

# INVERSE PROBLEMS FOR CONNECTIONS

GABRIEL P. PATERNAIN

ABSTRACT. We discuss various recent results related to the inverse problem of determining a unitary connection from its parallel transport along geodesics.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $(M, g)$  be a compact oriented Riemannian manifold with smooth boundary, and let  $SM = \{(x, v) \in TM; |v| = 1\}$  be the unit tangent bundle with canonical projection  $\pi : SM \rightarrow M$ . The geodesics going from  $\partial M$  into  $M$  can be parametrized by the set  $\partial_+(SM) = \{(x, v) \in SM; x \in \partial M, \langle v, \nu \rangle \leq 0\}$  where  $\nu$  is the outer unit normal vector to  $\partial M$ . For any  $(x, v) \in SM$  we let  $t \mapsto \gamma(t, x, v)$  be the geodesic starting from  $x$  in direction  $v$ . We assume that  $(M, g)$  is nontrapping, which means that the time  $\tau(x, v)$  when the geodesic  $\gamma(t, x, v)$  exits  $M$  is finite for each  $(x, v) \in SM$ . The scattering relation  $\alpha = \alpha_g : \partial_+(SM) \rightarrow \partial_-(SM)$  maps a starting point and direction of a geodesic to the end point and direction, where  $\partial_-(SM) = \{(x, v) \in SM; x \in \partial M, \langle v, \nu \rangle \geq 0\}$ .

Suppose now that  $E \rightarrow M$  is a Hermitian vector bundle of rank  $n$  over  $M$  and  $\nabla$  is a unitary connection on  $E$ . Associated with  $\nabla$  there is the following additional piece of scattering data: given  $(x, v) \in \partial_+(SM)$ , let  $P(x, v) = P_\nabla(x, v) : E(x) \rightarrow E(\pi \circ \alpha(x, v))$  denote the parallel transport along the geodesic  $\gamma(t, x, v)$ . This map is a linear isometry and the main inverse problem we wish to discuss here is the following:

**Question.** Does  $P$  determine  $\nabla$ ?

The first observation is that the problem has a natural gauge equivalence. Let  $\psi$  be a gauge transformation, that is, a smooth section of the bundle of automorphisms  $\text{Aut} E$ . The set of all these sections naturally forms a group (known as the gauge group) which acts on the space of unitary connections by the rule

$$(\psi^* \nabla)s := \psi \nabla (\psi^{-1} s)$$

where  $s$  is any smooth section of  $E$ . If in addition  $\psi|_{\partial M} = \text{Id}$ , then it is a simple exercise to check that

$$P_\nabla = P_{\psi^* \nabla}.$$

Thus we can rephrase the question above more precisely as follows:

**Question I.** (Manifolds with boundary) Let  $\nabla_1$  and  $\nabla_2$  be two unitary connections with  $P_{\nabla_1} = P_{\nabla_2}$ . Does there exist a gauge transformation  $\psi$  with  $\psi|_{\partial M} = \text{Id}$  and  $\psi^* \nabla_1 = \nabla_2$ ?

There is a version of this question which makes sense also for closed manifolds, that is,  $\partial M = \emptyset$ . Let  $\gamma : [0, T] \rightarrow M$  be a closed geodesic and let  $P_\nabla(\gamma) : E(\gamma(0)) \rightarrow E(\gamma(0))$  be the parallel transport along  $\gamma$ .

**Question II.** (Closed manifolds) Let  $\nabla_1$  and  $\nabla_2$  be two unitary connections and suppose there is a connection  $\nabla$  gauge equivalent to  $\nabla_1$  such that  $P_\nabla(\gamma) = P_{\nabla_2}(\gamma)$  for every closed geodesic  $\gamma$ . Are  $\nabla_1$  and  $\nabla_2$  gauge equivalent?

A connection  $\nabla$  is said to be *transparent* if  $P_\nabla(\gamma) = \text{Id}$  for all closed geodesics  $\gamma$ . Understanding the set of transparent connections modulo gauge is an important special case of Question II.

To make further progress on Questions I and II we need to impose some conditions on the manifold  $(M, g)$ .

In the case of manifolds with boundary a typical hypothesis is that of *simplicity*. A compact Riemannian manifold with boundary is said to be *simple* if for any point  $x \in M$  the exponential map  $\exp_x$  is a diffeomorphism onto  $M$ , and if the boundary is strictly convex. The notion of simplicity arises naturally in the context of the boundary rigidity problem [26]. For the case of closed manifolds there are two reasonable disjoint options. One is to assume that  $(M, g)$  is a Zoll manifold, i.e., a Riemannian manifold all of whose geodesics are closed, but we shall not really discuss this case in any detail here. The other is to assume that the geodesic flow is *Anosov*. Recall that the geodesic flow  $\phi_t$  is Anosov if there is a continuous splitting  $TSM = E^0 \oplus E^u \oplus E^s$ , where  $E^0$  is the flow direction, and there are constants  $C > 0$  and  $0 < \rho < 1 < \eta$  such that for all  $t > 0$  we have

$$\|d\phi_{-t}|_{E^u}\| \leq C \eta^{-t} \quad \text{and} \quad \|d\phi_t|_{E^s}\| \leq C \rho^t.$$

It is very well known that the geodesic flow of a closed negatively curved Riemannian manifold is a contact Anosov flow [17]. The Anosov property automatically implies that the manifold is free of conjugate points [18, 1, 22]. Simple manifolds are also free of conjugate points (this follows directly from the definition) and both conditions (simplicity and Anosov) are open conditions on the metric. It is remarkable that similar results exist in both situations.

It is easy to see from the definition that a simple manifold must be diffeomorphic to a ball in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Therefore any bundle over such  $M$  is necessarily trivial. For most of this paper we shall consider Questions I and II only for the case of trivial bundles; this will make the presentation clearer without removing substantial content.

Question I arises naturally when considering the hyperbolic Dirichlet-to-Neumann map associated to the Schrödinger equation with a connection. It was shown in [11] that when the metric is Euclidean, the scattering data for a connection can be determined from the hyperbolic Dirichlet-to-Neumann map. A similar result holds true on simple Riemannian manifolds: a combination of the methods in [11] and [45] shows that the hyperbolic Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for a connection determines the scattering data  $P_\nabla$ . For Calderón-type problems with connections we refer the reader to the survey article [13] in this volume.

*Acknowledgements.* I am very grateful to Gareth Ainsworth, Will Merry, Mikko Salo and the referee for several comments and corrections on an earlier draft.

## 2. ELEMENTARY BACKGROUND ON CONNECTIONS

Consider the trivial bundle  $M \times \mathbb{C}^n$ . For us a connection  $A$  will be a complex  $n \times n$  matrix whose entries are smooth 1-forms on  $M$ . Another way to think of  $A$  is to regard it as a smooth map  $A : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  which is linear in  $v \in T_x M$  for each  $x \in M$ .

Very often in physics and geometry one considers *unitary* or *Hermitian* connections. This means that the range of  $A$  is restricted to skew-Hermitian matrices. In other words, if we denote by  $\mathfrak{u}(n)$  the Lie algebra of the unitary group  $U(n)$ , we have a smooth map  $A : TM \rightarrow \mathfrak{u}(n)$  which is linear in the velocities. There is yet another equivalent way to phrase this. The connection  $A$  induces a covariant derivative  $d_A$  on sections  $s \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{C}^n)$  by setting  $d_A s = ds + As$ . Then  $A$  being Hermitian or unitary is equivalent to requiring compatibility with the standard Hermitian inner product of  $\mathbb{C}^n$  in the sense that

$$d\langle s_1, s_2 \rangle = \langle d_A s_1, s_2 \rangle + \langle s_1, d_A s_2 \rangle$$

for any pair of functions  $s_1, s_2$ .

Given two unitary connections  $A$  and  $B$  we shall say that  $A$  and  $B$  are gauge equivalent if there exists a smooth map  $u : M \rightarrow U(n)$  such that

$$(1) \quad B = u^{-1} du + u^{-1} A u.$$

It is an easy exercise to check that this definition coincides with the one given in the previous section if we set  $\psi = u^{-1}$ .

The *curvature* of the connection is the 2-form  $F_A$  with values in  $\mathfrak{u}(n)$  given by

$$F_A := dA + A \wedge A.$$

If  $A$  and  $B$  are related by (1) then:

$$F_B = u^{-1} F_A u.$$

Given a smooth curve  $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$ , the *parallel transport* along  $\gamma$  is obtained by solving the linear differential equation in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ :

$$(2) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{s} + A(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t))s = 0, \\ s(a) = w \in \mathbb{C}^n. \end{cases}$$

The isometry  $P_A(\gamma) : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  is defined as  $P_A(\gamma)(w) := s(b)$ . We may also consider the fundamental unitary matrix solution  $U : [a, b] \rightarrow U(n)$  of (2). It solves

$$(3) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{U} + A(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t))U = 0, \\ U(a) = \text{Id}. \end{cases}$$

Clearly  $P_A(\gamma)(w) = U(b)w$ .

### 3. THE TRANSPORT EQUATION AND THE ATTENUATED RAY TRANSFORM

Consider now the case of a compact simple Riemannian manifold. We would like to pack the information provided by (3) along every geodesic into one PDE in  $SM$ . For this we consider the vector field  $X$  associated with the geodesic flow  $\phi_t$  and we look at the unique solution  $U_A : SM \rightarrow U(n)$  of

$$(4) \quad \begin{cases} X(U_A) + A(x, v)U_A = 0, & (x, v) \in SM \\ U_A|_{\partial_+(SM)} = \text{Id}. \end{cases}$$

The scattering data of the connection  $A$  is now the map  $C_A : \partial_-(SM) \rightarrow U(n)$  defined as  $C_A := U_A|_{\partial_-(SM)}$ .

We can now rephrase Question I as follows:

**Question I.** (Manifolds with boundary) Let  $A$  and  $B$  be two unitary connections with  $C_A = C_B$ . Does there exist a smooth map  $U : M \rightarrow U(n)$  with  $U|_{\partial M} = \text{Id}$  and  $B = U^{-1}dU + U^{-1}AU$ ?

Suppose  $C_A = C_B$  and define  $U := U_A(U_B)^{-1} : SM \rightarrow U(n)$ . One easily checks that  $U$  satisfies:

$$\begin{cases} XU + AU - UB = 0, \\ U|_{\partial(SM)} = \text{Id}. \end{cases}$$

If we show that  $U$  is in fact smooth *and* it only depends on the base point  $x \in M$  we would have an answer to Question I, since the equation above reduces to  $dU + AU - UB = 0$  and  $U|_{\partial M} = \text{Id}$  which is exactly gauge equivalence. Showing that  $U$  only depends of  $x$  is not an easy task and it often is the crux of the matter in these type of problems. To tackle this issue we will rephrase the problem in terms of an *attenuated ray transform*.

Consider  $W := U - \text{Id} : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ , where as before  $\mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  stands for the set of all  $n \times n$  complex matrices. Clearly  $W$  satisfies

$$(5) \quad XW + AW - WB = B - A,$$

$$(6) \quad W|_{\partial(SM)} = 0.$$

We introduce a new connection  $\hat{A}$  on the trivial bundle  $M \times \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  as follows: given a matrix  $R \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  we define  $\hat{A}(R) := AR - RB$ . One easily checks that  $\hat{A}$  is Hermitian if  $A$  and  $B$  are. Then equations (5) and (6) are of the form:

$$\begin{cases} Xu + Au = -f, \\ u|_{\partial(SM)} = 0. \end{cases}$$

where  $A$  is a unitary connection,  $f : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N$  is a smooth function linear in the velocities,  $u : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N$  is a function that we would like to prove smooth and only dependent on  $x \in M$  and  $N = n \times n$ . As we will see shortly this amounts to understanding which functions  $f$  linear in the velocities are in the kernel of the attenuated ray transform of the connection  $A$ .

First recall that in the scalar case, the attenuated ray transform  $I_a f$  of a function  $f \in C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C})$  with attenuation coefficient  $a \in C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C})$  can be defined as the integral

$$I_a f(x, v) := \int_0^{\tau(x, v)} f(\phi_t(x, v)) \exp \left[ \int_0^t a(\phi_s(x, v)) ds \right] dt, \quad (x, v) \in \partial_+(SM).$$

Alternatively, we may set  $I_a f := u|_{\partial_+(SM)}$  where  $u$  is the unique solution of the transport equation

$$Xu + au = -f \text{ in } SM, \quad u|_{\partial_-(SM)} = 0.$$

The last definition generalizes without difficulty to the case of connections. Assume that  $A$  is a unitary connection and let  $f \in C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C}^n)$  be a vector valued function. Consider the following transport equation for  $u : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ ,

$$Xu + Au = -f \text{ in } SM, \quad u|_{\partial_-(SM)} = 0.$$

On a fixed geodesic the transport equation becomes a linear ODE with zero initial condition, and therefore this equation has a unique solution  $u = u^f$ .

**Definition 3.1.** *The attenuated ray transform of  $f \in C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C}^n)$  is given by*

$$I_A f := u^f|_{\partial_+(SM)}.$$

We note that  $I_A$  acting on sums of 0-forms and 1-forms always has a nontrivial kernel, since

$$I_A(dp + Ap) = 0 \text{ for any } p \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{C}^n) \text{ with } p|_{\partial M} = 0.$$

Thus from the ray transform  $I_A f$  one only expects to recover  $f$  up to an element having this form.

The transform  $I_A$  also has an integral representation. Consider the unique matrix solution  $U_A : SM \rightarrow U(n)$  from above. Then it is easy to check that

$$I_A f(x, v) = \int_0^{\tau(x, v)} U_A^{-1}(\phi_t(x, v)) f(\phi_t(x, v)) dt.$$

We are now in a position to state the next main question:

**Question III.** (Kernel of  $I_A$ ) Let  $(M, g)$  be a compact simple Riemannian manifold and let  $A$  be a unitary connection. Assume that  $f : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  is a smooth function of the form  $F(x) + \alpha_j(x)v^j$ , where  $F : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  is a smooth function and  $\alpha$  is a  $\mathbb{C}^n$ -valued 1-form. If  $I_A(f) = 0$ , is it true that  $F = 0$  and  $\alpha = d_A p = dp + Ap$ , where  $p : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  is a smooth function with  $p|_{\partial M} = 0$ ?

