

# Lee's Introduction to Smooth Manifolds: Chapter 1 Assorted Notes, Proofs and Exercises

Jack Ceroni\*

(Dated: Saturday 29<sup>th</sup> July, 2023)

## I. Exercise 1.1

For both definitions, it is clear that the new subsumes the old, as both open balls and  $\mathbb{R}^n$  are open neighbourhoods around every point of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Conversely, if we assume the original definition, then given some point  $p \in M$  and local homeomorphism  $\varphi : U \rightarrow \widehat{U}$ , then we can find an open ball  $B$  around  $\varphi(p)$ , and note that the restriction  $\varphi : \varphi^{-1}(B) \rightarrow B$  is a homeomorphism, so  $p$  has a neighbourhood homeomorphic to an open ball. As for the other case, this follows from the fact that open  $n$ -balls are homeomorphic to  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

---

## II. Example 1.4

We wish to show that the  $n$ -sphere is a manifold. The Hausdorff condition and second-countability are clearly inherited from the global space. As for the local Euclidean condition, the general strategy is to separate the sphere into different parts. Let  $p = (p_1, \dots, p_{n+1})$  be a point on the  $n$ -sphere. Clearly, there must exist some coordinate  $p_k \neq 0$ . We let

$$U_p = \{(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}) \mid x_k^2 = 1 - x_{n+1}^2 - \dots - x_{k+1}^2 - x_{k-1}^2 - \dots - x_1^2 \text{ and } \text{sign}(x_k) = \text{sign}(p_k)\} \quad (1)$$

Clearly,  $U_p = S^n \cap \mathbb{R}_k^{\text{sign}(p_k)}$ , which is open in the subspace topology. Let  $\pi_k : U_p \rightarrow \pi_k(U_p)$  be the projection onto all coordinates *except for the  $k$ -th*. Define

$$\pi_k^{-1}(x) = \pi_k^{-1}(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{n+1}) = (x_1, \dots, f_k(x), \dots, x_{n+1}) \quad (2)$$

where  $f_k(x) = \text{sign}(p_k) \sqrt{1 - x_{n+1}^2 - \dots - x_1^2}$  is clearly continuous. It is easy to check that  $\pi_k^{-1}$  is the well-defined inverse of  $\pi_k$ , and both maps are continuous, so  $\pi_k(U_p)$  is open, and  $\pi_k$  is the desired local homeomorphism.

---

## III. Lemma 1.10

Note that  $M$  is second-countable, let  $\mathcal{B}$  be the countable basis. For each  $p \in M$ , note that there exists a local homeomorphism  $\varphi : U \rightarrow \widehat{U}$ , where  $U$  contains  $p$ . Since there exists some  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  with  $p \in B \subset U$ ,  $B$  is homeomorphic to an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Thus, we have a countable subcollection  $\mathcal{B}'$  of elements of  $\mathcal{B}$  such that each  $p \in M$  is contained in some element of  $\mathcal{B}'$  and each element of  $\mathcal{B}'$  is homeomorphic (via some  $\varphi_B$ ) to an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

For each  $B \in \mathcal{B}'$ , let  $S_B$  denote the countable collection of all open balls of rational radius contained in  $\varphi_B(B)$ , centred at rational points. Let  $\varphi_B^{-1}(S_B)$  denote the inverse image of each of these balls, which are all open. Clearly, given some  $p \in U$  open in  $M$ ,  $p$  is contained in some  $B \in \mathcal{B}'$ , and  $B \cap U$  is an open subset of  $B$ , so  $\varphi_B(B \cap U)$  is open in  $\varphi_B(B)$ . We can pick an open ball in  $S_B$  containing  $\varphi_B(p)$ , so  $p$  is contained in some element of  $\varphi_B^{-1}(S_B)$  which is contained in  $B$ . Let  $S = \cup_{B \in \mathcal{B}'} S_B$ . Suppose  $\varphi_{B_1}^{-1}(B_1), \varphi_{B_2}^{-1}(B_2) \in S$  are two preimages of open balls with non-empty (thus open) intersection,  $U$ . Then the images  $\varphi_{B_1}(U)$  and

---

\* jackceroni@gmail.com

$\varphi_{B_2}(U)$  will intersect as and be open, so we can find some open ball  $B$  at a rational point, of rational radius, in this intersection, so  $\varphi_{B_1}^{-1}(B)$  (and  $\varphi_{B_2}^{-1}(B)$ ) are in  $U$ . Thus,  $S$  satisfies the intersection condition, and is in fact a countable basis of coordinate balls (as it is a countable intersection of countable sets).

