

Integral Probability Metrics on submanifolds: interpolation inequalities and optimal inference

Arthur Stéphanovitch

STEPHANOVITCH@DMA.ENS.FR

*Département de Mathématiques et Applications
Ecole Normale Supérieure, Université PSL, CNRS
F-75005 Paris, France*

Abstract

We study interpolation inequalities between Hölder Integral Probability Metrics (IPMs) in the case where the measures have densities on closed submanifolds. Precisely, it is shown that if two probability measures μ and μ^* have β -smooth densities with respect to the volume measure of some submanifolds \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M}^* respectively, then the Hölder IPMs $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}$ of smoothness $\gamma \geq 1$ and $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}$ of smoothness $\eta > \gamma$, satisfy $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}(\mu, \mu^*) \lesssim d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\eta}}$, up to logarithmic factors. We provide an application of this result to high-dimensional inference. These functional inequalities turn out to be a key tool for density estimation on unknown submanifold. In particular, it allows to build the first estimator attaining optimal rates of estimation for all the distances $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}$, $\gamma \in [1, \infty)$ simultaneously.

Keywords: integral probability metrics, interpolation inequality, manifold data, distribution estimation, minimax rate.

1 Introduction

The development of methods for estimating probability measures from data has been a major focus of contemporary statistics and machine learning (Bishop, 2006). This pursuit has given rise to thriving research fields such as generative models (Ruthotto and Haber, 2021), reinforcement learning (Szepesvári, 2022) and geometrical inference (Chazal et al., 2011). In order to evaluate the precision of the estimation, many methods use Integral Probability Metrics (IPMs) (Müller, 1997) as the distances to compare probability measures. It consists in choosing a class of functions \mathcal{F} and looking at the distance between two probability measures μ, μ^* defined by

$$d_{\mathcal{F}}(\mu, \mu^*) := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \int f(x) d\mu(x) - \int f(x) d\mu^*(x) \right|. \quad (1)$$

Notable examples of IPMs include the total variation distance (Verdú, 2014) (\mathcal{F} is the class of functions taking value in $[-1, 1]$), the Wasserstein distance (Villani, 2009) (\mathcal{F} is the class of 1-Lipschitz functions) and Maximum Mean Discrepancies (Smola et al., 2006) (\mathcal{F} is the unit ball of a RKHS). In this paper we focus on the Hölder IPMs that have been used in generative models (Arjovsky et al. (2017), Chakraborty and Bartlett (2024)) and geometric learning (Tang and Yang, 2023). For $\eta > 0$, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} two subsets of Euclidean spaces and $f = (f_1, \dots, f_p) \in C^{[\eta]}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ the set of $[\eta] := \max\{k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \mid k \leq \eta\}$ times differentiable functions, denote $\partial^\nu f_i = \frac{\partial^{|\nu|} f_i}{\partial x_1^{\nu_1} \dots \partial x_d^{\nu_d}}$ the partial differential operator for any multi-index

$\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ with $|\nu| := \nu_1 + \dots + \nu_d \leq \lfloor \eta \rfloor$. Write $\|f_i\|_{\eta-\lfloor \eta \rfloor} = \sup_{x \neq y} \frac{f_i(x) - f_i(y)}{\min\{1, \|x-y\|^{\eta-\lfloor \eta \rfloor}\}}$ and let

$$\mathcal{H}_K^\eta(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) = \left\{ f \in C^{\lfloor \eta \rfloor}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) \mid \max_i \sum_{|\nu| \leq \lfloor \eta \rfloor} \|\partial^\nu f_i\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})} + \sum_{|\nu| = \lfloor \eta \rfloor} \|\partial^\nu f_i\|_{\eta-\lfloor \eta \rfloor} \leq K \right\}$$

denote the ball of radius K of the Hölder space $\mathcal{H}^\eta(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$, the set of functions $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ of regularity η . In this work we are interested in comparing the Holder IPMs

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*) := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{H}_1^\eta} \int f(x) d\mu(x) - \int f(x) d\mu^*(x) \quad (2)$$

of different regularities η . The popularity of the Hölder IPM comes from its equivalence with the Wasserstein metric in the case $\eta = 1$. This metric enjoys several useful properties including the metrization of weak convergence of measures Villani (2021). Unfortunately, the Wasserstein distance has been shown to be computationally expensive (Peyré et al., 2019). Then, the need of finding smaller classes than the Lipschitz class in the IPM (1) arises. Ideally one wants to have a class \mathcal{F} that is smaller than the Lipschitz class but that still controls the Wasserstein distance. Classical interpolation inequalities (Lunardi, 2018) allow to show the connection between the different IPMs: if μ and μ^* have densities with respect to the Lebesgue measure and that belong to \mathcal{H}_1^β for $\beta > 0$, then for all $0 < \gamma < \eta$, we have

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}(\mu, \mu^*) \lesssim d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\eta}}, \quad (3)$$

up to logarithmic terms (see Theorem 3). These inequalities are key in the estimation of smooth densities as they allow to show that if an estimator $\hat{\mu}$ of μ^* attains optimal rates of estimation for the $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}$ distance, then it also attains optimal rates for the $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}$ distance for all $\gamma \in (0, \eta)$ (Stéphanovitch et al., 2023).

Recent use of high dimensional data have shed light on the fact that the optimal rates for the estimation of probability measures, degenerate exponentially with respect to the dimension of the data (Köppen, 2000). This is the so called "curse of dimensionality" and has led researcher to forsake density estimation to rather focus on measures with low intrinsic dimensional structure. In this context, a natural setting is to consider measures having densities with respect to the volume measure of a submanifold (Divol, 2022). However, classical interpolation inequalities like (3) do not apply anymore in this setting. In order to obtain efficient methods taking into account the low dimensional structure of the measures, it is then crucial to understand how these inequalities can be generalized.

Stéphanovitch et al. (2023) have recently shown a generalization of these inequalities in the case of push forward measures. Supposing that μ and μ^* have β -regular densities with respect to the volume measure of submanifolds \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M}^* respectively and that μ and μ^* are push forward measures of $\beta + 1$ -regular maps from the d -dimensional torus \mathbb{T}^d , it is shown that inequality (3) still stands in the case $\gamma \in [1, \beta + 1]$ and $\eta = \beta + 1$. In this paper, this result is generalized to measures having β -regular densities with respect to the volume measure of any closed submanifolds (without the push forward assumption) and to any $0 < \gamma < \eta$. This generalization allows measure estimation methods like Stéphanovitch et al. (2023) to

be generalized to the manifold setting. Precisely, we build the first estimator of density on unknown manifold that attains optimal rates for all the distances $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}$, $\gamma \in [1, \infty)$ simultaneously. Its construction is more simpler than previous estimators like Tang and Yang (2023) as its use of high regularity IPMs implicitly regularizes the data.

To motivate our result from a functional point of view, it is detailed in Section 3.1 how the generalization of inequality (3) is the extension of some interpolation inequalities between Besov norms of L^2 functions, to Besov norms of signed measures having low dimensional smooth structure.

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we set the notation, properly define our setting, and present the main results of the paper. In Section 3, we give a walk-through of the proof by stating the key intermediate results that allow to obtain Theorem 9. In Section 4 we present a direct application of Theorem 9 to the estimation of density on unknown manifold. In Section 5, we detail a simple example to get some intuition on Theorem 9. Technical points of the proofs are gathered in the supplementary material.

2 Preliminaries and main results

2.1 Setting

Let us start by defining the precise setting of our work. The results focus on β -regular densities with $\beta \geq 1$ with respect to the volume measure of closed (i.e. compact without boundary) manifolds that are of dimension $d \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and that are immersed in the ambient space \mathbb{R}^p with $p > d$ an integer.

For \mathcal{M} a closed d -dimensional submanifold embedded in \mathbb{R}^p and $x \in \mathcal{M}$, note

$$U_x = B^p(x, K^{-1}) \cap \mathcal{M} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_x : U_x \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_x(\mathcal{M}), \quad \varphi_x = \pi_{\mathcal{T}_x(\mathcal{M})} - x,$$

for $\pi_{\mathcal{T}_x(\mathcal{M})}$ the orthogonal projection onto the tangent space $\mathcal{T}_x(\mathcal{M})$ of \mathcal{M} at the point x and $B^p(x, K^{-1})$ the p -dimensional ball of radius $K^{-1} > 0$ around x . Let us fix a certain $K > 1$ and define the notion of regularity for manifold used in this work.

Definition 1 *A closed d -dimensional submanifold \mathcal{M} is said to verify the $(\beta + 1, K)$ -manifold condition if $\mathcal{M} \subset B^p(0, K)$ and for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$, $\varphi_x : U_x \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_x(\mathcal{M})$ is a diffeomorphism and verifies*

$$\varphi_x^{-1} \in \mathcal{H}_K^{\beta+1}(\varphi_x(U_x), U_x).$$

Definition 1 is equivalent to a reach condition (Federer, 1959) for $\beta+1$ -smooth submanifolds. The reach $r_{\mathcal{M}}$ of a manifold \mathcal{M} corresponds to the largest $\epsilon \geq 0$ such that its orthogonal projection $\pi_{\mathcal{M}}$ is well defined from \mathcal{M}^ϵ to \mathcal{M} with $\mathcal{M}^\epsilon = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^p \mid d(x, \mathcal{M}) < \epsilon\}$ the set of points having their distance to the manifold $d(x, \mathcal{M})$ smaller than ϵ . Definition 1 is very general as any $\beta + 1$ -regular closed submanifold with reach uniformly bounded from below, verifies the $(\beta + 1, K)$ -manifold condition for a sufficiently large K (Divol, 2022). Let us now define the notion of regularity for densities used in the paper.

Definition 2 A probability measure μ supported on a submanifold \mathcal{M} is said to verify the (β, K) -density condition if

- i) μ admits a density $f_\mu \in \mathcal{H}_K^\beta(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{R})$ with respect to the volume measure on \mathcal{M} ,
- ii) f_μ is bounded below by K^{-1} .

Supposing that the densities are bounded below is a classical assumption in the setting of density estimation on manifolds (Divol (2022), Tang and Yang (2023)). Here it is needed in order to obtain smooth optimal transport maps between some push forward measures in Proposition 4 using Caffarelli's regularity (Villani, 2009). For a measure μ supported on a set \mathcal{X} and a function g defined on \mathcal{X} and taking values in a set \mathcal{Y} , we write $g_{\#\mu}$ for the push forward measure of μ by g i.e. $\forall f \in \mathcal{H}_1^0(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{Y}} f(x) dg_{\#\mu}(x) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(g(u)) d\mu(u).$$

2.2 Main results

Throughout, the quantities $C, C_\delta, C_{\delta, \eta} \dots$ represent constants that can vary from line to line and that only depend on p, d, β, K and there underscore. Using Definitions 1 and 2, let us state the main result of the paper.

Theorem 9: Let $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*$ be two submanifolds satisfying the $(\beta + 1, K)$ -manifold condition (Definition 1) and μ, μ^* two probability measures satisfying the (β, K) -density condition (Definition 2) on \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M}^* respectively. Then for all $1 \leq \gamma \leq \eta$, we have

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq C \log \left(1 + d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{-1} \right)^{C_2} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\eta}}.$$

This result is sharp up to the logarithmic factor, meaning that the exponent $\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\eta}$ is optimal. The optimality of the exponent can be justified by three different arguments, the first one being that it is the same exponent as in the classical case (see Theorem 3). The second one is the example of Section 5, where we explicit a sequence of measures such that $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}(\mu_k, \mu^*) \rightarrow 0$ when k tends to the infinity and $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu_k, \mu^*) \geq C d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu_k, \mu^*)^{\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\eta}}$. Finally, the last one is more original as it is a statistical argument. Theorem 9 can be used to show that a certain estimator $\hat{\mu}$ of μ^* using i.i.d data, attains optimal rates of convergence up to logarithmic factors (Stéphanovitch et al., 2023). If the exponent on the $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}$ distance was larger than $\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\eta}$, this estimator would attain better rates than the optimal ones.

The logarithmic factor in Theorem 9 arises from the use of wavelet theory to describe Hölder spaces. Throughout the paper, we highlight the efficiency of the wavelet tool to describe smoothness as it allows to greatly simplify some geometric proofs. However, Hölder spaces with integer regularity exponent, can not be exactly described by wavelets Haroske (2006). This leads to the appearance of the term $\log \left(d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{-1} \right)^{C_2}$ in the inequality, as it allows to have injection of Besov into Hölder spaces. We do not keep track of the extra exponent C_2 to avoid unnecessary heaviness, as the obtained exponent is very likely suboptimal.

Theorem 9 is an improvement on Theorem 5.1 in Stéphanovitch et al. (2023) which requires the additional assumptions that the measures are push forward measures from the torus and that $\eta = \beta + 1$. Precisely, it is supposed that there exist $g, g^* \in \mathcal{H}_K^{\beta+1}(\mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d, \mathbb{R}^p)$ embeddings, such that $\mu = g_{\#\lambda^d}$ and $\mu^* = g^*_{\#\lambda^d}$. In particular, this model can only describe manifolds \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M}^* that are smooth deformations of the torus. On the other hand, our extension of the result for any $\eta \geq \gamma$, shows that the inequality behaves like in the classical case and the fact that the measures are on submanifolds (with possibly a complex topology) does not impact the IPMs. Theorem 9 shows that although the measures do not have any regularity from the point of view of the ambient space \mathbb{R}^p , their low dimensional regularity still intervenes the same way in their discrimination through IPMs. We also extend the result to the simpler case $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ in Proposition 10, where in this case the inequality is naturally different.

The motivation behind Theorem 9 is to extend the results of Stéphanovitch et al. (2023) to closed submanifolds that are not necessarily smooth deformations of the torus. Specifically, it is built in Section 4 an estimator of density on unknown submanifold attaining optimal rates.

Let us write \mathcal{F} for the set of probability measures μ such that there exists a submanifold \mathcal{M} satisfying the $(\beta+1, K)$ -manifold condition and that μ satisfies the (β, K) -density condition on \mathcal{M} . Additionally, we write $g(n) = \tilde{O}(f(n))$ for $g(n) \leq C \log(n)^{C_2} f(n)$.

Theorem 13 : Let $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, $\mu^* \in \mathcal{F}$ and (X_1, \dots, X_n) an i.i.d. sample of law μ^* . Then for $\mu_n^* := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}$, the estimator

$$\hat{\mu} \in \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{F}} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^{d/2}}(\mu, \mu_n^*), \tag{4}$$

satisfies for all $\gamma \geq 1$,

$$\sup_{\mu^* \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}_{X_i} [d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}(\hat{\mu}, \mu^*)] = \tilde{O} \left(\inf_{\hat{\theta} \in \Theta} \sup_{\mu^* \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}_{X_i} [d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}(\hat{\theta}, \mu^*)] \right),$$

where Θ denotes the set of all possible estimators of μ^* based on n sample.

To the best of our knowledge, the estimator (4) is the first one attaining optimal rates for all the distances $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}$, $\gamma \in [1, \infty)$ simultaneously. This estimator uses high regularity IPMs in the minimized loss which implicitly regularizes the data. Its construction is much simpler than previous optimal estimators (like Tang and Yang (2023) and Liang (2021)) because it does not need to compute a complex regularization of the empirical measure as the regularization is made through the use of high regularity IPMs.

2.3 Besov spaces and additional notations

Throughout the paper, we use the connection between Hölder and Besov spaces extensively (Triebel, 2010). Let us define the Besov spaces through their wavelet characterization. Let $\psi, \phi \in \mathcal{H}^{\beta+2}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ be a compactly supported *scaling* and *wavelet* function respectively (see

Daubechies wavelets (Daubechies, 1988)). For ease of notation, the functions ψ, ϕ will be written ψ_0, ψ_1 respectively. Then for $j \in \mathbb{N}, l \in \{1, \dots, 2^p - 1\}, w \in \mathbb{Z}^p$, the family of functions

$$\psi_{0w}(x) = \prod_{i=1}^p \psi_0(x_i - w_i) \quad , \quad \psi_{jlw}(x) = 2^{jp/2} \prod_{i=1}^p \psi_{l_i}(2^j x_i - w_i)$$

form an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R})$ (with l_i the i -th digit of the base-2-decomposition of l). Let $q_1, q_2 \geq 1, s > 0, b \geq 0$ be such that $\beta + 2 > s$. The Besov space $\mathcal{B}_{q_1, q_2}^{s, b}(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R})$ consists of functions f that admit a wavelet expansion in L^2 :

$$f(x) = \sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^p} \alpha_f(w) \psi_{0w}(x) + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{2^p-1} \sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^p} \alpha_f(j, l, w) \psi_{jlw}(x)$$

equipped with the norm

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{\mathcal{B}_{q_1, q_2}^{s, b}} &= \left(\left(\sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^p} |\alpha_f(w)|^{q_1} \right)^{q_2/q_1} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{jq_2(s+p/2-p/q_1)} (1+j)^{bq_2} \sum_{l=1}^{2^p-1} \left(\sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^p} |\alpha_f(j, l, w)|^{q_1} \right)^{q_2/q_1} \right)^{1/q_2}. \end{aligned}$$

with the usual modification for $q_1, q_2 = \infty$. Note that for $b = 0$, $\mathcal{B}_{q_1, q_2}^{s, 0}$ coincides with the classical Besov space \mathcal{B}_{q_1, q_2}^s (Giné and Nickl, 2015). For simplicity of notation, we write

$$f(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{2^p} \sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^p} \alpha_f(j, l, w) \psi_{jlw}(x)$$

with the convention that $\psi_{02^p w} = \psi_{0w}$ and for all $j \geq 1$, $\psi_{j2^p w} = 0$. The Besov spaces can be generalized for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$ as a subspace of the space of tempered distribution $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^p)$. Indeed for $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^p)$, writing $\alpha_f(j, l, w) = \langle f, \psi_{jlw} \rangle$, the Besov space for $s \in \mathbb{R}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{B}_{q_1, q_2}^{s, b} = \{f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^p) \mid \|f\|_{\mathcal{B}_{q_1, q_2}^{s, b}} < \infty\}.$$

The same way, we write $\mathcal{B}_{q_1, q_2}^{s, b}(K) = \{f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^p) \mid \|f\|_{\mathcal{B}_{q_1, q_2}^{s, b}} \leq K\}$. In the following we will use intensively the connection between Hölder and Besov spaces.

Lemma 1 (Proposition 4.3.23 Giné and Nickl (2015), (4.63) Haroske (2006)) *If $\alpha > 0$ is a non integer, then*

$$\mathcal{H}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R}) = \mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R})$$

with equivalent norms. If $\alpha \geq 0$ is an integer, then $\forall \epsilon > 0$

$$\mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{\alpha, 1+\epsilon}(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R}),$$

where we write $A \hookrightarrow B$ if the function space A compactly injects in the function space B .

This lemma states that Besov infinity and Hölder spaces coincides except when the regularity exponent is an integer. In particular, it implies that Theorem 9 extends to Besov infinity IPMs up to additional logarithmic terms for integer regularity exponents.

We write $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the dot product on \mathbb{R}^p , $\|x\|$ the Euclidean norm of a vector x . For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \wedge b$ and $a \vee b$ denote the minimum and maximum value between a and b respectively. We write Lip_1 for the set of 1-Lipschitz functions. The support of a function f is denoted by $\text{supp}(f)$. We denote by Id the identity application from a Euclidean space to itself.

For any map $f : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ we denote by ∇f the differential of f and by $\|\nabla f(x)\|$ its operator norm at the point x . We denote $(\nabla f(x))^\top$ its transpose matrix and if $k \leq l$, $\lambda_{\min}((\nabla f(x))^\top \nabla f(x))$ corresponds to the smallest eigenvalue of the matrix $(\nabla f(x))^\top \nabla f(x)$. We write $\int_{\mathcal{M}} f(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}}(x)$ for the integration of a function $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with respect to the volume measure on \mathcal{M} i.e. the d -dimensional Hausdorff measure. The Hausdorff distance between two submanifold $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*$ is denoted by $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*)$.

3 Walk-through of the construction of Theorem 9

In this section the main sub-results allowing to prove Theorem 9 are detailed. We first prove the classical inequality in the full dimensional setting. Then, it is explained how it can be generalized to the submanifold case.

3.1 The classical inequality

The classical setting corresponds to the case where the two measures μ, μ^* each have a squared integrable density with respect to the Lebesgue measure of the ambient space \mathbb{R}^p . This setting is called classical as the proof boils down to applying Hölder's inequality on the wavelet coefficients of the functions. This is a natural technique one could use for any interpolation between Banach spaces that are defined by the growth of coefficients in a given basis (see for example Wang (2021)).

To prove it, let us first define an operator that allows to change the regularity of a function by modifying its wavelet coefficients.

Definition 3 For a tempered distribution $f \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{s, b}(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R})$, define the tempered distribution $\Gamma^{\gamma, c}(f) \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{s+\gamma, b+c}(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R})$ by its wavelets coefficients

$$\langle \Gamma^{\gamma, c}(f), \psi_{jtz} \rangle = 2^{j\gamma} (1+j)^c \langle f, \psi_{jtz} \rangle.$$

The tempered distribution $\Gamma^{\gamma, c}(f)$ is a "regularization" of f if $\gamma < 0$ or $\gamma = 0$ and $c < 0$. For ease of notation, we will write Γ^γ instead of $\Gamma^{\gamma, 0}$.

