

# QUANTITATIVE MARKED LENGTH SPECTRUM RIGIDITY

KAREN BUTT

**ABSTRACT.** We consider a closed Riemannian manifold  $M$  of negative curvature and dimension at least 3 with marked length spectrum sufficiently close (multiplicatively) to that of a locally symmetric space  $N$ . Using the methods in [Ham99], we show the volumes of  $M$  and  $N$  are approximately equal. We then show the smooth map  $F : M \rightarrow N$  constructed in [BCG96] is a diffeomorphism with derivative bounds close to 1 and depending on the ratio of the two marked length spectrum functions. Thus, we refine the results in [Ham99] and [BCG96], which show  $M$  and  $N$  are isometric if their marked length spectra are equal. We also prove a similar result for compact negatively curved surfaces using the methods of [Ota90] together with a version of the Gromov compactness theorem [GW88, Pug87].

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The marked length spectrum  $\mathcal{L}_g$  of a closed Riemannian manifold  $(M, g)$  of negative curvature is a function on the free homotopy classes of closed curves in  $M$  which assigns to each class the length of its unique geodesic representative. Since the set of free homotopy classes of closed curves in  $M$  can be identified with conjugacy classes in the fundamental group  $\Gamma$  of  $M$ , we will write  $\mathcal{L}_g(\gamma)$  for the length of the unique geodesic representative of the conjugacy class of  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  with respect to the metric  $g$ .

To what extent the function  $\mathcal{L}_g$  determines the metric  $g$  is a question that has long been of interest. Notably, it has been conjectured that the marked length spectrum completely determines the metric, i.e. if  $g$  and  $g_0$  are negatively curved metrics on  $M$  satisfying  $\mathcal{L}_g = \mathcal{L}_{g_0}$  then  $g$  and  $g_0$  are isometric; see [BKB<sup>+</sup>85, Conjecture 3.1]. This marked length spectrum rigidity is known to be true in certain cases, such as [Ota90, Cro90] in dimension 2, [Ham99, BCG96] in dimension at least 3 when one of the manifolds is assumed to be locally symmetric, and [GL19, GKL19] if the metrics are assumed to be sufficiently close in a suitable  $C^k$  topology. There are other partial results, including generalizations beyond negative curvature; see the introduction to [GL19] for a more extensive history of the problem.

Still, even in the cases where rigidity does hold, there is more to be understood about to what extent the marked length spectrum determines the metric. Namely, if two homotopy-equivalent manifolds have marked length spectra which are not equal but are close, is there some sense in which the metrics are close to being isometric?

In the case of hyperbolic surfaces, this question was answered by Thurston in [Thu98]. More specifically, if  $(M, g)$  and  $(N, g_0)$  are both surfaces of constant negative curvature, then the best possible Lipschitz constant for a map  $F : M \rightarrow N$  in the same homotopy class as  $f$  is precisely  $\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \frac{\mathcal{L}_{g_0}(f_*\gamma)}{\mathcal{L}_g(\gamma)}$ . In the general case of higher dimensions and variable negative curvature, the microlocal techniques of [GL19, GKL19] provide explicit estimates (in a suitable Sobolev norm) for how close the metrics are in terms of the ratio  $\frac{\mathcal{L}_{g_0}}{\mathcal{L}_g}$ , or more precisely the geodesic stretch; in fact, their results hold more generally for non-positively

curved metrics with Anosov geodesic flow. However, these estimates require  $g$  and  $g_0$  to be sufficiently close metrics (in some  $C^k$  topology) on the same manifold.

In this paper, we provide new answers to this question in two cases: first, consider pairs of negatively curved metrics on a closed surface. To state our result precisely, let  $\mathcal{C}(2, \lambda, \Lambda, v_0, D_0)$  consist of all closed  $C^\infty$  Riemannian manifolds of dimension 2 with sectional curvatures contained in the interval  $[-\Lambda^2, -\lambda^2]$ , volume bounded below by  $v_0$ , and diameter bounded above by  $D_0$ . We show pairs of such spaces become more isometric as their marked length spectra get closer to one another, refining the main result in [Ota90].

**Theorem 1.1.** *Fix  $\lambda, \Lambda, v_0, D_0 > 0$ . Fix  $L > 1$ . Then there exists  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(L, \lambda, \Lambda, v_0, D_0) > 0$  small enough so that for any pair  $(M, g), (M, h) \in \mathcal{C}(2, \lambda, \Lambda, v_0, D_0)$  satisfying*

$$1 - \varepsilon \leq \frac{\mathcal{L}_g}{\mathcal{L}_h} \leq 1 + \varepsilon, \quad (1.1)$$

*there exists an  $L$ -Lipschitz map  $f : (M, g) \rightarrow (M, h)$ .*

Second, consider the case where  $(N, g_0)$  is a negatively curved locally symmetric space of dimension at least 3. Here, we quantify how close  $g$  and  $g_0$  are to being isometric by estimating the derivative of a map  $F : M \rightarrow N$  in terms of  $\varepsilon$ . This is considerably stronger than Theorem 1.1, since we are able to determine how the Lipschitz constant depends on  $\varepsilon$ . This refines the rigidity result in [Ham99, Corollary to Theorem A], which corresponds to the case  $\varepsilon = 0$  in the theorem below. As in the previous theorem, we only assume the marked length spectra of our metrics are close; we do not assume the metrics themselves are close in any  $C^k$  topology.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a closed Riemannian manifold of dimension at least 3 with fundamental group  $\Gamma$  and sectional curvatures contained in the interval  $[-\Lambda^2, 0)$ . Let  $(N, g_0)$  be a locally symmetric space. Assume there is a homotopy equivalence  $f : M \rightarrow N$  and let  $f_*$  denote the induced map on fundamental groups. Then there exists small enough  $\varepsilon_0$  (depending on  $\Gamma$ ) so that whenever  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$  and*

$$1 - \varepsilon \leq \frac{\mathcal{L}_{g_0}(f_*\gamma)}{\mathcal{L}_g(\gamma)} \leq 1 + \varepsilon \quad (1.2)$$

*for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , there is a  $C^2$  map  $F : M \rightarrow N$  homotopic to  $f$  and constants  $c_1(\varepsilon, n, \Gamma, \Lambda) < 1$ ,  $C_2(\varepsilon, n, \Gamma, \Lambda) > 1$  such that for all  $v \in TM$  we have*

$$c_1 \|v\|_g \leq \|dF(v)\|_{g_0} \leq C_2 \|v\|_g. \quad (1.3)$$

*More precisely, there is a constant  $C = C(n, \Gamma, \Lambda)$  so that  $c_1 = 1 - C\varepsilon^{1/8(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{1/4(n+1)})$  and  $C_2 = 1 + C\varepsilon^{1/8(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{1/4(n+1)})$ .*

*Remark 1.3.* If  $\tilde{N}$  is a real, complex or quaternionic hyperbolic space, we can take  $c_1 = 1 - C\varepsilon^{1/4(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{1/2(n+1)})$  and  $C_2 = 1 + C\varepsilon^{1/4(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{1/2(n+1)})$ . See Remark 3.32.

In [Ham99, Theorem A], Hamenstädt proves that two negatively curved manifolds with the same marked length spectrum have the same volume, provided one of the manifolds has geodesic flow with  $C^1$  Anosov splitting, a condition which holds in particular for locally symmetric spaces. (The *Anosov splitting* of the geodesic flow on the unit tangent bundle  $T^1N$  refers to the flow-invariant decomposition of  $TT^1N$  into the stable, unstable and flow directions; see the introduction to [Ham99].)

Thus, if  $M$  and  $N$  satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1.2 for  $\varepsilon = 0$ , they must have the same volume. Then, since the marked length spectrum determines the topological entropy of the geodesic flow, the fact that the two manifolds are isometric follows from the celebrated entropy rigidity theorem of Besson–Courtois–Gallot [BCG96, BCG95].

To prove Theorem 1.2, we start by proving an analogue of [Ham99, Theorem A] under the assumption the marked length spectra satisfy equation (1.2), i.e. we estimate the ratio  $\text{Vol}(M)/\text{Vol}(N)$  in terms of  $\varepsilon$ . In order to obtain an explicit estimate, we assume the Anosov splitting is  $C^{1+\alpha}$  instead of  $C^1$ . (For geodesic flows on manifolds with strictly  $\frac{1}{4}$ -pinched negative curvature, the Anosov splitting is  $C^{1+\alpha}$  for some  $\alpha > 0$ . The splitting is  $C^1$  by [HP75] and  $C^{1+\alpha}$  by [Has94, Theorem 5, Remark after Theorem 6].)

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a closed negatively curved Riemannian manifold with fundamental group  $\Gamma$ . Let  $(N, g_0)$  be another closed negatively curved manifold with fundamental group  $\Gamma$  and assume the geodesic flow on  $T^1N$  has  $C^{1+\alpha}$  Anosov splitting. Suppose the marked length spectra of  $M$  and  $N$  are  $\varepsilon$ -close as in (1.2). Then there is a constant  $C$  depending only on  $\tilde{N}$  such that*

$$(1 - C\varepsilon^\alpha)(1 - \varepsilon)^n \text{Vol}(M) \leq \text{Vol}(N) \leq (1 + C\varepsilon^\alpha)(1 + \varepsilon)^n \text{Vol}(M).$$

*If, in addition,  $(N, g_0)$  is locally symmetric and  $\varepsilon$  is sufficiently small (depending on  $n = \dim N$ ), then  $\alpha$  can be replaced with 2 in the above estimates and the constant  $C$  depends only on  $n$ .*

*Remark 1.5.* If the Anosov splitting of  $T^1N$  is only  $C^1$ , then our proof shows the quantities  $(1 \pm C\varepsilon^\alpha)$  can be replaced with constants that converge to 1 as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , but we are not able to determine the explicit dependence of these constants on  $\varepsilon$ ; see the statement above Lemma 2.15.

*Remark 1.6.* Unlike the estimate in Theorem 1.2, this volume estimate does not require a bound on the absolute sectional curvatures of  $M$ .

*Remark 1.7.* If  $N$  is locally symmetric, then  $\text{Vol}(N) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^n \text{Vol}(M)$  follows from Lemma 3.1 and the proof of the main theorem in [BCG96]. (See Remark 3.6 for more details.) However, the lower bound for  $\text{Vol}(N)/\text{Vol}(M)$  in Theorem 1.4 is also crucial for the proof of Theorem 1.2.

*Remark 1.8.* If  $\dim M = \dim N = 2$ , then our proof of Theorem 1.4 shows  $(1 - \varepsilon)^2 \text{Vol}(M) \leq \text{Vol}(N) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^2 \text{Vol}(M)$ , which is the optimal estimate. This result also follows from [CD04, Theorem 1.1].

**Outline.** The proof of Theorem 1.4 occupies the entirety of Section 2. As in [Ham99], we study the Liouville measure on the unit tangent bundle of  $M$ , which is locally a product of the Liouville current on the space of geodesics and the Lebesgue measure on orbits of the geodesic flow [Kai90, Theorem 2.1]. To control the Liouville current, we generalize the arguments in [Ota90] and [Ham99] in Proposition 2.3 and Theorem 2.6. In addition to modifying these existing arguments, we need to carefully control the time component of the Liouville measure, since when  $\mathcal{L}_g$  does not coincide with  $\mathcal{L}_{g_0}$ , the corresponding geodesic flows are not conjugate. In Section 2.7, we analyze the orbit equivalences of geodesic flows constructed in [Gro00]; more specifically, we use the marked length spectrum assumption  $1 - \varepsilon \leq \mathcal{L}_g/\mathcal{L}_{g_0} \leq 1 + \varepsilon$  to control the speed of the time changes via dynamical arguments.

In Section 3, we make use of the volume estimate in Theorem 1.4 to show the natural map constructed in [BCG96], which is an isometry in the case of  $\varepsilon = 0$ , satisfies the conclusion of Theorem 1.2 in the case of  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

Finally, we prove Theorem 1.1 in Section 4. We prove the result by contradiction, using the compactness results in [GW88, Pug87] to obtain a convergent sequence of counter-examples, and then adapting the methods in [Ota90] to show the limits are isometric.

**Acknowledgements.** I am very grateful to my advisor Ralf Spatzier for many helpful discussions and for help reviewing this paper. I thank Alex Wright for suggesting the question. I also thank David Constantine, Thang Nguyen and Yuping Ruan for helpful conversations. This research was supported in part by NSF grants DMS-2003712 and DMS-1607260.

## 2. VOLUME ESTIMATE

The first half of this paper is devoted to proving Theorem 1.4. We will repeatedly use the following standard construction, part of which can be found in [BCG96, Section 4]:

**Construction 2.1.** Let  $f : M \rightarrow N$  be a homotopy equivalence of negatively curved manifolds. Let  $\partial\tilde{M}$  denote the visual boundary of  $\tilde{M}$ . We can construct a map  $\bar{f} : \partial\tilde{M} \rightarrow \partial\tilde{N}$  such that for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  and all  $\xi \in \partial\tilde{M}$  we have  $\bar{f}(\gamma.\xi) = (f_*\gamma).\bar{f}(\xi)$ . Indeed, the homotopy equivalence  $f : M \rightarrow N$  can be lifted to a  $\Gamma$ -equivariant map  $\tilde{f} : \tilde{M} \rightarrow \tilde{N}$  such that  $\tilde{f}$  is additionally a quasi-isometry (details in [BCG96, Section 4]). Hence  $\tilde{f}$  induces a  $\Gamma$ -equivariant map  $\bar{f}$  between the boundaries  $\partial\tilde{M}$  and  $\partial\tilde{N}$ .

Now recall the space of geodesics of  $\tilde{M}$  is the quotient of  $T^1\tilde{M}$  obtained by identifying any two unit tangent vectors on the same orbit of the geodesic flow. This space can be identified with the set  $\partial^2\tilde{M}$  of pairs of distinct points in  $\partial\tilde{M}$  by associating the equivalence class of the unit tangent vector  $v$  with the pair  $(\pi(v), \pi(-v))$  of its forward and backward endpoints. Thus, the product  $\bar{f} \times \bar{f}$  gives a map between the spaces of geodesics of  $\tilde{M}$  and  $\tilde{N}$ . For notational simplicity, we will write this map as  $\bar{f} : \partial^2\tilde{M} \rightarrow \partial^2\tilde{N}$ .

Note the case  $\varepsilon = 0$  of Theorem 1.4 is Theorem A in [Ham99]. We follow the same overall approach as in [Ham99], which we now summarize. It follows from arguments in [Ota90] that the marked length spectrum of  $M$  determines the so-called *cross-ratio* of four points on the boundary  $\partial\tilde{M}$ . We start by generalizing these arguments to analyze how perturbing the marked length spectrum as in (1.2) affects the cross-ratio (Proposition 2.3).

In [Ham99], Hamenstädt proves the cross-ratio determines the so-called *Liouville current*, a measure on  $\partial^2\tilde{M}$  which can be used to reconstruct the Liouville measure on  $T^1M$ . In the  $\varepsilon = 0$  case, that is, equality of the marked length spectra, the geodesic flows on  $T^1N$  and  $T^1M$  are conjugate [Ham92], so one can use equality of Liouville currents to obtain equality of Liouville measures and hence volumes.

In Theorem 2.6, we generalize the arguments in [Ham99] to analyze how perturbing the cross-ratio – due to perturbing the marked length spectrum – affects the Liouville current. However, an estimate of the Liouville currents does not immediately imply a volume estimate since when  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the geodesic flows of  $M$  and  $N$  need not be conjugate. We instead obtain controlled orbit equivalences between the geodesic flows on  $T^1M$  and  $T^1N$  by delicately implementing the construction in [Gro00].

**2.1. The cross-ratio.** We now define the cross-ratio associated to any negatively curved Riemannian manifold  $(M, g)$ . Let  $p : \tilde{M} \rightarrow M$  be the universal cover of  $M$  and let  $\partial\tilde{M}$  be the visual boundary of  $\tilde{M}$ . Let  $\pi : T^1\tilde{M} \rightarrow \partial\tilde{M}$  denote the map which sends  $v$  to the forward boundary point of the geodesic determined by  $v$ . Let  $\partial^4\tilde{M}$  denote pairwise distinct quadruples of points in  $\partial\tilde{M}$ .

**Definition 2.2.** [Ota92, Lemma 2.1] Let  $a, b, c, d \in \partial^4\tilde{M}$ . Let  $a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i \in \tilde{M}$  be sequences converging to  $a, b, c, d$  respectively. Define

$$[a, b, c, d] = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(a_i, c_i) + d(b_i, d_i) - d(a_i, d_i) - d(b_i, c_i), \quad (2.1)$$

where  $d$  is the Riemannian distance function. By [Ota92, Lemma 2.1], this limit exists and is independent of the chosen sequences  $a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i$ . We call  $[\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot]$  the *cross-ratio*.

The proof of [Ota90, Theorem 1] shows the cross-ratio is completely determined by the marked length spectrum, and the argument is not specific to dimension 2. In this section, we prove the following result which shows how perturbing the marked length spectrum affects the cross-ratio.

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let  $(M, g)$  and  $(N, g_0)$  be negatively curved manifolds with  $\varepsilon$ -close marked length spectra as in (1.2). Let  $\bar{f} : \partial\tilde{M} \rightarrow \partial\tilde{N}$  be the map constructed from the homotopy equivalence  $f : M \rightarrow N$  as in Construction 2.1. We then have*

$$(1 - \varepsilon)[a, b, c, d] \leq [\bar{f}(a), \bar{f}(b), \bar{f}(c), \bar{f}(d)] \leq (1 + \varepsilon)[a, b, c, d].$$

Over the course of the proof of [Ota90, Theorem 1], the following lemma is proved, giving more precise information about how the marked length spectrum determines the cross-ratio. We include a careful proof, since the setup will be needed to prove Proposition 2.3.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Given  $(a, b, c, d) \in \partial^4\tilde{M}$ , there exist sequences  $a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i$  converging to  $a, b, c, d$ , respectively, so that the terms  $d(a_i, c_i), d(b_i, d_i), d(a_i, d_i), d(b_i, c_i)$  can be approximated arbitrarily well by lengths of closed geodesics.*

*Proof.* Since  $M$  is negatively curved, the geodesic flow  $\phi^t$  on  $T^1M$  is Anosov; hence there exists  $v \in T^1M$  with dense forward and backward orbit. Let  $v_1, v_2 \in T^1\tilde{M}$  vary over all lifts of  $v$  which determine two distinct geodesics in  $\tilde{M}$ . Then quadruples of the form  $(\pi(v_1), \pi(-v_1), \pi(-v_2), \pi(v_2))$  are dense in  $\partial^4\tilde{M}$ . Since the cross-ratio is continuous [Ota92], it suffices to check the proposition on this dense set of quadruples.

For  $i = 1, 2$ , let  $T_i^+, T_i^- > 0$  be large enough such that the expression

$$d(\phi^{T_1^+} v_1, \phi^{-T_2^-} v_2) + d(\phi^{T_2^+} v_2, \phi^{-T_1^-} v_1) - d(\phi^{T_1^+} v_1, \phi^{-T_1^-} v_1) - d(\phi^{T_2^+} v_2, \phi^{-T_2^-} v_2) \quad (2.2)$$

is arbitrarily close to  $[\pi(v_1), \pi(-v_1), \pi(-v_2), \pi(v_2)]$ . Now fix  $w \in T^1\tilde{M}$ . Since the geodesic tangent to  $v_1$  projects to a geodesic with dense forward orbit in  $T^1M$ , we can make  $T_1^+$  larger if necessary so that  $p(\phi^{T_1^+} v_1)$  is arbitrarily close to  $p(w)$  in  $M$ . Hence there is some  $\gamma_1^+ \in \Gamma$  such that  $\gamma_1^+ \cdot w$  is arbitrarily close to  $\phi^{T_1^+} v_1$  in  $\tilde{M}$ . By the same argument, there exist  $\gamma_i^\pm \in \Gamma$  such that  $\gamma_i^\pm \cdot w$  is close to  $\phi^{T_i^\pm} v_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ .

We now use this setup to show terms in (2.2) can be approximated arbitrarily well by lengths of closed geodesics. Consider the geodesic  $c$  in  $\tilde{M}$  joining the basepoints of  $\gamma_1^- \cdot w$  and  $\gamma_2^+ \cdot w$ . Since the endpoints of  $c$  can be made arbitrarily close to  $\pi(-v_1)$  and  $\pi(v_2)$ , the tangent vectors to  $c$  are arbitrarily close to the geodesic  $(\pi(-v_1), \pi(v_2))$ . Also,  $\phi^{-T_1^-} v_1$  gets

arbitrarily close to the tangent vector to  $(\pi(-v_1), \pi(v_2))$  as  $T_1^-$  gets larger. So the tangent vector to  $c$  at the footpoint  $\gamma_1^- \cdot w$  is arbitrarily close to  $\phi^{-T_1^-} v_1$ , and hence to  $\gamma_1^- \cdot w$  as well. Similarly, the tangent vector to  $c$  at the footpoint of  $\gamma_2^+ \cdot w$  is arbitrarily close to the vector  $\gamma_2^+ \cdot w$ .

