealing with the continuous bounded cohomology $H^n_{cb}(H; \mathbb{R})$ of non-amenable connected Lie groups $H$. For such groups the most efficient resolution that is presently available is the boundary resolution of Ivanov [30] and Burger and Monod [13]. In this particular resolution cocycles vanish only in degree at most 3; in degree greater than 3 there will inevitably be nonzero cocycles and one faces the problem of finding primitives. This explains why the few existing vanishing results such as in [13; 15] do not go beyond degree 3.

Our goal in this article is to develop a new approach to the construction of primitives in continuous bounded cohomology for real semisimple Lie groups. To demonstrate its effectiveness we settle the following special case of a conjecture due to Monod [38, Problem A]:

**Theorem 1.1** Let $G$ be a connected real Lie group that is locally isomorphic to $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$. Then

$$H^4_{cb}(G; \mathbb{R}) = 0.$$

Actually, for such $G$, Monod conjectured that $\text{bcd}(G) = 2$, i.e. that $H^n_{cb}(G; \mathbb{R}) = 0$ for all $n > 2$. In degree $n = 3$ there are no nonzero cocycles in the boundary resolution at all—see Burger and Monod [15]—but this is no longer true for $n > 3$. In this sense, Theorem 1.1 is the prototype of a vanishing theorem that requires the construction
of primitives. We believe that our method of proof generalizes to arbitrary $n > 3$ nd possibly to other Lie groups. This will be addressed in future work.

Monod’s conjecture about the bounded cohomology of $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ is a special case of a more general conjecture, which would allow one to compute the continuous bounded cohomology of arbitrary connected Lie groups. In fact, since continuous bounded cohomology is invariant under division by the amenable radical [13; 37], it is sufficient to compute the continuous bounded cohomology of semisimple Lie groups $H$ without compact factors and with finite center. For such groups it is conjectured — see Dupont [18] and Monod [38] — that the natural comparison map between the continuous bounded cohomology and the continuous cohomology is an isomorphism. This would imply that $\text{bcd}(H)$ coincides with the dimension of the associated symmetric space, thereby providing examples of groups of arbitrary bounded cohomological dimension. Plenty is known by now about surjectivity of the comparison map — see Dupont [18], Gromov [24], Bucher [5], Lafont and Schmidt [34], Goncharov [22] and Hartnick and Ott [27] — while injectivity still remains mysterious in higher degrees. Indeed, injectivity has so far been established only in degree 2 for arbitrary $H$ by Burger and Monod [13] and for some rank 1 groups in degree 3 by Burger and Monod [15], Bloch [3] and Pieters [43]. Theorem 1.1 is the first result in degree greater than 3. Incidentally, it has an application to the existence of solutions to perturbations of the Spence–Abel functional equation for Rogers’ dilogarithm, along the lines suggested in [15]. This will be discussed in our forthcoming [28].

For the proof of Theorem 1.1 we shall reformulate the problem of constructing bounded primitives in terms of a fixed point problem for the action of $G$ on a certain function space. The main idea is then to describe the fixed points as solutions of a certain system of linear first-order partial differential equations. In this way, we obtain primitives by solving the corresponding Cauchy problem. We show that, for carefully chosen initial conditions, particular solutions have additional discrete symmetries, which we finally use to deduce boundedness. We will give a more detailed outline of our strategy of proof in Section 2.7 after introducing some notation.
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2 Preliminaries on continuous bounded cohomology

2.1 The boundary action of \( \text{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R}) \)

The goal of this section is to describe a model for the continuous bounded cohomology of \( \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R}) \). Since continuous bounded cohomology of connected Lie groups is invariant under local isomorphisms by Corollary 7.5.10 of Monod [37], we have

\[
H^\bullet_{\text{cb}}(\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R}); \mathbb{R}) \cong H^\bullet_{\text{cb}}(\text{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R}); \mathbb{R}) \cong H^\bullet_{\text{cb}}(\text{PU}(1,1); \mathbb{R}),
\]

where the latter isomorphism is induced by the Cayley transform. We prefer to carry out our computations in the group \( G := \text{PU}(1,1) \). The group \( G \) acts by fractional linear transformations on the Poincaré disc \( \mathbb{D} \). We can identify \( G \) with the group of orientation-preserving isometries of \( \mathbb{D} \), which is an index-2 subgroup in the full isometry group \( \hat{G} \). The actions of \( G \) and \( \hat{G} \) extend continuously to the boundary \( S^1 \) of \( \mathbb{D} \) and the corresponding actions on \( S^1 \) will be referred to as the boundary action of \( G \) and \( \hat{G} \), respectively. The action of \( \hat{G} \) on \( S^1 \) (but not on \( \mathbb{D} \)) may be identified with the action of \( \text{PGU}(1,1) \) by fractional linear transformations. It is well known that this action is strictly 3–transitive; see Kerby [32, Theorem 11.1].

Explicitly, elements of \( \text{PGU}(1,1) \) can be represented by matrices of the form

\[
g_{a,b} := \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ b & a \end{pmatrix},
\]
We define the homogeneous differential \( d \) as \( df(z_0, \ldots, z_{n+1}) := \sum_{j=0}^{n+1} (-1)^j f(z_0, \ldots, \hat{z}_j, \ldots, z_{n+1}) \).

2.2 Cocycles and strict cocycles

We keep the notation introduced in the last section and denote by \( \mu_K \) the unique \( K \)-invariant probability measure on \( S^1 \). Given \( n \geq 0 \), we shall write \( \mathcal{M}((S^1)^{n+1}) \) for the space of \( \mu_K^{\otimes (n+1)} \)-measurable real-valued functions on \( (S^1)^n \) and \( L^\infty((S^1)^n) \) for the subspace of bounded functions. The quotients of these spaces obtained by identifying \( \mu_K^{\otimes (n+1)} \)-almost everywhere coinciding functions will be denoted by \( M((S^1)^{n+1}) \) and \( L^\infty((S^1)^{n+1}) \), respectively.

We define the homogeneous differential \( d : \mathcal{M}((S^1)^{n+1}) \to \mathcal{M}((S^1)^{n+2}) \) by

\[
\text{where } a, b \in \mathbb{C} \text{ with } |a|^2 - |b|^2 \in \{ \pm 1 \}. \text{ We denote by } [g_{a,b}] \text{ the equivalence class of the matrix } g_{a,b} \text{ in } \text{PGU}(1, 1). \text{ Given } \xi, s, t \in \mathbb{R}, \text{ we abbreviate }
\]

\[
k_\xi := [g_{e^{i\xi/2}, 0}], \quad a_s := [g_{\cosh(-s/2), \sinh(-s/2)}], \quad n_t := [g_{1 + \frac{1}{2}it, -\frac{1}{2}it}].
\]

We also set \( \epsilon := [g_{0,1}] \). Then \( \hat{G} \cong G \rtimes (\epsilon) \), where \( G \) is given by equivalence classes of matrices of determinant 1 and \( \epsilon \) acts on \( G \) via

\[
\epsilon [g_{a,b}] \epsilon^{-1} = [g_{\bar{a},\bar{b}}].
\]

Next we observe that \( K := \{ k_\xi \mid \xi \in \mathbb{R} \}, A := \{ a_s \mid s \in \mathbb{R} \} \) and \( N := \{ n_t \mid t \in \mathbb{R} \} \) are subgroups of \( G \). Moreover, \( K \) is a maximal compact subgroup of \( G \) and \( A \) normalizes \( N \). In particular, \( P = AN \) is a subgroup of \( G \), which is in fact a parabolic subgroup. The group \( K \) can also be described as the stabilizer of 0 under the \( G \)-action on \( \mathbb{D} \) and, similarly, the group \( P \) is the stabilizer of 1 for the boundary action of \( G \). Since \( N \) is the unipotent radical of \( P \) we have \( \text{Fix}(N) = \{ 1 \} \), whereas \( \text{Fix}(A) = \{ \pm 1 \} \). Moreover, we obtain an Iwasawa decomposition \( G = KAN \) and every elliptic (respectively hyperbolic, parabolic) element in \( G \) is conjugate to an element in \( K \) (respectively \( A, N \)).

Our parametrization of elements of \( K, A \) and \( N \) is chosen in such a way that the maps \( \xi \mapsto k_\xi, s \mapsto a_s \) and \( t \mapsto n_t \) define 1\(^{-}\)-parameter subgroups of \( G \), ie smooth homomorphisms \( \mathbb{R} \to G \). (Both the homomorphisms and their images are commonly referred to as 1\(^{-}\)-parameter subgroups. We reserve this term for the homomorphisms.) These parametrizations are not quite standard, but turn out to be convenient for certain computations in local coordinates; see Lemma 3.2 below.
This induces differentials on $L^\infty((S^1)^n)$, $M((S^1)^{n+1})$ and $L^\infty((S^1)^{n+1})$. Elements in the kernels of these four differentials are referred to as strict $n$–cocycles, strict bounded $n$–cocycles, $n$–cocycles and bounded $n$–cocycles, respectively.

The group $\hat{G}$ acts diagonally on $(S^1)^{n+1}$ and this action commutes with the action of the symmetric group $S_n$ by permutation of the variables. We thus obtain a $\hat{G} \times S_n$–action on each of the spaces $M((S^1)^{n+1})$, $L^\infty((S^1)^{n+1})$, $M((S^1)^n)$ and $L^\infty((S^1)^n)$. It is immediate from the explicit formula that all homogeneous differentials are $\hat{G}$–equivariant; in particular, the $\hat{G}$–action maps cocycles to cocycles. Given a subgroup $H < \hat{G}$, an $H$–invariant (strict, bounded) cocycle is simply called a (strict, bounded) $H$–cocycle and it is called a (strict, bounded) $H$–coboundary if it is contained in the image of the $H$–invariants under $d$.

A major technical inconvenience is caused by the failure of surjectivity of the map $M((S^1)^n)^G \to M((S^1)^n)^G$, which means that a $G$–cocycle $c$ may not admit an invariant representative, ie a strict $G$–cocycle which coincides with $c$ almost everywhere. Fortunately, for bounded function classes, existence of invariant representatives follows from Monod [40, Theorem A].

**Lemma 2.1** (Invariant representatives) The maps $L^\infty((S^1)^{n+1})^G \to L^\infty((S^1)^{n+1})^G$, $n \geq 0$, are surjective. In fact, they admit a family of sections compatible with the homogeneous differentials.

### 2.3 Orbitwise smooth functions

We say that a function $f \in M((S^1)^{n+1})$ is orbitwise smooth if for each $(z_0, \ldots, z_n)$ the map $G \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$g \mapsto f(g. z_0, \ldots, g. z_n)$$

is smooth. We record the following basic properties of such functions for later reference:

**Lemma 2.2**

(i) Every smooth function is orbitwise smooth. If $n \leq 2$, then every orbitwise smooth function in $M((S^1)^{n+1})$ restricts to a smooth function on $(S^1)^{n+1}$.

(ii) Orbitwise smooth functions in $M((S^1)^{n+1})$ form an $\mathbb{R}$–algebra.

(iii) If $f \in L^\infty((S^1)^n)$ is orbitwise smooth, then so is the function $I(f)$ in $L^\infty((S^1)^n)$ given by

$$I(f)(z_1, \ldots, z_n) = \int_{S^1} f(z, z_1, \ldots, z_n) \, d\mu_K(z).$$

(iv) Every class in $L^\infty((S^1)^{n+1})^G$ can be represented by an orbitwise smooth function.
**Proof** The first statement of (i) follows from smoothness of the orbit map of the diagonal $G$–action and the second statement follows from the fact that $(S^1)^{(n+1)}$ is a union of open $G$–orbits if $n \leq 2$. (ii) is obvious. Concerning (iii), we observe that

$$I(f)(g.z_0, \ldots, g.z_n) = \int_{S^1} f(z, g.z_1, g.z_2, g.z_3) d\mu_K(z)$$

$$= \int_{S^1} \frac{d(g.\mu_K)}{d\mu_K}(z) f(z, z_1, z_2, z_3) d\mu_K(z).$$

Orbitwise smoothness of this function now follows from smoothness of the Radon–Nikodym derivative (see eg Knapp [33, Proposition 8.43]). Finally, (iv) follows from Lemma 2.1 and the observation that every constant function is smooth.

We emphasize that, in general, the analog of (iv) fails for classes in $M((S^1)^{n+1})^G$, since boundedness is essential for the construction of invariant representatives. We will often apply Lemma 2.2 in the following form, which combines (i)–(iv) of the lemma:

**Corollary 2.3** If $f \in L^\infty((S^1)^{n+1})^G$ and $h \in C^\infty((S^1)^k)$, then the class $g$ in $L^\infty((S^1)^{n-k+1})$ given by

$$g(z_0, \ldots, z_{n-k}) := \int_{(S^1)^k} h(w_1, \ldots, w_k) f(w_1, \ldots, w_k, z_0, \ldots, z_{n-k}) d\mu_K^\otimes_k (w_1, \ldots, w_k)$$

admits an orbitwise smooth representative.

