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# PARTIAL COLLAPSING AND THE SPECTRUM OF THE HODGE LAPLACIAN 

COLETTE ANNÉ AND JUNYA TAKAHASHI


#### Abstract

The goal of the present paper is to calculate the limit spectrum of the Hodge-de Rham operator under the perturbation of collapsing one part of a manifold obtained by gluing together two manifolds with the same boundary. It appears to take place in the general problem of blowing up conical singularities as introduced in Maz06] and Row06, Row08).
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## 1. INTRODUCTION

This work takes place in the general context of the spectral studies of singular perturbations of the metrics, as a manner to know what are the topological or metrical meanings carried by the spectrum of geometric operators. We can mention in this direction, without exhaustivity, studies on the adiabatic limit (MM90], Rum00]), on collapsing ([F87], [Lo02a, Lo02b]), on resolution blowups of conical singularities (Maz06], Row06, Row08]) and on shrinking handles (AC95, ACP07]).

The present study can be concidered as a generalization of the results of AT09 where we studied the limit of the spectrum of the Hodge deRham operator under collapsing of one part of a connected sum.


Figure 1. partial collapsing of $M_{\varepsilon}$

In our previous work we restricted the submanifold $\Sigma$, used to glue the two parts, to be a sphere. In fact this problem is quite related to resolution blowups of conical singularities: the point is to measure the influence of the topology of the part which disappear and of the conical singularity created at the limit of the 'big part'. If we look at the situation from the 'small part' we understand the importance of the quasi-asymptotically conical space obtained by rescalling the small part and adding an infinite cone.

When $\Sigma=\mathbb{S}^{n}$ the conical singularity is quite simple, and there is no semibounded states, called extended solutions in the sequel, on the quasi-asymptotically conical space, our result presented here takes care of this new possibilities and gives a general answer of the problem studied by Mazzeo and Rowlett. Indeed, in Maz06, Row06, Row08 it is suppposed that the spectrum of the operator on the quasi-asymptotically conical space does not meat 0 . Our study relax this hypothesis. It is done only with the Hodge-de Rham operator but can easily be generalised.

Let's fix some notations.
1.1. set up. Let $M_{1}$ and $M_{2}$ be two connected manifolds with the same boundary $\Sigma$, a compact manifold of dimension $n \geq 2$. We denote by $m=n+1$ the dimension of $M_{1}$ and $M_{2}$.

We endow $\Sigma$ with a fixed metric $h$.
Let $\overline{M_{1}}$ be the manifold with conical singularity obtained from $M_{1}$ by adding to $M_{1}$ a cone $\mathcal{C}=\left[0,1\left[\times \Sigma \ni(r, y)\right.\right.$ : there exists on $\overline{M_{1}}=M_{1} \cup \mathcal{C}$ a metric $\bar{g}_{1}$ which writes, on the smooth part $r>0$ of the cone as $d r^{2}+r^{2} h$.

We choose on $M_{2}$ a metric $g_{2}$ which is 'trumpet like', ie. $M_{2}$ is isomorphic near the boundary to $\left[0,1 / 2\left[\times \Sigma\right.\right.$ with the conical metric which writes $d s^{2}+(1-s)^{2} h$ if $s$ is the coordinate defining the boundary by $s=0$.

For any $\varepsilon, 0<\varepsilon<1$ we define

$$
\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon}=\{(r, y) \in \mathcal{C}, r>\varepsilon\} \quad \text { and } \quad M_{1}(\varepsilon)=M_{1} \cup \mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon} .
$$

The goal of the following calculus is to determine the limit spectrum of the Hodgede Rham operator acting on the differential forms of the riemannian manifold

$$
M_{\varepsilon}=M_{1}(\varepsilon) \cup_{\varepsilon . \Sigma} \varepsilon . M_{2}
$$

obtained by gluing together $M_{1}(\varepsilon)$ and $\left(M_{2}, \varepsilon^{2} g_{2}\right)$. We remark that, by construction, these two manifolds have isometric boundary and that the metric $g_{\varepsilon}$ obtained on $M_{\varepsilon}$ is smooth.
Remark 1. The common boundary $\Sigma$ of dimension $n$ has some topological obstructions. In fact, since $\Sigma$ is the boundary of oriented compact manifold $M_{1}$ (or $\left.M_{2}\right), \Sigma$ is oriented cobordant to zero. So, by Thom's cobordism theory, all of the Stiefel-Whitney and the Pontrjagin numbers vanish (cf. C. T. C. Wall [प60] or [MS74], §18, p.217). Futhermore, this condition is also sufficient, that is, the inverse does hold. Especially, it is impossible to take $\Sigma^{2 k}$ as the complex projective spaces $\mathbb{C P}^{k},(k \geq 1)$.
1.2. results. We can describe the limit spectrum as follows: it has two parts one comes from the big part, namely $\overline{M_{1}}$, and is exprimed by the spectrum of a good extension of the Hodge Laplacian on this manifold with conical singularities, This extension is self adjoint and comes from an extension of the Gauß-Bonnet operators. All these extensions are classified by subspaces $W$ of the total eigenspace corresponding to eigenvalues belonging to ] $-1 / 2,1 / 2$ [ of an operator $A$ acting on the boundary $\Sigma$, this point is developed below in Section 2.2. The other part comes from the collapsed part, namely $M_{2}$, where the limit Gauß-Bonnet operator is taken with boundary conditions of Atiyah-Patodi-Singer type, this point is developed below in Section 2.3. This operator, denoted $\mathcal{D}_{2}$ in the sequel, can also be seen on the quasi-asymptotically conical space $\widetilde{M}_{2}$ already mentionned, namely

$$
\widetilde{M_{2}}=M_{2} \cup([1, \infty[\times \Sigma) .
$$

with the metric $d r^{2}+r^{2} h$ on the conical part. Only the eigenvalue zero is concerned with this part. In fact the manifolds $M_{\varepsilon}$ has small eigenvalues, in the
difference with AT09, and the multiplicity of 0 at the limit correspond to the total eigenspace of these small, or null, eigenvalues. Thus, our main theorem, which asserts the convergence of the spectrum, has two components.

Proposition A. If the limit value $\lambda \neq 0$ then it belongs to the positive spectrum of the Hodge-de Rham operator $\Delta_{1, W}$ on $\overline{M_{1}}$, with

$$
W=\bigoplus_{\gamma \in]-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\lceil } \operatorname{Ker}(A-\gamma)
$$

Proposition B. The multiplicity of 0 in the limit spectrum is given by the sum

$$
\operatorname{dim} \operatorname{ker} \Delta_{1, W}+\operatorname{dim} \operatorname{ker} \mathcal{D}_{2}+i_{1 / 2}
$$

where $i_{1 / 2}$ denote the dimension of the vector space $\mathcal{I}_{1 / 2}$, see (4), of extented solutions $\omega$ on $\widetilde{M_{2}}$ introduced by Carron C01, such that $A \omega=(1 / 2) \omega$ on restriction to $r=1$.
1.3. comments. We choose a simple metric to make explicits computations. This fact is not a restriction, as already explained in AT09], because of the result of Dodziuk D82 which assure uniform control of the eigenvalues of geometric operators with regard to variations of the metric.
1.4. examples. We exhibit some examples which bear small positive eigenvalues of the Hodge Laplacian action on $p$-forms.

Let $W_{i}(i=1,2)$ be a connected oriented compact manifold of dimension $n_{i}$ with boundary $\Sigma_{i}(i=1,2)$, respectively. Then, we define a closed manifold $M$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
M:=W_{1} \times \Sigma_{2} \cup_{\Sigma_{1} \times \Sigma_{2}} \Sigma_{1} \times W_{2}=M_{1} \cup_{\Sigma} M_{2} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $M_{1}:=W_{1} \times \Sigma_{2}, M_{2}:=\Sigma_{1} \times W_{2}$ and $\Sigma:=\Sigma_{1} \times \Sigma_{2}$.
This example is considered as a higher dimensional analogue of a simple graph manifold $M_{3}$ of dimension 3:

$$
M^{3}:=\Sigma_{1}^{*} \times S^{1} \cup_{T^{2}} S^{1} \times \Sigma_{2}^{*}
$$

where $\Sigma_{i}^{*}(i=1,2)$ is a Riemann surface removed a disk respectively.
1.4.1. Blowup of complex surfaces. - We recall here an example exibited in AT09: a blow-up at a one point of the complex projective surface $\mathbb{C P}^{2}$. This manifold is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{C P}^{2} \sharp \mathbb{C P}^{2}$, where $\overline{\mathbb{C P}^{2}}$ is a reversed orientation of $\mathbb{C P}^{2}$.

Then, by our main theorem, there exists a Riemannian metric $g_{\varepsilon}$ on $\mathbb{C P}^{2} \sharp \overline{\mathbb{C P}^{2}}$ whose positive eigenvalues are close to those of $\mathbb{C P}^{2}$, as desired.

Next, we consider the blowup of a closed complex surface $(M, J)$ of real dimension 4, where $J$ is a complex structure.

If we blowup $(M, J)$ at one point $p \in M$, then the resulting manifold $\widehat{M}$ is also compact complex surface which is diffeomorphic to $M \sharp \overline{\mathbb{C P}^{2}}$, that is, the connected sum of $M$ and $\overline{\mathbb{C P}^{2}}$. Note that $M^{*}$ is not biholomorphic to $M \sharp \overline{\mathbb{P}}^{2}$.

Take any Riemannian metric $g_{1}$ on $M$ which is flat around a point $p$. Then, from Theorem C of AT09, we can construct a family of $C^{\infty}$ metrics $g_{\varepsilon}$ on $\widehat{M} \cong M \sharp \overline{\mathbb{C P}^{2}}$ such that the spectrum of the blowup manifold ( $\widehat{M}, g_{\varepsilon}$ ) is as closed as that of the original manifold $\left(M, g_{1}\right)$.

In particular, all the positive spectrum of $\left(\widehat{M}, g_{\varepsilon}\right)$ converge to those of $\left(M_{1}, g_{1}\right)$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. This is one expression of blow-down from $\left(\widehat{M}, g_{\varepsilon}\right)$ to $\left(M, g_{1}\right)$. Indeed, the collapsing part $\overline{\mathbb{C P}^{2}}$ containing an exceptional (-1)-curve $\overline{\mathbb{C P}^{1}}$ shrinks to a point.

