

WIDTH STABILITY OF ROTATIONALLY SYMMETRIC METRICS

HUNTER STUFFLEBEAM AND PAUL SWEENEY JR.

ABSTRACT. We prove a conjecture of Marques-Neves in [39], and several alternative formulations thereof, about the stability of the min-max width of three-spheres under the additional assumption of rotational symmetry. We can moreover extend our results to all dimensions $n \geq 3$.

1. INTRODUCTION

A classical question in Riemannian geometry is how curvature controls the size and topology of a manifold. Typically, comparison and rigidity theorems exemplify this type of phenomenon. In [30], Marques and Neves proved such theorems for Riemannian 3-spheres under the presence of lower scalar curvature bounds and the existence of a minimal surfaces produced via min-max methods. Precisely, they show that if there is a Riemannian metric on the 3-sphere with positive Ricci curvature and scalar curvature greater than or equal to 6, then the so-called “width” of the metric is less than or equal to 4π . Moreover, equality is attained iff the metric is isometric to the standard unit round metric on the 3-sphere.

One can naturally wonder what happens when the hypotheses of a rigidity theorem are perturbed—if a geometric object almost satisfies the hypotheses of a rigidity theorem, is the object close to an object exemplifying the rigidity statement? These types of questions are typically phrased as “stability” problems. At the 2018 IAS Emerging Topics Workshop on *Scalar Curvature and Convergence* [39], Marques and Neves conjectured the following stability theorem related to their rigidity theorem above:

Conjecture 1.1. *Fix $D, V < \infty$. Suppose (\mathbb{S}^3, g_k) , $k = 1, 2, \dots$ are Riemannian 3-spheres which satisfy*

$$\text{Scal}_{g_k} \geq 6(1 - k^{-1}), \text{MinA}_{g_k} \geq 4\pi(1 - k^{-1}), \text{diam}_{g_k}(\mathbb{S}^3) \leq D, \text{ and } \text{Vol}_{g_k}^3(\mathbb{S}^3) \leq V.$$

Then (\mathbb{S}^3, g_k) converges in the Sormani–Wenger Intrinsic Flat sense to the round unit sphere (\mathbb{S}^3, g_{rd}) .

In Conjecture 1.1, the original condition on the width is replaced with a stronger condition on MinA , which is defined for a general Riemannian n -manifold (M^n, g) by

$$\text{MinA}_g := \inf \{ \text{Vol}_g^{n-1}(\Sigma) : \Sigma \text{ is a closed minimal hypersurface in } M \}.$$

In fact, since the width W_g is achieved by the area of a minimal surface, it is always true that $W_g \geq \text{MinA}_g$. Conjecture 1.1 also drops the assumption of $\text{Ric} > 0$; in the proof of Marques–Neves’ rigidity theorem, $\text{Ric} > 0$ is only used to ensure that the manifold contains no stable minimal 2-spheres. By [30, Appendix A], we see that if the scalar curvature of a 3-manifold is sufficiently close to 6 and MinA is sufficiently close to 4π , then the manifold contains no stable minimal embedded surfaces. Lastly, the additionally imposed bounds on diameter and volume guarantee the existence of a subsequential limit to $\{(\mathbb{S}^3, g_k)\}$ in the Sormani–Wenger intrinsic flat (\mathcal{IF}) topology (first defined in [41]) via Wenger’s compactness theorem [45]. This means that the aim of Conjecture 1.1 as stated is the identification of such a subsequential limit.

In this paper, we prove Conjecture 1.1 under the additional assumption of rotational symmetry, but without the assumption of a volume upper bound. We can even extend our results to all dimensions $n \geq 3$. In particular, our first result is the following, where $d_{\mathcal{IF}}$ denotes the \mathcal{IF} distance:

Theorem A. *Fix $\delta > 0$, $D > 0$. Let (\mathbb{S}^n, g) be a rotationally symmetric metric on the n -sphere. There exists an $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n, D, \delta) > 0$ such that if*

- $\text{diam}_g(\mathbb{S}^n) \leq D$,
- $\text{Scal}_g \geq 6(1 - \varepsilon)^2$,
- $\text{MinA}_g \geq \omega_{n-1}(1 - \varepsilon)^{n-1}$, where ω_{n-1} is the volume of the standard unit round $(n - 1)$ -sphere,

then $d_{\mathcal{V}\mathcal{IF}}((\mathbb{S}^3, g), (\mathbb{S}^3, g_{rd})) := d_{\mathcal{IF}}((\mathbb{S}^3, g), (\mathbb{S}^3, g_{rd})) + |\text{Vol}_g^n(\mathbb{S}^n) - \text{Vol}_{g_{rd}}^n(\mathbb{S}^n)| \leq \delta$.

We remark that without the uniform lower bounds on MinA to prevent bubbling along the sequence as in Conjecture 1.1, counterexamples can be constructed as shown by the second author in [43]. These examples

are rotationally symmetric and so, even with our added hypothesis of rotational symmetry here, the MinA condition is necessary. We also note that we do not need a volume bound for our proof, as it ends up being a *conclusion* (see also [33, Remark 1.5]).

In dimension two, Máximo and the first author have proven an analogous stability theorem which says that strictly convex 2-spheres, all of whose simple closed geodesics are close in length to 2π , are C^0 Cheeger–Gromov close to the round sphere [32]. In [3], Bamler and Máximo prove a version of Conjecture 1.1 without any symmetry assumption, but under the stronger curvature assumptions that $\text{sec} > 0$ and $\text{Scal} \geq 6$ instead of solely $\text{Scal} \geq 6$. Their result is also phrased in terms of the C^0 Cheeger–Gromov distance. It is interesting to note that despite the similarity of these results, all of our respective proof methods are quite different. The main techniques of [32] come from metric geometry and geometric measure theory, the techniques of [3] come from Ricci flow, and ours in this work principally come from the Sormani–Wenger Intrinsic Flat theory.

Furthermore, it is interesting to compare the width rigidity of Marques–Neves with Min-Oo’s conjecture: if g is a smooth metric on the hemisphere \mathbb{S}_+^n such that the scalar curvature satisfies $\text{Scal}_g \geq n(n-1)$, the induced metric on the boundary $\partial\mathbb{S}_+^n$ agrees with the standard unit round metric on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , and the boundary $\partial\mathbb{S}_+^n$ is totally geodesic with respect to g , then g is isometric to the standard unit round metric on \mathbb{S}_+^n . Perhaps surprisingly, Min-Oo’s conjecture turned out to be false in general with $n \geq 3$ due to an example of Brendle, Marques, and Neves [6] (see also [10, 44]). Nevertheless, many special cases of Min-Oo’s Conjecture are known to be true—see eg. [5, 16, 17, 19]. In dimension $n = 2$, Min-Oo’s conjecture is in fact true on the nose, and is contained in an old theorem of Toponogov (see [22] Theorem 3.4.10). In [42], the first author has proven a stability version of this Min-Oo Conjecture/Theorem.

Of particular interest here is the work of Hang and Wang in [16], wherein the authors show that: given a metric satisfying the hypotheses of Min-Oo’s Conjecture which is additionally conformal to the standard unit round metric, then the conjecture holds. Using PDE techniques from the proof of this result, we are able to prove an analogous “width rigidity theorem” in all dimensions $n \geq 3$ akin to the Marques–Neves theorem. In particular, we define a notion of width W_g for rotationally symmetric metrics in all dimensions $n \geq 3$ in Section 3.2, and show that

Theorem B. *Let $n \geq 3$ and g be a rotationally symmetric Riemannian metric on the n -sphere, \mathbb{S}^n such that*

- $\text{Scal}_g \geq n(n-1)$,
- $W_g \geq \omega_{n-1}$.

Then (\mathbb{S}^n, g) is isometric to (\mathbb{S}^n, g_{rd}) .

Other stability theorems involving scalar curvature and rotational symmetry have been proven. Lee and Sormani investigated the intrinsic flat stability of the positive mass theorem [26] and the Penrose inequality [25] under the assumption of rotational symmetry. More recently, Park, Tian, and Wang [33] proved that given $A, D > 0$ and a sequence of oriented rotationally symmetric Riemannian 3-manifolds without boundary (M_j^3, g_j) such that $\text{diam}_{g_j}(M_j) < D$, $\text{Scal}_{g_j} \geq 0$, and $\text{MinA}_{g_j} \geq A > 0$, then there is a subsequence that converges to a metric space (M_∞, g_∞) such that $\text{Vol}_{g_{j_k}}^3(M_{j_k})$ converges to the mass $\mathbf{M}(M_\infty)$, and where g_∞ is a C^0 , H^1 , rotationally symmetric metric. Moreover, in a certain sense g_∞ has nonnegative generalized scalar curvature. Therefore, by this result, we already know that there is a subsequence in Conjecture 1.1 that \mathcal{IF} -converges to such a limit space. The novel point of the conclusion of Theorem A is that the limit of such a sequence is the unit round sphere. We do not, however, appeal to the results of [33] in our arguments here.

Finally, we note that if we add a Ricci nonnegative hypothesis to Conjecture 1.1 then we can replace the MinA_g lower bound with a lower bound on our width W_g and prove the following Gromov–Hausdorff stability theorem for rotationally symmetric metrics.

Theorem C. *Fix $n \geq 3$ and $\delta > 0$. There exists an $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n, \delta) > 0$ such that if g is a rotationally symmetric metric on the n -sphere \mathbb{S}^n satisfying*

- $\text{Scal}_g \geq n(n-1)(1-\varepsilon)^2$;
- $\text{Ric}_g \geq 0$;
- $W_g \geq \omega_{n-1}(1-\varepsilon)^{n-1}$,

then $d_{GH}((\mathbb{S}^n, g), (\mathbb{S}^n, g_{rd})) \leq \delta$.

Lastly, as a result of the proofs of the above theorems we have a third version of the stability theorem in rotational symmetry—this time with respect to a convergence studied by Dong and Song in [13, Theorem 1.3] (see also [12]) to resolve a conjecture of Huisken and Ilmanen [20, Conjecture page 430] about the stability of the positive mass theorem. Recently, a convergence of this type also was used by Bryden and Chen for stability theorems related to tori [7]. Roughly, the idea of this convergence is to surgically remove a controlled “bad set” from each manifold in the sequence, so that the remainders converge in the Gromov–Hausdorff sense to the desired limit. The notion of “bad set” varies slightly from place to place in the literature, but the unifying idea is that the “bad set” of non-convergent points is geometrically small. In particular, we show

Theorem D. *Fix $n \geq 3$, $D > 0$, and $\delta > 0$. There exists an $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n, \delta, D) > 0$ such that if g is a rotationally symmetric metric on the n -sphere \mathbb{S}^n satisfying*

- $\text{diam}_g(\mathbb{S}^n) \leq D$;
- $\text{Scal}_g \geq n(n-1)(1-\varepsilon)^2$;
- $\text{MinA}_g \geq \omega_{n-1}(1-\varepsilon)^{n-1}$,

then there exists a smooth domain $Z \subset \mathbb{S}^n$ with at most two connected components satisfying

$$\text{Vol}_g^n(Z) + \text{Vol}_g^{n-1}(\partial Z) \leq \delta,$$

so that $d_{GH}((\mathbb{S}^n \setminus Z, g), (\mathbb{S}^n, g_{rd})) \leq \delta$.

