

The Atiyah Patodi Singer signature formula for measured foliations

Paolo Antonini

Paolo.Antonini@mathematik.uni-regensburg.de

paolo.anton@gmail.com

June 21, 2024

Abstract

Let (X_0, \mathcal{F}_0) be a compact manifold with boundary endowed with a foliation \mathcal{F}_0 which is assumed to be measured and transverse to the boundary. We denote by Λ a holonomy invariant transverse measure on (X_0, \mathcal{F}_0) and by \mathcal{R}_0 the equivalence relation of the foliation. Let (X, \mathcal{F}) be the corresponding manifold with cylindrical end and extended foliation with equivalence relation \mathcal{R} .

In the paper [1] we proved a formula for the L^2 - Λ index of a longitudinal Dirac-type operator $D^{\mathcal{F}}$ on X in the spirit of Alain Connes' non commutative geometry [8].

Here we specialize ourselves to the signature operator. We define three types of signature for the pair (foliation, boundary foliation): the analytic signature, denoted $\sigma_{\Lambda, \text{an}}(X, \partial X_0)$ is the L^2 - Λ -index of the signature operator on the cylinder; the Hodge signature $\sigma_{\Lambda, \text{Hodge}}(X, \partial X_0)$, defined using the natural representation of \mathcal{R} on the field of square integrable harmonic forms on the leaves and the de Rham signature, $\sigma_{\Lambda, \text{dR}}(X, \partial X_0)$, defined using the natural representation of \mathcal{R}_0 on the field of relative de Rham spaces of the leaves. We prove that these three signatures coincide

$$\sigma_{\Lambda, \text{an}}(X_0, \partial X_0) = \sigma_{\Lambda, \text{Hodge}}(X, \partial X_0) = \sigma_{\Lambda, \text{dR}}(X, \partial X_0).$$

As a consequence of these equalities and of the index formula we finally obtain the main result of this work, the Atiyah-Patodi-Singer signature formula for measured foliations:

$$\sigma_{\Lambda, \text{dR}}(X, \partial X_0) = \langle L(T\mathcal{F}_0), C_{\Lambda} \rangle + 1/2[\eta_{\Lambda}(D^{\mathcal{F}\partial})]$$

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Geometric Setting	5
3	The Hirzebruch formula	6
4	Computations with the leafwise signature operator	7
5	The Analytic signature	9
6	Fields of sesquilinear forms	9
7	The Hodge signature	9

8 Analytical signature=Hodge signature	10
9 The L^2-de Rham signature	10
9.0.1 manifolds with boundary with bounded geometry	10
9.0.2 Random Hilbert complexes	12
9.0.3 Definition of the de Rham signature	14
10 L^2 de Rham signature=Hodge signature	15
10.0.4 The boundary foliation and \mathcal{R}_0	15
10.0.5 Weakly exact sequences	17
10.0.6 Spectral density functions and Fredholm complexes.	18
10.0.7 The proof	24

1 Introduction

Let X_0 be a $4k$ -dimensional oriented manifold without boundary. One can give four different definitions of the signature.

- The topological signature $\sigma(X_0)$ is defined as the signature of the intersection form in the middle degree cohomology; $(x, y) := \langle x \cup y, [X_0] \rangle$, $x, y \in H^{2k}(X_0, \mathbb{R})$.
- The de Rham signature $\sigma_{\text{dR}}(X_0)$ is the signature of the Poincaré intersection form in the middle de Rham cohomology; $([\omega], [\phi]) := \int_{X_0} \omega \wedge \phi$; $\omega, \phi \in H_{dR}^{2k}(X_0)$.
- The Hodge signature, $\sigma_{\text{Hodge}}(X_0)$ is the signature of the Poincaré intersection form defined in the space of $2k$ Harmonic forms with respect to some choosen Riemannian structure; $(\omega, \phi) := \int_{X_0} \omega \wedge \phi$; $\omega, \phi \in \mathcal{H}^{2k}(X_0)$.
- The analytical signature is the index of the chiral signature operator¹

$$\sigma_{\text{an}}(X_0) := \text{ind}(D^{\text{sign},+}).$$

One can prove that all these numbers coincide,

$$\sigma(X_0) = \sigma_{\text{dR}}(X_0) = \sigma_{\text{Hodge}}(X_0) = \sigma_{\text{an}}(X_0). \tag{1}$$

The Hirzebruch formula

$$\sigma(X_0) = \int_{X_0} L(X_0)$$

can be proven using cobordism arguments as in the original treatment of Hirzebruch or can be seen as a consequence of the Atiyah–Singer index formula together with Hodge theory [5]. If $\widetilde{X}_0 \rightarrow X_0$ is a Galois covering with deck group Γ with X_0 as above Atiyah [3] used the Von Neumann algebra associated to the regular right representation of Γ to normalize the signature on the L^2 -middle degree harmonic forms on the total space. This signature $\sigma_\Gamma(X_0)$ again enters in a Hirzebruch type formula

$$\sigma_\Gamma(X_0) = \int_{X_0} L(X_0).$$

¹this is the differential operator $d + d^*$ acting on the complex of differential forms, odd w.r.t. the natural chiral grading $\tau := (-1)^k * (-1)^{\frac{1-1(1-1)}{2}}$, $D^{\text{sign}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & D^{\text{sign},-} \\ D^{\text{sign},+} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$

This is the celebrated Atiyah L^2 -signature theorem.

The Atiyah L^2 -signature theorem was extended by Alain Connes [8] to the situation in which the total space X_0 is foliated by an even dimensional foliation. This is the realm of the *non-commutative geometry*.

What can one say if X_0 has non empty boundary ?

So let now X_0 be an oriented compact manifold with boundary and suppose the metric is product type near the boundary. Attach an infinite cylinder across the boundary to form the manifold with cylindrical ends,

$$X = X_0 \bigcup_{\partial X_0} [\partial X_0 \times [0, \infty)]$$

In the seminal paper by Atiyah Patodi and Singer [4] is shown that the Fredholm index of the generalized boundary value problem with the pseudodifferential APS boundary condition on X_0 for the signature operator (or a chiral Dirac type operator) is connected to the L^2 -index of the extended operator on X . Indeed this Fredholm index is the L^2 -index on X plus a defect depending on the space of extended solutions on the cylinder. More precisely the operator on the cylinder acting on the natural space of L^2 -sections is no more Fredholm (in the general case in which the boundary operator is not invertible) but its kernel and the kernel of its formal adjoint are finite dimensional and this difference is given by the formula²

$$\text{ind}_{L^2}(D^+) = \int_{X_0} \hat{A}(X, \nabla) \text{Ch}(E) + \frac{\eta(0)}{2} + \frac{h_\infty(D^-) - h_\infty(D^+)}{2};$$

where $h_\infty(D^\pm)$ are the dimensions of the limiting values of the extended L^2 -solutions and $\eta(0)$ is the eta invariant of the boundary operator.

Then, in the case of the signature operator, in dimension $4k$ the authors investigate the relationship between the APS index of the operator on X_0 , the signature of the pair $(X_0, \partial X_0)$, the L^2 -index on X and the space of square integrable harmonic forms on X . The conclusion is that the signature $\sigma(X_0)$ is exactly the L^2 -index on the cylinder i.e. the difference of the dimensions h^\pm of positive/negative square integrable harmonic forms³ on X ,

$$\sigma(X_0) = h^+ - h^- = \text{ind}_{L^2}(D^{\text{sign},+})$$

while $h_\infty(D^{\text{sign},-}) = h_\infty(D^{\text{sign},+})$ by specific simmetries of the signature operator. In particular the APS signature formula becomes

$$\sigma(X_0) = \int_{X_0} L(X_0, \nabla) + \eta(D_{|\partial X_0}^{\text{sign}}).$$

In the case of Γ -Galois coverings of a manifold with boundary with a cylinder attached, $\tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ this program is partially carried on by Vaillant [25] in his Master thesis. More specifically he establishes a Von Neumann index formula in the sense of Atiyah [3] for a Dirac type operator and relates this index with the Γ -dimensions of the harmonic forms on the total space. The remaining part of the story i.e. the relation with the topologically defined L^2 -signature is carried out by Lück and Schick [13]. Call the index of Vaillant the analytical L^2 -signature of the compact piece X_0 , in symbols $\sigma_{\text{an},(2)}(X_0)$ while $\sigma_{\text{Hodge}}(X_0)$ is the L^2 signature defined using harmonic forms on \tilde{X} . Then Vaillant proves that

$$\sigma_{\text{an},(2)}(X_0) = \int_{X_0} L(X_0, \nabla) + \eta_\Gamma(D_{|\partial \tilde{X}}^{\text{sign}}) = \sigma_{\text{Hodge}}(X_0).$$

²opposite orientation w.r.t. APS

³indeed the intersection form is passes to be non-degenerate to the image of the relative cohomology into the absolute one. This vector space is naturally isomorphic to the space of L^2 -harmonic forms on X .

Luck and Schick define other different types of L^2 -signatures; de Rham $\sigma_{\text{dR},(2)}(X_0)$ and simplicial $\sigma_{\text{top},(2)}(X_0)$ and prove that they are all the same and coincide with the signatures of Vaillant. To be more precise they prove

$$\sigma_{\text{Hodge}}(X_0) = \sigma_{\text{dR},(2)}(X_0) = \sigma_{\text{top},(2)}(X_0).$$

None of these steps are easy adaptations of the closed case since in the classical proof a fundamental role is played by the existence of a gap around the zero in the spectrum of the boundary operator. This situation fails to be true in non compact (also cocompact) ambients.

In this paper we carry out this program for a foliated manifold with cylindrical ends endowed with a holonomy invariant measure Λ [8]. The framework is that explained by Connes in his seminal paper on non commutative integration theory [8]. Making use in a crucial way of the various semifinite Von Neumann algebras associated to square integrable representations of the Borel groupoid defined by the equivalence relation \mathcal{R} we extended in [1] the index formula of Vaillant.

THEOREM 1.0 — The Dirac operator has finite dimensional $L^2 - \Lambda$ -index and the following formula holds

$$\text{ind}_{L^2,\Lambda}(D^+) = \langle \widehat{A}(X) \text{Ch}(E/S), C_\Lambda \rangle + 1/2[\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}\partial}) - h_\Lambda^+ + h_\Lambda^-]. \quad (2)$$

The dimensions of the spaces of extended solutions, h_Λ^\pm are suitably defined using the fields of extended solutions along the leaves. The foliation eta invariant is defined by Ramachandran [17] and the usual integral in the APS formula is changed into the distributional pairing of a tangential distributional form with the Ruelle–Sullivan current [14]. Some work is needed to show that for the signature operator $h_\Lambda^+ = h_\Lambda^-$. Inspired by the definitions of Lück and Schick [13] we pass study three different representations of \mathcal{R}_0 (the equivalence relation of the foliation on the compact piece X_0) in order to define the Analytical Signature, $\sigma_{\Lambda,\text{an}}(X_0, \partial X_0)$ (i.e. the measured index of the signature operator on the cylinder), the de Rham signature $\sigma_{\Lambda,\text{dR}}(X_0, \partial X_0)$ (i.e the one induced by the representation which is valued in the relative de Rham spaces of the leaves) and the Hodge signature, $\sigma_{\Lambda,\text{Hodge}}(X_0, \partial X_0)$ (defined in terms of the representation of \mathcal{R}_0 in the harmonic forms on the leaves of the foliation on X).

Combining a generalization of the notion of the L^2 long exact sequence of the pair (foliation, boundary foliation), in the sense of sequences of Random Hilbert complexes (the analog of the homology L^2 long sequence of Hilbert Γ -modules in Cheeger and Gromov [7]) together with the analysis of boundary value problems of [23], we show that the methods in [13] can be generalized to give the following

THEOREM 1.0 — The above three notions of the Λ -signature for the foliation on X_0 coincide,

$$\sigma_{\Lambda,\text{dR}}(X, X_0) = \sigma_{\Lambda,\text{Hodge}}(X, X_0) = \sigma_{\Lambda,\text{an}}(X, X_0)$$

and the following APS signature formula holds true

$$\sigma_{\Lambda,\text{an}}(X_0, \partial X_0) = \langle L(X), C_\Lambda \rangle + 1/2[\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}\partial})]$$

2 Geometric Setting

A p -dimensional foliation \mathcal{F} on a manifold with boundary X_0 is transverse to the boundary if it is given by a foliated atlas $\{U_\alpha\}$ with homeomorphisms $\phi_\alpha : U_\alpha \rightarrow V_\alpha \times W_\alpha$ with V_α open in $\mathbb{H}^p := \{(x_1, \dots, x_p) \in \mathbb{R}^p : x_1 \geq 0\}$ and W_α open in \mathbb{R}^q with change of coordinated $\phi_\alpha(u, v)$ of the form

$$v' = \phi(v, w), \quad w' = \psi(w) \quad (3)$$

(ψ is a local diffeomorphism). Such an atlas is assumed to be maximal among all collections of this type. The integer p is the dimension of the foliation, q its codimension and $p + q = \dim(X_0)$. In each foliated chart, the connected components of subsets as $\phi_\alpha^{-1}(V_\alpha \times \{w\})$ are called plaques. The plaques coalesce (thanks to the change of coordinate condition (3)) to give maximal connected injectively immersed (not embedded !) submanifolds called leaves. One uses the notation \mathcal{F} for the set of leaves. Note that in general each leaf passes infinitely times through a foliated chart so a foliation is only locally a fibration. Taking the tangent spaces to the leaves one gets an integrable subbundle $T\mathcal{F} \subset TX_0$ that's transverse to the boundary i.e $T\partial X_0 + T\mathcal{F} = TX_0$ in other words the boundary is a submanifold that's transverse to the foliation. Let given on X a smooth oriented foliation \mathcal{F} with leaves of dimension $2p$ respecting the cylindrical structure i.e.

