

# THE ASYMPTOTIC GEOMETRY OF $G_2$ -MONOPOLES

DANIEL FADEL, ÁKOS NAGY, AND GONÇALO OLIVEIRA

**ABSTRACT.** This article investigates the asymptotics of  $G_2$ -monopoles. First, we find that when the underlying  $G_2$ -manifold has polynomial volume growth strictly greater than  $r^{7/2}$ , finite intermediate energy monopoles with bounded curvature have finite mass.

The second main result restricts to the case when the underlying  $G_2$ -manifold is asymptotically conical. In this situation, we deduce sharp decay estimates and that the connection converges, along the end, to a pseudo-Hermitian–Yang–Mills over the asymptotic cone.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	6
3. Consequences of Moser iteration and $\varepsilon$ -regularity	10
4. Finite mass from finite intermediate energy	13
5. Bochner/Weitzenböck formulas along the end	19
6. Refined asymptotics in the AC case	25
7. Boundary data	36
8. Decay of linearized solutions	39
References	42

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Context.** An important problem in  $G_2$  geometry is to develop methods to distinguish  $G_2$ -manifolds. This problem can be put in several ways, and recent advances produced invariants able to detect connected components of the moduli space of  $G_2$ -holonomy metrics [5–7].

Other approaches intended at producing invariants of  $G_2$ -manifolds aim to produce enumerative theories counting special submanifolds and gauge fields. For example, in

---

*Date:* September 16, 2020.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 53C07,58D27,58E15,70S15.

*Key words and phrases.*  $G_2$ -monopoles.

[18] Dominic Joyce alluded to the possibility of constructing such an enumerative invariant of  $G_2$ -manifolds by “counting” rigid compact coassociative submanifolds (see also [17]). On the other hand, Donaldson and Segal, in [11], proposed an enumerative invariant of certain (noncompact)  $G_2$ -manifolds by considering  $G_2$ -monopoles instead. They further suggest that this might be easier to define and possibly related to a more direct coassociative “count”.

The underlying idea behind this proposal is inspired by Taubes’ Gr=SW Theorem in [25] for 4 dimensional symplectic manifolds. The similarities stand from the fact that the Seiberg–Witten (SW) invariant is obtained from gauge theory while the Gromov–Witten (Gr) invariant is obtained from holomorphic curves, which in a symplectic manifold are calibrated, just like coassociatives in a  $G_2$ -holonomy manifold are.

The study of  $G_2$ -monopoles was initiated in [4, 20] and [21] where the third author gave evidence supporting the Donaldson–Segal program by finding families of  $G_2$ -monopoles parametrized by a positive real number  $m > 0$ , called the mass, which in the limit when  $m \rightarrow +\infty$  concentrate along a compact coassociative submanifold.

The goal of this article is to show that several of the asymptotic features satisfied by these examples are in fact general phenomena which follow from natural assumptions such as finiteness of the relevant energy. This is a very much needed development in order to justify the choice of function spaces to be used in a satisfactory moduli theory.

More about the other gauge theoretical approaches for producing invariants of  $G_2$ -manifolds can, for example, be found in [9–11, 15, 23, 27].

**1.2. Summary.** Let  $(X^7, \varphi)$  be a noncompact, complete, and irreducible  $G_2$ -manifold. We respectively denote by  $g$  and  $*$  the metric and Hodge star operator induced by the  $G_2$ -structure  $\varphi \in \Omega^3(X)$ . We also let  $\psi = *\varphi \in \Omega^4(X)$ . Given a compact Lie group  $G$  with Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  and a principal  $G$ -bundle  $P$  over  $X$ , we consider pairs  $(\nabla, \Phi)$ , where  $\nabla$  is a connection on  $P$  and  $\Phi$  a section of  $\mathfrak{g}_P = P \times_{(\text{Ad}, G)} \mathfrak{g}$  called the *Higgs field*. Such a pair  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  is said to be a  $G_2$ -monopole if

$$*(F_\nabla \wedge \psi) - \nabla\Phi = 0, \tag{1.1}$$

where  $F_\nabla \in \Omega^2(X, \mathfrak{g}_P)$  is the curvature of  $\nabla$  and  $\nabla\Phi$  denotes the covariant derivative of the Higgs field with respect to the induced connection on  $\mathfrak{g}_P$ .  $G_2$ -monopoles can be seen to be (at least formally) critical points of the *intermediate energy*:

$$\mathcal{E}^\psi(\nabla, \Phi) = \int_X (|F_\nabla \wedge \psi|^2 + |\nabla\Phi|^2) \text{vol}_X. \tag{1.2}$$

Note that  $F_\nabla \wedge \psi$  only contains certain components of  $F_\nabla$  and so the intermediate energy only controls part of the curvature of  $\nabla$ .<sup>1</sup> Indeed, the 2-forms on  $(X, \varphi)$  split into irreducible  $G_2$ -representations as  $\Lambda^2 = \Lambda_7^2 \oplus \Lambda_{14}^2$ , with the subscripts accounting for the dimension of the representation. Using this decomposition we can uniquely write  $F_\nabla = F_\nabla^7 + F_\nabla^{14}$  and we find that  $F_\nabla \wedge \psi = F_\nabla^7 \wedge \psi$ . Thus, the intermediate energy only accounts for the “smaller”  $F_\nabla^7$  component of the curvature. Furthermore, under certain technical and refined assumptions on the asymptotic behavior (see Section 1.4 in [20]) it is in fact possible to prove that  $G_2$ -monopoles minimize  $\mathcal{E}^\psi$ . In this article we drop such technical hypothesis and replace them by simpler more natural ones such as finiteness of the intermediate energy.

A word must be said about the reason for restricting to noncompact  $G_2$ -manifolds. Indeed, a short computation resulting from applying  $\nabla^*$  to equation (1.1) and using the Bianchi identity, shows that  $\nabla^* \nabla \Phi = 0$  which in turns implies that  $|\Phi|^2$  is subharmonic. Thus, if  $X$  was to be compact  $|\Phi|$  would be constant and thus  $\nabla \Phi = 0 = F_\nabla \wedge \psi$ . In particular,  $\nabla$  is a so-called  $G_2$ -instanton, which is a very interesting equation in itself. However, in this article we be focusing on “pure”  $G_2$ -monopoles and so we regard the case when  $\nabla \Phi \neq 0$  as being more interesting.

**Main results.** Recall that a  $G_2$ -holonomy Riemannian manifold  $(X, \varphi)$  is Ricci-flat. Then, as  $X$  is noncompact, an application of the Bishop–Gromov volume comparison theorem shows that for any  $x \in X$  and sufficiently large  $r \gg 1$ , the volume of radius  $r$  ball centered at  $x$  satisfies

$$r \lesssim \text{Vol}(B_r(x)) \lesssim r^n,$$

where  $n = 7$ . The  $G_2$ -manifold  $(X, \varphi)$  is said to have polynomial volume growth strictly greater than  $r^{n/2}$  if there is  $l > n/2$  such that  $\lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} r^{-l} \text{Vol}(B_r(x))$  converges to a positive constant.

Furthermore, by the Cheeger–Gromov splitting theorem, any irreducible  $(X, \varphi)$  has only one end, meaning that for all  $r$  large  $X - B_r(x)$  has only one connected component. Our first result gives conditions under which monopoles  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  have  $|\Phi|$  converging to a constant along this end. When this is the case,  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  is said to have finite mass and the value of the constant to which  $|\Phi|$  converges is called the mass.

---

<sup>1</sup>In fact, formally  $G_2$ -monopoles are also critical points for the *Yang–Mills–Higgs (YMH) energy*:

$$\mathcal{E}(\nabla, \Phi) = \int_X (|F_\nabla|^2 + |\nabla \Phi|^2) \text{vol}_X.$$

Here, we say formally because this energy need not be finite. Indeed, in contrast with the intermediate energy, the YMH energy is not finite in any known interesting example and in all previous works on  $G_2$ -monopoles.

**Theorem 1.1** (Finite intermediate energy implies finite mass). *Let  $(X, \varphi)$  be a noncompact, complete, and irreducible  $G_2$ -manifold of bounded geometry and with polynomial volume growth strictly greater than  $r^{n/2}$ . Then any finite intermediate energy  $G_2$ -monopole  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  with  $F_\nabla^{14}$  bounded, satisfies*

$$\lim_{\text{dist}(y,x) \rightarrow \infty} |\Phi(y)| = m, \quad (1.3)$$

for some nonnegative constant  $m < +\infty$  called the *mas* of  $(\nabla, \Phi)$ .

Notice that, as previously mentioned, the function  $|\Phi|^2$  is subharmonic. Hence, if in the previous theorem  $m = 0$  we have  $\Phi = 0$  everywhere and so  $\nabla$  is a  $G_2$ -instanton. Hence, we are primarily interested in the case when  $m \neq 0$ .

Our second main result gives the asymptotic structure of  $G_2$ -monopoles on the so called asymptotically conical (AC)  $G_2$ -manifolds. This is a very interesting class of  $G_2$ -manifolds for which explicit examples are known [2, 13], and on which  $G_2$ -monopoles have already been constructed [21, 22]. A  $G_2$ -manifold  $(X, \varphi)$  is AC if its end is asymptotically isometric to a metric cone  $(C = (1, +\infty)_r \times \Sigma, g_C = dr^2 + r^2 g_\Sigma)$ , see Definition 2.4 for the precise definition. In this case, the cross section of the asymptotic cone  $(\Sigma, g_\Sigma)$  comes equipped with a nearly Kähler structure  $(\omega, J)$  as defined in Definition 2.2. In this situation, a connection  $\nabla$  on a principal  $G$ -bundle over  $(\Sigma, \omega, J)$  is said to be *pseudo-Hermitian–Yang–Mills connection*, if

$$\begin{aligned} F_\nabla^{0,2} &= 0, \\ \Lambda F_\nabla &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where  $F_\nabla^{(0,2)}$  denotes the  $(0, 2)$  component of the curvature with respect to the almost complex structure  $J$  determined by the (nearly) Kähler structure and  $\Lambda F_\nabla$  the component of the curvature along its fundamental 2-form  $\omega$ . In the next theorem, we restrict to the case  $G = \text{SU}(2)$ .

**Theorem 1.2** (Asymptotics of  $G_2$ -monopoles on AC manifolds). *Let  $(X, \varphi)$  be an AC  $G_2$ -manifold and  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  a solution to the  $G_2$ -monopole equation (1.1) with finite intermediate energy (1.2) and such that  $|F_\nabla^{14}|$  decays uniformly along the end. Then, along the end of  $(X, \varphi)$*

$$|\nabla\Phi| \lesssim r^{-(n-1)},$$

and  $\|[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]\| + \|[\Phi, F_\nabla]\|$  decays exponentially.

Furthermore, if  $F_\nabla^{14}$  is assumed to quadratically decay, then there is a principal  $G$ -bundle  $P_\infty$  over  $\Sigma$ , together with a pair  $(\nabla_\infty, \Phi_\infty)$  such that:

- (a)  $\Phi_\infty$  is a  $\nabla_\infty$ -parallel section of the Adjoint bundle  $\mathfrak{g}_{P_\infty}$  over  $\Sigma$ , and

(b)  $\nabla_\infty$  is a pseudo-Hermitian–Yang–Mills connection with respect to the nearly Kähler structure on  $\Sigma$ ;

and

$$(\nabla(R), \Phi(R)) = (\nabla, \Phi)|_{\{R\} \times \Sigma} \rightarrow (\nabla_\infty, \Phi_\infty),$$

uniformly as  $R \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Remark 1.3.** *Some remarks are now in place.*

- $G_2$ -monopoles solve the second order equations (2.1a) and (2.1b) (see Lemma 2.5). These are the Euler-Lagrange equations for both the intermediate energy  $\mathcal{E}^\psi$  and the YMH energy. We also prove analogues of the above main results for general solutions of these equations, see Theorems 4.4, 6.1 and 7.1.
- The decay estimate for  $|\nabla\Phi|$  given above is sharp as proven in Remark 6.2.

This article also contains several other interesting results on the asymptotic behavior of  $G_2$ -monopoles. For example, in the conditions of Theorem 1.1, Corollary 4.5 gives a further refinement on the asymptotics of  $|\Phi|^2$ , and in the conditions of Theorem 1.2, Corollary 3.7 gives uniform decay of all derivatives of both  $F_\nabla$  and  $\nabla\Phi$  and Corollary 6.11 gives  $\nabla^{j+1}\Phi \in L_1^{1,4}$  for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Finally, Section 8 is entirely dedicated at proving decay properties of solutions to the linearized equation. This is a very important result which gives foundations for the moduli theory in [20].

**Comparison with previous work.** In [20] the third author worked under much stronger hypothesis in order to deduce similar results to those of Theorem 1.2. In that reference it is already assumed that: (1)  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  has finite mas, i.e. equation (1.3) holds; and (2) the connection  $\nabla$  is asymptotic to a connection  $\nabla_\infty$ , pulled back from the link  $\Sigma$  of the asymptotic cone, with  $|\nabla - \nabla_\infty| \lesssim r^{-1-\varepsilon}$  for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Under these hypothesis, the existence of  $\Phi_\infty$  as in (a) of Theorem 1.2 was then deduced. However, the proof of (b) in [20] uses the additional hypothesis that (3)  $\|[\Phi_\infty, \nabla - \nabla_\infty]\| \lesssim r^{-6-\varepsilon}$  for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

**Organization.** In Section 2 we fix some nomenclature, notations and derive preliminary important identities satisfied by  $G_2$ -monopoles, most notably a Bochner/Weitzenböck formula for  $\Delta|\nabla\Phi|^2$ . Next, in Section 3, we derive very useful consequences of the previous identities via Moser iteration and  $\varepsilon$ -regularity results, under the hypothesis of finite intermediate energy and bounded curvature. These yield that  $|\nabla\Phi|^2$  decays, is in  $L^p$  for all  $p \in [1, \infty]$ , and in case  $|F_\nabla|$  decays, we get that  $|\nabla^j F_\nabla|$  and  $|\nabla^{j+1}\Phi|$  decay for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ .

Section 4 is mainly concerned with a proof of our first main theorem, but in fact proves a considerably stronger result, stated as Theorem 4.4, and further partial refinements. The main tools here are the integrability and decay properties of the previous section, a

Sobolev–Hölder embedding coming from our volume growth assumptions, Green’s function asymptotics, and the gradient inequality of Cheng–Yau, all combined through a strategy inspired by the original work of Taubes in the classical 3-dimensional monopole equation in [16, Chapter IV].

In Section 5 we prove refined Bochner and Weitzenböck type formulas for finite mass monopoles away from the zero set of the Higgs field when the gauge group is  $G = \text{SU}(2)$ . Using decay hypothesis, we get in particular strong Bochner inequalities sufficiently far along the end of our irreducible  $G_2$ -manifold, cf. Corollary 5.4 and Lemma 5.5. We then restrict to the AC  $G_2$ -manifold case in Section 6. The first striking consequence of the Bochner inequalities, together with the maximum principle, is the exponential decay of the  $\Phi$ -transversal components of  $F_{\nabla}$  and  $\nabla\Phi$  in this context, proved in Proposition 6.3. We then move to use a combination of the Agmon identity, Hardy’s inequality and Moser iteration in Section 6.2 and Section 6.4 to get a sharp polynomial decay rate of  $|\nabla\Phi|$ , completing the proof of the first part of our second main result, restated as Theorem 6.1. Then, in Section 7 we use the previous results, together with Uhlenbeck compactness and related techniques to prove the convergence result of the second part of our second main result. Finally, we devote Section 8 to the study of the linearized  $G_2$ -monopole equation and using the same techniques of the previous sections we prove analogous decay results for its solutions.

**Acknowledgments.** The authors are extremely grateful to Mark Stern from whom they have learned the gross of the techniques employed in this paper. We also thank Detang Zhou for informing us of the reference [19]. The second named author is thankful to Thomas Walpuski for helpful discussions, and to Universidade Federal Fluminense and IMPA for their hospitality during the early stage of this project.

The first named author was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) - Finance Code 001. The third named author was supported by Fundação Serrapilheira 1812-27395, by CNPq grants 428959/2018-0 and 307475/2018-2, and FAPERJ through the program Jovem Cientista do Nosso Estado E-26/202.793/2019.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Notation and conventions.** In this article  $n = 7$ . We prefer to keep the  $n$  explicit as this allows to more easily read the use of several analytic results such as scaling, Moser iteration arguments, Hardy’s inequality etc. Keeping  $n$  instead of 7 is also convenient for more easily compare with other monopole theories.

We let  $\Delta = d^*d$  be the *Hodge–Laplacian* operator on functions of  $X$ , and  $\Delta_\nabla = d_\nabla d_\nabla^* + d_\nabla^* d_\nabla$  be the *covariant Hodge–Laplacian*, induced by  $\nabla$ , acting on  $\Omega^k(X, \mathfrak{g}_P)$ . We note that  $\Delta_\nabla = d_\nabla^* d_\nabla$  and coincides with the *rough Laplacian*  $\nabla^* \nabla$  on  $\Omega^0(X, \mathfrak{g}_P)$ .

We denote by  $c > 0$  a generic constant and we write  $x \lesssim y$  to mean that  $x \leq cy$ .

**2.2. Bounded geometry and Moser iteration.** We say that  $(X, g)$  has *bounded geometry* if its global injectivity radius,  $\text{inj}(X, g) = \inf_{x \in X} \text{inj}_x(X, g)$ , is positive, and the Riemann curvature tensor, together with all of its derivatives, is bounded, that is for each  $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , there is  $c_j > 0$  such that  $|\nabla^j \text{Riem}| \leq c_j$ .

We now cite a standard Moser iteration type result in the exact manner we need it in this article.

