

# Lipschitz extensions from spaces of nonnegative curvature into CAT(1) spaces

Sebastian Gietl

## Abstract

We prove that complete CAT( $\kappa$ ) spaces of sufficiently small radii possess metric cotype 2 and metric Markov cotype 2. This generalizes the previously known result for complete CAT(0) spaces. The generalization involves extending the variance inequality known for barycenters in CAT(0) spaces to an inequality analogous to one for 2-uniformly convex Banach spaces, and demonstrating that the barycenter map on such spaces is Lipschitz continuous on the corresponding Wasserstein 2 space. By utilizing the generalized Ball extension theorem by Mendel and Naor, we obtain an extension result for Lipschitz maps from Alexandrov spaces of nonnegative curvature into CAT( $\kappa$ ) spaces whose image is contained in a subspace of sufficiently small radius, thereby weakening the curvature assumption in the well-known Lipschitz extension theorem for Alexandrov spaces by Lang and Schröder. As an additional application, we obtain that  $\ell_p$  spaces for  $p > 2$  cannot be uniformly embedded into any CAT( $\kappa$ ) space with sufficiently small diameter.

## 1 Introduction

Given two metric spaces  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$ , the Lipschitz extension problem asks whether there exists a  $K \in (0, \infty)$  such that for any subset  $Z \subset X$  and any Lipschitz map  $f : Z \rightarrow Y$  with Lipschitz constant  $\|f\|_{\text{Lip}}$ , there is a Lipschitz extension  $\tilde{f} : X \rightarrow Y$  with Lipschitz constant  $\|\tilde{f}\|_{\text{Lip}}$  satisfying  $\|\tilde{f}\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq K\|f\|_{\text{Lip}}$ .

The classical Kirszbraun theorem states that if  $X$  and  $Y$  are Hilbert spaces, then the Lipschitz extension problem has a positive solution with  $\|\tilde{f}\|_{\text{Lip}} = \|f\|_{\text{Lip}}$ . It also has positive solutions in more general settings; for instance, this is shown in [26] by using a general extension result of Ball in [25] when  $X$  is a 2-uniformly smooth Banach space and  $Y$  a 2-uniformly convex Banach space. In particular, one can take  $X = L_p$  with  $p \in [2, \infty)$  and  $Y = L_q$  with  $q \in (1, 2]$ , but now we only have  $\|\tilde{f}\|_{\text{Lip}} \lesssim_{X,Y} \|f\|_{\text{Lip}}$ .<sup>1</sup> However, the Lipschitz extension problem is not limited to linear spaces. For example, in [32] or [3], results were achieved for metric spaces that are not necessarily linear, yet assume some kind of finite dimensionality for either  $X$  or  $Y$ . In [20], Lang and Schröder generalized Kirszbraun's theorem as follows. Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be geodesic spaces, and for  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ , assume that  $X$  is an Alexandrov space of (global) curvature  $\geq \kappa$ , and  $Y$  is a complete CAT( $\kappa$ ) space. Denote by  $D_\kappa$  the diameter of the spaceform of constant curvature  $\kappa$  (see in Section 2 for definitions). Then, any 1-Lipschitz map  $f : Z \rightarrow Y$  with  $\text{diam}(f(Z)) \leq D_\kappa/2$  has a 1-Lipschitz extension  $\tilde{f} : X \rightarrow Y$ . We will weaken the curvature assumption of their result in the case  $\kappa \geq 0$ , namely by utilizing a Lipschitz extension theorem by Mendel and Naor in [21], which is a generalised version of an extension result by Keith Ball in [25], we will prove Theorem 1. For the ensuing discussion, we establish the following notation. For  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ , we denote by  $D_{\kappa,\varepsilon}$  the quantity  $(1 - \varepsilon)D_\kappa$ , for fixed  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ . Additionally, in a metric space  $(X, d_X)$ , we use  $B_r(o)$  and  $\overline{B}_r(o)$  to represent the open and closed metric balls, respectively, of radius  $r > 0$  centered at  $o \in X$ .

<sup>1</sup>Given two quantities  $O, O' > 0$ , the notation  $Q \lesssim Q'$  and  $Q' \gtrsim Q$  means that there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that  $Q \leq CQ'$ . If the constant depends on some object  $\phi$ , such as a number or a space, this is indicated by  $Q \lesssim_\phi Q'$  or  $Q' \gtrsim_\phi Q$ .

**Theorem 1.** *For  $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$  and  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ , there exists a constant  $C_{\kappa,\varepsilon} \geq 1$  such that, for an Alexandrov space of nonnegative curvature  $(X, d_X)$  and any complete  $CAT(\kappa)$  space  $(Y, d_Y)$ , the following holds. Given a subset  $Z \subset X$  and a Lipschitz function  $f : Z \rightarrow Y$  with Lipschitz constant  $\|f\|_{Lip}$ , assume there is a point  $o \in X$  such that  $f(Z) \subset \overline{B}_r(o)$  with  $r \leq D_{\kappa,\varepsilon}/4$ . Then, there exists a Lipschitz extension  $\bar{f} : X \rightarrow Y$  of  $f$  with Lipschitz constant  $\|\bar{f}\|_{Lip} \leq C_{\kappa,\varepsilon}\|f\|_{Lip}$ .*

Besides weakening the curvature assumption, Theorem 1 facilitates Lipschitz extensions for all Lipschitz functions, not just those that are 1-Lipschitz. While this can be deduced from the results by Lang and Schröder in cases where  $\kappa = 0$  by rescaling the metric, our results extend beyond this limitation. However, the weakening of the assumptions comes with a trade-off regarding the Lipschitz constant of the extension, which can be large. Specifically, as  $\varepsilon$  becomes smaller, the bound on the Lipschitz constant correspondingly increases. The reason why we assume that  $f(Z)$  lies within a closed ball of radius bounded by  $D_{\kappa,\varepsilon}/4$ , rather than bounding the diameter of  $f(Z)$  by  $D_\kappa/2$  as in the results of Lang and Schröder, will be explained below. While Lang and Schröder have shown that the diameter bound in their result is optimal, it has been demonstrated in [1] that this assumption can be generalized. Specifically, it is sufficient to assume that there exists a point  $o \in Y$  such that  $f(Z)$  lies within a ball  $\overline{B}_r(o)$  with  $0 < r \leq D_\kappa/2$ .

The extension result in [21], on which Theorem 1 is based, is inspired by a classical result in Banach space theory by Maurey ([23]) for bounded linear operators between Banach spaces of Rademacher type 2 and cotype 2. As a product of the Ribe program (see [18] for an introductory survey), metric variants of these definitions exist. In [25], Keith Ball introduced such metric variants of Rademacher type and cotype, called Markov type (Definition 4) and Markov cotype (Definition 3). Similarly, Mendel and Naor introduced another variant of Rademacher cotype in [24], known as metric cotype. The metric cotype inequality can be refined in the sense that a certain parameter exhibits a sharp asymptotic behavior. The resulting property is called sharp metric cotype; see Definition 4 for a precise definition. In [21], it was demonstrated that any complete  $CAT(0)$  space possesses metric Markov cotype 2, and [5] shows that these spaces also possess sharp metric cotype 2. Building upon these results, we establish the following results.

**Theorem 2.** *Fix  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ , any complete  $CAT(\kappa)$  space of diameter smaller or equal to  $D_{\kappa,\varepsilon}/2$  has sharp metric cotype 2.*

**Theorem 3.** *Fix  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then, any closed ball of radius less than or equal to  $D_{\kappa,\varepsilon}/4$  in a complete  $CAT(\kappa)$  space has metric Markov cotype 2.*

Sharp metric cotype 2 serves as an obstruction to the existence of various types of metric embeddings of  $\ell_p$  for  $p > 2$  into the space. For example, in [5], it was demonstrated that  $\ell_p$  spaces, under a weak embedding notion allowing for significant distortions known as coarse embedding (see the introduction of [5] for a definition), do not embed into any complete  $CAT(0)$  space. This answered a question posed by Gromov in [11]. Our diameter bound in the case of positive curvature makes this result trivial; however, we still obtain a non-trivial result of this nature for uniform embeddings. A metric space  $(Y, d_Y)$  is said to embed uniformly into a metric space  $(X, d_X)$  if there exists a one-to-one mapping  $f : Y \rightarrow X$  such that both  $f$  and its inverse  $f^{-1} : f(Y) \rightarrow Y$  are uniformly continuous. By Prop. 8 of [5] and Theorem 2, we derive the following.

**Theorem 4.** *Fix  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ . If  $p > 2$ , then  $\ell_p$  does not uniformly embed into any complete  $CAT(\kappa)$  space of diameter smaller than or equal to  $D_{\kappa,\varepsilon}/2$ .*

To effectively describe the main idea behind Theorem 2 and 3, we review the concept of a uniformly convex Banach space. The modulus of convexity of a Banach space  $(X, \|\cdot\|)$  is defined as:

$$\delta_X(\varepsilon) := \inf \left\{ 1 - \left\| \frac{x+y}{2} \right\| : x, y \in X, \|x\| = \|y\| = 1 \text{ and } \|x-y\| = \varepsilon \right\},$$

for  $\varepsilon \in (0,2]$ . The Banach space  $(X, \|\cdot\|)$  is said to be uniformly convex if  $\delta_X(\varepsilon) > 0$  for all  $\varepsilon \in (0,2]$ . Furthermore, if  $p \geq 2$ , the space  $(X, \|\cdot\|)$  is said to be  $p$ -uniformly convex if there

exists a constant  $c > 0$  such that  $\delta_X(\varepsilon) \geq c\varepsilon^p$  for all  $\varepsilon \in (0, 2]$ . According to [15], this condition is equivalent to the existence of a constant  $K \geq 1$  such that for all  $x, y$  in  $X$  we have

$$\left\| \frac{x+y}{2} \right\|^p \leq \frac{\|x\|^p}{2} + \frac{\|y\|^p}{2} - \left\| \frac{x-y}{2K} \right\|^p. \quad (1)$$

2-uniformly convex Banach spaces are known to possess both Markov cotype 2 ([37]) and metric cotype 2 ([24]). The rationale that complete CAT(0) spaces also share these properties can be understood by the fact that their metric satisfies a similar convexity property as inequality (1) with constant equal to one, corresponding to the Hilbert space case. More precisely, for any CAT(0) space  $(X, d_X)$ , given any points  $x, y, z \in X$  and a geodesic  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  connecting  $x$  and  $y$ , the following inequality holds:

$$d_X(z, \gamma(t))^2 \leq (1-t)d_X(z, x)^2 + td_X(z, y)^2 - t(1-t)d_X(x, y)^2 \quad \forall t \in [0, 1]. \quad (2)$$

Now, for  $\kappa > 0$ , Ohta showed in [7], Proposition 3.1, that in a CAT( $\kappa$ )-space  $(X, d_X)$  with  $\text{diam}(X) \leq D_{\kappa, \varepsilon}/2$ , the metric satisfies a property similar to that of (1), but with a general constant. Specifically, for any points  $x, y, z \in X$  and the geodesic  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  connecting  $x$  and  $y$ , the following inequality holds:

$$d_X(z, \gamma(t))^2 \leq (1-t)d_X(z, x)^2 + td_X(z, y)^2 - \frac{k_\varepsilon}{2}t(1-t)d_X(x, y)^2 \quad \forall t \in [0, 1], \quad (3)$$

where  $k_\varepsilon = (\pi - \varepsilon\pi) \tan(\varepsilon\frac{\pi}{2})$ . When  $\kappa \leq 0$ , we have  $D_{\kappa, \varepsilon}/2 = \infty$  for any  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ , and in the limit  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 1} k_\varepsilon = 2$  we can recover (2) from (3). By considering the three unit vectors on a 2-dimensional sphere, it becomes evident that inequality (3) in general cannot be satisfied with a positive constant when the diameter is increased to  $D_\kappa/2$ . Note that  $z$  in inequality (3) is an arbitrary point in the space, which is important in the proofs presented in [5] and [21], which form the basis of our arguments for the Theorems 2 and 3.