As explained above a positive answer to Question III gives a positive answer to Question I. The next recent result provides a full answer to Question III in the two-dimensional case:

**Theorem 3.2.** [35] *Let  $M$  be a compact simple surface. Assume that  $f : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  is a smooth function of the form  $F(x) + \alpha_j(x)v^j$ , where  $F : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  is a smooth function and  $\alpha$  is a  $\mathbb{C}^n$ -valued 1-form. Let also  $A : TM \rightarrow \mathfrak{u}(n)$  be a unitary connection. If*

$I_A(f) = 0$ , then  $F = 0$  and  $\alpha = d_A p$ , where  $p : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  is a smooth function with  $p|_{\partial M} = 0$ .

Let us explicitly state the positive answer to Question I in the case of surfaces:

**Theorem 3.3.** [35] *Assume  $M$  is a compact simple surface and let  $A$  and  $B$  be two unitary connections. Then  $C_A = C_B$  implies that there exists a smooth  $U : M \rightarrow U(n)$  such that  $U|_{\partial M} = \text{Id}$  and  $B = U^{-1}dU + U^{-1}AU$ .*

We will provide a sketch of the proof of Theorem 3.2 in the next section, but first we survey some prior results on this topic.

In the case of Euclidean space with the Euclidean metric the attenuated ray transform is the basis of the medical imaging technology of SPECT and has been extensively studied, see [12] for a review. We remark that in connection with injectivity results for ray transforms, there is great interest in reconstruction procedures and inversion formulas. For the attenuated ray transform in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with Euclidean metric and scalar attenuation function, an explicit inversion formula was proved by R. Novikov [28]. A related formula also including 1-form attenuations appears in [3], inversion formulas for matrix attenuations in Euclidean space are given in [10, 29], and the case of hyperbolic space  $\mathbb{H}^2$  is considered in [2].

In our general geometric setting an essential contribution is made in the paper [39] in which it is shown that the attenuated ray transform is injective in the scalar case with  $a \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{C})$  for simple two dimensional manifolds. This paper also contains the proof of existence of holomorphic integrating factors of  $a$  for arbitrary simple surfaces; a result that extends to the case when  $a$  is a 1-form and that will be crucial in the proof of Theorem 3.2.

Various versions of Theorem 3.3 have been proved in the literature. Sharafutdinov [42] proves the theorem assuming that the connections are  $C^1$  close to another connection with small curvature (but in any dimension). In the case of domains in the Euclidean plane the theorem was proved by Finch and Uhlmann [11] assuming that the connections have small curvature and by G. Eskin [10] in general. R. Novikov [29] considers the case of connections which are not compactly supported (but with suitable decay conditions at infinity) and establishes local uniqueness of the trivial connection and gives examples in which global uniqueness fails (existence of “ghosts”). His examples are based on a remarkable connection between the Bogomolny equation in Minkowski  $(2 + 1)$ -space and the scattering data associated with the transport equation considered above. As it is explained in [47] (see also [9, Section 8.2.1]), certain soliton solutions  $A$  have the property that when restricted to space-like planes the scattering data is trivial. In this way one obtains connections in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with the property of having trivial scattering data but which are not gauge equivalent to the trivial connection. Of course these pairs are not compactly supported in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  but they have a suitable decay at infinity. Motivated by this L. Mason obtained a full classification of  $U(n)$  transparent connections for the round metric on  $S^2$  (unpublished) using methods from twistor theory as in [23].

## 4. SKETCH OF PROOF OF THEOREM 3.2

Let  $(M, g)$  be a compact oriented two dimensional Riemannian manifold with smooth boundary  $\partial M$ . As before  $SM$  will denote the unit circle bundle which is a compact 3-manifold with boundary given by  $\partial(SM) = \{(x, v) \in SM : x \in \partial M\}$ . Since  $M$  is assumed oriented there is a circle action on the fibers of  $SM$  with infinitesimal generator  $V$  called the *vertical vector field*. It is possible to complete the pair  $X, V$  to a global frame of  $T(SM)$  by considering the vector field  $X_\perp := [X, V]$ . There are two additional structure equations given by  $X = [V, X_\perp]$  and  $[X, X_\perp] = -KV$  where  $K$  is the Gaussian curvature of the surface. Using this frame we can define a Riemannian metric on  $SM$  by declaring  $\{X, X_\perp, V\}$  to be an orthonormal basis and the volume form of this metric will be denoted by  $d\Sigma^3$ . The fact that  $\{X, X_\perp, V\}$  are orthonormal together with the commutator formulas implies that the Lie derivative of  $d\Sigma^3$  along the three vector fields vanishes.

Given functions  $u, v : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  we consider the inner product

$$(u, v) = \int_{SM} \langle u, v \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^n} d\Sigma^3.$$

Since  $X, X_\perp, V$  are volume preserving we have  $(Vu, v) = -(u, Vv)$  for  $u, v \in C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C}^n)$ , and if additionally  $u|_{\partial(SM)} = 0$  or  $v|_{\partial(SM)} = 0$  then also  $(Xu, v) = -(u, Xv)$  and  $(X_\perp u, v) = -(u, X_\perp v)$ .

The space  $L^2(SM, \mathbb{C}^n)$  decomposes orthogonally as a direct sum

$$L^2(SM, \mathbb{C}^n) = \bigoplus_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} H_k$$

where  $H_k$  is the eigenspace of  $-iV$  corresponding to the eigenvalue  $k$ . A function  $u \in L^2(SM, \mathbb{C}^n)$  has a Fourier series expansion

$$u = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} u_k,$$

where  $u_k \in H_k$ . Let  $\Omega_k = C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C}^n) \cap H_k$ .

An important ingredient is the fibrewise *Hilbert transform*  $\mathcal{H}$ . This can be introduced in various ways (cf. [38, 39]), but perhaps the most informative approach is to indicate that it acts fibrewise and for  $u_k \in \Omega_k$ ,

$$\mathcal{H}(u_k) = -\text{sgn}(k) i u_k$$

where we use the convention  $\text{sgn}(0) = 0$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{H}(u) = \sum_k \mathcal{H}(u_k)$ . Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{Id} + i\mathcal{H})u &= u_0 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} u_k, \\ (\text{Id} - i\mathcal{H})u &= u_0 + 2 \sum_{k=-\infty}^{-1} u_k. \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 4.1.** A function  $u : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  is said to be holomorphic if  $(\text{Id} - i\mathcal{H})u = u_0$ . Equivalently,  $u$  is holomorphic if  $u_k = 0$  for all  $k < 0$ . Similarly,  $u$  is said to be antiholomorphic if  $(\text{Id} + i\mathcal{H})u = u_0$  which is equivalent to saying that  $u_k = 0$  for all  $k > 0$ .

As in previous works the following commutator formula of Pestov-Uhlmann [38] will come into play :

$$(7) \quad [\mathcal{H}, X]u = X_\perp u_0 + (X_\perp u)_0, \quad u \in C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C}^n).$$

We will give a proof of this formula later on in Lemma 6.7 below.

It is easy to extend this bracket relation so that it includes a connection  $A$ . We often think of  $A$  as a function restricted to  $SM$ . We also think of  $A$  as acting on smooth functions  $u \in C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C}^n)$  by multiplication. Note that  $V(A)$  is a new function on  $SM$  which can be identified with the restriction of  $-\star A$  to  $SM$ , so we will simply write  $V(A) = -\star A$ . Here  $\star$  denotes the Hodge star operator of the metric  $g$ . Then we have:

**Lemma 4.2.** For any smooth function  $u$  we have

$$[\mathcal{H}, X + A]u = (X_\perp + \star A)(u_0) + \{(X_\perp + \star A)(u)\}_0.$$

The proof makes use of a regularity result from [35, Proposition 5.2].

**Proposition 4.3.** Let  $f : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  be smooth with  $I_A(f) = 0$ . Then  $u^f : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  is smooth.

The next proposition from [35, Theorem 4.1] will provide the holomorphic integrating factors in the scalar case.

**Proposition 4.4.** Let  $(M, g)$  be a simple two-dimensional manifold and  $f \in C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C})$ . The following conditions are equivalent.

- (a) There exist a holomorphic  $w \in C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C})$  and antiholomorphic  $\tilde{w} \in C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C})$  such that  $Xw = X\tilde{w} = -f$ .
- (b)  $f(x, v) = F(x) + \alpha_j(x)v^j$  where  $F$  is a smooth function on  $M$  and  $\alpha$  is a 1-form.

The existence of holomorphic and antiholomorphic solutions for the case  $\alpha = 0$  was first proved in [39], but here we will need the case in which  $F = 0$ , but  $\alpha$  is non-zero.

Another key ingredient is an energy identity or a ‘‘Pestov type identity’’, which generalizes the standard Pestov identity [40] to the case where a connection is present. There are several predecessors for this formula [46, 42] and its use for simple surfaces is in the spirit of [44, 6]. Recall that the curvature  $F_A$  of the connection  $A$  is defined as  $F_A = dA + A \wedge A$  and  $\star F_A$  is a function  $\star F_A : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{u}(n)$ .

**Lemma 4.5** (Energy identity). If  $u : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  is a smooth function such that  $u|_{\partial(SM)} = 0$ , then

$$\|(X + A)Vu\|^2 - (K Vu, Vu) - (\star F_A u, Vu) = \|V(X + A)(u)\|^2 - \|(X + A)u\|^2.$$



**Remark 4.6.** The same Energy identity holds true for *closed* surfaces.

To use the Energy identity we need to control the signs of various terms. The first easy observation is the following:

**Lemma 4.7.** *Assume  $(X + A)u = F(x) + \alpha_j(x)v^j$ , where  $F : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  is a smooth function and  $\alpha$  is a  $\mathbb{C}^n$ -valued 1-form. Then*

$$\|V(X + A)u\|^2 - \|(X + A)u\|^2 = -\|F\|^2 \leq 0.$$

*Proof.* It suffices to note the identities:

$$\begin{aligned} \|V(X + A)u\|^2 &= \|V\alpha\|^2 = \|\alpha\|^2, \\ \|F + \alpha\|^2 &= \|\alpha\|^2 + \|F\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

Next we have the following lemma due to the absence of conjugate points on simple surfaces (compare with [6, Theorem 4.4]):

**Lemma 4.8.** *Let  $M$  be a compact simple surface. If  $u : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  is a smooth function such that  $u|_{\partial(SM)} = 0$ , then*

$$\|(X + A)Vu\|^2 - (K Vu, Vu) \geq 0.$$

*Proof.* Consider a smooth function  $a : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which solves the Riccati equation  $X(a) + a^2 + K = 0$ . These exist by the absence of conjugate points (cf. for example [41, Theorem 6.2.1] or proof of Lemma 4.1 in [44]). Set for simplicity  $\psi = V(u)$ . Clearly  $\psi|_{\partial(SM)} = 0$ .

Let us compute using that  $A$  is skew-Hermitian:

$$\begin{aligned} |(X + A)(\psi) - a\psi|_{\mathbb{C}^n}^2 &= |(X + A)(\psi)|_{\mathbb{C}^n}^2 - 2\Re\langle (X + A)(\psi), a\psi \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^n} + a^2|\psi|_{\mathbb{C}^n}^2 \\ &= |(X + A)(\psi)|_{\mathbb{C}^n}^2 - 2a\Re\langle X(\psi), \psi \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^n} + a^2|\psi|_{\mathbb{C}^n}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using the Riccati equation we have

$$X(a|\psi|^2) = (-a^2 - K)|\psi|^2 + 2a\Re\langle X(\psi), \psi \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^n}$$

thus

$$|(X + A)(\psi) - a\psi|_{\mathbb{C}^n}^2 = |(X + A)(\psi)|_{\mathbb{C}^n}^2 - K|\psi|_{\mathbb{C}^n}^2 - X(a|\psi|_{\mathbb{C}^n}^2).$$

Integrating this equality with respect to  $d\Sigma^3$  and using that  $\psi$  vanishes on  $\partial(SM)$  we obtain

$$\|(X + A)(\psi)\|^2 - (K \psi, \psi) = \|(X + A)(\psi) - a\psi\|^2 \geq 0.$$

□

We now show:

**Theorem 4.9.** *Let  $f : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  be a smooth function. Suppose  $u : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} Xu + Au = -f, \\ u|_{\partial(SM)} = 0. \end{cases}$$

*Then if  $f_k = 0$  for all  $k \leq -2$  and  $i \star F_A(x)$  is a negative definite Hermitian matrix for all  $x \in M$ , the function  $u$  must be holomorphic. Moreover, if  $f_k = 0$  for all  $k \geq 2$  and  $i \star F_A(x)$  is a positive definite Hermitian matrix for all  $x \in M$ , the function  $u$  must be antiholomorphic.*

*Proof.* Let us assume that  $f_k = 0$  for  $k \leq -2$  and  $i \star F_A$  is a negative definite Hermitian matrix; the proof of the other claim is similar.

We need to show that  $(\text{Id} - i\mathcal{H})u$  only depends on  $x$ . We apply  $X + A$  to it and use Lemma 4.2 together with  $(\text{Id} - i\mathcal{H})f = f_0 + 2f_{-1}$  to derive:

$$\begin{aligned} (X + A)[(\text{Id} - i\mathcal{H})u] &= -f - i(X + A)(\mathcal{H}u) \\ &= -f - i(\mathcal{H}((X + A)(u)) - (X_\perp + \star A)(u_0) - \{(X_\perp + \star A)(u)\}_0) \\ &= -(\text{Id} - i\mathcal{H})(f) + i(X_\perp + \star A)(u_0) + i\{(X_\perp + \star A)(u)\}_0 \\ &= -f_0 - 2f_{-1} + i(X_\perp + \star A)(u_0) + i\{(X_\perp + \star A)(u)\}_0 \\ &= F(x) + \alpha_x(v), \end{aligned}$$

where  $F : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  and  $\alpha$  is a  $\mathbb{C}^n$ -valued 1-form. Now we are in good shape to use the Energy identity from Lemma 4.5. We will apply it to  $v = (\text{Id} - i\mathcal{H})u = u_0 + 2\sum_{k=-\infty}^{-1} u_k$ . We know from Lemma 4.7 that its right hand side is  $\leq 0$  and using Lemma 4.8 we deduce

$$(\star F_A v, Vv) \geq 0.$$

But on the other hand

$$(\star F_A v, Vv) = -4 \sum_{k=-\infty}^{-1} k(i \star F_A u_k, u_k)$$

and since  $i \star F_A$  is negative definite this forces  $u_k = 0$  for all  $k < 0$ . □

We are now ready to outline the proof of Theorem 3.2.

