

Non-Euclidean elasticity for rods and almost isometric embeddings of geodesic tubes

Milan Krömer and Stefan Müller *

December 2, 2025

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Preliminaries	4
2.1	Fermi coordinates around a geodesic in \mathcal{M}	4
2.2	Lift of maps from a small geodesic tube in \mathcal{M}	6
2.3	Estimates for the center of mass in normal coordinates	8
2.4	Setup	9
3	Main theorem	12
4	Convergence of the energy	27
5	Minimization of the limiting functional	28
6	Uniqueness of the limit in \mathcal{X}^g / \sim	33
A	Lipschitz approximation on thin tubes	41
B	Fermi coordinates	42

1 Introduction

Non-Euclidean elasticity is a theory of elastic bodies which do not have a compatible stress-free reference configuration, and was originally developed to formulate and analyze models of metal plasticity and dislocations. Recently, it attracted a lot of attention in the study of biomechanical systems, see for example, [7, 17, 10, 9, 13]. In this context, bodies which are small in one or several dimensions are of particular interest because they often arise in applications and they show universal behavior based on the underlying geometric nonlinearities rather than the detailed material laws.

The goal of this article is twofold. First, we extend the derivation of a low energy theory for inextensible rods by Γ -convergence [15] from a Euclidean to a Riemannian setting. Secondly, for the case for thin geodesic tubes we extend the results of Maor and Shachar [14] on optimal embeddings of thin geometric objects in two ways. First, the target is a general Riemannian manifold rather than \mathbb{R}^n and, secondly, we give a precise description of the asymptotic energy as a quadratic form in the difference of the curvature tensors in the domain and the target (see [14, Question 3, page 154]). This also extends the work of Maor and Shachar [14] us [8] on the optimal embedding of small balls.

*MK and SM have been supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) through the Hausdorff Center for Mathematics (GZ 2047/1, Projekt-ID 390685813)

To set the stage, let (\mathcal{M}, g) and $(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}, \tilde{g})$ be smooth, oriented, n dimensional, Riemannian manifolds with $n \geq 2$ and assume that \mathcal{M} is complete and $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is compact. Let $\psi : [-L, L] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ be an injective unit speed geodesic and let $\underline{\nu} = (\nu_2, \dots, \nu_n) : (-L, L) \rightarrow (T\mathcal{M})^{n-1}$ be a parallel orthonormal frame of the normal bundle of ψ , such that $(\gamma', \underline{\nu})$ is positively oriented. We call the pair $(\gamma', \underline{\nu})$ a framed unit speed geodesic. Define geodesic normal coordinates (also known as Fermi coordinates) by

$$\psi(x) := \psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}(x) := \exp_{\gamma(x_1)} \sum_{j=2}^n x_j \nu_j(x_1)$$

and consider the geodesic tube

$$\Omega_h^* := \psi((-L, L) \times B_h(0)).$$

Note that Ω_h^* depends only on the geodesic γ and not on the frame $\underline{\nu}$. For sufficiently small $h > 0$, the set Ω_h^* can be identified with the set of those vectors in the normal bundle $N\gamma = \bigcup_{t \in (-L, L)} \{a \in T_{\gamma(t)} : (a, \gamma'(t)) = 0\}$ which have norm less than h . To a map $\tilde{u} : \Omega_h^* \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ we assign an energy

$$E_h(\tilde{u}) := \oint_{\Omega_h^*} \text{dist}^2(d\tilde{u}, SO(g, \tilde{g})) d \text{vol}_{\mathcal{M}}. \quad (1.1)$$

Here the integrand is given more explicitly by $\text{dist}^2(d\tilde{u}(p), SO(g(p), \tilde{g}(\tilde{u}(p))))$, where $SO(g(p), \tilde{g}(\tilde{u}(p)))$ denotes the set of orientation preserving linear isometries for $T_p\mathcal{M}$ to $T_{\tilde{u}(p)}\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ and the distance is taken with respect to the Riemannian Hilbert Schmidt norm for 1-1 tensors. Moreover, $\oint_{\Omega_h^*}$ denotes the average with respect to the Riemannian volume measure on \mathcal{M} .

Our first result is a compactness result. For every family of maps $\tilde{u}_h : \Omega_h^* \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ with $\sup_{0 < h < h_0} h^{-4} E_h(\tilde{u}_h) < \infty$ there exists a sequence $h_k \rightarrow 0$ and framed unit speed geodesics $(\tilde{\gamma}_k, \tilde{\nu}_k)$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ which converge to a framed unit speed geodesic $(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu})$ and have the following properties. If $v_k(x_1, hx')$ is the expression of \tilde{u}_k in geodesic normal coordinates, i.e., if

$$(\psi_{\tilde{\gamma}_k, \tilde{\nu}_k} \circ v_k)(x_1, x') = \tilde{u}_k \circ \psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}(x_1, hx'),$$

then v_k essentially satisfies

$$v_k(x_1, x') = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ hx' \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} h_k^2 w_k(x_1) - h_k^2 \partial_{x_1} y_k(x_1) \cdot x' \\ h_k y_k(x_1) + h_k^2 Z_k(x_1) x' \end{pmatrix} + h_k^3 \beta_k(x_1, x'),$$

where $Z_k(x_1)$ is a skew symmetric $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ matrix. Moreover, a subsequence of the tuple (w_k, y_k, Z_k, β_k) converges to (w, y, Z, β) in a suitable topology.

Our second result is a Γ -convergence result. With respect to the convergence indicated above, the functionals $h^{-4} E_h$ Γ -converges to a limit functional given by

$$\mathcal{I}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}(w, y, Z, \beta) := \int_{-L}^L \int_{B_1(0)} |\text{sym } G(x) - \mathcal{T}(x)|^2 dx, \quad (1.2)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G(x_1, x') &:= \begin{pmatrix} (\partial_{x_1} w) e_1 + (\partial_{x_1} A) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ x' \end{pmatrix} \Big| \partial_{x_2} \beta \Big| \dots \Big| \partial_{x_n} \beta \end{pmatrix} - \frac{1}{2} A^2, \\ \mathcal{T}(x_1, x') &:= \left(\mathcal{T}_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}^{\mathcal{R}}(x_1, x') - \mathcal{T}_{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}^{\mathcal{R}}(x_1, y(x_1) + x') \right), \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

and

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\partial_{x_1} y^T \\ \partial_{x_1} y & Z \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1.4)$$

see Theorem 19 below. Here $\mathcal{T}_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}^{\mathcal{R}}(x_1, x')$ is a quadratic form in x' which describes the rescaled deviation of the metric introduced by the Fermi coordinates in \mathcal{M} from the Euclidean metric. This deviation is a quadratic form in x' and the coefficients of the quadratic form depend on the curvature tensor \mathcal{R} along γ , see Lemma 3 below. Similarly, $\mathcal{T}_{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\underline{\nu}}}^{\tilde{\mathcal{R}}}(x_1, y(x_1) + x')$ describes the metric deficit in the target manifold $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$. The Γ -limit deviates from the Γ -limit in the Euclidean setting [15] exactly by the additional term $\mathcal{T}(x)$.

Actually, there is subtlety. The map \tilde{u}_h is only in $W^{1,2}$ and hence may not be uniformly close to any unit speed geodesic and we may not be able to express \tilde{u}_h in Fermi coordinates around such a geodesic. To overcome this difficulty, we use the same idea as in [8]: instead of \tilde{u}_h we consider a uniformly Lipschitz approximations \tilde{v}_h which agree with \tilde{u}_h except on a set of volume fraction $\mathcal{O}(h^4)$. We then define the limit (w, y, Z, β) in terms of the Lipschitz approximations \tilde{v}_h . It is not difficult to see that the limit does not depend on the choice of the approximation. Moreover, the limit is also independent on the precise choice of the geodesics $\tilde{\gamma}_h$, up to a natural finite dimensional equivalence relation related to an infinitesimal change of framed geodesic, see Definition 14 and Proposition 16.

Using the compactness of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$, it is easy to see by standard arguments for Γ -convergence that

$$\liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} h^{-4} E_h(\tilde{u}) = \min_{(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\underline{\nu}}) \in \mathcal{G}} m^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\underline{\nu}}},$$

where \mathcal{G} denotes the set of framed unit speed geodesics and where

$$m^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\underline{\nu}}} = \inf_{w, y, Z, \beta} \mathcal{I}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\underline{\nu}}}(w, y, Z, \beta),$$

see Theorem 25. We note that \mathcal{G} is finite dimensional, since a framed unit speed geodesic is determined by $p = \tilde{\gamma}(0)$ and a positively oriented orthonormal frame at p .

Finally, we show that $m^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\underline{\nu}}}$ can be expressed as quadratic form of the difference of the curvature tensors in \mathcal{M} and $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ along the corresponding framed unit speed geodesics. Set

$$\mathcal{A}(x_1) := \overline{\mathcal{R}}(x_1, 0) - \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(x_1, 0),$$

where $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ is the pullback of the curvature tensor on \mathcal{M} with respect to the Fermi coordinates for $(\gamma, \underline{\nu})$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ is the pullback of the curvature tensor $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ with respect to the Fermi coordinates for $(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\underline{\nu}})$. Then

$$m^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\underline{\nu}}} = \int_{-L}^L \mathbb{Q}(\mathcal{A}(x_1)) dx_1.$$

Here the quadratic form \mathbb{Q} is positive definite on the space of 4-tensors which have the symmetries of the curvature tensor and on those tensors it can be written as

$$\mathbb{Q}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbb{Q}_1(\mathcal{A}^{\text{par}}) + \mathbb{Q}_2(\mathcal{A}') + \mathbb{Q}_3(\mathcal{A}''),$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_{kl}^{\text{par}} = \mathcal{A}_{1k1l}, \quad \mathcal{A}'_{jkl} = \mathcal{A}_{1kjl}, \quad (\mathcal{A}'')_{ikjl} = \mathcal{A}_{ikjl}, \quad \text{for } i, j, k, l \geq 2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Q}_1(\mathcal{A}^{\text{par}}) &= \frac{1}{2(n+1)(n+3)} |\mathcal{A}^{\text{par}}|^2 - \frac{1}{2(n+1)^2(n+3)} (\text{tr } \mathcal{A}^{\text{par}})^2, \\ \mathbb{Q}_2(\mathcal{A}') &= \min_{b_1} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\{0\} \times B_1(0)} \sum_{j \geq 2} \left(\partial_j b_1(x') - \frac{1}{3} \mathcal{A}'_{jkl} x'_k x'_l \right)^2 dx', \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbb{Q}_3(\mathcal{A}'') = \min_{b'} \int_{\{0\} \times B_1(0)} \sum_{i, j \geq 2} \left((\text{sym } \nabla' b')_{ij}(x') - \frac{1}{6} \mathcal{A}''_{ikjl} x'_k x'_l \right) dx',$$

see Theorem 26 and Corollary 27. Note that \mathbb{Q}_1 is positive definite since $(\text{tr } \mathcal{A}^{\text{par}})^2 \leq (n-1)|\mathcal{A}^{\text{par}}|^2$. The expression of \mathbb{Q}_3 captures the behavior perpendicular to the geodesics γ and $\tilde{\gamma}$ and agrees with the formulae for asymptotic energy of the optimal embedding of small balls derived in [14] and [8].

In term of elasticity, the linearization of the energy density $\text{dist}^2(d\tilde{u}, SO(g, \tilde{g}))$ leads to an energy in linear elasticity which is isotropic and has the special Poisson's ratio 0. One can start instead with a general isotropic energy. To do so, one uses polar decomposition to write $d\tilde{u}(p) = R(p)S(p)$, where $R \in SO(g(p), \tilde{g}(p))$ and $S(p) : T_p M \rightarrow T_p M$ is symmetric (with respect to the metric $g(p)$). Then one considers an energy density $f(\lambda_1(p), \dots, \lambda_n(p))$ where $\lambda_1(p), \dots, \lambda_n(p)$ are the eigenvalues of $S(p)$ and f is a symmetric function of its n arguments, of class C^2 and satisfies $f(1, \dots, 1) = 0$, $Df(1, \dots, 1) = 0$ and $D^2f(1, \dots, 1) > 0$. Then the Γ -limit is given by

$$\int_{\Omega} \mu |G - \mathcal{T}|^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} (\text{tr}(G - \mathcal{T}))^2 dx$$

with suitable coefficients $\mu > 0$ and $\lambda > -\frac{2}{n}\mu$. The particular form of the Γ limit arises from the fact that the space of quadratic symmetric functions $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is spanned by the two functions $h_1(s) = \sum_{i=1}^n s_i^2$ and $h_2(s) = (\sum_{i=1}^n s_i)^2$, see [2] for a general discussion of symmetric functions in nonlinear elasticity.

Finally, we briefly comment on the assumption that $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ be compact. This assumption is not needed for the Γ -convergence result, but of course for the compactness statement, since otherwise the maps \tilde{u}_h might escape to infinity. If $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ has constant curvature we can use isometric translations to restore compactness. In particular we may take $\tilde{\mathcal{M}} = \mathbb{R}^n$. If $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is asymptotic to a constant curvature space at ∞ , then in the spirit of concentration compactness the limit $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} h^{-4} \inf_{\tilde{u}} E_h(\tilde{u})$ is either given by $\min_{(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}) \in \mathcal{G}} m^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}$ or by a limit problem on the space of constant curvature.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Fermi coordinates around a geodesic in \mathcal{M}

Let (\mathcal{M}, g) be a complete n -dimensional Riemannian manifold and let $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ be a geodesic with $|\gamma'| = 1$. Let $\underline{\nu} := (\nu_2, \dots, \nu_n)$ be a parallel orthonormal frame of the normal bundle of γ . Then the Fermi coordinates $\psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}$ are given by

$$\psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}(x_1, x') := \exp_{\gamma(x_1)} \left(\sum_{k=2}^n x_k \nu_k(x_1) \right). \quad (2.1)$$

We call $(\gamma, \underline{\nu})$ a *framed unit speed geodesic*.

Remark 1. The definition of $\psi := \psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}$ implies that that $D\psi(x_1, 0)$ is an isometry from \mathbb{R}^n to $T_{\gamma(x_1)}\mathcal{M}$. If γ has no self-intersections on the interval $[-L, L]$, then it follows from the inverse function theorem and a compactness argument that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that ψ is a diffeomorphism from $(-L, L) \times B_\varepsilon(0)$ to its image with $|D\psi| \leq 2$ and $|(D\psi)^{-1}| \leq 2$ and such that $\psi|_{(-L, L) \times B_\varepsilon(0)}$ is bilipschitz.

Remark 2. For the main results of this paper we consider *oriented* Riemannian manifolds and in this setting we will always assume that the frame $(\gamma'(x_1), \nu_2(x_1), \dots, \nu_n(x_1))$ is positively oriented.

We denote by \bar{g} the pullback metric of g under $\psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}$, i.e.,

$$\bar{g}(x)(X, Y) = (\psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}^* g)(x)(X, Y) = g_{\psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}(x)}(d\psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}(x)X, d\psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}(x)Y).$$

Furthermore, we let \mathcal{R} denote the Riemann curvature tensor on \mathcal{M} , i.e.

$$\mathcal{R}(Z, X, Y) := \nabla_X \nabla_Y Z - \nabla_Y \nabla_X Z - \nabla_{[X, Y]} Z. \quad (2.2)$$

This is a 1-3 tensor and we denote the associated 0-4 tensor also by \mathcal{R} , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{R}(W, Z, X, Y) = g(W, \mathcal{R}(Z, X, Y)). \quad (2.3)$$

We also define the curvature operator by

$$R(X, Y)Z := \mathcal{R}(Z, X, Y). \quad (2.4)$$

Lemma 3 ([12], [5, Chapter 9]). *Let (\mathcal{M}, g) be a smooth Riemannian manifold. Given a framed unit speed geodesic $(\gamma, \underline{\nu})$ on $[-L, L]$ in \mathcal{M} there exists $\rho > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that the Fermi coordinates $\psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}$ are defined in $\Omega_\rho = (-L, L) \times B_\rho$ and the pullback metric $\bar{g} = \psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}^* g$ and its Christoffel symbols $\bar{\Gamma}$ satisfy, for $|x'| < \rho$,¹*

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \bar{g}_{11}(x) - 1 + \sum_{k, l=2}^n \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{1k1l}(x_1) x'_k x'_l \right| &\leq C|x'|^3, \\ \left| \bar{g}_{1j}(x) + \frac{2}{3} \sum_{k, l=2}^n \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{jk1l}(x_1) x'_k x'_l \right| &\leq C|x'|^3, \quad j = 2, \dots, n, \\ \left| \bar{g}_{ij}(x) - \delta_{ij} + \frac{1}{3} \sum_{k, l=2}^n \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{jkil}(x_1) x'_k x'_l \right| &\leq C|x'|^3, \quad i, j = 2, \dots, n, \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \bar{\Gamma}_{ij}^k(x) + \frac{1}{3} (\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{kijl}(x_1) + \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{kijl}(x_1)) x'_l \right| &\leq C|x'|^2 \quad \text{if } i, j \geq 2, \\ \left| \bar{\Gamma}_{i1}^k(x) + \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{ki1l}(x_1) x'_l \right| &\leq C|x'|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

with $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{jkil}(x_1) = \psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}^* \mathcal{R}(x_1, 0)(e_j, e_k, e_i, e_l)$ where e_1, \dots, e_n is the canonical basis for \mathbb{R}^n . If $K \subset \mathcal{M}$ is compact then the constants $\rho > 0$ and C can be chosen uniformly for all unit speed geodesics γ with $\gamma((-L, L)) \subset K$.

Proof of Lemma 3. This follows by standard Jacobi field estimates. Indeed, the Taylor expansions for \bar{g} and $\bar{\Gamma}$ can be found, for example, in [12, eq. (66a)-(66c)], and [12, eq. (58b) and (58c)], respectively. Higher order Taylor expansions of the metric are established in [5, Chapter 9]. The uniformity of C and ρ follows from the fact that $\psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}$ is smooth (by standard results ODEs for geodesic and parallel transport) and the fact that K can be covered by finitely many charts. For the convenience of the reader we recall the proof in Appendix B. The argument shows that ρ and C can be controlled by the C^0 norm of the curvature tensor \mathcal{R} and its covariant derivative in a neighborhood of $\gamma([-L, L])$. \square

In order to simplify the notation below, we associate a matrix $\mathcal{T}_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}^{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ to every tuple $(\mathcal{A}, \gamma, \underline{\nu})$, where \mathcal{A} is a $(3, 1)$ -tensor on \mathcal{M} and $(\gamma, \underline{\nu})$ is a framed unit speed geodesic, as follows. For $i, j \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ we set

¹In our earlier paper [8] we used the definition $\mathcal{R}(X, Y, Z) = \mathcal{R}(X, Y)Z$ instead of (2.2). This gives a formula with the opposite sign in (2.5)

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathcal{T}_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}^{\mathcal{A}})_{11}(x_1, x') &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,l=2}^n \bar{\mathcal{A}}_{1k1l}(x_1) x'_k x'_l, \\
(\mathcal{T}_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}^{\mathcal{A}})_{1j}(x_1, x') &= -\frac{1}{3} \sum_{k,l=2}^n \bar{\mathcal{A}}_{jk1l}(x_1) x'_k x'_l, \\
(\mathcal{T}_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}^{\mathcal{A}})_{j1}(x_1, x') &= -\frac{1}{3} \sum_{k,l=2}^n \bar{\mathcal{A}}_{1kjl}(x_1) x'_k x'_l, \\
(\mathcal{T}_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}^{\mathcal{A}})_{ij}(x_1, x') &= -\frac{1}{6} \sum_{k,l=2}^n \bar{\mathcal{A}}_{jkil}(x_1) x'_k x'_l.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

Here $\bar{\mathcal{A}} = \psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}^* \mathcal{A}$ is the pullback of the restriction of the tensor \mathcal{A} to γ .

For a metric \bar{g} on \mathbb{R}^n we define a positive definite symmetric matrix $A_{\bar{g}}$ by $(A_{\bar{g}})_{ij} := \bar{g}_{ij} := \bar{g}(e_i, e_j)$. By $A_{\bar{g}}^{1/2}$ we denote the unique positive definite symmetric matrix M with $M^2 = A_{\bar{g}}$ and we set $A_{\bar{g}}^{-1/2} := M^{-1}$. We use the shorthand notations

$$(\bar{g}^{1/2})_{ij} := (A_{\bar{g}}^{1/2})_{ij}, \quad (\bar{g}^{-1/2})_{ij} := (A_{\bar{g}}^{-1/2})_{ij}. \tag{2.8}$$

Note that neither $A_{\bar{g}}^{1/2}$ nor $A_{\bar{g}}^{-1/2}$ are 0-2 or 1-1 tensors. Indeed, if $\varphi(x) = \lambda x$, then $\varphi^* \bar{g} = \lambda^2 \bar{g}$ and $(A_{\varphi^* \bar{g}})^{1/2} = \lambda A_{\bar{g}}^{1/2}$ while $(A_{\varphi^* \bar{g}})^{-1/2} = \lambda^{-1} A_{\bar{g}}^{-1/2}$ which is incompatible with the behaviour of 0-2 or 1-1 tensors.

An immediate consequence of Lemma 3 is that the Taylor expansions of the matrices $\bar{g}^{1/2}$ and $\bar{g}^{-1/2}$ are given by

$$\left| (\bar{g}^{1/2})(x) - \text{Id} - \mathcal{T}_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}^{\mathcal{R}}(x) \right| \leq C|x'|^3, \tag{2.9}$$

and

$$\left| (\bar{g}^{-1/2})(x) - \text{Id} + \mathcal{T}_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}^{\mathcal{R}}(x) \right| \leq C|x'|^3. \tag{2.10}$$

2.2 Lift of maps from a small geodesic tube in \mathcal{M}

If $\tilde{\gamma} : (-L, L) \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is a unit speed geodesic in a smooth Riemannian manifold $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$, then in general the Fermi coordinates associated with $\tilde{\gamma}$ are not globally invertible on a small cylinder, because $\tilde{\gamma}$ may have self-intersections. We will overcome this difficulty by the following lifting result.

Lemma 4. *Let $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ be a smooth n -dimensional Riemannian manifold and let $K \subset \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ be compact. Let $(\tilde{\gamma}, \underline{\nu})$ be a framed unit speed geodesic on $(-L, L)$ with $\tilde{\gamma}((-L, L)) \subset K$ and let $\tilde{\psi} := \psi_{\tilde{\gamma}, \underline{\nu}}$ be the associated Fermi map.*

For $\eta > 0$ define

$$U_\eta := (-L - \eta, L + \eta) \times B_\eta(0) \subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}, \tag{2.11}$$

$$V_\eta := \left\{ (s, q) \in (-L, L) \times \tilde{\mathcal{M}} : \text{dist}_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(q, \tilde{\gamma}(s)) < \eta \right\}. \tag{2.12}$$

Then there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $\tilde{\psi}$ can be extended to U_δ , the operator norm satisfies $|D\tilde{\psi}| \leq 2$ and there exists a unique smooth map $\tilde{\Phi} : V_{\delta/2} \rightarrow U_\delta$ satisfying

$$\tilde{\psi}(\tilde{\Phi}(s, q)) = q \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\Phi}(s, \tilde{\gamma}(s)) = (s, 0) \quad \text{for all } (s, q) \in V_{\delta/2}.$$

Moreover $\partial_s \tilde{\Phi} = 0$ in $V_{\delta/2}$, the operator norm satisfies $|D\tilde{\Phi}| \leq 2$, and $\tilde{\Phi}$ is Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant at most 6. Moreover, $\delta > 0$ can be chosen independently of L and of the framed unit speed geodesic $(\tilde{\gamma}, \underline{\nu})$ as long as $\tilde{\gamma}((-L, L)) \subset K$.

We will frequently use the following immediate consequence of Lemma 4.

Lemma 5. *Let \mathcal{M} and $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ be smooth, complete n -dimensional Riemannian manifolds and let $(\gamma, \underline{\nu})$ and $(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\underline{\nu}})$ be framed unit speed geodesics on $[-L, L]$ in \mathcal{M} and $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$, respectively. Let ψ and $\tilde{\psi}$ denote the Fermi coordinate maps for the framed geodesics. Let $\delta > 0$ be as in Lemma 4 and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be as in Remark 1. If a map $\tilde{v} : \psi(\Omega_\varepsilon) \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ satisfies*

$$\sup_{x \in \Omega_\varepsilon} d_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(v(\psi(x)), \tilde{\gamma}(x_1)) < \frac{1}{2}\delta \quad (2.13)$$

then there exists a lift $v : (-L, L) \times B_\varepsilon(0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times B_\delta(0)$ such that

$$\tilde{\psi} \circ v = \tilde{v} \circ \psi \quad \text{and} \quad |v(x_1) - x_1| < \delta \quad \text{for all } x_1 \in (-L, L).$$

If, in addition, \tilde{v} is Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant l , then v is Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant at most $4l$.