The following is an outline of the paper. In Section 3, we provide the necessary background and preliminaries on rotationally symmetric manifolds, min-max theory, Gromov–Hausdorff convergence, and Sormani–Wenger intrinsic flat convergence. In Section 4, we prove Theorem B. In Section 5, we prove some preliminary propositions needed in the proof of the stability theorems. Finally, in Section 6, we prove Theorem A, Theorem C, and Theorem D.

1.1. A Comment on Notation. Aside from other notation which we will introduce in the coming sections, we emphasize here that we follow tradition in using notation such as $\Psi = \Psi(x) = \Psi(x_1, x_2, \dots : a_1, a_2, \dots)$ to denote a non-negative function, which may change from line to line, depending on any number of variables x_i and any number of parameters a_i with the property that if the a_i are all held fixed, $\Psi \searrow 0$ as $x_i \rightarrow 0$.

Throughout the paper, we will also denote the Hausdorff metric by $d_{\mathcal{H}}(\cdot, \cdot)$, the Gromov-Hausdorff (GH) distance by $d_{GH}(\cdot, \cdot)$, the Sormani-Wenger Intrinsic Flat (\mathcal{IF}) distance by $d_{\mathcal{IF}}(\cdot, \cdot)$, and the Volume Preserving Intrinsic Flat (\mathcal{VIF}) distance by $d_{\mathcal{VIF}}(\cdot, \cdot)$.

2. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 947923). This paper was partially supported by Simons Foundation International, LTD. This work was supported in part by NSF Grant DMS-2104229 and NSF Grant DMS-2154613.

3. BACKGROUND AND PRELIMINARIES

3.1. Rotationally Symmetric Manifolds: An Overview. Since our main objects of interest in this paper are rotationally symmetric metrics on compact manifolds, we will work in coordinates that are well suited to this particular situation. Namely, we will view such an n -dimensional (M^n, g) as a warped product of a line segment $(0, D)$ with the round $(n-1)$ -sphere, endowed with a metric

$$g = ds^2 + f(s)^2 g_{rd}$$

where g_{rd} is the round metric on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . In general, we will use g_{rd} to denote the round metric on spheres of different dimensions, but which dimension is meant should always be clear from context. Here, $f(s)$ is a smooth, non-negative function on $(0, D)$. In particular, it is well known (see eg. [34]) that if $f(0^+) = 0$, then smoothness of the metric implies that (after smoothly extending f to $s = 0$):

- $f'(0) = 1$ and $f^{(even)}(0) = 0$;
- $f(s) > 0$ if $s \in (0, D)$;
- if $f(D^-) = 0$, then also $f'(D) = -1$ and $f^{(even)}(D) = 0$.

We will be able to focus our attention in this paper on regions of (M^n, g) where $f'(s)$ is nonzero and where a related coordinate system can also be utilized. In general, a rotationally symmetric manifold may be broken into parts based on the trichotomy

$$f'(s) <, =, > 0,$$

where $\{f'(s) = 0\}$ contains the cylindrical pieces of the manifold. On a connected component with $f'(s) \neq 0$, we may instead use $r := f(s)$ itself as the coordinate, and consider the metric

$$g = \frac{dr^2}{V(r)} + r^2 g_{rd}$$

for a positive smooth function $V(r) = (f'(f^{-1}(r)))^2$. We note that $V(r)$ satisfies its own appropriate derivative constraints at the endpoints of the interval, provided such a coordinate singularity point corresponds to a genuine smooth manifold point.

Focusing our attention now on such regions where both coordinate systems are available, we record the formulas we'll need for the fundamental geometric objects of concern. Given a metric

$$g = \frac{dr^2}{V(r)} + r^2 g_{rd} = ds^2 + f(s)^2 g_{rd} \tag{1}$$

we let $\Sigma_s := \{s\} \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, endowed with its induced metric. We then compute (see eg. [24]):

Ricci Curvature:

$$\text{Ric}_g(\partial_s, \partial_s) = -(n-1) \frac{f''(s)}{f(s)}$$

Scalar Curvature:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Scal}_g &= \frac{n-1}{r^2} [(n-2)(1-V(r)) - rV'(r)] \\ &= (n-1)(n-2) \left(\frac{1-|f'(s)|^2}{f(s)^2} - \frac{2}{n-2} \frac{f''(s)}{f(s)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Mean Curvature of Σ_s :¹

$$\begin{aligned} H_g(\Sigma_r) &= (n-1) \frac{V(r)^{1/2}}{r} \\ &= (n-1) \frac{f'(s)}{f(s)} \end{aligned}$$

Second Fundamental Form of Σ_s :

$$A_{ij} = f(s)f'(s)\delta_{ij}$$

Volume Form:

$$d\text{Vol}_g^n = \frac{r^{n-1}}{V(r)^{1/2}} d\mathcal{L}^1(r) \otimes d\text{Vol}_{g_{rd}}^{n-1}$$

We also record, for the reader's convenience, that when $g = g_{rd}$ is the round metric on an n -hemisphere, the coordinate representation in (1) has

$$\begin{cases} V_{rd}(t) = 1 - t^2 & \text{on } [0, 1] \\ f_{rd}(s) = \sin(s) & \text{on } [0, \pi/2]. \end{cases}$$

Lastly, we recall the following a priori estimate for $f'(s)$ when the scalar curvature is non-negative, whose proof is a simple application of the mean value theorem and the ODE for Scal_g :

Lemma 3.1 (cf. [33, Lemma 2.6]). *If $\text{Scal}_g \geq 0$, then $|f'(s)| \leq 1$ everywhere. Consequently, $0 \leq V(r) \leq 1$.*

¹In the following, the mean curvature is the divergence of the normal vector field along Σ_s pointing in the direction of ∂_s .

3.2. Min-Max Theory. In this section we introduce the main invariant of focus – the Simon-Smith min-max width W_g^{SS} of the metric g (and a high dimensional analogue for rotationally symmetric metrics).

The modern min-max theory for constructing minimal surfaces in manifolds has its genesis in the work of Birkhoff and Lyusternik-Schnirelmann on the existence of simple closed geodesics in two-spheres [4, 27], and can be described succinctly as an extension of classical Morse theory to the area functional. Since the pioneering work of Almgren and Pitts in [1, 36, 35], min-max theory has been at the center of a veritable industry in geometric analysis, whose rich history is impossible to fully survey here. Amongst the many groundbreaking results in the area, we highlight the work of Marques–Neves [28], Irie–Marques–Neves [21], and Song [38] in the resolution of Yau’s conjecture in [47] about the existence of infinitely many closed, embedded, minimal surfaces in every closed n -manifold ($3 \leq n \leq 7$), and the work [29] of Marques–Neves in the resolution of the Willmore Conjecture.

We now turn to introducing the aspects of min-max theory relevant to us here – those of the *Simon–Smith* variant of the theory originally pioneered by Almgren–Pitts. This min-max theory, developed by Smith in [37] (see also [9] for a fantastic accounting), produces a smooth and embedded minimal hypersurface in a Riemannian 3-manifold (M^3, g) . Consider here a Riemannian 3-sphere (\mathbb{S}^3, g) . The starting point is the construction of *sweepouts*: one-parameter families of 2-spheres in (\mathbb{S}^3, g) starting and ending at degenerate point spheres, so that the induced maps $F : \mathbb{S}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^3$ have nonzero degree. The *Simon–Smith width* of (\mathbb{S}^3, g) is defined to be the infimum over the areas of largest two-spheres in all such one-parameter family of two-spheres “sweeping out” (\mathbb{S}^3, g) . Let us give the following more precise definition (cf. [9, 30]):

Definition 3.2. *Given the standard embedding of $\mathbb{S}^3 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$, consider the level sets $\bar{\Sigma}_t := (x^4)^{-1}(t)$, $t \in [-1, 1]$, of the coordinate function $x^4 : \mathbb{S}^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (more generally, one could directly work with the level sets of a given Morse function on (\mathbb{S}^3, g)). Let also $\bar{\Lambda}$ be the collection of all families $\{\Sigma_t\}_{t \in [-1, 1]}$ with the property that $\Sigma_t = F_t(\bar{\Sigma}_t)$ for some smooth one-parameter family of diffeomorphisms $F_t : \mathbb{S}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^3$ all smoothly isotopic to the identity $\text{id} : \mathbb{S}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^3$. The Simon–Smith width of (\mathbb{S}^3, g) is then defined to be the number*

$$W_g^{SS} := \inf_{\{\Sigma_t\} \in \bar{\Lambda}} \left\{ \sup_{t \in [-1, 1]} \text{Vol}_g^2(\Sigma_t) \right\}.$$

One of the touchstone theorems in the Simon–Smith theory, which motivates our work in this paper, is the following result. In it, the area of the minimal sphere produced by min-max theory realizing the value W_g^{SS} can be viewed as a *size invariant* of (\mathbb{S}^3, g) . This is akin to the way in which the lengths of closed geodesics indicate the size and shape of positively curved two-spheres (see, for example, [32, 11], and Chapter 3 of [22]).

Theorem 3.3 (Marques–Neves cf. [30]). *Let (\mathbb{S}^3, g) have $\text{Ric}(g) > 0$ and $\text{Scal}_g \geq 6$. Then there exists an embedded minimal $\Sigma \simeq \mathbb{S}^2$ of Morse index one² such that*

$$W_g^{SS} = \text{Vol}_g^2(\Sigma) \leq 4\pi,$$

with equality possible iff (\mathbb{S}^3, g) is isometric to the unit round sphere (\mathbb{S}^3, g_{rd}) .

The collection $\bar{\Lambda}$ is commonly referred to as the *saturated family of sweepouts generated by $\{\bar{\Sigma}_t\}$* . In the rotationally symmetric case, it is easy to see that $\bar{\Lambda}$ is also generated by the following sweepout, which we term the *canonical sweepout*. It will be the focus of essentially all of our computations in the sequel.

Definition 3.4 (The Canonical Sweepout). *Let*

$$g = ds^2 + f(s)^2 g_{rd} \quad \text{with } s \in [0, D]$$

be a smooth, rotationally symmetric metric on the three-sphere \mathbb{S}^3 . Let p_- be the “south pole” of the suspension, where $s = 0$. The canonical sweepout is the one-parameter family $\{\Sigma_s\}_{s \in [0, D]}$ of two spheres, where $\Sigma_s := (\text{dist}_{p_-})^{-1}(s)$. Each Σ_s has the induced metric $f(s)^2 g_{rd}$, and therefore $\text{Vol}_g^2(\Sigma_s) = 4\pi f(s)^2$.