Note that Perel'man P97 constructed a sequence of closed Riemannnian manifolds with positive Ricci curvature whose second Betti number is as large as desired. This example, roughly speaking, glued complex projective surfaces $\mathbb{C P}^{2}$ more and more, so the limit space is glued by infinity many complexe projective spaces which is no longer a manifold.

## 2. Gauss-Bonnet operator

On a riemannian manifold, the Gauß-Bonnet operator is defined as the operator $D=d+d^{*}$ acting on differential forms. It is symmetric and can have few closed extensions on manifolds with boundary or with conical singularities. We review these extensions on the cases involved in our study.
2.1. Gauß-Bonnet operator on $M_{\varepsilon}$. We recall that, on $M_{\varepsilon}$, a Gauß-Bonnet operator $D_{\varepsilon}$, Sobolev spaces and also a Hodge-de Rham operator $\Delta_{\varepsilon}$ can be defined by a general construction on any manifold $X=X_{1} \cup X_{2}$, which is the union of two riemannian manifolds with isometric boundaries (the details are given in AC95 ): if $D_{1}$ and $D_{2}$ are the Gauß-Bonnet " $d+d^{*}$ " operators acting on the differential forms of each part, the quadratric form $q(\varphi)=\int_{X_{1}}\left|D_{1}\left(\varphi_{\mid X_{1}}\right)\right|^{2}+$ $\int_{X_{2}}\left|D_{2}\left(\varphi_{\mid X_{2}}\right)\right|^{2}$ is well defined and closed on the domain

$$
\mathcal{D}(q)=\left\{\varphi=\left(\varphi_{1}, \varphi_{2}\right) \in H^{1}\left(\Lambda T^{*} X_{1}\right) \times H^{1}\left(\Lambda T^{*} X_{2}\right),\left(\varphi_{1}\right)_{\mid \partial X_{1}} \stackrel{L_{2}}{=}\left(\varphi_{2}\right)_{\mid \partial X_{2}}\right\}
$$

and on this space the total Gauß-Bonnet operator $D(\varphi)=\left(D_{1}\left(\varphi_{1}\right), D_{2}\left(\varphi_{2}\right)\right)$ is defined and selfadjoint. For this definition, we have, in particular, to identify $\left(\Lambda T^{*} X_{1}\right)_{\mid \partial X_{1}}$ and $\left(\Lambda T^{*} X_{2}\right)_{\mid \partial X_{2}}$. This can be done by decomposing the forms in tangential and normal part (with inner normal), the equality above means then that the tangential parts are equal and the normal part opposite. This definition generalizes the definition in the smooth case.

The Hodge-de Rham operator $\left(d+d^{*}\right)^{2}$ of $X$ is then defined as the operator obtained by the polarization of the quadratic form $q$. This gives compatibility conditions between $\varphi_{1}$ and $\varphi_{2}$ on the commun boundary. We don't give details
on these facts because our manifold is smooth. But we shall use this presentation for the quadratic form.
2.2. Gauß-Bonnet operator on $\overline{M_{1}}$. Let $D_{1, \min }$ be the closure of the GaußBonnet operator defined on the smooth forms with compact support in the smooth part $M_{1}(0)$. For any such form $\varphi_{1}$ we write on the cone

$$
\varphi_{1}=d r \wedge r^{-(n / 2-p+1)} \beta_{1, \varepsilon}+r^{-(n / 2-p)} \alpha_{1, \varepsilon}
$$

and define $\sigma_{1}=\left(\beta_{1}, \alpha_{1}\right)=U\left(\varphi_{1}\right)$. The operator has, on the cone, the expression

$$
U D_{1} U^{*}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
0 & 1 \\
-1 & 0
\end{array}\right)\left(\partial_{r}+\frac{1}{r} A\right) \text { with } A=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\frac{n}{2}-P & -D_{0} \\
-D_{0} & P-\frac{n}{2}
\end{array}\right)
$$

where $P$ is the operator of degree which multiplies by $p$ a $p$-form, and $D_{0}$ is the Gauß-Bonnet operator on the manifold $\Sigma$.

While the Hodge-de Rham operator has, in these coordinates, the expression

$$
\begin{equation*}
U \Delta_{1} U^{*}=-\partial_{r}^{2}+\frac{1}{r^{2}} A(A+1) . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The closed extensions of the operator $D_{1}=d+d^{*}$ on the manifold with conical singularities $\overline{M_{1}}$ has been studied in BS88 and [97] They are classified by the spectrum of its Mellin symbol, which is here the operator with parameter $A+z$.

Spectrum of $A$. - The spectrum of $A$ was calculated in Brüning and Seeley BS88, p.703. By their result, it holds that the spectrum of $A$ is given by the values

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma= \pm \frac{1}{2} \pm \sqrt{\mu^{2}+\left(\frac{n-1}{2}-p\right)^{2}} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mu^{2}$ runs over the spectrum of the Hodge-de Rham operator on ( $\Sigma, h$ ) acting on the coclosed $p$-forms.

Indeed, looking at the Gauß-Bonnet operator acting on even forms, they identify even forms on the cone with the sections $\left(\varphi_{0}, \ldots, \varphi_{n}\right)$ of the total bundle $T^{*}(\Sigma)$ by $\varphi_{0}+\varphi_{1} \wedge d r+\varphi_{2}+\varphi_{3} \wedge d r+\ldots$. These sections can as well represent odd forms on the cone by $\varphi_{0} \wedge d r+\varphi_{1}+\varphi_{2} \wedge d r+\varphi_{3}+\ldots$. With these identifications, they have to study the spectrum of the following operator acting on sections of $\Lambda T^{*}(\Sigma)$

$$
S_{0}=\left(\begin{array}{ccccc}
c_{0} & d_{0}^{*} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
d_{0} & c_{1} & d_{0}^{*} & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & d_{0} & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & c_{n-1} & d_{0}^{*} \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & d_{0} & c_{n}
\end{array}\right)
$$

if $c_{p}=(-1)^{p+1}\left(p-\frac{n}{2}\right)$. With the same identification, if we introduce the operator $\widetilde{S}_{0}$ having the same formula but with on the diagonal the terms $\widetilde{c_{p}}=(-1)^{p}(p-$ $\left.\frac{n}{2}\right)=-c_{p}$, the operator $A$ can be written

$$
A=-\left(S_{0} \oplus \widetilde{S}_{0}\right)
$$

The expression of the spectrum of $A$ in then a direct consequence of the computations of BS88.
Closed extensions of $D_{1}$. - If $\left.\operatorname{spec}(A) \cap\right]-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\left[\right.$ is empty then $D_{1, \max }=D_{1, \min }$. In particular, $D_{1}$ is essentially selfadjoint on the space of smooth forms with compact support away from the conical singularities.

Otherwise, the quotient $\operatorname{dom}\left(D_{1, \max }\right) / \operatorname{dom}\left(D_{1, \min }\right)$ is isomorphic to

$$
B:=\bigoplus_{\gamma \in]-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\lceil } \operatorname{Ker}(A-\gamma)
$$

More precisely, by Lemma 3.2 of BS88, there is a surjective linear map

$$
\mathcal{L}: \operatorname{dom}\left(D_{1, \max }\right) \rightarrow B
$$

with $\operatorname{ker} \mathcal{L}=\operatorname{dom}\left(D_{1, \min }\right)$. Furthermore, we have the estimate

$$
\left\|u(t)-t^{-A} \mathcal{L}(\varphi)\right\|_{\mathrm{L}^{2}(\Sigma)} \leq C(\varphi)|t \log t|^{1 / 2}
$$

for $\varphi \in \operatorname{dom}\left(D_{1, \max }\right)$ and $u=U(\varphi)$.
Now, to any subspace $W \subset B$, we can associate the operator $D_{1, W}$ with domain $\operatorname{dom}\left(D_{1, W}\right):=\mathcal{L}^{-1}(W)$. As a result of BS88], all closed extensions of $D_{1, \text { min }}$ are obtained by this way. Remark that each $D_{1, W}$ defines a selfadjoint extension $\Delta_{1, W}=\left(D_{1, W}\right)^{*} \circ D_{1, W}$ of the Hodge-de Rham operator, and, as a result, we have $\left(D_{1, W}\right)^{*}=D_{1, \mathbb{I}\left(W^{\perp}\right)}$, where

$$
\mathbb{I}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
0 & \text { id } \\
-\mathrm{id} & 0
\end{array}\right), \quad \text { ie., } \quad \mathbb{I}(\beta, \alpha)=(\alpha,-\beta)
$$

This extension is associated to the quadratic form $\varphi \mapsto\|D \varphi\|^{2}$ with domain $\operatorname{dom}\left(D_{1, W}\right)$.

Finally we recall the results of Lesch L97. The operators $D_{1, W}$, and in particular $D_{1, \min }$ and $D_{1, \max }$, are elliptic and satisfy the singular estimate (SE), see page 54 of [L97, so by proposition 1.4.6 and the compacity of $\overline{M_{1}}$ they satisfy the Rellich property: the inclusion of $\operatorname{dom}\left(D_{1, W}\right)$ in $L_{2}$ is compact.
2.3. Gauß-Bonnet operator on $M_{2}$. We know by the works of Carron [C01], following Attiyah-Patodi-Singer APS75], that the operator $D_{2}$ admits a closed extension $\mathcal{D}_{2}$ with domain defined by a global boundary condition

$$
\Pi_{\leq 1 / 2} \circ U=0
$$

if $\Pi_{I}$ is the spectral projector of $A$ relative to the interval $I$, and $\leq 1 / 2$ represents the interval ] $-\infty, 1 / 2$ ]. Moreover this extension is elliptic in the sens that the $H_{1}$
norm of elements of the domain is controled by the norm of the graph. Indeed this boundary condition is related to a problem on a complete non bounded manifold as follows:

Let $\widetilde{M}_{2}$ denote the large manifold obtained from $M_{2}$ by gluing a conical cylinder $\mathcal{C}_{1, \infty}=\left[1, \infty\left[\times \Sigma\right.\right.$ with metric $d r^{2}+r^{2} h$ and $\widetilde{D_{2}}$ its Gauß-Bonnet operator. A differential form on $M_{2}$ admits an harmonic $L_{2}$-extension on $\widetilde{M}_{2}$ precisely when the restriction on the boundary satisfies $\Pi_{\leq 1 / 2} \circ U=0$.

