

Inradius collapsed manifolds with a lower Ricci curvature bound

Zhangkai Huang*, Takao Yamaguchi†

December 1, 2025

Abstract

In this paper, we study a family of n -dimensional Riemannian manifolds with boundary having lower bounds on the Ricci curvatures of interior and boundary and on the second fundamental form of boundary. A sequence of manifolds in this family is said to be inradius collapsed if their inradii tend to zero. We prove that the limit space C_0 of boundaries of inradius collapsed manifolds admits an isometric involution f , and that the limit of the manifolds themselves is isometric to the quotient space C_0/f . As an application, we show that the number of boundary components of inradius collapsed manifolds is at most two. Moreover, we prove that the limit space has a lower Ricci curvature bound and an upper dimension bound in a synthetic sense if in addition their boundaries are non-collapsed.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Preliminaries	6
2.1	Ricci limit spaces	7
2.2	RCD spaces	8
2.3	Manifolds with boundary: gluing and extension	11
3	Limit spaces of inradius collapsed manifolds	13
4	Metric structure of limit spaces	16
4.1	Tangent space and tangent map	17
4.2	Geometric properties of limit spaces	28
4.3	The $\text{RCD}(K, n-1)$ structure of limit spaces	31
4.4	The unbounded diameter case	36

*School of Mathematics, Sun Yat-sen University, China. Email: huangzhk27@mail.sysu.edu.cn

†Department of Mathematics, University of Tsukuba, Japan. Email: takao@math.tsukuba.ac.jp

1 Introduction

The convergence of Riemannian manifolds with boundary was first studied by Kodani in [36], and later by Anderson-Katsuda-Kurylev-Lassas-Taylor in [11] and by Wong in [46]. In this paper, we are concerned with collapsing phenomena of a certain family of Riemannian manifolds with boundary.

By collapsing phenomena, we refer specifically to inradius collapsing. Here, we study Riemannian manifolds with small inradii, defined as follows.

Definition 1.1 (Inradius collapsed manifolds). Let (M, g) be an n -dimensional Riemannian manifold with boundary. The *inradius* of M is defined as

$$\text{inrad}(M) = \sup_{x \in M} d_g(x, \partial M),$$

where d_g is the Riemannian distance function induced by g . A sequence of n -dimensional Riemannian manifolds $\{(M_i, g_i)\}$ is said to be *inradius collapsed* if $\text{inrad}(M_i) \rightarrow 0$.

The study of manifolds with small inradii is originated in [31] and [1]. In 2019, The second author and Zhang [47] investigated a sequence of n -dimensional inradius collapsed manifolds $\{(M_i, g_i)\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ with a lower sectional curvature bound, two side bounds on the second fundamental forms of boundaries, i.e.

$$\text{Sec}_{g_i} \geq H, \quad |\text{II}_{\partial M_i}| \leq \lambda. \quad (1.1)$$

Wong [45] proved the precompactness of this family in the pointed Gromov-Hausdorff topology; namely, any sequence of pointed n -dimensional Riemannian manifolds with boundary $\{(M_i, d_{g_i}, p_i)\}$ satisfying (1.1) has a convergent subsequence in the pointed Gromov-Hausdorff sense.

Under (1.1), the Gauss equation implies a uniform lower sectional curvature bound $K = K(H, \lambda)$ on ∂M_i . Analyzing the pointed Gromov-Hausdorff limit space (X, d, x_0) of $\{(M_i, d_{g_i}, p_i)\}$, the second author and Zhang proved that (X, d) is an Alexandrov space with curvature bounded from below by K . Moreover, for such manifolds with sufficiently small inradii, they showed that the numbers of components of their boundaries are at most 2.

In the present paper we consider the following family of Riemannian manifolds with boundary. Note that the case $n = 2$ is already settled in [47].

Definition 1.2. For arbitrary $n \in \mathbb{N} \cap [3, \infty)$, $H, K \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lambda \geq 0$ and $D > 0$, we denote by $\mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda, D)$ the family of n -dimensional compact Riemannian manifolds (M, g) with boundary such that

$$\text{Ric}_g \geq H, \quad \text{Ric}_{g_{\partial M}} \geq K, \quad \text{II}_{\partial M} \geq -\lambda, \quad \text{diam}(M, d_g) \leq D, \quad (1.2)$$

where Ric_g and $\text{Ric}_{g_{\partial M}}$ denotes the Ricci curvature of (M, g) and $(\partial M, g_{\partial M})$ respectively.

Unlike the case (1.1), the Gauss equation does not imply a lower Ricci curvature bound of ∂M even under the assumption $\text{Ric}_g \geq H$ and $|\text{II}_{\partial M}| \leq \lambda$ (see Remark 2.20 and Example 5.1). This raises the question of whether the family of boundaries of manifolds (M, g) satisfying $\text{Ric}_g \geq H$, $|\text{II}_{\partial M}| \leq \lambda$ and $\text{diam}(M, d_g) \leq D$ is precompact in the Gromov-Hausdorff topology. To address this, we introduce the additional condition $\text{Ric}_{g_{\partial M}} \geq K$ in (1.2). With this assumption, the assumption on the second fundamental forms can be refined to $\text{II}_{\partial M} \geq -\lambda$. Moreover, by adapting Wong's proof, we demonstrate that the family $\mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda, D)$ satisfies the results in [45, Theorem 1.9] (see also Theorem 2.19).

Our first result is the following theorem for limit spaces of inradius collapsed manifolds in $\mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda, D)$.

Theorem 1.3 (Theorems 4.16 and 4.19). *Assume $\{(M_i, g_i)\}$ is a sequence of inradius collapsed manifolds in $\mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda, D)$. Let (C_0, d) and (X, d_X) be the Gromov-Hausdorff limit spaces of $\{(\partial M_i, d_{g_{\partial M_i}})\}$ and $\{(M_i, d_{g_i})\}$ respectively. Then there exists an isometric involution $f : C_0 \rightarrow C_0$ such that (X, d_X) is isometric to the quotient space $(C_0/f, d^*)$, where d^* denotes the quotient metric induced by f .*

As an application, we get the following result.

Theorem 1.4. *There exists a positive number $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, H, K, \lambda, D)$ such that if $(M, g) \in \mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda, D)$ satisfies $\text{inrad}(M) < \epsilon$, then the number of components of ∂M is at most 2.*

In 1990's, Cheeger-Colding carried out pioneering and significant research programs [17–20] on Ricci limit spaces—the Gromov-Hausdorff limit spaces of Riemannian manifolds with a fixed dimension and a uniform lower Ricci curvature bound.

At the beginning of 21st century, Sturm [43, 44] and Lott-Villani [37] introduced a synthetic definition of lower Ricci curvature bounds $K \in \mathbb{R}$ and upper dimension bounds $N \in [1, \infty)$ for general metric measure spaces, known as the $\text{CD}(K, N)$ condition. Building on this, Ambrosio-Mondino-Savaré [5], Gigli [28, 29], Erbar-Kuwada-Sturm [25] and Ambrosio-Mondino-Savaré [9] introduced the $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ condition, which strengthens the $\text{CD}(K, N)$ condition by requiring the metric measure space to admit a Riemannian structure in the sense that its $H^{1,2}$ -Sobolev space is a Hilbert space.

As an example of $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces, consider weighted Riemannian manifolds. For an n -dimensional closed weighted Riemannian manifold $(M, d_g, e^{-f} \text{vol}_g)$ with $f \in C^\infty(M)$, the Bakry-Émery N -Ricci curvature tensor Ric_N is defined as

$$\text{Ric}_N := \begin{cases} \text{Ric}_g + \text{Hess}_g(f) - \frac{df \otimes df}{N-n} & \text{if } N > n, \\ \text{Ric}_g & \text{if } N = n \text{ and } f \text{ is a constant,} \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is known that if $\text{Ric}_N \geq K$, then $(M, d_g, e^{-f} \text{vol}_g)$ is an $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space.

Recently, Núñez-Zimbrón-Pasqualetto-Soultanis proved in [39, Corollary 1.4] that for every $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space (X, d, \mathbf{m}) , the metric space (X, d) is universally infinitesimally Hilbertian in the following sense.

Definition 1.5. A complete metric space (X, \mathbf{d}) is said to be *universally infinitesimally Hilbertian* if $H^{1,2}(\text{supp}(\mu), \mathbf{d}, \mu)$ is a Hilbert space for any Radon measure μ on X , where $\text{supp}(\mu)$ is the support of μ .

We summarize the geometric properties of the limit space of inradius collapsed manifolds in $\mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda, D)$ as follows.

Theorem 1.6 (Theorems 4.19 and 4.31). *Under the assumption of Theorem 1.3, the metric space (X, \mathbf{d}_X) is geodesically non-branching and universally infinitesimally Hilbertian.*

As a synthetic counterpart of non-collapsed Ricci limit spaces, De Philippis-Gigli [23] proposed the definition of non-collapsed $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces. To be precise, an $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space is called non-collapsed when its reference measure is the N -dimensional Hausdorff measure \mathcal{H}^N . Such spaces bear better regularity properties than general $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces. See for instance [2, 34].

Han [33] (see also Theorem 2.12) proved that manifolds in $\mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda, D)$ do not satisfy the $\text{RCD}(H, n)$ condition in general. Our second main result is stated as follows, which says that the Gromov-Hausdorff limit space of inradius collapsed manifolds in $\mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda, D)$ is a *non-collapsed* $\text{RCD}(K, n - 1)$ space when their boundaries are non-collapsed.

Theorem 1.7. *Assume $\{(M_i, g_i)\}$ is a sequence of inradius collapsed manifolds in $\mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda, D)$ such that*

$$\inf_i \text{vol}_{g_{\partial M_i}}(\partial M_i) > 0. \quad (1.3)$$

If $\{(M_i, \mathbf{d}_{g_i})\}$ converges to a metric space (X, \mathbf{d}_X) in the Gromov-Hausdorff sense, then $(X, \mathbf{d}_X, \mathcal{H}^{n-1})$ is a non-collapsed $\text{RCD}(K, n - 1)$ space.

Remark 1.8. When $\lambda = 0$, a result of Han [33] implies that for any inradius collapsed manifolds $\{(M_i, g_i)\}$ in $\mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda, D)$, after passing to a subsequence, the measured Gromov-Hausdorff limit of $(M_i, \mathbf{d}_{g_i}, (\text{vol}_{g_i}(M_i))^{-1} \text{vol}_{g_i})$ (where $(\text{vol}_{g_i}(M_i))^{-1} \text{vol}_{g_i}$ is the renormalized measure) is an $\text{RCD}(H, n)$ space. However, even under (1.3), the limit measure may not coincide with the $(n - 1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure (up to a multiplicative constant). See Example 5.3.

For the case $\lambda > 0$, such mGH limit space may fail to satisfy any RCD condition altogether, as shown in Example 5.5.

Remark 1.9. Under the assumption of Theorem 1.3, there exists a Radon measure μ on X such that $\text{supp}(\mu) = X$ and (X, \mathbf{d}_X, μ) is an $\text{RCD}(K, n - 1)$ space, except in the following cases:

- (1) $\lambda > 0$, $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{vol}_{g_{\partial M_i}}(\partial M_i) = 0$, C_0 is connected and f has no fixed point.
- (2) $\lambda > 0$, $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{vol}_{g_{\partial M_i}}(\partial M_i) = 0$, f has a fixed point, and the complement of the fixed point set of f is non-empty and connected.

See Remark 4.34.

In general, it remains unknown whether the limit space (X, \mathbf{d}_X) obtained in Theorem 1.3 admits a full-support Radon measure such that the resulting metric measure space satisfies some RCD condition.

As a noncompact analogue, we study inradius collapsed manifolds in the following family.

Definition 1.10. For $n \in \mathbb{N} \cap [3, \infty)$, $H, K \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lambda \geq 0$, let $\mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda)$ be the family of n -dimensional Riemannian manifolds (M, g) with boundary such that

$$\text{Ric}_g \geq H, \text{Ric}_{g_{\partial M}} \geq K, \text{II}_{\partial M} \geq -\lambda.$$

In connection with Theorems 1.3, 1.4, 1.6 and 1.7, we summarize our findings as follows. This result confirms that the aforementioned theorems are indeed independent of the parameter D .

Theorem 1.11. Assume $\{(M_i, g_i, p_i)\}$ is a sequence of inradius collapsed manifolds in $\mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda)$ with $p_i \in \partial M_i$. Let (C_0, \mathbf{d}, p) and (X, \mathbf{d}_X, x) be the pointed Gromov-Hausdorff limit spaces of $\{(\partial M_i, \mathbf{d}_{g_{\partial M_i}}, p_i)\}$ and $\{(M_i, \mathbf{d}_{g_i}, p_i)\}$ respectively. Then the following holds.

- (1) There exists an isometric involution $f : C_0 \rightarrow C_0$ such that (X, \mathbf{d}_X, x) is isometric to the quotient space $(C_0/f, \mathbf{d}^*, p)$, where \mathbf{d}^* denotes the quotient metric induced by f .
- (2) The metric space (X, \mathbf{d}_X) is geodesically non-branching and universally infinitesimally Hilbertian.
- (3) If in addition

$$\inf_i \text{vol}_{g_{\partial M_i}}(B_1^{\partial M_i}(p_i)) > 0,$$

then $(X, \mathbf{d}_X, \mathcal{H}^{n-1})$ is a non-collapsed $\text{RCD}(K, n-1)$ space.

Theorem 1.12. There exists a positive number $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, H, K, \lambda)$ such that if $(M, g) \in \mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda)$ satisfies $\text{inrad}(M) < \epsilon$, then the number of components of ∂M is at most 2.

We here explain the main idea of the proofs of our main theorems and the organization of this paper. The overall approach of this paper follows that of [47]. However, in the detailed proofs, we generalize the arguments in [47] that relied heavily on the assumption of a lower bound on the sectional curvature.

In Section 2, we begin by presenting fundamental concepts concerning Ricci limit spaces and RCD spaces. We then recall Wong's extension procedure [45] for manifolds in $\mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda, D)$, which involves attaching warped cylinders along the manifolds' boundaries.

In Section 3, we examine a sequence of inradius collapsed manifolds $\{(M_i, g_i)\}$ in $\mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda, D)$ and its Gromov-Hausdorff limit space (X, d_X) . This space coincides with the limit space of the boundaries equipped with exterior metrics $\{(\partial M_i, d_{g_i})\}$. Simultaneously, the sequence of the boundaries with intrinsic metrics $\{(\partial M_i, d_{g_{\partial M_i}})\}$, is precompact in the Gromov-Hausdorff topology, converging to a limit space (C_0, d) . Moreover, the identity maps $\text{id} : (\partial M_i, d_{g_{\partial M_i}}) \rightarrow (\partial M_i, d_{g_i})$ converge to a 1-Lipschitz surjection $\eta_0 : (C_0, d) \rightarrow (X, d_X)$. We show that $\eta_0^{-1}(x)$ contains at most two points for any $x \in X$. This naturally induces an involution $f : C_0 \rightarrow C_0$ (see Definition 3.9 and (4.24)).

In Section 4, we take a point $p \in C_0$ and let $x = \eta_0(p)$. We study the tangent spaces $T_p C_0$ and $T_x X$ and the induced tangent map $\eta_\infty : T_p C_0 \rightarrow T_x X$. We prove η_∞ preserves the distance from the origin, demonstrating that f is an isometric involution. Consequently, η_0 becomes a quotient map under the \mathbb{Z}_2 -action $\{f, \text{id}\}$, from which Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 follow. Combining Theorem 1.3 with [24] and [27], we derive Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 respectively. Note that the application of the Busemann function plays an important role in this section. Finally, we extend our analysis to the noncompact case of Ricci inradius collapsed manifolds. By employing a methodology similar to that in [47], we likewise obtain results analogous to those presented in Theorems 1.3, 1.4, 1.6 and 1.7.

In Section 5, we present characteristic examples of inradius collapsed manifolds. As established in [47, Theorem 1.6], for any manifold with boundary (M, g) satisfying (1.1), if the inradius of M is sufficiently small and ∂M has two components, then M is diffeomorphic to $W \times [0, 1]$, where W is a component of ∂M . Nevertheless, using Menguy's construction [38], we exhibit a sequence of four dimensional Ricci inradius collapsed manifolds such that the boundary of each manifold has two components, both diffeomorphic to S^3 , yet the second Betti number of these manifolds tends to infinity.

Acknowledgement. The first author acknowledges the support of Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, Sun Yat-sen University, Grant Number 24qnpy105. The Second author was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 21H00977.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, we denote by $J = J(c_1, \dots, c_n)$ a positive constant depending on c_1, \dots, c_n , which may vary from line to line.

We also make some convention on complete and separable metric spaces (X, d) . For a rectifiable curve γ in (X, d) , its length is denoted by $L^{(X, d)}(\gamma)$ (or briefly $L^d(\gamma)$, $L(\gamma)$). The set of Lipschitz functions is denoted by $\text{Lip}(X, d)$. For $f \in \text{Lip}(X, d)$, the local Lipschitz constant of f at $x \in X$ is defined as

$$\text{lip } f(x) = \begin{cases} \limsup_{y \rightarrow x} \frac{|f(y) - f(x)|}{d(y, x)} & \text{if } x \in X \text{ is not isolated,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The open ball of radius R centered at x is denoted as $B_R^{(X,d)}(x)$ (or briefly $B_R^X(x)$, $B_R(x)$). If (X, d) is geodesic, a unit speed minimal geodesic from x to y is denoted by $\gamma_{x,y}^{(X,d)}$ (or briefly $\gamma_{x,y}^d$, $\gamma_{x,y}$). We also denote by \mathcal{H}_d^m (or briefly \mathcal{H}^m) the m -dimensional Hausdorff measure on (X, d) for $m \in [1, \infty)$.

2.1 Ricci limit spaces

This subsection is aimed at recalling some properties of Ricci limit spaces. The precise definition of Gromov-Hausdorff convergence (GH convergence), Gromov-Hausdorff distance d_{GH} , pointed Gromov-Hausdorff convergence (pGH convergence), pointed Gromov-Hausdorff distance d_{pGH} , measured Gromov-Hausdorff convergence (mGH convergence) and pointed measured Gromov-Hausdorff convergence (pmGH convergence) are omitted. For detailed treatments, see [26] and [30].

Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $D > 0$. Let $\{(M_i, g_i)\}$ be a sequence of n -dimensional closed Riemannian manifolds with

$$\text{Ric}_{g_i} \geq -1, \quad \text{diam}(M_i, d_{g_i}) \leq D.$$

Owing to Gromov's compactness theorem, after passing to a subsequence, we may assume that there exists a complete and separable metric measure space (X, d, \mathbf{m}) (which is indeed an $\text{RCD}(-1, n)$ metric measure space by Section 2.2) such that

$$\left(M_i, d_{g_i}, \frac{\text{vol}_{g_i}}{\text{vol}_{g_i}(M_i)} \right) \xrightarrow{\text{mGH}} (X, d, \mathbf{m}).$$

We next introduce an important result on regular sets, whose precise definition is given as follows.

Definition 2.1 (k -regular sets). A point $x \in X$ is said to be a k -regular point if for any sequence of positive numbers $\{s_i\}$ with $s_i \rightarrow 0$ it holds that

$$(s_i^{-1}X, x) \xrightarrow{\text{pGH}} (\mathbb{R}^k, 0_k),$$

where we denote the rescaled pointed metric space $(X, s_i^{-1}d, x)$ by $(s_i^{-1}X, x)$ for simplicity. The set of all k -regular points of X is denoted by $\mathcal{R}_k(X)$.

The following theorem on the *dimension* of Ricci limit spaces is derived from [21, Theorem 0.1], [18, Theorem 3.1] and [22, Theorem 1.18].

Theorem 2.2. *There exists a unique integer $k \leq n$ such that $\mathbf{m}(X \setminus \mathcal{R}_k(X)) = 0$. This k is called the dimension of X .*

If in addition $\inf_i \text{vol}_{g_i}(M_i) > 0$, then (X, d, \mathbf{m}) is said to be a non-collapsed Ricci limit space. In this case, the following theorem is known due to [18].

Theorem 2.3. *For such (X, d, \mathbf{m}) , both the dimension and Hausdorff dimension are n and the reference measure satisfies $\mathbf{m} = (\mathcal{H}^n(X))^{-1} \mathcal{H}^n$. Moreover, the Hausdorff dimension of $X \setminus \mathcal{R}_n(X)$ does not exceed $n - 2$.*

Finally, let us recall the following Cheeger-Colding's splitting theorem.