²Recall that the *Morse index* of a two-sided minimal hypersurface Σ^{n-1} in (M^n, g) is the number of negative eigenvalues (counted with multiplicity) of the Jacobi operator $L^\Sigma = \Delta^\Sigma + \text{Ric}_g(\nu, \nu) + |A_\Sigma|^2$, where $\Delta^\Sigma = \text{div}^\Sigma \circ \nabla^\Sigma$, and ν is a unit normal to Σ .

Of course, our theorems are stated for all dimensions $n \geq 3$, a generality ultimately afforded in return for the rotational symmetry assumption. However, in high dimensions $n \geq 4$ there is no Simon–Smith theory available. In part, this is due to the fact that the regularity theory for minimal hypersurfaces produced from isotopy classes, which forms a key part of the Simon–Smith method, cannot prevent the presence of large singular sets, even in dimensions $4 \leq n \leq 7$ (see [46]). In particular there even seems to be *no known higher dimensional analogue of Theorem 3.3*. Therefore, to state our theorems for $n \geq 4$, we consider both a closely related invariant called MinA, and a higher dimensional width analogue both of which we introduce next.

Definition 3.5 (High Dimensional “Width”). *Let $n \geq 3$, and let*

$$g = ds^2 + f(s)^2 g_{rd} \quad \text{with } s \in [0, D]$$

be a smooth, rotationally symmetric metric on the n -sphere \mathbb{S}^n . The canonical sweepout $\{\Sigma_s\}_{s \in [0, D]}$ by $(n-1)$ -spheres is defined analogously to the $n=3$ case, and we define

$$W_g := \max_{s \in [0, D]} \text{Vol}_g^{n-1}(\Sigma_s).$$

We will state and can prove our main results using this clearly weaker invariant (in particular, we have not *infimized* over any collection of sweepouts) because the largest leaf in the canonical sweepout strongly controls the global geometry of a rotationally symmetric (\mathbb{S}^n, g) with the appropriate curvature bounds, as we will demonstrate. The other invariant, called MinA, is a familiar quantity appearing in stability problems in the context of the Sormani–Wenger Intrinsic Flat theory (see Section 3.4) and is defined as follows:

Definition 3.6 (MinA). *Let (M^n, g) be a Riemannian n -manifold. Then*

$$\text{MinA}_g := \inf \{ \text{Vol}_g^{n-1}(\Sigma) : \Sigma \text{ is a closed minimal hypersurface in } M \}.$$

Clearly, this is the *strongest* size invariant of the three that we have introduced, in the sense that a lower bound on MinA_g gives a lower bound on W_g (in all dimensions $n \geq 3$) – see Theorem 3.3 and Lemma 3.7. This invariant, originally introduced by Sormani in [40], serves to control *bubbling* and *spine formation* for sequences of manifolds converging in the Intrinsic Flat sense.

We end this section with a lemma which we will find useful in the proof of our main theorem. While a general rotationally symmetric metric on the sphere may have many minimal hypersurfaces which could be either stable or unstable, such a metric with nearly extremal scalar curvature and MinA bounds cannot.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $n \geq 3$. Then there exists an $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n) > 0$ such that if*

$$g = ds^2 + f(s)^2 g_{rd} \quad \text{with } s \in [0, D]$$

is a smooth, rotationally symmetric metric on the n -sphere \mathbb{S}^n satisfying

- $\text{Scal}_g \geq n(n-1)(1-\varepsilon)^2$;
- $\text{MinA}_g \geq \omega_{n-1}(1-\varepsilon)^{n-1}$,

then the canonical sweepout $\{\Sigma_s\}_{s \in [0, D]}$ of (\mathbb{S}^n, g) contains exactly one minimal hypersurface, which is necessarily unstable. If we further assume that

- $\text{Ric}_g \geq 0$,

then the same conclusion holds if we replace MinA_g with W_g .

Proof. Since $f(0) = f(D) = 0$, there is some minimal sphere Σ_{s_0} where $f(s_0) = \max_{s \in [0, D]} f(s) \geq (1-\varepsilon)$. By maximality, $f''(s_0) \leq 0$. For the sake of contradiction, suppose that there were another minimal sphere, say Σ_{t_0} where without loss of generality $s_0 < t_0 < D$. We will obtain a contradiction by showing the existence of a stable Σ_{r_0} of large area, which is impossible because of the lower scalar curvature bound. Indeed, if Σ_{r_0} is any stable minimal sphere in the sweepout, then as is well known the stability inequality and traced Gauss equation yield

$$\int_{\Sigma_{r_0}} \text{Scal}_{\Sigma_{r_0}} - |A_{\Sigma_{r_0}}|^2 \geq \int_{\Sigma_{r_0}} \text{Scal}_M.$$

Applying the scalar curvature lower bound, we obtain that

$$\frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{f(r_0)^2} \text{Vol}_g^{n-1}(\Sigma_{r_0}) = \int_{\Sigma_{r_0}} \text{Scal}_{\Sigma_{r_0}} \geq n(n-1)(1-\varepsilon)^2 \text{Vol}_g^{n-1}(\Sigma_{r_0})$$

which yields the following upper bound on the radius of Σ_{r_0} :

$$f(r_0) \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{n-2}{n}}.$$

Therefore, if $\text{MinA}_g \geq \omega_{n-1}(1-\varepsilon(n))^{\frac{n-1}{2}}$ where $\varepsilon(n) < 1 - \left(\frac{n-2}{n}\right)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}$ is fixed, then $\{\Sigma_s\}_{s \in [0, D]}$ contains no stable minimal surfaces since

$$\left(\frac{\text{MinA}_g}{\omega_{n-1}}\right)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \leq f(r_0).$$

Thus, for MinA_g so large it suffices to find a stable minimal Σ_{r_0} to obtain a contradiction. If either of $\Sigma_{s_0}, \Sigma_{t_0}$ is stable then we are done, and otherwise we have $f'(s_0) = f'(t_0) = 0$ with $f''(s_0), f''(t_0) < 0$. Then f attains a local minimum at some r_0 in the interior of $[s_0, t_0]$ where $f'(r_0) = 0$ and $f''(r_0) \geq 0$, so that Σ_{r_0} is a stable minimal sphere and we may again conclude.

In the case where $\text{Ric}_g \geq 0$, we also have that $f''(x) \leq 0$ on $[0, D]$. So $f'(s_0) = 0$ and $f''(s_0) \leq 0$. In fact, by the proof of Proposition 5.1 (which is independent of this lemma) it follows that $f''(s_0) < 0$. Thus, $f'(s) < 0$ for every $s \in (s_0, D]$, and there are no further minimal spheres in $\{\Sigma_s\}_{s \in (s_0, D]}$. A similar analysis shows that there are none in $\{\Sigma_s\}_{s \in [0, s_0)}$, so we are done. \square

3.3. Gromov–Hausdorff Convergence. Here we will review the Gromov–Hausdorff (GH) distance between two metric spaces. Gromov defined this distance between two metric spaces by generalizing the concept of Hausdorff distance between two subsets of a metric space. We refer the reader to [15] and [8] for further details.

The Gromov-Hausdorff distance between two compact metric spaces (X_1, d_1) and (X_2, d_2) can be defined by

$$d_{\text{GH}}((X_1, d_1), (X_2, d_2)) = \inf_Z \{d_{\mathcal{H}}^Z(\phi_1(X_1), \phi_2(X_2))\}$$

where the infimum is taken over all complete metric spaces (Z, d^Z) and all distance preserving maps $\phi_i : X_i \rightarrow Z$, and where $d_{\mathcal{H}}^Z$ denotes the standard Hausdorff distance between two compact subsets of (Z, d^Z) : For any compact $X, Y \subset Z$,

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}^Z(X, Y) = \inf\{r > 0 : X \subset B_r(Y) \text{ and } Y \subset B_r(X)\}$$

with $B_r(\cdot)$ denoting the r neighborhood of a subset of (Z, d^Z) . We say that a metric spaces (X_j, d_j) converge in the GH-sense to a metric space (X_∞, d_∞) if

$$d_{\text{GH}}((X_j, d_j), (X_\infty, d_\infty)) \rightarrow 0.$$

We note GH-distance defines a distance between two Riemannian manifolds since we can naturally view a Riemannian manifold as a metric space (M, d_g) where d_g is the induced distance function from g .

3.4. Sormani–Wenger Intrinsic Flat Convergence. In this section, we will review Sormani–Wenger intrinsic flat distance between two integral current spaces. Sormani and Wenger [41] defined intrinsic flat distance, which generalizes the notion of flat distance for currents in Euclidean space. To do so they used Ambrosio and Kirchheim’s [2] generalization of Federer and Fleming’s [14] integral currents to metric spaces. We refer the reader to [2] for further details about currents in arbitrary metric spaces and to [41] for further details about integral current spaces and intrinsic flat distance.

Let (Z, d^Z) be a complete metric space. Denote by $\text{Lip}(Z)$ and $\text{Lip}_b(Z)$ the set of real-valued Lipschitz functions on Z and the set of bounded real-valued Lipschitz functions on Z .

Definition 3.8 ([2], Definition 3.1). *We say a multilinear functional*

$$T : \text{Lip}_b(Z) \times [\text{Lip}(Z)]^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

on a complete metric space (Z, d) is an m -dimensional current if it satisfies the following properties.

- (i) *Locality:* $T(f, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_m) = 0$ if there exists an i such that π_i is constant on a neighborhood of $\{f \neq 0\}$.
- (ii) *Continuity:* T is continuous with respect to pointwise convergence of π_i such that $\text{Lip}(\pi_i) \leq 1$.
- (iii) *Finite mass:* there exists a finite Borel measure μ on X such that

$$|T(f, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_m)| \leq \prod_{i=1}^m \text{Lip}(\pi_i) \int_Z |f| d\mu \quad (2)$$

for any (f, π_1, \dots, π_m) .

We call the minimal measure satisfying (2) the mass measure of T and denote it $\|T\|$. We can now define many concepts related to a current. $\mathbf{M}(T) = \|T\|(Z)$ is defined to be the mass of T and the canonical set of a m -current T on Z is

$$\text{set}(T) = \left\{ p \in Z \mid \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|T\|(B(p, r))}{r^m} > 0 \right\}.$$

The support of T is

$$\text{spt}(T) := \text{spt}\|T\| = \{z \in Z : \|T\|(B_z(r)) > 0 \quad \forall r > 0\}.$$

Moreover, the closure of $\text{set}(T)$ is $\text{spt}(T)$. The boundary of a current T is defined as $\partial T : \text{Lip}_b(X) \times [\text{Lip}(X)]^{m-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where

$$\partial T(f, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_{m-1}) = T(\mathbf{1}, f, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_{m-1}).$$

Given a Lipschitz map $\phi : Z \rightarrow Z'$, we can pushforward a current T on Z to a current $\phi_{\#}T$ on Z' by defining

$$\phi_{\#}T(f, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_m) = T(f \circ \phi, \pi_1 \circ \phi, \dots, \pi_m \circ \phi).$$

A standard example of an m -current on Z is given by

$$\phi_{\#}[\theta](f, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_m) = \int_A (\theta \circ \phi)(f \circ \phi) d(\pi_1 \circ \phi) \wedge \dots \wedge d(\pi_m \circ \phi),$$

where $\phi : A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow Z$ is bi-Lipschitz and $\theta \in L^1(A, \mathbb{Z})$. We say that an m -current on Z is integer rectifiable if there is a countable collection of bi-Lipschitz maps $\phi_i : A_i \rightarrow Z$ where $A_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ are precompact Borel measurable with pairwise disjoint images and weight functions $\theta_i \in L^1(A_i, \mathbb{Z})$ such that

$$T = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \phi_{i\#} [\theta_i].$$

Moreover, we say an integer rectifiable current whose boundary is also integer rectifiable is an integral current. We denote the space of integral m -currents on Z as $\mathbf{I}_m(Z)$. We say that the triple (X, d, T) is an m -dimensional integral current space if (X, d) is a metric space, $T \in \mathbf{I}_m(\bar{X})$ where \bar{X} is the metric completion of X , and $\text{set}(T) = X$.

