

A refinement of bounded cohomology

by Światosław Gal & Jarek Kędra

Dedicated to Jacek Świątkowski on the occasion of his 60th birthday

ABSTRACT. We introduce a refinement of bounded cohomology and prove that the suitable comparison homomorphisms vanish for an amenable group. We investigate in this context Thompson's group F and provide further evidence towards its amenability. We show that the space of \mathfrak{r} -bounded cocycles of degree two is essentially as big as the space of Lipschitz functions on the underlying group. We also explain that such classes define metrics on the group.

1. Semibounded cohomology

Let Γ be a discrete group. An n -cochain $\omega: \Gamma^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is called **p -bounded** if for fixed $g_{p+1}, \dots, g_n \in \Gamma$ the function

$$\Gamma^p \ni g_1, \dots, g_p \mapsto \omega(g_1, \dots, g_p, g_{p+1}, \dots, g_n)$$

is bounded. For example, an n -bounded cochain is bounded in the usual sense. It is straightforward to check that the subcomplex $C_{(p)}^*(\Gamma; \mathbf{R}) \subseteq C^*(\Gamma; \mathbf{R})$ consisting of p -bounded cochains is preserved by the codifferential. Its cohomology will be denoted $H_{(p)}^n(\Gamma; \mathbf{R})$. The inclusions $C_{(p)}^*(\Gamma; \mathbf{R}) \subseteq C_{(p-1)}^*(\Gamma; \mathbf{R})$ induce maps in cohomology

$$H_{(n)}^n(\Gamma; \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow H_{(n-1)}^n(\Gamma; \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow H_{(1)}^n(\Gamma; \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow H_{(0)}^n(\Gamma; \mathbf{R}) = H^n(\Gamma; \mathbf{R}),$$

called **comparison homomorphisms**. In what follows, we will refer to $H^n(\Gamma; \mathbf{R})$ as standard cohomology.

It is well known [6, Section 3.0] that if a group Γ is amenable then its bounded cohomology vanishes in positive degrees. In particular, the comparison homomorphisms between bounded and standard cohomology are trivial. We generalise this result to the p -bounded cohomology.

Theorem 1.1. *If Γ is an amenable group then the comparison homomorphisms*

$$H_{(p)}^n(\Gamma; \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow H_{(p-1)}^n(\Gamma; \mathbf{R})$$

vanish for all $n > 0$ and $p = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Proof. The argument follows the proof of the fact that bounded cohomology of an amenable group vanishes in positive degree. Let \mathfrak{m} be a right-invariant mean on Γ . Define a map $M: C_{(p)}^{n+1}(\Gamma; \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow C_{(p-1)}^n(\Gamma; \mathbf{R})$ as

$$M\omega(g_1, \dots, g_n) = \int \omega(h, g_1, \dots, g_n) \mathfrak{m}(h).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} M\delta\omega(g_1, \dots, g_n) &= \int \delta\omega(h, g_1, \dots, g_n) \mathfrak{m}(h) \\ &= \int \omega(g_1, \dots, g_n) \mathfrak{m}(h) \\ &\quad - \int \omega(hg_1, g_2, \dots, g_n) \mathfrak{m}(h) + \int \omega(h, g_1g_2, \dots, g_n) \mathfrak{m}(h) \pm \dots \\ &\stackrel{!}{=} \omega(g_1, \dots, g_n) \\ &\quad - \int \omega(h, g_2, \dots, g_n) \mathfrak{m}(h) + \int \omega(h, g_1g_2, \dots, g_n) \mathfrak{m}(h) \pm \dots \\ &= \omega(g_1, \dots, g_n) - M\omega(g_2, \dots, g_n) + M\omega(g_1g_2, \dots, g_n) \mp \dots \\ &= \omega(g_1, \dots, g_n) - \delta M\omega(g_1, \dots, g_n), \end{aligned}$$

where, in the marked equality, we used, for the second term, invariance of \mathfrak{m} . We obtain that

$$M\delta\omega + \delta M\omega = \omega$$

and hence M is a homotopy for the comparison map. \square

Remark 1.2. In this paper we are interested in cohomology with trivial real coefficients, but parts of it could be written without a change for any coefficients with a metric (e.g. normed vector space) on which the group acts in uniformly bounded way. Otherwise, p -bounded cocycles may not form a chain complex. \diamond

