

Metric measure spaces satisfying Ricci curvature lower bounds Lecture 1

Andrea Mondino (University of Oxford)

Summer School 2021
Curvature Constraints and Spaces of Metrics

June 14–July 2, 2021
Institut Fourier-Grenoble (hybrid)



Plan of the journey

- ▶ Curvature and convergence of Smooth Riemannian manifolds.
- ▶ Ricci Curvature for non-smooth spaces: the $CD(K, N)$, $CD^*(K, N)$, $RCD(K, N)$, $RCD^*(K, N)$ conditions.
- ▶ Analytic and geometric properties of CD and RCD spaces.
- ▶ Applications to smooth Riemannian manifolds.

Gaussian curvature of 2-dimensional surfaces

- ▶ Let (Σ, g) be a 2-dimensional Riemannian surface. Denote by ∇ the Levi-Civita connection on (Σ, g) .
- ▶ Fix $p \in \Sigma$, and $\vec{e}_x = \frac{\partial}{\partial x}$, $\vec{e}_y = \frac{\partial}{\partial y}$ coordinate basis of $T_p \Sigma$.
- ▶ The **Gaussian Curvature** $K_{(\Sigma, g)}^G(p)$ of (Σ, g) at p is defined by

$$K_{\Sigma}^G(p) := \frac{g_p \left((\nabla_{\vec{e}_y} \nabla_{\vec{e}_x} - \nabla_{\vec{e}_x} \nabla_{\vec{e}_y}) \vec{e}_x, \vec{e}_y \right)}{\det(g_p)}$$

- ▶ If $(\Sigma, g) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is isometrically immersed, then
 $K_{(\Sigma, g)}^G(p)$ = product of the principal curvatures at p
= Jacobian of the Gauss map at p .
- ▶ **Examples:**
 - ▶ $0 \equiv$ Gaussian curvature of the Euclidean plane \mathbb{R}^2 .
 - ▶ $\frac{1}{r^2} \equiv$ Gaussian curvature of a 2-dimensional round sphere in \mathbb{R}^3 of radius r .
 - ▶ $-1 \equiv$ Gaussian curvature of the Hyperbolic plane:
half plane $\{(x, y) : y > 0\}$ with metric $ds^2 = \frac{dx^2 + dy^2}{y^2}$

Sectional and Ricci Curvature Riemannian manifolds

- ▶ Let (M^n, g) be an n -dimensional Riemannian manifold.
- ▶ Fix $p \in M$ and $\text{span}(\vec{e}_1, \vec{e}_2) = \Pi \subset T_p M$ a 2-dim subspace.
- ▶ Let $\Sigma_\Pi = \text{Exp}_p(\Pi \cap B_\varepsilon(0))$ = surface obtained by considering all the geodesics starting at p tangent to Π up to length ε . For $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough $\Sigma_\Pi \subset M$ is a smooth 2-dim surface.
- ▶ Define the **Sectional Curvature** of (M, g) at the 2-dim plane $\text{span}(\vec{e}_1, \vec{e}_2) = \Pi \subset T_p M$ as

$$\text{Sec}_p(\vec{e}_1, \vec{e}_2) = K_{\Sigma_\Pi}^G(p) = \text{Gaussian curvature of } \Sigma_\Pi \text{ at } p.$$

- ▶ Define the **Ricci Curvature** of (M, g) at the vector $\vec{v} \in T_p M$ as

$$\text{Ric}_p(\vec{v}, \vec{v}) = |\vec{v}|^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \text{Sec}_p(\vec{v}, \vec{e}_i) = \text{trace of the curvature''}$$

where $\{\vec{e}_1, \dots, \vec{e}_{n-1}, \vec{v}/|\vec{v}|\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $(T_p M, g_p)$.

Some notational remarks on the curvature bounds

Let (M^n, g) be an n -dimensional Riemannian manifold. Denote Sec the sectional curvature and Ric the Ricci curvature.