Example 3.9. Let (M^n, g) be a closed oriented Riemannian manifold. Then there is a naturally associated n -dimensional integral current space $(M, d_g, \llbracket M \rrbracket)$, where d_g is the distance function induced by the metric g and $\llbracket M \rrbracket : \text{Lip}_b(M) \times [\text{Lip}(M)]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$\llbracket M \rrbracket = \sum_{i,j} \psi_{i\#} [\mathbf{1}_{A_{ij}}]$$

where we have chosen a smooth locally finite atlas $\{(U_i, \psi_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of M consisting of positively oriented bi-Lipschitz charts, $\psi_i : U_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow M$ and A_{ij} are precompact Borel sets such that $\psi_i(A_{ij})$ have disjoint images for all i, j and cover M \mathcal{H}^n almost everywhere. Moreover, we have $\|\llbracket M \rrbracket\| = d\text{Vol}_g^n$.

The flat distance between two integral currents $T_1, T_2 \in \mathbf{I}(Z)$ is

$$d_{\mathcal{F}}^Z(T_1, T_2) = \inf\{\mathbf{M}(U) + \mathbf{M}(V) \mid U \in \mathbf{I}_m(X), V \in \mathbf{I}_{m+1}(X), T_2 - T_1 = U + \partial V\}.$$

The intrinsic flat (\mathcal{IF}) distance between two integral current spaces (X_1, d_1, T_1) and (X_2, d_2, T_2) is

$$d_{\mathcal{IF}}((X_1, d_1, T_1), (X_2, d_2, T_2)) = \inf_Z \{d_{\mathcal{F}}^Z(\phi_{1\#}T_1, \phi_{2\#}T_2)\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all complete metric spaces (Z, d^Z) and isometric embeddings $\phi_1 : (\bar{X}_1, d_1) \rightarrow (Z, d^Z)$ and $\phi_2 : (\bar{X}_2, d_2) \rightarrow (Z, d^Z)$. We note that if (X_1, d_1, T_1) and (X_2, d_2, T_2) are precompact integral current spaces such that

$$d_{\mathcal{IF}}((X_1, d_1, T_1), (X_2, d_2, T_2)) = 0$$

then there is a current preserving isometry between (X_1, d_1, T_1) and (X_2, d_2, T_2) , i.e., there exists an isometry $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ whose extension $\bar{f} : \bar{X}_1 \rightarrow \bar{X}_2$ pushes forward the current: $\bar{f}_{\#}T_1 = T_2$. We say a sequence of (X_j, d_j, T_j) precompact integral current spaces converges to $(X_{\infty}, d_{\infty}, T_{\infty})$ in the \mathcal{IF} -sense if

$$d_{\mathcal{IF}}((X_j, d_j, T_j), (X_{\infty}, d_{\infty}, T_{\infty})) \rightarrow 0.$$

If, in addition, $\mathbf{M}(T_i) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}(T_\infty)$, then we say (X_j, d_j, T_j) converges to $(X_\infty, d_\infty, T_\infty)$ in the volume preserving intrinsic flat (\mathcal{VIF}) sense.

In this paper, our main tool for estimating the Gromov-Hausdorff and Intrinsic-Flat distance between two spaces is the following key result of Lakzian and Sormani in [23]. In it, two manifolds are found to be close in one of these distances if there are large diffeomorphic subregions situated similarly in each space which are themselves close in the C^0 Cheeger–Gromov sense (defined in the following). Specifically, they proved the following:

Theorem 3.10 (Lakzian–Sormani *cf.* [23]). *Suppose that $M_1 = (M, g_1)$ and $M_2 = (M, g_2)$ are oriented precompact Riemannian manifolds with diffeomorphic subregions $U_i \subset M_i$ and diffeomorphisms $\psi_i : U \rightarrow U_i$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{(1 + \varepsilon)^2} \psi_2^* g_2(v, v) \leq \psi_1^* g_1(v, v) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^2 \psi_2^* g_2(v, v)$$

for every $v \in TU$ (i.e. g_1 and g_2 are close in the C^0 Cheeger-Gromov sense). We define the following quantities:

- $D_{U_i} = \sup\{\text{diam}_{M_i}(W) : W \text{ is a connected component of } U_i\}$;
- $a > \pi^{-1} \arccos((1 + \varepsilon)^{-1}) \max\{D_{U_1}, D_{U_2}\}$;
- $\lambda = \sup_{x, y \in U} |d_{M_1}(\psi_1(x), \psi_1(y)) - d_{M_2}(\psi_2(x), \psi_2(y))|$;
- $h = \sqrt{\lambda(\max\{D_{U_1}, D_{U_2}\} + \lambda/4)}$;
- $\bar{h} = \max\{h, \sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + 2\varepsilon D_{U_1}}, \sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + 2\varepsilon D_{U_2}}\}$.

Then the Gromov–Hausdorff distance between the metric completions of the M_i is bounded:

$$d_{GH}(\overline{M_1}, \overline{M_2}) \leq a + 2\bar{h} + \max\left\{d_H^{M_1}(U_1, M_1), d_H^{M_2}(U_2, M_2)\right\}.$$

Similarly, the intrinsic flat distance between the settled completions³ of the M_i is bounded:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathcal{IF}}(M'_1, M'_2) &\leq (a + 2\bar{h}) (\text{Vol}_{g_1}^n(U_1) + \text{Vol}_{g_2}^n(U_2) + \text{Vol}_{g_1}^{n-1}(\partial U_1) + \text{Vol}_{g_2}^{n-1}(\partial U_2)) \\ &\quad + \text{Vol}_{g_1}^n(M_1 \setminus U_1) + \text{Vol}_{g_2}^n(M_2 \setminus U_2). \end{aligned}$$

4. A WIDTH RIGIDITY THEOREM IN ALL DIMENSIONS Á LA MARQUES-NEVES

In this section, we prove a version of Marques–Neves’ Theorem 3.3 for rotationally symmetric manifolds in all dimensions $n \geq 3$. We emphasize that Theorem 3.3 is manifestly a *three-dimensional* result, on account of the fact that it concerns the Simon–Smith width which has no known higher dimensional analogue in generality (cf. Section 3.2). Rotational symmetry, however, allows us to introduce the related, weaker invariant W_g of Definition 3.5, which is clearly defined for every $n \geq 3$. With this extended definition of “width”, we can state and prove a rotationally symmetric version of Theorem 3.3 which is valid in all dimensions $n \geq 3$, and moreover requires *no* assumption on the Ricci curvature. The following is a restatement of Theorem B:

Theorem 4.1 (Rigidity of the Width in Rotational Symmetry). *Let $n \geq 3$ and g be a rotationally symmetric Riemannian metric on the n -sphere, \mathbb{S}^n such that*

- $\text{Scal}_g \geq n(n - 1)$;
- $W_g \geq \omega_{n-1}$,

where W_g is the Simon–Smith width when $n = 3$, and is as in Definition 3.5 for $n \geq 4$. Then (\mathbb{S}^n, g) is isometric to (\mathbb{S}^n, g_{rd}) .

Proof. Since (\mathbb{S}^n, g) is rotationally symmetric, we can write it in the isometric form

$$([0, 1] \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}, ds^2 + f(s)^2 g_{rd})$$

where $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a non-negative smooth function such that $f(0) = f(1) = 0$ and $f'(0) = -f'(1) = 1$. Therefore, we know that $f(s)$ obtains an interior maximum at some point $m^* \in (0, 1)$, and by the definition of W_g for each $n \geq 3$, we have that

$$\omega_{n-1} \leq W_g \leq \omega_{n-1} f(m^*)^{n-1}.$$

³i.e. the set of all points in the metric completion of M_i with positive lower density with respect to $d\text{Vol}_g$.

Now, consider the restricted metric $\bar{g} = ds^2 + f(s)^2 g_{rd}$ on the hemisphere $\mathbb{S}_+^n = [0, m^*] \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, and note that $\text{Scal}_{\bar{g}} \geq n(n-1)$. Furthermore, $\partial\mathbb{S}_+^n$ is totally geodesic with induced metric $f(m^*)^2 g_{rd}$. By the above observation, $f(m^*) \geq 1$ so we also obtain $\bar{g} \geq g_{rd}$ along $\partial\mathbb{S}_+^n$.

Next, note that by virtue of its rotational symmetry, \bar{g} is conformal to the Euclidean metric on the Euclidean n -ball of radius 1, $B^n(1)$. In particular, $(\mathbb{S}_+^n, \bar{g})$ is isometric to $(B^n(1), \tilde{g} := u^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g_{euc})$ for some smooth function $u : B^n(1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{>0}$. As is well known, the conformal factor u obeys the Yamabe equation

$$\text{Scal}_g = \text{Scal}_{\bar{g}} = u^{-\frac{n+2}{n-2}} \left(-\frac{4(n-1)}{n-2} \Delta u \right)$$

where Δ is the standard Euclidean Laplacian. Moreover, the fact that $\tilde{g} \geq g_{rd}$ along the boundary implies that $u|_{\partial B_1^n} \geq 1$. Therefore, since $\text{Scal}_g \geq n(n-1)$, u satisfies the PDE problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u \geq \frac{n(n-2)}{4} u^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}} & \text{in } B^n(1) \\ u \geq 1 & \text{on } \partial B^n(1), \end{cases}$$

and by Claim 3.5 of Hang–Wang in [16], the only possible solution is

$$u(x) = \left(\frac{2}{1 + |x|^2} \right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}.$$

This is exactly the conformal factor of the standard round metric g_{rd} on \mathbb{S}_+^n with respect to g_{euc} on $B^n(1)$, and applying the same argument to the other hemisphere of (\mathbb{S}^n, g) thus establishes the Theorem. \square

5. A PRIORI DIAMETER ESTIMATE

In this section we prove an explicit a priori upper bound for the diameter of a rotationally symmetric n -sphere with positive scalar curvature, non-negative Ricci curvature, and width bounded below by a dimensional constant.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $n \geq 3$, $\Lambda > 0$, $w_0 > \sqrt{\frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{\Lambda}} := 1/\sqrt{\tilde{\Lambda}}$. Then there exists a $D_0 = D_0(n, \Lambda, w_0) < \infty$ such that if*

$$g = ds^2 + f(s)^2 g_{rd} \quad \text{with } s \in [0, D]$$

is a smooth, rotationally symmetric metric on the n -hemisphere \mathbb{S}_+^n satisfying

- $\text{Scal}_g \geq \Lambda > 0$;
- $\text{Ric}_g \geq 0$;
- $f(0) \geq w_0 > 0$, $f'(0) = 0$, and $f(D) = 0$,

then $D \leq D_0$. In particular, if (\mathbb{S}^n, g) is rotationally symmetric and satisfies the above curvature conditions with $W_g \geq \omega_{n-1} w_0^{n-1}$, then $\text{diam}_g \leq 2D_0$.