**Convention 2.4** Whenever we are given a function class $f$ in $M((S^1)^{n+1})$ or $L^\infty((S^1)^{n+1})$ that admits an orbitwise smooth representative, we will use the same letter $f$ to denote an orbitwise smooth representative.

### 2.4 The boundary model for continuous bounded cohomology

A function class $f \in L^\infty((S^1)^{n+1})$ is called *alternating* provided $\sigma.f = (-1)^\sigma \cdot f$ for all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{n+1}$; we denote by $L^\infty_{\text{alt}}((S^1)^{n+1}) < L^\infty((S^1)^{n+1})$ the subspace of alternating function classes. Since the actions of $\hat{G}$ and $\mathfrak{S}_{n+1}$ commute, this subspace is $\hat{G}$–invariant. Moreover, the homogeneous differential maps alternating function classes to alternating functions classes, whence $(L^\infty_{\text{alt}}((S^1)^{\bullet+1}), d)$ is a subcomplex of $(L^\infty((S^1)^{\bullet+1}), d)$.

**Proposition 2.5** (Boundary model [37, Theorem 7.5.3]) Given a closed subgroup $H < \hat{G}$, the continuous bounded cohomology of $H$ is given by the cohomology of the complex $(L^\infty_{\text{alt}}((S^1)^{\bullet+1})^H, d)$, ie

$$H^n_{\text{cb}}(H; \mathbb{R}) \cong H^n(L^\infty_{\text{alt}}((S^1)^{\bullet+1})^H, d) \quad \text{for all } n \geq 0.$$
2.5 Even and odd cocycles

Given \( f \in L^\infty_\text{alt}((\mathbb{S}^1)^{n+1}) \), we denote by \( f^\pm \) the projections of \( f \) onto the \( \pm 1 \)-eigenspaces of \( \epsilon \). Explicitly, we have \( f^\pm = \frac{1}{2}(f \pm \epsilon.f) \) and \( f = f^+ + f^- \). We say that \( f \) is even if \( f = f^+ \) and odd if \( f = f^- \). Since \( \epsilon \) normalizes \( G \), the projections \( f \mapsto f^\pm \) preserve the subspace of \( G \)-invariants. They also commute with homogeneous differentials, since \( \epsilon \) does. In particular, every \( G \)-invariant alternating (strict) cocycle decomposes uniquely into a sum of a \( G \)-invariant alternating (strict) even cocycle and a \( G \)-invariant alternating (strict) odd cocycle, and similarly for coboundaries. On the level of cohomology this yields a decomposition

\[
H^\bullet_{\text{cb}}(G; \mathbb{R}) \cong H^\bullet_{\text{cb}}(G; \mathbb{R})_{\text{ev}} \oplus H^\bullet_{\text{cb}}(G; \mathbb{R})_{\text{odd}}.
\]

The first summand \( H^n_{\text{cb}}(G; \mathbb{R})_{\text{ev}} \) can be identified with the continuous bounded cohomology \( H^n_{\text{cb}}(\hat{G}; \mathbb{R}) \) of the extended group \( \hat{G} \). Similarly, if we denote by \( \mathbb{R}_\epsilon \) the unique non-trivial 1-dimensional \( \hat{G} \)-module, then \( H^\bullet_{\text{cb}}(G; \mathbb{R})_{\text{odd}} \cong H^\bullet_{\text{cb}}(\hat{G}; \mathbb{R}_\epsilon) \), whence the above decomposition can also be written as

\[
H^\bullet_{\text{cb}}(G; \mathbb{R}) \cong H^\bullet_{\text{cb}}(\hat{G}; \mathbb{R}) \oplus H^\bullet_{\text{cb}}(\hat{G}; \mathbb{R}_\epsilon).
\]

In particular, the vanishing of \( H^\bullet_{\text{cb}}(G; \mathbb{R}) \) is equivalent to the vanishing of both \( H^\bullet_{\text{cb}}(\hat{G}; \mathbb{R}) \) and \( H^\bullet_{\text{cb}}(\hat{G}; \mathbb{R}_\epsilon) \). It turns out that the vanishing of \( H^\bullet_{\text{cb}}(\hat{G}; \mathbb{R}_\epsilon) \) can be deduced using only combinatorial arguments; see Proposition 2.6 below. The vanishing of the first summand is considerably harder and its proof will occupy the rest of this article.

**Proposition 2.6** Every alternating \( G \)-invariant bounded 4-cocycle is even. In particular,

\[
H^4_{\text{cb}}(G; \mathbb{R})_{\text{odd}} \cong H^4_{\text{cb}}(\hat{G}; \mathbb{R}_\epsilon) = 0.
\]

The proof of Proposition 2.6 will be given in Appendix A. We remind the reader that non-zero even alternating \( G \)-invariant bounded 4-cocycles do exist; see Burger and Monod [15].

2.6 Primitives in the boundary model

Given a bounded \( G \)-cocycle \( c \in L^\infty((\mathbb{S}^1)^5)^G \) and any closed subgroup \( H \subset G \), we denote by

\[
P(c)^H := \{ p \in M((\mathbb{S}^1)^4)^H \mid dp = c \}
\]

the space of \( H \)-invariant primitives of \( c \) and by

\[
P^\infty(c)^H := \{ p \in L^\infty((\mathbb{S}^1)^4)^H \mid dp = c \}
\]
the subspace of bounded $H$–invariant primitives. In view of Proposition 2.5, the proof of Theorem 1.1 amounts to showing that $P^\infty(c)^G \neq \emptyset$ for any bounded alternating $G$–cocycle $c$ and, by Proposition 2.6, we may furthermore assume that $c$ is even. Under this assumption we will explicitly construct elements in $P^\infty(c)^G$. For this purpose, we first define an operator

$$I: L^\infty((S^1)^{n+1}) \to L^\infty((S^1)^n)$$

by

$$(2-1) \quad I(c)(z_1, \ldots, z_n) := \int_{S^1} c(z, z_1, \ldots, z_n) \, d\mu_K(z).$$

It induces an operator $I: L^\infty((S^1)^{n+1}) \to L^\infty((S^1)^n)$, which by abuse of notation we denote by the same symbol. By integrating the cocycle equation $dc = 0$, we see that $d(I(c)) = c$ for every cocycle $c$.

From now on we fix a bounded $G$–cocycle $c \in L^\infty((S^1)^5)^G$. For the moment we do not need to assume that $c$ is either alternating or even. By $K$–invariance of the measure $\mu_K$, we see from formula (2-1) that the function $I(c)$ is $K$–invariant, hence a $K$–invariant primitive of $c$. It will, however, in general not be $G$–invariant. In order to obtain $G$–invariant primitives we amend the operator $I$ in the following way.

We denote by $(S^1)^{(n)} \subset (S^1)^n$ the subset of $n$–tuples of pairwise distinct points in $S^1$. Note in particular that the $G$–action on $(S^1)^{(3)}$ is free and has two open orbits, given by positively and negatively oriented triples. We write $C^\infty((S^1)^{(3)})^K$ for the space of $K$–invariant real-valued smooth functions on $(S^1)^{(3)}$ and consider it as a subspace of $M((S^1)^3)$. We then define an operator

$$(2-2) \quad P_c: C^\infty((S^1)^{(3)})^K \to M((S^1)^4), \quad f \mapsto I(c) + df.$$

A key observation is that all $G$–invariant bounded primitives of $c$ necessarily lie in the image of the operator $P_c$. This will allow us to express primitives in terms of smooth (rather than measurable) solutions to differential equations.

**Proposition 2.7** The image of the operator $P_c$ satisfies

$$P^\infty(c)^G \subset P_c(C^\infty((S^1)^{(3)})^K) \subset P(c)^K.$$

**Proof** We have already seen that $I(c) \in P^\infty(c)^K$. We conclude that $P_c(f) \in P(c)^K$ for all $f \in C^\infty((S^1)^{(3)})^K$. Concerning the other inclusion, we observe that, if $p \in P^\infty(c)^G$ is any bounded primitive of $c$, then $dp = c = dI(c)$, whence $p - I(c)$ is a $K$–invariant cocycle. In particular, if we define $f := I(p - I(c))$, then $df = p - I(c)$ and thus

$$p = I(c) + df.$$
By Lemma 2.2 the function classes $p$ and $c$, and hence also $f$, can be represented by an orbitwise smooth function. Since $G$–orbits are open in $(S^1)^{(3)}$, we infer that this representative is actually smooth on $(S^1)^{(3)}$ and thus $p = P_c(f) \in P_c(C^\infty((S^1)^{(3)})^K)$. □

2.7 Strategy of proof

We briefly outline the strategy for the proof of Theorem 1.1. We shall proceed in three steps:

(1) In Section 3, we show that for any function $f \in C^\infty((S^1)^{(3)})^K$ the primitive $P_c(f)$ is $G$–invariant if and only if $f$ satisfies a certain system of linear first-order partial differential equations.

(2) In Section 4, we explicitly construct solutions $f$ of this system of differential equations, showing that $P(c)^G \neq \emptyset$.

(3) In Section 5, we prove that there exist particular solutions $f$ with certain additional discrete symmetries. For such functions $f$ we then show boundedness of $P_c(f)$, establishing that $P^\infty(c)^G \neq \emptyset$.

While the constructions in (1) and (2) work for arbitrary bounded $G$–cocycles $c$, the construction in (3) relies on $c$ being alternating and even.

3 Partial differential equations

3.1 The boundary action in local coordinates

In order to describe the boundary action of $G = \text{PU}(1, 1)$ explicitly, we introduce coordinates as follows. We consider $S^1$ as a subset of $\mathbb{C}$ and write $z \in S^1$ for a complex number $z$ of modulus 1. In addition, it will often be convenient to work with the angular coordinate $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$ defined by $z = e^{i\theta}$. Correspondingly, on $(S^1)^n$ we will use the two sets of coordinates $(z_0, \ldots, z_{n-1})$ and $(\theta_0, \ldots, \theta_{n-1})$. Note that, in angular coordinates on $S^1$, the measure $\mu_K$ is given by

$$\int_{S^1} f(z) \, d\mu_K(z) = \int_0^{2\pi} f(\theta) \, d\theta := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(\theta) \, d\theta.$$

Convention 3.1 Throughout, all operations on angular coordinates will implicitly be understood modulo $2\pi$. For example, $\theta_2 - \theta_1$ denotes the unique point in the interval $[0, 2\pi)$ that is congruent to $\theta_2 - \theta_1$ modulo $2\pi$. 
The $G$–action on $S^1$ induces a $G$–action on the interval $[0, 2\pi)$ by the relation $g.e^{i\theta} = e^{ig.\theta}$. Note that in particular $k_{\xi}.\theta = \theta + \xi$.

**Lemma 3.2** (Infinitesimal actions in angular coordinates) For every $\eta \in [0, 2\pi)$ we have
\[
\frac{d}{ds}(a_s.\eta) = \sin(a_s.\eta) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d}{dt}(n_t.\eta) = 1 - \cos(n_t.\eta).
\]

**Proof** To prove the first formula, we compute
\[
\frac{d}{ds}\bigg|_{s=0} (a_s.\phi) = \frac{1}{i e^{i\phi}} \frac{d}{ds}\bigg|_{s=0} e^{ias.\phi} = \frac{1}{i e^{i\phi}} \frac{d}{ds} \left( \frac{\cosh(-\frac{1}{2}s)e^{i\phi} + \sinh(-\frac{1}{2}s)}{\sinh(-\frac{1}{2}s)e^{i\phi} + \cosh(-\frac{1}{2}s)} \right) \bigg|_{s=0}
\]
\[
= \sin(\phi).
\]
Since the map $s \mapsto a_s$ is a 1–parameter group we further infer that
\[
\frac{d}{ds}(a_s.\eta) = \frac{d}{d\sigma}\bigg|_{\sigma=0} (a_{s+\sigma}.\eta) = \frac{d}{d\sigma}\bigg|_{\sigma=0} (a_{\sigma}(a_s.\eta)) = \sin(a_s.\eta).
\]
Likewise, for the second formula we compute
\[
\frac{d}{dt}\bigg|_{t=0} (n_t.\phi) = \frac{1}{i e^{i\phi}} \frac{d}{dt}\bigg|_{t=0} e^{int.\phi} = \frac{1}{i e^{i\phi}} \frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{(1 + \frac{1}{2}it)e^{i\phi} - \frac{1}{2}it}{\frac{1}{2}it e^{i\phi} + 1 - \frac{1}{2}it} \right) \bigg|_{t=0} = 1 - \cos \phi
\]
and conclude as above. \(\Box\)

### 3.2 Fundamental vector fields

We denote by $L_{K}^{(n)}$, $L_{A}^{(n)}$ and $L_{N}^{(n)}$ the differential operators that appear as fundamental vector fields for the infinitesimal action of the 1–parameter groups $\xi \mapsto k_\xi$, $s \mapsto a_s$ and $t \mapsto n_t$ on $(S^1)^{(n)}$, respectively. By Lemma 3.2, they are given in angular coordinates by
\[
L_{K}^{(n)} = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j}, \quad L_{A}^{(n)} = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \sin \theta_j \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \quad \text{and} \quad L_{N}^{(n)} = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (1 - \cos \theta_j) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j}.
\]
Note that $L_{K}^{(n)} f$ is well-defined for any orbitwise smooth function $f: (S^1)^n \to \mathbb{R}$, and similarly for $L_{A}^{(n)}$ and $L_{N}^{(n)}$. The next lemma is crucial for applications of the operators $L_{K}^{(n)}$, $L_{A}^{(n)}$ and $L_{N}^{(n)}$ in cohomology.

