

# Singular extension of critical Sobolev mappings with values into complete Riemannian manifolds

Federico Luigi Dipasquale

## Abstract

Triggered by a recent criterion, due to A. Petrunin [17], to check if a complete, non-compact, Riemannian manifold admits an isometric embedding into a Euclidean space with positive reach, we extend to manifolds with such property the singular extension results of B. Bulanyi and J. Van Schaftingen [5] for maps in the critical, nonlinear Sobolev space  $W^{m/(m+1),m+1}(X^m, \mathcal{N})$ , where  $m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}$  is a compact Riemannian manifold, and  $X^m$  is either the sphere  $\mathbb{S}^m = \partial\mathbb{B}_+^{m+1}$ , the plane  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , or again  $\mathbb{S}^m$  but seen as the boundary sphere of the Poincaré ball model of the hyperbolic space  $\mathbb{H}^{m+1}$ . As in [5], we obtain that the extended maps satisfy an exponential weak-type Sobolev-Marcinkiewicz estimate. Finally, we provide some illustrative examples.

## Introduction

The purpose of this note is to point out explicitly some direct consequences of the proof of the singular extensions theorems in [5], as well as their connections with a recent, sufficient criterion [17] to establish if a complete Riemannian manifold  $\mathcal{N}$  admits an isometric Euclidean embedding with positive reach. We recall that the *reach* of a submanifold  $\mathcal{S}$  of  $\mathbb{R}^\nu$  is the supremum of the sizes of the tubular neighbourhoods of  $\mathcal{S}$  on which the nearest-point projection is well-defined. In the following, we will denote  $\text{reach } \mathcal{N}$  the reach of a Euclidean isometric embedding of  $\mathcal{N}$ .

To see in which way the notion of reach is connected with the results in [5], we recall that in [5, Theorem 1.1], B. Bulanyi and J. Van Schaftingen proved that, if  $\mathcal{N}$  is *any* compact, smooth Riemannian manifold isometrically embedded in  $\mathbb{R}^\nu$ , for some  $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ , via Nash's theorem, then any map  $u$  in the critical, nonlinear Sobolev space  $W^{m/(m+1),m+1}(\mathbb{S}^m, \mathcal{N})$  can be extended to a map  $U \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(\mathbb{B}_1^{m+1}, \mathcal{N})$  whose trace on  $\mathbb{S}^m$  is  $u$  and satisfying the following weak-type exponential Marcinkiewicz-Sobolev estimate: for every  $t \in (0, \infty)$ ,

$$(1) \quad t^{m+1} \mathcal{L}^{m+1}(\{x \in \mathbb{B}_1^{m+1} \mid |Du(x)| \geq t\}) \\ \leq A \exp\left(B \iint_{\substack{(x,y) \in \mathbb{S}^m \times \mathbb{S}^m \\ d(u(x), u(y)) \geq \delta}} \frac{1}{|x-y|^{2m}} dx dy\right) \iint_{\mathbb{S}^m \times \mathbb{S}^m} \frac{d(u(x), u(y))^{m+1}}{|x-y|^{2m}} dx dy.$$

Here,  $A$  is a constant depending only on  $m$ ,  $B$  depends only on  $m$  and on the ratio  $\text{diam } \mathcal{N} / \text{reach } \mathcal{N}$ , and  $\delta$  depends only on  $m$  and on  $\text{reach } \mathcal{N}$  (in fact, it is the ratio of a dimensional constant and

reach  $\mathcal{N}$ ; we recall that, for compact  $\mathcal{N}$ ,  $\text{reach } \mathcal{N}$  is strictly positive). The estimate (1) is then extended to the case in which  $\mathbb{S}^m$  is replaced by  $\mathbb{R}^m$  and  $\mathbb{B}_1^{m+1}$  by  $\mathbb{R}_+^{m+1}$  and to the case in which  $\mathbb{S}^m$  is seen as the boundary sphere<sup>1</sup> of the Poincaré ball model of the hyperbolic space  $\mathbb{H}^{m+1}$ . (See, respectively, Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 in [5].)

We recall that, for  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$  an open set and for a Riemannian manifold  $\mathcal{N}$ , viewed as a submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^\nu$  thanks to Nash's theorem, the space  $W^{1,p}(\Omega, \mathcal{N})$  is usually defined as

$$W^{1,p}(\Omega, \mathcal{N}) := \{U \in W^{1,p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^\nu) : U(x) \in \mathcal{N} \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega\}.$$

In case  $\mathcal{N}$  is complete, it is known that this definition does not depend on the choice of the isometric Euclidean embedding (e.g., [3, Proposition 2.1]). In particular, one immediately sees this is the case if  $\mathcal{N}$  admits an isometric Euclidean embedding with positive reach (because in such case  $\mathcal{N}$  is necessarily complete, see the discussion after Theorem A below<sup>2</sup>). We define the space  $W^{s,p}(\partial\Omega, \mathcal{N})$  as

$$W^{s,p}(\partial\Omega, \mathcal{N}) := \left\{ u \in L^p(\partial\Omega, \mathbb{R}^\nu) : u(x) \in \mathcal{N} \text{ a.e. and } \iint_{\partial\Omega \times \partial\Omega} \frac{d(u(x), u(y))^p}{|x - y|^{sp+m}} dx dy < \infty \right\},$$

where  $d(\cdot, \cdot) : \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  denotes the geodesic distance in  $\mathcal{N}$ . This definition is independent of the choice of the isometric embedding of  $\mathcal{N}$  into  $\mathbb{R}^\nu$  (independently of the compactness of  $\mathcal{N}$ ).