Theorem 2.4 ([17]). *Let $\{(N_i, h_i)\}$ be a sequence of n -dimensional Riemannian manifolds such that $\text{Ric}_{h_i} \geq -\delta_i$ (where $\delta_i \rightarrow 0$) and that $\{(N_i, d_{h_i}, q_i)\}$ pGH converges to a pointed metric space (Y, d_Y, y) . If (Y, d_Y) contains a line γ , then there exists a length space (Ω, d_Ω) such that (Y, d_Y) is isometric to the product metric space $(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}, \sqrt{d_\Omega^2 + d_\mathbb{R}^2})$. Moreover, if we denote the projection onto the first coordinate by π , then $\pi(\gamma)$ is a single point $\omega \in \Omega$.*

2.2 RCD spaces

In this paper, when we say (X, d, \mathbf{m}) is a metric measure space, we mean that (X, d) is a complete separable metric space and \mathbf{m} is a nonnegative Borel measure which is finite on any bounded subset of X such that $\text{supp}(\mathbf{m}) = X$.

Let (X, d, \mathbf{m}) be a metric measure space.

Definition 2.5 (Cheeger energy). The *Cheeger energy* of $h \in L^2(\mathbf{m})$ is defined as

$$\text{Ch}(h) := \inf_{\{h_n\}} \left\{ \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \int_X (\text{lip } h_n)^2 d\mathbf{m} \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken among all sequences $\{h_n\} \subset \text{Lip}(X, d) \cap L^2(\mathbf{m})$ with $\|h_n - h\|_{L^2(\mathbf{m})} \rightarrow 0$.

Remark 2.6. The Sobolev space $H^{1,2}(X, d, \mathbf{m})$ defined as the set of all $L^2(\mathbf{m})$ -integrable function with finite Cheeger energy. For every $h \in H^{1,2}(X, d, \mathbf{m})$, by [3] and [4, Section 8.3], there exists $\{h_n\} \subset \text{Lip}(X, d) \cap L^2(\mathbf{m})$ such that $h_n \rightarrow h$ in $L^2(\mathbf{m})$, that $\text{lip } h_n \rightarrow \exists |\nabla h|$ in $L^2(\mathbf{m})$ and that

$$\text{Ch}(h) = \frac{1}{2} \int_X |\nabla h|^2 d\mathbf{m}.$$

This $|\nabla h|$ is unique and is called the *minimal relaxed slope* of h .

Remark 2.7. (X, d, \mathbf{m}) is said to be *infinitesimally Hilbertian* if $H^{1,2}(X, d, \mathbf{m})$ is a Hilbert space. In this case, for any $h_i \in H^{1,2}(X, d, \mathbf{m})$ ($i = 1, 2$), according to [5], the following $L^1(\mathbf{m})$ -integrable function is well-defined:

$$\langle \nabla h_1, \nabla h_2 \rangle := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{|\nabla(h_1 + \epsilon h_2)|^2 - |\nabla h_1|^2}{2\epsilon}.$$

Definition 2.8 (The Laplacian). Assume (X, d, \mathbf{m}) is infinitesimally Hilbertian. The domain of Laplacian, namely $D(\Delta)$, is defined as the set of all $h \in H^{1,2}(X, d, \mathbf{m})$ such that the following holds for some $\xi \in L^2(\mathbf{m})$.

$$\int_X \langle \nabla h, \nabla \varphi \rangle d\mathbf{m} = - \int_X \varphi \xi d\mathbf{m}, \quad \forall \varphi \in H^{1,2}(X, d, \mathbf{m}).$$

We denote by $\Delta h := \xi$ because ξ is unique if it exists.

We are now in a position to introduce the definition of $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space as follows. See [6, 9, 25, 29].

Definition 2.9. Let $K \in \mathbb{R}$ and $N \in [1, \infty)$. $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$ is said to be an $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space if

- (1) $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$ is infinitesimally Hilbertian.
- (2) There exist $x \in X$ and $C > 0$, such that for any $r > 0$ it holds that $\mathbf{m}(B_r(x)) \leq Ce^{Cr^2}$.
- (3) Any $h \in H^{1,2}(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$ satisfying $|\nabla h| \leq 1$ \mathbf{m} -a.e. has a 1-Lipschitz representative.
- (4) For any $h \in D(\Delta)$ with $\Delta h \in H^{1,2}(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$, the following holds for any $\varphi \in \text{Test}F(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$ with $\varphi \geq 0$,

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_X |\nabla h|^2 \Delta \varphi \, d\mathbf{m} \geq \int_X \varphi \left(\langle \nabla h, \nabla \Delta h \rangle + K |\nabla h|^2 + \frac{(\Delta h)^2}{N} \right) d\mathbf{m},$$

where $\text{Test}F(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$ is the class of test functions defined by

$$\text{Test}F(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}) := \{h \in \text{Lip}(X, \mathbf{d}) \cap D(\Delta) \cap L^\infty(\mathbf{m}) : \Delta h \in H^{1,2}(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}) \cap L^\infty(\mathbf{m})\}.$$

Remark 2.10. If in addition $\mathbf{m} = \mathcal{H}^N$, then $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$ is said to be a non-collapsed $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space. In this case, it is readily checked by [23] that N is an integer.

Remark 2.11. Let $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$ be an $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space. Then it admits a local Poincaré inequality ([41, Theorem 1]) and the reference measure \mathbf{m} satisfies the doubling condition ([37, Theorem 5.31], [44, Theorem 2.3]). As a consequence, [16, Theorem 6.1] implies that for every $g \in \text{Lip}(X, \mathbf{d}) \cap H^{1,2}(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$ we have $|\nabla g| = \text{lip } g$ \mathbf{m} -a.e.

Theorem 2.12 (RCD condition for manifolds with boundary [33, Theorem 1.1]). *Let (M, g) be an n -dimensional Riemannian manifold with boundary. Then the metric measure space $(M, \mathbf{d}_g, \text{vol}_g)$ is an $\text{RCD}(K, n)$ space if and only if M is path-connected and its Ricci curvature, second fundamental form satisfy*

$$\text{Ric}_g \geq K, \quad \Pi_{\partial M} \geq 0.$$

We introduce the following two important results about $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces.

Theorem 2.13 (Precompactness of pointed $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces under pmGH convergence [30]). *Let $\{(X_i, \mathbf{d}_i, \mathbf{m}_i, x_i)\}$ be a sequence of pointed $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces such that*

$$0 < \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{m}_i(B_1^{X_i}(x_i)) \leq \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{m}_i(B_1^{X_i}(x_i)) < \infty.$$

Then there exists a subsequence $\{(X_{i(j)}, \mathbf{d}_{i(j)}, \mathbf{m}_{i(j)}, x_{i(j)})\}$ which pmGH converges to a pointed $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}, x)$.

Theorem 2.14 (RCD(K, N) spaces are non-branching [24]). *Suppose $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$ is an RCD(K, N) space. Then the metric space (X, \mathbf{d}) is geodesically non-branching. That is, given any two constant speed geodesics γ_i ($i = 1, 2$), which are parameterized on the unit interval, if there exists $t \in (0, 1)$, such that*

$$\gamma_1(s) = \gamma_2(s), \quad \forall s \in [0, t],$$

then we have

$$\gamma_1(s) = \gamma_2(s), \quad \forall s \in [0, 1].$$

Let us end this subsection by recalling a result on quotient spaces of metric measure spaces.

Assume G is a compact Lie group acting isometrically on (X, \mathbf{d}) . That is, for any $g \in G$, the map

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_g : X &\longrightarrow X \\ x &\longmapsto gx, \end{aligned}$$

is an isometry. Let us set $X^* := X/G$ as the quotient space and $p : X \rightarrow X^*$ as the quotient map. The quotient metric \mathbf{d}^* is defined as

$$\mathbf{d}^*(x^*, y^*) := \inf_{x \in p^{-1}(x^*), y \in p^{-1}(y^*)} \mathbf{d}(x, y). \quad (2.1)$$

Proposition 2.15 (Quotient spaces of non-branching metric spaces are non-branching). *If (X, \mathbf{d}) is geodesically non-branching, then (X^*, \mathbf{d}^*) is also geodesically non-branching.*

Proof. We prove by contradiction. Without loss of generality, assume there exists two distinct unit speed minimal geodesics $\gamma_i : [-1, 1] \rightarrow X^*$ ($i = 1, 2$) such that $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2$ on $[-1, 0]$, but $\gamma_1(1) \neq \gamma_2(1)$.

Let $x = \gamma_1(-1)$, $y = \gamma_1(0)$ and $z_i = \gamma_i(1)$. Fix a point $\tilde{y} \in p^{-1}(y)$. Because G is compact, there exists $\tilde{x} \in p^{-1}(x)$ and $\tilde{z}_i \in p^{-1}(z_i)$ such that

$$\mathbf{d}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) = \mathbf{d}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{z}_1) = \mathbf{d}(\tilde{y}, \tilde{z}_2) = 1.$$

This together with (2.1) implies $\mathbf{d}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}_1) = \mathbf{d}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}_2) = 2$.

Let $\tilde{\sigma} : [-1, 0] \rightarrow X$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_i : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ be unit speed minimal geodesics from \tilde{x} to \tilde{y} and from \tilde{y} to \tilde{z}_i respectively.

Then the geodesic γ_i defined as

$$\gamma_i(t) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\sigma}(t), & t \in [-1, 0]; \\ \tilde{\sigma}_i(t), & t \in (0, 1], \end{cases}$$

is a unit speed minimal geodesic from \tilde{x} to \tilde{z}_i . This contradicts Theorem 2.14. \square

If moreover G is measure-preserving in the following sense:

$$(\tau_g)_\# \mathbf{m} = \mathbf{m}, \quad \forall g \in G,$$

where $(\tau_g)_\# \mathbf{m}$ means the push forward measure under τ_g , then we can endow X^* with the quotient measure $\mathbf{m}^* := p_\# \mathbf{m}$.

Theorem 2.16 ([27]). *If $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$ is an RCD(K, N) space, then $(X^*, \mathbf{d}^*, \mathbf{m}^*)$ is also an RCD(K, N) space.*

2.3 Manifolds with boundary: gluing and extension

This subsection is dedicated to recalling the extension procedure in [45].

Take $(M, g) \in \mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda, D)$, and consider the product space $C_M := \partial M \times [0, t_0]$ with the Riemannian metric $g_{C_M} = dt^2 + \phi^2(t)g_{\partial M}$, where

$$\phi(t) = (1 - \varepsilon_0) \exp \left(-\frac{2\lambda t_0^2}{1 - \varepsilon_0} \left(\frac{1}{t_0 - t} - \frac{1}{t_0} \right) \right) + \varepsilon_0,$$

for some fixed $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$, $t_0 > 0$. Then direct computation gives

$$\begin{cases} \phi(0) = 1, \phi(t_0) = \varepsilon_0, \\ \phi'(0) = -2\lambda, \phi'(t_0) = 0, \phi' < 0 \text{ on } (0, t_0), \\ \max_{[0, t_0]} |\phi''/\phi| \leq J(\lambda, \varepsilon_0, t_0). \end{cases}$$

Moreover, we have $\text{Ric}_{g_{C_M}} \geq -J(n, \lambda, K, \varepsilon_0, t_0)$.

For any $t \in [0, t_0]$, let $C_M^t := \partial M \times \{t\}$ and $\Pi^{C_M^t}$ be the second fundamental form of C_M^t defined as:

$$\Pi^{C_M^t}(V, W) = - \left\langle \nabla_V \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, W \right\rangle, \quad \forall V, W \in T(C_M^t).$$

It is obvious that

$$\Pi^{C_M^0} + \Pi^{\partial M} \geq \lambda > 0.$$

Therefore we are able to apply the following Perelman's gluing theorem.

Theorem 2.17 ([40]). *Let (N_i, h_i) ($i = 1, 2$) be two n -dimensional compact Riemannian manifolds with boundary. Assume $\phi : \partial N_1 \rightarrow \partial N_2$ is an isometry. Assume $\text{Ric}_{h_i} > H$ for some $H \in \mathbb{R}$, and the sum of the second fundamental forms $\Pi_{\partial N_1}|_p + \Pi_{\partial N_2}|_{\phi(p)}$, with $T_p N_1$ and $T_{\phi(p)} N_2$ identified by $d\phi$, is positive definite for every point $p \in \partial N_1$. Then the induced metric on $N = N_1 \cup_\phi N_2$ can be C^2 -smoothed out in an arbitrarily small tubular neighborhood of ∂N_1 in N to have a strict lower Ricci curvature bound H .*

Remark 2.18. Let $N = N_1 \cup_\phi N_2$ be the space constructed as above. For any $x, y \in N$, the distance $d(x, y)$ is defined as the infimum of the length of all piecewise smooth curves connecting x, y . This makes (N, d) a complete metric space. According to [14, Lemma 2], for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a C^2 Riemannian metric h on N such that

$$(1) \quad \text{Ric}_h > H.$$

$$(2) \quad d_{\text{GH}}((N, d), (N, d_h)) < \epsilon, \text{ where } d_{\text{GH}} \text{ is the Gromov-Hausdorff distance.}$$

The main technique of [45] is to apply Theorem 2.17 to the glued space $\widetilde{M} := M \cup_{\text{id}} C_M$. We collect two useful results by Wong as follows.

Theorem 2.19 ([45, Theorem 1.9]). *For all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cap [3, \infty)$, $H, K \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lambda \geq 0$ and $D > 0$, there exist constants $J_i = J_i(n, H, K, \lambda, D)$ ($i = 1, 2$) such that*

- (1) For any $(M, g) \in \mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda, D)$, any boundary component ∂M^α has an intrinsic diameter bound

$$\text{diam}(\partial M^\alpha, d_{g_{\partial M}}) \leq J_1.$$

- (2) For any $(M, g) \in \mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda, D)$, ∂M has at most J_2 components.

- (3) $\mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda, D)$ is precompact in the Gromov-Hausdorff topology.

Remark 2.20. Let us take an n -dimensional Riemannian manifold with boundary (M, g) and a point $p \in \partial M$. Let us also take an orthonormal basis $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ in $T_p M$ such that e_n is perpendicular to $T_p \partial M$.

Then according to the Gauss equation one has that at p ,

$$R_{g_{\partial M}}(e_i, e_j, e_k, e_l) = R_g(e_i, e_j, e_k, e_l) + \Pi(e_i, e_l)\Pi(e_j, e_k) - \Pi(e_j, e_l)\Pi(e_i, e_k),$$

where $R_{g_{\partial M}}$ is the Riemann curvature tensor of ∂M and R_g is that of M . Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ric}_{g_{\partial M}}(e_i, e_j) &= \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} R_{g_{\partial M}}(e_i, e_k, e_k, e_j) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (R_g(e_i, e_k, e_k, e_j) + \Pi(e_i, e_j)\Pi(e_k, e_k) - \Pi(e_i, e_k)\Pi(e_j, e_k)) \\ &= \text{Ric}_g(e_i, e_j) + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (\Pi(e_i, e_j)\Pi(e_k, e_k) - \Pi(e_i, e_k)\Pi(e_j, e_k)) - R_g(e_i, e_n, e_n, e_j). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the lower bound on Ric_g and the two sided bound on $\Pi_{\partial M}$ are not enough to guarantee the lower bound on $\text{Ric}_{g_{\partial M}}$ since the information about “ $R_g(e_i, e_n, e_n, e_j)$ ” remains unknown under these assumptions (see Example 5.1 for a counterexample). This is why we need the Ricci lower bound for ∂M in the setting of $\mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda, D)$. See also Remark 3.1.

In [45], Wong first used the assumptions of a lower bound on Ric_g and a two sided bound on $\Pi_{\partial M}$ to derive a lower bound on $\text{Ric}_{g_{\partial M}}$, and consequently on $\text{Ric}_{g_{CM}}$. By applying Theorem 2.17, he obtained a lower Ricci curvature bound for the glued space, which is a crucial step to prove Theorem 2.19. However, as discussed above, this line of reasoning does not hold.

Definition 2.21 (Warped product of metric spaces). Let $(X, d_X), (Y, d_Y)$ be two metric spaces, and $\phi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a continuous function. The warped length of a curve $\gamma = (\theta, \nu) : [a, b] \rightarrow X \times Y$ is defined as

$$L_\phi(\gamma) := \limsup_{|\Delta| \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^k \sqrt{\phi^2(\nu(s_i))d_X^2(\theta(t_{i-1}), \theta(t_i)) + d_Y^2(\nu(t_{i-1}), \nu(t_i))},$$

where $\Delta : a = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_k = b$, $|\Delta| = \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} |t_i - t_{i-1}|$ and $s_i \in [t_{i-1}, t_i]$. The warped product $(X \times_\phi Y, d_{X \times_\phi Y})$ is then defined as $X \times Y$ equipped with the metric induced by L_ϕ .

Proposition 2.22 ([46]). *Assume $\{(X_i, d_i)\}$ Gromov-Hausdorff converges to (X, d) . Let (Y, d_Y) be a compact metric space and $\phi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a continuous function. Then $(X \times_\phi Y, d_{X \times_\phi Y})$ is isometric to the Gromov-Hausdorff limit space of $(X_i \times_\phi Y, d_{X_i \times_\phi Y})$.*

3 Limit spaces of inradius collapsed manifolds

From now on, all metric spaces are considered component-wisely since the limit spaces may not be connected.

Let $\{(M_i, g_i)\} \subset \mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda, D)$ with $\text{inrad}(M_i) \rightarrow 0$. By Theorem 2.19, after passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $\{(M_i, d_{g_i})\}$ Gromov-Hausdorff converges to some compact metric space (Z, d_Z) .

According to the extension and smoothing out procedure in Section 2.3, letting $C_{M_i} := \partial M_i \times_\phi [0, t_0]$, we obtain an $\text{RCD}(-J(n, H, K, \lambda, \varepsilon_0, t_0), n)$ space $(\widetilde{M}_i, d_{\widetilde{M}_i}, \mathcal{H}^n)$ with $\text{diam}(\widetilde{M}_i, d_{\widetilde{M}_i}) \leq J(D, t_0)$, where $\widetilde{M}_i := M_i \cup_{\text{id}} C_{M_i}$, and the metric $d_{\widetilde{M}_i}$ is defined in the same way as Remark 2.18. By Theorems 2.12 and 2.13, after passing to a subsequence, we may assume

$$\left(\widetilde{M}_i, d_{\widetilde{M}_i}, \frac{\mathcal{H}^n}{\mathcal{H}^n(\widetilde{M}_i)} \right) \xrightarrow{\text{mGH}} (Y, d_Y, \mathbf{m}_Y), \quad (3.1)$$

$$\left(C_{M_i}, d_{g_{C_{M_i}}}, \frac{\text{vol}_{g_{C_{M_i}}}}{\text{vol}_{g_{C_{M_i}}}(C_{M_i})} \right) \xrightarrow{\text{mGH}} (C, d_C, \mathbf{m}_C), \quad (3.2)$$

$$\left(\partial M_i, d_{g_{\partial M_i}}, \frac{\text{vol}_{g_{\partial M_i}}}{\text{vol}_{g_{\partial M_i}}(\partial M_i)} \right) \xrightarrow{\text{mGH}} (C_0, d, \mathbf{m}), \quad (3.3)$$

for an $\text{RCD}(-J(n, H, K, \lambda, \varepsilon_0, t_0), n)$ space (Y, d_Y, \mathbf{m}_Y) , an $\text{RCD}(-J(n, \lambda, K, t_0, \varepsilon_0), n)$ space (C, d_C, \mathbf{m}_C) and an $\text{RCD}(K, n)$ space (C_0, d, \mathbf{m}) .

It follows from Proposition 2.22 that

$$(C, d_C) = (C_0 \times_\phi [0, t_0], d_{C_0 \times_\phi [0, t_0]}). \quad (3.4)$$

Remark 3.1. In convergences (3.3) and (3.4), the precompactness of the sequence $\{(\partial M_i, d_{g_{\partial M_i}})\}$ in the Gromov-Hausdorff topology is important. However, as explained in Remark 2.20, we need to add the assumption $\text{Ric}_{g_{\partial M_i}} \geq K$ ($i \in \mathbb{N}$), which is quite different from the setting in (1.1).

Let ι_i be the identity map from $(C_{M_i}, d_{g_{C_{M_i}}})$ to $(C_{M_i}, d_{\widetilde{M}_i})$, which is 1-Lipschitz. We define the limit map $\eta : (C, d_C) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$ as the limit of ι_i , which is also 1-Lipschitz.