*Proof.* Consider the area form  $\omega_g$  of the metric  $g$ . Since  $M$  is a disk there exists a smooth 1-form  $\varphi$  such that  $\omega_g = d\varphi$ . Given  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ , consider the Hermitian connection

$$A_s := A - is\varphi \text{Id}.$$

Clearly its curvature is given by

$$F_{A_s} = F_A - is\omega_g \text{Id}$$

therefore

$$i \star F_{A_s} = i \star F_A + s \text{Id},$$

from which we see that there exists  $s_0 > 0$  such that for  $s > s_0$ ,  $i \star F_{A_s}$  is positive definite and for  $s < -s_0$ ,  $i \star F_{A_s}$  is negative definite.

Since  $I_A(f) = 0$ , Proposition 4.3 implies that there is a *smooth*  $u : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  such that  $(X + A)(u) = -f$  and  $u|_{\partial(SM)} = 0$  (to abbreviate the notation we write  $u$  instead of  $u^f$ ).

Let  $e^{sw}$  be an integrating factor of  $-is\varphi$ . In other words  $w : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  satisfies  $X(w) = i\varphi$ . By Proposition 4.4 we know we can choose  $w$  to be holomorphic or antiholomorphic. Observe now that  $u_s := e^{sw}u$  satisfies  $u_s|_{\partial(SM)} = 0$  and solves

$$(X + A_s)(u_s) = -e^{sw}f.$$

Choose  $w$  to be holomorphic. Since  $f = F(x) + \alpha_j(x)v^j$ , the function  $e^{sw}f$  has the property that its Fourier coefficients  $(e^{sw}f)_k$  vanish for  $k \leq -2$ . Choose  $s$  such that  $s < -s_0$  so that  $i \star F_{A_s}$  is negative definite. Then Theorem 4.9 implies that  $u_s$  is holomorphic and thus  $u = e^{-sw}u_s$  is also holomorphic.

Choosing  $w$  antiholomorphic and  $s > s_0$  we show similarly that  $u$  is antiholomorphic. This implies that  $u = u_0$  which together with  $(X + A)u = -f$ , gives  $d_A u_0 = -f$ . If we set  $p = -u_0$  we see right away that  $F \equiv 0$  and  $\alpha = d_A p$  as desired.  $\square$

## 5. APPLICATIONS TO TENSOR TOMOGRAPHY

In this section we explain how the ideas of the previous section can be used to tackle a well-known inverse problem which is apriori unrelated with unitary connections.

We consider the geodesic ray transform acting on symmetric  $m$ -tensor fields on  $M$ . When the metric is Euclidean and  $m = 0$  this transform reduces to the usual X-ray transform obtained by integrating functions along straight lines. More generally, given a symmetric (covariant)  $m$ -tensor field  $f = f_{i_1 \dots i_m} dx^{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes dx^{i_m}$  on  $M$  we define the corresponding function on  $SM$  by

$$f(x, v) = f_{i_1 \dots i_m} v^{i_1} \dots v^{i_m}.$$

The ray transform of  $f$  is defined by

$$If(x, v) = \int_0^{\tau(x, v)} f(\phi_t(x, v)) dt, \quad (x, v) \in \partial_+(SM),$$

where  $\phi_t$  denotes the geodesic flow of the Riemannian metric  $g$ . If  $h$  is a symmetric  $(m - 1)$ -tensor field, its inner derivative  $dh$  is a symmetric  $m$ -tensor field defined by  $dh = \sigma \nabla h$ , where  $\sigma$  denotes symmetrization and  $\nabla$  is the Levi-Civita connection. A direct calculation in local coordinates shows that

$$dh(x, v) = Xh(x, v),$$

where  $X$  as before is the geodesic vector field associated with  $\phi_t$ . If additionally  $h|_{\partial M} = 0$ , then one clearly has  $I(dh) = 0$ . The ray transform on symmetric  $m$ -tensors is said to be  $s$ -injective if these are the only elements in the kernel. The terminology arises from the fact that any tensor field  $f$  may be written uniquely as  $f = f^s + dh$ , where  $f^s$  is a symmetric  $m$ -tensor with zero divergence and  $h$  is an  $(m - 1)$ -tensor with  $h|_{\partial M} = 0$  (cf. [40]). The tensor fields  $f^s$  and  $dh$  are called respectively the

*solenoidal* and *potential* parts of the tensor  $f$ . Saying that  $I$  is  $s$ -injective is saying precisely that  $I$  is injective on the set of solenoidal tensors.

The next result shows that the ray transform on simple surfaces is  $s$ -injective for tensors of any rank. This settles a long standing question in the two-dimensional case (cf. [37] and [40, Problem 1.1.2]).

**Theorem 5.1.** [36] *Let  $(M, g)$  be a simple surface and let  $m \geq 0$ . If  $f$  is a smooth symmetric  $m$ -tensor field on  $M$  which satisfies  $If = 0$ , then  $f = dh$  for some smooth symmetric  $(m - 1)$ -tensor field  $h$  on  $M$  with  $h|_{\partial M} = 0$ . (If  $m = 0$ , then  $f = 0$ .)*

It is not the objective of this article to discuss the vast literature on the tensor tomography problem for simple manifolds. Instead we refer the reader to [40] and to the references in [36] and we limit ourselves to supplying a proof of Theorem 5.1 based on the ideas of the previous section. The proof reduces to proving the next result. We say that  $f \in C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C})$  has degree  $m$  if  $f_k = 0$  for  $|k| \geq m + 1$  and  $m \geq 0$  is the smallest non-negative integer with that property.

**Proposition 5.2.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a simple surface, and assume that  $u \in C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C})$  satisfies  $Xu = -f$  in  $SM$  with  $u|_{\partial(SM)} = 0$ . If  $f \in C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C})$  has degree  $m \geq 1$ , then  $u$  has degree  $m - 1$ . If  $f$  has degree 0, then  $u = 0$ .*

*Proof of Theorem 5.1.* Let  $f$  be a symmetric  $m$ -tensor field on  $SM$  and suppose that  $If = 0$ . We write

$$u(x, v) := \int_0^{\tau(x, v)} f(\phi_t(x, v)) dt, \quad (x, v) \in SM.$$

Then  $u|_{\partial(SM)} = 0$ , and also  $u \in C^\infty(SM)$  by Proposition 4.3.

Now  $f$  has degree  $m$ , and  $u$  satisfies  $Xu = -f$  in  $SM$  with  $u|_{\partial(SM)} = 0$ . Proposition 5.2 implies that  $u$  has degree  $m - 1$  (and  $u = 0$  if  $m = 0$ ). We let  $h := -u$ . It is not hard to see that  $h$  gives rise to a symmetric  $(m - 1)$ -tensor still denoted by  $h$ . Since  $X(h) = f$ , this implies that  $dh$  and  $f$  agree when restricted to  $SM$  and thus  $dh = f$ . This proves the theorem.  $\square$

Proposition 5.2 is in turn an immediate consequence of the next two results.

**Proposition 5.3.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a simple surface, and assume that  $u \in C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C})$  satisfies  $Xu = -f$  in  $SM$  with  $u|_{\partial(SM)} = 0$ . If  $m \geq 0$  and if  $f \in C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C})$  is such that  $f_k = 0$  for  $k \leq -m - 1$ , then  $u_k = 0$  for  $k \leq -m$ .*

**Proposition 5.4.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a simple surface, and assume that  $u \in C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C})$  satisfies  $Xu = -f$  in  $SM$  with  $u|_{\partial(SM)} = 0$ . If  $m \geq 0$  and if  $f \in C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C})$  is such that  $f_k = 0$  for  $k \geq m + 1$ , then  $u_k = 0$  for  $k \geq m$ .*

We will only prove Proposition 5.3, the proof of the other result being completely analogous. We shall need the following result from [39, Proposition 5.1]:

**Proposition 5.5.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a simple surface and let  $f$  be a smooth holomorphic (antiholomorphic) function on  $SM$ . Suppose  $u \in C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C})$  satisfies*

$$Xu = -f \text{ in } SM, \quad u|_{\partial(SM)} = 0.$$

Then  $u$  is holomorphic (antiholomorphic) and  $u_0 = 0$ .

*Proof of Proposition 5.3.* Suppose that  $u$  is a smooth solution of  $Xu = -f$  in  $SM$  where  $f_k = 0$  for  $k \leq -m - 1$  and  $u|_{\partial(SM)} = 0$ . We choose a nonvanishing function  $r \in \Omega_m$  and define the 1-form

$$A := -r^{-1}Xr.$$

Then  $ru$  solves the problem

$$(X + A)(ru) = -rf \text{ in } SM, \quad ru|_{\partial(SM)} = 0.$$

Note that  $rf$  is a holomorphic function. Next we employ a holomorphic integrating factor: by Proposition 4.4 there exists a holomorphic  $w \in C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C})$  with  $Xw = A$ . The function  $e^w ru$  then satisfies

$$X(e^w ru) = -e^w rf \text{ in } SM, \quad e^w ru|_{\partial(SM)} = 0.$$

The right hand side  $e^w rf$  is holomorphic. Now Proposition 5.5 implies that the solution  $e^w ru$  is also holomorphic and  $(e^w ru)_0 = 0$ . Looking at Fourier coefficients shows that  $(ru)_k = 0$  for  $k \leq 0$ , and therefore  $u_k = 0$  for  $k \leq -m$  as required.  $\square$

Finally, let us explain the choice of  $r$  and  $A$  in the proof in more detail. Since  $M$  is a disk we can consider global isothermal coordinates  $(x, y)$  on  $M$  such that the metric can be written as  $ds^2 = e^{2\lambda}(dx^2 + dy^2)$  where  $\lambda$  is a smooth real-valued function of  $(x, y)$ . This gives coordinates  $(x, y, \theta)$  on  $SM$  where  $\theta$  is the angle between a unit vector  $v$  and  $\partial/\partial x$ . Then  $\Omega_m$  consists of all functions  $a(x, y)e^{im\theta}$  where  $a \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{C})$ . We choose the specific nonvanishing function

$$r(x, y, \theta) := e^{im\theta}.$$

In the  $(x, y, \theta)$  coordinates the geodesic vector field  $X$  is given by:

$$(8) \quad X = e^{-\lambda} \left( \cos \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \sin \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + \left( -\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial x} \sin \theta + \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial y} \cos \theta \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \right).$$

The connection  $A = -Xr/r$  has the form

$$A = ime^{-\lambda} \left( -\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial y} \cos \theta + \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial x} \sin \theta \right) = im \left( -\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial y} dx + \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial x} dy \right).$$

Here as usual we identify  $A$  with  $A(x, v)$  where  $(x, v) \in SM$ . This shows that the connection  $A$  is essentially the Levi-Civita connection of the metric  $g$  on the tensor power bundle  $TM^{\otimes m}$ , and since  $(X + A)r = 0$  we have that  $r$  corresponds to a section of the pull-back bundle  $\pi^*(TM^{\otimes m})$  whose covariant derivative along the geodesic vector field vanishes (here  $\pi : SM \rightarrow M$  is the standard projection).

A second proof of Proposition 5.4 in the same spirit may be found in [36].

## 6. CLOSED MANIFOLDS

In this section we will discuss Question II, but before embarking into that we need some preliminary discussion on cocycles with values in a Lie group over a flow  $\phi_t$ .

Let  $N$  be a closed manifold and  $\phi_t : N \rightarrow N$  a smooth flow with infinitesimal generator  $X$ . Let  $G$  be a compact Lie group; for our purposes it is enough to think of  $G$  as a compact matrix group like  $U(n)$ .

**Definition 6.1.** *A  $G$ -valued cocycle over the flow  $\phi_t$  is a map  $C : N \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow G$  that satisfies*

$$C(x, t + s) = C(\phi_t x, s) C(x, t)$$

for all  $x \in N$  and  $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$ .

In this paper the cocycles will always be smooth. In this case  $C$  is determined by its infinitesimal generator  $B : N \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$  given by

$$B(x) := - \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} C(x, t).$$

The cocycle can be recovered from  $B$  as the unique solution to

$$\frac{d}{dt} C(x, t) = -dR_{C(x, t)}(B(\phi_t x)), \quad C(x, 0) = \text{Id},$$

where  $R_g$  is right translation by  $g \in G$ . We will indistinctly use the word ‘‘cocycle’’ for  $C$  or its infinitesimal generator  $B$ .

**Definition 6.2.** *The cocycle  $C$  is said to be cohomologically trivial if there exists a smooth function  $u : N \rightarrow G$  such that*

$$C(x, t) = u(\phi_t x) u(x)^{-1}$$

for all  $x \in N$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Observe that the condition of being cohomologically trivial can be equivalently expressed in terms of the infinitesimal generator  $B$  of the cocycle by saying that there exists a smooth function  $u : N \rightarrow G$  that satisfies the equation

$$d_x u(X(x)) + d_{\text{Id}} R_{u(x)}(B(x)) = 0$$

for all  $x \in N$ . If  $G$  is a matrix group we can write this more succinctly as

$$Xu + Bu = 0$$

where it is understood that differentiation and multiplication is in the set of matrices.

**Definition 6.3.** *A cocycle  $C$  is said to satisfy the periodic orbit obstruction condition if  $C(x, T) = \text{Id}$  whenever  $\phi_T x = x$ .*

Obviously a cohomologically trivial cocycle satisfies the periodic orbit obstruction condition. The converse turns out to be true for transitive Anosov flows: this is one of the celebrated Livsic theorems [19, 20, 27].

