

Explicit elliptic estimates for nowhere vanishing harmonic 1-forms

Arham Deep

29th December 2025

Abstract

We compute an explicit constant for an injectivity estimate on $T^3 = S^1 \times S^1 \times S^1$ involving the Laplace Operator. First, we provide motivation for such explicit estimates. We perform the computation for T^3 endowed with the flat metric g_{flat} before generalising to perturbed metrics. Finally, we apply these results to show existence of a nowhere vanishing harmonic 1-form on the 3-Torus endowed with a perturbed metric.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Explicit elliptic estimates	3
2.1	Background	3
2.2	Local estimates	4
2.3	Estimates on 3-Torus with the flat metric	9
2.4	Estimates on 3-Torus with respect to a non-flat metric	11
3	Application: nowhere vanishing harmonic 1-forms	19
A	Appendix	20
A.1	Marcinkiewicz interpolation theorem	20
A.2	Explicit Sobolev Constant	21
A.3	Poincaré Inequality	22
A.4	Morrey's Inequality	23
B	Cut-off functions	25
C	Index of Constants	26
C.1	Section 2.2, Section 2.3	27
C.2	Section 2.4	27
C.3	Section 3	28

1 Introduction

The Laplace operator on a compact manifold M is one of the best understood elliptic differential operators, and much is known about it. In particular, *standard elliptic theory*, which was developed over the course of the last century, provides the following *injectivity estimate*:

Theorem 1.1 (Theorem H.27 in Besse (1987)). *There exists a constant $c > 0$ depending on M (but not on f) such that the following is true: for all $f \in W^{2,p}(M)$ which are L^2 -orthogonal to $\text{Ker } \Delta$ we have that:*

$$\|f\|_{W^{2,p}} \leq c \|\Delta f\|_{L^p} . \quad (1.2)$$

This theorem is typically shown by contradiction, and the constant c depends on the geometry of the manifold in a highly complicated way. In many problems in analysis, existence of the constant c alone is not enough, but it is necessary to give an *upper bound* for it.

Often, the manifold M is given through an explicit construction depending on some parameter, and it suffices to understand how c (or an upper bound for it) asymptotically depends on this parameter for extreme values. One example is the construction of anti-self-dual instantons in Taubes (1982), pioneering this technique in geometry. In this application, the parameter controlled the size of a connecting piece along which two manifolds are glued together. Another example is the first counterexample to Payne's conjecture in Hoffmann-Ostenhof et al. (1997). Here, the parameter controlled the number of holes of a region in \mathbb{R}^2 .

However, even more challenging are cases in which the manifold M does *not* depend on a parameter, and it does not suffice to understand some asymptotic behaviour. In these cases, one needs *explicit elliptic estimates*. Such estimates have been studied in their own right: in Plum (1992), explicit estimates for a class of second-order operators were proved, depending on the shape of a region in \mathbb{R}^2 . In Güneysu and Pigola (2018b,a) estimates on manifolds, depending explicitly on geometric data such as the curvature, were proved. Recently, the interest in such explicit estimates has been renewed, because they are required to carry out *numerically verified proofs*. (Nakao et al., 2019, Section 4.1) has examples of such proofs making use of explicit elliptic estimates.

Almost all explicit estimates appearing in the literature are for domains in \mathbb{R}^n and for a weaker norm instead of the $W^{2,p}$ -norm on the left side of Eq. (1.2). We are not aware of a work which gives an explicit constant for Eq. (1.2) on a closed manifold. In this paper we prove such estimates:

- For T^3 endowed with the flat metric
- For T^3 endowed with a metric "close" to the flat metric.

The injectivity estimate for T^3 endowed with the flat metric follows readily from the local theory and we obtain the following result:

Proposition 1.3. *For all $f \in W^{2,4}(T^3)$ which are L^2 -orthogonal to $\text{Ker } \Delta$ we have that:*

$$\|f\|_{W^{2,4}} \leq C_1 \|\Delta f\|_{L^4} , \quad (1.4)$$

where C_1 is defined in Eq. (2.39).

If one perturbs the metric, then the same estimate holds, only with a slightly perturbed constant. That is made precise in the following result:

Proposition 1.5. *Let g_{flat} be the flat metric on T^3 and g another metric. If $\|g - g_{\text{flat}}\|_{C^1} \leq C_2$, then for all $f \in L_2^p(T^3)$:*

$$\|f\|_{W^{2,4}} \leq C_3 \|\Delta f\|_{L^4} , \quad (1.6)$$

where C_3 is defined in Eq. (2.82) and C_2 must satisfy $C_{36}(C_2) < \frac{1}{C_1}$. Here, C_{36} is defined in Eq. (2.79) and C_1 is defined in Eq. (2.39).

Our choice of T^3 is motivated by (Joyce and Karigiannis, 2021, Section 7.5): there, a 3-torus contained in a 6-manifold is considered. It inherits a metric from the ambient manifold whose

definition is complicated, but it is expected to be close to (but not equal to) the flat metric on T^3 . If the metric was the flat metric, it would admit a harmonic 1-form that is nowhere vanishing. Since the metric on T^3 is conjectured to be close to be flat, it is still expected to admit a harmonic 1-form that is nowhere vanishing.

We can use Eq. (1.5) to give an effective bound for this. Using it, we find the following *sufficient criterion* for how close a metric on T^3 needs to be to the flat metric so that it admits a suitable 1-form. This makes (Joyce and Karigiannis, 2021, Section 7.1(E)) more precise:

Theorem 1.7. *Let g_{flat} be the flat metric on T^3 . If $\|g - g_{\text{flat}}\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, C^1} \leq C_4$, then there exists $\xi \in C^\infty(M)$ such that $dx_1 + d(\xi) \in \Omega^1(M)$ is a nowhere vanishing 1-form that is harmonic with respect to g . Here, C_4 must satisfy $C_4 < C_2$ and $C_{38}(C_4) > 0$, where C_{38} is defined in Eq. (3.7).*

The article is structured as follows: in Section 2.1 we list some basic definitions of geometric analysis to fix notations. In Section 2 we prove the aforementioned injectivity estimates on T^3 : in Section 2.2 we give explicit constants for some standard local estimates from the literature; from this Eq. (1.3) quickly follows and the remainder of the proof is presented in Section 2.3; then Eq. (1.5) follows from comparing nearby metrics, which is done in Section 2.4. Last, in Section 3 we prove our application to nowhere vanishing harmonic 1-forms.

Acknowledgements:

The author would like to give special thanks to **Dr Daniel Platt** for supervising this project over the past year and a half, for taking the time to host regular meetings in order to discuss this project. The author would also like to thank **Zihan Zhang** for keeping us company during the meetings and his great enthusiasm shown toward the project. The author would like to thank the following people for many fruitful conversations about mathematics:

- Yiheng (Jackie) Wu
- Rohan Money Shenoy
- Ariff Jazlan Johan

2 Explicit elliptic estimates

2.1 Background

The standard definition of a Sobolev Space over a general manifold from (Hebey and Robert, 2008, 2.1) is the following:

For Riemannian manifold (M, g) , the Sobolev Space $W^{k,p}(M, g)$ is the completion of $C^\infty(M)$ for the norm:

$$\|u\|_{W^{k,p}(M,g)} = \sum_{i=0}^k \|\nabla^i u\|_{g, L^p(M)},$$

where $\|\nabla^i u\|_{g, L^p(M)}$ is the L^p -norm of the function $|\nabla^i u|$ with respect to g .

Here, we use the pointwise norm of a (k, l) tensor T as the norm defined by the following inner product

$$\langle F, G \rangle = g^{i_1 r_1} \dots g^{i_k r_k} g_{j_1 s_1} \dots g_{j_l s_l} F_{i_1 \dots i_k}^{j_1 \dots j_l} G_{r_1 \dots r_k}^{s_1 \dots s_l} \quad (2.1)$$

For $M = \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, the pointwise norm of the $(0, 1)$ -tensor ∇u is equal to the vector norm of the gradient of u , and the pointwise norm of the $(0, 2)$ -tensor $\nabla^2 u$ is equal to the Frobenius norm of the Hessian of u .

2.2 Local estimates

In this section, we work in (open subsets of) Euclidean Space endowed with the flat metric. Any Sobolev norm in this subsection is assumed to be taken with respect to the flat metric.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ bounded and let $f \in L^p(\Omega)$ for some $1 < p < \infty$. Define the Newtonian potential of f as

$$w(x) := \int_{\Omega} \Gamma(x-y)f(y) \, dy,$$

where Γ is the fundamental solution of Laplace's equation in dimension n .

Theorem 2.2 (Theorem 9.9 in Gilbarg and Trudinger (2001)). *We have that $w \in L_2^p(\Omega)$ and $\Delta w = f$ almost everywhere, and*

$$\|D_{ij}w\|_{L^p} \leq C_{\text{Calderon-Zygmund}}(n, p) \|f\|_{L^p}, \quad (2.3)$$

where $C_{\text{Calderon-Zygmund}}(n, p) = 1$ if $p = 2$ and for $p > 2$:

$$C_{\text{Calderon-Zygmund}}(n, p) = C_{\text{Marcinkiewicz}}(1, 2, p') C_6^\alpha C_5^{1-\alpha},$$

And for $1 < p < 2$:

$$C_{\text{Calderon-Zygmund}}(n, p) = C_{\text{Marcinkiewicz}}(1, 2, p) C_6^\alpha C_5^{1-\alpha},$$

where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$, the numbers $C_{\text{Marcinkiewicz}}(1, 2, p')$ and α are defined in Eq. (A.1).

Proof. We use the proof presented in Gilbarg and Trudinger (2001), which aims to use the Marcinkiewicz Interpolation Theorem (Eq. (A.1)) for the case $1 < p < 2$ and extend by duality. The Marcinkiewicz Interpolation Theorem gives us a sufficient condition to show that a linear map from $L^p(\Omega)$ into itself is bounded, namely two inequalities regarding the distribution functions of T (refer to Eq. (A.1))

Define the linear operator: $T : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)$ as

$$Tf = D_{ij}w \quad (2.4)$$

Where i, j are fixed and w denotes the Newtonian Potential.

By the above discussion it is sufficient to show the following two inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{Tf}(t) &\leq C_5 \left(\frac{\|f\|_{L^2}}{t} \right)^2, \\ \mu_{Tf}(t) &\leq C_6 \frac{\|f\|_{L^1}}{t}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

Where $\mu_f(t) := |\{x \text{ such that } f(x) > t\}|$.

$C_5 = 1$ is derived explicitly in (Gilbarg and Trudinger, 2001, Equation 9.29).

We derive an explicit value for the constant C_6 and break down the derivation of this constant into steps.

