

Correctness, proof completeness, and novelty audit

First cohomology of Anosov actions of higher rank abelian groups and applications to rigidity

Anatole Katok, Ralf J. Spatzier

Reviewed source	Publications Mathématiques de l’IHÉS version of record · volume 79 (1994), pages 131–156
Exact version	Version of record
Journal citation	Anatole Katok and Ralf J. Spatzier. First cohomology of Anosov actions of higher rank abelian groups and applications to rigidity. Publications Mathématiques de l’IHÉS 79 (1994), 131–156.
DOI	10.1007/BF02698888
Audit date	August 23, 2026
Scope	Statements, proofs, and novelty
Important limitation. AI-generated analysis. This report is not a correctness certificate or a substitute for expert scrutiny.	

SUMMARY

01	Statements	Correct
02	Proofs	Contains incorrect or incomplete proofs
03	Novelty	No non-novelty findings

Statements

Correct The smooth and Hölder first-cohomology rigidity theorems, Livšic theorem, and rigidity applications are correct. The authors later withdrew Proposition 4.9 and supplied a different argument for the affected Hölder theorem; that verified repair preserves the central conclusions and their stated scope.

Theorems 2.9–2.10: First-cohomology and higher-rank Livšic conclusions

Printed pages 138–139 and 142–154 · Theorems 2.9–2.10

Correct · **verified repair for Theorem 2.9(b)**

Part (a) constructs smooth transfer functions by Fourier analysis in the algebraic cases and by exponentially decaying matrix coefficients in the semisimple cases; the Livšic theorem turns vanishing closed-orbit obstructions into Hölder, C^1 , or smooth coboundaries. Part (b) is not proved by the printed smoothing proposition, but the authors' erratum proves exponential decay for Hölder matrix coefficients in every standard case, first obtains a distributional solution, then shows that its translates by stable and unstable horospherical groups differ by continuous functions. Since those groups together with A and M generate G , this yields a continuous transfer function, and Theorem 2.10 upgrades it to Hölder. The repair covers exactly the printed conclusion.

Source: [Authors' erratum](#)

Theorems 2.12–2.14: Time-change, local Hölder rigidity, and invariant-volume applications

Printed pages 139 and 154–155 · Theorems 2.12–2.14

Correct

A time change is encoded by an $\mathbb{R}^k$ -valued cocycle; Theorem 2.9 reduces it to a linear homomorphism plus a transfer map, and compactness plus trivial isotropy forces that homomorphism to be an automorphism. Normal hyperbolicity supplies the orbit equivalence for local rigidity. For invariant volume, the logarithmic Jacobian is a cocycle; the repaired Hölder cohomology theorem and the regularity clause of Theorem 2.10 produce a smooth density, while total-volume preservation forces the remaining constant Jacobian to be one. These deductions remain valid after the repair of Theorem 2.9(b).

Source: [Version of record and authors' erratum](#)

Proofs

Contains incorrect or incomplete proofs The proof is incorrect as printed because Proposition 4.9 is false and is the sole bridge used to deduce Hölder cohomology rigidity from the smooth theorem. The authors’ erratum supplies a verified replacement argument. The focal matrix-coefficient estimate is correct within its explicitly narrower cocompact irreducible setting.

Proposition 4.9 and proof of Theorem 2.9(b): The smooth-approximation proposition is false

Printed pages 152–154 · Proposition 4.9 and proof of Theorem 2.9(b)

Incorrect as written · verified repair

The proposition asserts that every continuous cocycle over an arbitrary locally free $\mathbb{R}^k$ -action can be uniformly approximated by smooth cocycles. The authors explicitly state in their erratum that Proposition 4.9 is wrong and that this invalidates the printed proof of Theorem 2.9(b). The attempted flow-box patching smooths local leafwise potentials while preserving closedness, but it does not establish a globally smooth field with the claimed compatibility. Repair classification: Verified repair. The erratum bypasses smoothing altogether by using exponential decay of Hölder matrix coefficients to construct and regularize the transfer distribution directly.

