The Geometry of Ricci Curvature

Aaron Naber

Talk Outline

- Background
- Lower Ricci Curvature
- Bounded Ricci Curvature
- Examples and Degeneracies
- Extension of Ideas to Other Areas

BACKGROUND



 * Throughout the talk we let (Mⁿ, g, p) with p ∈ M be a pointed smooth Riemannian manifold of dimension n.

- Throughout the talk we let (Mⁿ, g, p) with p ∈ M be a pointed smooth Riemannian manifold of dimension n.
- * We denote by Rm(X,Y,Z,W)= $\langle \nabla^2_{X,Y}Z \nabla^2_{Y,X}Z,W \rangle$ the full curvature tensor.

- * Throughout the talk we let (Mⁿ, g, p) with p ∈ M be a pointed smooth Riemannian manifold of dimension n.
- * We denote by Rm(X,Y,Z,W)= $\langle \nabla^2_{X,Y}Z \nabla^2_{Y,X}Z,W \rangle$ the full curvature tensor.
- * By $Rc(X,Y) = \sum Rm(E_i, X, Y, E_i)$ the Ricci curvature.

- Throughout the talk we let (Mⁿ, g, p) with p ∈ M be a pointed smooth Riemannian manifold of dimension n.
- * We denote by Rm(X,Y,Z,W)= $\langle \nabla^2_{X,Y}Z \nabla^2_{Y,X}Z,W \rangle$ the full curvature tensor.
- * By $Rc(X,Y) = \sum Rm(E_i, X, Y, E_i)$ the Ricci curvature.
- * For a point $x \in M$ and r > 0, we denote by $B_r(x)$ the ball of radius r centered at x. We denote the volume of this ball by $Vol(B_r(x))$.



 In order to study the structure of the spaces (Mⁿ, g, p) it is often more convenient to study limit spaces

 In order to study the structure of the spaces (Mⁿ, g, p) it is often more convenient to study limit spaces

 $(M_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$

*

 In order to study the structure of the spaces (Mⁿ, g, p) it is often more convenient to study limit spaces

$$(M_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$$

*

 where the convergence is at least in the Gromov Hausdorff sense. We call such a sequence noncollapsed if

 In order to study the structure of the spaces (Mⁿ, g, p) it is often more convenient to study limit spaces

$$(M_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$$

*

 where the convergence is at least in the Gromov Hausdorff sense. We call such a sequence noncollapsed if

 $Vol(B_1(p_i)) > v > 0$

 In order to study the structure of the spaces (Mⁿ, g, p) it is often more convenient to study limit spaces

$$(M_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$$

 where the convergence is at least in the Gromov Hausdorff sense. We call such a sequence noncollapsed if

 $Vol(B_1(p_i)) > v > 0$

* and otherwise we call the sequence collapsed.

*

×



Given a limit space (M_i, g_i, p_i) → (X, d_X, p), or really any length space X, one considers the following definitions:

- Given a limit space (M_i, g_i, p_i) → (X, d_X, p), or really any length space X, one considers the following definitions:
- Definition: Given x ∈ X and r>0 define the blow up metric space by X
 _(x,r) ≡ (X, r⁻¹ d_X, p)

- Given a limit space (M_i, g_i, p_i) → (X, d_X, p), or really any length space X, one considers the following definitions:
- * Definition: Given x ∈ X and r>0 define the blow up metric space by X $_{(x,r)} \equiv (X, r^{-1} d_X, p)$
- ★ Definition: We say a metric space X_x is a tangent cone of X at x if there exists a sequence $r_i \rightarrow 0$ such that $X_{(x,r_i)} \rightarrow X_x$.

Background: Stratification

- Given a limit space X one decomposes X into pieces based on the conical behavior of the tangent cones. Rigorously Speaking:
- Definition: We say a metric space X is 0-conical if X=C(Y) is the cone of a metric space
 Y. We say X is k-conical if X=R^k×C(Y).
- * For a limit space X every tangent cone X_x is 0-conical.
- Definition: For a limit space X we define the strata
 (X)= {x \ in X: no tangent cone at x is k+1-conical}.
- * Its known that dim $S^k \le k$, where the dimension is the Hausdorff dimension.

* We briefly review various known structure theorems in a variety of geometric contexts of increasing complexity. Let $(M_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ be a limit space as before.

- * We briefly review various known structure theorems in a variety of geometric contexts of increasing complexity. Let $(M_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ be a limit space as before.
- If |sec_i| < K and Vol(B₁(p_i))>v> 0, then X is a differential n-dimensional Riemannian manifold (Cheeger).

- * We briefly review various known structure theorems in a variety of geometric contexts of increasing complexity. Let $(M_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ be a limit space as before.
- If |sec_i| < K and Vol(B₁(p_i))>v> 0, then X is a differential n-dimensional Riemannian manifold (Cheeger).
- * 2a. If |sec_i| < K and Vol(B₁(p_i))→0, then X is a differential stratified Riemannian manifold. The Isometry Group is a Lie Group. (Fukaya)

- * We briefly review various known structure theorems in a variety of geometric contexts of increasing complexity. Let $(M_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ be a limit space as before.
- If |sec_i| < K and Vol(B₁(p_i))>v> 0, then X is a differential n-dimensional Riemannian manifold (Cheeger).
- * 2a. If |sec_i| < K and Vol(B₁(p_i))→0, then X is a differential stratified Riemannian manifold. The Isometry Group is a Lie Group. (Fukaya)
- * 2b. If |sec_i| < K and Vol(B₁(p_i))→0, then away from a set S ⊆ X of dimension ≤ min {n-5,dimX-3}, X is a smooth Riemannian orbifold (Naber-Tian).

- * We briefly review various known structure theorems in a variety of geometric contexts of increasing complexity. Let $(M_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ be a limit space as before.
- If |sec_i| < K and Vol(B₁(p_i))>v> 0, then X is a differential n-dimensional Riemannian manifold (Cheeger).
- * 2a. If |sec_i| < K and Vol(B₁(p_i))→0, then X is a differential stratified Riemannian manifold. The Isometry Group is a Lie Group. (Fukaya)
- * 2b. If |sec_i| < K and Vol(B₁(p_i))→0, then away from a set S ⊆ X of dimension ≤ min {n-5,dimX-3}, X is a smooth Riemannian orbifold (Naber-Tian).
- 3. If sec_i > -K and Vol(B₁(p_i))>v> 0, then X is homeomorphic to an n-dimensional Riemannian manifold (Grove-Petersen).

- * We briefly review various known structure theorems in a variety of geometric contexts of increasing complexity. Let $(M_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ be a limit space as before.
- If |sec_i| < K and Vol(B₁(p_i))>v> 0, then X is a differential n-dimensional Riemannian manifold (Cheeger).
- * 2a. If |sec_i| < K and Vol(B₁(p_i))→0, then X is a differential stratified Riemannian manifold. The Isometry Group is a Lie Group. (Fukaya)
- * 2b. If |sec_i| < K and Vol(B₁(p_i))→0, then away from a set S ⊆ X of dimension ≤ min {n-5,dimX-3}, X is a smooth Riemannian orbifold (Naber-Tian).
- 3. If sec_i > -K and Vol(B₁(p_i))>v> 0, then X is homeomorphic to an n-dimensional Riemannian manifold (Grove-Petersen).
- * 4. If sec_i > -K and Vol(B₁(p_i)) →0, then X is homeomorphic to a stratified Riemannian manifold (Perelman). The Isometry Group is a Lie Group (Fukaya-Yamaguchi).



* What about the case (M_i, g_i, p_i) → (X, d_X, p) where Rc_i ≥ - K? First Structural Theorems go back to Cheeger-Colding (mid 90's):

- * What about the case (M_i, g_i, p_i) → (X, d_X, p) where Rc_i ≥ K? First Structural Theorems go back to Cheeger-Colding (mid 90's):
- If noncollapsed, Vol(B₁(p_i))>v> 0, then away from a set of codim 2, the limit space X is homeomorphic to a Riemannian manifold. The Isometry Group is a Lie Group.