To demonstrate Theorems 3 and 2, we utilize condition (3) to establish a generalized version of the well-known variance inequality for barycenters in CAT(0) spaces, analogous to an inequality known for 2-uniformly convex Banach spaces. As demonstrated in [5], this generalized variance inequality facilitates the establishment of metric cotype 2 for the specified CAT( $\kappa$ ) space. However, achieving Markov cotype requires an additional step. We further demonstrate that the barycenter map, i.e., the map which assigns a probability measure on a complete CAT( $\kappa$ ) space to its barycenter, is Lipschitz continuous on the corresponding Wasserstein 2 space, provided that the measure is supported on a closed ball of radius  $D_{\kappa, \varepsilon}/4$ . This continuity, combined with the generalized variance inequality as detailed in [21], establishes Markov cotype 2 for the considered ball.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we define Alexandrov spaces and provide their basic properties. In Section 3, we demonstrate the convexity of a particular function, crucial for establishing the Lipschitz continuity of the barycenter map. In Section 4, we discuss barycenters in CAT( $\kappa$ ) spaces, proving the generalized variance inequality and the Lipschitz continuity of the barycenter map. In Section 5, we define the notions of metric cotype and metric Markov cotype, prove Theorem 1, and explain how Theorems 2 and 3 are derived from our results.

## 2 Alexandrov Spaces

The purpose of this section is to establish the basic notions and standard results for Alexandrov spaces, that we will need in the subsequent sections. All the content in this section can be found, for example, in [27] or [8].

Let  $(X, d_X)$  be a metric space and  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ , we define  $\mathbb{M}^2(\kappa)$  as the 2-dimensional space form with constant curvature  $\kappa$ . Then the diameter of  $\mathbb{M}^2(\kappa)$ , denoted by  $D_\kappa$ , is given by:

$$D_\kappa = \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } \kappa \leq 0, \\ \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{\kappa}} & \text{if } \kappa > 0. \end{cases}$$

Let  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  be an interval. A curve  $\gamma : I \rightarrow X$  is called a geodesic if there exists a constant  $|\gamma'| \geq 0$  such that  $d_X(\gamma(s), \gamma(t)) = |\gamma'| |s - t|$  for all  $s, t \in I$ . For  $x, y \in X$ , a curve  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  is said to be a geodesic connecting  $x$  and  $y$  when it is a geodesic and  $\gamma(0) = x$  and  $\gamma(1) = y$ . The image of a geodesic connecting  $x$  and  $y$  is called a geodesic segment and denoted by  $[x, y]$ . We say  $(X, d_X)$  is geodesic if, for every pair of points  $x, y \in X$ , there exists a geodesic connecting  $x$  and  $y$ . We further define it as  $D_\kappa$ -geodesic if, for any pair of points  $x, y \in X$  whose distance is less than  $D_\kappa$ , there exists a geodesic connecting  $x$  and  $y$ .

A geodesic triangle  $\Delta$  in  $X$  consists of three points  $x, y, z \in X$ , its vertices, and a choice of three geodesic segments  $[x, y], [y, z], [z, x]$  joining them, its sides. A triangle  $\bar{\Delta}$  in  $\mathbb{M}^2(\kappa)$  with vertices  $\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z} \in \mathbb{M}^2(\kappa)$  is called a comparison triangle for  $\Delta$  if  $d_{\mathbb{M}^2(\kappa)}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = d_X(x, y)$ ,  $d_{\mathbb{M}^2(\kappa)}(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) = d_X(y, z)$  and  $d_{\mathbb{M}^2(\kappa)}(\bar{z}, \bar{x}) = d_X(z, x)$ . Such a triangle  $\bar{\Delta} \subseteq \mathbb{M}^2(\kappa)$  always exists if the perimeter  $d_X(x, y) + d_X(y, z) + d_X(z, x)$  of  $\Delta$  is less than  $2D_\kappa$ , and it is unique up to isometry.

**Definition 1** (Alexandrov space). *Fix  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$  and let  $(X, d_X)$  be a  $D_\kappa$ -geodesic space. The space  $(X, d_X)$  is said to be an Alexandrov space of curvature  $\leq \kappa$  (resp.  $\geq \kappa$ ) if for all geodesic triangles in  $X$  with a perimeter strictly less than  $2D_\kappa$  it holds that for all  $x, y \in \Delta$  and their corresponding points  $\bar{x}, \bar{y} \in \bar{\Delta}$ , the distance satisfies*

$$d_X(x, y) \leq d_{\mathbb{M}^2(\kappa)}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \quad (\text{resp. } d_X(x, y) \geq d_{\mathbb{M}^2(\kappa)}(\bar{x}, \bar{y})). \quad (4)$$

*Alexandrov spaces of curvature  $\leq \kappa$  are also called CAT( $\kappa$ )-spaces. When  $\kappa = 0$ , we also say that  $X$  is an Alexandrov space of nonpositive curvature (resp. nonnegative curvature)*

The definition above is a global version of what Alexandrov used to define spaces of bounded curvature. He defined a metric space to be a space of curvature  $\leq \kappa$  (resp.  $\geq \kappa$ ) if each point has a neighborhood such that all geodesic triangles in this neighborhood satisfy the above assumption. He also showed that if the metric space is a Riemannian manifold, this is the case if and only if the sectional curvature satisfies  $\leq \kappa$  (resp.  $\geq \kappa$ ). There are many other examples of Alexandrov spaces; in particular, any Hilbert space is both an Alexandrov space of curvature  $\leq 0$  as well as  $\geq 0$ .

One can define Alexandrov spaces not only by comparing distances but also by comparing angles. The angle between two geodesics  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ , both starting at the same point  $x \in X$ , is defined as

$$\angle_x(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) := \lim_{s, t \rightarrow 0} \arccos \frac{d_X(x, \gamma_1(s))^2 + d_X(x, \gamma_2(t))^2 - d_X(\gamma_1(s), \gamma_2(t))^2}{2d_X(x, \gamma_1(s))d_X(x, \gamma_2(t))},$$

when the limit exists. Given three points  $x, y, z \in X$ , when the geodesics that connect  $z$  and  $x$  respectively  $z$  and  $y$  are clear from context, we denote the corresponding angle by  $\angle_z(x, y)$ . This notation is specifically used when  $X$  is a CAT( $\kappa$ ) space and  $d_X(z, x), d_X(z, y) < D_\kappa$ , as in this case geodesic segments are unique. The metric space  $(X, d_X)$  is an Alexandrov space of curvature  $\leq \kappa$  (resp.  $\geq \kappa$ ) if and only if  $(X, d_X)$  is geodesic and for each triangle  $\Delta \subset X$  with vertices  $x, y, z \in X$ , corresponding angle  $\angle_x(y, z)$  and comparison triangle  $\bar{\Delta}$  with vertices  $\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}$ , when we denote by  $\bar{\angle}_x(y, z) = \angle_{\bar{x}}(\bar{y}, \bar{z})$  the corresponding angle in  $\mathbb{M}^2(\kappa)$ , we have

$$\angle_x(y, z) \leq \angle_{\bar{x}}(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) \quad (\text{resp. } \angle_x(y, z) \geq \angle_{\bar{x}}(\bar{y}, \bar{z})).$$

A function  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is said to be convex if for each geodesic  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  the composition  $f \circ \gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is convex. A subset  $C$  of the metric space  $(X, d_X)$  is said to be convex if every pair of points  $x, y \in C$  can be joined by a geodesic in  $X$  and the image of every such geodesic is contained in  $C$ .

### 3 The Convex Geometry of CAT( $\kappa$ )-Spaces

It is a well-known fact (see e.g., Cor. 2.5 in [34]) that in a CAT(0) space  $(X, d_X)$ , the distance function  $d_X : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is convex on the product space. However, this is not the case for CAT( $\kappa$ )

spaces with positive  $\kappa$ , where even the squared distance function fails to be convex. The objective of this section is to find a convex 'replacement' for the squared distance function in such spaces.

Besides being convex, the distance function on a CAT(0) space is, of course, also continuous, nonnegative, and equals zero only on the diagonal. Spaces that admit a function possessing these properties were termed 'spaces of convex geometry' by Kendall in [6]. He also demonstrated that small hemispheres satisfy these criteria. To be more precise, for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , when we denote by  $S^{n-1}$  the  $(n-1)$ -dimensional sphere, we define, for  $h > 0$ ,

$$S_h^{n-1} := \{x \in S^{n-1} : x_1 > h\},$$

then for  $\tilde{h} \in (0, h)$ , we have that the function given by  $S_h^{n-1} \times S_h^{n-1} \ni (x, y) \mapsto \left(\frac{|x-y|^2}{2(x_1 y_1 - h^2)}\right)^{\nu+1}$

possesses the desired properties, provided that  $2\nu\tilde{h}^2(h^2 - \tilde{h}^2) \geq 1$ . This holds true not only on a small hemisphere but also for small balls in CAT( $\kappa$ ) spaces with positive  $\kappa$ , as shown in [2], by generalizing Kendall's function. However, this function does not act as a 'replacement' for the squared distance function but rather for the distance function to some power greater than two.

In order to find a function that serves our purpose, we restrict ourselves to a ball  $B_r$  of radius  $r < D_\kappa/4$  in a CAT( $\kappa$ ) space. We adapt Kendall's function to suit our needs and employ the argument from [2] to generalize this to the broader case. We define  $\cos_\kappa := \cos(\sqrt{\kappa}\cdot)$ .

**Theorem 5.** Fix  $\kappa > 0$ , let  $(X, d_X)$  be a complete CAT( $\kappa$ )-space, and let  $B = \overline{B}_r(o)$  be a ball in  $X$  with radius  $r < D_\kappa/4$ , centered at  $o \in X$ . The function  $\Phi : B \times B \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  given by

$$\Phi(x, y) := \frac{1 - \cos_\kappa d_X(x, y)}{\sqrt{\cos_\kappa d_X(x, o) \cos_\kappa d_X(y, o) - \frac{1}{2}}},$$

is convex.

Note that due to the bound on the diameter of  $(X, d_X)$ , for any  $x \in X$ , we have  $\cos_\kappa(d_X(x, o)) > \cos(\frac{\pi}{4}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ . To prove Theorem 5, we demonstrate that  $\Phi$  is convex in the case of a sphere by calculating its second derivative. More precisely, we establish the following slightly more general result.

**Lemma 1.** Fix  $h > 0$  and  $x, y \in S_h^2$ . Let  $\bar{\lambda}, \underline{\lambda} : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow S_h^2$  be geodesics with  $\bar{\lambda}(0) = \underline{\lambda}(0)$  s.t.  $|\bar{\lambda}'| = |\underline{\lambda}'|$  and let  $\bar{\mu}, \underline{\mu} : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow S_h^2$  be geodesics with  $\bar{\mu}(0) = \underline{\mu}(0)$  s.t.  $|\bar{\mu}'| = |\underline{\mu}'|$ . Consider  $\tilde{h} \in (0, h)$  and set  $p := 1/(1 - \tilde{h}^2)$ , then we have that the function

$$\Psi(t) := \frac{|\bar{\lambda}(t) - \bar{\mu}(t)|^2}{2(c(\underline{\lambda}_1(t)\underline{\mu}_1(t) - \tilde{h}^2))^{\frac{1}{p}}},$$

has nonnegative second derivative at  $t = 0$ .