**Lemma 3.3** Let $L^{(n)}$ denote one of the operators $L_{K}^{(n)}$, $L_{A}^{(n)}$ and $L_{N}^{(n)}$. Then $L^{(n)}$ commutes with the homogeneous differential in the sense that
\[
d^n \circ L^{(n)} = L^{(n+1)} \circ d^n \quad \text{for every} \quad n > 0.
\]
Proof Let $\lambda \in C^\infty([0,2\pi))$ and consider the differential operators

$$L^{(n)}_\lambda := \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \lambda(\theta_j) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j}$$

for every $n > 0$. For any orbitwise smooth $(n-1)$–cochain $q$ we compute

$$(L^{(n+1)}_\lambda (d^n q))(\theta_0, \ldots, \theta_n) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} \lambda(\theta_j) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \left( \sum_{\ell=0}^{n} (-1)^\ell q(\theta_0, \ldots, \hat{\theta}_\ell, \ldots, \theta_n) \right)$$

$$= \sum_{\ell=0}^{n} (-1)^\ell \lambda(\theta_j) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} (\theta_0, \ldots, \hat{\theta}_\ell, \ldots, \theta_n)$$

$$= \sum_{\ell=0}^{n} (-1)^\ell (L^{(n)}_\lambda q)(\theta_0, \ldots, \hat{\theta}_\ell, \ldots, \theta_n)$$

$$= (d^n (L^{(n)}_\lambda q))(\theta_0, \ldots, \theta_n).$$

\[\Box\]

3.3 Infinitesimal invariance of primitives

We now return to the setting of Section 2.6. In particular, $c \in L^\infty((S^1)^5)^G$ is a cocycle and the operator

$$P_c \colon C^\infty((S^1)^3)^K \to \mathcal{P}(c)^K, \quad f \mapsto I(c) + df,$$

is defined as in (2-2). We will characterize $G$–invariance of primitives $P_c(f)$ in terms of differential equations for the function $f$. First, let us define function classes $c^\#, c^b \in L^\infty((S^1)^3)$ by

$$(3-1) \quad c^\#(\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) := \iiint \cos(\varphi) c(\eta, \varphi, \theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) \, d\eta \, d\varphi$$

and

$$(3-2) \quad c^b(\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) := \iiint \sin(\varphi) c(\eta, \varphi, \theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) \, d\eta \, d\varphi.$$

By Corollary 2.3 the function classes $c^\#$ and $c^b$ admit orbitwise smooth representatives. By Lemma 2.2(i) they can thus be represented by smooth functions on $(S^1)^3$. Following Convention 2.4, we denote these smooth representatives by the same letters $c^\#$ and $c^b$.

The next proposition achieves the first step in the agenda outlined in Section 2.7.
Proposition 3.4  Let \( f \in C^\infty((S^1)^{(3)})^K \) and \( c^\#, c^b \in C^\infty((S^1)^{(3)}) \) as above. Then the primitive \( P_c(f) \in \mathcal{P}(c)^K \) is \( G \)-invariant if and only if there exist functions \( v^\#, v^b \in C^\infty((S^1)^{(2)}) \) such that the triple \((f, v^\#, v^b)\) satisfies the system of partial differential equations

\[
\begin{align*}
L_A^{(3)} f &= c^\# + dv^#, \\
L_N^{(3)} f &= c^b + dv^b.
\end{align*}
\]

(3-3)

Note that all functions appearing in (3-3) are smooth, so all derivatives can be understood classically. The proof of Proposition 3.4 relies on the following lemma:

Lemma 3.5  The function class \( I(c) \in L^\infty((S^1)^{(4)}) \) admits an orbitwise smooth representative that satisfies

\[
\begin{align*}
L_A^{(4)} I(c) &= -dc^\#, \\
L_N^{(4)} I(c) &= -dc^b,
\end{align*}
\]

where \( c^\# \) and \( c^b \) are orbitwise smooth representatives of the function classes defined in (3-1) and (3-2).

Proof  By Corollary 2.3 the function class \( I(c) \) admits an orbitwise smooth representative. Fix an invariant representative \( \tilde{c} \) of \( c \) by Lemma 2.1. Using the \( A \)-invariance of \( \tilde{c} \) and Lemma 3.2, we compute

\[
L_A^{(4)} (I(c))(\theta_0, \ldots, \theta_3) = \frac{d}{ds} \int_{s=0} \tilde{c}(\varphi, a_s \theta_0, \ldots, a_s \theta_3) d\varphi
\]

\[
= \frac{d}{ds} \int_{s=0} d(a_s \varphi) \tilde{c}(\varphi, \theta_0, \ldots, \theta_3) d\varphi
\]

\[
= \int d(\varphi) \frac{d}{ds} \tilde{c}(\varphi, \theta_0, \ldots, \theta_3) d\varphi
\]

\[
= \int \sin(a_s \varphi) \tilde{c}(\varphi, \theta_0, \ldots, \theta_3) d\varphi
\]

\[
= \int \cos(\varphi) \tilde{c}(\varphi, \theta_0, \ldots, \theta_3) d\varphi.
\]

On the other hand, the cocycle identity

\[
0 = dc(\eta, \varphi, \theta_0, \ldots, \theta_3)
\]

\[
= c(\varphi, \theta_0, \ldots, \theta_3) - c(\eta, \theta_0, \ldots, \theta_3) + \sum_{j=0}^3 (-1)^j c(\eta, \varphi, \theta_0, \ldots, \hat{\theta}_j, \ldots, \theta_3)
\]
integrates against $\cos \varphi$ to

$$0 = \int \int \cos(\varphi)c(\varphi, \theta_0, \ldots, \theta_3)\, d\eta\, d\varphi - 0 + \sum_{j=0}^{3} (-1)^j c'^{\#}(\theta_0, \ldots, \hat{\theta}_j, \ldots, \theta_3)$$

$$= \int \cos(\varphi)c(\varphi, \theta_0, \ldots, \theta_3)\, d\varphi + dc'^{\#}(\theta_0, \ldots, \theta_3).$$

This establishes the first identity. Likewise, to prove the second identity we compute

$$L^{(4)}_N(I(c)))(\theta_0, \ldots, \theta_3) = \frac{d}{dt}\bigg|_{t=0} \int \tilde{c}(\varphi, n_t, \theta_0, \ldots, n_t, \theta_3)\, d\varphi$$

$$= \int \frac{d}{d\varphi}\frac{d(n_t, \varphi)}{dt}\bigg|_{t=0} \tilde{c}(\varphi, \theta_0, \ldots, \theta_3)\, d\varphi$$

$$= \int \frac{d}{d\varphi}(1-\cos(n_t, \varphi))\bigg|_{t=0} \tilde{c}(\varphi, \theta_0, \ldots, \theta_3)\, d\varphi$$

$$= \int \sin(\varphi)\tilde{c}(\varphi, \theta_0, \ldots, \theta_3)\, d\varphi$$

and then integrate the above cocycle identity against $\sin \varphi$.

**Proof of Proposition 3.4** By Corollary 2.3, the function class

$$P_c(f) = I(c) + df$$

admits an orbitwise smooth representative for every $f \in C^\infty((S^1)^3)^K$. This representative $P_c(f)$ is then smooth on $(S^1)^3$ by Lemma 2.2(i), hence $G$–invariant if and only if it is infinitesimally $G$–invariant. Since the subgroups $K$, $A$ and $N$ generate the group $G$, this in turn is equivalent to $P_c(f)$ satisfying the system of partial differential equations

$$\begin{cases}
L^{(4)}_K P_c(f) = 0, \\
L^{(4)}_A P_c(f) = 0, \\
L^{(4)}_N P_c(f) = 0.
\end{cases}$$

The first equation is automatically satisfied, since $P_c(f)$ is $K$–invariant by Proposition 2.7. Writing out the definition of $P_c(f)$ and applying Lemmas 3.3 and 3.5, the remaining two equations are seen to be equivalent to the system

$$\begin{cases}
d(L^{(3)}_A f) = dc'^{\#}, \\
d(L^{(3)}_N f) = dc^{\#}.
\end{cases}$$

If (3-3) admits a solution $(f, v'^{\#}, v^{\#}) \in C^\infty((S^1)^3) \times C^\infty((S^1)^2) \times C^\infty((S^1)^2)$, then we see by applying the operator $d$ to both sides of (3-3) that $f$ also satisfies
and thus $P_c(f)$ is $G$–invariant. Conversely, if $P_c(f)$ is $G$–invariant, then (3-4) holds and, if we define measurable function classes $v^\#: = I(L_A^{(3)} f - c^\#)$ and $v^b := I(L_N^{(3)} f - c^b)$, then the triple $(f, v^\#, v^b)$ satisfies (3-3). Moreover, $v^\#, v^b \in L^\infty((S^1)^2)$ admit smooth representatives on $(S^1)^2$, by Corollary 2.3 and Lemma 2.2(i). Thus, $P_c(f)$ is $G$–invariant if and only if (3-3) admits a solution

$$(f, v^\#, v^b) \in C^\infty((S^1)^3) \times C^\infty((S^1)^2) \times C^\infty((S^1)^2).$$

\[\square\]

### 3.4 The Frobenius integrability condition

We now turn to the problem of finding solutions of system (3-3). As we shall see in Proposition 3.7 below, it follows from the classical Frobenius theorem that this system admits a smooth solution $(f, v^\#, v^b)$ if and only if the functions $v^\#$ and $v^b$ satisfy a certain integrability condition. In order to state the result we define a function class $\tilde{c} \in L^\infty((S^1)^2)$ by

(3-5) \[\tilde{c}(\phi_1, \phi_2) := \oint \oint \oint \sin(\eta - \varphi) c(\eta, \varphi, \psi, \phi_1, \phi_2) \, d\eta \, d\varphi \, d\psi.\]

**Lemma 3.6** The function class $\tilde{c} \in L^\infty((S^1)^2)$ can be represented by a smooth $K$–invariant function on $(S^1)^2$.

**Proof** Smoothness is immediate from Corollary 2.3 and Lemma 2.2(i). By $K$–invariance of $c$ and of the measure, for every $\xi \in [0, 2\pi]$ we have

$$\tilde{c}(k_\xi, \phi_1, k_\xi, \phi_2) = \oint \oint \oint \sin(\eta - \varphi) c(\eta, \varphi, \phi_1 + \xi, \phi_2 + \xi) \, d\eta \, d\varphi \, d\psi$$

$$= \oint \oint \oint \sin(\eta - \varphi) c(\eta, \varphi - \xi, \psi - \xi, \phi_1, \phi_2) \, d\eta \, d\varphi \, d\psi$$

$$= \oint \oint \oint \sin((\eta + \xi) - (\varphi + \xi)) c(\eta, \varphi, \psi, \phi_1, \phi_2) \, d\eta \, d\varphi \, d\psi$$

$$= \tilde{c}(\phi_1, \phi_2).$$

\[\square\]

**Proposition 3.7** (Integrability condition) There exists a solution $(f, v^\#, v^b)$ to (3-3) in $C^\infty((S^1)^3) \times C^\infty((S^1)^2) \times C^\infty((S^1)^2)$ if and only if the pair $(v^\#, v^b)$ in $C^\infty((S^1)^2) \times C^\infty((S^1)^2)$ satisfies the system of partial differential equations

\begin{equation}
\begin{cases}
d(L_K^{(2)} v^\# + v^b) = 0, \\
d(L_K^{(2)} v^b - v^\#) = 0, \\
d(L_K^{(2)} v^\# - L_N^{(2)} v^\# + L_A^{(2)} v^b - \tilde{c}) = 0.
\end{cases}
\end{equation}
The proof of the proposition relies on the Frobenius theorem and will be deferred to Appendix B. In the sequel, we shall refer to system (3-6) as the Frobenius system. It will be enough for our purposes to find a function \( f \) satisfying system (3-3) for some pair \((v^#, v^b)\). We will hence not attempt to find all solutions of system (3-6). Rather, we will construct a single special solution \((v^#, v^b)\).