- * What about the case (M_i, g_i, p_i) → (X, d_X, p) where Rc_i ≥ K? First Structural Theorems go back to Cheeger-Colding (mid 90's):
- If noncollapsed, Vol(B₁(p_i))>v> 0, then away from a set of codim 2, the limit space X is homeomorphic to a Riemannian manifold. The Isometry Group is a Lie Group.
- * If collapsed, Vol(B₁(p_i)) \rightarrow 0, then there exists a set of full measure $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X$ such that every tangent cone at $x \in \mathcal{R}$ is *some* Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{k(x)}$, where 0 < k(x) < n.

- * What about the case (M_i, g_i, p_i) → (X, d_X, p) where Rc_i ≥ K? First Structural Theorems go back to Cheeger-Colding (mid 90's):
- If noncollapsed, Vol(B₁(p_i))>v> 0, then away from a set of codim 2, the limit space X is homeomorphic to a Riemannian manifold. The Isometry Group is a Lie Group.
- * If collapsed, Vol(B₁(p_i)) \rightarrow 0, then there exists a set of full measure $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X$ such that every tangent cone at $x \in \mathcal{R}$ is *some* Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{k(x)}$, where 0 < k(x) < n.
- * Conjecture (ChCo): If collapsed then k(x)=k is independent of x.

- * What about the case (M_i, g_i, p_i) → (X, d_X, p) where Rc_i ≥ K? First Structural Theorems go back to Cheeger-Colding (mid 90's):
- If noncollapsed, Vol(B₁(p_i))>v> 0, then away from a set of codim 2, the limit space X is homeomorphic to a Riemannian manifold. The Isometry Group is a Lie Group.
- * If collapsed, $Vol(B_1(p_i)) \rightarrow 0$, then there exists a set of full measure $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X$ such that every tangent cone at $x \in \mathcal{R}$ is *some* Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{k(x)}$, where 0 < k(x) < n.
- * Conjecture (ChCo): If collapsed then k(x)=k is independent of x.
- * Conjecture (ChCo,FY): If collapsed then the isometry group is a lie group.



* Finally we consider the case $(M_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ where $|Rc_i| \le K$.

- * Finally we consider the case $(M_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ where $|Rc_i| \le K$.
- In the case dim M_i = 4, χ(M_i) < K and Vol(M_i)>v>0, results due to Anderson, Bando, Kasue, Nakajima, and Tian give a complete picture of X.

- * Finally we consider the case $(M_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ where $|Rc_i| \le K$.
- * In the case dim $M_i = 4$, $\chi(M_i) < K$ and $Vol(M_i) > v > 0$, results due to Anderson, Bando, Kasue, Nakajima, and Tian give a complete picture of X.
- * In this case X is a Riemannian orbifold with at most a finite number of isolated singular points, all of which are of the form R^4/Γ with $\Gamma \subseteq O(4)$.
Background: Bounded Ricci Curvature

- * Finally we consider the case $(M_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ where $|Rc_i| \le K$.
- * In the case dim $M_i = 4$, $\chi(M_i) < K$ and $Vol(M_i) > v > 0$, results due to Anderson, Bando, Kasue, Nakajima, and Tian give a complete picture of X.
- * In this case X is a Riemannian orbifold with at most a finite number of isolated singular points, all of which are of the form R^4/Γ with $\Gamma \subseteq O(4)$.
- * Similar results hold in higher dimensions if $\chi(M_i) < K$ is replaced with $\int |Rm|^{n/2} < K$ (Anderson).

Background: Bounded Ricci Curvature

- * Finally we consider the case $(M_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ where $|Rc_i| \le K$.
- * In the case dim $M_i = 4$, $\chi(M_i) < K$ and $Vol(M_i) > v > 0$, results due to Anderson, Bando, Kasue, Nakajima, and Tian give a complete picture of X.
- * In this case X is a Riemannian orbifold with at most a finite number of isolated singular points, all of which are of the form R^4/Γ with $\Gamma \subseteq O(4)$.
- * Similar results hold in higher dimensions if $\chi(M_i) < K$ is replaced with $\int |Rm|^{n/2} < K$ (Anderson).
- * Under only |Rc_i|≤ K and Vol(M_i)>v>0, it can be said X is a Riemannian manifold away from a set of Hausdorff codim 2. If in addition one assumes ∫ |Rm |^{p/2} < K, then one can say X is a Riemannian manifold away from a set of Hausdorff codim p.

LOWER RICCI CURVATURE



A starting point for more recent advances on the limit spaces (M_i, g_i, p_i) → (X, d_X, p) with lower Ricci curvature bounds is the following theorem of Petrunin for limit spaces with lower sectional bounds:

- A starting point for more recent advances on the limit spaces (M_i, g_i, p_i) → (X, d_X, p) with lower Ricci curvature bounds is the following theorem of Petrunin for limit spaces with lower sectional bounds:
- * Theorem (Petrunin): Let X be an Alexandroff space (e.g. $\sec_i > -K$) and $\gamma:[0,1] \rightarrow X$ a minimizing geodesic on X, then if X₀ and X₁ are tangent cones at $\gamma(t_0)$ and $\gamma(t_1)$ with $t_0, t_1 \in (0,1)$, then X₀= X₁ are isometric.

- A starting point for more recent advances on the limit spaces (M_i, g_i, p_i) → (X, d_X, p) with lower Ricci curvature bounds is the following theorem of Petrunin for limit spaces with lower sectional bounds:
- * Theorem (Petrunin): Let X be an Alexandroff space (e.g. $\sec_i > -K$) and $\gamma:[0,1] \rightarrow X$ a minimizing geodesic on X, then if X₀ and X₁ are tangent cones at $\gamma(t_0)$ and $\gamma(t_1)$ with $t_0, t_1 \in (0,1)$, then X₀= X₁ are isometric.
- * Corollary: The regular set $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X$ is totally geodesic.

- A starting point for more recent advances on the limit spaces (M_i, g_i, p_i) → (X, d_X, p) with lower Ricci curvature bounds is the following theorem of Petrunin for limit spaces with lower sectional bounds:
- * Theorem (Petrunin): Let X be an Alexandroff space (e.g. $\sec_i > -K$) and $\gamma:[0,1] \rightarrow X$ a minimizing geodesic on X, then if X₀ and X₁ are tangent cones at $\gamma(t_0)$ and $\gamma(t_1)$ with $t_0, t_1 \in (0,1)$, then X₀= X₁ are isometric.
- * Corollary: The regular set $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X$ is totally geodesic.
- * Question: Does the same theorem hold for limit spaces with Lower Ricci Curvature?

- A starting point for more recent advances on the limit spaces (M_i, g_i, p_i) → (X, d_X, p) with lower Ricci curvature bounds is the following theorem of Petrunin for limit spaces with lower sectional bounds:
- * Theorem (Petrunin): Let X be an Alexandroff space (e.g. $\sec_i > -K$) and $\gamma:[0,1] \rightarrow X$ a minimizing geodesic on X, then if X₀ and X₁ are tangent cones at $\gamma(t_0)$ and $\gamma(t_1)$ with $t_0, t_1 \in (0,1)$, then X₀= X₁ are isometric.
- * Corollary: The regular set $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X$ is totally geodesic.
- * Question: Does the same theorem hold for limit spaces with Lower Ricci Curvature?
- * Answer: No!



* Issue: There exists limit spaces X with minimizing geodesics γ : [0,1] \rightarrow X such that at each γ (t) there is a unique tangent cone X_t, however for s and t distinct we have that X_s and X_t are not isometric.

- * Issue: There exists limit spaces X with minimizing geodesics γ: [0,1]→ X such that at each γ(t) there is a unique tangent cone X_t, however for s and t distinct we have that X_s and X_t are not isometric.
- Question: Can one at least control the rate of change of tangent cones at the same scale along a minimizing geodesic?

- * Issue: There exists limit spaces X with minimizing geodesics γ: [0,1]→ X such that at each γ(t) there is a unique tangent cone X_t, however for s and t distinct we have that X_s and X_t are not isometric.
- Question: Can one at least control the rate of change of tangent cones at the same scale along a minimizing geodesic?
- * Answer: Yes!