Indeed, these $L_{2}$ forms must satisfy $\left(\partial_{r}+\frac{1}{r} A\right) \sigma=0$ or, if we decompose the form along the eigenspaces of $A$ as $\sigma=\sum_{\gamma \in \operatorname{Spec}(A)} \sigma^{\gamma}$ then the equation imposes $\forall \gamma \in \operatorname{Spec}(A), \exists \sigma_{0}^{\gamma} \in \operatorname{ker}(A-\gamma)$ such that $\sigma^{\gamma}=r^{-\gamma} \sigma_{0}^{\gamma}$. This expression is in $L_{2}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1, \infty}\right)$ if and only if $\gamma>1 / 2$ or $\sigma_{0}^{\gamma}=0$.

It will be convenient to introduce the operator

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_{2} & : \Pi_{>\frac{1}{2}}\left(H^{1 / 2}(\Sigma)\right) \rightarrow L_{2}\left(\Lambda T^{*} \mathcal{C}_{1, \infty}\right) \\
\sigma & =\sum_{\gamma \in \operatorname{Spec}(A), \gamma>\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_{\gamma} \mapsto P_{2}(\sigma)=U^{*}\left(\sum_{\gamma \in \operatorname{Spec}(A), \gamma>\frac{1}{2}} r^{-\gamma} \sigma_{\gamma}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

This limit problem is of the category non parabolic at infinity in the terminology of Carron [C01], see particularly the theorem 2.1 there, then as a consequence of theorem 0.4 of the same paper we know that its kernel is finite dimensional.
Proposition 2. There exists a constant $C>0$ such that for each differential form $\varphi \in H^{1}\left(\Lambda T^{*} M_{2}\right)$ satisfying $\Pi_{\leq 1 / 2} \circ U(\varphi)=0$, then

$$
\|\varphi\|_{H^{1}} \leq C\left(\|\varphi\|_{L_{2}}+\left\|D_{2}(\varphi)\right\|_{L_{2}}\right)
$$

As a consequence, the kernel of $\mathcal{D}_{2}$, which is isomorphic to ker $\widetilde{D_{2}}$, is of finite dimension and can be sent in the total space $\sum_{p} H^{p}\left(M_{2}\right)$ of absolute cohomology.

A proof of this proposition can be obtain by the same way as proposition 5 in AT09.

Recall that Carron proved that a Dirac type operator on a manifold euclidean at infinity is non parabolic at infinity and it is still true for a manifold like $\widetilde{M}_{2}$, as a consequence of Theorem 2.2 of [C01]. For this type of operators Carron defined $L_{2}$ solutions which are in correspondance with the solutions of the elliptic operator of the proposition 2 , he defined also extended solutions which belong to the bigger space $\mathcal{W}$ which is defined as the closure of $C_{0}^{\infty}\left(\widetilde{M_{2}}\right)$ for the norm

$$
\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{W}}^{2}=\|\varphi\|_{L_{2}\left(M_{2}\right)}^{2}+\|D \varphi\|_{L_{2}\left(\widetilde{M_{2}}\right)}^{2} .
$$

An inequality of Hardy's type describe the growth at infinity of an extended solution.
Lemma 3. Let $v \in C_{0}^{\infty}(] e, \infty[)$ and $\lambda$ a real, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { if } \lambda \neq-1 / 2 \\
& \left(\lambda+\frac{1}{2}\right)^{2} \int \frac{v^{2}}{r^{2}} d r \leq \int \frac{1}{r^{2 \lambda}}\left(\partial_{r}\left(r^{\lambda} v\right)\right)^{2} d r \\
& \text { if } \lambda=-1 / 2 \quad \int \frac{v^{2}}{(r \log r)^{2} \log \log r} d r \quad \leq \int r\left(\partial_{r}\left(r^{-1 / 2} v\right)\right)^{2} d r \text {. }
\end{aligned}
$$

We remark now that, for $\varphi \in C_{0}^{\infty}\left(\widetilde{M_{2}}\right)$ with support on the infinite cone $r>e$ we can write

$$
\left\|D_{2} \varphi\right\|^{2}=\sum_{\lambda \in \operatorname{Spec}(A)} \int\left|\left(\partial_{r}+\frac{\lambda}{r} \sigma_{\lambda}\right)\right|^{2}=\sum_{\lambda \in \operatorname{Spec}(A)} \int \frac{1}{r^{2 \lambda}}\left|\partial_{r}\left(r^{\lambda}\right) \sigma_{\lambda}\right|^{2} d r
$$

Thus, by application of the lemma, we see that a solution of $\widetilde{D_{2}}$, which must be $\sigma_{\lambda}(r)=r^{-\lambda} \sigma_{\lambda}(1)$ on the infinite cone, and such that $\frac{1}{r} \varphi$ is $L_{2}$ satisfies

$$
\forall \lambda \leq \frac{-1}{2}, \quad \sigma_{\lambda}(1)=0
$$

while the $L_{2}$ solutions corresponds to the condition $\sigma_{\lambda}(1)=0 \quad \forall \lambda \leq \frac{1}{2}$. As a consequence, the extended solutions which are not $L_{2}$ correspond to boundary terms belonging to the total eigenspace related with eigenvalues of $A$ in the interval ] $-1 / 2,1 / 2]$. In the case studied in AT09 there was not such eigenvalues and we had not to take care of extended solutions.

Let denote, for $\gamma \in]-1 / 2,1 / 2]$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{I}_{\gamma}=\left\{\varphi, \widetilde{D_{2}} \varphi=0, \varphi(r=1) \in \operatorname{ker}(A-\gamma)\right\} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

the total space of extented solutions corresponding to the value $\gamma$ of the spectrum of $A$.
proof of the lemma 3 . Let $u \in C_{0}^{\infty}(] e, \infty[)$ and $\rho$ a positive function on the interval $] e, \infty[$. We calculate

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\int \frac{1}{r^{2 \lambda}}\left(\partial_{r}\left(r^{\lambda} \rho u\right)\right)^{2} d r= & \\
\qquad \begin{array}{ll} 
& \frac{1}{r^{2 \lambda}}\left(\rho^{\prime} r^{\lambda} u+\rho \partial_{r}\left(r^{\lambda} u\right)\right)^{2} d r= \\
& \int\left(\left(\rho^{\prime} u\right)^{2}+\frac{\rho^{2}}{r^{2 \lambda}}\left(\partial_{r}\left(r^{\lambda} u\right)\right)^{2}+\frac{\rho \rho^{\prime}}{r^{2 \lambda}} \partial_{r}\left(\left(r^{\lambda} u\right)^{2}\right)\right) d r
\end{array}
\end{array}
$$

integrating by part the last term, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int \frac{1}{r^{2 \lambda}}\left(\partial_{r}\left(r^{\lambda} \rho u\right)\right)^{2} d r= \\
& \qquad \begin{array}{ll}
\int\left(\frac{\rho^{2}}{r^{2 \lambda}}\left(\partial_{r}\left(r^{\lambda} u\right)\right)^{2}-\left(\rho \rho^{\prime \prime}-2 \lambda \frac{\rho \rho^{\prime}}{r}\right) u^{2}\right) d r \\
& \geq \int\left(\frac{2 \lambda \rho^{\prime}-r \rho^{\prime \prime}}{r \rho}(\rho u)^{2} d r\right)
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

We obtain finally the first result of the lemma by putting $\rho(r)=r^{\lambda+1 / 2}$ and $v=\rho u$.

The second one is obtained in the same way with $\lambda=-1 / 2$ and the choice of $\rho=\log \log r$.

## 3. A PRIORI ESTIMATES

A good method to evaluate what the limit problem should be is to suppose a priori that we have a normed family $\varphi_{\varepsilon}$ of eigenforms on $M_{\varepsilon}$ of degree $p$ for the Hodge-de Rham operator:

$$
\Delta_{\varepsilon} \varphi_{\varepsilon}=\lambda_{\varepsilon} \varphi_{\varepsilon} \text { with } \lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lambda_{\varepsilon}=\lambda<+\infty
$$

and to try to obtain all the consequences for the limit. Of course for the moment we are not sure that this family exists but the mini-max technics will assure this, and it will be the subject of the next section.
3.1. notations. As in ACP07 we use the following change of variables: with

$$
\varphi_{\varepsilon \mid M_{1}(\varepsilon)}=\varphi_{1, \varepsilon} \text { and } \varphi_{\varepsilon \mid M_{2}(1)}=\varepsilon^{p-m / 2} \varphi_{2, \varepsilon}
$$

we write on the cone

$$
\varphi_{1, \varepsilon}=d r \wedge r^{-(n / 2-p+1)} \beta_{1, \varepsilon}+r^{-(n / 2-p)} \alpha_{1, \varepsilon}
$$

and define $\sigma_{1}=\left(\beta_{1}, \alpha_{1}\right)=U\left(\varphi_{1}\right)$.
On the other part, it is more convenient to define $r=1-s$ for $s \in[0,1 / 2]$ and write $\varphi_{2, \varepsilon}=\left(d r \wedge r^{-(n / 2-p+1)} \beta_{2, \varepsilon}+r^{-(n / 2-p)} \alpha_{2, \varepsilon}\right)$ near the boundary. Then we can define, for $r \in[1 / 2,1]$ (the boundary of $M_{2}(1)$ corresponds to $r=1$ )

$$
\sigma_{2}(r)=\left(\beta_{2}(r), \alpha_{2}(r)\right)=U\left(\varphi_{2}\right)
$$

