Analytical obstructions to the weak approximation of Sobolev mappings into manifolds

Antoine Detaille

Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1 — Institut Camille Jordan
Website: andetaille.github.io

The 11th of June 2025

In this talk

Main goal: new families of counterexamples to the weak approximation property of Sobolev mappings into manifolds, joint work with J. Van Schaftingen (UCLouvain).

On the way:

- Sobolev mappings: definition and motivation;
- the strong density problem: statement and complete answer;
- the weak approximation problem: statement and state of the art.

Sobolev spaces with values into manifolds

Let $\mathscr{N}$ be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold, isometrically embedded in $\mathbb{R}^\nu$.
Let $\mathscr{M}$ be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension m and $1 \leq p < +\infty$.

Definition

$$W^{1,p}(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N}) = \{u \in W^{1,p}(\mathscr{M};\mathbb{R}^\nu) \colon u(x) \in \mathscr{N} \text{ for almost every } x \in \mathscr{M}\}$$

The strong density problem

Theorem

The space $C^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ is dense in $W^{1,p}(\mathscr{M})$.

Question

Define

$$H^{1,p}_S(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N}) = \{u \in W^{1,p}(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N}) \colon \text{there exists } (u_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \text{ in } C^\infty(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N}) \text{ such that } u_n \to u\}.$$

Does it hold that $H^{1,p}_S(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N}) = W^{1,p}(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N})$?

The strong density problem

Theorem

The space $C^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ is dense in $W^{1,p}(\mathscr{M})$.

Question

Define

$$H_S^{1,p}(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N}) = \{u \in W^{1,p}(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N}) \colon \text{there exists } (u_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \text{ in } C^\infty(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N}) \text{ such that } u_n \to u\}.$$

Does it hold that $H_S^{1,p}(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N}) = W^{1,p}(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N})$?

The strong density theorem

Theorem (Bethuel (1991))

Assume that $p < m$. Then, $H^{1,p}_S(\mathbb{B}^m; \mathcal{N}) = W^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^m; \mathcal{N})$ if and only if $\pi_{\lfloor p \rfloor}(\mathcal{N}) = \{0\}$.

Extensions to $W^{s,p}$: Brezis and Mironescu (2015, $0 < s < 1$); Bousquet, Ponce, and Van Schaftingen (2015, $s = 2, 3, \ldots$); D. (2023, $s > 1$ noninteger).

The case where $\mathcal{M}$ is topologically non-trivial was explored by Hang and Lin (2003). There, *global* obstructions may arise.

The strong density theorem

Theorem (Bethuel (1991))

Assume that $p < m$. Then, $H^{1,p}_S(\mathbb{B}^m; \mathscr{N}) = W^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^m; \mathscr{N})$ if and only if $\pi_{\lfloor p \rfloor}(\mathscr{N}) = \{0\}$.

Extensions to $W^{s,p}$: Brezis and Mironescu (2015, $0 < s < 1$); Bousquet, Ponce, and Van Schaftingen (2015, $s = 2, 3, \ldots$); D. (2023, $s > 1$ noninteger).

The case where $\mathscr{M}$ is topologically non-trivial was explored by Hang and Lin (2003). There, *global* obstructions may arise.

The strong density theorem

Theorem (Bethuel (1991))

Assume that $p < m$. Then, $H^{1,p}_S(\mathbb{B}^m; \mathscr{N}) = W^{1,p}(\mathbb{B}^m; \mathscr{N})$ if and only if $\pi_{\lfloor p \rfloor}(\mathscr{N}) = \{0\}$.

Extensions to $W^{s,p}$: Brezis and Mironescu (2015, $0 < s < 1$); Bousquet, Ponce, and Van Schaftingen (2015, $s = 2, 3, \ldots$); D. (2023, $s > 1$ noninteger).

The case where $\mathscr{M}$ is topologically non-trivial was explored by Hang and Lin (2003). There, *global* obstructions may arise.

