

ON STRONGLY INFLEXIBLE MANIFOLDS

CRISTINA COSTOYA, VICENTE MUÑOZ, AND ANTONIO VIRUEL

ABSTRACT. An oriented compact connected N -manifold M is inflexible if it does not admit self-maps of unbounded degree. In addition, if all the maps from any other oriented compact connected N -manifold have bounded degree, then M is said to be strongly inflexible. The existence of inflexible manifolds was established by Arkowitz and Lupton, however no example of simply-connected strongly inflexible manifold is known. Here we provide with an algorithm that uses Sullivan models to check whether a simply-connected manifold is strongly inflexible. Using this algorithm, we prove that all but one of the known examples of simply-connected inflexible manifolds are non-strongly inflexible.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let M be an oriented compact connected N -manifold. We are interested in the set

$$\deg(M) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\deg(f) \mid f: M \rightarrow M \text{ continuous}\} \subset \mathbb{Z}.$$

Constant maps and the identity map show that $0, 1 \in \deg(M)$, and $-1 \in \deg(M)$ if and only if M admits orientation-reversing self-maps. Moreover, $\deg(M)$ is a multiplicative semi-group, and therefore if there exists any $\ell \in \deg(M)$ such that $|\ell| > 1$, then $\deg(M)$ is unbounded. We say that M is *inflexible* if $\deg(M)$ is bounded. Simplicial volume allows to show that oriented closed connected hyperbolic manifolds are inflexible (see [9, Remark 6.2]) although there exist inflexible manifolds where either the simplicial volume is zero or not known [14, 15]. In particular, the simplicial volume is zero for simply-connected manifolds and every example of simply-connected inflexible manifold constructed at the time of writing has been built upon Rational Homotopy Theory techniques [1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9].

Suppose that M_0 , and M are oriented N -manifolds, and let

$$\deg(M, M_0) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\deg(f) \mid f: M \rightarrow M_0 \text{ continuous}\} \subset \mathbb{Z}.$$

Map composition gives rise to a multiplicative action of the semigroup $\deg(M_0)$ on the set $\deg(M, M_0)$. Therefore $0 \in \deg(M, M_0)$, and if there exists $0 \neq d \in \deg(M, M_0)$ and M_0 is not inflexible, then $\deg(M, M_0)$ is unbounded. We say that M_0 is *strongly inflexible* if for every N -manifold M the set $\deg(M, M_0)$ is bounded, bound that may depend on M . For instance, taking $M = \#_n M_0$, there is a degree n map $f: M \rightarrow M_0$. Observe that if M_0 is strongly inflexible, then M_0 is automatically inflexible.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 55P62. Secondary 57N65, 55P10.

The first author was partially supported by MINECO (Spain) grant MTM2016-79661-P. The second author was partially supported MINECO (Spain) grant PGC2018-095448-B-I00. The third author was partially supported by MINECO (Spain) grant MTM2016-78647-P.

When M_0 is strongly inflexible, the domination Mfd_N -seminorm associated with M_0 [9, Definition 7.1],

$$v_{M_0}(M) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup \{|d| \mid d \in \text{deg}(M, M_0)\},$$

is a nontrivial finite functorial Mfd_N -seminorm such that, for any given map $g: M \rightarrow M'$, $|\text{deg}(g)| v_{M_0}(M') \leq v_{M_0}(M)$ [9, Remark 7.5], so leading to Gromov-like degree theorems for simply-connected manifolds (see [9]).

The condition of being inflexible or strongly inflexible can be translated to the language of Sullivan algebras for simply-connected (or even nilpotent) spaces. Let $(\Lambda V, d)$ be a Sullivan model corresponding to a Poincaré duality space with formal dimension N . Suppose that $V^1 = 0$, and let $\nu \in (\Lambda V)^N$ be a representative of the volume form. Then $(\Lambda V, d)$ is inflexible if for every dga map

$$\varphi: (\Lambda V, d) \rightarrow (\Lambda V, d)$$

we have $\text{deg}(\varphi) = 0, \pm 1$, where $H([\nu]) = \text{deg}(\varphi)[\nu]$. Moreover, the Sullivan algebra $(\Lambda V, d)$ is strongly inflexible if for any Sullivan model $(\Lambda W, d)$, corresponding to a Poincaré duality space with formal dimension N , the set of degrees of all the dga morphisms

$$(\Lambda V, d) \rightarrow (\Lambda W, d)$$

is finite.

As we have mentioned in the abstract, no example of simply-connected strongly inflexible manifold (or dga) is known to date. In this paper we give a sufficient condition, Corollary 2.12, for being non-strongly inflexible: There exists a dga $(\Lambda W, d)$ with a positive weight (Definition 2.1) and a morphism

$$\varphi: (\Lambda V, d) \rightarrow (\Lambda W, d)$$

of nonzero degree, that is $H(\varphi)([\nu]) \neq 0$.

Using the above condition, we prove that *all*, but one, of the known examples of simply-connected inflexible dgas and manifolds, as given in [1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9], are non-strongly inflexible (see Theorem 5.2 and Theorem 5.4). For the one example for which we have not yet been able to prove that is non-strongly inflexible see Remark 5.5.

These results led us to raise the following conjecture:

Conjecture 1.1. *There do not exist simply-connected strongly inflexible manifolds.*

Acknowledgements. The authors want to thank C. Neofytidis for useful conversations and drawing our attention to [16].

2. WEIGHTS

In this section we discuss the key ingredient in this work, which is the relationship between weights in a dga and the strong inflexibility property.

Our definition of weight is taken from [3, 4].

Definition 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{A} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathcal{A}, d)$ be a dga. We say that \mathcal{A} has a weight ω if each degree component \mathcal{A}^k of \mathcal{A} decomposes as a direct sum*

$$\mathcal{A}^k = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} {}_n \mathcal{A}^k, \quad k \geq 0,$$

such that

- (i) $d({}_n\mathcal{A}^k) \subset {}_n\mathcal{A}^{k+1}$, and
- (ii) ${}_n\mathcal{A}^k \wedge {}_m\mathcal{A}^l \subset {}_{n+m}\mathcal{A}^{k+l}$.

Every nonzero element $x \in {}_n\mathcal{A} = \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} {}_n\mathcal{A}^k$ is said to have weight n , and it is denoted by $\omega(x) = n$. An element $x \in \mathcal{A}$ is said ω -homogeneous if x is a sum of monomials having the same weight.

Some useful notions of weights.

Definition 2.2. Let \mathcal{A} be a dga with a weight ω .

- (i) Given $a \in \mathcal{A}$ we say that ω detects a if a is ω -homogeneous and $\omega(a) \neq 0$.
- (ii) We say that ω is nontrivial if it detects some nonzero element $a \in \mathcal{A}$.

Remark 2.3. Let \mathcal{A} be a dga with a weight ω .

- (i) The constants $\mathcal{A}^0 = \mathbb{Q}$ have always weight $\omega(\lambda) = 0$, for $\lambda \in \mathcal{A}^0$.
- (ii) The weight ω is positive if ${}_n\mathcal{A} = 0$ for every $n < 0$ and ${}_0\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^0$.
- (iii) The weight ω on \mathcal{A} induces a weight, also denoted ω , in the cohomology of \mathcal{A} .

Remark 2.4. Let \mathcal{A} be a dga with a weight ω . If ω is positive, then ω detects every ω -homogeneous element in \mathcal{A} .

Lemma 2.5. Let (\mathcal{A}, d) be a dga with a weight ω . Given $x \in H(\mathcal{A}, d)$, there exists a decomposition $x = \sum [a_i]$, where the elements $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$ are ω -homogeneous, closed and $\omega(a_i) = \omega(a_j)$ if and only if $i = j$.

Proof. Let $x = [a] \in H^*(\mathcal{A}, d)$ be a cohomology class. Decompose $a = \sum a_i$ into ω -homogeneous elements such that $\omega(a_i) = \omega(a_j)$ if and only if $i = j$. Then $0 = da = \sum da_i$. As da_i are ω -homogeneous, we have $da_i = 0$. Hence $[a] = \sum [a_i]$. \square

Corollary 2.6. Let (\mathcal{A}, d) be a dga with a weight ω . If (\mathcal{A}, d) has Poincaré duality cohomology, formal dimension N and volume form $[\nu]$, then the representative ν can be chosen to be ω -homogeneous.

Proof. According to Lemma 2.5, we have $[\nu] = \sum [\nu_i]$, where the elements $\nu_i \in \mathcal{A}$ are ω -homogeneous, closed and $\omega(\nu_i) = \omega(\nu_j)$ if and only if $i = j$. Since $H^N(\mathcal{A}, d) \cong \mathbb{Q}$, and $H^N(\mathcal{A}, d)$ has a weight, it must be that only one i_0 has $[\nu_{i_0}] \neq 0$. Hence $[\nu] = [\nu_{i_0}]$ and ν_{i_0} is ω -homogeneous. \square

Definition 2.7. Let (\mathcal{A}, d) be a dga. We say that a class $x \in H(\mathcal{A}, d)$ is flexible if for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ there exists a dga morphism $f_n: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that $H(f_n)(x) = \lambda x$ with $\lambda \geq n$.

The existence of nontrivial weights implies the existence of flexible classes.

Lemma 2.8. Let (\mathcal{A}, d) be a dga, and $[a] \in H(\mathcal{A}, d)$. If (\mathcal{A}, d) has a weight ω that detects the element $a \in \mathcal{A}$, then $[a]$ is a flexible class.

Proof. For $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, let $\varphi_q: (\mathcal{A}, d) \rightarrow (\mathcal{A}, d)$ be the following morphism. If y an ω -homogeneous element, $\varphi_q(y) = q^{\omega(y)}y$. Otherwise, we decompose $y = \sum y_i$ into ω -homogeneous elements and $\varphi_q(y) = \sum q^{\omega(y_i)}y_i$.

Now, given $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we construct $f_n: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that $H(f_n)(x) = \lambda x$ with $\lambda \geq n$ as follows. Since ω detects a , then $\omega(a) \neq 0$ and therefore there exists $q_n \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $q_n^{\omega(a)} \geq n$. We define $f_n = \varphi_{q_n}$. \square

Corollary 2.9. *Let $(\Lambda V, d)$ be the Sullivan model of (\mathcal{A}, d) , a dga with Poincaré duality cohomology, formal dimension N and volume form $[\nu]$. If (\mathcal{A}, d) has a weight ω that detects ν , then $(\Lambda V, d)$ is not inflexible.*

Proof. Since ω detects ν , then by Lemma 2.8 the volume form $[\nu]$ is a flexible class. Therefore, for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ there exists a dga morphism $f_n: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that $\deg(f_n) = \lambda \geq n$. Finally, according to the Lifting Lemma [10, Lemma 12.4], f_n lifts to \tilde{f}_n , a self-map of $(\Lambda V, d)$ whose degree is $\deg(\tilde{f}_n) = \deg(f_n) = \lambda \geq n$, and therefore $(\Lambda V, d)$ is not inflexible. \square

Proposition 2.10. *Let (\mathcal{A}, d) be a simply-connected, finite type dga. For any nonzero class $[\nu] \in H^N(\mathcal{A}, d)$, there is a dga $(\bar{\mathcal{A}}, d)$ whose cohomology is Poincaré duality of formal dimension N , and a dga map*

$$q: (\mathcal{A}, d) \rightarrow (\bar{\mathcal{A}}, d),$$

such that $H(q)([\nu]) \neq 0$ is a volume form for $H^(\bar{\mathcal{A}}, d)$.*

Proof. We take a simply-connected finite type CW-complex X whose Sullivan model is isomorphic to (\mathcal{A}, d) , [18, Theorem 10.2 (ii)]. Let X' be the $(N + 1)$ -skeleton of X . Therefore $H^{\leq N}(X') \cong H^{\leq N}(X) \cong H^{\leq N}(\mathcal{A}, d)$. This is a finite CW-complex. By a theorem of Thom [17, Théorèmes III.4], the cohomology class $[\nu] \in H^N(X')$ is detected by an oriented compact N -manifold Z , that is there is a map $f: Z \rightarrow X'$ such that $\langle [\nu], f_*[Z] \rangle = \langle f^*[\nu], [Z] \rangle$.

