University of Parma Research Repository

On Taming and Compatible Symplectic Forms

note finali coverpage

(Article begins on next page)

21 September 2024

ON TAMING AND COMPATIBLE SYMPLECTIC FORMS

RICHARD HIND, COSTANTINO MEDORI, ADRIANO TOMASSINI

ABSTRACT. Let (X, J) be an almost complex manifold. The almost complex structure J acts on the space of 2-forms on X as an involution. A 2-form α is *J-anti-invariant* if $J\alpha = -\alpha$. We investigate the anti-invariant forms and their relation to taming and compatible symplectic forms. For every closed almost complex manifold, in contrast to invariant forms, we show that the space of closed anti-invariant forms has finite dimension.

If X is a closed almost-complex manifold with a taming symplectic form then we show that there are no non trivial exact anti-invariant forms. On the other hand we construct many examples of almost-complex manifolds with exact anti-invariant forms, which are therefore not tamed by any symplectic form. In particular we use our analysis to give an explicit example of an almost-complex structure which is locally almost-Kähler but not globally tamed.

The non-existence of exact anti-invariant forms however does not in itself imply that there exists a taming symplectic form. We show how to construct examples in all dimensions.

INTRODUCTION

Almost-complex structures on a manifold X can be categorized according to whether or not there exist taming or compatible symplectic forms. We recall that a symplectic form ω *tames* an almost-complex structure J if $\omega(v, Jv) > 0$ for all nonzero tangent vectors v, and ω is *compatible* with J if the formula $g(v, w) = \omega(v, Jw)$ defines a Riemannian metric g on X. If ω is compatible with J then the triple (X, J, ω) is sometimes called an almost-Kähler manifold. A Kähler manifold is an almost-Kähler manifold with J integrable.

Let $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}(X)$ be the set of almost-complex structures on X, then we can define subsets $\mathcal{J}_{tame} = \mathcal{J}_{tame}(X)$ and $\mathcal{J}_{comp} = \mathcal{J}_{comp}(X)$ of $\mathcal{J}$ to be the almost-complex structures for which there exists a taming or compatible symplectic form respectively. We also define a subset $\mathcal{J}_{loc.tame}$ of $\mathcal{J}_{tame}$ which consists of locally tame almost-complex structures, that is, $J \in \mathcal{J}_{loc.tame}$ if there exists an open cover $\{U_i\}$ of X such that $J|_{U_i} \in \mathcal{J}_{tame}(U_i)$ for all i. Similarly we can define locally compatible almost-complex structures $\mathcal{J}_{loc.comp} \subset \mathcal{J}_{comp}$. It is immediate that $\mathcal{J}_{loc.tame} = \mathcal{J}$ and that the set of (integrable) complex structures $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{J}_{loc.comp}$.

In summary we have the following diagram of inclusions.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\mathcal{I} & \subset & \mathcal{J}_{loc.comp} & \subset_j & \mathcal{J}_{loc.tame} & = & \mathcal{J} \\
& & \bigcup_{k_1} & & \bigcup_{k_2} & & \\
& & \mathcal{J}_{comp} & \subset_i & \mathcal{J}_{tame} & &
\end{array}$$

(1)

When our manifold X has dimension 4 the map j is actually a surjection, in other words $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}_{loc.comp}$. For a complete proof of this see Lejmi [13, Theorem 1]. It is a question of Donaldson [4, question 2] as to whether the map i is also a surjection.

In this paper a key observation is the following.

Proposition 0.1. *If X is closed (compact without boundary) and $J \in \mathcal{J}_{tame}$ then there are no non-zero exact J-anti-invariant 2 forms.*

Recall that a 2-form α is anti-invariant if $J\alpha = -\alpha$, where $J\alpha(v, w) = \alpha(Jv, Jw)$. In dimension 4 there are no non-zero exact anti-invariant forms with respect to any J, see Corollary 1.2, but in higher dimensions the existence of an exact anti-invariant form is an obstruction to the existence of a taming symplectic form.

It is in fact quite easy to find examples of almost-complex structures admitting exact anti-invariant forms. The following is a consequence of Theorem 1.4.

Theorem 0.2. *Suppose that W^{4n} is a $4n$ dimensional manifold with trivial tangent bundle. Then $X = W \times S^1 \times S^1$ has an almost-complex structure J for which there exist non-zero exact anti-invariant 2-forms.*

The methods used to establish Theorem 0.2 are very topological, they rely on Gromov's h-principle. Therefore we have little control on the almost-complex structure, in particular it is difficult in this way to find examples which lie in $\mathcal{J}_{loc.comp}$. This issue is addressed in section 3. For example, in section 3.3 we explicitly construct a nonintegrable almost-complex structure on a 6-dimensional manifold which is locally compatible yet admits a non-zero exact anti-invariant form, and so lies in $\mathcal{J}_{loc.comp} \setminus (\mathcal{J}_{tame} \cup \mathcal{I})$.

We remark however that the non-existence of exact anti-invariant forms is not a sufficient condition for an almost-complex structure to be tamed by a symplectic form. In dimension 4, since we never have any exact anti-invariant forms, examples are given by any almost-complex manifolds which are not symplectic. In higher dimensions, we can use a theorem of Peternell [17, Theorem 1.4] to imply the following.

Theorem 0.3. *A non-Kähler Moĭšezon manifold has no non-zero exact anti-invariant forms but no taming symplectic form.*

In dimension 6, a simpler concrete example is the following.