*Proof.* We define  $x := \bar{\lambda}(0) = \underline{\lambda}(0)$ ,  $y := \bar{\mu}(0) = \underline{\mu}(0)$  and  $\bar{u} := \bar{\lambda}'(0)$ ,  $\bar{v} := \bar{\mu}'(0)$ ,  $\underline{u} := \underline{\lambda}'(0)$ ,  $\underline{v} := \underline{\mu}'(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , then  $\bar{\lambda}''(0) = -|\bar{u}|^2 x$ ,  $\bar{\mu}''(0) = -|\bar{v}|^2 y$ ,  $\underline{\lambda}''(0) = -|\underline{u}|^2 x$  and  $\underline{\mu}''(0) = -|\underline{v}|^2 y$ . We set

$$\begin{aligned} p &:= \frac{1}{2}|x - y|^2 = 1 - \langle x, y \rangle \\ q &:= (c(x_1 y_1 - \tilde{h}^2))^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ \psi &:= p/q. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that  $\psi > 0$ . We have the following first and second derivative.

$$\psi' := \left[ \frac{d}{dt} \Psi(t) \right]_{t=0} = \frac{p'q - pq'}{q^2} = \frac{p' - \psi q'}{q},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\psi'' &:= \left[ \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \Psi(t) \right]_{t=0} = \frac{p''q - pq''}{q^2} - 2 \frac{p'q - pq'}{q^2} \cdot \frac{q'}{q} \\ &= \frac{p'' - \psi q''}{q} - \frac{2\psi'q'}{q}.\end{aligned}\tag{5}$$

Where

$$\begin{aligned}p' &= \langle \bar{u} - \bar{v}, x - y \rangle \\ p'' &= |\bar{u} - \bar{v}|^2 - |\bar{u}|^2 \langle x, x - y \rangle + |\bar{v}|^2 \langle y, x - y \rangle \\ &= |\bar{u} - \bar{v}|^2 - (|\bar{u}|^2 + |\bar{v}|^2) p,\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}p'' &\geq \frac{(p')^2}{2p} - (|\bar{u}|^2 + |\bar{v}|^2) p \\ &= \frac{(\psi q' + \psi' q)^2}{2\psi q} - (|\bar{u}|^2 + |\bar{v}|^2) \psi q,\end{aligned}\tag{6}$$

by using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and

$$\begin{aligned}q' &= \frac{c(\underline{u}_1 y_1 + x_1 \underline{v}_1)}{p(c(x_1 y_1 - \tilde{h}^2))^{1-\frac{1}{p}}} \\ q'' &= \frac{2c\underline{u}_1 \underline{v}_1 - c(|\underline{u}|^2 + |\underline{v}|^2) x_1 y_1}{p(c(x_1 y_1 - \tilde{h}^2))^{1-\frac{1}{p}}} + \frac{(1-p)c^2(\underline{u}_1 y_1 + x_1 \underline{v}_1)^2}{p^2(c(x_1 y_1 - \tilde{h}^2))^{2-\frac{1}{p}}}.\end{aligned}\tag{7}$$

Now by combining (5), (6) and (7) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\psi'' &\geq \frac{(\psi q' + \psi' q)^2}{2\psi q^2} - (|\bar{u}|^2 + |\bar{v}|^2) \psi \\ &\quad - \frac{2c\psi \underline{u}_1 \underline{v}_1 - c\psi(|\underline{u}|^2 + |\underline{v}|^2) x_1 y_1}{p(c(x_1 y_1 - \tilde{h}^2))^{1-\frac{1}{p}} q} + \frac{(p-1)c^2\psi(\underline{u}_1 y_1 + x_1 \underline{v}_1)^2}{p^2(c(x_1 y_1 - \tilde{h}^2))^{2-\frac{1}{p}} q} - \frac{2\psi'q'}{q} \\ &= \frac{\psi(q')^2}{2q^2} - \frac{\psi'q'}{q} + \frac{(\psi')^2}{2\psi} - (|\bar{u}|^2 + |\bar{v}|^2) \psi \\ &\quad - \frac{2\psi \underline{u}_1 \underline{v}_1 - \psi(|\underline{u}|^2 + |\underline{v}|^2) x_1 y_1}{p(x_1 y_1 - \tilde{h}^2)} + \frac{(p-1)c^2\psi(\underline{u}_1 y_1 + x_1 \underline{v}_1)^2}{p^2(c(x_1 y_1 - \tilde{h}^2))^2}\end{aligned}\tag{8}$$

We bound (8) from below by 0. First of all,

$$\frac{\psi(|\underline{u}|^2 + |\underline{v}|^2) x_1 y_1}{p(x_1 y_1 - \tilde{h}^2)} - (|\bar{u}|^2 + |\bar{v}|^2) \psi \geq 0,\tag{9}$$

by the choice of  $p$ . Secondly,

$$\frac{(p-1)c^2\psi(\underline{u}_1 y_1 + x_1 \underline{v}_1)^2}{p^2(c(x_1 y_1 - \tilde{h}^2))^2} - \frac{\psi'q'}{q} + \frac{(\psi')^2}{2\psi} = \frac{\psi}{q^2}(q')^2 - \frac{1}{q}\psi'q' + \frac{1}{2\psi}(\psi')^2 \geq 0,\tag{10}$$

as (10) is a quadratic form with  $\frac{\psi}{q^2}, \frac{1}{2\psi} \geq 0$  and discriminant  $\frac{1}{q^2} - 4\frac{\psi}{q^2} \frac{1}{2\psi} \leq 0$ . And thirdly,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\psi(q')^2}{2q^2} - \frac{2\psi \underline{u}_1 \underline{v}_1}{2\sqrt{x_1 y_1 - \frac{1}{2}q}} &= \frac{\psi(\underline{u}_1 y_1 + x_1 \underline{v}_1)^2}{2q^2} - \frac{2\psi \underline{u}_1 \underline{v}_1}{2q^2} \\ &= \frac{\psi}{2q^2} \left( \frac{y_1^2}{4q^2} \underline{u}_1^2 + \frac{\underline{u}_1 y_1 x_1 \underline{v}_1}{2q^2} - 2\underline{u}_1 \underline{v}_1 + \frac{x_1^2}{4q^2} \underline{v}_1^2 \right) \geq 0,\end{aligned}\tag{11}$$

because the quadratic form appearing in (11) satisfies  $\frac{y_1^2}{4q^2}, \frac{x_1^2}{4q^2} \geq 0$  and has discriminant  $\left(\frac{y_1 x_1}{2q^2} - 2\right)^2 - 4\frac{y_1^2}{4q^2}\frac{x_1^2}{4q^2} = \frac{-2y_1 x_1}{q^2} + \frac{4(x_1 y_1 - \frac{1}{2})}{q^2} = \frac{2y_1 x_1 - 2}{q^2} \leq 0$ . Combining (8), (9), (10) and (11) yields  $\psi'' \geq 0$ . For the above argument we assumed  $\psi > 0$ , but when  $\psi = 0$  then  $\psi'' = \frac{|\bar{u} - \bar{v}|^2}{q} \geq 0$ .  $\square$

Now we can proceed with the proof of Theorem 5.

*Proof of Theorem 5.* By rescaling the metric, we can assume  $\kappa = 1$ . We fix two geodesics  $\lambda, \mu : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ . We can assume that not both of them are constant. We have to show that  $t \mapsto \Phi(\lambda(t), \mu(t))$  is convex. For that, it is enough to show that for every  $t_0 \in (0, 1)$ , there exists a  $C^2$ -function  $\bar{\Phi}$  defined on a neighborhood of  $t_0$  such that  $\Phi(\cdot) \geq \bar{\Phi}(\cdot)$ ,  $\bar{\Phi}(t_0) = \Phi(t_0)$ , and  $\bar{\Phi}''(t_0) \geq 0$ .

Let  $t_0 \in (0, 1)$  be fixed. We set  $x := \lambda(t_0)$  and  $y := \mu(t_0)$ , we can assume that they are not equal. We choose  $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y} \in S^2_{1/\sqrt{2}}$  such that  $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}$ , and  $\tilde{o} := (1, 0, 0)$  are the vertices of a comparison triangle corresponding to the points  $x, y$ , and  $o$ . We then choose geodesics  $\bar{\lambda}, \underline{\lambda}, \bar{\mu}, \underline{\mu} : (t_0 - \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon) \rightarrow S^2_{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\lambda}(t_0) &= \underline{\lambda}(t_0) = \tilde{x}; & \bar{\mu}(t_0) &= \underline{\mu}(t_0) = \tilde{y}; \\ |\bar{\lambda}'| &= |\underline{\lambda}'| = |\lambda'|; & |\bar{\mu}'| &= |\underline{\mu}'| = |\mu'|, \end{aligned}$$

and additionally assume that for  $t > t_0$ ,  $\bar{\lambda}(t)$  and  $\bar{\mu}(t)$  lie in the same hemisphere with respect to the great circle running through  $\tilde{x}$  and  $\tilde{y}$ . We introduce some notation. By  $\lambda_{t_0+}$ , we mean the restriction of  $\lambda$  to the interval  $[t_0, t_0 + \varepsilon)$ , and  $\lambda_{t_0-}$  is defined analogously. By  $\angle_x(\lambda_{t_0+}, y)$ , we mean the angle between  $\lambda_{t_0+}$  and the unique geodesic connecting  $x$  and  $y$ . This is defined analogously for all the above-mentioned geodesics and points. With this notation, we additionally require,

$$\begin{aligned} \angle_{\tilde{x}}(\bar{\lambda}_{t_0+}, \tilde{y}) &= \angle_x(\lambda_{t_0+}, y); & \angle_{\tilde{y}}(\bar{\mu}_{t_0+}, \tilde{x}) &= \angle_y(\mu_{t_0+}, x); \\ \angle_{\tilde{x}}(\underline{\lambda}_{t_0+}, \tilde{o}) &= \angle_x(\lambda_{t_0+}, o); & \angle_{\tilde{y}}(\underline{\mu}_{t_0+}, \tilde{o}) &= \angle_y(\mu_{t_0+}, o), \end{aligned}$$

if  $\lambda$  or  $\mu$  respectively are non-constant, if they are constant, by the requirement on the speed, the same is true for the corresponding geodesics on the sphere.

Now for  $t \in (t_0 - \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon)$  we define,

$$P(t) := 1 - \cos d_X(\lambda(t), \mu(t)), \quad Q(t) := \sqrt{\cos d_X(\lambda(t), o) \cos d_X(\mu(t), o) - \frac{1}{2}}$$

and

$$\underline{Q}(t) := \sqrt{\cos d_{S^2}(\underline{\lambda}(t), \tilde{o}) \cos d_{S^2}(\underline{\mu}(t), \tilde{o}) - \frac{1}{2}}.$$

The function  $\bar{P}(t)$  is given the following way, if  $t \geq t_0$  and  $\lambda$  as well as  $\mu$  are nontrivial and we have that  $\angle_x(\lambda_{t_0+}, y)$  or  $\angle_y(\mu_{t_0+}, x)$  is zero, we set

$$\bar{P}(t) := 1 - \cos[d_{S^2}(\bar{\lambda}(t), \tilde{y}) + d_{S^2}(\tilde{x}, \bar{\mu}(t)) - d_{S^2}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})].$$

The same definition is used in the case when  $t \leq t_0$ ,  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  are nontrivial and  $\angle_x(\lambda_{t_0-}, y)$  or  $\angle_y(\mu_{t_0-}, x)$  are zero. In all other cases we set

$$\bar{P}(t) := 1 - \cos d_{S^2}(\bar{\lambda}(t), \bar{\mu}(t)).$$

Now it is apparent that  $\bar{P}(t_0) = P(t_0)$  and  $\underline{Q}(t_0) = Q(t_0)$ . Furthermore, we have that  $\bar{P}$  and  $\underline{Q}$  are  $C^2$  functions. In the case of  $\bar{P}$ , this can be seen, for example, when  $\angle_x(\lambda_{t_0+}, y) > 0$  and  $\angle_y(\mu_{t_0+}, x) = 0$ , by using that,

$$\begin{aligned} &1 - \cos d_{S^2}(\bar{\lambda}(t), \bar{\mu}(t)) \\ &= 1 - \cos d_{S^2}(\bar{\lambda}(t), \tilde{y}) \cos(|\mu'|t) - \sin d_{S^2}(\bar{\lambda}(t), \tilde{y}) \sin(|\mu'|t), \\ &1 - \cos[d_{S^2}(\bar{\lambda}(t), \tilde{y}) + d_{S^2}(\tilde{x}, \bar{\mu}(t)) - d_{S^2}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})], \\ &= 1 - \cos(|\lambda'|t) \cos[d_X(x, y) - |\mu'|t] - \sin(|\lambda'|t) \sin[d_X(x, y) - |\mu'|t] \cos \angle_x(\lambda_{t_0+}, y). \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} d/dt|_{t=0} \cos d_{S^2}(\bar{\lambda}(t), \bar{y}) &= -|\lambda'| \sin d_X(x, y) \cos \angle_x(\lambda_{t_0+}, y) \\ d^2/dt^2|_{t=0} \cos d_{S^2}(\bar{\lambda}(t), \bar{y}) &= -|\lambda'|^2 \cos d_X(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Lemma 1, we have that  $\left[ \frac{d^2 \bar{P}(t)}{dt^2} \right]_{t=t_0} \geq 0$ . It remains to show that  $P \geq \bar{P}$  and  $Q \leq \underline{Q}$  on  $(t_0 - \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon)$ .