Now by passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume

$$(M_i, d_{\widetilde{M}_i}) \xrightarrow{\text{GH}} (X, d_Y)$$

as the convergence of subsets under (3.1). We set

$$\eta_0 := \eta|_{C_0 \times \{0\}} : C_0 \rightarrow X.$$

Then it is clear that $\eta_0 : (C_0, d_C) \rightarrow (X, d_Y)$ is a surjective 1-Lipschitz map.

The following proposition is obvious. See also [47, Lemmas 3.1, 3.2].

Proposition 3.2. *The map η satisfies the following properties.*

- (1) *For any $(p, t) \in C \setminus C_0$, it holds that $d_Y(\eta(p, t), X) = t$.*
- (2) *$\eta : C \setminus C_0 \rightarrow Y \setminus X$ is a bijective local isometry. Here by local isometry we mean for any $(p, t) \in C \setminus C_0$, $\eta|_{B_{t/2}(p, t)}$ is an isometry.*

Remark 3.3 (Foot point and perpendicular). For any $y \in Y \setminus X$, Proposition 3.2 guarantees the existence of a unique (p, t) in $C \setminus C_0$ such that $\eta(p, t) = y$. Because η is continuous, taking the limit $x := \lim_{s \downarrow 0} \eta(p, s)$ yields $\eta_0(p) = x$ and

$$d_Y(y, x) = d_Y(y, X) = t.$$

This point x is referred to as the *foot point* of y , and the curve $\zeta : [0, t_0] \rightarrow Y$ defined by $\zeta(s) = \eta(p, s)$ is called a *perpendicular* to X at x .

Lemma 3.4. *Let y, z be two points in $Y \setminus X$ such that $\gamma_{y,z} \cap X = \emptyset$, then $\eta^{-1}(\gamma_{y,z})$ is also a minimal geodesic on C connecting $\eta^{-1}(y)$ and $\eta^{-1}(z)$.*

Proof. For simplicity denote by $\gamma := \gamma_{y,z}$ and by $l := d_Y(y, z)$. Then it follows from Proposition 3.2 that $L^{d_C}(\eta^{-1}(\gamma)) = l$. We are done by noticing that

$$l = d_Y(y, z) \leq d_C(\eta^{-1}(y), \eta^{-1}(z)) \leq L^{d_C}(\eta^{-1}(\gamma)) = l.$$

□

Let us set d_X as the intrinsic metric on X induced by d_Y . We have the following estimates.

Proposition 3.5. *There exists a constant $J = J(\lambda, \varepsilon_0, t_0)$ such that the following holds.*

- (1) *For any $x, y \in X$ we have*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, d_Y(x, y)]} d_Y(\gamma_{x,y}^{(Y, d_Y)}(t), X) \leq J (d_Y(x, y))^2.$$

- (2) *For any $p, q \in C_0$ with $d_C(p, q) \leq (2J)^{-1/2}$, we have*

$$d_{C_0}(p, q) \geq d_C(p, q) \geq (1 - J (d_C(p, q))^2) d_{C_0}(p, q).$$

- (3) *For any $x, y \in X$ with $d_Y(x, y) \leq (2J)^{-1/2}$, we have*

$$d_X(x, y) \geq d_Y(x, y) \geq (1 - J (d_Y(x, y))^2) d_X(x, y).$$

Proof. Although the proof is almost the same as [47, Lemmas 4.2 and 4.14], we give the proof for reader's convenience.

(1) Let γ be a unit speed minimal geodesic from x to y in Y and let $t^* \in (0, \mathbf{d}_Y(x, y))$ satisfy

$$\mathbf{d}_Y(\gamma(t^*), X) = \sup_{t \in (0, \mathbf{d}_Y(x, y))} \mathbf{d}_Y(\gamma(t), X).$$

Take $a, b \in (0, \mathbf{d}_Y(x, y))$ such that $t^* \in (a, b)$, that $\gamma((a, b)) \subset Y \setminus X$ and that $\gamma(a), \gamma(b) \in X$. Lemma 3.4 guarantees the existence of a unit speed minimal geodesic $\sigma : [a, b] \rightarrow C$ such that $\gamma = \eta \circ \sigma$ on $[a, b]$.

For any sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, take $z_i, w_i \in C_{M_i}$ such that $z_i \rightarrow \sigma(a + \epsilon)$ and $w_i \rightarrow \sigma(b - \epsilon)$ under the convergence (3.3). Let $\gamma_i := (\theta_i, \nu_i)$ be the unit speed minimal geodesic from z_i to w_i in C_{M_i} and let l_i be the distance between z_i and w_i in C_{M_i} .

By Theorem 2.14, the limit of γ_i must be $\sigma|_{[a+\epsilon, b-\epsilon]}$. Therefore, for sufficiently large i , we have $\gamma_i \cap \partial M_i = \emptyset$. Moreover, since for each $t \in (0, l_i)$ it holds

$$\nu_i''(t) = -\Pi^{C_{M_i}}(\sigma_i'(t), \sigma_i'(t)) = \frac{\phi'(\nu_i(t))}{\phi(\nu_i(t))} |\sigma_i'(t)|^2, \quad (3.5)$$

and γ_i is unit speed, we have $-J(\lambda, \varepsilon_0, t_0) \leq \sup_{[0, l_i]} \nu_i \leq 0$.

Let us take $t_i \in [0, l_i]$ such that $\nu_i(t_i) = \max_{[0, l_i]} \nu_i$. It is clear that $\nu_i'(t_i) = 0$. Moreover, there exists a real number ξ_i between t_i and l_i such that

$$\nu_i(l_i) - \nu_i(t_i) = \frac{(l_i - t_i)^2}{2} \nu_i''(\xi_i) \in [-J(\lambda, \varepsilon_0, t_0) l_i^2, 0]. \quad (3.6)$$

Since $\gamma_i(t_i) \rightarrow \sigma(t^*)$ and $l_i \rightarrow b - a + 2\epsilon$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, letting $i \rightarrow \infty$ in (3.6) and applying Proposition 3.2 yields

$$\mathbf{d}_Y(\gamma(t^*), X) \leq \mathbf{d}_Y(\gamma(b - \epsilon), X) + J(\lambda, \varepsilon_0, t_0)(b - a - 2\epsilon)^2.$$

Because $b - a \leq \mathbf{d}_Y(x, y)$, letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ then completes the proof.

(2) Let $\gamma := (\theta, \nu)$ be the unit speed minimal geodesic from p to q in C . From (1), we know $\sup_{[0, \mathbf{d}_C(p, q)]} \nu < J(\mathbf{d}_C(p, q))^2$. The conclusion follows directly from Definition 2.21 and the fact that

$$0 \geq \phi(\nu(t)) - 1 = \phi(\nu(t)) - \phi(0) \geq -J\nu(t), \quad \forall t \in [0, \mathbf{d}_C(p, q)].$$

(3) The proof follows from the same argument as in [47, Lemma 4.14(3)], and results from (1) and (2). \square

Remark 3.6. Since $\eta_0 : (C_0, \mathbf{d}_C) \rightarrow (X, \mathbf{d}_Y)$ is a surjective 1-Lipschitz map, $\eta_0 : (C_0, \mathbf{d}) \rightarrow (X, \mathbf{d}_X)$ is also a surjective 1-Lipschitz map.

Now we can identify (X, \mathbf{d}_X) with the Gromov-Hausdorff limit space of $\{(M_i, \mathbf{d}_{g_i})\}$ (namely (Z, \mathbf{d}_Z)) as follows.

Theorem 3.7. (X, \mathbf{d}_X) is isometric to (Z, \mathbf{d}_Z) .

Proof. It follows directly from Proposition 3.5 and the proof of [47, Propostion 3.8]. \square

As for the map η_0 , we have

Lemma 3.8. *For every $x \in X$, the following statement holds.*

- (1) $\#\eta_0^{-1}(x) \leq 2$.
- (2) *If $\#\eta_0^{-1}(x) = 2$, then by letting $\eta_0^{-1}(x) = \{p_1, p_2\} \subset C_0$ and taking $t \in (0, \frac{1}{2}\phi(t_0)\mathbf{d}(p_1, p_2))$, the curve $\gamma : [-t, t] \rightarrow Y$ defined by*

$$\gamma(s) = \begin{cases} \eta(p_1, -s), & -t \leq s < 0; \\ \eta(p_2, s), & 0 \leq s \leq t, \end{cases}$$

is a minimal geodesic in Y joining $\eta(p_1, t)$ and $\eta(p_2, t)$.

Proof. Assume there exist three distinct points $p_i \in C_0$ such that $\eta_0(p_i) = x \in X$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$). For $i = 1, 2, 3$, define the curve $\gamma_i : [0, t_0] \rightarrow Y$ as $\gamma_i(s) = \eta(p_i, s)$, which are geodesics and perpendiculars to X at x . We now claim that when $t < \frac{1}{2}\phi(t_0)\mathbf{d}(p_1, p_2)$, the curve $\gamma_{12} : [-t, t] \rightarrow Y$ defined by

$$\gamma_{12}(s) = \begin{cases} \gamma_1(s), & s \in (0, t); \\ \gamma_2(-s), & s \in (-t, 0), \end{cases}$$

is a unit speed minimal geodesic joining $\gamma_1(t)$ and $\gamma_2(t)$.

For any curve $\gamma : [0, l] \rightarrow Y$ with $\gamma(0) = \eta(p_1, t)$ and $\gamma(l) = \eta(p_2, t)$, if $\gamma \cap X = \emptyset$, then due to the warped product structure of (C, \mathbf{d}_C) and the local isometry property of η , we know $L(\gamma) > \phi(t_0)\mathbf{d}(p_1, p_2)$. If $\gamma \cap X \neq \emptyset$, then by letting $s_1 := \sup\{s | \gamma([0, s]) \subset Y \setminus X\}$, $s_2 := \inf\{s | \gamma([s, l]) \subset Y \setminus X\}$, we see

$$L(\gamma|_{[0, s_1]}) \geq \mathbf{d}_Y(\gamma(0), \gamma(s_1)) \geq \mathbf{d}_Y(\gamma(0), X) = t;$$

$$L(\gamma|_{[s_2, l]}) \geq \mathbf{d}_Y(\gamma(l), \gamma(s_2)) \geq \mathbf{d}_Y(\gamma(l), X) = t.$$

Therefore when $t < \frac{1}{2}\phi(t_0)\mathbf{d}(p_1, p_2)$, γ_{12} becomes the desired geodesic. However, we can similarly construct γ_{13} and γ_{23} . This leads to a contradiction with Theorem 2.14, which is enough to conclude. \square

By making an identification $(X, \mathbf{d}_X) = (Z, \mathbf{d}_Z)$, we define

Definition 3.9. For $k = 1, 2$, define

$$Z_k = X_k := \{x \in X | \#\eta_0^{-1}(x) = k\},$$

$$C_0^k := \{p \in C_0 | \eta_0(p) \in X_k\}.$$

4 Metric structure of limit spaces

In this section, we still use the notation in Section 3.

4.1 Tangent space and tangent map

Let $p \in C_0$ and $x = \eta_0(p)$. For any monotone decreasing sequence $\{s_i\}$ with $s_i \rightarrow 0$, by Theorem 2.13, and by passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume the existence of pointed metric spaces $(T_p C, \mathbf{d}_{T_p C}, o_p)$, $(T_x Y, \mathbf{d}_{T_x Y}, o_x)$ and $(T_p C_0, \mathbf{d}_{T_p C_0}, o_p)$ such that

$$(C, s_i^{-1} \mathbf{d}_C, p) \xrightarrow{\text{pGH}} (T_p C, \mathbf{d}_{T_p C}, o_p), \quad (4.1)$$

$$(Y, s_i^{-1} \mathbf{d}_Y, x) \xrightarrow{\text{pGH}} (T_x Y, \mathbf{d}_{T_x Y}, o_x), \quad (4.2)$$

$$(C_0, s_i^{-1} \mathbf{d}, p) \xrightarrow{\text{pGH}} (T_p C_0, \mathbf{d}_{T_p C_0}, o_p). \quad (4.3)$$

After passing to a subsequence, we may also assume that $\eta_i = \eta : (s_i^{-1} C, p) \rightarrow (s_i^{-1} Y, x)$ converges to a 1-Lipschitz map $\eta_\infty : (T_p C, o_p) \rightarrow (T_x Y, o_x)$. Moreover, by taking a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that

$$(X, s_i^{-1} \mathbf{d}_Y, x) \xrightarrow{\text{pGH}} (T_x X, \mathbf{d}_{T_x Y}, o_x), \quad (4.4)$$

for some pointed metric space $(T_x X, \mathbf{d}_{T_x Y}, o_x) \subset (T_x Y, \mathbf{d}_{T_x Y}, o_x)$ as convergence of subsets under (4.2). Here we remark that the limit spaces depend on the choice of the sequence $\{s_i\}$.

It is worth pointing out the direct product structure of $T_p C$ as follows, which may seem natural since the value of the warped function ϕ is almost 1 near 0.

Proposition 4.1. $(T_p C, \mathbf{d}_{T_p C})$ is isometric to $(T_p C_0 \times [0, \infty), \sqrt{\mathbf{d}_{T_p C_0}^2 + \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}}^2})$, where $\mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is the standard metric on $[0, \infty)$.

Proof. For any two points $q_\infty^j \in T_p C$ ($j = 1, 2$) with $l := \mathbf{d}_{T_p C}(q_\infty^1, q_\infty^2)$, assume $C \ni q_i^j \rightarrow q_\infty^j$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ under the convergence (4.1). Then the foot point p_i^j of q_i^j also converges to some $p_\infty^j \in T_p C_0$ with

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{d}_C(p_i^j, q_i^j)}{s_i} = \mathbf{d}_{T_p C}(q_\infty^j, T_p C_0) := r_j,$$

and $l_i := \mathbf{d}_C(q_i^1, q_i^2) = s_i l + o(s_i)$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

For each i , let $\gamma_i = (\theta_i, \nu_i)$ be the unit speed minimal geodesic from q_i^1 to q_i^2 . Notice that for every $t \in [0, l_i]$ it holds

$$\nu_i(t) = \mathbf{d}_C(\gamma_i(t), C_0) \leq \mathbf{d}_C(\gamma_i(t), \gamma_i(0)) + \nu_i(0) \leq l_i + s_i r_1 + o(s_i), \text{ as } i \rightarrow \infty,$$

which yields $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{[0, l_i]} \nu_i = 0$.

Given any $\epsilon > 0$, combining Definition 2.21 with the fact $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \phi(t) = 1$ we see for all $i \gg 1$ it holds

$$\frac{l_i}{s_i} \geq \frac{1 - \epsilon}{s_i} \sqrt{\mathbf{d}_{C_0}^2(p_i^1, p_i^2) + (\mathbf{d}_C(q_i^1, C_0) - \mathbf{d}_C(q_i^2, C_0))^2}$$

Therefore letting first $i \rightarrow \infty$ then $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ we obtain

$$\mathbf{d}_{T_p C}(q_\infty^1, q_\infty^2) \geq \sqrt{\mathbf{d}_{T_p C_0}^2(p_\infty^1, p_\infty^2) + (r_2 - r_1)^2}.$$

It now suffices to show the converse inequality. If $p_i^1 = p_i^2$, then it is obvious that

$$\mathbf{d}_C(q_i^1, q_i^2) = |\mathbf{d}_C(q_i^2, C_0) - \mathbf{d}_C(q_i^1, C_0)|.$$

If $p_i^1 \neq p_i^2$, take $\tilde{\theta}_i$ as the constant speed minimal geodesic in C_0 defined on $[0, 1]$ from p_i^1 to p_i^2 and define $\tilde{\nu}_i : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\tilde{\nu}_i(t) = \mathbf{d}_C(q_i^1, C_0) + (\mathbf{d}_C(q_i^2, C_0) - \mathbf{d}_C(q_i^1, C_0))t.$$

Then since $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{[0,1]} \tilde{\nu}_i = 0$, by letting $\tilde{\gamma}_i := (\tilde{\theta}_i, \tilde{\nu}_i)$ one can similarly prove that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{d}_C(q_i^1, q_i^2)}{s_i} \leq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L^C(\tilde{\gamma}_i)}{s_i} \leq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{d}_{C_0}^2(p_i^1, p_i^2) + (\mathbf{d}_C(q_i^2, C_0) - \mathbf{d}_C(q_i^1, C_0))^2}}{s_i}.$$

This implies

$$\mathbf{d}_{T_p C}(q_\infty^1, q_\infty^2) \leq \sqrt{\mathbf{d}_{T_p C_0}^2(p_\infty^1, p_\infty^2) + (r_2 - r_1)^2},$$

which completes the proof. \square

Remark 4.2. Assume $n \geq 3$ and the dimension of (C_0, \mathbf{d}) is $k \in [1, n-1] \cap \mathbb{N}$ (by Theorem 2.2). For any $p \in \mathcal{R}_k(C_0)$, it follows from [47, Lemma 4.2] and the proof of Proposition 4.1 that for all $t \in (0, t_0)$, the tangent space $(T_{(p,t)}C, o_{(p,t)})$ is unique and isometric to $(\mathbb{R}^{k+1}, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^{k+1}})$. Because η is a local isometry, $(T_{\eta(p,t)}Y, o_{\eta(p,t)})$ is likewise unique and isometric to $(\mathbb{R}^{k+1}, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^{k+1}})$.

Moreover, by [42, Theorem 1.3], we have $\mathbf{m}_Y = \eta_\# \mathbf{m}_C$, where $\eta_\# \mathbf{m}_C$ denotes the push forward measure of \mathbf{m} under η . Consequently, the dimension of (Y, \mathbf{d}_Y) is $k+1$.

By letting $\mathbf{d}_{T_x X}$ be the intrinsic metric on $T_x X$ induced by $\mathbf{d}_{T_x X}$, we also have the following convexity of $T_x X$ in $T_x Y$.

Lemma 4.3. *For any two points $x_\infty, z_\infty \in T_x X$, and for any unit speed minimal geodesic $\gamma_\infty : [0, l] \rightarrow T_x Y$ from x_∞, z_∞ in $T_x Y$, we have $\gamma_\infty([0, l]) \subset T_x X$. In particular, we have $(T_x X, \mathbf{d}_{T_x X}) = (T_x X, \mathbf{d}_{T_x Y})$.*

Proof. We prove by contradiction. Assume there exists $t^* \in (0, l)$ such that

$$\mathbf{d}_{T_x Y}(\gamma_\infty(t^*), T_x X) = \max_{[0, l]} \mathbf{d}_{T_x Y}(\gamma_\infty(\cdot), T_x X) > 0.$$

Let $l' = (t^* + l)/2$ and $y_\infty := \gamma_\infty(l')$. We may assume that $(X, s_i^{-1} \mathbf{d}_Y) \ni x_i \rightarrow x_\infty \in T_x X$ and $(Y, s_i^{-1} \mathbf{d}_Y) \ni y_i \rightarrow y_\infty \in T_x Y$ under (4.4) and (4.2) respectively. For each i , take a unit speed minimal geodesic $\gamma_i : [0, l_i] \rightarrow Y$ from x_i to y_i in Y . By Theorem 2.14,

γ_i converges to $\gamma_\infty|_{[0,l']}$ under the convergence (4.2). As a result, there exists $t_i \in (0, l_i)$ such that

$$\frac{d_Y(\gamma_i(t_i), X)}{s_i} = \frac{\max_{[0, l_i]} d_Y(\gamma_i(\cdot), X)}{s_i} \rightarrow d_{T_x Y}(\gamma(t^*), T_x X) \text{ as } i \rightarrow \infty.$$

Take $t'_i \in [0, t_i)$ such that $\gamma_i(t'_i) \in X$ and that $\gamma_i((t'_i, t_i]) \subset Y \setminus X$. According to the proof of Proposition 3.5(1), we know

$$0 = \frac{d_Y(\gamma_i(t'_i), X)}{s_i} \geq \frac{d_Y(\gamma_i(t_i), X)}{s_i} - \frac{J(\lambda, \varepsilon_0, t_0) l_i^2}{s_i},$$

which leads a contradiction since $l_i/s_i \rightarrow l'$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Hence we have $\gamma_\infty([0, l]) \subset T_x X$. \square

As a direct consequence of Propositions 3.2 and 3.5 (see also [47, Sublemma 4.4]), we have the following proposition.