The $L_{2}$ norm, for a form supported on $M_{1}$ in the cone $\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon, 1}$, has the expression

$$
\|\varphi\|^{2}=\int_{M_{1}}\left|\sigma_{1}\right|^{2} d r \wedge d \mathrm{vol}_{\Sigma}+\int_{M_{2}}\left|\varphi_{2}\right|^{2} d \mathrm{vol}_{M_{2}}
$$

and the quadratic form on study is

$$
\begin{equation*}
q(\varphi)=\int_{M_{\varepsilon}}\left|\left(d+d^{*}\right) \varphi\right|^{2}=\int_{M_{1}(\varepsilon)}\left|U D_{1} U^{*}\left(\sigma_{1}\right)\right|^{2}+\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \int_{M_{2}(1)}\left|D_{2}\left(\varphi_{2}\right)\right|^{2} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

The compatibility condition is, for the quadratic form, $\varepsilon^{1 / 2} \alpha_{1}(\varepsilon)=\alpha_{2}(1)$ and $\varepsilon^{1 / 2} \beta_{1}=\beta_{2}(1)$ or

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{2}(1)=\varepsilon^{1 / 2} \sigma_{1}(\varepsilon) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

The compatibility condition for the Hodge-de Rham operator, of first order, is obtained by expressing that $D \varphi \sim\left(U D_{1} U^{*} \sigma_{1}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon} U D_{2} U^{*} \sigma_{2}\right)$ belongs to the domain of $D$. In terms of $\sigma$ it gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{2}^{\prime}(1)=\varepsilon^{3 / 2} \sigma_{1}^{\prime}(\varepsilon) \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

To understand the limit problem we proceed to several estimates.
3.2. on the regular part of $M_{1}$. Let $\xi_{1}$ be a cut-off function on $M_{1}$ around the conical singularity:

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \leq r \leq 1 / 2 \Rightarrow \xi_{1}(r)=1 \text { and } r \geq 1 \Rightarrow \xi_{1}(r)=0 \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 4. For our given family $\varphi_{\varepsilon}$ satisfying $\Delta\left(\varphi_{\varepsilon}\right)=\lambda_{\varepsilon} \varphi_{\varepsilon}$ with $\lambda_{\varepsilon}$ bounded, the family $\left(1-\xi_{1}\right) \cdot \varphi_{1, \varepsilon}$ is bounded in $H^{1}\left(M_{1}\right)$.

Then it remains to study $\xi_{1} \cdot \varphi_{1, \varepsilon}$ which can be expressed with the polar coordinates. We remark that the quadratic form of these forms is uniformly bounded.

- Expression of the quadratic form. For any $\varphi$ such that the componant $\varphi_{1}$ is supported in the cone $\mathcal{C}_{1, \varepsilon}$, one has, with $\sigma_{1}=U \varphi_{1}$ and by the same calculus as in ACP07:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon, 1}}\left|D_{1} \varphi\right|^{2} d \operatorname{vol}_{g_{\varepsilon}} & =\int_{\varepsilon}^{1}\left|\left(\partial_{r}+\frac{1}{r} A\right) \sigma_{1}\right|^{2} d r \\
& =\int_{\varepsilon}^{1}\left[\left|\sigma_{1}^{\prime}\right|^{2}+\frac{2}{r}\left\langle\sigma_{1}^{\prime}, A \sigma_{1}\right\rangle+\frac{1}{r^{2}}\left|A \sigma_{1}\right|^{2}\right] d r
\end{aligned}
$$

3.3. estimates of the boundary term. The expression above can be decomposed with respect to the eigenspaces of $A$; in the following calculus, we suppose that $\sigma_{1}(1)=0$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\varepsilon}^{1}\left[\left|\sigma_{1}^{\prime}\right|^{2}+\frac{2}{r}\left\langle\sigma_{1}^{\prime}, A \sigma_{1}\right\rangle+\frac{1}{r^{2}}\left|A \sigma_{1}\right|^{2}\right] d r= \\
& =\int_{\varepsilon}^{1}\left[\left|\sigma_{1}^{\prime}\right|^{2}+\partial_{r}\left(\frac{1}{r}\left\langle\sigma_{1}, A \sigma_{1}\right\rangle\right)+\frac{1}{r^{2}}\left(\left\langle\sigma_{1}, A \sigma_{r}\right\rangle+\left|A \sigma_{1}\right|^{2}\right)\right] d r \\
& \quad=\int_{\varepsilon}^{1}\left[\left|\sigma_{1}^{\prime}\right|^{2}+\frac{1}{r^{2}}\left\langle\sigma_{1},\left(A+A^{2}\right) \sigma_{1}\right\rangle\right] d r-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\left\langle\sigma_{1}(\varepsilon), A \sigma_{1}(\varepsilon)\right\rangle .
\end{aligned}
$$

This shows that a control of the quadratic form gives a control of the boundary term if the operator $A$ is negative but $\left(A+A^{2}\right)$ is non negative. This last condition is satisfied exactly on the orthogonal complement of the spectral space corresponding to the interval ] - $1,0\left[\right.$. Applied to $\xi_{1} \cdot \varphi_{1, \varepsilon}$ it gives the following lemma

Lemma 5. Let $\Pi_{\leq-1}$ be the spectral projector of the operator $A$ relative to the interval $]-\infty,-1]$. There exists a constant $C>0$ such that, for any $\varepsilon>0$

$$
\left\|\Pi_{\leq-1} \circ U\left(\varphi_{1, \varepsilon}(\varepsilon)\right)\right\|_{H^{1 / 2}(\Sigma)} \leq C \sqrt{\varepsilon}
$$

In view of Proposition 2, we want also a control of the components of $\sigma_{1}$ along the eigenvalues of $A$ in ] -1,1/2], these components are in finite number and we can work term by term. So we write, on $\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon, 1}$,

$$
\sigma_{1}(r)=\sum_{\gamma \in \operatorname{spec} A} \sigma_{1}^{\gamma}(r), A \sigma_{1}^{\gamma}(r)=\gamma \sigma_{1}^{\gamma}(r)
$$

and we suppose again $\sigma_{1}(1)=0$. We have

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left(\partial_{r}+\frac{1}{r} A\right) \sigma_{1}^{\gamma}=r^{-\gamma} \partial_{r}\left(r^{\gamma} \sigma\right)  \tag{9}\\
\left(\varepsilon^{\gamma} \sigma_{1}^{\gamma}(\varepsilon)\right)^{2}=\left(\int_{\varepsilon}^{1} \partial_{r}\left(r^{\gamma} \sigma_{1}^{\gamma}\right)\right)^{2} \leq \int_{\varepsilon}^{1} r^{2 \gamma} \int_{\varepsilon}^{1}\left|\partial_{r}\left(\sigma_{1}^{\gamma}\right)+\frac{\gamma}{r}\left(\sigma_{1}^{\gamma}\right)\right|^{2} \tag{10}
\end{gather*}
$$

then, if the quadratic form is bounded, there exists a constant $C>0$ such that

$$
\left(\sigma_{1}^{\gamma}(\varepsilon)\right)^{2} \leq\left\{\begin{array}{l}
C \varepsilon^{-2 \gamma} \frac{1-\varepsilon^{2 \gamma+1}}{2 \gamma+1} \text { if } \gamma \neq-1 / 2  \tag{11}\\
C \varepsilon|\log \varepsilon| \text { if } \gamma=-1 / 2
\end{array}\right.
$$

This gives
Lemma 6. Let $\Pi_{I}$ be the spectral projector of the operator $A$ relative to the interval $I$. There exist constants $\alpha, C>0$ such that, for any $\varepsilon>0$

$$
\left\|\Pi_{-1,0[ } \circ U\left(\varphi_{1, \varepsilon}(\varepsilon)\right)\right\|_{H^{1 / 2}(\Sigma)} \leq C \varepsilon^{\alpha} .
$$

If $0<\alpha<1 / 2$ is such that $-\alpha$ is bigger than any negative eigenvalue of $A$. The estimate above gives also

Lemma 7. With the same notation, there exist constants $\beta, C>0$ such that, for any $\varepsilon>0$

$$
\left\|\Pi_{[0,1 / 2[ } \circ U\left(\varphi_{2, \varepsilon}(1)\right)\right\|_{H^{1 / 2}(\Sigma)} \leq C \varepsilon^{\beta} .
$$

If $1 / 2-\beta$ is the biggest non negative eigenvalue of $A$ strictly smaller than $1 / 2$ (if there is no such eigenvalue we put $\beta=1 / 2$ ).

Finally we study $\sigma_{1}^{1 / 2}$ for our family of forms (the parameter $\varepsilon$ is omited in the notation). It satisfies, for $\varepsilon<r<1 / 2$, the equation

$$
\left(-\partial_{r}^{2}+\frac{3}{4 r^{2}}\right) \sigma_{1}^{1 / 2}=\lambda_{\varepsilon} \sigma_{1}^{1 / 2}
$$

The solutions of this equation have expression in term of Bessel functions: there exist entire functions F , G with $F(0)=G(0)=1$ and differential forms in $\operatorname{ker}(A-1 / 2) c_{\varepsilon}, d_{\varepsilon}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{1}^{1 / 2}(r)=c_{\varepsilon} r^{3 / 2} F\left(\lambda_{\varepsilon} r^{2}\right)+d_{\varepsilon}\left(r^{-1 / 2} G\left(\lambda_{\varepsilon} r^{2}\right)+\frac{2}{\pi} \log (r) r^{3 / 2} F\left(\lambda_{\varepsilon} r^{2}\right)\right) \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

The fact that the $L_{2}$ norm is bounded gives that $c_{\varepsilon}^{2}+|\log \varepsilon| d_{\varepsilon}^{2}$ is bounded and finally, reporting this estimate in the expression above, that

$$
\left\|\sigma_{1}^{1 / 2}(\varepsilon)\right\|_{H^{1 / 2}(\Sigma)}=O\left((\varepsilon|\log \varepsilon|)^{-1 / 2}\right)
$$

This gives on the other part
Lemma 8. There exists a constant $C>0$ such that, for any $\varepsilon>0$

$$
\left\|\Pi_{\{1 / 2\}} \circ U\left(\varphi_{2, \varepsilon}\right)(1)\right\|_{H^{1 / 2}(\Sigma)} \leq C \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\log \varepsilon|}}
$$

## 4. PROOF OF THE SPECTRAL CONVERGENCE

The previous estimates shows that $\Pi_{\leq 1 / 2} \circ U\left(\varphi_{2, \varepsilon}\right)(1)$ goes to zero with $\varepsilon$ and that the limit would satisfy the good APS-boundary conditions ; on the other hand there is no restriction for the boundary term of $U\left(\varphi_{1, \varepsilon}\right)(\varepsilon)$ and finally the control on $\Pi_{\{1 / 2\}} \circ U\left(\varphi_{2, \varepsilon}\right)(1)$ does not permit to admit that this term will disappear.