We need to arrange that Z is simply-connected, and can do this by a surgery process. Let us assume for the moment that $N \geq 3$. As Z is compact, the fundamental group is finitely generated. Let γ_i be loops generating $\pi_1(Z)$, and we can perturb them so that they are embedded and disjoint. Take a small tubular neighbourhood of γ_i , which is $U_i \cong S^1 \times D^{N-1}$, since Z is oriented. Take a smaller disc $D_i^{N-1} \subset D^{N-1}$ and homotop f so that it is constant in the normal directions on $U_i = S^1 \times D^{N-1}$, that is $f(x, y) = \gamma_i(x)$, for $(x, y) \in U_i = S^1 \times D^{N-1}$. The loop $f \circ \gamma_i: S^1 \rightarrow X'$ is contractible, and let $H_i: D_i^2 \rightarrow X'$ be a contraction. Now we surger out the loops γ_i , that is we consider the N -manifold

$$Z' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (Z - \cup U_i) \cup (\cup D_i^2 \times \partial D^{N-1}).$$

A Seifert-van Kampen argument shows that Z' is simply-connected, and f can be extended to a map $f': Z' \rightarrow X'$, with $f'_*[Z'] = f_*[Z]$.

Let $(\bar{\mathcal{A}}, d)$ be a model of Z' , that exists since Z' is simply-connected. The cohomology of $(\bar{\mathcal{A}}, d)$ is Poincaré duality of formal dimension N . Then $f': Z' \rightarrow X' \subset X$ is represented by a dga map $q: (\mathcal{A}, d) \rightarrow (\bar{\mathcal{A}}, d)$ such that $H(q)([\nu]) \neq 0$. The case $N = 2$ can be done by hand, since we can take $(\bar{\mathcal{A}}, d)$ to be the model of S^2 . \square

Remark 2.11. The assumption of simply-connectedness in Proposition 2.10 is not necessary. The space X can be taken a nilpotent space. Then we can surger Z so that $\pi_1(f): \pi_1(Z') \rightarrow \pi_1(X')$ is injective, by killing the generators of the kernel of the morphism on fundamental groups. Thus Z' is nilpotent, and hence it admits a model.

Corollary 2.12. *Let (\mathcal{A}, d) be a dga with Poincaré duality and volume form $[\nu] \in H^N(\mathcal{A}, d)$. Suppose that there exists a dga (\mathcal{A}', d) and a map $\varphi: (\mathcal{A}, d) \rightarrow (\mathcal{A}', d)$ such that $H(\varphi)([\nu]) \neq 0$. If (\mathcal{A}', d) has a positive weight ω then (\mathcal{A}, d) is non-strongly inflexible.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.5, there exists a decomposition $H(\varphi)([\nu]) = \sum_{i=0}^r [a'_i]$ such that a'_i are ω -homogeneous, closed and $w(a'_i) \neq w(a'_j)$ if $i \neq j$. Assume that $\omega(a'_0) = \max\{\omega(a'_i) | i = 0, \dots, r\}$.

By Lemma 2.8, for every n , there is a map $f_n: (\mathcal{A}', d) \rightarrow (\mathcal{A}', d)$ verifying that $H(f_n)[a'_i] = q_n^{\omega(a'_i)} [a'_i]$ for every i , where q_n is a natural number satisfying that $q_n^{\omega(a'_0)} \geq n$.

Now, associated to (\mathcal{A}', d) , by Proposition 2.10 there is a dga $(\bar{\mathcal{A}}, d)$ whose cohomology is Poincaré duality of formal dimension N , and a dga map $q: (\mathcal{A}', d) \rightarrow (\bar{\mathcal{A}}, d)$ such that $H(q)([a'_0]) \neq 0$ is a volume form, let us call it $[\mu]$, for $H^*(\bar{\mathcal{A}}, d)$.

Finally, take $G_n = q \circ f_n \circ \varphi: (\mathcal{A}, d) \rightarrow (\bar{\mathcal{A}}, d)$, which in cohomology:

$$H(G_n)[\nu] = (q_n^{\omega(a'_0)} + \sum_{i=1}^r q_n^{\omega(a'_i)} \alpha_i)[\mu], \quad \alpha_i \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

Using that $q_n^{\omega(a'_0)} \geq n$ and that $\omega(a'_0) = \max\{\omega(a'_i) | i = 1, \dots, r\}$, we deduce that the set $\{\deg(G_n) | n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is unbounded and therefore (\mathcal{A}, d) is non-strongly inflexible. \square

Proposition 2.13. *Let $(\Lambda V, d)$ be a 2-step Sullivan algebra. Then it admits a positive weight.*

Proof. A 2-step Sullivan algebra is of the form ΛV for $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ such that $d(V_1) = 0$, and $d(V_2) \subset \Lambda V_1$. Let $\{x_i\}$ be a degree homogeneous basis of V_1 and $\{y_j\}$ a degree homogeneous basis of V_2 . Then a positive weight ω is defined by declaring the elements of the basis ω -homogeneous of weight

$$\omega(x_i) = |x_i|, \quad \omega(y_j) = |y_j| + 1.$$

and extend this weight to monomials in ΛV according to the rule in Definition 2.1(ii).

It remains to check that Definition 2.1(i) also holds. Indeed, given a monomial

$$z = \left(\prod_{i \in I} x_i^{n_i} \right) \left(\prod_{j \in J} y_j^{m_j} \right),$$

it is ω -homogeneous of weight

$$\omega(z) = \sum_{i \in I} n_i |x_i| + \sum_{j \in J} m_j (|y_j| + 1),$$

while

$$dz = \sum_{k \in J} \epsilon_k m_k (dy_k) y_k^{m_k - 1} \left(\prod_{i \in I} x_i^{n_i} \right) \left(\prod_{j \in J - \{k\}} y_j^{m_j} \right),$$

where $\epsilon_k = \pm 1$ and $dy_k \in V_1$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(dz) &= \omega\left((dy_k)y_k^{m_k-1}\left(\prod_{i \in I} x_i^{n_i}\right)\left(\prod_{j \in J-\{k\}} y_j^{m_j}\right)\right) \\ &= (|y_k| + 1) + (m_k - 1)(|y_k| + 1) + \sum_{i \in I} n_i |x_i| + \sum_{j \in J-\{k\}} m_j (|y_j| + 1) \\ &= \omega(z), \end{aligned}$$

and the condition in Definition 2.1(i) holds. \square

Corollary 2.14. *Every 2-step Sullivan algebra is non-strongly inflexible.*

3. UNIVERSAL SPACES

In this section we develop the necessary tools to extend our previous results on non-strong inflexibility from dgas to manifolds.

Recall that given p , a prime or zero, a map $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is said to be a p -equivalence if f induces an isomorphism on $H^*(X; \mathbb{Z}/p) \cong H^*(Y; \mathbb{Z}/p)$. Here $\mathbb{Z}/0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{Q}$.

Combining [5, 12, 13], a finite CW-complex X is said to be universal if for any p , for any given p -equivalence $k: Y \rightarrow Z$, and for an arbitrary map $g: X \rightarrow Z$, there is a map $h: X \rightarrow Y$ and there is a p -equivalence $f: X \rightarrow X$ such that the following diagram commutes up to homotopy:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\quad f \quad} & X \\ \downarrow h & & \downarrow g \\ Y & \xrightarrow{\quad k \quad} & Z. \end{array}$$

Universal spaces are characterized by their minimal models ([5, Theorem A]):

Theorem 3.1. *Let X be a simply-connected finite CW-complex, and $(\Lambda V, d)$ be its minimal model. Then X is universal if and only if $(\Lambda V, d)$ admits a positive weight.*

The cohomology of universal spaces is generated by flexible classes.

Theorem 3.2. *Let M be a manifold with volume form $\eta \in H^N(M; \mathbb{Z})$. Assume that there exists a map $g: X \rightarrow M$ such that X is a simply-connected finite universal CW-complex, $H^N(X; \mathbb{Q}) \cong \mathbb{Q}$, and $g^*(\eta) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} 1 \neq 0$. Then M is non-strongly inflexible.*

Proof. Let $(\Lambda V, d)$ be the Sullivan minimal model of X , which by Theorem 3.1 admits a positive weight ω . Then, by Lemma 2.5, there exists a decomposition of $g^*(\eta) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} 1$ into ω -homogeneous elements:

$$g^*(\eta) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} 1 = [v] \in H^N(X; \mathbb{Q}) \cong H^N(\Lambda V, d) \cong \mathbb{Q}.$$

Using Lemma 2.8, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we choose an integer l_n such that $l_n^{\omega(v)} \geq n$. Then there exists a dga morphism:

$$\begin{aligned} f_n: (\Lambda V, d) &\rightarrow (\Lambda V, d) \\ v &\mapsto l_n^{\omega(v)} v, \end{aligned}$$

for every ω -homogeneous element of $(\Lambda V, d)$.

Let $\zeta_X: X \rightarrow X_0$ be the rationalization of X , that is, the localization at 0, and let $\psi_n: X_0 \rightarrow X_0$ be the realization of f_n . Using that X is 0-universal, there exists a 0-equivalence $\tilde{\psi}_n: X \rightarrow X$ and a map $h_n: X \rightarrow X$ such that the following diagram homotopy commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\psi}_n} & X \\ h_n \downarrow & & \downarrow \zeta_X \\ X & \xrightarrow{\zeta_X} X_0 \xrightarrow{\psi_n} & X_0. \end{array} \quad (1)$$

Observe that $\tilde{\psi}_n$, ψ_n and ζ_X are 0-equivalences, thus h_n also is a 0-equivalence.

Using that (1) is homotopy commutative, we get that

$$H^N(\tilde{\psi}_n; \mathbb{Q})([v]) = H^N(\psi_n \circ \zeta_X \circ h_n; \mathbb{Q})([v]) = H^N(h_n; \mathbb{Q})(l_n^{\omega(v)}[v]) = c_n l_n^{w(v)}[v], \quad (2)$$

where c_n is a nonzero integer since h_n is a 0-equivalence.

Let $\nu = g^*(\eta) \in H^N(X; \mathbb{Z})$. By [17, Théorèmes III.4], there exists an N -manifold M' with volume form μ , and a map $\theta: M' \rightarrow X$ such that $\theta^*(\nu) = k\mu$ for some integer $k \neq 0$. We are going to show that $\deg(M', M)$ is unbounded, thus M is non-strongly inflexible.