Proposition 4.4. *The tangent map η_∞ has the following properties.*

- (1) *For any $(p_\infty, t) \in T_p C$, it holds that $d_{T_x Y}(\eta_\infty(p_\infty, t), T_x X) = t$.*
- (2) *$\eta_\infty : (T_p C, d_{T_p C}) \rightarrow (T_x Y, d_{T_x Y})$ is 1-Lipschitz and $\eta_\infty|_{T_p C \setminus T_p C_0} : T_p C \setminus T_p C_0 \rightarrow \eta_\infty(T_p C) \setminus T_x X$ is an injective local isometry in the sense of Proposition 3.2(2).*

Proof. For reader's convenience, we prove the injectivity of $\eta_\infty|_{T_p C \setminus T_p C_0} : T_p C \setminus T_p C_0 \rightarrow \eta_\infty(T_p C) \setminus T_x X$.

Assume there exist two points $p_\infty^i \in T_p C_0$ ($i = 1, 2$) such that $\eta_\infty(p_\infty^1, h) = \eta_\infty(p_\infty^2, h)$ for some $h > 0$. Combining the local isometry property of $\eta_\infty|_{T_p C \setminus T_p C_0}$ we know for any sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ it holds

$$d_{T_p C}((p_\infty^1, h), (p_\infty^2, h)) = d_{T_x Y}(\eta_\infty(p_\infty^1, h + \epsilon), \eta_\infty(p_\infty^2, h + \epsilon)) \leq 2\epsilon.$$

However, by Proposition 4.1 we have $d_{T_p C}((p_\infty^1, h), (p_\infty^2, h)) = d_{T_p C_0}(p_\infty^1, p_\infty^2)$. A contradiction. \square

We also obtain an analogues version of Lemma 3.4 as follows.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $x_\infty \in \eta_\infty(T_p C \setminus T_p C_0)$. For any point $y_\infty \in T_x Y \setminus T_x X$ such that*

$$d_{T_x Y}(x_\infty, y_\infty) < d_{T_x Y}(x_\infty, T_x X) + d_{T_x Y}(y_\infty, T_x X),$$

we have $y_\infty \in \eta_\infty(T_p C \setminus T_p C_0)$. Moreover, for any geodesic connecting x_∞ and y_∞ , there exists a unique geodesic in $T_p C \setminus T_p C_0$ whose image under η_∞ coincides with the given geodesic.

Proof. If one of the minimal geodesic from x_∞ to y_∞ intersects $T_x X$ at z_∞ , then a contradiction occurs since

$$d_{T_x Y}(x_\infty, y_\infty) = d_{T_x Y}(x_\infty, z_\infty) + d_{T_x Y}(y_\infty, z_\infty) \geq d_{T_x Y}(x_\infty, T_x X) + d_{T_x Y}(y_\infty, T_x X).$$

The second statement follows directly from the 1-Lipschitz local isometry property of $\eta_\infty|_{T_p C \setminus T_p C_0}$. \square

The following lemma will be very useful in this paper.

Lemma 4.6 (Busemann function on $T_x Y$). *Let $\tilde{v}(t) := (o_p, t)$, $t \in [0, +\infty)$ be the perpendicular to $T_p C_0$ at o_p and $v := \eta_\infty(\tilde{v})$. For any $s > 0$, set $b_s : y_\infty \mapsto (\mathbf{d}_{T_x Y}(y_\infty, v(s)) - s)$. Then the limit $b := \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} b_s$ exists and satisfies*

$$b^{-1}(-r) = \eta_\infty(T_p C_0 \times \{r\}), \quad \forall r > 0. \quad (4.5)$$

Proof. From the triangle inequality of the distance function, we know for any fixed $y_\infty \in T_x Y$, the function $s \mapsto b_s(y_\infty)$, is monotone non-increasing on $(0, \infty)$ with a lower bound $-\mathbf{d}_{T_x Y}(y_\infty, o_x)$. This guarantees the existence of the limit $b := \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} b_s$, which is known as the Busemann function on $T_x Y$.

Regarding (4.5), we first show that if $b(y_\infty) = -h < 0$, then there exists $p_\infty \in T_p C \setminus T_p C_0$ such that $\eta_\infty(p_\infty) = y_\infty$.

For any sufficiently large $s > 0$, we have $b_s(y_\infty) < -h/2 < 0$. Moreover, since v minimizes the distance between $v(s)$ and $T_x X$, it holds that $\mathbf{d}_{T_x Y}(y_\infty, T_x X) \geq -b_s(y_\infty)$. From the very definition of b_s we know

$$\mathbf{d}_{T_x Y}(y_\infty, v(s)) = b_s(y_\infty) + s < -b_s(y_\infty) + s \leq \mathbf{d}_{T_x Y}(y_\infty, T_x X) + \mathbf{d}_{T_x Y}(v(s), T_x X).$$

Lemma 4.5 then yields the existence of $q_\infty \in T_p C \setminus T_p C_0$ such that $\eta_\infty(q_\infty) = y_\infty$.

On the other hand, for any $q_\infty = (p_\infty, h) \in T_p C \setminus T_p C_0$, by letting $y_\infty = \eta_\infty(q_\infty)$ we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}_{T_x Y}(y_\infty, v(s)) - s &\leq \mathbf{d}_{T_p C}(q_\infty, \tilde{v}(s)) - s = \sqrt{\mathbf{d}_{T_p C_0}^2(p_\infty, o_p) + (s - h)^2} - s \\ &= \frac{-2sh + \mathbf{d}_{T_p C}^2(p_\infty, o_p) + h^2}{\sqrt{\mathbf{d}_{T_p C_0}^2(p_\infty, o_p) + (s - h)^2} + s} \rightarrow -h, \quad \text{as } s \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

This implies $b(y_\infty) < 0$. Moreover, from the previous argument we see the following holds for any sufficiently large $s > 0$.

$$\mathbf{d}_{T_x Y}(y_\infty, v(s)) - s = \mathbf{d}_{T_p C}(q_\infty, \tilde{v}(s)) - s.$$

This as well as (4.6) then shows $b(y_\infty) = -h$. Therefore we complete the proof of (4.5). \square

An application of Lemma 4.6 is the following result.

Proposition 4.7 (Perpendiculars at points in X_1 are not extendible). *Let $p \in C_0^1$ and $x = \eta_0(p)$. Then for any $\delta \in (0, t_0)$, there does not exist a unit speed minimal geodesic $\gamma : [-\delta, \delta] \rightarrow Y$ such that*

$$\gamma(t) = \eta(p, t), \quad \forall t \in [0, \delta].$$

Before proceeding the proof, we may need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $\gamma : [0, l] \rightarrow C$ be a unit speed minimal geodesic from $p \in C_0$ to $q \in C \setminus C_0$ such that $\gamma \cap C_0 = \{p\}$, then for some constant $J = J(\lambda, \varepsilon_0, t_0)$ we have*

$$\frac{d_C(\gamma(t), C_0)}{t} - h_{p,q} \in [-Jt, 0], \quad \forall t \in [0, l], \quad (4.7)$$

where

$$h_{p,q} := \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{d_C(\gamma(t), C_0)}{t}.$$

Proof. Let us fix a sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ and set $\bar{q} := \gamma(l - \epsilon)$. Assume $\partial M_i \ni p_i \rightarrow p \in C_0$ and $C_{M_i} \ni \bar{q}_i \rightarrow \bar{q} \in C$ under (3.3) and (3.2) respectively.

Let $\gamma_i|_{[0, l_i]} = (\sigma_i, \nu_i)$ be the unit speed minimal geodesic from p_i to \bar{q}_i in C_{M_i} . Using Theorem 2.14, we see γ_i converges to $\gamma|_{[0, l-\epsilon]}$ under (3.3).

Then by (3.5) and the fact that γ_i is unit speed, we have

$$-J(\lambda, \varepsilon_0, t_0) \leq \nu_i''(t) \leq 0, \quad \forall t \in [0, l_i]. \quad (4.8)$$

Therefore for each i , by using Lagrange mean-value Theorem and (4.8), we obtain

$$\frac{\nu_i(t)}{t} - \nu_i'(0) = \frac{\nu_i(t) - \nu_i(0)}{t} - \nu_i'(0) \in [-Jt, 0], \quad \forall t \in [0, l_i]. \quad (4.9)$$

This yields that for any $t_1, t_2 \in [0, l_i]$ it holds that

$$\left| \frac{\nu_i(t_1)}{t_1} - \frac{\nu_i(t_2)}{t_2} \right| \leq \left| \frac{\nu_i(t_1)}{t_1} - \nu_i'(0) \right| + \left| \frac{\nu_i(t_2)}{t_2} - \nu_i'(0) \right| \leq J(t_1 + t_2). \quad (4.10)$$

Thus letting $i \rightarrow \infty$ in (4.10) implies

$$\left| \frac{d_C(\gamma(t_1), C_0)}{t_1} - \frac{d_C(\gamma(t_2), C_0)}{t_2} \right| \leq J(t_1 + t_2), \quad \forall t_1, t_2 \in [0, l - \epsilon],$$

since $l_i \rightarrow l - \epsilon$. Hence $h_{p,q}$ is well-defined.

To see (4.7), for any $0 < \delta < t < l - \epsilon$, from (4.9) we have

$$\frac{\nu_i(t)}{t} - \frac{\nu_i(\delta)}{\delta} = \frac{\nu_i(t)}{t} - \nu_i'(0) + \left(\frac{\nu_i(\delta)}{\delta} - \nu_i'(0) \right) \in [-Jt, J\delta].$$

Then letting $i \rightarrow \infty$ shows

$$\frac{d_C(\gamma(t), C_0)}{t} - \frac{d_C(\gamma(\delta), C_0)}{\delta} \in [-Jt, J\delta]. \quad (4.11)$$

Hence the conclusion follows by letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$ in (4.11) and then letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

Proof of Proposition 4.7. Assume there exists $\delta > 0$ and a geodesic $\gamma : [-\delta, \delta] \rightarrow Y$ satisfying the above property.

If there exists $\delta' \in (0, \delta)$ (which is still denoted as δ for convenience) such that $\gamma([-\delta, 0)) \subset Y \setminus X$, then the 1-Lipschitz local isometry property of η yields that $\eta^{-1}(\gamma|_{[-\delta, 0]})$ is also a minimal geodesic on C . According to Lemma 4.8, we know

$$h := \lim_{s \downarrow 0} \frac{d_Y(\gamma(-s), X)}{s} \geq \frac{d_Y(\gamma(-\delta), X)}{\delta}.$$

Using Propositions 4.1 and 4.4 then shows

$$\begin{aligned} 2 &= \lim_{s \downarrow 0} \frac{d_Y(\gamma(-s), \gamma(s))}{s} \leq \liminf_{s \downarrow 0} \frac{d_C(\eta^{-1}(\gamma(-s)), (p, s))}{s} \\ &\leq \sqrt{(1-h)^2 + 1 - h^2} < \sqrt{2}, \end{aligned}$$

which is impossible.

According to the continuity of the map $t \mapsto d_Y(\gamma(t), X)$, it suffices to consider the case that there exists a sequence $t_i \rightarrow 0$ such that $\gamma(-t_i) \in X$ for all i .

Plugging $s_i = t_i^{3/2}$ into (4.1)-(4.4) and passing to a subsequence if necessary, we obtain tangent spaces and tangent maps denoted with the same notation for convenience. In addition, we may also require that $\gamma_i := \gamma|_{[-t_i, t_i]}$ converges to a limit geodesic γ_∞ in $T_x Y$ under (4.2).

Since $t_i/s_i \rightarrow \infty$, we see γ_∞ is a line. From Proposition 3.5 we know

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [-t_i, 0]} \frac{d_Y(\gamma(t), X)}{s_i} \leq J(\lambda, \varepsilon_0, t_0) \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{t_i^2}{s_i} = 0,$$

which yields $\gamma_\infty((-\infty, 0]) \subset T_x X$.

Notice that $\gamma_\infty(t) = \eta_\infty(o_p, t)$ for any $t > 0$. Let us consider the Busemann function b on $T_x Y$ as in Lemma 4.6. Then from our setting we know

$$b(\gamma_\infty(-t)) = t, \quad \forall t > 0.$$

For each $t > 0$, let $\zeta_t : [0, 1] \rightarrow T_x Y$ be the perpendicular to $T_x X$ at $\gamma_\infty(-t)$. We claim

$$2h \leq d_{T_x Y}(\zeta_t(h), \gamma_\infty(h)) \leq 2h + t, \quad \forall t, h \in (0, 1]. \quad (4.12)$$

If the first inequality does not hold for some t and h , then Lemma 4.5 would imply the existence of $q_\infty \in T_p C \setminus T_p C_0$ such that $\eta_\infty(q_\infty) = \zeta_t(h)$. However, by Lemma 4.6 we see $b(\gamma_\infty(-t)) = 0$, contradicting our assumption that $b(\gamma_\infty(-t)) = t$.

Now as $t \downarrow 0$, ζ_t converges to a unit speed minimal geodesic ζ from o_x to $w_\infty := \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \zeta_t(1)$. Moreover, from (4.12) we know that the curve

$$\tilde{\zeta}(t) := \begin{cases} \zeta(-t), & \text{if } t \in [-1, 0], \\ \gamma_\infty(t), & \text{if } t \in [0, 1], \end{cases}$$

is a minimal geodesic from w_∞ to $\gamma_\infty(1)$. This contradicts Theorem 2.14. \square

Another application of Lemma 4.6 is the following proposition.

Proposition 4.9. *The map $\eta_\infty|_{T_p C_0} : T_p C_0 \rightarrow T_x X$ is surjective.*

Proof. Fix an arbitrary point $x_\infty \in T_x X$. For any sufficiently large $s > 0$, define the geodesic $\gamma_s : [0, 1] \rightarrow T_x Y$ as

$$\gamma_s(t) = \gamma_{\eta_\infty(o_p, s), x_\infty}^{T_x Y}(s - t).$$

Since the triangle inequality implies $\mathbf{d}_{T_x Y}(\gamma_s(1), x_\infty) \leq \mathbf{d}_{T_x X}(o_x, x_\infty) + 1$, γ_s uniformly converges to a geodesic $\gamma_\infty : [0, 1] \rightarrow T_x Y$ such that

$$\gamma_\infty(t) \in b^{-1}(-t), \quad \forall t \in (0, 1]. \quad (4.13)$$

Here b is the Busemann function on $T_x Y$ defined in Lemma 4.6.

Therefore, (4.5) and the local isometry property of $\eta_\infty|_{T_p C \setminus T_p C_0}$ verifies the existence of a point $p_\infty \in T_p C_0$ such that

$$\gamma_\infty(t) = \eta_\infty(p_\infty, t), \quad \forall t \in [0, 1].$$

If $\eta_\infty(p_\infty) \neq x_\infty$, then by our construction it holds that $b(x_\infty) > 0$. However, this would lead to a contradiction, as can be shown by an argument analogous to that in the proof of Proposition 4.7.

Hence we have

$$\gamma_\infty(0) = \eta_\infty(p_\infty) = x_\infty, \quad (4.14)$$

from which we conclude. □

Corollary 4.10. *The 0-level set of the Busemann function satisfies $b^{-1}(0) = T_x X$.*

Proof. For any $x_\infty \in T_x X$, by using notations in the proof of Proposition 4.9, it follows from (4.13), (4.14) and the continuity of Busemann function that $b(x_\infty) = 0$, which implies $T_x X \subset b^{-1}(0)$.

To prove the reverse inclusion, let $x_\infty \in b^{-1}(0)$. For any sufficiently large $s > 0$, define the point

$$y_\infty^s := \gamma_{\eta_\infty(o_p, s), x_\infty}^{T_x Y}(s - 1).$$

By the definition of the function b_s in Lemma 4.6, this point satisfies $b_s(y_\infty^s) = -1$ and

$$b_s(x_\infty) = \mathbf{d}_{T_x Y}(x_\infty, y_\infty^s) - 1.$$

Because the function $s \mapsto b_s(x_\infty)$ is monotone non-increasing, y_∞^s converges to a limit point $y_\infty \in b^{-1}(-1)$ as $s \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, we have $\mathbf{d}_{T_x Y}(x_\infty, y_\infty) = 1$.

The conclusion follows by combining these results with Proposition 4.4 and Lemma 4.6. □

Corollary 4.11. *For any $x_\infty \in T_x X$ we have $1 \leq \#\eta_\infty^{-1}(x_\infty) \leq 2$.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.9, it suffices to show $\#\eta_\infty^{-1}(x_\infty) \leq 2$. Assume there exists three distinct points p_∞^i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) such that $\eta_\infty(p_\infty^i) = x_\infty$.

Let $t_\infty = \min_{i \neq j}(\mathbf{d}_{T_p C_0}(p_\infty^i, p_\infty^j))/2$ and $v_{ij} : [-t_\infty, t_\infty] \rightarrow T_x Y$ be the curve defined by

$$v_{ij}(t) = \begin{cases} \eta_\infty(p_\infty^i, t), & t \in (0, t_\infty]; \\ \eta_\infty(p_\infty^j, -t), & t \in [-t_\infty, 0]. \end{cases}$$

Since $t_\infty < \mathbf{d}_{T_p C_0}(p_\infty^i, p_\infty^j)$, according to the proof of Lemma 3.8, we know v_{ij} is exactly the unit speed minimal geodesic connecting $\eta_\infty(p_\infty^i, t_\infty)$ and $\eta_\infty(p_\infty^j, t_\infty)$. This contradicts Theorem 2.14. \square

When $x \in X_2$, since the tangent space $T_x X$ contains a line, we obtain the following Proposition.

Proposition 4.12. *For any $x \in X_2$, the tangent space $(T_x Y, \mathbf{d}_{T_x Y})$ is isometric to $(T_x X \times \mathbb{R}, \sqrt{\mathbf{d}_{T_x X}^2 + \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}}^2})$ and $\eta_\infty : (T_p C_0, \mathbf{d}_{T_p C_0}) \rightarrow (T_x X, \mathbf{d}_{T_x X})$ is an isometry.*

Proof. According to Theorem 2.4, there exists a metric space $(\Omega, \mathbf{d}_\Omega)$ and a point $\omega \in \Omega$ such that $(T_x Y, \mathbf{d}_{T_x Y})$ is isometric to $(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}, \sqrt{\mathbf{d}_\Omega^2 + \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}}^2})$ and that

$$\eta_\infty(o_p, t) = (\omega, t), \quad \forall t > 0.$$

Let us take the Busemann function b on $T_x Y$ as in Lemma 4.6. From the construction of Busemann function and Corollary 4.10, we know $b^{-1}(0) = \Omega \times \{0\} = T_x X$ and

$$b^{-1}(-r) = \eta_\infty(T_p C_0 \times \{r\}) = \Omega \times \{r\}, \quad \forall r > 0.$$

For every $r > 0$, since $\eta_\infty|_{B_r^{T_p C_0}(o_p) \times \{4r\}}$ is an isometry, $\eta_\infty : B_r^{T_p C_0}(o_p) \rightarrow B_r^\Omega(\omega)$ is also an isometry. By identifying Ω with $T_x X$, it follows that $\eta_\infty : T_p C_0 \rightarrow T_x X$ is an isometry. \square

In the remainder of this subsection, we focus on proving the following proposition. By Proposition 4.12, it suffices to consider the case where $p \in C_0^1$. From this point onward, we will assume $p \in C_0^1$ without further explicit mention.

Proposition 4.13. *For any $p_\infty \in T_p C_0$ it holds that*

$$\mathbf{d}_{T_p C_0}(o_p, p_\infty) = \mathbf{d}_{T_x X}(o_x, \eta_\infty(p_\infty)). \quad (4.15)$$

We start with the following lemma.

Lemma 4.14. *For any $t > 0$ and $p_\infty \in T_p C_0$, any minimal geodesic starting from $\eta_\infty(p_\infty, t)$ intersects $T_x X$ at most at one point.*

Proof. Let us prove by contradiction. By Lemma 4.3, without loss of generality, we may assume there exists a unit speed minimal geodesic $\gamma : [-1, 1] \rightarrow T_x Y$ such that $\gamma(-1) = \eta_\infty(p_\infty, h)$ for some $h \in (0, 1)$, that $\gamma([-1, 0)) \subset T_x Y \setminus T_x X$ and that $\gamma([0, 1]) \subset T_x X$. The local isometry property and 1-Lipschitz property of η_∞ imply that $\eta_\infty^{-1}(\gamma|_{[-1, 0)})$ is also a minimal geodesic in $T_p C$. Indeed, $\eta_\infty^{-1}(\gamma|_{[-1, 0]})$ is a minimal geodesic from (p_∞, h) to $q_\infty := \lim_{s \uparrow 0} \eta_\infty^{-1}(\gamma(s)) \in T_p C_0$.