Theorem 0.4. *The product of the Hopf surface and $\mathbb{C}P^1$ does not have non-zero exact anti-invariant forms or any symplectic forms at all.*

Cohomology properties can also be used to categorize almost-complex structures. Following [5] we can define subspaces $H_J^+(X), H_J^-(X) \subset H^2(X, \mathbb{R})$, the second de Rham cohomology of X, as follows. A class $\mathfrak{a} \in H_J^+(X)$ if there exists a 2 form α with $[\alpha] = \mathfrak{a}$ and $J\alpha = \alpha$. Similarly a class $\mathfrak{a} \in H_J^-(X)$ if it has a representative α which is anti-invariant with respect to J. The almost-complex manifold (X, J) is called $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-*pure* if

$H_J^+(X) \cap H_J^-(X) = \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-*full* if $H_J^+(X) + H_J^-(X) = H^2(X, \mathbb{R})$. In [5, Theorem 2.3], Drahjici, Li and Zhang show that an almost complex structure on a compact 4-dimensional manifold is $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-pure-and-full. Furthermore, in [14, Theorem 1.3], Li and Zhang proved that if J is $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-full and if the compatible cone

$$\mathcal{K}_J^c = \left\{ [\omega] \in H^2(X; \mathbb{R}) \mid \omega \text{ is compatible with } J \right\}$$

is non-empty, then

$$\mathcal{K}_J^t = \mathcal{K}_J^c + H_J^-(X).$$

Here we focus on $H_J^-(X)$ and study $\mathcal{Z}_J^-(X)$, the real vector space of closed anti-invariant 2-forms. We have already seen that if X is closed and $J \in \mathcal{J}_{tame}$ then there are no nonzero exact anti-invariant forms and so the map

$$\mathcal{Z}_J^-(X) \to H_J^-(X) \subset H^2(X, \mathbb{R})$$

is an injection. This can be contrasted with the case of invariant forms $\mathcal{Z}_J^+(X)$. At least if J is integrable then $\mathcal{Z}_J^+(X)$ is always infinite dimensional.

In the case when $J \in \mathcal{J}_{comp}$ we can be more precise. Let g be the Riemannian metric associated to a compatible symplectic form. Then we show in Proposition 2.2 that $\mathcal{Z}_J^-(X) \subset \mathcal{H}_g(X)$, the set of harmonic 2-forms with respect to g. In other words, we have the following.

Proposition 0.5. *J-anti-invariant forms are harmonic with respect to any Riemannian metric associated to a compatible symplectic form.*

It turns out that even if $J \notin \mathcal{J}_{comp}$ the closed anti-invariant forms $\mathcal{Z}_J^-$ lie in the kernel of a second order elliptic operator, see Proposition 2.4. Hence we have an alternative proof of a theorem from [10] saying that anti-invariant forms satisfy a unique continuation principle, see Proposition 2.6.

The paper is organized as follows. After fixing some notation, we establish some basic facts about anti-invariant forms in section 1 and prove Proposition 0.1 and Theorem 0.2. To complement these results we also derive the examples of Theorems 0.3 and 0.4. In section 2 we discuss the relation between anti-invariant forms and harmonic forms and in particular prove the unique continuation theorem for anti-invariant forms. Finally in section 3 we construct our explicit examples.

1. ANTI-INVARIANT FORMS ON ALMOST-COMPLEX MANIFOLDS.

We start by fixing some notation. Let (X, J) be a $2n$-dimensional almost complex manifold and denote by $\Lambda^2(X)$ the space of 2-forms on X. The almost complex structure acts on $\Lambda^2(X)$ as an involution by setting $J\alpha(u, v) = \alpha(Ju, Jv)$. Following [5], $\alpha \in \Lambda^2(X)$ is said to be *J-invariant* or *invariant*, if $J\alpha = \alpha$ and *J-anti-invariant* or *anti-invariant* if $J\alpha = -\alpha$. We denote by $\Lambda_J^+(X)$ and by $\Lambda_J^-(X)$ the space of J-invariant, J-anti-invariant forms respectively. Let $\mathcal{Z}(X)$ be the space of closed 2-forms on X. We set $\mathcal{Z}_J^\pm(X) = \Lambda_J^\pm(X) \cap \mathcal{Z}(X)$ and

$$H_J^\pm(X) = \left\{ \mathfrak{a} \in H^2(X; \mathbb{R}) \mid \mathfrak{a} = [\alpha], \ \alpha \in \mathcal{Z}_J^\pm(X) \right\}.$$

According to [5], an almost complex structure J is said to be $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-*pure* if $H_J^+(X) \cap H_J^-(X) = \{0\}$, $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-*full* if $H^2(X; \mathbb{R}) = H_J^+(X) + H_J^-(X)$.

We begin our study of anti-invariant forms in dimension 4.

Lemma 1.1. *Let (X, J, g) be a 4-dimensional almost Hermitian manifold. Let $\alpha \in \Lambda^2_-(X)$. Then $\alpha^2 = f \operatorname{Vol}_g$, where $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth non-negative function on X and Vol_g denotes the Riemannian volume form.*

Proof. Let $p \in X$ and let $\{v_1, Jv_1, v_2, Jv_2\}$ be a g-orthonormal positive basis of T_pX. Then, if $\{v_1^*, Jv_1^*, v_2^*, Jv_2^*\}$ denotes the dual basis of $\{v_1, Jv_1, v_2, Jv_2\}$, any J-anti-invariant 2-form at p can be written as

$$\alpha(p) = \lambda(v_1^* \wedge v_2^* - Jv_1^* \wedge Jv_2^*) + \mu(v_1^* \wedge Jv_2^* + Jv_1^* \wedge v_2^*).$$