Indeed, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we can define the composition:

$$G_n: M' \xrightarrow{\theta} X \xrightarrow{\tilde{\psi}_n} X \xrightarrow{g} M.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} G_n^*(\eta) &= (\tilde{\psi}_n \circ \theta)^*(g^*(\eta)) = \theta^*(\tilde{\psi}_n^*(\nu)) \quad (\text{now we use Equation (2)}) \\ &= \theta^*(c_n l_n^{\omega(v)} \nu + t) \quad (\text{where } t \text{ is some torsion element}) \\ &= c_n l_n^{\omega(v)} \theta^*(\nu) \quad (\theta^*(t) \text{ must be trivial since } H^N(M'; \mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}) \\ &= k c_n l_n^{\omega(v)} \mu. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $|\deg(G_n)| = |k c_n l_n^{\omega(v)}| \geq n$, as k and c_n are nonzero integers. □

Proposition 3.3. *Let (\mathcal{A}, d) be a connected dga with a positive weight ω . Then there exists a minimal model $\rho: (\Lambda V, d) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{A}$ such that $(\Lambda V, d)$ has a positive weight $\tilde{\omega}$ with $\omega(\rho(v)) = \tilde{\omega}(v)$, for every $\tilde{\omega}$ -homogeneous element $v \in \Lambda V$.*

Proof. First assume that \mathcal{A} is simply-connected. We construct V^n inductively. Suppose $\Lambda V^{<n}$ has already been constructed and has a weight $\tilde{\omega}$. By Remark 2.3(iii), $H(\Lambda V^{<n}, d)$ has an induced weight, and the map $H(\Lambda V^{<n}, d) \rightarrow H(\mathcal{A}, d)$ preserves weights. Consider the cokernel

$$Z^n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{coker}(\rho_*: H^n(\Lambda V^{<n}, d) \rightarrow H^n(\mathcal{A}, d)).$$

By the above, it admits a basis $\{z_i\}$ formed by homogeneous elements. This implies that there are closed elements $a_i \in \mathcal{A}^n$ which are ω -homogeneous and $z_i = [a_i]$. Consider also the kernel

$$B^n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \ker(\rho_*: H^{n+1}(\Lambda V^{<n}, d) \rightarrow H^{n+1}(\mathcal{A}, d)),$$

which has a basis $\{b_i\}$ formed by homogeneous elements. Let η_i be $\tilde{\omega}$ -homogeneous elements of $\Lambda^{n+1} V^{<n}$ with $b_i = [\eta_i]$. As $\rho_*([\eta_i]) = [\rho(\eta_i)] = 0$, we have that $\rho(\eta_i) = d\psi_i$ for

some $\psi_i \in \mathcal{A}^n$. We can discard those components which have weight different from $\tilde{\omega}(\eta_i)$, so that ψ_i is ω -homogeneous and $\omega(\psi_i) = \tilde{\omega}(\eta_i)$.

Now we define

$$V^n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Z^n \oplus B^n, \quad dz_i = 0, db_i = \eta_i,$$

declare $\tilde{\omega}(z_i) = \omega(a_i)$, $\tilde{\omega}(b_i) = \tilde{\omega}(\eta_i)$ and the map

$$\rho: V^n \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^n$$

by $\rho(z_i) = a_i$ and $\rho(b_i) = \psi_i$.

The case where \mathcal{A} is not simply-connected is similar, but now for every degree we have to do an induction, and the space V^n is constructed as the direct limit of the inductive system. The weight behaves well by direct limits. \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let (\mathcal{A}, d) be a connected dga with a positive weight ω , and $I \subset \mathcal{A}$ be a differential closed ideal (that is, $dI \subset I$) generated (as vector space) by ω -homogeneous elements. Then $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A}/I$ is a connected dga with positive weight $\tilde{\omega}$ defined by $\tilde{\omega}(\bar{a}) = \omega(a)$, for every ω -homogeneous element $a \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\bar{a} \neq 0$.*

Proof. Since $I \subset \mathcal{A}$ is a differential closed ideal, then $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A}/I$ is a connected dga, and it only remains to prove that the weight $\tilde{\omega}$ is well defined.

Assume $\tilde{\omega}$ is not well defined. Therefore there exist ω -homogeneous elements $a_l \in \mathcal{A}$, $l = 1, 2$, such that $\omega(a_1) \neq \omega(a_2)$ and $\bar{a}_1 = \bar{a}_2 \neq 0$. Then $a_1 - a_2 \in I$, and $a_1 - a_2 = \sum x_i$ where every $x_i \in I$ is ω -homogeneous, and $\omega(x_i) = \omega(x_j)$ if and only if $i = j$. Moreover, a_l is ω -homogeneous, $l = 1, 2$, and $\omega(a_1) \neq \omega(a_2)$. Hence $a_l = x_{i(l)}$, $l = 1, 2$, and $\bar{a}_1 = \bar{a}_2 = 0$. This is a contradiction as we assumed $\bar{a}_1 = \bar{a}_2 \neq 0$. \square

Finally, we obtain an integral version of Corollary 2.12.

Theorem 3.5. *Let (M, η) be a simply-connected N -manifold with minimal model $(\Lambda V, d)$. Write the rational volume form as $\eta \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} 1 = [\nu]$. Assume there exist a dga morphism $\psi: (\Lambda V, d) \rightarrow (\mathcal{A}, d)$ such that (\mathcal{A}, d) is a simply-connected finite type dga that has a positive weight and $H^N(\psi)([\nu]) \neq 0$. Then M is non-strongly inflexible.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.5, $H^N(\psi)([\nu]) = \sum [a_i]$ where every $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$ is closed ω -homogeneous, and $\omega(a_i) = \omega(a_j)$ if and only if $i = j$. Fix $\tilde{a} \in \mathcal{A}$, a nontrivial a_i in the decomposition above, take a complement $\mathcal{A}^N = \langle \tilde{a} \rangle \oplus W$, where W is spanned by ω -homogeneous elements, and define

$$I \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{A}^{\geq N+1} \oplus W.$$

Then $I \subset \mathcal{A}$ is a closed differential ideal generated (as vector space) by ω -homogeneous elements. By Lemma 3.4, $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A}/I$ is a finite type connected dga with positive weight and formal dimension N . Therefore, by Proposition 3.3, $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ admits a minimal model $(\Lambda W, d)$ with positive weight, which is the rational homotopy type of a simply-connected finite CW-complex X , with $H^N(X; \mathbb{Q}) \cong \mathbb{Q}$. Moreover, since $(\Lambda W, d)$ has a positive weight, X is universal by Theorem 3.1.

Let us consider the composition $\tilde{\psi}: \Lambda V \xrightarrow{\psi} \mathcal{A} \twoheadrightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$, and let $\tilde{\Psi}: X_0 \rightarrow M_0$ be its geometrical realization. Observe that $H^N(\tilde{\psi})([\nu]) \neq 0$ and so $H^N(\tilde{\Psi})([\nu]) \neq 0$.

Now, for $\zeta_M: M \rightarrow M_0$ (resp. $\zeta_X: X \rightarrow X_0$) the rationalization of M (resp. of X), which are 0-equivalences, since X is universal, there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\quad f \quad} & X \\ \downarrow g & & \downarrow \tilde{\Psi} \circ \zeta_X \\ M & \xrightarrow{\quad \zeta_M \quad} & M_0 \end{array}$$

where f is a 0-equivalence. We are going to show that $g^*(\eta) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} 1 \neq 0$ and therefore, by Theorem 3.2, M is non-strongly inflexible:

$$g^*(\eta) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} 1 = H^N(g; \mathbb{Q})([\nu]) = H^N(\tilde{\Psi} \circ \zeta_X \circ f; \mathbb{Q})([\nu]) = H^N(f; \mathbb{Q})(H^N(\tilde{\Psi})([\nu])) \neq 0.$$

□

4. 3-STEP SULLIVAN ALGEBRAS

Positive weights in Sullivan algebras relate to non inflexibility and non-strong inflexibility properties. We are going to exploit this aspect of positive weights to give a systematic way to check that certain 3-step Sullivan algebras are non-strongly inflexible. Our procedure applies to all but one of the inflexible Sullivan algebras known up to present (see Example 5.3 and Remark 5.5).

Definition 4.1. *We say that a Sullivan algebra*

$$\mathcal{M} = (\Lambda V_1 \otimes \Lambda V_2 \otimes \Lambda V_3, d),$$

is a 3-step algebra if $d(V_2) \subset \Lambda V_1$ and $d(V_3) \subset \Lambda(V_1 \oplus V_2)$.

We are only interested in 3-step Sullivan algebras of the form

$$\mathcal{M} = (\Lambda V_1 \otimes \Lambda V_2 \otimes \Lambda(z), d).$$

Out of such a Sullivan algebra \mathcal{M} , we are going to describe how to construct a *universal* \mathcal{B} , dga admitting positive weights, and a morphism of dgas $\psi: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$. Therefore, we have a sufficient condition, Corollary 2.12, to check that \mathcal{M} is non-strongly inflexible.

We first introduce some notions.

Definition 4.2. *A derivation differential graded algebra, ddga for short, is a triple (\mathcal{A}, d, θ) such that (\mathcal{A}, d) is a dga, and θ is a derivation of degree 0 on \mathcal{A} such that $d\theta = \theta d$.*

Let (\mathcal{A}, d, θ) and $(\mathcal{B}, d, \theta')$ be ddga. A ddga morphism $f: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is a dga morphism such that $f \circ \theta = \theta' \circ f$.

Definition 4.3. *Let (\mathcal{A}, d) be a dga. We call the free derivation differential graded algebra generated by \mathcal{A} to a ddga $(P(\mathcal{A}), d, \theta)$ equipped with a dga morphism $i: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow P(\mathcal{A})$ which is universal for ddgas, that is, for any ddga $(\mathcal{B}, d, \theta')$ and any dga map $f: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$, there is a unique ddga morphism $\bar{f}: P(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ such that $f = \bar{f} \circ i$.*

Clearly, as it is defined by an universal property, $(P(\mathcal{A}), d, \theta)$ has to be unique up to isomorphism. For its existence, it can be constructed as follows. Let

$$\widehat{P}(\mathcal{A}) = T(\mathcal{A} \oplus \theta\mathcal{A} \oplus \theta^2\mathcal{A} \oplus \dots)$$

be the tensor algebra on elements of \mathcal{A} and “formal” derivatives $\theta^k \mathcal{A} \cong \theta(\theta^{k-1})\mathcal{A}$, for $k \geq 1$, and $\theta^0 \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}$. There is a natural derivation θ on $\widehat{P}(\mathcal{A})$. Consider $I \subset \widehat{P}(\mathcal{A})$ the ideal generated by elements $a \otimes b - ab$, and $\theta(ab) - \theta a \otimes b - a \otimes \theta b$, for any pair of elements $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. This is a differential ideal, that is $\theta(I) \subset I$. Finally, set

$$P(\mathcal{A}) = \widehat{P}(\mathcal{A})/I,$$

and $d(\theta a) = \theta(da)$, for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$.

Unfortunately, the algebra $P(\mathcal{A})$ is not of finite type. To solve this, we define the dot algebra.

Definition 4.4. *Let (\mathcal{A}, d, θ) be a ddga. We say \mathcal{A} is dot algebra if $\theta^2 = 0$.*

There is a notion of free dot algebra generated by a dga:

Definition 4.5. *Let (\mathcal{A}, d) be a dga. We call the free dot algebra generated by \mathcal{A} or simply dot algebra of \mathcal{A} , to a dot algebra $(\dot{\mathcal{A}}, d, \theta)$ equipped with a dga morphism $i: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \dot{\mathcal{A}}$ which is universal for dot algebras, that is for any dot algebra $(\mathcal{B}, d, \theta')$ and any dga map $f: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$, there is a unique ddga morphism $\bar{f}: \dot{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ such that $f = \bar{f} \circ i$.*

The definition is

$$\dot{\mathcal{A}} = P(\mathcal{A})/P^{\geq 2}(\mathcal{A}),$$

which is the quotient of $P(\mathcal{A})$ by the ideal generated by $\theta^2(\mathcal{A})$ and $\theta(\mathcal{A}) \cdot \theta(\mathcal{A})$. We denote

$$\dot{a} = \theta(a).$$

Now let us deal with the situation of 3-step Sullivan algebras $\mathcal{M} = (\Lambda V_1 \otimes \Lambda V_2 \otimes \Lambda(z), d)$. Denote $\mathcal{A} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Lambda V = \Lambda(V_1 \oplus V_2) = \Lambda(x_i, y_j)$, where we denote the generators of V_1 as x_i , and denote the generators of V_2 as y_j . We put the positive weight ω on \mathcal{A} given by Proposition 2.13. Let

$$dz = P_0 + P_1 + \dots + P_m$$

be the decomposition into ω -homogeneous elements. Note that elements P_0, P_1, \dots, P_m are all of them closed. If $m = 0$, then dz is ω -homogeneous and we can define $\omega(z) = \omega(P_0)$, and \mathcal{M} has a positive weight. Hence it is non-strongly inflexible.