**Proposition 3.8** Let \( r \in C^\infty((0, 2\pi), \mathbb{C}) \) be a smooth complex-valued solution of the ordinary differential equation

\[
(3-7) \quad (1 - e^{-i\phi}) \frac{dr}{d\phi} = i r(\phi) - \tilde{c}(0, \phi).
\]

By Convention 3.1, we may define a function \( v \in C^\infty((S^1)^{(2)}, \mathbb{C}) \) by

\[
(3-8) \quad v(\theta_1, \theta_2) := e^{i\theta_1} r(\theta_2 - \theta_1).
\]

Then the pair \((v^#, v^b) := (\text{Re}(v), \text{Im}(v)) \in C^\infty((S^1)^{(2)}) \times C^\infty((S^1)^{(2)})\) is a solution of the Frobenius system (3-6).

**Proof** We remind the reader that throughout the proof we adhere to Convention 3.1. First observe that, if \( v \) is a solution of the system

\[
(3-9) \begin{cases} 
L^{(2)}_K v = i v, \\
e^{-i\theta_1} \frac{\partial v}{\partial \theta_1} + e^{-i\theta_2} \frac{\partial v}{\partial \theta_2} = \tilde{c},
\end{cases}
\]

then \((v^#, v^b) := (\text{Re}(v), \text{Im}(v))\) is a solution of (3-6). Indeed, taking real and imaginary parts of the first equation in (3-9) we obtain

\[
L^{(2)}_K v^# = -v^b, \quad L^{(2)}_K v^b = v^#,
\]

while taking the real part of the second equation yields

\[
L^{(2)}_K v^# - L^{(2)}_N v^# + L^{(2)}_A v^b = \tilde{c}.
\]

Next consider the transformation

\[
u(\theta_1, \theta_2) := e^{-i\theta_1} v(\theta_1, \theta_2).
\]

Then the first equation in (3-9) is equivalent to

\[
(3-10) \quad L^{(2)}_K u = 0
\]
and the second equation is equivalent to

\[ \tilde{c}(\theta_1, \theta_2) = e^{-i\theta_1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_1}(e^{i\theta_1} u(\theta_1, \theta_2)) + e^{-i\theta_2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_2}(e^{i\theta_1} u(\theta_1, \theta_2)) \]

\[ = i u(\theta_1, \theta_2) + \frac{\partial u}{\partial \theta_1} + e^{i(\theta_1 - \theta_2)} \frac{\partial u}{\partial \theta_2} \]

\[ = i u(0, \theta_2 - \theta_1) + (1 - e^{i(\theta_1 - \theta_2)}) \frac{\partial u}{\partial \theta_1}. \]

Here we used that \( \partial_{\theta_1} u = -\partial_{\theta_2} u \), by (3-10). Now let \( r \) be a solution of (3-7) and set \( v(\theta_1, \theta_2) := e^{i\theta_1} r(\theta_2 - \theta_1) \). Then \( u(\theta_1, \theta_2) = r(\theta_2 - \theta_1) \) obviously satisfies (3-10). By the \( K \)-invariance of \( \tilde{c} \) from Lemma 3.6, we have \( \tilde{c}(\theta_1, \theta_2) = \tilde{c}(0, \theta_2 - \theta_1) \). It follows that \( u \) solves (3-11).

\[ \square \]

### 4 Construction of primitives

**4.1 Solving the Frobenius system**

Throughout this section we fix a bounded \( G \)-cocycle \( c \in L^\infty((S^1)^5)^G \) and denote by

\[ P_c: C^\infty((S^1)^{(3)})^K \to \mathcal{P}(c)^K, \quad f \mapsto I(c) + df, \]

the operator from (2-2). Our goal is to solve the system (3-3) in order to construct a function \( f \in C^\infty((S^1)^{(3)})^K \) such that \( P_c(f) \in \mathcal{P}(c)^G \) is a \( G \)-invariant primitive for \( c \). The first step in the construction of this primitive is to solve the differential equation (3-7) for the function \( r \). As we have seen in Propositions 3.8 and 3.7, the function \( r \) then gives rise to a special solution \( (v^h, v^b) \) of the Frobenius system (3-6), which in turn determines the inhomogeneities in (3-3) in such a way that this system admits a solution \( f \).

The complex ordinary differential equation (3-7) can be solved by applying the method of variation of constants. Its general solution \( r(\phi) \in C^\infty((0, 2\pi), \mathbb{C}) \) is given by

\[ r(\phi) = (1 - e^{i\phi}) \cdot \left( C_0 - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\phi} \tilde{c}(0, \zeta) \frac{1}{1 - \cos \zeta} d\zeta \right), \]

where \( C_0 \) is an arbitrary complex constant. Note that different choices of \( C_0 \) lead to cohomologous cochains \( v \). We may therefore assume \( C_0 = 0 \), obtaining

\[ (4-1) \quad r(\phi) = -\frac{1}{2} (1 - e^{i\phi}) \cdot \int_0^{\phi} \frac{\tilde{c}(0, \zeta)}{1 - \cos \zeta} d\zeta. \]

We shall henceforth be working with the function \( r \) defined by this formula. A crucial observation is the following lemma:
Lemma 4.1 (Boundedness of the inhomogeneity) The function \( r \in C^\infty((0, 2\pi), \mathbb{C}) \) given by (4-1) is bounded. In particular, if \((v^\#, v^b) \in C^\infty((S^1)^{(2)}) \times C^\infty((S^1)^{(2)}) \) are defined as in Proposition 3.8, then the inhomogeneities in the system (3-3) are bounded.

Proof For all \( \phi \in (0, 2\pi) \) we have

\[
|r(\phi)| \leq \frac{1}{2} |1 - e^{i\phi}| \cdot \left| \int_\pi^{\phi} \frac{\zeta(0, \zeta)}{1 - \cos \zeta} d\zeta \right|.
\]

To estimate this further, observe that, on the one hand,

\[
|1 - e^{i\phi}| = \sqrt{2} \cdot \sqrt{1 - \cos \phi}
\]

and, on the other hand, we have

\[
\int_\pi^{\phi} \frac{\zeta(0, \zeta)}{1 - \cos \zeta} d\zeta \leq \|\zeta\|_\infty \cdot \int_\pi^{\phi} \frac{1}{1 - \cos \zeta} d\zeta \leq \|c\|_\infty \cdot \frac{\sqrt{1 + \cos \phi}}{\sqrt{1 - \cos \phi}}.
\]

Here we used that \( \|\zeta\|_\infty \leq \|c\|_\infty \), as well as

\[
\int_\pi^{\phi} \frac{1}{1 - \cos \zeta} d\zeta = -\cot\left(\frac{1}{2} \phi\right)
\]

and

\[
|\cot\left(\frac{1}{2} \phi\right)| = \frac{\sqrt{1 + \cos \phi}}{\sqrt{1 - \cos \phi}}.
\]

Note that \( \sqrt{1 + \cos \phi} \leq \sqrt{2} \). Hence, plugging (4-3) and (4-4) into (4-2) we arrive at

\[
|r(\phi)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{2} \cdot \sqrt{1 + \cos \phi} \cdot \|c\|_\infty \leq \|c\|_\infty
\]

for all \( \phi \in (0, 2\pi) \), which proves the lemma.

4.2 Cauchy initial value problem

Recall that solutions to a first-order linear partial differential equation may be constructed explicitly by integration along its characteristic curves, with initial values prescribed on some non-characteristic hypersurface; see Carathéodory [16, Chapter 3]. We shall now apply this principle in order to explicitly construct solutions of the system (3-3).

Let \( r \in C^\infty((0, 2\pi), \mathbb{C}) \) be given by (4-1). By Proposition 3.8 and Lemma 4.1, this determines a bounded solution \((v^\#, v^b) := (\text{Re}(v), \text{Im}(v)) \in C^\infty((S^1)^{(2)}) \times C^\infty((S^1)^{(2)}) \) of the Frobenius system (3-6) by

\[
v(\theta_1, \theta_2) := e^{i\theta_1} r(\theta_2 - \theta_1).
\]
We shall henceforth keep the function $v$ defined that way. Then, by Proposition 3.7, there exists a function $f \in C^\infty((S^1)^{(3)})$ satisfying the system of equations

\begin{align}
(4-6a) \quad L_K^{(3)} f &= 0, \\
(4-6b) \quad L_A^{(3)} f &= c^b + dv^b, \\
(4-6c) \quad L_N^{(3)} f &= c^b + dv^b.
\end{align}

We know from Section 3.2 that the characteristic curves for these equations are precisely the orbits for the actions of the subgroups $K$, $A$ and $N$ of $G$ on $(S^1)^{(3)}$, respectively. In order to construct the function $f$ we may therefore proceed as follows:

1. We use (4-6a) in order to construct $f$ with initial values $f_0 := f|_{H_0}$ prescribed on the hypersurface

$$H_0 := \{(z_0, z_1, z_2) \in (S^1)^{(3)} \mid z_0 = 1\}.$$ 

Of course, (4-6a) just says that $f$ is constant along the $K$–orbits in $(S^1)^{(3)}$. The hypersurface $H_0$ is non-characteristic for (4-6a), since it intersects transversally with the $K$–orbits in $(S^1)^{(3)}$. Note that, in order for $f$ to be compatible with the remaining equations (4-6b) and (4-6c), the hypersurface $H_0$ has to be invariant under the actions of $A$ and $N$. This, however, is indeed the case since the point 1 remains fixed under these two actions.

2. We use (4-6c) in order to construct $f_0$ with initial values $f_1 := f_0|_{H_1}$ prescribed on the union of $A$–orbits

$$H_1 := \{a_s(1, i, -i) \mid -\infty < s < \infty\} \cup \{a_s(1, -i, i) \mid -\infty < s < \infty\} \subset H_0.$$ 

Note that $H_1$ is non-characteristic for (4-6c) since it intersects transversally with the $N$–orbits in $H_0$. Moreover, in order for $f_0$ to be compatible with the remaining equation (4-6b), the curve $H_1$ has to be invariant under the action of $A$, which is obviously the case.

3. We use (4-6b) in order to construct $f_1$ with initial values $f_2 := f_1|_{H_2}$ prescribed on the set of base points

$$H_2 := \{(1, e^{2\pi i/3}, e^{4\pi i/3}), (1, e^{4\pi i/3}, e^{2\pi i/3})\} \subset H_1.$$ 

Note that (4-6b), when restricted to the curve $H_1$, becomes an ordinary differential equation, which can be solved directly.

In particular, we see that solutions of the system (3-3) are uniquely determined by the initial values of $f_2$ on the set of base points $H_2$ and hence form a 2–parameter family. We will work out the details of (1) in Section 4.3, while the details of (2) and (3) will be worked out in Section 4.4.
4.3 Reduction of variables

In angular coordinates, the hypersurface \( H_0 \) introduced in the previous section is given by

\[
H_0 = \{ (\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) \in [0, 2\pi]^3 \mid \theta_0 = 0, \theta_1 \neq \theta_2, \theta_1 \neq 0 \neq \theta_2 \}.
\]

The canonical projection \((\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) \mapsto (\theta_1, \theta_2)\) identifies \( H_0 \) with the open subset \( \Omega := (0, 2\pi)^2 \setminus \Delta \) of the square, where \( \Delta \subset (0, 2\pi)^2 \) denotes the diagonal in the open square. The coordinates in \( \Omega \) will be denoted by \((\phi_1, \phi_2)\). Moreover, we write \( \Omega_{\pm} := \{ (\phi_1, \phi_2) \mid \phi_1 \leq \phi_2 \} \) for the open subsets corresponding to the two \( G \)-orbits in \((S^1)^3\) consisting of positively and negatively oriented triples. The restriction \( f_0 := f \mid_{H_0} \) is then given by \( f_0(\phi_1, \phi_2) = f(0, \phi_1, \phi_2) \). Note that by \( K \)-invariance the function \( f \) is recovered from \( f_0 \) by

\[
f(\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) = f_0(\theta_1 - \theta_0, \theta_2 - \theta_0).
\]

Since the hypersurface \( H_0 \) is invariant under the actions of \( A \) and \( N \), the system (3-3) restricts to the system

\[
\begin{align*}
L_A^{(2)} f_0 &= c_0^* + (dv^*)_0, \\
L_N^{(2)} f_0 &= c_0^b + (dv^b)_0.
\end{align*}
\]

Here we denote by \( c_0^*, c_0^b, (dv^*)_0 \) and \( (dv^b)_0 \) the respective restrictions of the functions \( c^*, c^b, dv^* \) and \( dv^b \), ie

\[
\begin{align*}
c_0^*(\phi_1, \phi_2) &:= c^*(0, \phi_1, \phi_2), &
c_0^b(\phi_1, \phi_2) &:= c^b(0, \phi_1, \phi_2)
\end{align*}
\]

and

\[
\begin{align*}
(dv^*)_0(\phi_1, \phi_2) &:= dv^*(0, \phi_1, \phi_2), &
(dv^b)_0(\phi_1, \phi_2) &:= dv^b(0, \phi_1, \phi_2).
\end{align*}
\]

Note that these functions are smooth on \( \Omega \).

