is the corresponding partition of [0, 1] given by shrinking Δ and Δ' to $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and $[\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ respectively, and it follows immediately that the previously constructed mapping $\eta_{(U,u_0)}$ sends $(\gamma, \Delta) + (\gamma', \Delta')$ to $\eta_{(U,u_0)}(\gamma, \Delta) + \eta_{(U,u_0)}(\gamma', \Delta')$.

Consider now the following commutative diagram, in which the vertical map at the left sends (γ, Δ) to the homotopy class $[\gamma]$ and the map h is the Hurewicz homomorphism:

$$\Theta(U, u_0) \xrightarrow{\eta} H_1^{\text{smooth}}(U))$$

$$\downarrow \qquad \qquad \downarrow \qquad \qquad \downarrow$$

$$\pi_1(U, u_0) \xrightarrow{h} H_1(U))$$

We can now complete the proof as follows: The basic properties of line integrals imply that the line integral of ω along γ is equal to the integral of γ with respect to the chain $(\Gamma, \Delta) = \sum_i T_i$. Since $d\omega = 0$, the Generalized Stokes' Theorem implies that the integral $\int_{\text{Chain}(\gamma,\Delta)} \omega$ only depends on the image of (γ, Δ) in $H_1^{\text{smooth}}(U)$. If γ is basepoint preserving homotopic to the constant map whose value everywhere is u_0 , then the class of γ in $\pi_1(U, u_0)$ is trivial and hence we can use the diagram to conclude that $h^{\circ}[\gamma] = 0$ and hence $\eta(\gamma, \Delta) = 0$, and therefore by the preceding sentence we know that $\int_{\gamma} \omega = 0$, which is what we wanted to prove.

Proof that Theorem 1 implies Theorem 4. We do not know whether or not the freely homotopic closed curves γ_0 and γ_1 start and end at the same point, so assume that γ_i starts and ends at u_i for i = 0, 1. Choose appropriate partitions Δ_i such that γ_i is smooth on each subinterval determined by Δ_i for i = 0, 1. Since γ_0 and γ_1 are freely homotopic, the commutative diagram implies that

$$\eta_{(U,u_0)}(\gamma_0, \Delta_0) = \eta_{(U,u_1)}(\gamma_1, \Delta_1) \quad \text{in} \quad H_1^{\text{smooth}}(U)$$

As in the proof of Theorem 1, the integrand $\sum_i P_i dx_i$ corresponds to a closed 1-form ω , and therefore in this case the Generalized Stokes' Theorem implies that the integrals of ω over the chains $\int_{\text{Chain}(\gamma_0,\Delta_0)} \omega$ and $\int_{\text{Chain}(\gamma_1,\Delta_1)} \omega$ are equal As in the proof of Theorem 1, we know that these inegrals are respectively equal to the line integrals $\int_{\gamma_0} \omega$ and $\int_{\gamma_1} \omega$, and therefore these two line integrals must also be equal.

Some classical implications

Frequently one sees the 3-dimensional case of the following result in multivariable calculus texts:

THEOREM 5. Let $n \ge 3$, and suppose that U is obtained from \mathbb{R}^n by removing finitely many points. If $\mathbf{F} = (P_1, \dots, P_n)$ is a smooth vector field on U such that

$$\frac{\partial P_i}{\partial x_j} = \frac{\partial P_j}{\partial x_j}$$

for all $i \neq j$, then there is a smooth function g on U such that $\nabla g = \mathbf{F}$. In particular, if Γ is a regular piecewise smooth curve in U, then the value of the line integral

$$\int_{\Gamma} \sum_{i} P_{i} \, dx_{i}$$

depends only upon the endpoints of the curve Γ .

In particular, a result of this type is formulated as Theorem 7 on page 551 of Marsden and Tromba.

Theorem 5 contrasts sharply with the case n = 2, and the easiest way to explain the difference is to note that the complement of a finite subset in \mathbb{R}^n is simply connected if n = 3 but is not simply connected if n = 2. We shall give a simpler (but less elementary) argument which only requires us to know that $H^1(U; \mathbb{R})$ is trivial if $n \ge 3$. By the Universal Coefficient Theorem relating integral homology to real cohomology, we only need to prove the following:

LEMMA 6. Let $n \ge 3$, and suppose that U is obtained from \mathbb{R}^n by removing a set X which contains exactly k points. Then the singular homology groups of $U = \mathbb{R}^n - X$ are given by $H_j(\mathbb{R}^n - X) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ if k = 0, $H_j(\mathbb{R}^n - X) \cong \mathbb{Z}^k$ if k = n - 1, and $H_j(\mathbb{R}^n - X) \cong 0$ otherwise.

Proof that Lemma 6 implies Theorem 5. By Lemma 10 we know that $H_1(U = \mathbb{R}^n - X)$ is trivial because $n \geq 3$, and by the Universal Coefficient Theorem we know that $H^1(U;\mathbb{R}) \cong \text{Hom}(H_1(U),\mathbb{R})$; therefore $H^1(U;\mathbb{R})$ is trivial. Since $H^*_{\text{DR}}(U) \cong H^*(U;\mathbb{R})$ by de Rham's Theorem, it follows that $H^1_{\text{DR}}(U)$ is trivial and therefore every closed 1-form over U is exact; *i.e.*, if $d\omega = 0$ then $\omega = dg$ for some g.

Let ω be the 1-form $\sum_i P_i dx_i$; the hypothesis on the functions P_i is equivalent to the identity $d\omega = 0$, and therefore if this identity holds we can apply the preceding paragraph to conclude that $\omega = dg$ for some smooth function g. If we translate this back into the language of vector fields, we see that the original vector field \mathbf{F} is equal to ∇g , proving the first assertion in the conclusion of the theorem. The second assertion now follows because the line integral in question has the form $\int_{\Gamma} \nabla g \cdot d\mathbf{x}$ and we have already noted that the values of such line integrals only depend upon the endpoints of Γ .

Proof of Lemma 6. For each $x \in X$ let V_x be the open neighborhood of radius r centered at x; choose r to be smaller than half the minimum distance between points of X (the minimum exists by the finiteness of X, and let $V = \bigcup_x U_x$, so that $\mathbb{R}^n = V \cup (\mathbb{R}^n - X)$) and $V \cap X = \bigcup_x V_x - \{x\}$. Then by excision, the splitting of the homology of X into the homology of its arc componenents, and Theorem VII.1.7 in algtop-notes.pdf we know that

$$H_j(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n - X) \cong H_j(U, U - X) \cong H_j(\cup_x V_x, \cup_x V_x - \{x\}) \cong \bigoplus_x H_j(V_x, V_x - \{x\}) \cong \mathbb{Z}^k \text{ or } 0$$

where the group is zero unless j = n, in which case it is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}^k . We can now recover the homology groups $\mathbb{R}^n - X$ from the long exact homology sequence for $(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n - X)$ and the fact that $H_j(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is \mathbb{Z} if j = 0 and zero otherwise.

Similar conclusions hold if U is obtained from \mathbb{R}^n (where $n \ge 3$) by deleting an infinite sequence of isolated points $\{\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2, \cdots\}$. The main difference in the argument is that the open disk V_k centered at \mathbf{p}_k must have a radius r_k such that for each $j \ne k$ we have $|\mathbf{p}_j - \mathbf{p}_k| > r_k$; we can always find such positive radii if we have a sequence of isolated points.

176