Let's be less demanding: weak approximation

We say that $(u_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *weakly converges* to u in $W^{1,p}$, and we write $u_n \rightharpoonup u$, whenever $u_n \to u$ almost everywhere and

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathcal{E}^{1,p}(u_n, \mathscr{M}) = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \int_{\mathscr{M}} |\mathrm{D}u_n|^p < +\infty.$$

Define

$$H^{1,p}_W(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N}) = \{u \in W^{1,p}(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N}) \colon \text{there exists } (u_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \text{ in } C^\infty(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N}) \text{ such that } u_n \rightharpoonup u\}.$$

Question

Does it hold that $H^{1,p}_W(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N}) = W^{1,p}(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N})$?

Let's be less demanding: weak approximation

We say that $(u_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *weakly converges* to u in $W^{1,p}$, and we write $u_n \rightharpoonup u$, whenever $u_n \to u$ almost everywhere and

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathcal{E}^{1,p}(u_n, \mathcal{M}) = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \int_{\mathcal{M}} |Du_n|^p < +\infty.$$

Define

$$H^{1,p}_W(\mathcal{M};\mathcal{N}) = \{u \in W^{1,p}(\mathcal{M};\mathcal{N})\colon \text{there exists } (u_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \text{ in } C^\infty(\mathcal{M};\mathcal{N}) \text{ such that } u_n \rightharpoonup u\}.$$

Question

Does it hold that $H^{1,p}_W(\mathcal{M};\mathcal{N}) = W^{1,p}(\mathcal{M};\mathcal{N})$?

A topological obstruction: here we go again?

If $p \notin \mathbb{N}$ and $\pi_{\lfloor p \rfloor}(\mathscr{N}) \neq \{0\}$, then $H^{1,p}_W(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N}) \subsetneq W^{1,p}(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N})$ whenever $\dim \mathscr{M} > p$.

Theorem (Bethuel (1991))

If $p \notin \mathbb{N}$, then $H^{1,p}_W(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N}) = H^{1,p}_S(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N})$.

A topological obstruction: here we go again?

If $p \notin \mathbb{N}$ and $\pi_{\lfloor p \rfloor}(\mathscr{N}) \neq \{0\}$, then $H^{1,p}_W(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N}) \subsetneq W^{1,p}(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N})$ whenever $\dim \mathscr{M} > p$.

Theorem (Bethuel (1991))

If $p \notin \mathbb{N}$, then $H^{1,p}_W(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N}) = H^{1,p}_S(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N})$.

A new phenomenon: the case $p \in \mathbb{N}$

Unlike for $2 < p < 3$, we have $\frac{x}{|x|} \in H^{1,2}_W(\mathbb{B}^3; \mathbb{S}^2)$.

More generally, we have:

- $H^{1,2}_S(\mathbb{B}^3; \mathbb{S}^2) \subsetneq H^{1,2}_W(\mathbb{B}^3; \mathbb{S}^2) = W^{1,2}(\mathbb{B}^3; \mathbb{S}^2)$ (Bethuel (1990));
- $H^{1,p}_W(\mathscr{M}; \mathscr{N}) = W^{1,p}(\mathscr{M}; \mathscr{N})$ whenever $\mathscr{N}$ is $(p-1)$-connected (Hajłasz (1994));
- $H^{1,2}_W(\mathscr{M}; \mathscr{N}) = W^{1,2}(\mathscr{M}; \mathscr{N})$ for more general $\mathscr{N}$ (Pakzad and Rivière (2003)).

With more work, we should be able to prove that weak approximation always holds for $p \in \mathbb{N}$. No?

A new phenomenon: the case $p \in \mathbb{N}$

Unlike for $2 < p < 3$, we have $\frac{x}{|x|} \in H^{1,2}_W(\mathbb{B}^3; \mathbb{S}^2)$.

More generally, we have:

- $H^{1,2}_S(\mathbb{B}^3; \mathbb{S}^2) \subsetneq H^{1,2}_W(\mathbb{B}^3; \mathbb{S}^2) = W^{1,2}(\mathbb{B}^3; \mathbb{S}^2)$ (Bethuel (1990));
- $H^{1,p}_W(\mathscr{M}; \mathscr{N}) = W^{1,p}(\mathscr{M}; \mathscr{N})$ whenever $\mathscr{N}$ is $(p-1)$-connected (Hajłasz (1994));
- $H^{1,2}_W(\mathscr{M}; \mathscr{N}) = W^{1,2}(\mathscr{M}; \mathscr{N})$ for more general $\mathscr{N}$ (Pakzad and Rivière (2003)).