Its suggests that we have to introduce for the limit problem, as Hilbert space

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{H}_{\infty}=L_{2}\left(\overline{M_{1}}\right) \oplus \operatorname{ker} \widetilde{D_{2}} \oplus \operatorname{ker}\left(A-\frac{1}{2}\right) . \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

with the limit operator $\Delta_{1, W} \oplus 0 \oplus 0$ with $W$ defined as in Proposition A. acting on this space. Let's denote by $\lambda_{N}, N \geq 1$ its spectrum and also let's $\lambda_{N}(\varepsilon), N \geq 1$ be the total spectrum of the Hodge Laplacian on $M_{\varepsilon}$.
4.1. upper bound : $\lim \sup \lambda_{N}(\varepsilon) \leq \lambda_{N}$. With the minimax formula, which says that

$$
\lambda_{N}(\varepsilon)=\inf _{\substack{E \subset \operatorname{dom}\left(D_{\varepsilon}\right) \\ \operatorname{dim} E=N}}\left(\operatorname{Sup}_{\substack{\varphi \in E \\\|\varphi\|=1}} \int_{M_{\varepsilon}}\left|D_{\varepsilon} \varphi\right|^{2}\right)
$$

we have to describe how transplanting eigenforms of the limit problem on $M_{\varepsilon}$.
We describe this transplantation term by term. For the first we use the same ideas as in ACP07].

Any eigenform $\varphi$ of $\Delta_{1, W}$ can be written, as any element of $\operatorname{dom}\left(D_{1, \max }\right)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi & =\varphi_{0}+\bar{\varphi} \\
\varphi_{0} \in \operatorname{dom}\left(D_{1, \min }\right) \quad \text { and } \quad U(\bar{\varphi}) & = \begin{cases}0 & \text { for } r \geq 1 \\
\sum_{\gamma \in]-1 / 2,1 / 2[\cap \operatorname{spec}(A)} d_{\gamma} r^{-\gamma} \sigma_{\gamma} & \text { for } r \leq \frac{1}{2}\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

with $\sigma_{\gamma} \in \operatorname{Ker}(A-\gamma)$ and $d_{\gamma} \in \mathbb{R}$. (This fact is a consequence of the expression of the Bessel functions, it is the same calculus as in (21).) By definition of $D_{1, \min }, \varphi_{0}$ can be approached, with the operator norm, by a sequence of smooth forms with compact support in $M_{1}(0)$. On the other hand, $\bar{\varphi}$ is a finite sum, it is sufficient to prolongate each $r^{-\gamma} \sigma_{\gamma}$ on $M_{2}$, the good candidate is

$$
\psi_{\gamma}=U^{*}\left(\chi \cdot \varepsilon^{1 / 2-\gamma} r^{-\gamma} \sigma_{\gamma}\right)
$$

for $\chi$ a cut-off function supported on $] 1 / 2,3 / 2[$ and equal to 1 on a neighbourhood of 1 (for instance $\chi=1-\xi_{1}$ ).

Indeed one has

$$
\left\|\psi_{\gamma}\right\|_{L_{2}\left(M_{2}\right)}+\left\|D_{2}\left(\psi_{\gamma}\right)\right\|_{L_{2}\left(M_{2}\right)}=O\left(\varepsilon^{1 / 2-\gamma}\right) .
$$

For the two last ones, we shrink the infinite cone on $M_{1}$ and cut with the function $\xi_{1}$, already defined in (8).

Let's define

$$
\begin{align*}
P_{\varepsilon} & : \Pi_{>\frac{1}{2}}\left(H^{1 / 2}(\Sigma)\right) \rightarrow H^{1}\left(\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon, 1}\right)  \tag{14}\\
\sigma & =\sum_{\gamma \in \operatorname{Spec}(A), \gamma>\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_{\gamma} \mapsto P_{\varepsilon}(\sigma)=U^{*}\left(\sum_{\gamma \in \operatorname{Spec}(A), \gamma>\frac{1}{2}} \varepsilon^{\gamma-1 / 2} r^{-\gamma} \sigma_{\gamma}\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

We remark that $P_{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$ is the transplanted on $M_{1}$ of $P_{2}(\sigma)$ then there exists a constant $C$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|P_{2}(\sigma)\right\|_{L_{2}\left(\mathcal{C}_{1,1 / \varepsilon}\right)}^{2}=\left\|P_{\varepsilon}(\sigma)\right\|_{L_{2}\left(\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon, 1}\right)}^{2} \leq C \sum\left|\sigma_{\gamma}\right|^{2}=C\left\|\Pi_{>\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_{2}(1)\right\|_{L_{2}(\Sigma)}^{2} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

and also that, if $\psi_{2} \in \operatorname{Dom} \mathcal{D}_{2}$, then $\left(\xi_{1} P_{\varepsilon}\left(U\left(\psi_{2}\right)_{\mid \Sigma}\right), \psi_{2}\right)$ defines an element of $H^{1}\left(M_{\varepsilon}\right)$.

Finally, if $\operatorname{ker}(A-1 / 2)$ is not empty, for each $\bar{\sigma}^{1 / 2} \in \operatorname{ker}(A-1 / 2)$ non zero one can construct a pseudomode as follows

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi_{\varepsilon}=\left(\xi_{1} \cdot(|\log \varepsilon| r)^{-1 / 2} U^{*}\left(\bar{\sigma}^{1 / 2}\right),|\log \varepsilon|^{-1 / 2} \psi_{2}\right) \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\psi_{2}$ is the element of ker $D_{2}$ on $M_{2}$ with boundary value $\bar{\sigma}^{1 / 2}$. The $L_{2}$ norm of this element is bounded from above and below, and

$$
\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}\left\|\psi_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{L_{2}\left(M_{\varepsilon}\right)}=\left\|\bar{\sigma}^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{2}(\Sigma)}
$$

Moreover it satisfies $q\left(\psi_{\varepsilon}\right)=O\left(|\log \varepsilon|^{-1}\right)$ giving then a 'small eigenvalue', as well as the elements of $\operatorname{ker} \mathcal{D}_{2}$ and of $\operatorname{ker} \Delta_{W}$.

To conclude it suffises to verify that this transplanted forms have a RayleighRitz quotient comparable to the initial one and that the orthogonality is fast concerved by transplantation.
4.2. lower bound $: \lim \inf \lambda_{N}(\varepsilon) \geq \lambda_{N}$. We first proceed for one indice. We know, by the paragraph 4.1, that for each $N$, the family $\left(\lambda_{N}(\varepsilon), \varepsilon>0\right)$ is bounded, let

$$
\lambda=\lim \inf \lambda_{N}(\varepsilon)
$$

There exists a sequence $\varepsilon_{m}, m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{N}\left(\varepsilon_{m}\right)=\lambda$. We shall apply the previous calculus to this family.
4.2.1. on the side of $M_{2}$. Let $\chi$ be a cut-off function supported in [3/4, 1 [ equal to 1 on $\left[7 / 8,1\left[\right.\right.$ and $\sigma_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}=U\left(\varphi_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}\right)$. We construct the family

$$
\psi_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}=\varphi_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}-U^{*}\left(\Pi_{\leq \frac{1}{2}}\left(\chi \sigma_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}\right)\right)
$$

which belongs to the domain of $\mathcal{D}_{2}$, and then, by ellipticity of this operator
claim 1. The family $\psi_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}$ is bounded in $H^{1}\left(M_{2}\right)$, and as a consequence $\Pi_{>\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_{2}(1)$ is bounded in $H^{1 / 2}(\Sigma)$.
Moreover, its proximity with $\varphi_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}$ is controled:
claim 2. They satisfy $\lim _{\varepsilon_{m} \rightarrow 0}\left\|\psi_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}-\varphi_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}\right\|=0$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{\varepsilon_{m} \rightarrow 0}\left\|D_{2}\left(\psi_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}-\varphi_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}\right)\right\|=O\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon_{m}}\right) . \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\psi_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}-\varphi_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}\right\|^{2} \leq \int_{3 / 4}^{1}\left|\Pi_{\leq \frac{1}{2}} \sigma_{2}(r)\right|^{2} d r=\int_{3 / 4}^{1}\left(\left|\Pi_{\leq-1} \sigma_{2}(r)\right|^{2}+\left|\Pi_{]-1, \frac{1}{2}} \sigma_{2}(r)\right|^{2}\right) d r \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

The first term is controled as follows: because of the expression (5) of the quadratic form, we know that

$$
\int_{\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon_{m}, 1}}\left|\left(\partial_{r}+\frac{A}{r}\right) \Pi_{\leq-1} \sigma_{1}\right|^{2}+\frac{1}{\varepsilon_{m}^{2}} \int_{R}^{1}\left|\left(\partial_{r}+\frac{A}{r}\right) \Pi_{\leq-1} \sigma_{2}\right|^{2}
$$

is bounded, independently on $R \geq 3 / 4$, let $\Lambda$ be a bound. Developping and making an integration by parts gives, for any $\kappa_{2}$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{R}^{1}\left|\left(\partial_{r}+\frac{A}{r}\right) \kappa_{2}\right|^{2}= \\
& \int_{R}^{1}\left[\left|\kappa_{2}^{\prime}\right|^{2}+\frac{1}{r^{2}}\left\langle\kappa_{2},\left(A+A^{2}\right) \kappa_{2}\right\rangle\right] d r+\left\langle\kappa_{2}(1), A \kappa_{2}(1)\right\rangle-\left\langle\kappa_{2}(R), A \kappa_{2}(R)\right\rangle \tag{19}
\end{align*}
$$