Now consider the projection  $p(c)$  in  $M$ . This is a closed curve which is freely homotopic to  $\gamma_2^+ \circ (\gamma_1^-)^{-1}$ , and is a geodesic away from the basepoint of  $p(w)$ . In the previous paragraph we showed the two tangent vectors to  $p(c)$  at that point are both arbitrarily close to the vector  $p(w)$ . The Anosov closing lemma then implies  $p(c)$  is shadowed by a closed geodesic; see [Fra18, p. 105] and [KH97, Theorem 6.4.15]. In particular, this closed geodesic is in the same free homotopy class as  $p(c)$ . So  $d(\phi^{T_1^+} v_1, \phi^{T_1^-} v_1)$  is approximately  $\mathcal{L}_g(\gamma_2^+ \circ (\gamma_1^-)^{-1})$ . Using an analogous argument, the other three terms in equation (2.2) can also be approximated by terms of the form  $\mathcal{L}_g(\gamma_i^+ \circ (\gamma_j^-)^{-1})$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 2.3.* Let  $(a, b, c, d) \in \partial^4 \tilde{M}$ . By the previous lemma, there are sequences  $a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i \in \tilde{M}$  converging to  $a, b, c, d$  along with sequences  $\gamma_{a_i}, \gamma_{b_i}, \gamma_{c_i}, \gamma_{d_i}$  such that  $d(a_i, b_i)$  is approximately  $\mathcal{L}_g(\gamma_{b_i} \circ \gamma_{a_i}^{-1})$  and analogously for the other three terms in the defining equation for  $[a, b, c, d]$ . Let  $v_{a_i}, v_{b_i}$  be tangent vectors to the geodesic through  $a$  and  $b$  based at  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  respectively. Let  $v_{c_i}$  and  $v_{d_i}$  be defined analogously. Recall the  $\gamma_i$  were chosen such that there is  $w \in T^1 \tilde{M}$  satisfying the condition that the basepoints of the vectors  $\gamma_{a_i} \cdot w, \gamma_{b_i} \cdot w, \gamma_{c_i} \cdot w, \gamma_{d_i} \cdot w$  are arbitrarily close to  $v_{a_i}, v_{b_i}, v_{c_i}, v_{d_i}$ .

By [Gro00], there exists a  $\Gamma$ -equivariant homeomorphism  $\mathcal{F} : T^1 \tilde{M} \rightarrow T^1 \tilde{N}$ , which is an orbit equivalence of geodesic flows. Moreover,  $\mathcal{F}$  sends the geodesic through  $a, b \in \partial \tilde{M}$  to the geodesic through  $\bar{f}(a), \bar{f}(b) \in \partial \tilde{N}$ . Consider the distance between the footpoints of  $\mathcal{F}(v_{a_i})$  and  $\mathcal{F}(v_{b_i})$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is continuous we know  $\mathcal{F}(v_{a_i})$  is close to  $\gamma_{a_i} \cdot \mathcal{F}(w)$  and  $\mathcal{F}(v_{b_i})$  is close to  $\gamma_{b_i} \cdot \mathcal{F}(w)$ . By the Anosov closing lemma, (the projection of) the geodesic through  $\gamma_{a_i} \cdot \mathcal{F}(w)$  and  $\gamma_{b_i} \cdot \mathcal{F}(w)$  can be approximated with a closed geodesic of length  $\mathcal{L}_g(f_*(\gamma_{b_i} \circ \gamma_{a_i}^{-1}))$ . The same argument can be used to approximate the other three distances in the limit definition of  $[\bar{f}(a), \bar{f}(b), \bar{f}(c), \bar{f}(d)]$ . The desired result then follows from the assumption  $1 - \varepsilon \leq \frac{\mathcal{L}_{g_0}}{\mathcal{L}_g} \leq 1 + \varepsilon$ .  $\square$

*Remark 2.5.* This proof does not use that  $1 \pm \varepsilon$  is close to 1, so this generalizes [Ota92, Proposition 4.2].

**2.2. The Liouville current.** Let  $\omega$  be the 1-form on  $T^1 M$  obtained by pulling back the canonical 1-form on  $T^* M$  to  $TM$  via the identification induced by the Riemannian metric and then restricting to  $T^1 M$ . Then  $\omega$  and  $d\omega$  are both flow-invariant, and  $\omega$  is a contact form, meaning  $\omega \wedge (d\omega)^{n-1}$  is a volume form on  $T^1 M$ . The associated measure on  $T^1 M$  is called the *Liouville measure*. The total Liouville volume of  $T^1 M$  is the product of the Riemannian volume of  $M$  and the volume of the unit sphere in dimension  $n - 1$ ; thus the ratio of the volumes of  $M$  and  $N$  is the same as the ratio of the Liouville volumes of their respective unit tangent bundles.

Recall the space of geodesics is the quotient of  $T^1 \tilde{M}$  by the action of the geodesic flow, and can also be identified with the set  $\partial^2 \tilde{M}$  of pairs of distinct points in the boundary (see Construction 2.1). Since  $d\omega$  is flow-invariant, it descends to a 2-form on the space of geodesics  $\partial^2 \tilde{M}$ . This form is also symplectic, meaning  $(d\omega)^{n-1}$  is a volume form on  $\partial^2 \tilde{M}$ . The associated measure is called the *Liouville current*. In this section, we establish the following relation between the marked length spectra and the Liouville currents:

**Theorem 2.6.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a closed negatively curved Riemannian manifold of dimension at least 3 with fundamental group  $\Gamma$ . Let  $(N, g_0)$  be another closed negatively curved manifold with fundamental group  $\Gamma$  and assume the geodesic flow on  $T^1N$  has Anosov splitting of  $C^{1+\alpha}$  regularity. Suppose that the marked length spectra of  $M$  and  $N$  are  $\varepsilon$ -close as in (1.2). Let  $\lambda^M$  and  $\lambda^N$  denote the Liouville currents on  $\partial^2\tilde{M}$  and  $\partial^2\tilde{N}$  respectively, and let  $\bar{f}: \partial^2\tilde{M} \rightarrow \partial^2\tilde{M}$  as in Construction 2.1. Then there is a constant  $C = C(\tilde{N}, \tilde{g}_0)$  such that*

$$(1 - C\varepsilon^\alpha)(1 - \varepsilon)^{n-1}\bar{f}_*\lambda^M \leq \lambda^N \leq (1 + C\varepsilon^\alpha)(1 + \varepsilon)^{n-1}\bar{f}_*\lambda^M. \quad (2.3)$$

*If, in addition,  $(N, g_0)$  is locally symmetric and  $\varepsilon$  is sufficiently small (depending on  $n = \dim N$ ), then  $\alpha$  can be replaced with 2 in the above estimates and the constant  $C$  depends only on  $n$ .*

*Remark 2.7.* If the Anosov splitting of  $T^1N$  is only  $C^1$ , then our proof shows the quantities  $(1 \pm C\varepsilon^\alpha)$  can be replaced with constants that converge to 1 as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , but we are not able to determine the explicit dependence of these constants on  $\varepsilon$ ; see the statement above Lemma 2.15.

The proof of this theorem relies on relating the Liouville current to the cross-ratio, in order to then apply Proposition 2.3. We begin by explaining the explicit relation between the Liouville current and the cross-ratio in the case where  $\dim(M) = 2$ . Let  $a, b, c, d \in \partial\tilde{M}$  be four distinct points. Since  $\partial\tilde{M}$  is a circle, the pair of points  $(a, b)$  determines an interval in the boundary (after fixing an orientation). Let  $(a, b) \times (c, d) \in \partial^2\tilde{M}$  denote the geodesics starting in the interval  $(a, b)$  and ending in the interval  $(c, d)$ . Then

$$\lambda((a, b) \times (c, d)) = \frac{1}{2}[a, b, c, d]. \quad (2.4)$$

(See [Ota90, Proof of Theorem 2] and [HP97, Theorem 4.4].)

In [Ham99], Hamenstädt relates the Liouville current and the cross-ratio for manifolds of any dimension. If, in addition, the manifold  $N$  is such that  $TT^1N$  has  $C^1$  Anosov splitting, then the Liouville current is completely determined by the cross-ratio, and hence by the marked length spectrum, as is the case for surfaces. Hamenstädt's argument shows more specifically that if  $N$  satisfies the  $C^1$  Anosov splitting condition and  $M$  is another manifold with the same marked length spectrum, and hence cross-ratio, as  $N$ , then the Liouville currents of  $M$  and  $N$  agree. In particular, this shows Theorem 2.6 when  $\varepsilon = 0$ .

Before proving Theorem 2.6, we recall notation, terminology and select arguments from [Ham99]: Hamenstädt constructs measures  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  (to be defined in Constructions 2.9 and 2.21 respectively) on the space of geodesics, both completely determined by the cross-ratio, such that

$$\mathcal{S} \leq \lambda \leq \mathcal{P} \quad (2.5)$$

[Ham99, Propositions 3.8 and 3.13 a)]. If the underlying manifold has  $C^1$  Anosov splitting, which is the case for the locally symmetric space  $N$ , the stronger conclusion

$$\mathcal{S} = \lambda = \mathcal{P} \quad (2.6)$$

holds by [Ham99, Proposition 3.13 b)]. If  $M$  is such that its cross-ratio agrees with the cross-ratio of a locally symmetric space  $N$ , then  $\mathcal{S}^N = \bar{f}_*\mathcal{S}^M$  and  $\mathcal{P}^N = \bar{f}_*\mathcal{P}^M$ . Combining this with (2.5) and (2.6) gives

$$\bar{f}_*\lambda^M \leq \bar{f}_*\mathcal{P}^M = \lambda^N = \bar{f}_*\mathcal{S}^M \leq \bar{f}_*\lambda^M, \quad (2.7)$$

which forces  $\lambda^N = \bar{f}_* \lambda^M$ . Thus, in order to see the effects of the cross-ratio on the Liouville current, we need to use the exact constructions of  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  from [Ham99]. We start with preliminary definitions.

### 2.3. Definition of $\mathcal{S}$ .

**Definition 2.8.** [Ham99, p. 123] Fix  $\eta > 0$ . Let  $B(r) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be the ball of radius  $r$  centered at the origin and let  $\phi_0(x, y)$  denote the dot product of  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $\beta_1, \beta_2 : B(r) \rightarrow \partial \tilde{M}$  be continuous embeddings so that

$$|[\beta_1(x), \beta_1(0), \beta_2(y), \beta_2(0)] - \phi_0(x, y)| \leq \eta r^2 \quad (2.8)$$

for all  $x, y \in B(r)$ . We say the image  $\beta_1(B(r)) \times \beta_2(B(r)) \subset \partial \tilde{M} \times \partial \tilde{M} \setminus \Delta$  is a  $(1 + \eta)$  *quasi-symplectic  $r$ -ball*. We let  $\mathcal{Q}(\eta)$  denote the collection of all  $(1 + \eta)$ -quasisymplectic  $r$ -balls for arbitrary  $r$ .

Fix any distance  $d$  on  $\partial \tilde{M}$  that induces the visual topology. For  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}(\eta)$ , we let  $\text{diam}(Q)$  be the  $d \times d$  diameter of  $Q \subset \partial^2 \tilde{M}$ .

For  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}(\eta)$ , define a quantity  $\delta(Q)$  as follows. Write  $Q = A \times B$ , i.e.  $A = \beta_1(B(r))$ ,  $B = \beta_2(B(r))$ . First let  $\delta(A \times B; a, b) = \sup_{\xi \in A, \zeta \in B} [a, \xi, b, \zeta]$ . Now define

$$\delta(A \times B) = \inf_{a \in A, b \in B} \delta(A \times B; a, b). \quad (2.9)$$

(See [Ham99, p. 124] ).

**Construction 2.9.** [Ham99, p. 124] Let  $C \subset \partial \tilde{M} \times \partial \tilde{M}$  a Borel set and let  $a_{n-1}$  denote the volume of the unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ . Define

$$\mathcal{S}_\eta(C) = \inf \left\{ a_{n-1}^2 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta(Q_i)^{n-1} \mid Q_i \in \mathcal{Q}(\eta), \text{diam}(Q_i) \leq \eta, C \subset \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} Q_i \right\}.$$

Finally, let  $\mathcal{S}(C) = \limsup_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{S}_\eta(C)$ .

This concludes our summary of [Ham99].

### 2.4. Comparing $\bar{f}_* \mathcal{S}^M$ and $\mathcal{S}^N$ .

**Hypothesis 2.10.** For the remainder of this section, we assume

$$1 - \varepsilon \leq \frac{\mathcal{L}_{g_0}(f_* \gamma)}{\mathcal{L}_g(\gamma)} \leq 1 + \varepsilon.$$

(See (1.2) in the statement of Theorem 1.2)

By Proposition 2.3, the cross-ratios of  $M$  and  $N$  satisfy

$$(1 - \varepsilon)[a, b, c, d] \leq [\bar{f}(a), \bar{f}(b), \bar{f}(c), \bar{f}(d)] \leq (1 + \varepsilon)[a, b, c, d].$$

We want to compare  $\bar{f}_* \mathcal{S}^M$  and  $\mathcal{S}^N$ . Note that changing the cross-ratio used to define  $\mathcal{S}$  will change the quantity  $\delta(Q)$  and the set  $\mathcal{Q}(\eta)$ . We investigate this precisely below.

**Lemma 2.11.** *For any  $\eta > 0$ , let  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}(\eta)$ . We then have*

$$(1 - \varepsilon)\delta^M(Q) \leq \delta^N(\bar{f}(Q)) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\delta^M(Q).$$

*Proof.* This follows immediately from the definition of  $\delta$  in Equation 2.9 together with Proposition 2.3.  $\square$



**Lemma 2.12.** *Let  $Q \subset \partial^2 \tilde{M}$ . If  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}(\eta)$  then  $\bar{f}(Q) \in \mathcal{Q}(\eta + (1 + \eta)\varepsilon)$ .*

*Proof.* If  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}(\eta)$ , there are maps  $\beta_i : B(r) \rightarrow \partial \tilde{M}$  for  $i = 1, 2$  with  $Q = \beta_1(B(r)) \times \beta_2(B(r))$  such that

$$|[\beta_1(x), \beta_1(0), \beta_2(y), \beta_2(0)]_M - \phi_0(x, y)| \leq \eta r^2. \quad (2.10)$$

Using the triangle inequality, Proposition 2.3, and (2.10) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & |[\bar{f} \circ \beta_1(x), \bar{f} \circ \beta_1(0), \bar{f} \circ \beta_2(y), \bar{f} \circ \beta_2(0)]_N - \phi_0(x, y)| \\ & \leq \varepsilon |[\beta_1(x), \beta_1(0), \beta_2(y), \beta_2(0)]_M| + |[\beta_1(x), \beta_1(0), \beta_2(y), \beta_2(0)]_M - \phi_0(x, y)| \\ & \leq \varepsilon |[\beta_1(x), \beta_1(0), \beta_2(y), \beta_2(0)]_M| + \eta r^2 \\ & \leq \varepsilon(1 + \eta)r^2 + \eta r^2, \end{aligned}$$

which shows  $\bar{f}(Q) \in \mathcal{Q}(\eta + (1 + \eta)\varepsilon)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.13.** *Let*

$$\chi_\eta^C = \{\cup_{i=1}^\infty A_i \times B_i \mid C \subset \cup_{i=1}^\infty A_i \times B_i, \text{diam}(A_i \times B_i) \leq \eta, A_i \times B_i \in \mathcal{Q}(\eta)\}.$$

*Then*

$$\bar{f}\left(\chi_\eta^{\bar{f}^{-1}(C)}\right) \subset \chi_{\eta+(1+\eta)\varepsilon}^C$$

*for sufficiently small  $\eta$ .*

*Proof.* If  $\cup_{i=1}^\infty A_i \times B_i \in \chi_\eta^{\bar{f}^{-1}(C)}$  then  $\bar{f}(\cup_{i=1}^\infty A_i \times B_i) = \cup_{i=1}^\infty \bar{f}(A_i) \times \bar{f}(B_i)$  clearly satisfies the first condition in the definition of  $\chi_{\eta+(1+\eta)\varepsilon}^C$ . To check the second condition, note that since  $\bar{f}$  is continuous, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\eta > 0$  so that  $\text{diam}(A_i \times B_i) \leq \eta$  implies  $\text{diam}(\bar{f}(A_i) \times \bar{f}(B_i)) \leq \varepsilon \leq \eta + (1 + \eta)\varepsilon$ . The third condition follows from the previous lemma.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.14.** *The following inequality of measures holds:*

$$\mathcal{S}_N^\varepsilon \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^{n-1} \bar{f}_* \mathcal{S}_M.$$

*Proof.* For any  $C \subset \partial^2 \tilde{N}$ , Corollary 2.13 and Lemma 2.11 give

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}_* \mathcal{S}_M^\eta(C) &= \mathcal{S}_M^\eta(\bar{f}^{-1}(C)) \\ &= \inf \left\{ a_{n-1}^2 \sum_{i=1}^\infty \delta^{n-1}(A_i \times B_i) \mid \cup_{i=1}^\infty A_i \times B_i \in \chi_\eta^{\bar{f}^{-1}(C)} \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ a_{n-1}^2 \sum_{i=1}^\infty \delta^{n-1}(A_i \times B_i) \mid \cup_{i=1}^\infty \bar{f}(A_i) \times \bar{f}(B_i) \in \bar{f}(\chi_\eta^{\bar{f}^{-1}(C)}) \right\} \\ &\geq \inf \left\{ a_{n-1}^2 \sum_{i=1}^\infty \delta^{n-1}(A_i \times B_i) \mid \cup_{i=1}^\infty \bar{f}(A_i) \times \bar{f}(B_i) \in \chi_{\varepsilon(1+\eta)+\eta}^C \right\} \\ &\geq \inf \left\{ \frac{a_{n-1}^2}{(1 + \varepsilon)^{n-1}} \sum_{i=1}^\infty \delta^{n-1}(\bar{f}(A_i) \times \bar{f}(B_i)) \mid \cup_{i=1}^\infty \bar{f}(A_i) \times \bar{f}(B_i) \in \chi_{\varepsilon(1+\eta)+\eta}^C \right\} \\ &\geq \mathcal{S}_N^{\varepsilon(1+\eta)+\eta}(C) / (1 + \varepsilon)^{n-1} \end{aligned}$$

Taking  $\eta \rightarrow 0$  completes the proof.  $\square$

2.5. **Comparing  $\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon^N$  and  $\lambda^N$ .** If  $TT^1N$  has  $C^1$  Anosov splitting, then  $\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon^N \rightarrow \lambda^N$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  (see the proof of [Ham99, Corollary 3.12]). If we assume instead the splitting is  $C^{1+\alpha}$ , we obtain a more precise convergence statement:

**Lemma 2.15.** *Suppose the Anosov splitting of  $N$  is of class  $C^{1+\alpha}$ . Then there is a constant  $C$ , depending only on  $\tilde{N}$ , so that for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  (sufficiently small in terms of  $n$ ) we have*

$$\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon^N \geq \frac{1}{1 + C\varepsilon^\alpha} \lambda^N.$$

Recall from the proof of [Ham99, Corollary 3.12] that if  $\delta > 0$  and  $\chi(\delta)$  is chosen as in [Ham99, Lemma 3.11] then  $S_\chi \geq (1 + \delta)^{-1} \lambda$ . (This requires  $\delta$  to be sufficiently small in terms of  $n = \dim N$ .) As such, we prove Lemma 2.15 by explicitly determining the dependence of  $\chi(\delta)$  on  $\delta$ . Note it follows from the proof of [Ham99, Lemma 3.11] that  $\chi(\delta)$  is in turn equal to the quantity  $\kappa(\delta)$  from [Ham99, Property 4), p. 130]. We now recall all the relevant definitions in the statement of [Ham99, Property 4)]:

First we recall the definition of the function  $\phi$  at the beginning of [Ham99, Section 3]. Let  $\rho$  be a symplectic form on  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$  so that for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the submanifolds  $\{x\} \times \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \{y\}$  are Lagrangian. For  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , let  $c_x$  be a curve in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $c_x(0) = 0$  and  $c_x(1) = x$ . Similarly define a curve  $c_y$ . Then define a surface  $\Psi_{x,y}(s, t) = (c_x(s), c_y(t))$ . Let  $\phi(x, y) = \int_{\Psi_{x,y}} \rho$ . By [Ham99, Lemma 3.1], the function  $\phi$  is well-defined, i.e. does not depend on the choice of curves  $c_x$  and  $c_y$ . Note that if  $\rho_0$  is the standard symplectic form  $\sum_i dx_i \wedge dy_i$ , then the associated function  $\phi_0(x, y)$  is the dot product of  $x$  and  $y$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

Hamenstädt also defines such a function  $\phi$  associated to the symplectic form  $d\omega$  on the space of geodesics using special coordinates  $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \partial\tilde{M} \times \partial\tilde{M} \setminus \Delta$  to view  $d\omega$  as a symplectic form on  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ . We recall the construction of  $\Psi$ , which can be found above the statement of [Ham99, Lemma 3.9]: There exists a geodesic flow invariant connection  $\nabla$  on  $T^1N$  called the Kanai connection. This connection is flat when restricted to the leaves of the strong stable and strong unstable foliations  $W^{ss}$  and  $W^{su}$ , respectively (see the discussion in [Ham99] for more details). Fix  $v \in T^1\tilde{M}$  and let  $L^{su} : T_v W^{su} \rightarrow W^{su}$  and  $L^{ss} : T_v W^{ss} \rightarrow W^{ss}$  be exponential maps with respect to the restriction of this connection to  $W^{ss}$  and  $W^{su}$  respectively. Let  $\{X_i\}$  and  $\{Y_j\}$  be orthonormal bases for  $T_v W^{su}$  and  $T_v W^{ss}$  respectively so that  $d\omega(X_i, Y_j) = \delta_{ij}$ . For  $w \in W^{su}(v)$  and  $z \in W^{ss}(v)$  both sufficiently close to  $v$ , define  $[w, z]$  to be the unique point in  $W^{ss}(w) \cap W^{su}(z)$ . The regularity of the function  $[\cdot, \cdot]$  is the same as that of the Anosov splitting. Define  $\Psi(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}) = [L^{su}(\sum_i x_i X_i), L^{ss}(\sum_j y_j Y_j)]$ . Let  $\rho$  be the symplectic form on  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  given by  $\rho(x, y) = d\omega(d\Psi x, d\Psi y)$ , which is continuous when  $\Psi$  is  $C^1$ . Use this form  $\rho$  to define a function  $\phi$  as above. Recall  $\phi_0$  was defined similarly, but in place of the symplectic form  $\rho$ , the standard symplectic form  $\rho_0$  was used. Then the function  $\phi$  has the following property:

**Lemma 2.16.** [Ham99, Property 4), p. 130] *Suppose the Anosov splitting of  $N$  is  $C^1$ . Then for any  $\delta > 0$  there is  $\kappa(\delta)$  so that whenever  $\|x\|, \|y\| < \kappa(\delta)$  we have*

$$\frac{\phi(x, y) - \phi_0(x, y)}{\|x\| \|y\|} < \delta.$$

We now show how  $\kappa(\delta)$  depends on  $\delta$  in the case where the Anosov splitting is  $C^{1+\alpha}$ .