Proof. It follows from (2.13) that $(v \circ \psi)(\Omega_\varepsilon) \subset V_{\delta/2}$. Thus we can take $v(x) = \tilde{\Phi}(x_1, v(\psi(x)))$. To show the assertion on Lipschitz constant, we use that Lipschitz functions are differentiable almost everywhere. Then the chain rule and the bounds $|D\tilde{\Phi}| \leq 2$ and $|D\psi^{-1}| \leq 2$ imply that $|Dv(x)| \leq 4l$ almost everywhere. Since Ω_ε is convex, it follows that v has Lipschitz constant at most $4l$. \square

Proof of Lemma 4. Since $\tilde{\gamma}((-L, L))$ is contained in a compact subset there exists a $\delta_0 > 0$ such that $\tilde{\gamma}$ and the orthonormal frame can be extended to $(-L - 2\delta_0, L + 2\delta_0)$. Let $s \in [-L, L]$. Then $D\tilde{\psi}(s, 0)$ is a linear isometry from \mathbb{R}^n to $T_{\tilde{\gamma}(s)}\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$. By the inverse function theorem, there exists a $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ such that the restriction of $\tilde{\psi}$ to $(s - 2\delta, s + 2\delta) \times B_\delta(0)$ satisfies $|D\tilde{\psi}| \leq 2$ and $|(D\tilde{\psi})^{-1}| \leq 2$, is injective, and $\tilde{\psi}((s - \delta, s + \delta) \times B_\delta(0)) \supset B_{\delta/2}(\tilde{\gamma}(s))$. Thus there exists a smooth map

$$\tilde{\Psi}_s : B_{\delta/2}(\tilde{\gamma}(s)) \rightarrow (s - \delta, s + \delta) \times B_\delta(0)$$

with $\tilde{\psi} \circ \tilde{\Psi}_s = \text{id}$ and $|D\tilde{\Psi}_s| \leq 2$. By the usual compactness argument, such a $\delta > 0$ can be chosen uniformly for all $s \in [-L, L]$ and for all framed unit speed geodesics which satisfy $\tilde{\gamma}((-L, L)) \subset K$. Now define $\tilde{\Phi} : (-L, L) \times V_{\delta/2} \rightarrow U_\delta$ by

$$\tilde{\Phi}(s, q) = \tilde{\Psi}_s(q).$$

Then $\tilde{\Phi}(s, q) \in (s - \delta, s + \delta) \times B_\delta(0)$ and

$$\tilde{\psi}(\tilde{\Phi}(s, q)) = q.$$

Assume that $|s' - s| < \min(\delta, \delta/2 - \text{dist}_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(q, s))$. Then $q \in B_{\delta/2, \tilde{\gamma}(s')}$, since $\text{dist}_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(\tilde{\gamma}(s), \tilde{\gamma}(s')) \leq |s - s'|$. Thus $\tilde{\Phi}(s', q)$ is defined and $\tilde{\Phi}(s', q) \in (s' - \delta, s' + \delta) \times B_\delta(0) \subset (s - 2\delta, s + 2\delta) \times B_\delta(0)$. Since $\tilde{\psi}$ is injective on $(s - 2\delta, s + 2\delta) \times B_\delta(0)$ it follows that

$$\Phi(s', q) = \Phi(s, q) \quad \text{whenever } |s' - s| < \min(\delta, \delta/2 - \text{dist}_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(q, s)). \quad (2.14)$$

Hence $\partial_s \Phi(s, q) = 0$ and $\tilde{\Phi}$ is smooth function on $V_{\delta/2}$. Moreover, $|D\tilde{\Phi}| = |D_q \tilde{\Phi}| = |D\tilde{\Psi}_s| \leq 2$.

To show uniqueness, assume that $\hat{\Phi} : V_{\delta/2} \rightarrow U_\delta$ is smooth and satisfies $\hat{\Phi}(s, \gamma(s)) = (s, 0)$ for $s \in (-L, L)$ and $\tilde{\psi}(\hat{\Phi}(s, q)) = q$ for all (s, q) in $V_{\delta/2}$. Fix $\bar{s} \in (-L, L)$ and let $W := \{q \in B_{\delta/2}(\gamma(\bar{s})) : \hat{\Phi}(\bar{s}, q) = \tilde{\Phi}(\bar{s}, q)\}$. Then W is open, since $\tilde{\Phi}(\{\bar{s}\} \times W) \subset (\bar{s} - \delta, \bar{s} + \delta) \times B_\delta(0)$ and $\tilde{\psi}$ is injective on $(\bar{s} - \delta, \bar{s} + \delta) \times B_\delta(0)$. Moreover, W is relatively closed in $B_{\delta/2}(\gamma(\bar{s}))$ since $\hat{\Phi}$ and $\tilde{\Phi}$ are continuous. Finally W is not empty since $\gamma(\bar{s}) \in W$, by assumption. Since $B_{\delta/2}(\gamma(\bar{s}))$

is connected (for sufficiently small $\delta > 0$) we get $W = B_{\delta/2}(\gamma(\bar{s}))$. This holds for all $\bar{s} \in (-L, L)$ and hence $\hat{\Phi} = \tilde{\Phi}$.

Finally, we show that $\tilde{\Phi}$ is globally Lipschitz. By reducing $\delta > 0$, if needed, we may assume, in addition, that the balls $B_{\delta/2}(\tilde{\gamma}(s))$ are geodesically convex for all $s \in (-L, L)$. To prove the Lipschitz estimate, let $(s, q), (s', q') \in V_{\delta/2}$. By symmetry, we may assume that $\text{dist}_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(q', \tilde{\gamma}(s')) \leq \text{dist}_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(q, \tilde{\gamma}(s))$.

Assume first that $|s' - s| < \text{dist}_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(q, \tilde{\gamma}(s))$. Consider the length minimizing unit speed geodesic η from q to $\tilde{\gamma}(s)$ and let $q'' := \eta(|s' - s|)$. Then

$$\text{dist}_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(q'', \tilde{\gamma}(s)) = \text{dist}_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(q, \tilde{\gamma}(s)) - |s' - s|$$

and hence $\text{dist}_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(q'', \tilde{\gamma}(s')) \leq \text{dist}_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(q, \tilde{\gamma}(s')) < \delta/2$ since $|\tilde{\gamma}(s') - \tilde{\gamma}(s)| \leq |s' - s|$. Thus $\tilde{\Phi}(s, q'') = \tilde{\Phi}(s, q')$. Since $|D\tilde{\Phi}| \leq 2$ and since the balls $B_{\delta/2}(\tilde{\gamma}(s))$ and $B_{\delta/2}(\tilde{\gamma}(s'))$ are geodesically convex, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\Phi}(s, q) - \tilde{\Phi}(s', q)| &\leq |\tilde{\Phi}(s, q) - \tilde{\Phi}(s, q'')| + |\tilde{\Phi}(s', q') - \tilde{\Phi}(s', q'')| \\ &\leq 2|s' - s| + 2 \text{dist}_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(q', q'') \leq 4|s - s'| + 2 \text{dist}_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(q', q) < 6 \text{dist}_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(q', q). \end{aligned}$$

If $|s' - s| \geq \text{dist}_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(q, \tilde{\gamma}(s))$, we set $q'' = \tilde{\gamma}(s)$ and $q''' = \tilde{\gamma}(s')$. Then $\tilde{\Phi}(s, q'') = (s, 0)$ and $\tilde{\Phi}(s', q''') = (s', 0)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\Phi}(s, q) - \tilde{\Phi}(s', q)| &\leq |\tilde{\Phi}(s, q) - \tilde{\Phi}(s, q'')| + |\tilde{\Phi}(s', q') - \tilde{\Phi}(s', q''')| + |s - s'| \\ &\leq 2 \text{dist}_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(q, \tilde{\gamma}(s)) + 2 \text{dist}_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(q', \tilde{\gamma}(s')) + |s' - s| \\ &\leq 4 \text{dist}_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(q, \gamma(s)) + |s' - s| \leq 5|s' - s|. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used the assumption $\text{dist}_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(q', \gamma(s')) \leq \text{dist}_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(q, \gamma(s))$. Combining the estimates in the two cases, we see that $\tilde{\Phi}$ is Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant at most 6. \square

2.3 Estimates for the center of mass in normal coordinates

Definition 6 (Riemannian center of mass [6]). *Let (A, μ) be a probability space, let $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ be a complete Riemannian manifold and let $B_\rho \subset \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ be a convex geodesic ball. For a measurable function $f : A \rightarrow B_\rho$ define*

$$P_f : \overline{B}_\rho \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad P_f(m) = \frac{1}{2} \int_A \text{dist}^2(m, f(a)) d\mu(a). \quad (2.15)$$

We call $\mathcal{C}_f := \arg \min_{m \in \overline{B}_\rho} P_f(m)$ the Riemannian center of mass of f in A .

Remark 7. The function P_f in (2.15) is convex and has a unique minimum which lies in the interior of \overline{B}_ρ . A proof of this result and more details on the Riemannian center of mass can be found in [6].

Proposition 8. *Let \mathcal{N} be a complete, smooth Riemannian manifold. Let $p \in \mathcal{N}$. Then there exist $\rho > 0$ and $C' > 0$ with the following property. The ball $B_{2\rho}(p)$ is geodesically convex and the exponential map \exp_p is a smooth diffeomorphism from $B_{2\rho}(0) \subset T_p N \rightarrow B_{2\rho}(p)$. Moreover, the map $\psi := \exp_p^{-1} \circ \exp_q$ satisfies, for every $q \in B_\rho(p)$ and every $v \in T_q N$ with $|v| \leq \rho$*

$$|\psi(v) - \psi(0) - d\psi(0)v| \leq C'(d(p, q) + |v|)|v|^2. \quad (2.16)$$

If N is compact, then ρ and C can be chosen independently of the point $p \in N$.

Proof. Consider the map $c : [0, 1] \rightarrow N$ given by $c(t) = \exp_q tv$. Then c is a geodesic arc which connects $c(0) = q$ and $c(1) = \exp_q v$. Moreover, $|c'(t)| = |v|$ and thus $c([0, 1]) \subset B_{2\rho}(p)$. Hence we can define $\gamma := \varphi \circ c$, where $\varphi = \exp_p^{-1}$. Then $|\gamma'(t)| \leq C|c'(t)| \leq C|v|$.

Let Γ denote the Christoffel symbols corresponding to the chart φ . Then

$$\gamma''(t) = -\Gamma(\gamma(t))(\gamma'(t), \gamma'(t)) \quad (2.17)$$

and

$$\gamma(0) = \varphi(q) = \psi(0), \quad \gamma'(0) = d\psi(0)v, \quad \gamma(1) = \psi(v). \quad (2.18)$$

Since the chart φ defines normal coordinates, we have $\Gamma(0) = 0$. Moreover $D\Gamma$ is controlled in terms of the second derivatives of the metric. Hence

$$|\Gamma(\gamma(t))(\gamma'(t), \gamma'(t))| \leq C|\gamma(t)| |\gamma'(t)|^2 \leq C'(d(p, q) + |v|)|v|^2. \quad (2.19)$$

Hence the assertion (2.16) follows from (2.17) and (2.18). The fact that ρ and C can be chosen uniformly for compact \mathcal{N} follows from the usual argument. \square

Corollary 9. *Let p, ρ and C' be as in Proposition 8. Let $r \leq \rho/2$. Let (A, μ) be a probability space and let $f : A \rightarrow B_r(p)$ be a measurable map. Then the center of mass \mathbf{C}_f satisfies*

$$\left| \exp_p^{-1} \mathbf{C}_f - \int_A \exp_p^{-1} f(a) d\mu(a) \right| \leq C' r^3. \quad (2.20)$$

Proof. Let $q = \mathbf{C}_f$. Then by [6, Thm. 1.2] we have

$$\int_A \exp_q^{-1} f(a) d\mu(a) = 0. \quad (2.21)$$

Recall that $\psi = \exp_p^{-1} \circ \exp_q$. Thus $\exp_p^{-1} \circ f = \psi \circ (\exp_q^{-1} \circ f)$. It follows from (2.21) and (2.16) that

$$\left| \int_A \exp_p^{-1} f(a) d\mu(a) - \psi(0) \right| \leq C' r^3.$$

Since $\psi(0) = \exp_p^{-1}(q) = \exp_p^{-1} \mathbf{C}_f$, this concludes the proof. \square

2.4 Setup

Let $L > 0$. For $h > 0$ define $\Omega_h := (-L, L) \times B_h(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, and let $\Omega := (-L, L) \times B_1(0)$. We define the rescaled gradient $d_h v$ of a function $v : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$d_h v := \left(\partial_{x_1} v \left| \frac{1}{h} \partial_{x_2} v \right| \dots \left| \frac{1}{h} \partial_{x_n} v \right| \right).$$

If $I_h : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega_h$ is given by $I_h(x_1, x') = (x_1, hx')$, $v_h : \Omega_h \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $v = v_h \circ I_h$ then

$$d_h v = (dv_h) \circ I_h.$$

Let $(\gamma, \underline{\nu})$ be a framed unit speed geodesic in a complete Riemannian manifold \mathcal{M} and let

$$\Omega_h^* = \psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}(\Omega_h), \quad (2.22)$$

where $\psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}$ is the Fermi coordinate system defined in (2.1). For functions $\tilde{u} : \Omega_h^* \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ we define the energy

$$E_h(\tilde{u}) := \int_{\Omega_h^*} \text{dist}^2(d\tilde{u}, SO(g, \tilde{g})) d\text{vol}_g. \quad (2.23)$$

Remark 10. If $(\gamma, \underline{\nu})$, $(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\underline{\nu}})$ are as in Lemma 4 and v is a lift of \tilde{u} with respect to these geodesics, i.e. if $\tilde{\psi}_{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\underline{\nu}}} \circ v = \tilde{u} \circ \psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}$, then,

$$E_h(\tilde{u}) = \frac{1}{\int_{\Omega_h} \sqrt{\det \bar{g}} dx} \int_{\Omega_h} \text{dist}^2 \left((\bar{g} \circ v)^{1/2} dv \bar{g}^{-1/2}, SO(n) \right) \sqrt{\det \bar{g}} dx, \quad (2.24)$$

see for example [8, Eq. 2.5]. Here dv is identified with the matrix with components $(dv)_{ij} = \partial_{x_j} v_i$ and the matrices $\bar{g}^{-1/2}$ and $\bar{g}^{1/2}$ are defined in (2.8).

If $|(v_2, \dots, v_n)| \leq Ch$, then the metrics in (2.24) are $O(h^2)$ close to the identity. This will allow us to use the following compactness result in the Euclidean setting.

Theorem 11 ([15, Thm. 2.2]). *Let $n \geq 2$ and let $h_k \rightarrow 0$, $\bar{v}_k : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that*

$$\sup_k \frac{1}{h_k^4} \int_{\Omega} \text{dist}^2(d\bar{v}_k, SO(n)) dx < \infty. \quad (2.25)$$

Then there exist maps $Q_k : (-L, L) \rightarrow SO(n)$, $\tilde{Q}_k : (-L, L) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with $|\tilde{Q}_k| \leq c$ and constants $\bar{Q}_k \in SO(n)$, $c_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that the functions $v_k := \bar{Q}_k^T \bar{v}_k - c_k$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \|d_{h_k} v_k - Q_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq Ch_k^2, \\ \|Q_k - \tilde{Q}_k\|_{L^2(-L, L)} &\leq Ch_k^2, \quad \|\nabla \tilde{Q}_k\|_{L^2(-L, L)} \leq Ch_k, \\ \|Q_k - \text{Id}\|_{L^\infty} &\leq Ch_k. \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

Furthermore, set

$$\begin{aligned} w^k(x_1) &:= \int_{B_1(0)} \frac{(v_k)_1(x) - x_1}{h_k^2} dx', \\ y_i^k(x_1) &:= \int_{B_1(0)} \frac{(v_k)_i(x)}{h_k} dx', \quad i = 2, \dots, n, \\ z_{ij}^k(x_1) &:= -\frac{1}{\mu} \int_{B_1(0)} \frac{x_i(v_k)_j(x) - x_j(v_k)_i(x)}{h_k^2} dx', \quad i, j = 2, \dots, n, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mu := 2 \int_{B_{h_k}(0)} x_n^2 dx'$. By Z^k we denote the skew-symmetric matrix with entries z_{ij}^k . Then, up to subsequences, it holds:

1. $w^k \rightharpoonup w$ weakly in $W^{1,2}(-L, L)$,
2. $y_i^k \rightarrow y_i$ in $W^{1,2}(-L, L)$ with $y_i \in W^{2,2}(-L, L)$ for $i = 2, \dots, n$,
3. $z_{ij}^k \rightharpoonup z_{ij}$ weakly in $W^{1,2}(-L, L)$.
4. There exists a matrix $A \in W^{1,2}((-L, L); \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$ such that $(d_{h_k} v_k - \text{Id})/h_k \rightarrow A$ in $L^2(\Omega)$,
5. $\text{sym}(Q_k - \text{Id})/h_k^2 \rightarrow A^2/2$ uniformly on $(-L, L)$ with

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\partial_{x_1} y^T \\ \partial_{x_1} y & Z \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.27)$$

where Z is the skew-symmetric matrix with entries z_{ij} and $y = \begin{pmatrix} y_2 \\ \vdots \\ y_n \end{pmatrix}$.

6. The sequence β^k defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_1^k(x) &:= \frac{1}{h_k} \left(\frac{(v_k)_1(x) - x_1}{h_k^2} - w^k(x_1) + \sum_{i=2}^n x_i \partial_{x_1} y_i^k(x_1) \right), \\ \beta_j^k(x) &:= \frac{1}{h_k^2} \left(\frac{(v_k)_j(x) - h_k x_j}{h_k} - y_j^k(x_1) - h_k (Z^k x')_j \right) \quad \text{for } j = 2, \dots, n \end{aligned}$$

converges weakly in $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$ to a function β belonging to the space

$$\mathcal{B} := \left\{ \alpha \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n) : \int_{B_1(0)} \alpha(x) dx' = 0, \partial_{x_i} \alpha \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n), \int_{B_1(0)} \alpha_j x_i - \alpha_i x_j dx' = 0 \right\}. \quad (2.28)$$

Moreover, $\partial_{x_i} \beta^k \rightharpoonup \partial_{x_i} \beta$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ for $i = 2, \dots, n$.

In [15] Theorem 11 is proved for the case $n = 3$. The proof is analogous for all $n \geq 2$. Note that for $n = 2$ we have $Z = 0$ by antisymmetry.

Note that the limit (w, y, Z, β) is not unique, not even after choice of a subsequence. The point is that the choice of the constant rotations \overline{Q}_k and the constants c_k is not unique. Indeed, if we replace \overline{Q}_k by $\check{Q}_k = e^{h_k W} \overline{Q}_k$ and $\check{c}_k = c_k + h_k \check{c}' + h_k^2 w_0 e_1$ with W skew-symmetric, and v_k by $\check{v}_k := \check{Q}_k^T \overline{v}_k - \check{c}_k$, then the limits in the convergences 1. to 6. get replaced by

$$\begin{aligned}\check{w}(x_1) &= w_0 + w(x_1) + \frac{1}{2}(W^2)_{11}x_1 + \sum_{j=2}^n W_{1j}y_j(x_1), \\ \check{y}_i(x_1) &= y_i(x_1) + W_{1i}x_1 + \check{c}'_i, \quad i = 2, \dots, n, \\ \check{z}_{ij} &= z_{ij} + W_{ij}, \quad i, j = 2, \dots, n.\end{aligned}$$

It is not difficult to show that modulo this equivalence relation, the limit is unique (for a suitable subsequence). We will show this in a more general setting in Proposition 16 below.

Geometrically, the choice of \overline{Q}_k and c_k corresponds to the choice of a line segment γ_k given by

$$\gamma_k(t) = \overline{Q}_k(te_1 + c_k)$$

and a constant orthonormal frame $\nu_j = \overline{Q}_k e_j$ for $j \geq 2$ perpendicular to γ_k such that \overline{v}_k stays close to γ_k and $d_{h_k} v_k$ is close to \overline{Q}_k on average.

In the Riemannian setting, the straight line γ_k is replaced by a unit speed geodesic and the constant frame is replaced by a parallel orthonormal frame. In this setting we want the expression of \overline{v}_k in Fermi coordinates around this framed geodesic to satisfy Properties 1 to 6 of Theorem 11 without application of an additional rotation \overline{Q}_k and translation c_k . Here the following simple consequence of Theorem 11 will be useful.

Corollary 12. *Assume that $h_k \rightarrow 0$ and that the maps $\overline{v}_k : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfy*

$$\sup_k \frac{1}{h_k^4} \int_{\Omega} \text{dist}^2(d\overline{v}_k, SO(n)) dx < \infty. \quad (2.29)$$

Assume in addition that

$$\int_{\Omega} \left| \overline{v}_k(x) - \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right|^2 dx \leq Ch_k^2, \quad \text{for } j \geq 2, \quad (2.30)$$

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} (\overline{v}_k)_1(x) - x_1 dx \right| \leq Ch_k^2. \quad (2.31)$$

Then there exists $R_k \in SO(n-1)$ such that a subsequence of the maps

$$v_k^{\sharp} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & R_k \end{pmatrix}^T \overline{v}_k \quad (2.32)$$

satisfy (2.26) and Properties 1 to 6 of Theorem 11.

Note that the action of $\overline{R}_k \in SO(n-1)$ simply corresponds to a fixed rotation of the orthonormal frame around the curve.

Proof. Let \overline{Q}_k , c_k and v_k be as in Theorem 11. Set $d_k = \overline{Q}_k c_k$. Then

$$\overline{v}_k = \overline{Q}_k v_k + d_k,$$

and thus, for $j \geq 2$,

$$\int_{B_1(0)} (\overline{v}_k)_j(x_1, x') dx' = (d_k)_j + \sum_{l=2}^n h_k (\overline{Q}_k)_{jl} (y_k)_l(x_1) + (\overline{Q}_k)_{j1} x_1 + (\overline{Q}_k)_{j1} h_k^2 w_k(x_1).$$

Since y_k and w_k are bounded in $L^2((-L, L))$ it follows from (2.30) that

$$\int_{(-L, L)} |(d_k)_j + (\bar{Q}_k)_{j1} x_1|^2 dx_1 \leq Ch_k^2.$$

Hence

$$|(d_k)_j| + |(\bar{Q}_k)_{j1}| \leq Ch_k \quad \text{for } j \geq 2. \quad (2.33)$$

Similarly, we have

$$\int_{B_1(0)} (\bar{v}_k)_1(x_1, x') - x_1 dx' = (d_k)_1 + \sum_{l=2}^n h_k (\bar{Q}_k)_{1l} (y_k)_l + ((\bar{Q}_k)_{11} - 1) x_1 + (\bar{Q}_k)_{11} h_k^2 w_k \quad (2.34)$$

and we get

$$|(\bar{Q}_k)_{11} - 1| \leq Ch_k. \quad (2.35)$$

Since $\bar{Q}_k \in SO(n)$ we have $\sum_{l=1}^n (\bar{Q}_k)_{lj} (\bar{Q}_k)_{l1} = 0$, for $j \geq 2$, and thus we get

$$|(\bar{Q}_k)_{1j}| \leq Ch_k \quad \text{for } j \geq 2. \quad (2.36)$$

Since y_k and w_k are bounded in L^2 , it follows from (2.34) and the assumption (2.31) that

$$|(d_k)_1| \leq Ch_k^2. \quad (2.37)$$

Summarizing and recalling that $c_k = \bar{Q}_k^T d_k$, we get

$$|(c_k)_1| \leq Ch_k^2, \quad |(c_k)_j| \leq Ch_k, \quad |(\bar{Q}_k)^T e_1 - e_1| \leq Ch_k, \quad \text{for } j \geq 2. \quad (2.38)$$

It follows that there exist $Q_k^\sharp \in SO(n)$ such that

$$Q_k^\sharp e_1 = (\bar{Q}_k)^T e_1, \quad |Q_k^\sharp - \text{Id}| \leq Ch_k.$$

Then $\bar{Q}_k(Q_k^\sharp)_{e_1} = e_1$. Since $\bar{Q}_k(Q_k^\sharp) \in SO(n)$, we have

$$\bar{Q}_k Q_k^\sharp = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & R_k \end{pmatrix}$$

for some $R_k \in SO(n-1)$. Set

$$v_k^\sharp := (\bar{Q}_k Q_k^\sharp)^T \bar{v}_k = (Q_k^\sharp)^T (\bar{Q}_k)^T \bar{v}_k = (Q_k^\sharp)^T (v_k + c_k).$$

Since $Q_k^\sharp \in SO(n)$, the maps v_k^\sharp satisfy (2.26) (with Q_k and \tilde{Q}_k replaced by $(Q_k^\sharp)^T Q_k$ and $(Q_k^\sharp)^T \tilde{Q}_k$, respectively). Moreover, it is easy to see that Properties 1 to 6 for the sequence v_k imply the corresponding properties for a subsequence of v_k^\sharp . \square

3 Main theorem

From now on we always assume that \mathcal{M} and $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ are complete smooth, oriented n -dimensional Riemannian manifolds and that $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ has a positive injectivity radius. We will often assume that $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is compact. Then the assumption on the injectivity radius is automatically satisfied.