Source: [Authors’ erratum, first paragraph and replacement proof](#)

Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.2: The focal Sobolev matrix-coefficient estimate is valid only in its printed scope

Printed pages 140–142 · Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.2

Correct in scope

For an irreducible unitary representation with discrete kernel, the proof decomposes smooth vectors into K -types, applies Howe’s K -finite strongly- L^p bound, and uses Warner’s Casimir-eigenvalue and K -type dimension summability to obtain exponential decay controlled by Sobolev norms. Corollary 3.2 then uses irreducibility and cocompactness of Γ , Moore ergodicity, and Cowling’s representation-uniform exponent when no factor is locally isomorphic to $\mathrm{SO}(n, 1)$ or $\mathrm{SU}(n, 1)$. This derivation does not support the broader strong-spectral-gap setting later desired by BEG; that is a downstream source-scope mismatch, not a false statement in this paper. The exact proof chain retains statement-restricted edges to Howe Corollary 7.2, Cowling’s integrability theorem, Warner’s book, and Moore ergodicity.

Source: [Publications Mathématiques de l’IHÉS version of record](#)

Novelty

No non-novelty findings No non-novelty findings.

METHOD

Exact-source disclosure

This audit evaluated only the linked journal version of record. An arXiv preprint, accepted manuscript, or later correction is not silently substituted for that source.

Sources checked

1. Publications Mathématiques de l’IHÉS version of record · volume 79 (1994), pages 131–156
2. Authors’ erratum, first paragraph and replacement proof
3. Publications Mathématiques de l’IHÉS version of record

Audit instructions

You are a mathematical auditor. Evaluate only the correctness of the paper’s central statements, the correctness and completeness of its proofs, and evidence-backed non-novelty. Do not make editorial comments or evaluate importance, exposition, style, or suitability for publication. Keep the report neutral, precise, and professional.

PART 1 — CORRECTNESS OF THE MAIN STATEMENTS

Identify the paper’s central statements and assess each one separately using exactly one of these outcomes:

- Correct: the statement has a correct, verifiable proof; or, despite a defect in the printed proof, you can give a fully verified repair or independent proof.
- Incorrect: you can give strong formal evidence that the statement as written is false, preferably a counterexample or a complete contradiction.
- Not able to verify: the supplied proof does not establish the statement, and you can neither supply a fully verified proof nor disprove it.

For every adverse or unverified outcome, restate the exact claim and hypotheses, identify its location in the reviewed version, and give the decisive reasoning. Do not infer that a theorem is false merely because its printed proof is defective.

Assign the overall statements status by the following priority:

1. Contains wrong statements, if at least one central statement is Incorrect.
2. Contains unsupported statements, if no central statement is Incorrect but at least one is Not able to verify.
3. Correct, if every central statement is Correct, apart from any typographical or minor formal findings allowed by Part 4.

PART 2 — CORRECTNESS AND COMPLETENESS OF THE PROOFS

Audit the proofs of the central statements and every material internal or cited input on which they depend. For each proof or proof segment, use the narrowest supported outcome:

- Correct and complete: every substantive step is verifiable and no case or crucial nontrivial step is missing.
- Incorrect as written: a displayed calculation, inference, lemma, or cited application is formally false or inapplicable.
- Incomplete as written: a necessary substantive step or case is missing, even though no explicit contradiction has been proved.
- Not able to verify: the available paper and sources are insufficient to decide whether the step is valid.

Do not flag omitted routine details, compressed arguments, or “analogously” steps when the omitted reasoning is recoverable and correct. For every defect, identify its smallest exact location, explain its downstream dependency, and classify any proposed repair as one of:

- Verified repair: supply enough reasoning to verify that the repair works throughout every affected use.
- Plausible repair only: describe the possible repair but do not treat it as established.
- No repair supplied.

Assign the overall proofs status by the following priority:

1. Contains incorrect or incomplete proofs, if at least one proof is Incorrect as written or Incomplete as written.
2. Contains unverified proofs, if there is no proved incorrectness or incompleteness but at least one material proof is Not able to verify.
3. Correct, if all audited proofs are Correct and complete, apart from any typographical or minor formal findings allowed by Part 4.

PART 3 — NOVELTY OF THE MAIN STATEMENTS

This is a one-sided, evidence-only check. Evaluate only central results. Report a result only when a verifiable primary source, publicly available before the earliest public version of the paper that contains the result, proves the same statement up to a change of notation, or when the result follows directly and immediately from such an earlier theorem.

For each non-novelty finding, provide the earlier source, its public date, the exact theorem or proposition, and an explicit hypothesis-and-conclusion mapping. A later source cannot establish non-novelty. Do not flag a result merely because an easier proof exists or because it follows through a nontrivial argument. Do not flag a result that the paper itself explicitly presents as known, a survey item, or an alternative proof.

Mention only statements that meet this non-novelty threshold. Say nothing about statements for which no such evidence was found: do not certify novelty, list unsuccessful searches, or add statement-level “no prior source found” entries. If the list is empty, the section may say only “No non-novelty findings.”