**Lemma 2.17.** *Suppose the Anosov splitting of  $N$  is  $C^{1+\alpha}$ . Then there is a constant  $C = C(\tilde{N})$  so that  $\kappa(\delta) = (\frac{\delta}{C})^{1/\alpha}$  in the above lemma.*

*Proof.* Fix  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  and consider the parametrized surface  $\Psi_{x,y}(s, t) = (sx, ty)$ . Then, definitionally, we have

$$\frac{\phi(x, y) - \phi_0(x, y)}{\|x\|\|y\|} = \frac{1}{\|x\|\|y\|} \int_{\Psi_{x,y}} \rho - \rho_0.$$

Write  $\rho - \rho_0 = \sum_{i,j} a_{ij} dx_i \wedge dy_j$ . Since  $\Psi$  is  $C^{1+\alpha}$ , the  $a_{ij}$  are  $C^\alpha$ . Moreover,  $a_{ij}(0, 0) = 0$  [Ham99, Property 1), p. 128]. Thus  $|a_{ij}(sx, ty)| \leq C\|(sx, ty)\|^\alpha \leq C\|(x, y)\|^\alpha$  for some constant  $C$  depending on  $\tilde{N}$ .

We now have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\phi(x, y) - \phi_0(x, y)}{\|x\|\|y\|} &= \frac{1}{\|x\|\|y\|} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 (\rho - \rho_0) \left( \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial s}, \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial t} \right) ds dt \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}(sx, ty) dx_i \wedge dy_j \left( \frac{x}{\|x\|}, \frac{y}{\|y\|} \right) ds dt \\ &\leq C\|(x, y)\|^\alpha \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \sum_{i,j=1}^n dx_i \wedge dy_j \left( \frac{x}{\|x\|}, \frac{y}{\|y\|} \right) ds dt \\ &\leq n^2 C\|(x, y)\|^\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

If  $\|x\|, \|y\| < \kappa$ , we get  $|\phi(x, y) - \phi_0(x, y)| \leq C\kappa^\alpha \|x\|\|y\|$  for some constant  $C = C(\tilde{N})$ . So we can take  $\kappa(\delta) = (\delta/C)^{1/\alpha}$  for some other  $C = C(\tilde{N})$  and the conclusion of Lemma 2.16 will hold.  $\square$

Next we show how to improve the value of  $\kappa(\delta)$  when  $N$  is a locally symmetric space.

**Lemma 2.18.** *If  $N$  is a locally symmetric space, and  $\delta$  is sufficiently small (depending on  $n$ ) then we can take  $\kappa(\delta) = C\delta^{1/2}$  for some constant  $C$  depending only on the dimension of  $N$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $g(x, y) = \phi(x, y) - \phi_0(x, y)$ . Since  $N$  is locally symmetric, the stable and unstable foliations are real-analytic, and so is  $g$ . We now compute the first nonzero term of the power series expansion of  $g$  centered at  $(0, 0)$ .

Since  $\phi(0, 0) = \phi_0(0, 0) = 0$ , we get  $g(0, 0) = 0$ . Now fix  $y$  and let  $g_y(x)$  denote the function  $x \mapsto g(x, y)$ . Let  $g_x(y)$  be defined analogously. We know  $g_0(x) = 0$  for all  $x$  and  $g_0(y) = 0$  for all  $y$  [Ham99, Property 1)]. Hence the  $k$ -th derivative  $D^k g_0(x) = 0$  for all  $x$  and  $D^k g_0(y) = 0$  for all  $y$ .

Additionally, the function  $g_x(y)$  satisfies  $Dg_x(0) = 0$  [Ham99, Property 3)]. Analogously we have  $Dg_y(0) = 0$ . This, together with the previous paragraph, means if  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are both  $n$ -dimensional multi-indices, then we have  $\frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial x^\alpha} \frac{\partial^\beta}{\partial y^\beta} g(0, 0) = 0$  whenever  $|\alpha| = 0, 1$  or  $|\beta| = 0, 1$ . Hence the first nonzero term of the power series expansion of  $g$  centered at  $(0, 0)$  is of the form  $\sum_{i,j,k,l} a_{ijkl} x_i x_j y_k y_l$ . This means there is a constant  $C$  depending only on  $\tilde{N}$  such that

$$\frac{|\phi(x, y) - \phi_0(x, y)|}{\|x\|\|y\|} \leq \frac{1}{\|x\|\|y\|} C\|x\|^2\|y\|^2$$

so long as  $\|x\|, \|y\|$  are small enough for the power series expansion of  $g$  centered at the origin to converge at  $(x, y)$ . Set  $\kappa(\delta) = (\delta/C)^{1/2}$ . Then for small enough  $\delta$  (depending on  $\tilde{N}$ ), we obtain  $|\phi(x, y) - \phi_0(x, y)| \leq \delta\|x\|\|y\|$  whenever  $\|x\|, \|y\| \leq \kappa$ , as desired.  $\square$

## 2.6. Comparing $\lambda_N$ and $\bar{f}_*\lambda_M$ .

**Proposition 2.19.** *Let  $\lambda^M$  and  $\lambda^N$  denote the Liouville currents on  $\partial^2\tilde{M}$  and  $\partial^2\tilde{N}$  respectively. There is a constant  $C = C(\tilde{N})$  so that*

$$\lambda^N \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^{n-1}(1 + C\varepsilon^\alpha)\bar{f}_*\lambda^M.$$

*Proof.* Combining Proposition 2.14 together with [Ham99, Proposition 3.8] (see also (2.5)), we obtain

$$\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon^N \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^{n-1}\bar{f}_*\mathcal{S}^M \leq \bar{f}_*\lambda^M.$$

Lemma 2.17 together with the proof of [Ham99, Corollary 3.12] gives

$$\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon^N \geq (1 + C\varepsilon^\alpha)^{-1}\lambda^N$$

for some  $C$  depending only on  $\tilde{N}$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

*Remark 2.20.* If  $\tilde{N}$  is a symmetric space, Lemma 2.18 shows we can take  $\alpha = 2$  in the statement of the above proposition. Additionally, since there are only finitely many negatively curved symmetric spaces of a given dimension, we can say  $C$  depends only on  $n = \dim \tilde{N}$ .

To complete the proof of Theorem 2.6, we need a lower estimate for  $\lambda_N$  analogous to the upper estimate in Proposition 2.19. We obtain this by mimicking the above analysis for the measure  $\mathcal{P}$  instead of  $\mathcal{S}$ , see (2.5). We first recall the construction of  $\mathcal{P}$ :

**Construction 2.21.** [Ham99, Proposition 3.13] Let  $\eta > 0$  and  $U$  be an open subset of  $\partial^2\tilde{M}$ . Define

$$\mathcal{P}_\eta(U) = \sup \left\{ a_{n-1}^2 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta(Q_i)^{n-1} \mid Q_i \in \mathcal{Q}(\eta), \text{diam}(Q_i) \leq \eta, Q_i \subset U, Q_i \cap Q_j = \emptyset \right\}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{P}(U) = \liminf_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{P}_\eta(U)$ . For  $C \subset \partial^2\tilde{M}$  a Borel set, define  $\mathcal{P}(C) = \inf\{\mathcal{P}(U) \mid U \supset C\}$ .

**Proposition 2.22.** *Let  $\lambda^M$  and  $\lambda^N$  denote the Liouville currents on  $\partial^2\tilde{M}$  and  $\partial^2\tilde{N}$  respectively. There is a constant  $C = C(\tilde{N})$  so that*

$$\lambda_N \geq (1 - \varepsilon)^{n-1}(1 - C\varepsilon^\alpha)\bar{f}_*\lambda_M.$$

*If  $\tilde{N}$  is a symmetric space, we can take  $\alpha = 2$ , and the constant  $C$  depends only on  $n = \dim \tilde{N}$ .*

*Proof.* Let

$$\chi_\eta^U = \{\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} Q_i \mid Q_i \cap Q_j = \emptyset, Q_i \subset U, \text{diam}(Q_i) \leq \eta, Q_i \in \mathcal{Q}(\eta)\}.$$

Then  $\bar{f}(\chi_\eta^U) \subset \chi_{(1+\eta)\varepsilon+\eta}^{\bar{f}(U)}$  by Corollary 2.13. Using Lemma 2.11 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}_* \mathcal{P}_M^\eta(U) &= \mathcal{P}_M^\eta(\bar{f}^{-1}(U)) \\ &= \sup \left\{ a_{n-1}^2 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta(Q_i)^{n-1} \mid \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} Q_i \in \chi_\eta^{\bar{f}^{-1}(U)} \right\} \\ &\leq \sup \left\{ \frac{a_{n-1}^2}{(1-\varepsilon)^{n-1}} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta(\bar{f}(Q_i))^{n-1} \mid \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \bar{f}(Q_i) \in \bar{f}(\chi_\eta^{\bar{f}^{-1}(U)}) \right\} \\ &\leq \sup \left\{ \frac{a_{n-1}^2}{(1-\varepsilon)^{n-1}} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta(\bar{f}(Q_i))^{n-1} \mid \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \bar{f}(Q_i) \in \chi_{(1+\eta)\varepsilon+\eta}^U \right\} \\ &\leq \mathcal{P}_N^{(1+\eta)\varepsilon+\eta}(U)/(1-\varepsilon)^{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking  $\eta \rightarrow 0$  gives

$$(1-\varepsilon)^{n-1} \bar{f}_* \mathcal{P}_M(U) \leq \mathcal{P}_N^\varepsilon(U).$$

This, together with [Ham99, Proposition 3.13 a)] (see also (2.5)), gives

$$(1-\varepsilon)^{n-1} \bar{f}_* \lambda_M(U) \leq (1-\varepsilon)^{n-1} \bar{f}_* \mathcal{P}_M(U) \leq \mathcal{P}_N^\varepsilon(U).$$

It follows from Lemma 2.17 together with the proof of [Ham99, Proposition 3.13 b)] that

$$\mathcal{P}_N^\varepsilon \leq (1 - C\varepsilon^\alpha)^{-1} \lambda_N$$

for some constant  $C$  depending only on  $\tilde{N}$ .

Hence  $\lambda^N(U) \geq (1-\varepsilon)^{n-1}(1-C\varepsilon^\alpha) \bar{f}_* \mathcal{P}_M(U)$  for any open set  $U \subset \partial^2 \tilde{M}$ . To obtain this inequality for any Borel set  $A \subset \partial^2 \tilde{M}$  we take the infimum over all open sets  $U \supset A$ , from which the desired conclusion follows.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.6.* This follows immediately from Propositions 2.19 and 2.22.  $\square$

**2.7. Proof of the volume estimate.** In this section, we will use the estimate for the ratio  $\bar{f}_* \lambda^M / \lambda^N$  of the Liouville currents in Theorem 2.6 to compare  $\text{Vol}(M)$  and  $\text{Vol}(N)$ . Note the Riemannian volumes of  $M$  and  $N$  are determined by the Liouville volumes of  $T^1M$  and  $T^1N$ . To obtain the Liouville measure from the Liouville current, we integrate the Liouville current in the geodesic flow direction. Let  $\phi^t$  denote the geodesic flow of  $M$  and let  $\psi^t$  denote the geodesic flow of  $N$ . If the marked length spectra of  $M$  and  $N$  are equal, then the flows  $\phi^t$  and  $\psi^t$  are *conjugate* [Ham92], i.e. there is a homeomorphism  $\mathcal{F} : T^1M \rightarrow T^1N$  such that

$$\mathcal{F}(\phi^t v) = \psi^t \mathcal{F}(v)$$

for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}, v \in T^1M$ . If, in addition to this,  $M$  and  $N$  have the same Liouville current, then  $T^1M$  and  $T^1N$  have the same Liouville measure, so  $\text{Vol}(M) = \text{Vol}(N)$ .

If the lengths of closed geodesics of  $M$  and  $N$  are instead  $\varepsilon$ -close as in (1.2), the geodesic flows may not be conjugate. However, so long as  $M$  and  $N$  are negatively curved and have isomorphic fundamental groups, their geodesic flows are *orbit-equivalent* [Gro00]. This means there exists a function  $a(t, v)$  such that

$$\mathcal{F}(\phi^t v) = \psi^{a(t,v)} \mathcal{F}(v)$$

for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}, v \in T^1M$ .

In this section, we will use the assumption of approximately equal lengths (1.2) to show the time change  $a(t, v)$  is close to  $t$  on sets of large measure, thereby allowing us to show the total Liouville measures of  $T^1M$  and  $T^1N$  are close.

We begin by recalling the setup from [Gro00]. The construction starts with a preliminary  $\Gamma$ -equivariant orbit map  $\mathcal{F}_0 : T^1\tilde{M} \rightarrow T^1\tilde{N}$  which is not necessarily injective. Recall there is a homotopy equivalence  $f : M \rightarrow N$  by assumption. We can assume  $f$  is  $C^1$  by using that every continuous map is homotopic to a differentiable map; see [BP92, p. 86] and [MW97]. Let  $\tilde{f} : \tilde{M} \rightarrow \tilde{N}$  be a lift of  $f$ .

Let  $\eta$  be a bi-infinite geodesic in  $\tilde{M}$  and let  $\zeta = \tilde{f}(\eta)$  be the corresponding geodesic in  $\tilde{N}$ , where  $\tilde{f} : \partial^2\tilde{M} \rightarrow \partial^2\tilde{N}$  is obtained from extending the quasi-isometry  $\tilde{f}$  to a map  $\partial\tilde{M} \rightarrow \partial\tilde{N}$ ; see Construction 2.1. Let  $P_\zeta : \tilde{N} \rightarrow \zeta$  denote the orthogonal projection. Note this projection is  $\Gamma$ -equivariant, i.e.  $\gamma P_\zeta(x) = P_{\gamma\zeta}(\gamma x)$ . If  $(p, v) \in T^1\tilde{M}$  is tangent to  $\eta$ , then we can define  $\mathcal{F}_0(p, v)$  to be the tangent vector to  $\zeta$  at the point  $P_\zeta \circ \tilde{f}(p)$ . Thus  $\mathcal{F}_0 : T^1\tilde{M} \rightarrow T^1\tilde{N}$  is a  $\Gamma$ -equivariant map which sends geodesics to geodesics. As such, we can define a cocycle  $b(t, v)$  to be the time which satisfies

$$\mathcal{F}_0(\phi^t v) = \psi^{b(t, v)} \mathcal{F}_0(v).$$

*Remark 2.23.* Since  $\tilde{f}$  is  $C^1$  and the orthogonal projection is smooth in the  $t$ -direction, we have  $t \mapsto b(t, v)$  is  $C^1$ .

It is possible for a fiber of the orthogonal projection map to intersect the quasi-geodesic  $\tilde{f}(\eta)$  in more than one point; thus,  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is not necessarily injective. In order to obtain an injective orbit equivalence, we follow the method in [Gro00] and average the function  $b(t, v)$  along geodesics. We include a proof below, since the setup will be used throughout this section.

**Lemma 2.24.** *Let*

$$a_l(t, v) = \frac{1}{l} \int_t^{t+l} b(s, v) ds.$$

*There is a large enough  $l$  so that  $t \mapsto a_l(t, v)$  is injective for all  $v$ .*

*Proof.* The fundamental theorem of calculus gives

$$\frac{d}{dt} a_l(t, v) = \frac{b(t+l, v) - b(t, v)}{l}. \quad (2.11)$$

We claim there is a large enough  $l$  so that this quantity is always positive. To this end, suppose  $b(t+l, v) - b(t, v) = 0$ . This means  $\mathcal{F}_0(\phi^t v)$  and  $\mathcal{F}_0(\phi^{t+l} v)$  are in the same fiber of the normal projection onto the geodesic  $\tilde{f}(v)$ . Since  $s \mapsto \tilde{f}(\phi^s v)$  is a quasi-geodesic, there is a constant  $R$ , depending only on the quasi-isometry constants  $A$  and  $B$  of  $\tilde{f}$ , so that all points on  $\tilde{f}(\phi^s v)$  are of distance at most  $R$  from the geodesic  $\psi^t \mathcal{F}_0(v)$  [BH13, Theorem 3.H.1.7]. Thus two points on the same fiber of the normal projection are at most distance  $2R$  apart, which gives

$$A^{-1}l - B \leq d(f(\phi^t v), f(\phi^{t+l} v)) \leq 2R.$$

Taking  $l > A(2R + B)$  guarantees  $\frac{d}{ds} a_l(s, v)$  is never 0, and hence  $a_l(s, v)$  is injective.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.25.** *For each  $v \in T^1M$ , let*

$$\mathcal{F}_l(v) = \psi^{a_l(0, v)} \mathcal{F}_0(v)$$

*for  $a_l$  as in Lemma 2.24. Then  $\mathcal{F}_l$  is an orbit equivalence of geodesic flows.*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathcal{F}_l$  sends geodesics to geodesics, there exists a cocycle  $k_l(t, v)$  so that  $\mathcal{F}_l(v) = \psi^{k_l(t, v)} \mathcal{F}_l(v)$ . We need to check  $t \mapsto k_l(t, v)$  is injective. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} a_l(0, \phi^t v) &= \frac{1}{l} \int_0^l b(s, \phi^t v) ds \\ &= \frac{1}{l} \int_0^l b(s+t, v) - b(t, v) ds \\ &= a_l(t, v) - b(t, v). \end{aligned}$$

This means

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_l(\phi^t v) &= \psi^{a_l(0, \phi^t v)} \mathcal{F}_0(\phi^t v) \\ &= \psi^{a_l(0, \phi^t v) + b(t, v)} \mathcal{F}_0(v) \\ &= \psi^{a_l(t, v)} \mathcal{F}_0(v). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\mathcal{F}_l(\phi^t v) = \psi^{k_l(t, v)} \mathcal{F}_l(v) = \psi^{a_l(t, v)} \mathcal{F}_0(v)$ , and hence

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} k_l(t, v) = \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} a_l(t, v) = \frac{b(l, v)}{l}. \quad (2.12)$$

The proof of Lemma 2.24 shows the above quantity is positive. So  $\mathcal{F}_l$  is injective along geodesics, as desired.  $\square$

Now we will use the assumption  $1 - \varepsilon \leq \frac{\mathcal{L}_{g_0}}{\mathcal{L}_g} \leq 1 + \varepsilon$  (Hypothesis 2.10) to say more about this orbit equivalence.

**Lemma 2.26.** *Let  $v \in T^1 M$  be tangent to the axis of  $\gamma$  and let  $\tau = l(\gamma)$ . Then*

$$1 - \varepsilon \leq \frac{b(\tau, v)}{\tau} \leq 1 + \varepsilon.$$

*Proof.* By definition,  $b(\tau, v)$  is the distance from  $\mathcal{F}_0(v)$  to  $\mathcal{F}_0(\gamma v) = \overline{f}(\gamma) \mathcal{F}_0(v)$ . In addition, if  $v$  is on the axis of  $\gamma$ , then  $\mathcal{F}(v)$  is on the axis of  $\overline{f}(\gamma)$ , which means  $b(\tau, v)$  is equal to the translation length of  $\overline{f}(\gamma)$ . The hypothesis  $1 - \varepsilon \leq \frac{\mathcal{L}_{g_0}}{\mathcal{L}_g} \leq 1 + \varepsilon$  implies the translation length of  $\overline{f}(\gamma)$  is between  $(1 - \varepsilon)\tau$  and  $(1 + \varepsilon)\tau$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.27.** *There is a number  $L$  with  $1 + \varepsilon \leq L \leq 1 - \varepsilon$  such that for almost every  $v \in T^1 \tilde{M}$ , we have*

$$\frac{b(t, v)}{t} \rightarrow L$$

as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\beta(v) = \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} b(t, v)$  (see Remark 2.23). Then the fundamental theorem of calculus implies

$$b(T, v) = \int_0^T \beta(\phi^t v) dt.$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T \beta(\phi^t v) dt &= \int_0^T \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} b(s, \phi^t v) dt \\
&= \int_0^T \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} [b(s+t, v) - b(t, v)] dt && \text{(cocycle condition)} \\
&= \int_0^T \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} b(s+t, v) dt \\
&= b(T, v) - b(0, v).
\end{aligned}$$

The ergodic theorem then implies

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b(T, v)}{T} = \int_{T^1 M} \beta(v) d\mu(v)$$

for  $\mu$ -almost every  $v$ , where  $\mu$  is normalized Liouville measure on  $T^1 M$ . The integral of  $\beta$  on the right-hand side can be approximated by averaging  $\beta$  along closed geodesics (see [Sig72]). Lemma 2.26 then implies the value of this integral is between  $1 - \varepsilon$  and  $1 + \varepsilon$ .  $\square$

Now we will explicitly relate the Liouville current  $\lambda$  on  $\partial^2 \tilde{M}$  and the Liouville measure  $\mu$  on  $T^1 \tilde{M}$ . (This is a special case of a more general correspondence between geodesic-flow-invariant measures on  $T^1 \tilde{M}$  and finite measures on  $\partial^2 \tilde{M}$  due to Kaimanovich [Kai90, Theorem 2.1].)