**Proposition 2.1** (Moser iteration, cf. [29, Lemma 10]). *Let  $B_r(x) \subset (X^n, g)$  be a convex geodesic ball and  $u : B_r(x) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a smooth nonnegative function satisfying  $\Delta u \leq c_0 u$ , for some constant  $c_0 \geq 0$ . Then, there is a constant  $c > 0$  depending only on the geometry of  $B_r(x)$  such that*

$$\sup_{y \in B_{\frac{r}{2}}(x)} u(y) \leq c \left( c_0^{n/2} + r^{-n} \right) \int_{B_r(x)} u.$$

If  $(X, g)$  has bounded geometry then the constant  $c$  above can be taken to be universal in a way that it does not depend on  $x$ . In fact, there is  $r_0 \in (0, \text{inj}(X, g))$  such that for every  $r \in (0, r_0]$ ,  $x \in X$ , and any smooth nonnegative function  $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying  $\Delta u \leq c_0 u$  on all of  $X$ , then

$$\sup_{y \in B_{\frac{r}{2}}(x)} u(y) \lesssim \left( c_0^{n/2} + r^{-n} \right) \int_{B_r(x)} u.$$

**2.3. Asymptotically conical  $G_2$ -manifolds.** Now we give some definitions and notations concerning AC  $G_2$ -manifolds.

**Definition 2.2.** *Given a 6-manifold  $\Sigma^6$ , a pair of forms  $(\omega, \Omega_1) \in \Omega^2 \oplus \Omega^3(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$  determine an  $SU(3)$ -structure on  $\Sigma$  if:*

- *The  $GL(6, \mathbb{R})$  orbit of  $\Omega_1$  is open, with stabilizer a covering of  $SL(3, \mathbb{C})$ ;*
- *The following compatibility relations hold*

$$\omega \wedge \Omega_1 = \omega \wedge \Omega_2 = 0, \quad \frac{\omega^3}{3!} = \frac{1}{4} \Omega_1 \wedge \Omega_2,$$

*where  $\Omega_2 = J\Omega_1$  and  $J$  denotes the almost complex structure determined by  $\Omega_1$ .*

- *$g_\Sigma = \omega(\cdot, J\cdot)$  determines a Riemannian metric on  $\Sigma$ .*

We let  $\Omega$  be the complex volume form on  $(\Sigma, g_\Sigma)$  such that  $\operatorname{Re}(\Omega) = \Omega_1$  and  $\operatorname{Im}(\Omega) = \Omega_2$ . Furthermore, if the forms  $(\omega, \Omega)$  satisfy

$$d\Omega_2 = -2\omega^2 \quad \text{and} \quad d\omega = 3\Omega_1,$$

then  $(\Sigma, g_\Sigma)$  is said to be nearly Kähler.

**Lemma 2.3.** *Suppose that  $\Sigma^6$  is endowed with an  $SU(3)$ -structure determined by  $(\omega, \Omega_1)$ . Then the Riemannian cone  $(C(\Sigma) = (1, \infty)_r \times \Sigma, g_C = dr^2 + r^2 g_\Sigma)$  with the  $G_2$ -structure*

$$\phi_C = r^2 dr \wedge \omega + r^3 \Omega_1, \quad \psi_C = r^4 \frac{\omega^2}{2} - r^3 dr \wedge \Omega_2,$$

is a  $G_2$ -manifold if and only if  $(\Sigma^6, g_\Sigma)$  is nearly Kähler.

**Definition 2.4.** *We say that  $(X^7, \varphi)$  is asymptotically conical (AC) with rate  $\nu < 0$  when there exists a compact subset  $K \subset X$ , a closed nearly Kähler 6-manifold  $(\Sigma, g_\Sigma)$  and a diffeomorphism  $\varphi : C(\Sigma) \rightarrow X \setminus K$  such that the cone metric  $g_C$  on  $C(\Sigma)$  and its Levi-Civita connection  $\nabla_C$  satisfy:*

$$\left| \nabla_C^j (\varphi^* g - g_C) \right|_{g_C} = O(r^{\nu-j}) \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

The connected components of  $X \setminus K$  are called the ends of  $X$  and  $\Sigma$  is called the link of the asymptotic cone. By a slight abuse of notation we let  $r$  be any positive smooth extension of  $r \circ \varphi^{-1}|_{X \setminus K}$  to  $X$  and call  $r$  a radius function. For each  $R > 0$ , we let  $X_R = \{x \in X | r(x) \leq R\}$ , which, for large enough  $R$ , is a smooth manifold-with-boundary, with a fixed diffeomorphism type. We also let  $\Sigma_R = \partial X_R$ , which is a closed Riemannian 6-manifold.

**2.4. A Bochner/Weitzenböck formula.** Here we derive some basic but crucial equations satisfied by  $G_2$ -monopoles.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  be any solution of the  $G_2$ -monopole equation (1.1) on  $P \rightarrow X$ . Then the pair  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  satisfies*

$$\Delta_\nabla \Phi = 0, \tag{2.1a}$$

$$d_\nabla^* F_\nabla = [\nabla \Phi, \Phi]. \tag{2.1b}$$

In particular,  $\Delta_\nabla F_\nabla = [[F_\nabla, \Phi], \Phi] - [\nabla \Phi \wedge \nabla \Phi]$ .

*Proof.* The first equation,  $\Delta_\nabla \Phi = 0$  is immediate from applying  $d_\nabla^*$  to the  $G_2$ -monopole equation (1.1) and using the Bianchi identity  $d_\nabla F_\nabla = 0$  together with  $d\psi = 0$ . As for the second equation we first use the fact that  $3F_\nabla^7 = *(F_\nabla \wedge \psi) \wedge \psi$  to compute

$$3d_\nabla^* F_\nabla^7 = *d_\nabla *^2 (\nabla \Phi \wedge \psi) = *([F_\nabla, \Phi] \wedge \psi) = [\nabla \Phi, \Phi].$$



Notice that  $3F_{\nabla}^7 = F_{\nabla} + *(F_{\nabla} \wedge \varphi)$  and  $3F_{\nabla}^{14} = 2F_{\nabla} - *(F_{\nabla} \wedge \varphi)$ . Thus, using the fact that  $\varphi$  is closed we find

$$d_{\nabla}^* F_{\nabla} = 3d_{\nabla}^* F_{\nabla}^7 = \frac{3}{2}d_{\nabla}^* F_{\nabla}^{14}.$$

The result follows from inserting this into the equation above.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.6.** *For any solution  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  of the second order equations (2.1a) and (2.1b), we have*

$$\nabla^* \nabla(\nabla\Phi) = [[\nabla\Phi, \Phi], \Phi] - 2*[*F_{\nabla} \wedge \nabla\Phi]. \quad (2.2)$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\Delta |\nabla\Phi|^2 + |\nabla^2\Phi|^2 &= \langle \nabla\Phi, \nabla^* \nabla(\nabla\Phi) \rangle \\ &= -2\langle \nabla\Phi, [*F_{\nabla} \wedge \nabla\Phi] \rangle - \|[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

which implies

$$\frac{1}{2}\Delta |\nabla\Phi|^2 + |\nabla^2\Phi|^2 \lesssim |F_{\nabla}| |\nabla\Phi|^2 - \|[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]\|^2. \quad (2.4)$$

*Proof.* Using the Ricci-flatness and the Bochner/Weitzenböck formula, we have

$$\nabla^* \nabla(\nabla\Phi) = \Delta_{\nabla} \nabla\Phi - [*F_{\nabla} \wedge \nabla\Phi]. \quad (2.5)$$

Now, using the second order equations (2.1a) and (2.1b) and the Bianchi identity we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\nabla} \nabla\Phi &= d_{\nabla}^* [F_{\nabla}, \Phi] \\ &= [d_{\nabla}^* F_{\nabla}, \Phi] - [*F_{\nabla} \wedge \nabla\Phi] \\ &= [[\nabla\Phi, \Phi], \Phi] - [*F_{\nabla} \wedge \nabla\Phi]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

Putting equations (2.5) and (2.6) together implies equation (2.2).  $\square$

**2.5. Finite mass configurations.** To finish this preliminary section, we introduce the precise definition of finite mass configurations and make a simple but useful remark.

**Definition 2.7.** *A configuration  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  is said to have finite mass if  $|\Phi|$  converges uniformly to a constant  $m \in \mathbb{R}_+$  at infinity<sup>2</sup>;  $m$  is called the mass of  $(\nabla, \Phi)$ .*

**Remark 2.8.** *If  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  is a solution to the second order equations (2.1a) and (2.1b) then, in particular,  $\Delta_{\nabla} \Phi = 0$  and this implies that*

$$\Delta \frac{|\Phi|^2}{2} = \langle \Phi, \nabla^* \nabla\Phi \rangle - |\nabla\Phi|^2 = -|\nabla\Phi|^2 \leq 0.$$

<sup>2</sup>More precisely, for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is a compact subset  $K \subset X$  such that  $\|\Phi|(x) - m\| < \varepsilon$  for all  $x \in X \setminus K$ .

As a consequence, the function  $|\Phi|^2$  is subharmonic. Thus, if furthermore  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  has finite mass  $m \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , then by the Maximum Principle (cf. [16, Chapter VI, Proposition 3.3]) one has either  $|\Phi| \equiv m$  or  $|\Phi| < m$  on  $X$ . Moreover, in the later case, one has  $|\Phi| \geq \frac{m}{2}$  outside a sufficiently large compact subset.

### 3. CONSEQUENCES OF MOSER ITERATION AND $\varepsilon$ -REGULARITY

In this section we deduce step by step the consequences that can be taken from the use of Moser iteration and  $\varepsilon$ -regularity along the end of  $X$ . The final result of the section which concentrates our conclusions and follows from the preceding work is Corollary 3.7.

We start with a simple consequence of Lemma 2.6 using Moser iteration.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  be a solution to the second order equations (2.1a) and (2.1b). Then for any  $x \in X$  and  $0 < r < \text{inj}_x(X, g)$ ,*

$$\sup_{B_{\frac{r}{2}}(x)} |\nabla\Phi|^2 \lesssim \left( \|F_\nabla\|_{L^\infty(B_r(x))}^{n/2} + r^{-n} \right) \int_{B_r(x)} |\nabla\Phi|^2. \quad (3.1)$$

*Proof.* This follows from a direct application of the equation (2.4) in Lemma 2.6 with the Moser iteration result stated in Proposition 2.1.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.2.** *Let  $(X, \varphi)$  be a noncompact, irreducible  $G_2$ -manifold of bounded geometry. Let  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  be a solution to the second order equations (2.1a) and (2.1b). If  $|F_\nabla| \in L^\infty(X)$  and  $|\nabla\Phi|^2 \in L^1(X)$ , then  $|\nabla\Phi|^2 \in L^\infty(X) \cap L^p(X)$  for all  $p \in [1, \infty)$  and decays uniformly to zero along the end.*

*Proof.* Since  $(X, \varphi)$  has bounded geometry, there is  $r_0 \in (0, \text{inj}(X, g))$  such that the inequality (3.1) of Lemma 3.1 holds for all  $x \in X$  and  $r \in (0, r_0]$ . Given that  $|F_\nabla| \in L^\infty(X)$  and  $|\nabla\Phi|^2 \in L^1(X)$  we find that

$$\|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^\infty(X)}^2 \lesssim \left( \|F_\nabla\|_{L^\infty(X)}^{n/2} + r_0^{-n} \right) \int_X |\nabla\Phi|^2 < \infty,$$

hence  $|\nabla\Phi|^2 \in L^\infty(X) \cap L^1(X) \subseteq L^p(X)$  for all  $p \geq 1$ . Moreover, since  $|\nabla\Phi|^2 \in L^1(X)$ , if  $x_i \rightarrow \infty$  then  $\int_{B_{r_0}(x_i)} |\nabla\Phi|^2 \rightarrow 0$  and thus by inequality (3.1) one gets  $|\nabla\Phi|^2(x_i) \rightarrow 0$ . This shows that  $|\nabla\Phi|$  decays, completing the proof.  $\square$

**Definition 3.3.** *Let  $U \subset X$  be an open subset. When finite, we define the energy and the intermediate energy of a field configuration  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  by the integrals over  $U$  of*

$$\begin{aligned} e &= \frac{1}{2}|F_\nabla|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla\Phi|^2, \text{ and} \\ e_\psi &= \frac{1}{2}|F_\nabla \wedge \psi|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla\Phi|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

to which we refer as the energy density and intermediate energy density respectively.

Notice that in case the pair  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  is a  $G_2$ -monopole we have  $e_\psi = |\nabla\Phi|^2$  and so the intermediate energy is simply the squared  $L^2$ -norm of  $\nabla\Phi$ . In general, it follows from linear algebra that

$$|F_\nabla \wedge \psi|^2 = 3|F_\nabla^Z|^2,$$

thus

$$\int_U e = \frac{1}{2} \int_U (|F_\nabla^{14}|^2 - 2|F_\nabla^Z|^2) + \int_U e_\psi. \quad (3.3)$$

We now cite the following  $\varepsilon$ -regularity result for the energy density  $e$ .

**Proposition 3.4** ( $\varepsilon$ -regularity cf. [1, Theorem B] and [26, Theorem 1.3]). *Let  $(X^n, g)$  be an oriented Riemannian  $n$ -manifold of bounded geometry and let  $P$  be a  $G$ -bundle over  $X$  where  $G$  is a compact Lie group. Then there are constants  $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(X, g, \mathfrak{g}) > 0$  and  $r_0 = r_0(X, g) \in (0, \text{inj}(X, g))$  with the following significance. Let  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  be a solution to the second order equations (2.1a) and (2.1b) on  $P \rightarrow X$ . If  $x \in X$  and  $0 < r \leq r_0$  are such that*

$$r^{-(n-4)} \int_{B_r(x)} e < \varepsilon_0,$$

then

$$\sup_{B_{\frac{r}{2}}(x)} e \lesssim r^{-n} \int_{B_r(x)} e. \quad (3.4)$$

In fact, there is a gauge  $\sigma \in C^\infty(B_r(x), G)$  such that, for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , the local matrix representations  $(A)^\sigma$  and  $(\Phi)^\sigma$  of  $\nabla$  and  $\Phi$  in this gauge satisfies

$$\sup_{B_{\frac{r}{2}}(x)} \left| \nabla^{j+1}(A)^\sigma \right|^2 + \left| \nabla^{j+1}(\Phi)^\sigma \right|^2 \lesssim_j r^{-n} \int_{B_r(x)} e.$$

In particular,

$$\sup_{B_{\frac{r}{2}}(x)} \left( \left| \nabla^j F_\nabla \right|^2 + \left| \nabla^{j+1} \Phi \right|^2 \right) \lesssim_j r^{-n} \int_{B_r(x)} e. \quad (3.5)$$

*Sketch of proof.* The first part implying the  $C^0$ -bound from inequality (3.4) is a particular case of [1, Theorem B]. From this bound, for any fixed  $p > n/2$ , by possibly taking smaller  $r_0$  and  $\varepsilon_0$  one can make  $\|F_\nabla\|_{L^p(B_{\frac{r}{2}}(x))}$  to be smaller than Uhlenbeck's constant given by [26, Theorem 1.3]. Thus we can find a Coulomb gauge  $\sigma \in C^\infty(B_r(x), G)$  in which the second order equations (2.1a) and (2.1b) become an elliptic system and standard elliptic estimates apply, implying the second part of the stated result.  $\square$

As a consequence of Proposition 3.4 and Corollary 3.2, we get:

**Corollary 3.5.** *Let  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  be a solution to the second order equations (2.1a) and (2.1b). Suppose that  $|F_\nabla|$  decays uniformly to zero along the end and  $|\nabla\Phi|^2 \in L^1(X)$ . Then one actually has that  $|\nabla^j F_\nabla|$  and  $|\nabla^{j+1}\Phi|$  decay uniformly to zero along the end for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ .*

*Proof.* By Corollary 3.2 and the decay hypothesis on the curvature we know that  $e$  decays uniformly to zero at infinity. Therefore, if  $(x_i)$  is a sequence escaping to infinity then  $\int_{B_{r_0}(x_i)} e \rightarrow 0$ , so that by inequality (3.5) one has  $|\nabla^j F_\nabla|(x_i), |\nabla^{j+1}\Phi|(x_i) \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$

Now we turn to the particular case of  $G_2$ -monopoles. We start with an  $\varepsilon$ -regularity result for  $e_\psi$ .

**Proposition 3.6** ( $\varepsilon$ -regularity for  $e_\psi$ ). *Let  $(X^7, \varphi)$  be a  $G_2$ -manifold of bounded geometry and  $P$  a principal  $G$ -bundle over  $X$ , where  $G$  is a compact Lie group. Then there are constants  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(X, \varphi, \mathfrak{g}) > 0$  and  $r_0 = r_0(X, \varphi) \in (0, \text{inj}(X, g_\varphi))$  with the following significance. Let  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  satisfy the  $G_2$ -monopole equation (1.1) and suppose that  $x \in X$  and  $0 < r \leq r_0$  are such that*

$$r^{-(n-4)} \int_{B_r(x)} e_\psi < \varepsilon.$$

*Setting*

$$f_\nabla(x, r) = \sup_{B_r(x)} (|F_\nabla^{14}|^2 - 2|F_\nabla^7|^2),$$

*we have:*

(a) *If  $f_\nabla \leq 0$  then*

$$\sup_{B_{\frac{r}{2}}(x)} e_\psi \lesssim r^{-n} \int_{B_r(x)} e_\psi.$$

(b) *If  $f_\nabla \geq 0$  then*

$$\sup_{B_{\frac{r}{2}}(x)} e_\psi \lesssim (f_\nabla(x, r) + r^{-4}) \left( r^{-(n-4)} \int_{B_r(x)} e_\psi + f_\nabla(x, r)r^4 \right).$$

*Proof.* First, we note that from Lemma 2.6 we have

$$\Delta e_\psi \lesssim |F_\nabla^{14}| e_\psi + e_\psi^{3/2} \quad \text{on } B_r(x).$$

Thus, in case (a) one has

$$\Delta e_\psi \lesssim e_\psi^{3/2} \quad \text{on } B_r(x)$$

and in case (b) one has

$$\Delta e_\psi \lesssim f_\nabla(x, r)^{1/2} e_\psi + e_\psi^{3/2} \quad \text{on } B_r(x).$$

Next, using a well-known almost monotonicity property for the normalized energy in dimensions greater than four, cf. [1, Theorem 2.1], together with the energy identity (3.3) we have

$$s^{-(n-4)} \int_{B_s(x)} e_\psi \lesssim r^{-(n-4)} \int_{B_r(x)} e_\psi + f_\nabla(x, r)r^4, \quad \text{for all } s \in (0, r]. \quad (3.6)$$

In fact, notice that in case (a) we may drop last term in the right-hand side of inequality (3.6). With these observations in mind, the result follows by a standard nonlinear mean value inequality for the Laplacian, which in turn is a consequence of Moser iteration via the so-called ‘Heinz trick’; e.g. apply [12, Theorem A.3] with the parameters  $d = 4$ ,  $a \lesssim 1$ ,  $a_0 = 0$  and taking  $\tau = 0 = a_1$  in case (a), and  $\tau(r) = f_\nabla(x, r)r^4$  and  $a_1 = f_\nabla(x, r)^{1/2}$  in case (b).  $\square$

Using the same reasoning that allowed to deduce Corollary 3.5 from Proposition 3.4, we obtain the next result from Proposition 3.6 and Corollary 3.5.