Now take two densities $f, f^* \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R})$ and a potential $h \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^s(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R})$ to compare them. We call h a potential in reference to Kantorovich potentials in optimal transport (Santambrogio, 2015). The family of wavelets functions $(\psi_{jtw})_{jtw}$ being an orthonormal

basis of L^2 , we can write for $\tau > 0$ and $q \in (0, 1)$, $q^* = (1 - 1/q)^{-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} h(x)(f(x) - f^*(x))d\lambda^p(x) &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{2^p} \sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^p} \alpha_h(j, l, w)(\alpha_f(j, l, w) - \alpha_{f^*}(j, l, w)) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{2^p} \sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^p} 2^{-j\frac{\tau}{q} + j\frac{\tau}{q}} |\alpha_h(j, l, w)(\alpha_f(j, l, w) - \alpha_{f^*}(j, l, w))|^{1/q+1/q^*}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, applying Hölder's inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^p} h(x)(f(x) - f^*(x))d\lambda^p(x) \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{2^p} \sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^p} 2^{-j\tau} |\alpha_h(j, l, w)(\alpha_f(j, l, w) - \alpha_{f^*}(j, l, w))| \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ &\quad \times \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{2^p} \sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^p} 2^{\tau\frac{q^*}{q}} |\alpha_h(j, l, w)(\alpha_f(j, l, w) - \alpha_{f^*}(j, l, w))| \right)^{\frac{1}{q^*}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Let us take $\tilde{\Gamma}^{-\tau}(h) \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{s+\tau}$ and $\tilde{\Gamma}^{\frac{q^*}{q}\tau}(h) \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{s-\frac{q^*}{q}\tau}$ defined through their wavelet coefficients:

$$\alpha_{\tilde{\Gamma}^{-\tau}(h)}(j, l, w) = S(j, l, w)\alpha_{\Gamma^{-\tau}(h)}(j, l, w)$$

and

$$\alpha_{\tilde{\Gamma}^{\frac{q^*}{q}\tau}(h)}(j, l, w) = S(j, l, w)\alpha_{\Gamma^{\frac{q^*}{q}\tau}(h)}(j, l, w)$$

with $S(j, l, w) \in \{-1, 1\}$ the sign of $\alpha_h(j, l, w)(\alpha_f(j, l, w) - \alpha_{f^*}(j, l, w))$. Then, from (5) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^p} h(x)(f(x) - f^*(x))d\lambda^p(x) \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \tilde{\Gamma}^{-\tau}(h)(x)(f(x) - f^*(x))d\lambda^p(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \tilde{\Gamma}^{\frac{q^*}{q}\tau}(h)(x)(f(x) - f^*(x))d\lambda^p(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{q^*}}, \end{aligned}$$

which directly gives an interpolation inequality between Besov IPMs:

$$d_{\mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^s}(f, f^*) \leq d_{\mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{s+\tau}}(f, f^*)^{\frac{1}{q}} d_{\mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{s-\frac{q^*}{q}\tau}}(f, f^*)^{\frac{1}{q^*}}. \quad (6)$$

Finding the smallest $q \in (0, 1)$ such that the quantity $d_{\mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{s-\frac{q^*}{q}\tau}}(f, f^*)$ is finite, we obtain the following result.

Proposition 2 *Let $f, f^* \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{\beta, 2}(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R}, K)$ compactly supported in $B^p(0, K)$. Then for all $\alpha \geq \gamma > 0$, we have*

$$\sup_{h \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{\gamma}(1)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} h(x)(f(x) - f^*(x))d\lambda^p(x) \leq C \sup_{h \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{\alpha}(1)} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^p} h(x)(f(x) - f^*(x))d\lambda^p(x) \right)^{\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\alpha}}.$$

The proof of Proposition 2 can be found in Section C.7.1. Note that this result can be seen as a particular case of classical interpolation inequalities between Besov spaces (Hajaiej et al., 2010). Indeed, noticing that for $g \in L^2$ we have

$$\sup_{h \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{\gamma}(1)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} h(x)g(x)d\lambda^p(x) = \|g\|_{\mathcal{B}_{1,1}^{-\gamma}},$$

Proposition 2 is the application to the function $g = f - f^*$ of the inequality

$$\|g\|_{\mathcal{B}_{1,1}^{-\gamma}} \leq \|g\|_{\mathcal{B}_{1,1}^{\frac{\alpha-\gamma}{\beta+\alpha}}} \|g\|_{\mathcal{B}_{1,1}^{-\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\alpha}}}, \quad (7)$$

which can be shown just like Proposition 2.

Finally, by paying a logarithmic factor, we obtain that Proposition 2 translates to Hölder regularity.

Theorem 3 *For $f, f^* \in \mathcal{H}_K^{\beta}(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R})$ with compact support in $B^p(0, K)$, we have*

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^{\gamma}}(f, f^*) \leq C \log(1 + d_{\mathcal{H}_1^{\alpha}}(f, f^*)^{-1})^2 d_{\mathcal{H}_1^{\alpha}}(f, f^*)^{\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\alpha}}.$$

The proof of Theorem 3 can be found in Section C.7.2. The goal of this paper is to generalize this inequality to the case where f and f^* are densities with respect to the volume measures of two different closed submanifolds. The main difficulty of this generalization is to exploit the smoothness of the densities although, from the point of view of the ambient space \mathbb{R}^p , they do not have any. In particular, in the case where all the regularity exponents are non integers, Theorem 9 can be seen as a generalization of the interpolation inequality between Besov norms on functions (7) to Besov norms on the signed measures $\mu - \mu^*$. Indeed, although the tempered distribution $\mu - \mu^*$ does not belong to any Besov space with positive regularity exponent, Theorem 9 states that if μ and μ^* have low dimensional β -regularity then the inequality

$$\|\mu - \mu^*\|_{\mathcal{B}_{1,1}^{-\gamma}} \lesssim \|\mu - \mu^*\|_{\mathcal{B}_{1,1}^{-\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\alpha}}}$$

stands up to logarithmic factors.

3.2 Proof outline of the main result (Theorem 9)

In this Section, the principal steps of the proof of Theorem 9 are presented. We start by stating some properties resulting of the manifold assumption and use them to show that the integration with respect to a smooth density on \mathcal{M} , can be parameterized through the integration on \mathbb{R}^d (Proposition 4). Then, we show that if two measures supported on two manifolds respectively, are close enough for a distance $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^{\alpha}}$, there exists a smooth diffeomorphism between their support having some keys properties (Theorem 6). Finally, this diffeomorphism is used to split the IPMs into two distances: a distance between the support of the manifolds and a distance between the densities. This decomposition allows to conclude the proof of Theorem 9.

3.2.1 INTEGRATION ON MANIFOLDS VIA SMOOTH TRANSPORT MAPS

For a manifold \mathcal{M} satisfying the $(\beta + 1, K)$ -manifold condition, there exists an atlas

$(A_i, \varphi_i)_{i \in \{1, \dots, m\}}$ of \mathcal{M} such that:

- for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $A_i = \varphi_i^{-1}(B^d(0, \tau))$ with $\tau = \frac{1}{4K}$,
- for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{H}_K^{\beta+1}(A_i, B^d(0, \tau))$ and $\varphi_i^{-1} \in \mathcal{H}_K^{\beta+1}(B^d(0, \tau), A_i)$,
- for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$, there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that $B^p(x, \tau/2) \cap \mathcal{M} \subset A_i$.

The existence of this atlas results from basic properties of the $(\beta + 1, K)$ -manifold condition that are derived in Appendix Section A.1. Using this parametrization we can show that the integration with respect to a smooth density on \mathcal{M} can be parameterized through the integration on \mathbb{R}^d .

Proposition 4 *Let \mathcal{M} satisfying the $(\beta + 1, K)$ -manifold condition and μ a probability measure satisfying the (β, K) -density condition on \mathcal{M} . Then there exists a collection of constants $C_i > 0$, maps $\phi_i \in \mathcal{H}_C^{\beta+1}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p)$ with $\inf_{u \in B^d(0, \tau)} \lambda_{\min}((\nabla \phi_i(u))^\top \nabla \phi_i(u)) \geq C^{-1}$ and weight functions $\zeta_i \in \mathcal{H}_C^{\beta+1}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ with $\text{supp}(\zeta_i) \subset B^d(0, \tau)$, such that for all bounded continuous function $h : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have*

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} h(x) d\mu(x) = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{C_i} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(\phi_i(u)) \zeta_i(u) d\lambda^d(u).$$

The proof of Proposition 4 can be found in Section A.2. This is a key result that will enable to exploit the β -regularity of the densities defined on manifolds, using the wavelet decomposition on \mathbb{R}^d of the $\beta + 1$ -regular transport maps ϕ_i .

3.2.2 EXISTENCE OF A SMOOTH DIFFEOMORPHISM BETWEEN THE MANIFOLDS

We shall distinguish two cases:

- the case where the distance $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)$ is small enough so that there exists a smooth diffeomorphism between \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M}^* ,
- the case where the distance $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)$ is not small enough.

In the second case, one has $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*) \geq C^{-1}$ so it is easy to get $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq C d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)$. Therefore, let us focus on the first case and gather the properties that the diffeomorphism needs to respect.

Definition 4 *For $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*$ satisfying the $(\beta + 1, K)$ -manifold condition and $t \in (0, r^*/2)$ for r^* the reach of \mathcal{M}^* , such that $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*) < t$. We say that a map $T : \mathcal{M}^{\text{st}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^*$ is $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*)_{K_T}$ -compatible with a radius t if:*

- $T \in \mathcal{H}_{K_T}^{\beta+1}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*)$ and the restriction $T|_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^*$ is a diffeomorphism such that for $T|_{\mathcal{M}}^{-1} : \mathcal{M}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ the inverse application such that $T|_{\mathcal{M}}^{-1} \circ T|_{\mathcal{M}} = \text{Id}|_{\mathcal{M}}$, we have $T|_{\mathcal{M}}^{-1} \in \mathcal{H}_{K_T}^{\beta+1}(\mathcal{M}^*, \mathcal{M})$.

ii) For all $x \in \mathcal{M}^*$, $T^{-1}(\{x\}) - x \subset E_x$ a $p - d$ dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^p and

$$(T^{-1}(\{x\}) - x) \cap B^p(x, t) = B_{E_x}(0, t).$$

iii) For any $f \in \mathcal{H}_1^\eta(\mathcal{M}^{*t}, \mathbb{R})$ with $\eta \in [1, \beta + 1]$, the map $x \mapsto \int_{T^{-1}(\{x\})} f(y) d\lambda_{E_x}^{p-d}(y)$ belongs to $\mathcal{H}_{K_T}^\eta(\mathcal{M}^*, \mathbb{R})$.

iv) The map $x \mapsto ap_d(\nabla T(x))$ (Definition 6) is bounded below by K_T^{-1} .

Fulfilling compatibility may seem to be restrictive, but it is shown in Theorem 6, that as long as the $d_{\mathcal{H}^\alpha}$ distance between the measures is relatively small for any $\alpha > 0$, there exists a $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*)$ -compatible map. Let us first state that the distance $d_{\mathcal{H}^\alpha}$ controls the Wasserstein and Hausdorff distances.

Lemma 5 *Let $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*$ satisfying the $(0, K)$ -manifold condition and μ, μ^* two probability measures satisfying the $(0, K)$ -regularity density condition on \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M}^* respectively. Then for all $\alpha \geq 1$, there exists a constant $C_\alpha > 0$ such that $\forall t > 0$, if*

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\alpha}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq t^{(d+1)(2\alpha-1)},$$

then

$$W_1(\mu, \mu^*) \leq C_\alpha t^{d+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{H}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*) < C_\alpha t.$$

The proof of Lemma 5 can be found in Section B.1. We are now in position to state the existence of a $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*)$ -compatible map.

Theorem 6 *Let $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*$ satisfying the $(\beta + 1, K)$ -manifold condition and μ, μ^* probability measures on \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M}^* respectively satisfying the $(0, K)$ -density condition. For all $\alpha > 0$, there exists a constant $C_\alpha > 0$ such that if*

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\alpha}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq C_\alpha^{-1},$$

then there exists a $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*)_{K_T}$ -compatible map with radius $t = C_\alpha^{-1}$ and $K_T = C_\alpha$.

The proof of Theorem 6 can be found in Section B.2. We see that imposing that the densities are close for any IPM, implies that the manifolds are close in the sense that there exists a smooth diffeomorphism between them. This diffeomorphism is a key tool that is going to allow to decompose the IPMs into two distinct distances.

3.2.3 DECOMPOSITION OF THE IPMS INTO A MANIFOLD DISTANCE AND A DENSITY DISTANCE

To show the bound on the \mathcal{H}_1^γ IPM, we split it into two terms: one characterizing the distance between the supports, the other characterizing the distance between the densities. For $h \in \mathcal{H}_1^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R})$, T being $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*)$ -compatible and f_T the density of $T_{\#}\mu$ with respect to the volume measure on \mathcal{M}^* , we write

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{M}} h(x) f(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}}(x) - \int_{\mathcal{M}^*} h(x) f^*(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}^*}(x) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{M}} (h(x) - h(T(x))) f(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}}(x) + \int_{\mathcal{M}^*} h(x) (f_T(x) - f^*(x)) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}^*}(x). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The cost is split this way to exploit the regularity of f and f^* . Indeed, the second term of (8) discriminates measures on the same support \mathcal{M}^* . We are going to show that this case is equivalent to the classical inequality (Theorem 3) in full dimension. For the first term of (8), we will use Proposition 4 to write the integration against the density f on \mathcal{M} , as the integration on \mathbb{R}^d via $\beta + 1$ -regular transport maps. This will enable to exploit the regularity of the density through the wavelet coefficients of the transport maps.

Let us take care of the first term of (8) in the case $h \in \mathcal{H}_1^1(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R})$.

Lemma 7 *Let $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*$ satisfying the $(\beta+1, K)$ -manifold condition and μ, μ^* two probability measures satisfying the (β, K) -density condition on \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M}^* respectively. For all $\alpha > 0$, there exists a constant $C_\alpha > 0$ such that if*

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\alpha}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq C_\alpha^{-1},$$

then for T the $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*)$ -compatible map given by Theorem 6, we have for all $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $\eta \in (1, \beta + 1]$,

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu, T_{\#}\mu) \leq C \log(\epsilon^{-1})^4 \sup_{\substack{h \in \mathcal{H}_1^\eta \\ h|_{\mathcal{M}^*} = 0}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{M}} h(x) d\mu(x) \right)^{\frac{\beta+1}{\beta+\eta}} + \epsilon.$$

The proof of Lemma 7 can be found in Section C.2. This result highlights the fact that the first term of (8) focuses on the distance between the manifolds, as it bounds it with a supremum over functions being equal to 0 on \mathcal{M}^* . Although Lemma 7 bounds the distance $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu, T_{\#}\mu)$ only in the case $\gamma = 1$, it is easy to generalize it to the case $\gamma \geq 1$ (see the detailed proof of Theorem 9 in Section C.4 for explicit arguments) using the classical interpolation inequality (Corollary 20). Let us now bound the second term of (8).

Lemma 8 *Let $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*$ satisfying the $(\beta+1, K)$ -manifold condition and μ, μ^* two probability measures satisfying the (β, K) -density condition on \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M}^* respectively. For all $\alpha > 0$, there exists a constant $C_\alpha > 0$ such that if*

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\alpha}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq C_\alpha^{-1},$$

then for T the $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*)$ -compatible map given by Theorem 6, we have for all $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $0 < \gamma \leq \eta \leq \beta + 1$,

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}(T_{\#}\mu, \mu^*) \leq C \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2 d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(T_{\#}\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\eta}} + \epsilon.$$

The proof of Lemma 8 can be found in Section C.3. An immediate corollary of this result is that if the two measures μ, μ^* live on the same manifold \mathcal{M}^* (so that $T_{\#}\mu = \mu$), then

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq C \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2 d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\eta}} + \epsilon.$$

This is due to the reach condition on \mathcal{M}^* , which allows to thicken the manifold and apply the classical interpolation inequality as if we were in full dimension (see the proof of Lemma

8 for details). Note that contrary to Lemma 7, Lemma 8 allows to have $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. This supports the fact that the discrimination of densities with supports on the same manifolds is equivalent to the discrimination in full dimension. We will see in Proposition 10 that this is not true for densities having supports on different manifolds as the optimal potential behaves differently in this case.

Putting Lemmas 7 and 8 together, we finally obtain the interpolation inequality for densities having supports on different submanifolds.

Theorem 9 *Let $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*$ satisfying the $(\beta + 1, K)$ -manifold condition and μ, μ^* two probability measures satisfying the (β, K) -density condition on \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M}^* respectively. Then for all $1 \leq \gamma \leq \eta$, we have*

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq C \log \left(1 + d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{-1} \right)^{C_2} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\eta}}.$$

The detailed proof of Theorem 9 can be found in Section C.4. This result is the extension of Theorem 3 to the submanifold case for $\gamma \geq 1$. In contrast to the the full dimension setting, the case $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ behaves differently as stated in the following proposition.

Proposition 10 *Let $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*$ satisfying the $(\beta + 1, K)$ -manifold condition and μ, μ^* two probability measures satisfying the (β, K) -density condition on \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M}^* respectively. Then for all $0 < \gamma \leq \eta \leq 1$, we have*

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq C d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\gamma}{\eta}}.$$

The proof of Proposition 10 can be found in Section C.5. This inequality is sharp as the equality is attained in numerous cases. For example, if \mathcal{M} is the $p - 1$ sphere of radius 1, \mathcal{M}^* is the $p - 1$ sphere of radius $1 + \epsilon$ and μ, μ^* are rescaled volume measure on $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*$ respectively. In this case we have that the $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}$ and $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}$ distances behave like ϵ^γ and ϵ^η respectively. The intuition behind this result is that for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, the optimal potential h within \mathcal{H}_1^γ (i.e. $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}(\mu, \mu^*) = \int h d\mu - \int h d\mu^*$) behaves like $d(\cdot, \mathcal{M}^*)^\gamma$.

Putting Theorem 9 and Proposition 10 together, we obtain a general result for all $\gamma > 0$.

Corollary 11 *Let $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*$ satisfying the $(\beta + 1, K)$ -manifold condition and μ, μ^* two probability measures satisfying the (β, K) -density condition on \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M}^* respectively. Then for all $0 < \gamma < \eta$, we have*

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq C \log(1 + d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{-1})^{C_2} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^\delta,$$

with

$$\delta = \begin{cases} \frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\eta} & \text{if } \gamma \geq 1 \\ \frac{\beta\gamma+\gamma}{\beta+\eta} & \text{if } \gamma \leq 1 \leq \eta \\ \frac{\gamma}{\eta} & \text{if } \eta \leq 1. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

When $0 < \gamma < 1 < \eta$, the exponent δ is obtained by applying first Proposition 10 on $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}$ and $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}$, then applying Theorem 9 on $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}$ and $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}$. The exponent δ is still optimal as outlined in (20) using the example of Section 5.

In the assumptions of Corollary 11, we suppose that both μ and μ^* verify the point ii) of the density condition which is $f_\mu, f_{\mu^*} \geq K^{-1}$. However, it is only necessary that one of the measures verifies this condition as stated in the next result.

Proposition 12 *Let $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*$ satisfying the $(2, K)$ -manifold condition and μ, μ^* two probability measures with densities with respect to the volume measure on $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*$ respectively. Suppose that μ^* verifies the $(0, K)$ -density condition and that $f_\mu \in \mathcal{H}_K^1(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{R})$. Then for all $\eta > 0$, there exist constants $C, C_\eta > 0$ such that if $\inf_{x \in \mathcal{M}} f_\mu(x) \leq C_\eta^{-1}$, then*

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*) \geq C^{-1}.$$

The proof of Proposition 12 can be found in Section C.6. Using this result we have that if μ does not verify point ii) of the density condition for $K = C_\eta$, we have

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq C \leq C d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*).$$

Therefore, we could only suppose that one of the measures verifies point ii) of the density condition in Theorem 9. We did not write it this way for simplicity of read.

4 A direct application: optimal estimator of density on unknown submanifold

Suppose that we observe an i.i.d. sample $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathbb{R}^p$ from a probability measure μ^* satisfying the (β, K) density condition on an unknown \mathcal{M}^* satisfying the $(\beta + 1, K)$ manifold condition. A thriving field of Machine Learning/Statistics focuses on building an estimator $\hat{\mu}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ of μ^* that achieves optimal rates of convergence (see for example Tang and Yang (2023), Divol (2022), Schreuder et al. (2021), De Bortoli (2022)). In particular, fixing a $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$, Tang and Yang (2023) build a theoretical estimator that attains the optimal rate of estimation (up to a logarithmic factor) for the distance $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}$. In this section we show that Theorem 9 allows to build a much simpler estimator that attains optimal rates for all the distances $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}$, $\gamma \in [1, \infty)$ simultaneously.