Let $x_\infty = \eta_\infty(q_\infty)$. Denote by $\zeta : t \mapsto \eta_\infty(q_\infty, t)$ for convenience. Let us fix a sequence $r_i \downarrow 0$ and $a > 0$ such that

$$\sqrt{1 - h^2} + \sqrt{h^2 + a^2} < 1 + a.$$

For each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we take a perpendicular ζ_i to $T_x X$ at $\gamma(r_i)$.

Case 1 There exists a subsequence which is still denoted as r_i such that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} d_{T_x Y}(\zeta_i(1), \zeta(1)) = 2$$

Then the curve $v : [-1, 1] \rightarrow T_x Y$ defined as

$$v(t) = \begin{cases} \zeta(t), & t \in (0, 1]; \\ \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \zeta_i(-t), & t \in [-1, 0], \end{cases}$$

is a unit speed minimal geodesic such that

$$d_{T_x Y}(v(t), T_x X) = |t|, \quad \forall t \in [-1, 1]. \quad (4.16)$$

By Theorem 2.4, after passing to a subsequence, we may assume $(r_i^{-1} T_x Y, x_\infty)$ pGH converges to a pointed product space $(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}, (\omega, 0))$ and v converges to the line $v_\infty : t \mapsto (\omega, t)$ under this convergence.

Since (4.16) implies

$$d_{T_x Y}(v(t), \gamma(s)) \geq |t|, \quad \forall t \in [-1, 1], \forall s \in [0, 1],$$

we know $\gamma|_{[0, r_i]}$ converges to unit speed minimal geodesic $\gamma_\infty : [0, 1] \rightarrow \Omega$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d_{T_x Y}(\zeta(hr_i), \gamma(ar_i))}{r_i} = \sqrt{h^2 + a^2}.$$

According to the 1-Lipschitz property of η_∞ , we see $d_{T_x Y}(\gamma(-r_i), \zeta(hr_i)) \leq r_i \sqrt{1 - h^2}$. A contradiction then occurs because we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + a &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d_{T_x Y}(\gamma(-r_i), \gamma(ar_i))}{r_i} \\ &\leq \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d_{T_x Y}(\gamma(-r_i), \zeta(hr_i))}{r_i} + \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d_{T_x Y}(\zeta(hr_i), \gamma(ar_i))}{r_i} \\ &\leq \sqrt{1 - h^2} + \sqrt{h^2 + a^2} < 1 + a. \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

Case 2 $\limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} d_{T_x Y}(\zeta_i(1), \zeta(1)) < 2$.

By Lemma 4.5, there exists $\{q_i\} \subset T_p C_0$ such that for each i we have $\eta_\infty(q_i) = \gamma(r_i)$ and $d_{T_p C_0}(q_i, q_\infty) < 2$. If q_i converges to some $q'_\infty \neq q_\infty$, then following the argument in Lemma 3.8, the geodesic v' defined as

$$v'(t) = \begin{cases} \zeta(t), & 0 \leq t \leq d_{T_p C_0}(q_\infty, q'_\infty); \\ \eta_\infty(q'_\infty, -t), & -d_{T_p C_0}(q_\infty, q'_\infty) \leq t < 0, \end{cases}$$

would satisfy

$$d_{T_x Y}(v'(t), T_x X) = |t|, \quad \forall t \in [-d_{T_p C_0}(q_\infty, q'_\infty), d_{T_p C_0}(q_\infty, q'_\infty)].$$

However, this is impossible due to Case 1. Therefore, one must have $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} q_i = q_\infty$.

Let $t_i = d_{T_p C_0}(q_\infty, q_i)$. Since η_∞ is 1-Lipschitz, it follows that $t_i \geq r_i$. Applying Theorem 2.4 and Lemma 4.3, after passing to a subsequence, we may assume

$$(t_i^{-1} T_x Y, x_\infty) \xrightarrow{\text{pGH}} (\Omega \times \mathbb{R}, (\omega, 0)) \quad (4.18)$$

for a pointed product space $(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}, (\omega, 0))$, and

$$(t_i^{-1} T_x X, x_\infty) \xrightarrow{\text{pGH}} (T_{x_\infty}(T_x X), (\omega, 0))$$

for a pointed metric space $(T_{x_\infty}(T_x X), (\omega, 0))$ as convergence of subsets. Under (4.18), the geodesic γ converges to the line $\gamma_\infty : t \mapsto (\omega, t)$ with $\gamma_\infty(0) = (\omega, 0)$ and $\gamma_\infty([0, \infty)) \subset T_{x_\infty}(T_x X)$, and ζ converges to ζ_∞ , which is the perpendicular to $T_{x_\infty}(T_x X)$ at $(\omega, 0)$.

If $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} r_i/t_i = 0$, then following the same line of reasoning as before, we deduce the existence of $h_\infty > 0$ and a geodesic $v_\infty : [-h_\infty, h_\infty] \rightarrow T_{x_\infty}(T_x Y)$ such that v_∞ coincides with ζ_∞ on $[0, h_\infty]$ and that

$$d_{T_{x_\infty}(T_x Y)}(v_\infty(t), T_{x_\infty}(T_x X)) = |t|, \quad \forall t \in [-h_\infty, h_\infty].$$

This would also imply

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{d_{T_{x_\infty}(T_x Y)}(\zeta_\infty(ht), \gamma_\infty(at))}{t} = \sqrt{h^2 + a^2}.$$

Additionally, since

$$d_{T_{x_\infty}(T_x Y)}(\gamma_\infty(-t), \zeta_\infty(ht)) \leq t\sqrt{1 - h^2}, \quad \forall t > 0,$$

we arrive at a contradiction in a way similar to (4.17).

From the above discussion, we know there exists a map $\tau : [0, 1] \rightarrow T_p C_0$ such that $\gamma = \eta_\infty \circ \tau$ on $[0, 1]$ and that

$$\liminf_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{t}{d_{T_p C_0}(q_\infty, \tau(t))} > 0. \quad (4.19)$$

For each $t > 0$, let $\zeta_{i,t} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow T_x Y$ denote the ray $\zeta_{i,t}(s) = \eta_\infty(\tau(r_i t), s)$. Assume $\zeta_{i,t}$ converges to $\zeta_{\infty,t}$ under (4.18), which is the perpendicular to $T_{x_\infty}(T_x X)$ at $\gamma_\infty(t)$. Then $\zeta_{\infty,t}$ must be a ray in $\Omega \times \{t\}$.

However, by (4.19) and the 1-Lipschitz property of η_∞ , $\zeta_{\infty,t}$ converges to ζ_∞ as $t \downarrow 0$, yielding $\zeta_\infty \in \Omega \times \{0\}$. This leads to another contradiction because

$$d_{T_{x_\infty}(T_x Y)}(\zeta_\infty(h), \gamma_\infty(a)) = \sqrt{h^2 + a^2}.$$

□

Lemma 4.15. *Let $p \in C_0^1$ and assume $p_\infty \in T_p C_0$ satisfies $\eta_\infty^{-1}(\eta_\infty(p_\infty)) = \{p_\infty\}$. Then $\eta_\infty|_{T_p C_0}$ preserves the distance from p_∞ .*

Proof. By Lemma 4.14, for any $q_\infty \in T_p C_0$ and any $s > 0$, any minimal geodesic γ_s from $\eta_\infty(p_\infty)$ to $\eta_\infty(q_\infty, s)$ satisfies $\gamma_s \cap T_x X = \{\eta_\infty(p_\infty)\}$. Since $\eta_\infty|_{T_p C \setminus T_p C_0}$ is a 1-Lipschitz local isometry, $\eta_\infty^{-1}(\gamma_s)$ is also a minimal geodesic on $T_p C$ connecting p_∞ and (q_∞, s) . This gives the equality of distances

$$d_{T_p C}(p_\infty, (q_\infty, s)) = d_{T_x Y}(\eta_\infty(p_\infty), \eta_\infty(q_\infty, s)).$$

The conclusion follows by taking the limit as $s \rightarrow 0$. □

We are now in a position to give a proof of Proposition 4.13.

Proof of Proposition 4.13. Assume $p_\infty \in T_p C_0 \setminus \{o_p\}$. Let $\sigma : [0, l] \rightarrow T_x X$ be a unit speed minimal geodesic from o_x to $\eta_\infty(p_\infty)$.

For any sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, define

$$A_\epsilon := \{t \in [0, l] \mid d_{T_p C_0}(\eta_\infty^{-1}(\sigma(s)), o_p) \leq (1 + \epsilon)s, \forall s \in [0, t]\},$$

which is closed due to the continuity of η_∞ and is non-empty because $0 \in A_\epsilon$.

To show A_ϵ is open, choose any $t \in A_\epsilon$. If t satisfies $\#\eta_\infty^{-1}(\sigma(t)) = 1$, then Lemma 4.15 yields

$$\begin{aligned} d_{T_p C_0}(\eta_\infty^{-1}(\sigma(s)), o_p) &\leq (1 + \epsilon)t + d_{T_p C_0}(\eta_\infty^{-1}(\sigma(t)), \eta_\infty^{-1}(\sigma(s))) \\ &= (1 + \epsilon)t + s - t \leq (1 + \epsilon)s, \quad \forall s \in (t, l]. \end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

By Corollary 4.11, it suffices to consider the case that $\#\eta_\infty^{-1}(\sigma(t)) = 2$. Take two points $p_t^1, p_t^2 \in T_p C_0$ such that $d_{T_p C_0}(p_t^1, p_t^2) = 2l_t$ and $\eta_\infty(\{p_t^1, p_t^2\}) = \sigma(t)$. Define the geodesic $v : [-l_t, l_t] \rightarrow T_x Y$ by

$$v(s) = \begin{cases} \eta_\infty(p_t^1, s), & s \in [0, l_t]; \\ \eta_\infty(p_t^2, -s), & s \in [-l_t, 0), \end{cases}$$

which satisfies

$$d_{T_x Y}(v(s), T_x X) = |s|, \quad \forall s \in [-l_t, l_t]. \tag{4.21}$$

Moreover, from the proof of Corollary 4.11 we know v is a unit speed minimal geodesic from $\eta_\infty(p_t^2, l_t)$ to $\eta_\infty(p_t^1, l_t)$.

We claim there exists some small $\mu > 0$ such that for any $s \in [t, t + \mu]$ there exists $p_s^i \in \eta_\infty^{-1}(\sigma(s))$ such that

$$d_{T_p C_0}(p_t^i, p_s^i) \leq (s - t)(1 + \epsilon), \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (4.22)$$

Assume there exists a sequence $r_j \downarrow 0$ such that

$$d_{T_p C_0}(p_t^1, \eta_0^{-1}(\sigma(t + r_j))) > (1 + \epsilon)r_j, \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4.23)$$

By Theorem 2.4 and (4.21), after passing to a subsequence, there exists a metric space (Ω, d_Ω) such that as $j \rightarrow \infty$, $(r_j^{-1}T_x Y, \sigma(t))$ pGH converges to a product metric space $(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}, (\omega, 0))$. Moreover, $\sigma(t + r_j)$ converges to a point $(\omega', 0) \in \Omega \times \{0\}$ with $d_\Omega(\omega, \omega') = 1$.

For every $\tau > 0$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$, since

$$\eta_\infty : B_{\tau r_j}^{T_p C}((p_t^1, 5\tau r_j)) \rightarrow \eta_\infty(B_{\tau r_j}^{T_p C}((p_t^1, 5\tau r_j)))$$

is an isometry, $\eta_\infty(B_{\tau r_j}^{T_p C_0}(p_t^1) \times \{5\tau r_j\})$ converges to $B_\tau^\Omega(\omega) \times \{5\tau\}$ under the above pGH convergence. In particular, we know $B_{\tau r_j}^{T_p C_0}(p_t^1)$ GH converges to $B_\tau^\Omega(\omega)$. As a result, we have

$$\eta_\infty(B_{2r_j}^{T_p C_0}(p_t^1)) \subset B_{3r_j}^{T_x Y}(\sigma(t)) \subset \eta_\infty(B_{2r_j}^{T_p C_0}(p_t^1))$$

for all sufficiently large j . Therefore, there exists $p_{r_j}^1 \in \eta_\infty^{-1}(\sigma(t + r_j))$ such that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d_{T_p C_0}(p_{r_j}^1, p_t^1)}{r_j} = 1,$$

contradicting (4.23).

Thus we have (4.22). Because this implies $A_\epsilon = [0, l]$, the conclusion follows by letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

4.2 Geometric properties of limit spaces

This subsection is aimed at proving Theorem 1.4. By Lemma 3.8, we can define $f : C_0 \rightarrow C_0$ as

$$f(p) = \begin{cases} q & \text{if } p \in C_0^2 \text{ and } \{p, q\} = \eta_0^{-1}(\eta_0(p)), \\ p & \text{if } p \in C_0^1. \end{cases} \quad (4.24)$$

We first deal with the following theorem.

Theorem 4.16. $f : C_0 \rightarrow C_0$ is an isometry.

To prove this theorem, the continuity of f is needed.

Proposition 4.17. $f : C_0 \rightarrow C_0$ is a homeomorphism.

Proof. Since f is an involution, it suffices to show that f is continuous. Let $p_i \rightarrow p$ in C_0 , and $x_i := \eta_0(p_i)$, $x := \eta_0(p)$. We consider the following two cases.

Case 1 $p \in C_0^1$.

Since each component of C_0 is compact by Theorem 2.19, it suffices to show that any convergent subsequence of $\{f(p_i)\}$ (which is still denoted as $\{f(p_i)\}$ for simplicity) must converge to p .

Assume $f(p_i) \rightarrow q$ for some $q \in C_0$. Then the continuity of η_0 implies that

$$\eta_0(q) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \eta_0(f(p_i)) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} x_i = x.$$

Thus $q = p$ and we are done.

Case 2 $p \in C_0^2$.

Let $s_i := \mathbf{d}_X(x_i, x)$. Passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that $(s_i^{-1}C_0, p) \rightarrow (T_p C_0, o_p)$, $(s_i^{-1}C_0, f(p)) \rightarrow (T_{f(p)} C_0, o_{f(p)})$ and $(s_i^{-1}X, x) \rightarrow (T_x X, o_x)$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. By Propositions 4.1 and 4.12, $(T_p C_0, o_p)$ is isometric to $(T_{f(p)} C_0, o_{f(p)})$. Passing to a subsequence again, $\eta : (s_i^{-1}C_0, f(p)) \rightarrow (s_i^{-1}X, x)$ also converges to an isometry $\eta_\infty : (T_{f(p)} C_0, o_{f(p)}) \rightarrow (T_x X, o_x)$. In particular, for any sufficiently large i it holds

$$B_{2s_i}^X(x) \subset \eta_0(B_{3s_i}^{C_0}(f(p))) \subset B_{4s_i}^X(x),$$

from which we know $x_i \in X_2$ and $f(p_i) \rightarrow f(p)$. □

Corollary 4.18. C_0^1 and X_1 are closed in C_0 and X respectively.

Proof of Theorem 4.16. Fix $p, q \in C_0$ such that $\mathbf{d}(p, q) = l < \infty$. Let γ be a unit speed minimal geodesic from p to q . For any $\delta > 0$, set

$$A_\delta := \{t \in [0, l] \mid s \geq (1 - \delta)\mathbf{d}(f(p), f(\gamma(s))), \forall 0 \leq s \leq t\}.$$

Obviously A_δ is a closed set due to Proposition 4.17. If $\sup A_\delta = l_0 < l$, we claim there exists $\mu \in (0, l - l_0)$ such that

$$s - l_0 = \mathbf{d}(\gamma(l_0), \gamma(s)) \geq (1 - \delta)\mathbf{d}(f(\gamma(l_0)), f(\gamma(s))), \forall s \in (l_0, l_0 + \mu). \quad (4.25)$$

Assume there exists $s_i \downarrow l_0$ such that (4.25) does not hold for every s_i . Then applying Propositions 4.13 and 4.17 yields that

$$1 = \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{d}(\gamma(l_0), \gamma(s_i))}{\mathbf{d}_X(\gamma(l_0), \gamma(s_i))} \leq (1 - \delta) \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{d}(f(\gamma(l_0)), f(\gamma(s_i)))}{\mathbf{d}_X(\gamma(l_0), \gamma(s_i))} = 1 - \delta,$$

which is a contradiction.

Therefore for any $s \in [l_0, l_0 + \mu)$ it holds

$$s \geq (1 - \delta) \left(\mathbf{d}(f(p), f(\gamma(l_0))) + \mathbf{d}(f(\gamma(l_0)), f(\gamma(s))) \right) \geq (1 - \delta)\mathbf{d}(f(p), f(\gamma(s))),$$

contradicting $l_0 < l$. Thus $\sup A_\delta = \max A_\delta = l$. Letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$ then implies $\mathbf{d}(p, q) \geq \mathbf{d}(f(p), f(q))$.

The converse inequality $\mathbf{d}(f(p), f(q)) \geq \mathbf{d}(p, q)$ follows from the fact that f is an involution. This completes the proof. □

The following theorem can also be proved using the same method as in Theorem 4.16. For brevity, we only outline the key steps of the proof.

Theorem 4.19. *(X, \mathbf{d}_X) is isometric to the quotient space $(C_0/f, \mathbf{d}^*)$, where \mathbf{d}^* is the quotient metric defined as in (2.1). In particular, (X, \mathbf{d}_X) is geodesically non-branching.*

Proof. Fix $x, y \in X$ with $\mathbf{d}(x, y) = l$. Given any $\delta > 0$ we set

$$A_\delta := \{t \in [0, l] \mid s \geq (1 - \delta) \mathbf{d}(\eta^{-1}(x), \eta^{-1}(\gamma(s))), \forall 0 \leq s \leq t\}.$$

By Proposition 4.13 and Theorem 4.16 and the continuity argument, we conclude that $\sup A_\delta = l$. Taking the limit as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ completes the proof of the first statement. As for the second statement, it follows directly from Theorem 2.14 and Proposition 2.15. \square

Corollary 4.20. *Assume $p \in C_0^1$ and $x = \eta_0(p)$. Then under the convergence (4.3), the isometry $f : C_0 \rightarrow C_0$ converges to an isometry $f_\infty : T_p C_0 \rightarrow T_p C_0$. Moreover, $(T_x X, \mathbf{d}_{T_x X})$ is isometric to $(T_p C_0/f_\infty, \mathbf{d}_{T_p C_0}^*)$, where $\mathbf{d}_{T_p C_0}^*$ denotes the quotient metric induced by f_∞ .*

Proof. The first statement is obvious. For the second one, let us take $p_\infty, q_\infty \in T_p C_0$ and two sequences $\{p_i\}, \{q_i\} \subset C_0$ such that $p_i \rightarrow p_\infty$ and $q_i \rightarrow q_\infty$ respectively under (4.3).

By Theorem 4.19, we may choose $q'_i \in \eta_0^{-1}(q_i)$ such that $\mathbf{d}_X(\eta_0(p_i), \eta_0(q_i)) = \mathbf{d}(p_i, q'_i)$. As $q'_i \rightarrow \exists q'_\infty \in T_p C_0$ and $\eta_0 : (s_i^{-1} C_0, p) \rightarrow (s_i^{-1} X, x)$ converges to $\eta_\infty : (T_p C_0, o_p) \rightarrow (T_x X, o_x)$ under (4.3) and (4.4), we see

$$\mathbf{d}_{T_p C_0}(p_\infty, q'_\infty) = \mathbf{d}_{T_p C_0}(f_\infty(p_\infty), f_\infty(q'_\infty)) = \mathbf{d}_{T_x X}(\eta_\infty(p_\infty), \eta_\infty(q'_\infty)).$$

The proof is then completed by applying Proposition 4.9. \square

We end this section by proving the following proposition. Note that Theorem 1.4 is a direct consequence of this proposition.

Proposition 4.21. *The number of components of C_0 is at most 2.*

Proof. If $C_0^1 \neq \emptyset$, let $p \in C_0^1$. For any $q \in C_0$, applying Theorem 4.19 implies

$$\mathbf{d}(p, q) = \mathbf{d}(p, f(q)) = \mathbf{d}_X(\eta_0(p), \eta_0(q)) \leq D.$$

Therefore in this case C_0 is connected.