* Theorem (Colding-Naber): Let $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $Rc_i \ge -(n-1)$ and let $\gamma:[0,1] \rightarrow X$ be a minimizing geodesic. Let $s,t \in (\delta,1-\delta)$ with X_s and X_t tangent cones at the same scale at $\gamma(s)$ and $\gamma(t)$, respectively. Then there exists $C(n,\delta)$, $\alpha(n)>0$ such that $d_{GH}(X_s, X_t) < C | t-s |^{\alpha}$.

- * Theorem (Colding-Naber): Let $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $Rc_i \ge -(n-1)$ and let $\gamma:[0,1] \rightarrow X$ be a minimizing geodesic. Let $s,t \in (\delta,1-\delta)$ with X_s and X_t tangent cones at the same scale at $\gamma(s)$ and $\gamma(t)$, respectively. Then there exists $C(n,\delta)$, $\alpha(n)>0$ such that $d_{GH}(X_s, X_t) < C |t-s|^{\alpha}$.
- Tangent cones change at most at a Holder rate. In particular they change in a continuous fashion.
 - For all intensive purposes α is 1/2.
 - Holder rate is sharp. Tangent cones do not need to change at a Lipschitz rate, or even a C^{α} rate for $\alpha > 1/2$.
 - Effective version which says $\forall r > 0$ that $r^{-1} d_{GH}(B_r(\gamma(s)), B_r(\gamma(t))) < C | t-s |^{\alpha}$

* Usual two points: new estimates + how to use estimates:

- Usual two points: new estimates + how to use estimates:
- * How to use estimates: Gradient flow for $\nabla d_{\gamma(0)}$.
 - Measure theoretic gradient flow.
 - No estimates on d (in principle hessian estimates are required).
 - -"Theorem": If there exists an L² approximation h of d with L² hessian control on h, then one can construct and estimate the measure theoretic gradient flow.

- Usual two points: new estimates + how to use estimates:
- * How to use estimates: Gradient flow for $\nabla d_{\gamma(0)}$.
 - Measure theoretic gradient flow.
 - No estimates on d (in principle hessian estimates are required).

-"Theorem": If there exists an L² approximation h of d with L² hessian control on h, then one can construct and estimate the measure theoretic gradient flow.

New Estimates: Flow d by the heat equation to get smooth approximation h_t.
Previously known: For harmonic approximation h one has Vol(B_r)⁻¹f_{B_r}
(_{γ(t)}) | ∇² h |² < C r^{2-ε}. At best => r⁻¹ d_{GH}(B_r(γ(s)), B_r(γ(t))) < C | t-s | ^αr^{-1+ε/2}. - Need ε =
Can (essentially) be proved for parabolic approximation h_{r²}, but wrong for harmonic approximation h.



* Let us remark on some corollaries:

- * Let us remark on some corollaries:
- * Corollary(CoNa): There exists a subset $\mathcal{R}^k \subseteq X$ of full measure, with $0 \le k \le n$, such that if $x \in \mathcal{R}$ then the tangent cone at x is unique and isometric to Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^k

- * Let us remark on some corollaries:
- * Corollary(CoNa): There exists a subset $\mathcal{R}^k \subseteq X$ of full measure, with $0 \le k \le n$, such that if $x \in \mathcal{R}$ then the tangent cone at x is unique and isometric to Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^k
- * Uniquely defined dimension of limit space. *R* is the regular set.

- * Let us remark on some corollaries:
- * Corollary(CoNa): There exists a subset $\mathcal{R}^k \subseteq X$ of full measure, with $0 \le k \le n$, such that if $x \in \mathcal{R}$ then the tangent cone at x is unique and isometric to Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^k
- - Uniquely defined dimension of limit space. *R* is the regular set.
- * Corollary(CoNa): The subset $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X$ is weakly convex.

- * Let us remark on some corollaries:
- * Corollary(CoNa): There exists a subset $\mathcal{R}^k \subseteq X$ of full measure, with $0 \le k \le n$, such that if $x \in \mathcal{R}$ then the tangent cone at x is unique and isometric to Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^k
- - Uniquely defined dimension of limit space. *R* is the regular set.
- * Corollary(CoNa): The subset $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X$ is weakly convex.
- Given x,y ∈ R and any ε >0 there exists a curve γ ⊆ R connecting x and y whose length satisfies |γ| < d(x,y)+ε

- * Let us remark on some corollaries:
- * Corollary(CoNa): There exists a subset $\mathcal{R}^k \subseteq X$ of full measure, with $0 \le k \le n$, such that if $x \in \mathcal{R}$ then the tangent cone at x is unique and isometric to Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^k
- - Uniquely defined dimension of limit space. *R* is the regular set.
- * Corollary(CoNa): The subset $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X$ is weakly convex.
- Given x,y ∈ R and any ε >0 there exists a curve γ ⊆ R connecting x and y whose length satisfies |γ| < d(x,y)+ε
- Corollary(CoNa): The Isometry Group of X is a Lie Group.

Bounded Ricci Curvature



* Let us now consider limit spaces $(M_i^n, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $|Rc_i| \le n-1$ and $Vol(B_r(p_i)) > v > 0$.

- * Let us now consider limit spaces $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $|Rc_i| \le n-1$ and $Vol(B_r(p_i)) > v > 0$.
- * First let us see what our knowledge about tangent cones along geodesics yields us:

- * Let us now consider limit spaces $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $|Rc_i| \le n-1$ and $Vol(B_r(p_i)) > v > 0$.
- * First let us see what our knowledge about tangent cones along geodesics yields us:
- * Corollary(CoNa): The regular set $\mathcal{R}^n \subseteq X$ is a dense open smooth submanifold which is totally geodesic.

- * Let us now consider limit spaces $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $|Rc_i| \le n-1$ and $Vol(B_r(p_i)) > v > 0$.
- * First let us see what our knowledge about tangent cones along geodesics yields us:
- * Corollary(CoNa): The regular set $\mathcal{R}^n \subseteq X$ is a dense open smooth submanifold which is totally geodesic.
- * Corollary(CoNa): Given a minimizing unit speed geodesic $\gamma:[0,1] \rightarrow X$ with $\gamma(1) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ a regular point and $\gamma(0)$ possibly singular, then $\gamma(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for t >0 and there exists C>0 and $\alpha(n)>0$ such that $|\operatorname{Rm}|(\gamma(t)) \leq C t^{-2\alpha}$.

- * Let us now consider limit spaces $(M_i^n, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $|Rc_i| \le n-1$ and $Vol(B_r(p_i)) > v > 0$.
- * First let us see what our knowledge about tangent cones along geodesics yields us:
- * Corollary(CoNa): The regular set $\mathcal{R}^n \subseteq X$ is a dense open smooth submanifold which is totally geodesic.
- * Corollary(CoNa): Given a minimizing unit speed geodesic $\gamma:[0,1] \rightarrow X$ with $\gamma(1) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ a regular point and $\gamma(0)$ possibly singular, then $\gamma(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for t >0 and there exists C>0 and $\alpha(n)>0$ such that $|\operatorname{Rm}|(\gamma(t)) \leq C t^{-2\alpha}$.
- Curvature blows up at most polynomially along a minimizing geodesic.

Bounded Ricci Curvature: Regularity



Bounded Ricci Curvature: Regularity

We have seen previously that we can get Hausdorff dimension control over singular sets of limit spaces (Mⁿ_i, g_i, p_i) → (X, d_X, p) with |Rc_i| ≤ n-1 and Vol(B_r(p_i))>v>0.
Improved control if the the curvature operator satisfies |Rm|∈L^p.
- We have seen previously that we can get Hausdorff dimension control over singular sets of limit spaces (Mⁿ_i, g_i, p_i) → (X, d_X, p) with |Rc_i| ≤ n-1 and Vol(B_r(p_i))>v>0.
 Improved control if the the curvature operator satisfies |Rm | ∈ L^p.
- Hausdorff dimension control, although a great leap in understanding, is fairly weak.
 By itself it does not stop a set from even being dense, or arbitrarily dense.