4.1 The estimator

Let us write \mathcal{F} for the set of probability measures μ such that there exists a submanifold \mathcal{M} satisfying the $(\beta + 1, K)$ -manifold condition and that μ satisfies the (β, K) -density condition on \mathcal{M} . Define the estimator

$$\hat{\mu} \in \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{F}} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^{d/2}}(\mu, \mu_n^*), \quad (10)$$

with $\mu_n^* := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}$ the empirical measure from the data. Let us first bound the expected error $\mathbb{E}_{X_1, \dots, X_n \sim \mu^*} [d_{\mathcal{H}_1^{d/2}}(\hat{\mu}, \mu^*)]$ of our estimator. To this end, define for all $\mu \in \mathcal{F}$

$$h_\mu \in \arg \max_{h \in \mathcal{H}_1^{d/2}} \int h(x) d\mu(x) - \int h(x) d\mu^*(x),$$

an optimal potential between μ and μ^* and define

$$h_\mu^n \in \arg \max_{h \in \mathcal{H}_1^{d/2}} \int h(x) d\mu(x) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h(X_i),$$

an optimal potential between μ and μ_n^* . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[d_{\mathcal{H}_1^{d/2}}(\hat{\mu}, \mu^*)] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int h_{\hat{\mu}}(x) d\hat{\mu}(x) - \int h_{\hat{\mu}}(x) d\mu^*(x)\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int h_{\hat{\mu}}(x) d\hat{\mu}(x) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_{\hat{\mu}}(X_i) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_{\hat{\mu}}(X_i) - \int h_{\hat{\mu}}(x) d\mu^*(x)\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\int h_{\hat{\mu}}^n(x) d\hat{\mu}(x) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_{\hat{\mu}}^n(X_i)\right] + \mathbb{E}[d_{\mathcal{H}_1^{d/2}}(\mu_n^*, \mu^*)]. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, by definition of $\hat{\mu}$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int h_{\hat{\mu}}^n(x) d\hat{\mu}(x) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_{\hat{\mu}}^n(X_i)\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\int h_{\mu_n^*}^n(x) d\mu^*(x) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_{\mu_n^*}^n(X_i)\right] \leq \mathbb{E}[d_{\mathcal{H}_1^{d/2}}(\mu_n^*, \mu^*)].$$

Then, using Lemma 13 from Tang and Yang (2023) we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[d_{\mathcal{H}_1^{d/2}}(\mu_n^*, \mu^*)] \leq C \log(n) n^{-1/2},$$

which gives us using the previous derivations

$$\mathbb{E}[d_{\mathcal{H}_1^{d/2}}(\hat{\mu}, \mu^*)] \leq C \log(n) n^{-1/2}.$$

Now, using Theorem 9 we have that for all $\gamma \in [1, d/2]$,

$$\mathbb{E}[d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}(\hat{\mu}, \mu^*)] \leq C \mathbb{E}[\log(d_{\mathcal{H}_1^{d/2}}(\hat{\mu}, \mu^*)^{-1})^{C_2} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^{d/2}}(\hat{\mu}, \mu^*)^{\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+d/2}}],$$

so using Jensen's inequality, we finally get for all $\gamma \in [1, \infty)$,

$$\mathbb{E}[d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}(\hat{\mu}, \mu^*)] \leq C \log(n)^{C_2} (n^{-\frac{\beta+\gamma}{2\beta+d}} \vee n^{-1/2})$$

and this rate has been proven to be optimal (up to the logarithmic factor) in Tang and Yang (2023).

In all, we have shown the following minimax optimality for $\hat{\mu}$, where we write $g(n) = \tilde{O}(f(n))$ if there exist $C, C_2 > 0$ such that $g(n) \leq C \log(n)^{C_2} f(n)$.

Theorem 13 *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, $\mu^* \in \mathcal{F}$ and (X_1, \dots, X_n) an i.i.d. sample of law μ^* . Then the estimator $\hat{\mu}$ from (10) satisfies for all $\gamma \geq 1$*

$$\sup_{\mu^* \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}_{X_i}[d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}(\hat{\mu}, \mu^*)] = \tilde{O} \left(\inf_{\hat{\theta} \in \Theta} \sup_{\mu^* \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}_{X_i}[d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}(\hat{\theta}, \mu^*)] \right),$$

where Θ denotes the set of all possible estimators of μ^* based on n sample.

4.2 Discussion

If we were to replace the IPM $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^{d/2}}$ by the IPM $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}$ with $1 \leq \gamma < d/2$ in the estimator (10), we would only attain the rate $O(n^{-\frac{\gamma}{d}} \vee n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ which is not optimal for $\gamma \in [1, d/2)$. The intuition is that computing $\hat{\mu}$ with a high regularity IPM, implicitly regularizes the measure μ_n^* which allows to not have to compute a complex regularization of μ_n^* like in Liang (2021) or Tang and Yang (2023). This highlights the need of a sharp inequality like Theorem 9 allowing to compare the IPMs.

In contrast to Tang and Yang (2023), the estimator $\hat{\mu}$ (10) does not attain optimal rates for the distance $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}$ with $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. The intuition is that optimal potentials within $\mathcal{H}_1^{d/2}$ and \mathcal{H}_1^γ tend to be very different when γ is small so the estimator $\hat{\mu}$ is not adapted to IPMs of low regularity. This raises the question of whether there could exist an estimator being optimal for every $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$ simultaneously.

Like in Tang and Yang (2023), the estimator (10) is theoretical meaning it is not computable in practice. Nevertheless, the minimum over the class \mathcal{F} and the supremum over the class $\mathcal{H}_1^{d/2}$ could be approximated using stochastic gradient descent on neural network classes like in Stéphanovitch et al. (2023). The computational aspect of this estimator will be investigated in a future work.

5 An example to get some intuition on Lemma 7

5.1 Preamble

In this section, a detailed analysis of a simple example is provided in order to better understand Lemma 7. The main result of this paper (Theorem 9) is a direct implication of Lemmas 7 and 8. We only illustrate Lemma 7 as Lemma 8 focuses on probability measures having densities with respect to the same manifold and we showed that this case is equivalent to the full dimensional case. In contrast, Lemma 7 focuses on probability measures having densities with respect to two different manifolds.

To get some intuition on Lemma 7, we shall construct some submanifolds $\mathcal{M}^*, \mathcal{M}_n$, measures μ_n on \mathcal{M}_n and construct optimal potentials $h_n^* \in \mathcal{H}_1^\eta$ with $h_{n|\mathcal{M}^*}^* = 0$ such that

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu_n, T_{\#\mu_n}) \leq C \left(\int_{\mathcal{M}_n} h_n^*(x) d\mu_n(x) \right)^{\frac{\beta+1}{\beta+\eta}}, \quad (11)$$

for T being $(\mathcal{M}_n, \mathcal{M}^*)$ -compatible. The goals of this section are the following.

- Describe the shape of the potential h_n^* .
- Provide a concrete example where $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu_n, T_{\#\mu_n}) \geq C^{-1} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu_n, T_{\#\mu_n})^{\frac{\beta+1}{\beta+\eta}}$.

For simplicity we focus on $\eta \in [1, \beta + 1]$ being an integer. In order to well illustrate the result, the example needs to verify the following two points.

- i) It has to verify $\max_{h \in \mathcal{H}_1^\eta, h|_{\mathcal{M}^*} = 0} \int_{\mathcal{M}_n} h(x) d\mu_n(x) \rightarrow 0$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$ as otherwise we would have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu_n, T_{\#}\mu_n) &\leq K = K \left(\max_{\substack{h \in \mathcal{H}_1^\eta \\ h|_{\mathcal{M}^*} = 0}} \int_{\mathcal{M}_n} h(x) d\mu_n(x) \right)^{-1} \max_{\substack{h \in \mathcal{H}_1^\eta \\ h|_{\mathcal{M}^*} = 0}} \int_{\mathcal{M}_n} h(x) d\mu_n(x) \\ &\leq C \max_{\substack{h \in \mathcal{H}_1^\eta \\ h|_{\mathcal{M}^*} = 0}} \int_{\mathcal{M}_n} h(x) d\mu_n(x), \end{aligned}$$

so the result would be immediate.

- ii) The manifold \mathcal{M}_n has to oscillate around \mathcal{M}^* in the sense that the function $x \rightarrow \|x - T(x)\|$ needs to have strong irregularities and therefore not belonging to \mathcal{H}_C^η for $\eta > 1$. For example take \mathcal{M}^* the sphere of radius 1, \mathcal{M}_n the sphere of radius $1 + 1/n$ and μ_n the uniform measure on \mathcal{M}_n . Then for $T : \mathcal{M}^{*1/4} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^*$ the projection onto \mathcal{M}^* , the map $x \mapsto \|x - T(x)\|$ belongs to \mathcal{H}_C^η so the result is trivial. This would also be true for any T being $(\mathcal{M}_n, \mathcal{M}^*)$ -compatible as $(\mathcal{M}_n, \mathcal{M}^*)$ -compatible maps act like projections (see the proof of Theorem 6).

5.2 The example

5.2.1 DEFINITION OF THE MANIFOLDS AND MEASURES

Let $n, \beta \in \mathbb{N}$ and $g_n, g^* : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ defined by

$$g^*(t) := (\cos(2\pi t), \sin(2\pi t)) \text{ and } g_n(t) := (1 + (2\pi n)^{-(\beta+1)} \sin(2\pi n t))g^*(t). \quad (12)$$

Define the two submanifolds $\mathcal{M}_n := g_n([0, 1])$, $\mathcal{M}^* := g^*([0, 1])$ and μ_n the uniform measure on \mathcal{M}_n . The manifolds \mathcal{M}_n and \mathcal{M}^* are represented in Figure 1. We choose the $(\mathcal{M}_n, \mathcal{M}^*)$ -compatible map T to be the projection onto \mathcal{M}^* for simplicity of the derivations.

Figure 1: \mathcal{M}_n and \mathcal{M}^* defined in (12) for $\beta = 0$, $n = 20$ (left) and $n = 50$ (right).

We have that \mathcal{M}_n verifies the $(\beta + 1, C)$ -manifold condition and for all $\alpha > \beta + 1$, we have $\|g_n\|_{\mathcal{H}^\alpha} \geq C^{-1}n^{\alpha-(\beta+1)}$. Therefore this example is well suited to represent the case of $\beta + 1$ regular manifolds. We could have taken a sequence of manifolds \mathcal{M}_n^* parameterized by functions g_n^* that also oscillate around \mathcal{M}_n , but it would not have given more insights. Indeed, for T_n a $(\mathcal{M}_n, \mathcal{M}_n^*)$ -compatible map, we have

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu_n, T_{n\#\mu_n}) \leq d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu_n, T_{\#\mu_n}) + d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(T_{\#\mu_n}, T \circ T_{n\#\mu_n}) + d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(T \circ T_{n\#\mu_n}, T_{n\#\mu_n}).$$

The term $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(T_{\#\mu_n}, T \circ T_{n\#\mu_n})$ can be treated by Lemma 8 as it is a distance between measures having support on the same manifold. The other two terms are equivalent to our example at they are distances between a measure on an oscillating manifold (\mathcal{M}_n and $T_n(\mathcal{M}_n)$ respectively) and its projection by T onto \mathcal{M}^* . Therefore this case is equivalent to our example.

5.2.2 EXPECTED SHAPE OF OPTIMAL POTENTIALS

Let us take a closer look at the quantities involved in $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu_n, T_{\#\mu_n})$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu_n, T_{\#\mu_n}) &= \max_{h \in \mathcal{H}_1^1} \int_{\mathcal{M}_n} (h(x) - h(T(x))) f_{\mu_n}(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}_n}(x) \\ &\leq W_1(\mu_n, T_{\#\mu_n}) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{M}_n} \|x - T(x)\| f_{\mu_n}(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}_n}(x) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{M}^*} \|y - T_{|\mathcal{M}_n}^{-1}(y)\| f_{\mu_n}(T_{|\mathcal{M}_n}^{-1}(y)) \text{ap}_d(\nabla T(T_{|\mathcal{M}_n}^{-1}(y)))^{-1} d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}^*}(y) \\ &\leq C \int_{\mathcal{M}^*} \|y - T_{|\mathcal{M}_n}^{-1}(y)\| d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}^*}(y) \\ &\leq C \int_0^1 n^{-(\beta+1)} |\sin(2\pi nt)| dt \\ &\leq C n^{-(\beta+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that using the same derivations, we can show that $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu_n, T_{\#\mu_n}) \geq C^{-1}n^{-(\beta+1)}$ so $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu_n, T_{\#\mu_n})$ behaves like $O(n^{-(\beta+1)})$.

To build an optimal potential in \mathcal{H}_1^η , let us look at how to regularize the optimal Lipschitz potential

$$L_n^* := \|x - T(x)\| \in \text{Lip}_1$$

such that it belongs to \mathcal{H}_1^η for $\eta \geq 1$. A simple way could be to use Jensen's inequality:

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}_n} \|x - T(x)\| f_{\mu_n}(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}_n}(x) \leq \left(\int_{\mathcal{M}_n} \|x - T(x)\|^2 f_{\mu_n}(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}_n}(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (13)$$

We have that $\overline{L_n^*}(x) := \|x - T(x)\|^2$ belongs to $\mathcal{H}^{\beta+1}$ but is not an optimal potential as its cost is too low. Indeed, we obtain an exponent 1/2 in (13), which is strictly smaller than $\frac{\beta+1}{2\beta+1}$, the one of Lemma 7. The reason why $\overline{L_n^*}$ is not optimal is that it does not use the

fact that \mathcal{M}_n is of regularity $\beta + 1$. Let us study what should be the shape of an optimal potential. For $h \in \mathcal{H}^\eta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\mathcal{M}_n} (h(x) - h(T(x))) f_{\mu_n}(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}_n}(x) \\
 &= \int_{\mathcal{M}_n} \left\langle \int_0^1 \nabla h(T(x) + t(x - T(x))) dt, x - T(x) \right\rangle f_{\mu_n}(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}_n}(x) \\
 &= \int_{\mathcal{M}_n} \left(\langle \nabla h(T(x)), x - T(x) \rangle f_{\mu_n}(x) + O(\|x - T(x)\|^2) \right) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}_n}(x) \\
 &\leq C \int_{\mathcal{M}_n} \langle \nabla h(T(x)), x - T(x) \rangle d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}_n}(x) + Cn^{-2(\beta+1)} \\
 &\leq C \int_0^1 \langle \nabla h(g^*(t)), g^*(t) n^{-(\beta+1)} \sin(2\pi nt) \rangle dt + Cn^{-2(\beta+1)}, \tag{14}
 \end{aligned}$$

with g^* defined in (12). We see that in order to determine a good potential $h \in \mathcal{H}^\eta$, it is enough to determine the function $H : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ defined by

$$H(t) := \nabla h(g^*(t)). \tag{15}$$

When n is very large, \mathcal{M}_n and \mathcal{M}^* behave locally like the images of

$$\bar{g}^*(t) = (t, 0) \text{ and } \bar{g}_n(t) = (t, n^{-(\beta+1)} \sin(2\pi nt)), \tag{16}$$

as represented in Figure 2. Let us first study the local case where we are looking for an optimal potential between $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_n$ and $\bar{\mathcal{M}}^*$ defined as the images of \bar{g}^* and \bar{g}_n in (16). Recall from (14) that we want to maximize with respect to $H \in \mathcal{H}_1^{\eta-1}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2)$ the quantity

$$\int_0^1 \langle H(t), g^*(t) n^{-(\beta+1)} \sin(2\pi nt) \rangle dt,$$


which in the local case (16) corresponds to

$$n^{-(\beta+1)} \int_0^1 H_1(t) \sin(2\pi nt) dt, \tag{17}$$

for $H_1(t) := \langle H(t), g^*(t) \rangle$.

To maximise (17), we are going to take H_1 having the same sign as the function $x \mapsto \sin(2\pi nx)$. Therefore we will take $H_1(t) = 0$ when $\sin(2\pi nt) = 0$ (i.e. $t \in \{0, \frac{1}{2n}, \dots, \frac{2n-1}{2n}\}$), and for $t \in [\frac{k}{2n}, \frac{k+1}{2n}]$, $H_1(t)$ will be increasing in the direction of $\frac{\sin(\frac{k+1/2}{2n})}{|\sin(\frac{k+1/2}{2n})|}$ as t gets closer to the middle point $\frac{k+1/2}{2n}$. This is illustrated in Figure 2.

The idea behind this construction is to be able to utilize that \mathcal{M}_n is of regularity $\beta + 1$. It implies that we can quantify the distance between two points of intersections of the


 Figure 2: Zoom on a part of $\mathcal{M}_n, \mathcal{M}^*$ defined in (12).

manifolds \mathcal{M}_n and \mathcal{M}^* with respect to the distance between the manifolds. Indeed for two critical points $\frac{k}{2n}, \frac{k+1}{2n}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{k+1}{2n} - \frac{k}{2n} &= \frac{1}{2n} = O(n^{-(\beta+1)})^{\frac{1}{\beta+1}} = \left(\sup_{t \in [\frac{k}{2n}, \frac{k+1}{2n}] } n^{-\beta+1} |\sin(2\pi nt)| \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta+1}} \\ &= \left(\sup_{x \in \Theta_n(k)} \|x - T(x)\| \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta+1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

with $\Theta_n(k) = \{x \in \mathcal{M}_n \mid \exists \lambda \in [0, 1], T(x) = g^*(\lambda \frac{k}{2n} + (1-\lambda) \frac{k+1}{2n})\}$. Therefore as H_1 is increasing between critical points $\frac{k}{2n}, \frac{k+1}{2n}$, we will be able to relate the value $H_1(\frac{k+1/2}{2n})$ to the distance $\left(\sup_{x \in \Theta_n(k)} \|x - T(x)\| \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta+1}}$.

5.2.3 EXPLICIT CONSTRUCTION OF AN OPTIMAL POTENTIAL

Let us build $H_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1^{\eta-1}$ that maximizes (up to a multiplicative constant) the objective (17). Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{H}^\eta([0, 1], [0, 1])$ such that for all $k \in \{0, \dots, \eta-1\}$, $\nabla^k \lambda(0) = \nabla^k \lambda(1) = 0$ and for all $x \in [1/4, 3/4]$, $\lambda(x) \geq 1/2$. We define the optimal potential by

$$H_1(t) := \frac{(-1)^{\lfloor 2nt \rfloor}}{n^{\eta-1}} \lambda\left(2n\left(t - \frac{\lfloor 2nt \rfloor}{2n}\right)\right).$$

The cost (17) of H_1 can be lower bounded as follow.

$$\begin{aligned} n^{-(\beta+1)} \int_0^1 H_1(t) \sin(2\pi nt) dt &= n^{-(\beta+1)} 2n \int_0^{\frac{1}{2n}} H_1(t) \sin(2\pi nt) dt \\ &\geq 2n^{-\beta} \int_{\frac{1}{8n}}^{\frac{3}{8n}} H_1(t) \sin(2\pi nt) dt \\ &\geq 2n^{-\beta} \int_{\frac{1}{8n}}^{\frac{3}{8n}} \frac{1}{2n^{\eta-1}} \sin(2\pi nt) dt \\ &\geq C^{-1} n^{-\beta-\eta+1} \int_{\frac{1}{8n}}^{\frac{3}{8n}} \sin(2\pi nt) dt \\ &\geq C^{-1} n^{-(\beta+\eta)}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 n^{-(\beta+\eta)} &= \left(n^{-(\beta+1)} \right)^{\frac{\beta+\eta}{\beta+1}} \\
 &\geq C^{-1} \left(\int_0^1 n^{-(\beta+1)} |\sin(2\pi nt)| d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}_n}(x) \right)^{\frac{\beta+\eta}{\beta+1}} \\
 &\geq C^{-1} \left(\int_{\mathcal{M}_n} \|x - T(x)\| f_{\mu_n}(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}_n}(x) \right)^{\frac{\beta+\eta}{\beta+1}} \\
 &= C^{-1} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu_n, T_{\#}\mu_n)^{\frac{\beta+\eta}{\beta+1}},
 \end{aligned}$$

so in particular H_1 verifies that

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu_n, T_{\#}\mu_n) \leq C \left(n^{-(\beta+1)} \int_0^1 H_1(t) \sin(2\pi nt) dt \right)^{\frac{\beta+1}{\beta+\eta}}.$$

Let us now show that this potential is optimal (up to a multiplicative constant) by giving an upper bound on (17). For $f : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, let $(c_f(k))_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ denote its Fourier coefficients and let

$$\mathcal{W}_1^{\eta-1,2} = \{f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}) \mid \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |c_f(k)|^2 |k|^{2(\eta-1)} \leq 1\}$$

be the unit ball of the L^2 Sobolev space of regularity $\eta - 1$. As $\mathcal{H}^{\eta-1} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{W}^{\eta-1,2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sup_{f \in \mathcal{H}_1^{\eta-1}} \int_0^1 f(t) \sin(2\pi nt) dt &\leq C \sup_{f \in \mathcal{W}_1^{\eta-1,2}} \int_0^1 f(t) \sin(2\pi nt) dt \\
 &= C \sup_{f \in \mathcal{W}_1^{\eta-1,2}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} c_f(k) c_{\sin(2\pi n \cdot)}(k) \\
 &= C \sup_{f \in \mathcal{W}^{\eta-1,2}} -\frac{i}{2} c_f(n) + \frac{i}{2} c_f(-n) \\
 &\leq C n^{-(\eta-1)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$n^{-(\beta+1)} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{H}_1^{\eta-1}} \int_0^1 f(t) \sin(2\pi nt) dt \leq C n^{-(\beta+\eta)} \leq C_2 n^{-(\beta+1)} \int_0^1 H_1(t) \sin(2\pi nt) dt,$$

so H_1 is indeed optimal.