**Theorem 6.4** (The smooth Livsic periodic data theorem). *Suppose  $\phi_t$  is a smooth transitive Anosov flow. Let  $C$  be a smooth cocycle such that  $C(x, T) = \text{Id}$  whenever  $\phi_T x = x$ . Then  $C$  is cohomologically trivial.*

Given two  $G$ -valued cocycles  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  we shall say that they are *cohomologous* (or  $X$ -cohomologous) if there is a smooth function  $u : N \rightarrow G$  such that

$$C_1(x, t) = u(\phi_t x) C_2(x, t) u(x)^{-1}$$

for all  $x \in N$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Clearly if  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are cohomologous,  $C_1(x, T) = u(x) C_2(x, T) u(x)^{-1}$ , whenever  $\phi_T x = x$ . An extension of the Livsic theorem due to W. Parry [30] together with the regularity result from [27] gives the following extension of Theorem 6.4:

**Theorem 6.5** (The smooth Livsic periodic data theorem for two cocycles). *Suppose  $\phi_t$  is a smooth transitive Anosov flow. Let  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  be two smooth cocycles such that there is a Hölder continuous function  $u : N \rightarrow G$  for which  $C_1(x, T) = u(x) C_2(x, T) u(x)^{-1}$  whenever  $\phi_T x = x$ . Then  $C$  and  $D$  are cohomologous.*

Observe that if  $G$  is a matrix group then two cocycles  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are cohomologous iff their infinitesimal generators  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  are related by a smooth function  $u : N \rightarrow G$  such that

$$Xu + B_1 u - u B_2 = 0$$

or equivalently

$$B_2 = u^{-1} X u + u^{-1} B_1 u.$$

Note the formal similarity of this equation with the one that defines gauge equivalent connections. One could take the viewpoint that the main question raised in this paper is to decide when it is possible to go from cohomology defined by the operator  $X$  to cohomology defined by  $d$  in the geometric situation when  $X$  is the geodesic vector field. Let us be a bit more precise about this.

Let  $(M, g)$  be a closed Riemannian manifold with unit tangent bundle  $SM$  and projection  $\pi : SM \rightarrow M$ . The geodesic flow  $\phi_t$  acts on  $SM$  with infinitesimal generator  $X$ .

Consider the trivial bundle  $M \times \mathbb{C}^n$  and let  $\mathcal{A}$  stand for the set of all unitary connections. Given  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ , we have a pull-back connection  $\pi^* A$  on the bundle  $SM \times \mathbb{C}^n$  and we denote by  $\pi^* \mathcal{A}$  the set of all such connections.

Each connection  $A$  gives rise to a cocycle over the geodesic flow whose generator is  $\pi^* A(X) : SM \rightarrow \mathfrak{u}(n)$ . Note that  $\pi^* A(X)(x, v) = A(x, v)$ , in words,  $\pi^* A(X)$  is the restriction of  $A : TM \rightarrow \mathfrak{u}(n)$  to  $SM$ .

The cocycle  $C$  associated with this generator is nothing but parallel transport along geodesics, so that  $C : SM \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow U(n)$  solves

$$\frac{d}{dt} C(x, v, t) + A(\phi_t(x, v)) C(x, v, t) = 0, \quad C(x, v, 0) = \text{Id}.$$

On the set  $\pi^* \mathcal{A}$  we impose the equivalence relation  $\sim_X$  of being  $X$ -cohomologous and on  $\mathcal{A}$  we have the equivalence relation  $\sim$  given by gauge equivalence. There is a

natural map induced by  $\pi$ :

$$(9) \quad \mathcal{A}/\sim \mapsto \pi^*\mathcal{A}/\sim X.$$

Suppose now we have two connections  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  as in Question II and the geodesic flow is Anosov. Then Theorem 6.5 implies that  $\pi^*A_1(X)$  and  $\pi^*A_2(X)$  are cohomologous cocycles, that is, there is a smooth map  $u : SM \rightarrow U(n)$  such that on  $SM$  we have the *cohomological equation*

$$(10) \quad A_2 = u^{-1}Xu + u^{-1}A_1u.$$

This is the main dynamical input, that allows the passage from closed geodesics to  $X$ -cohomology. What is left is the geometric problem of deciding if the map in (9) is injective. Suppose for a moment that for some reason we can show that  $u(x, v)$  only depends on  $x$ . Then (10) means exactly that  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  are gauge equivalent since  $Xu = du$ . Thus understanding the dependence of  $u$  in the velocities is crucial and this often can be achieved using Pestov type identities and/or Fourier analysis as in the sketch of proof of Theorem 3.2 before. Let us see a good example of this in the simplest possible case in which  $n = 1$ . Since  $U(1) = S^1$  is abelian we can reduce (10) to the cohomologically trivial case

$$Xu + Au = 0$$

where  $A = A_1 - A_2$  and  $u : SM \rightarrow S^1$ . Write  $A = i\theta$ , where  $\theta$  is an ordinary real-valued 1-form. Then

$$(11) \quad du(X) + i\theta u = 0.$$

The function  $u$  gives rise to a real-valued closed 1-form in  $SM$  given by  $\varphi := \frac{du}{iu}$ . Since  $\pi^* : H^1(M, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H^1(SM, \mathbb{R})$  is an isomorphism when  $M$  is different from the 2-torus, there exists a closed 1-form  $\omega$  in  $M$  and a smooth function  $f : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\varphi = \pi^*\omega + df.$$

(It is easy to see that if  $\phi_t$  is Anosov, then  $M$  cannot be a 2-torus since for example,  $\pi_1(M)$  must grow exponentially.) When this equality is applied to  $X$  and combined with (11) one obtains

$$-\theta_x(v) - \omega_x(v) = df(X(x, v)) = X(f)(x, v)$$

for all  $(x, v) \in SM$ . It is known that this implies that  $\theta + \omega$  is exact and that  $f$  only depends on  $x$ . This was proved by V. Guillemin and D. Kazhdan [14] for surfaces of negative curvature, by C. Croke and Sharafutdinov [4] for arbitrary manifolds of negative curvature and by N.S. Dairbekov and Sharafutdinov [5] for manifolds whose geodesic flow is Anosov. It follows easily now that  $u$  only depends on  $x$  and hence  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  must be gauge equivalent and thus for  $n = 1$  we have a full answer. Before going further let us explain why if we have a smooth solution  $u$  to the cohomological equation

$$Xu = \theta$$



where  $\theta$  is a 1-form, then  $\theta$  is exact and  $u$  only depends on  $x$ . We can see this for  $\dim M = 2$  using the energy identity from Lemma 4.5 for the case  $A = 0$ . Since  $\theta$  is a 1-form, the right hand side is zero as in Lemma 4.7, thus

$$(12) \quad \|XVu\|^2 - (KVu, Vu) = 0.$$

If the flow is Anosov there are two solutions  $r^{s,u}$  of the Riccati equation  $X(r) + r^2 + K = 0$ . These solutions are related to the stable and unstable bundles as follows:  $-X_\perp + r^{s,u}V \in E^{s,u}$  and  $r^s - r^u$  never vanishes; for an account of these results we refer to [31]. Hence using the proof of Lemma 4.8 and (12) we deduce:

$$XVu - r^{s,u}Vu = 0$$

from which it follows that  $(r^s - r^u)Vu = 0$  and thus  $Vu = 0$ . This shows that  $u$  only depends on  $x$  and therefore  $\theta$  is exact.

Now that we have a better understanding of the abelian case  $n = 1$ , let us go back to the general equation (10). As in Section 3 we can introduce a new unitary connection  $\hat{A}$  on the trivial bundle  $M \times \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  as follows: given a matrix  $R \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$  we define  $\hat{A}(R) := AR - RB$ . Then equation (10) is the form

$$Xu + Au = 0$$

at the price of course, of increasing the rank of our trivial vector bundle. Note that  $F_{\hat{A}}(R) = F_AR - RF_B$ .

This suggests that in general we should study the following problem on closed manifolds. Given a unitary connection  $A$  on  $M \times \mathbb{C}^n$  and  $f : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  a smooth function of the form  $F(x) + \alpha_j(x)v^j$ , where  $F : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  is a smooth function and  $\alpha$  is a  $\mathbb{C}^n$ -valued 1-form, describe the set of smooth solutions  $u : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  to the equation

$$(13) \quad Xu + Au = -f.$$

Unfortunately we know very little about equation (13) in the general Anosov case. However for closed surfaces of negative curvature we have the following fundamental result which should be regarded as an extension of [14, Theorem 3.6].

The Fourier analysis that we set up in Section 4 works equally well in the case of closed oriented surfaces. Given  $u \in C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C}^n)$ , we write  $u = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} u_m$ , where  $u_m \in \Omega_m$ . We will say that  $u$  has degree  $N$ , if  $N$  is the smallest non-negative integer such that  $u_m = 0$  for all  $m$  with  $|m| \geq N + 1$ .

**Theorem 6.6.** [32, Theorem 5.1] *If  $M$  is a closed surface of negative curvature and  $f : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  has finite degree, then any smooth solution  $u$  of  $Xu + Au = -f$  has finite degree.*

Below we shall sketch the proof of this theorem, but first we need some preliminaries. As in [14] we introduce the following first order elliptic operators

$$\eta_+, \eta_- : C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C}^n) \rightarrow C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C}^n)$$

given by

$$\eta_+ := (X + iX_\perp)/2, \quad \eta_- := (X - iX_\perp)/2.$$

Clearly  $X = \eta_+ + \eta_-$ . We have

$$\eta_+ : \Omega_m \rightarrow \Omega_{m+1}, \quad \eta_- : \Omega_m \rightarrow \Omega_{m-1}, \quad (\eta_+)^* = -\eta_-.$$

Before going further, let us use these operators to give a short proof of the bracket relation (7):

**Lemma 6.7.** *The following formula holds:*

$$[\mathcal{H}, X]u = X_\perp u_0 + (X_\perp u)_0, \quad u \in C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C}^n).$$

*Proof.* It suffices to show that

$$[\text{Id} + i\mathcal{H}, X]u = iX_\perp u_0 + i(X_\perp u)_0.$$

Since  $X = \eta_+ + \eta_-$  we need to compute  $[\text{Id} + i\mathcal{H}, \eta_\pm]$ , so let us find  $[\text{Id} + i\mathcal{H}, \eta_+]u$ , where  $u = \sum_k u_k$ . Recall that  $(\text{Id} + i\mathcal{H})u = u_0 + 2 \sum_{k \geq 1} u_k$ . We find:

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{Id} + i\mathcal{H})\eta_+ u &= \eta_+ u_{-1} + 2 \sum_{k \geq 0} \eta_+ u_k, \\ \eta_+ (\text{Id} + i\mathcal{H})u &= \eta_+ u_0 + 2 \sum_{k \geq 1} \eta_+ u_k. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$[\text{Id} + i\mathcal{H}, \eta_+]u = \eta_+ u_{-1} + \eta_+ u_0.$$

Similarly we find

$$[\text{Id} + i\mathcal{H}, \eta_-]u = -\eta_- u_0 - \eta_- u_1.$$

Therefore using that  $iX_\perp = \eta_+ - \eta_-$  we obtain

$$[\text{Id} + i\mathcal{H}, X]u = iX_\perp u_0 + i(X_\perp u)_0$$

as desired. □

To deal with the equation  $Xu + Au = -f$ , we introduce the “twisted” operators

$$\mu_+ := \eta_+ + A_1, \quad \mu_- := \eta_- + A_{-1}.$$

where  $A = A_{-1} + A_1$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &:= \frac{A - iV(A)}{2} \in \Omega_1, \\ A_{-1} &:= \frac{A + iV(A)}{2} \in \Omega_{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that this decomposition corresponds precisely with the usual decomposition of  $\mathfrak{u}(n)$ -valued 1-forms on a surface:

$$\Omega^1(M, \mathfrak{u}(n)) \otimes \mathbb{C} = \Omega^{1,0}(M, \mathfrak{u}(n)) \oplus \Omega^{0,1}(M, \mathfrak{u}(n)),$$

where  $\star = -i$  on  $\Omega^{1,0}$  and  $\star = i$  on  $\Omega^{0,1}$  (here  $\star$  is the Hodge star operator of the metric).

We also have

$$\mu_+ : \Omega_m \rightarrow \Omega_{m+1}, \quad \mu_- : \Omega_m \rightarrow \Omega_{m-1}, \quad (\mu_+)^* = -\mu_-.$$

The equation  $Xu + Au = -f$  is now  $\mu_+(u) + \mu_-(u) = -f$ .

*Sketch of proof of Theorem 6.6.* We shall use the following equality proved in [32, Corollary 4.4]. Given  $u \in C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C}^n)$  we have

$$\|\mu_+ u\|^2 = \|\mu_- u\|^2 + \frac{i}{2}((K Vu, u) + (\star F_A u, u)),$$

where  $K$  is the Gaussian curvature of the metric and  $F_A$  is the curvature of  $A$ . This  $L^2$  identity is a close relative of the identity in Lemma 4.5. For  $u_m \in \Omega_m$  we have

$$\|\mu_+ u_m\|^2 = \|\mu_- u_m\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}((i \star F_A - mK \text{Id})u_m, u_m).$$

Hence if  $K < 0$ , there exist a constant  $c > 0$  and a positive integer  $\ell$  such that

$$(14) \quad \|\mu_+ u_m\|^2 \geq \|\mu_- u_m\|^2 + c\|u_m\|^2$$

for all  $m \geq \ell$ . Projecting the equation  $Xu + Au = -f$  onto  $\Omega_m$ -components we obtain

$$(15) \quad \mu_+(u_{m-1}) + \mu_-(u_{m+1}) = -f_m$$

for all  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Since  $f$  has finite degree, combining (15) and (14) we obtain

$$(16) \quad \|\mu_+(u_{m+1})\| \geq \|\mu_+(u_{m-1})\|$$

for all  $m$  sufficiently large. Since the function  $u$  is smooth,  $\mu_+(u_m)$  must tend to zero in the  $L^2$ -topology as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . It follows from (16) that  $\mu_+(u_m) = 0$  for all  $m$  sufficiently large. However, (14) implies that  $\mu_+$  is injective for  $m$  large enough and thus  $u_m = 0$  for all  $m$  large enough.

A similar argument shows that  $u_m = 0$  for all  $m$  sufficiently large and negative thus concluding that  $u$  has finite degree as desired.  $\square$

A glance at the proof shows that we can obtain the same finiteness result under the following weaker hypothesis:  $K \leq 0$  and the support of  $\star F_A$  is contained in the region where  $K < 0$ . A more careful inspection shows the following:

**Corollary 6.8.** *Suppose that the Hermitian matrix  $\pm i \star F_A(x) - K(x) \text{Id}$  is positive definite for all  $x \in M$  and that  $f$  has degree  $N$ . Then, any solution  $u$  of  $Xu + Au = -f$  must have degree  $N - 1$ . If  $N = 0$ , then  $f = 0$  and  $u = u(x)$  with  $d_A u = 0$ .*

Let us apply these ideas to show that for closed negatively curved surfaces, the map (9) is locally injective at flat connections. If  $A$  and  $B$  are two connections with sufficiently small curvatures, then  $F_A$  will be small enough so that the hypothesis of Corollary 6.8 is satisfied. Hence the map  $u$  solving (10) depends only on  $x \in M$  and  $A$  and  $B$  must be gauge equivalent. Putting everything together we have shown:

**Theorem 6.9.** *Let  $M$  be a closed negatively curved surface. There is  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that if  $A$  and  $B$  are two connections as in Question II with  $\|F_A\|_{C^0}, \|F_B\|_{C^0} < \varepsilon$ , then  $A$  and  $B$  are gauge equivalent.*

When  $A$  is the trivial connection, this theorem is essentially [32, Theorem A].