Now we shall assume that $dz = P_0 + P_1$. That is, we focus on the case $m = 1$, which is all that we need for our applications. Then, the dot algebra of $\mathcal{A} = \Lambda(V_1 \oplus V_2)$ is actually

$$\dot{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A} \otimes (\mathbb{Q} \oplus \dot{V}_1 \oplus \dot{V}_2).$$

Let us introduce elements u_1, u_2, u_3 with differentials given by:

$$du_1 = P_0 + \dot{P}_1,$$

$$du_2 = P_1,$$

$$du_3 = \dot{P}_0.$$

We assign weight to the dot algebra given by

$$\omega(\dot{y}) = \omega(y) + (\omega(P_0) - \omega(P_1)),$$

for $y \in V_1 \oplus V_2$, so that $P_0 + \dot{P}_1$ is ω -homogeneous. Now we set the weights

$$\omega(u_1) = \omega(P_0 + \dot{P}_1), \omega(u_2) = \omega(P_1), \omega(u_3) = \omega(\dot{P}_0).$$

If \mathcal{A} is $(\omega(P_1) - \omega(P_0))$ -connected, this provides a positive weight to $\mathcal{B} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \dot{\mathcal{A}} \otimes \Lambda(u_1, u_2, u_3)$. Finally consider the dga map

$$\begin{aligned} \psi: \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{A} \otimes \Lambda(z) &\longrightarrow \mathcal{B} = \dot{\mathcal{A}} \otimes \Lambda(u_1, u_2, u_3), \\ a \in \mathcal{A} &\mapsto a + \dot{a}, \\ z &\mapsto u_1 + u_2 + u_3. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

With the same notation as above, we have the following:

Proposition 4.6. *Let $[\nu] \in H^N(\mathcal{A})$ be a nonzero cohomology class and let $n = N - |dz|$. Suppose that there is not any nonzero $\xi \in H^{2n-N+1}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\xi \cup [P_0] = 0, \xi \cup [P_1] = 0$. If $H(\psi)([\nu]) = 0$ then there exist closed elements $A, B \in \mathcal{A}^n$ such that we can write $[\nu] = [AP_0 + BP_1]$ in $H(\mathcal{A})$ and*

$$(A - B)\dot{P}_1 \in \langle P_0, \dot{P}_0, P_1 \rangle + \text{im } d,$$

as elements in the algebra $\dot{\mathcal{A}}$.

Proof. If $H(\psi)([\nu]) = 0$ then $\nu + \dot{\nu} = d\chi$ is exact in \mathcal{B} . Write

$$\chi = \sum (A_i + \dot{B}_i)u_i + (C_{ij} + \dot{D}_{ij})u_i u_j + (E + \dot{F})u_1 u_2 u_3 + (G + \dot{H}),$$

for some elements $A_i, \dot{B}_i, C_{ij}, \dot{D}_{ij}, E, \dot{F}, G, \dot{H}$ in $\dot{\mathcal{A}}$, where the dot means that the element lies in the “dot” part, and the indices $i < j$.

Then we have the following set of equations

$$\begin{aligned} \nu &= (-1)^n (A_1 P_0 + A_2 P_1) + dG, \\ \dot{\nu} &= (-1)^n (\dot{B}_1 P_0 + A_1 \dot{P}_1 + \dot{B}_2 P_1 + A_3 \dot{P}_0) + d\dot{H}, \\ 0 &= dA_1 + (-1)^n C_{12} P_1, \\ 0 &= dA_2 + (-1)^{2n-N+1} C_{12} P_0, \\ 0 &= dC_{12}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

the last three obtained by taking the “dot” free coefficients of u_1, u_2 , and $u_1 u_2$, respectively, in the equality $\nu + \dot{\nu} = d\chi$.

From the above, $\xi = [C_{12}]$ is a cohomology class with $\xi \cup [P_0] = 0$, and $\xi \cup [P_1] = 0$. By hypothesis, $C_{12} = d\eta$ for some η . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} A &= A_1 - (-1)^n \eta P_1, \\ B &= A_2 - (-1)^{2n-N+1} \eta P_0, \end{aligned}$$

are closed and $\nu = (-1)^n (AP_0 + BP_1) + dG$ (recall that $|P_i| = n - N$).

Now apply the dot operator to the first equation in (4), to get

$$\dot{\nu} = (-1)^n (\dot{A}_1 P_0 + \dot{A}_2 P_1 + A_1 \dot{P}_0 + A_2 \dot{P}_1) + d\dot{G},$$

and compare it with the second equation, to get that $(A_1 - A_2)\dot{P}_1 \in \langle P_0, \dot{P}_0, P_1 \rangle + \text{im } d$. Clearly $(A - B)\dot{P}_1$ also lies in the same ideal. \square

Under the same assumptions and notation, we can now prove the main result in this section:

Theorem 4.7. *Let $[\nu] \in H^N(\mathcal{A})$ be a nonzero cohomology class and let $n = N - |dz|$. Suppose that there is not any nonzero $\xi \in H^{2n-N+1}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\xi \cup [P_0] = 0, \xi \cup [P_1] = 0$, and that whenever we have closed elements $A, B \in \mathcal{A}^n$ such that $[\nu] = [AP_0 + BP_1]$, we also have*

$$(A - B)\dot{P}_1 \notin \langle P_0, \dot{P}_0, P_1 \rangle + \text{im } d.$$

If \mathcal{A} is $(\omega(P_1) - \omega(P_0))$ -connected, then $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{A} \otimes \Lambda(z)$ is non-strongly inflexible.

Let (M, η) be a simply-connected N -manifold for which \mathcal{M} is a model. If \mathcal{A} is $(\omega(P_1) - \omega(P_0))$ -connected, then M is non-strongly inflexible.

Proof. By Proposition 4.6, we deduce that $H(\psi)([\nu]) \neq 0$, where ψ is the map (3). As \mathcal{B} admits a positive weight, then ω detects $H(\psi)([\nu])$. We apply Corollary 2.12 to conclude that \mathcal{M} is non-strongly inflexible. The last statement follows from Theorem 3.5. \square

5. THE ARKOWITZ-LUPTON EXAMPLE

The existence of inflexible manifolds was first established by Arkowitz and Lupton in [2, Example 5.1, Example 5.2]. They gave examples of simply-connected Sullivan algebras that have finitely many homotopy classes of dga endomorphisms. Then, using Barge and Sullivan obstruction theory, they showed that those examples are minimal models of simply-connected manifolds. In particular, these manifolds are inflexible.

The succeeding examples in literature have been built upon [2, Example 5.1] that we introduce now:

Definition 5.1. *(The Arkowitz-Lupton example) Let $\mathcal{M} = (\Lambda(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, y_3, z), d)$ be the Sullivan algebra with*

$$\begin{aligned} |x_1| &= 8 & dx_1 &= 0 \\ |x_2| &= 10 & dx_2 &= 0 \\ |y_1| &= 33 & dy_1 &= x_1^3 x_2 \\ |y_2| &= 35 & dy_2 &= x_1^2 x_2^2 \\ |y_3| &= 37 & dy_3 &= x_1 x_2^3 \\ |z| &= 119 & dz &= x_1^4 \gamma + x_1^{15} + x_2^{12} \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma = \alpha\beta$, $\alpha = x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1$, $\beta = x_1 y_3 - x_2 y_2$. So $\gamma = x_1^2 y_2 y_3 - x_1 x_2 y_1 y_3 + x_2^2 y_1 y_2$.

In the following we are going to show that the dga from Definition 5.1 is non-strongly inflexible. Observe that \mathcal{M} is a 3-step algebra as we introduced in the previous section. With the same notation as in Section 4, the 2-step algebra

$$\mathcal{A} = (\Lambda(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, y_3), d),$$

has a positive weight ω given by Proposition 2.13. The cohomology is

$$\begin{aligned} H^*(\mathcal{A}) &= \mathbb{Q}\{x_1^n, x_2^m, x_1^n \alpha, x_2^m \alpha, x_1^n \beta, x_2^m \beta, x_1^n \gamma, x_2^m \gamma \mid n, m \geq 0\} \\ &\oplus \mathbb{Q}\{x_1 x_2, x_1^2 x_2, x_1 x_2^2, x_1 x_2 \alpha, x_1 x_2 \beta, x_1 x_2^2 \alpha\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that there is a “free” part (first summand) and some extra low degree terms generators. There are the following exact elements:

$$d(y_1y_2) = x_1^2x_2\alpha, d(y_2y_3) = x_1x_2^2\beta, d(y_1y_3) = x_1^2x_2\beta + x_1x_2^2\alpha. \quad (5)$$

We also introduce the dot algebra, Definition 4.5,

$$(\dot{\mathcal{A}}, d) = \mathcal{A} \otimes (\mathbb{Q} \oplus \dot{V}_1 \oplus \dot{V}_2), \text{ where}$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\dot{x}_1| &= 8 & d\dot{x}_1 &= 0 \\ |\dot{x}_2| &= 10 & d\dot{x}_2 &= 0 \\ |\dot{y}_1| &= 33 & d\dot{y}_1 &= 3x_1^2\dot{x}_1x_2 + x_1^3\dot{x}_2 \\ |\dot{y}_2| &= 35 & d\dot{y}_2 &= 2x_1\dot{x}_1x_2^2 + 2x_1^2x_2\dot{x}_2 \\ |\dot{y}_3| &= 37 & d\dot{y}_3 &= \dot{x}_1x_2^3 + 3x_1x_2^2\dot{x}_2 \end{aligned}$$

and $\dot{\gamma} = \dot{\alpha}\beta + \alpha\dot{\beta}$, with $\dot{\alpha} = \dot{x}_1y_2 + x_1\dot{y}_2 - \dot{x}_2y_1 - x_2\dot{y}_1$, $\dot{\beta} = \dot{x}_1y_3 + x_1\dot{y}_3 - \dot{x}_2y_2 - x_2\dot{y}_2$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\gamma} &= 2\dot{x}_1x_1y_2y_3 - \dot{x}_1x_2y_1y_3 - x_1\dot{x}_2y_1y_3 + 2x_2\dot{x}_2y_1y_2 \\ &\quad + x_1^2\dot{y}_2y_3 - x_1x_2\dot{y}_1y_3 + x_2^2\dot{y}_1y_2 + x_1^2y_2\dot{y}_3 - x_1x_2y_1\dot{y}_3 + x_2^2y_1\dot{y}_2 \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

We have assembled the necessary elements to apply Theorem 4.7 and prove our main result in this section. For the proof to be more readable, we have moved some technical lemmas that are needed to the end of this section.

Theorem 5.2. *The dga \mathcal{M} from Definition 5.1 is non-strongly inflexible. Furthermore, any manifold for which \mathcal{M} is a Sullivan model is also non-strongly inflexible.*

Proof. Let us take $[\nu] = [x_1^{26}] \in H^{208}(\mathcal{A})$, $N = 208$. Now $dz = P_0 + P_1$, where

$$\begin{aligned} P_0 &= x_1^{15} + x_2^{12}, \\ P_1 &= x_1^4\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Now, $n = N - |dz| = 208 - 120 = 88$ and the cohomology $H^{88}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbb{Q}\{[x_1^{11}], [\gamma]\}$. For any $\xi \in H^{2n-N+1}(\mathcal{A})$ satisfying $\xi \cup [P_0] = 0$ and $\xi \cup [P_1] = 0$ it is clear that $\xi = 0$, just because $2n - N + 1 = -31 < 0$.

Let us write $[\nu] = [AP_0 + BP_1]$, where $A, B \in \mathcal{A}^{88}$ are closed elements. The possible solutions are of the form

$$\begin{aligned} A &= x_1^{11} + d\eta_A, \\ B &= a\gamma + d\eta_B, \end{aligned}$$

for $a \in \mathbb{Q}$. Then, we deduce that

$$(A - B)\dot{P}_1 = (4x_1^{14}\dot{x}_1\gamma + x_1^{15}\dot{\gamma}) + d((\eta_A - \eta_B)\dot{P}_1)$$

using that $\dot{P}_1 = 4x_1^3\dot{x}_1\gamma + x_1^4\dot{\gamma}$, $\gamma^2 = 0$ and $\gamma\dot{\gamma} = 0$.