Moreover, one may take the explicit value

$$D_0 = \frac{2nw_0}{n-2} \cdot \frac{1}{\tilde{\Lambda}w_0^2 - \log(\tilde{\Lambda}w_0^2) - 1}.$$

Remark 5.2. *The threshold value of $1/\sqrt{\tilde{\Lambda}}$ for the lower bound on w_0 is sharp, as can be seen by considering long and thin ellipsoids opening up to the constant scalar curvature Λ cylinder. We also recall, in dimension $n = 3$, that $8\pi/\Lambda$ is the upper threshold of area for a stable, embedded, closed, orientable minimal surface (necessarily a two-sphere) in an (M^3, g) with $\text{Scal}_g \geq \Lambda > 0$ (see eg. [30] Proposition A.1(i)). The explicit value of D_0 is certainly not sharp, however.*

Remark 5.3. *It is easy to see that each of these curvature assumptions is necessary for a universal bound on diameter. Without a positive scalar curvature lower bound, the sole assumption of non-negative Ricci curvature cannot force the hemisphere to “close up” in a controlled manner, as one can see by considering capped-off cylinders of unbounded length. Without the assumption of non-negative Ricci curvature, unduloid-like strings of spheres joined by thick necks with arbitrarily small negative Ricci lower bounds exist.*

Proof. Let $f : [0, D] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be such a warping function for a metric g on \mathbb{S}_+^n , and recall that the curvature conditions in the hypotheses enforce the following differential inequalities:

$$f''(x) \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda \leq (n-1)(n-2) \left(\frac{1-f'(x)^2}{f(x)^2} - \frac{2}{(n-2)} \frac{f''(x)}{f(x)} \right).$$

Together with $f(0) \geq w_0$, the first inequality tells us that on $[0, D]$

$$f(x) \geq \left(1 - \frac{x}{D}\right) f(0) \geq \left(1 - \frac{x}{D}\right) w_0.$$

Rearranging the second inequality, plugging in the above lower bound on $f(x)$, and using Lemma 3.1 tells us that on $[0, D]$

$$f''(x) \leq p(x) := \frac{n-2}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{x}{D}\right) w_0} - \tilde{\Lambda} w_0 \left(1 - \frac{x}{D}\right) \right).$$

Since $w_0 > 1/\sqrt{\tilde{\Lambda}}$, we have that $p(0) < 0$ and $p(x)$ is increasing. Moreover,

$$\delta := \sup \{0 < x \leq D : p(x) < 0 \text{ on } [0, x]\} > 0,$$

which is explicitly calculated to be

$$\delta = D \left(1 - \frac{1}{w_0 \sqrt{\tilde{\Lambda}}} \right).$$

Now, recalling that $f'(0) = 0$, $f'(D) = -1$, and $f''(x) \leq 0$, we compute from the above that

$$-1 = \int_0^D f''(s) ds \leq \int_0^\delta p(s) ds = \frac{n-2}{2nw_0} \left(1 - \tilde{\Lambda} w_0^2 + \log(\tilde{\Lambda} w_0^2) \right) D < 0$$

from which the claim follows. \square

6. STABILITY OF THE WIDTH: PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREMS

In this section we prove our main results, which will follow immediately from the following theorem, Lemma 3.7, and Proposition 5.1:

Theorem 6.1. *Fix $n \geq 3$, $D > 0$, and $\delta > 0$. There exists an $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n, \delta, D) > 0$ such that if g is a rotationally symmetric metric on the n -sphere \mathbb{S}^n satisfying*

- $\text{diam}_g(\mathbb{S}^n) \leq D$;
- $\text{Scal}_g \geq n(n-1)(1-\varepsilon)^2$;
- $\text{MinA}_g \geq \omega_{n-1}(1-\varepsilon)^{n-1}$,

then $d_{\mathcal{VIF}}(\mathbb{S}^n, g), (\mathbb{S}^n, g_{rd}) \leq \delta$.

Without any further assumptions, and notably without any further curvature bounds, we obtain the following more-or-less equivalent rephrasing of Theorem 6.1 in terms of the Gromov–Hausdorff distance. In this case, the potential formation of spines at the poles of the spheres is not controlled by the Gromov–Hausdorff topology, so we must excise this potential “bad set” to get Gromov–Hausdorff convergence (this technique has been used to great effect in stability problems before—see eg. [12, 13, 18, 20]). The following is a restatement of Theorem D:

Theorem 6.2. *Fix $n \geq 3$, $D > 0$, and $\delta > 0$. There exists an $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n, \delta, D) > 0$ such that if g is a rotationally symmetric metric on the n -sphere \mathbb{S}^n satisfying*

- $\text{diam}_g(\mathbb{S}^n) \leq D$;
- $\text{Scal}_g \geq n(n-1)(1-\varepsilon)^2$;
- $\text{MinA}_g \geq \omega_{n-1}(1-\varepsilon)^{n-1}$,

then there exists a smooth domain $Z \subset \mathbb{S}^n$ with at most two connected components satisfying

$$\text{Vol}_g^n(Z) + \text{Vol}_g^{n-1}(\partial Z) \leq \delta,$$

so that $d_{GH}(\mathbb{S}^n \setminus Z, g), (\mathbb{S}^n, g_{rd}) \leq \delta$.

Lemma 6.4. *For every $k \geq 1$, we have that*

$$1 - k^{-1} \leq R_k \leq \frac{1}{1 - k^{-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad (1 - k^{-1}) \leq \tilde{S}_k \leq S_k.$$

Proof. Recall that

$$\text{Scal}_{g_k} = \frac{n-1}{r^2} ((n-2)(1 - V(r)) - rV'(r)) \geq n(n-1)(1 - k^{-1})^2$$

which after suitable rearrangement becomes

$$(r^{n-2}(1 - V(r)))' \geq nr^{n-1}(1 - k^{-1})^2.$$

If we integrate both sides from 0 to R_k using $V_k(R_k) = 0$, we obtain the upper bound on R_k . The lower bound on R_k simply follows from the MinA_{g_k} lower bound. By pairing the MinA_{g_k} lower bound with Lemma 3.1, we also obtain the lower bound on \tilde{S}_k . \square

For every $k \geq 1$ we extend $V_{k,-}(r)$ from $[0, R_k]$ to $[0, 1]$ constantly by 0, and we extend $f_k(s)$ from $[0, \tilde{S}_k]$ to $[0, D]$ constantly by R_k . These extensions are smooth everywhere on their now fixed domains of definition, except at the points R_k and \tilde{S}_k , respectively, where they are continuous. By Lemma 6.4, we can assume that up to a subsequence, $\tilde{S}_k \nearrow \tilde{S} \in [1, D]$. Using the scalar curvature and MinA bounds, we may now prove our two most fundamental estimates on our metric tensors, which give pointwise convergence to the round sphere. The first estimate will eventually allow us to prove volume convergence (Lemma 6.11) and together with the second estimate we will be able to establish all of the other estimates needed (Lemma 6.8, Lemma 6.9, Lemma 6.10) to apply Lakzian–Sormani’s Theorem 3.10 to obtain the desired contradiction.

Lemma 6.5 (Fundamental Metric Estimates (I)). *Fix $0 < \eta < 1$. For every $k \geq 1$ large enough, we have the following uniform estimate for $r \in [\eta, 1]$:*

$$|V_{k,-}(r) - V_{rd}(r)| \leq \Psi(k^{-1} : \eta)$$

where we recall that $V_{rd}(r) = 1 - r^2$. Therefore if $0 < \rho \ll 1$, we have that

$$\left| \frac{V_{k,-}(r)}{V_{rd}(r)} - 1 \right| \leq \Psi(k^{-1} : \eta, \rho) \quad \text{on} \quad [\eta, 1 - \rho].$$

Proof. Recalling Section 3.1, via the scalar curvature lower bounds we have the following ordinary differential inequality for $V_{k,-}$ on $[0, R_k]$:

$$n(n-1)(1 - k^{-1})^2 \leq \text{Scal}_{g_k} = \frac{n-1}{r^2} ((n-2)(1 - V_{k,-}(r)) - rV'_{k,-}(r)),$$

or in other words

$$V'_{k,-}(r) + \frac{n-2}{r}V_{k,-}(r) \leq \frac{n-2}{r} - n(1 - k^{-1})^2r.$$

After multiplying this last line by the integrating factor r^{n-2} and integrating from 0 to $r \in (0, R_k]$, we obtain the upper bound

$$V_{k,-}(r) \leq 1 - (1 - k^{-1})^2r^2 \quad \text{on} \quad [0, R_k].$$

If we instead integrate from $r \in [0, R_k)$ to R_k and recall that $V_{k,-}(R_k) = 0$ by minimality, we obtain the lower bound

$$(1 - (1 - k^{-1})^2r^2) + \frac{(1 - k^{-1})^2R_k^n - R_k^{n-2}}{r^{n-2}} \leq V_{k,-}(r) \quad \text{on} \quad (0, R_k].$$

Notice that by Lemma 6.4 the second term on the left hand side could degenerate to $-\infty$ as $r \searrow 0$, but that on $[\eta, R_k]$ it is always bounded and decays to 0 uniformly as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, recalling the definition of $V_{rd}(r) = 1 - r^2$ on $[0, 1]$, we can easily wrap these estimates into the form

$$|V_{k,-}(r) - V_{rd}(r)| \leq \Psi(k^{-1} : \eta) \quad \text{on} \quad [\eta, 1].$$

The last estimate in the lemma follows from the first, if we pair it with the bounds $1 \geq V_{rd}(r) \geq 1 - (1 - \rho)^2$ on $[\eta, 1 - \rho]$. \square

Lemma 6.6 (Fundamental Metric Estimates (II)). *For every $k \geq 1$ large enough, we have the following uniform estimate for $s \in [\tilde{S} - 1, \tilde{S}]$ (recall that $\tilde{S} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{S}_k$):*

$$\left| \frac{f_k(s)}{f_{rd}\left(s + \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \tilde{S}\right)\right)} - 1 \right| \leq \Psi(k^{-1})$$

where we recall that $f_{rd}(s) = \sin(s)$. Therefore, for all large k , $f_k(\tilde{S}_k - 1) \leq \frac{3}{4}$ so that the two coordinate systems

$$(r, \theta) \in U_{k, \eta, -} := \left(\eta, R_k - \frac{1}{100}\right) \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \quad \text{and} \quad (s, \theta) \in E_{k, -} := \left(\tilde{S}_k - \frac{99}{100}, \tilde{S}_k\right] \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$$

cover all of (\mathbb{S}^n, g_k) except the “small” region $[0, \eta] \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ in the (r, θ) coordinates, and where both of these coordinate charts enjoy the estimates of this and the previous lemma.