4.4 Method of characteristics

We now construct the function \( f_0 \) by integrating equations (4-6b) and (4-6c) along their characteristic curves. Recall that the characteristics for these equations are precisely the orbits for the actions of the subgroups \( A \) and \( N \) on \( \Omega \) (see Figure 1).

It will be convenient to abbreviate the inhomogeneities appearing on the right-hand side of the system (4-8) by

\[
\begin{align*}
F_c^* &:= c_0^* + (dv^*)_0 \quad \text{and} \quad F_c^b := c_0^b + (dv^b)_0.
\end{align*}
\]
If we prescribe the value of $f_0$ on a single point in each of the orbits $\Omega_+$ and $\Omega_-$, the function $f_0$ will be uniquely determined by the relations

$$f_0(a_S.\phi_1, a_S.\phi_2) - f_0(\phi_1, \phi_2) = \int_0^S F_c^a(a_S.\phi_1, a_S.\phi_2) \, ds$$

and

$$f_0(n_T.\phi_1, n_T.\phi_2) - f_0(\phi_1, \phi_2) = \int_0^T F_c^b(n_T.\phi_1, n_T.\phi_2) \, dt.$$

More precisely, let us denote by

$$\Delta^\text{op} := \{(\phi, 2\pi - \phi) \mid \phi \in (0, 2\pi) \setminus \{\pi\}\} \subset \Omega$$

the antidiagonal in $\Omega$, which corresponds to the hypersurface $H_1$ introduced in Section 4.2. Note that it has two connected components. In order to compute the function $f_0$ we first introduce new coordinates on $\Omega$ that are adapted to the $N$–orbits. For every point $(\phi_1, \phi_2) \in \Omega$ we define $\Phi(\phi_1, \phi_2) \in (0, \pi) \cup (\pi, 2\pi)$ in such a way that $(\Phi(\phi_1, \phi_2), 2\pi - \Phi(\phi_1, \phi_2))$ is the point of intersection of the antidiagonal with the unique $N$–orbit passing through the point $(\phi_1, \phi_2)$. We then define $T(\phi_1, \phi_2) \in (-\infty, \infty)$ by the relation

$$(\phi_1, \phi_2) = n_T(\phi_1, \phi_2).((\Phi(\phi_1, \phi_2), 2\pi - \Phi(\phi_1, \phi_2))).$$

For later reference we note that

$$T(\phi_1, \phi_2) = -\frac{1}{2}(\cot(\frac{1}{2}\phi_1) + \cot(\frac{1}{2}\phi_2)),$$

which follows from the formula $n_t.\phi = 2 \arccot(-t + \cot(\frac{1}{2}\phi))$. Integrating the second equation in (4-8) along the $N$–orbits in $\Omega$, with initial values $f_1$ prescribed on the
Figure 2: A path traveling along $A$– and $N$–orbits from the basepoint $\omega_-$ to some point $(\phi_1, \phi_2)$ in $\Omega_-$.

antidiagonal $\Delta_{\text{op}}$, we then obtain

\begin{equation}
\tag{4-13}
f_0(\phi_1, \phi_2) = f_1(\Phi(\phi_1, \phi_2), 2\pi - \Phi(\phi_1, \phi_2)) + \int_0^{T(\phi_1, \phi_2)} F^b_c(n_t, \Phi(\phi_1, \phi_2), n_t, (2\pi - \Phi(\phi_1, \phi_2))) \, dt
\end{equation}

for every $(\phi_1, \phi_2) \in \Omega$. It remains to compute the function $f_1$ along the antidiagonal. Let

\[ \omega_+ := \left(\frac{2}{3} \pi, \frac{4}{3} \pi\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_- := \left(\frac{4}{3} \pi, \frac{2}{3} \pi\right) \]

be the points in $\Omega$ corresponding to the base points in $H_2$ introduced in Section 4.2. Note that $\omega_+$ and $\omega_-$ coincide with the barycenters of the triangles enclosing the domains $\Omega_+$ and $\Omega_-$ (see Figure 2). Define a new coordinate $S(\phi) \in (-\infty, \infty)$ on each component of the antidiagonal $\Delta_{\text{op}}$ by the relation

\[ (\phi, 2\pi - \phi) = a_{S(\phi)} \cdot \omega_\pm, \]

depending on whether the point $(\phi, 2\pi - \phi)$ lies in $\Omega_+$ or $\Omega_-$. Integrating the first equation in (4-8) along the $A$–orbits in $\Delta_{\text{op}}$, with initial values $f_2$ prescribed on the base points $\{\omega_+, \omega_-\}$, we get

\begin{equation}
\tag{4-14}
f_1(\phi, 2\pi - \phi) = f_2(\omega_\pm) + \int_0^{S(\phi)} F^\#_c(a_s, \omega_\pm) \, ds
\end{equation}

for every $\phi \in (0, \pi) \cup (\pi, 2\pi)$. 
4.5 Explicit primitives

Combining the results from the previous sections, we are now in a position to give the following explicit characterization of primitives:

**Proposition 4.2** (Explicit primitives) Let \((v^#, v^b) \in C^\infty((S^1)^{(2)}) \times C^\infty((S^1)^{(2)})\) be the real and imaginary parts of the function \(v \in C^\infty((S^1), \mathbb{C})\) defined by (4-5), where the function \(r \in C^\infty((0, 2\pi), \mathbb{C})\) is as in (4-1). Then the following hold:

(i) Let \(f \in C^\infty((S^1)^{(3)})^K\). The primitive \(P_c(f) \in \mathcal{P}(c)^K\) is \(G\)-invariant if and only if the function \(f\) solves the system (3-3).

(ii) There is a one-to-one correspondence between solutions \(f \in C^\infty((S^1)^{(3)})^K\) of (3-3) and solutions \(f_0 \in C^\infty(\Omega)\) of (4-8) via the relation

\[
f(\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) = f_0(\theta_1 - \theta_0, \theta_2 - \theta_0).
\]

(iii) Every pair \((f_0(\omega_+), f_0(\omega_-)) \in \mathbb{R}^2\) of initial values uniquely determines a smooth solution \(f_0 \in C^\infty(\Omega)\) of (4-8) by the formula

\[
(4-15) \quad f_0(\phi_1, \phi_2) = f_0(\omega_{\pm}) + \int_0^{S(\Phi(\phi_1, \phi_2))} F_c^#(a_s, \omega_{\pm}) \, ds + \int_0^{T(\phi_1, \phi_2)} F_c^b(n_t, \Phi(\phi_1, \phi_2), n_t, (2\pi - \Phi(\phi_1, \phi_2))) \, dt,
\]

where the functions \(F_c^#\) and \(F_c^b\) are as in (4-11). Conversely, any smooth solution of (4-8) arises in this way.

**Proof** Let \(f \in C^\infty((S^1)^{(3)})^K\). Assertion (i) holds by Proposition 3.4, while (ii) was proved in Section 4.3. Finally, our considerations in Section 4.4 show that the function \(f_0\) satisfies (4-8) if and only if it is given by formulas (4-13) and (4-14), in terms of integration along the unique path in \(\Omega\) starting at \(\omega_{\pm}\) and traveling to \((\phi_1, \phi_2)\) along \(A\)- and \(N\)-orbits via the point \((\Phi(\phi_1, \phi_2), 2\pi - \Phi(\phi_1, \phi_2))\) on the antidiagonal (see Figure 2), with initial values prescribed at \(\omega_{\pm}\). This proves (iii).

The proposition achieves the second step in the agenda outlined in Section 2.7. In particular, it shows that solutions \(f_0\) of (4-8) form a 2-parameter family.

5 Boundedness of primitives

5.1 Symmetries

Our construction of primitives in the previous section was valid for arbitrary \(G\)-cocycles \(c \in L^\infty((S^1)^5)^G\). However, for the proof of boundedness of primitives, which we shall
discuss in this section, it turns out to be essential that $c$ be alternating and even. As we have seen in Section 2.6, this is not a loss of generality. The following proposition discusses symmetries of the various functions appearing in the construction of primitives resulting from these additional assumptions.

**Proposition 5.1** (Symmetries) Assume that the cocycle $c \in L^\infty((S^1)^5)^G$ is alternating and even. Let $r \in C^\infty((0, 2\pi), \mathbb{C})$ be given by (4-1) and let $(v^#, v^b)$ in $C^\infty((S^1)^2) \times C^\infty((S^1)^2)$ be defined as in Proposition 3.8. Then the inhomogeneities on the right-hand sides of systems (3-3) and (4-8) have the following properties:

1. The functions $c^# + dv^#$ and $c^b + dv^b$ are alternating.

2. The function $F_c^# = c_0^# + (dv^#)_0$ is antisymmetric about the antidiagonal $\Delta^{op}$ in $\Omega$, i.e.

$$F_c^#(\phi_1, \phi_2) = -F_c^#(-\phi_2, -\phi_1)$$

for all $(\phi_1, \phi_2) \in \Omega$. In particular, it vanishes along the antidiagonal.

3. The function $F_c^b = c_0^b + (dv^b)_0$ is symmetric about the antidiagonal $\Delta^{op}$ in $\Omega$, i.e.

$$F_c^b(\phi_1, \phi_2) = F_c^b(-\phi_2, -\phi_1)$$

for all $(\phi_1, \phi_2) \in \Omega$.

**Proof** We begin with the following observation. The function $\tilde{c}$ defined in (3-5) is alternating since $c$ is assumed to be alternating. By Lemma 3.6, the function $\tilde{c}$ is $K$–invariant. Hence

$$\tilde{c}(0, \zeta) = \tilde{c}(-\zeta, 0) = -\tilde{c}(0, -\zeta).$$

By Convention 3.1, replacing $\zeta$ by $2\pi - \zeta$ we infer from this that

$$\int_{\pi}^{\phi} \frac{c(0, \zeta)}{1 - \cos \zeta} d\zeta = -\int_{\pi}^{2\pi-\phi} \frac{c(0, -\zeta)}{1 - \cos(-\zeta)} d\zeta = \int_{\pi}^{\phi} \frac{c(0, \zeta)}{1 - \cos \zeta} d\zeta$$

for every $\phi \in (0, 2\pi)$. Recall moreover from Section 4.2 that $(v^#, v^b) := (\text{Re}(v), \text{Im}(v))$, where

$$v(\theta_1, \theta_2) = e^{i\theta_1}r(\theta_2 - \theta_1)$$
and \( r \) is as in (4-1). Let us prove (i). Since \( c \) is alternating, it is immediate from (3-1) and (3-2) that \( c^# \) and \( c^b \) are alternating. By (4-1) and (5-1) we have

\[
(5-2) \quad v(\theta_1, \theta_2) = e^{i\theta_1}r(\theta_2 - \theta_1)
\]

\[
= -\frac{1}{2}(e^{i\theta_1} - e^{-i\theta_2}) \cdot \int_{\pi}^{\theta_2 - \theta_1} \frac{\check{c}(0, \zeta)}{1 - \cos \zeta} d\zeta
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2}(e^{i\theta_2} - e^{-i\theta_1}) \cdot \int_{\pi}^{\theta_1 - \theta_2} \frac{\check{c}(0, \zeta)}{1 - \cos \zeta} d\zeta = -v(\theta_2, \theta_1).
\]

It follows that \( dv \), and hence \( dv^# \) and \( dv^b \), are alternating. This proves (i). For the proof of (ii) and (iii) we have to show that

\[
(5-3) \quad F^c_c(\phi_1, \phi_2) = -F^c_c(-\phi_2, -\phi_1) \quad \text{and} \quad F^b_c(\phi_1, \phi_2) = F^b_c(-\phi_2, -\phi_1).
\]