The main result of this paper is the identification of the Γ -limit of the energy functional (2.23). We define the spaces \mathcal{X} and $\mathcal{X}^\mathcal{G}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X} &:= W^{1,2}((-L, L)) \times W^{2,2}((-L, L); \mathbb{R}^{n-1}) \times (W^{1,2}((-L, L); \mathbb{R}^{n-1 \times n-1}) \times \mathcal{B}, \\ \mathcal{X}^\mathcal{G} &:= \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{X}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

Here the space \mathcal{B} is defined in (2.28) and \mathcal{G} is the set of all framed unit speed geodesics $(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu})$. Note that \mathcal{G} is isomorphic to $\tilde{\mathcal{M}} \times SO(n)$, since any framed unit speed geodesic is uniquely determined by the initial conditions $(\tilde{\gamma}(0), \tilde{\gamma}'(0), \tilde{\nu}(0))$.

Definition 13 (Notion of convergence). *Let $h_k > 0$ with $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_k = 0$, let $\gamma : (-L, L) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ be a geodesic and let \tilde{u}_k be a sequence of maps in $W^{1,2}(\Omega_{h_k}^*; \tilde{\mathcal{M}})$ with $\Omega_{h_k}^* = \psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}(\Omega_{h_k})$. Let $(\tilde{\gamma}, \underline{\nu}, w, y, Z, \beta) \in \mathcal{X}^{\mathcal{G}}$. We say that u_k converges to the tuple*

$$(\tilde{\gamma}, \underline{\nu}, w, y, Z, \beta),$$

if there exists a k_0 such that for $k \geq k_0$ the following assertions hold:

1. *there exist Lipschitz maps $\tilde{v}_k : \Omega_{h_k}^* \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \ell &:= \sup_k \text{Lip } \tilde{v}_k < \infty, \\ \sup_k \frac{1}{h_k^4} \frac{1}{\mu(\Omega_{h_k}^*)} \mu(\{x \in \Omega_{h_k}^* : \tilde{v}_k(x) \neq \tilde{u}_k(x)\}) &< \infty, \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

where μ is the volume measure on $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$,

2. *there exist geodesics $\tilde{\gamma}_k : (-L, L) \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ such that*

$$\sup_k \sup_{x \in \Omega_{h_k}} \frac{1}{h_k} \text{dist}(\tilde{\gamma}_k(x_1), \tilde{v}_k(x)) < \infty \quad (3.3)$$

and $\tilde{\gamma}_k \rightarrow \tilde{\gamma}$ uniformly as $k \rightarrow \infty$,

3. *there exist parallel orthonormal frames $\tilde{\nu}_k$ of the normal bundle of $\tilde{\gamma}_k$ that converge to $\underline{\nu}$ with the following property. Let \bar{v}_k denote the lift of \tilde{v}_k in the sense of Lemma 4 and let $v_k = \bar{v}_k \circ I_{h_k}$ with $I_{h_k}(x_1, x') = (x_1, h_k x')$. Then the maps v_k satisfy (2.26) and Properties 1 to 6 of Theorem 11 with limits (w, y, Z, β) .*

We denote this convergence by $u_k \rightarrow (\tilde{\gamma}, \underline{\nu}, w, y, Z, \beta)$.

In view of the discussion of non-uniqueness after Theorem 11 we define an equivalence relation on the space $\mathcal{X}^{\mathcal{G}}$ as follows.

Definition 14. *We say that $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\nu}, \hat{w}, \hat{Z}, \hat{y}, \hat{\beta}) \sim (\check{\gamma}, \check{\nu}, \check{w}, \check{Z}, \check{y}, \check{\beta})$ if*

$$(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\nu}) = (\check{\gamma}, \check{\nu}) \quad (3.4)$$

and if there exist $J : (-L, L) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $B : (-L, L) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\text{skew}}^{n \times n}$ such that

$$J_1 = 0, \quad (3.5)$$

$$B e_1 = \partial_{x_1} J, \quad (3.6)$$

$$\partial_{x_1} B(x_1) = -\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(J(x_1), e_1), \quad (3.7)$$

and, for $j, l \geq 2$,

$$\hat{Z}_{jl} = \check{Z}_{jl} + B_{jl} \quad (3.8)$$

$$\hat{y} = \check{y} + J' \quad (3.9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x_1} \hat{w}(x_1) + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{11}(x_1, \hat{y}(x_1)) &= \partial_{x_1} \check{w}(x_1) + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{11}(x_1, \check{y}(x_1)) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}(\hat{A}^2 - \check{A}^2)_{11}(x_1) \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x_j} \hat{\beta}_1(x_1, x') + 2\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{1j}(x_1, \hat{y}(x_1) + x') &= \partial_{x_j} \check{\beta}_1(x_1, x') + 2\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{1j}(x_1, \check{y}(x_1) + x') \\ &\quad + e_j \cdot \partial_{x_1}(\check{Z} - \hat{Z})(x_1)x' + (\hat{A}^2 - \check{A}^2)_{1j}(x_1)x' \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{sym } \nabla' \hat{\beta}')_{jl}(x_1, x') + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{jl}(x_1, \hat{y}(x_1) + x') &= (\text{sym } \nabla' \check{\beta}')_{jl}(x_1, x') + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{jl}(x_1, \check{y}(x_1) + x') \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}(\hat{A}^2 - \check{A}^2)_{jl}(x_1), \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

where $\nabla' = (\partial_{x_2}, \dots, \partial_{x_n})$, $\hat{\beta}' = (\hat{\beta}_2, \dots, \hat{\beta}_n)$, $J' = (J_2, \dots, J_n)$ and

$$\hat{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\partial_{x_1}(\hat{y})^T \\ \partial_{x_1}\hat{y} & \hat{Z} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \check{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\partial_{x_1}(\check{y})^T \\ \partial_{x_1}\check{y} & \check{Z} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here we used the abbreviation $\tilde{\mathcal{T}} := \mathcal{T}_{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}^{\tilde{\mathcal{R}}}$. Moreover $\overline{\tilde{\mathcal{R}}} := \psi_{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}^* \tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ where $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ is the curvature tensor of \tilde{M} . Equivalently, $\overline{\tilde{\mathcal{R}}}$ is the curvature tensor of the pullback metric $\psi_{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}^* \tilde{g}$.

If the underlying framed geodesic is clear from the context we sometimes also write $(\hat{w}, \hat{Z}, \hat{y}, \hat{\beta}) \sim (\check{w}, \check{Z}, \check{y}, \check{\beta})$ to express the equivalence relation.

Note that for $\hat{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}$, the map $\hat{\beta} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is uniquely determined by $\nabla' \hat{\beta}_1$ and $\text{sym} \nabla' \hat{\beta}'$. Indeed, $\hat{\beta}_1$ is uniquely determined up to the addition of a function of x_1 and the condition $\int_{B_1(0)} \hat{\beta}_1(x) dx' = 0$ in the definition of \mathcal{B} determines $\hat{\beta}_1$ uniquely. Similarly, by Korn's inequality, $\hat{\beta}'$ is determined up to the addition of a map $c(x_1) + M(x_1)x'$ where $M : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ is linear and skew-symmetric. The conditions $\int_{B_1(0)} \hat{\beta}_j(x) dx' = 0$ for $j \geq 2$ and $\int_{B_1(0)} x_i \hat{\beta}_j(x) - x_j \hat{\beta}_i(x) dx' = 0$ for $i, j \geq 2$ thus determine $\hat{\beta}'$ uniquely.

Remark 15. It follows from (3.7), the map J is a Jacobi field (with respect to the pullback metric $\psi_{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}^* \tilde{g}$), i.e., J corresponds to an infinitesimal (normal) variation of the geodesic $\hat{\gamma}$. Similarly, B corresponds to an infinitesimal variation of the orthonormal frame $(\hat{\gamma}', \hat{\nu}_k, \dots, \hat{\nu}_n)$ of $\hat{\gamma}$.

A key observation is that the limit $(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}, w, y, Z, \beta)$ defined in (13) is unique up to the equivalence relation \sim . More precisely, the following result holds.

Proposition 16. Suppose that there exist Lipschitz maps \hat{v} and \check{v} from $\Omega_{h_k}^* = \psi(\Omega_{h_k})$ to $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ with the following properties:

$$\sup_k \max(\text{Lip } \hat{v}_k, \text{Lip } \check{v}_k) \leq l, \quad (3.13)$$

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{h_k^4} \frac{\mu \left\{ x \in \Omega_{h_k}^* : \hat{v}_k(x) \neq \check{v}_k(x) \right\}}{\mu(\Omega_{h_k})} = 0, \quad (3.14)$$

where μ is the volume measure on \mathcal{M} .

Assume further that there exist framed unit speed geodesics $(\hat{\gamma}_k, \hat{\nu})$ and $(\check{\gamma}_k, \check{\nu})$ such that

$$\sup_k \frac{1}{h_k} \sup_{x \in \Omega_{h_k}} \text{dist}(\hat{v}_k \circ \psi(x), \hat{\gamma}_k(x_1)) + \frac{1}{h_k} \sup_{x \in \Omega_{h_k}} \text{dist}(\check{v}_k \circ \psi(x), \check{\gamma}_k(x_1)) < \infty \quad (3.15)$$

and lifts $\hat{v}_k : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\check{v}_k : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\hat{\psi}_k \circ \hat{v}_k = \hat{v}_k \circ \psi \circ I_{h_k}, \quad \check{\psi}_k \circ \check{v}_k = \check{v}_k \circ \psi \circ I_{h_k}$$

where $\hat{\psi}_k$ and $\check{\psi}_k$ are the Fermi coordinate maps for the framed geodesics $(\hat{\gamma}_k, \hat{\nu})$ and $(\check{\gamma}_k, \check{\nu})$, respectively, and where $I_{h_k}(x_1, x') = (x_1, h_k x')$. Assume that \hat{v}_k and \check{v}_k satisfy Properties 1 to 6 of Theorem 11 and let $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\nu}, \hat{y}, \hat{w}, \hat{Z}, \hat{\beta})$ and $(\check{\gamma}, \check{\nu}, \check{y}, \check{w}, \check{Z}, \check{\beta})$ denote the corresponding limits defined in Definition 13. Then

$$(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\nu}) = (\check{\gamma}, \check{\nu}) \quad \text{and} \quad (\hat{w}, \hat{y}, \hat{Z}, \hat{\beta}) \sim (\check{w}, \check{y}, \check{Z}, \check{\beta}).$$

Proof. The proof uses standard calculations, but is a bit lengthy. Thus we postpone it to Section 6 below. \square

Definition 17. Let (γ, ν) and $(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu})$ be framed, unit speed geodesics in \mathcal{M} and $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$, respectively. For $(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}, w, y, Z, \beta) \in \mathcal{X}^{\mathcal{G}}$ define

$$\mathcal{I}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}(w, y, Z, \beta) := \int_{-L}^L \int_{B_1(0)} |\text{sym } G(x) - \mathcal{T}(x)|^2 dx, \quad (3.16)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G(x_1, x') &:= \left((\partial_{x_1} w) e_1 + (\partial_{x_1} A) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ x' \end{pmatrix} \middle| \partial_{x_2} \beta \middle| \dots \middle| \partial_{x_n} \beta \right) - \frac{1}{2} A^2, \\ \mathcal{T}(x_1, x') &:= \left(\mathcal{T}_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}^{\mathcal{R}}(x_1, x') - \mathcal{T}_{\tilde{\gamma}, \underline{\nu}}^{\tilde{\mathcal{R}}}(x_1, y(x_1) + x') \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

and

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\partial_{x_1} y^T \\ \partial_{x_1} y & Z \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.18)$$

Proposition 18. Suppose that $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\nu}, \hat{w}, \hat{y}, \hat{Z}, \hat{\beta}) \sim (\check{\gamma}, \check{\nu}, \check{w}, \check{y}, \check{Z}, \check{\beta})$ Then

$$\mathcal{I}^{\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\nu}}(\hat{w}, \hat{y}, \hat{Z}, \hat{\beta}) = \mathcal{I}^{\check{\gamma}, \check{\nu}}(\check{w}, \check{y}, \check{Z}, \check{\beta}).$$

Proof. By definition of the the equivalence relation, we have $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\nu}) = (\check{\gamma}, \check{\nu})$ and in the following we denote this framed geodesic by $(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu})$.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{E} &:= \text{sym } \hat{G} - \mathcal{T}_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}^{\mathcal{R}}(x_1, x') + \mathcal{T}_{\tilde{\gamma}, \underline{\nu}}^{\tilde{\mathcal{R}}}(x_1, \hat{y}(x_1) + x'), \\ \check{E} &:= \text{sym } \check{G} - \mathcal{T}_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}^{\mathcal{R}}(x_1, x') + \mathcal{T}_{\tilde{\gamma}, \underline{\nu}}^{\tilde{\mathcal{R}}}(x_1, \check{y}(x_1) + x'), \end{aligned}$$

where \hat{G} is computed using \hat{w} , \hat{A} and $\hat{\beta}$ and similarly for \check{G} . Set $E := \hat{E} - \check{E}$. It follows directly from (3.12) that

$$E_{jl} = 0 \quad \text{if } j, l \geq 2.$$

For $j \geq 2$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} 2E_{1j} &= \sum_{k=2}^n \partial_{x_1} \hat{A}_{jk} x_k + \partial_{x_j} \hat{\beta}_1 + 2\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{1j}(x_1, x' + \hat{y}(x_1)) - (\hat{A})_{1j}^2 \\ &- \left(\sum_{k=2}^n \partial_{x_1} \check{A}_{jk} x_k + \partial_{x_j} \check{\beta}_1 + 2\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{1j}(x_1, x' + \check{y}(x_1)) - (\check{A})_{1j}^2 \right) \\ &\stackrel{(3.11)}{=} \sum_{k=2}^n \partial_{x_1} \hat{A}_{jk} x_k - \sum_{k=2}^n \partial_{x_1} \check{A}_{jk} x_k - \sum_{k=2}^n \partial_{x_1} (\check{Z} - \hat{Z})_{jk} x_k \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

since $\hat{A}_{jk} = \hat{Z}_{jk}$ for $j, k \geq 2$ and similarly for \check{A} and \check{Z} .

Finally we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_{11} &= \partial_{x_1} \hat{w} + \sum_{l=2}^n \partial_{x_1} \hat{A}_{1l} x_l - \frac{1}{2} (\hat{A})_{11}^2 + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{11}(x_1, x' + \hat{y}(x_1)) \\ &- \left(\partial_{x_1} \check{w} + \sum_{l=2}^n \partial_{x_1} \check{A}_{1l} x_l - \frac{1}{2} (\check{A})_{11}^2 + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{11}(x_1, x' + \check{y}(x_1)) \right) \\ &= \partial_{x_1} \hat{w} - \sum_{l=2}^n \partial_{x_1}^2 \hat{y}_l x_l - \frac{1}{2} (\hat{A})_{11}^2 + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{11}(x_1, x' + \hat{y}(x_1)) \\ &- \left(\partial_{x_1} \check{w} - \sum_{l=2}^n \partial_{x_1}^2 \check{y}_l x_l - \frac{1}{2} (\check{A})_{11}^2 + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{11}(x_1, x' + \check{y}(x_1)) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(3.9), (3.10)}{=} -\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{11}(x_1, \hat{y}(x_1)) - \sum_{l=2}^n \partial_{x_1}^2 J_l(x_1) x_l + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{11}(x_1, x' + \hat{y}(x_1)) \end{aligned}$$

$$- \left(-\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{11}(x_1, \check{y}(x_1)) + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{11}(x_1, x' + \check{y}(x_1)) \right).$$

Since $v \mapsto \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(x_1, v)$ is quadratic, the derivative $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ with respect to v is bilinear. Moreover $\hat{y} - \check{y} = J'$ and $J_1 = 0$ so we get

$$E_{11} = D\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{11}(x_1)(x', J(x_1)) - \sum_{l=2}^n \partial_{x_1}^2 J_l(x_1) x_l. \quad (3.19)$$

It follows from the definition (2.7) of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ and the fact that $J_1 = 0$ that

$$D\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{11}(x_1)(x', J(x_1)) = - \sum_{k,l=2}^n \bar{\mathcal{R}}(x_1)_{1kl} J_k(x_1) x_l.$$

On the other hand J is a Jacobi field and (3.7) gives

$$\partial_{x_1}^2 J = \partial_{x_1} B e_1 = -\bar{\mathcal{R}}(x_1)(J(x_1), e_1) e_1.$$

Thus, for $l \geq 2$

$$\partial_{x_1}^2 J_l = -\bar{\mathcal{R}}(x_1)(e_l, e_1, J, e_1) = - \sum_{k,l=2}^n \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{l1k1}(x_1) J_k(x_1) = - \sum_{k,l=2}^n \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{1k1l}(x_1) J_k(x_1)$$

and thus

$$\sum_{l=2}^n \partial_{x_1}^2 J_l x_l = - \sum_{k,l=2}^n \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{1k1l}(x_1) J_k(x_1) x_l.$$

Hence $E_{11} = 0$. □

In the following we usually understand the convergence in Definition 13 as a convergence in $\mathcal{X}^{\mathcal{G}} / \sim$.

Theorem 19. *Let (\mathcal{M}, g) and $(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}, \tilde{g})$ be complete oriented, n -dimensional Riemannian manifolds with $n \geq 2$. Then the following statements hold:*

- (i) *Compactness: Assume in addition that $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is compact. Let $h_k \rightarrow 0$, $\tilde{u}_k \in W^{1,2}(\Omega_{h_k}^*, \tilde{\mathcal{M}})$ and suppose that $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{h_k^4} E_{h_k}(\tilde{u}_k) < \infty$. Then there exists a subsequence $h_{k_j} \rightarrow 0$ such that*

$$u_{k_j} \rightarrow (\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\underline{v}}, w, y, Z, \beta)$$

in the sense of Definition 13.

- (ii) *Γ -liminf inequality: If $h_k \rightarrow 0$ and $\tilde{u}_k \rightarrow (\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\underline{v}}, w, y, Z, \beta)$ in the sense of Definition 13, then*

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{h_k^4} E_{h_k}(\tilde{u}_k) \geq \mathcal{I}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\underline{v}}}(w, y, Z, \beta).$$

- (iii) *Recovery sequence: Given a tuple $(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\underline{v}}, w, y, Z, \beta)$ and a sequence $h_k \rightarrow 0$, there exists a sequence \tilde{u}_k such that $\tilde{u}_k \rightarrow (\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\underline{v}}, w, y, Z, \beta)$ in the sense of Definition 13 and*

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{h_k^4} E_{h_k}(\tilde{u}_k) \leq \mathcal{I}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\underline{v}}}(w, y, Z, \beta). \quad (3.20)$$

Combining properties (ii) and (iii) with Proposition 21 and Lemma 20, we obtain that the functionals $\frac{1}{h_k^4} E_{h_k}$ are Γ -convergent to the functional $\mathcal{I}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\underline{v}}}$ with respect to the convergence in Definition 13 modulo the equivalence relation of Definition 14. Regarding the compactness statement, we give an explicit construction of the paths $\tilde{\gamma}_k$ in step 2 of the proof of Theorem 19. First, we prove the Γ -liminf inequality.

Lemma 20. Assume that $\tilde{u}_k \rightarrow (\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}, w, y, Z, \beta)$ in the sense of Definition 13. Let \tilde{v}_k, \bar{v}_k and v_k be as in Definition 13, let $Q_k : (-L, L) \rightarrow SO(n)$ be such that (2.26) holds and define $G_k : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ by

$$G_k := \frac{Q_k^T (\bar{g}_k^{1/2} \circ v_k) d_{h_k} v_k (\bar{g}^{-1/2} \circ I_{h_k}) - \text{Id}}{h_k^2}.$$

where $I_{h_k}(x_1, x') = (x_1, h_k x')$. Then there exists a subsequence (not relabeled) and $G \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$ such that $G_k \rightharpoonup G$ weakly in L^2 and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sym } G(x) &= \partial_{x_1} w(x_1) e_1 \otimes e_1 - \frac{1}{2} A^2(x_1) + \text{sym} \left(\partial_{x_1} A(x_1) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ x' \end{pmatrix} \middle| \partial_{x_2} \beta \middle| \dots \middle| \partial_{x_n} \beta \right) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{T}_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}^{\mathcal{R}}(x_1, x') + \mathcal{T}_{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}^{\mathcal{R}}(x_1, y(x_1) + x'). \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

Moreover,

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{h_k^4} \int_{\Omega_{h_k}^*} \text{dist}^2(d\tilde{u}_k, SO(g, \tilde{g})) d\text{vol}_g \geq \int_{\Omega} |\text{sym } G|^2 dx. \quad (3.22)$$

Proof. The reasoning is similar to the proof of Lemma 2.3 in [15], but we need into account the extra contributions coming from the deviation of the pullback metric in Fermi coordinates from the Euclidean metric.

We have

$$G_k = \frac{Q_k^T (\bar{g}_k^{1/2} \circ v_k - \text{Id}) d_{h_k} v_k (\bar{g}^{-1/2} \circ I_{h_k})}{h_k^2} + \frac{Q_k^T d_{h_k} v_k - \text{Id}}{h_k^2} + \frac{Q_k^T d_{h_k} v_k (\bar{g}^{-1/2} \circ I_{h_k} - \text{Id})}{h_k^2}. \quad (3.23)$$

The maps \tilde{v}_k and hence \bar{v}_k are uniformly Lipschitz and therefore $d_{h_k} v_k$ is bounded in L^∞ . Moreover, the condition (3.3) implies that

$$\sup_{x \in \Omega} |v_k(x) - x_1| \leq C h_k. \quad (3.24)$$

It follows from the Taylor expansion of the metric in Fermi coordinates that

$$\frac{\bar{g}^{-1/2} \circ I_{h_k} - \text{Id}}{h_k^2} \rightarrow -\mathcal{T}_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}^{\mathcal{R}} \quad \text{uniformly in } \Omega,$$

see (2.10). By (2.26) we have $Q_k^T d_{h_k} v_k \rightarrow \text{Id}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ and thus

$$\frac{Q_k^T d_{h_k} v_k (\bar{g}^{-1/2} \circ I_{h_k} - \text{Id})}{h_k^2} \rightarrow -\mathcal{T}_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}^{\mathcal{R}} \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega). \quad (3.25)$$

To treat the term involving \bar{g} , we define $\iota(y)(x) := (x_1, y(x_1) + x')$, where $y : (-L, L) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ is the limit of $\frac{1}{h_k} \int_{B_1(0)} v'_k$. It follows from Property (6) in Theorem 11 that $h_k^{-1} v'_k \rightarrow \iota(y)$ in $L^2(\Omega)$. In view of (3.24) we also get convergence in $L^p(\Omega)$, for all $p < \infty$. Using again the bound (3.24) and the Taylor expansion (2.9) of the Fermi coordinates we get

$$\frac{(\bar{g}_k^{1/2} \circ v_k - \text{Id})}{h_k^2} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}^{\mathcal{R}} \circ \iota(y) \quad \text{in } L^q(\Omega), \text{ for all } q < \infty.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{Q_k^T (\bar{g}_k^{1/2} \circ v_k - \text{Id}) d_{h_k} v_k \bar{g}^{-1/2} \circ I_{h_k}}{h_k^2} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}^{\mathcal{R}} \circ \iota(y) \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega). \quad (3.26)$$

It remains to analyze the term $h_k^{-2}(Q_k^T d_{h_k} v_k - \text{Id})$. By (2.26), this term is bounded in $L^2(\Omega)$ and hence there exists a weakly convergent subsequence, not relabeled, such that

$$\frac{Q_k^T d_{h_k} v_k - \text{Id}}{h_k^2} \rightharpoonup H \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega). \quad (3.27)$$

Hence

$$G_k \rightharpoonup H + \mathcal{T}_{\tilde{\gamma}, \underline{\nu}}^{\tilde{\mathcal{R}}} \circ \iota(y) - \mathcal{T}_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}^{\mathcal{R}}. \quad (3.28)$$

The last two terms on the right and side take values in symmetric matrices. To compute $\text{sym } H$ we note that by Property 4 and Property 5 in Theorem 11 we have

$$\frac{d_{h_k} v_k - \text{Id}}{h_k} \rightarrow A \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{sym} \frac{Q_k^T - \text{Id}}{h_k^2} \rightarrow \frac{A^2}{2} \quad \text{uniformly.}$$

From Property 6 in Theorem 11 we get

$$\text{sym} \frac{d_{h_k} v_k - \text{Id}}{h_k^2} \rightarrow \partial_{x_1} w(x_1) e_1 \otimes e_1 + \text{sym} \left(\partial_{x_1} A(x_1) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ x' \end{pmatrix} \middle| \partial_{x_2} \beta \middle| \dots \middle| \partial_{x_n} \beta \right)$$

strongly in $W^{-1,2}(\Omega)$. Since

$$Q_k^T d_{h_k} v_k - \text{Id} = (Q_k^T - \text{Id}) + (d_{h_k} v_k - \text{Id}) + (Q_k^T - \text{Id})(d_{h_k} v_k - \text{Id})$$

and since A is skew-symmetric and thus A^2 is symmetric we get

$$\text{sym } H = \partial_{x_1} w(x_1) e_1 \otimes e_1 + \text{sym} \left(\partial_{x_1} A(x_1) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ x' \end{pmatrix} \middle| \partial_{x_2} \beta \middle| \dots \middle| \partial_{x_n} \beta \right) - \frac{A^2}{2}.$$

Finally we show (3.22). We first choose a subsequence k_j such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{h_{k_j}^4} \int_{\Omega_{h_{k_j}}^*} \text{dist}^2(d\tilde{u}_{k_j}, SO(g, \tilde{g})) d \text{vol}_g \\ &= \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{h_k^4} \int_{\Omega_{h_k}^*} \text{dist}^2(d\tilde{u}_k, SO(g, \tilde{g})) d \text{vol}_g. \end{aligned}$$

Then we apply the previous reasoning to the subsequence k_j . Thus there exists a further subsequence such that $G_{k_{j_l}} \rightarrow G$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$ where $\text{sym } G$ is given by (3.21). We need to show

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{h_{k_{j_l}}^4} \int_{\Omega_{h_{k_{j_l}}}^*} \text{dist}^2(d\tilde{u}_{k_{j_l}}, SO(g, \tilde{g})) d \text{vol}_g \geq \int_{\Omega} |\text{sym } G|^2.$$

This follows by a Taylor expansion away from the set where $h_k^2 G_k$ is not small (and the set where $\tilde{u}_k \neq \tilde{v}_k$). as in [4, 15]. For the convenience of the reader we include the details for the argument.