With more work, we should be able to prove that weak approximation always holds for $p \in \mathbb{N}$. No?

A new phenomenon: the case $p \in \mathbb{N}$

Unlike for $2 < p < 3$, we have $\frac{x}{|x|} \in H^{1,2}_W(\mathbb{B}^3; \mathbb{S}^2)$.

More generally, we have:

- $H^{1,2}_S(\mathbb{B}^3; \mathbb{S}^2) \subsetneq H^{1,2}_W(\mathbb{B}^3; \mathbb{S}^2) = W^{1,2}(\mathbb{B}^3; \mathbb{S}^2)$ (Bethuel (1990));
- $H^{1,p}_W(\mathscr{M}; \mathscr{N}) = W^{1,p}(\mathscr{M}; \mathscr{N})$ whenever $\mathscr{N}$ is $(p-1)$-connected (Hajłasz (1994));
- $H^{1,2}_W(\mathscr{M}; \mathscr{N}) = W^{1,2}(\mathscr{M}; \mathscr{N})$ for more general $\mathscr{N}$ (Pakzad and Rivière (2003)).

With more work, we should be able to prove that weak approximation always holds for $p \in \mathbb{N}$. No?

A new phenomenon: the case $p \in \mathbb{N}$

Unlike for $2 < p < 3$, we have $\frac{x}{|x|} \in H^{1,2}_W(\mathbb{B}^3; \mathbb{S}^2)$.

More generally, we have:

- $H^{1,2}_S(\mathbb{B}^3; \mathbb{S}^2) \subsetneq H^{1,2}_W(\mathbb{B}^3; \mathbb{S}^2) = W^{1,2}(\mathbb{B}^3; \mathbb{S}^2)$ (Bethuel (1990));
- $H^{1,p}_W(\mathscr{M}; \mathscr{N}) = W^{1,p}(\mathscr{M}; \mathscr{N})$ whenever $\mathscr{N}$ is $(p-1)$-connected (Hajłasz (1994));
- $H^{1,2}_W(\mathscr{M}; \mathscr{N}) = W^{1,2}(\mathscr{M}; \mathscr{N})$ for more general $\mathscr{N}$ (Pakzad and Rivière (2003)).

With more work, we should be able to prove that weak approximation always holds for $p \in \mathbb{N}$. No?

A new phenomenon: the case $p \in \mathbb{N}$

Unlike for $2 < p < 3$, we have $\frac{x}{|x|} \in H^{1,2}_W(\mathbb{B}^3; \mathbb{S}^2)$.

More generally, we have:

- $H^{1,2}_S(\mathbb{B}^3; \mathbb{S}^2) \subsetneq H^{1,2}_W(\mathbb{B}^3; \mathbb{S}^2) = W^{1,2}(\mathbb{B}^3; \mathbb{S}^2)$ (Bethuel (1990));
- $H^{1,p}_W(\mathscr{M}; \mathscr{N}) = W^{1,p}(\mathscr{M}; \mathscr{N})$ whenever $\mathscr{N}$ is $(p-1)$-connected (Hajłasz (1994));
- $H^{1,2}_W(\mathscr{M}; \mathscr{N}) = W^{1,2}(\mathscr{M}; \mathscr{N})$ for more general $\mathscr{N}$ (Pakzad and Rivière (2003)).

With more work, we should be able to prove that weak approximation always holds for $p \in \mathbb{N}$. No? 😰

Obstructions strike back: the analytical obstruction

Theorem (Bethuel (2020))

If $m \geq 4$, then $H^{1,3}_W(\mathscr{M}; \mathbb{S}^2) \subsetneq W^{1,3}(\mathscr{M}; \mathbb{S}^2)$.

Global topological obstructions were already known (Hang and Lin (2003)).
Here, the obstruction is local: it arises already if $\mathscr{M} = \mathbb{B}^4$.

Ingredients involve: the Hopf invariant, Pontryagin construction, the theory of scans by Hardt and Rivière (2003), and branched optimal transportation.