- ▶ For $K \in \mathbb{R}$, we write $\text{Sec} \geq K$ (resp. $\leq K$) if for every $p \in M$ and every 2-dim plane $\Pi \subset T_p M$ it holds $\text{Sec}_p(\Pi) \geq K$ (resp. $\leq K$).
- ▶ $\text{Ric}_p : T_p M \times T_p M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a quadratic form. We write $\text{Ric} \geq K$ (resp. $\leq K$) if the quadratic form $\text{Ric}_p - Kg_p$ is non-negative (resp. non-positive) definite at every $p \in M$.
- ▶ **Examples (model spaces):**
 - ▶ n -dimensional Euclidean space: $\text{Sec} \equiv 0$, $\text{Ric} \equiv 0$.
 - ▶ n -dimensional round sphere of radius 1: $\text{Sec} \equiv 1$, $\text{Ric} \equiv n - 1$.
 - ▶ n -dimensional Hyperbolic space: $\text{Sec} \equiv -1$, $\text{Ric} \equiv -(n - 1)$.

Some basics of comparison geometry

Question: (M, g) smooth Riemannian manifold.

If we assume some **upper/lower** bounds on the sectional or on the Ricci curvature what can we say on the analysis/geometry of (M, g) ?

- ▶ Upper/Lower bounds on the **sectional** curvature are strong assumptions with strong implications E.g. Cartan-Hadamard Theorem (if $\text{Sec} \leq 0$ then the universal cover of M is diffeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^N), **Topogonov triangle comparison theorem** (\rightsquigarrow definition of Alexandrov spaces: non smooth spaces with upper/lower bounds on the "sectional curvature"), etc.
- ▶ **Upper bounds on the Ricci curvature** are very (too) weak assumptions for geometric conclusions. E.g. Lokhamp Theorem (Gao-Yau, Brooks in dim 3): any closed manifold of $\dim \geq 3$ carries a metric with negative Ricci curvature.

Some basics of comparison geometry: lower Ricci bounds

Lower bounds on the Ricci curvature: a natural framework for comparison geometry (from below)

- ▶ Bishop-Gromov volume comparison: (not most general form)
If (M^n, g) has $\text{Ric} \geq 0$ then for all $x \in M$

$$R \mapsto \frac{\text{vol}_g(B_R(x))}{\omega_n R^n} \text{ is monotone non-increasing}$$

In particular, since $\rightarrow 1$ as $R \rightarrow 0 \rightsquigarrow \text{vol}_g(B_R(x)) \leq \omega_n R^n$.

- ▶ Laplacian comparison,
- ▶ Cheeger-Gromoll splitting,
- ▶ Li-Yau inequalities on heat flow,
- ▶ Lévy-Gromov isoperimetric inequality,
- ▶ ...

Non smooth setting: Origins of the topic

Gromov in the '80ies

- ▶ introduced a notion of **convergence for Riemannian manifolds**, known as Gromov-Hausdorff convergence (for non-compact manifolds, more convenient a pointed version, called pointed Gromov-Hausdorff convergence \rightsquigarrow GH-convergence of metric balls of every fixed radius)
- ▶ observed that a sequence of Riemannian n -dimensional manifolds satisfying a uniform Ricci curvature lower bound is **precompact**, i.e. it converges up to subsequences to a possibly non-smooth limit space (called, from now on, **Ricci limit space**)
- Natural **question**: what can we say about the **compactification** of the space of Riemannian manifolds with Ricci curvature bounded below (by, say, minus one)?
- **Hope**: useful also to establish properties for smooth manifolds.

Semi-smooth setting

Ricci limits can have singularities (e.g. a cone, the boundary of a convex body in \mathbb{R}^n) which can be dense.