1. The submanifold ∂X_0 is transversal to the foliation and inherits a $(2p - 1, q)$ foliation $\mathcal{F}_\partial = \mathcal{F}|_{\partial X_0}$ with foliated atlas given by $\phi_\alpha : U_\alpha \cap \partial X_0 \rightarrow \partial V_\alpha \times W_\alpha$. Note that the codimension is the same.
2. The restriction of the foliation on the cylinder is product type $\mathcal{F}|_Z = \mathcal{F}_\partial \times [0, \infty)$.

Note that these conditions imply that the foliation is normal to the boundary. We are going to introduce the notation for general Dirac type operators, we will specialize to the signature operator in the next section. The orientation we choose is the one given by $(e_1, \dots, e_{2p-1}, \partial_r)$ where (e_1, \dots, e_{2p-1}) is a positive leafwise frame for the induced boundary foliation. As explained in [4] this is a way to fix the boundary Dirac type operator. Let $E \rightarrow X$ be a leafwise Clifford bundle with leafwise Clifford connection ∇^E and Hermitian metric h^E . Suppose each geometric structure is of product type on the cylinder meaning that if $\rho : \partial X_0 \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \partial X_0$ is the base projection

$$E|_Z \simeq \rho^*(E|_{\partial X_0}), \quad h|_{\partial X_0}^E = \rho^*(h|_{\partial X_0}^E), \quad \nabla|_Z^E = \rho^*(\nabla|_{\partial X_0}^E).$$

Each geometric object restricts to the leaves to give a longitudinal Clifford module that's canonically \mathbb{Z}_2 graded by the leafwise chirality element. One can check immediately that the positive and negative boundary eigenbundles $E_{\partial X_0}^+$ and $E_{\partial X_0}^-$ are both modules for the Clifford structure of the boundary foliation. Leafwise Clifford multiplication by ∂_r induces an isomorphism of leafwise Clifford modules between the positive and negative eigenbundles $c(\partial_r) : E_{\partial X_0}^+ \rightarrow E_{\partial X_0}^-$. Put $F = E_{\partial X_0}^+$ the whole Clifford module on the cylinder $E|_Z$ can be identified with the pullback $\rho^*(F \oplus F)$ with the following action: tangent vectors to the boundary foliation $v \in T\mathcal{F}_\partial$ acts as $c^E(v) \simeq c^F(v)\Omega$ with $\Omega = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ while in the cylindrical direction $c^F(\partial_r) \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. In particular one can form the longitudinal Dirac operator assuming under the above identification the shape⁴

$$D = c(\partial_r)\partial_r + c|_{\mathcal{F}_\partial} \nabla^{E|_{\mathcal{F}_\partial}} = c(\partial_r)\partial_r + \Omega D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial} = c(-\partial_r)[- \partial_r - c(-\partial_r)\Omega D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}]. \quad (4)$$

⁴we choose to insert $-\partial_r$ the inward pointing normal to help the comparison with the orientation of A.P.S

Here $D^{\mathcal{F}\partial}$ is the leafwise Dirac operator on the boundary foliation. In the following, these identifications will be omitted letting D act directly on $F \oplus F$ according to

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & D^- \\ D^+ & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\partial_r + D^{\mathcal{F}\partial} \\ \partial_r + D^{\mathcal{F}\partial} & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \partial_u + D^{\mathcal{F}\partial} \\ -\partial_u + D^{\mathcal{F}\partial} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $u = -r$, $\partial_u = -\partial_r$ (interior unit normal) note this is the opposite of A.P.S. notation. Remember that the signature operator is the Dirac operator corresponding to the natural Clifford module structure on the bundle of exterior algebras. We shall enter in details in the next section.

Suppose also the manifold is endowen with a holonomy invariant transverse measure Λ . Call \mathcal{R}_0 and \mathcal{R} the equivalence relations of the foliations on X_0 and X respectively both seen as measured groupoids with their natural Borel structure.

3 The Hirzebruch formula

The reference for the notation about the signature operator is the book by Berline Getzler and Vergne [5]. Let X be an oriented Riemannian manifold and $|dvol|$ the unique volume form compatible with the metric i.e. the one assuming the value 1 on each positive oriented orthonormal frame. In other words $|dvol| = |\sqrt{g}dx|$. Define the Hodge $*$ operator in the usual way, $*e^{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge e^{i_k} = \text{sign}(\sigma)e_{j_1} \wedge \dots \wedge e_{i_{n-k}}$ where (e_1, \dots, e_n) is an oriented orthonormal basis, (i_1, \dots, i_k) and (j_1, \dots, j_k) are complementary multindices and σ is the permutation $\sigma := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & n \\ i_1 & \cdot & i_k & j_1 & \cdot & j_{n-k} \end{pmatrix}$. Since $*^2 = (-1)^{|\cdot|(n-|\cdot|)}$ this is an involution on even dimensional manifolds.

The bundle ΛT^*X of exterior algebras of X is a natural Clifford module under the action defined by $c(e^i) := \epsilon(e_i) - \iota(e^i)$ where $\epsilon(e^i)\omega = e^i \wedge \omega$ is the exterior multiplication by e^i and $\iota(e_i)$ is the contraction by the tangent vector e_i . Contraction and exterior multiplication are related one to each other by the metric adjunction, $\epsilon(e^i)^* = \iota(e_i)$. The chirality involution is $\tau := i^{[(n+1)/2]}c(e_1) \dots c(e_n)$ and is related to the Hodge duality operator by $\tau = i^{[(n+1)/2]} * (-1)^{n|\cdot| + \frac{|\cdot|(|\cdot|-1)}{2}}$, following from the identity (same deegree forms)

$$\int_X \alpha \wedge \tau \beta = (-1)^{n|\cdot| + |\cdot|(|\cdot|-1)/2} i^{[2n+1]/2} \int_X (\alpha, \beta) |dx|$$

while $\int_X \alpha \wedge * \beta = \int_X (\alpha, \beta) |dx|$. As a consequence one can write the adjoint of d in two different ways,

$$d^* = - * d * (-1)^{n|\cdot| + n} = -(-1)^n \tau d \tau.$$

Sections of the positive and negative eigenbundles of τ are called the self-dual and anti self-dual differential forms respectively and denoted by $\Omega^\pm(X)$.

Now suppose n is even, and X is compact. The bilinear form on the middle cohomolgy $H^{n/2}(X; \mathbb{R})$ defined by $(\alpha, \beta) \mapsto \int_X \alpha \wedge \beta$ satisfies the identity $(\alpha, \beta) = (-1)^{n/2}(\beta, \alpha)$. In particular if n is divisible by four this is symmetric and has a signature $\sigma(X)$ i.e. the number $p - q$ related to the representation $Q(x) = x_1^2 + \dots + x_p^2 - x_{p+1}^2 - \dots - x_q^2$ of the associated quadratic form (this is independent by the choosen basis). In this situation the chiral Dirac operator $d + d^*$ acting on the space of differential forms is called the Signature operator⁵

$$(d + d^*) = D^{\text{sign}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & D^{\text{sign}, -} \\ D^{\text{sign}, +} & 0 \end{pmatrix} : \Omega^+(X) \oplus \Omega^-(X) \longrightarrow \Omega^+(X) \oplus \Omega^-(X)$$

⁵it differs from the Gauss-Bonnet operator $d + d^*$ only for the choice of the involution

The Atiyah–Singer index theorem specializes, for the signature, to the Hirzebruch theorem

$$\text{ind}(D^{\text{sign},+}) = \sigma(X) = \int_X L(X)$$

where $L(X)$ is the L-genus, $L(X) = (\pi i)^{-n/2} \det^{1/2} \left(\frac{R}{\tanh(R/2)} \right)$ for the Riemannian curvature R . The relationship between the Hirzebruch formula that admits a purely topological proof (based on cobordism) and the Atiyah–Singer formula is given by the Hodge theorem stating a natural isomorphism between the space of harmonic forms $\mathcal{H}^q(X)$ i.e. the kernel of the forms laplacian $\Delta = (d + d^*)^2$ and the cohomology $H^q(X)$ together with Poincaré duality.

Now on a $4k$ -dimensional manifold with boundary with product structure the situation is much more complicated. The signature formula is the most important application of the index theorem in the A.P.S. paper. The operator can be written on a collar around the boundary as $D^{\text{sign},+} = \sigma(\partial_u + B)$ with the isomorphism $\sigma : \Omega(\partial X) \rightarrow \Omega^+(X)$ and B is the self-adjoint operator on $\Omega(\partial X)$ defined by $B\alpha = (-1)^{k+p+1}(*_\partial d - d*_\partial)\alpha$ with $\epsilon(\alpha) = \pm 1$ according to α even or odd degree while $*_\partial$ is the Hodge duality operator on ∂X . Since B commutes with $\alpha \mapsto (-1)^{|\alpha|} *_\partial \alpha$ and preserves the parity of forms we have the splitting $B = B^{\text{ev}} \oplus B^{\text{odd}}$ and the dimension of the kernel at the boundary as the η invariant are twice that of B^{ev} . The A.P.S index theorem says

$$\text{ind}(D^{\text{sign},+}) = \underbrace{h^+ - h^-}_{\text{ind}_{L^2}(D^{\text{sign},+})} - h_\infty^- = \int_X L - h(B^{\text{ev}}) - \eta(B^{\text{ev}})$$

where h^\pm are the dimensions of the L^2 -harmonic forms on the manifold \widehat{X} with a cylinder attached and h_∞^- is the dimension of the limiting values of the extended L^2 -harmonic forms in $\Omega^-(X)$.

The identifications of all these numbers with topological quantities require some work.

1. The space $\mathcal{H}(\widehat{X})$ of L^2 -harmonic forms on the elonged manifold \widehat{X} is naturally isomorphic to the image $\widehat{H}(X)$ of the natural map⁶ $H_0^*(\widehat{X}) \rightarrow H^*(\widehat{X})$. Equivalently one can use the relative de Rham cohomology $H^*(X, \partial X) \rightarrow H^*(X)$ defined with boundary conditions $\omega|_{\partial X} = 0$ on the de Rham complex. This is the role played by Hodge theory in the boundary case.
2. The signature $\sigma(X)$ of a manifold with boundary is defined to be the signature of the non-degenerate quadratic form on the middle-cohomology $\widehat{H}^{2k}(X)$. This is induced by the degenerate quadratic form given by the cup-product on the relative cohomology $H^{2k}(X, \partial X)$. By Lefschetz duality the radical of this quadratic form is exactly the kernel of the mapping $H^{2k}(X, \partial X) \rightarrow H^{2k}(X)$ then $\sigma(X) = h^+ - h^- = \text{ind}_{L^2}(A)$.
3. Finally A.P.S get rid of the third number h_∞^- proving that $h_\infty^- = h_\infty^+ = h(B^{\text{ev}})$ that together with $h_\infty^+ + h_\infty^- = 2h(B^{\text{ev}})$ gives the final signature formula $\sigma(X) = \int_X L - \eta(B^{\text{ev}})$.