Remark 1.3. One could use another definition of p -boundedness. Namely, an n -cochain $\omega: \Gamma^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is called **left- p -bounded** if for fixed $g_1, \dots, g_{n-p} \in \Gamma$ the function

$$\Gamma^p \ni g_{n-p+1}, \dots, g_n \mapsto \omega(g_1, \dots, g_{p-n}, g_{p-n+1}, \dots, g_n)$$

is bounded. Such definition (of 1-bounded 2-cocycle) appears in [4, Section 4] under the name of **semibounded** cocycle, where the authors use it to prove Polterovich's theorem stating that on the group of symplectic diffeomorphisms of a symplectically hyperbolic manifold all its elements are undistorted [4, Theorem 5.2].

Nevertheless, the involution

$$\widehat{\omega}(g_1, \dots, g_n) = \omega(g_n^{-1}, \dots, g_1^{-1})$$

is a chain map that interchanges p -bounded and left- p -bounded cocycles (with trivial coefficients), so both notions define isomorphic objects. \diamond

Remark 1.4. A similar concept to \mathfrak{r} -bounded cocycles was defined by Neumann and Reeves [11] for 2-cocycles and by Frigerio and Sisto [3] for any degree under the name *weakly bounded* cocycles. Both papers consider cocycles that take finite values as first argument varies.

Weakly bounded 2-cocycles were used to characterise central extensions of finitely generated groups that are quasi-isometric with trivial extensions. It was first observed by Gersten that this holds if the defining cocycle for an extension is bounded. Necessary and sufficient condition in terms of ℓ^∞ -cohomology (see [10]) was given by Kleiner and Leeb [9, Proposition 8.3]. The characterisation in terms of weakly bounded cocycles is due to Frigerio and Sisto [3, Corollary 2.5].

The connection between weakly bounded cocycles and ℓ^∞ -cohomology is a direct analogy to our Theorem 2.3. \diamond

2. The \mathfrak{r} -bounded cohomology

Let $\ell^\infty\Gamma$ denote the left module of bounded functions on Γ with the action defined by $(hF)(g) = F(gb)$.

Lemma 2.1. *The map $\Lambda_0: C_{(1)}^n(\Gamma; \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow C^{n-1}(\Gamma; \ell^\infty\Gamma)$ given by the formula*

$$\Lambda_0\omega(g_1, \dots, g_n)(b) = \omega(b, g_1, \dots, g_n)$$

is a homotopy, i.e. $\partial\Lambda_0\omega + \Lambda_0\partial\omega = \omega$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_0\partial\omega(g_0, \dots, g_n)(b) &= \partial\omega(b, g_0, \dots, g_n) \\ &= \omega(g_0, \dots, g_n) \\ &\quad - \omega(bg_0, \dots, g_n) + \omega(b, g_0g_1, \dots, g_n) \pm \dots \\ &= \omega(g_0, \dots, g_n) \\ &\quad - \Lambda_0\omega(g_1, \dots, g_n)(bg_0) + \Lambda_0\omega(g_0g_1, \dots, g_n)(b) \pm \dots \\ &= \omega(g_0, \dots, g_n) - \partial\Lambda_0\omega(g_0, \dots, g_n)(b). \end{aligned}$$

\square

The induced surjective map $\Lambda: C_{(1)}^n(\Gamma; \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow C^{n-1}(\Gamma; \ell^\infty\Gamma/\mathbf{R})$ anticommutes with the codifferential. The kernel consists of cocycles that do not depend on the first variable. We call them **\mathfrak{r} -constant** and denote by $C_{[1]}^n(\Gamma, \mathbf{R})$.