Coming back to the non local case, for $\Theta : \mathcal{M}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\Theta(x)$ is the unitary normal vector pointing outward the manifold \mathcal{M}^* at the point x , defining

$$h(x) = H_1 \circ g^{*-1} \circ T(x) \langle \Theta \circ T(x), x - T(x) \rangle,$$

we have $h \in \mathcal{H}_C^\eta(\mathcal{M}^{*n^{-(\beta+1)}}, \mathbb{R})$ so using Proposition 25 it can be extended into a map belonging to $\mathcal{H}_C^\eta(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R})$. Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{\mathcal{M}_n} (h(x) - h(T(x))) f_{\mu_n}(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}_n}(x) &\geq C \int_0^1 \langle H_1(t) g^*(t), g^*(t) n^{-(\beta+1)} \sin(2\pi nt) \rangle dt \\
 &\geq C d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu_n, T_{\#}\mu_n)^{\frac{\beta+\eta}{\beta+1}},
 \end{aligned}$$

so h is a potential satisfying (11) for the non local case. Finally, for all $h' \in \mathcal{H}_1^\eta(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R})$ with $h'|_{\mathcal{M}_{g^*}=0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{M}_n} h'(x) f_{\mu_n}(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}_n}(x) &\leq C \int_0^1 \langle \nabla h'(g^*(t)), g^*(t) n^{-(\beta+1)} \sin(2\pi nt) \rangle dt + C n^{-2(\beta+1)} \\ &\leq n^{-(\beta+1)} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{H}_1^{\eta-1}} \int_0^1 f(t) \sin(2\pi nt) dt + C n^{-2(\beta+1)} \\ &\leq C n^{-(\beta+\eta)} \\ &\leq C \int_{\mathcal{M}_n} h(x) f_{\mu_n}(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}_n}(x). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that h is an optimal potential for the non local case which gives in particular the sought-after inequality

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu_n, T_{\#\mu_n}) &\leq C \int_{\mathcal{M}_n} h(x) f_{\mu_n}(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}_n}(x) \\ &\leq C n^{-(\beta+\eta)} \\ &\leq C d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu_n, T_{\#\mu_n})^{\frac{\beta+\eta}{\beta+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally note that this example also allows to show that the exponent δ of Corollary 11 is optimal. Indeed, for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and $\eta \geq 1$ we have

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu_n, T_{\#\mu_n}) = O(n^{-\gamma(\beta+1)}) = O(n^{-\beta+\eta})^{\frac{\beta\gamma+\gamma}{\beta+\eta}} = d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu_n, T_{\#\mu_n})^{\frac{\beta\gamma+\gamma}{\beta+\eta}}. \quad (20)$$

5.2.4 FURTHER REMARKS ON THE EXAMPLE

We see that in the case $\eta = \beta + 1$, the exponent $\frac{\beta+1}{2\beta+1}$ is an improvement over the exponent $1/2$ given by Jensen's inequality (13). In contrary to $x \mapsto \|x - T(x)\|^2$, the potential h uses the fact that \mathcal{M}_n is of regularity $\beta + 1$. Instead of being equal to 0 on \mathcal{M}^* , ∇h increases between the intersections points of \mathcal{M}^* and \mathcal{M}_n which corresponds to the irregularities of the function $x \mapsto \|x - T(x)\|$. As the distance between these points is proportional to the distance between \mathcal{M}^* and \mathcal{M}_n to the power $\frac{1}{\beta+1}$, we have that $\|\nabla h(T(x))\|$ is proportional to $\|x - T(x)\|^{\frac{\eta-1}{\beta+1}} = \|x - T(x)\|^{\frac{\beta}{\beta+1}}$ for $\eta = \beta + 1$. This explains the improvement over the potential $x \mapsto \|x - T(x)\|^2$ as the norm of its gradient is proportional to $\|x - T(x)\|$.

The construction of h is similar to the one used in the proof of Lemma 7. In both cases we take

$$h(x) = \langle F(x), x - T(x) \rangle,$$

with F a regularization of the map $x \mapsto \frac{x-T(x)}{\|x-T(x)\|}$ belonging to $\mathcal{H}_C^{\eta-1}$ and such that $\|\nabla^{[\eta]} F(x)\| \leq \|x - T(x)\|^{-1+\eta-[\eta]}$. The difference lies in the regularization of the map $x \mapsto \frac{x-T(x)}{\|x-T(x)\|}$ where here we did a geometrical construction which is already quite complex even in the simple setting of this example. We believe that Lemma 7 could be proven using a construction of this type but it might be very complicated to describe it in the general

case. In the proof of Lemma 7, we simply regularize the function $x \mapsto \frac{x-T(x)}{\|x-T(x)\|}$ by lowering the size of its wavelet coefficients. This trick allows us to obtain a good potential of regularity $\eta - 1$ without really knowing its shape. In particular, this outlines the efficiency of the wavelet tool which allows to easily modify the regularity of functions while controlling their potential action.

References

- M. Arjovsky, S. Chintala, and L. Bottou. Wasserstein generative adversarial networks. In D. Precup and Y. Teh, editors, *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 70, pages 214–223. PMLR, 2017.
- C. M. Bishop. *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning (Information Science and Statistics)*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006. ISBN 0387310738.
- S. Chakraborty and P. L. Bartlett. On the statistical properties of generative adversarial models for low intrinsic data dimension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.15801*, 2024.
- F. Chazal, D. Cohen-Steiner, and Q. Mérigot. Geometric inference for probability measures. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 11:733–751, 2011.
- I. Daubechies. Orthonormal bases of compactly supported wavelets. *Communications on pure and applied mathematics*, 41(7):909–996, 1988.
- V. De Bortoli. Convergence of denoising diffusion models under the manifold hypothesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.05314*, 2022.
- V. Divol. Measure estimation on manifolds: an optimal transport approach. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 183(1-2):581–647, 2022.
- H. Federer. Curvature measures, 1959.
- H. Federer. *Geometric measure theory*. Springer, 2014.
- C. Fefferman, S. Ivanov, Y. Kurylev, M. Lassas, and H. Narayanan. Reconstruction and interpolation of manifolds i: The geometric whitney problem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.00674*, 2015.
- C. L. Fefferman. A sharp form of whitney’s extension theorem. *Annals of mathematics*, 161(1):509–577, 2005.
- E. Giné and R. Nickl. *Mathematical Foundations of Infinite-Dimensional Statistical Models*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2015. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781107337862.
- H. Hajaiej, L. Molinet, T. Ozawa, and B. Wang. Sufficient and necessary conditions for the fractional gagliardo-nirenberg inequalities and applications to navier-stokes and generalized boson equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1004.4287*, 2010.
- D. D. Haroske. *Envelopes and sharp embeddings of function spaces*. CRC Press, 2006.
- J. Jost. *Riemannian geometry and geometric analysis*, volume 42005. Springer, 2008.

- M. Köppen. The curse of dimensionality. In *5th online world conference on soft computing in industrial applications (WSC5)*, volume 1, pages 4–8, 2000.
- G. Leobacher and A. Steinicke. Existence, uniqueness and regularity of the projection onto differentiable manifolds, 2018. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.10578>.
- T. Liang. How well generative adversarial networks learn distributions, 2021.
- A. Lunardi. *Interpolation theory*, volume 16. Springer, 2018.
- A. Müller. Integral probability metrics and their generating classes of functions. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 29:429–443, 1997.
- G. Peyré, M. Cuturi, et al. Computational optimal transport: With applications to data science. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 11(5-6):355–607, 2019.
- L. Ruthotto and E. Haber. An introduction to deep generative modeling. *GAMM-Mitteilungen*, 44(2):e202100008, 2021.
- F. Santambrogio. Optimal transport for applied mathematicians. *Birkäuser, NY*, 55(58-63): 94, 2015.
- N. Schreuder, V.-E. Brunel, and A. Dalalyan. Statistical guarantees for generative models without domination. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 1051–1071. PMLR, 2021.
- A. J. Smola, A. Gretton, and K. Borgwardt. Maximum mean discrepancy. In *13th international conference, ICONIP*, pages 3–6, 2006.
- E. M. Stein. *Singular Integrals and Differentiability Properties of Functions (PMS-30)*. Princeton University Press, 1970. ISBN 9780691080796. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1bpmb07>.
- A. Stéphanovitch, E. Aamari, and C. Levrard. Wasserstein gans are minimax optimal distribution estimators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.18613*, 2023.
- C. Szepesvári. *Algorithms for reinforcement learning*. Springer Nature, 2022.
- R. Tang and Y. Yang. Minimax rate of distribution estimation on unknown submanifolds under adversarial losses. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(3):1282–1308, 2023.
- H. Triebel. Theory of function spaces II. 2010. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/1603865>.
- S. Verdú. Total variation distance and the distribution of relative information. In *2014 Information Theory and Applications Workshop (ITA)*, pages 1–3. IEEE, 2014.
- C. Villani. *Optimal transport: old and new*, volume 338. Springer, 2009.
- C. Villani. *Topics in optimal transportation*, volume 58. American Mathematical Soc., 2021.
- K.-C. Wang. A jackson-type inequality associated with wavelet bases decomposition. *Journal of Inequalities and Applications*, 2021(1):150, 2021.

Appendix A. Proofs of the properties of $\beta + 1$ -smooth submanifolds (Section 3.2.1)

In this Section, we give the detail of the proof of the integration on manifolds via smooth transport maps (Proposition 4) and list some properties of manifolds satisfying the $(2, K)$ -manifold condition.

A.1 Properties of $\beta + 1$ -smooth submanifolds

Recalling the notation of Definition 1, we obtain in the following result that the images of the charts contain the same ball around the origin.

Proposition 14 *If \mathcal{M} verifies the $(2, K)$ -manifold condition, then for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$,*

$$B^d(0, \frac{1}{4K}) \in \varphi_x(\overline{B^p}(x, \sqrt{\frac{3}{4}}K^{-1}) \cap M).$$

Proof Let us first notice that for all $z \in \overline{B^p}(x, \sqrt{\frac{3}{4}}K^{-1}) \cap \mathcal{M}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|z - \pi_{\mathcal{T}_x(\mathcal{M})}(z)\| &= \|\varphi_x^{-1}(\pi_{\mathcal{T}_x(\mathcal{M})}(z) - x) - \pi_{\mathcal{T}_x(\mathcal{M})}(z)\| \\ &= \|\varphi_x^{-1}(0) + \nabla\varphi_x^{-1}(0)(\pi_{\mathcal{T}_x(\mathcal{M})}(z) - x) \\ &\quad + \int_0^1 \nabla^2\varphi_x^{-1}(t(\pi_{\mathcal{T}_x(\mathcal{M})}(z) - x))(\pi_{\mathcal{T}_x(\mathcal{M})}(z) - x)dt - \pi_{\mathcal{T}_x(\mathcal{M})}(z)\| \\ &= \|\int_0^1 \nabla^2\varphi_x^{-1}(t(\pi_{\mathcal{T}_x(\mathcal{M})}(z) - x))(\pi_{\mathcal{T}_x(\mathcal{M})}(z) - x)dt\| \\ &\leq K\|\pi_{\mathcal{T}_x(\mathcal{M})}(z) - x\|^2 \\ &\leq K\|z - x\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi_x(z) - \varphi_x(x)\|^2 &= \|x - z\|^2 - \|z - \pi_{\mathcal{T}_x(\mathcal{M})}(z)\|^2 \\ &\geq \|x - z\|^2 - K^2\|x - z\|^4 \geq \frac{1}{4}\|x - z\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

so if $\|z - x\| \geq \frac{1}{2K}$ we have

$$\|\varphi_x(z) - \varphi_x(x)\| \geq \frac{1}{4K}. \quad (21)$$

Suppose now the result is not true and take $y \in B^d(0, \frac{1}{4K}) \cap \varphi_x(\overline{B^p}(x, \sqrt{\frac{3}{4}}K^{-1}))^c$ with A^c denoting the complementary of the set A . Define $\tilde{y} = t_y y$ for

$$t_y = \arg \max\{t \in [0, 1) \mid t y \in \varphi_x(\overline{B^p}(x, \sqrt{\frac{3}{4}}K^{-1}))\}.$$

As $\|\tilde{y} - \varphi_x(x)\| = \|\tilde{y}\| \leq \|y\| < \frac{1}{4K}$, we have by (21) that $\varphi_x^{-1}(\tilde{y}) \in B^p(x, \frac{1}{2K})$. But as φ_x is a local diffeomorphism, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $B^d(\tilde{y}, \epsilon) \in \varphi_x(\overline{B^p}(x, \sqrt{\frac{3}{4}}K^{-1}))$ which is

in contradiction with the definition of \tilde{y} . ■

This result enables to build a covering of \mathcal{M} with images of the ball $B^d(0, \frac{1}{4K})$ by smooth diffeomorphisms. Write $\tau = \frac{1}{4K}$ and let $(x_i)_{i=1, \dots, m}$ be a finite sequence such that $\mathcal{M} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^m B^p(x_i, \frac{\tau}{2})$.

Corollary 15 *If \mathcal{M} verifies the $(2, K)$ -manifold condition then $\mathcal{M} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^m \varphi_{x_i}^{-1}(B^d(0, \tau))$ and for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$, there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that $B^p(x, \frac{\tau}{2}) \cap \mathcal{M} \subset \varphi_{x_i}^{-1}(B^d(0, \tau))$.*

Proof Let $x \in B^p(x_i, \tau/2) \cap \mathcal{M}$, as the projection $\pi_{\mathcal{T}_{x_i}(\mathcal{M})}$ is 1-Lipschitz, we have $\varphi_{x_i}(x) \in B^d(0, \tau/2)$. Furthermore

$$B^p(x, \frac{\tau}{2}) \cap \mathcal{M} \subset B^p(x_i, \tau) \cap \mathcal{M} \subset \varphi_{x_i}^{-1}(B^d(0, \tau)).$$

For ease of notation, we will write φ_i instead of φ_{x_i} . Let us now bound below the norm of the differential of the φ_i 's. ■

Proposition 16 *If \mathcal{M} verifies the $(2, K)$ -manifold condition of Definition 1, then the charts $\varphi_i : B^d(0, \tau) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ verify that for all $u \in B^d(0, \tau)$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\|\nabla \varphi_i(u) \frac{v}{\|v\|}\| \geq 1/2.$$

Proof We have that $\nabla \varphi_i(x_i) = \text{Id}$ so for all $u \in B^d(0, \tau)$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$\|\nabla \varphi_i^{-1}(u)v\| = \|\nabla \varphi_i^{-1}(0)v + \int_0^1 \nabla^2 \varphi_i^{-1}(tu)uv dt\| \geq \|v\| - K\|u\|\|v\| \geq (1 - \frac{1}{4})\|v\|$$

recalling that $\tau = \frac{1}{4K}$. ■

In the following we will use the characterization of the reach for submanifolds.

Lemma 17 *(Federer (1959), Theorem 4.18) The reach $r \in [0, \infty)$ of a submanifold \mathcal{M} verifies*

$$r = \inf_{q \neq p \in \mathcal{M}} \frac{\|q - p\|^2}{2d(q - p, \mathcal{T}_p(\mathcal{M}))}.$$

Using this result, let us prove a lower bound on the reach resulting of the $(2, K)$ -manifold condition.

Proposition 18 *Let \mathcal{M} satisfying the $(2, K)$ -manifold condition, then r the reach of \mathcal{M} verifies $r \geq \frac{1}{2K}$.*

Proof Let $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\|x - y\| \leq K^{-1}$, for φ_y the orthogonal projection onto the tangent space $\mathcal{T}_y(\mathcal{M})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & d(x - y, \mathcal{T}_y(\mathcal{M})) \\
 &= d(\varphi_y^{-1}(\varphi_y(x)) - \varphi_y^{-1}(0), \mathcal{T}_y(\mathcal{M})) \\
 &\leq d(\nabla\varphi_y^{-1}(0)\varphi_y(x), \mathcal{T}_y(\mathcal{M})) + d\left(\int_0^1 \nabla^2\varphi_y^{-1}(t\varphi_y(x))\varphi_y(x)^2(1-t)dt, \mathcal{T}_y(\mathcal{M})\right) \\
 &= d\left(\int_0^1 \nabla^2\varphi_y^{-1}(t\varphi_y(x))\varphi_y(x)^2(1-t)dt, \mathcal{T}_y(\mathcal{M})\right) \\
 &\leq \frac{K}{2}\|\varphi_y(x)\|^2 \leq \frac{K}{2}\|x - y\|^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

Then $\|x - y\| \leq K^{-1}$ imply that

$$\frac{\|x - y\|^2}{2d(x - y, \mathcal{T}_y(\mathcal{M}))} \geq \frac{\|x - y\|^2}{2\frac{K}{2}\|x - y\|^2} = K^{-1}.$$

Now if $\|x - y\| \geq K^{-1}$ then

$$\frac{\|x - y\|^2}{2d(x - y, \mathcal{T}_y(\mathcal{M}))} \geq \frac{\|x - y\|^2}{2\|x - y\|} \geq \frac{1}{2K}.$$

■

A.2 Proof of Proposition 4

Let us first define the notion of approximation of unity subordinated to an atlas.

Definition 5 A collection of C^∞ functions $(\rho_i)_{i=1,\dots,m}$ on \mathcal{M} is said to be an approximation of unity subordinated to $(\varphi_i^{-1}(B^d(0, \tau)))_i$ if for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$,

- $0 \leq \rho_i \leq 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^m \rho_i(x) = 1$ for $x \in \mathcal{M}$,
- $\text{supp}(\rho_i) \subset \varphi_i^{-1}(B^d(0, \tau))$.

It is well known that there exists an approximation of unity subordinated to any atlas on a closed manifold (Jost, 2008). Using this approximation of unity we can now give the proof of Proposition 4.

Proof As μ has a density f_μ with respect to the volume measure on \mathcal{M} , then by change of variable we have that the measure $\varphi_{i\neq\mu}$ admits a density f_μ^i with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $B^d(0, \tau)$ given by

$$f_\mu^i(u) = f_\mu(\varphi_i^{-1}(u))\det((\nabla\varphi_i^{-1}(u))^\top \nabla\varphi_i^{-1}(u))^{1/2}.$$

Furthermore, as μ verifies the (β, K) -regularity density condition, we have by the Faa di Bruno formula that $f_\mu^i \in \mathcal{H}_C^\beta(B^d(0, \tau), \mathbb{R})$ and f_μ^i is bounded below by $\frac{1}{2K}$. Write

λ_i^d the Lebesgue measure on $B^d(0, \tau)$ normalized by $C_i^{-1} = \int f_\mu^i d\lambda^d / \int_{B^d(0, \tau)} d\lambda^d$. Then by Caffarelli's regularity (Theorem 12.50, Villani (2009)) we have that there exists $T_i \in \mathcal{H}_C^{\beta+1}(B^d(0, \tau), B^d(0, \tau))$ such that $T_{i\#\lambda_i^d} = \varphi_{i\#\mu}$. Furthermore, T_i is solution to the equation

$$\det(\nabla T_i)^{-1} = f_\mu^i \circ T_i$$

so in particular $\det(\nabla T_i) \geq C^{-1}$. As $\lambda_{\max}(\nabla T_i) \leq C$ we deduce that $\lambda_{\min}(\nabla T_i) \geq C^{-1}$. Therefore we have that $\lambda_{\min}(\nabla(\varphi_i^{-1} \circ T_i)) \geq C^{-1}$. Using Theorem 24, we can extend $\varphi_i^{-1} \circ T_i$ to a map $\phi_i \in \mathcal{H}_C^{\beta+1}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p)$.