Let us see an easy example which shows that the result in the theorem fails for  $n = 2$  without assumptions on the smallness of the curvature. The tangent bundle of an orientable Riemannian surface  $M$  is naturally a Hermitian line bundle. It is certainly not trivial in general, but it carries the Levi-Civita connection which is easily seen to be transparent. Indeed, the parallel transport along a closed geodesic  $\gamma$  must fix  $\dot{\gamma}(0)$  and consequently any vector orthogonal to it since the parallel transport is an isometry and the surface is orientable. The Levi-Civita connection on  $T^*M$  is also transparent and thus we obtain a transparent unitary connection on  $TM \oplus T^*M$ . But  $TM \oplus T^*M$  has zero first Chern class and thus it is unitarily equivalent to the trivial bundle  $M \times \mathbb{C}^2$ . In this way we obtain a transparent connection on  $M \times \mathbb{C}^2$  which in general is not equivalent to the trivial connection (it is non-flat if the Gaussian curvature is not identically zero). Taking higher tensor powers of  $TM$  and  $T^*M$  and adding them we obtain more examples of transparent connections all arising from the Levi-Civita connection. It turns out that these are not the only examples, but the failure of the uniqueness can be fully understood at least in some important cases. This will be the content of the next section, but before that, we would like to take another look at Theorem 6.6 in the abelian case  $n = 1$ .

When  $n = 1$ ,  $A = i\theta$  and the set  $\Omega_m$  can be identified with the set of smooth sections of  $\kappa^{\otimes m}$ , where  $\kappa$  is the canonical line bundle of  $M$ . In this case, well known results on the theory of Riemann surfaces imply that  $\mu_-$  is surjective for  $m \geq 2$  (see for example [8]) since  $\mu_-$  is essentially a  $\bar{\partial}_A$ -operator (we are assuming here that  $M$  has genus  $\geq 2$ ), see equation (25) below. It follows that  $\mu_+$  is injective for  $m \geq 1$ . Hence if  $f$  has degree  $N$  and  $u$  has finite degree and solves  $Xu + i\theta u = -f$ , then  $u$  must have degree  $N - 1$ . Thus in the abelian case we have:

**Theorem 6.10.** *Suppose that  $M$  is a closed surface of negative curvature and  $n = 1$ . If  $f$  has degree  $N$ , then any solution  $u$  of  $Xu + i\theta u = -f$  must have degree  $N - 1$ . If  $N = 0$ , then  $f = 0$  and  $u = u(x)$  with  $du + i\theta u = 0$ .*

When  $n \geq 2$ , the operators  $\mu_+$  could have non-trivial kernels for  $m \geq 1$ , and this precisely gives room for the existence of transparent connections.

## 7. TRANSPARENT CONNECTIONS

We start with some motivation for the constructions in this section. How can we construct a cohomologically trivial connection on  $M \times \mathbb{C}^2$ ? Let us suppose that we start with the simplest possible non-trivial  $u$ . This would be a smooth map  $u : SM \rightarrow SU(2)$  such that  $u = u_{-1} + u_1$ . We would need  $A = -X(u)u^{-1}$  to be a connection, thus its Fourier expansion should have only terms of degree  $\pm 1$ . Writing  $X = \eta_+ + \eta_-$  we discover that  $A$  is a connection iff

$$\eta_+(u_1)u_{-1}^* = \eta_-(u_{-1})u_1^* = 0.$$

In fact  $\eta_-(u_{-1})u_1^* = 0$  implies  $\eta_+(u_1)u_{-1}^* = 0$  and vice versa. This can be seen simply by conjugating each relation. So we need to ensure that:

$$(17) \quad \eta_-(u_{-1})u_1^* = 0.$$

What does this mean? Since  $u$  is unitary we have  $u_{-1}u_1^* = 0$  from which we see that  $L := \text{Ker}(u_{-1}) = \text{Im}(u_1^*)$  is a line subbundle of  $\mathbb{C}^2$ . Now (17) can be rewritten as

$$u_{-1}\eta_-(u_1^*) = 0$$

so if we pick  $0 \neq \xi \in \mathbb{C}^2$ , then  $s := u_1^*\xi \in L$  and the equation above says  $\eta_-(s) \in L$ . Below (cf. (22)) we will write an equation for  $\eta_-$  in local coordinates which shows that it is essentially a  $\bar{\partial}$ -operator and hence equation (17) is saying that  $L$  must be a *holomorphic* line bundle. But there is an ample supply of these: it is equivalent to providing a meromorphic function on  $M$ . Now we can ask, given a holomorphic line bundle  $L$  can we find a function  $u : SM \rightarrow SU(2)$  such that  $u = u_{-1} + u_1$  and  $\text{Ker}(u_{-1}) = L$ ? We will see below that this is indeed the case, but here is one way to think about it. Given the line bundle  $L$  consider the unique map  $f : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{su}(2)$  with  $\det f = 1$  (so that it hits the unit sphere in  $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ ) such that  $L$  is the eigenspace of  $f$  corresponding to the eigenvalue  $i$ . The map  $u$  in local coordinates is now

$$u(x, \theta) = \cos \theta \text{Id} + \sin \theta f(x).$$

Thus for every meromorphic function we obtain a cohomologically trivial connection. Are these all? Not quite, there are many more in which  $u$  has higher order dependence on velocities as we will see below.

We now provide details and we begin by giving a general classification result for cohomologically trivial connections on any surface.

As before let  $M$  be an oriented surface with a Riemannian metric and let  $SM$  be its unit tangent bundle. Let

$$\mathcal{A} := \{A : SM \rightarrow \mathfrak{u}(n) : V^2(A) = -A\}.$$

The set  $\mathcal{A}$  is identified with the set of all unitary connections on the trivial bundle  $M \times \mathbb{C}^n$ . Indeed, a function  $A$  satisfying  $V^2(A) + A = 0$  extends to a function on  $TM$  depending linearly on the velocities.

Recall from the previous section that  $A$  is said to be cohomologically trivial if there exists a smooth  $u : SM \rightarrow U(n)$  such that  $C(x, v, t) = u(\phi_t(x, v))u(x, v)^{-1}$ . Differentiating with respect to  $t$  and setting  $t = 0$  this is equivalent to

$$(18) \quad Xu + Au = 0.$$

Let  $\mathcal{A}_0$  be the set of all cohomologically trivial connections, that is, the set of all  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  such that there exists  $u : SM \rightarrow U(n)$  for which (18) holds.

Given a vector field  $W$  in  $SM$ , let  $G_W$  be the set of all  $u : SM \rightarrow U(n)$  such that  $W(u) = 0$ , i.e. first integrals of  $W$ . Note that  $G_V$  is nothing but the group of gauge transformations of the trivial bundle  $M \times \mathbb{C}^n$ .

We wish to understand  $\mathcal{A}_0/G_V$ . Now let  $\mathcal{D}$  be the set of all  $f : SM \rightarrow \mathfrak{u}(n)$  such that

$$-X_\perp(f) + VX(f) = [X(f), f]$$

and there is  $u : SM \rightarrow U(n)$  such that  $f = u^{-1}Vu$ . It is easy to check that  $G_X$  acts on  $\mathcal{D}$  by  $f \mapsto a^{-1}fa + a^{-1}V(a)$  where  $a \in G_X$ .

**Theorem 7.1.** *There is a 1-1 correspondence between  $\mathcal{A}_0/G_V$  and  $\mathcal{D}/G_X$ .*

*Proof.* Forward direction: a cohomologically trivial connection  $A$  comes with a  $u$  such that  $Xu + Au = 0$ . If we set  $f := u^{-1}V(u)$ , then  $f \in \mathcal{D}$ , i.e.,  $f$  satisfies the PDE  $-X_\perp(f) + VX(f) = [X(f), f]$ . This is a calculation, see [32, Theorem B] for details, but for the reader's convenience we explain the geometric origin of this equation. Using  $u$  we may define a connection on  $SM$  gauge equivalent to  $\pi^*A$  by setting  $B := u^{-1}du + u^{-1}\pi^*Au$ , where  $\pi : SM \rightarrow M$  is the foot-point projection. Since  $\pi^*A$  is the pull-back of a connection on  $M$ , the curvature  $F_B$  of  $B$  must vanish when one of the entries is the vertical vector field  $V$ . The PDE  $-X_\perp(f) + VX(f) = [X(f), f]$  arises by combining the two equations  $F_B(X, V) = F_B(X_\perp, V) = 0$  with  $B(X) = 0$ .

Backward direction: Given  $f$  with  $uf = V(u)$ , set  $A := -X(u)u^{-1}$ . Then  $A \in \mathcal{A}_0$ , i.e.  $V^2(A) = -A$ ; again this is a calculation done fully in Theorem B in [32].

Now there are two ambiguities here. Going forward, we may change  $u$  as long as we solve  $Xu + Au = 0$ . This changes  $f$  by the action of  $G_X$ . Going backwards we may change  $u$  as long as  $uf = V(u)$ , this changes  $A$  by a gauge transformation, i.e. an element in  $G_V$ .

□

Note that if the geodesic flow is transitive (i.e. there is a dense orbit) the only first integrals are the constants and thus  $G_X = U(n)$  acts simply by conjugation. If  $M$  is closed and of negative curvature, the geodesic flow is Anosov and therefore transitive.

The fact that the PDE describing cohomologically trivial connections arises from zero curvature conditions is an indication of the “integrable” nature of the problem at hand. The existence of a Bäcklund transformation that we will introduce shortly is another typical feature of integrable systems. Note that the space  $\mathcal{D}/G_X$  is in some sense simpler and larger when the underlying geodesic flow is more complicated, i.e. when it is transitive  $G_X$  reduces to  $U(n)$ .

**7.1. The Bäcklund transformation.** For the remainder of this section we restrict to the case in which the structure group is  $SU(2)$ . This is the simplest non-trivial case.

Suppose there is a smooth map  $b : SM \rightarrow SU(2)$  such that  $f := b^{-1}V(b)$  solves the PDE:

$$(19) \quad -X_\perp(f) + VX(f) = [X(f), f].$$

Then, by Theorem 7.1,  $A := -X(b)b^{-1}$  defines a cohomologically trivial connection on  $M$  and  $-\star A = V(A) = -bX(f)b^{-1} + X_\perp(b)b^{-1}$ .

**Lemma 7.2.** *Let  $g : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{su}(2)$  be a smooth map with  $\det g = 1$  (i.e.  $g^2 = -\text{Id}$ ). Then there exists  $a : SM \rightarrow SU(2)$  such that  $g = a^{-1}V(a)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $L(x)$  (resp.  $U(x)$ ) be the eigenspace corresponding to the eigenvalue  $i$  (resp.  $-i$ ) of  $g(x)$ . We have an orthogonal decomposition  $\mathbb{C}^2 = L(x) \oplus U(x)$  for every  $x \in M$ . Consider sections  $\alpha \in \Omega^{1,0}(M, \mathbb{C})$  and  $\beta \in \Omega^{1,0}(M, \text{Hom}(L, U)) = \Omega^{1,0}(M, L^*U)$  such that  $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$ . Such a pair of sections always exists; for example, we can choose a section  $\tilde{\beta}$  with a finite number of isolated zeros and then choose  $\tilde{\alpha}$  such that it does not vanish on the zeros of  $\tilde{\beta}$ . Then we set  $\alpha := \tilde{\alpha}/(|\tilde{\alpha}|^2 + |\tilde{\beta}|^2)^{1/2}$

and  $\beta := \tilde{\beta}/(|\tilde{\alpha}|^2 + |\tilde{\beta}|^2)^{1/2}$ . Note that  $\bar{\alpha} \in \Omega^{0,1}(M, \mathbb{C})$  and  $\beta^* \in \Omega^{0,1}(M, \text{Hom}(U, L)) = \Omega^{0,1}(M, U^*L)$ . Using the orthogonal decomposition we define  $a : SM \rightarrow SU(2)$  by

$$a(x, v) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha(x, v) & \beta^*(x, v) \\ -\beta(x, v) & \bar{\alpha}(x, v) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Clearly  $a = a_{-1} + a_1$ , where

$$a_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 0 \\ -\beta & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$a_{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \beta^* \\ 0 & \bar{\alpha} \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is straightforward to check that  $ag = V(a)$ . □

**Remark 7.3.** There is an alternative proof of this lemma along the following lines. Consider an open set  $U$  in  $M$  over which the circle fibration  $\pi : SM \rightarrow M$  trivializes as  $U \times S^1$ , where  $S^1 = \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ . In this trivialization  $V = \partial/\partial\theta$  and any solution to  $ag = V(a)$  has the form  $a_U := r_U(x)(\cos\theta \text{Id} + \sin\theta g(x))$ , where  $r_U : U \rightarrow SU(2)$  is smooth. Consider another set  $U'$  which trivializes  $\pi : SM \rightarrow M$  and which intersects  $U$ . We obtain a transition function  $\psi_{UU'} : U \cap U' \rightarrow S^1$ . The functions  $a_U$  can be glued to define a global function  $a : SM \rightarrow SU(2)$  as long as

$$r_U(x)(\cos\theta \text{Id} + \sin\theta g(x)) = r_{U'}(x)(\cos\theta' \text{Id} + \sin\theta' g(x))$$

where  $\theta = \theta' + \psi_{UU'}(x)$  and  $x \in U \cap U'$ . Hence to have a globally defined  $a$  we need to show the existence of smooth functions  $r_U : U \rightarrow SU(2)$  such that

$$\varphi_{UU'}(x) := \cos(\psi_{UU'}(x))\text{Id} + \sin(\psi_{UU'}(x))g(x) = (r_U(x))^{-1}r_{U'}(x).$$

The key observation is that  $\varphi_{UU'}$  defines an  $SU(2)$ -cocycle in the sense of principal bundles. Indeed, the cocycle property  $\varphi_{UU''}(x) = \varphi_{UU'}(x)\varphi_{U'U''}(x)$  follows right away from the fact that  $\psi_{UU'}$  is an  $S^1$ -cocycle. But an  $SU(2)$ -bundle over a surface is trivial, thus the existence of the functions  $r_U : U \rightarrow SU(2)$  follows.