We can make the same calculus on the cone $\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon_{m}, 1}$ so the boundary term at $R=1$ is absorbed. If we apply this control to $\kappa_{2}=\Pi_{\leq-1} \sigma_{2}$ for which $A(A+1)$ and $(-A)$ are non negative we obtain that

$$
\int_{R}^{1}\left|\Pi_{\leq-1} \sigma_{2}^{\prime}(t)\right|^{2}+\left\|\Pi_{\leq-1} \sigma_{2}^{\prime}(R)\right\|^{2}=O\left(\varepsilon_{m}^{2}\right)
$$

The second term in (18) is in fact the sum of few terms, we can control each of them as follows. let $\gamma$ be an eigenvalue of $A$ contained in the interval ] $-1, \frac{1}{2}$ ] and $\sigma_{2}{ }^{\gamma}$ the component of $\sigma_{2}$ along this eigenspace. We know that $\int_{R}^{1}\left|r^{-\gamma} \partial_{r}\left(r^{\gamma} \sigma_{2}^{\gamma}\right)\right|^{2}=O\left(\varepsilon_{m}{ }^{2}\right)$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|R^{\gamma} \sigma_{2}^{\gamma}(R)\right|^{2}=-2 \int_{R}^{1}\left\langle\partial_{r}\left(r^{\gamma}{\sigma_{2}}^{\gamma}(t)\right), r^{\gamma} \sigma_{2}{ }^{\gamma}(t)\right\rangle d t+\left|\sigma_{2}^{\gamma}(1)\right|^{2} \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

But, as a consequence of lemma 5. 6 and , one has $\left\|\sigma_{2}{ }^{\gamma}(1)\right\|^{2}=O\left(1 /\left|\log \left(\varepsilon_{m}\right)\right|\right)$, on the other hand, using the inequality of Cauchy-Schwarz, the fact that the $L_{2^{-}}$ norm of $\varphi_{\varepsilon_{m}}$ is 1 and the fact just recalled we have that

$$
\left|\sigma_{2}^{\gamma}(R)\right|^{2}=O\left(1 /\left|\log \left(\varepsilon_{m}\right)\right|\right)
$$

For the second part of the assertion, notice that

$$
D_{2}\left(\varphi_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}-\psi_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}\right)=D_{2} U^{*}\left(\Pi_{\leq \frac{1}{2}}\left(\chi \sigma_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}\right)\right)=\chi^{\prime} U^{*} \Pi_{\leq \frac{1}{2}}\left(\sigma_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}\right)+\chi D_{2} U^{*} \Pi_{\leq \frac{1}{2}}\left(\sigma_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}\right)
$$

and the norm of the first term is controled by $\int_{3 / 4}^{1}\left|\Pi_{\leq \frac{1}{2}} \sigma_{2}(r)\right|^{2} d r$ which is $O\left(1 /\left|\log \left(\varepsilon_{m}\right)\right|\right)$ by the previous estimate, and the norm of the second term, by $\left\|D_{2}\left(\varphi_{2}\right)\right\|$ which is $O\left(\varepsilon_{m}\right)$ because $q_{\varepsilon_{m}}\left(\varphi_{\varepsilon_{m}}\right)$ is uniformly bounded (remark that $D_{2}$ preserves the orthogonal decomposition following $\Pi_{\leq \frac{1}{2}}$ and $\Pi_{>\frac{1}{2}}$ on the cone).
Proposition 9. There exists a subfamily of the family $\varphi_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}$ which converges, as $m \rightarrow \infty$ to a bounded form $\varphi_{2}$ on $M_{2}$ which satisfies

$$
\varphi_{2} \in \operatorname{dom} \mathcal{D}_{2},\left\|\varphi_{2}\right\| \leq 1 \text { and } D_{2}\left(\varphi_{2}\right)=0
$$

Proof. Indeed, we know by the claim 1 that we can extract from the family $\psi_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}$ a subfamily which converge in $L_{2}$-norm and weakly in $H^{1}\left(M_{2}\right)$, denote $\varphi_{2}$ the limit. We know by the claim 2 that the corresponding subfamily of $\varphi_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}$ has the same limit and also that $\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty}\left\|D_{2}\left(\psi_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}\right)\right\|=0$ because this is true for $\varphi_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}$, the conclusion follows.
4.2.2. on the side of $M_{1}$. We first recall the better prolongation of $\Pi_{>\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_{2}(1)$ on $M_{1}\left(\varepsilon_{m}\right)$ given by $P_{\varepsilon}$ in (14) so that if $\psi_{2} \in \operatorname{Dom\mathcal {D}_{2}}$ and with the same cut-off function $\xi_{1}$, which has value 1 for $0 \leq r \leq 1 / 2$ and 0 for $r \geq 1,\left(\xi_{1} P_{\varepsilon_{m}}\left(U\left(\psi_{2}\right)_{\mid \Sigma}\right), \psi_{2}\right)$ defines an element of $H^{1}\left(M_{\varepsilon_{m}}\right)$. Let

$$
\tilde{\psi}_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}:=\xi_{1} P_{\varepsilon_{m}}\left(U\left(\psi_{2, \varepsilon_{m}}\right)_{\mid \Sigma}\right)
$$

Corollary 10. By uniform continuity of $P_{\varepsilon_{m}}$, and the convergence property of the last proposition

$$
\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty}\left\|\tilde{\psi}_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}-\xi_{1} P_{\varepsilon_{m}}\left(U\left(\varphi_{2}\right)_{\mid \Sigma}\right)\right\|_{L_{2}\left(M_{1}\right)}=0
$$

On the other hand $\xi_{1} P_{\varepsilon_{m}}\left(U\left(\varphi_{2}\right)_{\mid \Sigma}\right)$ converge weakly to 0 on the open manifold $M_{1}(0)$, more precisely, for any fixed $\eta, 0<\eta<1$

$$
\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty}\left\|\xi_{1} P_{\varepsilon_{m}}\left(U\left(\varphi_{2}\right)_{\mid \Sigma}\right)\right\|_{L_{2}\left(M_{1}(\eta)\right)}=0 .
$$

We now decompose $\varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}$ near the singularity as follows. Let

$$
\xi_{1} \varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}=\xi_{1}\left(\varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{\leq-1 / 2}+\varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{l-1 / 2,1 / 2]}+\varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{>1 / 2}\right)
$$

according to the decomposition, on the cone, of $\sigma_{1}$ along the eigenvalues of $A$ respectively less than $-1 / 2$, in ] $-1 / 2,1 / 2$ ] and larger than $1 / 2$.

We remark first that $\tilde{\psi}_{1}$ and $\varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{>1 / 2}$ have the same values on the boundary so the difference $\xi_{1} \varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{>1 / 2}-\tilde{\psi}_{1}$ can be viewed in $H^{1}\left(M_{1}\right)$ by a prolongation by 0 on the complementary of the cone, while the boundary value of $\varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{\leq-1 / 2}$ is small. We introduce for this term the cut-off function taken in ACP07]

$$
\xi_{\varepsilon_{m}}(r)= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } r \geq 2 \sqrt{\varepsilon_{m}} \\ \frac{\log \left(2 \varepsilon_{m}\right)-\log r}{\log \left(\sqrt{\varepsilon_{m}}\right)} & \text { if } r \in\left[2 \varepsilon_{m}, 2 \sqrt{\varepsilon_{m}}\right] \\ 0 & \text { if } r \leq 2 \varepsilon_{m}\end{cases}
$$

claim 3. $\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty}\left\|\left(1-\xi_{\varepsilon_{m}}\right) \xi_{1} \varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{\leq-1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{2}}=0$.
This is a consequence of the estimate of the Lemma 5 and 6: we remark that by the same argument we obtain also $\left\|\xi_{1} \varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{\leq-1 / 2}(r)\right\|_{H^{1 / 2}(\Sigma)} \leq C r^{1 / 2}$ so

$$
\left\|\left(1-\xi_{\varepsilon_{m}}\right) \xi_{1} \varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{\leq-1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{2}}=O\left(\varepsilon_{m}^{1 / 4}\right)
$$

claim 4. If we write, with evident notations,

$$
\varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{]-1 / 2,1 / 2]}=\sum_{\gamma \in]-1 / 2,1 / 2]} U^{*} \sigma_{1}^{\gamma}(r)=\varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{]-1 / 2,1 / 2[ }+U^{*} \sigma_{1}^{1 / 2}(r)
$$

$\sigma_{1}^{1 / 2}$ has the expression given in (1g) and then can be decomposed on $\sigma_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{1 / 2}=$ $\sigma_{0, \varepsilon_{m}}^{1 / 2}+\bar{\sigma}_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{1 / 2}$ where $\sigma_{0, \varepsilon_{m}}^{1 / 2}=c_{\varepsilon_{m}} r^{3 / 2} F\left(\lambda_{\varepsilon_{m}} r^{2}\right)$ belongs to $\operatorname{dom}\left(D_{1, \min }\right)$ and the family $c_{\varepsilon_{m}}$ is bounded. One can extract subsequences such that $\varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{]-1 / 2,1 / 2[ }$ and $U^{*}\left(\sigma_{0}^{1 / 2}\right)$ converge in $L_{2}$-norm while $\bar{\sigma}_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{1 / 2}$ is asymptotically equivalent to

$$
\bar{\sigma}_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{1 / 2} \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\left|\log \varepsilon_{m}\right|}} r^{-1 / 2} \bar{\sigma}_{1 / 2} \text { for some } \bar{\sigma}_{1 / 2} \in \operatorname{ker}(A-1 / 2)
$$

Thuse $U^{*} \sigma_{1 / 2}$ converge on each $M_{1}(\eta)$ to the same limit as $U^{*}\left(\sigma_{0, \varepsilon_{m}}^{1 / 2}\right)$, ie. $\bar{\sigma}_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{1 / 2}$ concentrate on the singularity .