Proof. We first observe that by our upper diameter bound D and the a-priori Lipschitz bound of Lemma 3.1, the Arzelá-Ascoli Theorem guarantees that a subsequence of the f_k converges uniformly on $[0, \tilde{S}]$ to a non-negative 1-Lipschitz function f_∞ which clearly satisfies $f_\infty(0) = 0$ and $f_\infty(\tilde{S}) = 1$ (by Lemma 6.4). In fact, we claim that f_∞ satisfies the following partial boundary value problem, from which the result follows easily:

$$\begin{cases} f'_\infty(s)^2 + f_\infty(s)^2 = 1 & \text{on } (\tilde{S} - 1, \tilde{S}) \\ f_\infty(\tilde{S}) = 1. \end{cases}$$

To establish this, recall that $V_{k, -}(f_k(s)) = (f'_k(s))^2$. Fix an arbitrary $0 < \eta < 1$. For any $s \in (\tilde{S} - \eta, \tilde{S})$, for all large enough k we also have $s \in (\tilde{S}_k - \eta, \tilde{S}_k)$ where f_k is smooth. By Lemma 3.1, we can estimate that

$$f_k(s) = R_k - \int_s^{\tilde{S}_k} f'_k(\xi) d\xi \geq (1 - k^{-1}) - (\tilde{S}_k - s) \geq 1 - \eta - k^{-1} \geq \frac{1 - \eta}{2} > 0$$

for all large enough k (depending on η). By the uniform convergence of the $V_{k, -}$ on $[(1 - \eta)/2, 1]$ just proven in Lemma 6.5, we therefore see that we also have uniform convergence of the $f'_k(s) = (V_{k, -}(f_k(s)))^{1/2}$ on $[\tilde{S} - \eta, \tilde{S} - \rho]$ for any $0 < \rho \ll 1$. To wit,

$$|f'_k(s)^2 - V_{k, -}(f_k(s))| \leq \Psi(k^{-1} : \eta, \rho) \quad \text{on } [\tilde{S} - \eta, \tilde{S} - \rho]$$

and so by Lemma 6.5 and the fact that $f_k \rightarrow f_\infty$ uniformly on $[0, \tilde{S}]$,

$$|f'_k(s)^2 + f_\infty(s)^2 - 1| \leq \Psi(k^{-1} : \eta, \rho) \quad \text{on } [\tilde{S} - \eta, \tilde{S} - \rho].$$

Thus, by sending $k \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain that f_∞ is differentiable and

$$f'_\infty(s)^2 + f_\infty(s)^2 = 1 \quad \text{on } [\tilde{S} - \eta, \tilde{S} - \rho],$$


from which smoothness follows. Sending $\eta \nearrow 1$ and $\rho \searrow 0$ establishes the claim, from which we see that

$$f_\infty(s) = \sin\left(s + \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \tilde{S}\right)\right) \quad \text{on } [\tilde{S} - 1, \tilde{S}].$$

The conclusion of the lemma now follows readily. \square

Remark 6.7. *Our arguments require us to use both of these coordinate systems in order to cover enough of the manifold to garner global convergence. Notice that Lemma 6.6 addresses a region of definite size around the largest sphere in the canonical sweepout of each (\mathbb{S}^n, g_k) , and tells us that inside this region we asymptotically see the geometry of the round sphere. However, the possibility of spine formation away from the minimal sphere causes the estimates in these coordinate charts to break down. Nevertheless, Lemma 6.5 and the uniform diameter bound give us enough control on the rest of the manifold to make up for this. See Figure 2.*

In the following sequence of lemmas, we estimate the various quantities appearing in the Lakzian–Sormani estimates of Theorem 3.10 using Lemmas 6.5 and 6.6. We also return to global setting on all of \mathbb{S}^n , having

FIGURE 2. The charts $U_{k,\eta}$ and E_k .

similarly carried out the analogous estimates on the hemispheres (\mathbb{S}_+^n, g_k) , which we cast in the following useful coordinate parametrizations:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{S}_+^n, g_k) &=_{\text{isom}} \left(\left(\tilde{S}_k, S_k \right] \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}, \quad g_k = ds^2 + f_k(s)^2 g_{rd} \right) \\ &=_{\text{isom}} \left((2 - R_k, 2] \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}, \quad g_k = \frac{1}{V_{k,+}(2-r)} dr^2 + (2-r)^2 g_{rd} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where $2-r = f_k(S_k - s)$. Using the notation established in Lemma 6.6, we thus work in the following charts for (\mathbb{S}^n, g_k) (see again Figure 2):

$$\begin{aligned} (r, \theta) \in U_{k,\eta} &:= U_{k,\eta,-} \sqcup U_{k,\eta,+} = \left(\left(\eta, R_k - \frac{1}{100} \right) \cup \left(2 - R_k + \frac{1}{100}, 2 - \eta \right) \right) \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \\ (s, \theta) \in E_k &:= E_{k,-} \cup E_{k,+} = \left(\tilde{S}_k - \frac{99}{100}, \tilde{S}_k + \frac{99}{100} \right) \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the restriction of g_k (defined in (r, θ) coordinates for $r \in [0, 2R_k] \setminus \{R_k\}$) has the following coordinate expressions:

$$g_k|_p = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{V_{k,-}(r)} dr^2 + r^2 g_{rd} & \text{if } p = (r, \theta) \in U_{k,\eta,-} \subset U_{k,\eta} \\ ds^2 + f_k(s)^2 g_{rd} & \text{if } p = (s, \theta) \in E_k \\ \frac{1}{V_{k,+}(2-r)} dr^2 + (2-r)^2 g_{rd} & \text{if } p = (r, \theta) \in U_{k,\eta,+} \subset U_{k,\eta}. \end{cases}$$

We also define the fixed charts

$$\begin{aligned} (r, \theta) \in U_\eta &:= U_{\eta,-} \sqcup U_{\eta,+} = \left(\left(\eta, \frac{9}{10} \right) \cup \left(\frac{11}{10}, 2 - \eta \right) \right) \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \\ (s, \theta) \in E &:= E_- \cup E_+ = \left(\tilde{S} - \frac{9}{10}, \tilde{S} + \frac{9}{10} \right) \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the restriction of g_{rd} (defined in (r, θ) coordinates for $r \in [0, 2] \setminus \{1\}$) has the following coordinate expressions:

$$g_{rd}|_p = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{1-r^2} dr^2 + r^2 g_{rd} & \text{if } p = (r, \theta) \in U_{\eta,-} \subset U_\eta \\ ds^2 + \sin \left(s + \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \tilde{S} \right) \right)^2 g_{rd} & \text{if } p = (s, \theta) \in E \\ \frac{1}{1-(2-r)^2} dr^2 + (2-r)^2 g_{rd} & \text{if } p = (r, \theta) \in U_{\eta,+} \subset U_\eta. \end{cases}$$

Finally, we let

$$\Omega_\eta := (\eta, 2 - \eta) \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$$

denote a spherical band. For all $k \geq 1$ so large that $|R_k - 1|, |\tilde{S}_k - \tilde{S}| < \min\{\frac{1}{1000}, \frac{\eta}{2}\}$, Lemma 6.6 guarantees that the charts $(U_{k,\eta}, g_k)$ and (E_k, g_k) together cover Ω_η with the pullback of g_k by the natural inclusion

induced by the (r, θ) coordinates, which we write as

$$\Omega_{k,\eta} := (\Omega_\eta, g_k) \hookrightarrow (\mathbb{S}^n, g_k).$$

Corresponding to this is, of course, the following subregion of the round sphere:

$$\Omega_{rd,\eta} := (\Omega_\eta, g_{rd}) \hookrightarrow (\mathbb{S}^n, g_{rd}).$$

Lemmas 6.5 and 6.6 then allow us to uniformly compare the components of g_k and g_{rd} on Ω_η to easily obtain the first estimate needed for Lakzian–Sormani’s Theorem 3.10:

Lemma 6.8 (C^0 Cheeger–Gromov Convergence). *For all $k \geq 1$ large enough,*

$$1 - \Psi(k^{-1} : \eta) \leq \frac{g_k(v, v)}{g_{rd}(v, v)} \leq 1 + \Psi(k^{-1} : \eta)$$

for every $v \in T\Omega_\eta$ (where we have omitted the pullback maps to Ω_η from the notation for readability).

Proof. Fix $v_p \in T_p\Omega_\eta$. If $p = (r, \theta) \in U_\eta$, then for all large enough $k \geq 1$ and Lemma 6.5

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{g_k(v, v)}{g_{rd}(v, v)} &= \frac{\frac{1}{V_k(r)} dr^2(v, v) + r^2 g_{rd}(v, v)}{\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-r^2}} dr^2(v, v) + r^2 g_{rd}(v, v)} \\ &\leq \frac{(1 + \Psi(k^{-1} : \eta)) \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-r^2}} dr^2(v, v) + r^2 g_{rd}(v, v) \right)}{\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-r^2}} dr^2(v, v) + r^2 g_{rd}(v, v)} \\ &= 1 + \Psi(k^{-1} : \eta) \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for the other inequality. Likewise, if it happens that $p = (s, \theta) \in E$, then for every $k \geq 1$ large enough and Lemma 6.6

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{g_k(v, v)}{g_{rd}(v, v)} &= \frac{ds^2(v, v) + f_k(s)^2 g_{rd}(v, v)}{ds^2(v, v) + \sin\left(s + \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \tilde{S}\right)\right)^2 g_{rd}(v, v)} \\ &\leq \frac{(1 + \Psi(k^{-1} : \eta)) \left(ds^2(v, v) + \sin\left(s + \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \tilde{S}\right)\right)^2 g_{rd}(v, v) \right)}{ds^2(v, v) + \sin\left(s + \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \tilde{S}\right)\right)^2 g_{rd}(v, v)} \\ &= 1 + \Psi(k^{-1} : \eta) \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for the other inequality, as desired. \square

For the next estimate, given $\Omega \subset (M, g)$ we recall the quantity

$$D_\Omega = \sup\{\text{diam}_M(W) : W \text{ is a connected component of } \Omega\}.$$

Seeing as though $S_k = \text{diam}_{g_k}(\mathbb{S}^n) \leq D$, we immediately obtain the following lemma:

Lemma 6.9 (Estimating $D_{\Omega_{k,\eta}}$, $D_{\Omega_{rd,\eta}}$, and a). *For all $k \geq 1$ large enough,*

$$D_{\Omega_{k,\eta}} \leq D \quad \text{and} \quad D_{\Omega_{rd,\eta}} \leq \pi.$$

Therefore, the parameter a in the statement of Theorem 3.10 may be taken such that $a \leq \Psi(k^{-1})$.