- ▶ **Cheeger-Colding** 1997-2000 three fundamental papers on JDG on the structure of Ricci limit spaces.
 - ▶ **Collapsing**: $\lim_k \text{vol}_{g_k}(B_1(\bar{x}_k)) = 0 \rightsquigarrow$ loss of dimension in the limit. More difficult, nevertheless they proved that the limit space has a uniquely defined volume measure (up to scaling) and a.e. point has a Euclidean tangent space (a priori, the dimension may vary from point to point). Such points are called **regular points**, the complementary is called **singular set**.
 - ▶ **Non collapsing**: $\liminf_k \text{vol}_{g_k}(B_1(\bar{x}_k)) > 0$. More results: the Hausdorff dimension passes to the limit, one can prove finer estimates on the singular set, e.g. Hausdorff codimension 2.
- ▶ **Colding-Naber**, Annals of Math. 2012: the dimension of the tangent space **does not** change on the regular set, even in the collapsed case.
- ▶ **Cheeger-Jiang-Naber**, Annals of Math. 2021: rectifiability of the singular set in the non-collapsed case.

Extrinsic Vs Intrinsic

- ▶ The aforementioned approach to Ricci curvature for non-smooth spaces is a **non-intrinsic point of view**: consider the non smooth spaces arising as limits of smooth objects. Dichotomy **collapsing-non collapsing**. Very powerful for structural properties.
- ▶ **Analogy**: like defining $W^{1,2}$ as completion of C^∞ endowed with $W^{1,2}$ -norm.
- ▶ But $W^{1,2}$ can be defined also in completely **intrinsic** way **without** passing via **approximations** (very convenient for doing calculus of variations).
- ▶ **GOAL**: define in an intrinsic-axiomatic way a non smooth space with Ricci curvature bounded below by K and dimension bounded above by N (containing Ricci limits no matter if collapsed or not).
 \rightsquigarrow weak version of a Riemannian manifold with $\text{Ric} \geq K$;
analogy with GMT (currents, varifolds, etc.)

Preliminary Observation

- ▶ **sectional curvature bounds** for non smooth spaces make perfect sense in **metric spaces** (X, d) (Alexandrov spaces): sectional curvature is a property of lengths (comparison triangles)
- ▶ **Ricci curvature** is a property of lengths and **volumes**: needs also a **reference volume measure**
 \rightsquigarrow natural setting **metric measure spaces** (X, d, m) .

Non smooth setting 1: the Kantorovich-Wasserstein space

Notations:

- ▶ (X, d, \mathfrak{m}) complete separable metric space with a σ -finite non-negative Borel measure \mathfrak{m} (more precisely $\mathfrak{m}(B_r(x)) \leq ce^{Ar^2}$ for some $A, c > 0$); if we fix a point $\bar{x} \in X$, $(X, d, \mathfrak{m}, \bar{x})$ denotes the corresponding pointed space.

- ▶ Let

$$\mathcal{P}_2(X) := \left\{ \mu : \mu \geq 0, \mu(X) = 1, \int_X d^2(x, \bar{x}) \mu(dx) < \infty \right\}$$

=Probability measures with finite second moment.

- ▶ Given $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$, define the (Kantorovich-Wasserstein) quadratic transportation distance

$$W_2^2(\mu_1, \mu_2) := \inf \left\{ \int_{X \times X} d^2(x, y) \gamma(dx dy) \right\}$$

where $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(X \times X)$ with $(\pi_i)_\# \gamma = \mu_i, i = 1, 2$

- ▶ $(\mathcal{P}_2(X), W_2)$ is a metric space, geodesic if (X, d) is geodesic

Non smooth setting 2: Entropy functionals

On the metric space $(\mathcal{P}_2(X), W_2)$ consider the following Entropy functionals.

- ▶ For $N \in (1, \infty]$, let $\mathcal{U}_{N,m}(\mu)$ defined as follows: if $\mu = \rho \mathbf{m} \ll \mathbf{m}$

$$\mathcal{U}_{N,m}(\rho \mathbf{m}) := -N \int \rho^{1-\frac{1}{N}} d\mathbf{m} \quad \text{if } 1 < N < \infty \quad \text{Rényi Entropy}$$

$$\mathcal{U}_{\infty,m}(\rho \mathbf{m}) := \int \rho \log \rho d\mathbf{m} \quad \text{Boltzmann-Shannon Entropy}$$

- ▶ if μ is not a.c. then if $N < \infty$ the non a.c. part does not contribute, if $N = +\infty$ then set $\mathcal{U}_{\infty,m}(\mu) = \infty$.
- ▶ Such entropy functionals show up (and actually were introduced) in statistical mechanics, thermodynamics, information theory, etc.