Let  $X$  denote the vector field on  $T^1 M$  which generates the geodesic flow. For every  $v \in T^1 M$ , we can choose local coordinates  $(t, x_1, \dots, x_m)$  near  $v$  so that  $\partial/\partial t = X$ . Then  $(0, x_1, \dots, x_m)$  defines a local smooth hypersurface  $K_0 \subset T^1 M$  which is transverse to  $X$ . Let  $K = \pi(K_0) \subset \partial^2 \tilde{M}$ . Then  $\int_{K_0} (d\omega)^{n-1} = \lambda(K)$ .

For  $T > 0$  define

$$K_T = \{\phi^t v \mid v \in K_0, t \in [0, T]\}. \quad (2.13)$$

With respect to our choice of local coordinates, we have  $K_T = \{(t, x_1, \dots, x_m) \mid 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  and  $\omega = dt$ . We thus obtain

$$\mu(K_T) = \int_{K_T} \omega \wedge (d\omega)^{n-1} = T \int_{K_0} (d\omega)^{n-1} = T\lambda(K). \quad (2.14)$$

**Lemma 2.28.** *Suppose*

$$\bar{f}_* \lambda^M \geq C' \lambda^N \quad (2.15)$$

for some constant  $C'$ . For  $T > 0$  and  $K_0 \subset T^1 M$  a local transversal to the geodesic flow, define  $K_T$  as in (2.13) above. For all  $\delta > 0$ , there is a large enough  $l$  (depending on  $K_T$  and  $\delta$ ) so that

$$\mu^N(\mathcal{F}_l(K_T)) \geq C'(1 - \varepsilon - \delta)(1 - \delta)\mu^M(K_T).$$

*Proof.* For almost every  $v \in K_T$ , Lemma 2.27 gives  $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b(l, v)}{l} = L$ , where  $1 - \varepsilon \leq L \leq 1 + \varepsilon$ . By Egorov's theorem, there is a large subset of vectors  $v$  (i.e. of measure at least  $(1 - \delta)\lambda^M(K_T)$ ) for which  $\frac{b(l, v)}{l} \rightarrow L$  uniformly in  $v$ . In fact, this subset can be taken to be of the form  $E_T := K_T \cap \pi^{-1}(E)$  for some  $E \subset K \subset \partial^2 \tilde{M}$ . To see this, we compare the convergence of  $\frac{b(l, v)}{l}$  with that of  $\frac{b(l, \phi^t v)}{l}$  for  $t \in [0, T]$ . The cocycle condition implies

$$\frac{b(l, \phi^t v) - b(l, v)}{l} = \frac{b(t, \phi^l v) - b(t, v)}{l}.$$



The numerator of the right hand side is bounded on the compact set  $[0, T] \times T^1M$  independent of  $l$ , so the left hand side goes to zero uniformly in  $v$  as  $l \rightarrow \infty$ .

Thus we can choose large enough  $l$  (depending on  $\delta$ ) so that  $L - \delta \leq \frac{b(l,v)}{l} \leq L + \delta$  for all  $v \in E_T$ . Using Lemma 2.27 and (2.12) we get

$$1 - \varepsilon - \delta \leq \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} k_l(t, v) \leq 1 + \varepsilon + \delta$$

for all  $v \in E_T$ . The cocycle condition implies

$$\int_0^t \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} k_l(t, \phi^s v) ds = \int_0^t \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} k_l(s+t, v) ds = k_l(t, v) - k_l(0, v).$$

This, together with the previous inequalities, gives

$$1 - \varepsilon - \delta \leq k_l(t, v)/t \leq 1 + \varepsilon + \delta.$$

This means

$$\mathcal{F}_l(E_T) = \{\psi^{k_l(t,v)} \mathcal{F}_l(v) \mid v \in E_0, t \in [0, T]\} \supset \{\psi^s \mathcal{F}_l(v) \mid v \in E_0, s \in [0, (1-\varepsilon-\delta)T]\}. \quad (2.16)$$

The Liouville measure of the rightmost set is  $(1 - \varepsilon - \delta)T\lambda^N(\bar{f}(E))$  by (2.14). Moreover,

$$T\lambda^M(E) = \mu^M(E_T) \geq (1 - \delta)\mu^M(K_T) = (1 - \delta)T\lambda^M(K)$$

shows  $\lambda^M(E) \geq (1 - \delta)\lambda^M(K)$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^N(\mathcal{F}_l(K_T)) &\geq \mu^N(\mathcal{F}_l(E_T)) \\ &\geq (1 - \varepsilon - \delta)T\lambda^N(\bar{f}(E)) && \text{(equation 2.16)} \\ &\geq (1 - \varepsilon - \delta)TC'\lambda^M(E) && \text{(equation 2.15)} \\ &\geq (1 - \varepsilon - \delta)TC'(1 - \delta)\lambda^M(K) \\ &= C'(1 - \varepsilon - \delta)(1 - \delta)\mu^M(K_T), \end{aligned}$$

which is the desired result.  $\square$

Now we are ready to prove the main theorem of this section, which relates the volumes of  $M$  and  $N$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* Let  $\delta > 0$ . Choose finitely many disjoint sets of the form  $K_{T^i}^i \subset T^1M$  (as defined in (2.13)) so that

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \mu(K_{T^i}^i) \geq \mu(T^1M) - \delta.$$

Now choose large enough  $l$  (depending on  $\delta$ ) so that the conclusion of Lemma 2.28 holds for  $K_{T^1}^1, \dots, K_{T^k}^k$  simultaneously. By Theorem 2.6, the hypothesis of Lemma 2.28 holds with  $C' = (1 - C\varepsilon^\alpha)(1 - \varepsilon)^{n-1}$ . We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^N(T^1N) &\geq \sum_i \mu^N(\mathcal{F}_l(K_{T^i}^i)) \\ &\geq C'(1 - \varepsilon - \delta)(1 - \delta) \sum_i \mu^M(K_{T^i}^i) \\ &\geq C'(1 - \varepsilon - \delta)(1 - \delta)(\mu^M(T^1M) - \delta). \end{aligned}$$

Taking  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  implies  $\text{Vol}(N) \geq (1 - C\varepsilon^\alpha)(1 - \varepsilon)^{n-1} \text{Vol}(M)$ . Switching the roles of  $M$  and  $N$  in all the arguments in this section gives the estimate in the other direction.  $\square$

## 3. ESTIMATES FOR THE BCG MAP

If  $\mathcal{L}_g = \mathcal{L}_{g_0}$ , then it follows from [Ham99, Theorem A] that  $\text{Vol}(M, g) = \text{Vol}(N, g_0)$ . Since  $\mathcal{L}_g$  determines the topological entropy of the geodesic flow, the entropy rigidity theorem of Besson-Courtois-Gallot [BCG96] states there is an isometry  $F : M \rightarrow N$ .

In the case where  $1 - \varepsilon \leq \frac{\mathcal{L}_{g_0}}{\mathcal{L}_g} \leq 1 + \varepsilon$  (Hypothesis 2.10), Theorem 1.4 states the volumes of  $M$  and  $N$  satisfy  $(1 - C\varepsilon^2)(1 - \varepsilon)^n \leq \frac{\text{Vol}(N)}{\text{Vol}(M)} \leq (1 + C\varepsilon^2)(1 + \varepsilon)^n$ , where  $C$  is a constant depending only on  $n$ . Moreover, the entropies are related as follows.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $h$  denote the topological entropy of the geodesic flow. Then with the above marked length spectrum assumptions we have*

$$\frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon} h(g) \leq h(g_0) \leq \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} h(g). \quad (3.1)$$

*Proof.* This follows from the following description of the topological entropy in terms of periodic orbits due to Margulis [Mar69]:

$$h(g) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log P_g(t), \quad (3.2)$$

where  $P_g(t) = \#\{\gamma \mid l_g(\gamma) \leq t\}$ . □

We use the results of Theorem 1.4 and Lemma 3.1 to modify the proof in [BCG96] that there is an isometry  $F : M \rightarrow N$ . More specifically, we use the same construction for the map  $F$  as in [BCG96] and show the matrix of  $dF_p$  with respect to suitable orthonormal bases is close to the identity matrix.

**3.1. Construction of the BCG map.** From now on, we will assume  $N$  is a locally symmetric space. This means  $\tilde{N}$  is either a real, complex or quaternionic hyperbolic space or the Cayley hyperbolic space of real dimension 16; let  $d = 1, 2, 4$  or  $8$  respectively.

We now normalize the metric  $g_0$  so the sectional curvatures are all  $-1$  in the case  $d = 1$  and contained in the interval  $[-4, -1]$  otherwise. Since  $\dim N \geq 3$ , Mostow rigidity implies  $(N, g_0)$  is determined up to isometry by its fundamental group  $\Gamma$  [Mos73]. Thus, from now on, any constants arising from the geometry of  $N$ , such as the diameter and the injectivity radius, can be thought of as depending only on  $\Gamma$ . We also rescale the metric  $g$  by the same factor as  $g_0$  in order to preserve the assumed marked length spectrum ratio in (1.2) as well as the established volume and entropy ratios. From now on, we will also assume the sectional curvatures of  $(M, g)$  are in the interval  $[-\Lambda^2, -\lambda^2]$  for some constants  $\lambda, \Lambda$ . Such constants always exist since  $M$  is assumed to be compact; however some of our estimates will depend on their specific values.

We first recall the construction of the map  $F : M \rightarrow N$  in [BCG96]. We then summarize the proof that  $F$  is an isometry in the case of equal entropies and volumes, before explaining how to modify it for approximately equal entropies and volumes.

Given  $p \in M$ , let  $\mu_p$  be the Patterson-Sullivan measure on  $\partial\tilde{M}$ . Let  $\bar{f} : \partial\tilde{M} \rightarrow \partial\tilde{N}$  as before (see Construction 2.1). Define  $F(p) = \text{bar}(f_*\mu_p)$ , where bar denotes the barycenter map (see [BCG96] for more details). We call  $F$  the *BCG map*. By the definition of the barycenter, the BCG map has the implicit description

$$\int_{\partial\tilde{N}} dB_{F(p), \xi}(\cdot) d(\bar{f}_*\mu_p)(\xi) = 0, \quad (3.3)$$

where  $\xi \in \partial\tilde{N}$  and  $B_{F(p),\xi}$  is the Busemann function on  $(\tilde{N}, g_0)$ . By the implicit function theorem, the BCG map  $F$  is  $C^1$  (actually,  $C^2$  since Busemann functions on  $\tilde{M}$  are  $C^2$  [Bal95, Proposition IV.3.2]), and its derivative  $dF_p$  satisfies

$$\int_{\partial\tilde{N}} \text{Hess}B_{F(p),\xi}^N(dF_p(v), u) d(\bar{f}_*\mu_p)(\xi) = h(g) \int_{\partial\tilde{N}} dB_{F(p),\xi}^N(u) dB_{p,\bar{f}^{-1}(\xi)}^M(v) d(\bar{f}_*\mu_p)(\xi) \quad (3.4)$$

for all  $v \in T_pM$  and  $u \in T_{F(p)}N$  [BCG96, (5.2)]. In light of this, it is natural to define the following quadratic forms  $H$  and  $K$ :

$$\langle K_{F(p)}u, u \rangle := \int_{\partial\tilde{N}} (\text{Hess}B_{F(p),\xi}(u)) d(\bar{f}_*\mu_p)(\xi), \quad (3.5)$$

$$\langle H_{F(p)}u, u \rangle := \int_{\partial\tilde{N}} (dB_{F(p),\xi}(u))^2 d(\bar{f}_*\mu_p)(\xi), \quad (3.6)$$

where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  denotes the Riemannian inner product coming from  $g_0$  [BCG96, p. 636].

Without any assumptions about the volumes or entropies, the following three inequalities hold; see [Rua22] for the Cayley case.

**Lemma 3.2.** [BCG96, Lemma 5.4]

$$|\text{Jac}F(p)| \leq \frac{h^n(g) \det(H)^{1/2}}{n^{n/2} \det(K)}.$$

**Lemma 3.3.** [BCG95, Lemma B3] *Let  $n \geq 3$  and let  $H$  and  $K$  be the  $n \times n$  positive definite symmetric matrices coming from the operators in (3.5) and (3.6), respectively. Then*

$$\frac{\det H}{\det(K)^2} \leq \frac{(n-1)^{\frac{2n(n-1)}{n+d-2}} \det(H)^{\frac{n-d}{n+d-2}}}{(n+d-2)^{2n} \det(I-H)^{\frac{2(n-1)}{n+d-2}}},$$

with equality if and only if  $H = \frac{1}{n}I$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** [BCG95, Lemma B4] *Let  $H$  be an  $n \times n$  positive definite symmetric matrix with trace 1, where  $n \geq 3$ . Let  $1 < \alpha \leq n-1$ . Then*

$$\frac{\det H}{\det(I-H)^\alpha} \leq \left( \frac{n^\alpha}{n(n-1)^\alpha} \right)^n.$$

Moreover, equality holds if and only if  $H = \frac{1}{n}I$ .

Combining the above three inequalities (setting  $\alpha = \frac{2(n-1)}{n-d}$ ) together with the fact that  $h(g_0) = n+d-2$ , we obtain:

**Lemma 3.5.** [BCG96, Proposition 5.2 i)]

$$|\text{Jac}F(p)| \leq \left( \frac{h(g)}{h(g_0)} \right)^n.$$

As in the proof of [BCG96, Theorem 5.1], the above lemma relates the volumes of  $M$  and  $N$  as follows:

$$\text{Vol}(N, g_0) \leq \int_M |F^*d\text{Vol}| = \int_M |(\text{Jac}F)d\text{Vol}| \leq \left( \frac{h(g)}{h(g_0)} \right)^n \text{Vol}(M, g). \quad (3.7)$$

*Remark 3.6.* This, together with Lemma 3.1, improves one of the inequalities in Theorem 1.4 in the special case where  $N$  is a locally symmetric space.

With this setup in mind, the argument in [BCG96] showing that  $F$  is an isometry consists of the following components:

- (1) If the volumes and entropies are equal, then the inequalities in (3.7) are all equalities, which gives equality in Lemma 3.5.
- (2) Thus, equality also holds in Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3, from which it follows that  $H = \frac{1}{n}I$  and  $K = \frac{n+d-2}{n}I = \frac{h(g_0)}{n}I$ . See [BCG96, p. 639].
- (3) With  $H$  and  $K$  as above, the end of the proof of Proposition 5.2 ii) in [BCG96] shows that  $dF_p = \left(\frac{h(g_0)}{h(g)}\right) I$ , which means  $F$  is an isometry in the case where the entropies are equal. This concludes the proof of Theorem 1 in [BCG96].

Assuming instead that  $1 - \varepsilon \leq \frac{\mathcal{L}_{g_0}}{\mathcal{L}_g} \leq 1 + \varepsilon$ , the equalities of volumes and entropies are replaced with the conclusions of Theorem 1.4 and Lemma 3.1 respectively. Proceeding as in the above outline, we can instead obtain estimates for  $\|dF_p\|$  in terms of  $\varepsilon$ :

- (1) We show equality almost holds in (3.7); that is, we find a lower bound for  $\text{Jac}F(p)$  of the form  $\beta(h(g)/h(g_0))^n$  for suitable  $\beta$  (Proposition 3.27).
- (2) This implies the eigenvalues of  $H$  are all close to  $1/n$  and the eigenvalues of  $K$  are all close to  $h(g_0)/n$  (Proposition 3.31).
- (3) With  $H$  and  $K$  as above, we mimic the proof of [BCG96, Proposition 5.2 ii)] to obtain bounds for  $\|dF_p\|$ , which completes the proof of Theorem 1.2 (Proposition 3.35).

The main difficulty is step (1), where we cannot simply mimic the arguments in [BCG96]. Indeed, with the above assumptions about the entropies (Lemma 3.1) and the volumes (Theorem 1.4), the inequalities in (3.7) become

$$(1 - C\varepsilon^2)(1 - \varepsilon)^n \frac{1}{(1 + \varepsilon)^n} \left(\frac{h(g)}{h(g_0)}\right)^n \text{Vol}(M) \leq \int_M |\text{Jac}F| \leq \left(\frac{h(g)}{h(g_0)}\right)^n \text{Vol}(M),$$

which does not give a lower bound for the integrand. In order to obtain a lower bound for  $|\text{Jac}F|$ , we use the above lower bound for its integral together with a Lipschitz bound for the function  $p \mapsto |\text{Jac}F(p)|$  (Proposition 3.25). The fact that this function is Lipschitz is immediate from the fact that  $F$  is  $C^2$ ; however, it is not clear a priori how the Lipschitz bound depends on  $(M, g)$ . Assuming  $1 - \varepsilon \leq \frac{\mathcal{L}_{g_0}}{\mathcal{L}_g} \leq 1 + \varepsilon$  holds (Hypothesis 2.10) for  $\varepsilon$  sufficiently small (depending on  $n$  and  $\Gamma$ ), we will show there is a Lipschitz bound for  $\text{Jac}F(p)$  depending only on the dimension  $n$ , the fundamental group  $\Gamma$  and the bounds  $-\Lambda^2$  and  $-\lambda^2$  for the sectional curvatures of  $M$ .

**3.2. Lower bound for  $K$ .** Recall the BCG map  $F$  is defined implicitly (see (3.3)), and its derivative  $dF_p$  satisfies the following equation

$$\langle KdF_p(v), u \rangle = h(g) \int_{\partial\tilde{N}} dB_{F(p),\xi}^N(u) dB_{p,\bar{F}^{-1}\xi}^M(v) d(\bar{F}_*\mu_p)(\xi).$$

(See (3.4) and (3.5).) In order to use this equation to find a Lipschitz bound for  $\text{Jac}F(p)$ , we start by bounding the quadratic form  $K$  away from zero (Proposition 3.17). Recall

$$\langle K_{F(p)}u, u \rangle := \int_{\partial\tilde{N}} (\text{Hess}B_\xi)_{F(p)}(u) d(\bar{F}_*\mu_p)(\xi). \quad (3.8)$$

Note that  $K$  depends not only on the symmetric space  $(N, g_0)$ , but also on  $(M, g)$ , since  $\mu_p$  is the Patterson-Sullivan measure on  $\partial\tilde{M}$  defined with respect to the metric  $g$ . We start by recalling that  $K$  is positive-definite for any given (negatively curved) metric  $g$  on  $M$  (see [BCG96, Definition 3.2]). We include a detailed proof as we will refer to the arguments later.

**Lemma 3.7.** *There is  $\kappa_g > 0$  so that  $\langle K_{F(p)}u, u \rangle \geq \kappa_g$  for all  $p \in \tilde{M}$ ,  $u \in T_{F(p)}^1\tilde{N}$ .*

*Proof.* First we examine the integrand in (3.8). Fix  $p \in \tilde{M}$  and  $u \in T_{F(p)}^1\tilde{N}$  and consider  $(\text{Hess}B_\xi)_{F(p)}(u)$ . Let  $v_{F(p),\xi}$  be the unit tangent vector based at  $F(p)$  so that the geodesic with initial vector  $v$  has forward boundary point  $\xi$ , i.e.  $v_{F(p),\xi}$  is the gradient of  $B_{\xi,F(p)}$ . Let  $\theta_\xi$  denote the angle between  $v_{F(p),\xi}$  and  $u$ . Then we can write  $u = (\cos\theta_\xi)v_{F(p),\xi} + (\sin\theta_\xi)w$  for some unit vector  $w$  perpendicular to  $v_{F(p),\xi}$ . Since  $(\text{Hess}B_\xi)_{F(p)}(u) = \langle \nabla_u v_{F(p),\xi}, u \rangle$ , we obtain  $(\text{Hess}B_\xi)_{F(p)}(u) = \sin\theta_\xi(\text{Hess}B_\xi)_{F(p)}(w)$ . Let  $R$  denote the curvature tensor of  $(\tilde{N}, \tilde{g}_0)$ . Using the formula

$$(\text{Hess}B_\xi)_{F(p)}(\cdot) = \sqrt{-R(v_{F(p),\xi}, \cdot, v_{F(p),\xi}, \cdot)}$$

(see [CF03, p. 16]) together with the fact the sectional curvatures of  $\tilde{N}$  are at most  $-1$ , it follows that

$$(\text{Hess}B_\xi)_{F(p)}(u) \geq \sin^2\theta_\xi.$$

Hence, the integrand in the definition of  $K_{F(p)}$  is 0 if and only if  $\theta_\xi = 0, \pi$ . This occurs precisely when  $\xi = \pi(\pm u)$ , where  $\pi$  is the projection of a unit tangent vector to its forward boundary point in  $\partial\tilde{N}$ . Since  $\mu_p$  is non-atomic, we have  $(\bar{f}_*\mu_p)(\partial\tilde{N} \setminus \{\pi(\pm u)\}) = 1 > 0$ . Thus  $(\text{Hess}B_\xi)_{F(p)}(u) > 0$  for a set of  $\xi$  of positive  $\bar{f}_*\mu_p$ -measure, which means  $K_{F(p)}(u, u) > 0$  for all  $(F(p), u) \in T^1\tilde{N}$ .