Hence,

$$\alpha^2(p) = 2(\lambda^2 + \mu^2)(v_1^* \wedge Jv_1^* \wedge v_2^* \wedge Jv_2^*).$$

$\square$

Corollary 1.2. *Let (X, J, g) be a compact 4-dimensional almost Hermitian manifold. Then there are no non-trivial exact anti-invariant forms on X.*

Proof. Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{Z}_J^-(X)$. By assumption $\alpha \neq 0$; assume by contradiction that $\alpha = d\beta$. Then,

$$0 = \int_X d(\beta \wedge d\beta) = \int_X \alpha^2 = \int_X f \operatorname{Vol}_g > 0,$$

and this is absurd. $\square$

We will see in Theorem 1.4 and in section 3 that non-zero exact anti-invariant forms can exist on higher dimensional almost-complex manifolds, but the following proposition rules this out if the almost-complex structure $J \in \mathcal{J}_{tame}$.

Proposition 1.3. *Let (X, J) be a compact $2n$-dimensional almost complex manifold. If ω is a symplectic form taming J, then there are no non-zero exact J-anti-invariant forms.*

Proof. By contradiction. Let ω be a symplectic form taming J. Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{Z}_J^-(X)$ be exact, $\alpha = d\beta$. Let $2k$ be the maximal rank of $\alpha(p)$, for $p \in X$. The following claim from linear algebra is useful.

Claim. A skew-symmetric anti-invariant 2-form η on a complex vector space V has rank $2r$ divisible by 4. Moreover η^r generates the complex orientation on $V/\ker \eta$ (with its induced complex structure) if $r/2$ is even and the opposite of the complex orientation if $r/2$ is odd.

Proof of claim. First note that as η is anti-invariant $\ker(\eta)$ is indeed a complex subspace of V and so the quotient $W = V/\ker(\eta)$ inherits a complex structure. Then η^r is a volume form on W which implies that $J\eta^r = \lambda\eta^r$ for some $\lambda > 0$. As η is anti-invariant this in turn implies that r must be even and we can take $\lambda = 1$.

Now we choose a basis of W of the form $e_1, f_1, e_2, f_2, \ldots, e_r, f_r$ such that if i is odd we have $\eta(e_i, f_i) = 1$ and $Je_i = e_{i+1}$ and $Jf_i = f_{i+1}$. Then necessarily if i is even we have $\eta(e_i, f_i) = -1$. We may also assume that $\eta(e_i, e_j) = \eta(f_i, f_j) = 0$ for all i, j and $\eta(e_i, f_j) = 0$ for all $i \neq j$.

Given this we compute

$$\eta^r(e_1, e_2, f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_{r-1}, f_r) = (-1)^r \eta(e_1, f_1)\eta(e_2, f_2)\ldots\eta(e_r, f_r) = (-1)^{r/2}$$

and the claim follows. $\qquad\square$

Returning to the proof, we have that k is even and $\alpha^k \wedge \omega^{n-k} = (-1)^{k/2} f \omega^n$, where f is a non-negative function on X. This is because ω gives the complex orientation on any complex subspace. The function f is positive exactly when α has maximum rank. Therefore

$$0 = (-1)^{k/2} \int_X d(\beta \wedge (d\beta)^{k-1} \wedge \omega^{n-k}) = (-1)^{k/2} \int_X \alpha^k \wedge \omega^{n-k} = \int_X f\,\omega^n > 0$$

and this is absurd. $\qquad\square$

To complement the above proposition, the following theorem shows that almost-complex structures admitting exact anti-invariant forms can be constructed under fairly general hypotheses.

Theorem 1.4. *Suppose that an orientable manifold M^{4n+1} admits a 2 form $\tilde\alpha$ of everywhere maximal rank $4n$ such that the quotient bundle $TM/\ker\tilde\alpha \to M$ has an almost-complex structure for which $\tilde\alpha$ is anti-invariant. Then there exists an almost-complex structure J on $M \times S^1$ which admits an exact nonzero anti-invariant 2 form.*

We emphasize that the hypotheses of the theorem are purely topological, in particular we do not need to assume that $\tilde\alpha$ is closed. The proof does not use the hypothesis that M has dimension $4n + 1$, only that the dimension is odd. However we have seen above that the rank of an anti-invariant form is necessarily a multiple of 4.

Proof. The result is a consequence of a theorem of McDuff, see [15] and [7, Thm 10.4.1], which states (in a simple form) that a 2-form of maximal rank on an odd dimensional manifold can be deformed through forms of maximal rank to an exact form. Hence we can find maximal rank 2-forms α_t on M such that $\alpha_0 = \tilde\alpha$ and α_1 is exact. Fixing a Riemannian metric on M the $4n$ dimensional subbundles $(\ker\tilde\alpha)^\perp$ and $(\ker\alpha_1)^\perp$ are isomorphic as symplectic vector bundles with forms $\tilde\alpha$ and α_1 respectively. Hence $(\ker\alpha_1)^\perp$ also admits an almost-complex structure J anti-invariant with respect to α_1. The corresponding orientation on $(\ker\alpha_1)^\perp$ together with one on M determines a trivialization of $\ker\alpha$. Hence we can extend J to an almost-complex structure on $M \times S^1$ such that J maps $\ker\alpha_1$ onto TS^1. Let us pull back α_1 to a 2-form α on $M \times S^1$ using the natural projection. Then α is also nonzero and exact. Finally since α vanishes on the complex planes spanned by $\ker\alpha_1$ and TS^1 it is anti-invariant as required. $\qquad\square$

To close this section we discuss our examples of complex manifolds which have no exact anti-invariant 2-forms but still have no taming symplectic forms.