► **Crucial observation**

[CorderoErausquin-McCann-Schmuckenshlager '01,
Otto-Villani '00, Sturm-Von Renesse '05]

If (X, d, m) is a smooth Riemannian manifold (M, g) , then $\text{Ric} \geq 0$ (resp. $\geq K$) iff the entropy functional $\mathcal{U}_{\infty, m}$ is $(K-)$ convex along geodesics in $(\mathcal{P}_2(X), W_2)$. i.e. for every $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ there exists a W_2 -geodesic $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ such that for every $t \in [0, 1]$ it holds

$$\mathcal{U}_{\infty, m}(\mu_t) \leq (1-t)\mathcal{U}_{\infty, m}(\mu_0) + t\mathcal{U}_{\infty, m}(\mu_1) - \frac{K}{2}t(1-t)W_2(\mu_0, \mu_1)^2.$$

- Notice that the notion of $(K-)$ convexity of the Entropy makes sense in a general metric measure space (X, d, m) .
- **DEF of $CD(K, N)$ condition** [Lott-Sturm-Villani '06]: fixed $N \in [1, +\infty]$ and $K \in \mathbb{R}$, (X, d, m) is a $CD(K, N)$ -space if the Entropy $\mathcal{U}_{N, m}$ is K -convex along geodesics in $(\mathcal{P}_2(X), W_2)$ (for finite N is a “distorted” (K, N) -geod. conv.).

Keep in mind:

- $CD(K, N) \rightsquigarrow$ definition Ricci curvature $\geq K$ and dimension $\leq N$ in an intrinsic/axiomatic way for metric measure spaces
- the more convex is $\mathcal{U}_{N,m}$ along geodesics in $(\mathcal{P}_2(X), W_2)$, the more the space is positively Ricci curved.

Good properties:

- ▶ CONSISTENT: (M, g) satisfies $CD(K, N)$ iff $Ric \geq K$ and $dim(M) \leq N$
- ▶ GEOMETRIC PROPERTIES: Brunn-Minkowski inequality, Bishop-Gromov volume growth, Bonnet-Myers diameter bound, Lichnerowicz spectral gap, etc.
- ▶ STABLE under convergence of metric measure spaces?
RK: stability will imply that Ricci limits are CD spaces.

Stability of $CD(K, N)$, 1: Lott-Villani Vs Sturm

- ▶ Framework of **proper** spaces (i.e. bounded closed sets are compact), **Lott-Villani**: $CD(K, N)$ is stable under **pointed measured Gromov-Hausdorff convergence** (i.e. for every $R > 0$ there is measured Gromov-Hausdorff convergence of balls of radius R around the given points of the space)
- ▶ Framework of **probability spaces with finite variance** (i.e. $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$): **Sturm** defined a distance (also known as Gromov-Wasserstein in the literature)

$$\mathbb{D}((X_1, d_1, \mathfrak{m}_1), (X_2, d_2, \mathfrak{m}_2)) := \inf W_2((\iota_1)_\# \mathfrak{m}_1, (\iota_2)_\# \mathfrak{m}_2),$$

inf among all metric spaces (Z, d_Z) and all isometric embeddings $\iota_i(\text{supp}(\mathfrak{m}_i), d_i) \rightarrow (Z, d_Z)$, $i = 1, 2$. He then proved that $CD(K, N)$ is stable w.r.t. \mathbb{D} -convergence.