Step 1: Rewrite $f = b + g \in L^2(\Omega)$ as a sum of two functions for appropriate $b, g \in L^2(\Omega)$
Our choice of functions $b, g \in L^2(\Omega)$ is motivated by the Cube Decomposition presented in (Gilbarg and Trudinger, 2001, Section 9.2). We first extend f to vanish outside Ω and we fix a cube K_0 satisfying $\Omega \subset K_0$, chosen to be large enough such that for a fixed choice of $t > 0$ we have that:

$$\int_{K_0} |f| \leq t|K_0|.$$

$|K_0|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of the cube. Subdivide K_0 into 2^n congruent subcubes. We organise the subcubes as follows: let K_2 denote the collection of subcubes where each subcube $K \in K_2$ satisfies:

$$\int_K |f| \leq t|K|. \quad (2.6)$$

The remaining subcubes satisfy

$$\int_K |f| > t|K|. \quad (2.7)$$

and we add them to the set Υ . For each of the subcubes in K_2 we repeat the process and decompose it into 2^n subcubes. If they satisfy Eq. (2.6), then they are a part of a newly defined set K_3 , if not we add them to the set Υ . This process is continued inductively, and we denote by Υ_l an enumeration of all cubes in Υ . For each subcube $K \in \Upsilon$, we denote \tilde{K} to be the subcube whose subdivision yields K . By construction, $|\tilde{K}|/|K| = 2^n$. So, for $K \in \Upsilon$ we find:

$$\int_K |f| \leq \int_{\tilde{K}} |f| \leq t|\tilde{K}| = 2^n t|K|.$$

Combining this with our assumption that $K \in \Upsilon$ we obtain the following inequality.

$$t < \frac{1}{|K|} \int_K |f| \leq 2^n t. \quad (2.8)$$

By the Lebesgue Differentiation Theorem (Stein, 2005, Chapter 3, Theorem 1.3) we have that, $|f| \leq t$ almost everywhere on $G := K_0 - \cup_l \Upsilon_l$. Now we split our function f into a good and bad part, as done in (Gilbarg and Trudinger, 2001, p.232). Define the good part, g , as follows:

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{for } x \in G \\ \frac{1}{|\Upsilon_l|} \int_{\Upsilon_l} f & \text{for } x \in \Upsilon_l. \end{cases}$$

The bad part is defined as $b = f - g$, by the linearity of T we have that:

$$\mu_{Tf}(t) \leq \mu_{Tg}(t/2) + \mu_{Tb}(t/2). \quad (2.9)$$

We list some properties of the "good" and "bad" function which we will use later (Gilbarg and Trudinger, 2001, p.226) :

$$\begin{aligned} |g| &\leq 2^n t \text{ a.e.,} \\ b(x) &= 0 \text{ for } x \in G, \\ \int_{\Upsilon_l} b &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

Step 2: Show that there exists a constant $C_7 > 0$ such that

$$\mu_{Tg}\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) \leq \frac{C_7}{t} \|f\|_{L^1}.$$

The explicit estimate for $\mu_{Tg}(t/2)$ is obtained in (Gilbarg and Trudinger, 2001, p.232), this is:

$$\mu_{Tg}\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) \leq \frac{2^{n+2}}{t} \|f\|_{L^1}. \quad (2.11)$$

We also provide the derivation here for completeness:

$$\mu_{Tg}\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) \leq \frac{4}{t^2} \int_{\Omega} g^2 \leq \frac{2^{n+2}}{t} \int_{\Omega} |g|.$$

For the first inequality we use Markov's Inequality Eq. (A.4) and for the second we use Eq. (2.10)

Step 3: Show that there exists a constant $C_8 > 0$ such that:

$$\mu_{Tb}\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) \leq \frac{C_8}{t} \|f\|_{L^1}. \quad (2.12)$$

As done in (Gilbarg and Trudinger, 2001, p.233) we define:

$$b_l = \begin{cases} b & \text{on } \Upsilon_l, \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere.} \end{cases} \quad (2.13)$$

Hence we have that:

$$Tb = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} Tb_l.$$

Now it suffices to show that there exists a constant such that for each l we have the following:

$$\left| x \in K_0 \text{ such that } Tb_l(x) > \frac{t}{2} \right| \leq \frac{C_9}{t} \|f\|_{L^1}. \quad (2.14)$$

Remark 2.15. Define $\rho := \text{diam}(\Upsilon_l)$ and let B_l be a ball of radius ρ centred at \bar{y} , where \bar{y} denotes the centre of Υ_l . The rough idea is to obtain bounds of the form:

$$\left| x \in K_0 - B_l \text{ such that } Tb_l(x) > \frac{t}{2} \right| \leq \frac{C_{10}}{t} \|f\|_{L^1}. \quad (2.16)$$

$$\left| x \in B_l \text{ such that } Tb_l(x) > \frac{t}{2} \right| \leq \frac{C_{11}}{t} \|f\|_{L^1}. \quad (2.17)$$

Combining the above two bounds will give Eq. (2.14). The choice to remove B_l specifically is made for the following reason: we aim to use Markov's inequality to show Eq. (2.16) and the corresponding integral can then be written in spherical coordinates. To obtain the latter bound, we bound the measure of the set B_l .

For fixed l we approximate b_l by a sequence of functions $\{b_{lm}\} \in C_0^\infty(\Upsilon_l)$ with compact support converging to b_l in $L^2(\Omega)$. For $x \notin \Upsilon_l$, we have the formula:

$$Tb_{lm}(x) = \int_{\Upsilon_l} D_{ij}\Gamma(x-y)b_{lm}(y)dy = \int_{\Upsilon_l} \{D_{ij}\Gamma(x-y) - D_{ij}\Gamma(x-\bar{y})\}b_{lm}(y)dy,$$

Where we use the definition of T Eq. (2.4) in the first equality and Eq. (2.10) for the second. We apply the mean value inequality: there exists \tilde{y} between y and \bar{y} satisfying:

$$|Tb_{lm}(x)| \leq \int_{\Upsilon_l} |DD_{ij}\Gamma(x-\tilde{y})| \cdot |y-\bar{y}|b_{lm}(y)dy.$$

From the estimate of I_6 in the proof (Gilbarg and Trudinger, 2001, Lemma 4.4) we have

$$|DD_{ij}\Gamma(x-y)| \leq C_{12}|x-y|^{-n-1}. \quad (2.18)$$

Where $C_{12} = \frac{n(n+5)}{\omega_n}$, consequently:

$$|Tb_{lm}(x)| \leq C_{12}\delta[\text{dist}(x, \Upsilon_l)]^{-n-1} \int_{\Upsilon_l} |b_{lm}(y)|dy.$$

Recall B_l is the ball centred at \bar{y} of radius ρ , i.e. $B_l = B_\delta(\bar{y})$. Let $r(x) := \text{dist}(x, \Upsilon_l)$. By integrating both sides and switching to spherical coordinates we arrive at:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{K_0-B_l} |Tb_{lm}|d\lambda &\leq C_{12}\rho \int_{K_0-B_l} \frac{1}{r^{n+1}} \int_{\Upsilon_l} |b_{lm}|d\lambda \\ &= C_{12}\rho \int_{\frac{\delta}{2}}^\infty \frac{1}{r^2}dr \int_{|\omega|=1} d\omega \int_{\Upsilon_l} |b_{lm}| \\ &= C_{12}\rho n\omega_n \frac{2}{\rho} \int_{\Upsilon_l} |b_{lm}| \\ &= 2C_{12}n\omega_n \int_{\Upsilon_l} |b_{lm}|, \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

where in the third step we used that the volume of the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^n is $n\omega_n$. Define $C_{13} = 2C_{12}n\omega_n = 2n^2(n+5)$. Next write $F^* = \cup B_l$, $G^* = K_0 - F^*$. For each $l, m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have from Eq. (2.19):

$$\int_{G^*} |Tb_{lm}| \leq C_{13} \int_{\Upsilon_l} |b_{lm}|.$$

Taking the limit as $m \rightarrow \infty$ we have the following:

$$\int_{G^*} |Tb_l| \leq C_{13} \int_{\Upsilon_l} |b_l|. \quad (2.20)$$

We now sum over l and obtain:

$$\int_{G^*} |Tb| \leq C_{13} \sum_{l=1}^\infty \int_{\Upsilon_l} |b_l| = C_{13} \int_{\cup \Upsilon_l} |b| \leq C_{13} \int_{K_0} |b| \leq C_{13} \int_{K_0} |f| + |g| \leq \int_{K_0} 2C_{13}|f|,$$

where in the first step we used $|Tb| = \sum_{l=1}^\infty |Tb_l|$ from Eq. (2.13) together with Eq. (2.20). Applying (Gilbarg and Trudinger, 2001, Lemma 9.7) we obtain:

$$\left| \left\{ x \in G^* \text{ satisfying } |Tb(x)| > \frac{t}{2} \right\} \right| \leq \frac{2}{t} \int_{G^*} |Tb| \leq \frac{4C_{13} \|f\|_{L^1}}{t}. \quad (2.21)$$

We bound the distribution function of Tb on F^* by simply bounding the measure of F^* . By (Gilbarg and Trudinger, 2001, p.234):

$$|F^*| \leq C_{14}|\Upsilon|, \quad (2.22)$$

where $C_{14} = \omega_n n^{n/2}$.

We use Eq. (2.8) to deduce that for each subcube $\Upsilon_l \in \Upsilon$:

$$|\Upsilon_l| \leq \frac{\int_{\Upsilon_l} f}{t}.$$

Summing over all subcubes in Υ and applying Eq. (2.22) gives us:

$$|F^*| \leq C_{14} \frac{\|f\|_{L^1}}{t}. \quad (2.23)$$

The prior bounds Eq. (2.23) and Eq. (2.21) imply that:

$$\mu_{Tb}\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) \leq \frac{(4C_{13} + C_{14})\|f\|_{L^1}}{t}.$$

We substitute this into Eq. (2.9) and together with Eq. (2.11) obtain that:

$$\mu_{Tf}(t) \leq \mu_{Tg}\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) + \mu_{Tb}\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) \leq (2^{n+2} + 4C_{13} + C_{14}) \frac{\|f\|_{L^1}}{t}.$$

Thus, we have proven Eq. (2.5) to hold for the following values of C_5 and C_6 :

$$C_6 = 2^{n+2} + 4C_{13} + C_{14}, C_5 = 1. \quad (2.24)$$

Applying the Marcinkiewicz interpolation theorem finishes the proof for $1 \leq p \leq 2$. We obtain that:

$$\|D_{ij}w\| \leq C_{\text{Marcinkiewicz}}(1, 2, p) T_1^\alpha T_2^{1-\alpha} \|f\|_{L^p}.$$

As in (Gilbarg and Trudinger, 2001, Theorem 9.9), this is extended to $p \geq 2$ by duality. Namely, the Calderon-Zygmund Constant for p is the same as that for the conjugate of p , which completes the proof. \square

We state the estimate relevant to the rest of this section:

Remark 2.25. We are interested in the constant in the case $p = 4$ and $n = 3$, we have that:

$$C_{15} := C_{\text{Calderon-Zygmund}}(3, 4) = 193$$

We are specifically interested in this result in the case of Compactly Supported Functions.

Corollary 2.26 (Corollary 9.10 in Gilbarg and Trudinger (2001)). *Define $\|D^2u\|_{L^p} := \|(D^2u|_{\text{Frob}})\|_{L^p}$. Let $u \in W_0^{2,4}(\Omega)$, $1 < p < \infty$, where $W_0^{2,p}(\Omega)$ denotes the L^4 -Sobolev space with two weak derivatives and compact support on $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Then*

$$\|D^2u\|_{L^p} \leq n^2 C_{\text{Calderon-Zygmund}}(n, p) \|\Delta u\|_{L^p},$$

where $C_{\text{Calderon-Zygmund}}(n, p)$ was defined in Eq. (2.2).

