

MA 200 - Lecture 22

1 Recap

1. Stated and proved change of variables
2. Volumes of parallelepipeds.

2 Change of variables and volumes of parametrised manifolds

Theorem 1. *There is a unique function $V : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \dots \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that*

1. *If O is an orthogonal matrix, then $V(Oa_1, \dots, Oa_k) = V(a_1, \dots, a_k)$.*
2. *If $a_1 = (b_1, 0), \dots, a_k = (b_k, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \{0\}$, then $V(a_1, \dots, a_k) = |\det(B)|$.*

V vanishes iff a_i are linearly independent. Moreover, $V(a_1, \dots, a_k) = \sqrt{\det(A^T A)}$ where A is the $n \times k$ matrix $A = [a_1 \dots]$.

Proof. Define $F(A) = \det(A^T A)$. If O is an orthogonal matrix, then $F(OA) = F(A)$. Moreover, if $a_i = (b_i, 0)$, then $F(A) = \det(B)^2 \geq 0$ with equality iff b_i (and hence $(b_i, 0)$) are linearly dependent. Now given an arbitrary a , there exists an orthogonal matrix such that $Oa = (b, 0)$ (indeed, take the standard basis to an orthonormal basis that restricts to one on the span of a). Now $V(A) = \sqrt{F(A)}$ satisfies the conditions of the theorem and the argument also shows uniqueness. \square

Let M be a C^r parametrised manifold-without-boundary of dimension k in \mathbb{R}^n , i.e., $M = \alpha(D)$ where $\alpha : D \subset \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a C^r coordinate parametrisation. Then the volume of M is defined as $v(M) = \int_D \sqrt{\det(D\alpha^T D\alpha)}$ if it exists (as an improper integral). Justification:

1. If we take an infinitesimal rectangle in \mathbb{R}^k with sides $dx_i e_i$, then $\frac{\partial \tilde{\alpha}}{\partial x_i} dx_i e_i$ are the sides of the infinitesimal parallelepiped it gets mapped to. We know that the volume of this parallelepiped is $\sqrt{\det(D\alpha^T D\alpha)}$.
2. It is independent of parametrisation: Suppose Let $\tilde{\alpha} : \tilde{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be another C^r coordinate parametrisation (homeomorphic to its image and $D\tilde{\alpha}$ has rank k everywhere). Then this is a reparametrisation of α , i.e., the map $\phi = \alpha \circ \tilde{\alpha}^{-1} : D \rightarrow \tilde{D}$ is a C^r diffeomorphism (why?) Now $\phi \circ \tilde{\alpha} = \alpha$ and hence $D\alpha_x = D\phi_{\tilde{\alpha}(x)} D\tilde{\alpha}_x \Rightarrow \det((D\alpha_x)^T D\alpha_x) = |\det(D\phi_{\tilde{\alpha}(x)})|^2 \det((D\tilde{\alpha}_x)^T (D\tilde{\alpha}_x))$. Hence by the change of variables formula, we are done.

More generally, if we want to calculate the “charge” or “mass” of a parametrised manifold, then if $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function (“the charge density”), the integral of f is defined to be $\int_M f dV = \int_D f \circ \alpha \sqrt{\det(D\alpha^T D\alpha)}$. The same proof shows reparametrisation invariance.

Examples:

1. Consider $\alpha : (0, 2\pi) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$: $\alpha(t) = (\cos(t), \sin(t))$. As we have shown earlier, α is a smooth coordinate parametrisation. The length of the circle-minus-one point is $\int_0^{2\pi} \sqrt{|\alpha'|^2} dt = 2\pi$. (Note that morally, the one point we missed has measure zero and shouldn't contribute to the circumference. Soon we will define the length of the full circle and you will easily see that indeed our expectation is correct.)
2. Suppose we have a parametrised surface, then $\det(D\alpha^T D\alpha) = \|\frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial u}\|^2 \|\frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial v}\|^2 - |\langle \frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial u}, \frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial v} \rangle|^2 = \|\alpha_u \times \alpha_v\|^2$ just as in UM 102. So using this expression we can calculate the area of the image of $\alpha : (0, \pi) \times (0, 2\pi) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ given by $\alpha(\theta, \phi) = (\sin(\theta) \sin(\phi), \sin(\theta) \cos(\phi), \cos(\theta))$ to be 4π as expected.
3. $\alpha : B_0(1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ given by $\alpha(x, y) = (x, y, \sqrt{1 - x^2 - y^2})$. Note that α is smooth on D but its derivatives are *not* bounded. Thus the integral must be made sense of as an improper integral. Let $U_N = B_{1-1/N}(0)$. The usual integral over U_N exists and equals $\int_{U_N} \sqrt{1 + \frac{x^2}{1-x^2-y^2} + \frac{y^2}{1-x^2-y^2}} = \int_{U_N} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2-y^2}}$. We can change variables to polar coordinates (because measure zero sets don't make a difference) and then use Fubini to calculate this integral and get something that converges to 2π .