If $C_0^1 = \emptyset$ and C_0 is not connected, we fix a point $p \in C_0$. For any $q \in C_0$, applying Theorem 4.19 again, we know that either $\mathbf{d}(p, q) = \mathbf{d}_X(\eta_0(p), \eta_0(q)) \leq D$ or $\mathbf{d}(p, f(q)) = \mathbf{d}_X(\eta_0(p), \eta_0(q)) \leq D$. This yields that the number of components of C_0 is at most 2. \square

Corollary 4.22. *Assume $C_0^1 \neq \emptyset$ and the dimension of C_0 is k . Let $p \in C_0^1$ and $x = \eta_0(p)$. Then under the convergences (4.1)-(4.4), $\eta_\infty : T_p C \rightarrow T_x Y$ is surjective. In particular, we have $X_1 \subset Y \setminus \mathcal{R}_{k+1}(Y)$.*

Proof. We first prove that

$$\eta_\infty(T_p C) = T_x Y. \quad (4.26)$$

For any $y_\infty \in T_x Y$, there exists a sequence of points $\{y_i\} \subset Y$ such that $y_i \rightarrow y_\infty$ under the convergence (4.1). By taking x_i as the foot point of y_i ($i \in \mathbb{N}$), we know that $\{x_i\}$ also converges to some $x_\infty \in T_x X$.

According to Proposition 3.2, we may take $p_i \in C_0$ such that $\eta(p_i, h_i) = y_i$ with $d_Y(y_i, X) = h_i$. Then it follows from Remark 3.3, Theorems 4.16 and 4.19 that $d_X(x_i, x) = d(p_i, p)$. Applying Proposition 3.5 we calculate that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d_C((p_i, h_i), p)}{s_i} &\leq \frac{d_C((p_i, h_i), p_i) + d_C(p_i, p)}{s_i} \\ &\rightarrow d_{T_x Y}(y_\infty, T_x X) + d_{T_x X}(x_\infty, o_x) \text{ as } i \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence after passing to a subsequence, we may assume $(p_i, h_i) \rightarrow \exists q_\infty \in T_p C$ under the convergence (4.1). In particular, we have $\eta_\infty(q_\infty) = y_\infty$, which completes the proof of (4.26).

As for the second statement, by Remark 4.2, the dimension of (Y, d_Y) is $k + 1$. If $x \in X_1 \cap \mathcal{R}_{k+1}(Y)$, then $T_x Y$ is isometric to \mathbb{R}^{k+1} . For any $R > 0$, the local isometry property of $\eta_\infty|_{T_p C \setminus T_p C_0}$ implies that $\eta_\infty : B_R^{T_p C_0}(o_p) \times \{2R\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ is an isometry. Since this holds for all R , applying Proposition 4.1 then yields that $T_p C_0$ is isometric to \mathbb{R}^k and $T_p C$ is isometric to the $(k + 1)$ -dimensional upper half plane in \mathbb{R}_+^{k+1} .

However, since it is obvious that $\eta_\infty : T_p C \rightarrow \eta_\infty(T_p C)$ is an isometry, we deduce a contradiction with (4.26). □

4.3 The $\text{RCD}(K, n - 1)$ structure of limit spaces

The main purpose of this section to introduce the $\text{RCD}(K, n - 1)$ structure on (X, d_X) .

When $C_0 = C_0^2$ and C_0 is not connected, by Theorem 4.19, each component of (C_0, d) is isometric to (X, d_X) . By selecting any such component (still denoted as (C_0, d, \mathbf{m})), we immediately see that (X, d_X, \mathbf{m}) becomes an $\text{RCD}(K, n - 1)$ space.

When $C_0 = C_0^1$, (C_0, d) is isometric to (X, d_X) , making (X, d_X, \mathbf{m}) an $\text{RCD}(K, n - 1)$ space as well.

We now turn to the case where both C_0^1 and C_0^2 are non-empty. Here, Theorem 4.19 directly implies the connectedness of C_0 . Refer to Examples 5.3 and 5.4 for examples.

Lemma 4.23. *Assume both C_0^1 and C_0^2 are non-empty. Then the interior of C_0^1 is empty. Moreover, X_2 is geodesically convex.*

Proof. The first statement follows directly from [47, Lemma 4.26]. The second statement is a generalized version of [47, Lemma 4.27], we give an alternative proof here.

Let $x, y \in X_2$ and $\{p_1, p_2\} = \eta_0^{-1}(x)$. Let $\gamma : [0, l] \rightarrow X$ be a unit speed minimal geodesic from x to y .

If γ is not fully contained in X_2 , then by Corollary 4.18 there exists $l_0 \in (0, l)$ which is the first parameter such that $\gamma(l_0) \in X_1$. Take $\tilde{\gamma}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2$ as unit speed minimal geodesics

from p_1 to $\eta_0^{-1}(\gamma(l_0))$ and from p_2 to $\eta_0^{-1}(\gamma(l_0))$ respectively. The 1-Lipschitz property of η_0 together with Theorems 4.16 and 4.19 implies $\eta_0(\tilde{\tau}_i) = \gamma|_{[0, l_0]}$ ($i = 1, 2$). Similarly, by taking $\tilde{\tau}$ as a unit speed minimal geodesic from $\eta_0^{-1}(\gamma(l_0))$ to a point $q \in \eta_0^{-1}(y)$, we know $\eta_0(\tilde{\tau}) = \gamma|_{[l_0, l]}$.

For $i = 1, 2$, define the curve $\tau_i : [0, l] \rightarrow C_0$ as

$$\tau_i(t) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\tau}_i(t), & t \in [0, l_0], \\ \tilde{\tau}(t), & t \in (l_0, l]. \end{cases}$$

It is obvious that $L^d(\tau_i) = l$. However, since η_0 is 1-Lipschitz, one has

$$L^d(\tau_i) \geq d(p_i, q) \geq d_X(x, y) = l.$$

Therefore, each τ_i is a minimal geodesic from p_i to q , which contradicts Theorem 2.14. \square

Corollary 4.24 ([47, Corollary 4.21]). *Assume C_0^2 is non-empty. Then $\eta_0 : C_0^2 \rightarrow X_2$ is a locally isometric double covering space.*

The next lemma is a direct consequence of [32, Lemma 4.1].

Lemma 4.25. *Assume both C_0^1 and C_0^2 are non-empty. Then $\mathbf{m}(C_0^1) = 0$.*

Provided C_0^1 has no contribution to the measure, under the assumption of the following proposition, there exists a natural RCD structure on (X, d_X) . Note that when C_0^2 is connected, there is an counterexample in Example 5.2.

Proposition 4.26. *Assume both C_0^1 and C_0^2 are non-empty and C_0^2 has two components. Then there exists a Randon measure \mathbf{m}_X such that (X, d_X, \mathbf{m}_X) is an $\text{RCD}(K, n-1)$ space.*

Proof. Fix $p \in C_0^2$ and let $x = \eta_0(p)$. Denote by U the component of C_0^2 containing p . For any $y \in X_2$, Lemma 4.23 ensures that any minimal geodesic γ from x to y lies entirely in $\gamma \subset X_2$. By Corollary 4.24, $\eta_0^{-1}(\gamma)$ is also a minimal geodesic in U , connecting p to a unique point $q \in \eta_0^{-1}(y)$ and satisfying $d(p, q) = d_X(\eta_0(p), \eta_0(q))$. This defines an isometry $\tau : X_2 \rightarrow U \subset C_0^2$ via $\tau(y) = q$.

Next, observe from the proof of Lemma 4.23 that the interior of X_1 is also empty. For any $y \in X_1$, take a sequence $\{y_i\} \subset X_2$ converging to y . The continuity of η_0 ensures $\tau(y_i) \rightarrow \eta_0^{-1}(y)$, allowing τ to extend to an isometry $\tau : X \rightarrow U \cup C_0^1$.

Finally, letting $\mathbf{m}_X = (\tau^{-1})_{\#} \mathbf{m}$ and using [8, Proposition 7.2] and Lemma 4.25, we complete the proof. \square

Remark 4.27. If we let $\mathbf{n} := (\eta_0)_{\#} \mathbf{m}$ be the push-forward measure of \mathbf{m} under η_0 , it remains unknown whether (X, d_X, \mathbf{n}) is an $\text{RCD}(K, n-1)$ space, for the following reason. Although some of the following was discussed in [27], we give the details here for reader's convenience.

For any $g \in \text{Lip}(X, \mathbf{d}_X)$, we define its lift $\tilde{g} : C_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as $\tilde{g} = g \circ \eta_0$. Theorem 4.19 implies that $\text{lip}^{C_0} \tilde{g} = (\text{lip}^X g) \circ \eta_0$.

Consider $g \in H^{1,2}(X, \mathbf{d}_X, \mathbf{n})$ with $|\nabla^X g|$ denoting its minimal relaxed slope. By Remark 2.6, there exists $\{g_i\} \subset \text{Lip}(X, \mathbf{d}_X) \cap L^2(\mathbf{n})$ such that $g_i \rightarrow g$ and $\text{lip}^X g_i \rightarrow |\nabla^X g|$ in $L^2(\mathbf{n})$. Therefore by Lemma 4.25, both $\{\tilde{g}_i\}$ and $\{\text{lip}^{C_0} \tilde{g}_i\}$ are Cauchy sequences in $L^2(\mathbf{m})$. Since $\{\tilde{g}_i\} \subset \text{Lip}(C_0, \mathbf{d})$ satisfies $\tilde{g}_i \rightarrow \tilde{g}$ in $L^2(\mathbf{m})$, Remark 2.11 combined with the completeness of Sobolev space yields $\text{lip}^{C_0} \tilde{g}_i \rightarrow |\nabla^{C_0} \tilde{g}|$ in $L^2(\mathbf{m})$. After passing to a subsequence, for \mathbf{m} -a.e. $p \in C_0$ (resp. \mathbf{n} -a.e. $x \in X$) we have $\text{lip}^{C_0} \tilde{g}_i(p) \rightarrow |\nabla^{C_0} \tilde{g}|(p)$ (resp. $\text{lip}^X g_i(x) \rightarrow |\nabla^X g|(x)$), which then shows $|\nabla^{C_0} \tilde{g}| = |\nabla^X g| \circ \eta_0$ \mathbf{m} -a.e.

The infinitesimally Hilbertian property of $(C_0, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$ implies that $(X, \mathbf{d}_X, \mathbf{n})$ is also infinitesimally Hilbertian. Moreover, for any $g, h \in H^{1,2}(X, \mathbf{d}_X, \mathbf{n})$, Remark 2.7 gives the equality

$$\langle \nabla^X g, \nabla^X h \rangle(\eta_0(p)) = \langle \nabla^{C_0} \tilde{g}, \nabla^{C_0} \tilde{h} \rangle(p) \text{ for } \mathbf{m}\text{-a.e. } p \in C_0.$$

However, for $g \in D(\Delta^X) \cap \text{Lip}(X, \mathbf{d}_X)$, we can not verify that $\tilde{g} \in D(\Delta^{C_0})$. Therefore, we can not establish $\Delta^{C_0} \tilde{g} = (\Delta^X g) \circ \eta_0$ \mathbf{m} -a.e. unless we know f preserves the measure \mathbf{m} . This obstruction prevents us from directly verifying the $\text{RCD}(K, n-1)$ condition for $(X, \mathbf{d}_X, \mathbf{n})$ through Definition 2.9.

Although in this case $(X, \mathbf{d}_X, \mathbf{n})$ does not necessarily bear an $\text{RCD}(K, n-1)$ structure, it inherits rectifiability from $(C_0, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$.

Proposition 4.28. *Let k be the dimension of C_0 . Then $(X, \mathbf{d}_X, \mathbf{n})$ is k -rectifiable in the following sense: for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a sequence $\{(G_i, \varphi_i)\}$, where $G_i \subset X$ are Borel sets satisfying $\mathbf{n}(X \setminus \cup_i G_i) = 0$ and the maps $\varphi_i : G_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ are $(1 + \epsilon)$ -biLipschitz with their images.*

Proof. Since the k -rectifiability of $(C_0, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$ was established by Cheeger-Colding in [20], there exists a sequence $\{(U_i, \varphi_i)\}$, where $U_i \subset C_0$ are Borel sets satisfying $\mathbf{m}(C_0 \setminus \cup_i U_i) = 0$ and the maps $\varphi_i : U_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ are $(1 + \epsilon)$ -biLipschitz with their images. By Lemma 4.25, we may assume $U_i \subset C_0^2$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

First, consider the case where $C_0^1 = \emptyset$. Because each component of C_0^2 is compact, owing to Corollary 4.24, there exists a finite open covering $\{B_{r_j}(p_j)\}$ of C_0^2 such that $\eta_0 : B_{r_j}(p_j) \rightarrow \eta_0(B_{r_j}(p_j))$ is an isometry for each j . By refining the sets U_i via $U_{i,j} = U_i \cap B_{r_j}(p_j)$ and relabelling, we may assume $\eta_0 : U_i \rightarrow \eta_0(U_i)$ is an isometry for every i . The desired conclusion follows by setting $(G_i, \psi_i) = (\eta_0(U_i), \varphi_i \circ (\eta_0|_{U_i})^{-1})$, ensuring each ψ_i remains $(1 + \epsilon)$ -biLipschitz.

For the case $C_0^1 \neq \emptyset$, the same construction applies for $A_j := \{p \in C_0^2 : \mathbf{d}(p, C_0^1) \geq i^{-1}\}$ after invoking Lemma 4.25, which thereby completes the proof. \square

The rest of this section is devoted to introduce an $\text{RCD}(K, n-1)$ structure to $(X, \mathbf{d}_X, \mathcal{H}^{n-1})$ under the assumption that C_0 is a non-collapsed Ricci limit space.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Combining (1.2), (1.3) with Theorem 2.3, we know

$$\mathbf{m} = \frac{\mathcal{H}_d^{n-1}}{\mathcal{H}_d^{n-1}(C_0)}.$$

Then it follows from Proposition 4.16 that $f_{\sharp}\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{m}$. From Theorems 2.16 and 4.19 we see that $(X, \mathbf{d}_X, (\eta_0)_{\sharp}\mathbf{m})$ is an $\text{RCD}(K, n-1)$ space.

When $C_0^2 = \emptyset$, Theorem 4.19 implies that $\eta_0 : (C_0, \mathbf{d}) \rightarrow (X, \mathbf{d}_X)$ is an isometry, from which the conclusion follows.

Therefore it suffices to consider the case where C_0^2 is non-empty. We claim that $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{d}}^{n-1}(C_0)(\eta_0)_{\sharp}\mathbf{m}$ coincides with $2\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{d}_X}^{n-1}$.

By Lemma 4.25, we have $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{d}}^{n-1}(C_0^1) = 0$. Since $\eta_0 : (C_0, \mathbf{d}) \rightarrow (X, \mathbf{d}_X)$ is 1-Lipschitz, we get $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{d}_X}^{n-1}(X_1) = 0$.

On the other hand, for any $p \in C_0^2$, by taking $\epsilon > 0$ such that $B_{\epsilon}(p) \cap B_{\epsilon}(f(p)) = \emptyset$, we know

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{d}}^{n-1}(B_{\epsilon}(p)) = \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{d}_X}^{n-1}(B_{\epsilon}(\eta_0(p))),$$

which yields

$$\frac{\mathbf{d}(\eta_0)_{\sharp}(\mathbf{m})}{\mathbf{d}\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{d}_X}^{n-1}} = \frac{2}{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{d}}^{n-1}(C_0)} \quad \text{on } X_2.$$

This is enough to conclude. \square

Remark 4.29. Under (1.3), the convergence (3.1) is also non-collapsing. By Theorem 2.3 and Corollary 4.22, the Hausdorff dimension of X_1 with respect to \mathbf{d}_Y is at most $n-2$. It immediately follows from Proposition 3.5 that the Hausdorff dimension of X_1 with respect to \mathbf{d}_X is at most $n-2$. Moreover, by Theorem 4.19, we know the Hausdorff dimension of C_0^1 with respect to \mathbf{d} is at most $n-2$. Indeed, Example 5.3 shows that this upper bound is sharp.

By [26, Proposition 2.10] and [45, Theorem 1.9], the family $\mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda, D)$ is precompact in the renormalized measured Gromov-Hausdorff topology in the following sense: given any sequence of manifolds with boundary $\{(M_i, \mathbf{g}_i)\} \subset \mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda, D)$, there exists a subsequence which is still denoted as $\{(M_i, \mathbf{g}_i)\}$, and a metric measure space $(Z, \mathbf{d}_Z, \mathbf{m}_Z)$ such that

$$\left(M_i, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{g}_i}, \frac{\text{vol}_{\mathbf{g}_i}}{\text{vol}_{\mathbf{g}_i}(M_i)} \right) \xrightarrow{\text{mGH}} (Z, \mathbf{d}_Z, \mathbf{m}_Z).$$

If moreover $\{(M_i, \mathbf{g}_i)\}$ inradius collapses, then by Theorem 3.7 and writing \mathbf{m}_Z as \mathbf{m}_X , we may assume

$$\left(M_i, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbf{g}_i}, \frac{\text{vol}_{\mathbf{g}_i}}{\text{vol}_{\mathbf{g}_i}(M_i)} \right) \xrightarrow{\text{mGH}} (X, \mathbf{d}_X, \mathbf{m}_X). \quad (4.27)$$

We first show that (X, \mathbf{d}_X) bears the weak infinitesimal splitting property, which is defined as follows.

Definition 4.30. A metric space (X, \mathbf{d}_X) is said to have the *weak infinitesimal splitting property* if, for every $x \in X$, there exists a sequence $s_i \downarrow 0$ such that $(s_i^{-1}X, x)$ pGH converges to a metric space $(T_x X, o_x)$ which satisfies the splitting property: whenever $\gamma \subset T_x X$ is a geodesic line, there exists a metric space Ω such that $T_x X$ is isometric to $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ with $\pi(\gamma)$ being a single point $\omega \in \Omega$, where π is the projection onto the first coordinate.

Theorem 4.31. *The metric space (X, \mathbf{d}_X) obtained in (4.27) satisfies the weak infinitesimal splitting property.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.12, to show the weakly infinitesimal splitting property, it suffices to consider the case where $x \in X_1$ and $T_x X$ contains a line γ .

Theorem 2.4 ensures the existence of a metric space $(\Omega, \mathbf{d}_\Omega)$ such that $(T_x Y, \mathbf{d}_{T_x Y})$ is isometric to $(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}, \sqrt{\mathbf{d}_\Omega^2 + \mathbf{d}_\mathbb{R}^2})$ with $\pi(\gamma) = \omega \in \Omega$.

Consider $x_\infty = (\omega', t') \in T_x X$ with $\omega' \neq \omega$. For each $t \in \mathbb{R}$, let γ_t be a unit speed minimal geodesic from x_∞ to (ω, t) . By Lemma 4.3, each γ_t lies entirely in $T_x X$. The product structure of $T_x Y$ implies that as $t \rightarrow \infty$, γ_t converges to the ray $v_+ : [t', \infty) \rightarrow X$ defined by $v_+(s) = (\omega', s)$. Similarly, we obtain the ray $v_- : (-\infty, t'] \rightarrow X$ with $v_-(s) = (\omega', s)$.

Consequently, the line $v : s \mapsto (\omega', s)$ is parallel to γ and entirely contained in $T_x X$. Applying Lemma 4.3 once more, we conclude that $(T_x X, \mathbf{d}_{T_x X})$ is isometric to $(\Gamma \times \mathbb{R}, \sqrt{\mathbf{d}_\Omega^2 + \mathbf{d}_\mathbb{R}^2})$ for some subset $\Gamma \subset \Omega$, completing the proof. \square

Using [39, Theorem 1.2], we immediately get the following proposition.

Proposition 4.32. *The metric space (X, \mathbf{d}_X) defined in (4.27) is universally infinitesimally Hilbertian. In particular, $(X, \mathbf{d}_X, \mathbf{m}_X)$ is infinitesimally Hilbertian.*

When $\lambda = 0$, the following result holds. As demonstrated in Example 5.3, the reference measure \mathbf{m}_X may not coincide with the $(n-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure of (X, \mathbf{d}_X) . Moreover, from Example 5.5 we know if $\lambda > 0$, then in general $(X, \mathbf{d}_X, \mathbf{m}_X)$ may not satisfy some RCD condition.