We now establish that  $Q \leq \underline{Q}$ . By angle comparison and the construction of  $\underline{\lambda}$ . Assuming that  $\lambda$  is non-constant, for  $t > t_0$ , we have,

$$\tilde{Z}_x(\lambda(t), o) \geq \angle_x(\lambda_{t_0+}, o) = \tilde{Z}_{\bar{x}}(\underline{\lambda}(t), \bar{o}). \quad (12)$$

For  $t < t_0$ , by using the triangle inequality for angles, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Z}_x(\lambda(t), o) &\geq \angle_x(\lambda_{t_0-}, o) \\ &\geq \pi - \angle_x(\lambda_{t_0+}, o) = \tilde{Z}_{\bar{x}}(\underline{\lambda}(t), \bar{o}) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Then, by (12) and (13), and using the spherical law of cosines, for all  $t \in (t_0 - \varepsilon, t_0 + \varepsilon)$ , we find that  $d_X(\lambda(t), o) \geq d_{S^2}(\underline{\lambda}(t), \bar{o})$  and similarly,  $d_X(\mu(t), o) \geq d_{S^2}(\underline{\mu}(t), \bar{o})$ , so together, we conclude that  $Q \leq \underline{Q}$ . Now, we show  $P \geq \bar{P}$ , we only consider the case for  $t > t_0$ , the case for  $t < t_0$  works analogously (similar as in 13). We consider three different cases.

If either  $\lambda$  or  $\mu$  is constant, or if  $\angle_x(\lambda_{t_0+}, y)$  or  $\angle_y(\mu_{t_0+}, x)$  equals  $\pi$ , then  $\angle_x(\lambda_{t_0+}, \mu(t)) = \angle_x(\lambda_{t_0+}, y)$  or  $\angle_y(\lambda(t), \mu_{t_0+}) = \angle_y(\mu_{t_0+}, x)$ . Consequently, by angle comparison and the construction of  $\bar{\lambda}$  and  $\bar{\mu}$ , we have

$$d_X(\lambda(t), \mu(t)) \geq d_{S^2}(\bar{\lambda}(t), \bar{\mu}(t))$$

If  $\angle_x(\lambda_{t_0+}, y), \angle_y(\mu_{t_0+}, x) \in (0, \pi)$ , then, because  $\bar{\lambda}(t)$  and  $\bar{\mu}(t)$  lie in the same hemisphere with respect to the great circle running through  $\tilde{x}$  and  $\tilde{y}$ , we have  $\angle_{\tilde{y}}(\bar{\mu}(t), \tilde{x}) = \angle_{\tilde{y}}(\bar{\lambda}(t), \bar{\mu}(t)) + \angle_{\tilde{y}}(\bar{\lambda}(t), \tilde{x})$  or  $\angle_{\tilde{x}}(\bar{\lambda}(t), \tilde{y}) = \angle_{\tilde{x}}(\bar{\lambda}(t), \bar{\mu}(t)) + \angle_{\tilde{x}}(\bar{\mu}(t), \tilde{y})$ , assuming the first one, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Z}_y(\lambda(t), \mu(t)) &\geq \angle_y(\lambda(t), \mu_{t_0+}) \geq \angle_y(\mu_{t_0+}, x) - \angle_y(\lambda(t), x) \\ &= \angle_y(\bar{\mu}(t), x) - \angle_y(\lambda(t), x) = \angle_{\tilde{y}}(\bar{\lambda}(t), \bar{\mu}(t)) + \angle_{\tilde{y}}(\bar{\lambda}(t), \tilde{x}) - \angle_y(\lambda(t), x) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Now, because  $\angle_{\tilde{x}}(\bar{\lambda}_{t_0+}, \tilde{y}) = \angle_x(\lambda_{t_0+}, y)$  and  $|\bar{\lambda}'| = |\lambda'|$ , we have that  $\tilde{x}, \bar{\lambda}(t)$ , and  $\tilde{y}$  are the vertices of a comparison triangle of  $x, \lambda(t)$ , and  $y$ . Therefore,  $\angle_{\tilde{y}}(\bar{\lambda}(t), \tilde{x}) \geq \angle_y(\lambda(t), x)$ , so by (14) we have  $d_X(\lambda(t), \mu(t)) \geq d_{S^2}(\bar{\lambda}(t), \bar{\mu}(t))$ .

If  $\angle_y(\mu_{t_0+}, x)$  or  $\angle_x(\lambda_{t_0+}, y)$  is zero, assume this for the first one, then

$$\begin{aligned} d(\lambda(t), \mu(t)) &\geq d(\lambda(t), y) - d(\mu(t), y) \\ &\geq d_{S^2}(\bar{\lambda}(t), \tilde{y}) + d_{S^2}(\bar{\mu}(t), \tilde{x}) - d_{S^2}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \end{aligned}$$

So all three cases together imply  $P \geq \bar{P}$ , which also concludes the proof.  $\square$

## 4 Barycenters in $\text{CAT}(\kappa)$ -spaces

Let  $(X, d_X)$  be a metric space. In the following, for  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , we will denote by  $\mathcal{P}_p(X)$  the set of all Borel probability measures on  $X$  with finite  $p$ -th moment, i.e., for all  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(X)$ , we have  $\int d(z, x)^p d\mu(x) < \infty$  for some  $z \in X$ , and therefore for any  $z \in X$  and by  $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(X)$  we denote the set of all probability measures of finite support. For  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}_p(X)$ , we denote by  $\Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$  the set of all measures  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(X \times X)$  with marginals  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$ . The set  $\mathcal{P}_p(X)$  is equipped with the Wasserstein  $p$  metric, defined by  $W_p(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \inf_{\mu \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \left( \int d_X(x, y)^p d\mu(x, y) \right)^{1/p}$ .



## 4.1 Barycenters and Jensen's inequality

The goal of this subsection is to define barycenters and prove basic properties, which will lead to Jensen's inequality for barycenters. Barycenters have been discussed, for example, in the context of CAT(0) spaces in [34], and for uniformly convex metric spaces (i.e., spaces satisfying inequality 3) in [19]. The results and proofs presented in this subsection are versions of the results and proofs from those sources, unless stated otherwise.

We focus on barycenters in CAT( $\kappa$ ) spaces with diameter smaller than  $D_\kappa/2$ . Although barycenters can be defined in open balls of radius  $D_\kappa$  (see [2]), we limit our discussion to the former case because the uniform convexity inequality 3 imposes this restriction.

**Proposition 1** (Barycenter). *Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . For  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  with  $\kappa_i \geq 0$ , let  $(X_i, d_{X_i})$  be a complete CAT( $\kappa_i$ ) space with  $\text{diam}(X_i) \leq D_{\kappa_i, \epsilon}/2$ . Set  $\kappa = \max_i \kappa_i$  and denote by  $(X, d_X)$  the complete CAT( $\kappa$ ) space defined by  $X = \prod_{i=1}^n X_i$  and  $d_X = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n d_{X_i}^2}$ . Consider  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , the function*

$$z \mapsto \int d(z, x)^2 d\mu(x)$$

*admits a unique minimizer  $\mathfrak{B}(\mu) \in X$ , called the barycenter of  $\mu$ . Furthermore, we have  $\mathfrak{B}(\mu) = (\mathfrak{B}(\mu_1), \dots, \mathfrak{B}(\mu_n))$ , where  $\mu_i \in \mathcal{P}_2(X_i)$  is the  $i$ -th marginal of  $\mu$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(z_n)$  be a sequence in  $X$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int d_X(z_n, x)^2 d\mu(x) = \inf_{z \in X} \int d_X(z, x)^2 d\mu(x).$$

For each  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ , denote by  $z_{n,m}$  the geodesic midpoint between  $z_n$  and  $z_m$ . Because each of the factors satisfies the convexity condition 3, there exists  $k > 0$  s.t.

$$d_X(x, z_{n,m})^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( d_X(x, z_n)^2 + d_X(x, z_m)^2 \right) - \frac{k}{8} d_X(z_n, z_m)^2, \quad \forall x \in X. \quad (15)$$

From (15) we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{z \in X} \int d_X(z, x)^2 d\mu(x) &\leq \int d_X(x, z_{n,m})^2 d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int \left( d_X(x, z_n)^2 + d_X(x, z_m)^2 \right) d\mu(x) - \frac{k}{8} d_X(z_n, z_m)^2, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{k}{8} d_X(z_n, z_m)^2 &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left( \int d_X(x, z_n)^2 + \int d_X(x, z_m)^2 d\mu(x) \right) \\ &\quad - \inf_{z \in X} \int d_X(z, x)^2 d\mu(x) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n, m \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

because  $(X, d_X)$  is complete, the existence of  $\mathfrak{B}(\mu) \in X$  follows. For the uniqueness, consider  $z_1, z_2 \in X$ , two different minimizers of  $z \mapsto \int d(z, x)^2 d\mu(x)$ , and denote by  $z_{1,2}$  a geodesic midpoint between  $z_1$  and  $z_2$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int d_X(z_1, x)^2 d\mu(x) &\leq \int d_X(x, z_{1,2})^2 d\mu(x) \\ &< \frac{1}{2} \int \left( d_X(x, z_1)^2 + d_X(x, z_2)^2 \right) d\mu(x) - \frac{k}{8} d_X(z_1, z_2)^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies the uniqueness. Finally, for any  $z \in X$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X d_X(z, x)^2 d\mu(x) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{X_i} d_{X_i}(z_i, x)^2 d\mu_i(x) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{X_i} d_{X_i}(\mathfrak{B}(\mu_i), x)^2 d\mu_i(x) = \int_X d_X((\mathfrak{B}(\mu_1), \dots, \mathfrak{B}(\mu_n)), x)^2 d\mu(x), \end{aligned}$$

by uniqueness of barycenters, it follows  $\mathfrak{B}(\mu) = (\mathfrak{B}(\mu_1), \dots, \mathfrak{B}(\mu_n))$ .  $\square$

We now introduce orthogonal projections. The second part of the following proposition is adapted from [27] (II.2.4).