A careful reading of the proofs of the results in [5] shows that the compactness of  $\mathcal{N}$  is used only for two purposes: (i) to ensure that the image of the Nash isometric embedding of  $\mathcal{N}$  into  $\mathbb{R}^\nu$  has positive reach, with well-defined and smooth nearest-point projection, and (ii) to ensure that the so-called *gap potential*

$$\iint_{\substack{(x,y) \in \mathbb{S}^m \times \mathbb{S}^m \\ d(u(x), u(y)) \geq \delta}} \frac{1}{|x - y|^{2m}} dx dy$$

controls the truncated Gagliardo energy of  $u$ . More precisely, for any  $\delta > 0$ , the gap potential trivially satisfies the inequality

$$\iint_{\substack{(x,y) \in \mathbb{S}^m \times \mathbb{S}^m \\ d(u(x), u(y)) \geq \delta}} \frac{1}{|x - y|^{2m}} dx dy \leq \frac{1}{\delta^{m+1}} \iint_{\substack{(x,y) \in \mathbb{S}^m \times \mathbb{S}^m \\ d(u(x), u(y)) \geq \delta}} \frac{(d(u(x), u(y)))^{m+1}}{|x - y|^{2m}} dx dy.$$

In addition, if  $u$  is bounded (for instance, if  $\mathcal{N}$  is compact), then

$$\iint_{\substack{(x,y) \in \mathbb{S}^m \times \mathbb{S}^m \\ d(u(x), u(y)) \geq \delta}} \frac{(d(u(x), u(y)))^{m+1}}{|x - y|^{2m}} dx dy \leq \left(2 \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^m)}\right)^{m+1} \iint_{\substack{(x,y) \in \mathbb{S}^m \times \mathbb{S}^m \\ d(u(x), u(y)) \geq \delta}} \frac{1}{|x - y|^{2m}} dx dy$$

<sup>1</sup>That is to say, the set of points at infinity of the Poincaré ball model, in the sense explained, for instance, in [10, Section 3.L].

<sup>2</sup>Alternatively, one could observe that the argument of [13, Lemma 1.4.3], which is stated in the compact case, holds *verbatim*, as it only requires the existence of a tubular neighbourhood of  $\mathcal{N}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^\nu$  on which the nearest-point projection is well-defined and  $C^1$ -smooth. If  $\mathcal{N}$  has positive reach in  $\mathbb{R}^\nu$ , the latter smoothness property holds thanks to results in [15].

From these inequalities and a careful reading of the proofs, one immediately deduces that [5, Theorems 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3] still hold if  $\mathcal{N}$  is any Riemannian manifold admitting an isometric Euclidean embedding with positive reach and if one restricts to bounded maps  $u$ .

In this note, we put the observations above in precise and slightly more general terms. Our main results are the following theorems, which are direct extensions of [5, Theorem 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3]. In those, we always assume that  $\mathcal{N}$  is connected. (By [4, Theorem 6.5], this does *not* entail a loss of generality as soon as  $m \geq 2$ .)

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$  and let  $\mathcal{N}$  be a connected Riemannian manifold admitting an isometric Euclidean embedding with positive reach. There exists constants  $A, B, \delta \in (0, \infty)$ , depending only on  $m$  and the reach of  $\mathcal{N}$  (and further specified in (4) below), such that for every  $u \in W^{m/(m+1), m+1}(\mathbb{S}^m, \mathcal{N})$  there exists a mapping  $U \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(\mathbb{B}_1^{m+1}, \mathcal{N})$  such that  $\text{tr}_{\mathbb{S}^m} U = u$  and for every  $t \in (0, \infty)$*

$$(2) \quad t^{m+1} \mathcal{L}^{m+1}(\{x \in \mathbb{B}_1^{m+1} \mid |Du(x)| \geq t\}) \\ \leq A \exp\left(B' \iint_{\mathbb{S}^m \times \mathbb{S}^m} \frac{d(u(x), u(y))^{m+1}}{|x-y|^{2m}} dx dy\right) \iint_{\mathbb{S}^m \times \mathbb{S}^m} \frac{d(u(x), u(y))^{m+1}}{|x-y|^{2m}} dx dy,$$

If, in addition,  $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^m, \mathcal{N})$  and  $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^m)} \leq L$ , then

$$(3) \quad t^{m+1} \mathcal{L}^{m+1}(\{x \in \mathbb{B}_1^{m+1} \mid |Du(x)| \geq t\}) \\ \leq A \exp\left(B' \iint_{\substack{(x,y) \in \mathbb{S}^m \times \mathbb{S}^m \\ d(u(x), u(y)) \geq \delta}} \frac{1}{|x-y|^{2m}} dx dy\right) \iint_{\mathbb{S}^m \times \mathbb{S}^m} \frac{d(u(x), u(y))^{m+1}}{|x-y|^{2m}} dx dy,$$

where  $B' = (2L)^{m+1}B$  depends only on  $m, L$  and  $\text{reach } \mathcal{N}$ . Moreover, one can take  $U \in C(\mathbb{B}_1^{m+1}, \mathcal{N})$ , where the singular set  $S \subset \mathbb{B}_1^{m+1}$  is a finite set whose cardinality is controlled by the right-hand side of (2) or, in case  $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^m, \mathcal{N})$ , by the right-hand side of (3).

More precisely, the proof shows that

$$(4) \quad A = A(m), \quad B = \frac{C(m)}{(\text{reach } \mathcal{N})^{m+1}}, \quad B' = C(m) \left(\frac{2L}{\text{reach } \mathcal{N}}\right)^{m+1},$$

where  $C(m) \in (0, \infty)$  depends only on  $m$ . In the particular case  $\mathcal{N}$  is compact,  $\text{diam } \mathcal{N}$  is finite and we can meaningfully bound  $d(u(x), u(y))$  in the exponential in (3) with  $\text{diam } \mathcal{N}$ . Consequently, (3) reduces to [5, Eq. (5)], with  $B'$  depending only on  $m$  and the ratio  $\text{diam } \mathcal{N} / \text{reach } \mathcal{N}$ , exactly as in [5].