**Corollary 3.7.** *Let  $(X, \varphi)$  be a noncompact, irreducible  $G_2$ -manifold of bounded geometry. Suppose  $(A, \Phi)$  is a solution to the  $G_2$ -monopole equation (1.1) with finite intermediate energy (3.2) (i.e.  $|\nabla\Phi|^2 \in L^1(X)$ ) and such that  $|F_\nabla^{14}| \in L^\infty(X)$ . Then, the function  $e_\psi = |\nabla\Phi|^2 \in L^\infty(X) \cap L^p(X)$  for all  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , and decays uniformly to zero at infinity. If furthermore  $|F_\nabla^{14}|$  decays uniformly to zero at infinity, then  $|\nabla^j F_\nabla|$  and  $|\nabla^{j+1}\Phi|$  decay uniformly to zero at infinity for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ .*

*Proof.* Given that  $e_\psi \in L^1$  and  $f(x, r) \leq \sup_{B_r(x)} |F_\nabla^{14}|^2 \leq \sup_X |F_\nabla^{14}|^2 < \infty$ , we can use Proposition 3.6 to conclude that  $e_\psi \in L^\infty(X)$  or, equivalently, that  $|F_\nabla^7| \in L^\infty(X)$  and therefore  $|F_\nabla| \in L^\infty(X)$ . Thus, by Corollary 3.2, we get the first part of the desired result. For the second part, note that we already have that  $|F_\nabla^7|$  decays, so if  $|F_\nabla^{14}|$  decays then  $|F_\nabla|$  decays. Hence, Corollary 3.5 applies.  $\square$

#### 4. FINITE MASS FROM FINITE INTERMEDIATE ENERGY

This section contains the proof of our first main result Theorem 1.1. In fact, we prove a more refined version of that result stated as Theorem 4.4 and Corollary 4.5.

We start by making some observations regarding consequences of our volume growth assumptions and an Hölder-Sobolev inequality following from it.

**Remark 4.1** (Local Bishop–Gromov). *Let  $x \in X$ ,  $\rho$  be the radial coordinate on  $T_x X$  and  $\lambda : T_x X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  the function so that write*

$$\exp_x^*(\text{vol}_X) = \lambda \, d\rho \wedge \text{vol}_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}},$$

where  $n = 7$ . Then, the Laplacian comparison theorem, see [28, Proposition 20.7], states that

$$\partial_\rho(\rho^{-(n-1)}\lambda) \leq 0, \quad (4.1)$$

away from the cut locus. As  $\rho^{-(n-1)}\lambda$  converges to a constant as  $\rho \rightarrow 0$  we find that for all  $\rho > 0$  we have  $\lambda \lesssim \rho^{n-1}$ . Furthermore, the Bishop–Gromov volume comparison and the Ricci-flat assumption we have that  $\lambda \sim \rho^{(n-1)-k}$  for  $\rho \gg 1$ , with  $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ .<sup>3</sup>

**Remark 4.2** (Global Bishop–Gromov). Let  $x \in X$ ,  $r > 0$  and denote by  $B_r(x)$  the geodesic ball of radius  $r$  centered at  $x$ . Our hypothesis implies that for  $r \gg 1$  we have

$$\text{Vol}(B_r(p)) \sim r^{n-k},$$

for some  $k < n/2$ . The Bishop–Gromov volume inequality, in this Ricci-flat case, yields that  $r^{-n}\text{Vol}(B_r(x))$ , is a nonincreasing function of  $r$ . This converges to a constant as  $r \rightarrow 0$  and by the above is of order  $\sim r^{-k}$  when  $r \gg 1$ . Thus, for all  $r > 0$

$$\frac{r^n}{1+r^k} \lesssim \text{Vol}(B_r(p)) \lesssim r^n.$$

We now turn to a Hölder–Sobolev embedding result, which then use to Theorem 4.4. Versions of this inequality can be found elsewhere; see for example [19].

**Lemma 4.3** (Hölder–Sobolev embedding). If  $p > n$  then there are constants  $C_0 > 0$  and  $R_0 > 0$  so that for any  $f$  with  $\nabla f \in L^p$  and  $x, y \in X$  with  $\text{dist}(x, y) \geq R_0$  we have

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq C_0 \text{dist}(x, y)^{1-\frac{n-k}{p}} \|\nabla f\|_{L^p}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $f$  be as in the statement and  $x, y \in X$ . Since  $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq |f(x) - f(z)| + |f(z) - f(y)|$ , we can integrate this over the  $z \in B_R(w)$ , where  $w$  is the midpoint of the unique geodesic connecting  $x$  to  $y$  and  $R = \text{dist}(x, y)/4$ , and get

$$\text{Vol}(B_R(w))|f(x) - f(y)| = \int_{B_R(w)} (|f(x) - f(z)| + |f(z) - f(y)|) \text{vol}_X(z). \quad (4.2)$$

<sup>3</sup>The bound  $k \leq n-1$  follows from Yau’s [30] adaptation of the Bishop–Gromov inequality to obtain a lower bound for the volume growth rate of large geodesic balls in Ricci-flat Riemannian manifolds.

Now let  $\gamma_{x,z}$  denote the arc-length parametrized geodesic connecting  $x$  to  $z$ . As  $|\dot{\gamma}_{x,z}(t)| = 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_R(w)} |f(x) - f(z)| \text{vol}_X(z) &= \int_{B_R(w)} \left| \int_0^{\text{dist}(x,z)} \partial_t f(\gamma_{x,z}(t)) dt \right| \text{vol}_X(z) \\ &\leq \int_{B_R(w)} \int_0^{\text{dist}(x,z)} |\nabla f(\gamma_{x,z}(t))| |\dot{\gamma}_{x,z}(t)| dt \text{vol}_X(z) \\ &\leq \int_0^{3R} \int_{B_R(w)} |\nabla f(\gamma_{x,z}(t))| \text{vol}_X(z) dt, \end{aligned}$$

with the last line following from the triangle inequality which gives  $\text{dist}(x, z) \leq 3R$ . Now, write  $\text{vol}_X(z) = \lambda(z) d\rho \wedge \text{vol}_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}$  and use the Laplacian comparison theorem as in equation (4.1) to deduce that

$$\lambda(z) \leq \frac{\text{dist}(x, z)^{n-1}}{\text{dist}(x, \gamma_{x,z}(t))^{n-1}} \lambda(\gamma_{x,z}(t)) \lesssim \frac{R^{n-1}}{\text{dist}(x, \gamma_{x,z}(t))^{n-1}} \lambda(\gamma_{x,z}(t)),$$

and thus

$$\text{vol}_X(z) \leq \frac{R^{n-1}}{\text{dist}(x, \gamma_{x,z}(t))^{n-1}} \text{vol}_X(\gamma_{x,z}(t)).$$

This, together with the fact that  $\gamma_{x,z}(t) \in B_{3R}(x)$  for  $z \in B_R(w)$  and all  $t \in [0, 3R]$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_R(w)} |f(x) - f(z)| \text{vol}_X(z) &\lesssim R^n \int_{B_{3R}(x)} \frac{|\nabla f(\tilde{z})|}{\text{dist}(x, \tilde{z})^{n-1}} \text{vol}_X(\tilde{z}) \\ &\lesssim R^n \|\text{dist}(x, \cdot)^{-(n-1)}\|_{L^{p'}(B_{3R}(x))} \|\nabla f\|_{L^p}. \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Hölder's inequality with  $p, p' = p/(p-1)$  conjugate exponents. Now, for  $\text{dist}(x, \cdot)^{-(n-1)} \in L^{p'}$  we must have  $p > n$  in which case, for  $R \gg 1$  we find using

remark 4.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\text{dist}(x, \cdot)^{-(n-1)}\|_{L^{p'}(B_{3R}(x))} &= \left( \int_{B_\varepsilon(x)} \text{dist}(x, \cdot)^{-\frac{p(n-1)}{p-1}} \text{vol}_X + \int_{B_{3R}(x) - B_\varepsilon(x)} \text{dist}(x, \cdot)^{-\frac{p(n-1)}{p-1}} \text{vol}_X \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \\
&\lesssim \left( 1 + \int_\varepsilon^{3R} \rho^{-\frac{p(n-1)}{p-1}} \rho^{(n-1)-k} d\rho \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \\
&\lesssim R^{(n-k)\frac{p-1}{p} - (n-1)} = R^{1-k-\frac{n-k}{p}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The the integral of  $|f(z) - f(y)|$  can be controlled using a similar trick and inserting into equation (4.2) we find that for  $R \gg 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
|f(x) - f(y)| &\lesssim \frac{R^n}{\text{Vol}(B_R(w))} R^{1-k-\frac{n-k}{p}} \|\nabla f\|_{L^p} \\
&\lesssim (1 + R^k) R^{1-k-\frac{n-k}{p}} \|\nabla f\|_{L^p} \\
&\lesssim R^{1-\frac{n-k}{p}} \|\nabla f\|_{L^p},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the inequalities deduced in remark 4.2 to bound the volume of the balls.  $\square$

We are now in position to settle the main consequence of all these preliminary observations. Namely, we find a large class of manifolds for which solutions of equations (2.1a) and (2.1b) with  $|\nabla\Phi| \in L^2(X)$  satisfying mild bounded curvature assumptions have finite mass. We state here the detailed version of our main Theorem 1.1. Its proof is inspired by Taubes' original work in the standard 3-dimensional BPS equation in [16, Chapter IV].

**Theorem 4.4.** *Let  $(X, \varphi)$  be a noncompact, irreducible  $G_2$ -manifold of bounded geometry with volume growth strictly greater than  $r^{n/2}$ . Let  $G$  be a positive Green function<sup>4</sup> of the scalar Laplacian on  $(X, g_\varphi)$ . Let  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  be a solution to the second order equations (2.1a) and (2.1b) with  $|\nabla\Phi|^2 \in L^1(X)$ . Suppose either that  $|F_\nabla| \in L^\infty(X)$  or that  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  is a  $G_2$ -monopole such that  $|F_\nabla^4| \in L^\infty(X)$ . Finally, let*

$$w(x) = - \int_M G(x, \cdot) (\Delta|\Phi|^2) \text{vol}_X. \quad (4.3)$$

*Then, the function  $w : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  defined by equation (4.3) is bounded, decays uniformly to zero at infinity, and there is a constant  $m \geq 0$  such that*

$$w = m^2 - |\Phi|^2.$$

<sup>4</sup>The existence of such is guaranteed by the Ricci-flatness and the volume growth assumption, cf. [19].



In particular,  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  has finite mass  $m$ .

*Proof.* We follow the strategy of [16, Theorem 10.3]. First, recall from the second order equations (2.1a) and (2.1b) that  $|\Delta|\Phi|^2| \lesssim |\nabla\Phi|^2 \in L^p(X)$  for all  $p \in [1, \infty]$  in either of the cases proven in Corollaries 3.2 and 3.7. Then, by the short distance asymptotic behavior of the Green's function, i.e.

$$G(x, y) \sim \frac{1}{\text{dist}(x, y)^{n-2}},$$

for  $\text{dist}(x, y) \ll 1$ , we have that  $G(x, \cdot) \in L^q_{\text{loc}}$  for  $q < \frac{n}{n-2}$  while  $G(x, \cdot) \lesssim 1$  on  $X - B_1(x)$ . Thus, separating the region of integration into two, choosing  $q = \frac{n-1}{n-2}$ , and using Hölder's inequality yields

$$|w(x)| \lesssim \int_X |G(x, y)| |\nabla\Phi|^2(y) dy \lesssim \| |\nabla\Phi|^2 \|_{L^{n-1}(X)} + \| |\nabla\Phi|^2 \|_{L^1(X)} \lesssim 1,$$

which shows that  $w$  is bounded. Next, by construction we know that  $w \geq 0$  and is the only solution of  $\Delta w = -\Delta|\Phi|^2$  which decays to zero along the ends of  $X$ . Furthermore, the function  $m^2 = |\Phi|^2 + w$  is a nonnegative harmonic, which we now show grows at most linearly. Fix  $y \in M$  and define

$$M(R) = \sup_{\text{dist}(x, y) \leq R} |\Phi(x)|^2.$$

As  $|\Phi|^2$  is subharmonic, the supremum is achieved at some point  $x_0$ , with  $\text{dist}(x_0, y) = R$ , that is  $M(R) = |\Phi(x_0)|^2$ . Furthermore,  $|\nabla|\Phi|^2| \lesssim |\Phi||\nabla\Phi|$  and Lemma 4.3 shows that for sufficiently large  $R \gg 1$

$$|\Phi(x_0)|^2 - |\Phi(y)|^2 \lesssim R^{1-\frac{n-k}{p}} M(R)^{1/2} \|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^p(B_R(y))},$$

for any  $p > n$ . Now recall that  $\|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^p(B_R(y))}^p \lesssim \|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X)}^p \lesssim 1$  by Corollaries 3.2 and 3.7. Then, choosing a small  $\delta = \delta(n, k) > 0$  and  $p = 2(n-k)/(1+\delta)$ , which is strictly greater than  $n$  if  $n > 2k$ , we find from Young's inequality that

$$M(R) \lesssim |\Phi(y)|^2 + 2R^{(1-\delta)/2} M(R)^{1/2} \lesssim |\Phi(y)|^2 + \varepsilon^{-1} R^{1-\delta} + \varepsilon M(R).$$

We now choose  $\varepsilon$  small enough so that the rightmost term can be absorbed by the left hand side. From this we find that

$$M(R) \lesssim |\Phi(y)|^2 + R^{1-\delta}$$

which shows that  $|\Phi|^2$  grows at strictly lower than linearly. Since  $w$  bounded we conclude that the nonnegative harmonic function  $m^2 = w + |\Phi|^2$  also grows strictly slower than linearly. Therefore, it must be constant as a corollary of the gradient inequality of [3],

which assures that a nonconstant harmonic function on a Ricci-flat manifold must grow at least linearly.  $\square$

Next, we combine this result with a Laplacian comparison argument to obtain a slight refinement of this asymptotic behavior.

**Corollary 4.5.** *Let both  $(X, \varphi)$  and  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  be as in Theorem 4.4 and  $k$  be such that  $(X, \varphi)$  has volume growth at most  $r^{n-k}$ . Then, for any  $x_0 \in X$  there is  $c > 0$  and  $R_0 \gg 1$  such that if  $\text{dist}(x, x_0) \geq R_0$*

$$|\Phi(x)|^2 \leq m^2 - \frac{c}{\text{dist}(x_0, x)^{n-k-2}}.$$

*Proof.* It follows from Theorem 4.4 that  $w = m^2 - |\Phi|^2$  decays to zero, and as  $\Delta w = 2|\nabla\Phi|^2$ , it is superharmonic. Now, let  $G(x_0, \cdot)$  be the decaying Green's function centered at  $x_0$ . As  $w$  is bounded, for any  $R > 0$  there is  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $w|_{\partial B_R(x_0)} > \varepsilon G|_{\partial B_R(x_0)}$ , and as both of these decay to zero at infinite we find that

$$\sup_{x \in X - B_R(x_0)} w > \sup_{x \in X - B_R(x_0)} \varepsilon G.$$

Thus, recalling that for  $\text{dist}(x_0, x) \gg 1$ , the Greens function is of order  $\text{dist}(x_0, x)^{-(n-k-2)}$ , see [19], we find from rearranging the above inequality that

$$|\Phi(x)|^2 \leq m^2 - \frac{c}{\text{dist}(x_0, x)^{n-k-2}},$$

for some constant  $c > 0$ .  $\square$

Another interesting easy consequence of Theorem 4.4 is the following.

**Corollary 4.6.** *Under the hypothesis of Theorem 4.4, the following inequality holds on  $X$ :*

$$|\nabla\Phi| \lesssim \|F_\nabla\|_{L^\infty(X)}(m^2 - |\Phi|^2).$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.6, we know that there is  $c > 0$  such that

$$\Delta|\nabla\Phi|^2 \leq c\|F_\nabla\|_{L^\infty(X)}|\nabla\Phi|^2.$$

On the other hand, we know that  $w = m^2 - |\Phi|^2$  is a nonnegative function such that  $\Delta w = 2|\nabla\Phi|^2$ . Thus,

$$\Delta(c\|F_\nabla\|_\infty w - |\nabla\Phi|^2) \geq 0.$$

Moreover, by Corollaries 3.2 and 3.7 and Theorem 4.4 we know that both  $|\nabla\Phi|$  and  $w$  decay. Therefore, the desired conclusion follows by the Maximum Principle.  $\square$

We finish this section by proving a simple result which constrains the asymptotic behavior of  $\nabla\Phi$  (cf. Remark 6.2).