To simplify the notation we now write again G_k instead of $G_{k_{j_l}}$. Let

$$F'_k = \{x \in \Omega_{h_k}^* : \tilde{v}_k(x) \neq \tilde{u}_k(x)\}, \quad F''_k := \{x \in \Omega : (\psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}} \circ I_{h_k})(x) \in F'_k\}.$$

Then, for $x \notin F''_k$ we have, by (2.24),

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{dist}(d\tilde{u}_k, SO(g, \tilde{g})) \circ \psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}} \circ I_{h_k} \\ &= \text{dist}(d\tilde{v}_k, SO(g, \tilde{g})) \circ \psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}} \circ I_{h_k} \\ &= \text{dist}((\tilde{g}_k \circ v_k)^{1/2} d_{h_k} v_k (\bar{g}^{-1/2} \circ I_{h_k}), SO(n)) \\ &= \text{dist}(\text{Id} + h_k^2 G_k, SO(n)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

where \bar{g} and $\bar{\tilde{g}}_k$ are the metrics of \mathcal{M} and $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ in the Fermi coordinates induced by $\psi_{\gamma, \underline{v}}$ and $\psi_{\gamma_k, \underline{\tilde{v}}_k}$, respectively. Set

$$F_k = F_k'' \cup \{|h_k^2 G_k| > h_k\}.$$

Then (3.2) and the boundedness of G_k in L^2 imply that

$$\mathcal{L}^n(F_k) \leq Ch_k^4 + Ch_k^2 \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

From (3.29) and the change of variables formula we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{h_k^4} \int_{\Omega_{h_k}^*} \text{dist}^2(d\tilde{u}_k, SO(g, \tilde{g})) d\text{vol}_g \\ & \geq \frac{1}{h_k^4} \int_{\Omega \setminus F_k} \text{dist}(\text{Id} + h_k^2 G_k, SO(n)) \sqrt{\det \bar{g}} \circ I_{h_k} dx \frac{1}{\int_{\Omega} \sqrt{\det \bar{g}} \circ I_{h_k} dx}. \end{aligned}$$

We have $\sqrt{\det \bar{g}} \circ I_{h_k} \rightarrow 1$ uniformly in Ω . Thus it suffices to show that

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{h_k^4} \int_{\Omega \setminus F_k} \text{dist}(\text{Id} + h_k^2 G_k, SO(n)) dx \geq \int_{\Omega} |\text{sym } G|^2 dx.$$

Now for $x \in \Omega \setminus F_k$ we have by Taylor expansion,

$$|\text{dist}(\text{Id} + h_k^2 G_k) - \text{sym } G_k| \leq Ch_k |h_k^2 G_k|.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{h_k^4} \int_{\Omega \setminus F_k} \text{dist}(\text{Id} + h_k^2 G_k, SO(n)) dx \\ & \geq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{h_k^4} \int_{\Omega} |\chi_{\Omega \setminus F_k} \text{sym } G_k|^2 dx \geq \int_{\Omega} |\text{sym } G|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

For the last inequality we used that $\text{sym } G_k \chi_{\Omega \setminus F_k}$ converges weakly in L^2 to $\text{sym } G$ (since $\mathcal{L}^n(F_k) \rightarrow 0$) and the lower semicontinuity of the L^2 norm under weak convergence in L^2 . This concludes the proof. \square

Proposition 21. *Let $(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{v}, w, y, Z, \beta) \in \mathcal{X}^{\mathcal{G}}$. Then there exist sequences $h_k \downarrow 0$ and $\bar{v}_k \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$ such that properties 1-6 of Theorem 11 hold. Furthermore, the sequence $\tilde{u}_k(x) := \psi_{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{v}} \circ \bar{v}_k \circ \psi_{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{v}}^{-1}(x)$ satisfies*

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{h_k^4} E_{h_k}(\tilde{u}_k) \leq \mathcal{I}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{v}}(w, y, Z, \beta). \quad (3.30)$$

Proof. The proof follows a similar strategy as in [15]. Suppose for the moment that w, y, Z, β are smooth. For $h > 0$ define

$$v_h(x_1, x') := \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ hx' \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} h^2 w \\ hy \end{pmatrix} - h^2 \begin{pmatrix} x' \cdot \partial_{x_1} y \\ Zx' \end{pmatrix} + h^3 \beta.$$

Then v_h is Lipschitz and satisfies properties 1-6. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} d_h v_h &= \text{Id} + \begin{pmatrix} h^2 \partial_{x_1} w & -h(\partial_{x_1} y)^T \\ h \partial_{x_1} y & Z \end{pmatrix} \\ &\quad - h^2 \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i,j} x_i \partial_{x_1}^2 y_j + x_j \partial_{x_1}^2 y_i & \left| \partial_{x_2} \beta \right| \dots \left| \partial_{x_n} \beta \right| \\ Zx' & \end{pmatrix} + O(h^3). \end{aligned}$$

Using the identity $(\text{Id} + B^T)(\text{Id} + B) = \text{Id} + 2\text{sym } B + B^T B$, we obtain

$$(d_h v_h)^T d_h v_h = \text{Id} + 2h^2 \partial_{x_1} w e_1 \otimes e_1 + 2h^2 \left(\partial_{x_1} A \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ x' \end{pmatrix} \middle| \partial_{x_2} \beta \middle| \dots \middle| \partial_{x_n} \beta \right) + h^2 A^T A + O(h^3).$$

Taking the square root and recalling the definition of G_h , we have

$$[(d_h v_h)^T d_h v_h]^{1/2} = \text{Id} + h^2 G_h + O(h^3).$$

For h sufficiently small we have $\det [(d_h v_h)^T d_h v_h]^{1/2} > 0$, hence by frame indifference

$$\text{dist}^2(d_h v_h, SO(n)) = \text{dist}^2 \left([(d_h v_h)^T d_h v_h]^{1/2}, SO(n) \right),$$

By Taylor expansion of $\text{dist}(\cdot, SO(n))$ we obtain

$$\frac{1}{h^2} \text{dist}(d_h v_h, SO(n)) \rightarrow |\text{sym } G| \quad \text{in } L^2,$$

and $\text{sym } G_h \rightarrow \text{sym } G$ in L^2 . Finally, the inequality (3.30) follows from (2.24). Now note that any tuple $(w, y, Z, \beta) \in \mathcal{X}$ can be approximated by smooth functions (w^k, y^k, Z^k, β^k) by density. We have $\mathcal{I}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}(w^k, y^k, Z^k, \beta^k) \rightarrow \mathcal{I}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}(w, y, Z, \beta)$. Then the upper bound (3.30) follows by a diagonal argument, see e.g. [1, Remark 1.2]. \square

The following fact on Lipschitz approximation of \mathbb{R}^s -valued Sobolev maps will be a crucial ingredient in proving the compactness of Theorem 19.

Lemma 22. *Let $s, n \geq 1$ and $1 \leq p < \infty$ and suppose $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded Lipschitz domain. Then there exists a constant $C = C(U, n, s, p)$ with the following property: For each $u \in W^{1,p}(U, \mathbb{R}^s)$ and each $\lambda > 0$ there exists $v : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^s$ such that*

$$(i) \quad \text{Lip } v \leq C\lambda,$$

$$(ii) \quad \mathcal{L}^n(\{x \in U : u(x) \neq v(x)\}) \leq \frac{C}{\lambda^p} \int_{\{x \in U : |du|_e > \lambda\}} |du|_e^p dx.$$

Here $|\cdot|_e$ denotes the Frobenius norm with respect to the standard scalar product on \mathbb{R}^n and \mathbb{R}^s , respectively. If $U = \Omega_h := (-L, L) \times B_h(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $h \in (0, L/2)$ then the constant C in (i) and (ii) can be chosen independent of h and L .

Remark 23. It is easy to see that the constant C can be chosen uniformly for all domains U' which are bilipschitzly equivalent to a given domain U , with a fixed bilipschitz constant M .

Proof. For the result for a fixed set U , see, for example [4, Prop. A.1]. Closely related results appeared earlier in [11] and [3, Sect 6.6.2, 6.6.3].

For sets of the form $U = (-L, L) \times B_h(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ one can obtain a bound which is uniform in h by first extending to a set $(-L, L) \times (-2h, 2h)^{n-1}$ by reflection multiple reflections to extend to $(-L, L)^n$. For the convenience of the reader we give a detailed proof in Appendix A. \square

Proof of Theorem 19 (i).

Step 1 (Existence of Lipschitz approximations).

The construction of the Lipschitz maps \tilde{v}_h is similar to the construction in [8]. We include the details for the convenience of the reader. Recall that by Nash's imbedding theorem [16, Theorem 3], $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ can be viewed as a subset of \mathbb{R}^s for sufficiently large s , and the metric on the tangent space of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is induced by the Euclidean metric in \mathbb{R}^s . Define $\bar{u}_k : \Omega_{h_k} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{M}} \subset \mathbb{R}^s$ by

$$\bar{u}_k := \tilde{u}_k \circ \psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}},$$

and let $\bar{g}_{ij}(x) := (\psi_{\gamma, \underline{v}}^* g)(x)(e_i, e_j)$ be the coefficients of the metric on \mathcal{M} in the standard Euclidean basis. By Lemma 3 we have

$$|\bar{g}_{ij}(x) - \delta_{ij}| \leq Ch_k^2 \quad \text{for all } x \in (-L, L) \times B_{h_k}(0).$$

Since the Frobenius norm, denoted by $|\cdot|_e$, of a map in $SO(n)$ is \sqrt{n} and $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is isometrically imbedded into \mathbb{R}^s , we have

$$|d\bar{u}_k|_e \leq (1 + Ch_k^2)(\sqrt{n} + \text{dist}(d\tilde{u}_k, SO(g, \tilde{g}))).$$

In particular for sufficiently large k we have the following implication:

$$\text{if } |d\bar{u}_k|_e \geq 4\sqrt{n} \quad \text{then} \quad \text{dist}(du_k, SO(g, \tilde{g})) \geq \frac{1}{2}|d\bar{u}_k|_e \geq 2\sqrt{n}.$$

We apply Lemma 22 with $u = \bar{u}_k$, $U = \Omega_h$ and $\lambda = 4\sqrt{n}$, and denote the corresponding Lipschitz approximation by \bar{v}_k , and set $E_k^2 := \{x \in \Omega_{h_k} : \bar{v}_k \neq \bar{u}_k\}$. Then

$$\text{Lip } \bar{v}_k \leq C. \tag{3.31}$$

Using that $\det \bar{g}(x) \geq (1 + Ch_k^2)^{-1} \geq \frac{1}{2}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^n(E_k^2) &= \frac{C}{\lambda^2} \int_{\{x \in \Omega_{h_k} : |d\bar{u}_k|_e > \lambda\}} |d\bar{u}_k|_e dx \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\lambda^2} \int_{\Omega_{h_k}} \text{dist}^2(d\tilde{u}_k, SO(g, \tilde{g})) d\text{vol}_g \\ &\leq C\mu(\Omega_{h_k})h_k^4. \end{aligned} \tag{3.32}$$

In the last inequality we used that $\lambda = 4\sqrt{n}$, so that $\frac{1}{\lambda^2} \leq 1$. Here, the map \bar{v}_k generally takes values in \mathbb{R}^s , not in $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$.

This issue can easily be resolved by projecting back to $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$. Indeed, since $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is compact, there exists $\rho > 0$ and a smooth projection $\pi_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}$ which maps a tubular ρ -neighborhood of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ in \mathbb{R}^s to $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$. By (3.32) we have

$$\mathcal{L}^n(E_k^2) = \mathcal{O}(h_k^{n-1+4}),$$

hence the radius of the largest ball in E_k^2 is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(h_k^{1+3/n})$. In particular

$$\sup_{x \in E_k^2} \text{dist}(\bar{v}_k(x), \tilde{\mathcal{M}}) \leq Ch_k.$$

Then $\bar{v}'_k := \pi_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}} \circ \bar{v}_k$ is well defined for h_k sufficiently small and satisfies $\text{Lip } \bar{v}'_k \leq C$. Since $\pi|_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}} = \text{id}$, we have $\{\bar{v}'_k \neq \bar{u}_k\} \subseteq \{\bar{v}_k \neq \bar{u}_k\}$. By Remark 1 the restriction of $\psi_{\gamma, \underline{v}}$ to a sufficiently small cylinder Ω_ε is bilipschitz. Thus $\tilde{v}_k := \bar{v}'_k \circ \psi_{\gamma, \underline{v}}^{-1}$ satisfies (3.2).

We also note that

$$E_{h_k}(\tilde{v}_k) \leq E_{h_k}(\tilde{u}_k) + Ch_k^4 \leq Ch_k^4. \tag{3.33}$$

Indeed, the measure of the set where $d\tilde{v}_k \neq d\tilde{u}_k$ is bounded by Ch_k^4 and on that set $|d\tilde{v}_k|$ is uniformly bounded.

Step 2 (Approximation by a geodesic). We will show that for each sufficiently large k there exists a unit speed geodesic $\check{\gamma}_k$ such that

$$\sup_{x \in \Omega_{h_k}} \text{dist}(\tilde{v}_k(x), \check{\gamma}_k(x_1)) \leq Ch_k. \tag{3.34}$$

We will first construct a continuous, piecewise geodesic curve γ^{pw} such that (3.34) holds with γ^{pw} instead of $\tilde{\gamma}_k$ and such that the l_2 norm of the jumps of the derivative of γ^{pw} and the quantity $|\gamma^{pw'}| - 1$ are controlled in terms of the energy of \tilde{v}_k . Then an ODE argument shows that there exists a unit speed geodesic $\tilde{\gamma}_k$ such that (3.34) holds, see Lemma 24 below. In the following we will always assume that h_k is sufficiently small, in particularly much smaller than the injectivity radius of \tilde{M} .

To construct the piecewise geodesic curve γ^{pw} , let $N_k := \left\lceil \frac{L}{h_k} \right\rceil$, $\varepsilon_k = \frac{L}{N_k}$, and

$$t_i := i\varepsilon_k \quad \text{for } i = -N_k, -N_k + 1, \dots, N_k, \quad s_i := \frac{t_i + t_{i+1}}{2},$$

and

$$\Omega_i = (t_i, t_{i+1}) \times B_{h_k}(0).$$

Here t_i , s_i and Ω_i also depend on k , but for easier readability we suppressed that dependence. Note that $h_k/2 \leq \varepsilon_k \leq h_k$.

Let \bar{x}_i be the Riemannian center of mass of the map $\tilde{v}_k \circ \psi|_{\Omega_i}$, see Definition 6. Here we equip Ω_i with the normalized Lebesgue measure. Since the maps \tilde{v}_k are uniformly Lipschitz we get

$$\sup_{x \in \Omega_i} d_{\tilde{M}}(\tilde{v}_k(x), \bar{x}_i) \leq Ch_k, \quad d_{\tilde{M}}(\bar{x}_i, \bar{x}_{i+1}) \leq Ch_k. \quad (3.35)$$

Define on $[s_{-N}, s_{N-1}]$ a piecewise the C^1 curve γ^{pw} by the condition

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma^{pw}|_{[s_i, s_{i+1}]} &\text{ is the unique length-minimizing geodesic with} \\ \gamma^{pw}(s_i) &= \bar{x}_i \text{ and } \gamma^{pw}(s_{i+1}) = \bar{x}_{i+1}. \end{aligned}$$

We extend γ^{pw} uniquely to geodesic on $(-\infty, s_{-N+1})$ and (s_{N-2}, ∞) . Using (3.34) for $x \in \Omega_i$, we see that

$$\sup_{x \in \Omega_{h_k}} \text{dist}(\tilde{v}_k(x), \gamma^{pw}(x_1)) \leq Ch_k. \quad (3.36)$$

The derivative γ^{pw} may jump at s_i for $i = -N + 1, \dots, N - 2$. For such values of i , we denote by $\gamma_+^{pw'}(s_i)$ the derivative of the geodesic defined on $[s_i, s_{i+1}]$ and by $\gamma_-^{pw'}(s_i)$ the derivative of the geodesic defined on $[s_{i-1}, s_i]$. By definition of the exponential map these geodesics are mapped to straight lines under $\exp_{\bar{x}_i}^{-1}$ and we have

$$\gamma_+^{pw'}(s_i) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_k} \exp_{\bar{x}_i}^{-1} \bar{x}_{i+1}, \quad \gamma_-^{pw'}(s_i) = -\frac{1}{\varepsilon_k} \exp_{\bar{x}_i}^{-1} \bar{x}_{i-1}, \quad (3.37)$$

To estimate the size of jump, we will apply the rigidity estimate for low energy maps to the maps

$$f_i = \exp_{\bar{x}_i}^{-1} \circ \tilde{v}_k \circ \psi|_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}.$$

For $j \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ we define

$$q_{i,j} := \oint_{\Omega_{i+j}} f_i \, dx \in T_{\bar{x}_i} \tilde{\mathcal{M}}.$$

Then $q_{i,0} = 0$ by the definition of the center of mass. Corollary 9 implies that

$$|\exp_{\bar{x}_i}^{-1} \bar{x}_{i+j} - q_{i,j}| \leq Ch_k^3 \quad \text{for } j = \pm 1. \quad (3.38)$$

Thus

$$\left| \gamma_+^{pw'}(s_i) - \frac{1}{\varepsilon_k} q_{i,1} \right| \leq Ch_k^2, \quad \left| \gamma_-^{pw'}(s_i) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon_k} q_{i,-1} \right| \leq Ch_k^2. \quad (3.39)$$

Set

$$A_i := \Omega_{i-1} \cup \Omega_i \cup \Omega_{i+1}.$$

Then the quantitative rigidity estimate in [4, Thm. 3.1] implies that there exist $R_i \in SO(n)$ such that

$$\int_{A_i} |df_i - R_i|^2 dx \leq \int_{A_i} \text{dist}^2(df_i, SO(n)) dx.$$

It follows from (3.35) and the expansion of the metric in normal coordinates in $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ and Fermi coordinates in \mathcal{M} that

$$\text{dist}(df_i, SO(n)) \leq \text{dist}(d\tilde{v}_k, SO(g, \tilde{g})) \circ \psi_{\gamma, \underline{v}} + Ch_k^2.$$

Set

$$E_{k,i} := \int_{A_i} \text{dist}^2(d\tilde{v}_k, SO(g, \tilde{g})) \circ \psi_{\gamma, \underline{v}} dx$$

and $c_i = \int_{A_i} f_i dx$. Since $\int_{A_i} x dx = s_i e_1$, the Poincaré inequality shows there exists a constant $C < \infty$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{|A_i|} \int_{A_i} |f_i(x) - R_i(x - s_i e_1) - c_i|^2 dx \\ & \leq \frac{Ch_k^2}{|A_i|} \int_{A_i} |df_i - R_i|^2 dx \\ & \leq \frac{Ch_k^2}{|A_i|} \int_{A_i} \text{dist}^2(df_i, SO(n)) dx \leq Ch_k^2(E_{k,i} + h_k^4). \end{aligned} \quad (3.40)$$

Since $\int_{\Omega_i} f_i dx = q_{i,0} = 0$ by the definition of the center of mass, and $\int_{\Omega_i} (x - s_i e_1) = 0$, Jensen's inequality implies that

$$|c_i| = \left| \int_{\Omega_i} f_i - R_i(x - s_i e_i) - c_i dx \right| \leq Ch_k(E_{k,i}^{1/2} + h_k^2).$$

Similarly, by integrating over Ω_{i-1} and Ω_{i+1} and using the estimate for c_i we get

$$|q_{i,-1} - R_i(-\varepsilon_k e_i)| \leq Ch_k(E_{k,i}^{1/2} + h_k^2), \quad |q_{i,1} - R_i(\varepsilon_k e_i)| \leq Ch_k(E_{k,i}^{1/2} + h_k^2).$$

In combination with (3.39) we get

$$|\gamma_{\pm}^{pw'}(s_i) - R_i e_i| \leq C(E_{k,i}^{1/2} + h_k^2) \quad (3.41)$$

and, in particular,

$$|\gamma_+^{pw'}(s_i) - \gamma_-^{pw'}(s_i)| \leq C(E_{k,i}^{1/2} + h_k^2). \quad (3.42)$$

Since $\det D\psi$ is bounded from above and below we deduce from (3.33) that

$$\sum_{i=-N+1}^{N-2} E_{k,i} \leq C \frac{2L}{\varepsilon_k} \int_{\Omega_{h_k}^*} \text{dist}^2(d\tilde{v}_k, SO(g, \tilde{g})) d\text{vol}_{\mathcal{M}} \leq Ch_k^3 \quad (3.43)$$

and hence $\sum_{i=-N+1}^{N-2} E_{k,i}^{1/2} \leq CN^{1/2} h_k^{3/2} \leq Ch_k$. Thus we finally get

$$\sum_{i=-N+1}^{N-2} |\gamma_+^{pw'}(s_i) - \gamma_-^{pw'}(s_i)| \leq Ch_k. \quad (3.44)$$

The estimate (3.43) implies $E_{k,i} \leq Ch_k^{3/2}$ for each i . Since $|\gamma^{pw}|$ is constant on the segments where γ^{pw} is a geodesic, it follows from (3.41) that

$$\sup_{s \in [-L, L]} ||\gamma^{pw'}(s) - 1| \leq Ch_k^{3/2}. \quad (3.45)$$

Using Lemma 24, we see that there exists a unit speed geodesic $\check{\gamma}_k$ such that

$$\sup_{t \in [-L, L]} \text{dist}_{\tilde{M}}(\gamma^{pw}(t), \check{\gamma}_k(t)) \leq Ch_k.$$

Combining this estimate with (3.36), we get (3.34).