PART 4 — TECHNICAL AND EVIDENTIARY RULES

1. Criticism must never be overstated. Call a statement incorrect, a proof incorrect or incomplete, or a result non-new only when strong formal evidence supports that exact judgment. Otherwise use Not able to verify where that outcome exists, or remain silent in the novelty section.
2. Review a specified paper version. Give exact page, theorem, equation, or proof locations; restate relevant quantifiers and hypotheses; and check domains, endpoints, parameter ranges, constants, and dependencies explicitly. Apply a defect only to the regimes and downstream results that actually depend on it.
3. Immediate-consequence closure: when deciding whether a conclusion is supported, treat the argument as including every immediate formal consequence of facts established earlier in the paper and available at that point. An immediate formal consequence is a local, mechanically checkable inference using only definitions already in force, elementary logic, direct substitution or renaming, weakening of an inequality or set inclusion, or a monotonicity or symmetry property explicit in a definition or already proved.
4. Such an inference must introduce no new lemma, estimate, construction, case analysis, limiting or compactness argument, external result, or new issue of uniformity or parameter dependence. Check the direction of monotonicity and the dependence of every threshold or constant explicitly. Do not exchange pointwise and uniform conclusions, change exceptional sets, interchange quantifiers or limits, or extend an endpoint under this rule unless the required fact was already established.
5. If the claimed conclusion follows after immediate-consequence closure, it is fully supported. Do not report a gap, unsupported statement, minor formal correction, or recommendation to add an explanatory sentence, and do not mention the suppressed item in the report. This suppression does not apply to a genuine typographical error as defined below, because a typo is a literal notation defect that still requires a textual correction. For example, if $P(\delta)$ is proved for every sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ and P is immediately monotone in the required direction, then the claim that $P(\delta)$ holds for every $\delta > 0$ requires no correction; the omitted monotonicity step is exposition rather than an audit finding.
6. Immediate-consequence closure permits reconstruction of an omitted inference; it does not permit silent alteration of the printed domain, hypotheses, or quantifiers of an intermediate statement later invoked outside its stated scope. If formal validity requires changing the text of that statement or its stated range, report the appropriate finding even when the repair is easy. Thus a result stated only for $t > 0$ and subsequently applied at $t = 0$ remains a formal scope mismatch unless the endpoint case was separately established before the application.
7. Apply this mandatory gate before recording any adverse, unverified, typographical, or minor formal finding: (a) identify the exact assertion or inference alleged to be defective; (b) reconstruct the strongest conclusion following from the preceding argument after all admissible immediate formal consequences are added; (c) identify the specific defect that remains — a formally demonstrated falsehood, a concrete nontrivial unresolved proof obligation, or a genuine domain, hypothesis, quantifier, or notation mismatch requiring a textual correction; and (d) state the evidence and minimal repair. If no specific defect remains, or if the only possible addition would be explanatory, suppress the finding entirely. Use Not able to verify only when a precise, nontrivial unresolved obligation can be identified.
8. A typographical error is an incorrect symbol, index, exponent, sign, variable name, or notation mismatch whose unique intended correction is mechanically determined from the surrounding text and does not alter the mathematical argument. Report it in yellow as Typo, with the printed text, correction, exact location, and reason it is harmless. It does not lower an overall status.
9. A minor formal correction is a boundary, endpoint, or displayed parameter-range defect that can be repaired consistently in every affected statement by a local change, without a new argument, without invalidating any related result or application, and without creating another substantive defect. Report it in yellow as Minor formal correction, with the same details. It does not lower an overall status.
10. Do not use either minor category if more than one materially different repair is possible; if the repair changes the substance or scope of a central result; if an excluded case is used later; if the correction fails to propagate consistently; or if a new mathematical idea is required. In such cases use the strongest substantive classification actually supported by evidence.
11. Write every mathematical expression as valid, compilable LaTeX. Use $\$ \dots \$$ for inline mathematics and $\$ \$ \dots \$ \$$ for displayed mathematics, with balanced delimiters and braces. Do not leave raw LaTeX commands outside math delimiters.
12. Separate theorem truth from the correctness of the printed proof. A theorem can be Correct in Part 1 because of a fully verified independent proof while its printed proof is adverse in Part 2. Conversely, a defective proof alone never licenses an Incorrect theorem classification.

Organize the report under Parts 1–3 and apply Part 4 throughout. Do not add editorial commentary, scores, rankings, recommendations, or a list of suppressed observations.

END OF REPORT