Stability of $CD(K, N)$, 2: not satisfactory for $N = \infty$

- ▶ $CD(K, N)$, for $N < \infty$ implies **properness** of X , so Lott-Villani fully covers the situation.
- ▶ $CD(K, \infty)$ does **not** imply any sort of **compactness**, not **even local**, so pmGH-convergence is quite unnatural. At least for normalized spaces with finite variance Sturm's approach covers the situation.
- ▶ In some geometric situations, the assumption that $m \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ is a bit too restrictive: e.g. when studying **blow ups** (i.e. tangent cone at a point \rightsquigarrow Cheeger, Colding, Naber) and **blow downs** (i.e. tangent cones at infinity \rightsquigarrow Cheeger, Colding, Minicozzi, Tian, etc.)
- ▶ One may also like to consider sequences of **non compact manifolds with diverging dimensions** or more generally sequences of spaces with diverging doubling constants.

- Q:1) What is a natural notion of convergence in these situations?
2) Is $CD(K, \infty)$ stable w.r.t. this notion?

Pointed measured Gromov (pmG for short) convergence

DEF:(Gigli-M.-Savaré) $(X_n, d_n, \mathfrak{m}_n, \bar{x}_n) \rightarrow (X_\infty, d_\infty, \mathfrak{m}_\infty, \bar{x}_\infty)$ in **pmG-sense** if there exist a complete and separable space (Z, d_Z) and isometric embeddings $\iota_n : X_n \rightarrow Z$, $n \in \bar{\mathbb{N}} := \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ s.t.

$$\int \varphi(\iota_n) \# \mathfrak{m}_n \rightarrow \int \varphi(\iota_\infty) \# \mathfrak{m}_\infty, \quad \forall \varphi \in C_{bs}(Z), \text{ where}$$

$C_{bs}(Z) := \{f : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ cont., bounded with bounded support} \}$.

- ▶ The **definition** above is **extrinsic** but we prove it can be **characterized** in a (maybe less immediate) **totally intrinsic way**, according various equivalent approaches (via a pointed version of Gromov reconstruction Theorem or via a pointed/weighted version of Sturm's \mathbb{D} -distance).
- ▶ On **doubling spaces** pmG-convergence above is **equivalent** to mGH-convergence (\rightsquigarrow consistent with Lott-Villani).
- ▶ On **normalized spaces of finite variance** pmG-convergence is **equivalent** to \mathbb{D} -convergence (\rightsquigarrow consistent with Sturm).
- ▶ pmG-convergence **no a priori assumption** on $(X_n, d_n, \mathfrak{m}_n)$.

$CD(K, \infty)$ is stable under pmG -convergence

THM(Gigli-M.-Savaré): Let $(X_n, d_n, m_n, \bar{x}_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of $CD(K, \infty)$ p.m.m. spaces converging to $(X_\infty, d_\infty, m_\infty, \bar{x}_\infty)$ in the pmG -sense. Then $(X_\infty, d_\infty, m_\infty)$ is a $CD(K, \infty)$ space as well.

Rough sketch of Proof (Borrowed from Lott-Sturm-Villani):

1. Prove Γ -convergence of $\mathcal{U}_{\infty, m}$ under pmG -convergence:

- ▶ “ Γ – lim inf inequality”: For every $\mu^\infty \in \mathcal{P}_2(X_\infty)$ and every $\mu^n \in \mathcal{P}_2(X_n)$ such that $\mu^n \rightarrow \mu^\infty$ weakly in Z , it holds that

$$\mathcal{U}_{\infty, m}(\mu^\infty | m_\infty) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{U}_{\infty, m}(\mu^n | m_n).$$

- ▶ “Existence of a recovery sequence”: For every $\mu^\infty \in \mathcal{P}_2(X_\infty)$ there exist $\mu^n \in \mathcal{P}_2(X_n)$ such that $\mu^n \rightarrow \mu^\infty$ weakly in Z and

$$\mathcal{U}_{\infty, m}(\mu^\infty | m_\infty) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{U}_{\infty, m}(\mu^n | m_n).$$

2. Use the compactness of m_n to prove compactness of Wasserstein-geodesics in the converging spaces
3. Conclude that K -geodesic convexity is preserved.