*Remark 1.* Any smooth closed convex set  $\mathcal{C}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^\nu$  has infinite reach (and viceversa, although we do not need this fact) for the trivial isometric closed embedding provided by the identity  $\iota : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\nu$ . Thus, in such case we can apply Theorem 1 and, by (4),  $B' = C(m) / \text{reach } \mathcal{C}$ , inequality (2), so that becomes *linear* in the Gagliardo seminorm. The same holds for Theorem 2

and Theorem 3 below. This alludes to a bridge between the classical linear theory and the nonlinear one, as developed in [5] and, still more recently, in [18]. Roughly speaking, in the remarkable paper [18] the compact Riemannian manifolds  $\mathcal{N}$  for which one can get a linear Gagliardo-type estimate for the extension of fractional Sobolev mappings with values into  $\mathcal{N}$  are characterised. We believe that the observations in this note can be carried over to extend at least some of the results of [18] to manifolds that are not necessarily compact but that admit an isometric Euclidean embedding with positive reach and satisfy analogous topological assumptions. These questions, that should complete the bridge between the linear and the nonlinear theory, will be settled and investigated elsewhere.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$  and let  $\mathcal{N}$  be a connected Riemannian manifold admitting an isometric Euclidean embedding with positive reach. There exists constants  $A, B, \delta \in (0, \infty)$ , depending only on  $m$  and the reach of  $\mathcal{N}$  and given by (4), such that for every  $u \in W^{m/(m+1), m+1}(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathcal{N})$  there exists a mapping  $U \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}_+^{m+1}, \mathcal{N})$  such that  $\text{tr}_{\mathbb{R}^m} U = u$  and for every  $t \in (0, \infty)$*

$$(5) \quad t^{m+1} \mathcal{L}^{m+1}(\{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^m \mid |Du(x)| \geq t\}) \\ \leq A \exp\left(B' \iint_{\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m} \frac{d(u(x), u(y))^{m+1}}{|x-y|^{2m}} dx dy\right) \iint_{\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m} \frac{d(u(x), u(y))^{m+1}}{|x-y|^{2m}} dx dy,$$

If, in addition,  $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^m, \mathcal{N})$  and  $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^m)} \leq L$ , then

$$(6) \quad t^{m+1} \mathcal{L}^{m+1}(\{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1} \mid |Du(x)| \geq t\}) \\ \leq A \exp\left(B' \iint_{\substack{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m \\ d(u(x), u(y)) \geq \delta}} \frac{1}{|x-y|^{2m}} dx dy\right) \iint_{\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m} \frac{d(u(x), u(y))^{m+1}}{|x-y|^{2m}} dx dy,$$

where  $B' = (2L)^{m+1} B$  depends only on  $m, L$  and  $\text{reach } \mathcal{N}$ . Moreover, one can take  $U \in C(\mathbb{R}_+^{m+1}, \mathcal{N})$ , where the singular set  $S \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1}$  is a finite set whose cardinality is controlled by the right-hand side of (5) or, in case  $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathcal{N})$ , by the right-hand side of (6).

In our last theorem, as in [5], we consider extensions of maps defined over  $\mathbb{S}^m$  to  $\mathbb{B}_1^{m+1}$ , where we endow  $\mathbb{B}_1^{m+1}$  with the Poincaré metric

$$\mathfrak{h}(x) = \frac{4g_{\text{eucl}}(x)}{(1-|x|^2)^2}.$$

We recall that  $(\mathbb{B}_1^{m+1}, \mathfrak{h})$  is a standard model (called the *Poincaré ball model*) for the hyperbolic space  $\mathbb{H}^{m+1}$ .

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$  and let  $\mathcal{N}$  be a connected Riemannian manifold admitting an isometric Euclidean embedding with positive reach. There exists constants  $A, B, \delta \in (0, \infty)$ , depending only on  $m$  and the reach of  $\mathcal{N}$  and given by (4), such that for every  $u \in W^{m/(m+1), m+1}(\mathbb{S}^m, \mathcal{N})$*

there exists a mapping  $U \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(\mathbb{H}^{m+1}, \mathcal{N})$  such that  $\text{tr}_{\mathbb{S}^m} U = u$  and for every  $t \in (0, \infty)$

$$(7) \quad \mathcal{H}^{m+1}(\{x \in \mathbb{H}^{m+1} \mid |Du(x)| \geq t\}) \leq \frac{A}{t^{m+1}} \exp\left(B' \iint_{\mathbb{S}^m \times \mathbb{S}^m} \frac{d(u(x), u(y))^{m+1}}{|x-y|^{2m}} dx dy\right) \iint_{\mathbb{S}^m \times \mathbb{S}^m} \frac{d(u(x), u(y))^{m+1}}{|x-y|^{2m}} dx dy,$$

If, in addition,  $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^m, \mathcal{N})$  and  $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^m)} \leq L$ , then

$$(8) \quad \mathcal{H}^{m+1}(\{x \in \mathbb{H}^{m+1} \mid |Du(x)| \geq t\}) \leq \frac{A}{t^{m+1}} \exp\left(B' \iint_{\substack{(x,y) \in \mathbb{S}^m \times \mathbb{S}^m \\ d(u(x), u(y)) \geq \delta}} \frac{1}{|x-y|^{2m}} dx dy\right) \iint_{\mathbb{S}^m \times \mathbb{S}^m} \frac{d(u(x), u(y))^{m+1}}{|x-y|^{2m}} dx dy,$$

where  $B' = (2L)^{m+1}B$  depends only on  $m$ ,  $L$  and  $\text{reach } \mathcal{N}$ . Moreover, one can take  $U \in C(\mathbb{H}^{m+1}, \mathcal{N})$ , where the singular set  $S \subset \mathbb{H}^{m+1}$  is a finite set whose cardinality is controlled by the right-hand side of (7) or, in case  $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^m, \mathcal{N})$ , by the right-hand side of (8).