Indeed, for each eigenvalue $\gamma \in]-1 / 2,1 / 2\left[\right.$ of $A$ the vector $\sigma_{\gamma}(r)$ satisfies the equation $\left(-\partial_{r}^{2}+\frac{\gamma(1+\gamma)}{r^{2}}\right) \sigma_{\gamma}=\lambda_{\varepsilon_{m}} \sigma_{\gamma}$ and it can be writen as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{\gamma}(r)=c_{\varepsilon_{m}} r^{\gamma+1} F\left(\lambda_{\varepsilon_{m}} r^{2}\right)+d_{\varepsilon_{m}}\left(r^{-\gamma} G\left(\lambda_{\varepsilon_{m}} r^{2}\right)\right) \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

if $\gamma \neq 1 / 2$, while the expression for $\gamma=1 / 2$ has been given in (12). Then, $\varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{]-1 / 2,1 / 2[ }$ belongs in the domain of $D_{1, \max }$, so, as a consequence of the Rellich property, we can extract subsequences which converge in $L_{2}$. While, as already mentionned for $\gamma=1 / 2$ the expression $c_{\varepsilon_{m}}^{2}+\left|\log \varepsilon_{m}\right| d_{\varepsilon_{m}}^{2}$ is bounded so $\lim d_{\varepsilon_{m}}=0$ and we can extract from $c_{\varepsilon_{m}}, \sqrt{\left|\log \varepsilon_{m}\right|} d_{\varepsilon_{m}}$ convergent subsequences. We define then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{\sigma}_{1}^{1 / 2}=\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{\left|\log \varepsilon_{m}\right|} d_{\varepsilon_{m}} \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proposition 11. The forms $\psi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}=\left(1-\xi_{1}\right) \varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}+\left(\xi_{1} \varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{>1 / 2}-\tilde{\psi}_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}\right)+\xi_{\varepsilon_{m}} \xi_{1} \varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{\leq-1 / 2}+$ $\xi_{1} U^{*}\left(\sigma_{0, \varepsilon_{m}}^{1 / 2}\right)$ belong to $\operatorname{dom}\left(D_{1, \min }\right)$ and define a bounded family.

Proof. We will show that each term is bounded. For the last one, it was already mentionned in claim 4. For the first one it is already done in Lemma *. For the
second one, we remark that

$$
\begin{align*}
& f_{\varepsilon_{m}}:=\left(\partial_{r}+\frac{A}{r}\right)\left(\xi_{1} \varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{>1 / 2}-\tilde{\psi}_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}\right)= \\
& \quad \xi_{1}\left(\partial_{r}+\frac{A}{r}\right)\left(\varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{>1 / 2}\right)+\partial_{r}\left(\xi_{1}\right)\left(\varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{>1 / 2}-P_{\varepsilon_{m}}\left(\psi_{2, \varepsilon_{m} \mid \Sigma}\right)\right) \tag{23}
\end{align*}
$$

is uniformly bounded in $L_{2}\left(M_{1}\right)$ because of (15). This estimate (15) shows also that the $L_{2}$-norm of $\left(\varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{>1 / 2}-\tilde{\psi}_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}\right)$ is bounded.
For the third one we use the estimate due to the expression of the quadratic form. Expriming that $\int_{\mathcal{C}_{r, 1}}\left|D_{1}\left(\xi_{1} \varphi^{\leq-1 / 2}\right)\right|^{2}$ is bounded by $\Lambda$ gives that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle\sigma_{1}^{\leq-1 / 2}(r), \sigma_{1}^{\leq-1 / 2}(r)\right\rangle \leq \Lambda r|\log r| \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

by the same argument as used for the lemma 5 and 6. Now

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|D_{1}\left(\xi_{\varepsilon_{m}} \xi_{1} \varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{\leq-1 / 2}\right)\right\| \leq\left\|\xi_{\varepsilon_{m}} D_{1}\left(\xi_{1} \varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{\leq-1 / 2}\right)\right\| & +\left\|\left|d \xi_{\varepsilon_{m}}\right| \xi_{1} \varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{\leq-1 / 2}\right\| \\
& \leq\left\|D_{1}\left(\xi_{1} \varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{\leq-1 / 2}\right)\right\|+\left\|\left|d \xi_{\varepsilon_{m}}\right| \xi_{1} \varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{\leq-1 / 2}\right\|
\end{aligned}
$$

the first term is bounded and, with $|A| \geq 1 / 2$ for this term, and the estimate (24), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|\left|d \xi_{\varepsilon_{m}}\right| \xi_{1} \varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{\leq-1 / 2}\right\|^{2} & \leq \frac{4 \Lambda}{\log ^{2} \varepsilon_{m}} \int_{\varepsilon_{m}}^{\sqrt{\varepsilon_{m}}} \frac{\log (r)}{r} d r \\
& \leq \frac{3 \Lambda}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

This complete the proof.
In fact the decomposition used here is almost orthogonal:
Lemma 12. There exists $\beta>0$ such that

$$
<\left(\varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{>1 / 2}-\tilde{\psi}_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}\right), \tilde{\psi}_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}>=O\left(\varepsilon_{m}{ }^{\beta}\right) .
$$

proof of lemma 12. - If we decompose the terms under the eigenspaces of $A$ we see that only the eigenvalues in $] 1 / 2,+\infty\left[\right.$ are involved and, with $f_{\varepsilon_{m}}=$ $\sum_{\gamma>1 / 2} f^{\gamma}$ and $\left(\varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{>1 / 2}-\tilde{\psi}_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}\right)=\sum_{\gamma>1 / 2} \varphi_{0}^{\gamma}$, the equation (23) and the fact that $\left(\varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{>1 / 2}-\tilde{\psi}_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}\right)\left(\varepsilon_{m}\right)=0$ give

$$
\varphi_{0}^{\gamma}(r)=r^{-\gamma} \int_{\varepsilon_{m}}^{r} \rho^{\gamma} f^{\gamma}(\rho) d \rho .
$$

Then for each eigenvalue $\gamma>1 / 2$ of $A$

$$
\begin{aligned}
<\left(\varphi_{0}^{\gamma}, \tilde{\psi}_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{\gamma}>=\right. & \varepsilon_{m}^{\gamma-1 / 2} \int_{\varepsilon_{m}}^{1} r^{-2 \gamma} \int_{\varepsilon_{m}}^{r} \rho^{\gamma}<\sigma_{\gamma}, f^{\gamma}(\rho)>_{L_{2}(\Sigma)} d \rho \\
= & \varepsilon_{m}^{\gamma-1 / 2} \int_{\varepsilon_{m}}^{1} \frac{r^{-2 \gamma+1}}{2 \gamma-1} r^{\gamma}<\sigma_{\gamma}, f^{\gamma}(r)>_{L_{2}(\Sigma)} d r+ \\
& \frac{\varepsilon_{m}{ }^{\gamma-1 / 2}}{2 \gamma-1} \int_{\varepsilon_{m}}^{1} \rho^{\gamma}<\sigma_{\gamma}, f^{\gamma}(\rho)>_{L_{2}(\Sigma)} d \rho
\end{aligned}
$$

Thuse, if $\gamma>3 / 2$ we have the majoration

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\lvert\,<\left(\varphi_{0}^{\gamma}, \tilde{\psi}_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{\gamma}>\left|\leq \varepsilon_{m}{ }^{\gamma-1 / 2} \int_{\varepsilon_{m}}^{1} \frac{r^{-\gamma+1}}{2 \gamma-1}\right|<\sigma_{\gamma}, f^{\gamma}(r)>_{L_{2}\left(\mathbb{S}^{n}\right)} \mid d r+\right.\right. \\
& \frac{\varepsilon_{m}^{\gamma-1 / 2}}{(2 \gamma-1) \sqrt{2 \gamma+1}}\left\|\sigma_{\gamma}\right\|\left\|f^{\gamma}\right\|_{L_{2}\left(\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon_{m}, 1}\right)} \\
& \leq C \varepsilon_{m}{ }^{\gamma-1 / 2}\left\|\sigma_{\gamma}\right\| \frac{\varepsilon_{m}(-2 \gamma+3) / 2}{(2 \gamma-1) \sqrt{2 \gamma-3}}\left\|f^{\gamma}\right\|_{L_{2}\left(\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon_{m}, 1}\right)}+ \\
& \frac{\varepsilon_{m}{ }^{\gamma-1 / 2}}{(2 \gamma-1) \sqrt{2 \gamma+1}}\left\|\sigma_{\gamma}\right\|\left\|f^{\gamma}\right\|_{L_{2}\left(\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon_{m}, 1}\right)}
\end{aligned}
$$

while, for $\gamma=3 / 2$ the first term is $O\left(\varepsilon_{m} \sqrt{\left|\log \varepsilon_{m}\right|}\right)$ and for $1 / 2<\gamma<3 / 2$ it is $O\left(\varepsilon_{m}{ }^{\gamma-1 / 2}\right)$. In short, we have

$$
\mid<\left(\varphi_{0}^{\gamma}, \tilde{\psi}_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{\gamma}>\mid \leq C \varepsilon_{m}{ }^{\beta}\left\|\sigma_{\gamma}\right\|\left\|f^{\gamma}\right\|_{L_{2}\left(\mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon_{m}, 1}\right)}\right.
$$

if $\beta>0$ satisfies $\gamma \geq \beta+1 / 2$ for all eigenvalue $\gamma$ of $A$ in $] 1 / 2,+\infty[$. This estimate gives the lemma.
Corollary 13. There exists from $\psi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}+\varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{1-1 / 2,1 / 2[ }$ a subfamily which converges in $L_{2}$ to a form $\varphi_{1}$ which satisfies on the open manifold $M_{1}(0)$ the equation $\Delta \varphi_{1}=\lambda \varphi_{1}$. Moreover

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\varphi_{1}\right\|^{2}+\left\|\widetilde{\varphi_{2}}\right\|^{2}+\left\|\bar{\sigma}^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{2}(\Sigma)}^{2}=1 \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

if $\widetilde{\varphi_{2}}$ is the prolongation of $\varphi_{2}$ by $P_{2}\left(\varphi_{2 \mid \Sigma}\right)$ on $\widetilde{M_{2}}$, and

$$
\bar{\sigma}^{1 / 2}=\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\left|\log \varepsilon_{m}\right|}} d_{\varepsilon_{m}}
$$

with the expression of (12).
Proof. Indeed, the family $\psi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}+\varphi_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}^{1-1 / 2,1 / 2[ }$ is bounded in dom $D_{1, \text { max }}$, one can then extract a subfamily which converges in $L_{2}$ but we know that $\tilde{\psi}_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}$ converges
to 0 in any $M_{1}(\eta)$, the conclusion follows. We obtain also, with the help of Lemma 12 that

$$
1-\left(\left\|\varphi_{1}\right\|^{2}+\left\|\varphi_{2}\right\|^{2}\right)=\lim \left(\left\|\tilde{\psi}_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}\right\|^{2}+\left\|\xi_{1} U^{*}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\left|\log \varepsilon_{m}\right|}} r^{-1 / 2} \bar{\sigma}_{1 / 2}\right)\right\|^{2}\right)
$$