**Lemma 4.7.** *Let  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  be a solution to the second order equations (2.1a) and (2.1b) with  $0 \neq \nabla\Phi \in L^2$ , and  $r : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a smooth positive radial function, meaning that for  $r \gg 1$  we have  $C^{-1}\text{dist}(x_0, \cdot) \leq r(\cdot) \leq C\text{dist}(x_0, \cdot)$ . Then, there is a sequence of points  $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $r(x_i) \rightarrow \infty$  such that if it exists, then*

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} r(x_i)^{n-k-1} (|\partial_r |\Phi|^2|(x_i)) > 0;$$

*in other words  $|\partial_r |\Phi|^2| = O(r^{-(n-k-1)})$ .*

*Proof.* We prove instead the contrapositive. Suppose that  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^{n-k-1} |\partial_r |\Phi|^2| = 0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X)}^2 &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \int_{X_R} |\nabla\Phi|^2 \text{vol}_X \\ &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Sigma_R} \langle \Phi, * \nabla\Phi \rangle \\ &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma_R} \partial_r |\Phi|^2 \text{vol}_{\Sigma_R} \\ &\lesssim \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} R^{n-k-1} \sup_{\Sigma_R} |\partial_r |\Phi|^2|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we find that  $\nabla\Phi = 0$ . □

## 5. BOCHNER/WEITZENBÖCK FORMULAS ALONG THE END

In the Bochner/Weitzenböck formulas presented below we assume that the gauge group  $G$  is  $SU(2)$  and that we are away from the zeros of  $\Phi$ . By Remark 2.8, if  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  is a finite mass solution to the second order equations (2.1a) and (2.1b), this is the case sufficiently far out along the end of our irreducible  $G_2$ -manifold.

In this situation, i.e.  $\Phi(x) \neq 0$  for  $x \in X$ , we can decompose  $\mathfrak{g}_P = \mathfrak{g}_P^{\parallel} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_P^{\perp}$  near  $x$ , by setting

$$\mathfrak{g}_P^{\parallel} = \ker(\text{ad}_{\Phi(x)} : \mathfrak{g}_P \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_P),$$

and  $\mathfrak{g}_P^{\perp}$  its orthogonal complement. Clearly, if  $G = SU(2)$ , then in fact  $\mathfrak{g}_P^{\parallel} = \langle \Phi \rangle$ . In what follows we split any section  $\chi$  of  $\mathfrak{g}_P$  defined around  $x$  as  $\chi = \chi^{\parallel} + \chi^{\perp}$ .

We start by applying this decomposition to refine the standard Bochner/Weitzenböck inequality in Lemma 2.6.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  be a solution to the second order equations (2.1a) and (2.1b). Then*

$$\frac{1}{2} \Delta |\nabla\Phi|^2 + |\nabla^2\Phi|^2 \lesssim |(F_{\nabla})^{\perp}| |(\nabla\Phi)^{\parallel}| |(\nabla\Phi)^{\perp}| + |(F_{\nabla})^{\parallel}| |(\nabla\Phi)^{\perp}|^2 - |[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]|^2. \quad (5.1)$$

If, moreover,  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  is a solution to the  $G_2$ -monopole equation (1.1) then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\Delta|\nabla\Phi|^2 &\lesssim |(F_\nabla^{14})^\perp| |(\nabla\Phi)^\parallel| |(\nabla\Phi)^\perp| \\ &\quad + (|(\nabla\Phi)^\parallel| + |(F_\nabla^{14})^\parallel|) |(\nabla\Phi)^\perp|^2 \\ &\quad - (|\nabla^2\Phi|^2 + |[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]|^2). \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

*Proof.* Recall equation (2.3) from Lemma 2.6. Splitting  $\nabla\Phi = (\nabla\Phi)^\parallel + (\nabla\Phi)^\perp$  and similarly for  $F_\nabla$  we find

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla\Phi, *[ *F_\nabla \wedge \nabla\Phi] \rangle &= \langle \nabla\Phi, *[ *(F_\nabla)^\perp \wedge (\nabla\Phi)^\perp] \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \nabla\Phi, *[ *(F_\nabla)^\perp \wedge (\nabla\Phi)^\parallel] \rangle + \langle \nabla\Phi, *[ *(F_\nabla)^\parallel \wedge (\nabla\Phi)^\perp] \rangle \\ &= 2\langle (\nabla\Phi)^\parallel, *[ *(F_\nabla)^\perp \wedge (\nabla\Phi)^\perp] \rangle + \langle (\nabla\Phi)^\perp, *[ *(F_\nabla)^\parallel \wedge (\nabla\Phi)^\perp] \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we get

$$|\langle \nabla\Phi, *[ *F_\nabla \wedge \nabla\Phi] \rangle| \lesssim |(F_\nabla)^\perp| |(\nabla\Phi)^\parallel| |(\nabla\Phi)^\perp| + |(F_\nabla)^\parallel| |(\nabla\Phi)^\perp|^2,$$

so inserting into equation (2.3) yields inequality (5.1).

As for the case where  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  satisfies the  $G_2$ -monopole equation (1.1), note that we have  $3 * F_\nabla^7 = \nabla\Phi \wedge \psi$ ; in particular,  $| (F_\nabla^7)^\parallel | \lesssim |(\nabla\Phi)^\parallel|$  and  $| (F_\nabla^7)^\perp | \lesssim |(\nabla\Phi)^\perp|$ . Using these, the orthogonal decomposition  $F_\nabla = F_\nabla^7 + F_\nabla^{14}$  and inserting into inequality (5.1), we get inequality (5.2).  $\square$

Next we compute Bochner type formulas for both  $|[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]|^2$  and  $|[F_\nabla, \Phi]|^2$ .

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  be a solution to the second order equations (2.1a) and (2.1b). Then,*

$$\frac{1}{2}\Delta|[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]|^2 + |\nabla|[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]|^2 \lesssim (-|\Phi|^2 + |(F_\nabla)^\parallel|)|[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]|^2 + 4|(\nabla\Phi)^\parallel| |[F_\nabla, \Phi]| |[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]|.$$

*Proof.* We start by computing each term in  $\Delta_\nabla[\Phi, \nabla\Phi] = d_\nabla d_\nabla^*[\Phi, \nabla\Phi] + d_\nabla^* d_\nabla[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]$ . First we get

$$d_\nabla^*[\Phi, \nabla\Phi] = -d_\nabla * ([\nabla\Phi \wedge * \nabla\Phi] + [\Phi, d_\nabla * \nabla\Phi]) = 0,$$

as  $[\nabla\Phi \wedge * \nabla\Phi] = 0$  and  $d_\nabla * d_\nabla \Phi = 0$  are both zero. We also have

$$\begin{aligned} d_\nabla^* d_\nabla[\Phi, \nabla\Phi] &= d_\nabla^* ([\nabla\Phi \wedge \nabla\Phi] + [\Phi, d_\nabla^2 \Phi]) \\ &= d_\nabla^* [\nabla\Phi \wedge \nabla\Phi] - * d_\nabla [\Phi, [\Phi, * F_\nabla]] \\ &= d_\nabla^* [\nabla\Phi \wedge \nabla\Phi] - * [\nabla\Phi \wedge [\Phi, * F_\nabla]] - * [\Phi, [\nabla\Phi \wedge * F_\nabla]] - [\Phi, [\Phi, d_\nabla^* F_\nabla]] \\ &= d_\nabla^* [\nabla\Phi \wedge \nabla\Phi] - 2 * [\Phi, [\nabla\Phi \wedge * F_\nabla]] + [\Phi, [\Phi, [\Phi, \nabla\Phi]]]. \end{aligned}$$

Putting these two together we find that

$$\Delta_{\nabla}[\Phi, \nabla\Phi] = d_{\nabla}^*[\nabla\Phi \wedge \nabla\Phi] + *[\nabla\Phi \wedge [*F_{\nabla}, \Phi]] + [\Phi, \Delta_{\nabla}\nabla\Phi].$$

Now, a short computation shows that  $d_{\nabla}^*[\nabla\Phi \wedge \nabla\Phi] = 2[\nabla_i \nabla_j \Phi, \nabla_i \Phi] e^j$  and so

$$\begin{aligned} \langle [\Phi, \nabla\Phi], d_{\nabla}^*[\nabla\Phi \wedge \nabla\Phi] \rangle &= 2\langle [\Phi, \nabla_j \Phi], [\nabla_i \nabla_j \Phi, \nabla_i \Phi] \rangle \\ &= 2\langle [\nabla_j \Phi, [\Phi, \nabla_i \Phi]], \nabla_i \nabla_j \Phi \rangle \\ &= -2\langle [\nabla_i \Phi, [\nabla_j \Phi, \Phi]], \nabla_i \nabla_j \Phi \rangle - 2\langle [\Phi, [\nabla_i \Phi, \nabla_j \Phi]], \nabla_i \nabla_j \Phi \rangle \\ &= -2\langle [\nabla_i \Phi, [\nabla_j \Phi, \Phi]], [F_{ij}, \Phi] \rangle - 2\langle [\Phi, [\nabla_i \Phi, \nabla_j \Phi]], [F_{ij}, \Phi] \rangle \\ &\quad + 2\langle [\nabla_i \Phi, [\nabla_j \Phi, \Phi]], \nabla_j \nabla_i \Phi \rangle \\ &= -2\langle [\nabla_i \Phi, [\nabla_j \Phi, \Phi]], [F_{ij}, \Phi] \rangle - 2\langle [\Phi, [\nabla_i \Phi, \nabla_j \Phi]], [F_{ij}, \Phi] \rangle \\ &\quad - 2\langle [\nabla_i \Phi, [\Phi, \nabla_j \Phi]], \nabla_j \nabla_i \Phi \rangle \end{aligned}$$

as  $[\nabla_j \Phi, \nabla_i \Phi]$  is anti-symmetric in  $i, j$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} 2\langle [\Phi, \nabla\Phi], d_{\nabla}^*[\nabla\Phi \wedge \nabla\Phi] \rangle &= 4\langle [\nabla_j \Phi, [\Phi, \nabla_i \Phi]], \nabla_i \nabla_j \Phi \rangle \\ &= -2\langle [\nabla_i \Phi, [\nabla_j \Phi, \Phi]], [F_{ij}, \Phi] \rangle - 2\langle [\Phi, [\nabla_i \Phi, \nabla_j \Phi]], [F_{ij}, \Phi] \rangle \\ &= -2\langle [\nabla_i \Phi, [\nabla_j \Phi, \Phi]] + [\Phi, [\nabla_i \Phi, \nabla_j \Phi]], [F_{ij}, \Phi] \rangle \\ &= 2\langle [\nabla_j \Phi, [\Phi, \nabla_i \Phi]], [F_{ij}, \Phi] \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^* \nabla[\Phi, \nabla\Phi] &= \Delta_{\nabla}[\Phi, \nabla\Phi] - *[*F_{\nabla} \wedge [\Phi, \nabla\Phi]] \\ &= [\Phi, \Delta_{\nabla}\nabla\Phi] + d_{\nabla}^*[\nabla\Phi \wedge \nabla\Phi] + *[\nabla\Phi \wedge [*F_{\nabla}, \Phi]] - *[*F_{\nabla} \wedge [\Phi, \nabla\Phi]], \end{aligned}$$

and using the second order equations again we find  $\Delta_{\nabla}\nabla\Phi = [[\nabla\Phi, \Phi], \Phi] - *[*F_{\nabla} \wedge \nabla\Phi]$  and so

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^* \nabla[\Phi, \nabla\Phi] &= [\Phi, [[\nabla\Phi, \Phi], \Phi]] + d_{\nabla}^*[\nabla\Phi \wedge \nabla\Phi] \\ &\quad + *[\nabla\Phi \wedge [*F_{\nabla}, \Phi]] - *[*F_{\nabla} \wedge [\Phi, \nabla\Phi]] - [\Phi, *[*F_{\nabla} \wedge \nabla\Phi]] \\ &= [\Phi, [[\nabla\Phi, \Phi], \Phi]] + d_{\nabla}^*[\nabla\Phi \wedge \nabla\Phi] - 2[\Phi, *[*F_{\nabla} \wedge \nabla\Phi]], \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used the (graded) Jacobi identity. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta \frac{||[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]||^2}{2} &= \langle [\Phi, \nabla\Phi], \nabla^* \nabla [\Phi, \nabla\Phi] \rangle - |\nabla[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]|^2 \\
&= \langle [\Phi, \nabla\Phi], [\Phi, [[\nabla\Phi, \Phi], \Phi]] \rangle - 2\langle [\Phi, \nabla\Phi], [\Phi, *[F_\nabla \wedge \nabla\Phi]] \rangle \\
&\quad + \langle [\Phi, \nabla\Phi], d_\nabla^* [\nabla\Phi \wedge \nabla\Phi] \rangle - |\nabla[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]|^2 \\
&= -|[[\nabla\Phi, \Phi], \Phi]|^2 + 2\langle [\nabla_j \Phi, [\Phi, \nabla_i \Phi]], [F_{ij}, \Phi] \rangle - 2\langle [\Phi, \nabla\Phi], [\Phi, *[F_\nabla \wedge \nabla\Phi]] \rangle \\
&\quad - |\nabla[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta \frac{||[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]||^2}{2} + |\nabla[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]|^2 &\lesssim -|\Phi|^2 ||[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]||^2 + 2|(\nabla\Phi)^\perp| |F_\nabla, \Phi| ||[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]|| \\
&\quad + 2|\Phi| \left( |(F_\nabla)^\parallel| |(\nabla\Phi)^\perp| + |(F_\nabla)^\perp| |(\nabla\Phi)^\parallel| \right) ||[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]||,
\end{aligned}$$

with the stated inequality following from noticing that  $|\Phi| |(\nabla\Phi)^\perp| \lesssim |[\nabla\Phi, \Phi]|$  and similarly for  $(F_\nabla)^\perp$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  be a solution to the second order equations (2.1a) and (2.1b). Then,*

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2} \Delta |F_\nabla, \Phi|^2 + |\nabla[F_\nabla, \Phi]|^2 &\lesssim (-|\Phi|^2 + |\text{Riem}| + |F_\nabla| + |\Phi|^{-2} |\nabla\Phi|) |F_\nabla, \Phi|^2 \\
&\quad + \left( |(\nabla\Phi)^\parallel| + |\Phi|^{-2} |F_\nabla| |(\nabla\Phi)^\parallel| + |\Phi|^{-1} |(\nabla F_\nabla)^\parallel| \right) |[\nabla\Phi, \Phi]| |F_\nabla, \Phi| \\
&\quad + |\Phi|^{-1} |\nabla_i [F_\nabla, \Phi]| |F_\nabla, \Phi|.
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We start by computing

$$\Delta \frac{||F_\nabla, \Phi||^2}{2} = \langle [F_\nabla, \Phi], \nabla^* \nabla [F_\nabla, \Phi] \rangle - |\nabla[F_\nabla, \Phi]|^2. \tag{5.3}$$

We work out the first term above using the Leibniz rule, the Weitzenböck formula for  $F_\nabla$  given by  $\nabla^* \nabla F_\nabla = \Delta_\nabla F_\nabla + \text{Riem}(F_\nabla) + (F_\nabla \cdot F_\nabla)$ , and the second order equations

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla^* \nabla [F_\nabla, \Phi] &= -\nabla_i \nabla_i [F, \Phi] \\
&= [-\nabla_i \nabla_i F, \Phi] - 2[\nabla_i F, \nabla_i \Phi] - [F, \nabla_i \nabla_i \Phi] \\
&= [\Delta_\nabla F_\nabla, \Phi] + \text{Riem}([F_\nabla, \Phi]) + (F_\nabla \cdot [F_\nabla, \Phi]) - 2[\nabla_i F_\nabla, \nabla_i \Phi] + [F_\nabla, \Delta_\nabla \Phi] \\
&= [[F_\nabla, \Phi], \Phi], \Phi - [[\nabla\Phi \wedge \nabla\Phi], \Phi] + \text{Riem}([F_\nabla, \Phi]) \\
&\quad + (F_\nabla \cdot [F_\nabla, \Phi]) - 2[\nabla_i F_\nabla, \nabla_i \Phi],
\end{aligned}$$

and the first term of the equations above is

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle [F_\nabla, \Phi], \nabla^* \nabla [F_\nabla, \Phi] \rangle &= -|\Phi|^2 |[F_\nabla, \Phi]|^2 - \langle [F_\nabla, \Phi], [[\nabla\Phi \wedge \nabla\Phi], \Phi] \rangle + \langle [F_\nabla, \Phi], \text{Riem}([F_\nabla, \Phi]) \rangle \\
&\quad + \langle [F_\nabla, \Phi], (F_\nabla \cdot [F_\nabla, \Phi]) \rangle - 2\langle [F_\nabla, \Phi], [\nabla_i F_\nabla, \nabla_i \Phi] \rangle \\
&\lesssim (-|\Phi|^2 + |\text{Riem}| + |F_\nabla|) |[F_\nabla, \Phi]|^2 \\
&\quad + \left( |(\nabla\Phi)| | \Phi | |(\nabla\Phi)^\perp| + |[\nabla_i F_\nabla, \nabla_i \Phi]| \right) |[F_\nabla, \Phi]|.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, notice that  $|\Phi| |(\nabla\Phi)^\perp| \lesssim |[\nabla\Phi, \Phi]|$  while

$$\begin{aligned}
|[\nabla_i F_\nabla, \nabla_i \Phi]| &\lesssim |(\nabla_i F_\nabla)| |(\nabla_i \Phi)^\perp| + |(\nabla F_\nabla)^\perp| |(\nabla_i \Phi)| \\
&\lesssim |\Phi|^{-1} |(\nabla F_\nabla)| |[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]| + |\Phi|^{-2} |[\Phi, [\Phi, \nabla_i F_\nabla]]| |(\nabla_i \Phi)| \\
&\lesssim |\Phi|^{-1} |(\nabla F_\nabla)| |[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]| + |\Phi|^{-2} |[\Phi, \nabla_i [\Phi, F_\nabla]] - [\Phi, [\nabla_i \Phi, F_\nabla]]| |(\nabla_i \Phi)| \\
&\lesssim |\Phi|^{-1} |(\nabla F_\nabla)| |[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]| + |\Phi|^{-1} |\nabla_i [\Phi, F_\nabla]| \\
&\quad + |\Phi|^{-2} |[\nabla_i \Phi, [F_\nabla, \Phi]] + [F_\nabla, [\Phi, \nabla_i \Phi]]| |(\nabla_i \Phi)| \\
&\lesssim |\Phi|^{-1} |(\nabla F_\nabla)| |[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]| + |\Phi|^{-1} |\nabla_i [\Phi, F_\nabla]| \\
&\quad + |\Phi|^{-2} (|\nabla\Phi| |[F_\nabla, \Phi]| + |F_\nabla| |[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]|) |(\nabla_i \Phi)|,
\end{aligned}$$

which upon inserting above gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle [F_\nabla, \Phi], \nabla^* \nabla [F_\nabla, \Phi] \rangle &\lesssim (-|\Phi|^2 + |\text{Riem}| + |F_\nabla| + |\Phi|^{-2} |\nabla\Phi|) |[F_\nabla, \Phi]|^2 \\
&\quad + \left( |(\nabla\Phi)| + |\Phi|^{-2} |F_\nabla| |(\nabla\Phi)| + |\Phi|^{-1} |(\nabla F_\nabla)| \right) |[\nabla\Phi, \Phi]| |[F_\nabla, \Phi]| \\
&\quad + |\Phi|^{-1} |\nabla_i [F_\nabla, \Phi]| |[F_\nabla, \Phi]|.
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting into equation (5.3) we obtain the inequality in the statement.  $\square$

We now give the main consequence of the Bochner inequalities proved in this section.