Establishing if a Euclidean embedding of a non-compact Riemannian manifold has positive reach is notoriously a very difficult task, in general. Therefore, our results would be of very limited interest without a reasonable criterion for identifying Riemannian manifolds with this property. In this respect, very recently A. Petrunin proved in [17] the following theorem.

**Theorem A** (Petrunin, [17]). *Suppose  $\mathcal{N}$  is a complete, smooth, connected Riemannian manifold with 1-bounded geometry. Then,  $\mathcal{N}$  admits an isometric tubed embedding into a Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^\nu$ , for some  $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ , if and only if  $\mathcal{N}$  has uniformly polynomial growth. The number  $\nu$  can be estimated in terms of the dimension  $n$  of  $\mathcal{N}$  and of the degree of the growth polynomial of  $\mathcal{N}$ .*

In Theorem A, a *tubed embedding* means a Euclidean embedding with positive reach,  $k$ -*bounded geometry* refers to the boundedness of the covariant derivatives of the Riemann curvature tensor up to order  $k$  and *uniformly polynomial growth* to the fact that the volume of geodesic balls is controlled by a uniform polynomial function (called a *growth polynomial*) of the radius (precise definitions are given in Section 1). By results in [15], if  $\varepsilon > 0$  is the reach of the tubed embedding of  $\mathcal{N}$  into  $\mathbb{R}^\nu$  provided by Theorem A, then the nearest-point projection is smooth up to the boundary of each  $\delta$ -neighbourhood of  $\mathcal{N}$ , for every  $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon)$ .

Although Theorem A is not a characterisation of complete Riemannian manifolds admitting a tubed embedding, but only a sufficient criterion, as observed in [17] the following conditions are instead necessary to this purpose: (i) bounded sectional curvature, (ii) positive injectivity radius; (iii) uniformly polynomial growth. At present, it is unknown whether such conditions are also sufficient or not (see the discussion in [17, §17] for more information).

Thanks to Theorem A, many complete, non-compact Riemannian manifolds are recognised as admitting tubed Euclidean embeddings. This allows us to apply our theorems in several situations not covered by the results in [5]. In the conclusive section of this paper, Section 4, we discuss some examples. We emphasise in particular the following ones:

- Warped products of the type  $\mathbb{R} \times_f \mathcal{M}$ , where  $\mathcal{M}$  is a compact Riemannian manifold and the warping function  $f$  satisfies the (mild) assumptions in Example 4.2;
- The universal covering of any compact Riemannian manifold whose fundamental group has *polynomial growth* (see, e.g., [10, Section 3.I]). This includes:
  - The universal covering of any compact Riemannian manifold with Ricci curvature bounded below;
  - The universal covering of any compact Riemannian manifold with Abelian fundamental group.

In [5], the first main result that is proven is Theorem 1.2, from which Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.3 (essentially) follow by conformal parametrisation of the ball  $\mathbb{B}_1^{m+1}$  (once endowed with the canonical metric and the other with the Poincaré metric) by  $\mathbb{R}_+^{m+1}$ . We follow the same line and, in Section 3, we sketch the proof of Theorem 2. This will be enough because the differences with respect to [5, Theorem 1.2] are confined to the beginning of the proof, which for the rest follows exactly as in [5]. With these modifications, Theorem 1 and Theorem 3 follow word-by-word as in [5], and therefore we will not repeat the whole arguments. To keep at minimum the size of this note, we always refer to the notation of [5], to which the reader is addressed for complete details. In the same spirit, we do not really try to explain the strategy of the proofs in [5], which is very neatly explained there. We only mention that the key point consists in dividing the domain appropriately, using  $\lambda$ -adic cubes, in regions where the *extension by averaging* of  $u$  (see Section 2) is close (in a precise quantitative sense) to  $\mathcal{N}$ . In such regions, one can define the required extension by reprojecting the extension by averaging onto  $\mathcal{N}$ , with controlled energy, using the nearest-point projection. In the cubes in the complement of these regions, one defines the extension by homogeneous extension of the trace on the boundary. The fact that the number of “bad cubes” is exponentially bounded by the Gagliardo energy (or the gap potential, in the compact or bounded case) yields the “bad” exponential term in the Marcinkiewicz-Sobolev estimates above.

**Acknowledgements** The author is a member of GNAMPA-INdAM, partially supported by the GNAMPA projects CUP\_E53C22001930001 and CUP\_E53C23001670001. The author would like to thank Marco Pozzetta for pointing out reference [17] and for useful discussions about it. He thanks also Giacomo Canevari for suggesting Examples 4.3 and Mattia Fogagnolo for useful discussions.

## 1 Positive reach and tubed embeddings

Following [17], given  $\mathcal{N}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  Riemannian manifolds, we say that an embedding  $f : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is a *tubed embedding* if its image  $f(\mathcal{N})$  has *positive reach* in  $\mathcal{M}$ . This implies that  $f(\mathcal{N})$  is closed in  $\mathcal{M}$  (in particular, a tubed embedding is a closed embedding) and, by definition, it means

that there exists a  $\varepsilon$ -neighbourhood  $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon$  of  $f(\mathcal{N})$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ , for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ , on which the *nearest-point projection*  $\Pi_{\mathcal{N}} : \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon \rightarrow f(\mathcal{N})$ , associating with each  $z \in \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon$  its closest point on  $f(\mathcal{N})$ , is well-defined. In this note we are only interested in the case in which  $(\mathcal{M}, g^{\mathcal{M}}) = (\mathbb{R}^\nu, \text{eucl})$ .

*Notation.* Let  $(\mathcal{N}, g)$  be a smooth Riemannian manifold of finite dimension  $n$ ; we will denote:

- $\nabla$  its Levi-Civita connection (extended to all tensor bundles over  $\mathcal{N}$ );
- Riem its Riemann curvature tensor;
- $\text{inj } \mathcal{N}$  its injectivity radius.