Lemma 2.2. *The complex of \mathfrak{r} -constant cochains with restricted codifferential is acyclic.*

Proof. A straightforward computation shows that ∂ preserves \mathfrak{r} -constant cochains. The map H defined by

$$H\omega(g_2, \dots, g_n) = \omega(1, 1, g_3, \dots, g_n)$$

is a homotopy proving acyclicity. \square

Consider the following short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow C_{[1]}^n(\Gamma; \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow C_{(1)}^n(\Gamma; \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow C^{n-1}(\Gamma; \ell^\infty \Gamma / \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow 0$$

and the induced long exact sequence in cohomology. As a corollary, we deduce the following theorem.

Theorem 2.3. *The map induced by Λ ,*

$$H_{(1)}^n(\Gamma; \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow H^{n-1}(\Gamma; \ell^\infty \Gamma / \mathbf{R})$$

is an isomorphism. Its composition with the Bockstein homomorphism

$$H^{n-1}(\Gamma; \ell^\infty \Gamma / \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow H^n(\Gamma; \mathbf{R})$$

corresponding to the short exact sequence of coefficients $\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \ell^\infty \Gamma \rightarrow \ell^\infty \Gamma / \mathbf{R}$ is equal to the comparison map $H_{(1)}^n(\Gamma; \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow H^n(\Gamma; \mathbf{R})$.

Proof. Let $\omega \in C_{(1)}^n(\Gamma; \mathbf{R})$ be a cocycle. Then $\Lambda_0(\omega) \in C^{n-1}(\Gamma; \ell^\infty \Gamma)$ is the lift of $\Lambda(\omega) \in C^{n-1}(\Gamma; \ell^\infty \Gamma / \mathbf{R})$. By definition, the Bockstein homomorphism, sends $[\Lambda(\omega)]$ to $[\partial \Lambda_0(\omega)]$. Since ω is a cocycle we get that $\partial \Lambda_0(\omega) = \omega - \Lambda_0(\partial \omega) = \omega$ which proves the statement. \square

Notice that a group Γ is amenable if and only if the short exact sequence of coefficients $0 \rightarrow \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \ell^\infty \Gamma \rightarrow \ell^\infty \Gamma / \mathbf{R} \rightarrow 0$ splits. In such a case the Bockstein map is trivial in accordance with Theorem 1.1.

3. 1-bounded 2-cocycles

In this section we discuss two constructions of pseudometrics on a group defined by 1-bounded 2-cocycles (in what follows, we will abuse terminology and refer to them as metrics). The first metric is defined by cocycles that are trivial in the standard cohomology. The second construction is defined for arbitrary cocycles.

We start with the first construction. Recall, that any bounded 2-cocycle in the kernel of the comparison homomorphism $H_b^2(\Gamma; \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow H^2(\Gamma; \mathbf{R})$ is a codifferential of a quasimorphism, *i.e.*, a function $\phi: \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that $\sup_{g, b \in \Gamma} |\phi(g) - \phi(gb) + \phi(b)| < \infty$. Thus the kernel of the comparison map can be identified with the space of quasimorphisms divided by the sum of the space of homomorphisms (annihilated by the codifferential) and the space of bounded functions (which correspond to coboundaries).

Similarly, any 1-bounded 2-cocycle in the kernel of the comparison homomorphism $H_{(1)}^2(\Gamma; \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow H^2(\Gamma; \mathbf{R})$ is a codifferential of a function $\phi: \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that for each fixed $g \in \Gamma$ we have, $\sup_{b \in \Gamma} |\phi(g) - \phi(gb) + \phi(b)| < \infty$. That is,

$$\|g\phi - \phi\|_0 := \sup_{b \in \Gamma} |\phi(gb) - \phi(b)| < \infty.$$

We call such functions **abstractly Lipschitz**. The above argument can be then summed up as follows.