Moreover, there is  $\kappa > 0$  so that  $K_{F(p)}(u, u) \geq \kappa$  for all  $p \in \tilde{M}$  and  $u \in T_{F(p)}^1\tilde{N}$ . To see this, first note  $\langle K_{\gamma F(p)}\gamma u, \gamma u \rangle = K_{F(p)}(u, u)$  for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , since the action of  $\Gamma$  is by isometries. Thus it suffices to bound  $K_{F(p)}(u, u)$  from below as  $(F(p), u) \in T^1\tilde{N}$  varies over a compact fundamental domain for  $T^1N$ . This follows from the fact that  $K_{F(p)}(u, u)$  varies continuously with respect to  $(F(p), u) \in T^1\tilde{N}$ .  $\square$

While  $K$  is positive-definite for any given negatively curved metric  $g$  on  $M$ , it is not clear from the above analysis that there is a lower bound which is uniform in  $g$ . To this end, we establish a type of compactness of the space of all metrics  $g$  on  $M$  with sectional curvatures in the interval  $[-\Lambda^2, 0)$  and marked length spectrum satisfying  $1 - \varepsilon \leq \mathcal{L}_g/\mathcal{L}_{g_0} \leq 1 + \varepsilon$  (Corollary 3.10). We start with some preliminary lemmas.

**Lemma 3.8.** *The injectivity radii of  $(M, g)$  and  $(N, g_0)$  satisfy*

$$(1 - \varepsilon)\text{inj}(M, g) \leq \text{inj}(N, g_0) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\text{inj}(M, g).$$

*Proof.* This follows from the fact that in negative curvature, the injectivity radius is half the length of the shortest closed geodesic [Pet06, p.178] together with the marked length spectrum assumption.

Indeed, let  $\gamma$  be the shortest closed geodesic in  $(M, g)$  and let  $\gamma_0$  be the shortest closed geodesic in  $(N, g_0)$ . Then the marked length spectrum assumption gives

$$2(1 + \varepsilon)\text{inj}(M, g) = (1 + \varepsilon)\mathcal{L}_g(\gamma) \geq \mathcal{L}_{g_0}(f_*\gamma) \geq \mathcal{L}_{g_0}(\gamma_0) = 2\text{inj}(N, g_0).$$

An analogous argument gives the other estimate.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.9.** *There is an upper bound for  $\text{diam}(M)$  depending only on  $\varepsilon$ , the dimension  $n$ , and the fundamental group  $\Gamma$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $p$  and  $q$  be such that  $\text{diam}(M) = d(p, q)$  and let  $c(t)$  be the curve joining  $p$  and  $q$ . Let  $r$  be the injectivity radius of  $(M, g)$ . Let  $m$  be the unique positive integer such that  $2(m-1)r \leq \text{diam}(M) \leq 2mr$ . Take balls of radius  $r$  centered at  $c(0), c(2r), c(4r), \dots, c(2mr)$ . Since  $M$  is negatively curved, the volume of any such ball is bounded below by the volume of a ball of radius  $r$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  [GHL90, Theorem 3.101 ii)], which we will denote by  $v(r, n)$ .

Then  $mv(r, n) \leq \text{Vol}(M) \leq C\text{Vol}(N)$ , for some  $C = C(\varepsilon, n)$  (see Theorem 1.4). This gives an upper bound for  $m$ , therefore

$$d(p, q) = \text{diam}(M) \leq 2rm \leq r \frac{C\text{Vol}(N)}{v(r, n)}.$$

Combining with the previous lemma gives

$$\text{diam}(M) \leq \frac{\text{inj}(N)}{1 - \varepsilon} (1 + \varepsilon)^n \frac{C\text{Vol}(N)}{v(\text{inj}(N), n)}.$$

Finally, since  $N$  is locally symmetric, it follows from Mostow Rigidity that  $\text{inj}(N)$  and  $\text{Vol}(N)$  depend only on  $\Gamma$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.10.** *Fix  $(N, g_0)$  a rank 1 locally symmetric space of dimension at least 3, and let  $M$  be another manifold with the same fundamental group as  $N$ . Fix  $\varepsilon, \Lambda > 0$ . Let  $\{g_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of Riemannian metrics on  $M$  with sectional curvatures in the interval  $[-\Lambda^2, 0)$  and marked length spectra satisfying  $1 - \varepsilon \leq \mathcal{L}_{g_0}/\mathcal{L}_{g_n} \leq 1 + \varepsilon$ . Then there is a  $C^{1, \alpha}$  Riemannian metric  $g_\infty$  on  $M$  and a subsequence  $\{g_{n_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  so that the distance functions  $d_{g_{n_k}}$  converge to  $d_{g_\infty}$  uniformly on compact sets.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(M, D_0, v_0, \Lambda)$  be the space of all Riemannian metrics on  $M$  with diameter bounded above by  $D_0$ , volume bounded below by  $v_0$ , and absolute sectional curvatures bounded above by  $\Lambda^2$ . Then, by [GW88, Theorem 1], the space of all such metrics is precompact in the following sense: every sequence in  $\mathcal{M}$  has a subsequence which converges in the Lipschitz topology to a limiting metric  $g_\infty$  whose coordinate functions  $g_\infty^{ij}$  are of  $C^{1, \alpha}$  regularity for some  $0 < \alpha < 1$  (see [GW88] for more details). Moreover, the associated distance functions converge uniformly on compact sets [GW88, p. 122].

Thus, it suffices to show any  $g_n$  as in the statement of the Corollary is contained in  $\mathcal{M}(M, D_0, v_0, \Lambda)$ . First, by Lemma 3.9, these metrics all satisfy  $\text{diam}(M, g) \leq D_0$  for some  $D_0 = D_0(n, \varepsilon, \Gamma)$ . Second, we know  $\text{vol}_g(M) \geq (h(g)/h(g_0))^n \text{vol}_{g_0}(N) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)^n \text{vol}_{g_0}(N)$  by [BCG96, Theorem 5.1 i)] and Lemma 3.1. Finally, the desired sectional curvature bound holds by assumption. This completes the proof.  $\square$

*Remark 3.11.* The metric space  $(M, g_\infty)$  is CAT(0) as it is a suitable limit of such spaces; see [BH13, Theorem II.3.9].

**Lemma 3.12.** *Suppose  $g_n$  is a sequence of Riemannian metrics on  $M$  (as in the statement of Corollary 3.10) so that the distance functions  $d_{g_n}$  converge uniformly to  $d_{g_\infty}$  on compact sets for some  $C^{1, \alpha}$  Riemannian metric  $g_\infty$ . Lift the  $g_n$  and  $g_\infty$  to metrics on  $\tilde{M}$ . Then for any  $A > 1$  there is sufficiently large  $k$  so that for all  $n \geq k$  we have*

$$A^{-1} d_{g_\infty}(p, q) \leq d_{g_n}(p, q) \leq A d_{g_\infty}(p, q)$$

for all  $p, q \in \tilde{M}$ . In other words, for sufficiently large  $n$ , the distance  $d_{g_n}$  on  $\tilde{M}$  is  $A$ -bi-Lipschitz equivalent to  $d_{g_\infty}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $D \subset \tilde{M}$  be a fundamental domain for  $M$ . Since  $d_{g_n} \rightarrow d_{g_\infty}$  uniformly on  $M$ , given any constant  $A > 1$ , there is large enough  $k$  so that  $n \geq k$  implies

$$A^{-1} d_{g_\infty}(p, q) \leq d_{g_n}(p, q) \leq A d_{g_\infty}(p, q)$$

for all  $p, q \in D$ . We can extend these inequalities to all  $p, q \in \tilde{M}$  as follows. Consider the  $g_\infty$ -geodesic from  $p$  to  $q$  in  $\tilde{M}$ , and let  $p = p_1, \dots, p_l = q$  be points on this geodesic such that each  $g_\infty$ -geodesic segment joining  $p_i$  to  $p_{i+1}$  is contained in a single fundamental domain of the form  $\gamma D$  for some  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ . By the triangle inequality,

$$d_{g_n}(p, q) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} d_{g_n}(p_i, p_{i+1}) \leq A \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} d_{g_\infty}(p_i, p_{i+1}) = A d_{g_\infty}(p, q).$$

An analogous argument gives the estimate in the other direction.  $\square$

Recall the CAT(0) boundary (visual boundary)  $\partial\tilde{M}$  of  $(M, g)$  is defined as asymptotic classes of geodesic rays [BH13, Definition II.8.1]. If  $p \in \tilde{M}$  is fixed, then for any  $\xi \in \partial\tilde{M}$ , there is a unique geodesic ray connecting  $x$  and  $\xi$  [BH13, Proposition II.8.2]. Thus, there is a natural identification between  $\partial\tilde{M}$  and the unit tangent space  $T_p^1 M$ . In light of this, we can make sense of the visual boundaries with respect to all our metrics  $g_n$  and  $g_\infty$  simultaneously, and we will denote this boundary by  $\partial\tilde{M}$ .

**Lemma 3.13.** *As above, let  $g_n$  be a sequence of Riemannian metrics so that the distance functions  $g_n$  converge uniformly on compact sets to the distance function of some limiting  $C^{1,\alpha}$  metric  $g_\infty$ . Fix  $p \in \tilde{M}$  and let  $\xi \in \partial\tilde{M}$ . For  $x \in \tilde{M}$  let  $b^n(x) := B_\xi^{g_n}(p, x)$  be the associated Busemann function with respect to the  $g_n$  metric, and let  $b^\infty(x)$  be defined analogously. Then there is a subsequence  $b^{n_k}$  converging to  $b^\infty$  uniformly on compact sets.*

*Proof.* Since  $b^n$  is a Busemann function, we have  $d_{g_n}(b^n(x), b^n(y)) \leq d_{g_n}(x, y)$ . For any  $A > 1$ , there is large enough  $k$  so that  $d_{g_n}(x, y) \leq A d_{g_\infty}(x, y)$  for all  $n \geq k$ . So the  $b^n$  form an equicontinuous family and thus converge uniformly on compact sets to some function  $b$  (after passing to a subsequence).

We claim  $b$  is in fact the Busemann function  $b^\infty(x)$  on  $\tilde{M}$  with respect to the distance induced by  $g_\infty$ . Since  $(M, g_\infty)$  is a CAT(0) space, we use the characterization of Busemann functions in [Bal95, Proposition IV.3.1]. First,  $b^\infty(p) = 0$  since this holds for all  $b^n$  by assumption. Second, we claim  $b^\infty$  is convex. To see this, fix  $(q, w) \in T^1\tilde{M}$ . Let  $\exp_q^n$  denote the exponential map with respect to the metric  $g_n$ . Since each  $b^n$  is convex, we have

$$b^n(\exp_q^n(tw)) \leq (1-t)b^n(q) + tb^n(\exp_q^n(w))$$

for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ . By [Pug87, Lemma 2], we have  $\exp_q^n(tw) \rightarrow \exp_q^\infty(tw)$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Since the  $b^n$  converge uniformly on compact sets, taking  $n \rightarrow \infty$  gives

$$b^\infty(\exp_q^\infty(tw)) \leq (1-t)b^\infty(q) + tb^\infty(\exp_q^\infty(w))$$

for each  $n$  and all  $t \in [0, 1]$ , which shows convexity. Third,  $|b^n(p) - b^n(q)| \leq d_{g_n}(p, q)$  for all  $n$ ; taking  $n \rightarrow \infty$  shows  $b^\infty$  has Lipschitz constant 1. Finally, we need to verify that for any  $q \in \tilde{M}$ , there is  $q_1 \in \tilde{M}$  with  $b^\infty(q) - b^\infty(q_1) = 1$ . For any  $n$ , we know there is  $q_1^n$  with  $b^n(q) - b^n(q_1^n) = 1$ , and we can choose  $q_1^n$  to also satisfy  $d_{g_n}(q, q_1^n) = 1$ . By Lemma 3.12,

the  $q_1^n$  are all contained in a bounded set for sufficiently large  $n$ , and hence we can pass to a convergent subsequence. The limit of this subsequence is the desired  $q_1$ .  $\square$

We now consider the Patterson–Sullivan measures  $\mu_p^{g_n}$  on  $\partial\tilde{M}$ . For any negatively curved metric  $g$  on  $M$ , define  $P_t^g = \{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid d_g(x, \gamma x) \leq t\}$  and let

$$\delta(g) = \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(\#P_t^g)}{t}.$$

Then  $\delta(g)$  is independent of the choice of  $x$  (in the definition of  $P_t^g$ ), and  $\delta(g) = h(g)$ , the critical exponent of  $\mu_p^g$ . (See [Qui06, Lemma 4.5].)

Now suppose we have a sequence of metrics  $g_n$  converging to a CAT(0) metric  $g_\infty$  of  $C^{1,\alpha}$  regularity, as in the conclusion of Corollary 3.10. Define  $\delta(g_\infty)$  as above.

**Lemma 3.14.** *If  $d_{g_n} \rightarrow d_{g_\infty}$  on compact sets, then  $\delta(g_n) \rightarrow \delta(g_\infty) < \infty$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $A > 1$ . By Lemma 3.12, there is large enough  $k$  so that for any  $n \geq k$  the distances  $d_{g_n}$  and  $d_{g_\infty}$  are  $A$ -bi-Lipschitz equivalent on all of  $\tilde{M}$ . Then  $P_t^{g_n} \subset P_{At}^{g_\infty}$  which implies  $\delta(g_n) \leq A \delta(g_\infty)$ . Analogously,  $\delta(g_\infty) \leq A \delta(g_n)$ . Thus,

$$|\delta(g_\infty) - \delta(g_n)| \leq \max(A - 1, 1 - A^{-1})\delta(g_n).$$

Since  $g_n$  satisfies  $1 - \varepsilon \leq \frac{\mathcal{L}_{g_0}}{\mathcal{L}_{g_n}} \leq 1 + \varepsilon$ , Lemma 3.1 shows  $\delta(g_n) = h(g_n) \leq (1 - \varepsilon)^{-1}h(g_0)$  for all  $n$ , where  $h(g_0)$  is the topological entropy of the geodesic flow of the symmetric space  $(N, g_0)$ . Thus  $|\delta(g_\infty) - \delta(g_n)| \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$

Fix  $p \in \tilde{M}$  and consider the sequence  $\{\mu_p^{g_n}\}$  of probability measures on  $\partial\tilde{M}$ . By the Banach–Aolglu theorem, this sequence must have a weakly convergent subsequence  $\{\mu_p^{g_{n_k}}\}$ , i.e. there exists a probability measure  $\nu_p$  such that for any continuous function  $\phi$  on  $\partial\tilde{M}$  we have

$$\int_{\partial\tilde{M}} \phi(\xi) d(\mu_p^{g_{n_k}})(\xi) \rightarrow \int_{\partial\tilde{M}} \phi(\xi) d(\nu_p)(\xi).$$

**Lemma 3.15.** *Suppose  $d_{g_n} \rightarrow d_{g_\infty}$  on compact sets. Consider any family of measures  $\{\nu_p\}_{p \in \tilde{M}}$  on  $\partial\tilde{M}$  obtained by the above limiting procedure. Then the family  $\{\nu_p\}_{p \in \tilde{M}}$  satisfies the following properties.*

- (1) *For all  $p, q \in \tilde{M}$  the Radon–Nikodym derivatives satisfy  $\frac{d\nu_p}{d\nu_q} = \exp(-\delta(g_\infty)B_{g_\infty}^\xi(p, q))$ .*
- (2) *For all  $p \in \tilde{M}$  and  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  the pushforward measures satisfy  $\gamma_*\nu_p = \nu_{\gamma p}$ .*

*Proof.* To show 1), fix  $p$  and  $q$  and take a subsequence  $\{g_n\}$  so that both  $\mu_p^{g_n} \rightarrow \nu_p$  and  $\mu_q^{g_n} \rightarrow \nu_q$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . For any continuous function  $\phi$  on  $\partial\tilde{M}$  we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial\tilde{M}} \phi(\xi) d(\nu_q)(\xi) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\partial\tilde{M}} \phi(\xi) d(\mu_q^{g_n})(\xi) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\partial\tilde{M}} \phi(\xi) \exp(-\delta(g_n)B_\xi^n(p, q)) d(\mu_p^{g_n})(\xi) \\ &= \int_{\partial\tilde{M}} \phi(\xi) \exp(-\delta(g_\infty)B_\xi^\infty(p, q)) d(\nu_p)(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

In the last equality, we use Lemmas 3.13 and 3.14. By an analogous argument, we also see  $\gamma_*\nu_p = \nu_{\gamma p}$  for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ .  $\square$



**Corollary 3.16.** (See [Rob03, Lemma 1.3].) Let  $\nu$  as in the previous lemma. Let  $x \in \tilde{M}$  and let  $\xi \in \partial\tilde{M}$ . Let  $c_{x,\xi}$  be the unique  $g_\infty$ -geodesic through  $x$  and  $\xi$ . Let

$$\mathcal{O}_x(y, R) = \{\xi \in \partial\tilde{M} \mid c_{x,\xi} \cap B(y, R) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Then

$$\nu_x(\mathcal{O}_x(\gamma.x, R)) \leq \exp(-h(g)(d_{g_\infty}(x, \gamma.x) - 2R)).$$

*Proof.* By the previous lemma, one can use the proof of [Rob03, Lemma 1.3] verbatim.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.17.** There is  $\kappa > 0$ , depending only on  $n, \varepsilon, \Gamma, \lambda, \Lambda$ , so that for all  $p \in \tilde{M}$  and all  $u \in T_{F(p)}^1 \tilde{N}$ , we have  $\langle K_{F(p)} u, u \rangle \geq \kappa$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.7, for any fixed metric  $g$ , there is  $\kappa_g > 0$  so that  $\langle K_{F(p)} u, u \rangle \geq \kappa_g$  for all  $p \in \tilde{M}$ ,  $u \in T_{F(p)}^1 \tilde{N}$ . Now let  $\mathcal{M}$  as in the proof of Corollary 3.10 and suppose for contradiction there is a sequence  $\{g_n\} \in \mathcal{M}$  so that  $\kappa_{g_n} \rightarrow 0$ . This means there are  $p_n \in \tilde{M}$ , together with  $u_n \in T_{F(p_n)}^1 \tilde{N}$ , so that  $\langle K_{F(p_n)} u_n, u_n \rangle \rightarrow 0$ . By compactness of  $T^1 \tilde{N}$ , we can assume  $p_n \rightarrow p$  for some  $p \in \tilde{M}$  and also  $u_n \rightarrow u$  for some  $u \in T_{F(p)}^1 \tilde{N}$  (after passing to a subsequence). Thus,  $(\text{Hess} B^\xi)_{F(p_n)}(u_n) \rightarrow (\text{Hess} B^\xi)_{F(p)}(u)$  uniformly in  $\xi$ . After passing to a further subsequence, we can assume  $\mu_p^{g_n} \rightarrow \mu_p^{g_\infty}$  (using Corollary 3.10 and Lemma 3.15). Thus, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{g_n} = K_{F(p_n)}(u_n, u_n) &= \int_{\partial\tilde{M}} (\text{Hess} B^\xi)_{F(p_n)}(u_n) \exp(-h(g_n) B_\xi(p_n, p)) (\bar{f}_* \mu_p^{g_n}) \\ &\rightarrow \int_{\partial\tilde{M}} (\text{Hess} B^\xi)_{F(p)}(u) (\bar{f}_* \nu_p). \end{aligned}$$

Since we assumed  $\kappa_{g_n} \rightarrow 0$ , the above limit is zero. However, the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.7 shows this expression is positive. Indeed, the only fact used about  $g$  was that the Patterson–Sullivan measure  $\mu_p^g$  of the complement of two points in the boundary is positive. This still holds for  $\nu_p$  by Corollary 3.16. Thus, we have arrived at a contradiction, and we conclude that  $\kappa_g$  is bounded away from 0 uniformly for  $g$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ .  $\square$

**3.3. Lipschitz constant for  $\text{Jac} F(p)$ .** To find such a Lipschitz constant, we start by finding a preliminary Lipschitz estimate for  $F$ . This uses the lower bound  $\kappa$  for  $K$  established in Proposition 3.17. While the fact that  $F$  is Lipschitz follows from the fact that  $F$  is  $C^2$ , it is not clear a priori which properties of  $(M, g)$  this Lipschitz constant depends on. In the end, this Lipschitz constant will turn out to be close to 1 in a way that depends only on  $\varepsilon, n, \Gamma, \Lambda$  by Theorem 1.2.