Proof. We have that u is the Newtonian potential of Δu , because u has compact support (by (Gilbarg and Trudinger, 2001, Equation 2.17)), so we can apply Eq. (2.2).

$$\begin{aligned} \|D^2u\|_{L^p} &:= \left\| \sqrt{\sum_{i=1,j=1}^n (D_{ij}u)^2} \right\|_{L^p} \leq \sqrt{\left\| \sum_{i=1,j=1}^n |D_{ij}(u)|^2 \right\|_{L^p}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\left(\sum_{i=1,j=1}^n \|D_{ij}(u)\|_{L^p} \right)^2} \\ &\leq n^2 C_{\text{Calderon-Zygmund}}(n, p) \|\Delta u\|_{L^p} \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

In the second inequality we apply (Hardy, 1952, Theorem 202) \square

Corollary 2.28. *Let $u \in W_0^{2,p}(\Omega)$, $1 < p < \infty$. Then*

$$\|D^2u\|_{L^p} + \|Du\|_{L^p} \leq C_{16} \|\Delta u\|_{L^p},$$

where $C_{16} = n^2 C_{\text{Calderon-Zygmund}(n,p)}(nC_{17} + 1)$.

Proof. The Calderon-Zygmund estimate, Eq. (2.26), bounds $\|D^2u\|_{L^p}$, it remains to bound $\|Du\|_{L^p}$. We have that $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}u$ is compactly supported for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Thus, by the Poincaré inequality Eq. (A.24):

$$\|D_i u\|_{L^p} \leq C_{17} \|DD_i u\|_{L^p}, \quad (2.29)$$

Where $C_{17} = \left(\frac{1}{\omega_n}|\Omega|\right)^{\frac{1}{n}}$. Hence

$$\|Du\|_{L^p} = \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |D_i(u)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^p} \leq \sqrt{\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n |D_i(u)|^2 \right\|_{L^p}} \leq \sqrt{\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \|D_i(u)\|_{L^p} \right)^2} \leq n \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} (\|D_i(u)\|_{L^p}).$$

In the second inequality we apply (Hardy, 1952, Theorem 202) inside the square root. We combine the above two estimates to conclude:

$$\|D^2u\|_{L^p} + \|Du\|_{L^p} \leq (nC_{17} + 1) \|D^2u\|_{L^p} \leq n^2 C_{\text{Calderon-Zygmund}(n,p)}(nC_{17} + 1) \|\Delta u\|_{L^p}. \quad \square$$

The constant that we have derived in Eq. (2.28) involves a constant term C_{17} which is dependent on the volume of Ω , and in our case we will be applying Eq. (2.28) to $\Omega = \tilde{Q} = [-1, 2]^3$, this will be motivated shortly.

Denote $C_{18} = \left(\frac{81}{4\pi}\right)^{1/3}$, as the value of C_{17} with $\Omega = \tilde{Q}$

2.3 Estimates on 3-Torus with the flat metric

Theorem 2.30. *From now we specialise to the case $p = 4$ Let $u \in W^{2,4}(T^3)$. Then*

$$\|u\|_{W^{2,4}(T^3)} \leq C_{19} \left(\|\Delta u\|_{L^4(T^3)} + \|u\|_{L^4(T^3)} \right), \quad (2.31)$$

Where C_{19} is defined in Eq. (2.37)

Proof. As usual we view $u \in W^{2,4}(T^3)$ as a function in $W^{2,4}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ that is periodic in each of the coordinate directions. Using a cutoff function we can apply the results from the previous section which requires "zero boundary". Let $Q := [0, 1]^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\tilde{Q} := [-1, 2]^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. Let $\chi : \tilde{Q} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be twice differentiable such that $\chi(x) = 1$ for all $x \in Q$ and $\chi(y) = 0$ for all $y \in \partial\tilde{Q}$. We define such a χ explicitly in Eq. (B.1). Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{W^{2,4}(T^3)} &= \|\chi u\|_{W^{2,4}(Q)}, \\ &\leq \|\chi u\|_{W^{2,4}(\tilde{Q})}, \\ &= \|\chi u\|_{L^4(\tilde{Q})} + \|D(\chi u)\|_{L^4(\tilde{Q})} + \|D^2(\chi u)\|_{L^4(\tilde{Q})}, \\ &\leq \|\chi u\|_{L^4(\tilde{Q})} + C_{16} \|\Delta(\chi u)\|_{L^4(\tilde{Q})}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.32)$$

where we used Eq. (2.28) in the last step. Here we find for the last term:

$$\|\Delta(\chi u)\|_{L^4(\tilde{Q})} \leq \underbrace{\|\Delta\chi\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{Q})} \|u\|_{L^4(\tilde{Q})}}_{\leq C_{20}} + 2 \|D\chi \cdot Du\|_{L^4(\tilde{Q})} + \underbrace{\|\chi\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{Q})} \|\Delta u\|_{L^4(\tilde{Q})}}_{\leq 1}, \quad (2.33)$$

where χ is the cut-off function and constants C_{20} , C_{21} and C_{22} are defined in Eq. (B.1). We now bound the middle term:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(D\chi) \cdot (Du)\|_{L^4(\tilde{Q})} &\leq 27^{\frac{1}{12}} \|(D\chi) \cdot (Du)\|_{L^6(\tilde{Q})} \\
&\leq 27^{\frac{1}{12}} C_{39} \|D((D\chi) \cdot (Du))\|_{L^2(\tilde{Q})} \\
&\leq 27^{\frac{1}{12}} C_{39} \left(\|D^2\chi\|_{C^0(\tilde{Q})} \cdot \|Du\|_{L^2(\tilde{Q})} + \|D\chi\|_{C^0(\tilde{Q})} \cdot \|D^2u\|_{L^2(\tilde{Q})} \right) \quad (2.34) \\
&\leq 27^{\frac{1}{12}} \max(\|D^2\chi\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{Q})}, \|D\chi\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{Q})}) C_{39} \|u\|_{W^{2,2}(\tilde{Q})} \\
&\leq 27^{\frac{1}{12}} C_{22} C_{39} \|u\|_{W^{2,2}(\tilde{Q})}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the first step we use Hölder's inequality; in the second step we use the Sobolev Embedding Theorem, Eq. (A.19); third we use the product rule and last we use Eq. (B.1). Since it arises fairly frequently denote

$$C_{23} = 27^{\frac{1}{12}}.$$

In order to prove Eq. (2.30), we require the following lemma:

Lemma 2.35 (Lemma 8.2.3 in Jost (2014)). *Let u be a weak solution of $\Delta u = f$ with $f \in L^2(\Omega)$. We then have for any $\Omega' \subset \Omega$ whose closure is contained in Ω*

$$\|Du\|_{L^2(\Omega')} \leq \frac{\sqrt{17}}{\delta^2} \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \delta^2 \|\Delta u\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

where $\delta = d(\Omega', \partial\Omega)$

Remark 2.36. In the following we use Eq. (2.35) with $\Omega' = Q, \Omega = \tilde{Q}, \delta = 1$.

We return to the proof of Eq. (2.31). We perform the tedious computation of combining the above lemma with Eq. (2.32) and Eq. (2.33)

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{L^4(T^3)} &\leq \|\chi u\|_{L^4(\tilde{Q})} + C_{16} \|\Delta(\chi u)\|_{L^p(\tilde{Q})} \\
&\leq 27 \|u\|_{L^4(Q)} + C_{16} (C_{20} \|u\|_{L^4(\tilde{Q})} + 2C_{23} C_{22} C_{39} \|u\|_{L^2_2(\tilde{Q})} + \|\Delta u\|_{L^4(\tilde{Q})}) \\
&\leq 27(1 + C_{16} C_{20}) \|u\|_{L^4(Q)} + 27C_{16} \|\Delta u\|_{L^4(Q)} + 54C_{16} C_{23} C_{22} C_{39} \|u\|_{W^{2,2}(Q)} \\
&\leq 27(1 + C_{16} C_{20}) \|u\|_{L^p(Q)} + 27C_{16} \|\Delta u\|_{L^4(Q)} + 54C_{16} C_{23} C_{22} C_{39} (\|u\|_{L^2(T^3)} + \|Du\|_{L^2(T^3)} + \|D^2u\|_{L^2(Q)}) \\
&\leq 27(1 + C_{16} C_{20} + 2C_{16} C_{23} C_{22} C_{39}) \|u\|_{L^4(Q)} + 27(C_{16} + 2C_{16} C_{23} C_{22} C_{39}) \|\Delta u\|_{L^4(Q)} + 54C_{16} C_{23} C_{22} C_{39} \|Du\|_{L^2(Q)} \\
&\leq 27(1 + C_{16} C_{20} + 2C_{16} C_{23} C_{22} C_{39}) \|u\|_{L^4(Q)} + 27(C_{16} + 2C_{16} C_{23} C_{22} C_{39}) \|\Delta u\|_{L^4(Q)} \\
&\quad + 54C_{16} C_{23} C_{22} C_{39} (\sqrt{17} \|u\|_{L^2(\tilde{Q})} + \|\Delta u\|_{L^2(\tilde{Q})}) \\
&\leq \{27(1 + C_{16} C_{20} + (2 + 54(27)\sqrt{17})C_{16} C_{23} C_{22} C_{39})\} \|u\|_{L^4(Q)} + \{27(C_{16} + 2 + 54(27)C_{16} C_{23} C_{22} C_{39})\} \|\Delta u\|_{L^4(Q)}
\end{aligned}$$

In the first step we recall Eq. (2.32), second we use Eq. (2.33) and substitute Eq. (2.34), third we use the periodicity assumption, fifth we use the fact that $C_{Calderon-Zygmund}(n, 2) = 1$ (when the matrix norm is the Frobenius Norm, see Eq. (2.25)) for any choice of n and Holder's inequality, in the sixth step we use Eq. (2.35) in accordance with Eq. (2.36) and the last step is similar to the third step. This concludes the proof of Eq. (2.31), with

$$C_{19} = 27(1 + C_{16} C_{20} + (2 + 54(27)\sqrt{17})C_{16} C_{23} C_{22} C_{39}). \quad (2.37)$$

□

We have shown Eq. (2.30), our goal is to prove Eq. (1.3) and the only difference is the $\|u\|_{L^p(T^3)}$ term on the right hand side. In the rest of the section we explain how to bound this term by Δu as well, this is reliant on the assumption in Eq. (1.3) that f is L^2 -Orthogonal to $\text{Ker } \Delta$

The following result is well known:

Lemma 2.38. *Assume that $u \in L^2(T^3)$, with $\int_{T^3} u = 0$, then:*

$$\|u\|_{L^2(T^3)} \leq \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \|\Delta u\|_{L^2(T^3)}.$$

Proof. By (Chavel, 1984, p.30), the smallest eigenvalue of Δ acting on functions with mean zero is $4\pi^2$. Writing u in an orthonormal eigenbasis for Δ proves the claim. \square

In the following we appeal to Eq. (A.22):

We now have gathered enough tools to prove the main result of the section Eq. (1.3).