To this end, we first note that, by (4-9) and since \( c \) is even, we have

\[
(5-4) \quad c^#_0(-\phi_2, -\phi_1) = \iint \cos(\varphi)c(\eta, \varphi, 0, -\phi_2, -\phi_1) \, d\eta \, d\varphi
\]

\[
= \iint \cos(\varphi)c(-\eta, -\varphi, 0, \phi_2, \phi_1) \, d\eta \, d\varphi
\]

\[
= \iint \cos(-\varphi)c(\eta, \varphi, 0, \phi_2, \phi_1) \, d\eta \, d\varphi
\]

\[
= -\iint \cos(\varphi)c(\eta, \varphi, 0, \phi_1, \phi_2) \, d\eta \, d\varphi
\]

\[
= -c^#_0(\phi_1, \phi_2)
\]

and, similarly,

\[
(5-5) \quad c^b_0(-\phi_2, -\phi_1) = \iint \sin(\varphi)c(\eta, \varphi, 0, -\phi_2, -\phi_1) \, d\eta \, d\varphi
\]

\[
= \iint \sin(-\varphi)c(\eta, \varphi, 0, \phi_2, \phi_1) \, d\eta \, d\varphi
\]

\[
= \iint \sin(\varphi)c(\eta, \varphi, 0, \phi_1, \phi_2) \, d\eta \, d\varphi = c^b_0(\phi_1, \phi_2).
\]

Applying (5-1) as in the proof of (i) above, we obtain

\[
v(-\theta_1, -\theta_2) = -\frac{1}{2}(e^{-i\theta_1} - e^{-i\theta_2}) \cdot \int_{\pi}^{-\theta_2 + \theta_1} \frac{\check{c}(0, \zeta)}{1 - \cos \zeta} d\zeta
\]

\[
= -\frac{1}{2}(e^{-i\theta_1} - e^{-i\theta_2}) \cdot \int_{\pi}^{\theta_2 - \theta_1} \frac{\check{c}(0, \zeta)}{1 - \cos \zeta} d\zeta = v(\theta_1, \theta_2).
\]
Combining this with (5-2) we arrive at
\[ v(\theta_1, \theta_2) = -v(-\theta_2, -\theta_1). \]
Consider the function \((dv)_0(\phi_1, \phi_2) := dv(0, \phi_1, \phi_2)\). The previous two identities imply that
\[
(dv)_0(\phi_1, \phi_2) = v(\phi_1, \phi_2) - v(0, \phi_2) + v(0, \phi_1) \\
= -(v(-\phi_2, -\phi_1) - v(0, -\phi_1) + v(0, -\phi_2)) \\
= -(dv)_0(-\phi_2, -\phi_1).
\]
Recall from (4-10) that \((dv^h)_0\) and \((dv^b)_0\) are the real and imaginary parts of \((dv)_0\). Hence we conclude that
\[
\begin{align*}
(dv^h)_0(\phi_1, \phi_2) &= -(dv^h)_0(-\phi_2, -\phi_1), \\
(dv^b)_0(\phi_1, \phi_2) &= (dv^b)_0(-\phi_2, -\phi_1).
\end{align*}
\]
The identities (5-3) now follow from (5-4), (5-5) and (5-6), which proves (ii)–(iii). □

Next we consider symmetries of the solutions of (4-8). We introduce some notation first. The \(S_3\)–action on \((S^1)^{(3)}\) commutes with the \(K\)–action, whence it descends to an action on \(\Omega\). To describe this action explicitly, we denote by \(s_1\) and \(s_2\) the Coxeter generators of \(S_3\) that act on \((S^1)^{(3)}\) by swapping coordinates in the pairs \((\theta_0, \theta_1)\) and \((\theta_1, \theta_2)\), respectively. Then, with respect to the coordinates \((\phi_1, \phi_2)\) on \(\Omega\), the actions of \(s_1\) and \(s_2\) are given by
\[
\begin{align*}
s_1(\phi_1, \phi_2) &= (-\phi_1, \phi_2 - \phi_1) & \text{and} & s_2(\phi_1, \phi_2) &= (\phi_2, \phi_1).
\end{align*}
\]
A function \(h_0 \in C^\infty(\Omega)\) will be called alternating under the action of \(S_3\) if \(s.h_0 = (-1)^s h_0\) for all \(s \in S_3\). Thus a function \(h_0 \in C^\infty(\Omega)\) is alternating under the action of \(S_3\) if and only if the function \(h \in C^\infty((S^1)^{(3)})^K\) defined by
\[
h(\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) = h_0(\theta_1 - \theta_0, \theta_2 - \theta_0)
\]
is alternating in the usual sense.

**Proposition 5.2** (Alternating solutions) Assume that the cocycle \(c \in L^\infty((S^1)^{5})^G\) is alternating and even. A solution \(f_0 \in C^\infty(\Omega)\) of (4-8) is alternating under the action of \(S_3\) if and only if
\[
(5-7) \quad f_0(\omega_+) = -f_0(\omega_-).
\]
In this case the primitive \(P_c(f) \in \mathcal{P}(c)^G\), where \(f \in C^\infty((S^1)^{(3)})^K\) is defined by (4-7), is alternating.
Proof First of all, we observe that $S_3$ acts on the base points $\{\omega_+, \omega_-\}$ by
\[
s_1.\omega_\pm = \omega_\mp, \quad s_2.\omega_\pm = \omega_\mp.
\]
Hence, if $f_0$ is alternating under the action of $S_3$ it follows that
\[
f_0(\omega_+) = (-1)^{s_1}f_0(s_1.\omega_+) = -f_0(\omega_-).
\]
Conversely, let $f_0$ be a solution of system (4-8) that satisfies (5-7). We will prove that $f_0$ coincides with its antisymmetrization under the action of $S_3$. By Proposition 4.2(ii), the function $f_0$ corresponds to a solution $f \in C^\infty((S^1)^3)^K$ of (3-3) via
\[
f(\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) = f_0(\theta_1 - \theta_0, \theta_2 - \theta_0).
\]
Now let
\[
\hat{f} := \frac{1}{6} \cdot \sum_{s \in S_3} (-1)^s s.f
\]
be the antisymmetrization of $f$. Then $\hat{f} \in C^\infty((S^1)^3)^K$, and we further claim that $\hat{f}$ solves (3-3) as well. To see this, observe that in (3-3) the operators $L_A^{(3)}$ and $L_N^{(3)}$ are symmetric, while by Proposition 5.1(i) the inhomogeneities $c^b + dv^b$ and $c^b + dv^b$ are alternating. Now, by $K$–invariance, the function $\hat{f}$ gives rise to a function $\hat{f}_0 \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ via
\[
\hat{f}(\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) = \hat{f}_0(\theta_1 - \theta_0, \theta_2 - \theta_0).
\]
Then Proposition 4.2(ii) implies that $\hat{f}_0$ solves the system (4-8). Moreover, we have
\[
\hat{f}_0 = \frac{1}{6} \cdot \sum_{s \in S_3} (-1)^s s.f_0,
\]
whence $\hat{f}_0$ is alternating under the action of $S_3$. It follows from (5-7) and (5-8) that $\hat{f}_0(\omega_\pm) = f_0(\omega_\pm)$. The uniqueness statement in Proposition 4.2(iii) implies that $\hat{f}_0$ coincides with $f_0$. $\square$

The proposition shows that solutions $f_0$ of (4-8) that are alternating under the action of $S_3$ form a 1–parameter family.

5.2 Boundedness

In order to complete the proof of Theorem 1.1 it remains to show that, among the $G$–invariant primitives we constructed in Section 4, there actually exist bounded ones. This is the content of the next proposition, which crucially relies on the symmetries unveiled in the previous section.
Proposition 5.3  (Boundedness) Assume that the cocycle \( c \in L^\infty((S^1)^5)^G \) is alternating and even. Let \( f_0 \in C^\infty(\Omega) \) be a solution of (4-8) that is alternating under the action of \( \mathfrak{S}_3 \). Define \( f \in C^\infty((S^1)^{(3)})^K \) by (4-7). Then the corresponding primitive \( P_c(f) \in \mathcal{P}(c)^G \) is bounded.

The proof of the proposition relies on the following three basic observations:

**Lemma 5.4** Let the function \( f_0 \in C^\infty(\Omega) \) be defined by (4-15). If \( f_0 \) is bounded along the line segments

\[
(0, \frac{2}{3}\pi) \cup \left(\frac{2}{3}\pi, 2\pi\right) \ni \xi \mapsto \left(\frac{2}{3}\pi, \xi\right)
\]

and

\[
(0, \frac{4}{3}\pi) \cup \left(\frac{4}{3}\pi, 2\pi\right) \ni \xi \mapsto \left(\frac{4}{3}\pi, \xi\right),
\]

and \( f \in C^\infty((S^1)^{(3)})^K \) is given by (4-7), then the corresponding primitive \( P_c(f) \) in \( \mathcal{P}(c)^G \) is bounded.

**Proof** By Proposition 4.2, \( P_c(f) = I(c) + df \) is \( G \)-invariant. By 3–transitivity of the \( G \)-action on \( S^1 \) and since \( I(c) \) is bounded, we therefore deduce that \( P_c(f) \) is bounded if and only if the function

\[
z \mapsto df(1, e^{2\pi i/3}, e^{4\pi i/3}, z)
\]

is bounded. Writing \( z = e^{i\xi} \), we may express this function as

\[
\xi \mapsto f\left(\frac{2}{3}\pi, \frac{4}{3}\pi, \xi\right) - f\left(0, \frac{4}{3}\pi, \xi\right) + f\left(0, \frac{2}{3}\pi, \xi\right) - f\left(0, \frac{2}{3}\pi, \frac{4}{3}\pi\right)
\]

\[= f_0\left(\frac{2}{3}\pi, \xi - \frac{2}{3}\pi\right) - f_0\left(\frac{4}{3}\pi, \xi\right) + f_0\left(\frac{2}{3}\pi, \xi\right) - f_0\left(\frac{2}{3}\pi, \frac{4}{3}\pi\right).
\]

The lemma follows.

**Lemma 5.5** Let \( C \) be a compact subset of the open square \((0, 2\pi)^2\). If the function \( f_0 \in C^\infty(\Omega) \) defined by (4-15) is bounded along the antidiagonal \( \Delta^{\text{op}} \) in \( \Omega \), then it is bounded on the subset \( C \cap \Omega \) of \( \Omega \).

**Proof** By Lemma 4.1 the function \( F_c^{\text{b}} = c_0^{\text{b}} + (dv)^{\text{b}} \) is bounded. Moreover, by assumption, the function \( f_0 \) is bounded along the antidiagonal \( \Delta^{\text{op}} \) in \( \Omega \), ie there exists a number \( M > 0 \) such that \( |f_0|_{\Delta^{\text{op}}} \leq M \). Hence we obtain from (4-15) the estimate

\[
|f_0(\phi_1, \phi_2)| \leq M + \|F_c^{\text{b}}\|_{\infty} \cdot |\phi_1, \phi_2|
\]

for all \((\phi_1, \phi_2) \in \Omega\). It remains to show that the function \( T \) is bounded on \( C \cap \Omega \). By compactness of \( C \) it will be enough to prove that the function \( T: \Omega \to \mathbb{R} \) extends to a continuous function on the open square \((0, 2\pi)^2\). This, however, is immediate from (4-12).
Lemma 5.6 Assume that the cocycle $c \in L^\infty((S^1)^{\mathbb{S}})^G$ is alternating. Then the function $f_0 \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ defined by (4-15) is locally constant along the antidiagonal $\Delta^{\text{op}}$ in $\Omega$.

Proof Since $c$ is alternating, the inhomogeneity $F^b_c$ vanishes along the antidiagonal $\Delta^{\text{op}}$ by Proposition 5.1(ii). The lemma now follows from (4-15).

Example 5.7 Assume that the cocycle $c$ is alternating. Consider the special solution $f_0$ determined by the initial values $f_0(\omega_{\pm}) = 0$. It is alternating under the action of $\mathbb{S}_3$ by Proposition 5.2. Moreover, by Lemma 5.6 it vanishes along the antidiagonal $\Delta^{\text{op}}$. Since under the action of $\mathbb{S}_3$ the components of $\Delta^{\text{op}}$ get identified with the medians of the triangles enclosing the domains $\Omega_+$ and $\Omega_-$, we further infer that $f_0$ also vanishes along these medians. Moreover, by Proposition 5.1(iii) the function $F^b_c$ is symmetric about the antidiagonal. Thus we see from (4-15) that the special solution $f_0$ is antisymmetric with respect to the antidiagonal and, hence, antisymmetric with respect to all medians.

We are now ready to prove Proposition 5.3.

Proof of Proposition 5.3 By Proposition 4.2(iii) the function $f_0$ is given by (4-15). Hence, by Lemma 5.4 it suffices to show that $f_0$ is bounded along the line segments $\xi \mapsto (\frac{2}{3}\pi, \xi)$ and $\xi \mapsto (\frac{4}{3}\pi, \xi)$. Since $f_0$ is alternating under the action of $\mathbb{S}_3$, it suffices to prove that $f_0$ is bounded along the images of these line segments in any
fundamental domain for the $\mathbb{S}_3$–action on $\Omega$. In fact, we may choose the fundamental domain in such a way that the image line segments lie inside a compact subset of $(0, 2\pi)^2$ (see Figure 3). By Lemmas 5.5 and 5.6, the function $f_0$ is then bounded on these line segments. □

Theorem 1.1 follows by combining Propositions 4.2, 5.2 and 5.3.