First let X be a Moišezon manifold, that is, a compact complex manifold which admits a proper modification from a projective manifold. Then the following result holds, see Peternell [17, Thm.1.4]

Theorem 1.5. *Let X be a Moišezon manifold. Assume there exists a real $(1,1)$-form ω and a real 2-form φ on X such that*

    i) ω *is positive definite,*

ii) $d(\omega - \varphi) = 0$,

iii) $\int_C \varphi = 0$ *for all curves* $C \subset X$.

Then X *is projective.*

This directly implies Theorem 0.3 as follows.

Proposition 1.6. *Any non-Kähler Moišezon manifold* X *has no non-trivial d-exact anti-invariant* 2*-forms and no taming symplectic forms.*

Proof. First, if α is a d-exact anti-invariant 2-form α on X then its pull back to a projective manifold is also exact and anti-invariant. By Proposition 1.3 this implies that α must be identically zero.

The fact that X has no taming symplectic form has already been pointed out by Draghici and Zhang, [6], but we give the argument here for completeness. Arguing by contradiction, suppose that η is a taming symplectic form. We can write $\eta = \omega - \psi_1 - \bar{\psi}_2$ where ω is a real $(1,1)$-form, ψ_1 is a real $(2,0)$-form and $\bar{\psi}_2$ is a real $(0,2)$-form. Then ψ_1 and $\bar{\psi}_2$ vanish on complex lines and so since η is taming the form ω is positive definite. Setting $\varphi = \psi_1 + \bar{\psi}_2$ the remaining two conditions of Theorem 1.5 are clearly satisfied and so X must be projective, a contradiction. $\qquad\square$

Finally we give a proof of Theorem 0.4. Let Y be the Hopf surface, that is, $Y = (\mathbb{C}^2 \backslash 0)/$ $z \sim 2z$ with its induced complex structure.

Proposition 1.7. *The product* $X = \mathbb{C}P^1 \times Y$ *does not have exact anti-invariant forms or any symplectic forms at all.*

Proof. The 6-manifold X is diffeomorphic to $S^2 \times S^3 \times S^1$ and so has no cohomology classes $\mathfrak{a}$ with $\mathfrak{a}^3 \neq 0$. Therefore it admits no symplectic forms at all.

There are two projections $p_1, p_2 : X \to \mathbb{C}P^1$. The first is just projection onto the first factor, the second is induced by projection onto Y and then quotienting by $\mathbb{C}^*$ to get $Y/\mathbb{C}^* = (\mathbb{C}^2 \backslash 0)/\mathbb{C}^* = \mathbb{C}P^1$. Therefore we can pull-back the Fubini-Study form using p_1 and p_2 to get invariant 2-forms ω_1 and ω_2 on X.

Suppose that there exists a non-zero exact anti-invariant 2-form α on X. As we are working in dimension 6 we have that $\alpha(x)$ has rank 0 or 4 at all points $x \in X$. Observe that applying Stokes' Theorem as in Proposition 1.3 gives a contradiction if there exists a closed 2-form Ω on X which satisfies $\alpha^2 \wedge \Omega \geq 0$ and $\alpha^2 \wedge \Omega(x) > 0$ at least for some $x \in X$. When $\alpha \neq 0$ its kernel is a complex line. Therefore as ω_1 and ω_2 are invariant we have $\alpha^2 \wedge (\omega_1 + \omega_2) \geq 0$ (for the complex orientation on X) and hence by the argument above we must have $\alpha^2 \wedge (\omega_1 + \omega_2) \equiv 0$.

This implies that when $\alpha(x) \neq 0$ it's kernel is generated by r and ir, where r is the radial, or S^1, direction in Y (coming from a suitably scaled radial vector in $\mathbb{C}^2$) and ir is parallel to the Hopf fibration. Indeed, if the kernel were transverse to this plane the form $\omega_1 + \omega_2$ would evaluate nontrivially. Hence r and ir lie in $\ker(\alpha(x))$ for all $x \in X$ and α is invariant under the vectorfields r and ir. These vectorfields generate a torus action on X whose projection onto the orbit space is just the holomorphic projection $(p_1, p_2) : X \to \mathbb{C}P^1 \times \mathbb{C}P^1$. Hence α is a pull-back of a form α' on $\mathbb{C}P^1 \times \mathbb{C}P^1$. As α is a closed anti-invariant form so is α'. Furthermore, as α' is anti-invariant it must vanish when restricted to both $\mathbb{C}P^1$ factors. Therefore it's cohomology class is trivial and so

α' is exact. But by Corollary 1.2 the only exact anti-invariant forms on a 4-dimensional manifold are identically 0, and this completes our proof.

$\square$

2. Hodge star operator for anti-invariant forms

Let (X, J, g) be an almost Hermitian manifold of dimension $2n$ and denote by ω the fundamental form of g. Then we have the following

Proposition 2.1. *Let α be J-anti-invariant 2-form on (X, J, g). Then*

$$(2) \qquad *\alpha = \frac{1}{(n-2)!}\alpha \wedge \omega^{n-2}.$$

For the sake of completeness we give the proof of (2).