**Lemma 3.18.** Let  $F$  be the BCG map. Then  $\|dF_p\| \leq \frac{h(g)}{\kappa}$  for all  $p \in \tilde{M}$ .

*Proof.* Using (3.4), we get the following inequality by applying Cauchy–Schwarz (see [BCG96, (5.3)]) together with the fact that  $\|dB(w)\| \leq \|w\|$  for any Busemann function:

$$\langle K_{F(p)} dF_p v, u \rangle \leq h(g) \|v\| \|u\|.$$

Now let  $\|v\| = 1$  and let  $u = dF_p(v)$ . Then the above inequality and Proposition 3.17 give

$$\kappa \|dF_p v\|^2 \leq \langle K_{F(p)} dF_p(v), dF_p(v) \rangle \leq h(g) \|dF_p(v)\|.$$

Thus

$$\|dF_p(v)\| \leq \frac{h(g)}{\kappa},$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

Let  $p, q \in \tilde{M}$  and let  $c(t)$  be unit speed the geodesic joining  $p$  and  $q$  such that  $c(0) = p$ . Let  $P_{c(t)}$  denote parallel transport along the curve  $c(t)$ . For  $i = 1, 2$ , let  $u_i \in T_{F(p)}^1 \tilde{N}$  and let  $U_i(t) = P_{F(c(t))} u_i$ .

We begin by finding a bound for the derivative of the function  $t \mapsto \langle K_{F(c(t))} U_1(t), U_2(t) \rangle$  for  $0 \leq t \leq T_0$ . This bound will depend only on  $\varepsilon, n, \Gamma, \Lambda$  and  $T_0$ .

**Lemma 3.19.** *Let  $K_{F(p)}^\xi(u_1, u_2) = (\text{Hess} B_\xi)_{F(p)}(u_1, u_2)$ . Let  $U_i(t) = P_{F(c(t))} u_i$  as above. Then the function  $t \mapsto K_{F(c(t))}^\xi(U_1(t), U_2(t))$  has derivative bounded by a constant depending only on  $\varepsilon, n, \Gamma, \Lambda$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $X = \frac{d}{dt}|_{t=0} F(c(t))$ . Then it suffices to find a uniform bound for  $\|X(K^\xi(U_1, U_2))\|$  on  $\tilde{N}$ . Since the  $U_i$  are parallel along  $X$ , we have  $X(K^\xi(U_1, U_2)) = \nabla K^\xi(U_1, U_2, X)$  (see [Car92, Definition 4.5.7]). So  $\|X(K^\xi(U_1, U_2))\| \leq \|\nabla K^\xi\| \|U_1\| \|U_2\| \|X\|$ . Since  $\|X\| \leq h(g)/\kappa$  by the previous lemma and  $\|U_1\| = \|U_2\| = 1$ , it remains to control  $\|\nabla K^\xi\|$ . We claim this quantity is uniformly bounded on  $\tilde{N}$ .

First note that if  $a$  is an isometry fixing  $\xi$ , then

$$K_x^\xi(v, w) = K_{a(x)}^\xi(a_* v, a_* w).$$

Now fix  $x_0 \in \tilde{N}$  and let  $e_1, \dots, e_n \in T_{x_0} \tilde{N}$  orthonormal frame. For any other  $x \in \tilde{N}$ , there exists an isometry  $a$  taking  $x$  to  $x_0$  fixing  $\xi$  (since  $\tilde{N}$  is a symmetric space). As such, we can extend the  $e_i$  to vector fields  $E_i$  on all of  $\tilde{N}$ . Then the quantity

$$\nabla K^\xi(E_i, E_j, E_k) = E_k(K^\xi(E_i, E_j)) - K^\xi(\nabla_{E_k} E_i, E_j) - K^\xi(\nabla_{E_k} E_i, E_j)$$

is invariant by isometries  $a$  fixing  $\xi$ , and is thus constant on  $\tilde{N}$ . This shows the desired claim that  $\|\nabla K^\xi\|$  is uniformly bounded on  $\tilde{N}$ . The bound depends only on the symmetric space  $\tilde{N}$  and hence only on the dimension  $n$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.20.** *Consider the function*

$$t \mapsto \langle K_{F(c(t))} U_1(t), U_2(t) \rangle$$

for  $0 \leq t \leq T_0$ . Its derivative is bounded by a constant depending only on  $\varepsilon, n, \Gamma, \Lambda, T_0$ .

*Proof.* Note that  $\bar{f}_* \mu_{c(t)}(\xi) = \exp \left[ -h(g) B_{\bar{f}^{-1}(\xi)}^M(p, c(t)) \right] \bar{f}_* \mu_p(\xi)$ . Then

$$\langle K_{F(c(t))} U_1(t), U_2(t) \rangle = \int_{\partial \tilde{N}} K^\xi(U_1(t), U_2(t)) \exp \left[ -h(g) B_{\bar{f}^{-1}(\xi)}^M(p, c(t)) \right] \bar{f}_* \mu_p(\xi).$$

The first term in the integrand is bounded above as a consequence of (3.2), and this bound depends only on the dimension  $n$ . By the previous lemma, the derivative of this function is bounded by a constant depending only on  $n, \varepsilon, \Gamma, \Lambda$ . Since  $|B_{\bar{f}^{-1}(\xi)}^M(p, c(t))| \leq d(p, c(t)) \leq T_0$ , the second term is bounded by a constant depending only on  $n, \varepsilon, T_0$ . The same is true of its derivative, since Busemann functions have gradient 1. Hence the derivative of  $\langle K_{F(c(t))} U_1(t), U_2(t) \rangle$  is bounded by a constant depending only on the desired parameters.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.21.** *The function  $t \mapsto \det K_{F(c(t))}$  on the interval  $0 \leq t \leq T_0$  is  $L_1$ -Lipschitz for some  $L_1 = L_1(\varepsilon, n, \Gamma, \Lambda, T_0)$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.20, the entries of the matrix  $K_{F(c(t))}$  (with respect to a  $g_0$ -orthonormal basis) vary in a Lipschitz way. Using (3.2), we see that for  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  unit vectors, the expression  $\text{Hess}B_{F(p),\xi}^N(u_1, u_2)$  is uniformly bounded above by some constant depending only on  $(\tilde{N}, \tilde{g}_0)$ . Since the entries of the matrix  $K_{F(c(t))}$  are Lipschitz and bounded, it follows the determinant of this matrix is Lipschitz.  $\square$

Recall (3.4) implies

$$\langle K_{F(p)}dF_p(v), u \rangle = h(g) \int_{\partial\tilde{M}} dB_{F(p),\bar{f}(\xi)}^N(u) dB_{p,\xi}^M(v) d\mu_p(\xi).$$

This formula, together with the Lipschitz bound for  $p \mapsto \det K_{F(p)}$  established in Corollary 3.21, will allow us to find a Lipschitz bound for  $p \mapsto \det(dF_p) = \text{Jac}F(p)$ .

**Lemma 3.22.** *Let  $p, q$  and  $c(t)$  be as above. Then the function*

$$t \mapsto dB_{c(t),\xi}^M(P_{c(t)}v)$$

*is  $\Lambda/2$ -Lipschitz for all  $v \in T_p^1\tilde{M}$ .*

*Proof.* We have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=0} dB_{c(t),\xi}(P_{c(t)}v) = \text{Hess}B_{p,\alpha}(c'(0), v) = \text{Hess}B_{p,\xi}(c'(0)^T, v^T),$$

where  $c'(0)^T$  and  $v^T$  are the components of  $c'(0)$  and  $v$  in the direction tangent to the horosphere through  $p$  and  $\xi$ . Using that  $\text{Hess}B_{p,\xi}$  is bilinear and positive definite on  $\text{grad}B_{p,\xi}^\perp$ , we obtain

$$4\text{Hess}B_{p,\xi}(c'(0)^T, v^T) \leq \text{Hess}B_{p,\xi}(c'(0)^T + v^T, c'(0)^T + v^T).$$

Let  $v' = c'(0)^T + v^T$  and note  $\|v'\| \leq 2$ . Let  $\beta(s)$  be a curve in the horosphere such that  $\beta'(0) = v'$ . Consider the geodesic variation  $j(s, t) = \exp_{\beta(s)}(t\text{grad}B_{\beta(s),\xi})$  and let  $J(t) = \frac{d}{ds}\Big|_{s=0} j(s, t)$  be the associated Jacobi field. Then  $J(0) = v'$  and  $J'(0) = \nabla_{v'}\text{grad}B_{p,\xi}$ . This means

$$\text{Hess}B_{p,\xi}(c'(0)^T + v^T, c'(0)^T + v^T) = \langle J'(0), J(0) \rangle.$$

Let  $\chi = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\lambda^2 + \Lambda^2}$ . According to [BK84, 4.2],

$$\langle J'(0), J(0) \rangle \leq \langle J'(0) + \chi J(0), J(0) \rangle \leq |J(0)|(\chi - \lambda).$$

Since  $|J(0)| = |v'| \leq 2$ , we get  $4\frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=0} dB_{c(t),\xi}(P_{c(t)}v) \leq \langle J'(0), J(0) \rangle \leq 2\Lambda$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.23.** *The function  $t \mapsto dB_{F(c(t)),\xi}^N(P_{F(c(t))}u)$  is  $(\frac{h(g)}{\kappa} + 1)$ -Lipschitz for all  $u \in T_{F(p)}^1\tilde{N}$ .*

*Proof.* We repeat the same proof as in the previous lemma, but replacing  $\lambda^2$  and  $\Lambda^2$  with 1 and 4, respectively. In this case,  $\chi - \lambda < 1$ . This gives

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=0} dB_{F(c(t)),\xi}^N(P_{F(c(t))}u) = \text{Hess}B_{F(p),\xi}^N(dF_p(c'(0)), u) < |dF_p(c'(0)) + u|.$$

Since  $c'(0)$  has norm 1, the Lipschitz bound from Lemma 3.18 gives  $|dF_p(c'(0)) + u| \leq \frac{h(g)}{\kappa} + 1$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.24.** *The function  $t \mapsto \det K_{F(c(t))}\text{Jac}F(c(t))$  on the interval  $0 \leq t \leq T_0$  is  $L_2$ -Lipschitz, where  $L_2$  depends only on  $\varepsilon, n, \Gamma, \Lambda, T_0$ .*

*Proof.* Consider the function

$$t \mapsto h(g) \int_{\partial \tilde{M}} dB_{F(c(t)), f(\xi)}^N(P_{F(c(t))}u) dB_{c(t), \xi}^M(P_{c(t)}v) e^{-h(g)B_{\varepsilon}(p, c(t))} d\mu_p(\xi).$$

The first two terms in the integrand are bounded by 1 in absolute value. The third term is bounded above by a constant depending only on  $\varepsilon, n, T_0$  as in the proof of Lemma 3.20 and  $h(g) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)h(g_0)$  by Lemma 3.1. Moreover, the three terms in the integrand are each Lipschitz – the first two by Lemmas 3.23 and 3.22, respectively, and the last one as in the proof of Lemma 3.20. Since the entries of the matrix  $K_{F(c(t))}(dF_{c(t)})$  are bounded and Lipschitz, the determinant of this matrix is also Lipschitz.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.25.** *The function  $p \mapsto |\text{Jac}F(p)|$  is  $L$ -Lipschitz, where the constant  $L$  depends only on  $\varepsilon, n, \Gamma, \Lambda$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $K_{F(p)}$  is a symmetric matrix, it has an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors  $u_i$ . Moreover,  $\langle K_{F(p)}u_i, u_i \rangle \geq \kappa \langle u_i, u_i \rangle$  by Proposition 3.17. It follows that  $\det K_{F(p)} \geq \kappa^n$ . Using this, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa^n |\text{Jac}F(p) - \text{Jac}F(q)| &\leq |\det K_{F(p)} \text{Jac}F(p) - \det K_{F(p)} \text{Jac}F(q)| \\ &\leq L_2 d(p, q) + |\text{Jac}F(q)| |\det K_{F(p)} - \det K_{F(q)}| \quad (\text{Lemma 3.24}) \\ &\leq L_2 d(p, q) + (1 + \varepsilon)^n L_1 d(p, q), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Corollary 3.21 and Lemmas 3.5 and 3.1. Moreover, Corollary 3.21 and Lemma 3.24 imply  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  depend only on  $\varepsilon, n, \Gamma, \Lambda$ . Proposition 3.17 states  $\kappa$  depends only on  $\varepsilon, n, \Gamma$ .  $\square$

Let  $c_\varepsilon := (1 - C\varepsilon^2)(1 - \varepsilon)^n$  be the constant from Theorem 1.4 satisfying  $c_\varepsilon \text{Vol}(M) \leq \text{Vol}(N)$ . (Recall  $C$  depends only on  $n$  since  $N$  is locally symmetric.) Let  $c(n)$  denote the volume of the unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Choose  $\varepsilon_0$  small enough so that

$$\frac{1 - c_{\varepsilon_0}/(1 + \varepsilon_0)^n}{\varepsilon_0^{1/(n+1)}} c_{\varepsilon_0}^{-1} (1 + \varepsilon_0)^n \leq \frac{c(n) \text{inj}(N, g_0)^n}{\text{Vol}(N)}.$$

This is possible since the first term on the lefthand side approaches 0 as  $\varepsilon_0 \rightarrow 0$ , while the other two approach 1. Indeed, the numerator of the first term can be written as  $2n\varepsilon_0 + O(\varepsilon_0^2)$ . The righthand side depends only on  $n$  and  $\Gamma$ , so the choice of  $\varepsilon_0$  depends only on  $n$  and  $\Gamma$ .

**Hypothesis 3.26.** From now on, we assume  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ . (The reason for this will become apparent in the proof of the next proposition, see (3.9).) Then for  $L$  as in Proposition 3.25, we have  $L(\varepsilon, n, \Gamma, \Lambda) \leq L(\varepsilon_0, n, \Gamma, \Lambda)$  for all  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ . From now on, we will use  $L = L(n, \Gamma, \Lambda)$  to denote  $L(\varepsilon_0, n, \Gamma, \Lambda)$ .

**3.4. Lower bound for  $|\text{Jac}F(p)|$ .** Now that we have a Lipschitz bound for  $\text{Jac}F(p)$ , we can use the fact that  $(M, g)$  and  $(N, g_0)$  have approximately equal volumes (Theorem 1.4) and approximately equal entropies (Lemma 3.1) to show equality almost holds in the inequality  $\text{Jac}F(p) \leq (h(g)/h(g_0))^n$  (Lemma 3.5).

**Proposition 3.27.** *There is a constant  $\beta < 1$ , depending only on  $\varepsilon, n, \Gamma, \Lambda$ , such that*

$$\beta \left( \frac{h(g)}{h(g_0)} \right)^n \leq |\text{Jac}F(p)|$$

for all  $p \in \tilde{M}$ . In particular, there is a constant  $C = C(n, \Gamma, \Lambda)$  so that  $\beta = 1 - C\varepsilon^{1/(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{2/(n+1)})$ .

We need two preliminary lemmas. Let  $\nu$  denote the measure on  $M$  coming from the Riemannian volume.

**Lemma 3.28.** *Let  $\phi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a  $\nu$ -measurable function such that  $\phi \geq 0$ . Suppose the integral of  $\phi$  satisfies  $0 \leq \int_M \phi \leq \delta$ . Let  $B = \{x \in M \mid \phi > \omega\}$  where  $\omega$  is some constant. Then  $\nu(B) \leq \delta/\omega$ .*

*Proof.* Note that  $\omega \nu(B) \leq \int_B \phi \leq \int_X \phi \leq \delta$ , which gives the desired bound.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.29.** *Let  $i_M$  denote the injectivity radius of  $M$  and let  $c(n)$  denote the volume of the unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Fix  $\delta < c(n)(i_M)^n$ . Let  $B \subset M$  be an open set with  $\nu(B) < \delta$ . Then there is  $r = r(\delta)$  such that for any  $p \in B$  there is  $q \in M \setminus B$  with  $d(p, q) \leq r$ . Moreover,  $r = c(n)\delta^{1/n}$  for some constant  $c(n)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $p \in B$ . Let  $q \in M \setminus B$  be the point such that  $d(p, q) = \min_{x \in M \setminus B} d(p, x)$ . Let  $r = d(p, q)$ . Then the open ball  $B(p, r)$  is contained in the set  $B$ . We consider the cases  $r \leq i_M$  and  $r > i_M$  separately:

In the case  $r \leq i_M$ , we can apply Theorem 3.101 ii) in [GHL90] to obtain the inequality  $\text{Vol}B(p, r) \geq c(n)r^n$ , where  $c(n)$  is the volume of the unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Since  $B(p, r) \subset B$ , this gives  $r^n \leq \frac{\delta}{c(n)}$ .

In the case  $r > i_M$ , we do not have the above volume estimate for the ball  $B(p, r)$ . However,  $B(p, i_M) \subset B(p, r) \subset B$  so the same argument as in the first case gives a bound  $(i_M)^n \leq \frac{\delta}{c(n)}$ . This is a contradiction for small enough  $\delta$ , so we must be in the first case.  $\square$

*Remark 3.30.* We have  $i_M \geq i_0$  where  $i_0$  is a constant depending only on  $\Gamma$  (and on  $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(\Gamma)$ ). Indeed, Lemma 3.8 gives  $i_M \geq \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon_0}i_N$ , and  $i_N$  depends only on  $\Gamma$  by Mostow rigidity and our choice of normalization for the metric  $g_0$ .

*Proof of Proposition 3.27.* Let  $c_\varepsilon := (1 - C\varepsilon^2)(1 - \varepsilon)^n$  be the constant from Theorem 1.4 satisfying  $c_\varepsilon \text{Vol}(M) \leq \text{Vol}(N)$ . (Recall  $C$  depends only on  $n$  since  $N$  is locally symmetric.) Using this theorem together with the bound  $\frac{h(g)}{h(g_0)} \leq 1 + \varepsilon$  from Lemma 3.1, we get

$$c_\varepsilon \frac{1}{(1 + \varepsilon)^n} \left( \frac{h(g)}{h(g_0)} \right)^n \text{Vol}(M) \leq c_\varepsilon \text{Vol}(M) \leq \text{Vol}(N).$$

Combining with (3.7) gives

$$c_\varepsilon \frac{1}{(1 + \varepsilon)^n} \left( \frac{h(g)}{h(g_0)} \right)^n \text{Vol}(M) \leq \int_M |\text{Jac}F| d\text{Vol} \leq \left( \frac{h(g)}{h(g_0)} \right)^n \text{Vol}(M).$$

Next, we apply Lemma 3.28 to  $\phi(p) = (h(g)/h(g_0))^n - |\text{Jac}F(p)| \geq 0$ . In this case, we indeed have  $0 \leq \int_M \phi \leq \delta$  with  $\delta = (1 - c_\varepsilon/(1 + \varepsilon)^n) (h(g)/h(g_0))^n \text{Vol}(M)$ . Let  $\alpha < 1$  and write

$$M_\alpha = \left\{ |\text{Jac}F(p)| \geq \alpha \left( \frac{h(g)}{h(g_0)} \right)^n \right\}.$$

Then  $M_\alpha = \{\phi \geq (1 - \alpha)(h(g)/h(g_0))^n\}$ . So Lemma 3.28 gives

$$\nu(M \setminus M_\alpha) \leq \frac{1 - c_\varepsilon/(1 + \varepsilon)^n}{1 - \alpha} \text{Vol}(M).$$

Let  $1 - \alpha = \varepsilon^{1/(n+1)}$ . Let  $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(n, \Gamma)$  as in Hypothesis 3.26. Then

$$\nu(M \setminus M_\alpha) \leq c(n)(\text{inj}(M, g))^n, \tag{3.9}$$

so the hypotheses of Lemma 3.29 are satisfied. The lemma gives  $r(\varepsilon) = c(n)\nu(M \setminus M_\alpha)^{1/n}$  so that for all  $p \in M \setminus M_\alpha$  there is  $q \in M_\alpha$  satisfying  $d(p, q) < r(\varepsilon)$ . Applying Proposition 3.25 with  $T_0 = r(\varepsilon_0)$ , we then have

$$\alpha \left( \frac{h(g)}{h(g_0)} \right)^n \leq |\text{Jac}F(q)| \leq Lr(\varepsilon) + |\text{Jac}F(p)|$$

for some  $L = L(n, \Gamma, \Lambda)$ . Rearranging and applying the entropy estimate in Lemma 3.1 gives

$$(\alpha - (1 - \varepsilon)^{-n} Lr(\varepsilon)) \left( \frac{h(g)}{h(g_0)} \right)^n \leq |\text{Jac}F(p)|.$$

Let  $\beta = \alpha - (1 - \varepsilon)^{-n} Lr(\varepsilon)$ . Using  $\alpha = 1 - \varepsilon^{1/(n+1)}$  gives  $\mu(M \setminus M_\alpha) \leq C\varepsilon^{1-1/(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{2-1/(n+1)})$  and  $r(\varepsilon) \leq C\varepsilon^{1/(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{2/(n+1)})$ , where the constants  $C$  depend only on  $n, \Gamma, \Lambda$ . So  $\beta = 1 - C\varepsilon^{1/(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{2/(n+1)})$  for some  $C = C(n, \Gamma, \Lambda)$ .  $\square$

**3.5. Estimates for  $\|dF_p\|$ .** Recall  $H_{F(p)}$  and  $K_{F(p)}$  are symmetric bilinear forms on  $T_{F(p)}\tilde{N}$  (see (3.5) and (3.6)). We will use the lower bound we just established for  $\text{Jac}F(p)$  in Proposition 3.27 to show  $H$  and  $K$  are close to scalar matrices. This will then allow us to mimic the proof of [BCG96, Proposition 5.2 ii)] to find bounds for the derivative of the BCG map that are close to 1.