- We have seen previously that we can get Hausdorff dimension control over singular sets of limit spaces (Mⁿ_i, g_i, p_i) → (X, d_X, p) with |Rc_i| ≤ n-1 and Vol(B_r(p_i))>v>0.
 Improved control if the the curvature operator satisfies |Rm|∈L^p.
- Hausdorff dimension control, although a great leap in understanding, is fairly weak. By itself it does not stop a set from even being dense, or arbitrarily dense.
- * Question 1. Can the Hausdorff dimension control be improved?

- We have seen previously that we can get Hausdorff dimension control over singular sets of limit spaces (Mⁿ_i, g_i, p_i) → (X, d_X, p) with |Rc_i| ≤ n-1 and Vol(B_r(p_i))>v>0.
 Improved control if the the curvature operator satisfies |Rm|∈L^p.
- Hausdorff dimension control, although a great leap in understanding, is fairly weak. By itself it does not stop a set from even being dense, or arbitrarily dense.
- * Question 1. Can the Hausdorff dimension control be improved?
- * Question 2. Is an assumption on L^p control on the curvature necessary?



* To study more refined structure of limits $(M_i^n, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $|Rc_i| \le n-1$ and $Vol(B_r(p_i)) > v > 0$ we introduce the regularity scale:

* To study more refined structure of limits $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $|Rc_i| \le n-1$ and $Vol(B_r(p_i)) > v > 0$ we introduce the regularity scale:

r

* Definition: Given $x \in X$ we define the regularity scale at x by $(x) = \max\{0 < r \le 1: |Rm| \le r^{-2} \text{ on } B_r(x)\}.$

* To study more refined structure of limits $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $|Rc_i| \le n-1$ and $Vol(B_r(p_i)) > v > 0$ we introduce the regularity scale:

- * Definition: Given $x \in X$ we define the regularity scale at x by $(x) = \max\{0 < r \le 1: |Rm| \le r^{-2} \text{ on } B_r(x)\}.$
- * r(x)=0 if x is not a regular point.

* To study more refined structure of limits $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $|Rc_i| \le n-1$ and $Vol(B_r(p_i)) > v > 0$ we introduce the regularity scale:

- * Definition: Given $x \in X$ we define the regularity scale at x by $(x) = \max\{0 < r \le 1: |Rm| \le r^{-2} \text{ on } B_r(x)\}.$
- * r(x)=0 if x is not a regular point.
- Scale invariant definition.

* To study more refined structure of limits $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $|Rc_i| \le n-1$ and $Vol(B_r(p_i)) > v > 0$ we introduce the regularity scale:

- * Definition: Given $x \in X$ we define the regularity scale at x by $(x) = \max\{0 < r \le 1: |Rm| \le r^{-2} \text{ on } B_r(x)\}.$
- * r(x)=0 if x is not a regular point.
- Scale invariant definition.
- * $|\operatorname{Rm}|(x) \le r^{-2}(x)$, though r(x) a much more effective measurement of regularity.

* To study more refined structure of limits $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $|Rc_i| \le n-1$ and $Vol(B_r(p_i)) > v > 0$ we introduce the regularity scale:

- * Definition: Given $x \in X$ we define the regularity scale at x by $(x) = \max\{0 < r \le 1: |Rm| \le r^{-2} \text{ on } B_r(x)\}.$
- * r(x)=0 if x is not a regular point.
- Scale invariant definition.
- * $|\operatorname{Rm}|(x) \le r^{-2}(x)$, though r(x) a much more effective measurement of regularity.
- * Previously theorems do not prove *any* effective lower bounds for r(x).



 Given a limit space X one decomposes X into pieces based on the *almost* conical behavior of the tangent cones. Roughly Speaking:

- Given a limit space X one decomposes X into pieces based on the *almost* conical behavior of the tangent cones. Roughly Speaking:
- * Definition: We say $x \in X$ is (k, ε, r) -conical if $B_r(x)$ is ε -almost k-conical. That is, $B_r(x)$ looks ε -close to a ball in $\mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{C}(Y)$ for some Y (that is, $r^{-1} d_{GH}(B_r(x), B_r(x_0)) < \varepsilon$).

- Given a limit space X one decomposes X into pieces based on the *almost* conical behavior of the tangent cones. Roughly Speaking:
- * Definition: We say $x \in X$ is (k, ε, r) -conical if $B_r(x)$ is ε -almost k-conical. That is, $B_r(x)$ looks ε -close to a ball in $\mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{C}(Y)$ for some Y (that is, $r^{-1} d_{GH}(B_r(x), B_r(x_0)) < \varepsilon$).
- * Definition: For a limit space X we define the strata $S_{\epsilon,r}^{k}(X) \equiv \{x \setminus in X: B_{s}(x) \text{ is not } (k+1,\epsilon,r) \text{ -conical for } r \leq s \leq 1\}.$

- Given a limit space X one decomposes X into pieces based on the *almost* conical behavior of the tangent cones. Roughly Speaking:
- * Definition: We say $x \in X$ is (k, ε, r) -conical if $B_r(x)$ is ε -almost k-conical. That is, $B_r(x)$ looks ε -close to a ball in $\mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{C}(Y)$ for some Y (that is, $r^{-1} d_{GH}(B_r(x), B_r(x_0)) < \varepsilon$).
- * Definition: For a limit space X we define the strata $S_{\epsilon,r}^{k}(X) \equiv \{x \setminus in X: B_{s}(x) \text{ is not } (k+1,\epsilon,r)\text{-conical for } r \leq s \leq 1\}.$
- Nontrivial for a smooth manifold.

- Given a limit space X one decomposes X into pieces based on the *almost* conical behavior of the tangent cones. Roughly Speaking:
- * Definition: We say $x \in X$ is (k, ε, r) -conical if $B_r(x)$ is ε -almost k-conical. That is, $B_r(x)$ looks ε -close to a ball in $\mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{C}(Y)$ for some Y (that is, $r^{-1} d_{GH}(B_r(x), B_r(x_0)) < \varepsilon$).
- * Definition: For a limit space X we define the strata $S_{\epsilon,r}^{k}(X) \equiv \{x \setminus in X: B_{s}(x) \text{ is not } (k+1,\epsilon,r) \text{ -conical for } r \leq s \leq 1\}.$
- Nontrivial for a smooth manifold.
- Effective: Controls behavior of X on balls of definite size.

- Given a limit space X one decomposes X into pieces based on the *almost* conical behavior of the tangent cones. Roughly Speaking:
- * Definition: We say $x \in X$ is (k, ε, r) -conical if $B_r(x)$ is ε -almost k-conical. That is, $B_r(x)$ looks ε -close to a ball in $\mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{C}(Y)$ for some Y (that is, $r^{-1} d_{GH}(B_r(x), B_r(x_0)) < \varepsilon$).
- * Definition: For a limit space X we define the strata $S_{\epsilon,r}^{k}(X) \equiv \{x \setminus in X: B_{s}(x) \text{ is not } (k+1,\epsilon,r) \text{ -conical for } r \leq s \leq 1\}.$
- Nontrivial for a smooth manifold.
- Effective: Controls behavior of X on balls of definite size.
- We will prove stronger Minkowski estimates on this effective set, as opposed to the weaker Hausdorff estimates proved for the ineffective standard singular set.



* Theorem (Cheeger-Naber). Let $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ be a limit space with $Rc_i \ge -(n-1)$ and $Vol(B_1(p_i)) > v > 0$. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $C(n, \varepsilon) > 0$ such that

* Theorem (Cheeger-Naber). Let $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ be a limit space with $Rc_i \ge -(n-1)$ and $Vol(B_1(p_i)) > v > 0$. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $C(n, \varepsilon) > 0$ such that

 $Vol(B_{\mathsf{r}}(S^{k}_{\epsilon,r} \cap B_{1})) < C r^{n-k-\epsilon}$

•

* Theorem (Cheeger-Naber). Let $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ be a limit space with $Rc_i \ge -(n-1)$ and $Vol(B_1(p_i)) > v > 0$. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $C(n, \varepsilon) > 0$ such that

 $Vol(B_{r}(S^{k}_{\epsilon,r} \cap B_{1})) < C r^{n-k-\epsilon}$

•

* - If one visualizes the k-strata as a k-dimensional manifold, then one should have Vol(B_r ($S^k_{\epsilon,r} \cap B_1$)) < C r^{n-k} , so the theorem gives everything less than this.