Proof of Eq. (1.3). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{W^{2,4}(T^3)} &\leq C_{19}(\|u\|_{L^4(T^3)} + \|\Delta u\|_{L^4(T^3)}) \\ &\leq C_{19}C_{40} \|u\|_{L^2(T^3)} + C_{19}C_{40} \|Du\|_{L^2(T^3)} + C_{19} \|\Delta u\|_{L^4(T^3)} \\ &\leq C_{19}C_{40} \|u\|_{L^2(T^3)} + C_{19} \|\Delta u\|_{L^4(T^3)} + C_{19}C_{40}(\sqrt{17} \|u\|_{L^2(\tilde{Q})} + \|\Delta u\|_{L^2(\tilde{Q})}) \\ &\leq C_{19}C_{40}(1 + 27\sqrt{17}) \|u\|_{L^2(T^3)} + C_{19}(1 + 27C_{40}) \|\Delta u\|_{L^4(T^3)} \\ &\leq \left[\frac{1}{4\pi^2} \{C_{19}C_{40}(1 + 27\sqrt{17})\} + C_{19}(1 + 27C_{40}) \right] \|\Delta u\|_{L^4(T^3)}. \end{aligned}$$

In the first step we appeal to Eq. (2.31), we next use Eq. (A.22), in the third step we use Eq. (2.35) with Eq. (2.36), in the last step we use Eq. (2.38) together with $\|\Delta u\|_{L^2} \leq \text{vol}(T^3)^{\frac{p-2}{2p}} \|\Delta u\|_{L^p}$ and $\text{vol}(T^3) = 1$. This proves the proposition with

$$C_1 = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \{C_{19}C_{40}(1 + 27\sqrt{17})\} + C_{19}(1 + 27C_{40}). \quad (2.39)$$

\square

2.4 Estimates on 3-Torus with respect to a non-flat metric

We now turn to proving the injectivity estimate on T^3 with respect to non-flat metrics, namely Eq. (1.5).

Throughout the section, let g_{flat} denote the flat metric on T^3 and let g denote another metric. In this section, we work exclusively with the manifold T^3 . Thus we omit it from the notation introduced to describe norms on Sobolev and L^p spaces, For example:

$$\text{We write } g, W^{2,p} \text{ instead of } W^{2,p}(T^3, g) \quad (2.40)$$

If the metric is not specified in a calculation assume that it is g_{flat} . In calculations we use the coordinates x_1, x_2, x_3 which have the property that $e_i := \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$ form an orthonormal basis with respect to g_{flat} , but not necessarily with respect to g . We write $g_{ij} = g\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\right)$ for the matrix representation of g in this coordinate basis.

The claim Eq. (1.5) will be established by showing the following intermediate inequalities, which illustrates the rough strategy of the proof.

$$\|u\|_{g, W^{2,4}} \leq C_{24} \|u\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, W^{2,4}} \leq C_1 C_{24} \|\Delta u\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, L^4} \leq C_{25} \|\Delta u\|_{g, L^4} + C(\delta) \|u\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, W^{2,4}} \quad (2.41)$$

In the last inequality if we take $\delta > 0$ to be sufficiently small can absorb the remainder term to obtain our desired inequality. To show our application in Section 3, it also turns out to be necessary to find an explicit constant for the following inequality:

$$\|u\|_{g, W^{2,4}} \geq C_{26} \|u\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, W^{2,4}} \quad (2.42)$$

Before we proceed we provide some linear algebra estimates that will be useful later.

Definition 2.43. Define the following norm on matrix valued functions on T^3

$$\begin{aligned} \|A\|_{C^0} &= \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq 3, x \in T^3} |A_{ij}(x)| \\ \|A\|_{C^1} &= \|A\|_{C^0} + \|dA\|_{C^0} \end{aligned}$$

Note this norm is not submultiplicative.

Lemma 2.44. *If $\|g - g_{\text{flat}}\|_{C^0} \leq \delta$, then we have the following bound for the determinant:*

$$C_{27} \leq \det(g) \leq C_{28},$$

where C_{27} and C_{28} are defined in Eq. (2.45).

Proof. The assumption implies $1 - \delta \leq g_{ii} \leq 1 + \delta, |g_{ij}| \leq \delta$ for $i \neq j$. The claim then easily follows from the explicit formula for the determinant of a 3×3 matrix with

$$C_{28} = (1 + \delta)^3 + 2\delta^3 + 3(1 + \delta)\delta^2, C_{27} = (1 - \delta)^3 - 2\delta^3 - 3(1 + \delta)\delta^2. \quad (2.45)$$

□

The following two lemmas involving the inverse of the Riemmanian metric also play a role:

Lemma 2.46. *Suppose $\|g - g_{\text{flat}}\|_{C^1} \leq \delta$ and that $\delta < \frac{1}{6}$, then we have the following:*

$$\|g^{-1} - g_{\text{flat}}\|_{C^1} \leq 2\delta. \quad (2.47)$$

Proof. We prove the C^0 bound and C^1 bound separately. Denote $g = I - A$, we intend to use the series expansion of $g^{-1} = (I - A)^{-1}$ and then use submultiplicativity, the C^0 and C^1 norms on matrices that we defined are not submultiplicative so we compare them to different matrix norms.

$$\begin{aligned} \|(I - A)^{-1} - I\|_{C^0} &\leq \|(I - A)^{-1} - I\|_1 := \sup_{j \in \{1, 2, 3\}} \sum_{i=1}^3 |A_{ij}| \\ \|(I - A)^{-1} - I\|_{C^0} &\leq \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} A^i - I \right\|_1 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (3\delta)^i \leq 6\delta, \end{aligned}$$

We now bound the derivative: We first set $B := I - A$ and we differentiate the identity $BB^{-1} = I$ to obtain:

$$B'(B^{-1}) + B(B^{-1})' = 0. \quad (2.48)$$

Rearranging this identity and multiplying both sides by B^{-1} to the left gives the following:

$$(B^{-1})' = -B^{-1}B'B^{-1}. \quad (2.49)$$

Using the submultiplicative property of the 1-norm:

$$\|(B^{-1})'\|_1 \leq (\|B^{-1}\|_1)^2 \|B'\|_1. \quad (2.50)$$

Using our prior work we have that:

$$\|(B^{-1})'\|_{C^0} \leq \|(B^{-1})'\|_1 \leq 36\delta^3. \quad (2.51)$$

We obtain that:

$$\|I - A\|_{C^1} \leq 6\delta + 36\delta^3, \quad (2.52)$$

which gives Eq. (2.47). This concludes the proof. \square

The next lemma compares the pointwise norm of covectors with respect to the flat metric and the perturbed metric.

Lemma 2.53. *Assume that V is a vector space equipped with two inner products g, h . For an h -orthonormal basis e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n write $g_{ij} = g(e_i, e_j)$. If $|g_{ij} - \delta_{ij}| \leq \delta$, for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots, n\}$ then for each $v \in V$ we have that:*

$$(1 - n\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} |v|_h \leq |v|_g \leq (1 + n\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} |v|_h. \quad (2.54)$$

Proof. Fix $v \in V$ it follows that $v = \sum_{i=1}^n v_i e_i$

$$\begin{aligned} |g(v, v) - h(v, v)| &= \left| \sum_{i=1, j=1}^n v_i v_j [g(e_i, e_j) - h(e_i, e_j)] \right| \\ &\leq \delta \sum_{i=1, j=1}^n |v_i v_j| \\ &\leq \delta \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |v_i| \right)^2 \\ &\leq \delta n h(v, v) \end{aligned} \quad (2.55)$$

In the third step we observe that $|v_i v_j| = |v_i| |v_j|$ and manipulate the sum accordingly and in the final step we apply norm equivalence between the 1-norm and the 2-norm. By using the triangle inequality we obtain that:

$$(1 - n\delta) h(v, v) \leq g(v, v) \leq (1 + n\delta) h(v, v). \quad (2.56)$$

Taking the square root in each term of the above gives the required result. \square

Slight adjustments to the above lemma gives us the analogous claim for tensors.

Lemma 2.57. *Suppose $w \in T_x^*(T^3)$, where $T_x^*(T^3)$ is the cotangent space of T^3 at x and $|g^{ij}(x) - \delta_{ij}| < \delta$, we obtain the following bound on pointwise norms.*

$$C_{29} |w|_{g_{\text{flat}}} \leq |w|_g \leq C_{30} |w|_{g_{\text{flat}}},$$

with $C_{30} = (1 + 3\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $C_{29} = (1 - 3\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Proof. $T_x^*(T^3)$ is a vector space with orthonormal basis dx_i for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Applying Eq. (2.53) gives the claim. \square

We now prove a similar claim to Eq. (2.57) but for covariant 2 tensors.

Lemma 2.58. *Suppose $T = \sum_{i=1, j=1}^3 T_{ij} dx_i \otimes dx_j \in (T_x^* T^3)^{\otimes 2}$ and $|g^{ij}(x) - \delta_{ij}| < \delta$, then we have the following bound on pointwise norms.*

$$C_{31}|T|_{g_{\text{flat}}} \leq |T|_g \leq C_{32}|T|_{g_{\text{flat}}}.$$

Proof. We would like to use Eq. (2.53). Note that $dx_i \otimes dx_j$ with $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ forms an orthonormal basis with respect to g_{flat} . It suffices to establish a bound for $|g^{ij,kl} - \delta_{ij,kl}|$, where we used the notation $g^{ij,kl} = \langle dx_i \otimes dx_j, d_k \otimes dx_l \rangle = g^{ik} g^{jl}$.

$$\begin{aligned} |g^{ij} g^{kl} - \delta_{ij} \delta_{kl}| &\leq |g^{ij} g^{kl} - g^{ij} \delta_{kl} + g^{ij} \delta_{kl} - \delta_{ij} \delta_{kl}| \\ &\leq |g^{ij} g^{kl} - g^{ij} \delta_{kl}| + |g^{ij} \delta_{kl} - \delta_{ij} \delta_{kl}| \\ &\leq |g^{ij}| |g^{kl} - \delta_{kl}| + |\delta_{kl}| |g^{ij} - \delta_{ij}| \\ &\leq (2 + 2\delta)2\delta. \end{aligned} \tag{2.59}$$

Now applying Eq. (2.53) yields the claim with:

$$C_{31} = \sqrt{1 - 9(2 + 2\delta)2\delta}, \tag{2.60}$$

$$C_{32} = \sqrt{1 + 9(2 + 2\delta)2\delta}. \tag{2.61}$$

□

We also require a bound for the Christoffel Symbols:

Lemma 2.62. *Suppose $\|g - g_{\text{flat}}\|_{C^1} \leq \delta$. Then for $i, j, m \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ we have the following:*

$$|\Gamma_{ij}^m| \leq C_{33} = 3^2 \delta^2. \tag{2.63}$$

Proof. We use the usual formula for the Christoffel Symbols of the Levi-Civita Connection:

$$\Gamma_{ij}^k = \sum_{n=1}^3 \frac{1}{2} g^{kn} \left(\frac{\partial g_{ni}}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial g_{nj}}{\partial x_i} - \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial x_n} \right). \tag{2.64}$$

By the Triangle Inequality we arrive at the following:

$$|\Gamma_{ij}^k| \leq \sum_{n=1}^3 \frac{1}{2} |g^{kn}| \left| \frac{\partial g_{ni}}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial g_{nj}}{\partial x_i} - \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial x_n} \right| \leq \sum_{n=1}^3 \frac{1}{2} (2\delta)(3\delta) = 3^2 \delta^2 \tag{2.65}$$

We use Eq. (2.47) and our assumption in the second step. □

Theorem 2.66. *With the assumptions in Eq. (1.5), we have the following:*

$$C_{26} \|u\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, W^{2,p}} \leq \|u\|_{g, W^{2,p}} \leq C_{24} \|u\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, W^{2,p}}. \tag{2.67}$$

Where:

$$C_{24} = \left(C_{35}(1 + 3\sqrt{3}C_{33})C_{32}C_{28}^{\frac{1}{2p}} \right), C_{26} = C_{34} + (1 - 3\sqrt{3}C_{33})C_{27}^{\frac{1}{2p}}C_{31}. \tag{2.68}$$

Proof. Step 1: We begin by proving

$$C_{34} \|u\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, W^{1,p}} \leq \|u\|_{g, W^{1,p}} \leq C_{35} \|u\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, W^{1,p}}, \quad (2.69)$$

where C_{34}, C_{35} are defined in Eq. (2.70).