Step 3 (Compactness). Choose a parallel orthonormal frame $\underline{\check{\nu}}$ along $\check{\gamma}$ and let $\Phi_{\check{\gamma}, \underline{\check{\nu}}}$ be the corresponding lifting map constructed in Lemma 4. Set

$$\check{v}_k(x) := \Phi_{\check{\gamma}, \underline{\check{\nu}}}(x_1, \tilde{\nu}_k \circ \psi_{\check{\gamma}, \underline{\check{\nu}}} \circ I_{h_k}(x)).$$

Then

$$\psi_{\check{\gamma}, \underline{\check{\nu}}} \circ \check{v}_k = \tilde{\nu}_k \circ \psi_{\check{\gamma}, \underline{\check{\nu}}} \circ I_{h_k}.$$

It follows from the expansion of the metric in Fermi coordinates and the estimate (3.34) that

$$\int_{\Omega} \text{dist}^2(d_{h_k} \check{v}_k, SO(n)) dx \leq Ch_k^4, \quad (3.46)$$

$$\int_{\Omega} \left| \check{v}_k(x) - \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right|^2 dx \leq Ch_k^2. \quad (3.47)$$

The last estimate can be improved for the first component $(v_k)_1(x) - x_1$, at least on average, by a small translation along the geodesic $\check{\gamma}$. For $\tau = \mathcal{O}(h_k)$ define translated framed geodesics by

$$\check{\gamma}_{\tau}(x_1) = \check{\gamma}(x_1 + \tau), \quad \underline{\check{\nu}}_{\tau}(x_1) = \underline{\check{\nu}}(x_1 + \tau).$$

Then

$$\psi_{\check{\gamma}_{\tau}, \underline{\check{\nu}}_{\tau}}(x_1, x') = \psi_{\check{\gamma}, \underline{\check{\nu}}}(x_1 + \tau, x').$$

If we define

$$\check{v}_{k, \tau}(x) := \Phi_{\check{\gamma}_{\tau}, \underline{\check{\nu}}_{\tau}}(x_1, \tilde{\nu}_k \circ \psi_{\check{\gamma}, \underline{\check{\nu}}} \circ I_{h_k}(x)), \quad (3.48)$$

we see that

$$\check{v}_{k, \tau}(x) = \check{v}_k(x) - \tau e_1. \quad (3.49)$$

Thus

$$\oint_{\Omega} (\check{v}_{k, \tau})_1(x) - x_1 dx = -\tau + \oint_{\Omega} (\check{v}_k)_1(x) - x_1 dx.$$

It follows from (3.47) that there exists a $\bar{\tau}$ with $|\bar{\tau}| \leq Ch_k$ and

$$\oint_{\Omega} (\check{v}_{k, \bar{\tau}})_1(x) - x_1 dx = 0.$$

Taking into account (3.49), (3.46), and (3.47) we see that the sequence $k \mapsto \check{v}_{k, \bar{\tau}}$ satisfies the assumptions of Corollary 12. Thus there exists $R_k \in SO(n-1)$ such the sequence of maps v_k , defined by

$$v_k = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & R_k \end{pmatrix}^T (\check{v}_{k, \tau})$$

satisfies (2.26) and Properties 1 to 6 of Theorem 11. Set

$$\tilde{\gamma}_k(x_1) = \check{\gamma}_{\tau}(x_1)$$

and define a parallel orthonormal frame along $\tilde{\gamma}_k$ by

$$\tilde{\nu}_j(x_1) := \sum_{l=2}^n (R_k)_{lj} (\check{\nu}_{\tau})_l(x_1).$$

Since $\tilde{\gamma}_k$ is a unit speed geodesic we have $\text{dist}_{\tilde{M}}(\tilde{\gamma}_k(x_1), \tilde{\gamma}_k(x_1)) \leq \tau \leq Ch_k$. Thus it follows from (3.34) that

$$\sup_{x \in \Omega_{h_k}} \text{dist}(\tilde{v}_k(x), \tilde{\gamma}_k(x_1)) \leq Ch_k. \quad (3.50)$$

Using that $R_k^T R_k = \text{Id}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}(v_k(x)) &= \exp_{\tilde{\gamma}(v_1(x))} \sum_{j=2}^n \tilde{\nu}_j(x_1) \sum_{i=2}^n (R_k)_{ij}(\tilde{v}_{k,\tau})_l(x) \\ &= \exp_{\tilde{\gamma}((\tilde{v}_{k,\tau})_1(x))} \sum_{i,j,l=2}^n (\tilde{\nu}_{k,\tau})_l(x_1) (R_k)_{lj} (R_k)_{ij} \tilde{v}_{k,\tau}(x) \\ &= \psi_{\tilde{\gamma}_\tau, \tilde{\nu}_\tau}(\tilde{v}_{k,\tau}(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Using (3.48) we get

$$\psi_{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}} \circ v_k = \tilde{v}_k \circ \psi \circ I_{h_k}, \quad (3.51)$$

and we have seen that the sequence $k \mapsto v_k$ satisfies (2.26) and Properties 1 to 6 of Theorem 11.

Finally, the compactness of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ implies that the space of framed unit speed geodesics on $(-L, L)$ is compact, since a framed unit speed geodesic $(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu})$ is determined by $\tilde{\gamma}(0)$ and an orthonormal frame in $T_{\gamma(0)}\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ and the geodesic and its frame depend continuously on these data. Thus there exists a subsequence such that $(\tilde{\gamma}_k, \tilde{\nu}_k)$ converges to a framed unit speed geodesic $(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu})$. This concludes the proof of assertion (i) of Theorem 19. \square

Lemma 24 (Approximation of piecewise geodesics by geodesics). *Let $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ be a smooth, compact Riemannian manifold. Let $\delta > 0$ be as in Lemma 4. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ with the following property.*

Let $\gamma_{pw} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ be continuous and assume that there exist $0 < t_1 < \dots < t_J < \infty$ such that $\gamma|_{(t_i, t_{i+1})}$ is a geodesic, for $i = 0, \dots, J$ with $t_0 = 0$ and $t_{J+1} = \infty$. Assume further that

$$|\gamma'(t_j^-) - \gamma'(t_j^+)| \leq F_j \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, J, \quad (3.52)$$

where $\gamma'(t_j^-)$ is the derivative at t_j of the extension of the geodesic defined on (t_{j-1}, t_j) and $\gamma'(t_j^+)$ is the derivative at t_j of the extension of the geodesic defined on (t_j, t_{j+1}) . Assume also that

$$||\gamma'_{pw}(0^+)| - 1| \leq F_0 \quad (3.53)$$

and

$$\sum_{j=0}^J F_j \leq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (3.54)$$

Set

$$\omega(t) := e^{Ct} F_0 + \sum_{k: t_k < t} C e^{C(t-t_k)} F_k. \quad (3.55)$$

Let $\tilde{\gamma} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ be the unit speed geodesic with $\tilde{\gamma}(0) = \gamma_{pw}(0)$ and $\gamma'(0) = \gamma'_{pw}(0^+)/|\gamma'_{pw}(0^+)|$. Then

$$d_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(\gamma_{pw}(t), \tilde{\gamma}(t)) \leq 2\omega(t) \quad \text{if } \omega(t) < \frac{\delta}{4}. \quad (3.56)$$

Proof. This is a natural adaptation of the standard Gronwall type estimate for differences of approximate solutions of the geodesic equation $y'' = \Gamma(y', y') + f$ with $f \in L^1$ to the case where f is a finite sum of Dirac masses.

Since γ_{pw} is a geodesic on (t_i, t_{i+1}) , the speed $|\gamma'_{pw}(t)|$ is constant in this interval. Thus, it follows from (3.52), (3.53), and (3.54) that

$$|\gamma'_{pw}(t)| \leq 2 \quad \text{for } t \notin \{t_1, \dots, t_J\}. \quad (3.57)$$

Set $v = \gamma'_{pw}(0^+)/|\gamma_{pw}(0^+)|$. By (3.53) we have

$$|\gamma'_{pw}(0^+) - v| \leq F_0. \quad (3.58)$$

Let $\tilde{\gamma} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ be the geodesic with

$$\tilde{\gamma}(0) = \gamma_{pw}(0), \quad \tilde{\gamma}'(0) = v.$$

Fix a parallel orthonormal frame $\tilde{\underline{\nu}}$ of the normal bundle of $\tilde{\gamma}$ and let $\tilde{\psi} = \tilde{\psi}_{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\underline{\nu}}}$ be the Fermi coordinate map.

We will show the following: if

$$\sup_{t \in [0, L']} d_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(\gamma_{pw}(t), \tilde{\gamma}(t)) < \delta/2 \quad (3.59)$$

for some $L' > 0$, then

$$d_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(\gamma_{pw}(t), \tilde{\gamma}(t)) \leq 2\omega(t) \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, L']. \quad (3.60)$$

From this the assertion of the lemma follows by the usual continuation argument.

Now assume that (3.59) holds for some $L' > 0$. Let $\tilde{\Phi}$ be the map in the lifting lemma, Lemma 4, and define, for $x_1 \in [0, L')$

$$y_{pw}(x_1) := \tilde{\Phi}(x_1, \gamma_{pw}(x_1)).$$

Then $\tilde{\psi} \circ y_{pw} = \gamma_{pw}$ and y_{pw} satisfies the geodesic equation

$$y''_{pw}(t) = \Gamma(y_{pw}(t))(y'_{pw}(t), y'_{pw}(t)) \quad \text{for } t \in (t_i, t_{i+1}). \quad (3.61)$$

where Γ denotes the Christoffel symbols in Fermi coordinates. The lift of $\tilde{\gamma}$ is given by the trivial map

$$\tilde{y}(t) = (t, 0).$$

Let

$$z(t) = y_{pw}(t) - \tilde{y}(t).$$

In Fermi coordinates we have $\Gamma((t, 0)) = 0$. Since $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is smooth and compact and $|y'_{pw}| \leq 2$, it follows that there exists a constant C which only depends on $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ such that

$$|z''(t)| \leq C|z(t)| \quad \text{for } t \in (t_i, t_{i+1}). \quad (3.62)$$

Considering the vector $\begin{pmatrix} z \\ z' \end{pmatrix}$, we get from the Gronwall inequality

$$\left| \begin{pmatrix} z \\ z' \end{pmatrix}(t) \right| \leq e^{C(t-t_i)} \left| \begin{pmatrix} z \\ z' \end{pmatrix}(t_i^+) \right| \quad \text{if } t \in (t_i, t_{i+1}). \quad (3.63)$$

Moreover, (after enlarging C if necessary) we have

$$\left| \begin{pmatrix} z \\ z' \end{pmatrix}(t_i^+) - \begin{pmatrix} z \\ z' \end{pmatrix}(t_i^-) \right| = |z'(t_j^+) - z'(t_j^-)| \leq CF_k, \quad \left| \begin{pmatrix} z \\ z' \end{pmatrix}(0^+) \right| \leq F_0. \quad (3.64)$$

Note that $|z'(t_j^+) - z'(t_j^-)|$ refers to the Euclidean norm in \mathbb{R}^n while the definition of F_k involves the norm given by the metric on \tilde{M} . Thus the constant C arises from the estimate of the metric in Fermi coordinates. We define

$$\alpha(t) := e^{-Ct} \left| \begin{pmatrix} z \\ z' \end{pmatrix}(t) \right|$$

for $t \notin \{t_1, \dots, t_J\}$ and similarly we define $\alpha(t_j^\pm)$. Then (3.62) and (3.63) imply that

$$\alpha(t) \leq F_0 + \sum_{k \geq 1: t_k \leq t} C e^{-Ct_k} F_k, \quad (3.65)$$

where for $t \in \{t_1, \dots, t_J\}$ the estimate holds for $\alpha(t^-)$ and $\alpha(t^+)$. It follows that

$$|z(t)| \leq \omega(t) \quad \text{for } t \in [0, L').$$

By Lemma 4 we have $|D\tilde{\Phi}| \leq 2$ in a convex set which contains the values of $y_{pw}(t)$ and $\tilde{y}(t)$. Hence

$$d_{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}}(\gamma_{pw}(t), \tilde{\gamma}(t)) \leq 2|z(t)| \leq 2\omega(t).$$

□

4 Convergence of the energy

Define

$$m^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}} := \inf_{(w, y, Z, \beta) \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{I}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}(w, y, Z, \beta).$$

Theorem 25. *Let \mathcal{M} be complete, $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ compact and let $(\gamma, \underline{\nu})$ be a framed unit speed geodesic in \mathcal{M} . Then*

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h^4} \inf_{u \in W^{1,2}(\Omega_h^*; \tilde{\mathcal{M}})} E_h(u) = \bar{m} := \min_{\mathcal{G}} m^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}, \quad (4.1)$$

where \mathcal{G} denotes the set of all framed unit speed geodesics $(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu})$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$.

Proof. This is a standard consequence of Theorem 19. We include the details for the convenience of the reader. First, note that \mathcal{G} is isomorphic to the set $\tilde{\mathcal{M}} \times SO(n)$ and therefore compact.

Consider the map $f : (\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}) \mapsto m^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}$. Clearly f is continuous. Since \mathcal{G} is compact, the minimum on the right hand side of (4.1) exists.

Upper bound: Set $L^+ := \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} h^{-4} \inf_{\tilde{u} \in W^{1,2}(\Omega_h^*; \tilde{\mathcal{M}})} E_h(\tilde{u})$ and let $h_k \rightarrow 0$ be a subsequence which realizes the limit superior. Let $(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu})$ be a framed unit speed geodesic and let $x \in \mathcal{X}$ be a minimizer of $\mathcal{I}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}$. It follows from Theorem 19 (iii) that $L^+ \leq m^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}$. Optimizing over $(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu})$ we get $L^+ \leq \bar{m}$.

Lower bound: Set $L^- := \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} h^{-4} \inf_{\tilde{u} \in W^{1,2}(\Omega_h^*; \tilde{\mathcal{M}})} E_h(\tilde{u})$ and let $h_k \rightarrow 0$ be a subsequence which realizes the limit inferior. Then there exist maps \tilde{u}_k such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{h_k^4} E_{h_k}(\tilde{u}_k) = L^-.$$

By Theorem 19 (i) there exists a subsequence u_{k_j} which converges to $(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}, x)$ with $x \in \mathcal{X}$ in the sense of Definition 13. By Theorem 19 (ii) we have $L^- \geq \mathcal{I}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}(x) \geq \bar{m}$. □

5 Minimization of the limiting functional

Recall that the $\tilde{\mathcal{T}} := \mathcal{T}_{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}^{\tilde{\mathcal{R}}} : (-L, L) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\mathcal{T} := \mathcal{T}_{\gamma, \nu}^{\mathcal{R}} : (-L, L) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ describe the quadratic correction between metric in Fermi coordinates in $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ and \mathcal{M} , respectively, and the Euclidean metric, see (2.7).

Theorem 26. *The infimum of the functional $\mathcal{I}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}$, defined in (3.16), is attained on \mathcal{X} and we have*

$$m^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}} := \min_{(w, y, Z, \beta) \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{I}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}(w, y, Z, \beta) = \min_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \mathcal{J}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}(\beta), \quad (5.1)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}(\beta) &= \int_{-L}^L \int_{B_1(0)} |\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{11}(x_1, x') - \overline{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}_{11}(x_1)|^2 dx' dx_1 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{-L}^L \int_{B_1(0)} \sum_{j=2}^n |\partial_{x_j} \beta_1(x) + \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{1j}(x_1, x')|^2 dx' dx_1 \\ &\quad + \int_{-L}^L \int_{B_1(0)} |\text{sym } \nabla' \beta'(x) + \hat{\mathcal{T}}''(x_1, x')|^2 dx' dx_1, \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

with

$$\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{ij} = \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{ij} - \mathcal{T}_{ij}, \quad (5.3)$$

$$\overline{\hat{\mathcal{T}}}_{11}(x_1) = \int_{B_1(0)} \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{11}(x_1, x') dx', \quad (5.4)$$

and where $\hat{\mathcal{T}}''$ denotes the $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ submatrix of $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ corresponding to the entries $i, j \geq 2$.

It is easy to see that the infimum of the quadratic functional \mathcal{J} is attained, see Proposition 28 below. Since \mathcal{J} is a quadratic functional in β , its minimizers depends linearly on $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$. It follows that $m^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}$ is a quadratic form in the difference of the curvature tensors $\tilde{\mathcal{R}} - \overline{\mathcal{R}}$ along the framed unit speed geodesics (γ, ν) and $(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu})$, respectively. Indeed, the minimization of \mathcal{J} over β can be carried out separately for each x_1 , since the functional does not involve derivatives of β with respect to x_1 . Thus there exists a quadratic form \mathbb{Q} on the space of 4-tensors which satisfy the symmetries of the curvature tensor such that

$$m^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}} = \int_{-L}^L \mathbb{Q}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(x_1) - \overline{\mathcal{R}}(x_1)) dx_1. \quad (5.5)$$

In addition, \mathbb{Q} has the following properties.

Corollary 27. *The quadratic form \mathbb{Q} is positive definite on the space of 4-tensors \mathcal{A} which have the symmetries of the curvature tensor² and on those tensors it can be written as*

$$\mathbb{Q}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbb{Q}_1(\mathcal{A}^{\text{par}}) + \mathbb{Q}_2(\mathcal{A}') + \mathbb{Q}_3(\mathcal{A}''), \quad (5.6)$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_{kl}^{\text{par}} = \mathcal{A}_{1k1l}, \quad \mathcal{A}'_{jkl} = \mathcal{A}_{1kjl}, \quad \mathcal{A}''_{ikjl} = \mathcal{A}_{ikjl}, \quad \text{for } i, j, k, l \geq 2 \quad (5.7)$$

and

$$\mathbb{Q}_1(\mathcal{A}^{\text{par}}) = \frac{1}{2(n+1)(n+3)} |\mathcal{A}^{\text{par}}|^2 - \frac{1}{2(n+1)^2(n+3)} (\text{tr } \mathcal{A}^{\text{par}})^2, \quad (5.8)$$

$$\mathbb{Q}_2(\mathcal{A}') = \min_{b_1} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\{0\} \times B_1(0)} \sum_{j \geq 2} \left(\partial_{x_j} b_1(x') - \frac{1}{3} \mathcal{A}'_{jkl} x'_k x'_l \right)^2 dx', \quad (5.9)$$

²I.e., $\mathcal{A}_{ijkl} = -\mathcal{A}_{jikl} = -\mathcal{A}_{ijlk} = \mathcal{A}_{klij}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{ijkl} + \mathcal{A}_{iklj} + \mathcal{A}_{iljk} = 0$

$$\mathbb{Q}_3(\mathcal{A}'') = \min_{b'} \int_{\{0\} \times B_1(0)} \sum_{i,j \geq 2} \left((\text{sym } \nabla' b')_{ij}(x') - \frac{1}{6} \mathcal{A}''_{ikjl} x'_k x'_l \right) dx'. \quad (5.10)$$

Note that \mathbb{Q}_1 is positive definite since $(\text{tr } \mathcal{A}^{\text{par}})^2 \leq (n-1)|\mathcal{A}^{\text{par}}|^2$.

In particular, we have $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} h^{-4} \inf_{\tilde{u}} E_h(\tilde{u}) = 0$ if and only if $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(x_1) = \overline{\mathcal{R}}(x_1)$ for every $x_1 \in (-L, L)$.

We note that the expression for \mathbb{Q}_3 , which captures the behavior normal to $\tilde{\gamma}$ agrees with the formula for the optimal embedding of $(n-1)$ dimensional balls derived in [8].

We will prove Corollary 27] at the end of this section. We first recall the following classical result which implies that the functional \mathcal{J} attains its minimum.

Proposition 28. *Let $B_1(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and consider the function spaces*

$$\mathcal{B}_1 := \left\{ b \in W^{1,2}(B_1(0)) : \int_{B_1(0)} b dx' = 0 \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{B}' := \left\{ b' \in W^{1,2}(B_1(0); \mathbb{R}^{n-1}) : \int_{B_1(0)} b' dx' = 0, \text{ skew} \left(\int_{B_1(0)} \nabla' b dx \right) = 0 \right\},$$

where $\nabla' = (\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_{n-1}})$. Then the following assertions hold.

1. If $f \in L^2(B_1(0); \mathbb{R}^{n-1})$ and $f' \in L^2(B_1(0); \mathbb{R}^{(n-1) \times (n-1)})$ then there exists a unique $\bar{b}_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1$ and a unique $\bar{b}' \in \mathcal{B}'$ such that

$$\|f + \nabla' \bar{b}_1\|_{L^2} = \min_{b_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1} \|f + \nabla' b_1\|_{L^2}, \quad \|f' + \nabla' \bar{b}'\|_{L^2} = \min_{b' \in \mathcal{B}'} \|f' + \nabla' b'\|_{L^2}.$$

Moreover, the maps $f \mapsto \bar{b}_1$ and $f' \mapsto \bar{b}'$ are linear and $\|\bar{b}_1\|_{L^2} \leq \|\bar{f}\|_{L^2}$ and $\|\bar{b}'\|_{L^2} \leq \|\bar{f}'\|_{L^2}$.

2. If $f' : B_1(0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{(n-1) \times (n-1)}$ is affine and $(f')^T = f'$ then there exists a unique $b' \in \mathcal{B}'$ such that

$$\text{sym}(\nabla' b') = f'.$$

Proof. By the Poincaré inequality the space $\{\nabla' b_1 : b_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1\}$ is a closed subspace of L^2 . Hence \bar{b}_1 is given by the orthogonal projection of $-f$ onto that subspace. Similarly, the space $\{\nabla' b' : b' \in \mathcal{B}'\}$ is a closed subspace of L^2 by the Korn and the Poincaré inequalities and \bar{b}' is the orthogonal projection of $-f'$ onto that subspace. This concludes the proof Assertion 1.

Assertion 2 is well known. Indeed, if $f'_{ij}(x) = A_{ijk} x_k n + a_{ij}$ with $A_{ijk} = A_{jik}$ and $a_{ij} = a_{ji}$, then it suffices to take

$$b'_i(x) = \frac{1}{2} (A_{ijk} - A_{jki} + A_{kij}) x_j x_k + a_{ij} x_j.$$

Uniqueness follows from Korn's inequality. \square

Proof of Theorem 26. It follows from Proposition 28 that attains J its minimum on \mathcal{B} . Indeed, the minimizer $\bar{\beta}$ is given by

$$\bar{\beta}(x_1, x') = \begin{pmatrix} (\bar{b}_{x_1})_1(x') \\ (\bar{b}'_{x_1})_1(x') \end{pmatrix}$$

where $(\bar{b}_{x_1})_1(x') \in \mathcal{B}_1$ is the minimizer in Proposition 28 for $f(x') = (\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{12}(x_1, x'), \dots, \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{1n}(x_1, x'))$ and $(\bar{b}'_{x_1})_1(x') \in \mathcal{B}'$ is the minimizer for $f'(x') = \hat{\mathcal{T}}''(x_1, x')$.