* Theorem (Cheeger-Naber). Let $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ be a limit space with $Rc_i \ge -(n-1)$ and $Vol(B_1(p_i)) > v > 0$. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $C(n,\varepsilon) > 0$ such that

 $Vol(B_{\mathsf{r}}(S^{k}_{\epsilon,r} \cap B_{1})) < C r^{n-k-\epsilon}$

- * If one visualizes the k-strata as a k-dimensional manifold, then one should have Vol(B_r ($S^k_{\epsilon,r} \cap B_1$)) < C r^{n-k} , so the theorem gives everything less than this.
- * Controls *tubes* around the singular set.

•

* Theorem (Cheeger-Naber). Let $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ be a limit space with $Rc_i \ge -(n-1)$ and $Vol(B_1(p_i)) > v > 0$. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $C(n,\varepsilon) > 0$ such that

 $Vol(B_{\mathsf{r}}(S^{k}_{\epsilon,r} \cap B_{1})) < C r^{n-k-\epsilon}$

- If one visualizes the k-strata as a k-dimensional manifold, then one should have Vol(B_r (S^k_{ε,r} ∩ B₁)) < C r^{n-k}, so the theorem gives everything less than this.
- * Controls *tubes* around the singular set.

•

* - Proof requires new ideas besides those of the standard dimension reduction for the estimate dim $S^k \le k$. In fact, the above gives a new and distinct proof of this estimate.



* - Cone splitting: Let X be a metric space, and assume there exists $x_0, x_1 \in X$ such that X is a metric cone with respect to both points. Then X=R×C(Y). (in words, two 0-symmetries implies a 1-symmetry). Similar statement for 'almost' metric cones.

- Cone splitting: Let X be a metric space, and assume there exists $x_0, x_1 \in X$ such that X is a metric cone with respect to both points. Then X=R×C(Y). (in words, two 0-symmetries implies a 1-symmetry). Similar statement for 'almost' metric cones.
- * Effective version of every tangent cone is a metric cone: Given a point in a limit space x∈ X and considering the scales r_i = 2⁻ⁱ. There are at most N(n,ε) number of scales r_i which are not (ε, r_i, 0)-conical (almost cones).

- Cone splitting: Let X be a metric space, and assume there exists $x_0, x_1 \in X$ such that X is a metric cone with respect to both points. Then X=R×C(Y). (in words, two 0-symmetries implies a 1-symmetry). Similar statement for 'almost' metric cones.
- * Effective version of every tangent cone is a metric cone: Given a point in a limit space x∈ X and considering the scales r_i = 2⁻ⁱ. There are at most N(n,ε) number of scales r_i which are not (ε, r_i, 0)-conical (almost cones).
- Entropy decomposition: Thus for each point there is a tuple T_i(x), where T_i(x)=1 is x is not (ε, r_i, 0)-conical and 0 otherwise. For each α-tuple {T_i} we can form the entropy decomposition

 $M = \bigcup E_{T_{\alpha}}$, where $E_{T_{\alpha}} = \{x \in X: T_i(x) = T_i \text{ for } 0 \le i \le \alpha\}$.

- Cone splitting: Let X be a metric space, and assume there exists $x_0, x_1 \in X$ such that X is a metric cone with respect to both points. Then X=R×C(Y). (in words, two 0-symmetries implies a 1-symmetry). Similar statement for 'almost' metric cones.
- * Effective version of every tangent cone is a metric cone: Given a point in a limit space x∈ X and considering the scales r_i = 2⁻ⁱ. There are at most N(n,ε) number of scales r_i which are not (ε, r_i, 0)-conical (almost cones).
- Entropy decomposition: Thus for each point there is a tuple T_i(x), where T_i(x)=1 is x is not (ε, r_i, 0)-conical and 0 otherwise. For each α-tuple {T_i} we can form the entropy decomposition

$$M = \bigcup E_{T_{\alpha}}$$
, where $E_{T_{\alpha}} = \{x \in X: T_i(x) = T_i \text{ for } 0 \le i \le \alpha\}$

* - Can prove the theorem for each $E_{T_{\alpha}}$. Apriori there may seem to be 2^{α} such sets, but previous bound says there are only α^{N} such sets. Hence can add error up for all such sets to prove the theorem.



* Theorem (ChNa). Let $(M_{i}^{n}, g_{i}, p_{i}) \rightarrow (X, d_{X}, p)$ be a limit space with $|Rc_{i}| \le n-1$ and Vol $(B_{1}(p_{i}))>v>0$. Then

- * Theorem (ChNa). Let $(M_i^n, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ be a limit space with $|Rc_i| \le n-1$ and Vol $(B_1(p_i)) > v > 0$. Then
- * 1) For every q < 1 we have ∫_{B1(p)} | Rm | ^q ≤ ∫_{B1(p)} r(x)^{-2q} ≤ C(n,q).
 2) If the M_i are Kahler then ∀ q < 2 we have ∫_{B1(p)} | Rm | ^q ≤ ∫_{B1(p)} r(x)^{-2q} ≤ C(n,q).
 3) If ∫_{B2(p)} | Rm | ^q ≤ K then Vol({r(x)≤ r} ∩ B1) ≤ C r^{2q}

- * Theorem (ChNa). Let (M^n_i , g_i , p_i) → (X, d_X , p) be a limit space with $|Rc_i| \le n-1$ and Vol $(B_1(p_i))>v>0$. Then
- * 1) For every q < 1 we have $\int_{B_1(p)} |Rm|^q \le \int_{B_1(p)} r(x)^{-2q} \le C(n,q)$. 2) If the M_i are Kahler then $\forall q < 2$ we have $\int_{B_1(p)} |Rm|^q \le \int_{B_1(p)} r(x)^{-2q} \le C(n,q)$. 3) If $\int_{B_2(p)} |Rm|^q \le K$ then $Vol(\{r(x) \le r\} \cap B_1) \le C r^{2q}$
- Apriori L^q bounds for the curvature and (more importantly) the regularity scale.
 4) for Kahler Einstein with bounded chern classes Vol(B_r(Sing)∩B₁) ≤ C r⁴
 Improves Hausdorff dimension estimates to effective Minkowski dimension estimates
 Proof is an immediate consequence of Quantitative Stratification and ε-regularity.

- * Theorem (ChNa). Let (M^n_i , g_i , p_i) → (X, d_X , p) be a limit space with $|Rc_i| \le n-1$ and Vol $(B_1(p_i))>v>0$. Then
- * 1) For every q < 1 we have $\int_{B_1(p)} |Rm|^q \le \int_{B_1(p)} r(x)^{-2q} \le C(n,q)$. 2) If the M_i are Kahler then $\forall q < 2$ we have $\int_{B_1(p)} |Rm|^q \le \int_{B_1(p)} r(x)^{-2q} \le C(n,q)$. 3) If $\int_{B_2(p)} |Rm|^q \le K$ then $Vol(\{r(x) \le r\} \cap B_1) \le C r^{2q}$
- * Apriori L^q bounds for the curvature and (more importantly) the regularity scale.
 4) for Kahler Einstein with bounded chern classes Vol(B_r(Sing)∩B₁) ≤ C r⁴
 Improves Hausdorff dimension estimates to effective Minkowski dimension estimates
 Proof is an immediate consequence of Quantitative Stratification and ε-regularity.
- * Conjecture(Na): There exists K(n,v)>0 such that $\int_{B_1(p)} |Rm|^2 \le K$, and hence Vol $(\{r(x)\le r\} \cap B_1) \le C r^4$.

Bounded Ricci Curvature: Collapsing



Bounded Ricci Curvature: Collapsing

* Much less is known about the case $(M_i^n, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $|Rc_i| \le n-1$ and $Vol(B_1(p_i)) \rightarrow 0$.