We remark that, by Corollary 10, $\varphi_{2}=0 \Rightarrow \lim _{m \rightarrow \infty}\left\|\tilde{\psi}_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}\right\|=0$. In fact one has by (15)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty}\left\|\tilde{\psi}_{1, \varepsilon_{m}}\right\|=\left\|P_{2}\left(\varphi_{2 \mid \Sigma}\right)\right\| . \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$

Finally, one has

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty}\left\|\xi_{1} U^{*}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\left|\log \varepsilon_{m}\right|}} r^{-1 / 2} \bar{\sigma}_{1 / 2}\right)\right\|_{L_{2}\left(M_{\left.\varepsilon_{m}\right)}\right.}=\left\|\bar{\sigma}^{1 / 2}\right\|_{L_{2}(\Sigma)} \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

4.3. lower bound, the end. Let's now $\varphi_{1}(\varepsilon), \ldots, \varphi_{N}(\varepsilon)$ be an orthonormal family of eigenforms of the Hodge-de Rham operator, for the eigenvalues $\lambda_{1}(\varepsilon), \ldots$, $\lambda_{N}(\varepsilon)$. We can make the same procedure of extraction for the all family. This gives, in the limit domain, a family $\left(\varphi_{1}^{j}, \varphi_{2}^{j}, \bar{\sigma}_{1 / 2}^{j}\right)_{1 \leq j \leq N}$. We already know by Corollary 13 that each element has norm 1, if we show that they are orthogonal we are done, by the application of the minimax formula to the limit problem (13).

Lemma 14. The limit family is orthonormal in $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}$.
Proof. If we follow the procedure for one indice, up to terms converging to zero, we had decomposed the eigenforms $\varphi_{j}(\varepsilon)$ on $M_{1}$ on three terms

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Phi_{\varepsilon}^{j}=\psi_{1, \varepsilon}+\varphi_{1, \varepsilon}^{]-1 / 2,1 / 2[ } \\
& \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon}^{j}=\tilde{\psi}_{1, \varepsilon_{m}} \\
& \bar{\Phi}_{\varepsilon}^{j}=U^{*}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{|\log \varepsilon|}} r^{-1 / 2} \bar{\sigma}_{1 / 2}^{j}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Let $a \neq b$ be two indices. If we apply Lemma 12 to any linear combination of $\varphi_{a}(\varepsilon)$ and $\varphi_{b}(\varepsilon)$ we obtain that

$$
\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty}<\Phi_{\varepsilon_{m}}^{a}, \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon_{m}}^{b}>_{L_{2}\left(M_{1}\left(\varepsilon_{m}\right)\right)}+<\Phi_{\varepsilon_{m}}^{b}, \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon_{m}}^{a}>_{L_{2}\left(M_{1}\left(\varepsilon_{m}\right)\right)}=0
$$

If we apply (26) we obtain

$$
\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty}<\tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon_{m}}^{a}, \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon_{m}}^{b}>_{L_{2}\left(M_{\varepsilon_{m}}\right)}+<\varphi_{2, \varepsilon}^{a}, \varphi_{2, \varepsilon}^{b}>_{L_{2}\left(M_{2}\right)}=<\tilde{\varphi}_{2}^{a}, \tilde{\varphi}_{2}^{b}>_{L_{2}\left(\widetilde{M_{2}}\right)}
$$

Then finally, from $<\varphi_{a}(\varepsilon), \varphi_{b}(\varepsilon)>=0$ we conclude

$$
<\varphi_{1}^{a}, \varphi_{1}^{b}>_{L_{2}\left(\overline{M_{1}}\right)}+<\varphi_{2}^{a}, \varphi_{2}^{b}>_{L_{2}\left(\widetilde{M_{2}}\right)}+<\bar{\sigma}_{1 / 2}^{a}, \bar{\sigma}_{1 / 2}^{b}>_{L_{2}(\Sigma)}=0
$$

Proposition 15. The multiplicity of 0 in the limit spectrum is given by the sum

$$
\operatorname{dim} \operatorname{ker} \Delta_{1, W}+\operatorname{dim} \operatorname{ker} \mathcal{D}_{2}+i_{1 / 2}
$$

where $i_{1 / 2}$ denote the dimension of the vector space $\mathcal{I}_{1 / 2}$, see (4), of extented solutions $\omega$ on $\widetilde{M}_{2}$ introduced by Carron [C01], such that $A \omega=(1 / 2) \omega$ on restriction to $r=1$. If the limit value $\lambda \neq 0$ then it belongs to the positive spectrum of the Hodge-de Rham operator $\Delta_{1, W}$ on $\overline{M_{1}}$, with

$$
W=\bigoplus_{\gamma \in]-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}[ } \operatorname{Ker}(A-\gamma) .
$$

Proof. The last process, with in particular (26) and (16), construct in fact an element in the limit Hilbert space

$$
\mathcal{H}_{\infty}=L_{2}\left(\overline{M_{1}}\right) \oplus \operatorname{ker} \widetilde{D_{2}} \oplus \operatorname{ker}\left(A-\frac{1}{2}\right)
$$

and this process is clearly isometric in the sense that if we have an orthonormal family $\varphi_{k, \varepsilon_{m}}, 1 \leq k \leq n$ we obtain at the limit an orthonormal family if $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}$ is defined as an orthonormal space of the Hilbert spaces. And if we begin with eigenforms of $D_{\varepsilon_{m}}$ we obtain at the limit eigenforms of $\Delta_{1, W} \oplus 0 \oplus 0$. The last calculus has shown that $\lim \inf \lambda_{N}\left(\varepsilon_{m}\right) \geq \lambda_{N}$.

Remark 16. To understand this result it is important to remember when occures the eigenvalue $1 / 2$ in the spectrum of $A$. By the expression (3) we find that it occures exactly

- for $n$ even, if $3 / 4$ is an eigenvalue of the Hodge Laplacian $\Delta_{\Sigma}$ acting on the coclosed forms of degree $n / 2$ or $n / 2-1$ of the submanifold $\Sigma$.
- for $n$ odd, if 0 is an eigenvalue of $\Delta_{\Sigma}$ for the $(n-1) / 2,(n+1) / 2$ or $(n-3) / 2$ forms but also if 1 is eigenvalue of the coclosed forms of degree $(n-1) / 2$ on $\Sigma$.


## 5. HARMONIC FORMS AND SMALL EIGENVALUES

It would be interesting to know how many small (but not zero) eigenvalues occure. For this purpose, we can use the topological meaning of harmonic forms.

The topology of $M_{\varepsilon}$ is independant of $\varepsilon \neq 0$ and can be apprehended by the Mayer Vietoris sequence:

$$
\cdots \rightarrow H^{p}\left(M_{\varepsilon}\right) \xrightarrow{\text { res }} H^{p}\left(M_{1}(\varepsilon)\right) \oplus H^{p}\left(M_{2}\right) \xrightarrow{\text { dif }} H^{p}(\Sigma) \xrightarrow{\text { ext }} H^{p+1}\left(M_{\varepsilon}\right) \rightarrow \ldots
$$

As already mentionned, the space $\operatorname{ker} \mathcal{D}_{2} \oplus \mathcal{I}_{1 / 2}$ can be sent in $H^{*}\left(M_{2}\right)$.
For $\overline{M_{1}}$ we can use the results of Cheeger. Following Ch83], we know that the intersection cohomology of $\overline{M_{1}}$ coincide with $\operatorname{ker}\left(D_{1, \max } \circ D_{1, \min }\right)$ if $H^{n / 2}(\Sigma)=0$.

And we know also that

$$
I H^{p}\left(\overline{M_{1}}\right)= \begin{cases}H^{p}\left(M_{1}(\varepsilon)\right) & \text { if } p \leq n / 2  \tag{28}\\ H_{c}^{p}\left(M_{1}(\varepsilon)\right) & \text { if } p \geq 1+n / 2\end{cases}
$$

These results can be used for our study only if $D_{1, \text { max }}$ and $D_{1, \text { min }}$ coincide. This appears if and only if $A$ has no eigenvalues in the interval ] $-1 / 2,1 / 2[$. As a consequence of the expression of the eigenvalues of $A$, recalled in (3), this is the case if and only if

- for $\mathbf{n}$ odd, the operator $\Delta_{\Sigma}$ has no eigenvalues in $] 0,1[$ on coexact ( $n-$ 1)/ 2 forms,
- for $\mathbf{n}$ even, the operator $\Delta_{\Sigma}$ has no eigenvalues in $[0,3 / 4[$ on $n / 2$ or ( $n / 2$ ) - 1 coclosed forms.
Thuse, if $D_{1, \max }=D_{1, \min }$, and this implies that $H^{n / 2}(\Sigma)=0$ in the case where $n$ is even, then the map

$$
H^{n / 2}\left(M_{\varepsilon}\right) \xrightarrow{\text { res }} H^{n / 2}\left(M_{1}(\varepsilon)\right) \oplus H^{n / 2}\left(M_{2}\right)
$$

is onto and then any small eigenvalue in this degree must come from an element of $\operatorname{ker} \mathcal{D}_{2} \oplus \mathcal{I}_{1 / 2}$ sent to 0 . In this case also the map

$$
H^{n / 2+1}\left(M_{\varepsilon}\right) \xrightarrow{\text { res }} H^{n / 2+1}\left(M_{1}(\varepsilon)\right) \oplus H^{n / 2+1}\left(M_{2}\right)
$$

in one to one so there may exist small eigenvalues in this degree.
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