Set

$$\overline{m} = \min_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \mathcal{J}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}(\beta).$$

We next show that $m^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}} \leq \bar{m}$. We first note that for $y = 0, Z = 0$ we have $A = 0$ and

$$\text{sym } G(x) + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(x_1, y(x_1) + x') - \mathcal{T}(x_1) = \text{sym} \left(\left(\begin{pmatrix} \partial_{x_1} w_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \middle| \partial_{x_2} \beta \middle| \dots \middle| \partial_{x_n} \beta \right) + \hat{\mathcal{T}} \right).$$

If we take

$$\partial_{x_1} \bar{w}(x_1) = - \int_{B_1(0)} \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{11}(x_1, x') dx',$$

then we get

$$\begin{aligned} m^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}} &\leq \mathcal{I}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}}(\bar{w}, 0, 0, \bar{\beta}) \\ &= \int_{-L}^L \int_{B_1(0)} \left| \text{sym} \left(\left(\begin{pmatrix} \partial_{x_1} w_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \middle| \partial_{x_2} \bar{\beta} \middle| \dots \middle| \partial_{x_n} \bar{\beta} \right) + \hat{\mathcal{T}} \right) \right|^2 dx' dx_1 \\ &= \mathcal{J}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}}(\bar{\beta}) = \bar{m}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus it suffices to show that $\mathcal{I}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}}(\bar{w}, y, Z, \bar{\beta}) \geq \bar{m}$. Then the infimum of $\mathcal{I}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}}$ is attained by $(\bar{w}, 0, 0, \bar{\beta})$ and $m^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}} = \bar{m}$. To get a lower bound for $\mathcal{I}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}}$ we first note that for each $x_1 \in (-L, L)$ the map

$$x' \mapsto \mathbb{L}(x_1, x') := \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(x_1, y(x_1) + x') - \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(x_1, x') - \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(x_1, y(x_1))$$

is linear, since $z' \mapsto \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(x_1, z')$ is a quadratic form. Recalling the definition of $\mathcal{I}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}}$ in (3.16)–(3.18) we get

$$\mathcal{I}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}}(\bar{w}, y, Z, \bar{\beta}) = \int_{-L}^L \int_{B_1(0)} |F|^2 dx' dx_1$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F(x) &= \begin{pmatrix} F_{11}(x) & (F')^T(x) \\ F'(x) & F'' \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \text{sym} \left((\partial_{x_1} w(x_1)) e_1 + (\partial_{x_1} A(x_1)) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ x' \end{pmatrix} \middle| \partial_{x_2} \beta \middle| \dots \middle| \partial_{x_n} \beta \right) - \frac{1}{2} A^2(x_1) \\ &\quad + \hat{\mathcal{T}}(x) + \mathbb{L}(x_1, x') + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(x_1, y(x_1)). \end{aligned}$$

If $f : B_1(0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is symmetric, i.e., $f(-x) = f(x)$ and $\hat{f} : B_1(0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is antisymmetric then $\int_{B_1(0)} f \hat{f} dx' = 0$. Moreover

$$\int_{B_1(0)} |f|^2 dx' \geq \int_{B_1(0)} \left| f - \int_{B_1(0)} f \right|^2 dx'.$$

Thus we get

$$\int_{B_1(0)} F_{11}^2(x_1, x') dx' \geq \int_{B_1(0)} \left| \hat{\mathcal{T}}(x_1, x') - \int_{B_1(0)} \hat{\mathcal{T}}(x_1, x') dx' \right|^2 dx'. \quad (5.11)$$

To estimate F' , define the symmetric and antisymmetric part of a map $f' : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ by $2f'_s(x_1, x') = f'(x_1, x') + f(x_1, x')$ and $2f'_a(x_1, x') = f'(x_1, x') - f(x_1, x')$ so that $f' = f'_s + f'_a$. Then we get

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \int_{B_1(0)} |F'(x_1, x')|^2 dx' &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_1(0)} |(\nabla' \beta_1)_s(x_1, x') + c(x_1) + \hat{\mathcal{T}}'(x_1, x')|^2 dx' \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \min_{\hat{\beta}_1} \int_{B_1(0)} |\nabla' \hat{\beta}_1(x_1, x') + \hat{\mathcal{T}}'(x_1, x')|^2 dx'. \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

For the second inequality it suffices to note that the function

$$\hat{\beta}(x) := \frac{1}{2} (\beta(x_1, x') - \beta(x_1, -x')) + c(x_1)x'$$

satisfies $\nabla' \hat{\beta} = (\nabla' \beta)_s(x_1, x') + c(x_1)$.

Finally, to estimate F'' we use that by Assertion 2 in Proposition 28 there exists a $\check{\beta}' : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ such that

$$\text{sym } \nabla' \check{\beta}'(x_1, x') = \left[-\frac{1}{2} A^2(x_1) + \mathbb{L}(x_1, x') + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(x_1) \right]''.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_1(0)} |F''(x_1, x')|^2 dx' &\geq \int_{B_1(0)} |\text{sym } \nabla' \beta'(x_1, x') + \text{sym } \nabla' \check{\beta}'(x_1, x') + \hat{\mathcal{T}}(x_1, x')|^2 dx' \\ &\geq \min_{\check{\beta}'} \int_{B_1(0)} |\nabla' \hat{\beta}'(x_1, x') + \hat{\mathcal{T}}''(x_1, x')|^2 dx'. \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

Now it follows from (5.11), (5.12), and (5.13) that $\mathcal{I}^{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}}(\bar{w}, y, Z, \bar{\beta}) \geq \bar{m}$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 26. \square

Proof of Corollary 27. The last statement follows from the fact that \mathbb{Q} is positive definite on the space of tensors which have the symmetries of the curvature tensor and Theorem 25.

The formula (5.6) and the expressions (5.9) and (5.10) for \mathbb{Q}_2 and \mathbb{Q}_3 follow from the formula (5.2) for \mathcal{J} in Theorem 26 and the formulae for \mathcal{T} and $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ in (2.7). For \mathbb{Q}_1 we get

$$\mathbb{Q}_1(\mathcal{A}^{\text{par}}) = \int_{\{0\} \times B_1(0)} \frac{1}{4} |\mathcal{A}_{kl}^{\text{par}} x'_k x'_l - c|^2 = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\{0\} \times B_1(0)} |\mathcal{A}_{kl}^{\text{par}} x'_k x'_l|^2 - \frac{1}{4} c^2, \quad (5.14)$$

with

$$c = \int_{\{0\} \times B_1(0)} \mathcal{A}_{kl}^{\text{par}} x'_k x'_l dx'. \quad (5.15)$$

To show the identity

$$\mathbb{Q}_1(\mathcal{A}^{\text{par}}) = \frac{1}{2(n+1)(n+3)} |\mathcal{A}^{\text{par}}|^2 - \frac{1}{2(n+1)^2(n+3)} (\text{tr } \mathcal{A}^{\text{par}})^2, \quad (5.16)$$

for the symmetric matrix \mathcal{A}^{par} , we first note that it suffices to show this identity for diagonal matrices, since both sides are invariant under orthogonal transformations $\mathcal{A}^{\text{par}} \mapsto Q^{-1} \mathcal{A}^{\text{par}} Q$ with $Q \in SO(n)$. Here we use that the measure $n-1$ dimensional Lebesgue measure on $B_1(0)$ is invariant under the action of Q . For diagonal matrices D , the map $D \mapsto \mathbb{Q}_1(D)$ is a quadratic form of the diagonal entries (d_1, \dots, d_{n-1}) which is invariant under permutation of the d_i . Thus \mathbb{Q}_1 is of the form

$$\mathbb{Q}_1(D) = \alpha \sum_i d_i^2 + \beta (\sum_i d_i)^2 = \alpha |D|^2 + \beta (\text{tr } D)^2.$$

To determine α and β , we set $m = n-1$ and use that

$$I_2 := \int_{\{0\} \times B_1(0)} x_j'^2 dx' = \frac{1}{m} \int_{B_1(0)} |x'|^2 dx' = \frac{1}{m+2}.$$

and (see below for a proof)

$$I_4 := \int_{\{0\} \times B_1(0)} (x_j')^4 dx' = \frac{3}{(m+2)(m+4)} \quad (5.17)$$

Now the definition of \mathbb{Q}_1 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} 4(m\alpha + m^2\beta) &= 4\mathbb{Q}_1(\text{Id}) = \oint_{\{0\} \times B_1(0)} |x'|^4 dx' - (mI_2)^2 = \frac{m}{m+4} - \frac{m^2}{(m+2)^2} \\ &= \frac{4m}{(m+2)^2(m+4)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

and

$$4(\alpha + \beta) = 4\mathbb{Q}_1(e_1 \otimes e_1) = I_4 - I_2^2 = \frac{3(m+2)}{(m+2)^2(m+4)} - \frac{m+4}{(m+2)^2(m+4)} \quad (5.19)$$

$$= \frac{2m+2}{(m+2)^2(m+4)}. \quad (5.20)$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} 4\beta &= \frac{1}{m-1} \frac{4-2m-2}{(m+2)^2(m+4)} = -\frac{2}{(m+2)^2(m+4)}, \\ 4\alpha &= \frac{2m+4}{(m+2)^2(m+4)} = \frac{2}{(m+2)(m+4)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $m = (n-1)$, this is equivalent to the desired identity (5.16).

It only remains to show the identity (5.17) for I_4 . Denote by B_R^m the open ball of radius R in \mathbb{R}^m and set

$$\omega_m := \mathcal{L}^m(B_1^m), \quad a_k = \int_0^{\pi/2} \cos^k t \, dt.$$

Using the substitution $r = \sin t$, we get

$$\omega_m = \int_{B_1^m} 1 \, dy = \int_0^1 1 \int_{B_{\sqrt{1-r^2}}^{m-1}} dy' \, dr = \int_0^1 (1-r^2)^{(m-1)/2} \omega_{m-1} \, dr = \omega_{m-1} a_m.$$

Using that $\sin^4 t = (1 - \cos^2 t)^2 = 1 - 2\cos^2 t + \cos^4 t$, we get similarly.

$$\begin{aligned} \omega I_4 &= \int_{B_1^m} y_1^4 \, dx = \int_0^1 r^4 \int_{B_{\sqrt{1-r^2}}^{m-1}} dy' \, dr = \int_0^1 r^4 (1-r^2)^{(m-1)/2} \omega_{m-1} \, dr \\ &= \int_0^1 \sin^4 t \cos^m t \, dt = a_{m+4} - 2a_{m+2} + a_m. \end{aligned}$$

Integration by parts and the identity $\sin^2 t = 1 - \cos^2 t$ give, for $k \geq 2$,

$$a_k = \int_0^{\pi/2} \cos^{k-1} t \cos t \, dt = \int_0^{\pi/2} (k-1) \cos^{k-2} t \sin t \sin t \, dt = (k-1)(a_{k-2} - a_k).$$

Thus $a_k = \frac{k-1}{k} a_{k-2}$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} I_4 &= \frac{a_{m+4} - 2a_{m+2} + a_m}{a_m} = \frac{m+3}{m+4} \frac{m+1}{m+2} - 2 \frac{m+1}{m+2} + 1 \\ &= \frac{(m+3)(m+1) - 2(m+1)(m+4) + (m+2)(m+4)}{(m+2)(m+4)} \\ &= \frac{3}{(m+2)(m+4)}. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of (5.17).

We now show that \mathbb{Q} is positive definite (on the space of tensors which satisfy the symmetries of the curvature tensor). It follows from the definition of the quadratic forms \mathbb{Q}_i , that \mathbb{Q} is positive semidefinite on that space. To prove positive definiteness, assume that $\mathbb{Q}(\mathcal{A}) = 0$. Then

$$\mathbb{Q}_1(\mathcal{A}^{\text{par}}) = 0, \quad \mathbb{Q}_2(\mathcal{A}') = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{Q}_3(\mathcal{A}'') = 0.$$

By (5.16), we get $\mathcal{A}^{\text{par}} = 0$. The condition $\mathbb{Q}_2(\mathcal{A}') = 0$ implies that there exists a β_1 such that

$$-3\partial_{x_j}\beta_1 = \mathcal{A}_{1kj}x_kx_l \quad \text{on } \{0\} \times B_1(0)$$

and thus

$$-3\partial_{x_m}\partial_{x_j}\beta_1 = \mathcal{A}_{1mjl}x_l + \mathcal{A}_{1ljm}x_l.$$

Since the second derivatives are symmetric this gives

$$0 = \mathcal{A}_{1mjl} + \mathcal{A}_{1ljm} - \mathcal{A}_{1jml} - \mathcal{A}_{1lmj}.$$

Now $-\mathcal{A}_{1lmj} = \mathcal{A}_{1ljm}$ and

$$0 = \mathcal{A}_{1ljm} + \mathcal{A}_{1jml} + \mathcal{A}_{1mlj} = \mathcal{A}_{1ljm} - (-\mathcal{A}_{1jml} + \mathcal{A}_{1mjl}).$$

Thus $\mathcal{A}_{1mjl} - \mathcal{A}_{1jml} = \mathcal{A}_{1ljm}$ and hence $\mathcal{A}_{1mlj} = 0$, for all $m, l, j \geq 2$.

Finally, using the compatibility conditions for a symmetrized gradient one easily concludes that $\mathbb{Q}_3(\mathcal{A}'') = 0$ implies that $\mathcal{A}'' = 0$, see, for example, [14] or [8]. \square

6 Uniqueness of the limit in $\mathcal{X}^{\mathcal{G}}/\sim$

In this section we prove Proposition 16. In Proposition 16 two things vary. We have two uniformly Lipschitz maps \hat{v} and \check{v} which agree on a large set and we consider the lift with respect to two different framed geodesics. Thus Proposition 16 will follow from Propositions 29 and 30 below, where we consider separately the effects of changing \hat{v} to \check{v} and of the lift with respect to two different framed geodesics.

Proposition 29. *Suppose that there exist Lipschitz maps \hat{v} and \check{v} from $\Omega_{h_k}^* = \psi(\Omega_{h_k})$ to $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ with the following properties:*

$$\sup_k \max(\text{Lip } \hat{v}_k, \text{Lip } \check{v}_k) \leq l, \quad (6.1)$$

$$\sup_k \frac{1}{h_k^4} \frac{\mu \left\{ x \in \Omega_{h_k}^* : \hat{v}_k(x) \neq \check{v}_k(x) \right\}}{\mu(\Omega_{h_k})} < \infty, \quad (6.2)$$

where μ is the volume measure on \mathcal{M} . Then

$$\sup_{x \in \Omega_{h_k}^*} \text{dist}(\hat{v}(x), \check{v}(x)) \leq Ch_k^{1+3/n}. \quad (6.3)$$

If, in addition, there exist framed unit speed geodesics $(\check{\gamma}_k, \check{\nu}_k)$ such that

$$\sup_k \frac{1}{h_k} \text{dist}(\check{v}_k \circ \psi(x), \check{\gamma}_k(x_1)) < \infty. \quad (6.4)$$

and if the lifts $\check{v}_k : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ defined by

$$\check{\psi}_k \circ \check{v}_k = \check{v}_k \circ \psi \circ I_{h_k}$$

satisfy Properties 1 to 6 of Theorem 11, then the lifts $\hat{v}_k : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ defined by

$$\hat{\psi}_k \circ \hat{v}_k = \hat{v}_k \circ \psi \circ I_{h_k}$$

exist and

$$\|\hat{v}_k - \check{v}_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq Ch_k^{3+3/n}. \quad (6.5)$$

Moreover, \hat{v}_k also satisfy Properties 1 to 6 of Theorem 11 and

$$(\hat{w}, \hat{y}, \hat{Z}, \hat{\beta}) = (\check{w}, \check{y}, \check{Z}, \check{\beta}). \quad (6.6)$$

Proof of Proposition 29. It follows from (6.2) that

$$\mu \{x \in \Omega_{h_k}^* : \hat{v}_k(x) \neq \check{v}_k(x)\} = \mathcal{O}(h_k^{n-1+4}).$$

Thus the radius of the largest ball in $\{x \in \Omega_{h_k}^* : \hat{v}_k(x) \neq \check{v}_k(x)\}$ is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(h_k^{1+3/n})$. Together with (6.1) this implies (6.3).

Thus

$$\sup_k \frac{1}{h_k} \text{dist}(\hat{v}_k \circ \psi(x), \check{\gamma}_k(x_1)) < \infty$$

and therefore the lift \hat{v}_k exists and

$$\sup_{x \in \Omega} |\hat{v}_k(x) - \check{v}_k(x)| \leq Ch_k^{1+3/n},$$

$$\mathcal{L}^n(\{x \in \Omega : \hat{v}_k(x) \neq \check{v}_k(x)\}) \leq Ch_k^4.$$

These two estimates imply (6.5). It follows from (6.5) that

$$\frac{1}{h_k^2} \|\hat{y}^k - \check{y}^k\|_{L^2} + \frac{1}{h_k} \|\hat{w}_k - \check{w}_k\|_{L^2} + \frac{1}{h_k} \|\hat{Z} - \check{Z}\|_{L^2} + \|\hat{\beta} - \check{\beta}\|_{L^2} \leq Ch_k^{3/n}.$$

This implies (6.6). \square

We now come to the heart of the matter, the change of the limits under the change of framed geodesics.

Proposition 30. *Let $\psi = \psi_{\gamma, \underline{\nu}}$ and let \tilde{v}_k be a sequence of Lipschitz maps from $\Omega_{h_k}^* = \psi(\Omega_{h_k})$ to $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ with $\sup_k \text{Lip } \tilde{v}_k \leq l$. Assume that there exist framed unit speed geodesics $(\hat{\gamma}_k, \hat{\nu}_k)$ and $(\check{\gamma}_k, \check{\nu}_k)$ such that*

$$\sup_k \frac{1}{h_k} \sup_{x \in \Omega_{h_k}} \text{dist}(\tilde{v}_k \circ \psi(x), \hat{\gamma}_k(x_1)) + \frac{1}{h_k} \sup_{x \in \Omega_{h_k}} \text{dist}(\tilde{v}_k \circ \psi(x), \check{\gamma}_k(x_1)) < \infty. \quad (6.7)$$

Then there exist lifts $\hat{v}_k : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\check{v}_k : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\hat{\psi}_k \circ \hat{v}_k = \tilde{v}_k \circ \psi \circ I_{h_k}, \quad \check{\psi}_k \circ \check{v}_k = \tilde{v}_k \circ \psi \circ I_{h_k},$$

where $\hat{\psi}_k$ and $\check{\psi}_k$ are the Fermi coordinate maps for the framed geodesics $(\hat{\gamma}_k, \hat{\nu}_k)$ and $(\check{\gamma}_k, \check{\nu}_k)$, respectively, and where $I_{h_k}(x_1, x') = (x_1, h_k x')$. Assume that \hat{v}_k and \check{v}_k satisfy Properties 1 to 6 of Theorem 11 and let $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\nu}, \hat{w}, \hat{y}, \hat{Z}, \hat{\beta})$ and $(\check{\gamma}, \check{\nu}, \check{w}, \check{y}, \check{Z}, \check{\beta})$ denote the corresponding limits defined in Definition 13.

Then

$$(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\nu}) = (\check{\gamma}, \check{\nu}) \quad (6.8)$$

and there exists a Jacobi field $J : (-L, L) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and an infinitesimal change of frame map $B : (-L, L) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{skew}^{n \times n}$ such that

$$J_1 = 0, \quad B e_1 = \partial_1 J, \quad (6.9)$$

$$\partial_{x_1}^2 J = -\bar{\mathcal{R}}(J, e_1) e_1, \quad (6.10)$$

and

$$\partial_{x_1} B = -\bar{\mathcal{R}}(J, e_1) \quad (6.11)$$

such that for $j, l \geq 2$,

$$\hat{Z}_{jl} = \check{Z}_{jl} + B_{jl}, \quad (6.12)$$

$$\hat{y} = \check{y} + J, \quad (6.13)$$

$$\partial_{x_1} \hat{w}(x_1) + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{11}(x_1, \hat{y}(x_1)) = \partial_{x_1} \check{w}(x_1) + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{11}(x_1, \check{y}(x_1))$$

$$+\frac{1}{2}(\hat{A}^2 - \check{A}^2)_{11}(x_1), \quad (6.14)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x_j} \hat{\beta}_1(x_1, x') + 2\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{1j}(x_1, \hat{y}(x_1) + x') &= \nabla' \hat{\beta}_1(x) + 2\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{1j}(x_1, \check{y}(x_1) + x') \\ e_j \cdot \partial_{x_1}(\check{Z} - \hat{Z})(x_1)x' + (\hat{A}^2 - \check{A}^2)_{1j}(x_1) & \end{aligned} \quad (6.15)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{sym } \nabla' \hat{\beta}')_{jl}(x_1, x') + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{jl}(x_1, \hat{y}(x_1) + x') &= (\text{sym } \nabla' \hat{\beta}')_{jl}(x_1, x') + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{jl}(x_1, \check{y}(x_1) + x') \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}(\hat{A}^2 - \check{A}^2)_{jl}(x_1), \end{aligned} \quad (6.16)$$

where $\nabla' = (\partial_{x_2}, \dots, \partial_{x_n})$, $\beta' = (\beta_2, \dots, \beta_n)$ and

$$\hat{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -(\partial_{x_1} \hat{y})^T \\ \partial_{x_1} \hat{y} & \hat{Z} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \check{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -(\partial_{x_1} \check{y})^T \\ \partial_{x_1} \check{y} & \check{Z} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here we used the abbreviation $\tilde{\mathcal{T}} = \mathcal{T}_{\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}}^{\tilde{\mathcal{R}}}$ with $(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu}) := (\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\nu}) = (\check{\gamma}, \check{\nu})$.

Proof. It follows from (6.7) that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x_1 \in (-L, L)} \text{dist}(\hat{\gamma}_k(x_1), \check{\gamma}_k(x_1)) = 0$. Hence $\hat{\gamma} = \check{\gamma}$ and we will write

$$\tilde{\gamma} := \hat{\gamma} = \check{\gamma}.$$

To prove the other assertions in Proposition 30, we will show in Proposition 31 below that there exists a lift $\Phi_k : \Omega_{Ch_k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\check{\psi}_k = \hat{\psi}_k \circ \Phi_k$$

and Φ_k is well behaved, in particular $|D^2 \Phi_k| = \mathcal{O}(h_k)$ and $\text{dist}(D\Phi_k, SO(n)) = \mathcal{O}(h_k^2)$ on Ω_{Ch_k} . It follows from the definition of Φ_k that $\hat{\psi}_k \circ \hat{v}_k = \check{\psi}_k \circ \check{v}_k = \hat{\psi}_k \circ \Phi_k \circ \check{v}_k$ and hence

$$\hat{v}_k = \Phi_k \circ \check{v}_k. \quad (6.17)$$

The convergence properties of \hat{v}_k and \check{v}_k will imply that $h_k^{-1}(D\Phi_k - \text{Id})$ is bounded in L^2 , and in Proposition 32 we analyze the limits of $h_k^{-1}(D\Phi_k - \text{Id})$ and $h_k^{-2}[(D\Phi_k^T D\Phi_k) - \text{Id}]$ and show (6.9)–(6.11).

The formulae (6.12)–(6.16) then follow from Proposition 33 below. \square

Proposition 31. *Let $(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}, \tilde{g})$ be a smooth, oriented, compact Riemannian manifold. Let $L > 0$ and $C > 0$. Then there exists a constant $C' > 0$ with the following property. Let $h_k > 0$ with $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_k = 0$, and let $\hat{\gamma}_k$ and $\check{\gamma}_k$ be unit speed geodesics in $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ with*

$$\text{dist}(\hat{\gamma}_k(x_1), \check{\gamma}_k(x_1)) \leq Ch_k \quad \text{for } x_1 \in (-L, L). \quad (6.18)$$

Let $\hat{\nu}_k$ and $\check{\nu}_k$ be positively oriented orthonormal parallel frames of the normal bundles of $\hat{\gamma}_k$ and $\check{\gamma}_k$, respectively, and let $\hat{\psi}_k$ and $\check{\psi}_k$ denote the corresponding Fermi coordinate maps.

Then for $k \geq k_0$ there exists a $\rho > 0$ a unique map $\Phi_k : (-2L, 2L) \times B_\rho(0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\check{\psi}_k = \hat{\psi}_k \circ \Phi_k.$$

Moreover, Φ_k is a smooth diffeomorphism onto its image and, for $x \in (-2L, 2L) \times B_{Ch_k}(0)$,

$$\text{dist}(D\Phi_k(x), SO(n)) \leq C'h_k^2, \quad (6.19)$$

$$|D^2 \Phi_k(x)| \leq C'h_k. \quad (6.20)$$

Proof. In the course of the proof we denote all constants which depend only on C , L , and the manifold $(\tilde{\mathcal{M}}, \tilde{g})$ by C' .

Since $\hat{\gamma}_k$ and $\check{\gamma}_k$ are geodesics, a Gronwall type argument shows that the estimate (6.18) also holds on $(-3L, 3L)$ with a different constant C' .

The existence of Φ_k (for the interval $(-3L, 3L)$) implies

$$|\Phi_k(x_1, 0) - (x_1, 0)| \leq C'h_k, \quad (6.21)$$

since the maps Φ_k are uniformly bilipschitz. It follows that Φ_k maps $(-2L, 2L) \times B_{Ch_k}(0)$ to a subset of $(-3L, 3L) \times B_{C'h_k}(0)$.

We denote by $\hat{g}_k := \hat{\psi}_k^* \tilde{g}$ the pullback of the metric in $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ and we write $\hat{\Gamma}_k$ for the Christoffel symbols of \hat{g}_k . Analogously we define \check{g}_k and $\check{\Gamma}_k$. To prove (6.19), we use that

$$\check{g}_k = \Phi_k^* \hat{g}_k. \quad (6.22)$$

If $|z'| \leq Ch_k$ then the estimates for the metric in Fermi coordinates gives

$$\delta_{ij} + \mathcal{O}(h_k^2) = \check{g}_k(z)(e_i, e_j) = \hat{g}_k(\Phi_k(z))(D\Phi_k e_i, D\Phi_k e_j) = (D\Phi_k(z))^T D\Phi_k(z))_{ij} + \mathcal{O}(h_k^2)$$

and this implies (6.19).