We first exhibit the upper bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{g, W^{1,p}} &= \left(\int_{T^3} |u|^p \sqrt{\det(g)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left(\int_{T^3} |du|_g^p \sqrt{\det(g)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq C_{28}^{\frac{1}{2p}} \left[\left(\int_{T^3} |u|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left(\int_{T^3} |du|_g^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right] \\ &\leq C_{30} C_{28}^{\frac{1}{2p}} \left[\left(\int_{T^3} |u|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left(\int_{T^3} |du|_{g_{\text{flat}}}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where we used Eq. (2.44) in the second step, and we used Eq. (2.57) in the third step.

The lower bound follows similarly:

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{g, W^{1,p}} &= \left(\int_{T^3} |u|^p \sqrt{\det(g)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left(\int_{T^3} |du|_g^p \sqrt{\det(g)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\geq C_{27}^{\frac{1}{2p}} \left[\left(\int_{T^3} |u|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left(\int_{T^3} |du|_g^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right] \\ &\geq C_{29} C_{27}^{\frac{1}{2p}} \left[\left(\int_{T^3} |u|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left(\int_{T^3} |du|_{g_{\text{flat}}}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_{35} = C_{30} C_{28}^{\frac{1}{2p}} \text{ and } C_{34} = C_{29} C_{27}^{\frac{1}{2p}}. \quad (2.70)$$

Step 2: Pointwise estimate for $\nabla^g \omega$, where $\omega \in \Omega^1(T^3)$.

In what follows, we write ∇ for the Levi-Civita connection of g_{flat} and ∇^g for the Levi-Civita connection of g . We compute at a fixed point that we omit from the notation. We have

$$|\nabla^g \omega|_g \leq |\nabla^g \omega - \nabla \omega|_g + |\nabla \omega|_g \leq C_{32} (|\nabla^g \omega - \nabla \omega|_{g_{\text{flat}}} + |\nabla \omega|_{g_{\text{flat}}}). \quad (2.71)$$

where we used the triangle inequality and Eq. (2.58).

By definition

$$|\nabla^g \omega - \nabla \omega|_{g_{\text{flat}}}^2 = \sum_{i,j=1}^3 |\nabla^g \omega(e_i, e_j) - \nabla \omega(e_i, e_j)|^2, \quad (2.72)$$

where we wrote $e_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$, which is an orthonormal basis with respect to g_{flat} .

Notice we have that:

$$\nabla^g \omega(e_i, e_j) - \nabla \omega(e_i, e_j) = \omega(\nabla_{e_i} e_j) - \omega(\nabla_{e_i}^g e_j) = -\omega(\nabla_{e_i}^g e_j), \quad (2.73)$$

where we used that $\nabla_{e_i} e_j = 0$ for $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

We will first compute the required estimate for dx_m , the standard orthonormal basis for 1-forms on T^3 , which are dual to the e_m from above. The same result for ω will follow immediately. Substituting Eq. (2.64) and Eq. (2.73) into Eq. (2.72) gives us:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\nabla^g dx_m - \nabla dx_m|_{g_{\text{flat}}}^2 &= \sum_{i=1, j=1}^3 |dx_m(\nabla_{e_i}^g e_j)|^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1, j=1}^3 \left| dx_m \left(\sum_{k=1}^3 \left(\sum_{n=1}^3 \frac{1}{2} g^{kn} \left(\frac{\partial g_{ni}}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial g_{nj}}{\partial x_i} - \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial x_n} \right) \right) e_k \right) \right|^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1, j=1}^3 \left| \sum_{n=1}^3 \frac{1}{2} g^{mn} \left(\frac{\partial g_{ni}}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial g_{nj}}{\partial x_i} - \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial x_n} \right) \right|^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1, j=1}^3 3^4 \delta^4 \\
&\leq 3^6 \delta^4.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.74}$$

In order to show the inequalities above we repeatedly use Eq. (2.47) and our main assumption $\|g - g_{\text{flat}}\|_{C^1} \leq \delta$. In the fourth step we use Eq. (2.63) Eq. (2.74) implies that:

$$|\nabla^g dx_m - \nabla dx_m|_{g_{\text{flat}}} \leq 3C_{33}.$$

By linearity we obtain:

$$|\nabla^g \omega - \nabla \omega|_{g_{\text{flat}}} \leq 3\sqrt{3}C_{33}|\omega|_{g_{\text{flat}}}.$$

Evidently, in order to prove Eq. (2.67) we are interested in the above bound for the 1-form $\omega = du$. The bound we care about is the following:

$$|\nabla^g du - \nabla du|_{g_{\text{flat}}} \leq 3C_{33} \sum_{i=1}^3 \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right|, \tag{2.75}$$

combining Eq. (2.75) and Eq. (2.71) gives us:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\nabla^g du|_g &\leq |\nabla^g du - \nabla du|_g + |\nabla du|_g \\
&\leq C_{32}(|\nabla^g du - \nabla du|_{g_{\text{flat}}} + |\nabla du|_{g_{\text{flat}}}) \\
&\leq C_{32}(3C_{33} \sum_{i=1}^3 \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right| + |\nabla du|_{g_{\text{flat}}}) \\
&\leq C_{32}(3\sqrt{3}C_{33} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^3 \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right)^2} + |\nabla du|_{g_{\text{flat}}}) \\
&\leq C_{32}(3\sqrt{3}C_{33}|du|_{g_{\text{flat}}} + |\nabla du|_{g_{\text{flat}}}).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.76}$$

In the penultimate step we use the equivalence of 1-norm and Euclidean norm and in the last step we use the definition of $|du|_{g_{\text{flat}}}$.

We derive similarly:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\nabla^g du|_g &\geq C_{31}(|\nabla du|_{g_{\text{flat}}} - |\nabla^g du - \nabla du|_{g_{\text{flat}}}) \\
&\geq C_{31} \left(|\nabla du|_{g_{\text{flat}}} - 3C_{33} \sum_{i=1}^3 \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right| \right) \\
&\geq C_{31}(|\nabla du|_{g_{\text{flat}}} - 3\sqrt{3}C_{33}|du|_{g_{\text{flat}}}).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.77}$$

We now have gathered all the ingredients required to prove Eq. (2.67). We start with Eq. (2.76),

$$|\nabla^g du|_g \leq C_{32}(\sqrt{3}|du|_{g_{\text{flat}}} + |\nabla du|_{g_{\text{flat}}}).$$

This pointwise bound readily gives a bound in the L^p norm.

$$\|\nabla^g du\|_{g, L^p} = \left(\int_{T^3} |\nabla^g du|_g^p \sqrt{\det(g)} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C_{28}^{\frac{1}{2p}} C_{32} \left\{ \left(\int_{T^3} |\nabla du|_{g_{\text{flat}}}^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left(\int_{T^3} 3\sqrt{3}C_{33}|du|_{g_{\text{flat}}}^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\}.$$

Summing the above estimate with Eq. (2.69) gives us the result.

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{g, W^{2,p}(T^3)} &\leq C_{35} \left[\left(\int_{T^3} |u|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left(\int_{T^3} |du|_{g_{\text{flat}}}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right] + C_{28}^{\frac{1}{2p}} C_{32} \left(\int_{T^3} |\nabla du|_{g_{\text{flat}}}^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + 3\sqrt{3}C_{28}^{\frac{1}{2p}} C_{33} C_{32} \left(\int_{T^3} |du|_{g_{\text{flat}}}^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&\leq \left(C_{35} + (1 + 3\sqrt{3}C_{33})C_{32}C_{28}^{\frac{1}{2p}} \right) \|u\|_{W^{2,p}}.
\end{aligned}$$

In order to obtain the corresponding lower bound, we perform a similar calculation. We obtain the following integral estimate from Eq. (2.77):

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla^g du\|_{g, L^p} &\geq C_{31} C_{27}^{\frac{1}{2p}} \left\{ \|\nabla du\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, L^p} - 3\sqrt{3}C_{33} \|du\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, L^p} \right\}, \\
\|u\|_{g, W^{2,p}} &\geq C_{34}(\|u\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, L^p} + \|du\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, L^p}) + C_{31} C_{27}^{\frac{1}{2p}} \left\{ \|\nabla du\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, L^p} - 3\sqrt{3}C_{33} \|du\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, L^p} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Our work in the first section immediately gives us the second step in Eq. (2.41)) This is the following:

$$\|u\|_{W^{2,p}} \leq C_1 \|\Delta u\|_{L^p}.$$

In order to prove Eq. (1.5), it remains to compare Laplace operators of g_{flat} and g .

Lemma 2.78. Assume $\|g - g_{\text{flat}}\|_{C^1} < \delta$,

$$\left(\int_{T^3} |\Delta u - \Delta^g u (\det g)^{\frac{1}{2p}}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C_{36} \|u\|_{W^{2,p}}, \tag{2.79}$$

where C_{36} is defined in Eq. (2.80).