What about general manifolds that cannot be covered by only one coordinate chart? (By the way, every manifold is, up to measure zero, a parametrised one.) Firstly, given any open cover by coordinate parametrisations, i.e., by parametrised open sets $U_i \cap M$ (where U_i are open in \mathbb{R}^n), choose a partition-of-unity for $\cup_i U_i$ subordinate to the open cover. Secondly assume that M is compact and cover it with finitely many coordinate parametrisations - one can find finitely many functions forming a partition-of-unity (local finiteness guarantees that actually any partition-of-unity is finite). Now suppose $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function. Define $\int_M f dV = \sum_i \int_{D_i} \rho_i f dV_{\alpha_i}$ (note that since $\rho_i f$ has compact support, each summand is a usual integral). Before we prove well-definedness, let us generalise manifolds-without-boundary to having boundary too (that is, instead of only considering the open hemisphere, we want to consider the closed hemisphere with its boundary circle too). After all, this sort of a notion is necessary for Green's theorem.

3 Manifolds-with-boundary

Consider a hemisphere. What does it look like near the boundary circle? Certainly not like an open subset of \mathbb{R}^2 but instead like an open subset of $\mathbb{H}^2 = \{y \geq 0\}$. So we define as follows: A subset $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is called a k -dimensional manifold-with-boundary if it can be covered with open subsets that are homeomorphic to an open subset U of either \mathbb{R}^k or \mathbb{H}^k via $\alpha : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ that is smooth and $D\alpha$ is 1 - 1 everywhere.

Recall that a function $f : S \subset \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be C^r if it can be extended to a C^r function on an open set containing S . This leads to a problem because a function is C^r at a point $p \in S$ if there is a neighbourhood $V_p \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ of p and a C^r function $\tilde{f}_p : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\tilde{f}_p = f$ on $V_p \cap S$. So why is a function C^r iff it is C^r at every point? This fact is true and can be proven using partitions-of-unity: Indeed, assume it is C^r at every point. Now take a partition-of-unity subordinate to the cover V_p of S . Now define $\tilde{f} = \sum_i \phi_i \tilde{f}_{p_i}$. Of course \tilde{f} is C^r on the open set $V = \cup_i V_{p_i} \supset S$ and when $q \in S$, $\tilde{f}(q) = \sum_i \phi_i(q) f(q) = f(q)$. Note also that if a function is C^r on an open subset of \mathbb{H}^k , then all the partial derivatives on the boundary points are uniquely determined (Why?)

If α, β are two coordinate parametrisations on a manifold-with-boundary, then $\alpha \circ \beta^{-1}$ is a C^r injective map whose derivative is injective on the intersection of the domains: Indeed, it is enough to show that $\beta^{-1} : M \cap \beta(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ can be extended to a C^r map on a neighbourhood. Firstly, if $V \subset \mathbb{H}^k$, then by definition, we can extend β to $\tilde{\beta}$ on an open subset $\tilde{V} \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ containing V . Now by the injective derivative theorem, after composing with diffeos, $\phi \circ \tilde{\beta} \circ \psi^{-1}(y) = (y_1, \dots, y_k, 0, 0 \dots)$ whose inverse can certainly be extended to an open set. Hence we are done in this case. In the case where $V \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, we apply this argument to β itself (as opposed to $\tilde{\beta}$).