**Corollary 5.4.** *Let  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  be a solution to the second order equations (2.1a) and (2.1b) with finite mass  $m \neq 0$ , set  $f = ([\nabla\Phi, \Phi], [F_\nabla, \Phi]) \in \Omega^1(\mathfrak{g}_P) \oplus \Omega^2(\mathfrak{g}_P)$  and suppose that  $|\text{Riem}|$ ,  $|\nabla\Phi|$ ,  $|F_\nabla|$  and  $|\nabla F_\nabla|$  decay uniformly to zero at infinity. Then, outside a sufficiently large compact set and for all sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$  we have*

$$\frac{1}{2} \Delta |f|^2 + (1 - \delta) |\nabla f|^2 \lesssim (-|\Phi|^2 + \varepsilon(\delta)) |f|^2,$$

where  $\varepsilon(\delta) > 0$  is a continuous function such that  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon(\delta) = 0$ .

*Proof.* This follows from summing the inequalities in Lemmata 5.2 and 5.3 and using Young's inequality to deal with the mixed terms of the form  $|[\nabla\Phi, \Phi]| |[F_\nabla, \Phi]|$  as well as

with the derivative terms  $|\nabla_i[F_\nabla, \Phi]| |F_\nabla, \Phi|$ . Under the hypothesis of uniform decay, the inequality in the statement follows.  $\square$

Here we state and prove a further improvement of the inequalities in Lemma 5.1. These are valid only sufficiently far out along the end and follow explicitly making use of the finiteness of the mass.

**Lemma 5.5** (Improved Bochner inequalities). *In the conditions of Theorem 4.4, the following inequalities hold outside a sufficiently large compact subset:*

$$\Delta|\nabla\Phi|^2 \lesssim |(F_\nabla)^\perp| |(\nabla\Phi)^\parallel| |(\nabla\Phi)^\perp| + (|(F_\nabla)^\parallel| - m^2) |(\nabla\Phi)^\perp|^2,$$

$$\Delta|\nabla\Phi|^2 \lesssim |(F_\nabla)^\perp| |(\nabla\Phi)^\parallel| |(\nabla\Phi)^\perp|,$$

$$\Delta|\nabla\Phi|^2 \lesssim |(F_\nabla)^\perp|^2 |(\nabla\Phi)^\parallel|^2.$$

In case  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  is a  $G_2$ -monopole, then we have:

$$\Delta|\nabla\Phi|^2 \lesssim |(F_\nabla^{14})^\perp| |(\nabla\Phi)^\parallel| |(\nabla\Phi)^\perp| + (|(\nabla\Phi)^\parallel| + |(F_\nabla^{14})^\parallel| - m^2) |(\nabla\Phi)^\perp|^2, \quad (5.4)$$

$$\Delta|\nabla\Phi|^2 \lesssim |(F_\nabla^{14})^\perp| |(\nabla\Phi)^\parallel| |(\nabla\Phi)^\perp|, \quad (5.5)$$

$$\Delta|\nabla\Phi|^2 \lesssim |(F_\nabla^{14})^\perp|^2 |(\nabla\Phi)^\parallel|^2. \quad (5.6)$$

*Proof.* We do the proof of the monopole case, the other is entirely analogous. Recall from inequality (5.2) that

$$\Delta|\nabla\Phi|^2 \lesssim |(F_\nabla^{14})^\perp| |(\nabla\Phi)^\parallel| |(\nabla\Phi)^\perp| + (|(\nabla\Phi)^\parallel| + |(F_\nabla^{14})^\parallel|) |(\nabla\Phi)^\perp|^2 - |[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]|^2.$$

Since, by Theorem 4.4,  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  has finite mass  $m > 0$ , it follows that outside a sufficiently large compact set  $K$  one has  $|\Phi| \geq m/2$  (see Remark 2.8):

$$|[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]|^2 \geq 4|\Phi|^2 |(\nabla\Phi)^\perp|^2 \geq m^2 |(\nabla\Phi)^\perp|^2.$$

Therefore we get inequality (5.4). Now recall that  $|F_\nabla^{14}|$  decays by hypothesis and that  $|\nabla\Phi|$  also decays as a consequence of Corollary 3.7. Thus, if  $K$  is large enough, then the last term in inequality (5.4) becomes negative, so that we get inequality (5.5).

Finally, to show inequality (5.6), note that we can use Young's inequality in the form

$$2|(F_\nabla^{14})^\perp| |(\nabla\Phi)^\parallel| |(\nabla\Phi)^\perp| \leq \varepsilon^{-1} |(F_\nabla^{14})^\perp|^2 |(\nabla\Phi)^\parallel|^2 + \varepsilon |(\nabla\Phi)^\perp|^2,$$

with  $\varepsilon > 0$  to be fixed later. Then, by inequality (5.4), we find that

$$\Delta|\nabla\Phi|^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1} |(F_\nabla^{14})^\perp|^2 |(\nabla\Phi)^\parallel|^2 + (\varepsilon + |(\nabla\Phi)^\parallel| + |(F_\nabla^{14})^\parallel| - m^2) |(\nabla\Phi)^\perp|^2.$$



Now choose  $\varepsilon \ll m^2$ , then given that both  $\|(\nabla\Phi)\|$ ,  $\|(F_\nabla^{14})\|$  decay, we conclude that the second term becomes negative so

$$\Delta|\nabla\Phi|^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}|(F_\nabla^{14})^\perp|^2\|(\nabla\Phi)\|^2,$$

as we wanted. □

## 6. REFINED ASYMPTOTICS IN THE AC CASE

In this section, let  $(X, \varphi)$  be an AC  $G_2$ -manifold as in Definition 2.4 and  $G = \text{SU}(2)$ . Here we prove first part of our second main Theorem 1.2. For the reader's convenience we restate this here as follows.

**Theorem 6.1.** *Let  $(X, \varphi)$  be an AC  $G_2$ -manifold and  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  satisfy the second order equations (2.1a) and (2.1b) with  $|\nabla\Phi|^2 \in L^1(X)$ . Suppose either that  $|F_\nabla|$  decays uniformly along the end or  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  is a  $G_2$ -monopole such that  $|F_\nabla^{14}|$  decays uniformly along the end. Then:*

- (i) *the transverse components of  $\nabla\Phi$  and  $F_\nabla$  decay exponentially along the end;*
- (ii)  *$|\nabla\Phi| = O(r^{-(n-1)})$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ .*

**Remark 6.2** (The decay of  $|\nabla\Phi|$  in (ii) is sharp). *Let  $(X, \varphi)$  be an irreducible AC  $G_2$ -manifold and  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  satisfy the second order equations (2.1a) and (2.1b) with  $|\nabla\Phi|^2 \in L^1(X)$ . Suppose either that  $|F_\nabla| \in L^\infty(X)$  or  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  is a  $G_2$ -monopole such that  $|F_\nabla^{14}| \in L^\infty(X)$ . Let  $m \geq 0$  be the mass of  $(\nabla, \Phi)$ , cf. Theorem 4.4. We show that if  $\nabla\Phi \neq 0$  then  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  cannot decay faster than as in (ii) of Theorem 6.1, as a consequence of the same argument in Lemma 4.7. Indeed, start noting that since  $\Delta_\nabla\Phi = 0$ , it follows from Stokes' Theorem that*

$$\int_{X_R} |\nabla\Phi|^2 = \int_{\Sigma_R} \langle \Phi, * \nabla\Phi \rangle.$$

Thus, if  $|\nabla\Phi| = o(r^{-(n-1)})$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$  then

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \langle \Phi, * \nabla\Phi \rangle r^{n-1} \leq \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} |\Phi| |\nabla\Phi| r^{n-1} \leq m \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} |\nabla\Phi| r^{n-1} = 0;$$

hence, using  $|\nabla\Phi|^2 \in L^1(X)$ ,

$$\|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X)}^2 = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \int_{X_R} \langle \Phi, * \nabla\Phi \rangle = 0,$$

i.e.  $\nabla\Phi = 0$ .

**6.1. Exponential decay for the transverse components.** In this subsection we prove that the components on  $\nabla\Phi$  and  $F_\nabla$  transverse to the Higgs field decay exponentially with  $r$ .

For the gauge group  $G = \text{SU}(2)$  it is enough to prove that both  $[\Phi, \nabla\Phi]$  and  $[\Phi, F_\nabla]$  decay exponentially.

When  $(X, \varphi)$  is AC note that  $|\text{Riem}|$  decays uniformly along the end. Let  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  satisfy the second order equations (2.1a) and (2.1b) with  $|\nabla\Phi|^2 \in L^1(X)$ . If  $|F_\nabla|$  decays uniformly along the end or  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  is a  $G_2$ -monopole such that  $|F_\nabla^{14}|$  decays uniformly along the end, then we have that  $|\nabla\Phi|, |F_\nabla|$  and  $|\nabla F_\nabla|$  also decay uniformly along the end by Corollaries 3.5 and 3.7. Furthermore, one has that  $|\Phi| \rightarrow m$  uniformly along the end by Theorem 4.4. Thus, we are in the conditions of Corollary 5.4 and for all sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$ , the function  $f = ([\nabla\Phi, \Phi], [F_\nabla, \Phi]) \in \Omega^1(\mathfrak{g}_P) \oplus \Omega^2(\mathfrak{g}_P)$ , along the end satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2}\Delta|f|^2 + (1 - \delta)|\nabla f|^2 \leq (-m^2 + \varepsilon(\delta))|f|^2, \quad (6.1)$$

where  $\varepsilon(\delta) > 0$  is a continuous function such that  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon(\delta) = 0$ . This has the remarkable consequence that the transverse components controlled by  $|f|$  decay exponentially along the end. The following gives part (i) of Theorem 6.1.

**Proposition 6.3.** *Let  $(X, \varphi)$  be AC and assume that the pair  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  satisfies the second order equations (2.1a) and (2.1b) and  $|\nabla\Phi|^2 \in L^1(X)$ . Suppose furthermore that either that  $|F_\nabla|$  decays uniformly along the end or  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  is a  $G_2$ -monopole such that  $|F_\nabla^{14}|$  decays uniformly along the end. Denote by  $m > 0$  the mass of  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  and  $\mu \ll m$  a small positive number. Then, there is  $R > 0$  (depending only on the geometry) and  $M > 0$  (depending on  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  and  $\mu$ ) such that for  $r \geq R$  we have*

$$\|[\nabla\Phi, \Phi]\|^2 + \|[F_\nabla, \Phi]\|^2 \leq M e^{-(m-\mu)r}.$$

In particular, for  $r \geq R$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |(\nabla\Phi)^\perp|^2 &\lesssim m^{-2} \|[\nabla\Phi, \Phi]\|^2 \leq m^{-2} M e^{-(m-\mu)r} \lesssim e^{-(m-\mu)r}, \\ |(F_\nabla^{14})^\perp|^2 &\leq |F_\nabla^\perp|^2 \lesssim m^{-2} \|[F_\nabla, \Phi]\|^2 \leq m^{-2} M e^{-(m-\mu)r} \lesssim e^{-(m-\mu)r}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Along the end of  $X$ , let  $r$  be the pullback of the radius function from the cone. Then, using the almost isometry to the cone we can write

$$-\Delta = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} + \frac{n-1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r^2} \Delta_\Sigma + \dots,$$

where the dots denote lower order terms. Furthermore, if  $w(r)$  is a function of  $r$  we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta w &= -w''(r)|dr|^2 + w'(r)\Delta r \\ &= -w''(r) - \frac{n-1}{r}w'(r) + \dots \end{aligned}$$

Thus, let  $M > 0$  and  $\mu > 0$  both to be fixed later and set  $w = Me^{-(m-\mu)r}$ . Then,

$$\Delta w = \left( -(m-\mu)^2 + \frac{n-1}{r}(m-\mu) + \dots \right) w.$$

Thus, given  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  sufficiently small so that  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\delta) \ll m^2$  we can find  $0 < \mu \ll m$  and  $R > 0$ , such that for  $r \geq R$

$$\Delta w \geq (-m^2 + \varepsilon) w.$$

This can be made by choosing  $\mu$  such that  $2m\mu - \mu^2 > 2\varepsilon$  and then choose  $R > 0$  depending only on the geometry<sup>5</sup> of  $(X, \varphi)$  so that for  $r \geq R$  we have  $\frac{n-1}{r}(m-\mu) + \dots > -\varepsilon$ . We can pick any  $\mu \in (m - \sqrt{m^2 - 2\varepsilon}, m)$ , so by decreasing the value of  $\varepsilon$  we may suppose that  $\mu$  is as small as we want. Using inequality (6.1), we find that for  $r \geq R$

$$\frac{1}{2}\Delta(|f|^2 - w) \leq (-m^2 + \varepsilon)(|f|^2 - w).$$

Now, both  $f$  and  $w$  decay to zero along the end, and for  $M > 0$  large enough we have  $|f|^2 \leq w$  at  $r = R$ . Therefore, using the inequality above we can apply the maximum principle to  $|f|^2 - w$  in the region  $r \geq R$  to find that

$$|f|^2 \leq w,$$

within that region. □

**6.2. Bounds from Hardy's inequality.** This section uses Hardy's inequality, the Agmon technique and Moser iteration to prove the following.

**Proposition 6.4.** *Under the hypothesis of Theorem 6.1 and for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we have*

$$|\nabla\Phi|^2 \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} r^{-2(n-2)+\varepsilon}.$$

We divide the proof of this result into a series of lemmas which we prove below. The concluding proof is given at the end.

For the rest of the paper, let  $L > l \gg 1$  and  $r_{l,L}$  be the following function:

$$r_{l,L} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{on } X - X_l, \\ \frac{2l+1}{l+1}r - l - 1 & \text{on } X_{l+1} - X_l, \\ r & \text{on } X_L - X_{l+1}, \\ L & \text{on } X - X_L. \end{cases} \quad (6.2)$$

<sup>5</sup>Since  $(X, \varphi)$  is AC, we have that  $-\Delta r \geq (n-1)r^{-1}(1 - O(r^{-\nu'}))$ , for some  $\nu' > 0$ .

Note that  $r_{l,L} \in L_1^\infty(X)$  and  $dr_{l,L} = \partial_r r_{l,L} dr$ , with

$$\partial_r r_{l,L} = \begin{cases} \frac{2l+1}{l+1} \sim 2 & \text{on } X_{l+1} - X_l, \\ 1 & \text{on } X_L - X_{l+1}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (6.3)$$

**Lemma 6.5.** *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 6.1, the tensors  $\nabla(r\nabla\Phi)$ ,  $r\nabla^2\Phi$  and  $r^\alpha(\nabla\Phi)^\perp$  are all square integrable, for all  $\alpha > 0$ .*

*Proof.* We start claiming that for any real function  $f \in L_1^\infty(X)$ , with support in  $X - X_l$ , we have the Agmon identity

$$\|\nabla(f\nabla\Phi)\|_{L^2(X)}^2 = \|df \otimes \nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_l)}^2 + \int_{X-X_l} \langle f^2 \nabla\Phi, \nabla^* \nabla(\nabla\Phi) \rangle.$$

It follows from Lemma 5.5 and Proposition 6.3, under the hypotheses above, that

$$\langle \nabla\Phi, \nabla^* \nabla(\nabla\Phi) \rangle \lesssim e^{-(m-\mu)r} |\nabla\Phi|^2 \in L^1(X).$$

Thus, the claim follows by the obvious approximation argument.

Next, let  $f = r_{l,L}$  as above. Then, since  $r^2 e^{-(m-\mu)r} \leq 1$  for  $r \geq l \gg 1$ , we have, for all  $L$  that

$$\|\nabla(r_{l,L}\nabla\Phi)\|_{L^2(X-X_l)}^2 \lesssim \|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X)}^2 + \int_{X-X_l} r_{l,L}^2 e^{-(m-\mu)r} |\nabla\Phi|^2 \lesssim \|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X)}^2.$$

Thus  $\nabla(r\nabla\Phi) \in L^2(X)$ . Since  $\nabla\Phi$  is also in  $L^2(X)$ , we have that

$$r\nabla^2\Phi = \nabla(r\nabla\Phi) - dr \otimes \nabla\Phi \in L^2(X).$$

Finally, note that Proposition 6.3 immediately implies that  $r^\alpha(\nabla\Phi)^\perp \in L^2(X)$  for all  $\alpha > 0$ , which concludes the proof.  $\square$

Next we improve the above result to allow higher powers of the radius function. We make use of the following Hardy type inequality.