Let $h : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a bounded continuous function, then for ρ_i an approximation of unity subordinated to $(\varphi_i^{-1}(B^d(0, \tau)))_i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\mu[h(X)] &= \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_\mu[h(X)\rho_i(X)] = \sum_{i=1}^m \int_{B^d(0, \tau)} h(\varphi_i^{-1}(u))\rho_i(\varphi_i^{-1}(u))d\varphi_{i\#\mu}(u) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{C_i} \int_{B^d(0, \tau)} h(\varphi_i^{-1} \circ T_i(u))\rho_i(\varphi_i^{-1} \circ T_i(u))d\lambda_i^d(u) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{C_i} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(\phi_i(u))\rho_i(\phi_i(u))\mathbb{1}_{\{u \in B^d(0, \tau)\}}d\lambda_i^d(u). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\zeta_i : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\zeta_i(u) = \rho_i(\phi_i(u))\mathbb{1}_{\{u \in B^d(0, \tau)\}}.$$

Then as ρ_i is subordinated to $(\varphi_i^{-1}(B^d(0, \tau)))_i$, we have that $\zeta_i \in \mathcal{H}_C^{\beta+1}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$. Finally,

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[h(X)] = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{C_i} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(\phi_i(u))\zeta_i(u)d\lambda_i^d(u),$$

which concludes the proof. ■

Appendix B. Proof of the existence of a diffeomorphism between the manifolds (Section 3.2.2)

Let us recall two results from Stéphanovitch et al. (2023) :

Proposition 19 *Let $h_1 \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{s_1, b_1}(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^p, 1)$, $h_2 \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{s_2, b_2}(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^p, 1)$ for $s_1, s_2, b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Then for $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $t, r \in [0, 1]$, $q > 1$ and $1/q + 1/q^* = 1$ we have*

$$\left\langle h_1, h_2 \right\rangle_{L^2} \leq \left\langle \tilde{\Gamma}^{t\tau}(h_1), \Gamma^{(1-t)\tau}(h_2) \right\rangle_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\langle \tilde{\Gamma}^{-r\frac{q^*}{q}\tau}(h_1), \Gamma^{-(1-r)\frac{q^*}{q}\tau}(h_2) \right\rangle_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{q^*}}$$

for $\tilde{\Gamma}^{t\tau}(h_1) \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{s_1+t\tau, b_1}$ and $\tilde{\Gamma}^{-r\frac{q^*}{q}\tau}(h_1) \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{s_1-r\frac{q^*}{q}\tau, b_1}$ such that

$$\langle \tilde{\Gamma}^{t\tau}(h_1)_i, \psi_{j|z} \rangle = S(j, l, w)_i \langle \Gamma^{t\tau}(h_1)_i, \psi_{j|z} \rangle$$

and

$$\langle \tilde{\Gamma}^{-t \frac{q^*}{q}} \tau(h_1)_i, \psi_{jlz} \rangle = S(j, l, w)_i \langle \Gamma^{-r \frac{q^*}{q}} \tau(h_1)_i, \psi_{jlz} \rangle$$

with $S(j, l, w)_i \in \{-1, 1\}$ the sign of $\langle h_{1i}, \psi_{jlz} \rangle \langle h_{2i}, \psi_{jlz} \rangle$, $i = 1, \dots, p$.

This proposition is a key result that we will use numerous times along the proof of Theorem 9. It is the classical interpolation inequality between Besov spaces of Section 3.1 in a more general form. An important Corollary is its applications to Hölder IPMs.

Corollary 20 *Let μ, μ^* two probability measures with compact support in \mathbb{R}^p . Then for any $\theta, \theta_1, \theta_2 > 0$ such that $\theta_1 < \theta < \theta_2$, we have for all $\epsilon > 0$*

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\theta}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq C \log(\epsilon^{-1})^{2\delta_{\theta_1, \theta_2}} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^{\theta_1}}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\theta_2 - \theta}{\theta_2 - \theta_1}} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^{\theta_2}}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\theta - \theta_1}{\theta_2 - \theta_1}} + \epsilon \delta_{\theta_1, \theta_2},$$

with $\delta_{\theta_1, \theta_2} = 1$ if θ_1 or θ_2 is an integer and $\delta_{\theta_1, \theta_2} = 0$ otherwise.

Let us define the notion of approximate Jacobian (Definition 2.10 in Federer (1959)).

Definition 6 *Let \mathcal{M} be a d -dimensional submanifold of \mathbb{R}^p and a map $T : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ of regularity C^1 . For $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$, using the matrix of $\nabla T(x)$ with respect to orthonormal basis of \mathbb{R}^p and $\mathcal{T}_{T(x)}(\mathcal{M})$, the approximate Jacobian of T , noted $ap_d(\nabla T(x))$, is equal to the square root of the sum of the squares of the determinants of the d by d minors of this matrix.*

We will use multiple times the next proposition.

Proposition 21 *(Theorem 3.2.22, Federer (2014)) For $t > 0$, $T : \mathcal{M}^{*t} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^*$ of regularity C^1 and $D : \mathcal{M}^{*t} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}^{*t}} D(x) ap_d(\nabla T(x)) d\lambda^p(x) = \int_{\mathcal{M}^*} \int_{T^{-1}(\{z\})} D(x) d\lambda^{p-d}(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}^*}(z),$$

for $\lambda_{\mathcal{M}^*}$ the volume measure on the submanifold \mathcal{M}^* .

B.1 Proof of Lemma 5

Proof If α is not an integer, using Corollary 20 with $\theta = 1$, $\theta_1 = 1/2$ and $\theta_2 = \alpha$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} W_1(\mu, \mu^*) &\leq 2K d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu, \mu^*) \\ &\leq C d_{\mathcal{H}_1^{1/2}}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha-1/2}} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\alpha}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{1}{2\alpha-1}} \\ &\leq C d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\alpha}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{1}{2\alpha-1}} \end{aligned}$$

If now α is an integer, then using Corollary 20 with $\theta = 1$, $\theta_1 = \frac{\alpha-3/2}{2(\alpha-1)}$ and $\theta_2 = \alpha + 1/2$, we get the same result. Then by hypothesis we have

$$W_1(\mu, \mu^*) \leq C t^{d+1}.$$

Let $\delta > 0$ and suppose that $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*) \geq \delta$. For $x \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $d(x, \mathcal{M}^*) \geq \delta$, write $\nu = \mu(\cdot \cap B^p(x, \delta/2))$. Then has μ has a density with respect to the volume measure of \mathcal{M} bounded below by K^{-1} , we have that

$$\nu(B^p(x, \delta/2) \cap \mathcal{M}) \geq K^{-1} \lambda_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M} \cap B^p(x, \delta/2)) \geq C \delta^d.$$

Using the dual formulation of the 1-Wasserstein distance, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} W_1(\mu, \mu^*) &= \sup_{D \in \text{Lip}(1)} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{X \sim \mu^* \\ Y \sim \mu}} [D(X) - D(Y)] \\ &\geq \int_{B^p(x, \delta/2)} d(y, \mathcal{M}^*) d\mu(y) \geq \frac{\delta}{2} \mu(B^p(x, \delta/2) \cap \mathcal{M}) \\ &\geq C\delta^{d+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore as $W_1(\mu, \mu^*) \leq Ct^{d+1}$, we can deduce that

$$\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*) \leq Ct. \quad \blacksquare$$

B.2 Proof of Theorem 6

Let us first use Proposition 3.1 in Fefferman et al. (2015) to show that there exists a C^∞ manifold close to \mathcal{M}^* .

As every charts ϕ_i (given by Proposition 4) of \mathcal{M}^* belongs to $\mathcal{H}_K^2(B^d(0, \tau), \mathcal{M})$, we have in particular that for all $x \in \mathcal{M}^*$ and $0 < s < \tau$,

$$\mathbb{H}(B^p(x, s) \cap \mathcal{M}^*, T_x(\mathcal{M})) \leq Ks^2.$$

Then applying Proposition 3.1 in Fefferman et al. (2015) we have that there exists a C^∞ closed manifold \mathcal{M}_s such that $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{M}^*, \mathcal{M}_s) \leq 5s^2$ with charts $\varphi_x^s \in \mathcal{H}_{C_\eta}^\eta(B^d(0, s), \mathcal{M}_s)$ $\forall \eta > 0$, and its reach r_s verifies $r_s \geq C^{-1}s$. We are going to use the orthogonal projection π_s onto the submanifold \mathcal{M}_s to build our map.

From Leobacher and Steinicke (2018) we know that the canonical projection π onto a submanifold \mathcal{M} with strictly positive reach r , verifies

$$\nabla \pi(x) = \left(\text{Id}_{\mathcal{T}_{\pi(x)}(\mathcal{M})} - \|x - \pi(x)\| L_{\pi(x), v} \right)^{-1} P_{\mathcal{T}_{\pi(x)}(\mathcal{M})}. \quad (22)$$

for $L_{\pi(x), v}$ the shape operator in the direction $v = \frac{x - \pi(x)}{\|x - \pi(x)\|}$. From Corollary 3 in Leobacher and Steinicke (2018), we also have that

$$\left\| \left(\text{Id}_{\mathcal{T}_{\pi(x)}(\mathcal{M})} - \|x - \pi(x)\| L_{\pi(x), v} \right)^{-1} \right\| \leq (1 - \|x - \pi(x)\|/r)^{-1}. \quad (23)$$

Furthermore if \mathcal{M} is of regularity η , there exists a constant $C_\eta > 0$ depending on the \mathcal{H}^η norm of the charts such that

$$\|\pi|_{\mathcal{M}^{r/2}}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\eta-1}} \leq C_\eta. \quad (24)$$

Using these results, let us show that the restriction of π_s to the manifold \mathcal{M}^* is a diffeomorphism.

Lemma 22 *Let $\mathcal{M}_s, \mathcal{M}^*$ satisfying the $(\beta+1, K)$ -manifold condition such that $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{M}_s, \mathcal{M}^*) \leq 5s^2$. Supposing $s > 0$ small enough, the map $\pi_s|_{\mathcal{M}^*} : \mathcal{M}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_s$, i.e. the restriction of the projection π_s to the manifold \mathcal{M}^* , is a diffeomorphism.*

Proof Let us first show that $\pi_s|_{\mathcal{M}^*}$ is a local diffeomorphism, by showing that if there existed $x \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\lambda_{\min}(\nabla(\pi_s \circ \varphi_x^{-1})(0)^\top \nabla(\pi_s \circ \varphi_x^{-1})(0))$ was too small, then the Hausdorff distance between \mathcal{M}_s and \mathcal{M}^* would be too large.

Let $x \in \mathcal{M}^*$ and $h \in (0, \frac{\tau}{2K})$. For $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|v\| = 1$ such that $\langle \pi_s(\varphi_x^{-1}(0)) - \varphi_x^{-1}(0), \nabla(\pi_s \circ \varphi_x^{-1} - \varphi_x^{-1})(0)v \rangle \geq 0$, using a Taylor expansion we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \|\pi_s(\varphi_x^{-1}(hv)) - \varphi_x^{-1}(hv)\| \\
 & \geq \|\pi_s(\varphi_x^{-1}(0)) - \varphi_x^{-1}(0) + \nabla(\pi_s \circ \varphi_x^{-1} - \varphi_x^{-1})(0)hv\| - Ch^2 \\
 & = \left(\|\pi_s(\varphi_x^{-1}(0)) - \varphi_x^{-1}(0)\|^2 + 2\langle \pi_s(\varphi_x^{-1}(0)) - \varphi_x^{-1}(0), \nabla(\pi_s \circ \varphi_x^{-1} - \varphi_x^{-1})(0)hv \rangle \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \|\nabla(\pi_s \circ \varphi_x^{-1} - \varphi_x^{-1})(0)hv\|^2 \right)^{1/2} - Ch^2 \\
 & \geq h\|\nabla(\pi_s \circ \varphi_x^{-1} - \varphi_x^{-1})(0)v\| - Ch^2 \\
 & \geq h(\|\nabla\varphi_x^{-1}(0)v\| - \|\nabla(\pi_s \circ \varphi_x^{-1})(0)v\|) - Ch^2 \\
 & \geq h(1/2 - \|\nabla(\pi_s \circ \varphi_x^{-1})(0)v\|) - Ch^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

As $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{M}_s, \mathcal{M}^*) \leq 5s^2$ we deduce with $h = \frac{\tau(1/2 - \|\nabla(\pi_s \circ \varphi_x^{-1})(0)v\|)}{2C}$ that

$$\frac{\tau^2(1/2 - \|\nabla(\pi_s \circ \varphi_x^{-1})(0)v\|)^2}{4C} \leq 5s^2$$

so

$$1/2 - \sqrt{20C} \frac{s}{\tau} \leq \|\nabla(\pi_s \circ \varphi_x^{-1})(0)v\|$$

which gives for s small enough

$$\lambda_{\min}(\nabla(\pi_s \circ \varphi_x^{-1})(0)^\top \nabla(\pi_s \circ \varphi_x^{-1})(0))^{1/2} \geq \frac{1}{4}. \quad (25)$$

In particular $\pi_s \circ \varphi_x^{-1}$ is an immersion and therefore $\pi_s|_{\mathcal{M}^*} : \mathcal{M}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_s$ is a local diffeomorphism.

Suppose there exists $x, y \in \mathcal{M}^*$ different such that $\pi_s(x) = \pi_s(y)$. Then

$$\|x - y\| \leq \|x - \pi_s(x)\| + \|y - \pi_s(y)\| \leq 2\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{M}^*, \mathcal{M}_s) \leq 10s^2.$$

Then taking $10s^2 \leq \frac{1}{K}$, we have that $y \in \varphi_x^{-1}(B(0, 10s^2))$. But from (25) and the fact that $\|\nabla^2(\pi_s \circ \varphi_x^{-1})\| \leq C$ we have that for s small enough, $\pi_s \circ \varphi_x^{-1}$ is a diffeomorphism on $B^d(0, 10s^2)$ and therefore $\pi_s(x) \neq \pi_s(y)$.

As \mathcal{M}^* is compact without boundary, $\pi_s(\mathcal{M}^*)$ is a closed submanifold of \mathcal{M}_s so being of same dimension, they are equal. We can conclude that $\pi_s|_{\mathcal{M}^*}$ is a diffeomorphism. \blacksquare

We can now define the map $T : \mathcal{M}^{*r_s/4} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^*$ by

$$T(x) = (\pi_{s|\mathcal{M}^*})^{-1} \circ \pi_s(x)$$

which is well defined for s small enough as $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{M}_s, \mathcal{M}^*) \leq 5s^2 < r_s/4$. Let us now state that T is the map we are interested in.

Proposition 23 *The map $T : \mathcal{M}^{*r_s/4} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^*$ defined by $T(x) = (\pi_{s|\mathcal{M}^*})^{-1} \circ \pi_s(x)$, is $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*)_{K_T}$ -compatible with radius $t = C_\alpha^{-1}$ and $K_T = C_\alpha$.*

Proof We have

$$\nabla T(x) = \nabla(\pi_{s|\mathcal{M}^*})^{-1}(\pi_s(x)) \circ \nabla \pi_s(x). \quad (26)$$

From (25) and the fact that for all $x \in \mathcal{M}^*$, φ_x^{-1} is 2-Lipschitz on $B^d(0, \tau)$, we have for all $h \in \mathcal{T}_x(\mathcal{M}^*)$,

$$\|\nabla \pi_{s|\mathcal{M}^*} h\| \geq \frac{1}{8} \|h\|. \quad (27)$$

Then, from (26) and the Faa di Bruno formula, we deduce that $T \in \mathcal{H}_{C_s}^{\beta+1}(\mathcal{M}_s^{r_s/4}, \mathcal{M}^*)$.

Supposing $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\alpha}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq s^{2(d+1)(2\alpha-1)}$ we have from Lemma 5 that $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*) \leq Cs^2$ so $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{M}_s, \mathcal{M}) \leq \mathbb{H}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*) + \mathbb{H}(\mathcal{M}_s, \mathcal{M}^*) \leq Cs^2$. We show the same way as we did with \mathcal{M}^* , that for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$, $\pi_s \circ \phi_x^{-1}$ is a local diffeomorphism for ϕ_x^{-1} the charts of \mathcal{M} and that π_s is injective on \mathcal{M} , so $\pi_{s|\mathcal{M}}$ is a diffeomorphism. Therefore, we deduce that $T|_{\mathcal{M}}$ is also a diffeomorphism.

Doing the same derivation as for \mathcal{M}^* to obtain (25), we get for \mathcal{M} that

$$\lambda_{\min}(\nabla(\pi_s \circ \phi_x^{-1})(0)^\top \nabla(\pi_s \circ \phi_x^{-1})(0))^{1/2} \geq C^{-1}.$$

Furthermore, as for all $y \in \mathcal{M}^*$ and $h \in \mathcal{T}_y(\mathcal{M}^*)$, we have

$$\|\nabla \pi_{s|\mathcal{M}^*}(y)h\| \leq 2\|h\|,$$

we deduce that

$$\lambda_{\min}(\nabla(T \circ \phi_x^{-1})(0)^\top \nabla(T \circ \phi_x^{-1})(0))^{1/2} \geq C^{-1}. \quad (28)$$

Then as ϕ_x^{-1} is C -Lipschitz, we have that

$$\lambda_{\min}(\nabla T|_{\mathcal{M}}(X)^\top \nabla T|_{\mathcal{M}}(X))^{1/2} \geq C^{-1},$$

so we deduce that $T|_{\mathcal{M}}^{-1} \in \mathcal{H}_{C_s}^{\beta+1}(\mathcal{M}^*, \mathcal{M})$. Therefore point *i*) is verified.

From Theorem 4.8 in Federer (1959) we have that $\pi_s : \mathcal{M}_s^{r_s} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_s$ the projection onto \mathcal{M}_s verifies point *ii*) of Definition 4 for a radius $t = r_s$, so as $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{M}^*, \mathcal{M}_s) \leq Cs^2 < r_s$, we deduce that T verifies *ii*) for a radius $r_s/2$.

Let us prove point *iii*). Let $f \in \mathcal{H}_{C_s}^{\beta+1}(\mathcal{M}_s, (\mathbb{R}^p)^{p-d})$ such that $(f_1(x), \dots, f_{p-d}(x))$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{T}_x(\mathcal{M}_s)^\top$. Let $R_x : \mathbb{R}^{p-d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ a linear map such that $R_x(e_i) = f_i(x)$

for (e_1, \dots, e_{p-d}) the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^{p-d} . Then for $h \in \mathcal{H}_1^\eta(\mathcal{M}^{\star t}, \mathbb{R})$ and $x \in \mathcal{M}^\star$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{T^{-1}(\{x\})} h(y) d\lambda_{E_x}^{p-d}(y) &= \int_{\mathcal{T}_{\pi_s(x)}(\mathcal{M}_s)^\perp \cap B(x, t)} h(y) d\lambda_{\mathcal{T}_{\pi_s(x)}(\mathcal{M}_s)^\perp}^{p-d}(y) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{p-d} \cap B(0, t)} h(x + R_x(z)) d\lambda^{p-d}(z). \end{aligned}$$

Then as $\forall z \in \mathbb{R}^{p-d}$, we have that the map $x \mapsto x + R_x(z)$ belongs to $\mathcal{H}_{C_s}^{\beta+1}(\mathcal{M}^\star, \mathbb{R}^p)$, so $x \mapsto h(x + R_x(z))$ belongs to $\mathcal{H}_{C_s}^\eta(\mathcal{M}^\star, \mathbb{R}^p)$ and therefore T verifies *iii*).

Let us prove *iv*). Using (25) and the fact that π_s is 2-Lipschitz on \mathcal{M}^\star , we have that for all $x \in \mathcal{M}^{\star t}$,

$$\inf_{z \in \mathcal{T}_T(x)(\mathcal{M}^\star)} \|\nabla T(x) \frac{z}{\|z\|}\| \geq C^{-1}.$$

Therefore, we deduce that the approximate Jacobian of T verifies

$$\text{ap}_d(\nabla T(x)) \geq C^{-1},$$

so T verifies the point *iv*) for $s > 0$ small enough. ■

Appendix C. Proofs of the interpolation inequalities in the manifold case (Section 3.2.3) and additional results

C.1 Extension Lemma

In this section we prove a general result allowing to extend maps that are defined on the neighborhood of a submanifold. This result is a corollary of the following version of Whitney's extension Theorem (Theorem A in Fefferman (2005) and Theorem 4 in Chapter 6 of Stein (1970)).

Theorem 24 *Given $\eta, p \geq 1$, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ depending only on p and β , for which the following holds. Let $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a closed subset of \mathbb{R}^p . Suppose that for any k distinct points $x_1, \dots, x_k \in E$, there exists $[\eta]$ degree polynomials P_1, \dots, P_k on \mathbb{R}^p , satisfying*

- a) $P_i(x_i) = f(x_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$;
- b) $\|\nabla^\alpha P_i(x_i)\| \leq M$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $|\alpha| \leq [\eta]$ and
- c) $\|\nabla^\alpha (P_i - P_j)(x_i)\| \leq M \|x_i - x_j\|^{\eta-\alpha}$ for $i, j = 0, \dots, k$ and $|\alpha| \leq [\eta]$ with M independent of x_1, \dots, x_k

Then f extends to $\mathcal{H}_{C_M}^\eta(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R})$.

Using this theorem we obtain the following extension result.