4 Computations with the leafwise signature operator

Let start with a compact manifold with boundary X_0 equipped with an oriented $4k$ -dimensional foliation transverse to the boundary. Suppose every geometric structure to be of product type

⁶the inclusion of the compact support cohomology into the ordinary one

near the boundary. As usual attach an infinite cylinder $Z_0 = \partial X_0 \times [0, \infty)_r$ and extend everything. The leafwise signature operator corresponds to the leafwise Clifford action defined above on the leafwise exterior bundle $\Lambda T^* \mathcal{F}$. If $(e_1, \dots, e_{4k-1}, \partial_r)$ is a leafwise positive orthonormal frame near the boundary, the leafwise chirality element ⁷ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \tau &:= i^{2k} c(e^1) \cdots c(e^{4k-1}) c(dr) = i^{2k} * (-1)^{|\cdot|(|\cdot|-1)/2} \\ &= -i^{2k} c(dr) c_\partial = -i^{2k} c(dr) *_\partial (-1)^{|\cdot|+|\cdot|(|\cdot|-1)/2} \end{aligned}$$

where $*$ is leafwise Hodge duality operator, $c_\partial = c(e^1) \cdots c(e^{4k-1})$ is, a part for the i^{2k} factor the leafwise boundary chirality operator and $*_\partial$ is the leafwise boundary Hodge operator. On the cylinder the leafwise bundle $\Lambda T^* \mathcal{F}$ is isomorphic to the pulled back bundle $\rho^*(\Lambda T^* \mathcal{F}_{\partial X_0})$ (the projection on the base ρ will be omitted throughout) while separating the dr component on leafwise forms $\alpha = \omega + \beta \wedge dr$ yields an isomorphism

$$(\Lambda T^* \mathcal{F})_{\partial X_0} \longrightarrow (\Lambda T^* \partial \mathcal{F}) \oplus (\Lambda T^* \mathcal{F}), \quad (5)$$

sometimes we shall write $(\Lambda T^* \partial \mathcal{F}) \wedge dr$ for the second addendum in (5) to remember this isomorphism. An easy computation involving rules as $d\omega = d_\partial \omega + (-1)^{|\omega|} \partial_r \omega \wedge dr$ for $\omega \in C^\infty([0, \infty); \Lambda T^* \partial \mathcal{F})$ and $c(dr)(\omega + \alpha \wedge dr) = (-1)^{|\omega|} \omega \wedge dr - (-1)^{|\alpha|} \alpha$ shows that the operator can be written on the direct sum $(\Lambda T^* \partial \mathcal{F}) \oplus (\Lambda T^* \mathcal{F})$ as the matrix

$$D^{\text{sign}} = \begin{pmatrix} d_\partial + c_\partial d_\partial c_\partial & -(-1)^{|\cdot|} \partial_r \\ (-1)^{|\cdot|} \partial_r & c_\partial d_\partial c_\partial \end{pmatrix} = c(dr) \partial_r + (d_\partial + c_\partial d_\partial c_\partial) \oplus (d_\partial + c_\partial d_\partial c_\partial) \quad (6)$$

and

$$\tau = i^{2k} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & c_\partial (-1)^{|\cdot|} \\ -c_\partial (-1)^{|\cdot|} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

Since $d_\partial^* = \tau_\partial d_\partial \tau_\partial = c_\partial d_\partial c_\partial$ formula (6) is equivalent to

$$D^{\text{sign}} = c(dr) \partial_r + (d_\partial + d_\partial^*) \oplus (d_\partial + d_\partial^*).$$

There's also another important formula corresponding to the fact that $d + d^*$ anticommutes with τ . Denote $\Omega^\pm(\mathcal{F})$ the positive (negative) eigenbundles i.e. the bundles of leafwise auto-dual (anti auto-dual) forms. We can write the operator on the cylinder as an operator on sections of the direct sum $\rho^*(\Omega^+(\mathcal{F})_{\partial X_0} \oplus \Omega^-(\mathcal{F})_{\partial X_0})$ as the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -(-1)^{|\cdot|} \partial_r + (*_\partial d_\partial - d_\partial *_\partial) i^{2k} (-1)^{|\cdot|(|\cdot|-1)/2} \\ (-1)^{|\cdot|} \partial_r + (*_\partial d_\partial - d_\partial *_\partial) i^{2k} (-1)^{|\cdot|(|\cdot|-1)/2} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ = c(dr) \partial_r + (*_\partial d_\partial - d_\partial *_\partial) i^{2k} (-1)^{|\cdot|(|\cdot|-1)/2} \Omega. \quad (8)$$

To pass from one representation to another we have to consider the following compositions

$$\Lambda T^* \partial \mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{i_1} (\Lambda T^* \partial \mathcal{F}) \oplus (\Lambda T^* \mathcal{F}) \wedge dr \xrightarrow{1+\tau} \Omega^+(\mathcal{F}) \xrightarrow{d+d^*} \Omega^-(\mathcal{F}) \xrightarrow{\text{Pr}_2} \Lambda T^* \partial \mathcal{F}.$$

$$\Lambda T^* \partial \mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{i_2} (\Lambda T^* \partial \mathcal{F}) \oplus (\Lambda T^* \mathcal{F}) \wedge dr \xrightarrow{1-\tau} \Omega^-(\mathcal{F}) \xrightarrow{d+d^*} \Omega^+(\mathcal{F}) \xrightarrow{\text{Pr}_1} \Lambda T^* \partial \mathcal{F}.$$

where i_j is the inclusion on the j -th factor and Pr_j is the corresponding projection.

⁷we omit symbols denoting leafwise action for ease of reading

5 The Analytic signature

The first definition we give is simple. It is merely the L^2 measured (chiral) index of the signature operator on the elonged space. In the paper [1] we proved this is well defined and finite. In particular the Λ -dimensions of the extended spaces of solutions is finite.

DEFINITION 5.1 — The Λ -analytic signature of the foliated manifold with boundary X_0 is the measured L^2 -chiral index of the signature operator on the foliated manifold with a cylinder attached

$$\sigma_{\Lambda, \text{an}}(X_0, \partial X_0) := \text{ind}_{L^2, \Lambda}(D^{\text{sign}, +}). \quad (9)$$

From the A.P.S index formula proved in [1] and the standard identification of the Atiyah–Singer integrand for the signature operator [5], formula (9) becomes

$$\sigma_{\Lambda, \text{an}}(X_0, \partial X_0) = \langle L(X), C_\Lambda \rangle + 1/2[\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}\partial}) - h_\Lambda^+ + h_\Lambda^-]$$

where $L(X)$ is the tangential L -characteristic class and the numbers h_Λ^\pm and the foliation eta-invariant are referred to the boundary signature operator.

As in [4] first we have to identify these numbers. Minor modifications of the proof of Vaillant [25] (a complete proof in [2]) are needed in order to prove that for the signature operator

$$h_\Lambda^+ = h_\Lambda^-.$$

consequently the signature formula drastically reduces to

$$\sigma_{\Lambda, \text{an}}(X_0, \partial X_0) = \langle L(X), C_\Lambda \rangle + 1/2[\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}\partial})].$$

6 Fields of sesquilinear forms

We shall make some definitions about borel fields of sesquilinear forms in the setting of non commutative integration theory [8]. Let $\mathcal{G} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ be a Borel groupoid with a square integrable representation on a Borel field of Hilbert spaces $(H_x)_{x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$. In the next it will be $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{R}_0$ or $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{R}$. Let $q = (q_x)_{x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ be a \mathcal{G} equivariant field of sesquilinear symmetric forms⁸, $q_x : H_x \times H_x \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. By the Riesz lemma there exist a family of bounded selfadjoint intertwining operators $B = (B_x)_{x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}}$ such that $q_x(\xi, \eta) = \langle \xi, B_x \eta \rangle_x$ for every $x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$. Measurability properties of q are addressed, by definition to that of B . Now B determines a field of hortonormal splittings $H_x = V_x^+ \oplus V_x^0 \oplus V_x^-$ where V_x^+ (V_x^-) is the image of the spectral projection $\chi_{(0, \tau)}(B_x)$ ($\chi_{(-\infty, 0)}(B_x)$) and V_x^0 is the kernel of B_x . If Λ is a transverse measure on \mathcal{G} one can measure the Random Hilbert spaces V_x^+ and V_x^- . If one of these formal dimension is finite one can define the Λ -signature of q as

$$\text{sign}_\Lambda(q) := \dim_\Lambda(V^+) - \dim_\Lambda(V^-).$$

7 The Hodge signature

Consider the field of Hilbert spaces of degree $2k$ square integrable harmonic forms $x \mapsto \mathcal{H}_x^{2k} := \ker\{\Delta_x^q : L^2(\Lambda^{2k}T^*L_x) \rightarrow L^2(\Lambda^{2k}T^*L_x)\}$ where L_x is a leaf of the $4k$ -dimensional oriented foliation on the manifold X with cylindrical ends. Since leafwise harmonic forms are closed this is a field of subspaces of the fields of de Rham cohomologies

⁸a sesquilinear form, antilinear in the second variable q is symmetric if $\overline{q(\xi, \eta)} = q(\eta, \xi)$

$H^*(L_x)$ hence inherits the structure of a measurable field of Hilbert spaces. This defines a square integrable representation of \mathcal{R} and there is a natural field of symmetric forms $s_x^\infty : \mathcal{H}_x^{2k} \times \mathcal{H}_x^{2k} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$s_x^\infty(\alpha, \beta) := \int_{L_x} \alpha \wedge \beta = \int_{L_x} (\alpha, * \beta).$$

In the paper [1] is proven that its Λ -signature is well defined in fact this is precisely a statement about the finite Λ -dimensionality of the kernel of the leafwise Laplace Beltrami operator on X .

DEFINITION 7.2 — The signature on harmonic forms (The Hodge signature or the harmonic signature) on the foliated elongated manifold is

$$\sigma_\Lambda^\infty(X) := \dim_\Lambda V^+ - \dim_\Lambda V^-.$$

We shall use also the symbol $\sigma_{\Lambda, \text{Hodge}}(X, X_0)$ to refer to the compact pair, to denote the same number.

8 Analytical signature=Hodge signature

We prove the first coincidence of the definitions of the analytical signature and the Hodge signature. The boundary operator here is $B = *|_{\Omega^{2k}}$. Since the dimension of the foliation is $4k$ we have $\tau_{\Omega^{2k}} = *|_{\Omega^{2k}}$. It follows that $V^\pm = \ker_{L^2}(D^{\text{sign}, \pm})$. Then with the index formula in the paper [1] we have this first result

THEOREM 8.2 — The analytical signature of the compact manifold with boundary and the signature on harmonic forms on the manifold with cylinder attached do coincide,

$$\sigma_{\Lambda, \text{an}}(X_0, \partial X_0) = \sigma_\Lambda^\infty(X) = \langle L(X), C_\Lambda \rangle + 1/2[\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}\partial})]. \quad (10)$$

9 The L^2 -de Rham signature

The goal of this section is to prepare the ground for the definition of the de Rham signature for the foliated manifold with boundary and the proof of its coincidence with the harmonic signature.

9.0.1 manifolds with boundary with bounded geometry

The generic leaf of (X_0, \mathcal{F}) is a Riemannian manifold with boundary with bounded geometry as those examined by Schick [21, 22, 23].

DEFINITION 9.3 — We say that a manifold with boundary equipped with a Riemannian metric has bounded geometry if the following holds

Normal collar : there exists $r_C > 0$ so that the geodesic collar

$$N := [0, r_C) \times \partial M : (t, x) \longmapsto \exp_x(t\nu_x)$$

is a diffeomorphism onto its image, where ν_x is the unit inward normal vector at $x \in \partial M$. Equip N with the induced metric. In the sequel N and its image will be identified. Denote $\text{im}[0, r_C/3) \times \partial M$ by $N_{1/3}$ and similarly $N_{2/3}$.

Injectivity radius of ∂M : the injectivity radius of ∂M is positive, $r_{\text{inj}}(\partial M) > 0$

Injectivity radius of M : there is $r_i > 0$ so that for $x \in M - N_{1/3}$ the exponential mapping is a diffeomorphism on $B(0, r_1) \subset T_x M$. In particular if we identify $T_x M$ with \mathbb{R}^m via an orthonormal frame we have Gaussian coordinates $\mathbb{R}^m \supset B(0, r_i) \rightarrow M$ around any point in $M - N_{1/3}$

Curvature bounds : for every $K \in \mathbb{N}$ there is some $C_K > 0$ so that $|\nabla^i R| \leq C_K$ and $|\nabla^\partial l| \leq C_K$, $0 \leq i \leq K$. Here ∇ is the Levi-Civita connection on M , ∇^∂ is the Levi-Civita connection on ∂M and l is the second fundamental form tensor with respect to ν .

Choose some $0 < r_1^C < r_{\text{inj}}(\partial M)$, near points $x' \in \partial M$ on the boundary one can define **normal collar coordinates** by iteration of the exponential mapping of ∂M and that of M ,

$$k_{x'} : \underbrace{B(0, r_i^C)}_{\subset \mathbb{R}^{m-1}} \times [0, r_C) \rightarrow M, (v, t) \mapsto \exp_{\exp_{x'}^M(v)}^M(tv).$$

For points $x \in M - N_{1/3}$ standard **Gaussian coordinates** are defined via the exponential mapping. In the following we shall call both **normal coordinates**. It is a non trivial fact that the condition on curvature bounds in definition 9.3 can be substituted by uniform control of each derivative of the metric tensor g_{ij} and its inverse g^{ij} on normal coordinates.

The definition extends to bounded geometry vector bundles on boundary manifolds with bounded geometry and each object of uniform analysis like i.e. uniformly bounded differential operators can be defined [23]. In particular, using a suitable partition of the unity adapted to normal coordinates one can define uniform Sobolev spaces (different coordinates give equivalent norms so we get hilbertable spaces) and every basic result continues to hold.