Proposition 3.1. *The kernel of the comparison map $H_{(1)}^2(\Gamma; \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow H^2(\Gamma; \mathbf{R})$ is isomorphic to the quotient on abstractly Lipschitz functions divided by the sum of the space of homomorphisms and the space of bounded functions. \square*

On the other hand, given abstractly Lipschitz function ϕ , the map $\delta\phi(b) = b\phi - \phi$ is a 1-cocycle with values in $\ell^\infty\Gamma$ and taking the class of $\delta\phi$ in $H^1(\Gamma; \ell^\infty\Gamma/\mathbf{R}) \cong H_{(1)}^2(\Gamma; \mathbf{R})$ corresponds to taking class of ϕ modulo homomorphisms (constant cocycles) and bounded functions (coboundaries).

The name *abstractly Lipschitz* is motivated by the following observation.

Proposition 3.2. *Let ϕ be a function on a group Γ . The following are equivalent*

- (1) ϕ is abstractly Lipschitz,
- (2) there exists a length function $|\cdot|$ on Γ , such that ϕ is Lipschitz with respect to $|\cdot|$.

Proof. Assume (1). Then ϕ is Lipschitz with respect to

$$|g|_\phi = \|g\phi - \phi\|_0.$$

Assume (2). Then $\|g\phi - \phi\|_0 \leq |g|$. \square

Notice that if Γ is finitely generated then abstractly Lipschitz functions are Lipschitz with respect to the word norm associated with a finite generating set.

The second construction goes as follows. Let ω be an arbitrary 1-bounded 2-cocycle. For a function $\psi \in \ell^\infty\Gamma$ define $|\psi|_{\text{osc}} = \sup_{b, b' \in \Gamma} |\psi(b) - \psi(b')|$ and define $\|g\|_\omega = |\omega(g, \cdot)|_{\text{osc}}$.

Proposition 3.3. *The function $\|\cdot\|_\omega$ is a well defined metric on Γ . Moreover, if η is a bounded 1-cochain, then $\|\cdot\|_\omega$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\omega+\delta\eta}$ are within finite (at most $2|\eta|_{\text{osc}}$) distance.*

Proof. By cocycle identity

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(g_1g_2, b) - \omega(g_1g_2, b') &= \omega(g_2, b) - \omega(g_1, g_2b) + \omega(g_1, g_2) \\ &\quad - \omega(g_2, b') + \omega(g_1, g_2b') - \omega(g_1, g_2) \\ &= \omega(g_2, b) - \omega(g_2, b') + \omega(g_1, g_2b) - \omega(g_1, g_2b'). \end{aligned}$$

Taking supremum of the absolute value of the above over all b and b' we get the triangle identity. The last statement is obvious. \square

One can rephrase the above statement, that every element of $H_{(1)}^2(\Gamma, \mathbf{R})$ defines a class of metrics on Γ which are within finite distance from each other.

In [4, Theorem 5.2] we essentially prove that a certain 1-bounded 2-cocycle \mathfrak{G} defines a metric on the group of Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms $\text{Ham}(X, \sigma)$ of a symplectically hyperbolic manifold (X, σ) and prove that each element of this group is undistorted with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{G}}$. Notice, that in [4] the function $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{G}}$ was defined slightly differently and did not satisfy triangle inequality (cf. [4, Lemma 4.1]).

Let us compare the two constructions. Given a 1-bounded 2-cocycle in the kernel of the comparison map, we defined two norms $\|\cdot\|_{\delta\phi}$ and $|\cdot|_{\phi}$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\phi(g, b) - \delta\phi(g, b') &= \phi(g) - \phi(gh) + \phi(b) - \phi(g) + \phi(gb') - \phi(b') \\ &= (g\phi - \phi)(b') - (g\phi - \phi)(b),\end{aligned}$$

we see that $\|g\|_{\delta\phi} = |g\phi - \phi|_{\text{osc}} \leq 2|g|_{\phi}$.