**Proposition 2** (orthogonal projection). *Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . For each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $\kappa_i \geq 0$ , let  $(X_i, d_{X_i})$  be a complete  $CAT(\kappa_i)$  space with  $\text{diam}(X_i) \leq D_{\kappa_i, \epsilon}/2$ . Set  $\kappa = \max_i \kappa_i$  and denote by  $(X, d_X)$  the complete  $CAT(\kappa)$  space given by  $X = \prod_{i=1}^n X_i$  and  $d_X = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n d_{X_i}^2}$ . Consider a closed convex subset  $C \subset X$ :*

1. *For each  $x \in X$ , there exists a unique point  $\pi(x) \in C$  such that  $d_X(x, \pi(x)) = d(x, C) := \inf_{y \in C} d_X(x, y)$ .*
2. *When  $x \notin C$  and  $y \in C$ , if  $y \neq \pi(x)$  then  $\angle_{\pi(x)}(x, y) \geq \pi/2$ .*

*The mapping  $\pi : X \rightarrow C$  is called the orthogonal projection.*

*Proof.* For the first point, fix  $x \in X$  and let  $(z_n)$  be a sequence in  $C$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_X(z_n, x) = \inf_{y \in C} d_X(y, x).$$

For each  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ , denote by  $z_{n,m}$  the geodesic midpoint between  $z_n$  and  $z_m$ . As  $C$  is convex, we have  $z_{n,m} \in C$ . Because each of the factors satisfies the convexity condition 3, there exists  $k > 0$  such that

$$d(x, C)^2 \leq d_X(x, z_{n,m})^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( d_X(x, z_n)^2 + d_X(x, z_m)^2 \right) - \frac{k}{8} d_X(z_n, z_m)^2, \quad (16)$$

This implies that  $(z_n)$  is a Cauchy sequence and by completeness, we have the existence of  $\pi(x) \in C$ . For the uniqueness, consider  $y_1, y_2 \in C$  such that  $d_X(z_1, x) = d_X(z_2, x) = \inf_{y \in X} d_X(y, x)$ . Denote by  $z_{1,2}$  the geodesic midpoint between  $z_1$  and  $z_2$ , then

$$d(x, y_1)^2 \leq d_X(x, z_{n,m})^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( d_X(x, y_1)^2 + d_X(x, y_2)^2 \right) - \frac{k}{8} d_X(y_1, y_2)^2,$$

which implies the uniqueness of  $\pi(x)$ .

For the second point, if  $\angle_{\pi(x)}(x, y)$  were less than  $\pi/2$ , then there would be  $x' \in [\pi(x), x]$  and  $y' \in [\pi(x), y]$  such that the comparison angle  $\bar{\angle}_{\pi(x)}(x', y')$  would be smaller than  $\pi/2$ . But then there is  $p \in [\pi(x), x']$  such that  $d_X(x', p) \leq d_{\mathbb{M}^2(\kappa)}(x', \bar{p}) < d_{\mathbb{M}^2(\kappa)}(x', \bar{\pi}(x)) = d_X(x', \pi(x)) = d_X(x', \pi(x'))$ , which contradicts  $d_X(x', \pi(x')) = \inf_{y \in C} d_X(y, x')$ .  $\square$

Barycenters always lie within the closed convex hull of the support of the corresponding measure.

**Proposition 3.** Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . For  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  with  $\kappa_i \geq 0$ , let  $(X_i, d_{X_i})$  be a complete  $CAT(\kappa_i)$  space with  $\text{diam}(X_i) \leq D_{\kappa_i, \epsilon}/2$ . Set  $\kappa = \max_i \kappa_i$  and denote by  $(X, d_X)$  the complete  $CAT(\kappa)$  space defined by  $X = \prod_{i=1}^n X_i$  and  $d_X = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n d_{X_i}^2}$ . For any  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , we have

$$\mathfrak{B}(\mu) \in \overline{\text{conv}}(\text{supp}(\mu)),$$

where  $\overline{\text{conv}}(\text{supp}(\mu))$  denotes the smallest closed convex subset of  $X$  which contains  $\text{supp}(\mu)$ .

*Proof.* Assume  $\mathfrak{B}(\mu) \notin \overline{\text{conv}}(\text{supp}(\mu))$ . Then, when  $\pi$  is the orthogonal projection onto  $\overline{\text{conv}}(\text{supp}(\mu))$ , as in Proposition 2, we have  $\mathfrak{B}(\mu) \neq \pi(\mathfrak{B}(\mu))$  and  $\angle_{\pi(\mathfrak{B}(\mu))}(\mathfrak{B}(\mu), x) \geq \pi/2$ , for any  $x \in \text{supp}(\mu)$ . Therefore, by angle comparison, also the corresponding angle in  $\mathbb{M}^2(\kappa)$  satisfies  $\angle_{\pi(\mathfrak{B}(\mu))}(\mathfrak{B}(\mu), x) \geq \pi/2$ .

1. Now, for  $\kappa \leq 0$ , by the Euclidean law of cosines, we have

$$d_X(\mathfrak{B}(\mu), x)^2 \geq d_X(x, \pi(\mathfrak{B}(\mu)))^2 + d_X(\pi(\mathfrak{B}(\mu)), \mathfrak{B}(\mu))^2,$$

2. and for  $\kappa > 0$  (assume w.l.o.g.  $\kappa = 1$ ), by the spherical law of cosines,

$$\cos(d_X(\mathfrak{B}(\mu), x)) \leq \cos(d_X(x, \pi(\mathfrak{B}(\mu)))) \cos(d_X(\pi(\mathfrak{B}(\mu)), \mathfrak{B}(\mu))).$$

So, in both cases, we have  $d_X(\mathfrak{B}(\mu), x) \geq d_X(x, \pi(\mathfrak{B}(\mu)))$ , which implies

$$\int d_X(z, x)^2 d\mu(x) \geq \int d_X(\mathfrak{B}(\mu), x)^2 d\mu(x) \geq \int d_X(x, \pi(\mathfrak{B}(\mu)))^2 d\mu(x) \quad \forall z \in X,$$

so  $\pi(\mathfrak{B}(\mu))$  is a barycenter of  $\mu$  and  $\mathfrak{B}(\mu) \neq \pi(\mathfrak{B}(\mu))$ , but this is a contradiction to the fact that barycenters are unique.  $\square$

We conclude this subsection by presenting the proof of Jensen's inequality for barycenters.

**Theorem 6** (Jensen's inequality). Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . For  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  with  $\kappa_i \geq 0$ , let  $(X_i, d_{X_i})$  be a complete  $CAT(\kappa_i)$  space with  $\text{diam}(X_i) \leq D_{\kappa_i, \epsilon}/2$ . Set  $\kappa = \max_i \kappa_i$  and denote by  $(X, d_X)$  the complete  $CAT(\kappa)$  space defined by  $X = \prod_{i=1}^n X_i$  and  $d_X = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n d_{X_i}^2}$ . Consider  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  and let  $\varphi \in L^1(\mu)$  be a lower semi-continuous convex function. Then

$$\varphi(\mathfrak{B}(\mu)) \leq \int \varphi(x) d\mu(x).$$

*Proof.* Consider  $\widehat{\varphi} : X \rightarrow X \times \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $\widehat{\varphi}(x) := (x, \varphi(x))$  and  $\widehat{\mu} := \widehat{\varphi}_* \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X \times \mathbb{R})$ , then we have

$$\mathfrak{B}(\widehat{\mu}) = (\mathfrak{B}(\mu), \mathfrak{B}(\varphi_* \mu)) = (\mathfrak{B}(\mu), \int \varphi(x) d\mu(x)) \quad (17)$$

We now show that  $\mathfrak{B}(\widehat{\mu})$  lies in the epigraph  $X_\varphi := \{(x, t) \in X \times \mathbb{R} \mid \varphi(x) \leq t\}$ . The epigraph  $X_\varphi$  is a closed convex subset of  $X \times \mathbb{R}$ . For the convexity, consider a geodesic  $\widehat{\gamma} : [0, 1] \rightarrow X \times \mathbb{R}$  connecting  $(x_0, s_0)$  and  $(x_1, s_1)$ , then  $\widehat{\gamma}(t) = (\gamma(t), (1-t)s_0 + ts_1)$  for some geodesic  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  between  $x_0$  and  $x_1$ , then because  $\varphi$  is convex

$$\varphi(\gamma(t)) \leq (1-t)\varphi(\gamma(0)) + t\varphi(\gamma(1)) \leq (1-t)s_0 + ts_1 \quad \forall t \in [0, 1].$$

For the closedness, consider a sequence  $((x_n, s_n))$  in  $X_\varphi$  which converges to  $(x, s) \in X \times \mathbb{R}$ , then because  $\varphi$  is lower semi-continuous  $\varphi(x) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x_n) \leq s$ . We also have that  $\text{supp}(\widehat{\mu}) \subset X_\varphi \subset X \times \mathbb{R} =: \widehat{X}$ , because

$$\widehat{\mu}(\widehat{X} \setminus X_\varphi) = \int 1_{\widehat{X} \setminus X_\varphi}(x, \varphi(x)) d\mu(x) = \int 1_{\{\varphi(x) > \varphi(x)\}} d\mu(x) = 0,$$

so because  $X_\varphi$  is closed and convex, together with Proposition 3, it follows that  $\mathfrak{B}(\widehat{\mu}) \in \overline{\text{conv}}(\text{supp}(\widehat{\mu})) \subset X_\varphi$ , together with (17) this implies the claim.  $\square$

## 4.2 The generalized variance inequality and Lipschitz continuity of the barycenter map

We begin by presenting a preliminary lemma which will be needed for proving the generalized variance inequality.

**Lemma 2.** Fix  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$  and let  $(X, d_X)$  be a complete  $CAT(\kappa)$  space with  $\text{diam}(X) \leq D_{\kappa, \epsilon}/2$ . Consider  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  and for any  $x \in X$  a geodesic  $\gamma_x : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  connecting  $x$  and  $\mathfrak{B}(\mu)$ , then we have

$$\mathfrak{B}(\mu) = \mathfrak{B} \left( \left( \gamma_{(\cdot)} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \right)_* \mu \right).$$

*Proof.* Fix  $z \in X$  and denote by  $\gamma_*\mu$  the measure  $(\gamma_{(\cdot)}(\frac{1}{2}))_*\mu$ . Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int d_X(z, x)^2 d\mu(x) &\geq \int d_X(\mathfrak{B}(\mu), x)^2 d\mu(x) = \int 4d_X \left( \mathfrak{B}(\mu), \gamma_x \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \right)^2 d\mu(x) \\ &= 2 \int d_X \left( \mathfrak{B}(\mu), \gamma_x \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \right)^2 d\mu(x) + 2 \int d_X \left( \gamma_x \left( \frac{1}{2} \right), x \right)^2 d\mu(x) \\ &\geq 2 \int d_X \left( \mathfrak{B}(\gamma_*\mu), \gamma_x \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \right)^2 d\mu(x) + 2 \int d_X \left( \gamma_x \left( \frac{1}{2} \right), x \right)^2 d\mu(x) \\ &= 4 \int \frac{1}{2} d_X \left( \mathfrak{B}(\gamma_*\mu), \gamma_x \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} d_X \left( \gamma_x \left( \frac{1}{2} \right), x \right)^2 d\mu(x) \\ &\geq 4 \int \frac{1}{4} d_X \left( \mathfrak{B}(\gamma_*\mu), x \right)^2 d\mu(x) = \int d_X \left( \mathfrak{B}(\gamma_*\mu), x \right)^2 d\mu(x), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is a consequence of the triangle inequality. By the uniqueness of barycenters, the claim follows.  $\square$

We now turn our attention to the generalized variance inequality. The term 'generalized' is used because the variance inequality is already well-established in the context of  $CAT(0)$  spaces (see, for example, Proposition 4.4 in [34]). Our proof is inspired by the proof presented in [37] (Lemma 6.5), which itself is a more general form of Lemma 3.1 in [25]. These sources have demonstrated this fact for 2-uniformly convex Banach spaces, where the barycenter map is defined as  $\mu \mapsto \int x d\mu(x)$ .