PROPOSITION 9.4 — Let $E \rightarrow M$ a bundle of bounded geometry over M . Suppose F is bounded vector bundle over ∂M . Then the following hold for the Sobolev spaces $H^s(E), H^t(F)$, $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$ of sections.

1. $H^s(E), H^t(F)$ is an Hilbert space (inner product depending on the choices).
2. The usual (bounded) Sobolev embedding theorem holds with values on the Banach space $C_b^k(E)$ of all sections with the first k derivatives uniformly bounded in normal coordinates,

$$H^s(E) \hookrightarrow C_b^k(E), \quad \text{whenever } s > m/2 + k.$$

3. For the bundle of differential forms one can use as Sobolev norm the one coming from the integral of the norm of covariant differentials $\|\omega\|_k^2 := \sum_{i=0}^k \int_M \|\nabla^i \omega(x)\|_{T_x^* M \otimes \Lambda T^* M}^2 |dx|$.
4. For $s < t$ we have a bounded embedding with dense image $H^t(E) \subset H^s(E)$. The map is compact if and only if M is compact. We define

$$H^\infty(E) := \bigcap_s H^s(E), \quad H^{-\infty}(E) := \bigcup_s H^s(E).$$

5. Let $p : C^\infty(E) \longrightarrow C^\infty(F)$ a k -bounded boundary differential operator i.e the composition of an order k bounded differential operator on E with the morphism of restriction to the boundary. Then p extends to be a bounded operator $p : H^s(E) \longrightarrow H^{s-k-1/2}(F)$ if $s > k + 1/2$. In particular we have the bounded restriction map $H^s(E) \longrightarrow H^{s-1/2}(E|_{\partial M})$ if $s > 1/2$.
6. $H^s(E)$ and $H^{-s}(E)$ are dual to each other by extension of the pairing

$$(f, g) = \int_M g(f(x))|dx|; f \in C_0^\infty(E), g \in C_0^\infty(E^*)$$

where E^* is the dual bundle of E . If E is a bounded Hermitian or Riemannian bundle, then the norm on $L^2(E)$ defined by charts is equivalent to the usual L^2 -norm

$$|f|^2 := \int_M (f, f)_x |dx|, f \in C_0^\infty(E).$$

Moreover $H^s(E)$ and $H^{-s}(E)$ are dual to each other by extension of $(f, g) = \int_M (f, g)_x |dx|$.

9.0.2 Random Hilbert complexes

We are going to define the de Rham L^2 complexes along the leaves. These are particular examples of Hilbert complexes studied in complete generality in [6]. So let $x \in X_0$, consider the unbounded operator with Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$d_{L_x^0} : \Omega_{d,x}^k = \{\omega \in C_0^\infty(\Lambda T^k L_x^0); \omega|_{\partial M} = 0\} \subset L_x^2(\Lambda T^k L_x^0) \longrightarrow L_x^2(\Lambda T^k L_x^0).$$

Being a differential operator it is closable, let $A_x^k(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0)$ the domain of its closure i.e the set of L^2 limits ω of sequences ω_n such that also the $d\omega_n$ converges in L^2 to some $\eta =: d\omega$. The graph norm $\|\cdot\|_A^2 := \|\cdot\|_{L^2}^2 + \|d\cdot\|_{L^2}^2$ gives the graph the structure of an Hilbert space where d is bounded. It is easily checked that $d(A_x^k) \subset \ker(d : A_x^{k+1}) \longrightarrow L_x^2$ then we have a Hilbert cochain complex

$$\dots \longrightarrow A_x^{k-1} \longrightarrow A_x^k \longrightarrow A_x^{k+1} \longrightarrow \dots$$

with cycles $Z_x^k(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) := \ker(d : A_x^k \longrightarrow A_x^{k+1})$ and boundaries $B_x^k(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) := \text{range}(d : A_x^{k-1} \longrightarrow A_x^k)$.

DEFINITION 9.5 — The L^2 (reduced)⁹ relative de Rham cohomology of the leaf L_x^0 is defined by the quotients

$$H_{dR,(2)}^{k,x}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) := Z_x^k(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) / \overline{B_x^k(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0)}.$$

Clearly the closure is taken in order to assure the quotient to be an Hilbert space. Similarly the L^2 -de Rham cohomology of the whole leaf, $H_{dR,(2)}^{k,x}(L_x^0)$ is defined using no (Dirichlet) boundary conditions. In particular $A_x^k(L_x^0)$ will be used to denote the domain of the closure of the differential as unbounded operator on $L^2(L_x^0)$ defined on compactly supported sections (the support possibly meeting the boundary). The subscript dR helps to make distinction

⁹the word reduced stands for the fact we use the closure to make the quotient, also the non reduced cohomology can be defined. For a Γ covering of a compact manifold the examination of the difference reduced/unreduced cohomology leads to the definition of the Novikov-Shubin invariants [12]

with Sobolev spaces. Each one of this spaces is naturally isomorphic to a corresponding space of harmonic forms. More precisely

DEFINITION 9.6 — The space of k L^2 -harmonic forms which fulfill Dirichlet boundary conditions on ∂L_x^0 is

$$\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^k(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) := \{\omega \in C^\infty \cap L^2, \omega|_{\partial L_x^0} = 0, (\delta\omega)|_{\partial L_x^0} = 0, \underbrace{(d\omega)|_{\partial L_x^0} = 0}_{\text{aut. satisfied}}\}$$

Note that the boundary conditions are exactly the square of the Dirichlet boundary condition on the Dirac operator $d + \delta$. Since each leaf is complete a generalization of an idea of Gromov shows that these forms are closed and co-closed, [21, 22]

$$\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^k(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) = \{\omega \in C^\infty \cap L^2(\Lambda^k L_x^0), d\omega = 0, \delta\omega = 0, \omega|_{\partial L_x^0} = 0\}.$$

Furthermore there's the L^2 -orthogonal Hodge decomposition [21, 22]

$$L^2(\Lambda^k T^* L_x^0) = \mathcal{H}_{(2)}^k(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) \oplus \overline{d^{k-1}\Omega_{d,x}^{k-1}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0)}^{L^2} \oplus \overline{\delta^{k+1}\Omega_{\delta,x}^{k+1}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0)}^{L^2}$$

where $\Omega_{d,x}^{k-1} := \{\omega \in C_0^\infty(\Lambda^{k-1} T^* L_x^0), \omega|_{\partial L_x^0} = 0\}$ and the corresponding one for δ with no boundary conditions is $\Omega_{\delta,x}^{k+1} := \{\omega \in C_0^\infty(\Lambda^{k+1} T^* L_x^0)\}$. These decompositions shows with a little work that the inclusion $\mathcal{H}^k(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) \hookrightarrow A_x^k$ induces isomorphism in cohomology (Hodge-de Rham Theorem)

$$\mathcal{H}^k(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) \cong H_{dR,(2)}^k(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0).$$

This is a consequence of the fact that the graph norm (of d) and the L^2 norm coincide on the space of cycles Z_x^k . Similar Hodge isomorphisms holds for the non-relative spaces and are well known in literature.

As x varies in X_0 they form measurable fields of Hilbert spaces. We discuss this aspect in a slightly more general way applicable to other situations. Remember that a measurable structure on a field of Hilbert spaces over X_0 is given by a fundamental sequence of sections, $(s_x)_{x \in X_0}$, $s_n(x) \in H_x$ such that $x \mapsto \|s_n(x)\|_{H_x}$ is measurable and $\{s(x)\}_n$ is total in H_x (see chapter IV in [24]).

PROPOSITION 9.7 — If for a family of closed densely defined operators (P_x) with minimal domain $\mathcal{D}(P_x)$ a fundamental sequence $s_n(x) \in \mathcal{D}(P_x)$ is a core for P_x and $P_x s_n(x)$ is measurable for every x and n then the family P_x is measurable in the sense of closed unbounded operators i.e. the family of projections Π_x^g on the graph is measurable in the square field $H_x \oplus H_x$ with product measurable structure.

PROOF — It is trivial in fact the graph is generated by vectors $(s_n(x), P_x s_n(x))$ then the projections is measurable. \square

The lemma above can be applied to the $(A_x^k(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0))_x$ in fact in the appendix of [10] a fundamental sequence φ_n of sections with the property that each $(\varphi_n(\cdot))|_{L_x^0}$ is smooth and compactly supported is shown to exist. The same proof works for manifold with boundary and since the boundary has zero measure one can certainly require to each φ_n to be zero on the boundary.

In particular we have defined complexes of square integrable representations. Reduction modulo Λ -a.e. gives complexes of random Hilbert spaces (with unbounded differentials) for which we introduce the following notations,

- $(L^{2,\mathcal{F}}(\Omega^\bullet X_0), d)$ is the complex of Random Hilbert spaces obtained by Λ a.e. reduction from the field of Hilbert complexes

$$\cdots \longrightarrow L^2(\Lambda^k T^* L_x^0) \xrightarrow{d} L^2(\Lambda^{k+1} T^* L_x^0) \longrightarrow \cdots \quad (11)$$

- $H_{dR,(2)}^{\bullet,\mathcal{F}}(X_0)$ is the random Hilbert space obtained by Λ a.e. reduction from the reduced L^2 homology of (11)
- $(L^{2,\mathcal{F}}(\Omega^\bullet X_0, \partial X_0), d)$ is the complex of Random Hilbert spaces obtained by Λ a.e. reduction from the field of Hilbert complexes with Dirichlet boundary condition

$$\cdots \longrightarrow L^2(\Lambda^k T^* L_x^0) \xrightarrow{d} L^2(\Lambda^{k+1} T^* L_x^0) \longrightarrow \cdots \quad (12)$$

with differentials considered as unbounded operators with domains $A_x^k(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0)$.

- $H_{dR,(2)}^{\bullet,\mathcal{F}}(X_0, \partial X_0)$ is the random Hilbert space of the reduced homology of the above complex.

9.0.3 Definition of the de Rham signature

Let $\dim(\mathcal{F}) = 4k$ Consider the measurable field of Hilbert spaces $A_x^k(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0)$ of the minimal domains of the de Rham leafwise differential with Dirichlet boundary conditions $\omega|_{\partial L_x^0} = 0$ as above, with the graph Hilbert structure and the induce Borel structure. This square integrable representation of \mathcal{R}_0 carries a field of bounded symmetric sesquilinear forms defined by

$$s_x^0 : A_x^{2k}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) \times A_x^{2k}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}, (\omega, \eta) \longmapsto \int_{L_x^0} \omega \wedge \bar{\eta} = \int_{L_x^0} (\omega, *\eta) d\nu^x$$

i.e. the \mathbb{C} -antilinear in the second variable extension of the wedge product on forms. The notation $\bar{\sigma} \otimes \gamma = \sigma \otimes \bar{\gamma}$ is the complex conjugate and ν^x is the Leafwise Riemannian metric. Note that also the scalar product (\cdot, \cdot) on forms is extended to be sesquilinear.

LEMMA 9.8 — The sesquilinear form s_x^0 passes to the L^2 relative cohomology of the leaf $H_{dR,(2)}^{2k}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0)$ factorizing through the image of the map $H_{dR,(2)}^{2k}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) \longrightarrow H_{dR,(2)}^{2k}(L_x^0)$ of the L^2 relative de Rham cohomology to the L^2 de Rham cohomology exactly as in the compact (one leaf) case.

PROOF — The first assertion is simply Stokes theorem, in fact let $\omega \in A_x^{2k}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0)$ i.e. $\omega_n \xrightarrow{L^2} \omega$, $d\omega_n \xrightarrow{L^2} 0$ and $\theta_m \in C_0^\infty(\Lambda T^{2k-1} L_x^0)$, $d\theta_m \xrightarrow{L^2} \varphi$ then

$$s_x^0(\omega, \varphi) = \lim_{n,m} \int_{L_x^0} \omega_n \wedge \overline{d\theta_m} = \lim_{n,m} \int_{L_x^0} d(\omega_n \wedge \overline{\theta_m}) = \lim_{n,m} \int_{\partial L_x^0} (\omega_n \wedge \theta_m)|_{\partial L_x^0} = 0.$$

The second one is clear and follows exactly from the classical case i.e. if $\beta_1 = \beta_2 + \lim_n d\rho_n$ with ρ_n compactly supported with no boundary conditions write

$$s_x^0([\alpha], [\beta]) = s_x^0([\alpha], [\beta_2]) + \lim_n \int \alpha \wedge \rho_n,$$

represent α as a L^2 limit of forms with Dirichlet boundary conditions than apply Stokes theorem again. \square

For every x the sesquilinear form s_x^0 on the cohomology corresponds to a bounded selfadjoint operator $B_x \in B(H_{dR,(2)}^{2k}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0))$ (a proof is in [19]) univocally determined by the condition $s_x^0(\alpha, \beta) = (\alpha, B_x \beta)$. Measurability properties of $(s_x^0)_{x \in X_0}$ are by definition (for us) measurability properties of the family $(B_x)_{x \in X_0}$. It is clear that everything varies in a Borel fashion (use again a smooth fundamental sequence of vector fields as in [10]) then the B_x 's define a self-adjoint random operator $B \in \text{End}_\Lambda(H_{dR,(2)}^{2k}(X_0, \partial X_0))$.