4. Hyperbolic classes

A good source of 1-bounded classes is provided by hyperbolic cocycles which are defined as follows.

Definition 4.1. Let X be a finite CW-complex and let $p: \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ be its universal cover. A cellular cocycle $\alpha \in C^k(X; \mathbf{R})$ is called **hyperbolic** if the cocycle $p^*\alpha$ is a coboundary of a bounded cochain. A cohomology class in $H^k(X; \mathbf{R})$ is called hyperbolic if it is represented by a hyperbolic cocycle.

The notion of a hyperbolic class is inspired by Gromov [7] who considered differential forms α with the property that the lift $p^*\alpha$ to the universal cover has a primitive that is bounded with respect to the Riemannian induced metric. By integrating such classes over cells we get that they yield hyperbolic classes in our sense. Moreover, Brunnbauer and Kotschick [2] defined and investigated hyperbolic cohomology classes on general Riemannian simplicial complexes and proved vanishing theorems for complexes with amenable groups (see Proposition 5.1).

Theorem 4.2. Let X be a finite connected CW-complex with $\pi_1(X) = \Gamma$ and let $\alpha \in C^k(X; \mathbf{R})$ be a hyperbolic cocycle. If the universal cover of X is $(k-1)$ -connected then there exists a 1-bounded cocycle $\omega \in C^k_{(1)}(\text{B}\Gamma; \mathbf{R})$ such that $c^*[\omega] = [\alpha]$, where $c: X \rightarrow \text{B}\Gamma$ is the map classifying the universal cover.

Proof. Let $\text{E}\Gamma'$ be an invariant subdivision of the k -skeleton of the simplicial complex $\text{E}\Gamma$ corresponding to the bar resolution. There exists an equivariant map $f: \text{E}\Gamma' \rightarrow \tilde{X}$, such that the composition $c \circ f$ is homotopic to the inclusion $\text{E}\Gamma' \rightarrow \text{E}\Gamma$.

Let $\alpha \in C^k(X; \mathbf{R})$ be a hyperbolic cocycle and let $p^*(\alpha) = \delta\beta$, where β is a bounded cochain. As $\text{E}\Gamma'$ is a subdivision of the k -skeleton of $\text{E}\Gamma$, the cochain $f^*\beta$ can be considered as a cochain on $\text{E}\Gamma$. Since β is not required to be Γ -equivariant, neither is $f^*\beta$. Let $\bar{\beta}$ be a Γ -equivariant cochain on $\text{E}\Gamma$ that agrees with $f^*\beta$ on simplices whose first vertex is 1.

It follows that the differentials $\delta f^*\beta$ and $\delta \bar{\beta}$ differ in only one term. That is, if $\omega = \delta(f^*\beta - \bar{\beta})$ then

$$\omega(g_1, \dots, g_k) = \langle g_1^*\beta - \bar{\beta}, f_*\Delta(g_2, \dots, g_k) \rangle,$$

where $\Delta(g_2, \dots, g_k)$ is the subdivision in $E\Gamma'$ of a simplex of $E\Gamma$ with vertices $1, g_2, g_2g_3, \dots, g_2 \cdots g_k$. Since β is bounded and the subdivision of $\Delta(g_2, \dots, g_k)$ does not depend on g_1 we see that ω is \mathfrak{I} -bounded. It follows that $[\omega] = f^*[\alpha]$, and thus $c^*[\omega] = [\alpha]$ which finishes the proof. \square

5. Hyperbolic classes and amenability

It immediately follows from Theorems 1.1 and 4.2 that any hyperbolic class on a CW-complex X as above is trivial if $\pi_1(X)$ is amenable. However, a more direct proof yields the following slightly stronger observation originally due to Brunnbauer Kotschick [2, Theorem 3.2] who used an isoperimetric characterisation of manifolds with amenable fundamental group due to Brooks. A different argument was used in [8] to show that the fundamental group of a closed symplectically hyperbolic manifold cannot be amenable.