**Theorem 7** (generalized variance inequality). Fix  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$  and let  $(X, d_X)$  be a complete  $CAT(\kappa)$  space with  $\text{diam}(X) \leq D_{\kappa, \epsilon}/2$ . Consider  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , then

$$\int d(z, x)^2 d\mu(x) \geq d(z, \mathfrak{B}(\mu))^2 + \frac{k}{2} \int d(\mathfrak{B}(\mu), x)^2 d\mu(x) \quad \forall z \in X,$$

where  $k = k_\varepsilon = (\pi - \varepsilon\pi) \tan(\varepsilon\frac{\pi}{2})$  if  $\kappa > 0$ , and  $k = 2$  if  $\kappa \leq 0$

*Proof.* Fix  $z \in X$ . Because of 2 resp. 3, we have that  $d(z, \cdot)^2$  is a convex lower semi-continuous function. Therefore, by Jensen's inequality 6, the following infimum exists,

$$\theta = \inf \left\{ \frac{\int d(z, x)^2 d\mu(x) - d(z, \mathfrak{B}(\mu))^2}{\int d(x, \mathfrak{B}(\mu))^2 d\mu(x)} : \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X) \text{ s.t. } \mu \neq \delta_x \quad \forall x \in X \right\}.$$

So, for any  $\phi > \theta$ , there exists  $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$  such that

$$\phi \int d(x, \mathfrak{B}(\mu_0))^2 d\mu_0(x) > \int d(z, x)^2 d\mu_0(x) - d(z, \mathfrak{B}(\mu_0))^2. \quad (18)$$

Also, for any  $x \in X$ , consider a geodesic  $\gamma_x : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  connecting  $\gamma_x(0) = x$  and  $\gamma_x(1) = \mathfrak{B}(\mu_0)$ . Then, we have

$$d(z, x)^2 \geq 2d\left(z, \gamma_x\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)\right)^2 + \frac{k}{4}d(x, \mathfrak{B}(\mu_0))^2 - d(z, \mathfrak{B}(\mu_0))^2. \quad (19)$$

Now, we denote by  $\gamma_*\mu_0$  the measure  $(\gamma_{(\cdot)}(\frac{1}{2}))_*\mu_0$ . Combining (18) and (19) together with Lemma 2 yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \phi \int d(x, \mathfrak{B}(\mu_0))^2 d\mu_0(x) \\ & > 2 \left( \int d\left(z, \gamma_x\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)\right)^2 d\mu_0(x) - d(z, \mathfrak{B}(\mu_0))^2 \right) + \frac{k}{4} \int d(x, \mathfrak{B}(\mu_0))^2 d\mu_0(x) \\ & = 2 \left( \int d\left(z, \gamma_x\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)\right)^2 d\mu_0(x) - d(z, \mathfrak{B}(\gamma_*\mu_0))^2 \right) + \frac{k}{4} \int d(x, \mathfrak{B}(\mu_0))^2 d\mu_0(x) \\ & \geq 2\theta \int d\left(\gamma_x\left(\frac{1}{2}\right), \mathfrak{B}(\mu_0)\right)^2 d\mu_0(x) + \frac{k}{4} \int d(x, \mathfrak{B}(\mu_0))^2 d\mu_0(x) \\ & = \frac{\theta}{2} \int d(x, \mathfrak{B}(\mu_0))^2 d\mu_0(x) + \frac{k}{4} \int d(x, \mathfrak{B}(\mu_0))^2 d\mu_0(x). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any  $\phi > \theta$ , it holds that  $\phi > \left(\frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{k}{4}\right)$ , which implies  $\theta \geq \frac{k}{2}$ .  $\square$

The barycenter map on CAT(0) spaces is 1-Lipschitz on the corresponding Wasserstein 2 space. Even more we have the following fact. We repeat the argument from [34] (Thm. 6.3).

**Proposition 4.** *Let  $(X, d_X)$  be a complete CAT(0) space and  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ , then*

$$d_X(\mathfrak{B}(\mu_1), \mathfrak{B}(\mu_2)) \leq W_1(\mu_1, \mu_2) \leq W_2(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

*Proof.* Fix  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X \times X)$  with marginals  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$ . Now because  $d_X : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is convex (see e.g. Cor. 2.5 in [34]) by Jensen's inequality 6 we have

$$d_X(\mathfrak{B}(\mu_1), \mathfrak{B}(\mu_2)) = d_X(\mathfrak{B}(\mu)) \leq \int d_X(x, y) d\mu(x, y),$$

which implies the claim.  $\square$

We emphasize the Lipschitz continuity on the Wasserstein 2 space because this is what we need for our goal of proving Theorem 3. Now we observe that this property is also true in the case of positive upper curvature bounds, by employing our convex 'replacement' of the squared distance function from section 3.

**Theorem 8.** *Fix  $\kappa > 0$ , and let  $(X, d_X)$  be a complete CAT( $\kappa$ )-space. Suppose  $B = \overline{B}_r(o)$  is a closed ball in  $X$  with radius  $r \leq D_{\kappa, \varepsilon}/4$ , centered at  $o \in X$ . There exists  $\Gamma_\varepsilon > 0$  such that, for any  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}_2(B)$  we have that*

$$d_X(\mathfrak{B}(\mu_1), \mathfrak{B}(\mu_2)) \leq \Gamma_\varepsilon W_2(\mu_1, \mu_2),$$

where  $\Gamma_\varepsilon = \frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{2}(\cos((1-\varepsilon)\frac{\pi}{2}))^{1/4}}$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(B \times B)$  with marginals  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$ . By Theorem 5, the function  $\Phi : B \times B \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  given by

$$\Phi(x, y) = \frac{1 - \cos_\kappa d_X(x, y)}{\sqrt{\cos_\kappa d_X(x, o) \cos_\kappa d_X(y, o) - \frac{1}{2}}}$$

is convex. Therefore, by Jensen's inequality 6, we have

$$\Phi(\mathfrak{B}(\mu_1), \mathfrak{B}(\mu_2)) = \Phi(\mathfrak{B}(\mu)) \leq \int \Phi(x, y) d\mu(x, y). \quad (20)$$

Now, inequality (20) implies

$$\sqrt{2}[1 - \cos_\kappa d_X(\mathfrak{B}(\mu_1), \mathfrak{B}(\mu_2))] \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\cos^2((1-\varepsilon)\frac{\pi}{4}) - \frac{1}{2}}} \int 1 - \cos_\kappa d_X(x, y) d\mu(x, y) \quad (21)$$

By using  $2\cos^2(x) - 1 = \cos(2x)$  and  $\frac{4}{\pi^2} \leq \frac{1-\cos(x)}{x^2} \leq \frac{1}{2}$  for all  $x \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ , we have that

$$\frac{4}{\pi^2} d_X(\mathfrak{B}(\mu_1), \mathfrak{B}(\mu_2))^2 \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\cos((1-\varepsilon)\frac{\pi}{2})}} \int d_X(x, y)^2 d\mu(x, y), \quad (22)$$

which implies the claim.  $\square$

## 5 Nonlinear Cotypes and Lipschitz extensions

There are two distinct metric versions of the Banach space notion of Rademacher cotype, named metric Markov cotype and metric cotype. While metric cotype is equivalent to Rademacher cotype when the metric space is a Banach space, metric Markov cotype is not. However, it facilitates Lipschitz extensions for maps from spaces of Keith Ball's Markov type (see [25]) into spaces of metric Markov cotype.

We fix the following nomenclature for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\pi \in \Delta^{n-1}$ , where  $\Delta^{n-1}$  is the  $n-1$ -dimensional simplex  $\{x \in [0, 1]^n : \sum_{i=1}^n x_i = 1\}$ . A stochastic matrix  $A = (a_{ij}) \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$  is reversible relative to the probability vector  $\pi$  if  $\pi_i a_{ij} = \pi_j a_{ji}$  for all  $i, j \in 1, \dots, n$ .

**Definition 2** (Markov Type). *A metric space  $(X, d_X)$  is said to have Markov type  $p \in (0, \infty)$  with constant  $M \in (0, \infty)$  if for every  $n, t \in \mathbb{N}$  and every  $\pi \in \Delta^{n-1}$  if  $A = (a_{ij}) \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$  is a stochastic matrix that is reversible relative to  $\pi$ , then for any  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$ , the following inequality holds,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \pi_i (A^t)_{ij} d_X(x_i, x_j)^p \leq M^p t \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \pi_i a_{ij} d_X(x_i, x_j)^p.$$

The infimum over those  $M \in (0, \infty)$  is denoted by  $M_p(X)$ .

By the triangle inequality, every metric space has Markov type 1. For  $p \in [1, 2]$ , it was shown in [25] (Prop. 1.4) that  $L_p$  spaces have Markov type  $p$ . Additionally, [39] demonstrated that 2-uniformly smooth Banach spaces have Markov type 2, particularly  $L_p$  spaces with  $p \in [2, \infty)$ . By [30], Alexandrov spaces of nonnegative curvature have Markov type 2. In [28], it was shown that spaces admitting a padded random partition have Markov type 2 (see section 3.3 of [28] for a definition), which includes planar graphs, as shown in [33], and spaces of finite Nagata dimension (see e.g. in the introduction of [32] for a definition). This dimensionality condition is satisfied, for example, by certain Gromov hyperbolic spaces (see e.g. [32] Prop. 3.5) and doubling metric spaces (see e.g. [32] Lemma 2.3), and thus particularly  $n$ -point spaces.

In [25], Ball introduced the notion of Markov cotype for metric spaces. Later, Mendel and Naor provided a seemingly different definition in [37], but they showed in [21] that these two notions, in fact, coincide. The following is the latter version of Markov cotype.

**Definition 3** (Metric Markov Cotype). *A metric space  $(X, d_X)$  is said to have metric Markov cotype  $p \in (0, \infty)$  with constant  $N \in (0, \infty)$  if for every  $n, t \in \mathbb{N}$ , every  $\pi \in \Delta^{n-1}$  and every*

stochastic matrix  $A = (a_{ij}) \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$  that is reversible relative to  $\pi$  then for every  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$  there exist  $y_1, \dots, y_n \in X$  satisfying,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i d_X(x_i, y_i)^p + t \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \pi_i a_{ij} d_X(y_i, y_j)^p \\ \leq N^p \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \pi_i \left( \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t A^s \right)_{ij} d_X(x_i, x_j)^p. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

The infimum over those  $N \in (0, \infty)$  is denoted  $N_p(X)$ .

In [37] it is shown  $p$ -uniformly convex Banach spaces have Markov type  $p$ . In [24], Mendel and Naor solved the longstanding open problem of finding a metric formulation of Rademacher cotype and showed that this definition, in the case of a Banach space, is in fact equivalent to the Rademacher cotype property.

In order to define metric cotype, we fix the following notation. Let  $\mathbb{Z}_{2m}$  be the set of integers modulo  $2m$ . The additions that appear in the arguments of the functions in the metric cotype definition are performed modulo  $2m$ . Furthermore  $e_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0), \dots, e_n = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$  denotes the standard basis of  $\mathbb{Z}_{2m}^n$ .

**Definition 4** (Metric Cotype). *A metric space  $(X, d_X)$  is said to have metric cotype  $q \in (0, \infty)$  with constant  $\Gamma \in (0, \infty)$  if for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists some  $m = m(n, q, X) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that every function  $f : \mathbb{Z}_{2m}^n \rightarrow X$  satisfies,*

$$\left( \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_{2m}^n} d_X(f(x + me_i), f(x))^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq \Gamma m \left( \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{\varepsilon \in \{-1, 1\}^n} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_{2m}^n} d_X(f(x + \varepsilon), f(x))^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}},$$

and it is said to have sharp metric cotype if additionally  $m \lesssim_{q, X} n^{1/q}$  and  $\Gamma \lesssim_{q, X} 1$ .

In addition to Banach spaces of Rademacher cotype  $p \in [2, \infty)$  inherently possessing metric cotype  $p$ , for example also ultrametric spaces exhibit metric cotype  $p$  for any  $p > 1$  (see [38]). However, the situation becomes more intricate when considering sharp metric cotype. It remains an open question whether every Banach space with Rademacher cotype  $p$  possesses this property. Nevertheless, if we have the additional knowledge that the Banach space is also  $K$ -convex (for the definition of  $K$ -convex Banach spaces and the related result, see [24]), then the property of sharp metric cotype  $p$  indeed holds. In particular this is the case for  $p$ -uniformly convex Banach spaces.

It's worth noting that the term "sharp metric cotype" was chosen because in the situation of definition 4, we always have  $m \geq \frac{1}{\Gamma} n^{1/q}$  and that in [24] metric cotype is defined seemingly different than 4 but in [5] it is shown that the two definitions coincide.