It may be worth noting that one can easily obtain sharper estimates for $D_{\Omega_{k,\eta}}$ and thus a in the above by explicitly constructing curves in (\mathbb{S}^n, g_k) between pairs of points $x, y \in \Omega_{k,\eta}$ and bounding their lengths using Lemmas 6.5 and 6.6, instead of cheaply using the uniform diameter bound. In this case, we would be able to ensure a choice of a such that $a \leq \Psi(k^{-1}, \eta)$ (recall from Subsection 1.1 that this means $\Psi \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and $\eta \searrow 0$). We carry such an argument out in the following:

Lemma 6.10 (Estimating λ , h , and \bar{h}). *For all large enough $k \geq 1$,*

$$\lambda_k := \sup_{x, y \in \Omega_\eta} |d_{g_k}(x, y) - d_{g_{rd}}(x, y)| \leq \Psi(k^{-1}, \eta).$$

Therefore, we also have $0 \leq h \leq \Psi(k^{-1}, \eta)$ and $0 \leq \bar{h} \leq \Psi(k^{-1}, \eta)$.

Proof. Fix any $x, y \in \Omega_\eta$. We first prove that

$$d_{g_k}(x, y) - d_{g_{rd}}(x, y) \leq \Psi(k^{-1}, \eta).$$

To do so, let γ be a minimizing g_{rd} geodesic in \mathbb{S}^n connecting x to y , which may certainly leave $\Omega_{rd, \eta}$. Let $\tilde{\gamma}$ be the piecewise smooth curve from x to y contained in the closure of $\Omega_{rd, \eta}$ obtained by replacing the single connected portion of γ outside $\Omega_{rd, \eta}$ with an intrinsically minimizing great circle arc in $\partial\Omega_{rd, \eta}$. This yields a piecewise smooth curve in Ω_η and thus in $\Omega_{k, \eta}$ which we continue to denote as $\tilde{\gamma}$. By the C^0 Cheeger–Gromov convergence of Lemma 6.8 (applied on, say, $\Omega_{\eta/2}$), we have that

$$d_{g_k}(x, y) \leq L_{g_k}(\tilde{\gamma}) \leq L_{g_{rd}}(\tilde{\gamma}) + \Psi(k^{-1}) \leq L_{g_{rd}}(\gamma) + \Psi(\eta) + \Psi(k^{-1}) = d_{g_{rd}}(x, y) + \Psi(k^{-1}, \eta).$$

Next we prove the opposite inequality

$$d_{g_{rd}}(x, y) - d_{g_k}(x, y) \leq \Psi(k^{-1}, \eta)$$

by fixing a g_k geodesic $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^n$ from x to y . This curve γ may just as well leave $\Omega_{k, \eta}$, but since it must begin and end in $\Omega_{k, \eta}$ there is a maximal set of times of the particular form $\mathcal{I} := [0, t_1] \cup (t_2, 1] \subset [0, 1]$ so that $\gamma'|_{\mathcal{I}} \subset \Omega_{k, \eta}$ ⁴. We simply replace the entire portion of γ between $\gamma(t_1)$ and $\gamma(t_2)$ with an intrinsically minimizing great circle arc in $\partial\Omega_{rd, \eta}$ to similarly obtain a new curve $\tilde{\gamma}$ lying in the closure of $\Omega_{k, \eta}$. We therefore estimate as above that for all large $k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{g_k}(x, y) &= L_{g_k}(\gamma) \geq L_{g_k}(\gamma') \geq L_{g_{rd}}(\gamma') - \Psi(k^{-1}) \\ &\geq L_{g_{rd}}(\tilde{\gamma}) - \Psi(\eta) - \Psi(k^{-1}) \geq d_{g_{rd}}(x, y) - \Psi(k^{-1}, \eta), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that the added portion in $\partial\Omega_\eta$ has round length less than $\pi\eta$. \square

Moving on, we establish convergence of the various volume quantities appearing in the estimates of Theorem 3.10:

Lemma 6.11 (Volume Convergence). *For all $k \geq 1$ large enough, we have that*

- (1) $|\text{Vol}_{g_k}^n(\Omega_{k, \eta}) - \text{Vol}_{g_{rd}}^n(\Omega_{rd, \eta})| \leq \Psi(k^{-1})$
- (2) $\text{Vol}_{g_k}^n(\mathbb{S}^n \setminus \Omega_{k, \eta}) \leq \Psi(\eta)$.
- (3) $\text{Vol}_{g_k}^{n-1}(\partial\Omega_{k, \eta}) \leq \Psi(\eta)$.

In particular, $|\text{Vol}_{g_k}^n(\mathbb{S}^n) - \text{Vol}_{g_{rd}}^n(\mathbb{S}^n)| \leq \Psi(k^{-1})$.

Proof. Clearly the full volume convergence follows from (1) and (2) by taking $\eta > 0$ arbitrarily small. (1) and (3) are implied directly by the C^0 Cheeger–Gromov convergence of Lemma 6.8, so it just remains to establish (2). To do so, we recall formula 3.1 for the volume tensor

$$d\text{Vol}_{g_k}^n = \frac{r^{n-1}}{V_{k,-}(r)^{1/2}} d\mathcal{L}^1(r) \otimes d\text{Vol}_{g_{rd}}^{n-1}$$

valid on the open hemisphere \mathbb{S}_-^n , and analogously on \mathbb{S}_+^n . We may thus estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Vol}_{g_k}^n([0, \eta] \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}) &= n\omega_n \int_0^\eta \frac{r^{n-1}}{V_{k,-}(r)^{1/2}} dr \\ &\leq n\omega_n \eta^{n-1} \int_0^\eta \frac{1}{V_{k,-}(r)^{1/2}} dr \\ &\leq n\omega_n \eta^{n-1} D = \Psi(\eta). \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, the integral in the penultimate line is the arc length of a segment of a meridian of (\mathbb{S}^n, g_k) starting from a pole. Seeing as though every meridian gives a minimizing path from one pole to the other (while also realizing the diameter of (\mathbb{S}^n, g_k) —see the proof of Lemma 2.1 in [33]), we arrive at the final bound. The other component of $\mathbb{S}^n \setminus \Omega_{k, \eta}$ enjoys an analogous estimate, so we may conclude. \square

⁴In fact, by using a cut and paste procedure as above aided by the generalization of Clairaut's Relation to general warped products (see eg. [31]), it is possible to show that a minimizing g_k geodesic can have at most a single connected arc in each of the two connected components of $\mathbb{S}^n \setminus \Omega_{k, \eta}$.




FIGURE 3. The “bad set” $Z_{k,\eta}$ which is surgically removed to obtain convergence.

At last, putting together Lemmas 6.8, 6.9, 6.10, 6.11 and Theorem 3.10 yields:

$$d_{\mathcal{VIF}}((\mathbb{S}^n, g_k), (\mathbb{S}^n, g_{rd})) \leq \Psi(k^{-1}, \eta).$$

Taking $\eta \searrow 0$ arbitrarily small and sending $k \rightarrow \infty$ thereby contradicts the assumption that the manifolds (\mathbb{S}^n, g_k) remain bounded away from (\mathbb{S}^n, g_{rd}) in the \mathcal{VIF} distance, establishing Theorem 6.1. \square

Proof of Theorem 6.2. As in the proof of Theorem 6.1, for the sake of contradiction we would begin with a fixed $\delta_0 > 0$ and a sequence of would-be counterexamples (\mathbb{S}^n, g_k) with the added property that for no smooth $Z_k \subset \mathbb{S}^n$ with at most two connected components satisfying

$$\text{Vol}_{g_k}^n(Z_k) + \text{Vol}_{g_k}^{n-1}(\partial Z_k) \leq \delta_0$$

is it true that $d_{GH}((\mathbb{S}^n \setminus Z_k, g_k), (\mathbb{S}^n, g_{rd})) < \delta_0$. Set $Z_{k,\eta} = \mathbb{S}^n \setminus \overline{\Omega_{k,\eta}}$ (See Figure 3). Since

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}((\mathbb{S}^n \setminus \overline{\Omega_{rd,\eta}}, g_{rd}), (\mathbb{S}^n, g_{rd})) \leq \Psi(\eta),$$

Lakzian–Sormani’s Theorem 3.10 together with Lemmas 6.8, 6.9, 6.10, 6.11 yield

$$d_{GH}((\mathbb{S}^n \setminus Z_{k,\eta}, g_k), (\mathbb{S}^n, g_{rd})) \leq \Psi(k^{-1}, \eta)$$

$$\text{Vol}_{g_k}^n(Z_{k,\eta}) + \text{Vol}_{g_k}^{n-1}(\partial Z_{k,\eta}) \leq \Psi(\eta : k^{-1}).$$

Taking $\eta \searrow 0$ arbitrarily small and sending $k \rightarrow \infty$ thereby contradicts the assumption that the manifolds $(\mathbb{S}^n \setminus Z_{k,\eta}, g_k)$ must remain bounded away from (\mathbb{S}^n, g_{rd}) in the Gromov–Hausdorff distance, establishing Theorem 6.2. \square

Finally, we establish the last result of our paper:

Proof of Theorem 6.3. We argue just as above under the new assumption of $\text{Ric} \geq 0$, where the key difference is the concavity of the warping functions $f_k(s)$ on $[0, D_k]$. This allows us to use Proposition 5.1 to give an a priori diameter upper bound for the metrics g_k , removing the diameter assumption of Theorem 6.2. This also allows us to rephrase the strong MinA condition as a condition on W_g .

To establish the result using what we have so far (as in the proofs of Theorems 6.1 and 6.2), all that remains to be established is the following lemma:

Lemma 6.12 (Hausdorff Convergence of the Subregions). *For all large enough $k \geq 1$, we have*

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}((\Omega_{k,\eta}, g_k), (\mathbb{S}^n, g_k)) \leq \Psi(k^{-1}, \eta) \quad \text{and} \quad d_{\mathcal{H}}((\Omega_{rd,\eta}, g_{rd}), (\mathbb{S}^n, g_{rd})) \leq \Psi(\eta).$$

Proof. The second estimate is obvious, so it only remains to consider the first. Seeing as though $(\Omega_{k,\eta}, g_k) \subset (\mathbb{S}^n, g_k)$, it suffices to show that a $\Psi(k^{-1}, \eta)$ open neighborhood of $(\Omega_{k,\eta}, g_k)$ in (\mathbb{S}^n, g_k) contains all of (\mathbb{S}^n, g_k) .