Proposition 5.1. *Let X be a finite complex and let α be a hyperbolic cocycle on X . If the fundamental group of X is amenable, then α is a coboundary.*

Proof. Let $p^*\alpha = \delta\beta$ with β bounded cochain on \tilde{X} . By averaging this equation with respect to a mean on the deck transformation group $\pi_1(X)$ we find β which is $\pi_1(X)$ -invariant, thus β is a lift of a cocycle β' on X and $\alpha = \delta\beta'$ which proves the claim. \square

6. Test case: Thompson's group F

It is a stimulating open question to determine whether Thompson's group F is amenable. Since it is a split extension

$$[F, F] \rightarrow F \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}^2,$$


its amenability is equivalent to the amenability of its commutator subgroup. The cohomology ring $H^*([F, F]; \mathbf{R}) = \mathbf{R}[u]$, where $\deg(u) = 2$. The explicit cocycle α representing u has been given by Ghys and Sergiescu [5, Corollaire 4.5]. Let $\mathbf{Z}^2 \rightarrow [F, F]$ be an injective homomorphism generate by two commuting nontrivial elements. It is easy to choose such elements so that the pull-back of u is nontrivial in $H^2(\mathbf{Z}^2; \mathbf{R})$ and, since \mathbf{Z}^2 is amenable, it can't be represented by a \mathfrak{I} -bounded cocycle. More generally, we have the following observation which provides further evidence for a possible amenability of F .

Proposition 6.1. *For every positive integer $n \in \mathbf{N}$ there exists an injective homomorphism $\psi: \mathbf{Z}^{2n} \rightarrow [F, F]$ such that $\psi^*(u^n) \neq 0$ in $H^{2n}(\mathbf{Z}^{2n}; \mathbf{R})$. Consequently, u^n cannot be represented by a \mathfrak{I} -bounded cocycle.*

Proof. Let $F' = [F, F]$ denote the commutator subgroup of Thompson's group F . Let $\alpha: F' \times F' \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a cocycle defined by the following formula

$$\alpha(f, g) = \sum_x \det \begin{pmatrix} \log_2 g'_L(x) & \log_2 (f \circ g)'_L(x) \\ \log_2 g'_R(x) & \log_2 (f \circ g)'_R(x) \end{pmatrix}$$

where the summation is over the breakpoints. The subscripts L and R refer to the left and right derivatives. This cocycle represents a generator of the cohomology ring $H^*(F'; \mathbf{R}) = \mathbf{R}[u]$. Let $f, g \in F'$ be elements defined by the following pictures.



Let $\psi: \mathbf{Z}^2 \rightarrow F'$ be an injective homomorphism defined by

$$\psi(e_1) = f \text{ and } \psi(e_2) = g,$$

where $e_1 = (1, 0)$ and $e_2 = (0, 1)$. It is a direct computation that $\alpha(f, g) = 1$ and that $\alpha(g, f) = -1$ (only the breaking point $(1/2, 1/2)$ contributes). Since $\zeta_2 = (e_1|e_2) - (e_2|e_1)$ is a cycle representing nontrivial class in $H_2(\mathbf{Z}^2; \mathbf{R})$ we get that $\langle \psi^* \alpha, \zeta_2 \rangle = 2$ and hence $\psi^*(u) \neq 0$ in $H^2(\mathbf{Z}^2; \mathbf{R})$. Since \mathbf{Z}^2 is amenable, u cannot be represented by a \mathfrak{r} -bounded cocycle.