Theorem 4.33. *Assume $\lambda = 0$. Then $(X, \mathbf{d}_X, \mathbf{m}_X)$ is an $\text{RCD}(K, n)$ space. If moreover (C_0, \mathbf{d}) is a non-collapsed Ricci limit space of $(\partial M_i, g_{\partial M_i})$ (i.e. (1.3) holds), then we have $\mathbf{m}_X \ll \mathcal{H}^{n-1}$.*

Proof. The first statement follows directly from Theorems 2.12 and 2.13. If (1.3) holds, Theorem 1.7 and Definition 2.9 yield that $(X, \mathbf{d}_X, \mathcal{H}^{n-1})$ is an $\text{RCD}(H, n)$ space. [35, Remark 4.3] shows the dimension of $(X, \mathbf{d}_X, \mathbf{m}_X)$ is also $n-1$, which combined with [15, Theorem 3.8] gives

$$\mathbf{m}_X(X \setminus \mathcal{R}_{n-1}(X)) = 0.$$

[7, Theorem 4.1] guarantees the existence of a subset $\mathcal{R}_{n-1}^*(X) \subset \mathcal{R}_{n-1}(X)$ such that

$$\mathbf{m}_X(\mathcal{R}_{n-1}(X) \setminus \mathcal{R}_{n-1}^*(X)) = 0,$$

and that for \mathbf{m} -a.e. $x \in \mathcal{R}_{n-1}^*(X)$, the density limit $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} r^{-(n-1)} \mathbf{m}_X(B_r(x))$ exists and is positive and finite.

For any Borel set $A \subset X$ with $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(A) = 0$, define

$$A_i := \left\{ y \in A \cap \mathcal{R}_{n-1}^*(X) \mid \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbf{m}_X(B_r(y))}{r^{n-1}} \leq i \right\}, i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Applying [10, Theorem 2.4.3] shows $\mathbf{m}_X(A_i) = 0$ for each i . The conclusion follows since

$$\mathbf{m}_X(A) = \mathbf{m}_X((A \setminus \mathcal{R}_{n-1}^*(X)) \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i) = 0.$$

□

Remark 4.34. In summary, there exists a Radon measure μ on X with $\text{supp}(\mu) = X$ such that (X, \mathbf{d}_X, μ) is an $\text{RCD}(K, n)$ space, except in the following cases:

- (1) $\lambda > 0$, $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{vol}_{\mathbf{g}_{\partial M_i}}(\partial M_i) = 0$ and $C_0 = C_0^2$ is connected.
- (2) $\lambda > 0$, $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{vol}_{\mathbf{g}_{\partial M_i}}(\partial M_i) = 0$, both C_0^1 and C_0^2 are non-empty and C_0^2 is connected.

In either of the above cases, whether such a Radon measure exists remains unknown.

Let us also consider the special case where the limit space of inradius collapsed manifolds in $\mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda, D)$ is a smooth Riemannian manifold. Compare [47, Theorem 5.4].

Theorem 4.35. *Assume (X, \mathbf{d}_X) is an $(n-1)$ -dimensional smooth closed Riemannian manifold. Then for any sufficiently large i , M_i is diffeomorphic to $X \times I$ or a twisted product $X \tilde{\times} I$, where $I = [-1, 1]$.*

Proof. We first show $X_2 \neq \emptyset$.

Assume $X = X_1$. Then by Theorem 4.19, we have $C_0 = C_0^1$ and (C_0, \mathbf{d}) is isometric to (X, \mathbf{d}_X) . According to [18, Theorem A.1.12], for all sufficiently large i , ∂M_i is diffeomorphic to C_0 , and the warped cylinder C_{M_i} is diffeomorphic to $C = C_0 \times_{\phi} [0, t_0]$. It follows that the boundary of C_{M_i} has exactly two components.

On the other hand, observe that the glued space \widetilde{M}_i has only one boundary component for all sufficiently large i . Since (Y, \mathbf{d}_Y) is now isometric to (C, \mathbf{d}_C) , applying [18, Theorem A.1.12] again yields that \widetilde{M}_i is diffeomorphic to Y for sufficiently large i , implying the topological of $Y = C$ must also have one component. A contradiction.

Suppose there exists a point $x \in X_1$. We take a geodesic convex neighborhood U near x whose diameter is less than the injectivity radius of X . By Lemma 4.23, one can first take $y \in U \cap X_2$ sufficiently close to x and extend the geodesic $\gamma_{y,x}$ to geodesic $\gamma_{y,z}$ for some $z \in U$. This is impossible due to the proof of Lemma 4.23. Hence $X = X_2$.

Using [18, Theorem A.1.12] again, we see for sufficiently large i , \widetilde{M}_i is diffeomorphic to Y . Since Y is diffeomorphic to either $X \times I$ or $C_0 \times I/(x, t) \sim (f(x), -t)$, which is a twisted I -product over X , the conclusion follows.

□

4.4 The unbounded diameter case

In this subsection, we introduce the unbounded diameter case of inradius collapsed manifolds in connection with [47, Section 6]. Since the proof of the results are almost the same, we omit some details.

Let $\{(M_i, g_i, p_i)\}$ be a sequence of manifolds with boundary in $\mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda)$ such that $p_i \in \partial M_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and that $\text{inrad}(M_i) \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

As in the beginning of Section 3, we still attach to each M_i a warped cylinder $C_{M_i} := M_i \times_\phi [0, t_0]$, obtaining a pointed metric space $(\widetilde{M}_i, \mathbf{d}_{\widetilde{M}_i}, p_i)$. Because each $(\widetilde{M}_i, \mathbf{d}_{\widetilde{M}_i}, (\mathcal{H}^n(B_1(p_i)))^{-1} \mathcal{H}^n, p_i)$ is an $\text{RCD}(-J(n, H, K, \lambda, \varepsilon_0, t_0), n)$ space, after passing to a subsequence, we may assume $(\widetilde{M}_i, \mathbf{d}_{\widetilde{M}_i}, p_i)$ converge to (Y, \mathbf{d}_Y, x) in the pointed Gromov-Hausdorff sense. Viewing the convergence of subsets, we also assume $\{(M_i, \mathbf{d}_{\widetilde{M}_i}, p_i)\}$ pGH converges to (X, \mathbf{d}_X, x) as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

Let

$$(C_{t_0}^Y, \widetilde{\mathbf{d}}_{t_0}) := (\{y \in Y \mid \mathbf{d}_Y(y, X) = t_0\}, \mathbf{d}_Y),$$

which is considered component-wisely. We introduce the metrics \mathbf{d}_X on X and \mathbf{d}_{t_0} on $C_{t_0}^Y$ as the intrinsic metrics induced by \mathbf{d}_Y and $\widetilde{\mathbf{d}}_{t_0}$ respectively. We set

$$(C_0, \mathbf{d}) := (C_{t_0}^Y \times \{0\}, (\phi(t_0))^{-1} \mathbf{d}_{t_0}), \quad C := C_0 \times_\phi [0, t_0].$$

Notice that for each $p \in C_0$, one can identify an element $y \in C_{t_0}^Y$, denoted by $\eta(p, t_0)$. Moreover, there exists a unique perpendicular $\gamma_{\eta(p, t_0)} : [0, t_0] \rightarrow Y$ to X such that $\gamma_{\eta(p, t_0)}(t_0) = \eta(p, t_0)$. Then we define the surjective 1-Lipschitz maps $\eta : C \rightarrow Y$ and $\eta_0 : C_0 \rightarrow X$, respectively, by

$$\eta(p, t) := \gamma_{\eta(p, t_0)}(t), \quad \eta_0(p) = \eta(p, 0).$$

It is clear that Proposition 3.2, Proposition 3.5, Theorem 3.7 and Lemma 3.8 continue to hold in this setting. Therefore, we may define the subsets as in Definition 3.9 and the involution $f : C_0 \rightarrow C_0$ as in (4.24).

Since the local isometry property of $\eta : Y \setminus X \rightarrow C \setminus C_0$, together with Theorem 2.4, guarantees the existence of the tangent space $T_p C_0$ for every $p \in C_0$, the local arguments in Subsections 4.1-4.3 remain valid, and all the results continue to hold for the present noncompact C_0 . In particular, we know the metric space (X, \mathbf{d}_X) is isometric to $(C_0, \mathbf{d})/f$ and the number of components of C_0 is at most two. This proves Theorem 1.11(1). Arguing similarly as in Theorem 4.19 and Proposition 4.32, we obtain Theorem 1.11(2). The proof of Theorem 1.11(3) follows from the same reasoning as that of Theorem 1.7.

Next we prove Theorem 1.12, which follows from the same monodromy argument as [47]. We briefly outline the ideas for reader's convenience.

Define $\widetilde{\mathcal{MM}}(n, H, K, \lambda)$ as the set of all triples (\widetilde{M}, M, p) , where $(M, g) \in \mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda)$, $p \in \partial M$, and \widetilde{M} is obtained via the extension procedure. Let $\partial_0 \widetilde{\mathcal{MM}}(n, H, K, \lambda)$ be the set of all pointed Gromov-Hausdorff limit spaces (Y, X, x) of sequences $\{(\widetilde{M}_i, M_i, p_i)\} \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{MM}}(n, H, K, \lambda)$ satisfying $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{inrad}(M_i) = 0$.

Now for every $\delta > 0$, there exists $\epsilon = \epsilon(\delta) > 0$ such that for every $(M, g, p) \in \mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda)$ with $\text{inrad}(M_i) < \epsilon$, one can find $(Y, X, x) \in \partial_0 \widetilde{\mathcal{MM}}(n, H, K, \lambda)$ satisfying the following properties.

- $\mathbf{d}_{\text{pGH}}((\widetilde{M}, \mathbf{d}_{\widetilde{M}}, p), (Y, \mathbf{d}_Y, x)) < \delta$.

- $d_{\text{pGH}}((B_{1/\delta}^{(M, d_{\widetilde{M}})}(p), d_{\widetilde{M}}, p), (B_{1/\delta}^{(X, d_Y)}(x), d_Y, x)) < \delta$.
- $d_{\text{pGH}}((\partial M \cap B_{1/\delta}^{\widetilde{M}}(p), d_{g_{\partial M}}, p), (C_0 \cap B_{1/\delta}^C(\tilde{x}), d, \tilde{x})) < \delta$. Here $\tilde{x} \in \eta_0^{-1}(x)$ and the pGH distance can be measured component-wisely.

Such space is called a δ -limit space of (\widetilde{M}, M, p) .

Fix a sufficiently large $R \gg t_0$. First, choose a sufficiently small $\delta = \delta(n, H, K, \lambda, R) > 0$ and take $\epsilon = \epsilon(\delta)$ such that for any $(M, g) \in \mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda)$ with $\text{inrad}(M) < \epsilon$, the following holds: if no δ -limit space (Y, X, x) of (\widetilde{M}, M, p) has the property that every point $z \in X \cap B_{16R}^Y(x)$ satisfies $\#(\eta_0)^{-1}(z) = 2$ (a property we will henceforth call *double in scale* $16R$ for convenience), then any $q \in \partial M \cap B_{8R}^{\widetilde{M}}(p)$ can be connected to p by a continuous curve lying in ∂M . Otherwise, $\partial M \cap B_{8R}^{\widetilde{M}}(p)$ has two components, and there exists a point $p' \in \partial M \cap B_{8R}^{\widetilde{M}}(p)$ such that any point $q \in \partial M \cap B_{8R}^{\widetilde{M}}(p)$ can be connected by a continuous curve in ∂M either to p or p' .

Therefore, if ∂M is disconnected, we claim that for every point $p \in \partial M$, any δ -limit space (Y, X, x) of (\widetilde{M}, M, p) is double in scale $16R$.

Assume there exists $p \in \partial M$ such that some δ -limit space is not double. Take a point q in a different component of ∂M with $d_g(p, q) = l > 100R$ and let $\gamma : [0, l] \rightarrow M$ be a unit speed minimal geodesic from p to q in M . For $\gamma(R)$, one can choose a nearest point $p_1 \in \partial M$ with $d_{\widetilde{M}}(p, p_1) \leq d_g(p, p_1) \leq 2R$. As a result, any δ -limit space of (\widetilde{M}, M, p_1) in scale $16R$ is not double, implying that $\partial M \cap B_{8R}^{\widetilde{M}}(p_1)$ is connected. Applying a monodromy argument, this property also holds for $\gamma(kR)$ with $k \leq [l/R]$, ultimately leading to a contradiction.

We remark that, via a similar monodromy argument, one can show that for ∂M for $(M, g) \in \mathcal{M}(n, H, K, \lambda)$ with $\text{inrad}(M) < \epsilon$, the number of components of ∂M is at most two. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.12.

5 Examples

We present several typical examples of inradius collapsed manifolds in this section. The first example illustrates why the additional assumption of a lower Ricci curvature bound on the boundaries is necessary.

Example 5.1. Let $n \geq 3$. For each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we take B_i as the unit ball in the space form of constant curvature $-i/(n-2)$ and glue B_i with itself along ∂B_i . After smoothing out near ∂B_i (Theorem 2.17), we obtain a sequence of $(n-1)$ -dimensional compact Riemannian manifolds without boundary $\{(N_i, h_i)\}$ such that $\text{diam}(N_i) \in (1, 3)$ and that $-(i+1) \leq \text{Ric}_{h_i} \leq -(i-1)$.

Let us consider the warped products $(M_i, g_i) = (N_i \times_{f_i} [0, 1/i], dt^2 + f_i^2 h_i)$, where $f_i(t) = -2it^2 + 1$ ($i \geq 2$). Then $\{(M_i, g_i)\}$ has a uniform lower Ricci curvature bound and a uniform two sided second fundamental form bound. Moreover, we have $\text{inrad}(M_i) \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. However, there does not exist a real number $K \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\text{Ric}_{h_i} \geq K$ for all i .

In the remainder of this section, we denote by $\mathbb{S}^n(r)$ the n -dimensional sphere with radius r and by $\mathbb{S}^n = \mathbb{S}^n(1)$ for brevity.

Example 5.2. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ be the involution defined as $\varphi(x, y, z) = (-x, -y, z)$. For $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let (N_i, h_i) be the product Riemannian manifold defined by $N_i := \mathbb{S}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1(i^{-1}) \times [-i^{-1}, i^{-1}]$. We also define the map $\Phi_i : N_i \rightarrow N_i$ as $\Phi_i((x, y, z), \theta, t) = (\varphi(x, y, z), -\theta, -t)$.

By taking (M_i, g_i) as the quotient Riemannian manifold $(N_i, h_i)/\Phi_i$, we know as $i \rightarrow \infty$, (M_i, d_{g_i}) GH converges to \mathbb{S}^2/φ and $(\partial M_i, d_{g_{\partial M_i}})$ GH converges to \mathbb{S}^2 . However, there does not exist an isometric embedding from \mathbb{S}^2/φ to $\mathbb{S}^2(r)$ for any $r > 0$. Compare Proposition 4.26.

We give an example of inradius collapsed manifolds whose boundaries are non-collapsed.

Example 5.3. For $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$(N_i, h_i) = (\{(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid x^2 + i^2(y^2 + z^2) = 1, z \leq 0\}, h_i),$$

where h_i is the natural Riemannian metric induced by $g_{\mathbb{R}^3}$. Let (M_i, g_i) be the product of N_i and \mathbb{S}^1 , i.e. $M_i = N_i \times \mathbb{S}^1$ and $g_i = h_i + g_{\mathbb{S}^1}$. It is clear that

$$\text{Ric}_{g_i} \geq 0, \text{ Ric}_{g_{\partial M_i}} \geq 0, \Pi_{\partial M_i} = 0.$$

As $i \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\left(\partial M_i, g_{\partial M_i}, \text{vol}_{g_{\partial M_i}} \right) \xrightarrow{\text{mGH}} (C_0, d, \mathbf{m}) := (\mathbb{S}^1(2/\pi) \times \mathbb{S}^1, d_{\mathbb{S}^1(2/\pi) \times \mathbb{S}^1}, \mathcal{H}^2),$$

and

$$\left(M_i, d_{g_i}, \frac{\text{vol}_{g_i}}{\text{vol}_{g_i}(M_i)} \right) \xrightarrow{\text{mGH}} (X, d_X, \mathbf{m}_X) := \left([-1, 1] \times \mathbb{S}^1, d_{[-1, 1] \times \mathbb{S}^1}, \frac{3(1-t^2)}{4} \mathcal{H}^2 \right),$$

where $d_{\mathbb{S}^1(2/\pi) \times \mathbb{S}^1}$ and $d_{[-1, 1] \times \mathbb{S}^1}$ are the distances induced by standard product structures, and t is the coordinate on $[-1, 1]$. Moreover, the map $\eta_0 : C_0 \rightarrow X$ is given by

$$\eta_0 \left(\frac{2}{\pi} \exp(\sqrt{-1}\alpha), \exp(\sqrt{-1}\beta) \right) = \left(-1 + \frac{2|\alpha - \pi|}{\pi}, \exp(\sqrt{-1}\beta) \right), \quad \forall \alpha, \beta \in [0, 2\pi).$$

It is obvious that $X_1 = \{\{\pm 1\} \times \mathbb{S}^1\}$ and $C_0^1 = \eta_0^{-1}(X_1)$, and that these sets both have Hausdorff dimension 1.

The following example shows that if we release the assumption (1.3), f may not preserve the measure \mathbf{m} .

Example 5.4. For any two sufficiently large number t_1, t_2 , we will construct a sequence of inradius collapsed manifolds (M_i, g_i) such that

$$\left(\partial M_i, d_{g_{\partial M_i}}, \frac{\text{vol}_{g_{\partial M_i}}}{\text{vol}_{g_{\partial M_i}}(\partial M_i)} \right) \xrightarrow{\text{mGH}} \left(\mathbb{S}^1(2/\pi), d_{g_{\mathbb{S}^1(2/\pi)}}, \mathbf{m} \right), \quad (5.1)$$

and that the measure \mathbf{m} satisfies

$$\frac{\mathbf{m}(U)}{\mathbf{m}(V)} \geq \frac{t_1}{4t_2}. \quad (5.2)$$

Here U, V are defined as

$$U := \left\{ \frac{2}{\pi} \exp(\sqrt{-1} \alpha) \mid \alpha \in \left[\frac{\pi}{2} \cos \left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \epsilon \right), \frac{\pi}{2} \cos \left(\frac{\pi}{4} - \epsilon \right) \right] \right\};$$

$$V := \left\{ \frac{2}{\pi} \exp(-\sqrt{-1} \alpha) \mid \alpha \in \left[\frac{\pi}{2} \cos \left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \epsilon \right), \frac{\pi}{2} \cos \left(\frac{\pi}{4} - \epsilon \right) \right] \right\}.$$

Let $M_i = \mathbb{S}^1 \times N_i$, where

$$N_i := \{ (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid x^2 + i^2(y^2 + z^2) = 1, z \geq 0 \},$$

and g_{N_i} be the natural Riemannian metric induced by $g_{\mathbb{R}^3}$.

For $\mu \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$, $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, take the coordinate chart on N_i as

$$\begin{cases} x = \sin \mu \cos \theta, \\ y = i^{-1} \sin \mu \sin \theta, \\ z = i^{-1} \cos \mu, \end{cases}$$

We define the Riemannian metric g_i on M_i as

$$g_i := i^{-2} \varphi^2(\theta) g_{\mathbb{S}^1} + g_{N_i}, \quad (5.3)$$

where

$$\varphi : [0, 2\pi] \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

$$\theta \longmapsto \begin{cases} t_1 \exp \left(\frac{1}{\left[\theta - \left(\frac{\pi}{4} - \epsilon \right) \right] \left[\theta - \left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \epsilon \right) \right]} \right) + 1, & \text{if } \theta \in \left[\frac{\pi}{4} - \epsilon, \frac{\pi}{4} + \epsilon \right]; \\ t_2 \exp \left(\frac{1}{\left[\theta - \left(\frac{7\pi}{4} - \epsilon \right) \right] \left[\theta - \left(\frac{7\pi}{4} + \epsilon \right) \right]} \right) + 1, & \text{if } \theta \in \left[\frac{7\pi}{4} - \epsilon, \frac{7\pi}{4} + \epsilon \right]; \\ 1, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

with $t_1 > t_2 > 0$ and $\epsilon \in (0, \pi/8]$ to be determined later.