Appendix A: Vanishing of odd cocycles

The goal of this appendix is to prove Proposition 2.6, which states that every bounded alternating $G$–invariant 4–cocycle is necessarily even. Our strategy here is inspired by Burger and Monod [15] in that we consider Fourier transforms of cocycles and study the conditions imposed on them by $G$–invariance. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we denote by $c(\mathbb{Z}^{n+1})$ the space of complex-valued sequences indexed by $\mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$ and by $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^{n+1})$ the subspace of square-summable sequences. We denote by $e_0, \ldots, e_n$ the standard basis of $\mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$ and use the multi-index notation

$$k := (k_0, \ldots, k_n) := \sum_{j=0}^{n} k_j e_j.$$ 

We then write $c_{alt}(\mathbb{Z}^{n+1})$ and $\ell^2_{alt}(\mathbb{Z}^{n+1})$, respectively, for the corresponding subspaces of alternating sequences and define two linear operators $A_{\pm}^{(n)} : \ell^2_{alt}(\mathbb{Z}^{n+1}) \to c_{alt}(\mathbb{Z}^{n+1})$ by

$$(A_+^{(n)} F)(k) := \sum_{j=0}^{n} (k_j + 1) \cdot F(k + e_j),$$

$$(A_-^{(n)} F)(k) := \sum_{j=0}^{n} (k_j - 1) \cdot F(k - e_j).$$

**Definition A.1** An element $C \in \ell^2_{alt}(\mathbb{Z}^{n+1})$ is called a combinatorial $n$–cocycle if the following hold:

(i) $C(k_0, \ldots, k_n) = 0$ unless $k_j = 0$ for precisely one $j \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$.

(ii) $C(k_0, \ldots, k_n) = 0$ unless $k_0 + \cdots + k_n = 0$.

(iii) $C \in \ker(A_+^{(n)}) \cap \ker(A_-^{(n)})$.

According to [15, Section 3.1], the Fourier transform $\hat{c}$ of a $G$–invariant alternating bounded $n$–cocycle $c$ is a combinatorial $n$–cocycle. Observe that $c$ is even if and only if $\hat{c}$ is even in the sense that $\hat{c}(-k) = \hat{c}(k)$. Proposition 2.6 will therefore be a consequence of the following combinatorial result:

---
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**Proposition A.2** Every combinatorial $4$–cocycle is even.

For the proof of Proposition A.2 we need two preparatory lemmas. Given a combinatorial $n$–cocycle $C$ we let $\text{supp}(C) := \{k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1} \mid C(k) \neq 0\}$ be the support of $C$.

**Lemma A.3** Let $C$ be a combinatorial $4$–cocycle and $(k_0, k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4) \in \text{supp}(C)$. Then there exists $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_5$ such that

$$k_{\sigma(0)} < k_{\sigma(1)} < k_{\sigma(2)} = 0 < k_{\sigma(3)} < k_{\sigma(4)}.$$

**Proof** Since $C$ is alternating and vanishes unless precisely one of its entries is 0, it suffices to show that $C$ vanishes on those $k \in \mathbb{Z}^5$ which satisfy either

\begin{equation}
(\text{A-1}) \quad k_0 > k_1 = 0 > k_2 > k_3 > k_4
\end{equation}

or $k_0 < k_1 = 0 < k_2 < k_3 < k_4$. We are going to show $C(k_0, 0, k_2, k_3, k_4) = 0$ whenever $k$ satisfies (A-1) and leave the second, analogous case to the reader. Our proof will be by induction on $k_0$.

If $k_0 \leq 5$ then the condition $k_2 + k_3 + k_4 = -k_0$ cannot be satisfied for $k$ satisfying (A-1), hence $C(k) = 0$. Otherwise, we use $C \in \ker(A_+^{(4)})$ to deduce that

$$0 = (A_+^{(4)}C)(k_0 - 1, 0, k_2, k_3, k_4)$$

$$= k_0 \cdot C(k_0, 0, k_2, k_3, k_4) + (k_2 + 1) \cdot C(k_0 - 1, 0, k_2 + 1, k_3, k_4)$$

$$+ (k_3 + 1) \cdot C(k_0 - 1, 0, k_2, k_3 + 1, k_4) + (k_2 + 1) \cdot C(k_0 - 1, 0, k_2, k_3, k_4 + 1).$$

The third summand on the right-hand side vanishes by antisymmetry if $k_2 + 1 = 0$, and by the induction hypothesis otherwise. Similarly, the last two summands vanish. Now the assumption $k_0 \neq 0$ implies $C(k_0, 0, k_2, k_3, k_4) = 0$. \hfill $\square$

**Lemma A.4** Let $C$ and $D$ be combinatorial $4$–cocycles such that

$$C(-n - 1, -n, 0, n, n + 1) = D(-n - 1, -n, 0, n, n + 1)$$

holds for all $n > 0$. Then $C = D$.

**Proof** Since the space of combinatorial cocycles is linear, we may assume $D = 0$ and hence

$$C(-n - 1, -n, 0, n, n + 1) = 0 \quad \text{for all} \ n > 0.$$
We have to show that $C = 0$. Using that $C$ is alternating and Lemma A.3, it suffices to prove that $C(k_0, k_1, 0, k_3, k_4) = 0$ whenever $k_0 < k_1 < 0 < k_3 < k_4$. Since $C \in \ker(A_+^{(4)})$ we have

$$0 = (A_+^{(4)} C)(k_0, k_1, 0, k_3, k_4 - 1) = (k_0 + 1) \cdot C(k_0 + 1, k_1, 0, k_3, k_4 - 1) + (k_1 + 1) \cdot C(k_0, k_1 + 1, 0, k_3, k_4 - 1) + 0 + (k_3 + 1) \cdot C(k_0, k_1, 0, k_3 + 1, k_4 - 1) + k_4 \cdot C(k_0, k_1, 0, k_3, k_4).$$

We may rewrite this as

$$(A-2) \quad C(k_0, k_1, 0, k_3, k_4) = -\frac{k_0 + 1}{k_4} \cdot C(k_0 + 1, k_1, 0, k_3, k_4 - 1) - \frac{k_1 + 1}{k_4} \cdot C(k_0, k_1 + 1, 0, k_3, k_4 - 1) - \frac{k_3 + 1}{k_4} \cdot C(k_0, k_1, 0, k_3 + 1, k_4 - 1).$$

Now we iterate this recursion. In each step we get a sum of terms of the form $C(k_0, k_1, 0, k_3, k_4)$, where the distance between $k_3$ and $k_4$ is smaller than in the previous step. We can thus run the iteration until we arrive at terms of the form $C(k_0, k_1, 0, n, n + 1)$ with $0 < n$. We may furthermore assume that $k_0 < k_1 < 0$, since $C$ is alternating. It then remains to show that

$$(A-3) \quad C(k_0, k_1, 0, n, n + 1) = 0 \quad \text{for all } k_0 < k_1 < 0 < n.$$

We prove this by a double induction on $n$ and $|k_0|$.

If $n = 1$ then the condition $k_0 + k_1 = -2n - 1$ forces $(k_0, k_1) = (-2, -1)$ and we are done by hypothesis. Now assume that $n > 1$ is arbitrary. The condition $k_0 + k_1 = -2n - 1$ forces $|k_0| \geq n + 1$. If $|k_0| = n + 1$ then $(k_0, k_1) = (-n - 1, -n)$ and we are again done by hypothesis. It thus remains to show (A-3) for $n > 1$ and $|k_0| > n + 1$, where we assume

$$C(k_0', k_1, 0, n', n' + 1) = 0$$

if either $n' < n$, or $n = n'$ and $|k_0'| < |k_0|$.

Now since $C \in \ker(A_+^{(4)})$ we have

$$0 = (A_+^{(4)} C)(k_0 + 1, k_1, 0, n, n + 1) = k_0 \cdot C(k_0, k_1, 0, n, n + 1) + (k_1 - 1) \cdot C(k_0 + 1, k_1 - 1, 0, n, n + 1) + 0 + (n - 1) \cdot C(k_0 + 1, k_1, 0, n - 1, n + 1) + n \cdot C(k_0 + 1, k_1, 0, n, n).$$
The second of the five summands on the right-hand side vanishes by induction hypothesis of the inner induction on \( k_0 \), while the last summand vanishes by antisymmetry. Since \( k_0 < -n - 1 < -2 \) we have \( k_0 \neq 0 \) and thus

\[
C(k_0, k_1, 0, n, n + 1) = -\frac{n-1}{k_0} \cdot C(k_0 + 1, k_1, 0, n-1, n+1).
\]

To deal with the expression on the right-hand side we again apply (A-2) with \( k_3 = n-1 \) and \( k_4 = n + 1 \). We thereby find

\[
C(k_0, k_1, 0, n, n + 1) = \frac{(n-1)(k_0 + 1)}{k_0(n+1)} C(k_0 + 1, k_1, 0, n-1, n) \\
+ \frac{(n-1)(k_1 + 1)}{k_0(n+1)} C(k_0, k_1 + 1, 0, n-1, n) \\
+ \frac{(n-1)n}{k_0(n+1)} C(k_0, k_1, 0, n, n).
\]

Here, the first two summands vanish by the induction hypothesis of the outer induction on \( n \) and the last summand vanishes by antisymmetry. This shows that \( C(k_0, k_1, 0, n, n + 1) = 0 \) and finishes the proof of the lemma.

**Proof of Proposition A.2** Given a combinatorial 4–cocycle \( C \) we define a function \( D : \mathbb{Z}^5 \to \mathbb{C} \) by \( D(k_0, \ldots, k_4) := C(-k_0, \ldots, -k_4) \). We claim that \( D \) is a combinatorial cocycle. Since \( C \) is alternating and in \( \ell^2 \), \( D \) is alternating and in \( \ell^2 \) as well. Conditions (i) and (ii) are obvious. Since \( C \in \ker(A^{(4)}) \) we have

\[
(A^{(4)}_+)D(k) = \sum_{j=0}^{4} (k_j + 1) \cdot D(k + e_j) = -\sum_{j=0}^{4} (k_j - 1) \cdot C(-k + e_j)
\]

\[
= -\sum_{j=0}^{4} (k_j - 1) \cdot C(-k - e_j) = -(A^{(4)}_-)C(-k_0, \ldots, -k_4) = 0,
\]

which shows that \( D \in \ker(A^{(4)}_+) \). Dually, \( C \in \ker(A^{(4)}_-) \) implies \( D \in \ker(A^{(4)}_-) \), which finishes the proof that \( D \) is a combinatorial cocycle.

On the other hand, antisymmetry of \( C \) yields

\[
D(-n-1, -n, 0, n, n + 1) = C(n+1, n, 0, +, -n, -n-1) = C(-n-1, -n, 0, n, n + 1).
\]

Now Lemma A.4 implies that \( C(k) = D(k) = C(-k) \), which means that \( C \) is even.

This finishes the proof of Proposition 2.6.
Appendix B: The Frobenius integrability condition

The goal of this appendix is to prove Proposition 3.7. We have to show that the system

\[
\begin{align*}
L_K^{(3)} f &= 0, \\
L_A^{(3)} f &= c^\# + dv^\#, \\
L_N^{(3)} f &= c^b + dv^b,
\end{align*}
\]

admits a solution \((f, v^\#, v^b)\) if and only if the pair \((v^\#, v^b)\) satisfies the Frobenius system (3-6). Here we consider \(f\) and \(v^\#, v^b\) as smooth functions on the domains \(D := [0, 2\pi)^{(3)}\) and \([0, 2\pi)^{(2)}\), respectively. It will be convenient to replace (B-1) by the equivalent system

\[
\begin{align*}
L_K^{(3)} f &= 0, \\
L_A^{(3)} f &= c^\# + dv^#, \\
L_N^{(3)} f - L_K^{(3)} f &= c^b + dv^b.
\end{align*}
\]

Consider the product \(D \times \mathbb{R}\). We denote the coordinates on \(D\) by \((\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2)\) and the coordinate on \(\mathbb{R}\) by \(\theta_3\). The graph \(\Gamma_f := \{(\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2, f(\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2))\}\) of the function \(f\) is a 3–dimensional submanifold of \(D \times \mathbb{R}\). Define vector fields on \(D \times \mathbb{R}\) by

\[
\begin{align*}
X &= L_K^{(3)}, \\
y &= L_A^{(3)} + (c^\# + dv^#) \partial_{\theta_3}, \\
z &= L_N^{(3)} - L_K^{(3)} + (c^b + dv^b) \partial_{\theta_3}.
\end{align*}
\]

Since \(G\) acts strictly 3–transitively on \(D\), it follows that these vector fields span a distribution \(E\) of constant rank \(3\) on \(D \times \mathbb{R}\). Then a triple \((f, v^\#, v^b)\) is a solution of (B-2) if and only if the graph \(\Gamma_f\) is an integral manifold for \(E\). Hence the Frobenius theorem (see eg Lee [35, Chapter 11]) implies that (B-2) admits a solution \((f, v^\#, v^b)\) if and only if the distribution \(E\) is integrable, ie the vector fields \(X, Y, Z\) form an involutive system. Note that

\[
[L_K^{(3)}, L_A^{(3)}] = L_K^{(3)} - L_N^{(3)}, \quad [L_K^{(3)}, L_N^{(3)} - L_K^{(3)}] = L_A^{(3)}, \quad [L_A^{(3)}, L_N^{(3)} - L_K^{(3)}] = L_K^{(3)}.
\]

Hence the vector fields \(X, Y, Z\) form an involutive system if and only if

\[
\]

We shall now make these conditions explicit. We start with two preliminary lemmas.