Similarly, the estimate (6.20) for $D^2\Phi_k$ follows from the estimates of the Christoffel symbols in Fermi coordinates. If we consider the curve $\alpha(t) = x + tv$ and express the covariant derivative of the vector field $W(t) := D\psi(\alpha(t))w = (D\psi \circ \Phi_k(\alpha(t)))D\Phi_k(\alpha(t))w$ along the curve $\psi \circ \alpha$ in both Fermi coordinates we get

$$D^2\Phi_k(x)(v, w) + \hat{\Gamma}_k(\Phi_k(x))(D\Phi_k(x)v, D\Phi_k(x)w) = D\Phi_k(x)(\check{\Gamma}_k(x)(v, w)), \quad (6.23)$$

By Lemma 3 the Christoffel symbols are bounded by $C|x'|$. Thus we get (6.20). \square

Proposition 32. *Assume that the hypotheses of Proposition 31 hold. Set*

$$\eta_k(x_1) := \Phi_k(x_1, 0), \quad Q_k(x_1) := D\Phi_k(x_1, 0).$$

and assume that, in addition,

$$B_k := \frac{Q_k - \text{Id}}{h_k} \quad \text{is bounded} \quad (6.24)$$

and $(\hat{\gamma}_k, \hat{\nu}_k)$ converges to $(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu})$ on $(-L, L)$. Then for subsequences (not relabeled) we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{h_k} \left(\eta_k(x_1) - \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) &\rightarrow J, \quad B_k \rightarrow B, \quad \text{uniformly,} \\ B e_1 &= \partial_{x_1} J e_1, \quad B^T = -B, \end{aligned} \quad (6.25)$$

and

$$\partial_{x_1}^2 J(x_1) = -\bar{\mathcal{R}}(x_1)(J(x_1), e_1) e_1, \quad (6.26)$$

$$\partial_{x_1} B(x_1) = -\bar{\mathcal{R}}(x_1)(J(x_1), e_1). \quad (6.27)$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(D\Phi_k(z_1, h_k z'))^T D\Phi_k(z_1, h_k z')) - \text{Id}}{h_k^2} &\rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(z_1, z') - \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(z_1, J'(x_1) + z') \\ &\text{uniformly on } (-2L, 2L) \times B_C(0), \end{aligned} \quad (6.28)$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{T}} := \mathcal{T}^{\bar{\mathcal{R}}}$.

Proof. Let $J_k(x_1) = h_k^{-1}(\eta_k(x_1) - (x_1, 0))$. Then J_k is bounded in C^1 by (6.21) and (6.24). The geodesic equation for η_k can be rewritten as

$$\partial_{x_1}^2 J_k = -\frac{1}{h_k} \hat{\Gamma}_k((x_1 e_1 + h_k J_k)(e_1 + h_k \partial_{x_1} J_k, e_1 + h_k \partial_{x_1} J_k).$$

Since $\hat{\Gamma}_k(x_1, 0) = 0$ and $|\hat{\Gamma}_k((x_1 e_1 + h_k J_k)| \leq Ch_k |J_k|$ by Lemma 3, it follows that J_k is bounded in C^2 . Hence a subsequence converges in C^1 and by (2.6) the limit J satisfies

$$\partial_{x_1}^2 J = -D\Gamma_{11}(x_1, 0)(J) = -\bar{R}(J, e_1)e_1. \quad (6.29)$$

By the definition of the Fermi coordinates $\check{\psi}_k$, the vector fields

$$Q_k(x_1)e_j = D\Phi_k(\eta_k(x_1))e_j = D\check{\psi}_k(x_1, 0)e_j$$

are parallel. Since $Q_k = \text{Id} + h_k B_k$ we get

$$\partial_{x_1} B_k(x_1)e_j = \frac{1}{h_k} \partial_{x_1} Q_k(x_1)e_j = -\frac{1}{h_k} \Gamma(\eta_k(x_1))(e_1, e_j + h_k B_k(x_1)e_j).$$

Using again (2.6), we see that

$$\partial_{x_1} B(x_1)e_j = -\bar{\mathcal{R}}(x_1)(J(x_1), e_1)e_j.$$

or, equivalently $\partial_{x_1} B(x_1) = -\bar{\mathcal{R}}(x_1)(J(x_1), e_1)$. This proves (6.27). The first identity in (6.25) follows from the fact that $B_k e_1 = h_k^{-1}(Q_k e_1 - e_1) = \partial_{x_1} h_k^{-1}(\eta_k - x_1)$. The skew symmetry of B follows from the fact that $\text{Id} + 2h_k \text{sym } B_k + B_k^T B_k = Q_k^T Q_k = \text{Id} + \mathcal{O}(h_k^2)$.

To show (6.28), we use that $\check{\psi}_k = \hat{\psi}_k \circ \Phi_k$ implies $\check{g}_k = \Phi_k^* \hat{g}_k$. Let $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_k = \hat{\psi}_k^* \tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ be the curvature tensor in the Fermi coordinates $\hat{\psi}_k$ and let $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k(x_1, x') := \mathcal{T}_{\hat{\gamma}_k, \hat{\nu}_k}^{\tilde{\mathcal{R}}}(x_1, x')$ denote the quadratic form in x' which describes the deviation of the metric $\hat{g}_k = \hat{\psi}_k^* \tilde{g}$ from the Euclidean metric (see (2.7) for the definition of this quadratic form). The quadratic form $x' \mapsto \check{\mathcal{T}}_k(x_1, x')$ is defined analogously.

Since $\check{g}_k = \Phi_k^* \hat{g}_k$ we have

$$\check{g}_k(z)(e_i, e_j) = \hat{g}_k(\Phi_k(z))(D\Phi_k e_i, D\Phi_k e_j).$$

Thus, for $|z'| \leq Ch_k$ we get

$$\delta_{ij} + (\check{\mathcal{T}}_k)_{ij}(z_1, z') + \mathcal{O}(h_k^3) = (D\Phi_k(z))^T D\Phi_k(z))_{ij} + (\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k)_{ij}(\Phi_k(z)) + \mathcal{O}(h_k^3).$$

Here we used that $D\Phi_k(z) = \text{Id} + \mathcal{O}(h_k)$. Now the pull back curvature tensors $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_k$ and $\check{\mathcal{R}}_k$ only differ by $\mathcal{O}(h_k)$ since $D\Phi_k = \text{Id} + \mathcal{O}(h_k)$ and $\Phi_k(z) - z = \mathcal{O}(h_k)$. Hence

$$(\check{\mathcal{T}}_k)_{ij}(z_1, z') = (\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k)_{ij}(z_1, z') + \mathcal{O}(h_k^3),$$

for $z' = \mathcal{O}(h_k)$. Also

$$(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k)_{ij}(\Phi_k(z)_1, \Phi'_k(z)) = (\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k)_{ij}(z_1, \Phi'_k(z)) + \mathcal{O}(h_k^3).$$

Thus

$$(D\Phi_k(z))^T D\Phi_k(z)) - \text{Id} = \hat{\mathcal{T}}_k(z_1, z') - \hat{\mathcal{T}}_k(z_1, \Phi'_k(z)) + \mathcal{O}(h_k^3).$$

Since $D\Phi_k - \text{Id} = \mathcal{O}(h_k)$ and $\Phi_k(z_1, 0) = \eta_k(z_1)$ we have

$$\Phi'_k(z) = \eta'_k(z_1) + z' + \mathcal{O}(h_k^2)$$

and therefore

$$\frac{(D\Phi_k(z))^T D\Phi_k(z) - \text{Id}}{h_k^2} = \hat{\mathcal{T}}_k(z_1, h_k^{-1}z') - \hat{\mathcal{T}}_k(z_1, h_k^{-1}\eta'_k(z_1) + h_k^{-1}z') + \mathcal{O}(h_k).$$

Using that $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k$ is a quadratic form in the second argument and that $h_k^{-1}\eta'_k \rightarrow J'$ uniformly we get

$$\frac{(D\Phi_k(z))^T D\Phi_k(z) - \text{Id}}{h_k} = -\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k(z_1, h_k^{-1}z') - \hat{\mathcal{T}}_k(z_1, J'(x_1) + h_k^{-1}z') + o(1).$$

The pullback curvature tensors $\hat{\psi}_k^* \tilde{R}$ converge to $\tilde{\psi}^* \tilde{R}$ uniformly on thin cylinders since $(\hat{\gamma}_k, \hat{\nu}_k)$ converges to $(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\nu})$ (note that this also implies the convergence of $\hat{\gamma}'_k$ to $\tilde{\gamma}'$). Thus the quadratic forms $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_k(x_1)$ converge to $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}(x_1)$ uniformly, and we get (6.28). \square

Proposition 33. *Let $\Omega = (-L, L) \times B_1(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Let Φ_k be as in Propositions 31 and 32 and suppose that $\hat{v}_k : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\check{v}_k : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfy properties 1. to 6. of Theorem 11 and assume that*

$$|\check{v}_k(x) - (x_1, 0)| + |\hat{v}_k(x) - (x_1, 0)| \leq Ch_k.$$

Assume further that $\hat{v}_k = \Phi_k \circ \check{v}_k$. Let $\eta_k(x_1) = \Phi_k(x_1, 0)$ and $Q_k(x_1) = D\Phi_k(x_1, 0)$ be as in Proposition 32. Then

$$B_k(x_1) := \frac{Q_k(x_1) - \text{Id}}{h_k} \rightarrow B(x_1), \quad (6.30)$$

$$\frac{\eta_k(x_1) - x_1}{h_k} \rightarrow J(x_1) \quad (6.31)$$

uniformly, as $k \rightarrow \infty$. In addition, $J_1 = 0$ and J and B satisfy (6.26) and (6.27), respectively.

Moreover, the limits $(\check{w}, \check{y}, \check{Z}, \check{\beta})$ and $(\hat{w}, \hat{y}, \hat{Z}, \hat{\beta})$ satisfy (6.12)–(6.16).

Proof. First, we show that

$$B_k(x_1) = \frac{D\Phi_k(x_1, 0) - \text{Id}}{h_k} \rightarrow \hat{A}(x_1) - \check{A}(x_1)$$

and $\hat{\nu} = \check{\nu}$.

We have $d_{h_k} \hat{v}_k = (D\Phi_k \circ \check{v}_k) D\check{v}_k$ and thus

$$\frac{d_{h_k} \hat{v}_k - \text{Id}}{h_k} = \frac{D\Phi_k \circ \check{v}_k - \text{Id}}{h_k} + D\Phi_k \circ \check{v}_k \frac{d_{h_k} \check{v}_k - \text{Id}}{h_k}. \quad (6.32)$$

By Property 4 of Theorem 11 we have

$$\frac{d_{h_k} \check{v}_k - \text{Id}}{h_k} \rightarrow \check{A}, \quad \frac{d_{h_k} \hat{v}_k - \text{Id}}{h_k} \rightarrow \hat{A} \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega).$$

Since $D\Phi_k$ is bounded, it follows from (6.32) that $h_k^{-1}(D\Phi_k \circ \check{v}_k - \text{Id})$ is bounded in $L^2(\Omega)$ and hence

$$D\Phi_k \circ \check{v}_k \rightarrow \text{Id} \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega).$$

Thus

$$\frac{D\Phi_k \circ \check{v}_k - \text{Id}}{h_k} \rightarrow \hat{A} - \check{A} \quad \text{in } L^1(\Omega). \quad (6.33)$$

By assumption, $|\check{v}_k(x) - (x_1, 0)| \leq Ch_k$. Moreover, by (6.20), we know that $h_k^{-1}|D^2\Phi_k(z_1, z')|$ is bounded if $|z'| \leq Ch_k$. Thus

$$|(D\Phi_k \circ \check{v}_k)(x) - B_k(x_1)| = |D\Phi_k(\check{v}_k(x)) - D\Phi_k(x_1, 0)| \leq Ch_k |\check{v}_k(x) - (x_1, 0)| \leq Ch_k^2.$$

Therefore $h_k^{-1}(D\Phi_k \circ \check{v}_k - B_k) \rightarrow 0$ uniformly and hence

$$B_k \rightarrow B \quad \text{in } L^1((-L, L)) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{A} - \check{A} = B. \quad (6.34)$$

Since $|\partial_{x_1} B_k(x_1)| \leq h_k^{-1} |D^2 \Phi_k(x_1, 0)|$ is bounded, we have $B_k \rightarrow B$ uniformly. By Proposition 32, B satisfies (6.27) and is skew symmetric. The formulae for \check{A} and \hat{A} imply that

$$B_{jl} = \hat{Z}_{jl} - \check{Z}_{jl}, \quad \text{for } j, l \geq 2. \quad (6.35)$$

Hence (6.12) holds. By definition of the Fermi coordinates and the map Φ_k , the j -th vector in the frame $\check{\nu}_k$ satisfies

$$(\check{\nu}_k)_j(0) = D\check{\psi}_k(0)e_j = D\hat{\psi}_k(\Phi_k(0)) D\Phi_k(0)e_j = D\hat{\psi}_k(\eta_k(0))(D\Phi_k(0))_{lj}e_l.$$

Since $\eta_k(0) \rightarrow 0$ and $D\Phi_k(0) \rightarrow \text{Id}$ it follows that the limiting frames agree at $x_1 = 0$ and hence everywhere, i.e. $\hat{\nu} = \check{\nu}$.

Next, we show the convergence of $h_k^{-1}\eta_k \rightarrow J$ and the identities $J_1 = 0$ and $J_j = \check{y}_j - \hat{y}_j$ for $j \geq 2$. By Property 6 in Theorem 11

$$\int_{\Omega} \left| \hat{v}_k(x_1, x') - \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ h_k \hat{y}_k(x_1) + h_k x' \end{pmatrix} \right|^2 dx \leq Ch_k^4, \quad (6.36)$$

$$\int_{\Omega} \left| \check{v}_k(x_1, x') - \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ h_k \check{y}_k(x_1) + h_k x' \end{pmatrix} \right|^2 dx \leq Ch_k^4. \quad (6.37)$$

Now, for $|z'| \leq Ch_k$, the boundedness of $h_k^{-1}D^2\Phi_k$ and the boundedness of B_k implies that

$$D\Phi_k(z_1, z') = \text{Id} + h_k B_k(z_1) + \mathcal{O}(h_k^2) = \text{Id} + \mathcal{O}(h_k).$$

Thus, for $|z'| \leq Ch_k$,

$$\Phi_k(z_1, z') - \eta_k(z_1) = \Phi_k(z_1, z') - \Phi_k(z_1, 0) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ z' \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(h_k^2)$$

It follows that

$$\hat{v}_k(x) = \Phi_k(\check{v}_k(x)) = \eta_k((\check{v}_k)_1(x)) + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \check{v}'_k \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(h_k^2).$$

Since $\partial_{x_1} \eta_k(x_1) = D\Phi_k(x_1, 0)e_1$ is bounded, we get

$$\left| \hat{v}_k(x) - \eta_k(x_1) - \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \check{v}'_k(x) \end{pmatrix} \right| \leq Ch_k^2 + C|(\check{v}_k)_1(x) - x_1|.$$

With (6.36) and (6.37) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \left| \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ h_k \hat{y}_k(x_1) + h_k x' \end{pmatrix} - \eta_k(x_1) - \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ h_k \check{y}_k(x_1) + h_k x' \end{pmatrix} \right|^2 dx \\ & \leq Ch_k^4 + \int_{\Omega} |(\check{v}_k)_1(x) - x_1|^2 dx \leq Ch_k^4. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{h_k} \left(\eta_k - \begin{pmatrix} \text{id} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \hat{y}_k - \check{y}_k \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \hat{y} - \check{y} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{in } L^2((-L, L)).$$

Since $\partial_{x_1} \eta_k$ is bounded, the maps $h_k^{-1}(\eta_k(x_1) - (x_1, 0))$ converge uniformly to $(0, \hat{y} - \check{y})$. By Proposition 32 we get $J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \hat{y} - \check{y} \end{pmatrix}$ and J satisfies (6.26). In particular, (6.13) holds.

Finally, we derive the formulae by $\partial_{x_1}(\hat{w} - \check{w})$, $\nabla'(\hat{\beta}_1 - \check{\beta}_1)$, and $\text{sym } \nabla'(\hat{\beta}' - \check{\beta}')$. By Property 6 in Theorem 11 we have

$$\text{sym } \frac{d_{h_k} \hat{v}_k - \text{Id}}{h_k^2} \rightharpoonup \hat{S}, \quad \text{sym } \frac{d_{h_k} \check{v}_k - \text{Id}}{h_k^2} \rightharpoonup \check{S} \quad \text{weakly in } W^{-1,2}(\Omega), \quad (6.38)$$

where

$$\check{S}(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_{x_1} w_1(x_1) - \partial_{x_1}^2 \check{y} \cdot x' & \frac{1}{2}(\nabla' \beta_1(x) + \partial_{x_1} Z(x_1) x')^T \\ \frac{1}{2}(\nabla' \beta_1(x) + \partial_{x_1} Z(x_1) x') & \text{sym } \nabla' \beta'(x) \end{pmatrix} \quad (6.39)$$

with the analogous formula for \hat{S} . Since $d_{h_k} \hat{v}_k = D\Phi_k \circ \check{v}_k$, $d_{h_k} \check{v}_k$, we have

$$\text{sym } \frac{d_{h_k} \hat{v}_k - \text{Id}}{h_k^2} = \text{sym } \frac{D\Phi_k \circ \check{v}_k - \text{Id}}{h_k^2} + \text{sym } \frac{d_{h_k} \check{v}_k - \text{Id}}{h_k^2} + \text{sym } \left(\frac{D\Phi_k \circ \check{v}_k - \text{Id}}{h_k} \frac{d_{h_k} \check{v}_k - \text{Id}}{h_k} \right). \quad (6.40)$$

It follows from (6.33), (6.34), and Property 4 of Theorem 11 that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sym } \left(\frac{D\Phi_k \circ \check{v}_k - \text{Id}}{h_k} \frac{d_{h_k} \check{v}_k - \text{Id}}{h_k} \right) = \text{sym}(B\check{A}) = \frac{1}{2} (B\check{A} + \check{A}B). \quad (6.41)$$

For the last identity we used that B and \check{A} are skew symmetric.

To analyze term $h_k^{-2} \text{sym}(D\Phi_k \circ \hat{v}_k - \text{Id})$ we use the identity

$$Q^T Q = (\text{Id} + (Q - \text{Id}))^T (\text{Id} + (Q - \text{Id})) = \text{Id} + 2 \text{sym}(Q - \text{Id}) + (Q - \text{Id})^T (Q - \text{Id}).$$

Thus

$$2 \text{sym } \frac{D\Phi_k \circ \check{v}_k - \text{Id}}{h_k^2} = \frac{(D\Phi_k \check{v}_k)^T D\Phi_k \check{v}_k - \text{Id}}{h_k^2} - \frac{(D\Phi_k \circ \check{v}_k - \text{Id})^T}{h_k} \frac{D\Phi_k \circ \check{v}_k - \text{Id}}{h_k}. \quad (6.42)$$

The second term on the right hand side converges to $-B^T B = B^2$.

For the first term on the right we use (6.28). By assumption, \check{v}_k has values in $(-2L, 2L) \times B_{Ch_k}$. Since the convergence in (6.28) is uniform on $(-2L, 2L) \times B_C(0)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(D\Phi_k \check{v}_k)^T D\Phi_k \check{v}_k - \text{Id}}{h_k^2} \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}((\check{v}_k)_1, h_k^{-1} \check{v}'_k) - \tilde{\mathcal{T}}((\check{v}_k)_1, J + h_k^{-1} \check{v}'_k) \\ &= \tilde{\mathcal{T}} \circ \check{\ell} - \tilde{\mathcal{T}} \circ \hat{\ell} \end{aligned} \quad (6.43)$$

in $L^1(\Omega)$, where

$$\check{\ell}(x) = (x_1, \check{y}(x_1) + x'), \quad \hat{\ell}(x) = (x_1, J(x_1) + \check{y}(x_1) + x') = (x_1, \hat{y}(x_1) + x').$$

For the last identity in (6.43) we used the pointwise estimate

$$\left| \tilde{\mathcal{T}}((\check{v}_k)_1(x), h_k^{-1} \check{v}'_k(x)) - \tilde{\mathcal{T}}((x_1), h_k^{-1} \check{v}'_k(x)) \right| \leq C |(v_k)_1(x) - x_1| \leq Ch_k$$

as well as the corresponding estimate for $T((\check{v}_k)_1(x), J(x_1) + \frac{1}{h_k} \check{v}'_k(x))$, the bound (6.37), and the fact that $z' \mapsto \mathcal{T}(z_1, z')$ is quadratic.

Combining (6.38), (6.40), (6.41), (6.42), and (6.43) we get,

$$\hat{S}(x) - \check{S}(x) = \frac{1}{2} (B\check{A} + \check{A}B)(x_1) + B^2(x_1) + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(x_1, \check{y}(x_1)) - \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(x_1, \hat{y}(x_1))$$

or, equivalently,

$$\hat{S}(x) + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(x_1, \hat{y}(x_1)) = \check{S}(x) + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(x_1, \check{y}(x_1)) + \frac{1}{2} \hat{A}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \check{A}^2. \quad (6.44)$$

Together with (6.39) and the corresponding formula for \hat{S} we get (6.14), (6.15), and (6.16). To obtain the identity (6.14) for $\partial_{x_1}(\hat{w} - \check{w})$ we integrate the (11) component of (6.44) in x' over $B_1(0)$ and we observe that the map $x' \mapsto \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(x_1, \check{y}(x_1) + x') - \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(x_1, \hat{y}(x_1) + x')$ is affine since $z' \mapsto \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(x_1, z')$ is a quadratic form and that for linear maps the integral in x' over $B_1(0)$ vanishes. \square

A Lipschitz approximation on thin tubes

Lemma 34. *Let $s, n \geq 1$ and $1 \leq p < \infty$ and suppose $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded Lipschitz domain. Then there exists a constant $C = C(U, n, s, p)$ with the following property: For each $u \in W^{1,p}(U, \mathbb{R}^s)$ and each $\lambda > 0$ there exists $v : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^s$ such that*

$$(i) \text{ Lip } v \leq C\lambda,$$

$$(ii) \mathcal{L}^n(\{x \in U : u(x) \neq v(x)\}) \leq \frac{C}{\lambda^p} \int_{\{x \in U : |du|_e > \lambda\}} |du|_e^p dx.$$

Here $|\cdot|_e$ denotes the Frobenius norm with respect to the standard scalar product on \mathbb{R}^n and \mathbb{R}^s , respectively. If $U = (-L, L) \times B_h(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $h \in (0, L/2)$ then the constant C in (i) and (ii) can be chosen independent of h and L .