Then we have

$$\text{Ric}_{g_i} \geq -J \text{ and } \text{Ric}_{g_{\partial M_i}} \geq -J \text{ for some constant } J = J(\epsilon, t_1, t_2). \quad (5.4)$$

Let

$$U_i := \left\{ (x, y, z) \in N_i \mid \theta \in \left[\frac{\pi}{4} - \epsilon, \frac{\pi}{4} + \epsilon \right], \mu = \frac{\pi}{2} \right\},$$

$$V_i := \left\{ (x, y, z) \in N_i \mid \theta \in \left[\frac{7\pi}{4} - \epsilon, \frac{7\pi}{4} + \epsilon \right], \mu = \frac{\pi}{2} \right\}.$$

Since we can control the value of cosine on $\left[\frac{\pi}{4} - \epsilon, \frac{\pi}{4} + \epsilon \right]$ and $\left[\frac{7\pi}{4} - \epsilon, \frac{7\pi}{4} + \epsilon \right]$, we calculate that for sufficiently large i ,

$$\frac{\text{vol}_{g_{\partial M_i}}(\mathbb{S}^1 \times U_i)}{\text{vol}_{g_{\partial M_i}}(\mathbb{S}^1 \times V_i)} = \frac{\int_{\frac{\pi}{4}-\epsilon}^{\frac{\pi}{4}+\epsilon} \varphi(\theta) \sqrt{\cos^2 \theta + i^{-2} \sin^2 \theta} d\theta}{\int_{\frac{7\pi}{4}-\epsilon}^{\frac{7\pi}{4}+\epsilon} \varphi(\theta) \sqrt{\cos^2 \theta + i^{-2} \sin^2 \theta} d\theta} \geq \Psi(\epsilon) \frac{\int_{\frac{\pi}{4}-\epsilon}^{\frac{\pi}{4}+\epsilon} \varphi(\theta) d\theta}{\int_{\frac{7\pi}{4}-\epsilon}^{\frac{7\pi}{4}+\epsilon} \varphi(\theta) d\theta}, \quad (5.5)$$

where $\Psi(\epsilon)$ is a constant depending on ϵ with $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \Psi(\epsilon) = 1$.

If we take t_1, t_2 to be sufficiently large, then the last term of (5.5) can be sufficiently close to $\Psi(\epsilon)t_2/t_1$. Therefore we know for any two sufficiently large t_1, t_2 it holds that

$$\frac{\text{vol}_{g_{\partial M_i}}(\mathbb{S}^1 \times U_i)}{\text{vol}_{g_{\partial M_i}}(\mathbb{S}^1 \times V_i)} \geq \frac{\Psi(\epsilon)t_1}{2t_2}. \quad (5.6)$$

Let us just fix a small ϵ and rewrite (5.6) as

$$\frac{\text{vol}_{g_{\partial M_i}}(\mathbb{S}^1 \times U_i)}{\text{vol}_{g_{\partial M_i}}(\mathbb{S}^1 \times V_i)} \geq \frac{t_1}{4t_2}.$$

According to (5.4), we have mGH convergence (5.1). Moreover, because U_i, V_i converge to U, V respectively under (5.1), the measure \mathbf{m} satisfies (5.2).

Let us make a comment that by taking $t_2 \gg t_1 \gg 1$, the ratio in (5.2) can be sufficiently large, which means that the reflection $f : C_0 \rightarrow C_0$ does not preserve the measure \mathbf{m} .

Example 5.5. Let $\{g_i\}$ be a sequence of continuous positive functions on $[-1, 1]$ such that

$$g_i(x) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{i^{-2} - (x + 1 - i^{-1})^2}, & x \in [-1, -1 + i^{-1}]; \\ i^{-2}, & x \in [1/4, 3/4]; \\ \sqrt{i^{-2} - (x - 1 + i^{-1})^2}, & x \in [1, 1 - i^{-1}], \end{cases}$$

and that g_i is smooth on $(-1, 1)$ with $\max_{[-1, 1]} g_i \leq i^{-1}$, $\max_{[-1+i^{-1}, 1-i^{-1}]} |g'_i| \leq J$ and $\sup_{(-1, 1)} |(g_i)''| \leq J$ for some constant $J > 0$.

For each i , let

$$(N_i, h_i) := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid |y| \leq g_i(x)\},$$

where $h_i := dx^2 + dy^2$. Let (M_i, g_i) be the standard product Riemannian manifold of (N_i, h_i) and $(\mathbb{S}^1(i^{-1}), dt^2)$. It is clear that

$$\text{Ric}_{g_i} = 0, \quad \text{Ric}_{g_{\partial M_i}} = 0,$$

and

$$|\Pi_{\partial M_i}| \leq \frac{|g_i''|}{(1 + (g_i')^2)^{3/2}} \leq J.$$

Under the convergence (4.27), we have $(X, \mathbf{d}_X) = ([-1, 1], dx, f dx)$, with

$$f = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g_i}{\int_{[-1, 1]} g_i(x) dx}.$$

From our construction, we know g_i is not convex on $(-1, 1)$, indicating that $\Pi_{\partial M_i} \geq 0$ does not hold for all i . Moreover, we have $f = 0$ on $[1/4, 3/4]$, which means and the metric measure space $([-1, 1], dx, f dx)$ does not satisfy the $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ condition for any $K \in \mathbb{R}$ and $N \in [1, \infty)$ because $\text{supp}(f) \neq [-1, 1]$.

We also make a comment about the least dimension upper bound through the following example.

Example 5.6. Under the assumption of Theorem 1.3, if $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{vol}_{g_{\partial M_i}}(\partial M_i) = 0$, i.e. $(C_0, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$ is a collapsed Ricci limit space, then it follows from [18, Theorem 3.1] that the Hausdorff dimension of the (C_0, \mathbf{d}) is at most $n - 2$. We will give an example about collapsing limit space of boundaries of inradius collapsed manifolds. The synthetic upper dimension bound of this limit space can not be improved to any $N \in (1, n - 1)$.

Let (M_i, g_i) be the product Riemannian manifold $M_i := N_i \times [0, i^{-1}]$, where

$$(N_i, h_i) := \{(x, y, z, w) \in \mathbb{R}^4 \mid x^2 + i^2(y^2 + z^2 + w^2) = 1\},$$

with h_i being the natural Riemannian metric induced by $g_{\mathbb{R}^4}$, and $g_i = h_i + dt^2$.

As $i \rightarrow \infty$, we see $\left(\partial M_i, \mathbf{d}_{g_{\partial M_i}}, \frac{\text{vol}_{g_{\partial M_i}}}{\text{vol}_{g_{\partial M_i}}(\partial M_i)}\right)$ mGH converges to the $\text{RCD}(0, 3)$ space $([-1, 1], dt, \frac{3t-t^3+2}{4}dt)$.

Let us recall the one-dimensional specialization of the Bakry–Émery $\text{CD}(K, N)$ condition for smooth weighted Riemannian manifolds (see [12, 13]). For an open interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, a function $h \in C_{loc}^2(I)$ is a $\text{CD}(K, N)$ density on I (i.e. $(I, dt, h dt)$ is a $\text{CD}(K, N)$ metric measure space) if and only if

$$(N - 1) \frac{(h^{\frac{1}{N-1}})''(x)}{h^{\frac{1}{N-1}}(x)} \leq -K, \quad \forall x \in I.$$

Now for $h = \frac{3t-t^3+2}{4}$ and $N \in (1, 3)$, we set $\varphi = h^{1/(N-1)}$. Because $\lim_{t \downarrow -1} \varphi''/\varphi = +\infty$, the upper dimension bound of the metric measure space $([-1, 1], dt, \frac{3t-t^3+2}{4}dt)$ can not be reduced to any $N \in (1, 3)$.

Finally, we give an example based on Menguy's construction [38, Theorem 0.1]. This example illustrates the distinction between the lower sectional curvature bound case (1.1) and the lower Ricci curvature bound case (1.2). For clarity, we adhere to Menguy's original notation.

Example 5.7. Let t_i be a monotone increasing sequence such that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} (t_{i+1} - t_i) = \infty, \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r_i}{i} = \infty,$$

where $r_i = 4t_i / \log(\log t_i)$. Let $M := [2, \infty) \times \Sigma \mathbb{S}^2$, where $\Sigma \mathbb{S}^2$ is the suspension over \mathbb{S}^2 , defined as $[0, \pi] \times \mathbb{S}^2 / \sim$, with $\{0\} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ and $\{\pi\} \times \mathbb{S}^2$ identified to south pole \mathbb{S}^3_- and north pole \mathbb{S}^3_+ respectively. The metric g on M is defined as

$$g := dt^2 + u^2(t) (dx^2 + f^2(t, x) d\sigma^2).$$

Here $d\sigma^2$ is the standard metric on \mathbb{S}^2 . The function $f : [2, \infty) \times [0, \pi] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as

$$f(t, x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{l(t)} \sin(l(t)x), & x \in [0, b(t)], \\ \frac{1}{l(t)} \sin(l(t)b(t)) \exp\left((1 - \epsilon(t) \log\left(\frac{x}{b(t)}\right))\right), & x \in [b(t), \epsilon(t)], \\ R \sin(x + \delta(t)\theta(x)), & x \in [\epsilon(t), \frac{\pi}{2}] \end{cases} \quad (5.7)$$

such that $f(t, x) = f(t, \pi - x)$, where $R \in (0, 1)$ is sufficient small, $\epsilon(t) = (\log^{1/4} t)^{-1}$, θ is a smooth monotone non-increasing function such that

$$\theta = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } x \leq 1/2; \\ 0, & \text{for } x \geq 1, \end{cases}$$

and l, b, δ are smooth positive functions on $(0, \infty)$ defined by [38, (1.52)-(1.58)]. The function u is defined as [38, (1.13), (1.14), (1.19-1.23)]. Both f and u are piecewise C^2 functions with jumps in the second derivative at a discrete set of points, but can be smoothed to C^2 while preserving positive Ricci curvature.

Denote by $\Gamma_t : \{t\} \times \Sigma \mathbb{S}^2$. From our construction we know for every $t \in (2, \infty)$, the hypersurface Γ_t is homeomorphic to \mathbb{S}^3 , though not necessarily C^2 -isometric to \mathbb{S}^3 . Let $X = u^{-1} \partial x$ and Σ_1, Σ_2 be dual vector fields of $u(t)f(t, x)d\sigma$. For every hypersurface Γ_t , we denote by Π_t the second fundamental form of Γ_t . With respect to the orthonormal basis $\{X, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2\}$, an application of Koszul formula guarantees that Π_t has the following expression.

$$\Pi_t := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{u_t}{u} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{u_t}{u} + \frac{f_t}{f} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{u_t}{u} + \frac{f_t}{f} \end{pmatrix}.$$

By [38, (1.30), (1.69)], for sufficiently large t , Π_t has a two sided bound $O(1/t)$. Owing to [38, (1.168), (1.169)], the intrinsic sectional curvature Sec_t of Γ_t satisfies

$$\text{Sec}_t(\Sigma_1 \wedge X) = -\frac{f_{xx}}{u^2 f}, \quad \text{Sec}_t(\Sigma_1 \wedge \Sigma_2) = \frac{1 - f_x^2}{u^2 f^2},$$

both of which are positive by [38, (1.64)-(1.66), (1.114)]. Moreover, by [38, (1.107)-(1.116)], the Ricci curvature of (M, g) is positive everywhere.

For each i and $j = 0, \dots, i-1$, by [38, Section 1.6], $B_{2^{-i}r_i}((t_i + jr_i/i) \times \mathbb{S}^3_-)$ satisfies the Perelman's property [38, Definition 0.13]. This allows us to remove each such ball and glue in a copy of \mathbb{CP}^2 along its boundary within the annulus

$$([t_i - 2r_i, t_i + 2r_i] \times \Sigma \mathbb{S}^2, g).$$

After smoothing, the resulting Riemannian manifold, which is originally the above annulus, is denoted by (N_i, h_i) .

According to [38, (1.28), (1.29)], there exists a constant $J > 1$ such that for all sufficiently large t it holds $Jt \geq u(t) \geq J^{-1}t$. Define the rescaled manifold $(M_i, g_i) := (N_i, t_i^{-2}h_i)$. Then we have $(M_i, g_i) \in \mathcal{M}(4, 0, 0, J, J)$, and

$$0 < \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{diam}(M_i) \leq \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{diam}(M_i) < \infty, \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{inrad}(M_i) = 0.$$

However, it is obvious that M_i is not diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{S}^3 \times [0, 1]$. After passing to a subsequence, assume $u(t_i)/t_i \rightarrow u_\infty \in [J^{-1}, J]$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Then a combination of (5.7) and [38, (1.52)] implies that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \delta(t) = 0$ and $\{(M_i, d_{g_i})\}$ Gromov-Hausdorff converges to $(\Sigma \mathbb{S}^2, d_{g_\infty})$, where the metric g_∞ is defined as

$$g_\infty := u_\infty (dx^2 + R^2 \sin^2 x d\sigma^2).$$

This space is smooth except for singularities at the two poles.

References

- [1] S. Alexander and R. Bishop. Thin Riemannian manifolds with boundary. *Math. Ann.*, 311(1):55–70, 1998.
- [2] L. Ambrosio, E. Brué, and D. Semola. Rigidity of the 1-Bakry-Émery in equality and sets of finite perimeter in RCD spaces. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 19(4):949–1001, 2019.
- [3] L. Ambrosio, M. Colombo, and S. Di Marino. Sobolev spaces in metric measure spaces: reflexivity and lower semicontinuity of slope. In *Variational methods for evolving objects*, volume 67 of *Adv. Stud. Pure Math.*, pages 1–58. Math. Soc. Japan, 2015.
- [4] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré. Density of Lipschitz functions and equivalence of weak gradients in metric measure spaces. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 29(3):969–996, 2013.
- [5] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré. Metric measure spaces with Riemannian Ricci curvature bounded from below. *Duke Math. J.*, 163(7):1405–1490, 2014.
- [6] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré. Bakry-Émery curvature-dimension condition and Riemannian Ricci curvature bounds. *Ann. Probab.*, 43(1):339–404, 2015.

- [7] L. Ambrosio, S. Honda, and D. Tewodrose. Short-time behavior of the heat kernel and Weyl's law on $\mathrm{RCD}^*(K, N)$ spaces. *Ann. Glob. Anal. Geom.*, 53:97–119, 2018.
- [8] L. Ambrosio, A. Mondino, and G. Savaré. On the Bakry–Émery Condition, the Gradient Estimates and the Local-to-Global Property of $\mathrm{RCD}^*(K, N)$ Metric Measure Spaces. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 26(1):24 – 56, 2016.
- [9] L. Ambrosio, A. Mondino, and G. Savaré. *Nonlinear diffusion equations and curvature conditions in metric measure spaces*, volume 262. American mathematical society, 2019.
- [10] L. Ambrosio and P. Tilli. *Topics on analysis in metric spaces*, volume 25. Oxford University Press on Demand, 2004.
- [11] M. Anderson, A. Katsuda, Y. Kurylev, M. Lassas, and M. Taylor. Boundary regularity for the Ricci equation, geometric convergence, and Gel'fand's inverse boundary problem. *Invent. Math.*, 158(2):261–321, 2004.
- [12] D. Bakry. L'hypercontractivité et son utilisation en théorie des semigroupes. In *Lectures on Probability Theory (Saint-Flour, 1992)*, volume 1581 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 1–114. Springer, Berlin, 1994.
- [13] D. Bakry and M. Émery. Diffusions hypercontractives. In *Séminaire de probabilités, XIX, 1983/84*, volume 1123 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 177–206. Springer.
- [14] B. Botvinnik, M. Walsh, and D. Wraith. Homotopy groups of the observer moduli space of Ricci positive metrics. *Geom. Topol.*, 23(6):3003–3040, 2019.
- [15] E. Brué and D. Semola. Constancy of the dimension for $\mathrm{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces via regularity of Lagrangian flows. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, 73(6):1141–1204, 2020.
- [16] J. Cheeger. Differentiability of Lipschitz functions on metric measure spaces. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 9(3):428–517, 1999.
- [17] J. Cheeger and T. Colding. Lower bounds on Ricci curvature and the almost rigidity of warped products. *Ann. Math.*, 144(2):189–237, 1996.
- [18] J. Cheeger and T. Colding. On the structure of spaces with Ricci curvature bounded below. I. *J. Differential Geom.*, 46(3):406–480, 1997.
- [19] J. Cheeger and T. Colding. On the structure of spaces with Ricci curvature bounded below. II. *J. Differential Geom.*, 54(1):13–35, 2000.
- [20] J. Cheeger and T. Colding. On the structure of spaces with Ricci curvature bounded below. III. *J. Differential Geom.*, 54(1):37–74, 2000.
- [21] T. Colding. Ricci curvature and volume convergence. *Ann. Math.*, 145(3):477–501, 1997.

- [22] T. Colding and A. Naber. Sharp Hölder continuity of tangent cones for spaces with a lower Ricci curvature bound and applications. *Ann. Math.*, 176:1173–1229, 2012.
- [23] G. De Philippis and N. Gigli. Non-collapsed spaces with Ricci curvature bounded from below. *J. Éc. Polytech. Math.*, 5:613–650, 2018.
- [24] Q. Deng. Hölder continuity of tangent cones in $\mathrm{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces and applications to non-branching. *Geom. Topol.*, 29(2):1037–1114, 2025.
- [25] M. Erbar, K. Kuwada, and K. Sturm. On the equivalence of the entropic curvature-dimension condition and Bochner’s inequality on metric measure spaces. *Invent. Math.*, 201(3):993–1071, 2015.
- [26] K. Fukaya. Collapsing of Riemannian manifolds and eigenvalues of Laplace operator. *Invent. Math.*, 87(3):517–547, 1987.
- [27] F. Galaz-Garcia, M. Kell, A. Mondino, and G. Sosa. On quotients of spaces with Ricci curvature bounded below. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 275(6):1368–1446, 2018.
- [28] N. Gigli. The splitting theorem in non-smooth context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1302.5555*, 2013.
- [29] N. Gigli. *On the differential structure of metric measure spaces and applications*, volume 236. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., 2015.
- [30] N. Gigli, A. Mondino, and G. Savaré. Convergence of pointed non-compact metric measure spaces and stability of Ricci curvature bounds and heat flows. *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, 111(5):1071–1129, 2015.
- [31] M. Gromov. Synthetic geometry in Riemannian manifolds. In *Proc. ICM*, volume 1, pages 415–419, 1978.
- [32] L. Guijarro and J. Santos-Rodríguez. On the isometry group of $\mathrm{RCD}^*(K, N)$ -spaces. *Manuscr. Math.*, 158(3):441–461, 2019.
- [33] B. Han. Measure rigidity of synthetic lower Ricci curvature bound on Riemannian manifolds. *Adv. Math.*, 373:107327, 2020.
- [34] V. Kapovitch and A. Mondino. On the topology and the boundary of N -dimensional $\mathrm{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces. *Geom. Topol.*, 25:445–495, 2021.
- [35] Y. Kitabeppu. A sufficient condition to a regular set being of positive measure on spaces. *Potent. Anal.*, 51(2):179–196, 2019.
- [36] S. Kodani. Convergence theorem for Riemannian manifolds with boundary. *Compos. Math.*, 75(2):171–192, 1990.
- [37] J. Lott and C. Villani. Ricci curvature for metric-measure spaces via optimal transport. *Ann. Math.*, 169(3):903–991, 2009.

- [38] X. Menguy. Noncollapsing examples with positive Ricci curvature and infinite topological type. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 10:600–627, 2000.
- [39] J. Núñez-Zimbrón, E. Pasqualetto, and E. Soultanis. Spaces with Riemannian curvature bounds are universally infinitesimally Hilbertian. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.05483*, 2025.
- [40] G. Perelman. Construction of manifolds of positive Ricci curvature with big volume and large Betti numbers. In *Comparison Geometry*, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ., page 157–164. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [41] T. Rajala. Local Poincaré inequalities from stable curvature conditions on metric spaces. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 44(3):477–494, 2012.
- [42] Y. Sakurai. Comparison geometry of manifolds with boundary under a lower weighted Ricci curvature bound. *Can. J. Math.*, 72(1):243–280, 2020.
- [43] K. Sturm. On the geometry of metric measure spaces. *Acta Math.*, 196(1):65–131, 2006.
- [44] K. Sturm. On the geometry of metric measure spaces. II. *Acta Math.*, 196(1):133–177, 2006.
- [45] J. Wong. An extension procedure for manifolds with boundary. *Pacific J. Math.*, 235(1):173–199, 2008.
- [46] J. Wong. Collapsing manifolds with boundary. *Geom. Dedicata*, 149(1):291–334, 2010.
- [47] T. Yamaguchi and Z. Zhang. Inradius collapsed manifolds. *Geom. Topol.*, 23(6):2793–2860, 2019.