Since $(\omega(P_1) - \omega(P_0)) = 122 - 120 = 2$, and \mathcal{A} is 7-connected, in order to apply Theorem 4.7, we need to check that the element $(A - B)\dot{P}_1$ is not in the ideal

$$I = \langle x_1^{15} + x_2^{12}, 15x_1^{14}\dot{x}_1 + 12x_2^{11}\dot{x}_2, x_1^4\dot{\gamma} \rangle + \text{im } d \subset \dot{\mathcal{A}}.$$

Since $4x_1^{14}\dot{x}_1\gamma \in I$, it is enough to check that $X \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x_1^{15}\dot{\gamma} \notin I$.

First, notice that there is a y -gradation in \mathcal{A} according to the number of y_j, \dot{y}_j , and the differential lowers the degree by one. The y -degree of X is two, so assume for a contradiction that $X = Y + d\eta$, for some closed element Y in I of y -degree equals two. Namely

$$Y = \dot{F}(x_1^{15} + x_2^{12}) + G(15x_1^{14}\dot{x}_1 + 12x_2^{11}\dot{x}_2) + \dot{H}x_1^4\gamma, \quad (7)$$

where \dot{F}, G, \dot{H} are of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{F} &= \dot{F}' + \dot{F}'', \quad \dot{F}' = \sum F'_{ij}y_i\dot{y}_j, \quad \dot{F}'' = \sum F''_{ijk}\dot{x}_k y_i y_j, \\ G &= \sum G_{ij}y_i y_j, \\ \dot{H} &= \sum H_k \dot{x}_k, \end{aligned}$$

with $F'_{ij}, F''_{ijk}, G_{ij}, H_k \in \mathbb{Q}[x_1, x_2]$. As Y is closed, we have

$$0 = dY = d(\dot{F}' + \dot{F}'')(x_1^{15} + x_2^{12}) + dG(15x_1^{14}\dot{x}_1 + 12x_2^{11}\dot{x}_2).$$

Look at the \dot{y}_j -term in this expression, $j = 1, 2$, to conclude that $\sum_i F'_{ij}y_i$ is closed. Hence, according to degrees, we deduce that

$$\dot{F}' \in W = \mathbb{Q}\{x_2\beta\dot{y}_1, x_2\alpha\dot{y}_2, x_1\beta\dot{y}_2, x_1\alpha\dot{y}_3\}.$$

Recalling that $X = Y + d\eta$, and (5), we see that the \dot{y} -part of the exact term $d\eta$ is of the form $x_1x_2\sum(R_j\alpha + S_j\beta)\dot{y}_j$, with R_j, S_j elements in $\mathbb{Q}[x_1, x_2]$.

Looking at the components $x_1\alpha, x_2\alpha, x_1\beta, x_2\beta$, and comparing the \dot{y}_j -parts, $j = 1, 2, 3$ of X, Y and $d\eta$, we obtain that:

$$\dot{F}' = x_1\beta\dot{y}_2 + x_1\alpha\dot{y}_3.$$

Therefore using (6) and (7), the equality $X = Y + d\eta$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned} x_1^{15}\dot{\gamma} &= x_1^{15}(-\beta x_2\dot{y}_1 + (\beta x_1 - \alpha x_2)\dot{y}_2 + \alpha x_1\dot{y}_3) + x_1^{15}((\beta y_2 + \alpha y_3)\dot{x}_1 - (\beta y_1 + \alpha y_2)\dot{x}_2) = \\ &= (x_1\beta\dot{y}_2 + x_1\alpha\dot{y}_3)(x_1^{15} + x_2^{12}) + \dot{F}''(x_1^{15} + x_2^{12}) + G(15x_1^{14}\dot{x}_1 + 12x_2^{11}\dot{x}_2) + \dot{H}x_1^4\gamma + d\eta, \end{aligned}$$

which can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{F}''(x_1^{15} + x_2^{12}) + G(15x_1^{14}\dot{x}_1 + 12x_2^{11}\dot{x}_2) + \dot{H}x_1^4\gamma - x_1^{15}((\beta y_2 + \alpha y_3)\dot{x}_1 - (\beta y_1 + \alpha y_2)\dot{x}_2) = \\ = -x_1^{15}x_2\beta\dot{y}_1 - x_1^{15}x_2\alpha\dot{y}_2 - x_1x_2^{12}\beta\dot{y}_2 - x_1x_2^{12}\alpha\dot{y}_3 - d\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Now use the formulas (5) to get rid of the terms \dot{y}_j at the expense of exact terms, for example $x_1^{15}x_2\beta\dot{y}_1 = d(x_1^{12}y_1\beta\dot{y}_1) - x_1^{12}y_1\beta d\dot{y}_1$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{F}''(x_1^{15} + x_2^{12}) + G(15x_1^{14}\dot{x}_1 + 12x_2^{11}\dot{x}_2) + \dot{H}x_1^4\gamma - x_1^{15}((\beta y_2 + \alpha y_3)\dot{x}_1 - (\beta y_1 + \alpha y_2)\dot{x}_2) = \\ = x_1^{12}y_1\beta d\dot{y}_1 + x_1^{12}y_1\alpha d\dot{y}_2 + x_2^9y_3\beta d\dot{y}_2 + x_2^9y_3\alpha d\dot{y}_3 + d\tilde{\eta}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

which is an equation in $\dot{\mathcal{A}}_1 = \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathbb{Q}\{\dot{x}_1, \dot{x}_2\}$. Using the formulas for $d\dot{y}_1, d\dot{y}_2, d\dot{y}_3$ and separating the components in \dot{x}_1, \dot{x}_2 independently, we get two equations:

$$\begin{aligned} F_1''(x_1^{15} + x_2^{12}) + 15Gx_1^{14} + H_1x_1^4\gamma - x_1^{15}(\beta y_2 + \alpha y_3) + d\tilde{\eta}_1 &= \\ &= 3x_1^{14}x_2y_1\beta + 2x_1^{13}x_2^2y_1\alpha + 2x_1x_2^{11}y_3\beta + x_2^{12}y_3\alpha, \\ F_2''(x_1^{15} + x_2^{12}) + 12Gx_2^{11} + H_2x_1^4\gamma + x_1^{15}(\beta y_1 + \alpha y_2) + d\tilde{\eta}_2 &= \\ &= x_1^{15}y_1\beta + 2x_1^{14}x_2y_1\alpha + 2x_1^2x_2^{10}y_3\beta + 3x_1x_2^{11}y_3\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

in the original dga $\mathcal{A} = \Lambda(x_i) \otimes \Lambda^2(y_j)$.

We look at the first equation modulo γ, x_2^{12} . By Lemma 5.8, $G = e\gamma$ for some $e \in \mathbb{Q}$, and by Lemma 5.6 and Remark 5.7, $d\tilde{\eta}_1$ is in the ideal generated by γ . Hence, the first equation reduces to

$$F_1''(x_1^{15}) - x_1^{15}(\beta y_2 + \alpha y_3) = 3x_1^{14}x_2y_1\beta + 2x_1^{13}x_2^2y_1\alpha + 2x_1x_2^{11}y_3\beta. \quad (9)$$

From Lemma 5.8 we know that the \dot{x}_1 -part of \dot{F}'' is $F_1'' = x_2y_1y_3 + x_1y_2y_3$. Then, the left hand side of (9) is of the form

$$2x_1^{15}x_2y_1y_3 + x_1^{16}y_2y_3.$$

The right hand side of (9) modulo γ, x_2^{12} reduces to

$$-3x_1^{15}x_2y_1y_3 + 5x_1^{14}x_2^2y_1y_2.$$

Hence, we obtain that

$$x_1^{16}y_2y_3 + 5x_1^{15}x_2y_1y_3 - 5x_1^{14}x_2^2y_1y_2 = 0 \pmod{(\gamma, x_2^{12})},$$

which by Lemma 5.9 leads to a contradiction.

Therefore, the element X is not in the ideal I . This discussion and the last item in Theorem 4.7 finish our proof. \square

Example 5.3. (*Inflexible dgas in literature*) We list the collection of inflexible dgas existing in literature that follow the same pattern as the Arkowitz-Lupton example.

	[2, Ex. 5.1] (cf. [9, Ex. I.3])	[2, Ex. 5.2] (cf. [9, Ex. I.4])	[9, Ex. I.1]
dy_1	$x_1^3x_2$	$x_1^3x_2$	$x_1^3x_2$
dy_2	$x_1^2x_2^2$	$x_1^2x_2^2$	$x_1^2x_2^2$
dy_3	$x_1x_2^3$	$x_1x_2^3$	$x_1x_2^3$
dz	$x_1^4\alpha\beta + x_1^{15} + x_2^{12}$	$x_2\alpha\beta + x_1^{12} + x_2^{10}$	$x_2^2\alpha\beta + x_1^{18} + x_2^9$
ν	x_1^{26}	x_2^{19}	x_2^{16}

	[9, Ex. I.2]	[6, Def. 1.1] $k \geq 1$	[1, Ex. 3.8]
dy_1	$x_1^3x_2$	$x_1^3x_2$	$x_1^3x_2$
dy_2	$x_1^2x_2^2$	$x_1^2x_2^2$	$x_1^2x_2^2$
dy_3	$x_1x_2^3$	$x_1x_2^3$	$x_1x_2^3$
dz	$x_2^2\alpha\beta + x_1^{15} + x_2^{10}$	$x_1^{6k-6}\alpha\beta + x_1^{6k+5} + x_2^{5k+4}$	$x_2^2\alpha\beta + x_1^{18} + x_2^9$
ν	x_2^{18}	x_1^{6k+16}	\bar{x}_2^{33} where $x_2 = \bar{x}_2^2$

The dgas in these tables are all minimal models of simply-connected inflexible manifolds. In Theorem 5.2 we have carried out in detail the proof that the dga from Definition 5.1 (first example of the table) is non-strongly inflexible. The other dgas can be treated by analogous arguments and calculations as those from Theorem 5.2 to obtain:

Theorem 5.4. *Let \mathcal{M} be one of the inflexible dgas from Example 5.3. Then, \mathcal{M} is non-strongly inflexible. Furthermore, any manifold for which \mathcal{M} is a Sullivan model is also non-strongly inflexible.*

Remark 5.5. The dga in [1, Section 3] is slightly different, since the volume form ν contains a Massey product like element. The dga is $(\Lambda(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4, z), d)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} |x_1| = 4 & & dx_1 = 0 \\ |x_2| = 6 & & dx_2 = 0 \\ |y_1| = 27 & & dy_1 = x_1^4 x_2^2 \\ |y_2| = 29 & & dy_2 = x_1^3 x_2^3 \\ |y_3| = 31 & & dy_3 = x_1^2 x_2^4 \\ |y_4| = 75 + 4k & & dy_4 = x_1^{19+k} \\ |z| = 77 & & dz = x_1 x_2 \alpha \beta + x_2 x_1^{18} + x_2^{13} \end{aligned}$$

where $k \geq 0$, and $\alpha = x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1$, $\beta = x_1 y_3 - x_2 y_2$, $\delta = x_2^2 y_4 - x_1^{15+k} y_1$ are nontrivial Massey products. The volume form is given by $\nu = x_2^{26} y_4 - x_1^{15+k} x_2^{24} y_1 = x_2^{24} \delta$.

We expect that the methods used in this section prove that this dga is non-strongly inflexible. However, showing that the corresponding map (3) satisfies $H(\psi)([\nu]) \neq 0$, needs significantly more calculations and our attempts have not proven fruitful yet.

As we have previously mentioned, the end of this section is devoted to prove some technical lemmas that are needed in the proof of Theorem 5.2.