**Proposition 3.31.** *Let  $F : \tilde{M} \rightarrow \tilde{N}$  be the BCG map and assume there is a constant  $\beta < 1$  as in the conclusion of Proposition 3.27 so that the Jacobian of  $F$  satisfies*

$$\beta \left( \frac{h(g)}{h(g_0)} \right)^n \leq |\text{Jac}F(p)|$$

for all  $p \in \tilde{M}$ . Let  $H_{F(p)}$  and  $K_{F(p)}$  be the symmetric bilinear forms on  $T_{F(p)}\tilde{N}$  defined in (3.5) and (3.6). Then there are constants  $a, a' < 1$  and  $A, A' > 1$ , depending only on  $\beta$  and  $n$ , such that

$$\begin{aligned} a \frac{1}{n} \langle v, v \rangle &\leq \langle H_{F(p)} v, v \rangle \leq A \frac{1}{n} \langle v, v \rangle, \\ a' \frac{h(g_0)}{n} \langle v, v \rangle &\leq \langle K_{F(p)} v, v \rangle \leq A' \frac{h(g_0)}{n} \langle v, v \rangle \end{aligned}$$

for all  $p \in M$  and all  $v \in T_{F(p)}\tilde{N}$ . In particular, there is a constant  $C = C(n, \Gamma, \Lambda)$  so that  $a = 1 - C\varepsilon^{1/2(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{1/(n+1)})$ ,  $A = 1 + C\varepsilon^{1/2(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{1/2(n+1)})$ ,  $a' = 1 - C\varepsilon^{1/4(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{1/2(n+1)})$ ,  $A' = 1 - C\varepsilon^{1/4(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{1/2(n+1)})$ .

*Remark 3.32.* If  $\tilde{N}$  is not Cayley hyperbolic space, we can take  $a = a'$  and  $A' = A$ . This is explained right after the proof of the proposition.

The lower bound on  $\text{Jac}F(p)$  can be thought of as equality almost holding in Lemma 3.5. This lower bound, together with the inequalities in Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3, implies equality almost holds in Lemma 3.4, that is,

$$\beta^{\frac{2(n+d-2)}{n-d}} \left( \frac{n^{\alpha-1}}{(n-1)^\alpha} \right)^n \leq \frac{\det H}{\det(I-H)^\alpha} \leq \left( \frac{n^{\alpha-1}}{(n-1)^\alpha} \right)^n, \quad (3.10)$$

where  $\alpha = \frac{2(n-1)}{n-d}$ .

In order to prove Proposition 3.31, we will first show that since  $\beta$  is close to 1, the matrix  $H$  is almost  $\frac{1}{n}I$ .

**Lemma 3.33.** *Let  $H$  be a symmetric positive definite  $n \times n$  matrix with trace 1 for  $n \geq 3$ . Let  $1 < \alpha \leq n - 1$  and let  $m = \left(\frac{n^{\alpha-1}}{(n-1)^\alpha}\right)^n$ . Suppose*

$$\frac{\det H}{\det(I - H)^\alpha} \geq \beta' m,$$

where  $\beta' = \beta^{\frac{2(n+d-2)}{n-d}}$  and  $\beta$  is as in Proposition 3.27. (Note  $0 < \beta' < 1$ .) Let  $\lambda_i$  denote the eigenvalues of  $H$ . Then there are constants  $a < 1$  and  $A > 1$ , depending on  $\beta$  and  $n$ , such that

$$a \frac{1}{n} \leq \lambda_i \leq A \frac{1}{n}$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . In particular, there is a constant  $C = C(n, \Gamma, \Lambda)$  so that  $a = 1 - C\varepsilon^{1/4n} + O(\varepsilon^{1/2n})$ ,  $A = 1 + C\varepsilon^{1/4n} + O(\varepsilon^{1/2n})$ .

*Proof.* It follows from [BCG95, Proposition B.5] (see [Rua22] for the Cayley case), Lemma 3.2 and Proposition 3.27 that there is a constant  $B(n) > 0$  so that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left( \lambda_i - \frac{1}{n} \right)^2 \leq \frac{1 - \beta'}{B}.$$

Write  $\delta = \sqrt{(1 - \beta')/B}$ . Then  $|\lambda_i - 1/n| < \delta$  implies we can take  $a = 1 - n\delta$ ,  $A = 1 + n\delta$ . Recall  $\beta = 1 - C\varepsilon^{1/(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{2/(n+1)})$  and  $\beta' = \beta^p$  for some  $p(n, d) > 1$ . Then  $\beta' = 1 - C'\varepsilon^{1/(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{2/(n+1)})$ , where  $C'$  is a possibly different constant still depending only on  $n, \Gamma, \Lambda$ . Thus there is a constant  $C = C(n, \Gamma, \Lambda)$  so that  $\delta = C\varepsilon^{1/2(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{1/(n+1)})$ . So we can take  $a = 1 - C\varepsilon^{1/2(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{1/(n+1)})$  and  $A = 1 + C\varepsilon^{1/2(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{1/(n+1)})$ , where  $C$  is another constant depending on the same parameters.  $\square$

Next, we need an analogue of Lemma 3.33 for the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality.

**Lemma 3.34.** *Let  $L$  be a symmetric positive-definite  $n \times n$  matrix with  $b \leq \text{trace}(L) \leq b'$  for positive constants  $b, b'$  depending only on  $\varepsilon, n, \Gamma, \Lambda$ . Suppose*

$$\det L \geq \alpha \left( \frac{1}{n} \text{trace} L \right)^n$$

for some  $0 < \alpha < 1$ . Let  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n$  denote the eigenvalues of  $L$ . Then there are constants  $a' < 1$  and  $A' > 1$  such that

$$a' \frac{\text{trace}(L)}{n} \leq \mu_i \leq A' \frac{\text{trace}(L)}{n}$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . In particular, there is a constant  $C = C(n, \Gamma, \Lambda)$  so that  $a' = 1 - C\sqrt{1 - \alpha}$ ,  $A' = 1 + C\sqrt{1 - \alpha}$ .

*Proof.* We will use the approach of the proof of [BCG95, Proposition B5]. Let  $\phi(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n) = \log(\mu_1 \cdots \mu_n)$ . Since  $\phi$  is concave, there is a constant  $B > 0$  so that the inequality

$$\log(\mu_1 \cdots \mu_n) \leq \log \left( \frac{\text{trace}(L)}{n} \right)^n - B \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \mu_i - \frac{\text{trace}(L)}{n} \right)^2$$

holds on the set of all  $\mu_i \geq 0$  satisfying  $\mu_1 + \cdots + \mu_n = \text{trace}(L)$ . The constant  $B$  depends only on the function  $\phi$ . In other words, it does not depend on any topological or geometric properties of the manifolds  $M$  and  $N$  other than the number  $n = \dim M = \dim N$ .

Since  $L$  is positive definite, we know  $0 < \mu_i < \text{trace}(L)$  for all  $i$ . So there exists  $T = T(\varepsilon, n, \Gamma, \Lambda)$  such that  $B \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \mu_i - \frac{\text{trace}(L)}{n} \right)^2 \leq T$ . Following the same steps as in the proof of [BCG95, Proposition B.5], we then obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left( \mu_i - \frac{\text{trace}(L)}{n} \right)^2 \leq \frac{1 - \alpha}{B \frac{1 - e^{-T}}{T}}.$$

Let  $\delta^2 = (1 - \alpha)/(B \frac{1 - e^{-T}}{T})$ . Then we can write  $\delta = C\sqrt{1 - \alpha}$  for some  $C = C(n, \Gamma, \Lambda)$ . Using the boundedness assumption  $b \leq \text{trace}(L) \leq b'$ , we conclude  $a' = 1 - C\sqrt{1 - \alpha}$ ,  $A' = 1 + C\sqrt{1 - \alpha}$  for some  $C = C(n, \Gamma, \Lambda)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.31.* First, note that  $\det K \geq a^{n/2}(h(g_0)/n)^n$  follows from [BCG95, Proposition B5] and Lemma 3.33. So equality almost holds in the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality. By Lemma 3.34, the eigenvalues of  $K$  are between  $a'h(g_0)/n$  and  $A'h(g_0)/n$ , where  $a' = 1 - C\sqrt{1 - a^{n/2}}$  and  $A' = 1 + C\sqrt{1 - a^{n/2}}$ . In terms of  $\varepsilon$ , we have  $a' = 1 - C\varepsilon^{1/4(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{1/2(n+1)})$  and  $A' = 1 - C\varepsilon^{1/4(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{1/2(n+1)})$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Remark 3.32.* When  $N$  is a real, complex or quaternionic hyperbolic space, we can write

$$K = I - H - \sum_{k=1}^{d-1} J_k H J_k, \quad (3.11)$$

for  $d = 1, 2, 4$ , respectively. Here,  $J_1, \dots, J_{d-1}$  are the orthogonal endomorphisms at each point defining the complex or quaternionic structure. They are parallel and satisfy  $J_i^2 = -Id$ ; see [BCG96, p. 638]. Now recall that Lemma 3.33 gives

$$a \frac{1}{n} \langle v, v \rangle \leq \langle H v, v \rangle \leq A \frac{1}{n} \langle v, v \rangle$$

for all  $v$ . To prove the corresponding statement for  $K$ , first note  $\langle J_k H J_k u, u \rangle = \langle -H J_k u, J_k u \rangle$ . Since  $\langle J_k u, J_k u \rangle = \langle u, u \rangle$ , we have

$$a \frac{1}{n} \langle u, u \rangle \leq \langle H J_k u, J_k u \rangle \leq A \frac{1}{n} \langle u, u \rangle.$$

We can use equation (3.11) to write

$$\begin{aligned} \langle K u, u \rangle &= \langle u, u \rangle - \langle H u, u \rangle + \sum_{k=1}^{d-1} \langle H J_k u, J_k u \rangle \\ &\leq \left( 1 - a \frac{1}{n} + A \frac{d-1}{n} \right) \langle u, u \rangle \\ &= \left( \frac{n+d-2}{n} + n\delta \frac{1}{n} + n\delta \frac{d-1}{n} \right) \langle u, u \rangle \quad (\text{using } a = 1 - n\delta, A = 1 + n\delta) \\ &\leq A \frac{n+d-2}{n} \langle u, u \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

By a similar argument,  $\langle K u, u \rangle \geq a \frac{n+d-2}{n} \langle u, u \rangle$ .  $\square$



**Proposition 3.35.** *Let  $F$  denote the BCG map, and suppose  $H$  and  $K$  satisfy the conclusion of Proposition 3.31. Then there are constants  $c_1 = c_1(\varepsilon, n, \Gamma, \Lambda) < 1$ ,  $C_2 = C_2(\varepsilon, n, \Gamma, \Lambda) > 1$  such that for all  $v \in TM$  we have*

$$c_1 \|v\|_g \leq \|dF(v)\|_{g_0} \leq C_2 \|v\|_g. \quad (3.12)$$

Moreover, there is a constant  $C = C(n, \Gamma, \Lambda)$  so that  $c_1 = 1 - C\varepsilon^{1/8(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{1/4(n+1)})$  and  $c_2 = 1 + C\varepsilon^{1/8(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{1/4(n+1)})$ .

*Proof.* We closely follow the proof of [BCG96, Proposition 5.2 ii)]. First note it suffices to prove the claim for  $v$  a unit vector. Using the definitions of  $H$  and  $K$  together with the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\langle KdF_p v, u \rangle \leq h(g) \langle Hu, u \rangle^{1/2} \left( \int_{X(\infty)} (dB_{p,\xi}(v))^2 d\mu_p(\xi) \right)^{1/2}.$$

(See [BCG96, (5.3)].) Using the upper bound for  $H$  in Proposition 3.31, the above inequality implies

$$\langle KdF_p v, u \rangle \leq \sqrt{A} \frac{h(g)}{\sqrt{n}} \|u\| \left( \int_{X(\infty)} (dB_{p,\xi}(v))^2 d\mu_p(\xi) \right)^{1/2}.$$

Now let  $u = dF_p(v)/\|dF_p(v)\|$ . Using the lower bound for  $K$  in Proposition 3.31 gives

$$\|dF_p\| \leq \frac{\sqrt{A} h(g)}{a' h(g_0)} \sqrt{n} \left( \int_{X(\infty)} (dB_{p,\xi}(v))^2 d\mu_p(\xi) \right)^{1/2}.$$

Now let  $L = dF_p \circ dF_p^T$  and let  $v_i$  be an orthonormal basis for  $T_p \tilde{M}$ . Then, since  $\|dB_{p,\xi}(v)\| \leq \|v\| = 1$ , we get

$$\text{trace}(L) = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle Lv_i, v_i \rangle = \langle dF_p(v_i), dF_p(v_i) \rangle \leq \left( \frac{\sqrt{A} h(g)}{a' h(g_0)} \right)^2 n.$$

Combining this with Proposition 3.27 and the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality gives

$$\beta^2 \left( \frac{h(g)}{h(g_0)} \right)^{2n} \leq |\text{Jac}F(p)|^2 = \det L \leq \left( \frac{1}{n} \text{trace} L \right)^n \leq \left( \frac{\sqrt{A} h(g)}{a' h(g_0)} \right)^{2n}. \quad (3.13)$$

Hence the hypotheses of Lemma 3.34 hold with  $\alpha = \beta^2(a')^{2n}/A^n$ . Using the expressions for  $\beta, a', A$  in Propositions 3.27 and 3.31, we can write  $\alpha = 1 - C\varepsilon^{1/4(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{1/2(n+1)})$  for some  $C = C(n, \Gamma, \Lambda)$ . Lemma 3.34 thus implies

$$a_1 \frac{1}{n} \text{trace} L \langle v, v \rangle \leq \langle Lv, v \rangle = \langle dF_p v, dF_p v \rangle \leq A_2 \frac{1}{n} \text{trace} L \langle v, v \rangle,$$

where  $a_1 = 1 - C\varepsilon^{1/8(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{1/4(n+1)})$  and  $A_2 = 1 + C\varepsilon^{1/8(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{1/4(n+1)})$ . Using (3.13) gives

$$a_1 \beta^{2/n} \left( \frac{h(g)}{h(g_0)} \right)^2 \leq \frac{\langle dF_p v, dF_p v \rangle}{\langle v, v \rangle} \leq A_2 \left( \frac{\sqrt{A} h(g)}{a h(g_0)} \right)^2.$$

Hence, there is a constant  $C = C(n, \Gamma, \Lambda)$  so that the lower bound can be written as  $1 - C\varepsilon^{1/8(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{1/4(n+1)})$  and the upper bound as  $1 + C\varepsilon^{1/8(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon^{1/8(n+1)})$ .  $\square$

## 4. SURFACES

In this section, we prove a generalization of Otal's marked length spectrum rigidity result for negatively curved surfaces [Ota90]. We show that pairs of negatively curved metrics on a surface become more isometric as the ratio of their marked length spectrum functions gets closer to 1. Aside from some background on the Liouville measure and Liouville current from Section 2, this section does not rely on earlier parts of this paper.

Let  $\mathcal{C}(2, \lambda, \Lambda, v_0, D_0)$  consist of all closed  $C^\infty$  Riemannian manifolds of dimension 2 with sectional curvatures contained in the interval  $[-\Lambda^2, -\lambda^2]$ , volume bounded below by  $v_0$ , and diameter bounded above by  $D_0$ . In this section we will prove the following theorem about surfaces whose marked length spectra are close:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Fix  $\lambda, \Lambda, v_0, D_0 > 0$ . Fix  $L > 1$ . Then there exists  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(L, \lambda, \Lambda, v_0, D_0) > 0$  small enough so that for any pair  $(M, g), (M, h) \in \mathcal{C}(2, \lambda, \Lambda, v_0, D_0)$  satisfying*

$$1 - \varepsilon \leq \frac{\mathcal{L}_g}{\mathcal{L}_h} \leq 1 + \varepsilon, \quad (4.1)$$

*there exists an  $L$ -Lipschitz map  $f : (M, g) \rightarrow (M, h)$ .*

The space  $\mathcal{C}(2, \lambda, \Lambda, v_0, D_0)$  has the property that any sequence has a convergent subsequence in the Lipschitz topology; this is often called the Gromov compactness theorem [GKPS99]. In this paper, we use refinements of Gromov's theorem due to Pugh and Greene–Wu [Pug87, GW88].

It follows from [GW88] that any sequence  $(M, g_n) \in \mathcal{C}(2, \lambda, \Lambda, v_0, D_0)$  has a subsequence  $(M, g_{n_k})$  converging in the following sense: there is a Riemannian metric  $g_0$  on  $M$  such that in local coordinates we have  $g_{n_k}^{ij} \rightarrow g_0^{ij}$  in the  $C^{1,\alpha}$  norm, and the limiting  $g_0^{ij}$  have regularity  $C^{1,\alpha}$ . Additionally, the distance functions  $d_{g_{n_k}}$  converge uniformly to  $d_{g_0}$  on compact sets; see [GW88, p. 122]. In particular, this implies the following:

**Lemma 4.1.** *Given any  $A > 1$ , there is a sufficiently large  $k$  so that for all  $p, q \in M$  we have  $A^{-1} d_{g_0}(p, q) \leq d_{g_{n_k}}(p, q) \leq A d_{g_0}(p, q)$ .*

We will use Gromov compactness to prove Theorem 1.1 by contradiction. Indeed, suppose the statement is false. Then for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there are  $(M, g_\varepsilon), (M, h_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{C}(2, \lambda, \Lambda, v_0, D_0)$  so that there is no  $L$ -Lipschitz map  $f : (M, g_\varepsilon) \rightarrow (M, h_\varepsilon)$ . By [GW88], there is a subsequence  $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$  so that  $(M, g_{\varepsilon_n}) \rightarrow (M, g_0)$  and  $(M, h_{\varepsilon_n}) \rightarrow (M, h_0)$  in the sense described above. From now on we will relabel  $g_{\varepsilon_n}$  as  $g_n$  and  $h_{\varepsilon_n}$  as  $h_n$ . To prove the main theorem, it suffices to prove the following statement:

**Proposition 4.2.** *Let  $(M, g_0)$  and  $(M, h_0)$  be the Greene–Wu limits of the counterexamples above. Then there is a map  $f : M \rightarrow M$  such that for all  $p, q \in M$  we have  $d_{g_0}(p, q) = d_{h_0}(f(p), f(q))$ .*

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Fix  $L > 1$  and suppose the theorem is false. Let  $(M, g_n), (M, h_n)$  be the convergent sequences of counter-examples defined above. Since  $(M, g_n) \rightarrow (M, g_0)$ , Lemma 4.1 gives large enough  $n$  so that  $\sqrt{L}^{-1} d_{g_0}(p, q) \leq d_{g_n}(p, q) \leq \sqrt{L} d_{g_0}(p, q)$  for all  $p, q \in M$ , and similarly for  $d_{h_n}$ . Then Proposition 4.2 gives

$$d_{g_n}(p, q) \leq \sqrt{L} d_{h_0}(f(p), f(q)) \leq L d_{h_n}(f(p), f(q)).$$

So  $f : (M, g_n) \rightarrow (M, h_n)$  is an  $L$ -Lipschitz map, which is a contradiction.  $\square$

**4.1. The marked length spectra of  $(M, g_0)$  and  $(M, h_0)$ .** To prove Proposition 4.2, we will first show  $(M, g_0)$  and  $(M, h_0)$  have the same marked length spectrum. Then we will construct an isometry  $f : (M, g_0) \rightarrow (M, h_0)$ . We use the same main steps as in [Ota90]; however, since  $g_0$  and  $h_0$  are only of  $C^{1,\alpha}$  regularity, there are additional technicalities that arise when verifying the requisite properties of the Liouville measure and Liouville current in this context.

We first recall some additional properties of the limit  $(M, g_0)$ . By a theorem of Pugh [Pug87, Theorem 1], this limiting metric will have a Lipschitz geodesic flow, and the geodesics themselves are of  $C^{1,1}$  regularity. Moreover, the exponential maps converge uniformly on compact sets [Pug87, Lemma 2], which is equivalent to the following:

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $\phi_n$  and  $\phi_0$  denote the geodesic flows on  $(T^1M, g_n)$  and  $(T^1M, g_0)$  respectively. Fix  $T > 0$  and let  $K \subset T^1M$  compact. Then  $\phi_n^t v \rightarrow \phi_0^t v$  uniformly for  $(t, v) \in [0, T] \times K$ .*

In addition, the space  $(M, g_0)$  is  $\text{CAT}(-\lambda^2)$  because it is a suitable limit of such spaces; see [BH13, Theorem II.3.9]. Thus, even though the curvature tensor is not defined for the  $C^{1,\alpha}$  metric  $g_0$ , this limiting space still exhibits many key properties of negatively curved manifolds. One such property, heavily used in Otal's proof of marked length spectrum rigidity [Ota90], is the fact that the angle sum of a non-degenerate geodesic triangle is strictly less than  $\pi$  [Car92, Lemma 12.3.1 ii)]. This still holds for  $\text{CAT}(-\lambda^2)$  spaces, essentially by definition [BH13, Proposition II.1.7 4].