Proof. Let α be any J-anti-invariant form on (X, J). Then $*\alpha$ is a $(2n-2)$-form. The Lefschetz decomposition applied to $\Lambda^{2n-2}(X)$ yields to

$$\Lambda^{2n-2}(X) = \bigoplus_{i \geq 0} L^i(P^{2(n-i)-2}(X)),$$

where $L : \Lambda^k(X) \to \Lambda^{k+2}$, $L(\gamma) = \gamma \wedge \omega$ is the Lefschetz operator and $P^k(X)$ is the space of primitive forms, which can be identified with $\ker L^{n-k+1}|_{\Lambda^k(X)}$ (see e.g., [11, Prop.1.2.30]). Therefore,

$$*\alpha = f\omega^{n-1} + L^{n-2}(\gamma),$$

where f is a smooth function and $\gamma \in P^2(X)$. Then, taking $*$ in the last formula, by [11, Prop.1.2.30], we get

$$\alpha = f\omega - (n-2)! J\gamma.$$

Since α is J-anti-invariant, by the last formula, $f = 0$ and $\gamma = \frac{1}{(n-2)!}\alpha$. Then (2) is proved. $\square$

As a consequence, we obtain the following

Proposition 2.2. *Let (X, J, g, ω) be a $2n$-dimensional almost Kähler manifold. Then $\mathcal{Z}_J^-(X) \subset \mathcal{H}^2(X)$, where $\mathcal{H}^2(X)$ denotes the space of 2-harmonic forms on X with respect to the Hermitian metric g.*

Proof. Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{Z}_J^-(X)$. Then by formula (2), since α and ω are closed, we get:

$$d^*\alpha = - * d * (\alpha) = -\frac{1}{(n-2)!} * d(\alpha \wedge \omega^{n-2}) = 0,$$

that is α co-closed. Since α is closed by assumption, then α is harmonic. $\square$

We record the following corollary, which of course also follows from Proposition 1.3.

Corollary 2.3. *If (X, J, g, ω) is a compact $2n$-dimensional almost Kähler manifold, then the natural map*

$$\mathcal{Z}_J^-(X) \hookrightarrow H^2_{dR}(X; \mathbb{R})$$

is an injection. In particular $\dim_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathcal{Z}_J^-(X)) \leq b_2(X)$. Furthermore, the map is an isomorphism if and only if $H_J^-(X) = H^2_{dR}(X; \mathbb{R})$.

In general, on an almost Hermitian manifold (X, J, g) of dimension $2n$, define a generalized co-differential on the space of 2-forms $\Gamma(\Lambda^2(X))$, $d^*_- : \Gamma(\Lambda^2(X)) \to \Gamma(\Lambda^1(X))$, by setting

$$d^*_-(\alpha) = d^*(\alpha) + \frac{1}{(n-2)!} * (\alpha \wedge d(\omega^{n-2})),$$

where d^* denotes the usual co-differential on (X, g). By formula (2), it follows that d^*_- vanishes on $\mathcal{Z}^2_-(X)$. Let E be the differential operator on $\Gamma(\Lambda^2(X))$ defined as

$$\mathbb{E} = \Delta(\alpha) + \frac{1}{(n-2)!} d(*(\alpha \wedge d(\omega^{n-2})))$$

Proposition 2.4. *The differential operator $\mathbb{E}$ is a second order elliptic operator, the principal part is the Hodge-de Rham laplacian Δ and $\mathcal{Z}^-_J(X) \subset \ker(\mathbb{E})$.*

Proof. By the definition of $\mathbb{E}$, for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{Z}^-_J(X)$, we have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(\alpha) &= \Delta(\alpha) + \frac{1}{(n-2)!} d(*(\alpha \wedge d(\omega^{n-2}))) = dd^*(\alpha) + d^*d(\alpha) + \\
&\quad \frac{1}{(n-2)!} d(*(\alpha \wedge d(\omega^{n-2}))) \\
&= dd^*(\alpha) + \frac{1}{(n-2)!} d(*(\alpha \wedge d(\omega^{n-2}))) = dd^*_-(\alpha) = 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

$\square$

Corollary 2.5. *If (X, J) is a compact $2n$-dimensional almost complex manifold, then $\dim \mathcal{Z}^-_J(X) < +\infty$.*

In contrast, $\mathcal{Z}^+_J(X)$ has infinite dimension if J is integrable, because for any smooth function $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ we have $dd^c f \in \mathcal{Z}^+_J(X)$.

We can now give another proof of the analytic continuation property for closed anti-invariant 2-forms (see [10, Thm.4.1])

Proposition 2.6. *Let X be a $2n$-dimensional connected almost complex manifold. Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{Z}^-_J(X)$ be vanishing at infinite order at some point $p \in X$. Then α is identically zero.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.4, α is a solution of an elliptic PDE, whose leading term is the Laplacian. Hence by [1] (see also [12]), the form α has strong unique continuation. $\square$

In contrast, this is false for $\mathcal{Z}^+_J(X)$ for the same reason as before.

3. Computations of $\mathcal{Z}^2_-(X)$

In this section we will do some explicit computations on the space of anti-invariant forms on complex manifolds, to contrast with the indirect Theorem 1.4. In section 3.1 we give an example of a complex manifold with $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{Z}^-_J(X) > \dim_{\mathbb{R}} H^-_J(X)$. By Corollary 2.3 this implies that the manifold is not almost Kähler. Indeed by Proposition 1.3 there is not even a taming symplectic form. Another such example is given in section 3.2. Finally in section 3.3 we construct an almost-complex manifold for which we can write down explicitly a compatible symplectic form on small open sets. However it also admits a non-zero exact anti-invariant form and so by Proposition 1.3 has no globally defined taming symplectic form.