Lemma 5.6. *$d\tilde{\eta}$ is in the ideal generated by γ .*

Proof. From (8), we know that $d\tilde{\eta} \in \mathcal{A} \otimes (\mathbb{Q} \oplus \dot{V}_1)$ and that has y -length two. Observe that since $\dot{x}_i \dot{y}_j = 0$, we can express

$$\tilde{\eta} = \sum \tilde{\eta}_i \dot{x}_i + \sum \hat{\eta}_j \dot{y}_j$$

where $\tilde{\eta}_i, \hat{\eta}_j \in \mathcal{A}$. If we apply the differential

$$d\tilde{\eta} = \sum d\tilde{\eta}_i \dot{x}_i + \sum d\hat{\eta}_j \dot{y}_j \pm \sum \hat{\eta}_j d\dot{y}_j$$

we conclude that the elements $d\hat{\eta}_j = 0$ (since $d\tilde{\eta}$ does not contain terms with \dot{y}_j) and they are of y -length one. Hence, $\hat{\eta}_j$ are closed elements of y -length two. Reasoning with degrees, we obtain that the only possibilities are:

$$\hat{\eta}_1 = (a_1 x_1^2 x_2^7 + b_1 x_1^7 x_2^3) \gamma,$$

$$\hat{\eta}_2 = (a_2 x_1^3 x_2^6 + b_2 x_1^8 x_2^2) \gamma,$$

$$\hat{\eta}_3 = (a_3 x_1^4 x_2^5 + b_3 x_1^9 x_2) \gamma,$$

for $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{Q}$.

On the other hand, since the differential decreases by one the y -length, $\tilde{\eta}$ is of length three and so $\tilde{\eta}_i$ is, which implies that $\tilde{\eta}_i = R_i(x_1, x_2)y_1y_2y_3$. Hence $d\tilde{\eta}_i = R_i(x_1, x_2)d(y_1y_2y_3) = R_i(x_1, x_2)x_1x_2\gamma$.

Gathering all this information, we deduce that $d\tilde{\eta}$ is in the ideal generated by γ . \square

Remark 5.7. Observe that the \dot{x}_i -part of $d\tilde{\eta}$ is also in the ideal generated by γ , $i = 1, 2$.

Lemma 5.8. *Let \dot{F}'' and G be the terms in (7). Then $G = e\gamma$, for some $e \in \mathbb{Q}$, and*

$$\dot{F}'' = x_2\dot{x}_2y_1y_2 + (x_2\dot{x}_1 + 2x_1\dot{x}_2)y_1y_3 + x_1\dot{x}_1y_2y_3.$$

Proof. Recall that $\dot{F}'' = \sum F''_{ijk}\dot{x}_k y_i y_j$ and that $|\dot{F}''| = 88$. By degrees reasoning, we get: $F''_{121} = 0$, $F''_{122} = ax_2$, $F''_{131} = bx_2$, $F''_{132} = cx_1$, $F''_{231} = px_1$, $F''_{232} = 0$, $a, b, c, p \in \mathbb{Q}$, so

$$\dot{F}'' = ax_2\dot{x}_2y_1y_2 + (bx_2\dot{x}_1 + cx_1\dot{x}_2)y_1y_3 + px_1\dot{x}_1y_2y_3.$$

Applying the differential and using Equation (5), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} d\dot{F}'' &= \dot{x}_1(-bx_1x_2^4y_1 - px_1^2x_2^3y_2 + (bx_1^3x_2^7 + px_1^3x_2^2)y_3) \\ &\quad + \dot{x}_2((-ax_1^2x_2^3 - cx_1^2x_2^3)y_1 + ax_1^3x_2^2y_2 + cx_1^4x_2y_3). \end{aligned}$$

We proceed the same way for $G = \sum G_{ij}y_i y_j$ and $|G| = 88$. By degrees reasoning, we get $G_{12} = ex_2^2$, $G_{13} = fx_1x_2$ and $G_{23} = gx_1^2$, $e, f, g \in \mathbb{Q}$, so

$$G = ex_1^2y_1y_2 + fx_1x_2y_1y_3 + gx_1^2y_2y_3.$$

Applying the differential, we get that

$$dG = y_1(-e - f)x_1^2x_2^4 + y_2(e - g)x_1^3x_2^3 + y_3(f + g)x_1^4x_2^2.$$

We now apply the differential to Equation (8) and compare the \dot{x}_i components of the new equation for $i = 1, 2$. Denote $d\dot{F}''_{|\dot{x}_i}$ the component of $d\dot{F}''$ in \dot{x}_i , for $i = 1, 2$. We start by comparing the \dot{x}_1 -components:

$$\begin{aligned} d\dot{F}''_{|\dot{x}_1}(x_1^{15} + x_2^{12}) + 15dGx_1^{14} &= y_1(-x_1^{16}x_2^4 - x_1x_2^{16}) + y_2(-x_1^{17}x_2^3 - x_1^2x_2^{15}) \\ &\quad + y_3(2x_1^{18}x_2^2 + 2x_1^3x_2^{14}), \end{aligned}$$

which is an equation in \mathcal{A} . Then, using our computation above of $d\dot{F}''$ and dG , we are going to compare the y_i -components of this last equation, for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

Comparing the y_1 -terms, we get that:

$$-bx_1^{16}x_2^4 - bx_1x_2^{16} - 15(f + e)x_1^{16}x_2^4 = -x_1^{16}x_2^4 - x_1x_2^{16},$$

so we deduce that $b = 1$ and that $e = -f$. Comparing the y_2 -terms, we get that $p = 1$ and $e = g$.

We now compare the \dot{x}_2 -components of the equation above:

$$\begin{aligned} d\dot{F}''_{|\dot{x}_2}(x_1^{15} + x_2^{12}) + dG12x_2^{11} &= y_1(-3x_1^{17}x_2^3 - 3x_1^2x_2^{15}) + y_2(x_1^{18}x_2^2 - x_1^3x_2^{14}) \\ &\quad + y_3(2x_1^{19}x_2 + 2x_1^4x_2^{13}). \end{aligned}$$

Again using our computations above of $d\dot{F}''$ and dG and comparing the y_i -terms of this last equation, for $i = 1, 2, 3$, we obtain that $a = 1$, and $c = 2$, which concludes our proof. \square

Lemma 5.9. *The element $Z = x_1^{16}y_2y_3 + 5x_1^{15}x_2y_1y_3 - 5x_1^{14}x_2^2y_1y_2$ is not in the ideal generated by γ and x_2^{12} .*

Proof. Let us suppose that $Z \in \langle \gamma, x_2^{12} \rangle$. Since $|Z| = 200$, by degree reasoning Z can only be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Z = & (a_1x_1^{10} + a_2x_2^8 + a_3x_1^5x_2^4 + a_4x_2y_1y_3 + a_5x_1y_2y_3)x_2^{12} \\ & + (b_1x_1^{14} + b_2x_1^4x_2^8 + b_3x_1^9x_2^4)\gamma \end{aligned}$$

By comparing both sides of the equation, it is clear that $a_1 = a_2 = a_3 = 0$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} x_1^{16}y_2y_3 + 5x_1^{15}x_2y_1y_3 - 5x_1^{14}x_2^2y_1y_2 = & \\ b_1x_1^{16}y_2y_3 - b_1x_1^{15}x_2y_1y_3 + b_1x_1^{14}x_2^{10}y_1y_2 & \\ + b_2x_1^6x_2^8y_2y_3 - b_2x_1^5x_2^9y_1y_3 + b_2x_1^4x_2^{10}y_1y_2 & \\ + b_3x_1^{11}x_2^4y_2y_3 - b_3x_1^{10}x_2^5y_1y_3 + b_3x_1^9x_2^6y_1y_2. & \end{aligned}$$

From this equation, we get that on the one hand $b_1 = 1$ and, on the other hand that $b_1 = -5$, which is a contradiction. \square

6. THE COSTOYA-VIRUEL EXAMPLE

In [8], the authors construct, for any given finite group Γ , a simply-connected elliptic inflexible manifold whose group of self homotopy equivalences is Γ . To that end, they start with the inflexible dga from Definition 5.1 and add generators corresponding to a certain graph $G = (V, E)$, with set of vertices V and set of edges E . These new generators interrelate in such a way to ensure that the self homotopy equivalences of the dga are the automorphisms of the graph, which happens to be Γ .

To analyze the dga of [8], we need the following result on fibrations.

Lemma 6.1. *Given a commutative diagram of dgas*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} (\Lambda V_1, d_1) & \hookrightarrow & (\Lambda V_2, d_2) & \twoheadrightarrow & (\Lambda V_3, d_3) \\ \downarrow \psi_1 & & \downarrow \psi_2 & & \parallel \psi_3 \\ (\Lambda \tilde{V}_1, \tilde{d}_1) & \hookrightarrow & (\Lambda \tilde{V}_2, \tilde{d}_2) & \twoheadrightarrow & (\Lambda V_3, d_3) \end{array} \quad (10)$$

where each $(\Lambda V_i, d_i)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, has Poincaré duality cohomology of formal dimension N_i , and volume form η_i . If $V_2 = V_1 \oplus V_3$, and $\tilde{V}_2 = \tilde{V}_1 \oplus V_3$, then $H(\psi_1)(\eta_1) \neq 0$ if and only if $H(\psi_2)(\eta_2) \neq 0$.

Proof. By [10, Section 15(a)], since $V_2 = V_1 \oplus V_3$, and $\tilde{V}_2 = \tilde{V}_1 \oplus V_3$, the diagram in Equation (10) is a Sullivan model for a commutative diagram of rational spaces

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X_1 & \longleftarrow & X_2 & \longleftarrow & X_3 \\ \Psi_1 \uparrow & & \Psi_2 \uparrow & & \parallel \Psi_3 \\ \tilde{X}_1 & \longleftarrow & \tilde{X}_2 & \longleftarrow & X_3 \end{array} \quad (11)$$

where the rows are rational fibrations. We proceed by analyzing the rational cohomology Serre spectral sequence (Sss) associated to each fibration in diagram (11), and compare them via the induced maps connecting both rows.

The Sss associated to the top row is

$$E_2^{p,q} = H^p(X_1; H^q(X_3; \mathbb{Q})) = H^p(X_1; \mathbb{Q}) \otimes H^q(X_3; \mathbb{Q}) \implies H^{p+q}(X_2; \mathbb{Q}).$$

Since the rational cohomology of X_i is concentrated in degrees at most N_i , $i = 1, 3$, then the group of highest total degree in the E_2 -term is $E_2^{N_1, N_3} = \mathbb{Q}\langle \eta_1 \otimes \eta_3 \rangle$, and the class $\eta_1 \otimes \eta_3$ survives in the E_∞ -term. Therefore, $N_2 = N_1 + N_3$ and $\eta_1 \otimes \eta_3$ represents a nontrivial multiple of η_2 in the associated graded vector space given by the Sss.

We now consider $\tilde{E}_2^{p,q}$, the Sss associated to the bottom row in diagram (11). By means of the edge morphisms, we also know $H(\psi_1)(\eta_1) \otimes H(\psi_3)(\eta_3) = H(\psi_1)(\eta_1) \otimes \eta_3$ represents a nontrivial multiple of $H(\psi_2)(\eta_2)$ in the associated graded vector space given by the \tilde{E}_∞ -term. Thus if $H(\psi_2)(\eta_2) \neq 0$, then $H(\psi_1)(\eta_1) \otimes \eta_3 \neq 0$ and $H(\psi_1)(\eta_1) \neq 0$.