Unless otherwise stated, we assume the metric  $g$  is fixed once and for all, and therefore we shall usually omit it from our notation. In this note, we will always deal with the embedding provided by Theorem A, and therefore we will omit explicit reference to the embedding in our notation and terminology (for instance, we will speak of the “reach of  $\mathcal{N}$ ”, in place of the “reach of  $f(\mathcal{N})$  in  $\mathbb{R}^\nu$ ”).

**Definition 1.1.** We say that  $\mathcal{N}$  has *uniformly polynomial growth* if there is a polynomial  $p$  (called a *growth polynomial*) such that

$$\text{vol } B_{\mathcal{N}}(x, R) \leq p(R),$$

for any  $x \in \mathcal{N}$ , where  $B_{\mathcal{N}}(x, R)$  denotes the geodesic ball of centre  $x$  and radius  $R$  in  $\mathcal{N}$ .

**Definition 1.2.** Given  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we say that  $\mathcal{N}$  has  *$k$ -bounded geometry* if:

- (i)  $\text{inj } \mathcal{N} > 0$ ;
- (ii) For every  $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$  such that  $\ell \leq k$ , there exists a constant  $C_k > 0$  such that  $|\nabla^\ell \text{Riem}| \leq C_k$ .

We say that  $\mathcal{N}$  has *bounded geometry* if it has  $k$ -bounded geometry for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

We recall that the positivity of the injectivity radius implies completeness (but the converse is not true).

*Remark 1.1.* Of course, every compact manifold has bounded geometry and uniformly polynomial growth.

*Remark 1.2.* By a result of Eichhorn [8], if  $(\mathcal{N}, g)$  is complete and all the covariant derivatives of the Riemann tensor are uniformly bounded up to order  $k$ , then all the derivatives of the metric are uniformly bounded up to order  $k$ , in every normal chart (a property called  *$k$ -uniform regularity of the metric*). Actually, as mentioned in [17, §17], for any  $k \geq 1$ , one could also get  $(k + 1, \alpha)$ -uniform regularity, for any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .

*Remark 1.3.* It can be proven ([6, Theorem 1.2] and references therein) that a Riemannian manifold has bounded geometry if and only if it is *uniformly regular*. An analysis of the proof actually shows that  $(k + 2)$ -uniform regularity implies  $k$ -bounded geometry for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

By Nash's embedding theorem, any Riemannian manifold  $\mathcal{N}$  can be isometrically embedded into a Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^\nu$ , for some  $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ . Nash's construction provides the general upper-bound  $\nu \leq \frac{1}{2}n(n+1)(3n+11)$ . However, Nash's argument does not yield, in general, a uniform  $\varepsilon$ -neighbourhood of  $f(\mathcal{N})$  on which the nearest-point projection is well-defined. (Of course, if  $\mathcal{N}$  is compact, then any isometric embedding of  $\mathcal{N}$  into  $\mathbb{R}^\nu$  has positive reach and smooth nearest-point projection — see, e.g., [19, Theorem 1 in Section 2.12.3] for a fully detailed proof.) In light of the necessary conditions mentioned in the Introduction, one may suspect that, to this purpose, uniform bounds on the derivatives of  $f$  could be quite useful. However, such bounds are not provided by the standard Nash's construction. Addressing the reader to [17] for the details, we briefly explain below the basic idea of the proof of Theorem A, which is expressly designed to obtain such bounds.

The isometric embedding of Theorem A is, as a matter of fact, a kind of Nash's theorem, in the sense that the desired tubed embedding is essentially (and very cleverly) obtained by slightly modifying and improving Nash's construction so to exploit the bounded geometry in order to obtain *uniformly smooth* embeddings, which is the crucial point of the argument. Petrunin first proves an easier version of Theorem A in which  $k$ -bounded geometry is assumed for all  $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$  (see [17, "Main theorem" in §2]). Then, he observes in [17, §17] that only very minor changes are needed to strengthen the theorem by requiring merely 3-bounded geometry. Finally, in the same section it is argued that, by Remark 1.2, Remark 1.3, and Günther's trick for the proof of Nash's theorem [12], one can relax the assumption to 1-bounded geometry.

To conclude this section, we mention that the proof of Theorem A yields an upper-bound for  $\nu$ . Such an upper-bound is expressed in terms of  $n$  and  $\deg p$  only but making it explicit would need some further explanations on the constructions in [17] that are not relevant to the purposes of the present note. We refer the interested reader to [17, §13].

## 2 Extensions by averaging

We recall here some terminology and notation from [5] that will be used in Section 3.

We write  $x = (x', x_{m+1})$  for points of  $\mathbb{R}_+^{m+1}$ . If  $u : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\nu$  is any measurable map, we denote  $V : \mathbb{R}_+^{m+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\nu$  its *extension by averaging*, defined by (see [5, Eq. (17)] and [9])

$$(2.1) \quad V(x) := \frac{1}{x_{m+1}^m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} u(z) \varphi\left(\frac{x' - z}{x_{m+1}}\right) dz = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} u(x' - x_{m+1}z) \varphi(z) dz,$$

where  $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R})$  is such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \varphi = 1, \quad \text{spt } \varphi \subseteq \mathbb{B}_1^{m+1}, \quad \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)} \leq 1, \quad \|\mathbf{D}\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)} \leq 2.$$

(The specific values of the  $L^\infty$ -bounds above do not play any rôle but it is useful to fix such bounds once and for all.)