**Lemma 6.6** (Hardy's Inequality, cf. [8, Proposition 3.7]). *Let  $(X, \varphi)$  be an AC  $G_2$ -manifold with rate  $\nu < 0$ . Then there is a constant  $C_H > 0$  such that for all  $\xi \in H^1$  with support in  $X - X_l$ , one has*

$$\|\nabla\xi\|_{L^2(X-X_l)}^2 \geq \left(\frac{n-2}{2}\right)^2 \|r^{-1}\xi\|_{L^2(X-X_l)}^2 - C_H \|r^{-1+\nu}\xi\|_{L^2(X-X_l)}^2. \quad (6.4)$$

**Lemma 6.7.** *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 6.1, if also<sup>6</sup>  $\nu \leq -\frac{3}{2}$ , then there is a constant  $C > 0$ , such that for all  $\varepsilon > 0$*

$$\|r^{\frac{n-4}{2}-\varepsilon}\nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_I)}^2 \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon}\|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_I)}^2. \quad (6.5)$$

Moreover both  $\nabla(r^p\nabla\Phi)$  and  $r^\alpha\nabla^2\Phi$  are square integrable as long as  $p < \frac{n-2}{2} = \frac{5}{2}$ .

*Proof.* If  $f \in L_1^\infty(X)$  with support in  $X - X_I$ , then (cf. proof of Lemma 6.5)

$$\|\nabla(f\nabla\Phi)\|_{L^2(X-X_I)}^2 \leq \|df \otimes \nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_I)}^2 + c \int_{X-X_I} f^2 e^{-(m-\mu)r} |\nabla\Phi|^2 \text{vol}_X. \quad (6.6)$$

On the other hand, applying Hardy's inequality (6.4) to the function  $f|\nabla\Phi|$  and using Kato's inequality gives us

$$\frac{(n-2)^2}{4} \|r^{-1}f\nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_I)}^2 - C_H \|r^{-1+\nu}f\nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_I)}^2 \leq \|\nabla(f\nabla\Phi)\|_{L^2(X-X_I)}^2.$$

The combination of these two inequalities gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(n-2)^2}{4} \|r^{-1}f\nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_I)}^2 &\leq \|df \otimes \nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_I)}^2 + C_H \|r^{-1+\nu}f\nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_I)}^2 \\ &\quad + c \int_{X-X_I} f^2 e^{-(m-\mu)r} |\nabla\Phi|^2 \text{vol}_X. \end{aligned}$$

Let now  $f = r_{l,L}^\alpha$  from equation (6.2). Since  $|dr_{l,L}^\alpha| \leq \alpha r_{l,L}^\alpha r^{-1} \chi_{[l,L]}(r) + \alpha r^{\alpha-1} \chi_{[l,l+1]}(r)$  (cf. equation (6.3)), we can rearrange the above inequality as

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{(n-2)^2}{4} - \alpha^2\right) \|r^{-1}r_{l,L}^\alpha \nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_I)}^2 &\lesssim \|r^{-1+\nu}r_{l,L}^\alpha \nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_I)}^2 + \int_{X-X_I} r_{l,L}^{2\alpha} e^{-(m-\mu)r} |\nabla\Phi|^2 \\ &\quad + cl^{2(\alpha-1)} \|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X_{l+1}-X_I)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The right hand side is finite and bounded independent of  $L$ , as long as  $\alpha \leq 1 - \nu$ . Thus, if also  $\alpha < \frac{n-2}{2} = \frac{5}{2}$ , then

$$\|r^{\alpha-1}\nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_{l+1})}^2 \leq \frac{C}{\frac{5}{2}-\alpha} \|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_I)}^2.$$

Writing  $\varepsilon = 5 - 2\alpha$ , we get inequality (6.5).

<sup>6</sup>All known examples have  $\nu \leq -3$ .

Similar to Lemma 6.5, using inequality (6.6) again, with  $f = r_{l,L}^\alpha$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(r_{l,L}^\alpha \nabla\Phi)\|_{L^2(X-X_l)}^2 &\leq \|dr_{l,L}^\alpha \otimes \nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_l)}^2 + c \int_{X-X_l} r_{l,L}^{2\alpha} e^{-(m-\mu)r} |\nabla\Phi|^2 \text{vol}_X \\ &\lesssim \|r^{\alpha-1} \nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_l)}^2 + \int_{X-X_l} |\nabla\Phi|^2 \text{vol}_X. \end{aligned}$$

Now the right hand side is bounded for all  $L$  when  $\alpha < \frac{n-2}{2}$ . Thus  $\nabla(r^\alpha \nabla\Phi)$  is square integrable, and hence so is  $r^\alpha \nabla^2\Phi = \nabla(r^\alpha \nabla\Phi) - \alpha r^{\alpha-1} dr \otimes \nabla\Phi$ .  $\square$

Now we are in the position to prove Proposition 6.4.

*Proof of Proposition 6.4.* Pick  $x \in X$  and let  $R = \frac{1}{4} \min(\{r(x), \text{inj}_x(X, g)\})^7$ . It follows from Proposition 6.3 and inequality (5.6) that

$$\Delta|\nabla\Phi|^2 \lesssim e^{-(m-\mu)r} |\nabla\Phi|^2.$$

For all  $\varepsilon > 0$  and, Moser iteration gives

$$|\nabla\Phi(x)|^2 \lesssim R^{-n} \int_{B_R(x)} |\nabla\Phi|^2 \text{vol}_X \leq R^{-2(n-2)+\varepsilon} \int_{B_R(x)} |r^{(n-4)/2-\varepsilon} \nabla\Phi|^2.$$

This together with Lemma 6.7 yields the stated result.  $\square$

**6.3. Bounds from an improved Hardy inequality.** This section follows the same strategy of the previous except that we combine the previously obtained bound with an improved Hardy-inequality which holds for  $H^1$ -functions supported along an end  $X - X_l$ . We summarize the main result as follows.

**Proposition 6.8.** *Under the hypothesis of Theorem 6.1, there are constants  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  such that for all  $t \in (0, 1)$  and  $\alpha < \frac{n-1}{2}$ , we have*

$$\|r^{\alpha-1/2} \nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X)}^2 \leq c_1 + c_2(n-1-2\alpha t)^{-1}. \quad (6.7)$$

*In particular,*

$$|\nabla\Phi|^2 = O(r^{-2(n-1)+\varepsilon}) \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty$$

*for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ .*

We start with the statement of the improved Hardy inequality.

<sup>7</sup>Recall that  $\text{inj}_x(X, g) \approx r(x)$ .

**Lemma 6.9** (Improved Hardy's Inequality as in [8]). *Let  $(X, \varphi)$  be an AC  $G_2$ -manifold with rate  $\nu < 0$ . Then, there is a constant  $C_H > 0$  such that for all  $\xi \in H^1$  with support in  $X - X_l$*

$$\|\partial_r \xi\|_{L^2(X-X_l)}^2 \geq \left(\frac{n-2}{2}\right)^2 \|r^{-1} \xi\|_{L^2(X-X_l)}^2 - C_H \|r^{-1+\nu} \xi\|_{L^2(X-X_l)}^2. \quad (6.8)$$

The proof of this result is exactly the same as that in [8] and so we jump into the proof of the main result of this section.

*Proof of Proposition 6.8.* Let  $r_{l,L}$  as in equation (6.2) and  $\alpha > 0$ , to be determined later. Applying the improved Hardy inequality (6.8) to the function  $r_{l,L}^\alpha \sqrt{r} |\nabla \Phi|$  and using Kato's inequality gives us

$$\frac{(n-2)^2}{4} \|r_{l,L}^\alpha r^{-1/2} \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_l)}^2 \leq \|\nabla_{\partial_r} (r_{l,L}^\alpha \sqrt{r} \nabla \Phi)\|_{L^2(X-X_l)}^2 + C_H \|r_{l,L}^\alpha r^{-1/2+\nu} \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_l)}^2, \quad (6.9)$$

which we now combine with the previously used strategy, now with the goal of proving Proposition 6.8. Recall the computation in the proof of Lemma 6.5 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla (r_{l,L}^\alpha \sqrt{r} \nabla \Phi)\|_{L^2(X-X_l)}^2 &= \|\partial_r (r_{l,L}^\alpha \sqrt{r} \nabla \Phi)\|_{L^2(X-X_l)}^2 + \|r_{l,L}^\alpha \sqrt{r} \nabla^\Sigma \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_l)}^2 \\ &\lesssim \|d(r_{l,L}^\alpha \sqrt{r}) \otimes \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X)}^2 + \int_X r_{l,L}^{2\alpha} r e^{-(m-\mu)r} |\nabla \Phi|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$

where  $\nabla^\Sigma$  denotes covariant differentiation, using the connection  $\nabla$ , in the directions along the kernel of  $dr$ , so that  $\nabla = \nabla_{\partial_r} \otimes dr + \nabla^\Sigma$ . Note that  $\nabla^\Sigma r = 0$ , and thus  $\nabla^\Sigma r_{l,L} = 0$ . Combining inequalities (6.9) and (6.10), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(n-2)^2}{4} \|r_{l,L}^\alpha r^{-1/2} \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_l)}^2 + \|r_{l,L}^\alpha \sqrt{r} \nabla^\Sigma \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_l)}^2 &\lesssim \|d(r_{l,L}^\alpha \sqrt{r}) \otimes \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X)}^2 \\ &\quad + \|r_{l,L}^\alpha r^{-1/2+\nu} \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_l)}^2 \\ &\quad + O(1), \end{aligned} \quad (6.11)$$

where  $O(1)$  corresponds to the rightmost term of the right hand side of inequality (6.10), which is bounded independently of  $L$  for any fixed  $\alpha$ .

Now, let

$$t = t(l, L, \alpha) = \frac{\|r_{l,L}^\alpha r^{-1/2} \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X_l - X_l)}^2}{\|r_{l,L}^\alpha r^{-1/2} \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_l)}^2} \in (0, 1). \quad (6.12)$$

Using equations (6.2) and (6.12), we get, as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , that

$$\|d(r_{l,L}^\alpha \sqrt{r}) \otimes \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X)}^2 = \left(\alpha^2 + \alpha\right)t + \frac{1}{4} \|r_{l,L}^\alpha r^{-1/2} \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X)}^2 + O(1), \quad (6.13)$$

where this  $O(1)$  term depends only on  $l, \alpha$  and the  $L^2$ -norm of  $\nabla \Phi$  in  $X_{l+1} - X_l$ ; in particular, for any fixed  $\alpha$ , it remains bounded as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . Next, we obtain a lower bound for the term

$\|r_{l,L}^\alpha \sqrt{r} \nabla^\Sigma \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X)}^2$  appearing in the left hand side of inequality (6.11). First, we compute<sup>8</sup>

$$0 = \int_{X-X_l} d(r_{l,L}^{2\alpha} |\nabla \Phi|^2 \iota_{\partial_r} \text{vol}_X) = \int_{X-X_l} (\partial_r(r_{l,L}^{2\alpha}) - r_{l,L}^{2\alpha} \Delta r) |\nabla \Phi|^2 + r_{l,L}^{2\alpha} \partial_r(|\nabla \Phi|^2) \text{vol}_X, \quad (6.14)$$

where we have used the fact that  $d(\iota_{\partial_r} \text{vol}_X) = -(\Delta r) \text{vol}_X$ . Using equation (6.3), we can further expand and rearrange equation (6.14), to get that there is  $C_1 = O\left(\alpha l^{2\alpha} \|\nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X_{l+1}-X_l)}^2\right)$ , bounded independently of  $L$ , such that

$$\int_{X-X_l} (\alpha t r_{l,L}^{2\alpha} r^{-1} - \frac{1}{2} r_{l,L}^{2\alpha} \Delta r) |\nabla \Phi|^2 \text{vol}_X = - \int_{X-X_l} r_{l,L}^{2\alpha} \langle \nabla \Phi, \nabla_{\partial_r} \nabla \Phi \rangle \text{vol}_X + C_1, \quad (6.15)$$

Let us rewrite the right hand side of equation (6.15) first. Using a normal frame, whose first element is  $\partial_r$ , and the harmonicity of  $\Phi$ , we show that

$$\begin{aligned} -\langle \nabla \Phi, \nabla_{\partial_r} \nabla \Phi \rangle &= -\langle \nabla_{\partial_r} \Phi, \nabla_{\partial_r} \nabla_{\partial_r} \Phi \rangle - \sum_{i=2}^n \langle \nabla_i \Phi, \nabla_{\partial_r} \nabla_i \Phi \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i=2}^n (\langle \nabla_{\partial_r} \Phi, \nabla_i \nabla_i \Phi \rangle - \langle \nabla_i \Phi, \nabla_i \nabla_{\partial_r} \Phi + [F_{ri}, \Phi] \rangle) \\ &\leq \sqrt{n-1} |\nabla \Phi| |\nabla^\Sigma \nabla \Phi| + O(|(\nabla \Phi)^\perp|^2 + |F_{ri}^{14}| |(\nabla \Phi)^\perp|). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using also Proposition 6.3, for the right hand side of equation (6.15), we get that (for another  $C_2$ , bounded independently of  $L$  or  $\alpha$ )

$$- \int_{X-X_l} r_{l,L}^{2\alpha} \langle \nabla \Phi, \nabla_{\partial_r} \nabla \Phi \rangle \text{vol}_X \leq \sqrt{n-1} \|r_{l,L}^\alpha r^{-1/2} \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X)} \|r_{l,L}^\alpha \sqrt{r} \nabla^\Sigma \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X)} + C_2. \quad (6.16)$$

Next we estimate the left hand side of equation (6.15). Recall that for some  $\nu' > 0$ , the radial function  $r$  satisfies

$$\frac{n-1}{r} - O(r^{-1-\nu'}) \leq -\Delta r \leq \frac{n-1}{r},$$

with the lower bound following from the assumption that  $(X, \varphi)$  is AC and the upper bound from the Laplacian comparison theorem together with the Ricci-flatness. Using this, we get (for some  $C_3 > 0$ ) that

$$\int_{X-X_l} (\alpha t r_{l,L}^{2\alpha} r^{-1} - \frac{1}{2} r_{l,L}^{2\alpha} \Delta r) |\nabla \Phi|^2 \text{vol}_X \geq (\alpha t + \frac{n-1}{2} - C_3 l^{-\nu'}) \|r_{l,L}^\alpha r^{-1/2} \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X)}^2. \quad (6.17)$$

<sup>8</sup>The first equality follows from an extension of Stokes' theorem due to [14], which states that for an orientable complete Riemannian  $n$ -manifold  $(M^n, g)$ , one has  $\int_M d\gamma = 0$  provided the  $(n-1)$ -form  $\gamma$  satisfies  $\gamma, d\gamma \in L^1$ .



Combining equation (6.15) and inequalities (6.16) and (6.17), we get

$$(n-1)^{-1} \left( \alpha t + \frac{n-1}{2} - C_3 l^{-\nu'} \right)^2 \|r_{l,L}^\alpha r^{-1/2} \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X)}^2 \leq \|r_{l,L}^\alpha \sqrt{r} \nabla^\Sigma \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X)}^2 + O(1). \quad (6.18)$$

Since  $\nu \leq -\frac{1}{2}$ , it follows from Proposition 6.4 that for  $\alpha < \frac{n-1}{2}$  we have

$$\|r_{l,L}^\alpha r^{-1/2+\nu} \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X)}^2 \leq O(1). \quad (6.19)$$

Hence inserting equations (6.13) and (6.19) and inequality (6.18) into inequality (6.11), and for  $\alpha < \frac{n-1}{2}$ , gives

$$\left( \frac{(n-2)^2}{4} - ((\alpha^2 + \alpha)t + \frac{1}{4}) + \frac{1}{n-1} \left( \alpha t + \frac{n-1}{2} - C_3 l^{-\nu'} \right)^2 \right) \|r_{l,L}^\alpha r^{-1/2} \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X)}^2 \leq O(1).$$

Thus  $r_{l,L}^\alpha r^{-1/2} \nabla \Phi$  is bounded in  $L^2$  independently of  $L$ , as long as the quantity in the parentheses above is positive (and  $\alpha < \frac{n-1}{2}$ ), which is equivalent to

$$\left( \alpha t + \frac{cl^{-\nu'}}{n-1} \right)^2 < \frac{(n-1)^2}{4} + \frac{nc^2 l^{-2\nu'}}{(n-1)^2} - c(n-1)l^{-\nu'}.$$

Since  $t \in (0, 1)$ , the above inequality is definitely satisfied for  $\alpha = \frac{n-1}{2} - O(l^{-\nu'/2})$ . Combining this with Moser iteration (as in the proof of Proposition 6.4), we get the bound

$$|\nabla \Phi|^2 \leq Cr^{-2(n-1)+O(l^{-\nu'/2})}.$$

Using this, we can bootstrap the previous computation, since for  $l$  large (but finite), we can now replace inequality (6.17) with

$$\int_{X-X_l} \left( \alpha t r_{l,L}^{2\alpha} r^{-1} - \frac{1}{2} r_{l,L}^{2\alpha} \Delta r \right) |\nabla \Phi|^2 \text{vol}_X \geq \left( \alpha t + \frac{n-1}{2} \right) \|r_{l,L}^\alpha r^{-1/2} \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X)}^2 - c \|r_{l,L}^\alpha r^{-(1+\nu')/2} \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X)},$$

as long as  $\alpha < \frac{n-1}{2}$ . After going through the remaining steps in an analogous way, we get the improved inequality

$$\left( \frac{(n-2)^2}{4} - ((\alpha^2 + \alpha)t + \frac{1}{4}) + \frac{1}{n-1} \left( \alpha t + \frac{n-1}{2} \right)^2 \right) \|r_{l,L}^\alpha r^{-1/2} \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X)}^2 \leq O(1),$$

which implies that, as long as  $\alpha < \frac{n-1}{2}$ , we have

$$\|r^{\alpha-1/2} \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X)}^2 \leq c_1 + \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \|r_{l,L}^\alpha r^{-1/2} \nabla \Phi\|_{L^2(X)}^2 \leq c_1 + c_2(n-1-2\alpha t)^{-1}.$$

Using Moser iteration again, together with  $t \in (0, 1)$ , we get that on  $X - X_l$  and for all  $\varepsilon > 0$

$$|\nabla \Phi| \leq \frac{C_l}{\varepsilon} r^{-(n-1)+\varepsilon},$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