3.1. **Iwasawa manifold.** On $\mathbb{C}^3$, consider the product $*$ defined as

$$(z_1, \ z_2, \ z_3) \ * \ (w_1, \ w_2, \ w_3) = (z_1 + w_1, \ z_2 + w_2, \ z_3 + z_1 w_2 + w_3) \ .$$

It is immediate to check that $\left(\mathbb{C}^3, \ *\right)$ is a nilpotent Lie group isomorphic to

$$\mathbb{H}(3) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & z_1 & z_3 \\ 0 & 1 & z_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in GL\left(3; \mathbb{C}\right) \ \mid \ z_1, z_2, z_3 \in \mathbb{C} \right\} \ .$$

We have that $\left(\mathbb{Z}\left[\mathrm{i}\right]\right)^3 \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ is a cocompact discrete subgroup of $\left(\mathbb{C}^3, \ *\right)$. The *Iwasawa manifold* X is defined as the manifold

$$X = \left(\mathbb{Z}\left[\mathrm{i}\right]\right)^3 \backslash \left(\mathbb{C}^3, \ *\right) \ .$$

It is a compact complex 3-dimensional nilmanifold; by [8], it follows that X is not formal; hence, it has no Kähler metrics, see [3, Main Theorem]; nevertheless, there exists a balanced metric on X. Let $\left(z^i\right)_{i \in \{1,2,3\}}$ be the standard complex coordinate system on $\mathbb{C}^3$; the following $(1,0)$-forms on $\mathbb{C}^3$ are invariant for the action (on the left) of $\left(\mathbb{Z}\left[\mathrm{i}\right]\right)^3$, so they give rise to a global coframe for $T^{* \, 1,0} X$:

$$\begin{cases} \varphi^1 = \mathrm{d}\, z^1, \\ \varphi^2 = \mathrm{d}\, z^2, \\ \varphi^3 = \mathrm{d}\, z^3 - z^1 \,\mathrm{d}\, z^2. \end{cases}$$

The structure equations are therefore

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{d}\,\varphi^1 &= 0, \\ \mathrm{d}\,\varphi^2 &= 0, \\ \mathrm{d}\,\varphi^3 &= -\varphi^1 \wedge \varphi^2. \end{cases}$$

By Hattori-Nomizu theorem, we compute the real cohomology group $H^2_{dR}(X; \mathbb{R})$ of X (for simplicity, we list the harmonic representative instead of its class and write $\varphi^{A\bar{B}}$ for $\varphi^A \wedge \bar{\varphi}^B$):

$$\begin{aligned} H^2_{dR}(X; \mathbb{R}) \ = \ &\mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \left\{ \varphi^{13} + \varphi^{\bar{1}\bar{3}}, \ \mathrm{i}\left(\varphi^{13} - \varphi^{\bar{1}\bar{3}}\right), \ \varphi^{23} + \varphi^{\bar{2}\bar{3}}, \right. \\ &\left. \mathrm{i}\left(\varphi^{23} - \varphi^{\bar{2}\bar{3}}\right), \ \varphi^{1\bar{2}} - \varphi^{2\bar{1}}, \ \mathrm{i}\left(\varphi^{1\bar{2}} + \varphi^{2\bar{1}}\right), \ \mathrm{i}\varphi^{1\bar{1}}, \ \mathrm{i}\varphi^{2\bar{2}} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

Note that each harmonic representative is of pure degree and hence the complex structure is $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-pure and full. The Betti numbers of X are

$$b^0 \ = \ 1 \ , \quad b^1 \ = \ 4 \ , \quad b^2 \ = \ 8 \ , \quad b^3 \ = \ 10 \ .$$

Then

$$\frac{1}{2}(\varphi^2 \wedge \varphi^3 + \bar{\varphi}^2 \wedge \bar{\varphi}^3), \frac{1}{2i}(\varphi^2 \wedge \varphi^3 - \bar{\varphi}^2 \wedge \bar{\varphi}^3), \frac{1}{2}(\varphi^1 \wedge \varphi^2 + \bar{\varphi}^1 \wedge \bar{\varphi}^2),$$

$$\frac{1}{2i}(\varphi^1 \wedge \varphi^2 - \bar{\varphi}^1 \wedge \bar{\varphi}^2), \frac{1}{2}(\varphi^1 \wedge \varphi^3 + \bar{\varphi}^1 \wedge \bar{\varphi}^3), \frac{1}{2i}(\varphi^1 \wedge \varphi^3 - \bar{\varphi}^1 \wedge \bar{\varphi}^3),$$

are J-anti-invariant closed 2-forms on X and consequently $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{Z}_J^-(X) > \dim_{\mathbb{R}} H_J^-(X)$.

3.2. **Nakamura manifold.** The *Nakamura manifold* is the compact quotient $X = \Gamma \backslash G$ of G by a uniform discrete subgroup Γ.

By [2, Corollary 4.2] we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
H^2_{dR}(X; \mathbb{R}) \;=\;& \operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \Big\{ [e^{14}], [e^{26} - e^{35}], [e^{23} - e^{56}], [\cos(2x_4)(e^{23} + e^{56}) - \sin(2x_4)(e^{26} + e^{35})], \\
& [\sin(2x_4)(e^{23} + e^{56}) - \cos(2x_4)(e^{26} + e^{35})] \Big\},
\end{aligned}
$$

i.e. in this case the de Rham cohomology of M is not isomorphic to $H^*(\mathfrak{g})$. The previous representatives are all harmonic forms. The complex structure on the solvmanifold X can be defined in term of $(1,0)$-forms as follows:

$$
\varphi^1 = e^1 + ie^4, \quad \varphi^2 = e^2 + ie^5, \quad \varphi^3 = e^3 + ie^6
$$