Assume now $H(\psi_1)(\eta_1) \neq 0$, but $H(\psi_2)(\eta_2) = 0$. Then $H(\psi_1)(\eta_1) \otimes \eta_3$ represents the zero class in the \tilde{E}_∞ -term. Since $\tilde{E}_n^{p,q} = 0$ for $q > N_3$, $H(\psi_1)(\eta_1) \otimes \eta_3$ can only be trivial in the \tilde{E}_∞ -term if there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\tilde{d}_n(H(\psi_1)(\eta_1) \otimes \eta_3) \neq 0$ in $\tilde{E}_n^{N_1-n-1, N_3-n}$. However,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{d}_n(H(\psi_1)(\eta_1) \otimes \eta_3) &= (H(\psi_1) \otimes H(\psi_3))(d_n(\eta_1 \otimes \eta_3)) \quad (\text{by naturality of edge morphisms}) \\ &= (H(\psi_1) \otimes H(\psi_3))(0) \quad (\text{since } 0 \neq \eta_1 \otimes \eta_3 \in E_\infty^{N_1, N_3}) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore if $H(\psi_1)(\eta_1) \neq 0$, then $H(\psi_2)(\eta_2) \neq 0$. \square

The dga of [8] is defined as follows.

Definition 6.2. For a finite and simple connected graph $G = (V, E)$ with more than one vertex, we define the minimal Sullivan algebra associated to G as

$$\mathcal{M}_G = \left(\Lambda(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, y_3, z) \otimes \Lambda(x_v, z_v \mid v \in V), d \right),$$

where degrees and differential are described by

$$\begin{aligned} |x_1| &= 8, & dx_1 &= 0 \\ |x_2| &= 10, & dx_2 &= 0 \\ |y_1| &= 33, & dy_1 &= x_1^3 x_2 \\ |y_2| &= 35, & dy_2 &= x_1^2 x_2^2 \\ |y_3| &= 37, & dy_3 &= x_1 x_2^3 \\ |x_v| &= 40, & dx_v &= 0 \\ |z| &= 119, & dz &= y_1 y_2 x_1^4 x_2^2 - y_1 y_3 x_1^5 x_2 + y_2 y_3 x_1^6 + x_1^{15} + x_2^{12} \\ |z_v| &= 119, & dz_v &= x_v^3 + \sum_{(v,w) \in E} x_v x_w x_2^4. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 6.3. \mathcal{M}_G is an elliptic inflexible dga of formal dimension $N = 208 + 80|V|$ and volume form $\nu = x_1^{26} \prod_{v \in V} x_v^2$.

Proof. This is included in [8] and [9, Proposition I.6]. \square

Theorem 6.4. *Let \mathcal{M}_G be the minimal model in Definition 6.2. Then there exist a dga morphism $\psi: \mathcal{M}_G \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{B}}$ such that $\bar{\mathcal{B}}$ is a finite type dga that has a positive weight and $H(\psi)([\nu]) \neq 0$. Therefore \mathcal{M}_G is non-strongly inflexible.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{A} be the 2-step algebra

$$\mathcal{A} = (\Lambda(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, y_3, x_v, z_v), d) \subset \mathcal{M}_G,$$

and define $P_0 = x_1^{15} + x_2^{12}$, $P_1 = y_1 y_2 x_1^4 x_2^2 - y_1 y_3 x_1^5 x_2 + y_2 y_3 x_1^6$. The algebra \mathcal{A} has a positive weight ω given by Proposition 2.13, and following the arguments of Section 4, there exists a dga $\mathcal{B} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\dot{\mathcal{A}} \otimes \Lambda(u_1, u_2, u_3), d)$, where

$$d(u_1) = \omega(P_0 + \dot{P}_1), d(u_2) = \omega(P_1), d(u_3) = \omega(\dot{P}_0).$$

such that ω extends to a positive weight on \mathcal{B} given by

$$\omega(u_1) = \omega(P_0 + \dot{P}_1), \omega(u_2) = \omega(P_1), \omega(u_3) = \omega(\dot{P}_0).$$

Let $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{B}$ be the differential ideal generated by the ω -homogeneous elements $\dot{x}_v, \dot{z}_v \in \mathcal{B}$. Then, according to Lemma 3.4, the dga $\bar{\mathcal{B}} = \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{I}$ admits a positive weight $\tilde{\omega}$. Define the dga map

$$\begin{aligned} \psi: \mathcal{M}_G &\longrightarrow \bar{\mathcal{B}}, \\ a \in \mathcal{A} &\longmapsto \bar{a} + \bar{\dot{a}}, \\ z &\longmapsto \bar{u}_1 + \bar{u}_2 + \bar{u}_3, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

and consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} (\Lambda(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, y_3, z), d) & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{M}_G & \twoheadrightarrow & (\Lambda(x_v, z_v \mid v \in V), d_3) \\ \downarrow \psi_1 & & \downarrow \psi & & \parallel \psi_3 \\ (\mathcal{B}_1, \tilde{d}_1) & \hookrightarrow & \bar{\mathcal{B}} & \twoheadrightarrow & (\Lambda(x_v, z_v \mid v \in V), d_3), \end{array} \tag{13}$$

where $\psi_1: (\Lambda(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, y_3, z), d) \rightarrow (\mathcal{B}_1, \tilde{d}_1)$ is the morphism constructed in (3).

Finally, notice that $d_3(x_v) = 0$, and $d_3(z_v) = x_v^3$, thus $(\Lambda(x_v, z_v \mid v \in V), d_3)$ is elliptic. By Proposition 4.6, ψ_1 maps nontrivially the volume form of $(\Lambda(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, y_3, z))$. Then $H(\psi)(\nu) \neq 0$ by Lemma 6.1, and \mathcal{M}_G is non-strongly inflexible by Corollary 2.12. \square

Remark 6.5. The same arguments and calculations used to prove that the dgas from Definition 6.2, [8, Def. 2.1], are non-strongly inflexible, work to show that the dgas from [6, Definition 2.1] and [7, Definition 4.1] are also non-strongly inflexible. Hence, as a corollary of Theorem 3.5, we get that any simply-connected manifold admitting one of those dgas as Sullivan minimal model, is also a non-strongly inflexible manifold.

7. CONNECTED SUMS AND STRONG INFLEXIBILITY

In this section we deal with more examples of inflexible manifolds that are produced from the manifolds of Sections 5 and 6. Using connected sums and products, infinitely many oriented closed simply-connected inflexible manifolds are constructed in [1] and [9]. We develop here all the tools to prove that building upon non-strongly inflexible manifolds produces non-strongly inflexible manifolds.

Proposition 7.1. *Suppose that M_1 is a compact oriented manifold which is non-strongly inflexible, and let M_2 be any other compact oriented manifold. Then $M_1 \times M_2$ is non-strongly inflexible.*

Proof. As M_1 is non-strongly inflexible, there exists a compact oriented manifold M' such that $\deg(M', M_1)$ is unbounded. Let $\lambda > 0$ and $f: M' \rightarrow M_1$ such that $|\deg(f)| \geq \lambda$. Then $f \times \text{Id}: M' \times M_2 \rightarrow M_1 \times M_2$ has $\deg(f \times \text{Id}) = \deg(f)$, hence $|\deg(f \times \text{Id})| \geq \lambda$. So $\deg(M' \times M_2, M_1 \times M_2)$ is unbounded, and hence $M_1 \times M_2$ is non-strongly inflexible. \square

Corollary 7.2. *The manifolds of [9, Theorem II.5] are inflexible but non-strongly inflexible.*

Proof. They are of the form $\coprod_{1 \leq l \leq k} M_l$, where M_l are taken from the examples given in Section 5, which are non-strongly inflexible by our previous results. Using Proposition 7.1, we conclude. \square

Proposition 7.3. *If M is a simply-connected oriented compact manifold which is non-strongly inflexible, then $\#_k M$ is non-strongly inflexible for all $k \geq 2$.*

Proof. Let M' be so that $\deg(M', M)$ is unbounded. We apply [16, Lemma 3.8.(2)] inductively to M, M' and $\#_k M, \#_k M'$ so that

$$\deg(M'_1, M_1) \cap \deg(\#_k M'_1, \#_k M_1) \subseteq \deg(\#_{k+1} M'_1, \#_{k+1} M_1).$$

Hence $\deg(M'_1, M_1) \subseteq \deg(\#_k M'_1, \#_k M_1)$ for all $k \geq 2$. This proves the result. \square

Corollary 7.4. *The manifolds of [9, Example II.4] are inflexible but non-strongly inflexible.*

Finally, in [9, Proposition II.13], the authors construct non-spinable simply-connected inflexible manifolds. To deal with them, we need the following:

Proposition 7.5. *Let M_1, M_2 be simply-connected compact oriented non-strongly inflexible N -manifolds. If there is M'_2 such that $\deg(M'_2, M_2) = \mathbb{Z}$, then $M_1 \# M_2$ is non-strongly inflexible.*

Moreover, if M_1, M_2, M'_1, M'_2 are compact oriented N -manifolds such that there is some $s > 0$ with $s\mathbb{Z} \subset \deg(M'_2, M_2)$ and $\deg(M'_1, M_1) \cap s\mathbb{Z}$ is infinite, then $M_1 \# M_2$ is non-strongly inflexible.

Proof. Let M'_1 be a compact oriented manifold such that $\deg(M'_1, M_1)$ is unbounded. The result follows from [16, Lemma 3.8.(2)] as $\deg(M'_2, M_2) = \mathbb{Z}$, implies $\deg(M'_1, M_1) \subset \deg(M'_1 \# M_2, M_1 \# M_2)$. Thus $\deg(M'_1 \# M_2, M_1 \# M_2)$ is unbounded and $M_1 \# M_2$ is non-strongly inflexible.

The second assertion is proved in a similar way. \square

Let $s > 0$ be an integer. We have the following improvement of Corollary 2.12 and Theorem 3.5

Proposition 7.6. *Let (\mathcal{A}, d) be a dga with Poincaré duality and volume form $[\nu] \in H^N(\mathcal{A}, d)$. Suppose that there exists a dga (\mathcal{A}', d') with a positive weight, and a map*

$\varphi: (\mathcal{A}, d) \rightarrow (\mathcal{A}', d')$ such that $H(\varphi)([\nu]) \neq 0$. Then there exists a dga $(\bar{\mathcal{A}}, d)$ whose cohomology is Poincaré duality of formal dimension N , and $\deg(\mathcal{A}, \bar{\mathcal{A}}) \cap s\mathbb{Z}$ is unbounded.

Moreover, if (M, η) is a simply-connected N -manifold with model (\mathcal{A}, d) as above, such that $\eta \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} 1 = [\nu]$, and (\mathcal{A}', d') is simply connected and finite type, then there exists a manifold M' such that $\deg(M', M) \cap s\mathbb{Z}$ is unbounded.

Proof. Following the arguments and notation in proof of Corollary 2.12, there exist a dga $(\bar{\mathcal{A}}, d)$ whose cohomology is Poincaré duality of formal dimension N , and fixed numbers $0 \neq \omega(a'_i) \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{Q}$, for $i = 0, \dots, r$, such that given any natural number q_n there is a dga map $G_n: (\mathcal{A}, d) \rightarrow (\bar{\mathcal{A}}, d)$ with

$$\deg(G_n) = (q_n^{\omega(a'_0)} + \sum_{i=1}^r q_n^{\omega(a'_i)} \alpha_i).$$

If $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ verifies $t\alpha_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, for $i = 1, \dots, r$, then $q_n = nst$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ makes $\deg(G_n) \in s\mathbb{Z}$. Therefore $\deg(\mathcal{A}, \bar{\mathcal{A}}) \cap s\mathbb{Z}$ is unbounded.

The last assertion follows from Theorem 3.5 that hinges in Theorem 3.2. There it is shown that there exists a manifold M' , and integers $k \neq 0$ and $\omega(v) > 0$, such that for every integer l_n there exists a map $G_n: M' \rightarrow M$ such that $|\deg(G_n)| = |kc_n l_n^{\omega(v)}|$ for some non zero integer c_n . Therefore

$$\{\deg(G_n) \mid l_n \in s\mathbb{Z}\} \subset \deg(M', M) \cap s\mathbb{Z}$$

is unbounded. \square

All manifolds in Sections 5-6 satisfy the conditions of Proposition 7.6, hence the degrees of maps $\deg(M', M) \cap s\mathbb{Z}$ are unbounded for any $s > 1$.