Note that by construction,  $\text{Ker } a_{\pm 1}$  coincides with the  $\mp i$  eigenspace of  $g$ .

Now let  $u := ab : SM \rightarrow SU(2)$  and let  $F := (ab)^{-1}V(ab) = b^{-1}gb + f$ .

**Question.** When does  $F$  satisfy (19)?

If it does, then it defines (via Theorem 7.1) a new cohomologically trivial connection given by

$$A_F = -X(ab)(ab)^{-1} = -X(a)a^{-1} + aAa^{-1},$$

where  $A$  is the cohomologically trivial connection associated to  $f$ .

Recall that the connection  $A$  defines a covariant derivative  $d_Ag = dg + [A, g]$ .

**Lemma 7.4.**  *$F$  satisfies (19) if and only if*

$$(20) \quad - \star d_Ag = (d_Ag)g.$$

*Proof.* Starting with  $F = b^{-1}gb + f$  and using that  $A = -X(b)b^{-1} = bX(b^{-1})$  we compute

$$X(F) = b^{-1}([A, g] + X(g))b + X(f).$$

Similarly, using  $X_{\perp}(b) = -(\star A)b + bX(f)$  we find

$$X_{\perp}(F) = b^{-1}([\star A, g] + X_{\perp}(g))b - [X(f), b^{-1}gb] + X_{\perp}(f).$$

Now we compute  $VX(F)$ ; here we use that  $V(g) = 0$ . We obtain

$$VX(F) = [b^{-1}([A, g] + X(g))b, f] + b^{-1}([- \star A, g] + VX(g))b + VX(f).$$

The last term we need for (19) is:

$$[X(F), F] = b^{-1}([A, g] + X(g), g)b + [b^{-1}([A, g] + X(g))b, f] + [X(f), b^{-1}gb] + [X(f), f].$$

Since  $f$  satisfies (19) we see that  $F$  satisfies (19) if and only if

$$-X_{\perp}(g) + VX(g) - 2[\star A, g] = [[A, g] + X(g), g].$$

Since  $g$  depends only on the base point and  $g^2 = -\text{Id}$  we can rewrite this as

$$-2\star(dg + [A, g]) = [dg + [A, g], g] = 2(dg + [A, g])g.$$

Thus  $F$  satisfies (19) if and only if

$$-\star d_Ag = (d_Ag)g$$

as claimed. □

We will now rephrase equation (20) in terms of holomorphic line bundles. Recall that the connection  $A$  induces a holomorphic structure on the trivial bundle  $M \times \mathbb{C}^2$  and on the endomorphism bundle  $M \times \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$ . We have an operator  $\bar{\partial}_A = (d_A - i\star d_A)/2 = \bar{\partial} + [A_{-1}, \cdot]$  acting on sections  $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$ .

Set  $\pi := (\text{Id} - ig)/2$  and  $\pi^{\perp} = (\text{Id} + ig)/2$  so that  $\pi + \pi^{\perp} = \text{Id}$ . Let  $L(x)$  be as above the eigenspace corresponding to the eigenvalue  $i$  of  $g(x)$ . Note that  $\pi$  is the Hermitian orthogonal projection over  $L(x) = \text{Image}(\pi(x))$ .

**Lemma 7.5.** *Let  $g : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{su}(2)$  be a smooth map with  $\det g = 1$ . The following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $-\star d_Ag = (d_Ag)g$ ;
- (2)  $L$  is a  $\bar{\partial}_A$ -holomorphic line bundle;
- (3)  $\pi^{\perp}\bar{\partial}_A\pi = 0$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that (1) holds. Apply  $\star$  to obtain:  $d_Ag = (\star d_Ag)g$ . Thus  $d_Ag - i\star d_Ag = i(d_Ag - i\star d_Ag)g$ . In other words  $\bar{\partial}_A g = i(\bar{\partial}_A g)g = -ig(\bar{\partial}_A g)$  (recall that  $g^2 = -\text{Id}$ ). Since  $\pi = (\text{Id} - ig)/2$ , then  $\bar{\partial}_A g = -ig(\bar{\partial}_A g)$  is equivalent to  $\pi^{\perp}\bar{\partial}_A\pi = 0$  which is (3).

Using the condition  $\pi^2 = \pi$ , we see that  $\pi^{\perp}\bar{\partial}_A\pi = 0$  is equivalent to  $(\bar{\partial}_A\pi)\pi = 0$ . The line bundle  $L$  is holomorphic iff given a local section  $\xi$  of  $L$ , then  $\bar{\partial}_A\xi \in L$ . Using that  $\pi\xi = \xi$  we see that  $\bar{\partial}_A\xi \in L$  iff  $(\bar{\partial}_A\pi)\xi = 0$ . Clearly, this happens iff  $(\bar{\partial}_A\pi)\pi = 0$  and thus (2) holds iff (3) holds.



□

The next theorem summarises the Bäcklund transformation that we just introduced and it follows directly from Lemmas 7.4 and 7.5 and Theorem 7.1.

**Theorem 7.6.** *Let  $A$  be a cohomologically trivial connection and let  $L$  be a holomorphic line subbundle of the trivial bundle  $M \times \mathbb{C}^2$  with respect to the complex structure induced by  $A$ . Define a map  $g : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{su}(2)$  with  $\det g = 1$  by declaring  $L$  to be its eigenspace with eigenvalue  $i$ . Consider  $a : SM \rightarrow SU(2)$  with  $g = a^{-1}V(a)$  as given by Lemma 7.2. Then*

$$A_F := -X(a)a^{-1} + aAa^{-1}$$

*defines a cohomologically trivial connection.*

**Definition 7.7.** Let  $A$  be a cohomologically trivial connection. Given a map  $g : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{su}(2)$  with  $\det g = 1$  and  $-\star d_A g = (d_A g)g$ , let  $a : SM \rightarrow SU(2)$  be any smooth map with  $ag = V(a)$ . Then the *Bäcklund transformation* of the connection  $A$  with respect to the pair  $(g, a)$  is:

$$\mathcal{B}_{g,a}(A) := -X(a)a^{-1} + aAa^{-1}.$$

By Theorem 7.6,  $\mathcal{B}_{g,a}(A)$  is a new cohomologically trivial connection.

**Remark 7.8.** Note that if the geodesic flow is transitive, two solutions  $u, w$  of  $Xu + Au = 0$  are related by  $u = wg$  where  $g$  is a constant unitary matrix, because  $X(w^{-1}u) = 0$ . Thus the degrees of  $u$  and  $w$  are the same. We can then talk about the “degree” of a cohomologically trivial connection as the degree of any solution of  $Xu + Au = 0$ .

**Remark 7.9.** If we let  $q := aga^{-1}$ , then a simple calculation shows that  $V(q) = 0$  and  $d_{A_F}q = a(d_A g)a^{-1}$ . Moreover,  $\star d_{A_F}q = (d_{A_F}q)q$  which means that  $-q$  satisfies (20) with respect to  $A_F$ . Hence if we run the Bäcklund transformation on  $A_F$  with  $g' := -q$  and  $a' := a^{-1}$  we recover  $A$  (note that  $a'g' = V(a')$ ). In other words  $\mathcal{B}_{-q,a^{-1}}(\mathcal{B}_{g,a}(A)) = A$ . Thus the Bäcklund transformation described in Theorem 7.6 has a natural “inverse”.

If we start, for example, with the trivial connection  $A = 0$  (which is obviously cohomologically trivial), then a map  $g : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{su}(2)$  with  $\det g = 1$  and  $-\star dg = (dg)g$  can be identified with a meromorphic function. The connections of degree one  $A_F = -X(a)a^{-1}$  given by Theorem 7.6 were first found in [32] and coincide with the ones described at the beginning of the section. In the next subsection we will show that any cohomologically trivial connection such that the associated  $u$  has a finite Fourier series can be built up by successive applications of the transformation described in Theorem 7.6, provided that the geodesic flow is transitive. This will provide a full classification of transparent  $SU(2)$ -connections over negatively curved surfaces.

**7.2. The classification result.** Let  $A$  be a transparent connection with  $A = -X(b)b^{-1}$  and  $f = b^{-1}V(b)$ , where  $b : SM \rightarrow SU(2)$ .

We first make some remarks concerning the  $SU(2)$ -structure. Let  $j : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$  be the antilinear map given by

$$j(z_1, z_2) = (-\bar{z}_2, \bar{z}_1).$$

If we think of a matrix  $a \in SU(2)$  as a linear map  $a : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ , then  $ja = aj$ . This implies that given  $b : SM \rightarrow SU(2)$  with  $b = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} b_k$ , then  $jb_k = b_{-k}j$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

**Assumption.** Suppose  $b$  has a finite Fourier expansion, i.e.,  $b = \sum_{k=-N}^{k=N} b_k$ , where  $N \geq 1$ . By Theorem 6.6 we know that this holds if  $M$  has negative curvature.

Let us assume also that  $N$  is the degree of  $b$  and thus both  $b_N$  and  $b_{-N} = -jb_Nj$  are non-zero.

The unitary condition  $bb^* = b^*b = \text{Id}$  implies that  $b_N b_{-N}^* = b_{-N}^* b_N = 0$ . These relations imply that the rank of  $b_{-N}$  and  $b_N$  is at most one and equals one on an open set, which, as we will see shortly, must be all of  $M$  except for perhaps a finite number of points. But first we need some preliminaries.

Consider isothermal coordinates  $(x, y)$  on  $M$  such that the metric can be written as  $ds^2 = e^{2\lambda}(dx^2 + dy^2)$  where  $\lambda$  is a smooth real-valued function of  $(x, y)$ . This gives coordinates  $(x, y, \theta)$  on  $SM$  where  $\theta$  is the angle between a unit vector  $v$  and  $\partial/\partial x$ . In these coordinates  $X$  is given by (8) and  $X_\perp$  by:

$$(21) \quad X_\perp = -e^{-\lambda} \left( -\sin \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \cos \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial y} - \left( \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial x} \cos \theta + \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial y} \sin \theta \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \right).$$

Consider  $u \in \Omega_m$  and write it locally as  $u(x, y, \theta) = h(x, y)e^{im\theta}$ . Using (8) and (21) a straightforward calculation shows that

$$(22) \quad \eta_-(u) = e^{-(1+m)\lambda} \bar{\partial}(he^{m\lambda}) e^{i(m-1)\theta},$$

where  $\bar{\partial} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + i \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right)$ . In order to write  $\mu_-$  suppose that  $A(x, y, \theta) = a(x, y) \cos \theta + b(x, y) \sin \theta$ . If we also write  $A = A_x dx + A_y dy$ , then  $A_x = ae^\lambda$  and  $A_y = be^\lambda$ . Let  $A_{\bar{z}} := \frac{1}{2}(A_x + iA_y)$ . Using the definition of  $A_{-1}$  we derive

$$(23) \quad A_{-1} = \frac{1}{2}(a + ib)e^{-i\theta} = A_{\bar{z}} d\bar{z}.$$

Putting this together with (22) we obtain

$$(24) \quad \mu_-(u) = e^{-(1+m)\lambda} (\bar{\partial}(he^{m\lambda}) + A_{\bar{z}} he^{m\lambda}) e^{i(m-1)\theta}.$$

Note that  $\Omega_m$  can be identified with the set of smooth sections of the bundle  $(M \times \mathbb{M}_2(\mathbb{C})) \otimes \kappa^{\otimes m}$  where  $\kappa$  is the canonical line bundle. The identification takes  $u = he^{im\theta}$  into  $he^{m\lambda}(dz)^m$  ( $m \geq 0$ ) and  $u = he^{-im\theta} \in \Omega_{-m}$  into  $he^{m\lambda}(d\bar{z})^m$ . The second equality in (23) should be understood using this identification.

Consider now a fixed vector  $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^2$  such that  $s(x, v) := b_{-N}(x, v)\xi \in \mathbb{C}^2$  is not zero identically. Clearly  $s$  can be seen as a section of  $(M \times \mathbb{C}^2) \otimes \kappa^{\otimes -N}$ . We may write  $b_{-N}$  and  $s$  in local isothermal coordinates as  $b_{-N} = he^{-iN\theta}$  and  $s = e^{N\lambda} h\xi(d\bar{z})^N$ .

**Lemma 7.10.** *The local section  $e^{-2N\lambda}s$  is  $\bar{\partial}_A$ -holomorphic.*

*Proof.* Using the operators  $\mu_{\pm}$  we can write  $X(b) + Ab = 0$  as

$$\mu_+(b_{k-1}) + \mu_-(b_{k+1}) = 0$$

for all  $k$ . This gives  $\mu_+(b_N) = \mu_-(b_{-N}) = 0$ . But  $\mu_-(b_{-N}) = 0$  is saying that  $e^{-2N\lambda}s$  is  $\bar{\partial}_A$ -holomorphic. Indeed, using (24), we see that  $\mu_-(b_{-N}) = 0$  implies

$$\bar{\partial}(he^{-N\lambda}) + A_{\bar{z}}he^{-N\lambda} = 0$$

which in turn implies

$$\bar{\partial}(e^{-N\lambda}h\xi) + A_{\bar{z}}e^{-N\lambda}h\xi = 0.$$

This equation says that  $e^{-2N\lambda}s = e^{-N\lambda}h\xi(d\bar{z})^N$  is  $\bar{\partial}_A$ -holomorphic.  $\square$

The section  $s$  spans a line bundle  $L$  over  $M$  which by the previous lemma is  $\bar{\partial}_A$ -holomorphic. The section  $s$  may have zeros, but at a zero  $z_0$ , the line bundle extends holomorphically. Indeed, in a neighbourhood of  $z_0$  we may write  $e^{-2N\lambda(z)}s(z) = (z - z_0)^k w(z)$ , where  $w$  is a local holomorphic section with  $w(z_0) \neq 0$ . The section  $w$  spans a holomorphic line subbundle which coincides with the one spanned by  $s$  off  $z_0$ . Therefore  $L$  is a  $\bar{\partial}_A$ -holomorphic line bundle that contains the image of  $b_{-N}$  (and  $U = jL$  is an anti-holomorphic line bundle that contains the image of  $b_N$ ). We summarise this in a lemma:

**Lemma 7.11.** *The line bundle  $L$  determined by the image of  $b_{-N}$  is  $\bar{\partial}_A$ -holomorphic.*

We now wish to use the line bundle  $L$  to construct an appropriate  $g : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{su}(2)$  such that when we run the Bäcklund transformation from the previous subsection we obtain a cohomologically trivial connection of degree  $\leq N - 1$ . But first we need the following lemma. Recall that a matrix-valued function  $f$  is said to be *odd* if  $f(x, v) = -f(x, -v)$  and *even* if  $f(x, v) = f(x, -v)$ .