Finally, note that since each  $\varphi_B$  is a homeomorphism,  $\overline{\varphi_B^{-1}(B)} = \varphi_B^{-1}(\overline{B})$ . Since  $\overline{B}$  is compact, so too is  $\varphi_B^{-1}(\overline{B})$  and thus  $\overline{\varphi_B^{-1}(B)}$ .

#### IV. Exercise 1.14

We begin with the first claim. Suppose  $\mathcal{X}$  is locally finite, let  $x$  be a point of the topological space. Then there exists a neighbourhood  $U$  intersecting only  $X_1, \dots, X_N$ . Suppose  $U$  intersects some  $\overline{X_M}$  not in this set. Then by definition,  $U$  contains a point  $y$  where every neighbourhood of  $y$  intersects  $X_M$ , so  $U$  intersects  $X_M$ , a contradiction. Thus,  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}$  is locally finite.

Next, note that  $\cup_{X \in \mathcal{X}} \overline{X} \subset \overline{\cup_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X}$  trivially. To prove inclusion the other way, given  $x \in \overline{\cup_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X}$ , note that every open set of  $x$  intersects the union at a finite number of  $X$ . If there isn't some  $X'$  intersected by all neighbourhoods, we can pick some neighbourhood  $U$  which intersects  $X_1, \dots, X_M$  and neighbourhood  $U_1, \dots, U_M$  where  $U_k$  does not intersect  $X_k$ . Then  $U \cap U_1 \cap \dots \cap U_M$  does not intersect any element of  $\mathcal{X}$ , which is a contradiction.

#### V. Proposition 1.16

*This result is very simple when it is understood diagrammatically*

We first require a lemma.

**Lemma V.1** (Lebesgue Number Lemma). Suppose  $X$  is a compact set in a metric space and  $\mathcal{A}$  is an open cover. Then there exists some  $\delta > 0$  such that every subset of  $X$  having diameter less than  $\delta$  is contained in an element of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $A_1, \dots, A_N$  be a finite subcover. The key idea is to use extreme value theorem. Define the function  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N d(x, X - A_k), \quad (3)$$

the average distance from  $x$  to the exterior of each  $A_k$ . Clearly,  $x \in A_k$ , for some  $A_k$  open, so the minimum value of  $f$  must be greater than 0. Set it to  $\delta$ . Suppose  $U$  has diameter less than  $\delta$ . Suppose  $U$  is not contained in a single  $A_k$ . Then, there exist points  $x$  and  $y$  of  $U$  not contained in a common  $A_k$ , with  $d(x, y) \leq \delta$ . Then, clearly,  $d(x, y) \geq d(x, X - A_k)$  for each  $A_k$ . But then,  $f(x) < \delta$ , a contradiction. It follows that  $U$  must be contained in a single  $A_k$ , so the lemma holds.  $\square$

Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a countable basis for  $M$ , let  $B, B' \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $B \cap B'$  is non-empty. Since  $B \cap B'$  is a manifold, it has a finite number of connected components, which are also path-connected. Pick some  $x$  from each component. Then, for all pairs of  $B, B' \in \mathcal{B}$ , take all such points  $x$  and combine them into a set  $\mathcal{X}$ . For each pair of points  $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$  where  $x, x' \in B$ , let  $h_{x,x'}^B(t)$  be a path between them.

Assume  $M$  is path-connected. Let us pick some  $p \in \mathcal{X}$ . Let  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$  be a loop in  $\pi_1(M, p)$ . The collection of  $f^{-1}(B)$  for  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  will clearly cover  $[0, 1]$ , so there exists a finite subcover,  $f^{-1}(B_1), \dots, f^{-1}(B_N)$ .

**WIP**