Corollary 7.7. *The manifolds of [9, Prop. II.13] are inflexible but non-strongly inflexible.*

Proof. The manifolds of [9, Prop. II.13] are of the form $M^{\times k} \times W$, where M is one of the manifolds in previous sections, and $W = S^{N-2} \tilde{\times} S^2$ is the nontrivial fibre bundle $S^{N-2} \rightarrow W \rightarrow S^2$.

With $s = 2$, there is some M' such that $\deg(M', M^{\times k}) \cap 2\mathbb{Z}$ is unbounded. Now taking the pull-back under the degree 2 map $g: S^2 \rightarrow S^2$ of the nontrivial bundle $S^{N-2} \rightarrow W \rightarrow S^2$ we get a trivial bundle $\tilde{W} = g^*W \cong S^{N-2} \times S^2$. As this has self-maps of any degree, we have that $\deg(\tilde{W}, W) \supset 2\mathbb{Z}$. Applying now Proposition 7.5, we get that $M^{\times k} \times W$ is non-strongly inflexible. \square

For completeness, we will include some results on degrees of maps for connected sums, using dgas. First, given subsets $A, B \subset \mathbb{Z}$, define

$$A + B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{a + b \mid a \in A, b \in B\} \subset \mathbb{Z}.$$

Lemma 7.8. *Let M_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$, be compact oriented N -manifolds. Then*

$$\deg(M_1, M_3) + \deg(M_2, M_3) \subset \deg(M_1 \# M_2, M_3).$$

Proof. Let $q: M_1 \# M_2 \rightarrow M_1 \vee M_2$ denote the pinching map. Then for any given maps $f_i: M_i \rightarrow M_3$, the map $f: M_1 \# M_2 \rightarrow M_3$ given by the composition $f = (f_1 \vee f_2) \circ q$ verifies $\deg(f) = \deg(f_1) + \deg(f_2)$, and the result follows. \square

Note that the containment in Lemma 7.8 can be strict. For instance, let $M_1 = M_2 = T^2$ be the 2-torus and M_3 be the compact oriented surface of genus 2.

Corollary 7.9. *Let M be a compact oriented and non-strongly inflexible N -manifold. Then there exist infinitely many compact oriented N -manifolds M' such that $\deg(M', M)$ is unbounded.*

Proof. Since M is non-strongly inflexible, there exists a compact oriented N -manifold M' such that $\deg(M', M)$ is unbounded. Then, according to Lemma 7.8 for any N -manifolds W , $\deg(M', M) \subset \deg(W \# M', M)$, and therefore $\deg(W \# M', M)$ is unbounded too. \square

The following is a straightforward consequence of the previous corollary.

Corollary 7.10. *Let M be a compact oriented N -manifold, and let v_M be the domination Mfd_N -seminorm associated with M (see [9, Definition 7.1]). If v_M is not finite, then there exist infinitely many compact oriented N -manifolds M' such that $v_M(M') = \infty$.*

Proof. Recall that given a compact oriented N -manifold M' ,

$$v_M(M') = \sup\{|d| \mid d \in \deg(M', M)\},$$

thus the result follows from Corollary 7.9. \square

Definition 7.11. *Let \mathcal{A}_i , $i = 1, 2$, be connected dgas, and let $a_i \in \mathcal{A}_i$ elements such that $|a_1| = |a_2|$. The connected sum of the pairs (\mathcal{A}_i, a_i) , $i = 1, 2$, is the dga*

$$(\mathcal{A}_1, a_1) \# (\mathcal{A}_2, a_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathcal{A}_1 \oplus_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathcal{A}_2) / I,$$

where $\mathcal{A}_1 \oplus_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathcal{A}_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2) / \mathbb{Q}\{(1, -1)\}$, and $I \subset \mathcal{A}_1 \oplus_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathcal{A}_2$ is the differential ideal generated by $a_1 - a_2$.

The connected sum of dgas provides a model for the connected sum of manifolds.

Theorem 7.12. *Let M_i , $i = 1, 2$, be simply-connected compact oriented N -manifolds. Let $(\mathcal{M}_i, [m_i])$ be the associated rational model. Then $(\mathcal{M}_1, m_1) \# (\mathcal{M}_2, m_2)$ is a rational model of $M_1 \# M_2$.*

Proof. If $(\mathcal{M}_i, [m_i])$ is a rational model of M_i , then $\mathcal{M}_1 \oplus_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathcal{M}_2$ is a rational model of $M_1 \vee M_2$ [11, Example 2.47], and therefore dividing by the ideal generated $m_1 - m_2$ is a rational model of $M_1 \# M_2$ [11, Example 3.6]. \square

The connected sum of dgas behaves nicely with positive weights

Proposition 7.13. *Let \mathcal{A}_i , $i = 1, 2$, be connected dgas, and let $a_i \in \mathcal{A}_i$ be elements such that $|a_1| = |a_2|$. If \mathcal{A}_i , $i = 1, 2$, has a positive weight ω_i such that a_i is ω_i -homogeneous, then $(\mathcal{A}_1, a_1) \# (\mathcal{A}_2, a_2)$ admits a positive weight.*

Proof. Let ω be the positive weight in $\mathcal{A}_1 \oplus_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathcal{A}_2$ given by

$$\omega(x) = \begin{cases} \omega_2(a_2)\omega_1(x), & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{A}_1 \text{ is } \omega_1\text{-homogeneous,} \\ \omega_1(a_1)\omega_2(x), & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{A}_2 \text{ is } \omega_2\text{-homogeneous.} \end{cases}$$

Then $a_1 - a_2 \in \mathcal{A}_1 \oplus_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathcal{A}_2$ is ω -homogeneous, hence $d(a_1 - a_2)$ is so. Therefore since

$$I = (\mathcal{A}_1 \oplus_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathcal{A}_2) \cdot (a_1 - a_2, d(a_1 - a_2)),$$

the differential closed ideal I is generated (as vector space) by ω -homogeneous elements, and according to Lemma 3.4, ω gives rise to a positive weight on $(\mathcal{A}_1, a_1) \# (\mathcal{A}_2, a_2)$. \square

Finally,

Theorem 7.14. *Let (M_i, η_i) be a simply-connected N -manifold with minimal model $\mathcal{M}_i = (\Lambda V_i, d)$, $i = 1, 2$. Write the volume form as $\eta_i = [\nu_i]$. Assume there exists a dga morphism $\psi_i: \mathcal{M}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_i$ such that \mathcal{A}_i is a finite type dga that has a positive weight and $H(\psi_i)([\nu]) \neq 0$. Then $M_1 \# M_2$ is non-strongly inflexible.*

Proof. Let ω_i be a positive weight on \mathcal{A}_i , $i = 1, 2$. We claim $\psi_i(\nu_i)$ may be assumed ω_i -homogeneous. As in the proof of Theorem 3.2, decompose $\psi_i(\nu_i) = \sum \alpha_j$ into ω_i -homogeneous elements, fix $\tilde{a}_i \in \mathcal{A}_i$ with nontrivial α_j , ω_i -homogeneous complements $\mathcal{A}_i = \langle \tilde{a}_i \rangle \oplus W_i$, and define

$$I_i = \mathcal{A}_i^{\geq N+1} \oplus W_i.$$

Then by Lemma 3.4, $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i = \mathcal{A}_i / I_i$ is a finite type connected dga with positive weight, and the induced map $\tilde{\psi}_i: \mathcal{M}_i \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i$ maps ν_i to a $\tilde{\omega}_i$ -homogeneous element. The algebra $(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_1, \tilde{\psi}_1(\nu_1)) \# (\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2, \tilde{\psi}_2(\nu_2))$ inherits a positive weight by Proposition 7.13. Therefore the obvious morphism

$$\tilde{\psi}_1 \# \tilde{\psi}_2: (\mathcal{M}_1, \nu_1) \# (\mathcal{M}_2, \nu_2) \rightarrow (\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_1, \tilde{\psi}_1(\nu_1)) \# (\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2, \tilde{\psi}_2(\nu_2))$$

is a morphism from the rational model of $(M_1 \# M_2, \eta)$ to a finite type dga that has a positive weight, such that $[(\tilde{\psi}_1 \# \tilde{\psi}_2)(\eta)] \neq 0$. Finally, according to Theorem 3.5, $(M_1 \# M_2, \eta)$ is non-strongly inflexible. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Amann, *Degrees of Self-Maps of Simply Connected Manifolds*, Int. Math. Res. Notices **18** (2015), 8545–8589.
- [2] M. Arkowitz, G. Lupton, *Rational obstruction theory and rational homotopy sets*, Math. Z. **235** (2000), no. 3, 525–539.
- [3] R. Body and R. Douglas, *Rational homotopy and unique factorization*, Pacific J. Math. **75** (1978), 331–338.
- [4] R. Body and R. Douglas, *Unique factorization of rational homotopy types*, Pacific J. Math. **90** (1980), 21–26.
- [5] R. Body, M. Mimura, H. Shiga, D. Sullivan, *p -universal spaces and rational homotopy types*, Comment. Math. Helv. **73** (1998), no. 3, 427–442.
- [6] C. Costoya, D. Méndez, A. Viruel, *Homotopically rigid Sullivan algebras and their applications*, An Alpine Bouquet of Algebraic Topology, Contemp. Math., vol. 708, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2018, pp. 103–121.
- [7] C. Costoya, D. Méndez, A. Viruel, *Realisability problem in arrow categories*, Collect. Math., **71** (2020), 383–405.
- [8] C. Costoya, A. Viruel, *Every finite group is the group of self homotopy equivalences of an elliptic space*, Acta Mathematica **213** (2014), 49–62.
- [9] D. Crowley, C. Löh, *Functorial seminorms on singular homology and (in)flexible manifolds*, Algebraic & Geometric Topology **15** (2015), 1453–1499.
- [10] Y. Félix, S. Halperin, J.C. Thomas, *Rational homotopy theory*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **205**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.

- [11] Y. Félix, J. Oprea, D. Tanré. Algebraic models in geometry. Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **17**. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008.
- [12] M. Mimura, R.C. O'Neill, H. Toda, *On p -equivalence in the sense of Serre*, Jpn. J. Math. **40** (1971), 1–10.
- [13] M. Mimura, H. Toda, *On p -equivalences and p -universal spaces*, Comment. Math. Helv. **46** (1971), 87–97.
- [14] C. Neofytidis, *On a problem of Hopf for circle bundles over aspherical manifolds with hyperbolic fundamental groups*, Preprint: arXiv:1712.03582.
- [15] C. Neofytidis, *Endomorphisms of mapping tori*, Preprint: arXiv:2010.12490.
- [16] H. Sun, S. Wang, J. Wu, and H. Zheng, *Self-mapping degrees of 3-manifolds*, Osaka J. Math. **49** (2012), 247–269.
- [17] R. Thom, *Quelques propriétés globales des variétés différentiables*, Comment. Math. Helv. **28** (1954), 17–86.
- [18] D. Sullivan, *Infinitesimal computations in topology*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **47** (1977), 269–331.

CITIC, DEPARTAMENTO DE COMPUTACIÓN, UNIVERSIDADE DA CORUÑA, 15071-A CORUÑA, SPAIN.

Email address: `crisrina.costoya@udc.es`

DEPARTAMENTO DE ÁLGEBRA, GEOMETRÍA Y TOPOLOGÍA, UNIVERSIDAD DE MÁLAGA, CAMPUS DE TEATINOS, s/n, 29071 MÁLAGA, SPAIN

Email address: `vicente.munoz@uma.es`

DEPARTAMENTO DE ÁLGEBRA, GEOMETRÍA Y TOPOLOGÍA, UNIVERSIDAD DE MÁLAGA, CAMPUS DE TEATINOS, s/n, 29071 MÁLAGA, SPAIN

Email address: `viruel@uma.es`