**Lemma 7.12.** *Assume that the geodesic flow is transitive and let  $b : SM \rightarrow SU(2)$  solve  $X(b) + Ab = 0$ . Then  $b$  is either even or odd.*

*Proof.* Write  $b = b_o + b_e$  where  $b_o$  is odd and  $b_e$  is even. Since the operator  $(X + A)$  maps even to odd and odd to even, the equation  $X(b) + Ab = 0$  decouples as

$$X(b_o) + Ab_o = 0;$$

$$X(b_e) + Ab_e = 0.$$

A calculation using these equations shows that  $X(b_o^*b_o) = X(b_e^*b_e) = X(b_o^*b_e) = 0$ . Since the geodesic flow is transitive, these matrices are all constant. Moreover, since  $b_o^*b_e$  is odd it must be zero. On the other hand  $jb = bj$  implies that  $jb_o = b_oj$  and  $jb_e = b_ej$ , which in turn implies that both  $b_o$  and  $b_e$  cannot have rank 1. Putting all this together, we see that either  $b_o$  or  $b_e$  must vanish identically.  $\square$

Suppose that the geodesic flow is transitive. By Lemma 7.12,  $b = b_{-N} + d + b_N$ , where  $d$  has degree  $\leq N - 2$ . We now seek  $a : SM \rightarrow SU(2)$  of degree one such that  $u := ab$  has degree  $\leq N - 1$ . For this we need  $a_1 b_N = a_{-1} b_{-N} = 0$ . We take a map  $g : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{su}(2)$  with  $\det g = 1$  such that its  $i$  eigenspace is  $L$  and its  $-i$  eigenspace is  $U$ . By Lemmas 7.5 and 7.11,  $-\star d_A g = (d_A g) g$ . The construction of  $a$  with  $ag = V(a)$  from Lemma 7.2 is precisely such that the kernel of  $a_{-1}$  is  $L$  and the kernel of  $a_1$  is  $U$ , so the needed relations to lower the degree hold.

Finally by Theorem 7.6,  $u$  gives rise to a cohomologically trivial connection  $-X(u)u^{-1}$ . Combining this with Theorem 6.6 we have arrived at the main result of this section:

**Theorem 7.13.** *Let  $M$  be a closed orientable surface of negative curvature. Then any transparent  $SU(2)$ -connection can be obtained by successive applications of Bäcklund transformations as described in Theorem 7.6.*

We finish this section with some remarks on the operators  $\mu_{\pm}$ . Let  $\Gamma(M, \kappa^{\otimes m})$  denote the space of smooth sections of the  $m$ -th tensor power of the canonical line bundle  $\kappa$ . Locally its elements have the form  $w(z)dz^m$  for  $m \geq 0$  and  $w(z)d\bar{z}^{-m}$  for  $m \leq 0$ . Given a metric  $g$  on  $M$ , there is map

$$\varphi_g : \Gamma(M, \kappa^{\otimes m}) \rightarrow \Omega_m$$

given by restriction to  $SM$ . This map is a complex linear isomorphism. Let us check what this map looks like in isothermal coordinates. An element of  $\Gamma(M, \kappa^{\otimes m})$  is locally of the form  $w(z)dz^m$ . Consider a tangent vector  $\dot{z} = \dot{x}_1 + i\dot{x}_2$ . It has norm one in the metric  $g$  iff  $e^{i\theta} = e^{\lambda}\dot{z}$ . Hence the restriction of  $w(z)dz^m$  to  $SM$  is

$$w(z)e^{-m\lambda}e^{im\theta}$$

as indicated above. Moreover there is also a restriction map

$$\psi_g : \Gamma(M, \kappa^{\otimes m} \otimes \bar{\kappa}) \rightarrow \Omega_{m-1}$$

which is an isomorphism. The restriction of  $w(z)dz^m \otimes d\bar{z}$  to  $SM$  is

$$w(z)e^{-(m+1)\lambda}e^{i(m-1)\theta},$$

because  $e^{-i\theta} = e^{\lambda}\bar{\dot{z}}$ .

Given any holomorphic bundle  $\xi$  over  $M$ , there is a  $\bar{\partial}$ -operator defined on:

$$\bar{\partial} : \Gamma(M, \xi) \rightarrow \Gamma(M, \xi \otimes \bar{\kappa}).$$

In particular we can take  $\xi = \kappa^{\otimes m}$  (or  $\kappa^{\otimes m} \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$ ). Combining this with equation (22) we get the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma(M, \kappa^{\otimes m}) & \xrightarrow{\varphi_g} & \Omega_m \\ \downarrow \bar{\partial} & & \downarrow \eta_- \\ \Gamma(M, \kappa^{\otimes m} \otimes \bar{\kappa}) & \xrightarrow{\psi_g} & \Omega_{m-1} \end{array}$$

In other words:

$$\eta_- = \psi_g \bar{\partial} \varphi_g^{-1}.$$

This equation exhibits explicitly the relation of  $\eta_-$  with the metric. More generally, if we let  $\bar{\partial}_A := \bar{\partial} + A_{\bar{z}}$ , then equation (24) shows that

$$(25) \quad \mu_- = \psi_g \bar{\partial}_A \varphi_g^{-1}.$$

In particular we see from (25) that the injectivity and surjectivity properties of  $\mu_-$  only depend on the conformal class of the metric and are the same as those of  $\bar{\partial}_A$ . Also, the index of  $\mu_-$  may be computed using Riemann-Roch (cf. [25, Appendix C]). If  $\xi = \kappa^{\otimes m} \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$  and  $g$  denotes the genus of  $M$ , then

$$\text{index}(\mu_-) = n(1 - g) + c_1(\xi) = (g - 1)n(2m - 1).$$

For the abelian case  $n = 1$ , it is a classical result that  $\bar{\partial}_A$  is surjective if  $g \geq 2$  and  $m \geq 2$ .

## 8. HIGGS FIELDS

Virtually everything that we have said above extends when a Higgs field is present. For us, a Higgs field is a smooth matrix-valued function  $\Phi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ . Often in gauge theories, the structure group is  $U(n)$  and the field  $\Phi$  is required to take values in  $\mathfrak{u}(n)$ . We call a Higgs field  $\Phi : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{u}(n)$  a skew-Hermitian Higgs field. The pairs  $(A, \Phi)$  often appear in the so-called Yang-Mills-Higgs theories. A good example of this is the Bogomolny equation in Minkowski  $(2+1)$ -space given by  $d_A \Phi = \star F_A$ . Here  $d_A$  stands for the covariant derivative induced on endomorphism  $d_A \Phi = d\Phi + [A, \Phi]$ ,  $F_A = dA + A \wedge A$  is the curvature of  $A$  and  $\star$  is the Hodge star operator of Minkowski space. The Bogomolny equation appears as a reduction of the self-dual Yang-Mills equation in  $(2+2)$ -space and has been object of intense study in the literature of Solitons and Integrable Systems, see for instance [9], [21, Chapter 8], [16, Chapter 4] and [24].

To include the Higgs field in the discussions above, we consider the following transport equation for  $u : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ ,

$$Xu + Au + \Phi u = -f \text{ in } SM, \quad u|_{\partial_-(SM)} = 0.$$

As before, on a fixed geodesic the transport equation becomes a linear system of ODEs with zero initial condition, and therefore this equation has a unique solution  $u = u^f$ .

**Definition 8.1.** *The geodesic ray transform of  $f \in C^\infty(SM, \mathbb{C}^n)$  with attenuation determined by the pair  $(A, \Phi)$  is given by*

$$I_{A, \Phi} f := u^f|_{\partial_+(SM)}.$$

Obviously when  $\Phi = 0$ ,  $I_A = I_{A, 0}$ . The following extension of Theorem 3.2 holds:

**Theorem 8.2.** [35] *Let  $M$  be a compact simple surface. Assume that  $f : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  is a smooth function of the form  $F(x) + \alpha_j(x)v^j$ , where  $F : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  is a smooth function and  $\alpha$  is a  $\mathbb{C}^n$ -valued 1-form. Let also  $A : SM \rightarrow \mathfrak{u}(n)$  be a unitary connection and  $\Phi : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{u}(n)$  a skew-Hermitian matrix function. If  $I_{A, \Phi}(f) = 0$ , then  $F = \Phi p$  and  $\alpha = d_A p$ , where  $p : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  is a smooth function with  $p|_{\partial M} = 0$ .*

The introduction of the Higgs field complicates matters from a technical point of view: more terms appear in the Pestov identity, and these need to be carefully controlled, we refer the reader to [35] for details.

Given a pair  $(A, \Phi)$  one can also associate to it scattering data. We look at the unique solution  $U_{A, \Phi} : SM \rightarrow U(n)$  of

$$\begin{cases} X(U_{A, \Phi}) + (A(x, v) + \Phi(x))U_{A, \Phi} = 0, & (x, v) \in SM \\ U_{A, \Phi}|_{\partial_+(SM)} = \text{Id}. \end{cases}$$

The scattering data of the pair  $(A, \Phi)$  is now the map  $C_{A, \Phi} : \partial_-(SM) \rightarrow U(n)$  defined as  $C_{A, \Phi} := U_{A, \Phi}|_{\partial_-(SM)}$ .

Using Theorem 8.2 we can derive the following result just as we have done for the proof of Theorem 3.3.

**Theorem 8.3.** [35] *Assume  $M$  is a compact simple surface, let  $A$  and  $B$  be two Hermitian connections, and let  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  be two skew-Hermitian Higgs fields. Then  $C_{A, \Phi} = C_{B, \Psi}$  implies that there exists a smooth  $U : M \rightarrow U(n)$  such that  $U|_{\partial M} = \text{Id}$  and  $B = U^{-1}dU + U^{-1}AU$ ,  $\Psi = U^{-1}\Phi U$ .*

A Higgs field can also be included for the case of closed manifolds. A classification of  $SO(3)$ -transparent pairs  $(A, \Phi)$  for surfaces of negative curvature may be found in [34].

## 9. ARBITRARY BUNDLES

In this section we briefly discuss the case of closed surfaces and arbitrary bundles (i.e. not necessarily trivial). We begin with some generalities.

Suppose  $E$  is a rank  $n$  Hermitian vector bundle over a closed manifold  $N$  and  $\phi_t : N \rightarrow N$  is a smooth transitive Anosov flow.

**Definition 9.1.** *A cocycle over  $\phi_t$  is an action of  $\mathbb{R}$  by bundle automorphisms which covers  $\phi_t$ . In other words, for each  $(x, t) \in N \times \mathbb{R}$ , we have a unitary map  $C(x, t) : E_x \rightarrow E_{\phi_t x}$  such that  $C(x, t + s) = C(\phi_t x, s) C(x, t)$ .*

If  $E$  admits a unitary trivialization  $f : E \rightarrow N \times \mathbb{C}^n$ , then

$$f C(x, t) f^{-1}(x, a) = (\phi_t x, D(x, t)a),$$

where  $D : N \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow U(n)$  is a cocycle as in Definition 6.1.

Let  $E^*$  denote the dual vector bundle to  $E$ . If  $E$  carries a Hermitian metric  $h$ , we have a conjugate isomorphism  $\ell_h : E \rightarrow E^*$ , which induces a Hermitian metric  $h^*$  on  $E^*$ . Given a cocycle  $C$  on  $E$ ,  $C^* := \ell_h C \ell_h^{-1}$  is a cocycle on  $(E^*, h^*)$ .

**Proposition 9.2.** *Let  $E$  be a Hermitian vector bundle over  $N$  such that  $E \oplus E^*$  is a trivial vector bundle. Let  $C$  be a smooth cocycle on  $E$  such that  $C(x, T) = \text{Id}$  whenever  $\phi_T x = x$ . Then  $E$  is a trivial vector bundle.*

*Proof.* As explained above, the cocycle  $C$  on  $E$  induces a cocycle  $C^*$  on  $E^*$ . On the trivial vector bundle  $E \oplus E^*$  we consider the cocycle  $C \oplus C^*$ . Clearly  $C \oplus C^*(x, T) = \text{Id}$

everytime that  $\phi_T x = x$ . Choose a unitary trivialization  $f : E \oplus E^* \rightarrow N \times \mathbb{C}^{2n}$  and write

$$f C \oplus C^*(x, t) f^{-1}(x, a) = (\phi_t x, D(x, t)a).$$

By Theorem 6.4, there exists a smooth function  $u : N \rightarrow U(2n)$  such that  $D(x, t) = u(\phi_t x)u^{-1}(x)$ . Since  $\phi_t$  is a transitive flow, we may choose  $x_0 \in N$  with a dense orbit and without loss of generality we may suppose that  $u(x_0) = \text{Id}$ . Let

$$\{e_1(x_0), \dots, e_n(x_0)\}$$

be a unitary frame at  $E_{x_0}$ . Write  $f(x_0, e_i(x_0)) = (x_0, a_i)$ , where  $a_i \in \mathbb{C}^{2n}$  and let

$$e_i(x) := f^{-1}(x, u(x)a_i).$$

Clearly at every  $x \in N$ ,  $\{e_1(x), \dots, e_n(x)\}$  is a smooth unitary  $n$ -frame of  $E_x \oplus E_x^*$ . We claim that in fact  $e_i(x) \in E_x$  for all  $x \in N$ . This, of course, implies the triviality of  $E$ . Note that

$$e_i(\phi_t x_0) = f^{-1}(\phi_t x_0, u(\phi_t x_0)a_i) = f^{-1}(\phi_t x_0, D(x_0, t)a_i) = C \oplus C^*(x_0, t)e_i(x_0).$$

But  $e_i(x_0) \in E_{x_0}$ , thus  $e_i(\phi_t x_0) \in E_{\phi_t x_0}$ . It follows that  $e_i(x) \in E_x$  for a dense set of points in  $N$ . By continuity of  $e_i$ ,  $e_i(x) \in E_x$  for all  $x \in N$ . □

**Remark 9.3.** The hypothesis of  $E \oplus E^*$  being trivial is not needed in Proposition 9.2. Ralf Spatzier has informed the author that it is possible to adapt the proof of the usual Livsic periodic data theorem to show directly that  $E$  is trivial. However, this weaker version is all that we will need below.