DEFINITION 9.9 — The Λ - L^2 de Rham signature of the foliated manifold X_0 with boundary ∂X_0 is

$$\sigma_{\Lambda, dR}(X_0, \partial X_0) := \text{tr}_\Lambda \chi_{(0, \infty)}(B) - \text{tr}_\Lambda \chi_{(-\infty, 0)}(B)$$

as random operators in $\text{End}_\Lambda(H_{dR,(2)}^{2k}(X_0, \partial X_0))$.

10 L^2 de Rham signature=Hodge signature

This is a very long proof. We need some new tools. The path to follow is clearly the one in the paper of of Lück and Schick [13]. We shall show at the end of the section that we can reduce to the case in which **every leaf meets the boundary** or in other words **the boundary contains a complete transversal**.

10.0.4 The boundary foliation and \mathcal{R}_0

We have denoted by \mathcal{F}_∂ the foliation induced on the boundary ∂X_0 i.e. the foliation where a leaf is a connected component of the intersection of a leaf L of \mathcal{F} with the boundary. Let $\underline{\mathcal{R}}_0 = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{F}_\partial)$ its equivalence relation with canonical inclusion $\underline{\mathcal{R}}_0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{R}_0$. We are under the assumption that the boundary contains a complete transversal T . This is also a complete transversal for \mathcal{F}_∂ , Call ν_T its characteristic function on \mathcal{R}_0 . Then every transverse measure Λ for \mathcal{R}_0 is univocally determined by the measure Λ_{ν_T} supported on T . As a consequence one gets a transverse measure, continue to call Λ , on $\underline{\mathcal{R}}_0$. Let now (H, U) be a square integrable representation of $\mathcal{R}_0 \longrightarrow X_0$ and H its corresponding random Hilbert space, it pulls back to a square integrable representation (H', U') of $\underline{\mathcal{R}}_0$. Also a random operator $A \in \text{End}_\Lambda(H)$ defines by restriction a random operator $A' \in \text{End}_\Lambda(H')$. We are going to show that

$$\text{tr}_\Lambda(A) = \text{tr}_\Lambda(A'). \tag{13}$$

This is automatically proven if we think about the trace in terms of the operator valued weight $\int \text{tr}_{H_x}(\cdot) d\Lambda_\nu(x)$ of Lemme 8 in [8], of course we have to pay some care checking the domains of definitions of the two traces but from normality and square integrability the operators in form $\theta_\nu(\xi, \xi)$ as in Proposition 15 in [8] furnish a sufficiently rich set to check the two. To see the problem under a slightly different point of view, first remember the trace of an operator is related to an integration of a Random variable (Proposition 14 Page 43 in [8]) on \mathcal{R}_0 . So if one chooses as transverse function the characteristic function of T and apply the Recipe of Connes finds out immediately that

PROPOSITION 10.10 — An intertwining operator between two square integrable representations of R_0 restricts to an intertwining operator between the pull-back representations of $\underline{\mathcal{R}}_0$ to give an element of the corresponding Von Neumann algebra with the same trace.

This simple argument allows ourselves to consider, as an instrument short sequences

$$0 \longrightarrow A_x^{k-1}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) \xrightarrow{i} A_x^{k-1}(L_x^0) \xrightarrow{r} A_x^{k-1}(\partial L_x^0) \longrightarrow 0, \quad x \in \partial X_0$$

as sequences of Random Hilbert spaces associated to $\underline{\mathcal{R}}_0$. In fact the third term seems not naturally defined without passing to the boundary relation. Now the third term of the sequence is directly related to the boundary. it seem we have to say again some words on the relation between $\underline{\mathcal{R}}_0$ and $\mathcal{R}_0|_{\partial X_0}$ or, better its restriction to the boundary $(\mathcal{R}_0)|_{\partial X_0}$. We shall investigate how $\underline{\mathcal{R}}_0$ sits inside $(\mathcal{R}_0)|_{\partial X_0}$ and the traces on algebras associated on it. Consider a class of $\underline{\mathcal{R}}_0$ i.e. a leaf of the boundary foliation; this is a connected component of a class of $(\mathcal{R}_0)|_{\partial X_0}$. In other words each class of $(\mathcal{R}_0)|_{\partial X_0}$ is a denumerable union of classes of $\underline{\mathcal{R}}_0$ i.e. the bigger one seems like to be some sort of denumerable union of the smaller under the obvious natural functor

$$\underline{\mathcal{R}}_0 \longrightarrow (\mathcal{R}_0)|_{\partial X_0}.$$

In the measure theory realm denumerability means that $(\mathcal{R}_0)|_{\partial X_0}$ is not so bigger than $\underline{\mathcal{R}}_0$. Also if one makes use of a complete transversal for $\underline{\mathcal{R}}_0$ to integrate natural¹⁰ Random Hilbert spaces associated to $(\mathcal{R}_0)|_{\partial X_0}$ this transversal touches denumerably times classes of $\underline{\mathcal{R}}_0$ so in definitive the geometric intuition says that *we are integrating (then taking traces) on the foliation induced on the boundary!* the notion of properness helps to understand this intuitive fact. Recall from [8] that a measurable functor A measurable functor $F : \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow M$ with values standard measure spaces is called proper if w.r.t the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{G} & \xrightarrow{F} & X := \bigcup_{x \in \mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \mathcal{G}^x \\ \downarrow r & \swarrow \pi & \\ \mathcal{G}^{(0)} & & \end{array}$$

\mathcal{G} acts properly on X i.e. there exist a strictly positive function $f \in \mathcal{F}^+(X)$ and a proper $\nu \in \mathcal{E}^+$ such that $\nu * f = 1$. Here we recall the defining formula

$$(\nu * f)(z) := \int_{\mathcal{G}^y} f(F(\gamma^{-1}) \cdot z) d\nu^y(\gamma).$$

Consider indeed the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \underline{\mathcal{R}}_0 & \xrightarrow{L'} & X' = \bigcup_{x \in \partial X_0} (\mathcal{R}_0)|_{\partial X_0}^x \\ \downarrow L' & & \\ X = \bigcup_{x \in \partial X_0} \mathcal{R}_0^x & & \end{array}$$

where L' is the left multiplication functor $x \mapsto (\mathcal{R}_0)|_{\partial X_0}^x$ while L is left traslation in \mathcal{R}_0 . Both are proper functors because the first is the restriction of the multiplication of \mathcal{R}_0 the second is the multiplication of the groupoid (Exemple after Definition 3 page 23 in [8]). Associate to L and L' some local trace of an intertwining operator B of a square integrable representation, say $x \mapsto L^2(\partial L_x^0)$. We are saying that the target space $L'(x)$ is $(\mathcal{R}_0)|_{\partial X_0}^x$ and the measure is $f \mapsto \alpha(f) = \text{tr}(B^{1/2} f B^{1/2})$; the same association is done for L . Note that the integral $\int L' d\Lambda$ is exactly $\text{tr}_\Lambda(B)$ in $\text{End}_\Lambda(L^2(\partial L_x^0))$. Now there is a Borel map associating to $z \in X$

¹⁰i.e. given by $L^2 \bullet L$, where L is left traslation on \mathcal{R}_0

a probability measure on X' as in Proposition 4 pag 23 in [8]. It is the Dirac measure i.e. $z = (x, y) \mapsto \lambda^z := \delta_{(x,y)}$. The property

$$\int \lambda^z d\alpha^x(z) = \alpha'(x)$$

is, by definition immediately verified. Hence Proposition 4 pag. 23 in [8] says that

PROPOSITION 10.11 — The trace on endomorphisms of natural representations of $(\mathcal{R}_0)|_{\partial X_0}$ is exactly the trace on the foliation induced on the boundary.

10.0.5 Weakly exact sequences

Consider for $x \in \partial X_0$ the Borel field of cochain complexes

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & \downarrow d & & \downarrow d & & \downarrow d \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & A_x^{k-1}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) & \xrightarrow{i} & A_x^{k-1}(L_x^0) & \xrightarrow{r} & A_x^{k-1}(\partial L_x^0) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow d & & \downarrow d & & \downarrow d \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & A_x^k(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) & \xrightarrow{i} & A_x^k(L_x^0) & \xrightarrow{r} & A_x^k(\partial L_x^0) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow d & & \downarrow d & & \downarrow d \end{array}$$

where each morphism must be considered as an unbounded operator on the corresponding L^2 , i is bounded since is merely the restriction of the identity mapping on $L^2(L_x^0, \Lambda T^* L_x^0)$ and r is restriction to the boundary.

PROPOSITION 10.12 —

1. For every k the domain $A_x^k(L_x^0)$ is contained in the Sobolev space of forms $H^1(L_x^0, \Lambda T^* L_x^0)$. In particular the composition with r makes sense.
2. The rows are exact.

PROOF — 1. An element ω in $A_x^k(L_x^0)$ is an L^2 -limit of smooth compactly supported forms ω_n with differential also convergent in L^2 . Then since the Hodge $*$ is an isometry on L^2 also $\delta\omega_n = \pm * \omega_n^*$ converges. In particular we can control the L^2 -norm of $d\omega$ and $\delta\omega$; this means we have control of the first covariant derivative, in fact $d + \delta = c \circ \nabla$ where c is the (unitary) Clifford action. Then the second term can be made less than the norm of ∇ by bounded geometry. In particular we have control on the order one Sobolev norm by proposition 9.4. The remaining part follows from the fact that the restriction morphism is bounded from H^1 to $H^{1/2} \hookrightarrow L^2$.

2. The only non-trivial point is exactness in the middle but as a consequence of the bounded geometry the boundary condition on the first space extends to H^1 (see proposition 5.4 in the thesis of Thomas Schick [21]) that together with point 1. is exactness. \square

REMARK — Note that the proof of the proposition above says also that the induced morphisms i_* and r_* are bounded.

DEFINITION 10.13 — We introduce the notations $L^{2,\mathcal{F}}(\Omega^\bullet X_0)$ and $L^{2,\mathcal{F}}(\Omega^\bullet X_0, \partial X_0)$ for the complexes of Random Hilbert spaces with unbounded differential introduced above.

Every arrow induces morphisms on the reduced L^2 cohomology. Miming the algebraic construction of the connecting morphism (everything works thanks to the remark above) we have, for every $x \in \partial X_0$ the long sequence of square integrable representations of the equivalence relation of the boundary foliation $\underline{\mathcal{R}}_0$

$$\begin{aligned} \cdots \longrightarrow H_{dR,(2)}^{k,x}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) &\xrightarrow{i_*} H_{dR,(2)}^{k,x}(L_x^0) \xrightarrow{r_*} \\ &\xrightarrow{r_*} H_{dR,(2)}^{k,x}(\partial L_x^0) \xrightarrow{\delta} H_{dR,(2)}^{k-1,x}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) \longrightarrow \cdots \end{aligned}$$

Remove the dependence on x to get a long sequence of Random Hilbert spaces over ∂X_0 with consistent notation with (11) and (12)

$$\begin{aligned} \cdots \longrightarrow H_{dR,(2)}^k(X_0, \partial X_0) &\xrightarrow{i_*} H_{dR,(2)}^k(X_0) \xrightarrow{r_*} \\ &\xrightarrow{r_*} H_{dR,(2)}^k(\partial X_0) \xrightarrow{\delta} H_{dR,(2)}^{k-1}(X_0, \partial X_0) \longrightarrow \cdots \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

DEFINITION 10.14 — We say that a sequence of Random Hilbert spaces as (14) is Λ -weakly exact at some term if in the correspondig Von Neumann algebra of Endomorphisms the projection on the closure of the range of the incoming arrow coincide with the projection on the kernel of the starting one. These means i.e at point $\xrightarrow{i_*} H_{dR,(2)}^k(X_0) \xrightarrow{r_*}$,

$$\overline{\text{range } i_*} = \ker r_* \in \text{End}_\Lambda(H_{dR,(2)}^k(X_0)).$$

Of course such a sequence cannot be exact, just as in the case of Hilbert Γ -modules there are simple examples of non exactness (see Example 1.19 in [12], or the example on manifolds with cylindrical ends in the paper of Cheeger and Gromov [7]). A necessary condition to weakly exactness is (left) fredholmness, as in [7].