**Lemma B.1** The functions \(c^\#\) and \(c^b\) defined in (3-1) and (3-2) satisfy

\[
L_K^{(3)} c^\# = -c^b, \quad L_K^{(3)} c^b = c^\#.
\]
Proof More generally, we prove that, for any function \( \lambda \in C^\infty((0, 2\pi)) \), the function

\[
    c_\lambda(\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) := \int \int \lambda(\varphi) \, c(\eta, \varphi, \theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) \, d\eta \, d\varphi
\]

satisfies \( L_K^{(3)} c_\lambda = c_{\lambda'} \). Indeed, by \( K \)-invariance of the cocycle \( c \) and the measure, we have

\[
    L_K^{(3)} c_\lambda(\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) = \frac{d}{d\xi} \bigg|_{\xi=0} \int \int \lambda(\varphi) c(\eta, \varphi + \xi, \theta_0 + \xi, \theta_1 + \xi, \theta_2 + \xi) \, d\eta \, d\varphi
\]

\[
    = \frac{d}{d\xi} \bigg|_{\xi=0} \int \int \lambda(\varphi) c(\eta - \xi, \varphi - \xi, \theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) \, d\eta \, d\varphi
\]

\[
    = \int \int \frac{d}{d\xi} \lambda(\varphi + \xi) c(\eta, \varphi, \theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) \, d\eta \, d\varphi
\]

\[
    = \int \int \lambda'(\varphi) c(\eta, \varphi, \theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) \, d\eta \, d\varphi. \quad \square
\]

Lemma B.2 The function \( \tilde{c} \) defined in (3-5) satisfies

\[
    (B-4) \quad L_K^{(3)} c^# - L_N^{(3)} c^# + L_A^{(3)} c^b = -d\tilde{c}.
\]

Proof Let us consider the left-hand side of (B-4). In a first step, using \( G \)-invariance of \( c \) and \( K \)-invariance of the measure, we compute

\[
    L_K^{(3)} c^#(\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) = \frac{d}{d\xi} \bigg|_{\xi=0} \int \int \cos(\varphi) c(\eta, \varphi, \theta_0 + \xi, \theta_1 + \xi, \theta_2 + \xi) \, d\eta \, d\varphi
\]

\[
    = \int \int \frac{d}{d\xi} \cos(\varphi + \xi) \bigg|_{\xi=0} c(\eta, \varphi, \theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) \, d\eta \, d\varphi
\]

and

\[
    L_N^{(3)} c^#(\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2)
\]

\[
    = \frac{d}{dt} \bigg|_{t=0} \int \int \cos(\varphi) c(\eta, \varphi, n_t \theta_0, n_t \theta_1, n_t \theta_2) \, d\eta \, d\varphi
\]

\[
    = \int \int \frac{d}{dt} \left( \cos(n_t \varphi) \frac{d(n_t \varphi)}{d\varphi} \frac{d(n_t \eta)}{d\eta} \right) \bigg|_{t=0} c(\eta, \varphi, \theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) \, d\eta \, d\varphi
\]
and, similarly,

\[ L^{(3)}_A c^b(\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) \]

\[ = \frac{d}{ds} \left|_{s=0} \int \int \sin(\varphi) c(\eta, \varphi, a_s, \theta_0, a_s, \theta_1, a_s, \theta_2) \, d\eta \, d\varphi \right. \]

\[ = \left. \int \int \frac{d}{ds} \left( \sin(a_s, \varphi) \frac{d(a_s, \varphi)}{d\varphi} \frac{d(a_s, \eta)}{d\eta} \right) \right|_{s=0} \left. c(\eta, \varphi, \theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) \, d\eta \, d\varphi. \right. \]

Second, using Lemma 3.2 we compute the derivatives appearing in the above formulas. Firstly, we have \( d \cos(\varphi + \xi)/d\xi|_{\xi=0} = -\sin(\varphi) \). Moreover,

\[ \frac{d}{dt} \left( \cos(n_t, \varphi) \frac{d(n_t, \varphi)}{d\varphi} \frac{d(n_t, \eta)}{d\eta} \right) \bigg|_{t=0} \]

\[ = -\sin(n_t, \varphi) \frac{d(n_t, \varphi)}{dt} \frac{d(n_t, \varphi)}{d\varphi} \frac{d(n_t, \eta)}{d\eta} \bigg|_{t=0} + \cos(n_t, \varphi) \frac{d}{d\varphi} \left( \frac{d(n_t, \varphi)}{dt} \frac{d(n_t, \eta)}{d\eta} \right) \bigg|_{t=0} + \cos(n_t, \varphi) \frac{d(n_t, \varphi)}{d\varphi} \frac{d}{d\eta} \left( \frac{d(n_t, \eta)}{dt} \right) \bigg|_{t=0} \]

\[ = -\sin(n_t, \varphi)(1 - \cos(n_t, \varphi)) \frac{d(n_t, \varphi)}{d\varphi} \frac{d(n_t, \eta)}{d\eta} \bigg|_{t=0} + \cos(n_t, \varphi) \frac{d}{d\varphi} \left( 1 - \cos(n_t, \varphi) \right) \frac{d(n_t, \eta)}{d\eta} \bigg|_{t=0} + \cos(n_t, \varphi) \frac{d(n_t, \varphi)}{d\varphi} \frac{d}{d\eta}(1 - \cos(n_t, \eta)) \bigg|_{t=0} \]

\[ = -\sin \varphi(1 - \cos \varphi) + \cos \varphi \sin \varphi + \cos \varphi \sin \eta \]

\[ = 2 \sin \varphi \cos \varphi + \cos \varphi \sin \eta - \sin \varphi. \]

Lastly,

\[ \frac{d}{ds} \left( \sin(a_s, \varphi) \frac{d(a_s, \varphi)}{d\varphi} \frac{d(a_s, \eta)}{d\eta} \right) \bigg|_{s=0} \]

\[ = \cos(a_s, \varphi) \frac{d(a_s, \varphi)}{ds} \frac{d(a_s, \varphi)}{d\varphi} \frac{d(a_s, \eta)}{d\eta} \bigg|_{s=0} + \sin(a_s, \varphi) \frac{d}{d\varphi} \left( \frac{d(a_s, \varphi)}{ds} \frac{d(a_s, \eta)}{d\eta} \right) \bigg|_{s=0} + \sin(a_s, \varphi) \frac{d(a_s, \varphi)}{d\phi} \frac{d}{d\eta} \left( \frac{d(a_s, \eta)}{ds} \right) \bigg|_{s=0} \]

\[ = \cos(a_s, \varphi) \sin(a_s, \varphi) \frac{d(a_s, \varphi)}{d\varphi} \frac{d(a_s, \eta)}{d\eta} \bigg|_{s=0} + \sin(a_s, \varphi) \frac{d}{d\varphi} \sin(a_s, \varphi) \frac{d(a_s, \eta)}{d\eta} \bigg|_{s=0} + \sin(a_s, \varphi) \frac{d(a_s, \varphi)}{d\varphi} \frac{d}{d\eta} \sin(a_s, \eta) \bigg|_{s=0} \]
= 2 \sin \varphi \cos \varphi + \sin \varphi \cos \eta.

Summing up, we obtain

\[ \begin{align*}
L^{(3)}_K c^b(\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) - L^{(3)}_N c^b(\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) + L^{(3)}_A c^b(\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) & = \iint (\sin \varphi \cos \eta - \cos \varphi \sin \eta) c(\eta, \varphi, \theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) \, d\eta \, d\varphi \\
& = -\iint \sin(\eta - \varphi) c(\eta, \varphi, \theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) \, d\eta \, d\varphi.
\end{align*} \]

Now we turn to the computation of the right-hand side of (B-4). The cocycle identity for \( c \) yields

\[ 0 = dc(\eta, \varphi, \psi, \theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) = c(\varphi, \psi, \theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) - c(\eta, \psi, \theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) + c(\eta, \varphi, \theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) - \sum_{j=0}^{2} (-1)^j c(\eta, \varphi, \psi, \theta_0, \ldots, \hat{\theta}_j, \ldots, \theta_2). \]

We multiply this identity by \( \sin(\eta - \varphi) \) and integrate over the variables \( \eta, \varphi \) and \( \psi \).

Integrating the first term, we get

\[ \iint \int \int \sin(\eta - \varphi) c(\varphi, \psi, \theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) \, d\eta \, d\varphi \, d\psi \]

\[ = \iint \int \left( \int \sin(\eta - \varphi) \, d\eta \right) c(\varphi, \psi, \theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) \, d\varphi \, d\psi = 0. \]

Likewise, the integral of the second term vanishes. We are thus left with

\[ \iint \sin(\eta - \varphi) c(\eta, \varphi, \theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) \, d\eta \, d\varphi \]

\[ = \iint \int \sin(\eta - \varphi) \left( \sum_{j=0}^{2} (-1)^j c(\eta, \varphi, \psi, \theta_0, \ldots, \hat{\theta}_j, \ldots, \theta_2) \right) \, d\eta \, d\varphi \, d\psi \]

\[ = \sum_{j=0}^{2} (-1)^j \iint \int \sin(\eta - \varphi) c(\eta, \varphi, \psi, \theta_0, \ldots, \hat{\theta}_j, \ldots, \theta_2) \, d\eta \, d\varphi \, d\psi \]

\[ = dc(\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2). \]

Comparing this with (B-5) above, formula (B-4) follows. \( \square \)

We are now in a position to finish the proof of Proposition 3.7 by spelling out the integrability conditions (B-3). Consider the first identity in (B-3). We have

\[ [X, Y] = [L^{(3)}_K, L^{(3)}_A] + (L^{(3)}_K (c^\# + dv^\#)) \partial \theta_3 = L^{(3)}_K - L^{(3)}_N + (L^{(3)}_K (c^\# + dv^\#)) \partial \theta_3. \]
Recall from Lemma B.1 and Lemma 3.3 that
\[ L_K^3 c^\# = -c^b, \quad L_K^3 d v^\# = d L_K^2 v^\#. \]
Thus,
\[ [X, Y] = L_K^3 - L_N^3 + (-c^b + d L_K^2 v^\#) \partial_{\theta_3}. \]
Comparing this to \(-Z\) we find
\[ (B-6) \quad [X, Y] = -Z \iff d(L_K^2 v^\# + v^b) = 0. \]
Likewise, for the second identity in \((B-3)\) we have
\[ (B-7) \quad [X, Z] = Y \iff d(L_K^2 v^b - v^\#) = 0. \]
Finally, observe that
\[ [Y, Z] = [L_A^3, L_N^3 - L_K^3] + [L_A^3, (c^b + d v^b) \partial_{\theta_3}] - [L_N^3 - L_K^3, (c^\# + d v^\#) \partial_{\theta_3}] \]
\[ = L_K^3 + ((L_K^2 - L_N^2) d v^\# + L_A^3 d v^b + (L_K^3 - L_N^3) c^\# + L_A^3 c^b) \partial_{\theta_3}. \]
By Lemma B.2 and Lemma 3.3, this becomes
\[ [Y, Z] = L_K^3 + (d(L_K^2 - L_N^2) v^\# + d L_A^2 v^b - d c) \partial_{\theta_3}. \]
We deduce that
\[ (B-8) \quad [Y, Z] = X \iff d(L_K^2 v^\# - L_N^2 v^\# + L_A^2 v^b - \ddot{c}) = 0. \]
Combining \((B-6), (B-7)\) and \((B-8)\), Proposition 3.7 now follows from \((B-3)\).
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