Proof. For the result for a fixed set U , see [4, Prop. A.1]. Now let $U = (-L, L) \times B_h(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $h \in (0, L/2)$ and let $u \in W^{1,p}(U, \mathbb{R}^s)$. We first extend u to $(-L, L) \times (-2h, 2h)^{n-1}$ and then to a function which is $8h$ -periodic in the second argument. Let $\phi \in C^1(B_1(0) \setminus \overline{B_{1/2}(0)}; \mathbb{R}^{n-1}) \cap C^0(\overline{B_1(0)} \setminus B_{1/2}(0); \mathbb{R}^{n-1})$ be a C^1 diffeomorphism from $B_1(0) \setminus \overline{B_{1/2}(0)} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ to $(-2, 2)^{n-1} \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}$ with

$$\sup_{B_1(0) \setminus \overline{B_{1/2}(0)}} |D\phi| + |(D\phi)^{-1}| < \infty$$

and $\phi|_{\partial B_1(0)} = \text{id}_{\partial B_1(0)}$. Then ϕ_h given by $\phi_h(y) = h\phi(\frac{1}{h}y)$ is a C^1 diffeomorphism from $B_h(0) \setminus \overline{B_{h/2}(0)}$ to $(-2h, 2h)^{n-1} \setminus \overline{B_h(0)}$ with

$$\sup_{B_h(0) \setminus \overline{B_{h/2}(0)}} |D\phi_h| + |(D\phi_h)^{-1}| = \sup_{B_1(0) \setminus \overline{B_{1/2}(0)}} |D\phi| + |(D\phi)^{-1}|.$$

For $u \in W^{1,p}((-L, L) \times B_h(0); \mathbb{R}^s)$ we define an extension $\bar{u} : (-L, L) \times (-2h, 2h)^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^s$ by

$$\bar{u}(x_1, x') = \begin{cases} u(x_1, x') & \text{if } x' \in B_h(0), \\ u(x_1, \phi_h^{-1}(x')) & \text{if } x' \in (-2h, 2h)^{n-1} \setminus B_h(0). \end{cases}$$

Then $|d\bar{u}|_e(x_1, x') \leq C'|du|_e(x_1, \phi_h^{-1}(x'))$ and therefore

$$\int_{\substack{(-L, L) \times (-2h, 2h)^{n-1} \\ |d\bar{u}| > C''\lambda}} |d\bar{u}|_e^p dx \leq C'' \int_{\substack{(-L, L) \times B_h(0) \\ |du| > \lambda}} |du|_e^p dx =: E.$$

Now we extend \bar{u} to a map $\hat{u} : (-L, L) \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^s$ by successive symmetric extension across the planes $x_i = 2h + 4h\ell$, $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$, $i = 2, \dots, n$. Then $x' \rightarrow \hat{u}(x_1, x')$ is $8h$ -periodic in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} , i.e. $\hat{u}(x_1, x' + z') = \hat{u}(x_1, x')$ if $z' \in 8h\mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$. Then

$$\int_{\substack{(-L, L) \times (-4h\ell, 4h\ell)^{n-1} \\ |d\hat{u}| > C''\lambda}} |d\hat{u}|_e^p dx \leq (2\ell)^{n-1} E.$$

Thus for $\ell = \lceil \frac{4L}{8h} \rceil = \lceil \frac{L}{2h} \rceil$ we get $\ell \geq 2$ and

$$\int_{\substack{(-L, L) \times (-4L, 4L)^{n-1} \\ |d\hat{u}| > C''\lambda}} |d\hat{u}|_e^p dx \leq (2\ell)^{n-1} E.$$

Applying (i) and (ii) from Lemma 34 to the set $U = (-1, 1) \times (-4, 4)^{n-1}$ and the map $x \mapsto \frac{C'}{L} \hat{u}(Lx)$ with λ replaced by $C''\lambda$ we see that there exists a map $\hat{v} : (-L, L) \times (-4L, 4L)^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^s$ such that $\text{Lip } \hat{v} \leq CC''\lambda$ and

$$\mathcal{L}^n(\{x \in (-L, L) \times (-4L, 4L)^{n-1} : \hat{v}(x) \neq \hat{u}(x)\}) \leq (2\ell + 1)^{n-1} \frac{C}{\lambda^p} E.$$

Let $\ell' = \ell - 1$. Then $8\ell'h \leq 4L$ and there exists $z' \in 8h \{-(\ell' - 1), \dots, \ell' - 1\}^{n-1}$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}^n(\{x \in (-L, L) \times (z' + (-4h, 4h)^{n-1}) : \hat{v}(x) \neq \hat{u}(x)\}) \leq \frac{(2\ell)^{n-1}}{(2\ell' - 1)^{n-1}} \frac{C}{\lambda^p} E \leq 4^{n-1} \frac{C}{\lambda^p} E,$$

since $2\ell' - 1 = 2\ell - 3$ and $\ell \geq 2$. Set $v(x_1, x') = \hat{v}(x_1, x' + z')$ for $x' \in B_h(0)$. Then

$$\text{Lip } v \leq CC'\lambda \quad \text{and} \quad u(x_1, x') = \hat{u}(x_1, x' + z'),$$

since $x' \mapsto \hat{u}(x_1, x')$ is $8h$ -periodic. Therefore

$$\mathcal{L}^n(\{x \in (-L, L) \times B_h(0) : v(x) \neq u(x)\}) \leq 4^{n-1} \frac{C}{\lambda^p} E = 4^{n-1} \frac{CC''}{\lambda^p} \int_{\substack{(-L, L) \times B_h(0) \\ |du|_e > \lambda}} |du|_e^p dx.$$

This concludes the proof. \square

B Fermi coordinates

Proof of Lemma 3. The Fermi map ψ is smooth since the solutions of the ordinary differential equation for geodesics depends smoothly on the initial data. To estimate the metric $\bar{g} = \psi^*g$ and its Christoffel symbols $\bar{\Gamma}$ we first note that the definition of the Fermi coordinates implies that

$$\bar{g}(x_1, 0)(e_i, e_j) = \delta_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\Gamma}(x_1, 0) = 0. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

We define a frame $(E_1(x), \dots, E_n(x))$ as follows: $E_i(x_1, x')$ is obtained by parallel transport of the canonical basis vector e_i of \mathbb{R}^n from $(x_1, 0)$ to (x_1, x') along the geodesic $t \mapsto (x_1, tx')$. Then

$$\bar{g}(x)(E_i(x), E_j(x)) = \delta_{ij}$$

since the covariant derivative of the metric vanishes. We define $A_i^j(x)$ by

$$e_i = A_i^j(x) E_j(x).$$

Then

$$\bar{g}_{ij}(x) = \bar{g}(x)(e_i, e_j) = A_i^k(x) A_j^l(x) \bar{g}(x)(E_k, E_l) = A_i^k(x) A_j^k(x). \quad (\text{B.2})$$

To estimate $A_i^j - \delta_i^j$, we will use Jacobi field estimates. For $i \geq 2$ the maps $t \mapsto (x_1, t(x' + se_i))$ are geodesics and hence

$$J(t) := te_i = tA_i^j(x_1, tx') E_j(x_1, tx')$$

is a Jacobi field along the geodesic $t \mapsto (x_1, tx')$. The Jacobi field equation $\frac{D}{dt} \frac{D}{dt} J = -\bar{\mathcal{R}}(x_1, tx')(J, x')x'$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t^2(tA_i^j(x_1, tx')) E_j(x_1, tx') &= -\bar{\mathcal{R}}(x_1, tx')(x', J, x') \\ &= -\bar{\mathcal{R}}(x_1, tx')^k(x', te_i, x') e_k = -\bar{\mathcal{R}}^k(x', e_i, x') tA_k^l(x_1, tx') E_l(x_1, tx'). \end{aligned}$$

With the notation

$$A(t; x) := A(x_1 + tx'), \quad M_i^k(t; x) := -\bar{\mathcal{R}}^k(x_1 + tx')(x', e_i, x')$$

this can be written as

$$\partial_t^2 \left(t A_i^j(t; x) \right) = M_i^k(t; x) \left(t A_k^j(t; x) \right) \quad \text{if } i \geq 2. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Using the first identity in (B.1), we see that $B_i^j(t; x) := t A_i^j(t; x)$ satisfies the initial conditions

$$B_i^j(t; x) = 0, \quad \partial_t B_i^j(0; x) = A_i^j(0; x) = \delta_i^j. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Similarly, $t \mapsto (x_1 + s, tx')$ are geodesics, so that e_1 is a Jacobi field along the geodesic $t \mapsto (x_1, tx')$. This yields the ODE

$$\partial_t^2 A_1^j(t; x) = M_1^k(t; x) A_k^j(t; x) \quad (\text{B.5})$$

and by (B.1) we have the initial conditions

$$A_1^j(t; x) = \delta_1^j, \quad \partial_t A_1^j(0; x) = 0. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Next we show that the system of ODEs (B.3) and (B.5) with initial conditions (B.4) and (B.6) implies that

$$|A_i^j(x) - \delta_i^j - \frac{1}{6} M_i^j(0; x)| \leq C |x'|^3, \quad \text{for } i \geq 2, j \geq 1, \quad (\text{B.7})$$

$$|A_1^j(x) - \delta_1^j - \frac{1}{2} M_1^j(0; x)| \leq C |x'|^3, \quad \text{for } j \geq 1 \quad (\text{B.8})$$

and

$$|\partial_{x_k} A_i^j(x) - \frac{1}{6} \partial_{x_k} M_i^j(0; x)| \leq C |x'|^2, \quad \text{for } i \geq 2, j \geq 1, \quad (\text{B.9})$$

$$|\partial_{x_k} A_1^j(x) - \frac{1}{2} \partial_{x_k} M_1^j(0; x)| \leq C |x'|^2, \quad \text{for } j \geq 1. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

Here the constant C can be estimated in terms of the supremum of the pulled back curvature tensor $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ and its first derivative.

To show (B.7) and (B.8), we use that the system of ODEs given by (B.3) and (B.5) with initial conditions (B.4) and (B.6) is equivalent to the following fixed point problem in $C^0([0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$:

$$A = T_x[A] := \text{Id} + S_x[A] \quad (\text{B.11})$$

where Id denotes the constant function from $[0, 1]$ to $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with value Id and the linear operator S_x is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (S_x)_1^j[A](t) &:= \int_0^t \int_0^s M_1^k(\sigma; x) A_k^j(\sigma) d\sigma ds, \quad \text{for } j \geq 1, \\ (S_x)_i^j[A](t) &:= \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \int_0^s \sigma M_1^k(\sigma; x) A_k^j(\sigma) d\sigma ds, \quad \text{for } i \geq 2, j \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\rho > 0$ and set

$$L_0 := \sup_{x \in (-2L, 2L) \times B_\rho(0)} |\mathcal{R}|, \quad L_1 := \sup_{x \in (-2L, 2L) \times B_\rho(0)} |D\mathcal{R}|.$$

Then, for $\sigma \in [0, 1]$,

$$|M(\sigma; x)| \leq CL_0 |x'|^2 \quad \text{for } x \in (-2L, 2L) \times B_\rho(0)$$

and thus the operator norm of S_x with respect to the supremum norm on $C^0([0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$ satisfies

$$\|S_x\| \leq CL_0 |x'|^2 \quad \text{for } x \in (-2L, 2L) \times B_\rho(0). \quad (\text{B.12})$$

Hence T_x is a contraction if $L_0\rho^2$ is sufficiently small. We will assume this from now on and we assume in particular that $L_0\rho^2 \leq 1$. Then it follows that for all $x \in (-2L, 2L) \times B_\rho(0)$ there exists a unique fixed point $\bar{A}_x \in C^0([0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$ of T_x and $\bar{A}_x(t) = A(t; x)$. Moreover $\bar{A}_x(t) = \text{Id} + \sum_{k=1}^\infty S^k[\text{Id}](t)$ and hence (B.12) implies that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} |\bar{A}_x(t) - \text{Id} - S_x[\text{Id}](t)| \leq CL_0^2|x'|^4.$$

In particular we have

$$\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} |\bar{A}_x(t) - \text{Id}| \leq C(L_0|x'|^2 + L_0^2|x'|^4) \leq CL_0|x'|^2. \quad (\text{B.13})$$

since $L_0\rho^2 \leq 1$. It is easy to see that

$$|M(t; x) - M(0; x)| \leq CL_1|x'|^3 \quad \text{for } t \in [0, 1].$$

Together with (B.13) and the definition of S_x this implies that, for $i \geq 2$ and $j \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \left| (\bar{A}_x)_1^j(t) - \delta_1^j - \frac{1}{2}t^2 M_1^j(0; x) \right| &\leq C(L_0^2|x'|^4 + L_1|x'|^3), \\ \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \left| (\bar{A}_x)_1^j(t) - \delta_1^j - \frac{1}{6}t^2 M_1^j(0; x) \right| &\leq C(L_0^2|x'|^4 + L_1|x'|^3). \end{aligned}$$

Using this estimate for $t = 1$, we get (B.7) and (B.8) since $A(x) = A(1; x) = \bar{A}_x(1)$.

Now the map $x \mapsto S_x$ is a C^1 map from $(-2L, 2L) \times B_\rho(0)$ to the space of bounded linear operators on $C^0([0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$. Hence $x \mapsto \bar{A}_x$ is C^1 and the derivative $F := \partial_{x_k} \bar{A}_x$ satisfies

$$F = S_x[F] + (\partial_{x_k} S_x)[\bar{A}_x].$$

It is easy to see that, for $x \in (-2L, 2L) \times B_\rho(0)$ and $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$|\partial_{x_k} M(t; x) - \partial_{x_k} M(0; x)| \leq CL_1|x'|^2, \quad (\text{B.14})$$

$$|\partial_{x_k} M(0; x)| \leq CL_0|x'|. \quad (\text{B.15})$$

Together with (B.13) we get, for $i \geq 2$ and $j \geq 1$,

$$\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \left| F_1^j(t) - (S_x)_1^j[F](t) - \frac{1}{2}t^2 \partial_{x_k} M_1^j(0; x) \right| \leq C(L_1|x'|^2 + L_0^2|x'|^3) \quad (\text{B.16})$$

$$\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \left| F_i^j(t) - (S_x)_i^j[F](t) - \frac{1}{6}t^2 \partial_{x_k} M_1^j(0; x) \right| \leq C(L_1|x'|^2 + L_0^2|x'|^3). \quad (\text{B.17})$$

Since $\|S_x\| \leq CL_0|x'|^2$ and $|\partial_{x_k} M(0; x)| \leq CL_0|x'|$ this implies (B.9) and (B.10).

We now turn to the estimates for the pull back metric \bar{g} and its Christoffel symbols $\bar{\Gamma}$. For ease of notation we simply write g and Γ instead of \bar{g} and $\bar{\Gamma}$. It follows from (B.2), (B.7), and (B.8) that

$$\bar{g}_{ij} - \delta_{ij} = (\mathcal{A}_i^j - \delta_i^j) + (\mathcal{A}_j^i - \delta_j^i) + \mathcal{O}(|x'|^4).$$

Moreover we have

$$M_i^j(0; x) = -\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{jkil}(x_1)x'_k x'_l$$

where

$$\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{jkil}(x_1) := (\psi^* \mathcal{R})(x_1, 0)(e_j, e_k, e_i, e_l) = \mathcal{R}(\psi(x_1, 0))(a_j, a_k, a_i, a_l)$$

with $a_j = D\psi(x_1, 0)e_j$, i.e., $a_1 = \gamma'(x_1)$ and $a_j = \nu_j(x_1)$ for $j \geq 2$.

In particular, $M_i^j(0; x)$ is symmetric in i and j , since $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{jkil} = \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{iljk}$. Thus

$$\left| \overline{g}_{ij}(x) - \delta_{ij} - \frac{1}{3} M_i^j(0; x) \right| \leq C|x'|^3, \quad \text{for } i \geq 2, j \geq 2, \quad (\text{B.18})$$

$$\left| \overline{g}_{1j}(x) - \delta_{ij} - \frac{2}{3} M_1^j(0; x) \right| \leq C|x'|^3, \quad \text{for } j \geq 2, \quad (\text{B.19})$$

$$\left| \overline{g}_{11}(x) - \delta_{ij} - M_1^1(0; x) \right| \leq C|x'|^3. \quad (\text{B.20})$$

This shows that (2.5) holds.

To estimate the Christoffel symbols we note that (B.2) and (B.7)–(B.10) imply that

$$\partial_{x_k} \overline{g}_{ij} = \partial_{x_k} A_i^j + \partial_{x_k} A_j^i + \mathcal{O}(|x'|^2).$$

Using the symmetry of $M_i^j(0; x)$ under exchange of i and j we get, for $i, j, k \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} 3\partial_{x_k} \overline{g}_{ij}(x) &= -[\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{jkil}(x_1) + \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{jlik}(x_1)]x'_l + \mathcal{O}(|x'|^2) = [\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{kji l}(x_1) + \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{kij l}(x_1)]x'_l + \mathcal{O}(|x'|^2), \\ 3\partial_{x_i} \overline{g}_{jk}(x) &= -[\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{kijl}(x_1) + \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{klji}(x_1)]x'_l + \mathcal{O}(|x'|^2) = -[\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{kijl}(x_1) + \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{jikl}(x_1)]x'_l + \mathcal{O}(|x'|^2), \\ 3\partial_{x_j} \overline{g}_{ki}(x) &= -[\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{ijk l}(x_1) + \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{ilkj}(x_1)]x'_l + \mathcal{O}(|x'|^2) = -[\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{ijk l}(x_1) + \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{kjil}(x_1)]x'_l + \mathcal{O}(|x'|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Here we also used that $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{ijkl} = \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{klij}$ and that $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ is antisymmetric in the first two arguments. Using this antisymmetry again, we get $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{jikl}(x_1) + \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{ijkl}(x_1) = 0$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} 6\overline{\Gamma}_{kij}(x) &= 3(\partial_{x_i} \overline{g}_{jk}(x) + \partial_{x_j} \overline{g}_{ki}(x) - \partial_{x_k} \overline{g}_{ij}(x)) \\ &= -2[\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{kji l}(x_1) + \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{kij l}(x_1)]x'_l + \mathcal{O}(|x'|^2) \quad \text{for } i, j, k \geq 2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.21})$$

For $k = 1$ and $i, j \geq 2$ we get $\partial_{x_1} \overline{g}_{ij} = 0$ and

$$\frac{3}{2} \partial_{x_i} \overline{g}_{j1}(x) = -[\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{1ijl}(x_1) + \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{ji1l}(x_1)]x'_l + \mathcal{O}(|x'|^2), \quad (\text{B.22})$$

$$\frac{3}{2} \partial_{x_j} \overline{g}_{1i}(x) = -[\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{ij1l}(x_1) + \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{1jil}(x_1)]x'_l + \mathcal{O}(|x'|^2). \quad (\text{B.23})$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} 3\overline{\Gamma}_{1ij}(x) &= \frac{3}{2}(\partial_{x_i} \overline{g}_{j1}(x) + \partial_{x_j} \overline{g}_{1i}(x) - \partial_{x_1} \overline{g}_{ij}(x)) \\ &= -[\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{1jil}(x_1) + \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{1ijl}(x_1)]x'_l + \mathcal{O}(|x'|^2) \quad \text{for } i, j \geq 2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this identity with (B.21) we get

$$\overline{\Gamma}_{kij}(x) = -\frac{1}{3}[\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{kji l}(x_1) + \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{kij l}(x_1)]x'_l + \mathcal{O}(|x'|^2) \quad \text{if } i, j \geq 2, k \geq 1. \quad (\text{B.24})$$

In view of the estimate for the metric we have

$$|\overline{\Gamma}_{ij}^k(x) - \overline{\Gamma}_{kij}(x)| \leq C|x'|^2. \quad (\text{B.25})$$

Thus (B.24) implies the first estimate in (2.6).

Similarly, (B.22) and (B.23) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} 3\overline{\Gamma}_{ij1}(x) &= \frac{3}{2}(\partial_{x_j} \overline{g}_{1i}(x) + \partial_{x_i} \overline{g}_{j1}(x) - \partial_{x_1} \overline{g}_{ij}(x)) \\ &= -[2\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{ij1l}(x_1) - \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{j1il}(x_1) - \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{1ijl}(x_1)]x'_l + \mathcal{O}(|x'|^2) \\ &= -3\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{ij1l}(x_1)x'_l + \mathcal{O}(|x'|^2) \quad \text{for } i, j \geq 2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.26})$$

Here we used in the last step that

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{ijkl} + \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{jkil} + \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{kijl} = \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{klij} + \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{iljk} + \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{jlki} = -[\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{lkij} + \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{lij k} + \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{ljk i}] = 0,$$

since $\mathcal{R}(X, Y)Z + \mathcal{R}(Y, Z)X + \mathcal{R}(Z, X)Y = 0$.

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} 2\overline{\Gamma}_{k11}(x) &= -\partial_{x_k}\overline{g}_{11}(x) = [\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{1k1l}(x_1) + \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{1l1k}(x_1)]x'_l + \mathcal{O}(|x'|^2) \\ &= 2\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{1k1l}(x_1)x_l + \mathcal{O}(|x'|^2) \\ &= -2\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{k11l}(x_1)x'_l + \mathcal{O}(|x'|^2) \quad \text{for } k \geq 2. \end{aligned} \tag{B.27}$$

In addition we have $\overline{\Gamma}_{111} = \mathcal{O}(|x'|^2)$, since $\partial_{x_1}\overline{g}_{11} = \mathcal{O}(|x'|^2)$ and the antisymmetry of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ in the first two arguments gives $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{111l} = 0$. Hence the identity (B.27) also holds for $k = 1$. Combining this observation with (B.26) (with (i, j) replaced by (k, i)) we get

$$\overline{\Gamma}_{k11}(x) = -\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{k11l}(x_1)x_l + \mathcal{O}(|x'|^2) \quad \text{for } i, k \geq 1. \tag{B.28}$$

Together with (B.25) we get the second estimate in (2.6).

Finally we discuss the independence of the constants in the estimates (2.5) and (2.6) of the framed unit speed geodesic $(\gamma, \underline{\nu})$. Set

$$C_\rho := (-2L, 2L) \times B_\rho(0).$$

It follows from (B.13) that there exists an ε_0 such that

$$\sup_{x \in C_\rho} |\overline{g} - \text{Id}| \leq C\rho^2 \sup_{x \in C_\rho} |\overline{\mathcal{R}}(x)|$$

as long as

$$\rho^2 \sup_{x \in C_\rho} |\overline{\mathcal{R}}(x)| \leq \varepsilon_0$$

where $|\mathcal{R}(p)|$ is an intrinsic norm of the curvature tensor at $p \in \mathcal{M}$. On the other hand, if $\frac{1}{2}\text{Id} \leq \overline{g} \leq 2\text{Id}$ then

$$\sup_{C_\rho} |\overline{\mathcal{R}}(x)| \leq C \sup_{p \in \psi(C_\rho)} |\mathcal{R}(p)|. \tag{B.29}$$

Thus a continuity argument shows that $\frac{1}{2}\text{Id} \leq \overline{g} \leq 2\text{Id}$ and (B.29) hold provided that

$$\rho^2 \sup_{p \in \psi(C_\rho)} |\mathcal{R}(p)| \leq \varepsilon_1$$

for some $\varepsilon_1 > 0$.

Similarly, the other constants in the estimates for \overline{g} and $\overline{\Gamma}$ are controlled by $\sup_{x \in C_\rho} |\overline{\mathcal{R}}(x)|$ and $\sup_{x \in C_\rho} |D\overline{\mathcal{R}}(x)|$. Now, for $|\Gamma| \leq 1$ and $\frac{1}{2}\text{Id} \leq \overline{g} \leq 2\text{Id}$, the quantity $\sup_{x \in C_\rho} |D\overline{\mathcal{R}}(x)|$ is controlled by the C^0 norm of \mathcal{R} and its covariant derivative $\nabla\mathcal{R}$ in $\psi(C_\rho)$. Thus another continuity argument based on (B.15)–(B.17) shows that the constants are uniformly controlled if

$$\rho \sup_{p \in \psi(C_\rho)} |\mathcal{R}(p)| + \rho^2 \sup_{p \in \psi(C_\rho)} |\nabla\mathcal{R}(p)| \leq \varepsilon_2$$

for some $\varepsilon_2 > 0$. In particular, for a compact manifold, the radius ρ and the constants C in can be chosen independent of the frame unit speed geodesic $(\gamma, \underline{\nu})$.

□

References

- [1] G. Alberti. Variational models for phase transitions, an approach via Γ -convergence. In G. Buttazzo, A. Marino, and M. K. V. Murthy, editors, *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations: Topics on Geometrical Evolution Problems and Degree Theory*, pages 95–114. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2000.
- [2] J. M. Ball. Differentiability properties of symmetric and isotropic functions. *Duke Math. J.*, 51(3):699–728, 1984.
- [3] L. C. Evans and R. F. Gariepy. *Measure theory and fine properties of functions*. Studies in Advanced Mathematics. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1992.
- [4] G. Friesecke, R. D. James, and S. Müller. A theorem on geometric rigidity and the derivation of nonlinear plate theory from three-dimensional elasticity. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 55(11):1461–1506, 2002.
- [5] A. Gray. *Tubes*, volume 2. Birkhäuser Basel, 2004.
- [6] H. Karcher. Riemannian center of mass and mollifier smoothing. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 30(5):509–541, 1977.
- [7] Y. Klein, E. Efrati, and E. Sharon. Shaping of elastic sheets by prescription of non-Euclidean metrics. *Science*, 315(5815):1116–1120, 2007.
- [8] M. Krömer and S. Müller. Scaling of the elastic energy of small balls for maps between manifolds with different curvature tensors. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 64(3):Paper No. 85, 17 pp., 2025.
- [9] I. Levin, E. Siéfert, E. Sharon, and C. Maor. Hierarchy of geometrical frustration in elastic ribbons: shape-transitions and energy scaling obtained from a general asymptotic theory. *J. Mech. Phys. Solids*, 156:Paper No. 104579, 14, 2021.
- [10] H. Liang and L. Mahadevan. The shape of a long leaf. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 106(52):22049–22054, 2009.
- [11] F. C. Liu. A Luzin type property of Sobolev functions. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 26(4):645–651, 1977.
- [12] F. K. Manasse and C. W. Misner. Fermi normal coordinates and some basic concepts in differential geometry. *J. Mathematical Phys.*, 4:735–745, 1963.
- [13] C. Maor and M. G. Mora. Rigorous analysis of shape transitions in frustrated elastic ribbons. *arXiv 2503.11779*, 2025.
- [14] C. Maor and A. Shachar. On the role of curvature in the elastic energy of non-Euclidean thin bodies. *J. Elasticity*, 134(2):149–173, 2019.
- [15] M. G. Mora and S. Müller. Derivation of the nonlinear bending-torsion theory for inextensible rods by Γ -convergence. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 18(3):287–305, 2003.
- [16] J. Nash. The imbedding problem for Riemannian manifolds. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 63:20–63, 1956.
- [17] E. Sharon, B. Roman, and S. HL. Geometrically driven wrinkling observed in free plastic sheets and leaves. *Phys Rev E*, 75:46211–046217, 2007.