Proof. We recall a convenient equivalent definition of Δ^g in terms of Christoffel Symbols.

$$\Delta^g(u) = \sum_{i=1, j=1}^3 g^{ij} \left(\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} - \sum_{k=1}^3 \Gamma_{ij}^k \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_k} \right).$$

We now compute that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \Delta u - \Delta^g u (\det g)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \right\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, L^p} &\leq \left\| \sum_{i=1, j=1}^3 (g^{ij} (\det g)^{\frac{1}{2p}} - \delta_{ij}) \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \right\|_{L^p} + \left\| \sum_{i=1, j=1, k=1}^3 g^{ij} \Gamma_{ij}^k (\det g)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_k} \right\|_{L^p} \\
&\leq \left(\left(C_{28}^{\frac{1}{2p}} - 1 \right) (1 + 2\delta) + 2\delta \right) \left\| \sum_{i=1, j=1}^3 \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \right\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, L^p} + 9(1 + 2\delta) C_{33} C_{28}^{\frac{1}{2p}} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_k} \right\|_{L^p} \\
&\leq 3 \left(\left(C_{28}^{\frac{1}{2p}} - 1 \right) (1 + 2\delta) + 2\delta \right) \|D^2 u\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, L^p} + 9\sqrt{3}(1 + 2\delta) C_{33} C_{28}^{\frac{1}{2p}} \|Du\|_{L^p} \\
&\leq 3 \left(\left(C_{28}^{\frac{1}{2p}} - 1 \right) (1 + 2\delta) + 2\delta \right) + 9\sqrt{3}(1 + 2\delta) C_{33} C_{28}^{\frac{1}{2p}} \|u\|_{W^{2,p}}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the second step we use the bound presented below on the summand exclusively in i and j , for the latter term involving Christoffel Symbols we use Eq. (2.63) and in the third step we use norm equivalence of the 1-norm and the 2-norm.

$$|g^{ij} (\det g)^{\frac{1}{2p}} - \delta_{ij}| \leq |g^{ij} (\det g)^{\frac{1}{2p}} - g^{ij}| + |g^{ij} - \delta_{ij}| \leq \left(C_{28}^{\frac{1}{2p}} - 1 \right) (1 + 2\delta) + 2\delta.$$

The factor of 2 in the first summand in the second step arises due to Eq. (2.47). We conclude that

$$C_{36}(\delta) = C_{36} = 3 \left(\left(C_{28}^{\frac{1}{2p}} - 1 \right) (1 + 2\delta) + 2\delta \right) + 9(1 + 2\delta) C_{33} \sqrt{3} C_{28}^{\frac{1}{2p}}. \quad (2.80)$$

□

We are now ready to prove the main result of the section.

Proof of Eq. (1.5). First observe that

$$\|\Delta u\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, L^p} \leq \left\| \Delta u - \Delta^g u (\det g)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \right\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, L^p} + \|\Delta^g u\|_{g, L^p}. \quad (2.81)$$

We consider Eq. (1.3), substituting Eq. (2.81) and Eq. (2.79) into the right hand side, we obtain:

$$\|u\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, L_2^p} \leq C_1 \|\Delta^g u\|_{g, L^p} + C_1 C_{36} \|u\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, L_2^p},$$

by taking $\delta > 0$ to be sufficiently small, $C_{36} < \frac{1}{C_1}$, it follows:

$$\|u\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, L_2^p} \leq \frac{C_1}{1 - C_1 C_{36}} \|\Delta^g u\|_{g, L^p}$$

Using Eq. (2.67) we obtain the required result with:

$$C_3 = \frac{C_{24} C_1}{1 - C_1 C_{36}}. \quad (2.82)$$

□

Remark 2.83. Using Wolfram Mathematica we compute that in fact $C_2 < 3 \times 10^{-14}$ satisfies the condition from Eq. (1.5).

3 Application: nowhere vanishing harmonic 1-forms

We are now ready to give the proof of Eq. (1.7):

Proof of Eq. (1.7). Let $\xi := \Delta_g^{-1}(d_g^* dx_1)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_g(dx_1 - d\xi) &= \Delta_g\{dx_1 - d\Delta_g^{-1}(d_g^* dx_1)\} \\ &= \Delta_g dx_1 - \Delta_g d\Delta_g^{-1}(d_g^* dx_1) \\ &= \Delta_g dx_1 - dd_g^* dx_1 \\ &= \Delta_g dx_1 - dd_g^* dx_1 - d_g^* ddx_1 = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

In the second step we use the fact that d and Δ_g commute and in the third step we use the fact that $d^2 = 0$. We now verify that the one-form $dx_1 - d\xi$ is nowhere-vanishing.

The function ξ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \|d\xi\|_{g,C^0} &\leq C_{30} \|d\xi\|_{C^0,g_{\text{flat}}} \\ &\leq C_{41} C_{30} \|\xi\|_{g_{\text{flat}},W^{2,4}} \\ &\leq \frac{C_{41} C_{30}}{C_{26}} \|\xi\|_{g,L^4_2} \\ &\leq \frac{C_{41} C_{30} C_3}{C_{26}} \|d_g^* dx_1\|_{g,L^4}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use Eq. (2.57) in the first step, we use Eq. (A.60) in the second step, we use Eq. (2.66) in the third step, and use Eq. (1.5) in the last step.

Denote:

$$C_{37} = \frac{C_{41} C_{30} C_3}{C_{26}}. \tag{3.2}$$

We use a definition of the codifferential which involves Christoffel Symbols, for convenience of calculation. For $\omega = \sum_j \omega_j dx_j$:

$$d_g^* \omega = - \sum_{i,j} g^{ij} \partial_i \omega_j + \sum_{i,j,k} g^{ij} \Gamma_{ij}^k \omega_k, \tag{3.3}$$

letting $\omega = dx_1$ in the above expression gives:

$$d_g^* dx_1 = \sum_{i,j} g^{ij} \Gamma_{ij}^1, \tag{3.4}$$

because each of the ω_j are constant functions. Eqs. (2.47) and (2.62) then give:

$$|d_g^* dx_1| \leq (3 + 18\delta) C_{33}. \tag{3.5}$$

This then implies the claim, because for all $x \in T^3$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |dx_1 + d\xi|_g(x) &\geq |dx_1|_g(x) - |d\xi|_g(x) \\ &\geq C_{29} - \|d\xi\|_{g,C^0} \\ &\geq C_{29} - C_{37} \|d_g^* dx_1\|_{g,L^p} \\ &\geq C_{29} - C_{37}(3 + 18\delta) C_{33} C_{28}^{\frac{1}{2p}}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

which is > 0 for small δ . That is, the 1-form $dx_1 + d\xi \in \Omega^1(T^3)$ is nowhere vanishing. For future use, we denote:

$$C_{38} = C_{38}(\delta) = C_{29} - C_{37}(3 + 18\delta)C_{33}C_{28}^{\frac{1}{2p}}. \quad (3.7)$$

□

A Appendix

A.1 Marcinkiewicz interpolation theorem

Theorem A.1 (Theorem 9.8 in Gilbarg and Trudinger (2001)). *Let T be a linear mapping from $L^1(\Omega) \cap L^r(\Omega)$ into itself, $1 \leq q < r < \infty$, and suppose there are constants T_1 and T_2 such that*

$$\mu_{Tf}(t) \leq \left(\frac{T_1 \|f\|_{L^q}}{t} \right)^q, \quad \mu_{Tf}(t) \leq \left(\frac{T_2 \|f\|_{L^r}}{t} \right)^r, \quad (A.2)$$

for all $f \in L^q(\Omega) \cap L^r(\Omega)$ and $t > 0$. Then T extends as a bounded linear mapping from $L^p(\Omega)$ into itself for any p such that $q < p < r$, and

$$\|Tf\|_{L^p} \leq C_{\text{Marcinkiewicz}}(p, q, r) T_1^\alpha T_2^{1-\alpha} \|f\|_{L^p}, \quad (A.3)$$

where $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{\alpha}{q} + \frac{1-\alpha}{r}$ and

$$C_{\text{Marcinkiewicz}}(p, q, r) = 2 \left(\frac{p(r-q)}{(p-q)(r-p)} \right)^{1/p}.$$

Proof. The same proof can be found in Gilbarg and Trudinger (2001), to make this paper more self-contained we present the proof here also. These are two basic facts about distribution functions which are also defined below

For any $p > 0$ and $|u|^p \in L^1(\Omega)$:

$$\mu_u(t) := |\{x \in \Omega | u(x) > t\}| \leq \frac{\int_\Omega |f|^p}{t^p} \quad (A.4)$$

$$\int_\Omega |u|^p = p \int_0^\infty t^{p-1} \mu_u(t) dt. \quad (A.5)$$

Fix $u \in L^q(\Omega) \cap L^r(\Omega)$ and $s > 0$, then rewrite $u = f_1 + f_2$ where

$$f_1(x) := \begin{cases} u(x) & \text{if } |u(x)| > s \\ 0 & \text{if } |u(x)| \leq s \end{cases} \quad (A.6)$$

$$f_2(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |u(x)| > s \\ u(x) & \text{if } |u(x)| \leq s \end{cases}. \quad (A.7)$$

Using the triangle inequality and the assumptions we obtain that:

$$\mu_{Tu}(t) \leq \mu_{Tf_1} \left(\frac{t}{2} \right) + \mu_{Tf_2} \left(\frac{t}{2} \right) \quad (A.8)$$

$$\leq \left(\frac{2T_1}{t} \right)^q \int_\Omega |f_1|^q + \left(\frac{2T_2}{t} \right)^r \int_\Omega |f_2|^r. \quad (A.9)$$

We combine the above with Eq. (A.5) to obtain:

$$\int_{\Omega} |Tu|^p = p \int_0^{\infty} t^{p-1} \mu_{Tf}(t) dt \quad (\text{A.10})$$

$$= p(2T_1)^q \int_0^{\infty} t^{p-q-1} \left(\int_{\Omega} |f_1|^q \right) dt + p(2T_2)^r \int_0^{\infty} t^{p-r-1} \left(\int_{\Omega} |f_2|^r \right) dt \quad (\text{A.11})$$

$$= p(2T_1)^q \int_0^{\infty} t^{p-q-1} \left(\int_{|f|>s} |f|^q \right) dt + p(2T_2)^r \int_0^{\infty} t^{p-r-1} \left(\int_{|f|\leq s} |f|^r \right) dt. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

The main trick presented in the proof (Gilbarg and Trudinger, 2001, Theorem 9.8) is that we take $t = As$ where A is a positive constant to be fixed later. We first derive our required estimate with the constant being a function of A and then minimise it to obtain a sharper result.

$$\int_{\Omega} |Tu|^p \leq p(2T_1)^q A^{p-q} \int_0^{\infty} s^{p-q-1} \left(\int_{|f|>s} |f|^q \right) ds + p(2T_1)^r A^{p-r} \int_0^{\infty} s^{p-r-1} \left(\int_{|f|\leq s} |f|^r \right) ds. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

The above integrals on the RHS have strictly non-negative integrand and thus can be rewritten and evaluated using Fubini's Theorem as follows:

$$\int_0^{\infty} s^{p-q-1} \left(\int_{|f|>s} |f|^q \right) ds = \int_{\Omega} |f|^q \int_0^{|f|} s^{p-q-1} ds \quad (\text{A.14})$$

$$= \frac{1}{p-q} \int_{\Omega} |f|^p, \quad (\text{A.15})$$

$$\int_0^{\infty} s^{p-r-1} \left(\int_{|f|\leq s} |f|^r \right) ds = \int_{\Omega} |f|^r \int_{|f|}^{\infty} s^{p-r-1} ds \quad (\text{A.16})$$

$$= \frac{1}{r-p} \int_{\Omega} |f|^p. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Substituting these evaluated integrals above gives us the required bound as a function of A as promised.

$$\int_{\Omega} |Tu|^p \leq \left\{ \frac{p(2T_1)^q A^{p-q}}{p-q} + \frac{p(2T_1)^r A^{p-r}}{r-p} \right\} \int_{\Omega} |u|^p. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Minimising the expression in braces with respect to A gives us the required result. \square

A.2 Explicit Sobolev Constant

Theorem A.19 (Explicit Sobolev Inequality for compactly supported functions). *If $1 \leq q < n$, then all $u \in W_0^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfy:*

$$\|u\|_{L^p} \leq K(n, q) \|Du\|_{L^q}, \quad (\text{A.20})$$

with $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{n}$ and

$$K(n, q) = \frac{q-1}{n-q} \left(\frac{n-q}{n(q-1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\frac{\Gamma(n+1)}{\Gamma(n/q)\Gamma(n+1-\frac{n}{q})\omega_{n-1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}},$$

where ω_n is the volume of the n -dimensional sphere with radius 1. (Aubin, 1998, 2.14)

Remark A.21. We use the above claim in Eq. (2.34) with $n = 3, q = 2$, denote $C_{39} = K(3, 2)$

Theorem A.22 (Explicit Sobolev Inequality (full generality) on the cube). *Suppose $p = 4$, $\Omega = [0, 1]^3$ and $u \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$, Then the following inequality holds:*

$$\|u\|_{L^4(\Omega)} \leq C_{40} \|u\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega)}. \quad (\text{A.23})$$

This can be found in (Mizuguchi et al., 2017, page 15, table 6) with $C_{40} = 13.25$

A.3 Poincaré Inequality

We first prove the following lemma.