Consider $\psi: \mathbf{Z}^4 \rightarrow F'$ generated by

$$f * 1, g * 1, 1 * f, 1 * g,$$

where $f, g \in F'$ are as above and the $*$ -product $a * b$ is a homeomorphism given by rescaled a on $[0, 1/2]$ and rescaled b on $[1/2, 1]$; see [1] for more details. Let $\zeta_4 = \sum (-1)^{\text{sgn}\sigma} (e_{\sigma(1)} | \cdots | e_{\sigma(4)})$ be the cycle generating $H^4(\mathbf{Z}^4; \mathbf{R})$. A slightly cumbersome calculation shows that $\langle \psi^* \alpha^2, \zeta_4 \rangle = 8$ which shows that $\psi^*[u^2] \neq 0$ in $H^4(\mathbf{Z}^4; \mathbf{R})$. As above, it follows that u^2 cannot be \mathfrak{r} -bounded.

By repeating inductively a similar trick with taking the $*$ -product we get that $\psi^*(u^{2^{n-1}}) \neq 0$ in $H^{2^n}(\mathbf{Z}^{2^n}; \mathbf{R})$ which proves the statement. \square

Acknowledgements. The first author was partially supported by Polish NCN grant 2017/27/B/ST1/01467. This work of the second author was funded by Leverhulme Trust Research Project Grant RPG-2017-159.

The authors would like to thank Collin Bleak for discussions about Thompson's group F and Francesco Fournier Facio for bringing their attention to the literature on weakly bounded cocycles.

References

- [1] BROWN, K. S. The homology of Richard Thompson's group F . In *Topological and asymptotic aspects of group theory. AMS special session on probabilistic and asymptotic aspects of group theory, Athens, OH, USA, March 26–27, 2004 and the AMS special session on topological aspects of group theory, Nashville, TN, USA, October 16–17, 2004*. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2006, pp. 47–59.

- [2] BRUNNBAUER, M., AND KOTSCHICK, D. On hyperbolic cohomology classes. *arXiv:0808.1482* (2008).
- [3] FRIGERIO, R., AND SISTO, A. Central extensions and bounded cohomology. *arXiv:2003.01146* (2020).
- [4] GAL, Ś., AND KĘDRA, J. A two-cocycle on the group of symplectic diffeomorphisms. *Math. Z.* 271, 3-4 (2012), 693–706.
- [5] GHYS, E., AND SERGIESCU, V. Sur un groupe remarquable de difféomorphismes du cercle. (On a remarkable group of the diffeomorphisms of the circle). *Comment. Math. Helv.* 62 (1987), 185–239.
- [6] GROMOV, M. Volume and bounded cohomology. *Publ. Math., Inst. Hautes Étud. Sci.* 56 (1982), 5–99.
- [7] GROMOV, M. Kähler hyperbolicity and L_2 -Hodge theory. *J. Differ. Geom.* 33, 1 (1991), 263–292.
- [8] KĘDRA, J. Symplectically hyperbolic manifolds. *Differ. Geom. Appl.* 27, 4 (2009), 455–463.
- [9] KLEINER, B., AND LEEB, B. Groups quasi-isometric to symmetric spaces. *Commun. Anal. Geom.* 9, 2 (2001), 239–260.
- [10] MILIZIA, F. ℓ^∞ -cohomology, bounded differential forms and isoperimetric inequalities. *arXiv:2107.09089* (2021).
- [11] NEUMANN, W. D., AND REEVES, L. Central extensions of word hyperbolic groups. *Ann. Math. (2)* 145, 1 (1997), 183–192.

ŚWIATOSŁAW R. GAL:
Instytut Matematyczny
Uniwersytet Wrocławski
pl. Grunwaldzki 2
50-384 Wrocław
Poland
sgal@mimuw.edu.pl

JAREK KĘDRA:
Mathematical Sciences
University of Aberdeen
Fraser Noble Building
Aberdeen AB243UE
Scotland, UK
kedra@abdn.ac.uk