Proposition 25 *Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ a closed set and \mathcal{M}^\star a closed submanifold covered by an atlas $(\varphi_i^{-1}(B^d(0, K^{-1})))_{\{i=1, \dots, m\}}$ with $\varphi_i^{-1} \in \mathcal{H}_K^1$ and with reach $r^\star \geq K^{-1}$. Suppose that*

- i) $d(E, \mathcal{M}^\star) < r^\star/4$,

ii) $\mathcal{M}^* \subset E$,

iii) there exists a map $\pi \in \mathcal{H}_C^0(E, \mathcal{M}^*)$ such that for all $x \in E$ and $t \in [0, 1]$, $x + t(\pi(x) - x) \in E$,

iv) there exists a map $D \in \mathcal{H}_C^1(\mathcal{M}^{**/2}, E)$ such that $D|_E = Id$.

Then for all maps $H \in \mathcal{H}_M^\eta(E, \mathbb{R})$, H can be extended into a map in $\mathcal{H}_{C_M}^\eta(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R})$.

Proof Let $x_1, \dots, x_k \in E$ and define for all $r \in \{1, \dots, k\}$

$$P_r(x) = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{[\eta]} \nabla^\alpha H(x_r) \frac{(x - x_r)^\alpha}{\alpha!}.$$

with the notations $\nabla^\alpha H(x_r)$ the α -differential of H and

$$\nabla^\alpha H(x_r)(x - x_r)^\alpha = \nabla^\alpha H(x_r)(x - x_r, x - x_r, \dots, x - x_r).$$

Then the polynomials P_r check conditions a) and b) of Theorem 24 for $M = \|H\|_{\mathcal{H}^\eta(E, \mathbb{R})}$. Let us show that they also verify condition c).

First, for $\alpha = [\eta]$, we have

$$\|\nabla^{[\eta]} P_r(x_r) - \nabla^{[\eta]} P_j(x_r)\| = \|\nabla^{[\eta]} H(x_r) - \nabla^{[\eta]} H(x_j)\| \leq C \|x_r - x_j\|^{\eta - [\eta]}.$$

Let $\alpha \in \{0, \dots, [\eta] - 1\}$ and take a path $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^1([0, 1], E)$ such that $\gamma(0) = x_j$ and $\gamma(1) = x_r$. Applying Taylor expansions recursively we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^\alpha P_r(x_r) &= \nabla^\alpha H(x_r) = \nabla^\alpha H(x_j) + \int_0^1 \nabla^{\alpha+1} H(\gamma(t_1)) \dot{\gamma}(t_1) dt_1 \\ &= \nabla^\alpha H(x_j) + \int_0^1 \left(\nabla^{\alpha+1} H(x_j) + \int_0^1 \nabla^{\alpha+2} H(\gamma(t_2 t_1)) t_1 \dot{\gamma}(t_2 t_1) dt_2 \right) \dot{\gamma}(t_1) dt_1 \\ &= \nabla^\alpha H(x_j) \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=1}^{[\eta] - \alpha - 1} \int_0^1 \dots \int_0^1 \nabla^{\alpha+l} H(x_j) \dot{\gamma}(t_l t_{l-1} \dots t_1) dt_l \dot{\gamma}(t_{l-1} t_{l-2} \dots t_1) t_{l-1} dt_{l-1} \dots \dot{\gamma}(t_1) t_1^{l-1} dt_1 \\ &\quad + \int_0^1 \dots \int_0^1 \nabla^{[\eta]} H(\gamma(t_{[\eta]-\alpha} \dots t_1)) \dot{\gamma}(t_{[\eta]-\alpha} \dots t_1) dt_{[\eta]-\alpha} \\ &\quad \quad \times \dot{\gamma}(t_{[\eta]-\alpha-1} \dots t_1) t_{[\eta]-\alpha-1} dt_{[\eta]-\alpha-1} \dots \dot{\gamma}(t_1) t_1^{[\eta]-\alpha-1} dt_1 \\ &= \nabla^\alpha H(x_j) \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=1}^{[\eta] - \alpha} \int_0^1 \dots \int_0^1 \nabla^{\alpha+l} H(x_j) \dot{\gamma}(t_l t_{l-1} \dots t_1) dt_l \dot{\gamma}(t_{l-1} t_{l-2} \dots t_1) t_{l-1} dt_{l-1} \dots \dot{\gamma}(t_1) t_1^{l-1} dt_1 \\ &\quad + \int_0^1 \dots \int_0^1 (\nabla^{[\eta]} H(\gamma(t_{[\eta]-\alpha} \dots t_1)) - \nabla^{[\eta]} H(x_j)) \dot{\gamma}(t_{[\eta]-\alpha} \dots t_1) dt_{[\eta]-\alpha} \dots \dot{\gamma}(t_1) t_1^{[\eta]-\alpha-1} dt_1. \end{aligned}$$

Using integration by part one can show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{l=1}^{\lfloor \eta \rfloor - \alpha} \int_0^1 \dots \int_0^1 \nabla^{\alpha+l} H(x_j) \dot{\gamma}(t_l t_{l-1} \dots t_1) d_{t_l} \dot{\gamma}(t_{l-1} t_{l-2} \dots t_1) t_{l-1} d_{t_{l-1}} \dots \dot{\gamma}(t_1) t_1^{l-1} dt_1 \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{\lfloor \eta \rfloor - \alpha} \nabla^{\alpha+l} H(x_j) \frac{1}{l!} (x_r - x_j)^l, \end{aligned}$$

so from the previous derivation we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla^\alpha P_r(x_r) - \nabla^\alpha P_j(x_r)\| \\ &= \left\| \int_0^1 \dots \int_0^1 (\nabla^{\lfloor \eta \rfloor} H(\gamma(t_{\lfloor \eta \rfloor - \alpha} \dots t_1)) - \nabla^{\lfloor \eta \rfloor} H(x_j)) \dot{\gamma}(t_{\lfloor \eta \rfloor - \alpha} \dots t_1) d_{t_{\lfloor \eta \rfloor - \alpha}} \dots \dot{\gamma}(t_1) t_1^{\lfloor \eta \rfloor - \alpha - 1} dt_1 \right\| \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \dots \int_0^1 C \|\gamma(t_{\lfloor \eta \rfloor - \alpha} \dots t_1) - x_j\|^{\beta - \lfloor \beta \rfloor} \|\dot{\gamma}(t_{\lfloor \eta \rfloor - \alpha} \dots t_1)\| d_{t_{\lfloor \eta \rfloor - \alpha}} \dots \|\dot{\gamma}(t_1)\| t_1^{\lfloor \eta \rfloor - \alpha - 1} dt_1. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that $\|x_r - x_j\| \leq r^*/4$ and for D the map of assumption iv), define

$$\gamma(s) = D(x_r + s(x_j - x_r))$$

which is well defined as for $s \in [0, 1]$,

$$d(x_r + s(x_j - x_r), \mathcal{M}^*) \leq \|x_r + s(x_j - x_r) - x_r\| + d(x_r, \mathcal{M}^*) < r^*/2.$$

We have $\|\dot{\gamma}(s)\| \leq C\|x_r - x_j\|$ so we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla^\alpha P_r(x_r) - \nabla^\alpha P_j(x_r)\| \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \dots \int_0^1 C \|x_r - x_j\|^{\beta - \lfloor \beta \rfloor} 4C \|x_r - x_j\| d_{t_{\lfloor \eta \rfloor}} 4C \|x_r - x_j\| d_{t_{\lfloor \beta \rfloor}} \dots 4C \|x_r - x_j\| dt_\alpha \\ &\leq C \|x_r - x_j\|^{\beta + 1 - \alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose now that $\|x_r - x_j\| \geq r^*/4$ and define $\delta \in \mathcal{H}^1([0, 1], \mathcal{M}^*)$ a geodesic on \mathcal{M}^* from x_j to x_r . Let

$$\gamma(s) = \begin{cases} x_r + 3s(\pi(x_r) - x_r) & \text{if } s \in [0, 1/3] \\ \delta(3(t - 1/3)) & \text{if } s \in (1/3, 2/3) \\ \pi(x_j) + 3(s - 2/3)(x_j - \pi(x_j)) & \text{if } s \in [2/3, 1] \end{cases}$$

be the path from x_r to x_j that starts by projecting x_r onto \mathcal{M}^* , then circulates along \mathcal{M}^* until it reaches the projection of x_j , and finally go to x_j in a straight line.

For $s \in [0, 1/3] \cup [2/3, 1]$ we have

$$\|\dot{\gamma}(s)\| \leq 3 \max(\|\pi(x_r) - x_r\|, \|\pi(x_j) - x_j\|) \leq C \leq Cr^{*-1} \|x_r - x_j\|.$$

As \mathcal{M}^* can be covered by an atlas $(\varphi_i^{-1}(B^d(0, \tau)))_{\{i=1, \dots, m\}}$ with $\varphi_i^{-1} \in \mathcal{H}_K^1$, we deduce that

$$\int_0^1 \|\dot{\delta}(t)\| dt \leq mK\tau.$$

Therefore, for δ with constant speed we have

$$\|\dot{\delta}(t)\| \leq mK\tau \leq Cr^{s-1} \|x_r - x_j\|.$$

We then get as in the case where $\|x_r - x_j\| \leq t/4$, that

$$\|\nabla^\alpha P_r(x_r) - \nabla^\alpha P_j(x_r)\| \leq C(r^{s-1} \|x_r - x_j\|)^{\beta+1-\alpha}.$$

Therefore using the sharp form of Whitney's extension (Theorem 24), H can be extended to a map in $\mathcal{H}_{CM}^\eta(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R})$. \blacksquare

C.2 Proof of Lemma 7

Let us first recall a result from Stéphanovitch et al. (2023) showing that we can gain some weak Besov regularity by paying a logarithmic term. For $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, we let $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}, C)$ be the set of functions $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with p -norm $\|f\|_{L^p} := (\int \|f\|^p d\lambda^d)^{1/p}$ bounded by $C > 0$.

Proposition 26 *Let $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}, 1) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and $g \in \mathcal{H}_1^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}, 1)$ with $\gamma > 0$. Then for all $\tau > 0$, $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x)g(x)d\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^d}(x) \leq C \log(\epsilon^{-1})^\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x)\tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{0, -\tau}(g)(x)d\lambda_{\mathbb{R}^d}(x) + C\epsilon$$

for

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{0, -\tau}(g)(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\log(\epsilon^{-1})} \sum_{l=1}^{2^d} \sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (1+j)^{-\tau} \alpha_g(j, l, w) \frac{\alpha_g(j, l, w) \alpha_f(j, l, w)}{|\alpha_g(j, l, w) \alpha_f(j, l, z)|} \psi_{j, l, z}(x).$$

Using Proposition 25, we can extend T into a map belonging to $\mathcal{H}_C^{\beta+1}(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R}^p)$. Let $h \in \mathcal{H}_1^1(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R})$, using Proposition 4 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int (h(x) - h(T(x)))f_\mu(x)d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}}(x) &\leq \int \|x - T(x)\|f_\mu(x)d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}}(x) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{C_i} \|\phi_i(u) - T(\phi_i(u))\| \zeta_i(u) d\lambda^d(u). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\xi \in (0, 1)$ and for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, define

$$X_i(u) = \phi_i(u) - T(\phi_i(u))$$

and $L_i : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ by

$$L_i(u) = \left(\frac{X_i(u)}{\xi} \mathbb{1}_{\{\|X_i(u)\| < \xi\}} + \frac{X_i(u)}{\|X_i(u)\|} \mathbb{1}_{\{\|X_i(u)\| \geq \xi\}} \right) \mathbb{1}_{\{u \in B^d(0, 2\tau)\}}. \quad (29)$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|\phi_i(u) - T(\phi_i(u))\| \zeta_i(u) d\lambda^d(u) \\
 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left\langle \frac{\phi_i(u) - T(\phi_i(u))}{\|\phi_i(u) - T(\phi_i(u))\|}, \phi_i(u) - T(\phi_i(u)) \right\rangle \zeta_i(u) d\lambda^d(u) \\
 &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle L_i(u), X_i(u) \rangle \zeta_i(u) d\lambda^d(u) + \xi.
 \end{aligned}$$

Let us write $K_X = \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, m\}} \|X_i\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\beta+1}} \vee 1 \leq C$ and $\delta_u^i = \|X_i(u)\|$ for $u \in B^d(0, 2\tau)$. We have that $L_i \in \mathcal{H}_1^0(B^d(0, 2\tau), \mathbb{R}^p)$, let us fix $\eta \in (1, \beta + 1]$ and show that L_i has some additional Hölder regularity.

Proposition 27 *For all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and $L_i : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ defined in (29), we have for all $u, v \in B^d(0, 2\tau)$,*

$$\|L_i(u) - L_i(v)\| \leq 8K_X \min(\delta_u^i, \delta_v^i)^{-(1-(\eta-\lfloor\eta\rfloor))} \|u - v\|^{1-(\eta-\lfloor\eta\rfloor)}.$$

Proof Suppose first that $\|u - v\| \geq \min(\delta_u^i, \delta_v^i)/(4K_X)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|L_i(u) - L_i(v)\| &\leq 2 = 2\|u - v\|^{-(1-(\eta-\lfloor\eta\rfloor))} \|u - v\|^{1-(\eta-\lfloor\eta\rfloor)} \\
 &\leq 8K_X \min(\delta_u^i, \delta_v^i)^{-(1-(\eta-\lfloor\eta\rfloor))} \|u - v\|^{1-(\eta-\lfloor\eta\rfloor)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Now if $\|u - v\| \leq \min(\delta_u^i, \delta_v^i)/(4K_X)$, then for $u_s = u + s(v - u)$ with $s \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|X(u_s)\| &\geq \|X_i(u)\| - sK_X\|u - v\| \\
 &\geq \delta_u^i - \frac{1}{4} \min(\delta_u^i, \delta_v^i) \\
 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \min(\delta_u^i, \delta_v^i).
 \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\nabla L_i(u) = \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{\|X_i(u)\| \geq \xi\}}}{\|X_i(u)\|} \left(\nabla X_i(u) - \frac{X_i(u)}{\|X_i(u)\|} \frac{(X_i(u))^\top}{\|X_i(u)\|} \nabla X_i(u) \right) + \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{\|X_i(u)\| < \xi\}}}{\xi} \nabla X_i(u),$$

so $\|\nabla L_i(u)\| \leq K_X \|X_i(u)\|^{-1} = K_X (\delta_u^i)^{-1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|L_i(u) - L_i(v)\| &= \left\| \int_0^1 \nabla L_i(u + s(v - u))(v - u) ds \right\| \\
 &\leq \|v - u\| \int_0^1 \|\nabla L_i(u + s(v - u))\| ds \leq 2K_X \min(\delta_u^i, \delta_v^i)^{-1} \|v - u\| \\
 &\leq 2K_X \min(\delta_u^i, \delta_v^i)^{-(1-(\eta-\lfloor\eta\rfloor))} \|u - v\|^{1-(\eta-\lfloor\eta\rfloor)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

■

We have that $\phi_i|_{B^d(0, \tau)}$ the restriction of ϕ_i to $B^d(0, \tau)$, is a diffeomorphism on its image. For $x \in \phi_i(B^d(0, \tau))$, we will write $\phi_i^{-1}(x)$ for the inverse application of $\phi_i|_{B^d(0, \tau)}$.

Let us define $F_i : T^{-1}(\phi_i(B^d(0, \tau))) \rightarrow B^d(0, \tau)$ by

$$F_i := \phi_i^{-1} \circ T_{|\mathcal{M}}^{-1} \circ T,$$

$$A := \{x \in \mathcal{M}^{\star t} \mid \|x - T(x)\| \leq \|T_{|\mathcal{M}}^{-1} \circ T(x) - T(x)\|\} \quad (30)$$

and $H_i : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$H_i(x) := \left\langle \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i) \circ F_i(x), x - T(x) \right\rangle \zeta_i(F_i(x)) \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{|\mathcal{M}}^{-1} \circ T(x) \in \phi_i(B^d(0, \tau))\}}. \quad (31)$$

We have the following result on L_i, X_i and H_i .

Proposition 28 *For all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle L_i(u), X_i(u) \rangle \zeta_i(u) d\lambda^d(u) \leq C \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2 \left(\int_{\mathcal{M}} H_i(x) d\mu(x) \right)^{\frac{\beta+1}{\beta+\eta}} + C\epsilon.$$

Proof For $r \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, Let

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{0, -2}(L_{i_r})(u) = \sum_{j=0}^{\log(\lfloor \epsilon^{-1} \rfloor)} \sum_{l=1}^{2^d} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (1+j)^{-2} \alpha_{L_{i_r}}(j, l, z) S(j, l, w)_{i_r} \psi_{j_l z}(u)$$

with $S(j, l, w)_{i_r} = \frac{\alpha_{L_{i_r}}(j, l, z) \alpha_{X_i \zeta_i}(j, l, z)_r}{|\alpha_{L_{i_r}}(j, l, z) \alpha_{X_i \zeta_i}(j, l, z)_r|}$. Then using Proposition 26, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle L_i(u), X_i(u) \rangle \zeta_i(u) d\lambda^d(u) \leq C \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{0, -2}(L_i)(u), X_i(u) \rangle \zeta_i(u) d\lambda^d(u) + C\epsilon.$$

Applying Proposition 19 for $h_1 = \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{0, -2}(L_i)$, $h_2 = X_i \zeta_i$, $s_1 = 0$, $b_1 = -2$, $s_2 = \beta + 1$, $b_2 = 0$, $\tau = -\eta + 1$, $t = 1$, $r = 0$ and $q = \frac{\beta+\eta}{\beta+1}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{0, -2}(L_i)(u), X_i(u) \rangle \zeta_i(u) d\lambda^d(u) \\ & \leq \left\langle \tilde{\Gamma}^{-\eta+1}(\tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{0, -2}(L_i)), X_i \zeta_i \right\rangle_{L^2}^{\frac{\beta+1}{\beta+\eta}} \left\langle \tilde{\Gamma}^0(\tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{0, -2}(L_i)), \Gamma^{\beta+1}(X_i \zeta_i) \right\rangle_{L^2}^{\frac{\eta-1}{\beta+\eta}} \\ & \leq \left\langle \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i), X_i \zeta_i \right\rangle_{L^2}^{\frac{\beta+1}{\beta+\eta}} \left\langle \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{0, -2}(L_i), \Gamma^{\beta+1}(X_i \zeta_i) \right\rangle_{L^2}^{\frac{\eta-1}{\beta+\eta}}. \end{aligned}$$

We have that $\Gamma^{\beta+1}(X_i \zeta_i) \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^0(C)$ and $\tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{0, -2}(L_i) \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{0, 2}(C)$ so

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{r=1}^p \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{2^d} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \alpha_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{0, -2}(L_i)}(j, l, z)_r \alpha_{\Gamma^{\beta+1}(X_i \zeta_i)}(j, l, z)_r \\ & \leq \sum_{r=1}^p \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{2^d} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (1+j)^{-2} C 2^{-jd} \mathbb{1}_{\{z \in B^d(0, C)\}} \\ & \leq C \sum_{r=1}^p \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (1+j)^{-2} \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\left\langle \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{0,-2}(L_i), \Gamma^{\beta+1}(X_i \zeta_i) \right\rangle_{L^2}^{\frac{\eta-1}{\beta+\eta}} \leq C.$$

Furthermore, recalling the proof of Proposition 4, we have that $(\phi_i)_{\#} \lambda_{|B^d(0,\tau)}^d = \mu_{|\phi_i(B^d(0,\tau))}$ so

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1,-2}(L_i), X_i \zeta_i \right\rangle_{L^2} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1,-2}(L_i)(u), X_i(u) \rangle \zeta_i(u) d\lambda^d(u) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1,-2}(L_i)(\phi_i^{-1}(x)), x - T(x) \rangle \zeta_i(\phi_i^{-1}(x)) d(\phi_i)_{\#} \lambda_{|B^d(0,\tau)}^d(x) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{M}} H_i(x) d\mu(x). \end{aligned}$$

We can then conclude that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle L_i(u), X_i(u) \rangle \zeta_i(u) d\lambda^d(u) \leq C \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2 \left(\int_{\mathcal{M}} H_i(x) d\mu(x) \right)^{\frac{\beta+1}{\beta+\eta}} + C\epsilon.$$

■

Let us now show that the maps H_i from (31) are of regularity η . To that end, let us first show that $\nabla^{[\eta]} \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1,-2}(L_i)$ exists and has some Hölder regularity.

Lemma 29 *For all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $i_1, \dots, i_{[\eta]} \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and $u \in B^d(0, \tau)$, we have*

$$\|\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{[\eta]}}^{[\eta]} \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1,-2}(L_i)(u)\| \leq CK_X (\delta_u^i)^{-(\lfloor \eta \rfloor + 1 - \eta)},$$

(with $\delta_u^i = \|X_i(u)\|$) and for $u, v \in B^d(0, 2\tau)$ we have

$$\|\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{[\eta]}}^{[\eta]} \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1,-2}(L_i)(u) - \partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{[\eta]}}^{[\eta]} \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1,-2}(L_i)(v)\| \leq CK_X (\delta_u^i \wedge \delta_v^i)^{-1} \|u - v\|^{\eta - \lfloor \eta \rfloor}.$$

Proof For $u \in B^d(0, \tau)$, we shall distinguish whether we have $\delta_u^i > \xi$ or not.