As in [5, Eq. (24)], for any given  $\lambda \in (1, \infty)$ , every  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , every  $\tau \in (1, \lambda)$ , and for any given  $h \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , we define the families of cubes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{\lambda, \tau, k, h} &:= \left\{ \tau \lambda^{-k} ([0, 1]^m + j + h) \mid j \in \mathbb{Z}^m \right\}, \\ \mathcal{Q}_{\lambda, \tau, k, h}^+ &:= \left\{ \tau \lambda^{-k} ([0, 1]^m + (j, (\lambda - 1)^{-1}) + h) \mid j \in \mathbb{Z}^m \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We recall, in addition, the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.1** ([5, Proposition 3.1]). *Let  $m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ . There exists constants  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  and  $C \in (0, \infty)$  depending only on  $m$  such that for every  $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ , for every  $\lambda \in [2, \infty)$ , for every measurable function  $u : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\nu$  and every set  $Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}^\nu$ , if  $V$  is an extension by averaging given by (2.1) and if  $u \in Y$  almost everywhere in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , then*

$$\begin{aligned} (2.2) \quad \int_1^\lambda \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{[0, 1]^m} \# \left\{ Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\lambda, \tau, k, h}^+ \mid \sup_{x \in \partial Q} \text{dist}(V(x), \mathcal{N}) \geq \delta \right\} dh \frac{d\tau}{\tau} \\ \leq \frac{C}{\delta^{m+1}} \iint_{\substack{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m \\ d(u(x), u(y)) \geq \delta}} \frac{(d(u(y), u(z)) - \eta\delta)_+^{m+1}}{|y - z|^{2m}} dy dz. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $Y$  can be *every* set in  $\mathbb{R}^\nu$ ; in particular, it need not to be compact, although Proposition 2.1 is applied in [5] in the proof of Theorems 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 with  $Y = \mathcal{N}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  compact.

*Remark 2.1.* As one can easily check, none of the preparatory results in [5] before the proof of [5, Theorem 1.2] requires the compactness of  $\mathcal{N}$ .

### 3 Proof of the theorems

In this section, we prove Theorem 2. As already explained in the Introduction, all the changes with respect to the proof of [5, Theorem 1.2] are confined to the beginning of the proof, therefore a very brief sketch explaining those will be enough. Moreover, following the arguments in [5], once those changes have been performed on the proof of [5, Theorem 1.2], no others are needed in the proofs of [5, Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.3], so that Theorem 1 and Theorem 3 follow automatically.

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Without loss of generality, we may assume  $\mathcal{N}$  is non-compact. Let  $2\delta_{\mathcal{N}} := \text{reach } \mathcal{N}$  be the reach of  $\mathcal{N}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^\nu$ . By assumption,  $2\delta_{\mathcal{N}} > 0$  and then, by results in [15], the nearest-point projection  $\Pi_{\mathcal{N}} : \mathcal{N} + \mathbb{B}_{2\delta_{\mathcal{N}}}^\nu \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\nu$  is smooth up to the boundary of the narrower neighbourhood  $\mathcal{N} + \mathbb{B}_{\delta_{\mathcal{N}}}^\nu$  of  $\mathcal{N}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^\nu$ .

Exactly as in the proof of [5, Theorem 1.2], since  $u(x) \in \mathcal{N}$  for almost every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , by Proposition 2.1 (i.e., by [5, Proposition 3.1]), we have

$$(3.1) \quad \int_1^\lambda \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{[0,1]^m} \# \left\{ Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\lambda, \tau, k, h}^+ \mid \sup_{x \in \partial Q} \text{dist}(V(x), \mathcal{N}) \geq \delta_{\mathcal{N}}/2 \right\} dh \frac{d\tau}{\tau} \\ \leq C_1 \iint_{\substack{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m \\ d(u(x), u(y)) \geq \eta \delta_{\mathcal{N}}/2}} \frac{(d(u(y), u(z)) - \eta \delta_{\mathcal{N}}/2)_+^{m+1}}{|y-z|^{2m}} dy dz,$$

where  $\eta$  is the constant of Proposition 2.1 (which depends only on  $m$ ) and  $C_1$  is the constant  $C = C(m)$  of Proposition 2.1 divided by  $\delta_{\mathcal{N}}/2$  (which depends only on  $\mathcal{N}$ ), so that  $C_1$  depends only on  $m$  and the reach of  $\mathcal{N}$ .

Now, for almost every  $y$  and  $z$  in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  and every  $\eta \in (0, \infty)$ , there holds

$$(3.2) \quad (d(u(y), u(z)) - \eta \delta_{\mathcal{N}}/2)_+ \leq d(u(y), u(z))$$

If, in addition,  $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^m)} \leq L$ , then for almost every  $y$  and  $z$  in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , we have

$$(d(u(y), u(z)) - \eta \delta_{\mathcal{N}}/2)_+^{m+1} \leq (d(u(y), u(z)))^{m+1} \leq \left(2\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^m)}\right)^{m+1} \leq (2L)^{m+1},$$

so that

$$\iint_{\substack{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m \\ d(u(x), u(y)) \geq \delta}} \frac{(d(u(y), u(z)) - \eta \delta_{\mathcal{N}}/2)_+^{m+1}}{|y-z|^{2m}} dy dz \leq (2L)^{m+1} \iint_{\substack{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m \\ d(u(x), u(y)) \geq \delta}} \frac{1}{|y-z|^{2m}} dy dz,$$

and the rest of the proof follows *verbatim* as in [5], setting  $\delta := \eta \delta_{\mathcal{N}}/2$  and choosing

$$\lambda := 1 + \exp \left( 2C_1 (2L)^{m+1} \iint_{\substack{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m \\ d(u(x), u(y)) \geq \delta}} \frac{1}{|y-z|^{2m}} dy dz \right).$$

In the end, this yields (6), with  $B' = 2C_1 (2L)^{m+1}$  depending only on  $m$ ,  $L$ , and reach  $\mathcal{N}$ , and  $A$  exactly as in [5] depending only on  $m$ .

In the general case, we set once again  $\delta := \eta \delta_{\mathcal{N}}/2$  but (keeping (3.2) in mind)

$$\lambda := 1 + \exp \left( 2C_1 \iint_{\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m} \frac{(d(u(y), u(z)))^{m+1}}{|y-z|^{2m}} dy dz \right).$$

The integral in the definition of  $\lambda$  is finite because it is exactly the Gagliardo energy of  $u$ . Once again, the rest of the proof applies *verbatim*, leading in the end to (5), with  $B$  depending only on  $m$  and reach  $\mathcal{N}$  and  $A$  exactly as in [5], and therefore depending only on  $m$ .  $\square$

## 4 Examples and final remarks

We conclude this note by listing some examples of target manifolds to which Theorem 1, Theorem 2, and Theorem 3 apply and that are not covered by the results in [5]. Finally, we point out a couple of remarks.