To show this, we consider (s, θ) coordinates for the complement of $\Omega_{k,\eta}$, where we recall that s is the g_k distance from the pole at $s = 0$ to the point with coordinates (s, θ) . Without loss of generality, let us show the estimate for the connected component of $\mathbb{S}^n \setminus \Omega_{k,\eta}$ written in coordinates as

$$([0, s_k] \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}, g_k = ds^2 + f_k(s)^2 g_{rd}),$$

where s_k is the unique parameter less than \tilde{S}_k where $\eta = f_k(s_k)$. Seeing as though $f_k(0) = 0$, $f_k(s_k) = \eta$, $f_k''(s) \leq 0$ on $[0, s_k]$, and $f_k'(s_k) = V_k(\eta)^{1/2} \rightarrow V_{rd}(\eta)^{1/2} = \sqrt{1 - \eta^2} > 0$, we see directly from integration that

$$\eta = f_k(s_k) = \int_0^{s_k} f_k'(\xi) d\xi \geq s_k f_k'(s_k) \geq s_k \left(\sqrt{1 - \eta^2} - \Psi(k^{-1}) \right)$$

for all large enough $k \geq 1$. Therefore, $0 < s_k \leq \Psi(\eta : k^{-1})$, telling us that the diameter of each connected component of the “missed” region $\mathbb{S}^n \setminus \Omega_{k,\eta}$ can be made arbitrarily small by taking $k \geq 1$ large enough and sending $\eta \searrow 0$. The Hausdorff distance estimate thus follows. \square

At long last, adding Lemma 6.12 to the prior smörgåsbord of Lemmas 6.8, 6.9, 6.10, 6.11, applying Lakzian–Sormani’s Theorem 3.10, and taking $\eta \searrow 0$ yields

$$d_{GH}((\mathbb{S}^n, g_k), (\mathbb{S}^n, g_{rd})) \leq \Psi(k^{-1}).$$

Sending $k \rightarrow \infty$ thereby contradicts the assumption that the manifolds (\mathbb{S}^n, g_k) remain bounded away from (\mathbb{S}^n, g_{rd}) in the Gromov–Hausdorff distance, establishing Theorem 6.3. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Frederick Justin Almgren Jr. “The homotopy groups of the integral cycle groups”. In: *Topology* 1 (1962), pp. 257–299.
- [2] Luigi Ambrosio and Bernd Kirchheim. “Currents in metric spaces”. In: *Acta Math.* 185.1 (2000), pp. 1–80.
- [3] Richard Bamler and Davi Máximo. “Almost-rigidity and the extinction time of positively curved Ricci flows”. In: *Mathematische Annalen* 369 (2015), pp. 899–911.
- [4] George D. Birkhoff. “Dynamical systems with two degrees of freedom”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 18.2 (1917), pp. 199–300.
- [5] Simon Brendle and Fernando C. Marques. “Scalar curvature rigidity of geodesic balls in S^n ”. In: *J. Differential Geom.* 88.3 (2011), pp. 379–394.
- [6] Simon Brendle, Fernando C. Marques, and Andre Neves. “Deformations of the hemisphere that increase scalar curvature”. In: *Invent. Math.* 185.1 (2011), pp. 175–197.
- [7] Edward Bryden and Lizhi Chen. *Stability for a class of three-tori with small negative scalar curvature*. 2024. arXiv: 2404.12795.
- [8] Dmitri Burago, Yuri Burago, and Sergei Ivanov. *A course in metric geometry*. Vol. 33. Graduate Studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001, pp. xiv+415.
- [9] Tobias H. Colding and Camillo De Lellis. “The min-max construction of minimal surfaces”. In: *Surveys in differential geometry, Vol. VIII (Boston, MA, 2002)*. Vol. 8. Surv. Differ. Geom. Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2003, pp. 75–107.
- [10] Justin Corvino, Michael Eichmair, and Pengzi Miao. “Deformation of scalar curvature and volume”. In: *Math. Ann.* 357.2 (2013), pp. 551–584.
- [11] Christopher Croke. “Area and the length of the shortest closed geodesic”. In: *Journal of Differential Geometry* 27 (1988), pp. 1–21.
- [12] Conghan Dong. “Some stability results of positive mass theorem for uniformly asymptotically flat 3-manifolds”. In: *Ann. Math. Québec* 48 (2024), pp. 427–451.
- [13] Conghan Dong and Antoine Song. *Stability of Euclidean 3-space for the positive mass theorem*. 2023. arXiv: 2302.07414.
- [14] Herbert Federer and Wendell H. Fleming. “Normal and integral currents”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 72 (1960), pp. 458–520. ISSN: 0003-486X. DOI: 10.2307/1970227. URL: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1970227>.
- [15] Misha Gromov. *Metric structures for Riemannian and non-Riemannian spaces*. Vol. 152. Progress in Mathematics. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1999.
- [16] Fengbo Hang and Xiaodong Wang. “Rigidity and non-rigidity results on the sphere”. In: *Comm. Anal. Geom.* 14.1 (2006), pp. 91–106.
- [17] Fengbo Hang and Xiaodong Wang. “Rigidity theorems for compact manifolds with boundary and positive Ricci curvature”. In: *J. Geom. Anal.* 19.3 (2009), pp. 628–642.
- [18] Sven Hirsch and Yiyue Zhang. *Stability of Llarull’s theorem in all dimensions*. 2024. arXiv: 2310.14412.

- [19] Yuhao Hu, Peng Liu, and Yuguang Shi. “Rigidity of 3D spherical caps via μ -bubbles”. In: *Pacific J. Math.* 323.1 (2023), pp. 89–114.
- [20] Gerhard Huisken and Tom Ilmanen. “The inverse mean curvature flow and the Riemannian Penrose inequality”. In: *J. Differential Geom.* 59 (2001).
- [21] Kei Irie, Fernando C. Marques, and André Neves. “Density of minimal hypersurfaces for generic metrics”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 187.3 (2018), pp. 963–972.
- [22] Wilhelm P.A. Klingenberg. *Riemannian Geometry*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 2011.
- [23] Sajjad Lakzian and Christina Sormani. “Smooth convergence away from singular sets”. In: *Comm. Anal. Geom.* 21.1 (2013), pp. 39–104.
- [24] Dan A. Lee. *Geometric relativity*. Vol. 201. Graduate Studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2019, pp. xii+361.
- [25] Dan A. Lee and Christina Sormani. “Near-equality of the Penrose inequality for rotationally symmetric Riemannian manifolds”. In: *Ann. Henri Poincaré* 13.7 (2012), pp. 1537–1556.
- [26] Dan A. Lee and Christina Sormani. “Stability of the positive mass theorem for rotationally symmetric Riemannian manifolds”. In: *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 686 (2014), pp. 187–220.
- [27] L. Lyusternik and L. Šchnirel’mann. “Topological methods in variational problems and their application to the differential geometry of surfaces”. In: *Uspehi Matem. Nauk (N.S.)* 2.1(17) (1947), pp. 166–217.
- [28] Fernando C. Marques and André Neves. “Existence of infinitely many minimal hypersurfaces in positive Ricci curvature”. In: *Invent. Math.* 209.2 (2017), pp. 577–616.
- [29] Fernando C. Marques and André Neves. “Min-max theory and the Willmore conjecture”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 179.2 (2014), pp. 683–782.
- [30] Fernando C. Marques and André Neves. “Rigidity of min-max minimal spheres in three-manifolds”. In: *Duke Math. J.* 161.14 (2012), pp. 2725–2752.
- [31] Yukihiro Mashiko and Katsuhiko Shiohama. “Comparison geometry referred to warped product models”. In: *Tohoku Math. J. (2)* 58.4 (2006), pp. 461–473.
- [32] Davi Máximo and Hunter Stufflebeam. *Stability of Convex Spheres*. 2023. arXiv: 2312.13995.
- [33] Jiewon Park, Wenchuan Tian, and Changliang Wang. “A compactness theorem for rotationally symmetric Riemannian manifolds with positive scalar curvature”. In: *Pure Appl. Math. Q.* 14.3-4 (2018), pp. 529–561.
- [34] Peter Petersen. *Riemannian geometry*. Third. Vol. 171. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, Cham, 2016, pp. xviii+499.
- [35] Jon T. Pitts. *Existence and regularity of minimal surfaces on Riemannian manifolds*. Vol. 27. Mathematical Notes. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ; University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1981, pp. iv+330.
- [36] Jon T. Pitts. “Regularity and singularity of one dimensional stationary integral varifolds on manifolds arising from variational methods in the large”. In: *Symposia Mathematica, Vol. XIV (Convegno di Geometria Simplettica e Fisica Matematica & Convegno di Teoria Geometrica dell’Integrazione e Varietà Minimali, INDAM, Rome, 1973)*. Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica, Rome, 1974, pp. 465–472.
- [37] Francis R. Smith. “On the existence of embedded minimal 2-spheres in the 3-sphere, endowed with an arbitrary metric”. In: *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.* 28.1 (1983), pp. 159–160.
- [38] Antoine Song. “Existence of infinitely many minimal hypersurfaces in closed manifolds”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 197.3 (2023), pp. 859–895.
- [39] Christina Sormani. “Conjectures on convergence and scalar curvature”. In: *Perspectives in scalar curvature. Vol. 2*. World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2023, pp. 645–722.
- [40] Christina Sormani. “Scalar curvature and intrinsic flat convergence”. In: *Measure theory in non-smooth spaces*. Partial Differ. Equ. Meas. Theory. De Gruyter Open, Warsaw, 2017, pp. 288–338.
- [41] Christina Sormani and Stefan Wenger. “The intrinsic flat distance between Riemannian manifolds and other integral current spaces”. In: *J. Differential Geom.* 87.1 (2011), pp. 117–199.
- [42] Hunter Stufflebeam. “Stability of convex disks”. In: *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 62.9 (2023), Paper No. 244, 20.
- [43] Paul Sweeney Jr. *Examples for Scalar Sphere Stability*. 2023. arXiv: 2301.01292.
- [44] Paul Sweeney Jr. *New Counterexamples to Min-Oo’s Conjecture via Tunnels*. 2023. arXiv: 2308.03184.
- [45] Stefan Wenger. “Compactness for manifolds and integral currents with bounded diameter and volume”. In: *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 40.3-4 (2011), pp. 423–448.

- [46] Brian White. “Existence of least-area mappings of N -dimensional domains”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 118.1 (1983), pp. 179–185.
- [47] Shing Tung Yau, ed. *Seminar on Differential Geometry*. Vol. No. 102. Annals of Mathematics Studies. Papers presented at seminars held during the academic year 1979–1980. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ; University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1982, pp. ix+706.

HUNTER STUFFLEBEAM: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA, PA, USA.
Email address: `hstuff(at)sas(dot)upenn(dot)edu`

PAUL SWEENEY JR.: UNIVERSITÀ DI TRENTO, DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, VIA SOMMARIVE 14, 38123 POVO DI TRENTO, ITALY
Email address: `paul(dot)sweeneyjr(at)unitn(dot)it`