We have that the real forms

$$
\frac{1}{2}(\varphi^2 \wedge \varphi^3 + \overline{\varphi}^2 \wedge \overline{\varphi}^3), \frac{1}{2i}(\varphi^2 \wedge \varphi^3 - \overline{\varphi}^2 \wedge \overline{\varphi}^3), \frac{1}{2}(\varphi^1 \wedge \varphi^2 + \overline{\varphi}^1 \wedge \overline{\varphi}^2),
$$

$$
\frac{1}{2i}(\varphi^1 \wedge \varphi^2 - \overline{\varphi}^1 \wedge \overline{\varphi}^2), \frac{1}{2}(\varphi^1 \wedge \varphi^3 + \overline{\varphi}^1 \wedge \overline{\varphi}^3), \frac{1}{2i}(\varphi^1 \wedge \varphi^3 - \overline{\varphi}^1 \wedge \overline{\varphi}^3),
$$

are anti-invariant and closed. Therefore, $\dim \mathcal{Z}^-_J(X) > b_2(X)$ and by Corollary 2.3, the complex structure J does not admit any compatible Kähler metric.

This can be also derived by complex Hodge theory, since φ^2 is a non closed holomorphic 1-form.

It has also to be remarked that as a consequence of a result by Hasegawa (see [9, main theorem]) X does not admit any Kähler structure.

3.3. **Locally almost-Kähler non globally almost Kähler manifold.** In this section we will provide a family of 6-dimensional almost complex (non complex) manifolds (N, J) which are locally almost Kähler but not globally. We first recall the construction of N (see [16] and [2]). Let $A \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ with two distinct real eigenvalues e^λ and $e^{-\lambda}$, where $\lambda > 0$. Let $Q \in \mathrm{GL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ such that

$$
QAQ^{-1} = \Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\lambda} & 0 \\ 0 & e^\lambda \end{pmatrix}.
$$

On $\mathbb{C}^2$, with coordinates (z, w), let $\sim$ be defined by

$$
\begin{pmatrix} z' \\ w' \end{pmatrix} \sim \begin{pmatrix} z \\ w \end{pmatrix} \Longleftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} z' \\ w' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} z \\ w \end{pmatrix} + Q \begin{pmatrix} m_1 + 2\pi i n_1 \\ m_2 + 2\pi i n_2 \end{pmatrix},
$$

where $m_1, m_2, n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $\mathbb{C}^2 / \sim$ is a complex torus $\mathbb{T}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$ and

$$
\Lambda \left[\begin{pmatrix} z \\ w \end{pmatrix} \right] = \left[\Lambda \begin{pmatrix} z \\ w \end{pmatrix} \right]
$$

is a well defined automorphism of $\mathbb{T}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$. Indeed, if $\begin{pmatrix} z' \\ w' \end{pmatrix} \sim \begin{pmatrix} z \\ w \end{pmatrix}$, then

$$\Lambda \begin{pmatrix} z' \\ w' \end{pmatrix} = \Lambda \begin{pmatrix} z \\ w \end{pmatrix} + \Lambda Q \begin{pmatrix} m_1 + 2\pi i n_1 \\ m_2 + 2\pi n_2 \end{pmatrix} =$$

$$= \Lambda \begin{pmatrix} z \\ w \end{pmatrix} + Q A \begin{pmatrix} m_1 + 2\pi i n_1 \\ m_2 + 2\pi n_2 \end{pmatrix} = \Lambda \begin{pmatrix} z \\ w \end{pmatrix} + Q \begin{pmatrix} m_1 + 2\pi i n_1 \\ m_2 + 2\pi n_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

so that $\Lambda \begin{pmatrix} z' \\ w' \end{pmatrix} \sim \Lambda \begin{pmatrix} z \\ w \end{pmatrix}$.

For example, take

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then $\lambda = \log \frac{3+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ and we can choose

(3)
$$P = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1-\sqrt{5}}{2} & 1 \\ 1 & \frac{\sqrt{5}-1}{2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Set

$$\lambda = \log \frac{3 + \sqrt{5}}{2}, \quad \mu = \frac{\sqrt{5} - 1}{2}.$$

Let x_1, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6 denote coordinates on $\mathbb{R}^6$ and, according to the previous notation, set $z = x_3 + i x_5$, $w = x_4 + i x_6$. Consider the following transformation of $\mathbb{R}^5$:

$$T_1(x_1, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6) = \left(x_1 + \lambda, e^{\lambda} x_3, e^{-\lambda} x_4, e^{\lambda} x_5, e^{-\lambda} x_6 \right).$$

We set

$$N = \frac{\mathbb{R}_{x_2}}{2\pi\mathbb{Z}} \times \frac{\mathbb{R}_{x_1} \times \mathbb{R}^4_{x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6}/\Gamma}{\langle T_1(x) \rangle}$$

where

$$\Gamma = \mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{Z}} \left\langle (1, \mu, 0, 0)^t, (-\mu, 1, 0, 0)^t, (0, 0, 2\pi, 2\pi\mu)^t, (0, 0, -2\pi\mu, 2\pi)^t \right\rangle$$

and $\langle T_1(x) \rangle$ denotes the subgroup of transformations generated by $T_1(x)$, so that $\mathbb{T}^2_{\mathbb{C}} \simeq \mathbb{R}^4_{x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6}/\Gamma$. Then N is a compact 6-dimensional manifold. The following six 1-forms on $\mathbb{R}^6$

$$\begin{cases} e^1 & = dx_1, \\ e^2 & = dx_2, \\ e^3 & = \exp(-x_1) dx_3, \\ e^4 & = \exp(x_1) dx_4, \\ e^5 & = \exp(-x_1) dx_5, \\ e^6 & = \exp(x_1) dx_6, \end{cases}$$

induce 1-forms on the manifold N. Therefore, we immediately get

$$(4) \qquad \begin{cases} de^1 &= 0 \,, \\ de^2 &= 0 \,, \\ de^3 &= -e^1 \wedge e^3 \,, \\ de^4 &= e^1 \wedge e^4 \,, \\ de^5 &= -e^1 \wedge e^5 \,, \\ de^6 &= e^1 \wedge e^6 \,. \end{cases}$$