**Example 4.1.** As mentioned in the Remark in the Introduction, trivial examples (which are however worth to emphasise again, for the reasons explained there) are provided by  $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{R}^\nu$  or any smooth closed convex set in  $\mathbb{R}^\nu$ .

**Example 4.2.** A first non-trivial example is provided by warped-products of the type  $\mathcal{N} := \mathbb{R} \times_f \mathcal{M}$ , where  $\mathcal{M}$  is any compact, connected, smooth Riemannian manifold and  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a smooth warping function, satisfying  $0 < a \leq f \leq b$  for positive real numbers  $a$  and  $b$ , and with bounded derivative up to order 3 (so to ensure  $\mathcal{N}$  has 1-bounded geometry, by Remark 1.1 Remark 1.3). Recalling Remark 1.1, it is easily realised that  $\mathcal{N}$  has uniformly polynomial growth. Then, Theorem A yields that  $\mathcal{N}$  has a tubed embedding in  $\mathbb{R}^\nu$  and our theorems can be applied.

**Example 4.3.** Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a compact Riemannian manifold and let  $\mathcal{N}$  be its universal Riemannian covering. Assume that  $\pi_1(\mathcal{M})$  has polynomial growth. Then,  $\mathcal{N}$  has uniformly polynomial growth (and viceversa; see, e.g., [11, Corollary, p. 57]). Moreover, since  $\mathcal{M}$  is compact and  $\mathcal{N}$  is its universal covering,  $\mathcal{N}$  has positive injectivity radius<sup>3</sup> and bounded geometry. Thus, by Theorem A,  $\mathcal{N}$  has an isometric Euclidean embedding with positive reach, and Theorems 1, 2, 3 hold for maps with values into  $\mathcal{N}$ .

Striking examples of compact manifolds whose fundamental group has polynomial growth are:

- Every compact manifold with non-negative Ricci curvature tensor ([16, Theorem 1]);
- Every compact manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  such that  $\pi_1(\mathcal{M})$  is Abelian.

Several other important examples of Riemannian manifolds with uniformly polynomial growth are listed in [11, p. 57].

**Example 4.4.** A Riemannian metric  $h$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is called *asymptotically Euclidean* if the set  $K := \text{spt}\{h - g_{\text{eucl}}\}$  is compact. Since  $K$  is compact,  $h$  and  $g_{\text{eucl}}$  are comparable and  $(\mathbb{R}^n, h)$  has positive injectivity radius (in particular, it is complete). Moreover,  $(\mathbb{R}^n, h)$  is clearly of bounded geometry (for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ), hence Theorem A applies.

**Example 4.5.** A Riemannian manifold  $(\mathcal{N}, g)$  is called *conical at infinity* if there exists a compact Riemannian manifold  $(\mathcal{M}, h_0)$  of dimension  $n - 1$ , a compact set  $K$  in  $\mathcal{N}$  and a diffeomorphism from  $\mathcal{N} \setminus K$  to  $[r_0, \infty) \times \mathcal{M}$ , such that, outside  $K$ ,

$$g = dr^2 + r^2 h_0,$$

---

<sup>3</sup>In fact,  $\text{inj } \mathcal{M} \leq \text{inj } \mathcal{N}$ , as for any  $p \in \mathcal{M}$  there holds  $\text{inj}_p \mathcal{M} \leq \text{inj}_{\hat{p}} \mathcal{N}$  where  $\hat{p}$  is any lift of  $p$  to  $\mathcal{N}$ .

so that  $g$  is conical outside  $K$ . If  $(\mathcal{N}, g)$  is conical at infinity, then it is complete and it has bounded geometry (see, e.g., [2]). Moreover, it is clear that manifolds conical at infinity have uniformly polynomial growth. Thus, Theorem A applies to them. (The reference [2] contains several other interesting, explicit examples of manifolds with bounded geometry.)

**Example 4.6.** *Asymptotically Locally Euclidean (ALE) manifolds* (with a single chart at infinity, see, e.g., [1, Definition 4.13]) have Euclidean (hence, polynomial) volume growth and, by tuning the decay rate, one can obtain ALE manifolds with bounded geometry, to which Theorem A applies.

The list above is merely illustrative and by no means exhaustive. We conclude our list with two counterexamples.

**Counterexample 4.7.** As already remarked in [17], the hyperbolic space *cannot* have a tubed Euclidean embedding because its volume growth rate is exponential. Note that the hyperbolic space satisfies all the other assumptions of Theorem A.

**Counterexample 4.8.** By a theorem of Milnor [16, Theorem 2], if  $\mathcal{M}$  is any compact manifold with all sectional curvature strictly less than zero, then  $\pi_1(\mathcal{M})$  has exponential growth. By Gromov’s result mentioned in Example 4.3, the universal Riemannian covering  $\mathcal{N}$  of  $\mathcal{M}$  *cannot* have uniformly polynomial growth. Therefore, it cannot have a tubed Euclidean embedding. Again,  $\mathcal{N}$  satisfies all the other assumptions of Theorem A.

Finally, we remark that much of the theory of weakly harmonic maps is developed for mappings with values into compact manifolds (c.f., e.g., [19, 13, 14]), so to exploit the existence of an isometric tubed embedding into a Euclidean space (for instance, to have at disposal the standard distributional theory and to define outer variations) and to overcome the inconvenience that, being weakly harmonic maps discontinuous in general, points that are close in the domain are not mapped into points that are close in the target space (and not even in the same coordinate chart, in general). Of course, such a restriction is not needed in the theory of  $C^2$ -smooth harmonic maps (c.f., e.g., [7]). We believe that, reasoning as in this note, a certain part of the theory of weakly harmonic maps can be extended to non-compact target manifolds admitting an isometric tubed embedding into a Euclidean space, thus partially filling the gap with the theory of  $C^2$ -smooth harmonic maps. These questions will be settled and more extensively investigated elsewhere.