10.0.6 Spectral density functions and Fredholm complexes.

Let U, V two Random Hilbert spaces on \mathcal{R}_0 (for these consideration also the holonomy groupoid or, more generally a Borel groupoid would work) and an unbounded Random operator $f : \mathcal{D}(f) \subset U \longrightarrow V$ i.e start with a Borel family of closed densely defined operators $f_x : U_x \longrightarrow V_x$ intertwining the representation of \mathcal{R}_0 . Since f is closable, the question of measurability is addressed in the paper [20]. For every $\mu \geq 0$ put $\mathcal{L}(f, \mu)$ as the set of measurable fields of subspaces $L_x \subset \mathcal{D}(f_x) \subset U_x$ (measurability is measurability of the family of the closures) such that for every $x \in X_0$ and $\phi \in L_x$, $\|f_x(\phi)\| \leq \mu \|\phi\|$. After reduction modulo Λ a.e. this becomes a set of Random Pre-Hilbert spaces we call $\mathcal{L}_\Lambda(f, \mu)$

DEFINITION 10.15 — The Λ -spectral density function of the family $\{f_x\}_x$ is the monotone

increasing function

$$\mu \longmapsto F_\Lambda(f, \mu) := \sup\{\dim_\Lambda : L \in \mathcal{L}_\Lambda(f, \mu)\}.$$

Here of course one has to pass to the closure in order to apply the Λ -dimension. We say f is Λ Fredholm if for some $\epsilon > 0$, $F_\Lambda(f, \epsilon) < \infty$

We want to show that this definition actually coincides with the definition given in term of the spectral measure of the positive self-adjoint operator f^*f .

LEMMA 10.16 — In the situation above

$$F_\Lambda(f, \mu) = \text{tr}_\Lambda \chi_{[0, \mu^2]}(f^*f) = \dim_\Lambda \text{range}(\chi_{[0, \mu^2]}(f^*f))$$

as a projection in $\text{End}_\Lambda(U)$.

Notice that since f^*f is a positive operator $\chi_{[0, \mu^2]}(f^*f) = \chi_{(-\infty, \mu^2]}(f^*f)$ is the spectral projection associated to the spectral resolution $f^*f = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mu d\chi_{(-\infty, \mu]}$.

PROOF — The spectral Theorem (a parametrized measurable version) shows that the ranges of the family of projections $\chi_{[0, \mu^2]}(f^*f)$ belong to the class $\mathcal{L}(f, \mu)$, then

$$\dim_\Lambda(\text{range}(\chi_{[0, \mu^2]}(f^*f))) \leq F_\Lambda(f, \mu).$$

In fact it's clear that $\chi_{[0, \mu^2]}(f_x^*f_x)\omega = \omega \Rightarrow \|f\omega\| \leq \mu\|\omega\|$. But now for every $L \in \mathcal{L}(f, \mu)$ we get a family of injections $\chi_{\mu^2}(f_x^*f_x)|_{L_x} \longrightarrow \text{range}(\chi_{\mu^2}(f_x^*f_x))$ that after reduction modulo Λ and with the crucial property a) of the formal dimension in Proposition 19 pag. 55 in [8],

$$\dim_\Lambda(L) \leq \dim_\Lambda(\text{range}(\chi_{[0, \mu^2]}(f^*f))).$$

□

DEFINITION 10.17 — A complex of random Hilbert cochains as $(L^2(\Omega^\bullet X_0), d)$ and its relative and boundary versions is said Λ -(left) Fredholm in degree k if the differential induced on the quotient

$$\frac{\mathcal{D}(d^k)}{\text{range}(d^{k-1})} \xrightarrow{d} L^2(\Omega^{k+1} X_0)$$

gives by Λ a.e. reduction a left Fredholm unbounded operator in the sense of definition 10.15. In particular the condition involving the spectrum distribution function is

$$F_\Lambda(d| : \mathcal{D}(d^k) \cap \text{range}(d^{k-1})^\perp \longrightarrow L^2(\Omega^{k+1} X_0), \mu) < \infty \quad (15)$$

for some positive number μ .

For this reason one calls the left hand-side of (15)

$$F_\Lambda\left(L^2(\Omega^k X_0, \partial X_0), \mu\right) := F_\Lambda(d| : \mathcal{D}(d^k) \cap \text{range}(d^{k-1})^\perp \longrightarrow L^2(\Omega^{k+1} X_0), \mu)$$

the spectral density function of the complex at point k .

REMARK — The definition above combined with lemma 10.16 says that we have to compute

the formal dimension of $\chi_{[0,\mu^2]}(f^*f)$ where $f = d_{|\mathcal{D}(d) \cap \overline{\text{range}(d^{k-1})}^\perp}$. But f is an injective restriction of d^k ; then every spectral projection $\chi_B(f^*f)$ projects onto a subspace that's orthogonal to $\ker(d^k)$. This means

$$F_\Lambda(d| : \mathcal{D}(d^k) \cap \text{range}(d^{k-1})^\perp \longrightarrow L^2(\Omega^{k+1}X_0), \mu) = \sup \mathcal{L}_\Lambda^\perp(f, \mu) \quad (16)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_\Lambda^\perp(f, \mu)$ is the set of Random fields of subspaces of $\mathcal{D}(d) \cap \ker(d)^\perp$ where d is bounded by μ (see Definition 10.15)

Now return to the boundary foliation $\partial\mathcal{F}_0$ with its equivalence relation $\underline{\mathcal{R}}_0$.

THEOREM 10.17 — All the three complexes of Random Hilbert spaces

$$L^{2,\mathcal{F}}(\Omega^\bullet X_0), \quad L^{2,\mathcal{F}}(\Omega^\bullet X_0, \partial X_0), \quad L^{2,\mathcal{F}}(\Omega^\bullet \partial X_0),$$

with unbounded differentials are Λ -Fredholm as representations of $\underline{\mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{R}(\partial\mathcal{F}_0)$.

PROOF — The proof follows by an accurate inspection of the relation between the differentials (with or without boundary conditions) and the Laplace operator through the theory of selfadjoint boundary differential problems developed in [21]. To make the notation lighter let $M = L_x^0$ with $\partial M = \partial L_x^0$ the generic leaf. We concentrate on the relative sequence at point $d : A^k(M, \partial M) \longrightarrow A^{k+1}(M, \partial M)$ where the differential is an unbounded operator on L^2 with Dirichlet boundary conditions. Let $\mathcal{D}(d) = A^{k+1}(M, \partial M)$. The following Lemma is inspired by Lemma 5.11 in [13] where in contrast Neumann boundary conditions are imposed.

LEMMA 10.18 — Let $\ker(d)$ be the kernel of d as unbounded operator with Dirichlet boundary conditions, then

$$\mathcal{D}(d) \cap \ker(d)^\perp = H_{\text{Dir}}^1 \cap \overline{\delta^{k+1} C_0^\infty(\Lambda^{k+1} T^* M)}^{L^2}$$

where H_{Dir}^1 is the space of order 1 Sobolev k -forms ω such that $\omega|_{\partial M} = 0$.

PROOF — First of all remember that the differential operator $d + \delta : C^\infty(\Lambda^\bullet T^* M) \longrightarrow C^\infty(\Lambda^\bullet T^* M)$ with either Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions is formally self-adjoint with respect to the greenian formula

$$(d^r \omega, \eta) - (\omega, \delta^{p+1} \eta) = \int_{\partial M} (\omega \wedge *^{p+1} \eta)|_\eta$$

and uniformly elliptic [21]. This means that this is an elliptic boundary value problem in the classical sense according to the original definition of Lopatinski and Shapiro, together with a uniform condition on the local fundamental solutions[21]. Now let $\omega \in C_0^\infty$ and $\eta \in \ker(d)$

i.e. $\eta_n \in C_0^\infty$, $(\eta_n)|_{\partial M} = 0$, $\eta_n \xrightarrow{L^2} \eta$, $d\eta_n \xrightarrow{L^2} 0$ then

$$(\eta, \delta\omega) = \lim_n (\eta_n, \delta\omega) = \underbrace{\lim_n (d\eta_n, \omega)}_0 \pm \underbrace{\int_{\partial M} (\eta_n \wedge *\omega)|_{\partial M}}_{\eta|_{\partial M}=0} = 0,$$

showing that $\overline{\delta C_0^\infty} \subset \mathcal{D}(d) \cap \ker(d)^\perp$. For the reverse inclusion take $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(d) \cap \ker(d)^\perp$ i.e. $\omega_n \in C_0^\infty$, $\omega_n \xrightarrow{L^2} \omega$, $d\omega_n \xrightarrow{L^2} 0$. For fixed $\eta \in C_0^\infty$,

$$\underbrace{((d + \delta)\eta, \omega)}_{d\eta \in \ker(d), \omega \in \ker(d)^\perp} = (\delta\eta, \omega) = \lim_n (\delta\eta, \omega_n) \underbrace{=}_{\omega_n|_{\partial M}=0} = \lim_n (\eta, d\omega).$$

Then we can apply the adjoint regularity theorem of Hörmander [21] Lemma 4.19, cor 4.22 saying that $\omega \in H_{\text{loc}}^1$ then $(\delta\omega, \eta) = (\omega, d\eta)$ holds because for every $\eta \in C_0^\infty(M - \partial M)$, $d\eta \in \ker(d)$ then $\delta\omega = 0$. It follows that for every $\sigma \in C_0^\infty$

$$0 \underbrace{=}_{d\sigma \in \ker(d)} (d\sigma, \omega) = \underbrace{(\sigma, \delta\omega)}_0 \pm \int_{\partial M} (\sigma \wedge *\omega)|_{\partial M} = \pm \int_{\partial M} (\bar{\omega} \wedge *\bar{\sigma})|_{\partial M}.$$

The last passage coming from the definition of the Hodge $*$ operator, $\sigma \wedge *\omega = (\sigma, \omega)dvol = (\bar{\omega}, \bar{\sigma})dvol = \bar{\omega} \wedge *\bar{\sigma}$, where $\bar{\cdot}$ is the complex conjugate in $\Lambda T^*M \otimes \mathbb{C}$. Now from the density of $\{i^*(\bar{*}\bar{\sigma})\}_{\sigma \in C_0^\infty}$ in $L^2(\partial M)$, $i : \partial M \hookrightarrow M$ the boundary condition $\omega|_{\partial M} = 0$ follows in particular $\omega \in H_{\text{Dir}}^1$. Now it remains to apply the Hodge decomposition

$$L^2(\Lambda^k T^*M) = \mathcal{H}_{(2)}^k(M, \partial M) \oplus \overline{d^{k-1}\Omega_d^{k-1}(M, \partial M)}^{L^2} \oplus \overline{\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}(M, \partial M)}^{L^2}_{\text{no } \partial\text{-conditions}}$$

to deduce $\omega \in \overline{\delta^{k+1}C_0^\infty(\Lambda^{k+1}T^*M)}^{L^2}$. \square

Consider again the formally selfadjoint boundary value problem $d + \delta$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions i.e. $\mathcal{D}(d + \delta) = H_{\text{Dir}}^1$. Its square in the sense of unbounded operators on L^2 is the laplacian Δ with domain

$$H_{\text{Dir}}^2 := \{\omega \in H^2 : \omega|_{\partial M} = 0, ((d + \delta)\omega)|_{\partial M} = (\delta\omega)|_{\partial M} = 0\}.$$

Let Δ_k^\perp the operator obtained from Δ on k -forms restricted to the orthogonal complement of its kernel, it is easy to see that the splitting

$$L^2(\Lambda^k T^*M) = \mathcal{H}_{(2)}^k(M, \partial M) \oplus \overline{d^{k-1}\Omega_d^{k-1}(M, \partial M)}^{L^2} \oplus \overline{\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}(M, \partial M)}^{L^2}_{\text{no } \partial\text{-conditions}}$$

induces the following splitting on Δ_k ,

$$\Delta_k^\perp = (\delta^{k+1}d^p)_{|\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}} \oplus (d^{k-1}\delta^k)_{|d^{k-1}\Omega_d^{k-1}}.$$

LEMMA 10.19 — The following identities of unbounded operators hold

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta^{k+1}d^p)_{|\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}} &= (d_{|\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}}^k)^* (d_{|\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}}^k), \\ (d^{k-1}\delta^k)_{|d^{k-1}\Omega_d^{k-1}} &= (d_{|\delta^k\Omega_\delta^k}^{k-1})(d_{|\delta^k\Omega_\delta^k}^{k-1})^* \end{aligned}$$

where the $d_{|\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}}^k$ is the unbounded operator on the subspace $\overline{\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}}$ of L^2 with domain $H_{\text{Dir}}^1 \cap \overline{\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}}$ and range $\overline{d^{k+1}\Omega_d^{k+1}}$.