Theorem A.24 (Poincaré Inequality). *Suppose $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and $1 \leq p < \infty$, then we have the following inequality:*

$$\|u\|_{L^p} \leq \left(\frac{1}{\omega_n} |\Omega| \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \|Du\|_{L^p}. \quad (\text{A.25})$$

There are two tools which we use to prove this theorem, one represents $u(x)$ as an integral (specifically a Riesz Potential to be defined below) and then refer to a bound for the norm of Riesz Potential:

Lemma A.26 (Lemma 7.14 Gilbarg and Trudinger (2001)). *Let $u \in W_0^{1,1}(\Omega)$ Then:*

$$u(x) = \frac{1}{n\omega_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\Omega} \frac{(x_i - y_i) D_i u(y)}{|x - y|^n} dy. \quad (\text{A.27})$$

Proof. We use the same proof as (Gilbarg and Trudinger, 2001, Lemma 7.14) but we provide the elementary details which are omitted. First we prove the claim for $u \in C_1^1(\Omega)$: For an arbitrary choice of direction $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $|\omega| = 1$ we have that:

$$u(x) = - \int_0^\infty \frac{d}{dr} (u(x + r\omega)) dr \quad (\text{A.28})$$

$$= - \int_0^\infty D_\omega(u(x + r\omega)) dr \quad (\text{A.29})$$

$$= - \frac{1}{n\omega_n} \int_0^\infty \int_{|\omega|=1} D_\omega(u(x + r\omega)) dr \quad (\text{A.30})$$

$$= - \frac{1}{n\omega_n} \int_0^\infty \int_{|\omega|=1} \omega \cdot D(u(x + r\omega)) dr \quad (\text{A.31})$$

$$= - \frac{1}{n\omega_n} \int_{\Omega} \frac{(y - x) \cdot D(u(y))}{|y - x|} \frac{1}{|y - x|^{n-1}} dy \quad (\text{A.32})$$

$$= \frac{1}{n\omega_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\Omega} \frac{(x_i - y_i) D_i u(y)}{|x - y|^n} dy \quad (\text{A.33})$$

For the first inequality we use the fundamental theorem of calculus (and the fact that u is compactly supported), for the second we use the multivariate chain rule (noting that $D_\omega(u(x+r\omega)) = \omega \cdot D(u(x+r\omega))$), for the third we integrate over $|\omega| = 1$ and divide by the measure of this set (surface area of the $n-1$ sphere) (one integrates LHS and RHS to get this), for the fifth equality we change from spherical coordinates back to cartesian.

□

Remark A.34. By applying the Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality to the above claim we obtain a useful estimate.

$$|u(x)| \leq \frac{1}{n\omega_n} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|Du(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-1}} dy. \quad (\text{A.35})$$

Lemma A.36 (Bound for norm of Riesz Potential, Lemma 7.12 in Gilbarg and Trudinger (2001)).
We define the operator V_{μ} on $L^1(\Omega)$ to be the Riesz Potential:

$$(V_{\mu}f)(x) = \int_{\Omega} |x-y|^{n(\mu-1)} f(y) dy \quad (\text{A.37})$$

The operator V_{μ} maps $L^p(\Omega)$ continuously into $L^q(\Omega)$ for any $1 \leq q < \infty$ satisfying

$$0 \leq \delta = \delta(p, q) = p^{-1} - q^{-1} < \mu \quad (\text{A.38})$$

Additionally, for any $f \in L^p(\Omega)$:

$$\|V_{\mu}f\|_{L^q} \leq \left(\frac{1-\delta}{\mu-\delta} \right)^{1-\delta} \omega_n^{1-\mu} |\Omega|^{\mu-\delta} \|f\|_{L^p}. \quad (\text{A.39})$$

Proof of Eq. (A.24). We are now ready to prove the Poincaré Inequality.

$$|u(x)| = \left| \frac{1}{n\omega_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\Omega} \frac{(x_i - y_i) D_i u(y)}{|x-y|^n} dy \right| \quad (\text{A.40})$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n\omega_n} \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{|x_i - y_i| |D_i u(y)|}{|x-y|^n} dy \quad (\text{A.41})$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n\omega_n} \int_{\Omega} \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i - y_i|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\sum_{i=1}^n |D_i u(y)|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|x-y|^n} dy \quad (\text{A.42})$$

$$= \frac{1}{n\omega_n} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|Du(y)|}{|x-y|^{n-1}} dy \quad (\text{A.43})$$

$$= (V_{\frac{1}{n}} |Du|)(x). \quad (\text{A.44})$$

For the first equality we use Eq. (A.26), for the second inequality we use the triangle inequality, for the third we use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the last equality is using the definition of Riesz potential.

$$\|u\|_{L^p} \leq \frac{1}{n\omega_n} n\omega_n^{1-\frac{1}{n}} |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{n}} \|Du\|_{L^p} = \left(\frac{1}{\omega_n} |\Omega| \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \|Du\|_{L^p}. \quad (\text{A.45})$$

We take the L^p norm of the derived inequality above and then we apply Eq. (A.36), this concludes the proof. \square

A.4 Morrey's Inequality

In this section we aim to prove the following:

Theorem A.46. Suppose $u \in C^1(T^3)$, then for $p = 4$, we have the following inequality.

$$\|u\|_{C^0(T^3)} \leq C_{41} \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(T^3)}. \quad (\text{A.47})$$

Proof. It is sufficient to prove the same claim for periodic functions defined on $\Omega = [0, 1]^3$. A more general claim is proved in (Evans, 2010, Theorem 4, Section 5.6), the proof is constructive and we obtain the desired constant following this construction. The rough idea is as follows: A similar bound to Eq. (A.35) can be exhibited for mean zero functions rather than compactly supported functions, this integral representation readily gives the result. This heuristic is made precise below.

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x)| &= \frac{1}{\omega_3} \int_{B(x,1)} |u(y)| dy \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\omega_3} \int_{B(x,1)} |u(x) - u(y)| dy + \frac{1}{\omega_3} \int_{B(x,1)} |u(y)| dy. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.48})$$

We first prove the following:

Lemma A.49.

$$\int_{B(x,r)} |u(x) - u(y)| dy \leq \frac{r^n}{n} \int_{B(x,r)} \frac{|Du(y)|}{|x - y|^{n-1}} dy. \quad (\text{A.50})$$

The proof of this lemma is (Evans, 2010, Theorem 4, Section 5.6). We follow the proof carefully and obtain explicit constants for the bounds. We aim to apply Hölder's inequality to the right hand side of Eq. (A.49) in order to obtain a $\|Du\|_{L^p}$ term. Applying Hölder's inequality to the second integral in Eq. (A.48) will yield the required claim with explicit constants for spheres.

We first fix $0 < s < r$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{S}^n$, we obtain that:

$$|u(x + s\omega) - u(x)| = \left| \int_0^s \frac{d}{dt} u(x + t\omega) dt \right| = \left| \int_0^s Du(x + t\omega) \cdot \omega dt \right| \leq \int_0^s |Du(x + t\omega)| dt. \quad (\text{A.51})$$

In the first step we use the fundamental theorem of calculus, in the second we use the multivariate chain rule and in the third we use that ω has length one.

Using Fubini's Theorem we obtain that:

$$\int_{\omega \in \mathbb{S}^n} |u(x + s\omega) - u(x)| d\omega \leq \int_0^s \int_{\omega \in \mathbb{S}^n} |Du(x + t\omega)| d\omega dt. \quad (\text{A.52})$$

We now use the substitution $y = x + t\omega$ to convert the above integral from spherical to cartesian coordinates.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\omega \in \mathbb{S}^n} |u(x + s\omega) - u(x)| d\omega &\leq \int_{y \in B(x,s)} \frac{|Du(y)|}{|x - y|^{n-1}} dy \\ &\leq \int_{y \in B(x,r)} \frac{|Du(y)|}{|x - y|^{n-1}} dy. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.53})$$

In the integral on the left hand side we use the substitution $z = x + s\omega$, we obtain the following:

$$\int_{\omega \in \mathbb{S}^n} |u(x + s\omega) - u(x)| d\omega = \frac{1}{s^{n-1}} \int_{z \in \partial B(x,s)} |u(z) - u(x)| dz, \quad (\text{A.54})$$

thus we have that:

$$\int_{z \in \partial B(x,s)} |u(z) - u(x)| dz \leq s^{n-1} \int_{y \in B(x,r)} \frac{|Du(y)|}{|x - y|^{n-1}} dy. \quad (\text{A.55})$$

Integrating the left and right hand side from 0 to r with respect to s yields the claim.

$$\int_{B(x,r)} |u(x) - u(y)| dy \leq \frac{r^n}{n} \int_{B(x,r)} \frac{|Du(y)|}{|x - y|^{n-1}} dy \quad (\text{A.56})$$

Substituting Eq. (A.49) into Eq. (A.48) with $r = 1$ yields:

$$|u(x)| \leq \frac{1}{\omega_3} \int_{B(x,1)} |u(y)| dy + \frac{1}{n\omega_3} \int_{B(x,1)} \frac{|Du(y)|}{|x - y|^{n-1}} dy, \quad (\text{A.57})$$

Applying Hölder's Inequality to both integrals yields, using $p = 4$, the following:

$$|u(x)| \leq \frac{1}{\omega_3} (\omega_3)^{\frac{3}{4}} \|u\|_{L^p(B(x,1))} + \frac{1}{n\omega_3} \left(\int_{B(x,1)} |x - y|^{\frac{4}{3}(n-1)} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \|Du\|_{L^p(B(x,1))}. \quad (\text{A.58})$$

The unit ball $B(x, 1)$ contains a translate of $\Omega = [0, 1]^3$. By periodicity we arrive at the following:

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x)| &\leq \omega_3^{-\frac{1}{4}} \|u\|_{L^p(T^3)} + \left(\int_{B(x,1)} |x - y|^{\frac{4}{3}(n-1)} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \|Du\|_{L^p(T^3)} \\ &\leq \max(\omega_3^{\frac{1}{4}}, \left(\int_{B(x,1)} |x - y|^{\frac{4}{3}(n-1)} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}}) \|u\|_{L_1^p(T^3)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.59})$$

We compute that in the case that $n=3$: $C_{41} = \max(\omega_3^{-\frac{1}{4}}, \left(\int_{B(x,1)} |x - y|^{\frac{8}{3}} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}}) \|u\|_{L_1^p(T^3)}$ \square

We prove a corollary that is used in Section 3

Corollary A.60. *Suppose $u \in L_2^p(T^3)$, then the following inequality holds:*

$$\|du\|_{C^0} \leq C_{41} \|du\|_{L_1^p}. \quad (\text{A.61})$$

The claim follows upon computation of the pointwise norm $|du|_{g_{\text{flat}}}$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \|du\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, C^0} &\leq \left\| \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^3 \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right)^2} \right\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, C^0} \\ &\leq C_{41} \left\| \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^3 \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \right)^2} \right\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, L_1^p} \\ &= C_{41} \|du\|_{g_{\text{flat}}, L_1^p}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.62})$$

\square

B Cut-off functions

The function S defined below was introduced in Perlin (2002) as the *smootherstep* function. It interpolates between 0 and 1 and is twice continuously differentiable.