Let  $M$  be a closed orientable surface. In this case, complex vector bundles  $E$  over  $M$  are classified topologically by the first Chern class  $c_1(E) \in H^2(M, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$ . Since  $c_1(E^*) = -c_1(E)$  and  $c_1$  is additive with respect to direct sums, we see that  $E \oplus E^*$  is the trivial bundle and therefore we will be able to apply Proposition 9.2. In fact we will show:

**Theorem 9.4.** [32] *Let  $M$  be a closed orientable Riemannian surface of genus  $g$  whose geodesic flow is Anosov. A complex vector bundle  $E$  over  $M$  admits a transparent connection if and only if  $2 - 2g$  divides  $c_1(E)$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $E$  admits a transparent connection. As explained above we may apply Proposition 9.2 to deduce that  $\pi^*E$  is a trivial bundle and since  $c_1(\pi^*E) = \pi^*c_1(E)$  we conclude that  $\pi^*c_1(E) = 0$ . Consider now the Gysin sequence of the unit circle bundle  $\pi : SM \rightarrow M$ ,

$$0 \rightarrow H^1(M, \mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} H^1(SM, \mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{0} H^0(M, \mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{\times(2-2g)} H^2(M, \mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} H^2(SM, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \dots$$

We see that  $\pi^*c_1(E) = 0$  if and only if  $c_1(E)$  is in the image of the map  $H^0(M, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^2(M, \mathbb{Z})$  given by cup product with the Euler class of the unit circle bundle. Equivalently,  $2 - 2g$  must divide  $c_1(E)$ .

Let  $\kappa$  be the canonical line bundle of  $M$ . We can think of  $\kappa$  as the cotangent bundle to  $M$ ; it has  $c_1(\kappa) = 2g - 2$ . The tensor powers  $\kappa^s$  of  $\kappa$  (positive and negative) generate all possible line bundles with first Chern class divisible by  $2 - 2g$  and they all carry the

unitary connection induced by the Levi-Civita connection of the Riemannian metric on  $M$ . All these connections are clearly transparent. Topologically, all complex vector bundles over  $M$  whose first Chern class is divisible by  $2 - 2g$  are of the form  $\kappa^s \oplus \varepsilon$ , where  $\varepsilon$  is the trivial vector bundle. Since the trivial connection on the trivial bundle is obviously transparent, it follows that every complex vector bundle whose first Chern class is divisible by  $2 - 2g$  admits a transparent connection.  $\square$

A similar argument shows that if  $E$  is a Hermitian *line* bundle with a transparent connection and  $\dim M \geq 3$ , then  $E$  must be trivial and the connection is gauge equivalent to the trivial connection.

## 10. OPEN PROBLEMS

To organize the discussion we will divide the set of open questions into the two cases: compact simple  $M$  and closed manifolds with Anosov geodesic flow.

### 10.1. Compact simple manifolds with boundary.

- (1) The most important problem here is to decide if Theorem 8.2 (or Theorem 3.2) holds when  $\dim M \geq 3$ . This will automatically extend Theorem 8.3 to any dimension.
- (2) Of equal importance is the tensor tomography problem in dimension  $\geq 3$ . In other words, does Theorem 5.1 extend to any dimension? This problem is explicitly stated in [40, Problem 1.1.2] and it has been solved by Pestov and Sharafutdinov for negatively curved manifolds [37] and then by Sharafutdinov under a weaker curvature condition [40]. It is also known that if “ghosts” exist, they must be regular: on a simple Riemannian manifold, every  $L^2$  solenoidal tensor field belonging to the kernel of the ray transform is  $C^\infty$  smooth [43].
- (3) We have only considered unitary connections and skew-Hermitian Higgs fields, mostly because these are the most relevant in Physics, but the problems addressed here make sense for any structure group. In particular, does Theorem 8.2 extend to the case of  $GL(n, \mathbb{C})$ ?
- (4) The proof of Theorem 3.2 uses in an essential way the existence of holomorphic integrating factors from Proposition 4.4 for scalar 1-forms and carefully avoids the question of existence of holomorphic integrating factors for matrix valued 1-forms. In other words, suppose  $A$  is a  $GL(n, \mathbb{C})$ -connection with  $n \geq 2$ . Does there exist a smooth fibrewise holomorphic map  $R : SM \rightarrow GL(n, \mathbb{C})$  such that  $XR + AR = 0$  on  $SM$ ?
- (5) Are there versions of Theorems 8.2 and Theorem 8.3 when the set of geodesics of a simple surface is replaced by another set of distinguished curves? I would expect a positive answer for magnetic geodesics in view of the work in [7].

**10.2. Closed manifolds with Anosov geodesic flow.** Here, the lack of answers is more pronounced, even for surfaces, but this is reasonable as one expects this setting to be harder. As we have seen the appearance of ghosts (i.e. non-trivial transparent connections) has to do with the different holomorphic structures that one can have



on a complex vector bundle over the surface. For simple surfaces this does not appear because there is essentially only one  $\bar{\partial}_A$  operator on a disk.

- (1) Perhaps one of the most important questions for surfaces is whether in Theorem 6.6 one can replace “negative curvature” by “Anosov geodesic flow”. This question is of great interest even when  $A = 0$ .
- (2) Does Theorem 6.9 extend to higher dimensions? I would expect a positive answer based on the Fourier analysis displayed in [15]. There is virtually nothing known on transparent connections in  $\dim M \geq 3$  as the next question shows.
- (3) Are there non-trivial transparent connections on  $M \times \mathbb{C}^2$ , where  $M$  is a closed hyperbolic 3-manifold?
- (4) Classify transparent  $U(n)$ -connections (and pairs) over a negatively curved surface using the ideas displayed in Section 7 for  $SU(2)$ .
- (5) Let  $M$  be a surface with an Anosov geodesic flow and suppose there is a smooth  $u : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $Xu = f$ , where  $f$  arises from a symmetric  $m$ -tensor. Must  $f$  be potential? (The tensor tomography problem for an Anosov surface). The proof given in this paper for simple surfaces does not extend since we do not have the analogue of holomorphic integrating factors from Proposition 4.4. The best result available for 2-tensors appears in [44] where a positive answer is given assuming in addition that the surface is free of focal points. A solution of this problem for the case of symmetric 2-tensors would give right away infinitesimal spectral rigidity for Anosov surfaces [14].

## REFERENCES

- [1] D.V. Anosov, *On geodesic flows satisfying the condition (Y)*, Proc. Steklov Inst. of Math. **167** (1985) 3–24.
- [2] G. Bal, *Ray transforms in hyperbolic geometry*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **84** (2005), 1362–1392.
- [3] J. Boman, J.-O. Strömberg, *Novikov’s inversion formula for the attenuated Radon transform – a new approach*, J. Geom. Anal. **14** (2004), 185–198.
- [4] C.B. Croke, V.A. Sharafutdinov, *Spectral rigidity of a negatively curved manifold*, Topology **37** (1998) 1265–1273.
- [5] N.S. Dairbekov, V.A. Sharafutdinov, *Some problems of integral geometry on Anosov manifolds*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **23** (2003) 59–74.
- [6] N. Dairbekov, G.P. Paternain, *Entropy production in Gaussian thermostats*, Comm. Math. Phys. **269** (2007) 533–543.
- [7] N. Dairbekov, G.P. Paternain, P. Stefanov, G. Uhlmann, *The boundary rigidity problem in the presence of a magnetic field*, Adv. Math. **216** (2007) 535–609.
- [8] J.J. Duistermaat, *On first order elliptic equations for sections of complex line bundles*, Compositio Math. **25** (1972) 237–243.
- [9] M. Dunajski, *Solitons, instantons, and twistors*. Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 19. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2010.
- [10] G. Eskin, *On non-abelian Radon transform*, Russ. J. Math. Phys. **11** (2004) 391–408.
- [11] D. Finch, G. Uhlmann, *The X-ray transform for a non-abelian connection in two dimensions*, Inverse Problems **17** (2001) 695–701.
- [12] D. Finch, *The attenuated X-ray transform: recent developments*, in Inside Out: Inverse Problems and Applications (edited by G. Uhlmann), p. 47–66, MSRI Publications **47**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2003).

- [13] C. Guillarmou, L. Tzou, *Survey on Calderón inverse problem in 2 dimensions*, to appear in Inside Out II (edited by G. Uhlmann).
- [14] V. Guillemin, D. Kazhdan, *Some inverse spectral results for negatively curved 2-manifolds*, Topology **19** (1980) 301–312.
- [15] V. Guillemin, D. Kazhdan, *Some inverse spectral results for negatively curved  $n$ -manifolds*, Geometry of the Laplace operator (Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Univ. Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii, 1979), 153–180, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., XXXVI, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1980.
- [16] N.J. Hitchin, G.B. Segal, R.S. Ward, *Integrable systems. Twistors, loop groups, and Riemann surfaces*. Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 4. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1999.
- [17] A. Katok, B. Hasselblatt, *Introduction to the modern theory of dynamical systems*. With a supplementary chapter by Katok and Leonardo Mendoza. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, 54. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [18] W. Klingenberg, *Riemannian manifolds with geodesic flow of Anosov type*, Ann. of Math. **99** (1974) 1–13.
- [19] A.N. Livsic, *Certain properties of the homology of  $Y$ -systems*, Mat. Zametki **10** (1971) 555–564.
- [20] A.N. Livsic, *Cohomology of dynamical systems*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. **36** (1972) 1296–1320.
- [21] N. Manton, P. Sutcliffe, *Topological solitons*. Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [22] R. Mañé, *On a theorem of Klingenberg*, Dynamical systems and bifurcation theory (Rio de Janeiro, 1985), 319–345, Pitman Res. Notes Math. Ser., 160, Longman Sci. Tech., Harlow, 1987.
- [23] L.J. Mason, *Global anti-self dual Yang-Mills fields in split signature and their scattering*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **597** (2006) 105–133.
- [24] L.J. Mason, N.M.J. Woodhouse, *Integrability, self-duality, and twistor theory*. London Mathematical Society Monographs. New Series, 15. Oxford Science Publications. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1996.
- [25] D. McDuff, D. Salamon,  *$J$ -holomorphic curves and symplectic topology*. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, 52. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004.
- [26] R. Michel, *Sur la rigidité imposée par la longueur des géodésiques*, Invent. Math. **65** (1981) 71–83.
- [27] V. Niţică, A. Török, *Regularity of the transfer map for cohomologous cocycles*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **18** (1998) 1187–1209.
- [28] R. Novikov, *An inversion formula for the attenuated X-ray transformation*, Ark. Mat. **40** (2002), 145–167.
- [29] R. Novikov, *On determination of a gauge field on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  from its non-abelian Radon transform along oriented straight lines*, J. Inst. Math. Jussieu **1** (2002) 559–629.
- [30] W. Parry, *The Livsic periodic point theorem for non-abelian cocycles*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **19** (1999) 687–701.
- [31] G.P. Paternain, *Geodesic flows*, Progress in Mathematics, **180** Birkhäuser 1999.
- [32] G.P. Paternain, *Transparent connections over negatively curved surfaces*, J. Mod. Dyn. **3** (2009) 311–333.
- [33] G.P. Paternain, *Bäcklund transformations for transparent connections*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **658** (2011) 27–37.
- [34] G.P. Paternain, *Transparent pairs*, to appear in J. Geom. Anal.
- [35] G.P. Paternain, M. Salo, G. Uhlmann, *The attenuated ray transform for connections and Higgs fields*, arXiv:1108.1118, to appear in Geom. Funct. Anal.
- [36] G.P. Paternain, M. Salo, G. Uhlmann, *Tensor tomography on surfaces*, arXiv:1109.0505.
- [37] L. Pestov, V.A. Sharafutdinov, *Integral geometry of tensor fields on a manifold of negative curvature*, Siberian Math. J. **29** (1988), 427–441.

- [38] L. Pestov, G. Uhlmann, *Two dimensional compact simple Riemannian manifolds are boundary distance rigid*, Ann. of Math. **161** (2005) 1089–1106.
- [39] M. Salo, G. Uhlmann, *The attenuated ray transform on simple surfaces*, J. Diff. Geom. **88** (2011) 161–187.
- [40] V.A. Sharafutdinov, *Integral geometry of tensor fields*, Inverse and Ill-posed Problems Series. VSP, Utrecht, 1994.
- [41] V.A. Sharafutdinov, Ray Transform on Riemannian Manifolds. *Eight Lectures on Integral Geometry*, available at <http://www.math.nsc.ru/~sharafutdinov/publ.html>.
- [42] V.A. Sharafutdinov, *On an inverse problem of determining a connection on a vector bundle*, J. Inverse and Ill-Posed Problems **8** (2000) 51–88.
- [43] V.A. Sharafutdinov, M. Skokan, G. Uhlmann, *Regularity of ghosts in tensor tomography*, J. Geom. Anal. **15** (2005), 517–560.
- [44] V.A. Sharafutdinov, G. Uhlmann, *On deformation boundary rigidity and spectral rigidity of Riemannian surfaces with no focal points*, J. Diff. Geom. **56** (2000) 93–110.
- [45] G. Uhlmann, *The Cauchy data and the scattering relation*, IMA Publications, **137**, “Geometric methods in inverse problems and PDE control” (2003) 263–288.
- [46] L.B. Vertgeim, *Integral geometry with a matrix weight, and a nonlinear problem of recovering matrices*, Sov. Math.-Dokl. **44** (1992) 132–135.
- [47] R.S. Ward, *Soliton solutions in an integrable chiral model in 2+1 dimensions*, J. Math. Phys. **29** (1988) 386–389.

DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS AND MATHEMATICAL STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE, CAMBRIDGE CB3 0WB, UK

*E-mail address:* g.p.paternain@dpmmms.cam.ac.uk