PROOF — This is again the *dual* (in the sense of boundary conditions) statement of Lemma 5.16 in [13]. We first state that the Hilbert space adjoint of the operator d^k with domain $H_{\text{Dir}}^1 \cap \overline{\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}}$ and range $\overline{d^{k+1}\Omega_d^{k+1}}$ is exactly δ^{k+1} with domain $H_{\text{Dir}}^1 \cap \overline{d^k\Omega_d^k}$. We shall omit degrees of forms and call d this restricted operator. Thanks to the intersection with H^1 this is also the restriction of $d + \delta$ to the same subspace, in particular $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(d^*) \subset \overline{dC_0^\infty}$ implies $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(d)$ and $d\omega = 0$. Take arbitrary $\eta \in H_{\text{Dir}}^1 \cap \overline{\delta C_0^\infty}$, then since $\delta\eta = 0$, $((d + \delta)\eta, \omega) = (d\eta, \omega) = (\eta, d^*\omega)$ and if $\eta \in H_{\text{Dir}}^1 \cap \overline{d\Omega_d}$, $((d + \delta)\eta, \omega) = (\delta\eta, \omega) = 0$. Since $\delta H_{\text{Dir}}^1 \perp \overline{d\Omega_d}$ this is immediately checked,

$$\sigma \in d\Omega_d, \sigma = d\lambda, \lambda|_{\partial M} = 0, (\sigma, \delta\gamma) = \underbrace{(d\sigma, \gamma)}_{=0} + \int_{|\partial M} \underbrace{(\sigma \wedge * \gamma)}_{=0}.$$

Also $(\eta, d^*\omega) = 0$ since $d^*\omega \in \overline{\delta C_0^\infty}$ and $d\Omega_{\text{Dir}} \perp \delta C_0^\infty$. Then we can apply again the adjoint regularity theorem [21], Lemma 4.19 to deduce $\omega \in H_{\text{loc}}^1$. The next goal is to show $\omega \in H_{\text{Dir}}^1$ i.e. $d\omega, \delta\omega \in L^2$, $\omega|_{\partial M} = 0$ but $dx = 0 \in L^2$, $\delta\omega = (d + \delta)\omega = d^*\omega \in L^2$ and

$$(\omega, dd\eta) = (d^*\omega, \delta\eta) = (\delta\omega, \delta\eta) = (\omega, d\delta\eta) \pm \int_{\partial M} (\delta\eta \wedge *\omega)|_{\partial M} \text{ for every } \eta \in C_0^\infty. \text{ Then } \\ 0 = \int_{\partial M} (\delta\eta \wedge *\omega)|_{\partial M} = \int_{\partial M} (\bar{\omega} \wedge *\delta\eta)|_{\partial M} \underbrace{=}_{=0} \int_{\partial M} (\omega \wedge *\delta\eta)|_{\partial M} \text{ for every } \eta. \text{ The boundary}$$

condition follows by density. Finally it is clear that $\delta d|_{\mathcal{D}(d^*d)} = \Delta = \Delta^\perp$ but we have to prove the coincidence of the domains

$$\mathcal{D}(\Delta) \cap \overline{\delta C_0^\infty} = \mathcal{D}(d^*(d|_{\overline{\delta C_0^\infty}})),$$

now $\mathcal{D}(\Delta) = H_{\text{Dir}}^2 = \{\omega \in H^2, \omega|_{\partial M}, (\delta\omega)|_{\partial M} = 0\} \subset \mathcal{D}(d^*d|_{\overline{\delta C_0^\infty}})$. Clearly

$$\omega \in \mathcal{D}(d^*d|_{\overline{\delta C_0^\infty}}) \Rightarrow \omega \in H_{\text{Dir}}^1 \cap \overline{\delta C_0^\infty},$$

$d\omega \in H_{\text{Dir}}^1$ then $(d + \delta)\omega \in H^1$ and since $\omega|_{\partial M} = 0$ by elliptic regularity (for the boundary value problem $(d + \delta)$ with Dirichlet conditions [21]) $\omega \in H^2$. We have just checked the boundary conditions, finally $\omega \in H_{\text{Dir}}^2 = \mathcal{D}(\Delta)$. The second equality in the statement is proven in a very similar way. \square

Now that the relation of d with Dirichlet boundary condition restricted to the complement of its kernel with the Laplacian (Δ^\perp) is clear we can use elliptic regularity to deduce that the relative Random Hilbert complex is Λ -Fredholm. This has to be done in two steps, the first is to show that the spectral function of the Laplacian controls the spectral function of the complex

$$F_\Lambda(\Delta_k^\perp, \sqrt{\mu}) = F_\Lambda(L^{2,\mathcal{F}}(\Omega^k X_0, \partial X_0), \mu) + F_\Lambda(L^{2,\mathcal{F}}(\Omega^{k-1} X_0, \partial X_0), \mu) \quad (17)$$

in fact

$$\begin{aligned} F_\Lambda(\Delta_k^\perp, \sqrt{\mu}) &= F_\Lambda\left(\left(\delta^{k+1}d^k\right)_{|\overline{\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}}}, \sqrt{\mu}\right) + F_\Lambda\left(\left(d^{k-1}\delta^k\right)_{|\overline{d^{k-1}\Omega_d^{k-1}}}, \sqrt{\mu}\right) \\ &= F_\Lambda\left(\left(\frac{d^k}{|\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}}\right)^* \left(\frac{d^k}{|\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}}\right), \sqrt{\mu}\right) + F_\Lambda\left(\left(\frac{d^{k-1}}{|\delta^k\Omega_\delta^k}\right)\left(\frac{d^{k-1}}{|\delta^k\Omega_\delta^k}\right)^*, \sqrt{\mu}\right) \\ &= F_\Lambda\left(\frac{d^k}{|\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}}, \mu\right) + F_\Lambda\left(\frac{d^{k-1}}{|\delta^k\Omega_\delta^k}, \mu\right) \end{aligned}$$

where, in the first step we have used the obvious fact that the spectral functions behave additively under direct sum of operators together with the remark after (10.17), at the second step there are lemmas 10.18 and 10.19 together with the following properties of the spectral functions

- $F_\Lambda(f^*f, \sqrt{\lambda}) = F_\Lambda(f, \lambda)$
- $F_\Lambda(\phi, \lambda) = F_\lambda(\phi^*, \lambda)$

that can be adapted to hold in our situation with unbounded operators. Good references are the paper of Lott and Lück [11] and the paper of Lück and Schick [13] that inspired completely this treatment.

Let us first recall the equation

$$F_\Lambda(\Delta_k^\perp, \sqrt{\mu}) = F_\Lambda(L^{2,\mathcal{F}}(\Omega^k X_0, \partial X_0), \mu) + F_\Lambda(L^{2,\mathcal{F}}(\Omega^{k-1} X_0, \partial X_0), \mu).$$

It says that we have only to show that Δ_k^\perp is left Λ -Fredholm to have control of both Fredholmness at degree k and $k-1$. We can use the heat kernel, in fact by elliptic regularity for each leaf the heat kernel $e^{-t\Delta_k, x^\perp}(z, z')$ is smooth and uniformly bounded along the leaf on intervals $[t_0, \infty)$ [21] Theorem 2.35. As x varies in ∂X_0 these bounds can be made uniform by the uniform geometry (in fact the constants depend on the metric tensor, its inverse and a finite number of their derivatives in normal coordinates) and we get a family of smooth kernels that varies transversally in a measurable fashion since it is obtained by functional calculus from a measurable family of operators. Then they give a Λ -trace class element in the Von Neumann algebra. Now the projections $\chi_{[0,\mu]}(f^*f)$ in definition 10.17 where f is the differential restricted to the complement of its kernel are obtained from the heat kernel as

$$\chi_{[0,\mu]}(f^*f) = \underbrace{\chi_{[0,\mu]}(\Delta_k^\perp)e^{\Delta_k^\perp}}_{\text{bounded}} \underbrace{\chi_{[0,\mu]}(\Delta_k^\perp)e^{-\Delta_k^\perp}}_{\Lambda\text{-trace class}} < \infty.$$

□

REMARK — The same argument of elliptic regularity for b.v. problems together with the various Hodge decompositions shows that each term of the long sequence (14) is a finite Random Hilbert space.

THEOREM 10.19 — The long sequence (14)

$$\begin{aligned} \cdots \longrightarrow H_{dR,(2)}^{k,\mathcal{F}}(X_0, \partial X_0) \xrightarrow{i_*} H_{dR,(2)}^{k,\mathcal{F}}(X_0) \xrightarrow{r_*} \\ \xrightarrow{r_*} H_{dR,(2)}^{k,\mathcal{F}}(\partial X_0) \xrightarrow{\delta} H_{dR,(2)}^{k-1,\mathcal{F}}(X_0, \partial X_0) \longrightarrow \cdots \end{aligned}$$

is Λ -weakly exact (definition 10.14)

PROOF — This is exactly the same proof of Cheeger and Gromov [7] or in the form appearing in the book by Lück (Theorem 1.21 in [12]). In fact the crucial final step there, that is based on the property of formal dimension of Hilbert Γ -modules

$$\dim_\Gamma \left(\bigcap_{i \in I} V_i \right) = \inf_{i \in I} \dim_\Gamma V_i,$$

can be replaced here by a corresponding property for the formal dimension of Random Hilbert spaces. □

10.0.7 The proof

THEOREM 10.19 — We have

$$\sigma_{\Lambda,dR}(X_0, \partial X_0) = \sigma_{\Lambda,\text{an}}(X, \partial X_0)$$

thus together with formula (10) w.r.t. the manifold with cylinder attached X all the three signatures we have defined agree

$$\sigma_{\Lambda,dR}(X_0, \partial X_0) = \sigma_{\Lambda,\text{an}}(X_0, \partial X_0) = \sigma_{\Lambda}^{\infty}(X) = \langle L(X), C_{\Lambda} \rangle + 1/2[\eta_{\Lambda}(D^{\mathcal{F}\theta})]$$

PROOF — We pass through different intermediate results, sometimes doing leafwise considerations. Our model is of course the work of Lück and Schick [13] whose our work is only an adaptation. The proof of Lück and Schick in turn is inspired by the classical argument of Atiyah Patodi and Singer [4] with the great issue that at L^2 level long sequences are only weakly exact and the spectrum of the boundary operator is not discrete.

First step. This is done. We have proved, following the method of Vaillant the equality

$$\sigma_{\Lambda,\text{an}}(X_0, \partial X_0) = \sigma_{\Lambda}^{\infty}(X)$$

where at right-hand side the signature on harmonic leafwise L^2 -forms on the elonged manifold with elonged foliation i.e. the Λ signature of the Poincarè product on leafwise harmonic forms. Our reference is then the harmonic signature.

Second step. We shall prove $\sigma_{\Lambda,dR}(X_0, \partial X_0) = \sigma_{\Lambda}^{\infty}(X)$. We explain now the strategy

We have to measure the $+/-$ eigenspaces of the intersection form on the field of Hilbert spaces $H_{dR,(2)}^{2k}(X_0, \partial X_0)$ as square integrable representations of \mathcal{R}_0 (the whole foliation on X_0). Now thanks to the fundamental note on section 10.0.4 it is sufficient to measure the corresponding projections in the von Neumann algebra arising by restriction of the Random Hilbert spaces to $\underline{\mathcal{R}}_0$ (the equivalence relation of the foliation induced on the boundary). This is a consequence of the very definition of the trace as an integral of a functor with values measure spaces and the fact the boundary contains a complete transversal. The passage to $\underline{\mathcal{R}}_0$ has the great vantage we can write boundary problems and sequences of random Hilbert spaces, in particular the third term in

$$0 \longrightarrow A_x^{k-1}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) \xrightarrow{i} A_x^{k-1}(L_x^0) \xrightarrow{r} A_x^{k-1}(\partial L_x^0) \longrightarrow 0$$

is natural as representations of $\underline{\mathcal{R}}_0$.