## 5.1 Nonlinear Cotypes for $\text{CAT}(\kappa)$ -spaces

In Thm. 5 of [5], it was demonstrated that any metric space which admits a barycenter map that satisfies the generalized variance inequality with a general exponent  $q \in [1, \infty)$  possesses sharp metric cotype  $q$ . There, such metric spaces were referred to as  $q$ -barycentric. Consequently, Theorem 2 is a direct result of Theorem 7. In Thm. 1.5 of [21], it was shown that if the barycenter map is additionally Lipschitz continuous on the Wasserstein  $p$  space, then the space also has metric Markov Cotype  $p$ . Thus, Theorem 3 follows from Theorem 7 and Theorem 8 resp. 4. More specifically, the proof of Theorem 1.5 in [21] demonstrates that for  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ , a closed ball  $\overline{B}_r$  of radius  $r \leq D_{\kappa, \varepsilon}/4$  in a complete  $\text{CAT}(\kappa)$  space has Markov cotype 2 constant  $N_2(\overline{B}_r) \leq (16\Gamma^2 \frac{2}{\kappa} + 1)$ , where

$$\Gamma = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \kappa \leq 0 \\ \frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{2}(\cos((1-\varepsilon)\frac{\pi}{2}))^{1/4}} & \text{if } \kappa > 0, \end{cases}$$

$$k = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } \kappa \leq 0 \\ (\pi - \varepsilon\pi) \tan\left(\varepsilon\frac{\pi}{2}\right) & \text{if } \kappa > 0. \end{cases}$$

Barycenters enable us to define martingales valued in nonlinear target spaces. To demonstrate how the generalized variance inequality leads to Theorems 2 and 3, we provide a definition and statement of a nonlinear martingale inequality. This inequality is the main tool used to establish Thm. 5 in [5] and Thm. 1.5 in [21]. The definition presented below is adapted from [21].

**Definition 5** (Martingale). *Fix  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$  and let  $(X, d_X)$  be a complete  $CAT(\kappa)$  space of  $\text{diam}(X) \leq D_{\kappa, \varepsilon}/2$ , let  $\Omega$  be a finite set and  $\mu : 2^\Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$  a probability measure of full support, i.e.,  $\mu(\{\omega\}) > 0$  for every  $\omega \in \Omega$ .*

1. *Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^\Omega$  be a  $\sigma$ -algebra. For each  $\omega \in \Omega$ , define  $\mathcal{F}(\omega) \subseteq \Omega$  to be the unique atom in  $\mathcal{F}$  that contains  $\omega$ . Given a function  $Z : \Omega \rightarrow X$ , its  $\mu$ -conditional barycenter is denoted by  $\mathfrak{B}_\mu(Z | \mathcal{F}) : \Omega \rightarrow X$  and is defined by*

$$\mathfrak{B}_\mu(Z | \mathcal{F})(\omega) = \mathfrak{B} \left( \frac{1}{\mu(\mathcal{F}(\omega))} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{F}(\omega)} \mu(a) \delta_{Z(a)} \right).$$

2. *Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\sigma$ -algebras  $\mathcal{F}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{F}_n \subseteq 2^\Omega$ . We say that a sequence of mappings  $\{Z_i : \Omega \rightarrow X\}_{i=0}^n$  is a  $\mu$ -martingale with respect to the filtration  $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=0}^n$  if*

$$\mathfrak{B}_\mu(Z_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}) = Z_{i-1}, \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

The following inequality is a nonlinear version of a martingale inequality originally proven by Pisier in [31] for martingales taking values in uniformly convex Banach spaces. It was extended in Lemma 2.1 of [21] to martingales as previously described, which take values in  $q$ -barycentric metric spaces. Therefore, this inequality is a consequence of the generalized variance inequality.

**Theorem 9** (Pisier's inequality). *Fix  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$  and let  $(X, d_X)$  be a complete  $CAT(\kappa)$  space of  $\text{diam}(X) \leq D_{\kappa, \varepsilon}/2$ . Suppose that  $\mu$  is a probability measure of full support on a finite set  $\Omega$  and that  $\{Z_i : \Omega \rightarrow X\}_{i=0}^n$  is a  $\mu$ -martingale with respect to a filtration  $\mathcal{F}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{F}_n \subseteq 2^\Omega$ . Then,*

$$\frac{k}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\Omega} d_X(Z_i, Z_{i-1})^2 \, d\mu \leq \int_{\Omega} d_X(Z_n, z)^2 \, d\mu - \int_{\Omega} d_X(Z_0, z)^2 \, d\mu \quad \forall z \in X,$$

where  $k = k_\varepsilon = (\pi - \varepsilon\pi) \tan\left(\varepsilon\frac{\pi}{2}\right)$  if  $\kappa > 0$ , and  $k = 2$  if  $\kappa \leq 0$

## 5.2 Lipschitz extensions

Now we turn our attention to proving Theorem 1. This is a consequence of the following theorem because Alexandrov spaces of nonnegative curvature  $(X, d_X)$  exhibit Markov type 2 with  $M_2(X) \lesssim 1$ , as demonstrated in [30].

**Theorem 10.** *For  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  and  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ , there exists a constant  $C_{\kappa, \varepsilon} \geq 1$  such that, for a metric space  $(X, d_X)$  of Markov type 2 and a complete  $CAT(\kappa)$  space  $(Y, d_Y)$ , the following holds. Given a subset  $Z \subset X$  and a Lipschitz function  $f : Z \rightarrow Y$  with Lipschitz constant  $\|f\|_{Lip}$ , assume there is a point  $o \in X$  such that  $f(Z) \subset \overline{B}_r(o)$  with  $r \leq D_{\kappa, \varepsilon}/4$ . Then, there exists a Lipschitz extension  $\tilde{f} : X \rightarrow Y$  of  $f$  with Lipschitz constant  $\|\tilde{f}\|_{Lip} \leq C_{\kappa, \varepsilon} \|f\|_{Lip}$ .*



In addition to Theorem 1, Theorem 10 also facilitates the extension of Lipschitz maps defined on domains that admit a padded random partition (see section 3.3 of [28] for a definition). However, the radius of the ball in 10 can be increased for such spaces. According to [22] (see section 1.3), when the domain admits a padded random partition, Lipschitz extensions can be found when the target space is a metric space that admits a barycenter map i.e. it sends each probability measure to a point in the space and maps Dirac deltas to the corresponding points, that is Lipschitz continuous with respect to the total variation norm. This property holds in an open ball in a  $\text{CAT}(\kappa)$  space of radius smaller than  $D_\kappa/2$  because there exists a Lipschitz continuous barycenter map with respect to the Wasserstein- $p$  distance for some  $p > 2$ , as shown by Proposition 24 in [2] and the Wasserstein- $p$  distance on a bounded set can be controlled by the total variation norm (see, e.g., [40]). When the domain in Theorem 10 is a 2-uniformly smooth Banach space, this yields a Lipschitz extension result that, to the best of our knowledge, has not been previously addressed in the literature.

The proof of Theorem 10 is based on a generalized version of Ball's extension theorem by Mendel and Naor, as detailed in [21] (Thm. 1.11). This theorem facilitates Lipschitz extensions to finitely many points, with a bound on the Lipschitz constant that is independent of the chosen points.

**Theorem 11** (generalized Ball extension theorem). *Fix  $p \in [1, \infty)$ . Let  $(X, d_X)$  be a metric space of Markov type  $p$  and let  $(Y, d_Y)$  be a metric space of metric Markov cotype  $p$  which admits a barycenter map  $\mathfrak{B} : (\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(Y), W_p) \rightarrow Y$  (i.e  $\mathfrak{B}(\delta_x) = x$ , for every  $x \in Y$ ) that is Lipschitz continuous with constant  $\Gamma \geq 1$ . Suppose that  $Z \subseteq X$  and  $f : Z \rightarrow Y$  is Lipschitz. Then for every finite subset  $S \subseteq X$  there exists  $\bar{f} : S \rightarrow Y$  with  $\bar{f}|_{S \cap Z} = f|_{S \cap Z}$  and*

$$\|\bar{f}\|_{\text{Lip}} \lesssim \Gamma M_p(X) N_p(Y) \|f\|_{\text{Lip}}.$$

In order to progress from Theorem 11 to 10 we need to repeat a few facts about ultralimits. Those facts can be found, for example, in Chapter 10 of [16]. Let  $I$  be an infinite set and  $\omega$  a non-principal ultrafilter on  $I$  i.e a finitely additive measure  $\omega : 2^I \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  such that  $\omega(I) = 1$  and  $\omega(F) = 0$  for every finite subset  $F$  of  $I$ . For a topological space  $Y$  and a function  $f : I \rightarrow Y$  the  $\omega$ -limit denoted by  $\omega - \lim_i f(i)$  is defined to be a point  $y \in Y$  such that for every neighborhood  $U$  of  $y$ , we have  $\omega(f^{-1}U) = 1$ . The point  $y$  is called the ultralimit of the function  $f$ . If  $Y$  is compact then the  $\omega$ -limit exists and if  $Y$  is also Hausdorff then it is unique.

Given a collection of metric spaces  $(X_i, d_{X_i})_{i \in I}$ , the ultralimit is defined in the following manner. Let  $\prod_i X_i$  be the product of the sets  $X_i$ . We define the distance between two points  $(x_i), (y_i) \in \prod_i X_i$  by

$$d_\omega((x_i), (y_i)) := \omega - \lim_i (i \mapsto d_{X_i}(x_i, y_i)),$$

The function  $d_\omega$  is a pseudo-distance taking values within the compact space  $[0, \infty]$ . The ultralimit  $(X_\omega, d_\omega)$  is formed by identifying all points within  $\prod_i X_i$  that have zero  $d_\omega$  distance. For an indexed family of points  $(x_i)_{i \in I}$  we denote the equivalence class of these points as  $x_\omega$ .

If the spaces  $X_i$  do not have uniformly bounded diameters, the ultralimit  $X_\omega$  divides into several components, each containing points at finite distances from one another. To isolate one of these components, we introduce specific base-points  $e_i$  within each  $X_i$ . This based or pointed metric space, will be denoted by  $(X_i, d_{X_i}, e_i)$ . The collection  $(e_i)$  gives a base-point  $e = e_\omega$  within  $X_\omega$ , we define

$$X_{\omega, e} := \{x_\omega \in X_\omega \mid d_\omega(x_\omega, e_\omega) < \infty\},$$

and denote the based ultralimit by  $(X_{\omega, e}, d_\omega, e_\omega)$ . In the following we will omit the  $e$  from the notation.

When each  $X_i$  is identical to some  $Y$ , for all indices  $i$ , the resulting ultralimit  $(X_\omega, d_\omega)$  is referred to as a constant ultralimit. We have the following examples of constant ultralimits. If  $Y$  is compact then the ultralimit of  $X_i = Y$  is isometric to  $Y$ . The same is true when we set  $X_i = \mathbb{R}^n$

when considering a sequence of base-points  $e_i$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , the ultralimit  $(X_\omega, d_\omega, e_\omega)$  is isometric to  $(\mathbb{R}^n, |\cdot|, 0)$ .

Given geodesics in  $X_i$ , the corresponding ultralimit yields geodesics in  $X_\omega$ . Those geodesics are called limit geodesics. Generally, these need not be the only geodesics in  $X_\omega$ . However, when  $X_i$  is a small enough  $\text{CAT}(\kappa)$  space they are. The following lemma is a version of Lemma 10.53 in [16], where this was proven in the case  $\kappa \leq 0$ . This assumption ensures that geodesics in the corresponding spaceform are unique. However, since we restrict the diameter of our spaces of interest, the same argument is applicable in the more general setting.