## References

- [1] Virginia Agostiniani, Mattia Fogagnolo, and Lorenzo Mazzieri. “Sharp geometric inequalities for closed hypersurfaces in manifolds with nonnegative Ricci curvature”. In: *Invent. Math.* 222.3 (2020), pp. 1033–1101. ISSN: 0020-9910. DOI: 10.1007/s00222-020-00985-4. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00222-020-00985-4>.
- [2] Eric Bahuaud et al. *Wellposedness of nonlinear flows on manifolds of bounded geometry*. 2022. arXiv: 2210.15886 [math.AP].

- [3] Pierre Bousquet, Augusto C. Ponce, and Jean Van Schaftingen. “Density of bounded maps in Sobolev spaces into complete manifolds”. In: *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)* 196.6 (2017), pp. 2261–2301. ISSN: 0373-3114. DOI: 10.1007/s10231-017-0664-1. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10231-017-0664-1>.
- [4] Haim Brezis and Petru Mironescu. *Sobolev maps to the circle—from the perspective of analysis, geometry, and topology*. Vol. 96. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications. Birkhäuser/Springer, New York, 2021, pp. xxxi+530. ISBN: 978-1-0716-1510-2; 978-1-0716-1512-6. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-0716-1512-6. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-0716-1512-6>.
- [5] Bohdan Bulanyi and Jean Van Schaftingen. *Singular extension of critical Sobolev mappings under an exponential weak-type estimate*. 2023. arXiv: 2309.12874 [math.AP].
- [6] Marcelo Disconzi, Yuanzhen Shao, and Gieri Simonett. “Some remarks on uniformly regular Riemannian manifolds”. In: *Math. Nachr.* 289.2-3 (2016), pp. 232–242. ISSN: 0025-584X. DOI: 10.1002/mana.201400354. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002/mana.201400354>.
- [7] James Eells and Luc Lemaire. *Two reports on harmonic maps*. World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 1995, pp. xii+216. ISBN: 981-02-1466-9. DOI: 10.1142/9789812832030. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1142/9789812832030>.
- [8] Jürgen Eichhorn. “The boundedness of connection coefficients and their derivatives”. In: *Math. Nachr.* 152 (1991), pp. 145–158. ISSN: 0025-584X. DOI: 10.1002/mana.19911520113. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002/mana.19911520113>.
- [9] Emilio Gagliardo. “Caratterizzazioni delle tracce sulla frontiera relative ad alcune classi di funzioni in  $n$  variabili”. In: *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova* 27 (1957), pp. 284–305. ISSN: 0041-8994. URL: [http://www.numdam.org/item?id=RSMUP\\_1957\\_\\_27\\_\\_284\\_0](http://www.numdam.org/item?id=RSMUP_1957__27__284_0).
- [10] Sylvestre Gallot, Dominique Hulin, and Jacques Lafontaine. *Riemannian geometry*. Third. Universitext. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004, pp. xvi+322. ISBN: 3-540-20493-8. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-18855-8. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-18855-8>.
- [11] Mikhael Gromov. “Groups of polynomial growth and expanding maps”. In: *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* 53 (1981), pp. 53–73. ISSN: 0073-8301. URL: [http://www.numdam.org/item?id=PMIHES\\_1981\\_\\_53\\_\\_53\\_0](http://www.numdam.org/item?id=PMIHES_1981__53__53_0).
- [12] Matthias Günther. “Zum Einbettungssatz von J. Nash”. In: *Math. Nachr.* 144 (1989), pp. 165–187. ISSN: 0025-584X. DOI: 10.1002/mana.19891440113. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002/mana.19891440113>.
- [13] Frédéric Hélein. *Harmonic maps, conservation laws and moving frames*. Second. Vol. 150. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics. Translated from the 1996 French original, With a foreword by James Eells. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002, pp. xxvi+264. ISBN: 0-521-81160-0. DOI: 10.1017/CB09780511543036. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511543036>.
- [14] Frédéric Hélein and John C. Wood. “Harmonic maps”. In: *Handbook of global analysis*. Elsevier Sci. B. V., Amsterdam, 2008, pp. 417–491, 1213. DOI: 10.1016/B978-044452833-9.50009-7. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-044452833-9.50009-7>.

- [15] Gunther Leobacher and Alexander Steinicke. “Existence, uniqueness and regularity of the projection onto differentiable manifolds”. In: *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.* 60.3 (2021), pp. 559–587. ISSN: 0232-704X. DOI: 10.1007/s10455-021-09788-z. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10455-021-09788-z>.
- [16] J. Milnor. “A note on curvature and fundamental group”. In: *J. Differential Geometry* 2 (1968), pp. 1–7. ISSN: 0022-040X. URL: <http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.jdg/1214501132>.
- [17] Anton Petrunin. *Tubed embeddings*. 2024. arXiv: 2402.16195 [math.DG].
- [18] Jean Van Schaftingen. *The extension of traces for Sobolev mappings between manifolds*. 2024. arXiv: 2403.18738 [math.AP].
- [19] Leon Simon. *Theorems on regularity and singularity of energy minimizing maps*. Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich. Based on lecture notes by Norbert Hungerbühler. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1996, pp. viii+152. ISBN: 3-7643-5397-X. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-0348-9193-6. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-0348-9193-6>.

Federico Luigi Dipasquale (Corresponding author), SCUOLA SUPERIORE MERIDIONALE

*E-mail address:* [f.dipasquale@ssmeridionale.it](mailto:f.dipasquale@ssmeridionale.it)