Proposition B.1. *Let*

$$S : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$$

$$t \mapsto \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t < 0 \\ 6t^5 - 15t^4 + 10t^3 & \text{if } t \in [0, 1] \\ 1 & \text{if } t > 1 \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

define $Q = [0, 1]^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\tilde{Q} = [-1, 2]^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ and let

$$\chi : \tilde{Q} \rightarrow [0, 1]$$

$$x \mapsto d(x, Q) = \min_{q \in Q} |x - q|. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Then χ is twice continuously differentiable and

$$\left\| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \chi \right\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{Q})} \leq C_{42},$$

$$\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \chi \right\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{Q})} \leq C_{43}$$

$$\left\| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x \partial y} \chi \right\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{Q})} \leq C_{44}. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

for

$$C_{42} = -60(-6 + \frac{13}{6}(9 + \sqrt{3}) - \frac{1}{4}(9 + \sqrt{3})^2 + \frac{1}{108}(9 + \sqrt{3})^3), \quad C_{43} = 60(2\sqrt{3} - 3), \quad C_{44} = 20(5\sqrt{3} - 6).$$

The above inequalities hold up to permutation of x, y and z by the symmetry of the cut off function. We use these bounds to compute C_{20} and C_{21}

$$\|\Delta \chi\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{Q})} \leq 3C_{42},$$

$$\|D \chi\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{Q})} \leq \sqrt{3}C_{43},$$

$$\|D^2 \chi\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{Q})} \leq 3C_{44}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

We conclude that

$$C_{20} = 3C_{42},$$

$$C_{21} = \sqrt{3}C_{43},$$

$$C_{22} = 3C_{44}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

C Index of Constants

In this section we list all the constants used in this paper and where they arise. When the value of a certain constant is explicitly stated, it is larger than the constant computed by Mathematica. When computing future constants in terms of prior constants we use the values stored in Mathematica and then round up.

C.1 Section 2.2, Section 2.3

- $C_1 = \frac{1}{4\pi^2}\{C_{19}C_{40}(1 + 27\sqrt{17})\} + C_{19}(1 + 27C_{40})$, The main result of Section 3.1: injectivity estimate with respect to the flat metric, see Eq. (1.3)
- C_5, C_6 , bounds on Distribution Functions which allow us to prove the Calderon-Zygmund Estimate. Applying Eq. (A.1) to Eq. (2.5) proves Eq. (2.2)
- C_7, C_8 , these bounds are used to derive C_6
- C_{12} see Eq. (2.18) and (Gilbarg and Trudinger, 2001, Lemma 4.4)
- C_{13} , used in the proof of Eq. (2.2)
- C_{14} , in the proof of Eq. (2.2), see Eq. (2.22) and Eq. (2.23)
-

$$C_{\text{Calderon-Zygmund}}(n, p) = \begin{cases} C_{\text{Marcinkiewicz}}(1, 2, p')T_1^\alpha T_2^{1-\alpha} = 2(\frac{p'-2}{1-p'})^{1/p}T_1^\alpha T_2^{1-\alpha} & p > 2 \\ C_{\text{Marcinkiewicz}}(1, 2, p)T_1^\alpha T_2^{1-\alpha} = 2(\frac{p-2}{1-p})^{1/p}T_1^\alpha T_2^{1-\alpha} & p < 2 \\ 1 & p = 2 \end{cases}$$

see Eq. (2.2)

- $C_{15} = C_{\text{Calderon-Zygmund}}(3, 4) = 293.519$, this particular case of the Calderon-Zygmund estimate is used throughout the rest of Section 2.3 and Section 2.4, see Eq. (2.25)
- C_{16} , see Eq. (2.28), this shows L^2 orthogonality to $\text{Ker}\Delta$ in Eq. (1.5) is only necessary to bound the norm of $\|f\|$
- $C_{17} = (\frac{1}{\omega_n}|\Omega|)^{\frac{1}{n}}$, an explicit estimate for the Poincaré Inequality, see Eq. (A.24), is dependent on $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$
- $C_{18} = (\frac{81}{4\pi})^{\frac{1}{3}}$, the explicit value for the Poincaré Inequality Eq. (A.24) when $\Omega = \tilde{Q}$.
- $C_{19} = 27(1 + C_{16}C_{20} + (2 + 54(27)\sqrt{17})C_{16}C_{23}C_{22}C_{39})$, denotes an explicit value for which the Schauder Estimate holds on T^3 , see Eq. (2.31)
- C_{20} , maximum value of the Laplacian of the cutoff function used in the proof of Eq. (2.31)
- C_{21} , maximum value of the derivative of the cutoff function. The cutoff function is defined in Eq. (B.1).
- C_{22} , largest entry of the second derivative of the cutoff function, Eq. (B.1)
- $C_{23} = 27^{\frac{3}{4}}$, This is the explicit Holder Constant in the following case.

$$\|f\|_{L^4([-1, 2]^3)} \leq C_{23} \|f\|_{L^6([-1, 2]^3)}$$

C.2 Section 2.4

- C_2 : denotes an amount we are able to perturb the metric so that our injectivity estimate still holds, see Eq. (1.5)
- C_3 , The main result of Section 3.2, see Eq. (1.5)
- C_{24} The explicit upper bound in Eq. (2.67)

- C_{25} Eq. (2.41)
- C_{26} See Eq. (2.67), this is an estimate that is required for the application in Section 4.
- $C_{27} = (1 - \delta)^3 - 2\delta^3 - 3(1 + \delta)\delta^2$ A lower bound for the determinant of the perturbed metric, see Eq. (2.44)
- $C_{28} = (1 + \delta)^3 + 2\delta^3 + 3(1 + \delta)\delta^2$ An upper bound for the determinant of the perturbed metric, see Eq. (2.44)
- C_{29} Compares pointwise norms of covectors when taken with respect to the flat metric and the perturbed metric, this is the lower bound, see Eq. (2.57)
- C_{30} Compares pointwise norms of covectors when taken with respect to the flat metric and the perturbed metric, this is the upper bound, see Eq. (2.57)
- C_{32} Compares pointwise norms of covariant 2-tensors when taken with respect to the flat metric and the perturbed metric, see Eq. (2.57)
- C_{33} See Eq. (2.62), this is a bound on the value of the Christoffel Symbols for the perturbed metric.
- C_{34} is an explicit value for the lower bound in Eq. (2.69)
- C_{35} is an explicit value for the upper bound in Eq. (2.69),
- C_{36} , the constant computed in Eq. (2.79), this is necessary to compare the norm of the laplacian between the flat and perturbed metrics.

C.3 Section 3

- C_{38} is defined in Eq. (3.7)
- C_{39} The optimal Sobolev Embedding constant for the embedding $L^2_{2,0} \hookrightarrow L^4$, this is Eq. (A.19)
- C_{40} , an explicit Sobolev Embedding constant for the embedding $L^2_2 \hookrightarrow L^4$ when $\Omega = [0, 1]^3$, this is Eq. (A.22)
- C_{41} An explicit bound for the constant appearing in Morrey's Inequality.

References

- Aubin, T. (1998). *Some Non-Linear Problems in Riemannian Geometry*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg. 21
- Besse, A. L. (1987). *Einstein manifolds*, volume 10 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin. 2
- Chavel, I. (1984). *Eigenvalues in Riemannian geometry*, volume 115 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Academic Press, Inc., Orlando, FL. Including a chapter by Burton Randol, With an appendix by Jozef Dodziuk. 11
- Evans, L. C. (2010). *Partial Differential Equations*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2nd edition. 24

- Gilbarg, D. and Trudinger, N. S. (2001). *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin. Reprint of the 1998 edition. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27
- Güneysu, B. and Pigola, S. (2018a). Nonlinear Calderón-Zygmund inequalities for maps. *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.*, 54(3):353–364. 2
- Güneysu, B. and Pigola, S. (2018b). Quantitative C^1 -estimates on manifolds. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (13):4103–4119. 2
- Hardy, Littlewood, P. (1952). Cambridge University Press. 8, 9
- Hebey, E. and Robert, F. (2008). Sobolev spaces on manifolds. *Handbook of Global Analysis*. 3
- Hoffmann-Ostenhof, M., Hoffmann-Ostenhof, T., and Nadirashvili, N. (1997). The nodal line of the second eigenfunction of the Laplacian in \mathbf{R}^2 can be closed. *Duke Math. J.*, 90(3):631–640. 2
- Jost, J. (2014). *Partial Differential Equations*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer New York, NY. 10
- Joyce, D. and Karigiannis, S. (2021). A new construction of compact torsion-free G_2 -manifolds by gluing families of Eguchi-Hanson spaces. *J. Differential Geom.*, 117(2):255–343. 2, 3
- Mizuguchi, Tanaka, Sekine, and Oishi (2017). Estimation of sobolev embedding constant on a domain dividable into bounded convex domains. *Journal of inequalities and applications*. 22
- Nakao, M. T., Plum, M., and Watanabe, Y. ([2019] ©2019). *Numerical verification methods and computer-assisted proofs for partial differential equations*, volume 53 of *Springer Series in Computational Mathematics*. Springer, Singapore. 2
- Perlin, K. (2002). Improving noise. In *Proceedings of the 29th annual conference on Computer graphics and interactive techniques*, pages 681–682. 25
- Plum, M. (1992). Explicit H_2 -estimates and pointwise bounds for solutions of second-order elliptic boundary value problems. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 165(1):36–61. 2
- Stein, S. (2005). *Real Analysis: Measure Theory, Integration and Hilbert Spaces*. Princeton Lectures In Analysis. Princeton University Press. 5
- Taubes, C. H. (1982). Self-dual Yang-Mills connections on non-self-dual 4-manifolds. *J. Differential Geometry*, 17(1):139–170. 2