The dual global frame $\{e_1, \ldots, e_6\}$ on N is given by

$$e_1 = \tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \,, \qquad e_2 = \tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_2} \,, \qquad e_3 = \exp(x_1)\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_3}$$
$$e_4 = \exp(-x_1)\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_4} \,, \qquad e_5 = \exp(x_1)\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_5} \,, \qquad e_6 = \exp(-x_1)\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_6}$$

Let $f = f(x_2)$ be a never vanishing $\mathbb{Z}$-periodic function; let us define the almost complex structure J on N as

$$Je_1 = e_2 \,, \quad Je_2 = -e_1 \,, \quad Je_3 = f(x_2)e_5 \,, \quad Je_4 = e_6 \,, \quad Je_5 = -\frac{1}{f(x_2)}e_3 \,, \quad Je_6 = -e_4 \,.$$

Then it can be checked that J is integrable if and only if f is constant. We show that J is locally almost Kähler. Indeed, let ω be the local non degenerate and closed 2-form defined as

$$\omega = dx_1 \wedge dx_2 + dx_3 \wedge dx_5 + dx_4 \wedge dx_6 \,;$$

then, since

$$J\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_1} = \tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_2} \,, \qquad J\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_2} = -\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \,, \qquad J\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_3} = f(x_2)\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_5} \,,$$
$$J\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_4} = \tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_6} \,, \qquad J\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_5} = -\tfrac{1}{f(x_2)}\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_3} \,, \qquad J\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_6} = -\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x_4} \,,$$

we immediately get that $J\omega = \omega$ and $\omega(J\cdot, \cdot) > 0$ for any non-zero tangent vector, i.e., J is locally almost Kähler. Now we prove that J cannot be globally Kähler, and more generally that there is no global taming symplectic form. In view of Proposition 1.3, it is sufficient to find a nonzero J-anti-invariant exact form. To this purpose, let

$$\alpha = \cos(x_2)e^2 \wedge e^4 + \sin(x_2)e^1 \wedge e^4 - \sin(x_2)e^2 \wedge e^6 + \cos(x_2)e^1 \wedge e^6 \,;$$

then, according to (4) and to definition of J, we have that $\alpha = d(\sin(x_2)e^4 + \cos(x_2)e^6)$ and that $J\alpha = -\alpha$, i.e., α is a J-anti-invariant exact 2-form.

References

[1] N. Aronszajn, A unique continuation theorem for solutions of elliptic partial differential equations or inequalities of second order, *J. Math. Pure Appl.* **36** (1957), 235–249.

[2] P. de Bartolomeis, A. Tomassini, On solvable generalized Calabi-Yau manifolds, *Ann. Inst. Fourier* **56** (2006), 1281–1296.

[3] P. Deligne, P. Griffiths, J. Morgan, D. Sullivan, Real homotopy theory of Kähler manifolds, *Invent. Math.* **29** (1975), no. 3, 245–274.

[4] S. K. Donaldson, *Two-forms on four-manifolds and elliptic equations*, Inspired by S. S. Chern, Nankai Tracts Math., vol. 11, World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2006, pp. 153–172.

[5] T. Drăghici, T.-J. Li, W. Zhang, Symplectic forms and cohomology decomposition of almost complex four-manifolds, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* **2010** (2010), no. 1, 1–17.

[6] T. Draghici, W. Zhang, A note on exact forms on almost complex manifolds, *Math. Res. Lett.* **19** (2012), 691–697.

[7] Y. Eliashberg, N. Mishashev, *Introduction to the h-principle*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 48. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002. xviii+206 pp..

[8] M. Fernández, A. Gray, *The Iwasawa manifold*, Differential geometry, Peñíscola 1985, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. **1209**, Springer, Berlin, 1986, 157–159.

[9] K. Hasegawa, A note on compact solvmanifolds with Kähler structures, *Osaka J. Math.* **43** (2006), 131–135.

[10] R. Hind, C. Medori, A. Tomassini, On non pure forms on almost complex manifolds, to appear in *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*.

[11] D. Huybrechts, *Complex Geometry An Introduction*, Springer, Berlin, 2005.

[12] J.L. Kazdan, Unique continuation in geometry, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **41** (1988), 667–681.

[13] M. Lejmi, Strictly nearly Kähler 6-manifolds are not compatible with symplectic forms, *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* **343** (2006), 759–762.

[14] T.-J. Li, W. Zhang, Comparing tamed and compatible symplectic cones and cohomological properties of almost complex manifolds, *Comm. Anal. Geom.* **17** (2009), 651–684.

[15] D. McDuff, Application of convex integration to symplectic and contact geometry, *Ann. Inst. Fourier, (Grenoble)*, **37** (1987), 107–133.

[16] I. Nakamura, Complex parallelisable manifolds and their small deformations, *J. Differential Geometry* **10** (1975), 85–112.

[17] T. Peternell, Algebraicity Criteria for Compact Complex Manifolds, *Math. Ann.* **275** (1986), 653–672.

Department of Mathematics, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556
E-mail address: hind.1@nd.edu

Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica, Università di Parma, Parco Area delle Scienze 53/A, 43124, Parma, Italy
E-mail address: costantino.medori@unipr.it
E-mail address: adriano.tomassini@unipr.it