Bounded Ricci Curvature: Collapsing

- * Much less is known about the case $(M_i^n, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $|Rc_i| \le n-1$ and $Vol(B_1(p_i)) \rightarrow 0$.
- * If n=4 and $\int_{B_2(x)} |Rm|^2 < \text{epsilon}$, then |Rm| < 1 on $B_1(x)$ (Cheeger-Tian).
Bounded Ricci Curvature: Collapsing

- * Much less is known about the case $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $|Rc_i| \le n-1$ and $Vol(B_1(p_i)) \rightarrow 0$.
- * If n=4 and $\int_{B_2(x)} |Rm|^2 < \text{epsilon}$, then |Rm| < 1 on $B_1(x)$ (Cheeger-Tian).
- * If n=4 and $\chi(M_i)$ ≤ K then X is a smooth Riemannian orbifold away from a finite number of isolated points (Naber-Tian).

Bounded Ricci Curvature: Collapsing

- * Much less is known about the case $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $|Rc_i| \le n-1$ and $Vol(B_1(p_i)) \rightarrow 0$.
- * If n=4 and $\int_{B_2(x)} |Rm|^2 < \text{epsilon}$, then |Rm| < 1 on $B_1(x)$ (Cheeger-Tian).
- If n=4 and $\chi(M_i)$ ≤ K then X is a smooth Riemannian orbifold away from a finite number of isolated points (Naber-Tian).
- * If |Rc_i| → 0 and diam(M_i), |sec_i| ≤ K then X is a Ricci flat Riemannian orbifold (Naber-Tian).

Bounded Ricci Curvature: Collapsing

- * Much less is known about the case $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $|Rc_i| \le n-1$ and $Vol(B_1(p_i)) \rightarrow 0$.
- * If n=4 and $\int_{B_2(x)} |Rm|^2 < \text{epsilon}$, then |Rm| < 1 on $B_1(x)$ (Cheeger-Tian).
- If n=4 and $\chi(M_i)$ ≤ K then X is a smooth Riemannian orbifold away from a finite number of isolated points (Naber-Tian).
- * If |Rc_i| → 0 and diam(M_i) , |sec_i| ≤ K then X is a Ricci flat Riemannian orbifold (Naber-Tian).
- * If $B_2(x)$ is *topologically simple* then $|\operatorname{Rm}| < 1$ on $B_1(x)$ (Naber).

Examples and Degeneracies



* In previous sections we have been studying limit spaces $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ and proving results on the structure of X. In this section we describe the opposite, and build limit spaces X which are particularly degenerate.

- * In previous sections we have been studying limit spaces $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ and proving results on the structure of X. In this section we describe the opposite, and build limit spaces X which are particularly degenerate.
- Limit spaces X differ from smooth spaces in that they admit nontrivial infinitesmal behavior. That is, tangent cones. The study of degeneracies of X comes down to the study of tangent cones of X.

- * In previous sections we have been studying limit spaces $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ and proving results on the structure of X. In this section we describe the opposite, and build limit spaces X which are particularly degenerate.
- Limit spaces X differ from smooth spaces in that they admit nontrivial infinitesmal behavior. That is, tangent cones. The study of degeneracies of X comes down to the study of tangent cones of X.
- * Recall:

- * In previous sections we have been studying limit spaces $(M^{n}_{i}, g_{i}, p_{i}) \rightarrow (X, d_{X}, p)$ and proving results on the structure of X. In this section we describe the opposite, and build limit spaces X which are particularly degenerate.
- Limit spaces X differ from smooth spaces in that they admit nontrivial infinitesmal behavior. That is, tangent cones. The study of degeneracies of X comes down to the study of tangent cones of X.

X

- Recall:
- * Definition: Given $x \in X$ and r > 0 define the blow up metric space by $(x,r) \equiv (X, r^{-1} d_X, p)$

- * In previous sections we have been studying limit spaces $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ and proving results on the structure of X. In this section we describe the opposite, and build limit spaces X which are particularly degenerate.
- Limit spaces X differ from smooth spaces in that they admit nontrivial infinitesmal behavior. That is, tangent cones. The study of degeneracies of X comes down to the study of tangent cones of X.
- * Recall:
- * Definition: Given $x \in X$ and r>0 define the blow up metric space by $(x,r) \equiv (X, r^{-1} d_X, p)$
- ▶ Definition: We say a metric space X_x is a tangent cone of X at x if there exists a sequence $r_i \rightarrow 0$ such that $X_{(x,r_i)} \rightarrow X_x$.

X



* Given a limit space (M_i^n, g_i, p_i) → (X, d_X, p) with $Rc_i \ge -(n-1)$ and $Vol(B_r(x)) > v > 0$, what is previously understood about tangent cones at p:

- * Given a limit space $(M_i^n, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $Rc_i \ge -(n-1)$ and $Vol(B_r(x)) > v > 0$, what is previously understood about tangent cones at p:
- * 1. Always Exist: Given any sequence $r_j \rightarrow 0$ there exists a subsequence s.t. $X_{(p,r_j)} \rightarrow X_p$

- * Given a limit space $(M_i^n, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $Rc_i \ge -(n-1)$ and $Vol(B_r(x)) > v > 0$, what is previously understood about tangent cones at p:
- * 1. Always Exist: Given any sequence $r_j \rightarrow 0$ there exists a subsequence s.t. $X_{(p,r_j)} \rightarrow X_p$
- * 2. Not Unique. Can exist $r_j \rightarrow 0$ and $r'_k \rightarrow 0$ such that $X_{(p,r_j)} \rightarrow X_p$ and $X_{(p,r'_k)} \rightarrow X'_p$

- * Given a limit space $(M_i^n, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $Rc_i \ge -(n-1)$ and $Vol(B_r(x)) > v > 0$, what is previously understood about tangent cones at p:
- * 1. Always Exist: Given any sequence $r_j \rightarrow 0$ there exists a subsequence s.t. $X_{(p,r_j)} \rightarrow X_p$
- * 2. Not Unique. Can exist $r_j \rightarrow 0$ and $r'_k \rightarrow 0$ such that $X_{(p,r_j)} \rightarrow X_p$ and $X_{(p,r'_k)} \rightarrow X'_p$
- * 3. A tangent cone $X_p = C(Y)$ is a metric cone over a compact metric space Y.



* Based on this we define the subset $\Omega_{X,p} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{GH}$ as the subset of all compact metric spaces such that $Y \in \Omega_{X,p}$ iff C(Y) is a tangent cone for X at p.

- * Based on this we define the subset $\Omega_{X,p} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{GH}$ as the subset of all compact metric spaces such that $Y \in \Omega_{X,p}$ iff C(Y) is a tangent cone for X at p.
- * We call $\Omega_{X,p}$ the space of cross sections at p. We say a tangent cone is smooth if Y is.

- * Based on this we define the subset $\Omega_{X,p} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{GH}$ as the subset of all compact metric spaces such that $Y \in \Omega_{X,p}$ iff C(Y) is a tangent cone for X at p.
- * We call $\Omega_{X,p}$ the space of cross sections at p. We say a tangent cone is smooth if Y is.
- * When $(M_{i}^{n}, g_{i}, p_{i}) \rightarrow (X, d_{X}, p)$ with Rc_i ≥ (n-1) and Vol $(B_{r}(x))$ >v>0, then the following are easy to deduce:

- * Based on this we define the subset $\Omega_{X,p} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{GH}$ as the subset of all compact metric spaces such that $Y \in \Omega_{X,p}$ iff C(Y) is a tangent cone for X at p.
- * We call $\Omega_{X,p}$ the space of cross sections at p. We say a tangent cone is smooth if Y is.
- * When (M_i^n, g_i, p_i) → (X, d_X, p) with $Rc_i \ge -(n-1)$ and $Vol(B_r(x)) > v > 0$, then the following are easy to deduce:
- * P1) If $Y_0, Y_1 \in \Omega_{X,p}$ then $Vol(Y_0)=Vol(Y_1)$.

- ★ Based on this we define the subset $\Omega_{X,p} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{GH}$ as the subset of all compact metric spaces such that Y∈ $\Omega_{X,p}$ iff C(Y) is a tangent cone for X at p.
- * We call $\Omega_{X,p}$ the space of cross sections at p. We say a tangent cone is smooth if Y is.
- * When (M_i^n, g_i, p_i) → (X, d_X, p) with $Rc_i \ge -(n-1)$ and $Vol(B_r(x)) > v > 0$, then the following are easy to deduce:
- * P1) If $Y_0, Y_1 \in \Omega_{X,p}$ then $Vol(Y_0)=Vol(Y_1)$.
- * P2) If $Y \in \Omega_{X,p}$ then $Rc[Y] \ge n-2$.