Obstructions strike back: the analytical obstruction

Theorem (Bethuel (2020))

If $m \geq 4$, then $H^{1,3}_W(\mathscr{M}; \mathbb{S}^2) \subsetneq W^{1,3}(\mathscr{M}; \mathbb{S}^2)$.

Global topological obstructions were already known (Hang and Lin (2003)).
Here, the obstruction is local: it arises already if $\mathscr{M} = \mathbb{B}^4$.

Ingredients involve: the Hopf invariant, Pontryagin construction, the theory of scans by Hardt and Rivière (2003), and branched optimal transportation.

Obstructions strike back: the analytical obstruction

Theorem (Bethuel (2020))

If $m \geq 4$, then $H^{1,3}_W(\mathscr{M}; \mathbb{S}^2) \subsetneq W^{1,3}(\mathscr{M}; \mathbb{S}^2)$.

Global topological obstructions were already known (Hang and Lin (2003)).
Here, the obstruction is local: it arises already if $\mathscr{M} = \mathbb{B}^4$.

Ingredients involve: the Hopf invariant, Pontryagin construction, the theory of scans by Hardt and Rivière (2003), and branched optimal transportation.

An analytical obstruction for every $p \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\}$

Theorem (D. and Van Schaftingen (2024))

For every $p \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\}$, there exists a compact Riemannian manifold $\mathscr{N}$ such that, if $\dim \mathscr{M} > p$, then

$$H^{1,p}_W(\mathscr{M}; \mathscr{N}) \subsetneq W^{1,p}(\mathscr{M}; \mathscr{N}).$$

Key procedure in the proof: superlinear energy growth

The *relaxed energy* is defined as

$$\mathcal{E}^{1,p}_{\mathrm{rel}}(u,\mathscr{M}) = \inf \liminf_{n\to+\infty} \int_{\mathscr{M}} |\mathrm{D}u_n|^p,$$

where the inf is over all sequences of $C^\infty(\mathscr{M};\mathscr{N})$ maps converging a.e. to u.

We construct a sequence $(u_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\liminf_{n\to+\infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}^{1,p}_{\mathrm{rel}}(u_n,\mathscr{M})}{\mathcal{E}^{1,p}(u_n,\mathscr{M})} = +\infty.$$

The conclusion follows from the nonlinear uniform boundedness principle (Hang and Lin (2003), Monteil and Van Schaftingen (2019)), a nonlinear version of the Banach–Steinhaus theorem.

Key procedure in the proof: superlinear energy growth

The *relaxed energy* is defined as

$$\mathcal{E}^{1,p}_{\mathrm{rel}}(u, \mathscr{M}) = \inf \liminf_{n \to +\infty} \int_{\mathscr{M}} |\mathrm{D}u_n|^p,$$

where the inf is over all sequences of $C^\infty(\mathscr{M}; \mathscr{N})$ maps converging a.e. to u.
We construct a sequence $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\liminf_{n \to +\infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}^{1,p}_{\mathrm{rel}}(u_n, \mathscr{M})}{\mathcal{E}^{1,p}(u_n, \mathscr{M})} = +\infty.$$

The conclusion follows from the nonlinear uniform boundedness principle (Hang and Lin (2003), Monteil and Van Schaftingen (2019)), a nonlinear version of the Banach–Steinhaus theorem.

A second family of analytical obstructions

Theorem (D. and Van Schaftingen (2024))

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$, if $\dim \mathscr{M} > 4n - 1$, then

$$H_W^{1,4n-1}(\mathscr{M}; \mathbb{S}^{2n}) \subsetneq W^{1,4n-1}(\mathscr{M}; \mathbb{S}^{2n}).$$

The key ingredient is a periodic construction using a Whitehead product.

This shows that Bethuel's counterexample is actually part of an infinite family (and considerably simplifies the proof).

A second family of analytical obstructions

Theorem (D. and Van Schaftingen (2024))

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$, if $\dim \mathscr{M} > 4n-1$, then

$$H_W^{1,4n-1}(\mathscr{M};\mathbb{S}^{2n}) \subsetneq W^{1,4n-1}(\mathscr{M};\mathbb{S}^{2n}).$$

The key ingredient is a periodic construction using a Whitehead product.

This shows that Bethuel's counterexample is actually part of an infinite family (and considerably simplifies the proof).

Thank you for your attention!