**6.4. The final estimate.** In this Section we finish the proof of Theorem 6.1, giving a proof of its part (ii).

We start by recalling equation (6.7) stated in Proposition 6.8. This states that there are positive constants  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  such that

$$\|r^{\alpha-1/2}\nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X)}^2 \leq c_1 + c_2(n-1-2\alpha t)^{-1}.$$

Let  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  be such that  $i \gg c_1 + c_2$  and choose  $\alpha = \frac{n-1}{2} - \frac{1}{i}$  and  $t = 1 - \frac{1}{i}$ . Then,

$$\|r^{\alpha-1/2}\nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X)}^2 \lesssim i,$$

which also reads as

$$\int_X |r^{\frac{n-2}{2}-\frac{1}{i}}\nabla\Phi|^2 \lesssim i,$$

and given that in  $\{x \in X | 1 \leq r(x) \leq R^i\}$  we have  $r^{-1/i} \geq R^{-1}$  we find that

$$\frac{1}{i} \int_{\{x \in X | 1 \leq r(x) \leq R^i\}} |r^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\nabla\Phi|^2 \lesssim R.$$

This may be also regarded as the average of the  $L^2$ -norm of  $r^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\nabla\Phi$  on the  $i$ -cylinders  $C_k = \{x \in X | R^k \leq r(x) \leq R^{k+1}\}$  for  $k = 0, 1, \dots, i-1$ , which is therefore uniformly bounded independently of  $i$ . As a consequence, there must be an infinite sequence of cylinders  $\{C_{i_j}\}_j$  with  $i_j \nearrow \infty$  for which

$$\int_{C_{i_j}} |\nabla\Phi|^2 \lesssim Rr^{-(n-2)}.$$

Then, using Moser iteration in a ball  $B_\rho(x_{i_j}) \subset C_{i_j}$  gives that

$$|\nabla\Phi(x_{i_j})|^2 \lesssim \rho^{-n} \int_{B_\rho(x_{i_j})} |\nabla\Phi|^2 \lesssim \rho^{-n} Rr^{-(n-2)}.$$

In case,  $R > 2$  we can set  $\rho = R^{i_j-1}$ . Then,  $R^2r^{-1} \geq \rho^{-1} \geq Rr^{-1}$  in  $C_{i_j}$  and the Moser iteration above yields a bound at all  $x_{i_j}$  in the sub-cylinders  $C'_{i_j} = \{x \in X | R^{i_j} + R^{i_j-1} \leq r(x) \leq R^{i_j+1} - R^{i_j-1}\} \subset C_{i_j}$  of the form

$$\sup_{x_{i_j} \in C'_{i_j}} |\nabla\Phi(x_{i_j})|^2 \lesssim r^{-n}(R^2-1)^n Rr^{-(n-2)} \lesssim R(R^2-1)^n r^{-2(n-1)}. \quad (6.20)$$

We have thus obtained a sequence of cylinders  $C'_{i_j}$  going off to infinity and where the bound (6.20) holds. As a consequence of this, if it was not true that  $|\nabla\Phi|^2 = O(r^{-2(n-1)})$  for  $r \gg 1$ , there must a sequence  $y_i$  with  $r(y_i) \nearrow \infty$  at which  $r^{2(n-1)}|\nabla\Phi|^2$  attains a local

maxima and

$$\limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} r(y_i)^{2(n-1)} |\nabla \Phi(y_i)|^2 = \infty.$$

From the condition that  $r^{2(n-1)} |\nabla \Phi|^2$  attains a local maxima at the  $y_i$  we find, by differentiating in the  $r$ -direction, that at  $y_i$

$$2(n-1) |\nabla \Phi|^2 + r \partial_r (|\nabla \Phi|^2) = 0.$$

On the other hand, the second derivative test at  $y_i$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \Delta (r^{2(n-1)} |\nabla \Phi|^2) \\ &= -(2n-2)(3n-4) r^{2(n-2)} |\nabla \Phi|^2 - (2n-2) r^{2n-3} \partial_r (|\nabla \Phi|^2) + r^{2(n-1)} \Delta |\nabla \Phi|^2 + \dots, \end{aligned}$$

with the ... denotes lower order terms in comparison to  $r^{2(n-2)} |\nabla \Phi|^2$ . Inserting the first order equation above we find that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq -(2n-2)(3n-4) r^{2(n-1)} |\nabla \Phi|^2 + (2n-2)^2 r^{2(n-1)} |\nabla \Phi|^2 + r^{2(n-1)} \Delta |\nabla \Phi|^2 + \dots \\ &= -2(n-1)(n-2) r^{2(n-2)} |\nabla \Phi|^2 + r^{2(n-1)} \Delta |\nabla \Phi|^2 + \dots, \end{aligned}$$

which we can rewrite as

$$2(n-1)(n-2) r^{-2} |\nabla \Phi|^2 \leq \Delta |\nabla \Phi|^2 + \dots$$

Thus, using the improved Bochner inequality in Lemma 5.5 we find that

$$|\nabla \Phi|^2 \lesssim r^2 |(F_{\nabla})^\perp|^2 |\nabla \Phi|^2 + \dots,$$

with the ... strictly lower order than  $|\nabla \Phi|^2$ . Given that  $(F_{\nabla})^\perp$  decays exponentially, as shown in Proposition 6.3, this is impossible unless  $|\nabla \Phi(y_i)| = 0$  which would contradict  $r^{2(n-1)} |\nabla \Phi|^2(y_i) \nearrow \infty$ . This completes the proof of Theorem 6.1.

**6.5. Bounds on higher order covariant derivatives of  $\Phi$ .** In this subsection, we assume the hypothesis of Theorem 6.1. The arguments here follow from an inductive procedure based on [24, Section 2].

**Lemma 6.10.**  $\nabla^{j+1} \Phi \in L^2$  for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ .

*Proof.* By assumption  $\nabla \Phi \in L^2$ , and by Lemma 6.5 we know that  $\nabla^2 \Phi \in L^2$ . We now induct. Suppose that  $\nabla^i(\nabla \Phi) \in L^2$  for all  $i \leq j$ . Recall from either Corollaries 3.5 and 3.7 that  $\nabla^i F_{\nabla}, \nabla^{i+1} \Phi \in L^\infty$  for all  $i$ , as well as  $\|\Phi\|_{L^\infty} \leq m$  by Theorem 4.4. Let  $\{f_k : X \rightarrow [0, 1]\}$  be a sequence of uniformly  $C^j$ -bounded functions, with  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f_k = 1$  pointwise. Differentiating the Bochner identity of equation (2.2)  $j$  times and taking the  $L^2$ -inner product

with  $f_k^2 \nabla^j(\nabla\Phi)$  gives:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \langle \nabla^j \left( \nabla^* \nabla + 2 * [F_\nabla \wedge \cdot] + \text{ad}(\Phi)^2(\cdot) \right) (\nabla\Phi), f_k^2 \nabla^j(\nabla\Phi) \rangle_{L^2(X)} \\ &\geq \|\nabla(f_k \nabla^j(\nabla\Phi))\|_{L^2(X)}^2 - \|df_k \otimes \nabla^j(\nabla\Phi)\|_{L^2(X)}^2 - \sum_{0 \leq l \leq j} c_l \|\nabla^l(\nabla\Phi)\|_{L^2(X)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

for constants  $c_l > 0$  that are determined by the sup norms of  $\nabla^i F_\nabla, \nabla^{i+1}\Phi$ ,  $i \leq j$ , the mass  $m \geq 0$  of  $(\nabla, \Phi)$ , and the other coefficients of  $[\nabla^j, \nabla^*]$ . Taking the limit as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  gives  $\nabla^{j+1}(\nabla\Phi) \in L^2$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 6.11.**  $\nabla^{j+1}\Phi \in L_1^{2n}$  for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ .

*Proof.* By Kato's inequality, if  $\nabla^{j+2}\Phi \in L^p$  then  $d|\nabla^{j+1}\Phi| \in L^p$ . Hence, using Lemma 6.10, we get  $|\nabla^{j+1}\Phi| \in L_1^2$  for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Now iterate this argument using the Sobolev Embeddings  $L_1^p \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{np}{n-p}}$  valid for all  $p < n$ .  $\square$

## 7. BOUNDARY DATA

In this section we prove the second part of Theorem 1.2.

**Theorem 7.1.** *Let  $(X, \varphi)$  be an irreducible AC  $G_2$ -manifold and  $P \rightarrow X$  be a principal  $SU(2)$ -bundle. Assume that  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  satisfies the second order equations (2.1a) and (2.1b) with  $\nabla\Phi \in L^2(X)$ , and either  $|F_\nabla|$  decays quadratically along the end or  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  is a  $G_2$ -monopole such that  $|F_\nabla^{14}|$  decays quadratically along the end.*

*If  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  is an  $G_2$ -monopole, then there is a principal  $SU(2)$ -bundle,  $P_\infty \rightarrow \Sigma$  and a pair  $(\nabla_\infty, \Phi_\infty)$ , where  $\nabla_\infty$  is a pseudo-Hermitian–Yang–Mills connection on  $P_\infty$  (with respect to the nearly Kähler structure on  $\Sigma$ ) and  $\Phi_\infty$  is a  $\nabla_\infty$ -parallel section of the adjoint bundle  $\mathfrak{g}_{P_\infty}$  over  $\Sigma$ , such that  $(\nabla(R), \Phi(R)) = (\nabla, \Phi)|_{\Sigma_R}$  converges uniformly to  $(\nabla_\infty, \Phi_\infty)$  as  $R \rightarrow \infty$ .*

We prove the several statements in this theorem as a result of 3 Lemmata stated and proved bellow.

**Lemma 7.2** (Existence of  $\nabla_\infty$ ). *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 7.1, there is a connection  $\nabla_\infty$  on a bundle over the link  $\Sigma$  such that  $\nabla(R) = \nabla|_{\Sigma_R}$  converges uniformly to  $\nabla_\infty$  as  $R \rightarrow \infty$ .*

*Proof.* By hypothesis, we know that

$$|F_\nabla|_g^2 \lesssim r^{-4}.$$

For the  $G_2$ -monopole case, in which we merely assume quadratic decay of  $F_\nabla^{14}$ , the quadratic decay of the full  $F_\nabla$  follows from Theorem 6.1 (ii):

$$3|F_\nabla^7|_g^2 = |\nabla\Phi|_g^2 \lesssim r^{-2(n-1)}.$$

Now consider the cylinders  $C_R = r^{-1}([R, eR])$  with the conical metric  $g_C$  which for large  $R$  approximates well the  $G_2$ -metric  $g$ . Then, we re-scale it by  $r^{-2}$  to obtain the cylindrical metric

$$h = r^{-2}g_C = dt^2 + g_\Sigma,$$

where  $t = \ln(r)$ . With respect to this translation invariant metric we can identify all the cylinders  $C_R$  with  $(C = [0, 1]_t \times \Sigma, h)$ . As from the above, we have

$$|\nabla\Phi|_h^2 \lesssim e^{-2nt} \quad \& \quad |F_\nabla|_h^2 \lesssim 1,$$

we find that the restriction of  $\nabla_i = \nabla|_{C_i}$  seen as a connection over  $C$  has uniformly bounded curvature with respect to  $h$ . Thus, Uhlenbeck's compactness results [26] apply and by possibly passing to a subsequence,  $A_i$  convergences modulo gauge, as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ , to a well defined connection  $\nabla_\infty$  on  $C$ .

We must now argue that such a connection is unique and does not depend on the subsequence. For that consider  $\nabla_i$  on  $C_i$  written in radial gauge with respect to  $r$ , i.e.  $\nabla_i = a_i(r)$  with  $a_i(\cdot)$  a 1-parameter family of connections over  $\Sigma$  parametrized by  $r \in [R, eR]$ , then  $F_{\nabla_i} = dr \wedge \partial_r a_i(r) + F_{a_i}(r)$  where  $F_{a_i}(r)$  is the curvature of  $a_i(r)$  over  $\{r\} \times \Sigma$ . Using this, we find  $|\partial_r \nabla_i|_g \leq |F_{\nabla_i}|_r \lesssim r^{-2}$  and so

$$\int_R^{eR} |\partial_r \nabla_i|_g \, dr \lesssim R^{-1},$$

which decays as  $R \rightarrow \infty$ . This not only shows that the limit

$$\nabla_\infty = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \nabla(r),$$

exists, as proves it is independent of the coordinate  $r$  and so a pullback from a connection over  $\Sigma$ . Thus, it agrees with the connection  $\nabla_\infty$  obtained as the uniform limit of the  $\nabla_i$  which is therefore pullback from  $\Sigma$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 7.3** ( $\nabla_\infty$  is pseudo-Hermitian–Yang–Mills). *In case  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  is a  $G_2$ -monopole, the connection  $\nabla_\infty$  from Lemma 7.2 is pseudo-Hermitian–Yang–Mills, i.e. it satisfies*

$$\Lambda F_{\nabla_\infty} = 0 = F_{\nabla_\infty}^{0,2},$$

*with respect to the nearly Kähler structure on  $\Sigma$  induced by the conical  $G_2$ -structure.*

*Proof.* With respect to the metric  $g_C$  and the coordinate  $r$  we can view

$$(C, g_C) = ([1, e]_r \times \Sigma, dr^2 + r^2 g_\Sigma),$$

that is,  $g_C$  is a conical metric on the fixed cylinder  $C$ . This metric has holonomy  $G_2$  and  $\varphi_C = dr \wedge \omega + \text{Re}(\Omega)$  with  $(\omega, \text{Re}(\Omega))$  determining the nearly Kähler structure on the cone. Hence, we can decompose the curvature of  $\nabla_\infty$  as

$$F_{\nabla_\infty} = F_{\nabla_\infty}^7 + F_{\nabla_\infty}^{14},$$

according to types with respect to  $\varphi_C$ .

On the other hand, as  $|F_{\nabla_\infty}^7|_h \lesssim e^{-2nt} \rightarrow 0$  uniformly, we conclude that any  $\nabla_\infty$  must satisfy

$$F_{\nabla_\infty}^7 = 0.$$

Now, write  $\nabla_\infty$  in radial gauge in  $C$ , i.e. as  $\nabla_\infty = a_\infty(r)$  with  $a_\infty(\cdot)$  a 1-parameter family of connections over  $\Sigma$  parametrized by  $r \in [1, e]$ . Then, its curvature can be written as

$$F_{\nabla_\infty} = F_{a_\infty} + dr \wedge \partial_r a_\infty.$$

Then, the condition  $F_{\nabla_\infty}^7 = 0$  can equivalently be written as  $F_{\nabla_\infty} \wedge \psi_C = 0$  where  $\psi_C = \frac{\omega^2}{2} - dr \wedge \text{Im}(\Omega)$ , which then yields

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_r a_\infty \wedge \frac{\omega^2}{2} &= F_{a_\infty} \wedge \text{Im}(\Omega), \\ F_{a_\infty} \wedge \frac{\omega^2}{2} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The result follows from observing that  $\partial_r a_\infty = 0$ . □

**Lemma 7.4** (Existence of  $\Phi_\infty$ ). *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 7.1, there is a  $\nabla_\infty$ -parallel section  $\Phi_\infty$  of the adjoint bundle  $\mathfrak{g}_{P_\infty}$  over  $\Sigma$  such that  $\Phi(R) = \Phi|_{\Sigma_R}$  converges uniformly to  $\Phi_\infty$  as  $R \rightarrow \infty$ .*

*Proof.* Consider  $\Phi_R = \Phi|_{C_R}$  where  $C_R = \{x \in X | \ln(R) \leq t(x) \leq \ln(R) + 1\}$  is equipped with the cylindrical metric  $h$  introduced in the proof of Lemma 7.2. Then, translating the coordinate  $t$ , we consider  $\Phi_R$  as a 1-parameter family of Higgs fields in the fixed cylinder  $C = [0, 1]_t \times \Sigma$  with the fixed metric  $h$ . Then, Theorem 6.1 (ii) implies

$$|\nabla \Phi|_h^2 \lesssim e^{-2nt},$$

for  $r \in [R, eR]$ , i.e.  $t \in [\ln(R), \ln(R) + 1]$ . Thus, translating this back to analyze the sequence  $\Phi_R$  in the cylinder  $C$  we have

$$|\nabla \Phi_R|_h^2 \lesssim R^{-2(n-1)},$$

which converges to zero as  $R \rightarrow \infty$ . This together with  $|\Phi_R| \lesssim m$  shows that  $\Phi_R \rightarrow \Phi_\infty$  uniformly over  $C$  with  $\nabla_\infty \Phi_\infty = 0$ . In particular,  $\partial_t \Phi_\infty = 0$  and so  $\Phi_\infty$  is independent of  $t$ , or  $r$ , and so is pulled back from  $\Sigma$ . □

## 8. DECAY OF LINEARIZED SOLUTIONS

In this section we make further use of the methods of the previous sections, and give decay estimates to finite energy solutions to the linearization of the  $G_2$ -monopole equation, with appropriate gauge fixing.