Moreover, we can define the marked length spectrum of  $(M, g_0)$  the same way as for negatively curved manifolds. The fact that there exists a geodesic representative for each homotopy class is a general application of the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem; see [BH13, Proposition I.3.16]. The proof that this geodesic representative is unique in the negatively curved case immediately generalizes to the  $\text{CAT}(-\lambda^2)$  case; see [Car92, Lemma 12.3.3].

We will now show  $(M, g_0)$  and  $(M, h_0)$  have the same marked length spectrum. We start with a preliminary lemma.

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $\langle \gamma \rangle$  be a free homotopy class. Let  $\gamma_0$  and  $\gamma_n$  denote the geodesic representatives with respect to  $g_0$  and  $g_n$  respectively. Write  $\gamma_0(t) = \phi_0^t v_0$  and  $\gamma_n(t) = \phi_n^t v_n$ . Then for all  $0 \leq t \leq l_{g_0}(\gamma_0)$ , we have  $\phi_n^t v_n \rightarrow \phi_0^t v_0$  in  $T^1M$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $T = l_{g_0}(\gamma_0)$ . By Lemma 4.3, choose  $n$  large enough so that  $d(\phi_n^t v_0, \phi_0^t v_0) < \varepsilon$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$ . In particular,  $\phi_n^T v_0$  is close to  $\phi_0^T v_0 = v_0$ . The Anosov closing lemma applied to the geodesic flow on  $(T^1M, g_n)$  gives  $\phi_n^t v_0$  is shadowed by a closed orbit. By construction, this closed orbit is close to  $\gamma_0$  and is also homotopic to it, which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.5.** *The Riemannian surfaces  $(M, g_0)$  and  $(M, h_0)$  have the same marked length spectrum.*

*Proof.* The previous lemma, together with Lemma 4.1, implies  $l_{g_n}(\gamma_n) \rightarrow l_{g_0}(\gamma_0)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Let  $\tilde{\gamma}_n$  be the geodesic representatives of  $\langle \gamma \rangle$  with respect to the  $h_n$  metrics. Then we also have  $l_{h_n}(\tilde{\gamma}_n) \rightarrow l_{h_0}(\tilde{\gamma}_0)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Since  $\mathcal{L}_{g_n}/\mathcal{L}_{h_n} \rightarrow 1$ , we obtain  $l_{g_0}(\gamma_0)/l_{h_0}(\tilde{\gamma}_0) = 1$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

**4.2. Liouville current.** Now that we have two surfaces with the same marked length spectrum, we will follow the method of [Ota90] to show they are isometric. Two key tools used

in Otal's proof are the Liouville current and the Liouville measure (both defined at the beginning of Section 2.2). In this section and the next, we will construct analogous measures for the limit  $(M, g_0)$  and show they still satisfy the properties required for Otal's proof.

Recall the Liouville current is a  $\Gamma$ -invariant measure on the space of geodesics of  $\tilde{M}$ ; see Section 2.2. Recall as well the following relation between the cross-ratio and Liouville current for surfaces. Let  $a, b, c, d \in \partial\tilde{M}$  be four distinct points. Since  $\partial\tilde{M}$  is a circle, the pair of points  $(a, b)$  determines an interval in the boundary (after fixing an orientation). Let  $(a, b) \times (c, d) \in \partial^2\tilde{M}$  denote the geodesics starting in the interval  $(a, b)$  and ending in the interval  $(c, d)$ . Then

$$\lambda((a, b) \times (c, d)) = \frac{1}{2}[a, b, c, d]. \quad (4.2)$$

(See (2.4), also [Ota90, Proof of Theorem 2] and [HP97, Theorem 4.4].)

We can use the above equation to define the Liouville current  $\lambda_0$  on  $(M, g_0)$ . Let  $\lambda_n$  denote the Liouville current with respect to the smooth metric  $g_n$ . It is then clear from Lemma 2.3 that  $\lambda_n(A) \rightarrow \lambda_0(A)$  for any Borel set  $A \subset \partial^2\tilde{M}$ .

We now recall a key property of the Liouville current used in Otal's proof. We begin by defining coordinates on the space of geodesics: Fix  $v \in T^1M$  and  $T > 0$ , and let  $t \mapsto \eta(t)$  be the geodesic segment of length  $T$  with  $\eta'(0) = v$ . Let  $\mathcal{G}_v^T$  denote the (bi-infinite) geodesics which intersect the geodesic segment  $\eta$  transversally. Let  $b : [0, T] \times (0, \pi) \rightarrow T^1M$  be the map defined by sending  $(t, \theta)$  to the unit tangent vector with footpoint  $\eta(t)$  obtained by rotating  $\eta'(t)$  by angle  $\theta$ . We can then identify each vector  $b(t, \theta)$  with a unique geodesic in  $\mathcal{G}_v^T$  (see [Ota90, p. 155]).

When  $g$  is a smooth Riemannian metric on  $M$ , the Liouville current with respect to the above coordinates is of the form  $\frac{1}{2} \sin \theta d\theta dt$ . The same proof works for the measure  $\lambda_0$  defined in terms of the  $C^{1,\alpha}$  Riemannian metric  $g_0$ . To see this, we begin by describing the space  $T_vT^1M$ . If  $\xi \in T_vT^1M$ , then  $\xi$  is tangent to a curve  $\beta(t) \in TM$ , which is in turn a vector field along a curve  $b(t) \in M$ . Let  $\nabla$  be the Levi-Civita connection for the metric  $g_0$  and let  $\kappa_v(\xi) := \nabla_{b'(t)}\beta(0)$  denote the connector map, which is of  $C^\alpha$  regularity. Let  $\pi_{TM} : TM \rightarrow M$  be the natural projection; then  $d\pi(\xi) = b'(0)$ . The map  $T_vT^1M \rightarrow T_pM \oplus T_pM$  given by  $\xi \mapsto (d\pi(\xi), \kappa_v(\xi))$  is an isomorphism [Bur83, 1.D].

Now for  $v \in T^1M$  and  $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in T_vT^1M$ , define the  $C^\alpha$  2-form

$$\tau_v(\xi_1, \xi_2) = \langle d\pi_{TM}\xi_2, \kappa_v\xi_1 \rangle - \langle d\pi_{TM}\xi_1, \kappa_v\xi_2 \rangle.$$

In the case of a smooth Riemannian metric, the above formula is the coordinate expression for the symplectic form  $d\omega$  defined at the beginning of Section 2.2 [Bur83, 1.D]. Since the  $g_n^i$  and their derivatives converge to those of  $g_0$ , this means  $\tau$  is the limit of the  $d\omega^n$  for the metrics  $g_n$ . Since each  $d\omega^n$  is invariant under the geodesic flow  $\phi_n$ , Lemma 4.3 implies  $\tau$  is invariant under the geodesic flow  $g_0$ . Therefore, we can think of  $\tau$  as a  $C^\alpha$  2-form on the space of geodesics, which in turn gives rise to a measure.

**Lemma 4.6.** *Let  $b : [0, T] \times (0, \pi) \rightarrow T^1M$  as above. Then  $b^*\tau = \sin \theta d\theta dt$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $(t, \theta)$  and let  $u = b(t, \theta)$ . Let  $\beta_1(t)$  denote the coordinate curve  $t \mapsto b(t, \theta)$ . This gives a parallel vector field along  $\eta$  making fixed angle  $\theta$  with  $\eta'$ . Thus if  $\xi_1$  is the vector tangent to  $\beta_1$  at  $u$ , we get  $\kappa_v\xi_1 = 0$  and  $d\pi\xi_1 = \eta'(t)$ . This latter vector is obtained by rotating  $u$  by angle  $\theta$ , which we will denote by  $\theta \cdot u$ .

Next, let  $\beta_2(\theta)$  denote the coordinate curve  $\theta \mapsto b(t, \theta)$ . This is a curve in the fiber over  $\eta(t)$ , which means  $d\pi(\xi_2) = 0$ . This curve traces out a circle in the unit tangent space, and its tangent vector is thus perpendicular to the circle. This means  $\kappa_v(\xi_2) = (\pi/2) \cdot u$ .

Hence

$$\tau_{b(t,\theta)}(\xi_2, \xi_1) = \langle \pi/2 \cdot u, \theta \cdot u \rangle - \langle 0, 0 \rangle = \sin \theta,$$

as claimed.  $\square$

We now claim the measure on the space of geodesics coming from the symplectic form  $\frac{1}{2}\tau$  is equal to the Liouville current. Indeed, this follows from [Ota90, Theorem 2]. To show this theorem is still true for  $(M, g_0)$ , it suffices to verify the geodesic flow  $\phi_0$  satisfies the Anosov closing lemma (see the proof of Proposition 2.4).

**Lemma 4.7.** *The Anosov closing lemma holds for the  $g_0$ -geodesic flow, i.e. given  $\delta > 0$ , there exist  $T_0 > 0$ ,  $\delta_0 > 0$  with the following property: for any  $v$  so that  $d(\phi^t v, v) < \delta_0$  for  $t \geq T_0$ , there exists  $w$  tangent to a periodic orbit of length  $t_0$  where  $|t - t_0| < \delta$  and  $d(\phi^s v, \phi^s w) < \delta$  for  $s \in [0, \min(t, t_0)]$ .*

*Proof.* We can choose  $T_0$  and  $\delta_0$  so that the conclusion of Anosov closing lemma holds for all  $g_n$  with  $n$  sufficiently large. Indeed, this follows from the fact that the stable/unstable distributions of the  $g_n$  geodesic flows converge uniformly on compact sets to those of the  $g_0$  geodesic flow as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ; see Lemma 3.13 and [Fra18, p. 105].

Now take  $v$  and  $t \geq T_0$  so that  $d_{g_0}(\phi_0^t v, v) < \delta_0/2$ . Choose  $n$  large enough such that  $\phi_n^t v$  is within  $\delta_0/2$  of  $\phi_0^t v$ . Applying the Anosov closing lemma to  $g_n$  gives  $w$  and  $t_0$  with  $|t - t_0| < \delta$ ,  $\phi_n^{t_0} w = w$  and  $d(\phi_n^s v, \phi_n^s w)$  for  $s \in [0, \min(t, t_0)]$ . By Lemma 4.4, this  $g_n$ -closed orbit is  $\delta$ -close to a  $g_0$ -closed orbit, which completes the proof.  $\square$

Since  $(M, g_0)$  and  $(M, h_0)$  are  $\text{CAT}(-\lambda^2)$  spaces, we can define a correspondence of geodesics  $\phi : (\partial^2 \tilde{M}, g_0) \rightarrow (\partial^2 \tilde{M}, h_0)$  as in Construction 2.1. The following fact is still true in this context; see [Ota90, p. 156].

**Proposition 4.8.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}_v \subset \partial^2 \tilde{M}$  be a coordinate chart with coordinates  $(t, \theta)$  and let  $\phi(\mathcal{G}_v) = \mathcal{G}_{\phi(v)}$  have coordinates  $(t, \theta')$ . Then  $\phi$  takes the measure  $\sin \theta \, d\theta \, dt$  to  $\sin \theta' \, d\theta' \, dt'$ .*

**4.3. Liouville measure.** Let  $\mu_n$  denote the Liouville measure on  $T^1 M$  with respect to the metric  $g_n$  on  $M$ . Let  $g_n^S$  denote the associated Sasaki metric on  $T^1 M$ . Then  $\mu_n$  is a constant multiple of the measure arising from the Riemannian volume form of  $g_n^S$ . In local coordinates, the measure  $\mu_n$  can be written in terms of the  $g_n^{ij}$  and their first derivatives. Since  $g_n^{ij} \rightarrow g_0^{ij}$  in the  $C^{1,\alpha}$  norm, we see the measures  $\mu_n$  converge to a measure  $\mu_0$ , which is the Riemannian volume associated to the  $C^\alpha$  Sasaki metric  $g_0^S$ . Hence, the measure  $\mu_0$  can be written locally as the product  $dm \times d\theta$ , where  $dm$  is the Riemannian volume on  $M$  coming from  $g_0$ , and  $d\theta$  is Lebesgue measure on the circle  $T_p^1 M$ .

We now recall the average change in angle function  $\Theta' : [0, \pi] \rightarrow [0, \pi]$  from [Ota90, Section 2]. First Otal considers the function  $\theta' : T^1 M \times [0, \pi] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined as follows. Given a unit tangent vector  $v$  and an angle  $\theta$ , let  $\theta \cdot v$  denote the vector obtained by rotating  $v$  by  $\theta$ . Consider lifts of the geodesics determined by  $v$  and  $\theta \cdot v$  passing through the same point in  $\tilde{M}$ . The correspondence of geodesics  $\phi$  (see above Proposition 4.8 and Construction 2.1) takes intersecting geodesics to intersecting geodesics (since  $\dim M = 2$ ). Let  $\theta'(\theta, v)$  denote the angle between the image geodesics in  $(\tilde{M}, h_0)$  at their point of intersection. Finally, let  $\Theta'(\theta) = \int_{T^1 M} \theta'(\theta, v) d\mu_0(v)$ .

The function  $\Theta'$  satisfies symmetry and subadditivity properties [Ota90, Proposition 6]. Indeed, the proof of [Ota90, Proposition 6] uses the above local product structure of the Liouville measure along with the fact that in negative curvature, the angle sum of a non-degenerate geodesic triangle is strictly less than  $\pi$ . As mentioned before, this latter fact holds for  $\text{CAT}(-\lambda^2)$  spaces as well [BH13, Proposition II.1.7.4].

To deduce the third key property of  $\Theta'$  (see [Ota90, Proposition 7] for the exact statement), we require the following fact about  $\mu_0$ , which holds by [Sig72] in the original smooth case. Since  $\phi_0$  is a geodesic flow on a  $\text{CAT}(-1)$  space, it satisfies a sufficiently strong specification property such that the proof of [Sig72] works verbatim in this context; see [CLT20, Theorem 3.2, Lemma 4.5].

**Proposition 4.9.** *Let  $f : T^1M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a continuous function. Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then there is a closed geodesic  $\gamma_0$  so that*

$$\left| \int_{T^1M} f d\mu_0 - \frac{1}{l_{g_0}(\gamma_0)} \int_{\gamma_0} f dt \right| < \varepsilon.$$

**4.4. Constructing a distance-preserving map  $f : (M, g_0) \rightarrow (M, h_0)$ .** Using Propositions 4.8 and 4.9, the proof of [Ota90, Proposition 7] shows the hypotheses of [Ota90, Lemma 8] are satisfied. Thus, the function  $\Theta'$  defined at the beginning of Section 4.3 is the identity. From this, it follows that  $\phi$  takes triples of geodesics intersecting in a single point to triples of geodesics intersecting in a single point; see the proof of [Ota90, Theorem 1]. We then define  $f : (M, g_0) \rightarrow (M, h_0)$  exactly as in [Ota90]: given  $p \in \tilde{M}$ , take any two geodesics through  $p$ . Then their images under  $\phi$  must also intersect in a single point, which we call  $\tilde{f}(p)$ . Then  $\tilde{f}$  is distance-preserving and  $\Gamma$ -equivariant by the same argument as in [Ota90].

This proves Proposition 4.2, and hence Theorem 1.1 is proved.

## REFERENCES

- [Bal95] Werner Ballmann, *Lectures on spaces of nonpositive curvature*, vol. 25, Springer Science & Business Media, 1995.
- [BCG95] Gérard Besson, Gilles Courtois, and Sylvestre Gallot, *Entropies et rigidités des espaces localement symétriques de courbure strictement négative*, Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA **5** (1995), no. 5, 731–799.
- [BCG96] ———, *Minimal entropy and Mostow’s rigidity theorems*, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems **16** (1996), no. 4, 623–649.
- [BH13] Martin R Bridson and André Haefliger, *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*, vol. 319, Springer, 2013.
- [BK84] Michael Brin and H Karcher, *Frame flows on manifolds with pinched negative curvature*, Compositio Mathematica **52** (1984), no. 3, 275–297.
- [BKB<sup>+</sup>85] Keith Burns, Anatole Katok, W Ballman, M Brin, P Eberlein, and R Osserman, *Manifolds with non-positive curvature*, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems **5** (1985), no. 2, 307–317.
- [BP92] Riccardo Benedetti and Carlo Petronio, *Lectures on hyperbolic geometry*, Springer, 1992.
- [Bur83] Keith Burns, *Hyperbolic behaviour of geodesic flows on manifolds with no focal points*, University of Wawrick (1983).
- [Car92] Manfredo Perdigao do Carmo, *Riemannian geometry*, Birkhäuser, 1992.
- [CD04] Christopher B Croke and Nurlan S Dairbekov, *Lengths and volumes in Riemannian manifolds*, Duke Mathematical Journal **125** (2004), no. 1, 1–14.
- [CF03] Christopher Connell and Benson Farb, *The degree theorem in higher rank*, Journal of Differential Geometry **65** (2003), no. 1, 19–59.

- [CLT20] David Constantine, Jean-François Lafont, and Daniel J Thompson, *The weak specification property for geodesic flows on CAT (-1) spaces*, Groups, Geometry, and Dynamics **14** (2020), no. 1, 297–336.
- [Cro90] Christopher B Croke, *Rigidity for surfaces of non-positive curvature*, Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici **65** (1990), no. 1, 150–169.
- [Fra18] Steven Frankel, *Coarse hyperbolicity and closed orbits for quasigeodesic flows*, Annals of Mathematics **188** (2018), no. 1, 1–48.
- [GHL90] Sylvestre Gallot, Dominique Hulin, and Jacques Lafontaine, *Riemannian geometry*, vol. 2, Springer, 1990.
- [GKL19] Colin Guillarmou, Gerhard Knieper, and Thibault Lefeuvre, *Geodesic stretch, pressure metric and marked length spectrum rigidity*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08666 (2019).
- [GKPS99] Mikhael Gromov, Misha Katz, Pierre Pansu, and Stephen Semmes, *Metric structures for Riemannian and non-Riemannian spaces*, vol. 152, Springer, 1999.
- [GL19] Colin Guillarmou and Thibault Lefeuvre, *The marked length spectrum of Anosov manifolds*, Annals of Mathematics **190** (2019), no. 1, 321–344.
- [Gro00] Mikhail Gromov, *Three remarks on geodesic dynamics and fundamental group*, Enseign. Math.(2) **46** (2000), 391–402.
- [GW88] Robert Greene and Hung-Hsi Wu, *Lipschitz convergence of Riemannian manifolds*, Pacific Journal of Mathematics **131** (1988), no. 1, 119–141.
- [Ham92] Ursula Hamenstädt, *Time-preserving conjugacies of geodesic flows*, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems **12** (1992), no. 1, 67–74.
- [Ham99] ———, *Cocycles, symplectic structures and intersection*, Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA **9** (1999), no. 1, 90–140.
- [Has94] Boris Hasselblatt, *Horospheric foliations and relative pinching*, Journal of Differential Geometry **39** (1994), no. 1, 57–63.
- [HP75] Morris W Hirsch and Charles C Pugh, *Smoothness of horocycle foliations*, Journal of Differential Geometry **10** (1975), no. 2, 225–238.
- [HP97] Sa’ar Hersensky and Frédéric Paulin, *On the rigidity of discrete isometry groups of negatively curved spaces*, Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici **72** (1997), no. 3, 349–388.
- [Kai90] Vadim A Kaimanovich, *Invariant measures of the geodesic flow and measures at infinity on negatively curved manifolds*, Annales de l’IHP Physique théorique **53** (1990), no. 4, 361–393.
- [KH97] Anatole Katok and Boris Hasselblatt, *Introduction to the modern theory of dynamical systems*, no. 54, Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [Mar69] Grigorii Aleksandrovich Margulis, *Applications of ergodic theory to the investigation of manifolds of negative curvature*, Funktsional’nyi Analiz i ego Prilozheniya **3** (1969), no. 4, 89–90.
- [Mos73] G Daniel Mostow, *Strong rigidity of locally symmetric spaces*, no. 78, University of Tokyo Press, 1973.
- [MW97] John Milnor and David W Weaver, *Topology from the differentiable viewpoint*, Princeton University Press, 1997.
- [Ota90] Jean-Pierre Otal, *Le spectre marqué des longueurs des surfaces à courbure négative*, Annals of Mathematics **131** (1990), no. 1, 151–162.
- [Ota92] ———, *Sur la géométrie symplectique de l’espace des géodésiques d’une variété à courbure négative*, Revista matemática iberoamericana **8** (1992), no. 3, 441–456.
- [Pet06] Peter Petersen, *Riemannian geometry. second edition*, vol. 171, Springer, 2006.
- [Pug87] Charles C Pugh, *The  $C^{1,1}$  conclusions in Gromov’s theory*, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems **7** (1987), no. 1, 133–147.
- [Qui06] Jean-François Quint, *An overview of patterson-sullivan theory*, Workshop The barycenter method, FIM, Zurich, 2006.
- [Rob03] Thomas Roblin, *Ergodicité et équidistribution en courbure négative*, no. 95, Société mathématique de France, 2003.
- [Rua22] Yuping Ruan, *The Cayley hyperbolic space and the volume entropy rigidity*, arXiv preprint math/2203.14418 (2022).
- [Sig72] Karl Sigmund, *On the space of invariant measures for hyperbolic flows*, American Journal of Mathematics **94** (1972), no. 1, 31–37.

- [Thu98] William P Thurston, *Minimal stretch maps between hyperbolic surfaces*, arXiv preprint math/9801039 (1998).