**Lemma 3.** *Fix  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ , and let  $(X, d_X)$  be a  $\text{CAT}(\kappa)$  space. For  $o \in X$ , let  $\overline{B}_r(o)$  be a closed ball of radius  $r \leq D_{\kappa, \varepsilon}/2$ , and consider the pointed metric space  $(\overline{B}_r(o), d_X, o)$ . Then, the corresponding constant ultralimit  $(X_\omega, d_\omega, o_\omega)$  is a pointed  $\text{CAT}(\kappa)$  space with  $d_\omega(o_\omega, x_\omega) \leq r$  for all  $x_\omega \in X_\omega$ .*

*Proof.* It is evident that  $d_\omega(o_\omega, x_\omega) \leq r$  for all  $x_\omega \in X_\omega$ , and that comparison inequalities applicable to geodesic triangles in  $\overline{B}_r(o)$  also apply to corresponding limit triangles in  $X_\omega$ . The task now is to demonstrate that  $X_\omega$  constitutes a uniquely geodesic metric space, where each geodesic segment in  $X_\omega$  represents a limit geodesic.

Fix  $x_\omega, y_\omega \in X_\omega$ . Suppose that  $z_\omega$  is a point on a geodesic connecting  $x_\omega$  and  $y_\omega$ , or equivalently

$$d_\omega(x_\omega, z_\omega) + d_\omega(z_\omega, y_\omega) = d_\omega(x_\omega, y_\omega),$$

Then, we have that  $\omega$ -almost surely  $d_{X_i}(x_i, z_i) + d_{X_i}(z_i, y_i) = d_{X_i}(x_i, y_i)$ .

Consider the point  $q_i \in [x_i, y_i]$  such that

$$d_{X_i}(x_i, z_i) = d_{X_i}(x_i, q_i) \text{ and } d_{X_i}(z_i, y_i) = d_{X_i}(q_i, y_i).$$

Take a triangle  $\Delta(x_i, q_i, y_i)$  and the corresponding comparison triangle  $\tilde{\Delta}(\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{q}_i, \tilde{y}_i)$  in  $\mathbb{M}^2(\kappa)$ . Since geodesics are unique in a ball of radius  $r$  in  $\mathbb{M}^2(\kappa)$ , we have

$$\omega - \lim d_{X_i}(z_i, q_i) \leq \omega - \lim d_{\mathbb{M}^2(\kappa)}(\tilde{z}_i, \tilde{q}_i) = 0,$$

and therefore  $z_\omega = q_\omega$ , which implies that the only geodesics in  $X_\omega$  are limit geodesics.  $\square$

We are now able to prove Theorem 10.

*Proof of Theorem 10.* Fix  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  set  $C_{\kappa, \varepsilon} := \Gamma(16\Gamma^2 \frac{2}{k} + 1)$  with  $\Gamma$  and  $k$  as defined in the beginning of subsection 5.1. Let  $(X, d_X)$  be a metric space of Markov type 2 and  $(Y, d_Y)$  a complete  $\text{CAT}(\kappa)$  space. Consider any subset  $Z \subset X$  and a Lipschitz map  $f : Z \rightarrow Y$  such that there exists a point  $o \in Y$  with  $f(Z) \subset \overline{B}_r(o)$  where  $r \leq D_{\kappa, \varepsilon}/4$ .

Let  $I$  be the set of finite subsets of  $X$ . Now because by Theorem 3  $\overline{B}_r(o)$  has Markov cotype 2 together with Theorem 8 by Theorem 11 we have that for each  $i \in I$  there exists a function  $\tilde{f}_i : i \rightarrow \overline{B}_r(o)$  which extends  $f$  and  $\|\tilde{f}_i\|_{\text{Lip}} \lesssim C_{\kappa, \varepsilon} M_2(X) \|f\|_{\text{Lip}}$ .

Let  $\omega$  be a non-principal ultrafilter on  $I$ , and let  $(Y_\omega, d_\omega, e_\omega)$  be the constant ultralimit corresponding to  $\overline{B}_r(o)$  with  $e_i = f(z)$  for a fixed  $z \in Z$ . We choose a function  $\tilde{f} : X \rightarrow Y_\omega$  s.t  $\tilde{f}(x)_i = \tilde{f}_i \cup z(x)$  when  $x \in i$  and  $\tilde{f}(x)_i = f(x)$  when  $x \in Z$ . Because for each  $x, y \in X$  and any neighborhood of  $d_\omega(\tilde{f}(x), \tilde{f}(y))$ , there exists some  $i \in I$  containing  $x$  and  $y$ , such that the distance  $d(\tilde{f}_i(x), \tilde{f}_i(y))$  lies in the neighborhood,  $\tilde{f}$  is Lipschitz with  $\|\tilde{f}\|_{\text{Lip}} \lesssim C_{\kappa, \varepsilon} M_2(X) \|f\|_{\text{Lip}}$ .

Now  $Y_\omega$  is a  $\text{CAT}(\kappa)$  space with  $d_\omega(e_\omega, y_\omega) \leq r$  for all  $y_\omega \in Y_\omega$ , by Lemma 3 and because  $\overline{B}_r(o)$  is a convex subset of  $Y_\omega$  via the embedding  $y \mapsto (y)_{i \in I}$ , there is 1-Lipschitz retraction  $\pi : Y_\omega \rightarrow \overline{B}_r(o)$ . For  $\kappa \leq 0$ ,  $\pi$  is given by the orthogonal projection (see e.g. [27] II. 2.4 for the fact that it is 1-Lipschitz) and when  $\kappa > 0$  then it was shown in [36] that such a map also exists. Now  $\pi \circ \tilde{f}$  extends  $f$  and  $\|\pi \circ \tilde{f}\|_{\text{Lip}} \lesssim C_{\kappa, \varepsilon} M_2(X) \|f\|_{\text{Lip}}$ .  $\square$

**Acknowledgments.** This work originates from the author's master's thesis conducted at the University of Bonn under the supervision of Karl-Theodor Sturm. The author would like to thank him for the helpful discussions and continuous support. Additionally, the author would like to thank Manor Mendel for pointing out the additional application of uniform non-embeddability.

## References

- [1] Alexander, Stephanie and Kapovitch, Vitali and Petrunin, Anton. Alexandrov meets Kirszbraun. arXiv preprint arXiv:1012.5636, 2010.
- [2] Yokota, Takumi. Convex functions and barycenter on CAT (1)-spaces of small radii. *Journal of the Mathematical Society of Japan*, 68(3):1297–1323, 2016.
- [3] Lang, Urs and Plaut, Conrad. Bilipschitz embeddings of metric spaces into space forms. *Geometriae Dedicata*, 87:285–307, 2001.
- [4] Bourgain, Jean and Milman, Vitali and Wolfson, Haim. On type of metric spaces. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 294(1):295–317, 1986.
- [5] Eskenazis, Alexandros and Mendel, Manor and Naor, Assaf. Nonpositive curvature is not coarsely universal. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 217:833–886, 2019.
- [6] Kendall, Wilfrid S. Convexity and the hemisphere. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 2(3):567–576, 1991.
- [7] Ohta, Shin-ichi. Convexities of metric spaces. *Geometriae Dedicata*, 125:225–250, 2007.
- [8] Burago, Dmitri and Burago, Yuri and Ivanov, Sergei. A course in metric geometry. American Mathematical Society, volume 33, 2022.
- [9] Gromov, M. Spaces and questions. *Geometric and Functional Analysis (GAFA), Special Volume, Part I*:118–161, 2000.
- [10] Gromov, M. Random walk in random groups. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 13(1):73–146, 2003.
- [11] Gromov, M. Asymptotic invariants of infinite groups. In *Geometric Group Theory, Vol. 2 (Sussex, 1991)*, volume 182 of London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, pages 1–295. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.
- [12] Gromov, M. Rigid transformations groups. In *Géométrie différentielle (Paris, 1986)*, volume 33 of *Travaux en Cours*, pages 65–139. Hermann, Paris, 1988.
- [13] Enflo, Per. On the nonexistence of uniform homeomorphisms between  $L_p$ -spaces. *Arkiv för matematik*, 8(2):103–105, 1970.
- [14] Maurey, B. Type, cotype and  $K$ -convexity. In *Handbook of the Geometry of Banach Spaces, Vol. 2*, pages 1299–1332. North-Holland, 2003.
- [15] Ball, K. and Carlen, E. A. and Lieb, E. H. Sharp uniform convexity and smoothness inequalities for trace norms. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 115:463–482, 1994.
- [16] Druţu, Cornelia and Kapovich, Michael. Geometric group theory. American Mathematical Soc., volume 63, 2018.
- [17] Gromov, Mikhael. Filling riemannian manifolds. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 18(1):1–147, 1983.
- [18] Naor, Assaf. An introduction to the Ribe program. *Japanese Journal of Mathematics*, 7:167–233, 2012.
- [19] Kuwae, Kazuhiro. Jensen’s inequality on convex spaces. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 49(3-4):1359–1378, 2014.

- [20] Lang, Urs and Schroeder, Viktor. Kirszbraun's theorem and metric spaces of bounded curvature. *Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA*, 7(3):535–560, 1997.
- [21] Mendel, Manor and Naor, Assaf. Spectral calculus and Lipschitz extension for barycentric metric spaces. *Analysis and Geometry in Metric Spaces*, 1:163–199, 2013.
- [22] Lee, James R and Naor, Assaf. Extending Lipschitz functions via random metric partitions. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 160(1):59–95, 2005.
- [23] Maurey, Bernard. Un théoreme de prolongement. *CR Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A*, 279:329–332, 1974.
- [24] Mendel, Manor and Naor, Assaf. Metric cotype. *Annals of Mathematics*, 168:247–298, 2008.
- [25] Ball, Keith. Markov chains, Riesz transforms and Lipschitz maps. *Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA*, 2(2):137–172, 1992.
- [26] Naor, A. and Peres, Y. and Schramm, O. and Sheffield, S. Markov chains in smooth Banach spaces and Gromov-hyperbolic metric spaces. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 134(1):165–197, 2006.
- [27] Bridson, Martin R and Haefliger, André. *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*. Springer Science & Business Media, volume 319, 2013.
- [28] Ding, Jian and Lee, James R and Peres, Yuval. Markov type and threshold embeddings. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 23(4):1207–1229, 2013.
- [29] Naor, A. and Schechtman, G. Remarks on non linear type and Pisier's inequality. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelles Journal)*, 552:213–236, 2002.
- [30] Ohta, Shin-Ichi. Markov Type of Alexandrov Spaces of Non-Negative Curvature. *Mathematika*, 55(1-2):177–189, 2009.
- [31] Pisier, Gilles. Martingales with values in uniformly convex spaces. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 20:326–350, 1975.
- [32] Lang, U. and Schlichenmaier, T. Nagata dimension, quasisymmetric embeddings, and Lipschitz extensions. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 58:3625–3655, 2005.
- [33] Naor, A. and Silberman, L. Poincaré inequalities, embeddings, and wild groups. *Compositio Mathematica*, 147(5):1546–1572, 2011.
- [34] Sturm, Karl-Theodor. Probability measures on metric spaces of nonpositive curvature. In *Heat kernels and analysis on manifolds, graphs, and metric spaces (Paris, 2002)*, volume 338 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 357–390. American Mathematical Soc., Providence, RI, 2003.
- [35] Ivanisvili, Paata and van Handel, Ramon and Volberg, Alexander. Rademacher type and Enflo type coincide. *Annals of mathematics*, 192(2):665–678, 2020.
- [36] Lytchak, Alexander and Petrunin, Anton. Short retractions of CAT (1) spaces. arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.09762, 2020.
- [37] Mendel, Manor and Naor, Assaf. Nonlinear spectral calculus and super-expanders. *Publications mathématiques de l'IHÉS*, 119:1–95, 2014.
- [38] Veomett, Ellen and Wildrick, Kevin. Spaces of small metric cotype. *Journal of Topology and Analysis*, 2(04):581–597, 2010.

- [39] Naor, A. and Peres, Y. and Schramm, O. and Sheffield, S. Markov chains in smooth Banach spaces and Gromov-hyperbolic metric spaces. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 134(1):165–197, 2006.
- [40] Gibbs, Alison L and Su, Francis Edward. On choosing and bounding probability metrics. *International statistical review*, 70(3):419–435, 2002.