- * Based on this we define the subset $\Omega_{X,p} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{GH}$ as the subset of all compact metric spaces such that $Y \in \Omega_{X,p}$ iff C(Y) is a tangent cone for X at p.
- * We call $\Omega_{X,p}$ the space of cross sections at p. We say a tangent cone is smooth if Y is.
- * When (M_i^n, g_i, p_i) → (X, d_X, p) with $Rc_i \ge -(n-1)$ and $Vol(B_r(x)) > v > 0$, then the following are easy to deduce:
- * P1) If $Y_0, Y_1 \in \Omega_{X,p}$ then $Vol(Y_0) = Vol(Y_1)$.
- * P2) If $Y \in \Omega_{X,p}$ then $Rc[Y] \ge n-2$.
- * P3) If $Y \in \Omega_{X,p}$ then Y is "geometrically cobordant" or "Ricci-closable".

- ★ Based on this we define the subset $\Omega_{X,p} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{GH}$ as the subset of all compact metric spaces such that Y∈ $\Omega_{X,p}$ iff C(Y) is a tangent cone for X at p.
- * We call $\Omega_{X,p}$ the space of cross sections at p. We say a tangent cone is smooth if Y is.
- * When (M^n_i, g_i, p_i) → (X, d_X, p) with $Rc_i \ge -(n-1)$ and $Vol(B_r(x)) > v > 0$, then the following are easy to deduce:
- * P1) If $Y_0, Y_1 \in \Omega_{X,p}$ then $Vol(Y_0)=Vol(Y_1)$.
- * P2) If $Y \in \Omega_{X,p}$ then $Rc[Y] \ge n-2$.
- * P3) If $Y \in \Omega_{X,p}$ then Y is "geometrically cobordant" or "Ricci-closable".
- * Question: If these are necessary conditions, are they sufficient?



* Answer: Yes!

- Answer: Yes!
- * Theorem(Colding-Naber): Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{GH}$ be a smoothly connected subset such that every $Y \in \Omega$ satisfies P1) and P2), and some $Y_0 \in \Omega$ satisfies P3). Then there exists a sequence $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $Rc_i \ge 0$ and $Vol(B_r(x)) > v > 0$ such that $\Omega_{X,p} \equiv \Omega$.

- * Answer: Yes!
- * Theorem(Colding-Naber): Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{GH}$ be a smoothly connected subset such that every $Y \in \Omega$ satisfies P1) and P2), and *some* $Y_0 \in \Omega$ satisfies P3). Then there exists a sequence $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $Rc_i \ge 0$ and $Vol(B_r(x)) > v > 0$ such that $\Omega_{X,p} \equiv \Omega$.
- Primary application of the above is to construct new examples of limit spaces with various degenerate behaviors.



* Example 1 (CoNa):

- * Example 1 (CoNa):
- * Let Ω be a smooth family of metrics on S² which vary from a small sphere to the football metric. Note that the required conditions on Ω are satisfied.

- * Example 1 (CoNa):
- * Let Ω be a smooth family of metrics on S² which vary from a small sphere to the football metric. Note that the required conditions on Ω are satisfied.
- Construct a limit space (X³, d_X, p) as in the previous theorem. It has the following properties:

- * Example 1 (CoNa):
- * Let Ω be a smooth family of metrics on S² which vary from a small sphere to the football metric. Note that the required conditions on Ω are satisfied.
- Construct a limit space (X³, d_X, p) as in the previous theorem. It has the following properties:
- * 1) It is the first example of a three dimensional limit space with nonunique tangent cones at some point pc∈ X.

- * Example 1 (CoNa):
- * Let Ω be a smooth family of metrics on S² which vary from a small sphere to the football metric. Note that the required conditions on Ω are satisfied.
- Construct a limit space (X³, d_X, p) as in the previous theorem. It has the following properties:
- * 1) It is the first example of a three dimensional limit space with nonunique tangent cones at some point pc∈ X.
- * 2) It is the first example of a limit space where at a point p∈ X, some tangent cones are smooth, and others are not.



* Example 2 (CoNa):

- * Example 2 (CoNa):
- Similarly let Ω be a smooth family on Sⁿ⁻¹ which vary from a small sphere to the spaces Sus^k(S^{n-k-1}), where Sus is the suspension of a space (so Sus^k(S^{n-k-1}) is the k-th suspension of a n-k-1 sphere).
- * Example 2 (CoNa):
- * Similarly let Ω be a smooth family on Sⁿ⁻¹ which vary from a small sphere to the spaces Sus^k(S^{n-k-1}), where Sus is the suspension of a space (so Sus^k(S^{n-k-1}) is the k-th suspension of a n-k-1 sphere).
- * Construct the limit space X using the previous Theorem. It has the following properties

- * Example 2 (CoNa):
- Similarly let Ω be a smooth family on Sⁿ⁻¹ which vary from a small sphere to the spaces Sus^k(S^{n-k-1}), where Sus is the suspension of a space (so Sus^k(S^{n-k-1}) is the k-th suspension of a n-k-1 sphere).
- * Construct the limit space X using the previous Theorem. It has the following properties
- * 1) At $p \in X$ there are tangent cones of the form $\mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{C}(Y)$ for all $0 \le k \le n-2$, where Y is a smooth space.

- * Example 2 (CoNa):
- Similarly let Ω be a smooth family on Sⁿ⁻¹ which vary from a small sphere to the spaces Sus^k(S^{n-k-1}), where Sus is the suspension of a space (so Sus^k(S^{n-k-1}) is the k-th suspension of a n-k-1 sphere).
- * Construct the limit space X using the previous Theorem. It has the following properties
- * 1) At $p \in X$ there are tangent cones of the form $\mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{C}(Y)$ for all $0 \le k \le n-2$, where Y is a smooth space.
- In particular the dimension of the singular set of a tangent cone is not an invariant of the point in question.

- Hence, one cannot stratify (in the sense of a stratified space) limit spaces which are limits with only lower Ricci bounds.



* Example 3 (CoNa):

- * Example 3 (CoNa):
- * This example is more complicated. We state it precisely below:

- * Example 3 (CoNa):
- * This example is more complicated. We state it precisely below:
- * Theorem(CoNa). There exists a limit space $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $Rc_i \ge 0$ and Vol $(B_r(x)) > v > 0$, such that at p there are distinct tangent cones $X_0 = C(Y_0)$ and $X_1 = C(Y_1)$ which are not homeomorphic. Specifically, Y_0 is homeomorphic to CP^2 #- CP^2 and Y_1 is homeomorphic to S^4 .

- * Example 3 (CoNa):
- * This example is more complicated. We state it precisely below:
- * Theorem(CoNa). There exists a limit space $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $Rc_i \ge 0$ and Vol $(B_r(x))>v>0$, such that at p there are distinct tangent cones $X_0=C(Y_0)$ and $X_1=C(Y_1)$ which are not homeomorphic. Specifically, Y_0 is homeomorphic to CP^2 #- CP^2 and Y_1 is homeomorphic to S^4 .
- * To prove we build a family Ω of smooth metrics (CP²#-CP²,g_s) where $s \in [0,1)$ such that Each (CP²#-CP²,g_s) satisfies P1) and P2).
 - The metric space (CP^2 #- CP^2 , g_0) is Ricci closable.
 - The Gromov-Hausdorff limit converges (CP²#-CP², g_s) \rightarrow (S⁴, g_1) to a metric on S⁴.