Remember the notation $x \in \partial X_0$, $\overline{L_x^0}$ is the leaf of the compact foliated manifold with boundary, L_x is the leaf of the foliation on the manifold X with a cylinder attached. Consider the random Hilbert space $H_{dr,(2)}^{2k}(X_0)$ obtained from the various L^2 cohomologies of the leaves with no boundary conditions (this is called sometimes in literature the L^2 -homology since it naturally pairs with forms with Dirichlet boundary conditions). We have a family of restriction maps $\partial X_0 \ni x \mapsto r_x^p : \mathcal{H}^{2k}(L_x) \longrightarrow H_{dR,(2)}^{2k}(L_x^0)$ and intertwining operators $(\mathcal{H}^{2k}(L_x))_{x \in X_0} \mapsto H_{dR,(2)}^{2k}(L_x^0)$. There are also natural mappings $i_x^{2k} : H_{dR,(2)}^{2k}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) \longrightarrow H_{dR,(2)}^{2k}(L_x)$. And the mapping q coming from the long sequence in cohomology as in the

following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
H_{dR,(2)}^{2k}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) & \xrightarrow{i_x^{2k}} & H_{dR,(2)}^{2k}(L_x^0) \\
\mathcal{H}^{2k}(L_x) & \xrightarrow{r_x^{2k}} & \downarrow q_x^{2k} \\
& & H_{dR,(2)}^{2k}(\partial L_x^0)
\end{array} \quad (18)$$

Following the program of Lück and Schick we shall prove

1. $\overline{\text{range}(r^{2k})} = \overline{\text{range}(i^{2k})}$ as projections in $\text{End}_{\Lambda, \mathcal{R}_0} [H_{dR,(2)}^{2k, \mathcal{F}}(X_0)]$ (19)

and the signature can be computed looking at the fields of sesquilinear Poincaré products on the images of i_x^{2k} as square integrable representations of \mathcal{R}_0 ,

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
H_{dR,(2)}^{2k}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) & \xrightarrow{i_x^{2k}} & H_{dR,(2)}^{2k}(L_x^0) \\
\mathcal{H}^{2k}(L_x) & \xrightarrow{r_x^{2k}} &
\end{array} \quad (20)$$

2. The signature of the field of products on the image of i_x^{2k} coincides with the signature of the fields of Poincaré products on $(\mathcal{H}_x)_{x \in X_0}$ as square integrable representations of \mathcal{R}_0 that in turn coincides with those computed tracing in \mathcal{R}_0

Notice about (19) that $\overline{\text{range}(i^{2k})} = \ker q^{2k}$ by the long exact sequence.

1. Lück and Schick (lemma 3.12 in [13]) prove the following result

LEMMA 10.20 —

$$q_x^{2k} \circ r_x^{2k} = 0, \quad x \in \partial X_0$$

By definition of the algebra of intert. operators $q_x^{2k} \circ r_x^{2k} = 0 \forall x \in \partial X_0 \implies \overline{\text{range } r_x^{2k}} \subset \ker q_x^{2k}$ then

$$\overline{\ker q^{2k}} \cdot \overline{\text{range } r^{2k}} = \overline{\text{range } i^{2k}} \cdot \overline{\text{range } r^{2k}} = \overline{\text{range } r^{2k}} \in \text{End}_{\Lambda, \mathcal{R}_0} [H_{dR,(2)}(X_0)]$$

Now Von Neumann dimentions come in play in a fundamental way. Consider the field of unbounded boundary differentials $d_x : L^2(\Omega^{2k-1} \partial L_x^0) \longrightarrow L^2(\Omega^{2k-1} \partial L_x^0)$ exactly as in [13] (and essentially by elliptic regularity and the fact trace=trace on the boundary foliation) they define a left Fredholm affiliated operator so the image of the field of the spectral projection $\chi_{(0,\gamma]}(\delta d)$ has dimension tending to zero for $\gamma \rightarrow 0$. Given $\epsilon > 0$ define the following field of subspaces,

$$E_{\epsilon,x}^{2k} := \text{range}(d \circ \chi_{(\gamma,\infty)}(\delta d)) \subset L^2(\Omega^{2k} \partial L_x^0).$$

Properties of E_ϵ^{2k}

1. it is measurable, in fact is obtained by functional calculus from a natural Borel family.
2. It has codimension less than ϵ in $\overline{\text{range}(d)}$ in fact $d \circ \chi_{(-\infty,0]}(\delta d) = 0$.
3. It is closed, because the restriction of δd to the subspace corresponding to $(0, \infty)$ satisfies $\delta d \geq \gamma$ than is invertible (this automatically seen using the polar decomposition).

Now we have to invoke the leafwise Hodge decomposition with (Neumann) boundary condition,

$$L^2(\Omega^{2k-1}(L_x^0)) = \overline{\text{range } d^{2k-2}} \oplus \overline{\text{range } \delta_{\{|\omega|_{\partial}=0\}}^{2k-2}} \oplus \ker \Delta_{\{(*\omega)|_{\partial}=0=(\delta\omega)|_{\partial}\}}^{2k}. \quad (21)$$

The methods of Schick [21] surely applies to the generic leaf L_x^0 in fact this is bounded geometry and has a collar so the fact its boundary has infinite connected components (complete in the induced metric) plays no role. So the space $H_{(2),dR}^{2k}(L_x^0)$ can be canonically identified with the third addendum in (21) and pull back to the boundary gives a well defined measurable¹¹ family of (uniformly) bounded mappings $\beta_x^{2k} : H_{(2),dR}^{2k}(L_x^0) \longrightarrow L^2(\Omega^{2k}(\partial L_x^0))$. Define, by pull-back the following measurable field of closed subspaces

$$K_{\epsilon,x}^{2k} \subset H_{(2),dR}^{2k}(L_x^0).$$

Properties of $K_{\epsilon,x}^{2k}$:

1. $K_{\epsilon,x}^{2k} \subset H_{(2),dR}^{2k}(L_x^0)$
2. $K_{\epsilon,x}^{2k} \subset (\beta_x^{2k})^{-1}(\overline{\text{range } d_{\partial}})$
3. The field $K_{\epsilon,x}^{2k}$ defines a projection having codimension in $\ker q^{2k}$ that's less than ϵ .

Then there's another density lemma in [13] (Lemma 3.16) stating another property,

$$K_{\epsilon}^{2k} \subset \text{range}(r_x^{2k} : \mathcal{H}_2^{2k}(L_x) \longrightarrow \overline{\text{range } i^{2k}}).$$

All of this properties certainly say that (19) is true (by normality of the trace we can reach $\overline{\text{range}(i^{2k})}$ with a family of subprojections whose codimension tends to zero).

2.

Again following [13], $q[0]^{2k}$ (notation of the proof of Lemma 10.0.7) defines a bounded family of mappings from $\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^{2k}(L_x)$ to $\overline{\text{range } d_{\partial}}$. So let $\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon,x}^{2k} \subset \mathcal{H}_{(2)}^{2k}(L_x)$ be as before the inverse image of $E_{\epsilon,x}^{2k}$. Since we are using harmonic forms the pull-back is (uniformly) bounded in the L^2 norm so $\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon,x}^{2k}$ is a field of closed subspaces giving projection of codimension in $\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^{2k}(X)$ not greater than ϵ . Now if

$$L_{\epsilon,x}^{2k} \subset \overline{\text{range } i_x^{2k}}$$

is the closure of the image of $L_{\epsilon,x}^{2k}$ under the mapping $r_x^{2k} : \mathcal{H}_{(2)}^{2k}(L_x) \longrightarrow \overline{\text{range } i_x^{2k}}$, its codimension into $\overline{\text{range } i^{2k}}$ is less than ϵ exactly because of (19) since the codimension of $\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon}^{2k}$ in $\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^{2k}(X)$ is less than ϵ .

The leafwise intersection form

$$s_x^0 : H_{(2)}^{2k}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) \times H_{(2)}^{2k}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

descends into a pairing on $\overline{\text{range } i_x^{2k}}$ which restricts to a pairing

$$\eta_x^0 : L_{\epsilon,x}^{2k} \times L_{\epsilon,x}^{2k} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}.$$

But the codimension of $L_{\epsilon}^{2k} \subset \overline{\text{range } i^{2k}}$ is less than ϵ one gets

$$|\text{sign}_{\Lambda}(s^0) - \text{sign}_{\Lambda}(\eta)| \leq \epsilon,$$

¹¹inverse image of a measurable field of subspaces by a unif. bounded measurable family of bounded operators is measurable, one can split the domain space as $\text{Ker} \oplus \text{Ker}^{\perp}$ and apply the well known fact that inverses of isom. are measurable [9]

remember that $\text{sign}_\Lambda(s^0) = \sigma_{\Lambda, dR}(X_0, \partial X_0)$.

Now it's a quite amazing computation performed by Luck and Schick [13] that the leafwise Hodge intersection form we called $s_x^\infty : \mathcal{H}_{(2)}(L_x) \times \mathcal{H}_{(2)}(L_x) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ descends to a pairing on each $\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon, x}^{2k}$ and in turn to exactly the pairing η_x^0 defined above. Again since the codimension of $\mathcal{H}_\epsilon^{2k}$ in $\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^{2k}(X)$ is $\leq \epsilon$ we get $|\text{sign}_\Lambda(s^\infty) - \text{sign}_\Lambda(\eta^0)| \leq \epsilon$ then

$$|\text{sign}_\Lambda(s^\infty) - \text{sign}_\Lambda(s^0)| \leq 2\epsilon.$$

The theorem is proved since ϵ is arbitrary. □

REMARK — On the assumption of the complete transversal contained into the boundary. The assumption $\text{Saturation}(\partial X_0) = X_0$ is really simply avoidable in fact one can write the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow A_x^{k-1}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) \xrightarrow{i} A_x^{k-1}(L_x^0) \xrightarrow{r} A_x^{k-1}(\partial L_x^0) \longrightarrow 0$$

for x also in the interior but the last arrow is null for $\partial L_x^0 = 0$ so everything works in the exactly same way.

References

- [1] Paolo Antonini. The Atiyah Patodi Singer index formula for measured foliations

completare referenza

- [2] Paolo Antonini The Atiyah Patodi Singer index formula for measured foliations. PhD thesis La Sapienza Rome arXiv:0901.0143,
- [3] M. F. Atiyah. Elliptic operators, discrete groups and von Neumann algebras. In *Colloque "Analyse et Topologie" en l'Honneur de Henri Cartan (Orsay, 1974)*, pages 43–72. Astérisque, No. 32–33. Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1976.
- [4] M. F. Atiyah, V. K. Patodi, and I. M. Singer. Spectral asymmetry and Riemannian geometry. I. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 77:43–69, 1975.
- [5] Nicole Berline, Ezra Getzler, and Michèle Vergne. *Heat kernels and Dirac operators*, volume 298 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.
- [6] J. Brüning and M. Lesch. Hilbert complexes *J Functional Analysis* 108, 88-132 (1992)
- [7] Jeff Cheeger and Mikhael Gromov. Bounds on the von Neumann dimension of L^2 -cohomology and the Gauss-Bonnet theorem for open manifolds. *J. Differential Geom.*, 21(1):1–34, 1985.
- [8] Alain Connes. Sur la théorie non commutative de l'intégration. In *Algèbres d'opérateurs (Sém., Les Plans-sur-Bex, 1978)*, volume 725 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 19–143. Springer, Berlin, 1979.
- [9] J. Dixmier. Von Neumann algebras. North Holland, Amsterdam, 1988.
- [10] James Heitsch and Conor Lazarov. Homotopy invariance of foliation Betti numbers, In *Invent. Math.*, 104 pages 321–347 1991.
- [11] John Lott, Wolfgang Lück L^2 -Topological invariants of 3-manifolds. *Invent. math.*, 120, 15–60 (1995)

- [12] Wolfgang Luck, L^2 Invariants: Theory and applications to geometry and K -Theory Volume 44 of the Springer series "A series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics"
- [13] Wolfgang Lück, Thomas Schick Various L^2 -signatures and a topological L^2 -signature theorem. High-dimensional manifold topology, 362–399, World Sci. Publishing, River Edge, NJ, 2003
- [14] Calvin C. Moore and Claude Schochet. *Global analysis on foliated spaces*, volume 9 of *Mathematical Sciences Research Institute Publications*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988. With appendices by S. Hurder, Moore, Schochet and Robert J. Zimmer.
- [15] A. E. Nussbaum Reduction theory for unbounded closed operators in hilbert space, *Duke Math. Journal*, 31(1):33–44, 1964.
- [16] Goran Peric. Eta invariants of Dirac operators on foliated manifolds, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 334(2): 761–782. 1992
- [17] Mohan Ramachandran. Von Neumann index theorems for manifolds with boundary. *J. Differential Geom.*, 38(2):315–349, 1993.
- [18] Revuz Markov chains. North-Holland Mathematical Library, vol. 11, North-Holland, Amsterdam; American Elsevier, New York, 1975, x + 336 pp., 35.50
- [19] M Reed and B. Simon Methods of Mathematical Physics IV. Academic Press, New York 1978.
- [20] A. E. Nussbaum Reduction theory for unbounded closed operators in hilbert space, *Duke Math. Journal*, 31(1):33–44, 1964.
- [21] Thomas Schick, Analysis on boundary manifolds of bounded geometry, Hodge-de Rham isomorphism and L^2 -index theorem. Dissertation. Printed by Shaker Verlag, 1996. ISBN=3-8265-1969-8 <http://www.uni-math.gwdg.de/schick/publ/disschick.htm>
- [22] Thomas Schick, Analysis and Geometry of Boundary-Manifolds of Bounded Geometry. <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/9810107>.
- [23] Thomas Schick, Boundary manifolds of bounded geometry. *Math. Nachr.* 223 (2001), 103–120.
- [24] Masamichi Takesaki Theory of operator algebra I Springer Verlag
- [25] B. Vaillant. Indextheorie für Überlagerungen. Diplomarbeit, Universität. Bonn, <http://styx.math.uni-bonn.de/boris/diplom.html>, 1997