**8.1. The linearized equation.** First we compute the (formal) linearization of the  $G_2$ -monopole equation (1.1).

Let the configuration space be  $\mathcal{C}_P = \text{Conn}_P \times \Omega_{\mathfrak{g}_P}^0$ , that is, the space of (Sobolev) pairs of connections on  $P$  and sections of  $\mathfrak{g}_P$ . Consider the (smooth) maps

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mon}^\pm : \mathcal{C}_P &\rightarrow \Omega_{\mathfrak{g}_P}^1; \\ (\nabla, \Phi) &\mapsto *(F_\nabla \wedge \psi) \pm \nabla\Phi, \end{aligned}$$

that, in case of a  $G_2$ -monopole, satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mon}^-(\nabla, \Phi) &= 0, \\ \text{mon}^+(\nabla, \Phi) &= 2\nabla\Phi. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathcal{C}_P$  is an affine space—in fact, an affine Hilbert manifold—the tangent spaces of  $\mathcal{C}_P$  at any point can canonically be identified with  $\Omega_{\mathfrak{g}_P}^1 \oplus \Omega_{\mathfrak{g}_P}^0$ , as Hilbert spaces. We can now compute the first derivative of  $\text{mon}^-$ . If  $X = (a, \phi) \in T_{(\nabla, \Phi)}\mathcal{C}_P$ , then

$$\left(T_{(\nabla, \Phi)}\text{mon}^-\right)(a, \phi) = *(d_\nabla a \wedge \psi) - \nabla\phi - [a, \Phi]. \quad (8.1)$$

We also impose the standard, Coulomb type gauge fixing condition that we only consider tangent vectors  $(a, \phi) \in T_{(\nabla, \Phi)}\mathcal{C}_P$  that are perpendicular to the gauge orbit through  $(\nabla, \Phi)$ , which amounts to the following PDE:

$$d_\nabla^* a + [\phi, \Phi] = 0. \quad (8.2)$$

We can organize equations (8.1) and (8.2) into a single equation. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(a, \phi) &= \left(*(d_\nabla a \wedge \psi) - \nabla\phi, -d_\nabla^* a\right), \\ q(a, \phi) &= ([\Phi, a], [\Phi, \phi]), \end{aligned}$$

and let  $L = \mathcal{D} + q$ . Then equations (8.1) and (8.2) are equivalent to

$$L(a, \phi) = 0. \quad (8.4)$$

We call equation (8.4) (or equations (8.1) and (8.2) together) the *linearized  $G_2$ -monopole equation*.

8.2. **A priori properties of the linearized  $G_2$ -monopole equation.** First we prove two Weitzenböck type formulas, one for  $L$  and one for  $L^*$ .

**Lemma 8.1.** *Let  $(\nabla, \Phi) \in \mathcal{C}_P$  be any pair. For any  $(a, \phi) \in T_{(\nabla, \Phi)}\mathcal{C}_P$  smooth pair let us define*

$$I_{\pm}(a, \phi) = \left( *[(2 * F_{\nabla}^{14} - *F_{\nabla}^7 \pm \nabla\Phi \wedge \psi) \wedge a] - [\text{mon}^{\pm}(\nabla, \Phi), \phi], *[ \text{mon}^{\pm}(\nabla, \Phi) \wedge *a] \right).$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} L^*L &= \nabla^*\nabla + I_+ - q^2, \\ LL^* &= \nabla^*\nabla + I_- - q^2. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We start by noticing that  $L = \mathcal{D} + q$  and  $L^* = \mathcal{D} - q$ , then we can write

$$\begin{aligned} L^*L &= \mathcal{D}^2 + [\mathcal{D}, q] - q^2, \\ LL^* &= \mathcal{D}^2 - [\mathcal{D}, q] - q^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let us first rewrite  $\mathcal{D}^2$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}^2(a, \phi) &= \mathcal{D}\left( *(d_{\nabla}a \wedge \psi) - \nabla\phi, -d_{\nabla}^*a \right) \\ &= \left( *(d_{\nabla}(*(d_{\nabla}a \wedge \psi) - \nabla\phi) \wedge \psi) - \nabla\left( -d_{\nabla}^*a \right), -d_{\nabla}^*\left( *(d_{\nabla}a \wedge \psi) - \nabla\phi \right) \right) \\ &= \left( *(d_{\nabla}(*(d_{\nabla}a \wedge \psi) - \nabla\phi) \wedge \psi) - \nabla\left( -d_{\nabla}^*a \right), -d_{\nabla}^*\left( *(d_{\nabla}a \wedge \psi) - \nabla\phi \right) \right) \\ &= \left( d_{\nabla}d_{\nabla}^*a + *(d_{\nabla}(*(d_{\nabla}a \wedge \psi)) \wedge \psi) - *\left( (d_{\nabla}^2\phi) \wedge \psi \right), \nabla^*\nabla\phi - *\left( (d_{\nabla}^2a) \wedge \psi \right) \right) \\ &= \left( d_{\nabla}d_{\nabla}^*a + *(d_{\nabla}(*(d_{\nabla}a \wedge \psi)) \wedge \psi) - [*(F_{\nabla} \wedge \psi), \phi], \nabla^*\nabla\phi - *([F_{\nabla} \wedge a] \wedge \psi) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Now standard computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} *(d_{\nabla}(*(d_{\nabla}a \wedge \psi)) \wedge \psi) &= 3d_{\nabla}^*d_{\nabla}^7a \\ &= d_{\nabla}^*d_{\nabla}a + *([F_{\nabla} \wedge a] \wedge \varphi). \end{aligned}$$

Using also that  $F_{\nabla} \wedge \psi = F_{\nabla} \wedge \psi$ , we get that

$$\mathcal{D}^2(a, \phi) = \left( d_{\nabla}d_{\nabla}^*a + d_{\nabla}^*d_{\nabla}a + *([F_{\nabla} \wedge a] \wedge \varphi) - *[F_{\nabla} \wedge \psi, \phi], \nabla^*\nabla\phi + *([F_{\nabla} \wedge \psi] \wedge a) \right).$$

Now recall the Weitzenböck identity for bundle-valued 1-forms on a Ricci-flat manifold:

$$\nabla^*\nabla a = d_{\nabla}d_{\nabla}^*a + d_{\nabla}^*d_{\nabla}a - *[(*F_{\nabla}) \wedge a].$$

Combining these we get

$$\mathcal{D}^2(a, \phi) = (\nabla^*\nabla a + *[(*F_{\nabla} - F_{\nabla} \wedge \varphi) \wedge a] - *[F_{\nabla} \wedge \psi, \phi], \nabla^*\nabla\phi + *([F_{\nabla} \wedge \psi] \wedge a)).$$



Let us now compute  $[\mathcal{D}, q]$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
[\mathcal{D}, q](a, \phi) &= \mathcal{D}([\Phi, a], [\Phi, \phi]) - q(*(\mathbf{d}_\nabla a \wedge \psi) - \nabla\phi, -\mathbf{d}_\nabla^* a) \\
&= (*(\mathbf{d}_\nabla([\Phi, a]) \wedge \psi) - \nabla([\Phi, \phi]), -\mathbf{d}_\nabla^*([\Phi, a])) \\
&\quad - ([\Phi, *(\mathbf{d}_\nabla a \wedge \psi) - \nabla\phi], [\Phi, -\mathbf{d}_\nabla^* a]) \\
&= (*[(\nabla\Phi \wedge \psi) \wedge a] + [\Phi, *(\mathbf{d}_\nabla a \wedge \psi)] - [\nabla\Phi, \phi] - [\Phi, \nabla\phi], *[\nabla\Phi \wedge *a] - [\Phi, \mathbf{d}_\nabla^* a]) \\
&\quad - ([\Phi, *(\mathbf{d}_\nabla a \wedge \psi)] - [\Phi, \nabla\phi], [\Phi, -\mathbf{d}_\nabla^* a]) \\
&= (*[(\nabla\Phi \wedge \psi) \wedge a] - [\nabla\Phi, \phi], *[\nabla\Phi \wedge *a]).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, after some simplification, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathcal{D}^2 \pm [\mathcal{D}, q] - \nabla^* \nabla)(a, \phi) &= \\
&= (*[(F_\nabla - F_\nabla \wedge \varphi + \pm \nabla\Phi \wedge \psi) \wedge a] - [\text{mon}^\pm(\nabla, \Phi), \phi], *[\text{mon}^\pm(\nabla, \Phi) \wedge *a]).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the identities that hold for any  $\omega = \omega^7 + \omega^{14} \in \Lambda^2 M = \Lambda_7^2 M \oplus \Lambda_{14}^2 M$ :

$$\omega \wedge \varphi = 2 * \omega^7 - * \omega^{14},$$

we can rewrite  $I_\pm(a, \phi)$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathcal{D}^2 \pm [\mathcal{D}, q] - \nabla^* \nabla)(a, \phi) &= \\
&= (*[(2 * F_\nabla^{14} - * F_\nabla^7 \pm \nabla\Phi \wedge \psi) \wedge a] - [\text{mon}^\pm(\nabla, \Phi), \phi], *[\text{mon}^\pm(\nabla, \Phi) \wedge *a]),
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

Using Moser iteration, we get the following immediate corollary.

**Corollary 8.2.** *Let  $(\nabla, \Phi) \in \mathcal{C}_P$  be a pair, such that  $r^2(|F_\nabla| + |\nabla\Phi|) \in L^\infty(X)$ . Let  $(a, \phi) \in T_{(\nabla, \Phi)}\mathcal{C}_P$  be in the  $L^2$ -kernel of either  $L$  or  $L^*$ ,  $V = (a, \phi)$ , and  $|V|^2 = |a|^2 + |\phi|^2$ . Then  $r^n|V|^2 \in L^\infty(X)$ .*

*Proof.* By elliptic regularity,  $V$  is smooth. Using the results of Lemma 8.1, we get (in both cases) and outside of  $X_R$  (for  $R$  large enough) that

$$\Delta|V|^2 \leq \frac{C}{r^2}|V|^2.$$

Thus we can use Moser iteration (cf. Proposition 2.1). Since the injectivity radius satisfies  $\text{inj}(x) \geq cr(x)$ , we have (with a potentially different constant) that

$$|V(x)|^2 \leq \frac{C}{r(x)^n} \int_{B_{r(x)/2}(x)} |V|^2 \text{vol}_X, \quad (8.5)$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

### 8.3. Decay properties of solutions to the linearized equation.

**Theorem 8.3.** *Let  $(\nabla, \Phi) \in \mathcal{C}_P$  be a pair, such that  $r^2(|F_\nabla| + |\nabla\Phi|) \in L^\infty(X)$ . Let  $(a, \phi) \in T_{(\nabla, \Phi)}\mathcal{C}_P$  be in the kernel of either  $L$  or  $L^*$ ,  $V = (a, \phi)$ , and  $|V|^2 = |a|^2 + |\phi|^2$ . Then for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we have that  $r^{2(n-1)-\varepsilon}|V|^2 \in L^\infty(X)$ .*

*Proof.* To prove the claim, we now bound the integrals  $\int_{B_{r(x)}(x)} |V|^2 \text{vol}_X$  in inequality (8.5), using the improved Hardy's inequality (6.8) in a similar way as in inequalities (6.9) and (6.10). More concretely, we show that for all  $\alpha < \frac{n-1}{2}$ :

$$\|r^{\alpha-\frac{1}{2}}V\|_{L^2(X)}^2 \leq \frac{C}{n-1-2\alpha} \|V\|_{L^2(X)}^2.$$

We again use inequality (6.8) together with Kato's inequality, but now with  $f = r_{l,L}^\alpha r^{-1/2}|V|$ , to get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(n-2)^2}{4} \|r_{l,L}^\alpha r^{-1/2}V\|_{L^2(X-X_i)}^2 + \|r_{l,L}^\alpha \sqrt{r}\nabla^\Sigma \nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_i)}^2 &\leq \|\nabla(r_{l,L}^\alpha \sqrt{r}\nabla\Phi)\|_{L^2(X-X_i)}^2 \\ &+ C_H \|r_{l,L}^\alpha r^{-1/2+\nu}\nabla\Phi\|_{L^2(X-X_i)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

From here we can proceed almost identically to proof of Proposition 6.8 (in fact, the computations are now easier as the equations are linear, and we already have the decay result for  $(\nabla, \Phi)$  by Theorem 1.2) to get that  $r^{2(n-1)-\varepsilon}|V|^2 \in L^\infty(X)$ .

Then, as in Section 6.4, one can show that, in fact,  $r^{2(n-1)}|V|^2 \in L^\infty(X)$   $\square$

### REFERENCES

- [1] A. Afuni, *Regularity and vanishing theorems for Yang–Mills–Higgs pairs*, Archiv der Mathematik **112** (2019), no. 5, 547–558.  $\uparrow$ 11, 13
- [2] R. L. Bryant and S. M. Salamon, *On the construction of some complete metrics with exceptional holonomy*, Duke Math. J. **58** (1989), no. 3, 829–850. MR1016448 (90i:53055)  $\uparrow$ 4
- [3] S-Y. Cheng and S-T. Yau, *Differential equations on Riemannian manifolds and their geometric applications*, Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics **28** (1975), no. 3, 333–354.  $\uparrow$ 17
- [4] S. A. Cherkis, *Octonions, monopoles, and knots*, Letters in Mathematical Physics **105** (2015), no. 5, 641–659.  $\uparrow$ 2
- [5] D. Crowley, S. Goette, and J. Nordström, *An analytic invariant of  $G_2$  manifolds* (2015), available at [arXiv: 1505.02734](https://arxiv.org/abs/1505.02734).  $\uparrow$ 1
- [6] D. Crowley and J. Nordström, *New invariants of  $G_2$ -structures*, Geometry & Topology **19** (2015), no. 5, 2949–2992.  $\uparrow$ 1
- [7] ———, *Exotic  $G_2$ -manifolds*, Mathematische Annalen (2020), available at [arXiv: 1411.0656](https://arxiv.org/abs/1411.0656).  $\uparrow$ 1
- [8] A. Degeratu and M. Stern, *Witten spinors on nonspin manifolds*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **324** (2013), no. 2.  $\uparrow$ 28, 31

- [9] A. Doan and T. Walpuski, *On counting associative submanifolds and Seiberg–Witten monopoles*, Pure and Applied Mathematics Quarterly **15** (2019), no. 4, available at [arXiv: 1712.08383](https://arxiv.org/abs/1712.08383). ↑2
- [10] ———, *Deformation theory of the blown-up Seiberg–Witten equation in dimension three*, Selecta Mathematica **26** (2020), no. 3, 1–48. ↑2
- [11] S. K. Donaldson and E. P. Segal, *Gauge theory in higher dimensions, II*, Surveys in differential geometry. Volume XVI. Geometry of special holonomy and related topics, 2011, pp. 1–41. MR2893675 ↑2
- [12] D. Fadel, *On the behavior of sequences of arbitrarily large mass monopoles in dimensions 3 and 7*, Ph.D. Thesis, 2020. ↑13
- [13] L. Foscolo, M. Haskins, and J. Nordström, *Infinitely many new families of complete cohomogeneity one  $G_2$ -manifolds:  $G_2$  analogues of the Taub–NUT and Eguchi–Hanson spaces* (2018), available at [arXiv: 1805.02612](https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.02612). ↑4
- [14] M. P. Gaffney, *A special Stokes’s theorem for complete Riemannian manifolds*, Annals of Mathematics **60** (1954), no. 1, pp. 140–145 (English). ↑32
- [15] A. Haydys,  *$G_2$  instantons and the Seiberg–Witten monopoles* (2017), available at [arXiv: 1703.06329](https://arxiv.org/abs/1703.06329). ↑2
- [16] A. Jaffe and C. H. Taubes, *Vortices and monopoles*, Progress in Physics, vol. 2, Birkhäuser Boston, Mass., 1980. Structure of static gauge theories. MR614447 (82m:81051) ↑6, 10, 16, 17
- [17] D. Joyce, *Fantasies about counting associative 3–folds and coassociative 4–folds in  $G_2$ -manifolds*, 12 June of 2012. Talk delivered at the  $G_2$  Days at UCL. ↑2
- [18] ———, *On counting special Lagrangian homology 3–spheres*, Contemporary Mathematics **314** (2002), 125–152. ↑2
- [19] P. Li and T. Luen-Fai, *Green’s functions, harmonic functions, and volume comparison*, Journal of Differential Geometry **41** (1995), no. 2, 277–318. ↑6, 14, 16, 18
- [20] G. Oliveira, *Monopoles in higher dimensions* (2014). ↑2, 3, 5
- [21] ———, *Monopoles on the Bryant–Salamon  $G_2$ -manifolds*, J. Geom. Phys. **86** (2014), 599–632. MR3282350 ↑2, 4
- [22] ———,  *$G_2$ -Monopoles with Singularities (Examples)*, Letters in Mathematical Physics **106** (2016), no. 11, 1479–1497. ↑4
- [23] H. N. Sá Earp, *Instantons on  $G_2$ -manifolds*, Ph.D. Thesis, 2009. ↑2
- [24] M. Stern, *Geometry of minimal energy Yang–Mills connections*, Journal of Differential Geometry **86** (2010), no. 1, 163–188. ↑35
- [25] C. H. Taubes, *GR = SW: counting curves and connections*, J. Differential Geom. **52** (1999), no. 3, 453–609. MR1761081 (2002i:53119) ↑2
- [26] K. K. Uhlenbeck, *Connections with  $L^p$  bounds on curvature*, Comm. Math. Phys. **83** (1982), no. 1, 31–42. MR648356 (83e:53035) ↑11, 37
- [27] T. Walpuski, *Gauge theory on  $G_2$ -manifolds*, Ph.D. Thesis, 2013. ↑2
- [28] ———, *MTH931 Riemannian Geometry II*, 2019. available at <https://walpu.ski/Teaching/RiemannianGeometry.pdf>. ↑14
- [29] C-Y. Wong, *Sigma models with repulsive potentials*, ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2017. Thesis (Ph.D.)–Duke University. MR3755065 ↑7
- [30] S-T. Yau, *Some function-theoretic properties of complete Riemannian manifold and their applications to geometry*, Indiana University Mathematics Journal **25** (1976), no. 7, 659–670. ↑14

(Daniel Fadel) UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL FLUMINENSE IME–GMA, NITERÓI, BRAZIL

URL: [sites.google.com/view/daniel-fadel-math-homepage/home](https://sites.google.com/view/daniel-fadel-math-homepage/home)

E-mail address: [fadel.daniel@gmail.com](mailto:fadel.daniel@gmail.com)

(Ákos Nagy) UCSB, SANTA BARBARA, CA, USA (PRESENT)/DUKE UNIVERSITY, DURHAM, NC, USA

URL: [akosnagy.com](https://akosnagy.com)

E-mail address: [contact@akosnagy.com](mailto:contact@akosnagy.com)

(Gonçalo Oliveira) UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL FLUMINENSE IME–GMA, NITERÓI, BRAZIL

URL: [sites.google.com/view/goncalo-oliveira-math-webpage/home](https://sites.google.com/view/goncalo-oliveira-math-webpage/home)

E-mail address: [galato97@gmail.com](mailto:galato97@gmail.com)