Let us first consider the case $\delta_u^i > \xi$. Define $L_{ui} : B^d(u, \frac{\delta_u^i}{4K_X}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ being equal to L_i . We then extend L_{ui} to \mathbb{R}^d by

$$\bar{L}_{ui}(v) = L_{ui}(\pi_{B_u}(v))(0 \vee (1 - 3\|v - \pi_{B_u}(v)\|)), \quad (32)$$

for π_{B_u} the projection on $B^d(u, \frac{\delta_u^i}{4K_X})$. For all $v \in B^d(u, \frac{\delta_u^i}{4K_X})$, we have $\delta_v^i \geq \delta_u^i/2$ so from Proposition 27 we get

$$L_{ui} \in \mathcal{H}_1^0(B^d(u, \frac{\delta_u^i}{4K_X}), \mathbb{R}^p) \cap \mathcal{H}_{16K_X(\delta_u^i)^{-(1-(\eta-\lfloor \eta \rfloor))}}^{1-(\eta-\lfloor \eta \rfloor)}(B^d(u, \frac{\delta_u^i}{4K_X}), \mathbb{R}^p).$$

Therefore, we also have that

$$\bar{L}_{ui} \in \mathcal{H}_1^0(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p) \cap \mathcal{H}_{16K_X(\delta_u^i)^{-(1-(\eta-\lfloor \eta \rfloor))}}^{1-(\eta-\lfloor \eta \rfloor)}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p).$$

For $r \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, let us write $(\alpha_{\bar{L}_{ui}}(j, l, z)_r)_{(j, l, z)}$ the wavelet coefficients of $(\bar{L}_{ui})_r$. As $\text{support}(\psi_{j,l,z}) \subset B^d(2^{-j}z, C2^{-j})$, we have that for any (j, l, z) such that $j \geq \lfloor \log_2(CK_X(\delta_u^i)^{-1}) \rfloor + 1$ and $\text{support}(\psi_{j,l,z}) \cap B^d(u, \frac{\delta_u^i}{8K_X}) \neq \emptyset$ then $\alpha_{\bar{L}_{ui}}(j, l, z)_i = \alpha_L(j, l, z)_i$. Let us note

$$\xi_u^i = \lfloor \log_2(CK_X(\delta_u^i)^{-1}) \rfloor + 1$$

and

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1, -2}(\bar{L}_{ui})_r(v) = \sum_{j=0}^{\log_2(\epsilon^{-1})} \sum_{l=1}^{2^d} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} 2^{-j(\eta-1)} (1+j)^{-2} S(j, l, z)_{ir} \alpha_{\bar{L}_{ui}}(j, l, z)_r \psi_{j,l,z}(v),$$

the $(\eta - 1, 2)$ wavelet regularization of \bar{L}_{ui} . In particular we have

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1, -2}(\bar{L}_{ui}) \in \mathcal{H}_C^{\eta-1}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p) \cap \mathcal{H}_{CK_X(\delta_u^i)^{-(1-(\eta-\lfloor \eta \rfloor))}}^{[\eta]}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^p).$$

Let $i_1, \dots, i_{[\eta]} \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{[\eta]}}^{[\eta]} \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i)_r(u)| \\ &= |\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{[\eta]}}^{[\eta]} \sum_{j=0}^{\log_2(\epsilon^{-1})} \sum_{l=1}^{2^d} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \alpha_{\tilde{\Gamma}^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i)}(j, l, z)_r \psi_{j,l,z}(u)| \\ &\leq |\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{[\eta]}}^{[\eta]} \sum_{j=0}^{\xi_u^i \wedge \log_2(\epsilon^{-1})} \sum_{l=1}^{2^d} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (\alpha_{\tilde{\Gamma}^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i)}(j, l, z)_r - \alpha_{\tilde{\Gamma}^{-\eta+1, -2}(\bar{L}_{ui})}(j, l, z)_r) \psi_{j,l,z}(u)| \\ &\quad + |\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{[\eta]}}^{[\eta]} \sum_{j=0}^{\xi_u^i \wedge \log_2(\epsilon^{-1})} \sum_{l=1}^{2^d} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \alpha_{\tilde{\Gamma}^{-\eta+1, -2}(\bar{L}_{ui})}(j, l, z)_r \psi_{j,l,z}(u)| \\ &\quad + |\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{[\eta]}}^{[\eta]} \sum_{j=\xi_u^i \wedge \log_2(\epsilon^{-1})+1}^{\log_2(\epsilon^{-1})} \sum_{l=1}^{2^d} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \alpha_{\tilde{\Gamma}^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i)}(j, l, z)_r \psi_{j,l,z}(u)|. \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

For $k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, let us write $\theta_k = \sum_{r=1}^{\lfloor \eta \rfloor} \mathbb{1}_{\{i_r=k\}}$. For the first term of (33) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & |\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{\lfloor \eta \rfloor}}^{\lfloor \eta \rfloor} \sum_{j=0}^{\xi_u^i \wedge \log_2(\epsilon^{-1})} \sum_{l=1}^{2^d} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (\alpha_{\tilde{\Gamma}^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i)}(j, l, z)_r - \alpha_{\tilde{\Gamma}^{-\eta+1, -2}(\bar{L}_{ui})}(j, l, z)_r) \psi_{j, l, z}(u)| \\
 & \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\xi_u^i \wedge \log_2(\epsilon^{-1})} \sum_{l=1}^{2^d} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |(\alpha_{\tilde{\Gamma}^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i)}(j, l, z)_r - \alpha_{\tilde{\Gamma}^{-\eta+1, -2}(\bar{L}_{ui})}(j, l, z)_r) \\
 & \quad \times 2^{j(\lfloor \eta \rfloor + d/2)} \prod_{k=0}^d \partial^{\theta_k} \psi_{l_k}(2^j u_k - z_k)| \\
 & \leq C \sum_{j=0}^{\xi_u^i \wedge \log_2(\epsilon^{-1})} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} 2^{j(\lfloor \eta \rfloor + 1 - \eta)} \left| \prod_{k=0}^d \partial^{\theta_k} \psi_{l_k}(2^j u_k - z_k) \right| \\
 & \leq C \sum_{j=0}^{\xi_u^i \wedge \log_2(\epsilon^{-1})} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} 2^{j(\lfloor \eta \rfloor + 1 - \eta)} C \mathbb{1}_{\{u \in \text{supp}(\psi_{j, l, z})\}} \\
 & \leq C \sum_{j=0}^{\xi_u^i \wedge \log_2(\epsilon^{-1})} 2^{j(\lfloor \eta \rfloor + 1 - \eta)} \leq C 2^{\xi_u^i (\lfloor \eta \rfloor + 1 - \eta)} \leq CK_X (\delta_u^i)^{-(\lfloor \eta \rfloor + 1 - \eta)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

If $\xi_u^i < \log_2(\epsilon^{-1})$, for the second term we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & |\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{\lfloor \eta \rfloor}}^{\lfloor \eta \rfloor} \sum_{j=0}^{\xi_u^i} \sum_{l=1}^{2^d} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \alpha_{\tilde{\Gamma}^{-\eta+1, -2}(\bar{L}_{ui})}(j, l, z)_r \psi_{j, l, z}(u) \\
 & \quad + \partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{\lfloor \eta \rfloor}}^{\lfloor \eta \rfloor} \sum_{j=\xi_u^i+1}^{\log_2(\epsilon^{-1})} \sum_{l=1}^{2^d} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \alpha_{\tilde{\Gamma}^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i)}(j, l, z)_r \psi_{j, l, z}(u)| \\
 & = |\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{\lfloor \eta \rfloor}}^{\lfloor \eta \rfloor} \sum_{j=0}^{\log_2(\epsilon^{-1})} \sum_{l=1}^{2^d} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \alpha_{\tilde{\Gamma}^{-\eta+1, -2}(\bar{L}_{ui})}(j, l, z)_r \psi_{j, l, z}(u)| \\
 & \leq \|\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{\lfloor \eta \rfloor}}^{\lfloor \eta \rfloor} \tilde{\Gamma}^{-\eta+1, -2}(\bar{L}_{ui})_r\|_{\infty} \leq CK_X (\delta_u^i)^{-(\lfloor \eta \rfloor + 1 - \eta)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if $\xi_u^i \geq \log_2(\epsilon^{-1})$ we have that the second term is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
 & |\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{\lfloor \eta \rfloor}}^{\lfloor \eta \rfloor} \sum_{j=0}^{\log_2(\epsilon^{-1})} \sum_{l=1}^{2^d} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \alpha_{\tilde{\Gamma}^{-\eta+1, -2}(\bar{L}_{ui})}(j, l, z)_r \psi_{j, l, z}(u)| \\
 & \leq \|\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{\lfloor \eta \rfloor}}^{\lfloor \eta \rfloor} \tilde{\Gamma}^{-\eta+1, -2}(\bar{L}_{ui})_r\|_{\infty} \leq CK_X (\delta_u^i)^{-(\lfloor \eta \rfloor + 1 - \eta)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Now that we have shown that

$$|\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{\lfloor \eta \rfloor}}^{\lfloor \eta \rfloor} \tilde{\Gamma}_{\epsilon}^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i)_r(u)| \leq CK_X (\delta_u^i)^{-(\lfloor \eta \rfloor + 1 - \eta)}, \quad (34)$$

for $u \in B^d(0, \tau)$ satisfying $\delta_u^i > \xi$, in the case $\delta_u^i \leq \xi$ we have $L_i(u) = X_i(u)$ so it can be treated the same way. Defining L_{ui} coinciding with L_i on $B^d(u, \frac{\xi}{4K_X})$ and doing the same derivations, we also obtain $|\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{[\eta]}}^{[\eta]} \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i)(u)_r| \leq CK_X(\delta_u^i)^{-([\eta]+1-\eta)}$.

Let us now show that for $u, v \in B^d(0, 2\tau)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{[\eta]}}^{[\eta]} \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i)_r(u) - \partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{[\eta]}}^{[\eta]} \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i)_r(v)| \\ & \leq CK_X((\delta_u^i)^{-1} \vee (\delta_v^i)^{-1}) \|u - v\|^{\eta - [\eta]}. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

If $\|u - v\| < \frac{\delta_u^i \wedge \delta_v^i}{8K_X}$, define $L_{i(u,v)}$ coinciding with L on $B^d(\arg \max_{w \in \{u,v\}} \delta_w, \frac{\delta_u^i \vee \delta_v^i}{8K_X})$ and extend it into $\bar{L}_{i(u,v)} : B^d(0, \tau) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ by projection as we did with L_{ui} in (32). Otherwise, if $\|u - v\| \geq \frac{\delta_u^i \wedge \delta_v^i}{8K_X}$, define $L_{i(u,v)}$ coinciding with L on $B^d(u, \frac{\delta_u^i \wedge \delta_v^i}{32K_X}) \cup B^d(v, \frac{\delta_u^i \wedge \delta_v^i}{32K_X})$. Then, we have $L_{i(u,v)} \in \mathcal{H}_{CK_X(\delta_u^i)^{-1} \vee (\delta_v^i)^{-1}}^1$ and we can extend it by projection on the balls as we did with L_{ui} in (32):

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{L}_{i(u,v)}(w) &= L_{i(u,v)}(\pi_{B_u}(w))(0 \vee (1 - 32K_X(\delta_u^i)^{-1})\|w - \pi_{B_u}(w)\|) \\ & \quad + L_{i(u,v)}(\pi_{B_v}(w))(0 \vee (1 - 32K_X(\delta_v^i)^{-1})\|w - \pi_{B_v}(w)\|). \end{aligned}$$

We also have $\bar{L}_{i(u,v)} \in \mathcal{H}_{C(\delta_u^i)^{-1} \vee (\delta_v^i)^{-1}}^1$. Then by splitting the wavelets coefficients of $\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{[\eta]}}^{[\eta]} \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i)_r(u) - \partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{[\eta]}}^{[\eta]} \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i)_r(v)$ as in (33), we obtain (35). \blacksquare

Using Lemma 29, we obtain that the maps H_i from (31) are of regularity η .

Proposition 30 *For all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, the application H_i belongs to $\mathcal{H}_C^\eta(A, \mathbb{R})$.*

Proof Define

$$F_i := \phi_i^{-1} \circ T_{|\mathcal{M}}^{-1} \circ T \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_i := \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{|\mathcal{M}}^{-1} \circ T(\cdot) \in \phi_i|_{B^d(0, \tau)}\}} \zeta_i \circ F_i.$$

We have $F_i \in \mathcal{H}_C^{\beta+1}(A, \mathbb{R}^d)$ and as $\text{supp}(\zeta_i) \subset B^d(0, \tau)$, the application σ_i belongs to $\mathcal{H}_C^{\beta+1}(A, \mathbb{R}^p)$. Furthermore, we have $(\text{Id} - T) \in \mathcal{H}_C^{\beta+1}(A, \mathbb{R}^p)$ and $\tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i) \in \mathcal{H}_C^{\eta-1}(B^d(0, \tau), \mathbb{R}^p)$, so we get from the Faa di Bruno formula that $H_i \in \mathcal{H}_C^{\eta-1}(A, \mathbb{R})$. Let $i_1, \dots, i_{[\eta]} \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ and write $P(\{i_1, \dots, i_{[\eta]}\})$ the set of subsets of $\{i_1, \dots, i_{[\eta]}\}$. For $x \in A$, we have

$$\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{[\eta]}}^{[\eta]} H_i(x) = \sum_{S \in P(\{i_1, \dots, i_{[\eta]}\})} \left\langle \partial_{i \in S}^{|S|} (\tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i) \circ F_i)(x), \partial_{i \notin S}^{[\eta] - |S|} ((\text{Id} - T)\sigma_i)(x) \right\rangle.$$

For all $S \in P(\{i_1, \dots, i_{[\eta]}\})$ with $|S| < [\eta]$, we have that

$$x \mapsto \left\langle \partial_{i \in S}^{|S|} (\tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i) \circ F_i)(x), \partial_{i \notin S}^{[\eta] - |S|} ((\text{Id} - T)\sigma_i)(x) \right\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_C^{\eta - [\eta]}(A, \mathbb{R}).$$

From the previous calculations, we know that

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{\lfloor \eta \rfloor}}^{[\eta]} \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i)(F_i(x))| &\leq CK_X \delta_{F_i(x)}^{i - (\lfloor \eta \rfloor + 1 - \eta)} \\
 &= CK_X \|T_{|\mathcal{M}}^{-1} \circ T(x) - T(T_{|\mathcal{M}}^{-1} \circ T(x))\|^{-(\lfloor \eta \rfloor + 1 - \eta)} \\
 &= CK_X \|T_{|\mathcal{M}}^{-1} \circ T(x) - T(x)\|^{-(\lfloor \eta \rfloor + 1 - \eta)} \\
 &\leq C \|x - T(x)\|^{-(\lfloor \eta \rfloor + 1 - \eta)},
 \end{aligned}$$

so

$$\left| \left\langle \partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{\lfloor \eta \rfloor}}^{[\eta]} (\tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i) \circ F_i)(x), (\text{Id} - T)\sigma_i(x) \right\rangle \right| \leq C \|x - T(x)\|^{\eta - \lfloor \eta \rfloor} \sigma_i(x). \quad (36)$$

Let $x, y \in A$ with $T_{|\mathcal{M}}^{-1} \circ T(x), T_{|\mathcal{M}}^{-1} \circ T(y) \in \phi_i(B^d(0, \tau))$ and $\|x - T(x)\| \leq \|y - T(y)\|$, from (35) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\left| \left\langle \partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{\lfloor \eta \rfloor}}^{[\eta]} (\tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i) \circ F_i)(x), (\text{Id} - T)\sigma_i(x) \right\rangle \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - \left\langle \partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{\lfloor \eta \rfloor}}^{[\eta]} (\tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i) \circ F_i)(y), (\text{Id} - T)\sigma_i(y) \right\rangle \right| \\
 &\leq \left| \left\langle \partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{\lfloor \eta \rfloor}}^{[\eta]} (\tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i) \circ F_i)(x) - \partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{\lfloor \eta \rfloor}}^{[\eta]} (\tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i) \circ F_i)(y), (\text{Id} - T)\sigma_i(x) \right\rangle \right| \\
 &\quad + \left| \left\langle \partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{\lfloor \eta \rfloor}}^{[\eta]} (\tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i) \circ F_i)(y), (\text{Id} - T)\sigma_i(x) - (\text{Id} - T)\sigma_i(y) \right\rangle \right| \\
 &\leq C \min(\|x - T(x)\|, \|y - T(y)\|)^{-1} \|x - y\|^{\eta - \lfloor \eta \rfloor} \|x - T(x)\| \\
 &\quad + C \|T_{|\mathcal{M}}^{-1} \circ T(y) - T(y)\|^{-(1 - (\eta - \lfloor \eta \rfloor))} \|(\text{Id} - T)\sigma_i(x) - (\text{Id} - T)\sigma_i(y)\| \\
 &\leq C \|x - y\|^{\eta - \lfloor \eta \rfloor} + C \|T_{|\mathcal{M}}^{-1} \circ T(y) - T(y)\|^{-(1 - (\eta - \lfloor \eta \rfloor))} \|(\text{Id} - T)\sigma_i(x) - (\text{Id} - T)\sigma_i(y)\|.
 \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\|(\text{Id} - T)\sigma_i(x) - (\text{Id} - T)\sigma_i(y)\| \\
 &= \|(\text{Id} - T)\sigma_i(x) - (\text{Id} - T)\sigma_i(y)\|^{1 - (\eta - \lfloor \eta \rfloor)} \|(\text{Id} - T)\sigma_i(x) - (\text{Id} - T)\sigma_i(y)\|^{\eta - \lfloor \eta \rfloor} \\
 &\leq (\|(\text{Id} - T)(x)\| + \|(\text{Id} - T)(y)\|)^{1 - (\eta - \lfloor \eta \rfloor)} \|x - y\|^{\eta - \lfloor \eta \rfloor} \\
 &\leq 2 \|(\text{Id} - T)(y)\|^{1 - (\eta - \lfloor \eta \rfloor)} \|x - y\|^{\eta - \lfloor \eta \rfloor} \\
 &\leq 2 \|T_{|\mathcal{M}}^{-1} \circ T(y) - T(y)\|^{1 - (\eta - \lfloor \eta \rfloor)} \|x - y\|^{\eta - \lfloor \eta \rfloor}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Now if $T_{|\mathcal{M}}^{-1} \circ T(x) \in \phi_i(B^d(0, \tau))$ and $T_{|\mathcal{M}}^{-1} \circ T(y) \notin \phi_i(B^d(0, \tau))$, we have from (36),

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left| \left\langle \partial_{i_1, \dots, i_{\lfloor \eta \rfloor}}^{[\eta]} (\tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{-\eta+1, -2}(L_i) \circ F_i)(x), (\text{Id} - T)\sigma_i(x) \right\rangle \right| &\leq C \|x - T(x)\|^{\eta - \lfloor \eta \rfloor} \sigma_i(x) \\
 &\leq C \sigma_i(x) \\
 &= C (\sigma_i(x) - \sigma_i(y)) \\
 &\leq C \|x - y\|.
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have finally that $H_i \in \mathcal{H}_C^\eta(A, \mathbb{R})$. ■

Let us now prove that we can extend H to the whole \mathbb{R}^p space using our extension result for maps defined on the neighborhood of a submanifold (Proposition 25). Define $D : \mathcal{M}^{\star t} \rightarrow A$ by

$$D(x) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x \in A \\ \frac{x-T(x)}{\|x-T(x)\|} \|T_{|\mathcal{M}}^{-1} \circ T(x) - T(x)\| + T(x) & \text{if } x \notin A. \end{cases}$$

For $x \notin A$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla D(x) &= \frac{\|T_{|\mathcal{M}}^{-1} \circ T(x) - T(x)\|}{\|x - T(x)\|} \left(\nabla(\text{Id} - T)(x) - \frac{x - T(x)}{\|x - T(x)\|} \frac{(x - T(x))^\top}{\|x - T(x)\|} \nabla(\text{Id} - T)(x) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{x - T(x)}{\|x - T(x)\|} \frac{(x - T(x))^\top}{\|x - T(x)\|} \nabla(T_{|\mathcal{M}}^{-1} \circ T - T)(x) + \nabla T(x), \end{aligned}$$

so $\|\nabla D(x)\| \leq C$. Then using Proposition 25, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, H_i can be extended to a map in $\mathcal{H}_C^\eta(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R})$.