- * Example 3 (CoNa):
- * This example is more complicated. We state it precisely below:
- * Theorem(CoNa). There exists a limit space $(M^n_i, g_i, p_i) \rightarrow (X, d_X, p)$ with $Rc_i \ge 0$ and Vol $(B_r(x)) > v > 0$, such that at p there are distinct tangent cones $X_0 = C(Y_0)$ and $X_1 = C(Y_1)$ which are not homeomorphic. Specifically, Y_0 is homeomorphic to CP^2 #- CP^2 and Y_1 is homeomorphic to S^4 .
- * To prove we build a family Ω of smooth metrics (CP²#-CP²,g_s) where $s \in [0,1)$ such that Each (CP²#-CP²,g_s) satisfies P1) and P2).
 - The metric space (CP^2 #- CP^2 , g_0) is Ricci closable.
 - The Gromov-Hausdorff limit converges (CP²#-CP², g_s) \rightarrow (S⁴, g_1) to a metric on S⁴.
- * Conjecture: Given a noncollapsed limit space X^n , the set of points *NH* where the tangent cones are not homeomorphic satisfies dim *NH* \leq n-5.



* In recent work with Hans-Joachim Hein we construct examples of Kahler Ricci flat spaces (X_i^{2n}, g_i, p_i) , $n \ge 3$, with the following properties:

- * In recent work with Hans-Joachim Hein we construct examples of Kahler Ricci flat spaces (X_i^{2n}, g_i, p_i) , $n \ge 3$, with the following properties:
- * 1. Each X_i²ⁿ is the limit of smooth noncollapsed Ricci flat manifolds (Calabi-Yau's).
 Each has an isolated singular point at p_i while is otherwise a smooth manifold.

- * In recent work with Hans-Joachim Hein we construct examples of Kahler Ricci flat spaces (X_i^{2n}, g_i, p_i) , $n \ge 3$, with the following properties:
- * 1. Each X_i²ⁿ is the limit of smooth noncollapsed Ricci flat manifolds (Calabi-Yau's).
 Each has an isolated singular point at p_i while is otherwise a smooth manifold.
- The tangent cones at p_i are isometric to C×(C/Z₂), in particular the singular set of the tangent cone has complex dimension 1.

- * In recent work with Hans-Joachim Hein we construct examples of Kahler Ricci flat spaces (X_i^{2n}, g_i, p_i) , $n \ge 3$, with the following properties:
- * 1. Each X_i²ⁿ is the limit of smooth noncollapsed Ricci flat manifolds (Calabi-Yau's).
 Each has an isolated singular point at p_i while is otherwise a smooth manifold.
- The tangent cones at p_i are isometric to C×(C/Z₂), in particular the singular set of the tangent cone has complex dimension 1.
- Can't stratify Einstein limits based on dimension of the tangent cone.
 - First example of noncollapsed limit which is not a Riemannian Stratified Space
 - There does not exist a local homeomorphism stability theorem for Einstein manifolds.

- * In recent work with Hans-Joachim Hein we construct examples of Kahler Ricci flat spaces (X_i^{2n}, g_i, p_i) , n ≥ 3, with the following properties:
- * 1. Each X_i²ⁿ is the limit of smooth noncollapsed Ricci flat manifolds (Calabi-Yau's).
 Each has an isolated singular point at p_i while is otherwise a smooth manifold.
- The tangent cones at p_i are isometric to C×(C/Z₂), in particular the singular set of the tangent cone has complex dimension 1.
- Can't stratify Einstein limits based on dimension of the tangent cone.
 - First example of noncollapsed limit which is not a Riemannian Stratified Space
 - There does not exist a local homeomorphism stability theorem for Einstein manifolds.
- * 4. diam $X_i^{2n} = 1$ and $Vol(B_1(p_i)) > v > 0$.

- * In recent work with Hans-Joachim Hein we construct examples of Kahler Ricci flat spaces (X_i^{2n}, g_i, p_i) , $n \ge 3$, with the following properties:
- * 1. Each X_i²ⁿ is the limit of smooth noncollapsed Ricci flat manifolds (Calabi-Yau's).
 Each has an isolated singular point at p_i while is otherwise a smooth manifold.
- The tangent cones at p_i are isometric to C×(C/Z₂), in particular the singular set of the tangent cone has complex dimension 1.
- Can't stratify Einstein limits based on dimension of the tangent cone.
 - First example of noncollapsed limit which is not a Riemannian Stratified Space
 - There does not exist a local homeomorphism stability theorem for Einstein manifolds.
- 4. diam $X_i^{2n} = 1$ and $Vol(B_1(p_i)) > v > 0$.
- * 5. $H^n(X_i^{2n}) \rightarrow \infty$.

Extension of the Quantitative Stratification



 Ideas extremely similar to the regularity estimates for Einstein manifolds work in many geometric and analytical contexts. Each case includes new Quantitative Stratification results and new ε-regularity theorems:

- Ideas extremely similar to the regularity estimates for Einstein manifolds work in many geometric and analytical contexts. Each case includes new Quantitative Stratification results and new ε-regularity theorems:
- * Harmonic Maps between Riemannian manifolds: Given a minimizing map f:M \rightarrow N we prove L^p estimates on $|\nabla f|$ for p<3 and $|\nabla^2 f|$ for p<3/2. These estimates are sharp and the first Sobolev estimates for general harmonic maps. (joint with J. Cheeger)

- Ideas extremely similar to the regularity estimates for Einstein manifolds work in many geometric and analytical contexts. Each case includes new Quantitative Stratification results and new ε-regularity theorems:
- * Harmonic Maps between Riemannian manifolds: Given a minimizing map f:M \rightarrow N we prove L^p estimates on $|\nabla f|$ for p<3 and $|\nabla^2 f|$ for p<3/2. These estimates are sharp and the first Sobolev estimates for general harmonic maps. (joint with J. Cheeger)
- Minimizing Hypersurfaces: Given a current I which is a minimizing hypersurface, we prove L^p estimates for the the second fundamental form A and its regularity scale for p<7. These estimates are sharp and the first for nonsmooth I (joint with J. Cheeger)

- Ideas extremely similar to the regularity estimates for Einstein manifolds work in many geometric and analytical contexts. Each case includes new Quantitative Stratification results and new ε-regularity theorems:
- * Harmonic Maps between Riemannian manifolds: Given a minimizing map f:M \rightarrow N we prove L^p estimates on $|\nabla f|$ for p<3 and $|\nabla^2 f|$ for p<3/2. These estimates are sharp and the first Sobolev estimates for general harmonic maps. (joint with J. Cheeger)
- Minimizing Hypersurfaces: Given a current I which is a minimizing hypersurface, we prove L^p estimates for the the second fundamental form A and its regularity scale for p<7. These estimates are sharp and the first for nonsmooth I (joint with J. Cheeger)
- * Mean Curvature Flow (joint with J. Cheeger and R. Haslhofer)

- Ideas extremely similar to the regularity estimates for Einstein manifolds work in many geometric and analytical contexts. Each case includes new Quantitative Stratification results and new ε-regularity theorems:
- * Harmonic Maps between Riemannian manifolds: Given a minimizing map f:M \rightarrow N we prove L^p estimates on $|\nabla f|$ for p<3 and $|\nabla^2 f|$ for p<3/2. These estimates are sharp and the first Sobolev estimates for general harmonic maps. (joint with J. Cheeger)
- Minimizing Hypersurfaces: Given a current I which is a minimizing hypersurface, we prove L^p estimates for the the second fundamental form A and its regularity scale for p<7. These estimates are sharp and the first for nonsmooth I (joint with J. Cheeger)
- * Mean Curvature Flow (joint with J. Cheeger and R. Haslhofer)
- * Critical Sets of Elliptic Equations (joint with J. Cheeger and D. Valtorta)

- Ideas extremely similar to the regularity estimates for Einstein manifolds work in many geometric and analytical contexts. Each case includes new Quantitative Stratification results and new ε-regularity theorems:
- * Harmonic Maps between Riemannian manifolds: Given a minimizing map f:M \rightarrow N we prove L^p estimates on $|\nabla f|$ for p<3 and $|\nabla^2 f|$ for p<3/2. These estimates are sharp and the first Sobolev estimates for general harmonic maps. (joint with J. Cheeger)
- Minimizing Hypersurfaces: Given a current I which is a minimizing hypersurface, we prove L^p estimates for the the second fundamental form A and its regularity scale for p<7. These estimates are sharp and the first for nonsmooth I (joint with J. Cheeger)
- * Mean Curvature Flow (joint with J. Cheeger and R. Haslhofer)
- * Critical Sets of Elliptic Equations (joint with J. Cheeger and D. Valtorta)