We can now conclude the proof of Lemma 7 using Proposition 28 as

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} H_i(x) d\mu(x) \leq C \sup_{f \in \mathcal{H}_1^\eta, f_{|\mathcal{M}^\star} = 0} \int_{\mathcal{M}} f(x) d\mu(x).$$

C.3 Proof of Lemma 8

Proof Let T be the $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^\star)$ -compatible map given by Theorem 6. As $T_{|\mathcal{M}}^{-1} \in \mathcal{H}_C^{\beta+1}(\mathcal{M}^\star, \mathcal{M})$, we have that $T_{\#\mu}$ admits a density $f_T \in \mathcal{H}_C^\beta(\mathcal{M}^\star, \mathbb{R})$ with respect to the volume measure on \mathcal{M}^\star . For $t \geq C^{-1}$ the radius of compatibility of the map T (see Definition 4) define the t -envelope of f_T and f_{μ^\star} as:

$$f_T^t(x) = \frac{f_T(T(x)) \Theta(4\|x - T(x)\|^2/t^2) |\text{ap}_d(\nabla T(x))|}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{p-d}} \Theta(4\|y\|^2/t^2) d\lambda^{p-d}(y)}$$

and

$$f_{\mu^\star}^t(x) = \frac{f_{\mu^\star}(T(x)) \Theta(4\|x - T(x)\|^2/t^2) |\text{ap}_d(\nabla T(x))|}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{p-d}} \Theta(4\|y\|^2/t^2) d\lambda^{p-d}(y)}$$

for ap_d the approximate jacobian defined in Definition 6 and $\Theta \in \mathcal{H}_C^\beta(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}_+)$ such that $\Theta(x) = \Theta(-x)$, $\Theta(0) = 1$ and $\Theta_{|(1,\infty)} = 0$.

As $\nabla T \in \mathcal{H}_K^\beta(\mathbb{R}^p, L(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R}^p))$ and $\text{ap}_d(\nabla T(x))$ is bounded below by K_T^{-1} (T verifies point (iv) of Definition 4), then from the Faa di Bruno formula, we deduce that $\text{ap}_d(\nabla T)$ belongs to $\mathcal{H}_C^\beta(\mathcal{M}^{\star t}, \mathbb{R})$. Let $h \in \mathcal{H}_K^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R})$ and define $\bar{h} : \mathcal{M}^{\star t} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\bar{h}(x) = h(T(x)) \kappa(2\|x - T(x)\|^2/t^2),$$

for $\kappa \in \mathcal{H}_C^\gamma(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ such that $\kappa_{|(-\infty, 1/2)} = 1$ and $\kappa_{|(1,\infty)} = 0$. Then $\bar{h} \in \mathcal{H}_C^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R})$ and from Proposition 21 we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\mathcal{M}} h(T(x))d\mu(x) - \int_{\mathcal{M}^*} h(x)d\mu^*(x) = \int_{\mathcal{M}^*} h(x)(f_T(x) - f_{\mu^*}(x))d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}^*}(x) \\
 & = \int_{\mathcal{M}^*} \frac{h(x)(f_T(x) - f_{\mu^*}(x))}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{p-d}} \Theta(4\|y\|^2/t^2)d\lambda^{p-d}(y)} \int_{T^{-1}(\{x\})} \Theta(4\|z - T(z)\|^2/t^2)d\lambda^{p-d}(z)d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}^*}(x) \\
 & = \int_{\mathcal{M}^*} \int_{T^{-1}(\{x\})} \frac{h(T(z))(f_T(T(z)) - f_{\mu^*}(T(z)))\Theta(4\|z - T(z)\|^2/t^2)}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{p-d}} \Theta(4\|y\|^2/t^2)d\lambda^{p-d}(y)} d\lambda^{p-d}(z)d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}^*}(x) \\
 & = \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} h(T(x))(f_T^t(T(x)) - f_{\mu^*}^t(T(x)))d\lambda^p(x) \\
 & = \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \bar{h}(x)(f_T^t(x) - f_{\mu^*}^t(x))d\lambda^p(x).
 \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{0,-2}(\bar{h})(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\log(\lfloor \epsilon^{-1} \rfloor)} \sum_{l=1}^{2^d} \sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^p} (1+j)^{-2} S(j,l,w) \alpha_{\bar{h}}(j,l,w) \psi_{jlw}(x)$$

for $S(j,l,w) = \frac{\alpha_{\bar{h}}(j,l,w)(\alpha_{f_T^t}(j,l,w) - \alpha_{f_{\mu^*}^t}(j,l,w))}{|\alpha_{\bar{h}}(j,l,w)(\alpha_{f_T^t}(j,l,w) - \alpha_{f_{\mu^*}^t}(j,l,w))|}$. Then using Proposition 26, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \bar{h}(x)(f_T^t(x) - f_{\mu^*}^t(x))d\lambda^p(x) \leq C \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{0,-2}(\bar{h})(f_T^t(x) - f_{\mu^*}^t(x))d\lambda^p(x) + C\epsilon.$$

Applying Proposition 19 for $h_1 = \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{0,-2}(\bar{h})$, $h_2 = f_T^t - f_{\mu^*}^t$, $s_1 = \gamma$, $b_1 = 2$, $s_2 = \beta$, $b_2 = 0$, $\tau = \gamma - \eta$, $t = 1$, $r = \frac{\gamma}{\beta + \gamma}$ and $q = \frac{\beta + \eta}{\beta + \gamma}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \bar{h}^\epsilon(x)(f_T^t(x) - f_{\mu^*}^t(x))d\lambda^p(x) \\
 & \leq \left\langle \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{\gamma-\eta,-2}(\bar{h}), f_T^t - f_{\mu^*}^t \right\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^p)}^{\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\eta}} \left\langle \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{\gamma,-2}(\bar{h}), \Gamma^\beta(f_T^t - f_{\mu^*}^t) \right\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^p)}^{\frac{\eta-\gamma}{\beta+\eta}}
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{2^p} \sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^p} 2^{j(\beta+\gamma)} |\alpha_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{0,-2}(\bar{h})}(j,l,w)| |\alpha_{f_T}(j,l,w) - \alpha_{f_{\mu^*}}(j,l,w)| \\
 & \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{2^d} \sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^p} (1+j)^{-2} C 2^{-jp} \mathbf{1}_{\{supp(\psi_{jlw} \cap B^p(0,K)) \neq \emptyset\}} \\
 & \leq C \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (1+j)^{-2} \leq C.
 \end{aligned}$$

Define $F_h : \mathcal{M}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$F_h(x) = \int_{T^{-1}(\{x\})} \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{\gamma-\eta,-2}(\bar{h})(z) \frac{\Theta(4\|z - T(z)\|^2/t^2)}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{p-d}} \Theta(4\|y\|^2/t^2)d\lambda^{p-d}(y)} d\lambda_{T^{-1}(\{x\})}(z).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{\gamma-\eta, -2}(\bar{h})(x)(f_T^t(x) - f_{\mu^*}^t(x))d\lambda^p(x) \\
 &= \int_{\mathcal{M}^*} \int_{T^{-1}(\{x\})} \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{\gamma-\eta, -2}(\bar{h})(z)(f_T^t(z) - f_{\mu^*}^t(z))|\text{ap}_d(\nabla T(z))|^{-1}d\lambda^{p-d}(z)d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}^*}(x) \\
 &= \int_{\mathcal{M}^*} \int_{T^{-1}(\{x\})} \tilde{\Gamma}_\epsilon^{\gamma-\eta, -2}(\bar{h})(z) \frac{(f_T(T(z)) - f_{\mu^*}(T(z)))\Theta(4\frac{\|z-T(z)\|^2}{t^2})}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{p-d}} \Theta(4\|y\|^2/t^2)d\lambda^{p-d}(y)}d\lambda^{p-d}(z)d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}^*}(x) \\
 &= \int_{\mathcal{M}^*} F_h(x)(f_T(x) - f_{\mu^*}(x))d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}^*}(x).
 \end{aligned}$$

As T verifies point iii) of Definition 4, we have $F_h \in \mathcal{H}_C^\eta(\mathcal{M}^*, \mathbb{R})$ so it can be extended using Proposition 25 to a map in $\mathcal{H}_C^\eta(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R})$. Then, we can conclude that

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}^*} h(x)(f_T(x) - f_{\mu^*}(x))d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}^*}(x) \leq C \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_1^\eta} \left(\int_{\mathcal{M}^*} h(x)(f_T(x) - f_{\mu^*}(x))d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}^*}(x) \right)^{\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\eta}}.$$

■

C.4 Proof of Theorem 9

Proof Let C_η the constant given by Theorem 6 such that if

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq C_\eta^{-1},$$

then there exists a map T being $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*)$ -compatible.

Suppose first that $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*) > C_\eta^{-1}$, then

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq 2K \leq 2KC_\eta d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq C d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\eta}}.$$

Suppose now that $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq C_\eta^{-1}$. Using Corollary 20 we have for all $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq C \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2 d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\eta-\gamma}{\eta-1}} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\eta-1}} + \epsilon. \quad (37)$$

Suppose first that $\eta \leq \beta + 1$. Using lemmas 7 and 8 we have

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq C \log(\epsilon^{-1})^4 \left(\sup_{\substack{h \in \mathcal{H}_1^\eta \\ h|_{\mathcal{M}^*} = 0}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{M}} h(x)d\mu(x) \right)^{\frac{\beta+1}{\beta+\eta}} + d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(T_{\#}\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\beta+1}{\beta+\eta}} \right) + \epsilon.$$

On one hand we have

$$\sup_{\substack{h \in \mathcal{H}_1^\eta \\ h|_{\mathcal{M}^*} = 0}} \int_{\mathcal{M}} h(x)d\mu(x) \leq \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_1^\eta} \int_{\mathcal{M}} h(x)d\mu(x) - \int_{\mathcal{M}^*} h(x)d\mu^*(x) = d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*),$$

on the other hand

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(T_{\#\mu}, \mu^*) = \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_1^\eta} \int_{\mathcal{M}} h(T(x)) d\mu(x) - \int_{\mathcal{M}^*} h(T(x)) d\mu^*(x) \leq C d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*),$$

as any map $h \circ T \in \mathcal{H}_C^\eta(\mathcal{M}^{*t/4}, \mathbb{R})$ can be extended to a map in $\mathcal{H}_C^\eta(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R})$ using Proposition 25. Therefore, we have

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq C \log(\epsilon^{-1})^4 d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\beta+1}{\beta+\eta}} + \epsilon.$$

Then plugging this in (37) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}(\mu, \mu^*) &\leq C \log(\epsilon^{-1})^6 d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\beta+1}{\beta+\eta} \frac{\eta-\gamma}{\eta-1} + \frac{\gamma-1}{\eta-1}} + \epsilon \\ &= C \log(\epsilon^{-1})^6 d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\eta}} + \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

so taking $\epsilon = d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\eta}}$, we get the result.

Now if $\eta > \beta + 1$, using lemmas 7 and 8 we have again

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu, \mu^*) &\leq d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu, T_{\#\mu}) + d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(T_{\#\mu}, \mu^*) \\ &\leq C \log(\epsilon^{-1})^4 d_{\mathcal{H}_1^{\beta+1}}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\beta+1}{2\beta+1}} + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

And using again Corollary 20 we have

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^{\beta+1}}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq C \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2 d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\eta-(\beta+1)}{\eta-1}} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\beta}{\eta-1}} + \epsilon$$

so

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq C \log(\epsilon^{-1})^6 d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\eta-(\beta+1)}{\eta-1} \frac{\beta+1}{2\beta+1}} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\beta}{\eta-1} \frac{\beta+1}{2\beta+1}} + \epsilon.$$

Then, taking $\epsilon = d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu, \mu^*) d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)$, we have

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq C \log(d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{-1})^6 d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\eta-(\beta+1)}{\eta-1} \frac{\beta+1}{2\beta+1}} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\beta}{\eta-1} \frac{\beta+1}{2\beta+1}},$$

which gives

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu, \mu^*)^{(\eta-1)(2\beta+1) - (\eta-1-\beta)(\beta+1)} \leq C \log(d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{-1})^{6(\eta-1)(2\beta+1)} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\beta(\beta+1)}.$$

As $(\eta-1)(2\beta+1) - (\eta-1-\beta)(\beta+1) = \beta(\eta+\beta)$ we obtain

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^1}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq C \log(d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{-1})^{6 \frac{(\eta-1)(2\beta+1)}{\beta(\eta+\beta)}} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\beta+1}{\beta+\eta}}.$$

Then plugging this result in (37), we obtain for $\epsilon = d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}(\mu, \mu^*) &\leq C \log(d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{-1})^{C_2} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\beta+1}{\beta+\eta} \frac{\eta-\gamma}{\eta-1} + \frac{\gamma-1}{\eta-1}} \\ &= C \log(d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{-1})^{C_2} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)^{\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\eta}}. \end{aligned}$$

■

C.5 Proof of Proposition 10

Proof As explained at the beginning of the proof of Theorem 9, we can suppose that the distance $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)$ is small enough so that there exists a $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*)$ -compatible map T . We have

$$d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}(\mu, \mu^*) \leq d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}(\mu, T_{\#\mu}) + d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}(T_{\#\mu}, \mu^*)$$

Using Lemma 8 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}(T_{\#\mu}, \mu^*) &\leq C \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2 d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(T_{\#\mu}, \mu^*)^{\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\eta}} + \epsilon \\ &\leq C d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(T_{\#\mu}, \mu^*)^{\frac{\gamma}{\eta}} \end{aligned}$$

for $\epsilon = d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(T_{\#\mu}, \mu^*)^{\frac{\gamma}{\eta}}$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\gamma}(\mu, T_{\#\mu}) &= \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_1^\gamma} \int_{\mathcal{M}} (h(x) - h(T(x))) f_\mu(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}}(x) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{M}} \|x - T(x)\|^\gamma f_\mu(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}}(x) \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\mathcal{M}} \|x - T(x)\|^\eta f_\mu(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}}(x) \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{\eta}} \end{aligned}$$

using Jensen's inequality. The function $H : \mathcal{M}^{st} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$H(x) = \|x - T(x)\|^\eta,$$

belongs to $\mathcal{H}_C^\eta(\mathcal{M}^{st}, \mathbb{R})$ and can therefore be extended to a map in $\mathcal{H}_C^\eta(\mathbb{R}^p, \mathbb{R})$ using Proposition 25. ■

C.6 Proof of Proposition 12

Proof Let $s \in (0, r_{\mathcal{M}^*})$, we are going to show that $W_1(\mu, \mu^*)$ is bounded below which will give us that $d_{\mathcal{H}_1^\eta}(\mu, \mu^*)$ is also bounded below by Lemma 5.

Suppose first that $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*) > s$ and for $y \in \mathcal{M}^*$ such that $d(y, \mathcal{M}) \geq s$, define $D_s^y : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$D_s^y(x) = (s - \|x - y\|) \vee 0.$$

As D_s is 1-Lipschitz, we have

$$\begin{aligned} W_1(\mu, \mu^*) &\geq \left(\int_{\mathcal{M}^*} D_s^y(x) f_{\mu^*}(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}^*}(x) - \int_{\mathcal{M}} D_s^y(x) f_\mu(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}}(x) \right) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{M}^* \cap B^p(y, s)} (s - \|x - y\|) f_{\mu^*}(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}^*} \\ &\geq C s^d K^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

which gives the result. Now if $\mathbb{H}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}^*) \leq s$, by Lemma 22 we have that for $s > 0$ small enough, π the canonical projection onto \mathcal{M}^* , is a diffeomorphism from \mathcal{M} to \mathcal{M}^* . Let be $z \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $f_\mu(z) \leq s$. Define $D_s^z : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$D_s(x) = \left(\frac{s}{2} \wedge (s - \|x - \pi(z)\|)\right) \vee 0.$$

As D_s is 1-Lipschitz, we have

$$W_1(\mu, \mu^*) \geq \int_{\mathcal{M}^*} D_s^z(x) f_{\mu^*}(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}^*}(x) - \int_{\mathcal{M}} D_s^z(x) f_\mu(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}}(x)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{M}^*} D_s^z(x) f_{\mu^*}(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}^*}(x) &= \int_{\mathcal{M}^* \cap B^p(\pi(z), s)} \frac{s}{2} \wedge (s - \|x - \pi(z)\|) f_{\mu^*}(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}^*}(x) \\ &\geq \int_{\mathcal{M}^* \cap B^p(\pi(z), s/2)} \frac{s}{2} f_{\mu^*}(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}^*}(x) \\ &\geq C s^{d+1} K^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{M}} D_s^z(x) f_\mu(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}}(x) &= \int_{\mathcal{M} \cap B^p(\pi(z), s)} \frac{s}{2} \wedge (s - \|x - \pi(z)\|) f_\mu(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}}(x) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{M} \cap B^p(\pi(z), s)} s f_\mu(x) d\lambda_{\mathcal{M}}(x) \\ &= s \int_{\varphi_x(\mathcal{M} \cap B^p(\pi(z), s))} f_\mu(\varphi_x^{-1}(u)) d\varphi_{x\#} \lambda_{\mathcal{M}}(u) \\ &\leq s \int_{B^d(\varphi_x(z), 2s)} f_\mu(\varphi_x^{-1}(u)) K^d d\lambda^d(u) \\ &\leq C s \int_{B^d(\varphi_x(\pi(z)), 2s)} (f_\mu(z) + K \|\varphi_x^{-1}(z) - u\|) d\lambda^d(u) \\ &\leq C s \int_{B^d(\varphi_x(\pi(z)), 2s)} (1 + 2K) s d\lambda^d(u) \\ &\leq C s^{d+2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have

$$W_1(\mu, \mu^*) \geq C s^{d+1} (1 - C_2 s),$$

so for s small enough we get the result. ■

C.7 Additional proofs from Section 3.1

C.7.1 PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2

Proof Using (6), we are looking for the smallest $q \in (0, 1)$ such that $d_{\mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{s-\frac{q^*}{q}, \tau}}(f, f^*)$ is finite.

Taking $f, f^* \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{\beta, 2}$ compactly supported in $B^p(0, K)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& d_{\mathcal{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{s-\frac{q^*}{q}\tau}}(f, f^*) \\
&= \sup_{h \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{s-\frac{q^*}{q}\tau}(1)} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{2^p} \sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^p} \alpha_h(j, l, w) (\alpha_f(j, l, w) - \alpha_{f^*}(j, l, w)) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{2^p} \sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^p} 2^{-j(s-\frac{q^*}{q}\tau+p/2)} \alpha_h(j, l, w) |\alpha_f(j, l, w) - \alpha_{f^*}(j, l, w)| \\
&\leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{2^p} \sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^p} 2^{-j(s-\frac{q^*}{q}\tau+p/2)} 2^{-j(\beta+p/2)} (1+j)^{-2} \|f - f^*\|_{\mathcal{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{\beta,2}} \mathbb{1}_{\{supp(\psi_{jlw}) \cap B^p(0,K) \neq \emptyset\}} \\
&\leq C \|f - f^*\|_{\mathcal{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{\beta,2}} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{-j(s-\frac{q^*}{q}\tau+\beta)} (1+j)^{-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

The last quantity is finite iff $\beta \geq \frac{q^*}{q}\tau - s$ which gives $\frac{1}{q} \leq \frac{\beta+s}{\beta+s+\tau}$. ■

C.7.2 PROOF OF THEOREM 3

Proof Using lemma 1 we have that $f - f^* \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{\beta}(C)$ and $h \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{\gamma}(C)$, then for $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} h(x) (f(x) - f^*(x)) d\lambda^p(x) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{2^p} \sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^p} \alpha_h(j, l, w) (\alpha_f(j, l, w) - \alpha_{f^*}(j, l, w)) \\
&\leq \sum_{j=0}^{\log_2(\epsilon^{-1})} \sum_{l=1}^{2^p} \sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^p} \alpha_h(j, l, w) (\alpha_f(j, l, w) - \alpha_{f^*}(j, l, w)) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=\log_2(\epsilon^{-1})+1}^{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{2^p} \sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^p} 2^{-j(\gamma+\beta+p)} \mathbb{1}_{\{supp(\psi_{jlw}) \cap B^p(0,K) \neq \emptyset\}} \\
&\leq \log_2(\epsilon^{-1})^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\log_2(\epsilon^{-1})} \sum_{l=1}^{2^p} \sum_{w \in \mathbb{Z}^p} (1+j)^{-2} |\alpha_h(j, l, w) (\alpha_f(j, l, w) - \alpha_{f^*}(j, l, w))| \\
&\quad + C\epsilon^{\gamma+\beta} \\
&\leq C \log_2(\epsilon^{-1})^2 d_{\mathcal{B}_{\infty,\infty}^{\gamma}(1)}(\Gamma^{0,-2}(f), \Gamma^{0,-2}(f^*)) + C\epsilon^{\gamma+\beta}.
\end{aligned}$$

As $f, f^* \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{\beta, 2}(C)$, we can now use Proposition 2 and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{\gamma}(1)}(\Gamma^{0, -2}(f), \Gamma^{0, -2}(f^*)) &\leq C d_{\mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{\alpha}(1)}(\Gamma^{0, -2}(f), \Gamma^{0, -2}(f^*))^{\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\alpha}} \\ &= d_{\mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^{\gamma, 2}(1)}(f, f^*)^{\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\alpha}} \\ &\leq C d_{\mathcal{H}_C^{\gamma}}(f, f^*)^{\frac{\beta+\gamma}{\beta+\alpha}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 1 for the last inequality. Putting everything together and taking $\epsilon = d_{\mathcal{H}_1^{\alpha}}(f, f^*) \wedge 1/2$ we obtain the result. \blacksquare